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Many research topics in condensed matter research, materials science and the life sciences make use of crystallographic methods to study crystalline and non-crystalline matter with neutrons, X-rays and electrons. Articles published in the *Journal of Applied Crystallography* focus on these methods and their use in identifying structural and diffusion-controlled phase transformations, structure–property relationships, structural changes of defects, interfaces and surfaces, etc. Developments of instrumentation and crystallographic apparatus, theory and interpretation, numerical analysis and other related subjects are also covered. The journal is the primary place where crystallographic computer program information is published.
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Small-angle scattering (SAS) curves are characterized by two main features: the Guinier region and the Porod region. Standard linear plots are available to fit SAS data and obtain a radius of gyration and a Porod exponent. A new Guinier–Porod empirical model is introduced to fit SAS data from spherical as well as nonspherical objects such as rods or platelets. It also applies to shapes intermediate between spheres and rods or between rods and platelets. The new model is used to fit SAS data from a Pluronic solution that sequentially forms unimers, then spherical micelles, then cylindrical micelles, then lamellar micelles upon heating. This single model can fit structures associated with all four phases as well as the intermediate structures.

1. Introduction

Small-angle scattering (SAS) data are analyzed either using standard linear plots (such as Guinier or Porod plots) or using nonlinear least-squares fits to appropriate models (Guinier & Fournet, 1955; Glatter & Kratky, 1982; Feigin & Svergun, 1987; Roe, 2000). The first method is easily performed and usually gives good estimates of ‘particle’ size (radius of gyration) and clues as to the nature of the scattering inhomogeneities through the Porod exponent; a Porod exponent \( d = 4 \) points to particles with smooth surfaces while \( d = 3 \) points to very rough surfaces. An exponent \( d = 3 \) can also point to scattering from ‘collapsed’ polymer chains (in a bad solvent) and \( d = 5/3 \) points to scattering from ‘fully swollen’ chains (in a good solvent). An exponent \( d = 2 \) can represent scattering either from Gaussian polymer chains or from a two-dimensional structure (such as lamellae or platelets). An exponent \( d = 1 \) represents scattering from a stiff rod (or thin cylinder). Porod exponents less than 3 are for ‘mass fractals’ while Porod exponents between 3 and 4 are for ‘surface fractals’.

A new Guinier–Porod empirical model is introduced. This model is used to fit actual scattering data from a Pluronic solution that forms the following phases upon heating: unimers with dissolved copolymers, spherical micelles, cylindrical micelles and finally lamellar micelles. This single new model can fit these diverse shapes. Alternative methods to fit the described data would involve the use of four separate models.

2. The Guinier–Porod model

A Guinier–Porod empirical model is introduced here. The scattering intensity is given by the two contributions

\[
I(Q) = G \exp \left( \frac{-Q^2 R_g^2}{3} \right) \quad \text{for } Q \leq Q_1,
\]

\[
I(Q) = \frac{D}{Q^{d}} \quad \text{for } Q \geq Q_1.
\]

\( Q \) is the scattering variable, \( I(Q) \) is the scattered intensity, \( R_g \) is the radius of gyration, \( d \) is the Porod exponent, and \( G \) and \( D \) are the Guinier and Porod scale factors, respectively. With the requirement that the values of the Guinier and Porod terms and their slopes (derivatives) be continuous at a value \( Q_1 \), the following relationships are obtained:

\[
Q_1 = \frac{1}{R_g} \left( \frac{3d}{2} \right)^{1/2},
\]

\[
D = G \exp \left( \frac{-Q_1^2 R_g^2}{3} \right) Q_1^d = G \exp \left( -\frac{d}{2} \right) \left( \frac{3d}{2} \right)^{d/2} \frac{1}{R_g^d}. \tag{2}
\]

The Guinier form is used for \( Q \leq Q_1 \) and the Porod form is used for \( Q \geq Q_1 \). The two forms are never used concurrently. Note that the value of \( Q_1 \) does not have to be set; it is
calculated internally using equation (2). This model is general and should apply in the entire range of Porod parameters. It is completely empirical. Note that another way of generating the functional form in equation (1) would have been through the use of the Heaviside step function defined as

\[ C_2 \left( \frac{Q}{C_0} \right) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } Q < Q_1 \\ 1 & \text{for } Q \geq Q_1 \end{cases} \]

The function \( C_2 \left( \frac{Q}{C_0} \right) \) would be multiplying the second term and \( C_2 \left( \frac{Q_1}{C_0} \right) \) would be multiplying the first term. Note also that the Porod exponent \( d \) is often a real number.

In order to test the Guinier–Porod model, small-angle neutron scattering (SANS) data from a Pluronic system forming micelles are used. The SANS data were taken at the NIST Center for Neutron Research. The sample temperature was varied from 283 to 363 K. Pluronics are a class of triblock copolymers comprising poly(ethylene oxide) (PEO) and poly(propylene oxide) (PPO) blocks. Pluronic P85 consists of the following block sequence: EO26PO40EO26. SANS data taken from 0.5% P85 in a d-water (deuterated water) sample at 323 K are discussed first. P85 is known to form spherical micelles in these conditions. The low P85 fraction was used in order to avoid inter-micelle contributions. The SANS data are shown in Fig. 1. A nonlinear least-squares fit to the smeared Guinier–Porod model is also included. The fit was performed in the \( Q \) range from 0.0038 to 0.075 Å\(^{-1}\) (marked by arrows in Fig. 1). Using these values and equation (2) the value of the transition point \( Q_1 \) turns out to be \( Q_1 = 0.053 \) Å\(^{-1}\) and is marked in Fig. 1.

The best fit to the Guinier–Porod model yields the following results: \( G = 7.55 \) (1), \( R_g = 46.03 \) (9) Å and \( d = 3.97 \) (9). The high-\( Q \) background contains contributions from incoherent as well as coherent scattering and is therefore \( Q \) dependent. The coherent part has contributions due to the structure of the PEO chains that are anchored on the spherical micelles containing PPO as well as from the higher-order oscillations of the form factor for the spherical micelles.

The so-called Beaucage (1996) model\(^1\) is often used to model SAS data in order to extract a radius of gyration and a Porod exponent. A generalized empirical Guinier–Porod model is introduced next to model the form factor for nonspherical objects.

### 3. Generalization of the Guinier–Porod model

In order to generalize the Guinier–Porod model to account for nonspherical scattering objects (such as rods or lamellae), the following functional form is used:

\[
I(Q) = \begin{cases} 
  G \frac{Q}{Q_1} \exp \left( -\frac{Q^2 R_g^2}{3 - s} \right) & \text{for } Q \leq Q_1, \\
  D \frac{Q^d}{Q^2} & \text{for } Q \geq Q_1.
\end{cases}
\]  

This is based on the generalized Guinier law for such elongated objects as rods or lamellae (Luzzati, 1960; Kratky, 1963; Glatter & Kratky, 1982; Hjelm et al., 1992). The same scaling factor \( G \) has been kept even though it has different units. The \( s \) parameter helps model nonspherical objects. For three-dimensional globular objects (such as spheres), \( s = 0 \) and one recovers the results of the previous section. For rods \( s = 1 \) and for lamellae (or platelets) \( s = 2 \). A dimensionality parameter \( 3 - s \) is defined.

\(^1\) Equation (8) of Beaucage (1996) relating the Guinier and the Porod scaling factors is in error. It should read \( B = (G_1 / R_g^2) \Gamma(d_1 / 2)(d_2 / 2) \times (2 + d_1) \) instead. Allowing these two factors to float independently during the nonlinear least-squares fitting process produces undesired artifacts.
Table 1
Fits of the Guinier–Porod model to the SANS data.
The reported statistical uncertainties obtained from the fits correspond to one standard deviation. Note that $Q_1$ is not a fit parameter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature (K)</th>
<th>$3 - s$</th>
<th>$R_g$ (Å)</th>
<th>$d$</th>
<th>$Q_1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>0.032 (4)</td>
<td>2.75 (3)</td>
<td>15.81 (66)</td>
<td>1.53 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>0.519 (11)</td>
<td>3.000 (3)</td>
<td>46.42 (14)</td>
<td>3.91 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>0.321 (3)</td>
<td>2.060 (2)</td>
<td>37.10 (14)</td>
<td>4.82 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>0.0036 (1)</td>
<td>1.208 (5)</td>
<td>27.17 (29)</td>
<td>2.87 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applying the same continuity of the Guinier and Porod functions and their derivatives yields

$$Q_1 = \frac{1}{R_g} \left[ \frac{(d - s)(3 - s)}{2} \right]^{1/2},$$

$$D = G \exp \left( -\frac{Q^2 R_g^2}{3 - s} \right) Q^{(d-s)} \left( \frac{d - s}{2} \right)^{(d-s)/2}.$$  

(4)

Note that the factor under the square root must be positive. This means that the constraints $d > s$ and $s < 3$ must be satisfied.

In order to test the generalized Guinier–Porod model, SANS data from the 0.5% P85/d-water sample at different temperatures are analyzed. That sample is known to form unimers (dissolved copolymers in solution) at 283 K, spherical micelles at 323 K, cylindrical micelles at 343 K and lamellar micelles at 363 K. The unimer phase is characterized by scattering from dissolved polymer coils (high $Q$) and some clustering at low $Q$. Ideal Gaussian coils give a factor function (the so-called Debye function) which varies as $1/Q^2$ in the Porod region. The form factor for spheres shows a flat low-$Q$ part while the high-$Q$ part dies out as $1/Q^4$ (with $d = 4$ for spheres with smooth surfaces). The form factor for cylinders shows a low-$Q$ part which varies as $1/Q^2$ and a high-$Q$ part that dies out as $1/Q^4$ (for a smooth surface).

Fits of the SANS data to the generalized Guinier–Porod model give reasonable results as shown in Table 1 and Fig. 2. The ‘dimensionality’ parameter $3 - s$ varies as it should.

Note that the radius of gyration for a sphere of radius $R$ is given by $R_g = R(3/5)^{1/2}$, that for the cross section of a randomly oriented cylinder of radius $R$ is given by $R_g = R/2^{1/2}$, whereas that for the cross section of a randomly oriented lamella of thickness $T$ is given by $R_g = T/12^{1/2}$.

4. Three regions

Note that the SANS data reported here show scattering from very long cylinders (at 343 K) or from extended lamellae (at 363 K). Only the cylinder radius or lamellar thickness can be obtained from the intermediate-$Q$ Guinier region observed (shown in Fig. 5). The data window is limited at low $Q$ so that no low-$Q$ Guinier region would allow an estimate of the cylinder length or lamellar lateral size.

The most general case containing three Guinier regions (that account for three different orthogonal particle sizes) can be described by this model. The simpler case with two Guinier regions is included here:

$$I(Q) = \frac{G_2}{Q_{s_2}} \exp \left( -\frac{Q^2 R_{g2}^2}{3 - s_2} \right) \quad \text{for} \quad Q \leq Q_{s_2},$$

$$I(Q) = \frac{G_1}{Q_{s_1}} \exp \left( -\frac{Q^2 R_{g1}^2}{3 - s_1} \right) \quad \text{for} \quad Q_{s_2} \leq Q \leq Q_{s_1},$$

$$I(Q) = \frac{D}{Q^d} \quad \text{for} \quad Q \geq Q_{s_1}.$$  

(5)

Here $3 - s_2$ and $3 - s_1$ are the ‘dimensionality’ parameters, and $R_{g2}$ and $R_{g1}$ are the radii of gyration for the short and overall sizes of the scattering object. For a cylinder of radius $R$ and length $L$, $R_{g2} = (L^2/12 + R^2)^{1/2}$ and $R_{g1} = R/L^{1/2}$. For a lamella of thickness $T$ and width $W$, $R_{g2} = (W^2/12 + T^2/12)^{1/2}$ and $R_{g1} = T/12^{1/2}$.

Here also, applying the constraint of continuity of the intensity function (of $Q$) and its derivative twice yields two transition regions, a new one at $Q_2$ and the old one at $Q_3$. $Q_2$ is between the low-$Q$ and intermediate-$Q$ Guinier regions and $Q_1$ is between the intermediate-$Q$ Guinier region and the Porod region:

$$Q_2 = \left( \frac{2}{3 - s_2} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{R_{g2}^2}{3 - s_2} - \frac{R_{g1}^2}{3 - s_1} \right)^{1/2},$$

$$G_2 = G_1 \exp \left[ -\frac{Q^2}{3 - s_1} \left( \frac{R_{g1}^2}{3 - s_1} - \frac{R_{g2}^2}{3 - s_2} \right) \right] Q^{(d-s_1)}.$$  

(6)

During the fitting to the generalized Guinier–Porod model, the first term in equation (5) is used for $Q \leq Q_2$, the second term is used for $Q_2 \leq Q \leq Q_3$, and the third term is used for $Q \geq Q_3$. Here also, keeping the factor under the square root positive implies $3 > s_1 > s_2$ and $R_{g2}^2/(3 - s_2) - R_{g1}^2/(3 - s_1) > 0$ (i.e. $R_{g2} > R_{g1}$).

The case of scattering from a cylinder, for example, is obtained by setting $3 - s_2 = 3$ (i.e. $s_2 = 0$) and $3 - s_1 = 2$. The form factor for a cylinder with $G_1 = 1$, $R_{g2} = 100$ Å, $R_{g1} = 10$ Å and $d = 4$ is plotted in Fig. 3. These radii of gyration correspond to a cylinder length $L = 12^{1/2}(100^2 - 10^2)^{1/2} = 344.67$ Å and radius $R = 10(2)^{1/2} = 14.14$ Å. Note that the $1/Q$ region characterizing a long rod applies between the low-$Q$ and the intermediate-$Q$ Guinier regions.

When the form factor given by the Guinier–Porod model contains three regions, it requires that $s_1 \geq s_2$. In general, for scattering objects with spherical symmetry $s_2 = s_1 = 0$ and for cylindrical objects $s_1 = 0$ and $s_2 = 1$. For lamellae with equal width and length, one has $s_2 = 0$ and $s_1 = 2$. Lamellae that are characterized by three distinct sizes (thickness, length and width) would be best described by three Guinier regions and a Porod region (a total of four regions) with $s_2 = 0$ for the lowest-$Q$ Guinier region.
The single Guinier–Porod model described here can empirically model widely different structures and could provide a simple shortcut for obtaining useful information from the scattering from a nonspherical object. The alternative would be to perform standard linear plots (such as the Guinier or Porod plots). These have limited reliability for complex phase behavior involving diverse particle shapes. The other alternative method would be to use exact known form factors for discrete structures (such as polymer coils, spheres, cylinder, lamellae etc.). One would have to use multiple models for each phase structure rather than the single model described here. Moreover, the exact structure factors method does not cover structures intermediate between the known discrete limits: for example, the intermediate structure representing elongated ellipsoids between spheres and cylinders, or the intermediate oblate structure between cylinders and lamellae. The model described here still does not handle peaks in the SAS data in its present form. Peaks could be handled by multiplying the particle form factor described here by a structure factor. Also, this model cannot reproduce oscillations characteristic of form factors for compact mono-disperse scattering objects.
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