NRC Publications Archive Archives des publications du CNRC

The effects of particle statistics on Rietveld analysis of cement

Whitfield, P. S.; Mitchell, L. D.

This publication could be one of several versions: author's original, accepted manuscript or the publisher's version. / La version de cette publication peut être l'une des suivantes : la version prépublication de l'auteur, la version acceptée du manuscrit ou la version de l'éditeur.

For the publisher's version, please access the DOI link below. / Pour consulter la version de l'éditeur, utilisez le lien DOI ci-dessous.

Publisher's version / Version de l'éditeur:

<https://doi.org/10.1524/9783486992588-013>

Eleventh European Powder Diffraction Conference, Zeitschrift für Kristallographie: Supplements; Issue 30, pp. 53-59, 2008-09-18

NRC Publications Archive Record / Notice des Archives des publications du CNRC :

<https://nrc-publications.canada.ca/eng/view/object/?id=80693483-eb60-4c8a-aa2d-3ec92dd6367d>

<https://publications-cnrc.canada.ca/fra/voir/objet/?id=80693483-eb60-4c8a-aa2d-3ec92dd6367d>

Access and use of this website and the material on it are subject to the Terms and Conditions set forth at

<https://nrc-publications.canada.ca/eng/copyright>

READ THESE TERMS AND CONDITIONS CAREFULLY BEFORE USING THIS WEBSITE.

L'accès à ce site Web et l'utilisation de son contenu sont assujettis aux conditions présentées dans le site

<https://publications-cnrc.canada.ca/fra/droits>

LISEZ CES CONDITIONS ATTENTIVEMENT AVANT D'UTILISER CE SITE WEB.

Questions? Contact the NRC Publications Archive team at

PublicationsArchive-ArchivesPublications@nrc-cnrc.gc.ca. If you wish to email the authors directly, please see the first page of the publication for their contact information.

Vous avez des questions? Nous pouvons vous aider. Pour communiquer directement avec un auteur, consultez la première page de la revue dans laquelle son article a été publié afin de trouver ses coordonnées. Si vous n'arrivez pas à les repérer, communiquez avec nous à PublicationsArchive-ArchivesPublications@nrc-cnrc.gc.ca.

<http://www.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/irc>

The effects of particle statistics on Rietveld analysis of cement

NRCC-50842

Whitfield, P.; Mitchell, L.D.

August 2009

A version of this document is published in / Une version de ce document se trouve dans:
Zeitschrift für Kristallographie, (Warsaw, Poland, September 18-22, 2008), pp.
53-59

The material in this document is covered by the provisions of the Copyright Act, by Canadian laws, policies, regulations and international agreements. Such provisions serve to identify the information source and, in specific instances, to prohibit reproduction of materials without written permission. For more information visit <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/showtdm/cs/C-42>

Les renseignements dans ce document sont protégés par la Loi sur le droit d'auteur, par les lois, les politiques et les règlements du Canada et des accords internationaux. Ces dispositions permettent d'identifier la source de l'information et, dans certains cas, d'interdire la copie de documents sans permission écrite. Pour obtenir de plus amples renseignements : <http://lois.justice.gc.ca/fr/showtdm/cs/C-42>

National Research
Council Canada

Conseil national
de recherches Canada

Canada

The Effects of Particle Statistics on Rietveld Analysis of Cement

P.S. Whitfield^{1*}, L.D. Mitchell¹

¹National Research Council Canada, 1200 Montreal Road, Ottawa ON K1A 0R6 CANADA

* Contact author; pamelawhitfield@nrc.gc.ca

Keywords: quantitative analysis, cement, Rietveld analysis

Abstract. Quantitative Rietveld analysis of cements is now a common tool in both industry and research. Many papers analyse cements without any additional sample preparation, over and above the grinding carried out by the manufacturer. The particle sizes in cements are usually in the range of 25-40 μ m, which is much coarser than recommended in texts dealing with particle statistics in diffraction. A systematic study has been undertaken to examine the effect of particle statistics on the results from Rietveld analysis of cements, and the influence of reducing the particle size by micronizing. In addition, the effects of changing divergence slit and use of sample rotation have been examined.

1. Introduction

Although it may seem obvious, one requirement for powder diffraction is that the sample is a real, statistical powder. The random orientation of crystallites in the sample is vital to obtain reliable relative intensities in a one dimensional 'slice' through the Debye-Scherrer cones, so this is more than an academic, mathematical issue. This begs the question "when is a powder really a powder?" This question was examined in the context of X-ray powder diffraction in an important paper by the late Deane Smith [1]. Where the sample consists of ideal spherical particles, whether a random distribution of crystallites has been achieved depends on both the particle size, and the volume of sample being sampled by the instrument. The volume can depend on both the diffractometer geometry and the absorption of the sample.

For a single phase sample, crystallites need to be 1 micron or smaller to produce a sufficient number of crystallites to approximate random powder [1]. Most samples analyzed do not meet these standards, which limits the accuracy and reproducibility of any quantitative analysis. Spinning the sample does not improve the statistics greatly. Achieving a 1 micron particle size requires some effort in sample preparation, with some kind of milling or grinding required. Milling can damage the microstructure of some materials (clays are particularly vulnerable) so care must be taken in choosing an appropriate mill. Workers analyzing challenging samples frequently use a special mill produced by McCrone that was designed for sample preparation. Poor particle statistics can have consequences for the relative intensities, and can be a source of significant error [2].

The effects of poor particle statistics become more obvious using microdiffraction techniques. Figure 1 demonstrates this, in a comparison between the data obtained from an as-received cement sample and one that was 'micronized' for 15 minutes in isopropyl alcohol. The cement shown in figure 1(a) has a particle size of around 25 microns. Although 20 microns (600 mesh) is often quoted as being sufficient for X-ray powder diffraction, the 2D frame shows the sample to be very grainy from the spotty nature of the Debye-Scherrer rings. The micronized sample has particles of mostly 2 microns and under, and shows nice, even intensities along the Debye-Scherrer rings as seen in figure 1(b). It should be obvious that good particle statistics become increasingly difficult to obtain for quantitative analysis of increasingly complex mixtures, as theoretically, each component of the mixture must have sufficient crystallites to form a random powder. Cements are complex, multi-phase systems, so figure 1 shows that satisfactory statistics are achievable from a practical viewpoint.

Quantitative X-ray analysis in any form requires reliable peak intensities to obtain accurate results. Consequently, for years it has been recommended to reduce the particle size to the order of a micron or two. Besides particle statistics, coarse particles can have adverse effects in the form of microabsorption and preferential orientation. Some efforts can be made to improve the particle statistics by varying the experimental data collection strategy. Using a larger divergence slit is an easy way to sample a larger volume of material, although care must be taken to avoid

beam-overspill. Sample rotation is often used as the main method for improving sample statistics, but in the form usually present on laboratory X-ray diffractometers it is not as effective as people often believe [3].

Rietveld analysis [4] is now the most common technique for QXRD of cements as the addition of a standard is not required [5]. Crystal structures are known for the major cement phases, so it is readily applied to most circumstances. Although techniques exist for reducing preferential orientation (back-loading, etc) and correcting microabsorption [6], particle statistics have to be addressed at the data collection stage. Specialised approaches such as the use of capillaries are not widely used in the laboratory despite the excellent results that can be obtained [7]. Rietveld software usually produces estimated errors in the form of estimated standard deviations (ESDs). Although these errors are only estimates, they are often used in the place of statistically derived errors.

This piece of work aims to gauge the effect that particle statistics have on the analysis of cements. Both micronized and raw materials were analysed. The repeatability in mounting and re-mounting samples was studied, as well as the effect of changing divergence slit size and use of rotation. The use of multiple repeats means that real errors with confidence limits can be calculated instead of using the software-derived ESDs.

Figure 1. 2D frames from (a) as-received cement and (b) micronized cement. The data were taken on a CoK α GADDS system with a 1mm monocapillary optic.

2. Experimental

A freshly opened sample of NIST SRM 637 Pink Cap Portland cement was split into two fractions, the first was used without processing. The second was processed with a McCrone micronizing mill. The cement was transferred to the milling vessel, containing corundum grinding elements, and isopropyl alcohol (IPA) was added as a liquid phase. The sample was milled for 10 minutes; after which the slurry was removed to a petri dish and allowed to dry in a fume cupboard. After drying the micronized cement was transferred to a sealed sample bottle. Both fractions were analysed using a Bruker D8 Advance X-ray diffractometer with CuK α . The machine was configured to a Bragg-Brentano setting with a Vantec PSD detector, motorised divergence slit and a rotating sample stage.

To study the reproducibility, each cement sample was mounted, run and re-mounted twice (a total of 3 mountings per sample). Four data sets per sample mount were collected with varying strategies (see table 1) to affect the particle statistics through changing the sample volume illumination and use of sample rotation. Repeating the data collection after re-mounting allows an actual standard deviation to be calculated, in addition to the estimated standard deviations that the Rietveld software produces.

Count times were chosen such that the peak intensities were as close as possible to each other, despite the different slit settings. Additionally all the data sets were normalised before analysis to minimise the effect of differing intensities on the final calculated errors. The R_{wp} residual is sensitive to the signal-to-noise ratio, and the intention was that the errors from the analysis should be due to the differences in particle statistics rather than other experimental factors.

Data analysis was done with a beta version of *TOPAS 4* from Bruker-AXS [8]. Quantitative analysis was undertaken using the standard structures of cement phases. The possible use of calcium silicate polymorphs was explored, but didn't significantly affect the result, probably due to the lower resolution of laboratory data versus that obtained with a synchrotron. Fundamental parameters were used to derive the instrument function including the effect of the PSD. The zero point error was determined using SRM 660a (LaB₆) and subsequently fixed. In line with common practice the March-Dollase preferential orientation correction [9] was used on the tricalcium silicate (C₃S) phase. Refined parameters of each phase included lattice parameters and Lorentzian size broadening. No attempt was made to correct for microabsorption using the Brindley correction as the unmicronized material is far from the required monodisperse particle distribution [6].

Table 1. Data collection conditions for each sample mounting.

Run number	Divergence slit (°)	Rotated
1	0.3	no
2	0.1	no
3	0.3	yes
4	0.1	yes

3. Results

Figure 2 shows overlays of what in each case should be identical patterns using the same diffractometer settings, but three different sample mountings for as-received and micronized samples. The un-micronized sample shown in figure 2(a) shows significant variation in relative peak intensities. This is a matter for concern, as variability in the relative intensities will increase the errors in the derived phase fractions.

Figure 2. Overlay of 3 repeats of (a) unmicronized and (b) micronized material using 0.3 degree divergence slit without rotation. Note the presence of a periclase reflection at around 43 degrees two theta in only one of the unmicronized datasets.

Also note in figure 2(a) that one of the repeats shows a noticeable periclase reflection at 43 degrees. The relative periclase peak intensity increased greatly on decreasing the divergence slit, from 0.3 to 0.1 degrees, leading to the conclusion that a single large grain was present somewhere near the centre of the sample. Analysis of the other two repeats yielded negligible periclase. Figure 2(b) shows a corresponding plot for the micronized sample. There is a

marked improvement in the reproducibility, with no sign of a distinct periclase reflection. Figure 3 shows the refined values for periclase for 3 repeats each for micronized and un-micronized material using the same diffractometer settings. It is immediately apparent that the micronized sample gave practically identical results in each case, whilst the un-micronized sample showed variability much greater than the calculated estimated standard deviations produced by *TOPAS*. The NIST certificate for SRM637 gives a certified periclase content of 0.6%, which is agreement with the results from the micronized material. Consequently, micronizing can have dramatic effects on the results from the minor phases. An additional benefit from improved particle statistics is a reduction in the residuals from Rietveld refinements. Figure 4 shows the fits for (a) unmicronized and (b) micronized material. The values of R_{wp} for the refinements are 7.6 and 6.6% respectively.

Figure 3. Quantitative results for periclase. Three identical repeats of micronized and un-micronized samples. The errors shown correspond to 2σ of the ESDs.

Figure 4. Rietveld difference plots for (a) unmicronized and (b) micronized material. The R_{wp} values are 7.6% and 6.6% for the unmicronized and micronized samples respectively.

Figure 5 shows the mean and 95% confidence limits with both the micronized and un-micronized samples for (a) tricalcium silicate (C_3S) and (b) dicalcium silicate (C_2S). The only statistically significant difference in C_3S between micronized and un-micronized samples occurred in the 0.1 degree un-rotated sets, which theoretically should have the worst particle statistics. There is a distinct trend for lower alite values and reduced errors in the micronized samples. March-Dollase coefficients for the un-micronized C_3S were approximately 0.93 whilst those of the micronized samples were around 0.98. This is very close to the value for a perfect powder of 1.0 [9]. Together with the slight peak broadening evident in the patterns from the smaller crystallites in the micronized samples, it demonstrates the better quality of the powder after micronizing.

Figure 5. Quantitative results showing the mean and 95% confidence limits for (a) C_3S - alite and (b) C_2S - belite, using different experimental procedures. The standard deviations are statistical as opposed to ESDs.

There are no statistically significant differences for the C_2S phase between micronized and un-micronized samples, although in the case of the unrotated 0.1° set this is mainly due to a greatly increased error. Once again the errors are generally reduced in the micronized samples, but for C_2S the values tend to be higher.

Figure 6 shows quantitative results for (a) calcium aluminoferrite (C_4AF) and (b) tricalcium aluminate (C_3A). For C_4AF there is significantly more scatter in the mean of the un-micronized samples, the differences are not statistically significant. This is in part due to the large errors associated with the un-micronized results with a 0.1° divergence slit. The quantitative data for C_3A in figure 6(b) is the only case where the micronized and un-micronized samples show statistically different results with all of the diffractometer settings. The micronized samples consistently show approximately 0.8% lower C_3A values than the un-micronized samples.

Figure 6. Quantitative results showing the mean and 95% confidence limits for (a) C_4AF and (b) C_3A using different experimental procedures. The standard deviations are statistical as opposed to ESDs.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

In terms of the major cement phases, the only one that consistently gave statistically different results between the two sample preparation methods was the C_3A . In many instances this was only because of the large errors in the un-micronized results. The C_3S did yield statistically different results where a 0.1 degree divergence slit was used without rotation. This particular combination should theoretically produce the poorest statistics, so the result is not surprising. For C_3S , the micronized samples have consistently lower mean values whilst the C_2S values were higher. Dramatic differences can occur in the minor phases. It appears as though large grains of periclase were present in the SRM. Micronizing successfully homogenized the sample, producing consistent results for periclase, despite its low abundance. However, the un-micronized samples have wildly varying results, depending on whether a grain was present in the area illuminated by the X-rays. In many instances the standard deviations calculated from three repeats of the micronized sample were lower than the ESDs calculated by *TOPAS*. This suggests that ESDs are not always a good indicator of the accuracy that can be obtained using Rietveld analysis for quantification of cements. In conclusion, it would appear as though Rietveld analysis of un-micronized cements will give results for the two major phases that are the same within 95% confidence limits of a micronized sample. However, the errors are significantly higher and the divergence slit can have an additional affect on the errors. The results for the C_3A repeats show a statistically significant difference between the micronized and un-micronized sample. Micronizing can have a major affect on the results of the minor phases, as demonstrated by the periclase in this paper. The micronized sample produced consistent results, whilst the un-micronized sample produced different results when remounted. It can be noted that the calculated ESDs for the periclase in the un-micronized sample were relatively small despite the result being obviously wrong.

References

1. Smith, D.K., 2001, *Powder Diffraction*, **16**, 186-191
2. Klug, H.P. & Alexander, L.E., 1974, *X-ray diffraction procedures for polycrystalline and amorphous materials* (New York: Wiley)
3. Hill, R.J. & Madsen, I.C., 2002, in *Structure Determination from Powder Diffraction Data*, edited by W.I.F. David, K. Shankland, L.B. McCusker, & Ch. Baerlocher (Oxford, Oxford University Press), pp. 98-117
4. Rietveld, H.M., 1967, *Acta Cryst.*, **22**, 151-152
5. Hill, R.J. & Howard, C.J., 1987, *J.Appl.Crystallogr.*, **20**, 467-474
6. Brindley, G.W., 1945, *Philos.Mag.*, **3**, 347-369
7. Mitchell, L.D., Margeson, J. & Whitfield, P.S., 2006, *Powder Diffraction*, **21**, 111-113
8. Bruker-AXS GmbH, 2008, *DIFFRACplus TOPAS*
9. Dollase, W.A., 1986, *J.Appl.Crystallogr.*, **19**, 267-272