

tof SANS data reduction in one slide!

$$Counts(R, \lambda) = I_0(\lambda) \frac{\partial \Sigma(Q)}{\partial \omega} \Omega(R)t T(\lambda)\eta(\lambda)$$
Incident flux:

$$I_0(\lambda) = \frac{M(\lambda)}{\eta_M(\lambda)}$$
Wavelength λ is proportional to arrival time at detector.
Need ratio of main detector efficiency compared to monitor.
e.g. Remove beam stop and put a small hole A_{H} at the sample to record:

$$D(\lambda) = \frac{C_H(\lambda)}{M_H(\lambda)} = \frac{\eta(\lambda)}{\eta_M(\lambda)} \frac{A_H}{A_S}$$
Rearranging:

$$I(Q) = \frac{\partial \Sigma(Q)}{\partial \Omega} = \frac{A_H}{A_S t} \sum_{R,\lambda \subset Q} C(R,\lambda)$$

$$R - radius on detector t - sample thickness T - transmission \eta - detector efficiency for a single to the sample to record.
$$D(\lambda) = \frac{\Omega(\lambda)}{M_H(\lambda)} = \frac{\eta(\lambda)}{\eta_M(\lambda)} \frac{A_H}{A_S}$$

$$D(\lambda) = \frac{\partial \Sigma(Q)}{\partial \Omega} = \frac{A_H}{A_S t} \sum_{R,\lambda \subset Q} C(R,\lambda)$$$$

Numerator sums counts in a time and space "Q bin". There are some subtleties hidden here, including that we are combining data with varying Q resolution. Transmission $T(\lambda)$ should include the SANS signal.

Proper statistics are *not* obtained by "averaging the reduced data from a series of wavelengths" . P.A.Seeger & R.P.Hjelm J.Appl.Cryst. 24(1991)467-478







| Fit the 2 peaks to Gaussians, on linear background | | | | FWHM % Resolution Mantid estimate | | | Should be constant for each peak Fit smeared = fwhm(Bragg) ? Fi | | it unsmeared | |
|--|------|--------------------|------------|---|------------|--|--|------------|--------------|-----|
| Wav1 | Wav2 | Q1 | Q2 | M1 | | M2 | 15 | 25 | 10 | 2U |
| 1.75 | 3 | 0.1238 | 0.1440 | | 8.6 | 7.6 | 10.3 | 5.8 | 13.4 | 9.6 |
| 3 | 5 | 0.1234 | 0.1424 | | 6.2 | 5.6 | 6.7 | 5.4 | 9.1 | 7.8 |
| 9 | 11 | 0.1236 | | | 4.0 | | 3.4 | | 5.2 | |
| 1.75 | 16.5 | 0.1235 | 0.1423 | 7 | 5.8 | 5.6 | 6.1 | 5.5 | 8.6 | 8.1 |
| Repeat reduction with 1% bins – see later | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | 11 | 0.1236 | | | 2.4 | | 3.3 | | 3.9 | |
| Mantid is averaging Mildner & | | | | Fit unsmeared minus smeared sqrt(U^2 - S^2) | | from unsmeared fwhm(Bragg) sqrt(U^2 - M^2) | | | | |
| of neutrons at each wavelength. | | | | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 2 | | |
| | | | | | 8.6 | 7. | .7 10.3 | 5 | 5.8 | |
| | | | | | 6.2 4 0 | 5. | .6 6.7 | , <u>5</u> | 5.4 | |
| | | Checks he | ere show | | 6.1 | 5. | .9 6.4 | L 5 | 5.8 | |
| | | sasview s good! | mearing is | | 2.1 | - | 3.1 | L | | |











The $\Delta\lambda/\lambda$ term for pulsed sources - more

(vi) ALSO may need to convolute one or more of:

 $\Delta\lambda$ due to data collection histogram time bin width (negligible in event mode) , $\Delta\lambda$ due to rebinning to histogram in the data reduction.

 $(\Delta \lambda)^2 = (\Delta_{moderator})^2 + (\Delta_{collection})^2 + (\Delta_{rebin})^2$

Aside: In the hexagonal phase example, it turned out that the data was collected in histogram mode with 0.75 msec bins (across the 100msec frame), and then the default was to rebin to $\Delta\lambda\lambda$ = 5% within Mantid. Repeat reduction with 1% bins, improved resolution.

Obviously the final Q bin size is also important, in the example this was 0.001 Å⁻¹ across the peaks, much smaller than "usual" for this part of Q range.

A further convolution for the final Q bin size ought to be included to allow for cases where the bin size dominates. Ideally the bin size should be say < $\sigma/2$ to give 4 or 5 bins across the FWHM, in which case this would have little effect.

Making the bin or rebin sizes too small has other consequences due to empty bins and "overbinning", strictly the resolution should be tracked separately from the bin step size.

Thus care is needed!

Postscript (added later)

The simple average of σ_{Q} in the Mantid SANS reduction is currently weighted by the number of neutrons from each wavelength bin in that Q bin. However, as we saw in the example, a few long wavelength neutrons give a noticeably sharper peak (as the shorter wavelengths there are more smeared out). The current weighting gives only a tiny decrease in σ at the peak position, could try weighting as I(Q) instead???

Note that the reduction software has no idea that the data "has a peak" !

The case of a "dip", such as in the form factor for monodisperse particles, is interesting since in the dip there are less neutrons and lower I(Q), so there seems no simple way to get a more representative mean for σ ? So will have to revert to throwing out the shorter wavelengths to improve resolution.

Though for convenience here resolution is described as FHWM(Q)/Q in %, Bragg peaks tend to be much the same width regardless of Q, so comparing FQHM(Q) or σ (Q) is actually better, else resolution at higher Q sounds better than it really is (especially for fixed wavelength, velocity selector, SANS).















tof **Q** resolution • Combining data over a broad wavelength range gives a resolution curve with sharp peak but broad tails. Ideally need resolution curves stored with data. Use theory and/or simulation for the same set up and reduction scheme. In many cases a single parameter Gaussian seems not too bad, at least for . a short pulse source. The code to average $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ in Mantid could average estimated resolution curves, then output the whole curve or optionally say 3 or 4 "fit" parameters, starting with σ . In critical cases, take wavelength slices and fit them separately, or put in a resolution threshold in the reduction, at very least throw out short wavelength data near the beam stop. Take care that binning in the data collection and reduction (particularly geometry) do not degrade Q resolution, but bins must not be too small. Not considered 2d data, $Q_x Q_y$, resolution, suspect simulations are the way • to go, again need an agreed method to store the information! • Sharper Bragg peaks at lower Q would be good!