1	REVISION 2
2	
3	TITLE: The valence quadrupole moment
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9 10	Kendrick Shepherd ¹ , Matthew C. F. Wander ² , Barry R. Bickmore ^{2⁺} , W. Joel Johansen ² , Tyler Goodell ² , Matthew Davis ² , Charles Andros ² , Larissa Lind ² , and Kathleen Robertson ²
11	
12	¹ Department of Civil Engineering, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602, U.S.A.
13	
14	² Department of Geological Sciences, Brigham Young University, Provo, U1 84602, U.S.A. E-
15	mail: barry_bickmore@byu.edu
10	
1/ 10	
18	
19 20	
20	
21 22	
22 72	
23 71	* Corresponding author
24 25	Concepting aution

Abstract

27	The bond-valence model has recently been expanded to include a directional component,
28	the vectorial bond-valence sum, which is useful for characterizing non-centrosymmetric
29	distortions involving lone-pair and second-order Jahn-Teller effects. Here we show that the
30	bond-valence sum and vectorial bond-valence sum are equivalent to monopole and dipole terms
31	in a multipole expansion of the bond valence incident to an atom. We then extend the multipole
32	expansion to include a quadrupole term, which describes the ellipsoidal deviation from spherical
33	symmetry of the bonding environment, and is useful for characterizing centrosymmetric
34	distortions, such as those caused by first-order Jahn-Teller effects. These distortions follow
35	characteristic patterns in valence space, which depend upon factors that include the <i>d</i> -orbital
36	configuration and size of the transition metal involved. This extended approach, called the
37	Valence Multipole Model, should prove useful for modeling molecular and crystal structures,

38 including those associated with spin transitions.

39

26

40 Keyword: Bond valence, vectorial bond-valence model, valence multipole model, bond angle,

41 molecular mechanics, Jahn-Teller effect, crystal field effects

42

This is a preprint, the final version is subject to change, of the American Mineralogist (MSA) Cite as Authors (Year) Title. American Mineralogist, in press. (DOI will not work until issue is live.) DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.2138/am-2016-5304

43

Introduction

44	Molecular modeling has become increasingly important for exploring the physical and
45	chemical properties of materials, including both known minerals and minerals hypothesized to
46	exist in the mantle (Cygan, 2001; Stixrude, 2001). Quantum mechanics (QM) provides a
47	powerful theoretical framework for understanding structure-property and structure-reactivity
48	relationships, but direct application of the theory is often too computationally expensive for the
49	large numbers of atoms and the longer simulation times frequently needed to simulate
50	geochemically significant materials and processes. Therefore, classically derived methods like
51	molecular mechanics (MM) are often used to reduce computational expense.
52	MM methods treat systems of atoms as "balls on springs," where bond lengths and bond
53	angles between particular atom types are given an ideal value, and simple energy cost functions
54	are assigned for deviations from those ideal values. This approach to partitioning the potential
55	energy surface is fraught with difficulties. One pervasive problem is that no single ideal value
56	for bond lengths and bond angles exists (Rappé and Casewit, 1997; Hinchliffe, 2003), so MM
57	methods tend to predict structures with unrealistically high symmetry (Comba et al., 2009).
58	Furthermore, ideal bond lengths and angles depend strongly on coordination number (Rappé and
59	Casewit, 1997; Hinchliffe, 2003; Comba et al., 2009). MM force fields often address this by
60	treating two atoms of the same element with different coordination numbers, as fundamentally
61	different atom types; but this solution precludes simulating chemical reactions involving
62	coordination number changes. Furthermore, bond lengths and angles can also be strongly
63	coupled (Rappé and Casewit, 1997; Hinchliffe, 2003; Comba et al., 2009). MM force fields
64	sometimes include higher-order terms to correct for such multi-body effects, but this complicates
65	the potential energy model, multiplying the number of adjustable parameters and requiring the

computation to keep track of more complicated spatial relationships than the traditional atompair distances and bond angles (Hinchliffe, 2003; Cramer, 2004).

68 It would be useful, therefore, to develop mathematically simpler methods for mimicking 69 multi-body effects in force fields. The bond-valence model (BVM) is an obvious choice to 70 address at least part of this problem, and in fact, bond-valence terms have been included in a few 71 MM force fields and related molecular-scale models (Lufaso and Woodward, 2001; Adams and Swenson, 2002; Grinberg et al., 2002; Cooper et al., 2003; Adams et al., 2004; Grinberg et al., 72 73 2004; Shin et al., 2005; Adams and Rao, 2009; Liu et al., 2013a; Liu et al., 2013b; Takenaka et 74 al., 2013; Adams and Rao, 2014). The BVM (see Theory section below) posits that bond lengths 75 can be converted into "bond valence" units using a simple, empirically calibrated equation, and 76 that the valence of all bonds incident to an atom should ideally sum to exactly cancel out the 77 atomic valence (i.e., oxidation number) of that atom. (Essentially, the BVM is a method for 78 relating bond length to bond order.) This rule, called the "valence-sum rule," is usually obeyed 79 quite closely in real crystal structures, and anomalous structures are almost always unstable 80 (Brown, 2002). This instability suggests there is an energy penalty for deviation from this ideal. 81 An energy cost function based on deviation from the valence-sum rule, however, would be 82 different than typical pair-wise or multi-body terms in MM force fields, because it would be a 83 multi-body term that takes into account the total bonding environment of an atom, but does so 84 simply by summing pair-wise terms (bond valences.)

The BVM is not a panacea, though, because its quantitative aspect (the valence-sum rule) deals only with bond lengths, and has nothing to do with the spatial arrangement of bonds. Part of this problem has recently been addressed via the "vectorial bond-valence model" (VBVM), which may provide a way to predict favorable bond angle configurations. Again, this is based on

89 the multi-body summations of pair-wise terms. Harvey et al. (2006) showed that if we treat each 90 bond as a vector in the direction from the cation to the anion centers and magnitude equal to the 91 bond valence, even distorted coordination polyhedra about group 12 cations tend to result in 92 vector sums close to zero. Bickmore et al. (2013) used a database of 178 simple oxide structures 93 to demonstrate that this is a general result for all atoms *not* subject to noncentrosymmetric 94 distortions, caused by electronic structure effects such as lone-pair and second-order Jahn-Teller 95 (SOJT) effects. They also showed that non-zero, vectorial bond-valence sums caused by such 96 noncentrosymmetric distortions vary systematically as a function of the strongest bond valence 97 incident to the atom, and finally that outliers with respect to these trends tend to be metastable 98 under ambient conditions. 99 The VBVM, as presently formulated, is not complete, however. It is not sensitive to 100 centrosymmetric distortions, such as those caused by first-order Jahn-Teller (FOJT) effects, 101 because these require no change to the vectorial bond-valence sums. Including FOJT effects in a 102 molecular mechanics framework is quite difficult (Comba et al., 2009), so a mathematically 103 simple method to address this across a broad range of conditions would be quite helpful. 104 In this contribution, therefore, we introduce a further expansion of the BVM to address 105 both noncentrosymmetric and centrosymmetric distortions by introducing a new valence-based structural descriptor called the "valence quadrupole moment." This quantity describes how 106 107 spherically symmetrical the distribution of bond valences is about an atom, and is highly 108 predictable on the basis of the magnitudes of the incident bond valences. 109 We call this expanded model the Valence Multipole Model (VMM). With the VMM, a 110 mathematically simple, multi-body approach to predicting the effects of bonded interactions on 111 coordination geometries in a very large number of compounds may be within reach.

112 113 Theory 114 The VMM encompasses the VBVM, which encompasses the BVM. Every stage in this 115 gradual expansion has involved showing how bond valence can be used to describe and predict 116 more aspects of molecular structures. In this section, we briefly describe the theory behind these 117 models, including our new valence quadrupole moment term. 118 119 The Bond-Valence Model (BVM) 120 The BVM was developed to rationalize physically reasonable structures in systems where 121 the bonds are between cation-anion pairs. In a quantitative sense, however, the model has 122 primarily been useful for predicting plausible combinations of cation-anion bond lengths in such 123 systems (Brown 2002). A plausible combination of bond lengths incident to ion *i* is one in which 124 the valence-sum rule (Eqn. 1) is obeyed, i.e., the sum of bond valences between ion *i* and its bonded atoms $j(S_i = \sum_i S_{ij})$ exactly negates the atomic valence of ion $i(V_i)$. 125 126 $S_i + V_i = 0$ v.u. (1)127 The atomic valence of an ion is equivalent to its oxidation number, and represents the number of 128 valence electron states available for polar bonding. The valence of a bond is taken to be negative 129 when incident to a cation and positive when incident to an anion, and bond valence is measured 130 in valence units (v.u.) There are ways to address fully covalent bonds in the BVM (O'Keeffe and 131 Brese, 1992; Wander et al., 2015a), but we neglect these here. 132 When applied only to polar bonds (c.f. Wander et al., 2015a), bond valence is sometimes 133 equated with the electric flux between atomic centers, in which case Eqn. 1 is simply a 134 reformulation of Gauss's Law, which must always be exactly fulfilled (Preiser et al., 1999;

Brown, 2002; 2014). In practice, however, one estimates bond valence by means of empirical correlations between bond length and valence, derived by assuming Eqn. 1 and applying a mathematical model such as Eqn. 2 to the bond lengths in a calibration set of experimentally derived, stable crystal structures (c.f. Wander et al., 2015b). Here, *R* is the bond length between ion *i* and a counter-ion *j*, whereas R_o and *B* are empirically derived parameters specific to a given cation-anion pair.

141
$$|s_{ij}| = e^{\binom{(R_0 - R)}{B}}$$
 (2)

142 The assumption that bond valence is predictable solely on the basis of bond length may 143 not be exactly true, on the one hand, and therefore bond-valence sums calculated via such 144 estimates may not strictly follow the valence-sum rule. On the other hand, Eqn. 2 does appear to 145 be useful for expressing ideal values of bond valence for a given bond length, and apparent 146 deviations from the valence-sum rule carry some energy cost (Lufaso and Woodward, 2001; 147 Brown, 2002; Adams et al., 2004; Adams and Rao, 2009; Brown, 2009; Perez-Mato et al., 2009; 148 Bickmore et al., 2013; Adams and Rao, 2014; Bickmore, 2014). 149 Although the BVM is mathematically and conceptually simple, it is powerful in that it is 150 usually quantitatively accurate, and its predictions concern combinations of bond lengths, rather 151 than single bonds.

152

153 The Vectorial Bond-Valence Model (VBVM)

The valence-sum rule predicts acceptable combinations of bond lengths about a central ion, but does not address bond directionality. The VBVM addresses directionality by treating bonds as vectors (\vec{s}_{ij}) with direction from cation center to anion center and magnitude equal to the bond valence. The valence vectors representing bonds incident to a given ion are summed

9/23

158 $(\vec{s}_i = \sum_j \vec{s}_{ij})$, and the norm (i.e., magnitude) of the vectorial bond-valence sum $(||\vec{s}_i||)$ is taken 159 as a single-parameter descriptor of the lopsidedness of the bonding distribution.

 $\|\vec{S}_i\|$ turns out to be fairly predictable. Harvey et al. (2006), for instance, showed that 160 $\|\vec{S}_i\| \approx 0$ v.u. for the Group 12 cations they examined, even when the coordination polyhedra 161 162 were significantly distorted. But what of ions for which electronic structure effects (e.g., lone-163 pair and second-order Jahn-Teller effects) dictate that the coordination sphere should ideally be 164 noncentrosymmetrically distorted? Bickmore et al. (2013) showed that while such distortions result in $\|\vec{S}_i\| \neq 0$, they are still predictable as a function of the valence of the strongest bond (s_i) 165 166 incident to the central ion in the suite of 178 simple oxides studied. Trends for ions of the same type, but different oxidation states, tend to differ, but collapse into a single trend when $\|\vec{S}_i\|$ is 167 plotted vs. the "minimum coordination number" $(N_{min} = V_i/s_1)$. They also showed that the 168 169 trends discovered are completely consistent with the predictions of the valence shell electron pair 170 repulsion (VSEPR) model (Gillespie and Hargittai, 1991; Müller, 2007).

171 We once again have a simple, yet predictable, multi-body structural descriptor ($\|\vec{S}_i\|$) 172 based on summation of pair-wise terms. This multi-body term does not dictate any particular 173 bond length or angle, but especially when combined with the valence-sum rule (Eqn. 1), does put 174 stringent constraints on acceptable combinations of bond lengths and bond angles about each ion 175 in a structure.

Another important point brought out by this work is that bond valence is an effective means of transforming bond lengths between disparate ion pairs into a common currency that (at least when normalized to the atomic valence of a central ion) implies consistent effects on bonding geometry. This should prove important for structural modeling, because it will make it easier to incorporate new atom types into force fields. 181

182 Centrosymmetric Distortions and the Ligand Field Theory

While $\|\vec{S}_i\|$ is useful for quantifying the lopsidedness of the distribution of bond valence 183 about an ion due to noncentrosymmetric distortions of the coordination sphere, it is incapable of 184 185 putting constraints on centrosymmetric distortions such as are commonly associated with 186 unevenly filled *d*-subshells in transition metals. Here we employ ligand field theory (LFT) to 187 qualitatively describe the origin and nature of these distortions (e.g., Burns, 1993; Müller, 2007). 188 Just as the VSEPR model explains the spatial distribution of bonds about main group 189 elements in terms of repulsion between bonding and lone electron pairs, LFT explains the spatial 190 distribution of bonds about transition metals in terms of mutual repulsion between bonding 191 electron pairs and nonbonding valence electrons, which are generally in *d*-subshells of transition 192 metals. The five orbitals in a *d*-subshell have lobes of electron probability density oriented in 193 various directions, and when populated evenly are spherically symmetrical. Thus, bonding 194 electron pairs will have no preferred direction, and will spread out as symmetrically as possible. 195 When the *d*-orbitals are populated unevenly, however, the bonding orbitals tend to be repelled 196 more from the more populated *d*-orbitals, raising the energy levels of the *d*-orbitals oriented 197 closest to the bonding orbitals and lowering the energy levels of the others. The result is that 198 certain coordination numbers are favored more than they otherwise would be, given the cation-199 anion radius ratio, and certain distortions of the coordination polyhedron may also be favored. 200 Some of the favored distortion types are due to the first-order Jahn-Teller (FOJT) effect, 201 which results in centrosymmetric distortions of the first coordination sphere. In fact, all d-orbital configurations except d^0 , d^5 (high-spin), and d^{10} are expected to produce such distortions, but 202 203 with some configurations the effect is so small as to be negligible, while in others the effect is

9/23

204	quite strong. Ligand octahedra, for instance, tend to elongate parallel to d_{z^2} , while the bonds
205	parallel to $d_{x^2-y^2}$ contract, or (rarely) vice versa. This effect is especially strong for d^4 (high-
206	spin), d^7 (low-spin), and d^9 configurations. Ligand tetrahedra about d^4 (high-spin), d^8 , and d^9
207	transition metals tend to flatten toward a square planar configuration to allow the bonded
208	electron pairs to avoid preferentially filled t_{2g} orbitals, or in the case of d^8 , to avoid all but
209	$d_{x^2-y^2}$. To a lesser degree, the ligands about d_3 and d_8 transition metals might distort in a
210	scissoring motion toward an elongated tetrahedral configuration to avoid preferentially filled e_g
211	orbitals (Müller, 2007).
212	In all these cases, the distortion is centrosymmetric and total bond valence is conserved,
213	so neither S_i nor $\ \vec{S}_i\ $ changes. The spherical symmetry of the coordination spheres does
214	change, however.
215	
216	The Valence Quadrupole Moment
217	Ellipsoidal deviation from spherical symmetry can be quantified in terms of a quadrupole
217 218	Ellipsoidal deviation from spherical symmetry can be quantified in terms of a quadrupole moment, which is the third (second-order) term of a multipole expansion, a mathematical series
217 218 219	Ellipsoidal deviation from spherical symmetry can be quantified in terms of a quadrupole moment, which is the third (second-order) term of a multipole expansion, a mathematical series used to approximate an arbitrary function that depends on angles. It is used primarily to describe
217218219220	Ellipsoidal deviation from spherical symmetry can be quantified in terms of a quadrupole moment, which is the third (second-order) term of a multipole expansion, a mathematical series used to approximate an arbitrary function that depends on angles. It is used primarily to describe distributions in three-(or higher)-dimensional space. A multipole expansion includes a monopole
217218219220221	Ellipsoidal deviation from spherical symmetry can be quantified in terms of a quadrupole moment, which is the third (second-order) term of a multipole expansion, a mathematical series used to approximate an arbitrary function that depends on angles. It is used primarily to describe distributions in three-(or higher)-dimensional space. A multipole expansion includes a monopole moment (a scalar, or zeroth-order tensor), a dipole moment (a 3x1 vector, or first-order tensor), a
 217 218 219 220 221 222 	Ellipsoidal deviation from spherical symmetry can be quantified in terms of a quadrupole moment, which is the third (second-order) term of a multipole expansion, a mathematical series used to approximate an arbitrary function that depends on angles. It is used primarily to describe distributions in three-(or higher)-dimensional space. A multipole expansion includes a monopole moment (a scalar, or zeroth-order tensor), a dipole moment (a 3x1 vector, or first-order tensor), a quadrupole moment (a 3x3 matrix, or second-order tensor), and higher-order terms such as an
 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 	Ellipsoidal deviation from spherical symmetry can be quantified in terms of a quadrupole moment, which is the third (second-order) term of a multipole expansion, a mathematical series used to approximate an arbitrary function that depends on angles. It is used primarily to describe distributions in three-(or higher)-dimensional space. A multipole expansion includes a monopole moment (a scalar, or zeroth-order tensor), a dipole moment (a 3x1 vector, or first-order tensor), a quadrupole moment (a 3x3 matrix, or second-order tensor), and higher-order terms such as an octupole moment, etc. Frequently, a multipole expansion is truncated after the first few terms,
 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 	Ellipsoidal deviation from spherical symmetry can be quantified in terms of a quadrupole moment, which is the third (second-order) term of a multipole expansion, a mathematical series used to approximate an arbitrary function that depends on angles. It is used primarily to describe distributions in three-(or higher)-dimensional space. A multipole expansion includes a monopole moment (a scalar, or zeroth-order tensor), a dipole moment (a 3x1 vector, or first-order tensor), a quadrupole moment (a 3x3 matrix, or second-order tensor), and higher-order terms such as an octupole moment, etc. Frequently, a multipole expansion is truncated after the first few terms, because it will still usefully approximate the complete function for a local environment.

- 228 To generate a multipole expansion, one performs a Taylor series expansion around a
- function that is assumed to obey the Laplace Equation (Jackson, 1998), e.g., electrostatic and
- 230 gravitational fields. For instance, consider an arbitrary distribution of N point charges q_i with
- 231 position vectors \vec{r}_i . The electric potential (Φ) at position \vec{R} outside the distribution can be
- calculated using Eqns. 3-6, where ε_0 is the permittivity of a vacuum, α and β are the Cartesian
- unit vectors: x, y, and z, and R or r_i represents the distance from the origin to position \vec{R} or $\vec{r_i}$,
- 234 respectively. $\delta_{\alpha\beta}$ is the Kronecker delta, which is one in the case that direction α equals direction
- 235 β , but otherwise zero.

$$236 \qquad 4\pi\varepsilon_0\Phi = \left[\frac{q_{tot}}{R}\right] + \left[\frac{1}{R^3}\sum_{\alpha=x,y,z}P_{\alpha}R_{\alpha}\right] + \left[\frac{1}{6R^5}\sum_{\alpha=x,y,z}\sum_{\beta=x,y,z}Q_{\alpha\beta}\left(3R_{\alpha}R_{\beta} - \delta_{\alpha\beta}R^2\right)\right] + \cdots$$
(3)

$$237 q_{tot} = \sum_{i}^{N} q_i (4)$$

$$238 P_{\alpha} = \sum_{i}^{N} q_{i} r_{i\alpha} (5)$$

239
$$Q_{\alpha\beta} = \sum_{i}^{N} q_{i} \left(3r_{i\alpha}r_{i\beta} - \delta_{\alpha\beta} \|\vec{r}_{i}\|^{2} \right)$$
(6)

240 In Eqn. 3, the first bracketed term is the electric monopole, the second is the dipole, and 241 the third is the quadrupole. The monopole represents the overall charge within a certain volume, 242 the dipole represents the linear distribution of the charges about a central location, and the 243 quadrupole represents their spherical distribution (Hinchcliffe, 2003). If we want to describe the 244 distribution of bond valence about a central atom, we might instead perform a multipole expansion on the bond-valence vectors (\vec{s}_{ii}) , with the central atom at the origin of this "valence 245 246 space." In this case, the bond valence sum (S_i) is the monopole moment, the vectorial bond valence sum (\vec{S}_i) is the dipole moment, and we define the valence quadrupole moment (Θ_i) as 247 248 follows.

249 We find it most useful to define the valence quadrupole moment about central atom *i* (Θ_i) in terms of bond-valence vectors (\vec{s}_{ij}) normalized to the valence sum (S_i) . Eqn. 7 250 describes these "fractional" bond-valence vectors (\vec{p}_{ij}) , and Eqns. 8-9 describe Θ_i . Here N is the 251 number of bonds *j* incident to the central atom, and $p_{ij_{\alpha}}$ or $p_{ij_{\beta}}$ represents the magnitude of \vec{p}_{ij} 252 projected onto one of the Cartesian directions, where $\alpha, \beta = x, y, z$. (E.g., $\vec{p}_{ij_x} = \vec{x} \cdot \vec{p}_{ij}$, where 253 \vec{x} is the unit vector in the x direction.) The Θ_i values calculated using fractional bond-valence 254 vectors (\vec{p}_{ij}) , instead of normal bond-valence vectors (\vec{s}_{ij}) , thus depend only upon the shape of 255 256 the bond-valence distribution, and not on the atomic valence of the central atom, or its over- or 257 under-bondedness.

258
$$\vec{p}_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} p_{ij_x} \\ p_{ij_y} \\ p_{ij_z} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{\vec{s}_{ij}}{S_i}$$
(7)

259

260
$$\mathbf{\Theta}_{i} = \frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{\alpha=x,y,z} \sum_{\beta=x,y,z} \left(3p_{ij_{\alpha}} p_{ij_{\beta}} - \delta_{\alpha\beta} \left\| \vec{p}_{ij} \right\|^{2} \right) \right]$$
(8)

261

262
$$\Theta_{i} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(3(p_{ij_{x}})^{2} - \|\vec{p}_{ij}\|^{2} \right) & 3\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_{ij_{x}} p_{ij_{y}} & 3\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_{ij_{x}} p_{ij_{x}} \\ 3\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_{ij_{y}} p_{ij_{x}} & \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(3\left(p_{ij_{y}}\right)^{2} - \|\vec{p}_{ij}\|^{2} \right) & 3\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_{ij_{y}} p_{ij_{x}} \\ 3\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_{ij_{x}} p_{ij_{x}} & 3\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_{ij_{x}} p_{ij_{y}} & \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(3(p_{ij_{x}})^{2} - \|\vec{p}_{ij}\|^{2} \right) \end{pmatrix}$$
263 (9)

264

265 The valence quadrupole moment has zero trace, by definition, and can be thought of as 266 describing an ellipsoid encompassing the bond-valence distribution. If one is only interested in 267 the shape, rather than the orientation, of such an ellipsoid, one may remove extraneous

One may further condense the information in the quadrupole moment matrix down to a single term by taking the Frobenius norm ($\|\Theta_i\|$) with Eqn. 10, where Θ_{mn} represents the nine elements of Θ_i in rows *m* and columns *n*. The Frobenius norm does not depend on the rotation of the axes (Horn and Johnson, 2012; Golub, 2013).

274

275
$$\|\mathbf{\Theta}_i\| = \sqrt{\sum_{m=1}^3 \sum_{n=1}^3 |\mathbf{\Theta}_{mn}|^2}$$
 (10)

276

277 $\|\mathbf{\Theta}_i\|$ is a scalar representing the spherical distortion of the bonding about an atom, with a 278 value of zero for spherically symmetrical distributions, and higher values representing 279 distributions distorted away from spherically symmetrical. For reference, Figure 1 shows several 280 common configurations of a central ion and surrounding ligands, along with their corresponding 281 values of $\|\mathbf{\Theta}_i\|$. In all of these examples, the magnitudes of the fractional bond valences between 282 a central atom and its ligands sum to 1.

283

284

Methods

Our purpose, in this study, is to test the hypothesis that $\|\mathbf{\Theta}_i\|$ is predictable largely on the basis of the magnitudes of the incident bond valences, especially in cases where centrosymmetric distortions of coordination polyhedra play a role (e.g., in transition metals). Therefore, we analyzed the coordination environments of 2995 unique atoms *i* in 471 oxide structures to obtain $\|\mathbf{\Theta}_i\|$ values. The $\|\mathbf{\Theta}_i\|$ values were, in turn, compared with the fractional bond valences $(p_{ii} = s_{ii}/S_i)$ of bonds incident to atom *i*. 291

292 Structures

293	Crystal structures were acquired from three online databases: the Crystallography Open
294	Database (http://www.crystallography.net), the American Mineralogist Crystal Structure
295	Database (Downs and Hall-Wallace 2003), and the Inorganic Crystal Structure Database
296	(http://icsd.fiz-karlsruhe.de). Structures were chosen for analysis if they were published after
297	1960, all cations had unambiguous oxidation states, SoftBV valence parameters (see below)
298	could be obtained for the cation-oxygen pairs, and deviation from ideal valence sums was <15%.
299	Structures were excluded from the study if strong, fully metallic or covalent bonds were present.
300	
301	Analysis
302	We analyzed the crystal structures using a MATLAB TM program designed to read
303	crystallographic information files, and compute interatomic distances, bond valences, bond-
304	valence vectors and valence quadrupole moments. The program is available from B.R. Bickmore
305	upon request.
306	We used the SoftBV parameters derived by Adams and coworkers (Adams 2001; Adams
307	and Swenson 2002; Adams et al. 2004; Adams and Rao 2009) to account for the effects of
308	polarizability. Because of the way they are derived, each set of SoftBV parameters is associated
309	with a cutoff distance that is long enough to account for very weak, secondary interactions.
310	
311	Results
312	In the oxide structures analyzed, $\ \mathbf{\Theta}_i\ $ appears to be predictable based on the valences of
313	the strongest bonds incident to the atoms. Figure 2 shows each atom in the database, color-coded

9/23

9/23

314	to indicate O ²⁻ , "normal" cations not expected to exhibit distortions due to electronic structure
315	effects, and cations subject to lone pair, FOJT, or SOJT effects. $\ \mathbf{\Theta}_i\ $ is plotted vs. both p_1 and
316	the second-strongest fractional bond valence (p_2) . The trends for all these ions are broadly
317	similar, approximately falling on a curved, triangular surface. The trends for different types of
318	ions are different enough that they cannot be accurately predicted on the basis of the same
319	equations, but Fig. 2 shows that normalizing the bond valences to the atomic valences moves
320	these trends into rough coincidence, and whatever differences are left can be ascribed to other
321	aspects of the electronic structure. These include bond character and atomic size, but as noted
322	above, we will address these effects in a forthcoming study.
323	In the remainder of this section, we will specifically discuss the behavior of O^{2-} and the
324	transition metals subject to FOJT Effects. The discussion of O ²⁻ behavior is meant to illustrate
325	the rough trend expected for all atoms (Fig. 2), but in most cases we find that $\ \mathbf{\Theta}_0\ $, does not add
326	much information to the monopole and dipole, because non-centrosymmetric distortions
327	dominate the coordination geometry of low coordination number anions subject to lone-pair
328	effects. The coordination geometry of cations subject to SOJT effects is also non-
329	centrosymmetric. Therefore, the most important application of $\ \mathbf{\Theta}_0\ $, will be the to characterize
330	centrosymmetric FOJT distortions.
331	
332	Oxygen
333	Figure 3 recreates Figure 2, but limits its scope to O^{2-} . Here, $\ \Theta_0\ $ tends to be near zero
334	when fractional bond strengths for the strongest two bonds are both ≤ 0.25 indicating
335	coordination numbers \geq 4.

336	For higher coordination numbers, the distortion pathways can be understood by reference
337	to Figure 4, in which certain theoretical pathways are outlined around the edges of the triangular
338	surface. To generate these theoretical pathways, we began with a molecular fragment in which
339	$p_1 = p_2 = p_3 = p_4 = 0.25$, in a perfect tetrahedral configuration ($\ \Theta_0\ = 0$). During distortion of
340	the fragment, we enforced the valence sum rule (Eqn. 1), and constrained $\ \vec{S}_0\ $ to follow the
341	relationship shown in Eqn. 11, which Bickmore et al. (2013) demonstrated for O^{2-} with $p_1 > 0.5$.
342	Furthermore, maximum symmetry was maintained, while still obeying the previous two criteria.
343	$\ \vec{S}_0\ = \frac{4}{3}p_1 - \frac{1}{3} \tag{11}$

On the trend marked by the blue line, we first kept $s_1 = s_2 = s_3$ and gradually moved one 344 345 of the bonded atoms away, adjusting the location of the other three to comply with the criteria 346 listed above. The continuation of the blue line was generated by gradually removing the second and then the third bonded atoms, until only one remained (p1 = 1, $\|\vec{S}_0\| = 2$ v.u.) The red line 347 was generated by simultaneously removing two bonded atoms. The path marked by the magenta 348 349 line corresponds to simultaneously removing three bonded neighbors, finally meeting the blue line at the corner corresponding to a 1-coordinated O^{2-} . The data points in between these trends 350 351 represent those with less symmetrical bond distributions.

We found that $\|\mathbf{\Theta}_0\|$ could be well described as a function of p_1 and p_2 in cases where p_3 < 0.25, as in Eqn. 12. However, for $p_3 \ge 0.25$, the model shown in Eqn. 13 improved the fit.

$$\|\mathbf{\Theta}_{i}\| = 0.06324 - 0.1792(p_{1}) - 0.6837(p_{2}) + 1.371(p_{1})^{2} + 0.5719(p_{1})(p_{2}) + 1.596(p_{1})^{2} \qquad (p_{3} < 0.25) \qquad (12)$$

 $\|\boldsymbol{\Theta}_i\| = 0.06324 - 0.1792(p_1) - 0.6837(p_2) + 1.371(p_1)^2 + 0.5719(p_1)(p_2) + 1.596(p_1)^2$

$$+ 0.140(p_3) (p_3 \ge 0.25) (13)$$

Figure 5 shows the predicted vs. observed values of $\|\mathbf{\Theta}_0\|$. While there are clear trends in the data, considerable scatter remains, especially among the data points around $p_1 = p_2$. This appears to be related partially to steric effects, but also largely to the effects of bond character (covalent or ionic) and atomic size. These effects will be quantified in a forthcoming study.

358

359 Transition Metals

360 Transition metals with unevenly distributed *d*-electrons are subject to the First-Order 361 Jahn-Teller (FOJT) effect, which induces centrosymmetric distortions for coordination numbers 362 4-6. The precise distortion pathways preferred by the different transition metal ions depend on 363 factors such as *d*-orbital occupancy and ion size, but we can make the following generalizations. 364 First, transition metals not subject to Jahn-Teller effects (including FOJT and SOJT) tend to adopt $\|\Theta_i\| \approx 0$ in the range $0.16 < p_1 < 0.25$ ($N_{min} = 4-6$). Those that are subject to FOJT 365 366 effects tend to have increasing $\|\Theta_i\|$ values as p_i goes from ~0.16 to ~0.25, with those subject to the strongest distortions approaching a square-planar configuration ($\|\Theta_i\| \approx 0.15$) at $p_1 \approx 0.25$ 367 368 (see Figure 1g).

Figures 6-11 illustrate these trends for ions of different transition metal elements: Co, Cr, Cu, Fe, Mn, and Ni, respectively. (Here, $\|\Theta_i\|$ is plotted vs. p_1 , rather than both p_1 and p_2 , because we found that including p2 added no information for centrosymmetrical distortions.) These figures clearly show that different ions of the same element, having different *d*-orbital

9/23

configurations, exhibit distinctly different distortion pathways. For example, Fe^{3+} is not 373 expected to exhibit FOJT distortion, because it has a high-spin d^5 configuration at low pressures. 374 Indeed, $\|\mathbf{\Theta}_{Fe^{3+}}\|$ (Figure 9) clusters around zero for $0.16 < p_1 < 0.25$, whereas $\|\mathbf{\Theta}_{Fe^{2+}}\|$ 375 increases from ~ 0 to $\sim 0.06-0.15$ over this interval, indicating that it prefers flattened tetrahedral 376 377 or square-planar configurations when 4-coordinated. Similar trends can be seen by comparing $Mn^{2+}(d^5)$ to $Mn^{3+}(d^4)$ and $Mn^{4+}(d^3)$ (Figure 10). Mn^{2+} does not show any trend over $0.16 < p_1$ 378 < 0.25, Mn⁴⁺ shows a weak trend, and Mn³⁺ shows a strong trend, as would be expected given 379 380 their *d*-orbital configurations. 381 Obviously, there is quite a bit of scatter about the trends we have highlighted, but this is

382 to be expected in disparate crystal structures, where various other factors influence the 383 configurations. However, the usefulness of $\|\Theta_i\|$ for modeling structures can be illustrated by 384 pressure series in which a transition metal undergoes a spin transition. Lavina et al. (2010), for 385 instance, tracked changes in the crystal structure of siderite (FeCO₃) from 0-56 GPa using X-Ray diffraction, and Farfan et al. (2012) characterized the Fe²⁺ spin transition that occurs at ~46 GPa 386 387 using *in situ* Raman spectroscopy. Abrupt structural and spectroscopic changes occurred at the spin transition, above which the trends exhibited some hysteresis. Figure 12 shows $\|\mathbf{\Theta}_{F\rho^{2+}}\|$ 388 plotted vs. pressure for this series. The changes in $\|\Theta_{Fe^{2+}}\|$ with pressure are small, but 389 390 relatively smooth until the spin transition at ~46 GPa, where there is a distinct shift in slope. 391 Above this pressure, the hysteresis is also observed. While a number of common structural 392 descriptors also exhibit abrupt shifts at the spin transition, it is important to note that the reason for the shift is related to the electronic structure of the Fe²⁺, and $||\Theta_{Fe^{2+}}||$ is a convenient single-393 394 parameter summary of the octahedral distortion about that atom. This seems likely to be useful

395 for constraining the behavior of model structures in ways that mimic the real quantum

- 396 mechanical causes.
- 397
- 398

Implications

399 When combined with our previous work (Bickmore et al., 2013), this work shows that 400 multipole expansions of the bond valence incident to atoms, including monopole (bond-valence 401 sum), dipole (vectorial bond-valence sum), and quadrupole terms, are capable of describing the 402 total bonding environment of atoms, even if the coordination sphere is subject to distortions due 403 to several common electronic structure effects, in a predictable manner. If we combine 404 predictions of ideal values for the valence multipole terms with energy cost functions for 405 deviation from those ideals, it should be possible to incorporate the VMM into a molecular 406 mechanics type of framework, as has already been partially done (Grinberg et al., 2002; Cooper 407 et al., 2003; Grinberg et al., 2004; Shin et al., 2005; Shin et al., 2007; Shin et al., 2008; Grinberg 408 et al., 2009; Liu et al., 2013a; Liu et al., 2013b; Takenaka et al., 2013). If so, it would be 409 possible to model electronic structure effects very simply that have so far proven very difficult 410 for non-quantum mechanical models. 411 Acknowledgements 412 We gratefully acknowledge the National Science Foundation (EAR-1227215 and EAR-413 1424682) and the Brigham Young University College of Physical and Mathematical Sciences 414 undergraduate mentoring program for funding this project. We also thank Prof. I. D. Brown and 415 Prof. Frank Hawthorne for providing helpful reviews of the initial manuscript.

- 416
- 417

References

418

419	Adams, S. and Swenson, J. (2002) Bond valence analysis of transport pathways in RMC models
420	of fast ion conducting glasses. Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics, 4, 3179-3184.
421	Adams, S. and Rao, R.P. (2009) Transport pathways for mobile ions in disordered solids from
422	the analysis of energy-scaled bond-valence mismatch landscapes. Physical Chemistry
423	Chemical Physics, 11, 3210-3216.
424	Adams, S. and Rao, R.P. (2014) Understanding ionic conduction and energy storage materials
425	with bond-valence-based methods. Structure and Bonding, 158, 129-160.
426	Adams, S., Moretzki, O., and Canadell, E. (2004) Global instability index optimizations for the
427	localization of mobile protons. Solid State Ionics, 168, 281-290.
428	Bambi, C. (2011) Constraint on the quadrupole moment of super-massive black hole candidates
429	from the estimate of the mean radiative efficiency of AGN. Physical Review D, 83,
430	103003.
431	Bickmore, B.R. (2014) Structure and acidity in aqueous solutions and oxide-water interfaces.
432	Structure and Bonding, 158, 191-203.
433	Bickmore, B.R., Wander, M.C.F., Edwards, J., Maurer, J., Shepherd, K., Meyer, E., Johansen,
434	W.J., Frank, R.A., Andros, C., and Davis, M. (2013) Electronic structure effects in the
435	vectorial bond-valence model. American Mineralogist, 98, 340-349.
436	Brown, I.D. (2002) The Chemical Bond in Inorganic Chemistry: The bond valence model, 278
437	p. Oxford University Press, New York.
438	Brown, I.D. (2009) Recent developments in the methods and applications of the bond valence
439	model. Chemical Reviews, 109, 6858-6919.
440	Brown, I.D. (2014) Bond valence theory. Structure and Bonding, 158, 11-58.

- 441 Burns, R.G. (1993) Mineralogical Applications of Crystal Field Theory, 551 p. Cambridge
 442 University Press, Cambridge.
- Comba, P., Hambley, T.W., and Martin, B. (2009) Molecular modeling of inorganic compounds,
 326 p. Wiley-VCH, Weinheim.
- 445 Cooper, V.R., Grinberg, I., and Rappe, A.M. (2003) Extending first principles modeling with
- 446 crystal chemistry: A bond-valence based classical potential. In P.K. Davies and D.J.
- 447 Singh, Eds., Fundamental Physics of Ferroelectrics. American Institute of Physics,
- 448 Melville, New York.
- 449 Cramer, C.J. (2004) Essentials of Computational Chemistry, 596 p. Wiley, Chichester, UK.
- 450 Cygan, R.T. (2001) Molecular modeling in mineralogy and geochemistry. Reviews in

451 Mineralogy and Geochemistry, 42, 1-35.

- Farfan, G., Wang, S., Ma, H., Caracas, R., and Mao, W.L. (2012) Bonding and structural
 changes in siderite at high pressure. American Mineralogist, 97, 1421-1426.
- Gillespie, R.J. and Hargittai, I. (1991) The VSEPR Model of Molecular Geometry, 248 p. Allyn
 and Bacon, Boston.
- 456 Golub, G.H. (2013) Matrix Computations, 728 p. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Grinberg, I., Cooper, V.R., and Rappe, A.M. (2002) Relationship between local structure and
 phase transitions of a disordered solid solution. Nature, 419, 909-911.
- 459 Grinberg, I., Cooper, V.R., and Rappe, A.M. (2004) Oxide chemistry and local structure of
- 460 $PbZr_{x}Ti_{1-x}O_{3}$ studied by density-functional theory supercell calculations. Physical Review 461 B, 69, 144118.
- 462 Grinberg, I., Shin, Y.-H., and Rappé, A.M. (2009) Molecular dynamics study of dielectric
- 463 response in a relaxor ferroelectric. Physical Review Letters, 103, 197601.

464	Harvey, M.A., Baggio, S., and Baggio, R. (2006) A new simplifying approach to molecular
465	geometry description: the vectorial bond-valence model. Acta Crystallographica, B62,
466	1038-1042.
467	Hinchliffe, A. (2003) Molecular Modelling for Beginners, 410 p. Wiley, Chichester, UK.
468	Horn, R.A. and Johnson, C.R. (2012) Matrix Analysis, 655 p. Cambridge University Press,
469	Cambridge.
470	Jackson, J.D. (1998) Classical Electrodynamics, 808 p. Wiley, New York.
471	Lavina, B., Dera, P., Downs, R.T., Yang, W., Sinogeikin, S., Meng, Y., Shen, G., and Schiferl,
472	D. (2010) Structure of siderite FeCO3 to 56 GPa and hysteresis of its spin-pairing.
473	Physical Review, B82, 064110.
474	Liu, S., Grinberg, I., and Rappé, A.M. (2013a) Development of a bond-valence based interatomic
475	potential for BiFeO3 for accurate molecular dynamics simulations. Journal of Physics:
476	Condensed Matter, 25, 102202.
477	Liu, S., Grinberg, I., Takenaka, H., and Rappé, A.M. (2013b) Reinterpretation of the bond-
478	valence model with bond-order formalism: An improved bond-valence-based interatomic
479	potential for PbTiO ₃ . Physical Review B, 88, 104102.
480	Lufaso, M.W. and Woodward, P.M. (2001) Prediction of the crystal structures of perovskites
481	using the software program SPuDS. Acta Crystallographica, B57, 725-738.
482	Müller, U. (2007) Inorganic Structural Chemistry, 268 p. Wiley, Chichester, UK.
483	O'Keeffe, M. and Brese, N.E. (1992) Bond-valence parameters for anion-anion bonds in solids.
484	Acta Crystallographica, B48, 152-154.

- 485 Perez-Mato, J.M., Withers, R.L., Larsson, A.-K., Orobengoa, D., and Liu, Y. (2009) Distortion
- 486 modes and related ferroic properties of the stuffed tridymite-type compounds SrAl₂O₄
- 487 and BaAl₂O₄. Physical Review, B79, 064111.
- 488 Pijpers, F.P. (1998) Helioseismic determination of the solar gravitational quadrupole moment.
- 489 Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 297, L76-L80.
- 490 Preiser, C., Lösel, J., Brown, I.D., Kunz, M., and Skowron, A. (1999) Long-range Coulomb
 491 forces and localized bonds. Acta Crystallographica, B55, 698-711.
- 492 Rappé, A.K. and Casewit, C.J. (1997) Molecular mechanics across chemistry, 444 p. University
 493 Science Books, Sausalito, CA.
- Shin, Y.-H., Cooper, V.R., Grinberg, I., and Rappe, A.M. (2005) Development of a bond-valence
 molecular-dynamics model for complex oxides. Physical Review B, 71, No. 054104.
- 496 Shin, Y.-H., Grinberg, I., Chen, I.-W., and Rappé, A.M. (2007) Nucleation and growth

497 mechanism of ferroelectric domain-wall motion. Nature, 449, 881-884.

- 498 Shin, Y.-H., Son, J.-Y., Lee, B.-J., Grinberg, I., and Rappé, A.M. (2008) Order-disorder
- 499 character of PbTiO₃. Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter, 20, 015224.
- 500 Stixrude, L. (2001) First principles theory of mantle and core phases. Reviews in Mineralogy and
 501 Geochemistry, 42, 319-343.
- Takenaka, H., Grinberg, I., and Rappé, A.M. (2013) Anisotropic local correlations and dynamics
 in a relaxor ferroelectric. Physical Review Letters, 110, 147602.
- 504 Wander, M.C.F., Bickmore, B.R., Davis, M., Johansen, W.J., Andros, C., and Lind, L. (2015a)
- 505 The use of cation-cation and anion-anion bonds to augment the bond-valence model.
- 506 American Mineralogist, 100, 148-159.

507	Wander, M.C.F., Bickmore, B.R., Lind, L., Andros, C., Hunt, J., Checketts, H., and Goodell, T.
508	(2015b) AIM analysis and the form of the bond-valence equation. American
509	Mineralogist, 100, 160-161.
510	
511	
512	

This is a preprint, the final version is subject to change, of the American Mineralogist (MSA) Cite as Authors (Year) Title. American Mineralogist, in press. (DOI will not work until issue is live.) DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.2138/am-2016-5304

513	Figure Captions
514	
515	Figure 1. The norm of the valence quadrupole moment ($\ \Theta_i\ $) describes the ellipsoidal deviation
516	from spherical symmetry of the coordination shell about a specified atom. $\ \mathbf{\Theta}_i\ $ about a central
517	atom are shown for a variety of coordination polyhedra, with fractional bond valence of the first
518	two strongest bonds of the system p_1 and p_2 . These sample configurations are used as reference
519	points for some of the subsequent figures.
520	
521	Figure 2. $\ \mathbf{\Theta}_i\ $ for all atoms in the database is plotted vs. the fractional bond valence of the two
522	strongest bonds. This shows that using fractional bond valence puts the quadrupole moments for
523	all types of atoms roughly in coincidence, regardless of oxidation state. Any differences,
524	therefore, can be attributed to various electronic structure effects.
525	
526	Figure 3. $\ \Theta_0\ $ for all oxygen atoms in the database is plotted vs. the fractional bond valence of
527	their two strongest incident bonds. The pattern is a curved, triangular surface at $p_1 \ge p_2 \ge 0.25$,
528	and clusters around 0 for $p_2 \le p_1 \le 0.25$.
529	
530	Figure 4. (a) $\ \Theta_0\ $ plotted vs. p_1 and p_2 . (b) The sample configurations shown in Fig. 1. Also
531	shown are predicted deformation pathways from a tetrahedral coordination polyhedron. We
532	assume that the valence sum rule is always obeyed, and the valence dipole moment for O
533	behaves as described in Bickmore et al. (2013). The magenta line begins with a tetrahedron
534	$(\ \Theta_0\ = 0, p_1 = p_2 = 0.25)$, and evolves as three atoms are gradually stretched, leaving a

535 structure with a single bond ($\|\Theta_0\| = 1.22, p_1 = 1, p_2 = 0$). The blue line begins with a

9/23

536	tetrahedron ($\ \Theta_0\ = 0$, $p_1 = p_2 = 0.25$), and then evolves as individual bonds are stretched and
537	removed, one at a time, until three bonds ($\ \mathbf{\Theta}_{0}\ = 0.16$, $p_1 = p_2 = p_3 = 0.333$), then two bonds
538	$(\ \mathbf{\Theta}_{0}\ = 0.52, p_{1} = p_{2} = 0.5)$, and finally one bond $(\ \mathbf{\Theta}_{0}\ = 1.22 \text{ v.u.}, p_{1} = 1, p_{2} = 0)$ remains.
539	The red line begins with a tetrahedron ($\ \Theta_0\ = 0$, $p_1 = p_2 = 0.25$), and then evolves as two
540	bonds are stretched simultaneously, leaving two bonds ($\ \Theta_0\ = 0.52$, $p_1 = p_2 = 0.5$).
541	
542	Figure 5. The predicted $\ \Theta_0\ $ (Eqns. 12-13) vs. actual $\ \Theta_0\ $.
543	
544	Figure 6. $\ \mathbf{\Theta}_i\ $ vs. p_1 for chromium ions with atomic valences of +2, +3, +4, +5, and +6. The
545	sample configurations from Fig. 1 are plotted, as well.
546	
547	Figure 7. $\ \mathbf{\Theta}_i\ $ vs. p_1 for manganese ions with atomic valences of +2, +3, and +4. The sample
548	configurations from Fig. 1 are plotted, as well.
549	
550	Figure 8. $\ \mathbf{\Theta}_i\ $ vs. p_1 for iron ions with atomic valences of +2 and +3. The sample
551	configurations from Fig. 1 are plotted, as well.
552	
553	Figure 9. $\ \mathbf{\Theta}_i\ $ vs. p_1 for cobalt ions with atomic valences of +2 and +3. The sample
554	configurations from Fig. 1 are plotted, as well.
555	
556	Figure 10. $\ \mathbf{\Theta}_{i}\ $ vs. p_{1} for nickel ions with atomic valences of +2, and +3. The sample
557	configurations from Fig. 1 are plotted, as well.
558	

559 Figure 11. $\|\mathbf{\Theta}_i\|$ vs. p_1 for copper ions with +2 atomic valences. The sample configurations

560 from Fig. 1 are plotted, as well.

561

562 Figure 12. $\|\Theta_{Fe^{2+}}\|$ vs. pressure for the siderite (FeCO₃) structure. Note that the change in

563 $\|\Theta_{Fe^{2+}}\|$ with pressure is relatively smooth until ~46 GPa, at which point a spin transition occurs

and a distinct shift in the trend occurs. Above this pressure, hysteresis is also observed.

565

566

567 568

569

570









ſ





$$0.25 + Cr^{2+} + Cr^{2+} + Cr^{3+} + Cr^{4+} + Cr^{5+} + Cr^{6+} + Cr^{6+}$$

*p*₁



$$0.25 + Mn^{2+} - Mn^{3+} - Mn^{3+} - Mn^{4+} + Fig 1d + Fig 1g - Fig 1h + Fig 1i + Fig 1j - Fig 1j -$$

*p*₁

