Tin Chemical Shift Anisotropy in Tin Dioxide: On Ambiguity of CSA Asymmetry Derived from MAS Spectra

Abil E. Aliev,[a]* Albert P. Bartók,[b] Jonathan R. Yates[c]

[a]Department of Chemistry, University College London, 20 Gordon Street, London WC1H 0AJ, U.K.

[b]Scientific Computing Department, Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Harwell Campus, Didcot OX11 0QX, UK

[c]Department of Materials, University of Oxford, Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PH, UK

*Author for correspondence: A.E.Aliev@ucl.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Two different axial symmetries of the ^{119}Sn chemical shift anisotropy (CSA) in tin dioxide with the asymmetry parameter (η) of 0 and 0.27 were reported previously based on the analysis of MAS NMR spectra. By analyzing the static powder pattern, we show that the ^{119}Sn CSA is axially symmetric. A nearly axial symmetry and the principal axis system of the ^{119}Sn chemical shift tensor in SnO_2 were deduced from periodic scalar-relativistic density functional theory (DFT) calculations of NMR parameters. The implications of fast small-angle motions on CSA parameters were also considered, which could potentially lead to a CSA symmetry in disagreement with a crystal symmetry. Our analysis of experimental spectra using spectral simulations and iterative fittings showed that MAS spectra recorded at relatively high frequencies do not show sufficiently distinct features in order to distinguish CSAs with $\eta \approx 0$ and $\eta \approx 0.4$. The example of SnO_2 shows that both the MAS lineshape and spinning sideband analyses may overestimate the η value by as much as ~0.3 and ~0.4, respectively. The results confirm that a static powder pattern must be analysed in order to improve the accuracy of the CSA asymmetry measurements. The measurements on SnO_2 nanoparticles showed that the asymmetry parameter of the ^{119}Sn CSA increases for nm-sized particles with a larger surface area compared to μm-sized particles. The increase of the η value for tin atoms near the surface in SnO_2 was also confirmed by DFT calculations.

INTRODUCTION

Compared to its solution-state counterpart, the solid-state NMR spectroscopy allows one to easily measure the chemical shift anisotropy (CSA) of spin ½ nuclei.[1] As with quadrupolar interactions,[2] the anisotropy of chemical shifts can potentially provide unique information about the motional geometry at the atomistic level in various materials.[3] The added advantage is that, unlike quadrupolar nuclei, the NMR spectra of spin ½ nuclei are relatively easy to measure, including CSA measurements. The CSA ($\Delta\delta$, ppm) and its asymmetry parameter (η, see Experimental and Computational section for definitions of $\Delta\delta$ and η) can also be used as a source of information about the size of nanoparticles, as at very small particle sizes the asymmetry of the environment of the surface nuclei becomes important thus affecting the measured CSA parameters due to the increase in the number of nuclei on the surface relative to the number of nuclei in the bulk.[4] Previously, Tunstall *et al.*[4] have investigated the effects of powder granule size in the range between $4 - 32$ nm on parameters such as ^{119}Sn NMR CSA, linewidth and spin-lattice relaxation in tin dioxide powders obtained from different thermal treatments.

Over the last 30 years, the most widely used technique applied for CSA determinations has relied on the analysis of solid-state NMR spectra acquired using magic angle spinning (MAS). General expressions were derived by Herzfeld and Berger for the intensities of sidebands observed in the MAS spectra of isolated spin half nuclei,[5] which are now used by various program packages.[6-8] One of the main advantages of MAS spectra compared to static lineshapes is that MAS usually allows one to resolve spinning sideband patterns for a range of species present, thus allowing one to determine CSA parameters selectively for all or nearly all species present.[9,10] Unlike static powder spectra, the spectral overlap of the broad lines can also be avoided in MAS spectra. An additional option to vary the MAS frequency or analyse spectra measured at several different MAS frequencies are particularly useful when the analysis of several species or multiple sites present in the same spectrum is required.

The reliability of CSA measurements from MAS spectra has attracted much attention.[6,9-12] In particular, the application of the method in the presence of strong dipolar interactions has been

considered.[13] There is a similarity between dipolar interactions and CSA, considering that although their effect is removed from the lineshape of the isotropic peak, both anisotropic interactions affect the intensities of the spinning sidebands. For example, homonuclear dipolar interactions between nearest ^{31}P nuclei at a distance of 4.20 Å in ammonium dihydrogen phosphate have been shown to cause a deviation from axial symmetry in ^{31}P MAS spectra, while the crystal symmetry suggests an axially symmetric ^{31}P CSA.[13d]

Frequently, distinguishing axially symmetric and asymmetric CSAs has proved problematic when using MAS spectra.[9] As shown by Eichele,[6] if the MAS frequency is much larger than the smallest frequency difference between two principal components, then the Herzfeld-Berger analysis may not be able to distinguish between them. According to Hodgkinson and Emsley,[12] for the values of the asymmetry parameter less than 0.2, static spectra provide a more reliable determination of the asymmetry parameter than MAS spectra, while the reliability of the determination of the anisotropy is always greater in spinning experiments than in static experiments. These conclusions were reached by Hodgkinson and Emsley[12] based on computational analysis alone, without experimental verifications.

Here, we consider [119]Sn CSA parameters of tin(IV) oxide, SnO_2, which were determined twice previously. The first CSA measurements of SnO_2 were reported in 1989 by Clayden *et al.*[14] The reported chemical shift anisotropy, $\Delta\delta$, was -125 ppm and the asymmetry parameter, η, was 0, i.e. the [119]Sn CSA was shown to be axially symmetric. In their 1992 report Cossement *et al.*,[15] re-determined these parameters for SnO_2 as -124.5 ppm and 0.27, thus showing that the chemical shift tensor is not axially symmetric. No discussion of the disagreement with the results of Clayden *et al.*[14] was provided and subsequent reports mostly accepted CSA parameters reported by Cossemont *et al.*,[15] including those using the experimental CSA parameters as a benchmark for verification of the performance of computational techniques.[16] Note that the value of $\Delta\delta$, reported by Cossement *et al.*[15] as -136 ppm for SnO_2, is defined as $\Delta\delta = \delta_{33} - \delta_{11}$,[13] which is different from Haeberlen's definition[17] of $\Delta\delta = \delta_{33} - (\delta_{11}$

+ δ_{22}) / 2, while the same definition of η is used by Cossement *et al.*[15] and Haeberlen[17] (see Experimental part).

Tin dioxide has a wide range of applications. Due to its superior properties in terms of electronic conductivity and thermal stability, interest in various nanoparticles based on tin dioxide has considerably increased in recent years.[18] For example, the search of topics of publications for "tin" and "oxide" in the Web of Science database revealed >3,100 publications in 2016 and >2,100 publications between January 2017 - September 2017. Tin dioxide nanoparticles are used in catalysis, energy-saving coatings and anti-static coatings,[18c,e] as well as in lithium-ion batteries[18b] and as anti-reflection coatings in solar cells,[18d] in the making of gas sensors,[18a] optoelectronic devices, resistors and liquid crystal displays. Magnetic properties of tin oxide nanoparticles are used in magnetic resonance imaging and in data storage. It is therefore important to address the existing ambiguity in the CSA parameters of such a primary material as SnO_2, so that accurate changes of the [119]Sn CSA as a function of a nanoparticle size and environment can be monitored using solid-state NMR techniques. We note that there is only a limited number of techniques available for the characterisation of metal oxides at an atomistic level and the solid-state NMR is one the most widely used techniques in this regard. Therefore, resolving disagreement in the scientific literature is of particular importance in this case in order to remove any ambiguity that could hamper the application of solid-state NMR techniques for the characterisation of tin dioxide based materials. There is a particular interest in a size-controlled synthesis of SnO_2 nanoparticles. Potentially, [119]Sn CSAs together with the measured signal linewidths can be used for particle size evaluations and can serve as complementary measurement to already existing techniques, such as powder X-ray powder diffraction and high-resolution transmission electron microscopy, widely used for the characterization of metal oxides. With the decrease in the particle size, the observed linewidth is expected to increase,[4] while the CSA is expected to become more asymmetric. Severe linebroadening observed for nanoparticles of a few nanometres in size complicates the choice of the initial model for the analysis of MAS spectra compared to standard tin dioxide with normal ~10 μm-sized particles,[4] which shows relatively sharp lines with the

linewidth of ~150 Hz. We have therefore undertaken the detailed analysis of tin dioxide in order to provide a correct reference point for nanoparticle studies and to identify experiments that would allow accurate determination of CSA parameters.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In order to unambiguously determine the symmetry of the [119]Sn CSA, we have acquired a static powder pattern for SnO_2. Figure 1 shows the ^{119}Sn NMR spectrum of a static SnO_2 sample without any rotation.


Figure 1. The experimental ^{119}Sn SSNMR spectrum of SnO_2 recorded without sample spinning (shown in black), overlaid with (a) the calculated spectrum with the iteratively fitted values of $\Delta\delta$ = -125.3 ppm and $\eta = 0$ (shown in purple) and (b) the calculated spectrum using the CSA parameters of Cossement *et al.*,[15] $\Delta\delta$ = -124.5 ppm and $\eta = 0.27$ (shown in purple).

Iterative fittings (Figure 1a) of the observed experimental lineshape were undertaken, in which the following error function, known as the best overlap value was maximised:

$$A_{dif} = \Sigma_{k=1}^{N} | I_k(exp) - I_k(calc)| \qquad (1)$$

$$A_{exp} = \Sigma_{k=1}^{N} | I_k(exp)| \qquad (2)$$

$$S_{ov} = 100 \left(1 - \frac{A_{dif}}{A_{exp}} \right) \tag{3}$$

where A_{dif} is the area between the experimental and the calculated lineshapes, A_{exp} is the area of the experimental spectrum and N is the number of points in the region of the experimental spectrum selected for fittings. In some of the fittings of the static powder pattern using our in-house program, the following function, referred to as the best-difference, was minimized:

$$S_{dif} = 100 \left(\frac{A_{dif}}{A_{exp}} \right) = 100 - S_{ov} \tag{4}$$

Table 1. The values of ^{119}Sn CSA parameters of SnO$_2$ determined from the analysis of static and MAS (frequency shown in kHz) lineshapes. The programs used (see Experimental) are indicated in brackets.

Parameter	Static (in-house)	Static (SoLA)[a]	2 kHz (SoLA)	3 kHz (SoLA)	4 kHz (SoLA)	5 kHz (SoLA)
δ_{iso}, ppm	-603.81	-603.81	-603.81	-603.75	-603.83	-603.79
$\Delta\delta$, ppm	-125.29	-125.52	-125.62	-125.64	-125.87	-127.70
η	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
δ_{11}, ppm	-562.03	-561.94	-561.94	-561.87	-561.88	-561.22
δ_{22}, ppm	-562.06	-561.99	-561.94	-561.87	-561.88	-561.22
δ_{33}, ppm	-687.34	-687.48	-687.55	-687.51	-687.74	-688.91
Ω, ppm	125.31	125.54	125.62	125.64	125.86	127.69
κ	0.99951	1.00	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.00
Best overlap, %	**98.57**	**99.10**	**94.86**	**95.66**	**95.26**	**95.40**

[a]Bruker curve fitting program SoLA (Solid Lineshape Analysis, version 2.2.4)

The region between -438.7 and -768.7 ppm was selected for fittings with $N = 6{,}052$. The best-fit values of the CSA parameters were $\Delta\delta = -125.3 \pm 0.9$ ppm and $\eta = 0.0 \pm 0.011$ (Table 1). Uncertainties were estimated via fittings of 10 differently processed spectra, including the variation of the exponential line broadening factor between $0 - 50$ Hz, using two different programs (see also Figure S1 in Supporting

Information showing the dependence of the error function on the value of η). For comparison, we also show calculated lineshapes with $\Delta\delta = -124.5$ ppm and $\eta = 0.27$ determined by Cossemont *et al.*[15] (Figure 1b), which clearly does not reproduce the experimentally observed lineshape.

Density functional calculations were carried out with CASTEP within the GIPAW (Gauge Including Projector Augmented Waves) formalism to predict CSA parameters (Tables 2 and 3). For the two experimentally determined structures,[19] computed values of CSA show little variance with different exchange-correlation functionals. Thus, these functionals appear to be sufficiently similar in predicting NMR parameters for a fixed geometry. For the optimised structures, however, there is a slightly larger difference which can be attributed to the different equilibrium geometries. Notably, the environment of the Sn atoms in the LDA-relaxed structure (Table 2) deviates more from the fully symmetrical arrangement due to the somewhat larger difference in the two types of Sn-O bond lengths (Table 2), but lattice vibrations even at room temperature are expected to be larger than this difference. For example, the anisotropic displacement parameters in SnO_2 are known to reach 4.4×10^{-3} Å^2 and 6.6×10^{-3} Å^2 for Sn and O atoms, respectively.[19b] As for the optimised lattice constants (Table 2), the observed functional-dependent changes are in agreement with the expectation that the most commonly used GGA (generalised gradient approximation) functional proposed by Perdew, Burke, and Ernzherhof (PBE) almost always overestimates the lattice constants of solids, while LDA (local density approximation) consistently underestimates them.[20] In both cases, the typical errors amount to 1% – 2% of the lattice parameters.[20] The PBEsol[20a] functional is the revised version of PBE specifically adapted for solids, which is known to yield lattice constants in better agreement with experiments than the original PBE functional.[20c] Indeed, our results in Table 2 confirm that lattice constants predicted by PBEsol are in better agreement with the experimental data than those from PBE or PW91. There appears to be a good correlation for the calculated asymmetry parameter in four optimised structures (Table 3) with either the area *ab* or volume *abc*, i.e. with the increase of either the transverse area *ab* or the lattice volume *abc*, the calculated asymmetry parameter decreases.

Table 2. Lattice parameters and nearest-neighbour Sn-O bond distances in Ångstroms in experimental and DFT-relaxed SnO_2 structures.

Structure	a	c	Sn-O_1	Sn-O_2
(I)[19a]	4.7380	3.1865	2.052	2.058
(II)[19b]	4.7374	3.1864	2.058	2.048
LDA	4.7158	3.1881	2.058	2.041
PBE	4.8187	3.2335	2.086	2.090
PW91	4.8136	3.2321	2.085	2.087
PBEsol	4.7592	3.2083	2.067	2.061

Table 3. [119]Sn CSA parameters in SnO_2 predicted by DFT calculations, using various exchange correlation functionals and structural parameters.

Structure	Chemical shift anisotropy, $\Delta\delta$ (in ppm) / Asymmetry parameter, η			
	LDA	PBE	PW91	PBEsol
(I)[19a]	-141.3 / 0.09	-139.8 / 0.09	-138.9 / 0.09	-142.3 / 0.08
(II)[19b]	-127.2 / 0.09	-125.8 / 0.09	-125.2 / 0.09	-128.0 / 0.10
optimised	-124.8 / 0.18	-129.4 / 0.04	-130.2 / 0.04	-129.2 / 0.09

Solid-state NMR spectra were also recorded and analyzed at different MAS frequencies (Figure 2). As starting values of CSA parameters in iterative fittings, we used $\Delta\delta$ = -125.3 ppm and η = 0, as derived from the analysis of the static powder pattern. The best-fit values are summarized in Table 1. These showed good agreement with the values measured from the static spectrum with only a small difference in the $\Delta\delta$ value, which increases on increasing the MAS frequency.

Figure 2. The experimental ^{119}Sn SSNMR spectra of SnO_2 recorded at MAS frequencies of (a) 2 kHz, (b) 3 kHz, (c) 4 kHz and (d) 5 kHz. The spinning sideband labelling (±1 and ±2) is shown in (d) relative to the isotropic peak labelled as 0.

Cossement *et al.*[15] used the MAS frequency of 5.1 kHz (at 9.4 T corresponding to a 400 MHz ^{1}H frequency) for CSA measurements. They started their analysis with the initial estimate of the CSA span (δ_{33} - δ_{11}) as -200 ppm and the asymmetry parameter η as 0.5. We undertook additional fittings of the spectrum recorded at the MAS frequency of 5 kHz at 7.05 T (Figure 2d) with the starting value of Δδ as -126 ppm and η as 0.5. The best-fit values found from iterative fittings were Δδ = -126.29 ppm and η = 0.285. The agreement between the experimental and the calculated lineshapes estimated as the best

10

overlap value, s_{ov} (see equations (1)-(3)), was 95.56%, which is better than 95.40% for $\Delta\delta$ = -127.70 ppm and $\eta = 0$ (Table 1). On fitting the spectrum recorded at the MAS frequency of 2 kHz at 7.05 T (Figure 2a) with the starting value of $\Delta\delta$ as -126 ppm and η as 0.5, the best-fit values were $\Delta\delta$ = -125.24 ppm and $\eta = 0.179$, with the s_{ov} value of 95.22%, i.e. better than 94.86% for $\Delta\delta$ = -125.62 ppm and $\eta = 0$ (Table 1). These were somewhat surprising results, as the best-fit spectra were established using an "incorrect" set of parameters. We therefore compared fitted lineshapes. At the MAS frequency of 5 kHz spectra with $\eta = 0.0$ and $\eta = 0.285$ were very similar to each other (Figures S2 and S3 in Supporting Information). This is in contrast with static powder patterns shown in Figure 1. Even at the MAS frequency of 2 kHz, spectra showed only small changes in relative intensities of spinning sidebands for η values of 0.0 and 0.179 (Figures S2 and S3 in Supporting Information). This result suggests that there is a more general problem with the use of MAS spectra for CSA measurements, i.e. the MAS spectra of tin dioxide at 2 and 5 kHz do not show sufficient distinct features for distinguishing the solution with $\eta = 0$ from that with $\eta \approx 0.2$ or $\eta \approx 0.3$.

To follow the sensitivity of the MAS spectrum to the asymmetry parameter, we have simulated ^{119}Sn MAS spectra at 5 kHz, where the reduced ^{119}Sn chemical shift anisotropy ($\delta_{red} = \delta_{33} - \delta_{iso}$ = -84 ppm) is kept constant, while η is changed between 0 and 1 (Figure 3). These simulations show that there is hardly any noticeable change in spinning sideband intensities for η values between 0 and 0.3. On going from $\eta = 0.3$ to $\eta = 0.4$, only a small increase in intensity is observed for the -1 sideband at approximately -650 ppm. The intensity of this sideband continues to increase gradually on increasing the η value further. These results indicate to an insensitivity of the MAS experiment to η values less than 0.3, and only little sensitivity at η values 0.3 and 0.4.

Figure 3. The spectral simulations of MAS spectra at 5 kHz, where the reduced ^{119}Sn chemical shift anisotropy ($\delta_{red} = \delta_{33} - \delta_{iso} = $ -84 ppm) is kept constant, while η is changed between 0 and 1.

As the error function used in our above lineshape fittings of MAS spectra fails to favour the correct solution with $\eta = 0$ at relatively low MAS frequency of 2 kHz, we have considered a more traditional Herzfeld-Berger method, which relies on the relative intensities of spinning sidebands.[5] One of the most mature programs, HBA, was used for this purpose.[6] HBA uses a Marquardt-Levenberg routine for iterative minimisation of the error function, s_{fit}, defined as:

$$s_{fit} = \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{[I_k(calc) - I_k(exp)]^2}{(N-p)} \right\}^{1/2} \qquad (5)$$

where I denotes the intensity of spinning sidebands and the isotropic peak, N is the total number of experimental peaks (including spinning sidebands and the isotropic peak), intensities of which are selected for the analysis and p is the number of optimized parameters. A statistical analysis of errors is carried out using dimensionless Herzfeld-Berger parameters μ and κ:[5]

$$\mu = (\nu_L/\nu_R) (\delta_{11} - \delta_{33}) \; 10^{-6} \qquad (6)$$

$$\kappa = 3 (\delta_{22} - \delta_{iso}) / (\delta_{11} - \delta_{33}) \qquad (7)$$

where ν_L and ν_R are Larmor and MAS frequencies, respectively. This analysis involves the calculation of a matrix **B**, the elements of which are calculated using the following equation:

$$B_{ij} = \sum \left[\frac{\partial I_k(calc)}{\partial p_i} \right] \left[\frac{\partial I_k(calc)}{\partial p_j} \right] \qquad (8)$$

where $p_{i,j}$ are the parameters μ and κ, $\partial I_k(calc)$ is the change in calculated intensity when parameters μ and κ are changed slightly from their optimized best-fit values by ± 0.2 and ± 0.05, respectively, and the summation involves all experimentally observed sidebands. The ratio R_i of conditional, s_{cond}, and marginal, s_{marg}, standard deviations is calculated using following equations:

$$s_{cond}(p_i) = s_{fit} \times (B_{ii})^{-1/2} \qquad (9)$$

$$s_{marg}(p_i) = s_{fit} \times [(B^{-1})_{ii}]^{1/2} \qquad (10)$$

$$R_i = s^2_{marg}(p_i) / s^2_{cond}(p_i) \qquad (11)$$

As shown previously, for a parameter p_i to be reasonably well defined by the experimental data, the ratio R_i must be close to 1.[9] Thus, while the error function s_{fit} reflects how well the predicted spinning sideband intensities match the corresponding experimental intensities, the values of additional parameters from

equations (9)-(11) allow us to evaluate how well the optimized parameters are defined by the experimental data for a given model.[9]

As with the lineshape fittings of MAS spectra, the analysis of the integral intensities of experimental spinning sidebands (Table S1 in Supporting Information) favours the asymmetric CSA model with two different η values of 0.27 and 0.41 at MAS frequencies of 2 and 5 kHz, respectively, based on the value of the error function, s_{fit}, alone. The improvements compared to the axially symmetric CSA model is significant at both MAS frequencies and the value of s_{fit} was reduced nearly by a factor of 2. At both 2 and 5 kHz MAS frequencies, however, the calculated ratios $R(\kappa)$ indicate that the $\eta = 0$ value is better defined by experimental data than either $\eta = 0.27$ or $\eta = 0.41$ (Table S1 in Supporting Information).

We have also considered a possibility of fitting intensities of spinning sidebands from multiple MAS spectra in a single iterative analysis. The joint analysis of all 4 spectra recorded at different MAS frequencies (Figure 2) in this manner led to $\eta = 0.24$ ($\Delta\delta = -125.3$ ppm). For MAS spectra analysed separately at 2, 3, 4 and 5 kHz, the best-fit η values were 0.27, 0.16, 0.21 and 0.41, respectively. Therefore, in none of the cases the correct value of $\eta = 0$ was deduced as the best-fit value from either separate or joint analysis of spinning sideband intensities in MAS spectra. Furthermore, the cross-examination via independent fittings of four different MAS spectra shows significant differences in the best-fit η values varying between 0.16 – 0.41. This indicates to the presence of systematic errors in CSA measurements from MAS spectra. Note that throughout their study of the reliability of the determination of the anisotropy and the asymmetry parameter of the chemical shift interaction using the Cramér-Rao lower bounds, Hodgkinson and Emsley[12] assumed that systematic errors are negligible in comparison with the random error. The example of tin dioxide considered above shows that deriving the CSA asymmetry from fittings of MAS spectra will be systematically incorrect as long as the MAS frequency is smaller than the differences between the principal components (δ_{11} - δ_{22}, according to the definition of η).[6] Then, in the case of the axial symmetry, when the differences between the principal components is zero, the MAS

frequency must be infinitely small in order to ensure that the source of systematic errors is removed, thus suggesting the use of static lineshape for the analysis. The requirement for the MAS frequency to be smaller than the difference (δ_{11} - δ_{22}) could arise from the requirement to sample the frequency region between δ_{11} and δ_{22} as densely as possible in order to minimize systematic errors.

The spectral simulations presented in Figure 3 show that MAS spectra recorded at relatively high frequencies do not show sufficiently distinct features in order to distinguish CSAs with $\eta \approx 0$ and $\eta \approx 0.4$. In addition, the example of SnO_2 considered above confirms that the spinning sideband analysis of MAS spectra for CSA measurements may overestimate the η value by as much as ~0.4, if the choice of the best solution is based on the error function alone. The latter reflects how well the fitted data matches the experiment, but does not account for how well the fitted parameters are defined by the experiment. The use of a single MAS spectrum recorded at a relatively high MAS frequency for the determination of CSA parameters therefore presents a wider concern in terms of misidentifying the CSA symmetry, if the reported η values are in the range $0 \leq \eta \leq 0.4$. Further revision may be needed in each case using the analysis of static powder patterns.

Solid-state 2D NMR techniques are also widely applied for measurements of CSA parameters.[10,21] Despite differences in various 2D techniques developed, they usually share the common goal of displaying an MAS-like spectrum along one dimension and a static or slow-spinning-sideband powder pattern along the other dimension.[10,21] In the light of the above discussion, these 2D techniques may prove useful for extracting static or slow-spinning-sideband powder patterns when multiple inequivalent sites or a range of different species are present. However, it is also well recognized that the applications of 2D techniques for CSA measurements are restricted, especially when multiple sites present in the system have the same or similar isotropic chemical shifts or when a very large number different sites are present in the solid material under study.

Despite the lack of the high-resolution, the static powder patterns can be used to distinguish axially symmetric ($\eta = 0$) and nearly axially symmetric ($\eta \approx 0.1$) CSAs in favourable cases with a narrow intrinsic

linewidth. A representative example in this regard is the static ^{31}P NMR spectrum of the monoclinic polymorph of triphenyl phospine oxide (TPPO, Figures S4 and S5 in Supporting information), where the inspection of the experimental static lineshape alone is sufficient to identify the axial asymmetry of the ^{31}P CSA (see also Figure S6, showing the static ^{119}Sn NMR spectrum of SnO$_2$ recorded at 16.44 T). In addition, the results of the CSA analysis collected in Table S2 show that the ratio $R(\kappa)$ of conditional and marginal standard deviations [equation (11),[9] for interconversions of κ and η, see equation (19)] does not favour the correct solution with $\eta \approx 0.1$ over $\eta = 0$ on analysing ^{31}P MAS spectra. For example, at the MAS frequency of 2 kHz, $R(\kappa) = 16$ for $\eta = 0.094$ and $R(\kappa) = 1$ for $\eta = 0$, i.e. the $R(\kappa)$ value suggests that the axial symmetry of the CSA with $\eta = 0$ is better defined by the experimental MAS spectrum than the correct solution with $\eta = 0.094$, known from the analysis of the static powder pattern. It appears that the R parameter may systematically favour the $\eta = 0$ case over that with small but nonzero value of η when an MAS spectrum is used for determining the CSA parameters. This additional example further emphasizes the importance of static lineshape measurements for establishing the correct symmetry of the chemical shift anisotropy.

We now consider the symmetry of the ^{119}Sn CSA in tin(IV) oxide in relation to its solid-state structure. In metal oxides, chemical shift parameters of metal atoms reflect the local symmetry of the oxygen polyhedral environments, which in turn is determined by the crystal structure. The less symmetric arrangement of oxygens surrounding a metal atom in a unit cell is expected to lead to a large chemical-shift anisotropy. For example, the ^{119}Sn CSA is -125 ppm in SnO$_2$, while it is -975 ppm in SnO (for comparison of surroundings of tin atoms in SnO$_2$ and SnO unit cells, see Figure 1 in Cossemont *et al.*[15]), i.e. the more spherical coordination of the tin atom in SnO$_2$ leads to a smaller CSA compared to that in SnO.

Three-dimensionally, a chemical shift anisotropy can be schematically presented using an ellipsoid (Figure 4a), the shape of which is determined by semi-principal axes *a*, *b* and *c*, which also represent distances from the centre of the ellipsoid to its surface along the *x*, *y*, and *z* axes, respectively. In this case,

$a = \delta_{11}$, $b = \delta_{22}$ and $c = \delta_{33}$. In the case of axial asymmetry, all three distances from the origin of the ellipsoid to its surface along axes a, b and c are different, while in the case of axial symmetry we expect two of the distances to be equal, but different from the third distance: $a = b \neq c$. Such a presentation allows us to relate the symmetry of the CSA to the symmetry of the environment surrounding the tin atom, as observed in crystallographic studies.

For the solid-state structure of tin(IV) oxide,[19] the space group is P4$_2$/mnm.[19b] The cell lengths are $a = b = 4.7374$ Å and $c = 3.1864$ Å. The cell angles are $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = 90°$. As shown in Figure 4b, the Sn – O distances in the plane parallel to the ab plane of the unit cell are equal in length (2.048 Å). In the diagonal plane of the unit call with the central tin atom and four oxygen atoms, all four Sn-O distances are equal (2.058 Å). The three different O – Sn – O bond angles are 78.52°, 101.48° and 90.00°. Note that Clayden et al.[14] have attributed the observed anisotropy of the [119]Sn CSA in tin dioxide to the differences in the bond angles.

The principal axis system (PAS) of the [119]Sn chemical shift tensor was deduced from CASTEP calculations in this work (Figure 4b). Due to the mirror planes, the PAS of the [119]Sn chemical shift tensor is expected to be orientated along [1 1 0], [$\bar{1}$ 1 0] and [0 0 1]. Thus, the CASTEP calculation correctly predicts the orientations of the x, y and z axes of the PAS as parallel to [1 1 0], [$\bar{1}$ 1 0] and [0 0 1] directions, respectively. Although the crystal symmetry determines the PAS in this case, it does not allow us to estimate the relative values of the three principal components, i.e. whether $\delta_{11} = \delta_{22} \neq \delta_{33}$ or $\delta_{11} \neq \delta_{22} \neq \delta_{33}$. However, as the y axis of the PAS is along the Sn-O bond and the x axis of the PAS is along the direction joining two Sn atoms 6.7 Å apart, there is no reason to expect that the electronic environment is the same in these directions and therefore the δ_{11} and δ_{22} components are equal. This is in agreement with the CASTEP predictions of η, as it is found in the range of $0.04 - 0.18$ (depending on the DFT method used) for the optimised structures and in the range $0.08 - 0.10$ for the structures from diffraction measurements (Table 2). Nevertheless, as the experimental value is 0, there is a good possibility that fast (compared to the NMR timescale) small-angle motions are present at room temperature which average

the measured value of η to 0. Such a possibility does indeed exist, provided that the tip of *z* axis of the PAS (Figure 4b) undergoes a full rotation, e.g. a wobbling type of motion.[2c,22] This is very similar to the well-studied examples from ^{2}H NMR, where ^{2}H quadrupole coupling constant and its asymmetry show dependence on the geometry and the amplitude of the fast small-angle motions.[2c]


Figure 4. (a) A schematic presentation of CSA as an ellipsoid, the shape of which is determined by distances **a** = δ_{11}, **b** = δ_{22} and **c** = δ_{33} from the centre of the ellipsoid to its surface along the *x*, *y*, and *z* axes; (b) A unit cell of SnO$_2$, as determined from neutron diffraction powder data.[19b] An orientation of the ^{119}Sn CSA PAS as predicted by CASTEP calculations is shown, where the *x*, *y* and *z* axes of the PAS are parallel to [1 1 0], [$\bar{1}$ 1 0] and [0 0 1] directions, respectively.

An example illustrating the effect of small-angle fast motions on the asymmetry of the CSAs is shown in Figure 5. In the fast motional regime in the NMR timescale, the NMR spectrum can be analysed in the same manner as that in the absence of the motions (see, for example, references [3, 22, 23]), with the difference that the CSA will be determined by the motionally averaged anisotropy, $\Delta\delta^*$, and the motionally averaged asymmetry parameter, η^*. In Figure 5, we show that depending on whether the principal *z* axis

18

of the CSA tensor undergoes a fast out-of-plane wobbling motion (simulated as a jump motion of the *z*-axis of the CSA with a 10° step between 36 equally spaced, equally populated orientations on the surface of a cone with a cone half-angle of 9°) or an in-plane librational motion (around the axis perpendicular to the *z*-axis of the CSA with the angle between the orientations of the *z*-axis of the CSA at the extrema +9° and −9°) the motionally averaged CSA will be axially symmetric and asymmetric, respectively.


Figure 5. The spectral simulations of static CSA lineshapes in the presence of a fast out-of-plane wobbling motion (shown in red; illustrated on the left) and an in-plane librational motion (shown in green; illustrated on the right). The static CSA lineshape in the absence of any motion is shown in black. The static CSA parameters $\Delta\delta$ = -126 ppm / η = 0.300 are motionally averaged to $\Delta\delta^*$ = -120.9 ppm / η^* = 0 and $\Delta\delta^*$ = -124.6 ppm / η^* = 0.315 by wobbling and librational motions, respectively, when $\beta = \phi = 9°$.

The relevance of this example in the case of tin dioxide is that the amplitude of a full-rotation (β in Figure 5) will affect the value of the motionally averaged anisotropy, $\Delta\delta^*$ i.e. the higher the amplitude,

19

the smaller the value of $|\Delta\delta^*|$. However, the value of β is dependent on the temperature and should be at least $\sim6°$ in order to lead to an experimentally significant ~2 ppm decrease in the $|\Delta\delta^*|$ value, i.e. very high-temperature measurements may be required in the case of rigid metal oxides. Unlike $\Delta\delta^*$, even at a very small, but non-zero value of β the expected value of η^* is 0 and any additional increase of β has no further effect on η^*. We note that the presence of thermal vibrations in SnO_2 was shown by crystallographic studies. In particular, Bolzan et al.[19b] analysed 11 different metal dioxides, including SnO_2, which adopt the rutile-type structure. They showed that the magnitude of the thermal vibrations of the atoms are correlated with the size of the cell which is relatively large in SnO_2 compared to other oxides considered.[19b] They also showed that thermal vibrations are strongly anisotropic for both metal and oxygen atoms. The metal atom displacements in the *ab* plane were larger than the displacement along the *c* axis (see Figure 4). It is therefore possible that the small-angle motions present in tin dioxide could be responsible for the axial symmetry of the chemical shift tensor measured experimentally. As the effect of small-angle motions is of general interest, particularly in terms of the possibility that the $\eta = 0$ case is often encountered due to the dynamics rather than the crystal symmetry, it would be beneficial to employ advanced techniques for the joint analysis of both the XRD and NMR results. Further detailed scrutiny of these subtle effects on the chemical shift tensor parameters, especially using the recently developed path integral molecular dynamics (PIMD) simulations,[24] will certainly be of general interest.

As discussed above, the CSA parameters are expected to be sensitive to the particle size. In order to study the influence of the particle size on the ^{119}Sn CSA parameters, Tunstall et al.[4] used MAS spectra recorded at about 6 kHz at 11.75 T. Unlike tin dioxide considered above, for nano-sized particles with a relatively high surface area, the observed NMR spectra can be considered as a sum of spectra due to a very large number of sites with different CSA parameters. Therefore, the measured values of CSA parameters will be affected by the structural disorder present in the system. To distinguish parameters measured for structurally inhomogeneous systems, we denote the CSA parameters measured for nanoparticles as $\langle\Delta\delta\rangle$ and $\langle\eta\rangle$. From the figures presented by Tunstall et al.,[4] the $\langle\Delta\delta\rangle$ / $\langle\eta\rangle$ values

determined were -131 ppm/0.11, -125 ppm/0.31, -113 ppm/0.66, -124 ppm/0.49, -123 ppm/0.32 and -126 ppm/0.0 for SnO_2 particles with the average sizes of 4, 5, 8, 16, 32 and ~10,000 nm, respectively, with the uncertainty of ±12 ppm for $\langle \Delta\delta \rangle$ and ±0.1 for $\langle \eta \rangle$. Thus, they observed significant changes in the CSA parameters, especially in the asymmetry parameter, as a function of the size of SnO_2 particles. The increase of the isotropic linewidth with the decrease of the particle size was also observed, with the measured approximate values of 650, 750, 1250, 1700 and 1550 Hz for particle sizes of 32, 16, 8, 5 and 4 nm, respectively, with the estimated uncertainty of ±10%. The maximum deviation from bulk values occurring at a particle size of 8 nm was observed in both the [119]Sn CSA asymmetry parameter and in the value of the ^{119}Sn NMR spin-lattice relaxation time. From the combined analysis of solid-state NMR and Raman results, it was concluded that the 8 nm particles are situated at the transition from bulk-dominated to surface-dominated samples.[4] However, it must be noted that the CSA parameters were determined from MAS spectra recorded at about 6 kHz (~32 ppm), whereas the difference between the reported $\langle \delta_{11} \rangle$ and $\langle \delta_{22} \rangle$ values (-567 and -576 ppm, respectively) is only 9 ppm for 4 nm particles. Additionally, the linewidth increases with the decrease of the particle size, reaching 8.3 ppm for 4 nm particles, which is nearly the same as the difference between the reported $\langle \delta_{11} \rangle$ and $\langle \delta_{22} \rangle$ values. In this case, both the high MAS frequency and the broad linewidth are likely to adversely affect the accuracy of CSA asymmetry measurements from MAS spectra, since $\langle \eta \rangle$ is defined as $(\langle \delta_{22} \rangle - \langle \delta_{11} \rangle) / (\langle \delta_{33} \rangle - \langle \delta_{\iota\sigma o} \rangle)$.

Tin dioxide nanoparticles with an estimated size of ~10 nm were available to us, showing a linewidth of 630±20 Hz (150±5 for tin dioxide considered above; both measured from the spectra recorded at the MAS frequency of 12 kHz at 7.05 T). From iterative fittings of the static lineshape (Figure 6a), the best-fit CSA parameters were $\langle \Delta\delta \rangle$ = -127 ± 3 ppm and $\langle \eta \rangle$ = 0.2 ± 0.1. The MAS spectra of SnO_2 nanoparticles recorded at 3, 4 (Figure 6b) and 5 kHz were also analysed using full lineshape fittings (Table 4). The best-fit values of $\langle \eta \rangle$ were 0.6 ± 0.1 at 3 kHz and 0.5 ± 0.1 at 4 and 5 kHz.

Figure 6. The experimental ^{119}Sn SSNMR spectra (shown in black) of SnO_2 nanoparticles recorded (a) without sample spinning, and (b) at MAS frequency of 4 kHz. Spectra are overlaid with the calculated lineshapes (shown in purple) with the iteratively fitted values of $\langle \Delta\delta \rangle$ = -127 ppm and $\langle \eta \rangle$ = 0.20 in (a) and $\langle \Delta\delta \rangle$ = -127 ppm and $\langle \eta \rangle$ = 0.52 in (b).

Although the agreement between the CSA parameters determined from spectra at different MAS frequencies is satisfactory, the values of η are nevertheless significantly higher than that derived from the static lineshape ($\langle \eta \rangle$= 0.2 ± 0.1). This is similar to the results discussed above for tin dioxide, for which the analysis of MAS spectra leads to η values higher than that determined from static powder patterns by 0.2 − 0.4. As apparent from the results shown in Table 4, the best-fit value of the δ_{33} component from both MAS and static spectra agree well, while the difference in ($\langle \delta_{11} \rangle - \langle \delta_{22} \rangle$) values is significant: 18 ppm from the static spectrum and ~45 ppm from the MAS spectra. Since the asymmetry parameter is defined as $\langle \eta \rangle = (\langle \delta_{22} \rangle - \langle \delta_{11} \rangle) / (\langle \delta_{33} \rangle - \langle \delta_{iso} \rangle)$, the nearly doubled value of ($\langle \delta_{22} \rangle - \langle \delta_{11} \rangle$) at a constant value of ($\langle \delta_{33} \rangle - \langle \delta_{iso} \rangle$) leads to significant increase in η values derived from MAS spectra compared to that from the static powder pattern. As the predicted difference of ($\langle \delta_{22} \rangle - \langle \delta_{11} \rangle$) is only ~2 kHz at 7.05 T, it is clear that MAS frequencies significantly slower than 2 kHz are needed in order to adequately sample the spectrum for accurate measurements of CSA asymmetries. However, slow MAS experiments are limited by the linewidth of the isotropic peak, thus making static lineshapes a preferred choice for CSA measurements.

Table 4. The values of ^{119}Sn CSA parameters of SnO_2 nanoparticles determined from the analysis of static and MAS (frequency shown in kHz) lineshapes. The chemical shift range between -400 ppm and -850 ppm was selected for fittings.

Parameter	Static	3 kHz	4 kHz	5 kHz
$\langle\delta_{iso}\rangle$, ppm	-604[a]	-604	-604	-604
$\langle\Delta\delta\rangle$, ppm	-128	-129	-127	-132
$\langle\eta\rangle$	0.2	0.6	0.5	0.5
$\langle\delta_{11}\rangle$, ppm	-553	-535	-540	-539
$\langle\delta_{22}\rangle$, ppm	-571	-587	-584	-580
$\langle\delta_{33}\rangle$, ppm	-689	-691	-689	-691
$\langle\Omega\rangle$, ppm	-571	156	149	153
$\langle\kappa\rangle$	0.7	0.3	0.4	0.4
Best overlap, %	96.47	93.70	95.56	96.01

[a]The isotropic chemical shift was determined from MAS spectra. The fixed value of the isotropic shift was used in fittings of the static powder pattern.

Theoretical studies of the effect of particle size on NMR parameters were also undertaken by computing the CSA parameters of Sn atoms in various low-index, relaxed stoichiometric surfaces of SnO_2. Slabs were generated using the PBE equilibrium lattice parameters from the bulk structure, obtaining the [1 0 0], [0 0 1], [1 0 1] and [1 1 0] surfaces. These are the surfaces previously shown to be low-energy,[25] and therefore are expected to provide a good representation of the nanocluster surfaces. To minimise interactions between the surfaces, the thickness of each slab was chosen to ensure that bulk-like NMR parameters are reproduced for the atoms in the centre regions, and 6 Å vacuum was used to separate the surfaces. As illustrated in Figure 7, there is a significant change in both the CSA and asymmetry for atoms near the surface. It is clear that the measured parameters depend on the exact ratio of the different atomic

environments making up the cluster, which we do not attempt to quantify here, but we can conclude that the increase in the asymmetry parameter is indeed confirmed.


Figure 7. The DFT-predicted CSA (left panel) and asymmetry (right panel) of ^{119}Sn atoms as a distance from the surface. The lines provide a guide for the eye. Note that the large positive anisotropy value (229 ppm) of the surface Sn atoms on the [1 0 1] surface correspond to a high asymmetry value (0.80), therefore the sign of the anisotropy is less meaningful, as it can easily change with a relatively small perturbation.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Two different sets of ^{119}Sn CSA parameters with $\eta = 0$ and $\eta = 0.27$ were reported previously for tin(IV) oxide based on the analysis of MAS NMR spectra.[14,15] By analyzing the static powder pattern, we show that the asymmetry parameter is 0. Periodic scalar-relativistic density functional calculations of NMR parameters suggest a nearly axial symmetry of the ^{119}Sn CSA in SnO_2. The principal axis system of the ^{119}Sn chemical shift tensor was also deduced from these calculations. Our analysis of MAS spectra using spectral simulations and iterative fittings showed that MAS spectra recorded at relatively high frequencies do not show sufficiently distinct features in order to distinguish CSAs with asymmetry parameters $\eta \approx 0$ and $\eta \approx 0.4$. The analysis of MAS spectra recorded at 2 kHz or 5 kHz using iterative fittings of either the full lineshape or the spinning sideband intensities also failed to lead to the correct solution, known from

the analysis of the static powder pattern. We have shown that a static powder pattern must be analysed in order to improve the accuracy of the CSA asymmetry measurements when η falls within a range between $0 \leq \eta < 0.4$. As judged by only very small changes in simulated MAS spectra, the relative insensitivity of MAS spectra to η values in the range $0 \leq \eta < 0.4$ is likely to be of general nature. Therefore, the use of MAS spectra for CSA determinations with the asymmetry parameter in the range between 0 and 0.4 presents a wider concern in terms of misidentifying the CSA symmetry, especially when a single spectrum recorded at a relatively high MAS frequency is considered. Potentially, a significant proportion of the reported results in the literature may be inaccurate. The implications of the latter could be particularly detrimental for verification of computational techniques. A representative example in this regard is the work by Alkan *et al.*,[16] where the incorrect set of experimental CSA parameters for tin dioxide[15] was used as a benchmark for the calculated values by different DFT methods.

We note that distinguishing the axially symmetric CSA from that which is nearly axially symmetric can be critically important for both structural and dynamics studies. As discussed above using the example of small-angle motions (Figure 5), accurate knowledge of the CSA symmetry allows one to deduce such subtle dynamics in the solid state as the geometry and the amplitude of motion not available from other techniques. The case of the measured axially symmetric CSA is also of practical methodological importance as fast (compared to the NMR timescale) small-angle dynamics may lead to motional averaging of the CSA asymmetry parameter to 0, in disagreement with the known crystal symmetry often measured at very low temperatures.

An example of structural importance is from nanoparticles. While for micrometre-sized particles the contribution from the surface area can be ignored, in the case of nanometre-sized particles the importance of the environment of the surface nuclei is becoming important. Thus, changes in the [119]Sn CSA parameters are expected on going from micrometre-sized particles to nanoparticles. Note that the measured [119]Sn CSA parameters are statistically averaged in nanoparticles due to the presence of different bulk and surface tin sites. In addition, as illustrated computationally (Figure 7) in this work, there are also

differences in tin sites depending on the distance from the surface. In principle, two-dimensional experiments could be useful when a handful of different sites are present in the system with comparable populations of the sites. In nanoparticles, however, the number of different sites approach nearly infinity. The feasible solution is therefore to measure parameters for nanoparticles in the same manner as for micrometre-sized tin dioxide and then look at their deviation from the CSA values measured for bulk tin dioxide. As apparent from the shape of the isotropic peak shown in Figure 6b for SnO_2 nanoparticles (see also spectra reported by Tunstall et al.[4]), MAS does not allow to resolve multiple tin sites in varying environments. However, the linewidth of the isotropic peak in MAS spectra can serve as a good indication of how wide the distribution of structural inhomogeneity is in a given sample of SnO_2 nanoparticles and this was explored successfully by Tunstall et al.[4] As pointed above, a size-controlled synthesis of SnO_2 nanoparticles is of primary practical importance and the CSA measurements could serve as a useful tool in this regard. Our initial results obtained from the analysis of the static powder pattern suggest that the asymmetry parameter of the [119]Sn chemical shift tensor increases for nm-sized SnO_2 nanoparticles compared to μm-sized SnO_2. This is in agreement with the previously reported results of Tunstall et al.[4] and the results of DFT calculations presented in this work.

EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPUTATIONAL SECTION

Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy. Tin(IV) oxide of 99% purity was purchased from Fisher Scientific and was used without further treatment. Solid-state ^{119}Sn NMR spectra were measured at 111.92 MHz on a Bruker Avance 300 spectrometer with 7.05 T wide-bore magnet at ambient probe temperature using a standard Bruker 4 mm double-resonance MAS probe. Tin(IV) oxide was packed into a zirconia rotor of 4 mm external diameter and spun at the MAS frequencies of 2-12 kHz with stability better than ±3 Hz. The same sample and probe were used for recording a ^{119}Sn NMR spectrum without any rotation. Solid-state ^{119}Sn NMR spectra with and without high-power proton decoupling were recorded using the following acquisition conditions: [119]Sn 90° pulse duration = 2.3 μs; recycle delay = 250 s; number of

transients 128 – 640. For "static" measurements without sample rotation, Hahn echo (with an echo delay of 15 μs) and single-pulse sequences were employed. As expected for a powder pattern with a relatively narrow width of ~18 kHz, no significant changes were observed between spectra recorded with single-pulse and Hahn echo sequences. The spectrum recorded with the Hahn echo sequence was used in our iterative fittings. The [119]Sn chemical shifts are given relative to tetramethyltin SnMe$_4$, which were calibrated using tetrakis(trimethylstannyl)methane C(SnMe$_3$)$_4$ (48.2 ppm).[26]

The static powder spectrum of tin dioxide was analysed using our in-house Fortran program, which is a modified version of the FASTPOWDER program, originally written for ^{2}H lineshape simulations.[27] Simplex and simulated annealing algorithms[28] were used for optimisation of spectral parameters, as described previously for ^{2}H lineshapes.[29] The best difference value s_{dif} (see equation (4)) was minimised in the iterative search for best-fit values. Static and MAS spectral lineshape fittings were also carried out using the Bruker curve fitting program SoLA (Solid Lineshape Analysis, version 2.2.4), which is part of their standard NMR software package TopSpin (version 3.2). As an estimate of the degree of agreement between the calculated and experimental lineshapes, the best overlap value (s_{ov}, in %) is used in SoLA (see equation (3) above), which is maximized in iterative fittings. The simplex algorithm is used in lineshape fittings. Unlike quasi-global optimization techniques,[28] the simplex algorithm (as well as the Levenberg–Marquardt algorithm used in the HBA program)[6] are known to lead to local minima in the error function depending on the starting values used. All the calculated static (by SoLA and modified FASTPOWDER) and MAS lineshapes (by SoLA) were convoluted by Lorentzian and Gaussian line-broadening functions with the linewidth parameters of *LB* and *GB*, respectively. Typical best-fit values of *LB*/*GB* were 167/1135 Hz in fittings of the static lineshape of SnO$_2$, 180/100 Hz in fittings of MAS spectra of SnO$_2$, 1187/5958 Hz in fittings of the static lineshape of SnO$_2$ nanoparticles, 1580/0 Hz in fittings of MAS spectra of SnO$_2$ nanoparticles.

The above mentioned modified version of the FASTPOWDER program[27,29] was also used for spectral simulations of static CSA lineshapes in the presence of fast small-angle motions.

In the case of the ^{119}Sn chemical shift anisotropy considered in this work with $(\delta_{33} - \delta_{iso}) < 0$, parameters are defined as follows:

$$\text{Principal CSA components } \delta_{11} \geq \delta_{22} \geq \delta_{33} \tag{12}$$

$$\text{Isotropic value } \delta_{iso} = (\delta_{11} + \delta_{22} + \delta_{33}) / 3 \tag{13}$$

$$\text{Reduced chemical shift anisotropy } \Delta\delta_{red} = \delta_{33} - \delta_{iso} \tag{14}$$

$$\text{Chemical shift anisotropy } \Delta\delta = \delta_{33} - (\delta_{11} + \delta_{22}) / 2 = 3\,\Delta\delta_{red} / 2 \tag{15}$$

$$\text{Asymmetry parameter } \eta = (\delta_{22} - \delta_{11}) / (\delta_{33} - \delta_{iso}) \text{ with } 0 \leq \eta \leq 1; \tag{16}$$

$$\text{Span } \Omega = \delta_{11} - \delta_{33} \tag{17}$$

$$\text{Skew } \kappa = 3\,(\delta_{22} - \delta_{iso}) / \Omega \text{ with } (-1 \leq \kappa \leq 1) \tag{18}$$

Here, the principal components of the chemical shift tensor, δ_{11}, δ_{22} and δ_{33}, are defined such that the highest frequency (the least shielded) component is labelled as δ_{11}, while δ_{33} corresponds to the lowest frequency (the most shielded) component. Unless otherwise specified, we use the definition of the chemical shift anisotropy according to equation (15), which is different from that of the reduced chemical shift anisotropy (see equation (14)) used in some solid-state NMR programs (e.g., SIMPSON,[11] SPINEVOLUTION[30] and Bruker curve fitting program SoLA). The two parameters reflecting the asymmetry of the chemical shift tensor, κ and η, can be interconverted using the following relationships:

$$\eta = [\delta_{iso} - \delta_{11} + (\kappa\Omega / 3)] / (\delta_{33} - \delta_{iso}) \tag{19}$$

Calculations. The density functional code CASTEP (version 17.2)[31] was used to calculate NMR parameters with a selection of local density and generalized gradient approximation exchange-correlation functionals.[32] Dispersion corrections were not included in the calculations. A plane-wave basis set with 870 eV cutoff energy was used in conjunction with on-the-fly generated ultrasoft pseudopotentials, including scalar relativistic effects within the zero-order regular approximation (ZORA).[33] The Brillouin zone was sampled by a Monkhorst-Pack grid[34] corresponding to 0.03 Å^{-1} spacing in the reciprocal space. Starting from crystallographically determined structural data, atomic positions and cell parameters were

relaxed, and NMR shielding calculations[35] were performed on both relaxed and unrelaxed structures using GIPAW.[36] The anisotropy parameters $\Delta\delta$ and η were obtained from the absolute shielding tensor using the same convention as described in equations (14) and (15). In the surface calculations (Figure 7), the PBE exchange-correlation functional was used with the same electronic parameters as in the bulk calculations. Keeping the lattice fixed, the atoms were allowed to relax and the NMR parameters were computed on the relaxed structures.

Calculations were performed on STFC's SCARF cluster and Thomas, the UK National Tier 2 High Performance Computing Hub in Materials and Molecular Modelling.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

(1)   (a) H. Saitô, I. Ando, A. Ramamoorthy, Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc., 57 (2010), 181–228.

(2)   (a) G. L. Hoatson, R. L. Vold, NMR Basic Principles and Progress; Springer-Verlag: Berlin, 1994; Vol. 32, pp 3– 67. (b) T. M. Alam, G. P. Drobny, Chem. Rev. 91 (1991) 1545-1590. (c) A. D. Ronemus, R. R. Vold and R. L. Vold, J. Chem. Soc., Faraday Trans. 1, 84 (1988) 3761-3776.

(3)   (a) S. L. Kohler, M. P. Klein, Biochemistry, 15 (1976) 967. (b) P. R. Collis, B. De Kruijff, Biochem. Biophys. Acta, 559 (1979) 399. (c) A. E. Aliev, K. D. M. Harris, P. H. Champkin, J. Phys. Chem. B 109 (2005) 23342-23350.

(4)   D. P. Tunstall, S. Patou, R. S. Liu, Y. H. Kao, Mater. Res. Bull. 34 (1999) 1513–1520.

(5)   J. Herzfeld, A. E. Berger, J. Chem. Phys. 73 (1980) 6021-6030.

(6)   HBA 1.7.5, K. Eichele, R. E. Wasylishen, Dalhousie University & Universitat Tubingen, 2015.

(7)   M. Bak, J. T. Rasmussen, N. C. Nielsen, J. Magn. Reson. 213 (2011) 366-400.

(8)   T. F. Kemp, M. E. Smith, Solid State NMR 35 (2009) 243-252.

(9)   A. C. Olivieri, J. Magn. Reson., Ser. A 123 (1996) 207-210.

(10)   (a) L. Shao, J. Titman, Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc. 51 (2007) 103-137. (b) L. Shao, J. R. Yates, J. Titman, J. Phys. Chem. A 111 (2007) 13126-13132.

(11)   (a) N. J. Clayden, C. M. Dobson, L.-Y. Lian and D. J. Smith, J. Magn. Reson. 69 (1986) 476. (b) S. E. Soss, P. F. Flynn, R. J. Iuliucci, R. P. Young, L. J. Mueller, J. Hartman, G. J. O. Beran, J. K. Harper, ChemPhysChem, 18 (2017) 1–9.

(12)   P. Hodgkinson, L. Emsley, J. Chem. Phys. 107 (1997) 4808–4816.

(13)   (a) G. L. Turner, K. A. Smith, R. J. Kirkpatrick, E. Oldfield, J. Magn. Reson. 70 (1986) 408–415. (b) C. M. Lagier, A. C. Olivieri, D. C. Apperley, R. K. Harris, Solid State Nucl. Magn. Reson. 1 (1992) 205–210. (c) T. Nunes, A. Vainrub, M. Ribet, F. Rachdi, P. Bernier, M. Almeida, J. Chem. Phys. 96 (1992) 8021–8025. (d) K. Eichele, R. E. Wasylishen, J. Phys. Chem. 98 (1994) 3108–3113. (e) J. Ŝepa, R. J. Gorte, B. H. Suits, D. White, Chem. Phys. Lett. 252 (1996) 281–286. (f) N. A. Davies, R. K. Harris, A. C. Olivieri, Mol. Phys. 87 (1996) 669–677. (g) C. M. Lagier, A. C. Olivieri, J. Magn. Reson. 126 (1997) 138–141. (h) L. Eichele, A.-R. Grimmer, Can. J. Chem. 89 (2011) 870–884.

(14)   N. J. Clayden, C. M. Dobson, A. Fern, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans. 1989, 843-847.

(15) C. Cossement, J. Darville, J.-M. Gilles, J. B. Nagy, C. Fernandez, J.-P. Amoureux, Magn. Reson. Chem. 30 (1992) 263-270.

(16) F. Alkan, S. T. Holmes, R. J. Iuliucci, K. T. Mueller, C. Dybowski, PCCP, 18 (2016) 18914-18922.

(17) U. Haeberlen, High Resolution NMR in Solids, Selective Averaging. In Adv. Magn. Reson., Suppl., ed. J. S. Waugh, Academic Press, New York, volume 1. pp. 1–468.

(18) (a) C. Nayral, E. Viala, P. Fau, F. Senocq, J.-C. Jumas, A. Maisonnat, B. Chaudret, Chem. Eur. J. 6 (2000) 4082-4090. (b) S. Han, B. Jang, T. Kim, S. M. Oh, T. Hyeon, Adv. Funct. Mater. 15 (2005) 1845-1850. (c) Z.-W. Chen, C.-H. Shek, C. M. L. Wu, J. K. L. Lai, Front. Mater. Sci. 7 (2013) 203–226 and references therein. (d) X. Wang, L. Zhi, K. Müllen, Nano Lett. 8 (2008) 323-327. (e) J. P. Cheng, J. Wang, Q. Q. Li, H. G. Liu, Y. Li, J. Indust. Eng. Chem. 44 (2016) 1-22 and references therein; (f) G. Fedorenko, L. Oleksenko, N. Maksymovych, G. Skolyar, O. Ripko, Nanoscale Res. Lett. 12 (2017) 329; (g) C. P. Gu, Y. W. Cui, L. Y. Wang, E. H. Sheng, J. J. Shim, J. R. Huang, Sens. Actuators B Chem. 241 (2017) 298-307; (h) A. B. Kuriganova, C. A. Vlaic, S. Ivanov, D. V. Leontyeva, A. Bund, N. V. Smirnova, J. Appl. Electrochem. 46 (2016) 527-538.

(19) (a) W. H. Bauer, A. A. Khan, Acta Cryst. B27 (1971), 2133-2139. (b) A. A. Bolzan, C. Fong, B. J. Kennedy, C. J. Howard, Acta Cryst. B53 (1997), 373-380.

(20) (a) J. P. Perdew, A. Ruzsinszky, G. I. Csonka, O. A. Vydrov, G. E. Scuseria, L. A. Constantin, X. Zhou, K. Burke, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100 (2008) 136406. (b) L. He, F. Liu, G. Hautier, M. J. T. Oliveira, M. A. L. Marques, F. D. Vila, J. J. Rehr, G.-M. Rignanese, A. Zhou, Phys. Rev. B 89 (2014) 064305. (c) P. Haas, F. Tran, P. Blaha, Phys. Rev. B, 79 (2009) 085104.]

(21)　　(a) A. Bax, N. M. Szeverenyi, G. E. Maciel, J. Magn. Reson. 52 (1983) 147-152. (b) Z. Gan, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 114 (1992) 8307-8309. (c) J. Z. Hu, W. Wang, F. Liu, M. S. Solum, D. W. Alderman, R. J. Pugmire, D. M. Grant, J. Magn. Reson. 113 (1995) 21-222. (d) H. Saitô, I. Ando, A. Ramamoorthy, Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc. 57 (2010) 181-228 and references therein.

(22)　　A. E. Aliev, Biopolymers, 77 (2005) 230-245.

(23)　　(a) C. Crockford, H. Geen, J. J. Titman, Solid-state Nucl. Magn. Reson. 22 (2002) 298-310. (b) L. Shao, J. J. Titman, (2006) J. Chem. Phys., 125, 064507. (c) F. Martini, H. K. Miah, D. Iuga, M. Geppi, J. J. Titman, J. Magn. Reson, 259 (2015) 102-107.

(24)　　(a) M. Dračínský, P. Hodgkinson, Chem. - Eur. J. 20 (2014) 2201-2207. (b) M. Dračínský, P. Bouř, P. Hodgkinson, J. Chem. Theory Comput. 12 (2016) 968-973.

(25)　　J. Oviedo, M. J. Gillan, Surface Science 463 (2000), 93.

(26)　　R. K. Harris, T. N. Mitchell, G. J. Nesbitt, Magn. Reson. Chem. 23 (1985) 1080-1081.

(27)　　R. J. Wittebort, E. T. Olejniczak, R. G. Griffin, J. Chem. Phys. 86 (1987) 5411-5420.

(28)　　W. H. Press, B. P. Flannery, S. A. Teukolsky, W. T. Vetterling, Numerical Recipes - The Art of Scientific Computing. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1989).

(29)　　A. E. Aliev, K. D. M. Harris, Magn. Reson. Chem. 36 (1998) 855-868.

(30)　　M. Veshtort, R. G. Griffin, J. Magn. Reson. 178 (2006) 248-282.

(31)　　S. J. Clark, M. D. Segall, C. J. Pickard, P. J. Hasnip, M. J. Probert, K. Refson, M.C. Payne, Z. Kristall. 220 (2005), 567

(32)   (a) J. P. Perdew, A. Zunger, Phys. Rev. B 23 (1981), 5048. (b) J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, M. Ernzerhof, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77 (1996), 3865. (c) J. P. Perdew, Y. Wang, Phys. Rev. B 45 (1992), 13244. (d) J. P. Perdew, A. Ruzsinszky, G. I. Csonka, O. A. Vydrov, G. E. Scuseria, L. A. Constantin, X. Zhou, K. Burke, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100 (2008), 136406.

(33)   J. Autschbach, T. J. Ziegler, Chem. Phys. 113 (2000), 9410.

(34)   H. J. Monkhorst, J. D. Pack, Phys. Rev. B 13 (1976), 5188.

(35)   C. Bonhomme, C. Gervais, F. Babonneau, C. Coelho, F. Pourpoint, T. Azais, S. E. Ashbrook, J. M. Griffin, J. R. Yates, F. Mauri, C. J. Pickard, Chem. Rev. 112 (2012), 5733.

(36)   (a) C. J. Pickard, F. Mauri, Phys. Rev. B 63 (2001), 245101. (b) J. R. Yates, C. J. Pickard, F. Mauri, Phys. Rev. B 76 (2007), 024401.