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#### Abstract

Bis(methylthio)-3H-1,2-dithiole-3thione, $\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{OS}_{4}$ (BMDT), $M_{r}=210 \cdot 34$, monoclinic, $P 2_{1} / c, a=8.975$ (1), $b=14.727$ (1), $c=13.151$ (3) $\AA$, $\beta=93.46(1)^{\circ}, \quad V=1735(1) \AA^{3}, \quad Z=8, \quad D_{m}=$ $1.62(1), \quad D_{x}=1.610 \mathrm{Mg} \mathrm{m}^{-3}, \quad \lambda(\mathrm{Mo} K \alpha)=$ $0.71073 \AA, \quad \mu=0.99 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1}, \quad F(000)=864, \quad T=$ $295 \mathrm{~K}, \quad R=0.033, w R=0.051$ for 3712 unique observed reflections with $I>2 \cdot 5 \sigma(I)$. 1,2-Dithiole-3-thione-[5,4-b]-5,6-dihydro-1,4-dithiin, $\quad \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{~S}_{5}$ (DTDD), $\quad M_{r}=224 \cdot 39$, monoclinic, $P 2_{1} / c, \quad a=$ 12.099 (2),$\quad b=17.613$ (2),$\quad c=8.201$ (3) $\AA, \quad \beta=$ 108.43 (2) ${ }^{\circ}, \quad V=1658(1) \AA^{3}, \quad Z=8, \quad D_{m}=1.79(1)$, $D_{x}=1.798 \mathrm{Mg} \mathrm{m}^{-3}, \quad \lambda($ Мо $K \alpha)=0.71073 \AA, \quad \mu=$ $1.26 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1}, F(000)=912, T=295 \mathrm{~K}, R=0.044, w R$ $=0.044$ for 3271 unique observed reflections with $I$ $>2 \cdot 5 \sigma(I)$. The two BMDT molecules in the asymmetric unit have nearly identical bond lengths and bond angles, whereas the two symmetry independent DTDD molecules differ with respect to the $-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}-\mathrm{S}$ fragment. The carbonyl O atom in BMDT and the thione $S$ atom in DTDD are involved in rather short intermolecular contact distances probably due to delocalization of $\pi$-electron density in the all-trans system ( $\mathrm{S}, \mathrm{O}$ ) $=$ $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{S}-$.


Introduction. Over the past few years there has been intense activity concerning the preparation and properties of organic metals and organic superconductors based on $3,4,3^{\prime}, 4^{\prime}$-bis(ethylenedithio)$2,2^{\prime}, 5,5^{\prime}$-tetrathiafulvalene (BEDT-TTF). The superconducting transition temperature $T_{c}$ of these materials has recently been raised to 11.6 K in $\kappa$-(BEDT-TTF) $)_{2} \mathrm{Cu}\left[\mathrm{N}(\mathrm{CN})_{2}\right] \mathrm{Br} \quad$ (Williams, Kini, Geiser, Wang, Carlson, Kwok, Vandervoort, Thompson, Stupka, Jung \& Whangbo, 1990). Metal

[^0]complexes of the related ligand dmit, also gives rise to molecular metals and superconductors (Kobayashi, Kim, Sasaki, Kato, Kobayashi, Moriyama, Nichio, Kajita \& Sasaki, 1987; Clark, Underhill, Parker \& Friend, 1989). There is considerable interest in the study of possible chemical modifications of the molecular framework of BEDTTTF and of the dmit ligand and the influence of such changes on the properties of the charge-transfer salts and metal complexes. We now wish to report the crystal structures of two compounds closely related to molecular fragments of BEDT-TTF and dmit, but containing a 1,2 -dithiole in place of the 1,3 -dithiole ring found in the latter two compounds.

Experimental. $X$-ray crystal structure analyses. The crystals of 4,5 -bis(methylthio)-3H-1,2-dithiole-3thione (BMDT) used in the X-ray investigation were recrystallized from chloroform/methanol and separated as pale-yellow prisms. A crystal with approximate dimensions $0.33 \times 0.33 \times 0.23 \mathrm{~mm}$ was selected for X-ray diffraction. The crystals of 1,2-dithiole-3-thione[5,4-b]-5,6-dihydro-1,4-dithiin
(DTDD) selected for the X-ray investigation were recrystallized from absolute ethanol and separated as yellow needles. Crystal of size $0.10 \times 0.23 \times 0.36 \mathrm{~mm}$ was used. Crystals of both compounds were mounted on an Enraf-Nonius CAD-4F diffractometer, graphite-monochromatized Mo $K \alpha$ radiation ( $\lambda=$ $0.71073 \AA$ ). Both BMDT and DTDD crystallize in space group $P 2_{1} / c$ (deduced from systematic extinctions) and both with $Z=8$ corresponding to two molecules in the asymmetric unit. The lattice parameters were determined from setting angles for 24 reflections (BMDT) with $11.30<\theta<14.33^{\circ}$ and 25 reflections (DTDD) with $11.71<\theta<13.80^{\circ}$. Density was determined by flotation in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{BrCl}$ and $\mathrm{CCl}_{4}$. The intensities of 5054 unique reflections ( $R_{\text {int }}=$ 0.02 ) were measured for BMDT ( $h: 0 \rightarrow 12, k: 0 \rightarrow 20$, $l:-18 \rightarrow 18$ ) with $2.0<\theta<30.0^{\circ} .3712$ reflections
with $I>2.5 \sigma(I)$ were used in the refinement process together with less-than reflections [ $I<2 \cdot 5 \sigma(I)$ ] with calculated values greater than the observed ( 4685 contributing reflections). Intensities of 4810 unique reflections for DTDD ( $h: 0 \rightarrow 16, k: 0 \rightarrow 24, l:-11 \rightarrow$ 10 ) with $2.0<\theta<30 \cdot 0^{\circ}, 3271$ with $I<2 \cdot 5 \sigma(I)$ were used in the refinement process together with less-than reflections [ $I<2 \cdot 5 \sigma(I)$ ] with calculated values greater than the observed ( 4374 contributing reflections). $\omega / 2 \theta$ scan technique was used with scan angles $\Delta \omega=$ $(1.20+0.35 \tan \theta)^{\circ}$ for both structures. Three reflections were used for orientation control every 100 reflections (BMDT: $\overline{4} 55,0 \overline{8} 5, \overline{5} \overline{1} \overline{5} ;$ DTDD: 283, 652 , $\overline{5} \overline{3}$ ). An intensity stability check was made every third hour of exposure time by using $\overline{5} \overline{1} 5$ (BMDT) and $\overline{6} 52$ (DTDD). During the data collection the standard intensity decreased by $8 \%$ for BMDT and $2 \cdot 5 \%$ for DTDD. Correction for decay was applied in both cases. The intensities were corrected for Lorentz and polarization effects. Absorption was ignored. The structures were solved with direct methods and refined by full-matrix least squares for anisotropic non-H atoms. The function $\sum w(\Delta|F|)^{2}$ was minimized. Average $(w \Delta|F|)^{2}$ was almost independent of $\left|F_{o}\right|$ by using $w=1$ when $\left|F_{o}\right|<$ $30 \cdot 0$, else $w=\left(30 \cdot 0 / F_{o}\right)^{2}$ for BMDT and $w=\left\{1+\left[\left(F_{o}\right.\right.\right.$ $\left.-32) / 85]^{2}\right\}^{-1}$ for DTDD. Positional H -atom parameters (BMDT) from $\Delta \rho$ maps. Refinements of $\mathrm{H}(x, y, z)$ using reflections with $\sin \theta / \lambda<0 \cdot 40 \AA^{-1}$, and fixed isotropic temperature factors. The atoms $\mathrm{C}(26)$ and $\mathrm{C}(27)$ (DTDD) are disordered and all positional H -atom parameters (DTDD) were calculated.

The refinement converged, with 217 parameters varied, to final $R=0.033, w R=0.051, S=1.07$ and $(\Delta / \sigma)_{\max }=0.005$ for BMDT and, with 196 parameters varied, to $R=0.044, w R=0.044, S=1.70$ and $(\Delta / \sigma)_{\text {max }}=0.009$ for DTDD [except for two disordered C atoms, $\mathrm{C}(26)$ and $\mathrm{C}(27)$, where $(\Delta / \sigma)_{\max }=$ $0 \cdot 269$ ]. Min. and max. values in final $\Delta \rho$ maps were -0.41 and $0.24 \mathrm{e} \AA^{-3}$ for BMDT and -0.68 and $0.72 \mathrm{e} \AA^{-3}$ for DTDD. Scattering factors from International Tables for X-ray Crystallography (1974, Vol. IV, pp. 99 and 149). Computer programs from SHELXS86 (Sheldrick, 1986) and XRAY76 (Stewart, Machin, Dickinson, Ammon, Heck \& Flack, 1976). The fractional coordinates for the molecules in the structures of DTDD and BMDT are given in Table 1.*

Discussion. The bond distances and bond angles for the two symmetry independent molecules in the

[^1]Table 1. Fractional coordinates and equivalent isotropic thermal parameters of non- H atoms in the structures of DTDD and BMDT

|  | $B_{\text {eq }}=(4 / 3) \sum_{i} \sum_{j} \beta_{i j} \mathbf{a}_{i} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{j}$. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $x$ | $y$ | $z$ | $B_{\text {cq }}\left(\AA^{2}\right)$ |
| BMDT1 |  |  |  |  |
| S(1) | 0.27084 (3) | 0.38462 (2) | $0 \cdot 32013$ (2) | 4.00 (2) |
| S(2) | 0.22590 (3) | 0.45397 (2) | 0.44954 (2) | 3.79 (2) |
| S(3) | 0.35324 (4) | 0.63537 (2) | 0.51051 (2) | 4.36 (2) |
| S(4) | 0.55207 (4) | 0.62674 (2) | 0.31629 (3) | 5.01 (2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(5)$ | 0.4764 (1) | 0.44301 (6) | $0 \cdot 20320$ (6) | 4.96 (7) |
| C(3) | $0 \cdot 3417$ (1) | 0.54483 (6) | 0.42632 (7) | $3 \cdot 22$ (6) |
| C(4) | 0.4234 (1) | 0.54134 (7) | 0.34199 (7) | 3.35 (6) |
| C(5) | $0 \cdot 4093$ (1) | 0.46196 (7) | 0.27846 (8) | 3.73 (7) |
| C(31) | $0 \cdot 2267$ (2) | 0.6040 (1) | 0.6064 (1) | $5 \cdot 3$ (1) |
| C(41) | 0.4851 (2) | 0.6641 (1) | $0 \cdot 1912$ (1) | $6 \cdot 2$ (1) |
| BMDT2 |  |  |  |  |
| S(11) | $0 \cdot 26424$ (3) | $0 \cdot 17169$ (2) | 0.54413 (2) | 4.23 (2) |
| S(12) | $0 \cdot 28149$ (3) | 0.03546 (2) | 0.51617 (2) | 3.97 (2) |
| S(13) | $0 \cdot 10258$ (4) | -0.06708 (2) | $0 \cdot 35600$ (2) | 4.43 (2) |
| S(14) | -0.07105 (3) | $0 \cdot 11729$ (2) | $0 \cdot 29618$ (2) | 4.69 (2) |
| $\mathrm{O}(15)$ | 0.0616 (1) | 0.26910 (6) | 0.44334 (8) | 5-28(7) |
| C(13) | 0.1455 (1) | 0.03387 (6) | 0.41736 (7) | $3 \cdot 20$ (6) |
| C(14) | 0.0729 (1) | $0 \cdot 11316$ (7) | $0 \cdot 39281$ (7) | 3.40 (6) |
| C(15) | $0 \cdot 1134$ (1) | 0.19305 (7) | $0 \cdot 45076$ (8) | 3.67 (7) |
| C(131) | 0.2397 (2) | -0.1443 (1) | $0 \cdot 4138$ (1) | 5.8 (1) |
| C(141) | 0.0259 (2) | 0.1647 (1) | $0 \cdot 1939$ (1) | 6.5 (1) |
| DTDD1 |  |  |  |  |
| S(11) | 0.82687 (6) | $0 \cdot 26059$ (4) | 0.0026 (1) | 3.63 (5) |
| S(12) | 0.90616 (6) | $0 \cdot 16022$ (4) | 0.0999 (1) | 3.74 (5) |
| C(13) | 1.0314 (2) | 0.1991 (2) | 0.2415 (3) | $3 \cdot 0$ (2) |
| S(13) | 1.13528 (7) | 0.14172 (5) | 0.3572 (1) | $4 \cdot 30$ (6) |
| C(14) | 1.0318 (2) | 0.2800 (2) | 0.2453 (3) | 2.8 (2) |
| S(15) | $1 \cdot 15418$ (6) | 0.32193 (4) | $0 \cdot 39243$ (9) | 3.68 (5) |
| C(16) | $1 \cdot 1130$ (3) | 0.4200 (2) | 0.3866 (4) | 4.2 (2) |
| C(17) | 1.0556 (3) | $0 \cdot 4506$ (2) | 0.2087 (4) | 4.1 (2) |
| S(18) | 0.91016 (6) | 0.41268 (4) | 0.1060 (1) | 4.09 (5) |
| C(19) | 0.9372 (2) | 0.3163 (1) | 0.1341 (3) | $2 \cdot 9$ (2) |
| DTDD2 |  |  |  |  |
| S(21) | 0.31435 (6) | 0.00766 (4) | $0 \cdot 29221$ (9) | $3 \cdot 46$ (5) |
| S(22) | $0 \cdot 41426$ (6) | 0.09780 (4) | 0.2638 (1) | 3.59 (5) |
| C(23) | 0.5309 (2) | 0.0460 (2) | 0.2443 (3) | 3.0 (2) |
| S(23) | 0.64517 (6) | 0.09070 (4) | 0.2194 (1) | 4.21 (6) |
| C(24) | 0.5169 (2) | -0.0343 (1) | 0.2552 (3) | $2 \cdot 7$ (2) |
| S(25) | 0.63315 (6) | -0.09008 (4) | 0.2385 (1) | 3.71 (5) |
| C(26) | 0.5885 (4) | -0.1839 (2) | 0.2717 (8) | $8 \cdot 1$ (5) |
| C(27) | 0.4717 (4) | -0.2043 (2) | 0.2187 (8) | 8.0 (5) |
| S(28) | $0 \cdot 36958$ (6) | -0.15214 (4) | 0.2899 (1) | 3.90 (5) |
| C(29) | $0 \cdot 4144$ (2) | -0.0594 (2) | 0.2768 (3) | $2 \cdot 80$ (5) |

DTDD structure are shown in Figs. $1(c)$ and $1(d)$ together with the atom-numbering scheme. The dithiole ring in both molecules of the asymmetric unit is essentially planar as the maximum deviations from a least-squares plane defined by the dithiole ring atoms are 0.02 (2) and 0.005 (4) $\AA$, respectively, for DTDD1 and DTDD2. The dithiole rings associated with the symmetry independent BMDT molecules (Figs. $1 a$ and $1 b$ ) are nearly planar with -0.04 (3) $\AA$ (BMDT1) and 0.02 (2) $\AA$ (BMDT2) as maximum deviations from the respective leastsquares planes. Generally the molecules BMDT1 and BMDT2 have nearly the same bond distances and bond angles and it is also the case for the two molecules DTDD1 and DTDD2 except with respect to the $-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}-\mathrm{S}-$ part which has disordered C atoms in DTDD2. $\mathrm{C}(26)$ and $\mathrm{C}(27)$ have extraordinarily large temperature factors and the
distance $\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(27)$ of 1.388 (6) $\AA$ does not correspond to a carbon-carbon single bond. The bond distances and bond angles associated with $\mathrm{S}(25)$ -$\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{S}(28)$ are therefore not 'trustworthy'.


Fig. 1. Bond distances $(\AA \AA)$, angles $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ and the atom-numbering scheme for the molecules (a) BMDT1, (b) BMDT2, (c) DTDD1 and (d) DTDD2.

No reliable split positions for $\mathrm{C}(26)$ and $\mathrm{C}(27)$ could be found. The different geometry in two $\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{CH}_{2}-$ $\mathrm{CH}_{2}-\mathrm{S}$ groups is also visible in the torsion angles $\mathrm{S}(15)-\mathrm{C}(16)-\mathrm{C}(17)-\mathrm{S}(18) 70.0$ (3) and $\mathrm{S}(25)-$ $\mathrm{C}(26)-\mathrm{C}(27)-\mathrm{S}(28)-55.7(7)^{\circ}$ which shows that the dithiine rings of DTDD1 and DTDD2 are twisted oppositely.

When the structures of 4,5 -bis(methylthio)-2H-1,3-dithiole-2-thione (BTDTT) and its 2-oxo analogue (BTDTO) (Simonsen, Varma, Clark \& Underhill, 1990) are compared to the structures of DTDD and BMDT some differences and similarities appear. The dithiole $\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{O})-\mathrm{S}$ bonds in BTDTO are longer than the corresponding bonds in BTDTT owing to the strong electron withdrawing ability from the carbonyl O atom compared to the thione $S$ atom. An analogous difference is observed between the dithiole $\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{S}, \mathrm{O})$ bond in BMDT and DTDD whereas the dithiole $\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{S}, \mathrm{O})-\mathrm{C}$ bonds in BMDT and DTDD are of equal length.
The $>\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{C}<$ bonds in the DTDD structure are significantly longer than the $>\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{C}<$ bond in BTDTT [ 1.352 (4) $\AA$ ], and a similar relation exists between the $>\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{C}<$ bond in BMDT and BTDTO $[1 \cdot 343$ (6) $\AA]$. The $>\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{S}$ bonds in DTDD are significantly longer than the corresponding bond in BTDTT $[1.647$ (3) $\AA$ ], just as the $>\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{O}$ bonds (BMDT) are when compared to $>\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{O}$ in BTDTO. The two $\mathrm{C}_{s p^{2}}-\mathrm{S}$ bonds outside the five-membered dithiole ring within the same compound differ by approximately $0.02 \AA$, in both


Fig. 2. Stereo drawing (ATOMS; Dowty, 1989) of one unit cell of the BMDT crystal structure. O $\cdots$ S contact distances less than $3.25 \AA$ are represented with thin lines.


Fig. 3. Stereo drawing (ATOMS; Dowty, 1989) of one unit cell of the DTDD crystal structure. $\mathrm{S} \cdots \mathrm{S}$ contact distances less than $3.70 \AA$ are represented with thin lines.

DTDD and BMDT in such a way that the shortest $\mathrm{C}_{s p^{2}-\mathrm{S}}$ bond is in a trans position to the $\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{S}=\mathrm{C}<$ fragment.

On the basis of the preceding considerations we suggest the existence of some intramolecular $\pi$-electron delocalization over the systems $\mathrm{S}(X 3)=\mathrm{C}(X 3)$ $\mathrm{C}(X 4)=\mathrm{C}(X 9)-\mathrm{S}(X 8) \quad(X=1 ; 2) \quad$ (DTDD) and $\mathrm{O}(Y 5)=\mathrm{C}(Y 5)-\mathrm{C}(Y 4)=\mathrm{C}(Y 3)-\mathrm{S}(Y 3) \quad(Y=0 ; 1)$
(BMDT). These delocalizations of $\pi$ electrons are probably responsible for a different pattern of $S \cdots S$ and $S \cdots O$ interactions in DTDD and BMDT compared to BTDTT and BTDTO. The two former structures have intermolecular $S \cdots S$ and $S \cdots O$ contacts involving the thione and carbonyl groups (Figs. 2 and 3 ), whereas this is not the case for the latter two structures.

The density of the DTDD crystals $\left(1.79 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~cm}^{-3}\right)$ is markedly higher than those of the related compounds (BMDT), (BTDTT) and (BTDTO) which all have a measured density of $1.62 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~cm}^{-3}$. The DTDD structure has five intermolecular $\mathrm{S} \cdots \mathrm{S}$ contact distances less than $3 \cdot 7 \AA$. Two of them are rather short, $\mathrm{S}(13) \cdots \mathbf{S}(21 ; 1+x, y, z) 3 \cdot 359(1), \mathrm{S}(11) \cdots \mathrm{S}(28 ; 1-x$, $-y,-z) 3.383(1) \AA$. The remaining three are: $\mathrm{S}(15) \cdots \mathrm{S}(25 ; \quad 2-x, \quad 0.5+y, \quad 0.5-z) \quad 3.453(1)$, $S(18) \cdots S(21 ; 1-x, 0.5+y, \quad 0.5-z) 3.508$ (1) and
$S(11) \cdots S(28 ; 1-x, 0 \cdot 5+y, 0 \cdot 5-z) 3 \cdot 670(1) \AA$. The BMDT structure has four intermolecular $S \cdots$ O contact distances less than $3.25 \AA$ with $\mathrm{S}(12) \cdots \mathrm{O}(5 ; x, 0.5$ $-y, \quad 0,5-z) \quad 2.949(1) \AA$ as the strongest, $\mathrm{S}(1) \cdots \mathrm{O}(15) \quad 3.071(1), \quad \mathrm{S}(2) \cdots \mathrm{O}(15) \quad 3.098(1)$, $\mathrm{S}(11) \cdots \mathrm{O}(5 ; x, 0 \cdot 5-y, 0 \cdot 5+z) 3 \cdot 225(1) \AA$.
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#### Abstract

C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{~S}, \quad M_{r}=229 \cdot 3\), orthorhombic, Pbca, $a=16.841$ (5); $b=12.189$ (4), $c=10.842$ (2) $\AA$, $V=2225 \cdot 6$ (2) $\AA^{3}, Z=8, D_{x}=1 \cdot 37, D_{m}$ (flotation) $=1.43 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~cm}^{-3}, \quad \lambda(\mathrm{Cu} \mathrm{K} \mathrm{\alpha})=1.54178 \AA, \quad \mu=$ $23.77 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}, F(000)=960, R=0.038$ for 1208 unique observed reflections $[I>2 \sigma(I)$ ]. The molecule consists of a five-membered dimethylpyrazole ring rather than a seven-membered ring. The $\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{C}$ average bond distance, $1.746 \AA$, is shorter than for a single bond. The benzothiazole nucleus adopts an almost planar conformation with a dihedral angle between the mean planes of the two individual rings of $1.5^{\circ}$. The dimethylpyrazole ring does not deviate much from planarity and is inclined at an angle of $13^{\circ}$ to


[^2]0108-2701/91/091908-04\$03.00
the benzothiazole ring. The molecules are well separated and stacked in parallel rows along the crystallographic axes.

Introduction. There has been considerable interest in studies of the structural configuration of the products obtained by the reaction of heterocyclic hydrazines with $\beta$-dicarbonyl compounds, and their biological activities. In the cases of 4-aryl-2hydrazines (Singh, Vaid, Prakash \& Prakash, 1986) and 2-hydrazinequinolines (Singh, Sehgal, Singh \& Dhawan, 1987), a five-membered ring formation (1) of the pyrazole group has been suggested for the compounds obtained on treatment with pentane-2,4-dione. However, an isomeric seven-membered ring formation (2) has been proposed for the same compounds by other groups of workers (Mahajan,


[^0]:    * IUPAC name: 5,6-dihydro[1,2]dithiolo[3,4-b][1,4]dithiin-3thione.

[^1]:    * Lists of structure factors, anisotropic displacement parameters and H -atom parameters have been deposited with the British Library Document Supply Centre as Supplementary Publication No. SUP 53976 ( 60 pp.). Copies may be obtained through The Technical Editor, International Union of Crystallography, 5 Abbey Square, Chester CH1 2HU, England.
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