Acta Cryst. (1995). C51, 801-805

# An Inclusion Complex of Uranyl in a Diazacrown: (Diaza-18-crown-6)<sup>2+</sup>.- $2CF_3SO_3^-$ and $[UO_2(diaza-18-crown-6)]^+$ .- $CF_3SO_3^-$

Pierre Thuéry, Nelly Keller, Monique Lance, Jean-Marc Sabattié, Julien-Daniel Vigner and Martine Nierlich

CEA, SCM, SE Saclay, Bâtiment 125, 91191 Gif-sur-Yvette CEDEX, France

(Received 23 December 1993; accepted 26 May 1994)

# Abstract

The structures of two compounds involving the 1,4,10,13-tetraoxa-7,16-diazacyclooctamacrocycle (diaza-18-crown-6,  $C_{12}H_{26}N_2O_4$ ) decane are reported. In 1,4,10,13-tetraoxa-7,16-diazoniacyclooctadecane bis(trifluoromethanesulfonate), C<sub>12</sub>H<sub>28</sub>- $N_2O_4^{2+}.2CF_3SO_3^{-}$ , (I), the two N atoms are protonated, resulting in a ring conformation different to that of the neutral crown. The second compound, dioxo[1,4,10,13-tetraoxa-7,16-diazocyclooctadecanido(1 - )]uraniumtrifluoromethanesulfonate,  $[UO_2(C_{12}H_{25}N_2O_4)]CF_3SO_3,$ (II), is composed of [UO<sub>2</sub>(diaza-18-crown-6)]<sup>+</sup> cations and  $CF_3SO_3^-$  anions. The linear uranyl moiety is included into the macrocycle with hexagonalbipyramidal coordination geometry; one of the N atoms is deprotonated and the two N atoms are thus at different distances from the U atom and have different geometries.

# Comment

This work is part of an investigation of inclusion complexes formed between the uranyl ion and macrocycles such as crown ethers (Folcher, Charpin, Costes, Keller & de Villardi, 1979; Navaza, Villain & Charpin, 1984; Deshayes *et al.*, 1994) and azacrowns or coronands (Nierlich, Sabattié, Keller, Lance & Vigner, 1994). The choice of a poorly coordinating solvent-anion pair allows direct uranyl-macrocycle coordination (Fux, Lagrange & Lagrange, 1984; Deshayes *et al.*, 1994). Some solution studies using spectrophotometric methods (Lagrange, Metabanzoulou, Fux & Lagrange, 1989) or EXAFS spectrometry (Deshayes *et al.*, 1994) have shown that the macrocycle diaza-18-crown-6 is able to form an inclusion complex with the uranyl ion. We report here the structures of two compounds obtained during the course of the investigation of inclusion complexes between uranyl and diaza-18-crown-6 in the solid state.

The synthesis of the two compounds was carried out as described previously (Nierlich et al., 1994), with anhydrous acetonitrile as a solvent and trifluoromethanesulfonate  $(CF_3SO_3^-)$  as a counter ion. Two different crystalline species could be isolated depending on the acidity of the medium and the concentrations of the reagents. Compound (I),  $[H_2 diaza-18$ -crown-6]<sup>2+</sup>.2CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>, corresponds to the uncomplexed crown with the two N atoms protonated and two  $CF_3SO_3^-$  ions as counter ions. Compound (II),  $[UO_2(diaza-18-crown-6)]^+$ .  $CF_3SO_3^-$ , is an inclusion complex between the uranyl ion and the crown with one aza group deprotonated and one  $CF_3SO_3^-$  ion per molecule of the complex as a counter ion. The possibility of varying the charge of nitrogen-containing crowns, as illustrated here, makes them more versatile than the corresponding crown ethers.



As shown in Figs. 1 and 2, the structure of  $[H_2 diaza-18$ -crown-6]<sup>2+</sup>.2CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> consists of macrocyclic cations and  $CF_3SO_3^-$  ions, the 1:2 ratio indicating that both N atoms of the macrocycle are protonated. The centrosymmetric macrocycle adopts the unusual conformation  $g^+g^+g^+g^-g^-g^-$ , different from the configuration  $g^+g^-g^+g^-g^+g^-$  adopted by the neutral macrocycle (Herceg & Weiss, 1972). One of the torsion angles around a C-O bond deviates significantly from that of an anti configuration  $[C(2) - O(1) - C(3) - C(4) - 71.1(7)^{\circ}];$  a similar situation is found for the crown ether 18-crown-6 (Dunitz & Seiler, 1974) and some of its inclusion complexes (Rogers, Rollins, Etzenhouser, Voss & Bauer, 1993), and in the complex [UO<sub>2</sub>(18-azacrown-(6)]<sup>2+</sup>.2CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> (Nierlich *et al.*, 1994). This C-O-C-C torsion angle is located between two

O—C—C—O torsion angles with the same sign, as has been noted previously (Fyles & Gandour, 1992; Rogers *et al.*, 1993).

The four O atoms and the two N atoms of the macrocycle are in a puckered plane with maximum deviations of  $\pm 0.12$  Å. The N(1)...N(1) distance of 4.687 (8) Å is shorter than in the free neutral macrocycle (5.84 Å; Moras, Metz, Herceg & Weiss, 1972) and both O···O distances are longer  $[O(1) \cdots O(1^{i})]$ 5.920 (8),  $O(2) \cdots O(2^{i})$  6.025 (8) Å] than in the neutral macrocycle (5.61–5.67 Å) [symmetry code: (i) -x, 1-y, -z]. The crystallographic symmetry is  $C_i$ , as in the neutral macrocycle (Herceg & Weiss, 1972), but, on the whole, the protonation of the two N atoms induces a more distorted geometry than in the neutral crown. The crystal packing consists of layers of macrocyclic cations and CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> ions, the shortest distances between the cations and the anions being N(1)...O(3) and N(1)...O(4), both of which are 2.83 (1) Å.



Fig. 1. An ORTEPII (Johnson, 1976) view of  $[H_2$ diaza-18crown-6]<sup>2+</sup>.2CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, (I), showing the atom-labelling scheme. Displacement ellipsoids are shown at the 40% probability level. Symmetry code: (i) -x, 1-y, -z.



Fig. 2. A stereoview of the crystal packing in (I) viewed along the a axis.

The structure of  $[UO_2(diaza-18-crown-6)]^+$ .-CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> is shown in Figs. 3 and 4. The symmetry plane contains U, O(3), O(4), N(1), N(2), S, C(7), O(5) and F(2). The uranyl group is hexacoordinated by the four O atoms and two N atoms of the crown, the U atom having a distorted hexagonal-bipyramidal coordination geometry. The uranyl group is nearly linear [O(3)=U=O(4) 174.54 (4)°], but the U=O distances [1.843 (4)-1.827 (4) Å] are longer than a typical U=O bond length of about 1.75 Å; this is probably due to the imperfect absorption correction (Charpin, Dejean, Folcher, Rigny & Navaza, 1985).

The two U-N distances are slightly different. confirming the deprotonation of one of the N atoms suggested by the 1:1 cation/anion ratio. Furthermore, the geometries around the two N atoms are significantly different; N(2), which has the shorter U—N distance [2.68 (6) Å], is in a nearly planar environment [U-N(2)-C(6) 115 (3), C(6)-N(2)- $C(6^{i})$  120 (5)°], which indicates that it has been deprotonated, while N(1) is slightly further from U [2.74 (6) Å] and is in a distorted tetrahedral environment  $[U-N(1)-C(1) \ 111(3), \ C(1)-N(1)-C(1^{i})$ 93 (4)°] [symmetry code: (i) -x, y, z]. A shorter mean U-N distance [2.60 (1) Å] has been deduced from EXAFS measurements (Deshaves et al., 1994), but in this case the crown was probably not deprotonated; in the inclusion complex between the uranyl ion and 18-azacrown-6 (Nierlich et al., 1994), the mean U-N distance [2.66 (6) Å] is of comparable magnitude. The two O atoms of diaza-18-crown-6 are at equal distances from U [2.71 (3) Å], but this mean distance is longer than is usually reported [2.53 (4) Å (Deshayes et al., 1994); 2.58 (10) Å (Navaza et al., 1984)]. These longer distances may be accounted for by the formation of a covalent bond between U and N(2), reducing the strength of the dative bonds involving U.

The macrocycle adopts the  $g^+g^-g^+g^-g^+g^-$  conformation (distorted  $D_{3d}$  sequence), the same as that of free diaza-18-crown-6 (Herceg & Weiss, 1972); this is one of the six more common conformations in 18-crown-6 complexes (Fyles & Gandour, 1992). The same holds true for the K<sup>+</sup> inclusion complex (which is not deprotonated) (Moras et al., 1972), but not for  $Cu^{2+}$ the complex, which adopts the  $g^+g^+g^-g^+g^+g^-$  conformation and is highly distorted because of the presence of covalent bonding (Herceg & Weiss, 1973). The torsion angles show only slight deviations with respect to the ideal gauche and anti conformations.

The O atoms and the U atom are coplanar within  $\pm 0.020$  Å with N(1) at 0.48 (3) and N(2) at -0.25 (2) Å from this mean plane. The distances N(1)…N(2) [5.42 (5) Å] and O(1)…O(2<sup>i</sup>)</sup> [5.42 (3) Å], are shorter than in the free and neutral macrocycle (Moras *et al.*, 1972). The crystal packing consists of alternate layers perpendicular to the *c* axis containing either the complex ions parallel to one another or CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> ions. The shortest distances between the complex and the CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> ions are found between the N atoms and the sulfate O atoms; the two N atoms are not equivalent in this respect as N(2) has one

neighbour, O(5), at 3.10 (4) Å, and N(1) has two, O(6) and  $O(6^{i})$ , at 3.6 (1) Å. The distances corresponding to intermolecular contacts are thus longer than in  $[H_2 diaza-18$ -crown-6]<sup>2+</sup>.2CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>.



Fig. 3. An ORTEPII (Johnson, 1976) view of [UO2(diaza-18 $crown-6]^+$ .  $CF_3SO_3^-$ , (II), showing the atom-labelling scheme. Displacement ellipsoids are shown at the 40% probability level. Symmetry code: (i) -x, y, z.



Fig. 4. A stereoview of the crystal packing in (II) viewed along the b axis.

# Experimental

# Compound (I)

Crystal data

C12H28N2O42+.2CF3SO3  $M_r = 562.51$ Triclinic ΡĪ a = 8.036 (3) Å b = 8.267 (2) Åc = 10.104 (3) Å  $\alpha = 73.88 (2)^{\circ}$  $\beta = 87.31 (3)^{\circ}$  $\gamma = 78.33 (3)^{\circ}$  $V = 631 (1) Å^3$ Z = 1 $D_x = 1.479 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$ 

Mo  $K\alpha$  radiation  $\lambda = 0.71073 \text{ Å}$ Cell parameters from 25 reflections  $\theta = 8 - 12^{\circ}$  $\mu = 0.29 \text{ mm}^{-1}$ T = 290 KIrregular  $0.40 \times 0.40 \times 0.25 \text{ mm}$ Light yellow

Data collection
Enraf-Nonius CAD-4
diffractometer
$\omega/2\theta$ scans
Absorption correction:
refined from $\Delta F$
(DIFABS; Walker &
Stuart, 1983)
1676 measured reflections
1565 independent reflections

### Refinement

Refinement on F	Unit v
R = 0.056	$\Delta  ho_{max}$
wR = 0.057	$\Delta  ho_{min}$
S = 0.88	Atom
1229 reflections	from
154 parameters	for
H-atoms included using a	(19
riding model (C—H 0.95,	
$N - H 1.05 \text{ Å}, B = 6 \text{ Å}^2$	

### 1229 observed reflections $[l > 3\sigma(l)]$ $R_{\rm int} = 0.013$ $\theta_{\rm max} = 22^{\circ}$ $h = -8 \rightarrow 8$ $k = -8 \rightarrow 8$ $l = -10 \rightarrow 0$ 3 standard reflections frequency: 60 min intensity decay: 1.7%

weights applied  $x = 0.32 \text{ e} \text{ Å}^{-3}$  $= -0.29 \text{ e} \text{ Å}^{-3}$ ic scattering factors m International Tables X-ray Crystallography 74, Vol. IV)

# Table 1. Fractional atomic coordinates and equivalent isotropic displacement parameters $(Å^2)$ for (I)

	В	$T_{\rm eq} = (4/3) \Sigma_i \Sigma_j$	$\beta_{ij}\mathbf{a}_i.\mathbf{a}_j.$	
	x	у	Z	$B_{eq}$
S	0.2240 (2)	0.1776 (2)	0.2329 (1)	3.54 (3)
F(1)	0.0892 (6)	0.2501 (7)	0.4529 (4)	10.3 (2)
F(2)	0.2171 (7)	-0.0068 (7)	0.4853 (5)	11.5 (2)
F(3)	0.3612 (6)	0.1860 (7)	0.4572 (4)	10.7 (1)
O(1)	-0.1172 (5)	0.7931 (5)	0.1182 (4)	4.67 (9)
O(2)	-0.3286 (5)	0.5389 (5)	0.1550 (4)	4.75 (9)
O(3)	0.0649 (5)	0.1369 (5)	0.2087 (4)	5.3 (1)
O(4)	0.2365 (6)	0.3526 (5)	0.1813 (4)	6.4 (1)
O(5)	0.3691 (5)	0.0601 (5)	0.2091 (5)	6.2 (1)
N(1)	0.1854 (5)	0.6863 (5)	-0.0030 (4)	3.5 (1)
C(1)	0.1774 (7)	0.7731 (7)	0.1085 (6)	4.7 (1)
C(2)	0.0298 (8)	0.7390 (8)	0.2024 (6)	5.2 (2)
C(3)	-0.2754 (8)	0.7916 (7)	0.1906 (6)	5.7 (2)
C(4)	-0.3116 (8)	0.6238 (8)	0.2573 (6)	5.9 (2)
C(5)	-0.3275 (7)	0.3611 (7)	0.2141 (6)	5.0 (2)
C(6)	0.3299 (7)	0.7169 (7)	-0.0972 (6)	4.7 (1)
C(7)	0.2238 (9)	0.1482 (9)	0.4152 (7)	6.4 (2)

$1a_{0} = 2$ . Detected geometric purumeters (A, ) for (1	Table 2. Selected	geometric p	oarameters (Å	Á, °)	for (	I)
---	-------------------	-------------	---------------	-------	-------	----

	-	-	
(H2diaza-18-crown-	6) <sup>2+</sup>		
N(1) - C(1)	1.487 (7)	O(1)—C(2)	1.410 (7)
O(1)—C(3)	1.438 (7)	O(2)—C(4)	1.426 (7)
O(2)—C(5)	1.423 (7)	C(1)—C(2)	1.506 (8)
C(3)—C(4)	1.445 (9)	C(5)—C(6 <sup>i</sup> )	1.497 (8)
C(6) = N(1) = C(1)	112.6 (4)	N(1) - C(1) - C(2)	111.2 (5)
C(1) - C(2) - O(1)	106.6 (5)	C(2) = O(1) = C(3)	115.3 (5)
O(1) - C(3) - C(4)	115.7 (6)	C(3)-C(4)-O(2)	109.1 (6)
C(4)-O(2)-C(5)	111.8 (5)	$O(2) - C(5) - C(6^{i})$	107.0 (5)
C(5 <sup>i</sup> )—C(6)—N(1)	111.4 (5)		
CF <sub>3</sub> SO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>			
S—O(3)	1.435 (4)	S	1.418 (4)
SO(5)	1.416 (4)	SC(7)	1.790 (8)
C(7)—F(1)	1.340 (9)	C(7)—F(2)	1.291 (9)
C(7)F(3)	1.325 (8)		

# C12H28N2O42+.2CF3SO3- AND [UO2(C12H25N2O4)]CF3SO3

0(3)-50(4)	115.9 (3)	O(3) - S - O(5)	114.5 (3)	O(6)	-0.111(2)	-0.247 (3)	0.261 (2)	17.2 (9)
O(4) = S = O(5)	114.4 (3)	O(3) - S - C(7)	102.8 (3)	N(1)	0	-0.011 (4)	-0.1254 (9)	2.8 (2)
O(4) - S - C(7)	102.1 (4)	O(5)—S—C(7)	104.7 (4)	N(2)	0	0.037 (3)	0.122(1)	2.8
F(1) - C(7) - F(2)	106.3 (7)	F(1) - C(7) - F(3)	107.0 (7)	C(1)	-0.101 (2)	-0.121 (3)	-0.151 (1)	3.4 (2)
F(2) - C(7) - F(3)	107.1 (7)	S-C(7)-F(1)	111.1 (5)	C(2)	-0.210 (2)	-0.049 (2)	-0.1280 (9)	3.4 (2)
S-C(7)-F(2)	113.2 (6)	S-C(7)-F(3)	111.7 (6)	C(3)	-0.315 (2)	0.010 (4)	-0.0310 (8)	3.4 (2)
., .,	Summetry code	(i) $-r = 1 - v - 7$		C(4)	-0.312 (2)	-0.041 (2)	0.0361 (9)	3.4
	Symmetry code.	(1) = x, 1 = y, -2.		C(5)	-0.212 (2)	-0.001 (4)	0.1222 (8)	3.4
				C(6)	-0.108 (2)	0.086 (2)	0.148(1)	3.4
				C(7)	0	-0.499 (5)	0.261 (1)	4.8 (7)

# Compound (II)

650 reflections 83 parameters

H atoms included using

 $0.95 \text{ Å}, B = 6 \text{ Å}^2$ 

Unit weights applied

a riding model (C-H

Crystal data

$[UO_2(C_{12}H_{25}N_2O_4)]$ -	Mo $K\alpha$ radiation	Table 4. Select	ed geometri	ic parameters (Å, '	$(\mathbf{I})$ for $(\mathbf{II})$
CF <sub>3</sub> SO <sub>3</sub>	$\lambda = 0.71073$ Å	LI environment			
$M_r = 680.44$	Cell parameters from 25	U = O(3)	1.84 (4)	U—O(4)	1.83 (4)
Orthorhombic	reflections	U—N(1)	2.74 (6)	U—N(2)	2.68 (6)
$Cmc2_1$	$\theta = 8 - 12^{\circ}$	U—O(1)	2.71 (3)	U—O(2)	2.71 (3)
a = 11.386 (4) Å	$\mu = 7.352 \text{ mm}^{-1}$			o	
b = 8.601(2) Å	T = 290  K	O(3) - U - O(4)	1/4.54 (4)	$O(1) = U = O(1^{\circ})$	123(1)
c = 21.858(7) Å	Plotelet	V(2) = U = O(2)	62 1 (5)	N(1) = U = N(2) O(1) = U = O(2)	59 2 (3)
U = 21.050 (7)  A	$0.40 \times 0.25 \times 0.12$ mm	O(2) - U - N(2)	59.3 (5)	0(1)-0 0(2)	57.2 (5)
V = 2141(2) A					
L = 4	Light yellow	(Diaza-18-crown-6)	-		
$D_x = 2.11 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$		N(1) - C(1)	1.59 (5)	N(2) - C(6)	1.42 (4)
		O(1) - C(2)	1.55 (4)	O(1) - C(3)	1.38 (4)
Data collection		C(1) = C(2)	1.30 (4)	C(2) = C(3)	1.53 (4)
Enraf–Nonius CAD-4	650 observed reflections	C(1)-C(2) C(5)-C(6)	1.50 (5)	C(J)—C(4)	1.55 (2)
diffractometer	$[I > 3\sigma(I)]$				
$\omega/2\theta$ scans	$R_{\rm int} = 0.011$	C(1) - N(1) - C(1')	93 (4)	N(1) - C(1) - C(2)	104 (3)
Absorption correction:	$\theta_{\rm max} = 25^{\circ}$	C(1) = C(2) = O(1) O(1) = C(2) = C(4)	112 (3)	C(2) = O(1) = C(3) C(3) = C(4) = O(2)	105 (3)
w scans (North Phillips	$h = 0 \rightarrow 13$	C(4) = C(3) = C(4)	108 (3)	O(2) - C(5) - C(6)	103(3) 102(3)
& Mathews 1068)	$k = 0 \rightarrow 10$	C(5) - C(6) - N(2)	113 (3)	$C(6) - N(2) - C(6^{i})$	120 (5)
T = 0.262 T =	$k = 0 \rightarrow 10$				
$I_{\min} = 0.302, I_{\max} =$	$l = -20 \rightarrow 0$	$CF_3SO_3^-$			
1.00	3 standard reflections	S	1.58 (5)	S = O(6)	1.37(3)
1204 measured reflections	frequency: 60 min	S = -C(7) C(7) = F(2)	1.78 (0)	C(7) = F(1)	1.51 (5)
1026 independent reflections	intensity decay: 2%	C(7) - F(2)	1.34 (4)		
		O(5)—S—O(6)	103 (3)	O(5)—S—C(7)	99 (2)
Refinement		O(6)—S—C(7)	105 (2)	O(6)—S—O(6 <sup>i</sup> )	136 (5)
Definition E	$(\Delta / -) = 0.07$	F(1)C(7)-F(2)	106 (4)	$F(1)-C(7)-F(1^{1})$	114 (5)
Reinfernent on F	$(\Delta/\sigma)_{\rm max} = 0.07$	F(1)—C(7)—S	114 (3)	F(2)—C(7)—S	103 (4)
R = 0.029	$\Delta \rho_{\rm max} = 0.77  {\rm e  A}^3$		Symmetry co	de: (i) - x, y, z.	
wK = 0.036	$\Delta \rho_{\rm min} = -1.50 \ {\rm e} \ {\rm A}^{-3}$		,, ···	., .,,,,-	
S = 6.10	Atomic scattering factors				

and anomalous-dispersion

terms from International

Crystallography (1974,

Tables for X-ray

Vol. IV)

# Table 5. Torsion angles (°)

$(H_2 diaza-18-crown-6)^{2+}.2CF_3SO_3^{-}, (I)$	
C(6) - N(1) - C(1) - C(2)	-179.8 (4)
C(1) - C(2) - O(1) - C(3)	-172.4 (5)
O(1)-C(3)-C(4)-O(2)	-64.0 (7)
$C(4) - O(2) - C(5) - C(6^{i})$	- 174.9 (4)
$C(5^{i})-C(6)-N(1)-C(1)$	-175.8 (3)
N(1) - C(1) - C(2) - O(1)	-56.1 (6)
C(2) - O(1) - C(3) - C(4)	-71.1 (7)
C(3)C(4)O(2)C(5)	167.3 (5)
$O(2) - C(5) - C(6^{i}) - N(1^{i})$	56.5 (4)

# Symmetry code: (i) -x, 1 - y, -z.

$[UO_2(C_{12}H_{25}N_2O_4)]^+.CF_3SO_3^-, (II)$	
$C(1^{i}) - N(1) - C(1) - C(2)$	175 (1)
C(1) - C(2) - O(1) - C(3)	- 169 (2)
O(1)-C(3)-C(4)-O(2)	56 (2)
C(4)-O(2)-C(5)-C(6)	-176 (2)
$C(5)-C(6)-N(2)-C(6^{i})$	- 169 (2)
N(1) - C(1) - C(2) - O(1)	-57 (2)
C(2) - O(1) - C(3) - C(4)	158 (2)
C(3)C(4)O(2)C(5)	174 (2)
O(2)C(5)C(6)N(2)	-60 (2)

Symmetry code: (i) -x, y, z.

$B_{eq} = (4/3) \sum_i \sum_j \beta_{ij} \mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{a}_j$ for U, S, F(1), F(2), O(5) and O(6);
$B_{\rm iso}$ for all others.

Table 3. Fractional atomic coordinates and equivalentisotropic displacement parameters (Å<sup>2</sup>) for (II)

	x	у	Z	$B_{eq}/B_{iso}$
U	0	0.0009 (4)	0	1.91 (1)
S	0	-0.2946 (9)	0.247(1)	6.5 (2)
F(1)	0.096 (2)	-0.569 (2)	0.243 (2)	12.4 (5)
F(2)	0	-0.507 (5)	0.3224 (9)	7.5 (6)
O(1)	-0.209(1)	-0.032(1)	-0.0576 (6)	2.7(1)
O(2)	-0.205 (1)	0.034(1)	0.0622 (6)	2.7
O(3)	0	-0.212 (2)	0.008 (9)	2.9 (2)
O(4)	0	0.210 (2)	-0.016 (9)	2.9
O(5)	0	-0.297 (3)	0.175(1)	7.3 (8)

Data collection was perfromed using CAD-4 Software (Enraf-Nonius, 1989). Lorentz-polarization corrections were applied to both sets of data. The S atom in (I) was located by the heavy-atom method and the remaining part of the structure by subsequent difference Fourier syntheses. The structure was refined by a full-matrix least-squares method with anisotropic displacement parameters for all non-H atoms. The U atom in (II) was located by the heavy-atom method and the remaining part of the structure by subsequent difference Fourier syntheses. The structure was refined by a full-matrix least-squares method with anisotropic displacement parameters for U and the atoms of the trifluoromethanesulfonate moiety (except C). Due to the pseudo-centrosymmetry of the macrocycle, strong correlations were present between atoms that would be equivalent in the centrosymmetric space group Cmcm. This could only be overcome by fixing constraints of equality on the corresponding displacement parameters. The two enantiomorphs were checked but gave the same results. All calculations were performed on a VAX4200 computer. Programs used: MolEN (Fair, 1990) and ORTEPII (Johnson, 1976).

Lists of structure factors, anisotropic displacement parameters, H-atom coordinates and bond distances and angles involving non-H atoms have been deposited with the IUCr (Reference: PA1104). Copies may be obtained through The Managing Editor, International Union of Crystallography, 5 Abbey Square, Chester CH1 2HU, England.

### References

- Charpin, P., Dejean, A., Folcher, G., Rigny, P. & Navaza, P. (1985). J. Chim. Phys. 82, 14-21.
- Deshayes, L., Keller, N., Lance, M., Navaza, A., Nierlich, M. & Vigner, J. (1994). Polyhedron, 13, 1725–1733.
- Dunitz, J. D. & Seiler, P. (1974). Acta Cryst. B30, 2739-2741.
- Enraf-Nonius (1989). CAD-4 Software. Version 5.0. Enraf-Nonius, Delft, The Netherlands.
- Fair, C. K. (1990). MolEN. An Interactive Intelligent System for Crystal Structure Analysis. Enraf-Nonius, Delft, The Netherlands.
- Folcher, G., Charpin, P., Costes, R. M., Keller, N. & de Villardi, G. C. (1979). *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, **34**, 87–90.
- Fux, P., Lagrange, J. & Lagrange, P. (1984). J. Chim. Phys. 81, 321-326.
- Fyles, T. M. & Gandour, R. D. (1992). J. Incl. Phenom. 12, 313-332.
- Herceg, M. & Weiss, R. (1972). Bull. Soc. Chim. Fr. pp. 549-551.
- Herceg, M. & Weiss, R. (1973). Acta Cryst. B29, 542-547.
- Johnson, C. K. (1976). ORTEPII. Report ORNL-5138. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tennessee, USA.
- Lagrange, J., Metabanzoulou, J. P., Fux, P. & Lagrange, P. (1989). Polyhedron, 8, 2251-2254.
- Moras, D., Metz, B., Herceg, M. & Weiss, R. (1972). Bull. Soc. Chim. Fr. pp. 551–555.
- Navaza, A., Villain, F. & Charpin, P. (1984). Polyhedron, 3, 143-149.
- Nierlich, M., Sabattié, J. M., Keller, N., Lance, M. & Vigner, J. D. (1994). Acta Cryst. C50, 52-54.
- North, A. C. T., Phillips, D. C. & Mathews, F. S. (1968). Acta Cryst. A24, 351-359.
- Rogers, R. D., Rollins, A. N., Etzenhouser, R. D., Voss, E. J. & Bauer, C. B. (1993). *Inorg. Chem.* 32, 3451–3462.
- Walker, N. & Stuart, D. (1983). Acta Cryst. A39, 158-166.

Acta Cryst. (1995). C51, 805-809

# Two Lasalocid Sodium Salts

XIUQI SHUI AND DRAKE S. EGGLESTON

SmithKline Beecham Pharmaceuticals, 709 Swedeland Road, King of Prussia, PA 19406, USA

(Received 8 February 1994; accepted 12 September 1994)

### Abstract

The structures of two new forms of lasalocid sodium salt, sodium 6-[7R-{5S-ethyl-5-(5R-ethyltetrahydro-5hydroxy-6S-methyl-2H-pyran-2R-yl) tetrahydro-3Smethyl-2S-furanyl}-4S-hydroxy-3R,5S-dimethyl-6-oxononyl]-2-hydroxy-3-methylbenzoate (A), Na<sup>+</sup>.C<sub>34</sub>H<sub>53</sub>O<sub>8</sub><sup>-</sup>, and sodium 6-[7R-{5S-ethyl-5-(5R-ethyltetrahydro-5hydroxy-6S-methyl-2H-pyran-2R-yl)tetrahydro-3Smethyl-2S-furanyl}-4S-hydroxy-3R,5S-dimethyl-6-oxononyl]-2-hydroxy-3-methylbenzoate diethyl ether solvate (B), Na<sup>+</sup>.C<sub>34</sub>H<sub>53</sub>O<sub>8</sub><sup>-</sup>.C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>10</sub>O, are reported. Form A exists as a 'head-to-head' dimer, while form B is a 'head-totail' dimer. Sodium is coordinated to six O atoms from the lasalocid anion in both forms, but the coordination spheres differ. Form A contains a bridging carbonyl O atom, but, remarkably, the carboxylate group does not coordinate to the sodium ion. In form B, the carbonyl O atom does not bridge but there is a direct carboxylatesodium interaction.

### Comment

The structures of sodium salts of lasalocid and a derivative have been known for almost two decades (Schmidt, Wang & Paul, 1974; Smith, Duax & Fortier, 1978). Two new forms (A and B) were obtained as we attempted to prepare other lasalocid complexes using the sodium salt as a starting material.



In both structures, the lasalocid anion adopts the usual circular intramolecularly hydrogen-bonded conformation with interactions involving O1 and O3, O2 and O4, and O8 and the carboxylate group. Both compounds A and B occur as dimers. In the 'head-to-head' dimer of A (Fig. 1), the dimeric nature derives from a crystallographic twofold symmetry transformation, whereas in the 'head-to-tail' dimer of B (Fig. 2), the dimeric complex is formed by two crystallographically independent

© 1995 International Union of Crystallography Printed in Great Britain – all rights reserved