Acta Crystallographica Section C Crystal Structure Communications

ISSN 0108-2701

(\pm)-1-Tetralone-3-carboxylic acid and (\pm)-1-tetralone-2-acetic acid: hydrogen bonding in two γ -keto acids

Alan Barcon, Andrew P. J. Brunskill, Roger A. Lalancette,* Hugh W. Thompson and Allan J. Miller

Carl A. Olson Memorial Laboratories, Department of Chemistry, Rutgers University, Newark, NJ 07102, USA Correspondence e-mail: rogerlal@andromeda.rutgers.edu

Received 6 November 2000 Accepted 20 December 2000

The crystal structure of (\pm) -4-oxo-1,2,3,4-tetrahydronaphthalene-2-carboxylic acid $(C_{11}H_{10}O_3)$ involves projection of the carboxyl group nearly orthogonal to the aromatic plane and hydrogen bonding of the acid groups by centrosymmetric pairing across the *a* edge and the center of the chosen cell $[O \cdots O = 2.705 (2) \text{ Å}]$. Intermolecular $C-H \cdots O=C$ close contacts to translationally related molecules are found for both the ketone (2.55 Å) and the acid (2.67 Å). In (\pm) -1-oxo-1,2,3,4-tetrahydronaphthalene-2-acetic acid $(C_{12}H_{12}O_3)$, the aggregation involves centrosymmetric carboxyl dimers mutually hydrogen bonded across the *bc* face and the *a* edge of the chosen cell $[O \cdots O = 2.674 (2) \text{ Å}]$. A 2.60 Å close C- $H \cdots O=C$ contact is found to the carboxyl group of centrosymmetrically related molecule.

Comment

Beyond the dimerization that dominates the hydrogen bonding in functionally unadorned carboxylic acids lies a range of alternative hydrogen-bonding modes that expands as other functional groups are added. Our continuing study of the crystal structures of keto acids explores the molecular characteristics that control their five known hydrogen-bonding modes (Lalancette, Thompson & Brunskill, 1999). Two of these, including carboxyl dimerization, lack ketone involvement, but acid-to-ketone catemers constitute a sizable minority of cases, while intramolecular hydrogen bonds and acid-to-ketone dimers are rarely observed. In addition, more than a dozen hydrates are known, having more complex hydrogen-bonding patterns.

We report here the structures and hydrogen-bonding behavior of the two tetralone acids of the title. The category of γ -keto acids is especially rich in hydrogen-bonding types, embracing internal hydrogen bonds and catemers of the helical, translational and glide types, as well as dimers and hydrated patterns. The two compounds presented here are part of a series of indanone and tetralone acids we have examined, in which the indanone species have been found to be predominantly catemers (Lalancette *et al.*, 1997; Lalancette, Brunskill & Thompson, 1999; Thompson, Brunskill & Lalancette, 1998; Thompson, Lalancette & Brunskill, 1998).

Fig. 1 shows the asymmetric unit of (\pm) -1-tetralone-3carboxylic acid $[(\pm)-4-0x0-1,2,3,4-tetrahydronaphthalene-2$ carboxylic acid, $C_{11}H_{10}O_3$, (I)] with the atomic numbering. The ketone ring adopts a conformation resembling a folded envelope, in which the dihedral angle for C1-C2-C3 versus the tetralone ring system excluding C2 is $49.92 (14)^{\circ}$, placing C2 above the average aromatic plane by 0.703 (3) Å, while C3 lies 0.059 (3) Å above it. This allows the ketone to lie nearly coplanar with the aromatic ring [torsion angle O1-C4- $C4A - C5 = -3.4 (3)^{\circ}$, while the carboxyl group is positioned pseudo-axially and turned so that it is nearly coplanar with the C2-C3 bond, with its carbonyl toward the ketone. The torsion angle O2-C9-C2-C3 is $-1.7 (3)^{\circ}$ and the vector angle for C2–C9 versus the tetralone ring system without C2 is 80.22 (8)°. The ketone-carboxyl dihedral angle (C3/C4/ C4A/O1 versus C9/O2/O3) is 82.3 (2)°.



This angular carboxyl conformation seems surprising, but its resemblance to the usual axial arrangements is both superficial and deceptive. Even apart from the flattening of the ketone ring, the H atoms responsible for unfavorable 1,3diaxial interactions in cyclohexane systems are absent in (I). The *gauche* arrangements created along the C1–C2 and C2– C3 bonds by the pseudo-axial carboxyl group are C9–C2– C1–C8A and C9–C2–C3–C4, but the terminal atoms, C9, C8A and C4, are all trigonal. These atoms therefore lack much of the three-dimensional character that creates the steric strain in alkylcyclohexanes, a situation also seen with haloand cyano-substituted cyclohexanes (Hirsch, 1967). The result is that the pseudo-axial and pseudo-equatorial conformations for (I) are energetically closer than in systems fully populated by tetrahedral C atoms. Although semi-empirical molecular





The asymmetric unit of (I), with the atomic numbering scheme. Displacement ellipsoids are drawn at the 20% probability level.

(AM1) modeling (Wavefunction, 1995; Dewar *et al.*, 1985) indicated the pseudo-equatorial conformation to be slightly more stable, any such advantage is obviously overbalanced by other forces in the crystal.

The disorder commonly detected in carboxyl dimers as an averaging of C–O distances and C–C–O angles (Leiserowitz, 1976) is not seen in (I), where these values are 1.214 (3)/ 1.313 (3) Å and 123.3 (2)/114.3 (2)°, respectively. Values cited as typical for highly ordered dimeric carboxyls are 1.21/1.31 Å and 123/112°, respectively (Borthwick, 1980).



Figure 2

A partial packing diagram for (I), with extracellular molecules, showing acid dimers centered on the *a* edge and at $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$. Close contacts found between O1 and H7 (2.55 Å), and between O2 and H1*B* (2.67 Å) of separate translationally related molecules are indicated by dotted lines. Displacement ellipsoids are drawn at the 20% probability level and carbon-bound H atoms have been removed for clarity.



Figure 3

The asymmetric unit of (II), with the atomic numbering scheme. Displacement ellipsoids are drawn at the 20% probability level.

Fig. 2 shows the packing arrangement for (I), involving centrosymmetric dimers centered on the *a* edge of the chosen cell and at $\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}$ [O···O = 2.705 (2) Å and O–H···O = 173 (3)°]. Translationally related molecules stack with an interplanar distance of 3.48 Å, but the aromatic portions do not stack directly together, and the overlap between stacked aromatic and ketone rings involves only about half of each ring. Close $C-H \cdots O = C$ contacts are found to separate translational neighbors between the ketone and H7 (2.55 Å), and between the acid and H1B (2.67 Å). These distances lie within the 2.7 Å range we often employ for non-bonded H···O packing interactions (Steiner, 1997). Using data compiled from a large number of $C-H \cdots O$ contacts, Steiner & Desiraju (1998) find significant statistical directionality even as far out as 3.0 Å and conclude that these are legitimately viewed as 'weak hydrogen bonds', with a greater contribution to packing forces than simple van der Waals attractions.

Fig. 3 shows the asymmetric unit of (\pm) -1-tetralone-2-acetic acid $[(\pm)$ -1-oxo-1,2,3,4-tetrahydronaphthalene-2-acetic acid, $C_{12}H_{12}O_3$, (II)] with the atomic numbering. The flexible ketone ring adopts a significantly more twisted conformation than in (I), placing C2 0.358 (3) Å above the average aromatic plane, while C3 lies 0.440 (3) Å below it. The ketone is significantly less coplanar with the aromatic ring than in the case of (I) [torsion angle O1-C1-C8A-C8 = -14.3 (3)°]. Free rotation is possible about only two bonds, and the



Figure 4

A partial packing diagram for (II), with extracellular molecules, showing acid dimers centered on the a edge and the bc face. A reciprocal close contact found between the acid carbonyl and the H6 atom of a centrosymmetrically related neighbor is indicated by dotted lines. Displacement ellipsoids are set at the 20% probability level and carbon-bound H atoms have been removed for clarity.

conformational arrangement at C2-C9 is staggered, with C9 forming a pseudo-equatorial bond so that the torsion angle C9-C2-C3-C4 is 171.3 (2)°. The C9-C10 bond is rotated so that the O2-C10-C9-C2 torsion angle is $23.4(3)^{\circ}$, placing the two carboxyl O atoms at similar distances from the ketone O atom $[O1 \cdots O2 = 3.173 (2) \text{ Å} and O1 \cdots O3 =$ 3.670 (2) Å]. The ketone-carboxyl dihedral angle (C2/C1/ C8A/O1 versus C10/O2/O3) is 79.1 (1)°. No carboxyl disorder was detected in (II), where the C–O distances are 1.216 (2)/1.311 (2) Å and the C–C–O angles are 123.7 (2)/114.1 (2) $^{\circ}$.

Fig. 4 shows the packing arrangement for (II), involving centrosymmetric dimers centered on the bc face and the a edge of the chosen cell $[O \cdots O = 2.674 (2) \text{ Å and } O - H \cdots O =$ 176°]. Centrosymmetrically related molecules stack with their aromatic rings significantly overlapped, at an interplanar distance of 3.65 Å, and a 2.60 Å close $C-H \cdots O=C$ contact is found between the acid and H6 of a centrosymmetrically related neighbor (to which it is not hydrogen bonded).

Compound (I) in KBr has a single IR peak at 1691 cm^{-1} for both C=O groups. In CHCl₃ solution, where dimers are known to predominate, the presence of two peaks, at 1687 and 1713 cm^{-1} , suggests the presence in solution of a different (or more than one) conformation. The KBr spectrum of (II) has discrete C=O absorptions at 1692 (ketone) and 1704 cm^{-1} (acid). In CHCl₃ solution, only slight shifts occur, and these peaks appear at 1683 and 1712 cm⁻¹, with a typical carboxyldilution shoulder *ca* 1740 cm⁻¹.

Experimental

Compound (I) was prepared from the Stobbe-condensation product of benzaldehyde with diethyl succinate by sequential saponification, hydrogenation (Pd/C) and acid-catalyzed cyclization (Horning & Walker, 1952). Crystals of (I) (m.p. 420 K) were obtained from ethyl acetate/cyclohexane. For compound (II), 2-carbomethoxy-1-tetralone was alkylated with ethyl bromoacetate and the product was hydrolyzed and decarboxylated under acidic conditions, as described by Bachman & Johnson (1949). After sublimation of the crude product, crystals of (II) (m.p. 383 K) were obtained from diethyl ether.

 $D_x = 1.416 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$

Cell parameters from 52

Mo $K\alpha$ radiation

reflections

 $\mu = 0.103 \text{ mm}^{-1}$

Trapezoid, colourless

 $0.56 \times 0.52 \times 0.10 \text{ mm}$

3 standard reflections

every 97 reflections

intensity variation: <0.7%

T = 293 (2) K

 $R_{\rm int} = 0.036$

 $\theta_{\rm max} = 25.01$

 $h = -7 \rightarrow 7$

 $k = 0 \rightarrow 6$

 $l = 0 \rightarrow 30$

 $\theta = 4.5 - 20.2^{\circ}$

Compound (I)

Crystal data

C11H10O3 $M_r = 190.19$ Monoclinic, $P2_1/c$ a = 6.2645 (7) Å $h = 5\,4440\,(12)$ Å c = 26.170(3) Å $\beta = 91.339 (11)^{\circ}$ $V = 892.2 (2) \text{ Å}^3$ Z = 4

Data collection

Siemens P4 diffractometer $2\theta/\theta$ scans Absorption correction: numerical (XPREP; Sheldrick, 1997) $T_{\rm min}=0.952,\ T_{\rm max}=0.990$ 2499 measured reflections 1582 independent reflections 1118 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$

5	
Refinement on F^2	$w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + (0.0365P)^2]$
$R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.045$	+ 0.2370P]
$wR(F^2) = 0.106$	where $P = (F_o^2 + 2F_c^2)/3$
S = 1.06	$(\Delta/\sigma)_{\rm max} = 0.02$
1582 reflections	$\Delta \rho_{\rm max} = 0.16 \ {\rm e} \ {\rm \AA}^{-3}$
141 parameters	$\Delta \rho_{\rm min} = -0.12 \text{ e } \text{\AA}^{-3}$
H atoms treated by a mixture of	Extinction correction: SHELXL97
independent and constrained	Extinction coefficient: 0.007 (2)
refinement	

Table 1

Selected geometric parameters (Å, °) for (I).

O2-C9	1.214 (3)	O3-C9	1.313 (3)
O2-C9-C2	123.3 (2)	O3-C9-C2	114.3 (2)

Table 2

Hydrogen-bonding geometry (Å, °) for (I).

$D - H \cdots A$	D-H	$H \cdot \cdot \cdot A$	$D \cdots A$	$D - \mathbf{H} \cdots A$
$\begin{array}{c} O3-H3\cdots O2^{i}\\ C1-H1B\cdots O2^{ii}\\ C7-H7\cdots O1^{iii} \end{array}$	0.94 (3)	1.77 (3)	2.705 (2)	173 (3)
	0.97	2.67	3.471 (3)	140
	0.93	2.55	3.368 (3)	147

Symmetry codes: (i) 1 - x, 1 - y, 1 - z; (ii) x - 1, y, z; (iii) x - 1, 1 + y, z.

Compound (II)

Crystal data

(

N

$C_{12}H_{12}O_3$	$D_x = 1.312 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$
$M_r = 204.22$	Mo $K\alpha$ radiation
Aonoclinic, $P2_1/n$	Cell parameters from 21
u = 8.0008 (10) Å	reflections
p = 10.579 (2) Å	$\theta = 4.6 - 15.0^{\circ}$
e = 12.6789 (13) Å	$\mu = 0.094 \text{ mm}^{-1}$
$B = 105.616 \ (8)^{\circ}$	T = 293 (2) K
$V = 1033.5 (3) \text{ Å}^3$	Block, colorless
Z = 4	$0.60 \times 0.34 \times 0.24 \text{ mm}$

Data collection

Siemens P4 diffractometer $2\theta/\theta$ scans Absorption correction: numerical (XPREP; Sheldrick, 1997) $T_{\rm min}=0.981,\ T_{\rm max}=0.997$ 2503 measured reflections 1822 independent reflections 1305 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$

Refinement

Refinement on F^2 $R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.043$ $wR(F^2) = 0.109$ S = 1.041822 reflections 149 parameters H atoms treated by a mixture of independent and constrained refinement

 $R_{\rm int} = 0.022$ $\theta_{\rm max} = 24.99^{\circ}$ $h = -9 \rightarrow 9$ $k = 0 \rightarrow 12$ $l = 0 \rightarrow 15$ 3 standard reflections every 97 reflections intensity variation: <1%

 $w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + (0.0330P)^2]$ + 0.2742P] where $P = (F_0^2 + 2F_c^2)/3$ $(\Delta/\sigma)_{\rm max} = 0.00$ $\Delta \rho_{\rm max} = 0.13 \text{ e} \text{ Å}^{-3}$ $\Delta \rho_{\rm min} = -0.13 \ {\rm e} \ {\rm \AA}^{-3}$

Table	3
-------	---

Selected geometric parameters (Å, $^{\circ}$) for (II).

O2-C10	1.216 (2)	O3-C10	1.311 (2)
O2-C10-C9	123.69 (18)	O3-C10-C9	114.05 (18)

Table 4

Hydrogen-bonding geometry (Å, °) for (II).

$D - H \cdots A$	D-H	$H \cdots A$	$D \cdots A$	$D - H \cdot \cdot \cdot A$
$O3-H3\cdots O2^{i}$	0.90	1.77	2.674 (2)	176
C6-H6···O2 ⁱⁱ	0.93	2.60	3.418 (3)	147
$C9-H9A\cdotsO1^{iii}$	0.97	2.71	3.336 (3)	122

Symmetry codes: (i) 2 - x, 1 - y, 1 - z; (ii) 2 - x, 1 - y, -z; (iii) $\frac{3}{2} - x$, $\frac{1}{2} + y$, $\frac{3}{2} - z$.

For both (I) and (II), all H atoms were found in electron-density difference maps but were placed in calculated positions and allowed to refine as riding models, with C–H distances of 0.97 Å for CH₂, 0.98 Å for methine and 0.93 Å for aromatic C atoms. All $U_{\rm iso}$ values for H atoms were refined. The carboxyl H atoms was also found in difference maps, but their positional and isotropic displacement parameters were allowed to fully refine.

For both compounds, data collection: *XSCANS* (Siemens, 1996); cell refinement: *XSCANS*; data reduction: *XSCANS*; program(s) used to solve structure: *SHELXS*97 (Sheldrick, 1997); program(s) used to refine structure: *SHELXL*97 (Sheldrick, 1997); molecular graphics: *SHELXL*97; software used to prepare material for publication: *SHELXL*97.

Supplementary data for this paper are available from the IUCr electronic archives (Reference: FR1312). Services for accessing these data are described at the back of the journal.

References

- Bachman, W. E. & Johnson, G. D. (1949). J. Am. Chem. Soc. 71, 3463–3468. Borthwick, P. W. (1980). Acta Cryst. B36, 628–632.
- Dewar, M. J. S., Zoebisch, E. G., Healy, E. F. & Stewart, J. J. P. (1985). J. Am. Chem. Soc. 107, 3902–3909.
- Hirsch, J. A. (1967). Table of Conformational Energies, in Topics in Stereochemistry, Vol. 1, edited by N. L. Allinger & E. L. Eliel, pp. 199–222. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Horning, E. C. & Walker, G. N. (1952). J. Am. Chem. Soc. 74, 5147-5151.
- Lalancette, R. A., Brunskill, A. P. J. & Thompson, H. W. (1997). Acta Cryst. C53, 1838–1842.
- Lalancette, R. A., Brunskill, A. P. J. & Thompson, H. W. (1999). Acta Cryst. C55, 568–572.
- Lalancette, R. A., Thompson, H. W. & Brunskill, A. P. J. (1999). Acta Cryst. C55, 1908–1911.
- Leiserowitz, L. (1976). Acta Cryst. B32, 775-802.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1997). SHELXTL. Version 5.10. Bruker AXS Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
- Siemens (1996). XSCANS. Version 2.2. Siemens Analytical X-ray Instruments Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
- Steiner, T. (1997). Chem. Commun. pp. 727-734.
- Steiner, T. & Desiraju, G. R. (1998). Chem. Commun. pp. 891-892.
- Thompson, H. W., Brunskill, A. P. J. & Lalancette, R. A. (1998). Acta Cryst. C54, 829–831.
- Thompson, H. W., Lalancette, R. A. & Brunskill, A. P. J. (1998). Acta Cryst. C54, 1180–1182.
- Wavefunction (1995). SPARTAN. Version 4.0. Wavefunction Inc., 18401 Von Karman Avenue, Irvine, CA 92715, USA.