organic papers

Acta Crystallographica Section E Structure Reports Online

ISSN 1600-5368

Graham Smith,^a* Urs D. Wermuth^a and Jonathan M. White^b

 ^aSchool of Physical and Chemical Sciences, Queensland University of Technology, GPO Box 2434, Brisbane 4001, Australia, and
^bSchool of Chemistry, University of Melbourne, Parkville 3010, Australia

Correspondence e-mail: g.smith@qut.edu.au

Key indicators

Single-crystal X-ray study T = 293 K Mean σ (C–C) = 0.002 Å R factor = 0.044 wR factor = 0.098 Data-to-parameter ratio = 11.2

For details of how these key indicators were automatically derived from the article, see http://journals.iucr.org/e. 8-Quinolinylurea

The crystal structure of 8-quinolinylurea, $C_{10}H_9N_3O$, shows the urea moiety to be close to coplanar with the quinoline ring, due to intramolecular hydrogen bonding between the quinoline-N atom and the H atom on the nearest urea N, and between the urea O atom and a quinoline-ring H atom. The molecules associate, through hydrogen bonds involving all potential donor and acceptor sites, to form a two-dimensional sheet structure.

Comment

We have previously reported the synthesis and crystal structures of unsymmetrically substituted ureas together with their adducts with a number of carboxylic acids. These ureas included phenylurea (Kashino & Haisa, 1977; Bott et al., 2000) and 1,1-diethylurea (Smith & Kennard, 2000; Smith et al., 2000). These unsymmetrically substituted ureas are of interest because of their potential herbicidal properties, e.g. monuron [3-(4-chlorophenyl)-1,1-dimethylurea; Baughman, Hembre et al., 1980] and diuron [3-(3,4-dichlorophenyl) 1,1-dimethylurea; Baughman, Sams et al., 1980] are commercial herbicides. The structure of the 1:1 proton-transfer compound of the unsymmetrical Lewis base-substituted urea (8-quinolinyl)urea with 3,5-dinitrosalicylic acid has previously been reported (Smith et al., 2001) and we report here the crystal structure of the parent urea compound, (8-quinolinyl)urea, (I), which has also been investigated for its phytotoxic properties (Pagani et al., 1983; Smith et al., 1997).



This determination shows only minor deviations from planarity in the overall molecule (Fig. 1), with the torsion angles C7-C8-N11-C21 and C8-N11-C21-N31 being 8.6 (3) and 171.0 (1) Å, respectively. This is largely due to the presence of intramolecular hydrogen bonds, on one side between the hetero-N atom of the quinoline residue and the H atom on the nearest urea-N atom $[N11\cdots N1 = 2.685 (2) \text{ Å}]$, and on the other side between the urea O atom and a quinoline ring H atom $[O21\cdots C7 = 2.895 (2) \text{ Å}]$. The (8-quinolinium)urea cations in the 1:1 proton-transfer compound with 3,5-dinitrosalicylic acid are considerably different conformationally, with the urea side chain inverted and non-coplanar with the quinoline ring and with no intramolecular

Received 27 May 2003 Accepted 5 June 2003 Online 17 June 2003

© 2003 International Union of Crystallography Printed in Great Britain – all rights reserved



Figure 1

The molecular configuration and atom-labelling scheme for (I), with displacement ellipsoids drawn at the 30% probability level.

hydrogen bonds. The molecules of (I) also form a cyclic hydrogen-bonding association through the urea functional groups and the hetero-N atom of the quinoline ring (Fig. 2 and Table 1). These dimers are then extended into a convoluted two-dimensional sheet structure *via n*-glide-related molecules, with a separation of *ca* 3.8 Å [*Cg*1···*Cg*1 = 3.838 (3) Å (*Cg*1 is the centroid of the N11-containing ring) and $\alpha = 0.02$ (2)°] between the sheets.

Experimental

The title compound, (I), was synthesized using the Vogel (1989) procedure. 8–Aminoquinoline (10 g, 0,069 mmol) was dissolved in 10 ml of hot glacial acetic acid and a solution of NaCNO (4.51 g, 0.069 mmol) in 50 ml of warm water was added with stirring, and the warmed solution stirred for a further 30 min. The mixture was cooled on an ice bath for 30 min and the precipitate of (I) removed by vacuum filtration and vacuum dried, giving 10 g of off-white product (77% yield). Recrystallization from absolute ethanol gave colourless crystals (m.p. 476–477 K) suitable for X-ray diffraction.

Crystal data

-	
$C_{10}H_9N_3O$	$D_x = 1.402 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$
$M_r = 187.20$	Mo $K\alpha$ radiation
Monoclinic, $P2_1/n$	Cell parameters from 978
a = 7.1436 (8) Å	reflections
b = 8.1394 (9) Å	$\theta = 2.7-22.1^{\circ}$
c = 15.2836 (17) Å	$\mu = 0.10 \text{ mm}^{-1}$
$\beta = 93.333 (2)^{\circ}$	T = 293 (2) K
$V = 887.16 (17) \text{ Å}^3$	Block, colourless
Z = 4	$0.10 \times 0.16 \times 0.32 \text{ mm}$
Data collection	
Bruker CCD area-detector	1133 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$
diffractometer	$R_{\rm int} = 0.050$
φ and ω scans	$\theta_{\rm max} = 25.0^{\circ}$
Absorption correction: none	$h = -8 \rightarrow 6$
4542 measured reflections	$k = -9 \rightarrow 9$
1566 independent reflections	$l = -15 \rightarrow 18$
Refinement	
Refinement on F^2	$w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + (0.0391P)^2]$
$R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.044$	where $P = (F_o^2 + 2F_c^2)/3$
$wR(F^2) = 0.098$	$(\Delta/\sigma)_{\rm max} < 0.001$
S = 0.97	$\Delta \rho_{\rm max} = 0.13 \ {\rm e} \ {\rm \AA}^{-3}$
1566 reflections	$\Delta \rho_{\rm min} = -0.12 \text{ e} \text{ Å}^{-3}$
140 parameters	Extinction correction: SHELXTL97
H atoms treated by a mixture of	Extinction coefficient: 0.0062 (18)



Figure 2

Packing in the unit cell, viewed down a, with hydrogen-bonding interactions shown as dashed lines.

Table 1

Hydrogen-bonding geometry (Å, °).

$D - H \cdots A$	D-H	$H \cdot \cdot \cdot A$	$D \cdots A$	$D - \mathbf{H} \cdot \cdot \cdot A$
$N11 - H11 \cdots N1$ $N31 - H31A \cdots O21^{i}$ $N31 - H31B \cdots N1^{ii}$ $C7 - H7 \cdots O21$	0.859 (17) 0.91 (2) 0.90 (2) 0.93	2.227 (17) 1.94 (2) 2.19 (2) 2.30	2.685 (2) 2.836 (3) 3.072 (2) 2.895 (2)	113.3 (14) 171 (2) 166.1 (18) 122

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

H atoms attached to N11 and N31 (H11, H31A and H31B) were located in difference syntheses and their positional and isotropic displacement parameters were refined. Other H atoms were included in the refinement in the riding-model approximation.

Data collection: *SMART* (Bruker, 2000); cell refinement: *SMART*; data reduction: *SAINT* (Bruker, 1999); program(s) used to solve structure: *SHELXTL*97 (Bruker, 1997); program(s) used to refine structure: *SHELXTL*97; molecular graphics: *PLATON for Windows* (Spek, 1999); software used to prepare material for publication: *SHELXTL*97.

The authors acknowledge financial support from The School of Physical and Chemical Sciences of the Queensland University of Technology and The University of Melbourne.

References

Baughman, R. G., Hembre, R. I., Helland, B. J. & Jacobson, R. A. (1980). *Cryst. Struct. Commun.* 9, 749–752.

- Baughman, R. G., Sams, D. D., Helland, B. J. & Jacobson, R. A. (1980). Cryst. Struct. Commun. 9, 885–889.
- Bott, R. C., Smith, G., Wermuth, U. D. & Dwyer, N. C. (2000). *Aust. J. Chem.* **53**, 767–777.

Bruker (1997). SHELXTL97. Bruker AXS Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, USA. Bruker (1999). SAINT. Version 6.02. Bruker AXS Inc., Madison, Wisconsin,

USA. Bruker (2000). SMART. Version 5.55. Bruker AXS Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, USA.

Kashino, S. & Haisa, M. (1977). Acta Cryst. B33, 855-860.

independent and constrained

refinement

- Pagani, G., Carmellino, M. L., Caccialanza, G. & Borgna, P. (1983). Dip. Chim. Farm. 38, 128-134.
- Smith, C. J., Hansch, C. & Morton, M. J. (1997). Mutat. Res. 379, 167-175.
- Smith, G., Bott, R. C., & Wermuth, U. D. (2001). Acta Cryst. E57, 0895-0897.
- Smith, G., Coyne, M. G. & White, J. M. (2000). Aust. J. Chem. 53, 203-208.

- Smith, G. & Kennard, C. H. L. (2000). Aust. J. Chem. 53, 999–1001. Spek, A. L. (1999). PLATON for Windows. September 1999 Version. University of Utrecht, The Netherlands.
- Vogel, A. I. (1989). Textbook of Practical Organic Chemistry, 5th ed. London: Longmans.