284. Crystal Structure and Molecular Conformation in Solution of 6-Phenyl- and ll-Phenyl-3,4,6,1l-tetrahydro-2H-pyrimido [2,l-c] [2,4]benzothiazepine

26th Communication on Seven-Membered Heterocycles')

by **Hans Peter Weher, Trevor J. Petcher** and **Hans Rudolf Loosli**

Sandoz Ltd, Pharmaceutical Division Chemical Research, CH-4002 Basel, Switzerland

(24. **VI.** 77)

Die Kristallstruktur und die molekulare Konformation in Lösung von 6-Phenyl- und **ll-Phenyl-3,4,6,1 I-tetrahydro-2H-pyrimido- (2, l-cl[2,4jhenzothiazepin**

Zusammenfassung

Die Rontgenstrukturanalysen der beiden Titelverbindungen ergaben, dass die Konformation der Thiazepinringe zwar voneinander verschieden sind, dass aber in beiden Verbindungen der Phenylsubstituent in axialer Stellung steht. Interpretationen der 'H-NMR.-Daten legen die Vermutung nahe, dass die bevorzugten Konformationen des siebengliedrigen Ringes in Losung in beiden Molekeln mit den im Kristall beobachteten Konformationen identisch sind.

In the course of the synthesis of tricyclic benzo-2,4-thiazepines of type **1** [**11,** 'H-NMR. data suggested that in solution the seven-membered thiazepine ring of the unsubstituted compound **(lc)** undergoes rapid pseudo-rotation, but that substitution of a phenyl in position *6* or 11 stabilizes the ring in a particular conformation with the aromatic substituent in an *axid* position. In order to study the conformation of the substituted thiazepine rings the crystal structures of the two compounds **(la)** (hereafter called "6-phenyl compound") and of the hydrobromide of **(1 b)** (hereafter called "11-phenyl compound") were determined by X-ray analysis.

 $R' = C₆H₅$, $R'' = H$ $R' = H$, $R'' = C_6H_5$

$$
R' = H, R'' = H
$$

¹) 25th Communication [1].

Crystal Data. - 6-phenyl-3,4,6,11-tetrahydro-2 H-pyrimido[2,1-c][2,4]benzothiazepine, C₁₈H₁₈N₂S, *M*= 294, colourless prismatic crystals, grown from a solution in toluene, m.p. 169-171°, monoclinic, space group *P2₁/c, a*=6.871, *b*=17.410, *c*=12.670(4) Å, β =99.70(2)°, $V=$ 1494 Å³, d_{calc}=1.31 g cm⁻³, μ (Cu*Ka*) = 18.1 cm⁻¹.

I1 **-Phenyl-3,4,6,ll-tetrahydro-2** H-pyrimido[2,l-c] **[2,4]-benzothiazepine-hydrobromide,** CI8Hl8N2S \times HBr, $M=$ 375, colourless, needle shaped crystals, grown from a solution in methanol, m.p. 213-216^o. monoclinic, space group P_2 /n, $a = 20.553(5)$, $b = 10.263(2)$, $c = 8.292(2)$ Å, $\beta = 95.38(2)$ °, $V = 1741$ Å³, $d_{calc} = 1.46$ g cm⁻¹, Z = 4, μ (CuKa) = 46.9 cm⁻¹.

Intensity Data. - For both crystals intensity profiles were measured on a four circle diffractometer (normal-beam equatorial method, crystal in bisecting position) with graphite monochromatized CuKaradiation, $(\bar{\lambda} = 1.542 \text{ Å}, (\omega/20)$ -scan mode, variable scan width $\Delta \omega = 1.0^{\circ} + 0.5$ tan (0) (11-phenyl compound), $A\omega = 1.0^{\circ} + 0.3$ tan (θ) (6-phenyl compound), scan time adjusted so as to accumulate 6000 counts per reflexion (max. scan time 120 s). The net intensity, *I,* was evaluated by profile analysis [2], and the variance defined as $\sigma^2(I) = \langle I \rangle + c^2I^2$, where $\langle I \rangle$ is the variance based on a *Poisson* distribution of the

measured counts, and c^2I^2 an intensity dependent term with $c = 0.02$ (both crystals).

The stability and orientation of the crystals were monitored throughout data collection by frequent

measurements of check reflexi The stability and orientation of the crystals were monitored throughout data collection by frequent measurements of check reflexions. 2217 unique reflexions in the range $1.5 < \theta < 60^{\circ}$ for the 11-phenyl measured, of which 1846 (11-phenyl compound) and 1994 (6-phenyl compound) were judged to have significant intensity, *i.e.* $I \ge 3.0\sigma(I)$. Both sets of data were corrected for *Lorentz* and polarisation effects and scaled to absolute structure amplitudes $|F_{\text{o}}|$ by the *Wilson* method [3]. The variance of $|F_{\text{o}}|$ was defined as $\sigma^2(F) = k \cdot Lp \cdot \sigma^2(I)/4I$, where k is the scale factor relating I and $|F_0|^2$, Lp the Lorentzpolarization factor. The calculation of normalised structure amplitude, $|E|$, yielded the averages $\langle |E| \rangle = 0.789, \langle |E^2 - 1| \rangle = 0.975, \langle |E|^2 \rangle = 0.992$ for the *I1-phenyl* compound (overall temperature factor \bar{B} = 5.0 Å²), and $\langle |E|\rangle$ = 0.804, $\langle |E^2 - 1|\rangle$ = 0.945, $\langle |E|^2\rangle$ = 1.000 for the 6-*phenyl* compound $(\bar{B} = 3.4 \text{ Å}^2)$.

Structure Solution and Refinement. - The structure of the 11-phenyl compound, which was crystallized as the hydrobromide, was solved by the heavy atom method. The quantity $\sum w(|F_o| - k g')$ $|F_c|$ ² was minimised by least squares by use of a block-diagonal approximation. Weights were assigned as $w = 1/\sigma^2(F)$ for significant reflexions and $w=0$ for insignificant ones. The LS-procedure was started by refining a scale factor (k), positional parameters for the atoms other than hydrogen, and isotropic temperature factors, and continued by replacement of the isbtropic by anisotropic temperature factors. At this stage a difference map revealed the presence of a disordered molecule of methanol with one atom on a center of symmetry. The peak in a general position could be assigned to the oxygen atom, because the distance of 3.30 Å to a bromine atom indicated a hydrogen bond $O-H \cdots Br^-$. The positions of the hydrogen atoms were then calculated and included in the refinement with isotropic temperature factors. In the final stages an isotropic extinction coefficient g' [4] was included into the parameter set, and the least-squares process converged to $R = 0.088$ for 1994 significant reflexions, and 281 variables. The average positional error for C- and N-atoms is around 0.006 to 0.008 A, for **S** and Br around 0.001 A, for H around 0.08 A. The isotropic extinction factor **g'** reached a value of 5.0(9), assuming a mean path length of 0.02 cm.

The structure of the 6-phenyl compound was solved by direct methods. The signs of 513 normalized structure factors with $|E| \ge 1.2$ were determined by an automated symbolic addition procedure [5] using some 8000 triple sign relations. All atoms other than hydrogen were clearly indicated in the E-map. The refmement process followed the same lines as that of the 11-phenyl compound and converged to R=0.045 for 1846 significant structure factors and 267 variables. *(C-,* N-, and S-atoms anisotropic, Hatoms isotropic, scale factor and isotropic extinction factor.) A difference map calculated at the conclusion of the refinement showed no significant residual density. The average positional error for Cand N-atoms is 0.003 to 0.004 A, for the sulfur atom 0.001 A, and for the H-atoms 0.03 to 0.05 A. The isotropic extinction coefficient refined to 1.6(2), assuming a mean path of 0.02 cm.

Fractional coordinates with e.s.d.'s for both molecules are given in *Table I,* the atomic numbering is shown in *Figs. 1* and 2. The scattering factors were taken from "International Tables of Crystallography" (1962). A list of structure factors and vibrational parameters can be obtained from the authors.

Table **1.** *Fractional coordinates with e.s.d.'s for the* **1** I-phenyl *and the* 6-phenyl *compounds.* The coordinates of the heavier atoms are multiplied by **lo5,** the values for hydrogen atoms by **104**

Fig. 1. *Atomic numbering and some torsion angles (e.s.d. around* **1.54** *of the* 1 *I-phenyl-compound*

Fig. 2. *Atomic numbering andsome torsion angles* **(e.s.d.** *around* I") *of the 6-phenyl compound*

Discussion. - The molecular conformations of the *6-phenyl* and the *11 -phenyl* compounds as found in the crystal structure are shown in stereoscopic projections in *Figs. 3* and *4.* Bond lengths and bond angles are given in *Tables* 2 and *3,* and some torsion angles are given in *Figs. 1* and 2.

The thiourea fragment in the *6-phenyl* compound has a distinct C-N double bond, $C(12a)-N(1)=1.274(6)$ Å, and a partial double bond, $C(12a)-N(5)=$ 1.366(4) Å. The atoms $C(12a)$ and $N(5)$ are slightly pyramidal with out-of-plane deviations of 0.033 A, and 0.044 A, respectively, and there is an appreciable torsion around the partial double bond $C(12a)-N(5)$. In the *I1-phenyl* compound the thiouronium fragment has two equal C-N partial double bonds of length 1.31(1) Å.

	6-Phenyl compound	11-Phenyl compound		6-Phenyl compound	11 -Phenyl compound
$N-(1)-C(2)$	1.457(5)	1.440(13)	$C(9)-C(10)$	1.387(5)	1.368(8)
$N(1)-C(12a)$	1.274(4)	1.311(8)	$C(10)-C(10a)$	1.385(4)	1.386(8)
$C(2)-C(3)$	1.461(6)	1.326(17)	$C(10a) - C(11)$	1.491(4)	1.527(7)
$C(3)-C(4)$	1.479(6)	1.460(15)	$C(11) - S(12)$	1,809(3)	1,849(5)
$C(4)-N(5)$	1.461(4)	1.467(8)	$C(11)-C(13)$		1.519(7)
$N(5)-C(6)$	1.470(3)	1.493(7)	$S(12) - C(12a)$	1.780(3)	1.766(6)
$N(5)-C(12a)$	1.366(4)	1.314(7)	$C(13)-C(14)$	1.387(4)	1.383(9)
$C(6)-C(6a)$	1.516(4)	1.495(8)	$C(13)-C(18)$	1.385(4)	1.387(8)
$C(6)-C(13)$	1.531(4)		$C(14)-C(15)$	1.388(4)	1.381(10)
$C(6a) - C(7)$	1.395(4)	1.417(8)	$C(15)-C(16)$	1.367(5)	1.355(10)
$C(6a) - C(10a)$	1,401(4)	1.397(7)	$C(16)-C(17)$	1.380(5)	1.387(8)
$C(7)-C(8)$	1.381(4)	1.356(9)	$C(17) - C(18)$	1.387(5)	1.373(8)
$C(8)-C(9)$	1.374(5)	1.369(9)			

Table 2. *Bond lengths with e.s.d.5 for the* 6-phenyl *and the* 1 1-phenyl *compounds*

Table 3. *Bond angles with e.s.d.5 for the* 6-phenyl *and the* 11-phenyl *compounds*

	6-Phenyl compound	11-Phenyl compound		6-Phenyl compound	11 -Phenyl compou
$C(2)-N(1)-C(12a)$	117.8(3)	121.4(7)	$C(6a) - C(10a) - C(10)$ 119.1 (3)		119.1(5)
$N(1)$ -C(2)-C(3)	113.2(4)	116.7(1.1)	$C(6a) - C(10a) - C(11)$ 119.7 (3)		124.9(5)
$C(2)-C(3)-C(4)$	113.1(4)	122.2(1.2)	$C(10)-C(10a)-C(11)$ 121.2(3)		115.7(5)
$C(3)-C(4)-N(5)$	113.7(3)	112.6(7)	$C(10a) - C(11) - S(12)$	114.5(2)	116.8(5)
$C(4)-N(5)-C(6)$	114.7(2)	118.4(5)	$C(10a) - C(11) - C(13)$		112.9(5)
$C(4)-N(5)-C(12a)$	118.5(3)	120.0(5)	$S(12)-C(11)-C(13)$		109.8(4)
$C(6)-N(5)-C(12a)$	126.5(2)	121.6(5)	$C(11)-S(12)-C(12a)$	111.6(1)	97.6(3)
$N(5)-C(6)-C(6a)$	112.7(2)	115.9(5)	$N(1) - C(12a) - N(5)$	126.5(3)	123.3(6)
$N(5)-C(6)-C(13)$	113.4(2)		$N(1)$ –C(12a)–S(12)	108.4(2)	117.6(5)
$C(6a) - C(6) - C(13)$	115.6(2)		$N(5)-C(12a)-S(12)$	124.9(3)	119.1(5)
$C(6)-C(6a)-C(7)$	118.9(3)	116.7(5)	$C(6)-C(13)-C(14)$	121.6(3)	119.2(5)
$C(6)-C(6a)-C(10a)$	121.9(3)	125.2(5)	$C(6)-C(13)-C(18)$	119.6(3)	122.9 (5)
$C(7)-C(6a)-C(10a)$	119.2(3)	117.6(5)	$C(14)-C(13)-C(18)$	118.8(3)	117.9(6)
$C(6a) - C(7) - C(8)$	120.7(3)	120.9(6)	$C(13)-C(14)-C(15)$	120.0(3)	120.0(7)
$C(7)-C(8)-C(9)$	120.2(3)	121.5(6)	$C(14)-C(15)-C(16)$	121.0(3)	121.3(8)
$C(8)-C(9)-C(10)$	119.6(3)	118.4(6)	$C(15)-C(16)-C(17)$	119.6 (4)	120.0 (7)
$C(9)$ –C(10)–C(10a)	121.2(3)	122.4(6)	$C(16)-C(17)-C(18)$	120.0(3)	118.7(6)
			$C(13)-C(18)-C(17)$	120.7(3)	122.1(5)

In comparison to the thiourea fragment in the *6-phenyl* compound the thiouronium is less distorted around $C(12a)-N(5)$, and the two atoms are less pyramidal (out-ofplane deviations 0.01 1, and 0.016 A, respectively).

In both molecules the tetrahydropyrimidine ring has an approximate envelope conformation with **C(3)** as flap. The pronounced thermal anisotropy of the flap atom (see *Figs.* 3 and *4)* indicates a certain degree of positional disorder similar to that observed in another tetrahydro-pyrimidine derivative (see preceding paper [6]).

The conformation of the seven-membered thiazepine ring in the two compounds is different (see torsion angles in *Figs. 1* and *2).* In the *11-phenyl* compound the sulfur atom is slightly above, and the nitrogen atom $N(5)$ is below the plane of the aromatic ring, which corresponds to conformation **A,** as shown schematically in *Fig. 5.* In the *6-phenyl* compound, however, both the *S-* and the N-atoms are below the aromatic ring plane, which corresponds to conformation **B** of Fig. *5.* Unexpected is the fact that in both structures the phenyl substituent is in $axial$ rather than in equatorial position on the thiazepine ring. However, a discussion of the ¹H-NMR. spectra given below shows that these conformations observed in the crystal appear to persist also in solution.

In *Figs.* 6 and *7* the packing of molecules in the crystal is shown in stereoscopic projection. There are no unusual intermolecular distances in the *6-phenyl* com-

Fig. *3. Stereoscopic projection of the* 6-phenyl *compound with the 50% -probability ellipsoids of atomic vibrations.* The hydrogen atoms are uniformly drawn with a sphere corresponding to $B = 1 \text{ Å}^2$.

Fig. **4.** *Stereoscopic projection of the 1* 1-phenyl *compound* (same specifications as *Fig.* 3)

pound. In the crystal structure of the *11-phenyl* compound there is a hydrogen bond from the methanol hydroxyl to the bromine, $O-H \cdots Br^{-}$ 3.30(1) Å, and another from the protonated $N^+(1)$ to the bromine, $N^+ - H \cdots Br^- = 3.27(1)$ Å.

¹H-NMR. Spectra and the Conformation in Solution. - In the 6-phenyl and 11*phenyl* derivatives, the geminal protons on $C(11)$, and $C(6)$, respectively, are

Fig. *5. Principal conformations of tetrahydropyrimido[2, I-c][2,4]bentothiazepine as obtained from molecular models*

Fig. *6. Packing diagram of the* 6-phenyl *compound viewed along* a (stereoscopic projection)

Fig. 7. *Packing diagram of the* 1 I-phenyl *compound viewed along* **b** (stereoscopic projection)

Fig. 8. *90 MHz 'H-NMR. Specrru of* **la** (a), lb-hydrochloride (b), *and* lc (c). The spectra were taken on a *Bruker* instrument **HX-90-E,** CDCl,, **TMS=** 0 ppm

Conformation of tricyclic frame ^a)	Position of phenyl	6	
A	axial	a) none	e) $H_{ax} - C(3)$
	equatorial	b) $H - C(7)$	f) $H - C(10)$
B	axial	c) $H - C(11)$	$g) H - C(6)$
	equatorial	d) $H - C(7)$	$h) H - C(10)$
$a)$ See Fig. 5.			

Table 4. *Hydrogen atoms expected to show high field shifts due to shielding by the phenyl substituent, depending on the conformation of the thjazepine ring, and the position of the substituent*

diastereotope [7]. For each of the four possible conformations, *i.e.* the axially- or equatorially-substituted compounds having conformations **A** or **B2),** specific changes in chemical shifts would result due to different shielding effects of the phenyl substituents (Table *4).*

Thus for the equatorial position of the phenyl substituents on $C(6)$ or $C(11)$ a high field shift of about 0.4 ppm for $H-C(7)$ (cases b and d), or $H-C(10)$ (cases f and h) would be observed for both types of conformation, **A** and **B.** Such shifts have been reported **[8]** for a similar geometrical situation. Since the spectra (Fig. 8a, b) show no signals in the region of about 6.8 ppm, an *equatorial* position of the phenyl is improbable for both compounds.

In the spectrum of the 11-phenyl compound (Fig. 8b), H_{ax} -C(3) shows a high field shift of about 0.8 pprn relative to the unsubstituted compound **(lc,** Fig. *8c).* From Table *4* (case e), the most probable conformation in CDCI, solution is the same **(A)** as found in the crystal structure.

In the spectrum of the 6-phenyl compound (Fig. 8a) the AB pattern of $H-C(11)$ is centered at 3.7 ppm, which corresponds to a high-field shift of about 0.8 ppm relative to the unsubstituted compound **(lc,** Fig. *8c).* According to case c, Table *4,* the most probable conformation in CDC1, solution is again the same **(B)** as found in the crystal structure.

The spectrum of the unsubstituted compound **(lc,** Fig. *8c),* taken at room temperature or at -70 °C, shows singlets for the geminal protons on both C(6) and $C(11)$, which indicates that the thiazepine ring is in fast *pseudo-rotation* between conformations **A** and **B,** and its mirror images. It appears that substitution of a phenyl ring on $C(6)$, or $C(11)$, impedes *pseudo*-rotation and fixes the seven-membered ring in a conformation corresponding to **B,** or **A,** respectively.

REFERENCES

- [I] *J. B. Bream* & *J. Schmutz,* Helv. *60, 2872* (1977).
- [2] *R. Diamond,* Acta crystallogr. *A25,43* (1969).
- *[3] A. J. C. Wilson,* Nature *151,* 150 (1942).
- *[4] P. Cuppens* & *W. C. Hamilton,* Acta crystallogr. *A26,71* (1970).
- *[5] J. Karle* & *I. Karle,* Acta crystallogr. *21,* 849 (1966).
- [6] *H. P. Weber, T. J. Petcher* & *H. R. Loosli,* Helv. Ms *703.*
- [7] *K. Mislow* & *M. Rabun.* Top. Stereochemistry *I,* 19 (1967).
- [8] *W. Oppolzer, R. Achini, E. Pfenninger* & *H. P. Weber,* Helv. *59,* 1168 (1976).

 $2)$ The enantiomer conformations need not to be considered separately for this purpose.