p-p length also. Assuming that the H-O-H angle increases to $118^{\circ}48'$ as in the case when linear H bonds are formed in LFMH, the p-p length increases to 1.67 Å. As this is in fair agreement with our experimental value it is possible that the H bonds which are slightly bent at room temperature become linear as the temperature is raised.

At 370°K the second moment abruptly drops to a very low value. After the experiment, it was noticed that crystals had regrown on the walls of the sample tube from the powder. On heating the sample outside in an open tube we found that the sample first loses its water and then decomposes. But if we heat the sample in a closed tube the sample first gives out water and then dissolves in it becoming a colourless liquid. On slow cooling crystals started growing slowly. An infrared spectrum of the crystal grown in 'melt' showed no change from that grown from solution. In our n.m.r. experiment, since the powder was well packed in the sample tube the sample inside must have 'melted' because of the protective cover of the upper layer, thus accounting for the abrupt transition in the spectrum. This opens up possibilities of growing large crystals of this optically important substance by the melt technique.

The authors are deeply indebted to Professor R. S. Krishnan and Professor P. S. Narayanan for their kind interest in this work. One of the authors (KM) is grateful to C. S. I. R., New Delhi, for financial support.

References

- CADENE, M. (1970). C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. B, 270, 909-912.
- CHIDAMBARAM, R. (1962). J. Chem. Phys. 36, 2361–2365. CHUMAKOV, A. A. & KOPTSIK, V. A. (1961). Chem. Abs.
- 55, 12984*h*. DONALDSON, J. D., KNIFTON, J. F. & ROSS, S. D. (1964). Spectrochim. Acta, **20**, 847–851.
- GUTOWSKY, H. S., MEYER, L. H. & MCCLURE, R. E. (1953). Rev. Sci. Instrum. 24, 644-652.
- HAMILTON, W. C. & IBERS, J. A. (1968). Hydrogen Bonding in Solids, p. 53. New York: Benjamin.
- HARVEY, K. B., MORROW, B. A. & SHURVELL, H. F. (1963). Canad. J. Chem. 41, 1181-1187.
- LARSON, A. C. & HELMHOLZ, L. (1959). J. Chem. Phys. 22, 2049–2050.
- McGRATH, J. W. & SILVIDI, A. A. (1963). J. Chem. Phys. 39, 3017-3021.
- MOHANA RAO, J. K. & VISWAMITRA, M. A. (1971). Ferroelectrics, 2, 209–216.
- PAKE, G. E. (1948). J. Chem. Phys. 16, 327-336.
- PEDERSEN, B. (1964). J. Chem. Phys. 41, 122-132.
- PIETRZAK, J. (1965). Acta Phys. Polon. 28, 217-227.
- POUND, R. V. (1952). Prog. Nucl. Phys. 2, 21-50.
- RAMANUJAM, P. S. (1969). Indian J. Pure Appl. Phys. 7, 420–423.
- SINGH, S., BONNER, W. A., POTOPOWICZ, J. R. & VAN UITERT, L. G. (1970). Appl. Phys. Lett. 17, 292–294.
- TIWARY, H. V. & NARAYANAN, P. S. (1971). Private communication.
- TORRE, L. P., ABRAHAMS, S. C. & BERNSTEIN, J. L. (1971). Unpublished.

Acta Cryst. (1973). B29, 379

The Crystal and Molecular Structure of 8-[3-(*p*-Fluorobenzoyl)propyl]-1-phenyl-1,3,8-triazaspiro[4,5]decan-4-one, C₂₃H₂₆N₃O₂F

BY M. H. J. KOCH

Laboratoire de Chimie Physique et de Cristallographie, Université de Louvain, Schapenstraat 39, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium

(Received 9 October 1972; accepted 24 October 1972)

Crystals of the title compound, $C_{23}H_{26}N_3O_2F$, are monoclinic, space group $P2_1/c$ with a=18.571, b=6.072, c=20.681 Å, $\beta=118.69^{\circ}$ and Z=4. The structure was solved by direct methods and refined by block-diagonal least-squares calculations to an *R* value of 0.09. The results are compared with those obtained previously on butyrophenone derivatives and the observed differences are explained on the basis of conformational energy calculations.

The title compound, usually called spiroperidol, is one of the most potent neuroleptic drugs known to date. It is 3500 times more potent than chlorpromazine in dogs. It seemed interesting to determine this structure and to compare it with the other known compounds in the butyrophenone series (Koch & Germain, 1972).

Experimental

The single crystals used were obtained as colourless needles by evaporation from a 60:40 mixture of 2propanol and dimethylformamide. Their quality was rather poor (high mosaicity). The crystal data and experimental details are given in Table 1. All intensity data were gathered with a Picker card-controlled 4-

Table 1. Crystallographic and experimental data

$C_{23}H_{26}N_{3}O_{2}F$	M.W. 395.5		
Monoclinic $P2_1/c$	a = 18.571 (14) Å		
	b = 6.072(4)		
	c = 20.681 (15)		
F(000) = 840	$\beta = 118.69 (3)^{\circ}$		

Crystal dimensions: $0.30 \times 0.30 \times 0.25$ mm

Source Cu K α , Ni filter, $\lambda = 1.5418$ Å, $\omega - 2\theta$ scan, $\Delta 2\theta \pm 0.7^{\circ}$, $\theta_{max} = 57.5^{\circ}$

Confidence level 2.0

Total number of independent reflexions: 2807

Total observed: 2232

circle diffractometer. The scattering factors used are those given in *International Tables for X-ray Crystallo*graphy (1962).

Structure determination and refinement

The structure was solved by direct methods using the program LSAM of Germain, Main & Woolfson (1969). The best *E*-map, according to the figures of merit, showed the whole molecule except for one atom in the phenone group.

Refinement was carried out by the block-diagonal least-squares method with a program written by Ahmed (Ahmed, Hall, Pippy & Huber, 1966). The anisotropic refinement was considered to be complete when all

Table 2. Final coordinates and thermal parameters and their standard deviations $(\times 10^4)$

 $B = \exp(B_{11}h^2 + B_{22}k^2 + B_{33}l^2 + B_{12}hk + B_{13}hl + B_{23}kl) \times 10^{-4}.$

	x/a	y/b	z/c	B ₁₁	B ₂₂	B ₃₃	B ₂₃	B ₁₃	B12
N(1)	4185 (2)	2101 (6)	1254 (2)	39 (1)	342 (12)	23 (1)	-15(6)	36 (2)	- 85 (6)
C(2)	4765 (3)	3902 (8)	1427 (2)	40 (2)	354 (15)	24 (1)	-3(7)	35 (2)	- 64 (8)
N(3)	4866 (2)	3992 (6)	779 (2)	40 (1)	332 (11)	27(1)	0 (6)	38 (2)	- 65 (7)
C(4)	4314 (2)	2869 (6)	212 (2)	35 (1)	248 (12)	23 (1)	13 (6)	37 (2)	-2(7)
C(5)	3780 (2)	1550 (7)	455 (2)	32 (1)	262 (12)	21 (1)	1 (6)	33 (2)	- 12 (7)
C(6)	3861 (3)	- 904 (7)	314 (2)	42 (2)	256 (12)	30 (1)	25 (7)	41 (3)	15 (8)
C(7)	3391 (3)	-1522(7)	- 487 (2)	58 (2)	250 (13)	33 (1)	-17(7)	61 (3)	-18(8)
N(8)	2522 (2)	- 891 (6)	-804(2)	52 (2)	289 (11)	25 (1)	-29(6)	40 (2)	- 53 (7)
C(9)	2447 (3)	1466 (7)	-764(2)	43 (2)	292 (13)	28 (1)	18 (7)	33 (3)	-3(8)
C(10)	2887 (2)	2275 (7)	33 (2)	38 (2)	287 (13)	28 (1)	-14 (7)	39 (2)	-3(8)
C(11)	2071 (4)	- 1744 (11)	-1568(3)	73 (3)	602 (24)	26 (2)	-91 (10)	51 (4)	- 186 (14)
C(12)	1146 (4)	-1577 (11)	-1883(3)	72 (3)	479 (22)	25 (1)	15 (9)	17 (3)	-112 (13)
C(13)	846 (3)	-3028(10)	-1461(3)	59 (2)	409 (18)	33 (2)	16 (9)	28 (3)	- 53 (11)
C(14)	-22(4)	-2636(9)	-1662 (3)	61 (3)	350 (18)	39 (2)	10 (10)	25 (4)	-4 (11)
C(15)	-410(3)	- 4037 (10)	-1336(3)	50 (2)	417 (19)	36 (2)	-65 (10)	21 (3)	-31 (11)
C(16)	-61(4)	- 5963 (11)	-962(3)	62 (3)	466 (21)	44 (2)	30 (11)	43 (4)	- 23 (13)
C(17)	-435 (5)	-7315(17)	-680(4)	91 (4)	859 (41)	47 (2)	-40 (17)	62 (5)	-234 (22)
C(18)	-1194(5)	-6583(18)	-759 (4)	82 (4)	1123 (51)	44 (2)	- 184 (19)	62 (5)	-344 24)
C(19)	-1554 (5)	-4672 (20)	-1120(5)	64 (3)	1139 (54)	66 (3)	-214 (23)	64 (6)	- 15+ (22)
C(20)	-1169 (4)	-3402(15)	-1415 (4)	48 (2)	779 (6)	61 (3)	- 113 (17)	34 (5)	25 (16)
C(21)	3849 (2)	1786 (7)	1723 (2)	34 (1)	311 (13)	20 (1)	9 (6)	31 (2)	6 (7)
C(22)	4088 (8)	3203 (8)	2336 (2)	38 (2)	372 (15)	24 (1)	8 (7)	31 (2)	19 (18)
C(23)	3790 (3)	2835 (9)	2833 (2)	46 (2)	430 (17)	24 (1)	-1 (8)	38 (3)	19 (9)
C(24)	3255 (3)	1176 (10)	2730 (2)	44 (2)	551 (20)	27 (1)	33 (9)	45 (3)	23 (10)
C(25)	3018 (3)	-216 (10)	2138 (3)	45 (2)	547 (21)	29 (1)	2 (9)	43 (3)	-62 (11)
C(26)	3309 (3)	72 (8)	1635 (2)	44 (2)	431 (16)	26 (1)	4 (8)	44 (3)	- 65 (10)
O(1)	4223 (2)	2883 (5)	-421 (2)	51 (1)	330 (10)	25 (1)	-8 (5)	51 (2)	- 59 (6)
O(2)	- 425 (3)	-1160 (9)	-2097 (3)	86 (3)	489 (17)	88(3)	159 (11)	52 (4)	129 (12)
F(1)	-1577(3)	-7751(13)	-483(3)	116 (3)	1548 (43)	67 (2)	-145 (16)	102 (4)	-495 (21)



Fig. 1. View of a dimer of $C_{23}H_{26}N_2O_2F$.

shifts were below 0.3 of their corresponding estimated standard deviations.

The final $R = \sum ||F_o| - |F_c|| / \sum |F_o|$ was 0.09 for the 2065 reflexions used in the refinement (167 weak reflexions for which $\Delta F/F_{obs}$ was larger than 0.4 were rejected during the last cycles of refinement).

The final positional parameters and their e.s.d.'s and the corresponding thermal parameters are given in in Table 2. A table of observed and calculated structure factors has been deposited with the National Lending Library, England, as Supplementary Publication No. SUP 30031.*

Results

The intramolecular bond distances and angles are given in Table 3. The atom numbering scheme is shown

* Copies of this table may be obtained through the Executive Secretary, International Union of Crystallography, 13 White Friars, Chester CH1 1NZ, England. in Fig. 1. The poor quality of the crystals can be explained by the intermolecular bonding. Each molecule is bonded to one molecule by two hydrogen bonds $N(3)\cdots O(1) \ 2\cdot 867 \ \text{Å} \ [O(1): 1-x, 1-y, -z]$ and $O(1)\cdots N(3) \ [N(3): 1-x, 1-y, -z]$. Hence the crystal is made up of dimers which are held together by packing forces only.

Discussion

The five-membered ring and the phenyl group are coplanar. As a result of this the phenyl group has the same orientation relative to the piperidine ring as in 4'-fluoro-4-{1-[4-hydroxy-4-(4'-fluoro)phenylpiperidino]}butyrophenone and its hydrochloride (later referred to as *B* and *C*, *A* being the title compound). The three derivatives have a different conformation of the side chain. Referring the values of the relevant torsional angles to the atom numbering in *A* one obtains the values given in Table 4. A calculation for the side chain of *A* was carried out using a general con-

Fable 3. Intramolecula	r bond	distances	and	angles	and	their	e.s.d.'s
------------------------	--------	-----------	-----	--------	-----	-------	----------

1·455 (6) Å
1.488 (5)
1.394 (6)
1.440 (6)
1.317 (5)
1.534 (6)
1.237 (5)
1.539 (6)
1.522 (6)
1.503 (6)
1.472 (7)
1.444 (6)
1.481 (6)
1.528 (6)
1.519 (10)
1.522 (9)
1.477 (10)
1.471 (9)
1-236 (8)
1.380 (9)
1.392 (11)
1.374 (12)
1.411 (15)
1.368 (15)
1.313 (12)
1.377 (13)
1.415 (6)
1.395 (7)
1.399 (7)
1.359 (8)
1.375 (7)
1.395 (7)

C(2) - N(1) - C(5)	$111 \cdot 1 (3)^{\circ}$
CON NON CON	117.2 (1)
C(2) = N(1) = C(21)	117.5 (4)
C(5) = N(1) = C(21)	125.9 (4)
N(1) - C(2) - N(3)	$102 \cdot 2(4)$
C(2) $N(2)$ $C(4)$	114.5 (4)
C(2) = N(3) = C(4)	114.2 (4)
N(3) - C(4) - C(5)	109.1(4)
N(3) - C(4) - O(1)	126.2 (4)
C(5) $C(4)$ $O(1)$	124.6 (4)
U(3) - U(4) - U(1)	124-0 (4)
N(1) - C(5) - C(4)	100.7(3)
	110 ((2)
N(1) - C(3) - C(6)	112.0 (3)
N(1) = C(5) = C(10)	113.7(3)
N(1) = C(3) = C(10)	115 7 (5)
C(4) - C(5) - C(6)	107.9 (3)
C(A) = C(E) = C(10)	111.0 (2)
C(4) - C(5) - C(10)	1110(3)
C(6) - C(5) - C(10)	110.5(3)
C(5) - C(6) - C(7)	113.1 (4)
C(6) C(7) N(8)	111.0(4)
C(0) = C(7) = I(0)	111 0 (4)
C(7) - N(8) - C(9)	110.3 (4)
C(7) $N(9)$ $C(11)$	108.8 (1)
U(1) - N(0) - U(11)	108.8 (4)
C(9) - N(8) - C(11)	112.7(4)
	111 2 (4)
N(8) - C(9) - C(10)	111.3 (4)
C(5) = C(10) = C(9)	113.4(4)
C(3) = C(10) - C(3)	110 0 (4)
N(8) - C(11) - C(12)	112.2 (5)
C(11) C(12) C(13)	111.4(5)
C(11) = C(12) = C(13)	111 4 (5)
C(12)-C(13)-C(14)	113.3 (5)
C(12) $C(14)$ $C(15)$	110.1 (5)
U(13) - U(14) - U(13)	119-1 (5)
C(13)-C(14)-O(2)	121.3(6)
C(15) C(14) C(2)	110.6 (6)
C(15) - C(14) - O(2)	119.0 (0)
C(14) = C(15) = C(16)	123.0(6)
	110 5 (6)
C(14)-C(15)-C(20)	118.2 (0)
C(16) = C(15) = C(20)	118.5 (6)
C(10) = C(13) = C(20)	110 5 (0)
C(15)-C(16)-C(17)	123.2 (7)
C(16) C(17) C(18)	116.3 (8)
C(10) - C(17) - C(10)	110 5 (0)
C(17)-C(18)-C(19)	122.0(9)
C(17) $C(19)$ $E(1)$	110.0 (8)
C(1/) - C(10) - F(1)	119.9 (0)
C(19) - C(18) - F(1)	118.1 (9)
	110 7 (0)
C(18) - C(19) - C(20)	119.7 (9)
C(15) = C(20) = C(19)	120.3 (8)
C(13) - C(20) - C(17)	120 5 (0)
N(1) - C(21) - C(22)	119.2 (4)
N(1) = C(21) = C(26)	123.0 (4)
1(1) = O(21) = O(20)	
C(22)-C(21)-C(26)	117.8 (4)
CON CON CON	119.8 (4)
C(21) - C(22) - C(23)	112 0 (4)
C(22)-C(23)-C(24)	121.4 (5)
Cina) Cina) Cina)	110.5 (5)
(23) - ((24) - ((23))	117.5 (5)
C(24)-C(25)-C(26)	121.0 (5)
	120.5 (5)
U(21) - U(20) - U(20)	120.2 (2)

382

formational analysis program (Koch 1971). The results for B and C would, of course, be expected to be very similar. For our purpose it was only necessary to take the torsional and van der Waals energies into account. The van der Waals energy was computed with Giglio's function using the values of the parameters given in the original paper (Giglio, 1969).

Table 4. Torsional angles in the side chain of butyrophenone derivatives $\varphi_1 \quad \varphi_2 \quad \varphi_3 \quad \varphi_4$ C(5)-C(6)-C(7)-N(8)-C(11)-C(12)-C(13)-C(14)-C(15) $A \quad -54 \quad -174 \quad 168 \quad -64 \quad 170 \quad 175$ $B \quad -62 \quad -176 \quad -179 \quad -166 \quad -68 \quad -177$ $C \quad -59 \quad -173 \quad 76 \quad 174 \quad -162 \quad 173$

The torsional energy was evaluated as $U_T = U_o (1 + \cos n\varphi)$. The values of U_o and *n* were taken from a study by Allinger, Miller, Van Catledge & Hirsch, 1967) on hydrocarbons and are given in Table 5. We made the assumption that the rotational barriers for C-N-C-X are the same as for C-C-C-X when N is a tetrahedral nitrogen. Calculated positions were used for the hydrogen atoms.

Table 5. Values of U_o and n used in the calculations

	U_0 (kcal mole ⁻¹)	n
C-C-C-C	0.65	3
H-C-C-C	1.00	3
H-C-C-H	0.62	3

The torsional angles φ_1 , φ_2 and φ_3^* were allowed to take all values from 0 to 360° in steps of 60°, all other parameters being fixed at their experimental value. The amount of calculation was reduced by taking the symmetry of the problem into account. It is obvious from a model that a combination of angles such as (180, 60, 60) is identical to (60, 300, 300). All combinations which corresponded to values of the energy less than 19 kcal mole⁻¹ above the lowest values (180, 180, 180) were submitted to a search in which the three angles were varied from -30° to $+30^\circ$ from their starting value by steps of 10°.

It turned out that only combinations with a value of φ_1 near 60 and 180° have an energy value less than 5 kcal mole⁻¹ above the minimum.

A two-dimensional energy map was then computed where only φ_2 and φ_3 were incremented by steps of 10°. Fig. 2 shows the result of this calculation. There are five nearly equal minima, three of which correspond to one of the observed conformations of the side chain. The dark regions of the map correspond to unallowed conformations (more than 30 kcal mole⁻¹ above the



Fig. 2. Result of the conformational energy calculation for the side chain of A. The upper scale corresponds to $\varphi_1 = 168^\circ$ and the lower to $\varphi_1 = 72^\circ$. The dots indicate the experimental values for the A, B and C structures respectively. The contours correspond to a difference of 1 kcal mole⁻¹.

minimum). The value of φ_4 was never varied during the calculations because it is obvious from a model that the most favourable value will always be close to 180°. It is to be expected that all analogous derivatives will fall into one of the five minima. The results of our calculations allow us to explain all the available structural information. Further study is however required to determine whether this is relevant to the activity of these compounds.

I thank Professor M. Van Meerssche for his interest in this work, Dr P. A. J. Janssen (Janssen Pharmaceutica, Beerse, Belgium) for providing a sample of spiroperidol and the Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique for a grant.

References

- ALLINGER, N. L., MILLER, M. A., VAN CATLEDGE, F. A. & HIRSCH, J. A. (1967). J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 89, 4345– 4357.
- AHMED, F. R., HALL, S. R., PIPPY, M. E. & HUBER, C. P. (1966). World List of Crystallographic Computer Programs, 2nd ed., Appendix, p. 52. Utrecht: Oosthoek.
- GERMAIN, G., MAIN, P. & WOOLFSON, M. M. (1969). LSAM. A system of computer programs for the automatic solution of centrosymmetric crystal structures.
- GIGLIO, E. (1969). Nature, Lond. 222, 339-341.
- International Tables for X-ray Crystallography (1962). Vol. III. Birmingham: Kynoch Press.
- KOCH, M. H. J. (1971). COMOL. A computer program for the calculation of the conformational energy of organic molecules.
- Koch, M. H. J. & Germain, G. (1972). Acta Cryst. B28, 121-125.

^{*} A zero value for the torsional angle along the C(2)-C(3)bond in C(1)-C(2)-C(3)-C(4) corresponds to the *cis* conformation. A positive angle corresponds to a counterclockwise rotation of C(4) when looking down from C(3) to C(2).