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#### Abstract

The crystal structure of the diethyl 2-benzimidazol-1-ylsuccinate-picric acid ( $1 / 1$ ) molecular complex has been determined by X-ray diffraction analysis. Diethyl 2-benzimidazol-1-ylsuccinate molecules form channels along the $a$ axis, in which the picric acid molecules are located. The benzimidazole moiety and the phenol group are held together by hydrogen bonding between the hydrogen of the phenol and the N3 atom of benzimidazole. Additionally, this hydrogen forms an intramolecular hydrogen bond with one O atom of the ortho-nitro group, thus producing a bifurcated hydrogen bond. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra in DMSO- $d_{6}$ solution and CP/MAS solid ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR studies of this 2-benzimidazol-1-ylsuccinate-picric acid ( $1 / 1$ ) molecular complex, as well as those of dimethyl, diethyl, di-n-butyl and 1-n-butyl-4-ethyl 2-imidazol-1-ylsuccinates, diethyl 2-pyrazol-1-ylsuccinate, ethyl imidazol-1-ylacetate, ethyl pyrazol-1-ylacetate and ethyl pyrazol-1-ylsuccinate, suggest that the picric acid linkage depends on the nature of the azole. Actual proton transfer is deduced for the imidazole derivatives, but only weak hydrogen bonding could be inferred for pyrazole derivatives.


## 1. Introduction

The formation of picrates is a common method for the conversion of liquids into stable, tractable solid compounds. Although picrates have long been used, controversy still exists regarding their structures. In many cases the bonding of these electron donor-acceptor (EDA) picric acid complexes strongly depends on the nature of the partners. The linkage could involve not only electrostatic attractions, but also the formation of molecular complexes.

We have recently described the synthesis and neutral hydrolysis of a series of azol-l-ylsuccinic and acetic esters (1)-(8) (Gil, Cruz, Cerdán \& Ballesteros, 1992; Gil, Zaderenko, Cruz, Cerdán \& Ballesteros, 1994; Zaderenko, Gil, Ballesteros \& Cerdán, 1994; Zaderenko, López \& Ballesteros, 1996). These products form crystalline $1: 1$ addition compounds (9)-(16) with picric acid (PA).

In this study we have established the structure of (9) in the solid state by X-ray diffraction analysis. The observed linkage is compared with those presented by other complexes (10)-(16) using NMR studies both in the solid state and in DMSO- $d_{6}$ solution.


(1)
(1)-PA:(9)
(2)-PA:(10

(5)
(6)-PA:(14)

(7)
(8)-PA:(16)

(9)

Compounds (1)-(8) were prepared as described previously (Gil, Cruz, Cerdán \& Ballesteros, 1992; Gil, Zaderenko, Cruz, Cerdán \& Ballesteros, 1994; Zaderenko, Gil, Ballesteros \& Cerdán, 1994; Zaderenko, López \& Ballesteros, 1996). PA complexes (9)-(16) were prepared by adding a solution containing a slight excess of picric acid in absolute ethanol to (1)-(8) dissolved in the minimal amount of absolute ethanol. Compounds (9)-(16) crystallized from the cold solution and were recrystallized from absolute ethanol. (3). $\mathrm{HBF}_{4}$ was prepared by treatment of (3) with a $54 \%$ diethyl ether solution of fluoroboric acid.

Table 1. Experimental details

| Crystal data |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Chemical formula | $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4} \cdot \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{7}$ |
| Chemical formula weight | 519.43 |
| Cell setting | Orthorhombic |
| Space group | $P_{n a 2}$ |
| $a(\AA \AA)$ | $11.310(1)$ |
| $b(\AA)$ | $23.183(4)$ |
| $c(\AA)$ | $9.462(1)$ |
| $V\left(\AA^{3}\right)$ | $2480.9(5)$ |
| $Z(4)$ |  |
| $D_{x}\left(\mathrm{Mg} \mathrm{m}^{-3}\right)$ | 4 |
| Radiation type | 1.391 |
| Wavelength $(\AA)$ | $\mathrm{Cu} \mathrm{K} \mathrm{\alpha}$ |
| No. of reflections for cell | 1.5418 |
| parameters | 53 |
| $\theta$ range $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ |  |
| $\mu\left(\mathrm{mm}^{-1}\right)$ | $3-25$ |
| Temperature $(\mathrm{K})$ | 0.985 |
| Crystal form | $293(2)$ |
| Crystal size $(\mathrm{mm})$ | Prism |
| Crystal colour | $0.35 \times 0.24 \times 0.21$ |
|  | Colourless |


| Data collection |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Diffractometer | Philips PW1100 |
| Data collection method | $\omega-2 \theta$ scans |
| Absorption correction | None |
| No. of measured reflections | 2241 |
| No. of independent reflections | 2241 |
| No. of observed reflections | 1683 |
| Criterion for observed reflections | $I>2 \sigma(I)$ |
| $\theta_{\text {max }}\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | 64.80 |
| Range of $h, k, l$ | $0 \rightarrow h \rightarrow 13$ |
|  | $0 \rightarrow k \rightarrow 27$ |
|  | $0 \rightarrow l \rightarrow 11$ |
| No. of standard reflections | 2 |
| Frequency of standard reflections | 90 |
| (min) |  |
| Intensity decay (\%) | None |


| Refinement |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Refinement on | $F^{2}$ |
| $R\left[F^{2}>2 \sigma\left(F^{2}\right)\right]$ | 0.0785 |
| $w R\left(F^{2}\right)$ | 0.2160 |
| $S$ | 1.135 |
| No. of reflections used in | 2241 |
| refinement |  |
| No. of parameters used | 334 |
| H-atom treatment | H atoms refined isotropically |
| Weighting scheme | $w=1 /\left[\sigma^{2}\left(F_{o}^{2}\right)+(0.0844 P)^{2}\right.$ |
|  | $\quad+2.4124 P]$, where |
|  | $P=\left(F_{o}^{2}+2 F_{c}^{2}\right) / 3$ |
| $(\Delta / \sigma)_{\max }$ | $<0.001$ |
| $\Delta \rho_{\max }\left(\mathrm{e} \AA^{-3}\right)$ | 0.316 |
| $\Delta \rho_{\min }\left(\mathrm{e} \AA^{-3}\right)$ | -0.224 |
| Extinction method | None |
| Source of atomic scattering factors | International Tables for |
|  | Crystallography $(1992$, Vol. C) |
| Absolute configuration | Flack (1983) |
|  |  |
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Table 2. Selected geometric parameters $\left(A,{ }^{\circ}\right)$

| $\mathrm{N} 1-\mathrm{C} 2$ | $1.347(9)$ | $\mathrm{C} 32-\mathrm{N} 33$ | $1.440(13)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{N} 1-\mathrm{C} 7 \mathrm{a}$ | $1.375(9)$ | $\mathrm{N} 33-\mathrm{O} 34$ | $1.171(15)$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 2-\mathrm{N} 3$ | $1.36(10)$ | $\mathrm{N} 33-\mathrm{O} 35$ | $1.179(13)$ |
| $\mathrm{N} 3-\mathrm{C} 3 \mathrm{a}$ | $1.376(9)$ | $\mathrm{C} 37-\mathrm{N} 38$ | $1.471(12)$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 3 \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{C} 7 \mathrm{a}$ | $1.415(10)$ | $\mathrm{N} 38-\mathrm{O} 39$ | $1.166(19)$ |
| $\mathrm{O} 10-\mathrm{C} 12$ | $1.433(10)$ | $\mathrm{N} 38-\mathrm{O} 40$ | $1.276(20)$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 12-\mathrm{C} 13$ | $1.458(15)$ | $\mathrm{C} 42-\mathrm{N} 43$ | $1.441(12)$ |
| $\mathrm{O} 17-\mathrm{C} 18$ | $1.474(12)$ | $\mathrm{N} 43-\mathrm{O} 44$ | $1.202(11)$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 18-\mathrm{C} 19$ | $1.443(20)$ | $\mathrm{N} 43-\mathrm{O} 45$ | $1.220(11)$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C} 2-\mathrm{N} 1-\mathrm{C} 7 \mathrm{a}$ | $108.1(6)$ | $\mathrm{N} 1-\mathrm{C} 7 \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{C} 3 \mathrm{a}$ | $106.0(6)$ |
| $\mathrm{N} 3-\mathrm{C} 2-\mathrm{N} 1$ | $110.7(7)$ | $\mathrm{O} 34-\mathrm{N} 33-\mathrm{O} 35$ | $121.0(13)$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 2-\mathrm{N} 3-\mathrm{C} 3 \mathrm{a}$ | $108.5(6)$ | $\mathrm{O} 39-\mathrm{N} 38-\mathrm{O} 40$ | $125.3(11)$ |
| $\mathrm{N} 3-\mathrm{C} 3 \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{C} 7 \mathrm{a}$ | $106.8(6)$ | $\mathrm{O} 44-\mathrm{N} 43-\mathrm{O} 45$ | $119.2(10)$ |

Table 3. Hydrogen-bond geometries ( $A,{ }^{\circ}$ )

| $D-\mathrm{H} \cdots A$ | $D-\mathrm{H}$ | $\mathrm{H} \cdots A$ | $D \cdots A$ | $D-\mathrm{H} \cdots A$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| O31—H31 $\cdots$ O45 | $0.820(10)$ | $1.963(11)$ | $2.659(11)$ | $142.3(9)$ |
| O31—H31 $\cdots \mathrm{N} 3$ | $0.820(10)$ | $2.044(11)$ | $2.556(10)$ | $120.1(9)$ |

### 2.1. Crystal structure determination

Crystals of (9) were obtained from absolute ethanol. Crystal and experimental data are given in Table $1 . \dagger$ The intensities were corrected for Lorentz and polarization factors; no absorption correction was applied. The structure was solved by direct methods. The C-, O- and N -atom positions were refined with anisotropic displacement parameters. Hydroxyl and some other H atoms were unambiguously located from a difference map. Only H8, H122, H182, H192, H193 and H41 were fixed at ideal geometries and refined using a riding model with fixed isotropic displacement parameters. The H atom attached to O 31 was refined as an OH -idealized group with an $X-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{H}$ tetrehedral angle. Several cycles of leastsquares refinement converged to $R=0.0785$ and $w R=$ 0.189 ; the rather high $R$ values may contain contributions from general uncertainties in the data and the high displacement parameters for the nitro groups of picric acid.

### 2.2. NMR determinations

${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 200.13 MHz ) and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 50.33 MHz ) spectra were recorded with freshly prepared DMSO- $d_{6}$ solutions on a Bruker AC200 spectrometer. Chemical shifts are expressed in p.p.m. relative to tetramethylsilane. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ cross-polarization magic angle spinning (CP/MAS) NMR spectra were obtained at 50.33 MHz on a Bruker CP-200 spectrometer. Samples were rotated at 3.5 or 2.5 kHz in a 7 mm ZrO 2 rotor; the initial contact

[^0]time was $1 \mathrm{~ms} ; 90^{\circ}$ pulse lengths for protons were $7 \mu \mathrm{~s}$; a 4 s delay between scans and 200 transients were used.

Chemical shifts were measured relative to the glycine resonance at 176.1 p.p.m. as an external reference.

## 3. Results and discussion

The geometric features of (9) are shown in Tables 2 and 3. The asymmetric unit contains one molecule of diethyl ( $\pm$ )-benzimidazol-1-ylsuccinate (1) and one molecule of picric acid (PA).

The benzimidazole ring is planar, with no atom deviating from the mean plane by more than $0.027(10) \AA$; the value of the dihedral angle being 0.8 (2) ${ }^{\circ}$. The geometry of the ring is similar to that found in the literature (Dik-Edixhoven, Schenk \& van der Meer, 1973; Toffoli, Rodier, Ceolin, Doung \& Joannic, 1990; Duesler, Engelmann, Curtin \& Paul, 1978). The side chains lie above and below the heterocycle and their planes form angles of 51.3 (3) and 69.9 (3) ${ }^{c}$ with the plane of the ring. The aromatic ring of picric acid is also planar, with no atom deviating from this mean plane by

(a)

(b)

Fig. 1. (a) ORTEP (Hall \& Stewart, 1990) view of (9), showing the atomic numbering. Displacement ellipsoids are drawn at the $50 \%$ probability level; (b) packing of molecules of (9) viewed down the $c$ axis.

Table 4. Selected ${ }^{1} H$ NMR chemical shifts ( $\delta$, p.p.m.) in DMSO- $d_{6}$ of (1)-(6) and (8) and their PA complexes (9)(14) and (16)

Assigments have been made on the basis of reported data: Gil, Cruz, Cerdán \& Ballesteros (1992); Gil, Zaderenko, Cruz, Cerdán \& Ballesteros (1994); Zaderenko, Gil, Ballesteros \& Cerdán (1994). In some cases COSY 2D (two-dimensional) NMR experiments have been carried out; s: singlet; bs: broad signal; vbs: very broad singlet. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR of PA in DMSO- $d_{6}: \mathrm{H} 3(5): 8.55(\mathrm{~s}) ; \mathrm{OH}: 11.10$ (s) p.p.m.

| Compound | CH | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | Azole | PA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) | 5.83 | 3.36 | $\begin{aligned} & 7.17-7.29 \\ & (\mathrm{H} 5, \mathrm{H} 6) \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  | 7.55-7.67 |  |
|  |  |  | (H4,H7) |  |
|  |  |  | 8.84 (H2) |  |
| (9) | 6.19 | 3.49 | 7.56-7.60 | 8.58 |
|  |  |  | (H5,H6) |  |
|  |  |  | 7.83-7.98 |  |
|  |  |  | (H4) |  |
|  |  |  | 8.00-8.02 |  |
|  |  |  | (H7) |  |
|  |  |  | 9.56 (H2) |  |
| $\Delta \delta[\delta(9)-\delta(1)]$ | 0.36 | 0.13 | 0.35 |  |
|  |  |  | (H5,H6) |  |
|  |  |  | 0.29 (H4) |  |
|  |  |  | 0.40 (H7) |  |
|  |  |  | 0.72 (H2) |  |
| (2) | 5.50 | 3.21 | 6.88 (H4) |  |
|  |  |  | 7.23 (H5) |  |
|  |  |  | 7.72 (H2) |  |
| (10) | 5.86 | 3.41 | 7.71 (H4) | 8.58 |
|  |  |  | 7.86 (H5) |  |
|  |  |  | 9.21 (H2) |  |
| $\Delta \delta[\delta(10)-\delta(2)]$ | 0.36 | 0.20 | 0.83 (H4) |  |
|  |  |  | 0.64 (H5) |  |
|  |  |  | 1.49 (H2) |  |
| (3) | 5.45 | 3.17 | 6.87 (H4) |  |
|  |  |  | 7.23 (H5) |  |
|  |  |  | 7.71 (H2) |  |
| (11) | 5.83 | 3.38 | 7.72 (H4) | 8.58 |
|  |  |  | 7.87 (H5) | OH: 13.50 (vbs) |
|  |  |  | 9.21 (H2) |  |
| $\Delta \delta[\delta(1)-\delta(3)]$ | 0.38 | 0.21 | 0.85 (H4) |  |
|  |  |  | 0.64 (H5) |  |
|  |  |  | 1.50 (H2) |  |
| (3). $\mathrm{HBF}_{4}$ | 5.82 | 3.34 | 7.70 (H4) |  |
|  |  |  | 7.89 (H5) |  |
|  |  |  | 9.21 (H2) |  |
| $\Delta \delta\left[\delta(3) \cdot \mathrm{HBF}_{4}-\delta(3)\right]$ | 0.37 | 0.17 | 0.83 (H4) |  |
|  |  |  | 0.66 (H5) |  |
|  |  |  | 1.50 (H2) |  |
| (4) | 5.47 | 3.18 | 6.87 (H4) |  |
|  |  |  | 7.23 (H5) |  |
|  |  |  | 7.72 (H2) |  |
| (12) | 5.84 | 3.39 | 7.70 (H4) | 8.58 |
|  |  |  | 7.86 (H5) | OH: 14.52 (vbs) |
|  |  |  | 9.18 (H2) |  |
| $\Delta \delta[\delta(12)-\delta(4)]$ | 0.37 | 0.21 | 0.83 (H4) |  |
|  |  |  | 0.63 (H5) |  |
|  |  |  | 1.46 (H2) |  |
| (5) | 5.47 | 3.18 | 6.87 (H4) |  |
|  |  |  | 7.24 (H5) |  |
|  |  |  | 7.73 (H2) |  |

Table 4 (cont.)

| Compound | CH | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | Azole | PA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (13) | 5.83 | 3.37 | 7.70 (H4) | $\begin{aligned} & 8.58 \\ & \text { OH: } 14.44 \\ & \text { (vbs) } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | 7.86 (H5) |  |
|  |  |  | 9.18 (H2) |  |
| $\Delta \delta[\delta(13)-\delta(5)]$ | 0.37 | 0.21 | 0.83 (H4) |  |
|  |  |  | 0.63 (H5) |  |
|  |  |  | 1.46 (H2) |  |
| (6) | 5.49 | 3.16 | 6.25 (H4) |  |
|  |  |  | 7.46 (H3) |  |
|  |  |  | 7.84 (H5) |  |
| (14) | 5.49 | 3.16 | 6.25 (H4) |  |
|  |  |  | 7.46 (H3) | OH: 8.52 <br> (bs) |
|  |  |  | 7.84 (H5) |  |
| $\Delta \delta[8(14)-\delta(6)]$ | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 (H4) |  |
|  |  |  | 0.00 (H3) |  |
|  |  |  | 0.00 (H5) |  |
| (8) |  | 5.04 | 6.26 (H4) |  |
|  |  |  | 7.45 (H3) |  |
|  |  |  | 7.71 (H5) |  |
| (16) |  | 5.04 | 6.26 (H4) | 8.58 |
|  |  |  | 7.45 (H3) | OH: |
|  |  |  |  | 10.78(s) |
|  |  |  | 7.71 (H5) |  |
| $\Delta \delta[\delta(16)-\delta(8)]$ | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 (H4) |  |
|  |  |  | 0.00 (H3) |  |
|  |  |  | 0.00 (H5) |  |

more than 0.016 (11) $\AA$. Bond distances and angles have normal values within experimental error (Hall \& Stewart 1990). The twist angles of the three nitro groups from the phenyl ring are $36(2), 8(2)$ and $2(2)^{\circ}$. The wide range of $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{O}$ distances [1.166(19)-1.276 (20) $\AA$ ] is probably due to the large temperature factors of the O atoms. All attempts to find a model for the disorder failed.

Proton transfer from the phenol group towards the benzimidazole ring does not occur. The benzimidazole moiety of the molecules forms channels along the $a$ axis within which the picric acid molecules are located, forming an inclusion molecular complex (Fig. 1b). The benzimidazole ring and the picric acid are held together by hydrogen bonding through the hydrogen of the phenol and the N 3 atom of the benzimidazole ring (Table 3). Furthermore, this hydrogen forms a bifurcated intramolecular hydrogen bond with the O 45 atom of the orthonitro group of the picric acid. Similar interactions have been reported in tryptophan metabolite-picric acid molecular complexes (Nagata, In, Doi, Ishida \& Wakahara, 1995). No stacking interactions between benzimidazole rings have been observed (Albert \& Cano, 1991). Although the nearest-neighbour intermolecular distance between ring centroids was $4.96 \AA$, the angle $\left(17.6^{\circ}\right)$ between the planes did not allow the ring interactions (Desiraju, 1989).

These results combined with NMR data of molecular complexes (9)-(16) in solution and the solid state provide valuable information about the nature of the linkage in the molecular complex.

| Compound | Conditions | C2 | C3 | Heterocyclic carbons |  |  |  | C7 | C7a | $\mathrm{C}_{\text {ipso }}$ | Picric acid carbons |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | C3a | C4 | C5 | C6 |  |  |  | $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{m}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{p}$ |
| (1) | DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ | 143.6 |  | 143.3 | 119.6 | 121.9 | 122.6 | 110.7 | 133.4 |  |  |  |  |
| (9) | DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ | 142.4 |  | 131.5 | 115.6 | 126.1 | 126.2 | 113.4 | 131.2 | 160.8 | 141.8 | 125.2 | 124.8 |
|  | CP/MAS | 143.3 |  | $\dagger$ | 114.7 | 126.4 | 126.4 | 110.8 | $\dagger$ | 161.3 | $\dagger$ | 126.4 | $\dagger$ |
| (3) | DMSO- $d_{6}$ | 137.6 |  |  | 128.3 | 118.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (11) | DMSO- $d_{6}$ | 136.5 |  |  | 122.0 | 119.9 |  |  |  | 160.9 | 141.8 | 125.2 | 124.4 |
| (3). $\mathrm{HBF}_{4}$ | DMSO- $d_{6}$ | 136.5 |  |  | 122.0 | 119.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (6) | DMSO- $d_{6}$ |  | 139.3 |  | 105.6 | 131.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (14) | DMSO- $d_{6}$ |  | 139.4 |  | 105.5 | 131.1 |  |  |  | 160.5 | 141.9 | 125.3 |  |
|  | CP/MAS |  | $\ddagger$ |  | 108.7 | $\ddagger$ |  |  |  | 161.7 | 142.0 | 125.6 | $\dagger$ |
| (8) | DMSO- $d_{6}$ |  | 139.3 |  | 105.6 | 131.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (16) | DMSO- $d_{6}$ |  | 139.1 |  | 106.0 | 132.1 |  |  |  | 160.3 | 141.9 | 125.4 | 125.5 |
|  | CP/MAS |  | 138.0 |  | 110.4 | 135.0 |  |  |  | 160.7 | 142.2 | 127.6 | $\dagger$ |
| (15) | DMSO- $d_{6}$ | 136.9 |  |  | 123.5 | 119.7 |  |  |  | 167.1 | 141.9 | 125.4 | 124.2 |
|  | CP/MAS | 136.4 |  |  | $\dagger$ | 120.2 |  |  |  | 162.4 | 146.6 | 126.1 | $\dagger$ |
| PA | DMSO- $d_{6}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 159.0 | 142.0 | 125.9 | 132.3 |

As shown in Table 4, the stability of the complexes is different in solution. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ chemical shifts of imidazole derivatives (10)-(13) and (15) are rather different from those observed for the free ligands (2)-(5) and (7), suggesting a strong bond with picric acid. However, in the pyrazole complexes (6) and (8) the linkage is completely destroyed in DMSO- $d_{6}$ solution, and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra of free ligands (6) and (8) and those from (14) and (16) are identical. The benzimidazole derivative (9), whose crystal structure has been elucidated here, represents an intermediate situation.

These results would suggest that in the case of imidazole derivatives (10)-(13) and (15) an actual proton transfer to N3 of the imidazole ring occurs, producing an ionic linkage which is stable in solution. Unfortunately, the picric acid hydroxyl resonance cannot be used to identify the proton transfer. In most cases this resonance is not visible or appears as a very broad signal, as in the case of (11), (12) and (13). However, the N3 protonation in (10)-(13) and (15) could be clearly observed because of the downfield shifting of H 2 (ca 1.50 p.p.m.) in all cases. The chemical shifts lie in the same range as observed in the protonated (3). $\mathrm{HBF}_{4}$ salt (see Table 4). Similar values have been found previously in imidazol-1ylacetic acid and 2-imidazol-1-yl-3-ethoxycarbonylpropionic acid obtained from neutral hydrolysis of (3) and (7) (Gil, Cruz, Cerdán \& Ballesteros, 1992; Gil, Zaderenko, Cruz, Cerdán \& Ballesteros, 1994; Zaderenko, Gil, Ballesteros \& Cerdán, 1994). These acids show a zwitterionic structure in the solid state and in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ solution, with proton transfer from the carboxylic group to the N3 of the imidazole ring (López, Zaderenko, Balcazar, Fonseca, Hernández-Cano \& Ballesteros, 1996).

Considering the bond patterns shown by (9) in the solid state, we can suggest that pyrazole derivatives (14) and (16) are linked in a similar manner. However, the poor electron-donor properties of N 2 of the pyrazole ring would imply less effective hydrogen bonds (Desiraju, 1995), which are destroyed in solution and are mantained only in the solid state.

To confirm this we compared the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ chemical shifts of some of the compounds in DMSO- $d_{6}$ solution and the solid state by the CP/MAS technique (Table 5). Protonation of N3 of the imidazole ring in (11) is confirmed since the chemical shifts of the corresponding C atoms showed the same values as those of (3). $\mathrm{HBF}_{4}$. However, ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ data in solutions of (14) and (16) are identical to those of the free ligands. In the solid state the differences between the free ligands (6) and (8) and the corresponding molecular complexes (14) and (16) are clearly observed. The resonances of C4 atoms in (14), and C4 and C5 atoms in (16) are shifted downfield by $+3.1,+4.8$ and +3.7 p.p.m., respectively.
The above results permit us to establish that the picric acid linkage clearly depends on the nature of the azole, being stronger in the case of imidazole. Its more basic
character $\left[\mathrm{p} K_{a}=6.99,1.43 \mathrm{p} K_{a}\right.$ units more basic than benzimidazole and $4.51 \mathrm{p} K_{a}$ units than pyrazole (Catalán, Abboud \& Elguero, 1987)] would allow proton transfer to form an ionic molecular complex. In fact, although we have not determined the $\mathrm{p} K_{a}$ values of all the azol-1ylalkanoic esters discussed here, we have reported previously the $\mathrm{p} K_{a}$ values in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ of (3) $\left(\mathrm{p} K_{a}=6.02\right)$ and methyl imidazol-1-ylacetate ( $\mathrm{p} K_{a}=6.35$ ): these esters are 1.12 and $0.79 \mathrm{p} K_{a}$ units more acidic than imidazole (Gil, Cruz, Cerdán \& Ballesteros, 1992; Gil, Zaderenko, Cruz, Cerdán \& Ballesteros, 1994). Considering the same relationship for the benzimidazole and pyrazole, it would be possible to estimate that the $\mathrm{p} K_{a}$ of (1) would be ca 4.44 and the $\mathrm{p} K_{a}$ of the pyrazole derivatives $c a 1.36$. The validity of this estimation is confirmed by the value obtained for (1) ( $\mathrm{p} K_{a}=4.54$ ), calculated according to the reported relationship between the $\mathrm{p} K_{a}$ of azoles and benzazoles in water solution: $\mathrm{p} K_{a}($ benzazole $)=-1.81+1.056 \mathrm{p} K_{a}($ azole $)$ (Catalán, Abboud \& Elguero, 1987). Thus, these azoles with an intermediate or relatively weak basic character yield picric acid molecular complexes, which are held together by hydrogen bonds involved in the supramolecular construction.
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[^0]:    $\dagger$ Lists of atomic coordinates, anisotropic displacement parameters, complete geometry, structure factors and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR data have been deposited with the IUCr (Reference: BM0007). Copies may be obtained through The Managing Editor, International Union of Crystallography, 5 Abbey Square, Chester CH1 2HU, England.

