

# A neutron diffraction study of the crystal of benzoic acid from 6 to 293K and a macroscopic-scale quantum theory of the lattice of hydrogen-bonded dimers

François Fillaux, Alain Cousson

#### ► To cite this version:

François Fillaux, Alain Cousson. A neutron diffraction study of the crystal of benzoic acid from 6 to 293K and a macroscopic-scale quantum theory of the lattice of hydrogen-bonded dimers. Chemical Physics, 2016, 479, pp.26-35. 10.1016/j.chemphys.2016.09.016 . hal-00637663v2

# HAL Id: hal-00637663 https://hal.science/hal-00637663v2

Submitted on 30 Sep 2016

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

#### A neutron diffraction study of the crystal of benzoic acid from 6 to 293 K and a macroscopic-scale quantum theory of the lattice of hydrogen-bonded dimers

François Fillaux<sup>a</sup>, Alain Cousson<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, UMR 8233, MONARIS, F-7505 Paris, France <sup>b</sup>Laboratoire Léon Brillouin (CEA-CNRS), C.E. Saclay, 91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, cedex, France

#### Abstract

Measurements via different techniques of the crystal of benzoie acid have led to conflicting conceptions of tautomerism: statistical disorder for diffraction; semiclassical jumps for relaxometry; quantum states for vibrational spectroscopy. We argue that these conflicts follow from the prejudice that nuclear positions and eigenstates are pre-existing to measurements, what is at variance with the principle of complementarity. We propose a self-contained quantum theory. First of all, new single-crystal neutron-diffraction data accord with long-range correlation for proton-site occupancies. Then we introduce a macroscopic-scale quantum-state emerging from phonon condensation, for which nuclear positions and eigenstates are indefinite. As to quantum-measurements, an incoming wave (neutron or photon) entangled with the condensate realizes a transitory state, either in the space of static nuclear-coordinates (diffraction), or in that of the symmetry coordinates (spectroscopy and relaxometry). We derive temperaturelaws for proton-site occupancies and for the relaxation rate, which compare favorably with measurements.

*Keywords:* Benzoic acid, Neutron diffraction, Hydrogen bonding, Tautomerism, tunneling, Quantum mechanics.

Preprint submitted to Elsevier

*Email addresses:* francois.fillaux@upmc.fr (François Fillaux), alain-f.cousson@cea.fr (Alain Cousson)

#### 1. Introduction

The crystal of benzoic acid (C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>5</sub>COOH) is a showcase for proton transfer across hydrogen bonds and tautomerism, which are both of importance in many fields across physics, chemistry and biology [1–22]. Diffraction reveals bistable centrosymmetric cyclic-dimers (C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>5</sub>COOH)<sub>2</sub> linked through hydrogen bonds. The lattice is comprised of tautomers, say  $L_1L_2$  (preferred) and  $R_1R_2$  (less favoured), exclusive of the symmetry-breaking configurations  $L_1R_2$  and  $R_1L_2$ (Fig. 1). The ratio  $R_1R_2 : L_1L_2$  increases smoothly and reversibly with temperature. Experimental and theoretical investigations enlighten the behavior of hydrogen bonds in a complex environment, with particular emphasis on proton tunneling that is a beacon for the emergence of classical from quantum.

$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{o}_{\mathbf{H}_{1}} \mathbf{m}_{1} \mathbf{e}_{2} \\ \mathbf{c}_{1} \mathbf{e}_{1} \mathbf{e}_{2} \\ \mathbf{o}_{1} \mathbf{m}_{1} \mathbf{e}_{2} \end{bmatrix}$
$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{H}_{1} & \mathbf{H}_{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{H}_{1} & \mathbf{R}_{2} & \mathbf{C} \\ 0 & \mathbf{H}_{1} & \mathbf{H}_{2} & \mathbf{C} \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{o} & \mathbf{h} & \mathbf{h} \\ \mathbf{c} & \mathbf{c} & \mathbf{h} \\ \mathbf{c} & \mathbf{c} & \mathbf{h} \\ \mathbf{o} & \mathbf{h} \\ \mathbf{h} \\ \mathbf{h} \end{bmatrix}$

Figure 1: Schematic lattice configurations for a crystal of benzoic acid.

At this point in time, there is no widespread agreement on the representation of proton transfer and tautomerism. (i) The coexistence of tautomers evidenced by diffraction is thought of as a random distribution of uncorrelated dimers  $L_1L_2$  and  $R_1R_2$  [4]. (ii) The proton relaxation-rate measured through solid-state-NMR or quasi-elastic neutron scattering (QENS) is represented by semiclassical stochastic jumps of rigid proton-pairs [7–20]. (iii) Vibrational spectra reveal the quantum nature of the crystal, as well as the nonlocal character of proton-states [21, 22]. (iv) Computational models for the crystal of benzoic acid [23–26], or for isolated dimers of formic acid [27–46], are based on Born-Oppenheimer separation of quantum electrons, on the one hand, and classical nuclei at fixed positions, on the other. Dynamical interconversion of tautomers

is represented by two mechanisms as concerted proton transfer in quasi 1-D at low temperature or/and stepwise single-proton transfer in quasi 2-D more likely at elevated temperature.

Here, we seek a self-contained theory bound to unquestionable facts. (i) The observed symmetry-related selection rules (*u*-infrared versus *g*-Raman) are those anticipated for centrosymmetric Bloch-states. (ii) There is no visible u - g splitting of the proton stretching-states to suggest any significant intradimer coupling term. (iii) For similar centrosymmetric dimers in the crystal of potassium hydrogen carbonate (KHCO<sub>3</sub>), the effective oscillator-mass of the proton states measured via inelastic neutron-scattering is practically 1 amu [47]. (iv) The observed energy-levels are consistent with double-well operators virtually identical for  $\nu_g$ OH and  $\nu_u$ OH (Table 1). The existing models are in conflict with these observations: (i) excludes interconversion via single-proton transfer; (ii) rules out concerted pairwise interconversion; (iii) excludes coupling terms with heavy atoms. The desired theory should be quantum in nature, what excludes definite trajectories for dimensionless nuclei [48].

A serious hurdle on the way toward a consistent theory is the diffraction work by Wilson et al. [4] reporting a significant amount of the less favored tautomer at low temperature ( $\approx 13\%$  at 20 K). This was attributed to a difference in tautomer entropy, that does not make any contact with solid-state NMR [15] and Fig. 1. In order to check this point, we have conducted new diffraction measurements and the data analysis reported in Sec. 2 argues against entropy. As to the theory, conflicts of representation appear when vibrational states and nuclei are thought of as elements of an objective reality attached to the crystal, irrespective of whether they are observed or not. In this present paper, this standpoint is referred to as "microrealism", by analogy with the notion of macrorealism introduced by Leggett and Garg [49]. Within the framework of quantum mechanics, conflicts can be ruled out because outcomes of measurements depend on the measuring apparatus. They are context-dependent and, according to the principle of complementarity [50], there is no deterministic relationship between positions and energies. Outcomes should be interpreted either

in the time-dependent wave-like representation, for spectroscopy and relaxometry, or in the static particle-like representation, for diffraction, knowing that these measurements are mutually exclusive and their representations pertain to orthogonal spaces. We elaborate on a crystal-state pre-existing to measurements, that is consistent with both representations. To this end, we introduce in Sec. 3 the notion of "quantum condensation", in line with our previous report on potassium dihydrogen phosphate ( $KH_2PO_4$  or KDP) [51].

#### 2. Neutron diffraction



Figure 2: (Color on line) Temperature laws for the occupancy factor of the less favored proton sites. • with error bars: experimental points (this work).  $\times$ : experimental points after [4]. Blue dot dashed with bars: eq. (7). Solid plus grey zone: eq. (8). Red dashed with bars: eq. (6). The grey zone and the bars represent dispersions of the theoretical curves due to uncertainties for the parameters.  $h\nu_l = (54\pm 6) \text{ cm}^{-1}$  and  $h\nu_{01} = (172\pm 4) \text{ cm}^{-1}$  are deduced from vibrational spectra.  $\Box$  and  $\diamond$ : (6) and (8), respectively, for  $p_l = 0$ .

Needle-shaped single-crystals  $(3 \times 3 \times 10 \text{ mm}^3)$  were grown by slowly cooling an ethanol-hexane solution. A specimen wrapped in aluminum was loaded in a



Figure 3: CO bond lengths as a function of the occupancy of the less favored proton sites.  $\blacksquare$  and  $\blacklozenge$  with error bars: experimental points (this work).  $\Box$  and  $\diamondsuit$ : after Ref. [[4]]. The straight lines are guides for the eyes.

closed-cycle-refrigerator. The temperature was controlled to within  $\pm 1$  K. Data were collected with the four-circle diffractometer, 5C2, based at the Orphée reactor of the Laboratoire Léon Brillouin [52].

Inspection of intensities for absent reflections confirms the  $P2_1/c$   $(C_{2h}^5)$ space-group assignment at every temperature [53]. The best structural parameters gathered in Table 2 were refined with CRYSTALS [54]. All parameters and probability densities at split proton-sites  $(\rho_L, \rho_R)$  were refined from Bragg-peak intensities, without further constraint. Temperature effects on the unit-cell parameters, the O···O lengths of  $C_i$ -dimers, the distances between proton sites along O···O bonds  $(d_{LR} \approx 0.70 \text{ Å})$ , as well as the aromatic-ring geometry, are rather modest and do not demonstrate any obvious trend.

The S-shaped  $\rho_R(T)$  (Fig. 2) as well as the best least squares fit to van't Hoff's law

$$\ln \frac{\rho_R}{\rho_L} = \Delta S_{\rho} + \Delta H_{\rho}/T$$

$$= -(0.07 \pm 0.03) + (86.8 \pm 1.7)/T$$
(1)

are consistent with a two-level system with negligible or even zero entropy. The enthalpy  $\Delta H_{\rho} = (86.8 \pm 1.7)$  K compares with previous estimates based on neutron diffraction,  $(80 \pm 7)$  K [4], solid-state NMR,  $(86.5 \pm 1.5)$  K [15], or

Raman,  $(54 \pm 6) \text{ cm}^{-1} = (81 \pm 9) \text{ K} [21, 22].$ 

Fig. 3 suggests a linear correlation between CO-bond lengths and  $\rho_L, \rho_R$ :

$$R_{C101}(T) = \rho_L(T)R_{C=O} + \rho_R(T)R_{C-O};$$
  

$$R_{C102}(T) = \rho_L(T)R_{C-O} + \rho_R(T)R_{C=O};$$
(2)

 $R_{\rm C=O} = 1.233$  Å,  $R_{\rm C-O} = 1.320$  Å,  $\rho_L(T) = (1 + \beta)^{-1}$ ,  $\rho_R(T) = \rho_L(T)\beta$ ,  $\beta = e^{-\Delta H_{\rho}/T}$ . This suggests distinct sublattices with fixed bond-lengths, in line with temperature-independent vibrational frequencies of the CO-modes [21, 22].

The total probability density at proton-sites is a constant:  $\rho = \rho_L(T) + \rho_L(T)$  $\rho_R(T) \equiv 1.00(1)$  [55]. This should be confronted with the cross-section anticipated for a static random distribution of uncorrelated occupied and empty sites with coherent scattering lengths  $b_{\rm H}$  and 0, respectively. According to Nield and Keen [56], we can split the scattering length at each site into two parts. The first part is the average scattering length  $b_{\rm H}^{av} = [b_{\rm H} + 0]/2$  and the second is the deviation  $b_{\rm H}^d = \pm r b_{\rm H}$ , where  $0 \le r \le 1/2$  is the occupancy of the less favored site. Then, the coherent differential cross-section is comprised of two non vanishing terms. Firstly, Bragg scattering proportional to  $(1-r)^2 b_{\rm H}^2$ . Secondly, a constant background of elastic diffuse scattering proportional to  $\overline{(b_{\rm H}^d)^2} = r^2 b_{\rm H}^2$ , hidden by the huge incoherent signal. Consequently, the total occupancy, that is a constant equal to 1, should be different from the total probability density  $\rho$  deduced from Bragg peak intensities effectively measured, that is expected to decrease from 1 at a very low temperature to 1/4 for r = 1/2 at room temperature. Our data suggest that  $\rho$  is independent of r, so  $\rho_L = (1 - r)$  and  $\rho_R = r$ . It transpires that probability densities at proton sites are strongly correlated and strict periodicity throughout the lattice yields Bragg scattering exclusively. Protons should be represented by extended density-waves, such that one and the same scatterer with coherent scattering length  $b_{\rm H}$  is simultaneously at every site with probability  $\rho_L$  and  $\rho_R$ , respectively. Then, Fig. 3 and (1) accord with a system of two tautomer-sublattice states at thermal equilibrium. Similar representations have been reported for various hydrogen bonded crystals [51, 57-61].

On the one hand, our  $\rho_R(T)$ -values are practically identical to those derived from solid-state NMR [15]. On the other hand, they are significantly different from those reported by Wilson et al. below 100 K [4] (X in Fig. 2), although their *R*-factors suggest data of reasonably good quality. Since hysteresis was excluded [4], temperatures claimed to be 50 K and 20 K by these authors were likely not the actual temperatures of the crystal.

Wilson et al. compared two structural models. On the one hand, they refined the mean position of protons (Fig. 2 in [4]). As the temperature increases, positions shift toward the bond center and thermal functions elongate dramatically along  $O \cdots O$ . This model is incompatible with the lack of frequency-shift for  $\nu$ OH modes. On the other hand, Wilson et al. considered protons split over two sites, as presented above. They set the total "occupancy", in fact the total probability density, to be a constant equal to 1 and they constrained the isotropic temperature factors to be equal (Fig. 3 in [4]). These two constrains amount to suppose strong correlations between proton-site occupancies and to exclude any random distribution. This model was found to be satisfactory, in accordance with our own data analysis. However, this work was not self-consistent, inasmuch as constrained probability densities and temperature factors were in conflict with the misleading entropy value of  $(0.27 \pm 0.08)$ cal.mol.<sup>-1</sup>K<sup>-1</sup> implying existence of more than two distinguishable tautomers. By contrast, our data show that  $\rho \equiv 1$  and  $\Delta S_{\rho} \approx 0$  are model-free.

#### 3. Quantum theory

A crystal is commonly represented by an ensemble of nuclear oscillators for which quantum correlations are destroyed by mechanisms extrinsic to the quantum theory [48], such as environment-induced decoherence [62–65]. In the harmonic approximation the molar Helmholtz energy for N degrees of freedom

per unit cell is

$$A_{i} = K + V - TS,$$
  
$$= \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left[ \mathcal{N}_{0} \frac{h\nu_{n}}{2} + \mathcal{R}T \ln\left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{h\nu_{n}}{kT}\right)\right) \right], \qquad (3)$$

where  $K, V, S, \mathcal{N}_0$  are the kinetic energy, the potential energy, the entropy and Avogadro's constant, respectively.

The decoherence scheme does not account for correlated occupancies at proton sites revealed by neutron diffraction (Sec. 2). In fact, for each degree of freedom of an isolated crystal, a superposition of phonons, say  $\propto \exp i(\mathbf{k}.\mathbf{u} \omega(\mathbf{k})t + \phi$ , with continuous distribution of arbitrary phases  $\phi$  yields a pure state, say  $|\Phi\rangle$ , that complies with the space-group symmetry operators of the crystal. The complexity of the statistical representation is hidden and new properties emerge. The wavefunction  $\Phi \equiv 0$  has continuous space-time-translation symmetry [51, 66]. Wavevectors, nuclear positions and time are indefinite. The potential energy and the entropy vanish. The eigenenergy for  $N\mathcal{N}_0$  free degreesof-freedom at thermal equilibrium is  $N\mathcal{R}T/2$ . It is single valued. Such a condensate is stable, as compared with the incoherent regime, if  $N\mathcal{R}T/2 < A_i$ . Since this condition is satisfied as  $TS \longrightarrow 0$  and not satisfied as  $TS \longrightarrow \infty$ , there is a dividing temperature for each mode. We suppose equipartition excludes coexistence in the same crystal of a coherent condensate for some degrees of freedom and incoherent phonons for other degrees of freedom, so the transition temperature of the crystal, say  $T_{ci}$ , should depend on the mean oscillator-energy  $h\bar{\nu}$ .

The isolated condensate has no definite property at the microscopic level. Our knowledge follows from statistics of contextual outcomes of complementary measurements, which are mutually exclusive. An incoming plane-wave (photon or neutron) entangled with the condensate breaks the continuous translationsymmetry and realizes a transitory Bloch-state at T, in-phase with the wave, that is not an eigenstate of the isolated crystal. Every single realization can be projected onto the eigenstates of a context-dependent operator distinctive of the quantum event in question. Bragg diffraction, namely coherent elas-

tic momentum-transfer breaking the continuous space-translation symmetry, realizes a static lattice-state in the momentum representation. Data acquisition reveals a pattern that can be transformed into positional parameters for nuclear-densities in direct space. Disorder is pointless. Coherent elastic diffuse scattering realizes a static non-periodic state. Incoherent elastic scattering realizes the static distribution of positional parameters. In every case, time remains indefinite, since there is no energy transfer, and temporal averaging is meaningless. Alternatively, energy transfer breaking the time-translation symmetry at a definite time  $t_0$  realizes either an eigenstate of the potential operator through resonance (Sec. 3.1), or a superposition through off resonance (Sec. 3.3), while nuclear positions remain indefinite. Bragg-diffraction, diffuse-coherent or incoherent elastic scattering, as well as quasi-elastic or inelastic events occur at random and are mutually exclusive, inasmuch as the outgoing wave is always detected as a single final state (wavefunction collapse). Individual quantum events are unpredictable. Only statistics are repeatable. Consequently, there is no deterministic relationship between contextual outcomes. Mutual exclusivity and lack of determinism still hold if one and the same instrument, such as a diffractometer, collects indiscriminately all events, coherent or incoherent, elastic or inelastic. Then, statistical outcomes of incompatible quantum events should be treated separately, within their respective representations, for a comprehensive account of the crystal.

On the molar-scale, the condensate as a whole is virtually unaffected by a single realization induced by a measuring instrument, or by the environment, and spontaneous decay of the induced state (Sect. 3.3) destroys quantum correlations with the outgoing wavefunction. The crystal is immune to decoherence. In addition, the probability for a wave to entangle a state previously realized is insignificant, so the outcome is independent of previous events.

Equation (3) yields  $T_{ci} > 300$  K if  $h\bar{\nu} > 350$  cm<sup>-1</sup>, what is likely for benzoic acid. We infer that a monodomain crystal at thermal equilibrium can be tentatively represented by a condensate that determines which microstate can be effectively realized and what outcome can be anticipated in the specific context

of a measuring apparatus. Diffraction data (Sec. 2) show that Bragg diffraction realizes a superposition of static sublattice-states and the outcome is a linear combination of nuclear-densities for disorder-free sublattices  $L_1L_2$  and  $R_1R_2$ . There is no evidence of coherent diffuse scattering due to a non-periodic distribution of static positions. Alternatively, vibrational spectroscopy reveals a two-level system, say l = 0 or 1, with energy gap  $h\nu_l$ , and eigenstates amenable to double-well operators [21, 22], which are rationalized in Sec. 3.1. Finally, relaxometry reveals a superposition state realized through off-resonance energy transfer (Sec. 3.3).

#### 3.1. Vibrational spectroscopy

It is commonly accepted that vibrational states can be deduced from a scalar potential function of the nuclear coordinates in direct space. However, this deterministic representation is in contradiction with two principles of quantum mechanics. Firstly, Heisenberg's uncertainty principle applied to nuclei at fixed positions means that kinetic momenta and the energy of the system are undetermined. Secondly, Bohr's complementarity principle [50]: because of the randomness of quantum events, there is no deterministic relationship between positions and energies, which are realized at random via mutually exclusive and unpredictable elastic or inelastic events, respectively. It is, therefore, necessary to consider distinct representations for nuclear positions and energy levels.

An introduction to our line of argument is the textbook case of two harmonic oscillators, say particles 1 and 2, represented by positional coordinates  $X_1, X_2$ , coupled via  $2K(X_1 - X_2)$ . In classical mechanics, the normal coordinates  $X_u, X_g$ , diagonalizing the Hamiltonian  $H(X_1, X_2) = H_u(X_u) + H_g(X_g)$ , are linear combinations of  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ . The particles oscillate in the plane  $\{X_1; X_2\} \equiv \{X_u; X_g\}$  with definite positions and momenta at any time. In quantum mechanics, deterministic trajectories are meaningless. The symmetry coordinates  $\Xi_u, \Xi_g$ , for the Hamiltonian operator  $\mathcal{H}_u(\Xi_u) + \mathcal{H}_g(\Xi_g)$  are not linear combinations of  $X_1, X_2$ . The classical representation in one and the same plane is replaced by a dichotomous representation in orthogonal planes:



Figure 4: Schematic of the proton static coordinates in the plane  $(x_1, x_2)$  perpendicular to that of the symmetry coordinates  $(\chi_u, \chi_g)$  for eigenstates. Bullets are distinctive positions discussed in the text. Sticks between bullets are guides for the eye.

 $\{\Xi_u; \Xi_g\}$  for eigenfunctions on the one hand,  $\{X_1; X_2\}$  for static positions on the other. There is neither energy-scale nor time-scale for  $\{X_1; X_2\}$ , whereas positions are indefinite for  $\{\Xi_u; \Xi_g\}$ . There is no correspondence between the potential operator  $\mathbb{V}_u(\Xi_u) + \mathbb{V}_g(\Xi_g)$  associated with the vibrational state vectors and the scalar potential  $V(X_1, X_2)$  for classical particles. The operator is, therefore, outside the bounds of the Born-Oppenheimer separation. It can be deduced from outcomes of measurements exclusively.

For the crystal of benzoic acid, we introduce nonlocal coordinates for particles or waves, beyond the bounds of the harmonic approximation. The static positional-parameters along  $O \cdots O$  bonds of particle-like protons  $1_i$  and  $2_i$  in the periodic lattice of dimers indexed  $i, 1 \leq i \leq \mathcal{N}_0$ , are represented by orthonormal coordinates  $x_1 = x_{1i}, x_2 = x_{2i} \forall i$ , in the plane  $\{x_1; x_2\}$  (Fig. 4). The symmetry coordinates for the degrees-of-freedom indexed  $m, 1 \leq m \leq \mathcal{N}_0$ , are represented by orthogonal coordinates  $\chi_u = \chi_{um}, \chi_g = \chi_{gm} \forall m$ , in the plane  $\{\chi_u; \chi_g\} \perp \{x_1; x_2\}$ .  $\{x_1; x_2\}$  is specific to static representations of outcomes of elastic events, while  $\{\chi_u; \chi_g\}$  holds for energy levels realized via inelastic events. This plane compares with the coordinates traditionally referred to as



Figure 5: Perspective view of the measurement-induced potential operator for the hydrogen bonding protons in the crystal of benzoic acid in the state l = 0.  $\chi_u$  and  $\chi_g$  are the symmetry coordinates of the "stretching" degrees of freedom.

"stretching", or  $\nu$ OH, in the classical harmonic approximation. This terminology remains convenient in quantum mechanics, but it does not refer any more to displacements.

The intersection line (dot-dashed in Fig. 4) is the locus for centrosymmetric configurations in x-space. Apart from this locus, configurations breaking  $C_i$ symmetry, eg  $R_1L_2$  or  $L_1R_2$ , are forbidden by space-group symmetry. The  $C_i$ symmetry is preserved throughout the  $\chi$ -plane, by construction. The eigenstates of the potential operators in 1-D, say  $\mathbb{V}_{\xi}(\chi_{\xi})$ ,  $\xi = "u"$  or "g", are  $|\psi_{\xi n}(\chi_{\xi})\rangle$ . The vibrational spectra [21, 22] are consistent with asymmetric double-wells for bare proton-waves, virtually identical for u and g species (Table 1), which are temperature-independent.

Vibrational spectra and neutron diffraction accord with realization of a combination of state vectors with energy-gap  $h\nu_l$ :

$$\phi\rangle = [|\mathcal{L}\rangle + p_l|\mathcal{R}\rangle](1+p_l)^{-1}; \tag{4}$$

where  $p_l = \exp(-h\nu_l/kT)$  is a deterministic temperature factor. These states are either separable (aka disentangled) for spectroscopy or non-separable (aka entangled) for diffraction or relaxometry.  $\mathbb{V}_{\mathcal{L}} = \mathbb{V}_0(\chi_u) + \mathbb{V}_0(\chi_g)$  is the operator



one-dimension is enhanced by a factor of 5. The quantum numbers are  $l, n_u, n_g$ , respectively. states.  $\chi_u$  and  $\chi_g$  are the symmetry coordinates. The weak component of the wave function in Figure 6: Schematic view of the wavefunctions of the measurement-induced "stretching"

for l = 0,  $\mathbb{V}_{\mathcal{R}} = \mathbb{V}_1(\chi_u) + \mathbb{V}_1(\chi_g) + h\nu_l$  for l = 1,  $|ln_u n_g\rangle = |ln_u\rangle|ln_g\rangle$  are the eigenstates. By convention, the minimum at  $L_{\xi}$  is lower than that at  $R_{\xi}$  for l = 0 and the energy difference between  $|01_{\xi}\rangle$  and  $|00_{\xi}\rangle$  is  $E_{01\xi} - E_{00\xi} = h\nu_{01}$  (Table 1). A *l*-flip  $(0 \leftrightarrow 1)$  toggles the sign of the double-well asymmetry, so  $R_{\xi}$  is lower than  $L_{\xi}$  and  $E_{11\xi} - E_{10\xi} = h\nu_{01}$ . The eigenstates of interest read:

$$|00_{\xi}\rangle = \cos\theta |\psi_{L\xi}\rangle + \sin\theta |\psi_{R\xi}\rangle; |10_{\xi}\rangle = \sin\theta |\psi_{L\xi}\rangle + \cos\theta |\psi_{R\xi}\rangle; |01_{\xi}\rangle = - \sin\theta |\psi_{L\xi}\rangle + \cos\theta |\psi_{R\xi}\rangle; |11_{\xi}\rangle = \cos\theta |\psi_{L\xi}\rangle - \sin\theta |\psi_{R\xi}\rangle.$$

(5)

 $\psi_{L\xi}$  and  $\psi_{R\xi}$  are eigenfunctions for polynomial expansions of the double-wells around  $L_{\xi}$  and  $R_{\xi}$ , respectively.  $2\theta = \arctan[\nu_{0\pm}/(\nu_{01}-\nu_{0\pm})]$ , where  $h\nu_{0\pm} = (6\pm 1) \text{ cm}^{-1}$  would be the ground-state splitting if  $h\nu_{01} = 0$ . Hence  $\cos\theta \approx 1$ and  $\sin\theta = \varepsilon = (1.8\pm 0.3)10^{-2}$ .  $\langle 00_{\xi}|\chi_{\xi}|00_{\xi}\rangle$  and  $\langle 11_{\xi}|\chi_{\xi}|11_{\xi}\rangle$  are localized to order  $\varepsilon^2$  at  $\langle L_{\xi}\rangle$ , whereas  $\langle 10_{\xi}|\chi_{\xi}|10_{\xi}\rangle$  and  $\langle 01_{\xi}|\chi_{\xi}|01_{\xi}\rangle$  are localized at  $\langle R_{\xi}\rangle$ .

The potential operator in 2 × 1-D and the eigenfunctions  $\Psi_{ln_un_g}(\chi_u, \chi_g)$  are sketched in Figs 5 and 6, respectively. In previous works [21, 22], the separation of x-space and  $\chi$ -space was overlooked, so the potential operator was represented as a scalar potential in direct space that is meaningless in quantum mechanics. Similarly, eigenfunctions represented in x-space were meaningless. In Fig. 5 the central barrier of  $\mathbb{V}_{\mathcal{L}}$  ( $\approx 10^4 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ ) is surrounded by four minima and we set the origin of the energy-scale to the lowermost state  $|000\rangle$ . Superposition of  $\mathbb{V}_{\mathcal{L}}$ and  $\mathbb{V}_{\mathcal{R}}$  yields 8 distinct minima. In Fig. 6,  $\Psi_{000}$  at zero and  $\Psi_{111}$  at  $h\nu_l$  +  $2h\nu_{01}$  are localized to order  $\varepsilon$  around  $\langle L_u L_g \rangle$ , centred at  $(-\Delta \chi_u/2, -\Delta \chi_g/2)$ .  $|\Psi_{000}|^2$  and  $|\Psi_{111}|^2$  are probability densities in  $\{x_1; x_2\}$  around the preferred configuration  $L_1L_2$  at  $(-d_{LR}/2, -d_{LR}/2)$  (Fig. 4).  $\Psi_{100}$  at  $h\nu_l$  and  $\Psi_{011}$  at  $2h\nu_{01}$  are localized around  $\langle R_u R_g \rangle$  centred at  $(\Delta \chi_u/2, \Delta \chi_g/2)$ .  $|\Psi_{100}|^2$  and  $|\Psi_{011}|^2$  are probability densities around the less favoured configuration  $R_1R_2$ at  $(d_{LR}/2, d_{LR}/2)$ . A dramatic consequence of the separation of x-plane and  $\chi$ -plane, as compared with classical mechanics, is that the states  $|ln_u \neq n_q\rangle$  at  $lh\nu_l + h\nu_{01}$  are localized outside the x-plane, around  $\langle R_u L_g \rangle$ ,  $(\Delta \chi_u/2, -\Delta \chi_g/2)$ , or  $\langle L_u R_g \rangle$ ,  $(-\Delta \chi_u/2, \Delta \chi_g/2)$ . The  $|\Psi_{ln_u \neq n_g}|^2$ 's are probability densities for proton-waves exclusively. They do not correspond to any static configuration.

This is a graphic illustration of the complementarity principle.

#### 3.2. Proton site occupancies

From the energy levels presented in fig. 6, we deduce the different temperature laws shown in fig. 2. Firstly, within the framework of microrealism, the R-site occupancy is

$$\rho_1 = \frac{p'_l}{(1+p'_l)(1+p'_{01})^2} + \frac{p'_{01}}{(1+p'_{01})^2} + \frac{p'_{01}^2}{(1+p'_l)(1+p'_{01})^2},$$

where  $p'_l = p_l$  and  $p'_{01} = \exp(-h\nu_{01}/kT)$  are statistical population factors (see red dash in Fig. 2). Secondly, from condensate viewpoint, measurement-induced lattice configurations depend on the deterministic temperature factors  $p_l$  and  $p_{01} = p'_{01}$ . In Fig. 2 we display two options. (i) The blue dot-dash for the two-level system:

$$\rho_2 = \frac{p_l}{1+p_l}.\tag{7}$$

(6)

(ii) The black solid if the states  $|l10\rangle$  and  $|l01\rangle$  are not realized via diffraction:

$$\rho_3 = \frac{p_l + p_{01}^2}{(1 + p_l)(1 + p_{01}^2)}.$$
(8)

This is the best option. Although there is no energy scale in x-space, temperature factors transpire from  $\chi$ -space through probability densities around the contact points  $L_uL_g - L_1L_2$  and  $R_uR_g - R_1R_2$ , while probability densities around  $R_uL_g$  or  $L_uR_g$  have no counterpart in x-space. Consequently, it is impossible to deduce the complete set of eigenstates of the potential operator from nuclear densities and, conversely, the complete energy level scheme is not representative of the probability density effectively measured via diffraction. Eigenstates and probability densities must be determined separately, via complementary measurements.

The site-occupancies are comprised of two terms:  $\rho_L = a(|\Psi_{000}|^2 + p_l p_{01}^2 |\Psi_{111}|^2)$ ;  $\rho_R = a(p_l |\Psi_{100}|^2 + p_{01}^2 |\Psi_{011}|^2)$ ;  $a = [(1 + p_l)(1 + p_{01}^2)]^{-1}$ . According to the classical words of chemistry, the states  $|000\rangle$  and  $|100\rangle$  would correspond to COOconfigurations  $L_1L_2$  and  $R_1R_2$  (Fig. 1), respectively, while the states  $|011\rangle$ and  $|111\rangle$  would correspond to transposition of proton pairs from C–O-sites to

C=O-sites at a rather modest energy cost. Then, the thermal laws for the mean CO-bond lengths should be different from (2). Alternatively, from condensate viewpoint, the COO-groupings are indefinite in the  $\chi$ -representation. The linear correlation (2) (Fig. 3) suggests that CO-bond lengths realized via diffraction match the proton-site occupancies determined via the contact points, so as to avoid the less favored structures.

From (8), we obtain  $\ln \frac{\rho_R}{\rho_L} = \ln(p_l + p_{01}^2)$  that is slightly different from (1). This could explain the residual entropy and the small difference, close to within data statistics, between  $\Delta H_{\rho}$  and  $h\nu_l$ . On the other hand, we anticipate that NMR should realize a linear combination of every eigenstates (see below sec. 3.3) and yield  $\ln \frac{\rho_R}{\rho_L} = \ln(\frac{\rho_1}{1-\rho_1})$ . In practice, (6), (7) or (8) cannot be distinguished conclusively on the ln-scale of van't Hoff plots.

#### 3.3. Relaxometry

Off-resonance energy-transfer realizes at the time t = 0 of the event a transitory state at T:

$$|S\rangle = \sum_{l,n_u,n_g} a_l b_{n_u n_g} |ln_u n_g\rangle; \tag{9}$$

 $a_0^2 = (1+p_l)^{-1}$ ;  $a_1^2 = p_l a_0^2$ ;  $b_{0,0}^2 = (1+p_{01})^{-2}$ ;  $b_{1,0}^2 = b_{0,1}^2 = p_{01}b_{0,0}^2$ ;  $b_{1,1}^2 = p_{01}^2b_{0,0}^2$ . Because  $S \equiv 0$ , each event realizes the same state and the relaxation statistics for a large number of events is predictable. The critical rate in  $2 \times 1$ -D is twice the ground-state splitting in 1-D ( $\nu_{0\pm} = 2\varepsilon\nu_{01}$ ) scaled by the amplitude of that part of the wavefunction equally delocalized over the four wells. Inspection of Fig. 6 allows us to distinguish three channels:

$$\tau^{-1} = 4\varepsilon\nu_{01} \left[ 2\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon p_{01}^{1/2} + 2p_{01}^{3/2} \right].$$
 (10)

The first term accounts for decay of  $\sum_{n_u,n_g} (a_0 b_{n_u n_g} |0n_u n_g\rangle + a_1 b_{n_u n_g} |1n_u n_g\rangle)$ through the 1-quantum channel  $1-h\nu_l$ , scaled by  $4\varepsilon^2$ . The second term is the  $1-h\nu_{01}$  channel for  $a_l b_{n_u n_g} |ln_u n_g\rangle + a_l b_{n'_u n'_g} |ln'_u n'_g\rangle$ , l = 0 or  $1, n'_u + n'_g - (n_u + n_g) =$ 1. The scaling amplitude is  $2\varepsilon$ . The last term is the  $2-h\nu_{01}$  channel for  $\sum_{n_u,n_g} a_l b_{n_u n_g} |ln_u n_g\rangle$ , l = 0 or 1, scaled by a factor of 4. Further *n*-quantum channels are negligible. It turns out that  $\tau^{-1}$  is independent of of  $p_l$ . The rate

is distinctive of quantum interferences, via probability amplitudes  $\varepsilon$ ,  $p_{01}^{1/2}$ ,  $p_{01}^{3/2}$ , while positional coordinates remain indefinite. The notion of particle-like protons tunneling back and forth across a barrier is meaningless.

As opposed to (10), Neumann et al. [15] have fitted NMR and QENS data with six phenomenological parameters inspired by the statistical model of Skinner and Trommsdorff [9]:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{exp}^{-1} &= (1.72 \pm 0.02) 10^8 \coth[(43 \pm 1)/kT] \\ &+ 10^{10} \exp(-120/kT) + 6.3 \times 10^{11} \exp(-400/kT). \end{aligned}$$

(11)

Here the rate follows from spontaneous fluctuations of nuclear positions and the measurement is a very weak process mirroring the unperturbed system. The first term represents "phonon-assisted" interconversion through "incoherent-tunneling" of rigid pairs. The other terms model classical jumps above potential barriers for distinct reaction-paths. This scheme accords with the existence of three relaxation channels, but rigid-pairs, low barriers and "phonon-assisted-tunneling" are excluded by spectroscopy.

In Fig. 7, (10) and (11) are similar, but their merits are quite different: two fixed parameters for the former as compared to six tuned parameters, which cannot be measured independently, for the latter. More fundamental, relaxometry is not amenable to microrealism because a snapshot of a stochastic ensemble of pre-existing particles, or wave packets, taken via a non-perturbing wave, is necessarily space-time averaged and should not demonstrate any rate. Alternatively, synchronization of the probe and the instability is intrinsic to quantum measurements of a pre-existing condensate.

In Fig. 7, there is no visible increase of the measured rate (11), as compared to (10), to suggest incoherent decay and/or emergence of the classical regime at elevated temperatures. In contrast with [7–20], relaxometry confirms that the bulk of the crystal is immune to decoherence.



Figure 7: Comparison of the empirical temperature law of benzoic acid (11) (solid line for unknown data statistics) with the quantum theory (10) (dot-dashed):  $\nu_{01} = 5.16 \times 10^{12} s^{-1}$ ,  $\varepsilon = 0.018$ ,  $\tau^{-1} = (2.3 \pm 1)10^8 + (6.77 \pm 1.15)10^9 \exp[-(128 \pm 13)/T] + (7.2 \pm 1.2)10^{11} \exp[-(385 \pm 9)/T]$ , in proton per second units. The grey zone features the uncertainty of the theoretical curve.

#### 4. Discussion

The crystal of benzoic acid is an open system amenable to the framework of quantum mechanics without any bias. The condensate follows from the linear formalism of quantum mechanics. The free energy determines thermal stability. The measurement-induced vibrational states are fully characterized by  $h\nu_l$ ,  $h\nu_{01}$  and  $\varepsilon$ , effectively measured. The level-scheme in  $\chi$ -space is model-free, inasmuch as the potential operator supporting the assignment scheme is of no physical importance. Positional parameters and proton-site occupancies in x-space are also model-free. The theory is self-contained.

The temperature laws (8) and (10) oppose to microrealism for which different statistics revealed by diffraction or spectroscopy should correspond to different physical systems. Alternatively, they accord with contextual outcomes of incompatible measurements. The relaxation rate of the delocalized protonwave is not representative of nuclear-displacements and the notion of dynamical interconversion through proton transfer is meaningless. In contrast with the

locally causal relationship between positions and energy in classical mechanics, well-established empirical correlations between structures in x-space and eigenstates in  $\chi$ -space are not amenable to local interactions. They emerge from statistics of unpredictable events building up either a diffraction pattern or a vibrational spectrum out from a condensate for which nuclear positions and energy levels are indefinite. The origin of such correlations could be in the quantum interplay between electrons and nuclei, that is beyond the bounds of the Born-Oppenheimer separation of quantum electrons and classical-like nuclei.

The framework can be applied to various hydrogen-bonded crystals [51]. In particular, the monoclinic crystal of KHCO<sub>3</sub> demonstrates quantum correlations up to 340 K [59, 67–69]. With hindsight, such correlations follow logically from a pre-existing condensate. The analogy with benzoic acid is straightforward since KHCO<sub>3</sub> is comprised of centrosymmetric dimers linked through hydrogen-bonds amenable to double-well operators:  $h\nu_{01} \approx 216 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  and  $\varepsilon \approx 5 \times 10^{-2}$  [70, 71]. The main difference is that the eigenstates of KHCO<sub>3</sub> at room temperature and below correspond to the left-hand-side column in Fig. 6, for a single four-well operator ( $p_l = 0$ ). Only  $|\Psi_{000}|^2$  and  $|\Psi_{011}|^2$  are relevant to diffraction. The difference between (6) and (8) is enhanced (Fig. 2,  $\Box$  and  $\diamond$ , respectively) and diffraction accords with the latter, in line with contextuality. In addition, the relaxation rate (10) turns into

$$\tau^{-1} = 4\varepsilon\nu_{01} \left[\varepsilon p_{01}^{1/2} + 2p_{01}^{3/2}\right]$$
(12)

that vanishes as  $T \longrightarrow 0$ , as effectively observed [72].

The framework can be also applied to isolated dimers of carboxylic-acids as follows. (i) Superposition of vibrational states yields a molecular condensate. (ii) Realization of non-separable isoenergetic  $|\mathcal{L}\rangle$  and  $|\mathcal{R}\rangle$  states yields a  $D_{2h}$ state [73]. (iii) The scheme for bare proton-waves is that depicted in Fig. 6 with  $h\nu_l = 0$ . (iv) The ground-state splitting is  $2h\tau^{-1}$  (10). The value  $2h\tau^{-1} =$  $(1.6 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-2}$  cm<sup>-1</sup> for the crystal of benzoic acid at T = 0 compares favourably with those reported for various dimers in supersonic jet-expansions:  $\approx 4.6 \times 10^{-2}$  cm<sup>-1</sup> for benzoic acid [74];  $\approx 1.8 \times 10^{-2}$  cm<sup>-1</sup> for benzoic-formic

acid heterodimers [75];  $\approx 1.9 \times 10^{-2} \text{ cm}^{-1}$  for 3-fluoro-benzoic acid [76];  $0.3 \times 10^{-2} - 1.6 \times 10^{-2} \text{ cm}^{-1}$  for (HCCOH)<sub>2</sub> or (DCOOH)<sub>2</sub> [77–79];  $\approx 0.8 \times 10^{-2} \text{ cm}^{-1}$  for formic-acetic acid [80];  $\approx 10^{-2} \text{ cm}^{-1}$  for formic-propiolic acid [81] etc. A superposition of four-well operators with opposite symmetries in 2×1-D could be thus a common feature for dimers of carboxylic acids and the mean observed splitting of  $\approx 1.76 \times 10^{-2} \text{ cm}^{-1}$  suggests that  $h\nu_1$  and  $\varepsilon$  are marginally affected by temperature and/or chemical substitution from crystals to isolated dimers.

Within the framework of classical mechanics, the dot-dash  $(x_1 = x_2)$  in Fig. 4 is the mean reaction-path for  $C_i$  proton-transfer. The configurations  $R_1L_2$  and  $L_1R_2$  at high energy being of no importance in supersonic jets, interconversion occurs in quasi 1-D. The distance between  $L_1L_2$  and  $R_1R_2$  is  $\sqrt{2d_{LR}}$ . The mass of the collective variable is 2 amu, or even more if it is correlated with displacements of heavy nuclei. The scalar double-well along the  $C_i$  locus should compare with cuts of  $\mathbb{V}_{\mathcal{L}}$  or  $\mathbb{V}_{\mathcal{R}}$  along the intersection line  $(\chi_u = \chi_q)$ , through the central barrier of  $\approx 10^4$  cm<sup>-1</sup> ( $\approx 30$  Kcal.mol<sup>-1</sup>), that is twice that in 1-D (Table 1). This is much greater than 3-12 Kcal.mol<sup>-1</sup> computed with quantum chemistry methods for the dimer of formic acid (see Table 2 in [46]). This difference is no wonder since the operator holds for bare proton-waves in  $\chi$ -space while quantum chemistry focuses on adiabatic transfer involving many degrees of freedom in x-space. In fact the condensate framework and quantum chemistry methods account for different systems, although with identical names. They are not comparable. It may happen that the lower adiabatic barrier counterbalances the longer inter-well distance and the greater collective mass, so as to yield, accidentally, a plausible value of the semiclassical tunneling-rate. Nevertheless, the classical view based on the Born-Oppenheimer separation is untenable since the barrier height, the inter-well distance and the collective mass are not in line with spectroscopy. As a matter of fact, the zero-point energy of a  $\nu OH$ transition observed at  $\approx~3000~{\rm cm^{-1}}$  yields a lower bound of  $\approx~4500~{\rm cm^{-1}}$  $(\approx 13.5 \text{ Kcal.mol}^{-1})$  for the barrier height in 1-D.

More fundamentally, beyond the great variety of computational models, an energy landscape in x-space is relevant for classical nuclei exclusively [30]. For

quantum nuclei, x-space is specific to elastic scattering events. There is neither energy-scale, nor potential function, nor spontaneous oscillations, nor locally causal relationship between positions and vibrational states. The dot-dashed locus in Fig. 4 is not a trajectory for the time evolution of a dimer. In contrast with previous works, eg [27, 33, 35, 42], the measurement-induced vibrational states cannot be deduced from a scalar landscape decorated with a quantized Hamiltonian. Minimum energy-paths [27, 28, 36], averaged trajectories [29, 34, 46], instanton rates [32, 33, 37] and collective variables do not capture any quantum phenomenon.

In addition to spectroscopic studies of cold molecules in supersonic jets, matter wave interferometry of  $C_{60}$  [82],  $C_{70}$  [83] and perfluoroalkylated molecules [84] sublimated at  $\approx 10^3$  K under high vacuum ( $\sim 10^{-11}$  bar) suggest that quantum condensation could be relevant for non hydrogenous molecules at elevated temperature. Interference fringes support the view that each molecule interferes with itself only. However, such interferences should not be visible if every single molecule could be represented by an incoherent mixture of internal vibrational states, since the spatial expansion of the vibrational wavefunctions should be similar to the de Broglie wavelength  $\lambda_{dB} \approx 0.025$  Å for C<sub>60</sub>, or even greater than  $\lambda_{dB}$  for perfluoralkylated derivatives. Translational and vibrational waves should not be separate through diffraction and each vibrational state should give its own pattern depending on the symmetry-related dephasing between neighboring slits. As a matter of fact, superposition of complementary fringes for symmetric or anti-symmetric states should smooth out the diffraction pattern. By contrast, the reported decoupling of the internal and external degrees of freedom under high vacuum accords with quantum condensation of the internal states, while the suppression of quantum interference as a function of the gas pressure in the vacuum chamber [85] accords with collision-induced breakdown of the continuous space-time translation symmetry.

#### 5. Conclusion

The crystal of benzoic acid at thermal equilibrium behaves as a condensate that is energetically favored, as compared to an incoherent mixture of phonons. Energy levels and nuclear positions (eg chemical bonds or tautomers) are indefinite. This framework can be applied to isolated dimers as well.

Outcomes of incompatible quantum measurements (diffraction versus spectroscopy) pertain to mutually exclusive representations, either in the space of static positional parameters, or in the orthogonal space of the symmetry coordinates for time-dependent eigenfunctions. Experimental studies of these complementary representations are necessary for a comprehensive account of the crystal.

Temperature effects are rationalized within a self-contained framework as follows: (i) measurement-induced realization of a temperature-dependent superposition of the state vectors of a two-level system; (ii) to each level is associated a four-well operator for bare proton-waves in  $2 \times 1$ -D that is comprised of identical asymmetric double-wells for each symmetry coordinate; (iii) the doublewells have opposite asymmetries for either state. Then, the temperature laws for proton-site occupancies, revealed by diffraction, or for the relaxation-rate of proton-waves, measured through solid-state NMR or quasi-elastic neutron scattering, and the energy-level scheme, revealed by spectroscopy, witness to the contextuality of outcomes of incompatible measurements. All observations accord with the quantum regime from cryogenic to room temperature.

In classical mechanics, tautomers are thought of as objective entities undergoing dynamical interconversion via nuclear trajectories, reaction paths and transition states. Archetypal mechanisms are concerted proton transfer in quasi 1-D at low temperature or/and stepwise single-proton transfer in quasi 2-D, more likely at elevated temperature. This intuitive scheme does not capture the quantum nature of the dimer of benzoic acid attested by spectroscopy. In the quantum regime, dynamical interconversion is meaningless. On the one hand, nuclear-site occupancies mirror the static tautomerization degree. On the other

hand,  $C_i$ -symmetry coordinates account for delocalization of proton waves in  $2 \times 1$ -D. There is no causal relationship due to local interactions between these representations. It turns out that for those systems whose quantum nature is attested by any technique, among which vibrational spectroscopy is the most straightforward, computational chemistry, nuclear trajectories, proton-transfer mechanisms, reaction paths along collective variables, transition states, etc, are pointless.

- S. Hayashi, J. Umemura, Disappearances of COOH infrared bands of benzoic acid, J. Chem. Phys. 60 (7) (1974) 2630–2633.
- [2] S. Hayashi, J. Umemura, Infrared spectroscopic evidence for the coexistence of two molecular conformations in crystalline fatty acids, J. Chem. Phys. 63 (5) (1975) 1732–1740.
- [3] S. Hayashi, M. Oobatake, R. Nakamura, K. Machida, Interpretation for the anomaly of the C=O stretching band in benzoic acid crystal, J. Chem. Phys. 94 (6) (1991) 4446–4452.
- [4] C. C. Wilson, N. Shankland, A. J. Florence, Direct determination of the temperature dependence of proton transfer in the benzoic acid dimer by single crystal neutron diffraction, Chem. Phys. Letters 253 (1996) 103–107.
- [5] C. C. Wilson, N. Shankland, A. J. Florence, A single-crystal neutron diffraction study of the temperature dependence of hydrogen-atom disorder in benzoic acid dimers, J. Chem. Soc., Faraday Trans. 92 (1996) 5051–57.
- [6] C. C. Wilson, X. Xu, A. J. Florence, N. Shankland, Temperature dependence of proton transfer in 4-chlorobenzoic acid, New J. Chem. 30 (2006) 979–981.
- B. H. Meier, F. Graf, R. R. Ernst, Structure and dynamics of intramolecular hydrogen bonds in carboxylic acid dimers: A solid state NMR study, J. Chem. Phys. 76 (2) (1982) 767–774.

- [8] R. Meyer, R. R. Ernst, Hydrogen transfer in double minimum potential: Kinetic properties derived from quantum dynamics, J. Chem. Phys. 86 (2) (1987) 784–801.
- [9] J. L. Skinner, H. P. Trommsdorff, Proton transfer in benzoic acid crystals: A chemical spin-boson problem. Theoretical analysis of nuclear magnetic resonance, neutron scattering, and optical experiments, J. Chem. Phys. 89 (2) (1988) 897–907.
- [10] A. Stöckli, B. H. Meier, R. Meyer, R. R. Ernst, Hydrogen bond dynamics in isotopically substituted benzoic acid dimers, J. Chem. Phys. 93 (3) (1990) 1502–1520.
- [11] R. Meyer, R. R. Ernst, Transitions induced in a double minimum system by interaction with a quantum mechanical heat bath, J. Chem. Phys. 93 (8) (1990) 5518–5532.
- [12] A. Heuer, U. Haeberlen, The dynamics of hydrogens in double well potentials: The transition of the jump rate from the low temperature quantummechanical to the high temperature activated regime, J. Chem. Phys. 95 (1991) 4201–4214.
- [13] V. P. Sakun, M. V. Vener, N. D. Sokolov, Proton tunneling assisted by the intermolecular vibration excitation. Temperature dependence of the proton spin-lattice relaxation time in benzoic acid powder, J. Chem. Phys. 105 (2) (1996) 379–387.
- [14] D. F. Brougham, A. J. Horsewill, R. I. Jenkinson, Proton transfer dynamics in the hydrogen bond: a direct measurement of the incoherent tunneling rate by NMR and the quantum-to-classical transition, Chem. Phys. Letters 272 (1997) 69–74.
- [15] M. Neumann, D. F. Brougham, C. J. McGloin, M. R. Johnson, A. J. Horsewill, H. P. Trommsdorff, Proton tunneling in benzoic acid crystals

at intermediate temperatures: Nuclear magnetic resonance and neutron scattering studies, J. Chem. Phys. 109 (17) (1998) 7300–7311.

- [16] L. Latanowicz, E. C. Reynhardt, Quantum mechanical and classical dynamics of double proton transfer in the hydrogen bond, Chem. Phys. Letters 341 (2001) 561–567.
- [17] S. Takeda, A. Tsuzuminati, An indication of slowing down of hydrogen atom transfer in isotopically mixed hydrogen bonds of benzoic acid crystals, Magn. Reson. Chem. 39 (2001) S44–S49.
- [18] L. Latanowicz, E. C. Reynahardt, J. Boguszyńska, Complex dynamics of proton and deuteron transfer in double hydrogen bond of benzoic acid isotopes, J. Molec. Struct. (Theochem) 710 (2004) 111–117.
- [19] Q. Xue, A. J. Horsewill, M. R. Johnson, H. P. Trommsdorff, Isotope effects associated with tunneling and double proton transferr in the hydrogen bonds of benzoic acid, J. Chem. Phys. 120 (23) (2004) 11107–11119.
- [20] W. Wu, D. L. Noble, A. J. Horsewill, The correspondence between quantum and classical mechanics: an experimental demonstration of the smooth transition between the two regimes, Chem. Phys. Letters 402 (2005) 519– 523.
- [21] F. Fillaux, M.-H. Limage, F. Romain, Quantum proton transfer and interconversion in the benzoic acid crystal: vibrational spectra, mechanism and theory, Chem. Phys. 276 (2002) 181–210.
- [22] F. Fillaux, F. Romain, M.-H. Limage, N. Leygue, Extended tunneling states in the benzoic acid crystal: Infrared and raman spectra of the OH and OD stretching modes, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 8 (2006) 4327 – 4336.
- [23] M. Plazanet, N. Fukushima, M. R. Johnson, A. J. Horsewill, H. P. Trommsdorff, The vibrational spectrum of crystalline benzoic acid: Inelastic neutron scattering and density functional theory calculations, J. Chem. Phys. 115 (7) (2001) 3241–3248.

- [24] M. R. Johnson, H. P. Trommsdorff, Dispersion of vibrational modes in benzoic acid crystals, Chem. Phys. Letters 364 (2002) 34–38.
- [25] M. Takahashi, Y. Kawazoe, Y. Ishikawa, H. Ito, Interpretation of temperature-dependent low frequency vibrational spectrum of solid-state benzoic acid dimer, Chem. Phys. Letters 479 (2009) 211–217.
- [26] R. Li, J. A. Zeitler, D. Tomerini, E. P. J. Parrott, L. F. Gladden, G. M. Day, A study into the effect of subtle structural details and disorder on the terahertz spectrum of crystalline benzoic acid, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 12 (2010) 5329–5340.
- [27] N. Shida, P. F. Barbara, J. Almlöf, A reaction surface hamiltonian treatment of the double proton transfer of formic acid dimer, J. Chem. Phys. 94 (5) (1991) 3633–3643.
- [28] Y. Kim, Direct dynamics calculation for the double proton transfer in formic acid dimer, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 118 (1996) 1522–1528.
- [29] S. Miura, M. E. Tuckerman, M. L. Klein, An ab initio path integral molecular dynamics study of double proton transfer in the formic acid dimer, J. Chem. Phys. 109 (1998) 5290–5299.
- [30] H. Ushiyama, K. Takatsuka, Successive mechanism of double-proton transfer in formic acid dimers: a classical study, J. Chem. Phys. 115 (13) (2001) 5903–5912.
- [31] Z. Smedarchina, A. Fernandez-Ramos, W. Siebrand, Calculation of the tunneling splitting in the zero-point level and CO-stretch fundamental of the formic acid dimer, Chem. Phys. Letters 395 (2004) 339–345.
- [32] Z. Smedarchina, A. Fernandez-Ramos, W. Siebrand, Tunneling dynamics of double proton transfer in formic acid and benzoic acid dimers, J. Chem. Phys. 122 (2005) 134309–12.

- [33] G. V. Mil'nikov, O. Kühn, H. Nakamura, Ground-state and vibrationally assisted tunneling in the formic acid dimer, J. Chem. Phys. 123 (2005) 074308–9.
- [34] P. R. L. Markwick, N. L. Doltsinis, D. Marx, Targeted Car-Parinello molecular dynamics: Elucidating double proton transfer in formic acid dimer, J. Chem. Phys. 122 (2005) 054112–8.
- [35] D. Luckhaus, Concerted hydrogen exchange tunneling in formic acid dimer, J. Phys. Chem. A 110 (2006) 3151–3158.
- [36] I. Matanović, N. Došlić, O. Kühn, Ground and asymmetric CO-stretch excited state tunneling splittings in the formic acid dimer, J. Chem. Phys. 127 (2007) 014309–7.
- [37] Z. Smedarchina, W. Siebrand, A. Fernández-Ramos, Correlated doubleproton transfer. I. Theory, J. Chem. Phys. 127 (2007) 174513.
- [38] G. L. Barnes, E. L. Sibert III, The effects of asymmetric motions on the tunneling splittings in formic acid dimer, J. Chem. Phys. 129 (2008) 164317–9.
- [39] G. L. Barnes, S. M. Squires, E. L. Sibert III, Symmetric double proton tunneling in formic acid dimer: A diabatic basis approach, J. Phys. Chem. B 112 (2008) 595–603.
- [40] I. Matanović, N. Došlić, B. R. Johnson, Generalized approximation to the reaction path: The formic acid dimer case, J. Chem. Phys. 128 (2008) 084103–10.
- [41] W. Siebrand, Z. Smedarchina, A. Fernández-Ramos, Tunneling splitting and level ordering in a CO-stretch fundamental of the formic acid dimer, Chem. Phys. Letters 459 (2008) 22–26.
- [42] D. Luckhaus, Hydrogen exchange in formic acid dimer: tunneling above the barrier, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 12 (2010) 8357–8361.

- [43] B. Saritha, M. Durga Prasad, An electronic structure perspective of the promoter modes in proton transfer reactions, J. Phys. Chem. A 115 (2011) 2802–2810.
- [44] A. Jain, E. L. Sibert III, Tunneling splittings in formic acid dimer: An adiabatic approximation to the Herring formula, J Chem Phys 142 (2015) 084115.
- [45] G. A. Pitsevich, A. E. Malevich, E. N. Kozlovskaya, I. Y. Doroshenko, V. Sablinskas, V. E. Pogorelov, D. Dovgal, V. Balevicius, Anharmonic analysis of C-H and O-H stretching vibrations of the formic acid dimer, Vibrational Spectroscopy 79 (2015) 67–75.
- [46] S. D. Ivanov, I. M. Grant, D. Marx, Quantum free energy landscapes from ab initio path integral metadynamics: Double proton transfer in the formic acid dimer is concerted but not correlated, J. Chem. Phys. 143 (2015) 124304.
- [47] S. Ikeda, S. Kashida, H. Sugimoto, Y. Yamada, S. M. Bennington, F. Fillaux, Inelastic neutron scattering study of the localized dynamics of protons in KHCO<sub>3</sub> single crystals, Phys. Rev. B 66 (2002) 184302.
- [48] A. J. Leggett, Testing the limits of quantum mechanics: motivation, state of play, prospects, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 14 (2002) R415–R451.
- [49] A. J. Leggett, A. Garg, Quantum mechanics versus macroscopic realism: Is the flux there when nobody looks?, Phys. Rev. Letters 54 (9) (1985) 857–860.
- [50] A. Plotnitsky, What is complementarity?: Niels Bohr and the architecture of quantum theory, Phys. Scr. T163 (2014) 01402 (20pp).
- [51] F. Fillaux, A. Cousson, Quantum interferences revealed by neutron diffraction accord with a macroscopic-scale quantum-theory of ferroelectrics KH<sub>2(1-ρ)</sub>D<sub>2ρ</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>, Eur. Phys. J. B 89 (2016) 72–13.

- [52] http://www-llb.cea.fr.
- [53] See supplementary material at [] for crystallographic information files.
- [54] http://www.xtl.ox.ac.uk/crystals.html.
- [55] See supplementary material Tables at [] for the refined structural parameters.
- [56] V. M. Nield, D. A. Keen, Diffuse neutron scattering from crystalline materials, Vol. 14 of Oxford series on neutron scattering in condensed matter, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2001.
- [57] R. J. Nelmes, On the structural evidence for a direct proton tunnelling effect in the KH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>-type transition, J. Phys. C:Sold State Phys. 21 (1988) L881–L886.
- [58] F. Fillaux, A. Cousson, M. J. Gutmann, Proton transfer across hydrogen bonds: From reaction path to Schrödinger's cat, Pure Appl. Chem. 79 (6) (2007) 1023–1039.
- [59] F. Fillaux, A. Cousson, Nonlocal protons and deuterons opposed to disorder: a single-crystal neutron diffraction study of KH<sub>0.76</sub>D<sub>0.24</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> and a theoretical framework, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 20 (2008) 252202.
- [60] F. Fillaux, A. Cousson, M. J. Gutmann, Evidence of macroscopically entangled protons in a mixed crystal of KH<sub>p</sub>D<sub>1-p</sub>CO<sub>3</sub>, J. Phys.: Cond. Matter 22 (2010) 045402.
- [61] F. Fillaux, A. Cousson, Neutron scattering studies of K<sub>3</sub>H(SO<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub> and K<sub>3</sub>D(SO<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub>: The particle-in-a box model for the quantum phase transition, J. Chem. Phys. 137 (2012) 074504–10.
- [62] E. Joos, H. D. Zeh, The emergence of classical properties through interaction with the environment, Z. Phys. B-Cond. Matter 59 (1985) 223–243.

- [63] W. H. Zurek, Decoherence and the transition from quantum to classical, Phys. Today 44 (1991) 36–44.
- [64] W. H. Zurek, Decoherence, einselection and the quantum origin of the classical, Rev. Modern Phys. 75 (3) (2003) 715–775.
- [65] W. H. Zurek, Quantum darwinism, classical reality, and the randomness of quantum jumps, Phys. Today 67 (2014) 44–50.
- [66] P. Coleman, Time crystals, Nature 493 (2013) 166–167.
- [67] S. Ikeda, F. Fillaux, Incoherent-elastic-neutron scattering study of the vibrational dynamics and spin-related symmetry of protons in the KHCO<sub>3</sub> crystal, Phys. Rev. B 59 (1999) 4134–4145.
- [68] F. Fillaux, A. Cousson, M. J. Gutmann, Macroscopic quantum entanglement and "super-rigidity" of protons in the KHCO<sub>3</sub> crystal from 30 to 300 K, J. Phys.: Cond. Matter 18 (2006) 3229–3249.
- [69] F. Fillaux, A. Cousson, M. J. Gutmann, A neutron diffraction study of macroscopically entangled proton states in the high temperature phase of the KHCO<sub>3</sub> crystal at 340 K, J. Phys.: Cond. Matter 20 (2008) 015225.
- [70] F. Fillaux, Calculation of infrared and raman band profiles of strong hydrogen bonds. OH stretching band and proton dynamics in crystalline potassium hydrogen carbonate, Chem. Phys. 74 (1983) 405–412.
- [71] F. Fillaux, J. Tomkinson, J. Penfold, Proton dynamics in the hydrogen bond. The inelastic neutron scattering spectrum of potassium hydrogen carbonate at 5 K, Chem. Phys. 124 (3) (1988) 425–437.
- [72] G. Eckold, H. Grimm, M. Stein-Arsic, Proton disorder and phase transition in KHCO<sub>3</sub>, Physica B 180-181 (1992) 336–338.
- [73] F. Fillaux, Quantum entanglement and nonlocal proton transfer dynamics in dimers of formic acid and analogues, Chem. Phys. Letters 408 (2005) 302–306.

- [74] I. Kalkman, C. Vu, M. Schmitt, W. L. Meerts, Tunneling splittings in the S<sub>0</sub> and S<sub>1</sub> states of the benzoic acid dimer determined by high-resolution UV spectroscopy, Chemphyschem 9 (2008) 1788–1797.
- [75] L. Evangelisti, P. Écija, E. J. Cocinero, F. C. o, A. Lesarri, W. C. R. Meyer, Proton tunneling in heterodimers of carboxylic acids: A rotational study of the benzoic acidformic acid bimolecule, J. Phys. Chem Letters 3 (2012) 3770–3775.
- [76] A. M. Daly, S. J. Carey, A. M. Pejlovas, K. Li, L. Kang, S. G. Kukolich, Gas phase measurements of mono-fluoro-benzoic acids and the dimer of 3-fluoro-benzoic acid, J. Chem. Phys. 142 (2015) 144303.
- [77] F. Madeja, M. Havenith, High resolution spectroscopy of carboxylic acid in the gas phase: Observation of proton transfer in (DCOOH)<sub>2</sub>, J. Chem. Phys. 117 (15) (2002) 7162–7168.
- [78] M. Ortlieb, M. Havenith, Proton transfer in (HCOOH)<sub>2</sub>: An IR highresolution spectroscopy studyof the antisymmetric C–O stretch, J. Phys. Chem. A 111 (2007) 7355–7363.
- [79] A. Gutberlet, G. W. Schwaab, M. Havenith, High resolution IR spectroscopy of the carbonyl stretch of (DCOOD)<sub>2</sub>, Chem. Phys. 343 (2008) 158–167.
- [80] M. C. D. Tayler, B. Ouyang, B. J. Howard, Unraveling the spectroscopy of coupled intramolecular tunneling modes: A study of double proton transfer in the formic-acetic acid complex, J. Chem. Phys. 134 (2011) 054316–9.
- [81] A. M. Daly, K. O. Douglass, L. C. Sarkozy, J. L. Neill, M. T. Muckle, D. P. Zaleski, B. H. Pate, S. G. Kukolich, Microwave measurements of proton tunneling and structural parameters for the propiolic acid-formic acid dimer, J. Chem. Phys. 135 (2011) 154304–12.

- [82] M. Arndt, O. Nairz, J. Vos-Andreae, C. Keller, G. van der Zouw, A. Zeilinger, Waveparticle duality of c<sub>60</sub> molecules, Nature 401 (1999) 680– 682.
- [83] B. Brezger, L. Hackermller, S. Uttenthaler, J. Petschinka, M. Arndt, A. Zeilinger, Matter-wave interferometer for large molecules, Phys. Rev. Letters 88 (2002) 100404.
- [84] S. Gerlich, S. Eibenberger, M. Tomandl, S. Nimmrichter, K. Hornberger,
  P. J. Fagan, J. Tüxen, M. Mayor, M. Arndt, Quantum interference of large organic molecules, Nature communications 2 (2011) 263.
- [85] K. Hornberger, S. Uttenthaler, B. Brezger, L. Hackermller, M. Arndt, A. Zeilinger, Collisional decoherence observed in matter wave interferometry, Phys. Rev. Letters 90 (2003) 160401.

MA

Table 1: Double-well operators, distances between minima  $(\Delta \chi_{\xi})$ , barrier heights  $(H_{\xi})$ , and energy levels, for the crystal of Benzoic acid.  $\chi_{\xi}$  are the symmetry species infrared-  $(\chi_u)$  or Raman-active  $(\chi_g)$ . The oscillator mass is  $\mu_u = \mu_g = 1$  amu. \*: observed via inelastic neutron scattering after Ref. [[23]].

RIP

	$\mathbb{V}_{L\xi}(\chi_{\xi}) \ (\mathrm{cm}^{-1})$	$\Delta \chi_0$ (Å)	$H_{\xi} \ (\mathrm{cm}^{-1})$	$h\nu_{01\xi} \ ({\rm cm}^{-1})$	$h\nu_{02\xi} \ ({\rm cm}^{-1})$	$h\nu_{03\xi} \ ({\rm cm}^{-1})$
Infrared [21]	$265\chi_u + 0.2860 \times 10^6 \chi_u^2$	0.70	5005	$(172 \pm 4)^*$	$2570\pm20$	$2840\pm20$
	$+171480\exp(-2.17\chi_u^2)$					
Raman $[22]$	$270\chi_g + 0.2829 \times 10^6 \chi_g^2$	0.69	5006	$171\pm4$	$2602\pm4$	$2853\pm4$
	$+171120\exp(-2.15\chi_g^2)$					
C						

3

Crystal data	6 K	$25 \mathrm{K}$	$50 \mathrm{K}$	$75~\mathrm{K}$	$100 \mathrm{K}$	125 K	150 K	$175 \mathrm{~K}$	$200 {\rm K}$	$250~{\rm K}$
$a(\text{\AA})$	5.401(1)	5.401(1)	5.415(1)	5.415(1)	5.500(1)	5.427(1)	5.456(1)	5.456(1)	5.500(1)	5.500(1
$b(\mathrm{\AA})$	5.004(1)	5.004(1)	5.016(1)	5.016(1)	5.100(1)	5.112(1)	5.074(1)	5.074(1)	5.100(1)	5.100(1
$c(\text{\AA})$	21.879(1)	21.879(1)	21.826(1)	21.826(1)	22.020(1)	21.810(1)	21.875(1)	21.875(1)	22.020(1)	22.020(
eta	$98.47(1)^{\circ}$	$98.47(1)^{\circ}$	$98.44(1)^{\circ}$	$98.44(1)^{\circ}$	$97.90(1)^{\circ}$	$98.26(1)^{\circ}$	$98.12(1)^{\circ}$	$98.12(1)^{\circ}$	$97.90(1)^{\circ}$	97.90(1
Volume (Å <sup>3</sup> )	584.8(2)	584.8(2)	586.4(2)	586.4(2)	611.8(2)	598.8(2)	599.4(2)	599.4(2)	611.8(2)	611.8(2
Reflections measured	2950	3594	2797	3364	3067	3092	2778	3607	3502	3828
Independent reflections	2589	2637	1946	2645	2724	2283	2297	2300	2714	2748
Reflections used	1649	1679	1382	1472	1363	1122	1018	951	1031	755
R-factor	0.093	0.079	0.058	0.090	0.051	0.048	0.047	0.041	0.069	0.049
Weighted R-factor	0.114	0.097	0.068	0.051	0.053	0.048	0.049	0.037	0.045	0.032
Number of parameters	132	137	137	137	137	137	137	137	137	137
Goodness of fit	1.148	1.117	1.113	1.026	1.085	1.124	1.134	1.101	1.033	1.113
Occupation $\rho_L$	1.00	0.966(13)	0.852(13)	0.761(13)	0.69(1)	0.65(1)	0.61(1)	0.59(1)	0.583(12)	0.57(2)
Occupation $\rho_R$	0.00	0.034(13)	0.148(13)	0.239(13)	0.31(1)	0.34(1)	0.38(1)	0.41(1)	0.417(12)	0.43(2)
$d_{LR}$ (Å)			0.68(1)	0.71(1)	0.69(1)	0.69(1)	0.67(1)	0.72(1)	0.70(1)	0.69(2)
$R_{\rm OO}$ (Å)	2.623(5)	2.621(5)	2.619(5)	2.614(5)	2.646(5)	2.628(5)	2.621(5)	2.610(5)	2.624(5)	2.623(5
Bond length C1O1 (Å)	1.233(3)	1.236(3)	1.244(3)	1.251(3)	1.268(2)	1.261(3)	1.269(3)	1.263(2)	1.271(3)	1.264(3
Bond length C1O2 (Å)	1.320(3)	1.313(3)	1.305(3)	1.293(3)	1.302(1)	1.286(3)	1.279(3)	1.280(3)	1.279(3)	1.276(4

Table 2: Neutron single crystal diffraction data and structure refinement of benzoic acid.  $\lambda = 0.8305$  Å. Space group  $P2_1/c$ .  $\sigma(I)$  limit: 3.00. Refinement on F. The occupation numbers for the proton sites are  $\rho_L$  and  $\rho_R$ . The variance for the last digit is given in parentheses.

34

#### Supplementary files:

Single-crystal neutron diffraction data of benzoic acid

#### 6 K

```
data_CRYSTALS_cif
_audit_creation_date 10-07-01
_audit_creation_method CRYSTALS_ver_12.84
```

```
_oxford_structure_analysis_title 'benzoic acid 6K 5C2'
_chemical_name_systematic ?
_chemical_melting_point ?
```

CR1P

_cell_length_a	5.4007(10)
_cell_length_b	5.0037(10)
_cell_length_c	21.8787(10)
_cell_angle_alpha	90
_cell_angle_beta	98.475(10)
_cell_angle_gamma	90
_cell_volume	584.78(16)

```
_symmetry_cell_setting 'Monoclinic'
_symmetry_space_group_name_H-M 'P 1 21/c 1 '
_symmetry_space_group_name_Hall '?'
loop_
_symmetry_equiv_pos_as_xyz
'x,y,z'
'-x,-y,-z'
'-x,y+1/2,-z+1/2'
'x,-y+1/2,z+1/2'
```

```
loop_
```
\_atom\_type\_symbol

\_atom\_type\_scat\_dispersion\_real \_atom\_type\_scat\_dispersion\_imag \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a1 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b1 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a2 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b2 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b3 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a4 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b4 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_c

D 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 6.6710 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 С 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 6.6460 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 Η 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 -3.7390 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 Ν 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 9.3600 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 5.8030 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4'

CRIF

\_cell\_formula\_units\_Z

4

# Given Formula = C1.75 H1.75 00.50
# Dc = 0.35 Fooo = 148.00 Mu = 0.26 M = 30.78
# Found Formula = C7 H6 02
# Dc = 1.39 F000 = 148.00 Mu = 1.02 M = 122.12



	_diffrn_radiation_wavelength	0.83200
	_diffrn_measurement_method	\w
	# If a reference occurs more than	once, delete the author
	# and date from subsequent referen	nces.
	_computing_data_collection	'USER DEFINED DATA COLLECTION'
	_computing_cell_refinement	'USER DEFINED CELL REFINEMENT'
	_computing_data_reduction	'USER DEFINED DATA REDUCTION'
	_computing_structure_solution	'USER DEFINED STRUCTURE SOLUTION'
	_computing_structure_refinement	'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)'
	_computing_publication_material	'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)'
	_computing_molecular_graphics	'CAMERON (Watkin et al., 1996)'
	_diffrn_standards_interval_time	0
	_diffrn_standards_interval_count	0
	_diffrn_standards_number	0
	_diffrn_standards_decay_%	0
	_diffrn_ambient_temperature	6
	_diffrn_reflns_number	2950
	_reflns_number_total	2589
	_diffrn_reflns_av_R_equivalents	0.061
	# Number of reflections with Friedels Law is 2589	
	# Number of reflections without F:	riedels Law is O
	# Theoretical number of reflection	ns is about 2635
	_diffrn_reflns_theta_min	2.203
	_diffrn_reflns_theta_max	42.582
V	_diffrn_measured_fraction_theta_ma	ax 0.988

_diffrn_reflns_theta_min	2.	.203
_diffrn_reflns_theta_max	42	2.582
_diffrn_measured_fraction_theta_	max	0.988

\_diffrn\_reflns\_theta\_full 35.343 \_diffrn\_measured\_fraction\_theta\_full 0.991

_diffrn_reflns_limit_h_min	-8
_diffrn_reflns_limit_h_max	8
_diffrn_reflns_limit_k_min	0
_diffrn_reflns_limit_k_max	8
_diffrn_reflns_limit_l_min	-35
_diffrn_reflns_limit_l_max	1
_reflns_limit_h_min	-8
_reflns_limit_h_max	8
_reflns_limit_k_min	0
_reflns_limit_k_max	8
_reflns_limit_l_min	0
_reflns_limit_l_max	35
_oxford_diffrn_Wilson_B_factor	0.00
_oxford_diffrn_Wilson_scale	0.00
_atom_sites_solution_primary	direct #heavy,direct,difmap,geom
<pre># _atom_sites_solution_secondary</pre>	difmap
_atom_sites_solution_hydrogens	geom
_refine_diff_density_min	-2.85
_refine_diff_density_max	6.42
_refine_ls_number_reflns	1649
_refine_ls_number_restraints	0
_refine_ls_number_parameters	132
_rorruc_rp_numper_barameterp	102

#\_refine\_ls\_R\_factor\_ref 0.0928
\_refine\_ls\_wR\_factor\_ref 0.1140
\_refine\_ls\_goodness\_of\_fit\_ref 1.1479
#\_reflns\_number\_all 2317
\_refine\_ls\_R\_factor\_all 0.1288
\_refine\_ls\_wR\_factor\_all 0.2799
# The I/u(I) cutoff below was used for refinement as

# well as the \_gt R-factors: \_reflns\_threshold\_expression I>3.0\s(I) \_reflns\_number\_gt 1649 \_refine\_ls\_R\_factor\_gt 0.0928 \_refine\_ls\_wR\_factor\_gt 0.1140

\_refine\_ls\_shift/su\_max

8.349863

GRIP

# choose from: rm (reference molecule of known chirality), # ad (anomolous dispersion - Flack), rmad (rm and ad), # syn (from synthesis), unk (unknown) or . (not applicable). \_chemical\_absolute\_configuration '.'

_refine_ls_structure_factor_coef	F	
_refine_ls_matrix_type	full	
_refine_ls_hydrogen_treatment	mixed	<pre># none, undef, noref, refall,</pre>
		<pre># refxyz, refU, constr or mixed</pre>
_refine_ls_weighting_scheme	calc	
_refine_ls_weighting_details		

```
Method, part 1, Chebychev polynomial, (Watkin, 1994, Prince, 1982)
 [weight] = 1.0/[A~0~*T~0~(x)+A~1~*T~1~(x) ... +A~n-1~]*T~n-1~(x)]
 where A^{-i^{-}} are the Chebychev coefficients listed below and x= Fcalc/Fmax
Method = Robust Weighting (Prince, 1982)
 W = [weight] * [1-(deltaF/6*sigmaF)^2^]^2^
 A~i~ are:
                                                       CR1
 0.741 0.554 0.247
;
_publ_section_references
;
Betteridge, P.W., Carruthers, J.R., Cooper, R.I.
Prout, K. & Watkin, D.J. (2003). J. Appl. Cryst. 36, 1487.
Larson, A.C. (1970) Crystallographic Computing, Ed Ahmed, F.R.,
Munksgaard, Copenhagen, 291-294.
Prince, E.
Mathematical Techniques in Crystallography
and Materials Science
Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.
Watkin D.J. (1994).
Acta Cryst, A50, 411-437.
Watkin, D.J., Prout, C.K. & Pearce, L.J. (1996). CAMERON, Chemical
Crystallography Laboratory, Oxford, UK.
# Uequiv = arithmetic mean of Ui i.e. Ueqiv = (U1+U2+U3)/3
```

# Replace last . with number of unfound hydrogen atomsattached to an atom.

- # ...\_refinement\_flags\_...
- # . no refinement constraints S special position constraint on site
- # G rigid group refinement of site R riding atom
- # D distance or angle restraint on site T thermal displacement constraints
- # U Uiso or Uij restraint (rigid bond) P partial occupancy constraint ANG

loop\_

#### \_atom\_site\_label

\_atom\_site\_type\_symbol

\_atom\_site\_fract\_x

- \_atom\_site\_fract\_y
- \_atom\_site\_fract\_z
- \_atom\_site\_U\_iso\_or\_equiv

\_atom\_site\_occupancy

\_atom\_site\_adp\_type

- \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_posn
- \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_adp
- \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_occupancy

\_atom\_site\_disorder\_assembly

\_atom\_site\_disorder\_group

\_atom\_site\_attached\_hydrogens

```
01 0 0.2091(4) 0.2427(5) 0.01300(11) 0.0075 1.0000 Uani . . . . .
02 0 -0.1048(4) 0.1479(5) 0.06663(11) 0.0077 1.0000 Uani . . . . .
C1 C 0.0949(4) 0.2844(4) 0.05686(10) 0.0054 1.0000 Uani . . . . .
C2 C 0.1729(4) 0.4943(4) 0.10389(9) 0.0059 1.0000 Uani . . . . .
C3 C 0.3819(4) 0.6518(4) 0.09797(10) 0.0073 1.0000 Uani . . . . .
C4 C 0.4571(4) 0.8489(5) 0.14204(10) 0.0074 1.0000 Uani . . . .
```

```
C5 C 0.3252(4) 0.8872(4) 0.19183(10) 0.0074 1.0000 Uani . . . . . .

C6 C 0.1167(4) 0.7290(4) 0.19765(10) 0.0073 1.0000 Uani . . . . . .

C7 C 0.0404(4) 0.5320(5) 0.15356(10) 0.0064 1.0000 Uani . . . . . .

H3 H 0.4827(9) 0.6203(12) 0.0589(2) 0.0214 1.0000 Uani . . . . . .

H4 H 0.6197(9) 0.9737(11) 0.1375(3) 0.0228 1.0000 Uani . . . . . .

H5 H 0.3854(10) 1.0409(11) 0.2261(2) 0.0218 1.0000 Uani . . . . . .

H6 H 0.0131(10) 0.7578(12) 0.2362(2) 0.0224 1.0000 Uani . . . . . .

H7 H -0.1237(9) 0.4100(11) 0.1570(2) 0.0206 1.0000 Uani . . . . . .

H10 H 0.1420(8) -0.0014(10) -0.0342(2) 0.0179(8) 1.0000 Uiso . . . . . .
```

```
_atom_site_aniso_label
```

```
_atom_site_aniso_U_11
```

```
_atom_site_aniso_U_22
```

```
_atom_site_aniso_U_33
```

\_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_23

\_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_13

\_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_12

```
D1 0.0087(8) 0.0091(8) 0.0053(9) -0.0018(7) 0.0031(7) -0.0019(7)
D2 0.0078(8) 0.0098(10) 0.0062(8) -0.0002(8) 0.0029(6) -0.0013(7)
C1 0.0068(7) 0.0064(9) 0.0033(8) -0.0007(6) 0.0013(6) -0.0009(6)
C2 0.0067(8) 0.0078(9) 0.0032(8) -0.0007(6) 0.0007(6) -0.0010(6)
C3 0.0063(7) 0.0098(8) 0.0058(8) -0.0010(7) 0.0014(6) -0.0009(6)
C4 0.0075(7) 0.0081(8) 0.0066(8) -0.0013(7) 0.0007(6) -0.0011(6)
C5 0.0085(7) 0.0082(8) 0.0056(8) -0.0017(6) 0.0010(5) -0.0008(6)
C6 0.0092(7) 0.0088(8) 0.0044(8) -0.0015(6) 0.0022(6) -0.0011(6)
C7 0.0074(7) 0.0076(8) 0.0045(8) -0.0047(17) 0.0109(14) -0.0051(17)
H4 0.0193(17) 0.023(2) 0.027(2) -0.0084(18) 0.0084(15) -0.0086(16)
H5 0.0260(19) 0.0182(19) 0.0214(19) -0.0075(17) 0.0041(16) -0.0064(16)
H6 0.027(2) 0.029(2) 0.0139(17) -0.0065(16) 0.0070(14) -0.0092(16)
```

```
_refine_ls_extinction_coef 6.5(12)
_refine_ls_extinction_method
    'Larson (1970), Equation 22'
                             _oxford_refine_ls_scale 0.1707(16)
loop_
_geom_bond_atom_site_label_1
 _geom_bond_site_symmetry_1
 _geom_bond_atom_site_label_2
 _geom_bond_site_symmetry_2
_geom_bond_distance
_geom_bond_publ_flag
01 . C1 . 1.233(3)
                     yes
O2 . H10 2_555 1.020(5)
                          no
02 . C1 . 1.320(3)
                     yes
C1 . C2 . 1.487(3)
                     yes
C2 . C3 . 1.398(3)
                     yes
C2 . C7 . 1.399(3)
                     yes
C3 . C4 . 1.397(3)
                     yes
C3 . H3 . 1.091(6)
                     no
C4 . C5 . 1.400(3)
                     yes
C4 . H4 . 1.094(5)
                     no
C5 . C6 . 1.397(3)
                     yes
C5 . H5 . 1.091(5)
                     no
   . C7 . 1.398(3)
C6
                     yes
    H6 . 1.089(6)
C6
                     no
C7 .
    H7 . 1.088(5)
                     no
loop_
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_1
 _geom_angle_site_symmetry_1
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_2
```

\_geom\_angle\_site\_symmetry\_2 \_geom\_angle\_atom\_site\_label\_3 \_geom\_angle\_site\_symmetry\_3 \_geom\_angle \_geom\_angle\_publ\_flag H10 2\_555 02 . C1 . 109.9(4) no 02 . C1 . 01 . 123.6(2) yes 02 . C1 . C2 . 114.1(2) yes 01 . C1 . C2 . 122.3(2) yes C1 . C2 . C3 . 118.98(19) yes C1 . C2 . C7 . 120.48(18) yes C3 . C2 . C7 . 120.54(19) yes C2 . C3 . C4 . 119.39(19) yes C2 . C3 . H3 . 119.6(3) no C4 . C3 . H3 . 121.0(3) no C3 . C4 . C5 . 120.26(19) yes C3 . C4 . H4 . 119.8(3) no C5 . C4 . H4 . 120.0(3) no C4 . C5 . C6 . 120.2(2) yes C4 . C5 . H5 . 119.9(3) no C6 . C5 . H5 . 120.0(4) no C5 . C6 . C7 . 119.7(2) yes C5 . C6 . H6 . 120.6(4) no C7 . C6 . H6 . 119.7(4) no . C7 . C6 . 119.88(19) C2 yes C7 . H7 . 119.6(3) C2no C6 . C7 . H7 . 120.5(3) no

#### $25 \mathrm{K}$

```
data_CRYSTALS_cif
_audit_creation_date
                            10-07-01
_audit_creation_method CRYSTALS_ver_12.84
                                                 SCRIP
_oxford_structure_analysis_title 'benzoic acid 25K'
_chemical_name_systematic
                                  ?
                                  ?
_chemical_melting_point
                                  5.4007(10)
_cell_length_a
_cell_length_b
                                  5.0037(10)
_cell_length_c
                                  21.8787(10)
                                  90
_cell_angle_alpha
                                  98.475(10)
_cell_angle_beta
                                  90
_cell_angle_gamma
_cell_volume
                                  584.78(16)
                                  'Monoclinic'
_symmetry_cell_setting
                                  'P 1 21/c 1 '
_symmetry_space_group_name_H-M
                                  , ? ,
_symmetry_space_group_name_Hall
loop_
 _symmetry_equiv_pos_as_xyz
 'x,y,z'
 '-x,-y,-z'
 '-x,y+1/2,-z+1/2'
  x,-y+1/2,z+1/2'
loop_
_atom_type_symbol
_atom_type_scat_dispersion_real
```

\_atom\_type\_scat\_dispersion\_imag \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a1 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b1 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a2 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b2 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b3 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a4 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b4 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_c

0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 D 0.0000 0.0000 6.6710 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' С 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 6.6460 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 Η 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 -3.7390 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 Ν 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 9.3600 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 5.8030 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000

\_cell\_formula\_units\_Z

4

# Given Formula = C1.75 H1.75 00.50
# Dc = 0.35 Fooo = 148.00 Mu = 0.26 M = 30.78
# Found Formula = C7 H6 02
# Dc = 1.39 F000 = 148.00 Mu = 1.02 M = 122.12

\_chemical\_formula\_sum 'C7 H6 O2'



# Sneidrick geometric approximation	0 1.00 1.00
_exptl_absorpt_correction_type	none
_exptl_absorpt_correction_T_min	1.0000
_exptl_absorpt_correction_T_max	1.0000
_diffrn_measurement_device_type	'Unknown'
_diffrn_radiation_monochromator	'copper 220'
_diffrn_radiation_type	' neutrons '
_diffrn_radiation_wavelength	0.83200
diffrn measurement method	\w

C

# If a reference occurs more than once, delete the author

# and date from subsequent references.

_computing_data_collection	'USER DEFINED DATA COLLECTION'
_computing_cell_refinement	'USER DEFINED CELL REFINEMENT'
_computing_data_reduction	'USER DEFINED DATA REDUCTION'
_computing_structure_solution	'USER DEFINED STRUCTURE SOLUTION'
_computing_structure_refinement	'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)'
_computing_publication_material	'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)'
_computing_molecular_graphics	'CAMERON (Watkin et al., 1996)'
	6
_diffrn_standards_interval_time	0
_diffrn_standards_interval_count	0
_diffrn_standards_number	0
diffrn standards docay <sup>9</sup>	0

\_diffrn\_standards\_interval\_time 0 \_diffrn\_standards\_interval\_count 0 \_diffrn\_standards\_number 0 0 \_diffrn\_standards\_decay\_%

\_diffrn\_ambient\_temperature 25 \_diffrn\_reflns\_number 3594 \_reflns\_number\_total 2637 \_diffrn\_reflns\_av\_R\_equivalents 0.090 # Number of reflections with Friedels Law is 2637 # Number of reflections without Friedels Law is 0 # Theoretical number of reflections is about 2659

_diffrn_reflns_theta_min	2.203	
_diffrn_reflns_theta_max	42.766	,
_diffrn_measured_fraction_theta_ma	ax 0.99	5

\_diffrn\_reflns\_theta\_full 42.766 \_diffrn\_measured\_fraction\_theta\_full 0.995

	_diffrn_reflns_limit_h_min	-8
	_diffrn_reflns_limit_h_max	1
	_diffrn_reflns_limit_k_min	0
	_diffrn_reflns_limit_k_max	8
	_diffrn_reflns_limit_l_min	-35
	_diffrn_reflns_limit_l_max	35
	_reflns_limit_h_min	-8
	_reflns_limit_h_max	8
	_reflns_limit_k_min	0
	_reflns_limit_k_max	8
	_reflns_limit_l_min	0
	_reflns_limit_l_max	35
	_oxford_diffrn_Wilson_B_factor	0.00
	_oxford_diffrn_Wilson_scale	0.00
	_atom_sites_solution_primary	direct #heavy,direct,difmap,geom
	<pre># _atom_sites_solution_secondary</pre>	difmap
	_atom_sites_solution_hydrogens	geom
	_refine_diff_density_min	-0.53
	_refine_diff_density_max	0.62
	_refine_ls_number_reflns	1679
<b>C</b> 1	_refine_ls_number_restraints	1
	_refine_ls_number_parameters	137
V		
	<pre>#_refine_ls_R_factor_ref 0.0791</pre>	

_refine_ls_wR_factor_ref	0.0973
_refine_ls_goodness_of_fit_ref	1.1173
#_reflns_number_all 2407	

_refine_ls_R_factor_all	0.1198
_refine_ls_wR_factor_all	0.1904

# The I/u(I) cutoff below was used for refinement as # well as the \_gt R-factors: \_reflns\_threshold\_expression I>3.0\s(I) \_reflns\_number\_gt 1679 \_refine\_ls\_R\_factor\_gt 0.0791 \_refine\_ls\_wR\_factor\_gt 0.0973

\_refine\_ls\_shift/su\_max

8.271246

CP-

# choose from: rm (reference molecule of known chirality), # ad (anomolous dispersion - Flack), rmad (rm and ad), # syn (from synthesis), unk (unknown) or . (not applicable). \_chemical\_absolute\_configuration '.'

Method, part 1, Chebychev polynomial, (Watkin, 1994, Prince, 1982) [weight] = 1.0/[A~0~\*T~0~(x)+A~1~\*T~1~(x) ... +A~n-1~]\*T~n-1~(x)]

```
where A^{-i^{-}} are the Chebychev coefficients listed below and x= Fcalc/Fmax
Method = Robust Weighting (Prince, 1982)
W = [weight] * [1-(deltaF/6*sigmaF)^2^]^2^
A~i~ are:
                                                SCRIP
0.562 0.432 0.111
;
_publ_section_references
;
Betteridge, P.W., Carruthers, J.R., Cooper, R.I.
Prout, K. & Watkin, D.J. (2003). J. Appl. Cryst. 36, 1487.
Larson, A.C. (1970) Crystallographic Computing, Ed Ahmed, F.R.,
Munksgaard, Copenhagen, 291-294.
Prince, E.
Mathematical Techniques in Crystallography
and Materials Science
Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.
Watkin D.J. (1994).
Acta Cryst, A50, 411-437.
Watkin, D.J., Prout, C.K. & Pearce, L.J. (1996). CAMERON, Chemical
Crystallography Laboratory, Oxford, UK.
;
```

# Uequiv = arithmetic mean of Ui i.e. Ueqiv = (U1+U2+U3)/3

# Replace last . with number of unfound hydrogen atomsattached to an atom.

- # ...\_refinement\_flags\_...
- # . no refinement constraints S special position constraint on site
- # G rigid group refinement of site R riding atom
- # D distance or angle restraint on site T thermal displacement constraints
- # U Uiso or Uij restraint (rigid bond) P partial occupancy constraint ANG

loop\_

#### \_atom\_site\_label

\_atom\_site\_type\_symbol

\_atom\_site\_fract\_x

- \_atom\_site\_fract\_y
- \_atom\_site\_fract\_z
- \_atom\_site\_U\_iso\_or\_equiv

\_atom\_site\_occupancy

- \_atom\_site\_adp\_type
- \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_posn
- \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_adp
- \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_occupancy
- \_atom\_site\_disorder\_assembly
- \_atom\_site\_disorder\_group
- \_atom\_site\_attached\_hydrogens

01 0 0.2096(4) 0.2431(4) 0.01300(10) 0.0087 1.0000 Uani . . . . . 02 0 -0.1036(4) 0.1474(4) 0.06641(9) 0.0091 1.0000 Uani . . . . . C1 C 0.0952(3) 0.2835(4) 0.05705(8) 0.0063 1.0000 Uani . . . . . C2 C 0.1734(3) 0.4938(4) 0.10378(8) 0.0063 1.0000 Uani . . . . . C3 C 0.3823(3) 0.6516(4) 0.09795(8) 0.0077 1.0000 Uani . C4 C 0.4573(3) 0.8486(4) 0.14206(8) 0.0084 1.0000 Uani . . .

```
C5 C 0.3251(3) 0.8872(4) 0.19179(8) 0.0082 1.0000 Uani . . .
C6 C 0.1166(3) 0.7291(4) 0.19762(8) 0.0081 1.0000 Uani . . .
C7 C 0.0404(3) 0.5319(4) 0.15358(8) 0.0073 1.0000 Uani . .
H3 H 0.4832(8) 0.6194(10) 0.0590(2) 0.0235 1.0000 Uani .
H4 H 0.6197(8) 0.9739(10) 0.1374(2) 0.0242 1.0000 Uani
H5 H 0.3853(8) 1.0409(10) 0.2262(2) 0.0229 1.0000 Uani .
H6 H 0.0128(9) 0.7585(10) 0.2360(2) 0.0232 1.0000 Uani
H7 H -0.1234(8) 0.4110(10) 0.1571(2) 0.0238 1.0000 Uani .
H10 H 0.1423(8) -0.0011(9) -0.03414(19) 0.0191(8) 0.966(13) Uiso .
H11 H 0.18(2) 0.14(3) -0.008(6) 0.0191(8) 0.034(13) Uiso . . P
loop_
_atom_site_aniso_label
_atom_site_aniso_U_11
_atom_site_aniso_U_22
_atom_site_aniso_U_33
_atom_site_aniso_U_23
_atom_site_aniso_U_13
_atom_site_aniso_U_12
01 0.0092(7) 0.0107(8) 0.0067(7) -0.0014(7) 0.0025(6) -0.0018(6)
02 0.0086(7) 0.0100(8) 0.0089(7) -0.0017(6) 0.0022(6) -0.0016(6)
C1 0.0066(6) 0.0068(7) 0.0051(6) -0.0010(5) 0.0003(5) -0.0003(5)
C2 \ 0.0065(7) \ 0.0067(7) \ 0.0056(7) \ -0.0003(5) \ 0.0004(5) \ -0.0001(5)
C3 0.0071(6) 0.0084(7) 0.0078(6) -0.0013(6) 0.0021(5) -0.0013(5)
C4 0.0079(6) 0.0086(7) 0.0087(6) -0.0017(5) 0.0012(5) -0.0014(5)
C5 0.0083(6) 0.0091(7) 0.0069(6) -0.0012(5) 0.0005(5) -0.0010(5)
C6 0.0088(6) 0.0088(7) 0.0066(6) -0.0018(5) 0.0013(5) -0.0011(5)
C7 0.0079(6) 0.0083(7) 0.0061(6) -0.0014(5) 0.0020(5) -0.0011(5)
H3 0.0227(16) 0.030(2) 0.0204(15) -0.0059(15) 0.0119(13) -0.0064(16)
H4 0.0217(16) 0.025(2) 0.0271(18) -0.0087(16) 0.0085(14) -0.0089(15)
H5 0.0253(17) 0.0208(18) 0.0224(16) -0.0084(15) 0.0023(14) -0.0068(14)
H6 0.0263(18) 0.028(2) 0.0180(16) -0.0086(14) 0.0131(13) -0.0037(16)
```

H7 0.0223(16) 0.026(2) 0.0245(17) -0.0064(15) 0.0090(14) -0.0108(15)

```
_refine_ls_extinction_coef 5.8(9)
_refine_ls_extinction_method
                             'Larson (1970), Equation 22'
_oxford_refine_ls_scale 0.1678(13)
loop_
_geom_bond_atom_site_label_1
 _geom_bond_site_symmetry_1
 _geom_bond_atom_site_label_2
 _geom_bond_site_symmetry_2
 _geom_bond_distance
_geom_bond_publ_flag
O1 . C1 . 1.236(3)
                     yes
01 . H11 . 0.70(14)
                      no
02 . H10 2_555 1.017(5)
                          no
02 . C1 . 1.313(3)
                     yes
C1 . C2 . 1.485(3)
                     yes
C2 . C3 . 1.399(3)
                     yes
C2 . C7 . 1.403(3)
                     yes
C3 . C4 . 1.397(3)
                     yes
C3 . H3 . 1.089(4)
                     no
C4 . C5 . 1.400(3)
                     yes
C4 . H4 . 1.095(5)
                     no
   . C6 . 1.397(3)
C5
                     yes
    H5 . 1.091(4)
C5
                     no
C6 .
    C7 . 1.398(3)
                     yes
C6 . H6 . 1.086(5)
                     no
C7 . H7 . 1.084(4)
                     no
loop_
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_1
```

\_geom\_angle\_site\_symmetry\_1 \_geom\_angle\_atom\_site\_label\_2 \_geom\_angle\_site\_symmetry\_2 \_geom\_angle\_atom\_site\_label\_3 \_geom\_angle\_site\_symmetry\_3 \_geom\_angle \_geom\_angle\_publ\_flag C1 . O1 . H11 . 120(10) no H10 2\_555 02 . C1 . 110.7(3) no 02 . C1 . 01 . 123.46(19) yes 02 . C1 . C2 . 114.62(17) yes O1 . C1 . C2 . 121.92(18) yes C1 . C2 . C3 . 119.27(16) yes C1 . C2 . C7 . 120.31(16) yes C3 . C2 . C7 . 120.41(16) yes C2 . C3 . C4 . 119.41(16) yes C2 . C3 . H3 . 119.4(3) no C4 . C3 . H3 . 121.2(3) no C3 . C4 . C5 . 120.33(16) yes C3 . C4 . H4 . 119.6(3) no C5 . C4 . H4 . 120.1(3) no C4 . C5 . C6 . 120.20(17) yes C4 . C5 . H5 . 119.9(3) no C6 . C5 . H5 . 119.9(3) no . C6 . C7 . 119.72(17) C5 yes C6 . H6 . 120.6(3) C5 no C7 C6 . H6 . 119.7(3) no C2 . C7 . C6 . 119.92(17) yes C2 . C7 . H7 . 119.7(3) no C6 . C7 . H7 . 120.3(3) no

```
50 K
```

```
data_CRYSTALS_cif
                            10-07-01
_audit_creation_date
_audit_creation_method CRYSTALS_ver_12.84
```

```
SCRIF
_oxford_structure_analysis_title 'benzoic acid 50K'
                              ?
_chemical_name_systematic
                              ?
_chemical_melting_point
```

```
5.4150(10)
_cell_length_a
                                   5.0160(10)
_cell_length_b
                                   21.8260(10)
_cell_length_c
_cell_angle_alpha
                                   90
_cell_angle_beta
                                   98.442(10)
                                   90
_cell_angle_gamma
                                   586.41(16)
_cell_volume
```

```
_symmetry_cell_setting
                                   'Monoclinic'
_symmetry_space_group_name_H-M
                                   °?,
_symmetry_space_group_name_Hall
loop_
 _symmetry_equiv_pos_as_xyz
 'x,y,z'
   x,-y,-z'
```

x,y+1/2,-z+1/2' 'x,-y+1/2,z+1/2'

'P 1 21/c 1 '

```
loop_
```

\_atom\_type\_symbol

\_atom\_type\_scat\_dispersion\_real \_atom\_type\_scat\_dispersion\_imag \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a1 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b1 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a2 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b2 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b3 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a4 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b4 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_c

D 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 6.6710 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 С 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 6.6460 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 Η 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 -3.7390 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 Ν 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 9.3600 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 5.8030 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4'

CRIF

\_cell\_formula\_units\_Z

4

# Given Formula = C1.75 H1.75 00.50
# Dc = 0.35 Fooo = 148.00 Mu = 0.26 M = 30.78
# Found Formula = C7 H6 02
# Dc = 1.38 F000 = 148.00 Mu = 1.02 M = 122.12



	_diffrn_radiation_wavelength	0.83200
	_diffrn_measurement_method	\w
	# If a reference occurs more than	once, delete the author
	# and date from subsequent referen	nces.
	_computing_data_collection	'USER DEFINED DATA COLLECTION'
	_computing_cell_refinement	'USER DEFINED CELL REFINEMENT'
	_computing_data_reduction	'USER DEFINED DATA REDUCTION'
	_computing_structure_solution	'USER DEFINED STRUCTURE SOLUTION'
	_computing_structure_refinement	'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)'
	_computing_publication_material	'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)'
	_computing_molecular_graphics	'CAMERON (Watkin et al., 1996)'
	_diffrn_standards_interval_time	0
	_diffrn_standards_interval_count	0
	_diffrn_standards_number	0
	_diffrn_standards_decay_%	0
	_diffrn_ambient_temperature	50
	_diffrn_reflns_number	2797
	_reflns_number_total	1946
	_diffrn_reflns_av_R_equivalents	0.039
	# Number of reflections with Fried	dels Law is 1946
	# Number of reflections without F:	riedels Law is O
	# Theoretical number of reflection	ns is about 2663
	_diffrn_reflns_theta_min	2.209
	_diffrn_reflns_theta_max	42.715
V	_diffrn_measured_fraction_theta_ma	ax 0.736

\_diffrn\_reflns\_theta\_full 29.046 \_diffrn\_measured\_fraction\_theta\_full 0.768

_diffrn_reflns_limit_h_min	-8
_diffrn_reflns_limit_h_max	3
_diffrn_reflns_limit_k_min	0
_diffrn_reflns_limit_k_max	8
_diffrn_reflns_limit_l_min	-35
_diffrn_reflns_limit_l_max	34
_reflns_limit_h_min	-8
_reflns_limit_h_max	8
_reflns_limit_k_min	0
_reflns_limit_k_max	8
_reflns_limit_l_min	0
_reflns_limit_l_max	35
_oxford_diffrn_Wilson_B_factor	0.00
_oxford_diffrn_Wilson_scale	0.00
_atom_sites_solution_primary	direct #heavy,direct,difmap,geom
<pre># _atom_sites_solution_secondary</pre>	difmap
_atom_sites_solution_hydrogens	geom
_refine_diff_density_min	-0.53
_refine_diff_density_max	0.62
_refine_ls_number_reflns	1382
_refine_ls_number_restraints	1
_refine_ls_number_parameters	137

#\_refine\_ls\_R\_factor\_ref 0.0582
\_refine\_ls\_wR\_factor\_ref 0.0683
\_refine\_ls\_goodness\_of\_fit\_ref 1.1131
#\_reflns\_number\_all 1796
\_refine\_ls\_R\_factor\_all 0.0927
\_refine\_ls\_wR\_factor\_all 0.1393
# The I/u(I) cutoff below was used for refinement as
# well as the \_gt R-factors:

\_reflns\_threshold\_expression I>3.0\s(I)
\_reflns\_number\_gt 1382
\_refine\_ls\_R\_factor\_gt 0.0582
\_refine\_ls\_wR\_factor\_gt 0.0683

\_refine\_ls\_shift/su\_max

6.843274

GRIP

# choose from: rm (reference molecule of known chirality), # ad (anomolous dispersion - Flack), rmad (rm and ad), # syn (from synthesis), unk (unknown) or . (not applicable). \_chemical\_absolute\_configuration '.'

_refine_ls_structure_factor_coef	F	
_refine_ls_matrix_type	full	
_refine_ls_hydrogen_treatment	mixed	<pre># none, undef, noref, refall,</pre>
		<pre># refxyz, refU, constr or mixed</pre>
_refine_ls_weighting_scheme	calc	
_refine_ls_weighting_details		

```
Method, part 1, Chebychev polynomial, (Watkin, 1994, Prince, 1982)
[weight] = 1.0/[A~0~*T~0~(x)+A~1~*T~1~(x) ... +A~n-1~]*T~n-1~(x)]
where A^{-i^{-}} are the Chebychev coefficients listed below and x= Fcalc/Fmax
Method = Robust Weighting (Prince, 1982)
W = [weight] * [1-(deltaF/6*sigmaF)^2^]^2^
                                              SCRIF
A~i~ are:
0.403 0.242 0.793E-01
;
```

\_publ\_section\_references

Betteridge, P.W., Carruthers, J.R., Cooper, R.I., Prout, K. & Watkin, D.J. (2003). J. Appl. Cryst. 36, 1487.

Larson, A.C. (1970) Crystallographic Computing, Ed Ahmed, F.R., Munksgaard, Copenhagen, 291-294.

Prince, E.

;

;

Mathematical Techniques in Crystallography and Materials Science Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.

Watkin D.J. (1994). Acta Cryst, A50, 411-437.

Watkin, D.J., Prout, C.K. & Pearce, L.J. (1996). CAMERON, Chemical Crystallography Laboratory, Oxford, UK.

# Uequiv = arithmetic mean of Ui i.e. Ueqiv = (U1+U2+U3)/3

# Replace last . with number of unfound hydrogen atomsattached to an atom.

# ...\_refinement\_flags\_...

# . no refinement constraints S special position constraint on site

# G rigid group refinement of site R riding atom

# D distance or angle restraint on site T thermal displacement constraints

# U Uiso or Uij restraint (rigid bond) P partial occupancy constraint

loop\_

\_atom\_site\_label \_atom\_site\_type\_symbol \_atom\_site\_fract\_x \_atom\_site\_fract\_y \_atom\_site\_fract\_z \_atom\_site\_U\_iso\_or\_equiv \_atom\_site\_occupancy \_atom\_site\_adp\_type \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_posn \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_adp \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_occupancy \_atom\_site\_disorder\_assembly \_atom\_site\_disorder\_group \_atom\_site\_attached\_hydrogens 01 0 0.2122(3) 0.2439(5) 0.01305(9) 0.0117 1.0000 Uani . . . . . 02 0 -0.1013(3) 0.1457(5) 0.06612(9) 0.0114 1.0000 Uani . . . . . C1 C 0.0950(3) 0.2828(3) 0.05717(8) 0.0077 1.0000 Uani . . . C2 C 0.1744(3) 0.4931(4) 0.10381(7) 0.0077 1.0000 Uani . . .

```
C3 C 0.3830(3) 0.6498(4) 0.09787(8) 0.0092 1.0000 Uani . . .
C4 C 0.4580(3) 0.8471(4) 0.14203(8) 0.0102 1.0000 Uani . . .
C5 C 0.3253(3) 0.8861(4) 0.19165(7) 0.0103 1.0000 Uani . .
C6 C 0.1171(3) 0.7278(4) 0.19744(8) 0.0099 1.0000 Uani .
C7 C 0.0411(3) 0.5318(4) 0.15349(7) 0.0091 1.0000 Uani
H3 H 0.4841(7) 0.6189(10) 0.0589(2) 0.0268 1.0000 Uani
H4 H 0.6204(8) 0.9702(10) 0.1373(2) 0.0285 1.0000 Uani
H5 H 0.3858(8) 1.0391(10) 0.2263(2) 0.0275 1.0000 Uani
H6 H 0.0133(8) 0.7601(11) 0.2360(2) 0.0280 1.0000 Uani .
H7 H -0.1222(7) 0.4090(10) 0.1572(2) 0.0249 1.0000 Uani
H10 H 0.1421(8) -0.0004(11) -0.0339(2) 0.0215(9) 0.852(13) Uiso . . P . . .
H11 H 0.168(5) 0.105(7) -0.0139(13) 0.0215(9) 0.148(13) Uiso . . P . . .
loop_
_atom_site_aniso_label
_atom_site_aniso_U_11
_atom_site_aniso_U_22
_atom_site_aniso_U_33
_atom_site_aniso_U_23
_atom_site_aniso_U_13
_atom_site_aniso_U_12
01 0.0121(6) 0.0139(8) 0.0097(7) -0.0022(7) 0.0041(5) -0.0019(6)
02\ 0.0106(6)\ 0.0138(9)\ 0.0101(7)\ -0.0015(7)\ 0.0020(5)\ -0.0028(6)
C1 0.0080(5) 0.0084(8) 0.0068(6) -0.0005(5) 0.0018(4) -0.0002(5)
C2 \ 0.0082(5) \ 0.0086(7) \ 0.0063(6) \ -0.0003(5) \ 0.0015(4) \ -0.0008(5)
C3 0.0086(5) 0.0097(7) 0.0097(6) -0.0007(6) 0.0029(4) -0.0022(5)
C4 0.0090(5) 0.0102(7) 0.0114(6) -0.0006(5) 0.0014(4) -0.0016(5)
C5 0.0107(5) 0.0104(7) 0.0096(6) -0.0014(5) 0.0003(4) -0.0009(5)
C6 0.0111(5) 0.0098(7) 0.0091(6) -0.0011(5) 0.0026(4) -0.0010(5)
C7 0.0091(5) 0.0099(7) 0.0083(6) -0.0009(5) 0.0022(4) -0.0012(5)
H3 0.0231(14) 0.035(2) 0.0255(17) -0.0109(17) 0.0147(13) -0.0072(15)
H4 0.0240(15) 0.030(2) 0.034(2) -0.0083(18) 0.0107(14) -0.0132(15)
```

```
H5 0.0297(16) 0.027(2) 0.0250(18) -0.0100(17) 0.0021(14) -0.0066(15)

H6 0.0329(17) 0.031(2) 0.0230(17) -0.0068(17) 0.0153(14) -0.0055(17)

H7 0.0226(13) 0.029(2) 0.0256(17) -0.0043(15) 0.0116(12) -0.0115(14)

_refine_ls_extinction_coef 4.8(6)

_refine_ls_extinction_method

    'Larson (1970), Equation 22'

_oxford_refine_ls_scale 0.1626(10)

loop_

_geom_bond_atom_site_label_1

_geom_bond_site_symmetry_1

_geom_bond_site_symmetry_2

_geom_bond_distance

_geom_bond_listance

_geom_bond_publ_flag

01 . C1 . 1.244(3) yes

01 . H11 . 0.92(°

02 . H1°
```

```
_geom_bond_atom_site_label_1
 _geom_bond_site_symmetry_1
 _geom_bond_atom_site_label_2
 _geom_bond_site_symmetry_2
 _geom_bond_distance
 _geom_bond_publ_flag
01 . C1 . 1.244(3)
                      yes
O1 . H11 . 0.92(3)
                      no
O2 . H10 2_555 1.015(6)
                            no
02 . C1 . 1.305(2)
                       yes
C1 . C2 . 1.485(2)
                      yes
C2 . C3 . 1.398(2)
                       yes
C2 . C7 . 1.402(2)
                      yes
C3 . C4 . 1.399(3)
                      yes
C3 . H3 . 1.088(4)
                      no
   . C5 . 1.399(2)
C4
                      yes
    H4 . 1.091(4)
C4
                      no
C5 .
    C6 . 1.400(2)
                       yes
C5 . H5 . 1.093(5)
                      no
C6 . C7 . 1.392(2)
                      yes
C6 . H6 . 1.090(4)
                      no
C7 . H7 . 1.090(4)
                      no
```

```
H10 . H11 . 0.68(3)
                       no
loop_
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_1
 _geom_angle_site_symmetry_1
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_2
 _geom_angle_site_symmetry_2
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_3
 _geom_angle_site_symmetry_3
 _geom_angle
 _geom_angle_publ_flag
C1 . 01 . H11 . 120.1(17)
                              no
H10 2_555 02 . C1 . 112.0(3)
                                 no
02 . C1 . 01 . 123.53(19)
                              yes
02 . C1 . C2 . 115.60(16)
                              yes
O1 . C1 . C2 . 120.87(16)
                              yes
                             yes
C1 . C2 . C3 . 119.50(14)
C1 . C2 . C7 . 119.93(14)
                              yes
C3 . C2 . C7 . 120.57(15)
                              yes
C2 . C3 . C4 . 119.39(15)
                              yes
C2 . C3 . H3 . 119.9(3)
                           no
C4 . C3 . H3 . 120.7(3)
                            no
C3 . C4 . C5 . 120.13(15)
                              yes
C3 . C4 . H4 . 119.5(3)
                           no
C5 . C4 . H4 . 120.4(3)
                            no
   . C5 . C6 . 120.19(16)
C4
                              yes
     C5 . H5 . 119.8(3)
C4
                            no
C6 .
    C5 . H5 . 120.0(3)
                            no
C5
  . C6 . C7 . 119.90(15)
                              yes
C5 . C6 . H6 . 119.9(3)
                            no
C7 . C6 . H6 . 120.2(3)
                            no
C2 . C7 . C6 . 119.82(14)
                              yes
```

C2 . C7 . H7 . 119.6(3) no C6 . C7 . H7 . 120.6(3) no 02 2\_555 H10 . H11 . 176(2) no H10 . H11 . O1 . 177(4) no

#### 75 K

·····	
75 K	
data_CRYSTALS_cif	
_audit_creation_date 10-07-01	
_audit_creation_method CRYSTALS_ver_12.84	
_oxford_structure_analysis_title 'benzoic acid 75K 5C2'	
_chemical_name_systematic ?	

?

\_chemical\_melting\_point

_cell_length_a	5.4150(10)
_cell_length_b	5.0160(10)
_cell_length_c	21.8260(10)
_cell_angle_alpha	90
_cell_angle_beta	98.442(10)
_cell_angle_gamma	90
_cell_volume	586.41(16)

_symmetry_cell_setting	'Monoclinic'		
_symmetry_space_group_name_H-M	'P 1 21/c 1		
_symmetry_space_group_name_Hall loop_	،?،		
_symmetry_equiv_pos_as_xyz			
'x,y,z'			

'-x,-y,-z'

'-x,y+1/2,-z+1/2' 'x,-y+1/2,z+1/2'

loop\_

\_atom\_type\_symbol \_atom\_type\_scat\_dispersion\_real \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a1 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b1 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a2 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b2 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a3 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b3 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b4 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b4 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_c \_atom\_type\_scat\_source

D 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 6.6710 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 С 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 6.6460 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 Η 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 -3.7390 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 Ν 0.0000 0.0000 9.3600 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 5.8030 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4'

\_cell\_formula\_units\_Z

4

# Given Form	mula = C1.75 H1	.75 00.5	50				
# Dc =	0.35 Fooo =	148.00	Mu =	0.26	M =	30.78	
# Found For	mula = C7 H6.00	02					
# Dc =	1.38 F000 =	148.00	Mu =	1.02	M =	122.12	
_chemical_f	ormula_sum		'C7 H6.00	02'			$\mathbf{O}$
_chemical_f	ormula_moiety		'C7 H6.00	02'			
_chemical_c	ompound_source		'commercia	al'			
_chemical_f	ormula_weight		122.12			X	
					C		
_cell_measu	rement_reflns_us	sed	0				
_cell_measu	rement_theta_min	ı	0				
_cell_measu	rement_theta_max	c	0				
_cell_measu	rement_temperatu	ire	75				
_exptl_crys	tal_description		'needle'				
_exptl_crys	tal_colour		'white'				
_exptl_crys	tal_size_min		'3mm'				
_exptl_crys	tal_size_mid		'3mm'				
_exptl_crys	tal_size_max		'10mm'				
_exptl_crys	tal_density_dif	frn	1.383				
_exptl_crys	tal_density_meas	3					
# Non-dispe	rsive F(000):						
_exptl_crys	tal_F_000		148				
_exptl_abso	rpt_coefficient	_mu	0.102				
# Sheldrick	geometric appro	oximatio	0 1.00 1.00	C			
_exptl_abso	rpt_correction_1	type	none				
_exptl_abso	rpt_correction_1	ſ_min	1.0000				

_exptl_absorpt_correction_T_max	1.0000		
_diffrn_measurement_device_type	'Unknown'		
_diffrn_radiation_monochromator	'copper 220'		
_diffrn_radiation_type	' neutrons '		
_diffrn_radiation_wavelength	0.83200		
_diffrn_measurement_method	\w		

# If a reference occurs more than once, delete the author # and date from subsequent references. 'USER DEFINED DATA COLLECTION' \_computing\_data\_collection 'USER DEFINED CELL REFINEMENT' \_computing\_cell\_refinement 'USER DEFINED DATA REDUCTION' \_computing\_data\_reduction \_computing\_structure\_solution 'USER DEFINED STRUCTURE SOLUTION' 'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)' \_computing\_structure\_refinement 'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)' \_computing\_publication\_material 'CAMERON (Watkin et al., 1996)' \_computing\_molecular\_graphics

_diffrn_standards_interval_time	0
_diffrn_standards_interval_count	0
_diffrn_standards_number	0
_diffrn_standards_decay_%	0

_diffrn_ambient_temperature	75	
_diffrn_reflns_number	3364	
_reflns_number_total	2645	
_diffrn_reflns_av_R_equivalents	0.164	
# Number of reflections with Fried	dels Law is 2645	
# Number of reflections without Fi	riedels Law is O	
# Theoretical number of reflection	ns is about 2667	
	_diffrn_reflns_theta_min	2.209
---	---	----------------------------------
	_diffrn_reflns_theta_max	42.811
	_diffrn_measured_fraction_theta_m	ax 0.991
	_diffrn_reflns_theta_full	41.955
	_diffrn_measured_fraction_theta_f	ull 0.999
	_diffrn_reflns_limit_h_min	-8
	_diffrn_reflns_limit_h_max	1
	_diffrn_reflns_limit_k_min	0
	_diffrn_reflns_limit_k_max	8
	_diffrn_reflns_limit_l_min	-35
	_diffrn_reflns_limit_l_max	35
	_reflns_limit_h_min	-8
	_reflns_limit_h_max	8
	_reflns_limit_k_min	0
	_reflns_limit_k_max	8
	_reflns_limit_l_min	0
	_reflns_limit_l_max	35
	_oxford_diffrn_Wilson_B_factor	0.00
	_oxford_diffrn_Wilson_scale	0.00
	_atom_sites_solution_primary	direct #heavy,direct,difmap,geom
	<pre># _atom_sites_solution_secondary</pre>	difmap
	_atom_sites_solution_hydrogens	geom
	_refine_diff_density_min	-0.53
V	_refine_diff_density_max	0.62

_refine_ls_number_reflns	1472	
_refine_ls_number_restraints	1	
_refine_ls_number_parameters	137	
<pre>#_refine_ls_R_factor_ref 0.0902</pre>		
_refine_ls_wR_factor_ref	0.0506	
_refine_ls_goodness_of_fit_ref	1.0256	
<pre>#_reflns_number_all 2579</pre>		G
_refine_ls_R_factor_all	0.1621	6
_refine_ls_wR_factor_all	0.0573	
<pre># The I/u(I) cutoff below was use</pre>	d for refinemen	t as
<pre># well as the _gt R-factors:</pre>		
_reflns_threshold_expression	I>3.0\s(I)	
_reflns_number_gt	1472	
_refine_ls_R_factor_gt	0.0902	
_refine_ls_wR_factor_gt	0.0506	
_refine_ls_shift/su_max	8.229464	
<pre># choose from: rm (reference mole</pre>	cule of known c	hirality),
# ad (anomolous dispersion - Flac	k), rmad (rm an	d ad),
<pre># syn (from synthesis), unk (unkn</pre>	own) or . (not	applicable).
_chemical_absolute_configuration	· · ·	
_refine_ls_structure_factor_coef	F	
_refine_ls_matrix_type	full	
_refine_ls_hydrogen_treatment	mixed	<pre># none, undef, noref, refall,</pre>

_refine	_ls_matrix_type	full
---------	-----------------	------

refine	ls	hydrogen	treatment
		_myurogom_	_ or ca omeno

mixed

# none, undef, noref, refall,

```
# refxyz, refU, constr or mixed
_refine_ls_weighting_scheme
                                  calc
_refine_ls_weighting_details
;
Method, part 1, Chebychev polynomial, (Watkin, 1994, Prince, 1982)
 [weight] = 1.0/[A~0~*T~0~(x)+A~1~*T~1~(x) ... +A~n-1~]*T~n-1~(x)]
 where A~i~ are the Chebychev coefficients listed below and x= Fcalc/Fmax
Method = Robust Weighting (Prince, 1982)
 W = [weight] * [1-(deltaF/6*sigmaF)^2^]^2^
                                            55
 A~i~ are:
 0.641 -1.47 0.282 -0.595
;
_publ_section_references
;
Betteridge, P.W., Carruthers, J.R., Cooper, R.I.,
Prout, K. & Watkin, D.J. (2003). J. Appl. Cryst. 36, 1487.
Larson, A.C. (1970) Crystallographic Computing, Ed Ahmed, F.R.,
Munksgaard, Copenhagen, 291-294.
Prince, E.
Mathematical Techniques in Crystallography
and Materials Science
Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.
Watkin D.J. (1994).
Acta Cryst, A50, 411-437.
Watkin, D.J., Prout, C.K. & Pearce, L.J. (1996). CAMERON, Chemical
```

```
Crystallography Laboratory, Oxford, UK.
;
# Uequiv = arithmetic mean of Ui i.e. Ueqiv = (U1+U2+U3)/3
# Replace last . with number of unfound hydrogen atomsattached to an atom.
# ..._refinement_flags_...
# . no refinement constraints
                                        S special position constraint on site
# G rigid group refinement of site
                                        R riding atom
# D distance or angle restraint on site T thermal displacement constraints
# U Uiso or Uij restraint (rigid bond) P partial occupancy constraint
                               nA
loop_
_atom_site_label
_atom_site_type_symbol
_atom_site_fract_x
_atom_site_fract_y
_atom_site_fract_z
_atom_site_U_iso_or_equiv
_atom_site_occupancy
_atom_site_adp_type
_atom_site_refinement_flags_posn
```

```
_atom_site_refinement_flags_adp
```

\_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_occupancy

\_atom\_site\_disorder\_assembly

\_atom\_site\_disorder\_group

\_atom\_site\_attached\_hydrogens

01 0 0.2139(4) 0.2447(5) 0.01297(9) 0.0149 1.0000 Uani . . . . .

02 0 -0.0988(4) 0.1442(5) 0.06581(10) 0.0155 1.0000 Uani . . . . .

```
C1 C 0.0952(3) 0.2817(4) 0.05725(8) 0.0106 1.0000 Uani . . .
C2 C 0.1751(3) 0.4917(4) 0.10374(8) 0.0101 1.0000 Uani . .
C3 C 0.3835(3) 0.6488(4) 0.09791(8) 0.0127 1.0000 Uani .
C4 C 0.4583(3) 0.8455(4) 0.14199(9) 0.0143 1.0000 Uani
C5 C 0.3259(3) 0.8850(4) 0.19167(8) 0.0135 1.0000 Uani
C6 C 0.1182(4) 0.7272(4) 0.19739(8) 0.0143 1.0000 Uani
C7 C 0.0425(3) 0.5314(4) 0.15360(8) 0.0122 1.0000 Uani
H3 H 0.4843(9) 0.6142(12) 0.0591(2) 0.0320 1.0000 Uani
H4 H 0.6199(9) 0.9679(12) 0.1369(3) 0.0334 1.0000 Uani
H5 H 0.3867(10) 1.0390(11) 0.2260(2) 0.0324 1.0000 Uani
H6 H 0.0118(10) 0.7578(12) 0.2358(2) 0.0314 1.0000 Uani
H7 H -0.1206(9) 0.4090(11) 0.1566(2) 0.0305 1.0000 Uani .
H10 H 0.1419(10) -0.0045(13) -0.0344(3) 0.0244(10) 0.761(13) Uiso . . P . . .
H11 H 0.168(3) 0.112(4) -0.0159(9) 0.0244(10) 0.239(13) Uiso . . P . . .
loop_
_atom_site_aniso_label
_atom_site_aniso_U_11
_atom_site_aniso_U_22
_atom_site_aniso_U_33
_atom_site_aniso_U_23
_atom_site_aniso_U_13
_atom_site_aniso_U_12
01 \ 0.0189(8) \ 0.0151(9) \ 0.0117(7) \ -0.0021(8) \ 0.0060(6) \ -0.0013(8)
02\ 0.0169(9)\ 0.0143(9)\ 0.0155(8)\ -0.0021(7)\ 0.0031(7)\ -0.0024(7)
C1 0.0129(7) 0.0102(8) 0.0090(6) -0.0009(5) 0.0027(5) -0.0008(5)
C2 0.0110(6) 0.0099(7) 0.0096(6) 0.0001(5) 0.0018(5) 0.0004(5)
C3 0.0124(6) 0.0124(8) 0.0138(7) -0.0023(6) 0.0033(5) -0.0022(6)
C4 0.0127(6) 0.0147(8) 0.0155(7) -0.0030(6) 0.0025(5) -0.0024(6)
C5 0.0158(7) 0.0105(8) 0.0139(7) -0.0019(6) 0.0007(5) -0.0006(6)
C6 0.0177(7) 0.0135(8) 0.0120(6) -0.0025(6) 0.0031(5) 0.0003(6)
C7 0.0152(7) 0.0117(8) 0.0102(7) 0.0004(5) 0.0039(5) -0.0017(6)
```

```
H3 0.0278(18) 0.041(3) 0.031(2) -0.011(2) 0.0158(16) -0.0064(19)

H4 0.0269(18) 0.034(3) 0.042(2) -0.012(2) 0.0147(17) -0.0155(18)

H5 0.036(2) 0.028(2) 0.032(2) -0.0119(18) 0.0026(17) -0.0095(19)

H6 0.044(2) 0.029(2) 0.0259(18) -0.0110(18) 0.0207(17) -0.009(2)

H7 0.0285(18) 0.037(3) 0.0296(19) -0.0062(18) 0.0148(16) -0.0145(18)
```

```
_refine_ls_extinction_coef 5.2(4)
_refine_ls_extinction_method
    'Larson (1970), Equation 22'
_oxford_refine_ls_scale 0.1625(8)
loop_
 _geom_bond_atom_site_label_1
 _geom_bond_site_symmetry_1
 _geom_bond_atom_site_label_2
 _geom_bond_site_symmetry_2
 _geom_bond_distance
 _geom_bond_publ_flag
01 . C1 . 1.251(3)
                     yes
O1 . H11 . 0.92(2)
                     no
O2 . H10 2_555 0.984(7)
                          no
02 . C1 . 1.293(3)
                     yes
C1 . C2 . 1.482(3)
                     yes
C2 . C3 . 1.398(3)
                     yes
C2 . C7 . 1.403(2)
                     yes
   . C4 . 1.396(3)
CЗ
                     yes
    H3 . 1.086(5)
C3
                     no
C4
    C5 . 1.399(3)
                     yes
C4 . H4 . 1.088(5)
                     no
C5 . C6 . 1.396(3)
                     yes
C5 . H5 . 1.093(5)
                     no
C6 . C7 . 1.390(3)
                     yes
```

C6 . H6 . 1.096(5) no C7 . H7 . 1.085(5) no H10 . H11 . 0.71(2) no loop\_ \_geom\_angle\_atom\_site\_label\_1 \_geom\_angle\_site\_symmetry\_1 \_geom\_angle\_atom\_site\_label\_2 \_geom\_angle\_site\_symmetry\_2 \_geom\_angle\_atom\_site\_label\_3 \_geom\_angle\_site\_symmetry\_3 \_geom\_angle \_geom\_angle\_publ\_flag C1 . 01 . H11 . 121.1(12) no H10 2\_555 02 . C1 . 113.2(4) no 02 . C1 . 01 . 123.6(2) yes 02 . C1 . C2 . 116.21(17) yes O1 . C1 . C2 . 120.21(19) yes C1 . C2 . C3 . 119.78(15) yes C1 . C2 . C7 . 120.05(16) yes C3 . C2 . C7 . 120.18(16) yes C2 . C3 . C4 . 119.48(16) yes C2 . C3 . H3 . 119.0(3) no C4 . C3 . H3 . 121.5(3) no C3 . C4 . C5 . 120.29(17) yes . C4 . H4 . 119.0(3) CЗ no C4 . H4 . 120.7(3) C5 no C4 C5 . C6 . 120.03(18) yes C4 . C5 . H5 . 119.7(3) no C6 . C5 . H5 . 120.3(3) no C5 . C6 . C7 . 119.97(18) yes C5 . C6 . H6 . 120.7(3) no

C7 . C6 . H6 . 119.4(3) no C2 . C7 . C6 . 120.05(17) yes C2 . C7 . H7 . 118.7(3) no C6 . C7 . H7 . 121.2(3) no O2 2\_555 H10 . H11 . 170.2(17) no H10 . H11 . O1 . 171(3) no

\_\_\_\_\_

#### $100 \mathrm{K}$

data\_CRYSTALS\_cif
\_audit\_creation\_date 10-07-01
\_audit\_creation\_method CRYSTALS\_ver\_12.84

\_oxford\_structure\_analysis\_title 'benzoic acid 100K nouvelle mesure'
\_chemical\_name\_systematic ?
\_chemical\_melting\_point ?

SCRI

_cell_length_a	5.5000(10)
_cell_length_b	5.1000(10)
_cell_length_c	22.0200(10)
_cell_angle_alpha	90
_cell_angle_beta	97.900(10)
_cell_angle_gamma	90
_cell_volume	611.80(17)
_symmetry_cell_setting	'Monoclinic'
_symmetry_space_group_name_H-M	'P 1 21/c 1
_symmetry_space_group_name_Hall	، <u>؟</u> ،

\_symmetry\_equiv\_pos\_as\_xyz

loop\_

'x,y,z' '-x,-y,-z' '-x,y+1/2,-z+1/2' 'x,-y+1/2,z+1/2'

loop\_

\_atom\_type\_scat\_dispersion\_real \_atom\_type\_scat\_dispersion\_imag \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a1 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b1 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a2 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b2 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a3 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b3 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a4 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b4 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_c

D 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 6.6710 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 С 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 6.6460 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 Η 0.0000 0.0000 -3.7390 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 9.3600 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 5.8030 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4'

80



# Sheldrick geometric approximatio 1.00 1.00

_exptl_absorpt_correction_type	none
_exptl_absorpt_correction_T_min	1.0000
_exptl_absorpt_correction_T_max	1.0000
_diffrn_measurement_device_type	'Unknown'
_diffrn_radiation_monochromator	'copper 220'
_diffrn_radiation_type	' neutrons '
_diffrn_radiation_wavelength	0.83200
_diffrn_measurement_method	\w

# If a reference occurs more than once, delete the author

# and date from subsequent references.

_computing_data_collection	'USER DEFINED DATA COLLECTION'
_computing_cell_refinement	'USER DEFINED CELL REFINEMENT'
_computing_data_reduction	'USER DEFINED DATA REDUCTION'
_computing_structure_solution	'USER DEFINED STRUCTURE SOLUTION'
_computing_structure_refinement	'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)'
_computing_publication_material	'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)'
_computing_molecular_graphics	'CAMERON (Watkin et al., 1996)'

RIP

_diffrn_standards_interval_time	0
_diffrn_standards_interval_count	0
_diffrn_standards_number	0
diffrn standards decay %	0

_diffrn_ambient_temperature	100	
_diffrn_reflns_number	3067	
_reflns_number_total	2724	
_diffrn_reflns_av_R_equivalents	0.052	
# Number of reflections with Fried	dels Law is	2724
# Number of reflections without Fi	riedels Law	is O
# Theoretical number of reflection	ns is about	2724

2.186

 $\leq$ 

\_diffrn\_reflns\_theta\_min

_diffrn_reflns_theta_max	42.529
_diffrn_measured_fraction_theta_m	ax 0.991
_diffrn_reflns_theta_full	41.678
_diffrn_measured_fraction_theta_f	ull 0.999
	G
_diffrn_reflns_limit_h_min	-8
_diffrn_reflns_limit_h_max	8
_diffrn_reflns_limit_k_min	0
_diffrn_reflns_limit_k_max	8
_diffrn_reflns_limit_l_min	0
_diffrn_reflns_limit_l_max	35
_reflns_limit_h_min	-8
_reflns_limit_h_max	8
_reflns_limit_k_min	0
_reflns_limit_k_max	8
_reflns_limit_l_min	0
_reflns_limit_1_max	35
_oxford_diffrn_Wilson_B_factor	0.00
_oxford_diffrn_Wilson_scale	0.00
_atom_sites_solution_primary	direct #heavy,direct,difmap,geom
<pre># _atom_sites_solution_secondary</pre>	difmap
_atom_sites_solution_hydrogens	geom
_refine_diff_density_min	-1.38

\_refine\_diff\_density\_max

1.29

_refine_ls_number_reflns	1363
refine_ls_number_restraints	1
refine_ls_number_parameters	137

#\_refine\_ls\_R\_factor\_ref 0.0507 \_refine\_ls\_wR\_factor\_ref 0.0531 \_refine\_ls\_goodness\_of\_fit\_ref 1.0846

#_reflns_number_all 2638	
_refine_ls_R_factor_all	0.1454
_refine_ls_wR_factor_all	0.1280

# The I/u(I) cutoff below was used for refinement as # well as the \_gt R-factors: \_reflns\_threshold\_expression I>3.0\s(I) \_reflns\_number\_gt 1363 \_refine\_ls\_R\_factor\_gt 0.0507 \_refine\_ls\_wR\_factor\_gt 0.0531

\_refine\_ls\_shift/su\_max

0.001550

# choose from: rm (reference molecule of known chirality), # ad (anomolous dispersion - Flack), rmad (rm and ad), # syn (from synthesis), unk (unknown) or . (not applicable). \_chemical\_absolute\_configuration '.'

\_refine\_ls\_structure\_factor\_coef F

```
_refine_ls_matrix_type
                                  full
                                                 # none, undef, noref, refall,
_refine_ls_hydrogen_treatment
                                  mixed
                                                 # refxyz, refU, constr or mixed
_refine_ls_weighting_scheme
                                  calc
_refine_ls_weighting_details
Method, part 1, Chebychev polynomial, (Watkin, 1994, Prince, 1982)
 [weight] = 1.0/[A~0~*T~0~(x)+A~1~*T~1~(x) ... +A~n-1~]*T~n-1~(x)]
 where A^{\sim}i^{\sim} are the Chebychev coefficients listed below and x= Fcalc/Fmax
Method = Robust Weighting (Prince, 1982)
 W = [weight] * [1-(deltaF/6*sigmaF)^2^]^2^
                               nanu
 A~i~ are:
 0.284 0.190E-01 0.551E-01
;
_publ_section_references
;
Betteridge, P.W., Carruthers, J.R., Cooper, R.I.,
Prout, K. & Watkin, D.J. (2003). J. Appl. Cryst. 36, 1487.
Larson, A.C. (1970) Crystallographic Computing, Ed Ahmed, F.R.,
Munksgaard, Copenhagen, 291-294.
Prince, E.
Mathematical Techniques in Crystallography
```

and Materials Science Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.

Watkin D.J. (1994). Acta Cryst, A50, 411-437.

;

Watkin, D.J., Prout, C.K. & Pearce, L.J. (1996). CAMERON, Chemical Crystallography Laboratory, Oxford, UK.

# Uequiv = arithmetic mean of Ui i.e. Ueqiv = (U1+U2+U3)/3

# Replace last . with number of unfound hydrogen atomsattached to an atom.

# ...\_refinement\_flags\_...
# . no refinement constraints S special position constraint on site
# G rigid group refinement of site R riding atom
# D distance or angle restraint on site T thermal displacement constraints
# U Uiso or Uij restraint (rigid bond) P partial occupancy constraint

loop\_ \_atom\_site\_label \_atom\_site\_type\_symbol \_atom\_site\_fract\_x \_atom\_site\_fract\_y \_atom\_site\_fract\_z \_atom\_site\_U\_iso\_or\_equiv \_atom\_site\_occupancy \_atom\_site\_adp\_type \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_posn \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_adp \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_occupancy \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_occupancy

```
_atom_site_disorder_group
```

\_atom\_site\_attached\_hydrogens

```
01 0 0.2161(4) 0.2433(4) 0.01297(8) 0.0197 1.0000 Uani . .
02 0 -0.0970(3) 0.1442(4) 0.06542(8) 0.0194 1.0000 Uani
C1 C 0.0963(3) 0.2803(3) 0.05746(6) 0.0135 1.0000 Uani
C2 C 0.1761(3) 0.4893(3) 0.10386(6) 0.0133 1.0000 Uani
C3 C 0.3843(3) 0.6459(4) 0.09788(7) 0.0172 1.0000 Uani
C4 C 0.4585(3) 0.8424(4) 0.14174(7) 0.0195 1.0000 Uani
C5 C 0.3267(3) 0.8815(3) 0.19141(7) 0.0180 1.0000 Uani
C6 C 0.1196(3) 0.7253(4) 0.19728(7) 0.0190 1.0000 Uani
C7 C 0.0430(3) 0.5294(3) 0.15339(6) 0.0159 1.0000 Uani .
H3 H 0.4842(8) 0.6146(10) 0.05877(19) 0.0394 1.0000 Uani .
H4 H 0.6202(8) 0.9649(10) 0.1370(2) 0.0412 1.0000 Uani .
H5 H 0.3868(8) 1.0333(9) 0.22579(19) 0.0380 1.0000 Uani .
H6 H 0.0147(9) 0.7578(11) 0.23559(18) 0.0414 1.0000 Uani . . . . .
H7 H -0.1206(8) 0.4068(9) 0.15662(19) 0.0350 1.0000 Uani . . . .
H10 H 0.1414(10) -0.0032(13) -0.0343(3) 0.0296(10) 0.692(10) Uiso . . P . . .
H11 H 0.166(2) 0.104(3) -0.0150(6) 0.0296(10) 0.308(10) Uiso . . P . . .
loop_
```

\_atom\_site\_aniso\_label \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_11 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_22 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_33 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_23 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_13 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_12 01 0.0262(8) 0.0192(8) 0.0154(6) -0.0041(6) 0.0089(5) -0.0039(7) 02 0.0202(7) 0.0200(8) 0.0183(6) -0.0050(6) 0.0031(5) -0.0072(7) 01 0.0154(5) 0.0143(7) 0.0109(5) -0.0004(5) 0.0025(4) -0.0010(5) 02 0.0139(5) 0.0157(6) 0.0104(5) 0.0011(5) 0.0015(4) -0.0007(5) 03 0.0156(5) 0.0181(7) 0.0186(5) -0.0023(5) 0.0045(5) -0.0035(5)

C4 0.0185(6) 0.0168(7) 0.0228(6) -0.0041(6) 0.0016(5) -0.0037(6) C5 0.0208(6) 0.0160(7) 0.0164(5) -0.0029(5) -0.0002(5) -0.0006(5) C6 0.0234(7) 0.0191(8) 0.0152(5) -0.0045(5) 0.0046(5) -0.0025(6) C7 0.0191(6) 0.0153(7) 0.0141(5) -0.0022(5) 0.0048(5) -0.0018(5) H3 0.0377(18) 0.048(2) 0.0362(18) -0.0092(18) 0.0186(16) -0.0115(18) H4 0.0325(16) 0.042(2) 0.051(2) -0.017(2) 0.0116(17) -0.0181(17) H5 0.045(2) 0.035(2) 0.0328(17) -0.0160(16) 0.0027(15) -0.0087(18) H6 0.055(2) 0.043(2) 0.0313(16) -0.0163(17) 0.0240(16) -0.011(2) H7 0.0345(16) 0.038(2) 0.0357(16) -0.0063(15) 0.0145(14) -0.0151(16)

2<sup>1</sup>)

7

\_refine\_ls\_extinction\_coef 3.6(4) \_refine\_ls\_extinction\_method 'Larson (1970), Equation 22' \_oxford\_refine\_ls\_scale 0.1433(6) loop\_ \_geom\_bond\_atom\_site\_label\_1 \_geom\_bond\_site\_symmetry\_1 \_geom\_bond\_atom\_site\_label \_geom\_bond\_site\_symmetry\_2 \_geom\_bond\_distance \_geom\_bond\_publ\_flag

O1 . C1 . 1.268(2) yes

O1 . H11 . 0.955(15) no

02 . H10 2\_555 1.001(7) no

. C1 . 1.302(2) 02 yes C2 . 1.500(2) C1yes C2 C3 . 1.417(2) yes C2 . C7 . 1.4095(18) yes C3 . C4 . 1.412(2) yes C3 . H3 . 1.095(4) no C4 . C5 . 1.407(2) yes

```
C4 . H4 . 1.104(4)
                     no
C5 . C6 . 1.411(2)
                     yes
C5 . H5 . 1.101(4)
                     no
C6 . C7 . 1.413(2)
                     yes
                                 C6 . H6 . 1.098(4)
                     no
C7 . H7 . 1.106(4)
                     no
H10 . H11 . 0.695(13)
                        no
loop_
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_1
 _geom_angle_site_symmetry_1
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_2
 _geom_angle_site_symmetry_2
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_3
 _geom_angle_site_symmetry_3
 _geom_angle
_geom_angle_publ_flag
C1 . 01 . H11 . 118.3(7)
                           no
H10 2_555 02 . C1 . 114.7(3)
                               no
02 . C1 . 01 . 123.06(17)
                            yes
02 . C1 . C2 . 117.08(13)
                            yes
O1 . C1 . C2 . 119.86(15)
                            yes
C1 . C2 . C3 . 120.11(12)
                            yes
C1 . C2 . C7 . 119.73(12)
                            yes
C3 . C2 . C7 . 120.16(13)
                            yes
   . C3 . C4 . 119.82(13)
C2
                            yes
    C3 . H3 . 119.4(3)
C2
                          no
C4
    C3 . H3 . 120.8(3)
                          no
C3 . C4 . C5 . 120.07(14)
                            yes
C3 . C4 . H4 . 119.9(3)
                          no
C5 . C4 . H4 . 120.0(3)
                          no
C4 . C5 . C6 . 120.01(14)
                            yes
```

C4 . C5 . H5 . 119.7(3) no C6 . C5 . H5 . 120.2(3) no C5 . C6 . C7 . 120.33(13) yes C5 . C6 . H6 . 120.1(3) no C7 . C6 . H6 . 119.6(3) no C2 . C7 . C6 . 119.61(13) yes C2 . C7 . H7 . 118.8(2) no C6 . C7 . H7 . 121.6(2) no 02 2\_555 H10 . H11 . 173.6(13) no H10 . H11 . O1 . 173.7(19) no \_\_\_\_\_

#### $125 \mathrm{~K}$

data\_CRYSTALS\_cif
\_audit\_creation\_date 10-07-01
\_audit\_creation\_method CRYSTALS\_ver\_12.84

\_oxford\_structure\_analysis\_title 'Benzoic acid 125K'
\_chemical\_name\_systematic ?
\_chemical\_melting\_point ?

_cell_length_a	5.4275(10)
_cell_length_b	5.1118(10)
_cell_length_c	21.8100(10)
_cell_angle_alpha	90
_cell_angle_beta	98.260(10)
_cell_angle_gamma	90
_cell_volume	598.83(16)

\_symmetry\_cell\_setting

'Monoclinic'

521

\_symmetry\_space\_group\_name\_H-M
\_symmetry\_space\_group\_name\_Hall
loop\_
\_symmetry\_equiv\_pos\_as\_xyz
'x,y,z'
'-x,-y,-z'
'-x,y+1/2,-z+1/2'

loop\_

\_atom\_type\_symbol

'x,-y+1/2,z+1/2'

\_atom\_type\_scat\_dispersion\_real \_atom\_type\_scat\_dispersion\_imag \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a1 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b1 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b2 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b3 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b3 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b4 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b4 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Source

С 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 6.6460 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 5.8030 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' Η 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 -3.7390 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000

, ?,

'P 1 21/c 1 '



# Sheldrick geometric approximatio 1.00 1.00

_exptl_absorpt_correction_type	none
_exptl_absorpt_correction_T_min	1.0000
_exptl_absorpt_correction_T_max	1.0000
_diffrn_measurement_device_type	'Unknown'
_diffrn_radiation_monochromator	'copper 220'
_diffrn_radiation_type	' neutrons '
_diffrn_radiation_wavelength	0.83200
_diffrn_measurement_method	\w

# If a reference occurs more than once, delete the author

# and date from subsequent references.

_computing_data_collection	'USER DEFINED DATA COLLECTION'
_computing_cell_refinement	'USER DEFINED CELL REFINEMENT'
_computing_data_reduction	'USER DEFINED DATA REDUCTION'
_computing_structure_solution	'USER DEFINED STRUCTURE SOLUTION'
_computing_structure_refinement	'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)'
_computing_publication_material	'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)'
_computing_molecular_graphics	'CAMERON (Watkin et al., 1996)'

RIP

_diffrn_standards_interval_time	0
_diffrn_standards_interval_count	0
_diffrn_standards_number	0
diffrn standards decay %	0

_diffrn_ambient_temperature	125
_diffrn_reflns_number	3092
_reflns_number_total	2283
_diffrn_reflns_av_R_equivalents	0.065
# Number of reflections with Fried	dels Law is 2283
# Number of reflections without F:	riedels Law is O
# Theoretical number of reflection	ns is about 2281

2.204

\_diffrn\_reflns\_theta\_min

_diffrn_reflns_theta_max	39.661
_diffrn_measured_fraction_theta_ma	ax 0.997
	0
_diffrn_reflns_theta_full	39.661
_diffrn_measured_fraction_theta_fr	ull 0.997
	C)
_diffrn_reflns_limit_h_min	-8
_diffrn_reflns_limit_h_max	8
_diffrn_reflns_limit_k_min	-7
_diffrn_reflns_limit_k_max	2
_diffrn_reflns_limit_l_min	-33
_diffrn_reflns_limit_l_max	3
_reflns_limit_h_min	-8
_reflns_limit_h_max	8
_reflns_limit_k_min	0
_reflns_limit_k_max	7
_reflns_limit_l_min	0
_reflns_limit_1_max	33
_oxford_diffrn_Wilson_B_factor	0.00
_oxford_diffrn_Wilson_scale	0.00
_atom_sites_solution_primary	direct #heavy,direct,difmap,geom
# _atom_sites_solution_secondary	difmap
_atom_sites_solution_hydrogens	geom
_refine_diff_density_min	-0.87

\_refine\_diff\_density\_max

0.84

_refine_ls_number_reflns	1122
_refine_ls_number_restraints	1
_refine_ls_number_parameters	137

#\_refine\_ls\_R\_factor\_ref 0.0479 \_refine\_ls\_wR\_factor\_ref 0.0479 \_refine\_ls\_goodness\_of\_fit\_ref 1.1245

<pre>#_reflns_number_all 2240</pre>	
_refine_ls_R_factor_all	0.1365
_refine_ls_wR_factor_all	0.1443

# The I/u(I) cutoff below was used for refinement as # well as the \_gt R-factors: \_reflns\_threshold\_expression I>3.0\s(I) \_reflns\_number\_gt 1122 \_refine\_ls\_R\_factor\_gt 0.0479 \_refine\_ls\_wR\_factor\_gt 0.0479

\_refine\_ls\_shift/su\_max

0.000087

# choose from: rm (reference molecule of known chirality), # ad (anomolous dispersion - Flack), rmad (rm and ad), # syn (from synthesis), unk (unknown) or . (not applicable). \_chemical\_absolute\_configuration '.'

\_refine\_ls\_structure\_factor\_coef F

```
_refine_ls_matrix_type
                                  full
                                                 # none, undef, noref, refall,
_refine_ls_hydrogen_treatment
                                  mixed
                                                 # refxyz, refU, constr or mixed
_refine_ls_weighting_scheme
                                  calc
_refine_ls_weighting_details
Method, part 1, Chebychev polynomial, (Watkin, 1994, Prince, 1982)
 [weight] = 1.0/[A~0~*T~0~(x)+A~1~*T~1~(x) ... +A~n-1~]*T~n-1~(x)]
 where A^{\sim}i^{\sim} are the Chebychev coefficients listed below and x= Fcalc/Fmax
Method = Robust Weighting (Prince, 1982)
 W = [weight] * [1-(deltaF/6*sigmaF)^2^]^2^
                               nanu
 A~i~ are:
 0.214 -0.127E-01 0.206E-01
;
_publ_section_references
;
Betteridge, P.W., Carruthers, J.R., Cooper, R.I.,
Prout, K. & Watkin, D.J. (2003). J. Appl. Cryst. 36, 1487.
Larson, A.C. (1970) Crystallographic Computing, Ed Ahmed, F.R.,
Munksgaard, Copenhagen, 291-294.
Prince, E.
Mathematical Techniques in Crystallography
and Materials Science
```

Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.

Watkin D.J. (1994). Acta Cryst, A50, 411-437.

;

Watkin, D.J., Prout, C.K. & Pearce, L.J. (1996). CAMERON, Chemical Crystallography Laboratory, Oxford, UK.

# Uequiv = arithmetic mean of Ui i.e. Ueqiv = (U1+U2+U3)/3

# Replace last . with number of unfound hydrogen atomsattached to an atom.

# ...\_refinement\_flags\_...
# . no refinement constraints S sp

# . no refinement constraints# G rigid group refinement of siteR riding atom

# D distance or angle restraint on site T thermal displacement constraints

# U Uiso or Uij restraint (rigid bond) P partial occupancy constraint

loop\_ \_atom\_site\_label \_atom\_site\_type\_symbol \_atom\_site\_fract\_x \_atom\_site\_fract\_y \_atom\_site\_fract\_z \_atom\_site\_U\_iso\_or\_equiv \_atom\_site\_occupancy \_atom\_site\_adp\_type \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_posn \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_adp \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_occupancy \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_occupancy \_atom\_site\_disorder\_assembly

```
_atom_site_disorder_group
```

\_atom\_site\_attached\_hydrogens

```
01 0 0.2169(4) 0.2431(5) 0.01298(9) 0.0240 1.0000 Uani . .
02 0 -0.0964(4) 0.1428(5) 0.06521(10) 0.0241 1.0000 Uani
C1 C 0.0961(3) 0.2790(4) 0.05755(7) 0.0162 1.0000 Uani
C2 C 0.1766(3) 0.4881(4) 0.10389(7) 0.0148 1.0000 Uani
C3 C 0.3838(3) 0.6449(4) 0.09773(8) 0.0205 1.0000 Uani
C4 C 0.4587(3) 0.8409(4) 0.14166(9) 0.0231 1.0000 Uani
C5 C 0.3268(3) 0.8793(4) 0.19123(8) 0.0222 1.0000 Uani
C6 C 0.1200(3) 0.7231(4) 0.19715(8) 0.0225 1.0000 Uani
C7 C 0.0444(3) 0.5287(4) 0.15338(7) 0.0192 1.0000 Uani .
H3 H 0.4838(8) 0.6142(11) 0.0589(2) 0.0408 1.0000 Uani .
H4 H 0.6200(9) 0.9635(12) 0.1368(3) 0.0461 1.0000 Uani .
H5 H 0.3869(9) 1.0308(11) 0.2256(2) 0.0440 1.0000 Uani .
H6 H 0.0159(10) 0.7535(12) 0.2356(2) 0.0452 1.0000 Uani . . . . .
H7 H -0.1184(9) 0.4071(10) 0.1571(2) 0.0391 1.0000 Uani . . . . .
H1 H 0.1408(11) 0.0009(15) -0.0344(3) 0.0309(11) 0.655(11) Uiso . . P . . .
H2 H 0.173(2) 0.103(3) -0.0144(6) 0.0309(11) 0.345(11) Uiso . . P . . .
loop_
```

\_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_11 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_22 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_23 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_23 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_13 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_12 D1 0.0296(9) 0.0260(10) 0.0187(8) -0.0045(9) 0.0113(7) -0.0051(9) D2 0.0254(9) 0.0257(11) 0.0225(8) -0.0012(8) 0.0077(7) -0.0086(8) C1 0.0176(6) 0.0174(8) 0.0142(6) -0.0007(6) 0.0047(5) -0.0015(6) C2 0.0167(6) 0.0145(7) 0.0139(6) 0.0004(5) 0.0041(5) -0.0011(6) C3 0.0182(7) 0.0226(9) 0.0216(7) -0.0027(7) 0.0063(5) -0.0047(7)

```
C4 0.0197(7) 0.0223(9) 0.0276(8) -0.0052(7) 0.0042(6) -0.0041(7)
C5 0.0230(7) 0.0212(9) 0.0218(7) -0.0062(6) 0.0014(6) -0.0016(7)
C6 0.0282(8) 0.0234(9) 0.0169(6) -0.0037(6) 0.0067(6) -0.0019(7)
C7 0.0214(7) 0.0205(8) 0.0172(7) -0.0004(6) 0.0078(6) -0.0014(6)
H3 0.039(2) 0.045(3) 0.043(2) -0.008(2) 0.0226(18) -0.007(2)
H4 0.0361(19) 0.047(3) 0.058(3) -0.016(2) 0.0140(19) -0.020(2)
H5 0.047(2) 0.045(3) 0.039(2) -0.022(2) 0.0034(18) -0.009(2)
H6 0.059(3) 0.045(3) 0.037(2) -0.012(2) 0.0241(19) -0.009(2)
H7 0.0391(19) 0.042(2) 0.0407(19) -0.0078(18) 0.0198(16) -0.0179(19)
```

50

7

\_refine\_ls\_extinction\_coef 2.5(3) \_refine\_ls\_extinction\_method

'Larson (1970), Equation 22' \_oxford\_refine\_ls\_scale 0.1291(5) loop\_

\_geom\_bond\_atom\_site\_label\_1 \_geom\_bond\_site\_symmetry\_1 \_geom\_bond\_atom\_site\_label \_geom\_bond\_site\_symmetry\_2 \_geom\_bond\_distance \_geom\_bond\_publ\_flag O1 . C1 . 1.261(2) yes O1 . H2 . 0.940(15) no O2 . H1 2\_555 1.002(8) no . C1 . 1.286(3) 02 yes C2 . 1.493(2) C1yes C2 C3 . 1.403(2) yes C2 . C7 . 1.395(2) yes C3 . C4 . 1.405(3) yes C3 . H3 . 1.081(4) no C4 . C5 . 1.394(3) yes

```
C4 . H4 . 1.094(5)
                     no
C5 . C6 . 1.398(3)
                     yes
C5 . H5 . 1.095(5)
                     no
C6 . C7 . 1.398(3)
                     yes
                                C6 . H6 . 1.087(4)
                     no
C7 . H7 . 1.093(4)
                     no
H1 . H2 . 0.687(13)
                      no
loop_
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_1
 _geom_angle_site_symmetry_1
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_2
 _geom_angle_site_symmetry_2
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_3
 _geom_angle_site_symmetry_3
 _geom_angle
_geom_angle_publ_flag
C1 . 01 . H2 . 119.2(7)
                          no
H1 2_555 02 . C1 . 115.6(4)
                             no
02 . C1 . 01 . 122.9(2)
                         yes
02 . C1 . C2 . 117.63(16)
                            yes
O1 . C1 . C2 . 119.47(17)
                            yes
C1 . C2 . C3 . 120.32(14)
                            yes
C1 . C2 . C7 . 119.84(14)
                            yes
C3 . C2 . C7 . 119.84(15)
                            yes
   . C3 . C4 . 119.95(15)
C2
                            yes
    C3 . H3 . 119.4(3)
C2
                          no
C4
    C3 . H3 . 120.6(3)
                          no
C3 . C4 . C5 . 119.92(17)
                            yes
C3 . C4 . H4 . 119.9(3)
                          no
C5 . C4 . H4 . 120.1(3)
                          no
C4 . C5 . C6 . 119.98(17)
                            yes
```

C4 . C5 . H5 . 119.7(3) no C6 . C5 . H5 . 120.3(3) no C5 . C6 . C7 . 120.24(16) yes C5 . C6 . H6 . 120.1(3) no C7 . C6 . H6 . 119.6(3) no C6 . C7 . C2 . 120.07(15) yes C6 . C7 . H7 . 121.0(3) no C2 . C7 . H7 . 119.0(3) no 02 2\_555 H1 . H2 . 177.1(13) no H1 . H2 . O1 . 179.9(18) no \_\_\_\_\_

#### 150 K

data\_CRYSTALS\_cif \_audit\_creation\_date 10-07-01 \_audit\_creation\_method CRYSTALS\_ver\_12.84

\_oxford\_structure\_analysis\_title 'benzoic acid 150K' ? \_chemical\_name\_systematic \_chemical\_melting\_point ?

_cell_length_a	5.4555(10)
_cell_length_b	5.0738(10)
_cell_length_c	21.8745(10)
_cell_angle_alpha	90
_cell_angle_beta	98.116(10)
_cell_angle_gamma	90
_cell_volume	599.42(16)

\_symmetry\_cell\_setting

'Monoclinic'

, ?,

'P 1 21/c 1 '

\_symmetry\_space\_group\_name\_H-M
\_symmetry\_space\_group\_name\_Hall
loop\_
\_symmetry\_equiv\_pos\_as\_xyz
'x,y,z'
'-x,-y,-z'
'-x,y+1/2,-z+1/2'

loop\_

\_atom\_type\_symbol

'x,-y+1/2,z+1/2'

\_atom\_type\_scat\_dispersion\_real \_atom\_type\_scat\_dispersion\_imag \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a1 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b1 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b2 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b3 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b3 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b4 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b4 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_c \_atom\_type\_scat\_source

С 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 6.6460 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 5.8030 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' Η 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 -3.7390 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000



# Sheldrick geometric approximatio 1.00 1.00

_exptl_absorpt_correction_type	none
_exptl_absorpt_correction_T_min	1.0000
_exptl_absorpt_correction_T_max	1.0000
_diffrn_measurement_device_type	'Unknown'
_diffrn_radiation_monochromator	'copper 220'
_diffrn_radiation_type	' neutrons '
_diffrn_radiation_wavelength	0.83200
_diffrn_measurement_method	\w

# If a reference occurs more than once, delete the author

# and date from subsequent references.

_computing_data_collection	'USER DEFINED DATA COLLECTION'
_computing_cell_refinement	'USER DEFINED CELL REFINEMENT'
_computing_data_reduction	'USER DEFINED DATA REDUCTION'
_computing_structure_solution	'USER DEFINED STRUCTURE SOLUTION'
_computing_structure_refinement	'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)'
_computing_publication_material	'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)'
_computing_molecular_graphics	'CAMERON (Watkin et al., 1996)'

RIP

_diffrn_standards_interval_time	0
_diffrn_standards_interval_count	0
_diffrn_standards_number	0
diffrn standards decay %	0

	_diffrn_ambient_temperature	150
	_diffrn_reflns_number	2778
	_reflns_number_total	2297
P	_diffrn_reflns_av_R_equivalents	0.099
	# Number of reflections with Fried	dels Law is 2297
	# Number of reflections without ${\rm F}$	riedels Law is O
	# Theoretical number of reflection	ns is about 2303

2.197

\_diffrn\_reflns\_theta\_min

_diffrn_reflns_theta_max	39.816
_diffrn_measured_fraction_theta_m	ax 0.993
	0
_diffrn_reflns_theta_full	39.020
_diffrn_measured_fraction_theta_f	ull 1.000
_diffrn_reflns_limit_h_min	-8
_diffrn_reflns_limit_h_max	8
_diffrn_reflns_limit_k_min	-7
_diffrn_reflns_limit_k_max	1
_diffrn_reflns_limit_l_min	-33
_diffrn_reflns_limit_l_max	0
_reflns_limit_h_min	-8
_reflns_limit_h_max	8
_reflns_limit_k_min	0
_reflns_limit_k_max	7
_reflns_limit_l_min	0
_reflns_limit_1_max	33
_oxford_diffrn_Wilson_B_factor	0.00
_oxford_diffrn_Wilson_scale	0.00
_atom_sites_solution_primary	direct #heavy,direct,difmap,geom
<pre># _atom_sites_solution_secondary</pre>	difmap
_atom_sites_solution_hydrogens	geom
_refine_diff_density_min	-0.72

#### \_refine\_diff\_density\_max

0.96

1018
1
137

#\_refine\_ls\_R\_factor\_ref 0.0470 \_refine\_ls\_wR\_factor\_ref 0.0491 \_refine\_ls\_goodness\_of\_fit\_ref 1.1337

<pre>#_reflns_number_all 2252</pre>	
_refine_ls_R_factor_all	0.1560
_refine_ls_wR_factor_all	0.1662

t # The I/u(I) cutoff below was used for refinement as # well as the \_gt R-factors: \_reflns\_threshold\_expression I>3.0\s(I) \_reflns\_number\_gt 1018 \_refine\_ls\_R\_factor\_gt 0.0470 \_refine\_ls\_wR\_factor\_gt 0.0491

\_refine\_ls\_shift/su\_max

0.000064

# choose from: rm (reference molecule of known chirality), # ad (anomolous dispersion - Flack), rmad (rm and ad), # syn (from synthesis), unk (unknown) or . (not applicable). \_chemical\_absolute\_configuration '.'

\_refine\_ls\_structure\_factor\_coef F

```
_refine_ls_matrix_type
                                   full
                                                   # none, undef, noref, refall,
_refine_ls_hydrogen_treatment
                                   mixed
                                                   # refxyz, refU, constr or mixed
_refine_ls_weighting_scheme
                                   calc
_refine_ls_weighting_details
Method, part 1, Chebychev polynomial, (Watkin, 1994, Prince, 1982)
 [weight] = 1.0/[A~0~*T~0~(x)+A~1~*T~1~(x) ... +A~n-1~]*T~n-1~(x)]
 where A^{\sim}i^{\sim} are the Chebychev coefficients listed below and x= Fcalc/Fmax
Method = Robust Weighting (Prince, 1982)
 W = [weight] * [1-(deltaF/6*sigmaF)^2^]^2^
 A~i~ are:
 0.190 -0.136E-02 -0.409E-02 -0.160E-01
;
_publ_section_references
;
Betteridge, P.W., Carruthers, J.R., Cooper, R.I.,
Prout, K. & Watkin, D.J. (2003). J. Appl. Cryst. 36, 1487.
Larson, A.C. (1970) Crystallographic Computing, Ed Ahmed, F.R.,
Munksgaard, Copenhagen, 291-294.
Prince, E.
```

Mathematical Techniques in Crystallography and Materials Science Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.
Watkin D.J. (1994). Acta Cryst, A50, 411-437.

;

Watkin, D.J., Prout, C.K. & Pearce, L.J. (1996). CAMERON, Chemical Crystallography Laboratory, Oxford, UK.

# Uequiv = arithmetic mean of Ui i.e. Ueqiv = (U1+U2+U3)/3

# Replace last . with number of unfound hydrogen atomsattached to an atom.

# ...\_refinement\_flags\_...
# . no refinement constraints S special position constraint on site
# G rigid group refinement of site R riding atom

# D distance or angle restraint on site T thermal displacement constraints

# U Uiso or Uij restraint (rigid bond) P partial occupancy constraint

loop\_ \_atom\_site\_label \_atom\_site\_type\_symbol \_atom\_site\_fract\_x \_atom\_site\_fract\_y \_atom\_site\_fract\_z \_atom\_site\_U\_iso\_or\_equiv \_atom\_site\_occupancy \_atom\_site\_adp\_type \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_posn \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_adp \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_occupancy \_atom\_site\_disorder\_assembly

```
_atom_site_disorder_group
```

\_atom\_site\_attached\_hydrogens

01 0 0.2189(5) 0.2419(5) 0.01309(10) 0.0281 1.0000 Uani . . 02 0 -0.0946(5) 0.1427(6) 0.06514(10) 0.0279 1.0000 Uani C1 C 0.0960(3) 0.2786(4) 0.05750(7) 0.0193 1.0000 Uani C2 C 0.1772(3) 0.4867(4) 0.10378(7) 0.0165 1.0000 Uani C3 C 0.3853(4) 0.6423(5) 0.09771(9) 0.0249 1.0000 Uani C4 C 0.4591(4) 0.8365(5) 0.14141(9) 0.0264 1.0000 Uani C5 C 0.3277(4) 0.8763(4) 0.19123(9) 0.0255 1.0000 Uani C6 C 0.1209(4) 0.7209(5) 0.19693(8) 0.0261 1.0000 Uani C7 C 0.0458(3) 0.5270(4) 0.15344(8) 0.0212 1.0000 Uani . H3 H 0.4837(10) 0.6099(13) 0.0588(2) 0.0493 1.0000 Uani ۰. H4 H 0.6189(10) 0.9610(13) 0.1367(3) 0.0524 1.0000 Uani . H5 H 0.3879(10) 1.0275(12) 0.2259(2) 0.0494 1.0000 Uani . H6 H 0.0198(11) 0.7515(13) 0.2358(2) 0.0515 1.0000 Uani . . . H7 H -0.1159(9) 0.4055(11) 0.1567(2) 0.0435 1.0000 Uani . . . . H1 H 0.1370(15) 0.0003(19) -0.0346(4) 0.0381(14) 0.615(13) Uiso . . P . . . H2 H 0.174(2) 0.101(3) -0.0155(6) 0.0381(14) 0.385(13) Uiso . . P . . . loop\_

\_atom\_site\_aniso\_label \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_11 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_22 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_33 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_23 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_13 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_12 01 0.0355(11) 0.0300(11) 0.0217(8) -0.0040(9) 0.0143(8) -0.0061(11) 02 0.0295(10) 0.0298(12) 0.0260(9) -0.0032(9) 0.0096(8) -0.0089(10) C1 0.0211(7) 0.0220(9) 0.0159(6) -0.0003(6) 0.0062(6) -0.0018(7) C2 0.0193(7) 0.0157(8) 0.0155(6) 0.0010(6) 0.0059(6) -0.0020(6)

C3 0.0245(8) 0.0265(10) 0.0253(8) -0.0044(8) 0.0087(6) -0.0049(8)

```
C4 0.0230(8) 0.0253(10) 0.0317(9) -0.0052(8) 0.0063(7) -0.0055(8)

C5 0.0296(9) 0.0212(9) 0.0249(8) -0.0054(7) 0.0017(7) -0.0012(8)

C6 0.0335(10) 0.0275(10) 0.0184(7) -0.0033(7) 0.0076(6) -0.0013(8)

C7 0.0254(8) 0.0216(9) 0.0180(7) -0.0008(6) 0.0083(6) -0.0036(8)

H3 0.048(3) 0.057(3) 0.049(2) -0.007(2) 0.027(2) -0.015(3)

H4 0.042(2) 0.052(3) 0.066(3) -0.018(3) 0.021(2) -0.024(2)

H5 0.055(3) 0.050(3) 0.042(2) -0.023(2) 0.004(2) -0.011(3)

H6 0.067(3) 0.053(3) 0.042(2) -0.017(2) 0.028(2) -0.016(3)

H7 0.046(2) 0.049(3) 0.042(2) -0.006(2) 0.0249(18) -0.018(2)
```

Ģ

s1)

\_refine\_ls\_extinction\_coef 2.2(2)
\_refine\_ls\_extinction\_method
 'Larson (1970), Equation 22'
\_oxford\_refine\_ls\_scale 0.1278(6)
loop\_

\_geom\_bond\_atom\_site\_label\_1 \_geom\_bond\_site\_symmetry\_1 \_geom\_bond\_atom\_site\_label \_geom\_bond\_site\_symmetry\_2 \_geom\_bond\_distance \_geom\_bond\_publ\_flag O1 . C1 . 1.269(3) yes O1 . H2 . 0.958(17) no O2 . H1 2\_555 0.990(11) no . C1 . 1.279(3) 02 yes C2 . 1.487(3) C1yes C2 C3 . 1.404(3) yes C2 . C7 . 1.399(2) yes C3 . C4 . 1.392(3) yes C3 . H3 . 1.081(5) no C4 . C5 . 1.401(3) yes

```
C4 . H4 . 1.093(5)
                     no
C5 . C6 . 1.396(3)
                     yes
C5 . H5 . 1.096(5)
                     no
C6 . C7 . 1.389(3)
                     yes
                                C6 . H6 . 1.088(4)
                     no
C7 . H7 . 1.087(5)
                     no
H1 . H2 . 0.674(14)
                      no
loop_
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_1
 _geom_angle_site_symmetry_1
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_2
 _geom_angle_site_symmetry_2
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_3
 _geom_angle_site_symmetry_3
 _geom_angle
_geom_angle_publ_flag
C1 . 01 . H2 . 119.7(8)
                          no
H1 2_555 02 . C1 . 115.1(5)
                             no
02 . C1 . 01 . 123.3(2)
                       yes
02 . C1 . C2 . 117.63(17)
                            yes
O1 . C1 . C2 . 119.11(19)
                            yes
C1 . C2 . C3 . 120.14(15)
                            yes
C1 . C2 . C7 . 119.79(15)
                            yes
C3 . C2 . C7 . 120.07(16)
                            yes
   . C3 . C4 . 119.51(16)
C2
                            yes
    C3 . H3 . 119.1(3)
C2
                          no
C4
    C3 . H3 . 121.4(3)
                          no
C3 . C4 . C5 . 120.38(18)
                            yes
C3 . C4 . H4 . 120.1(3)
                          no
C5 . C4 . H4 . 119.5(4)
                          no
C4 . C5 . C6 . 119.79(19)
                            yes
```

C4 . C5 . H5 . 120.2(3) no C6 . C5 . H5 . 120.0(3) no C5 . C6 . C7 . 120.17(17) yes C5 . C6 . H6 . 119.7(4) no C7 . C6 . H6 . 120.2(4) no C2 . C7 . C6 . 120.09(17) yes C2 . C7 . H7 . 118.5(3) no C6 . C7 . H7 . 121.4(3) no 02 2\_555 H1 . H2 . 174.6(16) no H1 . H2 . O1 . 176.6(20) no \_\_\_\_\_

#### $175 \mathrm{K}$

39 data\_CRYSTALS\_cif \_audit\_creation\_date 10-07-01 \_audit\_creation\_method CRYSTALS\_ver\_12.84

\_oxford\_structure\_analysis\_title 'benzoic acid 175K' ? \_chemical\_name\_systematic \_chemical\_melting\_point ?

_cell_length_a	5.4555(10)
_cell_length_b	5.0738(10)
_cell_length_c	21.8745(10)
_cell_angle_alpha	90
_cell_angle_beta	98.116(10)
_cell_angle_gamma	90
_cell_volume	599.42(16)

\_symmetry\_cell\_setting

'Monoclinic'

, ?,

'P 1 21/c 1 '

\_symmetry\_space\_group\_name\_H-M
\_symmetry\_space\_group\_name\_Hall
loop\_
\_symmetry\_equiv\_pos\_as\_xyz
'x,y,z'
'-x,-y,-z'
'-x,y+1/2,-z+1/2'

loop\_

\_atom\_type\_symbol \_atom\_type\_scat\_dispersion\_real \_atom\_type\_scat\_dispersion\_imag

'x,-y+1/2,z+1/2'

\_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a1 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b1 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a2 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b2 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a3 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b3 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b4 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b4 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_c \_atom\_type\_scat\_source

С 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 6.6460 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 5.8030 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' Η 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 -3.7390 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000



# Sheldrick geometric approximatio 1.00 1.00

_exptl_absorpt_correction_type	none
_exptl_absorpt_correction_T_min	1.0000
_exptl_absorpt_correction_T_max	1.0000
_diffrn_measurement_device_type	'Unknown'
_diffrn_radiation_monochromator	'copper 220'
_diffrn_radiation_type	' neutrons '
_diffrn_radiation_wavelength	0.83200
_diffrn_measurement_method	\w

# If a reference occurs more than once, delete the author

# and date from subsequent references.

_computing_data_collection	'USER DEFINED DATA COLLECTION'
_computing_cell_refinement	'USER DEFINED CELL REFINEMENT'
_computing_data_reduction	'USER DEFINED DATA REDUCTION'
_computing_structure_solution	'USER DEFINED STRUCTURE SOLUTION'
_computing_structure_refinement	'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)'
_computing_publication_material	'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)'
_computing_molecular_graphics	'CAMERON (Watkin et al., 1996)'

RIP

_diffrn_standards_interval_time	0
_diffrn_standards_interval_count	0
_diffrn_standards_number	0
diffrn standards decay %	0

	_diffrn_ambient_temperature	175	
	_diffrn_reflns_number	3607	
	_reflns_number_total	2300	
PG	_diffrn_reflns_av_R_equivalents	0.105	
	# Number of reflections with Fried	dels Law is	2300
	# Number of reflections without F:	riedels Law	is O
	# Theoretical number of reflection	ns is about	2311

2.197

\_diffrn\_reflns\_theta\_min

_diffrn_reflns_theta_max	39.850
_diffrn_measured_fraction_theta_ma	ax 0.992
	0
_diffrn_reflns_theta_full	39.053
_diffrn_measured_fraction_theta_fu	ull 1.000
	G.
_diffrn_reflns_limit_h_min	-8
_diffrn_reflns_limit_h_max	8
_diffrn_reflns_limit_k_min	-7
_diffrn_reflns_limit_k_max	3
_diffrn_reflns_limit_l_min	-33
_diffrn_reflns_limit_l_max	13
_reflns_limit_h_min	-8
_reflns_limit_h_max	8
_reflns_limit_k_min	0
_reflns_limit_k_max	7
_reflns_limit_l_min	0
_reflns_limit_1_max	33
_oxford_diffrn_Wilson_B_factor	0.00
_oxford_diffrn_Wilson_scale	0.00
_atom_sites_solution_primary	direct #heavy,direct,difmap,geom
# _atom_sites_solution_secondary	difmap
_atom_sites_solution_hydrogens	geom
_refine_diff_density_min	-0.58

\_refine\_diff\_density\_max

0.64

_refine_ls_number_reflns	951
_refine_ls_number_restraints	1
_refine_ls_number_parameters	137

#\_refine\_ls\_R\_factor\_ref 0.0412 \_refine\_ls\_wR\_factor\_ref 0.0369 \_refine\_ls\_goodness\_of\_fit\_ref 1.1009

#_reflns_number_all 2256	
_refine_ls_R_factor_all	0.1521
_refine_ls_wR_factor_all	0.1330

t # The I/u(I) cutoff below was used for refinement as # well as the \_gt R-factors: \_reflns\_threshold\_expression I>3.0\s(I) \_reflns\_number\_gt 951 \_refine\_ls\_R\_factor\_gt 0.0412 \_refine\_ls\_wR\_factor\_gt 0.0369

\_refine\_ls\_shift/su\_max

0.000092

# choose from: rm (reference molecule of known chirality), # ad (anomolous dispersion - Flack), rmad (rm and ad), # syn (from synthesis), unk (unknown) or . (not applicable). \_chemical\_absolute\_configuration '.'

\_refine\_ls\_structure\_factor\_coef F

```
_refine_ls_matrix_type
                                   full
                                                  # none, undef, noref, refall,
_refine_ls_hydrogen_treatment
                                   mixed
                                                  # refxyz, refU, constr or mixed
_refine_ls_weighting_scheme
                                   calc
_refine_ls_weighting_details
Method, part 1, Chebychev polynomial, (Watkin, 1994, Prince, 1982)
 [weight] = 1.0/[A~0~*T~0~(x)+A~1~*T~1~(x) ... +A~n-1~]*T~n-1~(x)]
 where A^{\sim}i^{\sim} are the Chebychev coefficients listed below and x= Fcalc/Fmax
Method = Robust Weighting (Prince, 1982)
 W = [weight] * [1-(deltaF/6*sigmaF)^2^]^2^
 A~i~ are:
 0.137 -0.792E-01 -0.296E-01 -0.413E-01
;
_publ_section_references
;
Betteridge, P.W., Carruthers, J.R., Cooper, R.I.,
Prout, K. & Watkin, D.J. (2003). J. Appl. Cryst. 36, 1487.
Larson, A.C. (1970) Crystallographic Computing, Ed Ahmed, F.R.,
```

Munksgaard, Copenhagen, 291-294.

Prince, E.

Mathematical Techniques in Crystallography and Materials Science Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.

Watkin D.J. (1994). Acta Cryst, A50, 411-437.

;

Watkin, D.J., Prout, C.K. & Pearce, L.J. (1996). CAMERON, Chemical Crystallography Laboratory, Oxford, UK.

# Uequiv = arithmetic mean of Ui i.e. Ueqiv = (U1+U2+U3)/3

# Replace last . with number of unfound hydrogen atomsattached to an atom.

# ...\_refinement\_flags\_...
# . no refinement constraints S special position constraint on site
# G rigid group refinement of site R riding atom
# D distance or angle restraint on site T thermal displacement constraints
# U Uiso or Uij restraint (rigid bond) P partial occupancy constraint

loop\_ \_atom\_site\_label \_atom\_site\_type\_symbol \_atom\_site\_fract\_x \_atom\_site\_fract\_y \_atom\_site\_fract\_z \_atom\_site\_U\_iso\_or\_equiv \_atom\_site\_occupancy \_atom\_site\_adp\_type \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_posn \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_adp \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_occupancy \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_occupancy \_atom\_site\_disorder\_assembly

```
_atom_site_disorder_group
_atom_site_attached_hydrogens
01 0 0.2181(5) 0.2415(5) 0.01299(9) 0.0331 1.0000 Uani . .
02 0 -0.0941(5) 0.1413(5) 0.06494(10) 0.0328 1.0000 Uani
C1 C 0.0974(3) 0.2770(4) 0.05753(7) 0.0228 1.0000 Uani
C2 C 0.1782(3) 0.4849(3) 0.10370(7) 0.0207 1.0000 Uani
C3 C 0.3852(3) 0.6390(4) 0.09762(8) 0.0279 1.0000 Uani
C4 C 0.4594(4) 0.8341(4) 0.14122(9) 0.0325 1.0000 Uani
C5 C 0.3280(4) 0.8728(4) 0.19086(9) 0.0312 1.0000 Uani
C6 C 0.1220(4) 0.7175(4) 0.19708(8) 0.0311 1.0000 Uani
C7 C 0.0466(3) 0.5240(4) 0.15331(7) 0.0256 1.0000 Uani .
H3 H 0.4834(9) 0.6083(11) 0.0588(2) 0.0543 1.0000 Uani .
H4 H 0.6198(10) 0.9568(12) 0.1366(3) 0.0588 1.0000 Uani .
H5 H 0.3876(10) 1.0245(11) 0.2259(2) 0.0559 1.0000 Uani .
H6 H 0.0204(11) 0.7512(12) 0.2360(2) 0.0610 1.0000 Uani . . . . .
H7 H -0.1157(9) 0.4032(11) 0.1571(2) 0.0525 1.0000 Uani . . . .
H1 H 0.1374(13) -0.0070(17) -0.0350(3) 0.0392(12) 0.589(10) Uiso . . P . . .
H2 H 0.1706(19) 0.105(2) -0.0152(5) 0.0392(12) 0.411(10) Uiso . . P . . .
loop_
_atom_site_aniso_label
_atom_site_aniso_U_11
_atom_site_aniso_U_22
_atom_site_aniso_U_33
_atom_site_aniso_U_23
_atom_site_aniso_U_13
_atom_site_aniso_U_12
01 0.0402(11) 0.0359(11) 0.0267(8) -0.0056(9) 0.0169(8) -0.0088(11)
02\ 0.0365(11)\ 0.0341(11)\ 0.0303(9)\ -0.0023(9)\ 0.0132(8)\ -0.0098(10)
```

C1 0.0254(8) 0.0248(8) 0.0191(6) -0.0002(6) 0.0064(5) -0.0020(7)

C2 0.0254(7) 0.0190(7) 0.0185(6) 0.0000(5) 0.0057(5) -0.0002(6)

C3 0.0260(8) 0.0287(9) 0.0307(7) -0.0027(7) 0.0101(6) -0.0053(8)

```
C4 0.0291(9) 0.0315(9) 0.0369(9) -0.0068(8) 0.0054(7) -0.0059(8)

C5 0.0347(9) 0.0285(9) 0.0296(8) -0.0068(7) 0.0012(7) -0.0009(8)

C6 0.0402(10) 0.0293(9) 0.0251(7) -0.0053(7) 0.0090(7) -0.0030(8)

C7 0.0297(9) 0.0272(9) 0.0220(7) -0.0018(6) 0.0107(6) -0.0034(7)

H3 0.052(2) 0.065(3) 0.052(2) -0.014(2) 0.029(2) -0.020(2)

H4 0.052(3) 0.059(3) 0.068(3) -0.017(3) 0.018(2) -0.026(2)

H5 0.065(3) 0.052(3) 0.051(2) -0.027(2) 0.007(2) -0.012(2)

H6 0.079(3) 0.062(3) 0.048(2) -0.023(2) 0.031(2) -0.014(3)

H7 0.054(3) 0.057(3) 0.053(2) -0.010(2) 0.031(2) -0.019(2)
```

9

511

\_refine\_ls\_extinction\_coef 2.1(2)
\_refine\_ls\_extinction\_method
 'Larson (1970), Equation 22'
\_oxford\_refine\_ls\_scale 0.1266(5)

loop\_

\_geom\_bond\_atom\_site\_label\_1 \_geom\_bond\_site\_symmetry\_1 \_geom\_bond\_atom\_site\_label \_geom\_bond\_site\_symmetry\_2 \_geom\_bond\_distance \_geom\_bond\_publ\_flag O1 . C1 . 1.263(2) yes O1 . H2 . 0.940(13) no O2 . H1 2\_555 0.952(9) no . C1 . 1.280(3) 02 yes C2 . 1.484(2)C1yes C2 C3 . 1.395(2) yes C2 . C7 . 1.397(2) yes C3 . C4 . 1.394(3) yes C3 . H3 . 1.076(4) no C4 . C5 . 1.397(3) yes

```
C4 . H4 . 1.091(5)
                     no
C5 . C6 . 1.395(3)
                     yes
C5 . H5 . 1.102(5)
                     no
C6 . C7 . 1.392(3)
                     yes
                                C6 . H6 . 1.093(4)
                     no
C7 . H7 . 1.090(5)
                     no
H1 . H2 . 0.721(11)
                      no
loop_
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_1
 _geom_angle_site_symmetry_1
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_2
 _geom_angle_site_symmetry_2
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_3
 _geom_angle_site_symmetry_3
 _geom_angle
_geom_angle_publ_flag
C1 . 01 . H2 . 119.0(6)
                          no
H1 2_555 02 . C1 . 115.2(5)
                             no
02 . C1 . 01 . 123.0(2)
                       yes
02 . C1 . C2 . 117.73(16)
                            yes
O1 . C1 . C2 . 119.29(17)
                            yes
C1 . C2 . C3 . 119.99(14)
                            yes
C1 . C2 . C7 . 119.60(15)
                            yes
C3 . C2 . C7 . 120.40(15)
                            yes
   . C3 . C4 . 119.54(16)
C2
                            yes
    C3 . H3 . 119.6(3)
C2
                          no
C4
    C3 . H3 . 120.9(3)
                          no
C3 . C4 . C5 . 120.03(18)
                            yes
C3 . C4 . H4 . 120.1(3)
                          no
C5 . C4 . H4 . 119.9(3)
                          no
C4 . C5 . C6 . 120.35(17)
                            yes
```

C4 . C5 . H5 . 120.3(3) no C6 . C5 . H5 . 119.3(3) no C5 . C6 . C7 . 119.67(16) yes C5 . C6 . H6 . 119.5(3) no C7 . C6 . H6 . 120.9(3) no C2 . C7 . C6 . 120.01(16) yes C2 . C7 . H7 . 119.4(3) no C6 . C7 . H7 . 120.5(3) no 02 2\_555 H1 . H2 . 173.6(13) no H1 . H2 . O1 . 175.8(15) no \_\_\_\_\_

#### 200 K

data\_CRYSTALS\_cif \_audit\_creation\_date 10-07-01 \_audit\_creation\_method CRYSTALS\_ver\_12.84

\_oxford\_structure\_analysis\_title 'benzoic acid 200K' ? \_chemical\_name\_systematic \_chemical\_melting\_point ?

_cell_length_a	5.5000(10)
_cell_length_b	5.1000(10)
_cell_length_c	22.0200(10)
_cell_angle_alpha	90
_cell_angle_beta	97.900(10)
_cell_angle_gamma	90
_cell_volume	611.80(17)

\_symmetry\_cell\_setting

'Monoclinic'

, ?,

'P 1 21/c 1 '

\_symmetry\_space\_group\_name\_H-M
\_symmetry\_space\_group\_name\_Hall
loop\_
\_symmetry\_equiv\_pos\_as\_xyz
'x,y,z'
'-x,-y,-z'
'-x,y+1/2,-z+1/2'

loop\_

'x,-y+1/2,z+1/2'

\_atom\_type\_symbol \_atom\_type\_scat\_dispersion\_real \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a1 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b1 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b2 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b2 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b3 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b4 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b4 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_c \_atom\_type\_scat\_source

D 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 6.6710 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 6.6460 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' Η 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 -3.7390 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' Ν 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 9.3600 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4'

```
0.0000
                                      0.0000
 0
         0.0000
                   0.0000
                                                0.0000
                                                         0.0000
                                                                   0.0000
                                                                            0.0000
   0.0000
                      5.8030 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4'
            0.0000
_cell_formula_units_Z
                                           4
# Given Formula = C1.75 H1.75 00.50
# Dc =
            0.33 \text{ Fooo} =
                                                            30.78
                            148.00 Mu =
                                              0.24 M =
# Found Formula = C7 H6 O2
                                                            122.12
                                              0.98 M =
# Dc =
            1.33 \text{ FOOO} =
                            148.00 Mu =
_chemical_formula_sum
                                    'C7 H6 O2'
                                    'C7 H6 O2'
_chemical_formula_moiety
_chemical_compound_source
                                    'commercial
_chemical_formula_weight
                                      122.12
_cell_measurement_reflns_used
                                           0
_cell_measurement_theta_min
                                           0
_cell_measurement_theta_max
                                           0
_cell_measurement_temperature
                                         200
_exptl_crystal_description
                                    'needle'
_exptl_crystal_colour
                                    'white'
_exptl_crystal_size_min
                                    '3mm'
_exptl_crystal_size_mid
                                    '3mm'
_exptl_crystal_size_max
                                    '10mm'
_exptl_crystal_density_diffrn
                                    1.326
_exptl_crystal_density_meas
# Non-dispersive F(000):
```

_exptl_crystal_F_000	148.000
_exptl_absorpt_coefficient_mu	0.098

# Sheldrick geometric approximati	o 1.00 1.00
_exptl_absorpt_correction_type	none
_exptl_absorpt_correction_T_min	1.0000
_exptl_absorpt_correction_T_max	1.0000
_diffrn_measurement_device_type	'Unknown'
_diffrn_radiation_monochromator	'copper 220'
_diffrn_radiation_type	' neutrons '
_diffrn_radiation_wavelength	0.83200
_diffrn_measurement_method	\w

# If a reference occurs more than once, delete the author # and date from subsequent references. 'USER DEFINED DATA COLLECTION' \_computing\_data\_collection 'USER DEFINED CELL REFINEMENT' \_computing\_cell\_refinement \_computing\_data\_reduction 'USER DEFINED DATA REDUCTION' 'USER DEFINED STRUCTURE SOLUTION' \_computing\_structure\_solution \_computing\_structure\_refinement 'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)' \_computing\_publication\_material 'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)' \_computing\_molecular\_graphics 'CAMERON (Watkin et al., 1996)'

SCRIP

_diffrn_standards_interval_time	0
_diffrn_standards_interval_count	0
_diffrn_standards_number	0
_diffrn_standards_decay_%	0
_diffrn_ambient_temperature	200
_diffrn_reflns_number	3502

\_reflns\_number\_total

2714

\_diffrn\_reflns\_av\_R\_equivalents 0.103

# Number of reflections with Friedels Law is 2714

# Number of reflections without Friedels Law is 0

# Theoretical number of reflections is about 2723

\_diffrn\_reflns\_theta\_min 2.186 \_diffrn\_reflns\_theta\_max 42.362 \_diffrn\_measured\_fraction\_theta\_max 0.996

\_diffrn\_reflns\_theta\_full 42.362 \_diffrn\_measured\_fraction\_theta\_full 0.996

\_diffrn\_reflns\_limit\_h\_min -8 \_diffrn\_reflns\_limit\_h\_max 1 \_diffrn\_reflns\_limit\_k\_min 0 \_diffrn\_reflns\_limit\_k\_max 8 \_diffrn\_reflns\_limit\_l\_min -35 \_diffrn\_reflns\_limit\_1\_max 35 \_reflns\_limit\_h\_min -8 \_reflns\_limit\_h\_max 8 \_reflns\_limit\_k\_min 0 \_reflns\_limit\_k\_max 8 \_reflns\_limit\_l\_min 0 \_reflns\_limit\_l\_max 35

\_oxford\_diffrn\_Wilson\_B\_factor 0.00 \_oxford\_diffrn\_Wilson\_scale

0.00

\_atom\_sites\_solution\_primary

direct #heavy,direct,difmap,geom

<pre># _atom_sites_solution_secondary</pre>	difmap
_atom_sites_solution_hydrogens	geom
_refine_diff_density_min	-0.56
_refine_diff_density_max	0.64
_refine_ls_number_reflns	1031
_refine_ls_number_restraints	1
_refine_ls_number_parameters	137
<pre>#_refine_ls_R_factor_ref 0.0690</pre>	
_refine_ls_wR_factor_ref	0.0445
_refine_ls_goodness_of_fit_ref	1.0326
<pre>#_reflns_number_all 2714</pre>	
_refine_ls_R_factor_all	0.2039
_refine_ls_wR_factor_all	0.0569
# The I/u(I) cutoff below was use	d for refinement as
# well as the _gt R-factors:	
_reflns_threshold_expression	I>3.0\s(I)
	1001

_reflns_number_gt	1031
_refine_ls_R_factor_gt	0.0690
_refine_ls_wR_factor_gt	0.0445

\_refine\_ls\_shift/su\_max 0.

0.004277

# choose from: rm (reference molecule of known chirality),

 $\ensuremath{\texttt{\#}}$  ad (anomolous dispersion - Flack), rmad (rm and ad),

 $\ensuremath{\texttt{\#}}$  syn (from synthesis), unk (unknown) or . (not applicable).

\_chemical\_absolute\_configuration '.'

```
_refine_ls_structure_factor_coef F
_refine_ls_matrix_type
                                  full
_refine_ls_hydrogen_treatment
                                  mixed
                                                  # none, undef, noref, refall,
                                                  # refxyz, refU, constr or mixed
_refine_ls_weighting_scheme
                                  calc
_refine_ls_weighting_details
:
Method, part 1, Chebychev polynomial, (Watkin, 1994, Prince, 1982)
 [weight] = 1.0/[A~0~*T~0~(x)+A~1~*T~1~(x) ... +A~n-1~]*T~n-1~(x)]
 where A~i~ are the Chebychev coefficients listed below and x= Fcalc/Fmax
Method = Robust Weighting (Prince, 1982)
 W = [weight] * [1-(deltaF/6*sigmaF)^2^]^2^
 A~i~ are:
 0.856 0.243 0.981 0.157 0.401
_publ_section_references
Betteridge, P.W., Carruthers, J.R., Cooper, R.I.,
Prout, K. & Watkin, D.J. (2003). J. Appl. Cryst. 36, 1487.
Larson, A.C. (1970) Crystallographic Computing, Ed Ahmed, F.R.,
Munksgaard, Copenhagen, 291-294.
```

Prince, E.

Mathematical Techniques in Crystallography and Materials Science Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.

Watkin D.J. (1994). Acta Cryst, A50, 411-437.

Watkin, D.J., Prout, C.K. & Pearce, L.J. (1996). CAMERON, Chemical Crystallography Laboratory, Oxford, UK.

# Uequiv = arithmetic mean of Ui i.e. Ueqiv = (U1+U2+U3)/3

# Replace last . with number of unfound hydrogen atomsattached to an atom.

# ...\_refinement\_flags\_...
# . no refinement constraints S special position constraint on site
# G rigid group refinement of site R riding atom
# D distance or angle restraint on site T thermal displacement constraints
# U Uiso or Uij restraint (rigid bond) P partial occupancy constraint

```
loop_
```

;

```
_atom_site_label
_atom_site_type_symbol
_atom_site_fract_x
_atom_site_fract_y
_atom_site_fract_z
_atom_site_U_iso_or_equiv
_atom_site_occupancy
_atom_site_adp_type
```

```
_atom_site_refinement_flags_posn
_atom_site_refinement_flags_adp
_atom_site_refinement_flags_occupancy
_atom_site_disorder_assembly
_atom_site_disorder_group
_atom_site_attached_hydrogens
01 0 0.2188(5) 0.2399(6) 0.01310(11) 0.0402 1.0000 Uani
02 0 -0.0924(5) 0.1405(6) 0.06506(12) 0.0385 1.0000 Uani
C1 C 0.0976(4) 0.2750(4) 0.05758(8) 0.0273 1.0000 Uani
C2 C 0.1784(4) 0.4819(4) 0.10360(8) 0.0257 1.0000 Uani
C3 C 0.3857(4) 0.6357(5) 0.09770(10) 0.0343 1.0000 Uani
C4 C 0.4588(4) 0.8294(5) 0.14095(11) 0.0390 1.0000 Uani
                                                        ۰.
C5 C 0.3291(4) 0.8677(5) 0.19114(10) 0.0388 1.0000 Uani .
C6 C 0.1231(4) 0.7140(5) 0.19683(10) 0.0396 1.0000 Uani .
C7 C 0.0476(4) 0.5210(5) 0.15340(8) 0.0319 1.0000 Uani . . . . .
H3 H 0.4843(10) 0.6050(13) 0.0585(3) 0.0628 1.0000 Uani . . . .
H4 H 0.6201(11) 0.9518(14) 0.1364(3) 0.0692 1.0000 Uani . . . . .
H5 H 0.3906(12) 1.0209(13) 0.2248(3) 0.0659 1.0000 Uani . . . . .
H6 H 0.0186(13) 0.7455(15) 0.2353(3) 0.0721 1.0000 Uani . . . . .
H7 H -0.1158(11) 0.4016(11) 0.1569(3) 0.0560 1.0000 Uani . . . . .
H1 H 0.1398(15) -0.007(2) -0.0344(4) 0.0451(14) 0.583(12) Uiso . . P . . .
H2 H 0.175(2) 0.099(3) -0.0150(6) 0.0451(14) 0.417(12) Uiso . . P . . .
loop_
_atom_site_aniso_label
_atom_site_aniso_U_11
_atom_site_aniso_U_22
_atom_site_aniso_U_33
```

```
_atom_site_aniso_U_23
```

```
_atom_site_aniso_U_13
```

\_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_12

01 0.0463(13) 0.0452(15) 0.0327(11) -0.0093(12) 0.0178(10) -0.0117(13)

```
D2 0.0396(13) 0.0417(15) 0.0363(11) -0.0051(11) 0.0121(10) -0.0107(12)
C1 0.0326(9) 0.0259(10) 0.0240(8) 0.0003(7) 0.0061(7) -0.0035(8)
C2 0.0289(8) 0.0249(11) 0.0235(8) 0.0026(7) 0.0045(6) 0.0003(8)
C3 0.0308(9) 0.0362(12) 0.0377(10) -0.0057(9) 0.0114(8) -0.0067(9)
C4 0.0328(10) 0.0389(13) 0.0455(11) -0.0075(10) 0.0063(8) -0.0065(9)
C5 0.0447(12) 0.0357(13) 0.0343(10) -0.0089(9) -0.0008(8) -0.0016(10)
C6 0.0471(12) 0.0428(14) 0.0299(9) -0.0069(9) 0.0090(8) -0.0026(11)
C7 0.0380(10) 0.0323(12) 0.0272(9) -0.0015(8) 0.0105(8) -0.0038(9)
H3 0.060(3) 0.069(4) 0.066(3) -0.023(3) 0.035(3) -0.020(3)
H4 0.055(3) 0.067(4) 0.087(4) -0.017(3) 0.018(3) -0.027(3)
H5 0.079(4) 0.059(4) 0.057(3) -0.024(3) 0.002(3) -0.016(3)
H6 0.088(4) 0.080(4) 0.056(3) -0.027(3) 0.038(3) -0.013(4)
H7 0.065(3) 0.051(3) 0.057(3) -0.006(2) 0.028(2) -0.021(3)
```

```
_refine_ls_extinction_coef 2.6(9)
_refine_ls_extinction_method
```

```
'Larson (1970), Equation 22'
_oxford_refine_ls_scale 0.1547(8)
loop_
```

```
_geom_bond_atom_site_label_1
 _geom_bond_site_symmetry_1
 _geom_bond_atom_site_label_2
 _geom_bond_site_symmetry_2
 _geom_bond_distance
 _geom_bond_publ_flag
    C1 . 1.271(3)
01 .
                      yes
    H2 . 0.955(18)
01.
                       no
O2 . H1 2_555 0.969(13)
                           no
02 . C1 . 1.279(3)
                      yes
C1 . C2 . 1.488(3)
                      yes
C2 . C3 . 1.405(3)
                      yes
```

C2 . C7 . 1.406(2) yes C3 . C4 . 1.393(3) yes C3 . H3 . 1.091(5) no C4 . C5 . 1.409(3) yes C4 . H4 . 1.100(6) no C5 . C6 . 1.398(4) yes C5 . H5 . 1.098(6) no C6 . C7 . 1.395(3) yes C6 . H6 . 1.099(5) no C7 . H7 . 1.097(5) no H1 . H2 . 0.702(13) no loop\_ \_geom\_angle\_atom\_site\_label\_1 \_geom\_angle\_site\_symmetry\_1 \_geom\_angle\_atom\_site\_label\_2 \_geom\_angle\_site\_symmetry\_2 \_geom\_angle\_atom\_site\_label\_3 \_geom\_angle\_site\_symmetry\_3 \_geom\_angle \_geom\_angle\_publ\_flag C1 . 01 . H2 . 119.4(7) no H1 2\_555 02 . C1 . 115.7(5) no 02 . C1 . 01 . 123.2(2) yes 02 . C1 . C2 . 117.71(19) yes . C1 . C2 . 119.1(2) 01 yes C2 . C3 . 120.21(17) C1yes C1 . C2 . C7 . 119.68(17) yes C3 . C2 . C7 . 120.11(18) yes C2 . C3 . C4 . 119.66(19) yes C2 . C3 . H3 . 119.4(3) no C4 . C3 . H3 . 120.9(4) no

C3 . C4 . C5 . 120.3(2) yes C3 . C4 . H4 . 120.1(4) no C5 . C4 . H4 . 119.6(4) no C4 . C5 . C6 . 119.8(2) yes C4 . C5 . H5 . 119.1(4) no C6 . C5 . H5 . 121.1(4) no C5 . C6 . C7 . 120.18(19) yes C5 . C6 . H6 . 120.2(4) no C7 . C6 . H6 . 119.6(4) no C2 . C7 . C6 . 119.94(19) yes C2 . C7 . H7 . 119.2(3) no C6 . C7 . H7 . 120.9(3) no 02 2\_555 H1 . H2 . 173.5(16) no H1 . H2 . O1 . 177.0(18) no

#### $250 \mathrm{K}$

data\_CRYSTALS\_cif
\_audit\_creation\_date 10-07-01
\_audit\_creation\_method CRYSTALS\_ver\_12.84

	_oxford_structure_analysis_title	'benzoic acid 250K'
	_chemical_name_systematic	?
	_chemical_melting_point	?
	_cell_length_a	5.5000(10)
	_cell_length_b	5.1000(10)
	_cell_length_c	22.0200(10)
	_cell_angle_alpha	90
V	_cell_angle_beta	97.900(10)

```
_cell_angle_gamma
                                 90
_cell_volume
                                 611.80(17)
                                 'Monoclinic'
_symmetry_cell_setting
                                    _symmetry_space_group_name_H-M
                                 'P 1 21/c 1 '
                                 , <sub>?</sub>,
_symmetry_space_group_name_Hall
loop_
 _symmetry_equiv_pos_as_xyz
 'x,y,z'
 '-x,-y,-z'
 '-x,y+1/2,-z+1/2'
 'x,-y+1/2,z+1/2'
loop_
_atom_type_symbol
_atom_type_scat_dispersion_real
_atom_type_scat_dispersion_imag
_atom_type_scat_Cromer_Mann_a1
_atom_type_scat_Cromer_Mann_b1
_atom_type_scat_Cromer_Mann_a2
_atom_type_scat_Cromer_Mann_b2
_atom_type_scat_Cromer_Mann_a3
_atom_type_scat_Cromer_Mann_b3
_atom_type_scat_Cromer_Mann_a4
_atom_type_scat_Cromer_Mann_b4
```

\_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_c

\_atom\_type\_scat\_source

D 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 6.6710 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' С 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 6.6460 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4'

 H
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000
 0.0000

\_cell\_formula\_units\_Z 4 # Given Formula = C1.75 H1.75 00.50 # Dc = 0.33 Fooo = 148.00 Mu = 0.24 M = 30.78 # Found Formula = C7 H6.00 02 # Dc = 1.33 F000 = 148.00 Mu = 0.98 M = 122.12

_chemical_formula_sum	'C7 H6.00 D2'
_chemical_formula_moiety	'C7 H6.00 D2'
_chemical_compound_source	, commercial,
_chemical_formula_weight	122.12

_cell_measurement_reflns_used	0
_cell_measurement_theta_min	0
_cell_measurement_theta_max	0
_cell_measurement_temperature	250

	200
_exptl_crystal_description	'needle'
_exptl_crystal_colour	'white'
_exptl_crystal_size_min	'3mm'
_exptl_crystal_size_mid	'3mm'
_exptl_crystal_size_max	'10mm'

00

SCRIPT

_exptl_crystal_density_diffrn	1.326
_exptl_crystal_density_meas	
# Non-dispersive F(000):	
_exptl_crystal_F_000	148
_exptl_absorpt_coefficient_mu	0.098
# Sheldrick geometric approximation	o 1.00 1.

\_exptl\_absorpt\_correction\_type none \_exptl\_absorpt\_correction\_T\_min 1.0000 \_exptl\_absorpt\_correction\_T\_max 1.0000 \_diffrn\_measurement\_device\_type 'Unknown' \_diffrn\_radiation\_monochromator 'copper 220' \_diffrn\_radiation\_type ' neutrons 0.83200 \_diffrn\_radiation\_wavelength \_diffrn\_measurement\_method \w

# If a reference occurs more than once, delete the author

# and date from subsequent references.

_computing_data_collection	'USER DEFINED DATA COLLECTION'
_computing_cell_refinement	'USER DEFINED CELL REFINEMENT'
_computing_data_reduction	'USER DEFINED DATA REDUCTION'
_computing_structure_solution	'USER DEFINED STRUCTURE SOLUTION'
_computing_structure_refinement	'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)'
_computing_publication_material	'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)'
_computing_molecular_graphics	'CAMERON (Watkin et al., 1996)'

_computing_molecular_graphics	,
_diffrn_standards_interval_time	0
_diffrn_standards_interval_count	0
_diffrn_standards_number	0
_diffrn_standards_decay_%	0

_diffrn_ambient_temperature	250
_diffrn_reflns_number	3828
_reflns_number_total	2748
_diffrn_reflns_av_R_equivalents	0.066
# Number of reflections with Frie	dels Law is 2748
# Number of reflections without F	riedels Law is O
# Theoretical number of reflection	ns is about 2783
_diffrn_reflns_theta_min	2.186
_diffrn_reflns_theta_max	42.745
_diffrn_measured_fraction_theta_m	ax 0.989
_diffrn_reflns_theta_full	41.890

_diffrn_reflns_theta_min	2.	186
_diffrn_reflns_theta_max	42	2.745
_diffrn_measured_fraction_theta_ma	ax	0.989

41.890 \_diffrn\_reflns\_theta\_full \_diffrn\_measured\_fraction\_theta\_full 1.000

_diffrn_reflns_limit_	h_min	-8
_diffrn_reflns_limit_	h_max	8
_diffrn_reflns_limit_	k_min	-1
_diffrn_reflns_limit_	k_max	8
_diffrn_reflns_limit_	l_min	0
_diffrn_reflns_limit_	l_max	35
_reflns_limit_h_min		-8
_reflns_limit_h_max		8
_reflns_limit_k_min		0
_reflns_limit_k_max		8
_reflns_limit_l_min		0
_reflns_limit_l_max		35

_oxford_diffrn_Wilson_B_factor	0.00
_oxford_diffrn_Wilson_scale	0.00
_atom_sites_solution_primary	direct #heavy,direct,difmap,geom
<pre># _atom_sites_solution_secondary</pre>	difmap
_atom_sites_solution_hydrogens	geom
_refine_diff_density_min	-0.56
_refine_diff_density_max	0.64
	6
_refine_ls_number_reflns	755
_refine_ls_number_restraints	1
_refine_ls_number_parameters	137
<pre>#_refine_ls_R_factor_ref 0.0488</pre>	
_refine_ls_wR_factor_ref	0.0320
_refine_ls_goodness_of_fit_ref	1.1133
#_reflns_number_all 2748	
_refine_ls_R_factor_all	0.2340
_refine_ls_wR_factor_all	0.0694
# The I/u(I) cutoff below was used	d for refinement as
<pre># well as the _gt R-factors:</pre>	
_reflns_threshold_expression	I>3.0\s(I)
_reflns_number_gt	755
_refine_ls_R_factor_gt	0.0488
_refine_ls_wR_factor_gt	0.0320
_refine_ls_shift/su_max	0.000756

# choose from: rm (reference molecule of known chirality),

```
# ad (anomolous dispersion - Flack), rmad (rm and ad),
# syn (from synthesis), unk (unknown) or . (not applicable).
_chemical_absolute_configuration '.'
_refine_ls_structure_factor_coef F
_refine_ls_matrix_type
                                  full
                                                 # none, undef, noref, refall,
_refine_ls_hydrogen_treatment
                                  mixed
                                                 # refxyz, refU, constr or mixed
_refine_ls_weighting_scheme
                                  calc
_refine_ls_weighting_details
;
Method, part 1, Chebychev polynomial, (Watkin, 1994, Prince, 1982)
 [weight] = 1.0/[A~0~*T~0~(x)+A~1~*T~1~(x) ... +A~n-1~]*T~n-1~(x)]
 where A~i~ are the Chebychev coefficients listed below and x= Fcalc/Fmax
Method = Robust Weighting (Prince, 1982)
 W = [weight] * [1-(deltaF/6*sigmaF)^2^]^2^
 A~i~ are:
 0.462 0.303 0.496 0.178 0.207
```

\_publ\_section\_references

Betteridge, P.W., Carruthers, J.R., Cooper, R.I., Prout, K. & Watkin, D.J. (2003). J. Appl. Cryst. 36, 1487.

Larson, A.C. (1970) Crystallographic Computing, Ed Ahmed, F.R., Munksgaard, Copenhagen, 291-294.

Prince, E. Mathematical Techniques in Crystallography and Materials Science Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.

Watkin D.J. (1994). Acta Cryst, A50, 411-437.

Watkin, D.J., Prout, C.K. & Pearce, L.J. (1996). CAMERON, Chemical Crystallography Laboratory, Oxford, UK.

# Uequiv = arithmetic mean of Ui i.e. Ueqiv = (U1+U2+U3)/3

# Replace last . with number of unfound hydrogen atomsattached to an atom.

# ...\_refinement\_flags\_...
# . no refinement constraints S special position constraint on site
# G rigid group refinement of site R riding atom
# D distance or angle restraint on site T thermal displacement constraints
# U Uiso or Uij restraint (rigid bond) P partial occupancy constraint

#### loop\_

;

\_atom\_site\_label \_atom\_site\_type\_symbol \_atom\_site\_fract\_x \_atom\_site\_fract\_y

\_atom\_site\_fract\_z \_atom\_site\_U\_iso\_or\_equiv \_atom\_site\_occupancy \_atom\_site\_adp\_type \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_posn \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_adp \_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_occupancy \_atom\_site\_disorder\_assembly \_atom\_site\_disorder\_group \_atom\_site\_attached\_hydrogens 01 0 0.2199(6) 0.2381(7) 0.01337(12) 0.0548 1.0000 Uani 02 0 -0.0909(5) 0.1398(7) 0.06535(13) 0.0517 1.0000 Uani . . . C1 C 0.0982(4) 0.2734(5) 0.05740(9) 0.0395 1.0000 Uani . . C2 C 0.1799(4) 0.4786(5) 0.10343(9) 0.0374 1.0000 Uani . C3 C 0.3851(4) 0.6322(5) 0.09745(10) 0.0479 1.0000 Uani . . . . . C4 C 0.4590(5) 0.8225(6) 0.14088(12) 0.0548 1.0000 Uani . . . . . C5 C 0.3311(5) 0.8600(6) 0.19052(11) 0.0517 1.0000 Uani . . . . . C6 C 0.1260(5) 0.7078(6) 0.19667(10) 0.0548 1.0000 Uani . . . . . C7 C 0.0503(4) 0.5172(5) 0.15338(9) 0.0441 1.0000 Uani . . . . . H3 H 0.4852(11) 0.5993(14) 0.0584(3) 0.0816 1.0000 Uani . . . . . H4 H 0.6200(12) 0.9458(15) 0.1355(3) 0.0912 1.0000 Uani . . . . . H5 H 0.3908(12) 1.0099(14) 0.2251(3) 0.0817 1.0000 Uani . . . . . H6 H 0.0200(14) 0.7416(15) 0.2346(3) 0.0900 1.0000 Uani . . . . . H7 H -0.1114(11) 0.3946(13) 0.1572(3) 0.0737 1.0000 Uani . . . . . H1 H 0.1419(18) -0.003(3) -0.0340(6) 0.0595(19) 0.570(17) Uiso . . P . . . H2 H 0.172(2) 0.103(4) -0.0151(8) 0.0595(19) 0.430(17) Uiso . . P . . . loop\_ \_atom\_site\_aniso\_label

\_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_11 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_22 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_33

```
_atom_site_aniso_U_23
_atom_site_aniso_U_13
_atom_site_aniso_U_12
01 \ 0.0618(16) \ 0.064(2) \ 0.0430(12) \ -0.0121(16) \ 0.0218(11) \ -0.0163(16)
02 0.0529(15) 0.058(2) 0.0461(13) -0.0090(15) 0.0136(11) -0.0152(15)
C1 0.0415(10) 0.0451(15) 0.0321(9) 0.0009(10) 0.0049(8) -0.0038(10)
C2 0.0376(10) 0.0404(15) 0.0343(10) 0.0031(10) 0.0052(8) 0.0015(10)
C3 0.0432(11) 0.0509(17) 0.0510(12) -0.0082(12) 0.0117(10) -0.0112(12)
C4 0.0442(12) 0.0558(18) 0.0636(14) -0.0074(13) 0.0051(10) -0.0131(12)
C5 0.0565(14) 0.0479(17) 0.0473(12) -0.0076(12) -0.0043(10) 0.0001(13)
C6 0.0638(15) 0.0589(18) 0.0436(12) -0.0153(13) 0.0138(10) -0.0056(14)
C7 0.0503(13) 0.0468(16) 0.0375(12) -0.0054(11) 0.0143(9) -0.0070(12)
H3 0.072(3) 0.097(5) 0.085(3) -0.024(3) 0.041(3) -0.029(3)
H4 0.067(3) 0.098(6) 0.112(5) -0.020(4) 0.024(3) -0.037(4)
H5 0.093(4) 0.072(4) 0.076(3) -0.036(3) -0.002(3) -0.013(3)
H6 0.120(5) 0.093(5) 0.066(3) -0.025(4) 0.045(3) -0.014(4)
H7 0.081(4) 0.079(4) 0.067(3) -0.016(3) 0.032(3) -0.030(3)
```

```
_refine_ls_extinction_coef 1.8(6)
_refine_ls_extinction_method
    'Larson (1970), Equation 22'
_oxford_refine_ls_scale 0.1399(7)
loop_
    _geom_bond_atom_site_label_1
    _geom_bond_site_symmetry_1
    _geom_bond_atom_site_label_2
    _geom_bond_site_symmetry_2
    _geom_bond_distance
    _geom_bond_publ_flag
```

```
01 . C1 . 1.264(3) yes
```

01 . H2 . 0.94(3) no
02 . H1 2\_555 0.99(2) no 02 . C1 . 1.276(4) yes C1 . C2 . 1.483(3) yes C2 . C3 . 1.395(3) yes C2 . C7 . 1.404(3) yes C3 . C4 . 1.384(4) yes C3 . H3 . 1.096(6) no C4 . C5 . 1.392(4) yes C4 . H4 . 1.105(7) no C5 . C6 . 1.391(4) yes C5 . H5 . 1.096(7) no C6 . C7 . 1.385(4) yes C6 . H6 . 1.096(6) no C7 . H7 . 1.100(6) no H1 . H2 . 0.690(17) no loop\_ \_geom\_angle\_atom\_site\_label\_1 \_geom\_angle\_site\_symmetry\_1 \_geom\_angle\_atom\_site\_label\_2 \_geom\_angle\_site\_symmetry\_2 \_geom\_angle\_atom\_site\_label\_3 \_geom\_angle\_site\_symmetry\_3 \_geom\_angle \_geom\_angle\_publ\_flag C1 . 01 . H2 . 118.8(8) no H1 2\_555 02 . C1 . 115.9(6) 02 . C1 . 01 . 123.8(3)

02. C1 . 01 . 123.8(3) yes 02. C1 . C2 . 117.3(2) yes 01 . C1 . C2 . 118.8(2) yes C1 . C2 . C3 . 120.31(18) yes C1 . C2 . C7 . 119.7(2) yes

no

C3 . C2 . C7 . 120.0(2) yes C2 . C3 . C4 . 119.6(2) yes C2 . C3 . H3 . 119.3(4) no C4 . C3 . H3 . 121.2(4) no C3 . C4 . C5 . 120.4(2) yes C3 . C4 . H4 . 119.3(4) no C5 . C4 . H4 . 120.3(4) no C4 . C5 . C6 . 120.3(2) yes C4 . C5 . H5 . 120.3(4) no C6 . C5 . H5 . 119.4(4) no C5 . C6 . C7 . 119.7(2) yes C5 . C6 . H6 . 120.7(4) no C7 . C6 . H6 . 119.6(4) no C2 . C7 . C6 . 120.1(2) yes C2 . C7 . H7 . 118.9(3) no C6 . C7 . H7 . 121.0(3) no 02 2\_555 H1 . H2 . 172.9(19) H1 . H2 . O1 . 175(2) no

#### 293 K

data\_CRYSTALS\_cif \_audit\_creation\_date 10-07-01 \_audit\_creation\_method CRYSTALS\_ver\_12.84

\_oxford\_structure\_analysis\_title 'benzoic acid 293K'
\_chemical\_name\_systematic ?
\_chemical\_melting\_point ?

\_cell\_length\_a

5.5000(10)

no

_cell_length_b	5.1000(10)
_cell_length_c	22.0200(10)
_cell_angle_alpha	90
_cell_angle_beta	97.900(10)
_cell_angle_gamma	90
_cell_volume	611.80(17)
_symmetry_cell_setting	'Monoclinic'
_symmetry_space_group_name_H-M	'P 1 21/c 1 '
_symmetry_space_group_name_Hall	،?،
loop_	6
_symmetry_equiv_pos_as_xyz	
'x,y,z'	
'-x,-y,-z'	
'-x,y+1/2,-z+1/2'	
'x,-y+1/2,z+1/2'	
loop_	
_atom_type_symbol	
stom turno gest dignorgion rosl	

```
loop_
```

\_atom\_type\_symbol \_atom\_type\_scat\_dispersion\_real \_atom\_type\_scat\_dispersion\_imag \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a1 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b1 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a2 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b2 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a3 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b3 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_a4 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_b4 \_atom\_type\_scat\_Cromer\_Mann\_c \_atom\_type\_scat\_source

0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 D 0.0000 0.0000 6.6710 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' С 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 6.6460 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' Η 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 -3.7390 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 Ν 0.0000 0.0000 9.3600 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4' 0 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 5.8030 'International Tables Vol C 4.2.6.8 and 6.1.1.4'

\_cell\_formula\_units\_Z

# Given Formula = C1.75 H1.75 00.50
# Dc = 0.33 Fooo = 368.00 Mu = 0.24 M = 30.78
# Found Formula = C7 H1 D5 02
# Dc = 1.27 F000 = 368.00 Mu = 0.96 M = 117.08

_chemical_formula_sum	'C7 H1 D5 O2'
_chemical_formula_moiety	'C7 H1 D5 O2'
_chemical_compound_source	'commercial'
_chemical_formula_weight	117.08

# Structure does not match formula

_cell_measurement_reflns_used	0
_cell_measurement_theta_min	0
_cell_measurement_theta_max	0
_cell_measurement_temperature	293

_exptl_crystal_description	'needle'
_exptl_crystal_colour	'white'
_exptl_crystal_size_min	'3mm'
_exptl_crystal_size_mid	'3mm'
_exptl_crystal_size_max	'10mm'
_exptl_crystal_density_diffrn	1.271
_exptl_crystal_density_meas	
<pre># Non-dispersive F(000):</pre>	
_exptl_crystal_F_000	368.000
_exptl_absorpt_coefficient_mu	0.096
# Sheldrick geometric approximation	lo 1.00 1.00
_exptl_absorpt_correction_type	none
_exptl_absorpt_correction_T_min	1.0000
_exptl_absorpt_correction_T_max	1.0000
_diffrn_measurement_device_type	'Unknown'
_diffrn_radiation_monochromator	copper 220'
_diffrn_radiation_type	' neutrons '
_diffrn_radiation_wavelength	0.83200
_diffrn_measurement_method	\w

# If a reference occurs more than once, delete the author

# and date from subsequent references.

PC	_computing_data_collection	'USER DEFINED DATA COLLECTION'
	_computing_cell_refinement	'USER DEFINED CELL REFINEMENT'
	_computing_data_reduction	'USER DEFINED DATA REDUCTION'
	_computing_structure_solution	'USER DEFINED STRUCTURE SOLUTION'
	_computing_structure_refinement	'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)'
	_computing_publication_material	'CRYSTALS (Betteridge et al., 2003)'
	_computing_molecular_graphics	'CAMERON (Watkin et al., 1996)'

148

CRIPS

- \_diffrn\_standards\_interval\_time 0 \_diffrn\_standards\_interval\_count 0 \_diffrn\_standards\_number 0 \_diffrn\_standards\_decay\_% 0 \_diffrn\_ambient\_temperature 293 \_diffrn\_reflns\_number 3401
- \_reflns\_number\_total 2630
- \_diffrn\_reflns\_av\_R\_equivalents 0.078
- # Number of reflections with Friedels Law is 2630
- # Number of reflections without Friedels Law is 0
- # Theoretical number of reflections is about 2760

_diffrn_reflns_theta_min	2.186
_diffrn_reflns_theta_max	42.601
_diffrn_measured_fraction_theta	_max 0.953

_diffrn_reflns_theta_full		39.619	
_diffrn_measured_fraction_	theta_	full	0.997

_diffrn_reflns_limit_h_min	0
_diffrn_reflns_limit_h_max	8
_diffrn_reflns_limit_k_min	-8
_diffrn_reflns_limit_k_max	1
_diffrn_reflns_limit_l_min	-33
_diffrn_reflns_limit_l_max	33
_reflns_limit_h_min	-8
reflns limit h max	8



\_reflns\_threshold\_expression I>3.0\s(I)

```
_reflns_number_gt
                                  511
_refine_ls_R_factor_gt
                                  0.0505
_refine_ls_wR_factor_gt
                                  0.0297
_refine_ls_shift/su_max
                                  0.000432
# choose from: rm (reference molecule of known chirality),
# ad (anomolous dispersion - Flack), rmad (rm and ad),
# syn (from synthesis), unk (unknown) or . (not applicable).
_chemical_absolute_configuration '.'
_refine_ls_structure_factor_coef F
_refine_ls_matrix_type
                                  full
_refine_ls_hydrogen_treatment
                                  mixed
                                                  # none, undef, noref, refall,
                                                  # refxyz, refU, constr or mixed
_refine_ls_weighting_scheme
                                  calc
_refine_ls_weighting_details
;
 Method, part 1, Chebychev polynomial, (Watkin, 1994, Prince, 1982)
 [weight] = 1.0/[A~0~*T~0~(x)+A~1~*T~1~(x) ... +A~n-1~]*T~n-1~(x)]
 where A^{-i} are the Chebychev coefficients listed below and x= Fcalc/Fmax
Method = Robust Weighting (Prince, 1982)
 W = [weight] * [1-(deltaF/6*sigmaF)^2^]^2^
 A~i~ are:
 0.580 -0.218 0.648 -0.581E-01 0.260
```

\_publ\_section\_references

#### CCEPTED MANU

Betteridge, P.W., Carruthers, J.R., Cooper, R.I., Prout, K. & Watkin, D.J. (2003). J. Appl. Cryst. 36, 1487.

Larson, A.C. (1970) Crystallographic Computing, Ed Ahmed, F.R., SCR Munksgaard, Copenhagen, 291-294.

Prince, E. Mathematical Techniques in Crystallography and Materials Science Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.

Watkin D.J. (1994). Acta Cryst, A50, 411-437.

;

;

Watkin, D.J., Prout, C.K. & Pearce, L.J. (1996). CAMERON, Chemical Crystallography Laboratory, Oxford, UK.

# Uequiv = arithmetic mean of Ui i.e. Ueqiv = (U1+U2+U3)/3

# Replace last . with number of unfound hydrogen atomsattached to an atom.

...\_refinement\_flags\_... #

- # . no refinement constraints S special position constraint on site
- # G rigid group refinement of site R riding atom
- # D distance or angle restraint on site T thermal displacement constraints
- # U Uiso or Uij restraint (rigid bond) P partial occupancy constraint

loop\_

\_atom\_site\_label

\_atom\_site\_type\_symbol

\_atom\_site\_fract\_x

\_atom\_site\_fract\_y

\_atom\_site\_fract\_z

\_atom\_site\_U\_iso\_or\_equiv

\_atom\_site\_occupancy

\_atom\_site\_adp\_type

\_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_posn

\_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_adp

\_atom\_site\_refinement\_flags\_occupancy

\_atom\_site\_disorder\_assembly

\_atom\_site\_disorder\_group

-----

\_atom\_site\_attached\_hydrogens

U1 U 0.2208(10) 0.2394(12) 0.0131(2) 0.0641 1.0000 Uani
D2 D -0.0899(9) 0.1408(11) 0.0652(2) 0.0578 1.0000 Uani
C1 C 0.0996(7) 0.2702(7) 0.05720(14) 0.0441 1.0000 Uani
C2 C 0.1815(6) 0.4756(7) 0.10399(15) 0.0419 1.0000 Uani
C3 C 0.3850(8) 0.6260(8) 0.0969(2) 0.0566 1.0000 Uani
C4 C 0.4603(8) 0.8164(8) 0.14052(19) 0.0614 1.0000 Uani
C5 C 0.3315(8) 0.8541(8) 0.19027(19) 0.0635 1.0000 Uani
C6 C 0.1284(8) 0.7025(8) 0.19658(18) 0.0623 1.0000 Uani
C7 C 0.0522(7) 0.5158(7) 0.15353(15) 0.0495 1.0000 Uani
D3 D 0.4827(10) 0.5965(12) 0.0580(3) 0.0910 1.0000 Uani
D4 D 0.6161(11) 0.9351(13) 0.1357(4) 0.1103 1.0000 Uani
D5 D 0.3900(12) 1.0007(13) 0.2236(3) 0.0946 1.0000 Uani
D6 D 0.0269(13) 0.7328(13) 0.2349(2) 0.1050 1.0000 Uani
D7 D -0.1061(10) 0.3937(11) 0.1575(2) 0.0837 1.0000 Uani
H10 H 0.137(5) -0.004(4) -0.0368(11) 0.0628 0.5039 Uani
H11 H 0.173(4) 0.094(5) -0.0165(10) 0.0650 0.4962 Uani

loop\_ \_atom\_site\_aniso\_label \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_11 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_22 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_33 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_23 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_13 \_atom\_site\_aniso\_U\_12 01 0.080(3) 0.058(3) 0.059(3) -0.015(3) 0.029(3) -0.021(3) 02 0.063(3) 0.059(3) 0.055(3) -0.013(2) 0.020(2) -0.024(3)  $C1 \ 0.052(2) \ 0.0402(19) \ 0.0412(17) \ -0.0017(15) \ 0.0094(17) \ -0.0039(16)$ C2 0.0455(19) 0.0368(18) 0.0437(18) 0.0054(15) 0.0067(16) -0.0016(16)C3 0.053(2) 0.054(2) 0.066(2) -0.004(2) 0.017(2) -0.0108(19) C4 0.062(3) 0.048(3) 0.073(3) -0.014(2) 0.006(2) -0.014(2) C5 0.073(3) 0.053(3) 0.060(2) -0.020(2) -0.008(2) -0.003(2) C6 0.083(3) 0.056(3) 0.0504(19) -0.0162(19) 0.018(2) -0.004(2) C7 0.061(2) 0.044(2) 0.046(2) -0.0096(18) 0.0172(18) -0.0090(19) D3 0.083(4) 0.094(4) 0.105(4) -0.032(3) 0.043(3) -0.031(3) D4 0.087(4) 0.099(4) 0.147(6) -0.041(4) 0.027(4) -0.044(4) D5 0.109(4) 0.072(3) 0.099(4) -0.033(3) 0.000(4) -0.007(3) D6 0.145(5) 0.098(5) 0.082(3) -0.035(3) 0.049(3) -0.022(4) D7 0.092(4) 0.086(3) 0.081(3) -0.019(3) 0.042(3) -0.030(3) H10 0.071(13) 0.045(12) 0.076(16) -0.009(9) 0.024(12) -0.010(9) H11 0.071(13) 0.073(17) 0.053(11) -0.015(9) 0.018(9) -0.012(12)

```
_refine_ls_extinction_coef 2.6(5)
_refine_ls_extinction_method
    'Larson (1970), Equation 22'
_oxford_refine_ls_scale 0.1412(9)
loop_
```

\_geom\_bond\_atom\_site\_label\_1

```
_geom_bond_site_symmetry_1
 _geom_bond_atom_site_label_2
 _geom_bond_site_symmetry_2
                           _geom_bond_distance
 _geom_bond_publ_flag
O1 . C1 . 1.260(5)
                     yes
O1 . H11 . 1.00(3)
                     no
O2 . H10 2_555 0.95(3)
                         no
02 . C1 . 1.266(6)
                     yes
C1 . C2 . 1.495(5)
                     yes
C2 . C3 . 1.383(5)
                     yes
C2 . C7 . 1.397(4)
                     yes
C3 . C4 . 1.388(6)
                     yes
C3 . D3 . 1.083(6)
                     yes
C4 . C5 . 1.397(6)
                     yes
C4 . D4 . 1.066(7)
                     yes
C5 . C6 . 1.381(6)
                     yes
C5 . D5 . 1.066(6)
                     yes
C6 . C7 . 1.368(5)
                     yes
                     yes
C6 . D6 . 1.085(6)
C7 . D7 . 1.083(5)
                     yes
H10 . H11 . 0.68(2)
                      no
loop_
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_1
 _geom_angle_site_symmetry_1
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_2
 _geom_angle_site_symmetry_2
 _geom_angle_atom_site_label_3
 _geom_angle_site_symmetry_3
 _geom_angle
 _geom_angle_publ_flag
```

C1 . 01 . H11 . 118.4(14) no H10 2\_555 02 . C1 . 116.5(13) no 02 . C1 . 01 . 125.1(5) yes 02 . C1 . C2 . 116.4(4) yes 01 . C1 . C2 . 118.5(4) yes C1 . C2 . C3 . 118.9(3) yes C1 . C2 . C7 . 120.2(3) yes C3 . C2 . C7 . 120.9(3) yes C2 . C3 . C4 . 118.6(4) yes C2 . C3 . D3 . 120.6(5) yes C4 . C3 . D3 . 120.7(5) yes C3 . C4 . C5 . 120.2(4) yes C3 . C4 . D4 . 119.7(5) yes C5 . C4 . D4 . 120.1(5) yes C4 . C5 . C6 . 120.4(4) yes C4 . C5 . D5 . 119.9(6) yes C6 . C5 . D5 . 119.7(6) yes C5 . C6 . C7 . 119.7(4) yes C5 . C6 . D6 . 120.5(5) yes C7 . C6 . D6 . 119.8(6) yes C2 . C7 . C6 . 120.2(4) yes C2 . C7 . D7 . 118.6(4) yes C6 . C7 . D7 . 121.2(4) yes 02 2\_555 H10 . H11 . 179(5) no H10 . H11 . O1 . 178(5) no PCC

156