



**HAL**  
open science

# The experimental library multipolar atom model refinement of L-aspartic acid

El-Eulmi Bendeif, Christian Jelsch

► **To cite this version:**

El-Eulmi Bendeif, Christian Jelsch. The experimental library multipolar atom model refinement of L-aspartic acid. *Acta Crystallographica Section C: Crystal Structure Communications* [1968-2013], 2007, 63 (6), pp.o361-o364. 10.1107/S0108270107021671 . hal-01713025

**HAL Id: hal-01713025**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01713025>**

Submitted on 20 Feb 2018

**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.

Acta Crystallographica Section C

**Crystal Structure  
Communications**

ISSN 0108-2701

Editor: **George Ferguson**

## **The experimental library multipolar atom model refinement of L-aspartic acid**

**El-eulmi Bendeif and Christian Jelsch**

Copyright © International Union of Crystallography

Author(s) of this paper may load this reprint on their own web site provided that this cover page is retained. Republication of this article or its storage in electronic databases or the like is not permitted without prior permission in writing from the IUCr.

## The experimental library multipolar atom model refinement of L-aspartic acid

El-eulmi Bendeif\* and Christian Jelsch

Laboratoire de Cristallographie et Modélisation des Matériaux Minéraux et Biologiques (LCM<sup>3</sup>B), CNRS, UMR 7036, Université Henri Poincaré Nancy 1, Faculté des Sciences, BP 239, 54506 Vandoeuvre lès Nancy CEDEX, France  
Correspondence e-mail: el-eulmi.bendeif@lcm3b.uhp-nancy.fr

Received 28 March 2007


Accepted 2 May 2007

Online 24 May 2007

The crystal structure of L-aspartic acid, C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>7</sub>NO<sub>4</sub>, has been determined using two types of refinement, *viz.* the standard independent atom model (IAM) and the experimental library multipolar atom model (ELMAM). The ELMAM refinement shows a good improvement of the statistical indices compared with the IAM model, notably in terms of thermal displacement parameters and bond distances involving H atoms.

### Comment

Despite the importance of L-aspartic acid (C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>7</sub>NO<sub>4</sub>), (I), only a few studies have been performed on the determination of its complexes. The X-ray crystal structure analysis of DL-aspartic acid was originally determined by Rao (1973) and a neutron structure analysis at room temperature has been reported by Sequeira *et al.* (1989). A topological analysis of the experimental charge density has been reported for DL-aspartic acid (Flaig *et al.*, 1998). The crystal structure of DL-aspartic acid nitrate monohydrate has also been characterized (Asath Bahadur & Rajaram, 1995), and more recently bis(DL-aspartic acid) sulfate (Srinivasan *et al.*, 2001) and L-aspartic acid nitrate L-aspartic acid (1/1) (Sridhar *et al.*, 2002) have also been reported. It is worth noting that the atomic coordinates reported for L-aspartic acid monohydrate by Umadevi *et al.* (2003) correspond to the D configuration.



The purpose of this study is the accurate low-temperature redetermination of the crystal structure of L-aspartic acid and the comparison of the refinements using the same intensity data set using the experimental library multipolar atom model refinement (ELMAM) (Zarychta *et al.*, 2007) and the standard independent atom model (IAM).


L-Aspartic acid, (I) (Fig. 1), was first prepared and its crystal and molecular structures characterized by Derissen *et al.* (1968) from single-crystal diffraction data at room temperature. However, a redetermination was considered worthwhile as, on the one hand, the atomic coordinates reported by Derissen *et al.* (1968) correspond to the D configuration, and on the other hand, fewer than 600 reflections were used to refine all structural parameters. The results reported here are based on data which are, to the best of our knowledge, the most extensive ( $\sin \theta/\lambda = 0.764 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ ), collected at 100 K with a conventional X-ray source (Mo  $K\alpha$ ) and a two-dimensional CCD detector.

Compound (I) crystallizes as a zwitterion, like many other  $\alpha$ -amino acids. The deprotonated and protonated carboxyl groups can be clearly distinguished. In the deprotonated carboxyl group, the two CT–O bonds to the terminal O atoms (OT1 and OT2) are identical to within one s.u. [1.255 (2) and 1.254 (1)  $\text{\AA}$ , respectively]. The protonated COOH group is, on the other hand, characterized by a double bond [CG–OD1 = 1.220 (2)  $\text{\AA}$ ] which is significantly shorter than the single bond involving the protonated O atom [CG–OD2 = 1.317 (3)  $\text{\AA}$ ] (Table 1). The C-atom skeleton is nearly fully extended, with a CT–CA–CB–CG torsion angle of 179.6 (2) $^\circ$ . The  $\alpha$ -amino group is in a near perfect staggered conformation around the CA–NT bond.

The crystal structure of (I) is made up of chains of aspartic acid molecules, linked by O–H...O hydrogen bonds, approximately parallel to the *c* axis (Fig. 2). The interchain interactions are provided mainly by three NT–H...O hydrogen bonds. Atom OT2 is involved twice in hydrogen bonding, while OT1 and OD2 are only involved in the O–H...O bond in the zigzag chain and OD1 in another O–H...NT hydrogen bond, a total of four hydrogen bonds per molecule (Table 2). The O–H...O hydrogen bond between the two carboxyl groups is quite short and straight [OD2...OT1 = 2.567 (1)  $\text{\AA}$ ]. Such a short hydrogen bond is also seen in the crystal structures of other amino acids (Bendeif *et al.*, 2005). There is no intramolecular hydrogen bond.

We now compare the two types of refinement models, *viz.* the usual independent atom model (IAM) and the experimental library multipolar atom model (ELMAM) (Zarychta *et al.*, 2007).

In the IAM refinement, a conventional spherical neutral atom model was applied. Scale factor, atomic positions and




**Figure 1**  
The L-aspartic acid molecule, showing the atom-labelling scheme. Displacement ellipsoids are drawn at the 50% probability level and H atoms are represented by spheres of arbitrary radii.


thermal displacement parameters for all atoms were refined using the *MOPRO* program (Guillot *et al.*, 2001; Jelsch *et al.*, 2005) until convergence. In the ELMAM refinements, the same parameters were varied, but a multipolar charged atom model was applied. The electron-density parameters were transferred from the library (Pichon-Pesme *et al.*, 1995, 2004) and subsequently kept fixed. The thermal riding restraints on H-atom *B* factors were applied similarly to the IAM refinement. Both refinements were carried out using the same intensity data and cut-off criterion [ $I/\sigma(I) > 0$ ] and with no *X*–H distance restraint.

The ELMAM refinement shows a good improvement in statistical indexes compared with the IAM refinement: the  $R(F)$  factor is reduced from 0.0553 to 0.0428,  $wR(F)$  from 0.0255 to 0.0190 and the goodness-of-fit from 1.88 to 1.46. The improvement of *X*–H distances towards the values obtained from neutron diffraction data on DL-aspartic acid (Sequeira *et al.*, 1989) is clearly visible (Table 1 and Fig. 3). Indeed, the O–H and the tertiary CA–HA bond lengths from the ELMAM refinement agree very well with the neutron diffraction values. For the CH<sub>2</sub> group, the largest discrepancies are 0.011 and 0.041 Å with the ELMAM and IAM structure refinements, respectively. The N–H bond lengths in the ammonium (–NH<sub>3</sub><sup>+</sup>) group obtained from the ELMAM refinement are slightly longer than those from the neutron diffraction experiment on DL-aspartic acid. The differences between the ELMAM and neutron diffraction values can be explained by the fact that the three H atoms are involved in different hydrogen-bond patterns in the L-aspartic and DL-aspartic crystal structures. The effect on other *X*–*Y* bonds (involving C, O and N atoms) is small.

We have also performed the rigid-bond test (Hirshfeld, 1976) for both refinements. In the ELMAM refinement, the



**Figure 2**  
The crystal packing of L-aspartic acid. Dotted lines represent hydrogen bonds.



**Figure 3**

Values of *X*–H distances in the structure of L-aspartic acid. The grey columns refer to the standard values used in X-ray diffraction. Values in the black columns were obtained from the IAM refinement and values in the light-grey dashed columns were obtained from the ELMAM refinement. Values in the dark-grey dashed columns were obtained from neutron diffraction data on DL-aspartic acid at room temperature (Sequeira *et al.*, 1989). Error bars are indicated for all values.

rigid bond test fails only for the CT–OT2, CB–CG and CA–CB bonds, and the average for all bonds is  $\Delta = 1.1 \times 10^{-3} \text{ \AA}^2$ , whereas in the IAM refinement, all bonds fail except the CB–CG bond, and the average is  $\Delta = 2.39 \times 10^{-3} \text{ \AA}^2$ . This analysis demonstrates that the atomic displacement parameters are more properly determined with the ELMAM refinement.

## Experimental

Crystals of L-aspartic acid were grown by slow evaporation of an aqueous solution when attempts were made to grow single crystals of a complex of L-aspartic acid with phosphoric acid. Crystals of (I) suitable for single-crystal X-ray diffraction were selected directly from the sample as prepared.

### Compound (I) in the ELMAM refinement

#### Crystal data

$C_4H_7NO_4$	$V = 263.48 (3) \text{ \AA}^3$
$M_r = 133.11$	$Z = 2$
Monoclinic, $P2_1$	Mo $K\alpha$ radiation
$a = 5.1135 (2) \text{ \AA}$	$\mu = 0.15 \text{ mm}^{-1}$
$b = 6.9059 (3) \text{ \AA}$	$T = 100 (2) \text{ K}$
$c = 7.5925 (3) \text{ \AA}$	$0.2 \times 0.15 \times 0.1 \text{ mm}$
$\beta = 100.662 (4)^\circ$	

#### Data collection

Oxford Diffraction Xcalibur	7129 measured reflections
Sapphire2 diffractometer	995 independent reflections
Absorption correction: integration	968 reflections with $I > 0$
( <i>ABSORB</i> ; DeTitta, 1985)	$R_{\text{int}} = 0.045$
$T_{\text{min}} = 0.971$ , $T_{\text{max}} = 0.982$	

#### Refinement

$R[F > 2\sigma(F)] = 0.043$	H atoms treated by a mixture of independent and constrained refinement
$wR(F) = 0.019$	
$S = 1.47$	$\Delta\rho_{\text{max}} = 0.30 \text{ e \AA}^{-3}$
968 reflections	$\Delta\rho_{\text{min}} = -0.20 \text{ e \AA}^{-3}$
110 parameters	
7 restraints	

**Table 1**  
Selected geometric parameters (Å, °) for (I) in the ELMAM refinement.

NT–H1	1.04 (4)	CT–OT2	1.254 (1)
NT–H2	1.07 (3)	CB–CG	1.510 (2)
NT–H3	1.08 (3)	CB–HB1	1.09 (3)
NT–CA	1.492 (3)	CB–HB2	1.07 (2)
CA–CT	1.535 (2)	CG–OD1	1.220 (2)
CA–CB	1.532 (3)	CG–OD2	1.317 (3)
CA–HA	1.07 (3)	OD2–HD	1.03 (2)
CT–OT1	1.255 (2)		
NT–CA–CT	109.7 (3)	CA–CB–HB2	104. (2)
NT–CA–CB	110.7 (4)	CT–CA–CB	108.0 (4)
NT–CA–HA	108. (2)	CT–CA–HA	110. (3)
H1–NT–H2	109. (5)	CB–CA–HA	111. (3)
H1–NT–H3	108. (5)	CB–CG–OD1	121.8 (5)
H1–NT–CA	109. (2)	CB–CG–OD2	113.9 (4)
H2–NT–H3	111. (5)	CG–CB–HB1	109. (3)
H2–NT–CA	109. (2)	CG–CB–HB2	108. (2)
H3–NT–CA	111. (2)	CG–OD2–HD	110. (3)
CA–CT–OT1	116.5 (3)	OT1–CT–OT2	126.5 (4)
CA–CT–OT2	116.9 (3)	OD1–CG–OD2	124.2 (5)
CA–CB–CG	114.6 (4)	HB1–CB–HB2	111. (4)
CA–CB–HB1	110. (3)		
CT–CA–CB–CG	179.6 (2)		

**Table 2**  
Hydrogen-bond geometry (Å, °) for (I) in the ELMAM refinement.

D–H...A	D–H	H...A	D...A	D–H...A
OD2–HD...OT1 <sup>i</sup>	1.03	1.55	2.567 (1)	171
NT–H2...OT2 <sup>ii</sup>	1.07	1.74	2.792 (2)	169
NT–H3...OD1 <sup>iii</sup>	1.08	1.73	2.806 (2)	175
NT–H1...OT2 <sup>iv</sup>	1.04	1.81	2.838 (3)	170

Symmetry codes: (i)  $x, y, z - 1$ ; (ii)  $-x + 1, y + \frac{1}{2}, -z + 1$ ; (iii)  $-x + 2, y + \frac{1}{2}, -z$ ; (iv)  $x + 1, y, z$ .**Compound (I) in the IAM refinement***Crystal data*

$C_4H_7NO_4$	$V = 263.48 (3) \text{ \AA}^3$
$M_r = 133.11$	$Z = 2$
Monoclinic, $P2_1$	Mo $K\alpha$ radiation
$a = 5.1135 (2) \text{ \AA}$	$\mu = 0.15 \text{ mm}^{-1}$
$b = 6.9059 (3) \text{ \AA}$	$T = 100 (2) \text{ K}$
$c = 7.5925 (3) \text{ \AA}$	$0.2 \times 0.15 \times 0.1 \text{ mm}$
$\beta = 100.662 (4)^\circ$	

*Data collection*

Oxford Diffraction Xcalibur Sapphire2 diffractometer	7129 measured reflections
Absorption correction: integration (ABSORB; DeTitta, 1985)	995 independent reflections
$T_{\min} = 0.971, T_{\max} = 0.982$	968 reflections with $I > 0$
	$R_{\text{int}} = 0.045$

*Refinement*

$R[F > 2\sigma(F)] = 0.055$	H atoms treated by a mixture of independent and constrained refinement
$wR(F) = 0.026$	$\Delta\rho_{\text{max}} = 0.43 \text{ e \AA}^{-3}$
$S = 1.88$	$\Delta\rho_{\text{min}} = -0.26 \text{ e \AA}^{-3}$
968 reflections	
110 parameters	
7 restraints	

The crystal structure of L-aspartic acid (Fig. 1) was solved in the noncentrosymmetric space group  $P2_1$  by direct methods using the program *SHELXS97* (Sheldrick, 1997). Least-squares refinement, based on  $|F|$ , was carried out using the program *MOPRO* (Guillot *et al.*, 2001; Jelsch *et al.*, 2005) using the conventional spherical neutral-

**Table 3**  
Selected geometric parameters (Å, °) for (I) in the IAM refinement.

NT–H1	0.95 (4)	CT–OT2	1.254 (3)
NT–H2	0.98 (4)	CB–CG	1.510 (3)
NT–H3	0.98 (4)	CB–HB1	1.04 (3)
NT–CA	1.493 (2)	CB–HB2	1.04 (2)
CA–CT	1.530 (3)	CG–OD1	1.214 (3)
CA–CB	1.524 (4)	CG–OD2	1.315 (4)
CA–HA	1.03 (4)	OD2–HD	0.93 (1)
CT–OT1	1.257 (2)		
NT–CA–CT	109.7 (5)	CA–CB–HB2	100. (9)
NT–CA–CB	110.7 (5)	CT–CA–CB	108.5 (5)
NT–CA–HA	107.1 (3)	CT–CA–HA	108. (8)
H1–NT–H2	108. (6)	CB–CA–HA	112. (1)
H1–NT–H3	109. (2)	CB–CG–OD1	122.0 (7)
H1–NT–CA	109. (2)	CB–CG–OD2	113.6 (5)
H2–NT–H3	108. (2)	CG–CB–HB1	110. (7)
H2–NT–CA	109. (3)	CG–CB–HB2	111. (5)
H3–NT–CA	112. (3)	CG–OD2–HD	113. (2)
CA–CT–OT1	116.5 (4)	OT1–CT–OT2	126.3 (5)
CA–CT–OT2	117.2 (5)	OD1–CG–OD2	124.4 (7)
CA–CB–CG	114.9 (6)	HB1–CB–HB2	111. (8)
CA–CB–HB1	108. (7)		
CT–CA–CB–CG	179.6 (3)		

**Table 4**  
Hydrogen-bond geometry (Å, °) for (I) in the IAM refinement.

D–H...A	D–H	H...A	D...A	D–H...A
OD2–HD...OT1 <sup>i</sup>	0.93	1.64	2.571 (3)	179
NT–H2...OT2 <sup>ii</sup>	0.98	1.82	2.792 (3)	169
NT–H3...OD1 <sup>iii</sup>	0.98	1.83	2.808 (3)	173
NT–H1...OT2 <sup>iv</sup>	0.95	1.90	2.839 (4)	170

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

atom model. The reflection weights were set equal to  $1/\sigma^2(F_o)$ . All H atoms were located in difference Fourier maps. Their  $U_{\text{iso}}(\text{H})$  values were restrained to be  $1.2U_{\text{eq}}$  of the attached atom with a standard deviation of  $0.01 \text{ \AA}$ . Observations with significantly large  $\Delta F$  values ( $>10$ ) were carefully excluded at every stage in order to avoid their undue influence on the course of refinement. In the absence of suitable anomalous scattering, refinement of the Flack (1983) parameter led to inconclusive values, so a definite conclusion on the absolute structure and chirality of the molecule cannot be drawn (Flack & Bernardinelli, 2000). Therefore, Friedel equivalents were merged prior to the final refinements, and the absolute structure was set by reference to the known chirality of the enantiopure acid used in the crystallization experiment.

For both refinements, data collection: *CrysAlis CCD* (Oxford Diffraction, 2006); cell refinement: *CrysAlis RED* (Oxford Diffraction, 2006); data reduction: *CrysAlis RED*; program(s) used to solve structure: *SHELXS97* (Sheldrick, 1997); program(s) used to refine structure: *MOPRO6* (Jelsch *et al.*, 2005). Molecular graphics: *ORTEPIII* (Burnett & Johnson, 1996) for (I) in the ELMAM refinement; *PLATON* (Spek, 2003) for (I) in the IAM refinement. For both refinements; software used to prepare material for publication: *enCIFer* (Allen *et al.*, 2004).

This work was partly funded by ANR grant No. NT05-3-41509. The authors thank the service Commun de Diffraction X sur Monocristaux (Université Henri Poincaré, Nancy 1) for providing access to crystallographic experimental facilities.

Supplementary data for this paper are available from the IUCr electronic archives (Reference: AV3087). Services for accessing these data are described at the back of the journal.

---

### References

- Allen, F. H., Johnson, O., Shields, G. P., Smith, B. R. & Towler, M. (2004). *J. Appl. Cryst.* **37**, 335–338.
- Asath Bahadur, S. & Rajaram, R. K. (1995). *Z. Kristallogr.* **210**, 276–278.
- Bendeif, E.-E., Dahaoui, S., François, M., Benali-Cherif, N. & Lecomte, C. (2005). *Acta Cryst.* **B61**, 700–709.
- Burnett, M. N. & Johnson, C. K. (1996). *ORTEP III*. Report ORNL-6895. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tennessee, USA.
- Derissen, J. L., Endeman, H. J. & Peerdeman, A. F. (1968). *Acta Cryst.* **B24**, 1349–1354.
- DeTitta, G. T. (1985). *J. Appl. Cryst.* **18**, 75–79.
- Flack, H. D. (1983). *Acta Cryst.* **A39**, 876–881.
- Flack, H. D. & Bernardinelli, G. (2000). *J. Appl. Cryst.* **33**, 1143–1148.
- Flaig, R., Koritsanszky, T., Zobel, D. & Luger, P. (1998). *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **120**, 2227–2238.
- Guillot, B., Viry, L., Guillot, R., Lecomte, C. & Jelsch, C. (2001). *J. Appl. Cryst.* **34**, 214–223.
- Hirshfeld, F. L. (1976). *Acta Cryst.* **A32**, 239–244.
- Jelsch, C., Guillot, B., Lagoutte, A. & Lecomte, C. (2005). *J. Appl. Cryst.* **38**, 38–54.
- Oxford Diffraction (2006). *CrysAlis CCD* and *CrysAlis RED*. Versions 1.171.31.7. Oxford Diffraction Ltd, Abingdon, Oxfordshire, England.
- Pichon-Pesme, V., Jelsch, C., Guillot, B. & Lecomte, C. (2004). *Acta Cryst.* **A60**, 204–208.
- Pichon-Pesme, V., Lecomte, C. & Lachekar, H. (1995). *J. Phys. Chem.* **99**, 6242–6250.
- Rao, S. T. (1973). *Acta Cryst.* **B29**, 1718–1720.
- Sequeira, A., Rajagopal, H. & Ramanadham, M. (1989). *Acta Cryst.* **C45**, 906–908.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1997). *SHELXS97*. University of Göttingen, Germany.
- Spek, A. L. (2003). *J. Appl. Cryst.* **36**, 7–13.
- Sridhar, B., Srinivasan, N. & Rajaram, R. K. (2002). *Acta Cryst.* **E58**, o1372–o1374.
- Srinivasan, N., Sridhar, B. & Rajaram, R. K. (2001). *Acta Cryst.* **E57**, o679–o681.
- Umadevi, K., Anitha, K., Sridhar, B., Srinivasan, N. & Rajaram, R. K. (2003). *Acta Cryst.* **E59**, o1073–o1075.
- Zarychta, B., Pichon-Pesme, V., Guillot, B., Lecomte, C. & Jelsch, C. (2007). *Acta Cryst.* **A63**, 108–125.