Successful Computationally Directed Templating of Metastable Pharmaceutical Polymorphs
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ABSTRACT: A strategy of using crystal structure prediction (CSP) methods to determine which, if any, isostructural template could facilitate the first crystallization of a predicted polymorph by vapor deposition is extended to the fenamate family. Mefenamic acid (MFA) and tolfenamic acid (TFA) are used as molecules with minimal chemical differences, whereas flufenamic acid (FFA) shows greater differences in the substituents. The three crystal energy landscapes were calculated, and periodic electronic structure calculations were used to confirm the thermodynamic plausibility of possible isostructural polymorphs to experimentally obtainable crystals of the other molecules. As predicted, a new polymorph, TFA form VI, was found by sublimation onto isomorphous MFA form I, using a recently developed technique. MFA and TFA form a continuous solid solution with the structure of MFA I and TFA VI at the limits, but the isomorphous MFA/FFA solid solution does not extend to a new polymorph of FFA. The novel solid solution structure of TFA and FFA was found, and a new isomorphous polymorph TFA VII was found by sublimation onto this new solid solution template. Sublimation of TFA onto a metal surface at the early stage of deposition gave TFA form VIII. We rationalize the formation of new polymorphs of only TFA.

1. INTRODUCTION

A knowledge of the solid form landscape, covering at least all polymorphs, solvates, and hydrates, is essential for the design of robust crystallization processes and to avoid the late appearance of unknown competing forms.1–3 Extensive efforts in polymorph screening4,5 show that the vast majority of molecules are polymorphic,6 and yet covering all possible crystallization conditions is not practicable because of the marked effect that impurities or deliberate seeding with related crystals can have on the production of novel polymorphs.7–10 Computational crystal structure prediction (CSP) is emerging as a complementary tool to polymorph screening, to help establish whether all polymorphs of interest have been found.11,12 but this frequently suggests that more polymorphs are thermodynamically feasible than are experimentally known.13 This raises the question as to whether a targeted crystallization experiment can be devised to specifically crystallize the unobserved low energy structures on the computational crystal energy landscape for the first time.13

On the basis of the knowledge of relative energies, we have used the possibility of isostructurality between closely related molecules as a route to finding a template to produce the first sample of a CSP predicted polymorph of another molecule. The first successful application of this strategy was in the carbamazepine family, with the production of the first catemeric polymorph of carbamazepine (CBZ V) by sublimation of CBZ onto single crystals of isomorphous dihydrocarbamazepine (DHC II).14 (CBZ V has recently been crystallized in another laboratory by a related templating experiment).15 While advances in computational methods can provide guidance to select a substrate, experiments to explore all possible orientations between the substrate and overlaying lattice can be very time-consuming. To address this concern, a new approach was developed using the polycrystalline material
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as substrate. The polycrystalline substrate approach provides access to all possible orientations of the substrate in a single-shot experiment. This strategy was validated by producing the first crystals of a novel polymorph of cyheptamide (CHY III), also using DHC II crystals as the template.16

The use of isostructural crystal structures implies that the molecules can adopt such a similar packing that they may well form a solid-solution under experimental conditions. Indeed the discovery of CBZ V was preceded by the demonstration that CBZ could form catemeric hydrogen bonds in a 50:50 solid solution17 of CBZ/DHC, which is isomorphous with DHC II. In contrast a recent study substituting methyl for Cl or Br found solid solutions that were not isomorphous with the pure components.18 The differences between surface-tempered growth from the vapor, formation of solid solutions, and the use of heterogeneous isostructural crystals for seeding solutions or melts to grow a targeted new form7 are important for understanding how similarities between predicted and known crystal structures can be exploited in polymorph discovery.

In this study, we sought to develop the strategy of using CSP to determine possible templates for finding new polymorphs in another family of molecules. The fenamates were chosen as a contrast to the carbamazepine family, in that the fenamate polymorphs differ in conformation and packing of aromatic rings but have the same hydrogen bonding functionality. Since the fenamates are a family of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatories, their polymorphism, transformations, and the effect of different polymorphs on bioavailability have been extensively studied.19,20 Many fenamates are highly polymorphic: flufenamic acid (FFA) held the record for nine characterized crystal structures, with forms IV–IX being discovered by polymer templating.21 Tolifenamic acid (TFA) has five polymorphs, with III–V being generated by polymer induced heterogeneous nucleation.22,23 Mefenamic acid (MFA) has three reported forms, with the metastable form II produced on slow cooling to room temperature at 5°C/min.

Hence, this paper uses computer prediction and experimental exploration of three of the polymorphic fenamates to study the capabilities of isostructural templating as a route to polymorph discovery by considering the following questions:

(1) Do similar molecules have isomorphous or isostructural crystal structures that are thermodynamically plausible, as generated by CSP methods?

(2) Can the ambient stable polymorphs (MFA I, TFA I, FFA III) be used as templates to generate the first crystals of an isostructural polymorph that has been predicted in (1), by sublimation?

(3) In cases where (2) generates a new polymorph: how structurally similar do the template and novel polymorph have to be? How is this related to the ability to form a solid solution that is isomorphous with both end points? How does the relative stability and kinetic feasibility of the polymorphs of a molecule limit the ability to produce further polymorphs? Can the novel polymorphs be produced by other routes?

2. EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS

2.1. Preparation of Solid Solutions. Samples were prepared by mixing pure preformed solutions of the two components in a common solvent (ethanol, diethyl ether, and acetonitrile) and allowing the sample to crystallize by slow evaporation at room temperature. Bulk materials were analyzed by one or both of the techniques of PXRD and 1H NMR spectroscopy to assess the composition of the solid solution material with respect to the input molar ratios. Carefully selected single crystals were analyzed by SCXRD, and the appropriate occupancies were refined to establish composition (Section S7.2). Where solid solutions were prepared from melts, this was done by finely grinding the two components into a single homogeneous powder, which was placed between two microscope slides. The samples were then heated to 175°C on a Kofler bench followed by slow cooling to room temperature at 5°C/min.

2.2. Procedures for Sublimation Experiments. An array of template crystals were mounted on a glass slide which was then exposed to a vapor of the material to be deposited26 produced by placing ca. 50 mg on a Petri dish which was heated to 120°C for 24 h. The deposited material was examined by optical microscopy, and individual single crystals were carefully removed and characterized by SCXRD.

2.3. Computational Methodology. The crystal energy landscapes were calculated by generating one million Z’ = 1 structures using CrystalPredictor,12 in the 59 most common space groups, including the main conformational variable of the fenamates (ψ, Figure 1) as a search variable. These structures were further refined using CrystalOptimizer38 to optimize the lattice energies as the sum of the conformational energy penalty, calculated at the PBE0/6-31+G(d) level of theory using Gaussian09,17 and the intermolecular lattice energy calculated within DMACRYST40 using the distributed multipole calculated by GDMA41 and the empirical exp-6 repulsion-dispersion model with the F1T parametrization.42 The sensitivity of the low energy crystal structures to the computational model was further investigated by using a polarizable continuum model (PCM, ε = 3) to calculate the distributed multipole and intramolecular energy penalty,43 and also a rigid-body free energy model.44 For selected
structures, lattice energies were also modeled using CASTEP45 with a PBE functional46 and both the TS47 and MBD*48 dispersion models. The nanocrystal surface calculations were performed using ORIENT.49 Further details and analysis are in the Supporting Information.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Are There More Fenamate Polymorphs To Be Targeted? The CSP generated crystal energy landscapes show that there are many lattice energy minima that do not correspond to known forms in this extensive search for $Z' = 1$ structures. Isostructural crystals were identified by having the 15 molecule coordination sphere match (Table S9). This shows that there are far more matches between low energy structures of TFA and MFA than with FFA, and provides an initial estimate of how metastable the structure would be. However, the experiments to use an isostructural template to produce the first nucleation of a new form are limited in that the templating crystal must not transform to a more stable form during the course of the experiment. We have focused therefore on using MFA I, TFA I, and FFA III and solid solution crystals as templates for sublimation. Looking for matches with template structures (Figure 2 and Table S9) shows that there is a structure of TFA that is isomorphous to the most stable form of MFA, and thermodynamically competitive with the metastable polymorphs of TFA. This suggests that TFA should be sublimed onto MFA form I crystals as a potential route to targeted crystallization of a new polymorph of TFA, form VI.

3.2. Targeted Production of the First Crystals of TFA form VI. Subliming TFA onto crystalline MFA form I, using the new methodology, does indeed produce crystals of a new form of TFA, form VI ($P\bar{1}, Z' = 1$), Figures 3, S13 and Table S17. The structure has a similar powder X-ray diffraction (PXRD) pattern to TFA IV ($P\bar{1}, Z' = 3$), produced by polymer induced heteronucleation,21 suggesting that the templating isomorphous crystal surface directs the TFA molecules into the simpler, slightly more stable lattice of form VI.

The production of TFA VI by sublimation onto MFA I is robust, as it was also produced in a separate laboratory by a modified purificaition sublimation apparatus. TFA VI can also be obtained by seeding ethanolic solutions of TFA with MFA I crystals and with crystals of FFA I but not FFA III (see Section S7.1.2).

3.3. Solid Solution Extensions of Crystal Structures of These Fenamates. All three binary solid solutions could be formed with a substantial proportion of both molecules. The MFA/TFA and MFA/FFA solid solutions (Sections S7.1.3 and...
S7.1.6) were isomorphous with MFA I. The solid solution of TFA/FFA (Section S7.1.8) is closely related, having very similar layers of hydrogen bonded dimers, but these are related by a screw rather than a translation, giving a P2₁/c structure in contrast to the P\bar{1} structures of MFA/FFA and MFA/TFA. However, the range of composition and methods of formation of these solid solutions differ.

The solid solution of MFA and TFA results from very good molecular matching: not only are both end points now known (MFA I and TFA VI), but careful examination of the molecular ratios in the solid solution, by both single crystal diffraction and NMR of a CDCl₃ solution prepared from the recovered crystals, show approximately the same molar ratio as the starting ethanol solution concentration (Section S7.1.4).

Both FFA solid solutions proved more challenging to produce due to the increased dissimilarity between molecular components. The MFA/FFA solid solution was prepared by crystallization from the melt after failed attempts to obtain the solid solution by crystallization from ethanol solution (Section 7.1.5–6). It is isomorphous with MFA I, but contains only a maximum of ~70% FFA. The TFA/FFA solid solution can be formed from ethanol solution up to 50% FFA molar ratio (Section S7.1.8).

3.4. Targeted Production of the First Crystals of TFA VII. The TFA/FFA solid solution provided another new fenamate crystal structure type, which can be readily prepared and is sufficiently stable to be used as template. Adding this to the computational matrix (Table S9) suggested that the TFA end point of the solid solution might be formed by subliming TFA onto the solid solution TFA/FFA. This sublimation experiment generated TFA VII which is isomorphous to the solid solution of TFA/FFA, concomitantly with TII crystals (Figure 4).

3.5. Control Experiments and Serendipitous Observation of Surface Polymorph TFA VIII. A variety of additional control experiments, subliming MFA, TFA, and FFA onto the template crystals MFA I, TFA I, FFA III, and the TFA/FFA solid solution were attempted. These all resulted in known polymorphs, frequently as mixtures (Section S7.2.1); for example, FFA III and FFA I concomitantly formed on the TFA/FFA solid solution template.

Sublimation of TFA onto a variety of metal and glass surfaces generally gave TFA I, though controlled sublimation onto copper gives a new form TFA VIII. The structure was determined by PXRD. The powder samples were mixtures of TFA I (P2₁/c, Z' = 1) and a new form TFA VIII (P\bar{1}, Z' = 1) which has the same layers stacked in a different way (Figure 5).

The proportion of TFA VIII was greater when less material was sublimed at lower temperatures. Some evidence of polymorph TFA VIII has also been found in samples obtained by sublimation onto smooth Ag or Cu surfaces (Section S8).

4. DISCUSSION

4.1. Do Similar Molecules Have Isostructural Structures That Are Thermodynamically Plausible, As Generated by CSP Methods? At the start of this study, the many known polymorphs of the heavily screened fenamates, MFA, TFA, and FFA all had distinct structures, despite MFA and TFA molecules being related by a Cl/CH₃ interchange, which often results in isomorphous crystals, and FFA having one smaller and one similar substituent. The steric similarity accounts for the crystal energy landscapes (Figure 2, Table S9) having matches between most of the observed Z' = 1 polymorphs and computer generated structures for the other molecules, within the large 15 kJ/mol window. There are many additional computer-generated structures, particularly for FFA. In comparing the relative energies of the matched structures (Table S9), it becomes clear that MFA and TFA have common structures that are similar in relative stability, but FFA structures have a very different energy ranking; i.e., when only the low energy structures, within the range of observed polymorphs, are examined, there are some matches between MFA and TFA, but most matches with FFA are high in energy and vice versa. (An exception is that substituting TFA in FFA II is only slightly less stable than any known TFA polymorph.)

On adding the experimental constraint that the templating crystal needs to be stable during the experiment, the most promising unobserved thermodynamically plausible polymorph was experimentally realized as TFA VI. The addition of the TFA/FFA solid solution structure to the matrix suggested that...
the structure which was found as TFA VII was intermediate in stability between the ordered and disordered metastable polymorphs of TFA, and that if MFA could adopt the structure it would be only slightly less stable than any of its known polymorphs. By the completion of this study, we had generated a polymorph of TFA isomorphous with MFA I, namely, TFA VI, and two new fenamate structure types, TFA VIII and the TFA/FFA solid solution with its isomorphous single component end point, TFA VII.

The key to successful templating is the thermodynamic plausibility of a new polymorph, which depends on the possible thermodynamic metastability of experimental polymorphs, and the likely errors in the relative stability as estimated by lattice energy calculations used in the CSP studies. We assessed the computational error by calculating the relative energies of all the experimental structures and the corresponding structures generated by substituting the alternative molecules into these lattices, by a range of dispersion-corrected periodic density functional theory methods, and also by the approximate inclusion of free energy or the effect of polarization as variations on the method used for the CSP study. The results (Section S4) vary as would be expected from the known limitations of all current computational methods for relative polymorph stability and are in reasonable agreement with the limited experimentally established Gibbs free energy differences between polymorphs and evidence for low temperature stability order (Section S4.1). Most calculations, including the most expensive periodic DFT-D calculations with the most theoretically justified dispersion correction (PBE-MBD*) (Figure 6) show that the observed polymorphs are more stable than the unobserved isostructural equivalents and confirm that the templating experiments were targeting metastable structures. We have found new polymorphs of TFA, which are comparable in stability with those found by polymer induced heteronucleation, but not the MFA equivalents of TFA polymorphs which would be less stable than the known MFA polymorphs. The FFA equivalents would be highly metastable.

The closeness of the polymorphs’ energies reflects the compromise between conformational distortions, the van der Waals dispersion, and π···π stacking interactions between the aromatic groups, and minor distortions of the common hydrogen bonding motif, with TFA and FFA adding halogen interactions into the mix of contributions which are being balanced. Analyzing the energy differences (Figure 6) helps explain why the most stable polymorphs differ and why there are not more isostructural structures adopted by these chemically similar molecules. The packing of FFA III is markedly more stable for FFA than it would be for TFA or MFA, as it adopts a conformation in which there is a steric clash between the additional methyl groups of MFA and TFA (Figure 7). All three molecules have a double well in the conformational energy, which can be attributed to the compromise between conjugation of the two aromatic rings favoring planar structures and the steric clash of the substituents and gives a similar small barrier when \( \phi = 0\)° corresponding to only proximity of hydrogen atoms. However, for FFA, the barrier for perpendicular rings is high and conformations with \( \phi \approx 180\)° accessible, whereas TFA and MFA have a lower energy barrier for perpendicular rings and a very high barrier around a planar conformation due to close approach of the methyl substituents. Thus, MFA and TFA cannot adopt the structures of FFA III, IV, VI, and VII because these contain at least one molecule in a high energy conformation (Figure S3). TFA and MFA have crystalline conformations in both wells, and there is only a small energy barrier between all observed conformations in isolation. The differences in low energy conformations may explain why MFA can be incorporated as an impurity into FFA I and MFA impurity inhibits the polymorphic transition from FFA I to III. In the case of FFA growth on other templates, the large barrier for FFA III

---

**Figure 6.** Relative lattice energies of the observed (□) \( Z' = 1 \) nondisordered polymorphs and computational substitutions of the other molecules in the same structures (×); the geometry is optimized at the PBE-TS level, and single point energies are evaluated by PBE-MBD*. The energies are relative to the experimentally most stable low temperature polymorphs, i.e., FFA III, MFA I, and TFA II. The color code for the molecules in the crystal structures is followed on the axes, with the solid solutions in blue and the structures used as templates in sublimation experiments in bold type. See Section S4 for a detailed analysis of relative energies by a variety of computational models and comparison with experimental stabilities.

**Figure 7.** Intramolecular (conformational) energy (\( \Delta E_{\text{intr}} \)) at the PBE0/6-31+G(d) level of theory for the three molecules as a function of \( \phi \). The range of dihedral angles observed in solid solutions and polymorphs which are isostructural with MFA I and TFA VII are shown, as is the dihedral angle found in FFA III. All experimental angles are listed in Table S1 and shown in the individual conformational profiles, Figure S3.
molecules to change conformation to the shape adopted by MFA and TFA polymorphs may also provide a kinetic barrier to forming new FFA polymorphs.

The other component of the lattice energies is the intermolecular energy. The carboxylic acid $R_2(8)$ hydrogen bond is the same in all structures, and so the main causes of the energy differences come from the packing of the substituted aromatic rings. The classification in Figure S2 of these interactions shows that the MFA I structure has methyl to methyl interactions, which can have one CH$_3$ replaced by Cl for TFA, or plausibly be adopted by FFA. This accounts for MFA I being the most commonly observed structural type, with the MFA/TFA solid solution existing continuously between the MFA I and TFA VI end points, and the MFA/FFA solid solution accommodating up to 70% FFA in this structure. All MFA polymorphs have the pair of methyl groups adjacent. MFA and TFA are similar in that the nonacidic rings are often approximately coplanar, but TFA has a wider range of contacts, with those where the Cl is near an aromatic hydrogen being the more stable. FFA appears to have a preference for structures in which CF$_3$ groups are aligned. There are some crystal structures of TFA and FFA where the substituents are pointing into the aromatic ring, including TFA VIII. This is the main packing difference between the MFA solid solution structures (MFA I) and the TFA/FFA solid solution (Figure 4). Overall, although the molecular differences can be used to rationalize the differences in the low energy crystal structures, the different contributions have to be balanced using high-level calculations.

4.2. Use of Templates To Generate the First Crystals of a Predicted Isostructural Polymorph. The production of TFA VI by sublimation onto the isomorphous template of MFA I is a clear success of the principle of using CSP to establish that there is an unobserved low energy polymorph that is isostructural with an available template that can be used in the sublimation experiment. The two molecules also form a solid solution with the same structure, with the molecules in the input ratio. This success in getting TFA to adopt the most stable structure for MFA seemed likely from the Cl/CH$_3$ exchange principle and is fully consistent with the calculated lattice energies. The robustness of the novel TFA VI is shown by its being formed in distinct sublimation experiments and by seeding ethanolic solutions.

The second new polymorph produced by sublimation onto a template is the formation of TFA VII on the TFA/FFA solid solution. This structure differs from the MFA I type, purely in the packing of the layers, reflecting the differences in the substituents. Thus, TFA can adopt either layer packing, but neither MFA nor FFA can, which is consistent with TFA being in both solid solution structures, but FFA being only partially absorbed into both solid solutions, and MFA I being the only solid solution structure for MFA.

4.3. Thermodynamic and Kinetic Feasibility of the Polymorphs. All the new polymorphs of TFA are metastable, and hence their formation is in kinetic competition with the more stable structures, and the time taken for characterization requires a slow transformation rate (TFA VI crystals were stable for more than a week and TFA VII for more than a day). There is no clear dividing line in the allowed degree of thermodynamic metastability (Figure 6); for example, a highly metastable form of MFA could have been templated by TFA I or the TFA/FFA solid solution, both of which only gave MFA I. The comparison of the observed polymorphs (Figure 8) shows a high degree of similarity between MFA I, the most...
stable form, and the metastable TFA polymorphs, so MFA is unlikely to be long-lived in an isostructural equivalent to TFA III, IV, or VII. The challenges in obtaining the known metastable forms of MFA as single crystals have been attributed to the ease of conversion to the stable form.25 A study of the epitaxial growth of MFA onto FFA I and FFA III56 found that the substrate affected the rate and orientation of crystalline growth, but it was MFA I that was formed.

4.4. Implications for the Design/Choice of Templates. The successful selection of templating crystals by modeling raises the question: when a CSP study shows that a molecule has unobserved yet potentially important thermodynamically plausible polymorphs, how you find a suitable template? Searching the CSD for an isostructural match to the CSP generated low energy structure, ignoring small molecular differences, might suggest a suitable template crystal for the targeted structure. The ability of the two molecules to form solid solutions also appears to be a useful indicator that the isostructurality is close enough. However, when the solid solution range is not continuous across all relative concentrations, as observed for FFA, sublimation has not produced the isomorphous FFA end-point. Practically, the sensitivity of the relative lattice energies to molecular changes, even as subtle as changing CH₃ for Cl, shown by the CSP studies (Figure 2), implies that it is likely to be rare that these conditions of close isostructurality are met. The kinetic effects that are operational in templating the formation of new polymorphs occur at the surface, and so we might hope that a suitable template crystal need only have some surfaces that could act as a template. We have explored the compatibility between different crystal surfaces by docking nanocrystals57 (of 25 molecules cut from the optimized target crystal structure) onto the idealized dominant crystal surfaces of the templates. (Section S5). These calculations show (Figure 9) that TFA can interact very strongly with the MFA I template surface supporting the formation of TFA VI by templating. In contrast FFA cannot form a stable structure that is closely isostructural to MFA I (RMSD₁₄ = 0.7 Å Table S9), and so the registry between the nanocrystal of FFA in this structure with the MFA I surface is poor. The results for the templating onto the TFA/FFA solid solution are less clear-cut, but the TFA VII structure that is templated by this crystal does have the strongest interaction (Figure 9 Table S12). The nanocrystal results are consistent with the bulk crystal energy predictions for templating and the experimental results, and so this approach may be useful for exploring surface matches that do not involve isostructural crystals. The idea of using nanocrystal to surface interactions has been used to establish the compatibility of two surfaces in various contexts, including determining possible agglomerating faces,57 accounting for surface templating favoring a particular hydration product59 or cocystal growth,59 and establishing epitaxy60,61 as a quantification of two crystals sharing the same surface structure.62 A smaller cluster can explain why seeding solutions with MFA I and FFA I produces TFA VI (Section S6). The similar surface is expected to lower the nucleation barrier to forming the new, possibly metastable form,62 and the nanocrystal represents establishing the new structure. These simulations are far from realistic, as if the nanocrystal docking onto unrelaxed surfaces represented the only templating mechanism, this would result in only a lateral continuation of the crystal growth. In our experiments, the fastest growing crystals stick out from the crystal faces vertically (Figure 3 (left) and Figure 4 (left)), though lateral crystals were also seen, as in the carbamazepine family templating experiments.16

Different organic surfaces or functional groups have long been associated with fenamate polymorphism, with many of the TFA and FFA polymorphs being discovered by polymer induced heteronucleation.61 FFA can be used as an additive to produce the metastable MFA II,63 and MFA III was found serendipitously in a failed cocrystallization with adenine.62 FFA V can be produced by addition of a salt additive,63 and we have also observed FFA V being formed when attempting to prepare a TFA/FFA solid solution with a high proportion of FFA (Table S16). The geometry of cellulose nanopores affects whether MFA I or II is crystallized.28 Self-assembled monolayers have templated mixtures of known forms of TFA and FFA, including TFA “Form X”, which seems to be a mixture of TFA I and II.64 The observation of TFA VII at the early stages of deposition onto copper surfaces, which lack the molecular structure of the isostructural templates, indicates other substrates will have an effect. However, our approach leads to the design of templates to target the discovery of a specific isostructural CSP predicted polymorph, and combines both functional group and crystal geometry matching.

The fenamate molecules have an irregular shape, and the CSP crystal energy landscapes show that all three molecules have other thermodynamically feasible structures. Finding or eliminating them from being possible polymorphs is challenging to our understanding of what controls the crystallization of flexible drug molecules. The van der Waals contacts of the flexible fenamates contrast with the use of isostructural templating to produce different hydrogen bonding motifs in the carbamazepine family of rigid molecules.16 This shows that the methodology could have applicability across a wide range of pharmaceutical molecules, given that many closely related molecules are likely to have been crystallized in drug discovery.

Figure 9. Dominant surfaces of the template crystals. Top: P1̅ MFA I and bottom P2₁/c TFA VII representing the TFA/FFA solid solution, showing the docking of 25 molecule nanocrystals of the same structure composed of (left to right) TFA, MFA, and FFA. The energy of docking the nanocrystal is color coded green for successful templating experiments, black for previously known pure polymorphs, and red for cases where templating did not produce a structure corresponding to the nanocrystal. The dominant interactions in the docking are the broadside substituent interactions (1a Figure S2) for the P1̅ structure (top) and the T-shaped interaction (6aβ Figure S2) for the P2₁/c structure (bottom).
5. CONCLUSION

By studying the isostructurality of known and computer generated crystal structures of three fenamate molecules, we have produced two new polymorphs of TFA, with a third being found by sublimation onto an inorganic surface. This is for a molecule that has been heavily studied in developing polymorph screening methods. The methodology originally used in the carbamazepine family, of subliming molecules onto isomorphous templates to produce the first nucleation of a predicted polymorph, has produced the first isomorphous pair of polymorphs (TFA VI and MFA I) within the fenamate family. The generation of solid solutions has produced a new fenamate structural type, the TFA/FFA solid solution, whose single component end point could be obtained by sublimation as TFA VII. There are more similarities in the current set of polymorph structures between MFA and TFA than between either and FFA (Figure 8). The differences in the conformational profiles of the molecules, and the variety of favored packings of the substituents of the aromatic ring, account for the difference in the relative stabilities of the different packings for the different molecules. However, the subtle balance between conformational energies and steric requirements to provide dense packing with different substituents is such that controlling the crystallization of these fenamates is an experimental and computational challenge. Since this arises from the compromises between the shallow potential wells for changing conformation and the weak intermolecular interactions, this behavior is likely to be typical of polymorphism in many pharmaceuticals.

This work shows that the targeted generation of new polymorphs by isomorphous templating can be extended to flexible molecules, and weaker intermolecular interactions, but is likely to require molecules with sufficient similarity to form at least a partial isomorphous solid solution. This is a significant step forward in the ability to design specific experiments to produce the first crystals of pharmaceutical polymorphs predicted by CSP.
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