Supporting information to:

Impurity-induced Acceleration of Polymorphic Conversion via Crystalline Solid Solutions and the T-X Phase Diagrams of Salicylic acid and 3-Hydroxybenzoic acid

Tao Zhang, Francesco Ricci, Seyed Sepehr Mohajerani, Mitchell Paolello, Fredrik L. Nordstrom*

Material & Analytical Sciences, Boehringer-Ingelheim, Ridgefield, 06877, Connecticut, USA. Email: fredrik.nordstrom@boehringer-ingelheim.com

Department of Physics, Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, 07030, New Jersey, USA

Department of Chemical Engineering, Rowan University, Glassboro, 08028, New Jersey, USA

Figure 1. XRPD overlay of select SA-3HBA Form I samples used in DSC analyses.

1 Mid-point between endotherms is used as an approximation of the baseline offset temperature of the lowtemperature endotherm. This separation also provides the calculation of the enthalpy of both the low- and hightemperature endotherms, when possible.

Figure 2. XRPD overlay of select SA-3HBA Form II samples used in DSC analyses prepared via evaporative crystallization from MeOH.

Table 2. DSC summary for SA-3HBA Form II

1 Mid-point between endotherms is used as an approximation of the baseline offset temperature of the lowtemperature endotherm. This separation also provides the calculation of the enthalpy of both the low- and hightemperature endotherms, when possible.

Table 3. DSC summary for SA-3HBA Form II: Exothermic transition from Form II (or βII) to Form I (or βI) of 3HBA

Table 4. Solid-Liquid Equilibria (SLE) summary of SA-3HBA Form I in 40 w% MeOH in H2O at 25°C

Table 5. Solid-Liquid Equilibria (SLE) summary of SA-3HBA Form II in 40 w% MeOH in H2O at 25° C

Solid	Liquid	Solid	Conc. of	Conc. of	X(SA)	X(3HBA)	X(solvent)
phase	w% or	w% or	SA	3HBA			mol
	mol%	mol%	mg SA/g solvent	mg 3HBA/g	mmol SA/(mol	mmol 3HBA/(m	solvent/(mol
	3HBA in	3HBA in		solvent	total)	ol total)	total)
	SA	SA					
SA	0.00%	0.00%	23.37	0.00	3.6813	0.0000	0.9963
α	18.25%	0.04%	26.81	5.99	4.2173	0.9416	0.9948
α	26.67%	0.08%	27.63	10.04	4.3423	1.5788	0.9941
α	37.37%	0.09%	29.52	17.61	4.6327	2.7639	0.9926
α	40.57%	0.13%	29.78	20.33	4.6723	3.1897	0.9921
α	55.26%	0.26%	34.06	42.06	5.3211	6.5720	0.9881
α	60.84%	0.39%	39.53	61.41	6.1523	9.5570	0.9843
α	65.38%	0.45%	43.14	81.46	6.6895	12.6310	0.9807
$\alpha + \beta$ II	73.37%	9.21%	60.17	165.79	9.1853	25.3108	0.9655
$\alpha + \beta$ II	72.92%	40.33%	60.31	162.41	9.2120	24.8068	0.9660
$\alpha + \beta$ II	72.58%	58.11%	62.02	164.14	9.4682	25.0573	0.9655
βII	80.93%	99.68%	35.59	150.99	5.4658	23.1907	0.9713
βII	86.61%	99.73%	22.53	145.77	3.4707	22.4509	0.9741
βII	87.77%	99.81%	19.89	142.76	3.0654	22.0069	0.9749
βIΙ	93.04%	99.82%	10.32	137.85	1.5943	21.2985	0.9771
3HBA, Form II	100.00%	100.00%	0.00	130.54	0.0000	20.2229	0.9798

Figure 3. Reference spectra for 3HBA Form I and II. Peak area between 1685 and 1705 cm-1 were used as reference to monitor polymorphic conversion rate

Figure 4. Example of changes in Raman spectra during a form conversion (wavelength: 1800 – 1500 cm-1)

Thermodynamic Modelling via NRTL

Fitting the Liquid BIPs $\Delta g^{L,\pi}_{12}$ and $\Delta g^{L,\pi}_{21}$

As mentioned in the text, for the liquid-state NRTL BIPs of 3-hydroxybenzoic acid (1) and salicylic acid (2), Δg_{12}^L and Δg_{21}^L were not expressed as functions of temperature due to the sparsity of solid-liquid equilibrium melt data (i.e., the SSLE data at the eutectic temperature). As also explained in the text, the Δg_{12}^L and Δg_{21}^L were treated separately for the equilibria involving βI and βII. Hence, we can succinctly denote the two different parameter sets as $\{\Delta g_{12}^{L,\pi},\Delta g_{21}^{L,\pi}\}$, where π denotes the β-phase (I or II) involved in the phase equilibria.

As performed in our earlier study [Wang, Y. Ricci, F., Nordstrom, F.L., Terminal crystalline solid solutions and T-X phase diagram of salicylic acid – 4-hydroxybenzoic acid, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys, 2024, 26, 3069.], a more in-depth study $\Delta g_{12}^{L,\pi}$ and $\Delta g_{21}^{L,\pi}$ was performed to assess the degeneracy of the liquid parameters with respect to the SSLE criteria which must be satisfied simultaneously:

$$
\left\{\gamma_i^{\alpha} x_i^{\alpha} f_i^S / f_i^L = \gamma_i^L x_i^L = \gamma_i^{\beta \pi} x_i^{\beta \pi} f_i^S / f_i^L\right\}_{i=1,2}
$$
\n(51)

Numerically, the regression procedure requires determination of the parameters $\Delta g_{12}^{L,\pi}$ and $\Delta g_{21}^{L,\pi}$ to calculate γ_i^L (provided known values of Δg_{12}^S and Δg_{21}^S , which we obtained from regressing the solvus data to the T-dependent expressions described in the text, and hence known values of γ_i^S). This was done by driving the objective function shown below to zero:

$$
OF = \sum_{i=1}^{2} (\gamma_i^{\alpha} x_i^{\alpha} f_i^S / f_i^L - \gamma_i^L x_i^L)^2 + (\gamma_i^{\beta \pi} x_i^{\beta \pi} f_i^S / f_i^L - \gamma_i^L x_i^L)^2
$$
\n^(S2)

Because there are only two regression parameters in the above equation ($\Delta g_{12}^{L,\pi}$ and $\Delta g_{21}^{L,\pi}$), one can easily visualize how the OF varies with the parameter values. Contour plots showing this functional dependency for both the βI and βII systems are illustrated below. These contour plots were used to locate the approximate minimum of the OF, and the corresponding approximate values of $\Delta g_{12}^{L,\pi}$ and $\Delta g_{21}^{L,\pi}$ were used as initial guesses in the regression algorithm.

Figure 5. Objective function at SSLE (α-βI-L), with varying values of $\Delta g^{L,l}_{22}$ *and* $\Delta g^{L,l}_{21}$ *. The right pane shows a zoomed view, with the data cursor showing the approximate location of the minimum.*

Figure 6. Objective function at SSLE (α-βII-L), with varying values of ∆g $_{12}^{L,II}$ *and ∆g* $_{21}^{L,II}$ *. The right pane shows a zoomed view, with the data cursor showing the approximate location of the minimum.*

We also note that it was attempted to predict the α-βII T-X phase diagram using the Δg_{12}^L and Δg_{21}^L values regressed to the α-βI data (e.g., $\{\Delta g_{12}^{L,I},\Delta g_{21}^{L,I}\}$); however, the predicted eutectic composition was in significant error. A potentially more accurate approach for using only one set of $\{\Delta g^L_{12},\Delta g^L_{21}\}$ would be to regress these two parameters to both the α-βI and α-βII phase equilibria simultaneously.

NRTL Parameter Values

The regressed NRTL BIP values are provided below. We note once again that the non-randomness parameters (α_{ij}) were all taken as 0.2 for both the solid and liquid state models. We reiterate that the liquid state BIPS for components 1 and 2 $\{\Delta g_{12}^{L,1}, \Delta g_{21}^{L,1}\}$ and $\{\Delta g_{12}^{L,II}, \Delta g_{21}^{L,II}\}$ were regressed to SSLE data in the 1-2 system (i.e., with respect to the two solid solutions in equilibrium with the eutectic melt). The other liquid state BIPs involving the solvent (e.g., $\Delta g_{13}^{L,l}$, etc...) were regressed to the solubility data in 40 w% MeOH in H₂O, where this fixed-composition binary solvent mixture was treated as a pseudo pure solvent.

$c_{12}^{S,I}$ = 18185.8959 J/mol
$d_{12}^{S,I}$ = -32.149 J/mol-K
$c_{21}^{S,I}$ = -3747.1294 J/mol
$d_{21}^{S,I}$ = 41.4138 J/mol-K
$c_{12}^{S,II}$ = 11139.8254 J/mol
$d_{12}^{S,II}$ = -6.839 J/mol-K
$c_{21}^{S,II}$ = -453.2698 J/mol
$d_{21}^{S,II}$ = 28.9163 J/mol-K

Table 6. NRTL Solid State BIPs

$\Delta g_{12}^{L,I}$	-5230.7972 J/mol
$\Delta g_{21}^{L,l}$	11619.6266 J/mol
$\Delta g_{13}^{L,I}$	19762.0553 J/mol
$\Delta g_{31}^{L,I}$	-6585.69442 J/mol
$\Delta g_{23}^{L,I}$	-4161.09328 J/mol
$\Delta g_{32}^{L,I}$	11119.0683 J/mol
$\Delta g_{12}^{L,II}$	-3002.0537 J/mol
$\Delta g_{21}^{L,II}$	6858.9432 J/mol
$\Delta g_{13}^{L,II}$	-9017.86118 J/mol
$\Delta g_{31}^{L,II}$	17803.6867 J/mol
$\Delta g_{23}^{L,II}$	-7094.86151 J/mol
$\Delta g_{32}^{L,II}$	18299.0624 J/mol

Table 7. NRTL Liquid State BIPs