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Xiongtao Jia ${ }^{\text {a }}$, Jingkang Wang ${ }^{\text {a,b,c, }, ~ T i n g ~ W a n g ~}{ }^{\text {a,b,c* }}$, Xin Huang ${ }^{\text {a,b,c }, ~ X i n ~} \mathrm{Li}^{\mathrm{a}}$, Na Wang ${ }^{\text {a }}$, Yunhai Huang ${ }^{\text {a }}$, Rui Li ${ }^{\text {a }}$, Bugui Zhao ${ }^{\text {d }}$, Tao Zhang ${ }^{\text {d }}$, Hongxun Hao ${ }^{\text {ab,b, }}{ }^{*}$
${ }^{\text {a }}$ National Engineering Research Center of Industrial Crystallization Technology, School of Chemical Engineering and Technology, Tianjin University, Tianjin 300072, China
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Collaborative Innovation Center of Chemical Science and Engineering (Tianjin), Tianjin 300072, China
c State Key Laboratory of Chemical Engineering, School of Chemical Engineering and Technology, Tianjin University, Tianjin 300072, China
${ }^{\text {d S Shandong Lukang Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd, Shandong 272021, China }}$

Table S1 Crystallographic information for the cefradine

| Crystal data |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Chemical formula | $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{19.67} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{4.33} \mathrm{~S}$ |
| $M_{\mathrm{r}}$ | 355.41 |
| Crystal system, space | Monoclinic, $I 2$ |
| group | 293 |
| Temperature (K) | $16.8521(4), 11.9552(2), 26.6656(6)$ |
| $a, b, c(\AA)$ | $108.107(3)$ |
| $\beta\left(^{\circ}\right)$ | $5106.3(2)$ |
| $V\left(\AA^{3}\right)$ | 12 |
| $Z$ | Cu Ka |
| Radiation type | 1.94 |
| $\mu\left(\mathrm{~mm}{ }^{-1}\right)$ | $0.25 \times 0.23 \times 0.20$ |
| Crystal size (mm) |  |
| Data collection | Bruker Smart Apex CCD area detector |
| Diffractometer | Multi-scan |
| Absorption correction | SADABS |
| $T_{\text {min }}, T_{\text {max }}$ | $0.632,0.935$ |
| No. of measured, |  |
| independent and |  |
| observed $[I>2 \sigma(I)]$ |  |
| reflections | $17284,8354,7909$ |
| $R_{\text {int }}$ |  |

$$
(\sin \theta / \lambda)_{\max }\left(\AA^{-1}\right)
$$

## Refinement <br> $R\left[F^{2}>2 \sigma\left(F^{2}\right)\right], w R\left(F^{2}\right)$, $S$

No. of reflections

$$
0.053,0.152,1.03
$$

No. of parameters
8354

No. of restraints 191

H -atom treatment
$\Delta \rho_{\text {max }}, \Delta \rho_{\text {min }}\left(\mathrm{e} \AA^{-3}\right)$
H atoms treated by a mixture of independent and constrained refinement $0.75,-0.51$

Absolute structure
Flack x determined using 3082 quotients [(I+)-(I-)]/[(I+)+(I-)] (Parsons, Flack and Wagner, Acta Cryst. B69 (2013) 249-259).
Absolute structure parameter

$$
0.008 \text { (11) }
$$

Computer programs: SHELXT 2018/2 (Sheldrick, 2018), SHELXL2018/3 (Sheldrick, 2018).






Fig.S1. Radial distribution functions $g(r)$ around the interfacial layers of (10-1). (a) Represents radial distribution functions $g(r)$ of solute (group 1) around the interfacial layers; (b) represents radial distribution functions $g(r)$ of solute (group 2) around the interfacial layers; (c) represents radial distribution functions $g(r)$ of solvent (group 1) around the interfacial layers; (d) represents radial distribution functions $g(r)$ of solvent (group 2) around the interfacial layers; (e) represents radial distribution functions $g(r)$ of solute around solvent (group 1); (f) represents radial distribution functions $g(r)$ of solute around solvent (group 2).



Fig.S2. Radial distribution functions $g(r)$ around the interfacial layers of (101). (a) Represents radial distribution functions $g(r)$ of solute (group 1) around the interfacial layers; (b) represents radial distribution functions $g(r)$ of solute (group 2) around the interfacial layers; (c) represents radial distribution functions $g(r)$ of solvent (group 1) around the interfacial layers; (d) represents radial distribution functions $g(r)$ of solvent (group 2) around the interfacial layers; (e) represents radial distribution functions $g(r)$ of solute around solvent (group 1); (f) represents radial distribution functions $g(r)$ of solute around solvent (group 2).


Fig.S3. Radial distribution functions $g(r)$ around the interfacial layers of (011). (a) Represents radial distribution functions $g(r)$ of solute (group 1) around the interfacial layers; (b) represents radial distribution functions $g(r)$ of solvent (group 1) around the interfacial layers; (c) represents
radial distribution functions $g(r)$ of solute around solvent (group 1); (d) represents radial distribution functions $g(r)$ of solute around solvent (group 2).


Fig.S4. Radial distribution functions $g(r)$ around the interfacial layers of (01-1). (a) Represents radial distribution functions $g(r)$ of solute (group 1) around the interfacial layers; (b) represents radial distribution functions $g(r)$ of solvent (group 1) around the interfacial layers; (c) represents radial distribution functions $g(r)$ of solute around solvent (group 1); (d) represents radial distribution functions $g(r)$ of solute around solvent (group 2).


Fig.S5. Snapshot of water (a), methanol (b), ethanol (c), acetonitrile (d), DMA (e), DMF (f) and DMSO (g) on the (10-1) face at 293.15 K at 500 ps (solute molecules were removed for clarity).


Fig.S6. Snapshot of water (a), methanol (b), ethanol (c), acetonitrile (d), DMA (e), DMF (f) and DMSO (g) on the (101) face at 293.15 K at 500 ps (solute molecules were removed for clarity).


Fig.S7. Snapshot of water (a), methanol (b), ethanol (c) and acetonitrile (d) on the (10-1) face at 293.15 K at 500 ps (solute molecules were removed for clarity).

Table S2 Peak finding reports of cefradine dehydrate (Deposition Number 963812 in CCDC)

| $\#$ | 2-Theta | $\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{A})$ | BG | Height | $\mathrm{I} \%$ | Area | $\mathrm{I} \%$ | FWHM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 7.603 | 11.6183 | 15 | 7574 | 76.2 | 55076 | 78.6 | 0.124 |
| 2 | 14.302 | 6.1877 | 17 | 6342 | 63.8 | 46739 | 66.7 | 0.125 |
| 3 | 14.76 | 5.9967 | 48 | 2122 | 21.4 | 16320 | 23.3 | 0.131 |
| 4 | 17.419 | 5.0868 | 14 | 4728 | 47.6 | 33761 | 48.2 | 0.121 |
| 5 | 19.962 | 4.4442 | 45 | 2956 | 29.8 | 20350 | 29.1 | 0.117 |
| 6 | 23.402 | 3.7981 | 61 | 2268 | 22.8 | 17520 | 25 | 0.131 |
| 7 | 23.702 | 3.7508 | 157 | 2202 | 22.2 | 14139 | 20.2 | 0.109 |
| 8 | 24.337 | 3.6543 | 184 | 4441 | 44.7 | 27607 | 39.4 | 0.106 |
| 9 | 25.017 | 3.5565 | 255 | 4202 | 42.3 | 26205 | 37.4 | 0.106 |
| 10 | 25.582 | 3.4792 | 173 | 1468 | 14.8 | 35325 | 50.4 | 0.409 |
| 11 | 25.798 | 3.4506 | 95 | 6449 | 64.9 | 47348 | 67.6 | 0.125 |
| 12 | 26.039 | 3.4192 | 49 | 3891 | 39.2 | 48846 | 69.7 | 0.213 |


| 13 | 27.879 | 3.1976 | 38 | 1601 | 16.1 | 15690 | 22.4 | 0.167 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | 28.878 | 3.0892 | 78 | 2509 | 25.3 | 17801 | 25.4 | 0.121 |

Table S3 Peak finding reports of theoretical monoclinic form (Deposition Number 2116441 in CCDC)

| $\# \#$ | 2-Theta | $\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{A})$ | BG | Height | $\mathrm{I} \%$ | Area | $\mathrm{I} \%$ | FWHM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 5.479 | 16.1175 | 36 | 2759 | 31.4 | 20958 | 29.1 | 0.129 |
| 2 | 7.242 | 12.1963 | 36 | 8793 | 100 | 71922 | 100 | 0.139 |
| 3 | 10.881 | 8.1244 | 8 | 1865 | 21.2 | 16474 | 22.9 | 0.15 |
| 4 | 16.359 | 5.4142 | 54 | 6591 | 75 | 57082 | 79.4 | 0.147 |
| 5 | 20.219 | 4.3884 | 90 | 1835 | 20.9 | 16219 | 22.6 | 0.15 |
| 6 | 20.839 | 4.2591 | 100 | 1152 | 13.1 | 19547 | 27.2 | 0.288 |
| 7 | 23.039 | 3.8572 | 59 | 1990 | 22.6 | 15781 | 21.9 | 0.135 |
| 8 | 24.679 | 3.6044 | 59 | 1641 | 18.7 | 26736 | 37.2 | 0.277 |
| 9 | 27.46 | 3.2454 | 44 | 641 | 7.3 | 20392 | 28.4 | 0.541 |
| 10 | 27.799 | 3.2066 | 44 | 443 | 5 | 14625 | 20.3 | 0.561 |
| 11 | 28.442 | 3.1356 | 99 | 1323 | 15 | 15145 | 21.1 | 0.195 |



Fig.S8. PXRD patterns of theoretical crystals and crystals obtained from group 1.


Fig.S9. PXRD patterns of theoretical crystals and crystals obtained from group 2.


Fig.S10. The crystal structure of monoclinic form.


Fig.S11. The crystal structure of cefradine dihydrate.
Table S4 Adsorption energies ( $\mathrm{kcal}^{1} / \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ ) of individual solvent molecules onto morphologically important crystal faces of cefradine based on the previous structure (CCDC no. 2019845).

|  |  | (10-1) | $\left(\begin{array}{lll}1 & 1\end{array}\right)$ | (0 1 1) | (0 1-1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Control | Water | -10.4 | -11.8 | -12.9 | -12.8 |
| Group 1 | Methanol | -9.15 | -10.5 | -11.4 | -11.6 |
|  | Ethanol | -8.29 | -9.92 | -11.2 | -11.3 |
|  | Acetonitrile | -10.0 | -11.3 | -12.1 | -12.8 |
| Group 2 | DMF | -10.6 | -14.6 | -17.4 | -18.4 |
|  | DMA | -11.3 | -14.6 | -16.9 | -17.9 |
|  | DMSO | -12.8 | -15.2 | -18.3 | -18.5 |

## S1. Distribution of cefradine while triethylamine was added

According to previous work, Fig.S12 plots the distribution of the three forms of cefradine as a function of pH in water. The activity of A increases first and then decreases with the increasing of pH and there is a maximum value at the isoelectric point ( $\mathrm{pH}=5.0$ ). With the addition of triethylamine, the pH of the solution gradually increased from acidic to isoelectric point, and the cation of cefradine gradually becomes the neutral molecular. The supersaturation adjusted by triethylamine was used as the driving force for crystal growth, and the neutral molecules produced were used as raw materials for crystal growth.


Fig.S12 Distribution curve of three existing forms of cefradine in methanol with $p \mathrm{H}$. and $A^{+}, A$ and $A^{-}$represent the cation, zwitterion and anion of cefradine

## S2. Details of MD simulation

Before simulations, all the crystal surfaces with vacuum slab and boxes of solution were optimized to make sure the structures were completely relaxed. During simulations, the crystal structure was kept fixed. The Condensed-phase Optimized Molecular Potentials for Atomistic Simulation Studies (COMPASS) force field (with force field-assigned partial atomic charges) was used to model atomic interactions in the crystal structure of cefradine, solvents and others. All the systems were initially subjected to energy minimization in order to avoid unwanted overlap between the atoms and to reduce the thermal noise in the system; then velocities were generated according to the Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution. Finally, isothermal and isochoric (NVT) MD simulations were conducted at 293.15 K . The temperature was controlled by the Nose-Hoover thermostat with a relaxation time of 0.1 ns , and Ewald summation was used to incorporate the long-range interactions. The equations of motion were integrated by the Verlet velocity algorithm with a time step of 1 fs for a simulation duration of 500 ps , and trajectories were saved at every 0.5 ps . The equilibration state was determined by observing the change in the thermodynamic
properties such as energy and temperature as a function of time. It was found that all the systems reach equilibrium within 100 ps of simulation; thus all the properties were estimated using trajectory after 100 ps . All the MD simulations were performed in Materials Studio (Version 7.0).

