## Supporting Information

S1. X-ray data for acetaminophen crystallized from pure ethanol and in the presence of $\alpha$-lactose monohydrate, D-mannitol, graphite, L-histidine and sodium chloride.


Figure S1. X-ray diffraction data for (a) AAP Form I simulated in Mercury 2.4 (b) AAP from pure ethanol (c) AAP crystallized in the presence of $\alpha$-lactose monohydrate (d) AAP crystallized in the presence of D-mannitol (e) AAP crystallized in the presence of graphite (f) AAP crystallized in the presence of L-histidine and (g) AAP crystallized in the presence of sodium chloride.

Diffraction pattern simulated in Mercury 2.4 using CIF file found in Cambridge Structural Database (REF Code: HXACAN07).

S2. Optical micrographs of the $\alpha$-lactose monohydrate and D-mannitol crystals used in the induction time measurements.


Figure S2. Optical micrographs of (a) $\alpha$-lactose monohydrate and (b) D-mannitol crystals used in the acetaminophen induction time experiments.

S3. EpiCalc epitaxy calculation for (0-11) Form I acetaminophen with (0-11) $\alpha$ lactose monohydrate and (100) Form I acetaminophen with (00-1) D-mannitol.
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Figure S3. A plot of dimensionless potential energy $\left(\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{V}_{0}\right)$ as a function of orientation angle $(\theta)$ for $\mathbf{a})(0-11)$ face of acetaminophen and $(0-11)$ face of $\alpha$-lactose monohydrate and $\mathbf{b})(100)$ face of acetaminophen and (00-1) of D-mannitol.

The EpiCalc calculations were performed using the following lattice values for the (0-11) and (100) faces of Form I acetaminophen, the ( $0-11$ ) face of $\alpha$-lactose monohydrate and the ( $00-1$ ) face of D-mannitol:
(0-11) Form I acetaminophen: $\mathrm{a}=14.84 \AA, \mathrm{~b}=7.09 \AA$ and $\beta=96.12^{\circ}$
(100) Form I acetaminophen: $a=11.62 \AA, b=9.23 \AA$ and $\beta=90^{\circ}$
(0-11) $\alpha$-lactose monohydrate: $\mathrm{a}=15.19 \AA, \mathrm{~b}=9.57 \AA$ and $\alpha=95.85^{\circ}$
(00-1) D-mannitol: $\mathrm{a}=16.9 \AA, \mathrm{~b}=8.69 \AA$ and $\alpha=90^{\circ}$
The acetaminophen overlayer dimensions were $25 \times 25$ cells and the orientation angle range tested was $180^{\circ}$ with a step size of $0.25^{\circ}$.

S4. EpiCalc epitaxy calculation for the (100) and (0-11) faces of Form I acetaminophen with the (002) face of graphite
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Figure S4. A plot of dimensionless potential energy $\left(\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{V}_{0}\right)$ as a function of orientation angle $(\theta)$ for $\mathbf{a}$ ) (100) face of acetaminophen and (002) face of graphite and $\mathbf{b}$ ) ( $0-11$ ) face of acetaminophen and (002) of graphite.

The EpiCalc calculations were performed using the following lattice values for the (100) and (0-11) faces of Form I acetaminophen and the (002) face of graphite:
(100) Form I acetaminophen: $\mathrm{a}=11.62 \AA, \mathrm{~b}=9.23 \AA$ and $\beta=90^{\circ}$
(0-11) Form I acetaminophen: $a=14.84 \AA, b=7.09 \AA$ and $\beta=96.12^{\circ}$
(002) graphite: $\mathrm{a}=\mathrm{b}=2.456 \AA$ and $\alpha=120^{\circ}$

The acetaminophen overlayer dimensions were $25 \times 25$ cells and the orientation angle range tested was $180^{\circ}$ with a step size of $0.25^{\circ}$.

S5. Table displaying the minimum interaction energy and optimal orientation angle between the $D$-mannitol (00-1) face and acetaminophen (100) face at different interplanar distances

| Interplanar distance (A) | Azimuthal Angle ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | Interaction energy per cell (kcal/mol) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | 90 | -0.50 |
| 6.8 | 270 | -0.55 |
| 6.6 | 270 | -0.61 |
| 6.4 | 270 | -0.66 |
| 6.2 | 270 | -0.72 |
| 6 | 270 | -0.78 |
| 5.8 | 270 | -0.83 |
| 5.6 | 90 | -0.92 |
| 5.4 | 90 | -1.01 |
| 5.2 | 90 | -1.11 |
| 5 | 90 | -1.24 |
| 4.8 | 90 | -1.39 |
| 4.6 | 90 | -1.56 |
| 4.4 | 90 | -1.72 |
| 4.2 | 75 | -1.91 |
| 4 | 25 | -2.16 |
| 3.8 | 25 | -2.45 |
| 3.6 | 25 | -2.77 |
| 3.4 | 25 | -3.06 |
| 3.2 | 270 | -3.33 |
| 3 | 90 | -3.78 |
| 2.8 | 90 | -4.28 |
| 2.6 | 90 | -4.78 |
| 2.4 | 90 | -4.99 |
| 2.2 | 90 | -4.85 |
| 2 | 155 | -4.84 |
| 1.8 | 270 | -5.15 |
| 1.6 | 270 | -5.59 |
| 1.4 | 270 | -5.61 |
| 1.2 | 270 | -4.53 |
| 1 | 260 | -1.93 |
| 0.8 | 260 | 3.94 |
| 0.6 | 260 | 20.93 |
| 0.4 | 90 | 57.26 |
| 0.2 | 90 | 108.45 |

S6. Table displaying the minimum interaction energy and optimal orientation angle between the $\alpha$-lactose $(\mathbf{0}-11)$ face and acetaminophen ( $0-11$ ) face at different interplanar distances

| Interplanar <br> distance <br> $(\AA)$ | Azimuthal <br> Angel ( $\left.{ }^{\circ}\right)$ | Interaction <br> energy per cell <br> $(\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 265 | -2.00 |
| 5.8 | 265 | -2.25 |
| 5.6 | 265 | -2.53 |
| 5.4 | 265 | -2.84 |
| 5.2 | 265 | -3.17 |
| 5 | 265 | -3.56 |
| 4.8 | 265 | -4.01 |
| 4.6 | 265 | -4.53 |
| 4.4 | 265 | -5.08 |
| 4.2 | 265 | -5.61 |
| 4 | 265 | -6.33 |
| 3.8 | 85 | -7.20 |
| 3.6 | 85 | -8.20 |
| 3.4 | 85 | -9.19 |
| 3.2 | 85 | -10.21 |
| 3 | 85 | -11.31 |
| 2.8 | 85 | -12.21 |
| 2.6 | 85 | -13.33 |
| 2.4 | 85 | -13.84 |
| 2.2 | 85 | -12.98 |
| 2 | 265 | -10.48 |
| 1.8 | 265 | -8.39 |
| 1.6 | 265 | -2.10 |
| 1.4 | 265 | 12.98 |
| 1.2 | 265 | 45.84 |
| 1 | 265 | 114.05 |
| 0.8 | 265 | 247.20 |
| 0.6 | 265 | 547.61 |
| 0.4 | 265 | 1200.92 |
| 0.2 | 265 | 3233.64 |
|  |  |  |

