Supporting Information

8 Pages

11 Figures

2 Tables

1 video

Shape Memory Polymer (SMP) Scaffolds with Improved Self-Fitting Properties

Michaela R. Pfau,¹ Kelly G. McKinzey,¹ Abigail A. Roth,¹ Lance M. Graul,¹ Duncan J. Maitland,¹ Melissa A. Grunlan^{1,2,3}*

¹Department of Biomedical Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843, United States.

²Department of Materials Science and Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843, United States.

³Department of Chemistry, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843, United States.



Figure S1. (a) Synthetic scheme for *linear*- and *star*-PLLA. (b) NMR spectra with red boxes to indicate the reference peaks representing the terminal CH used to calculate M_n . (c) Summary of thermal properties from DSC and M_n from NMR.



Figure S2. (a) Synthetic scheme for *star*-PCL-tetrol. [Note: *linear*-PCL-diol was purchased.] (b) NMR spectra with red boxes to indicate the reference peaks representing terminal CH₂ used to calculate M_n . (c) Summary of thermal properties from DSC and M_n from NMR.



Figures S3. (a) Synthetic scheme for acrylation of *linear*-PCL-diol and *star*-PCL-tetrol. NMR spectra for (b) *linear*-PCL-DA and (c) *star*-PCL-TA. (d) Summary of NMR % acrylation calculations.



Figure S4. Sol content values of scaffolds demonstrating adequate cross-linking with an upper limit of ~29% mass loss [~2-4% for *LPCL* and *SPCL* controls + ~25% thermoplastic PLLA] for semi-IPN compositions.



Figure S5. TGA of scaffolds verifying ~25% thermoplastic in PCL/PLLA semi-IPNs (a) for *linear*-PCL-DA based compositions, and (b) for *star*-PCL-TA based compositions.



Figure S6. (a) Pore size was maintained at ~220 μ m for all scaffolds, and (b) all scaffolds exhibited similar ~60% porosity ([#]p > 0.05).

	PCL			PLLA		
	T _m onset (°C)	T _m midpoint (°C)	% Crystallinity	T _m onset (°C)	T _m midpoint (°C)	% Crystallinity
L PCL	50.5 ± 0.41	56.1 ± 0.56	42.7 ± 1.7			
L/L	50.5 ± 0.61	56.6 ± 0.21	42.0 ± 1.9	153.9 ± 1.8	164.0 ± 1.5	37.6 ± 7.3
L/S	51.1 ± 0.27	56.3 ± 0.25	42.5 ± 2.0	152.2 ± 0.84	157.5 ± 0.44	19.5 ± 1.8
S PCL	42.6 ± 0.20	49.2 ± 0.02	30.4 ± 3.5			
S/L	41.0 ± 0.83	50.0 ± 0.12	33.5 ± 1.6	155.2 ± 0.56	160.0 ± 0.19	23.0 ± 7.1
S/S	39.7 ± 2.0	50.3 ± 0.20	39.2 ± 4.3	147.9 ± 2.2	156.5 ± 0.13	24.7 ± 5.8

Table S1. Thermal properties of scaffolds.



Figure S7. Scaffold (a) PCL % crystallinity; p < 0.05 and p > 0.05 versus *LPCL* and (b) PLLA % crystallinity; p < 0.05 and p > 0.05 versus *L/L*.



Figure S8. SEM images of solid film cross-sections of analogous compositions to scaffolds to examine relative miscibility or phase separation. Scale bars = $50 \mu m$.

	Modulus (MPa)	Compressive Strength (MPa)	Toughness (mJ)
L PCL	9.65 ± 2.8	21.6 ± 4.0	238 ± 74
L/L	23.8 ± 3.6	28.0 ± 5.2	275 ± 66
L/S	17.4 ± 4.2	34.3 ± 6.0	325 ± 61
S PCL	3.57 ± 0.58	15.0 ± 3.2	115 ± 25
S/L	11.9 ± 2.3	24.5 ± 7.7	184 ± 45
S/S	11.3 ± 2.4	15.3 ± 6.8	138 ± 58

 Table S2. Mechanical properties of scaffolds.



Figure S9. Quantitative shape fixity (R_f) and shape recovery (R_r) over 2 cycles; ${}^{\#}p > 0.05$.



Figure S10. The scaled-up, "larger", scaffolds ("lrg.") compared to "regular" scaffolds ("reg.") having: (a) 2X the diameter, (b) 5X the volume, and (c) constant density (**p < 0.01, #p > 0.05 versus reg).



Figure S11. "Larger" scaffold slices were subjected to SEM EDS elemental mapping to confirm full porogen (NaCl) leaching. As shown, Na and Cl were both not detected, indicating that scaffolds were free from residual porogens.

Video S1. Diffusion of *L/L* and *S/S* semi-IPN macromer solutions through salt templates.