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| C) |  |  |  | NSC |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{g}}\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | $\left.{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | $\%$ Crystallinity | $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{mol})$ |
|  | $45.1 \pm 0.90$ | $155 \pm 0.36$ | $49.8 \pm 0.56$ | 15.6 |
| Linear-PLLA-diol | $49.2 \pm 0.54$ | $152 \pm 0.47$ | $15.0 \pm 1.9$ | 14.7 |
| Star-PLLA-tetrol | 49.2 |  |  |  |

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 $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{n}}$. (c) Summary of thermal properties from DSC and $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{n}}$ from NMR.
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c)

|  | DSC |  |  | NMR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{g}}\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{m}}\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | $\%$ Crystallinity | $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{mol})$ |
| Linear-PCL-diol | $-65.1 \pm 0.82$ | $52.7 \pm 0.16$ | $47.7 \pm 1.3$ | 10.3 |
| Star-PCL-tetrol | $-63.2 \pm 1.2$ | $50.0 \pm 0.37$ | $44.8 \pm 1.6$ | 10.9 |

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 $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ used to calculate $M_{n}$. (c) Summary of thermal properties from DSC and $M_{n}$ from NMR.
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|  | NMR |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | \% acrylation |
| Linear-PCL-DA | 93.4 |
| Star-PCL-TA | 87.4 |

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 $\sim 29 \%$ mass loss [ $\sim 2-4 \%$ for $L P C L$ and $S P C L$ controls $+\sim 25 \%$ thermoplastic PLLA] for semiIPN 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 $\sim 220 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ for all scaffolds, and (b) all scaffolds exhibited similar $\sim 60 \%$ porosity ( ${ }^{\#} p>0.05$ ).

Table S1. Thermal properties of scaffolds.

|  | PCL |  |  | PLLA |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tm onset <br> $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathbf{C}\right)$ | $\mathbf{T m}_{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{m i d p o i n t}$ <br> $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathbf{C}\right)$ | \% <br> Crystallinity | Tm onset <br> $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathbf{C}\right)$ | Tm midpoint <br> $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathbf{C}\right)$ | \% <br> Crystallinity |
| $\boldsymbol{L P C L}$ | $50.5 \pm 0.41$ | $56.1 \pm 0.56$ | $42.7 \pm 1.7$ | -- | -- | -- |
| $\boldsymbol{L} / \boldsymbol{L}$ | $50.5 \pm 0.61$ | $56.6 \pm 0.21$ | $42.0 \pm 1.9$ | $153.9 \pm 1.8$ | $164.0 \pm 1.5$ | $37.6 \pm 7.3$ |
| $\boldsymbol{L} / \boldsymbol{S}$ | $51.1 \pm 0.27$ | $56.3 \pm 0.25$ | $42.5 \pm 2.0$ | $152.2 \pm 0.84$ | $157.5 \pm 0.44$ | $19.5 \pm 1.8$ |
| $\boldsymbol{S P C L}$ | $42.6 \pm 0.20$ | $49.2 \pm 0.02$ | $30.4 \pm 3.5$ | -- | -- | -- |
| $\boldsymbol{S} / \boldsymbol{L}$ | $41.0 \pm 0.83$ | $50.0 \pm 0.12$ | $33.5 \pm 1.6$ | $155.2 \pm 0.56$ | $160.0 \pm 0.19$ | $23.0 \pm 7.1$ |
| $\boldsymbol{S} / \boldsymbol{S}$ | $39.7 \pm 2.0$ | $50.3 \pm 0.20$ | $39.2 \pm 4.3$ | $147.9 \pm 2.2$ | $156.5 \pm 0.13$ | $24.7 \pm 5.8$ |



Figure S7. Scaffold (a) PCL \% crystallinity; ${ }^{*} p<0.05$ and ${ }^{\#} p>0.05$ versus $L P C L$ and (b) PLLA \% crystallinity; ${ }^{*} p<0.05$ and ${ }^{\#} p>0.05$ versus $\boldsymbol{L} / \boldsymbol{L}$.


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

Table S2. Mechanical properties of scaffolds.

|  | Modulus (MPa) | Compressive <br> Strength (MPa) | Toughness (mJ) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\boldsymbol{L P P C L}$ | $9.65 \pm 2.8$ | $21.6 \pm 4.0$ | $238 \pm 74$ |
| $\boldsymbol{L} / \boldsymbol{L}$ | $23.8 \pm 3.6$ | $28.0 \pm 5.2$ | $275 \pm 66$ |
| $\boldsymbol{L} / \boldsymbol{S}$ | $17.4 \pm 4.2$ | $34.3 \pm 6.0$ | $325 \pm 61$ |
| SPCL | $3.57 \pm 0.58$ | $15.0 \pm 3.2$ | $115 \pm 25$ |
| S/L | $11.9 \pm 2.3$ | $24.5 \pm 7.7$ | $184 \pm 45$ |
| S/S | $11.3 \pm 2.4$ | $15.3 \pm 6.8$ | $138 \pm 58$ |



Figure S9. Quantitative shape fixity $\left(\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}\right)$ and shape recovery $\left(\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ over 2 cycles; ${ }^{\#} p>0.05$.


Figure S10. The scaled-up, "larger", scaffolds ("lrg.") compared to "regular" scaffolds ("reg.") having: (a) 2 X the diameter, (b) 5X the volume, and (c) constant density ( ${ }^{*} p<0.01$, \# $p>0.05$ versus reg).
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| Element | Wt. \% |
| :---: | :---: |
| C | $50.6 \pm 2.0$ |
| O | $31.0 \pm 1.8$ |
| Au | $18.4 \pm 2.2$ |


| Element | Wt \% |
| :---: | :---: |
| C | $49.3 \pm 2.2$ |
| O | $33.8 \pm 2.1$ |
| Au | $17.0 \pm 2.5$ |


| Element | $\mathbf{W t .}$ \% |
| :---: | :---: |
| C | $48.1 \pm 2.1$ |
| O | $32.6 \pm 1.9$ |
| Au | $19.3 \pm 2.4$ |


| Element | Wt. \% |
| :---: | :---: |
| C | $49.3 \pm 2.1$ |
| O | $31.3 \pm 1.9$ |
| Au | $19.5 \pm 2.4$ |

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

Video S1. Diffusion of $\boldsymbol{L} / \boldsymbol{L}$ and $\boldsymbol{S} / \boldsymbol{S}$ semi-IPN macromer solutions through salt templates.

