ABSTRACT: Melt blending of homopolymers is an effective way to achieve an attractive combination of polymer properties. Dynamic vulcanization of fatty-acid-based polyester polyol with glycerol and poly(l-lactic acid) (PLLA) in the presence of hexamethylene diisocyanate (HDI) was performed with the aim of toughening PLLA. The dynamic vulcanization in an internal mixer led to the formation of a PLLA/PU biobased blend. Melt torque, Fourier transform infrared (FTIR), and gel fraction analysis demonstrated the successful formation of cross-linked polyurethane (PU) inside the PLLA matrix. Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) analysis showed that the PLLA/PU blends exhibit a sea−island morphology. Gel fraction analysis revealed that a rubbery phase was formed inside the PLLA matrix, which was insoluble in chloroform. FTIR analysis of the insoluble part shows the appearance of an absorption band centered at 1758 cm$^{-1}$, related to the crystalline carbonyl vibration of the PLLA component, thus suggesting the partial involvement of PLLA chains in the cross-linking reaction. The overall content of the PU phase in the blends significantly affected the mechanical properties, thermal stability, and crystallization behavior of the materials. The overall crystallization rate of PLLA was noticeably decreased by the incorporation of PU. At the same time, polarized light optical microscopy (PLOM) analysis revealed that the presence of the PU rubbery phase inside the PLLA matrix promoted PLLA nucleation. With the formation of the PU network, the impact strength showed a remarkable increase while Young’s modulus correspondingly decreased. The blends showed slightly reduced thermal stability compared to the neat PLLA.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, biodegradable polymers, especially those derived from renewable resources, have attracted increasing interest to alleviate the environmental concerns on the use of conventional petroleum-based polymers. Poly(lactic acid) (PLA) is an excellent, environmentally friendly plastic. It presents good properties, such as high rigidity and mechanical strength, high melting point, excellent biocompatibility and biodegradability, and easy processability. However, PLA also suffers from several drawbacks, which largely restricts its widespread application. In particular, the slow crystallization kinetics, low heat distortion temperatures, and high inherent brittleness limit the applications of PLA. Therefore, significant efforts have been devoted in the last decade to enhance the properties of PLA, in particular its toughness. Several strategies have been applied to overcome brittleness such as plasticization, the addition of fillers, melt blending with flexible polymers (elastomers/rubbers), and copolymerization. Chemical modification, including grafting and reactive blending or dynamic vulcanization, was found to be an efficient approach for PLA toughening.

Dynamic vulcanization and reactive blending represent a compelling way to tailor the properties and produce polymer blends with high performance. The technique involves the in situ reaction between PLA and added components during melt blending, with the formation of a cross-linked rubber phase inside the PLA matrix. Most often, the formed rubbery phase is a polyurethane (PU). PU is generally synthesized through a reaction of isocyanates (possessing more than one $\text{NCO}$ group) with compounds having active hydrogen functional groups, such as polyamines, polycarbonates, polyethers, and polyols ($\text{-OH}$). The final polyurethane product is composed of soft polymer segments (e.g., polyethers or polyols) and isocyanate-based hard/solid segments.

Several works reported the dynamic vulcanization of PLA with different components, i.e., epoxidized synthetic elasto-
mers, unsaturated polymers, and natural rubber, leading to the formation of supertough PLA materials with higher mechanical characteristics. The mechanism of ductility improvement is related to two main factors, which are the chemical modification of the molecular structure and the improved compatibility between the blend components.22,24–42

Several examples of supertoughened PLA blends obtained by either reactive interfacial compatibilization, or dynamic vulcanization with the formation of a second component rubbery phase are reported. To prepare systems using the first strategy, several acrylate-glycidyl copolymers have been adopted, e.g., poly(ethylene-glycidyl methacrylate) (EGMA) and ethylene-co-acrylic ester-co-glycidyl methacrylate (E-AE-GMA) rubber.43,44 Several types of rubbers vulcanized in situ within the PLA matrix have been tested, including (i) nitrile rubber cross-linked with dicumyl peroxide;27 (ii) soybean oil Vulcanized by free radical cross-linking agents;30 (iii) zinc ionomers of the ethylene methacrylic acid copolymer (EMAA-Zn) and elastomeric ethylene-butyl acrylate-glycidyl methacrylate terpolymer (EBA-GMA);31 and (iv) poly(glycerol succinate-co-maleate) (PGSMA).41 Besides the toughening effect, in some cases, an increase in crystallization rate or nucleation density of the material was also reported.27,34,39

The use of isocyanate-based crosslinkers or chain extenders enables us to obtain both the formation of a dynamically vulcanized rubber phase, when reactive oligomers with low $T_g$ are added to PLA, and the simultaneous interfacial compatibilization of the resulting blend, thanks to the reaction with the terminal hydroxyl groups of the PLA chains. Different “soft” building blocks have been proposed, such as poly(ethylene glycol),35 polyester polyol,42 and polyurethane elastomer prepolymer34 or biorenewable, e.g., based on castor oil.32,33,38,39 Largely enhanced ductility and impact resistance were reported for PLA-based blends, in addition to faster cold crystallization in most cases. Excellent compatibility of the formed rubber with PLA is generally expected because of the reported miscibility of poly(lactide) with some polyethers and polyesters. The development of biobased rubbery tough materials remains an important research objective. Fatty-acid-based polymers are promising candidates for this aim. In this work, we aimed to toughen poly(1-lactic acid) (PLLA) and prepare an almost fully biobased material by dynamic vulcanization with hexamethylene disocyanate (HDI), using PLLA, glycerol, and a polyester polyol derived from vegetable oils. The latter is produced by polymerization of fatty-acid dimers containing 36 carbon atoms and has the advantage of being commercially available. The morphology, thermal, and crystallization behavior were investigated and correlated with the measured mechanical properties.

\section*{RESULTS AND DISCUSSION}

\subsection*{Chemical Analysis.} Dynamic vulcanization was used to prepare PLLA/PU biobased blends in which the cross-linked PU was formed by the in situ polymerization of a polyester polyol oil, glycerol, and HDI. The reactive blending was performed in a Brabender internal mixer. All materials were prepared under the same conditions, including neat PLLA, for comparison purposes.

Interfacial compatibilization between the PLLA matrix and the PU phase can, in principle, take place, thanks to the reaction of the terminal hydroxyl groups of PLLA with the $-\text{NCO}$ groups of HDI. Figure 1 reports the measured melt torque versus time during the dynamic vulcanization process. As judged from the instrumental response, dynamic vulcanization displays two steps. The first step is related to the melting of PLLA pellets, and it is characterized by a sharp peak in the measured torque, which decreases gradually with mixing time because of both the melting of PLLA pellets and the lubrication/plasticization effect of polyol and glycerol.35,39 The second step starts with the addition of HDI; the torque increases gradually to an almost stable plateau because the viscosity of the system increases during the vulcanization reaction. The time at which the torque remains approximately constant indicates the end of the cross-linking process. It is worth noting that the measured torque decreases slightly when HDI is added. We hypothesize that this might be related to some extent of chain scission due to the high reactivity of the isocyanate.

To confirm the presence of a cross-linked PU network inside the PLLA matrix, we isolated a cross-linked fraction from the samples by prolonged extraction with chloroform and carried out further analysis. Figure 2 shows the weight percentage of insoluble residues of the different PLLA/PU blends. The gel fraction increases gradually with the increase of the polyol content. However, in all cases, the uncrosslinked part weight was lower than the total content of the added reactive mixture (polyester polyols oil, glycerol, and HDI). This difference likely indicates that only a part of the polyol chains is
effectively cross-linked, notwithstanding the stoichiometric ratios between isocyanate and hydroxyl groups. On the other hand, the presence of a non-negligible insoluble fraction confirms that the aim of producing a PLLA/rubber blend in situ has been achieved.

Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) was performed to confirm the occurrence of the reaction. The results related to the different as-prepared PLLA/PU blends and the insoluble fractions are reported in Figures 3 and 4, respectively. All of the characteristic absorption peaks of neat PLLA were also observed in the PLLA/PU blends spectra. Moreover, distinct absorption bands are present in the PLLA/PU samples. In particular, the peak at 1540 cm\(^{-1}\), which characterizes the urethane group, is clearly evidenced and increases with the polyol concentration. Accordingly, no trace of the isocyanate group peak of HDI (2270 cm\(^{-1}\)) could be detected in the reacted samples.

Figure 3 shows the spectra of the neat PLLA and the insoluble fractions of different PLLA/PU blends.

A scanning electron microscope (SEM) was used to study the spherulitic morphology and the superstructural growth rate of the PLLA phase within the different blends. Figure 6 shows examples of PLOM micrographs obtained for the different samples after 10 min of isothermal crystallization at 140 °C. The neat PLLA (Figure 6a) showed regular spherulites with large diameters. The regularity and perfection of the PLLA spherulites in the PLLA/PU blends decreased with the increase of the PU content, as small PU domains in the form of particlelike inclusions can be observed within the spherulite structure. In particular, at the highest content of PU, the characteristic radial fibrillar structure of the spherulite is not distinguishable anymore. The decreased PLLA spherulites regularity and texture perfection could be attributed to the interfibrillar segregation of the soft PU domains and polyols (the polyester polyol and glycerol). In fact, the micrometer-sized cross-linked polyol phase cannot be easily moved along with the growth front of the PLLA spherulites; hence, it will be engulfed inside the PLLA spherulites and thus strongly affect the lamellar arrangement. Similar results have been reported in the literature for PLLA crystallizing from an immiscible blend showing a certain interaction with the matrix.36 Another reason that could affect the PLLA spherulites regularity is the lowered PLLA chain mobility due to the reaction with PU after dynamic vulcanization.

Besides the morphology, the nucleation density of PLLA was affected by the dynamic vulcanization and the presence of the PU phase. Hence, the number of PLLA nuclei increase significantly with the increase of PU content, as shown from an enlarged view (Figure 7). The increase in the PLLA nuclei concentration could be due to (i) some transfer of nucleating impurities from the different additives to the PLLA matrix and (ii) an interface-induced nucleation mechanism due to PLLA/PU phase separation, perhaps ascribed to local order due to the interactions between PLLA and PU.36–49

Results of the PLLA spherulite growth rates as a function of the chosen crystallization temperature in the studied systems are shown in Figure 8. Overall, the effect of dynamic
Figure 5. SEM images of different PLLA/PU blends with different concentrations of PU phase: (a) neat PLLA, (b) PLLA/5PU, (c) PLLA/10PU, (d) PLLA/20PU, and (e, f) PLLA/30PU.

Figure 6. Polarized optical microscopy (POM) micrographs at a crystallization temperature of 140 °C for neat PLLA (a), PLLA/10PU (b), and PLLA/30PU (c).
vulcanization on the growth rate is not large. This is consistent with the phase-separated blend morphology. However, some small variations could be appreciated. In particular, we note that the PLLA spherulitic growth rate of PLLA/5PU and PLLA/10PU was slightly higher than that of the neat PLLA, which is tentatively explained by a decrease in the molecular weight, due to chain scission caused by HDI and thermal degradation. Indeed, a lower molecular weight of these blends with respect to the neat PLLA could also be inferred by the lower torque value at the end of the vulcanization (Figure 1). A lower chain length leads to faster spherulitic growth. For PU contents higher than 10 wt %, the PLLA growth rate is instead slightly decreased, in comparison with the other samples. Possibly, this depression is related to the extent of chemical bonding between PLLA and PU phase, which hinders the PLLA chain mobility, or the disturbance brought by the PU particles and different additives at the growth front since PU must be segregated at the interfibrillar level. This will lower the concentration of PLLA segments at the growing front and reduce the spherulitic growth rate. Due to the increased nucleation density with PU content, the minimum probed isothermal crystallization temperature, where we could clearly follow the growth rate, increased accordingly. Hence, for the neat PLLA, we were able to measure the growth rate starting from $T_c$ of 130 °C while the minimum applied $T_c$ was 138 °C for the PLLA/30PU blend.

**Crystallization Behavior of PLLA/PU Blends by Differential Scanning Calorimetry (DSC).** DSC was employed to study the thermal transitions of the neat PLLA and PLLA/PU blends. The different temperatures and enthalpies of the thermal events recorded during nonisothermal crystallization and melting at a scan rate of 10 °C/min are summarized in Table 1. At the same time, Figure 9 shows the respective DSC cooling and heating scans.

The neat PLLA crystallizes on cooling at around 103 °C, and the crystallization process is completed during the heating scan via a small cold crystallization exotherm at around 92 °C (see Figure 9a). Its endothermic melting peak was observed at 175 °C, and just before melting the PLLA crystals, a slight exothermic event is observed, tentatively attributed to the reorganization of a disordered modification into the more stable $\alpha$-form. For PLLA/PU blends with different PU contents, the DSC cooling scans show that the PLLA phase exhibits a crystallization exotherm peaked at around 106 °C for all of the samples, and the vitrification of the PLLA phase is also observed during cooling at around 63 °C, differently from...
the neat PLLA where the glass transition is undetectable due to higher crystallinity. No distinct transitions or peaks related to the PU phase could be observed. The crystallization enthalpy on cooling decreases significantly in the dynamically vulcanized samples (see Table 1), testifying the hindered crystallization in the blend.

The heating process is shown in Figure 9b. The neat PLLA displays an almost negligible cold crystallization peak at around 92 °C. At the same time, the PLLA/PU blends all exhibit a larger cold crystallization peak at about 99 °C. The cold crystallization enthalpy was affected as well and increased largely in the PLLA/PU blends (from 0.9 J/g in the neat PLLA to 8 J/g in PLLA/30PU). The crystallinity degree ($X_c\%$) of PLLA at the end of the temperature protocol, evaluated from the measured melting enthalpy after correction for the PLLA weight fraction in the particular blend, dropped from 33% for the neat PLLA to around 15% when the vulcanized PU is added. We must deduce that a meaningful hindrance effect of the PU phase on the crystallization is present, when the process occurs at temperatures lower than those probed by PLOM experiments. In fact, a significant decrease in the growth rate was only observed for the PLLA/30PU sample in the probed temperature range (as observed by PLOM). These noticeable decreases in the crystallinity, as shown by the DSC analysis, might be due to the higher viscosity of the blends compared to that of the neat PLLA.

**Thermal Stability of the PLLA/PU Blends.** Thermal stability of the neat PLLA and PLLA/PU blends under nonoxidative conditions was investigated by thermogravimetric analysis (TGA). The analysis was performed in the range of 25−800 °C at a heating rate of 10 °C/min under a constant nitrogen gas flow. Figure 10 shows the TGA weight loss curves as a function of temperature. From these curves, we can identify the onset and end of the thermal decomposition, indicated by $T_5$ (5% of mass loss) and $T_{end}$ (100% of mass loss), respectively.

The neat PLLA displays a single-stage decomposition process, with $T_5 = 304$ °C and $T_{end}$ around 374 °C. On the other hand, all the PLLA/PU blends show a two-stage decomposition, obviously related to the presence of two chemically distinct units, the PLLA and polyol phases. In fact, the magnitude of mass loss at the different steps varies in agreement with the blend composition, i.e., the percentage of low-temperature decomposition event decreases with increasing PU fraction and vice versa for the high-temperature event. An almost quantitative relation with the nominal content of PU is found.

For what concerns the degradation temperatures, the onset of PLLA degradation shifts to lower temperature after dynamic

---

**Table 1. Transition Temperatures and Enthalpies of PLLA Phase during the Nonisothermal Scans of the Different PLLA/PU Blends at a Cooling/Heating Rate of 10 °C/min**

| PLLA (wt %) | $T_{cc}$ (°C) | $\Delta H_{cc}$ (J/g) | $T_c$ (°C) | $\Delta H_c$ (J/g) | $T_m$ (°C) | $\Delta H_m$ (J/g) | $X_c$ (%) |
|------------|---------------|------------------------|------------|---------------------|------------|---------------------|----------|
| 100        | 92.3          | −0.9                   | 102.9      | −20.7               | 174.8      | 31.8                | 33       |
| 95         | 98.7          | −11.8                  | 105.4      | −5.8                | 172.4      | 27.4                | 17       |
| 90         | 100           | −15.2                  | 106.7      | −3.6                | 173.4      | 29.0                | 15       |
| 80         | 99.5          | −11.4                  | 106.4      | −4.2                | 173.1      | 24.1                | 14       |
| 70         | 98.5          | −8.3                   | 106.6      | −4.5                | 173.2      | 22.4                | 15       |

$\Delta H_m$ of 100% crystalline PLA is 93.7 J/g.
vulcanization and with the increasing PU phase content. In particular, T_d decreased from 304 °C for the neat PLLA to around 276 °C for PLLA/30PU.

The decomposition stage with T_{max} around 336 °C observed in the blends was attributed to the urethane bonds breaking, while the decomposition event ending at around 485 °C can be ascribed to the thermal degradation of the aliphatic segments of the polyester polyol.

Notwithstanding the slight decrease in the temperature of initial thermal degradation, a good thermal stability of different blends was observed, since the values of the decomposition temperatures are still at least 50 °C above the commonly employed processing temperature.

**Tensile and Impact Properties.** Generally, the mechanical properties of interest of polymers are related to their strength and toughness. Tensile elongation at the break and the impact strength are considered as measures of material’s toughness, whereas the flexural modulus and tensile strength at the break are informative of material’s strength. Figure 11 shows the corresponding stress—strain curves, while Figure 12a summarizes the results of the mechanical tensile test on different systems. The inclusion of vulcanized PU phase affects the system’s strength and rigidity. In particular, Young’s modulus decreases steadily to about one third its value in the neat PLLA when the PU content in the blend is 30 wt % of PU. Similarly, the stress at the break of the same blend is about 2 times lower than that of the neat PLLA. However, this softening of the material is not accompanied by a significant increase in the elongation at break, which keeps very low, below 2% strain.

As such, the modified PLLA still behaves as a brittle material upon tensile deformation. The behavior of the PLLA matrix dominates the mechanical response of the blend perhaps due to insufficient degree of molecular interactions between the two components, which leads to interfacial debonding, and the lack of any plasticization effects of the polylol segments on PLLA.

On the other hand, the Charpy impact tests revealed a reasonably good improvement in the impact strength values of the PLLA/PU blends. More specifically, the impact strength of the neat PLLA was found to be around 1 kJ/m², indicating the brittle nature of the material. In comparison, significant improvement of the impact strength of the PLLA/PU blends was observed; thus, the impact strength increases gradually with the PU content (see Figure 12b) up to a value of 7 kJ/m² for the PLLA/30PU blend (approximately 7 times that the value of the neat PLLA). It is deduced that the dispersed PU rubbery domains can partially absorb the energy released upon impact and hinder the crack growth, thus providing higher toughness to the PLLA/PU blends. However, in the tensile deformation mode, the failure of the sample is still dominated by the strong tendency of the PLLA matrix to develop crazes.

Similar enhancements of the impact strength of dynamically vulcanized PLLA were reported in the case of poly(σ-lactic acid)/poly(butylene succinate)/dicumyl peroxide (PLLA/PBS/DCP), poly(σ-lactic acid)/thermoplastic starch (PLA/TPS), poly(σ-lactic acid)/nitrite-butadiene rubber (PLA/NBR), poly(lactic acid)/polyurethane elastomer prepolymer (PLA/PUEP), poly(lactic acid)/cross-linked polyurethane (PLA/PU), poly(lactic acid)/ethylene-methyl acrylate-glycidyl methacrylate (PLA/EMA-GMA), poly(lactide/castor oil-based polyurethane prepolymer (PLA/COPUP), and poly(lactic acid)/poly(glycerol succinate-co-maleate) (PLA/PGSMA).

### CONCLUSIONS

The present work discusses the efficiency of dynamic vulcanization reaction and the formation of a PU phase for toughening brittle PLLA. The dynamic vulcanization of PLLA, polyester polyl, glycerol, and HDI was successfully accomplished, and almost fully biobased PLLA/PU blends were obtained. An analysis of the FTIR spectra, extracted and insoluble fractions, and the evolution of torque during sample preparation demonstrated the in situ formation of a PU phase, thanks to the reaction between NCO groups of HDI with the −OH groups of the polyester polyl, glycerol, and PLLA. The partial reaction with PLLA chain gives rise to some extent of interfacial compatibilization between PLLA and dispersed PU phase. The impact strength was significantly increased by the increase in the PU content; however, the tensile properties were not largely enhanced. For what concerns the thermal properties, DSC showed a depression in the nonisothermal crystallization rate of the blends, as compared to the neat PLLA. Thermogravimetric analysis demonstrated that all
PLLA/PU blends were sufficiently stable at the typical processing temperatures of PLLA.

Dynamic vulcanization to enable the in situ formation of a biobased elastomeric phase is thus proposed as a promising route for the improvement of PLLA properties for potentially widening its application range.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Materials.** Poly(l-lactic acid) (PLLA) (Synterra 1010) was supplied by Synbra Technology (Etten-Leur, Netherlands). PLLA 1010 is a crystallizable grade of PLLA with an l-lactide content of about 99 wt % and an average molecular weight of 1 × 10^4 g/mol. The melting point is in the range 175–180 °C, and the glass transition temperature (T_g) is around 55–60 °C. The polymer shows a melt flow rate (MFR) of about 12 g/10 min (190 °C, 2.16 kg, ISO 1133) and a density of 1.25 g/cm^3. PLLA was dried at 60 °C overnight prior to use.

Priplast 3196 is a dimerized fatty-acid-based polyol polyol with molecular weight of 3 kg/mol. The polyol has been synthesized from C36 fatty-acid dimers derivative, in turn, obtained by dimerization of unsaturated C18 fatty acids (such as oleic, linoleic, and linolenic acids). This material was kindly supplied by Croda Factory. Glycerol (49767) with a purity of 99.5% was purchased from Sigma-Aldrich and used as received. Cellulose extraction thimbles (Grade 208) were purchased from AquaLab technologies.

**Sample Preparation.** Dynamic vulcanization of the Priplast 3196 and glycerol in the presence of HDI inside the PLLA matrix was performed in a Plastograph Brabender internal mixer (W50 EHT, Brabender GmbH, Germany) at 200 °C using a rotor speed of 60 rpm for sufficient time (around 18 min). PLLA, polyol, and glycerol in predetermined amounts were first premixed in the Brabender at 200 °C and 60 rpm for 8 min to obtain a uniform melt. Then dynamic vulcanization of the polyol and glycerol was initiated by adding HDI under the same mixing conditions. An initial mass of around 40 g was used in each blend and a final yield of about 80–85% was obtained.

When the dynamic vulcanization occurred, the melt torque increased first and then leveled off (after approximately 10 min), which was interpreted as the end of the dynamic vulcanization process. The molar ratio of the −NCO group of HDI to the −OH group (of the polyol and glycerol) was fixed at 1:1, while the glycerol/polyol weight ratio was kept at about 10%. Five samples with the PLLA weight fraction of 100, 95, 90, 80, and 70 were prepared. The respective sample codes are reported in Table 2. For the sake of comparison, the neat PLLA was also treated under the same processing conditions in the internal mixer.

**Blend Characterization.** Determination of the Cross-Linked Fraction. Samples with a predetermined weight (m_0 = 1 g) were enclosed into cellulose extraction thimbles. The extraction was performed using a Soxhlet extractor for 3 days with an excess volume of boiling chloroform. The fraction of the sample that did not dissolve in chloroform but just swelled was then weighed (m_i) after complete drying under vacuum at room temperature. The insoluble fraction must consist of the vulcanized PU and possibly PLLA chains, which reacted with PU. The cross-linked fraction was calculated according to eq 1:

\[
\text{cross linked fraction (\%)} = \left( \frac{m_i}{m_0} \right) \times 100
\]

| Table 2. Composition of the Prepared Samples (in Weight Percentage, wt %) |
|-------------------------------------------------|
| Sample | PLLA (wt %) | priplast 3196 (wt %) | glycerol (wt %) | HDI (wt %) |
| neat PLLA | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PLLA/3PU | 95 | 3.42 | 0.38 | 1.2 |
| PLLA/10PU | 90 | 6.84 | 0.76 | 2.4 |
| PLLA/20PU | 80 | 13.68 | 1.52 | 4.8 |
| PLLA/30PU | 70 | 20.52 | 2.28 | 7.2 |

where m_i is the initial sample weight and m_0 is the weight of the insoluble part after extraction.

**Fourier Transform Infrared Analysis.** FTIR spectra of the PLLA/PU blends and insoluble sample fractions were recorded at room temperature using a Bruker IFS 66 spectrometer equipped with an attenuated total reflectance (ATR) accessary. A total of 32 spectra with a resolution of 4 cm⁻¹ were acquired for each sample in the range 500–4000 cm⁻¹.

**Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM).** Different PLLA/PU blends were cryogenically fractured after 3 h of immersion in liquid nitrogen. The fracture surfaces were observed by SEM after gold coating under vacuum using a Hitachi S-2700 electron microscope. Micrographs of the most representative inner regions of the specimens are reported.

**Polarized Light Optical Microscopy.** PLOM was employed to determine the morphology and measure the growth rate of PLLA spherulites. Films with a thickness of around 30 μm were prepared by microtoming and by gentle compression molding between two microscope glass slides on a hot plate. The micrographs of blend films were recorded with a LEICA DC 420 camera. A METTLER FP35Hz hot stage was employed to impose the desired thermal history.

The isothermal spherulitic growth rates of the neat PLLA and the PLLA phase within the PLLA/PU blends were measured. The samples were first heated to 200 °C for 3 min to erase the previous thermal history and then cooled to the chosen crystallization temperature, at which spherulitic growth was monitored in time by suitable image acquisition.

**Differential Scanning Calorimetry.** DSC was performed using a DSC1 STAR® system (Mettler-Toledo, Switzerland). The samples, with weight in the range of 3–5 mg and prepared by gentle compression molding between two glass slides, were melted at 200 °C for 3 min and then cooled to −50 °C at a rate of 10 °C/min. After cooling, the polymers were subsequently heated to 200 °C at 10 °C/min. During the DSC runs, a nitrogen flow at a rate of 20 mL/min was constantly applied. The crystallinity degree X_c (%) of the PLLA component in the different blends was calculated using the following formula:

\[
X_c (%) = \left( \frac{\Delta H_m - \Delta H_{m,c}}{\Delta H_m^c} \right) \times W_f
\]

where \(\Delta H_m\) and \(\Delta H_{m,c}\) are the measured enthalpies of melting and cold crystallization for the PLLA phase in the blends, \(\Delta H_m^c\) is the melting enthalpy of 100% crystalline PLA (93.7 J/g), and \(W_f\) is the weight fraction of PLLA in the blend.

**Thermogravimetric Analysis (TGA).** TGA was performed using TGA Mettler-Toledo (STAR® system Mettler thermo-balance). The temperature was increased from 25 to 800 °C.
with a heating rate of 10 °C/min under a nitrogen flow of 80 mL/min (Table 2).

**Tensile Tests.** The tensile properties of the PLLA/PU blends were determined with an Instron mechanical tester (Instron SS65) using a crosshead speed of 5 mm/min and dog bone specimens according to the ASTM-D638 standard. The specimens were cut from a compression molded plate, which, in turn, was prepared by compression of the blend in a “CARVER” manual press at 200 °C and 3.5 ton for 3 min, followed by continuous cooling to room temperature with tap water. The reported measured properties (Young’s modulus, strength, and deformation at the break) are average values from five different specimens.

**Impact Test.** The impact strengths of different PLLA/PU blends were determined using a Pendulum Impact Testing Machine (Charpy Zwick S102). The specimens of 60 mm × 10 mm × 2 mm were cut from a compression molded plate (prepared as mentioned in the tensile section) and a small notch (of around 1 mm in depth) was produced by means of a manual saw. The measured values are of significance for a relative comparison between the neat and the blended PLLA materials only, given that customized (nonstandard) sample preparation procedure and test were adopted. Five analyses were performed for each sample, and the average values are reported.
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