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Abstract

The Laser-Induced Particle Impact Test (LIPIT) can be used to probe projectile, target, and synergistic projectile-target responses to high strain rate deformation at the microscale. LIPIT’s advantages over other microscale launching techniques include the ability to controllably launch a single microparticle and precisely characterize the projectile momentum and kinetic energy before and after target impact. In addition, a LIPIT apparatus possesses a small laboratory footprint and is suitable for extension to high-throughput testing. Hence, LIPIT experiments have been used to study the dynamic response of many polymers, gels, and metals in different structural forms with various $h_t/d_p$ ratios. These microscopic high-rate deformation behavior and impact energy absorption studies were used to suggest promising materials for macroscopic applications. Geometric scale, however, can significantly influence dynamic material behavior through scale-induced changes in event time, strain rate, projectile/target material homogeneity, and more. In this study, such geometric-scale effects are intentionally investigated. Noncrystalline alumina spheres ranging five orders of magnitude in diameter ($d_p = 3 \mu m$–10 mm) were launched into scaled $h_t/d_p$ amorphous polycarbonate targets of thickness $h_t$ at normal incidence using either LIPIT or a gas gun, depending on the scale. Projectile impact velocity and the projectile diameter to target thickness ratio were held constant in all experiments ($v_i = 550 \text{ m/s}$ and $h_t/d_p = 0.25$, respectively). Impact energies spanned from hundreds of joules down to nanojoules (eleven decades). The specific impact energy absorption ($E_{sp}^*$), local plastic deformation, and deformation microstructure were compared across all scales. Length scale reduction sets in motion a remarkable 230% amplification in specific energy absorption and a 240% increase in relative impact deformation area. Corresponding numerical impact simulation results emphasize key limitations of current continuum-based
material models and indicate potential areas of improvement. These findings demonstrate that material property discoveries made using emerging high-throughput methods (LIPIT, nanoindentation, laser-driven flyers, etc.) may not be directly indicative of macroscopic behavior and performance.
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1. **Introduction and Motivation**

Nature’s spectacular impacts include collisions of galaxies transcending eons [1, 2], asteroid-planetary impacts triggering mass extinctions [3], biological events like the potent strikes of mantis shrimp [4], and star-powering fusion of atoms lasting only zeptoseconds [5]. Similarly, human-engineered collisions play vital roles in asteroid/meteoroid redirection [6], construction and fabrication processes [7], hypersonic missile defense [8], kinetic energy weapon impacts [9], cold spray application [10], innovative drug delivery methods [11], and fusion power generation [12]. Investigations of impact dynamics and their outcomes fuel the development of ballistic armor [13], automobile collision passenger safeguards [14], and spacecraft micrometeoroid/orbital debris shielding [15]. These impacts, driven by forces from gravity to atomic interactions, release energy ranging from yottajoules (10^{24} J) to attojoules (10^{-18} J) and can transform kinetic energy into thermal, chemical, potential, and mechanical energy, activating material elastic or inelastic deformation, fracture, fragmentation, melting, vaporization, sublimation, ionization, fission, and fusion. Amplifying this complexity, the mechanisms and processes at play can change dramatically with spatial and temporal scales.

Many impacts can be characterized by the projectile and target material properties, projectile diameter ($d_p$), target thickness ($h_t$), and impact velocity ($v_i$), provided that the target’s lateral dimensions are large enough to render boundary effects negligible. The following discussion focuses on a set pair of projectile and target materials. For a given target thickness to projectile diameter ratio ($h_t/d_p$), increasing $v_i$ shortens the primary event duration, which in turn raises the strain and heating rates. These rates are closely linked to the instantaneous material properties and phase [16]. Enlarging the spatial scale alone effectively lowers strain and heating rates through a corresponding increase in event duration. Decreasing this scale has the opposite effect. For a given combination of $h_t$, $d_p$, $h_t/d_p$, there exists a critical velocity at which target perforation will occur, commonly termed $V_{50}$ [17]. Conversely, for a given combination of $v_i$, $h_t$, $d_p$, there is a critical geometric ratio, ($h_t/d_p)_{crit}$, that results in target perforation. When a rigid $d_p$ projectile strikes a target at $v_i$, a ratio $h_t/d_p \ll (h_t/d_p)_{crit}$ typically yields thin film perforation, which resembles membrane stretching.
and puncturing [18]. Elevating \( h_t/d_p \) to \( (h_t/d_p)_{\text{crit}} \) alone causes a shift in impact behavior to ballistic limit perforation, characterized by target cratering, cracking, shear banding, spalling, bulging, petalling, and shear plugging [18, 19]. Semi-infinite penetration follows for \( h_t/d_p \gg (h_t/d_p)_{\text{crit}} \), leading to extensive target penetration and cratering. Material hierarchical inhomogeneities, from macroscale aggregates to microscale grains and crystals, result in spatial variations in material properties and failure mechanisms that complicate matters further [20].

Historically, scaled impact research has predominantly focused on ballistic impact and planetary science, with attention given to composites, granular materials, and metals (see, e.g., [21–25]). However, these studies often rely on certain simplifying assumptions (fully hydrodynamic behavior, axisymmetry, etc.) and are only applicable to a relatively narrow range of potential impact scenarios [e.g., cratering with \( h_t/d_p \gg (h_t/d_p)_{\text{crit}} \)]. Despite the prevalence of natural and artificial impacts, the knowledge of how energy transformation processes and dissipation mechanisms vary with length scale remains insufficient, particularly when transitioning from macro (\( \sim 10^{-2} \) m) to micro (\( \sim 10^{-6} \) m) material length scales. Such a gap in understanding must be addressed as high-throughput material characterization techniques transition to increasing smaller length scales [26–28].

At the microscale, executing and characterizing controlled impacts is fraught with challenges in experimental repeatability, measurement uncertainties, sample preparation, and stochastic variations in material properties. The Laser-Induced Particle Impact Test (LIPIT) has become an attractive method for probing microscale projectile, target, and synergistic projectile-target responses to high strain rate deformation [29–34]. LIPIT’s advantages over other microscale launching techniques include the ability to controllably launch a single microparticle with relatively low kinetic energy (\( \sim \)nanojoules) and precisely characterize the projectile momentum and kinetic energy before and after target impact. A LIPIT apparatus also has a small laboratory footprint (\( \sim 1 \times 1 \) m\(^2\)) and is suitable to employ in high-throughput testing (Fig. 1a) [35]. LIPIT experiments have been applied to investigate impact responses of polymers, gels, and metals, in various structural forms [34–41]. These prior studies have leveraged microscopic high-rate deformation, failure, and relative impact energy absorption results to identify promising materials for macroscopic applications. However, the specific energy absorbed in these microscopic events often exceeds macroscopic counterparts by at least an order of magnitude. For reference, Fig. 1b displays a comparison between the specific energy absorption (\( E_p^* \); more later) values obtained from microscopic and macroscopic experiments, as reported in a previous study [35]. Some microscopically determined \( E_p^* \) values [e.g., for multi-walled carbon nanotube (MWCNT) sheets] exceed macroscopic values for metals by over 2,300%! This stark difference underscores the need to exercise extreme caution when extrapolating microscopic material behavior, particularly at high rates, without a comprehensive grasp of length scale effects.
Figure 1: An overview of relevant launching techniques and experimental results from the literature: (a) representative launch capabilities as a function of impactor scale and (b) specific energy absorption as a function of impact velocity for macro- and micro-scales. Techniques include single-stage gas gun (SSGG), single-stage powder gun (SSPG), two-stage light gas gun (2SLGG), three-stage light gas gun (3SLGG), Van de Graaff accelerators (VDF), laser-driven flyers (LDF), laser-induced particle impact tests (LIPIT), rocket sleds, rail guns, and plasma guns. Materials impacted with similar $h/d$ ratios include multi-walled carbon nanotubes (MWCNT) of thicknesses $h_{106}$ and $h_{205}$, multi-layer graphene (MLG), polystyrene (PS), polycarbonate (PC), poly(vinylidene fluoride-co-trifluoroethylene) P(VDF-TrFE), aluminum, steel, Kevlar, and Dyneema. Figures were adapted from Refs. [35, 39].

Studying scale-induced changes in impact phenomena requires careful consideration of factors such as the projectile and target materials and geometries, as well as the impact velocity. The high sensitivity of polymer mechanical properties to temperature, pressure, and test rate, combined with the extreme conditions created in ballistic experiments, results in significant gradients in temperature, strain, strain rate, and stress state. These gradients evolve both over time and location. Consequently, the ballistic deformation of polymers stands out as the most scale-sensitive scenario (temporally and spatially). For instance, at the microscale, target thickness reduction alone has been shown to enhance $E_p^*$ [42]. One systematic approach to isolating length scale influences involves the selection of macroscopically and microscopically homogeneous materials while holding the impact velocity and relative geometries of the projectile and target constant. Amorphous polycarbonate (PC) can be used to satisfy these criteria. PC is an important tough and transparent commercial thermoplastic with a broad range of applications in electronics, automobiles, construction, medicine, space exploration, and ballistic protection [43–49]. Moreover, PC inherently has just one material length scale—the root-mean-square distance between its chain ends.

For amorphous thermoplastic polymers such as PC, polystyrene (PS), and poly(methyl methacrylate) (PMMA), material yield stress is generally proportional to strain rate ($\dot{\varepsilon}$) and inversely proportional to temperature ($T$) [50]. These effects have been widely studied for glassy thermoplastics using various testing methods: universal tensile testing ($\dot{\varepsilon} \sim 10^{-4}–10^1$ s$^{-1}$), rheometry ($\dot{\varepsilon} \sim 10^{-3}–10^3$ s$^{-1}$), Split-Hopkinson
tension/compression/torsion bar testing ($\dot{\varepsilon} \sim 10^3$–$10^4$ s$^{-1}$), and Taylor impacts ($\dot{\varepsilon} \sim 10^5$ s$^{-1}$) [50–52]. Test temperatures have spanned $-150 \leq T \leq 200^\circ$C. Across this range of loading rates and temperatures, the strength of glassy polymers can be attributed to their $\alpha$ and $\beta$ transitions occurring at $T_{\alpha}$ and $T_{\beta}$, respectively [51]. For PC, $T_{\alpha} \approx 140^\circ$C and $T_{\beta} \approx -100^\circ$C. In its glassy range ($T_{\beta} < T < T_{\alpha}$), PC’s tensile, compressive, and torsional yield stress all exhibit a linear increase with $\log \dot{\varepsilon}$ at constant $T$ and a linear decrease with $T$ at a constant $\dot{\varepsilon}$ (i.e., PC behavior is described by the Eyring theory) [51, 52]. These relationships deviate from linearity at $T \approx -50^\circ$C due to reduced backbone chain motion, leading to the observed $\beta$ mechanical damping peak at $T_{\beta}$. Hydrostatic pressure increases the yield strength, bulk modulus, and $T_g$ of PC. Post-yielding behavior in PC results from a balance between thermal softening and strain (and strain rate) hardening. At and above the yield stress, PC displays extensive viscous flow, while other glassy polymers, like PMMA and PS, undergo a ductile to brittle transition that is exacerbated by increasing strain rate [53]. PC maintains this ductility over a broad range of $T$ and $\dot{\varepsilon}$ due to its unusually low $T_{\beta}$, contrasting with most thermoplastics that are brittle for $T < T_g$. PC, however, can embrittle when subjected to ultra-high strain rates, ultra-low temperatures, or annealing.

For $T < T_g$, PC generally yields, flows, converts approximately 50–60% of plastic work to heat, and exhibits damage localization in the form of shear banding and crazing [54–58]. For $T > T_g$, such damage localization is nonexistent. Fracture occurs as crazes nucleate and break down into tensile cracks, which propagate as new crazes form at their tips. These cracks eventually combine to form a fracture surface. Despite its low heat conductivity, PC’s enhanced hardness through deformation-induced molecular orientation generally prevents its fracture from heat-induced shear instability. When subjected to macroscale ballistic impact ($\dot{\varepsilon} \lesssim 10^5$ s$^{-1}$), PC exhibits a variety of impact-driven failure modes, including dishing, petalling, cratering, cone cracking, and plugging [46]. The combined adiabatic heating from shocks and plastic work generates high temperatures, and this localized heating is enhanced by PC’s low thermal conductivity. Elevated temperatures and ensuing visco-plastic flow during impact can potentially suppress or even “erase” evidence of shear banding, crazing, and other failure mechanisms. Even so, under macroscale hypervelocity impact conditions ($\dot{\varepsilon} \sim 10^6$–$10^7$ s$^{-1}$), PC appears to fail more brittly, hinting at a possible ductile-to-brittle transition with increasing strain rate [43]. Such a transition (if present) is influenced by projectile/target shapes, impact velocity, event duration, and more.

Although PC is extensively used and studied at the macroscale, it has been the subject of only one LIPIT study [49]. This previous work demonstrated that, for PC, increasing entanglement density ($\nu_e$), either through higher molecular mass or reduced plasticizer content, noticeably increases $E_p^*$. PC, with its high entanglement density ($\nu_e \approx 10^{26}$ entanglements/m$^3$), stands out from other glassy polymers like PS ($\nu_e \approx 4 \times 10^{24}$). A higher entanglement density (more entanglement junctions per chain) generally enhances
material toughness and deformation resistance by forming an energy-absorbing network that restricts chain mobility, evenly distributes stress, enhances elasticity, and hinders crack growth [59–63]. Moreover, unlike other polymer glasses, PC’s high-rate mechanical behavior is less susceptible to adiabatic heating, potentially explaining its 81% higher LIPIT $E_p^*$ value at $v_i = 500$ m/s compared to PS (cf. Fig. 1b) [64]. Such material features could be responsible for the nominal entanglement-driven increases in $E_p^*$ reported in [49]. This previous study, however, did not compare LIPIT results with corresponding macroscale tests. In fact, a systematic experimental analysis of how length scale influences ballistic impact phenomena from macroscale to microscale has yet to be conducted for any material system.

In this study, rigid noncrystalline alumina spheres ranging five orders of magnitude in diameter ($d_p = 3$ µ$m$–10 mm) were launched into PC targets of thickness $h_t$ at normal incidence using either LIPIT or a gas gun, depending on the scale. The projectile impact velocity ($v_i \approx 550$ m/s) and the ratio of projectile diameter to target thickness ($h_t/d_p \approx 0.25$) were held fixed for all experiments. Impact energies span from hundreds of joules down to nanojoules, significantly expanding on previous relevant investigations [49, 65, 66]. The specific impact energy absorption ($E_p^*$), local plastic deformation, and deformation microstructure are compared across all considered scales. The decrease in length scale results in a significant increase in specific energy absorption and relative deformation area. Numerical predictions of PC impact behavior are combined with the experimental results to show limitations in current continuum-based material modeling approaches. These preliminary observations show that length scale influences cannot be ignored when developing and employing emerging high-throughput experimental techniques that promise accelerated material discovery (e.g., LIPIT, laser-driven flyers, and nanoindentation). Moreover, macroscopically observed impact phenomena and accompanying theory/models may not translate well to the microscale. In light of these implications, this study seeks to explore the influence of geometric scale on impact phenomena.

2. Methodology: Scaling the Impact

Thin films of PC were perforated at $v_i \approx 550$ m/s by noncrystalline rigid alumina spheres 3, 10, 100, 500, 1,000, 4,000, 10,000 µ$m$ in diameter. Regardless of length scale, the ratio of target thickness to projectile diameter ($h_t/d_p$) was fixed at roughly 0.25. These $v_i$ and $h_t/d_p$ values guaranteed target perforation while preserving the projectile’s integrity. Maintaining $v_i$ and $h_t/d_p$ ensured comparable impact conditions, enabling a robust assessment of the role length scale plays in PC’s deformation, failure, and specific energy absorption. The breadth of geometric scales probed in this study necessitated the use of two distinct projectile launching techniques. For the 3 µ$m$ and 10 µ$m$ diameter projectiles, a LIPIT apparatus in the Materials
Microstructures and Properties Laboratory at Texas A&M University (TAMU) was employed [40, 41]. The LIPIT technique involves using a laser pulse to ablate a gold film sandwiched between a glass substrate and a polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS) film [31, 35, 39, 42, 67]. Before launch, microparticles were distributed on the elastomer on the side of the “launch pad” that faces away from the laser’s point of incidence (Fig. 2a). The launch pads were prepared as described in Ref. [41]. The laser pulse generates a plasma that expands and rapidly deforms the PDMS layer, propelling a projectile through lab air (∼101 kPa) at high velocity towards a target (Fig. 2b). The laser power can be adjusted to vary the projectile’s launch velocity. In general, microparticles with diameters ranging 1–50 µm can be readily accelerated to velocities surpassing 1 km/s using this technique. A dedicated study to probe how length scale and velocity influence impact phenomena together is ongoing.

The remaining projectiles were launched using a single-stage gas gun (SSGG) and accompanying aeroballistic range located within the TAMU Hypervelocity Impact Laboratory (HVIL) [68]. The SSGG launching mechanism operates using helium gas, initially contained in a high-pressure reservoir at pressures up to 34 MPa (Fig. 2c). Upon remote activation of a fast-acting valve, the He gas rapidly expands down the launch tube (barrel), accelerating a projectile towards its target (Fig. 2d). The SSGG can launch single projectiles ranging from 2.0–12.7 mm in diameter or clusters of particles down to 100 µm in diameter using a simultaneously launched distributed particle (SLDP) technique, to velocities ranging 0.1–1.5 km/s [69]. As an aside, launch velocities up to 8 km/s can be achieved using the HVIL two-stage light gas gun [68]. For the SSGG technique, a single projectile or collections of projectiles were loaded into a four-piece spherical cavity sabot. During free-flight through a tank containing lab air (∼101 kPa), the sabot segments radially separated from the projectile(s). The projectile(s) then passed through an annular steel plate, which halted the sabot. Single 4 mm and 10 mm spheres were launched in an appropriately sized sabot, while the SLDP technique was used to launch the 100, 500, and 1,000 µm diameter particles to increase the likelihood of observable target impact (increase experimental success). The lab air conditions used to separate the sabot segments also induced radial SLDP dispersion via aerodynamic forces. This launch process resulted in a well-distributed impact site pattern on the corresponding PC thin film, with individual sites being far enough apart to be considered as separate impacts (nearest neighbor impact site spacing ≫10d_p) [69].

The PC target materials were sourced from Plaskolite, LLC. [TUFFAK®; h_t: 1,016 µm (PC1^{1016}) and 2,380 µm (PC1^{2380})] [70] and Rowland Advanced Polymer Films [RowTec®; h_t: 127 µm (PC2^{127}) and 254 µm (PC2^{254})] [71]. Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) curves for both PC1 and PC2 samples show

---

1Material Microstructures and Properties Laboratory Website: https://elt.engr.tamu.edu/.
2TAMU Hypervelocity Impact Laboratory Website: https://telacjyj.engr.tamu.edu/facility/hypervelocity-impact-laboratory-hvil/.
the materials have very similar glass transitions and glass transition temperatures ($T_g = 148–153^\circ$C) (Fig. 3a). Both materials had a mass density of $\rho_t = 1.20$ g/cc and key mechanical properties that differed by less than 3% (see Supplementary Information, Sect. SI.3). The polymers’ molecular weight averages ($M_n$: number average, $M_w$: weight average, $M_z$: Z-average) and molecular weight distribution ($PDI = M_w/M_n$: polydispersity) were measured using a TOSOH Ambient Temperature gel permeation chromatography (GPC) instrument with tetrahydrofuran (THF) as the solvent and polystyrene as the calibration standard. Both commercial materials had similar chromatographs: (PC1) $M_n = 27,737$ g/mol, $M_w = 55,711$ g/mol, $M_z = 87,908$ g/mol, $PDI = 2.01$ and (PC2) $M_n = 28,927$ g/mol, $M_w = 55,876$ g/mol, $M_z = 87,749$ g/mol, $PDI = 1.93$ (see Table S3 in Supplementary Information, Sect. SI.4).

The sample preparation technique was dependent on the film thickness. Targets with $h_t = 127, 254, 1,016,$ and $2,380$ µm were cut directly from the as-received PC1 or PC2 material and placed between two aper-
tured steel fixture plates (Fig. 3b and 3c). The 30 µm thick samples (PC2\textsuperscript{30}) were created by heated compression of the PC2\textsuperscript{127} material. Given the small in-plane dimensions of the resulting targets (around 25.4 mm), a custom fixture with a grid pattern was created to hold multiple square thin films (Fig. 3d). This arrangement enhanced the likelihood of target impact during a given SLDP launch, thereby facilitating more extensive post-impact analysis. For LIPIT samples, the PC2\textsuperscript{127} material was dissolved using 50/50 dichloromethane/toluene, then deposited on a silicon wafer attached to a spin coater. High-rate rotation and solvent evaporation yielded roughly 0.75 µm (PC2\textsuperscript{0.75}) and 2.25 µm (PC2\textsuperscript{2.25}) thick films, which were placed on a transmission electron microscopy (TEM) grids serving as LIPIT target fixtures (Fig. 3e). For all macroscopic SSGG experiments, the target assembly (target plus fixture) was centered on the launch tube (impact) axis. Translation stages were used as part of the LIPIT apparatus to identify a suitable projectile on the launch pad and impact site on the target inside a TEM grid square. In all experiments, target boundaries were far enough from the impact point to prevent in-plane reflected waves from affecting penetration/perforation dynamics (i.e., perforation times were less than \(\sim10\%\) of wave travel times; see Supplementary Information, Sect. SI.2).

Alumina (Al\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{3}) was chosen as the projectile material due to its relative homogeneity across the given length scales. The noncrystalline spheres were sourced from various commercial vendors depending on the diameter \(d_p\): Huake Scientific Research Materials Co., Ltd. \((d_p = 3 \, \text{µm and 10} \, \text{µm})\), Corpuscular Microspheres-Nanospheres \((d_p = 100 \, \text{µm})\), Goodfellow Cambridge Ltd. \((d_p = 500 \, \text{µm and 1,000} \, \text{µm})\), and Kyocera Corporation \((d_p = 4,000 \, \text{µm and 10,000} \, \text{µm})\). For reference, Fig. 4 shows representative images of the projectiles at each length scale captured with either an optical camera (Figs. 4a and 4b) or Thermo Fisher Helios NanoLab 660 dual-focused ion beam-scanning electron beam microscope operating with an incident beam energy and working distance of 1 kV and 4 mm, respectively (Figs. 4c–4g). In this figure, the projectile diameter \(d_p\) decreases from left to right and top to bottom: (a) 10 mm, (b) 4 mm, (c) 1 mm, (d) 500 µm, (e) 100 µm, (f) 10 µm, and (g) 3 µm. The spheres displayed consistent sphericities and diameters even at the finest length scale, maintaining relative uniformity and comparability across the impact experiments. With a density of \(\rho_p = 3.95 \, \text{g/cc}\), the projectiles varied in mass from \(m_p = 5.6\times10^{-11} \, \text{g} \) \((d_p = 3 \, \text{µm})\) to \(m_p = 2.1\times10^0 \, \text{g} \) \((d_p = 10 \, \text{mm})\). To underscore the extensive range of scale, the given mass values were used to calculate the projectile impact kinetic energy \(E_i = \frac{1}{2}m_p v_i^2\), assuming \(v_i = 550 \, \text{m/s}\) and neglecting rotational kinetic energy (Fig. 4h). The ballistic impacts presented in this work span \textit{eleven orders of magnitude} in kinetic energy \((10^{-9}–10^2 \, \text{J})\), representing the broadest range ever addressed in a single experimental impact study.

Prior to each experiment, the target thickness was measured using either a digital caliper \((h_t > 100 \, \text{µm})\)
Figure 3: An overview of the polycarbonate (PC) targets: (a) a representative differential scanning calorimetry curve for each as-received target material and (b) the target preparation process for each film thickness, \( h_t \). Two materials were used in target preparation: Plaskolite, LLC. TUFFAK® (PC1; \( h_t = 1.02, 2.38 \) mm) and Rowland Advanced Polymer Films RowTec® (PC2; \( h_t = 0.75, 2.25, 30, 127, 250 \) µm). All material had similar densities (\( \rho_t \)) and glass transition temperature (\( T_g \)) values. Targets were fixed (c) between apertured plates (\( h_t = 127, 254, 1,016, 2,380 \) µm), (d) in an array on a custom grid (\( h_t = 30 \) µm), or (e) on a 200 mesh TEM grid (\( h_t = 0.75, 2.25 \) µm).

In addition, the Keyence instrument was used to inspect the films for any obvious defects (impurities, second phase particles, cracks, etc.), significant thickness variations, and excessive surface roughness. Similarly, the diameter of each projectile was measured using either calipers, optical microscopy, or scanning electron microscopy (SEM), depending on the diameter. These steps were essential to ensure that the \( h_t/d_p \approx 0.25 \) ratio was largely maintained and that target inhomogeneities were minimized. During each experiment, high-speed cameras captured high-contrast, shadowgraphic images of the impact event. SSGG experiments employed a Shimadzu HPV-X2 camera, operating at a frame rate of 250 kHz and exposures ranging between 1000–1500 ns [72]. Light from high-intensity LED arrays, passed through a diffuser box, was used to illuminate the event [73]. A 50 mm lens was fitted onto the Shimadzu camera for the 1, 4, and 10 mm diameter

\[ h_t < 100 \text{ µm}. \]

Laser confocal and scanning electron microscopy were performed at the TAMU Small Scale Mechanical Behavior Laboratory.
Figure 4: Micrographs showcase the alumina projectiles used in the impact experiments with the following diameters ($d_p$ decreases from left to right): (a) 10 mm, (b) 4 mm, (c) 1 mm, (d) 500 µm, (e) 100 µm, (f) 10 µm, and (g) 3 µm. For reference of scale, the (h) impact kinetic energy ($E_i = \frac{1}{2} m_p v_i^2$) for each of these $d_p$ values is plotted, assuming impact velocities of $v_i = 550$ m/s and projectile masses of $m_p = \frac{1}{6} \pi d_p^2 \rho_p$, where $\rho_p = 3.95$ g/cc is the projectile density.

particle impact experiments, while an Infinity K2 Distamax long distance microscope with a CF2 objective was used for the other tests. The LIPIT experiments were captured at a rate of 1 GHz and exposure of 5 ns using a Specialized Imaging SIMX camera [74]. A collimated laser served as the source of illumination for these tests. High-speed images of each projectile, taken just before impact, were analyzed alongside OM and SEM micrographs to verify its diameter. These diagnostic setups ensured consistent, comparable, and high-contrast shadowgraphic images across all scales [40, 68]. Figure 5 showcases annotated schematics of the projectile, target, launch technique, and the diagnostic tools, sequentially arranged in descending order from left to right. This simple, high-level representation of the scaled experiments highlights their uniformity in impact scenarios/conditions and diagnostic setups.

The impact conditions and relative projectile/target material properties ensured negligible projectile deformation and no projectile fragmentation occurred for all experiments. Each alumina projectile impacted its corresponding PC target with velocity $v_i$, remained intact during target perforation, and excited with a residual velocity $v_r$ (Fig. 6a and 6b). Hence, the in-situ images also facilitated the measurement of $v_i$ and $v_r$ using open-source motion tracking softwares, such as Tracker [75] and ImageJ [76]. These velocity measurements were then used to compute the energy absorption of the target material, given by

$$E_p = \frac{1}{2} m_p v_i^2 - \frac{1}{2} m_p v_r^2 - E_{drag},$$  \quad (1)
where $m_p$ is the mass of the projectile and $E_{drag}$ is projectile kinetic energy loss due to drag, which was nonnegligible for the microsphere impacts and calculated using methods described in the supporting information of Refs. [42, 77]. The energy absorption can be normalized by the mass of an ideal plug of target material “ejected” by the projectile during target perforation (Fig. 6c) [39, 41, 49]. This nominal specific energy absorption facilitates ballistic performance comparisons across various materials and geometric scales and is given by

$$E_p^* = \frac{E_p}{\rho_t A_t h_t}, \quad (2)$$

where $\rho_t = 1.20 \text{ g/cc}$ is the mass density of the PC target material, $A_t = \pi/4 d_p^2$ is the projected area of the projectile, and $h_t$ is the thickness of the target. These calculations were instrumental in assessing a given target’s impact energy dissipation in a way that was comparable across length scales and to relevant $E_p^*$ values reported in the literature (see, e.g., [49]).

After each experiment, optical micrographs of the perforations and out-of-plane deformation on both the impact and exit sides of the target were captured using a Keyence VK-X3000 3D Surface Profiler. The effective deformation diameter ($D$) of an in-plane circular region containing permanent deformation was calculated as twice the in-plane radius ($R$) from the center of impact to the radial location of $\sim$5% vertical ($z$) target impact surface deflection, i.e.

$$R = r : \left| z_r - z_p(r) \right| / z_t \approx 5\%, \quad (3)$$
Figure 6: Simplified diagrams illustrate the projectile: (a) approaching the target at time \( t_0 \) with velocity \( v_i \) and (b) after perforating the target at time \( t_f \) with a residual velocity \( v_r \). Diagram (c) represents the method for normalizing the energy absorption of the target, \( E_p \), using the mass of a conceptualized “ejected” material plug (highlighted with crosshatching); the plug mass is defined as \( m_t = \pi/4 \rho_t h_t d_p^2 \). The final diagram, (d), depicts the normalized deformation area concept, expressed as \( A_d/A_p = D^2/d_p^2 \), where \( D \) is the diameter of the circle defined by \( A_d \).

where \( z_t \) is the constant vertical height of the undeformed target impact surface, \( z_p(r) \) is the height of the deformed target impact surface, and \( r \) is the radial coordinate (Fig. 6d). This diameter was used to characterize the normalized deformation area,

\[
\frac{A_d}{A_p} = \frac{D^2}{d_p^2},
\]

consistent with definitions used throughout the literature [49]. One-dimensional (1D) deformation profiles collected at each scale were normalized by the projectile diameter allowing for direct comparisons of the relative deformation for each test. SEM imaging of the LIPIT perforations on both the target impact and exit surfaces using the ThermoFisher Helios NanoLab 660 dual-focused ion beam-scanning electron beam microscope used for inspecting the alumina spheres (1 kV operating voltage, 4 mm working distance).

Hence, the variations in deformation behavior and failure mechanisms across length scales were quantified. An overview of the experimental workflow is summarized in Fig. 7.

3. Results and Discussion for the Scaled \( h_t/d_p \) Impacts

This section highlights essential findings from the scaled impact experiments, including specific energy absorption \( (E_p^*) \) and normalized deformation area \( (A_d/A_p) \) measurements, as well as representative optical microscopy images and profilometry scans of each perforation on both the front and back surfaces of each target. SEM micrographs of the LIPIT perforations are also presented. \( E_p^* \) and \( A_d/A_p \) are also compared to calculated values from the Elastic Plastic Impact Computation code (EPIC) simulations across all considered length scales (see Supplementary Information, Sect. SI.6).

The constant \( h_t/d_p \) impact experiments were performed at seven distinct length scales, which can be described by the diameter of the alumina projectiles: \( d_p = 3, 10, 100, 500, 1,000, 4,000, \) and 10,000 \( \mu \text{m} \).
Figure 7: A summary of the experimental workflow employed in this study. Key steps include (1) sample preparation, (2) pre-impact sample inspection with the Keyence VK-X3000 3D Surface Profiler, (3) scaled impact experiment using either the LIPIIT apparatus or SSGG, (4) optical microscopy and laser confocal microscopy of impact damage with the Keyence instrument, and (5) scanning electron microscopy (SEM) of impact damage using the ThermoFisher Helios NanoLab 660 dual-focused ion beam-scanning electron microscope.

For each scale, at least three tests were run to establish average data points and corresponding standard deviations, which tended to increase at smaller scales. LIPIIT thin films targets varied slightly in thickness due to inherent variability in the spin coating process, affecting the $h_t/d_p$ ratios. However, they remained near the intended value of 0.25. Similarly, thickness discrepancies in samples around $h_t = 30 \mu m$, made via compression molding, altered the $h_t/d_p$ ratio. Regardless of length scale and launch technique (SSGG, SSGG + SLDP, or LIPIIT), the projectile’s motion was captured using high-speed shadowgraphy. Figure 8 shows in descending order representative high-speed images captured before (Figs. 8a, 8c, 8e, 8g, 8i, 8k, 8m) and after (Figs. 8b, 8d, 8f, 8h, 8j, 8l, 8n) each scaled impact event by either the HPV-X2 ($d_p = 100, 500, 1,000, 4,000, 10,000 \mu m$) or SIMX ($d_p = 3$ and $10 \mu m$) camera. Yellow arrows and red dashed lines superimposed on the images highlight the direction of projectile motion and relative target thickness inside/on the corresponding fixture, respectively. The projectile impact velocity ($v_i$) and residual velocity ($v_r$) were determined for all experiments by tracking its horizontal motion across multiple shadowgraphs. The launching technique, relative length scale, and average impact and residual velocities are also shown in Fig. 8 for reference. Variations in $v_i$ at a given length scale were relatively minor (<10%). The key experimental parameters ($d_p$, $v_i$, $v_r$, $h_t$, $h_t/d_p$, $E_p^*$, and $A_d/A_p$), as well as the launch apparatus used at each length scale, are summarized in descending order in Table 1.

The specific energy absorption [$E_p^*$, Eq. (2)] of each scaled PC target was calculated for all experiments using the measured $v_i$ and $v_r$ values provided in Table 1. The variations in experimental $h_t$ and $v_i$ values, coupled with measureable deviations in $d_p$, likely explain the standard deviations in $E_p^*$ and $A_d/A_p$ at a given scale, particularly the notable increase in standard deviations with decreasing $d_p$. A heightened sensitivity of the target material to velocity changes occurs as $h_t$ decreases due to increasing strain and heating
rates (more later). This could also partially explain the observed higher standard deviations. Under the assumption of constant projectile-target homogeneous materials, relative geometries, and impact conditions, $E_p^*$ would be expected to remain constant in the absence of any scaling effects. Contrarily, $E_p^*$ exhibited a dramatic increase with a decrease in scale, ranging from approximately 0.4 MJ/kg for the $h_t = 2.38$ mm (thickest) target to as high as 1.5 MJ/kg for the $h_t = 0.75$ μm (thinnest) target (a roughly 230% increase; cf. Table 1). The specific energy absorption is plotted in Fig. 9a for each geometric scale, demonstrating an inverse power law relationship with projectile diameter ($E_p^* \propto d_p^{-0.16}$). The error bars on each data point represent the standard deviation in $E_p^*$ provided in Table 1. The LIPIT $E_p^*$ measurements align well with previously reported values for $v_i \approx 500$ m/s PC film impacts, though with reduced $h_t/d_p \approx 0.04$ ratios and $26,000 < M_w < 59,000$ g/mol [49]. The notable rise in $E_p^*$ with decreasing scale shown in Fig. 9a emphasizes that without proper physical understanding and scaling laws, microscopic impact phenomena cannot be directly extended to the macroscale or visa versa.

Post-impact characterization and measurements often help unravel in-situ material behavior and failure. The effective deformation area ($A_d$; cf. Fig. 6d) provides a simple estimation of the extent to which the target material was engaged and subsequently affected (through permanent deformation or failure) by the impact event. To establish a comparison baseline that spans various length scales, this area was directly extended to the macroscale or visa versa.

Table 1: A summary of the scaled impact experiments performed in this study. A minimum of three experiments were performed at each length scale to quantify the effects of impact velocity and target thickness variations on specific energy absorption ($E_p^*$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>$d_p$ (μm)</th>
<th>$v_i$ (m/s)</th>
<th>$v_r$ (m/s)</th>
<th>$h_t$ (μm)</th>
<th>$h_t/d_p$</th>
<th>Launch Apparatus</th>
<th>$E_p^*$ (MJ/kg)</th>
<th>$A_d/A_p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,000±2.5</td>
<td>561±29</td>
<td>482±29</td>
<td>2,380±130</td>
<td>0.24±0.01</td>
<td>SSGG</td>
<td>0.38±0.02</td>
<td>1.43±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,000±2.5</td>
<td>537±20</td>
<td>437±20</td>
<td>1,016±25</td>
<td>0.25±0.01</td>
<td>SSGG</td>
<td>0.42±0.02</td>
<td>1.70±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,000±2.5</td>
<td>539±4</td>
<td>434±4</td>
<td>254±25</td>
<td>0.25±0.03</td>
<td>SSGG SLDP</td>
<td>0.45±0.01</td>
<td>1.82±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>500±2.5</td>
<td>529±4</td>
<td>385±4</td>
<td>127±13</td>
<td>0.25±0.03</td>
<td>SSGG SLDP</td>
<td>0.57±0.01</td>
<td>2.15±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100±2.5</td>
<td>523±47</td>
<td>251±47</td>
<td>30±5</td>
<td>0.30±0.05</td>
<td>SSGG SLDP</td>
<td>0.77±0.16</td>
<td>2.66±0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10±0.80</td>
<td>522±42</td>
<td>207±42</td>
<td>2.25±0.25</td>
<td>0.23±0.04</td>
<td>LIPIT</td>
<td>1.12±0.15</td>
<td>3.92±0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3±0.32</td>
<td>535±34</td>
<td>38±34</td>
<td>0.75±0.05</td>
<td>0.25±0.04</td>
<td>LIPIT</td>
<td>1.25±0.24</td>
<td>4.81±1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$d_p$, projectile diameter; $v_i$, projectile impact velocity; $v_r$, residual velocity; $h_t$, target thickness; $h_t/d_p$, target-thickness-projectile-diameter ratio; $E_p^*$, specific energy absorption [Eq. (2)]; $A_d/A_p$, normalized deformation area [Eq. (4)].
Figure 8: High-speed images capture the impact events: the alumina projectiles in images (a, c, e, g, i, k, m) are depicted prior to impact, and those in images (b, d, f, h, j, l, n) are shown after target perforation. Each row in the image array corresponds to a specific projectile diameter ($d_p$), which decreases sequentially from the top to the bottom. The target films are highlighted using red dotted lines for enhanced visibility (the dark areas around the films indicate target fixtures). Yellow arrows show the direction of projectile motion. Information provided alongside each series details the launching method (SSGG, SSGG + SLDPS, or LIPIT), the impact velocity ($v_i$), residual velocity ($v_r$), and an accompanying scale.

Exponents for $A_d/A_p$ and $E_p^*$ are virtually the same. This trend in $A_d/A_p$ indicates that as the length scale decreases, a larger proportion of the target material undergoes deformation and failure.
Figure 9: Key impact experiment results as a function of length scale (projectile diameter): (a) specific energy absorption, Eq. (2), and (b) normalized deformation area, Eq. (4). Both metrics follow similar power law trends, decreasing dramatically with length scale. Also included are damage-area-normalized \( E_p^* \) values \([A_d/A_p])E_p^*\], as well as EPIC code predictions for \( E_p^* \) and \( A_d/A_p \).

An alternative approach to normalizing impact energy absorption \( E_p \) is by employing the deformation area rather than the projectile’s projected area \([A_p/A_d])E_p^*\]. Interestingly, these deformation-area-normalized \( E_p \) values remain largely constant across the different scales (see Fig. 9a; dash-dot line). These findings reveal that (i) relative target features resulting from impact-induced deformation and failure lack some consistency across length scale, even when the projectile/target materials and geometries and the impact velocity are unchanged, and (ii) the added volume of target material undergoing deformation as length scale decreases \([A_d - A_p])h_t\] is responsible (through plastic work, heating, etc.) for the rise in \( E_p^* \).

The complementary numerical impact simulations \((v_i \equiv 550 \text{ m/s} \text{ and } h_t/d_p \equiv 0.25)\) were used to approximate the projectile residual velocity \( v_r \) at each length scale. The simulation methodology, material models, and model parameters are provided in Supplementary Information, Sect. SI.6. The simulated \( v_i \) and \( v_r \) values were then used with Eq. (2) to arrive at predicted specific energy absorption \( E_p^* \) values (see Fig. 9a, dashed line). The simulations fail to reflect the experimental rise in \( E_p^* \) with decreasing projectile diameter \( d_p \). The EPIC simulations were also used to predict changes in normalized deformation area with scale, as shown in Fig. 9b. These predictions are based on the diameter \( D \) of a circular region encompassing all out-of-plane target deformation quantified using the same method described in Fig. 6d and Eq. (4). Similar to the \( E_p^* \) calculations, EPIC predicts negligible change in \( A_d/A_p \). The failure of advanced impact simulation techniques to predict any noticeable increase in \( E_p^* \) or \( A_d/A_p \) underscores a knowledge gap in understanding how impact behavior varies from the macroscale \( (10^{-2} \text{ m}) \) to the microscale \( (10^{-6} \text{ m}) \).
With smaller length scales, there is a dramatic increase in local strain and heating rates driven by a reduction in the duration of the penetration/perforation event. This rate escalation may substantially enhance or degrade local material properties and/or trigger different primary failure and energy dissipation mechanisms, leading to relatively higher projectile energy absorption. Specifically, event durations decrease from \(\sim 100 \mu s\) to \(\sim 100 \text{ ns}\) (by 1,000 times) when moving from larger to smaller length scales. This temporal reduction potentially inhibits some failure mechanisms from contributing to smaller-scale energy absorption, while activating or enhancing the contribution of others. One simple approach to estimating the nominal strain rate within the target involves using an analytical expression, such as that derived by Lee et al. [31]:

\[
\dot{\varepsilon} = \frac{t_p}{2} \left( \frac{v_i}{R_c} \right)^2, \tag{5}
\]

where \(t_p\) is the perforation/puncture time, \(R_c \approx v_c t_p\) is the cone radius, \(v_c \approx 1.23 c_{||} (v_i / \sqrt{2 c_{||}})^{2/3}\) is the cone velocity [78], \(c_{||} = \sqrt{E^*/\rho}\) is the in-plane wave speed, and \(E^* = E / (1 - \nu^2)\) is the plain-strain elastic modulus. For simplicity, the puncture time was approximated as \(t_p \approx h_t/v_i\). Equation (5) is plotted as a function of film thickness in Fig. 10, which illustrates a four order of magnitude increase in nominal strain rate from the largest to smallest scale. The increase in local strain rates were also captured in the scaled impact simulations. The maximum simulated equivalent plastic strain rates (max \(\dot{\varepsilon}_{eq}\)) are also included in the plot for comparison. They were on average roughly 140 times greater than the nominal analytical \(\dot{\varepsilon}\) values.

In general, instantaneous material properties can be substantially affected by the strain and heating rates. For PC, as with many materials, an increase in strain rate can enhance several properties, including yield stress and elastic modulus [79, 80]. This enhancement, however, can be offset by adiabatic-heating-induced thermal softening resulting from shock propagation and/or plastic work. Impact-induced temperatures can exceed the glass transition or melt temperature of the material, activating potentially higher energy absorbing deformation and failure mechanisms. This interplay likely contributed to the observed increase in specific energy absorption and normalized deformation area, as depicted in Fig. 9.

A further point to consider is the potential introduction of molecular anisotropy in the LIPIT samples resulting from their notably thin structure (\(h_t = 0.75, 2.25 \mu m\)). Such anisotropy could alter dynamic material behavior and failure in a way that favors energy absorption, contributing to the observed increases in \(E_p^*\) and \(A_d/A_p\) with decreasing scale (Fig. 9). The influence of molecular anisotropy, however, is unlikely due to the substantial size difference between the average PC molecule and even the thinnest target. For instance, the volume of the \(h_t = 0.75 \mu m\) target material beneath the projectile before impact (\(\pi/6 d^3_p h_t\)) is over one hundred thousand times greater than the volume of a sphere enclosing the average PC chain as defined by its root-mean-square end-to-end distance (see Supplementary Information, Sect. SI.1) [81].
Figure 10: Nominal target film strain rate [cf. Eq. (5)] as a function of its thickness, \( h_t \) \cite{31, 78}. Strain rate increases by roughly four orders of magnitude from the largest to smallest length scale.

Furthermore, while surface effects can depress \( T_g \) as films become thinner, these effects have a negligible influence on the bulk material \( T_g \) for linear glassy polymers until film thicknesses reach \( h_t \approx 100 \text{ nm} \) (~87% thinner than the thinnest \( h_t = 750 \text{ nm} \) film) \cite{82, 83}. These considerations show that any thickness-induced molecular anisotropy effects (if present) are overwhelmed by the projectile and do not effect energy absorption. Residual internal stresses in the PC targets caused by material manufacturing and processing might also affect impact energy absorption and deformation, particularly at smaller scales. The spin-coating and compression-molding sample preparation techniques, however, did not introduce any noticeable material anisotropy, as evidenced by cross-polarizing microscopy (refer to Supplementary Information, Sect. SI.5).

Despite the material models used [Eqs. (S5), (S6), and (S7)] being sensitive to strain rates and temperature, they do not accurately replicate the experimental target response. This disagreement exists although simulated strain rates are nominally consistent with expected experimental values (i.e., they grow by orders of magnitude). Most high-rate material models are calibrated using experimental results from Split-Hopkinson Bar tests at strain rates up to \( 10^4 \text{ s}^{-1} \)—but this is over four orders of magnitude less than nominal LIPIT values \cite{84}. Moreover, sample test temperatures typically do not exceed roughly 200°C for polymers. Therefore, a likely explanation for the discrepancy between the simulated and experimental \( E_p^* \) values could be that the material models and EOS employed are not designed and/or calibrated for the specific impact con-
ditions under investigation. Even so, calibrating existing established material models will be an insufficient approach: closing the gap in understanding may require the development of entirely new material models or computational approaches that accurately capture scale-induced changes in predominant material deformation behavior, phase transformations, and failure mechanisms that are negligible/overwhelmed at larger scales. These issues are discussed in more detail in the Supplementary Information, Sect. SI.7.

Post-experiment, the impacted PC samples were immediately sealed at room temperature to preserve the deformation and minimize contamination. Subsequent examinations of the impact and exit surfaces were conducted with optical and laser confocal microscopy (cf. Fig. 7). Figure 11 offers a visual comparison of the damage from alumina sphere impacts of diameters $d_p = 0.5, 1, 4, 10$ mm, arranged in descending order. Figures 11a, 11c, 11e, and 11g illustrate the impact sides of the perforated films, and Figs. 11b, 11d, 11f, and 11h depict the exit sides. Each image includes a superimposed yellow dashed circle representing the projectile’s projection and a scale bar positioned in the bottom right corner. Similarly, optical micrographs of the remaining perforations ($d_p = 3, 10, 100$ µm) are displayed in Fig. 12 using the same layout. In all experiments, the damaged area exceeded the projectile’s projected area ($A_d/A_p > 1$; cf. Fig. 9b).

The effective diameter of the perforation hole/opening was consistently smaller than that of the projectile, suggesting a degree of hole closure post-perforation, akin to material “self-healing” [85, 86]. Notably, the perforations from projectiles of 4 mm (Figs. 11a and 11b) and 100 µm (Figs. 12a and 12b) diameters seemed completely closed, possibly due to slightly larger $h_t/d_p$ ratios. Minimal out-of-plane deformation was observed on the impact face, in contrast to the significant deformation on the exit face across all considered length scales. Signs of jetting, the ejection of material from the impactor-target contact point, were present (Figs. 11e–11h), while there was little to no evidence of large-scale shear banding, crazing, or cracking. The apparent absence of these features might be due to adiabatic heating elevating temperatures above $T_g$, leading to substantial visco-plastic flow that concealed them. In fact, evidence of material flow was present in all micrographs. A slightly higher degree of surface roughness was present in the $h_t = 25$ µm target sample ($d_p = 100$ µm) due to the compression molding process (Figs. 12a and 12b); however, with nominal peak-to-valley distances being less than 0.01$d_p$, the experimental results were likely unaffected. Although the geometry and regularity of the perforations appear to vary with scale, the micrographs do not show any obvious changes in primary failure mechanisms or material behavior, such as ductile to brittle transitions. Figures 11 and 12, however, do visually demonstrate the growth of the deformation area ($A_d$) relative to the projectile’s projected area ($A_p$) as the length scale decreases.

The apparent concentric rings visible in the $d_p = 10$ µm (Figs. 12c and 12d) and $d_p = 3$ µm (Figs. 12e and 12f) perforation images are optical artifacts, likely arising from the perforation dimensions being near the limit of the Keyence microscope’s resolution capabilities. For this reason, optical microscopy of
Figure 11: Orthogonal micrographs (along impact axis) display perforations in the PC targets caused by impacts from alumina spheres with diameters of (a, b) $d_p = 10$ mm, (c, d) $d_p = 4$ mm, (e, f) $d_p = 1$ mm, and (g, h) $d_p = 0.5$ mm. Within the array of images, the left column (a, c, e, g) represents the impact face of the target, whereas the right column (b, d, f, h) depicts the exit face. On each micrograph, a 2D projection of the projectile is overlaid, indicated by a dashed yellow line, to serve as a point of reference.
Figure 12: Orthogonal micrographs (along impact axis) display perforations in the PC targets caused by impacts from alumina spheres with diameters of (a, b) \( d_p = 100 \ \mu\text{m} \), (c, d) \( d_p = 10 \ \mu\text{m} \), and (e, f) \( d_p = 3 \ \mu\text{m} \). Within the array of images, the left column (a, c, e) represents the impact face of the target, whereas the right column (b, d, f) depicts the exit face. On each micrograph, a 2D projection of the projectile is overlaid, indicated by a dashed yellow line, to serve as a point of reference.

The LIPIT samples was supplemented with SEM to obtain images that better show the physical features of the \( d_p = 10 \ \mu\text{m} \) and \( d_p = 3 \ \mu\text{m} \) perforations. Orthogonal images of the front (impact) and back sides of the thin films were captured for the same \( d_p = 10 \ \mu\text{m} \) (Figs. 13a and 13b) and \( d_p = 3 \ \mu\text{m} \) (Figs. 13e and 13f) perforations originally shown in Figs. 12c and 12d and Figs. 12e and 12f, respectively. Again, the yellow dashed circle superimposed on each image highlights the corresponding projectile’s size relative to the perforation. The concentric rings visible in the optical micrographs clearly do not appear in the SEM images. Isometric SEM images at a 48° angle from the film plane were taken of both the same \( d_p = 10 \ \mu\text{m} \) (Figs. 13c and 13d) and \( d_p = 3 \ \mu\text{m} \) (Figs. 13g and 13h) projectile perforations to better highlight the
Figure 13: Orthogonal (90°) and isometric (48°) SEM images of the PC target perforations resulting from LIPIT impacts from alumina spheres with diameters of (a–d) $d_p = 10 \, \mu m$ and (e–h) $d_p = 3 \, \mu m$. For each viewing perspective, an (a, c, e, g) impact side and exit side (b, d, f, h) image is shown. On each normal micrograph, a 2D projection of the projectile is overlaid, indicated by a dashed yellow line, to serve as a point of reference.

Perforation geometry and deformation features not evident in the normal SEM images. The relatively large conical perforation geometries seen in the isometric scans were characteristic of the LIPIT samples (more later) and are in general agreement with previous LIPIT results for PC thin films [49]. Perforation hole geometries and effective deformation areas in the SEM images aligned with those of the optical micrographs.

Another objective of this study was to probe scale-induced changes in perforation geometry. The OM and SEM images in Figs. 11–13 offer only limited quantitative data on the cross-sectional perforation geometries, so laser confocal microscopy was employed to collect profilometry data on both the front and back surfaces of the perforations at each length scale. To facilitate comparison and visualization, the front and back side 1D profiles were normalized using the projectile diameter ($d_p$) and shifted by the appropriate average $h_t/d_p$ ratio (cf. Table 1). This normalized representative two-dimensional (2D) cross-sectional profiles, as shown in descending order in Fig. 14. These cross sections are annotated with corresponding $d_p$ and $h_t$ values and highlighted with distinct colors. Matching microscopy images (cf. Figs. 11–13) are provided for reference on the right, with the imaging method noted at the top left of each micrograph. A scaled projectile profile ($d_p/d_p = 1$) moving downward at velocity $v_r$ is depicted at the bottom of the plot, illustrating that the normalized effective deformation area increases as the length scale decreases ($A_d/A_p \propto 1/d_p$). The figure also clearly shows that the perforation openings are consistently smaller than the projectile. Interestingly, the thicker specimens exhibit signs of plugging failure behavior, while the thinner specimens seem to undergo
more bulk bending deformation (dishing) [46]. More extensive dishing could lead to a proportionally higher degree of energy absorption because it involves substantial plastic deformation over a larger area, while plugging tends to be more localized and less deformative. This transition in the predominant failure mode with decreasing length scale could partially explain the observed enhancement in $E_p^*$ (cf. Fig. 9a).

4. Conclusions

When the length scale decreases from centimeters to microns, the dynamic behavior of materials can dramatically change due to corresponding modifications in event duration, strain and heating rates, material inhomogeneities, among other factors. Addressing this issue is vital to the success of emerging high-throughput material characterization techniques. The Laser-Induced Particle Impact Test (LIPIT) has proven to be a valuable method for studying high strain rate deformation of various materials at the microscale, thanks to its precision, minimal lab space requirement, and high-throughput testing capacity. Initial observations from LIPIT indicate that microscale energy absorption can exceed macroscale results by over a decade. This current study intentionally probes geometric scaling effects on dynamic material behavior by using a LIPIT apparatus and a single-stage light gas gun to launch noncrystalline alumina spheres of 3, 10, 100, 500, 1,000, 4,000, and 10,000 µm in diameter into scaled $h_t/d_p = 0.25$ polycarbonate (PC) targets. The results of these experiments, ranging in impact energies from hundreds of joules down to just nanojoules, suggest that decreasing length scale alone for the same projectile and target materials and geometries results in a dramatic 230% increase in energy absorption and a corresponding 240% rise in normalized deformation area. Microscopic and profilometric analysis of the PC perforations offers insights into potential transitions in deformation and failure behavior with decreasing scale. Complementary advanced numerical simulations of these impacts, however, do not show any increase in specific energy absorption or normalized deformation area even though predicted strain rates reflect expected values. Such discrepancies underscore the limitations of current material models when scaling down impacts from macroscale ($10^{-2}$ m) to microscale ($10^{-6}$ m). Experimental and simulation design, implementation, and analysis would be complicated by the introduction of material hierarchical inhomogeneities, such as those present in metals, carbon nanotube mats, etc. The findings of this study strongly suggest that length scale cannot be ignored in both developing and applying established and innovative microscale material characterization techniques, particularly for advanced material discovery. For these reasons, one key goal of this study is to stimulate scientific dialogue and begin developing a framework for investigating how geometric scale affects impact phenomena.
Figure 14: Representative experimental one-dimensional cross-sectional profiles of the perforated PC target samples (hatched region, figure inset). All profile data was captured using laser confocal microscopy and normalized by the respective projectile diameter ($d_p$) for comparison across length scales. At each scale, impact and exit side profiles (dark solid lines) are displaced by the corresponding $h_t/d_p$ values provided in Table 1 for ease of visualization. An impact side micrograph of the target perforation is shown for each cross-sectional profile, with the microscopy technique noted in the top left corner: optical microscopy (OM) or scanning electron microscopy (SEM). Length scale decreases from top to bottom. Vertical dashed lines show the projectile diameter ($d_p/d_p = 1$) relative to the perforation regions: normalized effective deformation area [$A_d/A_p$; Eq. (4)] grows with decreasing length scale.
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SI. Supplementary Information

SI.1. Polycarbonate Target Molecular Anisotropy Considerations

A polymer’s unperturbed root-mean-square (RMS) end-to-end distance \( R \) is one measure for estimating its molecular size and is generally best determined through one or more experimental methods (e.g., small-angle neutron scattering and/or small-angle X-ray scattering) [1, 2]. Theoretical models, however, can also approximate it by linking the polymer’s physical properties to its dimensions. Flory [3] developed a widely used expression given by

\[
R^2 = C_\infty Nl_0^2, \tag{S1}
\]

where \( C_\infty \) is the characteristic ratio, \( N = M_w/m_0 \) is the number of monomer units in the polymer chain, \( l_0 \) is the length of a single monomer, and \( m_0 \) is the average molecular weight per monomer. For polycarbonate (PC), \( C_\infty \approx 2.4, \ l_0 \approx 7 \ \text{Å}, \) and \( m_0 \approx 127 \ \text{g/mol} \) [4]. Taking \( M_w \approx 56,000 \ \text{g/mol} \) (Table S3), the approximate average number of monomer units is \( N \approx M_w/m_0 = 56,000/127 = 441 \). Therefore, an approximate RMS end-to-end distance for the PC used in this study is \( R \approx 23 \ \text{nm} \), which indicates that the \( h_t = 750 \ \text{nm} \) (thinnest) film thickness was roughly 32 times (3,200\%) larger than the PC RMS end-to-end distance.

The volume of the sphere which completely contains the PC chain (\( V \)) can be approximated from \( R \) as

\[
V \approx \frac{4}{3} \pi \left( R^2 \right)^{3/2}. \tag{S2}
\]

Hence, the approximate volume taken up by a given PC molecule is \( V \approx 51,000 \ \text{nm}^3 \). The volume of PC target material beneath the projectile is \( V_t = \pi/4 d_p^2 h_t \) (Fig. 6d). For the same thickness sample, this target volume was roughly \( 1.0 \times 10^5 \) times \((1.0 \times 10^7\%)\) greater than the spherical volume containing the PC chain. These simple calculations suggest that molecular anisotropy is negligible and likely does not contribute to the observed changes in specific energy absorption or effective deformation area (cf. Fig. 9), even for the thinnest films.

SI.2. Polycarbonate Target Boundary Considerations

In-plane reflected waves from the target’s boundary, influenced by the materials, shapes, and relative impact velocity of the projectile and target, can affect the dynamics of penetration and/or perforation. If the time taken for perforation \( t_p \) is significantly shorter than the duration for waves to travel from the impact point to the boundary and back \( t_b \), disruption from reflected waves is unlikely. Hence, evaluating the ratio \( t_p/t_b \) offers insight into potential boundary effects.
The time for a wave to travel to the boundary and back in a given target can be estimated as

\[ t_b = 2 \frac{r_b}{c_t}, \]  

(S3)

where \( r_b \) is the in-plane radius from the impact point to the target boundary and \( c_t = \sqrt{K_t/\rho_t} \), \( K_t \), and \( \rho_t \) are the target’s bulk sound speed, bulk modulus, and mass density, respectively. Similarly, the perforation/puncture time can be approximated as

\[ t_p = \frac{2h_t}{v_i + v_r}, \]  

(S4)

where \( h_t \) is the target film thickness, \( v_i \) is the projectile impact velocity, and \( v_r \) is the projectile residual velocity after impact. For the PC used in this study, \( K_t = 3.352 \) MPa and \( \rho_t = 1.2 \) g/cc. Hence, \( c_t \approx 1,700 \) m/s for all samples. Using experimental \( v_i \), \( v_r \), and \( r_b \) measurements, values for \( t_b \), \( t_p \), and \( t_p/t_b \) were approximated for all PC samples (Table S1). These simple calculations show that for all scaled impacts, the perforation time was much less than the wave travel time (\( t_p \lesssim 0.1t_b \)), indicating reflected in-plane waves did not influence experimental perforation dynamics.

Table S1: Approximations of wave travel time (\( t_b \)), perforation time (\( t_p \)), and their ratio (\( t_p/t_b \)) for all PC samples. Calculated values are based on the target’s bulk sound speed (\( c_t \)), projectile impact and residual velocities (\( v_i \) and \( v_r \)), and in-plane radius from the impact point to the boundary (\( r_b \)). The analysis shows that for all scaled impacts, the perforation time is significantly shorter than the wave travel time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>( d_p ) (( \mu )m)</th>
<th>( v_i ) (m/s)</th>
<th>( v_r ) (m/s)</th>
<th>( t_p ) (ns)</th>
<th>( r_b ) (mm)</th>
<th>( t_b ) (ns)</th>
<th>( t_p/t_b ) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SI.3. Polycarbonate Target Material Properties

Comparative material studies require materials to be (at least) initially similar. Table S2 outlines the some key material properties for TUFFAK® (PC1) and RowTec® (PC2), including mass density, Rockwell hardness, tensile yield strength, tensile modulus, thermal conductivity, and coefficient of thermal expansion, as supplied by the manufacturers [5, 6]. Noteworthy is the minimal variation in properties between the two materials, confirming their comparability for the purposes of this investigation. This similarity is crucial, as it supports the assumption that any differences in the ballistic impact response of the materials can be attributed to the effects of length scaling effects rather than material inconsistencies/differences.
Table S2: Comparative material properties of TUFFAK® and RowTec® polycarbonates as provided by their manufacturers [5, 6].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>TUFFAK®</th>
<th>RowTec®</th>
<th>Difference (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass density (g/cc)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwell hardness (R scale)</td>
<td>R118</td>
<td>R118</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensile yield strength (MPa)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensile modulus (GPa)</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal conductivity (W/m/K)</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient of thermal expansion (1/K)</td>
<td>$68 \cdot 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>$68 \cdot 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SI.4. Gel Permeation Chromatography (GPC) Characterization of Polycarbonate Samples

Gel permeation chromatography (GPC) data was obtained for both commercial polycarbonate (PC) materials: PC1 (TUFFAK® from Plaskolite, LLC.) and PC2 (RowTec® from Rowland Advanced Polymer Films). Specifically, their molecular weight averages ($M_n$: number average, $M_w$: weight average, $M_z$: Z-average) and distribution (polydispersity $PDI = M_w/M_n$) were assessed using a TOSOH Ambient Temperature GPC instrument. The results for both materials were similar: $M_n$ ranged from 27,737 to 28,927 g/mol, $M_w$ around 55,800 g/mol, $M_z$ approximately 87,800 g/mol, and $PDI$ between 1.93 and 2.01 (Table S3). Figure S1a shows representative GPC chromatographs for PC1 and PC2 in millivolt (mV) versus log molecular weight $[\log (M)]$ space, shedding light on molecular size distribution. Figure S1b shows cumulative weight percent versus molecular weight ($M$) normalized by the entanglement molecular weight $M_e \approx 2,500$ g/mol, indicating how molecular weight distribution correlates with the entanglement threshold. The comparable molecular weight distributions of the PCs confirm the materials’ similarity, supporting their comparison across length scales.

SI.5. Target and Perforation Isotropy Inspection Using Cross Polarizers

Images of representative PC samples at each length scale were obtained using cross-polarizing optical microscopy (OM) to assess their uniformity and isotropy—especially crucial for ultra-thin samples [7]. The in-plane orientation of the targets was determined by analyzing camera pixel intensity values within a “pixel sampling region,” identifying angles with the minimum ($\theta = 0^\circ$) and maximum ($\theta = \pm 45^\circ$) light transmission. This process was first applied to a representative as-received 2,380 µm thick sample (Fig. S3a and S3b), followed by an as-received 1,016 µm thick sample (Fig. S3c and S3d), an as-received 254 µm thick sample (Fig. S3e and S3f), an as-received 127 µm thick sample (Fig. S2a and S2b), a 30 µm thick compression-molded

Table S3: Gel permutation chromatography (GPC) results ($M_n$, $M_w$, $M_z$, and $PDI$) for the two commercial polycarbonate materials, PC1 and PC2 (see Supplementary Information, Sect. SI.4 and Fig. S1). The mass densities ($\rho_t$) and glass transition temperatures ($T_g$; obtained from DSC) of the target materials are also provided for reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor/Material</th>
<th>$M_n$ (g/mol)</th>
<th>$M_w$ (g/mol)</th>
<th>$M_z$ (g/mol)</th>
<th>$PDI (M_w/M_n)$</th>
<th>$\rho_t$ (g/cc)</th>
<th>$T_g$ (°C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RowTec® (PC1)</td>
<td>27,737</td>
<td>55,711</td>
<td>87,908</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>149.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUFFAK® (PC2)</td>
<td>28,927</td>
<td>55,876</td>
<td>87,749</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>152.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample (Fig. S2c and S2d), and finally a spin-coated LIPIT sample (Fig. S2e and S2f). For the $h_t \approx 0.8 \mu m$ and $h_t \approx 30 \mu m$ films, the difference in light intensity at $\theta = 0^\circ$ and $\theta = 45^\circ$ was negligible (<1%). Hence, the spin-coating and compression-molding sample preparation processes did not induce significant material anisotropy. As the sample thickness increased ($h_t \approx 127 \mu m$ and above; $h_t \gtrsim 160h_{t_{LIPIT}}$), the transmitted light intensity at $\theta = 45^\circ$ did begin to increase. This is expected. Birefringence in thicker samples might not accurately reflect the material’s inherent anisotropy. In thinner films that initially show no anisotropy, increasing thickness alone can lead to more interactions of polarized light with negligibly varying refractive indices and internal stresses, thereby amplifying birefringence effects. Material anisotropy in thicker films (if present) likely becomes less significant due to the averaging effect over the considerably larger thicknesses.

**SI.6. Scaled Numerical Impact Simulations**

The scaled $h_t/d_p$ impact experiments were complemented with simulations using the Elastic Plastic Impact Computation (EPIC) code, which couples finite element analysis with smooth particle hydrodynamics to capture large-scale deformations, fracture, and fragmentation. Impact-induced equivalent plastic strain, strain rate, and temperature distributions, as well as specific energy absorption ($E^*_p$) and normalized deformation area ($A_d/A_p$), were computed for each length scale. In the simulations, the alumina projectiles were assumed to be perfectly rigid. The $h_t$ thick PC targets were idealized and meshed in 3D quarter-symmetry using tetrahedral finite elements, where the characteristic element size increased with radial distance from...
Figure S2: Cross polarizing optical microscopy images at in-plane angles $\theta = 0^\circ$ (lowest light intensity) and $\theta = 45^\circ$ (highest light intensity) for representative as-received (a, b) $h_t \approx 2.4$ mm, (c, d) $h_t \approx 1$ mm, and (e, f) $h_t \approx 0.25$ mm samples. Light intensity was sampled in a circular “pixel sampling region” to identify in-plane angle $\theta$. 
Figure S3: Cross polarizing optical microscopy images at in-plane angles $\theta = 0^\circ$ (lowest light intensity) and $\theta = 45^\circ$ (highest light intensity) for representative (a, b) as-received $h_t \approx 127 \, \mu m$, (c, d) compression molded, and (e, f) spin-coated samples. Light intensity was sampled in a circular “pixel sampling region” to identify in-plane angle $\theta$.  

Representative As-Received Sample ($h_t \approx 127 \, \mu m$)  

Representative Compression-Molded Sample ($h_t \approx 30 \, \mu m$)  

Representative Spin-Coated Sample ($h_t = 0.8 \, \mu m$)
Figure S4: A straightforward illustration depicting the 3D quarter symmetric mesh (number of elements, \( N_{el} = \text{constant} = 686,280 \)) used for all EPIC code simulations along with the consistent impact conditions across the considered length scales (\( h_t/d_p = 0.25 \) and \( v_i = 550 \text{ m/s} \)). Simulation time steps and run times varied, both decreasing with scale (cf. Table S4). The projectile diameter (\( d_p \)) is provided in bold to indicate the scale.

the axis of impact. Projectile and target meshes consisting of a combined total of \( N_{el} = 686,280 \) elements were utilized for all simulations, irrespective of scale; a mesh sensitivity analysis was performed to ensure a convergent solution. The finite element edge length for the projectile (~0.08\( d_p \)) matched that for the target in the projectile-target contact region. The element-to-particle conversion feature of the EPIC code was employed, with the equivalent plastic strain (\( \varepsilon_{eq} \)) required for conversion in the target set to 30%, a standard value for ductile materials [8]. In essence, these projectile and target meshes were linearly scaled such that the target thickness (\( h_t \)) matched that of the corresponding experiment (\( h_t/d_p = \text{constant} = 0.25; \) Fig. S4). Key simulation features, including time steps (\( \Delta t \)), run times (\( t_{run} \)), and number of elements (\( N_{el} \)), are summarized in Table S4.

The PC target material behavior was simulated using a Mie-Gruneisen EOS [9], JC constitutive model [10], and a JC fracture model [11]. A cubic form of the Mie-Gruneisen EOS was employed, i.e.,

\[
P = (K_1\mu + K_2\mu^2 + K_3\mu^3)(1 - \Gamma\mu/2) + \Gamma E_s(1 + \mu),
\]

Table S4: A summary of the scaled impact simulations performed using the EPIC code. Key impact conditions, mesh geometry features, and simulation parameters are provided for reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>( d_p ) (( \mu m ))</th>
<th>( v_i ) (m/s)</th>
<th>( h_t/d_p )</th>
<th>( \Delta t ) (ps)</th>
<th>( t_{run} ) (( \mu s ))</th>
<th>( N_{el} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.070</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>686,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>686,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>686,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>686,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>686,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>686,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>686,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( d_p \), projectile diameter; \( v_i \), projectile impact velocity; \( h_t/d_p \), target-thickness-projectile-diameter ratio; \( \Delta t \), simulation time step; \( t_{run} \), simulation run time; \( N_{el} \), total number of elements.
Table S5: Mie-Gruneisen EOS [Eq. (S5)] and Johnson-Cook constitutive and fracture model [Eqs. (S6) and (S7)] parameters for the PC target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yield stress, $C_1$</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>[MPa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardening coefficient, $C_2$</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>[MPa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain rate coefficient, $C_3$</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure coefficient, $C_4$</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardening exponent, $N$</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softening exponent, $m$</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shear modulus, $G$</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>[MPa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain to failure coefficient, $D_1$</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exponential coefficient, $D_2$</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress triaxiality coefficient, $D_3$</td>
<td>-2.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain rate coefficient, $D_4$</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature coefficient, $D_5$</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spall strength, $σ_s$</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>[GPa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk modulus, $K_1$</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>[GPa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic M-G coefficient, $K_2$</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubic M-G coefficient, $K_3$</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>[GPa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruneisen coefficient, $Γ$</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melt temperature, $T_m$</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where $P$ is the pressure, $K_1, K_2,$ and $K_3$ are polynomial coefficients, $Γ$ is the Gruneisen coefficient, $E_s$ is the internal energy per unit volume, and $μ$ is given by the relationship $μ = ρ/ρ_0 - 1$ where $ρ$ is the current density and $ρ_0$ is the initial density. The JC constitutive model was used to determine the material’s dynamic flow stress ($σ$),

$$\sigma = (C_1 + C_2ε_{eq}^N) (1 + C_3 \ln \dot{ε}_{eq}^* \left[1 - (T^*)^m\right] + C_4 P),$$  

(S6)

where $C_1$ is the uniaxial yield stress, $C_2$ is the hardening coefficient, $ε_{eq}$ is the equivalent plastic strain, $N$ is the hardening exponent, $C_3$ is the strain rate coefficient, $\dot{ε}_{eq}^*$ is the dimensionless total equivalent plastic strain rate (normalized by a strain rate of $1 \, s^{-1}$), $T^* = (T - T_0)/(T_m - T_0)$ is the homologous temperature, $T$ and $T_0$ are the current and reference temperatures, $m$ is the softening exponent, $C_4$ is the pressure coefficient, and $P$ is the hydrostatic pressure where compression has a positive sense. The equivalent plastic strain to fracture ($ε_{eq}^f$) under constant conditions of $\dot{ε}_{eq}^*$ [cf. Eq. (S6)] is given by

$$ε_{eq}^f = (D_1 + D_2 e^{D_3 σ^*}) (1 + D_4 \ln \dot{ε}_{eq}^* \left(1 + D_5 T^*\right)), \quad (S7)$$

where $D_1 – D_5$ are fitting parameters, $σ^* = σ_m/σ_{eq}$ is the pressure stress ratio (stress triaxiality [11]), $σ_m$ is the mean normal stress, and $σ_{eq}$ is the equivalent stress. In the simulations, material point “damage” is defined as the ratio of the accumulated equivalent plastic strain to fracture (i.e., $ε_{eq}/ε_{eq}^f$). An element or converted particle is considered to be fully damaged or fractured when this ratio reaches a value of unity. All material model and EOS parameters were sourced from the EPIC materials library or the literature [12]. These values, as well as other important target material parameters, are reported in Table S5.
Length-scaled impact simulations necessitate careful consideration of material properties, features, and behaviors that are often negligible at the macroscale. These include material surface effects (adhesion, friction, surface tension), microstructure and morphology, defects and imperfections, as well as potentially drastic changes in phase, adiabatic heating, deformation, failure, and more. The mechanical behavior of polymers is highly sensitive to temperature, pressure, and testing rate. Since impact experiments induce extreme conditions with dynamic gradients in temperature, strain, strain rate, and stress state that evolve spatially and temporally, ballistic deformation of polymers is particularly susceptible to length scale effects. In addition, the surface-to-volume ratio is much higher at the microscale, meaning surface effects, including surface tension and surface energy, can potentially compete with or dominate over bulk properties [13, 14]. While macroscale properties assume an averaged, isotropic orientation of molecules, microscale properties can be highly anisotropic due to alignment of polymer chains arising from processing or geometric constraints (e.g., target thickness). The influence of polymer microstructural features, such as chain ends, entanglements, and voids, can have an amplified effect on local mechanical properties, such as impact resistance and ductility [15, 16]. Polymers may experience different phase transitions at the microscale due to constraints on molecular movement and phase separation processes [17, 18]. The microscale thermal conductivity of polymers can deviate from their bulk properties. This conductivity is heavily influenced by the microstructure, where features such as chain structure, crystallinity, crystal form, and the orientation of polymer chains in thin films play a more crucial role than the material’s density [19]. Such features cannot be rendered using macroscale continuum approaches. Moreover, due to the relative length scale and irregular nature of these polymer features, multi-scale continuum-based codes are likely also inadequate.

As deformation rates increase with decreasing scale, thermoplastics can exhibit significantly different viscoelastic and fracture behaviors compared to bulk materials due to a competition between loading rate and rate of polymer chain motion/alignment and entanglement dynamics. Furthermore, the validity of using conventional (bulk) material parameters at ultra-high strain rates exceeding $10^4 \text{s}^{-1}$ is questionable due to the current inability of reliably quantifying material properties at such rates. Material features and local variations in material properties that are negligible or “averaged out” at macroscales (i.e., continuum or bulk material properties) can become unavoidably magnified at the microscale. Yet, it is macroscale material properties that are used to model material elasticity, plasticity, thermal conductivity, fracture, failure, and more. Hence, the failure of continuum-based Finite Element Analysis (FEA) and/or Smooth Particle Hydrodynamics (SPH) computation to accurately simulate microscale impact behavior is not surprising. Since the issues reside with the continuum-based assumptions, they are not unique to EPIC and likely exist for other continuum codes, including LS-DYNA [20], Ansys Autodyn [21], CTH [22], and ALE3D [23].
Coarse-graining molecular dynamics (MD) might offer a more precise representation of microscale behaviors [24].

The EPIC simulations were analyzed more thoroughly to display these considerations given only changes in the impact scenario’s length scale \((v_\text{i} = 550 \text{ m/s and } h_\text{i}/d_\text{p} = 0.25)\). This inspection is also critical to identifying potential areas of improvement for future modeling. One simple approach involves capturing target cross-sectional snapshots depicting elemental \(\varepsilon_\text{eq}, \dot{\varepsilon}_\text{eq},\) and \(T\) values at a certain time \(t\) post-impact, such as at \(t = 0.5t_\text{p}\) \([\text{where } t_\text{p} \approx 2h_\text{i}/(v_\text{i} + v_\text{r})]\), when the projectile is roughly midway through perforation. At this stage, significant deformation is observable for all scaled impacts without the onset of extensive material failure. Such snapshots were obtained for particles with \(d_\text{p} = 10,000 \mu\text{m}\) \((\text{Figs. S5a–S5c}), d_\text{p} = 4,000 \mu\text{m}\) \((\text{Figs. S5d–S5f}), d_\text{p} = 1,000 \mu\text{m}\) \((\text{Figs. S5g–S5i}), d_\text{p} = 500 \mu\text{m}\) \((\text{Figs. S5j–S5k}), d_\text{p} = 100 \mu\text{m}\) \((\text{Figs. S5m–S5o}), d_\text{p} = 10 \mu\text{m}\) \((\text{Figs. S5p–S5r}),\) and \(d_\text{p} = 3 \mu\text{m}\) \((\text{Figs. S5s–S5u})\) simulated impact perforations. These PC target cross sections are arranged in decreasing order of \(d_\text{p}\), with each column representing a different variable: \((\text{left to right}) \varepsilon_\text{eq}, \dot{\varepsilon}_\text{eq},\) and \(T\). In each snapshot, the rigid alumina projectile has been hidden for ease of visualization. The simulation time after impact \((t)\) and length scale are indicated in the bottom left and right, respectively. The color bars at the bottom of each column correlate the colors used in the plots with their quantitative values. Variations in the deformation geometry are minor: the instantaneous “crater” size, penetration depth, and back-face bulging seem to be similar regardless of the scale. As \(d_\text{p}\) decreases, the elements possessing peak \(\varepsilon_\text{eq}\) values \((i.e., the element-to-particle conversion strain of 30\%)\) appear to shift outward symmetrically from directly beneath the projectile to lateral locations. The number of elements with \(\varepsilon_\text{eq} \approx 0.3\) also seem to decrease. Reducing the length scale leads to a rise in peak calculated strain rates \((\text{up to } \dot{\varepsilon}_\text{eq} \sim 10^{10} \text{ s}^{-1})\), without significantly affecting the overall distribution. Interestingly, the predicted temperature distribution remains largely unchanged, with peak temperatures reaching just \(T \approx 0.75T_\text{m}\) for the \(d_\text{p} = 3 \mu\text{m}\) impact.

In essence, the EPIC simulations fail to accurately mirror the physics seen in the impact experiments, as they show little variation in strain, strain rate, and temperature, as well as overall deformation and energy absorption, with decreasing length scale. This largely invariant response not only disagrees with experimental observations but also is contrary to expectations that nominal (not just peak) strain and heating rates should rise notably with decreasing scale due to shorter perforation times. Moreover, despite a significant increase in predicted peak strain rates \((\text{from } 10^6 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ to } 10^{10} \text{ s}^{-1})\), the lack of noticeable changes in the simulation outcomes suggests that the material models do not capture changes in material strain and strain rate hardening, thermal softening, melting, etc. These clear discrepancies underline the need to develop or rethink material models to better capture the behaviors observed in scaled impacts. This study, of course, is limited to a single material, PC, which is homogeneous and amorphous at all examined scales. Introducing
hierarchical material inhomogeneity and anisotropy, that are present in metals and carbon nanotube mats, into computational models would substantially increase their complexity. The simulation results included in this study simply demonstrate modeling limitations and potential areas for advancements.

Figure S5: Cross-sectional EPIC simulation snapshots for the (a–c) $d_p = 10$ mm, (d–f) $d_p = 4$ mm, (g–i) $d_p = 1$ mm, (j–l) $d_p = 500$ µm, (m–o) $d_p = 100$ µm, (p–r) $d_p = 10$ µm, and (s–u) $d_p = 3$ µm. Each column in the image array corresponds to a different spatially vary parameter: (a, d, g, j, m, p, s) equivalent plastic strain ($\varepsilon_{eq}$), (b, e, h, k, n, q, t) equivalent plastic strain rate ($\dot{\varepsilon}_{eq}$), and (c, f, i, l, o, r, u) temperature ($T$). The time after impact ($t \approx 0.5 t_p \approx 0.5 h/v$) is provided in the bottom right corner of each snapshot.
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