*Critical review Group 2 by Group 1 - LCA*

**Overall comments**

The overall impression of the report is that it is well-structured and logically presented. We do have a few questions regarding your system boundaries. Good that you give proposals to future studies. Good that you target the issue of recycling.

* How did you manage to include all possible processes? It seems to be a returning critique for LCA that it’s so difficult to actually include everything.
* How did you collect the marginal data that is needed in order to make a consequential LCA?

**Reflections on the choice of topic**

The topic was interesting as we knew little about it before reading the report. How did you come up with this topic? If you had known about the difficulties to find data, would you have chosen another topic?

**Language**

The language is easy to read and there is a flow in the text. A little more work could be put into the grammar with things like is/are. Be aware of when to use capital letters. Add page numbers to make it easier to follow the report.

**Structure**

The titles are relevant and according to the assignment, however the content could have been more thoroughly selected to suit the reader and a lot of the tables and figures could have been included in an appendix. Table 1 is missing units and it is difficult to interpret what it is showing. Maybe some figures are excessive and could have been removed or more clearly explained. The report is comprehensive but could have been somewhat shortened.

**Transparency and completeness**

It seems like all steps conducting the LCA are presented. The tables in the appendix does not show the amounts in accordance with the functional unit.

Do to all the steps being presented, it’s easy to follow the work and it make the document transparent.

The research questions are missing and therefore it is hard to interpret the relevance of the conclusion.

**Methodology**

A consequential analysis is conducted instead of attributional, where we not all supposed to do an attributional LCA?

**Results**

The results are in general well documented, while the input numbers are harder to follow.

* How could you perform a consequential LCA?

**Conclusions**

What impact categories are the most significant is answered in the conclusion. However, this is not defined in the goal definition.

**Aim and objectives**

You could add objectives in your goal definitions so that it corresponded to result and conclusions. For example, you suggest improvements in the process are only mentioned in the conclusion but never as a part of work that will be performed in the goal for the report

**Improvements**

Table in the appendix could be improved by quantification according to functional unit, so that the LCA could be redone and increase transparency.

In the recommendation, it is mentioned that 3D printing is a new method that could be further developed as the results now point to it being un sufficient. Is there some way to know if it will be worth putting more research money in the subject?