**Critical review of group 4 done by group 13**

**Overall comments**

* Report was easy to follow
* The topic of the study is interesting and relevant of today as the consumption of coffee is quite large all over the world
* It follows the template of structure that we were given, however the report should follow a clearer hierarchical structure, e.g. chapter 2 and 3 could be under introduction
* Good English vocabulary, there is storytelling in some parts of the report which could be improved such as “back to the waste scenario”
* Table 3 is illustrative
* Clear figures

**Transparency and completeness**

* The first flowcharts of the products presents a thorough view of both products, however wastewater is never mentioned in the report. To include this in the flowchart but not in the report is not transparent and leaves the reader to wonder if something is missing.
* The process flowcharts, Figure 4 and Figure 5, don’t present the percentage of cut-off. This should be included since it’s relevant to know if the entire process is presented. As a suggestion, a figure with a certain cut-off percentage could be presented as well as a figure with 0 percentage cut-off. This will also give a clearer view of which processes that are of most significance.

**Methodology**

* The transport of both products from China should not neglected. The Functional Unit gives that paper cups weights 7,9 kg and porcelain cup 0,228 kg. This becomes a factor of almost 35 times more for the paper cups and would therefore affect the respective transport factor significantly. However, if the transport has a small impact on the environmental aspects compared to other areas is not known, but if that is the case it should be explained and motivated.
* The allocation problem in regards to transport should perhaps be mentioned in the report. SimaPro handles this allocation problem by the user entering both the mass of product transported and the distance.

**Clarity of results and conclusions**

* The results are well documented and explained
* The study aims to answer which one of the two different cups that has the highest environmental burden. The conclusions are drawn thereafter.
* The figures could be incorporated into the conclusion and recommendations in order to strengthen the conclusions made
* Very good to give some examples of sensitivity factors and then choose a few of them. The motivation of why is also good.
* The conclusions made in the study are well supported by the results

**Improvements**

* Rename abstract to summary (since an abstract usually is shorter, about one paragraph)
* Proofread since there are some language errors
* Different ways of describing the geographical boundaries. Since it seems important with cities, maybe it is good to specify all of them and not write only China and Sweden
* Could be an idea to have the pictures in an appendix to, in order to up scale it and then refer to the appendix in the text. The reader could then go to the appendix and read if they believe that the pictures are a bit too small to read.
* Since the intended audience is the office worker might need some rethinking of what is included in the report. Example is: *Soap [GLO] market for | Alloc Def, S; Zeolite, powder [GLO] | market for | Alloc Def, S; Sodium percarbonate, powder [GLO] market for | Alloc Def, S; Sulfuric acid [GLO] | market for | Alloc Def, S* and *Sodium percarbonate, tetrahydrate, powder [GLO] | market for | Alloc Def, S*Furthermore, the intended audience should perhaps be corporate managements or corporates’ head of economy etc, because it’s better to provide office workers with the best choice rather than letting all workers decide for themselves.
* Description of what cup that corresponds to the different colours in the pictures
* Two figures are not correctly cited. Figure 1 is presented and then later after that (under the heading System Boundaries) it says in figure 1 and 2, where it would instead be figure 2 and 3