

Critical review of group 11

Over all comments

Thank you for a good and interesting report! The first thing we liked about your study was the choice of subject, we feel that it is up to date. It is important to reflect over choices you make when buying clothes and it gives the study a local connection. The layout of your report is also very satisfying and visual aids like graphs and tables are relevant and contribute to understanding of the results.

However, reading the report, we experience a small lack of objectivity. It leaves us with a feeling that you already beforehand have made up your mind about viscose being the better alternative. This is mostly shown in what impact categories you choose to focus on in your analyse, giving the viscose an advantage, and we feel that it perhaps reduces the trustworthiness in the comparison a bit.

To our extent of knowledge, the formal structure seems to be satisfying and the report is really good looking, well done!! Unfortunately some of the headings lack a bit of required content, for example cut-off criteria and conclusions, see below.

In quite a few places in the text we miss references, a lot of facts are just presented without its source which decreases the credibility. The exception is the introduction which has a lot of good references.

Methodology

You have chosen to do a comparative LCA, which means that you can set off the stages in the life cycles that are the same for both t-shirts. A comparative LCA is used when exploring the differences between two things. Identical stages can be excluded from the LCA, but we can't see that you have done that and it makes us a bit confused. The choice of doing an attributional/accounting LCA we agree with 100 %. We would also like you to specify that you are analysing conventional cotton and not organic cotton.

Further on, we are a bit confused about the relevance of the sensitivity analysis. What is the purpose of it? As far as we know, a sensitivity analysis is not mandatory, and we feel that it doesn't really contribute to the goal of the study.

Finally we would like you to clarify which cut-offs and assumptions you have made in your study, as well as specify what you mean with "as recent data as possible". This adds to a more transparent study.

Results and conclusions

We are impressed of how well you explain and discuss the results. A big plus is that you have traced the origin of different impacts in a clear and detailed way. The discussion of the data is interesting, although references is once again missing. It is not clear if your conclusions are supported by the results because the text under the heading conclusions doesn't really fulfill its purpose. We wish for a more explicit conclusion in accordance with

the goal of the study and a clear answer to the research question, instead of just a summary of the results.

Improvements

We have two suggested improvements for you to make this afternoon before you hand in the final version:

- An easy but often good tip is to proofread the report to correct some unnecessary errors that impairs the overall impression.
- Consider to state your research question explicit in the goal and scope section, this is to help the reader understand your choice of LCA-type and methodology. Additionally this is the underlying red thread in the report and it would be easier to follow if it was stated explicitly.

We hope that you find this critical review helpful in your learning process, as well as to improve your already good report. Thanks for a good reading experience!

Group 7