Int J Life Cycle Assess (2017) 22:1987–1988
DOI 10.1007/s11367-017-1350-7

ERRATUM

Erratum to: Impact of the selection of functional unit on the life cycle assessment of green concrete

Daman K. Panesar[1] · **Karina E. Seto**[1] · **Cameron J. Churchill**[2]

Published online: 12 June 2017

Erratum to: Int J Life Cycle Assess
DOI:10.1007/s11367-017-1284-0

It has come to the attention of the authors that a correction to the data presented in Table 2 is necessary. The errors in the original Table 2 do not have any implications on the subsequent analysis, discussion, or conclusions because the analysis was carried out based on the correct values. The corrected version of the table is reproduced here.

The online version of the original article can be found at http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11367-017-1284-0

✉ Daman K. Panesar
d.panesar@utoronto.ca

[1] Department of Civil Engineering, University of Toronto, 35 St., George St, Toronto, ON M5S 1A4, Canada

[2] Engineering and Society Program, McMaster University, 1280 Main, St W, Hamilton, ON L8S 4L7, Canada

Table 2 Mix designs and hardened properties used as input for the LCA and functional unit calculations

Quantity (kg/m^3)	Mix design identificaton			
	j^a = –	j^a = 1	j^a = 2	j^a = 3
	100GU[b]	GU-25SL	GUL-25SL	GU-8SF-25SL
Water	180	130	130	140
General use cement (GU)	429	266	–	276
General use limestone (GUL) cement	–	–	266	–
Slag (SL)	–	89	89	100
Silica fume (SF)	–	–	–	24
Coarse aggregate	900	1040	1040	1000[c]
Fine aggregate	875	833	827	800[c]
Air-entraining admixture (mL/kg of cementing material)	52	–	–	–
28-day compressive strength (MPa)	48.5	44.1	46.0	56.5
28-day rapid chloride permeability (C)	3186	1391	1470	421

[a] Index values corresponding to Eqs. (1) to (6)

[b] Base case scenario (Dolatabadi 2013)

[c] Aggregate quantities are estimated based on typical Ministry of Transportation proportions