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Results

1.1. Sensitivity analysis of paper from the four pulping operations

1.1.1. Environmental analysis

![Fig. S1. Sensitivity analysis results of four pulping. (a) PCMP. (b) PCP. (c) PBMP. (d) PWPP](image)

1.1.2. Economic analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>PCMP</th>
<th>PCP</th>
<th>PBMP</th>
<th>PWPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incomes</td>
<td>price of the paper</td>
<td>-262.0%</td>
<td>-270.0%</td>
<td>-166.2%</td>
<td>-266.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>price of the produced energy</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-108.0%</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost</td>
<td>capital cost</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feedstock</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>145.0%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>116.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>energy consumption</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>labor costs</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2. Scenario analysis of BL and PS treatment technologies
1.2.1. Characterization and normalization results of BL management

Fig. S2. Contributions of inputs and outputs to environmental indicators. (a) System 1. (b) System 2. (c) System 3

Fig. S3. Comparative environmental performances of three systems.
1.2.2. Characterization and normalization results of PS management

(a) PS-to-paperboard

(b) PS-to-heat

Fig. S4. ECER values of three systems. (a) System 1. (b) System 2. (c) System 3
Fig. S5. Contributions of inputs and outputs to environmental indicators. (a) PS-to-paperboard. (b) PS-to-heat. (c) PS-to-landfill

Fig. S6. Comparative environmental performances of three PS treatment methods. (a) normalized value. (b) ECER value