1. **What follows data collection?**
   1. Write-up/plots/graphs and analysis. Add more thorough analysis using finite element and enes220 style engineering analysis. Proof of theory (from research)?
2. **What qualifies as successful data/research?**
   1. Demonstration of “strong” and “material efficient”
   2. Existing work lacks structural analysis, so gathering data and narrowing down effective methods
3. **Why not fill the hole → subtractive manufacturing?**
   1. Not all damages can be repaired by filling (ex: ? complex geometry, material/structural integrity matters. Filling the hole would be for quick fixes)
   2. Maybe it’s more effective **¯\\_(ツ)\_/¯** we don’t know haven’t done it yet
   3. Filling is less material/energy efficient
4. **Scanning and obtaining the model?** 
   1. Outside the scope of our project
5. **Why would you repair an easy-to-replace 3d printed, plastic part?**
   1. Our research is proof-of-concept for future materials (metal)
   2. “Considering that the field is new (<10 years) the research and tech has to start from somewhere”
   3. **Applications?** 
      1. Iss 3d printed parts, 3d printed rutherford engine, mars rover, bone repairs
6. **Dust/Adhesion?**
   1. Detailed physical analysis for 3d printed parts can be really complex (such as adhesion) so we’re simply standardizing our conformal prints and ignoring that as an experimentation variable
      1. Environmental dust/adhesion is constant throughout every trial?
7. **How does our project do good?**
8. **Why is your project so shit** 
   1. Zoom University
9. **Why r we better than autocycle**
   1. Every reason