Phonology

It sounds weird (comparisons with exotic languages like Apache and Albanian)
[Lojban is designed to be clear, not cute.]
Several difficult sounds (x, .)
[found in most source languages, managed in others]
Many easily confused sounds (x, ', .; r, l; voiced/voiceless)
[see above. If x/' a problem can use theta for ']
(shouldn't ' be h, . be q?)
[because these sounds play special roles in the language, different from that of most sounds, it was found that they showed up better being differently marked. The suggested way was actually more confusing.]
vowels not clearly specified and tend to overlap
[overlap not generally in one person's speech but between two speakers. Most folks have 6 vowels in the appropriate arrangement and the slight differences in realization – even most of the extremes of English, for example --- are quickly compensated for.]
(a three vowel system would be clearer)
[it would also reduce the number of possible words of a given length by a very large factor.]
there are too many sibilants, many sentences come out as tongue-twisters,
[the distribution comes largely from the source languages, where sibilants rarely cause problem. But Chinese does have a lot compared with English.]
Many clusters are hard to produce.
[all occur in source languages and are not problematic there. And, if you have trouble, you can always buffer.]
Many perfectly good clusters are prohibited; we could get more words by using these,
[they don't occur in source language and speakers of these find them difficult to produce and hear correctly, e,g, dl, tl. – admittedly a matter of practice]
The restrictions on word forms makes things seem all the same and hard to recognize particular words.
[pattern helps recognize predicates, differences in letter shapes helps with individual words, getting beyond gismu removes the sameness]
written-spoken isomorphism doesn't work because it requires either marking stress or showing word boundaries
[marked stress and word boundaries are parts of two forms of the isomorphism, without them there is no such correlation]

cmavo

There are too damned many of them (more and harder to learn that gismu and constantly growing)

Many of them are of dubious usefulness.
[Lojban has the "anything any language can do, Lojban can do" principle of cultural unbias, which means a lot things that many people will rarely use.]

This mess is terribly unZipfy (the shortest words include many that are rarely, if ever used and are, indeed, designed to be that way.)
[their form and length is determined by their function, not there frequency. It would be strange indeed to have a mere syntactic tag of no particular mean – a right hand end, say – be an impressively long word, Zipf has its limits.]

There is no way save memorization to figure what class most belong to
[there are many systematic groups, UI, say or ke'a, but it is just not possible to fit all the needed items into groups]

Items of different classes and easily confused with one another often occur in the same environment, making mistakes even more disastrous (ro/lo, e.g.)

The rules for various classes are unclear, once you figure what the class is,

Apparently similar items belong to different classes and different items are grouped together.
[items of similar meaning may play different syntactic roles and it is the role that determines class.]

There are too many different classes.
[it needs many classes to do all sorts of things, since they may take slightly different syntax than any other role thus requiring a new class.]

The word space is almost totally full, so any tiny mistake produces a legitimate word which may throw the whole sentence off without warning.
[given all the words needed for the various roles and the need for speedy resolution of structure, it is not clear how else to do cmavo than this system

Many of these problems arise from early design decisions and could be relieved by changing those decisions:
a large number of classes are required by the particular monoparsing technique; other techniques are less profligate with words (elidable closers, the array of logical connectives,...)
many classes are for factors which are also covered by content words and could be expressed using phrases rather than single short words (emotions, evidentials, ….)
many items were stuck in to deal with special theories or to make distinctions which were never justified.

Many incompletely defined.

Precedence and scope undefined for most of them.

Gismu

Hard to learn (the supposed help from source languages is often a hindrance – cluing the wrong word, both ways. And it has never been tested to see whether it really helps)

Hard to learn the place structure of the predicates – both what places go in (not always obvious) and what (obvious) ones are left out and what the order is.

Language sourcing leads to clustering of gismu, many very similar but lots of spaces with nothing in them. A more even spread, with more space between, would be better
[Actually trying for such a spread quickly shows that you can mange it only with a reduced vocabulary size – and confusions still follow.]

Gismu have up to four different rafsi, increasing learning time and possible confusion, since most could come equally well from other gismu, One fixed form would be better.
[Which one? Choosing one means that there are more constructions where the long form must be used or buffers, both of which increase word length even if slightly clearer.]

Gismu have no taxonomic structure.
[There is no obvious one to use – we have looked --and to use any would be to interfere with the way gismu were constructed.]

Places changes their meaning with every gismu (almost) and the same meaning turns up in different places with different gismu, unlike most other languages.
[Lojban is different, as we have said. But as for places changing meaning, this is inevitable since the different gismu related different ideas. And one wouldn't expect "destination" to have the same place in the predicate for destination and in the predicate for point of departure.]

lujvo, etc.

Place structure is not obviously derived from components and is often incompletely described.

The rules for legitmate lujvo (etc.) are vague, incomplete and contradictory (see frequent disputes about whether a certain string is a word),

practical

No idioms – everything has to be literal or marked as figurative.

No complete dictionary and what there is does not give complete definitions with all relevant factors

Logical

Scope of quantifiers undefined (syntactically begin at first occurrence but logically somewhere left, end not given at all)

RHE of most structures elidable under under a set of vague, incomplete, contradictory rules (leaving elidables in makes for prolixity; eliding what can't be makes for misparses)
[one of the things the bapfuckers were supposed to fix before they got sidetracked and gave up]

Strings of terminators are hard to interpret even when correct (require a lot of memory of details of what went before)

Even with several systems and "repetition is also anaphora" the anaphoric pronoun system(s) are incomplete and hard to use, requiring detailed memory of the preceding structure and exact way in which a reference was made. The rules are also vague and/or contradictory.

Because logic and Lojban use very different sort of grammars, the connection between a Lojban parse

and a logical structure has not been demonstrated (or even examined).

Crucial logical information is wrongly placed, especially the collective/distributive contrast is placed on the sumti rather than on the connection between sumti and predicate (this means the connection is not specified – using 'lo' – or the same sumti cannot be used with various predicate, since different applications are involved).

[there is no place for the connection other than the sumti or the predicate and putting it on the predicate would mean that it could not be used with differently applied sumti. Of course, some collapses maybe should just not be made.]