International Journal of Applied and Natural Sciences (IJANS)
ISSN (P): 2319–4014; ISSN (E): 2319–4022
Vol. 14, Issue 2, Jul–Dec 2025; 1–10

International Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology
Connecting Researchers; Nurturing Innovations

CIRCULAR ECONOMY IN ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT: EVALUATING THE ROLE OF WASTE-TO-RESOURCE TECHNOLOGIES IN URBAN SUSTAINABILITY

S. Srividhya[1] & Dr. P. Sangeetha[2]

[1]Department of Physics, Indian Maritime University, Chennai Campus, India

[2]Department of Physics, Arignar Anna Arts and Science College, Cheyyar, India

ABSTRACT

The rapid pace of urbanization in the 21st century has intensified the demand for sustainable solutions to manage growing volumes of urban waste while reducing the environmental footprint of cities. Traditional linear economic models based on the "take-make-dispose" paradigm are increasingly proving inadequate to meet the ecological, economic, and social demands of modern urban environments. This research examines the emerging role of waste-to-resource technologies within the framework of the circular economy, with a focus on their contributions to urban sustainability and efficient environmental management. Circular economy principles advocate for the regeneration of natural systems, the design of out-of-waste cycles, and the continuous reuse of materials through strategies such as recycling, remanufacturing, and industrial symbiosis. The research explores how waste-to-resource technologies, including advanced composting systems, anaerobic digestion, materials recovery facilities (MRFs), pyrolysis, and chemical recycling, enable cities to transform waste streams into valuable inputs, such as renewable energy, construction materials, and agricultural supplements. These technologies are not merely tools for waste reduction but act as transformative mechanisms that redefine waste as an economic asset, thereby fostering resource efficiency and resilience. The study employs a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative data analysis of urban waste generation and recovery rates with qualitative interviews from municipal authorities, technology providers, and sustainability experts across selected metropolitan cities. The findings indicate a strong correlation between the deployment of waste-to-resource infrastructure and improvements in waste diversion rates, urban air and soil quality, and overall material efficiency. Moreover, cities that have embedded these technologies within policy frameworks and public-private partnerships have shown marked improvements in circularity metrics and citizen engagement. However, the study also highlights key barriers to the widespread adoption of such technologies, including capital intensity, lack of regulatory coherence, and inadequate public awareness. To address these challenges, the research recommends integrated policy mechanisms, targeted fiscal incentives, and capacity-building programs aimed at local governments and stakeholders. The broader implication of this research lies in establishing a roadmap for cities to transition from waste management systems to resource recovery ecosystems that are aligned with global climate goals and the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In conclusion, the integration of waste-to-resource technologies within urban planning is not only feasible but essential for the realization of circular, sustainable, and resilient urban systems. This research contributes to the evolving discourse on circular urbanism by offering empirical insights and actionable strategies that can shape the future of environmental management in urban landscapes.

***KEYWORDS**: Circular Economy; Waste-to-Resource Technologies; Urban Sustainability; Environmental Management; Resource Efficiency.*

Article History

***Received:** 04 Aug 2025* | ***Revised:** 05 Aug 2025* | ***Accepted:** 07 Aug 2025*

INTRODUCTION

Urban centers around the world face mounting pressure as population growth, economic expansion, and increasing consumption patterns converge to create staggering volumes of waste. Traditional approaches to waste management, rooted in linear models of consumption, production, and disposal, are proving unfit for the strain they place on natural resources and urban ecosystems. Landfill capacities are nearing saturation, air and water pollution risk is rising, and cities struggle with the long-term consequences of rigid waste-handling systems. In this context, the circular economy has emerged as a transformative paradigm that reimagines the fate of waste not as refuse but as a resource. At its core, a circular economy seeks to close loops in material cycles, decouple economic growth from resource depletion, and build regenerative systems that preserve value across multiple life cycles. Implementing such principles in urban settings demands more than policy reforms; it requires infrastructure, technology, and socioeconomic systems that convert urban waste into usable inputs. This research explores how waste-to-resource technologies such as anaerobic digestion, advanced composting, pyrolysis, and materials recovery facilities play a pivotal role in actualizing circular economy frameworks within cities. Rather than incremental improvements, these technologies represent a shift in mindset: from waste disposal to resource valorization. The introduction of technology-driven waste transformation has profound implications for governance, planning, and behavioral norms. Organic waste, once destined for dumpsites, can now offer renewable energy through biogas systems and nutrient-rich compost for agriculture. Plastic waste, historically a major source of pollution, can be chemically recycled or converted into fuels using modern conversion techniques. Construction and demolition debris can be remanufactured into alternative building materials. These transitions mark the potential of waste to not only reduce environmental burdens but also generate economic opportunities, enhance energy security, and foster community resilience.

This research begins by canvassing global and regional trends in urban waste generation, examining metrics such as per-capita municipal solid waste, waste composition, and current treatment methods. By highlighting examples of cities that have begun investing in waste-to-resource infrastructure, such as biogas plants in Europe or pyrolysis in Asia, this introduction demonstrates the real-world feasibility of the circular economy narrative. It acknowledges, however, that scaling such systems is complex. Capital intensity, regulatory uncertainty, fragmented waste segregation practices, and public awareness gaps pose significant barriers. These obstacles underscore the need for integrative frameworks that link technological potential with practical governance strategies. To address these challenges comprehensively, this study adopts a mixed-methods research design. Quantitative data is drawn from municipal waste statistics, recovery rates, and energy yields across multiple cities. Qualitative data derives from interviews with city administrators, technology providers, and environmental experts, illuminating practical considerations in project execution and public engagement. Through this dual lens, the study seeks to move beyond abstraction, providing grounded insights into the effective deployment of waste-to-resource systems. Early findings suggest that cities committed to circular principles and supported by public-private partnerships tend to outperform others in material recovery efficiency and community engagement. Interviews reveal that stakeholder collaboration from local government to waste haulers and civic groups is necessary for sorting, segregation, and feedstock sourcing. Financial incentives like pay-as-you-throw schemes and subsidies for composting or anaerobic digestion further catalyze adoption. Critically, pilots succeed when backed by strong data monitoring, performance measurement, and transparent impact reporting. Environmental outcomes of these technologies are promising. Life cycle analyses show reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, lower air and water pollution footprints, and deferred landfill expansion. Social outcomes are also improved: new jobs in waste sector value chains, enhanced public health from cleaner neighborhoods, and educational opportunities through urban compost or recycling civic programs. Importantly, as waste becomes part of a closed-loop system, citizen attitudes shift from passive consumption to active participation in urban material cycles.

Nonetheless, the transition is not seamless. Some cities experience resistance at early stages: cultural norms around waste, absent infrastructure at the household level, or skepticism about new technologies. Risk assessment must address potential unintended consequences, such as the misuse of compost-derived products or emissions from low-quality pyrolysis units. Furthermore, the economies of scale require coordination across municipalities and standardization in material quality protocols. In conclusion, the circular economy offers a powerful vision for rethinking urban environmental management. Waste-to-resource technologies stand at the heart of this transition, converting liability into assets and embedding sustainability into cityscapes. Through empirical modeling, stakeholder interviews, and cross-city analysis, this research aims to comprehensively evaluate how these technologies can be effectively integrated and scaled, addressing both opportunities and challenges. Ultimately, it seeks to provide city planners, policymakers, and sustainability advocates with actionable insights that reset the relationship between waste and resources in modern urban environments, demonstrating that sustainability can be both ecological and economic, systemic and scalable.

METHODOLOGY

This research employs a robust **mixed-methods design**, integrating both quantitative and qualitative approaches to rigorously evaluate waste-to-resource technologies in urban circular economy contexts. The overall aim is to triangulate multiple sources of evidence, numerical data, expert perspectives, and policy documentation to build a well-rounded and actionable understanding of how such technologies perform and scale.

Research Phases

The methodology is organized into three distinct but interlocked phases:

- **Phase 1: Quantitative data analysis** of municipal waste generation, diversion rates, energy yields, and recovery metrics from selected cities.
- **Phase 2: Qualitative stakeholder interviews** with municipal officials, technology providers, waste contractors, and sustainability experts.
- **Phase 3: Secondary data synthesis**, including policy documents, technology performance reports, and case study records to validate and contextualize findings.

Table 1: Research Design Overview

Phase	Method	Sample/Scope	Primary Data Sources	Objective
Phase 1	Quantitative	10 major cities globally	Municipal waste statistics, energy recovery logs	Measure performance and recovery efficiency
Phase 2	Qualitative	30 stakeholders (3–4 per city)	Semi-structured interviews	Understand operational challenges, enablers
Phase 3	Secondary synthesis	Policy & technology documents	Government reports, project evaluations	Validate and contextualize quantitative findings

Quantitative Phase

Data was gathered from publicly available municipal records and direct API uploads from ten metropolitan cities that have deployed waste-to-resource facilities, including composting plants, anaerobic digesters, and plastic-to-fuel systems. Metrics collected include:

- Per capita municipal solid waste generation (kg/day/person).
- Annual waste diversion percentages (% of total waste).
- Volume of renewable energy or reused output (MWh, tonnes compost, recycled plastics).
- Greenhouse gas emission reductions (CO_2-equivalent savings).

Data was standardized across cities by applying normalization on a per capita and per tonne basis. Statistical analysis included descriptive statistics, correlation testing, and regression modeling to determine the relationship between levels of investment in waste-to-resource infrastructure and indicators of urban sustainability.

Qualitative Phase

Stakeholder Identification: From each city, between three and four respondents were recruited purposively, including municipal waste officials, private technology operators, civil society representatives, and academic experts.

Interview Process: Semi-structured interviews were conducted virtually or in person. Each interview lasted approximately 45–60 minutes and was audio-recorded with consent. Core topics included:

- Operational challenges of technology deployment.
- Policy drivers and regulatory compliance.
- Community engagement and citizen response.
- Economic feasibility and financing mechanisms.

Transcriptions were coded using thematic analysis, following an iterative process: initial open coding, axial clustering, and selective theme consolidation.

Table 2: Key Qualitative Themes and Frequency

Theme	Description	Frequency*
Policy Incentives	Subsidies, mandates, regulatory tools	28 / 30
Feedstock Segregation	Household-level sorting practices	26 / 30
Public Awareness and Behavior	Community education and buy-in	24 / 30
Technical Performance Issues	Downtime, contamination, throughput	18 / 30
Metrics and Reporting	Monitoring, transparency mechanisms	22 / 30

*Number of stakeholders referencing each theme (out of 30 total)

Secondary Data Phase

Secondary sources comprised policy frameworks (e.g., waste legislation, circular economy mandates), performance audits for pilot projects in selected cities, and technical reports from technology providers. These documents provided cross-validation for interview insights and quantitative indicators, especially regarding economic models, success criteria, and unintended impacts.

Data Analysis Techniques

- **Quantitative**: Data were analyzed using SPSS for descriptive summary, Pearson correlation, and multivariate regression. Cities that invested in integrated infrastructure (e.g., both composting and anaerobic digestion) showed statistically higher diversion rates ($p < 0.05$) and lower per capita waste generation.
- **Qualitative**: NVivo software supported coding and theme mapping. A consensus check between two independent coders yielded inter-coder agreement of Cohen's Kappa = 0.82, indicating substantial reliability.
- **Mixed Integration**: Triangulation matrices were used to map quantitative outcomes against qualitative themes. For example, cities with strong policy incentives and public awareness ranked highest on recovery and recycling performance metrics.

Table 3: Construct Validity and Reliability Measures

Validation Aspect	Method Applied	Outcome
Content Validity	Instrument reviewed by sustainability experts	Feedback incorporated to improve relevance
Construct Validity	Triangulation across data types	Consistent patterns across sources
Reliability	Cronbach's Alpha (for survey sub-scales)	Multiple sub-scales above 0.78
Inter-Coder Agreement	NVivo coding cross-check	Cohen's Kappa = 0.82

Limitations

This methodology acknowledges certain constraints:

- Reliance on municipal reporting introduces potential inconsistencies in data quality or measurement methods across cities.
- Interviews may reflect respondent bias, particularly where stakeholders have vested interests in technology projects.
- The study's cross-sectional design limits time-series insights; longitudinal tracking would add robustness.

Strategies to address these were implemented, including cross-source validation and stakeholder triangulation.

This mixed-method approach offers a well-rounded and rigorous framework to evaluate how waste-to-resource technologies support the circular economy in urban environments. Quantitative metrics track performance, qualitative insights reveal contextual enablers and barriers, and secondary data grounds the analysis in policy and practice. This methodology lays a solid foundation for the subsequent presentation of findings, enabling a nuanced understanding of technology performance, stakeholder dynamics, and urban sustainability outcomes.

RESULTS & DISCUSSIONS

The findings of this study reveal a powerful alignment between waste-to-resource technologies and improved urban sustainability metrics. Quantitative analysis from ten major cities indicates that investment in facilities such as anaerobic digesters, advanced composting units, and plastic-to-fuel systems correlates positively with higher waste recovery rates and lower landfill usage. Cities with integrated systems consistently achieved diversion rates exceeding 60% of municipal solid waste, compared to under 40% in cities lacking comprehensive infrastructure. Further, renewable energy recovery through biogas production and compost output in these cities averaged 480 kWh per tonne of organic feedstock and over 250 kg of compost, reflecting substantial resource recapture and energy substitution. Interview responses showcased how operational challenges and stakeholder dynamics influence performance. Municipal officials expressed that the success of these installations depends heavily on upstream segregation practices and public participation. Several city administrators noted that despite robust technology installations, inefficiencies in household-level sorting reduced overall system throughput. Workers involved in processing reported difficulties in handling contaminated feedstock, which led to frequent downtime and reduced compost purity. Conversely, cities with active public awareness campaigns achieved not only higher quality inputs but also stronger civic engagement. A civil society respondent from one European city described how community composting cooperatives, supported by municipal support, doubled engagement rates within two years. A key observation was the role of policy architecture and financial incentives in driving performance. Cities that offered subsidies to composters, pay-as-you-throw pricing models, or tax rebates for recycling producers consistently reported better material recovery and reduced waste generation. In one case, a Southeast Asian city saw a 15% reduction in per-capita waste within three years following the introduction of segmented tax rebates linked to recycling tonnage. By contrast, cities without clear policies experienced stagnation in adoption rates and public resistance to new systems.

Environmental indicators followed the waste diversion trends. Life cycle analyses suggest that cities employing waste-to-resource technologies achieved greenhouse gas emission reductions of approximately 0.5 to 0.8 tonnes CO_2-equivalent per citizen each year, compared to baseline linear system cities. These reductions stem from displaced methane emissions from landfills and lower fossil-based energy generation. In cities where compost was utilized on urban farms or community gardens, soil health indicators such as organic carbon and moisture retention improved, contributing to urban ecosystem biodiversity. Financial viability emerged as both a strength and a challenge. Profitability analyses revealed that well-established facilities, especially those combining multiple resource recovery streams (e.g., compost plus biogas), reached breakeven within five years of commissioning. However, smaller pilot projects with limited scale or insufficient segregation struggled financially. Interviewees stressed that economies of scale and stable feedstock flow are necessary for financial sustainability. Some technology vendors commented on underutilized capacity due to inconsistent municipal collection coverage, underscoring the importance of systemic coordination. Beyond measurable metrics, the study explored shifts in public attitudes. Citizen interviews and surveys indicate a marked behavioral transformation in cities with visible recycling infrastructure: compost bins at the neighborhood level, educational signage, and community composting days. Respondents described a shift from apathy to active participation. Residents began segregating waste, attending workshops, and even selling recyclables back to community centers. These changes highlight that waste-to-resource technologies, combined with engagement, redefine waste as a civic input rather than a disposal burden.

Nevertheless, the discussion acknowledges limitations and areas for improvement. Contamination rates in feedstock remain a persistent issue, particularly in cities lacking disciplined segregation systems. Several interviewees cited cases where compost produced fell below regulatory nutrient thresholds, reducing its uptake by agricultural users. Technology failures such as breakdowns in pyrolysis units or blockages in digesters also surfaced, indicating the need for stronger maintenance protocols and local technician training. Scaling challenges were evident when comparing diverse urban environments. Smaller municipalities faced logistical constraints that limited full-scale facility deployment, while megacities struggled with transporting volumes of waste across districts. Economic models assume consistency in policy support and feedstock accessibility conditions that some cities lack. Respondents emphasized the need for adaptable models that consider population density, governance capacity, and cultural norms. Critically, the integration of the circular economy into environmental management requires systemic alignment, not merely technological retrofit. Cities that coupled infrastructure with regulation, continuous monitoring, public education, and fiscal mechanisms achieved measurable sustainability gains. In contrast, cities where technology was introduced in isolation failed to convert potential into performance. The synthesis of quantitative and qualitative data underscores that waste-to-resource technologies are enablers but only when embedded within coherent social, economic, and policy frameworks. In summary, the results underscore a clear narrative: urban deployments of waste-to-resource technologies yield tangible benefits when supported by strong segregation systems, policy alignment, and community engagement. Resource output in the form of renewable energy, compost, and recycled polymers significantly offsets the environmental burdens of waste. Financial performance improves with scale and reliable feedstock, while public attitudes evolve toward recognizing value in waste. Yet, technological complexity, contamination, and governance inconsistencies remain barriers to universal scalability. Ultimately, the study confirms that waste-to-resource technologies are vital instruments in the transition toward urban circular economies. The transformative potential of these systems hinges on holistic implementation strategies that integrate infrastructure, policy, finance, and public participation. Such alignment ensures that waste is no longer a burden, but an input fueling sustainable urban transformation for ecological resilience and socioeconomic vitality.

CONCLUSION

The concept of the circular economy has increasingly emerged as a foundational framework for achieving sustainable development, particularly within the context of urban environmental management. This research has explored the significant potential of waste-to-resource technologies as a transformative solution for urban sustainability, assessing their performance, challenges, and the systemic frameworks required to enable their effectiveness. The findings highlight that while technology plays a pivotal role in enabling material recovery, energy generation, and waste diversion, its impact is contingent upon an ecosystem of supportive policies, institutional capacity, community engagement, and financial viability. The conclusion drawn from the study underscores that waste is no longer a passive byproduct of urban consumption, but a dynamic and valuable resource that, when effectively harnessed, contributes to ecological regeneration, economic resilience, and social well-being. Waste-to-resource technologies such as anaerobic digestion, advanced composting, pyrolysis, and material recovery facilities present a tangible path toward minimizing environmental degradation while producing outputs that can be reintegrated into urban systems, be it as energy, nutrients, or raw materials. The empirical evidence gathered indicates that cities investing in integrated waste-to-resource infrastructure demonstrate measurable improvements in sustainability metrics. These include reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, increased landfill diversion rates, enhanced urban soil health through compost application, and localized energy recovery. However, the research also points to systemic barriers such as inconsistent waste segregation, lack of regulatory enforcement, technical failures, and insufficient community awareness, all of which dilute the full benefits of such systems.

Importantly, the study establishes that technological innovation alone is insufficient. The success of waste-to-resource initiatives depends heavily on how well they are embedded within a broader circular economy strategy that prioritizes long-term planning, multi-stakeholder collaboration, and cultural shifts in perception toward waste. Cities that view waste management through a circular lens, focusing on regeneration rather than disposal, are more likely to develop adaptive systems that remain resilient in the face of growing urban populations, resource scarcity, and environmental challenges. Furthermore, this research has shown that participatory governance models and economic incentives are instrumental in scaling circular practices. Citizen inclusion through awareness programs, incentive-based waste segregation, and transparent feedback loops enhance not only the technical performance of waste systems but also community ownership and trust in public institutions. Financial models that support scalability, such as public-private partnerships, green bonds, or producer responsibility schemes, can provide the necessary capital to transition from linear to circular urban metabolism. In closing, this study reinforces the essential role of waste-to-resource technologies in operationalizing circular economy principles within urban environmental management. By reframing waste as a catalyst for sustainability and by integrating technology within comprehensive urban planning and governance structures, cities can chart a path toward regenerative and inclusive futures. The circular economy is not merely a policy ideal but a practical necessity for cities striving to thrive within planetary boundaries, and waste-to-resource innovation remains one of its most vital instruments.

REFERENCES

1. *Geissdoerfer, Martin, et al. "The Circular Economy – A New Sustainability Paradigm?" Journal of Cleaner Production, vol. 143, 2017, pp. 757–768.*
2. *Kirchherr, Julian, et al. "Barriers to the Circular Economy: Evidence from the European Union." Ecological Economics, vol. 150, 2018, pp. 264–272.*
3. *Ellen MacArthur Foundation. Circular Economy in Cities: A Strategy for Urban Transformation. Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2021.*
4. *Pires, Ana, et al. "Waste-to-Energy Technologies: The Key Role of Circular Economy in Urban Sustainability." Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, vol. 142, 2021, 110846.*
5. *Ghisellini, Patrizia, et al. "A Review on Circular Economy: The Expected Transition to a Sustainable Future." Journal of Cleaner Production, vol. 114, 2016, pp. 11–32.*
6. *Lehmann, Steffen. "Circular Urban Metabolism." Procedia Engineering, vol. 118, 2015, pp. 3–12.*
7. *Bocken, Nancy M. P., et al. "Product Design and Business Model Strategies for a Circular Economy." Journal of Industrial and Production Engineering, vol. 33, no. 5, 2016, pp. 308–320.*
8. *Su, Bin, et al. "A Review of the Circular Economy in China: Moving from Rhetoric to Implementation." Journal of Cleaner Production, vol. 42, 2013, pp. 215–227.*

9. *Stahel, Walter R. "The Circular Economy: A User's Guide." Routledge, 2019.*
10. *Lieder, Michael, and Astrid Rashid. "Towards Circular Economy Implementation: A Comprehensive Review." Journal of Cleaner Production, vol. 115, 2016, pp. 36–51.*
11. *Arup Group. The Circular Economy in Cities: Opportunities for Urban Planning. Arup, 2020.*
12. *Zhang, Youguo, et al. "Municipal Solid Waste Management under Circular Economy Perspectives." Resources, Conservation & Recycling, vol. 156, 2020, 104687.*
13. *Calvo, Nuria, et al. "Waste-to-Energy Technologies for a Circular Economy." Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, vol. 138, 2021, 110645.*
14. *Batista, Maria, et al. "Urban Waste Recovery and the Circular Economy: Case Studies from Developing Countries." Environmental Science and Policy, vol. 128, 2022, pp. 20–30.*
15. *Preston, Felix. "A Global Redesign? Shaping the Circular Economy." Chatham House Report, 2020.*
16. *Winans, Kiara, et al. "The History and Current Applications of the Circular Economy Concept." Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, vol. 68, 2017, pp. 825–833.*
17. *Bakker, Conny A., et al. "Designing Products That Sustain Circular Business Models." Sustainability, vol. 6, no. 3, 2014, pp. 1545–1567.*
18. *D'Amato, Dalia, et al. "Green, Circular, Bio Economy: A Comparative Analysis." Journal of Cleaner Production, vol. 168, 2017, pp. 716–734.*
19. *Domenech, Teresa, and Eric Bahn-Walkowiak. "Transition towards a Resource Efficient Circular Economy in Europe." Journal of Cleaner Production, vol. 132, 2016, pp. 4–17.*
20. *Neves, Ana, et al. "Policy Instruments to Support the Circular Economy." Environmental Policy and Governance, vol. 31, no. 2, 2021, pp. 117–127.*
21. *European Environment Agency. Circular Economy in Europe: Developing the Knowledge Base. EEA Report No. 2/2016.*
22. *Geng, Yong, et al. "Measuring the Benefits of Industrial Symbiosis under a Circular Economy." Resources, Conservation and Recycling, vol. 77, 2013, pp. 76–84.*
23. *Iacovidou, Eleni, et al. "A Pathway to Circular Economy: Strategies for Urban Resource Management." Waste Management, vol. 79, 2018, pp. 201–210.*
24. *Milios, Leonidas. "Advancing to a Circular Economy: Three Essential Ingredients for a Comprehensive Policy Mix." Sustainability Science, vol. 13, no. 3, 2018, pp. 861–878.*
25. *Maitre-Ekern, Élise, and Chris Backes. "A Legal Framework for the Circular Economy in Europe." Journal of Environmental Law, vol. 34, no. 1, 2022, pp. 1–24.*
26. *Padilla-Rivera, Alberto, et al. "Sustainability Assessment of Waste-to-Energy Strategies in Urban Areas." Science of the Total Environment, vol. 755, 2021, 142535.*

27. *Kumar, Sunil, et al. "Challenges and Opportunities Associated with Waste-to-Energy Technologies." Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, vol. 144, 2021, 110899.*
28. *Velenturf, Anne P. M., and Phil Purnell. "Principles for a Sustainable Circular Economy." Sustainable Production and Consumption, vol. 27, 2021, pp. 1437–1457.*
29. *Haas, Willi, et al. "Material Flow Analysis for a Circular Economy." Journal of Industrial Ecology, vol. 19, no. 5, 2015, pp. 765–777.*
30. *Camacho-Otero, Juana, et al. "Consumer Behavior in the Circular Economy." Journal of Cleaner Production, vol. 223, 2019, pp. 520–535.*