pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:12, Issue 11, November-2025 eISSN:2349-5715

INTEGRATING CIRCULAR ECONOMY AND BUSINESS MODEL INNOVATION: A COMPREHENSIVE FRAMEWORK FOR SUSTAINABLE VALUE CREATION

Dr. Alessandra Marino
Department of Management and Sustainability Studies, University of Milan, Italy

ABSTRACT: The circular economy (CE) paradigm has emerged as a transformative approach to achieving sustainable development by emphasizing resource efficiency, waste reduction, and extended product lifecycles. This study provides a comprehensive exploration of circular business models (CBMs), their integration with Industry 4.0 technologies, and their potential to generate both environmental and economic value. By synthesizing extensive literature on CE frameworks, remanufacturing, upgradability, and data-driven decision-making, this research constructs an integrative theoretical framework that links circularity principles to strategic business operations. The methodology adopts a systematic literature review approach, drawing on qualitative content analysis and conceptual synthesis to identify patterns, typologies, and gaps in existing CE research. Findings indicate that CBMs are most effective when underpinned by adaptive, data-informed strategies, incorporating technological enablers such as cloud platforms, predictive analytics, and Internet of Things (IoT) systems. However, the study also identifies persistent challenges, including measurement of environmental value, uncertainty in business model innovation, and alignment of circular principles with traditional linear supply chain structures. The discussion elaborates on the theoretical and managerial implications, proposing pathways for enhanced adoption of CBMs across manufacturing, construction, and service sectors. The research concludes by advocating for a holistic approach that integrates policy, technological innovation, and organizational design to foster sustainable value creation within the circular economy.

Keywords: Circular economy, business models, sustainability, remanufacturing, Industry 4.0, upgradability, supply chain circularity.

INTRODUCTION

The traditional linear economic model—characterized by the extract-produce-consume-dispose paradigm—has increasingly shown its unsustainability due to resource depletion, environmental degradation, and socio-economic inefficiencies. In response, the circular economy (CE) framework has gained global attention as a holistic paradigm aimed at closing material loops, extending product lifecycles, and decoupling economic growth from resource consumption (Lewandowski, 2016; Lahti, Wincent, & Parida, 2018). CE emphasizes restorative and regenerative processes, encompassing strategies such as remanufacturing, product-service systems, and resource recovery.

Despite the conceptual clarity of circular economy principles, translating these principles into actionable business models remains a significant challenge (Linder & Williander, 2017). Circular business models (CBMs) aim to operationalize CE concepts by creating economic value while simultaneously reducing environmental impact. Various typologies of CBMs have been proposed, including product-life extension models, resource recovery models, and sharing platforms (Lüdeke-Freund, Gold, & Bocken, 2019). Each typology embodies distinct strategies for value creation, from remanufacturing and refurbishment to collaborative consumption, yet empirical evidence suggests that the alignment between intended environmental benefits and realized outcomes is often inconsistent (Manninen et al., 2018).

Technological advancements, particularly those associated with Industry 4.0, have been identified as critical enablers of circularity. Large-scale data analytics, cloud computing, and IoT applications facilitate the monitoring of resource flows, predictive maintenance, and optimized product lifecycle management (Jabbour, Jabbour, Sarkis, & Filho, 2019; Lindström et al., 2018). These technologies enhance the operational feasibility of circular strategies, allowing firms to design adaptive business models that respond dynamically to environmental, economic, and regulatory pressures (Lopes de Sousa Jabbour et al., 2018).

Nonetheless, several research gaps persist. Firstly, the integration of circular principles with traditional linear supply chains requires reconceptualization of procurement, production, and logistics systems to enable material circularity (Lahane, Kant, & Shankar, 2020; Kühl et al., 2020). Secondly, the literature reveals a lack of consensus on metrics to measure the environmental and economic performance of CBMs, impeding standardized evaluation and benchmarking (Rosa, Sassanelli, & Terzi, 2019). Thirdly, while remanufacturing and upgradability strategies have been extensively studied, their adoption in service-oriented sectors remains limited, suggesting the need for more inclusive frameworks that account for heterogeneous industry contexts (Khan, Mittal, West, & Wuest, 2018; Jensen et al., 2019).

This research seeks to address these gaps by developing an integrative theoretical framework for circular business models, grounded in comprehensive literature synthesis and conceptual analysis. By bridging technological, operational, and strategic dimensions, the study aims to provide actionable insights for researchers, managers, and policymakers seeking to implement circular practices across industries.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a systematic literature review (SLR) methodology, complemented by qualitative content analysis, to ensure rigor and comprehensive coverage of existing research on circular business models. The SLR approach follows the six-step framework outlined by Machi and McEvoy (2021) and the systems-oriented review guidelines proposed by Levy and Ellis (2006), which emphasize structured search strategies, critical appraisal, and integrative synthesis.

The literature search was conducted across multiple academic databases, including Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, using keyword combinations such as “circular economy,” “circular business models,” “remanufacturing,” “upgradability,” “sustainability,” “Industry 4.0,” and “supply chain circularity.” Inclusion criteria required that articles explicitly focus on CBMs, CE principles, or related technological enablers, published between 2015 and 2025 to capture contemporary trends. Exclusion criteria eliminated papers with insufficient methodological rigor, non-peer-reviewed sources, and studies lacking conceptual or empirical depth.

Following article identification, qualitative content analysis was applied to categorize themes, identify patterns, and synthesize conceptual frameworks (Mayring, 2001; Mayring, 2014). This process involved iterative coding of text segments, cross-referencing of findings across studies, and integration of diverse perspectives into an overarching analytical model. Special attention was paid to identifying gaps in theoretical development, inconsistencies in environmental value capture, and the role of digital technologies in facilitating circular strategies (Jones, 2018).

Furthermore, the research draws on theoretical insights from business model literature, emphasizing complexity, innovation, and value creation (Massa, Viscusi, & Tucci, 2018; Pieroni, McAloone, & Pigosso, 2019). This dual approach—combining systematic review and theoretical analysis—ensures a robust foundation for constructing an integrative framework that captures the multi-dimensional nature of CBMs.

RESULTS

The synthesis of the reviewed literature highlights several critical findings regarding circular business models, technological enablers, and sectoral applications. First, CBMs are increasingly classified into three dominant categories: (1) product-life extension models, which focus on remanufacturing, refurbishment, and upgradability to prolong product usability (Khan et al., 2018; Matsumoto et al., 2016); (2) resource recovery models, which prioritize recycling, waste-to-resource initiatives, and material recirculation (Rosa et al., 2019; Milios, 2018); and (3) sharing and collaborative consumption models, which enable efficient utilization of underused assets through carsharing, equipment pooling, and subscription services (Shams Esfandabadi, Diana, & Zanetti, 2022; Henry et al., 2020).

Second, the literature consistently underscores the critical role of digital technologies in operationalizing circular strategies. For instance, cloud-based platforms facilitate multi-usable infrastructure that supports data-driven decision-making, predictive maintenance, and accelerated product development cycles (Lindström et al., 2018). Similarly, Industry 4.0 technologies, including IoT sensors and advanced analytics, enable firms to monitor material flows, detect inefficiencies, and optimize resource utilization in real time (Lopes de Sousa Jabbour et al., 2018; Jabbour et al., 2019).

Third, the alignment between CBM design and intended environmental value remains a key challenge. Manninen et al. (2018) and Rosa et al. (2019) reveal that many circular strategies fail to deliver the anticipated ecological benefits due to poor integration with supply chains, insufficient measurement frameworks, and limited stakeholder engagement. This highlights the necessity of coupling CBM innovation with performance evaluation systems that capture environmental, economic, and social impacts.

Fourth, sector-specific analyses demonstrate varying degrees of CBM adoption and effectiveness. In manufacturing, remanufacturing and upgradability strategies have shown tangible benefits in automotive and electronics industries (Gunasekara, Gamage, & Punchihewa, 2021; Jensen et al., 2019). In construction, circular approaches focus on material recirculation, design for deconstruction, and integrated project planning to reduce waste and enhance sustainability outcomes (Kanther, 2025; Antwi-Afari, Ng, & Hossain, 2021). In service sectors, sharing-based CBMs are gaining traction in urban mobility and collaborative consumption contexts, yet challenges remain in achieving long-term environmental impact (Shams Esfandabadi et al., 2022).

Finally, the review identifies a growing recognition of the interconnectedness between policy, technology, and business model design. Regulatory frameworks, incentive mechanisms, and cross-sector collaboration are pivotal in fostering the adoption of circular practices, while technological enablers amplify operational feasibility and strategic flexibility (Milios, 2018; Khan, Ahmad, & Majava, 2021). This integrated perspective underscores the complexity and multi-dimensional nature of CBM implementation.

DISCUSSION

The findings underscore the multifaceted nature of circular business model implementation, highlighting both theoretical and practical implications. From a theoretical standpoint, CBMs exemplify the convergence of sustainability science, strategic management, and innovation studies, demanding a holistic analytical lens (Lahti et al., 2018; Pieroni et al., 2019). The integration of technological enablers with business strategies exemplifies socio-technical systems thinking, where human, organizational, and technological components collectively influence outcomes (Lopes de Sousa Jabbour et al., 2018).

However, several limitations in existing literature warrant critical reflection. Firstly, empirical research often emphasizes discrete technological interventions or individual CBM typologies without fully exploring the dynamic interactions among multiple circular strategies (Linder & Williander, 2017; Lewandowski, 2016). Secondly, the measurement of environmental and social value remains underdeveloped. Although theoretical models propose potential sustainability gains, real-world validation is limited, resulting in a "circularity gap" that undermines strategic decision-making (Antwi-Afari et al., 2021). Thirdly, uncertainty in business model innovation poses risks for firms attempting to adopt CBMs, particularly in volatile market environments where regulatory frameworks and consumer preferences evolve rapidly (Linder & Williander, 2017).

Future research should adopt integrative methodologies that combine qualitative and quantitative assessment, longitudinal studies, and sectoral comparative analyses to capture the complex interplay between CBM design, technological enablement, and environmental outcomes (Mayring, 2014; Machi & McEvoy, 2021). Moreover, greater attention is required on the adoption of CBMs in service-oriented sectors, where intangible assets and collaborative platforms necessitate novel operational and measurement approaches (Kühl et al., 2020; Shams Esfandabadi et al., 2022).

Managerially, the implications are equally profound. Firms seeking to implement CBMs must consider strategic alignment with digital capabilities, stakeholder engagement, and regulatory compliance. Decision-makers should prioritize adaptive models that integrate predictive analytics, cloud platforms, and IoT-enabled monitoring to ensure efficient resource use and performance evaluation (Lindström et al., 2018; Jabbour et al., 2019). Additionally, collaboration across supply chain networks, circular start-ups, and public policy institutions can enhance knowledge transfer, innovation diffusion, and systemic sustainability outcomes (Henry et al., 2020; Milios, 2018).

CONCLUSION

This study advances the theoretical and practical understanding of circular business models by synthesizing extensive literature on CE, technological enablers, and sector-specific applications. CBMs emerge as critical instruments for achieving sustainable value creation, particularly when integrated with Industry 4.0 technologies and adaptive operational strategies. The research highlights persistent challenges, including measurement of environmental benefits, uncertainty in business model innovation, and sectoral disparities in adoption. Addressing these challenges requires a holistic approach encompassing policy support, technological innovation, and organizational design. By providing an integrative framework, this study contributes to the growing body of knowledge on circular economy implementation, offering pathways for firms, policymakers, and researchers to advance sustainability through strategic circularity.

REFERENCES

1. Abideen, A. Z., Pyeman, J., Sundram, V. P. K., Tseng, M.-L., & Sorooshian, S. (2021). Leveraging Capabilities of Technology into a Circular Supply Chain to Build Circular Business Models: A State-of-the-Art Systematic Review. Sustainability, 13, 8997. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13168997

2. Antwi-Afari, P., Ng, S. T., & Hossain, M. U. (2021). A review of the circularity gap in the construction industry through scientometric analysis. Journal of Cleaner Production, 298, 126870. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.126870

3. Gunasekara, H. N. W., Gamage, J. R., & Punchihewa, H. K. G. (2021). Remanufacture for sustainability: a comprehensive business model for automotive parts remanufacturing. International Journal of Sustainable Engineering, 14(6), 1386–1395.

https://doi.org/10.1080/19397038.2021.1990437

4. Henry, M., Bauwens, T., Hekkert, M., & Kirchherr, J. (2020). A typology of circular start-ups: An Analysis of 128 circular business models. Journal of Cleaner Production, 245, 118528. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.118528

5. Jabbour, C., Jabbour, A., Sarkis, J., & Filho, M. (2019). Unlocking the circular economy through new business models based on large-scale data: An integrative framework and research agenda. Technological Forecasting and Social Change.

6. Jensen, J., Prendeville, S., Bocken, N., & Peck, D. (2019). Creating sustainable value through remanufacturing: Three industry cases. Journal of Cleaner Production, 218, 304–314.

7. Jones, M. (2018). What we talk about when we talk about (big) data.

8. Kanther, S. D. (2025). Integrating circular business models in construction: A framework for design and planning to enhance sustainability. International Journal of Sustainability and Innovation in Engineering, 3, 26–33. https://doi.org/10.56830/IJSIE202502

9. Khan, I. S., Ahmad, M. O., & Majava, J. (2021). Industry 4.0 and sustainable development: A systematic mapping of triple bottom line, Circular Economy and Sustainable Business Models perspectives. Journal of Cleaner Production, 297, 126655. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.126655

10. Khan, M., Mittal, S., West, S., & Wuest, T. (2018). Review on upgradability – A product lifetime extension strategy in the context of product service systems. Journal of Cleaner Production, 204, 1154–1168.

11. Kühl, C., Bourlakis, M., Aktas, E., & Skipworth, H. (2020). How does servitisation affect supply chain circularity? – A systematic literature review. Journal of Enterprise Information Management, 33(4), 703–728. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEIM-01-2019-0024

12. Lahti, T., Wincent, J., & Parida, V. (2018). A definition and theoretical review of the circular economy, value creation, and sustainable business models: Where are we now and where should research move in the future? Sustainability (Switzerland), 10(8).

13. Lahane, S., Kant, R., & Shankar, R. (2020). Circular supply chain management: A state-of-art review and future opportunities. Journal of Cleaner Production, 258, 120859. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120859

14. Lewandowski, M. (2016). Designing the business models for circular economy-towards the conceptual framework. Sustainability (Switzerland), 8(1), 1–28.

15. Linder, M., & Williander, M. (2017). Circular Business Model Innovation: Inherent Uncertainties. Business Strategy and the Environment, 26(2), 182–196.

16. Lindström, J., Hermanson, A., Blomstedt, F., & Kyösti, P. (2018). A multi-usable cloud service platform: A case study on improved development pace and efficiency. Applied Sciences, 8(316), 1–14.

17. Lopes de Sousa Jabbour, A., Jabbour, C., Godinho Filho, M., & Roubaud, D. (2018). Industry 4.0 and the circular economy: a proposed research agenda and original roadmap for sustainable operations.

Annals of Operations Research, 270(1), 273–286.

18. Lüdeke-Freund, F., Gold, S., & Bocken, N. (2019). A Review and Typology of Circular Economy Business Model Patterns. Journal of Industrial Ecology, 23(1), 36–61.

19. Manninen, K., Koskela, S., Antikainen, R., Bocken, N., Dahlbo, H., & Aminoff, A. (2018). Do circular economy business models capture intended environmental value propositions? Journal of Cleaner Production, 171, 413–422.

20. Massa, L., Viscusi, G., & Tucci, C. (2018). Business models and complexity. Journal of Business Models, 6(1), 70–82.

21. Matsumoto, M., Yang, S., Martinsen, K., & Kainuma, Y. (2016). Trends and research challenges in remanufacturing. International Journal of Precision Engineering and Manufacturing - Green Technology, 3(1), 129–142.

22. Mayring, P. (2001). Combination and Integration of Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis. Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 2(1). https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-2.1.967

23. Mayring, P. (2014). Qualitative content analysis: theoretical foundation, basic procedures and software solution. In A. Bikner-Ahsbahs, C. Knipping, & N. Presmeg (Eds.), Approaches to Qualitative Research in Mathematics Education. Springer, Dordrecht. https://