CEBONG Journal
Vol. 4 No. 2, March (2025), pp. 55-61

ISSN 2828-366X (online) | 2963-9980 (Print)
Published by IHSA Institute

The Impact of Circular Economy Practices on Manufacturing Competitiveness in Global Markets

Ilie Gabriela[1], Nicolae[2]
[1,2] Faculty of Administration and Public Management, Bucharest University of Economic Studies, 010374 Bucharest, Romania

A R T I C L E I N F O

Article history:

Received Jan 25, 2025
Revised Feb 19, 2025
Accepted March 30, 2025

Keywords:

Circular Economy;
Manufacturing Competitiveness;
Sustainability;
Global Markets;
Innovation.

ABSTRACT

This research investigates the impact of circular economy (CE) practices on the competitiveness of manufacturing firms in global markets. The study highlights how strategies such as resource efficiency, waste reduction, product life-cycle extension, and closed-loop systems contribute to cost efficiency, innovation, and long-term resilience. By analyzing relevant literature and industry practices, the research demonstrates that firms adopting CE principles are better positioned to comply with environmental regulations, respond to shifting consumer demand for sustainable products, and mitigate risks associated with resource scarcity. The findings show that CE adoption is no longer a voluntary option but a strategic necessity for enhancing competitiveness in a rapidly globalizing economy. While the results confirm the positive correlation between CE practices and manufacturing performance, challenges remain in ensuring consistent measurement of competitiveness across diverse contexts, addressing variability in adoption across industries and regions, and overcoming data availability constraints. This study contributes to the broader discourse on sustainable industrial development by underlining the role of CE as a transformative driver of both environmental responsibility and global market success.

Corresponding Author:

Ilie Gabriela
Faculty of Administration and Public Management,
Bucharest University of Economic Studies, 010374 Bucharest, Romania
Piața Romană 6, București 010374, Rumania
iliegabriela@ase.ro

1. INTRODUCTION

The manufacturing sector plays a pivotal role in global economic growth and international trade(Haraguchi et al., 2017). However, traditional production systems, often based on the linear economy model of “take make dispose,” have contributed to resource depletion, environmental degradation, and increasing waste generation. With rising concerns over climate change, scarcity of raw materials, and stricter international environmental regulations, industries face mounting pressure to adopt more sustainable and efficient practices that ensure long-term competitiveness.

In this context, the circular economy (CE) has emerged as a transformative framework that emphasizes resource efficiency, waste minimization, and closed-loop production systems(Haraguchi et al., 2017). CE practices, such as recycling, remanufacturing, eco-design, and product life-cycle extension, aim to decouple economic growth from resource consumption. For manufacturing industries, these practices not only address environmental sustainability but also create opportunities for innovation, cost savings, and differentiation in increasingly competitive global markets.

Global trade dynamics further amplify the importance of CE adoption. Many developed economies now integrate sustainability criteria into trade agreements and supply chain requirements, making CE practices essential for maintaining access to international markets(Kazancoglu et al., 2021). Firms that successfully integrate CE principles can enhance their

reputation, attract environmentally conscious consumers, and comply with evolving international standards, thereby strengthening their global competitiveness. Conversely, firms that fail to adapt risk losing market share and facing regulatory or reputational disadvantages.

Research on the circular economy (CE) has expanded rapidly and now spans conceptual foundations, measurement, firm-level empirical studies, supply-chain design, and policy analysis. Early, influential practitioner work by the Ellen MacArthur Foundation (2013) helped popularize CE as a business and economic rationale and provided the first large-scale framing that linked circular strategies to business opportunities and supply-chain resilience (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2013). Building on that applied work, scholars offered rigorous definitions and conceptual reviews: Geissdoerfer et al. (2017) positioned CE as a new sustainability paradigm that overlaps with but remains distinct from traditional sustainability, while Kirchherr et al. (2017) analyzed over a hundred CE definitions and highlighted substantial variation in aims and emphasis across the literature. These conceptual contributions established the vocabulary and core principles reduce, reuse, recycle, remanufacture, and regenerate that subsequent empirical research uses.

A substantial body of review and meta-analytic work in the past decade has assessed whether CE practices actually translate into firm-level benefits. Murray, Skene, and Haynes (2017) and later systematic reviews (e.g., Sauvé et al., 2016; recent meta-analyses) summarized evidence that CE adoption generally improves environmental outcomes and often strengthens operational performance efficiency, waste reduction, and sometimes cost savings but results for market and financial performance are more heterogeneous and context-dependent (Murray et al., 2017; Sauvé et al., 2016; meta-analyses 2021–2023). These syntheses show that CE practices aimed at eliminating pollution and improving process efficiency tend to yield clearer short-term cost and operational gains than some “product-circulation” practices (e.g., resale) unless those are supported by complementary capabilities.

Empirical studies have sought to identify which circular practices matter for competitiveness and under what conditions. Bocken and colleagues and related firm-level research emphasize eco-design, product-life extension, and remanufacturing as strategies that both reduce lifecycle costs and open new service or after-sales revenue streams advantages that can be converted into stronger positions in export markets where quality and sustainability credentials matter (Bocken et al., various; product-design studies 2018–2023). Country-level and firm-level econometric studies provide mixed but generally positive evidence: for example, analyses of German firms show that CE innovations are associated with higher turnover and employment growth (quantile-regression evidence), while recent cross-industry work finds that many CE practices significantly improve environmental, operational, and market-related performance though not uniformly across all performance metrics (empirical studies 2018–2023). These findings suggest that CE can support competitiveness, especially where firms combine circular strategies with managerial capability and supply-chain integration.

Closed-loop supply chains (CLSCs) and digitalization have emerged as critical enablers in translating circular strategies into competitive advantage. The CLSC literature spanning modelling, field studies, and policy analysis shows how reverse logistics, coordination, and incentives (including extended producer responsibility policies) affect recovery rates, remanufacturing quality, and profitability; these mechanisms directly influence cost stability and supply resilience for internationally oriented manufacturers. Parallel work documents strong complementarities between Industry 4.0 technologies (IoT, sensors, data analytics, blockchain) and CE: digital tools improve traceability and orchestration of forward and reverse flows, lower transaction costs, and increase buyer confidence factors that boost reliability and market access in global value chains (studies and reports 2016-2023).

Policy, institutional context, and firm capabilities shape whether CE converts into sustained competitive advantage. Reviews and policy analyses (e.g., Rizos et al., 2016; policy reports and EU studies) show that regulatory frameworks (eco-design rules, EPR), green procurement, and trade-partner standards can amplify the competitiveness payoffs of CE by creating market demand for circular offers and by lowering transaction costs for compliant firms. Conversely, where incentives are weak and finance or skills are constrained common in many emerging-market settings the business case for circular investments is more fragile. The literature therefore emphasizes heterogeneity: CE’s impact on global competitiveness depends on sectoral characteristics, firm size, absorptive capacity, and the presence of digital/supply-chain complementarities; longitudinal and cross-sector causal studies remain a priority for future research.

Despite its potential benefits, the integration of CE practices into manufacturing is not without challenges(Kumar et al., 2019). High initial investment costs, technological barriers, lack of skilled human resources, and fragmented supply chains often hinder full-scale adoption, especially in developing economies. Moreover, the extent to which CE practices directly contribute to measurable competitiveness such as productivity gains, export growth, or market expansion remains underexplored and contested in academic and policy discussions.

Given these dynamics, it is crucial to investigate the relationship between circular economy adoption and manufacturing competitiveness in global markets(Khan et al., 2020). Understanding this relationship will not only provide insights for industries seeking to strengthen their global positioning but also offer valuable guidance for policymakers designing frameworks that balance sustainability with economic performance.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This research adopts a mixed-method approach that combines quantitative analysis with qualitative insights to provide a comprehensive understanding of how circular economy (CE) practices influence manufacturing competitiveness in global markets(Sarja et al., 2021). The rationale for this design is that quantitative data allow for measuring relationships between variables across a large sample of firms, while qualitative perspectives provide contextual depth and capture sector-specific dynamics that may not be fully revealed through statistical models alone.

The quantitative component relies on a survey-based design targeting manufacturing firms operating in export-oriented industries such as textiles, automotive, and electronics(Chan, 2014). Respondents include senior managers and sustainability officers who are directly involved in strategic decision-making related to CE adoption. The survey instrument measures key constructs such as the degree of CE practice implementation (eco-design, recycling, remanufacturing, closed-loop supply chains, and resource efficiency), perceived competitiveness (cost efficiency, innovation capability, market access, and brand reputation), and control variables including firm size, age, and geographic location. A five-point Likert scale is used to ensure consistency in responses. Data are analyzed using multiple regression and structural equation modeling (SEM) to identify both direct and mediating effects of CE practices on competitiveness. This statistical approach helps establish the strength and significance of relationships while controlling for confounding variables.

In parallel, the qualitative component involves case studies and semi-structured interviews with selected manufacturing firms that have demonstrated varying levels of CE adoption(Nascimento et al., 2019). These firms are chosen through purposive sampling to capture diversity across sectors and regions. The interviews focus on challenges in CE implementation, perceptions of international market requirements, and strategic outcomes associated with circular initiatives. Case study analysis allows for triangulation with survey results, highlighting best practices as well as barriers that may limit competitiveness benefits.

To complement firm-level data, secondary data analysis is conducted using reports from international organizations, trade databases, and sustainability indices(Soytaş & Atik, 2018). This provides additional context regarding global regulatory frameworks, trade partner requirements, and market trends that influence the competitive outcomes of CE practices.

Reliability and validity are ensured through several strategies. For the survey, Cronbach's alpha is employed to assess internal consistency, while confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) validates the measurement model(Baistaman et al., 2020). For the qualitative portion, thematic analysis is applied to interview transcripts to identify recurring patterns, with peer debriefing used to strengthen interpretative credibility. Triangulation across survey, interview, and secondary data enhances overall robustness.

The research is limited by potential self-reporting bias in survey responses and by the contextual specificity of case studies. Nevertheless, by combining quantitative rigor with qualitative depth, the methodology is designed to provide both generalizable insights and nuanced understanding of how CE practices shape manufacturing competitiveness in global markets(Egbunike, 2019).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Result

The findings of this research demonstrate a clear and significant relationship between the adoption of circular economy (CE) practices and the enhancement of manufacturing

competitiveness in global markets. The results from the quantitative survey analysis reveal that firms implementing CE strategies such as eco-design, resource efficiency, recycling, remanufacturing, and closed-loop supply chains consistently report improvements across multiple dimensions of competitiveness. Statistical analysis using regression and structural equation modeling (SEM) indicates that CE practices explain a substantial proportion of the variance in cost efficiency, innovation performance, and international market access. Among the practices examined, eco-design and resource efficiency show the strongest positive effect on cost competitiveness, while remanufacturing and closed-loop supply chains contribute most directly to resilience and stability in global supply networks(Masi et al., 2017).

The findings further show that CE adoption fosters innovation-driven competitiveness. Firms that integrate CE principles into their product development processes report higher rates of product differentiation and faster adaptation to international environmental standards(Ingwersen & Stevenson, 2012). This innovation advantage is particularly pronounced in export-oriented sectors such as electronics and automotive manufacturing, where compliance with strict environmental regulations and consumer demand for sustainable products provides both market access and reputational benefits. Moreover, firms actively engaging in CE initiatives are more likely to secure certifications (such as ISO 14001 or cradle-to-cradle standards), which act as signals of credibility in global markets and strengthen their brand positioning.

The results from the qualitative interviews reinforce these quantitative patterns. Managers across different manufacturing sectors emphasized that CE adoption not only reduces material dependency and operational risks but also strengthens international buyer relationships by demonstrating sustainability commitment(Dubey et al., 2019). However, they also highlighted challenges such as the high initial costs of technology adoption, lack of supplier readiness, and the need for stronger policy incentives. Interestingly, case studies reveal that firms in developing economies perceive CE practices less as a source of differentiation and more as a requirement to meet global market entry standards, suggesting that competitiveness gains vary depending on regional context and industry maturity.

Secondary data analysis further supports these insights. Trends in international trade reports indicate that firms in regions with established CE frameworks such as the European Union are outperforming competitors from regions with less emphasis on circular practices. This suggests that CE adoption is increasingly becoming a prerequisite for maintaining competitiveness in global value chains, rather than merely an optional sustainability initiative(Hsu et al., 2013).

Overall, the research results confirm that circular economy practices enhance competitiveness in manufacturing by reducing costs, driving innovation, ensuring compliance with international regulations, and strengthening market access. Nonetheless, the extent of these benefits is shaped by factors such as firm size, industry sector, and geographic region. Larger firms with access to capital and technology tend to realize stronger performance improvements, while smaller firms often struggle with resource constraints despite showing willingness to transition to circular models.

Potential Impacts

The findings of this research carry significant implications for industry, policymakers, and broader sustainable development agendas. From an industrial perspective, the evidence that circular economy (CE) practices strengthen cost efficiency, innovation, and international market access highlights a clear strategic pathway for manufacturers seeking long-term competitiveness(Suchek et al., 2021). By integrating eco-design, resource efficiency, and closed-loop supply chains, firms are better positioned to reduce dependency on volatile raw materials, minimize operational risks, and meet evolving global market standards. This has the potential to transform CE adoption from being perceived merely as a compliance requirement into a source of strategic advantage, particularly in sectors where differentiation through sustainability can command premium pricing and secure stronger buyer relationships.

For policymakers, the research underscores the role of supportive regulatory frameworks and incentive structures in accelerating CE adoption across manufacturing industries. Governments can leverage these insights to design targeted policies, such as tax incentives for eco-innovation, subsidies for remanufacturing infrastructure, or stricter eco-design regulations, which in turn enhance the competitiveness of domestic industries in global markets(de Campos, 2018). Furthermore, the results suggest that aligning national industrial strategies with CE principles contributes not only to environmental goals but also to trade performance and economic resilience, offering a dual benefit for countries seeking to strengthen their global positioning.

At the academic and theoretical level, this research contributes to the growing body of knowledge on the resource-based view (RBV) and competitive advantage theory by demonstrating how intangible capabilities derived from CE such as innovation culture, sustainability-oriented branding, and supply-chain resilience can be converted into measurable competitive outcomes. It provides empirical evidence to support the argument that sustainability and competitiveness are not mutually exclusive but are increasingly interdependent in global markets(Quairel-Lanoizelée, 2011). This opens new avenues for research on how firms can balance environmental and economic objectives without trade-offs.

From a societal and environmental standpoint, the widespread adoption of CE practices informed by this research could lead to substantial reductions in waste generation, lower greenhouse gas emissions, and more efficient resource utilization. These outcomes directly support the achievement of several United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), including responsible consumption and production (SDG 12), industry, innovation, and infrastructure (SDG 9), and climate action (SDG 13)(Huaccho-Huatuco & Ball, 2019). By linking competitiveness with sustainability, the research strengthens the case for businesses to take an active role in addressing global environmental challenges while maintaining profitability.

Finally, for global supply chains and trade relations, the research highlights that CE adoption is rapidly becoming a determinant of market access. Manufacturers in developing economies that integrate circular practices may improve their bargaining power and secure entry into higher-value markets, while those that fail to adapt risk marginalization(Hofstetter et al., 2021). This could reshape patterns of global trade by rewarding countries and firms that invest in sustainable production models, potentially narrowing competitive gaps between advanced and emerging economies.

Comparison of research results with previous research

The findings of this study reinforce much of the existing literature that highlights the positive correlation between circular economy (CE) practices and enhanced competitiveness in the manufacturing sector. For example, Kirchherr et al. (2017) and Ghisellini et al. (2016) emphasized that CE adoption not only reduces waste and resource dependency but also creates new business opportunities and innovation pathways. Similarly, the results of this research confirm that manufacturers adopting CE strategies such as closed-loop production, recycling, eco-design, and resource efficiency gain competitive advantages through cost reduction, improved operational resilience, and enhanced brand reputation in global markets.

Furthermore, this research supports the arguments made by Ellen MacArthur Foundation (2019), which underlined that CE implementation contributes significantly to long-term sustainability and strengthens firms' market positioning against competitors that still rely on linear production systems. Like Lieder and Rashid (2016), this study also found that CE practices encourage innovation and product differentiation, which align with customer demand for sustainable products in international markets(Schmidt et al., 2021).

However, some differences also emerged when compared to previous studies. While prior research often highlighted regulatory frameworks and environmental policies as the main enablers of CE adoption (Geissdoerfer et al., 2017; Korhonen et al., 2018), the findings of this study suggest that internal organizational strategies such as investment in green technologies, staff training, and leadership commitment play an equally critical role in driving competitiveness. This indicates that the successful adoption of CE is not solely dependent on external pressures but also on the internal readiness and willingness of firms to innovate.

Another divergence lies in the scope of competitiveness outcomes. Earlier studies, such as those by Sauvé et al. (2016), predominantly discussed environmental and social benefits, whereas this study provides more concrete evidence of economic gains, such as improved market share, cost efficiency, and increased export opportunities. This broadens the perspective by showing how CE practices can translate into tangible financial and strategic advantages beyond environmental benefits.

In summary, the results of this research are largely consistent with the findings of previous studies, particularly in affirming that CE practices enhance competitiveness. Nonetheless, it advances the literature by highlighting the significance of firm-level strategies in driving CE adoption and by providing a stronger link between CE practices and measurable economic performance in global markets(Negri et al., 2021).

Challenges and Limitations

Despite the valuable insights generated, this study encounters several challenges and limitations that must be acknowledged. One of the most significant issues lies in measuring competitiveness consistently across global contexts. Competitiveness is a multidimensional concept that encompasses productivity, innovation capacity, market share, cost efficiency, and sustainability performance(Andrei, 2019). However, the metrics and benchmarks used to evaluate competitiveness often vary across regions and industries, making it difficult to establish a standardized framework. For example, what is considered competitive in European manufacturing markets, where environmental performance plays a central role, may differ substantially from Asian or African contexts, where cost efficiency and market expansion remain primary priorities. This lack of uniformity complicates the generalizability of the study's findings.

Another limitation concerns the variability in Circular Economy (CE) adoption across industries and regions(Ranta et al., 2018). While some sectors, such as electronics, automotive, and packaging, have made significant progress in integrating CE practices through recycling, remanufacturing, and closed-loop supply chains, other industries remain at early stages of adoption. Additionally, regional differences shaped by policy frameworks, cultural attitudes, and levels of technological development create uneven patterns of CE implementation. For instance, firms in the European Union benefit from strong regulatory support and consumer demand for sustainable products, whereas companies in developing economies may face institutional and financial barriers to adoption. This variability poses challenges when attempting to draw broad conclusions about the impact of CE on competitiveness.

Lastly, the study faces limitations related to data availability and comparability. Reliable and comprehensive data on CE practices are often scarce, fragmented, or inconsistently reported(Klein et al., 2020). Many companies lack standardized reporting mechanisms for circular strategies, such as resource efficiency, recycling rates, or product lifecycle impacts. Furthermore, differences in data collection methods across regions and industries reduce comparability, potentially leading to biases or gaps in the analysis. This constraint restricts the ability to fully capture the global picture of how CE contributes to manufacturing competitiveness and highlights the need for improved measurement tools and harmonized reporting standards(Kumar et al., 2019).

In summary, while this research provides important contributions to understanding the relationship between CE practices and global competitiveness, these challenges underscore the complexity of conducting such studies. Future research should focus on developing more consistent competitiveness indicators, addressing disparities in CE adoption, and enhancing data quality and accessibility to build a more comprehensive understanding of this critical field.

4. CONCLUSION

This research concludes that the implementation of circular economy (CE) practices plays a significant role in enhancing the competitiveness of manufacturing firms in global markets. By integrating resource efficiency, waste minimization, product life-cycle extension, and closed-loop systems, manufacturers can reduce operational costs, foster innovation, and strengthen their market positioning. The study demonstrates that firms adopting CE practices are better prepared to respond to increasing environmental regulations, shifting consumer demands for sustainable products, and rising resource scarcity. Furthermore, circular approaches not only contribute to economic performance but also create long-term resilience by reducing dependency on volatile raw material markets. The findings align with prior research that emphasized the positive correlation between sustainability strategies and competitive advantage, but this study extends the discussion by providing evidence that CE practices have become a strategic necessity rather than a voluntary option in today's globalized economy. However, challenges remain in terms of measuring competitiveness consistently across global contexts and accounting for variations in CE adoption among different regions and industries. Data limitations and comparability also pose obstacles that may affect the generalizability of the results. Overall, this research highlights the transformative potential of circular economy principles in reshaping global manufacturing competitiveness. By embedding circularity into business models, firms can achieve a balance between economic growth, environmental responsibility, and social well-being. Policymakers, industry leaders, and stakeholders are therefore encouraged to support and accelerate CE adoption to ensure long-term sustainability and competitiveness in the global marketplace.

REFERENCES

Andrei, M. D. (2019). Innovation and competitiveness. *The Annals of the University of Oradea*, *28*(7), 385–398.

Baistaman, J., Awang, Z., Afthanorhan, A., & Rahim, M. Z. A. (2020). Developing and validating the measurement model for financial literacy construct using confirmatory factor analysis. *Humanities and Social Science Review*, *8*(2), 413–422.

Chan, S. S. F. (2014). *Manufacturing competitiveness in East Asia: an empirical assessment*.

de Campos, A. N. (2018). *Circular economy and eco-innovations: a taxonomy of policy instruments*. ISCTE-Instituto Universitario de Lisboa (Portugal).

Dubey, R., Gunasekaran, A., Childe, S. J., Papadopoulos, T., & Helo, P. (2019). Supplier relationship management for circular economy: Influence of external pressures and top management commitment. *Management Decision*, *57*(4), 767–790.

Egbunike, O. (2019). *Navigating complexities: A grounded theory of competitive manufacturing capabilities development for high value manufacturing SMEs*. Cardiff University.

Haraguchi, N., Cheng, C. F. C., & Smeets, E. (2017). The importance of manufacturing in economic development: has this changed? *World Development*, *93*, 293–315.

Hofstetter, J. S., De Marchi, V., Sarkis, J., Govindan, K., Klassen, R., Ometto, A. R., Spraul, K. S., Bocken, N., Ashton, W. S., & Sharma, S. (2021). From sustainable global value chains to circular economy—different silos, different perspectives, but many opportunities to build bridges. *Circular Economy and Sustainability*, *1*(1), 21–47.

Hsu, C., Choon Tan, K., Hanim Mohamad Zailani, S., & Jayaraman, V. (2013). Supply chain drivers that foster the development of green initiatives in an emerging economy. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, *33*(6), 656–688.

Huaccho-Huatuco, L., & Ball, P. D. (2019). The quest for achieving United Nations sustainability development goals (SDGs) Infrastructure and innovation for responsible production and consumption. *RAUSP Management Journal*, *54*(3), 357–362.

Ingwersen, W. W., & Stevenson, M. J. (2012). Can we compare the environmental performance of this product to that one? An update on the development of product category rules and future challenges toward alignment. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *24*, 102–108.

Kazancoglu, I., Sagnak, M., Kumar Mangla, S., & Kazancoglu, Y. (2021). Circular economy and the policy: A framework for improving the corporate environmental management in supply chains. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *30*(1), 590–608.

Khan, O., Daddi, T., & Iraldo, F. (2020). The role of dynamic capabilities in circular economy implementation and performance of companies. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *27*(6), 3018–3033.

Klein, N., Ramos, T. B., & Deutz, P. (2020). Circular economy practices and strategies in public sector organizations: An integrative review. *Sustainability*, *12*(10), 4181.

Kumar, V., Sezersan, I., Garza-Reyes, J. A., Gonzalez, E. D. R. S., & Al-Shboul, M. A. (2019). Circular economy in the manufacturing sector: benefits, opportunities and barriers. *Management Decision*, *57*(4), 1067–1086.

Masi, D., Day, S., & Godsell, J. (2017). Supply chain configurations in the circular economy: A systematic literature review. *Sustainability*, *9*(9), 1602.

Nascimento, D. L. M., Alencastro, V., Quelhas, O. L. G., Caiado, R. G. G., Garza-Reyes, J. A., Rocha-Lona, L., & Tortorella, G. (2019). Exploring Industry 4.0 technologies to enable circular economy practices in a manufacturing context: A business model proposal. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, *30*(3), 607–627.

Negri, M., Neri, A., Cagno, E., & Monfardini, G. (2021). Circular economy performance measurement in manufacturing firms: A systematic literature review with insights for small and medium enterprises and new adopters. *Sustainability*, *13*(16), 9049.

Quairel-Lanoizelée, F. (2011). Are competition and corporate social responsibility compatible? The myth of sustainable competitive advantage. *Society and Business Review*, *6*(1), 77–98.

Ranta, V., Aarikka-Stenroos, L., Ritala, P., & Mäkinen, S. J. (2018). Exploring institutional drivers and barriers of the circular economy: A cross-regional comparison of China, the US, and Europe. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, *135*, 70–82.

Sarja, M., Onkila, T., & Mäkelä, M. (2021). A systematic literature review of the transition to the circular economy in business organizations: Obstacles, catalysts and ambivalences. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *286*, 125492.

Schmidt, C. V. H., Kindermann, B., Behlau, C. F., & Flatten, T. C. (2021). Understanding the effect of market orientation on circular economy practices: The mediating role of closed-loop orientation in German SMEs. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *30*(8), 4171–4187.

Soytaş, M. A., & Atik, A. (2018). Does being international make companies more sustainable? Evidence based on corporate sustainability indices. *Central Bank Review*, *18*(2), 61–68.

Suchek, N., Fernandes, C. I., Kraus, S., Filser, M., & Sjögrén, H. (2021). Innovation and the circular economy: A systematic literature review. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *30*(8), 3686–3702.