

# Review of: "Sustainable Prosperity and Circular Economy in the Care of Mother Earth — The Blue Kiss"

Joseph Sarkis<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Worcester Polytechnic Institute

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

I read through this work, and it is an interesting perspective. It focuses on what has been defined as an emancipatory theoretical perspective. It seeks to integrate political, law, and social thought into the typical technical, business, and analytical discussion (and related theories) of the Circular Economy--but more generally, of sustainability.

Overall, I believe the article gives a good overall history of sustainability, but not necessarily as much depth on the circular economy. As has been stated in many previous works in the field of the circular economy--the circular economy is a polysemous--ambiguous and vague concept. It is a concept that takes on many definitions and can really be defined in many ways. In fact, some argue that the circular economy may actually encourage greater consumption, not necessarily of materials, but of energy, through the rebound effect.

The author takes on the perspective from broader law and social (feminist perspectives) but leaves the reader wanting a bit more depth into these areas, along with a clearer definition of the circular economy. Just focusing on the three "REs" of the circular economy may be limiting, but at least they define it. If you only focus on these elements, the issue that arises is whether recycling, reuse, etc., are really better overall for the environment. There is something called the "rebound effect" of circularity (there are a few articles on this, I will try not to give too many references) which essentially gives permission to use more energy in consumption because there is less guilt. There are issues of whether 'strong sustainability' is really occurring with the circular economy.

But, in reading the article, I was looking for more and stronger evidence and argumentation of eco-feminism and feminist theory with the circular economy. It was light on this topic. Seeing greater focus on what feminist theory (and its sub-theories) say with respect to circularity is important, and it is something that would definitely have been insightful for many circular economy researchers and practitioners. This is why I came here to learn a bit more about this overlap. The author states explicitly, a couple of times, that women have been doing 'eco-efficiency' aspects of circularity. The 'first level'. It is this issue where the author should expand (biomimicry and general sustainability argumentation is nice, but it would have been better to focus on circularity, given it is the leading socio-economic topic in this article).

I would like to see some additional evidence that women are doing this as part of their lives. I do not know actually, if this is true, it may be, but a bit more development and evidence is needed. Some more linkage is important, not all the examples provided necessarily fit the circular economy perspective, or do they (again, this gets back to how do you define circular economy and circularity, it should not necessarily be the same thing as sustainability).

Let's get back to the conclusion section about the various levels. There is some mention at the first level (which needs greater evidence, discussion, and development). But, the last two levels: from the article "At a second level, the reuse and recycling of resources is pursued through supra-company organisations, and finally, at a third level, companies promote integration into different local production and consumption systems, encouraging the transit of resources between industries and urban systems <sup>52</sup>."

I was waiting for the feminist perspective and linkage at these two additional levels. Supra-company organizations at the second level is where a significant portion of circularity can effectively occur, but what does feminist theory say about this level? This detail (maybe it occurred somewhere in the article, but it was not prevalent) is needed. Does it say not enough is being done at that level? Do organizations with greater female involvement in management and operations or boards do this better than other organizations? Does it make a difference? Then we talk about the interorganizational activities, does government come into play? Do cultures and countries with greater gender equity do this better, has it been studied? Who passed the laws? Many, many questions arise. Clearly, not all can be answered, but some guidance on important questions is needed.

Thank you for continuing the conversation, but I was hoping for more relationship between the Blue Kiss and circularity.