

Contributions of sociometabolic research to sustainability science

Helmut Haberl^{1*}, Dominik Wiedenhofer^{1,4}, Stefan Pauliuk^{2,4}, Fridolin Krausmann¹, Daniel B. Müller³ and Marina Fischer-Kowalski^{1,4}

Recent high-level agreements such as the Paris Agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals aim at mitigating climate change, ecological degradation and biodiversity loss while pursuing social goals such as reducing hunger or poverty. Systemic approaches bridging natural and social sciences are required to support these agendas. The surging human use of biophysical resources (materials, energy) results from the pursuit of social and economic goals, while driving global environmental change. Sociometabolic research links the study of socioeconomic processes with biophysical processes and thus plays a pivotal role in understanding society–nature interactions. It includes a broad range of systems science approaches for measuring, analysing and modelling of biophysical stocks and flows as well as the services they provide to society. Here we outline and systematize major sociometabolic research traditions that study the biophysical basis of economic activity: urban metabolism, the multi-scale integrated assessment of societal and ecosystem metabolism, biophysical economics, material and energy flow analysis, and environmentally extended input–output analysis. Examples from recent research demonstrate strengths and weaknesses of sociometabolic research. We discuss future research directions that could also help to enrich related fields.

Transformations towards a sustainable future, as manifested in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), require substantial development efforts in many parts of the world. Human use of Earth's biophysical resources, such as energy, materials or land, needs to be strongly reduced or altered to avoid severe ecological degradation and mitigate climate change^{1–3}. Too often, these challenges are tackled independently or even at the expense of one another, while they are indeed strongly interlinked. Examples include the expected economic damages resulting from global warming⁴, the economic affordability, resource requirements and environmental impacts of low-carbon technologies^{5,6}, and the manifold interdependencies between sustainability and energy use⁷. Quantitative, comprehensive research capable of linking social, economic and environmental domains is hence required to guide and monitor progress towards sustainability^{8,9}. Systemic interdisciplinary research frameworks help to integrate scientific knowledge from different disciplines, across the great divides between natural and social sciences as well as the humanities. They provide common definitions and system boundaries, and guide indicator, database and model development. Application of too narrow or ambiguous system boundaries as well as oversimplification of complex interactions may result in misleading research outcomes if fundamental conflicts among SDGs, synergies and other systemic effects are neglected¹⁰.

Overview and definitions

Sociometabolic research (SMR) is a systems approach to studying society–nature interactions at different spatiotemporal scales. It is based on the assumption that social systems and ecosystems are complex systems that reproduce themselves, interact with each other and co-evolve over time^{11–13}. Social metabolism encompasses biophysical flows exchanged between societies and their natural

environment as well as the flows within and between social systems (Fig. 1). Sociometabolic flows operate and maintain biophysical structures of society, such as buildings, infrastructures or machinery, usually denoted as ‘artefacts’¹¹, ‘manufactured capital’^{14,15}, ‘in-use stocks of materials’¹⁶ or ‘material stocks’¹⁷; we use here the latter notion. Systematically observing societies’ use of biophysical resources is a core goal of SMR¹⁸. SMR helps to overcome the widespread conceptual disregard of biophysical processes in many economic and social science approaches¹⁹ and demonstrate the ‘size’ or ‘scale’ of human activities compared with the biosphere^{20,21}.

Explicitly or implicitly, sociometabolic research builds on the following assumptions^{11,18}. (1) The functioning of social systems, including the economy, rests on successfully organizing energy and material flows to expand, maintain and operate its biophysical basis: human population, livestock and artefacts such as buildings, infrastructures or durable commodities. These stocks generate important flows, such as physical, intellectual or emotional labour, products such as bread, clothes or electricity, and services such as living space or mobility. (2) The composition, magnitude and patterns of social metabolism determine society’s environmental pressures and impacts. Sustainability requires sociometabolic flows to be compatible with the supply and sink capacity of the biosphere. (3) First principles of the natural sciences (for example, the laws of thermodynamics) apply to the metabolism of socioeconomic systems and are fundamental to their understanding.

In that sense, social systems (like humans themselves) constitute hybrids of biophysical and symbolic systems shaped by discourses, power relations or monetary flows, and are subject to intentional organization¹¹. At what point in social metabolism natural elements cross the system boundary of society (Fig. 1) requires theoretically grounded, consistent and pragmatic decisions depending on the respective research goals. A criterion used to define the boundary

¹Institute of Social Ecology, University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna (BOKU), Vienna, Austria. ²Industrial Ecology Group, Faculty of Environment and Natural Resources, University of Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany. ³Industrial Ecology Programme, Department of Energy and Process Engineering, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim, Norway. ⁴These authors contributed equally: Dominik Wiedenhofer, Stefan Pauliuk, Marina Fischer-Kowalski. *e-mail: helmut.haberl@boku.ac.at




Fig. 1 | SMR systematically quantifies flows of biophysical resources associated with defined social systems or their components. SMR investigates the socioeconomic transformations of natural resources and traces outputs of waste and emissions to the environment. This figure highlights major biophysical stocks and flows considered in SMR. It shows the system boundaries used in MEFA, which traces extraction of materials and energy from the natural environment, their use for feeding people and livestock or expanding, maintaining and operating artefacts such as buildings, factories, machinery or infrastructures. Materials and energy are eventually released into the environment as wastes and emissions. Traded raw materials or products are important, often dominant, components of social metabolism on all levels below the global total. Image courtesy of Miljana 'Manja' Podovac.

between nature and society is the intensity of society's interventions into natural systems¹⁸. The boundaries shown in Fig. 1 were defined for economy-wide material flow accounting²² and comprise all flows required to reproduce society's material stocks¹¹. Different socio-metabolic approaches (see 'SMR traditions') deviate in their specific operationalization of these boundaries, but share a focus on the biophysical reproduction of specific functionally integrated socioeconomic systems. Regarding social metabolism as a systems phenomenon leads to the expectation that nexus features resulting from systemic interdependencies such as synergies, trade-offs, problem shifting, lock-in or nonlinearity may be relevant (discussed below).

A family tree of SMR

SMR presupposes a common ground between social and natural sciences²³. Such a common ground had existed among early political economists and social theorists who acknowledged the role of natural factors such as land, labour and energy on the social sciences side, and natural scientists who extended their disciplinary knowledge on nutrient flows, energy and thermodynamics to economies and societies (Fig. 2)^{24,25}. Increasing academic differentiation in the course of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century discouraged shared paradigms between social and natural sciences. On the social sciences side, few scholars discussed, for example, the role of energy for societal development²⁶, whereas the mainstream focused on culture, discourses and decision-making. Economics became a science of markets, prices and flows of money. In the 1960s and 1970s, the intellectual separation of social and natural phenomena was criticized by researchers who revived and created mind models and knowledge relinking both scientific realms^{27,28}. These approaches relied on emerging new epistemologies derived from, among others, the theory of complex systems^{29,30} and theoretical ecology^{31,32}.

Increasing environmental concerns motivated researchers from different backgrounds to develop various research strands of SMR. Despite efforts at harmonization³³, several variants of SMR with differing scopes and methods exist (see 'SMR traditions'). A recent bibliographical analysis found that the number of references to the term 'social metabolism' has risen from 400 in the period 1991–2000 to over 3,000 in the following decade, and another 6,000 in the period 2011–2015 (ref. ³⁴).

SMR traditions

We here discuss five selected research traditions by summarizing their respective conceptual backgrounds, the social systems studied, key empirical tools and indicators, the temporal scale of their analytical perspectives, and main regulatory and policy applications. The focus is on traditions explicitly investigating the biophysical basis of society and identifying themselves as part of SMR. Given space constraints, we do not aim to be comprehensive.

Urban metabolism. Studies of urban metabolism focus on material and energy flows within urban systems, accumulation of material stocks and the exchange processes of urban areas with their hinterlands. This tradition was pioneered among others by Abel Wolman and Stephen Boyden (Fig. 2)^{35,36}, and indeed *avant la lettre* by Heinrich von Thünen³⁷. A long-standing concern of this research strand is the relationships between urbanization, density, urban form, and the resource requirements and waste outputs of cities. Recent research analysed whether dense urban areas require less energy and materials use than scattered settlements providing the same standard of living³⁸. Other studies focused on resource flows outside cities resulting from the consumption of urban dwellers, reckoning that resources saved within dense urban settings may be overcompensated by 'upstream' resource use in supply chains supporting city dwellers³⁹. Another topic is how to plan and organize new urban areas with lower resource use^{40,41}. Urban metabolism research uses material and energy flow analysis (MEFA) to directly investigate cities using similar system boundaries as in Fig. 1, and environmentally extended input–output analysis (EE-IOA) to analyse (inter) national supply chains to quantify footprints of urban areas (both discussed below)^{42–44}. Another strand of research uses the term urban metabolism rather metaphorically. These studies employ concepts and methods from political science, sociology, social geography or ethnography but usually do not aim at quantifying the biophysical processes at the core of SMR^{45,46}; for a recent review see ref. ⁴⁷.

Multiscale integrated analysis of societal and ecosystem metabolism. Abbreviated MuSIASEM, this approach was developed by researchers around Mario Giampietro and Kozo Mayumi based on the work of Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen⁴⁸. Its proponents argue that since socioecological systems are self-organized, their proper analysis requires considering their hierarchically organized structural and functional compartments operating at different space–time scales^{49,50}. MuSIASEM applies the theory of complex hierarchical systems to SMR by integrating information on social, economic and sociometabolic dimensions at multiple scales. It uses Georgescu-Roegen's concept of 'funds', which refers to entities such as labour, land or technological capital that provide services to the social system. Funds have to be maintained but are not consumed^{50,51}. MuSIASEM studies typically account for energy use, human activity, and value added for the system as a whole and its compartments. Variables are often used in a context-dependent manner to fit the purpose of each specific study⁴⁹; data are derived from census statistics, MEFA (see below) or other models. MuSIASEM has been applied to rural systems⁵², mining⁵³ and urban waste management⁵⁴. The nexus between resources such as food, water or energy⁵⁵ and the links with ecosystem metabolism⁵⁶ are increasingly studied. A recent review is ref. ⁵⁰.



Biophysical economics. Biophysical economics focuses on the central role of energy for the economy, which is often ignored in mainstream economics. Its founders include Kenneth Boulding⁵⁷ and Robert U. Ayres⁵⁸. This tradition can be traced back well into the nineteenth century (Fig. 2) and was inspired by Eugene and Howard Odum⁵⁹ as well as others working on ecological energy analysis^{25,29,60}. One of its central tenets is that net energy gained is more important to society than the total amount of primary energy used, hence its core interest on energy return on energy investment (EROI)^{61,62}. EROI can be applied at a variety of scales, from technologies or supply chains⁶³ to system-wide analyses that aim to integrate social and biophysical approaches^{64–66}. This tradition often uses other system boundaries than those shown in Fig. 1 because it traces energy flows from extraction through processing to final uses, thereby not emphasizing territorial boundaries. One typical finding is that fossil fuels have a relatively high EROI that gradually declines over time, while renewable technologies usually have lower EROIs⁶⁷. This poses substantial challenges for a low-carbon transition because it implies reductions in useful energy⁶⁸. Biophysical economics also uses methods such as energy and exergy accounting. Energy is a measure of energy embodied in resources traced back to a common denominator, for example, solar energy^{69–71}. Exergy is the share of

Material and energy flow analysis. MEFA focuses on the role of resources for social and economic development and aims to inform sustainable resource management. One of its founders is Robert U. Ayres^{58,75}, who advocated the mass-balanced analysis of economic systems as a counterpart to monetary-economic perspectives (Fig. 2). MEFA studies range from investigations of specific substances⁷⁶ to comprehensive assessments of many materials⁷⁷. They trace biophysical flows through socioeconomic systems, their accumulation as stocks and the ensuing waste or recycling flows (Fig. 1). MEFA covers national and global scales as well as regions, households, industries or other units, and uses stationary or dynamic approaches⁷⁸. Substance flow analysis tracks individual chemical elements linked with services such as shelter and transport⁷⁶. Economy-wide material flow accounting comprehensively monitors material flows through economies and is applied in environmental reporting (see ‘Monitoring resource use at the country level’)^{2,79}. Studies of long-term trends in resource use as well as comparative cross-country datasets^{80,81} investigate the potentials for decoupling

the use of materials and energy from economic growth and well-being⁸². Material flow accounting and substance flow analysis can be combined to provide detailed assessment of flows of specific materials and substances. Such data support environmental, resource, circular economy and waste management policies, and can help to improve supply chains⁸³. Recent MEFA research emphasizes dynamic modelling of the relation between in-use stocks of products and the associated resource flows required to deliver physical services such as shelter and transport¹⁶. For reviews see refs.^{79,84}.

Environmentally extended input–output analysis. EE-IOA focuses on the biophysical and monetary interrelations between economic sectors. It links production, consumption and environmental stressors within and across countries. EE-IOA goes back to the work of Wassily Leontief (Fig. 2)⁸⁵ and has been proposed early on as a means to “integrate the world of commodities into the larger economy of nature”⁸⁶. It is used to study flows through economic sectors within a socioeconomic system (boundaries as in Fig. 1), but also to assess international supply chains. EE-IO tables report supply and use flows between economic sectors in a specific year, usually in monetary values. They extend this sectoral information with biophysical or social information, such as materials, energy, greenhouse gas emissions, water or human labour. Several detailed, high-quality global multi-regional input–output models exist that integrate national tables with global trade data and extend them with a large array of environmental and social indicators^{87,88}. Aggregated monetary IO tables and detailed physical process descriptions were combined with so-called hybrid models^{89,90}. These approaches have tremendously increased the potential of EE-IOA for studying sustainability concerns ‘embodied’ in consumption and displaced across supply chains. Such studies reveal structural changes in the supply chains of commodities over time and shed light on the interplay between growing consumption, international burden-shifting due to expanding supply chains and increasing industrial efficiency^{91–93}. A recent review is ref.⁹⁴.

Related approaches. With their own large, partially overlapping, scientific communities, related approaches include the ecological footprint, life-cycle assessment (LCA) and integrated assessment models (IAMs). The ecological footprint translates resource use into a measure of bioproductive land required for its sustenance (‘footprint’) and compares it with the availability of such land (‘biocapacity’) to determine the extent to which humans live beyond planetary limits⁹⁵. LCA is used to evaluate product life cycles, compare products or identify potentials for reducing environmental impacts^{96–99}. Consequential LCA considers systemic feedbacks⁶, which could also profit from the SMR methods discussed here. IAMs are comprehensive and detailed tools to analyse feedbacks between socioeconomic and Earth systems, but mostly do not include an explicit representation of society’s biophysical basis and its underlying thermodynamic principles¹⁰⁰. Whether one pigeonholes these traditions within or outside SMR may be a matter of taste; discussing them in detail is out of scope for this Review.

Recent insights from SMR

We here exemplify how SMR can bridge natural and social sciences in addressing sustainability and providing useful information for monitoring and policy-making. Due to space limitations, we focus on the global level and do not include examples from all SMR traditions.

The great acceleration to the Anthropocene. Proposals to introduce a new geological epoch, the Anthropocene¹⁰¹, reflect how profoundly the planet is being transformed by human activities, as planetary boundaries have been transgressed¹⁰². Socioeconomic flows of reactive nitrogen and carbon affect global biogeochemical cycles, with severe consequences for climate¹⁰³ and biodiversity¹⁰⁴.

The notion of a ‘great acceleration’¹⁰² highlights the increasing speed of these transformations.

SMR corroborates these concepts by providing long-term trajectories of social metabolism and its relations to socioeconomic and political factors (Fig. 3). Over the past century, humanity’s use of materials and energy has reached a comparable magnitude to flows within the biosphere (for example, energy, nitrogen and phosphorous), representing a step change in Earth history¹⁰⁵. Over the past 115 years, extraction of materials, energy and water increased 8- to 12-fold (Fig. 3a), while material stocks, global gross domestic product (GDP) and useful physical work surged (Fig. 3b). Global population increased fivefold, and average life expectancy doubled, indicating that the increasing availability of resources and material stocks resulted in improved living conditions for substantial parts of the world population. Solid waste generation and dissipative uses increased 15-fold, while emissions of carbon, nitrogen, sulphur and methane increased 10-fold (Fig. 3c). CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion increased 19-fold, constituting a major driver of human-induced climate change¹⁰³.

Figure 3 shows no signs of a global stabilization of societal resource use; rather, it suggests a new acceleration period since the early 2000s, mainly due to rapidly progressing industrialization and urbanization in many emerging economies, as well as steadily high consumption in many high-income economies¹⁰⁶. It supports the view that world population growth has contributed to increasing environmental pressures¹⁰⁷, while the growth of resource use per capita associated with rising economic activity and affluence played an even larger role¹⁰⁸.

Asking how economic (GDP) growth drives resource use^{109–111}, and conversely, to what extent resources such as energy contribute to economic growth^{112,113}, has occupied SMR researchers for decades. Patterns found vary between different studies, but mostly suggest that resource use and emissions per unit of GDP decline over time due to gains in resource efficiency, which is defined as the ratio of resources used per inflation-corrected GDP^{82,114}. Improvements in resource efficiency are denoted as ‘decoupling’ of economic growth and resource use. ‘Relative decoupling’ means that resource use grows at a slower pace than GDP, while ‘absolute decoupling’ refers to absolute reductions in resource use coinciding with economic growth¹¹⁵. Figure 3 as well as country-level studies^{82,116} suggest that relative decoupling is frequent, but absolute decoupling is rare and mainly observed during recessions or periods of low or absent economic growth^{82,117}. Globally, resource use increases along with economic growth, although mostly at a slower pace. An exception is the accumulation of material stocks, which matched GDP almost perfectly (Fig. 3b)¹⁵. The use of GDP in such studies is controversial because GDP only measures economic activity, not social well-being, and neglects inequality and services delivered by existing capital stocks¹¹⁸ (see also ‘The biophysical basis of social progress’).

Monitoring resource use at the country level. As the surging human use of resources drives the Earth system into uncharted territory, the question arises how to consistently monitor it. This is especially useful at levels where political competencies for resource management exist, for example, for countries. SMR has developed country-level indicators applied in sustainable resource-use policies across the world, including the monitoring of progress towards the SDGs^{106,119}. The International Resource Panel of the United Nations Environment Programme maintains a comprehensive international database covering most countries worldwide (<http://www.resourcepanel.org/global-material-flows-database>). It provides data on extraction, trade, processing and consumption of resources and provides indicators from both production- and consumption-based perspectives (Fig. 4). The production-based perspective relates to MEFA focused on national territory (Fig. 1),




Fig. 3 | Scale and dynamics of global social metabolism in the Anthropocene, illustrating the systemic interlinkages between resource use, socioeconomic dynamics and ensuing waste and emissions. **a**, Resource extraction and inputs into social metabolism. **b**, Key socioeconomic dynamics such as population, GDP, life expectancy, useful physical work/useful exergy, and material stocks (here the mass of manufactured capital). **c**, A comprehensive mass-balanced (that is, output = input - net change of stocks) estimate of all outputs of wastes and emissions to the environment as well as fossil-fuel related CO₂ emissions. System boundaries as in Fig. 1. Data sources: global extraction of materials, primary energy and freshwater from refs. ^{178–180}; global GDP in international Geary-Khamis \$, population and life-expectancy from refs. ^{181–183}; material stocks from ref. ¹⁵; useful physical work or useful exergy from ref. ¹⁸⁴; outputs of waste and emissions to the environment from ref. ¹⁸⁰; CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel use and cement production from ref. ¹⁸⁵.

while the consumption-based perspective allocates resources used along international supply chains to a country's final consumption, utilizing EE-IOA.

Within a production-based perspective, country-level resource use is measured as 'domestic material consumption' (Fig. 4a) or DMC (explained in Fig. 4). DMC differs between countries by more than one order of magnitude, largely following their development status and pathway, population density and resource endowments^{82,106,120,121}. According to the United Nations Environment Programme database, the average DMC of low-income countries was 3.2 ± 1.1 t capita⁻¹ yr⁻¹ in 2012, while it was approximately six times higher (18 ± 10.1 t capita⁻¹ yr⁻¹) in high-income countries. Inequality is even larger from a consumption-based perspective, that is, measured as the 'material footprint' (explained in Fig. 4) of goods consumed in each country. The material footprint is 2.3 ± 1 t capita⁻¹ yr⁻¹ in low-income countries compared with over ten times more (26.7 ± 15.5 t capita⁻¹ yr⁻¹) in high-income countries that rely on the import of resource-intensive products^{106,122}. A map of the difference between DMC and MF (Fig. 4b) shows that MF exceeds DMC in most high-income countries in Europe and North America. The reason is that resource-intensive production steps increasingly take place in other, largely poorer and less resource-efficient, economies⁹², partially due to 'outsourcing' of environmental pressures from rich to poor regions¹²³, but also due to export-oriented growth in many developing economies.

Although the link between material flows and environmental impacts differs by types of materials and impacts, indicators from MEFA can serve as useful proxies for aggregate environmental pressures, both on national territory (DMC) and along supply chains (material footprint). The material footprint is highly correlated with the carbon footprint and the ecological footprint^{82,124} and indicates how much environmental pressure is related globally to national consumption. SMR studies have so far found no evidence for successful

continued absolute decoupling between resource use and economic growth (see 'The great acceleration to the Anthropocene')¹²⁵. Reducing material flows to sustainable levels within planetary boundaries will require far-reaching transformations of social metabolism^{17,126–128}, and probably also of socioeconomic systems.

Social metabolism and the circular economy. Early statements from biophysical economics and MEFA traditions of SMR⁵⁸ already advocated closing of material cycles, later denoted as 'circular economy'. In recent decades, the circular economy concept has gained substantial traction in China and Japan and increasingly in the European Union and the United States^{129,130}. Developing sector-, material- and product-specific strategies and policies to foster circularity requires a high-resolution description of material cycles. SMR can provide such data, as shown in Fig. 5, which gives an overview of the global steel cycle in 2008. MEFA tools allow for taking a closer look at the flows within the socioeconomic system boundaries delineated in Fig. 1. The material cycle perspective allows material stocks and flows to be consistently depicted. Results support hypotheses formulated in the 'Overview and definitions' section on temporal dynamics of stock–flow relations: they show how fast material stocks grow, when and how materials become available for recycling, and how much recycling contributes to maintaining stocks.

The rapid growth of global steel stocks limits the potential of supplying a large fraction of steel inputs from recycled material (Fig. 5). Globally, 75% of all steel inputs go into new stocks; hence, the steel cycle is a combination of linear and circular systems. With current stock growth patterns, a hypothetical reduction of all end-of-life losses to zero (impossible for thermodynamic reasons) would reduce the need for primary production of steel by only approximately 10%. Material stocks, which are closely correlated with economic activity (Fig. 3b), are growing in all world regions (Fig. 5).




Fig. 4 | Biophysical resource use within national-political boundaries. a, Production-based perspective: country-level resource use. Domestic Material Consumption (DMC), that is, the mass of domestic extraction plus the mass of actual import minus export (MEFA methods, system boundaries as in Fig. 1). **b**, Consumption-based perspective: producers versus consumers. The material footprint attributes resource use along supply chains to national final demand. It is calculated by extending MEFA with data from EE-IOA. Both indicators are proxies for environmental pressures within national boundaries (DMC) and along global supply chains linking all extraction to final consumption (material footprint). Countries in the 'green' category (material footprint differs from DMC by less than 10%) extract approximately the same mass of resources on their own territory as is embodied in the goods they consume; 'producers' extract more domestically, 'consumers' less. The global sum total of yearly resource use is the same for DMC and material footprint (mass balance principle). Data sources: refs. ^{2,106} and <http://www.resourcepanel.org/global-material-flows-database>.

In the United States, 60% of final steel consumption goes into the net expansion (that is, inflows minus outflows) of stocks; in China, this figure is at a staggering 99%. Steel stocks in China and the United States are of similar size in absolute numbers, but per-capita values are much lower in China, suggesting a huge potential for further stock growth in China in a catch-up scenario.

Recycling rates of end-of-life steel outflows are substantial, and while there may still be potentials to raise them further, the energetic and monetary costs of doing so must not be underestimated^{131,132}. Moreover, modern technologies not only require steel but increasingly rely on most of the elements in the periodic table, thereby corroborating hypotheses formulated in the 'Overview and definitions'

section regarding systemic feedbacks between different parts of social metabolism. For example, mixtures of metals in products results in barriers to their recyclability and substitutability^{132,133}. Knowledge about the full life cycle of metal stocks, including losses by design¹³⁴, and when and where stocks reach the end of their service lifetime and subsequently become available for re-use and recycling into secondary resources, can help to improve circularity^{135,136}. When taking all resource inputs into the global economy into account, however, sociometabolic circularity is only at ~6% of inflows, due to the high relevance of stock expansion and energy throughputs for total resource use, as well as the low end-of-life recovery rates of most minor metals¹³⁷ and materials other than metals¹³⁸.




Fig. 5 | Socioeconomic metabolism of steel. Depiction of the global steel cycle in 2008 showing the flows and links between material stocks, their maintenance and expansion, and primary metal production, the latter being a major driver of greenhouse emissions. Steel remelted from post-consumer scrap accounts for less than 20% of global steel production. Rapidly expanding in-use stocks demand high levels of primary production, as secondary production can only maintain existing stocks. Data sources: refs. ^{15,135,139}.

The biophysical basis of social progress. Reducing resource use would be a less daunting challenge if it were possible with little detriment to social well-being. Recent SMR suggests that social progress rests not only on annual flows of resources, a high EROI⁶², or creation of value added (GDP), but also on the services from material stocks such as buildings, infrastructure and machinery^{14,16,17,133,139,140}. This warrants a broader approach towards eco-efficiency considering aspects of social progress beyond economic activity. Towards that end, we here analyse relations between social metabolism and the recently established social progress index (SPI). The SPI is a composite index based on a dashboard of outcome-oriented indicators of fulfilment of basic human needs and foundations of well-being and opportunities. It considers nutrition, shelter, water, sanitation, safety, access to knowledge and information, health, education, freedom, rights, and environmental quality but not monetary measures such as investments or GDP¹⁴¹. Social progress in terms of SPI is related to social metabolism; for example, it is correlated with a sustained history of high resource use¹⁴⁰.

Figure 6 documents the number of countries achieving a certain SPI for any level of material stocks of concrete, a good proxy of overall material stocks¹⁵, and total primary energy supply per capita and year. It reveals that very high levels of SPI are reached at a level of ~50 tons of concrete stocks per capita and below ~100 GJ capita⁻¹ yr⁻¹ of total primary energy use. No clear trend in SPI prevails above those levels. Income is represented by a colour code, demonstrating that there are deviations between the material stocks and energy flows, economic activity and the SPI worthy of further analysis. Results corroborate findings from recent work on the resource requirements of social well-being and development

employing the human development index (HDI). The HDI integrates indicators of life expectancy, education, as well as GDP and its distribution¹⁴². Recent SMR typically found saturation functions indicating that a high HDI can be reached at intermediate levels of resource use with no clear trend above certain thresholds^{82,143}. While resource requirements for achieving a decent HDI decreased in recent decades due to rising resource efficiency^{110,139}, most countries still either transgress planetary boundaries and/or fail on social goals¹²⁶. Similar insights have been generated using indicators for energy and carbon footprints as well as EROI^{62,110}. These results support the hypotheses formulated in the ‘Overview and definitions’ section regarding nonlinearities in socioecological systems and the relevance of going beyond monetary perspectives.

Outlook and conclusions

Social metabolism is a thriving research framework guiding empirical analysis and modelling of society–nature interactions. Different SMR traditions (reviewed in ‘SMR traditions’) essentially study the same underlying process, that is, society’s use of biophysical material and energy resources. They provide insights on patterns, drivers, systemic feedbacks, and sustainability implications of resource use from different angles. SMR provides perspectives missing from dominant approaches based primarily on monetary or social data. When coupled with information on the ability of the environment to generate resources or absorb wastes, results from SMR indicate transgressions of planetary¹⁰² or regional boundaries¹⁴⁴. SMR can also help to integrate social science approaches into the analysis of the great acceleration towards the Anthropocene (‘The great acceleration to the Anthropocene’)




Fig. 6 | The sociometabolic basis of human well-being and social progress, as measured through the SPI. a, Material stocks and social progress. Concrete stocks versus SPI in 97 countries. **b**, Energy consumption and social progress. Total primary energy supply ($\text{GJ capita}^{-1} \text{yr}^{-1}$) versus SPI in 104 countries. The green and red dashed lines show the ranges defined as high and medium social progress, respectively¹⁴¹. Concrete amounts to $\sim 45\%$ of total global material stocks^{15,186}. Material stocks of buildings, infrastructure and machinery and the energy required to operate and maintain these stocks jointly provide services to society. Data sources: concrete from ref. ¹⁸⁶; total primary energy supply and SPI from ref. ¹⁴¹; income classes from ref. ¹⁸⁷. Total primary energy supply and concrete stocks are available for different subsets of countries, which explains the different numbers of countries in income classes in **a** and **b**.

and provides a robust, internationally accepted basis for the monitoring of resource use in various contexts of national and international policy-making ('Monitoring resource use at the country level')¹⁴⁵, based on the laws of thermodynamics¹⁴⁶.

The reviewed literature and examples corroborate expectations that systemic interactions in resource use are crucially important ('Overview and definitions'). Interactions between and among different resources, for example, between materials and energy^{133,134,147,148}, are a case in point ('Social metabolism and the circular economy'). The patterns shown in Fig. 3 reveal only the tip of the iceberg of leakage or burden-shifting phenomena analysed with EE-IOA methods ('SMR traditions')^{149,150}. SMR revealed many examples for nonlinear society–nature interactions. For example, the research reviewed in 'The biophysical basis of social progress' suggests saturation functions between indicators of social progress, and resource flows and material stocks, respectively ('The great acceleration to the Anthropocene').

SMR suggests the existence of important lock-in effects and legacies related to the build-up of material stocks. Future greenhouse gas emissions (from 2010 to 2060) expected to result from fossil fuels required for the operation of existing infrastructures until the end of their lifetime amount to roughly half of the remaining emission budget consistent with the 2°C target^{151,152}. Over half of all socio-metabolic material flows is currently used to build up infrastructure and artefacts ('The great acceleration to the Anthropocene')¹⁵, indicating that these lock-ins may worsen. These results point to the central role of urban and infrastructure development for reducing future resource requirements^{38,153}. Such considerations have motivated proposals for a 'stock–flow–service nexus' framework^{14,16,17,133}, which recognizes that specific combinations of stocks and flows provide essential services such as nutrition, shelter or mobility, and hence are crucial for understanding resource requirements associated with development trajectories or sustainability transformations¹²⁶. The absence of continued absolute decoupling between GDP and resource use ('Monitoring resource use at the country level') indicates how large this challenge is.

SMR, however, also has weaknesses. In interdisciplinary research, it is often hard to clearly identify research boundaries and label research approaches ('SMR traditions'). The construction of SMR may seem artificial to scholars not familiar with the approach.

Areas requiring more attention in the future include approaches to link social metabolism with the behaviour of individual agents, for example, via microeconomics, agent-based modelling or costs. The use of statistical methods, including proper uncertainty analysis or data reconciliation based on statistical inference, and the reporting of uncertainties in publications is underdeveloped in current SMR^{154,155}. Efforts to gather high-quality data on biophysical resources remain high on the agenda of SMR. A central concern is the consistent integration of system-wide assessments with approaches aiming at better process and product resolution. A high level of detail in evaluating technologies and production processes or identifying potentially critical materials, though, is often at odds with capturing system-wide effects such as resource availability, rebound effects or problem shifting related to substitution, lock-in (legacies), leakage or rebound effects¹⁵⁶.

SMR has become a core element in communities such as ecological economics²⁸, industrial ecology^{157,158} and integrated land-change science^{159,160}. SMR explicitly addresses economic theory and aims at broadening economic thought^{50,64} by providing a biophysical perspective on growth theory¹¹², efficiency and rebound effects^{156,161} or the decoupling debate¹⁶². Incorporating SMR principles into the macroeconomic modules of integrated assessment models would strengthen their ability to comply with thermodynamic principles and more systematically take feedbacks between different resources into account¹⁰⁰. Links between social sciences and SMR include analyses of issues such as inequality or social conflict^{163–166}. SMR is used in political ecology to investigate environmental conflicts^{167,168}, labour^{169,170} or ecologically unequal exchange^{171–173}. Efforts to explicitly link SMR to other social science efforts, for example, practice theory or sociotechnical systems approaches, could be strengthened, in particular in the emerging fields of sustainability transformation research^{123,126,174,175}. While decoupling and resource efficiency will be an important part of strategies for more sustainable resource use, many SMR researchers now believe that ecological modernization will not suffice and far-reaching social and economic transformations are required^{12,127,176}. SMR can form a backbone of sustainability science by delivering consistent analyses of social metabolism that help to better understand the interdependencies between societal well-being and the physical services provided by society's metabolism.

Data availability

The analyses shown in Figs. 3–6 rely on publicly available data from the cited references.

Received: 3 July 2017; Accepted: 9 January 2019;

Published online: 27 February 2019

References

- IPCC *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change* (eds Edenhofer, O. et al.) (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2014).
- Global Material Flows and Resource Productivity* (United Nations Environment Programme, 2016).
- Policy Coherence of the Sustainable Development Goals, a Natural Resources Perspective* (United Nations Environment Programme, 2015).
- Stern, N. The economics of climate change. *Am. Econ. Rev.* **98**, 1–37 (2008).
- Foxon, T. J. Transition pathways for a UK low carbon electricity future. *Energy Policy* **52**, 10–24 (2013).
- Hertwich, E. G. et al. Integrated life-cycle assessment of electricity-supply scenarios confirms global environmental benefit of low-carbon technologies. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **112**, 6277–6282 (2015).
- McCollum, D. L. et al. Connecting the sustainable development goals by their energy inter-linkages. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **13**, 033006 (2018).
- Liu, J. et al. Systems integration for global sustainability. *Science* **347**, 1258832 (2015).
- Hoekstra, A. Y. & Wiedmann, T. O. Humanity's unsustainable environmental footprint. *Science* **344**, 1114–1117 (2014).
- Plevin, R. J., Delucchi, M. A. & Creutzig, F. Using attributional life cycle assessment to estimate climate-change mitigation benefits misleads policy makers. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **18**, 73–83 (2014).
- Fischer-Kowalski, M. & Weisz, H. Society as hybrid between material and symbolic realms. *Adv. Hum. Ecol.* **8**, 215–251 (1999).
- González de Molina, M. & Toledo, V. M. *The Social Metabolism: A Socio-Ecological Theory of Historical Change* (Springer, Cham, 2014).
- Weisz, H. The probability of the improbable: society–nature coevolution. *Geogr. Ann. Ser. B* **93**, 325–336 (2011).
- Weisz, H., Suh, S. & Graedel, T. E. Industrial ecology: the role of manufactured capital in sustainability. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **112**, 6260–6264 (2015).
- Krausmann, F. et al. Global socioeconomic material stocks rise 23-fold over the 20th century and require half of annual resource use. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **114**, 1880–1885 (2017).
- Pauliuk, S. & Müller, D. B. The role of in-use stocks in the social metabolism and in climate change mitigation. *Glob. Environ. Change* **24**, 132–142 (2014).
- Haberl, H., Wiedenhofer, D., Erb, K.-H., Görg, C. & Krausmann, F. The material stock–flow–service nexus: a new approach for tackling the decoupling conundrum. *Sustainability* **9**, 1049 (2017).
- Pauliuk, S. & Hertwich, E. G. Socioeconomic metabolism as paradigm for studying the biophysical basis of human societies. *Ecol. Econ.* **119**, 83–93 (2015).
- Lejano, R. P. & Stokols, D. Social ecology, sustainability, and economics. *Ecol. Econ.* **89**, 1–6 (2013).
- Goodland, R. & Daly, H. Environmental sustainability: universal and non-negotiable. *Ecol. Appl.* **6**, 1002–1017 (1996).
- Daly, H. E. Economics in a full world. *Sci. Am.* **293**, 78–85 (2005).
- Fischer-Kowalski, M. et al. Methodology and indicators of economy-wide material flow accounting — state of the art and reliability across sources. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **15**, 855–876 (2011).
- Fischer-Kowalski, M. Society's metabolism: the intellectual history of materials flow analysis, part I, 1860–1970. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **2**, 107–136 (1998).
- Christensen, P. Classical roots for a modern materials-energy analysis. *Ecol. Modell.* **38**, 75–89 (1987).
- Cleveland, C. J. Biophysical economics: historical perspective and current research trends. *Ecol. Modell.* **38**, 47–73 (1987).
- Martinez-Alier, J. *Ecological Economics: Energy, Environment and Society* (Blackwell, Oxford, UK, Cambridge, USA, 1987).
- Dunlap, R. E. & Catton, W. R. Struggling with human exemptionalism: the rise, decline and revitalization of environmental sociology. *Am. Sociol.* **25**, 5–30 (1994).
- Ropke, I. Trends in the development of ecological economics from the late 1980s to the early 2000s. *Ecol. Econ.* **55**, 262–290 (2005).
- Martinez-Alier, J., Munda, G. & O'Neill, J. in *The Economics of Nature and the Nature of Economics* (eds Cleveland, C. J., Stern, D. I. & Costanza, R.) 34–56 (Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK, Northampton, MA, 2001).
- Varela, F. G., Maturana, H. R. & Uribe, R. Autopoiesis: the organization of living systems, its characterization and a model. *Biosystems* **5**, 187–196 (1974).
- Ulanowicz, R. E. *Ecology, the Ascendent Perspective* (Columbia Univ. Press, New York, 1997).
- Holling, C. S. Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **4**, 1–23 (1973).
- Bringezu, S., Fischer-Kowalski, M., Kleijn, R. & Palm, V. (eds) In *Proc. ConAccount Workshop 21–23 January 1997, Leiden* (Wuppertal Institute, Wuppertal, 1997).
- Amate, J., Molina, M. Gde & Toledo, V. M. El metabolismo social. Historias, métodos y principales aportaciones. *Revista Iberoamericana Econ. Ecol.* **27**, 30–152 (2017).
- Wolman, A. The metabolism of cities. *Sci. Am.* **213**, 179–190 (1965).
- Boyden, S., Millar, S., Newcombe, K. & O'Neill, B. *Ecology of a City and its People: The Case of Hong Kong* (Austrian National Univ., Canberra, 1981).
- von Thünen, J. H. *Der isolierte Staat in Beziehung auf Landwirtschaft und Nationalökonomie* (Historisches Wirtschaftsarchiv, Paderborn, 2013).
- Kennedy, C. A. et al. Energy and material flows of megacities. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **112**, 5985–5990 (2015).
- Lenzen, M. & Peters, G. M. How city dwellers affect their resource hinterland. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **14**, 73–90 (2010).
- Schäffler, A. & Swilling, M. Valuing green infrastructure in an urban environment under pressure — the Johannesburg case. *Ecol. Econ.* **86**, 246–257 (2013).
- Ramaswami, A., Russell, A. G., Culligan, P. J., Sharma, K. R. & Kumar, E. Meta-principles for developing smart, sustainable, and healthy cities. *Science* **352**, 940–943 (2016).
- Athanassiadis, A. et al. Comparing a territorial-based and a consumption-based approach to assess the local and global environmental performance of cities. *J. Clean. Prod.* **173**, 112–123 (2018).
- Kennedy, C., Pincetl, S. & Bunje, P. The study of urban metabolism and its applications to urban planning and design. *Environ. Pollut.* **159**, 1965–1973 (2011).
- Zhang, Y., Yang, Z. & Yu, X. Urban metabolism: a review of current knowledge and directions for future study. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **49**, 11247–11263 (2015).
- Gandy, M. Rethinking urban metabolism: water, space and the modern city. *City* **8**, 363–379 (2004).
- Newell, J. P. & Cousins, J. J. The boundaries of urban metabolism: towards a political-industrial ecology. *Prog. Hum. Geogr.* **39**, 702–728 (2015).
- Beloin-Saint-Pierre, D. et al. A review of urban metabolism studies to identify key methodological choices for future harmonization and implementation. *J. Clean. Prod.* **163**, S223–S240 (2017).
- Georgescu-Roegen, N. *The Entropy Law and the Economic Process* (Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, USA, 1971).
- Giampietro, M., Mayumi, K. & Sorman, A. H. *The Metabolic Pattern of Societies: Where Economists Fall Short* (Routledge, London, 2012).
- Gerber, J.-F. & Scheidel, A. In search of substantive economics: comparing today's two major socio-metabolic approaches to the economy — MEFA and MuSIASEM. *Ecol. Econ.* **144**, 186–194 (2018).
- Giampietro, M., Mayumi, K. & Ramos-Martin, J. Multi-scale integrated analysis of societal and ecosystem metabolism (MuSIASEM): theoretical concepts and basic rationale. *Energy* **34**, 313–322 (2009).
- Ravera, F. et al. Pathways of rural change: an integrated assessment of metabolic patterns in emerging ruralities. *Environ. Dev. Sustain.* **16**, 811–820 (2014).
- Silva-Macher, J. C. A metabolic profile of Peru: an application of multi-scale integrated analysis of societal and ecosystem metabolism (MuSIASEM) to the mining sector's exosomatic energy flows. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **20**, 1072–1082 (2016).
- Chifari, R., Lo Piano, S., Bukkens, S. G. F. & Giampietro, M. A holistic framework for the integrated assessment of urban waste management systems. *Ecol. Indic.* **94**, 24–36 (2016).
- Giampietro, M., Aspinall, R. J., Ramos-Martin, J. & Bukkens, S. G. F. *Resource Accounting for Sustainability Assessment: The Nexus between Energy, Food, Water and Land Use* (Routledge, London, 2014).
- Lomas, P. L. & Giampietro, M. Environmental accounting for ecosystem conservation: linking societal and ecosystem metabolisms. *Ecol. Modell.* **346**, 10–19 (2017).
- Boulding, K. in *Steady State Economics* (ed. Daly, H. E.) 121–132 (W. H. Freeman, San Francisco, 1972).
- Ayres, R. U. & Kneese, A. V. Production, consumption, and externalities. *Am. Econ. Rev.* **59**, 282–297 (1969).
- Odum, H. T. *Environment, Power and Society* (Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1971).
- Dale, M., Krundieck, S. & Bodger, P. Global energy modelling — a biophysical approach (GEMBA) part 1: an overview of biophysical economics. *Ecol. Econ.* **73**, 152–157 (2012).
- Cleveland, C. J., Costanza, R., Hall, C. A. S. & Kaufmann, R. Energy and the US economy: a biophysical perspective. *Science* **225**, 890–897 (1984).
- Lambert, J. G., Hall, C. A. S., Balogh, S., Gupta, A. & Arnold, M. Energy, EROI and quality of life. *Energy Policy* **64**, 153–167 (2014).

63. Gupta, A. K. & Hall, C. A. S. A review of the past and current state of EROI data. *Sustainability* **3**, 1796–1809 (2011).
64. Hall, C. A. S. & Klitgaard, K. A. *Energy and the Wealth of Nations: An Introduction to Biophysical Economics* (Springer, New York, 2017).
65. Kümmel, R. *The Second Law of Economics, Energy, Entropy and the Origins of Wealth* (Springer, New York, 2011).
66. Hall, C., Lindenberg, D., Kümmel, R., Kroeger, T. & Eichhorn, W. The need to reintegrate the natural sciences with economics. *BioScience* **51**, 663–673 (2001).
67. Hall, C. A. S., Balogh, S. & Murphy, D. J. R. What is the minimum EROI that a sustainable society must have? *Energies* **2**, 25–47 (2009).
68. King, L. C. & van den Bergh, J. C. J. M. Implications of net energy-return-on-investment for a low-carbon energy transition. *Nat. Energy* **3**, 334–340 (2018).
69. Odum, H. T. *Environmental Accounting, EMERGY and Environmental Decision Making* (Wiley, Chichester, 1996).
70. Geng, Y., Sarkis, J., Ulgiati, S. & Zhang, P. Measuring China's circular economy. *Science* **339**, 1526–1527 (2013).
71. Yang, Z. F. et al. Solar energy evaluation for Chinese economy. *Energy Policy* **38**, 875–886 (2010).
72. Ayres, R. U., Ayres, L. W. & Warr, B. Exergy, power and work in the US economy, 1900–1998. *Energy* **28**, 219–273 (2003).
73. Sousa, T. et al. The need for robust, consistent methods in societal exergy accounting. *Ecol. Econ.* **141**, 11–21 (2017).
74. Romero, J. C. & Linares, P. Exergy as a global energy sustainability indicator. A review of the state of the art. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* **33**, 427–442 (2014).
75. Ayres, R. U. & Ayres, L. W. *Accounting for Resources, 1: Economy-Wide Applications of Mass-Balance Principles to Materials and Waste* (Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK, Northampton, MA, 1998).
76. Baccini, P. & Brunner, P. H. *Metabolism of the Anthroposphere* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991).
77. Moriguchi, Y. Material flow indicators to measure progress toward a sound material-cycle society. *J. Mater. Cycles Waste Manag.* **9**, 112–120 (2007).
78. Baccini, P. & Bader, H.-P. *Regionaler Stoffhaushalt* (Spektrum Akademischer Verlag, Heidelberg, 1986).
79. Krausmann, F., Schandl, H., Eisenmenger, N., Giljum, S. & Jackson, T. Material flow accounting: measuring global material use for sustainable development. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* **42**, 647–675 (2017).
80. Giljum, S., Dittrich, M., Lieber, M. & Lutter, S. Global patterns of material flows and their socio-economic and environmental implications: a MFA study on all countries world-wide from 1980 to 2009. *Resources* **3**, 319–339 (2014).
81. Dong, L. et al. Material flows and resource productivity in China, South Korea and Japan from 1970 to 2008: a transitional perspective. *J. Clean. Prod.* **141**, 1164–1177 (2017).
82. Steinberger, J. K., Krausmann, F., Getzner, M., Schandl, H. & West, J. Development and dematerialization: an international study. *PLoS ONE* **8**, e70385 (2013).
83. Chen, M. & Graedel, T. E. A half-century of global phosphorus flows, stocks, production, consumption, recycling, and environmental impacts. *Glob. Environ. Change* **36**, 139–152 (2016).
84. Huang, C.-L., Vause, J., Ma, H.-W. & Yu, C.-P. Using material/substance flow analysis to support sustainable development assessment: a literature review and outlook. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* **68**, 104–116 (2012).
85. Leontief, W. Environmental repercussions and the economic structure: an input-output approach. *Rev. Econ. Stat.* **52**, 262–271 (1970).
86. Daly, H. E. On economics as a life science. *J. Polit. Econ.* **76**, 392–406 (1968).
87. Tukker, A. et al. Towards robust, authoritative assessments of environmental impacts embodied in trade: current state and recommendations. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **22**, 585–598 (2018).
88. Malik, A., McBain, D., Wiedmann, T. O., Lenzen, M. & Murray, J. Advancements in input-output models and indicators for consumption-based accounting: MRIO models for consumption-based accounting. *J. Ind. Ecol.* <https://doi.org/10.1111/jiec.12771> (2018).
89. Bullard, I. & Herendeen, R. A. The energy cost of goods and services. *Energy Policy* **3**, 268–278 (1975).
90. Bullard, C. W., Penner, P. S. & Pilati, D. A. Net energy analysis: handbook for combining process and input-output analysis. *Resour. Energy* **1**, 267–313 (1978).
91. Wood, R., Stadler, K., Bulavskaya, T., Giljum, S. & Lutter, S. Growth in environmental footprints and environmental impacts embodied in trade: resource efficiency indicators from EXIOBASE3. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **22**, 553–564 (2018).
92. Plank, B., Eisenmenger, N., Schaffartzik, A. & Wiedenhofer, D. International trade drives global resource use: a structural decomposition analysis of raw material consumption from 1990–2010. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **52**, 4190–4198 (2018).
93. Meng, J. et al. The rise of south–south trade and its effect on global CO₂ emissions. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 1871 (2018).
94. Wiedmann, T. & Lenzen, M. Environmental and social footprints of international trade. *Nat. Geosci.* **11**, 314–321 (2018).
95. Wackernagel, M. et al. Tracking the ecological overshoot of the human economy. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **99**, 9266–9271 (2002).
96. Guinée, J. B. & Heijungs, R. In *Kirk-Othmer Encyclopedia of Chemical Technology* <https://doi.org/10.1002/0471238961.lifeguin.a01> (Wiley, 2015).
97. Hellweg, S. & Canals, L. Mi Emerging approaches, challenges and opportunities in life cycle assessment. *Science* **344**, 1109–1113 (2014).
98. Zamagni, A., Guinée, J., Heijungs, R., Masoni, P. & Raggi, A. Lights and shadows in consequential LCA. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **17**, 904–918 (2012).
99. Earles, J. M. & Halog, A. Consequential life cycle assessment: a review. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **16**, 445–453 (2011).
100. Pauliuk, S., Arvesen, A., Stadler, K. & Hertwich, E. G. Industrial ecology in integrated assessment models. *Nat. Clim. Change* **7**, 13–20 (2017).
101. Crutzen, P. J. Geology of mankind. *Nature* **415**, 23–23 (2002).
102. Steffen, W. et al. Planetary boundaries: guiding human development on a changing planet. *Science* **347**, 1259855–1259855 (2015).
103. IPCC *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis* (eds Stocker, T. F. et al.) (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2013).
104. Johnson, C. N. et al. Biodiversity losses and conservation responses in the Anthropocene. *Science* **356**, 270–275 (2017).
105. Lenton, T. M., Pichler, P.-P. & Weisz, H. Revolutions in energy input and material cycling in Earth history and human history. *Earth Syst. Dyn.* **7**, 353–370 (2016).
106. Schandl, H. et al. Global material flows and resource productivity: forty years of evidence. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **22**, 827–838 (2017).
107. Ehrlich, P. R. *The Population Bomb: Population Control or Race to Oblivion?* (Sierra Club, Ballantine Books, New York, 1968).
108. York, R., Rosa, E. A. & Dietz, T. STIRPAT, IPAT and ImPACT: analytic tools for unpacking the driving forces of environmental impacts. *Ecol. Econ.* **46**, 351–365 (2003).
109. Moran, D. D., Wackernagel, M., Kitzes, J. A., Goldfinger, S. H. & Boutaud, A. Measuring sustainable development — nation by nation. *Ecol. Econ.* **64**, 470–474 (2008).
110. Steinberger, J. K., Timmons Roberts, J., Peters, G. P. & Baiocchi, G. Pathways of human development and carbon emissions embodied in trade. *Nat. Clim. Change* **2**, 81–85 (2012).
111. Dietz, T., Rosa, E. A. & York, R. Environmentally efficient well-being: Is there a Kuznets curve? *Appl. Geogr.* **32**, 21–28 (2012).
112. Ayres, R. U. & Warr, B. *The Economic Growth Engine: How Energy And Work Drive Material Prosperity* (Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK, Northampton, MA, 2009).
113. Warr, B. & Ayres, R. U. Useful work and information as drivers of economic growth. *Ecol. Econ.* **73**, 93–102 (2012).
114. Zhang, C., Chen, W.-Q. & Ruth, M. Measuring material efficiency: a review of the historical evolution of indicators, methodologies and findings. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* **132**, 79–92 (2018).
115. *Decoupling Natural Resource Use And Environmental Impacts From Economic Growth* (United Nations Environment Programme, 2011).
116. Pothen, F. & Schymura, M. Bigger cakes with fewer ingredients? A comparison of material use of the world economy. *Ecol. Econ.* **109**, 109–121 (2015).
117. Shao, Q., Schaffartzik, A., Mayer, A. & Krausmann, F. The high 'price' of dematerialization: a dynamic panel data analysis of material use and economic recession. *J. Clean. Prod.* **167**, 120–132 (2017).
118. Costanza, R. et al. Development: time to leave GDP behind. *Nature* **505**, 283–285 (2014).
119. Bringezu, S. et al. Multi-scale governance of sustainable natural resource use — challenges and opportunities for monitoring and institutional development at the national and global level. *Sustainability* **8**, 778 (2016).
120. Krausmann, F., Fischer-Kowalski, M., Schandl, H. & Eisenmenger, N. The global sociometabolic transition. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **12**, 637–656 (2008).
121. Steinberger, J. K., Krausmann, F. & Eisenmenger, N. Global patterns of materials use: a socioeconomic and geophysical analysis. *Ecol. Econ.* **69**, 1148–1158 (2010).
122. Wiedmann, T. O. et al. The material footprint of nations. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **112**, 6271–6276 (2015).
123. Muradian, R., Walter, M. & Martinez-Alier, J. Global transformations, social metabolism and the dynamics of socio-environmental conflicts. *Glob. Environ. Change* **22**(Spec. Issue), 559–794 (2012).
124. Simas, M., Pauliuk, S., Wood, R., Hertwich, E. G. & Stadler, K. Correlation between production and consumption-based environmental indicators. *Ecol. Indic.* **76**, 317–323 (2017).
125. Steinberger, J. K. & Krausmann, F. Material and energy productivity. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **45**, 1169–1176 (2011).

126. Görg, C. et al. Challenges for social-ecological transformations: contributions from social and political ecology. *Sustainability* **9**, 1045 (2017).
127. O'Neill, D. W., Fanning, A. L., Lamb, W. F. & Steinberger, J. K. A good life for all within planetary boundaries. *Nat. Sustain.* **1**, 88–95 (2018).
128. Bringezu, S. Possible target corridor for sustainable use of global material resources. *Resources* **4**, 25–54 (2015).
129. Ghisellini, P., Cialani, C. & Ulgiati, S. A review on circular economy: the expected transition to a balanced interplay of environmental and economic systems. *J. Clean. Prod.* **114**, 11–32 (2016).
130. McDowall, W. et al. Circular economy policies in china and europe: circular economy policies in China and Europe. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **21**, 651–661 (2017).
131. Björklund, A. & Finnveden, G. Recycling revisited — life cycle comparisons of global warming impact and total energy use of waste management strategies. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* **44**, 309–317 (2005).
132. Reck, B. K. & Graedel, T. E. Challenges in metal recycling. *Science* **337**, 690–695 (2012).
133. Graedel, T. E., Harper, E. M., Nassar, N. T. & Reck, B. K. On the materials basis of modern society. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **112**, 6295–6300 (2015).
134. Ciacci, L., Reck, B. K., Nassar, N. T. & Graedel, T. E. Lost by design. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **49**, 9443–9451 (2015).
135. Pauliuk, S., Milford, R. L., Müller, D. B. & Allwood, J. M. The steel scrap age. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **47**, 3448–3454 (2013).
136. Wang, P., Li, W. & Kara, S. Dynamic life cycle quantification of metallic elements and their circularity, efficiency, and leakages. *J. Clean. Prod.* **174**, 1492–1502 (2018).
137. Graedel, T. E. et al. What do we know about metal recycling rates? *J. Ind. Ecol.* **15**, 355–366 (2011).
138. Haas, W., Krausmann, F., Wiedenhofer, D. & Heinz, M. How circular is the global economy? An assessment of material flows, waste production, and recycling in the European Union and the world in 2005. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **19**, 765–777 (2015).
139. Pauliuk, S. Critical appraisal of the circular economy standard BS 8001:2017 and a dashboard of quantitative system indicators for its implementation in organizations. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* **129**, 81–92 (2018).
140. Mayer, A., Haas, W. & Wiedenhofer, D. How countries' resource use history matters for human well-being — an investigation of global patterns in cumulative material flows from 1950 to 2010. *Ecol. Econ.* **134**, 1–10 (2017).
141. Porter, M., Stern, S. & Green, M. *Social Progress Index 2017* (Social Progress Imperative, 2017).
142. Costa, L., Rybski, D. & Kropp, J. P. A human development framework for CO₂ reductions. *PLoS ONE* **6**, e29262 (2011).
143. Lamb, W. F. et al. Transitions in pathways of human development and carbon emissions. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **9**, 014011 (2014).
144. Dearing, J. A. et al. Safe and just operating spaces for regional social-ecological systems. *Glob. Environ. Change* **28**, 227–238 (2014).
145. *Measuring Material Flows and Resource Productivity. Volume I. The OECD Guide* (Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development, 2008).
146. Liao, W., Heijungs, R. & Huppes, G. Thermodynamic analysis of human-environment systems: a review focused on industrial ecology. *Ecol. Modell.* **228**, 76–88 (2012).
147. Liu, G., Bangs, C. E. & Müller, D. B. Stock dynamics and emission pathways of the global aluminium cycle. *Nat. Clim. Change* **3**, 338–342 (2012).
148. Sandberg, N. H. et al. Dynamic building stock modelling: application to 11 European countries to support the energy efficiency and retrofit ambitions of the EU. *Energy Build.* **132**, 26–38 (2016).
149. Hertwich, E. G. & Peters, G. P. Carbon footprint of nations: a global, trade-linked analysis. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **43**, 6414–6420 (2009).
150. Peters, G. P., Minx, J. C., Weber, C. L. & Edenhofer, O. Growth in emission transfers via international trade from 1990 to 2008. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **108**, 8903–8908 (2011).
151. Davis, S. J., Caldeira, K. & Matthews, H. D. Future CO₂ emissions and climate change from existing energy infrastructure. *Science* **329**, 1330–1333 (2010).
152. Raupach, M. R. et al. Sharing a quota on cumulative carbon emissions. *Nat. Clim. Change* **4**, 873–879 (2014).
153. Seto, K. C., Golden, J. S., Alberti, M. & Turner, B. L. Sustainability in an urbanizing planet. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **114**, 8935–8938 (2017).
154. Bretschger, L. & Smulders, S. Challenges for a sustainable resource use: uncertainty, trade, and climate policies. *J. Environ. Econ. Manag.* **64**, 279–287 (2012).
155. Laner, D., Rechberger, H. & Astrup, T. Systematic evaluation of uncertainty in material flow analysis. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **18**, 859–870 (2014).
156. Hertwich, E. G. Consumption and the rebound effect: an industrial ecology perspective. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **9**, 85–98 (2005).
157. Ayres, R. U. & Simonis, U. E. *Industrial Metabolism: Restructuring for Sustainable Development* (United Nations Univ. Press, Tokyo, 1994).
158. Chertow, M., Lifset, R. & Yang, T. In *Oxford Bibliographies in Ecology* <https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199830060-0200> (2018).
159. Erb, K.-H. How a socio-ecological metabolism approach can help to advance our understanding of changes in land-use intensity. *Ecol. Econ.* **76**, 8–14 (2012).
160. Turner, B. L., Lambin, E. F. & Reenberg, A. The emergence of land change science for global environmental change and sustainability. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **104**, 20666–20671 (2007).
161. Allwood, J. M., Ashby, M. F., Gutowski, T. G. & Worrell, E. Material efficiency: a white paper. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* **55**, 362–381 (2011).
162. Schandl, H. et al. Decoupling global environmental pressure and economic growth: scenarios for energy use, materials use and carbon emissions. *J. Clean. Prod.* **132**, 45–56 (2016).
163. Duro, J. A., Schaffartzik, A. & Krausmann, F. Metabolic inequality and its impact on efficient contraction and convergence of international material resource use. *Ecol. Econ.* **145**, 430–440 (2018).
164. Pichler, M., Schaffartzik, A., Haberl, H. & Görg, C. Drivers of society-nature relations in the Anthropocene and their implications for sustainability transformations. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* **26–27**, 32–36 (2017).
165. López, L. A., Arce, G., Morenate, M. & Zafrilla, J. E. How does income redistribution affect households' material footprint? *J. Clean. Prod.* **153**, 515–527 (2017).
166. Ahmed, N. M. *Failing States, Collapsing Systems: Biophysical Triggers of Political Violence* (Springer Nature, Cham, 2017).
167. Martinez-Alier, J. *The Environmentalism of the Poor: A Study of Ecological Conflicts and Valuation* (Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK, Northampton, MA, 2002).
168. Pérez-Rincón, M., Vargas-Morales, J. & Crespo-Marín, Z. Trends in social metabolism and environmental conflicts in four Andean countries from 1970 to 2013. *Sustain. Sci.* **13**, 635–648 (2018).
169. Simas, M., Goldstein, L., Huijbregts, M. J., Wood, R. & Hertwich, E. The “bad labor” footprint: quantifying the social impacts of globalization. *Sustainability* **6**, 7514–7540 (2014).
170. Simas, M., Wood, R. & Hertwich, E. Labor embodied in trade. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **19**, 343–356 (2015).
171. Giljum, S. & Eisenmenger, N. North-south trade and the distribution of environmental goods and burdens: a biophysical perspective. *J. Environ. Dev.* **13**, 73–100 (2004).
172. Hornborg, A. & Jorgensen, A. K. *International Trade and Environmental Justice: Toward a Global Political Ecology* (Nova Science, Hauppauge, 2010).
173. Hornborg, A. & Martinez-Alier, J. Ecologically unequal exchange and ecological debt. *J. Polit. Ecol.* **23**, 328–333 (2016).
174. Rotmans, J. & Fischer-Kowalski, M. Conceptualizing, observing and influencing socio-ecological transitions. *Ecol. Soc.* **14**, 3 (2009).
175. Geels, F. W., Schwanen, T., Sorrell, S., Jenkins, K. & Sovacool, B. K. Reducing energy demand through low carbon innovation: a sociotechnical transitions perspective and thirteen research debates. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.* **40**, 23–35 (2018).
176. Haberl, H., Fischer-Kowalski, M., Krausmann, F., Martinez-Alier, J. & Winiwarter, V. A socio-metabolic transition towards sustainability? Challenges for another great transformation. *Sustain. Dev.* **19**, 1–14 (2011).
177. Fischer-Kowalski, M. & Hüttler, W. Society's metabolism: the intellectual history of materials flow analysis, part II, 1970–1998. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **2**, 107–136 (1998).
178. Shiklomanov, I. A. Appraisal and assessment of world water resources. *Water Int.* **25**, 11–32 (2000).
179. Krausmann, F. et al. Growth in global materials use, GDP and population during the 20th century. *Ecol. Econ.* **68**, 2696–2705 (2009).
180. Krausmann, F., Lauk, C., Haas, W. & Wiedenhofer, D. From resource extraction to outflows of wastes and emissions: the socioeconomic metabolism of the global economy, 1900–2015. *Glob. Environ. Change* **52**, 131–140 (2018).
181. Riley, J. C. Estimates of regional and global life expectancy, 1800–2001. *Popul. Dev. Rev.* **31**, 537–543 (2005).
182. *World Development Indicators* (The World Bank, accessed 22 August 2017); <http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators>
183. Bolt, J. & van Zanden, J. L. The Maddison Project: collaborative research on historical national accounts. *Econ. History Rev.* **67**, 627–651 (2014).
184. De Stercke, S. *Dynamics of Energy Systems: A Useful Perspective* IIASA Interim Report No. IR-14-013 (International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, 2014).
185. Marland, G., Boden, T. A. & Andres, R. J. *Global, Regional, and National Fossil-Fuel CO₂ Emissions* (Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Environmental Sciences Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, 2016).
186. Cao, Z., Shen, L., Lovik, A. N., Müller, D. B. & Liu, G. Elaborating the history of our cementing societies: an in-use stock perspective. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **51**, 11468–11475 (2017).

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge research funding from the European Research Council ERC (MAT-STOCKS, grant 741950) and from the Austrian Science Fund FWF (projects MISO P27590 and GELUC P29130-G27). We thank M. Podovac for help with Figs. 1 and 2 and M. Niedertscheider for help with the maps in Fig. 3.

Author contributions

All authors contributed to reviewing and discussing literature and writing the article. H.H. and D.W. conceived Fig. 1. M.F.-K. conceived Fig. 2. F.K. and D.W. compiled data and drafted Fig. 3. D.W. compiled data and drafted Fig. 4. S.P. compiled data and drafted Fig. 5. D.W. and S.P. compiled data and drafted Fig. 6. H.H. structured the paper and discussions. All authors contributed to writing the text.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Additional information

Reprints and permissions information is available at www.nature.com/reprints.

Correspondence should be addressed to H.H.

Publisher's note: Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

© Springer Nature Limited 2019