International Journal of Engineering & Extended Technologies Research (IJEETR)

|ISSN: 2322-0163| www.ijeetr.com | A Bimonthly, Peer Reviewed, Scholarly Indexed Journal |

| Volume 5, Issue 1, January - February 2023 |

DOI:10.15662/IJEETR.2023.0501003

Waste-to-Resource Networks for Inorganic Chemical Manufacturing: A Case Study

Prashant Rajurkar

Environmental Specialist, Department of Environmental Health and Safety, Eastman Chemicals, Springfield, MA, USA

ABSTRACT: The transition from linear "take-make-dispose" production models to circular economy paradigms requires innovative approaches to industrial waste management. This paper examines waste-to-resource networks in inorganic chemical manufacturing through the lens of industrial ecology and circular economy principles. A comprehensive review of methodologies, frameworks, and real-world case studies demonstrate the transformation of industrial waste streams into valuable resources. The study analyzes multi-objective optimization approaches combining Material Flow Analysis (MFA), Life Cycle Assessment (LCA), industrial symbiosis algorithms, and digital platform technologies. Key case studies include potassium chloride recovery from cement kiln bypass dust, municipal solid waste incineration ash mining and chemical cluster symbiosis optimization. Results indicate that waste-to-resource networks can deliver substantial environmental and economic benefits, including reduced virgin material consumption, lower emissions, and significant cost savings. However, implementation faces challenges related to data complexity, inter-organizational coordination, technical heterogeneity, and regulatory barriers. The paper concludes with future research directions emphasizing digital platforms, physics-based network models, and stakeholder facilitation mechanisms to accelerate the adoption of circular economy practices in the inorganic chemical sector.

KEYWORDS: Waste-to-resource networks, industrial ecology, circular economy, inorganic chemical manufacturing, industrial symbiosis, material flow analysis, life cycle assessment, waste valorization

I. INTRODUCTION

The global chemical industry generates approximately 300 million tonnes of waste annually, with inorganic chemical manufacturing contributing a significant portion of this burden [1]. Traditional linear production models characterized by extraction, production, consumption, and disposal, have led to resource depletion, environmental degradation, and economic inefficiencies. The urgency of addressing these challenges has intensified with growing concerns about climate change, resource scarcity, and sustainable development goals. The concept of waste-to-resource networks represents a paradigm shift from viewing industrial waste as a disposal problem to recognizing it as a valuable feedstock for other processes. This approach aligns with industrial ecology principles that emphasize closing material loops, minimizing virgin resource extraction, and creating symbiotic relationships between industrial processes [2]. In the context of inorganic chemical manufacturing, waste streams often contain valuable elements such as potassium, phosphorus, metals, and other chemicals that can be recovered and reintroduced into production cycles.

Problem Statement

Despite growing interest in waste-to-resource networks, several barriers limit large-scale adoption in inorganic chemical manufacturing. The following table summarizes these barriers:

Table 1. Challenges in Waste-to-Resource Network

Challenge	Description
Technical complexity	Multi-component and contaminated waste streams require advanced separation and purification technologies.
Economic viability	Recovery processes must compete with inexpensive virgin materials and high capital costs.
Organizational barriers	Industrial symbiosis demands coordination, transparency, and trust across multiple firms.
Regulatory uncertainty	Ambiguous classification of by-products and inconsistent secondary-material policies create risk.
Knowledge gaps	Limited understanding of optimal network design and decision-support methods hampers implementation.

International Journal of Engineering & Extended Technologies Research (IJEETR)

|ISSN: 2322-0163| www.ijeetr.com | A Bimonthly, Peer Reviewed, Scholarly Indexed Journal |

| Volume 5, Issue 1, January - February 2023 |

DOI:10.15662/IJEETR.2023.0501003

This study addresses these challenges through the following goals:
1. Review and synthesize current concepts, frameworks, and methodologies for waste-to-resource networks in inorganic chemical manufacturing.
2. Analyze real-world case studies demonstrating successful implementation and measurable outcomes.
3. Identify key success factors, barriers, and challenges based on empirical and comparative evidence.
4. Propose future research and practical recommendations to accelerate circular economy adoption within the inorganic chemical sector.

II. LITERATURE SURVEY

2.1. Industrial Ecology and Circular Economy

Industrial ecology emerged in the 1970s as a systems-based approach to understanding material and energy flows in industrial systems. The field draws inspiration from natural ecosystems, where waste from one organism becomes food for another, creating closed-loop nutrient cycles [3]. Key principles include:

- Systems thinking: Analyzing industrial activities as interconnected systems rather than isolated processes
- Material flow analysis: Quantifying inputs, outputs, and accumulations of materials throughout product life cycles
- Life cycle thinking: Considering environmental impacts from raw material extraction through end-of-life disposal
- Industrial symbiosis: Facilitating resource exchange networks among geographically or organizationally proximate firms

The circular economy concept builds on industrial ecology foundations, emphasizing business models and economic systems designed to eliminate waste through superior initial design, maintenance, repair, reuse, remanufacturing, refurbishing, and recycling [4]. In the context of inorganic chemical manufacturing, circular economy strategies focus on:

- Closing material loops through recovery and recycling
- Extending product lifespans and optimizing resource utilization
- Shifting from product sales to service-based business models
- Designing processes for disassembly and material recovery

2.2. Waste Valorization

Waste valorization refers to the process of converting waste materials into more useful products including materials, chemicals, fuels, or other sources of energy [5]. In inorganic chemical manufacturing, valorization strategies include:

- Direct reuse: Using waste materials as-is in other processes (e.g., slag in cement production)
- Material recovery: Extracting specific elements or compounds from waste streams
- Energy recovery: Converting waste materials into heat, electricity, or fuel
- Chemical transformation: Processing waste into new chemical products

The economic viability of valorization depends on factors including waste composition, available technologies, market prices for recovered materials, and regulatory frameworks. Studies indicate that waste streams with concentrated valuable elements (>1% by weight) and consistent composition offer the most promising valorization opportunities [6].

2.3. Industrial Symbiosis

Industrial symbiosis represents a collaborative approach where traditionally separate industries exchange materials, energy, water, and by-products to achieve competitive advantages through shared resources [7]. Successful symbiosis networks exhibit several characteristics:

- Geographic proximity: Reduced transportation costs and logistics complexity
- Complementary material flows: One organization’s waste matches another's input requirements
- Trust and cooperation: Long-term relationships and transparent communication
- Economic benefits: Cost savings or revenue generation for participating firms
- Environmental improvements: Reduced virgin material use and waste disposal

The Kalundborg Symbiosis in Denmark represents the most cited example, where a power plant, oil refinery, pharmaceutical company, and other facilities exchange steam, cooling water, fly ash, and other materials, collectively saving millions of euros annually while reducing environmental impacts [8].

International Journal of Engineering & Extended Technologies Research (IJEETR)

|ISSN: 2322-0163| www.ijeetr.com | A Bimonthly, Peer Reviewed, Scholarly Indexed Journal |

| Volume 5, Issue 1, January - February 2023 |

DOI:10.15662/IJEETR.2023.0501003

III. METHODOLOGIES AND FRAMEWORKS

3.1 Optimization Approaches

Multi-objective optimization methods guide the design of waste-to-resource networks by balancing economic and environmental performance. Table 2 and 3 summarize optimization approaches and assessment tools.

Table 2. List of Optimization Approaches

Method	Description	Key Insights / Results
Mixed-Integer Linear Programming (MILP)	Defines optimal material flows, facility locations, and technology choices using cost and environmental objectives under mass-balance and capacity constraints.	Vadenbo et al. [9] combined MFA–LCA to identify Pareto-optimal networks minimizing cost and impact.
Heuristic Algorithms	Used for large-scale networks where exact solutions are infeasible.	Duque et al. [10] achieved 70–85% faster computation with <5% deviation from optimal solutions.
Symbiosis Algorithms	Identify inter-firm material exchange opportunities.	Lyu et al. [11] applied algorithms to a chemical cluster (569 inputs, 435 products, 55 by-products), identifying 218 symbiotic pairs, 0.91 Mt recovered material, and 1.25B CNY (≈USD 175M) in savings.

Table 3. List of Assessment Tools

Tool	Purpose	Typical Findings / Benefits
Material Flow Analysis (MFA)	Quantifies inputs, outputs, and accumulations of materials within systems.	Reveals inefficiencies and supports regulatory compliance.
Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)	Evaluates cradle-to-grave environmental impacts (GHG, resource use, toxicity).	Waste-to-resource scenarios show 40–80% climate impact and 50–90% resource depletion reductions [12].
Techno-Economic Analysis (TEA)	Assesses feasibility and financial performance (CAPEX, OPEX, NPV, IRR).	Determines investment viability and sensitivity to market and policy conditions.

3.2 Digital Platforms and Decision Support Systems

Digital and data-driven tools increasingly enable network coordination and optimization as described in Table 4.

Table 4. List of Digital Platforms

Platform Type	Functionality	Reference / Outcome
Ontology-based Systems	Catalog waste streams and technologies; match valorization routes; support stakeholder communication.	Hsien et al. [13] improved cross-sector integration.
Database Platforms	Centralize material and process data; facilitate matchmaking between generators and users.	Pacheco-López et al. [14] enabled real-time performance tracking.
Thermodynamic Network Models	Combine thermodynamics, graph theory, and control logic to optimize circularity.	König [15] linked models with Industry 4.0 systems for monitoring and control.

3.3 Previous Research and Gaps

There has been extensive research that spans process, network, and sectoral levels as follows:

- Process level: Metal [16], phosphorus [17], CO_2 [18], and plastic [19] recovery.

International Journal of Engineering & Extended Technologies Research (IJEETR)

|ISSN: 2322-0163| www.ijeetr.com | A Bimonthly, Peer Reviewed, Scholarly Indexed Journal |

| Volume 5, Issue 1, January - February 2023 |

DOI:10.15662/IJEETR.2023.0501003

- Network level: Symbiosis case studies (Kalundborg, Ulsan, Rotterdam) [20], GIS mapping [22], and governance frameworks [23].
- Sectoral level: Cement [24], steel [25], chemical [26], and mining [27] industries.

Irrespective of the extensive research on this subject matter, the following gaps continue to remain:
1. Integration gap – Weak linkage between process-level and network-scale models.
2. Implementation gap – Limited real-world documentation.
3. Scale gap – Few regional/national applications.
4. Dynamic gap – Lack of temporal evolution models.
5. Policy gap – Minimal analysis of enabling regulations and incentives.

This study addresses these gaps through an integrated framework combining optimization, case studies, and comparative assessment to link methodology, implementation, and policy dimensions.

3.4 Network Optimization Model

The core optimization model determines optimal material flows, technology selections, and facility locations. The following variables and equations are used for the model:

Table 5. List of Variables and Corresponding Definitions

Variable	Definition	Units / Type
x_{ijt}	Material flow from source i to destination j using technology t	Tonnes/year (continuous variable)
y_{jt}	Binary variable indicating whether technology t is installed or used at location j	0 or 1 (binary)
z_k	Production level of product k	Tonnes/year (continuous)
e_{ijt}	Environmental impact factor (emissions, energy use, etc.) per unit processed by technology t	kg CO_2-eq/tonne or MJ/tonne
d_{ij}	Transport distance from i to j	km
$e_{transport}$	Environmental impact factor per tonne-kilometer of transport	kg CO_2-eq/(t·km)
$e_{virgin,k}$	Avoided impact from substituting virgin production of product k	kg CO_2-eq/tonne

Objective functions:

Economic objective will be to maximize net profit as described in equation (1):

$$Max\ Z_1 = \sum(Revenue\ from\ products) - \sum(Operating\ costs) - \sum(Capital\ costs) \quad (1)$$

$$= \sum_k (p_k \times z_k) - \sum_{i,j,t} c_{ijt} \times x_{ijt} - \sum_{j,t} C_{jt} \times y_{ijt} \quad (2)$$

The environmental objective would be to minimize life cycle impacts):

$$Min\ Z_2 = \sum(Production\ impacts) + \sum(Transportation\ impacts) - \sum(Avoided\ virgin\ production) \quad (3)$$

$$= \sum_{ijt}\left(e_{ijt} \times x_{ijt}\right) + \sum_{i,j,t}(d_{ij} \times x_{ijt} \times e_{transport}) - \sum_k e_{virgin,k} \times z_k \quad (4)$$

Following table describes the constraints of the model:

Table 6. List of Constraints

Constraint	Equation	Rationale
Mass balance at source	$\Sigma_{jt}\ x_{ijt} \leq W_i$	Total material sent from source i cannot exceed available waste quantity W_i.
Mass balance at destination	$\Sigma_{it}(\eta_{ijt} \times x_{ijt}) = z_j$	Output product equals total inputs times recovery efficiency η of each technology.
Capacity limit	$\Sigma_i\ x_{ijt} \leq Q_{jt} \times y_{jt}$	Facility j using technology t cannot

International Journal of Engineering & Extended Technologies Research (IJEETR)

|ISSN: 2322-0163| www.ijeetr.com | A Bimonthly, Peer Reviewed, Scholarly Indexed Journal |

| Volume 5, Issue 1, January - February 2023 |

DOI:10.15662/IJEETR.2023.0501003

		exceed its design capacity Q if installed ($y_{jt} = 1$).
Quality constraint – input	$\Sigma_i(q_i \times x_{ijt})/\Sigma_i x_{ijt} \geq Q_{min,j}$	Average input quality (e.g., % purity) must exceed minimum required for technology j.
Quality constraint – output	$purity(z_k) \geq P_{min,k}$	Product k must meet minimum purity or specification (e.g., 90 % KCl).
Technology installation	$y_{jt} \in \{0, 1\}$	Technology either installed or not.
Single technology per site	$\Sigma_t y_{jt} \leq 1$	Only one processing technology per site to simplify design and cost allocation.

The model generates Pareto-optimal solutions representing different trade-offs between economic and environmental objectives. Solution methods include weighted sum method, ε-constraint method and population based evolutionary algorithms.

IV. CASE STUDIES

The qualitative case studies complement quantitative optimization by capturing implementation dynamics and context-specific factors. Key dimensions include:

Table 7. Implementation Dynamics

Focus Area	Elements Examined
Implementation	Governance structures, stakeholder engagement, technology deployment, and performance management.
Success Factors	Technical reliability, economic viability, environmental compliance, and social acceptance.
Barriers	Technical (variability, contamination), economic (capital, market volatility), organizational (coordination, trust), and regulatory (classification, permitting).

4.1 Application Context: Inorganic Chemical Manufacturing

The inorganic chemical sector encompasses a wide range of **waste-to-resource opportunities** across several sub-industries. Three representative application domains—cement production, waste-to-energy incineration, and chemical industrial clusters—illustrate the potential for material recovery, energy integration, and circular network design.

4.1.1 Cement and Construction Materials

Cement kilns generate bypass dust equivalent to 2–5% of clinker mass, typically rich in chlorides and alkali metals that disrupt kiln chemistry [28]. The valorization strategy includes a combination of selective leaching, pH-controlled precipitation, and evaporative crystallization enables recovery of more than 90% purity potassium chloride (KCl) for use as fertilizer. Integration of waste heat from kiln flue gases for evaporation, along with internal recycling of non-product streams, achieves near-closed-loop operation and eliminates external disposal.

4.1.2 Municipal Solid Waste Incineration (MSWI)

Incineration residues contain economically valuable metals—Al (2–10%), Cu (0.2–1.5%), and Zn (0.5–2%)—with a potential value of USD 100–400 per tonne of ash [29]. The valorization strategy includes a sequential process involving magnetic and eddy-current separation, acid leaching, electrowinning, and precipitation enables the recovery of multiple base metals at high purity. Techno-economic assessments indicate that such integrated "ash mining" can yield 50–100% higher revenues compared with energy-only waste-to-energy operations.

4.1.3 Chemical Industrial Clusters

Large-scale clusters hosting 20 or more facilities offer substantial potential for industrial symbiosis and resource exchange [11]. Some of the exchange pathways include:

International Journal of Engineering & Extended Technologies Research (IJEETR)

|ISSN: 2322-0163| www.ijeetr.com | A Bimonthly, Peer Reviewed, Scholarly Indexed Journal |

| Volume 5, Issue 1, January - February 2023 |

DOI:10.15662/IJEETR.2023.0501003

- Acid–base neutralization between production streams
- Utilization of waste heat for endothermic processes
- Use of off-specification products as feedstocks
- Reuse of treated wastewater as cooling or process water

The network effect materialized due to greater diversity and scale enhance matching potential, with well-developed clusters achieving 30–50% of theoretical symbiosis utilization, leading to significant material savings and cost efficiencies.

4.2 Integration of Methodologies

The study employs an integrated optimization–case study framework that links modeling with real-world validation. Optimization models identify theoretical opportunities, while case studies test feasibility and refine assumptions. Quantitative metrics (e.g., recovery, cost, emissions) are contextualized with qualitative factors such as organizational and regulatory conditions. Multi-scale feedback connects facility-level data with cluster-level optimization, enabling iterative improvement. This integrated approach bridges theory and practice, offering robust, scalable guidance for implementing circular economy strategies in the inorganic chemical sector.

V. RESULTS

This section summarizes three representative waste-to-resource case studies in inorganic chemical manufacturing, followed by a comparative synthesis of technical, economic, and environmental findings.

5.1) Case Study 1: Potassium Chloride Recovery from Cement Kiln Bypass Dust [28]

A 4,000 t/day cement kiln produced ~30 t/day of chlorine-rich bypass dust (8–12 wt% Cl) requiring costly disposal. The dust contained recoverable potassium salts incompatible with clinker production.

Table 8. Integrated Valorization System

Stage	Description	Outcome / Metric
Leaching	Dust mixed with water (80 °C, 60 min)	>95 % soluble salts dissolved
Purification	Lime + $Fe_2(SO_4)_3$ addition	Pb, Cd, Cr < 10 ppm
Crystallization	Multi-stage evaporation using kiln flue gas	90–92 % pure KCl
Separation & Drying	Centrifugation and thermal drying	Fertilizer-grade crystals
Recycling	Residual Ca–Mg streams returned to kiln	100 % dust utilization

The resource integration achieved is as follows and performance is described in Table 9:

- Flue-gas heat (150–250 °C) replaced ~80 % of external energy.
- 90 % water recycled.
- CO_2 from flue gas used for pH control.
- Zero external waste achieved.

Table 9. Performance Results

Parameter	Result
KCl production	6 t/day (85 % K recovery)
Product purity	90–92 %
Capex / Opex	USD 2.8 M / USD 45 t^{-1} dust
Revenue	USD 380 t^{-1} KCl
Annual net benefit	USD 1.2 M
Payback / IRR	2.3 y / 38 %
Virgin KCl avoided	2,190 t/y
Landfill avoided	10,950 t/y
CO_2 reduction	450 t/y
Heavy-metal immobilization	> 99 % Pb, Cd, Cr

International Journal of Engineering & Extended Technologies Research (IJEETR)

|ISSN: 2322-0163| www.ijeetr.com | A Bimonthly, Peer Reviewed, Scholarly Indexed Journal |

| Volume 5, Issue 1, January - February 2023 |

DOI:10.15662/IJEETR.2023.0501003

Operational uptime	> 95 %
Scalability	2,000–8,000 t/d kilns

Factors such as effective heat integration, fertilizer market access, regulatory clarity, and strong technical collaboration enabled rapid implementation and profitability would impact the outcome.

5.2 Case Study 2: Municipal Solid Waste Incineration Ash Mining [29]

A 500,000 t/y waste-to-energy facility generated 125,000 t/y of bottom + fly ash. Fly ash required hazardous disposal due to heavy-metal content. An integrated ash-mining system was developed to recover metals. Table 10 describes the process overview.

Table 10. Process Overview

Stage	Main Operations	Performance
Physical Separation	Magnetic / eddy current / screening	Fe and Al-Cu recovery
Chemical Leaching	Sequential acid + alkaline extraction	Cu, Zn, Pb, Ni dissolution
Metal Recovery	Electrowinning, selective precipitation	85–94 % recovery (≥ 95 % purity)
Residue Management	Neutralization + stabilization	Safe residue disposal

For a pilot of 100 kg/day, following are the recovery statistics, full-scale economics and environmental performance:

Table 11. Recovery Statistics

Metal	Recovery (%)	Purity (%)
Cu	94	99.2
Zn	91	96.5
Al	88	98.1
Pb	85	97.8
Ni	82	95.3

Table 12. Projected Full-Scale Economics (125,000 t/y)

Item	Value
Capex	USD 18.5 M
Opex	USD 2.95 M/y
Total revenue	USD 4.87 M/y
Net annual benefit	USD 1.5 M
Payback / IRR	12.3 y / 11.2 %
NPV (20 y, 8 %)	USD 8.7 M

Table 13. Environmental Performance

Indicator	Impact
Virgin metal avoided	2,125 t/y
Landfill avoided	125,000 t/y
Hazardous waste avoided	15,000 t/y
Climate change	– 45 kg CO_2-eq/t ash
Fossil resource depletion	– 180 MJ/t
Toxicity reduction	60–80 % vs. landfilling

5.3 Case Study 3: Chemical Industrial Cluster Symbiosis Optimization [11]

A Chinese chemical industrial cluster (35 facilities) producing polymers, dyes, and pharmaceuticals sought to optimize inter-facility material exchanges for a circular economy. The following tables describe the symbiosis algorithm framework and network outcomes.

International Journal of Engineering & Extended Technologies Research (IJEETR)

|ISSN: 2322-0163| www.ijeetr.com | A Bimonthly, Peer Reviewed, Scholarly Indexed Journal |

| Volume 5, Issue 1, January - February 2023 |

DOI:10.15662/IJEETR.2023.0501003

Table 14. Symbiosis Algorithm Framework

Step	Function
Data compilation	Inventories of 569 raw materials, 435 products, 55 by-products
Matching algorithm	Identifies feasible material exchanges between facilities
Optimization	Maximizes efficiency, cost, and environmental value
Network design	Configures direct, hub-based, and cascading exchanges

Table 15. Symbiosis Network Outcomes

Metric	Value
Potential symbiotic pairs	218
Direct / Hub / Cascading	156 / 42 / 20
Additional material flows	910,000 t/y
Virgin material avoided	850,000 t/y
Waste avoided	780,000 t/y
Annual cost savings	1.25 B CNY (≈ USD 175 M)
Payback / Capex	3.6 y / 450 M CNY
CO_2 reduction	185,000 t/y
Water reduction	2.8 M m^3/y
Energy savings	1,850 TJ/y

5.4 Comparative Analysis and Synthesis

Across these case studies, several factors consistently supported successful waste-to-resource implementation. Economic viability, driven by positive ROI and short payback periods, was the strongest enabler. Projects utilizing proven technologies, integrating waste heat and existing infrastructure, and accessing established end-markets achieved the most stable performance. Supportive regulations and committed leadership further strengthened implementation success.

Table 16. Case Studies Comparison

Dimension	Case 1: Cement KCl	Case 2: Ash Mining	Case 3: Cluster Symbiosis
Scale	Single facility	Single facility	Multi-facility cluster
Sector	Cement	Waste-to-energy	Chemicals
Focus	KCl recovery	Metal recovery	Multi-stream exchange
Capex	USD 2.8 M	USD 18.5 M	USD 63 M (450 M CNY)
Annual benefit	USD 1.2 M	USD 1.5 M	USD 175 M (1.25 B CNY)
Payback	2.3 y	12.3 y	3.6 y
Complexity	Low	Medium	High
Market certainty	High	Medium	High

Persistent challenges included data-intensive planning, high capital requirements, process and quality-control complexity, and coordination difficulties in multi-party projects. Regulatory ambiguity over waste classification and commodity price volatility also constrained scalability.

For practice, facility operators should focus on detailed waste characterization and proven, integrative solutions; industrial clusters should adopt phased, high-value-first approaches with shared coordination platforms; technology developers should provide modular, data-driven systems; and policymakers should clarify regulations, incentivize circular investments, and create certification frameworks for secondary materials.

International Journal of Engineering & Extended Technologies Research (IJEETR)

|ISSN: 2322-0163| www.ijeetr.com | A Bimonthly, Peer Reviewed, Scholarly Indexed Journal |

| Volume 5, Issue 1, January - February 2023 |

DOI:10.15662/IJEETR.2023.0501003

VI. CONCLUSION

This study demonstrated that waste-to-resource networks in inorganic chemical manufacturing can convert disposal liabilities into economic and environmental gains. The outcome of three case-studies reviewed in this study suggests that:

- Cement bypass dust valorization produced 6 t/day of 90 % pure KCl with a 2.3-year payback.
- Incineration ash mining recovered metals worth USD 100–400 / t.
- Chemical-cluster symbiosis enabled 0.91 Mt/y additional material flows and USD 175 M/y savings.

Collectively, the results confirm that integrated recovery and reuse can deliver profitability, waste elimination, and emissions reduction. Integrated analytical approaches combining optimization models (e.g., MILP, network algorithms) and case studies yielded both quantitative insights and qualitative lessons on implementation feasibility. Financial performance varied by scale and sector: single-facility projects achieved faster paybacks, while multi-facility clusters realized greater aggregate gains but higher coordination complexity. Following are key outcomes of this study:

1. Integrated Framework: Combines optimization, case study, and comparative synthesis to bridge modeling and practice.
2. Empirical Evidence: Provides detailed quantitative and qualitative documentation for three real-world systems.
3. Cross-Case Insights: Identifies success factors and barriers across scales and contexts.
4. Actionable Guidance: Translates academic analysis into practical strategies for industry and policymakers.

Following are some future research directions:

- Dynamic and risk-based modeling should be conducted to capture evolving market and policy conditions.
- The socio-economic assessment could be expanded integrating social equity and job impacts.
- Policy and incentive analysis should be performed to evaluate effective regulatory instruments.
- Digital platforms combining data, optimization, and stakeholder coordination could be considered.
- Sector-specific and cross-sectoral studies (e.g., steel, lithium, phosphate) should be conducted to identify transferable synergies.
- Scale-up and financing frameworks should be developed for commercial deployment.

Persistent challenges include waste heterogeneity, regulatory ambiguity, and high upfront capital. The success of implementing this framework depends on technical maturity, market access, policy support, and leadership commitment. The findings of this study are constrained by the limited number of sectors and regional scope (two cases from China), partial reliance on modeled data, and a temporal window up to 2022. Broader validation across geographies, sectors, and evolving technologies is needed.

REFERENCES

1. Wu, Q., Lee, K. C., Bell, Z., et al. (2005). Sustainable Development through By-Product Synergy. *Proceedings of the 2005 AIChE Spring National Meeting*.
2. Nzihou, A., & Lifset, R. (2010). Waste Valorization, Loop-Closing, and Industrial Ecology. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 14(2), 196-199. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-9290.2010.00242.x
3. Ellen MacArthur Foundation. (2013). *Towards the Circular Economy: Economic and Business Rationale for an Accelerated Transition*. Ellen MacArthur Foundation.
4. Fisher, O., Watson, N. J., Escrig, J., et al. (2020). Intelligent Resource Use to Deliver Waste Valorisation and Process Resilience in Manufacturing Environments: Moving towards sustainable process manufacturing. *Johnson Matthey Technology Review*, 64(3), 295-310. https://doi.org/10.1595/205651320X15735483214878
5. Rankin, W. J. (2013). Towards Zero Waste Production in the Minerals and Metals Sector. In *Handbook of Recycling* (pp. 543-552). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-48763-2_43
6. Chertow, M. R. (2000). Industrial Symbiosis: Literature and Taxonomy. *Annual Review of Energy and the Environment*, 25(1), 313-337.
7. Jacobsen, N. B. (2006). Industrial Symbiosis in Kalundborg, Denmark: A Quantitative Assessment of Economic and Environmental Aspects. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 10(1-2), 239-255.
8. Vadenbo, C., Hellweg, S., & Guillén-Gosálbez, G. (2014). Multi-objective optimization of waste and resource management in industrial networks – Part I: Model description. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 89, 52-63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2014.05.010

9. Duque, J., Barbosa-Póvoa, A. P., & Novais, A. Q. (2010). An Efficient and Fast General Optimization Model for a Sustainable Recovery Network of Industrial Polluted Wastes. *Computer-Aided Chemical Engineering*, 28, 1087-1092. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1570-7946(10)28182-8
10. Voss, R., Lee, R. P., & Fröhling, M. (2022). Chemical Recycling of Plastic Waste: Comparative Evaluation of Environmental and Economic Performances of Gasification- and Incineration-based Treatment for Lightweight Packaging Waste. *Circular Economy and Sustainability*, 2(3), 1097-1126. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43615-021-00145-7
11. Hsien, K. J., Lin, Y. C., & Chen, P. C. (2016). Ontology-based waste-to-resource matching system for industrial symbiosis. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 60, 183-196.
12. Pacheco-López, A., Somoza-Tornos, A., Graells, M., et al. (2020). Synthesis and assessment of waste-to-resource routes for circular economy. *Computer Aided Chemical Engineering*, 48, 1807-1812.
13. Cordell, D., Drangert, J. O., & White, S. (2009). The story of phosphorus: Global food security and food for thought. *Global Environmental Change*, 19(2), 292-305.
14. Aresta, M., Dibenedetto, A., & Angelini, A. (2014). Catalysis for the Valorization of Exhaust Carbon: from CO2 to Chemicals, Materials, and Fuels. Technological Use of CO2. *Chemical Reviews*, 114(3), 1709-1742.
15. Ragaert, K., Delva, L., & Van Geem, K. (2017). Mechanical and chemical recycling of solid plastic waste. *Waste Management*, 69, 24-58.
16. Park, J. M., Park, J. Y., & Park, H. S. (2016). A review of the National Eco-Industrial Park Development Program in Korea: Progress and achievements in the first phase, 2005-2010. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 114, 33-44.
17. Chopra, S. S., & Khanna, V. (2014). Understanding resilience in industrial symbiosis networks: Insights from network analysis. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 141, 86-94.
18. Jensen, P. D., Basson, L., Hellawell, E. E., et al. (2011). Quantifying 'geographic proximity': Experiences from the United Kingdom's National Industrial Symbiosis Programme. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 55(7), 703-712.
19. Boons, F., Spekkink, W., & Mouzakitis, Y. (2011). The dynamics of industrial symbiosis: a proposal for a conceptual framework based upon a comprehensive literature review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 19(9-10), 905-911.
20. Schneider, M., Romer, M., Tschudin, M., et al. (2011). Sustainable cement production—present and future. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 41(7), 642-650.
21. Yellishetty, M., Ranjith, P. G., & Tharumarajah, A. (2010). Iron ore and steel production trends and material flows in the world: Is this really sustainable? *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 54(12), 1084-1094.
22. Chen, X., & Fujita, T. (2012). Development of an optimization model for the design of eco-industrial parks. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 24, 80-87.
23. Taha, Y., Elghali, A., Hakkou, R., et al. (2021). Towards Zero Solid Waste in the Sedimentary Phosphate Industry: Challenges and Opportunities. *Minerals*, 11(11), 1250. https://doi.org/10.3390/min11111250
24. Gao, T., Shen, L., Shen, M., et al. (2016). Analysis on differences of carbon dioxide emission from cement production and their major determinants. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 103, 160-170.
25. Allegrini, E., Maresca, A., Olsson, M. E., et al. (2014). Quantification of the resource recovery potential of municipal solid waste incineration bottom ashes. *Waste Management*, 34(9), 1627-1636.