



HAL
open science

A review of socio-economic metabolism representations and their links to action: Cases in agri-food studies

Andréa Wiktor Gabriel, Sophie Madelrieux, Philippe Lescoat

► **To cite this version:**

Andréa Wiktor Gabriel, Sophie Madelrieux, Philippe Lescoat. A review of socio-economic metabolism representations and their links to action: Cases in agri-food studies. *Ecological Economics*, 2020, 178, pp.12/106765. <10.1016/j.ecolecon.2020.106765>. <hal-02932981>

HAL Id: hal-02932981

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02932981v1>

Submitted on 11 May 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

A review of socio-economic metabolism representations and their links to action: cases in agri-food studies

Abstract

Socio-economic metabolism (SEM) occupies a central place in the study of agri-food systems. While researchers are asked to address growing environmental and social issues, the link between theoretical choices of representation and action is rarely discussed as such. We propose a cross-sectional analysis between the way SEM is described and how researchers propose to act, based on a literature concerned with agri-food systems. We distinguish the metabolism representations based on funds, flows and stocks, scales and levels, as well as socio-economic analysis. Action is seen through the operational goals pursued by the researchers, the action-research interfaces in which they engage, and the partners with whom they interact. We identified eight schools of thought related to three different types of representations: (1) space and compartment-based representations; (2) economic agent-based representations; and (3) multi-faceted and composite representations. We show that metabolism representations and action are deeply intertwined. The analysis of the biophysical basis of society is neither independent of normative claims regarding how this basis should evolve, nor of the means to get there. We then discuss the consequences of this fact on the choices of representation of metabolism and particularly the interest of anchoring SEM in pragmatism.

Highlights

1. Socio-economic metabolism (SEM) is increasingly present in agri-food studies.
2. 102 articles are examined to identify their way of representing SEM and links to action.
3. Eight “schools of thought” are described.
4. SEM representations are not neutral and are intertwined with choices of action.
5. Philosophical pragmatism is proposed to embrace this methodological pluralism.
6. This includes adopting a relational ontology and proposing multiple representations.
7. Action involves taking part in deliberative and democratic processes.

Keywords

research-management interface; participative research; metabolic networks; epistemology; pragmatism

1 Introduction: socio-economic metabolism and action

Socio-economic metabolism is seen as a paradigm for studying the biophysical basis of our societies. It “*constitutes the self-reproduction and evolution of the biophysical structures of human society. It comprises those biophysical transformation processes, distribution processes, and flows, which are controlled by humans for their purposes [and] the biophysical structures of society*” (Pauliuk et al. 2015). The notion of SEM has evolved over time and the scope of the term differs among scholars. Socio-metabolic studies translate into a wide diversity of operational concepts, such as industrial (Frosch et al. 1989), society’s (Fischer-Kowalski et al. 1998), urban (Barles 2015) and socio-economic metabolism (Pauliuk et al. 2015). In the remainder of the text, we will use “socio-economic metabolism” (SEM) to refer to the paradigm in general.

Several bibliographical reviews concerning SEM studies have recently been published. They include a comparison of two frameworks (Gerber et al. 2018), a cross-sectional analysis between industrial ecology and politics (Breetz 2017), and tool oriented ones (Fernandez-Mena et al. 2016; Beloin-Saint-Pierre et al. 2017; Haberl et al. 2019).

Metabolism is indeed a tool for management. According to Odum (1971), ecologists should use metabolism as a tool to share their analysis of reality with society and, finally, to position themselves as the actual managers of the interactions between society and the environment. The final goal is to “manage” the human system with actions based on ecological laws (Madison 1997). Social metabolism is seen as a tool for socio-ecological transition (Fischer-Kowalski et al. 2009), ecological intensification (González de Molina et al. 2017) or sustainability (Haberl et al. 2019).

While action plays an important role in SEM studies, it is rarely addressed as such in the reviews. What are researchers normative and operational objectives? What do they stand for and how can they be achieved? How does action relate to choices of metabolic representation? These questions are central if we want to address the environmental, social and political challenges revealed by metabolic representations.

In agri-food studies

SEM is increasingly present in agri-food studies. Agri-food systems play a major role in the biophysical basis of our societies and strongly contribute to society’s SEM in terms of material stocks and flows (Krausmann et al. 2009). Material flows and, in particular, flows of biomass or living matter are the subject of new challenges with the development of the bioeconomy (Vivien et al. 2019). Agriculture is the main producer of biomass in human economies by far, reaching 89 % in total mass. The biomass of humans and livestock surpass that of wild mammals by a ratio of 20 (Bar-On et al. 2018).

Development of SEM in the industrial age includes a metabolic rift between the city and the countryside (Foster 2000) as well as agricultural sector specialization (Lemaire et al. 2014). It translates into an environmental footprint (Courtonne et al. 2016) such as nitrogen pollution (Bellarby et al. 2017) or depletion of organic matter in the soil (Andrieu et al. 2014). The unsustainable nature of the ongoing SEM is unanimously recognized and a consensus exists on the urgency to transform it (Haberl et al. 2019).

76 Goals and article map

77 We propose a review of the literature based on SEM representation and action in agri-food
78 systems. This includes agricultural production, food systems and their associated com-
79 ponents such as inputs and waste flows. Several steps are followed. Firstly in section 2,
80 methods are chosen to isolate the relevant literature, describe SEM representation and the
81 researchers' links to action. Thanks to these tools, section 3 is an attempt to characterize
82 schools of thought regarding SEM and action. Section 4 presents some limits of the review
83 and discusses the fact that representations and action are linked: studies of metabolism are
84 not neutral and "schools of thought" are also "schools for action". We conclude with a
85 proposal of epistemological and methodological choices for SEM, anchored in pragmatism.

86 2 Methodology

87 2.1 Identification of literature dealing with SEM through key- 88 words

89 A systematic exploration of the literature was carried out to identify articles that deal with
90 SEM in agri-food systems. We looked for papers that focus on the biophysical structures
91 of human societies, seen in terms of human-controlled processes of transformation and dis-
92 tribution. We interpreted the "human society" criteria in a restrictive way: the flows must
93 have a social aspect, e.g., taking place on a scale larger than that of the farm, or involving a
94 collective process.

95 Searches in the scientific literature were performed using the Web of Science, with three
96 sets of keywords: those referring to (1) metabolic processes (e.g., *metabo*^{*1}; *material*; *flow*;
97 *biomass*; *circulation*); (2) agri-food systems (e.g., *agri*^{*}; *farm*^{*}; *agrarian*; *agroecosystem*);
98 and (3) social (e.g., *social*, *societ*^{*}, *collective*, *politic*^{*}). Results of the search cover the
99 period from 2000-2019. 738 articles featured at least one keyword for each category. After
100 excluding off-topic articles, 259 publications remained. While almost no authors explicitly
101 used the concept of SEM, we ensured that all three criteria were met in the articles' abstracts.
102 A total of 89 articles remained. On this basis, 13 additional articles were identified via the
103 snowball effect. The total number of articles analyzed was 102.

104 2.2 Literature description and classification

105 The articles are described according to their SEM representation and their links with action
106 (Table 1). Theoretical articles were used to describe the school of thought, and case studies
107 to illustrate methodological choices. Complementary articles, not described in the review,
108 and not specialized in agri-food, were used to describe the schools of thought. These articles
109 are mainly theoretical or seminal. Each school is then described in a synthetic way, according
110 to how the metabolism is represented, as well as its relationship to action. Two to three case
111 studies are proposed as an illustrative example for each school.

112 Based only on the SEM representation, we identified eight "schools of thought" in which
113 the various articles are classified. When various but similar names coexisted (e.g., *industrial*

¹ *metabo*^{*} means that all words starting with *metabo* were investigated, e.g., *metabolism*, *metabolic*, *metabolized*, etc.

Items	Areas of analysis	Existing modes
Representation	(a) Stocks flows and funds	Stocks and flows; economic funds and flows; ecological funds and flows; humans and non-humans as funds and flows
	(b) Scales and levels	Large-scale spaces; middle or small scales; physical black boxes; individual companies or sectors;
	(c) Socio-economic context	Historical material transitions (Marxist) ; social performance analysis ; power structure analysis; local stakeholder analysis; actor-networks
Action	(d) Claimed research goals	Limit the size of the metabolism; change the system; re-localize the economy; foster economic performance; limit environmental impact; close the loop ; preserve the ecological and economical funds; develop an ecological-process-based and socially fair food system; enhance diverse and locally-based sustainability programs
	(e) Research-management interface	Trickle-down; user-push; transfer-and-translate; research-with-management
	(f) Tools	Transition analysis; critical analysis; stakeholder analysis; management tools; post-normal-science-based tools; extended description
	(g) Actors and partners	Leaders of countries; civil society; local authorities and stakeholders; companies; trade associations ; farmers and civil society; various stakeholders.

Table 1: List of literature classification criteria according to the type of SEM representation and links with action

114 *ecology, industrial clusters and industrial symbiosis*), a compromise was made (e.g., *industrial*
115 *ecology and symbiosis*). For the sake of simplicity, only the most prominent and contrasting
116 frameworks were chosen.

117 **2.2.1 The representation of socio-economic metabolism: stocks/flows/funds/scales** 118 **levels and socio-economic context**

119 Articles are classified according to their SEM representation, especially the way they deal
120 with (a) stocks, flows and funds; (b) scales and levels; and (c) socio-economic context. These
121 three criteria are used to distinguish schools of thought.

122 (a) We followed Georgescu-Roegen’s (1971) proposal to represent human-mediated metabolic
123 processes using three distinct categories: stocks, flows and funds. A *stock* is what is present
124 in the system at a given moment of time. A *flow* represents change: it is usually used for
125 representing an input or an output of a given process. *Funds* are durable entities, which
126 are the “active agents of the process”, while flows are “used or acted upon by the agents”
127 (Georgescu-Roegen 1971). A diversity of entities can be taken into account. These include
128 *economic or ecological processes, human and non-human agents*.

129 (b) Living systems present parallel levels of organization on different scales and levels.
130 Spatial scales (e.g., region, state, global, etc.) and functional levels (humans are made of
131 organs, cells, molecules, etc., which at the same time are part of a household, part of a

community, part of a country)(Giampietro 2004). For each study, we attempted to describe the scales and levels that are taken into account in metabolic representations. For scales, these include: *large-scale spaces, middle or small scales*; for levels: *physical black boxes, individual companies or sectors*.

(c) The biophysical basis of our societies is rarely described alone. It is regularly integrated into a socio-economic context. Its analysis encompasses the diversity of the social sciences: historical, sociological, political, etc. The main types of analyses used were derived from the reading of the corpus. These include *historical material transitions, social performance analysis, (Marxist) power structure analysis, local stakeholder analysis, actor-networks*.

2.2.2 Action: goals, interfaces, tools and partners

The links between SEM representation and action are analyzed on the basis of four criteria: (d) problem definition and the researcher's goal; (e) type of research-management interface; (f) type of analysis or tools used; and (g) the chosen actors and partners.

(d) Problem definition and the researcher's goal are deduced from what the author states in the article. These objectives can be expressed explicitly or make reference to theoretical articles, e.g., *limit the size of the metabolism, change the system, re-localize the economy, foster economic performance and limit environmental impact*.

(e) The types of research-management interfaces are characterized using the typology of Gosselin et al. (2018), which distinguishes four types of interfaces between research and management: trickle-down, transfer-and-translate, user-push and research-within-management (Fig. 1).

1- In *trickle down* interfaces, knowledge is generated with no direct link to management. Researchers produce research, independently of topics of interest to users. Users can adopt it if they wish, but the researcher makes no effort in that direction.

2- In *transfer-and-translate* interfaces, scientists make an effort to transfer their results, while managers translate them into coherent management practices (e.g., extension officers at the interface between scientific knowledge and farmers).

3- In *user-push* interfaces, the users commission research on topics they are interested in. Managers may ask researchers to produce knowledge that will inform their future management.

4- *Research-within-management* is based on strong interactions through bidirectional flows of knowledge. Researchers and managers work together, pushing and pulling knowledge to define research questions and to conduct research relevant to their mutual skills and needs.

(f) The type of analysis or tools provided by the researcher for the action is described. It includes *transition analysis, critical analysis, stakeholder analysis, data and management tools, post-normal-science-based analysis and exchanges and extended descriptions*.

(g) The actors described as potential agents for change as well as the ones who are partners with whom the researchers collaborate are identified. These include *leaders of countries, civil society, local authorities and stakeholders, companies, farmers and civil society, as well as various stakeholders*.




Figure 1: Scheme of research-management interfaces (Gosselin et al. 2018).

3 Results: eight schools of thought to represent SEM and their links with action

We identified eight schools of thought related to three different types of SEM representations. Each of these types contains several schools of thought. The way each school represents the metabolism and the relationship to action is described below (Sections 3.1 to 3.3), and summarized in Table 2.

3.1 Space and compartment-based representations

Space and compartment-based representations were developed, in particular, by Fischer-Kowalski (2015). These types of approaches consider society as a set of black boxes within which flows of matter and energy pass and are disposed of (Gomiero 2017).

We identified three main schools of thought: (1) social ecology; (2) metabolic rift and Marxist ecology; and (3) urban and territorial ecology.

3.1.1 Social ecology

In this school of thought, articles are generally far-reaching descriptions of metabolic changes and dynamic studies, taking the evolution of agri-food systems into account. They focus on large-scale spaces like countries or regions, and link them to broad historical analyses such as long-term socio-ecological transitions. Flows represent materials (e.g., biomass production and appropriation of the net primary production of a country (Kohlheb et al. 2009)), energy (e.g., the systemic account of a nation’s carbon budget, comprising socioeconomic as well as ecological carbon flows in a historic time series (Erb 2012; Cusso et al. 2006)). Stocks consist of human and non-human populations such as livestock, infrastructure or land use (Fischer-Kowalski et al. 2009). These “black box” representations do not describe agents or “funds” as such (Frankova 2017). Instead, authors take an holistic or whole system approach, for example describing the effect of a whole country’s metabolism in terms of environmental

School of thought (number of articles)	Representation	Action	Articles
Space and compartment-based representations (39)			
Social ecology (20)	Stocks and flows at large scale spaces or between physical black boxes analyzed through historical material transitions	Limit the size of the metabolism through trickle-down and transition analysis directed at leaders of countries	"Bouwman et al. 2013; Cusso et al. 2006; Díaz de Astarloa et al. 2018; Fischer-Kowalski et al. 2009; Fischer-Kowalski et al. 2015; Fischer-Kowalski et al. 1998; Frankova 2017; Grešlová et al. 2019; Grešlová et al. 2015; Gueldner et al. 2017; Guzman et al. 2015; Guzman et al. 2018; Kohlheb et al. 2009; Krausmann 2009; Krausmann 2004; Kuskova 2013; Magalhães et al. 2019; Soto et al. 2016; Yuan et al. 2011; Zhang et al. 2012"
Metabolic rift and Marxist ecology (9)	Stocks and flows at large-scale spaces analyzed through Marxist frameworks	Change the system through trickle-down and critical analysis directed at civil society	"Clausen et al. 2015; Foster et al. 2014; Gomiero 2017; Gunderson 2011; Martinez-Alier et al. 2010; Moore 2000; Moore 2011; Schneider et al. 2010; Schneider 2017"
Urban and territorial ecology (10)	Stocks and flows at middle or small scales analyzed through stakeholder analysis	Develop and relocalize the territory's economy through transfer-and-translate and provision of management tools directed at local authorities	"Barles 2014; Barles et al. 2011; Barles 2015; Barles 2007; Billen et al. 2012; Buclet 2011; Buclet 2015; Cerceau et al. 2014; Oliveira et al. 2016; Tedesco et al. 2017"
Economic-agent-based representations (26)			
Supply-chains-based metabolism (11)	Stocks and flows at individual companies or sector level analyzed through stakeholder analysis	Limit environmental impact and foster economic performance through user-push or transfer-and-translate and provision of management tools directed at companies and trade associations	"Blengini et al. 2009; Courtonne et al. 2016; Filippini et al. 2016; Kulak et al. 2016; Kytzia et al. 2004; Miranda-Ackerman et al. 2017; Pagotto et al. 2016b; Sellitto et al. 2018; Wirsenius 2003; Xu et al. 2016; Yazan et al. 2018"
Industrial ecology and symbiosis (15)	Stocks and flows at individual companies or local scale analyzed through stakeholder analysis	Close the loop and foster economic performance through user-push or transfer-and-translate and provision of management tools directed at companies	"Alfaro et al. 2014; Bellarby et al. 2017; Chance et al. 2018; Fernandez-Mena et al. 2019; Frone et al. 2017; Hobbes et al. 2007; Iacondini et al. 2015; Niutanen et al. 2003; Nowak et al. 2015; Nuhoff-Isakhanyan et al. 2017; Pagotto et al. 2016a; Shastri et al. 2011; Simboli et al. 2015; Tamura et al. 2014; Zaban-iotou et al. 2015"
Multi-faceted and composite representations (37)			
Multi-scale analysis of agroecosystems (8)	Economic and ecological funds and flows at multiple scales analyzed by their social performance	Preserve the funds through a research-within-management interface and post-normal-science-based tools directed at various stakeholders	"Brunori et al. 2016; Gamboa 2011; Giampietro 2004; Gomiero et al. 2001; González-Acevedo et al. 2016; Grillot et al. 2018; Scheidel et al. 2015; Serrano-Tovar et al. 2014"
Agroecology within food systems and landscapes (18)	Ecological funds and flows at the food system and landscape scales analyzed through power structure frameworks	Develop an ecological-process-based and socially fair food system through research-within-management interfaces directed at farmers and civil society	"Altieri 2002; Bonaudo et al. 2014; Dumont et al. 2013; Francis et al. 2003; González de Molina et al. 2020; González de Molina et al. 2017; Guzmán et al. 2012; L. Resque et al. 2019; Martin et al. 2016; Méndez et al. 2013; Méndez et al. 2017; Moraine et al. 2017; Rivera-Ferre 2018; Rosset et al. 1997; Mier y Terán Giménez Cacho et al. 2018; Ryschawy et al. 2017; Vaarst et al. 2018; Wezel et al. 2018"
Pragmatic sociology and earthbound ecology (11)	Humans and non-humans as funds and flows along non-scalar biomass flows analyzed jointly as actor-networks	Enhance diverse and locally-based sustainability programs through research-within-management and extended descriptions directed at human and non-human entities	"Akrich et al. 2006; Callon 1984; Coq-Huelva et al. 2012; Glover et al. 2018; Goodman 2001; Gray et al. 2013; Kristensen et al. 2016; Le Velly et al. 2016; Mol et al. 2006; Onyas et al. 2018; Wegerif et al. 2016"

Table 2: Articles classified in the eight schools of thought. NB: The 7 criteria used are made explicit within the table. The text follow the same pattern, with the criteria described in order. In the column "Representation" : (a) funds and flows, (b) their scale, (c) analyzed through their socio-economic-context. In the column "Action": (d) Goal, (e) the research-management interface, (f) the tools with (g) the actors.

196 impacts or pollution (Gueldner et al. 2017), or an analysis of the transition between different
197 metabolic regimes (Soto et al. 2016). On this scale, it is not easy to deal with actors and
198 their deliberate efforts. The agents in charge of governance are out of scope: socio-economic
199 context is often disconnected from the description of stocks and flows. Researchers aim for
200 the sustainability of resource use or the resilience of societies. They are interested in the size
201 of the metabolism and, more or less explicitly, seek to reduce its size to a sustainable level.
202 Research-management relies on a trickle-down interface: stakeholders are rarely involved and
203 they almost never commission the research to promote change themselves (Fischer-Kowalski
204 et al. 2009). Researchers promote change through knowledge, which is provided in a top-down
205 way without taking the needs of any specific agents into account or trying to translate this
206 knowledge in terms more suitable for policy making. When described, the potential actors
207 are often public actors (e.g., national governments or international institutions). Facts come
208 with no insight into what should be done, e.g., how global governance of flow could be
209 implemented in the real world.

210 **3.1.2 Metabolic rift and Marxist ecology**

211 These articles explore a range of metabolism-related themes inspired by Marx's theories. The
212 focus is on the same scales as those of social ecology (e.g., stocks and flows in a region-wide
213 agricultural sector, long-term transformations), although the quantitative analysis of flows
214 is often more succinct. What could act on metabolism and, consequently, on the capitalist
215 system, is rarely described. Marxist descriptions of metabolism are, according to Georgescu-
216 Roegen (1971), of the stocks-and-flows type. Funds or agents' abilities to change the system
217 are not central. When they are mentioned, it is recalled that their capacity to change the
218 system is limited (Gunderson 2011). Authors rely explicitly on Marxist concepts such as
219 the metabolic rift. This concept refers to the rupture between humanity and nature and,
220 extensively, between the city and the countryside (Foster 2000; Moore 2011). The metabolic
221 rift perspective has been since used in a large variety of case studies. Performance is measured
222 in terms of rifts in soil nutrient cycles or in terms of structural changes in relation to global
223 carbon, nitrogen and water cycling (Gunderson 2011). The metabolic rift presents strong
224 and multiple connections with other Marxist analyses, referring to the socio-economic context,
225 such as these concerning capital or labor, and emphasizing power structures and exploitation
226 (Foster 2000; Gunderson 2011).

227 The claimed goal is to change the system towards more social or environmental justice.
228 To propose an alternative and support their arguments, several authors rely on comparisons
229 with non-capitalist economies, e.g., Cuba (Clausen et al. 2015). The research-management
230 interface is mainly based on a trickle-down model, and rely on critical analysis to generate
231 change. Links with ongoing actions, when mentioned, associate social metabolism with
232 environmental justice struggles lead by the civil society (Martinez-Alier et al. 2010).

233 **3.1.3 Urban and territorial ecology**

234 Urban and territorial ecology describe flows at local scales (e.g., territories or cities). At
235 these scales, local authorities, economic agents, populations and living beings are described
236 as active agents and funds. This gives rise to stakeholder analyses, sometimes inscribed in
237 a broader historical context. Barles et al. (2007) analyzed metabolic interaction between
238 Paris and the Seine during the industrial era. Funds at the scale of a territory are extensively

239 described (administrative authorities, city-scale policies). Other levels are also described:
240 lower ones (individual companies, civil society), or higher ones (changes in the technological
241 or economic landscape, state-driven planning). Buclet et al. (2015) described different sub-
242 systems within a territory (agri-food system, wealth creation system, etc.) and explained the
243 dynamics in the light of global factors and individual institutions. The goal is to produce
244 analyses and representations at the scales of local stakeholders in order to reach a sustainable
245 development of the territory e.g., through flow relocalization. These studies regularly involve
246 a transfer-and-translate interface with the local authorities, to whom data and management
247 tools are provided. The terms and concepts used are often very close to those used by
248 administrative agents, making exchanges easier.

249 **3.2 Economic agent-based representations**

250 Articles in this type of SEM representation describe metabolism in terms of material flows
251 between individual economic agents. We distinguish two forms: (1) a linear representation,
252 the supply chain, where actors are distributed according to their place in the production
253 process, “from cradle to grave”, or from resource extraction to waste management; and (2)
254 an ideal form, the perfect circle, in which there is no external resource or waste: the industrial
255 symbiosis.

256 **3.2.1 Supply-chains-based metabolism**

257 These studies are concerned with the organizations involved during the production pro-
258 cess of a product, from the extraction of resources to the delivery of the finished product
259 to a consumer (or beyond). They take a functional level standpoint and distinguish pro-
260 cesses according to the role played in the chain, e.g., production, transformation or distri-
261 bution. Studies exist at all levels (local individual companies to global supply chains), and
262 characterize metabolism through life-cycle analysis (LCA) or material flow analysis (MFA).
263 Socio-economic context is integrated through economic and stakeholder analysis such as
264 economically-extended MFA (Kytzia et al. 2004), social networks (Xu et al. 2016) or scenario
265 building (Kulak et al. 2016). The goal is to help economic agents to limit environmental im-
266 pacts (e.g., resource extraction, waste, pollution or carbon footprints), while maintaining or
267 fostering economic performance. Most of the studies are related to a “transfer-and-translate”
268 interface. The results are intended to be directly discussed with the decision makers, mainly
269 the companies, but also trade or sector associations. The fact that the results or the tools
270 can be directly mobilized by the actors is regularly a top priority. For example, Kulak et al.
271 (2016) analyzed the bread supply chain using LCA to generate scenarios with experts during a
272 collaborative design workshop, and then discussed the scenarios with farmers on a feedback
273 loop basis. Blengini and Busto (2009) discussed the environmental impacts of alternative
274 rice production systems using LCA and proposed their results as a tool for communication
275 between suppliers and their customers.

276 **3.2.2 Industrial ecology and symbiosis**

277 Industrial ecology stems from Ayres’s (2002) analogy between the ecosystems of ecological
278 sciences and the industry. SEM representations represent products or substance flows, and
279 focus on economic agents at different scales: an individual agent, e.g., a collective facility

(Chance et al. 2018), a couple, e.g., an olive farm and a mill (Zabaniotou et al. 2015), or a large network of farmers or industries (Nowak et al. 2015; Frone et al. 2017). Studies are divided between retrospective case studies (Nuhoff-Isakhanyan et al. 2017) and scenarios of industrial symbiosis (a real, linear, unsustainable system is compared to a closed and ideal system). For example, Alfaro et al. (2014) studied a small farming system at a village scale. A scenario of rural symbiosis was presented in the aim of increasing productivity and decreasing waste. While most studies do not rely on deep socio-economic analysis, some explore factors that are internal to economic agents such as knowledge, attitudes or practices. Multiple stakeholders are taken into account (e.g., farmers, extension agents) (Bellarby et al. 2017).

The goal of these approaches is to “close the loop” of materials and substances. Natural ecosystems are proposed as models for industrial activities: *“Our industrial system [would] behave like an ecosystem, where the wastes of a species [are] a resource to another species. The outputs of an industry [would] be the inputs of another, thus reducing use of raw materials and pollution”* (Frosch et al. 1989). The paradigmatic vision of sustainable industrial systems is characterized by minimized physical exchanges with the environment (Wassenaar 2015). Researchers regularly work closely with companies and operators. They are involved in the choice of research directions and are the subject of particular attention in terms of translation of the results. Resource-use optimization is often considered to be synergistic with economic performance (or profit making). Researchers seek to provide data or tools that allow companies to better manage interactions within their economic ecosystem. Most of these studies rely on user-push or transfer-and-translate interfaces. In some cases involving long-term relationships, researchers take part in a research-within-management interface, aimed at building a planned industrial symbiosis (Iacondini et al. 2015).

3.3 Multi-faceted and composite representations

The articles in this type of SEM representation do not describe agri-food systems in terms of large-scale stocks and flows, nor do they propose an economic-agent-based funds and flows analysis. We present these “atypical” multi-faceted and composite representations of metabolism through three examples: (1) multi-scale analysis of agroecosystems; (2) agroecology within food systems and landscapes; and (3) pragmatic sociology and earthbound ecology.

3.3.1 Multi-scale intergated analysis of agroecosystems

This framework is more broadly termed as Multi-Scale Integrated Analysis of Societal and Ecosystem Metabolism (MuSIASEM). It provides analysis of agroecosystems in terms of material and energy flows as well as biophysical and socio-economic funds. It provides theory and operational tools for characterization across multiple hierarchical levels of the performance of socio-economic activities (Giampietro et al. 2009). Serrano-Tovar et al. (2014) characterize the socioeconomic activities by a series of quantitative indicators at different scales (individual process, household, community). Humans workforce and the land are represented as funds, while flows are both material and economic. The main goal is the assessment of technical performance and better consideration of the biophysical constraints at the basis of economic activity. The sustainability is assessed in terms of viability (resources used and waste produced at rates compatible with those of the biophysical environment),

323 feasibility (human labour available), and desirability. The aim is to preserve the economic
324 and ecological funds which ensure the metabolism works. In this sense, MuSIASEM is in
325 direct continuity with Georgescu-Roegen’s approaches.

326 When dealing with action, theoretical articles of MuSIASEM often refer to post-normal
327 sciences. This method is intended to be a response to situations in which “*the facts [are]*
328 *uncertain, values in dispute, stakes high and decisions urgent*” (Funtowicz et al. 1995). It
329 recognizes that each description of the metabolism is necessarily partial. There are mutu-
330 ally multiple descriptions of the metabolism, provided by different scientific communities,
331 mutually irreducible to each other and nevertheless relevant. Post normal science includes
332 practices typical of research-within-management interfaces such as communication of uncer-
333 tainties, taking part in social negotiation about desirable changes, and the co-evaluation of
334 results within an extended peer community, including stakeholders. For example, Bruonori
335 et al. (2016) assess local and global food chains across different commodities and countries
336 through multi-scale metabolic and participatory evaluation. The results are then discussed
337 in workshops with stakeholders.

338 This negotiation and participatory part, although described as essential in theory (Gi-
339 ampietro 2004), is nevertheless not described in every case study. Many studies follow similar
340 methods without referring to MuSIASEM in the strict sense, nor following a post-normal
341 approach. Gonzalez-Acevedo et al. (2016) compare different coffee systems according to
342 ecological economic indicators (e.g., economic, energy performance and self-sufficiency), on
343 the scale of households and society. The results are provided to coffee traders through a
344 trickle-down interface.

345 **3.3.2 Agroecology within food systems and landscapes**

346 Agroecology is “*the integrative study of the ecology of the entire food system*” (Francis et al.
347 2003). It emphasizes the interrelatedness of all agroecosystem components and the com-
348 plex dynamics of ecological processes (Altieri 2002): agronomic and ecological analyses are
349 combined with social or cultural aspects. Metabolic processes are given special attention
350 (González de Molina et al. 2017). These processes include nutrient cycling, crop-livestock
351 interactions (Bonaudo et al. 2014; Martin et al. 2016) and material flows in food systems
352 (Francis et al. 2003; Vaarst et al. 2018). Whereas traditionally focused on farm and plot
353 scale, the landscape, community and multi-scale approaches are receiving increasingly more
354 attention. The description of the socio-economic context is based on analyses of power struc-
355 tures.

356 Science and action are considered together. Agroecology provides the basic ecological
357 principles for how to study, design and manage agroecosystems (Altieri 2002). It is both a
358 science, an agricultural practice and a political movement (Wezel et al. 2009). Researchers
359 claim normativity as their goal. They aim at a more sustainable agricultural system based
360 on a strong dependence on ecological processes or services as well as on social justice. Action
361 is considered broadly and involves civil society, NGOs, academics, local authorities, etc.
362 Farmers are integrated into the construction of knowledge in participative action-research
363 within a research-within-management interface (Méndez et al. 2013; Guzmán et al. 2012).
364 For example, Moraine et al. (2017) propose a framework to perform integrated assessment
365 of crop–livestock systems at the territorial level, combining ecological (crops, grasslands and
366 animals) and social (farmers and chain actor interactions) systems. This framework is used
367 as an intermediary object with stakeholders in participatory design approaches. However,

368 many studies only provide elements of diagnosis or analysis in a trickle-down way. Resque
369 et al. (2019) analyze agrobiodiversity, and how it relates to public mediated food chains.
370 Stakeholder knowledge and perception is analyzed in relation to these programs. The results
371 provide areas for management improvement.

372 **3.3.3 Pragmatic sociology and earthbound ecology**

373 In agro-food studies, this school of thought brings together constructivists approaches that
374 have challenged previous understandings and include frameworks such as the actor-network-
375 theory (Goodman 2001) or convention theory (Kristensen et al. 2016; Coq-Huelva et al. 2012).
376 They focuses attention on hybridity and the role of heterogeneous associations in complex
377 networks (Goodman 2001), and seek to understand what is happening in the process of build-
378 ing and stabilizing networks. Both humans and non-humans entities are considered as active
379 agents (Callon 1990). The researchers follow the actors in the situations they encounter, and
380 provide qualitative descriptions of links. In agri-food studies, this implies following mate-
381 rial flows through their transformations, in markets and technical devices. Representations
382 describe composite consisting of heterogeneous elements including humans, materials and
383 technical devices that flexibly adjust to one another and act collectively (Çalışkan et al.
384 2010). No scales are explicitly described.

385 Akrich et al. (2006) studied the process of network building around cane straw as a source
386 of energy for households. The evolution of the straw flow is followed, and its transformations
387 are analyzed in connection with other agents (technological tools, institutions, etc). The
388 straw flow is not only a flow, in Georgescu-Roegen’s terms, but also a real agent, that
389 actively transforms other agents around it. Wegerif et al. (2016) use an ethnomethodological
390 approach to follow the agents implied in the food chain of a town, and trace interactions
391 between them, highlighting transformations of food, people and ideas throughout the process.
392 Socio-economic aspects are not considered as context, but rather considered as an integral
393 part of the metabolism. These are described jointly as actor-networks.

394 The goal of pragmatic sociology is not normative, but procedural: it intends to bring
395 attention to the network of ties that binds us to all life forms. These attachments sometimes
396 described as “down-to-Earth”, “earthbound” or “terrestrial” form the basis for a new defini-
397 tion of ecology (Latour et al. 2017). They aim to bring out different visions of metabolism
398 concerning its sustainability (Onyas et al. 2018), resilience (Wegerif et al. 2016) or possible
399 future arrangements (Kristensen et al. 2016). These works are considered as performative by
400 the researchers. Following the internal logic of the school, we consider these works as relying
401 on research-within-management.

402 **4 Discussion**

403 **4.1 Limits and weaknesses**

404 Our literature survey did not capture all the diversity of metabolic approaches. The keyword
405 approach has made it possible to identify a variety of approaches from distant disciplines.
406 However, it excluded relevant work only for vocabulary reasons. This is problematic since
407 our field of study presents strong conceptual variability. Harvesting additional articles via
408 the snowball effect has at least partially filled this gap. On the other hand, the method
409 underestimates the non-English documents or books that were recovered only indirectly.




Figure 2: Summary diagram of schools of thought according to modes of representation and action

410 The stock/flow/fund framework proposed by Georgescu-Roegen (1971) is sometimes diffi-
 411 cult to operationalize. In practice, it is not always easy to distinguish whether an author
 412 refers to stocks or funds. Concerning socio-economic analyses, criteria such as quantita-
 413 tive/qualitative or micro/macro would also have led to a different classification. For science
 414 and technics scholars, the relationship to action is considered as a process of translations
 415 where representations and actors mutually transform each other through a dynamic process
 416 (Callon 1984). This type of interpretation would further require qualitative description work,
 417 which would be difficult to integrate into a simple analysis grid.

418 The schools of thought are constructed according to our reading of SEM representations
 419 and links with action that we perceived in the articles. The authors of the papers do not al-
 420 ways claim to be from the schools in which they are classified. For example, the article by Mol
 421 et al. (2006) is mainly based on descriptions characteristic of the school of thought “Prag-
 422 matic sociology and earthbound ecology”. However, these authors claim to rely partially on
 423 industrial ecology, without endorsing its goals.

424 4.2 Representation and action are deeply intertwined

425 Our work showed a diversity of schools, described in terms of the way they deal with SEM
 426 (representation and action) (Fig. 2). The way in which representations and action are
 427 intertwined is discussed by type of representation:

4.2.1 In space and compartment-based representations

In space and compartment-based representations scales usually correspond to administrative scales, e.g., countries or regions (Fischer-Kowalski et al. 2009), which are usually “black-boxed”. Action is not explicitly the main goal of these studies: researchers outline the problem and describe some of the quantities to be dealt with. The goal is normative and global, whether it is to change the economic system (Marxist ecology), or simply to drastically reduce its size (social ecology). Stakeholders are rarely involved and they are usually mobilized in a trickle-down interface. This contrasts with studies focused on smaller spatial scales such as urban or territorial ecology. They focus on smaller spatial scales and their goal is more agent-centered (e.g., sustainability of a given territory in urban and territorial ecology). Biophysical constraints are expressed at a territorial scale in a way favorable to their being taken into account by institutions: e.g., an Austrian-wide description is well suited to the Austrian authorities. Furthermore, when the metabolism is described at the scale of a given region, the administrative authorities of that region are regularly mentioned as partners. Policymakers and beyond them, governments or states, are assumed to be interested in handling collective problems such as the excessive size of SEM (Görg et al. 2017).

4.2.2 In economic agent-based representations

In economic agent-based representations authors explicitly claim their interest in action. The operational goal is agent-centered: economic, technical or environmental performance (e.g., closing the loop) is considered to be synergistic with the economic interest of companies.

Representation and actions are closely intertwined and this is reflected, in particular, by the place given to economic actors. Economic agents are given a central role since businesses are seen as the main actors able to handle change and technological innovation, and these are seen as essential for environmental improvement (Ayres et al. 2002). They are considered as economic funds, analyzed as stakeholders, and considered as partners in research-management interfaces. Agents that are described as funds in SEM representations are the same as those that are considered as potential partners through user-push or transfer-and-translate interfaces.

4.2.3 In multi-faceted and composite representations

Multi-faceted and composite representations offer descriptions that are neither centered mainly on economic actors, nor on predetermined spaces or compartments. Multi-scale analysis of agroecosystems, agroecology or pragmatic sociology do this in different ways: they question scales, challenge the science/politics divide or integrate humans and non-humans, respectively. All rely on a representation of multiple funds and actors at different scales or in a non-scalar way. Each of these approaches proposes a renewed way of dealing with action. All these approaches explicitly consider that the relationship to action must be taken into account in scientific representations (by post-normal science, by taking into account indigenous knowledge, or by the performativity of descriptions, respectively). The authors insist on the importance of taking multiple agents into account when generating representations (choice of scales, entities to be represented), and discussing them through collective deliberation in a research-within-management interface.

4.3 The theoretical and practical limits of schools of thought

Each school of thought chooses to open different black boxes and focuses only on a part of the system. Representations focused on specific scales or actors favor certain (agricultural) models over others, e.g., a large-scale SEM representation would favor the dominant systems, masking a variety of alternative models. The fact that companies are described as central in industrial ecology helps to rule out any alternative model. Historians' work shows that this legitimization of industries through metabolic representations has roots that go back to the beginning of industrialization in the 19th century (Fressoz 2016). Thus, each school defines different incommensurable visions of what a sustainable SEM should be and how it should be changed: schools of thought are also "schools for change". However, these positions are not definitive: there are not only variations within schools of thought, but also exchanges between them.

4.3.1 Practical cases diverge from theoretical claims

In some situations there is a discrepancy between the positions defended in the theoretical articles and what is actually described in the case studies. For example, MuSIASEM follows the proposals of post-normal science and states that researchers should take part in social negotiations and co-evaluate the results with stakeholders with a communication on uncertainties (Giampietro 2005). However, these recommendations rarely appear in case studies. Agroecology claims that science and politics cannot be separated, and farmers, researchers and civil society must be associated in the construction of knowledge, practices and social struggles (Altieri et al. 2011). Nonetheless, the case studies do not always show such a trans-disciplinary posture. This difference generates dissensions and different competing narratives (Rivera-Ferre 2018).

4.3.2 Schools of thought transform in relation to each other

The different schools of thought interact and define themselves in relation to each other. For example, agroecology presents itself as being opposed to input substitution like that proposed by industrial ecology (Rosset et al. 1997), and opposes the idea that sustainability could be attained through a mono-supply chain approach (Francis et al. 2003). MuSIASEM proposes to focus on funds, as opposed to the stock and flow descriptions found in social ecology, and proposes decision-making based on social negotiation as opposed to the reductionist computer-based optimization found in industrial ecology (Giampietro 2002). Territorial ecology considers itself different from industrial ecology seen as focusing exclusively on resource-use optimization or on industrial societies, and leaves room for non-material flows in its analysis (Buclet 2015).

The different schools also influence each other. Social ecologists turn to multi-level analysis or downscale to get closer to actors (Fischer-Kowalski et al. 2009). Urban ecologists look for quantitative tools in industrial ecology (Beloin-Saint-Pierre et al. 2017). Social agrarian metabolism is described as a fusion between agroecology and social ecology, analyzing agroecosystem components through a metabolic lens, as funds and flows (González de Molina et al. 2020). Concepts such as agro-industrial ecology are proposed as mixes between agroecology and industrial ecology in the aim of more sustainable agricultural systems (Dumont et al. 2013; Fernandez-Mena et al. 2016).

511 4.4 Epistemological and methodological consequences

512 SEM studies find themselves in a balance between two epistemologies, positive and practical.
513 While the majority of researchers aim to a certain extent to produce positive or neutral
514 results (Pauliuk et al. 2015), many SEM studies have a practical focus, judging their results
515 by their usefulness in influencing reality.

516 This raises the question of unstructured methodological pluralism (Spash 2013). In or-
517 der to “unite the community”, encourage “fruitful exchanges” or favor “change”, “action”,
518 a certain number of authors have proposed definitions, epistemological or methodological
519 positions and a set of attributes to be preserved in metabolic representations and in SEM
520 in particular (Wassenaar 2015; Pauliuk et al. 2015; Breetz 2017; Beloin-Saint-Pierre et al.
521 2017). We suggest that an appealing path lies in the pragmatic philosophy.

522 4.4.1 Pragmatism, a philosophy anchored in empiricism

523 This current of thought is born in the United States at the beginning of the 20th century
524 with Charles Peirce, William James and John Dewey. It has made a major contribution in
525 linking ideas and their consequences, and particularly their usefulness for action.

526 The first pragmatists developed their ideas in opposition to the idealistic philosophers of
527 their time. They criticized them for giving value to abstract concepts with no direct link to
528 reality. To the idealistic attitude, pragmatism opposes an empirical one. The philosopher’s
529 work consists in inquiry, investigation. Ideas, concepts or representations have no value
530 in themselves and must be tested in accordance with the facts. Thus, pragmatism is a
531 generalization of the scientific and experimental spirit to the whole of our human experience.

532 Pragmatists propose to focus on the practical, factual consequences of our ideas. They
533 enjoin us to *“consider the practical effects of the objects of [our] conception. Then, [to*
534 *consider that our] conception of those effects is the whole of [our] conception of the object”*
535 (Peirce et al. 1923).

536 4.4.2 The issue of pluralism

537 How do pragmatists approach the issue of pluralism, which is of interest to us here? William
538 James describes two opposing philosophical positions: monists and pluralists. For the
539 monists, the world has an intrinsic and absolute unity. For pluralists, it is disjointed, and
540 there are as many worlds as there are points of view. Pragmatists refuse to decide between
541 these two extremes, seeking instead a mediating way. Wondering about *the One and the*
542 *Many* from a pragmatic perspective means answering the following question: *“Granting the*
543 *oneness to exist, what facts will be different in consequence? [...] What is the practical value*
544 *of the oneness for us?”* (James 1907).

545 4.4.2.1 A relational ontology

546 The pragmatic way consists in investigating what unites different elements, one by one.
547 The world is one in the measure of the sum of the connections that we can discover in the
548 experience. Oneness is described in the terms of links or relationship, i.e in a relational
549 ontology.

550 4.4.2.2 *Multiple representations*

551 Nevertheless, the criteria for judging links are innumerable, the experience is multiple (James
552 1907). The diversity of criteria for satisfaction (or assessment) implies that there is necessarily
553 a plurality of values, and therefore a plurality of possible representations.

554 4.4.2.3 *Collective action and deliberation*

555 The world is also multiple in the sense that the future of the world is indeterminate, it holds
556 possibilities that cannot be predetermined. It always has something incomplete, something
557 in the making. This means that the action and perspective of each human being counts.
558 Pragmatism attaches great importance to collective action (Madelrieux et al. 2010), and
559 especially deliberative and democratic processes that respect this pluralism (Rorty 1999).

560 4.4.3 **Socio-ecological metabolism from a pragmatic perspective**

561 Our results show that the practical consequences of pragmatic thinking are already and
562 variously taken into account by many schools of thought:

563 4.4.3.1 *An empirical approach: metabolism as a reality rather than an analogy*

564 Flows in industrial systems used to be compared to flows and processes internal to an or-
565 ganism. The reference to physiology is less used today, and it is the reference to ecology,
566 the science which actually describes the movement of materials and energy through living
567 communities, that is preferred (Pauliuk et al. 2015; Wassenaar 2015). Social ecology pro-
568 poses representations which describes social and natural metabolisms in the same ecological
569 terms (Fischer-Kowalski et al. 2009; Kohlheb et al. 2009). MuSIASEM uses the funds/flows
570 framework to investigate both human and non-human-made funds in economic processes.
571 Pragmatic sociology and "earthbound" refer, often explicitly, to ecology.

572 4.4.3.2 *A relational ontology through metabolic networks*

573 Most schools refer more and more explicitly to a relational ontology. In industrial ecology
574 and supply chains, some authors refer to "metabolic network", i.e., "a subset of a complex
575 system of interconnected transformative processes across all scales of life", or rely on social
576 and material network analysis (Schiller et al. 2014; Wassenaar 2015). In Marxist ecology, non-
577 binary concepts such as the "metabolic shift" are recently preferred to the historic "metabolic
578 rift", in order to focus on the transformations, rather than on the rupture between two ideal
579 systems (Moore 2017). In pragmatic sociology, it means abandoning levels or scales and
580 focusing instead on intensifications and extensions of entangled dependencies (Conway 2016).

581 4.4.3.3 *Multiple representations: multiple scales, agents and values*

582 Pluralism in terms of representations is widely shared: the SEM does not prescribe a specific
583 level of aggregation or definitive boundaries (Pauliuk et al. 2015). Social ecology proposes
584 representations at multiple scales, from local to global. In agroecology, scales such as the
585 agroecosystem, the food system and the landscape are all considered as legitimate for investi-
586 gation (Francis et al. 2003). Some schools take a step further and consider that multiple rep-
587 resentations should be taken into account at the same time: MuSIASEM explicitly considers

588 the existence of different “value systems” found among stakeholders. Their incommensura-
589 bility implies that multiple and irreducible representations are inevitable (Giampietro et al.
590 2009). The same position is defended by pragmatic sociology or urban and territorial ecology
591 which describes agents with different representations of the reality (Buclet 2015; Latour et al.
592 2017).

593 4.4.3.4 *Collective action and deliberation: multi-criteria-debate-based goals*

594 Concerning action, most schools value collective action and deliberation, to a certain extent.
595 This implies a shift from scientific-knowledge-based action to multi-criteria-debate-based one.
596 Görg et al. (2017) propose anchoring social ecology in critical thinking and transdisciplinarity
597 with the help of political ecology. This leads to considering several goals together, e.g.,
598 composing industrial ecology’s goals with animal health, pollution or diversity, thanks to a
599 multi-criteria analysis (Bonaudo et al. 2014). Wassenaar (2015), speaking about industrial
600 ecology argues that goals or “desirable changes” “would best be based on locally debated
601 criteria”. Multi-faceted and composite representations adopt this posture more extensively:
602 MuSIASEM acknowledges that decisions have to emerge from negotiation and are not a
603 prerequisite engraved in stone. Industrial ecology’s goal of “closing the loop” is nuanced
604 with other social goals (Boons et al. 2009). Pragmatic sociology, by taking an interest in the
605 multiple representations of the actors and the particular situations in which they are linked,
606 contributes to giving them a place in the social debate without imposing any normative goal.
607 Agroecology gives a central place to the knowledge and choices of farmers, and re-anchors
608 the choices regarding food systems on a societal scale.

609 5 Conclusion

610 This work offers some cross-sectional analysis that may be of value for SEM practitioners
611 with an interest in social changes, including sustainability or transdisciplinary practices. It
612 provides an understanding of the multiple schools of thought and can be used to acquire a
613 better grasp of their sometimes implicit presuppositions. It also allows them to be discussed
614 in relation to their choices of representation of metabolism, and in terms of goals and means
615 of action. Our results suggest an opportunity to move away from a positivist and value-
616 free epistemology in the study of SEM. Pragmatism provides tools to deal with the multiple
617 incompatible values at play in the transformation of SEM, which echoes a vision of Ecological
618 Economics with weak comparability of values (Martinez-Alier et al. 1998).

619 6 Acknowledgement

620 The PhD scholarship of A.W. Gabriel is funded by INRAE. This study received funding from
621 the French Environment & Energy Agency (ADEME) through the BOAT project. We would
622 like to thank the anonymous reviewers who contributed greatly to enhancing the quality of
623 the article.

References

- [1] Madeleine Akrich, Michel Callon, and Bruno Latour. *Sociologie de la traduction: textes fondateurs*. fr. Collection Sciences Sociales. OCLC: 611010721. Paris: 'Ecole des mines de Paris, 2006. ISBN: 978-2-911762-75-8.
- [2] Jose Alfaro and Shelie Miller. “Applying Industrial Symbiosis to Smallholder Farms: Modeling a Case Study in Liberia, West Africa”. en. In: *Journal of Industrial Ecology* 18.1 (Feb. 2014), pp. 145–154. ISSN: 10881980. DOI: 10.1111/jiec.12077.
- [3] Miguel A Altieri. “Agroecology : The Science of Natural Resource Management for Poor Farmers in Marginal Environments”. In: *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 93 (2002), pp. 1–24.
- [4] Miguel A. Altieri and Victor Manuel Toledo. “The Agroecological Revolution in Latin America: Rescuing Nature, Ensuring Food Sovereignty and Empowering Peasants”. In: *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 38.3 (July 2011), pp. 587–612. ISSN: 0306-6150. DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2011.582947.
- [5] N. Andrieu et al. “From Farm Scale Synergies to Village Scale Trade-Offs: Cereal Crop Residues Use in an Agro-Pastoral System of the Sudanian Zone of Burkina Faso”. In: *Agricultural Systems* (2014). ISSN: 0308521X. DOI: 10.1016/j.agsy.2014.08.012.
- [6] Robert U. Ayres and Leslie Ayres, eds. *A Handbook of Industrial Ecology*. Cheltenham, UK ; Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Pub, 2002. ISBN: 978-1-84064-506-4.
- [7] Yinon M. Bar-On, Rob Phillips, and Ron Milo. “The Biomass Distribution on Earth”. en. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115.25 (June 2018), pp. 6506–6511. ISSN: 0027-8424, 1091-6490. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1711842115.
- [8] S. Barles. “Urban Metabolism and River Systems: An Historical Perspective - Paris and the Seine, 1790-1970”. English. In: *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 11.6 (2007), pp. 1757–1769. ISSN: 1027-5606. DOI: 10.5194/hess-11-1757-2007.
- [9] Sabine Barles. “L’écologie territoriale et les enjeux de la dématérialisation des sociétés : l’apport de l’analyse des flux de matières”. fr. In: *Développement durable et territoires. Économie, géographie, politique, droit, sociologie* Vol. 5 (Feb. 2014). ISSN: 1772-9971. DOI: 10.4000/developpementdurable.10090.
- [10] Sabine Barles. “The Main Characteristics of Urban Socio-Ecological Trajectories: Paris (France) from the 18th to the 20th Century”. In: *Ecological Economics* 118 (Oct. 2015), pp. 177–185. ISSN: 0921-8009. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.07.027.
- [11] Sabine Barles, Nicolas Buclet, and Gilles Billen. “L’écologie Territoriale : Du Métabolisme Des Sociétés à La Gouvernance Des Flux d’énergie et de Matières”. In: *CIST2011 - Fonder Les Sciences Du Territoire*. Paris, France: Collège international des sciences du territoire (CIST), Nov. 2011, pp. 16–22.
- [12] J. Bellarby et al. “Strategies for Sustainable Nutrient Management: Insights from a Mixed Natural and Social Science Analysis of Chinese Crop Production Systems”. English. In: *Environmental Development* 21 (Mar. 2017). WOS:000398943600005, pp. 52–65. ISSN: 2211-4645. DOI: 10.1016/j.envdev.2016.10.008.

-
- 664 [13] Didier Beloin-Saint-Pierre et al. “A Review of Urban Metabolism Studies to Identify
665 Key Methodological Choices for Future Harmonization and Implementation”. en. In:
666 *Journal of Cleaner Production* 163 (Oct. 2017), S223–S240. ISSN: 09596526. DOI: 10.
667 1016/j.jclepro.2016.09.014.
- 668 [14] G. Billen et al. “Grain, Meat and Vegetables to Feed Paris: Where Did and Do They
669 Come from? Localising Paris Food Supply Areas from the Eighteenth to the Twenty-
670 First Century”. en. In: *Regional Environmental Change* 12.2 (June 2012), pp. 325–
671 335. ISSN: 1436-3798, 1436-378X. DOI: 10.1007/s10113-011-0244-7.
- 672 [15] Gian Andrea Blengini and Mirko Busto. “The Life Cycle of Rice: LCA of Alterna-
673 tive Agri-Food Chain Management Systems in Vercelli (Italy)”. en. In: *Journal of*
674 *Environmental Management* 90.3 (Mar. 2009), pp. 1512–1522. ISSN: 03014797. DOI:
675 10.1016/j.jenvman.2008.10.006.
- 676 [16] Thierry Bonaudo et al. “Agroecological Principles for the Redesign of Integrated Crop
677 – Livestock Systems”. In: *Europe* 57 (2014), pp. 43–51. DOI: 10.1016/j.eja.2013.
678 09.010.
- 679 [17] Frank Boons and Jennifer A. Howard-Grenville, eds. *The Social Embeddedness of*
680 *Industrial Ecology*. OCLC: ocn277196447. Cheltenham ; Northampton, MA: Edward
681 Elgar, 2009. ISBN: 978-1-84720-782-1.
- 682 [18] Lex Bouwman et al. “Exploring Global Changes in Nitrogen and Phosphorus Cycles
683 in Agriculture Induced by Livestock Production over the 1900-2050 Period”. English.
684 In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*
685 110.52 (Dec. 2013). WOS:000328858800024, pp. 20882–20887. ISSN: 0027-8424. DOI:
686 10.1073/pnas.1012878108.
- 687 [19] Hanna L. Breetz. “Political-Industrial Ecology: Integrative, Complementary, and Crit-
688 ical Approaches”. en. In: *Geoforum* 85 (Oct. 2017), pp. 392–395. ISSN: 00167185. DOI:
689 10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.11.011.
- 690 [20] Gianluca Brunori et al. “Are Local Food Chains More Sustainable than Global Food
691 Chains? Considerations for Assessment”. en. In: *Sustainability* 8.5 (May 2016), p. 449.
692 DOI: 10.3390/su8050449.
- 693 [21] Nicolas Buclet. *Écologie Industrielle et Territoriale: Stratégies Locales Pour Un Développement*
694 *Durable*. Environnement et Société. Villeneuve d’Ascq, France: Presses universitaires
695 du Septentrion, 2011. ISBN: 978-2-7574-0331-0.
- 696 [22] Nicolas Buclet, ed. *Essai d’écologie territoriale: l’exemple d’Aussois en Savoie*. French.
697 OCLC: 944030575. Paris: CNRS éditions, 2015. ISBN: 978-2-271-08887-1.
- 698 [23] Koray Çalıřkan and Michel Callon. “Economization, Part 2: A Research Programme
699 for the Study of Markets”. en. In: *Economy and Society* 39.1 (Feb. 2010), pp. 1–32.
700 ISSN: 0308-5147, 1469-5766. DOI: 10.1080/03085140903424519.
- 701 [24] Michel Callon. “Some Elements of a Sociology of Translation: Domestication of the
702 Scallops and the Fishermen of St Brieuc Bay”. en. In: *The Sociological Review* 32.1_suppl
703 (May 1984), pp. 196–233. ISSN: 0038-0261, 1467-954X. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-954X.
704 1984.tb00113.x.

-
- 705 [25] Michel Callon. “Techno-Economic Networks and Irreversibility”. en. In: *The Socio-*
706 *logical Review* 38.1_suppl (May 1990), pp. 132–161. ISSN: 0038-0261, 1467-954X. DOI:
707 10.1111/j.1467-954X.1990.tb03351.x.
- 708 [26] Juliette Cerceau et al. “Quel territoire pour quelle écologie industrielle? Contribution à
709 la définition du territoire en écologie industrielle”. fr. In: *Développement durable et ter-*
710 *ritoires* Vol. 5, n.1 (Feb. 2014). ISSN: 1772-9971. DOI: 10.4000/developpementdurable.
711 10179.
- 712 [27] Eva Chance et al. “The Plant-An Experiment in Urban Food Sustainability”. English.
713 In: *Environmental Progress and Sustainable Energy* 37.1 (Jan. 2018), pp. 82–90. ISSN:
714 1944-7442. DOI: 10.1002/ep.12712.
- 715 [28] Rebecca Clausen, Brett Clark, and Stefano B. Longo. “Metabolic Rifts and Restora-
716 tion: Agricultural Crises and the Potential”. English. In: *World Review of Political*
717 *Economy* 6.1 (2015). WOS:000357510800001, pp. 4–32. ISSN: 2042-891X. DOI: 10.
718 13169/worlrevipoliecon.6.1.0004.
- 719 [29] Philip Conway. “Back down to Earth: Reassembling Latour’s Anthropocenic Geopolit-
720 ics”. en. In: *Global Discourse* 6.1-2 (Jan. 2016), pp. 43–71. ISSN: 2326-9995, 2043-7897.
721 DOI: 10.1080/23269995.2015.1004247.
- 722 [30] Daniel Coq-Huelva, Manuel David García-Brenes, and Assumpta Sabuco-i-Cantó.
723 “Commodity Chains, Quality Conventions and the Transformation of Agro-Ecosystems:
724 Olive Groves and Olive Oil Production in Two Andalusian Case Studies”. en. In: *Eu-*
725 *ropean Urban and Regional Studies* 19.1 (Jan. 2012), pp. 77–91. ISSN: 0969-7764. DOI:
726 10.1177/0969776411428560.
- 727 [31] Jean-Yves Courtonne et al. “Environmental Pressures Embodied in the French Cereals
728 Supply Chain”. en. In: *Journal of Industrial Ecology* 20.3 (June 2016), pp. 423–434.
729 ISSN: 10881980. DOI: 10.1111/jiec.12431.
- 730 [32] X Cusso, R Garrabou, and E Tello. “Social Metabolism in an Agrarian Region of
731 Catalonia (Spain) in 1860-1870: Flows, Energy Balance and Land Use”. English. In:
732 *Ecological Economics* 58.1 (June 2006), pp. 49–65. ISSN: 0921-8009. DOI: 10.1016/j.
733 ecolecon.2005.05.026.
- 734 [33] D. A. Díaz de Astarloa and W. A. Pengue. “Nutrients Metabolism of Agricultural
735 Production in Argentina: NPK Input and Output Flows from 1961 to 2015”. In:
736 *Ecological Economics* 147 (May 2018), pp. 74–83. ISSN: 0921-8009. DOI: 10.1016/j.
737 ecolecon.2018.01.001.
- 738 [34] B. Dumont et al. “Prospects from Agroecology and Industrial Ecology for Animal
739 Production in the 21st Century”. en. In: *animal* 7.06 (June 2013), pp. 1028–1043.
740 ISSN: 1751-7311, 1751-732X. DOI: 10.1017/S1751731112002418.
- 741 [35] Karl-Heinz Erb. “How a Socio-Ecological Metabolism Approach Can Help to Advance
742 Our Understanding of Changes in Land-Use Intensity”. en. In: *Ecological Economics*
743 76 (Apr. 2012), pp. 8–14. ISSN: 09218009. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.02.005.
- 744 [36] Hugo Fernandez-Mena et al. “Flows in Agro-Food Networks (FAN): An Agent-Based
745 Model to Simulate Local Agricultural Material Flows”. en. In: *Agricultural Systems*
746 (Nov. 2019), p. 102718. ISSN: 0308521X. DOI: 10.1016/j.agsy.2019.102718.

-
- 747 [37] Hugo Fernandez-Mena, Thomas Nesme, and Sylvain Pellerin. “Towards an Agro-
748 Industrial Ecology: A Review of Nutrient Flow Modelling and Assessment Tools in
749 Agro-Food Systems at the Local Scale”. en. In: *Science of The Total Environment* 543
750 (Feb. 2016), pp. 467–479. ISSN: 00489697. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.11.032.
- 751 [38] R. Filippini et al. “Food Production for the City: Hybridization of Farmers’ Strategies
752 between Alternative and Conventional Food Chains”. English. In: *Agroecology and*
753 *Sustainable Food Systems* 40.10 (2016). WOS:000387160300003, pp. 1058–1084. ISSN:
754 2168-3565. DOI: 10.1080/21683565.2016.1223258.
- 755 [39] Marina Fischer-Kowalski and Jan Rotmans. “Conceptualizing, Observing, and Influ-
756 encing Social–Ecological Transitions”. en. In: *Ecology and Society* 14.2 (July 2009).
757 ISSN: 1708-3087. DOI: 10.5751/ES-02857-140203.
- 758 [40] Marina Fischer-Kowalski and Helmut Haberl. “Social Metabolism: A Metric for Bio-
759 physical Growth and Degrowth”. In: *Handbook of Ecological Economics*. Ed. by Joan
760 Martinez-Alier. Edward Elgar Publishing, Sept. 2015, pp. 100–138. ISBN: 978-1-78347-
761 140-9. DOI: 10.4337/9781783471416.00009.
- 762 [41] Marina Fischer-Kowalski and Walter Hüttler. “Society’s Metabolism”. en. In: *Journal*
763 *of Industrial Ecology* 2.4 (Oct. 1998), pp. 107–136. ISSN: 1530-9290. DOI: 10.1162/
764 jiec.1998.2.4.107.
- 765 [42] Chris Foster et al. “The Environmental Effects of Seasonal Food Purchase: A Rasp-
766 berry Case Study”. In: *JOURNAL OF CLEANER PRODUCTION* 73 (June 2014),
767 pp. 269–274. ISSN: 0959-6526. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.12.077.
- 768 [43] John Bellamy Foster. *Marx’s Ecology: Materialism and Nature*. New York: Monthly
769 Review Press, 2000. ISBN: 978-1-58367-012-5 978-1-58367-011-8.
- 770 [44] C. Francis et al. “Agroecology: The Ecology of Food Systems”. en. In: *Journal of*
771 *Sustainable Agriculture* 22.3 (July 2003), pp. 99–118. ISSN: 1044-0046, 1540-7578. DOI:
772 10.1300/J064v22n03_10.
- 773 [45] Eva Frankova, ed. *Socio-Metabolic Perspectives on the Sustainability of Local Food*
774 *Systems*. New York, NY: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2017. ISBN: 978-3-319-69235-7.
- 775 [46] Jean-Baptiste Fressoz. “La Main Invisible A-t-Elle Le Pouce Vert ? : Les Faux-Semblants
776 de ”l’écologie Industrielle ”Au Xixe Siècle”. In: *Techniques & culture* 65-66 (Oct.
777 2016), pp. 324–339. ISSN: 0248-6016, 1952-420X. DOI: 10.4000/tc.8084.
- 778 [47] Dumitru Florin Frone and Simona Frone. “Circular Economy in Romania: An Indus-
779 trial Synergy in the Agri-Food Sector”. In: *Management Economic Engineering in*
780 *Agriculture and Rural Development* 17.2 (2017), pp. 103–109. ISSN: 2284-7995.
- 781 [48] Robert A. Frosch and Nicholas E. Gallopoulos. “Strategies for Manufacturing”. In:
782 *Scientific American* 261.3 (Sept. 1989), pp. 144–152. ISSN: 0036-8733. DOI: 10.1038/
783 scientificamerican0989-144.
- 784 [49] S. O. Funtowicz and Jerome R. Ravetz. “Science for the Post Normal Age”. en. In:
785 *Perspectives on Ecological Integrity*. Ed. by Laura Westra and John Lemons. Envi-
786 ronmental Science and Technology Library. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 1995,
787 pp. 146–161. ISBN: 978-94-011-0451-7. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-011-0451-7_10.

- 788 [50] Gonzalo Gamboa. *Assessing the Sustainability of the Metabolic Patterns of Mayan-*
789 *Q'eqchi' Peasant Households: The Polochic Valley, Guatemala*. Working Paper 201128.
790 Latin American and Caribbean Environmental Economics Program, 2011.
- 791 [51] Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen. *The Entropy Law and the Economic Process*. German.
792 OCLC: 900843014. Erscheinungsort nicht ermittelbar: Harvard University Press, 1971.
793 ISBN: 978-0-674-28164-6 978-0-674-28165-3.
- 794 [52] Julien-François Gerber and Arnim Scheidel. “In Search of Substantive Economics:
795 Comparing Today’s Two Major Socio-Metabolic Approaches to the Economy – MEFA
796 and MuSIASEM”. en. In: *Ecological Economics* 144 (Feb. 2018), pp. 186–194. ISSN:
797 09218009. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.08.012.
- 798 [53] Mario Giampetro. “Complexity and Scales: The Challenge for Integrated Assessment”.
799 In: *Integrated Assessment* 3.3 (2002), pp. 247–265. ISSN: 1389-5176. DOI: 10.1076/
800 iaij.3.2.247.13568.
- 801 [54] M. Giampietro. *Multi-Scale Integrated Analysis of Agroecosystems*. Advances in Agroecology.
802 Boca Raton, Fla: CRC Press, 2004. ISBN: 978-0-8493-1067-6.
- 803 [55] Mario Giampietro. “Complexity and Scales: The Challenge”. en. In: *Integrated Assessment*
804 3.2 (Feb. 2005). ISSN: 1389-5176.
- 805 [56] Mario Giampietro, Kozo Mayumi, and Jesus Ramos-Martin. “Multi-Scale Integrated
806 Analysis of Societal and Ecosystem Metabolism (MuSIASEM): Theoretical Concepts
807 and Basic Rationale”. In: *Energy*. WESC 2006 Advances in Energy Studies 6th World
808 Energy System Conference 5th Workshop on Advances, Innovation and Visions in Energy
809 and Energy-Related Environmental and Socio-Economic Issues 34.3 (Mar. 2009),
810 pp. 313–322. ISSN: 0360-5442. DOI: 10.1016/j.energy.2008.07.020.
- 811 [57] Dominic Glover and Glenn Davis Stone. “Heirloom Rice in Ifugao: An ‘Anti-Commodity’
812 in the Process of Commodification”. In: *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 45.4 (Apr.
813 2018), pp. 776–804. ISSN: 0306-6150. DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2017.1284062.
- 814 [58] Tiziano Gomiero. “Biophysical Analysis of Agri-Food Systems: Scales, Energy Efficiency,
815 Power and Metabolism of Society”. In: *Socio-Metabolic Perspectives on the Sustainability of Local Food Systems*.
816 Ed. by Eva Fraňková, Willi Haas, and Simron J. Singh. Vol. 7. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017,
817 pp. 69–101. ISBN: 978-3-319-69235-7 978-3-319-69236-4. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-69236-4_3.
- 818
- 819 [59] Tiziano Gomiero and Mario Giampietro. “Multiple-Scale Integrated Analysis of Farming
820 Systems: The Thuong Lo Commune (Vietnamese Uplands) Case Study”. en. In:
821 *Population and Environment* 22.3 (Jan. 2001), pp. 315–352. ISSN: 1573-7810. DOI:
822 10.1023/A:1026624630569.
- 823 [60] Alejandra González-Acevedo and Víctor M. Toledo. “Metabolismos Rurales : indicadores económico ecológicos y su aplicación a sistemas cafeteros”. ca. In: *Revibec*
824 *: revista de la Red Iberoamericana de Economía Ecológica* 26 (2016), pp. 0223–237.
825 ISSN: 1390-2776.
826
- 827 [61] Manuel González de Molina et al. “Agrarian Metabolism: The Metabolic Approach Applied to Agriculture”. en. In: *The Social Metabolism of Spanish Agriculture, 1900–2008*.
828 Vol. 10. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020, pp. 1–28. ISBN: 978-3-030-
829 20899-8 978-3-030-20900-1. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-20900-1_1.
830

-
- 831 [62] Manuel González de Molina and Gloria Guzmán Casado. “Agroecology and Ecological
832 Intensification. A Discussion from a Metabolic Point of View”. en. In: *Sustainability*
833 9.1 (Jan. 2017), p. 86. ISSN: 2071-1050. DOI: 10.3390/su9010086.
- 834 [63] D. Goodman. “Ontology Matters: The Relational Materiality of Nature and Agro-
835 Food Studies”. English. In: *Sociologia Ruralis* 41.2 (Apr. 2001). WOS:000168504100002,
836 pp. 182–+. ISSN: 0038-0199. DOI: 10.1111/1467-9523.00177.
- 837 [64] Christoph Görg et al. “Challenges for Social-Ecological Transformations: Contribu-
838 tions from Social and Political Ecology”. en. In: *Sustainability* 9.7 (June 2017), p. 1045.
839 ISSN: 2071-1050. DOI: 10.3390/su9071045.
- 840 [65] Frédéric Gosselin et al. “Ecological Research and Environmental Management: We
841 Need Different Interfaces Based on Different Knowledge Types”. en. In: *Journal of*
842 *Environmental Management* 218 (July 2018), pp. 388–401. ISSN: 03014797. DOI: 10.
843 1016/j.jenvman.2018.04.025.
- 844 [66] Benjamin J. Gray and Jane W. Gibson. “Actor-Networks, Farmer Decisions, and
845 Identity”. en. In: *Culture, Agriculture, Food and Environment* 35.2 (Dec. 2013), pp. 82–
846 101. ISSN: 21539553. DOI: 10.1111/cuag.12013.
- 847 [67] Petra Grešlová et al. “Agroecosystem Energy Metabolism in Czechia and Poland in
848 the Two Decades after the Fall of Communism: From a Centrally Planned System
849 to Market Oriented Mode of Production”. en. In: *Land Use Policy* 82 (Mar. 2019),
850 pp. 807–820. ISSN: 02648377. DOI: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.01.008.
- 851 [68] Petra Grešlová et al. “Social Metabolism of Czech Agriculture in the Period 1830–2010”.
852 en. In: *AUC GEOGRAPHICA* 50.1 (June 2015), pp. 23–35. ISSN: 2336-1980, 0300-
853 5402. DOI: 10.14712/23361980.2015.84.
- 854 [69] Myriam Grillot et al. “Multi-Level Analysis of Nutrient Cycling within Agro-Sylvo-
855 Pastoral Landscapes in West Africa Using an Agent-Based Model”. en. In: *Environ-*
856 *mental Modelling & Software* 107 (Sept. 2018), pp. 267–280. ISSN: 13648152. DOI:
857 10.1016/j.envsoft.2018.05.003.
- 858 [70] Dino Gueldner and Fridolin Krausmann. “Nutrient Recycling and Soil Fertility Man-
859 agement in the Course of the Industrial Transition of Traditional, Organic Agriculture:
860 The Case of Bruck Estate, 1787-1906”. English. In: *Agriculture Ecosystems & Envi-*
861 *ronment* 249 (Nov. 2017). WOS:000412256000010, pp. 80–90. ISSN: 0167-8809. DOI:
862 10.1016/j.agee.2017.07.038.
- 863 [71] Ryan Gunderson. “The Metabolic Rifts of Livestock Agribusiness”. en. In: *Organiza-*
864 *tion & Environment* 24.4 (Dec. 2011), pp. 404–422. ISSN: 1086-0266. DOI: 10.1177/
865 1086026611424764.
- 866 [72] Gloria I. Guzman and Manuel Gonzalez De Molina. “Energy Efficiency in Agrarian
867 Systems From an Agroecological Perspective”. English. In: *AGROECOLOGY AND*
868 *SUSTAINABLE FOOD SYSTEMS* 39.8 (Sept. 2015), pp. 924–952. ISSN: 2168-3565.
869 DOI: 10.1080/21683565.2015.1053587.
- 870 [73] Gloria I. Guzmán et al. “Participatory Action Research in Agroecology: Building Local
871 Organic Food Networks in Spain”. en. In: *Journal of Sustainable Agriculture* (Sept.
872 2012), p. 120904081413002. ISSN: 1044-0046, 1540-7578. DOI: 10.1080/10440046.
873 2012.718997.

-
- 874 [74] Gloria I. Guzman et al. “Spanish Agriculture from 1900 to 2008: A Long-Term Per-
875 spective on Agroecosystem Energy from an Agroecological Approach”. English. In:
876 *REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE* 18.4, SI (Apr. 2018), pp. 995–1008. ISSN:
877 1436-3798. DOI: 10.1007/s10113-017-1136-2.
- 878 [75] Helmut Haberl et al. “Contributions of Sociometabolic Research to Sustainability
879 Science”. en. In: *Nature Sustainability* 2.3 (Mar. 2019), pp. 173–184. ISSN: 2398-9629.
880 DOI: 10.1038/s41893-019-0225-2.
- 881 [76] Marieke Hobbes et al. “Material Flows in a Social Context - A Vietnamese Case Study
882 Combining the Materials Flow Analysis and Action-in-Context Frameworks”. English.
883 In: *Journal of Industrial Ecology* 11.1 (2007). WOS:000244433600012, pp. 141–159.
884 ISSN: 1088-1980. DOI: 10.1162/jiec.2007.1049.
- 885 [77] Antonella Iacondini et al. “Feasibility of Industrial Symbiosis in Italy as an Opportu-
886 nity for Economic Development: Critical Success Factor Analysis, Impact and Con-
887 strains of the Specific Italian Regulations”. English. In: *Waste and Biomass Val-*
888 *orization* 6.5 (Oct. 2015). WOS:000361888500021, pp. 865–874. ISSN: 1877-2641. DOI:
889 10.1007/s12649-015-9380-5.
- 890 [78] William James. *Pragmatism*. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co, 1907. ISBN: 978-0-915145-
891 04-1 978-0-915145-05-8.
- 892 [79] Norbert Kohlheb and Fridolin Krausmann. “Land Use Change, Biomass Production
893 and HANPP: The Case of Hungary 1961-2005”. English. In: *Ecological Economics* 69.2
894 (Dec. 2009). WOS:000272871600009, pp. 292–300. ISSN: 0921-8009. DOI: 10.1016/j.
895 ecolecon.2009.07.010.
- 896 [80] F Krausmann. “Milk, Manure, and Muscle Power. Livestock and the Transformation
897 of Preindustrial Agriculture in Central Europe”. English. In: *HUMAN ECOLOGY*
898 32.6 (Dec. 2004), pp. 735–772. ISSN: 0300-7839. DOI: 10.1007/s10745-004-6834-y.
- 899 [81] Fridolin Krausmann. *Land Use and Socio-Economic Metabolism in Pre-Industrial*
900 *Agricultural Systems: Four Nineteenth-Century Austrian Villages in Comparison*. Inst.
901 of Social Ecology, IFF-Fac. for Interdisciplinary Studies, Klagenfurt Univ., 2009.
- 902 [82] Fridolin Krausmann et al. “Growth in Global Materials Use, GDP and Population
903 during the 20th Century”. In: *Ecological Economics* 68.10 (Aug. 2009), pp. 2696–
904 2705. ISSN: 0921-8009. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2009.05.007.
- 905 [83] Dan Kristian Kristensen and Chris Kjeldsen. “Imagining and Doing Agro-Food Fu-
906 tures Otherwise: Exploring the Pig City Experiment in the Foodscape of Denmark”.
907 en. In: *Journal of Rural Studies* 43 (Feb. 2016), pp. 40–48. ISSN: 0743-0167. DOI:
908 10.1016/j.jrurstud.2015.11.011.
- 909 [84] Michal Kulak et al. “Eco-Efficiency Improvement by Using Integrative Design and Life
910 Cycle Assessment. The Case Study of Alternative Bread Supply Chains in France”. In:
911 *JOURNAL OF CLEANER PRODUCTION* 112.4 (Jan. 2016), pp. 2452–2461. ISSN:
912 0959-6526. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.11.002.
- 913 [85] Petra Greslova Kuskova. “A Case Study of the Czech Agriculture since 1918 in a Socio-
914 Metabolic Perspective - From Land Reform through Nationalisation to Privatisation”.
915 English. In: *LAND USE POLICY* 30.1 (Jan. 2013), pp. 592–603. ISSN: 0264-8377. DOI:
916 10.1016/j.landusepol.2012.05.009.

-
- 917 [86] Susanne Kytzia, Mireille Faist, and Peter Baccini. “Economically Extended—MFA: A
918 Material Flow Approach for a Better Understanding of Food Production Chain”. en.
919 In: *Journal of Cleaner Production* 12.8-10 (Oct. 2004), pp. 877–889. ISSN: 09596526.
920 DOI: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2004.02.004.
- 921 [87] Antonio L. Resque et al. “Agrobiodiversity and Public Food Procurement Programs
922 in Brazil: Influence of Local Stakeholders in Configuring Green Mediated Markets”.
923 en. In: *Sustainability* 11.5 (Mar. 2019), p. 1425. ISSN: 2071-1050. DOI: 10.3390/
924 su11051425.
- 925 [88] Bruno Latour and Catherine Porter. *Facing Gaia: Eight Lectures on the New Climatic*
926 *Regime*. eng. Cambridge, UK ; Medford, MA: Polity, 2017. ISBN: 978-0-7456-8433-8
927 978-0-7456-8434-5.
- 928 [89] Ronan Le Velly and Ivan Dufeu. “Alternative Food Networks as ”Market Agence-
929 ments”: Exploring Their Multiple Hybridities”. English. In: *Journal of Rural Studies*
930 43 (Feb. 2016). WOS:000371188100015, pp. 173–182. ISSN: 0743-0167. DOI: 10.1016/
931 j.jrurstud.2015.11.015.
- 932 [90] Gilles Lemaire et al. “Integrated Crop–Livestock Systems: Strategies to Achieve Syn-
933 ergy between Agricultural Production and Environmental Quality”. en. In: *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 190 (June 2014), pp. 4–8. ISSN: 01678809. DOI:
934 10.1016/j.agee.2013.08.009.
- 935 [91] Stéphane Madelrieux and William James. *Le pragmatisme de William James (Pre-
936 sentation)*. French. OCLC: 762818996. Paris: ”Le Monde : Flammarion, 2010. ISBN:
937 978-2-08-124341-5.
- 938 [92] Mark Glen Madison. “Potatoes Made of Oil: Eugene and Howard Odum and the Ori-
939 gins and Limits of American Agroecology”. In: *Environment and History* 3.2 (1997),
940 pp. 209–238. ISSN: 0967-3407.
- 941 [93] Nelo Magalhães et al. “The Physical Economy of France (1830–2015). The History of
942 a Parasite?” In: *Ecological Economics* 157 (Mar. 2019), pp. 291–300. ISSN: 0921-8009.
943 DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2018.12.001.
- 944 [94] Guillaume Martin et al. “Crop–Livestock Integration beyond the Farm Level: A Re-
945 view”. In: *Agronomy for Sustainable Development* 36.3 (2016), p. 53. DOI: 10.1007/
946 s13593-016-0390-x.
- 947 [95] Joan Martinez-Alier et al. “Social Metabolism, Ecological Distribution Conflicts, and
948 Valuation Languages”. In: *Ecological Economics*. Special Section: Ecological Distri-
949 bution Conflicts 70.2 (Dec. 2010), pp. 153–158. ISSN: 0921-8009. DOI: 10.1016/j.
950 ecolecon.2010.09.024.
- 951 [96] Joan Martinez-Alier, Giuseppe Munda, and John O’Neill. “Weak Comparability of
952 Values as a Foundation for Ecological Economics”. en. In: *Ecological Economics* 26.3
953 (Sept. 1998), pp. 277–286. ISSN: 09218009. DOI: 10.1016/S0921-8009(97)00120-1.
- 954 [97] V Ernesto Méndez, Christopher M Bacon, and Roseann Cohen. “Agroecology as a
955 Transdisciplinary, Participatory, and Action-Oriented Approach”. en. In: *Agroecology*
956 *and Sustainable Food Systems* (2013), p. 18.
- 957

-
- 958 [98] V. Méndez et al. “Integrating Agroecology and Participatory Action Research (PAR):
959 Lessons from Central America”. en. In: *Sustainability* 9.5 (Apr. 2017), p. 705. ISSN:
960 2071-1050. DOI: 10.3390/su9050705.
- 961 [99] Mateo Mier y Terán Giménez Cacho et al. “Bringing Agroecology to Scale: Key Drivers
962 and Emblematic Cases”. en. In: *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems* 42.6 (July
963 2018), pp. 637–665. ISSN: 2168-3565, 2168-3573. DOI: 10.1080/21683565.2018.
964 1443313.
- 965 [100] Marco A. Miranda-Ackerman, Catherine Azzaro-Pantel, and Alberto A. Aguilar-Lasserre.
966 “A Green Supply Chain Network Design Framework for the Processed Food Indus-
967 try: Application to the Orange Juice Agrofood Cluster”. In: *COMPUTERS & IN-
968 DUSTRIAL ENGINEERING* 109 (July 2017), pp. 369–389. ISSN: 0360-8352. DOI:
969 10.1016/j.cie.2017.04.031.
- 970 [101] A. P. J. Mol and Tran Thi My Dieu. “Analysing and Governing Environmental Flows:
971 The Case of Tra Co Tapioca Village, Vietnam”. English. In: *Njas-Wageningen Journal
972 of Life Sciences* 53.3-4 (Feb. 2006), pp. 301–317. ISSN: 1573-5214. DOI: 10.1016/
973 S1573-5214(06)80011-4.
- 974 [102] Jason W. Moore. “Environmental Crises and the Metabolic Rift in World-Historical
975 Perspective”. en. In: *Organization & Environment* 13.2 (June 2000), pp. 123–157.
976 ISSN: 1086-0266, 1552-7417. DOI: 10.1177/1086026600132001.
- 977 [103] Jason W. Moore. “Metabolic Rift or Metabolic Shift? Dialectics, Nature, and the
978 World-Historical Method”. In: *Theory and Society* 46.4 (Aug. 2017), pp. 285–318.
979 DOI: 10.1007/s11186-017-9290-6.
- 980 [104] Jason W. Moore. “Transcending the Metabolic Rift: A Theory of Crises in the Capi-
981 talist World-Ecology”. en. In: *Journal of Peasant Studies* 38.1 (Jan. 2011), pp. 1–46.
982 ISSN: 0306-6150, 1743-9361. DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2010.538579.
- 983 [105] Marc Moraine, Michel Duru, and Olivier Therond. “A Social-Ecological Framework for
984 Analyzing and Designing Integrated Crop-Livestock Systems from Farm to Territory
985 Levels”. en. In: *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems* 32.01 (Feb. 2017), pp. 43–56.
986 ISSN: 1742-1705, 1742-1713. DOI: 10.1017/S1742170515000526.
- 987 [106] V. Niutanen and J. Korhonen. “Industrial Ecology Flows of Agriculture and Food In-
988 dustry in Finland: Utilizing by-Products and Wastes”. English. In: *International Jour-
989 nal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology* 10.2 (June 2003). WOS:000184309600005,
990 pp. 133–147. ISSN: 1350-4509.
- 991 [107] Benjamin Nowak et al. “Nutrient Recycling in Organic Farming Is Related to Diversity
992 in Farm Types at the Local Level”. en. In: *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*
993 204 (June 2015), pp. 17–26. ISSN: 01678809. DOI: 10.1016/j.agee.2015.02.010.
- 994 [108] Gohar Nuhoff-Isakhanyan et al. “Network Structure in Sustainable Agro-Industrial
995 Parks”. In: *Journal of Cleaner Production* 141 (Jan. 2017), pp. 1209–1220. ISSN: 0959-
996 6526. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.09.196.
- 997 [109] Howard T. Odum. *Environment, Power, and Society*. English. 1st edition. New York,
998 NY: John Wiley & Sons Inc, June 1971. ISBN: 978-0-471-65275-5.

-
- 999 [110] Pedro Miguel Oliveira and Maria Manuela Natario. “Territorial Innovation Systems
1000 and Strategies of Collective Efficiency The Case of Tagus Valley Agro-Food Com-
1001 plex”. In: *EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF INNOVATION MANAGEMENT* 19.3 (2016),
1002 pp. 362–382. ISSN: 1460-1060. DOI: 10.1108/EJIM-07-2014-0072.
- 1003 [111] Winfred Ikiring Onyas, Morven G. McEachern, and Annmarie Ryan. “Co-Constructing
1004 Sustainability: Agencing Sustainable Coffee Farmers in Uganda”. en. In: *Journal of*
1005 *Rural Studies* 61 (July 2018), pp. 12–21. ISSN: 0743-0167. DOI: 10.1016/j.jrurstud.
1006 2018.05.006.
- 1007 [112] Murilo Pagotto and Anthony Halog. “Towards a Circular Economy in Australian
1008 Agri-Food Industry: An Application of Input-Output Oriented Approaches for Ana-
1009 lyzing Resource Efficiency and Competitiveness Potential: Approaches for Analyzing
1010 Resource Efficiency”. en. In: *Journal of Industrial Ecology* 20.5 (Oct. 2016), pp. 1176–
1011 1186. ISSN: 10881980. DOI: 10.1111/jieec.12373.
- 1012 [113] Murilo Pagotto and Anthony Halog. “Towards a Circular Economy in Australian Agri-
1013 Food Industry An Application of Input-Output Oriented Approaches for Analyzing
1014 Resource Efficiency and Competitiveness Potential”. English. In: *Journal of Industrial*
1015 *Ecology* 20.5 (Oct. 2016). WOS:000387326900016, pp. 1176–1186. ISSN: 1088-1980.
1016 DOI: 10.1111/jieec.12373.
- 1017 [114] Stefan Pauliuk and Edgar G. Hertwich. “Socioeconomic Metabolism as Paradigm for
1018 Studying the Biophysical Basis of Human Societies”. en. In: *Ecological Economics* 119
1019 (Nov. 2015), pp. 83–93. ISSN: 09218009. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.08.012.
- 1020 [115] Charles S Peirce and John Dewey. *Chance, Love, and Logic: Philosophical Essays*.
1021 en. Ed. by Morris R Cohen. 1st ed. Routledge, 1923. ISBN: 978-1-315-82312-6. DOI:
1022 10.4324/9781315823126.
- 1023 [116] Marta G. Rivera-Ferre. “The Resignification Process of Agroecology: Competing Nar-
1024 ratives from Governments, Civil Society and Intergovernmental Organizations”. en.
1025 In: *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems* 42.6 (July 2018), pp. 666–685. ISSN:
1026 2168-3565, 2168-3573. DOI: 10.1080/21683565.2018.1437498.
- 1027 [117] Richard Rorty. “Pragmatism as Anti-Authoritarianism”. In: *Revue Internationale de*
1028 *Philosophie* 53.207 (1) (1999), pp. 7–20. ISSN: 0048-8143.
- 1029 [118] Peter M. Rosset and Miguel A. Altieri. “Agroecology versus Input Substitution: A
1030 Fundamental Contradiction of Sustainable Agriculture”. In: *Society & Natural Re-*
1031 *sources* 10.3 (May 1997), pp. 283–295. ISSN: 0894-1920. DOI: 10.1080/08941929709381027.
- 1032 [119] Julie Ryschawy et al. “Designing Crop–Livestock Integration at Different Levels: To-
1033 ward New Agroecological Models?” en. In: *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* 108.1
1034 (May 2017), pp. 5–20. ISSN: 1385-1314, 1573-0867. DOI: 10.1007/s10705-016-9815-
1035 9.
- 1036 [120] Arnim Scheidel and Katharine N. Farrell. “Small-Scale Cooperative Banking and the
1037 Production of Capital: Reflecting on the Role of Institutional Agreements in Support-
1038 ing Rural Livelihood in Kampot, Cambodia”. en. In: *Ecological Economics* 119 (Nov.
1039 2015), pp. 230–240. ISSN: 09218009. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.09.008.

-
- 1040 [121] Frank Schiller, Alexandra S. Penn, and Lauren Basson. “Analyzing Networks in Industrial Ecology – a Review of Social-Material Network Analyses”. en. In: *Journal of Cleaner Production* 76 (Aug. 2014), pp. 1–11. ISSN: 09596526. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.03.029.
- 1041
- 1042
- 1043
- 1044 [122] Mindi Schneider. “Wasting the Rural: Meat, Manure, and the Politics of Agro-Industrialization in Contemporary China”. English. In: *Geoforum* 78 (Jan. 2017). WOS:000392684700010, pp. 89–97. ISSN: 0016-7185. DOI: 10.1016/j.geoforum.2015.12.001.
- 1045
- 1046
- 1047 [123] Mindi Schneider and Philip McMichael. “Deepening, and Repairing, the Metabolic Rift”. In: *JOURNAL OF PEASANT STUDIES* 37.3 (2010), pp. 461–484. ISSN: 0306-6150. DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2010.494371.
- 1048
- 1049
- 1050 [124] Miguel Afonso Sellitto, Luis Antonio Machado Vial, and Claudia Viviane Viegas. “Critical Success Factors in Short Food Supply Chains: Case Studies with Milk and Dairy Producers from Italy and Brazil”. In: *JOURNAL OF CLEANER PRODUCTION* 170 (Jan. 2018), pp. 1361–1368. ISSN: 0959-6526. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.09.235.
- 1051
- 1052
- 1053
- 1054
- 1055 [125] Tarik Serrano-Tovar and Mario Giampietro. “Multi-Scale Integrated Analysis of Rural Laos: Studying Metabolic Patterns of Land Uses across Different Levels and Scales”. English. In: *Land Use Policy* 36 (Jan. 2014), pp. 155–170. ISSN: 0264-8377. DOI: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2013.08.003.
- 1056
- 1057
- 1058
- 1059 [126] Yogendra Shastri et al. “Agent-Based Analysis of Biomass Feedstock Production Dynamics”. English. In: *Bioenergy Research* 4.4 (Dec. 2011), pp. 258–275. ISSN: 1939-1234. DOI: 10.1007/s12155-011-9139-1.
- 1060
- 1061
- 1062 [127] Alberto Simboli, Raffaella Taddeo, and Anna Morgante. “The Potential of Industrial Ecology in Agri-Food Clusters (AFCs): A Case Study Based on Valorisation of Auxiliary Materials”. en. In: *Ecological Economics* 111 (Mar. 2015), pp. 65–75. ISSN: 09218009. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.01.005.
- 1063
- 1064
- 1065
- 1066 [128] David Soto et al. “The Social Metabolism of Biomass in Spain, 1900-2008: From Food to Feed-Oriented Changes in the Agro-Ecosystems”. English. In: *Ecological Economics* 128 (Aug. 2016). WOS:000378669700014, pp. 130–138. ISSN: 0921-8009. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2016.04.017.
- 1067
- 1068
- 1069
- 1070 [129] Clive L. Spash. “The Shallow or the Deep Ecological Economics Movement?” en. In: *Ecological Economics* 93 (Sept. 2013), pp. 351–362. ISSN: 09218009. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2013.05.016.
- 1071
- 1072
- 1073 [130] Shuichi Tamura and Koichi Fujie. “Material Cycle of Agriculture on Miyakojima Island: Material Flow Analysis for Sugar Cane, Pasturage and Beef Cattle”. English. In: *Sustainability* 6.2 (Feb. 2014). WOS:000332123100020, pp. 812–835. ISSN: 2071-1050. DOI: 10.3390/su6020812.
- 1074
- 1075
- 1076
- 1077 [131] Camille Tedesco et al. “Potential for Recoupling Production and Consumption in Peri-Urban Territories: The Case-Study of the Saclay Plateau near Paris, France”. English. In: *Food Policy* 69 (May 2017). WOS:000403123500004, pp. 35–45. ISSN: 0306-9192. DOI: 10.1016/j.foodpol.2017.03.006.
- 1078
- 1079
- 1080
- 1081 [132] Mette Vaarst et al. “Exploring the Concept of Agroecological Food Systems in a City-Region Context”. en. In: *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems* 42.6 (July 2018), pp. 686–711. ISSN: 2168-3565, 2168-3573. DOI: 10.1080/21683565.2017.1365321.
- 1082
- 1083

-
- 1084 [133] F.-D. Vivien et al. “The Hijacking of the Bioeconomy”. en. In: *Ecological Economics*
1085 159 (May 2019), pp. 189–197. ISSN: 09218009. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.01.
1086 027.
- 1087 [134] Tom Wassenaar. “Reconsidering Industrial Metabolism: From Analogy to Denoting
1088 Actuality”. en. In: *Journal of Industrial Ecology* 19.5 (Oct. 2015), pp. 715–727. ISSN:
1089 1530-9290. DOI: 10.1111/jiec.12349.
- 1090 [135] Marc C. A. Wegerif and Paul Hebinck. “The Symbiotic Food System: An ”Alterna-
1091 tive’ Agri-Food System Already Working at Scale”. English. In: *Agriculture-Basel*
1092 6.3 (Sept. 2016). WOS:000385520100014, p. 40. ISSN: 2077-0472. DOI: 10.3390/
1093 agriculture6030040.
- 1094 [136] A. Wezel et al. “Agroecology as a Science, a Movement and a Practice. A Review”.
1095 en. In: *Agronomy for Sustainable Development* 29.4 (Dec. 2009), pp. 503–515. ISSN:
1096 1774-0746, 1773-0155. DOI: 10.1051/agro/2009004.
- 1097 [137] Alexander Wezel et al. “Agroecology in Europe: Research, Education, Collective Ac-
1098 tion Networks, and Alternative Food Systems”. en. In: *Sustainability* 10.4 (Apr. 2018),
1099 p. 1214. ISSN: 2071-1050. DOI: 10.3390/su10041214.
- 1100 [138] Stefan Wirsenius. “The Biomass Metabolism of the Food System: A Model-Based Sur-
1101 vey of the Global and Regional Turnover of Food Biomass”. en. In: *Journal of Indus-
1102 trial Ecology* 7.1 (Jan. 2003), pp. 47–80. ISSN: 1530-9290. DOI: 10.1162/108819803766729195.
- 1103 [139] Wanying Xu et al. “Understanding the Mechanism of Food Waste Management by
1104 Using Stakeholder Analysis and Social Network Model: An Industrial Ecology Per-
1105 spective”. en. In: *Ecological Modelling* 337 (Oct. 2016), pp. 63–72. ISSN: 03043800.
1106 DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2016.06.006.
- 1107 [140] Devrim Murat Yazan et al. “Cooperation in Manure-Based Biogas Production Net-
1108 works: An Agent-Based Modeling Approach”. In: *APPLIED ENERGY* 212 (Feb.
1109 2018), pp. 820–833. ISSN: 0306-2619. DOI: 10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.12.074.
- 1110 [141] Zengwei Yuan et al. “Phosphorus Flow Analysis of the Socioeconomic Ecosystem of
1111 Shucheng County, China”. English. In: *ECOLOGICAL APPLICATIONS* 21.7 (Oct.
1112 2011), pp. 2822–2832. ISSN: 1051-0761. DOI: 10.1890/10-1409.1.
- 1113 [142] A. Zabaniotou et al. “Boosting Circular Economy and Closing the Loop in Agriculture:
1114 Case Study of a Small-Scale Pyrolysis-Biochar Based System Integrated in an Olive
1115 Farm in Symbiosis with an Olive Mill”. English. In: *Environmental Development* 14
1116 (Apr. 2015). WOS:000363553800005, pp. 22–36. ISSN: 2211-4645. DOI: 10.1016/j.
1117 envdev.2014.12.002.
- 1118 [143] Yan Zhang et al. “Ecological Network Analysis of China’s Societal Metabolism”. En-
1119 glish. In: *Journal of Environmental Management* 93.1 (Jan. 2012). WOS:000297971000028,
1120 pp. 254–263. ISSN: 0301-4797. DOI: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2011.09.013.