

This item is the archived peer-reviewed author-version of:

Rebound effects following technological advancement? The case of a global shock in ferrochrome supply

Reference:

Buyle Matthias, Audenaert Amaryllis, Brusselaers Jan, Van Passel Steven.- Rebound effects following technological advancement? The case of a global shock in ferrochrome supply
Journal of cleaner production / Masson - ISSN 1879-1786 - 391(2023), 136264
Full text (Publisher's DOI): <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JCLEPRO.2023.136264>
To cite this reference: <https://hdl.handle.net/10067/1935690151162165141>

1 Rebound effects following technological advancement? The case of a global 2 shock in ferrochrome supply

3 Matthias Buyle^{1,2,3*}, Amaryllis Audenaert¹, Jan Brusselaers^{2,4}, Steven Van Passel^{3,5}

- 4 1. *Energy and Materials in Infrastructure and Buildings (EMIB), University of Antwerp, 2020 Antwerp, Belgium*
- 5 2. *Unit Sustainable Materials Management, Flemish Institute for Technological Research (VITO), 2400 Mol, Belgium*
- 6 3. *VCCM, Flanders Make, Belgium*
- 7 4. *Institute for Environmental Studies, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 1081 HV, Amsterdam, Netherlands*
- 8 5. *Department of Engineering Management, University of Antwerp, 2000 Antwerp Belgium*

9 * Correspondence: matthias.buyle@uantwerpen.be, matti.buyle@vito.be

10 Abstract

11 Novel recycling technologies aim at increasing material efficiency by turning former waste products
12 into valuable reclaimed resources. A key question is whether such technologies really reduce primary
13 resource consumption or instead stimulate aggregated market demand. In this study the consequences
14 of a positive shock in ferrochrome supply to the global stainless steel value chain is assessed
15 quantitatively. This new source might be unlocked by technology under development for the recovery
16 of chromium from carbon and stainless steel slags. The aim of this study is to quantitatively assess the
17 income and substitution effects of reclaimed ferrochrome along a part of the stainless steel value chain.
18 The impact of the supply shock is analysed by means of a vector autoregression (VAR), a dynamic model
19 where lagged values of all included variables estimate current state of the system. Additionally, the VAR
20 model is extended to a structural vector autoregression (SVAR) to account for contemporary effects as
21 well. Both the VAR and SVAR model indicate that additional ferrochrome supply leads to an increase in
22 aggregated supply of stainless steel, in combination with a substitution effect between ferrochrome
23 and nickel. The extended SVAR model additionally highlights that contemporaneous effects do play an
24 important role as well to capture the direct rebound effect in the ferrochrome market when working
25 with quarterly data. In other words, an additional supply of reclaimed ferrochrome triggers a complex
26 combination of interactions and consequences, yet it does not necessarily lead to a lower overall
27 material consumption. The main contributions of this paper are the assessment of direct rebound
28 effects of supplying reclaimed metals along the value chain and the demonstration that quantifying the
29 effects of circular strategies is feasible.

30 Highlights

- 31 - Emerging technologies have the potential to unlock new source of ferrochrome
- 32 - Analysis of a shock in ferrochrome supply to the global stainless steel market
- 33 - Vector autoregression to quantify income and substitution effects along value chain
- 34 - Additional ferrochrome leads to a structural increase in supply of stainless steel
- 35 - Substitution effects between ferrochrome and nickel are observed

36 Keywords

37 Emerging technology, rebound effect; by-product valorisation; vector autoregression, chromium
38 recovery

39 1. Introduction

40 One of the core ideas of the circular economy is that technological development can assist in increasing
41 material efficiency by turning former waste products into valuable reclaimed resources (Ellen

1 MacArthur Foundation, 2015). But do such emerging technologies really reduce primary resource
2 consumption and corresponding environmental impact, or do they stimulate aggregated market
3 demand instead? For example, in recent years there has been a growing interest for valorising valuable
4 properties of carbon and stainless steel slag. To date, although these slag types are no longer
5 considered as waste, they usually end up in low quality applications that ignore the value of the
6 entrapped residual metals (Singh and Ordoñez, 2016). Recently, research has been done on how to
7 increase the value of carbon and stainless steel slag after treatment. Three strategies can be
8 distinguished in literature: high-quality matrix valorisation, metal recovery and alternative use outside
9 the steel industry. The goal of the first strategy is to create high quality construction products like
10 carbonated building blocks (Di Maria et al., 2018), the second aims at recovering entrapped valuable
11 metals such as vanadium and chromium (Wang et al., 2019), while the use of slag in wastewater
12 treatment applications is an example of the last strategy (Ahmad et al., 2020). The current study builds
13 on previous research efforts that go beyond the state of the art by combining the first two strategies,
14 thus valorising the full potential of the carbon and stainless steel slags (Buyle et al., 2021). The main
15 goal of this technology under development is the recovery of chromium, while the metal-free residual
16 matrix material can serve as an input for carbonated building blocks. Currently this technology has a
17 low technology readiness level (TRL). But after further technical and economic optimization, two new
18 types of reclaimed products may enter the market in the future, namely chrome compounds and
19 carbonated bricks. In the rest of this study, the focus will be on the recovered chrome, assessing its
20 global market potential and influence on the stainless steel market by means of an econometric model.
21 This model will clarify the pricing mechanisms that play a role in parts of the simulated value chain of
22 stainless steel. The starting point is the assumption that further R&D efforts will enable the recovery of
23 chromium as ferrochrome (FeCr) in an economically viable way (Buyle et al., 2021; CHROMIC, 2021).

24 Chromium is one of the key elements of stainless steel. It is typically added in the form of ferrochrome,
25 and it is essential to harden steel and increase resistance to corrosion (Kropschot and Doebrich, 2010).
26 At the moment, around 80% of global ferrochrome production is consumed in stainless steel products
27 (Wolfe, 2018). However, to date there is no market for recovered ferrochrome as there are currently
28 no separating technologies commercially available. Chromium is only indirectly recycled, as part of
29 (stainless) steel scrap that is recycled. This way, a recycling rate of 40 to 75% is achieved depending on
30 the region and the steel grade (Daigo et al., 2010; Nakamura et al., 2017), while the potential global
31 indirect end-of-life recycling rate is estimated at 70% for all steel grades (Henckens, 2021). In this
32 context, it is unclear what might happen if a new source of reclaimed ferrochrome enters the market,
33 which will be available for direct use. Such a new source is complementary to scrap recycling but
34 competes with primary ferrochrome production. Given its importance in the stainless steel value chain,
35 a proper evaluation of ferrochrome supply needs to involve stainless steel production. So, both the
36 ferrochrome and the stainless steel markets have to be considered if one is interested in the (indirect)
37 effect of additional ferrochrome supply.

38 When evaluating the burdens and benefits of new recycling technologies, for example by means of an
39 environmental life cycle assessment (LCA), it is typically assumed that recovered materials can replace
40 primary ones on the market at a 1:1 ratio as long as both meet the same technical or functional
41 requirements (European Commission - Joint Research Centre - Institute for Environment and
42 Sustainability, 2010; Weidema et al., 2009). However, this assumption overlooks the market dynamics
43 with its direct and indirect rebound effects, which could lead to over-optimistic conclusions. For
44 example, Greening et al. (2000) identify four types of rebound effect in the context of increasing energy
45 efficiency, namely direct rebound, secondary, economy-wide, and transformational rebound effects.
46 Direct rebound effects can be considered as pure price effects and decomposed in a substitution and
47 income effect, while secondary effects result from increases in demand for other goods and services.

1 Economy-wide effects capture price and quantity readjustments as well, often in a general equilibrium
2 context (Brockway et al., 2021; Sorrell, 2007). Transformational effects refer to changes in consumers'
3 preferences and the alteration of social institutions. However, incomplete substitution beyond energy
4 services has been acknowledged in literature as well (Ekvall, 2000; Zink et al., 2016). The integration of
5 economic models in environmental studies is one of the proposed approaches to take into account
6 market dynamics, such as price, income and substitution effects. A distinction can be made between
7 theoretical work and more empirical solutions, e.g. (partial) equilibrium or (environmentally extended)
8 input-output models, whether or not combined with LCA or other environmental assessment methods.
9 Dealing with direct and secondary rebound effects from a theoretical point of view, according to (Zink
10 and Geyer, 2017) an additional supply of circular products on the market should be evaluated by
11 applying the following criteria: are circular products really substitutes for their linear counterparts and
12 if so, first do they increase aggregated demand and second is the environmental impact of reclaimed
13 products or resources lower compared to primary ones. Figge and Thorpe (2019) build on work of Zink
14 and Geyer and they emphasize the importance of producers in the context of a (circular) rebound
15 effect, in addition to the classic consumer-producer approach. So, from a theoretical point of view, it is
16 clear that the rebound effect of new circular strategies must be taken into account. However, it remains
17 unclear how to put this in practice. Economic models are useful tools to complete policy assessments
18 because they rely on actual data about the current structure of an economy, combined with a set of
19 equations based on economic theory. These equations allow modelling the behaviour of economic
20 agents and hence to analyse the impact of demand, supply and policy shocks. Such models have already
21 been applied in the agri-food sector (Chalmers et al., 2015), in (bio)energy systems (Beaussier et al.,
22 2022; Earles et al., 2013; Menten et al., 2015), in agriculture (Vázquez-Rowe et al., 2013) and when
23 dealing with metals (Ekvall and Andrae, 2006). More recently, efforts have been made to capture
24 economy-wide rebound effects by linking LCA to integrated assessment models (IAM). IAMs aim to
25 model the global economy, considering economy-wide interactions between regions, sectors and policy
26 goals (e.g. climate targets). An example of a prospective IAM is *Premise* (Sacchi et al., 2022). However,
27 despite the benefits of a consistent economy-wide model, the drawback of IAMs is their coarse
28 technological resolution. In literature there is a strong focus on behavioural changes (direct and
29 secondary) as a consequence of increased energy efficiency (Cansino et al., 2022; Sorrell and
30 Dimitropoulos, 2008). However, very little research exists on the empirical assessment of the economic
31 impact of supplying reclaimed materials to the market. Zink et al. (2018) analysed the effect of a
32 sustained shock of additional supply of recycled aluminium to the US market with a simultaneous
33 equation model (SEM). They concluded that recycled aluminium only replaces 10 to 20% of primary
34 aluminium, but that more research is needed to evaluate whether additional supply leads to increased
35 industrial material consumption or to substitution by other materials such as steel or plastics.

36 In the light of the increasing attention for the circular economy and material efficiency in general, it is
37 key to properly assess the consequences of actions aimed at increasing circularity and improving
38 sustainability. However, when it comes to empirically estimating the impact of marketing recovered
39 materials, very little information is available. Zink et al. (2018) is one of the exceptions and studies the
40 production of recovered aluminium. Moreover, despite the importance of the (stainless) steel industry,
41 there is very little empirical research available that focuses on a larger part of the value chain. Studies
42 often have a narrow focus, for example the issue of China's excess steelmaking capacity (Ahn, 2016). In
43 this context, the aim of this study is to quantitatively assess the effect of a positive shock in the supply
44 of ferrochrome to the global stainless steel value chain. This will be achieved through the following
45 three objectives: an analysis of the structure of the global stainless steel and ferrochrome market in
46 order to develop a theoretical model (1), and an estimation of the consequences of a shock in
47 ferrochrome supply by means of a Vector Autoregression (VAR) model (2). A VAR is a dynamic model in

1 which one estimates the current state of the system via lagged values of all included variables. However,
2 it is not unlikely that interactions will occur within the current period. So, the last objective is to find
3 out whether such contemporary effects do indeed play a role, by extending the initial VAR to a
4 Structural Vector Autoregression (SVAR) model (3). Two hypotheses will be tested with the VAR and
5 SVAR models. Both are based on economic theory and involve the quantification of direct rebound
6 effects. The first hypothesis is that an additional supply in ferrochrome can lead to lower prices, which
7 reduces the production cost of stainless steel, which in turn can lead to greater aggregated demand for
8 stainless steel. The second hypothesis is that a lower price of one of the inputs in the production of
9 stainless steel can lead to a substitution effect, namely between ferrochrome and nickel.

10 This work makes three important contributions. First, to the authors' knowledge this is the first study
11 to assess rebound effects of reclaimed metals along (a part of) the value chain. By applying a VAR and
12 a SVAR, all actors within the model are treated endogenously, so that interaction between multiple
13 markets can be estimated dynamically based on real data. The big advantage is that in this way, both
14 direct (substitution) and indirect (income) effects can be analysed quantitatively. Second, this research
15 will show that it is feasible to quantify the effect of circular strategies, such as waste valorisation and
16 recycling. By focusing on empirical data and econometric modelling, the gap between environmental
17 and economic models can be bridged, reducing the need for generic guidelines and the use of rules of
18 thumb. This approach is exemplified for low TRL slag treatment technologies, highlighting the benefit
19 for econometric evaluations at early design stages in specific. Third, the concept of direct rebound
20 effects is applied to the supply side in a non-energy related context.

21 2. Material and methods

22 2.1 Literature review

23 A schematic representation of the stainless steel making process is shown in Figure 1. In modern
24 manufacturing applications, inputs are melted in an electric arc furnace (EAF). These inputs are stainless
25 steel scrap and other types of ferrous scrap, pig iron from blast furnace (BF) production and other
26 alloying metals such as chromium, nickel, molybdenum and vanadium. Thereafter, excess carbon is
27 removed in an argon oxygen decarburization (AOD) system and given the desired shape as the metal
28 begins to cool. In the following paragraphs, the most important inputs and their market context are
29 analysed more in detail.

30 Around 80% of the ferrochrome is consumed by the stainless steel sector (Wolfe, 2018). Any change in
31 the ferrochrome supply must therefore be analysed together with the stainless steel sector. The steel
32 market – and by extension the stainless steel market – is a global one (Bucur et al., 2017; Wolfe, 2018),
33 where prices converge in the long run (Giuliodori and Rodriguez, 2015). Global stainless steel
34 production has grown exponentially in the last two decades, with output nearly tripling from 19 Mt in
35 2000 to 52.2 Mt in 2019 (ISSF, 2020). China is the main driver of this growth: China's share of Asian
36 stainless steel slab production has increased dramatically from 4% (0.25 Mt) in 2000, to 71% (22 Mt) by
37 2017 (Chan-wook, 2018). For the entire stainless steel market, China's share was 56%, followed by the
38 European Union (13%), India (8%), Japan (6%) and the US (5%) (ISSF, 2020). In response to the exploding
39 domestic demand, Chinese stainless steelmaking capacity has expanded substantially over the past two
40 decades. However, the slowdown in Chinese economic growth at the start of the second decade -
41 described by the Chinese authorities as the “new normal” – led to substantial overcapacity in the
42 Chinese steel sector (Ahn, 2016). Due to the declining domestic demand, steelmakers sought export
43 markets to alleviate domestic oversupply, impacting global steel prices (Ahn, 2016). In summary, the
44 stainless steel market can be considered as a global market, with China as a major player influencing
45 global prices and output. Smaller markets such as the EU and US can be considered price takers,

1 although import tariffs have been introduced on Chinese steel (products) in recent years (Aperam,
2 2020).

3 There are substantial regional differences in the key drivers of stainless steel demand (Pariser et al.,
4 2018). For example, in Japan demand is driven by architecture, buildings and construction, along with
5 the automotive sector, while the main application in Europe is machinery and equipment. Nevertheless,
6 stainless steel is a versatile material that is used in many economic sectors. So depending on the
7 application there may be substitutes (International Energy Agency, 2020). For example, a shift to
8 electric vehicles (EV) could reduce the use of stainless steel in favour of lighter materials, like aluminium
9 or carbon fibre. Nevertheless, stainless steel remains the most suitable and cheapest option for many
10 applications and as a result, despite the differences between regions, demand usually follows general
11 economic activity (Giuliodori and Rodriguez, 2015).

12 The main inputs to stainless steel production - and the driver of supply - that determine production
13 costs are chromium, nickel and energy prices. The chromium content in stainless steel is 10.5% or more
14 (typically around 18%) to ensure corrosion resistance (Kropschot and Doebrich, 2010; Pariser et al.,
15 2018), while nickel (6 to 26%) is usually added to improve the formability and ductility of stainless steel
16 (Nickel Development Institute, 1993). Even more than chromium, nickel is a dominant determinant of
17 the price of stainless steel (Aperam, 2020). Both chromium and nickel can be added in primary form or
18 embedded in steel scrap. Nevertheless, since the alloying element content of scrap is variable, primary
19 alloying elements are still needed to get the desired grade (Pariser et al., 2018). However, unlike
20 chromium and nickel, the scrap market does not follow regular economic cycles, as it mainly relies on
21 scrap collection (Pariser et al., 2018). Because suppliers can easily switch between steel grades,
22 chromium and nickel are – to some extent – substitutes in production. Nonetheless, most of the output
23 is distributed over a limited number of grades (Giuliodori and Rodriguez, 2015). The importance of the
24 alloying elements can be demonstrated by the stainless steel pricing in Europe and the US, where the
25 price is composed of a base price and a monthly updated alloy surcharge. The former is quite stable
26 since 2000, while the latter is much more volatile (Aperam, 2020; Outokumpu, 2021; Pariser et al.,
27 2018).

28 In addition to the overall supply and demand drivers, it is important to consider China's role in the
29 global stainless steel market. In the last decade, a trend of fiscal decentralizing along with the
30 promotion system by which government officials strive for GDP growth, has given local governments
31 strong incentives to excessively support the (stainless) steel market, e.g. provide preferential tax,
32 provide cheap land, etc. (Yu and Shen, 2020), resulting in oversupply in China's steel market. Despite
33 the central government's goal of cutting back steelmaking capacity and reducing supply, in reality the
34 opposite is happening. An additional problem is that such a market disequilibrium cannot be solved by
35 market mechanisms alone, so government measures are required here (Yu and Shen, 2020). To tackle
36 overcapacity, companies are looking for new foreign markets, putting pressure on the global stainless
37 steel market (Ahn, 2016). An additional complexity is the heterogeneity of the Chinese steel market:
38 while some of the larger companies are subject to (some degree of) governmental control, many of the
39 smaller ones are not. So to conclude, China certainly has some market power, driven by GDP targets
40 leading to excess steelmaking capacity, yet it cannot be considered a mono- or oligopolist (Sourisseau,
41 2018).




Figure 1. Schematic representation of the stainless steel making process. The blue dotted rectangle defines the system boundaries based on the literature review. The grey dotted rectangle represents the potential new route for ferrochrome recovery.

2.2 Empirical framework

In order to answer the second and third research question, an econometric model must dynamically capture the interaction between different markets and other drivers of supply and demand identified in the previous section. In this research, a vector autoregression (VAR) model is applied. A VAR is a multivariate linear time series model where the endogenous variables in the system are linear functions of the lagged values of all endogenous variables (Lütkepohl, 2005). One of the advantages of VAR models is that they are atheoretical, eliminating the need for structural equations assumptions. In this way, VAR models can describe the underlying process better than, for example, simultaneous equation models (SEM), which are subject to the risk of misspecification of structural equations and the requirement of an a priori division between endogenous and exogenous variables (Chan and Chung, 1995; Manera, 2006). On the other hand, a disadvantage of VAR models is that they only contain lagged variables, unlike SEMs.

The general formula for a VAR(p) model is as follows, with p the number of lags, k the set of explanatory variables and t the time index:

$$y_t = c + A_1 y_{t-1} + \dots + A_p y_{t-p} + u_t \quad \text{Eq. 1}$$

Where $y_t = [y_{1t} \ y_{2t} \ \dots \ y_{kt}]'$ is a random ($k \times 1$) vector, $c = [c_1 \ c_2 \ \dots \ c_k]'$ a fixed time-invariant ($k \times 1$) vector, A_i are fixed time-invariant ($k \times k$) coefficient matrices and $u_t = [u_{1t} \ u_{2t} \ \dots \ u_{kt}]'$ is a ($k \times 1$) vector of error terms (Lütkepohl, 2005). All effects of omitted variables and contemporaneous interaction are assumed to be included in the error term, in the literature often referred to as innovations.

However, it is not clear from theory whether instantaneous interaction can occur. SVAR studies of other metal markets indicate significant instantaneous effects, by using monthly (Wang and Wang, 2019) or quarterly data (Chen and Yang, 2021). Quarterly data is used for this study (see section 2.3) so it is not unlikely that some agents will respond to available information within a period. To take this into account, the initial VAR model is extended to a structural VAR (SVAR) as a sensitivity analysis. In a VAR, the vector of error terms u_t captures both the variances of the error terms and the contemporaneous effects. In contrast in a SVAR, the covariance matrix u_t is assumed to be diagonal and to contain only variances of the error term, while the contemporaneous relationships are described in one or two

1 additional matrices. Therefore, with a SVAR analysis, it is possible to examine both dynamic interactions
 2 and immediate correlations between variables. In this study a SVAR with short term restrictions is
 3 implemented in its most general form, namely with the AB-model (AB-SVAR) (Lütkepohl, 2005). The
 4 general formula is presented in Eq. 2, where A_0 is the invertible contemporaneous correlation matrix
 5 of endogenous variables and B_0 is the matrix characterizing the structural relationships of errors. In this
 6 case, a set of simultaneous equations is specified for the errors of the reduced form model instead of
 7 for the observable variables directly. Thereby the model accounts for the shift from specifying direct
 8 relations for the observable variables to formulating relations for the error terms (Gao et al., 2018;
 9 Lütkepohl, 2005).

$$A_0 y_t = c + A_1 y_{t-1} + \dots + A_p y_{t-p} + B_0 e_t \quad \text{with } A_0 u_t = B_0 e_t \quad \text{and } e_t \sim (0, I_k) \quad \text{Eq. 2}$$

10 Both A_0 and B_0 contain $k \times k$ elements. However, to obtain a unique solution to the system of equations,
 11 a total of $2k^2 - k(k+1)/2$ restrictions must be specified, even if the diagonal elements of A_0 are set to
 12 one. Usually, this is done by choosing a specific shape for A_0 and B_0 that sets zero constraints, as
 13 illustrated in Eq. 3 and Eq. 4. In addition, specifying the restrictions should not be done using sample
 14 data, but should come from sources outside the model (Lütkepohl, 2005). The assumptions about the
 15 possible contemporaneous interactions should be made based on literature or economic theory. More
 16 specifically, the AB-model requires a hierarchy to be defined where the highest level does not respond
 17 to contemporaneous information, while the lowest level responds simultaneously to all other variables.
 18 For example, variable 1 (a_{11}) can affect variables 2 to k (a_{21}, \dots, a_{k1}) but does not respond to these
 19 variables, variable 2 (a_{21}) can affect variables 3 to k (a_{32}, \dots, a_{k2}) but will respond only to variable 1, and
 20 so on.

$$A_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ a_{21} & 1 & & 0 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{k1} & a_{k2} & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{Eq. 3}$$

$$B_0 = \begin{bmatrix} b_{11} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & b_{22} & & 0 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & b_{kk} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{Eq. 4}$$

21 2.3 Variable description & model specification

22 Both the VAR and SVAR models rely on the same dataset of quarterly data from 2010-Q1 until 2019-Q4
 23 ($n=40$). The selection of quarterly data is mainly due to the limited availability of higher resolution
 24 production data. A higher sampling rate would have been desirable, nonetheless the quarterly data is
 25 detailed enough to capture seasonal effects in the model.

26 Based on the literature review in section 2.1, seven essential variables have been identified. An
 27 overview of them is presented in Table 1. Central to the model is the stainless steel market, with $\ln Q_{ss}$
 28 representing the global crude stainless steel production volume as reported by the (ISSF, 2020) and
 29 $\ln P_{ss}$ representing the global market price for stainless steel. The latter is approximated by the
 30 weighted average unit price for EU hot rolled coils (HRC) of stainless steel. Unit prices are derived from
 31 the Eurostat Comext database, for which imports to the EU are accounted for but intra-EU trade is
 32 excluded (Eurostat, 2022) (See Appendix 1 for more details). The global ferrochrome market is the
 33 second market to appear in the model. $\ln Q_{fcr}$ represents the global ferrochrome production volume,
 34 approximated by South African chromite production (Statistics South Africa, 2022). The rationale of this
 35 proxy is that chromite is almost entirely used in the production of ferrochrome and that South Africa is
 36 responsible for more than 50% of global production (Wolfe, 2018). Therefore, trends in South African
 37 chromite production are believed to reflect global ferrochrome production movements. For the global
 38 market price for ferrochrome, $\ln P_{fcr}$, an identical approach is followed as for $\ln P_{ss}$, based on weighted
 39 average unit prices for ferrochrome (Eurostat, 2022). Nickel is an important factor of production and

1 affects the production cost of stainless steel. InPni represents the global nickel market price, including
2 all types of nickel compounds (World Bank, 2022). Two other relevant variables were identified from
3 the literature review. First, the global stainless steel market is affected by China's excess production
4 capacity and capacity utilization rate. Due to the lack of data, the latter is approximated by the export
5 value of China's stainless steel exports, InEXPVAL (Trading Economics, 2022). Fluctuations in export
6 value are believed to reflect excess production volume as it is mainly driven by policy goals and
7 exported. Second, global demand follows the general economic cycles. The OECD Industrial production
8 index (InINDPROD) has been selected as indicator for demand(OECD, 2022a). Nominal prices are
9 deflated by applying the OECD Producer Price Indices (PPI) with 2015 as the reference year (OECD,
10 2022b). All variables in this model are logarithmically processed to eliminate possible heteroscedasticity
11 and facilitate interpretation of the outcome.

Table 1. Variables and data sources

Variable	Description	Units untransformed data	Source
InQss	Global crude stainless steel production volume	kton	(ISSF, 2020)
InPss	Global stainless steel market price	Euro/ton	(Eurostat, 2022)
InQfecr	Global ferrochrome production volume	index with 2015 as base year	(Statistics South Africa, 2022)
InPfecr	Global ferrochrome market price	Euro/ton	(Eurostat, 2022)
InPni	Global nickel market price	\$/mton	(World Bank, 2022)
InEXPVAL	Export value of Chinese stainless steel export	1000\$	(Trading Economics, 2022)
InINDPROD	OECD Industrial production index	index with 2015 as base year	(OECD, 2022a)

12 An AB-SVAR model is included in this study, which takes into account short-term constraints in the form
13 of zero-restrictions in A_0 and B_0 . A brief literature review was conducted on SVAR studies targeting
14 steel and other metals to identify hierarchical relationships between variables. The least restrictions
15 are placed on global macroeconomic trends, with indicators such as GDP (Ehrlich, 2018; Hammoudeh
16 et al., 2015; Stürmer, 2013). Specifically for metals, both (Stürmer, 2013) and (Ehrlich, 2018) argue that
17 production quantity influences prices within a given period. But change in production takes time and
18 the effects are expected to occur in later periods. This is also supported by (Gao et al., 2018; Zhong et
19 al., 2019) who argue that the more flexible an agent is, the more likely a contemporary response
20 becomes. In a SVAR context this means that the flexible agents are lower in the hierarchy. Translating
21 these observations to the seven variables of interest, it becomes clear that InINDPROD is the most
22 general and aggregated indicator. So the assumption is that all other variables can respond within a
23 period (a_{21} to a_{71}). InEXPVAL is also a macroeconomic indicator, but only for China. The first restriction
24 is therefore the assumption that InINDPROD does not affect InEXPVAL ($a_{12} = 0$). Next are the two
25 production variables, with ferrochrome being less flexible (Wolfe, 2018). The last three are the price
26 variables, ordered by their position in the value chain, assuming that production inputs directly
27 influence the price of the final output. The identified relationships and hierarchy are summarized in Eq.
28 5, which is the empirical operationalization of the conceptual formulas Eq. 2 to Eq. 4.

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ a_{21} & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ a_{41} & a_{42} & a_{43} & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ a_{51} & a_{52} & a_{53} & a_{54} & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ a_{61} & a_{62} & a_{63} & a_{64} & a_{65} & 1 & 0 \\ a_{71} & a_{72} & a_{73} & a_{74} & a_{75} & a_{76} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u_{\ln\text{INDPROD}} \\ u_{\ln\text{EXPVAL}} \\ u_{\ln\text{Qfecr}} \\ u_{\ln\text{Qss}} \\ u_{\ln\text{Pni}} \\ u_{\ln\text{Pfecr}} \\ u_{\ln\text{Pss}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} b_{11} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b_{22} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b_{33} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & b_{44} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & b_{55} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & b_{66} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & b_{77} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} e_{\ln\text{INDPROD}} \\ e_{\ln\text{EXPVAL}} \\ e_{\ln\text{Qfecr}} \\ e_{\ln\text{Qss}} \\ e_{\ln\text{Pni}} \\ e_{\ln\text{Pfecr}} \\ e_{\ln\text{Pss}} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{Eq. 5}$$

1 3. Results & discussion

2 3.1 Descriptive statistics & data analysis

3 Summary statistics and graphs of the seven variables are presented in Table 2 and Figure 2 (see
4 Appendix 2 for untransformed variables). These graphs clearly show that all variables except $\ln P_{fecd}$ are
5 trending to some degree. Prices tend to fall, while output, export value and the OECD industrial
6 production index are rising. The short-term fluctuations indicate the possibility of seasonal effects. The
7 seasonal effects are indeed confirmed through a decomposition analysis (see Appendix 3).

8 To derive meaningful results from an econometric analysis, it is important that the data is predictable
9 to some degree, meaning that the data is stationary. A time series is stationary if its probability
10 distribution does not change over time (Stock and Watson, 2020). A time series that is not stationary is
11 said to have a unit root, which can be converted to stationary time series by differencing the original
12 time series. Variables that exhibit this behaviour are also referred to as 'integrated of order n ' with n
13 the number of times the series is differenced. To test for unit roots, both an Augmented Dickey Fuller
14 (ADF) test (Dickey and Fuller, 1979; Fuller, 1973) and a Phillips and Perron (PP) test (Phillips and Perron,
15 1988) were performed. The null hypothesis in both tests is that a unit root is present in a time series
16 sample. In addition, a Kwiatkowski–Phillips–Schmidt–Shin (KPSS) test (Kwiatkowski et al., 1992) is
17 included as well. In this case, the null hypothesis is the opposite, which is that the time series is
18 stationary around a deterministic trend, so no unit root is present. The p-values of the three tests are
19 listed in Table 2. According to the KPSS test, trend stationarity cannot be rejected for all variables. A
20 unit root can be rejected for all variables for at least one test (ADF or PP) except for $\ln P_{ni}$. An option
21 would be to take first differences of $\ln P_{ni}$. However, given the relatively small sample size and the low
22 power of the stationarity tests, it is relevant to look at literature as well (Arltová and Fedorová, 2016).
23 In this context, (Ahrens and Sharma, 1997) found that nickel price series appear to be generated by a
24 trend stationary process without a unit root. It was therefore decided to continue with $\ln P_{ni}$ without
25 differencing, but assuming a deterministic trend in the model.

Table 2. Summary statistics and p-values from ADF, PP and KPSS stationarity tests. (note: for ADF & PP $p < 0.05$ means reject non-stationarity, while for KPSS $p < 0.05$ means reject stationarity). Superscripts ***, **, * indicate significance at 1%, 5% and 10% respectively

Variable	Mean	Min	Max	Std. dev.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ADF(1)	PP	KPSS
$\ln Q_{ss}$	9.23	8.92	9.52	0.18	-0.15	-1.17	0.01 ***	0.01 ***	0.10
$\ln P_{ss}$	7.52	7.24	7.87	0.16	0.31	-0.87	0.05 **	0.04 **	0.09
$\ln P_{ni}$	9.57	9.07	10.22	0.31	0.28	-0.89	0.63	0.69	0.10
$\ln P_{fecd}$	6.89	6.72	7.19	0.11	0.71	0.39	0.05 *	0.11	0.10
$\ln Q_{fecd}$	-0.10	-0.58	0.18	0.19	-0.47	-0.50	0.01 ***	0.01 ***	0.10
$\ln EXPVAL$	16.15	15.46	16.56	0.21	-0.91	1.88	0.43	0.02 **	0.10
$\ln INDPROD$	-0.006	-0.097	0.055	0.039	-0.12	-0.73	0.54	0.08 **	0.10




Figure 2. Plot of the time series of the log transformed seven variables of interest

1 To facilitate the model specification, the autocorrelation function (ACF) and partial ACF (PACF) were
 2 calculated for all variables. A very persistent ACF suggests the existence of a unit root, while a faster
 3 decreasing effect indicates an autoregressive component in the data. In contrast, significant lags in the
 4 PACF indicate a moving average component (Stock and Watson, 2020). All ACF and PACF plots are
 5 included in Appendix 4; only key findings are discussed in the manuscript. First, no significant lags were
 6 identified for all seven variables in the PACF. So, no moving average components are included in the
 7 model. Second, one to nine significant lags are identified in the ACF. These observations support the
 8 choice for the selection of an autoregressive model such as a (S)VAR, given the available data.

9 Based on the previous observations, the starting point will be a VAR(1) and SVAR(1) model, including a
 10 deterministic trend and seasonal dummies. However, according to the Akaike and Bayesian Information
 11 Criterion (AIC & BIC), the ideal lag length is four periods (see Appendix 5 for details). The problem that
 12 arises is that there are not enough observations to properly estimate a system with seven variables,
 13 four lags and some dummies. In addition, since the data is quarterly, four lags most likely only capture
 14 the seasonal effect. Therefore, in this research there has been opted to include only one lag,
 15 complemented with three seasonal dummies. The underlying rationale is that the AR(1) component
 16 absorbs the indirect effects of previous lags more parsimoniously. This is of course a limitation, so in
 17 future research efforts additional data should be collected to increase sample size.

18 3.2 VAR(1)

19 The reduced form of the VAR(1) was estimated consistently with ordinary least squares. The coefficients
 20 of the seven regression equations are included in Appendix 6. Own lagged variables are always
 21 significant, but it is important to note that in addition, all variables are significant at least once in the
 22 set of equations. However, because a VAR is a set of equations, a shock in one variable affects the entire

1 system of equations. It is therefore difficult to interpret the individual coefficients and the analysis of
2 the model is usually done via the orthogonal (cumulative) impulse response functions (IRF). IRFs
3 describe how the model responds over time to structural shocks of a single variable. Before looking at
4 the results, it is important to evaluate the model first. For the full model, the roots of the characteristic
5 polynomial are less than one, so the model is robust and stable. Based on the asymptotic Portmanteau
6 Test of the residuals, there is no serial correlation in the residuals. Moreover, there is also no
7 heteroscedasticity in the residuals and no structural breaks occur either. Only the soft pre-requisite of
8 normality is violated, but this does not affect the interpretation of the IRFs (Lütkepohl, 2005). So, the
9 model withstands the most important diagnostics (full details are added in Appendix 5).

10 IRFs with a length of 50 periods are shown in Figure 3. In this manuscript, only the orthogonal
11 cumulative IRFs of a one standard deviation shock of $\ln Q_{fecd}$ are analysed, as this is the driving variable
12 to answer the research questions. In this study, the general research question relates to the aggregated
13 market responses in the medium-term so the cumulative effects matter. Non-cumulative IRFs reflect
14 changes from period to period and are easier to notice when convergence is achieved. In an exploratory
15 preliminary evaluation of the results, convergence was analysed this way. All other IRFs are listed in
16 Appendix 8. The IRFs also include the 90% confidence interval. According to (Lütkepohl, 2005),
17 responses over time can be considered statistically significant if significance for at least one time period
18 can be identified. Nevertheless, as other statistics, e.g. F-statistics and adjusted R^2 , indicate that the
19 model is relevant, all IRFs will be discussed. All variables are log transformed, meaning that the effects
20 can be interpreted as percentage changes:

- 21 - The structural shock of one standard deviation of ferrochrome production corresponds to an
22 additional supply of 5.7%. Then this rises to 7.4% after two periods, before converging to a
23 value of 6.3%. In other words, the equilibrium situation is about 10% higher compared to the
24 initial shock, indicating the existence of a rebound effect. As expected by economic theory, the
25 extra supply of ferrochrome leads to a price decrease of 1.7% in the longer term.
- 26 - The drop in the nickel price suggests that nickel and ferrochrome are indeed substitutes to
27 some extent. Even though they are not direct technical substitutes, a shift between steel grades
28 can occur. When looking at the IRF after a shock of $\ln P_{ni}$, the substitution between nickel and
29 ferrochrome appears here as well (see Appendix 8, fig 17). The possibility of such a substitution
30 was confirmed both by empirical evidence (Giuliodori and Rodriguez, 2015) and by long-term
31 forecasts of the stainless steel market (Sverdrup and Olafsdottir, 2019). A final note on nickel
32 prices is that convergence is achieved, but only after a very long time. Previous studies confirm
33 the long-lasting effect of shocks on the nickel market, ranging from 9 to 18 years (Cashin and
34 McDermott, 2001; Ehrlich, 2018).
- 35 - The stainless steel market is clearly affected by a shock in ferrochrome supply. If ferrochrome
36 prices fall, possibly accompanied by a shift between steel grades, stainless steel prices are
37 expected to decrease by 6%. The latter in turn leads to a 4.6% increase in total stainless steel
38 demand in the long term. This observation endorses the central research question, namely the
39 existence of a rebound effect after a ferrochrome shock.
- 40 - The supply indicator $\ln INDPROD$ is only affected to a very limited extent, which makes sense as
41 this is a macroeconomic indicator that covers the entire OECD economy and not just the
42 stainless steel sector.
- 43 - The only unexpected result is the large influence of $\ln Q_{fecd}$ on $\ln EXPVAL$, which converges to
44 17.4%. One possible interpretation is that Chinese exports are responding to the growing
45 aggregated demand for stainless steel. This would mean that GDP targets are not the only
46 driver of Chinese exports. This is in line with Sourisseau's observation of a very heterogeneous
47 Chinese steel sector (Sourisseau, 2018).




Figure 3. Cumulative IRF after a shock of $\ln Q_{fecn}$ of the VAR(1) model

1 3.3 SVAR(1)

2 In the second part of the analysis, the initial model is extended. Contemporaneous interaction is
 3 possible to some extent, but it is limited by the constraints defined by the shape of the A_0 and B_0
 4 matrices (see Appendix 7). Again, only the IRFs of a shock in ferrochrome supply are shown (Figure 4);
 5 all the others are listed in Appendix 9. Comparing the results with the original VAR(1) model, it is clear
 6 that similar conclusions can be drawn. However, there are also some important differences to note.

7 First of all, the contemporaneous effects are not negligible. After a 6.13%¹ shock of $\ln Q_{fecn}$, there are
 8 substantial price effects at $t = 0$: +1.6%, -2.1% and -2.0% for $\ln P_{jni}$, $\ln P_{fecr}$ and $\ln P_{ss}$, respectively. $\ln Q_{ss}$

¹ This represents one standard deviation of $\ln Q_{fecn}$ based on the SVAR(1) model.

1 also reacts within the first period, but to a lesser extent (+0.7%). This also means that, given that the
 2 long-term equilibrium situation is quite similar, convergence is achieved at a faster rate compared to
 3 the initial VAR(1) model. Second, the bounds of the confidence intervals are slightly narrower. This is in
 4 particular true for the main variable of interest $\ln Q_{ss}$. So, allowing instantaneous interaction makes the
 5 conclusion of a rebound effect on the stainless steel market more robust. Third, $\ln Q_{fecd}$ converges to
 6 7.96% after a shock of 6.13%, which is an increase of 29.8%. Thus, when contemporaneous interaction
 7 is taken into account, the direct rebound effect nearly triples (from 10.5% for VAR(1) to 19.8% for
 8 SVAR(1))




Figure 4. Cumulative IRF after a shock of $\ln Q_{fecd}$ of the SVAR(1) model

9 3.4 Model evaluation and limitations

10 To the best of the author's knowledge, the present study is the first to conduct VAR and SVAR to
 11 estimate the global impact of an additional supply of ferrochrome and its effect on related markets
 12 such as stainless steel. Validation by direct comparison with other studies was not possible as no clear
 13 benchmark studies could be identified. Only the work of (Zink et al., 2018) has a similar research
 14 question, focusing on recycled aluminium but applying the rather coarse simultaneous equation model
 15 (SEM). Nevertheless, as validation of the model, most of the results could be explained by economic

1 theory or validated point by point with literature, such as the slow convergence of nickel prices (Cashin
2 and McDermott, 2001; Ehrlich, 2018), the potential substitution between stainless steel grades
3 (Giuliodori and Rodriguez, 2015; Sverdrup and Olafsdottir, 2019) or the existence of both a price and
4 an income effect on the steel and nickel market (Fernandez, 2018).

5 In general, the results obtained confirm the initial hypotheses. However, this global model is highly
6 aggregated. Future research efforts should focus on geographical disaggregation, as there are regional
7 differences in consumption patterns, trade restrictions, import tariffs, transport costs, quality
8 restrictions, etc. Such differences can lead to deviations from the global trends, due to the specific local
9 or regional context. The model could also be extended to other determinants of the stainless steel
10 supply chain, such as the stainless steel scrap and the energy market.

11 Another aspect is that the model is based on historical data, so it does not account for possible
12 changes. For example, nickel demand is expected to increase substantially in the future, driven by
13 electric vehicle battery production (International Energy Agency, 2020). This trend is already happening
14 today, with the supplier shifting to the production of battery-grade nickel (Pariser et al., 2018). Such a
15 trend will affect the stainless steel market as well. Incorporating projections on the nickel and other
16 markets in the model is another research opportunity.

17 Finally, it was found that an additional supply of ferrochrome resulted in an increase in the aggregate
18 supply of stainless steel. However, the environmental impact is unclear. More steel will be produced,
19 but given the assumption that the additional shocks are produced from (stainless) steel slag, which is
20 expected to have a lower environmental impact in the long term compared to primary production, it is
21 still unclear what the net effect will be.

22 4. Conclusion

23 This study deals with the assessment of the consequences of introducing additional supply of reclaimed
24 raw materials, including the effect on the demand for downstream production. The method is applied
25 to the ferrochrome and stainless steel market from a global perspective. Based on the results of the
26 proposed model, the initial hypotheses could be confirmed: a shock in ferrochrome supply does lead
27 to an increase in the aggregated supply of stainless steel, in combination with a substitution between
28 ferrochrome and nickel. Additionally, the SVAR model highlights that contemporaneous effects also
29 play an important role to capture the direct rebound effect in the ferrochrome market when working
30 with quarterly data. In other words, an additional supply of reclaimed ferrochrome will cause a complex
31 combination of interactions and consequences, but will not necessarily lead to a lower overall material
32 consumption.

33 Based on the observations in this study, several policy recommendations can be formulated. First, to
34 evaluate circular strategies such as recycling or reuse, indirect effects must be considered. A 1:1
35 substitution ratio between primary and secondary materials is highly unrealistic, given the existence of
36 rebound, substitution and income effects across different markets. By recognizing and quantifying such
37 effects, the development of greener technologies can be stimulated and unwanted side effects and
38 externalities can be avoided. These can then be tackled more accurately with the appropriate policy
39 instrument (e.g. bans, subsidy, tax, etc.). Second, when evaluating materials that can serve as inputs for
40 other processes or materials, it is important to look beyond a single market and include a wider part of
41 the value chain. In this study, an isolated evaluation of the ferrochrome market alone would have failed
42 to capture several indirect effects. After all, the most important consequence of the shock analysed is
43 the extra stainless steel production. Finally, the fact that indirect effects between markets have been
44 identified does not prevent emerging (circular) technologies to play an important role. However,

1 ambitions during technology development must be higher so that the benefits of recovery, recycling or
2 reuse exceed the burdens caused by the increase in aggregated demand. Therefore, future research
3 efforts on emerging circular technologies, should combine a thorough econometric assessment with
4 the quantification of direct and indirect environmental impacts, to draw robust conclusions and guide
5 further research efforts.

6 Abbreviations

VAR	Vector Auto Regression
SVAR	Structural Vector Auto Regression
SEM	Simultaneous Equation Model
TRL	Technology Readiness Level

7 Acknowledgements

8 Thanks to Loïc De Weerd for providing insightful feedback. Matthias Buyle would like to thank Research
9 Foundation Flanders (FWO-Vlaanderen) for supporting with a postdoctoral fellow- ship (Postdoctoral
10 Fellow - junior; 1207520N).

11 Formatting of funding sources

12 This work was supported by Research Foundation Flanders (FWO-Vlaanderen) (Matthias Buyle -
13 Postdoctoral Fellow -junior; 1207520N)

14 CRedit authorship contribution statement

15 Matthias Buyle: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Data curation, Writing – original draft.

16 Amaryllis Audenaert: Supervision, Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing.

17 Jan Brusselaers: Supervision, Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – review & editing.

18 Steven Van Passel: Supervision, Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing.

19 Declaration of competing interest

20 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships
21 that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

22 Appendices

23 1. Appendix 1: Market price estimation based on trade data

24 2. Appendix 2: Summary statistics untransformed variables

25 3. Appendix 3: Decomposition analysis

26 4. Appendix 4: Details ACF & PACF

27 5. Appendix 5: Model diagnostics VAR(1)

28 6. Appendix 6: Coefficients VAR(1)

29 7. Appendix 7: Coefficients A_0 and B_0 matrix SVAR(1)

30 8. Appendix 8: Impulse response functions VAR(1)

31 9. Appendix 9: Impulse response functions SVAR(1)

32 10. Appendix 10: Dataset

33 a. *Dataset_VAR_Quarterly_import.xlsx*

34 11. Appendix 11: R-script

35 a. *VAR-SVAR.R*

1 5. References

- 2 Greening, L., Greene, D.L., Difiglio, C., 2000. Energy efficiency and consumption — the rebound effect
3 — a survey. *Energy Policy* 28, 389–401. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-4215\(00\)00021-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-4215(00)00021-5)
- 4 Ahmad, S.Z.N., Hamdan, R., Al-Gheethi, A., Alkhadher, S., Othman, N., 2020. Removal of phosphate from
5 wastewater by steel slag with high calcium oxide column filter system; efficiencies and
6 mechanisms study. *Journal of Chemical Technology & Biotechnology* 95, 3232–3240.
7 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jctb.6501>
- 8 Ahn, B., 2016. Changing China’s Steel Industry in the New Normal. *Asian Steel Watch* 1, 24–29.
- 9 Ahrens, W.A., Sharma, V.R., 1997. Trends in Natural Resource Commodity Prices: Deterministic or
10 Stochastic? *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 33, 59–74.
11 <https://doi.org/10.1006/jeem.1996.0980>
- 12 Aperam, 2020. *Aperam Annual Report 2020*. Luxembourg.
- 13 Arltová, M., Fedorová, D., 2016. Selection of unit root test on the basis of length of the time series and
14 value of AR(1) parameter. *Statistika* 96, 47–64.
- 15 Beaussier, T., Caurla, S., Bellon-Maurel, V., Delacote, P., Loiseau, E., 2022. Deepening the territorial Life
16 Cycle Assessment approach with partial equilibrium modelling: First insights from an application
17 to a wood energy incentive in a French region. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 179.
18 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2021.106024>
- 19 Brockway, P.E., Sorrell, S., Semieniuk, G., Heun, M.K., Court, V., 2021. Energy efficiency and economy-
20 wide rebound effects: A review of the evidence and its implications. *Renewable and Sustainable*
21 *Energy Reviews* 141, 110781. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2021.110781>
- 22 Bucur, A., Dobrotă, G., Oprean-Stan, C., Tănăsescu, C., 2017. Economic and Qualitative Determinants
23 of the World Steel Production. *Metals (Basel)* 7, 163. <https://doi.org/10.3390/met7050163>
- 24 Buyle, M., Maes, B., van Passel, S., Boonen, K., Vercalsteren, A., Audenaert, A., 2021. Ex-ante LCA of
25 emerging carbon steel slag treatment technologies: Fast forwarding lab observations to industrial-
26 scale production. *J Clean Prod* 313, 127921. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.127921>
- 27 Cansino, J.M., Ordóñez, M., Prieto, M., 2022. Decomposition and measurement of the rebound effect:
28 The case of energy efficiency improvements in Spain. *Appl Energy* 306, 117961.
29 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2021.117961>
- 30 Cashin, P., McDermott, C.J., 2001. The Long-Run Behavior of Commodity Prices: Small Trends and Big
31 Variability. *IMF Working Papers* 01, 1. <https://doi.org/10.5089/9781451848991.001>
- 32 Chalmers, N.G., Brander, M., Revoredo-Giha, C., 2015. The implications of empirical and 1:1
33 substitution ratios for consequential LCA: using a 1 % tax on whole milk as an illustrative example.
34 *International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment* 20, 1268–1276. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-015-0939-y>
- 35
36 Chan, K., Chung, Y.P., 1995. Vector autoregression or simultaneous equations model? The intraday
37 relationship between index arbitrage and market volatility. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 19, 173–
38 179. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-4266\(94\)00128-P](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-4266(94)00128-P)

- 1 Chan-wook, P., 2018. The Asian Stainless Steel Market: Trends, Issues and Prospects. *Asian Steel Watch*
2 5, 66–71.
- 3 Chen, Y., Yang, S., 2021. Time-varying effect of international iron ore price on China's inflation: A
4 complete price chain with TVP-SVAR-SV model. *Resources Policy* 73.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2021.102200>
- 6 CHROMIC, 2021. CHROMIC - efficient mineral processing and Hydrometallurgical Recovery of
7 byproduct Metals from low-grade metal containing secondary raw materials [WWW Document].
8 Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation program under Grant Agreement n° 730471. URL
9 <http://www.chromic.eu/>
- 10 Daigo, I., Matsuno, Y., Adachi, Y., 2010. Substance flow analysis of chromium and nickel in the material
11 flow of stainless steel in Japan. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 54, 851–863.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2010.01.004>
- 13 Di Maria, A., Salman, M., Dubois, M., Van Acker, K., 2018. Life cycle assessment to evaluate the
14 environmental performance of new construction material from stainless steel slag. *The*
15 *International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment* 23, 2091–2109. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-018-1440-1)
16 [018-1440-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-018-1440-1)
- 17 Dickey, D.A., Fuller, W.A., 1979. Distribution of the Estimators for Autoregressive Time Series with a
18 Unit Root. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 74, 427–431.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1979.10482531>
- 20 Earles, J.M., Halog, A., Ince, P., Skog, K., 2013. Integrated Economic Equilibrium and Life Cycle
21 Assessment Modeling for Policy-based Consequential LCA. *Journal of Industrial Ecology* 17, 375–
22 384. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-9290.2012.00540.x>
- 23 Ehrlich, L.G., 2018. What drives nickel prices: A structural VAR approach, HWWI Research Paper, No.
24 186. Hamburg, DE.
- 25 Ekvall, T., 2000. A market-based approach to allocation at open-loop recycling. *Resources, Conservation*
26 *and Recycling* 29, 91–109. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0921-3449\(99\)00057-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0921-3449(99)00057-9)
- 27 Ekvall, T., Andrae, A., 2006. Attributional and Consequential Environmental Assessment of the Shift to
28 Lead-Free Solders (10 pp). *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment* 11, 344–353.
29 <https://doi.org/10.1065/lca2005.05.208>
- 30 Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2015. Delivering the circular economy: A toolkit for policymakers. London,
31 UK.
- 32 European Commission - Joint Research Centre - Institute for Environment and Sustainability, 2010. ILCD
33 handbook: General guide to life cycle assessment—Detailed guidance, First edit. ed. Publications
34 Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. <https://doi.org/10.2788/38479>
- 35 Eurostat, 2022. Eurostat Comext database [WWW Document]. Database. URL
36 <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/newxtweb/> (accessed 8.22.22).
- 37 Fernandez, V., 2018. Price and income elasticity of demand for mineral commodities. *Resources Policy*
38 59, 160–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2018.06.013>
- 39 Figge, F., Thorpe, A.S., 2019. The symbiotic rebound effect in the circular economy. *Ecological*
40 *Economics* 163, 61–69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.04.028>

- 1 Fuller, W.A., 1973. Introduction to Statistical Time Series. John Wiley and Sons, New York, USA.
- 2 Gao, C., Huang, J. bai, Chen, J. yu, Tang, W. yuan, Wang, Z. ping, Liu, J. xing, 2018. Industrial transmission
3 effect of international metal price shocks in perspective of industry chain. Journal of Central South
4 University 25, 2929–2943. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11771-018-3963-9>
- 5 Giuliadori, D., Rodriguez, A., 2015. Analysis of the stainless steel market in the EU, China and US using
6 co-integration and VECM. Resources Policy 44, 12–24.
7 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2014.11.006>
- 8 Hammoudeh, S., Nguyen, D.K., Sousa, R.M., 2015. US monetary policy and sectoral commodity prices.
9 Journal of International Money and Finance 57, 61–85.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jimonfin.2015.06.003>
- 11 Henckens, T., 2021. Scarce mineral resources: Extraction, consumption and limits of sustainability.
12 Resources, Conservation and Recycling 169, 105511.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2021.105511>
- 14 International Energy Agency, 2020. Iron and Steel Technology Roadmap. Paris, France.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1787/3dcc2a1b-en>
- 16 ISSF, 2020. Stainless Steel in Figures 2020. Brussels, Belgium.
- 17 Kropschot, S.J., Doebrich, J., 2010. Chromium-Makes Stainless Steel Stainless, U.S. Geological Survey
18 Fact Sheet 2010–3089. Reston, USA.
- 19 Kwiatkowski, D., Phillips, P.C.B., Schmidt, P., Shin, Y., 1992. Testing the null hypothesis of stationarity
20 against the alternative of a unit root. Journal of Econometrics 54, 159–178.
21 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076\(92\)90104-Y](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076(92)90104-Y)
- 22 Lütkepohl, H., 2005. New Introduction to Multiple Time Series Analysis. Springer Berlin Heidelberg,
23 Berlin.
- 24 Manera, M., 2006. Modelling factor demands with SEM and VAR: an empirical comparison. Journal of
25 Productivity Analysis 26, 121–146. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11123-006-0009-3>
- 26 Menten, F., Tchung-Ming, S., Lorne, D., Bouvart, F., 2015. Lessons from the use of a long-term energy
27 model for consequential life cycle assessment: The BTL case. Renewable and Sustainable Energy
28 Reviews 43, 942–960. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.11.072>
- 29 Nakamura, S., Kondo, Y., Nakajima, K., Ohno, H., Pauliuk, S., 2017. Quantifying Recycling and Losses of
30 Cr and Ni in Steel Throughout Multiple Life Cycles Using MaTrace-Alloy. Environmental Science
31 and Technology 51, 9469–9476. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b01683>
- 32 Nickel Development Institute, 1993. Design guidelines for the selection and use of stainless steel.
- 33 OECD, 2022a. Industrial production - OECD Data [WWW Document]. Database. URL
34 <https://data.oecd.org/industry/industrial-production.htm> (accessed 8.22.22).
- 35 OECD, 2022b. Producer price indices (PPI) - OECD Data [WWW Document]. Database. URL
36 <https://data.oecd.org/price/producer-price-indices-ppi.htm> (accessed 8.22.22).
- 37 Outokumpu, 2021. Outokumpu Annual Report 2021. Outokumpu, Helsinki, Finland.

- 1 Pariser, H.H., Backeberg, N.R., Masson, O.C.M., Bedder, J.C.M., 2018. Changing nickel and chromium
2 stainless steel markets - a review. *J South Afr Inst Min Metall* 118, 1–12.
3 <https://doi.org/10.17159/2411-9717/2018/v118n6a1>
- 4 Phillips, P.C.B., Perron, P., 1988. Testing for a unit root in time series regression. *Biometrika* 75, 335–
5 346. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/75.2.335>
- 6 Sacchi, R., Terlouw, T., Siala, K., Dirnaichner, A., Bauer, C., Cox, B., Mutel, C., Daioglou, V., Luderer, G.,
7 2022. PRospective EnvironMental Impact asSEment (premise): A streamlined approach to
8 producing databases for prospective life cycle assessment using integrated assessment models.
9 *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 160, 112311.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2022.112311>
- 11 Singh, J., Ordoñez, I., 2016. Resource recovery from post-consumer waste: important lessons for the
12 upcoming circular economy. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 134, 342–353.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.12.020>
- 14 Sorrell, S., 2007. The Rebound effect : an assessment of the evidence for economy-wide energy savings
15 from improved energy efficiency. UK Energy Research Centre, Sussex.
- 16 Sorrell, S., Dimitropoulos, J., 2008. The rebound effect: Microeconomic definitions, limitations and
17 extensions. *Ecological Economics* 65, 636–649. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2007.08.013>
- 18 Sourisseau, S., 2018. The Global Iron and Steel Industry: From a Bilateral Oligopoly to a Thwarted
19 Monopsony. *Australian Economic Review* 51, 232–243. [https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-
20 8462.12264](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8462.12264)
- 21 Statistics South Africa, 2022. P2041 - Mining: Production and sales [WWW Document]. Database. URL
22 https://www.statssa.gov.za/?page_id=1866&PPN=P2041&SCH=7806 (accessed 8.22.22).
- 23 Stock, J., Watson, M., 2020. *Introduction to Econometrics*, 4th Editio. ed. Pearson Education Limited,
24 Harlow, UK.
- 25 Stürmer, M., 2013. 150 years of boom and bust - What drives mineral commodity prices?, Discussion
26 Paper 5/2013. Bonn (DE).
- 27 Sverdrup, H.U., Olafsdottir, A.H., 2019. Assessing the Long-Term Global Sustainability of the Production
28 and Supply for Stainless Steel. *BioPhysical Economics and Resource Quality* 4, 8.
29 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41247-019-0056-9>
- 30 Trading Economics, 2022. China Exports of Iron & Steel [WWW Document]. Database. URL
31 <https://tradingeconomics.com/china/exports-of-iron-steel> (accessed 8.22.22).
- 32 Vázquez-Rowe, I., Rege, S., Marvuglia, A., Thénie, J., Haurie, A., Benetto, E., 2013. Application of three
33 independent consequential LCA approaches to the agricultural sector in Luxembourg.
34 *International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment* 18, 1593–1604. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-
35 013-0604-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-013-0604-2)
- 36 Wang, G., Lin, M., Diao, J., Li, H.-Y., Xie, B., Li, G., 2019. Novel Strategy for Green Comprehensive
37 Utilization of Vanadium Slag with High-Content Chromium. *ACS Sustainable Chemistry &
38 Engineering* 7, 18133–18141. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acssuschemeng.9b05226>
- 39 Wang, T., Wang, C., 2019. The spillover effects of China's industrial growth on price changes of base
40 metal. *Resources Policy* 61, 375–384. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2017.11.007>

- 1 Weidema, B.P., Ekvall, T., Heijungs, R., 2009. Guidelines for application of deepened and broadened
2 LCA. Deliverable D18 of work package 5 of the CALCAS project, Deliverable D18 of work package.
3 Rome, Italy.
- 4 Wolfe, E., 2018. Commodity Insights Bulletin Chromite, Kpgm.
- 5 World Bank, 2022. World Bank Commodity Price Data (The Pink Sheet) [WWW Document]. Database.
6 URL <https://www.worldbank.org/en/research/commodity-markets#1> (accessed 8.22.22).
- 7 Yu, B., Shen, C., 2020. Environmental regulation and industrial capacity utilization : An empirical study
8 of China. *J Clean Prod* 246, 118986. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.118986>
- 9 Zhong, M., He, R., Chen, J., Huang, J., 2019. Time-varying effects of international nonferrous metal price
10 shocks on China's industrial economy. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 528.
11 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2019.121299>
- 12 Zink, T., Geyer, R., 2017. Circular Economy Rebound. *Journal of Industrial Ecology* 21, 593–602.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jiec.12545>
- 14 Zink, T., Geyer, R., Startz, R., 2018. Toward Estimating Displaced Primary Production from Recycling: A
15 Case Study of U.S. Aluminum. *J Ind Ecol* 22, 314–326. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jiec.12557>
- 16 Zink, T., Geyer, R., Startz, R., 2016. A Market-Based Framework for Quantifying Displaced Production
17 from Recycling or Reuse. *Journal of Industrial Ecology* 20, 719–729.
18 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jiec.12317>
- 19