

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Multidimensional Analyses Reveal Unequal Resource, Economic, and Environmental Gains and Losses among the Global Aluminum Trade Leaders

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Wang W., Chen W.-Q., Diao Z.-W., Ciacci L., Pourzahedi L., Eckelman M.J., et al. (2021). Multidimensional Analyses Reveal Unequal Resource, Economic, and Environmental Gains and Losses among the Global Aluminum Trade Leaders. ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY, 55(10), 7102-7112 [10.1021/acs.est.0c08836].

Availability:

[This version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/11585/854781 since: 2023-05-05](https://hdl.handle.net/11585/854781)

Published:

[DOI: http://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c08836](http://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c08836)

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

> This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (https://cris.unibo.it/). When citing, please refer to the published version.

> > (Article begins on next page)

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:

Wang, W., Chen, W.Q., Diao, Z.W., Ciacci, L., Pourzahedi, L., Eckelman, M.J., Yang, Y., Shi, L. Multidimensional analyses reveal unequal resource, economic, and environmental gains and losses among the global aluminum trade leaders. Environmental Science & Technology 2021, 55, 7102-7112.

The final published version is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c08836>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna [\(https://cris.unibo.it/\)](https://cris.unibo.it/)

When citing, please refer to the published version.

12 *^f* Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Northeastern University, Massachusetts 13 02115, USA

- 14 *^g* Key Laboratory of the Three Gorges Reservoir Region's Eco-Environment, Ministry of Education,
- 15 Chongqing University, Chongqing 400045, China
- *^h* 16 Environmental Studies Program, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755, USA
- ^{*i*} State Key Joint Laboratory of Environmental Simulation and Pollution Control, School of
- 18 Environment, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China

 ABSTRACT: Disputes around trade inequality have been growing over the last two decades, with different countries claiming inequality in different terms including monetary deficits, resource appropriation and degradation, and environmental emissions transfer. Some studies have noted and analyzed the complexity of trade imbalances and their various consequences, but lacked industrial perspective and not provided enough insights about the formation mechanism and solutions. This paper quantifies (1) the direct monetary flows, (2) direct resource flows, and (3) indirect energy use and GHG emissions embodied in aluminum trade for the four economies with the highest aluminum trade flows, *i.e.*, US, China, Japan, and Australia. Results show that resource-related trade inequalities indeed not uniform across economic and environmental impacts. The US has a negative balance in monetary flows but positive balances in resource flows, embodied energy use and GHG emissions. China has a positive balance in monetary and resource flows but negative balances in embodied energy use and GHG emissions. Japan has a positive balance while Australia has a negative balance in all flows. These heterogeneous gains and losses along the global leaders of aluminum trade arise largely from their different trade structures and the heterogeneities of price, energy use and GHG emission intensities of aluminum products. In country level, outsourcing mining process which has the highest material intensity and refining and smelting processes which have the highest environmental burden intensity, and keeping domestic manufacturing which has the highest value added and exporting finished products is a good developing strategy. To reduce trade inequality in world level, global aluminum recycling system should be developed and the production and green technologies transfer between countries should be promoted.

 KEYWORDS: aluminum; trade inequality; embodied energy; embodied GHG emissions; material flow analysis; sustainable resources management

TOC art

1. INTRODUCTION

 Disputes around trade inequality have been growing in the last two decades. Different countries have 45 claimed they have suffered from trade inequality in various terms, which can be characterized by: (1) 46 Trade deficits in monetary terms, ¹ e.g., large and chronic US trade deficits with other countries, such as China, have resulted in US unemployment and economic slowdown; (2) Ecological burden, 2 *e.g.*, through export-oriented extraction or manufacturing industries and the import of various solid wastes from developed economies, countries like China have experienced increases in environmental 50 pollution and human health impacts; and (3) Resource appropriation and degradation,³ e.g., mines in Australia, Latin America, and Southeast Asia that have the richest reserves have become the focus of global competition. Because of that, since 2018, international trade tensions have increased markedly, particularly between the US and other countries including China, Canada, Mexico, and several 54 European Union countries.⁴⁻⁶ In the same year, China banned the import of 24 types of waste, 55 followed by Vietnam, Malaysia, and Thailand.^{7,8} Recognizing the growing significance of critical minerals for high-tech industries, Australia has implemented the critical minerals strategy to promote 57 the country's minerals extraction and downstream processing sectors.⁹ These and other measures are justified under the auspices of protecting themselves from the negative effects of unequal trade.

 International trade results in the geographic reallocation of traded commodities and the capital, labor, natural resources such as water and land, materials, and energy, and environmental emissions 61 embodied in these flows.¹⁰ For a specific commodity, flows from country A to country B can be classified into direct flows and indirect flows (Figure 1). Direct flows include physical flow and monetary flows, for which the directions are opposite to each other. Indirect flows (also referred to as virtual, hidden, or embodied flows) are linked to the direct physical flows and have the same directions.

 When a country experiences unbalanced direct and indirect trade flows, unequal exchange happens. 67 Unequal, however, does not necessarily mean unfair¹¹ because, in addition to market failures, 68 comparative advantage—the foundation of international trade—can also result in trade imbalances.¹² 69 Unequal exchange theory was first proposed by economists, with a focus on the inequality of 70 monetary flows usually measured by US dollar.¹³ It was then introduced into the research field of 71 resource and environmental systems analysis in the end of $1980s$.^{14,15} Since then, the direct physical 72 flow measured by the mass of materials traded among countries is often analyzed, $16,17,17,18$ as well as 73 virtual flows of water^{19–21}, land use^{22,23}, energy use^{24,25} and environmental emissions^{26–28} embodied in international trade. Particularly, there is a rapidly growing body of literature on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions embodied in trade due to the concern with and debate on global warming 76 responsibility and 'carbon leakage'.^{29,30} With the complexity and multi-dimensional nature of international trade has been paid attention recently, some studies considered more than one impact from the international trade and highlight the mismatch of countries' benefits and costs in 79 international trade. $26,28,31,32$ Despite the important insights discovered in previous studies, there is a lack of the analysis on industry level, and most of studies didn't provide ample understanding of the formation mechanism and solutions.

 Here, we report on an industry study that aims to understand the broad impacts of international trade and explore the reasons, by examining both the direct and indirect trade flows and multiple consequences from physical flows and monetary flows to indirect energy use and GHG emissions. We take aluminum as a case study because of its technological versatility and application in multiple economic sectors, its essential role in economic development, and its importance as the second-87 highest production volume metal after steel.³³ In addition, the production of alumina and primary aluminum is highly energy and GHG emissions intensive. Prior research showed that in 2014 the aluminum industry accounted for 4% of global industrial final energy demand and 3% of industry's 90 total direct CO_2 emissions.³⁴ Trade in aluminum has also been the focus of recent political activity; for example, the US investigated the effects of aluminum imports on the national security and proclaimed a 10% *ad valorem* tariff on aluminum articles in March 2018. ³⁵

 We focus on the global leaders of aluminum trade: the US, China, Japan, and Australia. The former 94 three countries are the top three importers, while the latter is the top exporter.³⁶ US, China, and Japan 95 are also the three largest economies in the world, together accounting for \sim 50% of global gross domestic product (GDP). Thus, these four countries are the most representative and influential countries in the global aluminum industry. Specifically, we (i) perform a coupling analysis of direct trade flows (both monetary and physical flows) and indirect trade flows (embodied energy and GHG emissions) for aluminum, (ii) analyze how each country's aluminum trade evolved during 1991-2016, and (iii) explore how and why these four economies have contributed to, suffered from, and benefited from economic and environmental inequalities with the rest of the world in the trade of aluminum.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

 Identification of aluminum-containing products (ACPs). The anthropogenic life cycle of aluminum is composed of four principal life stages: production, fabrication and manufacturing, use, 105 and waste management and recycling (Figure S1 in the Supporting Information (SI)). $33,37,38$ More than

 one hundred ACPs are identified (Table S1 in the SI) and are classified into six groups according to their position in the value chain: (1) bauxite, (2) alumina, (3) end of life (EOL) products & scrap (EP&S), (4) unwrought aluminum (UA), (5) semis, and (6) finished products (FP). The first, second and third groups can be regarded as raw materials to produce unwrought aluminum, while the fifth and sixth groups consist of semi-finished products and finished products, respectively. There are two sources of unwrought aluminum: primary aluminum (PA), produced from natural ores and concentrates (*e.g.*, bauxite), and secondary aluminum (SA), produced from EOL products & scrap (EP&S). Only trade of scrap is quantified in the group EP&S, because trade of most EOL products such as e-waste, old ships and cars have been banned³⁹ or their data are unavailable⁴⁰.

 Calculation of direct and indirect trade flows. A diagram illustrating data sources and decision tree used in the calculating of these four trade flows of aluminum contained in each ACP is shown in SI (see Figure S2) and all the equations can be seen in section 3 of the SI.

 Direct trade flows (monetary and physical flows) are collected directly from the UN Comtrade 119 Database⁴¹ in which monetary trade value data are available for all ACPs in 1991-2016 while physical trade value data may be unavailable for some ACPs in the group of finished products for a few years. 121 Adjusted by US consumer price index, monetary trade value is converted into 2000 US dollars. ACP's monetary trade value is then allocated to the aluminum contained in it by mass. The physical trade value of aluminum contained in a specific traded ACP is determined by multiplying the ACP's physical trade value by its physical aluminum content (Table S1 in the SI). For those FP which physical trade data do not exist, physical trade values are estimated by dividing monetary trade value in constant 2000 US dollars by prices (in constant 2000 US) which are deduced by historical prices and the method of linear interpolation.

 Indirect flows, including energy use and GHG emissions embodied in aluminum for ACPs, are calculated by multiplying the "cradle-to-product" (CTP) energy use and GHG emissions intensity of 130 aluminum contained in ACPs (indicated by EI_{Al}^{CTP} and GI_{Al}^{CTP}) by their physical aluminum content. EI_{Al}^{CTP} and GI_{Al}^{CTP} are the accumulation of the process incremental energy use and GHG emissions 132 intensity of aluminum in a ACP (indicated by EI_{Al}^{Inc} and GI_{Al}^{Inc}) from bauxite mining process (the starting point of aluminum's life cycle) to the process that the ACP is generated in.

 EI_{Al}^{Inc} and GI_{Al}^{Inc} are calculated by life cycle inventory (LCI) data from the aluminum industry 135 (International Aluminum Institute^{43–47} and European Aluminum Association^{48–50}), which provide a 136 LCI data sets⁵¹ by production process (process-based LCA) for multiple years that is periodically updated. Both direct and indirect energy use and GHG emissions are calculated (Figure S1 in the SI). Energy use and GHG emissions from transportation process are not considered because they are commodity-specific and have been shown to be relatively insignificant. Primary aluminum production and secondary aluminum through EP&S management (including EP&S collection, sorting, separation, and recycling) are considered as two independent systems. That means CTP energy use and GHG emissions intensities of EP&S are calculated starting from collection instead of mining.

 Input-Output LCA (IOLCA) method is used to estimate energy use and GHG emissions intensity for manufacturing process of each finished ACP, because LCI data for each individual manufacturing process are unavailable. Burdens are calculated using aggregate energy use and GHG emissions

 intensities for the industry sector to which each finished ACP belongs (Table S1 in the SI). To avoid 148 double counting, only direct energy use and GHG emissions for manufacturing process are calculated.

 For each ACP, a country's trade flows consist of aluminum imports and exports with the rest of the world. Balances of trade in each of the four flows are measured. A positive physical trade balance (PTB) or monetary trade balance (MTB) means countries gain resources and economic benefits from international trade. A positive embodied energy use balance (EUB) and embodied GHG emission balance (EEB) means countries derive ecological benefits from trade as energy use and emissions occur elsewhere. In contrast, negative physical, monetary, or ecological trade balances imply that a country suffers from trade as energy use and emissions occur domestically but products are consumed elsewhere.

 Uncertainty analysis. As all of flows need to be calculated based on aluminum content data which 158 may have high uncertainty, we collected the highest and lowest contents from former studies^{37,52} and compared all the results. Results show that aluminum contents only have effect on the scale of these four flows instead of the trends and directions, which show that the conclusions in this study are relatively robust.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Gains and contribution of these four countries

 Contributions and gains of each targeted country are shown in Figure 2 and Figure S4. Overall, the four countries resulted in unequal trade in these four flows for years 1991-2016. More precisely, the US has negative balance in monetary value and positive balance in resources, energy, and GHG emissions. China has negative balance in energy and GHG emissions and positive balance in physical and monetary values, a feature consistent with China's status as a developing and manufacturing nation. Japan, as a manufacturing powerhouse with few domestic reserves, has positive balance in all flows, and keeps getting not only resources and economic benefits but also energy and environmental benefits in the aluminum international trade. Australia, as the largest exporter of aluminum resources (bauxite is accounted 55% of Australia's total export in 2016), has a negative balance in all flows.

 Gain and contribution of these four countries changed during the past quarter century. China has experienced the most dramatic changes in trade balances for each of the four flows, as it is hugely expanded its production, manufacturing capacity, and final demand for aluminum. China became net- importer in physical flow in 2000 and, since then, its trade balances in all flows expanded very fast and more intensively than those in the other countries in 2016 (see Figure S4). The US had positive balance in all flows before 1999. Then, with the decrease of domestic aluminum-containing products 179 output,³³ the negative balance of monetary value has enlarged and got more and more energy and environmental benefits from international trade. Australia has increased negative balance in all flows during the time span investigated, especially for physical trade. Japan showed the least change. It kept a positive balance in all flows in the time span under scrutiny. However, this positive balance in monetary value has been declined in the last decade.

3.2 Resources consequences

 None of the countries showed a neutral balance in physical flows from 1991 to 2016 (see Figure 3). The US was a net-importer over the entire study period. Except for EP&S, the US imported all groups of ACPs, especially bauxite, unwrought aluminum, and finished products. China's aluminum imports have grown very fast and overtook those of Japan in the year 2002 and of the US in the year 2009 as the biggest net aluminum importer. As the major manufacturer, China mainly imported commodities like bauxite, alumina, and EP&S, and exported finished goods and semis, such as building & construction products and consumer durables. For unwrought aluminum, China maintained an almost stationary the balance between imports and exports. At 2016, Japan was the third largest aluminum importer. Japan mainly imported unwrought aluminum and exported finished products mainly transportation equipment. Australia, as it is rich in aluminum resources, is the only net-exporter in physical flow among these four countries. It mainly exported bauxite, alumina, unwrought aluminum, while imported finished products and semis to meet the domestic demand.

3.3 Economic consequences

 All four countries have monetary trade imbalances during 1991-2016. Except for Japan, trade imbalances in China, US, and Australia have continued to widen (see Figure 4 and Figure S6). With the rapid increase of finished products export, China's aluminum monetary trade has undergone a sharp increase. China became a country with monetary surplus in 2000 and overtook Japan as the country with the highest aluminum trade gains in 2008. The US turned into a net-importer of finished products in 1999, resulting in monetary trade deficits since then that have widened with the rapid increase of finished products import. Australia, although it is a main country exporter aluminum ore and concentrates in the global aluminum cycle, it suffered from negative monetary unbalances because of the import of finished products, which have generally higher prices than aluminum ores and concentrates. Australia's trade deficit is lower and it is growing more slowly than that of the US. Japan has always been a surplus country in monetary flow from 1991 to 2016. With the decline of net-exports of finished products in the last decade, Japan's trade surplus meets a similar synchronized decline. Overall, these four countries' aluminum trade in monetary value are dominated by finished products, because finished products have much higher prices than other ACPs (see Figure 4).

3.4 Energy and environmental consequences

 Trade balance of embodied energy and GHG emissions in each country is demonstrated together, because energy use and GHG emissions are linked and provide similar insights. Aluminum international trade has led to a reallocation of energy use and GHG emissions for the four target countries over the study period (see Figure 5, Figure S7, and Figure S8). China, as the largest manufacturer of semis and finished products to the world, carries a large net burden in domestic 218 energy use and GHG emissions that sum amounts are 130×10^{17} J and 283×10^{7} t_{CO2eq} during the whole research period. Australia, as a main resources provider, bear 865×10^{17} J energy and 117×10^{7} t_{CO2eq} environmental costs from 1991 to 2016, especially in unwrought aluminum and alumina trade. The US are a net-exporter of embodied energy and GHG emissions. Due to importing nearly all types 222 of ACPs, the US have outsourced 129×10^{17} J energy and 236×10^{7} t_{CO2eq} GHG emissions in the whole research period. Like China, Japan exported mainly semis and finished products. However, Japan is also a net-exporter of energy and GHG emissions. That is because unwrought aluminum, semis and finished products have the highest and similar energy and GHG emissions which are about 31-38 226 tCO2/t Al. Japan imported three times of unwrought aluminum than exported finished products and semis, offsetting the energy and environmental burden from exported ACPs. While, China meets a balance in unwrought aluminum trade which can't compensate the energy and environmental burden from exported finished products and semis.

3.5 Reasons for unequal exchange

231 Based on previous studies^{53–55}, reasons for these heterogenous gains and losses in aluminum trade among the four countries include the following: (1) different structures of aluminum trade; (2) the heterogeneity among different ACPs and ACP groups; and (3) the heterogeneity of the same ACP or ACP group produced in different countries. We analyze on these reasons below:

 ◼ **Different structures of aluminum trade.** Our multi-dimensional analyses show that these four countries play totally different roles in the global aluminum trade system, with Australia mainly as a resource provider, China a low-tech producer, Japan as high-tech manufacturer, and the United States mainly as a consumer. As shown in Figure 3, the US imported all ACPs except scrap. The amount of scrap the US exported was very small, so the monetary value and the embodied energy and GHG emissions were far from compensating those of other imported ACPs. Australia was the only country that exported bauxite, alumina, and unwrought aluminum, and its physical trade was dominated by the export of these three with low value-added products. The profits Australia earned from these products were not enough to offset the costs this country had to pay for the import of high added finished products and it suffered from substantial burdens of energy use and GHG emissions for the exported alumina and unwrought aluminum. Both China and Japan imported low value-added products but in different forms. China mainly imported bauxite, alumina, and scrap for smelting aluminum, which is very energy and emissions intensive, while Japan mainly imported unwrought aluminum, hence, can outsourced almost all resources, energy, and emissions-intensive industrial processes, such as refining and smelting (see Figure 6). Both China and Japan exported finished products, but the former country also

 exported many semis, which have higher value than unwrought aluminum but lower than most finished products.

 ◼ **Heterogeneity among different ACPs.** ACPs are heterogeneous because the same kilogram of aluminum contained in different ACPs can have different prices and different embodied CTP environmental burdens (see Figure 6). Generally, an ACP with higher manufacturing degrees will have higher prices and higher embodied CTP energy use and GHG emission, because each additional industrial process requires additional inputs of labor, raw materials, and energy, and generates more emissions. However, as illustrated in Figure 6, the two processes with the highest energy use and GHG emissions are primary aluminum smelting and alumina refining, while the processes with the highest value-added are finished product manufacturing and semis fabrication. In particular, the high energy- and emissions-intensity of primary aluminum smelting results in a dramatic difference of embodied CTP environmental burdens among the group of bauxite, alumina, scrap, and the group of unwrought aluminum and manufactured products. Conversely, the high value added of finished products manufacturing results in a considerable difference of monetary prices between finished products and all other ACPs. Therefore, those countries, like Japan, that import unwrought aluminum and export its manufactured products can transfer energy and environment burdens to trade partners, while those countries, like Japan and China that export finished products can earn profits from the international trade.

 ◼ **Heterogeneity of ACPs produced in different countries.** The same ACP or ACP groups produced in different countries can have different CTP embodied energy use, GHG emissions, and value added. This is because different countries have different industrial technologies, energy mixes and efficiencies, GHG emission intensities per energy use, labor productivities, and 273 intellectual levels. This heterogeneity can be explained by the so called "term of trade"⁵⁶ and relevant extensions. Commodity terms of trade (CTOT), energy terms of trade (ETOT) and pollution terms of trade (PTOT) are used to estimate countries' ability to obtain money, energy and environmental benefits from international trade.⁵⁷ The higher the CTOT, the better; while the lower the ETOT and PTOT, the better (see section 5 of the SI). As shown in Figure 7, an item produced and exported from Japan and the US generally has higher value-added and lower CTP embodied energy use and GHG emissions than in other countries. In contrast, an item produced in China and Australia generally has lower value-added and higher CTP embodied energy use and GHG emissions than in other countries. This means that, when exporting the same product, China and Australia earn less profits but bear higher environmental burdens than Japan and the US. Fortunately, China and Australia's CTOT, ETOT, and PTOT have been improved during the past 26 years, especially in their main exported ACPs (see figure S9-11).

4. DISCUSSION

 This study provides an attempt to couple different dimensions of trade analyses to explore both the direct and indirect impacts of aluminum trade in the US, China, Japan, and Australia - four main 288 actors in the global aluminum industry but with different profiles in the aluminum supply chain. These four countries have different gains and contributions in the aluminum international trade, which mainly result from the different and changing structures of aluminum trade and the heterogeneity of ACPs in different countries, and these two reflect the different comparative advantages of these four countries.

 With very rich natural resource and energy endowment, Australia plays an irreplaceable role of providing minerals (including bauxite) and raw products to the world; however, its manufacturing industries are relatively weak compared to those of the other countries. The US used to have the strongest manufacturing capacity during 1940s-early 1990s and they were a net exporter of aluminum 297 semis and finished products in most 1990s.⁵⁸ Then, the US gradually moved part of its energy and emissions intensive industries, such as the aluminum smelting industry, to other countries: this production shift has determined a reduction of alumina import but also an increase of finished products import after 2000. However, it is worth noting that the US still have capability in alumina refining, aluminum smelting, and especially semis manufacturing. Theoretically, the US could rely entirely on the domestic capacity to meet the internal demand for aluminum semis, and it is the only 303 country out of the four that generates such a large amount of old scrap that can be exported.⁴ As a country lacking in natural mineral resources, Japan must import aluminum. However, its high energy prices and strict environmental regulation restricted the development of alumina refining and 306 aluminum smelting industries in Japan;⁵⁹ thus, it import unwrought aluminum ingot rather than bauxite or alumina. In addition, Japan became one of the global manufacturing countries since 308 1970s⁵⁸ and has been very competitive in the manufacturing of aluminum semis and finished products. China had a rapid growth of manufacturing capacity after it entered the World Trade Organization in 310 2001³⁷ and subsequently experiences sharp increases in the import of bauxite, alumina, and scrap and in the export of semis and finished products. However, it also resulted in the corresponding high 312 energy use and environmental emissions/pollutions in China.⁶⁰

 Our results suggest that complete equality in the international trade seems extremely difficult to achieve. Some processes are not cost-effective, such as mining which has high resource cost or refining and smelting which have high energy and environmental cost (see Figure 6b, d, f). Countries who have mining, refining, or smelting processes will pay more for the same profits than other countries. Outsourcing these processes is a good strategy for competitive countries and it is happening in the past decades. Four of the five bauxite mines in Australia are controlled by two multinational corporations that are headquartered outside of the country. With significant shifts of refining and smelting capacity from the US and Japan to China over the past decades, the latter has become the 321 center of primary aluminum production.⁴³ Once Australia and China upgrade their aluminum industries and produce higher technology products, relocation of these low cost-effective processes from these two countries can be expected.

 However, this good strategy in country level can only transfer resource and environmental burden among countries. It cannot reduce trade inequality in world level. In fact, countries do not have motivations to reduce their own gains and help other counties achieve trade balance. On the contrary, they tend to enlarge their comparative advantage and gain benefits in more aspects from the international trade. So, reducing trade inequality need to be done in world level.

 Aluminum scrap is another source of aluminum besides bauxite. Secondary aluminum, as the down- stream product of aluminum scrap, supplements primary aluminum inputs but generally at lower energy and environmental costs. Hence, developing a global aluminum recycling system is a chance to help balance trade inequalities. To make full use of every aluminum scrap, countries have responsibility to have a well domestic collection, classification, and pretreatment capability to prevent from being degraded using, even if these scraps are exported and recycled by other countries. However, the current amount of aluminum scrap is far from being enough to reduce reliance on bauxite extraction and further processing, making the demand for and production of primary aluminum unavoidable. If countries that produce primary aluminum have backward technologies and high energy and GHG emissions intensities in their aluminum industries, relocation of these processes to these countries may increase the total resource use and emissions in global level. To address these challenges, one strategy is to transfer advanced production technologies and green technologies along with the relocation of these industries. International organizations, such as WTO and international aluminum association, should promote to reduce production and green technology restrictions in aluminum international trade and clean energy.

 By coupling multiple dimensions and analyzing the direct and indirect flows of a widely applied metal as aluminum, this study provides new insights into the global trade inequality issue. We recommend that physical, monetary, and embodied trade flows be considered simultaneously and call for more careful and comprehensive research for trade policy making. Besides the four dimensions that are analyzed in this study, there are other factors that could be included in future studies to gain a comprehensive understanding of different countries' comparative advantages as well as real gains and losses in the trade of aluminum as well as of other materials. These factors include, but are not limited to, water use, labor input, land use, toxic emissions, impacts on human health and the ecosystem. To further strengthen the findings or reveal additional insights, integration of the method developed in this study with complementary quantitative information achievable by means of MFA/SFA techniques or extended input-output methods is highly recommended.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

- **Supporting Information.** Detailed information about monetary value, physical value, embodied
- energy use and GHG emissions calculation method and results (PDF).
-
- AUTHOR INFORMATION
- **Corresponding Author**
- 361 *E-mail: $wqchen@iue.ac.cn$ and $slone@tsinglehua.edu.cn$
- **ORCID**
- Wanjun Wang: 0000-0001-7168-7338
- Wei-Qiang Chen: 0000-0002-7686-2331
- Luca Ciacci: 0000-0002-5151-5384
- Leila Pourzahedif: 0000-0002-5775-9371
- Matthew J. Eckelman: 0000-0002-0595-3682
- Yi Yang: 0000-0002-1131-6196
- **Author contributions**
- Wanjun Wang and Wei-Qiang Chen contributed equally to this work.

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study is sponsored by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under project

71961147003 and Key Research Project of Frontier Science of Chinese Academy of Sciences (No.

- QYZDB-SSW-DQC012).
-

5. References

 (1) Reinbold, B.; Wen, Y. Understanding the Roots of the U.S. Trade Deficit. *The Regional Economist* **2018**, *26* (3), 2.

 (2) Jiang, X.; Zhang, Q.; Zhao, H.; Geng, G.; Peng, L.; Guan, D.; Kan, H.; Huo, H.; Lin, J.; Brauer, M.; Martin, R. V.; He, K. Revealing the hidden health costs embodied in Chinese exports. *Environmental science & technology* **2015**, *49* (7), 4381–4388. DOI: 10.1021/es506121s.

 (3) Prior, T.; Giurco, D.; Mudd, G.; Mason, L.; Behrisch, J. Resource depletion, peak minerals and the implications for sustainable resource management. *Global Environmental Change* **2012**, *22* (3), 577–587. DOI: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.08.009.

 (4) U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Industry and Security. *The Effect of Imports of Aluminum on the National Security - January 17, 2018*.

 (5) United States Trade Representative. *United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement*. https://ustr.gov/trade-agreements/free-trade-agreements/united-states-mexico-canada-agreement (accessed 2019-06-11).

 (6) United States Trade Representative. *Findings of The Investigation into China's Acts Policies, and Practices Related to Technology Transfer, Intellectual Property, and Innovation Under Section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974*.

 (7) Zhang Yue. *Solid waste imports face stricter controls in boost to environment*. http://english.gov.cn/state_ council/ministries/2017/08/08/content_281475776692484.htm (accessed 2019-06-11).

 (8) Zafirah Zein. *Thailand to ban plastic waste imports by 2021*. https://www.eco-business.com/news/thailand-to-ban-plastic-waste-imports-by-2021/ (accessed 2019-06-11).

 (9) Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resource, Australian Government. *Australia's Critical Minerals Strategy*. https://www.industry.gov.au/data-and-publications/australias-critical-minerals-strategy (accessed 2020-06-07).

 (10) Wiedmann, T.; Lenzen, M. Environmental and social footprints of international trade. *Nature Geosci* **2018**, *11* (5), 314–321. DOI: 10.1038/s41561-018-0113-9.

 (11) Singh, S. J.; Eisenmenger, N. How unequal is international trade? An ecological perspective using Material Flow Accounting (MFA). *Journal für Entwicklungspolitik* **2010**, *26* (4), 57–88. DOI: 10.20446/JEP-2414-3197-26-4- 57.

 (12) Moran, D. D.; Lenzen, M.; Kanemoto, K.; Geschke, A. Does ecologically unequal exchange occur? *Ecological Economics* **2013**, *89*, 177–186. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2013.02.013.

 (13) Ramaswami, V. K. Trade Imbalance, Gains from Trade and National Income Change. *The Economic Journal* **1955**, *65* (259), 450. DOI: 10.2307/2227324.

 (14) Frey, R. S.; Gellert, P. K.; Dahms, H. F. *Ecologically Unequal Exchange*; Springer International Publishing, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-89740-0.

 (15) Klimek, P.; Obersteiner, M.; Thurner, S. Systemic trade risk of critical resources. *Science advances* **2015**, *1* (10), e1500522. DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.1500522.

 (16) Bruckner, M.; Giljum, S.; Lutz, C.; Wiebe, K. S. Materials embodied in international trade – Global material extraction and consumption between 1995 and 2005. *Global Environmental Change* **2012**, *22* (3), 568–576. DOI: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2012.03.011.

- (17) Jiang, M.; An, H.; Guan, Q.; Sun, X. Global embodied mineral flow between industrial sectors:A network perspective. *Resources Policy* **2018**, *58*, 192–201.
- (18) Dittrich, M.; Bringezu, S. The physical dimension of international trade Part 1: Direct global flows between 1962 and 2005. *Ecological Economics* **2010**, *69* (9), 1838–1847. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2010.04.023.
- (19) Duarte, R.; Pinilla, V.; Serrano, A. Long Term Drivers of Global Virtual Water Trade:A Trade Gravity Approach for 1965-2010. *Ecological Economics* **2019**, *156*, 318–326. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2018.10.012.
- (20) D'Odorico, P.; Carr, J.; Dalin, C.; Dell'Angelo, J.; Konar, M.; Laio, F.; Ridolfi, L.; Rosa, L.; Suweis, S.; Tamea, S.;
- Tuninetti, M. Global virtual water trade and the hydrological cycle:patterns, drivers, and socio-environmental impacts. *Environmental Research Letters* **2019**, *14* (5). DOI: 10.1088/1748-9326/ab05f4.
- (21) Han, M. Y.; Chen, G. Q.; Li, Y. L. Global water transfers embodied in international trade:Tracking imbalanced and inefficient flows. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **2018**, *184*, 50–64. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.02.195.

 (22) Han, M.; Chen, G. Global arable land transfers embodied in Mainland China's foreign trade. *Land Use Policy* **2018**, *70*, 521–534.

(23) Prell, C.; Sun, L.; Feng, K.; He, J.; Hubacek, I. Uncovering the spatially distant feedback loops of global

trade:A network and input-output approach. *Science of the Total Environment* **2017**, *586*, 401–408. DOI:

10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.11.202.

 (24) Chen, B.; Li, J. S.; Wu, X. F.; Han, M. Y.; Zeng, L.; Li, Z.; Chen, G. Q. Global energy flows embodied in international trade:A combination of environmentally extended input-output analysis and complex network analysis. *Applied Energy* **2018**, *210*, 98–107. DOI: 10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.10.113.

 (25) Wu, X. D.; Guo, J. L.; Meng, J.; Chen, G. Q. Energy use by globalized economy:Total-consumption-based perspective via multi-region input-output accounting. *Science of the Total Environment* **2019**, *662*, 65–76. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.01.108.

 (26) Zhang, W.; Wang, F.; Hubacek, K.; Liu, Y.; Wang, J.; Feng, K.; Jiang, L.; Jiang, H.; Zhang, B.; Bi, J. Unequal Exchange of Air Pollution and Economic Benefits Embodied in China's Exports. *Environmental science & technology* **2018**, *52* (7), 3888–3898. DOI: 10.1021/acs.est.7b05651.

- (27) Lin, B.; Xu, M. Does China become the "pollution heaven" in South-South trade?:Evidence from Sino-Russian trade. *Science of the Total Environment* **2019**, *666*, 964–974. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.02.298.
- (28) Yu, Y.; Feng, K.; Hubacek, K. China's unequal ecological exchange. *Ecological Indicators* **2014**, *47*, 156–163. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2014.01.044.
- (29) Davis, S. J.; Peters, G. P.; Caldeira, K. The supply chain of CO2 emissions. *Proceedings of the National*
- *Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **2011**, *108* (45), 18554–18559. DOI:

10.1073/pnas.1107409108.

- (30) Hubacek, K.; Baiocchi, G.; Feng, K.; Muñoz Castillo, R.; Sun, L.; Xue, J. Global carbon inequality. *Energ. Ecol. Environ.* **2017**, *2* (6), 361–369. DOI: 10.1007/s40974-017-0072-9.
- (31) Prell, C.; Feng, K. Unequal Carbon Exchanges: The Environmental and Economic Impacts of Iconic U.S. Consumption Items. *Journal of Industrial Ecology* **2016**, *20* (3), 537–546. DOI: 10.1111/jiec.12377.
- (32) Dorninger, C.; Hornborg, A.; Abson, D. J.; Wehrden, H. von; Schaffartzik, A.; Giljum, S.; Engler, J.-O.; Feller, R.
- L.; Hubacek, K.; Wieland, H. Global patterns of ecologically unequal exchange: Implications for sustainability in
- the 21st century. *Ecological Economics* **2021**, *179*, 106824. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2020.106824.
- (33) Chen, W.-Q.; Graedel, T. E. Dynamic analysis of aluminum stocks and flows in the United States: 1900–2009. *Ecological Economics* **2012**, *81*, 92–102. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.06.008.
- (34) International Energy Agency. *Energy Technology Perspectives 2017*:*Catalysing Energy Technology Transformations*.
- (35) Donald J. Trump. *Proclamation on World Trade Week, 2019*. https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/proclamation-world-trade-week-2019/ (accessed 2019-06-11).
- (36) Liu, G.; Müller, D. B. Mapping the global journey of anthropogenic aluminum: a trade-linked multilevel material flow analysis. *Environmental science & technology* **2013**, *47* (20), 11873–11881. DOI:
- 10.1021/es4024404.
- (37) Chen, W.-Q.; Shi, L. Analysis of aluminum stocks and flows in mainland China from 1950 to 2009: Exploring the dynamics driving the rapid increase in China's aluminum production. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*
- **2012**, *65*, 18–28. DOI: 10.1016/j.resconrec.2012.05.003.
- (38) Weiqiang, C.; S. H. I. Lei; Xiaoyu, C.; Yi, Q. Substance Flow Analysis of Aluminium in China for 1991-2007 (Ⅰ):Trade of Aluminium from a Perspective of Life Cycle and Its Policy implications. *Resources Science* **2009**, *31* (11), 1887–1897.
- (39) UNEP. *Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal*. http://www.basel.int/Portals/4/Basel%20Convention/docs/text/BaselConventionText-e.pdf.
- (40) Lee, D.; Offenhuber, D.; Duarte, F.; Biderman, A.; Ratti, C. Monitour: Tracking global routes of electronic waste. *Waste management (New York, N.Y.)* **2018**, *72*, 362–370. DOI: 10.1016/j.wasman.2017.11.014.
- (41) UN Comtrade. *United Nations commodity trade statistics database*. http://comtrade. un. org.
- (42) World Bank. *Consumer price index (2010 = 100)*. https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/FP.CPI.TOTL.
- (43) International Aluminium Institute. *Life Cycle Inventory Data and Environmental Metrics for the Primary Aluminum Industry*.
- (44) International Aluminium Institute. *Global Life Cycle Inventory Data for the Primary Aluminum Industry 2010 DATA*.
- (45) International Aluminium Institute. *Life Cycle Assessment of Aluminum: Inventory Data for the Primary Aluminum Industry*.
- (46) International Aluminium Institute. *Life Cycle Assessment of Aluminum: Inventory Data for the Worldwide Primary Aluminum Industry*.
- (47) International Aluminium Institute. *Life Cycle Inventory of the Worldwide Aluminum Industry With Regard to Energy Consumption and Emissions of Greenhouse Gases_Paper 1_Automotive*.
- (48) European Aluminium Association. *Life-Cycle inventory data for aluminium production and transformation processes in Europe*.
- (49) European Aluminium Association. *Environmental Profile Report for the European Aluminium Industry*.
- (50) European Aluminium Association. *Environmental Profile Report for the European Aluminium Industry*.
- (51) Liu, G.; Müller, D. B. Addressing sustainability in the aluminum industry: a critical review of life cycle
- assessments. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **2012**, *35*, 108–117. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.05.030.
- (52) Liu, G.; Bangs, C. E.; Müller, D. B. Unearthing potentials for decarbonizing the U.S. aluminum cycle.
- *Environmental science & technology* **2011**, *45* (22), 9515–9522. DOI: 10.1021/es202211w.
- (53) OECD. *Measuring distortions in international markets the aluminium value chain*.
- (54) USDE. *U.S. Energy Requirements for Aluminum Production: Historical Perspective, Theoretical Limits and Current Practices*.
- (55) Dahlström, K.; Ekins, P. Combining economic and environmental dimensions: Value chain analysis of UK
- aluminium flows. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* **2007**, *51* (3), 541–560. DOI:
- 10.1016/j.resconrec.2006.09.010.
- (56) OECD. *Terms of trade*. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/content/data/7722246c-en.
- (57) Grether, J.-M.; Mathys, N. A. The pollution terms of trade and its five components. *Journal of Development Economics* **2013**, *100* (1), 19–31. DOI: 10.1016/j.jdeveco.2012.06.007.
- (58) Carmine Nappi. *The Global Aluminium Industry: 40 Years from 1972*.
- (59) Samuels, R. J. The industrial destructuring of the Japanese aluminum industry. *Pacific Affairs* **1983**, *56* (3), 495–509.

 (60) Liu, Z.; Geng, Y.; Adams, M.; Dong, L.; Sun, L.; Zhao, J.; Dong, H.; Wu, J.; Tian, X. Uncovering driving forces on greenhouse gas emissions in China' aluminum industry from the perspective of life cycle analysis. *Applied Energy*

2016, *166*, 253–263. DOI: 10.1016/j.apenergy.2015.11.075.

FIGURES

Figure 1. Direct and indirect flows resulting from the trade of a physical commodity. Color flows (physical commodity and monetary value) are direct flows; Grey flows (i.e. embodied emissions, energy use, and so on) are indirect flows.

import	L HI	usu		$\mathsf{L}\mathsf{U}_2$
USA	176×10^{6}	-659×10^{9}	129×10^{17}	236×10^{7}
CHN	107×10^{6}	1117×10^{9}	-130×10^{17}	-283×10^{7}
JPN	57×10^6	1991×10^{9}	32×10^{17}	61×10^7
AUS	-259×10^{6}	-165×10^{9}	-865×10^{17}	-117×10^{7}

Figure 2. Cumulative and annual balance of trade in resource, economic, energy and environmental

consequences for (a) US, (b) CHN, (c) JPN, (d) AUS from 1991 to 2016.

Figure 3. Net import of aluminum embedded in different product groups measured by mass for (a) the US, (b) China, (c) Japan, and (d) Australia from 1991 to 2016. EP&S = EOL Products & Scrap, UA ⁼ Unwrought Aluminum, Semis, FP ⁼ Finished Products, Mt = Million tonnes. ¹⁹⁹¹ ¹⁹⁹² ¹⁹⁹³ ¹⁹⁹⁴ ¹⁹⁹⁵ ¹⁹⁹⁶ ¹⁹⁹⁷ ¹⁹⁹⁸ ¹⁹⁹⁹ ²⁰⁰⁰ ²⁰⁰¹ ²⁰⁰² ²⁰⁰³ ²⁰⁰⁴ ²⁰⁰⁵ ²⁰⁰⁶ ²⁰⁰⁷ ²⁰⁰⁸ ²⁰⁰⁹ ²⁰¹⁰ ²⁰¹¹ ²⁰¹² ²⁰¹³ ²⁰¹⁴ ²⁰¹⁵ ²⁰¹⁶ 1991 1992 1993 1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016

Figure 4. Money net-earned by trade of different ACP groups for (a) the US, (b) China, (c) Japan, and (d) Australia from 1991 to 2016. EP&S = EOL Products & Scrap, UA = Unwrought Aluminum, Semis, FP = Finished Products.

Figure 5. Net import of embodied energy in aluminum trade for (a) the US, (b) China, (c) Japan, and (d) Australia from 1991 to 2016. EP&S = EOL Products & Scrap, UA = Unwrought Aluminum, Semis, $FP = F^2$ Finished Products, $PJ = Pet^2 = 10^{15}$ J.

Figure 6. (a) Price, (b) Material intensity, (c) Embodied energy use intensity based on physical value, (d) Embodied GHG emissions intensity based on physical value, (e) Embodied energy use intensity based on monetary value, and (f) Embodied GHG emissions intensity based on monetary value of different ACP groups. Price is the average of these four countries' export and import price. $PV =$ physical value, $MV =$ monetary value; Price = Monetary value per t Al; Material intensity = t Al per USD; Energy use intensity based on monetary value = CTP energy use per t USD; GHG emissions intensity based on monetary value = CTP GHG emissions per USD; Energy use intensity based on physical value = CTP energy use per t Al; GHG emissions intensity based on physical value = CTP GHG emissions per t Al.

Figure 7. The seven ACP groups' (a) Export price, (b) Import price, (c) Commodity terms of trade, (d) CTP energy use intensity of export, (e) CTP energy use intensity of import, (f) Energy terms of trade, (g) CTP GHG emissions intensity of export, (h) CTP GHG emissions intensity of import, and (i) Pollution terms of trade of these four countries during 1991 to 2016. Commodity terms of trade = Export price / Import price. Energy terms of trade = CTP energy use intensity of export / CTP energy use intensity of import. Pollution terms of trade = CTP GHG emissions intensity of export / CTP GHG emissions intensity of import.

Supporting Information for:

Multi-Dimensional Analyses Reveal Heterogenous Gains and Losses among the Global Aluminum Trade leaders

Wanjun Wang^{a,b,c}, Wei-Qiang Chen^{a,b,c*}, Zhou-Wei Diao^d, Luca Ciacci^e, Leila Pourzahedi^f, Matthew J.

Eckelman^f, Yi Yang^{g,h}, and Lei Shi^{i*}

^a Key Lab of Urban Environment and Health, Institute of Urban Environment, Chinese Academy of Sciences, 1799 Jimei Road, Xiamen, Fujian, 361021, China

*^b*University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100049, China

^c Fujian Institute of Innovation, 1799 Jimei Road, Xiamen, Fujian, 361021, China

^{*d*}BP (China) Investment Company Limited., Beijing, 100020, China

^e Department of Industrial Chemistry "Toso Montanari", Alma Mater Studiorum–University of Bologna, Bologna, 40136, Italy

^f Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Northeastern University, Massachusetts 02115, USA

^g Key Laboratory of the Three Gorges Reservoir Region's Eco-Environment, Ministry of Education, Chongqing University, Chongqing 400045, China

^h Environmental Studies Program, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755, USA

^{*i*} State Key Joint Laboratory of Environmental Simulation and Pollution Control, School of Environment, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China

*Correspondence to: Wei-Qiang Chen [\(wqchen@iue.ac.cn\)](mailto:wqchen@iue.ac.cn) and Lei Shi [\(slone@tsinghua.edu.cn\)](mailto:slone@tsinghua.edu.cn)
Content

[Figure S1: Schematic diagram for the anthropogenic aluminum life cycle and its LCA boundary.........................](#page-40-0) 39 [Figure S2. Data sources and process for calculating the monetary trade volume \(MTV\), physical trade volume \(PTV\),](#page-48-0) [and energy use and GHG emissions embodied in the trade of aluminum contained in a specific aluminum-containing](#page-48-0) [product \(ACP\)..](#page-48-0) 47 [Figure S3: Basic structure of an economic input-output table...](#page-61-0) 60 [Figure S4 The average, bottom, and top value of PTB, MTB, EUB, and GEB for \(b\) China, \(c\) Japan, and \(d\)](#page-75-0) [Australia from 1991 to 2016..](#page-75-0) 74

6. Life Cycle of Aluminum in the Anthroposphere and Its Life Cycle Analysis Boundary

The life cycle of aluminum in the anthroposphere can be seen in Figure S1, which is composed of eight life stages: Mining, Refining, Smelting, Fabrication, Manufacturing, Use, Collection & Pretreating, and Recycling. Except Use stage, each of these life stages can produce aluminum-containing products (ACPs) to be traded between countries. These APCs can be seen in table S1. More detailed information about life cycle of aluminum can be seen in the former research¹.

Different from life cycle of aluminum, the boundary of aluminum LCA study also contains Paste/Anode production process and Energy generation process. Energy use and GHG emissions from Mining, Refining, Paste/Anode production, Smelting, Fabrication, Manufacturing, Collection & Pretreating, and recycling compose the direct energy use and GHG emissions. Indirect energy use and GHG emissions are from energy (both electricity and fuel) generation processes. GHG emissions not only contain carbon dioxide emissions but also perfluorocarbons (PFCs) emissions from smelting process.

Figure S1: Schematic diagram for the anthropogenic aluminum life cycle and its LCA boundary.

7. The List of Aluminum-Containing Products and Their Aluminum Content

There are 143 items of APCs had been accounted. All the APCs have been divided into six group according to the life stages which can be seen in Table S1. They are Bauxite (2 items), Alumina (1 item), EOL products & Scrap (1 item), Unwrought aluminum (1 item), Semis (6 items), Finished products (132 items). For the finished APCs, based on their applications, we divide them into Transportation (29 items), Building & Construction (6 items), Machinery & Equipment (33 items), Consumer Durables (48 items), Electrical Engineering (7 items), and others (9 items). Codes of ACPs are SITC 1 codes, which is the first version of Standard International Trade Classification. The aluminum concentration for ACPs are also shown in Table SI, and data sources can be found in former $research^{2,3}$.

Table S1: The list of aluminum-containing products (ACPs) in the international trade and their aluminum concentration data.

Life Stage	Categories of ACPs	SITC ₁		Al Content $(\%)$			
			Commodity Name	Averag e	Bottom	Top	
Mining	Bauxite	2833	Bauxite and concentrates of aluminum	27.8	23.8	31. 8	
		28401^a	Ash and residues bearing nonferrous metals	50	40	60	
Refining	Alumina	51365	Aluminum oxide and hydroxide	43.2	34.3	52. \mathbf{I}	
Collection $\&$ Pre-	EOL products & Scrap	28404	Aluminum waste and scrap	84	80	88	

a. This data is adjusted by H0-281820 and H0-281830. Because SITC1-28401 includes ash and residues containing other non-ferrous metal except aluminum.

8. Calculation Process of Direct and Indirect Trade Flows

Data gathered through literature review for quantifying direct and indirect trade flows of aluminum contained in each ACP can be grouped into four categories: (1) data on monetary trade volume (MTV) of the ACP measured by US dollars; (2) data on physical trade volume (PTV) of the ACP measured by net weight; (3) data on physical content of aluminum in the ACP; and (4) data on energy use and GHG emissions intensities of aluminum for each process. The detailed calculation processes of PTV, MTV, and embodied energy use and GHG emissions of aluminum in an ACP are as follows.

Figure S2. Data sources and process for calculating the monetary trade volume (MTV), physical trade volume (PTV), and energy use and GHG emissions embodied in the trade of aluminum contained in a specific aluminum-containing product (ACP).

8.1 Calculation of direct trade flows

To calculate monetary flow and physical flow of aluminum trade, data in the first, second, and third groups are used. Sources of data on physical aluminum contents in ACPs have been described in detail in our former studies^{1,2,4} and are also available in Table S1. For each ACP, aluminum trade

flows measured by monetary value ($MF_{Al,i,j}$) and physical value ($PF_{Al,i,j}$) are calculated by equations $(1), (2), \text{ and } (3),$

$$
MF_{A,l,i,j} = MF_{P,i,j} \times C_{A,l,i} \tag{1}
$$

$$
PTV data available \t\t\t\t $PF_{A,l,i,j} = PF_{P,i,j} \times C_{A,l,i}$ \t\t\t\t(2)
$$

PTV data unavailable
$$
PF_{A,l,i,j} = MF_{P,i,j}/P_{P,i,j} \times C_{A,l,i}
$$
 (3)

where $PF_{P,i,j}$ and $MF_{P,i,j}$ indicate physical and monetary value of ACP_i in year *j*, respectively, $C_{Al,i}$ denotes the average aluminum content of ACP_i , and $P_{P,i,j}$ is the price of ACP_i in year *j*.

8.2 Calculation of indirect trade flows

Two indirect flows that are energy use $(EF_{Al,i,j})$ and GHG emissions $(GF_{Al,i,j})$ embodied in aluminum for ACP_i in year *j* are calculated by equations (4) and (5), based on data in the first and second groups,

$$
EF_{Al,i,j} = PF_{Al,i,j} \times EI_{Al,i,j}^{CTP}
$$
\n
$$
\tag{4}
$$

$$
GF_{Al,i,j} = PF_{Al,i,j} \times GI_{Al,i,j}^{CTP}
$$
\n
$$
(5)
$$

where $EI_{Al,i,j}^{CTP}$ and $GI_{Al,i,j}^{CTP}$ indicate cradle to product (CTP) energy use and GHG emissions intensity of aluminum contained in ACP_i in year *j*.

Based on the framework in figure S1, $EI_{Al,i,j}^{CTP}$ and $GI_{Al,i,j}^{CTP}$ are calculated as the accumulation of the process incremental energy use and GHG emissions intensity (indicated by $EI_{Al,i,j}^{Inc}$ and $GI_{Ai,i,j}^{Inc}$) of aluminum from bauxite mining process (the start point of aluminum's life cycle) to the process *k* (the process that the ACP is generated in), as shown in equation (6) and (7). However, $EI_{Al,i,j}^{Inc}$ and

 $GI_{Ai,i,j}$ couldn't obtained directly. Energy use and GHG emissions per ACP output in each process (indicated by EI_P^{Inc} and GI_P^{Inc}) is used as supplementary. $EI_{Al,i,j}^{Inc}$ and $GI_{Al,i,j}^{Inc}$ are equal to $EI_{P,i,j}^{Inc}$ and $GI_{P,i,j}^{Inc}$ divided by the average aluminum content of ACP_i , which can be seen in equation (8) and (9),

$$
EI_{A l,i,j}^{CTP} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} EI_{A l,i,j}^{Inc} \quad (6)
$$

\n
$$
GI_{A l,i,j}^{CTP} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} EI_{A l,i,j}^{Inc} \quad (7)
$$

\n
$$
EI_{A l,i,j}^{CTP} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} EI_{P,i,j}^{Inc} / C_{A l,i} \quad (8)
$$

$$
GI_{A1,i,j}^{CTP} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} GI_{P,i,j}^{Inc} / C_{A1,i}
$$
 (9)

The key to calculate indirect flows is to obtain reliable data on EI_P^{Inc} and GI_P^{Inc} . Various LCA reports, databases, and papers about energy use and GHG emission for each ACP production process have been searched. Data in the US,^{5,6} Japan,⁷ China,⁸ Australia, Europe,^{9–11} and the world average^{12–} ¹⁶ are collected, some of which have time specific data, some not. Those data vary across areas and over time. In comparison, world average data are much complete and accurate. And there is an obvious decline trend over time because of technology improvement, especially in electrolysis process which has the highest energy use and GHG emissions among all the production processes. We use life cycle inventory (LCI) data from aluminum industries (International Aluminum Institute and European Aluminum Association) which collected by process based LCA (PLCA) and build a time series LCI data set to avoid the uncertainties due to improvements in energy efficiency across the industry. Both direct and indirect energy use and GHG emissions are calculated. Energy use and GHG emissions from transportation process are ignored. Life cycle of primary aluminum production

and life cycle of EP&S recycling are seen as two independent systems. Secondary aluminum production process begins with EP&S collection & pre-treating rather than bauxite mining.

Incremental PLCA data in manufacturing process are unavailable. Input-Output Life Cycle Assessment (IOLCA) method is used to explore energy use and GHG emissions intensity in manufacturing process for finished ACPs (indicated by $EI_{Finished\ ACP}^{Inc}$ and $GI_{Finished\ ACP}^{Inc}$), which is calculated by energy use and GHG emissions intensity for industry which finished ACP belongs to. To avoid double counting, only direct energy use and GHG emission for manufacturing process are calculated. Equation (10) and (11) show the calculation processes. $EI_{\text{Finished } ACP_{i,j}}^{Inc}$ and $GI_{Finished \, ACP_{i,j}}^{Inc}$ indicates the incremental energy use and GHG emissions intensity of finished ACP *i* in the year *j*; $EI_{Industry_{m,j}}^{dir}$ and $GI_{Industry_{m,j}}^{dir}$ are direct energy use and GHG emissions intensity of industry *m* in the year *j*; finished ACP *i* is belongs to industry *m*; $P_{P,i,j}$ indexes the price of the ACP *i* in the year *j*. More details about calculated process can be seen in SI 3.2.

$$
EI_{Finished \, ACP_{i,j}}^{Inc} = EI_{Industry_{m,j}}^{dir} \times P_{P,i,j}
$$
\n
$$
(10)
$$

$$
GI_{Finished \, ACP_{i,j}}^{Inc} = GI_{Industry_{m,j}}^{dir} \times P_{P,i,j}
$$
\n(11)

8.3 Calculation of trade balance

Because the direction of the monetary trade flow is the opposite of that of the physical trade flow and the embodied energy use and GHG emission flows (Figure 1), the balance of the MTV of aluminum (MTB) is accounted as the difference between the export flow and the import flow, while the balance of the PTV of aluminum (PTB), of the embodied energy use (EUB), and of the embodied GHG emissions (EEB), is accounted as the difference between the respective import flow and export

flow. After determining the volumes and balances of the four trade flows of the aluminum contained in each ACP, total trade volumes and balances of each of the four trade flows can be summed up for each of the six ACPs groups and all ACPs. Equations are as follows,

$$
MTB_{Al,i,j} = MF_{Al,i,j}^{Expert} - MF_{Al,i,j}^{Import}
$$
\n(12)

$$
PTB_{Al,i,j} = PF_{Al,i,j}^{Import} - PF_{Al,i,j}^{Expert}
$$
\n(13)

$$
EUB_{Al,i,j}^{Import} = EF_{Al,i,j}^{Import} - EF_{Al,i,j}^{Expert}
$$
\n(14)

$$
GEB_{Al,i,j}^{Import} = GF_{Al,i,j}^{Import} - GF_{Al,i,j}^{Expert}
$$
\n(15)

9. Coefficients of Energy Use and GHG Emissions for Aluminum

9.1 Coefficients of Energy Use and GHG Emissions for Raw Material and Semis Products

9.1.1 Energy use

Direct energy use coefficients are from International Aluminum Institute (IAI) and European Aluminum (EAA). We prefer to use data from IAI, because these data are world average which can more accurately reflect the energy use and GHG emissions of these four countries' aluminum industries than that from EAA which only show European average. LCI data collected by EAA are acted as complement.

IAI had collected global aluminum industry data for use in LCAs since 1998. These LCI data have been published in years 2000^{12} , 2003^{13} , 2007^{14} , 2013^{15} , and 2017^{16} , which report worldwide aluminum production in years 1995-1998, 2000, 2005, 2010, and 2015. IAI also reports energy intensity and energy consumption of smelting and refining from the year 1980 to $2017¹⁷$ and

perfluorocarbon emissions in the period 1990-2017. However, IAI LCAs only include five processes: Mining, Refining, Paste/Anode production, Electrolysis, and Ingot casting. For semi-production and secondary aluminum production processes, data from EAA's ecological profile reports are used. EAA has been collected LCA data from European producers and manufacturers since 1992 and a series of reports had been published. Early reports, which published in years 1996, 2000, and 2005¹⁰, are not available. Fortunately, some data in these early reports had been published in the 2008 version, which can cover data in years 1998, 2002, and 2005. And in 2013 and 2018, EAA reported LCA data in 2010 and $2015^{9,11}$.

Data from IAI and EAA are not always in the same study period. In order to combine data from IAI and EAA into a timeseries database, some adjusts are needed. The data source of energy use coefficients for each production process are detailed in Table S2-S3.

Indirect energy use intensity is energy input per output in petrol coke and pitch production and energy production. Coefficients for petrol coke and pitch production and coefficients for fuel production can be seen in table S4-S5. IAI provides historical aluminum industry global power mix data on the website, which are used to estimate secondary energy use for electricity. The calculation process has been shown in Table S6.

Table S2: Data source of direct energy use coefficients. Year in this table is the time that data be collected.

Life Stage	$1991 - 1995$	$1996 - 2000$	$2001 - 2005$	$2006 - 2010$	$2011 - 2016$
Mining	IAI $(1995-1998)^{a}$	IAI(2000)	IAI(2005)	IAI(2010)	IAI(2015)

a. In IAI's 1998 report, data in different production processes are collected during 1995-1998.

b. Coefficients from 1996 to 2000 are the average value of data collected in the year 1998 and 2002.

c. There are no date collected by EAA after 2005.

d. Assumed to have the same energy use coefficients of extrusion.

Table S3: Calorific values for types of fuel¹⁸.

a. Calorific value of residual fuel oil

- b. Calorific value of liquefied petroleum gases
- c. Calorific value of anthracite

Table S4: Coefficients of energy input in petrol coke and pitch production¹⁹.

Table S5: Indirect energy input for fuel production³.

a. Assumed to be the same coefficient of natural gas.

Table S6: Secondary energy use for electricity²⁰.

9.1.2 GHG emissions

Both IAI and EAA don't report GHG emissions data. Direct GHG emissions coefficients are calculated by direct energy use coefficients. IAI have provided technical guidance²¹ and tools²² to support aluminum producers and researchers quantifying GHG emissions. We use them to estimate GHG emissions. Some estimated parameter and source can be seen in Table S7-S10.

Indirect GHG emissions coefficients from electricity production in the period 1991-2016 are estimated by IAI global power mix data. These data are shown in Table S11. Global perfluorocarbon emissions intensity during 1991 to 2016 have been reported by IAI, which are used immediately.

Table S7: Direct GHG emissions intensity data²³.

Table S8: Emission factors for calculating process CO₂ emissions from petrol coke and pitch production^a.

a. These data are calculated by fuel use in production. Emission coefficients of fuels are from IPCC (2006).

Table S9: Emission factors for calculating process co_2 emissions from Paste/Anode consumption²².

Table S10: Indirect emissions from fuel production³.

a. Assumed to be the same coefficient of natural gas.

Year	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Coeffici	0.354	0.350	0.343	0.328	0.384	0.394	0.402	0.416	0.415	0.428	0.465	0.479	0.501
ent	6	2	5	6	5	5	2	2	9	6	5	3	$\boldsymbol{0}$
Year	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Coeffici	0.493	0.454	0.487	0.497	0.509	0.520	0.510	0.533	0.536	0.548	0.587	0.590	0.614
ent	2	6	6	5		$\overline{4}$	3		θ		8	4	

Table S11: GHG emissions coefficients for electricity production.

9.1.3 Converting process incremental data into CTP data

Section 4.2 and 4.3 illustrate the process incremental energy use (or GHG emissions) intensity of raw materials and semis. We should convert these data into CTP data. Factors we use are shown in Table S12.

Ingot-unalloyed/Extrusion	0.8850	1.0130	1.0080	1.0000	1.0030
Secondary aluminum/Extrusion	0.5590	0.3240	0.3240	0.3230	0.2910
Ingot-unalloyed/Rolling	1.0200	1.0120	1.0040	1.0040	1.0040
Secondary aluminum/Rolling	0.3830	0.3830	0.3830	0.4060	0.3470
Ingot-unalloyed/Foil	1.0320	1.0320	1.0070	1.0100	1.0070
Secondary aluminum/Foil	0.5950	0.5950	0.5950	0.3900	0.1550
Ingot-unalloyed/Powder and flake	0.8850	1.0130	1.0080	1.0410	1.0030
Secondary aluminum/Powder and flake	0.5590	0.3240	0.3240	0.3230	0.2910

9.2 Estimating Method of Incremental Energy Use and GHG Emissions for Manufacturing Process

Input-Output Life Cycle Assessment (IO-LCA) is used to calculating incremental energy use (GHG emissions) intensity (indicated by $EI_{Finished\ ACP}^{Inc}$ and $GI_{Finished\ ACP}^{Inc}$) intensity for manufacturing process of each finished ACP, which is calculated by direct energy use and GHG emissions intensity (indicated by $EI_{Industry}^{dir}$ and $GI_{Industry}^{dir}$) for industries which finished ACP belongs to. So, the key is to estimate direct energy use and GHG emissions intensity of industries which ACPs belongs to.

Direct energy use (GHG emissions) intensity of industry is calculated by IO tables and their satellite. Figure S3 shows the structure of an input-output table. According to the environmental input-output analysis developed by Leontief 24 , direct energy use and GHG emissions intensity for industry *m* in the year *j* can be obtained as follows:

$$
EI_{Industry_{m,j}}^{dir} = TE_{m,j}/X_j
$$
\n(15)

$$
GI_{\text{Industry}_{m,j}}^{\text{dir}} = T G_{m,j} / X_j \tag{16}
$$

where *A* is the technical coefficients matrix in the year *j*, $TE_{m,i}$ and $TG_{m,i}$ are the total energy use and GHG emissions for industry *m* in the year *j*; total output is denoted by *X* which contains domestic consumption and export.

Figure S3: Basic structure of an economic input-output table.

There are four countries involved in this study, US, China, Japan, and Australia, which publish IO tables every few years. And based on these official IO tables, Eora database has developed timeseries of environmentally extended IO tables for the four countries from 1990 to 2015. Except China, other three countries' IO table have very detailed sector category (more than 300 sectors). So, we use these three countries' environmentally extended IO tables in Eora database to calculate incremental energy use (GHG emissions) intensity in each finished ACP' manufacturing process. Eora database didn't publish IO table for the year 2016, so we use the IO tables in 2015 to replace.

The first step is locating finished ACPs into different sectors of the three countries' IO table. According to some convert files provided by these three countries²⁵⁻²⁸, the relationship between finished ACPs and IO table sectors can be seen in table S13. And then, based on IO tables in Eora database and equation 15 and 16, each industry's direct energy use (GHG emissions) intensity for the three countries can be calculated.

Incremental energy use (GHG emissions) intensity for finished ACPs' manufacturing processes are calculated by each country's export price and industry's direct energy use (GHG emissions) intensity (Equation 10 and 11). However, due to US, Japan and Australia have very different economic structure and technical condition, environmental coefficients about some finished ACPs in the three countries are quite different. Hence, we adopt the average value.

Table S13: The conversion table between finished ACPs and IO sectors of US, Japan, and Australia.

10. Definition of Terms of Trade

Terms of trade (TOT) is commonly used to represent the competitiveness of countries in international trade. In this paper, we use the main three variants of TOT to calculate the ability of these four countries to get monetary, energy and environmental benefits in aluminum international trade.

Commodity terms of trade (CTOT) is used to analyze the profitability of countries which is defined as the ratio between a country's commodity export price and its import price. When the export price is larger than import price, CTOT is higher than 100%. That means the country can get monetary value from a same product or product group's international trade.

Energy terms of trade (ETOT) and pollution terms of trade (PTOT) are used to measures the energy and environmental gains and losses that a country get from international trade.²⁹ They are estimated by the ratio between a product or product group's CTP energy use and GHG emissions intensity of export and its CTP energy and GHG emissions intensity of import. When ETOT and PTOT are smaller than 100%, the energy and environmental burden embodied in the export goods are lower than that in imported goods. The country can get energy and environmental benefits from other countries by international trade.

The higher TOT, the better a country's profitability. On the contrary, the lower ETOT and PTOT, the better a country's ability to get energy and environmental benefits from other countries.

11. Uncertainty analysis

The results are mainly sensitive to the aluminum content of ACPs. We calculate the resource, monetary value, energy, and environmental burden in these four countries' aluminum trade under different aluminum contents (Figure S4). Results show that aluminum content has great impact on the absolute value of four flows. But it won't change the trends and directions of the four flows, which means it do not change the conclusions of this study.

Figure S4 The average, bottom, and top value of PTB, MTB, EUB, and GEB for (b) China, (c) Japan, and (d) Australia from 1991 to 2016.

12. Results

Figure S5 Aluminum trade balance in resource, economic, energy and environmental consequences for these four countries.

Figure S6 Net import of aluminum embedded in different product groups measured by mass for (a) the US, (b) China, (c) Japan, and (d) Australia from 1991 to 2016. EP&S = EOL Products & Scrap, $UA =$ Unwrought Aluminum, Semis, $FP =$ Finished Products. Mt = Million tonnes.

Figure S7 Money earned by trade of different ACP groups for (a) US, (b) China, (c) Japan, and (d) Australia from 1991 to 2016. EP&S = EOL Products & Scrap, UA = Unwrought Aluminum, Semis, FP = Finished Products.

Figure S8 Net import of embodied energy in aluminum trade for (a) US, (b) China, (c) Japan, and (d) Australia from 1991 to 2016. EP&S = EOL Products & Scrap, UA = Unwrought Aluminum, Semis, $FP = F \text{inished Products.} \text{PI} = \text{Petajoule} = 10^{15} \text{ J}.$

Figure S9. Net import of embodied GHG emissions in aluminum trade for (a) US, (b) China, (c) Japan, and (d) Australia from 1991 to 2016. EP&S = EOL Products & Scrap, UA = Unwrought Aluminum, Semis, FP = Finished Products.

Figure S10 The seven ACP groups' commodity terms of trade of these four countries. CTOT = Commodity terms of trade; Linear fit of CTOT shows the trend of each of ACP's CTOT.

Figure S11 The seven ACP groups' energy terms of trade of these four countries. ETOT = Energy terms of trade; Linear fit of ETOT shows the trend of each of ACP's ETOT.

Figure S12 The seven ACP groups' pollution terms of trade of these four countries. PTOT = Pollution terms of trade; Linear fit of PTOT shows the trend of each of ACP's PTOT.

13. References

(1) Chen, W.-Q.; Graedel, T. E. Dynamic analysis of aluminum stocks and flows in the United States: 1900–2009. *Ecological Economics* **2012**, *81*, 92–102. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.06.008.

(2) Chen, W.-Q.; Shi, L. Analysis of aluminum stocks and flows in mainland China from 1950 to 2009: Exploring the dynamics driving the rapid increase in China's aluminum production. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* **2012**, *65*, 18–28. DOI: 10.1016/j.resconrec.2012.05.003.

(3) Liu, G.; Bangs, C. E.; Müller, D. B. Unearthing potentials for decarbonizing the U.S. aluminum cycle. *Environmental science & technology* **2011**, *45* (22), 9515–9522. DOI: 10.1021/es202211w.

(4) Weiqiang, C.; S. H. I. Lei; Xiaoyu, C.; Yi, Q. Substance Flow Analysis of Aluminium in China for 1991-2007 (Ⅰ):Trade of Aluminium from a Perspective of Life Cycle and Its Policy implications. *Resources Science* **2009**, *31* (11), 1887–1897.

(5) AA. *Life Cycle Inventory Report for the North American Aluminum Industry*.

(6) AA. *The Environmental Footprint of Semi-Finished Aluminum Products in North America*.

(7) JAA. *Aluminum and the Environment*. https://www.aluminum.or.jp/environment/index.html (accessed 2019- 06-13).

(8) Wu, J.; Wang, H.; Chen, W.; Shi, L. Quantifying energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions of the primary aluminum industry in China **2010**, *50* (3), 407–410.

(9) European Aluminium Association. *Life-Cycle inventory data for aluminium production and transformation processes in Europe*.

(10) European Aluminium Association. *Environmental Profile Report for the European Aluminium Industry*.

(11) European Aluminium Association. *Environmental Profile Report for the European Aluminium Industry*.

(12) International Aluminium Institute. *Life Cycle Inventory of the Worldwide Aluminum Industry With Regard to Energy Consumption and Emissions of Greenhouse Gases_Paper 1_Automotive*.

(13) International Aluminium Institute. *Life Cycle Assessment of Aluminum: Inventory Data for the Worldwide Primary Aluminum Industry*.

(14) International Aluminium Institute. *Life Cycle Assessment of Aluminum: Inventory Data for the Primary Aluminum Industry*.

(15) International Aluminium Institute. *Global Life Cycle Inventory Data for the Primary Aluminum Industry 2010 DATA*.

(16) International Aluminium Institute. *Life Cycle Inventory Data and Environmental Metrics for the Primary Aluminum Industry*.

(17) International Aluminium Institute. *Primary Aluminium Smelting Energy Intensity*. http://www.worldaluminium.org/statistics/primary-aluminium-smelting-energy-intensity/#linegraph (accessed 2019-06-15).

(18) IPCC. IPCC Guidelines for national greenhouse gas inventories. *Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme*.

(19) U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Industrial Technologies. *Energy and Environmental Profile of the U.S. Aluminum Industry*.

(20) International Aluminium Institute. *Primary aluminium smelting power consumption*. http://www.worldaluminium.org/statistics/primary-aluminium-smelting-power-consumption/#data (accessed 2019-06-20).

(21) International Aluminium Institute. *Aluminium carbon footprint technical support document*. http:// www.world-aluminium.org/media/filer_public/2018/11/22/carbon_footprint_technical_support_document_v1_ published.pdf.

(22) International Aluminium Institute. *Calculating direct GHG emissions from primary aluminum production calculation worksheets*. http://www.ghgprotocol.org/sites/default/files/ghgp/ Aluminium%20Sector%20GHG%20Workbook%20-%20version%202_1_0.xls.

(23) International Aluminium Institute. *IAI Statistical Survey Forms: Energy*. http://www.world-aluminium.org/ media/filer_public/2018/04/17/2018_iai_smelter_anode_energy_survey_form_84lDZLT.xlsx.

(24) Leontief, W. Environmental Repercussions and the Economic Structure: An Input-Output Approach. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* **1970**, *52* (3), 262. DOI: 10.2307/1926294.

(25) BEA. *Benchmark Input-Output Data*. https://www.bea.gov/industry/benchmark-input-output-data (accessed 2019-09-10).

(26) MIC. *Input-Output Table for 2005 (Comprehensive commentary)*. https://www.soumu.go.jp/toukei_ toukatsu/data/io/005index.htm (accessed 2019-09-10).

(27) ABS. *1292.0 - Australian and New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification (ANZSIC), 1993*. https:// www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/66f306f503e529a5ca25697e0017661f/ 82031A289B5EA094CA25697E0018FB48?opendocument (accessed 2019-09-12).

(28) Eurostat. *Index of correspondence tables*. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/ramon/relations/index.cfm? TargetUrl=LST_REL&StrLanguageCode=EN&IntCurrentPage=1 (accessed 2019-05-12).

(29) Antweiler, W. The Pollution Terms of Trade. *Economic Systems Research* **1996**, *8* (4), 361–366. DOI: 10.1080/09535319600000027.