Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY Faik Bilgili, Erciyes University, Türkiye

*CORRESPONDENCE José Balsa-Barreiro, ⊠ jobalbar@media.mit.edu

SPECIALTY SECTION

This article was submitted to Environmental Economics and Management, a section of the journal Frontiers in Environmental Science

RECEIVED 27 March 2023 ACCEPTED 31 March 2023 PUBLISHED 11 April 2023

CITATION

Balsa-Barreiro J, Wang S, Tu J, Li Y and Menendez M (2023), Editorial: The nexus between innovation and environmental sustainability. *Front. Environ. Sci.* 11:1194703. doi: 10.3389/fenvs.2023.1194703

COPYRIGHT

© 2023 Balsa-Barreiro, Wang, Tu, Li and Menendez. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Editorial: The nexus between innovation and environmental sustainability

José Balsa-Barreiro^{1,2}*, Shaojian Wang³, Jianjun Tu⁴, Yingcheng Li⁵ and Monica Menendez²

¹MIT Media Lab, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, United States, ²CITIES, Division of Engineering, New York University Abu Dhabi, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, ³Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Urbanization and Geo-simulation, School of Geography and Planning, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, China, ⁴College of Economics and Management, Southwest University, Chongqing, China, ⁵School of Architecture, Southeast University, Nanjing, China

KEYWORDS

environmental sustainability, globalization, policy analysis, spatial planning, technological innovation, complexity

Editorial on the Research Topic

The nexus between innovation and environmental sustainability

Osborn (1948) notably discussed environmental destruction by humankind, and since then, we have only faced growing concerns about resource over-consumption and environmental degradation. In the last few decades, it has become more evident that natural environments are increasingly stressed, potentially harming human communities even in the short to medium term (Steffen et al., 2015). At a global scale, humanity consumes natural resources 1.8 times faster than the rate at which those resources are generated. The consumption rate differs enormously between countries, ranging from 9 in Qatar to 0.3 in Yemen. The two most powerful global economies also show substantial differences: 5.1 (United States) and 2.4 (China) (Global Footprint Network, 2018). Such differences can be explained by factors related to production models and economic maturity, as well as collective lifestyles and behavioral patterns, which must be understood in the right context (Balsa-Barreiro et al., 2022a; Balsa-Barreiro et al., 2022b). Despite technological breakthroughs in recent decades, many scholars emphasize that global economic growth has not been decoupled from environmental impacts and resource needs (Parrique et al., 2019; Hickel and Kallis, 2020). As a result, many countries in the early stages of economic maturity, such as China and other Southeast Asian countries, are still willing to pay high environmental costs for economic growth (Balsa-Barreiro et al., 2019). The trend for the coming years will depend on the implementation of successful eco-innovative approaches, the shift to more mature economies in certain regions, and potentially other factors, such as the emergence of a new geopolitical scenario related to an eventual deglobalization (Balsa-Barreiro et al., 2020) and the emergence of major changes in the labor market (Rossi and Balsa-Barreiro, 2020).

In order to maximize benefits while reducing environmental costs, societies will have to cope with crucial transformations based on eco-innovative approaches. Environmental sustainability requires innovative methods to promote industrial upgrading, clean energy, green financing, and social responsibility toward the environment (Madaleno et al 2022). Many of these transformations will be technologically driven, but must still incorporate

multiple dimensions. Fukasaku (2020) refers to the key role of innovation policies, whereas Wiedmann et al. (2020) refer to lifestyle changes complementing technological shifts. Along this direction, we are observing how the most advanced countries are recently moving from linear economies to circular ones (Almeida and Cardoso, 2022; Nygaard, 2022) in order to shift away from the infinite-growth paradigm to alternative economic models that are compatible with ecological integrity.

The goal of this Research Topic is to analyze the link between innovation and environmental sustainability by evaluating factors such as knowledge (Dong et al.), finance policies (Gao et al.), trading (Andriamahery et al.), green financing (Zhang et al.), and environmental regulations (Sun; Chen et al.). These studies are conducted at different scales, from individuals (An et al.), to small datasets related to companies (Dong et al.; Zhang et al.), to wide regions in China (Dong et al.; Gao et al.; Sun et al.; Yin et al.) and Africa (Andriamahery et al.et al.; Chukwudi et al.). Zhang et al. (evaluating 49 countries) and Chen et al. (discussing OECD and Non-OECD economies) conducted the largest studies. In short, this Research Topic features 10 articles with contributions from 32 authors. Some highlights are summarized below:

Dong et al. evaluated 36 unicorn enterprises in China to study the relationship between knowledge and open innovation. Zhang et al. evaluated 176 innovative enterprises and demonstrated how the talent ecosystem and collaborative innovation positively affect innovation performance.

In China, Gao et al. evaluated the impact of science and technology finance policy on urban green development at the city level. They found that this impact varies by region and depends on the level of urban innovation, being more evident in the highly innovative cities located in the Midwestern region. Yin et al. analyzed how the innovation environment affected the transformation of resource-based cities in the Gansu Province during the last decade. Sun et al. estimated the impact of environmental regulations on innovation and productivity related to green agricultural technology across 30 provinces and cities. Results showed that as the level of regional economic development gradually increases, environmental regulation can have a significant impact on both innovation and productivity.

In Africa, Andriamahery et al. analyzed the relationship between trade and environmental quality in Sub-Saharan Africa. They estimated a set of trade variables such as income *per capita* growth, energy intensity, foreign direct investment, human capital, and CO₂ emissions. The results showed that trading has a consistently negative impact on the environment by increasing N₂O, ACH₄, and CO₂ emissions across the whole region, but also across the different income groups. Chukwudi et al. analyzed the asymmetric impact of technological innovation on CO₂ emissions in South Africa for the last six decades. They found that technological innovation helps reduce CO₂ emissions, whereas trade openness is

References

environmentally harmful over the long term, despite the fact that it can be beneficial in the short term.

Zhang et al. discussed how technological innovation and green finance can contribute to clean energy transition, carbon emission reduction, and climate change mitigation in 49 countries with green bonds. Chen et al. examined the combinatory impact of environmental policies and technological innovation on the ecological footprint both for OECD and Non-OECD economies. An et al. demonstrated the positive impact of Internet payment technology on environmental sustainability by evaluating 623 individuals in China.

The articles published on this Research Topic contribute to a better understanding of the "*Nexus between innovation and environmental sustainability*". Now that this Research Topic is completed, we will endeavor in next special issues to open new approaches by facilitating trans-disciplinary discussion on this and/or closely related Research Topic aimed to improve human welfare by respecting ecological integrity for future generations.

Author contributions

JB-B drafted the manuscript and the rest of authors reviewed it. All authors contributed to the editorial article and approved the submitted version.

Acknowledgments

JB-B and MM acknowledge the support of the NYUAD Center for Interacting Urban Networks (CITIES), funded by Tamkeen under the NYUAD Research Institute Award CG001.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Almeida, S., and Cardoso, A. (2022). Drivers and barriers in the transition from a linear economy to a circular economy. J. Clean. Prod. 341, 130865. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.130865

Balsa-Barreiro, J., Li, Y., Morales, A., and Pentland, A. (2019). Globalization and the shifting centers of gravity of world's human dynamics: Implications for sustainability. *J. Clean. Prod.* 239, 117923. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.117923

Balsa-Barreiro, J., Menendez, M., and Morales, A. (2022a). Scale, context, and heterogeneity: The complexity of the social space. *Sci. Rep.* 12, 9037. doi:10.1038/s41598-022-12871-5

Balsa-Barreiro, J., Menendez, M., and Morales, A. (2022b). Fitting the complexity of the social space into the right dimension. Nat. Portfolio

Behav. Soc. Sci. Available online at https://socialsciences.nature.com/posts/ fitting-the-complexity-of-the-social-space-into-the-right-dimension (Access March 14th, 2023).

Balsa-Barreiro, J., Vie, A., Morales, A., and Cebrian, M. (2020). Deglobalization in a hyperconnected world. *Nat. Palgrave Commun.* 6 (28), 28. doi:10.1057/s41599-020-0403-x

Fukasaku, Y. (2020). "Innovation for environmental sustainability: A background," in *Innovation and the environment* (Paris, France: OECD Proceedings).

Global Footprint Network (2018). Global footprint Network. https://www.overshootday. org/how-many-earths-or-countries-do-we-need (Access March 14th, 2023).

Hickel, J., and Kallis, G. (2020). Is green growth possible? New Polit. Econ. 25 (4), 469-486. doi:10.1080/13563467.2019.1598964

Madaleno, M., Dogan, E., and Taskin, D. (2022). A step forward on sustainability: The nexus of environmental responsibility, green technology, clean energy and green finance. *Energy Econ.* 109, 105945. doi:10.1016/j.eneco.2022.105945

Nygaard, A. (2022). From linear to circular economy: A transaction cost approach to the ecological transformation of the firm. *Circular Econ. Sustain.* 2, 1127–1142. doi:10. 1007/s43615-022-00158-w

Osborn, F. (1948). Our plundered planet. Boston, MA, USA: Little, Brown and Co.

Parrique, T., Barth, J., Briens, F., Kerschner, C., Kraus-Polk, A., Kuokkanen, A., et al. (2019). Decoupling Debunked: Evidence and arguments against green growth as a sole strategy for sustainability. Brussels, Belgium: European Environmental Bureau (EEB).

Rossi, E., and Balsa-Barreiro, J. (2020). The future of work in the post-COVID-19 world. *Econ. Political Wkly.* 55 (44), 23-26.

Steffen, W., Broadgate, W., Deutsch, L., Gaffney, O., and Ludwig, C. (2015). The trajectory of the anthropocene: The great acceleration. *Anthropocene Rev.* 2 (1), 81–98. doi:10.1177/2053019614564785

Wiedmann, T., Lenzen, M., Keyßer, L., and Steinberger, J. (2020). Scientists' warning on affluence. *Nat. Commun.* 11, 3107. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-16941-y