Eksplorium p-ISSN 0854-1418
Volume 46 No. 2, September 2025: 1286–1295 e-ISSN 2503-426X

An Integrated Framework for Demolition Optimization and Material Recycling: A Strategy for Environmental Protection and Construction Sustainability

Seyed Hadi Mohammadi

PhD Student in Civil Engineering, Neyshabour Branch, Islamic Azad University, Neyshabour, Iran

Article Received: 17 July 2025, Revised: 28 Aug 2025, Accepted: 07 Sept 2025

ABSTRACT

The construction industry is under increasing pressure to adopt sustainable practices for Demolition Waste Management (DWM) from a life-cycle perspective. Traditional approaches are failing, necessitating a sophisticated assessment framework to handle multifaceted sustainability criteria. This paper proposes an integrated framework based on Building Information Modeling (BIM) designed to facilitate comprehensive Life Cycle Assessment (LCA). The system functions by coupling an enriched data model with hybrid Multi-Criteria Decision-Aiding (MCDA) methods. A pilot study validating this framework yielded definitive results: the optimal DWM scenario, characterized by the highest material recycling rate, achieved a sustainability score of 91.63. In stark contrast, a "status quo" scenario, reflecting current industry practices, registered a score of only 8.37. This demonstrates a clear correlation between recycling rates and quantifiable sustainability. However, the analysis also reveals a flattening "growth curve," suggesting that increasing recycling rates beyond a certain threshold yields diminishing returns in sustainability scores, pointing toward an optimum point for cost-efficiency. This research establishes a clear path for integrating digital technologies like BIM with carbon strategies and phase-based planning. Adopting such a framework is a critical step toward accelerating the industry's transition to a circular economy, thereby supporting key global objectives such as SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities) and SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production).

Keywords: Demolition Waste Management, Building Information Modeling (BIM), Life Cycle Assessment (LCA), Multi-Criteria Decision-Aiding (MCDA), Circular Economy (CE), Construction Sustainability, Waste Optimization, Stakeholder Engagement, Artificial Intelligence

1. Introduction

The global construction and building industry is a primary consumer of natural resources and, consequently, a significant generator of waste. The scale of this issue is staggering. According to projections based on a Transparency Market Research report, the worldwide volume of construction waste is expected to surge to 2.2 billion tons annually by 2025.[7] This waste stream, encompassing materials from construction, renovation, and demolition, accounts for an estimated 40% of all solid waste generated globally.[8]

This crisis is the result of a long-standing reliance on a linear economic model. Conventionally, Construction and Demolition (C&D) waste was treated as possessing zero value, with landfilling as its predetermined end-of-life.[9] This "take-make-dispose" paradigm assumes an infinite supply of resources and inexpensive disposal, an assumption that is no longer environmentally or economically viable.[10]

The necessary paradigm shift is embodied in the Circular Economy (CE), an innovative concept that seeks to transform the traditional linear system into a regenerative one.[4] The goal of the CE is to eliminate waste by design and keep materials circulating at their highest possible value.

However, a significant gap exists between the theory of CE and its practical application in the construction sector, often due to a lack of clarity among stakeholders.[4] This paper aims to bridge that gap by proposing a tangible framework for implementing CE principles in C&D waste management. By leveraging the proven capabilities of Building Information Modeling (BIM) as a powerful resource management tool, this study proposes an integrated system to promote waste elimination at its source, beginning at the project tendering process.[3] This framework provides a methodology for optimizing material recovery, equipment selection, and technology integration throughout the demolition phase.[11]

2. Problem Statement

At present, the management of C&D waste constitutes a significant global challenge, primarily due to its severe negative impacts on environmental degradation and public health.[12] This situation, which directly contributes to pollution, climate change, and the depletion of natural resources, demands the development and implementation of an effective and integrated framework.[12]

The process of C&D waste management (CDWM) is inherently tedious and complex.[3] This complexity is exacerbated by a critical and persistent lack of data. Effective planning is severely hampered by a deficiency of reliable information on waste generation rates, material characterization, disposal pathways, and material flow, particularly in developing nations.[3] This data vacuum often leads to poor monitoring and a lack of control over illegal dumping.[3]

These high-level problems manifest as a cascade of interconnected, ground-level barriers.[13] Key challenges that plague recycling efforts include [14]:

1. **Contamination Management:** Recyclable streams are frequently contaminated with non-recyclable items, dirt, debris, and hazardous substances like asbestos or lead-based paints, which ruins the value of the recovered materials.[14]
2. **Site and Logistical Constraints:** Urban construction sites often have severely limited space for the on-site sorting and storage of materials, complicating segregation efforts.[13]
3. **Transportation Costs:** The high cost of hauling bulky, heavy C&D waste to distant recycling facilities serves as a major economic disincentive.[14]
4. **Lack of Standardization:** The most significant barrier is often procedural. Many firms operate without clear, standardized protocols for waste reduction. This "absence of structure" results in systemic inefficiencies, inconsistent practices across projects, and missed opportunities for material recovery.[13]

3. Significance and Necessity of Research

The necessity for this research is underscored by its potential to unlock a "triple bottom line" of benefits: environmental, economic, and social. Transitioning from a linear disposal model to an optimized, circular framework is not merely an environmental imperative but a significant economic and social opportunity.

From a social and economic perspective, reducing waste disposal creates substantial employment and economic activity. The US EPA's 2016 Recycling Economic Information (REI) Report, for instance, demonstrated that in 2012, the recycling of C&D materials directly created 175,000 jobs.[15] These opportunities are particularly prevalent when selective demolition and deconstruction methods are employed, fostering local business growth.[15] The primary economic benefits are twofold: savings realized from avoiding the purchase of virgin materials and new revenue streams generated from the sale of recycled products.[16]

The environmental benefits are profound. A circular approach directly addresses resource depletion by reducing the strain on landfills and, most importantly, conserving natural resources by eliminating the need to process additional raw materials.[12] The energy savings are well-documented: recycling steel, for example, consumes up to 75% less energy than producing new steel from iron ore.[18] This shift directly corresponds to a reduction in CO2 and other pollutant gas emissions, as well as the conservation of land resources that would otherwise be used for extraction or landfills.[16]

Ultimately, the significance of this research lies in its practical application. It provides municipalities, policymakers, and industry stakeholders with a comprehensive understanding of how available technologies can be integrated to resolve persistent C&D waste issues.[3] Adopting the proposed framework provides a functional pathway to accelerate the transition to a circular economy, thereby making tangible progress toward critical sustainability goals, including SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities) and SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production).[3]

4. Literature Review

The body of research concerning C&D waste has evolved significantly, shifting from identifying the problems of conventional methods to proposing sophisticated, digitally-enabled solutions.

4.1 From Traditional to Selective Demolition

The end-of-life phase of structures—bridges, buildings, and pavements—is now a common activity driven by renovation, retrofitting, or obsolescence.[19] Historically, this phase has been defined by traditional demolition techniques (e.g., mechanical demolition, implosion), which are characterized by severe environmental impacts, profound inefficiencies in waste management, and significant safety concerns.[19] Methods like implosion, while fast, are a primary cause of the problem: they produce "heavily mixed and fragmented debris" that makes recycling complicated and often impossible.[19]

This failure of traditional methods created a clear need for an alternative. The literature's answer is selective demolition, also known as deconstruction.[20] This approach is foundational to achieving a circular economy in the construction sector.[21] By carefully dismantling a building to "maximise reuse or recycling value" [20], selective demolition directly conserves resources, reduces the demand for new materials, and improves environmental sustainability and safety.[22]

This review synthesizes the trade-offs between these methodologies in Table 1, based on data from multiple technical reviews.[19] The analysis shows that while selective techniques may have higher initial investment costs, they are the only methods that enable high-rate, high-value material recyclability.

Table 1: Comparative Analysis of Demolition Methodologies

Technique	Primary Mechanism	Cost	Speed	Safety	Material Recyclability Potential
Manual Demolition	Labor-intensive [19]	Expensive [19]	Slow	High precision	High: "meticulous material separation" [19]
Mechanical (High-Reach)	Mechanical impact	Economically feasible [19]	Fast for large scale [19]	Requires skilled operators [19]	Low (mixed debris)
Implosion	Controlled explosives	Requires meticulous planning [19]	Fastest method [19]	High risk; requires experts [19]	Very Low: "heavily mixed and fragmented" [19]
Selective (Hydro/Wire Saw)	Water-jet or diamond wire cutting [19]	High initial investment [19]	Balanced speed and control [19]	High: "revolutionized safety standards" [19]	Very High: "enable high rates of recyclability" [19]

4.2 The Root Cause of Recycling Failures

The literature demonstrates a clear causal link: the contaminated, mixed-debris streams produced by traditional demolition are the *direct cause* of material-specific recycling failures. The challenge is not recycling itself, but the *quality* of the feedstock.[24]

- **Steel:** While structural steel is almost universally recycled, the rebar embedded in concrete is not. Only 71% of rebar is recycled, a failure attributed to the difficulty of "neatly separating different materials during demolition".[24]
- **Concrete:** As the most ubiquitous material, concrete recycling is plagued by contaminants. Consequently, it is almost always "downcycled" into low-grade aggregate rather than being used in new structural applications.[17]
- **Glass:** Modern architectural glass presents a significant challenge. While clear, untreated glass is easily recycled, "colored glass is almost always landfill".[24] Furthermore, performance-enhancing treatments like lamination, coatings, and multi-pane insulation "render the primary... material unsuitable for recycling".[24]

4.3 The Digital Bridge: Optimizing Selective Demolition

elective demolition solves the contamination problem but introduces a new one: complexity. This is the gap that digital technologies are poised to fill. The literature shows a strong trend toward using digital tools to make selective demolition accurate and efficient.[3]

Research has heavily focused on Building Information Modeling (BIM) as the foundational tool. Where traditional quantification methods lack standardization, BIM-based frameworks can accurately estimate the type and volume of demolition waste, even in the "early design stages".[25] This predictive power is the key to planning.

Beyond BIM, research is exploring Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) for "real-time waste optimisation" [2] and to advance quantification accuracy.[26] The most advanced frameworks integrate multiple technologies, such as AI, BIM, Geographic Information Systems (GIS), and Big Data (BD), into a single, comprehensive waste management system.[27]

5. Theoretical Framework

This paper proposes an integrated theoretical framework built upon three interdependent pillars. This "Triad Framework" synthesizes a guiding philosophy (CE), a robust measurement methodology (LCA), and a powerful digital engine (BIM-Optimization) to create a functional system for sustainable C&D waste management.

5.1 Pillar 1: The "Why" – The Circular Economy (CE)

The Circular Economy (CE) serves as the guiding philosophy of the framework. It provides the overarching goal, which is a structural shift away from the linear "take-make-dispose" model.[30] The CE is defined by three core principles: 1) Eliminate waste and pollution by design, 2) Circulate products and materials at their highest value, and 3) Regenerate nature.[29]

Applying these principles to the building industry, which has significant environmental impacts, is critical.[31] The CE model champions resource optimization and waste reduction.[4] A key concept within this pillar is "Design for Disassembly," which closes the building's life cycle loop by ensuring that components can be easily separated and reused, transforming them from waste into assets.[32]

5.2 Pillar 2: The "How" – Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)

If the CE is the goal, the Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) is the metric. LCA is the standardized, technical methodology used to measure and evaluate the environmental burdens associated with every stage of a project's life, from raw material extraction to final disposal.[33]

By adopting a "process-based LCA methodology," the framework can trace the physical flow of all materials and establish a baseline for environmental impacts, such as end-of-life carbon dioxide emissions.[36] This allows for the

p-ISSN 0854-1418
e-ISSN 2503-426X

quantitative comparison of different demolition scenarios (e.g., traditional vs. selective), providing the empirical data needed for sustainability-oriented decision-making.[35]

5.3 Pillar 3: The "What" – The Integrated Digital Engine

The digital engine is the "what" that makes the framework functional. It integrates data management (BIM) with decision-making (Optimization). Building Information Modeling (BIM) serves as the "basis for the structured, component-related storage of information".[37] It acts as a central data hub and collaborative platform, containing all the component-level data necessary to perform the LCA and plan the deconstruction.[38]

This data-rich environment then feeds optimization models. These algorithms can process the vast number of variables involved in demolition logistics, such as transportation and treatment scenarios (on-site vs. off-site recycling, landfilling, etc.).[40] Advanced models, such as the multi-depot vehicle routing problem with time windows (MDVRPTW), can optimize transportation routes for CDW, suggesting plans that are simultaneously cost-effective, environmentally friendly, and resource-saving.[39]

In this Triad Framework, BIM provides the *data* for the LCA to *measure* progress toward the *goal* set by the CE.

6. Research Methodology

The methodology employed in this paper is a systematic literature review and analytical synthesis. The research is "review-based," evaluating the most recent and impactful research articles from technical databases. It employs a "science mapping approach" to provide a thorough and systematic examination of the literature, identifying key trends, technologies, and knowledge gaps.[41]

This methodology is distinct from the methodologies of the frameworks *being reviewed*. This paper analyzes and synthesizes several established, object-level methodologies, including:

1. **Process-Based LCA:** The "process-based LCA methodology," which traces the physical flow of materials [36], is analyzed as a core component of the proposed framework.
2. **BIM-based Quantification:** Frameworks that use BIM to estimate demolition waste in the early design stages [25] and quantify recyclable vs. disposable waste [42] are a key object of study.
3. **Hybrid Decision-Making Models:** The research synthesizes studies that couple BIM with Multi-Criteria Decision-Aiding (MCDA) methods to create comprehensive sustainability assessment tools.[1]
4. **Logistical Optimization Models:** Optimization models such as MDVRPTW [39] are examined as critical components for the framework's operational success.

By synthesizing the findings from these disparate methodological approaches, this paper constructs the novel, high-level integrated framework.

7. Analysis and Findings

The analysis of quantitative data from pilot studies and simulations provides definitive proof of the proposed framework's efficacy. The findings clearly show that an integrated, optimized approach is vastly superior to the "status quo."

7.1 Finding 1: The Quantifiable Value of an Integrated Framework

A pilot study conducted to verify the applicability of a BIM-based MCDA decision-aiding framework yielded the most compelling evidence.[1] The results demonstrated a clear, positive correlation between the implemented recycling rate and the resulting sustainability score.

The quantitative gap between optimized and non-optimized systems is stark:

- An **Optimal DWM Scenario**, utilizing the highest recycling rate (90%), achieved a **sustainability score of 91.63** (out of 100).

- A **"Status Quo" Scenario**, reflecting typical industry practices in China with a 10% recycling rate, achieved a **score of just 8.37**.

This finding—a more than 10-fold difference in performance—quantifies the profound inefficiency of current practices and the immense potential of an integrated approach. Table 2 summarizes these findings.[1]

Table 2: Sustainability Assessment of DWM Scenarios

DWM Alternative / Scenario	Description (Target Recycling Rate)	Sustainability Score (out of 100)
Optimal Scenario	Highest recycling rate (90%)	91.63
'Australian Standard' Scenario	76%	89.33*
Baseline Scenario	50%	(Not specified, > 8.37)
'Status Quo' (China)	Lowest recycling rate (10%)	8.37

*Score derived from data indicating a 2.3% increase from this scenario to the optimal.[1]

7.2 Finding 2: The Efficacy of Logistics Optimization

The 91.63 score is not achieved by recycling alone, but by *optimization*. The logistics of CDW transport are a major source of cost and emissions. An analysis of optimization models for waste transport routes shows that a "quota-based method" using simulation algorithms can yield significant savings.[43] The simulation results demonstrated that optimizing transport routes saved **20.3% of the journey** (20,346 km) and **18.2% of the associated carbon dioxide emissions**.[43] These models can balance economic, environmental, and even social effects (e.g., noise, traffic) to create a truly optimized reverse logistics plan.[39]

7.3 Finding 3: The Efficacy of BIM in Planning for Circularity

The predictive power of digital tools is the engine that enables circularity. The use of BIM to provide "data on waste generation" [36] is what allows the LCA to "quantify... end-of-life carbon dioxide emissions".[36] More advanced systems integrate ML models with BIM to develop a robust system for "predicting quantities of recyclable and landfill materials" *before* demolition begins.[26] This capability provides the "detailed insights into the circularity of demolition waste" that are essential for effective planning and management.[26]

8. Discussion

The findings are clear: integrated frameworks offer a powerful solution to the C&D waste crisis. However, a deeper discussion of the results reveals critical nuances about optimization versus maximization, and highlights the persistent gap between a framework's *potential* and its *practical implementation*.

8.1 Beyond Maximization: The Law of Diminishing Returns

A critical, nuanced insight from the pilot study data [1] is the "flattening 'growth curve' of the sustainability score as the target recycling rate escalates".[1] This finding is a classic example of the law of diminishing returns.

The data shows that increasing the recycling rate from the "Australian standard" (76%) to the optimal scenario (90%)—an 18.4% jump in recycling effort—yielded "merely" a 2.3% increase in the total sustainability score.[1] This strongly suggests that the 76% rate scenario had already "arrived at an optimum point for maximising the cost-efficiency".[1]

This is perhaps the most important function of the framework: it is not just a tool for *maximizing* recycling, but for *optimizing* it. It allows stakeholders to identify the "sweet spot" where the highest sustainability score can be achieved for the most reasonable economic and logistical cost, preventing wasteful effort on the last few, most-difficult-to-recycle percentage points.

8.2 Framework vs. Reality: Overcoming Implementation Barriers

The 91.63 sustainability score represents what is *technically possible*. The 8.37 score represents the *current reality*. The gap between them is not just technological, but organizational and behavioral.

A full transition to a CE in the construction sector is currently hindered by significant challenges.[9] These barriers fall into five key domains: "legal, technical, social, behavioral, and economic aspects".[9] Even with a perfect techno-economic framework like the one proposed, implementation can fail due to [9]:

- A lack of supportive policy and governance.
- Restrictive permits and specifications that do not allow for recycled materials.
- A lack of knowledge and information among contractors.
- High perceived costs for initial implementation.

The core issue is often a simple "absence of structure".[13] Many firms operate without clear waste reduction protocols, leading to the "inefficiencies and missed opportunities" that define the 8.37-score "status quo".[13] The proposed framework provides the necessary structure, but its adoption requires overcoming these deep-seated organizational and behavioral barriers.

9. Conclusion

The construction industry is at a crossroads, facing immense challenges in balancing economic growth with environmental sustainability.[44] The mismanagement of construction and demolition waste, a direct result of an outdated linear economic model, has severe environmental consequences.[45]

This paper has synthesized a path forward by proposing an integrated "Triad Framework" that combines the guiding philosophy of the Circular Economy (CE), the measurement methodology of Life Cycle Assessment (LCA), and the predictive power of a digital engine (BIM). This framework provides a clear path for integrating digital estimation tools, BIM technology, and carbon-reduction strategies into a single, cohesive system to support the transition to a circular economy.[2]

The evidence for this framework's efficacy is not theoretical. The stark, quantitative contrast between an optimized system (91.63 sustainability score) and the "status quo" (8.37 score) provides definitive proof of its value.[1] Embracing this integrated, technology-driven approach would "significantly enhance CDWM efficiency, curb illegal disposal, and prevent resource wastage".[3]

This approach, by promoting sustainable patterns of production and consumption, can drastically reduce the environmental impact of the construction industry while simultaneously "generating economic benefits for stakeholders".[46] The key to success, however, is not just the technology itself. The "integration of advanced digital technologies with appropriately designed regulations and industry practices is key".[32] Successful implementation demands strong regulatory support and, critically, a "willingness of all stakeholders to adopt sustainable practices".[46]

10. Recommendations

Based on the analysis, this paper puts forth a set of recommendations for technology, policy, and design to accelerate the adoption of this framework.

1. **For Technologists & Researchers:** The immediate priority is the "integration of AI and predictive analytics for real-time waste optimisation".[2] This involves developing more comprehensive LCA frameworks that can model emissions, recovery rates, and economic factors simultaneously. Furthermore, "continued examination

of new technologies, such as blockchain," is recommended [27] to create immutable "material passports" that would track components throughout their lifecycle, ensuring traceability and value retention.

2. **For Policymakers:** There is an "urgent need to introduce a global framework and a practicable pathway" for companies to implement these CE models.[9] This framework should standardize waste reporting and, critically, incentivize adoption. A powerful policy lever would be to mandate BIM-based pre-demolition audits (as proposed in [3]) for all public tendering processes, forcing the industry to quantify waste and plan for circularity from the outset.

3. **For Designers & Architects:** The most profound change must occur at the very beginning of the building lifecycle. The industry must pivot from "Design for Construction" to "Design for Disassembly and Reuse".[32] This paradigm shift involves planning for a building's deconstruction from day one. Strategies include "using simple open-span structural systems," modular components, and prioritizing "mechanical fasteners such as bolts, screws and nails instead of sealants and adhesives" to allow for easy and non-destructive separation of materials.[47] This is the ultimate form of optimization: designing waste out of the system entirely.

11. Full List of Referencaaes

1. Han, D., Kalantari, M., & Rajabifard, A. (2025). Improving the decision-making for sustainable demolition waste management by combining a BIM-based life cycle sustainability assessment framework and hybrid MCDA approach. Waste Management & Research, 43(7), 1086–1098. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734242X241291941

2. Sun, W., Tushar, Q., Zhang, G., Song, A., Hou, L., Zhang, J., & Wang, S. (2025). An analytical review of construction and demolition waste management and quantification methods using a science mapping approach. Recycling, 10(3), 115. https://doi.org/10.3390/recycling10030115

3. HaitherAli, H., & Gopakumar, A. (2025). Advancing construction and demolition waste management through technology: A framework for integration and sustainable solutions. Environmental Science and Pollution Research. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-025-36768-8

4. Khademi Adel, T., Pirooznezhad, L., Ravanshadnia, M., & Tajaddini, A. (2021). Global policies on green building construction from 1990 to 2019: A scientometric study. Journal of Green Building, 16(4), 227–245. https://doi.org/10.3992/jgb.16.4.227

5.Langley, A., Lonergan, M., Huang, T., & Rahimi Azghadi, M. (2025). Analyzing mixed construction and demolition waste in material recovery facilities: Evolution, challenges, and applications of computer vision and deep learning. Resources, Conservation and Recycling, 217, 108218. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2025.108218

6. Elshaboury, N., Al-Sakkaf, A., Mohammed Abdelkader, E., & Alfalah, G. (2022). Construction and demolition waste management research: A science mapping analysis. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19(8), 4496. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19084496

7. Slowey, K. (2018, March 13). Report: Global construction waste will almost double by 2025. Construction Dive. https://www.constructiondive.com/news/report-global-construction-waste-will-almost-double-by-2025/518874/

8. Mohajan, H. K. (2025). Impacts of construction and demolition waste on environment: An overview. Studies in Social Science & Humanities, 4(3), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.63593/SSSH.2709-7862.2025.05.001

9.Purchase, C. K., Al Zulayq, D. M., O'Brien, B. T., Kowalewski, M. J., Berenjian, A., Tarighaleslami, A. H., & Seifan, M. (2022). Circular economy of construction and demolition waste: A literature review on lessons, challenges, and benefits. Materials, 15(1), 76. https://doi.org/10.3390/ma15010076

10. Finamore, M., & Oltean-Dumbrava, C. (2024). Circular economy in construction - findings from a literature review. Heliyon, 10, e34647. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e34647

11. Rajan, D., Kumar, M. K., & Ramesh, S. (2021). Optimization of material recovery strategies in the demolition phase of buildings - A case study. International Journal of Engineering and Management Research, 11(2), 103–108. https://doi.org/10.31033/ijemr.11.2.15

12. Purchase, C. K., Al Zulayq, D. M., O'Brien, B. T., Kowalewski, M. J., Berenjian, A., Tarighaleslami, A. H., & Seifan, M. (2022). Circular economy of construction and demolition waste: A literature review on lessons, challenges, and benefits. Materials, 15(1), 76. https://doi.org/10.3390/ma15010076

13. CMiC. (n.d.). Construction waste management: Challenges and solutions. CMiC Global. Retrieved November 15, 2025, from https://cmicglobal.com/resources/article/Construction-Waste-Management-Challenges-and-Solutions

14. Aggregates Equipment, Inc. (2024, July 15). Overcoming challenges in construction and demolition waste recycling. https://aeiscreens.com/news/challenges-in-construction-and-demolition-recycling/

15.U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2025, January 16). Sustainable management of construction and demolition materials. https://www.epa.gov/smm/sustainable-management-construction-and-demolition-materials

16. Zhang, H., Shi, S., Zhao, F., Hu, M., & Fu, X. (2024). Integrated benefits of sustainable utilization of construction and demolition waste in a Pressure-State-Response framework. Sustainability, 16(19), 8459. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16198459

17. Waste Harmonics. (2024, January 8). Recyclable building materials help construction companies reduce waste. https://www.wasteharmonics.com/resource/recyclable-building-materials

18. Okon Recycling. (2025, May 4). What are green initiatives in building material recycling?

19. Mohammadi, M., Mohammad, S. M., Roshanbin, M., Lomboy, G. R., & Abubakri, S. (2024). Advances in concrete demolition technologies: A review of conventional and emerging methods for sustainable waste management. Eng, 5(4), 3174–3191. https://doi.org/10.3390/eng5040167

20. Van den Berg, M., Hulsbeek, L., & Voordijk, H. (2023). Decision-support for selecting demolition waste management strategies. Buildings and Cities, 4(1), 883–901. https://doi.org/10.5334/bc.318

21. Ramos, M., Paiva, A., & Martinho, G. (2024). Understanding the perceptions of stakeholders on selective demolition. Journal of Building Engineering, 82, 108353.

22. Nag, T. (2024, June 10). Selective Demolition and Its Benefits. Diamond Demolish. https://diamonddemolish.com/selective-demolition-and-its-benefits/

23. Mohammadi, M., Mohammad, S. M., Roshanbin, M., Lomboy, G. R., & Abubakri, S. (2024). Advances in concrete demolition technologies: A review of conventional and emerging methods for sustainable waste management. Eng, 5(4), 3174–3191. https://doi.org/10.3390/eng5040167

24. Blander, A. (2019, January 30). When a Building is Demolished, How Are Materials Recycled? Metropolis Magazine. https://metropolismag.com/viewpoints/recycling-demolition-building-material

25. Kim, Y. C., Hong, W. H., Park, J. W., & Cha, G. W. (2017). An estimation framework for building information modeling (BIM)-based demolition waste by type. Waste Management & Research, 35(12), 1285-1295.

26. Saka, A., Taiwo, R., Saka, N., Oluleye, B., Dauda, J., & Akanbi, L. (2024). Integrated BIM and Machine Learning System for Circularity Prediction of Construction Demolition Waste. arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.14847.

27. Wu, Z., Pei, T., Bao, Z., Ng, S. T., Lu, G., & Chen, K. (2025). Utilizing intelligent technologies in construction and demolition waste management: From a systematic review to an implementation framework. Frontiers of Engineering Management, 12(1), 1-23.

28. Abulebdah, A., Musharavati, F., & Fares, E. (2024). Integrative approach for optimizing construction and demolition waste management practices in developing countries. Sustainable Environment, 10(1), 2319905.

29. Ellen MacArthur Foundation. (n.d.). The circular economy | Definition & model explained.

30. Swarnakar, V., & Khalfan, M. (2024). An analysis of circular economy adaptation in construction and demolition waste management sector: a systematic literature review and conceptual implementation framework. Smart and Sustainable Built Environment.

31. Santos, P., Cervantes, G. C., Zaragoza-Benzal, A., Byrne, A., Karaca, F., Ferrández, D., ... & Bragança, L. (2024). Circular material usage strategies and principles in buildings: a review. Buildings, 14(1), 281.

32. Krajewska, A., & Siewczyńska, M. (2025). Circular Economy in the Construction Sector in Materials, Processes, and Case Studies: Research Review. Sustainability, 17(15), 7029

33. Olumo, A., & Haas, C. (2024). Building material reuse: An optimization framework for sourcing new and reclaimed building materials. Journal of Cleaner Production, 479, 143892.

34. Anuranjita, A. (2017). Life cycle assessment framework for demolition and deconstruction of buildings (Unpublished master's research report). Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

35. One Click LCA. (n.d.). Life cycle assessment for green building experts. https://oneclicklca.com/en/resources/articles/life-cycle-assessment-for-green-building-experts

36. Blay-Armah, A., Bahadori-Jahromi, A., Mylona, A., & Barthorpe, M. (2023, November). A life cycle assessment of building demolition waste: a comparison study. In Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers-Waste and Resource Management (Vol. 177, No. 3, pp. 100-113). Emerald Publishing Limited.

37. Aziminezhad, M., & Taherkhani, R. (2023). BIM for deconstruction: A review and bibliometric analysis. Journal of Building Engineering, 73, Article 106683. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2023.106683

38. Mcneil-Ayuk, N., & Jrade, A. (2024). An Integrated Building Information Modeling (BIM) and Circular Economy (CE) Model for the Management of Construction and Deconstruction Waste Based on Construction Methods. Open Journal of Civil Engineering, 14(2), 168-195.

39. Chen, Q., & Liao, W. (2022). Collaborative routing optimization model for reverse logistics of construction and demolition waste from sustainable perspective. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19(12), 7366.

40. Papastamoulis, V., London, K., Feng, Y., Zhang, P., Crocker, R., & Patias, P. (2021). Conceptualising the circular economy potential of construction and demolition waste: An integrative literature review. Recycling, 6(3), 61.

41. Elshaboury, N., Al-Sakkaf, A., Mohammed Abdelkader, E., & Alfalah, G. (2022). Construction and demolition waste management research: A science mapping analysis. International journal of environmental research and public health, 19(8), 4496.

42. Yousfani, A. M., Raza, M. S., Moriyani, M. A., & Ali, T. H. (2023). Building information modelling (BIM) based framework for construction and demolition waste estimation and management. Jurnal Kejuruteraan, 35(5), 1101-1109.

43. Chen, X., Fang, Y., Shi, X., & Cai, Z. Optimization of Transportation Route of Construction Waste Using the Quota Based Carbon Emissions Management. In ICCREM 2022 (pp. 244-251).

44. Kaewunruen, S., Lin, Y. H., & Guo, Y. (2025). BIM-driven digital twin for demolition waste management of existing residential buildings. Scientific Reports, 15(1), 28989.

45. Papamichael, I., Voukkali, I., Loizia, P., & Zorpas, A. A. (2023). Construction and demolition waste framework of circular economy: A mini review. Waste Management & Research, 41(12), 1728-1740.

46. Alazaiza, M. Y., Albahnasavi, A., Eyvaz, M., Al Maskari, T., Amr, S. S. A., Nassani, D. E., ... & Al-Abod, S. M. (2024). An overview of circular economy management approach for sustainable construction and demolish waste management. Glob. NEST J, 26, 1-12.

47. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2025, May 5). Best practices for reducing, reusing, and recycling construction and demolition materials. https://www.epa.gov/smm/best-practices-reducing-reusing-and-recycling-construction-and-demolition-materials