

Enhancing the cosmetics industry sustainability through a renewed sustainable supplier selection model

Federica Acerbi, Roberto Rocca, Luca Fumagalli, Marco Taisch

Department of management, economics and industrial engineering, Politecnico di Milano, via Lambruschini 4/b, 20159, Milan, Italy,

federica.acerbi@polimi.it [corresponding author], roberto.rocca@polimi.it,
luca.l.fumagalli@polimi.it, marco.taischi@polimi.it

Federica Acerbi, PhD is a post-doc researcher at Politecnico di Milano (Italy). She got both her bachelor and master's degrees at Politecnico di Milano. She developed her PhD research in both academic and industrial contexts with attention towards sustainable operations management in manufacturing, focusing on data and information valorisation enabling the embracement of circular manufacturing. She has been and is still involved in European and national research projects. She is also involved in industrial consultancy projects with Italian and multinational companies facilitating their digital transformation. She is teaching assistant and tutor in two master courses at Politecnico di Milano: "Sustainable Manufacturing" and "Operations Management". She is co-leader of the Special Interest Group on Eco-Efficient and Circular Industrial Systems of IFIP WG 5.7.

Roberto Rocca is PhD candidate in the Manufacturing Group at the Department of Management, Economics and Industrial Engineering of the Politecnico di Milano, where he has been collaborating since 2016. His research interests are focused on Sustainable Manufacturing paradigm, Sustainability Metrics and Assessment, Circular Economy and I4.0 technologies supporting sustainable operations in manufacturing field. He is currently conducting his PhD on ICT data-driven architecture for Sustainable Manufacturing in the Cosmetics Industry.

Luca Fumagalli is Assistant Professor at Politecnico di Milano. He is Mechanical Engineer, graduated from Politecnico di Milano in 2006, and obtained his PhD in Industrial Engineering at Politecnico di Milano in 2010. He works on different research topics about production management, industrial services and in particular maintenance management related topics, with a specific concern on new technological solutions. His research activity has been related also to European research funded projects. Luca Fumagalli is co-director of the Industry 4.0 Lab at DIG and vice-director of Master Megmi delivered by MIP.

Marco Taisch is Full Professor at Politecnico di Milano, where he teaches *Digital Manufacturing, Sustainable Manufacturing* and *Operations Management*. He is one of the coordinators of the Manufacturing Group of the School of Management of Politecnico di Milano. He is vice-president of EFFRA and he is a member of the Board of the Italian Smart Factory Cluster. Since 2002, he has been particularly dedicated to the study of technological trends by carrying out technological Roadmaps and studies of Technologies foresight on Manufacturing, for the European Commission. He is co-founder and Scientific Chairman of the World Manufacturing Foundation. He is the President of MADE, the Competence Center of Milan.

Enhancing the cosmetics industry sustainability through a renewed sustainable supplier selection model

The cosmetics industry requires a long-term sustainable strategy to balance its continuously growing trend worldwide and its resources consumption. In this view, the suppliers' selection process is gaining more attention affecting products' overall sustainability. The objective of this contribution is hence to develop and validate the Cosmetics Sustainable Supplier Selection (C-SSS) model allowing the selection of sustainable suppliers for the cosmetic industry, evaluating them in an objective and balanced manner. The model was built relying on both scientific and grey literature, by incorporating the characteristics of existing SSS models usually used separately. The C-SSS enabled to integrate the EMM approach (to reduce the subjectivity), the ANP approach (to evaluate criteria interconnections), and the TOPSIS and ELECTRE models (to create a hybrid compensation model) to support managers in objectively selecting the most sustainable suppliers. The C-SSS model was applied and validated through an industrial use case in a cosmetics Italian company.

Keywords: Sustainability; cosmetics industry; sustainable supplier selection; vendor rating; sustainable supply chain

1. Introduction

Nowadays, the sustainability paradigm, which is based on the environmental, social, and economic pillars (i.e. the Triple Bottom Line (TBL)) (Elkington, 2013), is spreading all over the society, becoming a strategic element in governments and companies' plans due to the unprecedented uncontrolled resources usage (United Nations, 2015). In particular, the manufacturing sector is moving towards circular-oriented strategies influencing product design, production, distribution, and consumption (Bjørnbet *et al.*, 2021) (Federica Acerbi and Taisch, 2020a). Among all, due to its ever-growing size and massive consumption of natural resources, the cosmetics industry is required to update its current operations to face new sustainable requirements and norms (Pereira de Carvalho and Barbieri, 2012) (Rocca *et al.*, 2022). For instance, fair-

trade labels and sustainability indexes, such as those referred to Corporate Social Responsibility, are introduced to strengthen the relationships with several stakeholders, among which final users, with the goal to clarify the sustainable-oriented characteristics of a certain product (Bom *et al.*, 2019) and facilitate the stakeholders' engagement in the embracement of sustainability pillars (Gong *et al.*, 2019). Indeed, the cooperation with industrial entities, external to the company, and also with final consumers are fundamental to undertake a sustainable and circular-oriented path (Santa-Maria, Vermeulen and Baumgartner, 2021) independently from the industry in which the company operates. The growing attention to sustainability pillars (i.e., TBL) in the cosmetics industry (Ambak *et al.*, 2019; Amberg and Fogarassy, 2019) is hence becoming fundamental. Cosmetic products are increasingly spreading in our daily life activities, and consumers are becoming keener on purchasing green products, as environmental and ethical considerations are increasingly relevant factors in their purchase behaviour (Appolloni *et al.*, 2022). According to Bom *et al.* (2019), "cosmetics sustainability" can be defined "*as a complex and multi-faceted issue that cannot be evaluated considering single aspects, but using an integrated assessment about the environmental, social and economic dimensions and about the final product quality and performance*". The increasing importance of the cosmetics industry is visible from an economic perspective too; its value has been estimated at €76.7 billion at retail sales price in 2020 in Europe ("Cosmetics Europe - The Personal Care Association: Cosmetics Industry," 2021). Also, for the job market, the cosmetics industry represents for Europe a great player, accounting, in 2019, over 2 million jobs, out of which 167,730 were employed for the manufacturing of products ('Socio-Economic Contribution of the European Cosmetics Industry', 2019). The growing trend of this industry in the global market is evident having a steadily increment in the last

five years with a pick of the 5,5% in 2018 (*Cosmetic industry growth* | Statista, 2020). Therefore, considering, on one hand, the increasing growth of the cosmetics industry and, on the other hand, the necessity to start undertaking a path towards more sustainable systems, it is required by cosmetics manufacturing companies to engage in value chains with sustainable-oriented stakeholders (Fonseca-Santos, Antonio Corrêa and Chorilli, 2015; Bom, MRibeiro and Marto, 2020) and within this context to keep under control and assess the performances of the stakeholders across the entire value chain (Brown and Bajada, 2018). Therefore, starting from the design phase of products, which is responsible for most of the impacts of the subsequent product life cycle stages (Sassanelli *et al.*, 2020), it is fundamental to choose accurately all the products characteristics among which the materials and thus the related suppliers (Federica Acerbi and Taisch, 2020b) (F Acerbi and Taisch, 2020). Actually, in the extant literature emerged that the two key challenges for sustainability initiatives in value chain flexibility are the lack of suppliers' commitment to sustainable products and the lack of sustainable knowledge along the value chain (Dwivedi *et al.*, 2021). Considering that suppliers might influence the sustainability performances of products and of the entire supply chain (Song, Xu and Liu, 2017) their involvement in the sustainability pathway of producers becomes essential. The scientific literature reports some models to properly select sustainable suppliers such as the one by (van Thanh and Lan, 2022) that is focused on the food industry or the one by (Wang *et al.*, 2022) focused on the resiliency of the supply chain to ensure the supply of critical resources. However, there are still some open points not yet covered by them. For instance, it is still lacking a clear definition of criteria to evaluate suppliers specifically for the context of cosmetics companies under the sustainability umbrella; (Atthirawong, 2020) proposed a preliminary study on cosmetics and then, the research by (Tong, Pu and Ma, 2019) can

be considered closed to cosmetics being it focused on chemical industry but there is not a comprehensive sustainable oriented model focused on cosmetics. Moreover, existing Sustainable Supplier Selection (SSS) models usually cover the TBL pillars in an unbalanced manner (e.g. (Hashemi, Karimi and Tavana, 2015) is focused mainly on economic and environmental aspects). In addition, they may not take into account potential subjective judgements (e.g. (Liu *et al.*, 2019)) or interdependences among criteria (e.g. (Amindoust, 2018)) or the possibility to have more than one decision-maker (e.g. (Hendiani *et al.*, 2020)). There is the need to develop a unique comprehensive model to cover the emerged literature gap and concretely support cosmetics companies in selecting the best sustainable suppliers in accordance with their strategic needs. For this reason, the research objective (RO) of this contribution is to overcome this open gap and develop a novel model allowing the selection of suppliers for cosmetic companies, evaluating them in a balanced and objective manner according to a set of criteria suggesting their sustainability-oriented performances. In doing that, the integration of already existing supplier selection models, which often employ a silos approach, covering the key above mentioned relevant characteristics and weaknesses have been conducted to finally have a complete model tailored on the cosmetics industry. An initial proposal, but neither comprehensive nor focused on cosmetics, was made by (Yu, Zhao and Li, 2019) that included in a single model the Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS) and the Elimination and Choice Translating Reality (ELECTRE) methods, although it assumed that the criteria are independent among each other. Further details will be given in the literature review and model development sections.

The remainder of this contribution is structured as follows. Section 2 reports the research methodology employed to address the RO. Section 3 elucidates the key criteria

to be included for the SSS process tailored on cosmetics companies and it also analyses the already existing SSS models. Section 4 describes the novel model (i.e. Cosmetic Sustainable Supplier Selection model (C-SSS model)) developed after a comparison and selection of the already existing ones identified in the extant literature. Section 5 validates the model based on its application in an industrial case. Section 6 discusses the results highlighting the key practical and theoretical implications. Last, Section 7 concludes the contribution by also highlighting the key limitations opening towards future research opportunities.

2. Research Methodology

To address the RO, thus developing a comprehensive model for the SSS for cosmetics companies, it has been firstly conducted a review of the extant literature. This review was performed to ensure to keep into account all the key sustainable-oriented criteria, thus covering the entire TBL, relevant for cosmetics companies and to analyze the already developed SSS models also in terms of structure. Then, the developed model has been applied and validated in a real industrial case. More in detail, the research process followed in this contribution is depicted in Figure 1 and explained below.




Figure 1 Research process

1. A literature review was conducted to analyze especially the SSS models already available in the extant literature to identify the needed criteria and the characteristics of the existing SSS models. This review has been performed mainly on Scopus database, based on the following string: TITLE-ABS-KEY (("sustainabl*" OR "circular" OR "green") AND (("supplier*" OR "vendor*") AND ("selection model*" OR "choice model*"))) AND (LIMIT-TO (LANGUAGE , "English")). This string generated an outcome of 75 contributions, out of which 42 have been considered eligible to be reviewed being them focused on the manufacturing sector, on sustainability-related issues, on supplier selection models and not only on supply chain management. Actually, few contributions were focused specifically on cosmetics and only some of them concerned the chemical, pharmaceutical and food industries (e.g. (van Thanh and Lan, 2022)) which might have some characteristics adherent to the cosmetics one. Therefore, to ensure to grasp all the needed criteria, other documents also coming from grey literature have been reviewed (e.g. the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standards). Moreover, through a snowball process and suggestions from experts, 40 contributions were added to the systematic literature review results. Out of these 40 contributions, 25 contributions were included in the review to extend the analysis about the cosmetic-related criteria to be assessed during the SSS process. The other 15 contributions were added to enlarge the analysis over the already existing SSS models to ensure the evaluation of all the possible models' characteristics. This initial stage enabled to achieve the following tasks.

1.1. Identification and selection of the criteria to be included in the C-SSS model. This step of the methodology relied on the analysis of contributions and documents available in different databases, thus not only Scopus. To ensure to consider all the criteria required in the SSS process for cosmetics companies (i.e.,

including norms, regulations, and standards), the analysis of the criteria already used in previous SSS models has been merged with the ISO standards developed for the industry, which were analysed through the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) lenses.

1.2. Analysis of the eligible models available in the extant literature and selection of those coherent with the RO. A deep analysis of the already existing SSS models available in the extant literature has been performed. This enabled to evaluate their key strengths, to be included in the novel model, and their key weaknesses, to be overcome through the novel model, leading to the integration of different SSS models into a comprehensive one.

2. Development of the novel C-SSS model. Based on the literature review findings, especially on those contributions tailored on the cosmetics industry (e.g. (Atthirawong, 2020)), a C-SSS model has been developed. As previously anticipated, the model has been conceptualized grounding on the literature findings, both scientific and grey literature, and it has been concretely built to be applied to an industrial use case. The concrete realization of the model was possible thanks to the integration of an excel file and an open-source software, “*SuperDecisions*” (SuperDecisions, 2022). These two technical tools are simple to be used and affordable for any type of company while ensuring to cover all the steps required in selecting the proper supplier by a cosmetics manufacturer (all the steps are detailed in the model application section).

3. Application and validation of the model. As previously anticipated, the model has been applied and validated in a Small and Medium Enterprise operating in the cosmetics industry localized in the north of Italy.

More specifically, the flow chart for the model conceptualization, development, and application is summarized in Figure 2 which shows the steps employed starting from the

literature findings. Additional details for the selection of the approaches are reported in sections 3 and 4, summarized in Figure 6 reported in sub-section 4.1.




Figure 2 Research design for the realization of the C-SSS model

3. Literature Review

The increased need for sustainable-related accountability by cosmetics companies to address the requests coming from clients, public opinion, and governments with new norms and regulations, led to the need to create resilient and sustainable supply chains (Pereira de Carvalho and Barbieri, 2012). This need requires a careful and thoughtful selection of partners and suppliers (Giannakis *et al.*, 2020). Thus, the SSS process emerged to be a core aspect for the creation of a sustainable cosmetics supply chain (Chai, Liu and Ngai, 2013; Fortunati, Martiniello and Morea, 2020). This process can be defined as *“the process by which firms identify, evaluate, and contract with suppliers [...] to reduce purchase risk, maximize overall value to the purchaser, and develop closeness*

and long-term relationships between buyers and suppliers” (Taherdoost and Brard, 2019).

In general, the criteria for the selection of suppliers have changed over time moving from only quantitative indicators (e.g., price), to a mix of both qualitative and quantitative considerations (Tong, Pu and Ma, 2019). Currently, within these criteria, also the sustainability-oriented ones need to be considered, giving a new name to the process: “Sustainable Supplier Selection” (SSS) process defined as “*a comprehensive consideration of economic, environmental and social aspects in supplier selection process*” (Yu, Zhao and Li, 2019).

In this regard, the analysis of the required criteria for a SSS process undertaken by a cosmetic company, together with an analysis of the existing SSS models present in the extant literature are elucidated below.

3.1. SSS Criteria in Cosmetics

This chapter aims to clarify the key sustainable-oriented criteria to be included in a SSS model for the cosmetics industry looking at both scientific literature (sub-section 3.1.1.) and ISO standards (sub-section 3.1.2).

3.1.1. Criteria from scientific literature

The extant literature, in addition to the standard criteria of price, quality, flexibility and delivery suggested, in most of the contributions (e.g. (Bai and Sarkis, 2010), (Hashemi, Karimi and Tavana, 2015)) highlighted a set of criteria which can be clustered into four key classes to be considered in the SSS process, especially while dealing with the cosmetic industry: (i) safety, (ii) environmental pollution, (iii) aquatic toxicity and (iv) sourcing and resource consumptions. A brief explanation of the four classes is described

below, and Table 1 summarizes the most relevant criteria and sub-criteria identified for the already existing SSS models.

Table 1 Sustainable-related criteria in SSS models

Criteria	Sub Criteria	Reference
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and safety • Health and safety incidents • Health and safety practices • Staff training • Employer Rights • Cost of work safety and labor health • Social Commitment • Local community influence 	(Bai and Sarkis, 2010) (Hashemi, Karimi and Tavana, 2015) (Park, Okudan Kremer and Ma, 2018)(Amindoust, 2018)(Tavassoli, Saen and Zanjirani, 2020)(Hendiani <i>et al.</i> , 2020)(Kaur <i>et al.</i> , 2020)(Tong, Pu and Ma, 2019) (van Thanh and Lan, 2022) (Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2022) (Rahmadani and Suparno, 2021) (Sahota, 2014) (Sreedhar <i>et al.</i> , 2020) (Kaur <i>et al.</i> , 2020) (Thanh and Lan, 2022)
Environmental Pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pollution control • Production of toxic products • Production of waste • Environmental Pollutant effects cost • Current environmental efficiency • Average volume of air pollutants, solid waste, and harmful materials released 	(Bai and Sarkis, 2010)(Kuo, Wang and Tien, 2010) (Hashemi, Karimi and Tavana, 2015) (Hendiani <i>et al.</i> , 2020)(Kaur <i>et al.</i> , 2020)(Tong, Pu and Ma, 2019)(Fallahpour <i>et al.</i> , 2021) (van Thanh and Lan, 2022) (Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2022) (Li <i>et al.</i> , 2021) (Rahmadani and Suparno, 2021) (Dhanirama, Gronow and Voulvoulis, 2012) (Guerranti <i>et al.</i> , 2019) (Sahota, 2014) (Freeman and Chen, 2015) (Mohammadi <i>et al.</i> , 2017) (Khalilzadeh and Derikvand, 2018) (Kaur <i>et al.</i> , 2020) (Thanh and Lan, 2022)
Aquatic Toxicity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production of polluting agents • Average volume of wastewater 	(Bai and Sarkis, 2010) (Hashemi, Karimi and Tavana, 2015) (Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2022) (Vita <i>et al.</i> , 2018) (Bom <i>et al.</i> , 2019) (Secchi <i>et al.</i> , 2016)

Sourcing and resource consumption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consumption of energy • Consumption of raw material • Consumption of water • Environmental programs • Energy Efficiency • Eco-design • Green R&D and innovation • Use of environment friendly material • Recycled Material • Energy Conservation 	(Bai and Sarkis, 2010)(Kuo, Wang and Tien, 2010) (Hashemi, Karimi and Tavana, 2015) (Amindoust, 2018)(Tavassoli, Saen and Zanjirani, 2020)(Hendiani <i>et al.</i> , 2020)(Kaur <i>et al.</i> , 2020)(Fallahpour <i>et al.</i> , 2021) (van Thanh and Lan, 2022) (Jayant and Paul, 2014) (Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2022)(Li <i>et al.</i> , 2021)(Rahmadani and Suparno, 2021) (Bom, MRibeiro and Marto, 2020) (Secchi <i>et al.</i> , 2016)(Jaccarini and Refalo, 2017) (Schneiders and Anklin, 2013) (Pulverail and Givaudan, 2013) (Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2022) (Freeman and Chen, 2015) (Mohammadi <i>et al.</i> , 2017) (Khalilzadeh and Derikvand, 2018) (Kaur <i>et al.</i> , 2020) (Thanh and Lan, 2022)
-----------------------------------	---	--

Safety concerns are among the most relevant criteria to be considered when looking at the ingredients and the chemicals used in cosmetics products. To evaluate product safety, manufacturers need to perform a risk assessment starting from product development until the marketing cycle (Engasser *et al.*, 2007). Moreover, there are several standards worldwide to be addressed among which the 1938 Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and its amendments in the Unites States, and 1976 EU Cosmetics Directive and its revisions in the European Union (Engasser *et al.*, 2007). Another important issue for the cosmetics industry is the animal testing (Sahota, 2014). Although these practices are required to prevent humans from negative consequences on safety issues of cosmetic products, concerns for animals' treatment and wellbeing arose and actions against these practices have been taken (Sreedhar *et al.*, 2020). For instance, in Europe, the first action on the implementation of a ban on sales and import of cosmetics tested on animals was

taken in 2013, followed by India in 2014 and New Zealand in 2015 (Sreedhar *et al.*, 2020). This attention led to the rising of vegan-friendly and cruelty free cosmetics brands (InVitro International, 2019). In other countries, this attention is still limited, and no regulations are present although alternatives to animal testing are available (e.g., the Virtual Human Platform (VHP) (Cosmetic Europe, 2020)).

Environmental pollution is another criterion to be included in the analysis, considering that cosmetics products contain a wide range of chemicals and some of them are labeled as “chemicals of emerging concern” (Dhanirama, Gronow and Voulvoulis, 2012). In this sense, an important aspect to be considered is the use of microbeads in cosmetics formulations. Microbeads are solid microplastic spheres with small diameter (less than 5mm) used in cosmetics products to perform for instance the skin exfoliation (Guerranti *et al.*, 2019). Being them composed by plastic material that might be dispersed in the aquatic plants, the substitution with natural ingredients has been considered since they pose a threat to the wellbeing of the ecosystem and to the biodiversity loss (Guerranti *et al.*, 2019). Actually, the use of plastic materials has impact on both the formulation and the packaging. Plastic represents hence one of the most diffused materials for the packaging because of its flexibility and lightness (Sahota, 2014). There are actions to start thinking at different packaging as the proposal by (Jaccarini and Refalo, 2017) (Cosmetics Europe, 2019) of bio-based packaging and the introduction of design for environment practices.

Aquatic toxicity is another important issue to be considered in this industry since after the use phase, several products enter the aquatic environment, and traditional methods of treatment can be used only to remove a limited amount of this waste (Vita *et al.*, 2018). Among the most diffused ingredients representing a threat for the aquatic environment there are the parabens, UV filters in solar protection, antimicrobial and

preservatives agents (Vita *et al.*, 2018). Moreover, the petrochemical derivatives are other ingredients to be kept under control since they generate emissions having a non-renewable nature, and the silicones too should be considered being them bioaccumulate and thus posing threat to aquatic life (Bom *et al.*, 2019). Another key aspect to be kept into account in the cosmetics industry is the quantity of water used in the production process that was reported to be one of the most relevant issues after a Life Cycle Assessment study conducted on a bio-based cosmetic product (Secchi *et al.*, 2016).

Additionally, considering the relevant role of the raw materials and ingredients of cosmetics products and of their packaging, also their *sourcing and their resource consumptions* represent important elements in cosmetics (Jaccarini and Refalo, 2017) (Secchi *et al.*, 2016) (Bom, MRibeiro and Marto, 2020). The ingredients used come from regions worldwide with different conditions and different resource consumptions. Therefore, it cannot be taken for granted that natural ingredients are more sustainable in respect with artificial or synthetic ones. Indeed, there are several issues concerning environmental and social aspects to be considered especially in the procurement phase when ingredients are selected (Bom *et al.*, 2019). Some certifications have been introduced such as the fair-trade partnerships ensuring to operate in a social and environmental responsible manner (Schneiders and Anklin, 2013). In fact, traceability and transparency along the supply chain are becoming more and more relevant in this sense (Pulverail and Givaudan, 2013), also because the cosmetic value chains and more specifically the networks of suppliers are mainly global. This might bring some concerns such as great levels of uncertainty, hidden costs and, different national regulations (Manuj and Mentzer, 2008). For these reasons, sustainable suppliers' development practices have been put in place to support suppliers in improving their performances and capabilities

according to the customer needs creating long-term relationships (Sancha, Longoni and Giménez, 2015) (Belotti Pedroso *et al.*, 2021).

3.1.2. Criteria from ISO linked to SDGs

As reported in the methodology section, the ISO standards specifically designed for the cosmetics industry have been investigated to evaluate the performances of a supplier in terms also of adherence to sustainable-oriented standards already in use in the industrial world. The ISO were analysed in combination with the SDGs to highlight their sustainability-oriented value as reported in Table 2.

Table 2 ISO and related SDGs for the cosmetics industry

Sub-field	Name	Year	SDG
Analytical approach for screening and quantification methods for heavy metals in cosmetics	ISO/TR 17276	2014	-
Analytical method	ISO/TR 18818	2017	-
	ISO 10130	2009	3
	ISO 12787	2011	3
	ISO/TR 14735	2013	-
	ISO 15819	2014	3
	ISO/TS 22176	2020	3
Calculation of organic indexes of hydrolates	ISO/TR 23199	2019	-
Determination of sunscreen UVA photoprotection in vitro	ISO 24443	2012	3
Good Manufacturing Practices	ISO/TR 24475	2010	-
	ISO 22716	2007	3, 8
Guidelines on technical definitions and criteria for natural and organic cosmetic ingredients	ISO 16128-2	2017	3, 12
	ISO 16128-1	2016	3, 12
Guidelines on the stability testing of cosmetic products	ISO/TR 18811	2018	-
Methods of extract evaporation and calculation of organic indexes	ISO/TR 22582	2019	-
Microbiology	ISO 11930	2019	3
	ISO 16212	2017	9
	ISO 17516	2014	3
	ISO 18415	2017	3
	ISO 18416	2015	3
	ISO/TR 19838	2016	-
	ISO 21148	2017	3
	ISO 21149	2017	3
	ISO 21150	2015	3
	ISO 21322	2020	-
ISO 22717	2015	3	

	ISO 22718	2015	3
	ISO 29621	2017	3
Packaging and labelling	ISO 22715	2006	3
Sun protection test methods	ISO 16217	2020	3
	ISO 18861	2020	3
	ISO 24442	2011	3
	ISO 24444	2019	3
	ISO/TR 26369	2009	-

3.2. SSS Models Analysis

Considering the list of criteria to be kept into account in cosmetics, it is important to find a solution allowing to include all these criteria in a comprehensive assessment model by giving them the proper weight. In this regard, the extant literature presents some possibility in terms of SSS models, even though the majority is not focused on the cosmetics industry. In Table 3 the extensive analysis is described by reporting the type of model adopted, the limitations or strengths highlighted by the authors, the industry in which the model was applied (if available), and the sustainable pillars considered in the criteria used in the model.

Table 3 SSS Models analysis

References	Model and Theory adopted	Limitations or Strengths	Industry	Criteria
(Chan and Chan, 2004)	AHP	It does not consider interdependencies among criteria	advanced technology industry	n.a.
(Lee <i>et al.</i> , 2009)	Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) and Fuzzy Set Theory (FST)	FST reduces the subjectivity level	n.a.	n.a.
(Zhou, Li and Yu, 2009)	ANP-ENTROPY-TOPSIS	It considers the TOPSIS approach once the weights have been weighted and aggregated	n.a.	n.a.

(Bai and Sarkis, 2010)	Rough set theory (RST)	Huge amount of data and information should be available to use this model	n.a.	TBL criteria
(Kuo, Wang and Tien, 2010)	Artificial Neural Network (ANN) and two multi-attribute decision analysis (MADA) methods: data envelopment analysis (DEA) and analytic network process (ANP)	ANN is based on historical data.	n.a.	Environmental criteria
(Jolai <i>et al.</i> , 2011)	AHP and TOPSIS	It enables to consider several alternatives	n.a.	n.a.
(Zeydan, Çolpan and Çobanoğlu, 2011)	Fuzzy AHP, TOPSIS, DEA	Fuzzy numbers limit the subjectivity	n.a.	n.a.
(Dai and Blackhurst, 2012)	AHP and Quality Function Deployment (QFD)	It does not consider interdependencies among criteria	n.a.	Business-related criteria
(Lan, 2013)	Preference Ranking Organization Method for Enrichment Evaluation (PROMETHEE)	Not focused specifically on sustainability	n.a.	n.a.
(Jayant and Paul, 2014)	ANP (Analytic network process)	The ANP enables to capture the interdependencies among various criteria.	Agricultural-Machinery Industry	Environmental Criteria
(Liu, 2014)	Group Eigenvalue Method (GEM)	Not focused on sustainability	Food	n.a.
(Azadi <i>et al.</i> , 2015)	Fuzzy DEA	Qualitative variables can be transformed into quantitative variables	n.a.	n.a.
(Freeman and Chen, 2015)	AHP – Entropy - TOPSIS	AHP and Entropy were used to create the weights	electronic machinery manufacturer	Environmental and economic criteria

		and the TOPSIS to perform the ranking		
(Hashemi, Karimi and Tavana, 2015a)	Analytic network process (ANP), Grey relational analysis (GRA) and Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS)	ANP includes the interdependencies among criteria	automotive industry	Environmental and Economic Criteria
(Mei, Ye and Zeng, 2016)	Entropy Measured Method (EMM) to generate Entropy-weighted ANP	It aims to reduce the level of subjectivity asking to the decision makers to evaluate the suppliers' capability and not the weights	One-of-a-kind production	n.a.
(Um, 2016)	AHP and fuzzy set ranking methodologies	Fuzzy set ranking methodologies are used to integrate multiple attribute decision problem reducing the uncertainties	n.a.	Environmental criteria
(Mohammadi <i>et al.</i> , 2017)	type 2 fuzzy sets (IT2FSs)	type 2 fuzzy sets (IT2FSs) enable to deal with uncertainties	n.a.	Environmental and Economic criteria
(Tang, 2017)	MCDM	No specific limitations	n.a.	n.a.
(Amindoust, 2018)	FST, Fuzzy Inference System (FIS) and DEA	Focused only on affinity index of each supplier respect to resiliency and sustainability Moreover, it does not consider the dependencies among indicators	producer of special alloy for petrol container for vehicles	TBL including resilience

(Awasthi, Govindan and Gold, 2018)	Fuzzy AHP - VIKOR	Fuzzy numbers limit the subjectivity	electronic goods manufacturing company	n.a.
(Khalilzadeh and Derikvand, 2018)	stochastic programming and LP-metric method	stochastic programming is used to manage the uncertainty and the LP-metric method enables to solve the multi-objective model as a single-objective model	n.a.	Environmental and Economic criteria
(Sahu <i>et al.</i> , 2018)	Integration of VIKOR, SAW and GRA methodology	These methods support the ranking and selection of the weaknesses and strengths of companies	n.a.	n.a.
(Sahu, Sahu and Sahu, 2018)	Interval-valued fuzzy numbers (IVFNs)	Fuzzy numbers cover issues related to uncertainties. Nevertheless, there are very few criteria considered in the model concerning environmental, green and social issues	n.a.	n.a.
(Park, Okudan Kremer and Ma, 2018)	Multi-attribute utility theory (MAUT); Multi-objective integer linear programming (MOILP)	More than one objective can be taken into account	bicycle producer	Regional – related criteria
(Zhang, 2018)	Entropy weight method (EWM) and TOPSIS		Construction	n.a.

(Chen, Wang and Tan, 2019)	Six Sigma	The main indicator should be related to the quality of suppliers	n.a.	n.a.
(Chen, Huang and Chang, 2019)	Six Sigma	Based on QUALITY	n.a.	n.a.
(Liu <i>et al.</i> , 2019)	Best-worst method (BWM) and alternative queuing method (AQM)	The ranking results of sustainable suppliers through this model are highly dependent upon decision makers' subjective evaluations	n.a.	n.a.
(Memari <i>et al.</i> , 2019)	Fuzzy TOPSIS	Fuzzy numbers limit the subjectivity	n.a.	n.a.
(Rashidi and Cullinane, 2019)	Fuzzy DEA and fuzzy TOPSIS		n.a.	n.a.
(Tong, Pu and Ma, 2019)	FST and TOPSIS	It is considered an opportunity to include more quantitative criteria and use different MCDM tools	Chemical Industry (assessment for evaluating equipment maintenance suppliers in the chemical industry,)	n.a.
(Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2019)	FST	Focused mainly on the assessment of resilience performances of suppliers	n.a.	n.a.

(Yadavalli <i>et al.</i> , 2019)	Fuzzy TOPSIS	Fuzzy numbers limit the subjectivity	General (manufacturing)	n.a.
(Yazdani <i>et al.</i> , 2019)	decision-making trial and evaluation laboratory (DEMATEL) + (evaluation based on distance from average solution) EDAS + VIKOR (Vlse Kriterijumska Optimizacija I Kompromisno Resenje)	EDAS to prioritise the alternatives. Uncertainties are not considered, thus it is suggested to use fuzzy numbers in the future	Manufacturing in general	Environmental criteria
(Yu, Zhao and Li, 2019)	TOPSIS method and the Elimination and Choice Translating Reality (ELECTRE) method	This research assumed that sustainable criteria are independent among each other.	home appliances	n.a.
(Atthirawong, 2020)	TOPSIS	Focused on cosmetic	cosmetic	n.a.
(Chen, Huang and Chang, 2020)	Six Sigma	Focused only on QUALITY	n.a.	n.a.
(Deniz, 2020)	MCDM, pairwise comparison among criteria, TOPSIS	It overcomes the cognitive biases	n.a.	n.a.
(el Mariouli and Abouabdellah, 2020)	Fuzzy DEMATEL		n.a.	n.a.
(Giannakis <i>et al.</i> , 2020)	ANP	It enables to clarify the links present among the criteria	n.a.	n.a.
(Hendiani <i>et al.</i> , 2020)	Multi-criteria decision making (MCDM)	This model was built for a context in which only one decision maker is involved.	n.a.	TBL criteria

(Kaur <i>et al.</i> , 2020)	MCDM based on Mixed integer linear program (MILP); Mixed Integer Non-Linear Program (MINLP)	There are not specific limitations, but the authors stated that in the future other approaches like fuzzy-MCDM such as fuzzy-ISM, fuzzy-DEMATEL, fuzzy-TISM, fuzzy-ELECTREE, fuzzy-PROMETHEE etc might be adopted	n.a.	Environmental and Social Criteria
(Liu <i>et al.</i> , 2020)	MCDM method integrating regret theory and QUALIFLEX method		automotive industry	n.a.
(Tavassoli, Saen and Zanjirani, 2020)	DEA	Limited set of criteria considered	n.a.	TBL (high - level perspective)
(Fallahpour <i>et al.</i> , 2021)	Fuzzy preference programming (FPP) and multi-objective optimization on the basis of ratio analysis (MOORA)	It cannot be considered a predictive model to be used in the future for intelligent-based models	Food	Environmental Criteria
(Li <i>et al.</i> , 2021)	MCDM integrating BWM and TODIM	The TODIM method can be used only with crisp numbers.	Machinery Industry - >Cloud Manufacturing	Environmental Criteria
(Song <i>et al.</i> , 2021)	Intuitionistic fuzzy analytic hierarchy process (IFAHP)		Pre-fabricated building	n.a.

(Rahmadani and Suparno, 2021)	DEMATEL-ANP and FMEA	This model is much more focused on the risk assessment	pharmaceutical industry	n.a.
(Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2021)	Taguchi capability index	The main indicator should be related to the quality of suppliers	Bycicle Manufacturer	n.a.
(Chen and Lin, 2022)	Product Lifetime Performance Index	Focused only on lifetime performance of products	electronics industry	n.a.
(Dang <i>et al.</i> , 2022)	MCDM based on spherical fuzzy Analytical Hierarchical Process (SF-AHP) and grey Complex Proportional Assessment (G-COPRAS)	It is focused on the capability to react to a disruptive event like covid in a sustainable manner Other MCDM methods (VIKOR, MABAC, WASPAS, MULTIMOORA, etc.) could be applied to the SSS problem in future research	automotive industry	n.a.
(Sahu <i>et al.</i> , 2022)	MCDM approach integrating AHP, DEMATEL, ANP, Extended MOORA and SAW techniques.	DEMATEL facilitates the disclosure of the causal relationships among LARG metrics. MOORA is used to rank suppliers The criteria examined cover Lean-Agile-Resilient-Green (LARG) practices. Only 19 cover the green area and none covers the social area	Automotive	n.a.
(Tavana <i>et al.</i> , 2021)	fuzzy best-worst method (HFBWM)	Limited to the reverse logistics suppliers only.	Tire re-utilization	n.a.

(van Thanh and Lan, 2022)	Fuzzy Analytical Hierarchy Process (FAHP)	AHP produces rank reversal	Food	TBL (criteria)
(Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2022)	MCDM integrating Fuzzy Analytical Hierarchy Process (FAHP) model and TOPSIS	The are potentialities in exploring other models to be integrated	Garnment Industry	Environmental criteria
(Zakeri, Yang and Konstantas, 2022)	MCDM based on the alternative ranking process by alternatives' stability scores (ARPASS)	Not focused on sustainability	n.a.	n.a.
(Thanh and Lan, 2022)	Fuzzy Analytical Hierarchy Process (FAHP) method, and the Combined Compromise Solution (CoCoSo) algorithm	Fuzzy Analytical Hierarchy Process (FAHP) method, and the Combined Compromise Solution (CoCoSo) algorithm for the selection of suppliers by ranking them	Food-processing industry	Environmental, Social and Economic Criteria

These models are all characterised by some strengths and weaknesses. For instance, those focused on cosmetics are not structured neither to capture in a balanced manner the whole panel of sustainability-oriented criteria nor to include more than one decision maker. For this reason, the existing models focused on other industries have been analysed to evaluate how to overcome their limits by combining their useful characteristics, thus integrating them into a unique and comprehensive model. Among all, the main criticalities emerged in the existing models are: (i) subjectivity, (ii) single decision maker perspective, (iii) no criteria interconnections and (iv) no cosmetics and sustainable -related criteria included.

The Multi Criteria Decision Models (MCDM) emerged from the extant literature (Giannakis *et al.*, 2020) to be good tools ensuring a balanced evaluation of the potential

trade-offs among criteria. The evaluation is conducted based on experts' judgments and comparisons between criteria or alternatives (Deniz, 2020). Among all, the extant literature presents MCDM such as Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), Analytic Network Process (ANP) fuzzy-based approaches, Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity (TOPSIS) (Giannakis et al., 2020; Rashidi and Cullinane, 2019; Zeydan, Çolpan and Çobanoğlu, 2011). In addition, to deal with the imprecise data conversion of uncertain and subjective information from the decision-makers into interval of fuzzy numbers, the Fuzzy Set Theory (FST) can be integrated into these models (Awasthi, Govindan and Gold, 2018; Azadi et al., 2015; Memari et al., 2019; Rashidi and Cullinane, 2019; Yadavalli et al., 2019). Fuzzy techniques enable to reduce the subjectivity of the evaluation of the decision-makers, highly affecting the MCDM, by translating qualitative linguistic variables into quantitative numeric values (Zadeh, 1965).

Regarding the SSS models, another aspect to be considered is their compensatory nature. It would be possible in fact to compensate a bad performance of a certain criterion with a good performance in another one belonging to a different category as suggested by (Yu, Zhao and Li, 2019). In the sustainability context, a non-compensatory model would better work to ensure not lagging a certain category of criteria (Yu, Zhao and Li, 2019). At the same time, the compensatory model would enable to balance the different criteria and it is well known and diffused into companies. Therefore, hybrid models have been proposed to integrate both the natures, i.e. compensatory and non-compensatory, of the SSS models (Junior, Osiro and Carpinetti, 2013) (Yu, Zhao and Li, 2019). For instance, it is possible to integrate the TOPSIS model, which has a compensatory nature model currently quite diffused, with the ELECTRE, a non-compensatory nature model, which is coherent with a sustainable

oriented evaluation of the suppliers (Yu, Zhao and Li, 2019). Summarizing, the main characteristics that necessitate to be considered in the development of a novel SSS model are the following:

- The integration of multiple perspectives of decision-makers
- The reduction of subjectivity of the decision-makers
- The evaluation of the presence of interdependencies and interconnections among criteria
- The model compensation nature.

4. Cosmetics Sustainable Supplier Selection (C-SSS) Model development

4.1. Model conceptualization based on scientific findings

The novel C-SSS model relies on the findings from the extant literature about SSS models. More in detail, three key models were taken as references to build the novel one tailored on cosmetics industry. These three were chosen as main reference since they already validated part of the integration of some of the approaches which emerged in the literature as fundamental to address the weaknesses. Atthirawong, (2020) developed a model focused on the green supplier selection process in the cosmetics industry. This model relies on the TOPSIS method which has a compensatory nature not properly useful for this context due to the high subjectivity given to the evaluation. Thus, a hybrid model proposed by (Yu, Zhao and Li, 2019) has been considered to be inserted in the novel model since it includes both the TOPSIS and ELECTRE approaches backed by the Entropy Measured Method (EMM). This integrated solution allows to reduce the level of subjectivity asking to the decision makers to evaluate the suppliers' capability and not the weights. Moreover, still in accordance with the model proposed by (Yu, Zhao and Li, 2019), a quantitative and objective evaluation is required, and this can be

performed thanks to the Fuzzy Time Series (FTS) that hence has been considered too in the developed model. The integrated models and approaches proposed by (Yu, Zhao and Li, 2019) are reported in Figure 3.




Figure 3 - Synthetic structure of the model proposed by (Yu, Zhao and Li, 2019)

However, the model proposed by (Yu, Zhao and Li, 2019) has an important limit since the criteria considered by the model are considered as independent, while their interrelations are needed to be taken into account during the selection process of suppliers. For this reason, it was considered valuable the inclusion in the novel model of an ANP model. The ANP enables to keep into account the independencies present among criteria using this information as input for the TOPSIS model. Anyway, the results should be objective and balanced among them thus, both the EMM and the entropy-weighted ANP evaluation methods were used since they address both objective and subjective judgments as presented also by (Mei, Ye and Zeng, 2016). Although this research does not concern the SSS process, it has been taken only as reference as a structured and validated way to link entropy and ANP results. In addition, to strengthen the potential links present between the EMM, the ANP and the TOPSIS model, another model was analysed, the one proposed by (Zhou, Li and Yu, 2009) even though focused on other industry and topics. Therefore, to address this integration based on already validated models, the research proposed by (Zhou, Li and Yu, 2009) was included as another grounding model since it considers the TOPSIS approach once the weights have been aggregated. Figure 4 shows the summary of the integrated analysis of (Mei, Ye and Zeng, 2016) and (Zhou, Li and Yu, 2009).




Figure 4 - Synthetic structure of the model proposed by (Mei, Ye and Zeng, 2016) and (Zhou, Li and Yu, 2009)

Last, to also include multiple actors in the evaluation phase and to lower the random error possibility made by individuals, it was employed the approach used by (Shyur and Shih, 2006). This model applied the geometric mean to derive group preferences provided by multiple decision makers. Indeed, this model was selected since it already tested the integration between the ANP and the TOPSIS approaches with the geometric mean for the evaluation of a local Taiwanese company's suppliers.

As a result, the model proposed by the authors is an aggregation of the approaches and models applied and already validated by (Yu, Zhao and Li, 2019) , (Mei, Ye and Zeng, 2016) and (Zhou, Li and Yu, 2009) as depicted in Figure 5.




Figure 5 - Synthetic structure of the model resulted as aggregation of models proposed by (Yu, Zhao and Li, 2019) , (Mei, Ye and Zeng, 2016) and (Zhou, Li and Yu, 2009)

The final novel C-SSS model structure is reported below in Figure 6 where the specific steps and the related methodologies employed are reported. Immediately below the Figure 6, the steps are described in their details.




Figure 6 C-SSS model development

Therefore, the extant literature enabled to clarify the key characteristics and criteria to be included in a novel C-SSS model. Based on that, the key steps for the model development are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4 Model development steps

Area	#	Step name	Method used
Criteria selection and evaluation of a network (ANP)	1.	Sustainable criteria formulation	Literature review

	2. Construction of ANP network of criteria and definition of sub-criteria ANP-based weights	ANP method
Evaluation divided per sustainability pillars	3. Qualitative criteria representation	TFNs
	4. Aggregation of decision makers' evaluations	Geometric mean
	5. Definition of sub-criteria entropy-based weights	Entropy measured method
	6. Aggregation of sub-criteria ANP and entropy-based weights	Linear combination
	7. Suppliers' performances evaluation with respect to economic, environmental, and social aspects, respectively	TOPSIS method
Aggregated evaluation	8. Definition of criteria entropy-based weights	Entropy measured method
	9. Aggregation of criteria ANP and entropy-based weights	Linear combination
	10. Suppliers' final rank	Improved ELECTRE method

4.2. Model application

To use the C-SSS model, both the suppliers and the company's decision-makers are involved, and two technical tools are employed to make the process smoother as reported in Table 5. Indeed, as previously described in the methodology section, these tools are easy to be applied in industrial cases being cheap and user-friendly.

Table 5 Stakeholders involved in the selection process and technical interfaces

Stage	Stakeholder	Technical Interface
Suppliers' questionnaire	Suppliers	Excel
Decision makers' evaluation	Decision makers	Excel
	Decision makers	SuperDecisions
Final computations and ranking	-	Excel

4.2.1. Marco-phase 1

Starting with *macro phase 1* (i.e., criteria selection and evaluation of a network), it is first required to select the decision makers, and make them select the proper criteria to

be used for the selection of their companies' suppliers (see analysis in sub-section 3.1.1.). The selection of a specific set of criteria (see *Step 1* of Table 4) depends on the context of application and on the company's strategy. These criteria can be chosen among those identified from the scientific and grey literature. These criteria were revised and grouped in three main classes corresponding to the TBL pillars, as reported below in Table 6, to ensure the balanced consideration of all the three pillars.

Table 6 Criteria for the supplier selection in cosmetics

ECONOMIC CRITERIA	EC1	ISO 22716 (Good manufacturing practices) application	Cosmetic
	EC2	ISO 22715 (Packaging and Labelling) application	
	EC3	ISO 9001 (Quality Management)	General
	EC4	Cost	
	EC5	Quality	
	EC6	Compliance	
	EC7	Market presence	
	EC8	Service	
	EC9	Technology	
	EC10	Time needed to be compliant with quality/economic requirements	Development
	EC11	Willingness to be audited and share information about quality/economic performance improvement	
ENVIRONMENTAL CRITERIA	EN1	Cruelty-free programs and certifications	Cosmetic
	EN2	Water pollution	
	EN3	Toxicity level of production activities (e.g., Freshwater ecotoxicity, Acidification, ...)	
	EN4	Local territory safeguard and correct harvest practices	
	EN5	Circular practices, recycling initiatives, plastic reduction policies	
	EN6	Supply chain traceability	
	EN7	Energy consumption	
	EN8	Production practices and operations impacts' traceability	
	EN9	ISO 14001 (Environmental Management System)	General
	EN10	Time needed to be compliant with environmental requirements	Development
	EN11	Willingness to be audited and share information about environmental performance improvement	
S O C	SC1	Fair trade certifications	Cosmetic

	SC2	Local development programs	
	SC3	Sustainable working conditions (e.g., minimum wage, vacation days...)	
	SC4	Professional growth opportunity	
	SC5	Equal opportunities for men and women	
	SC6	Rights of Indigenous Peoples	
	SC7	SA 8000 certification (social accountability international)	General
	SC8	Freedom of association	
	SC9	Supplier social assessment	
	SC10	Occupational health and safety	
	SC11	Public policy	
	SC12	Time needed to be compliant with social requirements	Development
	SC13	Willingness to be audited and share information about social performance improvement	

All the criteria are translated into polar questions to ensure an easy adoption of the model by companies. These questions are sent to the suppliers to obtain all the information that need to be evaluated by the decision-makers through the developed model. Indeed, in *Step 2* (see Table 4), the ANP model is introduced. This model enables to keep into account both inner and outer dependences, allowing to consider the interactions within and between groups of criteria (Jayant, 2016). The general structure of these models is based on two layers: the control and the network layers. These layers perform respectively the pairwise comparison and evaluate the influences present among criteria in the network (Jayant and Paul, 2014). The ANP implementation requires first to ask the decision-makers to build a network making visible the interdependencies among criteria. Secondly, to define the criteria weights by conducting a pairwise comparisons for each relationship between groups and single criteria. Once the ANP model is built, it is possible to create the “Supermatrix”. This underlines the relationships among criteria by representing the relative importance of an element on the left of the matrix compared to an element at the top of the matrix, with respect to a particular control criterion by giving specific weights (Saaty, 2006). In this matrix, the

subjectivity of the weights is then balanced by more objective weights thanks to the use of the EMM (Mei, Ye and Zeng, 2016) which is better described in *Step 5* (see Table 4).

4.2.2. Macro-phase 2

Entering the macro phase 2, and more specifically the *Step 3* (see Table 4), it is required to make sure to use qualitative criteria as the quantitative ones to allow an objective comparison. To address this issue, it has been used the FST (Lee *et al.*, 2009). More specifically, it has been used to convert the qualitative criteria into quantitative values by using the graded mean integration representation method (Jolai *et al.*, 2011), thus by transferring a triangular fuzzy number (TFN) $A = (a_1, a_2, a_3)$ into a crisp real number.

Having set all the criteria as numeric variables, it is possible to enter the *Step 4* (see Table 4) allowing to aggregate the evaluations coming from the several decision-makers. In doing that, geometric mean is used. This is defined as the k^{th} root of the product of k numbers. In the context of suppliers' evaluation, each decision maker $z = 1, \dots, k$ expresses his opinion x_{zij} regarding each supplier $i = 1, \dots, m$ for what concerns criterion $j = 1, \dots, n$. *Equation (1)* defines the geometric mean of evaluations made by all decision makers.

$$x_{ij} = \left(\prod_{z=1}^k x_{zij} \right)^{\frac{1}{k}} = \sqrt[k]{x_1 * x_2 * \dots * x_k} \quad (1)$$

The aggregated values can be used as inputs for the *Step 5* (see Table 5) requiring the application of the EMM (Mei, Ye and Zeng, 2016). According to Shannon, (1997), entropy is a measure of the uncertainty of information according to which the more data are dispersed, the bigger the uncertainty is, the greater relevance the criterion has. In this way, each decision on the criteria can be expressed by entropy values, and the relative importance can be determined objectively. More specifically, this model

presents three main clusters of criteria (e.g., economic, environment, and social as reported in Table 6) within which there are specific criteria to be assessed. So, considering $j = 1, \dots, n$ as the single criterion and $i = 1, \dots, m$ the different suppliers, the idea is to compute first the normalized decision matrix $R = (r_{ij})$ based on the nature of the single criterion x_{ij} as follows:

$$\text{Benefit Criterion} \quad r_{ij} = \frac{x_{ij}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m x_{ij}^2}} \quad 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Cost Criterion} \quad r_{ij} = \frac{1/x_{ij}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m 1/x_{ij}^2}} \quad 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n \quad (3)$$

Figure 7 depicts how it looks like in the excel file

Figure 7 Excel for the score computation

Based on the normalized values p_{ij} of (r_{ij}) to be computed as in Equation (4), each entropy measure e_j is computed as reported in equation (5).

$$p_{ij} = \frac{r_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^m r_{ij}} \quad \text{and} \quad k = \frac{1}{\ln m} \quad [0 * \ln 0 \equiv 0] \quad (4)$$

$$e_j = -k \sum_{i=1}^m p_{ij} * \ln p_{ij} \quad 1 \leq i \leq m, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n \quad (5)$$

The measure e_j allows to calculate the importance of the criterion that is greater when the divergence value d_j computed in *Equation (6)* is higher.

$$d_j = 1 - e_j \quad 1 \leq j \leq n \quad (6)$$

Finally, the divergence value is used to compute the normalized criteria weights w_j based on *Equation (7)*. The denominator consists in the sum of the criteria grouped by sustainable aspects.

$$w_j = \frac{d_j}{\sum_{j=1}^n d_j} \quad 1 \leq j \leq n \quad (7)$$

Step 6 (see Table 4) aims to integrate the results from the ANP and EMM to ensure the objectivity of the evaluations and in doing that, a linear combination of the two is computed as suggested by (Mei, Ye and Zeng, 2016). To allow this integration, it is first necessary to associate the ANP weights with the different sustainable pillars and normalize them to align these results with those of the EMM (which have been already computed for the single pillar of the TBL). The vector containing the ANP weights is composed by the weights of the different criteria $j = 1, \dots, n$ within which n can be considered the sum of all the criteria corresponding to the different sustainable pillars as follows: $n = a + b + c$ where a corresponds to the sum of all the economic-related criteria, b to the sum of all the environmental-related criteria and c to those related to the social aspects. Therefore, the three vectors of normalized ANP weights can be obtained by means of *Equation (8), (9), (10)*.

$$\overline{W}_{1j}(\text{economic}) = \frac{\overline{W}_{1j}}{\sum_{j=1}^a \overline{W}_{1j}} \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, a \quad (8)$$

$$\overline{W}_{ij}(\text{environmental}) = \frac{\overline{W}_{ij}}{\sum_{j=1}^b \overline{W}_{ij}} \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, b \quad (9)$$

$$\overline{W}_{ij}(\text{social}) = \frac{\overline{W}_{ij}}{\sum_{j=1}^c \overline{W}_{ij}} \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, c \quad (10)$$

The final weight vector $W_j(j = 1, \dots, n)$ is obtained as in the *Equation (11)* where subjective weights provided by ANP are reported as w_j'' , and those objectives weights computed with the EMM are reported in the equation as w_j' . This vector multiplied by the evaluation matrix $R = (r_{ij})$ allows to obtain the weighted normalized evaluation matrix $V = (v_{ij})$ reported in the *Equation (12)*.

$$W_j = \frac{w_j' w_j''}{\sum_{j=1}^n w_j' w_j''}, j = 1, \dots, n \quad (11)$$

$$v_{ij} = W_j * r_{ij} \quad 1 \leq i \leq m, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n \quad (12)$$

These results are the required inputs to implement the hybrid TOPSIS (*Step 7* of Table 4) adopted to evaluate the performances of suppliers with respect to economic, environmental, and social aspects respectively, which require the EMM adoption for every single pillar. The *TOPSIS* method aims to select the alternative that has (Hwang and Yoon, 1981):

- the shortest distance from the Positive Ideal Solution (PIS), solution that maximizes the benefit criteria and minimizes the cost criteria;
- the farthest distance from the Negative Ideal Solution (NIS), solution that maximizes the cost criteria and minimizes the benefit criteria.

Based on the weighted normalized decision matrixes $V = (v_{ij})$ computed above, PIS and NIS are calculated as reported in the *Equations (13)* and *(14)*, respectively by considering “I” the cluster of the benefit criteria, and “J” the cluster with the cost criteria.

$$A^+ = \{v_1^+, \dots, v_n^+\} = \{(max_j v_{ij} | i \in I), (min_j v_{ij} | i \in J)\} \quad (13)$$

$$A^- = \{v_1^-, \dots, v_n^-\} = \{(min_j v_{ij} | i \in I), (max_j v_{ij} | i \in J)\} \quad (14)$$

To finally compute the relative closeness C_i , of each solution i to the best solution with the Equation (17), the distance from PIS and NIS is computed for each solution i , as reported in Equations (15) and (16) respectively:

$$d_i^+ = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n (v_{ij} - v_j^+)^2} \quad 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n \quad (15)$$

$$d_i^- = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n (v_{ij} - v_j^-)^2} \quad 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n \quad (16)$$

$$C_i = \frac{d_i^-}{d_i^+ + d_i^-} \quad 1 \leq i \leq m \quad (17)$$

4.2.2. Macro-phase 3

Entering the third macro-phase means to be able to rank the suppliers and chose the most proper one looking in an aggregated way to the three sustainability pillars. Therefore, the improved ELECTRE methods is used to rank all the alternatives (Yu, Zhao and Li, 2019).

First, starting from the weights obtained in *Step2* related to criteria referred to each sustainability pillar, the cumulated weights for each sustainability aspect are computed as the sum of the single weights (*Step 8* of Table 4) with the Equation (18), Equation (18) the Equation (18).

$$\overline{W_{economic}} = \sum_{j=1}^a W_{ij} \quad (18)$$

$$\overline{W_{environmental}} = \sum_{j=1}^b W_{ij} \quad (19)$$

$$\overline{W_{social}} = \sum_{j=1}^c W_{ij} \quad (20)$$

These weights are combined with those of the decision matrix that is based on the ranks of suppliers with respect to economic, environmental, and social criteria obtained

through the TOPSIS method. Therefore, in *Step 9* (see Table 4), the EMM is used and applied to this new decision matrix X to obtain a normalized decision matrix $R = (r_{ij})$. Therefore, *Equations 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12* are applied to obtain three weights w_j one for each sustainable pillar. After *Step 8* and *Step 9*, six weights (i.e., two weights, thus entropy and ANP weights, for each sustainability pillar) are obtained and in *Step 10*, the linear combination is applied aggregating the six weights obtained with the three weights v_j using the *Equations (11), and (12)*.

To concretely apply the ELECTRE method, the criteria required to be divided into concordance and discordance subsets C_{kl} and D_{kl} for each pair of supplier alternatives A_k and A_l ($k, l = 1, 2, \dots, m$ and $k \neq l$), where:

- The concordance set of criteria C_{kl} is the collection of criteria where A_k is better than or equal to A_l (*Equation 21*)
- The discordance set D_{kl} contains all criteria for which A_k is worse than A_l (*Equation 22*)

$$C_{kl} = \{j | v_{kj} \geq v_{lj}\} \quad 1 \leq k, l \leq m, k \neq l, 1 \leq j \leq n \quad (21)$$

$$D_{kl} = \{j | v_{kj} < v_{lj}\} = J - C_{kl} \quad 1 \leq k, l = m, k \neq l, 1 \leq j \leq n \quad (22)$$

In this set of criteria, for each pair of suppliers k and l , it is possible to compute all the concordance and discordance indexes c_{kl} and d_{kl} relying on the *Equations (23)* and *(24)*. Based on the discordance index, it is computed the revised discordance index d'_{kl} (*Equation (25)*) to be included in the computation of the revised weighted aggregated matrix $E = (e_{kl})$ as reported in *Equation (26)*.

$$c_{kl} = \sum_{j \in C_{kl}} w_j \quad 1 \leq k, l \leq m, k \neq l, 1 \leq j \leq n \quad (23)$$

$$d_{kl}(t_k) = \frac{\max_{j \in D_{kl}} w_j |v_{kj} - v_{lj}|}{\max_j w_j |v_{kj} - v_{lj}|} \quad 1 \leq k, l \leq m, k \neq l, 1 \leq j \leq n \quad (24)$$

$$d'_{kl} = 1 - d_{kl} \quad (25)$$

$$e_{kl} = c_{kl} * d'_{kl} \quad (26)$$

Finally, to evaluate the net advantage value adv_k referred to the supplier K (thus the alternative A_k), it is used the *Equation (27)*. The higher the adv_k the better the alternative is. This value allows to have a single rank of the alternatives in a decreasing order, with respect to all sustainability aspects and related selected criteria.

$$adv_k = \sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^m e_{ki} - \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^m e_{jk} \quad (27)$$

Wrapping up, thanks to this revised C-SSS model, it is possible to overcome some criticalities emerged in previous works as reported in Table 7 and to enable companies operating in the cosmetics industry to choose the most appropriate suppliers according to their sustainable-oriented strategies and needs.

Table 7 Model comparisons

Criticism of previous models	Solutions in this new model
Agreement on evaluations	Geometric mean on multiple evaluations
Subjectivity in decision makers' evaluations	EMM
Criteria interdependency	ANP network and weights
Model compensation	Hybrid model, composed of TOPSIS and ELECTRE approaches

5. Cosmetic Sustainable Supplier Selection Model application and validation

The proposed C-SSS model was applied in a manufacturing company operating in the cosmetics industry in the north of Italy. The company has a strong commitment towards sustainability, which is also reinforced by the requests coming from their direct clients and final consumers. The application of the model requires the involvement of both the suppliers and the company's decision makers. Therefore, to streamline the information

gathering and sharing, two different tools are used: Excel and *SuperDecision* Software as reported in the methodology section (see section 2, Table 5).

First, the decision-makers must select the criteria, grouped in an excel file, to be considered for the supplier selection. Based on this initial choice, the questionnaire is created and sent to the suppliers. The questionnaire is based on both qualitative and quantitative questions reported on an Excel file. While the quantitative questions can be easily filled with numeric variables, the qualitative ones are detailed questions to which it is possible to answer “yes” or “no”. An example is reported below in Figure 8.

QUESTION	ANSWER	NOTES
<i>Please answer "yes/no" to the following questions. If a "+" is showed, please insert a numeric value in "notes" column to answer. If a "-" is showed, please provide a full answer in "notes" column. If a "*" is showed, please consider also "not applicable" as possible answer.</i>		
	yes/no	<i>Please provide any relevant information in the "notes" box.</i>
EC1 - ISO 22716 (Good manufacturing practices) application		
ECQ1 - Do you follow the ISO 22716 guidelines on Good manufacturing practices?	No	
ECQ2 - If not, do you have specific regulations you follow?	Yes	We have strict procedures in place
ECQ3 - If not, do you keep extensive documentation throughout the whole process?	Yes	
EC2 - ISO 22715 (Packaging and labelling) application		
ECQ4 - Do you follow the ISO 22715 guidelines on packaging and labelling?	No	
ECQ5 - If not, do you have specific regulations you follow?	Yes	We comply with national regulations
EC3 - ISO 9001 (quality management)		
ECQ6 - Do you have a quality management system?	Yes	
ECQ7 - Do you have a specific quality function in your company?	Yes	
ECQ8 - In what phase(s) of production do you carry out quality testing?	-	Products are tested after all production phases and as final product
ECQ9 - Are you ISO 14001 certified?	No	
ECQ10 - If not, are you planning on getting the certification within the next two years?	Yes	We are in the process of getting the evaluation
EC4 - Cost		
ECQ11 - Can you provide an estimate for the ... (a kg of product)	-	5€/kg
ECQ12 - Are you willing to share information about your cost breakdown structure?	Yes	
EC5 - Quality		
ECQ13 - Are you open for reviews by our Quality Manager?	Yes	
ECQ14 - Insert specific supply requests	-	97% of good pieces

Figure 8 Questionnaire example

The answers are filled in by the decision-makers and their judgments are expressed into a unique scale relying on the FST model as previously described. Figure 9 reports an example of the excel sheet used by the single decision-maker.

SUPPLIERS		CRITERIA SELECTION																															
Define how many suppliers to		Decide the criteria to consider, dividing them into the three main sustainable aspects																															
Please fulfil "Name" column only		Please fulfil "Definition" and "Cost/Benefit" columns only																															
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Name</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>S1</td> <td>Supplier A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>S2</td> <td>Supplier B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>S3</td> <td>Supplier C</td> </tr> <tr> <td>S4</td> <td>Supplier D</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Name	S1	Supplier A	S2	Supplier B	S3	Supplier C	S4	Supplier D	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Definition</th> <th>Cost/Benefit [-/+]</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="5">Economic</td> <td>EC-C1</td> <td>ISO 22716</td> <td>+</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EC-C2</td> <td>ISO 22715</td> <td>+</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EC-C3</td> <td>ISO 9001</td> <td>+</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EC-C4</td> <td>Cost</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EC-C5</td> <td>Quality</td> <td>+</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Definition	Cost/Benefit [-/+]	Economic	EC-C1	ISO 22716	+	EC-C2	ISO 22715	+	EC-C3	ISO 9001	+	EC-C4	Cost	-	EC-C5	Quality	+
	Name																																
S1	Supplier A																																
S2	Supplier B																																
S3	Supplier C																																
S4	Supplier D																																
	Definition	Cost/Benefit [-/+]																															
Economic	EC-C1	ISO 22716	+																														
	EC-C2	ISO 22715	+																														
	EC-C3	ISO 9001	+																														
	EC-C4	Cost	-																														
	EC-C5	Quality	+																														
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Definition</th> <th>Cost/Benefit [-/+]</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="6">Environmental</td> <td>EN-C1</td> <td>Water pollution</td> <td>+</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EN-C2</td> <td>Toxicity level of production activities</td> <td>+</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EN-C3</td> <td>Local territory safeguard and correct harvest practices</td> <td>+</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EN-C4</td> <td>Circular practices, recycling initiatives, plastic reduction policies</td> <td>+</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EN-C5</td> <td>Energy consumption</td> <td>+</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EN-C6</td> <td>Production practices and operations impacts' traceability</td> <td>+</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Definition	Cost/Benefit [-/+]	Environmental	EN-C1	Water pollution	+	EN-C2	Toxicity level of production activities	+	EN-C3	Local territory safeguard and correct harvest practices	+	EN-C4	Circular practices, recycling initiatives, plastic reduction policies	+	EN-C5	Energy consumption	+	EN-C6	Production practices and operations impacts' traceability	+							
	Definition	Cost/Benefit [-/+]																															
Environmental	EN-C1	Water pollution	+																														
	EN-C2	Toxicity level of production activities	+																														
	EN-C3	Local territory safeguard and correct harvest practices	+																														
	EN-C4	Circular practices, recycling initiatives, plastic reduction policies	+																														
	EN-C5	Energy consumption	+																														
	EN-C6	Production practices and operations impacts' traceability	+																														
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Definition</th> <th>Cost/Benefit [-/+]</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="5">Social</td> <td>SC-C1</td> <td>Fair trade certifications</td> <td>+</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SC-C2</td> <td>Sustainable working conditions</td> <td>+</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SC-C3</td> <td>Professional growth opportunity</td> <td>+</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SC-C4</td> <td>Equal opportunities for men and women</td> <td>+</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SC-C5</td> <td>SA 8000</td> <td>+</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Definition	Cost/Benefit [-/+]	Social	SC-C1	Fair trade certifications	+	SC-C2	Sustainable working conditions	+	SC-C3	Professional growth opportunity	+	SC-C4	Equal opportunities for men and women	+	SC-C5	SA 8000	+										
	Definition	Cost/Benefit [-/+]																															
Social	SC-C1	Fair trade certifications	+																														
	SC-C2	Sustainable working conditions	+																														
	SC-C3	Professional growth opportunity	+																														
	SC-C4	Equal opportunities for men and women	+																														
	SC-C5	SA 8000	+																														
		<div style="text-align: right;"> <input type="button" value="Initialization"/> <input type="button" value="Clear sheet"/> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Legend</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Very poor</td> <td>VP</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td> <td>P</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Medium poor</td> <td>MP</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Medium</td> <td>M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Medium good</td> <td>MG</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Good</td> <td>G</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Very good</td> <td>VG</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> </div>			Legend		Very poor	VP	Poor	P	Medium poor	MP	Medium	M	Medium good	MG	Good	G	Very good	VG													
Legend																																	
Very poor	VP																																
Poor	P																																
Medium poor	MP																																
Medium	M																																
Medium good	MG																																
Good	G																																
Very good	VG																																

Figure 9 Example of an excel sheet used by a single decision-maker

The decision-makers are also required to create the network among the criteria. By adopting the ANP model it is possible to keep into account the interdependencies present among the different criteria. This network puts the basis to identify the pairwise comparisons and obtain the weights for each single criterion. The ANP approach is concretely adopted relying on *SuperDecisions software*. This software requires first to set and populate the clusters of criteria (in this research the criteria are chosen among those reported in Table 6), second it requires to identify and populate the clusters with the available solutions, which in this case correspond to the different suppliers among which to choose, as presented in Figure 10.




Figure 10 Super Decision criteria links

Finally, the software enables to make the decision-makers define the inner and outer dependencies present among the criteria as reported in Figure 11 and to ensure the pairwise comparison among the criteria in a scale from -9 to +9 as reported in Figure 12.

Make/Show Connections

Select parent (from) node
 Cost

Select child (to) cluster
 All

Nodes	Connected
Cost	<input type="checkbox"/>
ISO 9001	<input type="checkbox"/>
ISO 22715	<input type="checkbox"/>
ISO 22716	<input type="checkbox"/>
Quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Circular practices	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Energy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Figure 11 Inner and outer interdependencies among criteria

2. Node comparisons with respect to Supplier A

Graphical Verbal Matrix Questionnaire Direct

Comparisons wrt "Supplier A" node in "Economic" cluster
 Cost is extremely more important than ISO 9001

1.	Cost	>=9.5	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	>=9.5	No comp.
2.	Cost	>=9.5	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	>=9.5	No comp.
3.	Cost	>=9.5	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	>=9.5	No comp.
4.	Cost	>=9.5	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	>=9.5	No comp.
5.	ISO 9001	>=9.5	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	>=9.5	No comp.
6.	ISO 9001	>=9.5	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	>=9.5	No comp.
7.	ISO 9001	>=9.5	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	>=9.5	No comp.
8.	ISO 22715	>=9.5	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	>=9.5	No comp.
9.	ISO 22715	>=9.5	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	>=9.5	No comp.
10.	ISO 22716	>=9.5	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	>=9.5	No comp.

Figure 12 Pairwise comparison

Based on these analyses, it is possible to obtain the weights of the criteria to make them usable automatically by the software. These weights are normalized based on the clusters considered as reported in the example referred to the case under analysis reported in Table 8.

Table 8 Clustering of criteria evaluation

Cluster	Name	Normalized By Cluster	Limiting
<i>Economic</i>	Cost	0.3412	0.1367
	ISO 9001	0.0260	0.0104
	ISO 22715	0.0173	0.0069
	ISO 22716	0.1716	0.0687
	Quality	0.4439	0.1778
	<i>Partial total</i>		1
<i>Environmental</i>	Circular practices	0.1159	0.0176
	Energy	0.4070	0.0617
	Local territory safeguard	0.4498	0.0682
	Production practices traceability	0.0102	0.0015
	Toxicity level of production activities	0.0036	0.0005
	Water pollution	0.0135	0.0020
	<i>Partial total</i>		1
<i>Social</i>	Equal opportunities for men and women	0.1672	0.0749
	Fair trade certifications	0.1374	0.0615
	Professional growth opportunity	0.0323	0.0145
	SA 8000	0.2661	0.1191
	Sustainable working conditions	0.3971	0.1778
	<i>Partial total</i>		1
<i>Suppliers</i>	Supplier A	0	0
	Supplier B	0	0
	Supplier C	0	0
	Supplier D	0	0
	<i>Partial total</i>		1
<i>Total</i>		4	1

The normalized values are used in the TOPSIS model while the limiting values, those coming from the automatic computation performed by the *SuperDecision* Software, are used as inputs in the ELECTRE model. These weights, combined with the responses by the suppliers, enable to finally rank the suppliers to choose the best option as reported in the example depicted in Figure 13 (the potentials suppliers are only four in this specific case). This combination enables the creation of specific scores for the different suppliers looking on the TBL. Based on that, the model enabled to express a preference on the most suitable supplier and additionally, it enabled to look at the

results across the different sustainability-related pillars (i.e. TBL pillars). This second result is valuable when there are two or more suppliers reaching the same final score, but it is required to select only one among the two. In this way, it is possible to decide, for instance, to select the one that obtained the highest score in the environmental-related criteria in case it would be more aligned with the strategic goal of the company in that historical moment. In this specific case, Supplier A was chosen as best option for the company as visible in Figure 13.




Figure 13 Final ranking

5. Discussion

As emerged from the results obtained after the model adoption (i.e. the C-SSS model), the company was able to integrate the perspectives of several decision-makers, to balance their judgments and finally to rank the different suppliers considering the sustainability-related criteria enhancing their stakeholders' engagement capabilities. Therefore, the C-SSS model acts as facilitator to improve the circular-manufacturing ecosystem giving the possibility to establish stronger partnerships and collaborations among manufacturers and suppliers. Indeed, the selection of specific suppliers stands in

the accurate analysis of criteria covering the whole TBL in accordance with the circularity principles, looking for instance at the possibility to recycle resources, reduce resources consumption etc. Moreover, the C-SSS model enabled to overcome the key weaknesses emerged in the already existing models, being it a comprehensive model able to involve different decision-makers while ensuring objectivity in their choices, capable to consider the potential interdependences present among criteria while ensuring the inclusion of the entire spectrum of sustainability-oriented criteria required for the cosmetics industry. Last, the adoption of the C-SSS model benefitted the company ensuring a deep and thoughtful audit of their suppliers allowing the creation of a stronger and more resilient value chain through their engagement. Indeed, the questionnaire shared with the suppliers increases the suppliers' awareness in terms of the expectations from the company regarding sustainability and circular-oriented certifications or required characteristics. Therefore, the contributions from this research cover both practical and theoretical perspective.

From a practical perspective, the C-SSS model, once used in an industrial case, emphasized its potentialities in addressing a core aspect facilitating the sustainable transition of cosmetics companies, thus the supplier selection process. Through the industrial case, it emerged that the model allows to make collaborate and converge a series of decision-makers, even with contrasting ideas, working for the same company but operating in different departments (e.g. production and quality). Decision-makers from different departments were asked to evaluate and select a set of criteria, under the big umbrella of sustainability for cosmetics companies, required to evaluate the most appropriate supplier for their company. Based on this initial choice, the questionnaire for the suppliers was developed and shared with them to select the best option. Therefore, from the model application, it emerged that the model enables to engage

suppliers in the sustainable transition of the producer itself making them aware about the sustainable characteristics required by the company. Actually, thanks to an accurate integration of the needed characteristics of the existing SSS models, it was possible (i) to involve different decision-makers while limiting the subjectivity in their choices, (ii) to consider a wide spectrum of criteria referred to sustainability, together with their potential interdependencies, and finally (iii) to select the most appropriate supplier for the company. This model, hence, based on a mathematical computation, facilitates the company in selecting the best supplier considering among all, the request coming from consumers and governments integrated with the company's strategic objectives.

Moreover, it enables to take into account the potential interconnections present among the criteria selected. The set of criteria to be selected by the decision-makers includes those found in the scientific and grey literature in terms of ISO standards mostly linked to the SDGs. In this way, a cosmetics company can conduct an updated vendor rating ensuring the adherence with the current norms and standards for its industry. Moreover, the model modularity and adaptability facilitate its usage also in the future when the set of criteria might have been changed due to new norms, regulations, consumers' changed behaviour or updated company's strategic goals.

From a theoretical perspective, the C-SSS model allows to overcome the criticalities emerged in the already existing SSS models by integrating their fundamental characteristics (e.g. judgement objectivity, multiple-decision makers, criteria interdependencies, sustainable criteria, etc.) into a unique and comprehensive model. Therefore, it was possible to create an SSS model, the C-SSS model, tailored on cosmetics companies interested in embracing a sustainable-oriented path, which before was not present in the extant literature. The model innovativeness stands not only in the inclusion of all the sustainable-related criteria needed to be considered by a cosmetics

company, but also in the accurate usage and selection of existing SSS models' characteristics needed for each specific stage of the supplier selection process. The C-SSS model, with respect to the previous models, includes in the selection process a wider set of criteria for cosmetics companies, including standards, covering the whole TBL. It takes into account criteria interdependences and engages several stakeholders (company's departments and suppliers) while keeping high the level of objectivity of the internal stakeholders' choices. More specifically, referring to the existing models, to ensure an agreement among the different decision-makers on the evaluation, it has been introduced the geometric mean on the different evaluations, and to reduce the subjectivity coming from decision makers' evaluations it has been used the EMM approach. Moreover, to keep into account the interconnections that might be present among the criteria considered, the ANP approach has been included in the model too. Last, to ensure the creation of a hybrid compensation model, the TOPSIS and the ELECTRE models have been concurrently adopted. Indeed, the combination of compensating and non-compensating approached within a unique model facilitates the creation of the ranking of the suppliers keeping into account and respecting the integrity of each single sustainability pillar.

All the above-mentioned elements characterising the C-SSS model developed in this contribution represent the key innovative aspects of the model.

6. Conclusions

The RO of this contribution aimed at overcoming the inefficiencies and criticalities emerged in the existing SSS models by developing a novel one tailored on the cosmetics industry. This revised model ensures the coverage of the most recent advancements and requirements for cosmetic companies in regards of sustainability and

circularity issues leading to the creation of a circular manufacturing ecosystem. In doing that, it has been conducted firstly a review of the extant scientific and grey literature investigating the key sustainable and circular criteria to be included in the model to ensure the coverage of the TBL pillars when dealing with cosmetic companies. In parallel to this, it has been reviewed the literature about existing SSS models to analyse their key characteristics, their key weaknesses and to evaluate what should have been kept into the revised novel tailored on cosmetics. Based on these analyses, the set of sustainable-related criteria for cosmetic companies has been identified and the SSS models to be integrated have been selected and deeply analysed. Grounding of these findings, the C-SSS model has been developed and applied in an Italian manufacturing company operating in the cosmetic industry.

Regarding the limitations of this research, although the technical tools used (i.e. Excel and *SuperDecisions* software) are affordable and easy to be accessed by any type of company, *ad hoc* tools might be considered in the future to be easily integrated with the vendor rating software already used by cosmetics companies. Additionally, a survey could be conducted on a wider set of manufacturing companies operating in the cosmetics industry to verify that the current set of criteria included in the model is exhaustive and complete. In parallel to that, a more extensive literature review focused only on cosmetics sustainable-related criteria might be conducted in future research. Last, the present model should be applied in a wider number of companies in the future to verify its generalizability.

References

Acerbi, Federica and Taisch, M. (2020a) 'A literature review on circular economy adoption in the manufacturing sector', *Journal of Cleaner Production*, p. 123086. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.123086>.

- Acerbi, F and Taisch, M. (2020) 'Information Flows Supporting Circular Economy Adoption in the Manufacturing Sector'. Edited by L. B. et al. Department of Management, Economics and Industrial Engineering, Politecnico di Milano, Piazza Leonardo da Vinci 32, Milan, 20133, Italy: Springer, pp. 703–710. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-57997-5_81.
- Acerbi, Federica and Taisch, M. (2020b) 'Towards a data classification model for circular product life cycle management', in B.A. Nyffenegger F., Ríos J., Rivest L. (ed.) *Product Lifecycle Management Enabling Smart X. PLM 2020. IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology*. Springer, Cham, pp. 473–486. Available at: https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-62807-9_38.
- Ambak, A. et al. (2019) 'The Effects of Lifestyles on Sustainable Consumption: A Conceptual Study of Cosmetics and Personal Care Products', in. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.12-11-2018.2288827>.
- Amberg, N. and Fogarassy, C. (2019) 'Green consumer behavior in the cosmetics market', *Resources*, 8(3). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/resources8030137>.
- Amindoust, A. (2018) 'A resilient-sustainable based supplier selection model using a hybrid intelligent method', *Computers and Industrial Engineering*, 126, pp. 122–135. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2018.09.031>.
- Appolloni, A. et al. (2022) 'Green recovery in the mature manufacturing industry: The role of the green-circular premium and sustainability certification in innovative efforts', *Ecological Economics*, 193, p. 107311. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2021.107311>.
- Atthirawong, W. (2020) 'Application of TOPSIS Method to Green Supplier Selection for a Thai OTOP Producer', 20(1), pp. 144–155. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.14456/cast.2020.4>.
- Awasthi, A., Govindan, K. and Gold, S. (2018) 'Multi-tier sustainable global supplier selection using a fuzzy AHP-VIKOR based approach', *International Journal of Production Economics*, 195, pp. 106–117. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2017.10.013>.
- Azadi, M. et al. (2015) 'A new fuzzy DEA model for evaluation of efficiency and effectiveness of suppliers in sustainable supply chain management context', *Computers and Operations Research*, 54, pp. 274–285. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cor.2014.03.002>.
- Bai, C. and Sarkis, J. (2010) 'Integrating sustainability into supplier selection with grey system and rough set methodologies', *International Journal of Production Economics*, 124(1), pp. 252–264. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2009.11.023>.
- Belotti Pedroso, C. et al. (2021) 'Supplier development adoption: A conceptual model for triple bottom line (TBL) outcomes', *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 314(June), p. 127886. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.127886>.

- Bjørnbet, M.M. et al. (2021) 'Circular economy in manufacturing companies: A review of case study literature', *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 294, p. 126268. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.126268>.
- Bom, S. et al. (2019) 'A step forward on sustainability in the cosmetics industry: A review', *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 225, pp. 270–290. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.03.255>.
- Bom, S., MRibeiro, H.M. and Marto, J. (2020) 'Sustainability calculator: A tool to assess sustainability in cosmetic products', *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(4), pp. 1–15. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12041437>.
- Brown, P.J. and Bajada, C. (2018) 'An economic model of circular supply network dynamics: Toward an understanding of performance measurement in the context of multiple stakeholders', *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 27(5), pp. 643–655. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2069>.
- Chai, J., Liu, J.N.K. and Ngai, E.W.T. (2013) 'Application of decision-making techniques in supplier selection: A systematic review of literature', *Expert Systems with Applications*, 40(10), pp. 3872–3885. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2012.12.040>.
- Chan, F.T.S. and Chan, H.K. (2004) Development of the supplier selection model-a case study in the advanced technology industry.
- Chen, H.-Y. and Lin, K.-P. (2022) 'Fuzzy supplier selection model based on lifetime performance index', *Expert Systems with Applications*, 208, p. 118135. Available at: <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2022.118135>.
- Chen, K.-S., Huang, C.-T. and Chang, T.-C. (2019) 'A decision-making approach to selecting supplier based on the quality evaluation of process', in *Proceedings - 25th ISSAT International Conference on Reliability and Quality in Design*, pp. 83–87. Available at: <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85072274592&partnerID=40&md5=3e4066f542a475979be287fa1b5bb304>.
- Chen, K.-S., Huang, C.-T. and Chang, T.-C. (2020) 'Decision-Making for the Selection of Suppliers Based on the Process Quality Assessment', *International Journal of Reliability, Quality and Safety Engineering*, 27(6). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218539320500163>.
- Chen, K.S., Wang, C.H. and Tan, K.H. (2019) 'Developing a fuzzy green supplier selection model using six sigma quality indices', *International Journal of Production Economics*, 212, pp. 1–7. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2019.02.005>.
- Cosmetic Europe (2020) ANNUAL REPORT 2020 - Cosmetic Europe.
- Cosmetic industry growth | Statista (2020) Statista.
- Cosmetics Europe (2019) Environmental Sustainability The European Cosmetics Industry's Contribution 2017-2019.

- Cosmetics Europe - The Personal Care Association: Cosmetics Industry (no date).
- Dai, J. and Blackhurst, J. (2012) 'A four-phase AHP-QFD approach for supplier assessment: A sustainability perspective', *International Journal of Production Research*, 50(19), pp. 5474–5490. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2011.639396>.
- Dang, T.T. et al. (2022) 'A Two-Stage Multi-Criteria Supplier Selection Model for Sustainable Automotive Supply Chain under Uncertainty', *Axioms*, 11(5). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/axioms11050228>.
- Deniz, N. (2020) 'Cognitive biases in MCDM methods: an embedded filter proposal through sustainable supplier selection problem', *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 33(5), pp. 947–963. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEIM-09-2019-0285>.
- Dhanirama, D., Gronow, J. and Voulvoulis, N. (2012) 'Cosmetics as a potential source of environmental contamination in the UK', <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09593330.2011.640353>, 33(14), pp. 1597–1608. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09593330.2011.640353>.
- Dwivedi, A. et al. (2021) 'Addressing the Challenges to Sustainable Initiatives in Value Chain Flexibility: Implications for Sustainable Development Goals', *Global Journal of Flexible Systems Management*, 22(S2), pp. 179–197. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40171-021-00288-4>.
- Elkington, J. (2013) *The triple bottom line: Does it all add up?: Assessing the sustainability of business and CSR*, *The Triple Bottom Line: Does it All Add Up*. Edited by J. Richardson and A. Henriques. Taylor and Francis. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781849773348>.
- Engasser, P. et al. (2007) 'Safety of cosmetic products', *Journal of Cosmetic Dermatology*, 6(SUPPL. 1), pp. 23–31. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1473-2165.2007.00317.X>.
- Fallahpour, A. et al. (2021) 'Green sourcing in the era of industry 4.0: towards green and digitalized competitive advantages', *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 121(9), pp. 1997–2025. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-06-2020-0343>.
- Fonseca-Santos, B., Antonio Corrêa, M. and Chorilli, M. (2015) 'Sustainability, natural and organic cosmetics: Consumer, products, efficacy, toxicological and regulatory considerations', *Brazilian Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, 51(1), pp. 17–26. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1984-82502015000100002>.
- Fortunati, S., Martiniello, L. and Morea, D. (2020) 'The strategic role of the corporate social responsibility and circular economy in the cosmetic industry', *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12125120>.
- Freeman, J. and Chen, T. (2015) 'Green supplier selection using an AHP-Entropy-TOPSIS framework', *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 20(3), pp. 327–340. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/SCM-04-2014-0142>.

- Giannakis, M. et al. (2020) 'Supplier sustainability performance evaluation using the analytic network process', *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 247. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119439>.
- Gong, M. et al. (2019) 'The role of customer awareness in promoting firm sustainability and sustainable supply chain management', *International Journal of Production Economics*, 217, pp. 88–96. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2019.01.033>.
- Guerranti, C. et al. (2019) 'Microplastics in cosmetics: Environmental issues and needs for global bans'. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.etap.2019.03.007>.
- Hashemi, S.H., Karimi, A. and Tavana, M. (2015a) 'An integrated green supplier selection approach with analytic network process and improved Grey relational analysis', *International Journal of Production Economics*, 159, pp. 178–191. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2014.09.027>.
- Hashemi, S.H., Karimi, A. and Tavana, M. (2015b) 'An integrated green supplier selection approach with analytic network process and improved Grey relational analysis', *International Journal of Production Economics*, 159, pp. 178–191. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2014.09.027>.
- Hendiani, S. et al. (2020) 'A likelihood-based multi-criteria sustainable supplier selection approach with complex preference information', *Information Sciences*, 536, pp. 135–155. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2020.05.065>.
- Hwang, C.-L. and Yoon, K. (1981) 'Methods for Multiple Attribute Decision Making', pp. 58–191. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-48318-9_3.
- InVitro International (2019) *The Trend Towards Cruelty-free Cosmetics – Beauty from the Inside Out - InVitro Intl.*
- Jaccarini, P. and Refalo, P. (2017) 'Life cycle analysis of a portable cosmetic package', *Challenges for Technology Innovation: An Agenda for the Future - Proceedings of the International Conference on Sustainable Smart Manufacturing, S2M 2016, (August 2019)*, pp. 269–276. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781315198101-53>.
- Jayant, A. (2016) 'An Application of Analytic Network Process (ANP) to Evaluate Green Supply Chain Management Strategies: A Case Study', in *MATEC Web of Conferences*. EDP Sciences, p. 03003. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1051/mateconf/20165703003>.
- Jayant, A. and Paul, V. (2014) 'A green supplier selection model for an agriculture-machinery industry', in. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/296777361>.
- Jolai, F. et al. (2011) 'Integrating fuzzy TOPSIS and multi-period goal programming for purchasing multiple products from multiple suppliers', *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, 17(1), pp. 42–53. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pursup.2010.06.004>.

- Junior, F.R.L., Osiro, L. and Carpinetti, L.C.R. (2013) 'A fuzzy inference and categorization approach for supplier selection using compensatory and non-compensatory decision rules', *Applied Soft Computing Journal*, 13(10), pp. 4133–4147. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2013.06.020>.
- Kaur, H. et al. (2020) 'Sustainable stochastic production and procurement problem for resilient supply chain', *Computers and Industrial Engineering*, 139. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2018.12.007>.
- Khalilzadeh, M. and Derikvand, H. (2018) 'A multi-objective supplier selection model for green supply chain network under uncertainty', *Journal of Modelling in Management*, 13(3), pp. 605–625. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JM2-06-2017-0062>.
- Kuo, R.J., Wang, Y.C. and Tien, F.C. (2010) 'Integration of artificial neural network and MADA methods for green supplier selection', *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 18(12), pp. 1161–1170. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2010.03.020>.
- Lan, R. (2013) 'Study on applying PROMOTHEE in selecting suppliers in the supply chain', in *International Conference on Construction and Real Estate Management 2013*.
- Lee, A.H.I. et al. (2009) 'A green supplier selection model for high-tech industry', *Expert Systems with Applications*, 36(4), pp. 7917–7927. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2008.11.052>.
- Li, D.P. et al. (2021) 'Green Supplier Selection Under Cloud Manufacturing Environment: A Hybrid MCDM Model', *SAGE Open*, 11(4). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211057112>.
- Liu, H.C. et al. (2019) 'A new integrated MCDM model for sustainable supplier selection under interval-valued intuitionistic uncertain linguistic environment', *Information Sciences*, 486, pp. 254–270. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2019.02.056>.
- Liu, L. et al. (2020) 'Sustainable supplier selection based on regret theory and QUALIFLEX method', *International Journal of Computational Intelligence Systems*, 13(1), pp. 1120–1133. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2991/ijcis.d.200730.001>.
- Liu, W. (2014) 'Group eigenvalue method for food supplier selection model with ordinal interval preference information', *Advance Journal of Food Science and Technology*, 6(5), pp. 711–714. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.19026/ajfst.6.99>.
- Manuj, I. and Mentzer, J.T. (2008) 'Global supply chain risk management strategies', *Journal of Business Logistics*, 29(1), pp. 133–155. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2158-1592.2008.tb00072.x>.
- el Mariouli, O. and Abouabdellah, A. (2020) 'Development of Supplier Selection Model Using Fuzzy DEMATEL Approach in a Sustainable Development Context', in M.S. Bouhleb and S. Rovetta (eds) *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Sciences of Electronics, Technologies of Information and Telecommunications*

- (SETIT'18), Vol.1. Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp. 59–71.
- Mei, Y., Ye, J. and Zeng, Z. (2016) 'Entropy-weighted ANP fuzzy comprehensive evaluation of interim product production schemes in one-of-a-kind production', *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 100, pp. 144–152. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CIE.2016.08.016>.
- Memari, A. et al. (2019) 'Sustainable supplier selection: A multi-criteria intuitionistic fuzzy TOPSIS method', *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 50, pp. 9–24. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmsy.2018.11.002>.
- Mohammadi, H. et al. (2017) 'Green supplier selection by developing a new group decision-making method under type 2 fuzzy uncertainty', *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 93(1–4), pp. 1443–1462. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00170-017-0458-z>.
- Park, K., Okudan Kremer, G.E. and Ma, J. (2018) 'A regional information-based multi-attribute and multi-objective decision-making approach for sustainable supplier selection and order allocation', *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 187, pp. 590–604. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.03.035>.
- Pereira de Carvalho, A. and Barbieri, J.C. (2012) 'Innovation and Sustainability in the Supply Chain of a Cosmetics Company: a Case Study', *Journal of technology management & innovation*, 7(2), pp. 144–156. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-27242012000200012>.
- Pulverail, R. and Givaudan, F. (2013) 'Ethical Sourcing of Raw Materials', *Sustainability: How the Cosmetics Industry is Greening Up*, pp. 69–95. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118676516.ch4>.
- Rahmadani, M. and Suparno (2021) 'Risk analysis for sustainable supplier selection', in *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*. IOP Publishing Ltd. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1726/1/012005>.
- Rashidi, K. and Cullinane, K. (2019) 'A comparison of fuzzy DEA and fuzzy TOPSIS in sustainable supplier selection: Implications for sourcing strategy', *Expert Systems with Applications*, 121, pp. 266–281. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2018.12.025>.
- Rocca, R. et al. (2022) 'Sustainability paradigm in the cosmetics industry: State of the art', *Cleaner Waste Systems*, 3, p. 100057. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clwas.2022.100057>.
- Saaty, T.L. (2006) 'The Analytic Network Process', in *Proceedings of the 14th International Symposium on Operational Research, SOR 2017*, pp. 180–186. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-33987-6>.
- Sahota, A. (2014) 'Introduction to Sustainability', in *Sustainability: How the Cosmetics Industry is Greening Up*. John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.
- Sahu, Atul Kumar et al. (2018) 'Performance modeling and benchmarking of green supply chain management', *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 25(7), pp.

2248–2271. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-02-2017-0032>.

Sahu, Atul Kumar et al. (2022) ‘Decision-making framework for supplier selection using an integrated MCDM approach in a lean-agile-resilient-green environment: evidence from Indian automotive sector’, *The TQM Journal* [Preprint]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-12-2021-0372>.

Sahu, N.K., Sahu, Atul Kumar and Sahu, Anoop Kumar (2018) ‘Green supply chain management assessment under chains of uncertain indices’, *Journal of Modelling in Management*, 13(4), pp. 973–993. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JM2-07-2017-0068>.

Sancha, C., Longoni, A. and Giménez, C. (2015) ‘Sustainable supplier development practices: Drivers and enablers in a global context’, *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, 21(2), pp. 95–102. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.PURSUP.2014.12.004>.

Santa-Maria, T., Vermeulen, W.J.V. and Baumgartner, R.J. (2021) ‘Framing and assessing the emergent field of business model innovation for the circular economy: A combined literature review and multiple case study approach’, *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, 26, pp. 872–891. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2020.12.037>.

Sassanelli, C. et al. (2020) ‘Addressing Circular Economy through Design for X approaches: A Systematic Literature Review’, *Computers in Industry*, 120(103245), pp. 1–23.

Schneiders, B. and Anklin, F. (2013) ‘The Social Impact of a Cosmetics Company’, *Sustainability: How the Cosmetics Industry is Greening Up*, (2014), pp. 47–68. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118676516.ch3>.

Secchi, M. et al. (2016) ‘Assessing eco-innovations in green chemistry: Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) of a cosmetic product with a bio-based ingredient’, *Journal of Cleaner Production* [Preprint]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.04.073>.

Shannon, C.E. (1997) ‘The Mathematical Theory of Communication’, *M.D. Computing*, 14(4), pp. 306–317. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2307/410457>.

Shyur, H.J. and Shih, H.S. (2006) ‘A hybrid MCDM model for strategic vendor selection’, *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, 44(7–8), pp. 749–761. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.MCM.2005.04.018>.

‘Socio-Economic Contribution of the European Cosmetics Industry’ (2019).

Song, W., Xu, Z. and Liu, H.C. (2017) ‘Developing sustainable supplier selection criteria for solar air-conditioner manufacturer: An integrated approach’, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 79, pp. 1461–1471. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RSER.2017.05.081>.

Song, Y. et al. (2021) ‘Research on supplier selection of prefabricated building elements from the perspective of sustainable development’, *Sustainability (Switzerland)*,

- 13(11). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13116080>.
- Sreedhar, D. et al. (2020) 'Ban of cosmetic testing on animals: A brief overview', *International Journal of Current Research and Review*, 12(14), pp. 113–116. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.31782/IJCRR.2020.121424>.
- SuperDecisions (2022) SuperDecisions, <https://www.superdecisions.com/>.
- Taherdoost, H. and Brard, A. (2019) 'Analyzing the Process of Supplier Selection Criteria and Methods', in *Procedia Manufacturing*, pp. 1024–1034. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.promfg.2019.02.317>.
- Tang, S.-L. (2017) 'Green supplier selection model with hesitant fuzzy information', *Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems*, 32, pp. 189–195. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3233/JIFS-151377>.
- Tavana, M. et al. (2021) 'An integrated fuzzy sustainable supplier evaluation and selection framework for green supply chains in reverse logistics', *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* [Preprint]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-14302-w/Published>.
- Tavassoli, M., Saen, R.F. and Zanjirani, D.M. (2020) 'Assessing sustainability of suppliers: A novel stochastic-fuzzy DEA model', *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, 21, pp. 78–91. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2019.11.001>.
- van Thanh, N. and Lan, N.T.K. (2022) 'A New Hybrid Triple Bottom Line Metrics and Fuzzy MCDM Model: Sustainable Supplier Selection in the Food-Processing Industry', *Axioms*, 11(2). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/axioms11020057>.
- Thanh, N. van and Lan, N.T.K. (2022) 'A New Hybrid Triple Bottom Line Metrics and Fuzzy MCDM Model: Sustainable Supplier Selection in the Food-Processing Industry', *Axioms*, 11(2), p. 57. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/axioms11020057>.
- Tong, L., Pu, Z. and Ma, J. (2019) 'Maintenance supplier evaluation and selection for safe and sustainable production in the chemical industry: A case study', *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 11(6). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11061533>.
- Um, W.S. (2016) 'Supplier Evaluation and Selection Using AHP Method and Uncertainty Theory', in. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.11159/icmie16.101>.
- United Nations (2015) United Nations Sustainable Development, Sustainable Development Goals. Available at: <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/> (Accessed: 10 July 2019).
- Vita, N.A. et al. (2018) 'Parameters for assessing the aquatic environmental impact of cosmetic products', *Toxicology Letters*, 287, pp. 70–82. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.toxlet.2018.01.015>.

- Wang, C.-H. et al. (2021) 'Data driven supplier selection as a circular economy enabler: A Taguchi capability index for manufactured products with asymmetric tolerances', *Advanced Engineering Informatics*, 47, p. 101249. Available at: <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aei.2021.101249>.
- Wang, C.N. et al. (2022) 'Sustainable supplier selection model in supply chains during the COVID-19 pandemic', *Computers, Materials and Continua*, 70(2), pp. 3005–3019. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.32604/cmc.2022.020206>.
- Wang, W. et al. (2019) 'Decision support system toward evaluation of resilient supplier', *Kybernetes*, 49(6), pp. 1741–1765. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/K-05-2019-0345>.
- Yadavalli, V.S. et al. (2019) 'An integrated optimization model for selection of sustainable suppliers based on customers' expectations', *Operations Research Perspectives*, 6. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orp.2019.100113>.
- Yazdani, M. et al. (2019) 'A risk-based integrated decision-making model for green supplier selection', *Kybernetes*, 49(4), pp. 1229–1252. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/K-09-2018-0509>.
- Yu, C., Zhao, W. and Li, M. (2019) 'An integrated sustainable supplier selection approach using compensatory and non-compensatory decision methods', *Kybernetes*, 48(8), pp. 1782–1805. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/K-02-2018-0063>.
- Zadeh, L.A. (1965) 'Fuzzy sets', *Information and Control*, 8(3), pp. 338–353. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958\(65\)90241-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958(65)90241-X).
- Zakeri, S., Yang, Y. and Konstantas, D. (2022) 'A Supplier Selection Model Using Alternative Ranking Process by Alternatives' Stability Scores and the Grey Equilibrium Product', *Processes*, 10(5). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/pr10050917>.
- Zeydan, M., Çolpan, C. and Çobanoğlu, C. (2011) 'A combined methodology for supplier selection and performance evaluation', *Expert Systems with Applications*, 38(3), pp. 2741–2751. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2010.08.064>.
- Zhang, C. (2018) 'Research of the Selection of Green Material Suppliers Based on Entropy- TOPSIS Model', in *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*. Institute of Physics Publishing. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/394/5/052063>.
- Zhou, L.S., Li, C. and Yu, X.H. (2009) 'A post Evaluation technique for engineering project investment based on ANP-ENTROPY-TOPSIS', in *Proceedings - International Conference on Management and Service Science, MASS 2009*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICMSS.2009.5305005>.

The authors report there are no competing interests to declare