

bradscholars

Life cycle sustainability assessment of alternative green roofs – A systematic literature review

Item Type	Article
Authors	Tighnavard Balasbaneh, A.;Sher, W.;Madun, A.;Ashour, Ashraf
Citation	Tighnavard Balasbaneh A, Sher W, Madun A et al (2024) Life cycle sustainability assessment of alternative green roofs – A systematic literature review. Building and Environment. 248: 111064.
DOI	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2023.111064
Rights	© 2024 Elsevier. Reproduced in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)
Download date	2026-03-13 13:49:02
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/10454/19947

Life Cycle Sustainability Assessment of Alternative Green Roofs – A Systematic Literature Review

Ali Tighnavard Balasbaneh¹, Willy Sher², Aziman Madun³, Ashraf Ashour⁴

¹*Faculty of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, 86400 Parit Raja, Johor, Malaysia, Tel: +60136743818, tighnavard@uthm.edu.my*

²*School of Architecture and Built Environment, College of Engineering, Science and Environment, The University of Newcastle (UON), University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia,*

³*Faculty of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, 86400 Parit Raja, Johor, Malaysia,*

⁴*Faculty of Engineering, University of Bradford, Bradford BD71DP, United Kingdom*

Abstract

There is general agreement on the importance of green roofs as ways of reducing GHG emissions, reducing overall costs and improving sustainability in urban areas. This systematic literature review highlights life cycle sustainability assessment as an essential criterion to evaluate green roofs. A bibliometric analysis was used to quantitatively review relevant literature. The Scopus database was chosen as a bibliographic database of academic publications. This period of search started from 2003 and final search was conducted on February 15, 2023. Based on further in-depth reading, 88 publication records which met the selection criteria, including 74 papers and 14 conference papers. Researchers from the United States contributed almost 31 % of the documents. We evaluated leading studies in this field and discussed assessment method, system boundaries and research gaps through a critical literature review and a systematic search review. Finally, we propose a framework and identify a gap and future research. The environmental aspect of green roofs have received more attention than economic issues. We found that most economic evaluations of green roofs are limited to their construction stage. As yet there is no comprehensive social study on green roofs. We considered a unified study of the economic, environmental impact and social evaluation of green roofs to be warranted. Additionally, various measurement methods should be used to assess the economic profitability of green roofs over the long term. In summary, this study provides a deeper understanding of the environmental, social, and economic performance of green roofs and identifies research gaps as well as future research directions.

Keywords: Life Cycle Sustainability Assessment; Green roofs; Life Cycle Assessment; Circular Economy; Social Life Cycle Assessment;

43 **1. Introduction**

44 **1.1 Life Cycle Sustainability Assessment**

45 An increasing population worldwide has expanded the rate of construction of new buildings in
46 recent decades. For example, the value of construction was around 7.3 trillion in 2021, and it is expected to
47 increase by about 14.41 trillion by 2030 [1]. The construction building industry is responsible for
48 consuming about 40% of all global resources, producing 33% of all emissions and 40% of all waste
49 worldwide [2, 3]. Consequently, the construction industry generates almost 40% of annual CO₂ emissions.
50 Sustainable development adheres to the principles of respect for nature, environmental protection, and
51 responsible management of social and economic standards. The statistics above highlight the need for
52 sustainability to be considered in the construction sector to control resource consumption and eliminate
53 waste. Urban sustainability and global climate change issues can be addressed by designing cities that are
54 climate-conscious and energy-efficient [4]. In recent years, green roof construction has become an
55 increasingly popular design tool because of the numerous environmental benefits it provides [5]. Using a
56 green roof can support the sustainability objectives of an organization because it conserves energy by
57 insulating a building and reducing thermal heat gain [6]. Reducing the energy consumption of buildings
58 can also result in a significant reduction of CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel-fired power plants [7], reducing
59 pollution [8] as well as energy consumption [9]. Green roofs also decrease the heat island effect, leading to
60 a natural change of water [10]. This study focuses on the Sustainability Life Cycle Assessment (SLCA) of
61 green roofs. Furthermore, it identifies the gaps in previous studies. This will help researchers explore
62 additional challenges of the sustainability of green roofs in future studies.


63 Life Cycle Sustainability Assessment (LCSA) is one of the most valuable methods of evaluating
64 sustainability in the building sector. LCSA refers to the assessment of three sustainability pillars [11,12].
65 These pillars are life cycle assessment (LCA), life cycle cost (LCC) and social life cycle assessment
66 (SLCA). LCA is a methodology for assessing the environmental impacts associated with all the stages of
67 the life cycle of a building. LCC includes all costs associated with the life cycle of a building. SLCA is a
68 method that can be used to assess the social and sociological aspects of buildings, their actual and potential
69 positive as well as negative impacts during their life cycle [107]. In 1987, the Brundtland report [109]
70 referred to the terms of LCSA for the first time. Accordingly, Agenda 21 built on the Brundtland
71 Report, which stressed the importance of linking social and economic development with
72 environmental protection [110]. Each of these assessments has its own distinctive methodology [14].
73 SLCA generally uses a questionnaire to identify the most appropriate product from a social perspective.
74 Some questions that have been asked in this context relate to freedom of association, economical, social,
75 and environmental impacts, and fewer occupational accidents [15]. It is important to note that LCSA is
76 similar to the circular economy. According to a previous study [16], LCSA can be used to evaluate
77 circular economy strategies as it incorporates a comprehensive framework and is also capable of preventing
78 barriers between value chains and stockholders. Previous studies [16,17] indicate that circularity indicators
79 cannot be used in isolation. They argue that LCSA needs to be used to evaluate the entire process of a
80 product.

81

82

83 **1.2 Types of Green Roofs**

84 As mentioned above, one of the ways of constructing sustainable buildings is to build green roofs
85 [19]. Numerous studies over the past decade have identified the environmental benefits of green roofs in
86 cities. Green roof systems have many components, including roofing membranes, a protection layer, a
87 drainage layer, a filter layer, an irrigation system for the dry climates, and different types of vegetation, all
88 resting on an insulated structure [10]. Generally, these roofs fall into three categories [20]: extensive,
89 intensive and semi-intensive. Figure 1 shows the main features of green roofs. First, the extensive green
90 roof is of modest depth, has plants with shallow roots, and requires low maintenance. Second is the intensive
91 green roof, with a deeper layer of soil, and planted with various trees and plants and require considerable
92 maintenance. Currently and in widespread use, ‘extensive’ green roofs are planted with homogeneous
93 species and display shorter-term characteristics than intended [21].



94
95 Figure 1, Roofs with greenery of two types: extensive (right) and intensive (left) [22]

96 The third type of green roof is called semi-intensive [23]. Figure 2 shows different configurations
97 of this type. Green roofs with semi-intensive features are an intermediate type between extensive and
98 intensive roofs. They support a wide variety of shrubs and herbs, and provide ample possibilities for
99 landscaping [24]. Semi-intensive green roofs differ from extensive green roofs, in which vegetation grows
100 naturally. Clients and landscape architects and can choose plant types based on their interests and needs.
101 As a way to address the listed urban circularity challenges, green roofs can be integrated into newly
102 constructed and existing buildings (intensive, extensive and semi-intensive) [22] thereby offering solutions
103 to service “circular cities” [25].

104




Figure 2, Semi-intensive green roofs [24]

105
106

107 The maximum depth of roofs is 180mm, 250mm and 760mm for extensive, semi-intensive [24] and
 108 intensive green roofs, respectively. The vegetation planted in intensive roofs include trees, shrubs and
 109 lawns, while extensive roofs are limited to grasses, herbs and moss. However, semi-intensive roofs are of
 110 average soil depth compared to the two previous roof planting systems. They support shrubs, grass and
 111 herbs but not trees [26]. The weights for these roofs vary between 200 kg/m², 300 kg/m² and 800 kg/m² for
 112 extensive, semi-intensive and intensive green roofs respectively. The weight of an extensive green roof
 113 system is understandably the lowest among the alternatives and there is therefore no need to strengthen the
 114 roof structure [27]. However, the weight intensive green roof gardens needs to be considered when
 115 designing the roof structure system. Extensive green roofs are not trafficable by people and are considered
 116 inaccessible. In contrast, their intensive counterparts are suitable for social interactions and can be used by
 117 the public [28].

118
119

1.3 Theoretical Background

121 Vegetation such as vertical gardens, green façades and green roofs contribute to sustainability in
 122 cities as they absorb carbon from alternative urban sources [10]. Green roofs provide important benefits
 123 including reducing the heat island effect, extending roof life and reducing carbon emissions [29].
 124 Additionally, Kosareo and Ries [30] found that extensive and intensive green roofs could reduce stormwater
 125 run-off and mitigate urban heat island impact by 90% and 60%, respectively. Another study [31] found that
 126 19.8 ha of green roofs in Chicago improved air quality by removing about 1700 kg of air pollutants in one
 127 year. An investigation by Mirnezhad, Bin Aminudin and Yeap [32] measured and evaluated the heat transfer
 128 between conventional and green roofs. They found that green roofs could decrease temperature by 1-2 °C
 129 in hot and humid climates. Other researchers [33] investigated the energy performance of three different
 130 green roofs in a Mediterranean climate. They found that intensive green roofs required less cooling energy
 131 than extensive green roofs. Energy use was 20%, 70%, and 60% lower for extensive, semi-intensive and
 132 intensive green roofs compared to a traditional roof. These results confirm the advantages of green roofs.
 133 Another study [34] found that 50%–75% of roofs could improve air quality when covered with plants.
 134 Green roofs also have other advantages such as providing noise barriers in urbanized regions [35].

135 Green roofs produce fewer environmental emission in both the production and use phases [36].
136 Some studies have focused on the LCA of green technologies, such as green roofs. For example, one of the
137 first LCA studies of extensive green roof systems investigated reducing the energy consumption of
138 residential buildings [37]. Other study [38] compared the LCA of four existing roofs, namely: intensive
139 green roofs, extensive green roofs, semi-intensive green roofs and conventional roofs. This showed that
140 extensive green roofs generated the least biodiversity loss and was considered the best option. Yet another
141 study evaluated the LCA of roofs and established that the manufacturing phase of intensive green roofs
142 resulted in higher GWP (global warming potential) compared with extensive green systems and gravel
143 roofing systems [39]. In contrast to research advocating green roofs as a sustainable building method [39,
144 40], other research offers a contrary perspective. For example, one study compared the LCA of conventional
145 and green roofs [42]. This showed that conventional roofs have less environmental impact than extensive
146 green roofs. This is not surprising because extensive green roofs require considerably more materials and
147 components than conventional ones. Different studies have compared the LCA of green roofs with different
148 insulation materials, heat resistances, and waterproof layers [43]. The investigators argue that green roofs
149 contribute the highest emissions and most damage to human health and the ecosystem. This relates to the
150 construction of green roof as more materials are needed compared to roofs designed only for heat resistance
151 or waterproofing. A LCA study conducted by Rincón, [44] evaluated the reduction in cooling and heating
152 of alternative layers of recycled rubber, pozzolana when insulated and not insulated with polyurethane for
153 extensive green roofs and conventional roofs. They showed that recycled rubber could decrease the
154 environmental impact of extensive green roofs compared to a non-insulated conventional roof. Another
155 LCA study [24] analyzed four different semi-intensive green roofs, including hydrophilic mineral wool and
156 extruded polystyrene. Yet another LCA study [45] evaluated ten alternative flat roofs with and without
157 plantings. They found that green roofs with plants had a higher environmental impact benefit and lower
158 cost. These studies clearly highlight the need for a comprehensive life cycle boundary analysis for
159 evaluating alternative case studies. Some reviews of green roof literature have been conducted in the past
160 few years. For example, a LCA study [50] of green roofs revealed that they could have less environmental
161 impact than traditional roofs. Additionally, this study recommended that industry byproducts be studied
162 more thoroughly.

163 Some studies have estimated the cost of green roofs versus conventional roofs. For example, a cost
164 analysis of traditional roofs versus extensive green roof systems was conducted by Talbot [46]. They found
165 that green roofs cost around 25% less than traditional roofs at the end of their lifetime [47]. They showed
166 that green roofs (extensive and intensive) are more economical than other non-greened roofs. Another LCC
167 study conducted by Chan and Chow [48] compared conventional roofs with green roofs. Their findings
168 were that for the replacement cost of a conventional roof, the cost payback period is about ten years.
169 Additionally, a limited number of articles have combined LCA and LCC as a single study [41, 47]. The
170 study reported in this paper has been conducted to evaluate the LCSA of all sustainability approaches: LCA,
171 LCC, and SLCA. We also propose a framework that highlights gaps in current knowledge to inform further
172 research.

173

174

175

176 **2. Method**

177 **2.1 Principles and Procedures**

178 The results of this study are presented in two sections. The first presents the result as a bibliometric
179 analysis which is shown as a co-occurrence map of keywords, geographical distribution, organization and
180 counties. The second section analyses different details of LCA, LCC, and SLCA based on various
181 characteristics used in their assessment. Recently, academic researchers have become increasingly
182 interested in bibliometric analyses [51]. Bibliometric evaluation includes statistical strategies and
183 mathematical methods to evaluate the bibliometric data from a previously selected publication, such as
184 articles and conference papers [52]. The bibliometric method could be described as a quantitative review
185 technique such as analyzing citations on bibliometric data such as units of publication and citation. The
186 bibliometric technique considers a review method to discover the relationship among emerging research
187 topics, journal citations, and the current state of the existing research area.

188 Figure 3 shows the systematic procedures of selecting appropriate literature for this study. In the
189 first stage, appropriate keywords were chosen to target SLCA and green roofs. The evolution of the search
190 terms used is presented in Table 1. Searches were conducted using the keywords and their combinations.
191 The final search was conducted on February 15, 2023. In the second stage, the Scopus database was chosen
192 as a bibliographic database of academic publications. Scopus is one of the most commonly used databases
193 for bibliometric analyses due to its unique features [53]. Our searches were limited to articles and
194 conference papers as well as book chapters to identify high-quality research. We searched for English
195 documents published between 2003 and 2022. As part of stage 3, 164 publications were found related to
196 the definition of the search (title, abstract, and keywords). All duplicate papers were excluded (exclusion)
197 based on the titles of articles and grey literature, and 154 records were retained for further processing. A
198 review of abstracts identified 42 papers outside the scope of the study and these were discarded. The
199 remaining 112 articles were checked for their title, abstract and keywords, and 13 records that did not focus
200 on environmental or economic aspects of sustainability assessment were excluded. Based on a further in-
201 depth reading, ten papers were removed, leaving 88 records which met the selection criteria, including 74
202 papers and 14 conference papers. The last analysis stage (4) is explained in the bibliometric analysis section
203 (2.2). It is worth mentioning that papers related to surveys of air conditioner resizing and storm-water
204 related to green roofs were considered outside the scope of this research.




Figure 3. Procedures of selections of article

205
206

207

208 2.2 Bibliometric Analysis

209 Visualizing similarities (VOS) viewer software has become increasingly popular in bibliometric
 210 research. This software was developed [54] to present bibliometric maps in a visually appealing manner. It
 211 allows literature to be efficiently collated, similarities between selected publications identified within
 212 parameters, and significant themes identified among publications [55]. In addition, it was possible to map
 213 the sciences encountered and analyze networks using VOSviewer (ver.1.6.19). Moreover, in terms of
 214 bibliometric mapping, clustering and the visualization of networks, this study was limited in its analyses of
 215 keywords and co-authorships. We retrieved data from the Scopus database and exported them in a .csv
 216 (Microsoft Excel) file [55]. The selected keywords for the database are illustrated as shown in Table 1.

217 Table 1. Results of keyword search terms

Query	Number of articles	After refine
"green roof " AND "Sustainability" AND "Life Cycle"	44	32
"green roof " AND "Sustainability" AND "Life Cycle assessment" AND "LCA"	21	18
"green roof " AND "Sustainability" AND "Life Cycle cost"	13	13
"green roof " AND "Life Cycle cost"	35	34
"green roof " AND "Life Cycle assessment" AND "LCA"	62	59
"green roof " AND "Social Life Cycle assessment"	0	0
"green roof " AND "Life Cycle cost" AND "Life Cycle assessment" AND "LCA" AND "LCC"	9	8
"green roof " AND "Life Cycle assessment" OR "Life Cycle cost" AND "Social Life Cycle assessment"	0	0
Initial Title Screening Total		164
Total after removing duplication		88

218

219 To conduct a bibliometric analysis, three primary steps are required. They include an evaluation of
220 performance, network analysis and science mapping. An evaluation of performance involves evaluating the
221 number of publications and citations (the h-index) as well as related metrics (e.g., the number of citations).
222 This reflects the influence and strength of relationships between different title attributes of articles using
223 their co-occurrence weights and total link strengths. An analysis of citations may include citation analyses,
224 co-citation analyses, bibliographic coupling analyses, co-word (keyword) analyses, and co-authorship
225 analyses. Through network analysis, bibliometric mapping results can be enhanced. A common method is
226 to evaluate and visualize network metrics and cluster data. The methodology adopted for this study followed
227 previous research [56]. Data obtained from Scopus were used for a performance analysis that included the
228 number of publications, citations, and impact factor.

229 Three types of visualisation are available in VOSviewer: overlays, networks, and densities. Data
230 clustering was effected solely using network visualisation. Keywords and topics are displayed as well as
231 their co-occurrences, co-authorship, and country of origin regardless of co-occurrence of words or co-
232 authorship. Additionally, colors indicate the popularity and similarity of studies. As these are frequently
233 used in multiple studies, line colors used for the interconnection of words change. Smaller connections are
234 indicated by lighter colors, while larger connections are indicated by darker colors.

235


236 **3 Results**

237 **3.1 Bibliometric Data**

238 This section expands on the descriptive analysis of bibliometric evaluation. Different criteria have
239 been considered such as years of publication, geographical distribution, number of citations and the journals
240 in which the papers were published. Preliminary results based on document type distribution showed that
241 around 79.5% of papers are published in journals versus 26% as conference papers. Only 4.5% are book
242 chapters. Most of the publications related to the green roof are articles (70), which represent 79.55% of all
243 the documents. The second source of publications, conference papers, provided 14 papers and represents
244 15.9% of all the selected documents. The last source, book chapters, provided four papers accounting for
245 only 4.5%. Most publications were published in international journals.

246 Growth in the number of publications related to this topic is shown in figure 4. The first study
247 related to the life cycle of green roofs was about LCC in 2003 [57], while the first green roof study of LCA
248 was not until 2006 [37]. The number of publications rose during 2007 and then decreased in the next year
249 (2008). No relevant research was published during 2009, showing that research about green roofs was
250 sporadic. However, since 2012 the number of publications stabilized to more than four papers every year.
251 Still, many peaks and some bottom observed probably showed the uncertainty about LCSEA research about
252 a green roof. Only one paper relevant related was published in 2011, but output rose to eight in 2012 and
253 decreased to four papers in 2021. Prior to that, only nine papers were published until 2011, and from 2012
254 to 2022, this number rose to 79, showing an 88% increase rate. The annual publication rate increased in
255 2022 to 13 papers, being the highest number of publications to date. The growth trend publications in life
256 cycle studies of the green roof thus has many ups and downs. In contrast, similar studies about building or
257 construction show an increase each year [58]. This shows that the importance of life cycle studies of green
258 roofs have not been prioritised. Figure 4 also shows the number of citations these papers attracted. The first

259 citations appeared only two years after the first published article in 2005. Unlike the number of publications
 260 that have not increased steadily during the last twenty years, the number of citations has had a more stable
 261 growth trajectory. The total number of citations increased from 23 in 2009 to 458 in 2021 only decreasing
 262 to 423 in 2022.



263 Figure 4. Annual growth of publications from 2003 to 2022
 264

265 Table 2 shows the primary outlets that publish life cycle studies of green roofs. The “Journal of
 266 cleaner production” and “Building and environment” published the most articles. However, “Building and
 267 Environment” attracted the highest citations. Table 2 also lists the journals' highest total link strength in
 268 green roofs for LCSA. Journals such as the Journal of Cleaner Production, Building and Environment,
 269 International journal of life cycle assessment, Environmental and climate technologies, Environmental
 270 science and technology, Energy and buildings, and Science of the total environment received the highest
 271 co-citation link strengths. These journals are the preeminent research outlets for green roofs and LCSA.

272 Table 2, Main sources of research from 2003 to 2022


Source	Documents	Citations	Total link strength
Building and environment	7	746	55
Web of conferences	2	0	3
Energy and buildings	2	207	7
Environmental and climate technologies	2	1	8
Environmental monitoring and assessment	2	73	4
Environmental science and technology	3	405	23
International journal of life cycle assessment	2	31	2
International journal of sustainable building technology and urban development	2	21	10
Journal of cleaner production	7	281	55
Journal of environmental management	3	289	3
Science of the total environment	2	37	9
Journal of Water (Switzerland)- MDPI	2	28	5

273

274

3.1.1 Geographical Distribution

275 Figure 5 shows the geographical distribution of the documents analysed. This shows that
 276 researchers in the United States are actively in green roof and life cycle research. In addition, authors in
 277 many European countries such as Italy, Spain, Germany, Portugal, and the Netherlands are publishing a
 278 high number of publications in this field. However, researchers in China are the only ones in Asia that are
 279 active in this field. The United States and Italy have been listed as the top countries for publications since
 280 2003, and these countries have made a significant contribution to life cycle and green roof topics. Table 3
 281 provides details of regions/ countries for these papers. To compare citations, the United States and Italy
 282 have the highest number relative to their number of publications. The citation is 1108 (31%), 465 (13%),
 283 304 (9%), 296 (8%), and 220 (6%) for the United States, Italy, Singapore, Canada, and Germany,
 284 respectively.



285
286

Figure 5. Total link strength of active key regions from 2003 to 2022

287 Italy has the highest link strength among other countries. This represents the country's core role in
 288 cooperating with others on this topic. Thus, Italy has made a solid contribution to developing green roof
 289 life cycle studies. Researcher in Italy have co-authored papers on green roofs and their life cycle
 290 applications with researchers in several countries. Other countries with high total link strengths include
 291 Germany, Portugal, and Greece, respectively. Surprisingly, the total link strength of the United States is
 292 among the lowest in the ranking of nine out of twenty countries. This might relate to the fact that researchers
 293 from the United States rarely collaborate and publish papers with researchers from other countries.

294 The link between two countries or circles shows that authors in these countries cooperate with
 295 author from other countries. The thicker the connection, the stronger the cooperation between the two
 296 countries in terms of the number of contributions. The lines and circles in yellow represent new researchers
 297 conducting research on the topic. Bosnia and Herzegovina and Sweden are countries where researchers
 298 have recently published papers about green roofs and life cycles. It is also interesting to note links between

299 countries. For example, a strong relationship is found between the United States, Germany, Canada and the
 300 Netherlands. Researchers from these countries have been contributing to this topic for the longest time.
 301

302 Table 3, Details of regions/ countries in selected papers

Country	Documents	Citations	Total link strength
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2	14	1113
Canada	5	296	167
China	8	140	351
Egypt	2	13	66
France	3	52	231
Germany	5	220	1386
Greece	5	56	1332
Hong Kong	2	192	9
India	2	8	4
Italy	16	465	1582
Lebanon	2	43	204
Netherlands	5	86	187
Portugal	5	72	1361
Singapore	2	304	59
South Korea	3	186	46
Spain	9	209	1161
Sweden	3	1	7
Turkey	2	19	1136
United states	17	1108	385

303 Figure 6 shows the network of countries in which LCSA studies were conducted from 2003 to
 304 2022. Each circle represents countries with publications about green roofs and LCSA, and the size of each
 305 circle represents the number of publications. The large circles for Italy and the United States thus mean that
 306 researchers in these countries have published most papers in this field. The link between two countries or
 307 circles shows that authors in these countries cooperate with those from other countries. The thicker the
 308 connection, the stronger the cooperation between the two countries in terms of the number of contributions.
 309 The lines and circles in yellow represent new researchers conducting research on the topic. Bosnia and
 310 Herzegovina and Sweden are countries where researchers have recently published papers about green roofs
 311 and life cycle studies. It is also interesting to note links between countries. For example, a strong
 312 relationship is found between the United States, Germany, Canada and the Netherlands. Researchers from
 313 these countries have been contributing to this topic for the longest time.




Figure 6. A network of regions/ countries in which LCSA studies were conducted in 2003 to 2022.

3.1.2 Co-occurrence of Keywords

One of the main components of any research paper is the keywords that represent their content. The co-occurrence of the keywords ‘green roof’ and ‘life cycle studies’ was effected by setting the minimum frequency to two keywords in VOSviewer software. Next, the process of filtering was conducted to merge synonyms such as “green roof” and “green roofs” and to convert abbreviations into full terms (“life cycle assessment” and “LCA”). Some general terms such as (“method”, “conclusion”, etc.) were ignored. Analysis of the keywords revealed 298 results for the green roof and life cycle topic with one co-occurrence threshold. When the minimum number of co-occurrences was changed to at least two, the threshold number decreased to 50. Consequently, sixteen keywords with the highest number of co-occurrences were selected as shown in Table 4. The most cited keyword was “Life cycle assessment, LCA, Life cycle analysis, etc.” with an occurrence of 33, which covered 25% of all shares and with total link strength of 71 (26%). The second highest keyword was “green roof, green roofs”, with a frequency of 30 (23%) and total link strength of 54 (20%). The third highest cited keyword was life cycle cost, with a frequency of 13 (10%) and total link strength of 24 (9%). The remaining highest cited keywords are environmental impact (8%), sustainability (5%), extensive green roof (5%), energy efficiency (5%), energy saving (4%), low impact development (3%), and green infrastructure (3%), respectively.

337

Table 4, Details of Co-occurrence of keywords of the selected publications

	Keyword	Occurrences	Total link strength
1	Life cycle analysis	2	7
2	Life cycle approach	2	4
3	Life cycle assessment	33	71
4	Life cycle cost	13	24
5	Green roof	30	54
6	CO ₂ emission reduction	2	6
7	Sustainability	7	20
8	Sustainable development	3	6
9	Low impact development	4	2
10	Green infrastructure	4	6
11	Environmental impact	10	22
12	Extensive green roof	6	16
13	Energy efficiency	6	14
14	Energy saving	5	10
15	Urban heat island	2	5
16	Vegetative roofs	2	4

338

339 The current network map shows five highly interconnected clusters. Among the top five knowledge
340 areas of life cycle and green roof, the most popular topics were life cycle assessment, green roof, life cycle
341 cost, and environmental impact. Furthermore, these keywords were strongly associated with different
342 clusters. The other cluster in concern is mainly related to green construction and infrastructure, and their
343 corresponding issues can be seen as “ecology”, “green architecture”, “green infrastructure”, “retention”,
344 and “sustainable development”. The purple cluster relates to “life cycle cost”, “low impact development”,
345 “energy saving”, and “cradle to grave”. The green cluster refers to “environment impact”, “recycle”,
346 “building”, “extensive green roof”, “life cycle approach”, “urban area”, “vegetable roof”, while the light
347 blue cluster relates to “life cycle assessment”, “rooftop agriculture”, and “sustainability”, and “storm
348 water”. The blue cluster relates to “energy consumption”, “maintenance”, “flat roof”, “environment
349 performance”, and “eco-design”. The yellow cluster refers to “green roof” “green wall”, “white roof”,
350 “urban heat island” “energy efficiency”.

351 The red cluster in figure 7 is mainly related to green construction and infrastructure. Corresponding
352 issues can be seen as “ecology”, “green architecture”, “green infrastructure”, “retention”, and “sustainable
353 development”. The purple cluster relates to “life cycle cost”, “low impact development”, “energy saving”,
354 and “cradle to grave”. The green cluster refers to “environment impact”, “recycle”, “building”, “extensive
355 green roof”, “life cycle approach”, “urban area”, “vegetable roof”, while the light blue cluster relates to
356 “life cycle assessment”, “rooftop agriculture”, and “sustainability”, and “storm water”. The blue cluster
357 relates to “energy consumption”, “maintenance”, “flat roof”, “environment performance”, and “eco-
358 design”. The yellow cluster refers to “green roof” “green wall”, “white roof”, “urban heat island” “energy
359 efficiency”.




Figure 7. Co-occurrence map of the keywords from 2003 to 2022

3.2 Life Cycle Sustainability Analysis

3.2.1 LCA Evaluation

The meta-analysis can be used to inform recommendations or provide guidance for future designs. Table 5 presents the top 12 most cited research papers in Scopus. The most cited research article is “Comparative environmental life cycle assessment of green roofs” [30] from Building and Environment, with 250 citations. This is one of the first studies to use the Simapro software to evaluate the LCA of green roofs. This study considered the Impact 2002+ life cycle impact assessment (LCIA) method for four environment categories: ozone layer depletion; acidification; eutrophication; and global warming. They claimed that intensive green roofs are ideal in all five impact categories. The second highest cited article “Comparative life cycle assessment of standard and green roofs” from the journal of environmental science & technology has 223 citations. It is the first investigation to use Simapro Software to analyse the LCA of green roofs [37]. However, it only evaluated extensive green roofs for a range of environmental categories, including abiotic depletion, ozone layer depletion, freshwater aquatic ecotoxicity, terrestrial ecotoxicity, global warming, photochemical oxidation, human toxicity, eutrophication, acidification, ecotoxicity, and marine aquatic. However, the authors did not mention the LCIA method by name. Another highly cited article [59] used the CML-2 and Eco-indc-99 LCIA methods for analysis.

382 Table 5, Most cited articles on life cycle assessment of green roofs

	Source	Year	Location	Types of roof	Functional unit	Lifetime (Years)	Method /Software	Total citations
1	[30]	2007	USA	Extensive/ Intensive	-	50	Simapro	250
2	[37]	2016	Canada	Extensive	-	50	Simapro	223
3	[60]	2010	United States	Green roof	-	-	-	67
4	[59]	2007	UK	Innovative system	treated greywater	15	Simapro	65
5	[61]	2015	Finland	Extensive	1m ²	40	Simapro	64
6	[44]	2014	Spain	Extensive	9 m ²	50	LCAmanager	59
7	[24]	2017	Czech Republic	Intensive	1 m ²	20	GaBi	54
8	[62]	2013	Spain	Extensive	50 m ²	-	European database	51
9	[27]	2012	Italy	Extensive	1 m ²	50	Simapro	48
10	[63]	2012	Netherlands	Extensive	kWh of electricity	30	Simapro	42
11	[64]	2014	Spain	Extensive/ Intensive	300 m ²	30	Ecoinvent 99 (EI99), IMPACT 2002+ and Cumulative Energy Demand	37
12	[65]	2018	Portugal	semi-intensive	1 m ²	50	GaBi	34

383 The fourth and fifth most cited papers also evaluated extensive green roofs, as well as most of the
384 other studies. This may be because this kind of green roof does not require changing the last ceiling
385 thickness of building with needing the lowest thickness of soil; consequently, it is particularly suitable for
386 existing building structures [66]. Most studies evaluated one type of green roof, either the extensive green
387 roof [27], intensive green roof [24], or semi-intensive green roof [65]. Some researchers compared the LCA
388 of different types of green roofs. For example, one study [30] compared two types of green roof (extensive
389 and intensive green roofs), finding that ozone layer depletion, acidification, eutrophication, and global
390 warming impact categories of intensive green roofs were better than those of extensive roofs. Another study
391 found that intensive green roofs have the highest impact on all damage categories, including human health
392 and climate change, compared to extensive green roofs [64]. A further study [67] compared the LCA of
393 alternative roofs: traditional gravel ballasted roofs, and white reflective roofs with extensive and intensive
394 green roofs. They found that many life cycle stages need to be evaluated in future research, such as water
395 retention, pollutant extraction from the atmosphere by a green roof, and thermal insulation effects. Their
396 results indicated that both green roofs perform better than other alternatives [67].

397 There are many different LCIA methods that have been used in alternative LCA studies. Despite
398 most studies using the IMPACT2002 +, ReCiPe v1.06, and CML2 baseline, other LCIA methods were used
399 in a few studies. For example, one study [68] applied the UM-LCA method. The UM-LCA approach has
400 limitations and these should be considered when evaluating results. A study by Goldstein et al. (2013)
401 discussed how UM-LCA can be useful only with appropriate geographic boundaries and functional units.
402 The differences between the UM-LCA method and other LCIA methods such as IMPACT2002 +, ReCiPe
403 v1.06, and CML2 need further investigation to identify their differences. The LCIA methods used included
404 Impact 2002+ (six times, 24%), followed by CML 2001, ReCiPe v1.06, and CML2 baseline (four times,
405 16%). The eco-Indicator 99 method was used twice (8%). Other LCIA such as TRACI v2.1 [69], LCA/EPD
406 [70], IPCC [71], European database [62], and Cumulative Energy Demand [64] were only used once in
407 different studies. The majority of LCA studies used Simapro software to analyze green roofs (19 times,
408 70%), followed by GaBi software (three times, 11%). Other software was used once in different LCA
409 studies, eBalance 4.7 [72], CYPE Engineers [73], Athena [69], EPA-W [43], and LCA-calculator [66].

410

411 **3.2.2 LCC Evaluation**

412 Table 6 shows the most cited articles on the LCC of green roofs. Different LCC methods may be
 413 used including the net present value (NPV), present value (PV), internal rate of return (IRR), and pay back
 414 period (PBP). The most cited study [20] is from the Journal of Environmental Management, entitled “Life-
 415 cycle cost-benefit analysis of extensive vegetated roof systems” with 254 citations. Most studies used NPV
 416 to compare different scenarios. Some studies [74] used other methods, such as PBP and IRR. Some studies
 417 compared extensive and intensive green roofs. For example, one study [57] compared two intensives (80%
 418 shrub & 50% tree) with an extensive green roof. They found that the initial cost of extensive, intensive with
 419 80% shrubs and intensive with 50% trees was 89 \$ M², 178 \$ M², 197 \$ M², respectively. The extensive
 420 green roof was therefore considered a lower-cost option. Only a few studies compared the LCC between
 421 intensive and extensive green roofs. Mohapatra et al., (2020) believed that semi-intensive roofs deliver
 422 higher energy efficiency than extensive green roofs. However, the LCC of the semi-intensive roof was not
 423 evaluated in any of the selected publications. Other costing methods such as total rate of return (TRR),
 424 discounted payback period (DPP), and external rate of return (ERR), could be used in future studies to
 425 evaluate green roof costs and energy consumption.

426 Table 6, Most cited articles on life cycle cost of green roof

	Source	Location	Types of roofs	Method/Software	Total citation
1	[20]	USA	Extensive	NPV	254
2	[74]	Italy	Extensive	NPV, IRR, PBP	215
3	[75]	USA	Extensive	cost-effectiveness	190
4	[57]	Singapore	Extensive/Intensive	Discounting method	184
5	[76]	Hong kong	Green roof	PV	163
6	[77]	United states	Extensive	NPV	119
7	[78]	Italy	Extensive	NPV	56
8	[79]	China	Green roof	NPV	31
9	[80]	Hong Kong	Extensive	PV	28
10	[81]	USA	Green Roof	-	17
11	[99]	Italy	Extensive/ Intensive	NPV, Life Cycle Revenue, and Discounted Cashflow	12

427

428 **3.2.3 LCA & LCA Evaluation**

429 Table 7 shows the most cited articles on LCA and LCC of green roofs. One of these is “LCC and
 430 LCCO₂ analysis of green roofs in elementary schools with energy saving measures” by Hong et al., (2012)
 431 published in the Journal of Energy and Buildings, with 88 citations. The authors evaluated 16 case studies
 432 with green roofs, incorporating external insulation, exterior blinds, double glazing, and a light-emitting
 433 diode. The impact of alternate green roofs could not be distinguished in this study since its focus was on a
 434 different element of existing buildings. The first study about LCA that claimed to have a consequential life
 435 cycle analysis was by Wang, Eckelman and Zimmerman [82]. A consequential LCA provides an estimate
 436 of how global environmental burdens are affected by the production and use of a product and how to make
 437 changes to improve choices [83]. This study focuses on the LCA of alternative rainfall scenarios of green
 438 infrastructures such as green roofs. Another study [49] analyzed the life cycle CO₂ and LCC of sixteen
 439 different types of vegetation for green roofs. This revealed that green roofs, sedum, and grass generate low
 440 total costs. In another study, two green roof types, roof farm and extensive roof garden, were compared.
 441 This found the roof farm to be more expensive than the roof garden [84]. Another study [66] assessed the
 442 energy environment and cost of a building and applied some strategies such as retrofitting of extensive
 443 green roofs, windows, and thermal insulation. LCA and LCC were compared in another [42], finding that

444 traditional roofs have less environmental impact compared to extensive green roofs. It is probably because
 445 extensive green roofs require more materials than a traditional one. In conclusion, none of the reviewed
 446 studies identified the most effective green roofs with respect to LCA and LCC. Furthermore, none of these
 447 studies considered semi-intensive green roofs and how these differ from the other two types of green roof.
 448 Therefore, it is currently not possible to identify the optimum green roof structure.

449 Table 7, Most cited articles on life cycle assessment and life cycle cost of green roof

	Source	Location	Types of roof	Functional unit	Lifetime (Years)	LCA method/Software	Citation
1	[85]	Republic of Korea	Extensive / Intensive/ Mix system	Not spacificd	15	-	88
2	[82]	United States	Green roof	1298 m2	40	SimaPro	101
3	[49]	Korea	Extensive	-	40	-	71
4	[66]	Italy	Extensive	-	100	Design Builder	42
5	[84]	Republic of Korea	Extensive	140m2	40	ecoinvent database (v3.3)	10
6	[42]	Greece	Extensive	-	45	SimaPro	2

450

451 3.3 Life Cycle System Boundary Monitoring

452 3.3.1 System Boundary of LCA

453 Table 8 shows research about the LCA of green roofs and the various phases of the life span of
 454 green roofs. Since an evaluation of cradle-to-gate (A1-A3) is compulsory in LCA studies, we have excluded
 455 studies that consider only these stages. The literature includes cradle-to-gate (A1–A3) [70], cradle-to-site
 456 (A1–A5) [67], and cradle-to-grave (A1–C4) [44,85]. All these studies focused on the production and
 457 manufacturing stage (A1–A3) more than others. This might be related to EPD (Environmental Product
 458 Declaration) EN15804 and EN15978, as any LCA must assess A1–A3. No studies focused on the entire
 459 life cycle of a green roof. In other words, even studies that presented their system boundaries as a complete
 460 life cycle do not include all the subcategories of these phases. Figure 8 shows that there is no mention of
 461 repair (B3), refurbishment (B5), and reuse (D1) in any LCA studies. These stages need further evaluation.

462 Although almost half of the LCA studies considered maintenance (B2), the assumptions made
 463 differed from one study to another. There thus appears to be a need for a robust framework and clear
 464 understanding. The maintenance of the wall of a building is quite different from a green roof. For example,
 465 one study considered the maintenance for a green roof to be that the plants needed cleaning [38]. The
 466 maintenance of semi-intensive green roofs was seen as intermediate maintenance, and was limited to
 467 occasional irrigation, weeding, and fertilization [72]. However, in this study, the maintenance of the main
 468 structure of the green roof and its alternative layers has not been considered. Another study [69] claimed
 469 that their study had considered maintenance. However, this was limited to weed control. Another study [87]
 470 considered only fertilization for the 40 year life span of the roof. A further study [24] considered fertilization
 471 of the substrate, visual checks and weeding for the maintenance stage. Maintenance includes regular visual
 472 inspection and actions necessary to retain the desirable functionality level [88]. Unlike the study of Manso,
 473 Castro-Gomes, Paulo, Bentes and Teixeira [65] waterproofing and irrigation require maintenance every ten
 474 years of the 50 year life span of the roof. This is different to the work of other researchers. Thus, a detailed
 475 framework for maintaining different green roofs is needed as the depth of soil in the various roofs is
 476 different and may affect the process.

478 Table 8 Description of Life cycle stages of selected articles related to the life cycle assessment

		Raw Material Extraction	Transport	Manufacturing in Factory	Transport to Site	Installation and Erected Process	Use	Maintenance	Repair	Replacement	Refurbishment	Operation Energy Use	Operation Water Use	Demolition	Transport	Waste Processing	Disposal	Reuse	Recovery	Recycling	Landfill	
Source	Year	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7	C1	C2	C3	C4	D1	D2	D3	D4	
[45]	2022																					
[70]	2022																					
[89]	2020																					
[72]	2020																					
[86]	2020																					
[69]	2020																					
[66]	2020																					
[87]	2020																					
[65]	2018																					
[73]	2018																					
[59]	2007																					
[24]	2017																					
[90]	2017																					
[91]	2016																					
[67]	2016																					
[43]	2015																					
[61]	2015																					
[44]	2014																					
[88]	2013																					
[27]	2012																					
[92]	2008																					
[30]	2007																					
[84]	2018																					
[49]	2012																					
[37]	2016																					
[93]	2014																					
[94]	2019																					
[38]	2019																					
[71]	2022																					
[42]	2021																					
[60]																						

480 The replacement (B4) stage for green roofs also needs further evaluation. For example, one study
 481 [24] considered replacement of the substrate but it was not clear what materials were used, what was
 482 replaced and how many times this was done during the life span of the roof. Another study considered
 483 replacing irrigation, plants, and sealing [38]. Yet another study [30] claimed that the average life span
 484 of a conventional roofing system is usually 10 to 15 years before replacement. The same study
 485 stated that it was necessary to assess a green roof and disclose the life span of the green roof before
 486 replacement was considered. The different layer of a green roof, including thermal insulation, root
 487 barriers, vapour barriers and waterproof layers, have different life spans. These need to be considered
 488 separately for replacement and / or maintenance. On the other hand, since green roofs are exposed to the
 489 elements, the life span of green roof layers and components can be affected compared to the materials used
 490 inside. These scenarios need to be considered in future studies.




Figure 8, Life cycle assessment stage of system boundaries

492
493

494

495 The operational energy use stage (B6) was considered in few green roof studies. One study [86]
 496 analyzed the LCA and energy consumption of extensive green roofs. Other researchers included B6 and
 497 considered annual energy consumption for extensive green roofs [48,59]. Future studies could investigate
 498 operation energy use of alternative green roofs. Another study [86] considered recycling, but was limited
 499 to the energy consumption of extensive green roofs. Environmental performance was not calculated.
 500 Extensive green roofs can be retrofitted to existing buildings without structural changes. The environmental
 501 performance of intensive green roofs on existing buildings may present larger benefits during the use phase
 502 as larger reductions in heating and cooling energy use are expected [91]. However, additional structural
 503 requirements would likely increase upstream environmental impacts. This needs to be considered with
 504 bigger system boundaries and include reuse and recycling.

505

506 3.3.2 The System Boundary of LCC

507 The system boundaries of cost or economic performance need to be analyzed in a similar manner
 508 to environmental performance in terms of their objectives and scope. According to ISO 15686-5 (2017),
 509 economic performance can be evaluated in different phases of the life cycle of a green roof. Table 9 presents
 510 various studies which concentrate on the economic assessment of these roofs at different stages of their life
 511 cycle. It is imperative to consider the inclusion of green roofs at the design stage. This is so that structural
 512 integrity is taken into account [10], Thus the A0 stage is added as a design phase. Surprisingly, no studies
 513 considering the costs of the design stage. However, most studies included the manufacturing cost (A1-A3),
 514 as this shows stakeholders what needs to be spent to construct a green roof. LCC for extensive green roofs
 515 have been analysed considering only manufacturing and construction stages [42]. One of the first studies
 516 that included disposal costs for green roofs used the benefit-cost analysis (BCA) method [78]. However,
 517 this study only considered an extensive roof. Currently, no other studies were located that evaluate the cost

518 of waste and disposal of other green roofs, namely, intensive and semi intensive green roofs. Therefore, it
 519 is suggested that the end of life costs of alternative green roofs is evaluated.

520

521

Table 9, Description of Life cycle stages of selected articles related to the life cycle cost

	Design	Raw Material Extraction	Transport	Manufacturing in Factory	Transport to Site	Installation and Erected Process	Use	Maintenance	Repair	Replacement	Refurbishment	Operation Energy Use	Operation Water Use	Demolition	Transport	Waste Processing	Disposal	Reuse	Recovery	Recycling	Landfill	
Source	A0	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7	C1	C2	C3	C4	D1	D2	D3	D4	
[42]																						
[66]																						
[78]																						
[60]																						
[92]																						
[84]																						
[49]																						
[95]																						
[20]																						
[77]																						
[96]																						
[97]																						
[80]																						
[76]																						
[85]																						
[98]																						
[57]																						
[99]																						

522 One study [92] compared the LCC of an extensive green roof with that of a built-up roof. Another
 523 study compared green roof construction cost on different buildings, such as for a single-family, multi-family
 524 and commercial buildings [60]. Roof farms with roof gardens have also been compared for extensive roofs
 525 [84]. A limited number of studies compared the LCC of intensive and extensive green roofs. However, no
 526 study compared all three types. Figure 9 shows that most studies do not account for all LCA phases (from
 527 raw material extraction to disposal). No study examined all green roof layers or the potential use of recycled
 528 materials. The refurbishment (B5) stage should be considered in future studies.




Figure 9, Life cycle cost stage of system boundaries

529
530

531

532

533 4. Optimal Type of Green Roof

534 Table 10 presents studies that evaluated alternative types of green roofs. Surprisingly, there is little
 535 agreement on the best choice. For example, studies that evaluated the LCA of green roofs indicated that
 536 intensive green roofs are ideal and more environmentally friendly [29, 87,29]. On the other hand, some
 537 studies claim that extensive green roofs are more sustainable compared to intensive green roofs [63,86].
 538 Some studies compared all three green roof types, finding that extensive green roofs as an ideal sustainable
 539 choice [37, 100]. Furthermore. SLCA is a neglected area of green roof research. Some investigations on the
 540 SLCA of green roofs have been conducted recently. For example, a survey of the importance of cost of
 541 garden and farm roofs found that people did not consider economic cost to be an essential aspect of green
 542 roofs [84]. A recent review [103] of urban green infrastructure showed that most published research
 543 investigated how green structures affect the thermal performance of buildings, but none evaluated human
 544 well-being and health. Other research [93] has evaluated green roofs in terms of selected criteria, such as
 545 Structural design force, fire safety and durability. There is as yet no comprehensive published research on
 546 SLCA.

547 Another study [30] conducted a LCA study of three types of green roofs in the USA. The system
 548 boundaries considered were for manufacturing and transporting raw materials, maintenance and disposing
 549 of the materials at the end of their life. The Impact 2002+ LCIA method was used, and identified the
 550 intensive green roof as the best choice. Extensive and extensive green roofs were compared in another study
 551 using CML2 baseline 2000 v2.1 LCIA method. This was conducted for Sydney, a coastal area, and for a
 552 life cycle of 25 years [100]. The system boundaries for this study included the manufacturing process,
 553 installation of green roofs and separate assessment of air pollutants. Transportation and demolition were
 554 not considered. The findings were that intensive green roofs reduce global warming emissions more than

555 extensive green and non-green roofs. This study demonstrated that intensive green roofs have lower total
 556 environmental impacts in several categories, such as abiotic depletion, terrestrial ecotoxicity,
 557 photochemical oxidation, acidification and eutrophication. This study concluded that intensive green roofs
 558 were the type to be recommended.

559 Table 10, different studies combining of green roofs

Source	Intensive	Semi-intensive	Extensive	Best choices
Life cycle assessmnet				
[30]				Intensive
[64]				Extensive
[100]				Intensive
[38]				Extensive
[93]				Extensive
[67]				Extensive
Life Cycle Cost				
[57]				Extensive


560

561 Some other studies arrived at contrasting results. A study using two LCIA methods IMPACT 2002+
 562 and Ecoinvent 99 (EI99) to evaluate different roofing systems, including extensive and intensive green
 563 roofs [64]. The result of the LCIA studies showed that extensive roofs have a lower impact in the material
 564 manufacturing, transportation, maintenance phase and disposal stage. Another study [67] compared the
 565 LCA of alternative roofs using the Impact 2002 LCIA method using 15 impact categories. System
 566 boundaries were limited to the manufacturing and transportation stages. The findings were that extensive
 567 green roofs had a lower environmental impact for all categories than intensive green roofs. A further study
 568 [38] compared all three types of green roof using two LCIA methods: IMPACT 2002+ and ReCiPe 2016.
 569 This study's system boundary comprised manufacturing, transportation, maintenance, replacement, water
 570 use, and disposal. However, both maintenance and replacement were limited to cleaning, sealing and plants,
 571 and not defined separately for the green roof structure and materials which need to be replaced every 10 or
 572 15 years based on other studies. A different investigation indicated that an extensive green roof is an ideal
 573 choice [93]. Table 10 shows that only one study evaluated the semi-intensive green roof. There are thus
 574 opportunities for more studies to evaluate this green roof and compare it with other alternatives, such as
 575 intensive and extensive coverings for all life cycle stages, including the load and benefit stages. Only one
 576 study was found to have investigated the LCC of all different green roofs [57]. Another study [102] pointed
 577 out that extensive and inaccessible public green roofs costs at least \$108, while an intensive and publicly
 578 accessible green roof costs at least \$355. Some other studies have combined LCA and LCC as one unified
 579 research. However, a study [85] considered both extensive and intensive green roofs, but it is unclear which
 580 one is more effective or environmentally friendly. This is because the study simultaneously combined green
 581 roofs with other strategies, such as internal and external insulations, venetian blinds, single and double
 582 glazing, fluorescent lamps and LED. This made it impossible to identify the contribution of alternative
 583 green roofs on energy saving and cost-efficient options.

584 Table 10 highlights the lack of an LCA study that compares all green roof types simultaneously,
 585 both environmentally and economically, in a holistic manner. None of the investigations explored above
 586 considered the load and benefits stage, which include reuse, recycling, and recovery. Recycling might have
 587 a reverse impact on both LCA and LCC as it has a net positive impact. This could affect decision-making
 588 about the choice of types of green roofs.

589 **5. Discussion and Research Gaps**

590 Based on the literature, the following research gaps are proposed for further investigations. Figure
 591 10 shows the framework of knowledge gaps to be surveyed in future.



592 Figure 10, the framework of knowledge gaps and future research
 593

- 594 ➤ Firstly, semi-intensive green roofs needs further investigation for both LCC and LCA compared to
 595 other green roofs. This is mainly because a semi-intensive green roofs have been omitted in many
 596 studies, especially for cost comparisons.
- 597 ➤ Comparing attributional and consequential modelling is also a topic for future studies of green roof
 598 LCA. A limited number of LCA studies consider the attributional method [68, 65]. No studies about
 599 the consequential LCA study on a green roof were located. The LCC for both consequential and
 600 attributional modelling needs to be considered for alternative green roofs. Consequential LCA has
 601 come to the fore in LCA research to respond to a different key question that is not addressed by

602 attributional LCA. The consequential approach is useful when large-scale decisions need to be
603 made, like for urban planning policies that could relate to green roofs. In the consequential
604 approach, system boundaries are expanded to include avoided processes due to reuse and recycling
605 at the end of life [83].

- 606 ➤ There is no agreement on the best LCA alternative green roof in literature. We recommend that this
607 topic is investigated, considering all the life cycle stages of green roofs.
- 608 ➤ The system boundary of SLCA is based on the Society of Environmental Toxicology and
609 Chemistry [104]. Social- UNEP/SETAC allows for comparisons of different products or materials
610 [103, 104]. The principal stakeholder categories are divided into workers, local community, society,
611 and consumers. Each category is for different purposes such as freedom of association, health and
612 safety, fair salary for workers, or consumer satisfaction.
- 613 ➤ Future research into LCA, LCC and SLCA of alternative green roofs is warranted. Such
614 comparisons might use multi-criteria analysis using the multi-criteria decision-making (MCDM)
615 method. Since each LCA, LCC and SLCA has a different unit of measurement (Balasbaneh, 2020;
616 Balasbaneh & Sher, 2021), it requires a technique that can compare alternatives. The MCDM
617 method presents a foundation for prioritizing, sorting, and selecting materials and helps in overall
618 assessment.
- 619 ➤ There is no evidence of recycling, reuse and recovery (D1-D3) having been considered in previous
620 LCA and LCC studies. Some work has been recently conducted on the end-of-life of green roofs.
621 For example, one study reported the use of recycled polystyrene foam slabs (as thermal insulation)
622 in a green roof [42]. Green roofs may comprise concrete, steel, mastic asphalt, waterproof
623 membrane, root barrier, thermal insulation, drainage, filtration, and substrate. Future studies are
624 encouraged to consider the recycling of all these materials at the end of their life cycle.
- 625 ➤ There are currently no studies on the repair and refurbishment stages (B3, B5) for the LCA of green
626 roof materials at the end of the life span of a roof or building. Equally, there are no studies on the
627 refurbishment stage (B5) for LCC. LCC and LCA studies of renovation and refurbishment of
628 existing roofs to extensive green roofs would be informative and encourage the provision of
629 sustainable solutions.
- 630 ➤ It is currently not clear what the difference is between maintenance (B2) of alternative green roof
631 cost and environmental impact following EN15804 and EN15978. Although some research has
632 claimed there is no need for any maintenance of extensive green roofs (Williams et al., 2010), other
633 studies have claimed that maintenance had been considered for this stage including irrigation,
634 fertilizing the substrate, and sealing. It is also necessary to appreciate that intensive and semi-
635 intensive green roofs have different maintenance requirements. In fact, the lack of maintenance
636 guidelines and insufficient data on green roof performance may be a significant obstacle to the
637 adoption of green roof technology.
- 638 ➤ Waste processing (C3) modules (Koroxenidis & Theodosiou, 2021) are also neglected in most
639 green roof studies. The differences and magnitude of waste among three different alternative roof
640 are thus not clear.
- 641 ➤ A lack of rigour in current decision-making has been observed in the choice of green roofs. This is
642 a critical issue and related to the importance of constructing green roofs for human health and
643 sustainable cities. This area should be addressed in future research (Table 10).
- 644 ➤ One of the latest studies [108] argues that installing a green roof in a tropical climate is significant
645 and can improve the LCC of the existing building as a retrofit option to save energy. However, the

646 LCA and LCC of retrofitting conventional roofs to green roofs or alternative green roofs require
647 further exploration.

648 ➤ Studies mainly examined the environmental performance of specific climates in specific contexts
649 regarding location and climate without comparing the effects of different contexts. Providing
650 additional insight into location and climate impacts will be useful in future studies.

651 ➤ Finally, an integrated and coherent approach is needed to address the complexity of decision-
652 making to evaluate green roofs and reveal the best options. This requirement can be fulfilled by
653 integrating LCA, LCC, and S-LCA into a framework for LCSA to promote a sustainable circular
654 economy.

655

656 **6. Conclusion**

657 This paper has reported on a literature review of green roofs. It has focused on life cycle
658 sustainability assessment in the context of the environment, economic and social impact. This study has
659 evaluated current research to determine the future directions and research gaps. The bibliometric analysis
660 has identified current trends and progress in the field of life cycle sustainability assessment (LCSA) of
661 green roofs. A search pattern query was used to find relevant article sources, including green roof, life cycle
662 assessment, life cycle cost, social life cycle assessment, and sustainability. We found that the number of
663 publications between 2003 and 2022 has increased by 88% from 2012 until 2022. However, there are many
664 gaps in the current literature that need to be filled to enable selection of the best green roof. The US and
665 Italy are countries whose researchers publish most in this field, followed by Spain and China.

666 Secondly, the results of a meta-analysis and systematic search review showed that most of the
667 studies compare green roofs with traditional roofs. A limited number of studies compare different types of
668 green roofs. Very few studies considered the LCA of semi-intensive green roofs. No study compared the
669 costs of all three green roof from cradle to the grave for all stages. Simapro software and IMPACT2002 +
670 as a life cycle impact assessment (LCIA) method were the most applied approaches used in LCA studies.
671 Most of these studies focus on the production and construction of green roofs. The repair stage,
672 refurbishment stage and reuse of materials at the end-of-life span have not been considered in any LCA
673 studies.

674 The cost of the design stage for green roofs needs to be evaluated in future research since different
675 green roof types require various structures due to the weight and thickness of these roofs. The refurbishment
676 stage and scenario after the lifespan of the building have not been considered in any LCC studies. The most
677 critical outcome from this study relates to the social life cycle assessment of alternative green roof that has
678 not been evaluated in any studies. We have conducted a thorough review of literature of green roofs,
679 revealing areas that have been thoroughly investigated as well as those that have not. This is the major
680 contribution of this paper – to identify areas of future research

681

682 **Declarations**

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

685 Ethics approval and consent to participate Not applicable

686 Authors' contributions: All authors contributed to the study conception and design. All authors read and
687 approved the final manuscript.
688 Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
689 Consent to Participate: Not applicable.
690 Consent for publication: Not applicable.
691 Funding information is not applicable
692 Data availability: The datasets used and analysed during the current study are available from the
693 corresponding author on reasonable request
694

695

696 **References**

- 697 [1] A. Dodoo, L. Gustavsson, and R. Sathre, "Life cycle primary energy implication of retrofitting a
698 wood-framed apartment building to passive house standard," *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, vol. 54, no.
699 12, pp. 1152–1160, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.resconrec.2010.03.010.
- 700 [2] C. Piccardo, A. Dodoo, L. Gustavsson, and U. Y. A. Tettey, "Retrofitting with different building
701 materials: Life-cycle primary energy implications," *Energy*, vol. 192, p. 116648, 2020, doi:
702 10.1016/j.energy.2019.116648.
- 703 [3] M. Haupt and M. Zschokke, "How can LCA support the circular economy?—63rd discussion forum
704 on life cycle assessment, Zurich, Switzerland, November 30, 2016," *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.*, vol.
705 22, no. 5, pp. 832–837, 2017, doi: 10.1007/s11367-017-1267-1.
- 706 [4] S. Hallegatte and J. Corfee-Morlot, "Understanding climate change impacts, vulnerability and
707 adaptation at city scale: An introduction," *Clim. Change*, vol. 104, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 2011, doi:
708 10.1007/s10584-010-9981-8.
- 709 [5] L. L. H. Peng and C. Y. Jim, "Economic evaluation of green-roof environmental benefits in the
710 context of climate change: The case of Hong Kong," *Urban For. Urban Green.*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp.
711 554–561, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.ufug.2015.05.006.
- 712 [6] T. Theodosiou, "Green roofs in buildings: Thermal and environmental behaviour," *Adv. Build.
713 Energy Res.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 271–288, 2009, doi: 10.3763/aber.2009.0311.
- 714 [7] M. R. Seyedabadi, U. Eicker, and S. Karimi, "Plant selection for green roofs and their impact on
715 carbon sequestration and the building carbon footprint," *Environ. Challenges*, vol. 4, no. April, p.
716 100119, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.envc.2021.100119.
- 717 [8] W. C. Li and K. K. A. Yeung, "A comprehensive study of green roof performance from
718 environmental perspective," *Int. J. Sustain. Built Environ.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 127–134, 2014, doi:
719 10.1016/j.ijbsbe.2014.05.001.
- 720 [9] P. Bevilacqua, "The effectiveness of green roofs in reducing building energy consumptions across
721 different climates . A summary of literature results," *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 151, p.
722 111523, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2021.111523.
- 723 [10] C. S. C. Calheiros and A. I. Stefanakis, "Green Roofs Towards Circular and Resilient Cities," *Circ.
724 Econ. Sustain.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 395–411, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s43615-021-00033-0.
- 725 [11] M. Finkbeiner, E. M. Schau, A. Lehmann, and M. Traverso, "Towards life cycle sustainability
726 assessment," *Sustainability*, vol. 2, no. 10, pp. 3309–3322, 2010, doi: 10.3390/su2103309.

- 727 [12] W. Kloepffer, “Life cycle sustainability assessment of products (with Comments by Helias A. Udo
728 de Haes, p. 95),” *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 89–95, 2008, doi:
729 10.1065/lca2008.02.376.
- 730 [13] A. T. Balasbaneh and W. Sher, “Life cycle sustainability assessment analysis of different concrete
731 construction techniques for residential building in Malaysia,” *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.*, no.
732 0123456789, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s11367-021-01938-6.
- 733 [14] V. G. Larsen, N. Tollin, P. A. Sattrup, M. Birkved, and T. Holmboe, “What are the challenges in
734 assessing circular economy for the built environment? A literature review on integrating LCA, LCC
735 and S-LCA in life cycle sustainability assessment, LCSA,” *J. Build. Eng.*, vol. 50, no. November
736 2021, p. 104203, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.jobe.2022.104203.
- 737 [15] S. A. Hosseiniyou, S. Mansour, and M. A. Shirazi, “Social life cycle assessment for material
738 selection: A case study of building materials,” *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 620–645,
739 2014, doi: 10.1007/s11367-013-0658-1.
- 740 [16] M. Niero and M. Z. Hauschild, “Closing the Loop for Packaging: Finding a Framework to
741 Operationalize Circular Economy Strategies,” *Procedia CIRP*, vol. 61, pp. 685–690, 2017, doi:
742 10.1016/j.procir.2016.11.209.
- 743 [17] C. Peña *et al.*, “Using life cycle assessment to achieve a circular economy,” *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.*,
744 vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 215–220, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s11367-020-01856-z.
- 745 [18] L. Rigamonti and E. Mancini, “Life cycle assessment and circularity indicators,” *Int. J. Life Cycle
746 Assess.*, vol. 26, no. 10, pp. 1937–1942, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s11367-021-01966-2.
- 747 [19] M. Shafique, R. Kim, and M. Rafiq, “Green roof benefits, opportunities and challenges – A review,”
748 *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 90, no. April 2017, pp. 757–773, 2018, doi:
749 10.1016/j.rser.2018.04.006.
- 750 [20] T. Carter and A. Keeler, “Life-cycle cost-benefit analysis of extensive vegetated roof systems,” *J.
751 Environ. Manage.*, vol. 87, no. 3, pp. 350–363, 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2007.01.024.
- 752 [21] R. Meglin, S. Kytzia, and G. Habert, “Uncertainty, variability, price changes and their implications
753 on a regional building materials industry: The case of Swiss canton Argovia,” *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol.
754 330, p. 129944, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.129944.
- 755 [22] D. Pearlmutter *et al.*, “Closing water cycles in the built environment through nature-based solutions:
756 The contribution of vertical greening systems and green roofs,” *Water (Switzerland)*, vol. 13, no.
757 16, 2021, doi: 10.3390/w13162165.
- 758 [23] S. C. Andersen, H. Birgisdottir, and M. Birkved, “Life Cycle Assessments of Circular Economy in
759 the Built Environment—A Scoping Review,” *Sustain.*, vol. 14, no. 11, 2022, doi:
760 10.3390/su14116887.
- 761 [24] P. Vacek, K. Struhala, and L. Matějka, “Life-cycle study on semi intensive green roofs,” *J. Clean.
762 Prod.*, vol. 154, pp. 203–213, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.03.188.
- 763 [25] N. Atanasova *et al.*, “Nature-Based Solutions and Circularity in Cities,” *Circ. Econ. Sustain.*, vol.
764 1, no. 1, pp. 319–332, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s43615-021-00024-1.
- 765 [26] M. Manso, I. Teotónio, C. M. Silva, and C. O. Cruz, “Green roof and green wall benefits and costs:
766 A review of the quantitative evidence,” *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 135, no. July 2020, 2021,
767 doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2020.110111.

- 768 [27] G. Peri, M. Traverso, M. Finkbeiner, and G. Rizzo, “Embedding ‘substrate’ in environmental
769 assessment of green roofs life cycle: Evidences from an application to the whole chain in a
770 Mediterranean site,” *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 35, pp. 274–287, 2012, doi:
771 10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.05.038.
- 772 [28] I. Schultz, D. J. Sailor, and O. Starry, “Effects of substrate depth and precipitation characteristics on
773 stormwater retention by two green roofs in Portland OR,” *J. Hydrol. Reg. Stud.*, vol. 18, no. June,
774 pp. 110–118, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.ejrh.2018.06.008.
- 775 [29] J. Baleta, H. Mikulčić, J. J. Klemeš, K. Urbaniec, and N. Duić, “Integration of energy, water and
776 environmental systems for a sustainable development,” *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 215, pp. 1424–1436,
777 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.01.035.
- 778 [30] L. Kosareo and R. Ries, “Comparative environmental life cycle assessment of green roofs,” *Build.
779 Environ.*, vol. 42, no. 7, pp. 2606–2613, 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.buildenv.2006.06.019.
- 780 [31] J. Yang, Q. Yu, and P. Gong, “Quantifying air pollution removal by green roofs in Chicago,” *Atmos.
781 Environ.*, vol. 42, no. 31, pp. 7266–7273, 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2008.07.003.
- 782 [32] M. Mirnezhad, A. M. R. Bin Aminudin, and K. S. Yeap, “Thermal performance & temperature
783 mitigation towards application of green roof in tropical climate,” *Chem. Eng. Trans.*, vol. 56, pp.
784 397–402, 2017, doi: 10.3303/CET1756067.
- 785 [33] C. M. Silva, M. G. Gomes, and M. Silva, “Green roofs energy performance in Mediterranean
786 climate,” *Energy Build.*, vol. 116, pp. 318–325, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.01.012.
- 787 [34] M. Viecco, H. Jorquera, A. Sharma, W. Bustamante, H. J. S. Fernando, and S. Vera, “Green roofs
788 and green walls layouts for improved urban air quality by mitigating particulate matter,” *Build.
789 Environ.*, vol. 204, no. July, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.buildenv.2021.108120.
- 790 [35] T. Van Renterghem and D. Botteldooren, “Reducing the acoustical façade load from road traffic
791 with green roofs,” *Build. Environ.*, vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 1081–1087, 2009, doi:
792 10.1016/j.buildenv.2008.07.013.
- 793 [36] A. Moňoková, S. Vilčeková, and I. Selecká, “Life Cycle Analysis of Single Family Houses and
794 Effects of Green Technologies on Environment,” *Proceedings*, vol. 16, no. 1, p. 19, 2019, doi:
795 10.3390/proceedings2019016019.
- 796 [37] B. Bass and S. Saiz, “Comparative Life Cycle Assessment of Standard and Green Roofs of Standard
797 and Green Roofs,” vol. 40, no. January, pp. 4312–4316, 2016.
- 798 [38] A. Brachet, N. Schiopu, and P. Clergeau, “Biodiversity impact assessment of building’s roofs based
799 on Life Cycle Assessment methods,” *Build. Environ.*, vol. 158, no. April 2019, pp. 133–144, 2019,
800 doi: 10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.04.014.
- 801 [39] C. Lamnatou and D. Chemisana, “Evaluation of photovoltaic-green and other roofing systems by
802 means of ReCiPe and multiple life cycle-based environmental indicators,” *Build. Environ.*, vol. 93,
803 no. P2, pp. 376–384, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.buildenv.2015.06.031.
- 804 [40] G. Guillaume, B. Gauvreau, and P. L’Hermite, “Numerical study of the impact of vegetation
805 coverings on sound levels and time decays in a canyon street model,” *Sci. Total Environ.*, vol. 502,
806 pp. 22–30, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.08.111.
- 807 [41] A. F. Speak, J. J. Rothwell, S. J. Lindley, and C. L. Smith, “Urban particulate pollution reduction
808 by four species of green roof vegetation in a UK city,” *Atmos. Environ.*, vol. 61, pp. 283–293, 2012,
809 doi: 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.07.043.

- 810 [42] E. Giama, C. Papageorgiou, I. Theodoridou, and A. M. Papadopoulos, "Life Cycle Analysis and
811 Life Cycle Cost Analysis of green roofs in the Mediterranean climatic conditions," *Energy Sources,
812 Part A Recover. Util. Environ. Eff.*, vol. 00, no. 00, pp. 1–14, 2021, doi:
813 10.1080/15567036.2021.1914782.
- 814 [43] A. Contarini and A. Meijer, "LCA comparison of roofing materials for flat roofs," *Smart Sustain.
815 Built Environ.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 97–109, 2015, doi: 10.1108/SASBE-05-2014-0031.
- 816 [44] L. Rincón, J. Coma, G. Pérez, A. Castell, D. Boer, and L. F. Cabeza, "Environmental performance
817 of recycled rubber as drainage layer in extensive green roofs. A comparative Life Cycle
818 Assessment," *Build. Environ.*, vol. 74, pp. 22–30, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.buildenv.2014.01.001.
- 819 [45] M. Botejara-Antúnez, J. González-Domínguez, and J. García-Sanz-Calcedo, "Comparative analysis
820 of flat roof systems using life cycle assessment methodology: Application to healthcare buildings,"
821 *Case Stud. Constr. Mater.*, vol. 17, no. June, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.cscm.2022.e01212.
- 822 [46] Clark, C., Adriaens, P., & Talbot, F. B. (2008). Green roof valuation: a probabilistic economic
823 analysis of environmental benefits. *Environmental science & technology*, 42(6), 2155-2161.
- 824 [47] U. Porsche and M. Köhler, "LIFE CYCLE COSTS OF GREEN ROOFS - A Comparison of
825 Germany, USA, and Brazil," *RIO 3 - World Clim. Energy Event*, no. December, pp. 1–5, 2003.
- 826 [48] A. L. S. Chan and T. T. Chow, "Energy and economic performance of green roof system under
827 future climatic conditions in Hong Kong," *Energy Build.*, vol. 64, pp. 182–198, 2013, doi:
828 10.1016/j.enbuild.2013.05.015.
- 829 [49] J. Kim, T. Hong, and C. W. Koo, "Economic and environmental evaluation model for selecting the
830 optimum design of green roof systems in elementary schools," *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 46, no.
831 15, pp. 8475–8483, 2012, doi: 10.1021/es2043855.
- 832 [50] T. P. Scolaro and E. Ghisi, "Life cycle assessment of green roofs: A literature review of layers
833 materials and purposes," *Sci. Total Environ.*, vol. 829, p. 154650, 2022, doi:
834 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.154650.
- 835 [51] N. Donthu, S. Kumar, N. Pandey, and P. Gupta, "Forty years of the International Journal of
836 Information Management: A bibliometric analysis," *Int. J. Inf. Manage.*, vol. 57, no. September
837 2020, p. 102307, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102307.
- 838 [52] N. Donthu, S. Kumar, D. Mukherjee, N. Pandey, and W. M. Lim, "How to conduct a bibliometric
839 analysis: An overview and guidelines," *J. Bus. Res.*, vol. 133, no. April, pp. 285–296, 2021, doi:
840 10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.04.070.
- 841 [53] C. K. de C. Araújo, R. Salvador, C. M. Piekarski, C. C. Sokulski, A. C. de Francisco, and S. K. de
842 C. A. Camargo, "Circular economy practices on wood panels: A bibliographic analysis," *Sustain.*,
843 vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 1–21, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su11041057.
- 844 [54] N. J. van Eck and L. Waltman, "Software survey: VOSviewer, a computer program for bibliometric
845 mapping," *Scientometrics*, vol. 84, no. 2, pp. 523–538, 2010, doi: 10.1007/s11192-009-0146-3.
- 846 [55] H. Nobanee *et al.*, "A bibliometric analysis of sustainability and risk management," *Sustain.*, vol.
847 13, no. 6, pp. 1–16, 2021, doi: 10.3390/su13063277.
- 848 [56] J. K. Tamala, E. I. Maramag, K. A. Simeon, and J. J. Ignacio, "A bibliometric analysis of sustainable
849 oil and gas production research using VOSviewer," *Clean. Eng. Technol.*, vol. 7, p. 100437, 2022,
850 doi: 10.1016/j.clet.2022.100437.

- 851 [57] N. H. Wong, S. F. Tay, R. Wong, C. L. Ong, and A. Sia, “Life cycle cost analysis of rooftop gardens
852 in Singapore,” *Build. Environ.*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 499–509, 2003, doi: 10.1016/S0360-
853 1323(02)00131-2.
- 854 [58] M. Chàfer, L. F. Cabeza, A. L. Pisello, C. L. Tan, and N. H. Wong, “Trends and gaps in global
855 research of greenery systems through a bibliometric analysis,” *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, vol. 65, no. July
856 2020, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.scs.2020.102608.
- 857 [59] F. A. Memon *et al.*, “Life cycle impact assessment of greywater recycling technologies for new
858 developments,” *Environ. Monit. Assess.*, vol. 129, no. 1–3, pp. 27–35, 2007, doi: 10.1007/s10661-
859 006-9422-3.
- 860 [60] M. Blackhurst, C. Hendrickson, and H. S. Matthews, “Cost-Effectiveness of Green Roofs,” *J.*
861 *Archit. Eng.*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 136–143, 2010, doi: 10.1061/(asce)ae.1943-5568.0000022.
- 862 [61] S. Bozorg Chenani, S. Lehvãvirta, and T. Hãkkinen, “Life cycle assessment of layers of green
863 roofs,” *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 90, pp. 153–162, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.11.070.
- 864 [62] I. Cerón-Palma, E. Sanyé-Mengual, J. Oliver-Solà, J. I. Montero, C. Ponce-Caballero, and J.
865 Rieradevall, “Towards a green sustainable strategy for social neighbourhoods in Latin America:
866 Case from social housing in Merida, Yucatan, Mexico,” *Habitat Int.*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 47–56, 2013,
867 doi: 10.1016/j.habitatint.2012.09.008.
- 868 [63] L. Bullen, S. J. McLaren, D. Dowdell, and C. Chandrakumar, “Absolute sustainability of New
869 Zealand office buildings in the context of climate targets,” *Build. Environ.*, vol. 205, no. May, p.
870 108186, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.buildenv.2021.108186.
- 871 [64] C. Lamnatou and D. Chemisana, “Photovoltaic-green roofs: A life cycle assessment approach with
872 emphasis on warm months of Mediterranean climate,” *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 72, pp. 57–75, 2014,
873 doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.03.006.
- 874 [65] M. Manso, J. Castro-Gomes, B. Paulo, I. Bentes, and C. A. Teixeira, “Life cycle analysis of a new
875 modular greening system,” *Sci. Total Environ.*, vol. 627, pp. 1146–1153, 2018, doi:
876 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.01.198.
- 877 [66] M. R. Trovato, F. Nocera, and S. Giuffrida, “Life-cycle assessment and monetary measurements for
878 the carbon footprint reduction of public buildings,” *Sustain.*, vol. 12, no. 8, 2020, doi:
879 10.3390/SU12083460.
- 880 [67] M. El Bachawati, R. Manneh, R. Belarbi, T. Dandres, C. Nassab, and H. El Zakhem, “Cradle-to-
881 gate Life Cycle Assessment of traditional gravel ballasted, white reflective, and vegetative roofs: A
882 Lebanese case study,” *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 137, pp. 833–842, 2016, doi:
883 10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.07.170.
- 884 [68] K. L. Ipsen, R. K. Zimmermann, P. S. Nielsen, and M. Birkved, “Environmental assessment of
885 Smart City Solutions using a coupled urban metabolism—life cycle impact assessment approach,”
886 *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.*, vol. 24, no. 7, pp. 1239–1253, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s11367-018-1453-9.
- 887 [69] L. Yao, A. Chini, and R. Zeng, “Integrating cost-benefits analysis and life cycle assessment of green
888 roofs: a case study in Florida,” *Hum. Ecol. Risk Assess.*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 443–458, 2020, doi:
889 10.1080/10807039.2018.1514251.
- 890 [70] B. Brunklaus, J. Schade, and J. Mukkavaara, “The use of green roofs to improve wooden buildings
891 for a future bioeconomy,” *E3S Web Conf.*, vol. 349, p. 04014, 2022, doi:
892 10.1051/e3sconf/202234904014.

- 893 [71] D. Muscas, F. Frota, D. A. Landi, C. Fabiani, D. Grohmann, and L. Rocchi, “Zoysia Soil-Less Green
894 Roof ’ s Performance : A Life Cycle Assessment,” vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 955–967, 2022.
- 895 [72] Y. Wang *et al.*, “Environmental performances and energy efficiencies of various urban green
896 infrastructures: A life-cycle assessment,” *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 248, p. 119244, 2020, doi:
897 10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119244.
- 898 [73] M. J. Carretero-Ayuso and J. García-Sanz-Calcedo, “Comparison between building roof
899 construction systems based on the LCA,” *Rev. la Constr.*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 123–136, 2018, doi:
900 10.7764/RDLC.17.1.123.
- 901 [74] K. Perini and P. Rosasco, “Cost-benefit analysis for green façades and living wall systems,” *Build.
902 Environ.*, vol. 70, pp. 110–121, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.buildenv.2013.08.012.
- 903 [75] F. Montalto, C. Behr, K. Alfredo, M. Wolf, M. Arye, and M. Walsh, “Rapid assessment of the cost-
904 effectiveness of low impact development for CSO control,” *Landsc. Urban Plan.*, vol. 82, no. 3, pp.
905 117–131, 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.landurbplan.2007.02.004.
- 906 [76] T. F. M. Chui, X. Liu, and W. Zhan, “Assessing cost-effectiveness of specific LID practice designs
907 in response to large storm events,” *J. Hydrol.*, vol. 533, pp. 353–364, 2016, doi:
908 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2015.12.011.
- 909 [77] J. Sproul, M. P. Wan, B. H. Mandel, and A. H. Rosenfeld, “Economic comparison of white, green,
910 and black flat roofs in the United States,” *Energy Build.*, vol. 71, pp. 20–27, 2014, doi:
911 10.1016/j.enbuild.2013.11.058.
- 912 [78] G. Peri, M. Traverso, M. Finkbeiner, and G. Rizzo, “The cost of green roofs disposal in a life cycle
913 perspective: Covering the gap,” *Energy*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 406–414, 2012, doi:
914 10.1016/j.energy.2012.02.045.
- 915 [79] C. Xu *et al.*, “Benefits of coupled green and grey infrastructure systems: Evidence based on analytic
916 hierarchy process and life cycle costing,” *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, vol. 151, no. September, pp. 1–
917 10, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.resconrec.2019.104478.
- 918 [80] W. Zhan and T. F. M. Chui, “Evaluating the life cycle net benefit of low impact development in a
919 city,” *Urban For. Urban Green.*, vol. 20, pp. 295–304, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.ufug.2016.09.006.
- 920 [81] H. E. Tavakol-Davani, H. Tavakol-Davani, S. J. Burian, B. J. McPherson, and M. E. Barber, “Green
921 infrastructure optimization to achieve pre-development conditions of a semiarid urban catchment,”
922 *Environ. Sci. Water Res. Technol.*, vol. 5, no. 6, pp. 1157–1171, 2019, doi: 10.1039/c8ew00789f.
- 923 [82] R. Wang, M. J. Eckelman, and J. B. Zimmerman, “Consequential environmental and economic life
924 cycle assessment of green and gray stormwater infrastructures for combined sewer systems,”
925 *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 47, no. 19, pp. 11189–11198, 2013, doi: 10.1021/es4026547.
- 926 [83] R. T. Fauzi, P. Lavoie, A. Tanguy, and B. Amor, “On the possibilities of multilevel analysis to cover
927 data gaps in consequential S-LCA: Case of multistory residential building,” *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol.
928 355, no. October 2021, p. 131666, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.131666.
- 929 [84] E. Kim *et al.*, “Economic and environmental sustainability and public perceptions of rooftop farm
930 versus extensive garden,” *Build. Environ.*, vol. 146, no. August, pp. 206–215, 2018, doi:
931 10.1016/j.buildenv.2018.09.046.
- 932 [85] T. Hong, J. Kim, and C. Koo, “LCC and LCCO 2 analysis of green roofs in elementary schools with
933 energy saving measures,” *Energy Build.*, vol. 45, pp. 229–239, 2012, doi:
934 10.1016/j.enbuild.2011.11.006.

- 935 [86] J. Koura, R. Manneh, R. Belarbi, V. El Khoury, and M. El Bachawati, “Comparative cradle to grave
936 environmental life cycle assessment of traditional and extensive vegetative roofs: an application for
937 the Lebanese context,” *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 423–442, 2020, doi:
938 10.1007/s11367-019-01700-z.
- 939 [87] L. Cirrincione, M. La Gennusa, C. Marino, A. Nucara, A. Marvuglia, and G. Peri, “Passive
940 components for reducing environmental impacts of buildings: analysis of an experimental green
941 roof,” *20th IEEE Mediterr. Electrotech. Conf. MELECON 2020 - Proc.*, pp. 494–499, 2020, doi:
942 10.1109/MELECON48756.2020.9140546.
- 943 [88] K. Angelakoglou, M. Dimitriou, and G. Gaidajis, “Comparative evaluation of flat roof thermal
944 systems in Greece,” *Int. J. Sustain. Build. Technol. Urban Dev.*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 243–257, 2013,
945 doi: 10.1080/2093761X.2013.801803.
- 946 [89] I. M. Kourtis, V. A. Tsihrintzis, and E. Baltas, “A robust approach for comparing conventional and
947 sustainable flood mitigation measures in urban basins,” *J. Environ. Manage.*, vol. 269, no. February,
948 p. 110822, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.110822.
- 949 [90] M. Maiolo, M. Carini, G. Capano, and P. Piro, “Synthetic sustainability index (SSI) based on life
950 cycle assessment approach of low impact development in the Mediterranean area,” *Cogent Eng.*,
951 vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 2017, doi: 10.1080/23311916.2017.1410272.
- 952 [91] E. Cubi, N. F. Zibin, S. J. Thompson, and J. Bergerson, “Sustainability of Rooftop Technologies in
953 Cold Climates: Comparative Life Cycle Assessment of White Roofs, Green Roofs, and Photovoltaic
954 Panels,” *J. Ind. Ecol.*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 249–262, 2016, doi: 10.1111/jiec.12269.
- 955 [92] H. Muga, A. Mukherjee, and J. Mihelcic, “An integrated assessment of the sustainability of green
956 and built-up roofs,” *J. Green Build.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 106–127, 2008, doi: 10.3992/jgb.3.2.106.
- 957 [93] M. Dabbaghian, K. Hewage, B. Reza, K. Culver, and R. Sadiq, “Sustainability performance
958 assessment of green roof systems using fuzzy-analytical hierarchy process (FAHP),” *Int. J. Sustain.
959 Build. Technol. Urban Dev.*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 260–276, 2014, doi: 10.1080/2093761X.2014.923794.
- 960 [94] S. Pushkar, “Modeling the substitution of natural materials with industrial byproducts in green roofs
961 using life cycle assessments,” *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 227, pp. 652–661, 2019, doi:
962 10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.04.237.
- 963 [95] F. Bianchini and K. Hewage, “Probabilistic social cost-benefit analysis for green roofs: A lifecycle
964 approach,” *Build. Environ.*, vol. 58, pp. 152–162, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.buildenv.2012.07.005.
- 965 [96] C. Melo, I. Teotónio, C. M. Silva, and C. O. Cruz, “What’s the economic value of greening transport
966 infrastructures? The case of the underground passages in Lisbon,” *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, vol. 56, no.
967 September 2019, p. 102083, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.scs.2020.102083.
- 968 [97] I. M. Withanage, N. Zainudeen, and M. Nadeeshani, “Financial viability of using green roofing in
969 residential buildings,” *World Constr. Symp.*, no. November, pp. 350–359, 2019, doi:
970 10.31705/WCS.2019.35.
- 971 [98] T. Wu and R. E. Smith, “Economic benefits for green roofs: A case study of the skaggs pharmacy
972 building, university of Utah,” *Int. J. Des. Nat. Ecodynamics*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 122–138, 2011, doi:
973 10.2495/DNE-V6-N2-122-138.
- 974 [99] M. R. Trovato and C. Cappello, “Climate Adaptation Heuristic Planning Support System (HPSS):
975 Green-Blue Strategies to Support the Ecological Transition of Historic Centres,” *Land*, vol. 11, no.
976 6, 2022, doi: 10.3390/land11060773.

- 977 [100] M. G. Rasul and L. K. R. Arutla, "Environmental impact assessment of green roofs using life cycle
978 assessment," *Energy Reports*, vol. 6, pp. 503–508, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.egy.2019.09.015.
- 979 [101] E. Koroxenidis and T. Theodosiou, "Comparative environmental and economic evaluation of green
980 roofs under Mediterranean climate conditions – Extensive green roofs a potentially preferable
981 solution," *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 311, no. May, p. 127563, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.127563.
- 982 [102] J. W. Oh *et al.*, "Comparative CO2 emissions of concrete and timber slabs with equivalent structural
983 performance," *Energy Build.*, vol. 281, p. 112768, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.enbuild.2022.112768.
- 984 [103] A. J. Ghazalli, C. Brack, X. Bai, and I. Said, "Physical and Non-Physical Benefits of Vertical
985 Greenery Systems: A Review," *J. Urban Technol.*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 53–78, 2019, doi:
986 10.1080/10630732.2019.1637694.
- 987 [104] I. Huertas-Valdivia, A. M. Ferrari, D. Settembre-Blundo, and F. E. García-Muiña, "Social life-cycle
988 assessment: A review by bibliometric analysis," *Sustain.*, vol. 12, no. 15, pp. 1–25, 2020, doi:
989 10.3390/su12156211.
- 990 [105] M. Kühnen and R. Hahn, "Indicators in Social Life Cycle Assessment: A Review of Frameworks,
991 Theories, and Empirical Experience," *J. Ind. Ecol.*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 1547–1565, 2017, doi:
992 10.1111/jiec.12663.
- 993 [106] C. Benoît-Norris *et al.*, "Introducing the UNEP/SETAC methodological sheets for subcategories of
994 social LCA," *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.*, vol. 16, no. 7, pp. 682–690, 2011, doi: 10.1007/s11367-011-
995 0301-y.
- 996 [107] A. T. Balasbaneh, "Applying multi-criteria decision-making on alternatives for earth-retaining
997 walls : LCA , LCC , and S-LCA," pp. 2140–2153, 2020.
- 998 [108] Y. Lu, P. Li, Y. P. Lee, and X. Song, "An integrated decision-making framework for existing
999 building retrofits based on energy simulation and cost-benefit analysis," *J. Build. Eng.*, vol. 43, no.
1000 1239, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.job.2021.103200.
- 1001 [109] UN (1987) Report of the world commission on environment and development: our common future. Oxford
1002 University Press, Oxford
- 1003 [110] UN (1992) Agenda 21. United Nations, New York