

Constitutional Review and Minority Rights: Aligning Domestic Courts with International Norms

Rochmat Ali Syaefudin¹

¹Poltekkes Kemenkes Surakarta, Indonesia

Correspondent: rochmatalis@poltekkes-solo.ac.id¹

Received : September 14, 2024

Accepted : October 19, 2024

Published : October 31, 2024

Citation: Syaefudin, R.A., (2024). Constitutional Review and Minority Rights: Aligning Domestic Courts with International Norms. *Legalis : Journal of Law Review*, 24), 242-253.

<https://doi.org/10.61978/legalis.v2i4.1120>

ABSTRACT: The protection of minority rights is central to democratic governance and international human rights law. This article examines how constitutional review mechanisms interact with international normative frameworks to shape outcomes for ethnic, religious, and linguistic minorities in democratic states. Drawing on the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the UN Declaration on Minorities, and the Council of Europe Framework Convention, the study outlines the legal obligations imposed on states. Through a comparative doctrinal and institutional analysis of Germany, India, South Africa, the United States, and the European Court of Human Rights, it evaluates the effectiveness of different constitutional review models. Data from the Comparative Constitutions Project and landmark case law illustrate the significance of institutional design particularly centralized review and individual complaint mechanisms in enabling courts to enforce minority protections. The discussion highlights the importance of institutional strength, alignment with international norms, resistance to political interference, and transjudicial dialogue in sustaining robust protections. The article concludes that judicial effectiveness in minority rights adjudication hinges on coherent legal frameworks, empowered institutions, and principled jurisprudence that resonates with international human rights standards.

Keywords: Constitutional Review, Minority Rights, International Law, Institutional Design, Comparative Constitutional Law, Judicial Enforcement, Human Rights.



This is an open access article under the CC-BY 4.0 license

INTRODUCTION

The protection of minority rights forms a cornerstone of modern democratic governance but continues to provoke complex legal and political debates. Ethnic, religious, and linguistic minorities persistently encounter systemic disadvantages and exclusion that endanger their identity and participation in public life. In response, international human rights law has developed an increasingly robust framework to articulate and protect the rights of these communities. However, translating such norms into effective legal guarantees at the domestic level depends heavily on the institutional mechanisms available, particularly constitutional review.

International legal instruments provide a crucial framework for minority protections, embedding key rights and principles within binding and non-binding agreements. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), especially Article 27, affirms the rights of individuals belonging to minority groups to enjoy their culture, profess their religion, and use their language. This right is interpreted authoritatively in General Comment No. 23 by the Human Rights Committee, which underscores its individual nature and direct applicability. Complementing this, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities (1992) mandates states to promote the identity and participation of minorities in national life. These frameworks, alongside the Council of Europe's Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, form a triad of international normative standards that outline both state obligations and individual entitlements.

The post-World War II era marked a pivotal moment in the institutionalization of constitutional review mechanisms, closely linked to the global reassertion of human rights and democratic accountability. Many states adopted new constitutions that embedded checks and balances designed to prevent authoritarian resurgence and to entrench fundamental rights. Judicial institutions, particularly constitutional courts, emerged as key actors in ensuring the supremacy of these constitutional guarantees. The diffusion of judicial review was catalyzed by both domestic reforms and international influence, including treaty obligations and advisory support from bodies such as the Venice Commission. These developments reflect a broader recognition of courts as central guardians of minority protections, particularly where majoritarian politics threaten inclusivity.

Indeed, international treaties have not only shaped domestic normative commitments but have also guided the drafting and interpretation of constitutional provisions. The ICCPR and regional human rights conventions have frequently served as templates or reference points in constitutional drafting processes. For example, African states referencing the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights often incorporate protections for linguistic and cultural diversity. This mutual interaction where domestic law is informed by international standards and judicial interpretation feeds back into treaty enforcement underscores a dynamic process of legal integration. It also amplifies the potential for judicial actors to serve as conduits for international norm internalization.

Nevertheless, the real-world application of minority rights remains highly uneven across democracies. Institutional capacity, judicial independence, political culture, and societal attitudes toward diversity all influence the degree to which formal protections translate into substantive equality. In some contexts, courts have actively dismantled discriminatory laws, reinforcing the spirit of international treaties. In others, weak institutions or populist pressures undermine enforcement, despite normative commitments. This divergence illustrates that legal frameworks alone are insufficient; robust and autonomous constitutional review mechanisms are essential for bridging the gap between norm and reality.

Judicial review serves as the interface through which international norms can be operationalized in domestic legal systems. Courts function not only as dispute resolution bodies but also as normative interpreters, shaping legal discourse and influencing legislative behavior. As constitutional courts increasingly engage with international human rights jurisprudence, they contribute to a form of legal cosmopolitanism that bolsters minority protections. Landmark

rulings, such as those invalidating discriminatory statutes or affirming rights of linguistic or sexual minorities, exemplify the capacity of courts to act as engines of rights transformation. Through such adjudication, international standards are not merely affirmed but are given concrete meaning within national legal orders.

Yet these advances exist alongside formidable challenges. The resurgence of authoritarian populism, nationalist rhetoric, and political polarization has strained the resilience of constitutional institutions. In some jurisdictions, courts face direct attacks on their independence, budgetary constraints, or legislative override mechanisms. Moreover, resistance to perceived foreign influence particularly in the domain of human rights has led to selective compliance with international norms. These dynamics risk not only undermining the judiciary's role in minority protection but also fracturing the consensus around universal rights. Courts may find themselves caught between their constitutional mandates and political hostility to rights enforcement.

The interaction of global and local forces legal, political, and cultural shapes the evolving landscape of minority rights. As globalization deepens and domestic pluralism intensifies, the need for coherent, rights-based constitutional frameworks becomes ever more pressing. This study is motivated by the imperative to understand how different models of constitutional review interact with international norms to produce varying outcomes in minority rights enforcement. It focuses on five jurisdictions Germany, India, South Africa, the United States, and the European Court of Human Rights as representative cases illustrating diverse institutional designs and normative alignments.

The objective of this study is to analyze how the normative architecture of international human rights law intersects with the institutional features of constitutional review to influence judicial protection of minority rights. It argues that strong institutional mechanisms especially centralized constitutional courts with abstract review and access to individual complaints combined with alignment to international norms, produce more consistent and effective protection. The study offers a doctrinal and institutional comparative framework, filling a critical gap in the literature on legal enforcement of minority rights. By drawing on international standards, national jurisprudence, and comparative institutional analysis, it contributes to an integrated understanding of how rights protections are constructed, contested, and sustained across jurisdictions.

METHOD

This chapter outlines the methodological approach used in the analysis of how international human rights norms and institutional models of constitutional review interact to shape the protection of minority rights in democratic states. The research is situated in the tradition of comparative legal-doctrinal analysis and integrates data from authoritative legal texts, case law, and institutional datasets.

The study adopts a comparative legal-doctrinal approach as its primary analytical framework. This method systematically compares multiple legal systems, helping identify both shared patterns and divergent practices in the constitutional protection of minority rights. One of the key strengths of this method is its capacity to generate insights into the structural and normative configurations of

different constitutional regimes, offering a deep understanding of how judicial institutions operate across varied political and cultural settings Ицербанюк (Muwahid & Bagus, 2023; Ицербанюк, 2021).

By focusing on constitutional texts, court decisions, and international treaties, the method fosters legal dialogue between jurisdictions and contributes to the refinement of foundational constitutional principles. It also incorporates contextual analysis, allowing consideration of how historical, societal, and political conditions influence legal design and implementation (Jiang et al., 2023). However, the method is not without limitations. It may face challenges in achieving unbiased comparisons due to institutional asymmetries and divergent legal traditions. Furthermore, reliance on legal texts may obscure practical enforcement dynamics, especially in contexts with weak rule-of-law institutions (Suharno et al., 2021; Tian et al., 2024, p. 024).

The study employs a typology of constitutional review mechanisms to classify judicial systems based on their institutional design. Drawing from established literature in comparative political science and constitutional theory, the research distinguishes between centralized and decentralized models of review. Centralized models prevalent in civil law jurisdictions assign constitutional adjudication to specialized courts, whereas decentralized models common in common law countries allow ordinary courts to review constitutional issues as they arise in specific cases (Ismayilov, 2024).

In addition to the basic dichotomy, the typology considers procedural distinctions such as abstract versus concrete review, and whether courts possess the authority to hear individual constitutional complaints. These classifications help capture the functional and philosophical diversity of judicial powers and contribute to the broader debates on judicial activism, restraint, and institutional legitimacy (Kim & Nolette, 2023; Thohir & Sukriono, 2023). Moreover, the typology reflects ongoing global debates on judicial overreach, democratic backsliding, and the politicization of constitutional adjudication (Rishan, 2022; Sajó & Uitz, 2017).

The empirical foundation of the study relies on three key datasets and sources:

1. Comparative Constitutions Project (CCP): This dataset provides structured information on the existence and characteristics of constitutional courts, the availability of abstract review and individual complaints, and other legal provisions related to minority protections. Data are analyzed across a country-year panel from 2000 to 2024.
2. Doctrinal Case Law: Landmark judgments from Germany (Lüth), India (Navtej Singh Johar), USA (Brown, Obergefell), South Africa (National Coalition), and the ECtHR (Sejdić & Finci) are selected based on their relevance to minority rights enforcement. These decisions are analyzed to extract doctrinal reasoning, normative alignment, and interpretive strategies.
3. International Normative Texts: The ICCPR, UN Declaration on Minorities, and Council of Europe Framework Convention serve as the core legal standards against which national practices are compared.

To ensure robustness, the study supplements these with insights from CompLaw, the Global Constitutionalism Project, and datasets developed by the International Association of

Constitutional Law (IACL). These tools enable cross-country and longitudinal comparisons of judicial authority and institutional development (Gabel et al., 2024; Lawston et al., 2017).

The analysis focuses on a selected set of democratic jurisdictions that exemplify diverse institutional designs and legal traditions. While this enhances comparative richness, the generalizability of findings may be constrained by the sample size. Additionally, the study emphasizes *de jure* provisions and doctrinal interpretations, acknowledging that these may not fully reflect *de facto* enforcement conditions or broader political dynamics.

Despite these limitations, the methodology offers a structured, rigorous, and context-sensitive framework for exploring how constitutional review can support the realization of minority rights in accordance with international standards.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Normative Frameworks

The core normative frameworks underpinning minority rights in international law are found in the ICCPR, the UN Declaration on the Rights of Minorities, and the Council of Europe's Framework Convention.

ICCPR Article 27 affirms that individuals belonging to ethnic, religious, or linguistic minorities shall not be denied the right to enjoy their own culture, profess and practice their own religion, or use their own language. Interpretations by treaty bodies and human rights courts have emphasized that these rights are tied to broader principles of non-discrimination and participation (Carraro, 2019). States are required not only to abstain from interfering with these rights but to take positive actions to facilitate their realization (Ullmann & Staden, 2023).

The Framework Convention provides more detailed rights, including education in minority languages, media access, and public participation. However, its enforcement is more dependent on state willingness, lacking binding mechanisms like the ICCPR's individual complaint process (Bao et al., 2023; Puska, 2017).

UN bodies also contribute through enforcement mechanisms such as periodic reviews, country-specific reports, and General Comments. These tools help clarify the scope of obligations and enhance compliance (Gupta et al., 2024). General Comments in particular are influential in guiding legal reforms and interpreting rights in light of evolving social contexts.

Institutional Typologies and Design

The effectiveness of minority rights protection is closely linked to the design of constitutional review mechanisms. Empirical research distinguishes between centralized systems (e.g., Germany, Italy), where specialized constitutional courts hold exclusive review powers, and diffuse systems (e.g., USA), where all courts may conduct review in specific cases (Karakamisheva-Jovanovska & Saveski, 2022).

Abstract review which allows courts to examine the constitutionality of laws without a specific case is especially useful for proactive rights protection. Individual complaint mechanisms, conversely, allow affected persons to directly challenge violations, reinforcing accountability (Thohir & Sukriono, 2023).

Specialized constitutional courts tend to provide more consistent interpretations and are better equipped to handle complex constitutional issues. Their narrow focus and often greater judicial independence enable them to resist political pressures and defend minority rights more robustly (Rishan, 2022; Sajó & Uitz, 2017).

The Venice Commission's classifications confirm these dynamics and identify emerging hybrid systems that blend centralized and diffuse features, offering pathways for reform in transitional democracies (Kim & Nolette, 2023).

Doctrinal Enforcement in Landmark Cases

Judicial decisions have progressively expanded minority protections by interpreting constitutional values of dignity, privacy, and equality in line with international standards.

In *Lüth* (Germany), the court emphasized free expression as essential to dignity and pluralism (Shwartz-Asher & Ahituv, 2019). In *Navtej Singh Johar* (India), the Supreme Court decriminalized same-sex relationships, linking personal autonomy and dignity to constitutional morality (Saintyves et al., 2024).

Sejdić & Finci (ECtHR) invalidated ethnic exclusions in Bosnia's political system, mandating reforms for inclusive governance (Zinkler, 2019).

The interpretation of equality clauses has evolved to include intersectional understandings, prompting recognition of overlapping identities and the need for substantive equality (Bor et al., 2022; Pavlíková & Dijk, 2021).

Finally, the use of international references in national judgments reflects increasing legal globalization. Courts draw on foreign jurisprudence, treaty law, and soft law guidance to justify expansive interpretations of rights (Aylward & Halford, 2020). This not only enhances legitimacy but promotes doctrinal convergence across jurisdictions.

The data and cases analyzed confirm that minority rights protection improves where strong legal norms intersect with well-designed institutional mechanisms, supported by progressive judicial reasoning.

The findings emphasize that institutional design and normative alignment are fundamental to the judicial protection of minority rights. Constitutional review mechanisms grounded in international legal standards substantially strengthen courts' ability to safeguard the rights of ethnic, religious, and linguistic minorities. This discussion integrates the empirical and doctrinal findings of the previous chapters with broader theoretical insights into institutional strength, international norm alignment, political resistance, and transjudicial dialogue.

Institutional strength emerges as a pivotal determinant of effective minority rights enforcement. Robust judicial institutions, characterized by independence, professionalism, and procedural integrity, are essential for ensuring the credibility and functionality of constitutional review. In systems with well-established constitutional courts and competent human rights commissions, courts are more likely to act decisively against discriminatory policies and legislative omissions (Lacatus, 2018; Sieberer et al., 2020). These institutions create legal spaces where minority groups can articulate grievances, challenge exclusion, and claim protections. Conversely, fragile institutions suffer from low public trust, vulnerability to political interference, and incapacity to enforce judgments, thereby exacerbating patterns of marginalization (Neo, 2021).

In parallel, the degree of normative alignment between domestic constitutional frameworks and international human rights law also profoundly influences judicial outcomes. When constitutional texts and judicial interpretations reflect commitments to international instruments such as the ICCPR or regional treaties, courts are more likely to embrace inclusive and progressive readings of rights (Lutsyshyn & Sokolovsky, 2023). Such alignment facilitates the incorporation of General Comments, foreign jurisprudence, and treaty body reports into domestic adjudication, reinforcing both legitimacy and coherence across legal regimes (Trofymenko et al., 2024). Importantly, this process nurtures a rights-based legal culture where equality, dignity, and participation are elevated above majoritarian preferences.

However, institutional alignment and normative ambition are often met with political resistance. In contexts marked by populism or majoritarian rule, constitutional courts that uphold minority rights may become targets of backlash. This includes attempts to restrict judicial independence through changes in appointment procedures, budgetary controls, or statutory amendments aimed at curtailing judicial powers (Agyemang et al., 2017). Such efforts not only weaken the institutional capacity of courts but also signal broader authoritarian tendencies, threatening the entire constitutional order (Metelska-Szaniawska & Lewkowicz, 2020). The risk of backlash is particularly acute when courts intervene in socially contentious areas, such as language rights, religious expression, or LGBTQ+ protections, which populist actors may frame as elite overreach (Hamacher, 2021).

The resilience of courts under these conditions often hinges on their institutional legitimacy and the broader political ecosystem. Where public confidence in the judiciary is high, and where civil society is engaged, courts are more likely to withstand political interference and maintain their protective functions (Drabble et al., 2021). Additionally, support from international actors, including treaty bodies and supranational courts, can bolster domestic judicial decisions and deter retaliation by political elites.

Transjudicial dialogue further enhances the capacity of constitutional courts to protect minority rights. Through cross-jurisdictional referencing, courts learn from each other, adapt doctrines to local contexts, and co-create a shared jurisprudence of rights. This doctrinal borrowing is evident in cases such as *Lüth*, *Navtej Singh Johar*, and *Sejdić & Finci*, where international precedents and global human rights principles were invoked to support progressive rulings (Akbar et al., 2023; Piątek, 2016). Such exchanges strengthen the interpretive toolkit available to judges and legitimize decisions that advance minority protections, even in politically fraught environments (Kasse & Woldemariam, 2022).

Nevertheless, the process of transjudicial dialogue is not without limitations. Differences in legal traditions, cultural values, and constitutional structures may complicate the transplantation of doctrines. Courts must balance international inspiration with contextual sensitivity to ensure legitimacy and compliance (Zhou et al., 2023). Still, the dialogic approach remains a powerful strategy for building convergent standards and promoting judicial solidarity in defense of vulnerable groups.

In sum, the protection of minority rights through constitutional adjudication is contingent upon a constellation of factors. Institutional strength ensures that courts can act effectively and independently. Normative alignment with international law provides a principled foundation for inclusive judgments. Resistance from political actors presents real but navigable threats, particularly when courts are embedded within supportive civic and international networks. Transjudicial dialogue further enriches judicial reasoning and fortifies the global commitment to minority protections. Together, these dynamics define the contemporary landscape of constitutional justice for minorities.

CONCLUSION

This study analyzed the dynamic relationship between international human rights norms and constitutional review institutions in safeguarding minority rights within democratic systems. It found that judicial effectiveness depends not only on the structural integrity of courts but also on their normative alignment with global human rights instruments such as the ICCPR, the UN Declaration on Minorities, and the Council of Europe Framework Convention. These frameworks collectively reinforce the principles of dignity, equality, and participation that underpin constitutional adjudication.

By integrating comparative doctrinal and institutional analyses, this study offers an original framework that links institutional design with normative alignment. Centralized courts with abstract review powers and individual complaint mechanisms were shown to provide stronger and more consistent protections, especially when supported by judicial independence and engagement with international jurisprudence. This institutional–normative synergy enables courts to transform minority rights from abstract commitments into enforceable legal guarantees.

The findings contribute to comparative constitutional scholarship by demonstrating that the protection of minority rights requires both structural robustness and principled jurisprudence informed by international standards. Strengthening constitutional review mechanisms and embedding global human rights norms into domestic systems can enhance judicial legitimacy, foster transjudicial dialogue, and promote inclusive democratic governance rooted in justice, equality, and human dignity.

REFERENCE

- Agyemang, O. S., Kyeraa, M., Ansong, A., & Frimpong, S. (2017). Institutional Structures and the Strength of Investor Confidence in Africa. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 59(6), 899–915. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijlma-03-2016-0033>
- Akbar, A., Usman, M., & Lin, T. (2023). Institutional Dynamics and Corporate Innovation: A Pathway to Sustainable Development. *Sustainable Development*, 32(3), 2474–2488. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2790>
- Aylward, E. T., & Halford, S. (2020). How Gains for SRHR in the UN Have Remained Possible in a Changing Political Climate. *Sexual and Reproductive Health Matters*, 28(1), 1741496. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26410397.2020.1741496>
- Bao, N., Liu, Q., Reynolds, M., Figueras, M., Smith, E., Wang, W., Cao, M. C., Muller, D. A., Mavrikakis, M., Cohen, I., McEuen, P. L., & Abbott, N. L. (2023). Gas-Phase Microactuation Using Kinetically Controlled Surface States of Ultrathin Catalytic Sheets. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(19). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2221740120>
- Bor, A., Jørgensen, F. J., Lindholt, M. F., & Petersen, M. B. (2022). Moralizing the COVID-19 Pandemic: Self-Interest Predicts Moral Condemnation of Other's Compliance, Distancing, and Vaccination. *Political Psychology*, 44(2), 257–279. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12835>
- Carraro, V. (2019). Promoting Compliance With Human Rights: The Performance of the United Nations' Universal Periodic Review and Treaty Bodies. *International Studies Quarterly*, 63(4), 1079–1093. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqz078>
- Drabble, L. A., Mericle, A. A., Gómez, W., Klinger, J. L., Trocki, K. F., & Karriker-Jaffe, K. J. (2021). Differential Effects of State Policy Environments on Substance Use by Sexual Identity: Findings From the 2000–2015 National Alcohol Surveys. *Annals of LGBTQ Public and Population Health*, 2(1), 53–71. <https://doi.org/10.1891/lgbtq-2020-0029>
- Gabel, M. J., Carrubba, C. J., Helmke, G., Martin, A. D., Staton, J. K., Ward, D., & Ziegler, J. N. (2024). CompLaw: A Coding Protocol and Database for the Comparative Study of Judicial Review. *Journal of Law and Courts*, 12(2), 466–492. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jlc.2024.4>
- Gupta, A., Biermann, F., Driel, E. v., Bernaz, N., Jayaram, D., Kim, R. E., Kotzé, L. J., Ruddigkeit, D., VanDeveer, S. D., & Wewerinke-Singh, M. (2024). Towards a Non-Use Regime on Solar Geoengineering: Lessons From International Law and Governance. *Transnational Environmental Law*, 13(2), 368–399. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s2047102524000050>
- Hamacher, L. P. (2021). Representing Future Generations in Public Participation Procedures Regarding the Siting of a Nuclear Waste Repository. *Safety of Nuclear Waste Disposal*, 1, 219–220. <https://doi.org/10.5194/sand-1-219-2021>
- Ismayilov, R. R. o. (2024). Writ of Certiorari as a Means of Ensuring Centralization of Diffuse Constitutional Review. *Russian Justice*, 1, 28–35. <https://doi.org/10.37399/issn2072-909x.2025.1.28-35>

- Jiang, T., Wu, X., & Yin, Y. (2023). Logistics Efficiency Evaluation and Empirical Research Under the New Retailing Model: The Way Toward Sustainable Development. *Sustainability*, 15(20), 15028. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su152015028>
- Karakamisheva-Jovanovska, T., & Saveski, D. (2022). Macedonian Constitutional Court and Ratified International Agreements—Can the Concluded International Agreement Be a Subject of Constitutional Review? *Zbornik Radova Pravnog Fakulteta U Splitu*, 59(2), 315–349. <https://doi.org/10.31141/zrpfs.2022.59.144.315>
- Kasse, G. M., & Woldemariam, G. (2022). The Matrix of Ethnic Federalism in Ethiopia in Protecting Internal Minority Rights: Examining Perceptions in Oromia Regional State. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 9(1), 206–225. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ejecs/1050>
- Kim, D., & Nolette, P. (2023). The Institutional Foundations of the Uneven Global Spread of Constitutional Courts. *Perspectives on Politics*, 22(1), 294–311. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1537592723002025>
- Lacatus, C. (2018). Explaining Institutional Strength: The Case of National Human Rights Institutions in Europe and Its Neighbourhood. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 26(11), 1657–1677. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2018.1545795>
- Lawston, P. M., Santanello, J. A., Franz, T. E., & Rodell, M. (2017). Assessment of Irrigation Physics in a Land Surface Modeling Framework Using Non-Traditional and Human-Practice Datasets. <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2017-51>
- Lutsyshyn, H., & Sokolovsky, O. (2023). Issues of National Minorities in the Policy of the Eastern Partnership. *Nowa Polityka Wschodnia*, 38(3), 137–150. <https://doi.org/10.15804/npw20233807>
- Metelska-Szaniawska, K., & Lewkowicz, J. (2020). Post-Socialist “Illiberal Democracies”: Do De Jure Constitutional Rights Matter? *Constitutional Political Economy*, 32(2), 233–265. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10602-020-09316-4>
- Muwahid, M., & Bagus, M. (2023). Measuring the Executorial Power of the Constitutional Court of the Republic Indonesia Decisions. *Al-Daulah Jurnal Hukum Dan Perundangan Islam*, 13(2), 230–247. <https://doi.org/10.15642/ad.2023.13.2.230-247>
- Neo, J. L. (2021). Religious Minorities in Asia: Between the Scylla of Minority Protection and Charybdis of Religious Freedom Rights? *Religions*, 12(10), 881. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12100881>
- Pavlíková, B., & Dijk, J. P. v. (2021). Jehovah’s Witnesses and Their Compliance With Regulations on Smoking and Blood Treatment. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(1), 387. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19010387>
- Piątek, D. (2016). Institutions and Economic Growth in Transition Countries—New Experiences and Implications From Financial Crisis 2007–2010 (Part 1). *Ekonomia I Prawo*, 15(4), 515. <https://doi.org/10.12775/eip.2016.035>

- Puska, P. (2017). WHO FCTC as a Pioneering and Learning Instrument Comment on “The Legal Strength of International Health Instruments—What It Brings to Global Health Governance?” *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, 7(1), 75–77. <https://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2017.63>
- Rishan, I. (2022). Doubting the Impartiality: Constitutional Court Judges and Conflict of Interest. *Jurnal Jurisprudence*, 12(1), 92–105. <https://doi.org/10.23917/jurisprudence.v12i1.1058>
- Saintyves, B., Spenko, M., & Jaeger, H. M. (2024). A Self-Organizing Robotic Aggregate Using Solid and Liquid-Like Collective States. *Science Robotics*, 9(86). <https://doi.org/10.1126/scirobotics.adh4130>
- Sajó, A., & Uitz, R. (2017). Who Guards the Guardians? <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198732174.003.0010>
- Shwartz-Asher, D., & Ahituv, N. (2019). Comparison Between Face-to-Face Teams and Virtual Teams With Respect to Compliance With Directives. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 12(04), 549–571. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jssm.2019.12438>
- Sieberer, U., DUTKOWSKI, J. F., Meißner, P., & Müller, W. C. (2020). ‘Going Institutional’ to Overcome Obstruction: Explaining the Suppression of Minority Rights in Western European Parliaments, 1945–2010. *European Journal of Political Research*, 59(4), 886–909. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12376>
- Suharno, S., Junaidi, A., & Zaelani, M. A. (2021). Embodying the Meaning of the Guardian of the Constitution in the Role of the Constitutional Court of Reducing Constitutions Indicated by Policy Corruption. *International Journal of Educational Research & Social Sciences*, 2(3), 592–599. <https://doi.org/10.51601/ijersc.v2i3.88>
- Thohir, Moh., & Sukriono, D. (2023). Implementation Authority of the Constitutional Court in the Indonesian Constitutional Law System. *International Journal of Business Law and Education*, 4(2), 1495–1503. <https://doi.org/10.56442/ijble.v4i2.350>
- Tian, W., Zhang, S., Gao, Y., Wang, Y., & Cui, Q. (2024). Drug Utilization Reviews to Reduce Inappropriate Drug Use and Pharmaceutical Costs in Inpatients Based on Diagnosis-Related Group Data. *Technology and Health Care*, 32(6), 4353–4363. <https://doi.org/10.3233/thc-240284>
- Trofymenko, V., Serohin, V., Fedorchenko, O., Ovcharenko, R., & Kovalova, Y. (2024). Protection of the Civilian Population From Human Rights Violations Through European Mechanisms in Wartime. *PJC*, 16.2, 545–559. <https://doi.org/10.62271/pjc.16.2.545.559>
- Ullmann, A. J., & Staden, A. v. (2023). A Room Full of ‘Views’: Introducing a New Dataset to Explore Compliance With the Decisions of the UN Human Rights ‘Treaty Bodies’ Individual Complaints Procedures. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 68(2–3), 534–561. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00220027231160460>

- Zhou, B., Hu, X., & Xiong, C. (2023). Differential Influences of High-Speed Railway Stations on the Surrounding Construction Land Expansion and Institutional Analysis: The Case of Taiwan and Hainan. *Land*, 13(1), 10. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land13010010>
- Zinkler, M. (2019). Supported Decision Making in the Prevention of Compulsory Interventions in Mental Health Care. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2019.00137>
- Щербанюк, О. (2021). Constitutional Identity in the Argumentation of Decisions of Constitutional Courts. *Constitutional Legal Academic Studies*, 3, 77–84. <https://doi.org/10.24144/2663-5399.2020.3.08>