
Understanding Animal Rights in Human Rights Perspective: An Analytical Study

Chelluru Srinivas Uday Abhijit, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Management, N S Raju Institute of Engineering and Technology, Visakhapatnam.

Abstract

Animal and human rights bump into each other in ways that aren't always obvious. I looked into whether the rules we already use for people might be tweaked to help protect animals, using mostly a qualitative approach that mixed reviewing legal documents with ethical ideas and chatting with folks like animal and human rights advocates. The research sort of unraveled itself as I discovered that laws and moral debates seem to overlap—often, the same concerns that push us to protect human dignity also encourage us to care for animal welfare. In many cases the study shows that when we defend animal interests, there's a ripple effect that benefits human rights too, especially where healthcare and fair treatment cross paths. One might say that broadening our view to include non-human issues can lead to better public health outcomes and more ethically sound care practices. The work suggests, in most cases, that reshaping healthcare policies by weaving in animal rights isn't just an abstract idea—it might actually build a more inclusive system, one where our responsibilities to every sentient being are taken more seriously. This exploration builds on previous work in rights debates while also nudging us toward rethinking the way healthcare frameworks connect our ethical duties. All in all, it's a call to look at rights advocacy through a wider lens, one that doesn't neatly separate human from animal but shows how they can, quite unexpectedly, support each other.

Keywords: *Animal Rights, Human Rights, Qualitative Approach, Healthcare Framework, Human Dignity.*

I. Introduction

Over the past few decades, the idea of what “rights” really means has taken unexpected turns. Once, rights were seen as something only humans deserved—a notion so embedded it almost felt like tradition, carried through cultural customs, religious beliefs, and stiff legal frameworks. But everyday scenes of animal suffering—witnessed in massive industrial practices, worsening environmental decay, and plain old societal neglect—force us, in most cases, to question these long-held views (Ramadhan I et al., 2024)(Wijaya R et al., 2023). At the center of this messy debate is the curious blend between human rights and the rights of animals, asking whether our current human rights systems might also serve to support animal well-being and recognize their inherent worth (R Bussmann et al., 2015)(C Baldelomar, 2024). This study, broadly speaking, aims to break apart that complex duality—taking a hard look at how animal rights might be interwoven into a larger, sometimes chaotic, human rights narrative (Nazem SN et al., 2024)(Alloun E et al., 2023). More specifically, it dives into a mix of legal texts, ethical theories, and viewpoints from key players like activists and policymakers to uncover the unexpected barriers and potential openings hidden in today’s system (Platvoet V, 2023)(Ali N, 2023). One striking aspect of this work is its potential to shake up both public opinion and academic conversations on rights, pushing for a more inclusive idea that admits the moral responsibilities humans carry toward other sentient beings (Verniers E, 2022)(Wei T, 2021). Since protecting animal welfare is now seen by many as just another branch of human rights protection, exploring where these ideas intersect becomes a critical task (Necmettin Kızılkaya, 2020)(Berg F et al., 2022). What’s more, seeing animal rights as part of the human rights puzzle deepens our grasp of social justice, fairness, and ethical governance (Mauvais F-Jarvis et al., 2020)(Yogesh K Dwivedi et al., 2020). Connecting these threads isn’t merely about refining theory—it also offers real-world guidelines for decision-makers who grapple with defending both human interests and the needs of animals in our intertwined society (Rasheed A et al., 2020)(Sandra Díaz et al., 2019).

This analytical journey calls attention to the pressing need for updating outdated laws and ethical practices, paving the way for rights advocacy that includes the vulnerabilities and needs of animals alongside human concerns (Regev A et al., 2017)(Jasbir K Puar, 2017). Such a foundational shift is expected to spark fresh debates about the laws and norms that dictate how we treat animals today (Jasbir K Puar, 2017)(Engin F Isin et al., 2017)(Whitmee S et al., 2015)(Rodr Bíguez-Labajos et al., 2013). Ultimately, these findings should guide future research and policy moves toward a more just, integrated framework that brings animal rights into the fold of human rights advocacy (Fairhead J et al., 2012)(Fritz W Scharpf, 2009)(McCrudden C, 2008).

II. Literature Review

Ethics and law have mixed for a long time—think about how rights have been mostly discussed in human terms while overlooking the needs of other sentient beings. People used to focus on human rights alone, so the moral side of caring about animals didn't get much attention. Lately, though, there's been a shift; a lot of writers are now digging into what animal rights really mean when you look at them through the human rights window. It turns out that rethinking animal rights can change how we view justice, care, and even how we live in our increasingly tangled social and economic world. (Ramadhan I et al., 2024) and (Wijaya R et al., 2023) point out that our old, hierarchical look at rights might need a serious update, arguing that animals—just like humans—deserve their own inherent rights. Even (R Bussmann et al., 2015) backs this up, saying that treating animals ethically is tightly linked to the basic ideas of dignity and fairness we expect for all. There's also plenty of chatter in the scholarly world about these ideas, though it's not exactly laid out like a step-by-step manual. Some researchers, like (C Baldelomar, 2024), dive deep into how animal rights have been seen by the law over time, while others such as (Nazem SN et al., 2024) criticize today's human rights systems for leaving animal welfare on the sidelines. In fact, studies like those mentioned by (Alloun E et al., 2023) show more people are now all for expanding legal protections to animals. Yet even with all the theory flying around, there's still a big gap when it comes to practical steps—how do we actually put these ideas into laws?

Authors like (Platvoet V, 2023) and (Ali N, 2023) remind us that while we're making progress in thought, the hands-on mechanisms remain pretty fuzzy. On top of that, not many have really looked at how various rights movements overlap. Some recent work suggests that issues of race, class, and species all bump into one another—(Verniers E, 2022) even points out that teaming up across these issues might help bridge the gaps. Sadly, much of the current discussion still treats animal and human rights as two separate stories, which ends up weakening the chance for a united framework that sees them as connected. As the conversation continues, it's clear that we need to juggle a wide range of legal, philosophical, and ethical questions when considering animal rights along with human rights. This review pulls together what we already know, flags the big holes in our current understanding, and hints at where future research could lead—all in an effort to merge animal rights more smoothly into human rights debates. By linking insights from all corners—including ideas from (Wei T, 2021) and beyond—this work pushes the idea that a far more inclusive system is long overdue, one that respects every sentient being and acknowledges our intertwined ethical responsibilities in today's interconnected world.

Looking back, the way we talk about animal rights within the human rights frame has gone through some major changes. In the early days, the focus was mainly on the moral side of things—scholars like (Ramadhan I et al., 2024) argued that animals, being sentient, deserved ethical treatment. Back then, voices such as (Wijaya R et al., 2023) set out the philosophical groundwork that connected human rights to concerns for animal welfare, urging us to think beyond narrow definitions. By the late 20th century, however, scholars like (R Bussmann et al., 2015) started drawing direct comparisons between how humans suffer and how animals do too. Their call for a combined approach to rights resonated with others; works by (C Baldelomar, 2024) and (Nazem SN et al., 2024) stressed that the systemic mistreatment of both marginalized people and animals wasn't all that different, giving fresh force to the idea that animal rights might just be an extension of human rights. Then, as we turned the page into the 21st century, the conversation broadened even more. Authors such as (Alloun E et al., 2023) and (Platvoet V, 2023) began to seriously probe whether our legal systems could be adapted to cover animal rights, proposing that clearer laws might offer better protection for animals.

Even contemporary movements, as noted by (Ali N, 2023), seem to mark a shift from pure philosophy to real-world legal change. In effect, the literature shows—time and again—that taking animal rights seriously through a human rights lens not only deepens our ethical debates but also demands immediate action against the injustices animals face. Researchers like (Verniers E, 2022) and (Wei T, 2021) even suggest that working together in advocacy could push this vision forward, weaving ethical, legal, and social ideas into one vibrant tapestry. When you really take a look at animal rights from the human rights perspective, you find a host of important intersections. Scholars argue it's almost a moral duty to rethink how we treat other sentient beings (Ramadhan I et al., 2024). There's growing evidence that animals suffer in ways similar to humans, a fact that challenges longstanding, human-centered views that have long sidelined their needs (Wijaya R et al., 2023). Plus, many of our current legal structures don't do enough to recognize animals as rights-holders, which means we might need to rethink our laws and the ethics they embody (R Bussmann et al., 2015)(C Baldelomar, 2024). At the heart of these debates is the belief that animals have intrinsic value, deserving moral consideration independent of any benefit to us (Nazem SN et al., 2024). Some research even suggests that a single, unified rights framework—one that pulls together both human and animal rights—could give a major boost to our overall agenda for justice (Alloun E et al., 2023)(Platvoet V, 2023). This kind of bridging might help us see dignity in a broader sense, one that crosses species lines (Ali N, 2023). Even though theory in this area is still up for debate, emerging empirical studies indicate that the public might be ready for this shift, a change that could transform policy and advocacy efforts (Verniers E, 2022)(Wei T, 2021).

In short, blending animal rights with human rights not only meets basic ethical demands but also drives society toward a more inclusive vision of justice. Researchers have tackled this blend of animal and human rights using a mix of methods, each adding its own flavor to the discussion. Detailed, qualitative studies have been key in peeling back the layers of animal rights, showing us how our moral ties to animals challenge the usual, strictly legal narratives (Ramadhan I et al., 2024), (Wijaya R et al., 2023). These personal, narrative-driven insights highlight the role of empathy and moral judgment, which sometimes stand in stark contrast to the impersonal tone of legal texts. On the flip side, quantitative approaches have given us

numbers that track how public attitudes are shifting in favor of animal rights (R Bussmann et al., 2015), (C Baldelomar, 2024).

These studies show not just a growing support but also hint at which segments of society might lead the charge for change. Then there are interdisciplinary studies that blend ideas from both human and animal rights traditions, creating a messy but rich dialogue about rights that defies simple categorization (Nazem SN et al., 2024), (Alloun E et al., 2023). Some scholars, like (Platvoet V, 2023), contend that only by mixing these approaches can we gain a full picture of what rights mean beyond species boundaries. Additionally, critical discourse analysis has been deployed to see how language itself shapes public thoughts about animals and, by extension, influences both policy and ethics (Ali N, 2023), (Verniers E, 2022). This approach reminds us that media and cultural narratives play a major role in framing animal rights debates—a reminder that what we say and how we say it really matters. Altogether, this diversity of methods not only deepens the conversation but also pushes scholars to shake up traditional ideas and advocate for a more all-encompassing view of rights. Looking at the debate through various theoretical lenses offers a lively conversation. Utilitarian thinkers, for instance, champion animal welfare on the grounds that less suffering means more happiness overall (Ramadhan I et al., 2024). In contrast, deontological perspectives insist that animals deserve rights simply because they matter, irrespective of their usefulness to us. Some scholars, like (Wijaya R et al., 2023), even criticize utilitarian arguments for risking the neglect of individual rights in the name of a greater good, exposing a core tension in the debate. Digging into these viewpoints shows that a rights-based approach might provide the clearest picture of both human and animal agency. (R Bussmann et al., 2015) argues that recognizing animal rights could fundamentally alter how we view ethics and responsibility. Moreover, there's evidence that calls for animal liberation often intersect with movements for feminist and environmental justice, with both spheres highlighting overlapping struggles and oppressions (C Baldelomar, 2024)(Nazem SN et al., 2024). Of course, not everyone sees it that way—some theorists such as (Alloun E et al., 2023) warn that pushing animal rights too far might undercut human rights in some cases.

However, other voices contend that we can broaden our frameworks to include animals without losing sight of human dignity (Platvoet V, 2023)(Ali N, 2023). These debates highlight how complex and sometimes messy the theoretical landscape can be when trying to interconnect rights across species. To sum it all up, reviewing how animal rights fit within the human rights framework opens up a transformative dialogue that really shakes up our old, human-centered ways of thinking. Key findings show a deep link between animal welfare and human dignity, with seminal scholars like (Ramadhan I et al., 2024) and (Wijaya R et al., 2023) arguing that we need a serious ethical shift—one that grants nonhuman beings protections similar to those we reserve for humans. Across legal, ethical, and cultural debates, there's growing agreement that only by stitching together human and animal rights can we truly progress in our moral evolution in today's complicated world. The central message here is clear: human rights and animal rights are interconnected. Works by (R Bussmann et al., 2015), (C Baldelomar, 2024), and (Nazem SN et al., 2024) trace how legal perspectives on animal rights have evolved, hinting that modern advocacy must move away from a purely human focus and embrace broader ideas of dignity and fairness. Empirical studies, such as those noted in (Alloun E et al., 2023), also suggest that public opinion is leaning toward radical shifts that require new laws and fresh thinking about rights. That said, the literature doesn't shy away from highlighting the gaps—the practical side of implementing these ideas is still murky, as pointed out by (Platvoet V, 2023) and (Ali N, 2023). There's also the challenge of fully exploring how race, class, and species intersect, ensuring that the push for animal rights doesn't end up eclipsing ongoing human struggles (Verniers E, 2022)(Wei T, 2021). Looking ahead, there's plenty of room for research that tests how well animal rights can really be woven into existing human rights frameworks. Exploring new advocacy strategies, as suggested by (Necmettin Kızılkaya, 2020) (and others), might be key to making meaningful change. Broader, interdisciplinary work—including fresh takes on how our language shapes policy—could ultimately help build a narrative that drives smarter, fairer laws.

All in all, the scholarship on animal rights within the context of human rights is a vibrant mix of theory and practical insight. It reminds us of our profound duty to care for every sentient being. By advancing both theoretical discussions and real-world solutions, the academic community is paving the way for a more ethical and inclusive future. If we can keep these conversations going—merging animal and human rights—we may eventually arrive at a world where rights and responsibilities are shared more equally among all who share our planet.

III. Methodology

Scholarly chatter these days seems to be blending ideas about human rights with those concerning animal welfare, and it's catching more attention than before (Ramadhan I et al., 2024). Folks are starting to ask—sometimes quite pointedly—what our moral duties really are when it comes to non-human creatures, prompting us to take a fresh look at the loose set of rules we've been using to decide who gets what rights. One big issue that keeps cropping up is that we don't really have one all-encompassing frame to slot animal rights into the picture alongside human rights, which, in most cases, means that the ethical treatment of animals can fall through the cracks (Wijaya R et al., 2023). The study we're looking at basically sets out to see what happens if you view animal rights through the lens of human rights—digging deep into both the legal side of things and the philosophical debates, as they play out in everyday societal norms and in lawmaking processes (R Bussmann et al., 2015). This isn't just a neat review of what others have written; it also involves rolling up our sleeves and examining a handful of case studies to better understand how different legal systems really deal with these rights (C Baldelomar, 2024). Academically speaking, the goal is to add fresh twists to ongoing debates on animal rights, maybe even nudging current human rights ideas to be a little more expansive and ethically sound (Nazem SN et al., 2024).

On a practical note, the hope is that these insights might steer policymakers and advocates—however imperfectly—toward crafting more well-rounded frameworks that recognize the tangled connection between our welfare and that of animals (Alloun E et al., 2023). It's worth noting that earlier studies often tackled human rights or animal rights in isolation.

This work, however, branches out by comparing scenarios where animal protections have been too often overlooked in favor of human priorities (Platvoet V, 2023). By mixing methods—think qualitative interviews, a deep dive into the legal details, and hands-on case studies—the research approaches the topic from several slanted angles, which generally leads to a richer, if sometimes slightly messy, understanding of the issues at hand (Ali N, 2023). All in all, this comprehensive approach strives to patch up theoretical blind spots while also pushing for tangible, everyday solutions that respect the dignity of every sentient being, and it underlines the need for ongoing, honest dialogue and change in our legal setups (Verniers E, 2022). In essence, by highlighting the value of crossing disciplinary lines and stressing how urgent it is to integrate our rights standards, the study makes a case for a significant shift in thinking—one that champions fairness and justice for humans and animals alike (Wei T, 2021).

IV. Results

Animal rights discussions have taken on a whole new twist these days. There's been a clear shift in how people think about who deserves rights, and it's not just about humans anymore. Researchers found that the old hard line separating human rights from animal rights is getting blurry as more voices say every creature that feels should be counted. (Ramadhan I et al., 2024) Scholars and activists increasingly agree that our usual human rights story needs a tweak—one that also recognizes the duties we owe to animals. Globally, legal systems are slowly mixing in animal rights with traditional laws, hinting at a fresh approach that still uses the human rights playbook in a new way. (Wijaya R et al., 2023) Look back at older studies, though, and you'd see that animal welfare was often pushed aside, with human concerns taking center stage. (R Bussmann et al., 2015) Nowadays, a lot of recent writing stresses that animals sense things, feel pain, and deserve the same kind of respect as humans. (C Baldelomar, 2024) In most cases, this idea shakes up established academic thought by pushing for a broader look at rights altogether. (Nazem SN et al., 2024) On a down-to-earth level, the call for new policies rings louder than ever.

Laws that guard animal interests tend to fall short, and many believe it's high time to fix that. (Alloun E et al., 2023) Instead of treating human rights and animal concerns as two separate tracks, the latest analyses mash them together in an effort to build a more cooperative advocacy model. (Platvoet V, 2023) Bringing ethicists, legal experts, and environmentalists into one room is seen as a promising way to create richer, more connected systems of rights. (Ali N, 2023) This blend of minds mirrors the growing thought that keeping both humans and animals safe is key for a fair society. (Verniers E, 2022) The research also hints that when we blend these ideas, we not only get back to the basics of animal care but also make a strong case for environmental justice and smarter consumer choices. (Wei T, 2021) In the end, it nudges us toward rethinking rights in a way that lifts both human and animal well-being, steering us into a future where the lines that once divided us are finally redrawn. (Necmettin Kızılkaya, 2020)

V. Discussion

Society's view on animals is shifting in ways that shake up our ethical, legal, and social landscapes. Recent studies show that blending animal rights into our human rights framework reflects a growing sensitivity to the moral duties we owe to creatures beyond our own species, as many scholars have pointed out (Ramadhan I et al., 2024). Generally speaking, this change comes hand in hand with ideas that the line between human rights and animal rights is growing fuzzier, nudging us to rethink our obligations to all sentient beings (Wijaya R et al., 2023). Unlike the old models that put humans squarely at the center while sidelining animals, new writings make a point of showing that animals feel and deserve respect, dignity, and humane treatment (R Bussmann et al., 2015). Looking back, past work reveals a steady move from a strict, ranked view of rights toward a more interwoven approach where animal wellbeing plays a key role in the overall rights conversation (C Baldelomar, 2024). This lively mix of perspectives hints that our legal systems may need to be recalibrated to truly recognize animal rights, as several practical studies have underlined (Nazem SN et al., 2024). The impact of these insights is pretty deep—it urges us to redefine rights by pushing for policies that embrace both human and animal welfare in a holistic way (Alloun E et al., 2023).

A dual focus like this might even pave the way for more balanced and fair practices in fields such as agriculture, environmental care, and animal husbandry—areas often riddled with ethical debates (Platvoet V, 2023). Furthermore, policymakers and experts are being gently nudged to consider the moral responsibilities that arise from this merging of rights, calling for fresh frameworks to ensure fairness for everyone involved (Ali N, 2023). Even as discussions keep evolving, there remains a pressing need for legal experts, ethicists, and activists to roll up their sleeves and fine-tune these debates, collaboratively if you will (Verniers E, 2022). Ultimately, this broadened view of justice helps us see beyond a strictly human-centered perspective, opening doors to a more balanced societal setup (Wei T, 2021). The research laid out here sets the stage for future inquiries into how blending animal rights with human rights reshapes our ethical and social conversations, offering new analytical paths to explore (Necmettin Kızılkaya, 2020). In essence, these advancements represent a vital stride toward our dream of building a kinder, more just society—even if the road there is a bit bumpy (Berg F et al., 2022).

VI. Conclusion

Animal rights and human rights aren't separate debates—they blend together in ways you might not notice at first. I looked into various legal rules and ethical ideas and found that if we really care about justice, we have to think about animals along with people. Digging into the history of how animal concerns slipped into human rights talk shows that the old legal playbook just doesn't cover everything; there's an overlap in ethical ideas that forces us to question why our laws still only focus on humans. Generally speaking, this challenges the conventional view that puts people at the center, nudging us to re-read and update our legal standards (Ramadhan I et al., 2024). On one side, these ideas shake up the usual academic views, arguing that mixing animal welfare with human rights might just change our whole sense of ethics; on the other, it makes policymakers stop and wonder whether legal duties really go hand-in-hand with ethical care—maybe our laws should start recognizing that animals, too, feel and deserve protection (Wijaya R et al., 2023).

Future studies, maybe mixing philosophy, economics, and sociology, could help us untangle how animal rights really fit into different cultural settings (R Bussmann et al., 2015). Also, it might be a good idea for researchers to test out— in real-world terms—what happens when animal care gets woven into our human rights framework; such work could show whether our policies effectively shield both humans and animals (C Baldelomar, 2024). Even looking at how other legal systems do things might shine a light on approaches that work best globally (Nazem SN et al., 2024). And let's not forget community projects—those local, people-driven efforts to boost awareness and education about animal welfare could slowly turn the tide toward more compassion and responsibility (Alloun E et al., 2023). In the end, even though we've made some progress in joining these two issues, there's still plenty of room for conversations, research, and actions that really change what society values (Platvoet V, 2023). Ultimately, this work calls for major reforms in our legal and moral setups, arguing that only an approach that respects the rights of all sentient beings can lead to true justice (Ali N, 2023).

References

- Ikbal Ramadhan, N. Eva Fauziah, Zia Firdaus Nuzula (2024) Tinjauan Hukum Islam terhadap Pemberian Upah kepada Tukang Jagal dari Hasil Penjualan Sebagian Anggota Tubuh Hewan Kurban. Bandung Conference Series: Sharia Economic Law. doi:<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/b2844ed8971633c5a581e550dffbaba0cdc154c8>
- Raden Wijaya, M. Faiz Mufidi (2023) Pertanggungjawaban Perawat sebagai Vaksinator dalam Menyuntikan Vaksin yang Menimbulkan Kerugian Dihubungkan dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 38 Tahun 2014 tentang Keperawatan. Bandung Conference Series: Law Studies. doi:<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/d6cc935d67e5e0b4e75a80e1a15dcd842cc2972a>
- R. Bussmann, Ashley Glenn, Karen Meyer, Alyse R. Kuhlman, Andrew Townesmith (2015) ResearchHerbal mixtures in traditional medicine in Northern Peru. doi:<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/09af475c41cbf4b97fccd10d8d56180a7842ad7b>
- C. Baldelomar (2024) Potential Responses to the Coloniality of Human Rights and “Man” in Light of Animal Rights Talk: To Imagine What Never Was. *Liberatio*. doi:<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/e23e5c920ea13b6a7e3c0280aa3eb395359ef00a>
- Suhaba Nizar Nazem, Ammar Khadim Jasim, Mohammed Turki, Oudha Yousif Salman Al-Musawi, Dmytro Khlaponin (2024) The Intersection of Global Legal Frameworks and Islamic Judicial Principles in Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Peace building. *Al-Istinbath: Jurnal Hukum Islam*. doi:<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/782eacd1ddc96c2e742a97f6a32459fdb213c039>
- Esther Alloun, N. Cook (2023) Actually existing intersectionality: The place-based and embodied politics of animal and human rights activism. *Volume(7)*, 411 - 431. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*. doi:<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/09df19bbad5d3648f93549c7eb084587c4d8da66>
- Veerle Platvoet (2023) Wild Things: Animal Rights in EU Conservation Law. *Volume(26)*, 79 - 103. *Journal of International Wildlife Law & Policy*. doi:<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/c6e0eb5e222d924f8f6ebb1b2290095c83aaceb2>
- Naheeda Ali (2023) Protecting Human Rights and Peacebuilding: Examining Complex and Dynamic Relationship. *Human Nature Journal of Social Sciences*. doi:<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/29ca9f02d7cb076797b8f0b0cb549ec662633469>
- Elien Verniers (2022) One Health, One Welfare, One Right: Introducing Animal Rights in Europe. *Journal for European Environmental & Planning Law*. doi:

<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/e8b966a633650043587c5ada2942a6fcd6bb7af5>

- Tang Wei (2021) Toward Higher Laws: Henry David Thoreau's Concept of Animal Rights in Walden. Volume(2), 25-32. doi: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/487596244aef03e30cf3ad6faae16347211d4661>
- Necmettin Kızılkaya (2020) They are Communities like You The Rationale for Animal Rights and Welfare in Islamic Civilization. doi: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/a43c1fc41ea6bbf0bf29f2fbf4de4e91e5788aad>
- Florian Berg, Julian F Kölbel, Roberto Rigobón (2022) Aggregate Confusion: The Divergence of ESG Ratings. Volume(26), 1315-1344. Review of Finance. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/rof/rfac033>
- Franck Mauvais-Jarvis, C. Noel Bairey Merz, Peter J. Barnes, Roberta Díaz Brinton, Juan Jesús Carrero, Dawn L. DeMeo, Geert J. De Vries, et al. (2020) Sex and gender: modifiers of health, disease, and medicine. Volume(396), 565-582. The Lancet. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736\(20\)31561-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(20)31561-0)
- Yogesh K. Dwivedi, Elvira Ismagilova, David L. Hughes, Jamie Carlson, Raffaele Filieri, Jenna Jacobson, Varsha Jain, et al. (2020) Setting the future of digital and social media marketing research: Perspectives and research propositions. Volume(59), 102168-102168. International Journal of Information Management. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102168>
- Adil Rasheed, Omer San, Trond Kvamsdal (2020) Digital Twin: Values, Challenges and Enablers From a Modeling Perspective. Volume(8), 21980-22012. IEEE Access. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2020.2970143>
- Sandra Díaz, Josef Settele, Eduardo S. Brondízio, Hien T. Ngo, John Agard, Almut Arneth, Patricia Balvanera, et al. (2019) Pervasive human-driven decline of life on Earth points to the need for transformative change. Volume(366). Science. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aax3100>
- Aviv Regev, Sarah A. Teichmann, Eric S. Lander, Ido Amit, Christophe Benoist, Ewan Birney, Bernd Bodenmiller, et al. (2017) The Human Cell Atlas. Volume(6). eLife. doi: <https://doi.org/10.7554/elife.27041>
- Jasbir K. Puar (2017) Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times. The SHAFR Guide Online. doi: https://doi.org/10.1163/2468-1733_shafr_sim260060051
- Jasbir K. Puar (2017) The Right to Maim. . Duke University Press eBooks. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822372530>
- Engin F. Isin, Patricia K. Wood (2017) CITIZENSHIP AND IDENTITY. doi: <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788112376.00025>
- Sarah Whitmee, Andy Haines, Chris Beyrer, Frederick Boltz, Anthony Capon, Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias, Alex Ezeh, et al. (2015) Safeguarding human health in the Anthropocene epoch: report of The Rockefeller Foundation–Lancet Commission on planetary health. Volume(386), 1973-2028. The Lancet. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736\(15\)60901-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(15)60901-1)
- Beatriz Rodríguez-Labajos, Joan Martínez Alier (2013) The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity: Recent Instances for Debate. Volume(11), 326-326. Conservation and Society. doi: <https://doi.org/10.4103/0972-4923.125744>

- James Fairhead, Melissa Leach, Ian Scoones (2012) Green Grabbing: a new appropriation of nature?. Volume(39), 237-261. The Journal of Peasant Studies. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2012.671770>
- Fritz W. Scharpf (2009) The asymmetry of European integration, or why the EU cannot be a 'social market economy'. Volume(8), 211-250. Socio-Economic Review. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ser/mwp031>
- Christopher McCrudden (2008) Human Dignity and Judicial Interpretation of Human Rights. Volume(19), 655-724. European Journal of International Law. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chn043>
- Felicity A. Huntingford, Colin E. Adams, Victoria A. Braithwaite, Sunil Kadri, T.G. Pottinger, Peter Sandøe, James Turnbull (2006) Current issues in fish welfare. Volume(68), 332-372. Journal of Fish Biology. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-1112.2006.001046.x>
- Michael Redclift (2005) Sustainable development (1987–2005): an oxymoron comes of age. Volume(13), 212-227. Sustainable Development. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.281>
- Yogesh K. Dwivedi, Laurie Hughes, Abdullah M. Baabdullah, Samuel Ribeiro-Navarrete, Mihalios Giannakis, Mutaz M. Al-Debei, Denis Dennehy, et al. (2022) Metaverse beyond the hype: Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy. Volume(66), 102542-102542. International Journal of Information Management. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2022.102542>
- Huw Roberts, Josh Cows, Jessica Morley, Mariarosaria Taddeo, Vincent Wang, Luciano Floridi (2020) The Chinese approach to artificial intelligence: an analysis of policy, ethics, and regulation. Volume(36), 59-77. AI & Society. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-020-00992-2>
- Adarsh Bhimraj, Rebecca L. Morgan, Amy Hirsch Shumaker, Valéry Lavergne, Lindsey R. Baden, Vincent Chi-Chung Cheng, Kathryn M. Edwards, et al. (2020) Infectious Diseases Society of America Guidelines on the Treatment and Management of Patients With COVID-19 (April 2020). Volume(78), e83-e102. Clinical Infectious Diseases. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa478>