

Analyzing Legislative Approaches to the Rehabilitation of Drug Addicts through a Social Engineering Lens: Best Practices and Challenges

Siti Ngaisah¹, Wredha Danang Widoyoko², Haryono³, Diah Ayu Rahmawati⁴, Yoga Adi Prayogi⁵

¹ Universitas Bhayangkara Surabaya and ngaisah@ubhara.ac.id

² Universitas Bhayangkara Surabaya and danangfh@ubhara.ac.id

³ Universitas Bhayangkara Surabaya and haryono@ubhara.ac.id

⁴ Universitas Bhayangkara Surabaya and diahayu@ubhara.ac.id

⁵ Universitas Bhayangkara Surabaya and yoga.ap@ubhara.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes legislative approaches to the rehabilitation of drug addicts through the lens of social engineering, examining best practices and identifying key challenges. A juridical analysis of selected national and international legislation highlights the alignment of legal frameworks with social engineering principles, focusing on recovery, reintegration, and harm reduction. Case studies from jurisdictions like Portugal and the Netherlands demonstrate the effectiveness of decriminalization and integrated healthcare policies in reducing recidivism and improving public health. However, challenges such as resource constraints, societal stigma, and policy inconsistencies remain significant barriers to implementation. The findings emphasize the need for comprehensive, evidence-based legislation that balances punitive and rehabilitative measures to address drug addiction effectively.

Keywords: Drug Rehabilitation, Social Engineering, Legislative Framework, Harm Reduction

1. INTRODUCTION

Drug addiction is a critical public health and social problem, posing a major challenge to individuals, families, and society as a whole. It not only impairs the health and well-being of those affected but also fosters social instability, economic burdens, and criminal activities [1], [2]. In response, governments and policymakers worldwide have pursued comprehensive legal frameworks to address drug addiction through punishment and rehabilitation [3], [4]. While punitive approaches depend on deterrence, rehabilitation focuses on recovery, reintegration, and the reduction of recidivism, making it a critical component in the fight against drug addiction [1], [3], [5].

Drug addiction is a serious worldwide problem that affects public health, social stability, and economic well-being. While many efforts have been made, traditional punitive approaches often failed to address the root causes of addiction, which resulted in high recidivism rates and overloaded prison systems [6], [7]. There is a need for innovative legislative frameworks emphasizing rehabilitation, reintegration, and harm reduction as an urgent need for sustainable solutions [3], [4], [8]. Global examples, such as those from Portugal and the Netherlands, further illustrate how principles of social engineering can lead to transformative legislative practices and positive societal outcomes. It is an imperative that needs to be urgently addressed in order to promote public health, reduce societal stigma, and provide supportive environments for recovery.

Most of the legislative approaches to drug addiction have emphasized punitive measures rather than rehabilitation, thus yielding ineffective long-term outcomes such as high recidivism rates and the marginalization of addicts in society [4], [9], [10]. The inconsistent application of social

engineering in drug rehabilitation laws across different jurisdictions further exacerbates the problem, with limited integration of healthcare, social support, and community-based programs. Besides, resource constraints and stigma significantly affect the full realization of rehabilitation frameworks, particularly in low- and middle-income countries. Further, best practices such as decriminalization and harm reduction are underutilized, and their effectiveness is often impaired by policy incoherence and lack of effective enforcement mechanisms [11], [12].

This paper examines the use of legislation in rehabilitating drug addicts as a form of social engineering. Social engineering, which is defined by sociologist Roscoe Pound, puts the law in the perspective of an instrument of social change with its emphasis on the creation of rules of law that guide behavior in a desired pattern. This perspective applied to drug addiction involves a study of how legislation can be designed to control not only drug-related offenses but also to help in the recovery and social reintegration of addicts. Social engineering through legal approaches aims to address the root causes of addiction and create supportive environments that ensure long-term societal benefits.

This paper inspects the legislation on file regarding the rehabilitation of drug addicts from a juridical perspective, assessing the conformity of legal frameworks with the principles of social engineering. It also enumerates the best practices from successful jurisdictions and pinpoints those challenges that consistently impede the full effectiveness of these laws, such as resource constraints, inconsistencies in enforcement, and stigma against drug addicts at the societal level.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 *Theoretical Framework*

The concept of social engineering, introduced by Roscoe Pound, positions law as a tool to shape society by balancing competing interests and promoting social order, emphasizing that effective legislation should address immediate societal issues while guiding behavior toward long-term societal goals [13], [14]. In the context of drug addiction, this theory advocates for laws that rehabilitate addicts by addressing the root causes of addiction and facilitating their reintegration into society. Scholars by [15]–[17], highlight that rehabilitation-focused legislation must be designed to foster behavioral change, encourage community support, and reduce societal stigma, aligning with restorative justice principles that prioritize repairing harm and restoring offenders to their communities over punitive measures. However, critics argue that achieving this balance often demands significant resources and political will, both of which are frequently lacking in many jurisdictions.

2.2 *Legislative Frameworks for Drug Rehabilitation*

Legislation addressing drug addiction varies widely across jurisdictions, shaped by differing cultural, economic, and political contexts. Countries like Portugal and the Netherlands have implemented decriminalization policies that prioritize treatment over punishment, with legislative frameworks emphasizing accessible healthcare, community-based rehabilitation programs, and robust social support systems [18]. These approaches have been shown to lower drug-related deaths, reduce stigma, and improve public health outcomes. In contrast, punitive approaches, as practiced in the United States and some Southeast Asian countries, focus on criminalizing drug use and

enforcing strict penalties. While these measures may deter drug use in the short term, they often neglect the root causes of addiction, leading to overcrowded prison systems, limited rehabilitation opportunities, and higher rates of recidivism, thereby undermining long-term recovery efforts [19]–[22].

2.3 Best Practices in Rehabilitation

Best practices in drug rehabilitation emphasize the importance of integrated approaches that combine legal, medical, and social interventions. Successful programs commonly include evidence-based treatment methods, such as cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) and medication-assisted treatment (MAT), which have proven effective in reducing addiction and preventing relapse. Supportive legal frameworks play a critical role by facilitating access to healthcare, protecting against discrimination, and promoting social reintegration, all of which enhance the overall effectiveness of rehabilitation efforts [23], [24]. Additionally, community involvement, through initiatives like peer support groups and vocational training, is vital for sustaining recovery and reducing societal stigma [6], [25], [26]. Case studies from Portugal illustrate the success of decriminalization policies combined with comprehensive treatment and harm-reduction strategies, supported by legislative measures that ensure access to healthcare and social services, ultimately fostering an environment conducive to recovery.

2.4 Research Gaps

While existing literature provides valuable insights into legislative approaches to drug rehabilitation, several gaps remain. Limited research exists on the comparative effectiveness of social engineering-driven frameworks across different cultural and economic contexts. Moreover, there is a need for empirical studies examining the long-term outcomes of rehabilitation-focused legislation, particularly in resource-constrained settings.

3. METHODS

3.1 Approach

The research design is a qualitative juridical analysis that will dwell on the legislative frameworks guiding drug rehabilitation. This approach has its basis in normative legal research, which studies laws as an instrument in regulating society and bringing about changes in human behavior. Through the use of a social engineering perspective, this study intends to establish how the laws can effectively deal with the rehabilitation and social reintegration of drug addicts.

3.2 Data Collection

Data collection involves a review of the legislative documents, such as national drug laws and rehabilitation policies, and other international frameworks like the United Nations' conventions on drug control and human rights to understand approaches toward drug rehabilitation. Case studies from innovative policy jurisdictions such as Portugal and the Netherlands seek to highlight best practices and are compared with punitive approaches of countries like the United States and certain Southeast Asian nations. Academic literature-including peer-reviewed articles, legal commentaries, and reports from governmental and nongovernmental organizations-provides supplementary insights into the efficacy and challenges of existing legislative frameworks. Where possible, it also collects statistical data on drug-related offenses, rehabilitation success rates, and recidivism to create an empirical context.

3.3 Data Analysis

This includes three major steps: content analysis, where a look is made at the legislative texts to identify various provisions related to rehabilitation through the lenses of access to treatment, harm reduction, and reintegration strategies, checking whether they correspond to social engineering principles; comparative analysis that looks at best practices and challenges across jurisdictions in respect to differences in approaches taken, implementation mechanisms, and their respective outcomes; and, lastly, critical evaluation, or finding the gaps in policy design, resource allocation, and societal acceptance within the framework of the existing legislation. Informed by the theory of Roscoe Pound, the work of social engineering evaluates laws in terms of their function to promote changes in society, striking a balance between individual and societal interests, encouraging behavioral transformation with supportive legal mechanisms for change, and not forgetting to address social stigma and systemic barriers to rehabilitation.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Application of Social Engineering Principles in Rehabilitation Legislation

The analysis reveals that legislative frameworks in different jurisdictions vary widely in their application of social engineering principles. These laws aim to create a societal balance by addressing drug addiction not solely as a criminal issue but as a public health and social concern.

Portugal's groundbreaking approach, which decriminalized drug use and established the Commission against Drug Addiction, exemplifies the use of law as a social engineering tool. Portugal's groundbreaking drug policy, which decriminalized drug use and established the Commission for the Fight against Drug Addiction, serves as a clear example of how the law can serve as a social engineering tool. This framework focuses on harm reduction and recovery, shifting individuals away from a punitive approach towards a supportive treatment system, positioning addiction as a public health issue. Since decriminalization in 2001, heroin use dropped dramatically from 100,000 to 25,000 in 2017, while fatal overdoses decreased by more than 85% and new HIV diagnoses decreased by more than 90% [27]. It also redefined addiction as a disease, integrating comprehensive medical and psychological support [27]. Aligned with social engineering principles, the approach follows a 'six-star' framework that emphasizes mindfulness, motivation, and quality decision-making for effective implementation [28]. In addition, it promotes social inclusion by reducing stigma against drug use and facilitating access to treatment, creating a supportive environment for recovery and community reintegration [20].

The Netherlands has successfully integrated harm reduction policies, such as supervised drug use facilities (SCS) and needle and syringe exchange programs (NSP), into its legal framework, which promotes a health-based approach to addiction. SCS provide a safe environment for drug use, significantly lowering overdose rates through supervised consumption and drug testing for harmful substances such as fentanyl, which also reduces the need for emergency interventions [29]. The NSP, on the other hand, played an important role in reducing HIV and hepatitis rates among PWID in Amsterdam, with full participation associated with a 72% reduction in HCV risk [30], as well as being a cost-effective program that reduces the burden of healthcare costs in the long run [31]. The Dutch harm reduction model complements treatment by addressing broader health and social challenges related to drug use [32]. Moreover, the involvement of drug-using communities in these strategies, such as Amsterdam's customized drug information campaign, increases policy effectiveness and acceptance [33]. These strategies overall not only reduce the adverse effects of drug use but also encourage positive behavioral changes among users.

The shift from a punitive approach to drug-related offenses in the United States towards rehabilitation reflects a growing recognition of the importance of effective treatment. Initiatives such as drug courts (TCs) and community sanctions aim to integrate rehabilitation into the criminal justice system, although their fragmented implementation often undermines their effectiveness. Treatment

courts, which emerged in the 1980s to combine substance use disorder (SUD) treatment with judicial accountability, have shown success dependent on the presence of dedicated coordinators and judicial training, despite often being constrained by resources and differing community values [34]. Similarly, community sanctions as an alternative to imprisonment have rehabilitative potential, but their effectiveness is hampered by limited resources and a lack of personalized assessment [35]. Restorative justice approaches, which emphasize rehabilitation over punishment, view people who use drugs as victims in need of support, rather than solely as offenders. By facilitating out-of-court settlements, this approach aligns legal outcomes with community needs, creating a balance between the rights of offenders and public safety [10].

4.2 Best Practices in Legislative Approaches

The analysis identifies several best practices from jurisdictions with successful rehabilitation-focused legislation, including decriminalization policies, as seen in Portugal, which channel individuals into treatment programs rather than the criminal justice system, significantly reducing stigma, enhancing access to healthcare, and fostering societal reintegration. Integrated healthcare systems, such as those in the Netherlands, seamlessly connect legal frameworks with medical and psychological support, ensuring comprehensive care for drug addicts. Community-based programs, supported by legislative frameworks, promote initiatives like peer support groups, vocational training, and education campaigns, which enhance long-term recovery and reduce relapse risks. Additionally, harm reduction measures, including supervised consumption facilities, needle exchange programs, and safe practice education, mitigate immediate risks associated with drug use while aligning with public health objectives. These best practices illustrate that legislative approaches rooted in social engineering principles can effectively address both individual and societal dimensions of drug addiction.

4.3 Challenges in Implementing Rehabilitation Legislation

Despite the success of certain models, significant challenges continue to impede the effectiveness of rehabilitation-focused legislation. Resource limitations remain a critical issue, particularly in low-income countries, where insufficient funding for healthcare and social services hampers the establishment and maintenance of comprehensive rehabilitation programs. Policy inconsistencies also undermine efforts, as contradictory approaches—such as the coexistence of decriminalization initiatives with punitive drug laws—create confusion and hinder implementation. Societal stigma further exacerbates the problem, as deeply ingrained negative perceptions of drug addiction discourage individuals from seeking help and pose significant barriers to societal reintegration, issues that legislative measures alone cannot fully address. Additionally, enforcement and coordination issues, including poor collaboration between legal, healthcare, and social institutions and inconsistent enforcement of laws, often result in fragmented service delivery and reduced impact of rehabilitation efforts.

Despite progress in rehabilitation-focused legislation, a number of significant challenges still hinder its effectiveness, particularly in low-income countries. Limited resources are a major constraint, with a lack of funding for health and social services limiting the development of rehabilitation programs, as seen in Pakistan, where rehabilitation services receive inadequate budget allocations, impacting accessibility and quality [36]. The WHO's Rehabilitation 2030 initiative highlights the need for increased global investment in rehabilitation services [37]. In addition, policy inconsistencies, such as the implementation of decriminalization running concurrently with punitive laws, create confusion and hinder effective implementation [38]. The lack of a cohesive health policy further complicates the provision of rehabilitation services that include universal health coverage [39]. Societal stigma against drug addiction is also a major barrier, discouraging individuals from seeking help and making social reintegration difficult, while cultural beliefs and negative perceptions of rehabilitation services contribute to underutilization [40]. Law enforcement issues and

poor coordination among legal, health, and social agencies result in fragmented service provision and ineffective rehabilitation outcomes [37]. These challenges, collectively, undermine efforts to build comprehensive rehabilitation programs.

Discussion

The findings underscore the critical role of legislation in shaping societal responses to drug addiction, with rehabilitation-focused frameworks offering valuable lessons. Effective legislative design must adopt a holistic approach that integrates healthcare, social support, and legal measures to address the multifaceted nature of addiction. Striking a balance between punitive and rehabilitative measures is essential, as overemphasis on punishment can exacerbate the issue by increasing recidivism and marginalizing addicts. Community involvement is another crucial aspect, with legislation encouraging active participation in rehabilitation efforts to foster recovery and reduce stigma. Additionally, learning from global best practices, such as Portugal's decriminalization and the Netherlands' harm reduction strategies, provides a blueprint for crafting effective frameworks in other regions. Finally, addressing structural barriers, including resource allocation, capacity building, and public awareness, is imperative to overcoming challenges and ensuring the success of rehabilitation-focused legislation.

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that legislative approaches to drug rehabilitation are most effective when they align with social engineering principles, prioritizing recovery and societal reintegration over punitive measures. Jurisdictions like Portugal and the Netherlands offer valuable examples of how decriminalization and integrated healthcare systems can address the root causes of addiction while promoting public health. However, the success of such approaches depends on addressing significant challenges, including resource limitations, societal stigma, and enforcement inconsistencies.

Policymakers must adopt a holistic approach to legislative design, ensuring that laws support accessible treatment, community-based programs, and harm reduction strategies. Moreover, international collaboration and the sharing of best practices are essential for advancing global efforts to combat drug addiction. By prioritizing rehabilitation-focused legal frameworks, societies can foster a more compassionate and effective response to this critical issue, ultimately contributing to social stability and public health improvements.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. A. Rather and I. A. Mir, "EXPLORING THE EPIDEMIC OF DRUG ADDICTION IN KASHMIR: UNDERSTANDING ITS ROOT CAUSES," *J. Account. Res. Util. Financ. Digit. Assets*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 641–643, 2023.
- [2] J. Dua, "The problem of drug addiction in india: Its consequences and effective measures," *J. Drug Deliv. Ther.*, vol. 12, no. 1-5, pp. 159–163, 2022.
- [3] H. R. Wani and A. Ahmed, "A Qualitative Study of the Initiation, Causes, and Consequences of Drug Addiction," *J. Ment. Heal. Hum. Behav.*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 10–15, 2024.
- [4] A. Hambali, N. Mappaselleng, and S. Wata, "Law Enforcement Against Drug Abusers Through Medical Rehabilitation and Social Rehabilitation," *Int. J. Relig.*, vol. 5, pp. 5226–5240, Aug. 2024, doi: 10.61707/ravxc229.
- [5] L. Manurung, "The Impact of Drug Abuse on Families and Society (Literature Review)," *MSJ Major. Sci. J.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 239–244, 2024.
- [6] A. J. Molina-Fernández and I. M. Arribas-Tiemblo, "Substance use recovery: Global health perspectives and experiences," *Glob. Heal. Econ. Sustain.*, p. 3243, 2024.
- [7] K. S. J. Linus and H. B. K. Hutaso, "Penyembuhan dan Pencegahan pada Kecanduan Narkoba dan Zat Adiktif: Sebuah Tinjauan Pustaka," *MAHESA Malahayati Heal. Student J.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 494–502, 2023.
- [8] Y. Theodorakis, M. Hassandra, and F. Panagiotounis, "Enhancing Substance Use Disorder Recovery through Integrated Physical Activity and Behavioral Interventions: A Comprehensive Approach to Treatment and Prevention," *Brain Sci.*, vol. 14, no. 6, p. 534, 2024.
- [9] D. Muslim, N. Darwis, and S. Sudarto, "Legal Study Analysis of Criminal Law Policy in the Implementation of Integrated Assessment for Drug Abusers based on Law Number 35 of 2009 Concerning Narcotics," 2024.

- [10] M. J. H. Hermawan and C. D. Wulansari, "Sociological Analysis Of Restorative Justice In Rehabilitative Law Enforcement For Drug Abuse Cases," *Ius Poenale*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 1–14, 2024.
- [11] C. Jaya and F. Hikmah, "Legal Reform on Rehabilitation for Drug Users as an Ultimum Remedium Effort," *J. USM LAW Rev.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 364–375, 2024.
- [12] S. Pulungan, E. Soponyono, and S. Purnomo, "Reforming Indonesia's Approach to Narcotics Offenses: A Call for Rehabilitation over Incarceration," *South East. Eur. J. Public Heal.*, pp. 249–253, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.70135/seejph.vi.1473.
- [13] E. Otieno Owade, "The Law as a Tool Of Social Engineering: A Jurisprudential Perspective From Kenyan Courts," *Available SSRN 4628709*, 2023.
- [14] P. M. Griffin, "Engineering approaches for addressing opioid use disorder in the community," *Annu. Rev. Biomed. Eng.*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 207–229, 2020.
- [15] A.-M. Kennedy and A. Parsons, "Social engineering and social marketing: why is one 'good' and the other 'bad'?", *J. Soc. Mark.*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 198–209, 2014.
- [16] G. M. Sa'adi, A. Hasan, and M. Umar, "Analisa Pasal 412 Kuhp Baru Tentang Kohabitasi (Pendekatan Maqashid As-Syari'ah As-Syathibi Dan Teori Social Engineering Roscoe Pound)," *Indones. J. Islam. Jurisprudence, Econ. Leg. Theory*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 584–607, 2023.
- [17] S. A. Gochhayat, "'Social Engineering by Roscoe Pound': Issues in Legal and Political Philosophy," *Available SSRN 1742165*, 2010.
- [18] K. Hill, K. Dunham, K. Doneski, K. L. Sue, K. Thakarar, and J. Butner, "In Support of the Decriminalization of Personal Drug and Paraphernalia Use and Possession: Position Statement of AMERSA, Inc (Association for Multidisciplinary Education, Research, Substance Use and Addiction)," *Substance Use & Addiction Journal*. SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA, p. 29767342241277620, 2024.
- [19] K. Johnson, I. Pinchuk, M. I. E. Melgar, M. O. Agwogie, and F. Salazar Silva, "The global movement towards a public health approach to substance use disorders," *Ann. Med.*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 1797–1808, 2022.
- [20] A. Finucane and J. M. Stritch, "Connecting the Person by Removing the Stigma: Why Ireland Should Follow the Portuguese Model of Drug Decriminalisation," *South East. Eur. J. Public Heal.*, 2023.
- [21] A. Schloenhardt, *Legalisation and Decriminalisation of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances*. Carl Grossmann Verlag, 2022.
- [22] F. Ali *et al.*, "Navigating the nexus between British Columbia's public consumption and decriminalization policies of illegal drugs," *Heal. Res. Policy Syst.*, vol. 22, no. 1, p. 60, 2024.
- [23] A. J. Gordon and E. M. Oliva, "Applying and advancing best practices in opioid use disorder and addiction treatment: Introduction to the special issue on implementation science and quality improvement scholarship," *Substance Abuse*, vol. 39, no. 2. SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA, pp. 125–128, 2018.
- [24] E. Louie, E. L. Barrett, A. Baillie, P. Haber, and K. C. Morley, "Implementation of evidence-based practice for alcohol and substance use disorders: protocol for systematic review," *Syst. Rev.*, vol. 9, pp. 1–6, 2020.
- [25] K. Litak, "ADVANCES IN THE TREATMENT OF ALCOHOL, OPIOID, AND CANNABIS ADDICTION," *Wiadomości Lek.*, vol. 77, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.36740/WLek202408242.
- [26] J. I. C. Goni and A. Van Looy, "Process innovation capability in less-structured business processes: a systematic literature review," *Bus. Process Manag. J.*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 557–584, Jan. 2022, doi: 10.1108/BPMJ-07-2021-0487.
- [27] T. Lancet, "Drug decriminalisation: grounding policy in evidence," *Lancet (London, England)*, vol. 402, no. 10416. p. 1941, 2023.
- [28] C. Moury and M. Escada, "Understanding successful policy innovation: The case of Portuguese drug policy," *Addiction*, vol. 118, no. 5, pp. 967–978, 2023.
- [29] A. Z. Ball, "The Implementation of Supervised Consumption Site: Effectiveness and Challenges," *J. Educ. Humanit. Soc. Sci.*, vol. 22, pp. 780–784, 2023.
- [30] D. K. van Santen *et al.*, "The effect of needle and syringe program and opioid agonist therapy on the risk of HIV, hepatitis B and C virus infection for people who inject drugs in Amsterdam, the Netherlands: findings from an emulated target trial," *Addiction*, vol. 116, no. 11, pp. 3115–3126, 2021.
- [31] A. Bórquez, J. A. Cepeda, and N. K. Martin, "Modeling the impact of harm reduction for opioid use disorder on infectious disease prevention," in *The Opioid Epidemic and Infectious Diseases*, Elsevier, 2021, pp. 247–274.
- [32] D. Hedrich and R. L. Hartnoll, "Harm-reduction interventions," *Textb. Addict. Treat. Int. Perspect.*, pp. 757–775, 2021.
- [33] A. Hardon *et al.*, "Caring for 'Hassle-Free Highs' in Amsterdam," *Anthropol. Humanism*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 212–222, 2020.
- [34] J. S. Ramey, F. Volk, F. Milacci, and T. Gogolin, "Educating the "Gods": Operations, outcomes, and opportunities in treatment courts," *New Trends Qual. Res.*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. e960–e960, 2024.
- [35] X. Zhang, "Feasible and Ethical Dilemmas of Rehabilitation - Focusing on Community Sanction," *Stud. Soc. Sci. Res.*, vol. 4, p. p27, Oct. 2023, doi: 10.22158/sss.v4n4p27.
- [36] A. Waheed, S. Shah, and T. Mahmood, "Managing barriers to resource allocation for the rehabilitation services in Pakistan: a review article," *Anaesthesia, Pain Intensive Care*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 776–782, 2024.
- [37] H. Ohnmar *et al.*, "Barriers and facilitators for increased accessibility to quality rehabilitation services in low-and middle-income countries: a systematic review," *Eur. J. Phys. Rehabil. Med.*, vol. 60, no. 3, p. 514, 2024.
- [38] A. Ghaffar *et al.*, "Role and promise of health policy and systems research in integrating rehabilitation into the health systems. List of Authors".

- [39] W. R. Frontera and W. DeGroot, "importance of health policy and systems research for strengthening rehabilitation in health systems," *Rehabilitation (Stuttg.)*, vol. 62, no. 05, pp. 265–267, 2023.
- [40] C. Cyuzuzo, M. Dukuzimana, C. Muhire, M. Ames, and E. Ngwakongnwi, *Challenges to rehabilitation services in Sub-Saharan Africa from a user, health system and service provider perspective: A scoping review (Preprint)*. 2024. doi: 10.2196/preprints.58841.