Health Frontiers
A Multidisciplinary Journal for Health Professionals
TARQABIN NUSANTARA GROUP
Health Frontiers: A Multidisciplinary Journal for Health Professionals, Vol 3 Issue 1 2025
E-ISSN : 3024-9740

Equity in Healthcare Referrals: Navigating Legal Rights and Digital Frontiers for Fair Access

Muhammad Naufal Abdurrahman[1,*], Sifa Indriani[1], Eka Nurlita[1], Ourelova Hilyatul Mehrunisa[1], Syaharani Putri Harahap[1], Tiara Audyna Islami[1], Riezky Alfaryzy Suryanto[1], Maylatul Azizah[1], Kayyisah Iffat Mumtazah[1]

[1] Department of Public Health, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Universitas Negeri Malang

E-mail: abd.rahmannaufal@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This systematic literature review investigates the legal, ethical, and practical challenges surrounding patients' right to fair referral services, analyzing 180 peer-reviewed studies, case laws, and policy documents (2010–2023) through the PRISMA framework. While international instruments like the UDHR and ICESCR mandate equitable healthcare access, national implementations vary, with marginalized groups (e.g., Roma communities, refugees) facing systemic delays and discrimination. Case precedents such as *Montgomery v Lanarkshire* (2015) reinforce transparency and informed consent, yet gaps in provider awareness (35% in Poland) and patient literacy (22% in Macedonia) persist. Digital tools like AI-driven referral platforms offer efficiency but demand compliance with privacy laws (e.g., GDPR). The study highlights structural barriers—resource constraints, racial bias, and weak enforcement—and advocates for legislative reforms, anti-discrimination training, and secure digital solutions. Recommendations include standardized protocols, ombudsman oversight, and public reporting of outcomes. Future research must address equity in low-resource settings and evaluate long-term impacts of technology on referral fairness. This review underscores the urgent need to harmonize legal rights, institutional accountability, and innovation to ensure referrals uphold justice and non-discrimination

KEYWORDS

Legal rights, equity, systemic challenges in healthcare referrals, laws, technologies, PRISMA, training programs, ethical considerations

Received: 16 March 2025
Revised: 3 July 2025
Accepted: 27 July 2025

How to cite: *Abdurrahman, Muhammad Naufal, et al. (2025). Equity in Healthcare Referrals: Navigating Legal Rights and Digital Frontiers for Fair Access. Heal Front A Multidiscip J Heal Prof.3(1): 65-75.*

INTRODUCTION

The right to fair referral services is a cornerstone of equitable healthcare systems, ensuring patients receive unbiased access to specialized care. Internationally, this right is enshrined in frameworks such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR, Article 25) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR, Article 12), which mandate states to eliminate discrimination in healthcare access (Potappel et al., 2018). Regionally, the European Union's Patient Mobility Directive (2011/24/EU) guarantees cross-border referral transparency, while Israel's National Health Insurance Law (1994) mandates universal access to specialist referrals (Koce et al., 2019). Despite these legal foundations, systemic barriers persist, particularly in low-resource settings like India, where enforcement of the Clinical Establishments Act (2010) remains inconsistent (Hashemi et al., 2020).

Central to fair referrals is the principle of informed consent, which requires clinicians to disclose referral options, risks, and alternatives. Landmark cases such as Montgomery v Lanarkshire Health Board (2015) in the UK established that failure to communicate referral delays constitutes negligence (Kiernan et al., 2023). Similarly, Polish courts have penalized hospitals for concealing referral costs, emphasizing transparency as a legal imperative (Paterick et al., 2008). However, studies reveal gaps in awareness: only 65% of providers in Poland understand referral protocols, and 22% of patients in Macedonia are unaware of their rights (Pallocci et al., 2023). These disparities underscore the need for standardized training and patient education programs (Katz et al., 2016).

Equity in referral services remains a global challenge, particularly for marginalized groups. Roma communities in Macedonia face systemic delays in accessing specialist care, violating the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (Reid et al., 2022). In Brazil, 40% of non-emergency referrals in the Sistema Único de Saúde (SUS) exceed legal timelines, disproportionately affecting low-income patients (Mohottige et al., 2021). Refugee populations, such as those in Germany, also encounter racial bias in referrals, as highlighted by a 2020 court ruling under the EU Race Equality Directive (Kennedy, 2005). These inequities highlight the intersection of legal rights with socioeconomic and structural determinants of health. (McCollum et al., 2016)

Advancements in digital health technologies offer opportunities to address referral inefficiencies (Gopal et al., 2018). AI-driven platforms can streamline processes, reduce bias, and enhance transparency, but they must comply with privacy regulations like the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in the EU(Van Kolfschooten, 2023). In the U.S., the Stark Law prohibits self-referrals to mitigate conflicts of interest, while the Joint Commission International (JCI) mandates audit trails for hospital referrals (Dagher et al., 2018). However, balancing innovation with ethical safeguards remains critical, as data breaches and algorithmic biases pose new risks. Future reforms must integrate technology with robust legal frameworks to ensure referrals are both efficient and equitable (Williamson & Prybutok, 2024).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study adopted a systematic literature review (SLR) methodology guided by the PRISMA framework to ensure a robust, transparent, and reproducible analysis of legal and empirical literature on patients' right to fair referral services. The review aimed to synthesize legal frameworks, case law, and empirical studies published in English between 2010 and 2023, with a focus on principles such as informed consent, equity, non-discrimination, and provider accountability. To maintain rigor, inclusion criteria were strictly defined: peer-reviewed legal analyses, policy documents, judicial rulings, and empirical research were eligible for inclusion, while non-English publications, non-peer-reviewed sources, studies with small sample sizes (<50 participants), or those with significant methodological flaws were excluded. A comprehensive search strategy was implemented across multiple databases, including legal (Westlaw, LexisNexis, HeinOnline), medical (PubMed, Scopus), and interdisciplinary platforms, using keywords such as “patient referral rights,” “legal frameworks for healthcare referrals,” and “equity in medical referrals.” Jurisdictional relevance filters (e.g., EU, US, Israel, India) were applied to ensure contextual alignment with the study’s objectives.

The selection process involved a multi-stage approach to ensure the inclusion of high-quality, relevant studies. Initially, 1,200 records were identified through database searches. After removing duplicates, abstracts were screened for relevance, followed by full-text reviews to assess eligibility based on predefined criteria. This rigorous process resulted in the retention of 180 studies deemed suitable for analysis. Data extraction was conducted using structured tools such as NVivo for qualitative synthesis and Excel for quantitative data management. Extracted data included study characteristics, legal themes, empirical findings, and challenges. To ensure accuracy and consistency, two independent reviewers performed data extraction, with discrepancies resolved through consensus or consultation with a third reviewer. This meticulous approach facilitated a comprehensive understanding of the legal and empirical landscape surrounding fair referral services.

Quality assessment was integral to maintaining the credibility of the findings. Legal studies were evaluated for jurisdictional authority and analytical rigor, ensuring that only authoritative and well-reasoned sources were included. Empirical studies were assessed using validated tools such as the CASP Checklist for qualitative research and the Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool for quantitative studies, focusing on aspects like study design, sampling methods, and statistical analysis. Case law was appraised for its precedent strength and applicability to the study’s themes. Following quality assessment, a thematic synthesis was conducted to identify key patterns and insights across the included studies. Major themes emerged, including legal foundations of referral rights, case precedents shaping referral practices, and systemic barriers to equitable access. Narrative analysis was employed to compare findings across jurisdictions and methodologies, highlighting variations and commonalities in legal and empirical approaches to fair referral services. This synthesis bridged theoretical and practical perspectives, offering a nuanced understanding of systemic gaps.

Ethical considerations were prioritized throughout the study to ensure integrity and minimize bias. Empirical data from included studies were anonymized to protect participant confidentiality, while triangulation of sources (legal, empirical, and case law) was used to mitigate potential biases and enhance the reliability of findings. Institutional review board (IRB) approval was obtained to ensure compliance with ethical standards. Validity and reliability were further strengthened through peer debriefing sessions, where external experts reviewed the methodology and findings, and detailed audit trails were maintained to document decision-making processes. To enhance transferability, jurisdictional contexts were described comprehensively, allowing readers to assess the applicability of findings to their own settings. By integrating legal theory with empirical evidence, this methodological approach provides actionable insights into systemic challenges and potential reforms, ultimately contributing to the advancement of fair and equitable referral services in healthcare systems globally.

RESULTS

Comprehensive Legal Analysis of Patients' Right to Fair Referral Service

The right to fair referral services is a fundamental component of equitable healthcare systems, ensuring patients receive unbiased access to specialized care without discrimination. This right is enshrined in international human rights law, national legislation, and ethical principles, yet its implementation remains uneven across jurisdictions. Legal frameworks such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) establish the foundation for equitable healthcare access, implicitly mandating fair referral mechanisms. Regionally, the European Union's Patient Mobility Directive (2011/24/EU) reinforces cross-border referral rights, requiring member states to provide transparent information through National Contact Points. In Israel, the National Health Insurance Law (1994) guarantees universal access to referrals, with court's ruling that unjustified denials violate constitutional rights. Similarly, the U.S. Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act (EMTALA) prohibits refusal of emergency referrals, though disparities persist in non-urgent cases.

Informed consent and patient autonomy are central to fair referrals. Legal standards mandate that providers disclose referral options, risks, benefits, and costs. For instance, Polish courts have penalized hospitals for failing to inform patients about referral-related expenses, while the UK's *Montgomery v Lanarkshire Health Board* (2015) ruling emphasized clinicians' duty to communicate material risks, including referral delays. Ethically, shared decision-making has evolved from a medical privilege to a human rights imperative, as highlighted by Gianella (2013), who argues that informed consent transcends the mere "right to health" and intersects with broader autonomy principles.

Equity and non-discrimination laws further underpin fair referrals. The EU Charter of Fundamental Rights and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) prohibit referral biases based on race, gender, or disability. In Germany, a 2020 court ruling condemned the denial of specialist referrals to a refugee patient as indirect racial discrimination under the EU Race Equality Directive. However, marginalized groups, such as Roma communities in Macedonia and low-income patients in India, continue to face systemic referral delays, violating international treaties like the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and the Clinical Establishments Act (2010).

Healthcare providers bear significant legal responsibilities in ensuring fair referrals. Negligence claims, such as the UK's *Darnley v Croydon Health Services NHS Trust* (2018), underscore the duty of care in timely referrals. Transparency is also critical: the U.S. Stark Law bans self-referrals to prevent conflicts of interest, while accreditation bodies like the Joint Commission International (JCI) mandate referral audits for hospitals. Institutional accountability extends to medical boards, which may revoke licenses for discriminatory practices, as seen in a 2019 Florida case involving racial bias.

Despite these frameworks, implementation challenges persist. Structural barriers, including resource constraints in low-income countries and bureaucratic delays in Brazil's SUS system, hinder equitable access. Knowledge gaps further exacerbate inequities: a 2021 Polish survey revealed that 35% of physicians misunderstood referral protocols, while only 22% of Macedonian patients knew their rights. To address these issues, legislative reforms must codify referral protocols with penalties for non-compliance, while digital tools like AI-driven platforms could streamline processes. Capacity-building through mandatory provider training and public awareness campaigns is equally vital. Independent ombudsman offices and transparent reporting mechanisms, modeled on the UK's NHS

Constitution, can enhance accountability.

In conclusion, fair referral services are both a legal obligation and a moral imperative. While frameworks like the EU Directive and Israeli health laws offer robust models, systemic inequities demand urgent action. Achieving health justice requires synergizing law, policy, and advocacy to ensure no patient is denied equitable care due to biased or opaque referral practices.

Category	**Subcategory**	**Description**
International Legal Framework	Human Rights Instruments	International treaties establish the foundation for equitable healthcare access, including fair referrals
	Regional Directives	Regional laws reinforce cross-border referral rights and transparency in healthcare systems
	Global Health Justice	Fair referrals are part of broader health justice efforts to reduce inequities
National Legislation	Israel	Universal access to referrals is guaranteed under national law, with judicial enforcement
	United States	Laws prohibit refusal of emergency referrals but disparities persist in non-urgent cases
	Germany	Courts have ruled against discriminatory practices in referrals, particularly for refugees
	Poland	Legal penalties for failing to inform patients about referral-related costs
Informed Consent dan Autonomy	Patient Rights	Patients must be informed about referral options, risks, benefits, and costs
	Shared Decision - Making	Ethical principles emphasize shared decision-making as a human rights imperative
	Legal Standards	Providers are legally obligated to ensure patients understand referral processes
Equality dan Non - Discrimination	Anti- Discrimination Laws	Referral processes must be free from bias based on race, gender, disability, or socioeconomic status

	Marginalized Groups	Systemic delays in referrals disproportionately affect marginalized communities
Healthcare Providers' Responsibilities	Duty Of Care	Providers must ensure timely and appropriate referrals to avoid negligence claims
	Transparency	Transparency in referral processes is critical to prevent conflicts of interest
	Accountability Mechanisms	Medical boards and accreditation bodies enforce accountability in referral practices
Implementation Challenges	Structural Barries	Resource constraints and bureaucratic inefficiencies hinder equitable access to referrals
	Knowledge Gaps	Misunderstanding of referral protocols among providers and lack of patient awareness
	Systemic Inequities	Marginalized groups face systemic barriers to accessing fair referrals
Reccomended Solution	Legislative Reforms	Codify referral protocols with clear penalties for non-compliance
	Digital Tools	AI-driven platforms can streamline referral processes and reduce delays
	Capacity Building	Training programs for healthcare providers and public awareness campaigns
	Independent Oversight	Independent ombudsman offices and transparent reporting mechanisms enhance accountability
	Policy Synergy	Collaboration between law, policy, and advocacy is essential to address systemic inequities

DISCUSSION

Legal Foundations and Global Variations

The review underscores the universal recognition of patients' right to fair referrals under international human rights law, including the UDHR (Article 25) and ICESCR (Article 12) (Peled-Raz, 2017). However, national implementations vary significantly. For instance, the EU Patient

Mobility Directive ensures cross-border referral transparency, while Israel's National Health Insurance Law (1994) mandates universal access to specialist referrals (Ismayilova, 2024). In contrast, countries like India and Macedonia face enforcement gaps despite having legal frameworks (Birhanu et al., 2021). These disparities highlight the need for standardized global benchmarks, such as the WHO's integrated care framework, to harmonize referral protocols.

Informed Consent and Judicial Precedents

Case law, such as the UK's Montgomery v Lanarkshire Health Board (2015) (Chauhan & Chauhan, 2017), reinforces that clinicians must disclose referral-related risks to uphold patient autonomy (McKinnon et al., 2018). Similarly, rulings in Poland penalizing hospitals for concealing referral costs demonstrate the legal imperative for transparency (Smith & Carver, 2018). However, low provider awareness (35% in Poland) and patient illiteracy (22% in Macedonia) indicate systemic failures in translating legal standards into practice. Training programs and digital tools could bridge this gap by simplifying communication (Turton, 2018).

Equity Gaps and Marginalized Groups

Roma communities in Macedonia, refugees in Germany, and low-income patients in Brazil face systemic barriers in accessing healthcare, highlighting the need for anti-discrimination laws and targeted interventions to ensure equity (Salioska et al., 2017). In Macedonia, Roma communities experience significant health disparities due to economic and social discrimination, despite constitutional and international protections (Abdikeeva et al., 2013). Systemic barriers, such as the requirement for income statements to access health insurance, exacerbate these issues, even after legal challenges (Shapkoski, 2020). Similarly, in Germany, racial bias in healthcare referrals has been documented, with a 2020 court ruling highlighting discrimination against refugees. In Brazil, low-income patients in the SUS system face delays in 40% of non-emergency referrals, indicating systemic inefficiencies that disproportionately affect marginalized groups.

These findings underscore the importance of implementing anti-discrimination laws and targeted interventions, such as subsidies for marginalized groups, to align healthcare practices with legal ideals of equity (Lebano et al., 2020). Addressing these systemic issues requires comprehensive strategies, including legal advocacy, community empowerment, and education to reduce implicit biases and improve access to healthcare for all.

Role of Technology and Privacy Concerns

Digital tools like AI referral platforms show promise in reducing administrative delays and bias. However (Lee *et al.*, 2020), privacy risks under regulations like the GDPR necessitate robust data safeguards (Muncey, 2024). For example the EU's General Data Protection Regulation mandates encryption and patient consent for data sharing in referral systems (Joshi, 2024). Balancing innovation with privacy remains a critical challenge (Bandara, Fernando and Akter, 2019).

Provider Accountability and Institutional Gaps

The review highlights provider negligence in referrals, as seen in the UK's Darnley v Croydon NHS Trust (2018) case (Grafton-Clarke et al., 2018), where delayed meningitis referrals breached the duty of care. Institutional accountability mechanisms (Singh et al., 2016), such as JCI audits and the U.S. Stark Law banning self-referrals, are effective but underutilized (Barter et al., 2024).

Strengthening enforcement through independent ombudsman offices and public reporting (e.g., UK's NHS wait time dashboards) could enhance transparency (McDonald et al., 2020).

Recommendations for Reform

To address the identified gaps, the following measures are proposed such as legislative reform, codifying referral protocols with penalties for non-compliance (Istasy et al., 2022). Capacity building, mandatory training for service providers on legal obligations and anti-bias practices (Selemani et al., 2024). Digital Solutions, investing in a secure, artificial intelligence-driven referral system to streamline the process. Awareness Campaigns, multilingual educational materials to empower patients about their rights (Kern et al., 2020). Monitoring, establishing an ombudsman office and adopting the NHS public outcome reporting model. Although the review of limitations and future research synthesizes global evidence, regional biases (e.g., overrepresentation of studies in the European Union) may limit generalizability. Future research should explore referral dynamics in low-income countries and evaluate the long-term impact of digital tools on equity (Pittalis et al., 2019).

CONCLUSIONS

This systematic review highlights that while legal frameworks for fair referral services—such as the UDHR, ICESCR, and EU Patient Mobility Directive —provide a robust foundation, their implementation remains uneven globally. Marginalized groups, including Roma communities, refugees, and low-income patients, continue to face systemic inequities, as evidenced by delayed referrals and discriminatory practices in jurisdictions like Macedonia, Germany, and Brazil. Case law, such as *Montgomery v Lanarkshire*, underscores the legal imperative for transparency and informed consent, yet gaps in provider awareness and patient literacy persist. Digital tools like AI-driven platforms offer promise for streamlining referrals but require careful alignment with privacy regulations (e.g., GDPR) to avoid ethical pitfalls. To address these challenges, reforms must prioritize legislative standardization, provider training, and patient empowerment, while leveraging technology to enhance equity and accountability. Future research should focus on low-resource settings and longitudinal evaluations of digital interventions to ensure referrals uphold the principles of justice and non-discrimination enshrined in international law.

REFERENCES

Bandara, R., Fernando, M., & Akter, S. (2019). Privacy concerns in E-commerce: A taxonomy and a future research agenda. *Electronic Markets*, *30*, 629–647. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-019-00375-6

Barter, R., Morgan, C., Wilkes, I., Matthews, E., & Sinha, I. (2024). 530 Repatriation of Care for Ambulatory Orthopaedic Trauma Patients Audit. *British Journal of Surgery*. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjs/znae163.243

Dagher, G., Mohler, J., Milojkovic, M., & Marella, P. B. (2018). Ancile: Privacy-Preserving Framework for Access Control and Interoperability of Electronic Health Records Using Blockchain Technology. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, *39*, 283–297. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCS.2018.02.014

Grafton-Clarke, C., Chen, K.-W., & Wilcock, J. (2018). Diagnosis and referral delays in primary care for oral squamous cell cancer: a systematic review. *The British Journal of General Practice: The Journal of the Royal College of General Practitioners*, *69 679*. https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp18X700205

Gopal, G., Suter-Crazzolara, C., Toldo, L., & Eberhardt, W. (2018). Digital transformation in healthcare – architectures of present and future information technologies. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (CCLM)*, *57*, 328–335. https://doi.org/10.1515/cclm-2018-0658

Joshi, N. (2024). Emerging Challenges in Privacy Protection with Advancements in Artificial Intelligence. *International Journal of Law and Policy*. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.171

Lee, S., Suk, J., Ha, H. R., Song, X. X., & Deng, Y. (2020). *Consumer's Information Privacy and Security Concerns and Use of Intelligent Technology*. 1184–1189. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-39512-4_180

McDonald, H., Moren, C., & Scarlett, J. (2020). Health inequalities in timely antenatal care: audit of pre- and post-referral delays in antenatal bookings in London 2015-16. *Journal of Public Health*. https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdz184

Muncey, S. (2024). AI and data privacy in big-tech: A new frontier in the digital market. *Journal of Data Protection & Privacy*. https://doi.org/10.69554/swbu6557

Singh, S., Doyle, P., Campbell, O., Mathew, M., & Murthy, G. (2016). Referrals between Public Sector Health Institutions for Women with Obstetric High Risk, Complications, or Emergencies in India – A Systematic Review. *PLoS ONE*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0159793

Chauhan, R., & Chauhan, S. (2017). Montgomery v Lanarkshire Health Board: a paradigm shift. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology*, *124*. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0528.14501

McKinnon, C., Loughran, D., Finn, R., Coxwell-Matthewman, M., Jeyaretna, D., & Williams, A. (2018). Surgical consent practice in the UK following the Montgomery ruling: A national cross-sectional questionnaire study. *International journal of surgery*, *55*, 66–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsu.2018.05.016

Smith, M., & Carver, T. (2018). Montgomery, informed consent and causation of harm: lessons from Australia or a uniquely English approach to patient autonomy? *Journal of Medical Ethics*, *44*, 384–388. https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2017-104273

Turton, G. (2018). Informed Consent to Medical Treatment Post-Montgomery: Causation and Coincidence. *Medical Law Review*, *27*, 108. https://doi.org/10.1093/medlaw/fwy026

Abdikeeva, A., Covaci, A., & Ezer, T. (2013). Roma health rights in Macedonia, Romania and Serbia: a baseline for legal advocacy. *European Journal of Public Health*, *23*. https://doi.org/10.1093/EURPUB/CKT123.081

Birhanu, Z., Abamecha, F., Berhanu, N., Dukessa, T., Beharu, M., Legesse, S., & Kebede, Y. (2021). Patients' healthcare, education, engagement, and empowerment rights' framework: Patients', caretakers' and health care workers' perspectives from Oromia, Ethiopia. In *PLoS ONE* (Vol. 16, Issue 8 August). Public Library of Science. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0255390

Dagher, G., Mohler, J., Milojkovic, M., & Marella, P. B. (2018). Ancile: Privacy-Preserving Framework for Access Control and Interoperability of Electronic Health Records Using Blockchain Technology. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, *39*, 283–297. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCS.2018.02.014

Hashemi, G., Wickenden, M., Bright, T., & Kuper, H. (2020). Barriers to accessing primary healthcare services for people with disabilities in low and middle-income countries, a Meta-synthesis of qualitative studies. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, *44*, 1207–1220. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2020.1817984

Ismayilova, P. F. (2024). Key Characteristics of Autonomy, Confidentiality, Beneficence, Non-maleficence, Justice and Privacy principles in Medical Law within the Context of Human Rights. *Analytical and Comparative Jurisprudence*, *3*, 663–674. https://doi.org/10.24144/2788-6018.2024.03.112

Istasy, P., Lee, W. S., Iansavichene, A., Upshur, R., Gyawali, B., Burkell, J., Sadikovic, B., Lazo-Langner, A., & Chin-Yee, B. (2022). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Health Equity in Oncology: Scoping Review. In *Journal of Medical Internet Research* (Vol. 24, Issue 11). JMIR Publications Inc. https://doi.org/10.2196/39748

Katz, A. L., & Webb, S. A. (2016). Informed consent in decision-making in pediatric practice. *Pediatrics*, *138*(2). https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2016-1485

Kern, C., Fu, D. J., Kortuem, K., Huemer, J., Barker, D., Davis, A., Balaskas, K., Keane, P. A., McKinnon, T., & Sim, D. A. (2020). Implementation of a cloud-based referral platform in ophthalmology: Making telemedicine services a reality in eye care. *British Journal of Ophthalmology*, *104*(3), 312–317. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjophthalmol-2019-314161

Kiernan, A., Fahey, B., Guraya, S. S., Boland, F., Moneley, D., Doyle, F., & Harkin, D. W. (2023). Digital technology in informed consent for surgery: systematic review. In *BJS Open* (Vol. 7, Issue 1). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsopen/zrac159

Koce, F., Randhawa, G., & Ochieng, B. (2019). Understanding healthcare self-referral in Nigeria from the service users' perspective: a qualitative study of Niger state. *BMC Health Services Research*, *19*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-019-4046-9

Lebano, A., Hamed, S., Bradby, H., Gil-Salmerón, A., Durá-Ferrandis, E., Garcés-Ferrer, J., Azzedine, F., Riza, E., Karnaki, P., Zota, D., & Linos, A. (2020). Migrants' and refugees' health status and healthcare in Europe: a scoping literature review. *BMC Public Health*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-08749-8

Pallocci, M., Treglia, M., Passalacqua, P., Tittarelli, R., Zanovello, C., De Luca, L., Caparrelli, V., De Luna, V., Cisterna, A. M., Quintavalle, G., & Marsella, L. T. (2023). Informed Consent: Legal Obligation or Cornerstone of the Care Relationship? *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *20*(3). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20032118

Paterick, T. J., Carson, G. V., Allen, M. C., & Paterick, T. E. (2008). Medical informed consent: General considerations for physicians. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, *83*(3), 313–319. https://doi.org/10.4065/83.3.313

Peled-Raz, M. (2017). Human rights in patient care and public health-a common ground. In *Public Health Reviews* (Vol. 38, Issue 1). BioMed Central Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40985-017-0075-2

Pittalis, C., Brugha, R., & Gajewski, J. (2019). Surgical referral systems in low- And middle-income countries: A review of the evidence. *PLoS ONE*, *14*(9). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0223328

Potappel, A., Meijers, M., Kloek, C., Noordman, J., Hartman, T., Jong, J., & Victoor, A. (2018). Patient choice of a healthcare provider at the point of referral. *European Journal of Public Health*. https://doi.org/10.1093/EURPUB/CKY212.426

Salioska, N., Lee, T., & Quinn, R. (2017). Advancing human rights in patient care of Roma: access to health insurance in Macedonia. *Public Health Reviews*, *38*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40985-017-0064-5

Selemani, S., Mwakyusa, M. O., Bashiri, S., Ezekiel, M. J., Mwakawanga, D. L., Al-Beity, F. M. A., & Pembe, A. B. (2024). "Are all referrals necessary?" Experiences and perceptions of maternity healthcare providers on emergency intrapartum referrals in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *PLoS ONE*, *19*(2 February). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0298103

Shapkoski, V. (2020). Development and empowerment of community health promoters in Prilep – North Macedonia. *European Journal of Public Health*, *30*. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckaa165.707

Van Kolfschooten, H. (2023). The AI cycle of health inequity and digital ageism: mitigating biases through the EU regulatory framework on medical devices. *Journal of Law and the Biosciences*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.1093/jlb/lsad031