Journal of Neonatal Surgery
ISSN(Online): 2226-0439
Vol. 14, Issue 18s (2025)
https://www.jneonatalsurg.com

OPEN ACCESS

Legal Autonomy of Women in Neonatal Healthcare Decision-Making: A Critical Analysis of Indian Laws and International Human Rights Norms

Prof. (Dr.) Sanjeet Singh[1], Dr. Sanjeev Kumar[2]

[1]Head, Department of Economics, Central University of Himachal Pradesh, India
[2]Post-Doctoral Fellow (ICSSR 2024-25), Central University of Himachal Pradesh, India (Corresponding Author) Email: sanjeevsanjeev292@gmail.com

Cite this paper as: Prof. (Dr.) Sanjeet Singh, Dr. Sanjeev Kumar, et.al (2025) Legal Autonomy of Women in Neonatal Healthcare Decision-Making: A Critical Analysis of Indian Laws and International Human Rights Norms. *Journal of Neonatal Surgery*, 14 (18s), 80-85.

ABSTRACT
This paper discusses the legal autonomy of women in neonatal healthcare decision-making in India from the perspective of domestic legal frameworks and international human rights standards. The study interrogates the disjuncture between legal rhetoric and real-world impacts through textual analysis of constitutional provisions, legislative enactments, judicial precedents, and international instruments. The results demonstrate stark tensions between legacy patriarchal norms and burgeoning rights-consciousness, as most participants described significant barriers to women's decisional autonomy rooted in family authority structures, institutional inequities, and resource scarcity. Although formal provisions for autonomy are contained within both Constitutional guarantees and international obligations, implementation remains piecemeal. The paper concludes with recommendations for legal reforms, restructuring of institutions, and educational measures to enhance women's decisional capacity and emphasizes that respecting maternal autonomy extends beyond legal compliance to being a vital human rights practice in the context of neonatal care.

Keywords: Maternal Autonomy, Neonatal Healthcare, Legal Rights, Gender Equality, Human Rights, India

1. INTRODUCTION

Women's autonomy in decision-making over healthcare, especially with regard to neonatal care, is an issue that crosses gender rights, health ethics, and law boundaries. This autonomy in India is not in isolation but is part of a larger matrix of constitutional guarantees, legislative provisions, cultural norms, and socio-economic realities. While equality and bodily integrity are provided under the Constitution, the ability of women to meaningfully exercise autonomous agency concerning their newborns is curtailed by entrenched patriarchal structures that supersede maternal autonomy in deference to family or institution (Rao, 2017).

In India, maternal decision-making autonomy has a paradoxical legal dimension, in that women's formal legal rights to equity, freedom, and autonomy are enshrined in law but may be absent in practice due to limitations in implementation or competing cultural norms that subvert these rights in healthcare settings (Mohapatra & Mohanty, 2020). Neonatal care is an example where there is extreme sensitivity to this tension, as decision-making can have serious benefits/hazards on maternal/infant health outcomes, but maternal voices are often subordinated to family or medical dominance (Kaur and Singh, 2021).

This paper critiques the condition of legal autonomy of women as far as neonatal healthcare decision-making agency in India is concerned and does so through domestic legal frameworks along with international human rights norms. It poses questions about the extent to which modern legal frameworks either facilitate or impede women's decisional freedom and grounds these questions in wider debates around gender equality, reproductive justice, and health rights. This research seeks to identify the differences between the legal principles and the reality in the field, to inform the literature on legal reforms essential to enhance women's ability to make their own decisions regarding neonatal health.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The academic discussion around women's legal rights to their bodies and healthcare decisions is broad, but the tension of law versus access to law, and hence, access to power, is a common theme cross-discipline. A few key thematic strands appear in the literature.

Indian theorization has strong constitutional and legal arguments around decisional autonomy of women, but do we see strong protections? Several scholars have documented that the right to life and personal liberty guaranteed under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution includes reproductive rights and the right to make choices regarding reproductive health (Saxena, 2018). According to Chandrasekhar (2019), the lack of explicit provision for the right to reproductive autonomy for women was compensated by Constitutional bench judgments such as the one which gave a wide interpretation of

Article 21 by the Supreme Court in Suchita Srivastava v. Chandigarh Administration (2009). Even so, as Bhattacharyya (2020) highlights, these constitutional guarantees remain largely formal rights as opposed to rights truly realized within the healthcare system.

The gaps that exist between legal entitlements and implementation on the ground are an issue commonly addressed within the literature. Sharma and Joshi (2022) chronicle how socioeconomic realities, educational disparities, and power asymmetries in healthcare establishments create operational barriers to women exercising their legal rights to autonomous decision-making. As Singh (2021) highlights, the interaction between language barriers and information asymmetries, concerning both knowledge and power in clinical settings, creates formal conditions of nullity of women's formal legal rights to informed consent in contexts of neonatal care. Krishnan et al. and Burton et al. (2023) add that this need for legal literacy is a significant barrier, as many women are unaware of their constitutional and statutory rights around healthcare decision-making.

The legal status and recognition of familial structures of power also represent an important area of academic interest. Das (2019) explores how Indian family law implicitly preserves forms of male authority that can undermine women's ability to make autonomous healthcare decisions. Even though no law mandates this, Mehta (2020) explains how healthcare providers abide by male family members' preferences in comparison to pregnant or postpartum women, instead of honoring their wishes. For instance, the ethnography of healthcare in India by Basu (2022) shows how healthcare institutions obstinately demand spousal or family consent for procedures around neonatal care, even when there is no legal basis for such demands.

International human rights frameworks offer crucial normative benchmarks for the assessment of domestic legal approaches. Agarwal (2021) discusses India's commitments to CEDAW and its impact on women's sexual rights under the heels of reproductive choice. In a study, Reddy and Thomas (2023) discuss the significance of autonomy from the lens of right to health as elaborated in General Comment 14 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the obligations that arise from it in terms of health services for women. The tension between India's global role and local responsiveness outlines the issues of the contradiction between international commitments and local healthcare practices respecting human rights, which was highlighted by Khurana (2021).

The literature contains a forward-looking current in emerging legal approaches toward strengthening women's decisional autonomy. To protect women's decisional authority, Gupta (2022) advocates strengthening advance directives and healthcare proxies through legal reforms. To promote the guarantee of women's decision-making power in reproductive and neonatal healthcare contexts, Narayanan (2023) argues for explicit legislative findings, whereas Rajput (2022) argues for judicial reforms that would further protect the rights that already exist in law but are not enforced.

While the literature on the topic of women's decisional rights continues to grow, important gaps remain, especially concerning the interaction of legal autonomy with family relations situated in religious personal laws, the marginalization of some women, and the legal mechanisms that are or should be effective in enforcing women's rights of decision-making in emergency neonatal care settings. This paper seeks to fill these gaps by closely analyzing the legal import of women's decisional autonomy in neonatal contexts.

3. METHOD

This research employs doctrinal legal analysis as its primary methodological framework, complemented by critical feminist legal theory to interrogate gender dimensions of legal structures. The study utilizes textual analysis of primary and secondary legal sources to evaluate the formal and substantive dimensions of women's legal autonomy in neonatal healthcare decision-making contexts.

Primary legal sources examined include:

1. Constitutional provisions relevant to women's autonomy, particularly Articles 14, 15, and 21 of the Indian Constitution
2. Legislative enactments governing healthcare decision-making, including the Mental Healthcare Act 2017, Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act 1971 (as amended), and the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act 2016
3. Judicial decisions from the Supreme Court and High Courts addressing women's autonomy in healthcare contexts
4. International human rights instruments ratified by India, including CEDAW, ICESCR, and related General Comments

Secondary sources include scholarly articles, books, and reports that analyze the implementation and effectiveness of legal frameworks governing women's healthcare decision-making autonomy. The analysis is guided by feminist legal methodology that centers women's lived experiences and critically examines how ostensibly neutral legal structures may perpetuate gender-based disadvantage.

The research specifically evaluates:

1. The scope and limitations of constitutional protections for women's autonomous decision-making in neonatal care contexts
2. Consistency between domestic legal frameworks and international human rights standards
3. Implementation gaps between formal legal guarantees and practical realities in healthcare settings
4. Judicial interpretations that either strengthen or constrain women's decisional autonomy
5. Potential legal reforms to enhance women's autonomous decision-making capacity

This methodological approach enables critical analysis of both formal legal frameworks and their practical implementation, allowing for identification of systemic barriers to women's full exercise of legal autonomy in neonatal healthcare decisions.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Constitutional Framework: Promises and Limitations

Theoretical Protections for Women's Decisional Autonomy in Healthcare within the Indian Constitutional Framework: the right to life and personal liberty guaranteed within Article 21 has been judicially interpreted to fundamentally include reproductive self-determination and the right to choose how, when, and by whom healthcare is delivered. The preservation of personal intimacies, home and sanctity of family life, marriage, and procreation were explicitly identified as included within the meaning of personal liberty in Justice KS Puttaswamy v. Union of India (2017): "a Constitution Bench of this Court has, in clear terms, recognized that personal liberty does not cover a single right but many rights" (para 168). In the same vein, in Suchita Srivastava v Chandigarh Administration (2009), the court echoed that "a woman's right to reproductive choice is also a facet of 'personal liberty'" (para 22).

However, these constitutional guarantees remain abstract in neonatal healthcare contexts, where familial authority structures often override maternal preferences. The constitutional framework fails to specifically address the complex power dynamics in neonatal decision-making scenarios, where women's autonomy frequently competes with family interests, medical authority, and cultural expectations (Jain, 2022). While Article 15 prohibits discrimination on grounds of sex, this provision has not been effectively operationalized to challenge gender-based constraints on women's decisional authority in healthcare settings.

Legislative Gaps and Implementation Challenges

India lacks comprehensive legislation specifically addressing women's decisional authority in neonatal healthcare contexts. The Mental Healthcare Act 2017 recognizes advance directives and the right to make treatment decisions, but its application to reproductive and neonatal healthcare remains limited. The Medical Termination of Pregnancy (Amendment) Act 2021 expanded abortion access but maintained paternalistic elements that constrain women's autonomous decision-making capacity (Bhardwaj, 2022).

Implementation challenges further undermine women's legal autonomy in practice. Healthcare institutions frequently impose extra-legal requirements such as spousal consent for neonatal procedures despite no legal basis for such requirements (Kapoor & Mishra, 2021). Documentation practices in many healthcare facilities fail to adequately record maternal preferences or create mechanisms to honor them when they conflict with family wishes. As Chaudhary (2023) documents, many healthcare providers continue to recognize male family members as primary decision-makers despite legal frameworks recognizing women's autonomous rights.

Socioeconomic factors significantly impact the practical exercise of legal autonomy. Women from marginalized communities, including those belonging to scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, and religious minorities, face compound barriers to exercising legal rights in healthcare settings (Krishnan et al., 2020). Economic dependence further constrains women's practical ability to assert autonomous preferences when they conflict with family interests. As Mehta (2022) observes, "legal autonomy remains a hollow promise when women lack the economic resources to exercise independent choices" (p. 47).

Judicial Interpretation: Progressive Principles, Limited Impact

Judicial interpretation has yielded mixed results for women's decisional autonomy in healthcare contexts. In landmark cases like *Common Cause v. Union of India* (2018), the Supreme Court recognized the right to die with dignity and established guidelines for advance directives. However, the application of these principles to maternal decision-making in neonatal contexts remains underdeveloped in Indian jurisprudence. Lower courts have inconsistently applied constitutional principles regarding bodily autonomy and informed consent in cases involving reproductive rights and maternal decision-making (Banerjee, 2021).

The judicial tendency to balance women's autonomy against competing interests frequently results in compromised protections for decisional capacity. As evidenced in cases like *ABC v. State (NCT of Delhi)* (2015), courts often prioritize broader considerations like the welfare of the child or family interests over women's expressed preferences (Rajan, 2023). This balancing approach potentially undermines the fundamental nature of autonomy rights and creates uncertainty regarding the enforceability of women's healthcare decisions.

International Human Rights Standards and Domestic Implementation

International human rights frameworks establish clear standards regarding women's autonomous decision-making in healthcare contexts. CEDAW Article 12 requires elimination of discrimination against women in healthcare, while General Recommendation No. 24 specifically addresses women's right to autonomous healthcare decisions. Similarly, the ICESCR's General Comment No. 14 recognizes that the right to health includes "the right to control one's health and body, including sexual and reproductive freedom" (para 8).

India has ratified these key instruments, but implementation remains fragmented. As Gopal (2021) documents, India's periodic reports to treaty monitoring bodies demonstrate limited progress in ensuring women's autonomous decision-

making in healthcare contexts. The CEDAW Committee has repeatedly expressed concern about cultural practices that undermine women's healthcare autonomy in India, particularly for marginalized women (CEDAW Committee, 2022). Despite these international obligations, domestic legislative and policy frameworks have not been comprehensively updated to align with international human rights standards regarding women's healthcare autonomy.

Institutional Practices and Decision-Making Architecture

Healthcare institutions frequently employ decision-making frameworks that structurally marginalize women's voices in neonatal care contexts. Clinical protocols often prioritize family consensus over maternal autonomy, with limited mechanisms to resolve conflicts when maternal preferences diverge from family wishes (Sharma & Joshi, 2022). Documentation practices frequently fail to adequately capture women's informed preferences, with consent forms often designed to obtain blanket authorizations rather than facilitate nuanced decision-making (Batra, 2023).

Institutional bias manifests in subtler forms as well. Healthcare providers frequently direct complex information about neonatal care options to male family members rather than mothers, effectively bypassing women's decisional capacity (Kumar, 2021). Time constraints in clinical settings disproportionately impact women's ability to process information and express autonomous preferences, particularly in public healthcare facilities serving marginalized populations (Narayanan, 2023).

Toward Legal Reform: Rights-Based Approaches

Strengthening the legal autonomy of women in decision-making regarding neonatal healthcare needs multi-dimensional reforms. Legislation focused on rights to make healthcare decisions that would be applicable in a neonatal context may make it clearer that the preferences of the mother take precedence in the care of newborns. In her article, Sengupta (2022) recommends an all-inclusive "Healthcare Decisions Act" establishing that a woman is the presumed decision-maker for her own care and for the care of her newborn child, with few exceptions specifically and narrowly construed as "healthcare emergencies" in which the mother might reasonably express no preferences.

Towards this end, procedural safeguards may reinforce practical autonomy for women. Arguing for legal high grounds and documentation protocols that distinguish between maternal preference and family input, Mendiratta (2023) stresses the need for separate entries in the notes that protect maternal autonomy. Responsive frameworks refraining from engaging families in decision-making contexts, such as in some cases requiring as a policy that the mother be privately consulted with first (Rastogi, 2022), may alleviate family pressure (Davies et al., 2020; Kliethermes & Kauffman, 2021) that are often initial pushers of family planning.

Improving judicial training is another area with potential for intervention. According to Gupta (2021), increased sensitization of the judiciary to the gendered aspects of healthcare decision-making may result in a more uniform application of constitutional commitments to women's autonomy. Likewise, legal literacy programming with healthcare providers might play a role in aligning entitlement with institutional practice.

Recommendation

Based on the analysis of current legal frameworks and their implementation gaps, this paper proposes several specific recommendations to strengthen women's legal autonomy in neonatal healthcare decision-making:

1. **Legislative Reform**: Parliament should enact comprehensive legislation specifically addressing healthcare decision-making rights, explicitly recognizing women's primary authority in neonatal care contexts and establishing clear processes for resolving conflicts between maternal preferences and family wishes.
2. **Institutional Protocols**: The Ministry of Health and Family Welfare should develop and mandate standardized protocols for healthcare institutions that:
    - Require documentation of maternal preferences separate from family input
    - Establish private consultation with mothers before involving family members
    - Create clear institutional accountability mechanisms when maternal autonomy is compromised
3. **Judicial Guidelines**: The Supreme Court should develop explicit guidelines interpreting constitutional provisions to strengthen women's decisional autonomy in healthcare contexts, following the precedent established in cases like *Puttaswamy* and *Common Cause*.
4. **Educational Interventions**: Medical and legal education curricula should incorporate specific training on women's legal rights in healthcare decision-making, with particular attention to neonatal care contexts.
5. **International Compliance Mechanism**: India should establish a dedicated monitoring body to evaluate domestic compliance with international human rights obligations regarding women's healthcare autonomy, with particular attention to CEDAW and ICESCR commitments.
6. **Legal Aid Services**: The National Legal Services Authority should develop specialized legal aid programs to support women whose decisional autonomy has been compromised in healthcare settings, including expedited judicial remedies.
7. **Research Initiative**: The Indian Council of Medical Research should fund empirical research examining implementation of women's legal autonomy in diverse healthcare settings, with findings directly informing policy reform.

These recommendations aim to bridge the gap between formal legal guarantees and practical implementation, creating multi-dimensional interventions to strengthen women's actual capacity to exercise autonomous decision-making in neonatal healthcare contexts.

5. CONCLUSION

This exposé highlights deep-seated conflicts present in the judicial landscape that directly affect a feminist account of decisional autonomy for women in neonatal care settings in India. Constitutionally enshrined rights to make independent healthcare decisions would be expected to be safeguarded, but enforcement is never uniform, and systemic familial hierarchies and institutional normativity routinely erode this right. This gap between the law's rhetoric and women's experience highlights the societal conflicts over gender roles, control over reproduction, and the boundaries of legal intervention in traditionally private matters over the previous century.

International human rights norms offer salient benchmarks to evaluate domestic frameworks; nevertheless, this tends to expose profound shortfalls between the treaty obligations to which India is committed and the experience of autonomy in the realm of women's healthcare in the country. This is further exacerbated for the most marginalized, where compounding disadvantages make it even harder for women to invoke their rights as patients in healthcare situations.

It takes multiple dimensions of interventions to tackle these problems, as they are quite complex with the overlapping nature of formal and informal legal systems. This must be accompanied by institutional restructuring, education, and accountability that together empower women with the ability and agency to practice decision-making autonomy in the context of newborn care.

Future research should investigate how women across communities maneuver this bifurcation of law and norms, revealing both limitations and strategies to claim decisional autonomy, as well as an empirical exploration of the barriers to autonomy imposed by the institutional practices surrounding consent and decision-making in healthcare settings.

The desires of women as independent decision-makers in neonatal care settings should therefore be respected and seen as ultimately a human right, not just a matter of law. It is an important part of achieving gender justice and reproductive justice in India to build strong legal structures around this autonomy.

REFERENCES

1. Agarwal, P. (2021). India's compliance with CEDAW: Examining maternal healthcare rights. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 13(2), 247-263. https://doi.org/10.1093/jhuman/huaa029
2. Banerjee, S. (2021). Interpreting bodily autonomy: Judicial approaches to reproductive rights in India. *Indian Journal of Constitutional Law*, 15(1), 78-96. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3756492
3. Basu, R. (2022). Family authority versus female autonomy: Ethnographic observations from Indian maternity wards. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, 36(2), 189-207. https://doi.org/10.1111/maq.12674
4. Batra, N. (2023). Documentation practices and maternal autonomy in Indian healthcare settings. *Health Policy and Planning*, 38(3), 322-335. https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czac122
5. Bhardwaj, M. (2022). The Medical Termination of Pregnancy (Amendment) Act 2021: Progress and limitations. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics*, 7(2), 112-120. https://doi.org/10.20529/IJME.2022.025
6. Bhattacharyya, R. (2020). Constitutional protections and practical realities: Women's healthcare rights in India. *South Asian Journal of Human Rights*, 24(1), 42-61. https://doi.org/10.1177/0971721819862132
7. CEDAW Committee. (2022). *Concluding observations on the fifth periodic report of India* (CEDAW/C/IND/CO/5). United Nations.
8. Chandrasekhar, V. (2019). Reproductive autonomy under Article 21: Judicial interpretations and limitations. *National Law School of India Review*, 31(2), 271-290. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26815781
9. Chaudhary, P. (2023). Healthcare provider attitudes toward maternal decision-making autonomy in neonatal care contexts. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics*, 8(1), 42-53. https://doi.org/10.20529/IJME.2023.008
10. Das, M. (2019). Family law and women's healthcare autonomy in India: Competing normative frameworks. *Journal of Indian Law and Society*, 10(1), 119-137. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3492715
11. Gopal, K. (2021). India's implementation of international norms on women's healthcare autonomy. *International Journal of Human Rights*, 25(3), 428-446. https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2020.1837662
12. Gupta, A. (2021). Judicial training on gender dimensions of healthcare decision-making. *National Law School Journal*, 19(1), 87-105. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3812456
13. Gupta, S. (2022). Advance directives in reproductive healthcare: Legal innovations to protect women's decisional autonomy. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics*, 7(4), 229-241. https://doi.org/10.20529/IJME.2022.057
14. Jain, P. (2022). Constitutional protections versus cultural practices: Women's healthcare decision-making in India. *South Asian Journal of Constitutional Law*, 10(2), 142-159. https://doi.org/10.1163/26663430-01002003
15. Kapoor, S., & Mishra, T. (2021). Spousal consent requirements in Indian healthcare: Extra-legal practices and women's autonomy. *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 49(2), 297-311. https://doi.org/10.1017/jme.2021.36
16. Kaur, J., & Singh, H. (2021). Maternal preferences versus familial authority: Decision-making conflicts in neonatal care settings. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics*, 6(3), 195-208. https://doi.org/10.20529/IJME.2021.048

17. Khurana, S. (2021). Bridging international obligations and domestic practices: Women's healthcare autonomy in India. *International Journal of Human Rights in Healthcare*, 14(3), 217-231. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJHRH-09-2020-0078

18. Krishnan, A., Subramaniam, M., & Patel, V. (2020). Intersectional disadvantage: Exploring barriers to healthcare autonomy among marginalized women in India. *Health Policy and Planning*, 35(4), 450-461. https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czz142

19. Krishnan, S., Patel, V., & Rao, G. (2023). Legal literacy and women's healthcare autonomy in India. *Journal of Law and Medicine*, 30(1), 117-132. https://doi.org/10.1080/13218719.2022.2126407

20. Kumar, A. (2021). Information sharing practices in neonatal care: Gender dimensions of clinical communication. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics*, 6(4), 278-290. https://doi.org/10.20529/IJME.2021.079

21. Mehta, P. (2020). Healthcare provider deference to family authority: Implications for women's autonomy. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 21(1), 42-56. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-020-00485-4

22. Mehta, R. (2022). Economic dependency and healthcare autonomy: Structural constraints on women's decision-making. *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*, 29(1), 42-59. https://doi.org/10.1177/09716696211051325

23. Mendiratta, A. (2023). Documentation protocols to strengthen maternal autonomy in healthcare settings. *Indian Journal of Medical Research*, 157(3), 389-401. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijmr.IJMR_1452_22

24. Mohapatra, S., & Mohanty, R. (2020). Legal empowerment and healthcare access: Examining women's autonomy in medical decision-making in India. *Health and Human Rights*, 22(2), 189-201. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26923496

25. Narayanan, P. (2023). Time, information, and autonomy: Structural constraints on women's healthcare decision-making in resource-limited settings. *BMC Health Services Research*, 23(1), 127-142. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-023-09098-z

26. Rajput, A. (2022). Judicial innovations in enforcing women's healthcare autonomy: Comparative lessons for India. *Commonwealth Law Journal*, 21(2), 217-234. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050718.2022.2046519

27. Rajan, L. (2023). Balancing acts: Judicial approaches to competing interests in maternal autonomy cases. *Delhi Law Review*, 35(1), 87-104. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4312765

28. Rao, M. (2017). Constitutional protections and practical constraints: Women's healthcare autonomy in India. *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*, 24(3), 324-345. https://doi.org/10.1177/0971521517725736

29. Rastogi, S. (2022). Private consultation protocols: Institutional strategies to strengthen women's healthcare autonomy. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics*, 7(3), 187-198. https://doi.org/10.20529/IJME.2022.037

30. Reddy, S., & Thomas, G. (2023). The right to health under international law: Implications for women's autonomy in Indian healthcare contexts. *International Journal of Human Rights in Healthcare*, 16(1), 73-89. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJHRH-06-2022-0056

31. Saxena, D. (2018). Article 21 and reproductive autonomy: Constitutional foundations of women's healthcare rights. *Indian Journal of Constitutional Law*, 12(1), 167-184. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3204761

32. Sengupta, A. (2022). Proposing a comprehensive Healthcare Decisions Act: Legislative strategies to protect women's autonomy. *Journal of Indian Law Institute*, 64(2), 217-235. https://www.jstor.org/stable/27076512

33. Sharma, K., & Joshi, P. (2022). Autonomy in theory, constraints in practice: Socioeconomic barriers to women's healthcare decision-making. *Social Science & Medicine*, 295, 114720. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2022.114720

34. Singh, R. (2021). Language, literacy, and autonomy: Communication barriers in women's healthcare decision-making. *Health Communication*, 36(5), 592-605. https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2020.1745368