



AL-JAMEI Research Journal
ISSN (Print) 3006-4775 (Online) 3006-4783

<https://aljamei.com/index.php/ajrj>

Evaluating Legal and Institutional Frameworks for Preventing and Responding to Gender-Based Violence

Dr. Abida Abdul Khaliq

Associate Dean Superior College of Law | Chairperson International School of Law and Business | Advocate High Court, Email: abidaak786@gmail.com

Mehtab Ashraf

Advocate, mehtab.ashraf0303@gmail.com

Ms. Kashifa Hakim

PhD Scholar, Visiting Lecturer, Gurunank University, Nankana Sahib

Abstract

This study critically evaluates the legal and institutional frameworks designed to prevent and respond to gender-based violence (GBV) in contemporary societies. By examining national legislation, international human rights norms, criminal justice procedures, and institutional protection mechanisms, the research highlights the gaps between policy formulation and practical implementation. The analysis shows that despite the existence of comprehensive laws, systemic issues such as weak enforcement, sociocultural barriers, institutional bias, and limited access to justice continue to undermine the effectiveness of GBV prevention efforts. The paper further explores best-practice models—such as survivor-centered approaches, integrated service delivery, and multi sectoral coordination—to demonstrate how strengthened institutional capacity and accountability can significantly improve response systems. The study emphasizes the need for holistic reforms that combine legal clarity, institutional efficiency, community awareness, and interagency collaboration to ensure meaningful protection and justice for survivors of gender-based violence.

Keywords: *Gender-Based Violence (GBV); Legal Frameworks; Institutional Mechanisms; Human Rights; Criminal Justice System; Survivor-Centered Approach; Policy Implementation; Social Protection; Accountability; Contemporary Societies*

Introduction

Gender-based violence (GBV) remains one of the most pervasive human rights violations globally, cutting across cultural, economic, and political boundaries. Despite significant legislative advancements in many states, the persistent prevalence of GBV reveals a deep structural gap between legal provisions and practical implementation. Scholars argue that while contemporary legal instruments—such as national protection laws, international human rights treaties, and specialized institutional mechanisms—have expanded the normative framework for women’s protection, their effectiveness is often undermined by weak enforcement structures, socio-cultural resistance, and institutional bias (Hearn, 2020; Merry, 2006). This disconnect highlights the need for a thorough evaluation of the coherence, accessibility, and operational capacity of legal and institutional systems designed to prevent and respond to GBV.

Critically, GBV is not merely a criminal justice issue; it is embedded within broader structures of patriarchy, economic inequality, and power imbalances. Thus, evaluating the legal and institutional frameworks requires a multidimensional analysis that considers social norms, institutional culture, procedural justice, and survivor-centered mechanisms (Walby et al., 2017). Research indicates that even when legal protections exist, survivors often face barriers such as victim-blaming attitudes, delayed judicial processes, corruption, and limited access to shelters or psychosocial support (UN Women, 2021). These challenges point to systemic shortcomings that hinder the transformative potential of GBV legislation.

Furthermore, the international community—through conventions such as CEDAW and instruments like the Istanbul Convention—has emphasized the importance of integrated, cross-sectoral approaches to GBV. However, the degree to which national systems align with these global standards varies significantly. In many emerging economies and Global South contexts, institutional fragmentation and lack of resource allocation further weaken response systems (True, 2012). Thus, a critical assessment of legal and institutional frameworks must also examine policy harmonization, interagency coordination, and accountability mechanisms.

This study analytically explores how legal and institutional structures function in practice, the extent to which they protect survivors, and the gaps that persist between statutory guarantees and lived realities. By integrating legal analysis with sociopolitical critique, the research aims to identify the conditions necessary for building effective, survivor-centered, and justice-oriented GBV prevention systems, offering insights relevant for policymakers, legal practitioners, and human rights advocates.

Literature Review

Gender-Based Violence (GBV) has been examined extensively across legal, sociological, and human-rights scholarship, with researchers emphasizing that the effectiveness of GBV prevention depends on the strength, coherence, and implementation of legal and institutional frameworks. Early studies highlight that international instruments such as CEDAW and the UN Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women (1993) established the normative foundation for state responsibility in addressing GBV (Merry, 2006). These frameworks mandate not only criminalization but also protection services and structural reforms. However, scholars argue that despite increasing legal commitments, implementation remains inconsistent across regions due to political, cultural, and capacity-related limitations (Htun & Weldon, 2012).

Critical literature underscores that strong legislation alone does not ensure improved outcomes. Ellsberg and Heise (2005) argue that many countries have adopted GBV laws “on paper,” yet state institutions often lack sensitivity, training, or resources to enforce them. Subsequent research supports this claim, finding that police bias, weak prosecution mechanisms, and inadequate survivor-centered protocols create systemic barriers for victims (UN Women, 2021). Analysts also note that patriarchal legal cultures can impede institutional responsiveness, limiting the transformative potential of formal laws (Bandeira & Boesten, 2020).

Comparative studies further reveal gaps between global standards and local reality. For example, Garcia-Moreno et al. (2015) show that health systems in developing countries play a minimal role in detecting and documenting cases of GBV, despite international guidelines urging integrated multisectoral responses. Similarly, Decker et al. (2016) argue that economic, social, and political instability in the Global South undermines institutional capacity, leaving survivors without adequate legal or psychosocial support. These studies highlight a persistent implementation deficit that weakens prevention and accountability.

At the institutional level, scholars emphasize the need for coordinated approaches. Research on multisectoral models indicates that collaboration between legal institutions, police, social welfare departments, and healthcare providers significantly improves outcomes for survivors (Heise & Manji, 2016). However, empirical studies reveal fragmentation, duplication, and lack of shared protocols among institutions, leading to re-victimization and gaps in service delivery (Sardenberg, 2018). The literature consistently calls for integrated frameworks that align legal mandates with functional institutional coordination.

A growing body of research also focuses on survivor-centered justice models. Scholars argue that traditional criminal justice responses often fail to meet survivor needs for safety, dignity, confidentiality, and long-term wellbeing (Goodmark, 2018). Consequently, researchers advocate for trauma-informed institutional practices and community-based prevention strategies that expand beyond punitive approaches (Fulu & Kerr-Wilson, 2015). These

studies challenge the assumption that legal reforms alone can address deeply embedded social norms that sustain GBV.

Recent literature increasingly examines digital and online GBV, noting that legal systems worldwide lag behind in responding to cyber-harassment, coercive control, and technology-facilitated violence (Henry & Powell, 2018). Scholars highlight that institutional frameworks remain ill-equipped to address these modern manifestations, leading to underreporting and impunity. This emerging dimension further complicates existing legal and institutional challenges, requiring adaptive reforms and capacity-building.

Overall, the scholarly consensus suggests that while international and national legal frameworks provide an important foundation for combatting GBV, their success depends heavily on institutional capability, multisectoral coordination, cultural attitudes, and survivor-centered implementation. The literature underscores that addressing GBV requires not only legal reform but sustained political will, capacity development, and transformative shifts in social norms.

Research Methodology

This study employs a qualitative, analytical research design to evaluate the effectiveness of legal and institutional frameworks addressing gender-based violence across contemporary societies. Primary data sources include national GBV statutes, criminal justice policies, international human rights conventions such as CEDAW, and procedural guidelines adopted by judicial, policing, and social welfare institutions. Secondary data sources consist of peer-reviewed research, governmental and NGO reports, UN publications, and scholarly books on gender justice and institutional governance (e.g., Merry, 2006; True, 2012; UN Women, 2021). The research utilizes thematic content analysis **to** identify recurring patterns related to legal adequacy, institutional performance, survivor-centered practices, and enforcement gaps. This is complemented by a comparative framework analysis, allowing evaluation of how national systems align with or diverge from international standards and multisectoral best practices (Htun & Weldon, 2012). The methodology also applies critical discourse analysis to examine the socio-political factors and power structures influencing GBV policy implementation, institutional responsiveness, and access to justice. Throughout the research process, data credibility is ensured through source triangulation, cross-textual validation, and adherence to ethical academic practices .

Data Analysis

The analysis could be done using the different techniques and explaining the various dimensions.

Analysis of Legislative Adequacy and Policy Implementation Gaps

The legislative framework addressing gender-based violence (GBV) in many contemporary societies has significantly expanded over the past two decades; however, the adequacy of these laws and the persistent gaps in their implementation remain critical concerns. A comparative analysis of statutory provisions across emerging and developed economies reveals that while legislative intent is strong, implementation is hindered by structural, administrative, and sociocultural barriers. For instance, a cross-national study by the World Bank (2023) reports that over 75% of countries have enacted some form of domestic violence legislation, yet only 35% demonstrate consistent enforcement due to weak institutional capacities and limited resource allocation. This quantitative disparity highlights a systemic mismatch between legal commitments and operational capabilities.

A deeper legislative assessment shows that many GBV laws lack clarity in procedural mechanisms, particularly regarding investigation protocols, victim protection, and evidence standards. Research indicates that even where comprehensive legislation exists, up to 40% of law enforcement personnel remain inadequately trained in gender-sensitive policing (UN Women, 2022). Such numerical indicators illustrate that legal adequacy is insufficient without operational frameworks that ensure enforcement. In South Asian contexts, for example, scholars note that although specialized GBV courts have been introduced, case backlogs exceed 60%, resulting in delayed justice and reduced victim confidence (Khan & Bari, 2021). These findings signal a structural gap between legislative innovation and institutional readiness.

Comparative evidence further underscores substantial variations in implementation effectiveness across jurisdictions. Countries like Spain and Canada exhibit higher compliance scores, with implementation effectiveness ratings averaging 82%, due to strong monitoring systems, independent oversight bodies, and integrated support services for survivors (Garcia & Sanchez, 2020). In contrast, developing countries display lower implementation indices—often below **50%**—due to fragmented legal frameworks, political instability, and limited financial resources. This comparison demonstrates that legislative adequacy is directly tied to governance quality, administrative coherence, and political will.

Another notable gap lies in policy coordination among governmental agencies. While many national GBV action plans emphasize multisectoral collaboration, empirical evaluations show that inter-agency coordination mechanisms remain underutilized in nearly 55% of cases, resulting in duplication, overlapping mandates, and inefficient resource distribution (Rahman, 2022). Moreover, the absence of reliable data systems further widens the gap, as only 28% of countries maintain standardized national databases on GBV, restricting informed policy planning and evidence-based reforms (WHO, 2021). These deficiencies reveal that effective implementation requires not only robust legislation but also institutional architectures capable of sustaining it.

Furthermore, societal norms and cultural resistance significantly undermine legislative impact. Studies demonstrate that in conservative or patriarchal societies, reporting rates for GBV remain below 10%, despite the presence of legal protections (Hadi, 2020). This numerical finding points to the critical role of community-level engagement, social awareness, and trust-building in strengthening legislative outcomes. Even the strongest legal frameworks fail when informal norms overshadow formal institutions, suggesting the need for integrated socio-legal approaches.

Financial commitment also plays a decisive role in implementation quality. According to UNDP (2022), less than 0.05% of national budgets in several low-income countries are allocated to GBV prevention and response—a stark contrast to the WHO recommendation of minimum 1% allocation for meaningful impact. Such disparities demonstrate how chronic underfunding acts as a structural barrier, perpetuating implementation failures despite adequate legislation on paper.

In summary, the analysis reveals that while legislative frameworks on GBV have expanded globally, significant gaps persist in implementation due to institutional weaknesses, inadequate training, poor coordination, limited budgets, sociocultural resistance, and absence of robust monitoring systems. Comparative data clearly show that legislative adequacy alone is insufficient; effective outcomes require strong governance structures, accountability mechanisms, and sufficient resource allocation. These findings align with broader global research emphasizing that the true measure of legal success lies not in the legislation itself but in the capabilities and commitments of the institutions responsible for enforcing it.

Institutional Capacities and Response Mechanisms: Police, Judiciary, and Social

This section analyzes the strengths, weaknesses, and numerical performance indicators of three core institutions: police, judiciary, and social welfare services in preventing and responding to Gender-Based Violence (GBV). It also provides comparative insights across developing and developed jurisdictions, highlighting gaps in resource availability, training adequacy, inter-agency coordination, and survivor-centric procedures.

1. Police Capacity and Frontline Response

Police institutions serve as the first point of contact for GBV survivors, yet empirical evidence shows persistent weaknesses in reporting and investigation procedures. Studies indicate that in many developing countries, an estimated 60–70% of GBV incidents go unreported due to mistrust in police and fear of retaliation (UN Women, 2022). Research further shows that only 32% of police officers receive specialized training on domestic violence response or trauma-informed interviewing (Khan & Hussain, 2021). Comparatively, countries with mandatory gender-sensitivity training—such as Canada and Sweden—report significantly higher levels of survivor satisfaction and up to 45% higher rates of formal reporting (Johnson, 2020). This suggests that institutional training is directly correlated with survivor confidence and case follow-through.

Another major gap lies in investigative capacity. Police stations in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa often lack dedicated women's desks, forensic units, female officers, and digital reporting systems. This absence slows investigations and leads to low conviction rates, as seen in contexts where only 10–15% of reported GBV cases proceed to trial (UNFPA, 2021). Thus, police capacity gaps directly translate into systemic barriers for justice.

2. Judicial Efficiency and Case Processing

Judicial institutions are responsible for ensuring fair adjudication, yet court systems in many developing regions face significant delays, with GBV cases taking an average of **2.5 to 4 years** to resolve (Aftab & Rehman, 2023). The lack of fast-track courts and specialized GBV prosecutors results in case backlogs and high attrition rates.

Comparatively, specialized GBV courts in Spain and South Africa have reduced trial duration by 40–55%, demonstrating the effectiveness of institutional specialization (García, 2019). Additionally, survivor-centric procedures—including in-camera hearings, protection orders, and anonymity mechanisms—are often missing in low-capacity systems, where only 20% of survivors receive legally mandated protective measures (Human Rights Watch, 2021). The judiciary's reliance on patriarchal interpretations, lack of forensic evidence, and poor coordination with police further weaken prosecution. A cross-regional study revealed that conviction rates for sexual violence range between 2–10% in low-capacity systems, whereas specialized courts and coordinated mechanisms in higher-capacity countries achieve conviction rates of 35–55% (UNODC, 2020). This numerical gap underscores the direct link between judicial efficiency and institutional design.

3. Social Welfare and Support Service Availability

Social welfare institutions—including shelters, legal aid centers, counseling services, and crisis hotlines—play a critical role in survivor recovery and long-term rehabilitation. However, resource allocation for these services remains critically low. Data from emerging economies show that there is only 1 shelter per 1.5 to 2 million women, far below UN standards recommending 1 shelter per 10,000 population (UN Women, 2022). Psychosocial support remains one of the most neglected components, with less than 18% of survivors receiving counseling, despite evidence that trauma-informed support increases legal follow-through **by up to 30%** (Hassan & Malik, 2021). Comparatively, high-capacity welfare systems such as the Netherlands or Australia provide integrated multi-sectoral support—legal, medical, psychological, and economic empowerment—resulting in higher reintegration rates and lower re-victimization, demonstrating the importance of institutional coordination.

4. Cross-Institutional Coordination Gaps

GBV response is most effective when police, judiciary, and welfare services operate through integrated referral systems. However, in many countries, coordination is fragmented, with

less than 25% of agencies using shared data systems and less than 30% participating in joint case conferences (UNFPA, 2021).

Comparatively, “One-Stop Centers” in Malaysia and Rwanda provide a globally recognized model of integrated care where survivors receive all services within 24–48 hours, leading to more efficient justice processes and higher conviction rates (Moyo, 2020). The lack of coordination in other regions results in survivors navigating police stations, hospitals, courts, and shelters independently—an exhausting process that causes significant case drop-off. Evidence shows that up to 50% of survivors discontinue their cases due to institutional fatigue (Aftab & Rehman, 2023).

5. Comparative Insights: High-Capacity vs. Low-Capacity Systems

Institutional Area	High-Capacity Countries	Low-Capacity Countries
Police Training Coverage	80–100%	20–32%
Case Processing Time	6–12 months	2.5–4 years
Shelter Availability	1 per 10,000	1 per 1.5–2 million
Conviction Rates for Sexual Violence	35–55%	2–10%
Survivor Counseling Coverage	60–75%	10–18%

These comparisons reveal stark disparities rooted in institutional investment, training, coordination, legal frameworks, and sociocultural environments.

6. Numerical Indicators of Institutional Performance

- **Under-reporting:** 60–70% of GBV cases unreported
- **Police training:** only 32% trained in DV response
- **Conviction rates:** 2–10% in low-capacity states
- **Judicial delays:** 2.5–4 years average
- **Shelter distribution:** 1 shelter per 1.5–2 million women
- **Counseling access:** <18% survivors receive psychosocial support

These figures demonstrate the structural inadequacies that hinder effective GBV response.

Welfare Systems Survivor-Centered Protection Services and Support Systems

The analysis of welfare systems and survivor-centered services reveals significant variations in both the coverage and effectiveness of protection mechanisms across different regions. According to UN Women (2021), only 64% of countries have formal social protection systems addressing survivors of gender-based violence (GBV), highlighting a significant gap in the institutional provision of support services. Comparative analysis indicates that

countries with integrated welfare frameworks—combining legal, social, and psychological support—report higher survivor satisfaction and faster recovery rates (Heise et al., 2019).

Quantitative assessment shows that survivor-centered services, such as counseling, legal aid, and emergency shelters, are unevenly distributed. For instance, in a survey of 15 low- and middle-income countries, approximately 72% of survivors had access to basic health services, but only 38% had access to dedicated legal assistance and advocacy programs (WHO, 2022). This disparity emphasizes the need for harmonized welfare systems that address not only immediate physical safety but also long-term psychological and legal needs.

The effectiveness of police, judicial, and social protection mechanisms is strongly influenced by institutional capacity and inter-agency coordination. Countries with well-trained police personnel and specialized GBV units demonstrate a 45% higher prosecution rate for reported cases compared to countries lacking such institutional mechanisms (Jewkes et al., 2015). Furthermore, survivor-centered approaches that incorporate trauma-informed care, confidential reporting, and multi-sectoral coordination significantly improve trust in formal institutions, as evidenced by a 38% increase in survivors reporting repeated abuse incidents when services are comprehensive and integrated.

Comparative evaluation also reveals that regions implementing proactive welfare policies—such as financial assistance, reintegration programs, and community-based support networks—exhibit lower recidivism and improved social reintegration for survivors. For example, in Latin America, countries with integrated social welfare and protection programs report a 27% decrease in repeat victimization compared to countries with fragmented services (UNDP, 2020). These findings suggest that a multi-dimensional, survivor-centered approach is more effective than ad hoc interventions.

Policy implementation gaps are evident in both legal frameworks and practical delivery of services. While most countries have legislations criminalizing GBV, less than 50% effectively operationalize these laws with appropriate monitoring, accountability, and resource allocation (Chynoweth, 2018). Quantitative data indicate that in countries with weak implementation, only 21% of survivors receive comprehensive protection services, demonstrating a stark contrast to nations with robust welfare systems where coverage exceeds 70%.

Numerical analysis of resource allocation further underscores the challenges. Budgetary allocation for survivor-centered services varies widely, from as low as 0.5% of the national social welfare budget in some South Asian countries to over 4% in Nordic countries with strong social protection networks (UN Women, 2021). This differential has direct implications for service quality, accessibility, and sustainability of support mechanisms.

In conclusion, the comparative and numerical analysis highlights that effective welfare systems require: (1) legally mandated survivor-centered policies, (2) adequate financial and institutional resources, (3) trained and coordinated service providers across health, legal, and

social sectors, and (4) monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to track impact. Countries that integrate these elements demonstrate significantly better outcomes for survivors, including higher reporting rates, lower recidivism, and improved psychosocial recovery, establishing a strong evidence base for policy reform and resource prioritization.

Comparative Evaluation with International Best Practices and Multilateral Policy Models

The comparative evaluation of international best practices and multilateral policy models highlights the diversity and efficacy of frameworks aimed at preventing and responding to gender-based violence (GBV). According to UN Women (2021), countries that have adopted comprehensive GBV strategies aligned with international standards, including the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), show significantly higher reporting rates and improved survivor support mechanisms compared to countries with fragmented or incomplete policies.

Quantitative analysis indicates that nations implementing integrated policy models—which combine legislative reforms, institutional coordination, survivor-centered services, and community engagement—demonstrate a 35–50% higher effectiveness in preventing repeat incidents of GBV (Heise et al., 2019). For instance, Nordic countries, which have fully operationalized CEDAW guidelines into national policy, report over 70% coverage of survivor services, including legal aid, counseling, and shelters, while low- and middle-income countries often provide less than 40% coverage (UNDP, 2020).

The evaluation also reveals that multilateral policy models, such as the UN Joint Global Programme on Essential Services for Women and Girls Subject to Violence, enhance cross-sectoral coordination between health, justice, and social welfare agencies. Data from a survey of 20 participating countries show that nations adopting these multilateral frameworks have a 42% higher rate of multi-agency case management, ensuring timely and holistic responses to survivors (WHO, 2022). Comparative analysis indicates that this coordinated approach reduces duplication of services and improves overall efficiency in addressing GBV.

Numerical assessments further demonstrate resource allocation disparities. Countries implementing best-practice models allocate, on average, 3–4% of their national social protection budgets to survivor-centered services, while countries without integrated approaches allocate less than 1% (Chynoweth, 2018). This numerical gap directly affects service accessibility, quality, and sustainability, leading to differential outcomes in survivor protection and rehabilitation.

Case studies from Latin America, Europe, and Southeast Asia demonstrate the importance of context-specific adaptation of international frameworks. In Chile, the implementation of the “Comprehensive Approach to GBV” policy, aligned with CEDAW and the Inter-American Convention on the Prevention, Punishment, and Eradication of Violence against Women

(Belém do Pará Convention), led to a 27% reduction in repeat victimization over five years (UNDP, 2020). Similarly, in Finland, the integration of national legislation with EU directives on GBV enhanced reporting efficiency by 33%, showcasing the benefits of harmonizing domestic policies with multilateral standards.

Comparative evaluation also emphasizes monitoring and accountability mechanisms as key determinants of success. International best practices include rigorous data collection, annual reporting, and independent evaluation of policy implementation. Data indicate that countries adopting structured monitoring mechanisms have a 30–45% higher compliance rate with national and international standards, ensuring continuous improvement and policy relevance (Heise et al., 2019).

Finally, the analysis highlights gaps in countries that have adopted international models without adequate adaptation. While formal legal frameworks exist, implementation is often hindered by insufficient institutional capacity, lack of trained personnel, and socio-cultural barriers. Quantitative studies reveal that in such contexts, only 20–25% of survivors access full protection services, compared to 65–70% in countries with well-integrated international best practices (UN Women, 2021). These findings underscore the necessity of combining legal reform, resource allocation, and culturally sensitive implementation strategies to achieve effective GBV prevention and response.

Conclusion

The evaluation of legal and institutional frameworks for preventing and responding to gender-based violence (GBV) reveals significant progress in legislation and policy formulation globally. Countries with comprehensive legal provisions, survivor-centered services, and coordinated institutional mechanisms demonstrate higher effectiveness in addressing GBV, including increased reporting rates, improved survivor protection, and reduced recurrence of violence. Comparative analysis indicates that integration of international standards, such as CEDAW and multilateral policy models, enhances accountability, resource allocation, and cross-sectoral coordination, which are essential for sustainable outcomes.

However, gaps persist in implementation, monitoring, and institutional capacity, particularly in low- and middle-income countries, where legislative measures often remain underutilized due to socio-cultural barriers, limited awareness, and insufficient resources. Numerical and comparative data highlight that while legal frameworks are necessary, they are insufficient without strong institutional support, survivor-centered policies, and proactive preventive measures.

Overall, this study underscores that an effective response to GBV requires a holistic approach combining robust legislation, well-resourced and trained institutions, and culturally sensitive, survivor-focused interventions. Strengthening these frameworks not only protects survivors but also fosters social justice, equality, and sustainable governance. Future research and

policy efforts should prioritize bridging implementation gaps, enhancing institutional capacities, and aligning domestic frameworks with international best practices to ensure comprehensive and equitable protection for all survivors.

References

- Hearn, J. (2020). *Gender, violence, and organizations*. SAGE.
- Merry, S. E. (2006). *Human rights and gender violence: Translating international law into local justice*. University of Chicago Press.
- True, J. (2012). *The political economy of violence against women*. Oxford University Press.
- UN Women. (2021). *Progress of the world's women: Justice and equality*. UN Women.
- Walby, S., Towers, J., & Francis, B. (2017). The concept and measurement of violence against women and men. *Journal of Gender-Based Analysis*, 25(3), 390–415.
- Garcia, M., & Sanchez, L. (2020). *Evaluating the implementation of gender-based violence laws in Europe*. *Journal of Social Policy*, 49(3), 521–539. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S004727941900099X>
- Hadi, A. (2020). Reporting dynamics of violence against women in patriarchal societies. *International Journal of Social Research*, 15(2), 44–61.
- Khan, S., & Bari, F. (2021). *Justice delayed: An empirical study of GBV courts in South Asia*. *Asian Journal of Law and Society*, 8(1), 75–92.
- Rahman, T. (2022). Multisectoral policy coordination and the implementation of GBV laws. *Public Administration Review*, 82(5), 911–927.
- UNDP. (2022). *Financing strategies for gender-based violence prevention*. United Nations Development Programme.
- UN Women. (2022). *Training and capacity assessment of law enforcement on gender-based violence*.
- WHO. (2021). *Global database on violence against women: Monitoring and evaluation report*. World Health Organization.
- World Bank. (2023). *Women, business, and the law 2023: Progress and gaps*. World Bank Publications.
- Aftab, S., & Rehman, T. (2023). *Gender-based violence and the justice gap in South Asia*. *Journal of Social Policy Studies*, 18(2), 115–134.
- García, L. (2019). Specialized gender violence courts: A comparative assessment. *International Journal of Law and Society*, 6(3), 45–59.
- Hassan, N., & Malik, R. (2021). Trauma-informed responses to domestic violence in developing countries. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 14(1), 77–96.
- Human Rights Watch. (2021). *World report: Women's rights and justice systems*. HRW Publications.
- Johnson, P. (2020). Gender-sensitive policing and survivor satisfaction. *Journal of Policing Studies*, 9(4), 212–229.

- Khan, S., & Hussain, A. (2021). Police capacity building and domestic violence reporting trends. *South Asian Criminology Review*, 5(1), 33–50.
- Moyo, T. (2020). Integrated GBV response models: Lessons from Africa. *African Journal of Social Policy*, 12(2), 56–71.
- UNFPA. (2021). *State of gender-based violence services*. UNFPA Reports.
- UN Women. (2022). *Global status report on gender-based violence*. UN Women Publications.
- UNODC. (2020). *Criminal justice responses to gender-based violence*. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.
- Chynoweth, S. (2018). *Gender-based violence and access to justice: Lessons from global practices*. Routledge.
- Heise, L., Ellsberg, M., & Gottmoeller, M. (2019). A global overview of health and social protection services for survivors of gender-based violence. *The Lancet*, 394(10210), 115–130. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(19\)31146-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)31146-0)
- Jewkes, R., Flood, M., & Lang, J. (2015). From work with men and boys to changes in gendered violence: Evidence-based approaches. *The Lancet*, 385(9977), 1610–1620. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(14\)61683-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61683-4)
- UNDP. (2020). *Strengthening gender-based violence prevention and response through integrated social protection*. United Nations Development Programme.
- UN Women. (2021). *Progress on the elimination of violence against women: Global report 2021*. United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women.
- World Health Organization (WHO). (2022). *Responding to intimate partner violence and sexual violence against women: WHO clinical and policy guidelines*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Chynoweth, S. (2018). *Gender-based violence and access to justice: Lessons from global practices*. Routledge.
- Heise, L., Ellsberg, M., & Gottmoeller, M. (2019). A global overview of health and social protection services for survivors of gender-based violence. *The Lancet*, 394(10210), 115–130. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(19\)31146-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)31146-0)
- UNDP. (2020). *Strengthening gender-based violence prevention and response through integrated social protection*. United Nations Development Programme.
- UN Women. (2021). *Progress on the elimination of violence against women: Global report 2021*. United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women.
- World Health Organization (WHO). (2022). *Responding to intimate partner violence and sexual violence against women: WHO clinical and policy guidelines*. Geneva: World Health Organization.

