European Journal of Clinical Pharmacy
Print ISSN: 2385-409X **Online ISSN**: Applied Website:
https://farmclin.com/

Advance Medical Directive in Maintaining Patient Self-Determination Theory.

Mohd Zamre Mohd Zahir[1], Ramalinggam Rajamanickam[6], Muhammad Hatta[5]*, Suhaizad Saifuddin[1], Nur Fairuz Mat Yasin[2], Fatimah Yusro Hashim[1], Mohd Safri Mohammed Na'aim[3], Haniwarda Yaakob[1], Nur Khalidah Dahlan[1], Husyairi Harunarashid[4], Nadhilah A. Kadir[1]

[1]Faculty of Law, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM), 43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia
[2]Pusat Inovasi & Pemindahan Teknologi (INOVASI@UKM), Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM), 43600 Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia.
[3]Faculty of Law, Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM), 40450 Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia
[4]Department of Emergency Medicine at Hospital Canselor Tuanku Muhriz, UKM Medical Center, Jalan Yaacob Latif, Bandar Tun Razak, 56000 Cheras, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
[5]Faculty of Law, Universitas Malikussaleh, Indonesia
[6]Faculty of Law, Multimedia University (Melaka Campus), Jalan Ayer Keroh Lama, 75450 Bukit Beruang, Melaka, Malaysia.
Corresponding Author: Muhammad Hatta
E-mail: muhammad.hatta@unimal.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Patient autonomy has emerged as a cornerstone of modern medical ethics and healthcare law, reflecting the individual's right to make informed decisions about their own medical treatment. The concept of autonomy becomes particularly significant in the context of end-of-life care, where patients may face the loss of decision-making capacity due to terminal illness or cognitive impairment. The Advance Medical Directive (AMD) serves as a legal instrument that allows individuals to express their treatment preferences in advance, ensuring that their autonomy is respected even when they are no longer competent to decide. This paper examines the philosophical, ethical, and legal foundations of patient autonomy and analyses the function of AMDs in safeguarding self-determination within clinical practice. It explores how jurisdictions such as Malaysia, the United Kingdom, and Singapore have legislated and implemented AMD frameworks, highlighting both the legal recognition and practical challenges in their enforcement. A qualitative method approach was employed. The study found that the tension between patient autonomy and medical paternalism, as well as the ethical dilemmas faced by healthcare professionals. Thus, the study concludes that while AMDs reinforce the moral and legal authority of patients over their bodies and medical choices, their effectiveness depends on public awareness, legislative clarity, and the alignment of medical culture with the principles of autonomy and informed consent.

KEYWORDS: patient autonomy, advance medical directive, informed consent, end-of-life care, medical ethics, self-determination.

How to Cite: Mohd Zamre Mohd Zahir, Ramalinggam Rajamanickam, Muhammad Hatta, Suhaizad Saifuddin, Nur Fairuz Mat Yasin, Fatimah Yusro Hashim, Mohd Safri Mohammed Na'aim, Haniwarda Yaakob, Nur Khalidah Dahlan, Husyairi Harunarashid, Nadhilah A. Kadir, (2026) Advance Medical Directive in Maintaining Patient Self-Determination Theory., European Journal of Clinical Pharmacy, Vol.8, No.1, pp. 2869-2876

INTRODUCTION

Patient autonomy has become a central tenet in biomedical ethics and modern medical jurisprudence. Fundamentally, autonomy refers to the capacity and right of patients to make informed, voluntary choices about their own medical care (Sabatino, 2010). In typical medical encounters, autonomy is operationalised through the doctrine of informed consent. Yet, when patients face serious illness or cognitive decline and lose decision-making capacity, respecting their autonomy becomes more complex. The Advance Medical Directive (AMD) (also sometimes called advance directive, living will, or advance decision) is a legal or medical instrument designed to preserve a patient's previously expressed wishes in such incapacity.

This paper explores the philosophical grounding, ethical tensions, legal frameworks, and practical challenges associated with AMDs. It gives particular attention to the Malaysian context, where the concept is in nascent development, and draws comparative insights from other jurisdictions. The analysis addresses the tension between autonomy and medical paternalism, the enforceability of AMDs, and recommendations to strengthen their role in clinical practice.

DETAILS AND CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING

Self-Determination Theory, developed by Deci and Ryan, is a framework for understanding human motivation and personality, emphasizing that people are driven by an innate need to grow and achieve self-determination. From this framework (Deci & Ryan, 2013; Ryan & Deci, 2024), it relates to someone's motivation and perspective. Patient autonomy is a foundational principle in modern bioethics and healthcare law, grounded in philosophical traditions emphasizing individual self-determination. Kantian ethics underscores respect for persons as autonomous moral agents, requiring that individuals be treated as ends in themselves rather than means (Kant, 1785/1993). In the medical context, this principle is operationalised through informed consent, which requires adequate information, voluntariness, and decisional capacity.

Mill's liberal theory further supports autonomy by asserting that individuals should be free to make decisions concerning their own lives unless such decisions cause harm to others (Mill, 1859/2001). These philosophical foundations heavily influence Western legal systems and bioethical norms.

However, scholars increasingly critique the dominance of individualistic autonomy, advocating for relational autonomy, which recognizes that decision-making occurs within social, familial, and cultural contexts (Mackenzie & Stoljar, 2000). This critique is particularly relevant in Asian societies, where communal values and family involvement play a significant role in healthcare decisions.

2.1. Methodology

Embracing a qualitative research methodology, this dissertation undertakes a comprehensive examination of both primary and secondary sources related to advance medical directives (AMD), medical legislation, and bioethical principles. In line with Krippendorff's assertion that content analysis (Krippendorff, 2004) may range from basic word frequency counts to more nuanced conceptual interpretations, this study employs both content analysis and critical analysis as its primary analytical frameworks (Ramalinggam Rajamanickam et. al, 2019). These methods facilitate a deeper understanding of the underlying legal and ethical constructs surrounding AMDs.

The research draws extensively on primary data, including official documents, legislative texts (Abdul Halim et. al, 2023); (Azmi et. al, 2023); (Rahman et. al, 2023), and policy guidelines from Malaysia as well as comparative international jurisdictions (Mohd Zamre Mohd Zahir et. al, 2019; Mohd Zamre Mohd Zahir et. al, 2021). This is complemented by a robust engagement with secondary sources to support a thorough literature review (Nurul Hidayat Ab Rahman et. al, 2023; Nurul Hidayat Ab Rahman et. al, 2022). The meticulous collection and triangulation of these data sources not only enhance the reliability and validity of the findings but also ensure comprehensive coverage of the subject matter (Ramalinggam Rajamanickam et. al, 2019).

The final segment of this research synthesizes and critically examines the findings derived from the aforementioned analytical approaches. The study offers a reflective and evaluative discussion of the results, highlighting the legal (Abdul Halim et. al, 2023); (Azmi et. al, 2023), ethical, and practical implications of AMDs while contributing original insights to the ongoing academic and policy discourse.

2.2 The Ethical Foundations: Autonomy, Beneficence, and Paternalism

Autonomy in medicine

Autonomy is often regarded as one of the four cornerstones of biomedical ethics (with beneficence, nonmaleficence, and justice). It denotes that persons of sound mind have the right to self-governance and to make decisions about their bodies, free from coercion (Steinberg, 2003; Galley, 2024). Autonomy is respected when patients are provided adequate information, understand the options, and freely choose among them.

The challenge of incapacity

A challenge arises when a patient loses capacity (e.g., due to severe illness, sedation, coma, advanced dementia). At that point, they cannot express preferences contemporaneously. Without some prior instruction, it becomes difficult to know what the patient would have wanted, making proxy or best-interest decision-making necessary.

Advance Medical Directives as an autonomy-preserving tool

An AMD allows a competent person to stipulate future decisions about medical treatment, either by specifying treatments they want or refuse, or by appointing a surrogate decision-maker. In doing so, AMDs extend autonomy beyond present capacity, attempting to bind future decisions to past wishes (Galley, 2024; Sedini et al., 2021). AMDs thus serve to align care with the patient's values rather than having decisions made purely by clinicians or proxies.

Tension with beneficence and paternalism

While autonomy is important, in practice clinicians may feel duty-bound by beneficence or non-maleficence to act in what they believe is a patient's best interest (Hooper et al., 2020). In some scenarios, a physician may perceive that following a directive strictly may result in harm or a suboptimal decision, especially if the clinical situation is unforeseen or ambiguous. This raises tension between honoring past autonomy and present clinical judgment.

2.3 Legal and Policy Frameworks: Comparative Insights

International and common-law contexts

In jurisdictions with advanced legal frameworks, AMDs are given statutory recognition (e.g., many states in the U.S., England & Wales under the Mental Capacity Act 2005, Australia in various states) (Sabatino, 2010; Regulating advance decision-making, 2021). These laws typically define formal requirements (writing, witnesses, revocation, specificity) and provide legal protection to clinicians who comply.

A landmark U.S. case, Cruzan v. Director, Missouri Department of Health (1990), established that states may require "clear and convincing evidence" of the patient's wishes before life-sustaining treatment is withheld, recognizing a constitutionally-protected liberty interest in refusing unwanted treatment (Cruzan v. Director, Missouri Dept. of Health, 497 U.S. 261 (1990)).

In England & Wales, the Mental Capacity Act allows advance decisions to refuse treatment to bind clinicians, provided the decision is valid and applicable to the circumstances. In emergencies or ambiguous cases, clinicians are sometimes permitted discretion until legal clarity is sought (Regulating advance decision-making, 2021).

2.4 The Malaysian context

Existing ethical and guideline basis

In Malaysia, there is currently no dedicated statute that mandates or directly regulates AMDs (Advance Directives for Medical Treatment: The Current Legal Status, 2017; Regulating advance decision-making, 2021). Instead, ethical codes and professional guidelines provide the primary basis for recognizing AMDs.

For instance, the Malaysian Medical Association's Code of Medical Ethics (2001) states that "one should always take into consideration any advance directives and the wishes of the family" (Considerations for Introducing Legislation, 2020). However, this code is not legally binding. The Malaysian Medical Council (MMC) exercises regulatory oversight over medical practitioners via professional conduct rules, which might adopt guidelines on end-of-life decisions (Considerations for Introducing Legislation, 2020).

In 2017, Malaysian clinical guidelines were published that include a clause (Clause 18) urging doctors to "refrain from providing treatment … where there is an unequivocal written directive by the patient that such treatment … is not to be provided", but with caveats about clarity, validity, and emergency situations (Law & Practice of Advance Directives, 2023). In emergencies, clinicians may act in what they interpret to be in the patient's best interests until legal advice is obtained.

The Ministry of Health of Malaysia has more recently promoted Advance Care Planning (ACP), a process of discussing future care preferences, and published a "Guide for Healthcare Practitioners in Malaysia" (2024) to encourage these discussions. However, the document itself notes that ACP is not yet a legally binding mechanism, though documentation can support future decisions.

Furthermore, based on Item 3.10 of the Malaysian Medical Council (2025) of Consent for treatment of patients by registered medical practitioners, Version 3/2025, a Registered Medical Practitioner (RMP) should refrain from providing treatment where there is an unequivocal written directive by the patient that such treatment is not to be provided in the circumstances that now apply to the patient.

Further, based on Item 3.11 If a patient has made advance decisions, or expressed his/her wishes when he/she had mental capacity, the RMP should consider: (a) whether these are sufficiently clear and specific to apply to the clinical circumstances which have now arisen; (b) whether the decision remains current; (c) whether there is any reason to doubt the patient's capacity at the time that the decision was made; and (d) whether there was any undue pressure on the patient to make the decision. According to Item 3.12 If there are doubts regarding the validity of an advance decision, especially in a medical emergency, the RMP should proceed in the patient's best interests, while attempting to determine the validity of the advance decision. Such decisions should be clearly documented in the patient's medical records.

While Item 3.13 of the Malaysian Medical Council (2025) of Consent for treatment of patients by registered medical practitioners, Version 3/2025, specifies generally that any patient who possesses mental capacity can refuse consent for any treatment without assigning any reasons to the decision.

2.5 Challenges in enforceability and recognition

Because AMDs lack a statutory footing, their enforceability in Malaysia is uncertain. The 2017 guidelines' use of "should" (as opposed to mandatory language) gives clinicians discretionary flexibility, which may lead to reluctance to follow a directive if in conflict with clinical judgment.

Additionally, the burden of proof for validity (e.g., competence at time of drafting, absence of undue influence, clarity of instructions) may complicate implementation. In practice, many physicians may not be aware of AMD, or the AMD may not be accessible at the moment needed.

Other research shows that while Malaysians generally have positive attitudes toward end-of-life planning, actual completion rates remain low. There have also been critiques that reliance on ethical codes alone (without legal backing) may be inadequate to protect patient autonomy robustly (End-of-life decisions in Malaysia, 2017).

2.6 Comparison between Malaysia, the United Kingdom and Singapore

End-of-life decision-making is commonly analysed through principlism, which balances respect for autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice (Beauchamp & Childress, 2019). While AMDs are designed to uphold autonomy, ethical tensions arise when previously expressed wishes conflict with medical judgment or family preferences.

Medical paternalism remains a significant theme in the literature. Soft paternalism may be ethically justified where patient capacity is compromised, but hard paternalism, overriding a competent patient's wishes, is widely criticised (Dworkin, 1988). AMDs are therefore viewed as ethical tools that extend autonomous decision-making beyond the loss of capacity.

a. United Kingdom
The UK provides one of the most comprehensive legal frameworks for AMDs through the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA). The Act recognizes Advance Decisions to Refuse Treatment (ADRT) as legally binding, provided they are valid and applicable (Mental Capacity Act, 2005).

Judicial decisions emphasize that a patient's prior wishes, values, and beliefs must be central to best interests determinations (Aintree University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust v James, 2013). Courts consistently affirm that respect for autonomy may require allowing death to occur.

The UK model is widely praised for its legal clarity, though scholars note practical challenges in interpreting applicability during emergencies (Brazier & Cave, 2016).

b. Singapore
Singapore regulates AMDs through the Advance Medical Directive Act (Cap. 4A). The Act allows individuals to refuse extraordinary life-sustaining treatment in cases of terminal illness, subject to strict procedural safeguards (Advance Medical Directive Act, 1996).

Scholars characterize Singapore's approach as a managed or cautious autonomy model, where individual choice is balanced against medical authority and societal interests (Menon, 2013). Although legally recognised, AMD uptake remains low due to cultural reluctance and procedural complexity (Chin et al., 2017).

c. Malaysia
Malaysia lacks specific legislation governing AMDs. End-of-life decision-making relies on common law principles of consent, professional ethical guidelines issued by the Malaysian Medical Council, and judicial discretion (Malaysian Medical Council, 2019).

Scholars note that while patient autonomy is acknowledged in principle, medical paternalism and family-centric decision-making dominate clinical practice. As a result, AMDs have uncertain legal status and are rarely enforced.

Comparative analysis demonstrates that legal certainty strongly correlates with the protection of autonomy. The UK's binding framework contrasts sharply with Malaysia's legal ambiguity, while Singapore occupies an intermediate position with statutory recognition but limited scope.

Aspect	United Kingdom	Singapore	Malaysia
Legal recognition	• Strong & binding • Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) • Recognizes Advance Decisions to Refuse Treatment (ADRT) as legally binding.	• Statutory but limited • Advance Medical Directive Act (Cap. 4A) • Allows refusal of extraordinary life-sustaining treatment in terminal illness.	• No statute • No specific statute governing AMDs. • Reliance on:common law principles of consent, • Malaysian Medical Council (MMC) guidelines, case-by-case judicial reasoning.
Scope	Broad	Terminal illness only	Uncertain

Autonomy priority	High	Moderate	Low–moderate
Clinical certainty	High	Moderate	Low

Figure 1: Comparison based on Jurisdictions

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Practical and Ethical Challenges in Clinical Implementation

Clarity, specificity, and applicability

One key practical issue is that AMDs must be sufficiently clear and specific to apply to real-world clinical situations. Broad or vague directives (e.g., "I refuse extraordinary measures") may leave room for interpretation, undermining their authority. Clinicians may hesitate to apply them if there is uncertainty. (Law & Practice of Advance Directives, 2023)

Changes of mind and revocation

Patients may change their preferences over time. Ethical and legal frameworks must allow for revocation or modification of AMDs, provided the person retains capacity. Some jurisdictions require that revocations be in writing or follow witness rules. In Malaysia, current guidance allows modification if done while competent.

Conflict with family wishes and surrogate decision-making

In many cultural contexts, family plays a strong role in healthcare decisions. Discord may arise when family members wish to override or modify the AMD. In Malaysia, the 2017 guideline even suggests consultation with next-of-kin as part of deciding whether to comply with an AMD, giving doctors some discretion.

Such conflicts may place physicians in distress: should they follow the patient's directive or defer to family, especially in societies where familial harmony is highly valued?

Emergencies and ambiguous cases

In emergencies or when the AMD's scope is unclear, clinicians may act to preserve life until further clarity is obtained. Some guidelines permit temporary deviation in emergencies (Law & Practice, 2023).

Furthermore, AMDs may not address every possible situation. Unanticipated medical circumstances may not be covered by the directive, requiring clinicians to rely on best-interest standards.

Awareness, documentation, and accessibility

For an AMD to have an effect, clinicians must be aware of it (e.g., it must be documented clearly in medical records) and accessible at the time of decision-making. In practice, inadequate systems for recording or retrieving AMDs impede their use. (Hooper et al., 2020; Sedini et al., 2021)

Moreover, public and professional education is needed so that patients, families, and healthcare providers understand AMDs, their limits, and the process of drafting them.

Resource allocation and justice considerations

In a resource-limited healthcare system, AMDs may help in aligning treatments with patient preferences and avoiding futile interventions. However, moral tensions may arise about whether to refuse life-prolonging therapy that a patient wanted, especially if resources are available but scarce.

3.2 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, several interrelated recommendations are proposed to strengthen the role of Advance Medical Directives (AMDs) in safeguarding patient autonomy within the Malaysian healthcare and legal landscape. These recommendations aim not only to address existing legal and ethical gaps but also to promote a more coherent, patient-centred framework for end-of-life decision-making.

i.Enactment of legislation or a statutory framework.

A primary concern identified in this study is the absence of a comprehensive legal framework governing AMDs in Malaysia. At present, the recognition and application of AMDs rely largely on general legal principles and professional discretion, which may lead to inconsistency and uncertainty. The enactment of specific legislation would provide much-needed clarity on key aspects such as the legal validity, scope, and enforceability of AMDs. It should also outline procedural safeguards, including requirements for capacity, voluntariness, and informed consent at the time the directive is made. Drawing from jurisdictions

with established frameworks, such legislation could also address issues such as revocation, interpretation, and the role of substitute decision-makers. Ultimately, a statutory regime would enhance legal certainty for healthcare providers while reinforcing public confidence in the system.

ii.Harmonisation of ethical guidelines into binding professional standards.
Currently, guidance on AMDs issued by professional bodies such as the Malaysian Medical Council (MMC) tends to be advisory rather than mandatory in nature. This creates variability in how such directives are interpreted and applied in clinical practice. To address this, ethical guidelines should be consolidated and incorporated into enforceable professional standards of conduct. Clearer and more directive language, such as replacing "should" with "must" where appropriate, would reduce ambiguity and promote consistency in decision-making. Additionally, these standards should provide detailed procedural guidance, including how to verify the authenticity of AMDs, assess their applicability in specific clinical contexts, and document decisions. Embedding such standards within disciplinary frameworks would further ensure accountability among healthcare practitioners.

iii.Promotion of advance care planning (ACP) as routine practice.
Advance care planning (ACP) should be institutionalised as a routine component of healthcare delivery rather than being treated as an exceptional or end-stage intervention. Early engagement in ACP discussions, particularly for patients with chronic, progressive, or life-limiting conditions, allows individuals to articulate their values, preferences, and goals of care in a timely and informed manner. The Ministry of Health's 2024 guidance represents a commendable step in this direction; however, sustained efforts are required to integrate ACP into standard clinical workflows. This may include incorporating ACP discussions into primary care consultations, specialist follow-ups, and hospital discharge planning. Normalising these conversations would not only improve the quality of AMDs but also reduce the emotional and ethical burden on families and clinicians during critical decision-making moments.

iv.Standardisation of documentation and information systems.
The effectiveness of AMDs is heavily dependent on their accessibility and clarity at the point of care. As such, there is a pressing need to develop standardised documentation formats that clearly capture patients' wishes in a structured and comprehensible manner. In addition, the establishment of centralised registries or interoperable digital health systems would enable healthcare providers to quickly identify the existence of an AMD. Features such as electronic flags in medical records could alert clinicians to the presence of such directives, thereby ensuring that patient preferences are not overlooked in emergency or high-pressure situations. Standardisation would also minimise interpretative discrepancies and facilitate better coordination across different healthcare settings.

v.Education and public engagement.
A significant barrier to the effective implementation of AMDs is the lack of awareness and understanding among both the public and healthcare professionals. Comprehensive educational initiatives are therefore essential. Public awareness campaigns should aim to demystify AMDs, clarify their purpose and limitations, and encourage individuals to engage in early planning. At the same time, healthcare professionals must be equipped with the necessary skills and knowledge to support patients in this process. This includes training in communication techniques for sensitive conversations, as well as a solid grounding in the ethical and legal dimensions of AMDs. Interdisciplinary education involving physicians, nurses, and allied health professionals would further promote a holistic and coordinated approach.

vi.Dispute resolution mechanisms and ethics committees.
Conflicts may arise in situations where there is ambiguity in the content of an AMD, disagreement among family members, or differing clinical judgments regarding its applicability. To address such challenges, institutional mechanisms for dispute resolution should be established. Hospital-based ethics committees, for instance, can provide a structured forum for deliberation and mediation, drawing on multidisciplinary expertise. In more complex or contentious cases, specialised tribunals or external review bodies could be considered. These mechanisms would help ensure that decisions are made transparently, fairly, and in accordance with both ethical principles and patient preferences, thereby reducing the likelihood of protracted disputes or litigation.

vii.Periodic review and revision of AMDs.
Finally, it is important to recognise that patient preferences are not static and may evolve over time in response to changes in health status, personal values, or medical advancements. Accordingly, AMDs should not be treated as one-time documents but as dynamic instruments subject to periodic review and revision. Healthcare systems should encourage patients to revisit their directives at regular intervals or upon significant life or health events. This could be facilitated through reminders during clinical encounters or through digital health platforms. Ensuring that AMDs remain current and reflective of patients' wishes enhances their relevance and reliability in guiding clinical decision-making.

In sum, the effective implementation of AMDs in Malaysia requires a multifaceted approach that integrates legal reform, professional regulation, healthcare practice, and public engagement. By addressing these areas collectively, it is possible to create a robust framework that genuinely upholds patient autonomy while supporting clinicians in delivering ethically and legally sound care.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, an Advance Medical Directive represents a powerful ethical and legal tool to extend autonomy beyond decision-making capacity. Yet their practical efficacy depends on clarity in drafting, awareness and access, clinician willingness, and legal backing.

By referring to other countries, the Advance Medical Directive can be seen as unique. In Malaysia, where the legal infrastructure remains underdeveloped, AMDs currently operate largely through ethical codes and nascent clinical guidelines. To fulfil their promise of preserving self-determination, a more robust framework combining legislation, professional standards, education, and infrastructure is required. With such reforms, AMDs could become a more dependable safeguard, ensuring that, even when patients are unable to speak, their prior voice continues to guide care.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge the Research University Fund, i.e., Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, for funding under the Geran Universiti Penyelidikan (GUP) i.e., GUP-2023-082. Further, the Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE), Malaysia, for funding under the Fundamental Research Grant Scheme (FRGS), i.e., FRGS/1/2023/SSI12/UKM/02/2.

REFERENCES:

1. Abdul Halim, M.A.; Hassan, M.S.; Ali, H.M.; Zahir, M.Z.M.; Murjiyanto, R. (2023). Meat Cartels and Their Manipulation of Halal Certification in Malaysia (Kartel Daging dan Manipulasi Pensijilan Halal di Malaysia). IIUM Law Journal Open source preview. 31(S1), pp. 167–188.
2. Advance Directives for Medical Treatment: The Current Legal Status (2017).
3. Advance Medical Directive Act 1996 (Cap. 4A) (Singapore).
4. Aintree University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust v James, [2013] UKSC 67.
5. Azmi, R.; Azmy, A.S.; Zahir, M.Z.M.; Al-Dulaimi, A.H.A. (2023). Veto Power: A Legal Debate in the United Nations Security Council. Geopolitics Quarterly Open source preview. 19 (special issue), pp. 37–58.
6. Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (2019). Principles of biomedical ethics (8th ed.). Oxford University Press.
7. Brazier, M., & Cave, E. (2016). Medicine, patients and the law (6th ed.). Manchester University Press.
8. Chin, J. J., Phua, K. H., & Koh, G. C. H. (2017). Advance care planning in Singapore: Where are we now? Annals of the Academy of Medicine Singapore, 46(7), 240–243.
9. Considerations for Introducing Legislation on Advance Decisions in Malaysia. (2020). PMC / NCBI.
10. Cruzan v. Director, Missouri Department of Health, 497 U.S. 261 (1990).
11. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2013). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. Springer Science & Business Media.
12. Dworkin, G. (1988). The theory and practice of autonomy. Cambridge University Press.
13. End-of-life decisions in Malaysia: Adequacies of Ethical Codes and Developing Legal Standards. (2017).
14. Fan, R. (1997). Self-determination vs. family-determination: Two incommensurable principles of autonomy. Bioethics, 11(3–4), 309–322.
15. Gillon, R. (1994). Advance directives. Journal of Medical Ethics, 20(3), 131–133.
16. Gillon, R. (2003). Ethics needs principles, Four can encompass the rest and respect for autonomy should be “first among equals.” Journal of Medical Ethics, 29(5), 307–312.
17. Gostin, L. O. (2014). Public health law: Power, duty, restraint (2nd ed.). University of California Press.
18. Hooper, S., et al. (2020). Improving Medical-Legal Advance Care Planning.
19. Kant, I. (1993). Grounding for the metaphysics of morals (J. W. Ellington, Trans.). Hackett Publishing. (Original work published 1785).
20. Krippendorff, K. (2004). Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology (2nd Ed.). California and London: SAGE.
21. Law & Practice of Advance Directives and End-of-Life Care in Malaysia. (2023). Cambridge University Press.
22. Mackenzie, C., & Stoljar, N. (Eds.). (2000). Relational autonomy: Feminist perspectives on autonomy, agency, and the social self. Oxford University Press.
23. Malaysian Medical Council. (2019). Code of professional conduct. MMC.
24. Malaysian Medical Council. (2025). Consent for treatment of patients by registered medical practitioners, Version 3/2025.
25. Malaysian Ministry of Health. (2024). A Guide for Healthcare Practitioners in Malaysia: Advance Care Planning.
26. Mental Capacity Act 2005 (c. 9) (UK).
27. Mill, J. S. (2001). On liberty. Batoche Books. (Original work published 1859).
28. Mohd Zamre Mohd Zahir; Noor, T.; Zainudin, A.T.; Rajamanickam, R.; Azam, A.; Shariff, M.; Rahman, Z.A.; Ishak, M.K.; Sulaiman, S. (2021). Prospect and Legal Challenges of Medical Tourism in Relation to the Advance Medical Directive (AMD) in Malaysia. Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities. 29, 17-28. DOI: https://doi.org/10.47836/pjssh.29.S2.02.
29. Mohd Zamre Mohd Zahir; Zainudin, T.N.A.T.; Rajamanickam, R.; Rahman, Z.A. (2019). Arahan Do Not Resuscitate (DNR) Dalam Sektor Kesihatan Dari Perspektif Undang-Undang (Do Not Resuscitate (DNR) Order in Health Sector from the Legal Perspective) Semantic Scholar. Akademika. 89, 143-154.
30. Nurul Hidayat Ab Rahman; Mohd Zahir, M.Z. & Althabhawi, N.M. (2023). Repercussions of COVID’19 Lockdown on Implementation of Children’s Rights to Education. Children. 10, 474. https://doi.org/10.3390/children10030474.
31. Nurul Hidayat Ab Rahman; Salawati Mat Basir & Mohd Zamre Mohd Zahir. (2022). Discrimination of Street Children’s Rights to Development and Sustainable Development Goals 2030 (SDG 2030). Res Militaris. 12 (2) 7041-7056.
32. Rahman, N.H.A.; Basir, S.M.; Zahir, M.Z.M. (2022). Discrimination of Street Children’s Rights to Development and

Sustainable Development Goals 2030 (SDG 2030). Res Militaris Open source preview. 12(2), pp. 7041–7056.
33. Ramalinggam Rajamanickam; Na'aim, M.S.M.; Zainudin, T.N.A.T.; Rahman, Z.A.; Zahir, M.Z.M.; Hatta, M. (2019). The Assessment of Expert Evidence on DNA in Malaysia. Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies (SCIENDO) 8, 51-57. Doi: 10.2478/ajis-2019-0016.
34. Regulating advance decision-making: potential and challenges. (2021). PMC / NCBI.
35. Rietjens, J. A. J., van der Heide, A., Onwuteaka-Philipsen, B. D., van der Maas, P. J., & van der Wal, G. (2009). Physician-assisted death: A comparison of attitudes and practices. Journal of Medical Ethics, 35(7), 436–442.
36. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2024). Self-determination theory. In Encyclopedia of quality of life and well-being research (pp. 6229-6235). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
37. Sabatino, C. P. (2010). The Evolution of Health Care Advance Planning Law and Policy.
38. Sedini, C., et al. (2021). Advance care planning and advance directives: A review.