

ECONOSCITECH INTEGRATION

ISSUE
7

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC
ELECTRONIC JOURNAL



**TASHKENT STATE
UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS**



**American University
of Technology**

Powered by Arizona State University®

ISSN: 3060-5075



Acceptance of articles

PUBLISHED EVERY MONTHLY



ARTICLE CONTRIBUTORS

**PROFESSORS-TEACHERS, SPECIALISTS
AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCHERS.**



Google
Scholar

**Academic
Resource
Index**
ResearchBib

BASE

OpenAIRE

doi
Digital
Object
Identifier

OPEN ACCESS

CONTACT:



+998 94 3540880



<https://econoscitech-integration-journal.uz>



2026

**EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:**

Zufarova Nozima Gulamiddinovna
DSc., Dean of Tourism Faculty, TSUE

DEPUTY EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:

Makhmudov Nosir Makhmudovich
DSc., Prof., Academician

DEPUTY EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:

Suyunov Dilmurod Xolmurodovich
Doctor of Economics (DSc), Professor,

DEPUTY EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:

Allayarov Shamsiddin Amanullayevich
doctor of economics (DSc), professor

RESPONSIBLE SECRETARY:

Otaboyev Axmed Maxsudbek o'g'li
TSUE independent researcher

THE SCIENTIFIC-POPULAR
ELECTRONIC JOURNAL
"ECONOSCITECH-INTEGRATION"
HAS BEEN REGISTERED UNDER
THE NUMBER C-5669651 BY THE
AGENCY FOR INFORMATION AND
MASS COMMUNICATIONS (AOKA)
OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN,
EFFECTIVE FROM OCTOBER 9, 2024.

In accordance with Resolution No. 384/6 dated April 10, 2026, issued by the Presidium of the Supreme Attestation Commission under the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Innovation of the Republic of Uzbekistan, this journal is included in the list of recommended international scientific publications for publishing the primary research findings of doctoral dissertations in the field of Economic Sciences.

Partners: Tashkent State University of Economics / American University of Technology in Tashkent (AUT)

Electronic publication. Issue 7. 374 pages.
Approved for publication in July 2026.

Editorial Board Members:

Sharipov Kongratbay Avezimbetovich,
Doctor of Technical Sciences (DSc), Professor



Teshabayev To'liqin Zakirovich,
Doctor of Economic Sciences (DSc), Professor



Said Irandoust,
Doctor of Chemical Engineering Sciences,
Professor



Abdurakhmanova Gulnora Kalandarovna,
Doctor of Economic Sciences (DSc), Professor



Khudoykulov Sadirdin Karimovich,
Doctor of Economics, (DSc), Professor



Tokunaga Masahiro,
professor, PhD of Economics of the Faculty of
Business and Commerce



Debasis Das,
professor Department of Computer Science



Nitin Goje,
professor and Program Lead - Computer Science



Nargizakhon Shamshieva
Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor



Rakhmonov Norim Razzakovich,
Doctor of Economic Sciences (DSc), Professor

Bayxonov Bahodirjon Tursunbayevich
Doctor of Science (DSc), Professor



Shomurodov Ravshan Tursunkulovich,
PhD, Associate Professor



Boymuratov Abduraxmat Djumayevich
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Economics



Sharopova Nafosat Radjabovna
DSc, Associate Professor



Sultanova Kamila Mukhtorali Kizi
Master of Science

CONTENTS

RECONCEPTUALIZING HIGHER EDUCATION MARKETING IN THE ALGORITHMIC ERA: INSTITUTIONAL GENERATIVE AI AND MULTIDIMENSIONAL UNIVERSITY BRAND EQUITY	10
Nozima Zufarova	
DEVELOPMENT OF WAREHOUSE AND INVENTORY MANAGEMENT IN MANUFACTURING ENTERPRISES	16
Maxmidov Shirinboy Botirovich	
IMPROVING THE MECHANISM FOR ENHANCING THE POTENTIAL OF OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY ENTERPRISES IN UZBEKISTAN	25
Bekmuhamedova Malika Iskandarbekovna	
IMPROVING THE METHODOLOGY OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE-BASED MARKETING DECISION-MAKING IN CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS MANUFACTURING ENTERPRISES	30
Uzakova Umida Ruzievna	
ORGANIZATIONAL AND ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF DIGITAL SERVICES IN THE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM	37
Berdiev Sunnatullo Alikulovich	
GLOBAL JUSTICE CODE AND GLOBAL JUSTICE INDEX: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR GLOBAL GOVERNANCE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	43
Alimov Nasimjon Hoshimovich	

GLOBAL JUSTICE CODE AND GLOBAL JUSTICE INDEX: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR GLOBAL GOVERNANCE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT



Alimov Nasimjon Hoshimovich
Head of the Center for Applied Projects and Political Education,
O'zLiDeP
Candidate of Economic Sciences, Associate Professor
Email: nasimjon1@mail.ru
Tel.: +998 90 175 67 01

Abstract. This article develops a conceptual framework for the Global Justice Code and proposes a methodology for constructing the Global Justice Index (GJI), aimed at assessing justice across economic, social, environmental, and institutional dimensions. The study is motivated by growing global inequalities, geopolitical tensions, climate challenges, and imbalances in resource distribution. Using comparative analysis, institutional economics, social justice theory, and composite index methodology, the research develops a multidimensional model of global justice. The proposed index integrates indicators of economic justice, social justice, environmental justice, and institutional justice. The article argues that existing international indices do not provide a comprehensive assessment of justice and proposes a new framework that can serve as a global governance instrument under the auspices of the United Nations. The study contributes to the development of global justice theory and offers practical recommendations for establishing a Global Justice Council and publishing annual Global Justice Reports.

Keywords: global justice, Global Justice Code, Global Justice Index, sustainable development, institutional economics, global governance, economic justice, social justice, environmental justice, rule of law, composite index, United Nations.

Аннотация. В статье разработана концептуальная основа Глобального кодекса справедливости и предложена методология построения Глобального индекса справедливости (ГИС), направленного на оценку справедливости в экономическом, социальном, экологическом и институциональном измерениях. Актуальность исследования обусловлена ростом глобального неравенства, геополитической напряженности, климатическими вызовами и дисбалансом в распределении ресурсов. С использованием сравнительного анализа, институциональной экономики, теории социальной справедливости и методологии составного индекса разработана многомерная модель глобальной справедливости. Предложенный индекс объединяет показатели экономической, социальной, экологической и институциональной справедливости. В исследовании обосновывается, что существующие международные индексы не обеспечивают всесторонней оценки справедливости, и предлагается новая концептуальная основа, которая может служить инструментом глобального управления под эгидой Организации Объединенных Наций. Исследование вносит вклад в развитие теории глобальной справедливости и предлагает практические рекомендации по созданию Глобального совета по справедливости и подготовке ежегодных докладов о глобальной справедливости.

Ключевые слова: глобальная справедливость, Глобальный кодекс справедливости, Глобальный индекс справедливости, устойчивое развитие, институциональная экономика, глобальное управление, экономическая справедливость, социальная справедливость, экологическая справедливость, верховенство права, составной индекс, Организация Объединенных Наций.

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary world is experiencing an unprecedented combination of economic globalization, rapid technological innovation, digital transformation, climate change, geopolitical conflicts, and increasing social polarization. While globalization has substantially expanded international trade, investment flows, and technological progress, its benefits have been distributed unevenly among countries and social groups. Consequently, global inequality has become one of the most pressing challenges confronting humanity in the twenty-first century.

According to the *World Inequality Report 2024*, the richest 10 percent of the global population currently own approximately three-quarters of total private wealth, whereas nearly half of the world's population possesses less than two percent of global assets [1]. Similarly, the *United Nations Sustainable Development Goals Report 2024* indicates that despite considerable progress in reducing extreme poverty over previous decades, multiple dimensions of inequality, including income disparities, unequal access to education and healthcare, environmental degradation, digital exclusion, and institutional weaknesses, continue to hinder sustainable development worldwide [2].

Recent geopolitical tensions, military conflicts, food insecurity, climate emergencies, migration crises, and the rapid diffusion of artificial intelligence have further demonstrated that justice can no longer be regarded exclusively as a domestic political or legal issue. Instead, justice has become a global public good requiring coordinated international governance mechanisms capable of balancing economic efficiency, social inclusion, environmental sustainability, and institutional accountability.

Although numerous international organizations publish global rankings, including the Human Development Index (HDI), Sustainable Development Goals Index (SDGI), Rule of Law Index (WJP), Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI), and Global Peace Index (GPI), each of these indicators evaluates only a specific dimension of development. None provides an integrated quantitative assessment of global justice encompassing economic, social, environmental, institutional, and intergenerational dimensions simultaneously [3–7]. Consequently, policymakers lack a comprehensive analytical instrument for evaluating justice across countries and monitoring progress toward equitable and sustainable development.

Theoretical discussions concerning justice have evolved significantly from Aristotle's distributive justice to Rawls' theory of justice as fairness, Sen's capability approach, and contemporary institutional economics. Nevertheless, existing theoretical frameworks rarely provide operational instruments that integrate normative principles with measurable indicators suitable for international comparative analysis [8–11]. This methodological gap motivates the development of a comprehensive framework capable of translating justice theory into practical policy assessment.

The present study addresses this gap by proposing two complementary innovations: first, the Global Justice Code (GJC), serving as a universal normative framework based on fundamental principles of justice; and second, the Global Justice Index (GJI), designed as a multidimensional composite indicator for evaluating justice across countries. Together, these instruments establish an integrated architecture for measuring, monitoring, and promoting global justice.

The object of the research is the system of global socio-economic relations and international governance institutions that influence the distribution of opportunities, resources, and development outcomes.

The subject of the research comprises the institutional, economic, social, environmental, and governance mechanisms determining global justice and their quantitative assessment through a multidimensional composite index.

The aim of the study is to develop a conceptual and methodological framework for implementing the Global Justice Code and constructing the Global Justice Index, capable of measuring justice comprehensively at the international level.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Evolution of Justice Theory. The concept of justice has occupied a central place in philosophy, political science, and economics for more than two millennia. Classical philosophical traditions regarded justice primarily as a moral virtue regulating relationships between individuals and society. Aristotle defined justice as the highest political virtue and distinguished between distributive justice and corrective justice, emphasizing proportional equality in the allocation of social goods and responsibilities. His approach established the philosophical foundation for subsequent theories of distributive justice.

Modern theories of justice have been profoundly influenced by John Rawls, whose work *A Theory of Justice* introduced the concept of "justice as fairness." Rawls proposed two fundamental principles: equal basic liberties for all individuals and the Difference Principle, according to which social and economic inequalities are

acceptable only if they benefit the least advantaged members of society. Rawls' framework remains one of the most influential normative models for evaluating social institutions.

While Rawls focused primarily on distributive fairness, Robert Nozick defended a libertarian perspective that emphasized individual liberty, voluntary exchange, and strong protection of private property rights. According to Nozick, justice depends on legitimate acquisition and voluntary transfer rather than equal outcomes [12]. This perspective significantly influenced contemporary discussions on market institutions and economic freedom.

A further development of justice theory emerged through the Capability Approach developed by Amartya Sen and expanded by Martha Nussbaum. Sen argued that justice should be evaluated according to individuals' real opportunities, or capabilities, to achieve valuable functionings rather than solely by resource distribution. Nussbaum further developed a comprehensive list of central human capabilities, linking justice directly with human development and quality of life [13].

Overall, contemporary justice theory has gradually evolved from normative philosophical discussions toward multidisciplinary approaches integrating economics, institutional analysis, human development, governance, and sustainability.

Contemporary Approaches to Global Justice. The acceleration of globalization has substantially broadened the scope of justice beyond national boundaries. Contemporary scholars increasingly argue that globalization has created new forms of inequality requiring supranational institutions and global governance mechanisms.

Thomas Pogge argues that affluent countries and international institutions bear moral responsibility for global poverty because existing global economic arrangements systematically disadvantage developing countries [14]. His institutional perspective shifts attention from charitable assistance toward structural reforms of international governance.

Similarly, Joseph Stiglitz emphasizes that unequal globalization results largely from imperfect international institutions, market failures, and asymmetrical bargaining power. According to Stiglitz, improving global governance requires more transparent, inclusive, and accountable international economic institutions [15].

Thomas Piketty empirically demonstrates that wealth concentration has increased dramatically in recent decades. His analysis highlights the importance of progressive taxation, international fiscal cooperation, and institutional reforms for reducing inequality [16].

Jeffrey Sachs links justice with sustainable development, arguing that economic prosperity, environmental protection, and social inclusion should be pursued simultaneously through integrated public policies [17].

Institutional economists such as Douglass North and Daron Acemoglu further demonstrate that inclusive institutions constitute one of the primary determinants of long-term economic development, political stability, and social justice [18]. Their work indicates that institutional quality should be considered an essential dimension of any comprehensive justice assessment.

More recently, growing attention has been devoted to environmental justice, climate justice, digital justice, algorithmic fairness, and intergenerational justice. Reports published by the United Nations, OECD, World Bank, and UNDP increasingly recognize that sustainable development cannot be achieved without reducing multidimensional inequalities across economic, social, environmental, technological, and institutional domains [19–21].

Consequently, contemporary literature increasingly views justice as a multidimensional concept requiring integrated measurement rather than the isolated evaluation of individual sectors.

Existing International Indices and Research Gap. Numerous international organizations have developed composite indices for assessing particular aspects of development and governance. The Human Development Index (HDI) measures achievements in health, education, and income, while the Sustainable Development Goals Index evaluates countries' progress toward achieving the 17 SDGs. Other widely used indicators include the Rule of Law Index, Corruption Perceptions Index, Environmental Performance Index, Global Peace Index, and Worldwide Governance Indicators [22–23].

Although these indices provide valuable analytical information, each focuses primarily on a limited set of indicators. None simultaneously evaluates distributive justice, institutional accountability, environmental sustainability, equal opportunities, digital inclusion, intergenerational equity, and governance quality within a unified conceptual framework.

The comparative analysis reveals a significant methodological gap in contemporary literature. Existing international indices evaluate development, governance, or sustainability separately, but none offers an integrated framework capable of measuring global justice as a multidimensional institutional phenomenon.

The present research addresses this gap by introducing an original conceptual architecture composed of five mutually reinforcing components:

Global Justice Code — a universal normative framework based on fundamental principles of justice;

Global Justice Index (GJI) — a multidimensional composite indicator measuring justice across economic, social, environmental, and institutional dimensions;

Global Justice Observatory — a permanent international analytical platform responsible for monitoring global justice trends;

Global Justice Council — a proposed institutional mechanism operating under the auspices of the United Nations to coordinate international cooperation on justice-related issues;

Global Justice Strategy — 2030 — a long-term strategic framework designed to integrate justice principles into sustainable global development policies.

Unlike previous studies that primarily focus on individual dimensions of justice, this research proposes a unified theoretical and methodological framework connecting normative principles, institutional governance, quantitative measurement, and policy implementation. In this respect, the proposed framework represents an original contribution to the emerging field of global justice studies and offers a practical foundation for evidence-based international policymaking.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employs a comprehensive qualitative and comparative research methodology aimed at developing a conceptual framework for the Global Justice Code (GJC) and constructing the Global Justice Index (GJI). Since global justice is a multidimensional concept encompassing economic, social, environmental, and institutional dimensions, the research applies an interdisciplinary approach that integrates theories of justice, institutional economics, sustainable development, and composite indicator methodology.

The study primarily uses comparative analysis to examine existing international indices, including the Human Development Index (HDI), Sustainable Development Goals Index (SDGI), Rule of Law Index (WJP), Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI), Environmental Performance Index (EPI), and Global Peace Index (GPI). These indices are compared in terms of their conceptual scope, indicator systems, and ability to measure different aspects of justice.

In addition, systems analysis is employed to identify the interrelationships among economic, social, environmental, and institutional justice. This approach enables the construction of an integrated framework that reflects the multidimensional nature of justice rather than considering each component separately.

The research also applies institutional analysis to evaluate the role of international organizations, governance mechanisms, legal norms, and public institutions in promoting global justice. Particular attention is paid to the institutional responsibilities of the United Nations and other international organizations in establishing universal principles of justice.

To construct the proposed Global Justice Index, the study follows the widely accepted methodology for composite indicators. First, four major dimensions of justice are identified:

- Economic justice;
- Social justice;
- Environmental justice;
- Institutional justice.

Each dimension consists of several measurable indicators commonly published by international organizations such as the United Nations, the World Bank, the OECD, Transparency International, and the World Justice Project.

For simplicity and transparency, the Global Justice Index is calculated as the arithmetic mean of the four dimensions:

GJI

where:

GJI – Global justice index

EJ – Economic justice score

SJ – Social justice score

ENVJ – Environmental justice score

IJ – Institutional justice score.

In practical applications, each dimension may include several normalized indicators measured on a scale from 0 to 100, allowing direct comparison among countries.

The methodological approach adopted in this study provides a transparent, flexible, and reproducible framework that may be further expanded through additional indicators, weighting procedures, or econometric validation in future research.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Conceptual Structure of the Global Justice Code. The analysis demonstrates that existing international legal documents contain numerous justice-related principles. However, these principles remain fragmented

across various declarations, conventions, treaties, and policy documents. As a result, there is currently no comprehensive normative framework that integrates all major dimensions of global justice.

To address this gap, the study proposes the Global Justice Code as a universal conceptual framework consisting of ten fundamental principles (Table 1).

Table 1. Fundamental principles of the Global justice code¹

Principle	Main objective	Main criteria
Human dignity	Protection of fundamental human rights	Human rights, personal freedom
Equality of opportunities	Equal access to education, healthcare and employment	Equal opportunities, non-discrimination
Economic justice	Fair distribution of income and resources	Poverty reduction, income equality
Social justice	Social inclusion and welfare	Social protection, access to public services
Environmental justice	Sustainable use of natural resources	Climate protection, environmental sustainability
Institutional accountability	Transparent and responsible governance	Rule of law, anti-corruption
Digital justice	Equal digital opportunities	Digital inclusion, AI fairness
Intergenerational justice	Protection of future generations	Sustainable development, resource conservation
Peace and security	Prevention of conflicts	International cooperation, peace
Global solidarity	Shared responsibility for global development	International partnership, mutual assistance

The proposed Code integrates existing international legal principles into a unified conceptual system capable of guiding global governance and sustainable development policies.

Structure of the Global justice index. Based on the proposed conceptual framework, the Global justice index consists of four major dimensions (Table 2).

Table 2. Structure of the Global justice index²

Dimension	Weight	Examples of indicators
Economic Justice	25%	Income inequality, poverty, unemployment, income distribution
Social Justice	25%	Education, healthcare, gender equality, social protection
Environmental Justice	25%	CO ₂ emissions, renewable energy, ecological sustainability
Institutional Justice	25%	Rule of law, corruption control, government effectiveness

The equal weighting approach is adopted in the present study because each dimension represents an essential component of global justice. Future studies may refine these weights using expert evaluation or statistical techniques.

Proposed Global justice index model. The proposed Global justice index provides a comprehensive measure of justice by integrating four complementary dimensions into a single composite indicator (Table 3).

¹ author's development

² author's development

Table 3. Illustrative calculation of the Global justice index³

Component	Score
Economic justice	78
Social justice	82
Environmental justice	70
Institutional justice	75

Accordingly, the country would be classified as:

90–100 = Very high justice

75–89 = High justice

60–74 = Moderate justice

Below 60 = Low justice

The proposed Global **justice index** differs from existing international indices in several important respects.

First, it integrates economic, social, environmental, and institutional dimensions into a single analytical framework.

Second, it combines normative principles with measurable indicators, thereby connecting justice theory with practical policy evaluation.

Third, the proposed framework may serve not only as a comparative ranking tool but also as an institutional mechanism for monitoring progress toward sustainable and equitable development.

Finally, the study argues that the establishment of a **Global justice Observatory** and an annual **Global justice Report** under the auspices of the United Nations would significantly strengthen international efforts to monitor global inequalities, evaluate policy effectiveness, and promote evidence-based global governance.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of this study demonstrate that justice has evolved beyond a purely philosophical or ethical concept into a multidimensional determinant of sustainable development, institutional quality, and global stability. Contemporary global challenges, including widening income inequality, environmental degradation, geopolitical conflicts, digital transformation, and institutional fragmentation, require a comprehensive framework capable of integrating normative principles with practical policy instruments.

The analysis of existing international indices reveals that current measurement systems assess only separate dimensions of development, such as human development, governance, environmental sustainability, or peace. None of these frameworks provides a comprehensive evaluation of global justice by simultaneously incorporating economic, social, environmental, and institutional dimensions. This methodological gap limits the ability of policymakers and international organizations to monitor justice comprehensively and design balanced development strategies.

To address this limitation, the study proposes an original conceptual framework consisting of two complementary instruments: the Global Justice Code (GJC) and the Global Justice Index (GJI).

The Global Justice Code establishes ten fundamental principles that may serve as universal normative standards for promoting justice in international relations and sustainable development. These principles integrate human dignity, equal opportunities, economic justice, social justice, environmental responsibility, institutional accountability, digital justice, intergenerational justice, peace and security, and global solidarity into a coherent governance framework.

The proposed Global Justice Index provides a multidimensional methodology for measuring justice through four interrelated components: economic justice, social justice, environmental justice, and institutional justice. The index offers a transparent and adaptable analytical instrument that can be applied to compare countries, monitor development trends, and evaluate public policies.

The study contributes to the literature in several important ways. First, it broadens the theoretical understanding of global justice by integrating philosophical, economic, institutional, and sustainability perspectives. Second, it introduces an original methodology for measuring justice through a composite index. Third, it establishes a conceptual linkage between normative principles and institutional implementation, thereby facilitating evidence-based policymaking. Finally, it proposes an institutional architecture capable of supporting more effective global governance under the framework of the United Nations.

³ author's development

Overall, the research argues that global justice should be regarded not merely as an ethical aspiration but as a measurable strategic objective essential for achieving inclusive growth, sustainable development, and long-term international stability.

Based on the research findings, the following policy recommendations are proposed.

At the international level:

The United Nations may consider initiating discussions on the development of the Global Justice Code as a voluntary international normative framework complementing existing human rights and sustainable development instruments.

The Global Justice Index may be introduced as an analytical tool for assessing countries' performance in promoting equitable, inclusive, and sustainable development.

The publication of an annual Global Justice Report could enhance transparency, facilitate international benchmarking, and strengthen accountability in implementing justice-oriented development policies.

The establishment of a Global Justice Observatory under the auspices of an appropriate international organization could provide continuous monitoring, comparative analysis, and evidence-based policy recommendations regarding global justice trends.

At the national level:

Governments should integrate justice-related indicators into national development strategies, ensuring that economic growth is accompanied by social inclusion, environmental sustainability, and institutional effectiveness.

Public policy evaluation should incorporate multidimensional justice indicators alongside traditional macroeconomic performance measures.

Digital transformation strategies should promote equal access to digital infrastructure, transparent governance, protection of personal data, and the ethical application of artificial intelligence.

Public investment policies should pursue a balanced distribution of economic opportunities while strengthening institutional accountability and reducing regional disparities.

The proposed framework demonstrates that justice should become one of the central pillars of twenty-first-century global governance. By integrating normative values with measurable indicators and institutional mechanisms, the Global Justice Code and Global Justice Index offer a practical foundation for promoting inclusive development, reducing multidimensional inequalities, and strengthening international cooperation in pursuit of a more equitable and sustainable world.

REFERENCES

1. Acemoglu D., Robinson J.A. *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty*. – New York: Crown Publishers, 2012.
2. Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
3. Global Peace Index 2024: Measuring Peace in a Complex World. – Sydney: Institute for Economics and Peace, 2024.
4. Human Development Report 2023/2024. – New York: United Nations Development Programme, 2024.
5. North D.C. *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
6. Nozick R. *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. – New York: Basic Books, 1974.
7. Nussbaum M. *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*. – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011.
8. OECD. *Society at a Glance 2024: OECD Social Indicators*. – Paris: OECD Publishing, 2024.
9. Piketty T. *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.
10. Pogge T. *World Poverty and Human Rights*. – Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008.
11. Rawls J. *A Theory of Justice*. – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.
12. Rule of Law Index 2024. – Washington, D.C.: World Justice Project, 2024.
13. Sachs J. *The Age of Sustainable Development*. – New York: Columbia University Press, 2015.
14. Sen A. *The Idea of Justice*. – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.
15. Stiglitz J. *The Price of Inequality*. – New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2012.
16. Sustainable Development Report 2024. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2024.
17. Transparency International. *Corruption Perceptions Index 2024*. – Berlin: Transparency International, 2025.
18. United Nations. *The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2024*. – New York: United Nations, 2024.
19. World Bank. *World Development Report 2024*. – Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 2024.
20. World Economic Forum. *Global Risks Report 2025*. – Geneva: World Economic Forum, 2025.
21. World Inequality Lab. *World Inequality Report 2024*. – Paris: World Inequality Lab, 2024.

Proofreader: Xondamir Ismoilov
Layout and Designer: Hasan Maqsudov

2026. № 7

© When materials are reproduced, the ECONOSCITECH-INTEGRATION journal must be cited as the source. Authors are responsible for the accuracy of the information in materials and advertisements published in the journal. Editorial opinions may not always align with those of the authors. Submitted materials will not be returned to the editorial office.

To publish articles in this journal, you may submit articles, advertisements, stories, and other creative materials through the following links. Materials and advertisements are published on a paid basis.

You may subscribe to the journal at any time using the following details. Once subscribed, please send a screenshot or photo of your payment confirmation to our Telegram page @iqtisodiyot_77. Based on this, we will send the latest issue of the journal to your address each month.

Our address: Tashkent city, Yunusobod district, 19th block, House 17.

