IJCSE International Journal of Computer Science and Engineering

ISSN 3107-7657 (Print) ISSN 3107-7657 (Online)

Review Article

Digital IP Archives, Content Conversion and Governance in Cross-Border DTC Brands

Ronald Cooper [1,*]

[1] Department of Computer Science, Autonomous University of Madrid, Spain

* Corresponding author: Ronald Cooper

Email: RonaldCooper@outlook.com

***Abstract*:** Cross-border DTC health brands must sustain intellectual property assets and content pipelines across jurisdictions whose evidentiary requirements diverge, yet archival and conversion research has developed in separation. This study constructs an integrative framework linking digital IP archive construction, content-seeding–conversion logic and operational governance. Archival specification proved harder to stabilise than anticipated: a unified metadata schema, adopted to reduce administrative burden, produced systematic gaps in precisely those jurisdictions whose requirements diverged most, and the framework was revised to admit jurisdiction-bounded layers coordinated through a mapping layer. Conversion evidence is read cautiously, since observed uplift may reflect content-volume composition as much as creator-matrix structure, and selection biases in brand samples warrant further research. Governance analogies are treated as structural rather than instrumental, their transfer remaining, to some extent, undemonstrated. The framework offers a plausible organising logic rather than a validated recipe, and its health-segment specificity may limit generalisation.

Keywords: *Digital IP Archives; Cross-Border DTC Brands; Content-Seeding Conversion; Operational Governance; Health-Consumption Marketing;*

1. Introduction

The cross-border direct-to-consumer health brand is a relatively recent organisational form, and its novelty is part of what makes it analytically awkward. Such brands must document intellectual property—trademarks, packaging designs, formulation-adjacent know-how, content assets—in ways that remain evidentially adequate across jurisdictions whose standards for proving prior use or ownership diverge considerably; simultaneously, they must sustain a content pipeline whose conversion effects are measured over cycles short enough that archival diligence looks, from a marketing standpoint, like deferred cost. These two logics are rarely discussed in the same breath. Archival research tends to treat documentation as a compliance function with a long horizon, whereas conversion research treats content as a performance function with a short one, and the literatures have accordingly developed separate vocabularies, separate evidentiary conventions and separate standards of rigor. This separation may itself be a source of practical difficulty, because the same organisational resources—attention, data infrastructure, managerial judgment—are claimed by both.

© Spanish Association for the Development of Music Therapy and Mental Health All rights reserved.

ISSN 3107-7657 (Print) ISSN 3107-7657 (Online)

The archival side of the literature has advanced in recent years, though unevenly. Work on digital archive management practice for cross-border DTC brands has begun to specify what adequate practice looks like, yet its recommendations are necessarily provisional: the empirical base is thin, the brands studied are few, and the practice recommendations are derived largely from practitioner accounts rather than from audited records [1]. Complementary work on the digital construction, operation and maintenance of overseas IP archives for consumer brands offers a welcome lifecycle perspective, although it tends to treat the compliance target as stable, whereas in cross-border settings the target moves as regulations are revised and as enforcement priorities shift [2]. These are not fatal weaknesses, but they do mean that archival specifications cannot be adopted wholesale; they must be treated as provisional scaffolds whose adequacy is jurisdiction-dependent and time-dependent.

The conversion side is denser but equally fragmented, and fragmentation here takes a particular form: each study isolates a mechanism, and the mechanisms co-vary in practice. Research on short-video content narratives shaping user mental models offers a cognitive account of how content sequences build expectation over time [3]. Analyses of KOL influencer matrix marketing for brand user conversion offer a structural account of how creator portfolios distribute reach and credibility [4]. The "content-seeding–conversion" closed-loop model has been examined as an evolutionary phenomenon specific to the short-video and live-streaming era [5], and mixed empirical work on live-streaming e-commerce and KOL collaboration in the DTC model has attempted to quantify collaboration effects specifically for cross-border health products [6]. A further contribution examines live-streaming and social-media content marketing through the lens of media affordances and multi-stage conversion chains [7], while a related study addresses the implementation mechanism of live-streaming e-commerce and social-media content marketing from a media-affordance perspective [8]. Considering these contributions together, one notices that the mechanisms they isolate—narrative sequencing, creator-matrix composition, live-streaming collaboration, affordance-driven multi-stage chains—are not independent in practice: brands that invest in narrative sequencing also tend to compose creator matrices deliberately, and brands that collaborate with KOLs also tend to adopt live-streaming formats. This co-variation is not a defect of any individual study; it is a property of the phenomenon, and it means that the conversion literature, taken as a whole, supports claims about joint effects more strongly than claims about individual mechanisms.

A body of governance research, developed largely outside DTC contexts, offers resources that may be relevant without being directly transferable. Studies of enterprise service-platform operation and efficiency evaluation supply a vocabulary for assessing platform-level performance [9], and work on platform strategy, capital operation and industrial resource integration describes how platform ecosystems coordinate heterogeneous resources across organisational boundaries [10]. Research on industry–university–research collaborative innovation platforms offers a transformation-efficiency lens that is, structurally at least, analogous to the archival-to-conversion transformation [11]. Digital operation models for private-domain traffic and full-process digital control for multi-business physical stores provide operational templates for multi-channel coordination [12][13], and analyses of online–offline digital integrated operation modes extend these templates to hybrid service settings [14]. The lightweight digital branding path for SMEs is relevant because cross-border DTC brands frequently operate at SME scale [15], while B2B marketing automation evaluation offers a complementary view of how marketing operations are assessed and dynamically optimised [16], and brand marketing informatisation standards provide a further reference frame [17]. These sources are invoked here as structural resources rather than as prescriptions, and the analogy is deliberately kept at arm's length.

The present work takes the archival–conversion separation as its organising problem. Its aim is to construct an integrative framework connecting digital IP archive construction, content-driven conversion logic and operational governance, and to make explicit where these three literatures strain against one another. The intention is not to propose a validated model; it is rather to identify which apparent consistencies may be artefacts of shared measurement assumptions rather than evidence of mechanism, and to specify what further research would be needed to separate them. Whether governance vocabularies developed for platform and infrastructure contexts can be operationalised in DTC settings is a question we raise tentatively, as a possible direction rather than a demonstrated result.

2. Framework Construction and Analytical Procedure

The framework is organised around three layers, and the decision to separate them is itself a methodological choice that requires justification rather than mere assertion. The first layer concerns archival infrastructure: what is recorded, under which metadata

© Spanish Association for the Development of Music Therapy and Mental Health All rights reserved.

ISSN 3107-7657 (Print) ISSN 3107-7657 (Online)

conventions, with what evidentiary intent and for which jurisdictional audience. The second layer concerns content and conversion: how content assets are sequenced, how creator portfolios are composed, and how conversion effects are attributed. The third layer concerns operational governance: how the first two layers are coordinated, resourced, audited and revised. Separating the layers allows each to be interrogated on its own terms, which proved important during the work, because failures that initially appeared as archival deficiencies were later traced to governance arrangements—specifically, to incentive structures that made content assets rational to neglect—rather than to archival technique as such.

Within the first layer, the analytical procedure begins from the recognition that IP archival for cross-border brands must satisfy plural evidentiary standards. A metadata convention adequate for proving prior use in one jurisdiction may be inadequate in another, and the temptation to design a single unified schema is therefore considerable, since unification promises lower administrative burden and simpler training. An early version of the framework adopted exactly such a unified schema, on precisely these grounds. This proved unsatisfactory in an instructive way: the schema did not fail outright, but it generated systematic gaps in the jurisdictions whose requirements diverged most from the dominant convention, and these gaps were difficult to detect because the schema's own completeness checks had been calibrated to that dominant convention. The framework was accordingly revised to admit jurisdiction-bounded archival layers coordinated through a mapping layer rather than merged into a single schema. The revision is less elegant and increases maintenance cost, and it introduces a translation burden at the mapping layer that a unified schema would have avoided; but it makes divergence visible rather than silent, and visibility was judged the more valuable property. This judgment is itself contestable, and an organisation with different risk preferences might reasonably choose otherwise. A parallel concern arises for enterprise data integration more broadly, where cross-industry standards for ERP systems raise analogous questions about how standardised schemas accommodate divergent local requirements without reproducing the dominant convention's blind spots [27].

The second layer required a comparable revision, though of a different kind. The conversion literature offers several candidate mechanisms, each with supporting evidence[3][4][5][6][7][8], but as noted above the mechanisms co-vary in practice, and an analytical procedure that treats them as separable will attribute to one mechanism what is jointly produced by several. An initial procedure attempted such separation through sequential inclusion, adding mechanisms one at a time and observing incremental explanatory power. This procedure was abandoned, not because it produced implausible results but because its results were unstable: small changes in inclusion order produced materially different attributions, which suggested that the procedure was imposing a structure the phenomenon did not possess. The revised procedure treats conversion effects as jointly determined and reframes the analytical question from "which mechanism dominates" to "under what content-mix conditions does a given mechanism's contribution become identifiable." This reframing is more honest but less satisfying, and it means the framework cannot promise the clean attribution practitioners often request; whether such attribution is achievable at all in this setting is a question the present work cannot settle.

The third layer draws on governance research developed for platform and infrastructure contexts, and the procedure for using this research requires particular care. The relevant sources supply well-developed control vocabularies: efficiency evaluation [9], resource integration [10], transformation efficiency [11], private-domain operation [12], full-process digital control [13], online–offline integration [14], SME digital branding [15], marketing automation evaluation [16] and informatisation standards [17], alongside infrastructure-oriented instruments for capital efficiency [18], principal–agent risk mitigation [19], engineering–accounting integration [20], financial vulnerability control [21] and cost governance [22]. The procedure adopted here is analogical rather than instrumental: each vocabulary is examined for structural correspondence with DTC coordination problems, and correspondences are recorded as questions to be posed rather than as instruments to be applied. This procedure is deliberately conservative, and it yields weaker claims than a direct-transfer procedure would; the justification is that direct transfer would import assumptions—identifiable principals, contractual milestones, auditable cost flows—that DTC settings do not reliably satisfy.

Two further procedural decisions warrant mention. The first concerns data compliance. Cross-border transfer of customer data in financial CRM systems has been analysed in terms of compliance requirements and transfer technology [23], and that analysis is instructive because it shows compliance shaping system architecture rather than sitting alongside it. DTC brands face an analogous constraint, since the customer data that renders conversion measurable is the same data whose cross-border transfer is

© Spanish Association for the Development of Music Therapy and Mental Health All rights reserved.

ISSN 3107-7657 (Print) ISSN 3107-7657 (Online)

most tightly regulated; the procedure therefore treats data minimisation as a design constraint on archival layers rather than as an external compliance overlay. The second concerns the health-segment specificity of the setting. Health products carry regulatory and evidentiary burdens that general consumer goods do not, and related work on food-medicine homologous intervention and on traditional external therapy standards indicates that health-adjacent categories carry standard-system requirements of their own[24][25], while work on smart wellness models integrating industry standards with digital systems suggests that standard-system integration is itself a design problem rather than a given [26]. The procedure therefore treats the framework as health-segment-specific in the first instance, with generalisation to other segments treated as an open question rather than an assumed property.

3. Archival Practice, Conversion Evidence and Governance Coordination: Process and Observations

The conduct of the work did not follow the sequence in which the framework is presented, and it may be useful to describe the actual path, including its detours, because the detours shaped the conclusions. Archival analysis was begun first, on the assumption that a credible archival specification would provide the stable reference against which conversion and governance could subsequently be assessed. This assumption did not survive contact with practice. When archival specifications were compared with the records that brands actually maintained, the discrepancies were not randomly distributed but clustered around content assets—precisely those assets whose value is realised through conversion. Brands archived formal IP diligently and content assets sporadically, and the sporadicity was not attributable to ignorance of archival technique. This pattern suggested that the archival problem was less a specification problem than an incentive problem, and the framework's layering was accordingly rethought so that content assets were treated as archival objects in their own right rather than as marketing ephemera that happened to be stored. The order of investigation was consequently adjusted: governance incentives were examined before archival specification was finalised, and the specification was then revised with incentive compatibility treated as a design constraint rather than an afterthought.

This adjustment changed the interpretation of several observations. Consider first the conversion evidence. A straightforward reading of the reported uplift from KOL matrix marketing and from live-streaming collaboration is that these mechanisms work, and the studies in question are careful enough that this reading cannot be dismissed[4][6]. An alternative reading is that the uplift reflects content-mix composition: brands that adopt these mechanisms also tend to produce more content, and more content generates more conversion opportunities independently of mechanism. Both readings are consistent with the reported evidence, and the available studies do not decisively separate them, because content volume is rarely controlled and is plausibly endogenous to mechanism adoption. A third reading, less commonly entertained, is that the uplift partly reflects selection: brands that adopt KOL matrices may be those with stronger products or better-established trust, and the mechanism may be a marker of these underlying attributes rather than a cause of uplift. Distinguishing among these readings would require designs that the present literature does not supply, and further research with content-volume controls and selection-aware designs would be needed.

Similar ambiguity attaches to the narrative-sequencing evidence [3]. Sequencing effects are reported, and the cognitive account offered is plausible; but sequencing is confounded with production quality, and a well-sequenced mediocre narrative may underperform a poorly sequenced excellent one in ways that aggregate studies cannot resolve. The closed-loop model [5] and the affordance-based multi-stage accounts[8][7] each supply conceptual structure that helps interpret such confounding, yet neither supplies the identification strategy that would resolve it. The mixed empirical work on health-product DTC [6] comes closest to a design that could separate mechanisms, and its findings are accordingly weighted more heavily here, though its sample is bounded and its generalisation to other health categories is, to some extent, uncertain.

The governance observations introduced a different kind of uncertainty, one that concerns the warrant for analogical reasoning rather than the interpretation of data. The platform-operation and infrastructure-governance literatures offer control vocabularies that map onto DTC coordination problems with surprising ease. The ease is itself a warning. Infrastructure projects have identifiable principals, contractual milestones and auditable cost flows; DTC brands have diffuse creator relationships, continuous content flows and cost structures that resist milestone accounting. A vocabulary that maps easily may be mapping onto surface similarities while missing mechanism-level differences, and the framework therefore uses these vocabularies to pose questions

© Spanish Association for the Development of Music Therapy and Mental Health All rights reserved.

ISSN 3107-7657 (Print) ISSN 3107-7657 (Online)

rather than to supply answers. Whether any of them can be operationalised in DTC settings is a question we cannot yet answer, and it is possible that the analogies are more useful for critique than for design.

The data-compliance observations added a complication that the framework had not initially anticipated, and it is worth describing because it illustrates how a constraint can migrate from periphery to centre. Data compliance was initially treated as an external overlay, a set of requirements to be satisfied once archival layers were designed. Closer examination showed that the requirements shape architecture rather than sit alongside it, in much the same way that compliance requirements shape financial CRM architecture [23]. The customer data that makes conversion measurable is the data whose cross-border transfer is most tightly regulated, and archival design must therefore accommodate data minimisation in ways that reduce measurement precision. This trade-off is not resolvable by better design; it is a genuine tension, and the jurisdiction-bounded archival layers are best understood as a way of making the tension explicit rather than as a solution to it. A reader might reasonably ask whether the tension could be reduced by federated analytics that keep data in place; this is possible in principle, though the evidentiary requirements of IP disputes may not be satisfiable by federated arrangements, and the question is left open.

4. Discussion

The findings invite several interpretations, and it would be premature to settle on one. A first interpretation is that the framework works: jurisdiction-bounded archival layers preserve evidentiary adequacy while making divergence visible, content-mix-conditioned conversion analysis preserves mechanism identifiability without overclaiming, and governance vocabularies preserve coordination discipline while remaining appropriately hedged. A second interpretation is less flattering, namely that the framework's coherence is partly an artefact of the literatures it draws on. Archival, conversion and governance studies each carry assumptions—about stability of compliance targets, about separability of mechanisms, about identifiability of principals—and a framework that integrates them may inherit a set of assumptions that are mutually compatible and nonetheless mistaken. The two interpretations are not mutually exclusive, and the honest position is that the present evidence is consistent with a mixture of both, in proportions that further work may clarify.

This leads us to further thinking about what "integration" means when the integrated literatures were developed for different purposes. The conversion literature aims to explain and, increasingly, to predict; the archival literature aims to specify and to assure; the governance literature aims to control and to evaluate. These aims are not commensurable, and an integrative framework that treats them as commensurable risks producing a synthesis that is coherent on paper and unusable in practice. A more defensible position is that integration should preserve the distinct aims rather than dissolve them, and that the framework's value lies in making the tensions between assurance, prediction and control visible to practitioners who must act under all three simultaneously. On this reading, the framework is less a model than a device for structuring deliberation, and its success should be judged by whether it improves the quality of trade-off reasoning rather than by whether it predicts outcomes.

The transferability question raised in the introduction deserves a more careful, and more sceptical, treatment than it usually receives. It is tempting to observe that DTC brands, service platforms and infrastructure projects all face coordination-under-competing-requirements problems, and to conclude that governance instruments transfer. The sources reviewed here do display such structures across enterprise service platforms [9], platform strategy and resource integration [10], collaborative innovation platforms [11], private-domain traffic operation [12], full-process digital store control [13] and online–offline integrated operation [14], and the infrastructure-oriented sources display them as well. This temptation should nevertheless be resisted. The analogy is at the level of problem structure, not at the level of mechanism, and structural analogy is a weak warrant for instrumental transfer. What may transfer is the discipline of making trade-offs explicit and of treating verification as a design variable; what is unlikely to transfer is the specific control instrument, because instruments are calibrated to the mechanisms they govern.

The health-segment specificity of the setting warrants separate discussion, because it bounds the framework's claims more tightly than the general limitations do. Health products carry regulatory and evidentiary burdens that general consumer goods do not, and the framework's emphasis on jurisdiction-bounded archival layers is therefore more strongly warranted here than it would be for non-health DTC brands. Work on food-medicine homologous intervention and on traditional external therapy standards indicates

© Spanish Association for the Development of Music Therapy and Mental Health All rights reserved.

that health-adjacent categories carry standard-system requirements of their own[24][25], and work on smart wellness models suggests that integrating industry standards with digital systems is itself a design problem [26]. These are not DTC studies, and they should not be read as direct support for the framework; their relevance is that they reinforce the point that health-segment evidentiary requirements are not generic and cannot be assumed to generalise from general consumer research. Whether the framework is best read as a health-segment framework with plausible but unproven transferability, or as a general framework whose health application is a special case, is a question we leave open.

The limitations of the present work should be stated without softening. The archival observations derive from a bounded set of brands and were not audited against dispute outcomes, so their evidentiary adequacy is inferred rather than demonstrated; the conversion evidence is confounded by content volume and possibly by selection; the governance vocabularies are applied analogically and not tested instrumentally; and the data-compliance tension is described rather than resolved. These limitations do not invalidate the framework, but they do bound its claims, and the boundary should be visible to readers who might otherwise over-extend it. The conversion literature is also evolving rapidly, and studies published within the present year may themselves be superseded before the framework is tested—a limitation of the field rather than of this study, but one that affects the framework's shelf life nonetheless.

5. Conclusion and Outlook

Read as a whole, the work suggests that the binding constraint in cross-border DTC health-consumption branding may lie less in archival technique or conversion tactics than in the governance logic that ties assurance, prediction and control together, and that this logic is entangled with the literatures that supply its vocabulary in ways that make independent validation difficult to secure; elevating the discussion from practice specification to the incommensurability of assurance, prediction and control reframes the practical problem as one of designing organisational arrangements that hold three incompatible aims in productive tension, a reframing whose value extends, tentatively and by structural analogy rather than by mechanism, to platform operation and infrastructure governance, where competing requirements and bounded compromise are equally familiar; and it points toward future work in which content-volume-controlled conversion studies, cross-jurisdictional archival audits benchmarked against dispute outcomes, and explicitly instrumental governance trials could begin to separate genuine integration from metaphorical coherence, while the transferability of the disciplined analogy remains an open and, we think, worthwhile question.

Data Availability Statement

Data will be made available on request.

Funding

This work was supported without any funding.

Conflicts of Interest

The author(s) declare no conflicts of interest.

Ethical Approval and Consent to Participate

Not applicable.

References

[1] *Huang, J. (2026). Research on Digital Archive Management Practice of Intellectual Property Assets for Cross-Border DTC Brands. Frontiers in Management Science, 5(3), 61-70.*

[2] *Huang, J. (2026). Research on Digital Construction, Operation and Maintenance of Overseas Intellectual Property Archives for Consumer Brands. Law and Economy, 5(3), 89-97.*

[3] *Jin, M. (2026). Research on the Path of Short-Video Content Narratives Shaping User Mental Models for DTC Health-Consumption Brands. Journal of Linguistics and Communication Studies, 5(3), 16-24.*

© Spanish Association for the Development of Music Therapy and Mental Health All rights reserved.

[4] Jin, M. (2026). An Analysis on the Empowering Path of KOL Influencer Matrix Marketing for Brand User Conversion. Journal of World Economy, 5(3), 33-43.

[5] Meiying, J. (2026). Research on the Evolution of the "Content-Seeding-Conversion" Closed-Loop Model for DTC Brands in the Short-Video and Live-Streaming Era. Research in Media and Communication, 2(2), 76-86.

[6] Jin, M. (2026). Application and Optimization Path of Live Streaming E-Commerce and KOL Collaboration in the DTC Model: A Mixed Empirical Study Based on Cross-Border DTC of Health Consumer Products. Journal of Research in Social Science and Humanities, 5(3), 42-51.

[7] Jin, M. (2026). Research on the Implementation Mechanism of Live-Streaming E-Commerce and Social Media Content Marketing for DTC Brands—From the Perspective of Media Affordances and Multi-Stage Conversion Chain. Frontiers in Management Science, 5(4), 39-48.

[8] Jin, M. (2026). Research on the Implementation Mechanism of Live-Streaming E-Commerce and Social Media Content Marketing for DTC Brands—From the Perspective of Media Affordances and Multi-Stage Conversion Chain. Frontiers in Management Science, 5(4), 39-48.

[9] Shi, C. (2026). Research on Digital Operation System and Efficiency Evaluation of Enterprise Service Platform. Frontiers in Management Science, 5(3), 26-33.

[10] Chuan, S. (2026). Platform Strategy, Capital Operation and Industrial Resource Integration: Multi-Dimensional Transmission Mechanism of Private Economy Empowered by Industrial Service Ecosystem. Insights in Social Science, 4(3), 12-22.

[11] Shi, C. (2026). Research on the Operation Mechanism and Achievement Transformation Efficiency of Industry-University-Research Collaborative Innovation Platform. Journal of World Economy, 5(2), 40-48.

[12] Zeng, J. (2026). Research on Digital Operation and Management Model of Private Domain Traffic for Physical Stores. Frontiers in Management Science, 5(3), 34-42.

[13] Jingye, Z. (2026). Full-Process Digital Control Model and Practical Path for Multi-Business Physical Stores. Insights in Social Science, 4(3), 1-11.

[14] Zeng, J. (2026). An Analysis of Online-Offline Digital Integrated Operation Modes in Comprehensive Service Industry. Journal of World Economy, 5(2), 65-72.

[15] Lu, B. (2025). The Lightweight Path to Digital Branding for SMEs. Frontiers in Management Science, 4(5), 29-34.

[16] Lu, B. (2025). B2B Marketing Automation: Evaluation and Dynamic Optimization. Journal of World Economy, 4(4), 107-113.

[17] Lu, B. (2025). The Three-Dimensional Standard Framework and Industry Adaptation in Brand Marketing Informatization. Studies in Social Science & Humanities, 4(5), 9-14.

[18] Chen, P. (2026). Evaluation of Capital Efficiency of Public-Infrastructure Projects Based on Project Financial-Cost Governance Theory. Journal of World Economy, 5(3), 44-52.

[19] Peidi, C. (2026). Mitigating Principal-Agent Risks in Public Infrastructure Projects Through Joint Engineering-Financial Review Procedures. Current Research in Law & Practice, 4(2), 90-100.

[20] Peidi, C. (2026). Empirical Analysis of Engineering-Accounting Integration Model for Reducing Cost-Related Financial Losses in Infrastructure Delivery Phase. Insights in Social Science, 4(3), 45-55.

[21] Chen, P. (2026). Controlling Financial Vulnerabilities in Infrastructure Projects by Integrating Engineering Management and CPA Practices. Law and Economy, 5(3), 98-105.

[22] Chen, P. (2026). Cost-Governance Mechanisms for Mitigating Budget Overruns in Large-Scale Infrastructure Projects. Frontiers in Management Science, 5(3), 43-51.

[23] Qiu, Y. (2025). Research on Compliance and Cross-Border Transfer Technology of Customer Data in Financial CRM Systems. Law and Economy, 4(11), 18-24.

[24] Cao, P. (2026). A Prospective Cohort Study on Food-Medicine Homologous Intervention for People with Chronic Fatigue Based on Traditional Chinese Medicine Constitution Classification. Current Research in Medical Sciences, 5(4), 41-49.

[25] Chen, Y. (2026). Construction and Application of Standard System for Traditional External Therapy in Traditional Chinese Medicine Health Preservation. Journal of Innovations in Medical Research, 5(2), 23-31.

[26] Yao, C. (2026). Construction and Practice of Smart Wellness Model Integrating Traditional Chinese Medicine Health Preservation Industry Standards and Digital Systems. Insights in Social Science, 4(2), 76-86.

[27] Qiu, Y. (2026). Technical Standard Development and Application for Cross-Industry Data Integration of Enterprise-Level ERP Systems. Frontiers in Management Science, 5(1), 47-53.

© Spanish Association for the Development of Music Therapy and Mental Health All rights reserved.