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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

While the topic under discussion in this piece is of interest and importance the value added of this particular manuscript is not obvious to me. The authors’ already cite the Chatham House Paper of the Corresponding Author, and I would suggest that the Ooms & Hammonds reference provides more insight and coherence on the issue.

The article aims to ‘provide something that is missing in the theoretical space in Global Health: a logical framework that allows moving from the conceptual pluralism to practical agreement on policy’ (lines 106-108). However I was not clear where the insights into the practical agreement on policy were presented as it was a little vague on the feasibility of the idea and I would like to have seen more reflection on the political economy in which this concept is expected to unfold.

One of the central components of the paper, Figure 1, and its subsequent explanation do not seem to me to add any new insights in to the debate.

I accept this is a complex issue and it is difficult to distil it into a limited word count. I also appreciate that many of these authors are eminent and well respected in the field of global health governance, however, I find the arguments put forward in this paper a little porous and hard to follow. For example, I would like to have seen more critical thinking around the concept of a Global Fund for Health and more reflection on how this would somehow overcome the existing inefficiencies and political quagmire that is associated with the current GFATM.

Maybe the thrust of the paper is a conceptual exploration and the authors do not seek to get drawn too much into the realities, preferences and positioning of various global health stakeholders - and furthermore - how this would challenge the concept for a Global Fund for Health? If so, then one suggestion would be to be much clearer in the introduction about the exact remit and purpose of the paper explaining what the paper was and was not aiming to achieve – this would help manage readers’ expectations.
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