Dear authors, I have read your Debate article with great interest. It touches on a very topical issue, i.e. the realisation of UHC on the ground. I find the four ways that are proposed for applying a human rights framework very worthwhile.

Here and there, I find the analysis still somewhat open-ended. I had some difficulty understanding how these four ways are grounded in human rights law and seeing how they may become operable in practice. If the analysis is not grounded in the legal framework and made more concrete, then there is the risk that this article 'repeats the global rhetoric of human rights', as is suggested in line 6.

Here are some suggestions for strengthening your overall message:

- to ensure that the reader has the overview, could you number the four ways, and/or to put them in a Box with a brief explanation? And are the four ways that are proposed your own invention, or have they been derived from another study, or from an emerging doctrine more generally? In short, it would be worth to explain why precisely these four ways have been selected, and how authoritative they are;

- is it possible to ground your proposal for the four ways a bit more in the human rights framework? (eg in the Box that I suggest above?) What are the legal bases for these four ways? Can they all be traced back directly to the human rights framework, or is it more open-ended than that?;

- Does the reader know what is the HRBA? Does the reader know where it originated? And what are the components? If the concept does not have a fixed meaning and is interpreted in different ways by different authors, would it help to explain the reader that it is an open-
ended concept, and to explain how you interpret it, or what you consider the most authoritative explanation?

- why the emphasis on women's, children's and adolescent's rights? Why have these groups been singled out? Why have other groups been left out? Could you focus on the human rights of vulnerable individuals more generally instead?

- why does the Uhuru judgment provide a clear example of enhancing the validity of laws and policies if the outcome of the case was not so favourable?

- fair financing: how exactly is this grounded in the right to health? (line 152 - if fair financing is a right - the question of financing is more than an ethical one - what is meant here?)

- same with priority setting? can that be derived from human rights law?

- Figures 1 and 2 require a further explanation

Some specific comments:

- line 20 UHC is a crucial aspect of realising the right to health: is there a source for this? GC 14 does not mention UHC

- line 32 et al

- line 336: with malpractice: with addressing malpractice?

- line 353: health are require: skip are
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