*Instructions*

*The right to health as a legal standard and the social determinants of health have emerged in the past two decades as powerful frameworks for action in public health. However, they do not necessarily begin from the same perspectives, and while there are commonalities, there are also important differences.*

*Using General Comment No 14 and the WHO framework for action on SDH as your starting point, write an essay comparing and contrasting these two frameworks and discussing their implications for public health work*

*Generally (and briefly) introduce the two documents, what they present, and where they have come from.*

*Identify commonalities and differences that interest you and critically reflect upon them. You won't be able to be comprehensive, so be selective based on what you noticed when reading/in the lectures/in the literature seminar. For example, discuss 2 commonalities and 2 differences (you wouldn't have space for more than this without being very shallow in your discussion).*

*Be critical and reflective: Which approach makes sense to you from your discipline and why? Which approach do you think sounds more realistic or feasible (practically, culturally, politically) and why? What's missing from one or both that you think is needed? What are the relative strengths and limitations? etc.*

*Use the other literature from this part of the course to help you in your discussion. (See again the literature seminar materials, the introductions to the right to health, the literature for Jesper's lectures)  
Include a short introduction explaining what you will say, and a conclusion summarising what you said (Tip: Write these last)  
Make sure your writing is clear and has a logical flow to it. Grammatical errors are expected to some degree if English is not your first language, but the examiner has to be able to understand what you mean.)*