

Response to Reviewers

I sincerely thank the reviewers for their careful reading and constructive comments.

Below I respond to each point and indicate where revisions have been made in the revised manuscript:

Reviewer Comment	Author Response and Revisions	Location in Manuscript
Comment 1: Clarify the connection between third-generation human rights (including environmental protection) and religious freedom, and define more clearly the boundaries between religious organizational autonomy and state regulatory authority.	I have substantially expanded the discussion of third-generation human rights throughout the manuscript (all highlighted in yellow). The Introduction now explicitly explains how religious freedom straddles all three generations of human rights, with detailed discussion of environmental stewardship and protection of sacred sites. Section II elaborates on collective cultural rights and environmental dimensions. Section III includes comprehensive analysis of organizational autonomy boundaries, emphasizing that autonomy is framed by non-discrimination requirements and protection of fundamental rights. The discussion is supported by footnotes [2], [3], [10], [12].	Introduction: p. 2, paras. 2-3; Section II: pp. 3-4; Section III: pp. 5-6, subsection 3.1; Footnotes: [2], [3], [10], [12]
Comment 2: The eight assessment indicators are too abstract and need clearer operational definitions, measurement criteria, and concrete	I have significantly expanded Section V with detailed operational guidance. The section now includes: (1) comprehensive Table 1 mapping each indicator to specific ICCPR and ICESCR provisions; (2) detailed explanatory text on how indicators serve as analytical prompts; (3) concrete	Section V: pp. 9-11; Table 1: p. 10; Subsection 5.1: pp. 11-12; Footnotes: [19], [20]

examples of compliant and non-compliant practices.	example of Japan's proportionate 1995 Aum Shinrikyō legislative response; (4) discussion of complementary cross-national datasets and quantitative analysis methods; (5) ten model legislative provisions translating principles into operational rules. The methodological basis is reinforced through footnotes [19] and [20].	
Comment 3: Broaden the comparative perspective beyond the U.S. and Japan, or at least clarify how the proposed framework could be applied in other national contexts (Europe or Global South).	I have substantially strengthened comparative analysis throughout. Introduction explicitly states the framework is portable across diverse constitutional traditions with examples from Japan, U.S., Europe and other regions. Section II incorporates European human rights jurisprudence. Section IV includes entirely new paragraph on European Court of Human Rights (<i>Kokkinakis v. Greece</i>), French <i>laïcité</i> debates, and Indian pluralist secularism, demonstrating how different constitutional traditions reconcile religious diversity under similar human rights constraints. Conclusion emphasizes framework's generalizability. Supported by footnotes [5], [13], [17], [18].	Introduction: p. 2, para. 4; Section II: pp. 3-4; Section IV: pp. 7-8, para. 4; Section VI: p. 13, para. 2; Footnotes: [5], [13], [17], [18]
Comment 4: Provide more nuanced guidance on how the proposed model provisions would work in practice, including how the 'least restrictive means' requirement operates in concrete scenarios and how potential conflicts between	I have significantly enhanced discussion of proportionality and least restrictive means throughout. Section II includes expanded analysis of ICCPR Article 18(3) strict conditions. Section III devotes entire new subsection 3.2 to 'Permissible Limitations and Proportionality,' explaining how states must consider alternative regulatory options and choose least intrusive means. Section	Section II: pp. 3-4, paras. 4-5; Section III: pp. 5-6, subsection 3.2; Section IV: pp. 7-8; Section V: pp. 9-10; Footnotes: [9], [11], [12], [13]

indicators might be resolved.	IV demonstrates application through Japan's Aum Shinrikyō example. The ten model provisions, especially Articles 4, 6, and 7, provide detailed operational guidance on balancing freedom with public interest. Supported by footnotes [9], [11], [12], [13].	
Comment 5: Streamline Sections III and IV to avoid redundancy, and improve the logical flow from theoretical principles to indicators and legislative recommendations.	I have completely restructured the manuscript to ensure clarity and eliminate redundancy. Introduction provides clear roadmap signaling movement from international norms (Section II) to foundational principles (Section III) to balancing in practice (Section IV) to operational indicators (Section V). Section III now organized with clear subsections 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, each addressing distinct principle without overlap. Section IV significantly expanded with concrete examples and comparative analysis. Section V opens with explicit transitional language linking preceding analysis to operational framework. Overall expansion from 3,500 to 5,400 words allows detailed treatment without redundancy.	Throughout manuscript; Introduction: pp. 2; Section III: pp. 5-6; Section IV: pp. 7-8; Section V: pp. 9-11
Comment 6 (Reviewer 2): Overall positive evaluation noting the article is a worthy contribution, well written, well organized, and supported by adequate references.	I am grateful for Reviewer 2's generous assessment. This enhanced version preserves and strengthens core structure while substantially improving comprehensiveness, scholarly depth, and practical utility.	Throughout manuscript; Footnotes: 1-20; References: pp. 17-18