**Dos Santos Human quarantine and the State of exception:**

Review Comments:

1. This paper addresses issues relevant to ethicssuch as quarantine, human rights, and biopower in cases of polio vaccinations, Ebola quarantines, and the ever present threat of an influenza epidemic

2. The interpretation is not well developed. Eg. the first two sentences (“The geographical distribution . . . of protection and of health.”) are provocative yet remain unsubstantiated. Please substantiate, preferably with logic and direction that is related to and builds off of your discussion.

Also, the authors could move some of the conclusions to the Discussion section in order to offer balance (i.e., shorten the Conclusion and add more heft to the discussion).

3. Loose generalisations are present, eg the more provocative and polemical statementsmust be better substantiated or toned down (if scarce evidence) in some instances**.**

4. While there no specific omissions,not linking the themes of the paper to modern and current quarantine practices--such as smallpox, polio, Ebola, and planning for influenza epidemics--is a missed opportunity.

Specific points;

5. Abstract: suggestions:(a) Tighten the text to make it more succinct. (b) the sentence “In conclusion, human quarantine…are scientifically based.” is extremely abrupt and is unsubstantiated within the abstract. It constitutes a strong conclusion with no supporting evidence posited in the abstract. (c) Regarding the last sentence (“The sick person…‘walking danger to public health.’), please explain why the argument is correct (which I agree with) and what are possible alternatives.

6. Keywords: Suggestions: (1) delete ‘statistics’ and ‘war’ from keywords since they are unsubstantiated; (2) consider changing ‘infectious’ to ‘infectious disease’; (3) consider adding ‘public health’ and ‘biopower’ as keywords in replace of keywords that were deleted.

7. Thesis of Paper: Authors must clearly state their objective/research question/overarching argument. Presently, the ‘thesis statement’ of the paper is unclear or unfocused at best. Please state clearly at the end of the Introduction, and be sure to restate at the beginning of the Conclusion.

8. Data, Evidence, and Substance: Draw upon more quantitative and empirical data to prove your theoretical arguments. This is lacking and thus leaves several of your arguments unsubstantiated.

9. The authors have continually missed out on linking ideas to modern and current quarantine practices, such as smallpox, polio, Ebola, and planning for influenza epidemics. These practices and cases from these practices, which are well documented, could inform the authors’ arguments.

10. Increase the rigor and diversity of your citations. Replace some references with articles that span other disciplines and/or are placed in more highly regarded outlets. Also, you may choose to cite a related article from IJME to link to and push forward IJME’s related missions (e.g., Juran, Trivedi, and Kolivras (2017). Considering the ‘public’ in public health: popular resistance to the Smallpox Eradication Programme in India. *IJME* (2)2: 104-111.) Other useful links may be:

[Ethical considerations surrounding the response to Ebola: the Spanish experience](https://bmcmedethics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12910-016-0135-z)

Royo-Bordonada MA, Garcia Lopez FJ.

<https://bmcmedethics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12910-016-0135-z>

Isolation of an individual already treated for Ebola: has India gone too far?

Devnani M, Guo Y. Available from: http://ijme.in/articles/isolation-of-an-individual-already-treated-for-ebola-has-india-gone-too-far/?galley=html

11. Style: Proofread a couple more times. Also, remove and/or shorten unnecessary words, phrases, and articles so that the paper reads more clearly and concisely.
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