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Reviewer's report:

General

------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

My only suggestions about changes to the paper pertain to what is not there rather than to what is. What is there is fine and excellently presented. I was, however, a bit let down by the paper's conclusions. That the authors only call for additional national consideration and specification to existing codes does not force the debate forward with much verve. It has always seemed to me more productive to suggest, in addition to calling for further debate and clarification, a direction that such debate and clarification might take. Especially given the long history of the debate about the boundaries of clinician obligations during contagious disease outbreaks, and the authors claim that current discussions have been vague and ambiguous thus far, to have this paper really contribute to pushing the public discourse meaningly forward, a strategy that involves the authors taking a position to which others may lean towards or away from might help things along.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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