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Reviewer's report:

TITLE: Missed opportunities for improving practice performance in adult immunizations: a meta-narrative review of the literature.

This is an interesting article focused on a relevant topic for research and assessment of preventive health services performance. The identification, description and standardization of missed opportunities in vaccination provide useful information for the health services improvement and for the performance comparability.

I have only few comments for the authors:

BACKGROUND:

Page 3, Lines 51-58: In the first part of the background please provide setting references for your statements (i.e. are coverage targets and the number of office visits global or referred to US?).

MATERIAL AND METHODS:


RESULTS:

Page 9, Lines 183-93: Is this session coherent to the purposes of the study? Immunization rates are not discussed in the discussion session and, in my opinion, they do not add relevant information to the article as they are presented. If you prefer to keep this session in the main text, you should comment these results in relation to the aims of the study.

Page 9, Line 185: Please correct "pneumococcal vaccinate rate" with "pneumococcal vaccination rate".
Page 11, Line 238: Do you mean "population-level missed opportunities" instead of "patient-level"?

DISCUSSION:

The operationalization of missed opportunities is a very interesting topic, well discussed in your review. There are only two aspects that, in my opinion, are particularly relevant in the definition of missed opportunities and that should be deeply discussed. The first is the selection of the health care settings that classify as eligible a visit or an encounter. This selection affects both the meaning of information for local improvement purposes and the comparability of results of different studies performed in different settings. The second is the timeframe that should be considered in the eligibility criteria. Especially for adult immunizations, an excessively long period of time increases the impact of the ceiling effect on the "population-level" variable.

A wider discussion about how the authors of included articles approach these topics, about the rationale for their decisions and your comments and suggestions could be useful for the interpretation of previous results and for the design of future studies.

Page 12, Line 266: Define the acronym "PDSA".

TABLE 1: Please provide the complete search strategy, if it's available, in the main document or in supplementary material as you prefer.

TABLE 2: The acronyms used in the table should be reported and explained in the table caption (i.e. VA, PPV, OCPE-S, QI);

TABLE 2: The country in which each study was performed should be reported in the first column, in order to help the reader to contextualize the results.

TABLE 2: In the "significant results or observations" column, the results should be reported in a clearer way (i.e. You should better describe what the numbers and percentages in Nowalk et al. refer to);

TABLE 2: The reported year of publication should be corrected for Singleton et al, Kyaw et al, Skull et al and Fontanesi et al.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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