Additional file 2: Evaluation questionnaire

1. Were the instructions for the internet form clear? Yes / no, because... / don’t know
2. Was your intended role in the expert panel clear? Yes / no, because... / don’t know
3. Was the overall procedure clear (combination of internet form and panel discussion)? Yes / no, because... / don’t know
4. Was the final reference diagnosis a reflection of medical practice? Yes / no, because... / don’t know
5. Please indicate how much time you spent filling in the internet form: ___ minutes / don’t know
6. Was the login procedure time-consuming or difficult? Yes / no, because... / don’t know
7. Was the consensus procedure valid to establish the syndrome? 10-point scale: Completely invalid – completely valid
8. Was the consensus procedure valid to establish the aetiology? 10-point scale: Completely invalid – completely valid
9. Was the consensus procedure valid to establish the prognosis? 10-point scale: Completely invalid – completely valid
10. Were all diagnostic questions clear? Yes / no, because... / don’t know
11. Was sufficient clinical information available to establish the diagnosis? Yes / no, because... / don’t know
12. Was all information transparently presented (both in the internet form and the forms used during the panel discussion)? Yes / no, because... / don’t know
13. Was the sequence of information logical? Yes / no, because... / don’t know
14. To what extent did the preselection of only the most important information from the patient’s history and the neuropsychological conclusion influence your diagnosis? 10-point scale: Not at all – completely
15. Was it useful to have only the most relevant parts of the history and neuropsychological summary preselected? Yes / no, because... / don’t know
16. When you were asked to establish the reference diagnosis, your conclusion on the baseline diagnosis was available. To what extent did this influence your reference diagnosis? 10-point scale: Not at all – completely
17. Did you use the internet during the individual diagnostic scoring? Yes, namely... / no/ don’t know
18. Did you recognize any of the cases (and thus had foreknowledge about the patient)? Yes / no / don’t know
19. Each case was assessed by experts from 3 disciplines (neurologist, geriatrician and psychiatrist). In your opinion, did the experts have sufficient expertise to establish a valid diagnosis? Yes / no, because... / don’t know
20. Did all experts have an equal share in the discussion? Yes / no, because... / don’t know
21. How many years of experience are required for an expert to establish a valid diagnosis? ___ years / don’t know
22. Was a follow-up period of 2 years sufficient to establish a valid reference diagnosis? Yes / no, because... / don’t know
23. Was the number of experts (3) sufficient to establish a valid reference diagnosis? Yes / no, because... / don’t know
24. Should we have applied stricter decision rules to arrive at a diagnosis (e.g. ask the experts to strictly apply NINCDS-ADRDA or NIA / AA criteria)? Yes, namely... / no / don’t know
25. Did you feel impeded in sharing your opinion in the group discussion? Yes, namely... / no / don’t know
26. Do you have any suggestion for improvement of the protocol? Yes, namely... / no / don’t know
27. Would you be willing to evaluate 50 more cases in a second expert panel? Yes/no, because.../don’t know
28. Name (optional)