General comments
Online consultation of individuals is a relatively new method, thus methodological research on this method is valuable. General comments include:

1. The rationale for the specific study is that feasibility of online consultation of individuals is unclear. However, other studies with online expert consultation have been published, so please specify which aspects of feasibility exactly are unknown. Feasibility should be defined and operationalized in terms of one or more measures.

2. Alternatively the study may be rephrased in terms of a comparative evaluation, either of similar panels (replication?) or of panels with varying size (20 versus 40). To me, the most relevant result is not the feasibility but the replication of findings across panels – which is fairly low.

3. The introduction (p.3) has a pro-innovation bias. The potential disadvantages of online consultation of experts should also be listed.

4. Generalizability of the findings should be discussed: is this only relevant for experts on quality improvement, for any type of expert (how are experts defined?), for any group of professionals or well-informed people? Is 66% participation among expert high, average or low?

5. ExpertLens is a the name of a specific product. It would be more appropriate to find a generic name for the method, particularly given the conflicts of interest.

Minor comments.
6. It would be helpful to get more information on the context in which this study was done: e.g. what is the relationship between the authors and the various groups that were approached?

7. Quality improvement is an example in this study, so I suggest to introduce it in the methods section.

8. Please specify how many unique individuals were approached (sampling frame).

9. Please explain why panels had unequal size (or did I miss this explanation?).
10. MAD-M is interesting statistic, but I would need more information on its theoretical distribution for a meaningful interpretation.

11. I found the section on replication the most relevant part of the paper, thus I would favour a table on these figures. The crucial message here is that the consistency across panels is fairly low – a message that could be highlighted more, also in the abstract of the paper.

12. The results on participants’ satisfaction were less interesting. This text may be shortened.
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