

Appendix 1. Literature search approach.

Database	Search terms
MedLine Ovid	<p>(attitude* or stance* or opinion* or position* or orientat* or insight* or esteem* or estimat* or percepti* or belie* or decision* or decide* or determin* or prescrib* or chose* or choos* or choice* or guid* or recommend* or commission* or adopt* or accept* or uptak* best practice).mp AND (((physician.mp. or Physicians/) OR (clinician* or doctor* or specialist* or consultant*).mp.) AND (exp dermatology/ or exp internal medicine/ or exp endocrinology/ or exp gastroenterology/ or exp rheumatology/))</p> <p>OR (exp general practice/ or exp family practice/ or exp general practitioners/ or exp hospitalists/ or exp physicians, family/ or exp physicians, primary care/or physician.mp. or Physicians/ or (clinician* or doctor* or specialist* or consultant*).mp.) AND (exp DIABETES MELLITUS/ or diabetes.mp.) AND (exp Biosimilar Pharmaceuticals/ or biosimilar*.mp.)</p> <p>(attitude* or stance* or opinion* or position* or orientat* or insight* or esteem* or estimat* or percepti* or belie* or decision* or decide* or determin* or prescrib* or chose* or choos* or choice* or guid* or recommend* or commission* or adopt* or accept* or uptak* best practice).mp AND (((Physicians/ or (physician* or clinician* or doctor* or specialist* or consultant*).mp.) AND (exp Biosimilar Pharmaceuticals/ or biosimilar*.mp.)</p>
Scopus	<p>TITLE-ABS-KEY (biosimilar* AND (((physician* OR clinician* OR doctor* OR specialist* OR consultant*) W/20 (rheumatology OR gastroenterology OR endocrinology OR dermatology OR diabetes OR "internal medicine")) OR (rheumatologist* OR gastroenterologist* OR endocrinologist* OR dermatologist* OR hospitalist OR "General Practitioner*" OR physicians W/2 family)) AND</p> <p>(attitude* OR stance* OR opinion* OR position* OR orientat* OR insight* OR esteem* OR estimat* OR percepti* OR belie* OR decision* OR decide* OR determin* OR prescrib* OR choice* OR choos* OR chose* OR "best practice" OR guidi* OR guide* OR recommend* OR commission* OR adopt* OR accept* OR uptak*)) AND (LIMIT-TO (SRCTYPE , "j ") OR</p> <p>LIMIT-TO (SRCTYPE , "p ")) AND (LIMIT-TO (DOCTYPE , "ar ") OR</p> <p>LIMIT-TO (DOCTYPE , "re ") OR LIMIT-TO (DOCTYPE , "cp ") OR LIMIT-TO (DOCTYPE , "ip ")) AND (LIMIT-TO (LANGUAGE , "English "))</p> <p>TITLE-ABS-KEY(biosimilar* AND (physician* OR clinician* OR doctor* OR specialist* OR consultant*) AND (attitude* OR stance* OR opinion* OR position* OR orientat* OR insight* OR esteem* OR estimat* OR percepti* OR belie* OR decision* OR decide* OR determin* OR prescrib* OR choice* OR choos* OR chose* OR "best practice" OR guidi* OR guide* OR recommend* OR commission* OR adopt* OR accept* OR uptak*)) AND (LIMIT-TO (SRCTYPE,"j ") OR LIMIT-TO (SRCTYPE,"p ")) AND</p> <p>(LIMIT-TO (DOCTYPE,"ar ") OR LIMIT-TO (DOCTYPE,"re ") OR LIMIT-TO (DOCTYPE,"cp ") OR</p> <p>LIMIT-TO (DOCTYPE,"ip ")) AND (LIMIT-TO (LANGUAGE,"English "))</p>

Appendix 2. Quality assessment protocol.

Date:

Evaluator:

Authors:

Title:

Design	Yes			
Meta-analysis				
Randomized controlled trial				
Systematic review				
Quantitative study: type (survey, pilot, other)				
Qualitative study: type (interview, focus group, other)				
Other, what?				
	Yes (1p)	Partly (½p)	No (0p)	Notes
Aim and context				
1 Is there an explicit aim?				
2 Is the context described?				
Methodology				
3 Is the data collection described accurately and is it repeatable?				
4 Is the sample selection preventative/relevant/not strategic (sample selected intentionally)?				
5 Is the dropout described?				
6 Is the data analysis described accurately and is it repeatable?				
7 Are the (statistical or other) methods adequate and applicable in relation to the aims of the study?				
Results				
8 Are the findings logic, reliable and clearly displayed?				
Discussion and conclusions				
9 Is there a critical discussion on the findings?				
10 Is there a critical discussion on the method?				
11 Is there a new value?				
12 Are the aims of the study met in the results and findings of the study?				
13 Are the instruments valid?				
14 Are the instruments reliable?				
Ethics				
15 Is there an ethical discussion?				
16 Are the authors non-dependable and free of any conflicts of interest?				
17 Did the participants participate without receiving a fee?				
TOTAL POINTS				

Quality assessment (rounded upwards when necessary): high: ≥ 15 yes, moderate: 12-14.5 yes, low: < 12 yes

Quality assessment protocol adapted from the protocols of Åkesson et al. (2006), Tong et al. (2007), Joanna Briggs Institute (2014) and Swedish Agency for Health Technology Assessment and Assessment of Social Services (2016).