AMSTAR

									4. Was the status of publication (i.e.			7. Was the	8. Was the scientific quality of the included	9. Were the			
	8 1	2122/2122		List relevant	Was meta-analysis performed for the relevant	1. Was an 'a priori	Was there duplicate study selection and data		grey literature) used as an inclusion	5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded)	6. Were the characteristics of the included		appropriately in formulating	•	likelihood of publication bias	11. Was the conflict of interest	
Observer	Citation	PICO/PIRO no.	PICO/PIRO name	outcomes	outcomes?	design provided?	extraction?	performed?	criterion?	provided?	studies provided?	and documented?	conclusions?	appropriate?	assessed?	included?	Notes
																	forfatteren er israeler. ad 8. konkluderer på patienttilfreds mm. Som de ikke viser data på.
Line/Jakob	Katz 2012		4 salt+ nUVB vs nUVB	klinisk effekt (no	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	
Line/ Jakob	Naldi 2009		4 salt+ nUVB vs nUVB	klinisk effekt	yes	Yes	Not applicable	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Ingen beskrivelse af litteraturs@

