Overblik over AMSTAR vurderinger af retningslinjer for NKR Hofte

				4. Was the			7. Was the					
		2. Was		status of			scientific	8. Was the	9. Were the	10. Was		
		there	3. Was a	publication	5. Was a list	6. Were the	quality of	scientific quality	methods	the		
		duplicate	comprehen	(i.e. grey	of studies	characterist	the included	of the included	used to	likelihood	11. Was	
	1. Was an	study	sive	literature)	(included	ics of the	studies	studies used	combine the	of	the	
	'a priori'	selection	literature	used as an	and	included	assessed	appropriately in	findings of	publicatio	conflict of	
	design	and data	search	inclusion	excluded)	studies	and	formulating	studies	n bias	interest	Anvendes
Reference	provided?	extraction?	performed?	criterion?	provided?	provided?	documented	conclusions?	appropriate?	assessed?	included?	i NKR?
PICO 1+2												
Fransen, 2014	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not applica	a No	Ja
Uthman, 2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Nej
PICO 3												
Beumer, 2015	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Ja
Wang, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Ja
PICO 5												
Kroon 2014	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Nej
Williamson 201	5 Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Nej
	7 103	103	103	110	163	163	163	103	103	103	103	· •cj
PICO 6+7												
Minns Lowe,	.,	.,	.,			.,			.,	.,		
2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Ja
Okoro, 2012	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Ja
PICO 8												
Van der												
Weegen, 2015	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Ja