Strahlenschutzkommission

Geschäftsstelle der
Strahlenschutzkommission
Postfach 12 06 29
D-53048 Bonn

http://www.ssk.de

Protection of man against the hazards of solar UV radiation and UV radiation in solaria

Recommendation of the German Commission on Radiological Protection

Adopted at the 280th meeting of the German Commission on Radiological Protection on 11 and 12 February 2016

The German original of this English translation was published in 2016 by the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety under the title:

Schutz des Menschen vor den Gefahren solarer UV-Strahlung und UV-Strahlung in Solarien

Empfehlung der Strahlenschutzkommission

1 Introduction

The German Commission on Radiological Protection (SSK) started publishing recommendations and information about protecting humans against UV radiation in 1990 as a reaction to the constantly increasing incidence of skin cancer among humans resulting from ultraviolet radiation. The recommendation "Protection of man against exposure from solar radiation and UV irradiation units" was issued in 1990. Following this and several other publications, the SSK issued the "Practical behaviour recommendation to protect against skin cancer resulting from ultraviolet radiation" in 1993 and the recommendation "Protection of man against solar ultraviolet radiation" in 1997. These documents were then added to in 2001 by issuing another recommendation "Protection of man against the hazards of UV radiation in solaria" (SSK 1990, SSK 1993, SSK 1997, SSK 2001).

Scientific annexes included in the above SSK recommendation texts referred to the current state of research at that time, on the basis of which recommendations were issued on how to handle solar and artificial UV radiation with little risk.

After having already classified solar UV radiation as being carcinogenic to humans, in 2009 the World Health Organization (WHO) also classified UV radiation from artificial sources as being carcinogenic to humans. A broader set of data and new scientific findings are now available that can be incorporated into existing recommendations on the protection of man against solar UV radiation and UV radiation from artificial sources.

This text embodies and represents the results of that work, and replaces the recommendations and scientific backgrounds from 1990, 1993, 1997 and 2001 described above. The remaining information, statements and recommendations the SSK has previously issued about UV radiation highlight certain individual aspects and therefore remain effective without change. This applies in particular to the SSK statement issued in 2006 titled "Hazards from UV exposures of children and adolescents" which investigates ways to protect children and adolescents from the risk of UV radiation (SSK 2006). In this statement, the SSK recommends that children and adolescents receive regular and more in-depth instruction on the potential risks of UV radiation. The SSK also called upon legislators to prohibit children and adolescents below the age of 18 from using solaria. The German government followed this request by enacting the "Act on the protection against non-ionising radiation used in humans" (NiSG 2009) in 2009.

As requested in the advisory mandate for this recommendation which was issued by the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU, today known as the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety - BMUB), "the effect of UV radiation on the formation of endogenous vitamin D" has been investigated as it is a tricky topic due to publications from the last decade largely having been interpreted such that thorough UV protection could lead to a lack of vitamin D among the majority of the population. This also gives rise to discussions as to whether a vitamin D deficiency could be expedient to or may negatively affect the development of a number of illnesses, e.g. cancer, in various organs.

Discussions surrounding vitamin D deficiency have led to an increase in the number of people using solaria over the last few years, and to an overall increase in solar UV exposure. The assumption here is that potential biopositive effects of UV-induced vitamin D synthesis outweigh the known health risks of UV radiation.

The SSK is monitoring this development closely, which is why it has reviewed its UV recommendations based on new findings. As a result of this review and the debate surrounding the effects of UV-induced vitamin D on health, the SSK does not see any fundamental need to

change the previous recommendations issued with regard to UV protection and minimising the risk of skin cancer.

2 Recommendations

The following recommendations are issued for skin types I to IV.

2.1 General recommendations

In October 2014, the European Code against Cancer (ECAC) was published on behalf of the World Health Organization (WHO) (IARC 2015).

The SSK follows the general recommendations provided by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), which were jointly funded at an international level. The recommendations are as follows:

– Avoid excessive[1] UV exposure; this applies to children in particular,
– Application of sun protection measures,
– No use of solaria.

The SSK has taken these general recommendations into consideration while putting together its own recommendations for the general public on how to protect against UV radiation, with a particular focus on UV protection for children.

2.2 Recommendations to protect against solar UV radiation

A person's solar UV radiation exposure level depends on the time of day, the time of year, their geographical location, the given weather conditions, and their individual behaviour. The UV Index is used to measure the level of solar UV irradiation relevant to sunburn (see Chapter 4 of the scientific background). UV protection measures should be based on the UV Index level and the WHO recommendations provided for that level.

The following order is recommended when applying sun protection measures:

– Avoid strong solar UV exposure
– Wear suitable clothing and sunglasses
– Apply sunscreen

The following measures should be taken to avoid strong solar UV exposure:

– Take note of the UV Index forecast when planning outdoor activities
– Avoid getting sunburn at all costs when spending time in the sun
– Seek shade

[1] When defining "excessive" UV exposure, various factors need to be taken into consideration, including individual, constitutional skin cancer risk as well as the highly variable UV radiation intensity relevant to sunburn quantified by the UV Index. The photophysical and photobiological principles described in the scientific background, the UV Index description (see Chapter 4) and the representation of individual risk factors (see Chapter 3.2.1.4) should enable an individual, situational estimate of excessive UV exposure as well as the targeted use of protective measures recommended below.

- Go outdoors in the morning or evening rather than during the middle of the day
- Give the skin time to get used to the sun (e.g. in spring or when on holiday); when on holiday, take account of the risk of high UV exposure when close to the equator, high up in the hills, or near water
- Keep the amount of time spent outdoors to a minimum when there is a high UV Index level

The following points should be observed when wearing suitable clothing and sunglasses:

- Wear clothing with sufficiently dense fabric that covers the majority of the body
- Cover the head with a broad-brimmed hat
- Wear footwear that covers the instep
- Wear sunglasses bearing the UV-400 symbol that offer sufficient protection against UV radiation from the side and which carry the applicable standard (DIN-EN ISO 12312-1) (DIN 2013)
- Never look directly at the sun, even when wearing sunglasses

Bear the following points in mind when applying sunscreen:

- Any areas of skin not covered by clothing should be protected using sunscreen with a high sun protection factor (SPF)
- Sunscreen should be applied evenly and in sufficient quantity (2 mg/cm²)[2] in order to achieve the stated sun protection factor (SPF)
- Only sunscreen should be used that provides full details of the UV range filtered out (UVA and UVB) as well as full details of the ingredients in order to ensure comprehensive UV protection and prevent allergic reactions from taking place

When spending time in the sun, perfumes, deodorants and cosmetics should not be used.

Anyone who takes medication should read the included instructions before spending time in the sun and, if necessary, consult the physician who prescribed the medication or ask a pharmacist.

The behavioural prevention measures stated above should be accompanied by technical measures to reduce solar UV exposure in terms of situational prevention (creating shade by means of a canopy, awning, etc.). These technical measures should in turn be accompanied by organisational measures, especially around noon (e.g. when organising sports events).

2.2.1 Protection of children against UV radiation

The following points should also be taken into consideration when protecting children against UV radiation:

- Infants should not be directly exposed to the sun
- Children’s eyes should be protected by wearing suitable children’s sunglasses with the quality characteristics described above

The following situational prevention measures are highly recommended for children:

[2] European Commission, Enterprise and Industry Directorate-General. Commission recommendation of 22 September 2006 on the efficacy of sunscreen products and the claims made relating thereto, 2006/647/EC. J.Eur. Union L265, 39 - 43 (2007).

- Shaded areas should be provided at crèches, preschools and schools; a sufficient number of shaded areas of ample size should be provided and care should be taken to keep residual UV exposure (e.g. due to scatter radiation) to a minimum
- Technical measures (i.e. provision of shaded areas) should be accompanied by organisational measures to reduce UV exposure, especially around noon (e.g. when planning schedules and organising sports events)

2.3 Recommendations for the protection of man against the hazards of UV radiation in solaria

The German UV Radiation Protection Ordinance (UVSV 2011) provides out a number of requirements that must be met when operating solaria. One such example is the fact that since January 2012, only UV irradiation devices with a maximum erythema-weighted irradiance of 0.3 W/m² are permitted for use. The legal basis for this ordinance is the "Act on the protection against non-ionising radiation used in humans" (NiSG 2009). After its enactment in August 2009, solaria operators are no longer permitted to allow minors to use their solaria and may be subject to a large fine should they break the law.

The SKK welcomes this law as it can make a major contribution to reducing UV-induced risks, particularly the occurrence of skin cancer. However, the SSK is concerned that German legislation and concepts based on scientific findings and recommendations for protecting the public against the hazards of UV radiation are largely called into question by standardisation bodies at national and international level in order to safeguard economic interests. The SSK is particularly unsettled about the fact that solaria still claim to be able to treat certain illnesses (e.g. psoriasis, neurodermatitis, acne).

Solaria visits represent an additional avoidable exposure of the human body to UV radiation. In light of this and the fact that UV radiation has been clearly proven to be carcinogenic (El Ghissassi et al. 2009), the SSK recommends:

- No use of solaria
- Ensuring that legislation pertaining to solaria is strictly enforced. Solaria operators must be subject to regular inspections to ensure that they comply with the German UV Radiation Protection Ordinance (UVSV)
- Commercially operated solaria should be prevented from advertising their services for therapeutic purposes. The treatment of certain illnesses by using UV radiation requires medical indication and should only be performed under medical supervision in clinics or specialist practices

2.4 Special consideration of the vitamin D problem

Sufficient vitamin D synthesis is ensured if a person's uncovered face, hands, arms and lower legs are subject to half of the minimum UV dose relevant to sunburn (0.5 *MED*) two to three times per week without wearing any sunscreen. For people, e.g. with skin type II, who spend time in the sun every day, this corresponds to about 15 minutes at a UV Index of 7 (which may be reached in the middle of summer in Germany) or about 30 minutes at a UV Index of 3. During winter in Germany, i.e. from mid-October to mid-March, it is practically impossible to form vitamin D at a UV index < 3. Even if a person is suspected of having a vitamin D deficiency, the SSK strongly advises against the use of solaria for health reasons and/or due to a low level of solar UV exposure owing to the time of year because solaria visits are associated with an increase in the risk of skin cancer. A diagnosed vitamin D deficiency should be treated by a doctor using a suitable form of medication.

Strahlenschutzkommission

Geschäftsstelle der
Strahlenschutzkommission
Postfach 12 06 29
D-53048 Bonn

http://www.ssk.de

Protection of man against the hazards of solar UV radiation and UV radiation in solaria

Scientific background to the recommendation of the German Commission on Radiological Protection

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

Life on Earth would not be possible without sunlight. Parts of the visible light emitted by the sun are needed for photosynthesis and therefore influence our biorhythms. Infrared (IR) radiation emitted by the sun heats up the Earth. Around 4% of optical radiation from the sun that reaches Earth is ultraviolet (UV) radiation. Vitamin D production in humans requires a certain UV radiation level and dose that is absorbed via the skin. However, it has also been proven that UV radiation is mutagenic and has a carcinogenic effect on humans. This is due to the fact that UV radiation damages genetic material (DNA) and other cellular components of human skin cells and the eye. UV radiation also weakens the immune system, which leads to a number of UV-dependent illnesses whose aetiology is yet to be fully explained. However, UV radiation has been proven to be the environmental risk factor in the formation of skin cancer, the frequency of which has increased drastically in Germany over the last few decades. Knowledge of this main risk factor (UV radiation) allows for the development of behaviour and situational prevention (primary prevention) measures to combat the formation of skin cancer. When still at an early stage, skin cancer can be easily cured, thus also making it a target cancer for early detection (secondary prevention).

2 Solar and artificial UV radiation

2.1 Definition of optical radiation/UV radiation

2.1.1 Optical radiation – a form of energy within the electromagnetic spectrum

Ultraviolet radiation is an optical radiation range within the electromagnetic spectrum.



Fig. 1: UV range as part of optical radiation within the electromagnetic spectrum (© BAuA Dortmund 2011)

Ultraviolet (UV) radiation consists of an electromagnetic wavelength ranging from 100 nm to 400 nm (see Fig. 1). The UV radiation range is subdivided further, and the boundaries for these subdivisions are provided in Table 1. There are differing definitions for the UVB and UVA boundaries (315 nm or 320 nm) and for the UVA and visible light boundaries (380 nm or 400 nm). The values provided in Table 1 follow those set out in the "International lighting vocabulary" issued by the International Commission on Illumination (CIE 1987) and are therefore used in this scientific background.

Table 1*: UV radiation ranges*

Range	λ **in nm**
UVA	from 315 to 400
UVB	from 280 to 315
UVC	from 100 to 280

2.1.2 Emission spectrums of UV radiation sources

Depending on the radiation source, UV radiation sources may have continuous or discontinuous emission spectrums. A discontinuous spectrum may be a "line spectrum" composed of discrete emission lines, but it could be a band spectrum in which radiation is emitted at certain wavelength bands. A monochromatic spectrum is a special line spectrum with just one single emission wavelength.

2.1.3 Characterisation of UV radiation – relations, quantities, symbols, units

The quantity used to measure the intensity of optical radiation hitting a surface is known as irradiance *E*. The exposure of the irradiated object is calculated by multiplying exposure time Δt_{exp} (in s) by irradiance *E* (in W/m²) and is expressed as exposure *H* ("dose" in J/m²):

$$H = E \cdot \Delta t_{exp}. \tag{1}$$

The following equations apply in the event of varying irradiance:

$$H = \sum_{\Delta t_{exp}} E(t)\Delta t \qquad \text{or} \qquad H = \int_{\Delta t_{exp}} E(t)\mathrm{d}t. \tag{2}$$

The emission of an optical radiation source is characterised by the spectral radiance distribution. The wavelength-dependent radiation intensity is characterised by the spectral distribution of the irradiances per wavelength interval and expressed as spectral irradiance $E\lambda(\lambda)$ [W/(m²·nm)].

Photobiological effects triggered by UV radiation are largely dependent upon the wavelength and therefore upon the photon energy (see Chapter 2.2.3). This wavelength-dependent biological effectiveness is known as the impact spectrum or action spectrum. In order to express this mathematically and perform measurements for evaluation purposes, this photobiological effect action spectrum is approximated using a spectral weighting function $s_{biol}(\lambda)$ for UV radiation – so for UV erythema it is approximated using $s_{er}(\lambda)$.

The photobiologically weighted irradiance E_{bio} takes account of the spectral irradiance $E\lambda(\lambda)$ by means of integration across every wavelength interval, multiplied by the spectral weighting function $s_{biol}(\lambda)$ of the photobiological effect within the observed range of λ_1 to λ_2.

Expressed mathematically, this results in the following photobiologically weighted illuminance:

$$E_{biol} = \int_{\lambda_1}^{\lambda_2} E_\lambda(\lambda) \cdot s_{biol}(\lambda)\mathrm{d}\lambda\,. \tag{3}$$

This formula is also used to determine erythemally effective irradiance from solar UV radiation during a day with the aim of determining the UV Index (see Chapter 4). UV radiation with a weighted irradiance E_{biol} over an exposure time of t_{exp} results in a biologically effective exposure H_{biol} (also often known as "UV dose"):

$$H_{biol} = \int_{\Delta t_{exp}} E_{biol}(t)\mathrm{d}t \tag{4}$$

The photobiologically weighted irradiance on a person may change over time: $E_{biol}(t)$. This may be caused by a change to the distance from the UV radiation source or due to intermittent periods of time spent in the radiation field, or by a change to the UV radiation source emission itself.

Annex 1 contains an overview of photobiological quantities that serve to characterise UV radiation and exposure. It also provides a description of the quantities, symbols and units as well as references for further information.

Unweighted physical quantities are not a suitable unit for photobiological assessments. The results of unweighted measurements take equal account of all of the wavelengths. The photobiological effect on structures also consisting of microorganisms or organic tissue is, to a large extent, often dependent upon the radiation wavelength across several orders of magnitude. The photobiological weightings described above take account of this, with said weightings differing from one another depending on the observed effect.

2.2 Physical basis of the photobiological effects of UV radiation

2.2.1 Dependency of irradiance on incidence angle

Irradiance depends on the incidence angle θ. Maximum radiant flux per area occurs in the event of vertical incidence (θ = 0°). As the incidence angle increases up to the point where it merely glances an object, the irradiated area increases while irradiance decreases. The dependency of irradiance on the incidence angle is based on the cosine law

$$E = E_0 \cos\theta \tag{5}$$

where

E_0 is irradiance E on a flat surface for $\theta = 0°$

θ is the angle between the incident beam and perpendicular on the irradiated area

Depending on the anatomic region of the body or the body's momentary position, the skin will be irradiated by the sun at various angles of incidence. Due to the angle dependency described above, the so-called "sun terraces" (e.g. nose, shoulders) will first reach the sunburn threshold dose when exposed for the same period of time because they have the steepest angle of incidence for solar UV radiation.

2.2.2 Wavelength-dependent penetration depth of UV radiation into tissue

The penetration depth of UV radiation depends on the wavelength (see Fig. 2) and is influenced by the absorption behaviour of so-called chromophores (light-absorbing molecules) as well as reflection in the tissue. Skin thickness and thickness of the individual skin layers vary significantly and depend, among other things, on the localisation of the area of skin under consideration. As a result, in vivo transmission for the various skin layers can only ever be approximated. Fig. 3 contains a data table resulting from an investigation into skin penetration depth for various wavelengths. The penetration depth increases as the wavelength increases. At 250 nm (UVC, only emitted by artificial UV radiation sources), around 82% of the radiation is absorbed in the first 20 µm. At 297 nm (UVB), around 90% of the radiation is absorbed in the first 40 µm. At 365 nm, UVA radiation penetrates a depth of more than 20% of the epidermis. Within the transition range between UVA and visible light, around 60% of the radiation reaches the cutis (epidermis and dermis). Around 1% reaches the subcutis (Bruls et al. 1984).



Bundesamt für Strahlenschutz 2016

Fig. 2: Penetration depth of UV radiation into the skin



Fig. 3: Approximated in vivo transmission (in %) into various tissue depths for several wavelengths (according to Bruls et al. 1984)

The penetration depth of UV radiation into the eye also depends on wavelength (see Fig. 4). The penetration depth can be roughly expressed as follows (see Table 2; the transitions are smooth, however):

Table 2: Penetration depth of UV radiation into the eye (adult)

Radiation type	Penetrates the eye to the
UVC	Cornea/conjunctiva
UVB	Lens of the eye
UVA (98 – 99%)	Lens of the eye
UVA (1 – 2% > 365 nm)	Retina

UVB radiation is fully absorbed by the human lens of the eye. This also applies to UVA radiation with wavelengths below 365 nm. However, 1-2% of UVA radiation above 365 nm still reach the retina (Glickman 2011, Krutmann et al. 2014, Mainster und Turner 2010). A child's eye represents an exception to this (see Chapter 3.3.1).



Bundesamt für Strahlenschutz 2016

Fig. 4: Penetration depth of UV radiation into the eye

2.2.3 Action spectra – Description of the radiation effect's dependency on wavelength

UV radiation affects microorganisms, plants, animals and humans due to the fact that its radiation energy is absorbed by certain molecules known as chromophores. These molecules in organisms or tissue (e.g. human skin or the eyes) absorb the radiation energy, generate photoproducts and induce biochemical changes that may lead to cell changes or cell death and hence to a reaction by the affected organ (see Chapter 3.1). DNA is a major chromophore whose spectral absorption drops by around five orders of magnitude (around 1/100,000) to up to 320 nm from the maximum (around 265 nm). Due to the limited penetration depth into human tissue, UV radiation generally only affects two organs: the eyes and the skin (see Chapter 3).

The UV-induced cascade of biochemical reactions starts with wavelength-dependent absorption by the chromophores and ends with a wavelength-dependent organ reaction. An action

spectrum describes the efficiency of optical radiation (e.g. UV radiation) in order to trigger/achieve a fixed response/end point of each monochromatic wavelength interval for the observed photobiological effect. Standardised spectral weighting functions (see Fig. 5) are available to mathematically describe some photobiological end points (see Chapter 2.1.3). They are used to compare effectiveness between UV radiation sources rather than to mathematically determine physiological results in organisms/people.

When using action spectra, it should be noted that they are determined using monochromatic radiation and that the interactions of effects at various wavelengths/ranges are not taken into account.



Fig. 5*: Standardised spectral weighting functions $s_{biol}(\lambda)$ for various photobiological processes*

s_{er}*: UV erythema (ISO 1999)*

s_{pp}*: Persistent pigmentation (largely corresponds to the erythema weighting function)*

s_{vd}*: Formation of pre-vitamin D3 from pro-vitamin D3 in the skin (CIE 2006)(data from CIE 2006a, CIE 2000b)*

s_{nmsc}*: Photocarcinogenesis of non-melanoma skin cancer - NMSC) (CIE 2006b)*

s_{eff}**: UV radiation hazard (ACGIH 2008, European Union 2006, ICNIRP 2004)*

s_{TT}: *Formation of thymine dimers (Freeman et al. 1989, Young et al. 1998)*

s_{pi} *Immediate pigment darkening from photooxidation of preexisting melanin*

**) The "artificial" action spectrum for the "harmful effects of UV on man" is used as a form of prevention when it comes to health and safety at work. It was derived as an envelope consisting of spectral threshold curves for triggering acute UV effects in the eyes and skin. This includes photokeratitis (corneal inflammation resulting from UV exposure) and photoconjunctivitis (conjunctivitis resulting from UV exposure) of the eye, and UV erythema of the skin (see Chapter 3).*

2.2.3.1 Illustration of superimposition of the UV radiation spectrum and action spectrum for photobiologically weighted irradiance

In order to assess photobiological effects and processes, the physical quantities have to be taken into account along with the wavelength dependencies of biological effects. The effectiveness of photobiological effects in the UVB range alone can vary by a factor of more than 100 (see Fig. 5). The photobiological effectiveness continually transitions from the UVA range to the UVB and UVC ranges. The values measured for physical UVA or UVB for characterising photobiological processes can only be potentially used for comparison if the action spectrum is identical (and measured using the same measuring device). Photobiologically weighted measurements require a highly precise UV sensor with adequate relative spectral sensitivity that corresponds to the weighting function of the investigated photo effect (broadband radiometer). Alternatively, irradiance is measured wavelength by wavelength using a spectroradiometer. Depending on the wavelength interval, these measured values are then multiplied by the accompanying effectiveness of the spectral weighting function of the observed effect and added to all of the individual interval values (integral convolution of the radiation spectrum and spectral action function: see Chapter 2.1.3 formula (4)).

As illustrated in Fig. 6, minor spectral deviations may occur between the UV radiation sources, as shown here for the summer and winter sun, which in turn lead to major changes in terms of photobiological effectiveness.



Fig. 6: UV radiation spectrum, spectral weighting function and photobiologically weighted UV effectiveness. The physical unweighted irradiance E for summer sun at noon is four times higher than in winter. Photobiological weighting (see Chapter 2.1.3 formula (4)) with a spectral weighting function for UV erythema $s_{er}(\lambda)$ shows that erythemally effective irradiance E_{er} is 40 times higher in summer (solar elevation angle $\gamma_s = 60°$) than in winter (solar elevation angle $\gamma_s = 15°$); see also the key for Fig. 5

As illustrated in Fig. 7, the photobiologically weighted UV exposure quantities E_{biol} and H_{biol} (see Chapter 2.1.3 formulae (3) and (4) and Annex 1) can be determined for each

photobiological effect (for which a weighting function is known) and for each UV radiation source triggering this effect.



Fig. 7: UV radiation spectrum, spectral weighting function and photobiologically weighted UV effectiveness for a photodermatological broadband UVB emitter:
- *Relations between unweighted UV radiation (E(λ))*
- *Erythema-weighted UV radiation ($E_{er}(\lambda)$) and*
- *NMSC-weighted UV radiation ($E_{nmsc}(\lambda)$) (NMSC: Non-melanoma skin cancer)*

2.2.3.2 *MED*, SED – individual sensitivity and unit used to evaluate the effect of UV erythema

UV erythema (dermatitis solaris or "sunburn") is a traumatic reaction following overexposure of the skin to UV radiation (see Chapter 3.1.6). Reddening of the skin is a visible end point for deriving an action spectrum. Wavelength-dependent effectiveness depends on the extent of reddening (barely perceivable, mild, moderate, severe) selected as an end point. Standardised spectral weighting functions for UV erythema (e.g. ISO 1999) are based on mean values from various studies.

***MED* – Minimal erythema dose:**

Minimal erythema dose (*MED*) is the exposure value *H* (1 *MED*) which leads to the onset of highly localised skin reddening of an individual following a fixed control period (typically 24 hours). The *MED* is used as a unit to express individual momentary UV sensitivity of a single person.

MED depends on the following factors:

- Physiological and pathophysiological influences (see Chapter 3)
- Erythematous reaction over time: commences after 2 to 3 hours, reaches a maximum after 8 to 12 hours (up to 24 hours depending on the level of triggering UV dose)
- Time of reading following application of the UV test exposure: quasi-standard time of reading: 24 hours (when the erythematous reaction abates)
- Anatomic localisation: the *MED* for human skin varies depending on localisation (Table 3)

Table 3*: MED depending on anatomic localisation, determined using monochromatic UV radiation λ = 297 nm. Information is provided for 13 different, presumably light-skinned adults*

Part of the body	***MED* (297 nm) in J/m²**
Back	256 ± 111
Stomach	206 ± 56
Chest	204 ± 84
Forehead	204 ± 53
Cheek	211 ± 42
Neck	218 ± 93
Upper upper arm	380 ± 105
Lower upper arm	325 ± 101
Upper lower arm	424 ± 104
Lower lower arm	481 ± 191
Back of the hand	856 ± 177
Lower leg	691 ± 272

In order to uniformly evaluate and compare the radiation effect of UV sources of various spectral irradiance distributions in terms of their erythemal effectiveness and irrespective of individual sensitivity of human skin to erythema, a standardised spectral erythemal effectiveness curve was agreed upon (see below).

SED – Standard Erythema Dose:

The standard erythema dose (SED) is used as a unit for erythema-weighted exposure H_{er} (see Chapter 2.1.3 and Annex 1):

H_{er} = 100 J/m² = 1 SED.

Erythema-weighted exposure H_{er} is used to compare the erythemal effectiveness of UV radiation sources in relation to the "Erythema Reference Action Spectrum" (ISO/CIE 17166, 1999). Mean *MED* values for groups of individuals (e.g. UV skin types, see Chapter 3.1.4, Table 13) can be expressed in multiples of the SED unit (see Table 4).

The *MED* of an individual person can be provided in SED for a specific emitter spectrum. However, it should be noted that the individual *MED* provided in SED only also applies to a UV source with a significantly deviating spectral radiation distribution if the individual erythema sensitivity spectrum of the person largely matches that of the reference spectrum (see above). Given the existing variations for individual spectral erythema sensitivities, cases involving significant spectral differences between both UV radiation sources may see the *MED* – expressed in SED – deviate from the result of the first radiation source.

Table 4: Standardised constraints for the minimal erythema dose of the back for various skin types (DIN 2010), expressed as H_{er} in J/m² and SED.

UV skin type	Individual UV dose	Minimal erythema dose	
		in J/m²	in SED
I	1 *MED*	200	2.0
II	1 *MED*	250	2.5
III	1 *MED*	350	3.5
IV	1 *MED*	450	4.5

2.3 Solar UV radiation

2.3.1 Solar spectrum

The sun is a thermal radiation source. The level of radiation emission, radiation spectrum distribution and radiation spectrum maximum depend on the body's surface temperature as per Planck's distribution law. Planck's distribution law applies perfectly to ideal blackbodies (bodies that absorb and emit 100% of radiation). With real bodies, radiation emissions are lower than the theoretical maximum. Radiation emitted by hot bodies is also known as blackbody radiation or thermal radiation.



Fig. 8: Solar radiation spectrum (Source: Wikipedia (Wikipedia 2006), last visited on 11 April 2016). (AM0 = Air Mass 0: Solar radiation above the atmosphere, AM1.5: Solar radiation on the Earth's surface with a solar elevation angle of around 42° above the horizon)

Fig. 8 shows the solar radiation spectrum. It is the same as the spectrum of an ideal blackbody with a temperature of around 5,900 K (5,600 °C) (borderline of the yellow area). The borderline of the orange area indicates the solar spectrum outside of the Earth's atmosphere. There, solar radiation also contains visible and infrared wavelengths along with UVC, UVB and UVA wavelengths. The solar spectrum on the Earth's surface (borderline of the inner coloured area)

is much different to that of the extraterrestrial solar spectrum. Solar radiation is partially reflected, scattered and absorbed by constituents of the Earth's atmosphere such as ozone, oxygen, water vapour and carbon dioxide. Shortwave UV wavelengths are severely reduced by ozone, which is why solar radiation on the Earth's surface contains practically no wavelengths below 290 nm, i.e. it does not contain any UVC radiation (Fachverband für Strahlenschutz e.V. 2012). Clouds and aerosols are also highly variable attenuators of solar radiation in the Earth's atmosphere.

The solar spectrum on Earth varies depending on the sun's position above the horizon (solar elevation). Depending on the time of year, the time of day, and the observation location, solar radiation must pass through a layer of air of differing thickness before reaching the Earth's surface. This means that radiation is absorbed at different levels, which applies to total irradiance and selectively for various ranges. Total solar radiation of a horizontal, plane surface is known as global radiation and consists of direct radiation with a line of sight to the sun, radiation scattered in the atmosphere, and radiation scattered or reflected on the ground, and comprises UV radiation as well as visible and infrared radiation.



Fig. 9: Solar spectra measured on a cloudless summer day. Place of measurement: Sankt Augustin (N 50.8°; E 7.2°); Times of measurement (solar elevation angle): 08:30 (26.9°), 13:30 (62.2°) and 17:30 CEST (36.5°). Source: Institute for Occupational Safety and Health of the German Social Accident Insurance (IFA 2011)

Fig. 9 shows how the solar spectrum measured on the Earth's surface is dependent upon solar elevation (IFA 2011). The higher the sun above the horizon, the higher the total irradiance. At a higher solar elevation angle, the spectrum maximum shifts towards smaller wavelengths. Within the UV range, the spectrum changes significantly with solar elevation. Fig. 9 shows that there is no radiation at wavelengths below 290 nm. The UVB range (280 nm to 315 nm) and UVA range (315 nm to 400 nm) increase significantly as the solar elevation angle rises. The higher the sun above the horizon, the higher the level of UV radiation and hence the higher the risk when people are exposed to solar radiation without taking precautions. However, solar radiation also contains potentially harmful UV wavelengths, even at low solar elevation. UV

and other spectral wavelengths are only low enough not to cause acute eye and skin damage at either sunrise or sunset. Table 5 shows the level of UV radiation within the total ultraviolet and visible solar radiation range together with the ratio of UVA to UVB radiation depending on solar elevation.

Table 5*: Ratio of UVA to UVB and visible solar radiation with the sun in various positions, calculated using the spectra provided in Fig. 9*

Solar elevation angle [°]	UVB (280-315 nm): E [W/m²]	UVA (316-400 nm): E [W/m²]	UVB/UVA ratio	UV/(UV + visible radiation) ratio
26.9	0.22	14.1	0.015	0.069
36.5	0.37	20.8	0.018	0.049
62.2	1.27	42.7	0.030	0.076

If solar radiation penetrates the atmosphere, part of that radiation is scattered due to air molecules. This is known as Rayleigh scattering, which occurs when the radiation wavelength is higher than the diameter of the particles that are causing the scattering. The higher the level of scattered solar radiation, the lower the wavelength and the thicker the layer of air to be penetrated. Ultraviolet and blue solar radiation are therefore scattered more readily than other solar radiation wavelengths. This occurs most frequently at sunrise and sunset, i.e. with a solar elevation angle close to 0° when solar radiation has to penetrate the thickest layer of air. At higher solar elevation, the sun appears white due to the overlapping of many different wavelengths within the solar spectrum, whereas at sunrise and sunset, the sun appears red because the blue wavelengths within the visible light spectrum have largely disappeared due to scattering, meaning that the visible light spectrum is dominated by red wavelengths.

The scattered wavelengths of direct solar radiation can again be scattered by air molecules in the atmosphere, making them appear blue to observers on the Earth's surface. This is why the sky appears blue in every direction on a clear day. Rayleigh scattering increases as wavelengths become shorter, meaning that blue sky also contains UV wavelengths (UVA and UVB radiation), which are invisible to humans. If humans were able to see UV radiation, the sky would be dazzling.

In order to ensure protection against solar UV radiation, it is important to know that the global radiation to which a person is exposed outdoors consists of several components: direct solar radiation in the line of sight of the sun, radiation scattered by the sky, and radiation reflected by the ground. The ratio of reflected radiation to direct solar radiation is known as albedo (whiteness). UV radiation from the sky may constitute up to 50% of global radiation, meaning that it is not simply enough to use, e.g. a parasol, as a protective measure to shield against direct solar radiation. Radiation from the sky also requires shielding.

2.3.2 Solar elevation

Alongside several other factors, the level of solar UV radiation exposure on Earth largely depends upon the position of the sun in the sky. The higher the sun in the sky, the stronger the UV irradiance on Earth (if influencing factors such as the weather are excluded, although these may dominate). It is therefore interesting to know the solar elevation at a specific time and place. This in turn depends on the Earth's rotation and orbit around the sun. These factors are known and can therefore be calculated.

The position above the horizon as perceived by someone on Earth is stated as the elevation angle between the direction of the horizon and the direction in which the sun can be seen. At summer solstice (20/21 June) at the 50th degree of latitude (geographical latitude in Mainz, Germany), the sun rises to a maximum of 63.4° above the horizon. The Earth’s rotational axis

has an ecliptic of 23.4° in relation to the axis of the Earth's orbit around the sun, meaning that maximum daily solar elevation varies during the course of a year. The lowest noon solar elevation angle is 16.6°, which occurs during winter solstice (21/22 December). This is the reason why the solar UV radiation risk is higher in summer months than in winter months (see Chapter 2.2.3.1, Fig. 6). However, in winter, other factors such as snow-covered ground at high altitudes during the pursuit of winter sports may increase solar UV radiation risk. The right-hand chart in Fig. 11 shows outdoor UV radiation exposure fluctuations based on the time of year. It shows the monthly mean values for the daily maximum values of the UV Index, a measure for expressing erythemally effective irradiance of solar UV radiation measured across the UV measuring network (see Chapter 4). The chart shows that, weather permitting, between March and October outdoor UV exposure can be so high that protective measures are recommended. When doing winter sports at high altitudes, areas of the skin such as the face may need protection from strong solar radiation even between November and February.

Specification of time is linked to the sun's movement, but the local noon solar elevation can only be derived by corrections. This should be described in more detail due to its significance in terms of radiation exposure. In order to determine positions on Earth, the Earth's surface is divided up into 360 lines of longitude and 180 lines of latitude (starting at zero at the equator and counting up to 90 on either side of the equator, i.e. north and south). As the Earth performs one full axial rotation within a period of 24 hours, the sun passes 360 lines of longitude each day. The sun appears to move 15 lines of longitude from east to west every hour (it is in fact the Earth that rotates, but to people on the Earth's surface it appears as though the sun arcs across the horizon). The basis for measuring time on Earth is the prime meridian ($\lambda = 0°$ W/E) which passes through Greenwich in London (see Fig. 10). When noon solar elevation is reached in Greenwich, the UTC (Universal Time Coordinated, also formerly known as Greenwich Mean Time – GMT) is exactly noon (12:00). There are seasonal deviations, however. Germany and other European countries use Central European Time (CET), which refers to the 15^{th} meridian east. When the sun is at its highest in that location, it is by definition 12:00 CET. For reference: CET = UTC + 1 hour. During the summer months, the clocks are changed to Central European Summer Time (CEST): For reference: CEST = UTC + 2 hours. The 15th meridian east is located near Görlitz on the eastern border of Germany. Most places in Germany are west of the 15th meridian east, meaning that the time in Germany does not match the solar time determined by local noon solar elevation.



Fig. 10*: Time zones in Europe. The time zone coloured yellow represents Universal Time Coordinated (UTC) = GMT. The countries coloured green use Central European Time (CET - GMT + 1 hour) (from EC 2014)*

It is of interest to know when noon solar elevation (culmination) is reached during the day. The time of culmination depends on the location on Earth, on the time zone and on the season. There are 8.9 lines of longitude between Germany's eastern border near Görlitz and its western border near Aachen. This means that the sun needs 36 minutes on its apparent trajectory, which in turn means that due to the Earth's rotation, noon solar elevation varies in Germany between noon (12:00) and 12:36 CET during winter months and between 13:00 and 13:36 CEST during summer months. In addition to this, the Earth's elliptical orbit around the sun and the Earth's tilted axis (ecliptic) may cause the noon solar elevation for a given location to fluctuate within a range of -14 minutes to +16 minutes over the course of a year when compared to the average culmination time. The largest fluctuations can be seen during winter months. During summer (in 2014 this was from 30 March to 26 October), the fluctuations ranged from -7 minutes to +15 minutes. Depending on the date and location within Germany, noon solar elevation may occur between 11:46 and 12:52 CET in winter and between 12:53 and 13:51 CEST during summer. The exact culmination time and accompanying solar elevation angle can be calculated for any location and for each day using nautical tables (Köhne und Wößner 2005) and the Sun & Earth Applet (Giesen 2000).

In some countries using Central European Time, noon solar elevation fluctuations occur to an even greater extent than in Germany (see Fig. 10). Countries that experience extreme

fluctuations are Norway, Poland, Hungary, Serbia and Macedonia in the east and Spain in the west. Table 6 shows the time ranges within which maximum solar elevation may vary during the course of a year.

Table 6*: Varying maximum solar elevation times over the course of a year in various countries using Central European Time*

Country	Daily maximum solar elevation range	
	in winter	in summer
Germany	11:46 - 12:52 CET	12:53 - 13:51 CEST
Norway	10:42 - 12:58 CET	11:49 - 13:57 CEST
Poland	11:10 - 12:20 CET	12:17 - 13:19 CEST
Spain	12:33 - 13:53 CET	13:40 - 14:52 CEST

The time at which the sun is at its highest is of importance in terms of protection against UV radiation. One of the recommendations is to avoid spending time outdoors during the period around noon if there are no or only a few clouds in the sky so as to avoid overexposure to solar UV radiation. As can be seen in Fig. 11, solar UV radiation varies significantly depending on the time of day and season. The left-hand chart shows the UV Index (see Chapter 4) over the course of a day (measured by the German Weather Service in Lindenberg on 23 June 2005). It shows that solar UV irradiance increases rapidly following sunrise and peaks at the place of measurement at 13:00 CEST. After that time, solar UV irradiance decreases rapidly until sunset. If a person spends time outdoors, the level of potential solar UV dose to the skin is the product of the level of UV irradiance and exposure time (see Chapter 2.1.3). The area below the curve in the left-hand chart in Fig. 11 is a quantity for the UV dose. As can be seen in the curve in the left-hand chart in Fig. 11, around half of the area below the curve falls between -2 hours (around 11 a.m.) and +2 hours (around 3 p.m.) of the maximum. Around a quarter of the area below the curve falls between sunrise (around 5 a.m.) and 2 hours before the maximum (around 11 a.m.), while another quarter falls between 2 hours after the maximum (around 3 p.m.) and sunset (around 9 p.m.). In order to reduce the potential UV dose, no time should be spent outdoors starting 2 hours before and up to 2 hours after the maximum daily extreme UV exposure period. Based on this, the WHO recommends wearing suitable clothing, sunglasses and sunscreen to protect against the sun, and to seek shade when the UV Index ranges from 3 to 7. If the UV Index reaches 8 or more, the WHO recommends avoiding spending time outdoors. However, high UV irradiance values can still be assumed both before and after such peaks. The example in the left-hand chart in Fig. 11 shows a maximum UV Index of just over 8. However, two hours prior to the maximum, the UV Index has already reached 6 to 7, and two hours after the maximum, the UV index still provides a reading of 6 to 7. These are also values that require corresponding UV protection (see the UV Index and protective measures in Chapter 4). The WHO recommends using protective measures with a UV Index of 3 or more (WHO 2002). On the day used in the example in the left-hand chart of Fig. 11, protective UV measures are recommended between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m.



Fig. 11: *Left: Typical UV Index curve over the course of a day measured by the German Weather Service in Lindenberg on 23 June 2005. Curve smoothed, time of day converted to CEST. Right: Typical UV Index curve over the course of a year. Calculated maximum UV Index values on the 21st day of every month in 2014. Radiation transfer model used: Quick TUV Calculator (NCAR 2016), Parameters: Location: N 50° E 10° (Near Arnstein am Main), Sky: clear, Ozone: 300 DU, Altitude: 0.0 km, Albedo: 0.1*

Such recommendations should be adjusted to avoid overexposure when on holiday abroad. Table 7 provides examples of time periods during which maximum UV exposures are to be expected based on geographical location, the east-west longitudes of various countries, and the variation of daily noon solar elevation (Table 6). High solar UV irradiance (UV Index ≥ 3) may also occur before and after, thus rendering the need for corresponding protective measures when spending time outdoors.

Table 7: *Time periods of potentially higher solar exposure in different countries using Central European Time; the data take account of geographical location, east-west longitudes and variation of time of noon solar elevation over the course of a year.*

Country	High solar exposures over time
Poland, Slovakia, Hungary, Serbia, Macedonia	10:30 - 15:30 CEST
Germany	11:00 - 16:00 CEST
France	11:30 - 16:30 CEST
Spain (mainland)	11:30 - 17:00 CEST

2.3.3 Solar UV radiation and personal dose equivalent

2.3.3.1 Methods used to determine photobiologically effective UV exposure

Reliable data about solar UV radiation exposure need to be collected and made available in order to clarify scientific issues and inform the general public about the risks of solar UV radiation.

An overview and stipulations of methods used to measure or estimate and assess solar UV exposures are provided in DIN EN 14255-3 (DIN 2008). This standard includes simple methods for roughly estimating potential UV exposure, links to model data calculations for solar

immission, and measuring options for measuring solar irradiance on a plane surface and for performing measurements on people, and are described below.

Solar UV radiation immission can be measured using fixed spectroradiometers (with subsequent weighting using the necessary spectral weighting functions) (see Fig. 12(a)) or broadband radiometers (with UV sensors whose spectral response has been adjusted to the spectral weighting function) (see Fig. 12(b)). The UV Index can also be determined locally using such measuring techniques.



Fig. 12*: Measuring solar UV radiation using (a) spectroradiometers and (b) photobiologically weighted broadband radiometers*

UV immissions in Germany are determined and recorded by continually measuring terrestrial UV radiation in various locations (see Fig. 13) using a UV measuring network operated by the Federal Office for Radiation Protection (BfS), the Federal Environmental Agency (UBA) and other institutions.

Fig. 13: *Locations for measuring solar terrestrial UV radiation in Germany* ***(http://www.bfs.de/EN/topics/opt/uv/index/index_node.html)****, measurement performed on 4 June 2014*

More detailed measurements of individual UV exposures can be performed using mobile electronic data-logging dosimeters (see Fig. 14 A/B) or cumulatively measuring film dosimeters (see Fig. 14 C/D).



Fig. 14: *Personal UV dosimeters (left) and "4in1 dosimeter" (right) are used to perform intercalibration when collecting biologically weighted solar UV exposure. (A) X-2000 data-logging dosimeter, (B) UVDAN data-logging dosimeter, (C) Polysulphone film dosimeter, (D) VioSpor dosimeter (Basis: Biofilm)*

When affixed to certain places on the body, these light and small film dosimeters enable solar UV exposure to be measured all over the body and averaged for hours, days or weeks while taking account of the exposed person's movement. When comparing personal (erythema-weighted) UV exposures of parts of the body typically exposed to UV, such as the face, arms,

hands or chest, with the results of stationary measurements, it can be seen that up to 30% of local erythemally effective solar radiation may reach various parts of the body's surface (Knuschke et al. 2004, Knuschke et al. 2007).

When assessing the risk of solar UV radiation, the acute reaction of the skin to UV radiation – UV erythema – is used by drawing upon the reference erythemal action spectrum (ISO 1999) (see Fig. 5).

Precise determination of personal solar UV exposure is not always needed to protect against solar UV exposure. General information about the risk of spending time outdoors is often sufficient. The World Health Organization (WHO), the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) introduced the UV Index as a standard measure to inform the general public about solar UV irradiance (see CIE S 013/E:2003 (CIE 2003)). The solar UV Index (UVI) is a measure of the erythemally effective UV irradiance on the Earth's surface and is measured or predicted on the basis of prevailing or anticipated weather conditions on a horizontal surface. As the UV Index is generally determined for larger regions, local solar UV exposure may differ depending on cloud cover and other reasons. Chapter 4 provides more information about the UV Index, its properties and its limits, and how it should be used as a guide for estimating the risk of solar UV radiation.

A similar approach involves the determination of skin and ocular exposure factors (Diffey 1984, ICNIRP 2007) as provided in Annex 2. It enables a rough estimate of local solar UV exposure by taking local factors (cloud cover, albedo) and individual factors (clothing and protective measures) into consideration. As this is not based on measurements, it may give rise to greater uncertainty than an estimate based on the UV Index.

The "shadow rule" is seen as an option for roughly estimating whether there is a risk of local solar exposure without using any measuring equipment and then determining whether protective measures should be implemented. "If the shadow is shorter than the height of the object in question, then the sun has an elevation angle of > 45° and thus protective measures should be implemented." It should be noted that this guidance may well be practical, but it does not correspond with the UV Index-based protection concept since a UV Index of 5 can be reached with a solar elevation angle of 45°. In extreme cases, a UV Index of 3, above which level protective measures are recommended, can even be reached at a solar elevation angle of 32° or more if the sky is clear (Knuschke et al. 2015). This is why, whenever possible, it makes sense to take account of UV Index values and forecasts for locations all over the world, such as those provided on http://www.wetter-online.de. On top of that, if the sky is clear, adjustment factors (Annex 3) can be applied to the current local UV Index using the length of shadows.

When planning precautions to be taken to protect against solar UV radiation while travelling, it may make sense to calculate exposure to global solar radiation depending on the time of year, the time of day, geographical location, etc. There are programs available to perform such calculations:
(http://cprm.acom.ucar.edu/Models/TUV/Interactive_TUV/, http://nadir.nilu.no/~olaeng/fastrt/fastrt.html).

In some cases, solar UV immission and personal solar UV exposure must be determined more accurately, and can be achieved by measuring the erythemally effective exposure, the irradiation covered by ICNIRP due to its detrimental health effects, and/or the irradiation covered by NMSC as set out in DIN EN 14255-3 (DIN 2008) together with the corresponding spectral weighting functions (see Fig. 5). This data can be used to determine individual risks.

2.3.3.2 Extent of solar UV exposure of the general public while on holiday, at leisure or at work

The extent of personal solar UV exposure is determined by global factors influencing solar UV immission as well as individual behaviour. The main global factors are the time of year, time of day, geographical latitude, prevailing weather conditions, and altitude at which the person spends time (see Chapters 2.3.1 and 2.3.2). As a global factor, the meteorological situation influences solar UV irradiance on the ground, with cloud cover and turbidity having an effect along with conditions such as temperature and rainfall influencing whether a person spends time outdoors. Investigations into various characterised groups of people in Germany show that the amount of time spent outdoors and accumulated personal UV doses, averaged for the given group, correlate with daily maximum temperatures (Knuschke et al. 2004).

The part of the body and its orientation to the sun are both key factors when it comes to irradiance on the skin, and lead to a body distribution of solar exposure. Various methods such as model calculations for maximum UV exposures with fixed orientation of body parts to the sun, measurements on static or rotating mannequins fitted with personal dosimeters, short-term measurements involving people outdoors (2-3 hours) or cumulative measurements performed over several days under everyday circumstances can all be used for investigations into body distribution. When using these investigations as a guide, the chest, face and wrist accumulate roughly 30% of the exposure received by the crown of the head. Momentary irradiance that constantly changes due to movement is higher for “sun terraces” (e.g. 60-70% for the shoulders). Specific areas of the skin in a fixed position (e.g. when sunbathing) that receive vertical solar radiation are subject to higher irradiance than the irradiance that falls upon a plane surface. Tables relating to body distribution and to dependencies of solar elevation during the course of the year are available in a number of publications (Diffey et al. 1977, Herlihy et al. 1994, Hoeppe et al. 2004, Knuschke et al. 2004, Knuschke et al. 2015, Knuschke et al. 2007). This solar UV exposure body distribution must be taken into account if UV measurement data used to determine an individual’s UV exposure reflect the UV exposure on a plane surface, as is the case, e.g. when determining the UV Index (see Chapter 4).

There are few national (or international) investigations available to date that provide substantiated measured data for individual UV exposure among various groups of the population. Estimates of personal exposures or personal dosimetric measurements, such as those carried out by various working groups in the last 30 years, were used to estimate cumulative solar UV exposures over shorter or longer periods of time with the aim of arriving at conclusions for average annual UV exposures and possibly cumulative lifetime UV doses. The backdrop for this are epidemiological results that prove there is a link between, e.g. the risk of squamous cell carcinoma and the cumulative lifetime UV dose. The personal dosimetric measurements methodically interpreted to evaluate cumulative exposure data level out the brief yet very high UV exposures. This must be taken into account when evaluating the estimates and measuring data provided below. Within the scope of a review, Godar (Godar 2005) compiles personal UV doses for people who work indoors and outdoors, children and adolescents by expressing them as a percentage in relation to erythemally effective solar UV immission (based on a plane surface) (see Table 8). The review included studies with personal UV dose estimates gleaned from surveys (Airey et al. 1997, Boldeman et al. 2004, Diffey et al. 1996, Godar 2001, Godar et al. 2001) and studies where personal UV dosimeters were used (Challoner et al. 1976, Gies et al. 1998, Kimlin et al. 1998, Leach et al. 1978, Munakata et al. 1998, Parisi et al. 2000, Schothorst et al. 1985, Slaper 1987, Thieden et al. 2004). The data show a significant influence on the extent of individual solar UV exposure by including periods of time spent on holiday.

Table 8: *Percentage of personal UV doses (without or – if stated – with exposures while on holiday as well as the period under observation) of adults, children and adolescents in terms of solar immission on a horizontal surface (modified according to Godar 2005*

	Time period	Personal UV dose as a percentage of solar UV immission				Study
		Indoor workers	Outdoor workers	Children	Adolescents	
Total global estimate excluding holiday		3% (2-4%)	10% (6.6-17.7%)	3% (2-4%)		
Sweden 58-60°N	Summer	6%	10%			(Munakata et al. 1998)*
	Summer			6.4% (0-5 years)		(Boldeman et al. 2004)
Denmark 55,41°N	Full year incl. holiday	3.1% 4.2%	6.6% (gardener)	4.1% (4-15 years)	4.7% (16-19 years)	(Thieden et al. 2004)
England 50-55°N	Full year	3% (2-4%)				(Challoner et al. 1976), Leach et al. 1978)
	Full year		10%			(Challoner et al. 1976)
	Summer			6.1% girls 6.9% boys (9-10 years)	4% girls 4.2% boys (14-15 years) 4.7 % 16-19 years (incl. holiday)	(Diffey et al. 1996)
Netherlands 52.5°N	Full year	2.5%	7%			(Schothorst et al. 1985, Slaper 1987)
Japan 40° N	Full year			3.1% (9-12 years)		(Kimlin et al. 1998)**
USA 44°N		3.1% (> 21 years)		3.1%	2.6%	(Godar 2001, Godar et al. 2001)
USA 34°N		3.1% (> 21 years)		3.1% (0-12 years)	2.6% (13-19 years)	(Godar 2001, Godar et al. 2001)
Australia 21-28°S	Summer	4.2% (27.5°S)	9.8% (gardener 27.5°S)		4.7% (15-16 years, 27.5°S)	(Kimlin et al. 1998)
	Summer		14% (farmer, 27.5°S)			(Airey et al. 1997)
	Summer			4.1% (7-12 years)	4.5% (13-19 years)	(Parisi et al. 2000)
	3/4 of a year incl. holiday			8% (boys 12 years, 21-28°S); 4.9% (girls 12 years, 21-28°S)		(Gies et al. 1998)

*) Godar's original publication stated – evidently incorrectly – that a Japanese study (Munakata et al. 1998) was the source of the data for Sweden (indoor and outdoor workers). Presumably the source should be (Boldeman et al. 2004).

**) Godar's original publication stated – evidently incorrectly – that an Australian study (Kimlin et al. 1998) was the source of the data for Japan (children). Presumably the source should be (Munakata et al. 1998).

In order to be able to evaluate the extent of solar UV exposure, the relations of personal UV doses to UV immission expressed as percentages are required along with, in particular, absolute values such as mean daily UV exposures in SED/d for the various behaviour groups of the general public.

Tables 9, 10 and 11 show personal dosimetric measurements over the course of a year for indoor workers (n = 18, personal UV dosimeter on the wrist) in Denmark (Thieden et al. 2006) and for indoor workers (n = 120, personal UV dosimeter on the chest) and outdoor workers (n = 120, dosimeter on the chest) in Germany, but also for children in their final year of preschool and then their first year at primary school (n = 60, personal UV dosimeter on the chest) (Knuschke et al. 2004), each subdivided into UV exposures received at work and at leisure. The Danish study used the mean daily UV dose for each person from the individual monthly total (consisting of workdays and days at leisure) to arrive at the median values of the personal UV dose per day and per group of people. The German personal UV monitoring study determined the median values per group using measured cumulative personal UV dosimeter values over a period of 10 workdays and 6 days at leisure/weekend days for each person during the given month. The personal dose measurements provided are extremely complex and can therefore only by carried out in small numbers in relation to the total population (82 million, of which 40 million are workers and 20 million are children). The data from the investigated random test therefore only provide indications for the link between occupation, i.e. group of people, and solar UV exposure level.

Everyday exposures already show clear differences in the extent of personal UV doses received during workdays and those received during days of leisure. Individual behaviour in terms of frequency of time spent outdoors play a major role in personal UV dose level, particularly during days of leisure. Here it should be noted that a distinction must be made within groups of people, such as indoor and outdoor workers, between those who pursue few outdoor leisure activities, and those who regularly pursue outdoor leisure activities such as hiking, cycling, running, etc. (Knuschke 2011).

Table 9: Indoor workers: Median of personal UV doses received in SED*/d over the course of a year during workdays or days at leisure in Denmark (measured on the wrist) (Thieden et al. 2006) and in Germany (measured on the chest) with further subdivision as follows: A: few outdoor activities (80% of monitored indoor workers) and B: regular outdoor activities (20% of monitored indoor workers) (Knuschke et al. 2004)*

Indoor workers - personal UV dose in SED/d						
Month	**Workday**			**Day at leisure**		
	Denmark	Germany		Denmark	Germany	
		A	B		A	B
February/ March*	0.005/ 0.067	0.040	0.055	0.008/ 0.10	0.067	0.23
May	0.19	0.23	0.41	1.06	0.71	2.1
September	0.21	0.073	0.13	0.48	0.25	0.91
December	0.002	0.014	0.018	0.007	0.021	0.049

* Denmark: February/March; Germany: 19 February to 6 March

Table 10: Outdoor workers: Median of personal UV doses received in SED*/d over the course of a year during workdays or days at leisure in Germany (measured on the chest with further subdivision as follows: A: few outdoor activities (70% of monitored outdoor workers) and B: regular outdoor activities (including journey to work and after work) (30% of monitored outdoor workers). Occupations of those involved: Road construction worker, gardener and landscaper, postman, traffic warden (Knuschke et al. 2004).*

Outdoor workers - personal UV dose in SED/d						
Month	**Workday**			**Day at leisure**		
		Germany			Germany	
		A	B		A	B
February/March*		0.15	0.26		0.069	0.15
May		0.72	1.15		0.51	1.6
September		0.25	0.39		0.23	0.88
December		0.040	0.067		0.021	0.041

* 19 February to 6 March

Table 11: Children (A: Preschool last year, B: Primary school 1st grade): Median of personal UV doses in SED*/d over the course of a year during workdays or days at leisure (weekend days) in Germany (measured on the chest)(Knuschke et al. 2004).*

Children – Personal UV dose in SED/d						
Month	**Workday**			**Day at leisure**		
		Germany			Germany	
		A	B		A	B
February/March*		0.094	0.12		1.10	1.05
May		0.51	0.72		0.84	1.1
September		0.24	0.15		0.29	0.31
December		0.037	0.034		0.020	0.037

* 19 February to 6 March

The random sample of personal UV doses measured among 120 indoor workers and 120 outdoor workers during days at leisure shows that there are hardly any differences between the two groups of people in terms of their outdoor leisure behaviour. Both the median personal UV dose values (see Tables 9 and 10) and the statistic distribution of individual doses around the median are comparable among the two groups of people, even during different seasons (Knuschke et al. 2004).

Personal UV doses in groups of people follow a log-normal distribution (Knuschke et al. 2004). A factor of 15 to 20 is present for the exposure level between the 5^{th} and 95^{th} percentile of the distribution of personal UV doses within a group of people with the same characteristics. Median group values can be reproduced relatively well under comparable conditions, but there is a high level of personal influence on the individual UV dose (Knuschke et al. 2004). This must be taken into consideration when comparing the median values for different groups of people.

The median personal UV doses for a group of people with different outdoor activities (see above) are 2.5 to 3 times higher during summer and 3 to 4 times higher during winter than those of indoor workers. Irrespective of the season, groups of people with regular outdoor activities have a personal UV dose that is three times higher on days at leisure (see Tables 9 and 10) than that of groups of people with “normal”, low levels of outdoor activity.

The median personal UV doses recorded during personal dosimetric monitoring of indoor workers can, depending on assignment of outdoor activity, also be transferred to groups of

school pupils (aged 14 or more), students, housewives and nursing home residents (Knuschke und Krins 2000).

Groups of children from preschools who were monitored by personal dosimeters over the period of a year and then moved up to primary school the following year exhibited few differences in personal UV dose distributions for workdays (i.e. while attending either preschool or school) and days at leisure (in the company of their parents) (see Table 11). Here, the medians for the personal UV doses at weekends (days at leisure) are highly comparable with those of indoor workers with few outdoor leisure activities, i.e. with those of parents to whom this kind of behaviour can be largely attributed.

Cumulative personal UV doses over the course of a year enable annual UV doses and, if details of the person's lifetime are known, cumulative lifetime UV doses to be stipulated or estimated, which can then be investigated in relation to mean UV population exposures. Such estimates are also used, for example, when evaluating UV light-induced skin cancer as a potential occupational disease as described in BK 5103 (BKV 1997)[3] However, cumulative personal UV dose data level out individual UV exposure peaks that occur during the measurement periods as a result of various influencing factors (including behaviour and weather). UV exposures around the 95th percentile (even with cumulative measurement) are around 3 to 5 times higher than the median values, which are indicative of exposure peaks in the measurement intervals.

Table 12: Number of cases per monitoring group with personal doses (measured on the wrist) of ≥ 10 SED *on at least one day for the number of data records per year for this group (Thieden et al. 2004)*

People	**Number**	**% of group**
Total	160 / 346	46
Children (5-15a)	38 / 68	56
Adolescents	17 / 22	77
Indoor workers	42 / 111	38
Sunbathers	27 / 49	55
Golfers	12 / 31	39
Gardeners	24 / 65	37

Measurements performed using personal dosimeters with data-logging can exhibit such increased individual UV exposures (see Table 12). UV exposure measurements taken on the wrist (see Table 12) can be roughly compared with facial exposures (Knuschke et al. 2015). In the absence of any measures to protect the skin from light, erythemally effective exposures ≥ 10 SED lead to a mean *MED* being exceeded five-fold for skin type I and twice for the non-adapted skin type IV. This random sample showed that such overexposures on one or more occasions during the year were observed in 40% to 50% of the monitored subjects.

These facts show – especially for children – the importance of preventive behaviour measures, such as providing shaded areas in general and, in particular, at crèches, preschools and schools; organisational measures should also be applied to avoid high UV exposure, e.g. suitable daily schedules, when organising work and schedules, and when organising sports events. Preventive behaviour measures are also required and may include information campaigns on the effects of

[3] With effect from 1 January 2015, multiple "actinic keratoses" – precursors to squamous cell carcinoma – and squamous cell carcinoma itself have been added to the so-called occupational disease list on account of solar UV radiation.

UV radiation as well as individual protective measures or the inclusion of UV Index information in daily schedules.

Personal UV doses are much higher when on holiday than during everyday exposures on workdays and days at leisure. For the majority of the population that does not work outdoors, holiday(s) constitute(s) up to 50% of annual UV exposure (Knuschke 2006). As Fig. 15 shows, the season and holiday destination play a major part in such data. Holidays spent in distant countries in winter, e.g. the Canary Islands, the Caribbean or Malaysia, accumulate an extremely high personal UV dose. However, one week of doing winter sports can lead to higher facial UV exposure than the weekly facial exposure of road construction workers in summer. It should also be noted that personal UV doses measured while spending summer holidays at the North Sea and Baltic Sea do not differ by more than an average of 5 SED per day from summer holidays spent at the Mediterranean Sea. One reason for this could be that comparably lower daytime temperatures at the North Sea and Baltic Sea lead to people often taking advantage of the midday warmth to visit the beach, while people generally tend to avoid going to the beach at noon when on holiday at the Mediterranean Sea because it is too hot. (Note: For a typical person with UV skin type II with non-adapted skin: 1 *MED* ≈ 2.5 SED.)



Fig. 15*: Mean personal UV dose over 7 days of holiday in relation to an everyday week (5 workdays with 2 days of weekend/days at leisure) for indoor and outdoor workers in summer and winter (Knuschke 2006)*

Individual UV exposure contributions received over the course of the year while at work, at leisure and on holiday provide the cumulative annual UV dose. Based on personal dosimetric measurements from the wrist over one (n = 340), two (n = 39) and three (n = 14) season(s), Thieden and employees in Denmark estimated an annual UV exposure of 132 SED/a for indoor workers (n = 89), 224 SED/a for gardeners (n = 47), 217 SED/a for golfers (n = 24), 181 SED/a for "sunbathers" (n = 53), 175 SED/a for female adolescents, 116 SED/a for male adolescents and 147 SED/a for children (Thieden et al. 2004). Comparable values were provided by continual personal UV monitoring of various occupational groups in Germany over a period of 52 weeks with a small test sample per group of n = 5. The measurements with dosimeters on the chest resulted in 353 SED/a for construction workers, 235 SED/a for farm workers (using

agricultural machinery), 266 SED/a for dustbin men, 173 SED/a for preschool staff, 148 SED/a for sports teachers, 133 SED/a for window cleaners (chest pressed against the facade) (neck in summer: 450% of chest UV exposure) and 114 SED/a for indoor workers (Knuschke et al. 2007, Unverricht et al. 2006).

Based on a database of personal UV doses from 1,100 person years involving a lot of different groups of people from the general public as well as data from the Federal Statistical Office, a mean annual UV exposure of 130 SED/a was estimated for the population in Germany in reference to exposure of the chest (Knuschke 2011). Previous measurements also provide higher values, e.g. 200 SED/a for children in Northern Europe (Diffey 1999, SSK 2006). It should be noted again that the recording of UV exposure using personal dosimeters is influenced by many factors such as the type of dosimeter used, the recording period, climatic fluctuations and the modelling sometimes used. In addition, individual UV exposure is greatly dependent upon individual behaviour, and UV exposures vary significantly among the general public. This cannot be sufficiently reflected by providing a single annual mean. A frequency distribution of UV exposures among the general public is required in order to provide a full picture.

2.4 Artificial UV radiation sources

UV radiation exposures from artificial radiation sources may occur both during a person's private life and at workplaces. Except for solaria visits and medical applications, such private exposures generally remain at a low level. Due to their relevance to UV exposure of the general public, solaria are covered in more detail in Chapter 5. Artificial radiation sources in private-life scenarios that may emit low levels of UV radiation include light bulbs, halogen light bulbs, fluorescent lights, energy-efficient light bulbs and light-emitting diodes (LED). Further details in this regard are available, e.g. in the SSK statement "Modern light sources" (SSK 2010). UV lamps are used cosmetically to cure gel nails. When compared to solar UV exposure of the hands, this kind of exposure is deemed insignificant (Diffey 2012, Markova und Weinstock 2013).

However, UV radiation exposure may reach high levels at workplaces with artificial UV emitters. Welding work leads to a high level of UV exposure. Depending on the technique and welding parameters used, electrical welding can lead to UV irradiance that is 1,500 times higher than the highest level of solar UV irradiance that occurs on Earth (IFA 2011). In extreme cases, the permitted UV exposure limits may be exceeded after just 0.3 s. Unlike the solar radiation spectrum on the Earth's surface, welding spectra include UVB, UVA and UVC radiation. Therefore, from a radiation protection perspective, welding is an extremely hazardous procedure. Sufficient radiation protection is imperative, and corresponding protection regulations have been in place for many years now. Further details about this can be found in the BGIA Report 3/2007 (UV radiation exposures at workplaces" (IFA 2007).

Other artificial UV emitters in the workplace include the following: gas flames when processing glass (IFA 2010), UVC sources for sterilisation purposes, UV emitters for crack-testing purposes, UV emitters for drying paint and adhesives, and UVA lamps to make markings visible.

As most artificial radiation sources are used at workplaces, risk assessments for such sources are performed in line with health and safety regulations. More information about this is available in the optical radiation handbook (Reidenbach et al. 2012)

3 Effect of UV radiation

As the UVC wavelengths in the solar UV spectrum cannot penetrate the ozone layer, only the UVA and AVB wavelengths of the solar UV spectrum are relevant to biological effects on Earth (see Fig. 16). Only these spectral ranges are used in solaria (which is also due to legislation). Some technical applications (e.g. sterilisation lamps, welding equipment) may also cause UVC emissions. The effect of UVC as a result of such applications must be taken into account (see Chapter 2.4), but is not covered in this recommendation.

The effect of UV radiation on man is conveyed via the skin and the eye. UV-dependent effects can be divided into short-term and long-term effects. The former occurs immediately or just a few minutes, hours or days after UV exposure, while the latter are characteristic of late effects (years or decades after exposure). Short-term effects include pigmentation (tanning) of the skin, reddening of the skin/sunburn (erythema), immunosuppression and vitamin D3 photosynthesis, corneal inflammation and conjunctivitis (photokeratitis/ photoconjunctivitis) and, at times, photochemical retina damage in the eyes, while late UV exposure effects are characterised by ageing of the skin, lens opacities (cataracts) and, above all, skin cancer. With the exception of vitamin D3 photosynthesis and, to some extent, immunosuppression, both acute skin reactions and late effects on the skin are usually caused by UV-induced DNA damage (Eaton 1994, Heenen et al. 2001, Melnikova und Ananthaswamy 2005, Phan et al. 2006, Tadokoro et al. 2005).



Fig. 16*: UV radiation on the Earth's surface. While UVC is fully absorbed by the ozone layer, UVB (partially) and UVA (almost fully) penetrate the atmosphere. UVA penetrates the skin further (as far as the subcutis) than UVB, which penetrates the epidermis to the basal cell layer. (German Association of Dermatological Prevention – ADP e.V.)*

3.1 Biological effect of UV radiation on the skin

The skin is man's largest organ; its structure (see Fig. 17) acts as a physical barrier against the effects of environmental noxae on the organism, yet it is itself affected as an organ by damaging influences such as UV radiation.



Fig. 17*: Diagram of human skin. The upper layer of skin is known as the epidermis (1), followed by the dermis and subcutis (3). Hair follicles (4) with the sebaceous gland (5) extend deep into the dermis. Here are the sweat glands (6). (Beiersdorf AG)*

Depending on the wavelength, UV radiation penetrates the skin to differing levels (see Chapter 2.2.2). Due to its interaction characteristics with molecular components of the skin (scattering, absorption, reflection), UVB radiation may penetrate the epidermis through to the basal cell layer. UVA radiation penetrates deeper into the skin and can reach the dermis and subcutis (see Figs. 2, 3 and 16). UV radiation may be absorbed by a range of different chromophores whose absorption spectra are within the UV range. These also include cellular components such as proteins and intracellular photosensitive molecules like flavins or porphyrins (Cadet et al. 2012). However, the absorption of UV photons by the DNA molecule is of key importance here.

3.1.1 Children's skin

Children's skin requires separate consideration when it comes to skin cell damage caused by UV radiation and the associated risk of skin cancer. This is particularly the case with epidemiological data where an increased occurrence of skin cancer during adulthood can be observed depending on UV exposure during childhood (see Chapter 3.2.1.3) (Autier und Doré 1998, Green et al. 2011a, Oliveria et al. 2006). Considering acute skin reactions following UV exposure, such as tanning or sunburn, there is no difference between adult and children's skin when it comes to UV sensitivity. Just a few weeks after birth, the ability for pigmentation is

already fully developed (Höger 2008, Loomis et al. 2001) and the minimum UV dose that may trigger sunburn (*MED*) is, on average, the same for adults and children (Cox et al. 1992). However, one difference can be seen in the structure of children's skin (Höger 2008) (see Fig. 18). Looking at the epidermis cones that extend into the dermis, epidermal thickness does not differ from that of adult skin. However, the dermal papillae, which together with the epidermis cones form the dermoepidermal junction, extend further into the epidermis. As a result, part of the basal cell layer in which the assumed target cells for UV-induced development of skin cancer (interfollicular epidermal stem cells and pigment-forming melanocytes) are localised is exposed to a higher level of penetrating UV radiation.



Fig. 18*: Diagram of adult skin and children's skin. In children's skin, the dermal papillae extend deep into the epidermis. Part of the epidermal stem cells in the basal cell layer are thus further below the surface of the skin than is the case with adult skin, hence increasing the level of exposure of UV radiation. (German Association of Dermatological Prevention – ADP e.V.)*

An additional stem cell pool associated with the development of skin cancer is the bulge region of the hair follicle (see Fig. 19). This also describes another difference between adult skin and children's skin. Children's skin has vellus hair which develops into terminal hair during puberty (Randall 2008). With vellus hair, the sensitive bulge region, which is also home to the precursors of pigment cells, is located further away from the surface of the skin than terminal hair, meaning that it is exposed to higher levels of damaging UV radiation (Garcia et al. 2011). The described phenomena indicate that epidermal stem cells may be exposed to higher levels of UV exposure due to their localisation in children's skin, thus increasing the risk of developing skin cancer during adulthood (Volkmer und Greinert 2011). Thorough protection from the sun during childhood should therefore be ensured in order to minimise this risk.



Fig. 19*: Localisation of the stem cell region (bulge region) in vellus hair and terminal hair. Children's skin mainly has vellus hair, which develops into terminal hair during puberty. The stem cell region (bulge region) of vellus hair is closer to the surface of the skin, and is thus exposed to higher levels of UV radiation. (German Association of Dermatological Prevention – ADP e.V, modified according to (Garcia et al. 2011))*

3.1.2 DNA damage

Induction - Direct reaction path (mainly UVB)

With this reaction path, primarily UVB photons are absorbed directly by the DNA molecule, and the absorbed energy is used for a photodimerisation reaction of neighbouring pyrimidine bases. Two UV-specific photoproducts generally occur as a result of this: cyclobutane pyrimidine dimers (CPD) and pyrimidine (6-4) pyrimidone photoproducts (6-4PP) (see Fig. 20). As can be seen in the action spectrum for the production of CPDs (see Chapter 2.2.3, Fig. 5), UVB radiation is around 1,000 times more effective than UVA radiation (Mouret et al. 2012). CPDs are induced at a ratio of 3:1 when compared to 6-4PP (Mouret et al. 2006). When irradiating cell cultures, a UVB dose that may trigger sunburn in man (skin type II, see Chapter 3.1.4, Table 13) is enough to generate several 100,000 CPDs in the genome of human ceratinocytes in vitro (Greinert et al. 2000).



Fig. 20*: Diagram of the most common UV-induced DNA damage. Cyclobutane pyrimidine dimers (CPD) and pyrimidine (6-4) pyrimidone photoproducts (6-4PP) occur after exposure of neighbouring pyrimidines to UV radiation*

Induction - Indirect reaction path (mainly UVA)

UVA radiation mainly develops its damaging effect on the DNA molecule via indirect reaction paths. Here, the energy from UVA photons is absorbed by endogenous cellular photosensitive chromophors (photosensitisers) such as riboflavins and NADH. In an excited electronic (triplet) state, they can then interact with molecular oxygen via so-called type I and II photoreactions to form reactive oxygen species such as superoxide anions, H_2O_2, OH radicals or singlet oxygen. These reactive oxygen species may then lead to DNA single-strand breaks (SSB), DNA double-strand breaks (DSB), DNA protein crosslinking, alkali albile sites (ALS) or base modifications such as UVA-specific 8-oxoguanine (Matsumura und Ananthaswamy 2002a).

New works also show that UVA radiation is also in a position to produce CPDs (even if there is a smaller yield than UVB radiation). The mechanisms leading to the occurrence of CPDs following UVA exposure are yet to be fully established (Cadet et al. 2012, Mouret et al. 2012). However, premutagenic CPDs are the most common cause of UVA-induced DNA damage in human skin (Mouret et al. 2006). Given that 95% of solar UV radiation is within the UVA spectrum, this finding is of particular importance when assessing the risk of solar (and artificial) UV radiation.

Repairing UV-induced DNA damage

In mammal cells, bulky lesions such as CPD and 6-4 PP can be eliminated from the genome by means of nucleotide excision repair (NER). This is a complex interaction involving a number of proteins (up to 30) that are responsible for detecting damage, unravelling DNA, cutting DNA, processing DNA and the like. In the end, the damage is enzymatically cut out of the double helix in a 28 to 31-nucleotide long, single-strand DNA section before the resulting gap is filled again (with the opposite strand as a matrix) (Lagerwerf et al. 2011, van der Wees et al. 2007).

UV-induced oxidative damage such as 8-oxoguanine and other oxidative DNA damage may, depending on the kind of damage and its processing, be eliminated from the genome by a number of enzymatic repair paths (Peterson und Côté 2004), including base excision repair (BER) (Dianov und Parsons 2007, Robertson et al. 2009), DNA single-strand break repair (SSB repair) (Dianov und Parsons 2007, Horton et al. 2008, Wilson 2007), DNA double-strand break repair (DSB repair) (Shrivastav et al. 2008, Valerie und Povirk 2003, Weinstock et al. 2006), mismatch repair (Skinner und Turker 2005, Slupphaug et al. 2003) as well as nucleotide excision repair (NER) (Lindahl 1993, Satoh et al. 1993, Wang 2008).

Overall, these briefly outlined repair systems are able to effectively eliminate DNA damage from the genome (within a period of minutes through to days, depending on the kind of damage and quantity of induced damage). However, taking into account the fact that minimal erythemal dose (see Chapter 2.2.3.2) generates several 100,000 CPDs per genome of each individual exposed cell (Greinert et al. 2000), it becomes clear how effective, e.g. NER works, and how dysfunctions (non-repair) can occur, as is the case with overloading, deficiency and/or limited repair, which can then lead to mutations.

The DNA repair mechanisms are determined genetically. Xeroderma pigmentosum is a genetic disorder that leads to the affected person being much more sensitive to UV radiation and up to 1,000 times more at risk of developing skin cancer (Emmert et al. 2011, Kraemer et al. 2007, van Steeg und Kraemer 1999).

UV-specific mutations

If UVA-induced or UVB-induced CPDs in a cell's genome are not rectified by cellular repair mechanisms, they lead to the occurrence of C→T or CC→TT transition mutations known as UV signature mutations because they generally only occur in the broad spectrum of all potential DNA mutations (Matsumura und Ananthaswamy 2002a, Pfeifer und Besaratinia 2012, Sage et al. 2012). The majority of mutations identified in skin tumours are UV-specific (Aszterbaum et al. 1999, Benjamin und Ananthaswamy 2007, Brellier et al. 2004, de Gruijl et al. 2001). Mutations occur in a range of tumour suppressor genes and oncogenes (e.g. patched, p16, ras, p53), which play a key part in particular in the etiology of basal cell carcinoma (BCC) and squamous cell carcinoma (SCC). CPDs represent the main UV-induced DNA damage in terms of skin cancer. In addition, UVA-specific DNA lesions can contribute to the occurrence of mutations such as T→G transversions as a result of 8-oxoguanine, which can be made responsible for the development of skin cancer (de Gruijl et al. 1993, Dumaz et al. 1997, Matsumura und Ananthaswamy 2002a).

3.1.3 Immunosuppression

One of the main effects of UV radiation is its ability to suppress the body's immunological response to antigens. In vivo experiments involving mice show that (UV-induced) skin tumours following subcutaneous transplantation only grow in animals who have been immunosuppressed in advance with UV radiation, while the skin of non-exposed mice rejected the tumours (Norval 2000). UV exposure triggers a series of reactions in the skin that may lead

to local, but possibly also systemic immunosuppression. These reactions are a complicated interaction involving a wide range of different cell types such as keratinocytes, antigen presenting cells, Langerhans cells and T-helper cells (T_h cells) as well as a number of cellular messengers and mediators such as interleukins (IL-1, IL-2, IL-10) or interferons such as interferon γ (INF-γ). The precise mechanisms are yet to be fully understood. Although a number of immunosuppressive experiments have been performed on animals, it is now assumed that local and systemic suppression of the human immune system is triggered by comparable mechanisms (Bataille et al. 2000, Duthie et al. 1999, Kelly et al. 1998, Moyal und Fourtanier 2002), and has also been proven in the course of human studies (Ruegemer et al. 2002). As one of the immune system's tasks is to identify and eliminate degenerate cells, immunosuppression resulting from UV radiation can also be considered an additional risk factor for the development of skin cancer in man (Yoshikawa et al. 1990). In connection with this, the increased risk of skin cancer should also be associated with (transplant) patients receiving immunosuppression therapy.

3.1.4 Tanning

Tanning is the result of UV-induced melanogenesis (Maddodi et al. 2012), which can be split into two wavelength-dependent mechanisms (Sklar et al. 2013):

1. UVA-induced pigment darkening (PD)
2. UVB-induced delayed tanning (DT)

Melanin is the chromophore for both radiation qualities (UVA and UVB) that absorbs UV radiation and, following UV exposure, is released via melanocytic dendrites to neighbouring keratinocytes in order to protect their nucleus from the damaging effects of UVA and UVB radiation.

UVA radiation only generates an intense PD following extremely high doses (>100,000 J/m^2) and with particular effectiveness at wavelengths of around 340 nm. Here, UVA causes the oxidation of melanin precursors, which are stored in the melanocytes' small cell organelles, the melanosomes. The oxidised form of melanin is then released via the melanosomes to neighbouring keratinocytes and spreads itself over the nucleus as a protective barrier. The UVA-induced pigmentation change occurs dose-dependent in two phases. At doses > 10,000 J/m² to 20,000 J/m², immediate pigment darkening (IPD) is induced within minutes, but fades again after a period of a few minutes to a few hours. If the UVA doses exceed values 100,000 J/m² to 200,000 J/m², a more intense IPD is induced that fades again within hours and leaves behind persistent pigment darkening (PPD) that may last for more than 24 hours and result in UVA-induced delayed tanning (DT) (Sklar et al. 2013). In contrast to IPD and PPD, DT occurs due to photochemical reactions that generate a resynthesis of melanin. The UVA-dependent melanin accumulation depends on the wavelength. At a range of 340 nm to 400 nm, there is an increase in melanin density in the basal cell layer of the epidermis. In contrast, an increase in melanin granules can be seen in cell layers closer to the surface at a range of 315 nm to 340 nm (due to the low penetration depth of the epidermis). However, it was shown that the IPD, PDD or DT generated by UVA does not provide any (or only very little) protection against subsequent UV exposure (Miyamura et al. 2011). As a result, literature on erythema formation provides a sun protection factor (SPF) of 1.5 for UVA-included tanning, and is thus relatively low (Gange et al. 1985).

UVB radiation results in delayed tanning (DT). It initially occurs around 24 hours after exposure and reaches maximum intensity 3 to 6 days later. Without renewed exposure, this tanning fades within about 3 to 4 weeks as a result of the cell proliferation of human skin. UVB-induced tanning is the result of a de novo synthesis of melanin and an increase in the number

of melanosomes in the melanocytes subsequently transported to neighbouring keratinocytes. Photoprotection from tanning acquired in this way is heavily dependent upon the genetically determined ability to form melanin, which determines skin type (see Table 13). The ratio between pheomelanin and eumelanin (two possible forms of melanin) is, in particular, seen as a key indicator of the presence of weak melano-protection (skin type I, pheo/eu = large) or effective melano-protection (skin type IV, pheo/eu = small) (Kadekaro et al. 2003). Literature provides SPF values of 2 to 3 for UVB/SSR-induced tanning (Gange et al. 1985, Sheehan et al. 2002). However, these values refer to erythema formation and do not provide any information about the influence of DT on DNA damage relevant to skin cancer.

Table 13*: Definition of skin types*

	Properties	**Acute reaction to high UV exposure**	**Ability to form melanin**
Skin type I (Caucasian)	– Extremely fair skin – Generally has freckles – Extremely sensitive skin – Light eyes – Sandy-red hair	Never tans Generally burns	Limited melanogenesis
Skin type II (Caucasian)	– Fair skin – Often has freckles – Sensitive skin – Light eyes – Light hair	Slowly tans Often burns	Limited melanogenesis
Skin type III (Caucasian)	– Medium skin – Light or dark eyes – Brown hair	Slowly tans uniformly Sometimes burns	Normal melanogenesis
Skin type IV (Caucasian)	– Olive skin, generally not sensitive – Dark eyes – Dark brown or black hair	Tans quickly and well Rarely burns	Normal melanogenesis
Skin type V (e.g. Asian)	– Dark skin, generally not sensitive – Dark eyes – Black hair	Rarely burns	Protected by melanin
Skin type VI (Negroid)	– Black skin, generally not sensitive – Dark eyes – Black hair	Very rarely burns	Protected by melanin

3.1.5 Hyperkeratosis

Hyperkeratosis is a UV-induced increase in cell division within the epidermis, represented histologically as an acanthosis, which is then followed by increased horn formation, i.e. thickening of the horny layer of the skin (stratum corneum). Both UVB and UVA can generate hyperkeratosis, although UVB does this to a greater extent (Gambichler et al. 2005, Pearse et al. 1987). UV-induced proliferation of epidermal keratinocytes occurs 24 to 48 hours after exposure (Matsumura und Ananthaswamy 2002b). Here, activation of the epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) plays a major part as it is a key signal path via which proliferation, differentiation and survival of the cell are controlled (El-Abaseri et al. 2006). As EGFR activation is a major factor in a number of cancer entities, this mechanism can also be linked to the development of skin cancer. On the other hand, UV-induced hyperkeratosis and the epidermis thickened as a whole provide epidermis cells, particularly the basal cell layer and the cutis below that, a certain level of natural UV protection. However, hyperkeratosis only occurs

with UV exposures that correspond to or exceed a momentary, individual minimal erythema dose, as shown in experiments into the dose-response relationship (Knuschke et al. 2010). Everyday exposures received while avoiding sunburn (which also includes workers who always perform activities outdoors) do not lead to any demonstrable hyperkeratosis. As a result, the protective effect is negligible in terms of erythema sensitivity (Knuschke et al. 2010). On average, repeat extreme UV exposures over prolonged periods of time (daily over a period of 20 days resulting in UV erythema) lead to a 40-fold increase in the *MED*. A similar procedure involving an albino increased the *MED* by a factor of 4.5, which was confirmed by the histology and attributed to the reactive acanthosis that was triggered. This led to the conclusion that following excessive UV exposures, Caucasian skin increases individual *MED* by a factor of 40. The reactive acanthosis triggered thereby accounts for around a quarter of the *MED* increase (Jung und Anton-Lamprecht 1971).

3.1.6 Sunburn (inflammation, solar erythema)

Inflammatory early effects largely triggered by UVB have been investigated thoroughly, both in vitro and in vivo. They are characterised by a complex regulated change in the concentration of molecules which maintain the intercellular communication network between different cell types (keratinocytes, melanocytes, mast cells, granulocytes and macrophagocytes) in the human epidermis (Black et al. 1980, Clydesdale et al. 2001, Krutmann und Grewe 1995, Urbanski et al. 1990). UV-induced changes to these molecule class concentrations can be determined 2 to 72 hours after exposure. Histamine release of mast cells appears to represent an extremely early post-exposure event, and vasodilation is a clinical parameter that can be determined at an early stage which eventually leads to clinically perceivable erythema. From a morphological perspective, this involves a (subjectively) barely perceivable reddening of the skin that occurs 24 hours after exposure and subsides after a number of days. This kind of slight reddening represents the mildest form of sunburn. However, as the level of UV exposure increases, severe sunburn may occur together with blistering. The occurrence of erythema remains the dermatological quantity for overexposure of the skin to UV radiation. Nevertheless, DNA damage of relevance to skin cancer may in fact occur before the erythema threshold is reached.

3.1.7 Vitamin D

3.1.7.1 Cutaneous vitamin D3 synthesis

Vitamin D3, the precursor to naturally occurring, biologically active vitamin D metabolite 1α,25-dihydroxyvitamin D3 (1α,25(OH)2D3), occurs in human skin when UVB radiation (280 nm to 315 nm) acts on 7-dehydrocholesterol (7-DHC) (provitamin D3) (Holick 2007, Reichrath 2009) (see Fig. 21). 7-DHC is formed from cholesterol. Based on living conditions in Germany and a number of other countries with similar solar exposure, it is estimated that 80% to 90% of vitamin D present in the body is formed due to endogenous synthesis in the skin, while around 10% to 20% of vitamin D comes from the consumption of food (vitamin D3 from animal foodstuffs, vitamin D2 from vegetable foodstuffs and fungi) (Holick 2007).

UVB-triggered synthesis of vitamin D3 from its precursors takes place within a complex network of photochemical reactions which, according to the current state of knowledge, is characterised by conversion rates in four photoreversible and one non-reversible phototransformation, and involves a total of nine different biochemical equilibrium reactions (Lehmann et al. 1999, Schlumpf et al. 2010). As well as other factors such as UV exposure time period and exposed skin surface, vitamin D3 formation in the skin largely depends upon wavelength and irradiance of the UV radiation as well as the ratio of UVB (280 nm to 315 nm) to UVA (315 nm to 400 nm) (Holick et al. 1980). If previtamin D3 is formed in the skin due to UVB exposure, a few minutes later an equally UVB-dependent photoisomerisation of

previtamin D3 occurs via an additional reaction path along with the (in terms of calcium metabolism) inactive isomers tachysterol and lumisterol (Holick 1981, Wacker und Holick 2013). This results in a stable equilibrium. Vitamin D3 also absorbs UVB and is broken down into various photoproducts such as 5,6-transvitamin D3 or suprasterol as a result of a photodegradation process (Wacker und Holick 2013). Photoisomerisation and photodegradation prevent vitamin D3 from being overproduced (see Chapter 3.2.2).



Fig. 21: Diagram of vitamin D synthesis (according to Asmuß and Baldermann 2012)

3.1.7.2 Human vitamin D metabolism

Vitamin D formed in the skin or consumed via foodstuffs passes through the blood stream bound to vitamin D-binding protein (DBP or GC) and on to the liver where it is hydroxylated for the first time in C-25 position by the cytochrome P450 enzyme (vitamin D-25 hydroxylation, CYP27A1; CYP2R1) (Holick et al. 1980) (see Fig. 21). 25-hydroxyvitamin D [25(OH)D] is the main vitamin D metabolite in blood, where it is generally bound to DBP. A second hydroxylation in C-1 position occurs in the renal tubule and involves another cytochrome P450 enzyme, namely 25-hydroxyvitamin D-1α-hydroxylase (CYP27B1). This results in 1α,25(OH)2D3, the biologically active metabolite of vitamin D. While C-25 hydroxylation in the liver does not appear to be impaired later in life (Harris und Dawson-Hughes 2002), the ability for C-1 hydroxylation is assumed to decline due to age-related functional renal impairment, although renal function does need to be extremely limited for this to occur (Armbrecht et al. 1980, Gallagher et al. 2007).

The concentration of 1α,25(OH)2D3 in blood is regulated by a feedback mechanism involving 1α,25(OH)2D3 itself (via induction of the 1α,25(OH)2D3-metabolising enzyme [1α,25(OH)2D3-24-hydroxylase, CYP24A1]), and also by parathormone (parathyrin, parathyroid hormone - PTH), calcium and various cytokines such as interferon γ (IFNγ) and the tumour necrosis factor α (TNFα) (Holick 2003, Holick 2007).

It was long assumed that only the kidney is able to convert 25(OH)D to the active form 1α,25(OH)2D3. However, in vitro experiments as well as studies on nephrectomised patients have shown that a number of extrarenal cells such as keratinocytes, monocytes, macrophages, osteoblasts, prostate cells and colon cells are also able to convert 25(OH)D to the active form

1α,25(OH)2D3 by expression of 1α-hydroxylase (Bikle et al. 1986, Holick 2007, Lehmann et al. 1999). In keratinocytes, both 1α-hydroxylase (CYP27B1) and 25-hydroxylase (CYP27A1) were proven (Fu et al. 1997, Lehmann et al. 1999, Seifert et al. 2009), meaning that keratinocytes possess the enzymatic requirements to fully synthesise 1α,25(OH)2D3 from 7-DHC. This was also confirmed by Lehmann et al. (Lehmann et al. 2001) using an in vivo skin model. Based on the current state of knowledge, the 1α,25(OH)2D3 formed in extrarenal tissue is not passed on to the bloodstream and is not involved in regulating bone and calcium metabolism; instead it regulates local proliferation, differentiation and a number of different tissue-specific functions (Holick 2007).

In the target cells and renal tubule cells, the breakdown of 1α,25(OH)2D3 is initiated by CYP24A1 via a third hydroxylation in C-24 position (Holick 2007). This results in 24,25-dihydroxycholecalciferol, which only has a weak biological effect (Henry 2001, Holick 2007). Based on the current state of knowledge, 1α,25(OH)2D3 has a 100-fold to 1,000-fold higher level of biological activity than other known natural vitamin D metabolites (Holick 2007).

These metabolic steps apply in equal measure to vitamin D2 and vitamin D3. However, the biological effectiveness of vitamin D2, which humans only absorb through foodstuffs or substitution, may be lower than that of vitamin D3 (Trang et al. 1998).

3.2 Biological effect of UV radiation and long-term effects on the skin

As described in Chapter 3.1, UV radiation penetrates the skin and, once there, leads to immediately measurable effects such as DNA damage. Hours later it often leads to local or systemic reactions by the body such as tanning, sunburn or immunosuppression. Over the course of years, repeat acute damage, indicated for example by UV-induced ageing of the skin, may lead to late health effects such as skin cancer. Vitamin D3 synthesis (see Chapter 3.1.7) is the only positive effect of UV radiation and is in stark contrast to all of the other damaging effects of UV radiation. Vitamin D3 synthesis is indeed a positive effect as a lack of vitamin D can cause negative biological effects in terms of bone structure and preservation.

A distinction must be made between deterministic and stochastic effects when describing the health effects of UV radiation. Deterministic effects always occur after a dose threshold has been exceeded (as is the case with sunburn, for example), where the higher the exposure, the higher the effect that occurs beyond the dose threshold. With stochastic effects, only the probability of occurrence depends on the dose (as is the case with skin cancer, for example). The extent (clinical progression in the event of skin cancer) of the effect is not determined by the dose. Based on the current state of knowledge, a dose threshold is not known for the development of skin cancer.

3.2.1 Skin cancer

Skin cancer represents the most severe late effect due to excessive exposure to solar and/or artificial UV radiation. As can also be seen globally, the number of people developing skin cancer in Germany has been growing significantly for many years now (see Figs. 22 and 23). This rise is attributed to increased solar exposure during leisure time and increased use of solaria. The temporally and locally limited thinning of the ozone layer in Europe may also have an impact on this observation. The introduction of skin cancer screening for people with statutory health insurance in 2008 also led to the expectation of an increase in skin cancer incidence. The German Institute for Cancer Epidemiology regularly provides skin cancer incidence extrapolations for Germany. As skin cancer data collection in the German state of Schleswig-Holstein is nearing completeness, this data will be used as a basis for calculation. The age-specific incidence rates of various types of skin cancer (source: Cancer Register

Schleswig-Holstein, http://www.krebsregister-sh.de) are assigned and totalled for the corresponding age groups of Germany's general population (source: Federal Statistical Office). The extrapolation provides the skin cancer incidence in Germany, based on the assumption that incidence rates for Schleswig-Holstein are representative of Germany as a whole. This assumption appears to be justified as additional estimates (Association of Population-based Cancer Registries in Germany – GEKID) provide similar results for malignant melanoma. New skin cancer incidence rates for 2012 collected as described above are presented in Table 14. By observing all three types of skin cancer, i.e. basal cell carcinoma, squamous cell carcinoma and malignant melanoma, skin cancer was the most common form of cancer in Germany with around 260,000 new registered cases in 2012. For many years now, efforts have been made on a regular basis to warn the general public in Germany about the risks of UV radiation. Any resulting reduction in UV exposure should lead to a decline in the number of new cases of skin cancer. Such a trend appears to be occurring with malignant melanoma (see Fig. 22), but at present it cannot be ruled out that this is due to a random fluctuation.



Fig. 22: *Development of age-standardised incidence rates over time for malignant melanoma in Germany, European standard (EASR) (Epidemiologisches Krebsregister Saarland 2016, GEKID 2014)*



Fig. 23: Development of age-standardised incidence rates over time for non-melanocytic skin cancer (squamous cell carcinoma and basal cell carcinoma) in Germany, European standard (EASR) (Epidemiologisches Krebsregister Saarland 2016, GEKID 2014)

Table 14*: Extrapolation of new skin cancer incidences in Germany in 2012 (age-standardised)*

Skin cancer entity	Total:	Male	Female
Malignant melanoma, invasive	21,180	10,640	10,540
Malignant melanoma, in situ	9,420	4,780	4,640
Malignant melanoma, total	30,600	15,420	15,180
Basal cell carcinoma	149,920	74,970	74,950
Squamous cell carcinoma, invasive	45,140	25,200	19,940
Squamous cell carcinoma, in situ	38,210	17,410	20,800
Squamous cell carcinoma, total	83,350	42,610	40,740
Skin cancer, total	263,870	133,000	130,870

Source: Cancer Register Schleswig-Holstein, 2015 (Katalinic 2015)

3.2.1.1 Basal cell carcinoma (BCC)

Basal cell carcinoma is a tumour that grows slowly and generally starts out as a small nodule that destroys local tissue (see Fig. 24) and only metastasises in a few exceptional cases. It is assumed to originate in the epithelium of hair follicles and generally occurs on the head and throat region, which is constantly exposed to UV radiation. It can, however, also occur in other parts of the body normally covered by clothing. Basal cell carcinoma has no precursor. Depending on its localisation, the consequences can be severe and may have a substantial impact. The risk of developing BCC is influenced both by the lifetime dose of UV radiation and by intermittent UV exposures such as holidays in southern countries and sunburn which occurred during childhood or as adolescents (Armstrong und Kricker 2001, Gallagher et al. 1995b, Kricker et al. 1991, Kricker et al. 1995b, Kricker et al. 1995a, Rosso et al. 1996, Vitasa et al. 1990, Wu et al. 2014a, Wu et al. 2014b, Zanetti et al. 1996).

In up to 100% of all occurring BCCs, mutations (often UV signature C→T transition mutations) are described as occurring in genes of the key Sonic-Hedgehog-Patched-Smoothened signalling pathway involved in hair follicle growth and morphogenesis in the skin (Aszterbaum et al. 1999, Brellier et al. 2004). A number of experiments indicate that this signalling pathway's disorder represents the main reason for developing BCC, and that BCCs arise from hair follicle cells (Boehnke et al. 2012, Boukamp 2005).



Fig. 24*: Basal cell carcinoma*

BCC represents the most common form of skin cancer. According to Table 14, there were 74,970 new cases of BCC in men and 74,950 new cases of BCC in women in Germany in 2012. The 6th and 7th decade of a person's lifespan is the peak age for BCC. Metastasis is extremely

uncommon (Di Lernia et al. 2013). The rate of mortality is low: < 0.6 per 100,000 male inhabitants and 0.3 per 100,000 female inhabitants for non-melanocytic skin cancer (BCC and SCC) (GEKID 2014).

3.2.1.2 Squamous cell carcinoma (spinocellular carcinoma - SCC)

Squamous cell carcinomas destroy local tissue during growth and occur in 90% of cases in areas exposed to UV such as the face, ears, lower lip and back of the hand (see Fig. 25). The risk of developing SCC increases with the UV lifetime dose (Armstrong und Kricker 2001, Wu et al. 2014a, Wu et al. 2014b). SCCs generally occur in skin that has been chronically damaged by UV (e.g. solar elastosis) and in which actinic keratosis forms as a precursor with sharply delimited reddening and a raw, sandpaper-like surface. Over time, firmly adhering, brownish-yellow cornifications that look like a scab will develop. In up to 10% of cases, the changes will result in squamous cell carcinoma. Based on the cornification, the squamous cell carcinoma infiltrates the skin, which subsequently becomes nodular and grows to a point where it may split like an ulcer. This change may take place very quickly, perhaps even within a few days or weeks.



Fig. 25*: Squamous cell carcinoma*

For SCC etiology there is a relatively well described model in which early UV-specific mutations in the p53 gene during tumour initiation favour the development of a precancerous precursor of SCC, actinic keratosis (AK). It is assumed that AK only initially involves a mutation of a single allele of the p53 gene which prevents the p53-dependent apoptosis of some of the UV-damaged cells (sunburn cells). As “neighbouring” cells exhibit normal apoptosis at the same time, p53-mutated cells have a “selection advantage” and can expand clonally to the AK. If the second p53 allele is mutated during the tumour promotion phase, the p53-dependent cell cycle checkpoint function is deactivated. This leads to uncontrolled cell growth and, as a result of induction, to further (possibly UV-induced) mutations in other genes (e.g. ras) during the tumour progression phase, which in turn leads to the formation of invasive SCCs (Brash 1997, Cleaver und Crowley 2002, Ziegler et al. 1994). In more than 90% of patients with in situ SCC (i.e. not yet invasively growing SCC), UV signature mutations were proven in the p53 gene (Ortonne 2002).

SCC is the second-most common skin cancer. There were 42,610 new cases of SCC in men and 40,740 new cases of SCC in women in Germany in 2012 (see Table 14). The 6th and 7th decade of a person’s lifespan is the peak age for SCC, although young people can also develop it as well. The rate of mortality is low: 0.6 per 100,000 male inhabitants and 0.3 per 100,000 female inhabitants for non-melanocytic skin cancer (BCC and SCC). Depending on the extent of the

tumour, around 0.5% to 5% of patients with SCC in the skin experience metastasis (Lund 1965, Møller et al. 1979), although this figure rises to around 16% for patients with extremely advanced tumours (Brantsch et al. 2008). The occurrence of metastasis is associated with a poor prognosis.

3.2.1.3 Malignant melanoma (MM)

Malignant melanoma (see Fig. 26) generally involves a pigmented skin tumour that is responsible for around 90% of all mortalities from skin cancer. Among other reasons, this is due to the fact that metastasis often occurs (in 25% of all cases) (Garbe und Lasithiotakis 2006)). MM occurs in various clinical manifestations. Some melanomas grow slowly into the afflicted area, whereas others spread out and penetrate the skin very rapidly. MM can occur anywhere on the skin, and the areas of the head covered with hair, the mucous membranes and the skin underneath fingernails and toenails may also be afflicted. The link between UV exposure and induction of MM in the skin is regularly called into question as MM also occurs in parts of the body that are not generally exposed to UV. However, most cases of MM (94%) occur in parts of the body that may be regularly or intermittently exposed to UV radiation (face, other parts of the head, neck, chest, back, upper arm, lower arm, hand, thigh, lower leg, foot) (Blum et al. 2004).



Fig. 26*: Malignant melanoma (scale in mm)*

There are a number of indications that MM occurs as a result of intermittent UV exposure and severe sunburn during childhood and as adolescents (Armstrong und Kricker 2001, Blum et al. 2004, Dulon et al. 2002). This is also supported by so-called immigrant studies which investigate the risk of developing MM by migrating to a country with a high risk of disease when compared to the person's place of birth. The study data involving Europeans with a light skin type who migrated to Israel or Australia showed that the risk of developing MM only increased in the country of immigration if migration occurred during the person's childhood (Cooke 1985, Katz et al. 1982, Khlat et al. 1992, Levine et al. 2013, McCredie und Coate 1989, Steinitz et al. 1989). Light-skinned individuals (skin type I; see Chapter 3.1.4, Table 13) with red or blonde hair, who tend to develop freckles, do not tan, and burn easily in the sun, are at high risk of developing MM. There are indications that this is linked to the formation of the pigment pheomelanin, which has a photosensitising effect as damaging reactive oxygen species

occur after this molecule absorbs UVA radiation (Ranadive et al. 1986). More recent works also indicate that the formation of pheomelanin also increases the level of reactive oxygen species in the cell without the influence of UV radiation (Morgan et al. 2013), which is why pheomelanin can be said to have a potentially mutagenous effect (Mitra et al. 2012). In contrast to SCC and BCC, UV-induced mutations in the p53 gene appear to be of minor importance. Only around 20% of malignant melanomas exhibit p53 mutations (Zerp et al. 1999).

Mutations in the BRAF gene are of major importance to the development of MM (Daniotti 2004, Sasaki et al. 2004). These mutations lead to permanent activation of the important MAPK (mitogen-activated protein kinase) reaction path (Sondak und Smalley 2009). In 2010, Pleasance and staff catalogued for the first time ever the entire spectrum of somatic mutations in the entire genome of a melanoma metastasis (Pleasance et al. 2010). Their catalogue showed that the majority (around 70%) of detected single-base substitutions were type C→T and around 70% of dinucleotide substitutions were type CC→TT. As these are known to be UV-specific mutations (signature mutations – see Chapter 3.1.2), this finding creates a strong link between malignant melanoma and UV exposure (Pfeifer und Besaratinia 2012).

For malignant melanoma there are indications that the predisposition is autosomal dominant as around 3% to 5% of afflicted patients have one or more direct relatives who have also had malignant melanoma (Fallah et al. 2014, Olsen et al. 2010). Mutations in the $p16^{INK4A}$ gene play an important part in this regard (Hussussian et al. 1994, Kamb et al. 1994).

There were 15,420 new cases of MM in men and 15,180 new cases of MM in women in Germany in 2012 (see Table 14), with around 3,000 people dying as a result of their illness. The peak age for MM is around 50, although young people can also develop it as well.

3.2.1.4 Risk factors for skin cancer

The description of risk factors is based on the current S3 guideline on prevention of skin cancer with systematic literature research ranging from January 1995 to April 2012 (AWMF 2014)(AWMF 2014)(AWMF 2014)(AWMF 2014)(AWMF 2014).

When it comes to risk factors, a distinction must be made between constitutional (congenital), acquired and exposure risk factors for each skin cancer type.

Skin type is a constitutional risk factor for non-melanocytic skin cancer (BCC and SCC) (see Chapter 3.1.4, Table 13) (Gallagher et al. 1995a, Gallagher et al. 1995b) (see Table 15), while acquired risk factors include chronically UV-damaged skin (Moon und Oh 2001), the presence of actinic keratoses (Dodson et al. 1991), a previous affliction of BCC or SCC (past medical history) (Marcil und Stern 2000), immunosuppression (e.g. within the context of an organ transplantation) (Berg und Otley 2002, Dantal et al. 1998, España et al. 1995, Jensen et al. 1999, Otley 2002, Preciado et al. 2002) or skin damaged by radiation therapy (Karagas et al. 1996, Lichter et al. 2000, Travis und Arndt 1986).

Pertinent literature incorporating various studies provide values for relative risks (RR) and lifetime risks for the given acquired risk factors for non-melanocytic skin cancer. Some of the values for non-melanocytic skin cancer are provided below by way of example:

The presence of multiple actinic keratoses over a 10-year period with a lifetime risk of developing squamous cell carcinoma (SCC) is stated as being within a range of 6% to 10%. There is a 30% risk of developing an additional SCC within 5 years, and around a 40% risk of developing a basal cell carcinoma (BCC) within 5 years. There is a 44% risk of developing an additional BCC within 3 years, and around a 6% risk of developing a SCC within 5 years. SCCs occur up to sixty-five times more often in immunosuppressed transplant patients than in control patients. Immunosuppressed transplant patients develop more SCCs than BCCs (4:1).

SCC and BCC differ in terms of exposure risk factors. While the probability of developing an SCC correlates with an increasing UV dose acquired over a lifetime (cumulative dose), the UV dose-response relationship for BCC is yet to be fully established. With BCC, cumulative UV exposure only appears to be of minor importance, with intermittent UV exposure playing a great part (Armstrong und Kricker 2001, Khalesi et al. 2013) (see Table 17).

Table 15: Relative risks for non-melanocytic skin cancer (SCC, BCC): Constitutional risk factor "skin type" (see Chapter 3.1.4, Table 13) (Gallagher et al. 1995a, Gallagher et al. 1995b)

Risk factor	**Relative risk Numbers in brackets: 95% CI**
Skin type I vs. IV (BCC)	5.1 (1.4-11.3)
Skin type II vs. IV (BCC)	5.3 (1.7-10.6)
Skin type I vs. IV (SCC)	1.4 (0.5-3.0)
Skin type II vs. IV (SCC)	2.2 (0.7-3.8)

Constitutional risk factors of MM are skin type (see Chapter 3.1.4, Table 13) (Gandini et al. 2005c) and the number of hereditary, in particular large and very large pigmentations (DeDavid et al. 1997, Greeley et al. 1965, Grob et al. 1990, Hendrickson und Ross 1981, Illig 1986). The main acquired risk factors for MM include the number of acquired pigmentations (Bataille et al. 1996, Breitbart et al. 1997, Gandini et al. 2005a, Naldi et al. 2000), the number of clinically atypical pigmentations (Gandini et al. 2005a, Halpern et al. 1991), a previous history of developing MM (Tucker et al. 1985) and a direct relative (parent, child) developing MM (Ford et al. 1995, Hemminki et al. 2001). The risk factors for malignant melanoma identified in a large meta-analysis are set out in Table 16. Intermittent UV exposures (e.g. holidays involving high levels of solar exposure) and sunburn represent the largest exposure risk factor for MM (Armstrong und Kricker 2001, Gandini et al. 2005b) (see Table 17). Exposure in solaria is also a risk factor, and the risk of developing MM due to regular solaria use (once per month) is 60% higher among people below the age of 35 (Boniol et al. 2012a, Boniol et al. 2012b).

Table 16: Relative risks for malignant melanoma (constitutional and acquired) (Gandini et al. 2005a, Gandini et al. 2005b, Gandini et al. 2005c)

Risk factors	**Relative risks (95% CI)**
Skin type I (see Chapter 3.1.4, Table)	2.09 (1.67-2.58): I vs. IV
Number of acquired nevi	6.89 (4.63-10.25): 101-120 vs. < 15
Number of atypical nevi	6.36 (3.80-10.33): 5 vs. 0
Melanoma in family history	1.74 (1.41-2.14)
Lots of freckles	2.10 (1.80-2.45)
Skin colour: light vs. dark	2.06 (1.68-2.52)
Eye colour: blue vs. dark	1.47 (2.80-2.55)
Hair colour: red vs. dark	2.02 (1.24-3.29)
Precursor and skin cancer lesions*	4.28 (2.8-6.55)
Actinic damage**	2.02 (1.24-3.29)

* Actinic keratosis, squamous cell carcinoma, basal cell carcinoma, ** Solar lentigines, elastosis

Table 17: Relative risks of developing BCC, SCC and MM based on various solar exposure samples (Armstrong und Kricker 2001). The relative risk is determined by comparing the lowest and highest UV exposure within the investigated groups with various exposure samples.

Exposure type	BCC - RR (95% CI)	SCC - RR (95% CI)	MM - RR (95% CI)
Total (cumulative):	0.98 (0.68-1.41)	1.53 (1.02-2.27)	1.20 (1.00-1.44)
Occupational	1.19 (1.07-2.27)	1.64 (1.26-2.13)	0.86 (0.77-0.96)
Non-occupational or intermittent	1.38 (1.24-1.54)	0.91 (0.68-1.22)	1.71 (1.54-1.90)
Sunburn at every age	1.40 (1.29-1.51)	1.23 (0.90-1.69)	1.91 (1.69-2.17)

3.2.2 Importance of vitamin D

3.2.2.1 The health discussion surrounding UV-induced vitamin D

Over the last 10 years, experts and, increasingly, the general public, have been discussing whether UV-induced vitamin D synthesis in the skin and the resulting bio-availability of vitamin D in the body can improve a person's health beyond the scope of the known positive influence it has on bone structure and preservation. This is contrasted by the need for thorough UV protection in order to minimise the risk of developing skin cancer, and thus requires a thorough risk-benefit analysis.

The discussion was initiated by epidemiological findings from geographical correlation studies (ecological studies) and experimental studies which support the hypothesis that the development of cancer and other illnesses could be related to reduced vitamin D production owing to reduced UV exposure (Deeb et al. 2007, Garland und Garland 1980, Grant 2009a, Grant und Mohr 2009). The two major analyses conducted by the International Agency for Research on Cancer and the Institute of Medicine (IOM 2011a, IARC 2008), and a review by Lucas et al. 2015 (Lucas et al. 2015) provide a good overview of the literature published on this topic.

Over the last few years, this data has led to increased calls (e.g. by the WHO (Lucas et al. 2006a)) for more balanced messages on radiation protection to be issued (to the public) which, besides pointing out the risks of UV radiation, also indicate the positive health effects of UV radiation (particularly in relation to vitamin D production).

When evaluating the data available on the health effects of UV radiation that are considered "healthy", particularly in terms of vitamin D production and vitamin D levels (in blood or serum), there are at least three points that need to be taken into account:

A Action spectra of vitamin D production / development of skin cancer

B Ideal 25(OH)D concentration and necessary UV exposure

C Study design – study quality

These three points are described below.

A Action spectra of vitamin D production / development of skin cancer:

The action spectra for the occurrence of UV-induced DNA lesions (e.g. thymine dimers, see Chapter 2.2.3, Fig. 5), for the formation of (non-melanocytic) skin cancer, for the induction of erythema, and for the UV-dependent synthesis of previtamin D in the skin are almost identical (see Fig. 27) (Wolpowitz und Gilchrest 2006).



Fig. 27: Cutaneous vitamin D synthesis cannot be considered independently of the damaging effects of UV radiation because the spectral action spectra overlap one another. The diagram shows the action spectra for cutaneous synthesis of previtamin D (blue) (Matsuoka et al. 1987), for induction of squamous cell carcinomas, and for DNA damage (green) (de Gruijl 1999) as well as for induction of erythema (red) (Adams et al. 1982). The maximum effectiveness for all end points is within the UVB range. Diagram from Wolpowitz and Gilchrest 2006

This means that, in principle, UV-induced vitamin D synthesis cannot occur without an increase in the risk of developing premutagenic DNA lesions and skin cancer (de Gruijl 1999, IARC 2008, Wolpowitz und Gilchrest 2006). This fact is important in terms of radiation protection and must be duly taken into account when issuing recommendations to the general public.

B Ideal 25(OH)D concentration and necessary UV exposure:

There is still a lot of uncertainty regarding the quantitative link between UV dose, vitamin D production in the skin, and the extent to which factors such as age, skin pigmentation level, use of sunscreen, areas of exposed skin on the body, ratio of UVA and UVB depending on the time of day and year, and other factors that influence vitamin D synthesis (see e.g. (Fioletov et al. 2009, Fioletov et al. 2010, Godar et al. 2011, Godar et al. 2012, Tsiaras und Weinstock 2011)). Due to a large interindividual variability of measured serum concentrations of 25(OH)D, there is also no evidence of a certain value of vitamin D serum concentration that characterises healthy people in general. Differing methods of determination can also lead to different results (e.g. (Roth et al. 2008)).

Due to large studies (primarily on the risk of falling and risk of fracturing) and the reference values published in a large review conducted by the Institute of Medicine (IOM 2011a) and in agreement with, e.g. the German Nutrition Society (DGE 2011), a 25(OH)D serum concentration of at least 50 nmol/l (20 ng/ml) is considered sufficient for meeting the general public's vitamin D requirements. The DGE considers a deficit to be present at a concentration of less than 30 nmol/l (12 ng/ml), (DGE, ÖGE und SGE 2013).

In light of this, data collected by the Robert Koch Institute that was published in 2008 generated a large amount of public interest. The representative study conducted Germany-wide by the

Robert Koch Institute determined the 25(OH)D concentrations in the serum of 3,917 adults (participants of the nutrition survey conducted between October 1997 and March 1999 and integrated in the national health survey of 1998 (Mensink et al. 1999)) aged between 18 and 79 (RIA testing kit, DiaSorin, Stillwater, USA). The 25(OH)D values in the serum of 10,015 children and adolescents aged between 1 and 17 (participants of the German Health Interview and Examination Survey for Children and Adolescents, KiGGS) were also measured. Children and adolescents from a migrant background were represented in line with their numbers among the general population.

Table 18: 25(OH)D concentrations in serum, annual average by age and gender (Source: Statement issued by the German Nutrition Society (DGE 2011) (according to Hintzpeter et al. 2008a, 2008b)

25-hydroxyvitamin D		All (age: 1-17)	Boys (age: 1-17)	Girls (age: 1-17)	All (age: 18-79)	Men (age: 18-79)	Women (age: 18-79)
[nmol/l]	[ng/ml]	n = 10,015	n = 5,107	n = 4,908	n = 3,917	n = 1,706	n = 2,211
< 12.5	< 5.0	3.8%	3.60%	4.00%	2.0%	2.20%	1.9%
12.5 to < 25	5.0 to < 10	15.50%	15.60%	15.40%	14.3%	13.40%	15.1%
25 to < 50	10 to < 20	43.70%	42.90%	44.50%	41.0%	41.20%	40.8%
50 to < 75	20 to < 30	22.80%	23.3%	22.30%	20.8%	22.60%	19.1%
> 75	> 30	14.20%	14.60%	13.8%	21.9%	20.60%	23.1%

Around 62% of boys and 64% of girls aged 1 to 17 and 57% of men and 58% of women aged 18 to 79 exhibited suboptimal 25-hydroxyvitamin D concentrations of less than 50 nmol/l (20 ng/ml) when averaged over the course of a year (see Table 18). When evaluating and interpreting the results of the study, a value of 25 nmol/l (10 ng/ml) was used as the reference level for determining a deficit (Hintzpeter et al. 2008a), and was also provided 2011 as a reference level for a vitamin D deficit (DGE 2011) in the statement issued by the DGE. According to that study, 19% of boys and girls, and 16% of men and 17% of women aged 18 to 79 exhibited a vitamin D deficit with 25(OH)D values of less than 25 nmol/l (10 ng/ml) (see Table 18).

25(OH)D concentrations in the serum are highly dependent upon the seasons with the average general population exhibiting lower levels in winter and higher levels in summer. In winter, 25(OH)D concentrations of less than 50 nmol/l (20 ng/ml) in the serum were seen in around 50% of infants aged 1 to 2, in over 60% of people aged 18 to 79, and in over 80% of adolescents aged 11 to 17. Even in summer, the majority of women aged 65 to 79 (75%) and migrants aged 3 to 17 (65%) had 25(OH)D concentrations of less than 50 nmol/l (20 ng/ml) in the serum (Hintzpeter et al. 2008a, Hintzpeter et al. 2008b).

Assuming a 25(OH)D deficit at a level of less than 25 nmol/l (10 ng/ml), this was seen to be the case in winter among 31% of women in this category aged between 65 and 79, and among 23% of women in this category aged between 65 and 79 during summer. With adolescent males aged 11 to 17 and from a migrant background, a deficit was seen among 51% of the group during winter and 15% in summer, while with adolescent females aged 11 to 17 and from a migrant background, a deficit was observed among 50% during winter and 17% in summer (DGE 2011).

This data was partially taken as an opportunity to counter a suboptimal vitamin D status (< 50 nmol/l, < 20 ng/ml 25(OH)D correspondingly) among large parts of the general population (more than 50% according to the results of the RKI studies) by recommending a

more intense UV exposure involving both solar and artificial UV radiation. The assumption was also made that thorough UV protection aimed at minimising the risk of skin cancer actually contributes to a lack of vitamin D and should therefore be associated with an increased risk of developing various other illnesses, including cancer. A number of publications issued by a working group posited that this leads to a significant increase in the number of deaths from cancer as a whole, and that the economic burden on the health services due to a lack of vitamin D is much higher than that incurred due to UV-induced skin cancer (Grant 2002, Grant 2008, Grant 2009b, Grant 2011, Grant und Garland 2006, Grant et al. 2005, Grant et al. 2010).

Up until recently, there were no validated results available for UV-dependent vitamin D synthesis in human skin in vivo. Age is known to play a part in vitamin D synthesis of the skin as it declines significantly with age and can drop to a rate of less than 50% (MacLaughlin und Holick 1985). As well as the decreasing thickness of skin as a person ages (Need et al. 1993), a reduced level of 7-DHC is considered to be a potential cause of the reduction in vitamin D synthesis in older skin (MacLaughlin und Holick 1985). Holick et al. (Holick et al. 1989) showed, albeit with very low numbers of test subjects (n), that a single UV full-body exposure of younger test subjects (aged 20 to 30, n=6) leads to a far greater increase in 25(OH)D serum concentration [from 6.5 nmol/l (2.6 ng/ml) to 75 nmol/l (30 ng/ml)] than among older test subjects [aged 62 to 80, n = 6; an increase from 3.2 nmol/l (1:5 ng/ml) to 19 nmol/l (7.6 ng/ml)]. More recent experiments fail to confirm these age-dependent trends (up to the age of 65), both in terms of 7-DHC levels in the skin and when it comes to 25(OH)D_3 formation effectiveness (Knuschke et al. 2012).

A series of experiments and their resulting estimates, particularly those provided by the working group headed by M. Holick (on a small group of test subjects), suggest that in many parts of the world, brief and limited UV exposures to the sun are enough to ensure sufficient cutaneous vitamin D synthesis (Holick 2007). These estimates show that cutaneous production of vitamin D by exposing the body to the sun in a bathing outfit, thus resulting in a minimal erythema dose (1 *MED*), i.e. the UV dose that causes visible reddening of the skin, roughly corresponds to the oral consumption of 10,000 to 25,000 IE (250 to 635 µg) of vitamin D (Matsuoka et al. 1987). As a result, some authors consider an exposure of less than 18% of the body's surface (e.g. hands, arms and face) two to three times per week with a dose of up to a third or half of the *MED* in spring, summer and autumn as being enough for ensuring a sufficient vitamin D supply (Holick 2007, Holick 2008).

Recent investigations which, for the first time ever, determined the vitamin D serum concentration following UV exposure under controlled conditions involving a number of test subjects in "summer clothing", are now able to confirm these estimates by way of experiment:

Rhodes et al. (Rhodes et al. 2010) and Webb et al. (Webb et al. 2011) exposed Caucasians (skin types I, II and III, see Chapter 3.1.4, Table 13), dressed only in a T-shirt and shorts (≈ 35% skin) and with no protection, to an UV irradiation device emitting solar spectrum UV (95% UVA, 5% UVB) totalling 1.3 SED (approx. 0.5 *MED* for skin type II) three times per week for a period of 6 weeks. In the described temporal exposure sample, the 1.3 SED were sufficient to build up and maintain a 25(OH)D serum concentration of 50 nmol/l (20 ng/ml). Taking into account the fact that the study involved the exposed person lying down while receiving UV exposure from a device, Webb et al. corrected the exposure period for a more realistic case where people are upright (standing). Under these conditions, a period of 33 minutes three times per week or 17 minutes per day of solar UV exposure of 35% of the skin (T-shirt and shorts) to the noon sun in summer in Manchester, England, is enough to maintain a sufficient level of 25(OH)D. As Rhodes et al. and Webb et al. show, this period of exposure is a mean for the investigated skin types I - III. It should be noted that exposure of the "sun terraces" (Hoeppe et

al. 2004) may be much higher, meaning that there is a risk of UV erythema being triggered among skin types I – III.

These figures prove that brief outdoor exposures wearing summer clothing and involving UV indices typical during summer are enough to ensure sufficient 25(OH)D serum concentrations.

As vitamin D production depends on the level of the skin's UV exposure (i.e. the product of irradiance and length of exposure) (see Chapter 4), a shorter period of exposure at higher levels of UV irradiance (see above), which may occur during the period around noon in summer in Manchester, are enough to ensure sufficient 25(OH)D serum concentrations, while lower UVI values require a longer period of exposure.

These prolonged UV exposures over relative short periods of time do not lead to an increase in vitamin D formation. In its 2008 report, the IARC (IARC 2008) points out that maximum previtamin D3 synthesis for people with light skin is reached quickly (within minutes) when exposed to sub-erythemal UV doses (Holick 1981) and that an equilibrium between photoisomerisation products (tachysterol, lumisterol), photodegradation and previtamin D3 already occurs after brief UVB exposures (Holick 2004). If this exposure range is exceeded, it only leads to an increase in UV-induced DNA damage and an increase in the risk of developing skin cancer, but not to an increase in previtamin D3 in the epidermis (Gilchrest 2008, Wolpowitz und Gilchrest 2006).

Use of sunscreen and vitamin D production

In order to prevent skin cancer, it is recommended to avoid extreme UV exposure, wear clothing with UV protection, and to use sunscreen. When used correctly (i.e. by applying 2 mg/cm² to the body), modern sunscreens can reduce UVB and UVA exposure and thus limit the risk of skin cancer (Green et al. 2011b). As a result, there have been frequent discussions as to whether sunscreen contributes towards vitamin D deficiency and potential health risks (see above and Chapter 3.2.2.2).

Smaller experimental and patient studies conducted by Matsuoka et al. do in fact show that vitamin D production is limited by the use of sunscreen (Matsuoka et al. 1987, Matsuoka et al. 1988, Matsuoka et al. 1990). The same working group performed a case-control study which reported that long-term users (1 year) of sunscreen exhibited 25(OH)D concentrations of around 40 nmol/l (16 ng/ml) compared to about 90 nmol/l (36 ng/ml) in the control group, i.e. long-term sunscreen users exhibited a lower vitamin D serum level, but no vitamin D deficiency (Matsuoka et al. 1988). These results were also confirmed in a prospective randomised control study conducted by Marks et al. which showed that the use of sunscreen with SPF 17 was enough to avoid the onset of actinic keratoses without causing a vitamin D deficit (Marks et al. 1995). This finding was supported by several other studies (Farrerons et al. 1998, Sollitto et al. 1997). More recent works are contradictory. Applying 2 mg/cm² of sunscreen reduces and prevents vitamin D production in terms of its concentration (Faurschou et al. 2012), while a recent Australian study shows that applying sunscreen has no influence on vitamin D status (Jayaratne et al. 2012). These contradictory findings were reflected in a large investigation carried out within the scope of the US National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES 2006 to 2009) and generally linked to spending time in the shade and wearing full-length clothing (Linos et al. 2012). The studies take account of the influence of potentially different behaviour exhibited by sunscreen users who tend to spend prolonged periods in the sun (Autier et al. 2000).

In spite of these somewhat contradictory findings, it is assumed that the use of sunscreen does not lead to a vitamin D deficit (Wolpowitz und Gilchrest 2006). This is, on the one hand, due to the fact that even when using sunscreen with SPF 20, 5% of UVB radiation still reaches the

skin. On the other hand, it is also known that people often do not apply sunscreen as recommended and required to ensure ideal UV protection as per the SPF. Studies show that sunscreen is often applied unevenly and in an insufficient quantity (only about 50% of the required 2 mg/cm²) (Bech-Thomsen und Wulf 1992, Wolpowitz und Gilchrest 2006). However, it should be noted that the use of sunscreen does not provide any protection against skin cancer (IARC 2001).

Vitamin D supplements

At certain times of the year (e.g. in winter), insufficient UV irradiance means that it is practically impossible to synthesise sufficient concentrations of vitamin D or any vitamin D at all by means of cutaneous photosynthesis (Hanwell et al. 2010, Thieden et al. 2009, Webb et al. 2010).

However, a number of major studies conducted over the last few years have shown that vitamin D supplements are enough to maintain or build up sufficient vitamin D concentrations in the serum (DGE 2011, IOM 2011a, IARC 2008). Vitamin D supplements therefore represent one, if not the main exit from the ongoing debate on UV skin cancer risk and vitamin D deficit. International studies assume that a daily vitamin D supplement of 200 IE to 600 IE (depending on age) is enough to ensure sufficient vitamin D supply (Weinstock und Moses 2009). However, other studies state that up to 5,000 IE are required on a daily basis (Aloia et al. 2008, Heaney et al. 2003). This excludes a toxic effect resulting from a vitamin D supplement of up to 4,000 or even 10,000 caused by hypercalcemia and/or hypercalciuria (Hathcock et al. 2007)

There is currently no agreement as to which quantity (IE) of vitamin D should be taken as a supplement (DGE 2011, IOM 2011b, IARC 2008, Zeeb und Greinert 2010).

C Study design

The validity of a study depends on the study design. Generally speaking, interventions studies are associated with a high level of evidence, while ecological studies are linked to a low level of evidence.

The link between UV exposure and the development of skin cancer was confirmed in a number of ecological studies, various experimental studies, and by clarifying interaction mechanisms. For this reason, the SSK performed an evaluation comparing the evidence of cancer risks due to radiation (SSK 2011) in which it concluded that the evidence in favour of a link between UV exposure and skin cancer is convincing. Based on this scientific evidence, the IARC has classified UVA and UVB radiation as a class I carcinogen (carcinogenic for humans) (El Ghissassi et al. 2009).

When it comes to the health effects of vitamin D, convincing evidence gleaned from extensive intervention studies present the positive effect that oral vitamin D substitution has on the risk of older people falling over (see Chapter 3.2.2.2) (DGE 2011). Many of the studies used as a basis over the last few years when discussing a link between a lack of vitamin D (due to low UV exposure) and an increase in cancer mortality (involving various types of cancer) are of an ecological nature (see, e.g. (Grant und Mohr 2009)). Available ecological studies generally involve the collection of cancer mortalities in different geographical regions in which certain approaches were used for UV exposure of the general population. As the IARC emphatically shows, these approaches can only be used to generate hypotheses on the potential effects of UV exposure (IARC 2008) as ecological studies exhibit known limitations when it comes to proving causal relationships. These limitations are predominantly given if associations for groups of individuals (e.g. in different geographical regions) are not the same as for individuals themselves. As a result, some studies assume that every person in a certain region is subject to the same UV exposure as everyone else. Given the known influences of personal behaviour on,

e.g. accumulated UV dose for the given UV Index, this is a misleading generalisation. In view of this, in its report "Vitamin D and cancer" (IARC 2008), the IARC concludes with the estimate that "...ecological studies have many potential biases that affect the ability to draw conclusions from them about causality at the level of the individual person".

The SSK has shared this view for some time now: "Due to the considerable problem with controlling confounders and including interactions at an aggregated data level, the SSK considers ecological studies to be generally unsuitable for investigating epidemiological relationships. Risk estimates that are only or primarily based on ecological studies only provide convincing evidence in a few exceptional cases (radiation exposure is the main risk factor, a large number of small-scale exposure measurements are available, etc.)" (SSK 2007b, SSK 2007a).

3.2.2.2 Risk of illness in connection with vitamin D status

In order to clarify the link between vitamin D status, risk of illness, and the occurrence of various illnesses (incl. cancer), a number of studies (of varying quality) have been conducted over the last few years which mainly look into the influence of vitamin D supplementation under controlled conditions on incidence, morbidity and mortality rates of illnesses. The German Nutrition Society (DGE) used available literature as a basis for compiling the evidence in favour of certain illnesses as well as falls and fractures to show whether or not there are any links (see Table 19).

There is compelling evidence that vitamin D supplements or sufficient vitamin D status in older people is associated with a reduced risk of falls and fractures. With probable evidence, sound vitamin D supply reduces the risk of old people suffering limited range of motion (power, mobility, balance) and reduces the risk of premature death. This evaluation is based on the results of intervention studies and meta-analyses of intervention studies. With all other investigated illnesses, the evidence in favour of vitamin D having a preventive effect was only deemed to be possible or insufficient (see Table 19). This also applies to ecological studies on cancers, which led to interpretations that there is a link between UV exposure, vitamin D production and reduced cancer incidence and mortality.

Table 19: Summary of the results on the potential preventive effect of vitamin D. Table from (DGE 2011)

	Evidence			
	compelling	**prob-able**	**possible**	**insufficient**
Falls	↓ (older people)			
Limited range of motion		↓ (older people)		
Fractures	↓ (older people)			
Cancers, total				Ø
Colorectal carcinoma			↓	
Breast cancer			○	
Prostate cancer		○		
Malignant tumours of the endometrium, oesophagus and stomach, kidneys, ovaries and pancreas, and Non-Hodgkin lymphoma		○		
Pancreatic cancer		○	(↑)*	
Diabetes mellitus type 2				Ø
High blood pressure			○** (↓)***	
Cardiovascular illnesses			↓	
Total mortality		↓ (older people)		

↓ Reduction in risk due to vitamin D supplementation (in intervention studies) and with increasing 25(OH)D serum concentrations (in observational studies),
↑ Increase in risk with increasing 25(OH)D serum concentrations (in observational studies),
○ No correlation,
Ø Insufficient evidence;
* At serum concentrations > 100 nmol/l;
** In normotonics, i.e. people with normal glucose tolerance;
*** In hypertonics

The results of the summary provided by the German Nutrition Society therefore match those of large overview studies presented over the last few years by the IARC and IOM (IOM 2011b, IARC 2008). Among others, the IARC points out that large, randomised controlled trials (RCTs) must first be able to determine whether there is a link between vitamin D supply and a reduction in cancer risk. The IARC also emphasises the substantial fact that there is no evidence to ascertain whether a low vitamin D status could perhaps be due to developing cancer.

Based on the result of these large, recently compiled overview analyses, a group of experts met up at a workshop organised by the ICNIRP, the WHO, and BfS at the start of December 2011. During the course of this workshop, the experts recommended not changing the behaviour suggestions for the general public to avoid increasing the risk of skin cancer when exceeding certain UV Index values (Allinson et al. 2012) (see Chapter 4).

3.2.3 Ageing of the skin

As is the case with all other organs, human skin is subject to a natural ageing process. Unlike other (inner) organs, the skin forms a barrier between the body and the environment, and

protects against the influence of natural (environmental) and artificial exposures such as UV radiation, which could lead to ageing. Premature ageing depends on cumulative UV exposure and UV skin sensitivity, and often occurs in people with a light skin type (skin types I and II, see Chapter 3.1.4, Table 13). Increased solar elastosis occurs due to the deposition of elastin directly below the dermis-epidermis boundary layer, and is responsible for the resulting visible UV-induced premature ageing of the skin (photoageing) which is exhibited in the form of clear, deep folds and wrinkles (see Fig. 28) as well as "leathery" skin. Other manifestations of aged skin include increased pigmentation, dryness, and the onset of telangiectasia (visible venules) (Yaar et al. 2002). When compared to skin exhibiting photageing, aged skin that has been protected from the sun is often thinner, with even pigmentation, looser, and generally only with small, fine folds and wrinkles (Yaar et al. 2002).

Reactive oxygen species (ROS) in skin cells are considered to be a primary mechanism initiated as a molecular response in human skin to UV radiation (UVB and UVA). ROS predominantly consist of superoxide anions (O_2^-), peroxides (H_2O_2), hydroxyl radicals (OH•) and singlet oxygen ($^1O_2$). The exact mechanisms that cause these ROS, e.g. by activating receptors and transmitting signals to the cell, remain unclarified. What is clear, however, is that UV exposure damages the skin's connective tissue. The induction of matrix metalloproteinases (MPPs) such as collagenase MMP-1, which destroys the cellular matrix by breaking down collagen, plays an important part in this process (Angel et al. 2001, Karin et al. 1997). Procollagen expression is also inhibited in the skin's fibroblasts (Fisher et al. 2002), which also has a negative effect on net collagen production following UV exposure (Fisher et al. 2000). This eventually leads to characteristic, UV-exposure-induced (not age-induced) premature folds and wrinkles in the skin caused by photoageing.



Fig. 28*: Skin with chronic UV damage*

3.2.4 Photodermatoses

3.2.4.1 Polymorphous light eruption

Polymorphous light eruption (PLE) accounts for 90% of all genuine photodermatoses (Berg 1989, Ros und Wennersten 1986). PLE is often referred to as a "sun allergy", although it is not actually an allergic reaction since it has not been possible to furnish proof of a relevant photoallergen to date. A number of investigations and experiments into this have already been performed, yet the exact action spectrum of polymorphous light eruption still remains unknown. Indirect findings, such as the fact that patients in whom PLE was also induced when exposed

to UV through panes of glass (through which only UVA can pass), indicate that UVA radiation is the prevailing factor here (Diepgen et al. 1989, Hönigsmann und Ortel 1988, Lindmaier und Neumann 1991).

PLE causes itching, reddening, red nodules (papular) or red patches (plaque), but only in areas of the skin exposed to solar radiation. Nodules with vesicles (papular vesicular) may also occasionally occur. Since all of these skin changes can occur, light eruption is considered to be polymorphous. Patients will only ever exhibit one of the above indications, meaning that the skin is monomorphous. Changes to the skin often occur on the throat, chest, arms and back of the hand. Sometimes they occur on the face, and occasionally around the edges of the ear during childhood. These skin reactions occur several hours after solar exposure and recede within a few days, even without administering any form of treatment. However, they may reappear after being exposed to the sun again.

3.2.4.2 Phototoxic, photoallergic reactions

Phototoxic and photoallergic reactions represent additional potential outcomes of UV exposure. With phototoxic dermatitis, UV radiation triggers photochemical reactions in substances, which in turn lead to inflammations. Photoallergic reactions are where a substance is chemically activated by UV radiation such that the substance is bound to a macromolecule and then triggers sensitisation. This sensitisation can, in turn, lead to allergic reactions.

Phototoxic reactions occur a few hours after exposure and appear in the form of sunburn in exposed parts of the skin. Sunburn involves reddening of the skin, often with swelling and blistering, which are mainly limited to exposed areas of the skin. As is usually the case with sunburn, the skin will subsequently tan (melanin-induced pigmentation). This is quite pronounced, especially with phototoxic reactions caused by external contact, and often lasts for several months. Cosmetics/perfumes and other scents containing bergamot oils with furocoumarins as photosensitive molecules may in particular trigger a phototoxic reaction if applied to the skin and the person then exposes those parts of the skin to the sun. Various medications, the number of which should not be underestimated, can also trigger phototoxic reactions. Such medications include antibiotics, diuretics, retinoids, antiepileptics, antihistamines, antifungals, antidepressants, etc. (Cosa 2004, Lehmann 2004, Lugović et al. 2007, Schauder 2005, Svensson et al. 2001). A list of potentially photosensitising medications is provided in Annex 4. Other lists of photosensitising medications are available in international literature or on the internet (Aronson 2004, Litt 2000, Malone et al. 2003, Moore 2002).

Photoallergic dermatoses occur in areas of the skin exposed to solar or artificial UV radiation. They can expand to neighbouring areas of the skin and spread out to distant regions of the skin. Expansion and spreading out are developments that distinguish photoallergic dermatoses from phototoxic dermatoses, which are limited to the area exposed to UV. Changes observed in the skin are similar to those exhibited with typical allergic eczematous contact dermatitis: Reddening, nodules, vesicles; desquamation during regression. Photoallergic contact dermatitis, which is triggered by a UV-modified contact allergen applied to the skin, can thus be distinguished from a photoallergic reaction to medication where the allergen reaches the skin via the blood stream.

3.3 Ocular damage

The effect of UV radiation on the eye depends, among other things, on the depth to which the radiation penetrates, the intensity and duration of exposure, and the resulting effects over time. UV radiation causes ocular effects in areas where the radiation is absorbed.

3.3.1 Child's eye

The eye's UV transmittance depends on age (see Chapter 2.2.2). In contrast to the anatomy of the adult eye (see Chapter 2.2.2), the transmission spectrum of a child's lens includes an additional narrow window at 320 nm, which allows part of this range to penetrate the lens of a child's eye immediately after birth (Glickman 2011, Söderberg 2011). This phenomenon decreases constantly with age. By the age of 14, only about 1% of UV radiation containing this range reaches the retina. From the age of 30, this transmission window is fully closed (Glickman 2011, Mainster und Turner 2010). Correspondingly, the child's eye may be more sensitive to UV radiation and therefore requires special protection against high levels of UV exposure in order to prevent against damage as described below (Söderberg 2011).

3.3.2 Corneal inflammation and conjunctivitis

UV radiation with a high level of intensity can damage the front of the eye within a matter of hours or even minutes. It can cause photokeratitis (corneal inflammation) and photoconjunctivitis. Both types of damage are caused by photochemical reactions and their resulting oxidative stress in epithelial cells (Black et al. 2011, Cejka et al. 2012). Here, the outermost cells of the cornea and conjunctiva are destroyed, with the effects of the damage presenting themselves in the form of severe eye pain six to eight hours after exposure. The afflicted person feels like he/she has sand in his/her eyes. New epithelial cells are formed constantly in the cornea and conjunctiva, meaning that such damage is reversible, with the healing process taking around one to two days to complete following initial manifestation. Action spectra and thresholds for triggering damage are provided as a standard in DIN 5031 Part 10 (DIN 2012). The action spectra and photoconjunctivitis are provided in Figure 29. The above standard provides a threshold dose for triggering photoconjunctivitis of $H_{s,ko}$ = 50 J/m². DIN 5031-10 sets a value of $H_{s,ke}$ = 100 J/m² as the threshold dose for photokeratitis.



Fig. 29: *Standardised action spectra for photoconjunctivitis and photokeratitis (from DIN 2012*)

Photoconjunctivitis and photokeratitis predominantly occur in situations where the eyes are exposed to high UV irradiance. This is the case, e.g. when spending time on snow-covered mountains when the sky is clear, or when using an electric welder without wearing any eye

protection. Mountaineers call this relatively frequently occurring illness “snow blindness”, while welders call it “welder’s flash”.

3.3.3 Clouding of the eye lens (cataract) due to UV radiation

Long-term or frequent UV exposures can trigger a clouding of the eye lens (cataract). This is caused by a change to crystalline proteins in the lens cells as a result of photochemical reactions. In conjunction with other factors, such as diabetes, this may lead to cell pigmentation and clouding of the eye lens. This process continues over time until the person’s vision is severely impaired or the person goes completely blind. In contrast to other tissue in the body, the eye lens is not able to produce new cells, thus rendering such damage irreversible. Clouding of the eye lens may occur for several reasons: as a result of the effect of ionising, infrared and ultraviolet radiation, prolonged consumption of certain kinds of medication, and certain illnesses such as diabetes (Werdermann 1998). With UV-induced cataracts, UVA and UVB radiation can have a damaging effect (Müller-Breitenkamp et al. 1999), while more recent experiments indicate that UVB plays the more dominant part (Okuno et al. 2012). An exact action spectrum for clouding of the human eye as a result of the long-term effects of UV radiation remains unknown. To date, only action spectra for the short-term effects were determined during animal experiments (NRPB 2002, Okuno et al. 2012).

Cataracts represent a serious health problem worldwide. Risk factors for a cataract include strong genetic components, smoking and UV exposure (Brian und Taylor 2001). According to estimates, around 5% of all cataracts can be attributed to the effects of UV radiation (Neale et al. 2003). Cataracts often lead to blindness in large numbers of people in developing countries where medical provisions are often in short supply and solar radiation is generally high. As long ago as 1990, it was assumed that more than 3 million people go blind each year in India as a result of cataracts (Minassian und Mehra 1990). More recent epidemiological investigations from China present a convincing link between solar UV exposure and cataract frequency (Wang et al. 2012). Several other authors have also highlighted this problem (Lucas 2011).

The UV irradiance level that causes such an illness is far below the level that leads to acute photokeratitis or conjunctivitis. The most important factor here is a long exposure time, generally over several decades. Cataracts can be triggered by artificial UV radiation sources, as was the case with a doctor’s assistant who treated small children with a sunlamp for many years without wearing any eye protection. In this case, it was possible to determine a damaging UV dose (Siekmann et al. 1997). However, cataracts can also be caused by solar UV radiation. This affects people who frequently work outdoors, e.g. farmers or sailors. Cataracts can in fact affect anyone. An age-related cataract occurs among people approaching the age of eighty and above (Werdermann 1998). The number of people among the general public who develop cataracts increases significantly with age. Cataracts are an extremely prevalent illness in general. However, modern operation procedures mean that the clouded eye can be replaced with a plastic lens. Around 700,000 cataract operations are performed every year in Germany (Werdermann 1998). Due to insufficient health care, cataracts remain the world’s most common cause of loss of sight (Bourne et al. 2013, Thylefors 1998).

There is currently no explanation as to whether the development of cataracts is a stochastic or deterministic process (SSK 2009).

3.3.4 Other eye illnesses potentially dependent upon UV

Cataracts are not the only illness where UV radiation is or is considered to be the likely cause. Other such illnesses include pterygium (conjunctivae), pinguecula and squamous cell carcinoma of the eye lens/conjunctiva, and ocular melanoma.

Pterygium (surfer's eye) is a degenerative, mostly bilateral, generally nasal conjunctival hyperplasia that is wing-shaped and grows from the nasal side of the conjunctiva. In a few rare cases, the pterygium grows to such an extent that the pupil is covered, thus limiting the afflicted person's sight. Along with the repeat influence of foreign objects (sand, dust, etc.) UV radiation is also thought to be responsible for triggering pyterygium (Threlfall und English 1999).

Pinguecula is a fibrous degenerative change to the interpalpebral conjunctiva. It involves pathological changes similar to those of actinic elastosis of the skin, hence why UV radiation is discussed as being a possible trigger. However, there is still not a great deal of epidemiological evidence in support of this connection (Norn 1979, Norn 1982).

There is, however, strong evidence in favour of UV-induced skin tumours on the eyelid. In 90% of cases these are BCCs, while in 9% of cases they involve SCCs (Yam und Kwok 2014).

Neoplasia can also occur in the eye due to the effects of UV radiation. Squamous cell carcinoma of the eye lens and conjunctiva typically occur in the eyelid fold (Sun et al. 1997), i.e. a localisation exposed to UV. These neoplasia are rare, but increasingly occur among xeroderma pigmentosum (XP) sufferers. XP is characterised by extreme sensitivity to UV radiation and is based on DNA repair defects for UV-induced DNA damage (Sun et al. 1997). Latitude-dependent experiments and animal studies show that there is a clear link between UV exposure and squamous cell carcinoma of the eye lens and conjunctiva (Kusewitt et al. 2000, Newton et al. 1996).

In terms of ocular melanoma, the WHO assumes in its Environmental Burden of Disease Series, No 13: "Solar Ultraviolet Radiation" from 2006 (Lucas et al. 2006b) that there is "insufficient" evidence for the link between natural UV exposure and the occurrence of ocular melanoma.

A meta-analysis published in 2005 (Shah et al. 2005) agrees in part with this statement, but notes that occupational exposures from welding (during which UV radiation is emitted) represent a risk factor for ocular melanoma.

In 2006, Stang and staff (Stang et al. 2006) pointed out that only little information is available about the incidence of uveal melanomas (i.e. melanomas that occur in the pigmented, melanocyte-rich uvea, the triple-layer structure of the eye, corneosclera-uvea-retina) as such cases are poorly registered or not registered at all. However, the authors of two case-control studies were able to show that uveal melanoma incidence is increasing at a low absolute level (2 to 10 cases per 1,000,000). A new study (Schmidt-Pokrzywniak et al. 2009) carried out by the same working group shows that there appears to be a positive link between light iris colours and UV exposure when it comes to the risk of uveal melanomas.

Epidemiological data gleaned from a more recent review only show minimal evidence of a link between natural UV exposure and the occurrence of uveal melanomas (Mallet et al. 2013). However, molecular experiments into uveal melanomas revealed UV-specific mutations in frequently affected genes of the uveal melanoma (GNAQ, GNA11 and RAC1). The same genes also saw non-UV-specific mutation patterns that also occur in the frequently mutated BRAF gene of the skin's malignant melanoma.

Future research will need to provide clear evidence of a link between UV exposure and the risk of uveal melanoma.

Macular degeneration is the term used to summarise a group of retina illnesses that affect the fovea (macula lutea) and cause gradual loss of function of the various retina cells. The most common form by far is age-related macular degeneration (AMD). As UV radiation is almost entirely absorbed by the cornea and lens in adults, a link between UV exposure and the occurrence of AMD is not to be expected. This was proved in a series of studies reviewed by Yam and Kwok (2014) (Yam und Kwok 2014). On the other hand, a recent meta-analysis

showed a 38% higher risk of AMD in relation to solar exposure (Sui et l. 2013). New molecular investigations show that cumulated deletions occur in the mitochondrial DNA of the macular region which can be linked to oxidative damage (Gendron et al. 2013) and also occur after UV exposure. The current assumption is that visible light and, in particular, the blue spectrum (440 nm to 500 nm) may lead to retina damage and hence the occurrence of AMD. However, it cannot be excluded that the low proportion of UV radiation that reaches the retina may also contribute to AMD.

3.4 Summarising evaluation

In view of the debate surrounding the (potentially) positive effects of UV-induced vitamin D on health, the SSK does not see any need to change the recommendations issued with regard to UV protection and in order to minimise the risk of skin cancer.

Given the current state of knowledge, sufficient vitamin D synthesis is ensured if a person's uncovered face, hands, arms and lower legs are subject to half of the minimum UV dose relevant to sunburn (0.5 *MED*) two to three times per week without wearing any sunscreen. Suitable medication administered under proper medical supervision can be used to treat a vitamin D deficiency that is having a negative effect on a person's health.

Additional solar or artificial UV exposure (e.g. in solaria) should be avoided due to the potential of damaging the eyes and the skin, and especially because of the associated increase in the risk of skin cancer. This also applies to elderly people as they must already be assumed to have sustained significant prior UV damage.

4 UV Index

The UV Index (UVI) was introduced in 1994 by the World Health Organization (WHO), the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP), the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP). The UVI represents an internationally standardised indicator of the UV irradiance present in a given location. It can be used to estimate an individual's risk of sunburn when spending time outdoors.

The UVI is a way of measuring the erythema-weighted irradiance of solar UV radiation that reaches a horizontal surface, and is determined using equation (6) (Naldi et al. 2000):

$$\mathrm{UVI} = k_{er} \int_{250\,nm}^{400\,nm} E_{\lambda}(\lambda) s_{er,rel}(\lambda) \mathrm{d}\lambda = k_{er} E_{er} \qquad (6)$$

E_{er}: Erythemally effective irradiance [Wm^{-2}]

$E\lambda(\lambda)$: Spectral irradiance [$Wm^{-2}nm^{-1}$]

$s_{er,rel}(\lambda)$: Relative spectral sensitivity for UV erythema (CIE reference action spectrum; ISO 17166:1999/CIE S 007/E-1998))

The scaling factor is $k_{er} = 40\ m^2W^{-1}$. The UV Index is generally expressed as an integer.

The UV Index corresponds to a momentary quantity at a certain time as per equation (6). Weather forecasts often only provide the maximum expected UV Index value for the given day. The UVI represents a dimensionless number due to the introduction of constant k. According to equation (6), UVI 1 corresponds to an erythema-weighted irradiance of $E_{er} = 0.025\ Wm^{-2}$, while UVI 12 equates to an irradiance of $E_{er} = 0.3\ Wm^{-2}$.

An agreement was reached at international level to always state the UVI as an integer. The UVI forecasts provided by the Federal Office for Radiation Protection (BfS) and the German Weather Service[4] take this agreement into account. UVI diurnal cycles or current UVI values are also often published. In line with the recommendation issued by the German Commission on Radiological Protection in 2004, the daily maximum UVI should be clearly marked with the abbreviation "max." (SSK 2004).

UVI - a globally standardised scale

A UVI of 7 is to be understood the same way in Germany as in Kenya or Canada. At the equator, UVI levels of 12 or more may be reached. In Germany, UVI levels may reach 8 or 9 in summer, with some mountainous regions in southern Germany reaching even higher levels than that. The higher the UVI, the faster sunburn will occur with unprotected skin.

UVI - influencing factors

The UVI depends on meteorological factors and the position of the sun. It changes depending on the time of day, year and geographical latitude. The total ozone concentration in the atmosphere (not to be confused with the summer smog ozone concentration close to the ground) and the level of cloud cover and altitude also contribute to UVI levels. Major cloud cover can reduce the UVI, while the presence of just a few clouds hardly reduces the UVI at all. Certain situations involving clouds can in fact lead to the UVI being higher than with a clear sky due to the presence of additional scatter radiation.

UVI application

In the 20 years since the UV Index was introduced, the media have disseminated the UVI in order to let the general public know the daily solar UV exposure forecast, the associated risks and required protective measures (see Fig. 30).

The UV Index is an indicator of the risk from solar UV radiation when spending time outdoors. The UV Index is often used when attempting to determine the level of UV exposure to a person's skin, therefore equating the UV Index's given UV irradiance with skin exposure (UV Index = skin exposure). This can be used to calculate self-protection times, i.e. periods of time up to which people with a certain skin type (see Chapter 3.1.4, Table 13) can presumably be exposed before the onset of skin erythema. However, equating the UV Index with skin exposure is incorrect as personal exposures involving certain parts of the body may differ significantly from local immission. They may, in fact, be lower, equal to or higher than the immission.

UV irradiance may be higher than the UV irradiance provided by the UV Index for the following reasons:

- Areas of the skin on upward-facing parts of the body may be better aligned with the sun than horizontally laid-out measuring surfaces used to determine the UV Index. Depending on the prevalent environmental and weather conditions, UV irradiance on such surfaces may also be higher than on horizontal surfaces. This leads to increased UV exposure and shorter times until the onset of sunburn on the body's "sun terraces" (nose, forehead, shoulders, etc.).

[4] (http://http://www.bfs.de/EN/topics/opt/uv/index/forecast/forecast_node.html)
(http://kunden.dwd.de/uvi/max?uv_euro=ID1)

– UV reflected by a person's surroundings, e.g. when spending time around snow or water, may lead to higher UV exposure. Spending time at altitude also increases UV exposure.

– Clouds at the UVI measuring point may differ from a person's place of residence.

A self-protection time calculated on the basis of the UV Index and a standardised erythema dose threshold also fail to take account of the actual variation in skin sensitivity present from person to person. The above reasons mean that it is not possible to derive exact self-protection times purely from the UVI values.

The UV Index is a general indicator of the level of potential risk from spending time outdoors without protection. The higher the UV Index, the higher the potential UV burden, and hence the more necessary it is to implement sun protection measures to avoid sunburn and long-term damage such as skin cancer (see Fig. 30). When applied this way, the UV Index can be a useful aid in protecting against damage from solar UV radiation.



Fig. 30: *Internationally agreed UV protection recommendations depending on the UV Index (http://http://www.bfs.de/EN/topics/opt/uv/index/index_node.html, last visited on 21 July 2016)*

Back in 2005, an "international workshop on UV exposure guidance" and vitamin D looked into "balanced messages" aimed at avoiding skin cancer while also representing an ideal vitamin D status (ICNIRP 2006). This workshop established several gaps in scientific findings before moving on to define recommendations for future scientific investigations (McKinlay 2006).

Since the workshop was held in 2005, there has not been a downturn in the scientific debate on the risk of skin cancer from UV radiation in contrast to the benefits of UV radiation in ensuring sufficient vitamin D status. Discussions have been held at scientific conferences as to whether the UV Index and its associated recommended protective measures need to be revised on the basis of new scientific findings.

For this reason, at the end of 2011, ICNIRP, WHO and BfS formed a working group of experts tasked with reviewing and evaluating the scientific basis for UVI. The working group put together an overview of new works on vitamin D and also investigated the role of UVA radiation when determining the UVI and in terms of photocarcinogenesis (Allinson et al. 2012).

The group of experts provided the following summarising evaluation:

– "Based on these gaps in knowledge and the note that only small amounts of UVB radiation, well below the minimum erythemal dose (Webb 2006) are needed for vitamin-D-synthesis, the expert group felt it was not warranted at this stage to extend the concept of the UVI to include vitamin D issues";

– "Therefore, although the contribution of UVA to carcinogenesis has been undoubtedly underestimated in the past, minor modification of the action spectrum to take this into account is not expected to have a significant impact on the UVI".

The following observation was made in terms of using the UVI in intervention campaigns for primary prevention:

– "... the impact of the UVI on sun protection behaviour is currently very limited and primary research is needed to improve the effectiveness of the UVI as an educational tool. The final goal of changing sun protection behaviour in the population might be reached by developing health promotion campaigns that account for personal determinants, such as attitudes, self-efficacy and self-affirmation".

5 Solaria

Despite the fact that UV radiation specifically generated in irradiation devices in solaria is classified as being "carcinogenic for humans" (class Ia carcinogen) by the IARC (El Ghissassi et al. 2009), such devices are frequently used all over the world (Bock et al. 2013, Diehl 2010, Dissel et al. 2009, Heckman et al. 2008, Køster et al. 2009, Schneider et al. 2013, Schneider und Krämer 2010, Schneider et al. 2009, Thomson et al. 2010). There is a trend indicating that solaria are being increasingly used by teenagers (Køster et al. 2009, Thomson et al. 2010) and young adults (Bock et al. 2013, Diehl 2010, Schneider und Krämer 2010).

A 2012 study from Germany shows that 39% of the German population aged 19 to 45 have visited a solarium at least once (ever user), while around 15% of the same age group visited a solarium in the last 12 months (current user). Around 5% of minors are current solarium users, while around 9% of people with skin types I and II are current solarium users. Positive determinants for using solaria are female gender, a migrant background, and full-time or at least part-time employment. The main reason given for using solaria are for relaxation purposes and to boost attractiveness (Schneider et al. 2013).

Unfortunately, there are only a few studies that look into spectral distribution and real irradiance of UV radiation in solaria. However, the few studies published on the subject (up until 2013) show that the erythema-weighted irradiance is often higher in many devices than that set out in recommendations and national/international classifications (Bonino et al. 2009, Facta et al. 2013, Gerber et al. 2002, Gies et al. 2011, Nilsen et al. 2011, Nilsen et al. 2008, Oliver et al. 2007). This appears to particularly apply to the UVA in the emitted UV spectrum of irradiation devices used in solaria. Nilsen et al. conducted a large-scale study where they performed spectral measurements on more than 190 UV irradiation devices in 78 solaria in Norway. This study showed that the mean UVA irradiance of the face was 5 times higher than the level of natural solar exposure (35°N, Crete during the period around noon). At the irradiation device's two points of emission (bed and lid), the UVA irradiance was 3.2 times and 3.4 times higher

respectively than in the sun. Peak UVA exposures in solaria were 19 times higher than the level of solar exposure. The mean UVB exposures in solaria were 0.7 to 0.8 times lower than regular solar exposure. The mean erythema-weighted irradiance in solaria corresponded to that of solar exposure in Crete during the period around noon (35°N) (Nilsen et al. 2011, Nilsen et al. 2012).

In 2009, Germany introduced the Act on the protection against non-ionising radiation used in humans to govern UV exposure and the use of solaria (NiSG 2009, Yam und Kwok 2014) along with the accompanying UV Radiation Protection Ordinance (UVSV 2011, Linos et al. 2012). This legislation prohibits the use of erythema-weighted UVA and UVB irradiance at levels above 0.3 W/m². Solaria operators are banned from letting adolescents below the age of 18 use their facilities. Since November 2012, solaria operators are required to employ trained personnel who are in turn required to offer their customers advice on tanning. Further details about UVSV are provided in List 1.

List 1: Contents of the German UV Radiation Protection Ordinance (UVSV) (selection)

- Maximum irradiance:
  - E_{er} (250 – 400 nm) ≤ 0.3 W/m²
  - E_{er} (200 – 280 nm) ≤ 0.003 W/m²

  These values are also stipulated in EN 60335-2-27:2008
- Equipment and organisation safety measures:
  - Provision of UV goggles (protection level 2-5 as per DIN EN 170)
  - Designed or marked minimum distance to be maintained from UV lamps (if the distance can be adjusted)
  - Emergency shutdown
  - Forced shutdown at 800 J/m²
  - Minimum selectable erythemally effective irradiation H_{er} ≤ 100 J/m²
- At least one qualified person (specialist) for the solarium's entire opening hours if the solarium has more than 2 devices:
- Instruct customers on how to use the equipment (emergency shutdown), offer advice in terms of UV skin type, and provide a dose plan
- Duty to inform customers of the following:
  - Maximum irradiation time of first irradiation for UV skin types I - VI
  - UV skin types I and II are exclusion criteria for using solaria
  - Risk of exposing the eyes to UV radiation and in conjunction with medication or cosmetics
  - Ban on children and adolescents below the age of 18 from using solaria
- Duty to keep records (incl. rolling sunbed and log book)

It should be noted that this – now legally binding – value of 0.3 W/m² for maximum permissible erythema-weighted irradiance in solaria still represents an UV Index of 12 (vertical irradiation), i.e. it is a value equivalent to the erythema-weighted solar irradiance present at noon at the equator with clear skies. This means that it is not possible to declare exposures received at solaria as being free of risk under these conditions. This was proven, e.g. in recent studies and meta-analyses that clearly indicate a link between solaria use and an increased risk of skin cancer (Berwick 2008, Coelho und Hearing 2010, Doré und Chignol 2012, Fears et al. 2011, Lazovich et al. 2010). However, the best evidence in support of this link comes from two large-scale meta-analyses published in the last 7 years. Back in 2007, IARC published a meta-analysis summarising works that looked into the link between solaria use and melanoma risk. The meta-analysis showed that regular solaria use (once per month) before the age of 30 led to a 75% increase in the risk of developing melanoma later in life (IARC 2007).

A recent meta-analysis from 2012 (Boniol et al. 2012a) now covering 27 studies uses a 1.20% (95% CI: = 1.08 to 1.34) increase in the relative risk of developing melanoma when comparing solaria "ever users" with "never users". This risk increases to 1.59% (95% CI: 1.36 to 1.85) if first solaria use takes place before the age of 35**.** A dose-response relationship was also calculated which showed that each additional solarium use per year leads to a 1.8% (95% CI: 0

to 3.5) increase in melanoma risk. It is also estimated that around 5% of all new melanoma cases in Europe can be attributed to solaria use (mainly among women). This meta-analysis also includes relative risks (RR) for the occurrence of non-melanocytic skin cancers (SCC, BCC) when comparing "ever users" with "never users"; SCC: RR=2.23 (95% CI: 1.39 to 3.57), BCC: RR=1.09 (95% CI: 1.01 to 1.18). These data emphatically support the recommendations against using solaria, and a number of countries worldwide have either imposed restrictions on solaria use or, as is the case in a few countries, banned solaria altogether (Sinclair und Makin 2013).

5.1 UV lamp types and lamp spectra

Solaria generally use low-pressure mercury lamps (fluorescent lamps) as their artificial UV radiation sources. Metal halide lamps are sometimes also used, especially for partial body tanning devices and integrated facial tanners in solaria. These lamps are fitted with preliminary filters to remove short-wave UVB, UVC and IR spectra.

In Germany, the Act on the protection against non-ionising radiation used in humans (NiSG) and UV Radiation Protection Ordinance (UVSV) legally require the erythemally effective irradiance in solaria devices to be limited to a maximum of 0.3 W/m². The radiation spectra of fluorescent lamps typically used in solaria prior to and since the introduction of this legislation are illustrated in Fig. 31(a) together with the level of UVB and UVA in the spectra. The UV and VIS emitted within the radiation spectrum may vary depending on the composition of the fluorescent material. Solaria lamps must be designed such that their emission complies with the irradiance limit of E_{er}(250 nm to 400 nm) ≤ 0.3 W/m² on the user's body. The radiation spectra of solaria lamps as per the 0.3 W/m² limit have clearly shifted to the longer-wave UVA spectrum.

Metal-haloid lamps are medium-pressure mercury lamps with metal haloid added to increase the gas discharge resonance line density to a quasi-continuous spectrum. Fig. 31(b) shows the spectrum and spectral erythemal effectiveness of an UVA facial tanner fitted with a metal-haloid lamp.

It should again be noted that the legal limit for erythemally effective irradiance in solaria is 0.3 W/m² and the associated shift of the used UV spectra to the longer-wave UVA spectrum does not lead to risk-free solaria use. Both the remaining UVB spectrum required to obtain a lasting tan (see Chapter 3.1.4) and the now enhanced UVA range of the spectrum contribute to DNA damage and may ultimately lead to skin cancer (see Chapter 3.2.1).



(a)



(b)

Fig. 31: *Artificial UV radiation sources typically used in solaria (a) UV fluorescent lamp spectra prior to and after the introduction of the erythemally effective irradiance limit of 0.3 W/m² with a higher and lower UVB spectrum and (b) a metal-haloid lamp spectrum with spectral erythemal effectiveness*

5.2 Device design for cosmetic skin-tanning purposes

In Germany, sunbeds are used in 90% of cases. Upright tanning booths are hardly ever used in Germany (in contrast to the USA where they are the most commonly used type of device). The surface on which the person lays down is generally fitted with acrylic glass through which UVB

can pass. In order to determine the erythemally effective irradiance of ≤ 0.3 W/m², the resulting UV radiation of the fluorescent lamp and acrylic glass used need to be taken into account. The tunnel-like cover also contains fluorescent lamps, either with or without additional facial tanning lamps, which either use fluorescent lamps with a higher UVB/UVA spectrum or metal-haloid lamps. There are also sunbed designs where metal-haloid lamps are used for the entire upper body.

As is the case with facial tanners, partial-body tanning devices mainly used in people's homes use both fluorescent lamps and metal-haloid lamps. As stipulated in the German UV Radiation Protection Ordinance (UVSV), users should be informed of the shortest permissible irradiation distance for such lamps in order to prevent the E_{er}(250 nm to 400 nm) ≤ 0.3 W/m² limit from being exceeded.

6 References

Adams et al. 1982 — Adams JS, Clemens TL, Parrish JA, Holick MF. Vitamin-D synthesis and metabolism after ultraviolet irradiation of normal and vitamin-D-deficient subjects. N Engl J Med. 1982 Mar 25;306:722-725

Airey et al. 1997 — Airey DK, Wong JC, Fleming RA, Meldrum LR. An estimate of the total UV-B exposure for outdoor workers during a south-east Queensland summer. Health Phys. 1997 Apr;72:544-549

Allinson et al. 2012 — Allinson S, Asmuss M, Baldermann C, Bentzen J, Buller D, Gerber N, Green AC, Greinert R, Kimlin M, Kunrath J, Matthes R, Polzl-Viol C, Rehfuess E, Rossmann C, Schuz N, Sinclair C, Deventer E, Webb A, Weiss W, Ziegelberger G. Validity and use of the UV index: report from the UVI working group, Schloss Hohenkammer, Germany, 5-7 December 2011. Health Phys. 2012 Sep;103:301-306

Aloia et al. 2008 — Aloia JF, Patel M, Dimaano R, Li-Ng M, Talwar SA, Mikhail M, Pollack S, Yeh JK. Vitamin D intake to attain a desired serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D concentration. Am J Clin Nutr. 2008 Jun;87:1952-1958

ACGIH 2008 — American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH). 2008 TLVs and BEIs. Threshold Limit Values (TVLs) for Chemical Substances and Physical Agents and Biological Exposure Indices (BEIs), 2008

Angel et al. 2001 — Angel P, Szabowski A, Schorpp-Kistner M. Function and regulation of AP-1 subunits in skin physiology and pathology. Oncogene. 2001 Apr 30;20:2413-2423

AWMF 2014 — Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Wissenschaftlichen Medizinischen Fachgesellschaften (AWMF) DK, Deutsche Krebshilfe. Leitlinienprogramm Onkologie (Deutsche Krebsgesellschaft, Deutsche Krebshilfe, AWMF): S3-Leitlinie Prävention von Hautkrebs, Langversion 1.0, 2014, AWMF Registernummer: 032/052OL, http://leitlinienprogramm-onkologie.de/Leitlinien.7.0.html (Zugriff am 29.01.2014).

Armbrecht et al. 1980 — Armbrecht HJ, Zenser TV, Davis BB. Effect of vitamin D metabolites on intestinal calcium absorption and calcium-binding protein in young and adult rats. Endocrinology. 1980 Feb;106:469-475

Armstrong und Kricker 2001 — Armstrong BK, Kricker A. The epidemiology of UV induced skin cancer. J Photochem Photobiol B. 2001 Oct;63:8-18

Aronson 2004 — Aronson JK. Side effects of drugs annual 27. Amsterdam 2004, Elsevier, 2004

Asmuß und Baldermann 2012 — Asmuß M, Baldermann C. UV-Strahlung und Vitamin D. http://www.umweltbundesamt.de/publikationen/umid-022012-themenheft-uv-strahlung (zuletzt besucht am 22.02.2016)

Aszterbaum et al. 1999 — Aszterbaum M, Beech J, Epstein EH, Jr. Ultraviolet radiation mutagenesis of hedgehog pathway genes in basal cell carcinomas. J Investig Dermatol Symp Proc. 1999 Sep;4:41-45

Autier und Doré 1998 — Autier P, Doré JF. Influence of sun exposures during childhood and during adulthood on melanoma risk. EPIMEL and EORTC Melanoma Cooperative Group. European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer. Int J Cancer. 1998 Aug 12;77:533-537

Autier et al. 2000 Autier P, Doré JF, Reis AC, Grivegnée A, Ollivaud L, Truchetet F, Chamoun E, Rotmensz N, Severi G, Césarini JP. Sunscreen use and intentional exposure to ultraviolet A and B radiation: a double blind randomized trial using personal dosimeters. Br J Cancer. 2000 Nov;83:1243-1248

Bataille et al. 1996 Bataille V, Bishop JA, Sasieni P, Swerdlow AJ, Pinney E, Griffiths K, Cuzick J. Risk of cutaneous melanoma in relation to the numbers, types and sites of naevi: a case-control study. Br J Cancer. 1996 Jun;73:1605-1611

Bataille et al. 2000 Bataille V, Bykov VJ, Sasieni P, Harulow S, Cuzick J, Hemminki K. Photoadaptation to ultraviolet (UV) radiation in vivo: photoproducts in epidermal cells following UVB therapy for psoriasis. Br J Dermatol. 2000 Sep;143:477-483

Bech-Thomsen und Wulf 1992 Bech-Thomsen N, Wulf HC. Sunbathers' application of sunscreen is probably inadequate to obtain the sun protection factor assigned to the preparation. Photodermatol Photoimmunol Photomed. 1992 Dec;9:242-244

Benjamin und Ananthaswamy 2007 Benjamin CL, Ananthaswamy HN. p53 and the pathogenesis of skin cancer. Toxicol Appl Pharmacol. 2007 Nov 1;224:241-248

Berg und Otley 2002 Berg D, Otley CC. Skin cancer in organ transplant recipients: Epidemiology, pathogenesis, and management. J Am Acad Dermatol. 2002 Jul;47:1-17; quiz 18-20

Berg 1989 Berg M. Epidemiological studies of the influence of sunlight on the skin. Photodermatol. 1989 Apr;6:80-84

BKV 1997 Berufskrankheitenverordung vom 31. Oktober 1997 (BGBl I S. 2623), zuletzt durch Art. 1 der Verordnung vom 22. Dezember 2014 (BGBl I S. 2397) geändert.

Berwick 2008 Berwick M. Are tanning beds "safe"? Human studies of melanoma. Pigment Cell Melanoma Res. 2008 Oct;21:517-519

Bikle et al. 1986 Bikle DD, Nemanic MK, Gee E, Elias P. 1,25-Dihydroxyvitamin D3 production by human keratinocytes. Kinetics and regulation. J Clin Invest. 1986 Aug;78:557-566

Black et al. 1980 Black AK, Fincham N, Greaves MW, Hensby CN. Time course changes in levels of arachidonic acid and prostaglandins D2, E2, F2 alpha in human skin following ultraviolet B irradiation. Br J Clin Pharmacol. 1980 Nov;10:453-457

Black et al. 2011 Black AT, Gordon MK, Heck DE, Gallo MA, Laskin DL, Laskin JD. UVB light regulates expression of antioxidants and inflammatory mediators in human corneal epithelial cells. Biochem Pharmacol. 2011 Apr 1;81:873-880

Blum et al. 2004 Blum A, Garbe C, Bauer J. Epidemiologie und Risikofaktoren des malignen Melanoms. Onkologe. 2004 2004/07/01;10:688-700

Bock et al. 2013 Bock C, Diehl K, Litaker D, Breitbart EW, Greinert R, Schneider S. Sunbed use in Germany: trends, user histories and factors associated with cessation and readiness to change. Br J Dermatol. 2013 Aug;169:441-449

Boehnke et al. 2012 Boehnke K, Falkowska-Hansen B, Stark HJ, Boukamp P. Stem cells of the human epidermis and their niche: composition and function in epidermal regeneration and carcinogenesis. Carcinogenesis. 2012 Jul;33:1247-1258

Boldeman et al. 2004	Boldeman C, Dal H, Wester U. Swedish pre-school children's UVR exposure - a comparison between two outdoor environments. Photodermatol Photoimmunol Photomed. 2004 Feb;20:2-8
Bonino et al. 2009	Bonino A, Facta S, Saudino S, Anglesio L, D'Amore G. Tanning lamps ultraviolet emissions and compliance with technical standards. Radiat Prot Dosimetry. 2009 Dec;137:197-200
Boniol et al. 2012a	Boniol M, Autier P, Boyle P, Gandini S. Cutaneous melanoma attributable to sunbed use: systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ. 2012a Jul 24;345:e4757
Boniol et al. 2012b	Boniol M, Autier P, Boyle P, Gandini S. Correction - Cutaneous melanoma attributable to sunbed use: systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ. 2012b Dec 13;345:e8503
Boukamp 2005	Boukamp P. Non-melanoma skin cancer: what drives tumor development and progression? Carcinogenesis. 2005 Oct;26:1657-1667
Bourne et al. 2013	Bourne RR, Stevens GA, White RA, Smith JL, Flaxman SR, Price H, Jonas JB, Keeffe J, Leasher J, Naidoo K, Pesudovs K, Resnikoff S, Taylor HR, Group VLE. Causes of vision loss worldwide, 1990-2010: a systematic analysis. Lancet Global health. 2013 Dec;1:e339-349
Brantsch et al. 2008	Brantsch KD, Meisner C, Schönfisch B, Trilling B, Wehner-Caroli J, Röcken M, Breuninger H. Analysis of risk factors determining prognosis of cutaneous squamous-cell carcinoma: a prospective study. Lancet Oncol. 2008 Aug;9:713-720
Brash 1997	Brash DE. Sunlight and the onset of skin cancer. Trends Genet. 1997 Oct;13:410-414
Breitbart et al. 1997	Breitbart M, Garbe C, Büttner P, Weiss J, Soyer HP, Stocker U, Krüger S, Breitbart EW, Weckbecker J, Panizzon R, Bahmer F, Tilgen W, Guggenmoos-Holzmann I, Orfanos CE. Ultraviolet light exposure, pigmentary traits and the development of melanocytic naevi and cutaneous melanoma. A case-control study of the German Central Malignant Melanoma Registry. Acta Derm Venereol. 1997 Sep;77:374-378
Brellier et al. 2004	Brellier F, Marionnet C, Chevallier-Lagente O, Toftgard R, Mauviel A, Sarasin A, Magnaldo T. Ultraviolet irradiation represses PATCHED gene transcription in human epidermal keratinocytes through an activator protein-1-dependent process. Cancer Res. 2004 Apr 15;64:2699-2704
Brian und Taylor 2001	Brian G, Taylor H. Cataract blindness – challenges for the 21st century. Bull World Health Organ. 2001;79:249–256
Bruls et al. 1984	Bruls WA, Slaper H, van der Leun JC, Berrens L. Transmission of human epidermis and stratum corneum as a function of thickness in the ultraviolet and visible wavelengths. Photochem Photobiol. 1984 Oct;40:485-494
Cadet et al. 2012	Cadet J, Mouret S, Ravanat JL, Douki T. Photoinduced damage to cellular DNA: direct and photosensitized reactions. Photochem Photobiol. 2012 Sep-Oct;88:1048-1065
Cejka et al. 2012	Cejka C, Luyckx J, Cejkova J. Central corneal thickness considered an index of corneal hydration of the UVB irradiated rabbit cornea as influenced by UVB absorber. Physiol Res. 2012 Jul 20;61:299-306

Challoner et al. 1976	Challoner AV, Corless D, Davis A, Deane GH, Diffey BL, Gupta SP, Magnus IA. Personnel monitoring of exposure to ultraviolet radiation. Clin Exp Dermatol. 1976 Jun;1:175-179
Cleaver und Crowley 2002	Cleaver JE, Crowley E. UV damage, DNA repair and skin carcinogenesis. Front Biosci. 2002 Apr 1;7:d1024-1043
Clydesdale et al. 2001	Clydesdale GJ, Dandie GW, Muller HK. Ultraviolet light induced injury: immunological and inflammatory effects. Immunol Cell Biol. 2001 Dec;79:547-568
Coelho und Hearing 2010	Coelho SG, Hearing VJ. UVA tanning is involved in the increased incidence of skin cancers in fair-skinned young women. Pigment Cell Melanoma Res. 2010 Feb;23:57-63
CIE 1987	Commission International de l'Eclairage (CIE). International Lighting Vocabulary, 1987
CIE 2006	Commission International de l'Eclairage (CIE). Action spectrum for the production of previtamin D3 in human skin. , 2006
Cooke 1985	Cooke KR, Fraser J. Migration and death from malignant melanoma. Int J Cancer. 1985 Aug 15;36:175-178
Cosa 2004	Cosa G. Photodegradation and photosensitization in pharmaceutical products: Assessing drug phototoxicity. Pure ApplChem. 2004;76:263-275
Cox et al. 1992	Cox NH, Diffey BL, Farr PM. The relationship between chronological age and the erythemal response to ultraviolet B radiation. Br J Dermatol. 1992 Apr;126:315-319
Daniotti 2004	Daniotti M, Oggionni M, Ranzani T, Vallacchi V, Campi V, Di Stasi D, Torre GD, Perrone F, Luoni C, Suardi S, Frattini M, Pilotti S, Anichini A, Tragni G, Parmiani G, Pierotti MA, Rodolfo M. BRAF alterations are associated with complex mutational profiles in malignant melanoma. Oncogene. 2004 Aug 5;23:5968-5977
Dantal et al. 1998	Dantal J, Hourmant M, Cantarovich D, Giral M, Blancho G, Dreno B, Soulillou JP. Effect of long-term immunosuppression in kidney-graft recipients on cancer incidence: randomised comparison of two cyclosporin regimens. Lancet. 1998 Feb 28;351:623-628
de Gruijl 1999	de Gruijl FR. Skin cancer and solar UV radiation. Eur J Cancer. 1999 Dec;35:2003-2009
de Gruijl et al. 1993	de Gruijl FR, Sterenborg HJ, Forbes PD, Davies RE, Cole C, Kelfkens G, van Weelden H, Slaper H, van der Leun JC. Wavelength dependence of skin cancer induction by ultraviolet irradiation of albino hairless mice. Cancer Res. 1993 Jan 1;53:53-60
de Gruijl et al. 2001	de Gruijl FR, van Kranen HJ, Mullenders LH. UV-induced DNA damage, repair, mutations and oncogenic pathways in skin cancer. J Photochem Photobiol B. 2001 Oct;63:19-27
DeDavid et al. 1997	DeDavid M, Orlow SJ, Provost N, Marghoob AA, Rao BK, Huang CL, Wasti Q, Kopf AW, Bart RS. A study of large congenital melanocytic nevi and associated malignant melanomas: review of cases in the New York University Registry and the world literature. J Am Acad Dermatol. 1997 Mar;36:409-416

Deeb et al. 2007	Deeb KK, Trump DL, Johnson CS. Vitamin D signalling pathways in cancer: potential for anticancer therapeutics. Nat Rev Cancer. 2007 Sep;7:684-700
DGE 2011	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Ernährung (DGE). Stellungnahme: Vitamin D und Prävention ausgewählter chronischer Krankheiten. Herausgegeben von der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Ernährung e V (DGE), Godesberger Allee 18,. 2011
DGE, ÖGE und SGE 2013	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Ernährung (DGE), Österreichische Gesellschaft für Ernährung (ÖGE), Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Ernährungsforschung (SGE), Schweizerische Vereinigung für Ernährung (Hrsg.). Referenzwerte für die Nährstoffzufuhr. Bonn, Umschau Buchverlag; Auflage: 1. Aufl., 5. überarb. Nachdruck (20. August 2013), 2013
DIN 2008	Deutsches Institut für Normung (DIN). DIN-EN 14255-3:2008, Messung und Beurteilung von personenbezogenen Expositionen gegenüber inkohärenter optischer Strahlung - Teil 3: Messung und Beurteilung von Strahlungsexpositionen durch die Sonne. Beuth Verlag. 2008
DIN 2010	Deutsches Institut für Normung (DIN). DIN 5050-1:2010-01, Solarien und Heimsonnen - Teil 1: Messverfahren und Kennzeichnung. Beuth Verlag. . 2010
DIN 2012	Deutsches Institut für Normung (DIN). DIN 5031-10:2012, Strahlungsphysik im optischen Bereich und Lichttechnik - Teil 10: Photobiologisch wirksame Strahlung, Größen, Kurzzeichen und Wirkungsspektren, Beuth Verlag. 2012
DIN 2013	Deutsches Institut für Normung (DIN). DIN EN ISO 12312-1:2015-12, Augen- und Gesichtsschutz - Sonnenbrillen und ähnlicher Augenschutz - Teil 1: Sonnenbrillen für den allgemeinen Gebrauch (ISO 12312-1:2013 + Amd.1:2015). Beuth Verlag. 2013
Di Lernia et al. 2013	Di Lernia V, Ricci C, Zalaudek I, Argenziano G. Metastasizing basal cell carcinoma. Cutis. 2013 Nov;92:244-246
Dianov und Parsons 2007	Dianov GL, Parsons JL. Co-ordination of DNA single strand break repair. DNA Repair (Amst). 2007 Apr 1;6:454-460
Diehl 2010	Diehl K, Litaker DG, Greinert R, Zimmermann S, Breitbart EW, Schneider S. The prevalence of current sunbed use and user characteristics: the SUN-Study 2008. Int J Public Health. 2010 Oct;55:513-516
Diepgen et al. 1989	Diepgen TL, Häberle M, Fartasch M, Stüben O, Hornstein OP. [Characteristics of polymorphous light dermatosis--results of a prospective survey and study of 302 affected patients]. Z Hautkr. 1989 Apr 15;64:279-280, 283-275
Diffey 1984	Diffey B. Using a microcomputer program to avoid sunburn. Photodermatol. 1984 Feb;1:45-51
Diffey 1999	Diffey BL. Human exposure to ultraviolet radiation; in Hawk JLM (ed): Photodermatology. London, Sydney, Auckland, Arnold, 1999, pp 5-24
Diffey 2012	Diffey BL. The risk of squamous cell carcinoma in women from exposure to UVA lamps used in cosmetic nail treatment. Br J Dermatol. 2012 Nov;167:1175-1178

Diffey et al. 1996 Diffey BL, Gibson CJ, Haylock R, McKinlay AF. Outdoor ultraviolet exposure of children and adolescents. Br J Dermatol. 1996 Jun;134:1030-1034

Diffey et al. 1977 Diffey BL, Kerwin M, Davis A. The anatomical distribution of sunlight. Br J Dermatol. 1977 Oct;97:407-410

Dissel et al. 2009 Dissel M, Rotterdam S, Altmeyer P, Gambichler T. Indoor tanning in North Rhine-Westphalia Germany: a self-reported survey. Photodermatol Photoimmunol Photomed. 2009 Apr;25:94-100

Dodson et al. 1991 Dodson JM, DeSpain J, Hewett JE, Clark DP. Malignant potential of actinic keratoses and the controversy over treatment. A patient-oriented perspective. Arch Dermatol. 1991 Jul;127:1029-1031

Doré und Chignol 2012 Doré JF, Chignol MC. Tanning salons and skin cancer. Photochem Photobiol Sci. 2012 Jan;11:30-37

Dulon et al. 2002 Dulon M, Weichenthal M, Blettner M, Breitbart M, Hetzer M, Greinert R, Baumgardt-Elms C, Breitbart EW. Sun exposure and number of nevi in 5- to 6-year-old European children. J Clin Epidemiol. 2002 Nov;55:1075-1081

Dumaz et al. 1997 Dumaz N, van Kranen HJ, de Vries A, Berg RJ, Wester PW, van Kreijl CF, Sarasin A, Daya-Grosjean L, de Gruijl FR. The role of UV-B light in skin carcinogenesis through the analysis of p53 mutations in squamous cell carcinomas of hairless mice. Carcinogenesis. 1997 May;18:897-904

Duthie et al. 1999 Duthie MS, Kimber I, Norval M. The effects of ultraviolet radiation on the human immune system. Br J Dermatol. 1999 Jun;140:995-1009

Eaton 1994 Eaton JW. UV-mediated cataractogenesis: a radical perspective. Doc Ophthalmol. 1994;88:233-242

El-Abaseri et al. 2006 El-Abaseri TB, Putta S, Hansen LA. Ultraviolet irradiation induces keratinocyte proliferation and epidermal hyperplasia through the activation of the epidermal growth factor receptor. Carcinogenesis. 2006 Feb;27:225-231

El Ghissassi et al. 2009 El Ghissassi F, Baan R, Straif K, Grosse Y, Secretan B, Bouvard V, Benbrahim-Tallaa L, Guha N, Freeman C, Galichet L, Cogliano V, Group WIAfRoCMW. A review of human carcinogens--part D: radiation. Lancet Oncol. 2009 Aug;10:751-752

Emmert et al. 2011 Emmert B, Hallier E, Schön MP, Emmert S. [Xeroderma pigmentosum (XP) : A genetic disease sheds light on UV-induced skin cancer]. Hautarzt. 2011 Feb;62:91-97

Epidemiologisches Krebsregister Saarland 2016 Epidemiologisches Krebsregister Saarland. Interaktive Datenbank http://www.krebsregister.saarland.de/.

España et al. 1995 España A, Redondo P, Fernández AL, Zabala M, Herreros J, Llorens R, Quintanilla E. Skin cancer in heart transplant recipients. J Am Acad Dermatol. 1995 Mar;32:458-465

European Union 2006 European Union. Directive 2006/25/EC on the minimum health and safety requirements regarding the exposure of workers to the risks arising from physical agents (artificial optical radiation). EU-Directive 2006/25/EC. 2006

Fachverband für Strahlenschutz e.V. 2012 Fachverband für Strahlenschutz e.V. Leitfaden „Sonnenstrahlung“. http://osiris22.pi-consult.de/userdata/l_20/p_105/library/data/fs-06-130-2-aknir_sonnenstrahlung.pdf (zuletzt besucht am 12.04.2016)

Facta et al. 2013 Facta S, Fusette SS, Bonino A, Anglesio L, d'Amore G. UV emissions from artificial tanning devices and their compliance with the European technical standard. Health Phys. 2013 Apr;104:385-393

Fallah et al. 2014 Fallah M, Pukkala E, Sundquist K, Tretli S, Olsen JH, Tryggvadottir L, Hemminki K. Familial melanoma by histology and age: joint data from five Nordic countries. Eur J Cancer. 2014 Apr;50:1176-1183

Farrerons et al. 1998 Farrerons J, Barnadas M, Rodríguez J, Renau A, Yoldi B, López-Navidad A, Moragas J. Clinically prescribed sunscreen (sun protection factor 15) does not decrease serum vitamin D concentration sufficiently either to induce changes in parathyroid function or in metabolic markers. Br J Dermatol. 1998 Sep;139:422-427

Faurschou et al. 2012 Faurschou A, Beyer DM, Schmedes A, Bogh MK, Philipsen PA, Wulf HC. The relation between sunscreen layer thickness and vitamin D production after ultraviolet B exposure: a randomized clinical trial. Br J Dermatol. 2012 Aug;167:391-395

Fears et al. 2011 Fears TR, Sagebiel RW, Halpern A, Elder DE, Holly EA, Guerry Dt, Tucker MA. Sunbeds and sunlamps: who used them and their risk for melanoma. Pigment Cell Melanoma Res. 2011 Jun;24:574-581

Fioletov et al. 2009 Fioletov VE, McArthur LJ, Mathews TW, Marrett L. On the relationship between erythemal and vitamin D action spectrum weighted ultraviolet radiation. J Photochem Photobiol B. 2009 Apr 2;95:9-16

Fioletov et al. 2010 Fioletov VE, McArthur LJ, Mathews TW, Marrett L. Estimated ultraviolet exposure levels for a sufficient vitamin D status in North America. J Photochem Photobiol B. 2010 Aug 2;100:57-66

Fisher et al. 2000 Fisher GJ, Datta S, Wang Z, Li XY, Quan T, Chung JH, Kang S, Voorhees JJ. c-Jun-dependent inhibition of cutaneous procollagen transcription following ultraviolet irradiation is reversed by all-trans retinoic acid. J Clin Invest. 2000 Sep;106:663-670

Fisher et al. 2002 Fisher GJ, Kang S, Varani J, Bata-Csorgo Z, Wan Y, Datta S, Voorhees JJ. Mechanisms of photoaging and chronological skin aging. Arch Dermatol. 2002 Nov;138:1462-1470

Ford et al. 1995 Ford D, Bliss JM, Swerdlow AJ, Armstrong BK, Franceschi S, Green A, Holly EA, Mack T, MacKie RM, Osterlind A, et al. Risk of cutaneous melanoma associated with a family history of the disease. The International Melanoma Analysis Group (IMAGE). Int J Cancer. 1995 Aug 9;62:377-381

Freeman et al. 1989 Freeman SE, Hacham H, Gange RW, Maytum DJ, Sutherland JC, Sutherland BM. Wavelength dependence of pyrimidine dimer formation in DNA of human skin irradiated in situ with ultraviolet light. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1989 Jul;86:5605-5609

Fu et al. 1997 — Fu GK, Lin D, Zhang MYH, Bikle DD, Shackleton CHL, Miller WL, Portale AA. Cloning of Human 25-Hydroxyvitamin D-1α-Hydroxylase and Mutations Causing Vitamin D-Dependent Rickets Type 1. Mol Endocrinol. 1997 Dec;11:1961-1970

Gallagher et al. 2007 — Gallagher JC, Rapuri P, Smith L. Falls are associated with decreased renal function and insufficient calcitriol production by the kidney. J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol. 2007 Mar;103:610-613

Gallagher et al. 1995a — Gallagher RP, Hill GB, Bajdik CD, Coldman AJ, Fincham S, McLean DI, Threlfall WJ. Sunlight exposure, pigmentation factors, and risk of nonmelanocytic skin cancer. II. Squamous cell carcinoma. Arch Dermatol. 1995a Feb;131:164-169

Gallagher et al. 1995b — Gallagher RP, Hill GB, Bajdik CD, Fincham S, Coldman AJ, McLean DI, Threlfall WJ. Sunlight exposure, pigmentary factors, and risk of nonmelanocytic skin cancer. I. Basal cell carcinoma. Arch Dermatol. 1995b Feb;131:157-163

Gambichler et al. 2005 — Gambichler T, Künzlberger B, Paech V, Kreuter A, Boms S, Bader A, Moussa G, Sand M, Altmeyer P, Hoffmann K. UVA1 and UVB irradiated skin investigated by optical coherence tomography in vivo: a preliminary study. Clin Exp Dermatol. 2005 Jan;30:79-82

Gandini et al. 2005a — Gandini S, Sera F, Cattaruzza MS, Pasquini P, Abeni D, Boyle P, Melchi CF. Meta-analysis of risk factors for cutaneous melanoma: I. Common and atypical naevi. Eur J Cancer. 2005a Jan;41:28-44

Gandini et al. 2005b — Gandini S, Sera F, Cattaruzza MS, Pasquini P, Picconi O, Boyle P, Melchi CF. Meta-analysis of risk factors for cutaneous melanoma: II. Sun exposure. Eur J Cancer. 2005b Jan;41:45-60

Gandini et al. 2005c — Gandini S, Sera F, Cattaruzza MS, Pasquini P, Zanetti R, Masini C, Boyle P, Melchi CF. Meta-analysis of risk factors for cutaneous melanoma: III. Family history, actinic damage and phenotypic factors. Eur J Cancer. 2005c Sep;41:2040-2059

Gange et al. 1985 — Gange RW, Blackett AD, Matzinger EA, Sutherland BM, Kochevar IE. Comparative protection efficiency of UVA- and UVB-induced tans against erythema and formation of endonuclease-sensitive sites in DNA by UVB in human skin. J Invest Dermatol. 1985 Oct;85:362-364

Garbe und Lasithiotakis 2006 — Garbe C, Lasithiotakis KG. Epidemiologie des Melanoms der Haut; in Garbe C (ed): Management des Melanoms. Springer Medizin Verlag Heidelberg, 2006, pp 49-62

Garcia et al. 2011 — Garcia AM, McLaren CE, Meyskens FLJ. Melanoma: is hair the root of the problem? Pigment Cell Melanoma Res. 2011 Feb;24:110-118

Garland und Garland 1980 — Garland CF, Garland FC. Do sunlight and vitamin D reduce the likelihood of colon cancer? Int J Epidemiol. 1980 Sep;9:227-231

Gendron et al. 2013 — Gendron SP, Bastien N, Mallet JD, Rochette PJ. The 3895-bp mitochondrial DNA deletion in the human eye: a potential involvement in corneal ageing and macular degeneration. Mutagenesis. 2013 Mar;28:197-204

Gerber et al. 2002 — Gerber B, Mathys P, Moser M, Bressoud D, Braun-Fahrländer C. Ultraviolet emission spectra of sunbeds. Photochem Photobiol. 2002 Dec;76:664-668

GEKID 2014 Gesellschaft der epidemiologischen Krebsregister in Deutschland e.V. (GEKID. Inzidenz und Mortalität von Krebserkrankungen in den Bundesländern. Interaktiver Atlas der Gesellschaft für epidemiologische Krebsregister in Deutschland. http://www.gekid.de/Atlas/CurrentVersion/atlas.html (Zuletzt besucht am 11.04.2016.).

NiSG 2009 Gesetz zum Schutz vor nichtionisierender Strahlung bei der Anwendung am Menschen vom 29. Juli 2009 (BGBl. I S. 2433), das zuletzt durch Artikel 5 des Gesetzes vom 8. April 2013 (BGBl. I S. 734) geändert worden ist.

Gies et al. 2011 Gies P, Javorniczky J, Henderson S, McLennan A, Roy C, Lock J, Lynga C, Melbourne A, Gordon L. UVR emissions from solaria in Australia and implications for the regulation process. Photochem Photobiol. 2011 Jan-Feb;87:184-190

Gies et al. 1998 Gies P, Roy C, Toomey S, MacLennan R, Watson M. Solar UVR exposures of primary school children at three locations in Queensland. Photochem Photobiol. 1998 Jul;68:78-83

Giesen 2000 Giesen J. ErdeSonneApplet http://www.geoastro.de/ErdeSonne/SE/se_applet.html (zuletzt besucht am 11.04.2016) 2000

Gilchrest 2008 Gilchrest BA. Sun exposure and vitamin D sufficiency. Am J Clin Nutr. 2008 Aug;88:570S-577S

Glickman 2011 Glickman RD. Ultraviolet phototoxicity to the retina. Eye Contact Lens. 2011 Jul;37:196-205

Godar 2001 Godar DE. UV doses of American children and adolescents. Photochem Photobiol. 2001 Dec;74:787-793

Godar 2005 Godar DE. UV Doses Worldwide. Photoch Photobiol. 2005 Jul-Aug;81:736-749

Godar et al. 2011 Godar DE, Pope SJ, Grant WB, Holick MF. Solar UV doses of adult Americans and vitamin D(3) production. Dermatoendocrinol. 2011 Oct;3:243-250

Godar et al. 2012 Godar DE, Pope SJ, Grant WB, Holick MF. Solar UV doses of young Americans and vitamin D3 production. Environ Health Perspect. 2012 Jan;120:139-143

Godar et al. 2001 Godar DE, Wengraitis SP, Shreffler J, Sliney DH. UV doses of Americans. Photochem Photobiol. 2001 Jun;73:621-629

Grant 2002 Grant WB. An estimate of premature cancer mortality in the U.S. due to inadequate doses of solar ultraviolet-B radiation. Cancer. 2002 Mar 15;94:1867-1875

Grant 2008 Grant WB. Solar ultraviolet irradiance and cancer incidence and mortality. Adv Exp Med Biol. 2008;624:16-30

Grant 2009a Grant WB. How strong is the evidence that solar ultraviolet B and vitamin D reduce the risk of cancer?: An examination using Hill's criteria for causality. Dermatoendocrinol. 2009a Jan;1:17-24

Grant 2009b Grant WB. In defense of the sun: An estimate of changes in mortality rates in the United States if mean serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D levels were raised to 45 ng/mL by solar ultraviolet-B irradiance. Dermatoendocrinol. 2009b Jul;1:207-214

Grant 2011	Grant WB. An estimate of the global reduction in mortality rates through doubling vitamin D levels. Eur J Clin Nutr. 2011 Sep;65:1016-1026
Grant und Garland 2006	Grant WB, Garland CF. The association of solar ultraviolet B (UVB) with reducing risk of cancer: multifactorial ecologic analysis of geographic variation in age-adjusted cancer mortality rates. Anticancer Res. 2006 Jul-Aug;26:2687-2699
Grant et al. 2005	Grant WB, Garland CF, Holick MF. Comparisons of estimated economic burdens due to insufficient solar ultraviolet irradiance and vitamin D and excess solar UV irradiance for the United States. Photochem Photobiol. 2005 Nov-Dec;81:1276-1286
Grant und Mohr 2009	Grant WB, Mohr SB. Ecological studies of ultraviolet B, vitamin D and cancer since 2000. Ann Epidemiol. 2009 Jul;19:446-454
Grant et al. 2010	Grant WB, Schwalfenberg GK, Genuis SJ, Whiting SJ. An estimate of the economic burden and premature deaths due to vitamin D deficiency in Canada. Mol Nutr Food Res. 2010 Aug;54:1172-1181
Greeley et al. 1965	Greeley PW, Middleton AG, Curtin JW. Incidence of Malignancy in Giant Pigmented Nevi. Plast Reconstr Surg. 1965 Jul;36:26-37
Green et al. 2011a	Green AC, Wallingford SC, McBride P. Childhood exposure to ultraviolet radiation and harmful skin effects: epidemiological evidence. Prog Biophys Mol Biol. 2011a Dec;107:349-355
Green et al. 2011b	Green AC, Williams GM, Logan V, Strutton GM. Reduced melanoma after regular sunscreen use: randomized trial follow-up. J Clin Oncol. 2011b Jan 20;29:257-263
Greinert et al. 2000	Greinert R, Boguhn O, Harder D, Breitbart EW, Mitchell DL, Volkmer B. The dose dependence of cyclobutane dimer induction and repair in UVB-irradiated human keratinocytes. Photochem Photobiol. 2000 Nov;72:701-708
Grob et al. 1990	Grob JJ, Gouvernet J, Aymar D, Mostaque A, Romano MH, Collet AM, Noe MC, Diconstanzo MP, Bonerandi JJ. Count of benign melanocytic nevi as a major indicator of risk for nonfamilial nodular and superficial spreading melanoma. Cancer. 1990 Jul 15;66:387-395
Halpern et al. 1991	Halpern AC, Guerry Dt, Elder DE, Clark WH, Jr., Synnestvedt M, Norman S, Ayerle R. Dysplastic nevi as risk markers of sporadic (nonfamilial) melanoma. A case-control study. Arch Dermatol. 1991 Jul;127:995-999
Hanwell et al. 2010	Hanwell HE, Vieth R, Cole DE, Scillitani A, Modoni S, Frusciante V, Ritrovato G, Chiodini I, Minisola S, Carnevale V. Sun exposure questionnaire predicts circulating 25-hydroxyvitamin D concentrations in Caucasian hospital workers in southern Italy. J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol. 2010 Jul;121:334-337
Harris und Dawson-Hughes 2002	Harris SS, Dawson-Hughes B. Plasma vitamin D and 25OHD responses of young and old men to supplementation with vitamin D3. J Am Coll Nutr. 2002 Aug;21:357-362
Hathcock et al. 2007	Hathcock JN, Shao A, Vieth R, Heaney R. Risk assessment for vitamin D. Am J Clin Nutr. 2007 Jan;85:6-18

Heaney et al. 2003	Heaney RP, Davies KM, Chen TC, Holick MF, Barger-Lux MJ. Human serum 25-hydroxycholecalciferol response to extended oral dosing with cholecalciferol. Am J Clin Nutr. 2003 Jan;77:204-210
Heckman et al. 2008	Heckman CJ, Coups EJ, Manne SL. Prevalence and correlates of indoor tanning among US adults. J Am Acad Dermatol. 2008 May;58:769-780
Heenen et al. 2001	Heenen M, Giacomoni PU, Golstein P. Individual variations in the correlation between erythemal threshold, UV-induced DNA damage and sun-burn cell formation. J Photochem Photobiol B. 2001 Oct;63:84-87
Hemminki et al. 2001	Hemminki K, Lönnstedt I, Vaittinen P. A population-based study of familial cutaneous melanoma. Melanoma Res. 2001 Apr;11:133-140
Hendrickson und Ross 1981	Hendrickson MR, Ross JC. Neoplasms arising in congenital giant nevi: morphologic study of seven cases and a review of the literature. Am J Surg Pathol. 1981 Mar;5:109-135
Henry 2001	Henry HL. The 25(OH)D(3)/1alpha,25(OH)(2)D(3)-24R-hydroxylase: a catabolic or biosynthetic enzyme? Steroids. 2001 Mar-May;66:391-398
Herlihy et al. 1994	Herlihy E, Gies PH, Roy CR, Jones M. Personal dosimetry of solar UV radiation for different outdoor activities. Photochem Photobiol. 1994 Sep;60:288-294
Hintzpeter et al. 2008a	Hintzpeter B, Mensink GB, Thierfelder W, Müller MJ, Scheidt-Nave C. Vitamin D status and health correlates among German adults. Eur J Clin Nutr. 2008a Sep;62:1079-1089
Hintzpeter et al. 2008b	Hintzpeter B, Scheidt-Nave C, Müller MJ, Schenk L, Mensink GB. Higher prevalence of vitamin D deficiency is associated with immigrant background among children and adolescents in Germany. J Nutr. 2008b Aug;138:1482-1490
Hoeppe et al. 2004	Hoeppe P, Oppenrieder A, Erianto C, Koepke P, Reuder J, Seefeldner M, Nowak D. Visualization of UV exposure of the human body based on data from a scanning UV-measuring system. Int J Biometeorol. 2004 Sep;49:18-25
Höger 2008	Höger PH. Kinderdermatologie. Stuttgart, New York, Schattauer, 2008
Holick 1981	Holick MF. The cutaneous photosynthesis of previtamin D3: a unique photoendocrine system. J Invest Dermatol. 1981 Jul;77:51-58
Holick 2003	Holick MF. Evolution and function of vitamin D. Recent Results Cancer Res. 2003;164:3-28
Holick 2004	Holick MF. Sunlight and vitamin D for bone health and prevention of autoimmune diseases, cancers, and cardiovascular disease. Am J Clin Nutr. 2004 Dec;80:1678S-1688S
Holick 2007	Holick MF. Vitamin D deficiency. N Engl J Med. 2007 Jul 19;357:266-281
Holick 2008	Holick MF. Sunlight, UV-radiation, vitamin D and skin cancer: how much sunlight do we need? Adv Exp Med Biol. 2008;624:1-15

Holick et al. 1980 Holick MF, MacLaughlin JA, Clark MB, Holick SA, Potts JT, Jr., Anderson RR, Blank IH, Parrish JA, Elias P. Photosynthesis of previtamin D3 in human skin and the physiologic consequences. Science. 1980 Oct 10;210:203-205

Holick et al. 1989 Holick MF, Matsuoka LY, Wortsman J. Age, vitamin D, and solar ultraviolet. Lancet. 1989 Nov 4;2:1104-1105

Hönigsmann und Ortel 1988 Hönigsmann H, Ortel B. [Polymorphous photodermatosis--photobiologic diagnosis and therapy]. Z Hautkr. 1988 Aug 15;63:676-678

Horton et al. 2008 Horton JK, Watson M, Stefanick DF, Shaughnessy DT, Taylor JA, Wilson SH. XRCC1 and DNA polymerase beta in cellular protection against cytotoxic DNA single-strand breaks. Cell Res. 2008 Jan;18:48-63

Hussussian et al. 1994 Hussussian CJ, Struewing JP, Goldstein AM, Higgins PA, Ally DS, Sheahan MD, Clark WH, Jr., Tucker MA, Dracopoli NC. Germline p16 mutations in familial melanoma. Nat Genet. 1994 Sep;8:15-21

Illig 1986 Illig L. Small and giant congenital melanocytic nevi as precursors to melanoma in children and adults. Pediatr Pol. 1986 Aug;61:475-483

IFA 2007 Institut für Arbeitschutz der Deutschen Gesetzlichen Unfallversicherung (IFA). UV-Strahlenexpositionen an Arbeitsplätzen. BGIA-Report 3/2007. http://www.dguv.de/ifa/Publikationen/Reports-Download/BGIA-Reports-2007-bis-2008/BGIA-Report-3-2007/index.jsp (zuletzt besucht am 11.04.2016)

IFA 2010 Institut für Arbeitsschutz der Deutschen Gesetzlichen Unfallversicherung (IFA). UV-Strahlenexpositionen bei der Glasbearbeitung mit Gasbrennern. Informationen des Instituts für Arbeitsschutz der DGUV. http://www.dguv.de/dguv/medien/ifa/de/fac/strahl/pdf/uv_expositionen_gasbrenner.pdf (zuletzt besucht am 11.04.2016)

IFA 2011 Institut für Arbeitsschutz der Deutschen Gesetzlichen Unfallversicherung (IFA). Kanzerogenes Potenzial von Sonnenstrahlung und künstlichen UV-Strahlenquellen http://publikationen.dguv.de/dguv/pdf/10002/kanzerogen-opt-strahlenquellen.pdf (zuletzt besucht am 11.04.2016)

IOM 2011a Institute of Medicine (IOM). Dietary Reference Intakes for Calcium and Vitamin D, 2011a

IOM 2011b Institute of Medicine (IOM). Dietary Reference Intakes for Calcium and Vitamin D. 2011b

IARC 2001 International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). Sunscreens. IARC Handbook of Cancer Prevention, Volume 5, 2001

IARC 2008 International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). Vitamin D and Cancer. IARC Working Group Reports. 2008;5

IARC 2015 International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). European Code Against Cancer http://cancer-code-europe.iarc.fr/index.php/en/ecac-12-ways/sun-uv-exposure-recommendation (zuletzt besucht am 11.04.2016).

IARC 2007 International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) Working Group on artificial ultraviolet light and skin cancer. The association of use of sunbeds with cutaneous malignant melanoma and other skin cancers: A systematic review. Int J Cancer. 2007 Mar 1;120:1116-1122

ICNIRP 2004 International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP). Guidelines on limits of exposure to ultraviolet radiation of wavelengths between 180 nm and 400 nm (incoherent optical radiation). Health Phys. 2004 Aug;87:171-186

ICNIRP 2006 International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP). UV exposure guidance: A balanced approach between health risks and health benefits of UV and Vitamin D. Proceedings of an International Workshop, ICNIRP. Prog Biophys Mol Biol. 2006 Sep;92:1-184

ICNIRP 2007 International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP). Protecting workers from ultraviolet radiation, 2007

ISO 1999 International Organization for Standardization (ISO). Erythema reference action spectrum and standard erythema dose (ISO17166/CIE 007/E). https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/#iso:std:iso:17166:ed-1:v2:en (zuletzt besucht am 11.04.2016.)

Jayaratne et al. 2012 Jayaratne N, Russell A, van der Pols JC. Sun protection and vitamin D status in an Australian subtropical community. Prev Med. 2012 Aug;55:146-150

Jensen et al. 1999 Jensen P, Hansen S, Møller B, Leivestad T, Pfeffer P, Geiran O, Fauchald P, Simonsen S. Skin cancer in kidney and heart transplant recipients and different long-term immunosuppressive therapy regimens. J Am Acad Dermatol. 1999 Feb;40:177-186

Jung und Anton-Lamprecht 1971 Jung EG, Anton-Lamprecht I. Untersuchungen über Albinismus. Arch Derm Forsch. 1971;240:123-137

Kadekaro et al. 2003 Kadekaro AL, Kavanagh RJ, Wakamatsu K, Ito S, Pipitone MA, Abdel-Malek ZA. Cutaneous photobiology. The melanocyte vs. the sun: who will win the final round? Pigment Cell Res. 2003 Oct;16:434-447

Kamb et al. 1994 Kamb A, Shattuck-Eidens D, Eeles R, Liu Q, Gruis NA, Ding W, Hussey C, Tran T, Miki Y, Weaver-Feldhaus J, et al. Analysis of the p16 gene (CDKN2) as a candidate for the chromosome 9p melanoma susceptibility locus. Nat Genet. 1994 Sep;8:23-26

Karagas et al. 1996 Karagas MR, McDonald JA, Greenberg ER, Stukel TA, Weiss JE, Baron JA, Stevens MM. Risk of basal cell and squamous cell skin cancers after ionizing radiation therapy. For The Skin Cancer Prevention Study Group. J Natl Cancer Inst. 1996 Dec 18;88:1848-1853

Karin et al. 1997 Karin M, Liu Z, Zandi E. AP-1 function and regulation. Curr Opin Cell Biol. 1997 Apr;9:240-246

Katalinic 2015 Katalinic A. Aktuelle Zahlen zur Epidemiologie von Melanomen und Hellem Hautkrebs. http://www.krebsregister-sh.de/aktuelles/Zahlen_Hautkrebs_2015.pdf (zuletzt besucht am 11.04.2016)

Katz et al. 1982 Katz L, Ben-Tuvia S, Steinitz R. Malignant melanoma of the skin in Israel: effect of migration. Wasington, New York, Hemisphere, 1982

Kelly et al. 1998 — Kelly DA, Walker SL, McGregor JM, Young AR. A single exposure of solar simulated radiation suppresses contact hypersensitivity responses both locally and systemically in humans: quantitative studies with high-frequency ultrasound. J Photochem Photobiol B. 1998 Jul 10;44:130-142

Khalesi et al. 2013 — Khalesi M, Whiteman DC, Doi SA, Clark J, Kimlin MG, Neale RE. Cutaneous markers of photo-damage and risk of Basal cell carcinoma of the skin: a meta-analysis. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2013 Sep;22:1483-1489

Khlat et al. 1992 — Khlat M, Vail A, Parkin M, Green A. Mortality from melanoma in migrants to Australia: variation by age at arrival and duration of stay. Am J Epidemiol. 1992 May 15;135:1103-1113

Kimlin et al. 1998 — Kimlin MG, Parisi AV, Wong JC. Quantification of personal solar UV exposure of outdoor workers, indoor workers and adolescents at two locations in Southeast Queensland. Photodermatol Photoimmunol Photomed. 1998 Feb;14:7-11

Knuschke 2006 — Knuschke P. Personal UV monitoring in health prevention and risk analysis. UV News. 2006 Aug;8:62-63

Knuschke 2011 — Knuschke P. Forschungsergebnisse auf dem Gebiet der beruflichen solaren UV-Expositionen. Dermatol Beruf Umwelt. 2011;59:78-83

Knuschke und Krins 2000 — Knuschke P, Krins A. UV-Personendosimetrie Teil B: Mit Verwendung des Polysulfonfilms als UV-Sensor. . Schlußbericht BMBF-Vorhaben 07UVB54B Standort: Univeristätsbibliothek Hannover und Technische Informationsbibliothek F 00 B 1544. 2000

Knuschke et al. 2004 — Knuschke P, Kurpiers M, Koch R, Kuhlisch W, Witte K. Mittlere UV-Expositionen der Bevölkerung. http://edok01.tib.uni-hannover.de/edoks/e01fb06/511831935.pdf (zuletzt besucht am 12.04.16)

Knuschke et al. 2012 — Knuschke P, Lehmann B, Püschel A, Rönsch H. UV-abhängige Vitamin D Synthese - Bilanzierung der Expositionszeit durch UV zur Produktion des optimalen Vitamin D3-Bedarfs im menschlichen Körper - Vorhaben 3607S04538. Ressortforschungsberichte zur kerntechnischen Sicherheit und zum Strahlenschutz. Herausgegeben vom Bundesamt für Strahlenschutz (BfS). urn:nbn:de:0221-201210029658

Knuschke et al. 2015 — Knuschke P, Ott G, Bauer A, Janßen M, Mersiowsky K, Püschel A, Rönsch H. Schutzkomponenten bei solarer UV-Exposition. Schriftenreihe der Bundesanstalt für Arbeitsschutz und Arbeitsmedizin, Forschung Projekt F 2036. Dortmund/Berlin/Dresden, 2015

Knuschke et al. 2010 — Knuschke P, Unverricht I, Aschoff R, Cuevas M, Janßen M, Koch E, Krüger A, Ott G, Thiele A. Untersuchung des Eigenschutzes der Haut gegen solare UV-Strahlung bei Arbeitnehmern im Freien. Schriftenreihe der Bundesanstalt für Arbeitsschutz und Arbeitsmedizin, Forschung Projekt F 1986. Dortmund/Berlin/Dresden, 2010

Knuschke et al. 2007 — Knuschke P, Unverricht I, Ott G, Janßen M. Personenbezogene Messung der UV-Exposition von Arbeitnehmern im Freien. Schriftenreihe der Bundesanstalt für Arbeitsschutz und Arbeitsmedizin, Forschung Projekt F 1777. Dortmund/Berlin/Dresden 2007

Köhne und Wößner 2005	Köhne A, Wößner M. Nautisches Jahrbuch. http://www.kowoma.de/gps/astronav/nautjahrbuch.htm zuletzt besucht am 12.04.2016
Køster et al. 2009	Køster B, Thorgaard C, Clemmensen IH, Philip A. Sunbed use in the Danish population in 2007: a cross-sectional study. Prev Med. 2009 Mar;48:288-290
Kraemer et al. 2007	Kraemer KH, Patronas NJ, Schiffmann R, Brooks BP, Tamura D, DiGiovanna JJ. Xeroderma pigmentosum, trichothiodystrophy and Cockayne syndrome: a complex genotype-phenotype relationship. Neuroscience. 2007 Apr 14;145:1388-1396
Kricker et al. 1991	Kricker A, Armstrong BK, English DR, Heenan PJ. Pigmentary and cutaneous risk factors for non-melanocytic skin cancer--a case-control study. Int J Cancer. 1991 Jul 9;48:650-662
Kricker et al. 1995a	Kricker A, Armstrong BK, English DR, Heenan PJ. Does intermittent sun exposure cause basal cell carcinoma? a case-control study in Western Australia. Int J Cancer. 1995a Feb 8;60:489-494
Kricker et al. 1995b	Kricker A, Armstrong BK, English DR, Heenan PJ. A dose-response curve for sun exposure and basal cell carcinoma. Int J Cancer. 1995b Feb 8;60:482-488
Krutmann et al. 2014	Krutmann J, Behar-Cohen F, Baillet G, de Ayguavives T, Ortega Garcia P, Peña-García P, Remé C, Wolffsohn J. Towards standardization of UV eye protection: what can be learned from photodermatology? Photodermatol Photoimmunol Photomed. 2014 Apr-Jun;30:128-136
Krutmann und Grewe 1995	Krutmann J, Grewe M. Involvement of cytokines, DNA damage, and reactive oxygen intermediates in ultraviolet radiation-induced modulation of intercellular adhesion molecule-1 expression. J Invest Dermatol. 1995 Jul;105:67S-70S
Kusewitt et al. 2000	Kusewitt DF, Hubbard GB, Warbritton AR, McLeskey SW, Miska KB, Henkel RD, Robinson ES. Cellular origins of ultraviolet radiation-induced corneal tumours in the grey, short-tailed South American opossum (Monodelphis domestica). J Comp Pathol. 2000 Aug-Oct;123:88-95
Lagerwerf et al. 2011	Lagerwerf S, Vrouwe MG, Overmeer RM, Fousteri MI, Mullenders LH. DNA damage response and transcription. DNA Repair (Amst). 2011 Jul 15;10:743-750
Lazovich et al. 2010	Lazovich D, Vogel RI, Berwick M, Weinstock MA, Anderson KE, Warshaw EM. Indoor tanning and risk of melanoma: a case-control study in a highly exposed population. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2010 Jun;19:1557-1568
Leach et al. 1978	Leach JF, McLeod VE, Pingstone AR, Davis A, Deane GH. Measurement of the ultraviolet doses received by office workers. Clin Exp Dermatol. 1978 Mar;3:77-79
Lehmann et al. 2001	Lehmann B, Genehr T, Knuschke P, Pietzsch J, Meurer M. UVB-induced conversion of 7-dehydrocholesterol to 1alpha,25-dihydroxyvitamin D3 in an in vitro human skin equivalent model. J Invest Dermatol. 2001 Nov;117:1179-1185
Lehmann et al. 1999	Lehmann B, Tiebel O, Meurer M. Expression of vitamin D3 25-hydroxylase (CYP27) mRNA after induction by vitamin D3 or UVB radiation in keratinocytes of human skin equivalents--a preliminary study. Arch Dermatol Res. 1999 Sep;291:507-510

Lehmann 2004 Lehmann P. [Photodermatoses--diagnosis and treatment]. Dtsch Med Wochenschr. 2004 Feb 6;129:259-266; quiz 267-270

Levine et al. 2013 Levine H, Afek A, Shamiss A, Derazne E, Tzur D, Astman N, Keinan-Boker L, Mimouni D, Kark JD. Country of origin, age at migration and risk of cutaneous melanoma: a migrant cohort study of 1,100,000 Israeli men. Int J Cancer. 2013 Jul 15;133:486-494

Lichter et al. 2000 Lichter MD, Karagas MR, Mott LA, Spencer SK, Stukel TA, Greenberg ER. Therapeutic ionizing radiation and the incidence of basal cell carcinoma and squamous cell carcinoma. The New Hampshire Skin Cancer Study Group. Arch Dermatol. 2000 Aug;136:1007-1011

Lindahl 1993 Lindahl T. Instability and decay of the primary structure of DNA. Nature. 1993 Apr 22;362:709-715

Lindmaier und Neumann 1991 Lindmaier A, Neumann R. [The patient with polymorphous light dermatosis. Skin type, hardening and other light-associated markers]. Hautarzt. 1991 Jul;42:430-433

Linos et al. 2012 Linos E, Keiser E, Kanzler M, Sainani KL, Lee W, Vittinghoff E, Chren MM, Tang JY. Sun protective behaviors and vitamin D levels in the US population: NHANES 2003-2006. Cancer Causes Control. 2012 Jan;23:133-140

Litt 2000 Litt JZ. Drug Eruption Reference Manual - The Pharmacist's Guide to Drug Eruptions and Interactions, Panthenon New York, 2000

Loomis et al. 2001 Loomis C, Koss T, Chu D. Fetal Skin Development; in Eichenfield LF, Frieden IJ, Ersterly NB (eds): Neonatal Dermatology. Saunders Elsevier, 2001, pp 1-17

Lucas 2011 Lucas RM. An epidemiological perspective of ultraviolet exposure--public health concerns. Eye Contact Lens. 2011 Jul;37:168-175

Lucas et al. 2006a Lucas RM, M.H. R, McMichael AJ. Is the current public health message on UV exposure correct? Bull World Health Organ. 2006a Jun 21;84:485-491

Lucas et al. 2006b Lucas RM, McMichael T, Smith W, Armstrong B. Solar Ultraviolet Radiation: Global burden of disease from solar ultraviolet radiation, 2006b

Lucas et al. 2015 Lucas RM, Norval M, Neale RE, Young AR, de Gruijl FR, Takizawa Y, van der Leun JC. The consequences for human health of stratospheric ozone depletion in association with other environmental factors. Photochem Photobiol Sci. 2015 Jan;14:53-87

Lugović et al. 2007 Lugović L, Situm M, Ozanić-Bulić S, Sjerobabski-Masnec I. Phototoxic and photoallergic skin reactions. Coll Antropol. 2007 Jan;31 Suppl 1:63-67

Lund 1965 Lund HZ. How often does squamous cell carcinoma of the skin metastasize? Arch Dermatol. 1965 Dec;92:635-637

MacLaughlin und Holick 1985 MacLaughlin J, Holick MF. Aging decreases the capacity of human skin to produce vitamin D3. J Clin Invest. 1985 Oct;76:1536-1538

Maddodi et al. 2012 Maddodi N, Jayanthy A, Setaluri V. Shining light on skin pigmentation: the darker and the brighter side of effects of UV radiation. Photochem Photobiol. 2012 Sep-Oct;88:1075-1082

Mainster und Turner 2010 Mainster MA, Turner PL. Ultraviolet-B phototoxicity and hypothetical photomelanomagenesis: intraocular and crystalline lens photoprotection. Am Journal Ophthalmol. 2010 Apr;149:543-549

Mallet et al. 2013 Mallet JD, Gendron SP, Drigeard Desgarnier MC, Rochette PJ. Implication of ultraviolet light in the etiology of uveal melanoma: A review. Photochem Photobiol. 2013 Aug 24

Malone et al. 2003 Malone PM, Melville M, Staff DRE. Topical Drugs Photosensitivity, Greenwood Village: Micromedix, Colorado, 2003

Marcil und Stern 2000 Marcil I, Stern RS. Risk of developing a subsequent nonmelanoma skin cancer in patients with a history of nonmelanoma skin cancer: a critical review of the literature and meta-analysis. Arch Dermatol. 2000 Dec;136:1524-1530

Markova und Weinstock 2013 Markova A, Weinstock MA. Risk of skin cancer associated with the use of UV nail lamp. J Invest Dermatol. 2013 Apr;133:1097-1099

Marks et al. 1995 Marks R, Foley PA, Jolley D, Knight KR, Harrison J, Thompson SC. The effect of regular sunscreen use on vitamin D levels in an Australian population. Results of a randomized controlled trial. Arch Dermatol. 1995 Apr;131:415-421

Matsumura und Ananthaswamy 2002a Matsumura Y, Ananthaswamy HN. Molecular mechanisms of photocarcinogenesis. Front Biosci. 2002a Apr 1;7:d765-783

Matsumura und Ananthaswamy 2002b Matsumura Y, Ananthaswamy HN. Short-term and long-term cellular and molecular events following UV irradiation of skin: implications for molecular medicine. Expert Rev Mol Med. 2002b Dec;4:1-22

Matsuoka et al. 1987 Matsuoka LY, Ide L, Wortsman J, MacLaughlin JA, Holick MF. Sunscreens suppress cutaneous vitamin D3 synthesis. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 1987 Jun;64:1165-1168

Matsuoka et al. 1988 Matsuoka LY, Wortsman J, Hanifan N, Holick MF. Chronic sunscreen use decreases circulating concentrations of 25-hydroxyvitamin D. A preliminary study. Arch Dermatol. 1988 Dec;124:1802-1804

Matsuoka et al. 1990 Matsuoka LY, Wortsman J, Hollis BW. Use of topical sunscreen for the evaluation of regional synthesis of vitamin D3. J Am Acad Dermatol. 1990 May;22:772-775

McCredie und Coate 1989 McCredie M, Coate MS. Cancer incidence in migrants to New South Wales: 1972 to 1984. Woolloomooloo, New South Wales Cancer Council, 1989

McKinlay 2006 McKinlay A. Workshop round-up session rapporteur's report. Prog Biophys Mol Biol. 2006 Sep;92:179-184

Melnikova und Ananthaswamy 2005 Melnikova VO, Ananthaswamy HN. Cellular and molecular events leading to the development of skin cancer. Mutat Res. 2005 Apr 1;571:91-106

Mensink et al. 1999 Mensink GBM, Thamm M, Haas K. Die Ernährung in Deutschland 1998. Gesundheitswesen Sonderheft 2. 1999; 61:S200-S206

Minassian und Mehra 1990 Minassian DC, Mehra V. 3.8 million blinded by cataract each year: projections from the first epidemiological study of incidence of cataract blindness in India. Br J Ophthalmol. 1990 Jun;74:341-343

Mitra et al. 2012 Mitra D, Luo X, Morgan A, Wang J, Hoang MP, Lo J, Guerrero CR, Lennerz JK, Mihm MC, Wargo JA, Robinson KC, Devi SP, Vanover JC, D'Orazio JA, McMahon M, Bosenberg MW, Haigis KM, Haber DA, Wang Y, Fisher DE. An ultraviolet-radiation-independent pathway to melanoma carcinogenesis in the red hair/fair skin background. Nature. 2012 Nov 15;491:449-453

Miyamura et al. 2011 Miyamura Y, Coelho SG, Schlenz K, Batzer J, Smuda C, Choi W, Brenner M, Passeron T, Zhang G, Kolbe L, Wolber R, Hearing VJ. The deceptive nature of UVA tanning versus the modest protective effects of UVB tanning on human skin. Pigment Cell Melanoma Res. 2011 Feb;24:136-147

Møller et al. 1979 Møller R, Reymann F, Hou-Jensen K. Metastases in dermatological patients with squamous cell carcinoma. Arch Dermatol. 1979 Jun;115:703-705

Moon und Oh 2001 Moon JS, Oh CH. Solar damage in skin tumors: quantification of elastotic material. Dermatology. 2001;202:289-292

Moore 2002 Moore DE. Drug-induced cutaneous photosensitivity: incidence, mechanism, prevention and management. Drug Saf. 2002;25:345-372

Morgan et al. 2013 Morgan AM, Lo J, Fisher DE. How does pheomelanin synthesis contribute to melanomagenesis?: Two distinct mechanisms could explain the carcinogenicity of pheomelanin synthesis. Bioessays. 2013 Aug;35:672-676

Mouret et al. 2006 Mouret S, Baudouin C, Charveron M, Favier A, Cadet J, Douki T. Cyclobutane pyrimidine dimers are predominant DNA lesions in whole human skin exposed to UVA radiation. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2006 Sep 12;103:13765-13770

Mouret et al. 2012 Mouret S, Forestier A, Douki T. The specificity of UVA-induced DNA damage in human melanocytes. Photochem Photobiol Sci. 2012 Jan;11:155-162

Moyal und Fourtanier 2002 Moyal DD, Fourtanier AM. Effects of UVA radiation on an established immune response in humans and sunscreen efficacy. Exp Dermatol. 2002;11 Suppl 1:28-32

Müller-Breitenkamp et al. 1999 Müller-Breitenkamp U, Hockwin O, Siekmann H, Wegener A, S. . UV-induzierte Pathologie des menschlichen Auges. In: Nichtionisierende Strahlung - mit ihr leben in Arbeit und Umwelt. 31. Jahrestagung des Fachverbandes für Strahlenschutz, Köln, 27.09.1999-01.10.1999. Tagungsband. Köln, TÜV-Verlag, 1999

Munakata et al. 1998 Munakata N, Ono M, Watanabe S. Monitoring of solar-UV exposure among schoolchildren in five Japanese cities using spore dosimeter and UV-coloring labels. Jpn J Cancer Res. 1998 Mar;89:235-245

Naldi et al. 2000	Naldi L, Lorenzo Imberti G, Parazzini F, Gallus S, La Vecchia C. Pigmentary traits, modalities of sun reaction, history of sunburns, and melanocytic nevi as risk factors for cutaneous malignant melanoma in the Italian population: results of a collaborative case-control study. Cancer. 2000 Jun 15;88:2703-2710
NCAR 2016	National Center for Atmospheric research (NCAR). Quick TUV Calculator. (http://cprm.acom.ucar.edu/Models/TUV/Interactive_TUV/) (zuletzt besucht am 15.02.2016). http://cprm.acd.ucar.edu/Models/TUV/Interactive_TUV/ zuletzt besucht am 09.12.2015
NRPB 2002	National Radiological Protection Board (NRPB). Health effects from ultraviolet radiation. Report of an advisory group on non-ionising radiation. Documents of the NRPB, Volume 13 No 1. Chilton, 2002
Neale et al. 2003	Neale RE, Purdie JL, Hirst LW, Green AC. Sun exposure as a risk factor for nuclear cataract. Epidemiology. 2003 Nov;14:707-712
Need et al. 1993	Need AG, Morris HA, Horowitz M, Nordin C. Effects of skin thickness, age, body fat, and sunlight on serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D. Am J Clin Nutr. 1993 Dec;58:882-885
Newton et al. 1996	Newton R, Ferlay J, Reeves G, Beral V, Parkin DM. Effect of ambient solar ultraviolet radiation on incidence of squamous-cell carcinoma of the eye. Lancet. 1996 May 25;347:1450-1451
Nilsen et al. 2011	Nilsen LT, Aalerud TN, Hannevik M, Veierød MB. UVB and UVA irradiances from indoor tanning devices. Photochem Photobiol Sci. 2011 Jul;10:1129-1136
Nilsen et al. 2012	Nilsen LT, Aalerud TN, Hannevik M, Veierød MB. High UV-A exposure from sunbeds. Pigment Cell Melanoma Res. 2012 Sep;25:639-640
Nilsen et al. 2008	Nilsen LT, Hannevik M, Aalerud TN, Johnsen B, Friberg EG, Veierød MB. Trends in UV irradiance of tanning devices in Norway: 1983-2005. Photochem Photobiol. 2008 Sep-Oct;84:1100-1108
Norn 1979	Norn MS. Prevalence of pinguecula in Greenland and in Copenhagen, and its relation to pterygium and spheroid degeneration. Acta Ophthalmol (Copenh). 1979 Feb;57:96-105
Norn 1982	Norn MS. Spheroid degeneration, pinguecula, and pterygium among Arabs in the Red Sea territory, Jordan. Acta Ophthalmol (Copenh). 1982 Dec;60:949-954
Norval 2000	Norval M. The Impact of Ultraviolet Radiation on Immune Responses. Radiation Protection Dosimetry. 2000 September 1, 2000;91:51-56
Okuno et al. 2012	Okuno T, Nakanishi-Ueda T, Ueda T, Yasuhara H, Koide R. Ultraviolet action spectrum for cell killing of primary porcine lens epithelial cells. J Occup Health. 2012;54:181-186
Oliver et al. 2007	Oliver H, Ferguson J, Moseley H. Quantitative risk assessment of sunbeds: impact of new high power lamps. Br J Dermatol. 2007 Aug;157:350-356
Oliveria et al. 2006	Oliveria SA, Saraiya M, Geller AC, Heneghan MK, Jorgensen C. Sun exposure and risk of melanoma. Arch Dis Child. 2006 Feb;91:131-138

Olsen et al. 2010	Olsen CM, Carroll HJ, Whiteman DC. Familial melanoma: a meta-analysis and estimates of attributable fraction. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2010 Jan;19:65-73
Olson et al. 1966	Olson RL, Sayre RM, Everett MA. Effect of anatomic location and time on ultraviolet erythema. Arch Dermatol. 1966 Feb;93:211-215
Ortonne 2002	Ortonne JP. From actinic keratosis to squamous cell carcinoma. Br J Dermatol. 2002 Apr;146 Suppl 61:20-23
Otley 2002	Otley CC. Immunosuppression and skin cancer: pathogenetic insights, therapeutic challenges, and opportunities for innovation. Arch Dermatol. 2002 Jun;138:827-828
Parisi et al. 2000	Parisi AV, Meldrum LR, Wong JC, Aitken J, Fleming RA. Effect of childhood and adolescent ultraviolet exposures on cumulative exposure in South East Queensland schools. Photodermatol Photoimmunol Photomed. 2000 Feb;16:19-24
Pearse et al. 1987	Pearse AD, Gaskell SA, Marks R. Epidermal changes in human skin following irradiation with either UVB or UVA. J Investig Dermatol. 1987 Jan;88:83-87
Peterson und Côté 2004	Peterson CL, Côté J. Cellular machineries for chromosomal DNA repair. Genes Dev. 2004 Mar 15;18:602-616
Pfeifer und Besaratinia 2012	Pfeifer GP, Besaratinia A. UV wavelength-dependent DNA damage and human non-melanoma and melanoma skin cancer. Photochem Photobiol Sci. 2012 Jan;11:90-97
Phan et al. 2006	Phan TA, Halliday GM, Barnetson RS, Damian DL. Spectral and dose dependence of ultraviolet radiation-induced immunosuppression. Front Biosci. 2006 Jan 1;11:394-411
Pleasance et al. 2010	Pleasance ED, Cheetham RK, Stephens PJ, McBride DJ, Humphray SJ, Greenman CD, Varela I, Lin ML, Ordóñez GR, Bignell GR, Ye K, Alipaz J, Bauer MJ, Beare D, Butler A, Carter RJ, Chen L, Cox AJ, Edkins S, Kokko-Gonzales PI, Gormley NA, Grocock RJ, Haudenschild CD, Hims MM, James T, Jia M, Kingsbury Z, Leroy C, Marshall J, Menzies A, Mudie LJ, Ning Z, Royce T, Schulz-Trieglaff OB, Spiridou A, Stebbings LA, Szajkowski L, Teague J, Williamson D, Chin L, Ross MT, Campbell PJ, Bentley DR, Futreal PA, Stratton MR. A comprehensive catalogue of somatic mutations from a human cancer genome. Nature. 2010 Jan 14;463:191-196
Preciado et al. 2002	Preciado DA, Matas A, Adams GL. Squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck in solid organ transplant recipients. Head Neck. 2002 Apr;24:319-325
Ranadive et al. 1986	Ranadive NS, Shirwadkar S, Persad S, Menon IA. Effects of melanin-induced free radicals on the isolated rat peritoneal mast cells. J Invest Dermatol. 1986 Mar;86:303-307
Randall 2008	Randall VA. Androgens and hair growth. Dermatol Ther. 2008 Sep-Oct;21:314-328
Reichrath 2009	Reichrath J. Skin cancer prevention and UV-protection: how to avoid vitamin D-deficiency? Br J Dermatol. 2009 Nov;161 Suppl 3:54-60
Reidenbach et al. 2012	Reidenbach H-D, Brose M, Ott G, Siekmann H. Praxis-Handbuch optische Strahlung - Gesetzesgrundlagen, praktische Umsetzung und betriebliche Hilfen. Berlin, Erich Schmidt Verlag,, 2012

Rhodes et al. 2010 Rhodes LE, Webb AR, Fraser HI, Kift R, Durkin MT, Allan D, O'Brien SJ, Vail A, Berry JL. Recommended Summer Sunlight Exposure Levels Can Produce Sufficient (≥20 ng ml(−1)) but Not the Proposed Optimal (≥32 ng ml(−1)) 25(OH)D Levels at UK Latitudes. J Invest Dermatol. 2010 May;130:1411-1418

Robertson et al. 2009 Robertson AB, Klungland A, Rognes T, Leiros I. DNA repair in mammalian cells: Base excision repair: the long and short of it. Cell Mol Life Sci. 2009 Mar;66:981-993

Ros und Wennersten 1986 Ros AM, Wennersten G. Current aspects of polymorphous light eruptions in Sweden. Photodermatol. 1986 Oct;3:298-302

Rosso et al. 1996 Rosso S, Zanetti R, Martinez C, Tormo MJ, Schraub S, Sancho-Garnier H, Franceschi S, Gafà L, Perea E, Navarro C, Laurent R, Schrameck C, Talamini R, Tumino R, Wechsler J. The multicentre south European study 'Helios'. II: Different sun exposure patterns in the aetiology of basal cell and squamous cell carcinomas of the skin. Br J Cancer. 1996 Jun;73:1447-1454

Roth et al. 2008 Roth HJ, Schmidt-Gayk H, Weber H, Niederau C. Accuracy and clinical implications of seven 25-hydroxyvitamin D methods compared with liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry as a reference. Ann Clin Biochem. 2008 Mar;45:153-159

Ruegemer et al. 2002 Ruegemer J, Schuetz B, Hermann K, Hein R, Ring J, Abeck D. UV-induced skin changes due to regular use of commercial sunbeds. Photodermatol Photoimmunol Photomed. 2002 Oct;18:223-227

Sage et al. 2012 Sage E, Girard PM, Francesconi S. Unravelling UVA-induced mutagenesis. Photochem Photobiol Sci. 2012 Jan;11:74-80

Sasaki et al. 2004 Sasaki Y, Niu C, Makino R, Kudo C, Sun C, Watanabe H, Matsunaga J, Takahashi K, Tagami H, Aiba S, Horii A. BRAF point mutations in primary melanoma show different prevalences by subtype. J Invest Dermatol. 2004 Jul;123:177-183

Satoh et al. 1993 Satoh MS, Jones CJ, Wood RD, Lindahl T. DNA excision-repair defect of xeroderma pigmentosum prevents removal of a class of oxygen free radical-induced base lesions. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1993 Jul 1;90:6335-6339

Schauder 2005 Schauder S. Phototoxische Reaktionen der Haut durch Medikamente. Dtsch Ärztebl. 2005 2005 Aug 29;102:A 2314-2319

Schlumpf et al. 2010 Schlumpf M, Reichrath J, Lehmann B, Sigmundsdottir H, Feldmeyer L, Hofbauer GF, Lichtensteiger W. Fundamental questions to sun protection: A continuous education symposium on vitamin D, immune system and sun protection at the University of Zürich. Dermatoendocrinol. 2010 Jan;2:19-25

Schmidt-Pokrzywniak et al. 2009 Schmidt-Pokrzywniak A, Jöckel KH, Bornfeld N, Sauerwein W, Stang A. Positive interaction between light iris color and ultraviolet radiation in relation to the risk of uveal melanoma: a case-control study. Ophthalmology. 2009 Feb;116:340-348

Schneider et al. 2013 Schneider S, Diehl K, Bock C, Schlüter M, Breitbart EW, Volkmer B, Greinert R. Sunbed use, user characteristics, and motivations for tanning: results from the German population-based SUN-Study 2012. JAMA Dermatol. 2013 Jan;149:43-49

Schneider und Krämer 2010 Schneider S, Krämer H. Who uses sunbeds? A systematic literature review of risk groups in developed countries. J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol. 2010 Jun;24:639-648

Schneider et al. 2009 Schneider S, Zimmermann S, Diehl K, Breitbart EW, Greinert R. Sunbed use in German adults: risk awareness does not correlate with behaviour. Acta Derm Venereol. 2009;89:470-475

Schothorst et al. 1985 Schothorst AA, Slaper H, Schouten R, Suurmond D. UVB doses in maintenance psoriasis phototherapy versus solar UVB exposure. Photodermatol. 1985 Aug;2:213-220

Seifert et al. 2009 Seifert M, Tilgen W, Reichrath J. Expression of 25-hydroxyvitamin D-1alpha-hydroxylase (1alphaOHase, CYP27B1) splice variants in HaCaT keratinocytes and other skin cells: modulation by culture conditions and UV-B treatment in vitro. Anticancer Res. 2009 Sep;29:3659-3667

Shah et al. 2005 Shah CP, Weis E, Lajous M, Shields JA, Shields CL. Intermittent and chronic ultraviolet light exposure and uveal melanoma: a meta-analysis. Ophthalmology. 2005 Sep;112:1599-1607

Sheehan et al. 2002 Sheehan JM, Cragg N, Chadwick CA, Potten CS, Young AR. Repeated ultraviolet exposure affords the same protection against DNA photodamage and erythema in human skin types II and IV but is associated with faster DNA repair in skin type IV. J Invest Dermatol. 2002 May;118:825-829

Shrivastav et al. 2008 Shrivastav M, De Haro LP, Nickoloff JA. Regulation of DNA double-strand break repair pathway choice. Cell Res. 2008 Jan;18:134-147

Siekmann et al. 1997 Siekmann H, Hockwin O, Müller-Breitenkamp U. Grauer Star durch UV-Strahleneinwirkung - Begutachtung eines Berufskrankheiten-Falls und Bestimmung der Schädigungsdosis. Arbeitsmed Sozialmed Umweltmed 098/1997-BIA. 1997;32:385-393

Sinclair und Makin 2013 Sinclair C, Makin JK. Implications of lessons learned from tobacco control for tanning bed reform. Prev Chronic Dis. 2013;10:E28

Skinner und Turker 2005 Skinner AM, Turker MS. Oxidative mutagenesis, mismatch repair, and aging. Sci Aging Knowledge Environ. 2005 Mar 2;2005:re3

Sklar et al. 2013 Sklar LR, Almutawa F, Lim HW, Hamzavi I. Effects of ultraviolet radiation, visible light, and infrared radiation on erythema and pigmentation: a review. Photochem Photobiol Sci. 2013 Jan;12:54-64

Slaper 1987 Slaper H. Skin cancer and UV exposure: investigations on the estimation of risks. Ph D thesis, Universty of Utrecht. 1987

Slupphaug et al. 2003 Slupphaug G, Kavli B, Krokan HE. The interacting pathways for prevention and repair of oxidative DNA damage. Mutat Res. 2003 Oct 29;531:231-251

Söderberg 2011 Söderberg PG. Optical radiation and the eyes with special emphasis on children. Prog Biophys Mol Biol. 2011 Dec;107:389-392

Sollitto et al. 1997 Sollitto RB, Kraemer KH, DiGiovanna JJ. Normal vitamin D levels can be maintained despite rigorous photoprotection: six years' experience with xeroderma pigmentosum. J Am Acad Dermatol. 1997 Dec;37:942-947

Sondak und Smalley 2009 — Sondak VK, Smalley K. Targeting mutant BRAF and KIT in metastatic melanoma: ASCO 2009 meeting report. Pigment Cell Melanoma Res. 2009 Aug;22:386-387

Stang et al. 2006 — Stang A, Schmidt-Pokrzywniak A, Lehnert M, Parkin DM, Ferlay J, Bornfeld N, Marr A, Jöckel KH. Population-based incidence estimates of uveal melanoma in Germany. Supplementing cancer registry data by case-control data. Eur J Cancer Prev. 2006 Apr;15:165-170

Steinitz et al. 1989 — Steinitz R, Parkin DM, Young JL, Bieber CA, Katz L. Cancer incidence in Jewish migrants to Israel, 1961-1981. IARC Sci Publ. 1989:1-311

SSK 1990 — Strahlenschutzkommission (SSK). Schutz des Menschen bei Sonnenbestrahlung und bei Anwendung von UV-Bestrahlungsgeräten. Empfehlung der Strahlenschutzkommission, verabschiedet in der 97. Sitzung der SSK am 26./27.04.1990. BAnz Nr. 144 vom 04.08.1990.

SSK 1993 — Strahlenschutzkommission (SSK). Praktische Verhaltensempfehlungen zum Schutz vor Hautkrebs durch UV-Strahlung, Empfehlung der Strahlenschutzkommission, verabschiedet in der 117. Sitzung der SSK am 22./23.04.1993. BAnz Nr. 117 vom 29.06.1993.

SSK 1997 — Strahlenschutzkommission (SSK). Schutz des Menschen vor solarer UV-Strahlung, Empfehlung der Strahlenschutzkommission, verabschiedet in der 144. Sitzung der SSK am 27.02.1997. BAnz Nr. 98 vom 03.06.1997.

SSK 2001 — Strahlenschutzkommission (SSK). Schutz des Menschen vor den Gefahren der UV-Strahlung in Solarien, Empfehlung der Strahlenschutzkommission, verabschiedet in der 172. Sitzung der SSK am 08.06.2001. BAnz Nr. 193 vom 16.10.2001.

SSK 2004 — Strahlenschutzkommission (SSK). Die Klassifikation des solaren UV-Index (UVI), Anpassung an die internationale Empfehlung der WHO, Empfehlung der Strahlenschutzkommission, verabschiedet in der 192. Sitzung der SSK am 24./25.06.2004. BAnz Nr. 221 vom 20.11.2004.

SSK 2006 — Strahlenschutzkommission (SSK). Gesundheitliche Gefährdung durch UV-Exposition von Kindern und Jugendlichen, Stellungnahme der Strahlenschutzkommission mit wissenschaftlicher Begründung, verabschiedet in der 210. Sitzung der SSK am 28./29.09.2006 (Wiss. Begründung verabschiedet in der 211. Sitzung der SSK am am 14.11.2006). In: Empfehlungen und Stellungnahmen der Strahlenschutzkommission 2006, Veröffentlichungen der Strahlenschutzkommission, Band 61, H. Hoffmann GmbH - Fachverlag, Berlin, 2007, ISBN 987-3-87344-141-5.

SSK 2007a — Strahlenschutzkommission (SSK). Möglichkeiten epidemiologischer Studien zum Zusammenhang von Kinderleukämie und natürlicher Radon-Exposition, Empfehlung der Strahlenschutzkommission, verabschiedet in der 217. Sitzung der SSK am 20./21.09.2007. BAnz Nr. 21a vom 07.02.2008.

SSK 2007b — Strahlenschutzkommission (SSK). Einfluss der natürlichen Strahlenexposition auf die Krebsentstehung in Deutschland, Stellungnahme der Strahlenschutzkommission mit wissenschaftlicher Begründung, verabschiedet in der 220. Sitzung der SSK am 05./06.12.2007. Veröffentlichungen der Strahlenschutzkommission, Band 62, H. Hoffmann GmbH - Fachverlag, Berlin, 2008, ISBN 978-3-87344-144-6.

SSK 2009 — Strahlenschutzkommission (SSK). Strahleninduzierte Katarakte, Empfehlung der Strahlenschutzkommission, verabschiedet in der 234. Sitzung der SSK am 14.05.2009. BAnz Nr. 180a vom 27.11.2009.

SSK 2010 — Strahlenschutzkommission (SSK). Moderne Lichtquellen, Stellungnahme der Strahlenschutzkommission, verabschiedet in der 242. Sitzung der SSK am 01./02.Juli 2010. BAnz Nr. 171 vom 15. November 2011.

SSK 2011 — Strahlenschutzkommission (SSK). Vergleichende Bewertung der Evidenz von Krebsrisiken durch elektromagnetische Felder und Strahlungen, Stellungnahme der Strahlenschutzkommission, verabschiedet in der 248. Sitzung der SSK am 14./15.04.2011. BAnz Nr. 26 vom 15. Februar 2012.

Sui et l. 2013 — Sui GY, Liu GC, Liu GY, Gao YY, Deng Y, Wang WY, Tong SH, Wang L. Is sunlight exposure a risk factor for age-related macular degeneration? A systematic review and meta-analysis. Br J Ophthalmol. 2013 Apr;97:389-394

Sun et al. 1997 — Sun EC, Fears TR, Goedert JJ. Epidemiology of squamous cell conjunctival cancer. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 1997 Feb;6:73-77

Svensson et al. 2001 — Svensson CK, Cowen EW, Gaspari AA. Cutaneous drug reactions. Pharmacol Rev. 2001 Sep;53:357-379

Tadokoro et al. 2005 — Tadokoro T, Yamaguchi Y, Batzer J, Coelho SG, Zmudzka BZ, Miller SA, Wolber R, Beer JZ, Hearing VJ. Mechanisms of skin tanning in different racial/ethnic groups in response to ultraviolet radiation. J Invest Dermatol. 2005 Jun;124:1326-1332

Thieden et al. 2004 — Thieden E, Philipsen PA, Heydenreich J, Wulf HC. UV radiation exposure related to age, sex, occupation, and sun behavior based on time-stamped personal dosimeter readings. Arch Dermatol. 2004 Feb;140:197-203

Thieden et al. 2009 — Thieden E, Philipsen PA, Heydenreich J, Wulf HC. Vitamin D level in summer and winter related to measured UVR exposure and behavior. Photochem Photobiol. 2009 Nov-Dec;85:1480-1484

Thieden et al. 2006 — Thieden E, Philipsen PA, Wulf HC. Ultraviolet radiation exposure pattern in winter compared with summer based on time-stamped personal dosimeter readings. Br J Dermatol. 2006 Jan;154:133-138

Thomson et al. 2010 — Thomson CS, Woolnough S, Wickenden M, Hiom S, Twelves CJ. Sunbed use in children aged 11-17 in England: face to face quota sampling surveys in the National Prevalence Study and Six Cities Study. BMJ. 2010 Mar 18;340:c877

Threlfall und English 1999 — Threlfall TJ, English DR. Sun exposure and pterygium of the eye: a dose-response curve. Am J Ophthalmol. 1999 Sep;128:280-287

Thylefors 1998 — Thylefors B. A global initiative for the elimination of avoidable blindness. Am J Ophthalmol. 1998 Jan;125:90-93

Trang et al. 1998 — Trang HM, Cole DE, Rubin LA, Pierratos A, Siu S, Vieth R. Evidence that vitamin D3 increases serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D more efficiently than does vitamin D2. Am J Clin Nutr. 1998 Oct;68:854-858

Travis und Arndt 1986 — Travis LB, Arndt KA. Occupational skin cancer. Four major carcinogens that put workers at risk. Postgrad Med. 1986 May 1;79:211-214, 217

Tsiaras und Weinstock 2011 — Tsiaras WG, Weinstock MA. Factors influencing vitamin D status. Acta Derm Venereol. 2011 Mar;91:115-124

Tucker et al. 1985 — Tucker MA, Boice JD, Jr., Hoffman DA. Second cancer following cutaneous melanoma and cancers of the brain, thyroid, connective tissue, bone, and eye in Connecticut, 1935-82. Natl Cancer Inst Monogr. 1985 Dec;68:161-189

Unverricht et al. 2006 — Unverricht I, Janßen M, Ott G, Knuschke P. UV-Monitoring at Outdoor Workplaces - A Base for Well-Balanced Health Prevention Regulations. . Thematic Network for Ultraviolet Measurements, Newsletter. 2006;8:56-58

Urbanski et al. 1990 — Urbanski A, Schwarz T, Neuner P, Krutmann J, Kirnbauer R, Kock A, Luger TA. Ultraviolet light induces increased circulating interleukin-6 in humans. J Invest Dermatol. 1990 Jun;94:808-811

UVSV 2011 — UV-Schutz-Verordnung vom 20. Juli 2011 (BGBl. I S. 1412).

Valerie und Povirk 2003 — Valerie K, Povirk LF. Regulation and mechanisms of mammalian double-strand break repair. Oncogene. 2003 Sep 1;22:5792-5812

van der Wees et al. 2007 — van der Wees C, Jansen J, Vrieling H, van der Laarse A, Van Zeeland A, Mullenders L. Nucleotide excision repair in differentiated cells. Mutat Res. 2007 Jan 3;614:16-23

van Steeg und Kraemer 1999 — van Steeg H, Kraemer KH. Xeroderma pigmentosum and the role of UV-induced DNA damage in skin cancer. Mol Med Today. 1999 Feb;5:86-94

Vitasa et al. 1990 — Vitasa BC, Taylor HR, Strickland PT, Rosenthal FS, West S, Abbey H, Ng SK, Munoz B, Emmett EA. Association of nonmelanoma skin cancer and actinic keratosis with cumulative solar ultraviolet exposure in Maryland watermen. Cancer. 1990 Jun 15;65:2811-2817

Volkmer und Greinert 2011 — Volkmer B, Greinert R. UV and children's skin. Prog Biophys Mol Biol. 2011 Dec;107:386-388

Wacker und Holick 2013 — Wacker M, Holick MF. Sunlight and Vitamin D: A global perspective for health. Dermatoendocrinol. 2013 Jan 1;5:51-108

Wang 2008 — Wang Y. Bulky DNA lesions induced by reactive oxygen species. Chem Res Toxicol. 2008 Feb;21:276-281

Wang et al. 2012 — Wang Y, Yu J, Gao Q, Hu L, Gao N, Gong H, Liu Y. The relationship between the disability prevalence of cataracts and ambient erythemal ultraviolet radiation in China. PLoS One. 2012;7:e51137

Webb 2006 — Webb AR. Who, what, where and when-influences on cutaneous vitamin D synthesis. Prog Biophys Mol Biol. 2006 Sep;92:17-25

Webb et al. 2011 — Webb AR, Kift R, Berry JL, Rhodes LE. The vitamin D debate: translating controlled experiments into reality for human sun exposure times. Photochem Photobiol. 2011 Mar-Jun;87:741-745

Webb et al. 2010 — Webb AR, Kift R, Durkin MT, O'Brien SJ, Vail A, Berry JL, Rhodes LE. The role of sunlight exposure in determining the vitamin D status of the U.K. white adult population. Br J Dermatol. 2010 Nov;163:1050-1055

Weinstock et al. 2006 — Weinstock DM, Richardson CA, Elliott B, Jasin M. Modeling oncogenic translocations: distinct roles for double-strand break repair pathways in translocation formation in mammalian cells. DNA Repair (Amst). 2006 Sep 8;5:1065-1074

Weinstock und Moses 2009 — Weinstock MA, Moses AM. Skin cancer meets vitamin D: the way forward for dermatology and public health. J Am Acad Dermatol. 2009 Oct;61:720-724

Werdermann 1998 — Werdermann D. www.auge-online.de (zuletzt besucht am 11.04.2016). 1998

Wikipedia 2006 — Wikipedia. Stichwort: Sonnenstrahlung, zuletzt besucht am 11.04.2016. http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sonnenstrahlung

Wilson 2007 — Wilson DM, 3rd. Processing of nonconventional DNA strand break ends. Environ Mol Mutagen. 2007 Dec;48:772-782

Wolpowitz und Gilchrest 2006 — Wolpowitz D, Gilchrest BA. The vitamin D questions: how much do you need and how should you get it? J Am Acad Dermatol. 2006 Feb;54:301-317

WHO 2002 — World Health Organization (WHO). Global Solar UV-Index - A Practical Guide. (www.who.int/uv/publications/en/UVIGuide.pdf) (Zuletzt besucht am 15.02.2016.). http://www.who.int/uv/publications/globalindex/en/ zuletzt besucht am 16.2.2014

Wu et al. 2014a — Wu S, Han J, Laden F, Qureshi AA. Long-term ultraviolet flux, other potential risk factors, and skin cancer risk: a cohort study. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2014a Jun;23:1080-1089

Wu et al. 2014b — Wu S, Han J, Vleugels RA, Puett R, Laden F, Hunter DJ, Qureshi AA. Cumulative ultraviolet radiation flux in adulthood and risk of incident skin cancers in women. Br J Cancer. 2014b Apr 2;110:1855-1861

Yaar et al. 2002 — Yaar M, Eller MS, Gilchrest BA. Fifty years of skin aging. J Investig Dermatol Symp Proc. 2002 Dec;7:51-58

Yam und Kwok 2014 — Yam JC, Kwok AK. Ultraviolet light and ocular diseases. Int Ophthalmol. 2014 Apr;34:383-400

Yoshikawa et al. 1990 — Yoshikawa T, Rae V, Bruins-Slot W, Van den Berg JW, Taylor JR, Streilein JW. Susceptibility to effects of UVB radiation on induction of contact hypersensitivity as a risk factor for skin cancer in humans. J Invest Dermatol. 1990 Nov;95:530-536

Young et al. 1998 — Young AR, Chadwick CA, Harrison GI, Nikaido O, Ramsden J, Potten CS. The similarity of action spectra for thymine dimers in human epidermis and erythema suggests that DNA is the chromophore for erythema. J Invest Dermatol. 1998 Dec;111:982-988

Zanetti et al. 1996 — Zanetti R, Rosso S, Martinez C, Navarro C, Schraub S, Sancho-Garnier H, Franceschi S, Gafa L, Perea E, Tormo MJ, Laurent R, Schrameck C, Cristofolini M, Tumino R, Wechsler J. The multicentre south European study 'Helios'. I: Skin characteristics and sunburns in basal cell and squamous cell carcinomas of the skin. Br J Cancer. 1996 Jun;73:1440-1446

Zeeb und Greinert 2010 — Zeeb H, Greinert R. The role of vitamin D in cancer prevention: does UV protection conflict with the need to raise low levels of vitamin D? Dtsch Arztebl Int. 2010 Sep;107:638-643

Zerp et al. 1999 — Zerp SF, van Elsas A, Peltenburg LT, Schrier PI. p53 mutations in human cutaneous melanoma correlate with sun exposure but are not always involved in melanomagenesis. Br J Cancer. 1999 Feb;79:921-926

Ziegler et al. 1994 — Ziegler A, Jonason AS, Leffell DJ, Simon JA, Sharma HW, Kimmelman J, Remington L, Jacks T, Brash DE. Sunburn and p53 in the onset of skin cancer. Nature. 1994 Dec 22-29;372:773-776

Annex 1

Table A1 Terminology of quantities and units used to characterise UV radiation (derived from EN 14255-4 2006, Table 1)

Symbole	Größe (Erklärung)	Maßeinheit	Definiert in
λ	Wellenlänge	nm	CIE 17.4 (1987) ref 845-01-14
λ_1, λ_2	Grenzen des Wellenlängenbereichs $\Delta\lambda$	nm	EN 14255-4 (2006)
Δt_{exp}	Expositionsdauer	s	EN 14255-4 (2006)
E	Bestrahlungsstärke	W/m² (10 W/m² = 1 mW/cm²)	CIE 17.4 (1987) 845-01-37
$E_\lambda(\lambda)$	spektrale Bestrahlungsstärke	W/(m²·nm)	EN 14255-4 (2006)
H	Bestrahlung	J/m² (10 J/m² = 1 mJ/cm²)	CIE 17.4 (1987) 845-01-42
$H_\lambda(\lambda)$	spektrale Bestrahlung	J/(m²·nm)	EN 14255-4 (2006)
$s_{biol}(\lambda)$	Wichtungsfunktion für einen photobiologischen Effekt	—	
$s_{er}(\lambda)$	Erythemwichtungsfunktion	—	ISO/CIE 17166 (1999)
$s(\lambda)$; $s_{eff}(\lambda)$ *)	Wichtungsfunktion für die Gefährdung durch Ultraviolettstrahlung ($s(\lambda) = s_{eff}(\lambda)$) *)	—	EN 14255-4 (2006) *) z. B. in ICNIRP (2004)
$s_{nmsc}(\lambda)$	Wichtungsfunktion für die Photokarzinogenese nicht-melanozytärer Hautkrebs (NMSC)	—	CIE S 019/E (2006a)
E_{biol}	biologisch effektive Bestrahlungsstärke	W/m²	
E_{er}	erythem-effektive Bestrahlungsstärke	W/m²	ISO/CIE 17166 (1999)
E_S; E_{eff} *)	effektive Bestrahlungsstärke für die Gefährdung durch Ultraviolettstrahlung ($E_S = E_{eff}$) *)	W/m²	EN 14255-4 (2006) *) e. g. ICNIRP (2004)
E_{nmsc}	Non-Melanoma Skin Cancer effektive Bestrahlungsstärke	W/m²	EN 14255-4 (2006)
H_{er}	erythem-effektive Bestrahlung	J/m²	ISO/CIE 17166 (1999)
H_S; H_{eff} *)	Effektive Bestrahlung für die Gefährdung durch Ultraviolettstrahlung ($H_S = H_{eff}$) *)	J/m²	EN 14255-4 (2006) *) e. g. in ICNIRP (2004)
H_{nmsc}	Effektive Bestrahlung bezüglich des NMSC-Risikos	J/m²	EN 14255-4 (2006)
SED	Standard-Erythemdosis (H_{er} = 100 J/m² = 1 SED)	—	ISO/CIE 17166 (1999)
MED	minimale Erythemdosis (individuelle UV-Response der Haut, gekennzeichnet durch eine gerade abgegrenzte zarte Rötung)	—	ISO/CIE 17166 (1999)
I_{UV}	solarer UV-Index ($I_{UV} = k_{er} \int_{250nm}^{400nm} E_\lambda \cdot s_{er}(\lambda) d\lambda$, k_{er} = 40 m²/W)	—	CIE S 013 (2003)
f_{SE}	Hautexpositionsfaktor	—	ICNIRP (2007)
γ_s	Sonnenhöhe (Winkel zwischen Horizont und der Sonne)	°	
SZA	solar zenith angle (Winkel zwischen der Sonne und der Normalen auf die Erdoberfläche) SZA = 90° - θ_s)	°	

*) The weighting function for the risk from ultraviolet radiation is expressed differently in various sources: $s(\lambda)$ in EN 14255-4 and $s_{\mathrm{eff}}(\lambda)$ in ICNIRP (2004). However, these different expressions refer to the same function. There are also different terms in use for spectrally weighted quantities: E_{s} or E_{eff} and H_{s} or H_{eff}.

Annex 2

Indicative estimate of solar UV exposure without measurement

From: ICNIRP, *Protecting workers from ultraviolet radiation*, in *ICNIRP 14/2007*, H.M. Vecchia P, Stuck BE, van Deventer E, Niu S. , Editor. 2007. p. 52-55.

The International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP), the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the World Health Organization (WHO) published a paper titled "Protecting Workers from UV Radiation" (ICNIRP, 2007). A skin exposure factor A 1 and ocular exposure factor A 2 were published so as to be able to provide indicative estimates of solar outdoor exposures for which no measurement data are available about the extent of solar UV exposure.

The skin exposure factor is determined by multiplying a series of risk assessment factors, f_1 to f_6, which influence individual solar UV exposure:

$$\text{Skin exposure factor} = f_1 * f_2 * f_3 * f_4 * f_5 * f_6 \qquad \text{(A 1)}$$

Table A2-2 compiles the set of risk assessment factors that influence the extent of outdoor skin exposures. These factors are not all strictly independent. Nevertheless, it is possible to provide an indicative estimate if at least basic facts such as localisation, time of year, intended length of time to be spent outdoors, surroundings and level of UV protection are known or can be estimated. Once the factors for each situation have been determined (see Table A2-2), they are multiplied to arrive at the skin exposure factor.

Table A2-1 is a classification of the determined skin exposure factors and their derived minimum protection levels. It contains the individual protection components recommended for the individual categories of skin exposure factors.

Table A2-1: Guide for determining the minimum level of protection required for the workplace (derived from ICNIRP 2007)

Haut-Expositionsfaktor	**benötigtes Hautschutzniveau**
< 1	nichts erforderlich
> 1 aber < 3	Hemd, Hut mit Krempe
> 3 aber < 5	Langärmeliges Hemd und Hosen, Hut mit Krempe, Lichtschutzsubstanz mit LSF 15+
> 5	Arbeitsumgebung und -gewohnheiten anpassen. Möglichst Schatten schaffen. Langärmeliges Hemd und Hosen, Hut mit Krempe, Lichtschutzsubstanz mit LSF 15+

Table A2-2: Risk assessment factors for solar-exposed skin (derived from ICNIRP 2007, Table 9)

Jahreszeit	**Geographische Breite (Faktor f_1)**		
	>50°N oder S	30°-50°N oder S	<30°N oder S
Frühling/Sommer	4	7	9
Herbst/Winter	0,3	1,5	5
Wolkenbedeckung	**Faktor f_2**		
Klarer Himmel	1		
Wechselhafte Bewölkung	0,7		
Bedeckter Himmel	0,2		
Expositionsdauer	**Faktor f_3**		
Ganztägig	1		
1-2 Stunden zur Mittagszeit	0,5		
Am frühen Morgen oder späten Nachmittag	0,2		
Bodenreflexion	**Faktor f_4**		
Frischer Schnee	1,8		
Trockener Sand, Meeresbrandung, Beton	1,2		
Alle anderen Oberflächen, auch offene Gewässer	1		
Bekleidung	**Faktor f_5**		
Oberkörper, Schultern und Arme ungeschützt	1		
Oberkörper geschützt, aber Arme und Beine exponiert	0,5		
Voll bekleidet, nur Hände und Gesicht exponiert	0,02		
Schatten	**Faktor f_6**		
Kein Schatten, z. B. offene Felder, Tundra, Strand, Meer	1		
Teilweise Schatten, z. B. lockere Bebauung, vereinzelte Bäume	0,3		
Guter Schatten, z. B. dichte Bebauung, Wald, Sonnendach	0,02		

The ocular exposure factor is also determined by multiplying a series of risk assessment factors, f_1 to f_6, which influence individual solar UV exposure (see Tables A2-3 and A2-4):

$$\text{Ocular exposure factor} = f_1 * f_2 * f_3 * f_4 * f_5 * f_6 \qquad \text{(A 2)}$$

Table A2-3: Guide for determining the minimum level of protection required for the workplace (derived from ICNIRP 2007)

Augen-Expositionsfaktor	**benötigtes Augenschutzniveau**
<1	nichts erforderlich
>1 aber <3	Hut mit Krempe
>3 aber <5	Hut mit Krempe, Brillengläser oder Sonnenbrille
>5	Rundum anliegender Augenschutz, Hut mit Krempe

Table A2-4: Risk assessment factors for solar-exposed eyes (derived from ICNIRP 2007, Table 10)

Jahreszeit	**Geografische Breite (Faktor f_1)**		
	> 50°N oder S	30° - 50°N oder S	< 30°N oder S
Frühling/Sommer	4	7	9
Herbst/Winter	0,3	1,5	5
Wolkenbedeckung	**Faktor f_2**		
Klarer Himmel	1		
Wechselhafte Bewölkung	1,5		
Bedeckter Himmel	0,2		
Expositionsdauer	**Faktor f_3**		
Ganztägig	1		
1-2 Stunden zur Mittagszeit	0,3 - 0,5		
Am frühen Morgen oder späten Nachmittag	0,2		
Bodenreflexion	**Faktor f_4**		
Frischer Schnee	1		
Trockener Sand, Meeresbrandung, Beton	0,1		
Alle anderen Oberflächen, auch offene Gewässer	0,02		
Augenschutz	**Faktor f_5**		
Kein Augenschutz	1		
Sonnenbrille ohne Hut	0,5		
Klare Brillengläser ohne Hut	0,5		
Sonnenbrille oder Brille und Hut mit Krempe	0,02		
Schatten	**Faktor f_6**		
Kein Schatten, z. B. offene Felder, Tundra, Strand, Meer	1		
Horizont hinter Bergen oder Häusern, vereinzele Bäume	0,3		
Horizont und teilweise Himmel durch Hochhäuser verdeckt	0,02		

Annex 3

Estimating the UV Index using the shadow rule

The current intensity of solar radiation in a person's given location determines whether or not measures to protect against the sun are necessary. The UV Index is an indicator of the level of solar UV irradiance. The WHO recommends the use of various measures to protect against the sun depending on the UV Index. If it is not possible to find out the current UV Index for the given location from the radio, TV or internet, the UV Index can be roughly estimated using the so-called shadow rule. If there are no clouds in the sky, the UV Index depends on solar elevation, i.e. the height of the sun above the horizon (solar elevation angle). As the length of the shadow of a vertical object also depends on solar elevation, the length of the shadow can be used to determine the UV Index.

Table A3-1: Estimating the UV Index based on solar elevation and the corresponding shadow length if there are no clouds in the sky. Calculation using the Quick TUV Calculator, inputs: Solar zenith angle = (90° - Solar elevation angle), date: 000630, ozone: 300 DU, albedo 0.1, altitude: 0.0 km, measurement altitude: 0.0 km. (http://cprm.acd.ucar.edu/Models/TUV/Interactive_TUV/)

Solar elevation angle [°]	Ratio of shadow length to height of a vertical rod	UV Index
37	1.33	3
42	1.11	4
45	1.00	4.6
47	0.93	5
52	0.78	6
56	0.67	7
61	0.55	8
66	0.45	9

Table A3-1 allows for a simple estimate of the UV Index if there are no clouds in the sky. Divide the length of the shadow of a vertical rod (or person) by the rod's (or person's) height. In the second column of Table A3-1, look for the value closest to the calculated ratio. Then move across one column to the right for the UV Index based on the given solar elevation angle. If the shadow length to rod length ratio is less than 1.3, the WHO recommends (Naldi et al. 2000) using protective measures for the estimated UV Index. If the shadow is shorter than the height of the rod (ratio ≤ 1.0), measures to protect against the sun must be implemented.

Calculation note: This calculation should enable a rough estimate of the current UV Index when in a given location so as to be able to take any necessary measures to protect against the sun as per the WHO recommendation. The UV Index in Table A3-1 calculated from the solar zenith angle using the Quick TUV Calculator applies to average latitudes on Earth (Central Europe), clear skies, sea level, normal albedo and a comparably low level of ozone in the atmosphere. This is on the safe side in terms of ozone content, i.e. higher UV Index levels are generally calculated than with a higher ozone content. The actual UV Index may be higher than the levels provided in Table A3-1 when at high altitudes, e.g. mountains. Table A3-1 should not be used for locations near to the equator. The relationship between solar elevation and UV Index also does not apply if there is a lot of cloud cover.

Annex 4

Medication used in Germany in 2005 for which photosensitisation reports are available[*1]

From: Schauder, S., Phototoxic reactions in the skin triggered by medication. Deutsches Ärzteblatt, 2005. 102: p. 2,314-2,319.

Diuretics
Hydrochlorothiazide, Furosemide
Bendroflumethiazide
Amiloride, etacrynic acid
Triamterene, Spironolactone
Xipamide[*2]

Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs)
Naproxen, Ketoprofen
Tiaprofenic acid
Piroxicam
Diclofenac
Phenylbutazone, mefenaminic acid
Indometacin, ibuprofen

Antimicrobial substances
Sulfamethoxazole/*Trimethoprim*, Sulfasalazine
Ciprofloxacin, enoxacin, lomefloxacin
Ofloxacin, norfloxacin
Oxytetracycline, tetracycline
Doxycycline, minocycline
Isoniazid
Gentamicin
Griseofulvin, nitrofurantoin

Antimalarial substances
Chloroquine
Quinine, pyrimethamine
Mefloquine
Hydroxychloroquine

Antipsychotics
Chlorpromazine
Thioridazine
Promethazine
Chlorprothixene
Perazine, fluphenazine, promazine
Haloperidol

Antidepressants
Amitriptyline, trimipramine
Nortriptyline, desipramine
Imipramine, Doxepin
Clomipramine[*2]

Substances with cardiovascular side effects
Amiodarone, nifedipine
Quinidine, captopril, enalapril
Fosinopril, ramipril, disopyramide
Hydralazine
Simvastatin

Antiepileptics
Carbamazepine, lamotrigine
Phenobarbital, phenytoin
Topiramate[*2], valproic acid[*2]

Antihistamines
Cyproheptadine
Diphenhydramine
Loratadine

Cytotoxic substances
Fluorouracil, vinblastine
Dacarbazine, procarbazine
Methotrexate
Azathioprine

Hormones
Corticosteroids, oestrogen, progesterone, spironolactone

Systemic dermatitis medication
Isotretinoin, *methoxsalen*
(= 8-Methoxypsoralen)

Other
Gold salts, Hematoporphyrin

[*1]Listed due to their therapeutic active group and generic name; medications within an active group are listed in order of the number of reports according to which they trigger photosensitisation. Medications with roughtly the same number of reports as one another are listed in the same row.
Active agents in *italics* also trigger photoallergic reactions.

[*2]Denotes medications that do not appear in the list provided by Moore (2002), but which meet the given criteria and are available on the German market.

The above list of around 90 medications approved for sale in Germany for which there are a number of reports on their photosensitising (phototoxic and photoallergic) effects are based on data from:

Schauder S and Ippen H 1988 Photosensitivity. In: Manuale allergologicum V, Fuchs E and Schulz KH (eds), Dustri-Verlag, Deisenhofen 1988, 1-30

Malone et al. 2003 Malone PM, Melville M, Staff DRE. Topical Drugs Photosensitivity, Greenwood Village: Micromedix, Colorado, 2003

Moore 2002 Moore DE. Drug-induced cutaneous photosensitivity: incidence, mechanism, prevention and management. Drug Saf. 2002;25:345-372