Lampiran 1 Lembar *Critical Appraisal Cohort Study*

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR COHORT STUDIES

Author: Ingibjorg E. Thorisdottir, Rannveig Sigurvinsdottir, Alfgeir L. Kristjansson, John P. Allegrante, Christa L.Lilly, Inga Dora Sigfusdottir (2020)

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population?	■	☐	☐	☐
2. Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people 3. to both exposed and unexposed groups?	■	☐	☐	☐
4. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	■	☐	☐	☐
5. Were confounding factors identified?	■	☐	☐	☐
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	☐	■	☐	☐
7. Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)?	■	☐	☐	☐
8. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	■	☐	☐	☐
9. Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur?	■	☐	☐	☐
10. Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored?	■	☐	☐	☐
11. Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized?	■	☐	☐	☐
12. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	■	☐	☐	☐

Overall appraisal: Include ■ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Lampiran 2 Lembar *Critical Appraisal Analytical Cross-sectional Study*

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR ANALYTICAL CROSS SECTIONAL STUDIES

Author: Bianca S. Honnekeri, Dr. Akhil Goel, Dr. Maithili Umate, Dr. Nilesh Shah, Dr. Avinash De Sousa (2017)

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	■	☐	☐	☐
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	■	☐	☐	☐
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	■	☐	☐	☐
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	■	☐	☐	☐
5. Were confounding factors identified?	■	☐	☐	☐
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	■	☐	☐	☐
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	■	☐	☐	☐
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	■	☐	☐	☐

Overall appraisal: Include ■ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Lampiran 3 Lembar *Critical Appraisal Analytical Cross-sectional Study*

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR ANALYTICAL CROSS SECTIONAL STUDIES

Author: . Nida Muzaffar, Eudys Briceno Brito, Joshua Fogel, David Fagan, Krishan Kumar, Rita Verma (2018)

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	■	☐	☐	☐
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	■	☐	☐	☐
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	■	☐	☐	☐
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	■	☐	☐	☐
5. Were confounding factors identified?	■	☐	☐	☐
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	■	☐	☐	☐
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	■	☐	☐	☐
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	■	☐	☐	☐

Overall appraisal: Include ■ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Lampiran 4 Lembar *Critical Appraisal Analytical Cross-sectional Study*

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR ANALYTICAL CROSS SECTIONAL STUDIES

Author: Tanya Hawes, Melanie J. Zimmer-Gembeck, Shawna M. Campbell (2020)

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	■	☐	☐	☐
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	■	☐	☐	☐
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	■	☐	☐	☐
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	■	☐	☐	☐
5. Were confounding factors identified?	■	☐	☐	☐
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	☐	■	☐	☐
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	■	☐	☐	☐
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	■	☐	☐	☐

Overall appraisal: Include ■ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Lampiran 5 Lembar *Critical Appraisal Analytical Cross-sectional Study*

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR ANALYTICAL CROSS SECTIONAL STUDIES

Author: Zahrul Khafida Silmi, Wiwin Renny Rachmawati, Tulus Puji Hastuti (2020)

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	■	☐	☐	☐
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	■	☐	☐	☐
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	■	☐	☐	☐
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	■	☐	☐	☐
5. Were confounding factors identified?	■	☐	☐	☐
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	☐	■	☐	☐
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	■	☐	☐	☐
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	■	☐	☐	☐

Overall appraisal: Include ■ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Lampiran 6 Lembar *Critical Appraisal Analytical Cross-sectional Study*

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR ANALYTICAL CROSS SECTIONAL STUDIES

Author: Paweł A. Atroszko, Julia M. Balcerowsk, Piotr Bereznowski, Adriana Biernatowsk, Ståle Pallesen, Cecilie Schou Andreassen (2018)

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	■	☐	☐	☐
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	■	☐	☐	☐
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	■	☐	☐	☐
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	■	☐	☐	☐
5. Were confounding factors identified?	■	☐	☐	☐
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	☐	■	☐	☐
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	■	☐	☐	☐
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	■	☐	☐	☐

Overall appraisal: Include ■ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Lampiran 7 Lembar *Critical Appraisal Analytical Cross-sectional Study*

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR ANALYTICAL CROSS SECTIONAL STUDIES

Author: Amandeep Dhir, Yossiri Yossatornc, Puneet Kaur, Sufen Chen (2018)

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	■	☐	☐	☐
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	■	☐	☐	☐
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	■	☐	☐	☐
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	■	☐	☐	☐
5. Were confounding factors identified?	■	☐	☐	☐
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	■	☐	☐	☐
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	■	☐	☐	☐
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	■	☐	☐	☐
Total				

Overall appraisal: Include ■ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Lampiran 8 Lembar *Critical Appraisal Analytical Cross-sectional Study*

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR ANALYTICAL CROSS SECTIONAL STUDIES

Author: Antonius J. van Rooji, Christopher J. Ferguson, Dike van de Mheen, Tim M. Schoenmakers (2017)

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	■	☐	☐	☐
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	■	☐	☐	☐
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	■	☐	☐	☐
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	■	☐	☐	☐
5. Were confounding factors identified?	■	☐	☐	☐
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	☐	■	☐	☐
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	■	☐	☐	☐
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	■	☐	☐	☐

Overall appraisal: Include ■ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Lampiran 9 Lembar *Critical Appraisal Prevalence Study*

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR STUDIES REPORTING PREVALENCE DATA

Author: Chloe Berryman, Christopher J. Ferguson, Charles Negy (2017)

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?	■	☐	☐	☐
2. Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?	■	☐	☐	☐
3. Was the sample size adequate?	■	☐	☐	☐
4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	■	☐	☐	☐
5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?	■	☐	☐	☐
6. Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?	■	☐	☐	☐
7. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?	■	☐	☐	☐
8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis?	■	☐	☐	☐
9. Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?	■	☐	☐	☐

Overall appraisal: Include ■ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Lampiran 10 ***Plan of Action***

Plan of Action

(OKTOBER 2020-JULI 2021)

Kegiatan Penelitian		**OKTOBER 2020**				**NOVEMBER 2020**				**DESEMBER 2020**				**JANUARI 2021**				**FEBRUARI 2021**				**MARET 2021**				**APRIL 2021**				**MEI 2021**				**JUNI 2021**				**JULI 2021**			
Tahap Persiapan		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
a.	Penentuan Judul																																								
b.	Mencari Literatur																																								
c.	Penyusunan Proposal																																								
d.	Konsultasi Proposal																																								
e.	Perbaikan Proposal																																								
f.	Uji Sidang Proposal																																								
g.	Revisi Proposal																																								
h.	Pengurusan Izin																																								

Kegiatan Penelitian		OKTOBER 2020				NOVEMBER 2020				DESEMBER 2020				JANUARI 2021				FEBRUARI 2021				MARET 2021				APRIL 2021				MEI 2021				JUNI 2021				JULI 2021			
Tahap Pelaksanaan		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
a.	Pengambilan Data																																								
b.	Pengolahan Data																																								
c.	Analisa dan Pengolahan Data																																								
d.	Konsultasi Hasil																																								
Tahap Evaluasi																																									
a.	Perbaikan Hasil																																								
b.	Pelaporan Hasil																																								
c.	Uji Sidang KTI																																								

	Kegiatan Penelitian	OKTOBER 2020				NOVEMBER 2020				DESEMBER 2020				JANUARI 2021				FEBRUARI 2021				MARET 2021				APRIL 2021				MEI 2021				JUNI 2021				JULI 2021			
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
d.	Perbaikan Hasil																																								

Malang, Juli 2020

Pembimbing	Mahasiswa
Dr. Tri Anjaswarni, S.Kep., M.Kep NIP. 196705191991032001	Rahmita Mulia Putri

Lampiran 11 Lembar Konsultasi Karya Tulis Ilmiah (KTI)

LEMBAR KONSULTASI KTI

Nama Mahasiswa : **Rahmita Mulia Putri**

NIM : **P17210183064**

Nama Pembimbing: **Dr. Tri Anjaswarni, S.Kp., M.Kep.**

NO.	TANGGAL	REKOMENDASI PEMBIMBING	TANDA TANGAN
1.	3 Oktober 2020	**Agenda:** - Penyusunan jurnal dan daftar pustaka dengan Mendeley - Pemantapan judul - Kontrak pembelajaran **Rekomendasi:** - Membuat POA - Membuat resume jurnal - Menyusun Bab 1	
2.	28 Oktober 2020	**Agenda:** 1. Penjelasan sistematika penyusunan Bab 1 2. Perbaikan Bab 1 **Rekomendasi:** 1. Perbaiki susunan kalimat dan alur paragraf	
3.	18 November 2020	**Agenda:** - Konsultasi penyusunan bab 2 - Pemantapan bab 1 **Rekomendasi:** - Memperbaiki bab 1 - Mulai menyusun bab 2	
4.	5 Desember 2020	**Agenda:** - Pemantapan bab 1 **Rekomendasi:** - Memperbaiki bab 1 - Menyusun bab 2	

NO.	TANGGAL	REKOMENDASI PEMBIMBING	TANDA TANGAN
5.	3 Januari 2021	**Agenda:** - Konsultasi bab 1 dan 2 **Rekomendasi:** - Perbaiki sitasi - Tambahkan sumber jurnal - Mulai menyusun bab 3	
6.	9 Januari 2021	**Agenda:** - Konsultasi bab 1-3 **Rekomendasi:** - Perbaiki tata cara penomoran, spasi - Perbaiki penataan diagram PRISMA	
7.	13 Januari 2021	**Agenda:** - Konsultasi bab 1-3 **Rekomendasi:** - Tambahkan halaman pengesahan - Perbaiki tata cara penulisan	
8.	18 Januari 2021	**Agenda:** - Konsultasi bab 1-3 **Rekomendasi:** - Perbaiki penulisan sitasi - Tambahkan kepala tabel - Acc seminar proposal	
9.	13 Juni 2021	**Agenda:** - Konsultasi bab 4 **Rekomendasi:** - Perbaiki judul - Perbaiki penataan tabel jurnal - Sesuaikan isi dengan tujuan	
10.	3 Juli 2021	**Agenda:** - Konsultasi bab 4 **Rekomendasi:** - Kelompokkan kecemasan - Bahas jurnal secara keseluruhan - Perbaiki pembahasan	
11.	9 Juli 2021	**Agenda:** - Konsultasi bab 4 **Rekomendasi:** - Tambahkan hasil penilaian kualitas jurnal - Lanjutkan bab 5	

NO.	TANGGAL	REKOMENDASI PEMBIMBING	TANDA TANGAN
12.	11 Juli 2021	**Agenda:** - Konsultasi bab 1-5 **Rekomendasi:** - Hitamkan tulisan - Tambahkan presentase capaian rata-rata pada penilaian jurnal - Acc seminar hasil	
13.	15 Juli 2021	**Agenda:** Konsultasi KTI final **Rekomendasi:** - Tambahkan data durasi penggunaan sosial media yang terbaru - Tambahkan penggunaan positif dan negatif dari tiap jurnal - Tambahkan durasi waktu dari tiap jurnal - Tambahkan saran bagi remaja dan saran durasi penggunaan sosmed - Cek akreditasi jurnal	
14.	26 Juli 2021	**Agenda:** Konsultasi KTI final **Rekomendasi:** Perbaikan sistematika penulisan	

Lampiran 12 PRISMA *Checklist*

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	
Summary	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio,	

measures		difference in means).	

Section/Topic	#	Checklist Item	Reported On Page #
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I^2) for each meta-analysis.	