



*Lampiran 2*

**JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Quasi-Experimental Studies (non-randomized experimental studies)**

Reviewer : Ratri Galuh Kirana  
 Author : Fauziyah & Djoko  
 number : 1

Date : 07/06/2021  
 Year : 2017 record

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Was there a control group?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Were the outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overall appraisal:    Include     Exclude     Seek further info

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

---

Cut of point = 100

*Lampiran 3*

**JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Quasi-Experimental Studies (non-randomized experimental studies)**

Reviewer : Ratri Galuh Kirana  
 Author : Suarni & Fitarina  
 2

Date : 07/06/2021  
 Year : 2019 record number :

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Was there a control group?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Were the outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overall appraisal: Include  Exclude  Seek further info

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

---

Cut of point = 100

*Lampiran 4*

**JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Quasi-Experimental Studies (non-randomized experimental studies)**

Reviewer : Ratri Galuh Kirana  
 Author : Awaluddin, dkk  
 3

Date : 07/06/2021  
 Year : 2019 record number :

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Was there a control group?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Were the outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overall appraisal: Include  Exclude  Seek further info

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

---

Cut of point = 100

*Lampiran 5*

**JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Quasi-Experimental Studies (non-randomized experimental studies)**

Reviewer : Ratri Galuh Kirana  
Author : Sari & Sari

Date : 07/06/2021  
Year : 2020 record number : 1

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Was there a control group?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Were the outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overall appraisal:    Include     Exclude     Seek further info

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

---

Cut of point = 100

*Lampiran 6*

**JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Quasi-Experimental Studies (non-randomized experimental studies)**

Reviewer : Ratri Galuh Kirana  
 Author : Lasito, dkk

Date : 07/06/2021  
 Year : 2021 record number : 5

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Was there a control group?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Were the outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overall appraisal:    Include     Exclude     Seek further info

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

---

Cut of point = 100

*Lampiran 7*

**JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Quasi-Experimental Studies (non-randomized experimental studies)**

Reviewer : Ratri Galuh Kirana  
 Author : Ritonga & Daulay  
 number : 6

Date : 07/06/2021  
 Year : 2018 record

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Was there a control group?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Were the outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overall appraisal:    Include     Exclude     Seek further info

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

---

Cut of point = 100

*Lampiran 8*

**JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Quasi-Experimental Studies (non-randomized experimental studies)**

Reviewer : Ratri Galuh Kirana  
 Author : Karimi et.al  
 number : 7

Date : 07/06/2021  
 Year : 2019 record

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Was there a control group?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Were the outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overall appraisal:    Include     Exclude     Seek further info

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

---

Cut of point = 100



*Lampiran 9*

**PRISMA CHECKLIST**

<b>TITLE</b>			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	√
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
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.	√
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
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).	√
<b>METHODS</b>			
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 measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	√
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.	√
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	√
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	√
<b>RESULTS</b>			
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	√
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	√
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).	√
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	√
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	√
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	√
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	√
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).	√

Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	√
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	√
<b>FUNDING</b>			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.	√

Lampiran 10










**LEMBAR BIMBINGAN KTI**

Nama mahasiswa : Ratri Galuh Kirana

NIM : P17210184127

Nama pembimbing : Kissa Bahari, S. Kep., Ns,  
M. Kep., PhD.NS

NO	TANGGAL	REKOMENDASI PEMBIMBING	TANDA TANGAN PEMBIMBING
1	6/10/2020	Konsul judul 1) Memperbaiki judul 2) Membuat rencana bimbingan dengan pembimbing	
2	17/10/2020	Konsul BAB I 1) Ditambahi hasil jurnal dan disimpulkan hasilnya 2) Penulisan daftar pustaka sesuai panduan menggunakan <i>Harvard style</i>	
3	24/10/2020	Konsul BAB I 1) Memperbaiki penulisan latar belakang	
4	4/11/2020	Konsul BAB III 1) Menentukan metode penelitian yang digunakan	
5	7/11/2020	Konsul BAB II 1) Menambahkan referensi tentang tinjauan pustaka	

6	10/11/2020	Konsul BAB III 1) Menambahkan tabel kriteria inklusi dan eklusi, kata kunci ( <i>keywords</i> ), dan PRISMA flow chart	
7	20/11/2020	Konsul BAB III 1) Menambahkan contoh tabel penyajian data	
8	24/11/2020	Konsul Lampiran Disetujui untuk uji proposal	
9	26/06/2021	Konsul BAB IV 1) Memperbaiki tabel penyajian hasil	
10	10/07/2021	Konsul BAB IV 1) Memperbaiki <i>PRISMA Flow Chart</i> dan pembahasan	
11	12/07/2021	Konsul BAB IV 1) Memperbaiki hasil <i>literature review</i>	
12	17/07/2021	Konsul BAB V dan Abstrak 1) Terjemahkan abstrak yang telah dibuat ke dalam bahasa inggris 2) Disetujui untuk ujian sidang hasil	

*Lampiran 11*

**CURRICULUM VITAE**



**DATA PRIBADI**

Nama : Ratri Galuh Kirana  
Tempat, Tanggal Lahir : Malang, 12 September 2000  
Jenis Kelamin : Perempuan  
Agama : Islam  
Alamat : Jl. Kol. Sugiono VII / 17 RT.03 RW.02  
Kel. Mergosono Kec. Kedungkandang Malang  
Email : ratrigaluhkirana20@gmail.com

**DATA PENDIDIKAN**

TK Aisyah Bustanul Athfal 06 Malang	2005 – 2006
SDN Mergosono I Malang	2006 – 2012
SMP Negeri 9 Malang	2012 – 2015
SMK Negeri 2 Malang	2015 – 2018
Politeknik Kesehatan Kemenkes Malang	2018 – 2021