

LAMPIRAN

Lampiran 1. JBI Tools

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR ANALYTICAL CROSS SECTIONAL

Reviewer : Fandika Ilham Nur Pradana
 Date : Maret 2021
 Author : Chopra, K. K., & Arora, V. K.
 Year : 2020
 Record Number : 1

Yes No Unclear

No
t
applic
able

1. Were criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined? √sample clearly defined?
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail? √setting described in detail?
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way? √valid and reliable way?
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition? √used for measurement of the
5. Were confounding factors identified? √identified?
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated? √confounding factors stated?
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way? √a valid and reliable
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used? √analysis used?

Overall appraisal: Include Exclude Seek futher info

Comments (Including reason for exclusion):

Artikel ini mendapatkan skor 80% sehingga dinyatakan layak untuk dilakukan sintesis data.

Lampiran 2. JBI Tools

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR ANALYTICAL CROSS SECTIONAL

Reviewer : Fandika ilham Nur Pradana
 Date : Maret 2020
 Author : Trejos-Herrera, A. M, et al
 Year : 2021
 Record Number : 2

Yes No Unclear
 No
 t
 applic
 able

1. Were criteria for inclusion in the \checkmark sample clearly defined?
2. Were the study subjects and the \checkmark setting described in detail?
3. Was the exposure measured in a \checkmark valid and reliable way?
4. Were objective, standard criteria \checkmark used for measurement of
the
condition?
5. Were confounding factors \checkmark identified?
6. Were strategies to deal with \checkmark confounding factors
stated?
7. Were the outcomes measured in \checkmark a valid and realible way?
8. Was appropriate statistical \checkmark analysis used?

Overall appraisal: Include Exclude Seek futher info

Comments (Including reason for exclusion):

Artikel ini mendapatkan skor 80% sehingga dinyatakan layak untuk dilakukan sintesis data.

Lampiran 3. JBI Tools

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR ANALYTICAL CROSS SECTIONAL

Reviewer : Fandika Ilham Nur Pradana
 Date : Maret 2021
 Author : Mukhtar S.
 Year : 2020
 Record Number : 3

	Yes	No	Unclear	No t applic able
1. Were criteria for inclusion in the	√			
2. Were the study subjects and the	√			
3. Was the exposure measured in a	√			
4. Were objective, standard criteria condition?	√			
5. Were confounding factors			√	
6. Were strategies to deal with stated?			√	
7. Were the outcomes measured in			√	
8. Was appropriate statistical			√	

Overall appraisal: Include Exclude Seek futher info

Comments (Including reason for exclusion):

Artikel ini mendapatkan skor 80% sehingga dinyatakan layak untuk dilakukan sintesis data.

Lampiran 4. JBI Tools

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR ANALYTICAL CROSS SECTIONAL

Reviewer : Fandika Ilham Nur Pradana
 Date : Maret 2021
 Author : Giorgi, G., et al
 Year : 2020
 Record Number : 4

	Yes	No	Unclear	No t applic able
1. Were criteria for inclusion in the	√			
2. Were the study subjects and the	√			
3. Was the exposure measured in a	√			
4. Were objective, standard criteria	√			
condition?				
5. Were confounding factors			√	
6. Were strategies to deal with			√	
stated?				
7. Were the outcomes measured in	√			
8. Was appropriate statistical	√			

Overall appraisal: Include Exclude Seek futher info

Comments (Including reason for exclusion):

Artikel ini mendapatkan skor 80% sehingga dinyatakan layak untuk dilakukan sintesis data.

Lampiran 5. JBI Tools

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR ANALYTICAL CROSS SECTIONAL

Reviewer : Fandika Ilham Nur Pradana
 Date : Maret 2021
 Author : Barello, S., et al
 Year : 2020
 Record Number : 5

	Yes	No	Unclear	No t applic able
1. Were criteria for inclusion in the	√			
2. Were the study subjects and the	√			
3. Was the exposure measured in a	√			
4. Were objective, standard criteria	√			
condition?				
5. Were confounding factors		√		
6. Were strategies to deal with		√		
stated?				
7. Were the outcomes measured in		√		
way?				
8. Was appropriate statistical	√			
analysis used?				
Overall appraisal:	Include	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Exclude	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Seek futher info	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments (Including reason for exclusion):

Artikel ini mendapatkan skor 70% sehingga dinyatakan layak untuk dilakukan sintesis data.

Lampiran 6. JBI Tools

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR ANALYTICAL CROSS SECTIONAL

Reviewer : Fandika Ilham Nur Pradana
 Date : Maret 2021
 Author : Dubey, S., et al
 Year : 2020
 Record Number : 6

	Yes	No	Unclear	No t applic able
1. Were criteria for inclusion in the	√			
2. Were the study subjects and the	√			
3. Was the exposure measured in a	√			
4. Were objective, standard criteria	√			
condition?				
5. Were confounding factors			√	
6. Were strategies to deal with			√	
stated?				
7. Were the outcomes measured in			√	
way?				
8. Was appropriate statistical			√	
Overall appraisal:	Include	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Exclude	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Seek futher info	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments (Including reason for exclusion):

Artikel ini mendapatkan skor 70% sehingga dinyatakan layak untuk dilakukan sintesis data.

Lampiran 7. JBI Tools

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR ANALYTICAL CROSS SECTIONAL

Reviewer : Fandika Ilham Nur Pradana
 Date : Maret 2021
 Author : Hagger, M. S., et al
 Year : 2020
 Record Number : 7

	Yes	No	Unclear	No t applic able
1. Were criteria for inclusion in the	√			
2. Were the study subjects and the	√			
3. Was the exposure measured in a		√		
4. Were objective, standard criteria	√			
5. Were confounding factors		√		
6. Were strategies to deal with	√			
7. Were the outcomes measured in	√			
8. Was appropriate statistical	√			

Overall appraisal: Include Exclude Seek futher info

Comments (Including reason for exclusion):

Artikel ini mendapatkan skor 80% sehingga dinyatakan layak untuk dilakukan sintesis data.

Lampran 2

PRISMA CHECKLIST

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 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.	
RESULTS			
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]).	
DISCUSSION			
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.	
FUNDING			
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.	