#### **LAMPIRAN**

# Lampiran 1

# JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES

| eviewe  | Sonia Zalma Ardiansyah   | _Date_    | 17 M     | ei 2017  |                |                   |
|---------|--|-----------|----------|----------|----------------|-------------------|
| Author_ | Imelda Appulembang   | Year_20   | 17       | Record   | i Number_      | 01                |
|         |  |           | Yes      | No       | Unclear        | Not<br>applicable |
|         | Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about whit variable comes first)?             |           | V        |          |                |                   |
|         | Were the participants included in any comparise similar?   | ons       | V        |          |                |                   |
|         | Were the participants included in any comparise<br>receiving similar treatment/care, other than the<br>exposure or intervention of interest? |           | V        |          |                |                   |
| 4.      | Was there a control group?   |           |          | V        |                |                   |
|         | Were there multiple measurements of the outcomboth pre and post the intervention/exposure?   | ome       | V        |          |                |                   |
|         | Was follow up complete and if not, were differe<br>between groups in terms of their follow up<br>adequately described and analyzed?          | ences     |          |          | $\overline{V}$ |                   |
|         | Were the outcomes of participants included in a comparisons measured in the same way?  | any       | $\nabla$ |          |                |                   |
| 8.      | Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?  |           | V        |          |                |                   |
| 9.      | Was appropriate statistical analysis used?   |           | $\nabla$ |          |                |                   |
|         | 500 2 500 79   | further i | nfo 🗆    | 1        |                |                   |
|         | ts (Including reason for exclusion)  |           |          | , ,      | 1.1. 77. 70    | ,                 |
| Artikel | ini dapat dimasukkan dalam kriteria inklusi deng   | an skor   | keselu   | runan ad | alah //./%     | 0.                |

© JBI, 2020. All rights reserved. JBI grants use of these tools for research purposes only. All other enquiries should be sent to <a href="mailto:ibisynthesis@adelaide.edu.au">ibisynthesis@adelaide.edu.au</a>.

Critical Appraisal Checklist for Quasi-Experimental Studies - 3

# JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES

| Author | Dwi Astuti, Ummi Kulsum Year   | 2018     | Record | d Number_ | 02                |
|--------|--|----------|--------|-----------|-------------------|
|        |  | Yes      | No     | Unclear   | Not<br>applicable |
| 1.     | Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is<br>the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which<br>variable comes first)? | V        |        |           |                   |
| 2.     | Were the participants included in any comparisons similar?   | $\nabla$ |        |           |                   |
| 3.     | Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?   | $\nabla$ |        |           |                   |
| 4.     | Was there a control group?   |          | V      |           |                   |
| 5.     | Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure?   | V        |        |           |                   |
| 6.     | Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?          |          |        | V         |                   |
| 7.     | Were the outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?  | V        |        |           |                   |
| 8.     | Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?  |          |        | V         |                   |
| 9.     | Was appropriate statistical analysis used?   | V        |        |           |                   |
|        | appraisal: Include $\overline{\mathbb{V}}$ Exclude $\square$ Seek further  | rinfo 🗆  | ]      |           |                   |
|        | nts (Including reason for exclusion)<br>Iini dapat dimasukkan ke dalam kriteria inklusi dengan   | 1 1      |        | 66.60/    |                   |

© JBI, 2020. All rights reserved. JBI grants use of these tools for research purposes only. All other enquiries should be sent to <a href="mailto:ibisynthesis@adelaide.edu.au">ibisynthesis@adelaide.edu.au</a>.

Critical Appraisal Checklist for Quasi-Experimental Studies - 3

# JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR ANALYTICAL CROSS SECTIONAL STUDIES

| applica  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?  Verall appraisal: Include V Exclude Seek further info                                    | eviewe     | Sonia Zalma Ardiansyah   | Date_      | Maret 2                 | 019            |         |                   |
|--|------------|--|------------|-------------------------|----------------|---------|-------------------|
| applica  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?  Comments (Include  Exclude  Seek further info  Comments (Including reason for exclusion) |            |  | Year_2     | 019                     | Record         | Number_ | 03                |
| 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?  Comments (Including reason for exclusion)  |            |  |            | Yes                     | No             | Unclear | Not<br>applicable |
| 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 V Exclude Seek further info  |            |  | clearly    |                         | V              |         |                   |
| 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?  Comments (Including reason for exclusion)  |            |  | ribed in   | $\overline{V}$          |                |         |                   |
| 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?  Comments (Including reason for exclusion)  |            | 발생님 못했다. 그 회에 있는 사람들이 하나를 내가 되었다. 하나 사람들이 하는 사람들이 되었다. 그 사람들이 되었다. | liable     | V                       |                |         |                   |
| 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   |            |  |            |                         | $\overline{V}$ |         |                   |
| 7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?  8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?  Overall appraisal: Include V Exclude Seek further info  | 5. \       | Nere confounding factors identified?                               |            |                         |                | V       |                   |
| way?  8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?  Overall appraisal: Include  |            |  | tors       |                         |                | V       |                   |
| Overall appraisal: Include   |            |  | reliable   | $\overline{\mathbb{V}}$ |                |         |                   |
| Comments (Including reason for exclusion)  | 8. \       | Nas appropriate statistical analysis used?                         |            | $\nabla$                |                |         |                   |
| Artikel ini dapat dimasukkan dalam kriteria inklusi dengan skor keseluruhan adalah 50%.  | Comment    | s (Including reason for exclusion)                                 |            |                         |                |         |                   |
| ***  | Artikel ir | i dapat dimasukkan dalam kriteria inklusi den                      | gan skor l | keselurul               | nan adala      | ah 50%. |                   |

© JBI, 2020. All rights reserved. JBI grants use of these tools for research purposes only. All other enquiries should be sent to <a href="mailto:ibisynthesis@adelaide.edu.au">ibisynthesis@adelaide.edu.au</a>.

Critical Appraisal Checklist for Analytical Cross Sectional Studies - 3

# JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIALS

|    | Macey Delcambre, MD; Dylan Haynes, BS; Tamar Hajar, MD; Spring Golden, MD; Anna Bar, MD; Emile Author_Latour, MS; and Justin J. Leitenberger, MD                                      | 9                       | Record f  | Number04 |    |
|----|---|-------------------------|-----------|----------|----|
|    |   | Yes                     | No        | Unclear  | NA |
|    | Was true randomization used for assignment of participants to treatment groups? $ \\$   | $\nabla$                |           |          |    |
|    | Was allocation to treatment groups concealed?   |                         |           | V        |    |
|    | Were treatment groups similar at the baseline?  | $\nabla$                |           |          |    |
|    | Were participants blind to treatment assignment?  |                         |           | $\nabla$ |    |
|    | Were those delivering treatment blind to treatment assignment?  |                         |           | V        |    |
|    | Were outcomes assessors blind to treatment assignment?  |                         |           | $\nabla$ |    |
|    | Were treatment groups treated identically other than the intervention of interest?  | $\overline{\mathbf{V}}$ |           |          |    |
|    | Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?   |                         | V         |          |    |
|    | Were participants analyzed in the groups to which they were randomized?   | $\nabla$                |           |          |    |
| 0. | Were outcomes measured in the same way for treatment groups?  | $\nabla$                |           |          |    |
| 1. | Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?   | $\nabla$                |           |          |    |
| 2. | Was appropriate statistical analysis used?  | $\nabla$                |           |          |    |
| 3. | Was the trial design appropriate, and any deviations from the standard RCT design (individual randomization, parallel groups) accounted for in the conduct and analysis of the trial? | $\nabla$                |           |          |    |
|    | Overall appraisal: Include  |                         | ıhan adal | ah 61.5% |    |

© JBI, 2020. All rights reserved. JBI grants use of these tools for research purposes only. All other enquiries should be sent to <a href="mailto:jbisynthesis@adelaide.edu.au">jbisynthesis@adelaide.edu.au</a>.

Critical Appraisal Checklist for Randomized Controlled Trials - 3

# JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIALS

|     | Saskia M. Tipotsch-Maca, MD; Ralph M. Varsits, MD; Christian Ginzel, MD; Pia V. Vecsei- Author Marlovits, MD, MSc, MBA.   | 16                      | Record N  | Number05    | _  |
|-----|---|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|----|
|     |   | Yes                     | No        | Unclear     | NA |
| ι,  | Was true randomization used for assignment of participants to treatment groups?   | $\nabla$                |           |             |    |
|     | Was allocation to treatment groups concealed?   | $\overline{V}$          |           |             |    |
| 3.  | Were treatment groups similar at the baseline?  | $\nabla$                |           |             |    |
| 1.  | Were participants blind to treatment assignment?  |                         | $\nabla$  |             |    |
| 5.  | Were those delivering treatment blind to treatment assignment?  |                         | $\nabla$  |             |    |
| 5.  | Were outcomes assessors blind to treatment assignment?  |                         | $\nabla$  |             |    |
| 7.  | Were treatment groups treated identically other than the intervention of interest?  | $\nabla$                |           |             |    |
| 3.  | Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?   |                         | $\nabla$  |             |    |
| ).  | Were participants analyzed in the groups to which they were randomized? $\label{eq:controlled}$   | $\nabla$                |           |             |    |
| 10. | Were outcomes measured in the same way for treatment groups?  | $\overline{\mathbf{V}}$ |           |             |    |
| 11. | Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?   | $\nabla$                |           |             |    |
| 12. | Was appropriate statistical analysis used?  | $\nabla$                |           |             |    |
| 13. | Was the trial design appropriate, and any deviations from the standard RCT design (individual randomization, parallel groups) accounted for in the conduct and analysis of the trial? | $\nabla$                |           |             |    |
|     | Overall appraisal: Include $\overline{f V}$ Exclude $oxedsymbol{f \Box}$ Seek further in  | fo 🗌                    |           |             |    |
|     | Comments (Including reason for exclusion)   | •                       |           | 111 (0.20)  |    |
|     | Artikel ini dapat dimasukkan ke dalam kriteria inklusi dengan sk  | or Kese                 | lurunan a | dalah 69.2% |    |

© JBI, 2020. All rights reserved. JBI grants use of these tools for research purposes only. All other enquiries should be sent to <a href="mailto:jbisynthesis@adelaide.edu.au">jbisynthesis@adelaide.edu.au</a>.

Critical Appraisal Checklist for Randomized Controlled Trials - 3

#### JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR COHORT STUDIES

| eviewe | er_Sonia Zalma Ardiansyah   | 24 Feb                  | ruari 20 | 20                      |                   |
|--------|---|-------------------------|----------|-------------------------|-------------------|
|        | Brett M Wiesen, BS; Michael R Bronsert, PhD, MS; Davis M Aasen, BS; Abhinav B Singh, MD; Anne Lambert-Kerzner, PhD, MSPH; | 2020                    | Recor    | d Number_               | 06                |
|        | William G Henderson, PhD, MPH; Karl E Hammermeister, MD; Robert A Meguid, MD, MPH, FACS                                   | Yes                     | No       | Unclear                 | Not<br>applicable |
| 1.     | Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population?   | $\overline{V}$          |          |                         |                   |
| 2.     | Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups?                              | $\overline{\mathbf{V}}$ |          |                         |                   |
| 3.     | Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?  | V                       |          |                         |                   |
| 4.     | Were confounding factors identified?  | $\overline{V}$          |          |                         |                   |
| 5.     | Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?  | $\nabla$                |          |                         |                   |
| 6.     | Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)?                |                         |          | V                       |                   |
| 7.     | Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?   | $\overline{\mathbb{V}}$ |          |                         |                   |
| 8.     | Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur?                                   |                         |          | V                       |                   |
| 9.     | Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored?                         |                         |          | $\overline{\mathbb{V}}$ |                   |
| 10.    | Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized?   |                         |          | V                       |                   |
| 11.    | Was appropriate statistical analysis used?  | $\nabla$                |          |                         |                   |
|        | appraisal: Include 💟 Exclude 🗆 Seek further   | rinfo [                 | ]        |                         |                   |
|        | nts (Including reason for exclusion)<br>ini dapat dimasukkan ke dalam kriteria inklusi dengar                             | 1. 1                    |          |                         | 2 60/             |

# JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIALS

|     | Reviewer Sonia Zalma Ardiansyah  | Date                 | 30 M                    | ei 2019   |             |    |
|-----|--|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|----|
|     | Michael H. Zhang, Zeeshan U. Haq, Eva<br>Author_Braithwaite, Noah C. Simon, Kamran M. I  | n M.<br>Riaz Year 20 | 19                      | Record N  | Number_07   | _  |
|     |  |                      | Yes                     | No        | Unclear     | NA |
| Ι,  | Was true randomization used for assignment of particl groups?  | pants to treatment   | $\nabla$                |           |             |    |
|     | Was allocation to treatment groups concealed?  |                      |                         |           | $\nabla$    |    |
| 1.  | Were treatment groups similar at the baseline?   |                      | $\nabla$                |           |             |    |
| ١.  | Were participants blind to treatment assignment?   |                      |                         |           |             |    |
| 5.  | Were those delivering treatment blind to treatment as  | ssignment?           |                         |           | V           |    |
| 5.  | Were outcomes assessors blind to treatment assignment  | ent?                 |                         |           | V           |    |
| 7.  | Were treatment groups treated identically other than interest?   | the intervention of  | $\nabla$                |           |             |    |
| 3.  | Was follow up complete and if not, were differences b terms of their follow up adequately described and ana  |                      |                         |           | V           |    |
| 9.  | Were participants analyzed in the groups to which the  | y were randomized?   | $\nabla$                |           |             |    |
| 10. | Were outcomes measured in the same way for treatm  | ent groups?          | $\nabla$                |           |             |    |
| 11. | Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?  |                      | $\nabla$                |           |             |    |
| 12. | Was appropriate statistical analysis used?   |                      | $\nabla$                |           |             |    |
| 13. | Was the trial design appropriate, and any deviations fr<br>design (individual randomization, parallel groups) acco<br>conduct and analysis of the trial? |                      | $\overline{\mathbf{V}}$ |           |             |    |
|     | Overall appraisal: Include $\boxed{\mathbb{V}}$ Exclude  | Seek further in      | nfo 🗌                   |           |             |    |
|     | Comments (Including reason for exclusion)  |                      |                         |           |             |    |
|     | Artikel ini dapat dimasukkan ke dalam kriteri  | ia inklusi dengan sk | or kese                 | luruhan a | dalah 61.5% |    |

tools for research purposes only. All other enquiries should be sent to jbisynthesis@adelaide.edu.au.

# Lampiran 8 JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIALS

|     | Reviewe               | r_Sonia Zalma Ardiansyah Date  | 12 Apri   | 1 2020    |           |    |
|-----|-----------------------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|----|
|     | 1                     | Yueyue Miao, B.AdvSci; Victoria L. Venning, MD, Kylie-Ann Mallitt, PhD; Julia E. J. Rhodes, MD; Noah J. Issemman, PhD; Gilberto Moreno, MD; Simon Lee, MD; William Ryman, MD; Gayle Fischer, MD; Rebecca B. Saunderson, MD | 2020      | Record I  | Number_09 | _  |
|     |                       |  | Yes       | No        | Unclear   | NA |
| l.  | Was true r<br>groups? | randomization used for assignment of participants to treatment   | V         |           |           |    |
|     | Was alloca            | ation to treatment groups concealed?   | $\nabla$  |           |           |    |
| 1.  | Were trea             | stment groups similar at the baseline?   | $\nabla$  |           |           |    |
| 1.  | Were part             | ticipants blind to treatment assignment?   |           |           | V         |    |
| 5.  | Were thos             | se delivering treatment blind to treatment assignment?   |           |           | V         |    |
| 5.  | Were out              | comes assessors blind to treatment assignment?   |           |           | V         |    |
| 7.  | Were trea interest?   | tment groups treated identically other than the intervention of  | $\nabla$  |           |           |    |
| 3.  |                       | w up complete and if not, were differences between groups in<br>heir follow up adequately described and analyzed?  |           |           | V         |    |
| 9.  | Were part             | ticipants analyzed in the groups to which they were randomized   | V         |           |           |    |
| 10. | Were out              | comes measured in the same way for treatment groups?   | $\nabla$  |           |           |    |
| 11. | Were outo             | comes measured in a reliable way?  | $\nabla$  |           |           |    |
| 12. | Was appro             | opriate statistical analysis used?   | $\nabla$  |           |           |    |
| 13. | design (inc           | rial design appropriate, and any deviations from the standard RC dividual randomization, parallel groups) accounted for in the nd analysis of the trial?   | T 🔽       |           |           |    |
|     | Overall ap            | ppraisal: Include $\overline{ m V}$ Exclude $\square$ Seek furthe  | er info   |           |           |    |
|     |                       | ts (Including reason for exclusion)<br>ni dapat dimasukkan ke dalam kriteria inklusi dengan  | skor kese | luruhan 6 | 9.2%      |    |
|     |                       |  |           |           |           |    |

tools for research purposes only. All other enquiries should be sent to <a href="mailto:bisynthesis@adelaide.edu.au">bisynthesis@adelaide.edu.au</a>.

# JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIALS

|     |                       | Sonia Zalma Ardiansyah   | Date      | 3 Mar                   | Ct 2010   |             |     |
|-----|-----------------------|--|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-----|
|     | 2                     | Benoit Lattuca, Nicolas Barber-Chamoux, Benjamin Alox, Anis Sfaxi, Aurélien Mullier, Noelie Miton, Thomas Levasseur, Clement Servox, François Derimay, Olivier Hacher, Pascall Morerft, Damien Mett, Olivier Lairex, Nethan Mewton, Loic Belle, Mariama Akodad, Thomas Mathivet, Fions Ecaroct, Justice Pollet, Nicolas Danchin, Philippe-Gabriel Steg, Yves Juillière, Claire Bouleti | _Year     | 2018                    | Record P  | Number10    | _   |
|     |                       |  |           | Yes                     | No        | Unclear     | N.A |
|     | Was true r<br>groups? | randomization used for assignment of participants to tre   | atment    | $\nabla$                |           |             |     |
| 2.  | Was alloca            | ation to treatment groups concealed?   |           | $\nabla$                |           |             |     |
| 3.  | Were trea             | tment groups similar at the baseline?  |           | $\nabla$                |           |             |     |
| 4.  | Were part             | cicipants blind to treatment assignment?   |           | V                       |           |             |     |
| 5.  | Were thos             | se delivering treatment blind to treatment assignment?   |           |                         |           | V           |     |
| 5.  | Were out              | comes assessors blind to treatment assignment?   |           |                         | $\nabla$  |             |     |
| 7.  | Were trea interest?   | tment groups treated identically other than the interven   | ntion of  | $\nabla$                |           |             |     |
| 3.  |                       | w up complete and if not, were differences between gro<br>heir follow up adequately described and analyzed?  | ups in    |                         |           | $\nabla$    |     |
| 9.  | Were part             | cicipants analyzed in the groups to which they were rand   | lomized?  | $\nabla$                |           |             |     |
| 10. | Were out              | comes measured in the same way for treatment groups?   |           | $\nabla$                |           |             |     |
| 11. | Were outo             | comes measured in a reliable way?  |           | $\nabla$                |           |             |     |
| 12. | Was appro             | opriate statistical analysis used?   |           | $\overline{\mathbf{V}}$ |           |             |     |
| 13. | design (inc           | rial design appropriate, and any deviations from the star<br>dividual randomization, parallel groups) accounted for ir<br>nd analysis of the trial?  |           | $\nabla$                |           |             |     |
|     | Overall ap            | opraisal: Include 💟 Exclude 🗌 See  | k further | info 🔲                  |           |             |     |
|     | Comment               | ts (Including reason for exclusion)  |           |                         |           |             |     |
|     | Artikel i             | ni dapat dimasukkan ke dalam kriteria inklusi  | dengan    | skor kese               | luruhan a | dalah 76.9% |     |

© JBI, 2020. All rights reserved. JBI grants use of thes tools for research purposes only. All other enquiries should be sent to <a href="mailto:bisynthesis@adelaide.edu.au">bisynthesis@adelaide.edu.au</a>.



#### LEMBAR BIMBINGAN SKRIPSI

Nama Mahasiswa : Sonia Zalma Ardiansyah

NIM : P17211173018

Nama Pembimbing I : Dr. Susi Milwati, S.Kp., M.Pd.

| NO. | TANGGAL    | REKOMENDASI<br>PEMBIMBING   | TANDA TANGAN<br>PEMBIMBING |
|-----|------------|---|----------------------------|
| 1.  | 27/09/2020 | Konsultasi judul Rekomendasi:  - Judul "Pengaruh Pemberian Informed Consent terhadap Tingkat Kecemasan pada Pasien Pre Operasi" disetujui Konsultasi pengambilan data saat pandemi Rekomendasi: - Menyiapkan studi literatur dengan minimal 10 jurnal | Jy                         |
| 2.  | 20/10/2020 | Konsultasi metode penelitian Rekomendasi: - Penelitian menggunakan metode <i>Literature</i> Review - Melanjutkan mencari jurnal minimal 11 dan menyusun BAB I   | Jz.                        |
| 3.  | 22/10/2020 | Konsultasi BAB I<br>Rekomendasi:<br>- Revisi latar belakang   | Jy                         |
| 4.  | 12/11/2020 | Pengumpulan revisi latar<br>belakang  | 97                         |
| 5.  | 16/11/2020 | Konsultasi BAB I<br>Rekomendasi:<br>- Revisi latar belakang   | Jy                         |
| 6.  | 25/11/2020 | Pengumpulan revisi BAB I  | J.,                        |

|          | 1          | I   |                         |
|----------|------------|---|-------------------------|
| 7.       | 15/12/2020 | Rekomendasi: - Menyelesaikan BAB II dan BAB III   | Jy                      |
| 8.       | 24/12/2020 | Konsultasi BAB II<br>Rekomendasi: - Melanjutkan penyusunan<br>BAB III                     | 97                      |
| 9.       | 28/12/2020 | Pengumpulan BAB III   | 97                      |
| 10.      | 02/01/2021 | Rekomendasi:  - Membuat presentasi Power Point BAB I, II, dan III                         | Jz.                     |
| 11.      | 03/01/2021 | Presentasi BAB I, II, dan III<br>Rekomendasi: - Revisi latar belakang<br>yang ditampilkan | 97                      |
| 12.      | 12/01/2021 | Pengumpulan revisi PPT  | 97                      |
| 13.      | 14/01/2021 | Presentasi BAB I, II, III revisi  | 97                      |
| 14.      | 16/01/2021 | Proposal disetujui<br>Rekomendasi:<br>- Lanjut sidang proposal                            | 97                      |
| 15.      | 30/04/2021 | Pengumpulan dan bimbingan<br>BAB IV   | A3/                     |
| 16.      | 17/05/2021 | Pengumpulan BAB V dan revisi<br>BAB IV  | <b>G</b> 5/             |
| 17.      | 24/05/2021 | Pengumpulan revisi BAB IV dan BAB V   | <b>G</b> <sub>2</sub> / |
| <u> </u> | ı          | <u> </u>  |                         |

| 18. | 26/05/2021 | Bimbingan BAB IV dan BAB V          | <b>G</b> 37   |
|-----|------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| 19. | 27/05/2021 | Pengumpulan revisi BAB IV dan BAB V | <del>92</del> |
| 20. | 29/05/2021 | Bimbingan dan pengumpulan abstrak   | <b>A</b> 37   |
| 21. | 30/05/2021 | Pengumpulan revisi abstrak          | <b>A</b> 37   |
| 22. | 03/06/2021 | ACC Sidang Skripsi                  | A37           |



#### LEMBAR BIMBINGAN SKRIPSI

Nama Mahasiswa : Sonia Zalma Ardiansyah

NIM : P17211173018

Nama Pembimbing II : Naya Ernawati, S.Kep., Ns., M.Kep.

| NO. | TANGGAL    | REKOMENDASI   | TANDA TANGAN   |
|-----|------------|---|--|
|     |            | PEMBIMBING  | <b>PEMBIMBING</b>  |
| 1.  | 29/09/2020 | Konsultasi judul Konsultasi pengambilan data saat pandemi Rekomendasi:  - Menentukan terlebih dahulu RS yang dituju untuk penelitian kemudian mengerjakan BAB I | Ah:  |
| 2.  | 10/10/2020 | Konsultasi judul<br>Rekomendasi:  - Membuat tabel PICOT<br>sesuai jurnal yang<br>didapatkan   | Th:  |
| 3.  | 19/10/2020 | Pengumpulan tabel PICOT   | Th:  |
| 4.  | 21/10/2020 | Konsultasi RS yang dituju untuk penelitian Rekomendasi:  - Menentukan RS yang bisa digunakan untuk penelitian - Menyusun BAB I                                  | Th:  |
| 5.  | 21/10/2020 | Pengumpulan BAB I   | Th:  |
| 6.  | 22/10/2020 | Pembimbing mengirimkan revisi untuk BAB I   | Th:  |
| 7.  | 14/11/2020 | Pengumpulan BAB I dan konsultasi metode penelitian Rekomendasi: - Penelitian menggunakan metode <i>Literature Review</i>  | This was a second of the secon |

| 8.  | 19/11/2020 | Konsultasi BAB II<br>Rekomendasi: - Menyelesaikan BAB II<br>dan BAB III   | Th: |
|-----|------------|---|-----|
| 9.  | 25/12/2020 | Pengumpulan BAB II dan III  | Ah: |
| 10. | 02/01/2021 | Pengumpulan Critical Appraisal Checklist  | Ah: |
| 11. | 06/01/2021 | Konsultasi revisi BAB II dan III<br>Rekomendasi:  - Untuk penelitian LR<br>sebaiknya menggunakan<br>judul analisis faktor<br>bukan pengaruh | Ah: |
| 12. | 09/01/2021 | Pengumpulan proposal  | Ah: |
| 13. | 10/01/2021 | Konsultasi judul, tetap<br>menggunakan judul pengaruh   | Ah: |
| 14. | 16/01/2021 | Proposal disetujui Rekomendasi: - Lanjut sidang proposal  | Ah: |
| 15. | 01/05/2021 | Pengumpulan BAB IV  | Th: |
| 16. | 17/05/2021 | Pengumpulan BAB V   | Ah: |
| 17. | 27/05/2021 | Bimbingan revisi BAB IV dan BAB V   | Ah: |
| 18. | 02/06/2021 | Pengumpulan abstrak   | Ah: |
| 19. | 03/06/2021 | ACC Sidang Skripsi  | Ah: |