

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Akre, A. M. (2010). Sensitivity of the Pediatric Early Warning Score to Identify Patient Deterioration, *125*(4). <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2009-0338>
- Almeida, J. P., Valente, I. F., & da Rocha Lordelo, M. (2018). Association between pediatric Risk, Injury, Failure, Loss and End Stage Renal Disease score and mortality in a pediatric intensive care unit: A retrospective study. *Revista Brasileira de Terapia Intensiva*, *30*(4), 429–435. <https://doi.org/10.5935/0103-507X.20180065>
- Burns, J., Sellers, D. E., Meyer, E. C., Newby, M. L., & Truog, R. D. (2015). Epidemiology of Death in the Pediatric Intensive Care Unit at Five U.S. Teaching Hospital. *NIH Public Access*, *42*(9), 2101–2108. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0000000000000498>.Epidemiology
- California Department of Health Services. (n.d.). Provider Standard : Pediatric Intensive Care Units.
- Dewi, R. (2016). Pediatric early warning score: Bagaimana langkah kita selanjutnya? *Sari Pediatri*, *18*(1), 68. <https://doi.org/10.14238/sp18.1.2016.68-73>
- Elita, L., Triratna, S., & Bahar, E. (2016). Validation of the Pediatric Early Warning Score to determine patient deterioration from illness. *Paediatrica Indonesiana*, *56*(4), 251. <https://doi.org/10.14238/pi56.4.2016.251-6>
- El-Nawawy, A., Aly, &, Mohsen, A., Abdel-Malik, M., & Taman, S. O. (2017). Performance of the pediatric logistic organ dysfunction (PELOD) and (PELOD-2) scores in a pediatric intensive care unit of a developing country. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00431-017-2916-x>
- Gaur, A., Ambey, R., Medical, A. S.-I. J. of, & 2015, U. (2015). Modified pediatric logistic organ dysfunction scoring system: A feasible tool in pediatric intensive care units. *Academia.edu*.
- Gonçalves, J. P., Severo, M., Rocha, C., Jardim, J., Mota, T., & Ribeiro, A. (2015). Performance of PRISM III and PELOD-2 scores in a pediatric intensive care unit. *European Journal of Pediatrics*, *174*(10), 1305–1310. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00431-015-2533-5>
- Hon, K. L., Luk, M. P., Fung, W. M., Li, C. Y., Yeung, H. L., Liu, P. K., ... Koh, P. L. (2017). Mortality, length of stay, bloodstream and respiratory viral infections in a pediatric intensive care unit. *Journal of Critical Care*, *38*, 57–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrc.2016.09.019>

- Imelda, Maddeppungeng, M., Ganda, I. J., & Daud, D. (2015). RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEVERITY LEVEL OF DISEASE IN CHILDREN WITH MATERNAL ANXIETY AT PEDIATRIC INTENSIVE CARE UNIT, 0853414819.
- Latief, A., Pudjiadi, A. H., & Kushartono, H. (2016). *Buku Panduan Pelayanan Emergensi , Rawat Intermediet dan Rawat Intensif Anak Buku Panduan Pelayanan Emergensi , Rawat Intermediet dan Rawat Intensif Anak*. Jakarta: Ikatan Dokter Anak Indonesia.
- Latief, A., Pudjiadi, A. H., Kushartono, H., & Malisie, R. F. (2016). Buku Panduan Pelayanan emergensi, rawat intermediet dan rawat intensif anak, 56.
- Lee, O. J., Jung, M., Kim, M., Yang, H. K., & Cho, J. (2017). Validation of the pediatric index of mortality 3 in a single pediatric intensive care unit in Korea. *Journal of Korean Medical Science*, 32(2), 365–370. <https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2017.32.2.365>
- Leteurtre, S., Duhamel, A., Deken, V., Lacroix, J., Care, F. L.-C., & 2015, U. (2015). Daily estimation of the severity of organ dysfunctions in critically ill children by using the PELOD-2 score. *Springer*.
- Lubis, I. K., & Susilawati, S. (2017). Analisis Length Of Stay (Los) Berdasarkan Faktor Prediktor Pada Pasien DM Tipe II di RS PKU Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Kesehatan Vokasional*, 2(2), 161. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jkesvo.30330>
- Marlina, L., Hudaya S, D., & Garna, H. (2008). Perbandingan Penggunaan Pediatric Index Of Mortality 2 (PIM2) dan Skor Pediatric Logistic Organ Dysfunction (PELOD), Untuk memprediksi kematian pasien sakit kritis anak. *Sari Pediatri*, 10(38).
- Naghieb, S., Van Der Starre, C., Gischler, S. J., Joosten, K. F. M., & Tibboel, D. (2010). Mortality in very long-stay pediatric intensive care unit patients and incidence of withdrawal of treatment. *Intensive Care Medicine*.
- Patki, V., Raina, S., & Antin, J. (2016). Comparison of Severity Scoring Systems in a Pediatric Intensive Care Unit in India: A Single-Center Prospective, Observational Cohort Study. *Journal of Pediatric Intensive Care*, 06(02), 098–102. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0036-1584811>
- Pollack, M. M., Holubkov, R., Reeder, R., Dean, J. M., Meert, K. L., Berg, R. A., ... Tamburro, R. (2018). PICU Length of stay: Factors associated with bed utilization and development of a benchmarking model. *Pediatric Critical Care Medicine*, 19(3), 196–203. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PCC.0000000000001425>

- Qiu, J., Lu, X., Wang, K., Zhu, Y., Zuo, C., & Xiao, Z. (2017). Comparison of the pediatric risk of mortality, pediatric index of mortality, and pediatric index of mortality 2 models in a pediatric intensive care unit in China. *Medicine (United States)*, 96(14). <https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.00000000000006431>
- Rallis, H. M. (2018). *Guidelines for writing a literature review*. diakses tanggal 11 April 2020, <<https://www.d.umn.edu/~hrallis/guides/researching/litreview.html>>.
- Santoso, B. B. (2017). Mengenal Instalasi Gawat Darurat (IGD) dan Pediatric Intensive Care Unit (PICU) di Rumah Sakit.
- Seiger, A. N., & Maconochie, I. (2015). Validity of Different Pediatric Early Warning Scores in the Emergency Department, 132(4). <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2012-3594>
- Setyawati, A., & Marwiati. (2017). Manajemen Asuhan Keperawatan Pada Anak Dengan Disfungsi Kardiovaskular (Congestive Heart Failure) Pada Anak: Literature Review. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kesehatan*, 49–65.
- Siregar, A. Z., & Harahap, N. (2019a). *Strategi dan teknik penulisan karya tulis ilmiah dan publikasi*.
- Siregar, A. Z., & Harahap, N. (2019b). *Strategi dan teknik penulisan karya tulis ilmiah dan publikasi*. [e-book], diakses 20 April 2020, dari <<https://books.google.co.id/books?id=Vr2iDwAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=buku+tentang+penelitian+literatur+review&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjHz8K2qfboAhVe6nMBHbiSCmgQ6AEIPzAC#v=onepage&q=buku%20tentang%20penelitian%20lite>>.
- Thorley et al. (2019). *No Title*.
- Torres, A. (2015). When Your Child's in the Pediatric Intensive Care Unit.
- Tyagi, P., Tullu, M. S., & Agrawal, M. (2018). Comparison of Pediatric Risk of Mortality III, Pediatric Index of Mortality 2, and Pediatric Index of Mortality 3 in Predicting Mortality in a Pediatric Intensive Care Unit. *Journal of Pediatric Intensive Care*, 7(4), 201–206. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0038-1673671>

LAMPIRAN

LAMPIRAN 1

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 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.	

Page 1 of 2

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
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.	

From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

For more information, visit: www.prisma-statement.org.