

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- AHA. (2017). American Heart Association.
- Allida, S., Du, H., Xu, X., Prichard, R., Chang, S., Hickman, L. D., ... Inglis, S. C. (2020). mHealth education interventions in heart failure. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 2015(7). <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD011845>
- Alligood. (2010). Nursing Theorists and Their Wor. United Stated of America: Mosby Elsevier.
- Alligood, M. R. (2014). Nursing Theories and their work(8th ed.). Elsevier Inc.
- Berkman, N. D., Sheridan, S. L., Donahue, K. E., Halpern, D. J., & Crotty, K. (2011). Low health literacy and health outcomes: An updated systematic review. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 155(2), 97–107. <https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-155-2-201107190-00005>
- Bettany, J., & Saltikov. (2012). *How to do a Systematic Literature Review in Nursing*. USA: Nursing standart.
- Brain, & Spain. (2016). Improving the Patient Experience with The Medical Memory.
- Brunton, S. A. (2011). Improving medication adherence in chronic disease management. *Journal of Family Practice*, 60(4), 1–8.
- Casemiro, F. G., Quirino, D. M., Diniz, M. A. A., Rodrigues, R. A. P., Pavarini, S. C. I., & Gratão, A. C. M. (2018). Effects of health education in the elderly with mild cognitive impairment. *Revista Brasileira de Enfermagem*, 71 2(suppl 2), 801–810. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0034-7167-2017-0032>
- CASP. (2018). Critical Appraisal Skills Programme CASP Randomised Controlled Trial Checklist.
- CDC. (2017). *Chronic Diseases and Cognitive Decline – A Public Health Issue*. Amerika.
- Chaib, F. (2019). WHO launches digital app to improve care for older people.
- Chen, J., Zhao, H., Hao, S., Xie, J., Ouyang, Y., & Zhao, S. (2018). International Journal of Nursing Sciences Motivational interviewing to improve the self-care

- behaviors for patients with chronic heart failure : A randomized controlled trial. *International Journal of Nursing Sciences*, 5(3), 213–217.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnss.2018.04.012>
- Chen, Y., Funk, M., Wen, J., Tang, X., He, G., & Liu, H. (2018). Effectiveness of a multidisciplinary disease management program on outcomes in patients with heart failure in China: A randomized controlled single center study. *Heart and Lung: Journal of Acute and Critical Care*, 47(1), 24–31.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrtlng.2017.10.002>
- Clark, A. P., McDougall, G., Riegel, B., Joiner-Rogers, G., Innerarity, S., Meraviglia, M., ... Davila, A. (2015). Health status and self-care outcomes after an education-support intervention for people with chronic heart failure. *Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing*, 30(4), S3–S13.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/JCN.0000000000000169>
- Clarke, J. (2011). What is a systematic review. *Evidence-Based Nursing*, 14(3), 64.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/ebn.2011.0049>
- Fathizadeh, Shojaeizadeh, Mahmoodi, Garmarodi, Amirsardari, Azadbakht, & Gheysvandy. (2016). The Impact of Health Education Based on PRECEDE Model on Knowledge, Attitude and Behavior of Grade Nine Female Students about Iron Deficiency Anemia in Qazvin, 7(3), 321–330.
- Fincham, E., Gašević, D., Jovanović, J., & Pardo, A. (2019). From Study Tactics to Learning Strategies: An Analytical Method for Extracting Interpretable Representations. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 12(1), 59–72.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/TLT.2018.2823317>
- Formosa, M. (2012). Critical Geragogy: Situating Theory in Practice.
- Galiana, L., Oliver, A., Sansó, N., & Benito, E. (2015). Validation of a New Instrument for Self-care in Spanish Palliative Care Professionals Nationwide. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 18, E67.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/SJP.2015.71>
- Ghiyasvandian, S., Ghorbani, M., Zakerimoghadam, M., Purfarzad, Z., & Kazemnejad, A. (2016). The effects of a self-care program on the severity of

- symptoms and quality of life of patients with irritable bowel syndrome. *Gastroenterology Nursing*, 39(5), 359–365.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/SGA.0000000000000229>
- Ha Dinh, T. T., Bonner, A., Clark, R., Ramsbotham, J., & Hines, S. (2016). The effectiveness of the teach-back method on adherence and self-management in health education for people with chronic disease: a systematic review. *JBI Database of Systematic Reviews and Implementation Reports*, 14(1), 210–247.
<https://doi.org/10.11124/jbisrir-2016-2296>
- Halmo, R., Galuszka, J., Langova, K., & Galuszkova, D. (2015). Self care in patients with chronic heart failure. Pilot study - self care includes problems. *Biomedical Papers*, 159(1), 124–130. <https://doi.org/10.5507/bp.2013.044>
- Hariyati, R. T. S. (2010). Mengenal Systematic Review Theory dan Studi Kasus. *Jurnal Keperawatan Indonesia*, 13(2), 124–132.
<https://doi.org/10.7454/jki.v13i2.242>
- Holly, C., Salmond, S. W., & Saimbert, M. K. (2012). *Comprehensive Systematic Review for Advanced Nursing Practice*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Howick, J., Chalmers, I., Glasziou, P., Greenhalgh, T., Heneghan, C., Liberati, A., ... Thornton, H. (2011). The Oxford Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine. oxford. Retrieved from <http://www.cebm.net/index.aspx?o=5653>
- Irwan, A. M. (2018). Tantangan Health Literacy. *Jurnal Luka Indonesia*, 4(1).
- Irwan, A. M., Kato, M., Kitaoka, K., Kido, T., Taniguchi, Y., & Shogenji, M. (2016). Self-care practices and health-seeking behavior among older persons in a developing country: Theories-based research. *International Journal of Nursing Sciences*, 3(1), 11–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnss.2016.02.010>
- Irwan, A. M., Kato, M., Kitaoka, K., Ueno, E., Tsujiguchi, H., & Shogenji, M. (2016). Development of the salt-reduction and efficacy-maintenance program in Indonesia. *Nursing and Health Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nhs.12305>
- Jamal, M., Ahmad, W., Andleeb, S., Jalil, F., Imran, M., Asif, M., ... Atif, M. (2017). ScienceDirect Bacterial biofilm and associated infections. *Journal of the*

- Chinese Medical Association*, 5–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcma.2017.07.012>
- JB. (2017). Checklist for Systematic Reviews and Research Syntheses. *The Joanna Briggs Institute*. Retrieved from <http://joannabriggs.org/research/critical-appraisal-tools.html> www.joannabriggs.org
- Jeihooni, A. K., Kashfi, S. M., Hatami, M., Avand, A., & Bazrafshan, M. rafi. (2017). The Effect of Educational Program Based on PRECEDE Model in Promoting Prostate Cancer Screening in a Sample of Iranian Men, *34*, 161–172. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13187-017-1282-8>
- Jiang, Y., Shorey, S., Seah, B., Chan, W. X., Tam, W. W. S., & Wang, W. (2018). The effectiveness of psychological interventions on self-care, psychological and health outcomes in patients with chronic heart failure—A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, *78*, 16–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2017.08.006>
- Kang, X., Dennison Himmelfarb, C. R., Li, Z., Zhang, J., Rong, & Guo, J. (2015). Construct validity of the chinese version of the self-care of heart failure index determined using structural equation modeling. *Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing*, *30*(3), 222–228. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JCN.0000000000000134>
- Khuzaimah, S., & Sharoni, A. (2016). Health education programmes to improve foot self-care practices and foot problems among older people with diabetes : a systematic review. <https://doi.org/10.1111/opn.12112>
- Kimball, S., Buck, G., Goldstein, D., Largaespada, E., Logan, L., Stebbins, D., ... Kalman-Yearout, K. (2010). Testing a Teaching Appointment and Geragogy-Based Approach to Medication Knowledge at Discharge, *35*(1), 31–40.
- LeBlanc, R. G., & Jacelon, C. S. (2018). Self-care among older people living with chronic conditions. *International Journal of Older People Nursing*, *13*(3), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1111/opn.12191>
- Lei, X., & Cai, M. (2018). Self-care ability and influencing factors in chronic heart failure patients. *Biomedical Research (India)*, *29*(3), 595–601. <https://doi.org/10.4066/biomedicalresearch.29-17-3205>
- Lestari, H. E. P. (2015). Strategi Pendidikan Kesehatan. Retrieved from

- <https://www.informasibidan.com/2015/10/strategi-pendidikan-kesehatan.html>
- Liou, H., Chen, H., Hsu, S., Lee, S., & Chang, C. (2015). ScienceDirect The effects of a self-care program on patients with heart failure. *Journal of the Chinese Medical Association*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcma.2015.06.004>
- Massey, E. K., Gregoor, P. J. H. S., Nette, R. W., Van Den Dorpel, M. A., Van Kooij, A., Zietse, R., ... Weimar, W. (2016). Early home-based group education to support informed decision-making among patients with end-stage renal disease: A multi-centre randomized controlled trial. *Nephrology Dialysis Transplantation*, *31*(5), 823–830. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ndt/gfv322>
- Moher, D., A. Liberati, Tetzlaff, J., & Altman, D. G. (2009). “Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement.” *Annals of Internal Medicine*, *264–69*(151 (4)).
- Moon, M. K., Yim, J. E., & Jeon, M. Y. (2018). The Effect of a Telephone-Based Self-management Program Led by Nurses on Self-care Behavior, Biological Index for Cardiac Function, and Depression in Ambulatory Heart Failure Patients. *Asian Nursing Research*, *12*(4), 251–257. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anr.2018.10.001>
- Nakre, P., & Harikiran, A. (2013). Effectiveness of oral health education programs: A systematic review. *Journal of International Society of Preventive and Community Dentistry*, *3*(2), 103. <https://doi.org/10.4103/2231-0762.127810>
- NYHA. (2019). New York Heart Association.
- Padila. (2013). *Buku Ajar Keperawatan Gerontik*. Yogyakarta: Nuha Medika.
- Parker, S., Powell, L., Hermann, J., Phelps, J., & Brown, B. (2011). Preferred educational delivery strategies among limited income older adults enrolled in community nutrition education programs. *Journal of Extension*, *49*(1), 1–10.
- Perez, M. A., & Luquis, R. R. (2016). *Cultural competence in health education and health promotion*. United States of America: wile.
- Polit, DF., and C. B. (2010). *Essentials of Nursing Research, Appraising Evidence for Nursing Practice*. Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer Health,.
- Ponikowski, P., Voors, A. A., Anker, S. D., Bueno, H., Cleland, J. G. F., Coats, A. J.

- S., ... Davies, C. (2016). 2016 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure. *European Heart Journal*, *37*(27), 2129-2200m. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehw128>
- Pratama, W. W., Nurhest, P. O. Y., & Sulistiowati, M. D. (2019). Pengaruh Telenursing Terhadap Perawatan Diri Pasien Dengan Penyakit Kronis. *Community of Publishing in Nursing (COPING)*, *7*(2), 87–94. Retrieved from <https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/coping/article/view/53714>
- Ranjbaran, S., Dehdari, T., Haghighi, K. sadeghniat, & Majdabadi, mahmood mahmoodi. (2015). Poor Sleep Quality in Patients after Coronary Artery Bypass Graft Surgery: An Intervention Study Using the PRECEDE-PROCEED Model, 1–8. Retrieved from <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26157457/>
- Rasmusson, K., Flattery, M., & Baas, L. S. (2015). American association of heart failure nurses position paper on educating patients with heart failure. *Heart and Lung*, *44*(2), 173–177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrtlng.2015.01.001>
- Reid, K. R. Y., Reid, K., Esquivel, J. H., Thomas, S. C., Rovnyak, V., Hinton, I., & Campbell, C. (2019). Using video education to improve outcomes in heart failure. *Heart and Lung*, *48*(5), 386–394. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrtlng.2019.05.004>
- Richard, A. A., & Shea, K. (2011). Delineation of Self-Care and Associated Concepts. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, *43*(3), 255–264. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1547-5069.2011.01404.x>
- Riegel, B., Jaarsma, T., & Strömberg, A. (2012). A middle-range theory of self-care of chronic illness. *Advances in Nursing Science*, *35*(3), 194–204. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ANS.0b013e318261b1ba>
- Rodis, O. M. M., & Locsin, R. C. (2019). The implementation of the Japanese Dental English core curriculum: Active learning based on peer-teaching and learning activities. *BMC Medical Education*, *19*(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-019-1675-y>
- Rujiwatthanakorn, D., Panpakdee, O., Malathum, P., & Tanomsup, S. (2011). Effectiveness of a self-management program for Thais with type 2 diabetes. *Thai*

- Journal of Nursing Research*, 15(2), 97–110. Retrieved from <https://login.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cin20&AN=2009193720&site=ehost-live>
- Seraji, M., & Rakhshani, F. (2018). Effect of education on practice and knowledge rate of hospitalized heart failure patients regarding their self-care behaviors and methods. *Journal of Research and Health*, 8(1), 61–67. <https://doi.org/10.29252/acadpub.jrh.8.1.61>
- Shah, V. O., Carroll, C., Mals, R., Ghahate, D., Bobelu, J., Sandy, P., ... Burge, M. R. (2015). A home-based educational intervention improves patient activation measures and diabetes health indicators among Zuni Indians. *PLoS ONE*, 10(5), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0125820>
- Shamseer, L., Moher, D., Clarke, M., Ghersi, D., Liberati, A., Petticrew, M., ... Whitlock, E. (2015). Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (prisma-p) 2015: Elaboration and explanation. *BMJ (Online)*, 349(January), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g7647>
- Sharma, M., & Romas, J. A. (2012). *theoretical Foundations of Health Education and Health Promotion* (kedua). Canada: Higher Education. Retrieved from www.jblearning.com
- Siabani, S., Driscoll, T., Davidson, P. M., & Leeder, S. R. (2015). Efficacy of a home-based educational strategy involving community health volunteers in improving self-care in patients with chronic heart failure in western Iran : A randomized controlled trial. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474515115585651>
- Smeltzer, suzanne C., Bare, B. G., Hinkle, J. L., & Cheever, kerry H. (2010). *Brunner and suddarth's ; textbook of Medical-Surgical Nursing* (12th ed.). Philadelphia.
- Sun, J., Zhang, Z.-W., Ma, Y.-X., Liu, W., & Wang, C.-Y. (2019). Application of self-care based on full-course individualized health education in patients with chronic heart failure and its influencing factors, 7(16). <https://doi.org/10.12998/wjcc.v7.i16.2165>
- Suri, H. (2020). *Systematic Reviews in Educational Research. Systematic Reviews in*

- Educational Research*. Australia: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-27602-7>
- Uchmanowicz, I., Jankowska-Polańska, B., Mazur, G., & Froelicher, E. S. (2017a). Cognitive deficits and self-care behaviors in elderly adults with heart failure. *Clinical Interventions in Aging*, *12*, 1565–1572.
<https://doi.org/10.2147/CIA.S140309>
- Uchmanowicz, I., Jankowska-Polańska, B., Mazur, G., & Froelicher, E. S. (2017b). Cognitive deficits and self-care behaviors in elderly adults with heart failure. *Clinical Interventions in Aging*, *12*, 1565–1572.
<https://doi.org/10.2147/CIA.S140309>
- Ulya, Z., & Iskandar, A. (2017). Pengaruh Pendidikan Kesehatan Dengan Media Poster Terhadap Pengetahuan Manajemen Hipertensi Pada Penderita Hipertensi. *Jurnal Keperawatan Soedirman*, *12*(1), 38.
<https://doi.org/10.20884/1.jks.2017.12.1.715>
- Vergnes, J. N., Marchal-Sixou, C., Nabet, C., Maret, D., & Hamel, O. (2010). Ethics in systematic reviews. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, *36*(12), 771–774.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.2010.039941>
- Wang, Q., Dong, L., Jian, Z., & Tang, X. (2017). Effectiveness of a PRECEDE-based education intervention on quality of life in elderly patients with chronic heart failure. *BMC Cardiovascular Disorders*, *17*(1), 1–7.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12872-017-0698-8>
- WHO. (2016). World Health organization.
- WHO. (2020). World Health Organization. Retrieved from
https://www.who.int/health-topics/ageing#tab=tab_1
- WHO Library. (2012). Health education: theoretical concepts, effective strategies and core competencies. Retrieved from
https://applications.emro.who.int/dsaf/EMRPUB_2012_EN_1362.pdf
- Wonggom, P., Tongpeth, J., Newman, P., Du, H. Y., & Clark, R. (2016). Effectiveness of using avatar-based technology in patient education for the improvement of chronic disease knowledge and self-care behavior: a systematic

review protocol. *JBI Database of Systematic Reviews and Implementation Reports*, 14(9), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.11124/JBISRIR-2016-003083>

LAMPIRAN

Lampiran 1 JBI Critical appraisal checklist for RCT

JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Randomized Controlled Trials

Reviewer _____ Date _____

Author _____ Year _____ Record Number _____

| | Yes | No | Unclear | NA |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Was true randomization used for assignment of participants to treatment groups? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Was allocation to treatment groups concealed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Were treatment groups similar at the baseline? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Were participants blind to treatment assignment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Were those delivering treatment blind to treatment assignment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Were outcomes assessors blind to treatment assignment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Were treatment groups treated identically other than the intervention of interest? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. 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"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. Were participants analyzed in the groups to which they were randomized? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. Were outcomes measured in the same way for treatment groups? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12. Was appropriate statistical analysis used? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Overall appraisal: Include Exclude Seek further info

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

Lampiran 2 JBI Critical Appraisal for Quasi eksperimen

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

Reviewer _____ Date _____

Author _____ Year _____ 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"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar? | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Was there a control group? | <input 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 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 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 type="checkbox"/> | <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"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. Was appropriate statistical analysis used? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Overall appraisal: Include Exclude Seek further info

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

Lampiran 3 Level evidence dan rekomendasi

| Level | Therapy / Prevention, Aetiology / Harm | Prognosis | Diagnosis | Differential diagnosis / symptom prevalence study | Economic and decision analyses |
|-------|--|---|--|--|---|
| 1a | SR (with homogeneity*) of RCTs | SR (with homogeneity*) of inception cohort studies; CDR” validated in different populations | SR (with homogeneity*) of Level 1 diagnostic studies; CDR” with 1b studies from different clinical centres | SR (with homogeneity*) of prospective cohort studies | SR (with homogeneity*) of Level 1 economic studies |
| 1b | Individual RCT (with narrow Confidence Interval”); | Individual inception cohort study with > 80% follow-up; CDR” validated in a single population | Validating** cohort study with good” ” ” ” reference standards; or CDR” tested within one clinical centre | Prospective cohort study with good follow-up**** | Analysis based on clinically sensible costs or alternatives; systematic review(s) of the evidence; and including multi-way sensitivity analyses |
| 1c | All or none§ | All or none case-series | Absolute SpPins and SnNouts” “ | All or none case-series | Absolute better-value or worse-value analyses ” ” ” “ |
| 2a | SR (with homogeneity*) of cohort | SR (with homogeneity*) of either | SR (with homogeneity*) of Level >2 | SR (with homogeneity*) of 2b and better | SR (with homogeneity*) of Level >2 economic |

| | studies | retrospective cohort studies or untreated control groups in RCTs | diagnostic studies | studies | studies |
|----|---|---|--|--|---|
| 2b | Individual cohort study (including low quality RCT; e.g., <80% follow-up) | Retrospective cohort study or follow-up of untreated control patients in an RCT; Derivation of CDR” or validated on split-sample§§§§ only | Exploratory** cohort study with good” ” ” reference standards; CDR” after derivation, or validated only on split-sample§§§§ or databases | Retrospective cohort study, or poor follow-up | Analysis based on clinically sensible costs or alternatives; limited review(s) of the evidence, or single studies; and including multi-way sensitivity analyses |
| 2c | “Outcomes” Research; Ecological studies | “Outcomes” Research | | Ecological studies | Audit or outcomes research |
| 3a | SR (with homogeneity *) of case-control studies | | SR (with homogeneity*) of 3b and better studies | SR (with homogeneity*) of 3b and better studies | SR (with homogeneity*) of 3b and better studies |
| 3b | Individual Case-Control Study | | Non-consecutive study; or without consistently applied reference standards | Non-consecutive cohort study, or very limited population | Analysis based on limited alternatives or costs, poor quality estimates of data, but including sensitivity analyses incorporating clinically sensible variations. |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| 4 | Case-series (and poor quality cohort and case-control studies) | Case-series (and poor quality prognostic cohort studies***) | Case-control study, poor or non-independent reference standard | Case-series or superseded reference standards | Analysis with no sensitivity analysis |
| 5 | Expert opinion without explicit critical appraisal, or based on physiology, bench research or “first principles” | Expert opinion without explicit critical appraisal, or based on physiology, bench research or “first principles” | Expert opinion without explicit critical appraisal, or based on physiology, bench research or “first principles” | Expert opinion without explicit critical appraisal, or based on physiology, bench research or “first principles” | Expert opinion without explicit critical appraisal, or based on economic theory or “first principles” |

Grades of Recommendation :

| | |
|---|--|
| A | consistent level 1 studies |
| B | consistent level 2 or 3 studies <i>or</i> extrapolations from level 1 studies |
| C | level 4 studies <i>or</i> extrapolations from level 2 or 3 studies |
| D | level 5 evidence <i>or</i> troublingly inconsistent or inconclusive studies of any level |

“Extrapolations” are where data is used in a situation that has potentially clinically important differences than the original study situation.

Lampiran 4 Risk of Bias Tools

| Bias domain | Source of bias | Support for judgment | Review authors' judgment (assess as low, unclear or high risk of bias) |
|--------------------|---|--|--|
| Selection bias | Random sequence generation | Describe the method used to generate the allocation sequence in sufficient detail to allow an assessment of whether it should produce comparable groups | Selection bias (biased allocation to interventions) due to inadequate generation of a randomised sequence |
| | Allocation concealment | Describe the method used to conceal the allocation sequence in sufficient detail to determine whether intervention allocations could have been foreseen before or during enrolment | Selection bias (biased allocation to interventions) due to inadequate concealment of allocations before assignment |
| Performance bias | Blinding of participants and personnel* | Describe all measures used, if any, to blind trial participants and researchers from knowledge of which intervention a participant received. Provide any information relating to whether the intended blinding was effective | Performance bias due to knowledge of the allocated interventions by participants and personnel during the study |
| Detection bias | Blinding of outcome assessment* | Describe all measures used, if any, to blind outcome assessment from knowledge of which intervention a participant received. Provide any information relating to whether the intended blinding was effective | Detection bias due to knowledge of the allocated interventions by outcome assessment |
| Attrition bias | Incomplete outcome data* | Describe the completeness of outcome data for each main outcome, including attrition and exclusions from the analysis. State whether attrition and exclusions were reported, the numbers in each intervention group (compared with total randomised participants), reasons for attrition or exclusions where reported, and any reinclusions in analyses for the review | Attrition bias due to amount, nature, or handling of incomplete outcome data |
| Reporting bias | Selective reporting | State how selective outcome reporting was examined and what was found | Reporting bias due to selective outcome reporting |
| Other bias | Anything else, ideally prespecified | State any important concerns about bias not covered in the other domains in the tool | Bias due to problems not covered elsewhere |

*Assessments should be made for each main outcome or class of outcomes.

Lampiran 5 Checklist PRISMA

| Section/topic | # | Checklist item | Reported on page # |
|---------------------------|---|---|--------------------|
| TITLE | | | |
| Title | 1 | Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both. | cover Line 2 |
| 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. | Page xii |
| INTRODUCTION | | | |
| Rationale | 3 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. | Page 1-3 |
| Objectives | 4 | Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS). | Page 6 |
| 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. | Page 39 |
| 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. | Page 39 |
| 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. | Page 40 |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|----|--|---------|
| Search | 8 | Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated. | Page 40 |
| 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). | Page 45 |
| 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. | Page 45 |
| Data items | 11 | List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made. | Page 49 |
| 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. | 48 |
| 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. | Page 51-52 |
| 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. | Page 52 |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|----|--|---------|
| 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). | Page 66 |
| 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. | Page 63 |
| Synthesis of results | 21 | Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. | Page 58 |
| 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). | Page 72 |
| 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). | Page 79 |
| Conclusions | 26 | Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. | Page 80 |
| 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.

Lampiran 6 SINTESIS GRID

| NO | Author, Year, Country | Title | Population | Study Design | Study Aim | Intervention | Instrumen and Follow Up | Outcome |
|----|--------------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| 1. | (Clark et al., 2015) Amerika Serikat | Health Status and Self-care Outcomes After an Educational Support Intervention for People With Chronic Heart Failure | Jumlah partisipan 50 pasien berusia 60 tahun lebih menderita penyakit jantung kronik | Randomized control trial | Menguji efek dari dukungan pendidikan dengan menggunakan strategi untuk meningkatkan kesehatan dan perawatan diri pada orang dewasa / tua dengan penyakit jantung kronik grade 1-3. | Pendidikan dan pengembangan keterampilan dengan tindak lanjut telepon disampaikan secara individual oleh perawat spesialis Fase pertama disampaikan selama periode 3 bulan pertama, bertemu setiap 10 hingga 14 hari selama 1 hingga 1,5 jam fase kedua , 3 bulan kedua pendidikan melalui telepon | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) • Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire (KCCQ) • Self-care of Heart Failure Index (SCHFI) | Hasil positif terlihat dalam beberapa variabel yaitu status kesehatan pada 3 bulan pertama dilaporkan meningkat pada kelompok intervensi (p=.013) dan 3 bulan kedua (p=.034). Hasil perawatan diri : pengetahuan meningkat dari waktu ke waktu (p=.000) dibanding awal. Kemampuan perawatan diri |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------------------|--|--|--------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | termasuk pemeliharaan perawatan direplikasi dengan keyakinan diri (p=.001), manajemen perawatan diri (p=.03) dan kepercayaan diri (p=.006) meningkat dari waktu ke waktu |
| 2. | (Moon et al., 2018), Korea | The Effect of a Telephone-Based Self-management Program Led by Nurses on Self-care Behavior, | Jumlah partisipan 38 orang, kelompok intervensi 18 kelompok kontrol 20, berusia 60-75 tahun Terdiagnosa HF 6 bulan sampai 10 tahun | Quasi eksperimen t | untuk menguji efek dari program dukungan manajemen diri berbasis telepon yang dipimpin oleh perawat pada perilaku | Kelompok eksperimen menerima program dukungan manajemen diri berbasis telepon, yang mencakup sesi pendidikan tatap muka selama 30 menit dan empat sesi konsultasi telepon dan pendidikan. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heart Failure Self-care Behavior 9-item (EHFScB-9) • Echocardiography and | Para peserta dalam kelompok eksperimen menunjukkan peningkatan skor perilaku perawatan diri yang signifikan (p <0,001), dan penurunan skor depresi (p =.001) dibandingkan |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|------------------------------------|---|---|---------------------|---|--|--|---|
| | | | | | perawatan diri, indeks biologis untuk fungsi jantung, dan depresi | Sesi pendidikan tatap muka dilakukan pada kunjungan pertama ke klinik rawat jalan. Setelah itu, konsultasi telepon mingguan dan sesi pendidikan dilakukan selama 4 minggu. | | dengan kelompok kontrol. |
| 3. | (Seraji & Rakhshani, 2018) Iran | Effect of education on practice and knowledge rate of hospitalized heart failure patients regarding their self-care behaviors and methods | Jumlah partisipan 140 pasien yang dirawat di Rumah sakit dengan HF, usia rata-rata 60 tahun | Quasi eksperimental | untuk menentukan efek pendidikan pada pengetahuan dan praktik pasien gagal jantung yang dirawat di rumah sakit mengenai perilaku perawatan diri mereka. | Pendidikan kesehatan diberikan melalui pidato menggunakan media buklet dan film. Kedua media diberikan kepada pasien | Kuesioner yang dibuat oleh para peneliti | skor pengetahuan kelompok intervensi (pre: 8.23±3.79, post: 21.93±2.32) p<0,001, kontrol (pre: 8.08±3.27, post: 10.10±2.03) p<0,0001. Praktik perawatan diri kelompok intervensi (pre: |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------|--|--|-----|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | 39.40±5.49, post: 66.04±3.44) p<0,001, kontrol (pre: 43.17±6.59, post: 45.33±3.64) p<0,001. |
| 4. | (Wang et al., 2017) Cina | Effectiveness of a PRECED E-based education intervention on quality of life in elderly patients with chronic heart failure | Partisipan berjumlah 62 pasien dengan CHF usia lebih dari 60 tahun | RCT | untuk menggunakan PRECEDE model untuk secara optimal menyesuaikan program promosi pendidikan kesehatan di antara pasien usia lanjut dengan CHF dan menyelidiki pengaruhnya terhadap | Kelompok intervensi dan kelompok kontrol sama-sama menerima perawatan konvensional namun pada Kelompok intervensi juga menerima 2 bulan intervensi pendidikan berdasarkan model PRECEDE selama 9 sesi dengan 60-90 menit setiap seminggu sekali, melalui | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Skala Perilaku Perawatan Diri Gagal Jantung Eropa (EHFScBS-9) pasien akan di follow up selama 3 bulan, selama follow up pasien disarankan melaporkan self-care setiap 2 minggu | Setelah intervensi, skor semua item kecuali item 9 (saya berolahraga secara teratur) dan skor total menurun secara signifikan pada kelompok intervensi dan secara signifikan berbeda dari yang di kelompok kontrol. Temuan ini |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------------------|---|--|----------------------|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | | depresi, perilaku perawatan diri, dan kualitas hidup | wawancara tatap muka, bahan tertulis, ceramah, tanya jawab sesi, diskusi, dan interaksi dengan pasien lain | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kuisisioner Kesehatan (PHQ-9) • Kuesioner Minnesota Living Heart Failure Questionnaire (MLHFQ) | menunjukkan bahwa intervensi pendidikan secara signifikan meningkatkan perilaku perawatan diri |
| 5. | (Liou et al., 2015) Taiwan | The effects of a self-care program on patients with heart failure | Jumlah partisipan sebanyak 131 pasien dan terdiagnosa CHF. Kelompok intervensi sebanyak 56 pasien dan kelompok kontrol 75 pasien. Pasien yang terdaftar telah melalui persetujuan tertulis | Quasi eksperimen tal | Menilai efektifitas program perawatan diri untuk meningkatkan pengetahuan terkait CHF dan evaluasi perubahan perawatan diri dibandingkan perawatan biasa | Tahap awal peneliti akan mengikuti pedoman praktik klinik yang dikembangkan oleh panel expert berdasarkan Riegel Self-Care Heart Failure Model. Kemudian dari program dan pengalaman tersebut mengembangkan booklet pengajaran dan rekaman video dalam bahasa mandarin dan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of the CHF questionnaire • self-care of HF index (SCHFI) telah ditranslasi kedalam bahasa mandarin dan telah ditinjau oleh ahli bahasa | Hasil 4 pengukuran perawatan diri menunjukkan perbedaan yang signifikan antara 2 kelompok. Efek program perawatan diri memiliki dampak yang positif pada kelompok intervensi namun tidak pada kelompok kontrol. Program perawatan diri |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | Taiwan Kelompok intervensi akan menerima sesi pelatihan perawatan diri sendiri selama 1 hari setelah 1 minggu masuk rumah sakit | | juga memiliki efek yang signifikan pada perilaku perawatan diri selama 3 bulan, hasil ini terutama pada pemeliharaan perawatan diri, manajemen perawatan diri dan kepercayaan perawatan diri. |
| 6. | (Siabani et al., 2015) Australia | Efficacy of a home- based education al strategy involving communi- ty health volunteer s in improvin- g self- | Jumlah partisipan 112 pasien CHF berada pada kelas II atau III NYHA | Randomize d control trial | Mengevalua- si efektivitas strategi pendidikan berbasis rumah menggunak- an CHV dalam meningkatk- an perawatan diri pasien dengan CHF | Kelompok intervensi pertama (CHV) pendidikan secara individual diberikan oleh relawan kesehatan dirumah pasien termasuk kepatuhan pengobatan, manajemen perawatan diri | • Self-care of heart failure index (SCHFI) | Komponen perawatan diri meningkat secara signifikan pada dua kelompok intervensi untuk besaran efek termasuk maintenance (FHP: 29.5 (11.87), CHV 26.2 (12.69), managemen (FHP: 31.3 (11.80), CHV: |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| | | care in patients with chronic heart failure in western Iran | | | dibandingkan dengan strategi pendidikan formal dengan kelompok kontrol yang menerima perawatan biasa di Iran barat | selama 2 jam Kelompok intervensi kedua (FHP) dikerjakan oleh seorang perawat dan dokter umum, kelas pendidikan selama 3 jam dengan istirahat 30 menit | | 29.4 (10.85) dan kepercayaan perawatan diri hanya mengalami sedikit peningkatan (FHP: 18.1 (16.69), CHV: 9.5 (16.55)) Kelompok FHP memiliki peningkatan lebih besar dibanding kelompok CHV. |
| 7. | (Sun et al., 2019) Cina | Application of self-care based on full-course individualized health education in patients with chronic heart failure | 100 partisipan terdiagnosis CHF oleh AHA dan termasuk kelas II atau lebih berdasarkan klasifikasi NYHA | Randomized control trial | Untuk menyelidiki penerapan perawatan diri berdasarkan pendidikan kesehatan individual kursus penuh (FCIHE) dan faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhinya pada | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kelompok kontrol menerima perawatan rutin, bimbingan kesehatan rutin dan tindak lanjut melalui telepon 2 minggu setelah keluar dari RS • Kelompok intervensi menerima FCIHE.. selama 3 hari | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-care of heart failure index (SCHFI) • 36-item short form health survey (SF-36) berisi delapan sub-skala, termasuk fungsi fisik, keterbatasan peran karena masalah | skor perilaku perawatan diri tidak menunjukkan perbedaan yang signifikan saat masuk antara kedua kelompok ($P > 0,05$). Namun, pada 3 dan 6 bulan setelah pulang, skor total pemeliharaan perawatan diri, |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|---|--|--------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| | | and its influencing factors | | | pasien dengan gagal jantung kronis (CHF). | rancangan dimodulasi dalam bentuk jadwal harian. Tindak lanjut dilakukan setelah pulang melalui platform medis berbasis internet. | fisik, sakit tubuh, persepsi kesehatan umum, vitalitas, fungsi sosial, pembatasan peran karena masalah emosional, dan kesehatan mental. | manajemen, kepercayaan diri, dan perilaku secara signifikan lebih tinggi pada kelompok intervensi daripada kelompok kontrol (P <0,05) |
| 8. | (Y. Chen et al., 2018) Cina | Effectiveness of a multidisciplinary disease management program on outcomes in patients with heart failure in | 62 partisipan dibagi dalam 2 kelompok dan terdiagnosis CHF dengan kelas NYHA II s/d IV | Randomized control trial | Menilai efektifitas MDMP pada kualitas hidup, kinerja fisik, gejala depresi, perilaku perawatan diri dan penerimaan kembali di rumah sakit | Pendidikan diawali oleh seorang ahli jantung termasuk pengenalan terkait penyakit jantung, pengendalian berat badan, pemantauan input dan output serta apa yang dilakukan jika kondisi memburuk, keterampilan perawatan diri, kepatuhan pengobatan dan rekomendasi diet disampaikan secara | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MLHFQ adalah kuesioner untuk menilai kualitas hidup • European Heart Failure Self-care Behavior Scale (EHFScBS) untuk mengukur | skor pada MLHFQ atau kualitas hidup sebagai hasil primer meningkat sebesar 37% pada kelompok kontrol dan. 66% pada kelompok MDMP (intervensi). Variasi dalam perilaku perawatan diri sebagai hasil |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------|--|--|-----------------|------------|-------------------------|---|
| | | China | | | pada pasien CHF | individual | perilaku perawatan diri | sekunder setelah intervensi keduanya signifikan pada hari 90 dan hari 180 -6.90 ± 1.00 P <0,001; -8.29 ± 0.88 P<0.001) masing-masing pada kelompok intervensi dibandingkan sebelum intervensi. |
|--|--|-------|--|--|-----------------|------------|-------------------------|---|