DAFTAR PUSTAKA

Agulnik, A., Aceltuno, A. M., Robles, L. N. M., Forbes, P. W., Vasquez, D. J. S., Mack, R., … Carlos, R.-G. (2017). Validation of a pediatric early warning system for hospitalized pediatric oncology patients in a resource-limited setting, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.30951

Agulnik, A., Forbes, P. W., Stenquist, N., Rodriguez-galindo, C., & Kleinman, M. (2016). Validasi Skor Peringatan Dini Pediatrik pada Pasien Onkologi Anak Rawat Inap dan Transplantasi Sel Punca Hematopoietik, *17*(April), 146–153.

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

Al-Sharbatti, S. S., & Aljumaa, L. I. (2012). Infant feeding patterns and risk of acute respiratory infections in Baghdad/Iraq. *Italian Journal of Public Health*, *9*(3), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.2427/7534

Almblad, A. C., Siltberg, P., Engvall, G., & Målqvist, M. (2018). Implementation of Pediatric Early Warning Score; Adherence to Guidelines and Influence of Context. *Journal of Pediatric Nursing*, *38*, 33–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pedn.2017.09.002

Appraisal, E., Steps, N., & Creator, C. (2018). Pediatric early warning score (PEWS). *Pediatric Emergency Medicine Practice*, 1–2.

Brayman. (2012). *Social Research Methods (4th)*.

Breslin, K., Marx, J., Hoffman, H., McBeth, R., & Pavuluri, P. (2014). Pediatric early warning score at time of emergency department disposition is associated with level of care. *Pediatric Emergency Care*, *30*(2), 97–103. https://doi.org/10.1097/PEC.0000000000000063

Brown, S. R., Garcia, D. M., & Agulnik, A. (2019). Scoping review of pediatric early warning systems (PEWS) in resource-limited and humanitarian

settings. *Frontiers in Pediatrics*, *6*(January). https://doi.org/10.3389/fped.2018.00410

Chaiyakulsil, C., & Pandee, U. (2015). Validation of pediatric early warning score in pediatric emergency department, *57im*, 694–698. https://doi.org/10.1111/ped.12595

Creswell, & W, J. (2012). *Educational research, Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative reseacrh (F. Edition (Ed); 4th ed)*.

David, A., Turner, & Cheifetz, I. (2005). *In Kliegman RM. Nelson textbook of pediatrics. 20th ed. Philadelphia*. Elsevier Inc.

Dean, N. P., Fenix, J. B., Spaeder, M., & Levin, A. (2017). Evaluation of a Pediatric Early Warning Score Across Different Subspecialty Patients, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1097/PCC.0000000000001176

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

Dharma. (2011). *Metodologi Penelitian Keperawatan (Edisi 1)*. CV. Trans Info Media.

Dharmawati, I., Setyaningtyas, A., & Kusumastuti, N. P. (2017). Profil pasien di gawat darurat medik anak di RSUD DR. Soetomo Surabaya. *Jurnal Ners*, *7*(2), 131–135.

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

Ennis, L. (2015). Paediatric early warning scores on a children ' s ward : a quality improvement initiative, *26*(7), 25–31.

Fanurik, D., Schmitz, M. L., Reach, K., Haynes, K., & Leatherman, I. (2015).

Hospital room or treatment room for pediatric inpatient procedures: which location do parents and children prefer? *Pain Res Manage*, *4*(2), 148–156.

Fitzsimons, J., MacDonell, R., Nicholson, A., & Martin, C. (2017). Paediatric early warning system (PEWS), (March), 1–26. Retrieved from https://www.hse.ie/eng/services/publications/clinical-strategy-and-programmes/pews-user-manual.pdf

Gold, D. L., Mihalov, L. K., & Cohen, D. M. (2014). Evaluating the Pediatric Early Warning Score, 1249–1256. https://doi.org/10.1111/acem.12514

Goldman, R. D., Scolnik, D., Chauvin-Kimoff, L., Farion, K. J., Ali, S., Lynch, T., … Klassen, T. P. (2009). Practice variations in the treatment of febrile infants among pediatric emergency physicians. *Pediatrics*, *124*(2), 439–445. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2007-3736

Groot, J. F. De, Damen, N., Loos, E. De, Steeg, L. Van De, Koopmans, L., Rosias, P., & Bruijn, M. (2018). Implementing paediatric early warning scores systems in the Netherlands : future implications. *BMC Pediatric*, *18*(128), 1–10.

Jofiro, G., Jemal, K., Beza, L., & Bacha Heye, T. (2018). Prevalence and associated factors of pediatric emergency mortality at Tikur Anbessa specialized tertiary hospital: A 5 year retrospective case review study. *BMC Pediatrics*, *18*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12887-018-1287-4

Kementrian Kesehatan RI. (2018). Peraturan Mentri Kesehatan Republik Indonesia No. 47 Tahun 2018 Tentang Pelayanan Kegawatdaruratan.

Kroeger, A. R., & Smith, A. H. (2017). Memprediksi penerimaan kembali yang tidak direncanakan ke unit perawatan intensif jantung pediatrik menggunakan Skor Peringatan Dini Pediatrik predischarge, (April), 4–7.

L, D., Mihalov, L. K., & Cohen, D. M. (2014). Evaluating the Pediatric Early Warning Score (PEWS) System For Admitted Patients in the Padiatric

Emergency Department. *Society For Academic Emergency Medicine*, *21*(11), 1249–1256. https://doi.org/10.1111/acem.12514.Evaluating

Latief, A., Pudjiadi H., A., Kushartono, H., & Fachrina, R. (2016). *Buku Panduan Pelayanan Emergensi, Rawat Intermediet dan rawat Intensif Anak*. Jakarta: Badan Penerbit Ikatan Dokter Anak Indonesia.

Lillitos, P. J., Hadley, G., & Maconochie, I. (2015). Can paediatric early warning scores (PEWS) be used to guide the need for hospital admission and predict signi fi cant illness in children presenting to the emergency department ? An assessment of PEWS diagnostic accuracy using sensitivity and speci fi c, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1136/emermed-2014-204355

Lotfi, A. B. M. (2017). Profil kematian pasien kurang 8 jam di instalasi gawat darurat RSUP. Dr. Wahidin Sudirohusodo Makassar. Retrieved from http://digilib.unhas.ac.id/uploaded_files/temporary/DigitalCollection/MGQwMDVmNTMwOTc5YmQ2ZDNiOGQwNTAxNTNkOTA2N2I3NTI2YjlmOQ==.pdf

Mangunatmadja, I. (2016). Pendekatan Klinis Berbagai Kasus Neurologi Anak yang Membutuhkan Pemeriksan Pencitraan. *Sari Pediatri*, *5*(2), 85. https://doi.org/10.14238/sp5.2.2003.85-90

Maryah Ardiyani, V., Titin Andri, M. W., & Eko, R. K. (2015). Analisis peran perawat terhadap waiting time dan length of stay pada ruang triage di instalasi gawat darurat rumah sakit dr Saiful Anwar Malang. *Jurnal CARE*, *3*(1), 39–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2010.04.038

Monaghan, A. (2005). Detecting and managing deterioration in children. *Paediatric Nursing*, *17*(1), 32–35.

Murti B. (2015). No Title. *Jurnal Kedokteran Indonesia*, *1*(1), 1–3.

Nanda, M. F. (2014). *Manajemen rumah sakit, manajemen pelayanan rawat inap*. Universitas Andalas.

Nielsen, K. R., Migita, R., Batra, M., Gennaro, J. L. Di, Roberts, J. S., & Weiss, N. S. (2015). Identifying High-Risk Children in the Emergency Department, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1177/0885066615571893

Niu, X., Tilford, B., Duffy, E., Kobayashi, H., & Ryan, K. (2016). Feasibility and Reliability of Pediatric Early Warning Score in the Emergency Department, *31*(2), 161–166. https://doi.org/10.1097/NCQ.0000000000000162

Nofiati. (2016). *Manajemen Pelayanan Rumah Sakit Pelayanan Rawat Inap yang Ideal*. Jakarta: Universitas Esa Unggul.

Nur Salam. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Ilmu Keperawatan*. Jakarta: Salemba Medika.

Oliveira, J. De, Miranda, F., Camargo, C. L. De, Portela, D. S., & Monaghan, A. (2017). Accuracy of a pediatric early warning score in the recognition of clinical, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1590/1518-8345.1733.2912

Parshuram, C. S., Hutchison, J., & Middaugh, K. (2009). Development and initial validation of the bedside paediatric early warning system score. *Critical Care*, *13*(4), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1186/cc7998

Peraturan Mentri Kesehatan Republik Indonesia Nomor 920/Men.Kes/Per/XII/86 Tentang Upaya Pelayanan Kesehatan Swasta di Bidang Medik. (2011).

Prafita Putra, A. I. (2017). *Panduan pelaksaan early warning system RSU Wiradadi Husada Banyumas*. Banyumas.

Race, A., Dudek, J., Gross, T., & Woolridge, D. (2017). The impact of a pediatric emergency department facility verification system on pediatric mortality rates in Arizona. *The Journal Of Emergency Medicine*, *52*(6), 894–901. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1016/j.jemermed.2017.02.011

Sandell, J. M., & Maconochie, I. K. (2016). Paediatric early warning systems (PEWS) in the ED, *33*(11), 2016–2018. https://doi.org/10.1136/emermed-2016-205877

Seiger, A. N., & Maconochie, I. (2013). Validity of Different Pediatric Early Warning Scores in the Emergency Department, *132*(4). https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2012-3594

Skaletzky, S. M., Raszynski, A., & Totapally, B. R. (2012). Validation of a modified pediatric early warning system score: A retrospective case-control study. *Clinical Pediatrics*, *51*(5), 431–435. https://doi.org/10.1177/0009922811430342

Solevåg, A. L., Eggen, E. H., Schröder, J., & Nakstad, B. (2013, August 26). Use of a Modified Pediatric Early Warning Score in a Department of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine. *PLoS ONE*. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0072534

Thorley et al. (2019). *No Title*.

Vredebregt, S. J., Moll, H. A., Smit, F. J., & Verhoeven, J. J. (2018). Recognizing critically ill children with a modified pediatric early warning score at the emergency department, a feasibility study. *European Journal of Pediatrics*, 229–234. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00431-018-3285-9

Wahyudi, P., Indriati, G., & Bayhakki. (2014). Gambaran Skor Pediatric Early Warning Score (Pews) Pada Pola Rujukan Pasien Anak Di Instalasi Gawat Darurat. *Jom Psik*, *1*(2), 1–8.

WHO. (2019). *Mortality among children aged 5–14*. Retrieved from https://www.who.int/gho/child_health/mortality/mortality_five_to_fourteen/en/

Wong, D. L. (2009). *Pedoman klinis Keperawatan Pediatric (Wong and Whaley's clinical manual of pediatric nursing). (4th ed). (Monica Eater & Sari Kurnianingsih, Penerjemah)*. Jakarta: EGC.

World Health Organization (WHO). (2007). Paediatric Mortality in 2005. Geneva : Department Health and Research WHO.

Zhu, C., Wu, X., Liang, Y., Ma, W., & Ren, L. (2015). The mortality of patients in a pediatric emergency department at a tertiary medical center in center: An observational study. *World Journal Emergency Medicine*, *6*(3), 212–216. https://doi.org/10.5847/wjem.j.1920

LAMPIRAN

LAMPIRAN 1

MOOSE Guidelines for Meta-Analyses and Systematic Reviews of Observational Studies*

	Topic	Page number
Title	Identify the study as a meta-analysis (or systematic review)	
Abstract	Use the journal's structured format	
Introduction	**Present:**	
	The clinical problem	
	The hypothesis	
	A statement of objectives that includes the study population, the condition of interest, the exposure or intervention, and the outcome(s) considered	
Sources	**Describe:**	
	Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators)	
	Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords	
	Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors	
	Databases and registries searched	
	Search software used, name and version, including special features used (e.g. explosion)	
	Use of hand searching (e.g, reference lists of obtained articles)	
	List of citations located and those excluded, including justification	
	Method of addressing articles published in languages other than English	
	Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies	
	Description of any contact with authors	
Study Selection	**Describe**	
	Types of study designs considered	
	Relevance or appropriateness of studies gathered for assessing the hypothesis to be tested	
	Rationale for the selection and coding of data (eg, sound clinical principles or convenience)	
	Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding, and inter-rater reliability)	
	Assessment of confounding (e.g. comparability of cases and controls in studies where appropriate)	
	Assessment of study quality, including blinding of quality assessors; stratification or regression on possible predictors of study results	
	Assessment of heterogeneity	
	Statistical methods (eg, complete description of fixed or random effects models, justification of whether the chosen models account for predictors of study results, dose-response models, or cumulative meta-analysis) in sufficient detail to be replicated	

Results	**Present**	
	A graph summarizing individual study estimates and the overall estimate	
	A table giving descriptive information for each included study	
	Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis)	
	Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings	
Discussion	**Discuss**	
	Strengths and weaknesses	
	Potential biases in the review process (eg, publication bias)	
	Assessment of quality of included studies	
	Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results	
	Generalization of conclusions (ie, appropriate for the data presented and within the domain of the literature review	
	Guidelines for future research	
	Disclosure of funding source	

*Modified from Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, Olkin I, Williamson GD, Rennie D, et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. JAMA 2000;283:2008–12.

LAMPIRAN 2

Appraisal Tool of Descriptive/Cross-Sectional Studies

How to use this appraisal tool

Three broad issues need to be considered when appraising the report of a descriptive/ cross-sectional study (e.g., a study that collects data on individuals at one time point using a survey or review of medical charts):

Are the results of the study valid?

What are the results?

Will the results help locally?

The 11 questions on the following pages are designed to help you think about these issues systematically. The first two questions are screening questions and can be answered quickly. If the answer to both is "yes", it is worth proceeding with the remaining questions. You are asked to record a "yes", "no" or "can't tell" to most of the questions. A number of italicized prompts are given after each question. These are designed to remind you why the question is important. Record your reasons for your answers in the spaces provided. These questions are adapted from Guyatt GH, Sackett DL, and Cook DJ, Users' guides to the medical literature. II. How to use an article about therapy or prevention. *JAMA* 1993; 270 (21): 2598-2601 and *JAMA* 1994; 271(1): 59-63

No.	**Screening Questions**	Yes	Can't tell	No
1.	**Did the study address a clearly focused issue?** *HINT: A question can be focused in terms of:* *– the population(s) studied* *– the health measure(s) studied (e.g., risk factor, preventive behavior, outcome*			
2.	**Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question?** *HINT: Consider* - *Is a descriptive/cross-sectional*			

	study an appropriate way of answering the question? - *Did it address the study question?*			
	Detailed Questions	Yes	Can't tell	No
3.	**Were the subjects recruited in an acceptable way?** *HINT: We are looking for selection bias which might compromise the generalizability of the findings:* *- Was the sample representative of a defined population?* *- Was everybody included who should have been included?*			
4.	**Were the measures accurately measured to reduce bias?** *HINT: We are looking for measurement or classification bias:* *- Did they use subjective or objective measurements?* *- Do the measures truly reflect what you want them to (have they been validated)?*			
5.	**Were the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?** *Consider:* - *if the setting for data collection was justified* - *if it is clear how data were collected (e.g., interview, questionnaire, chart review)* - *if the researcher has justified the methods chosen* - *if the researcher has made the methods explicit (e.g. for interview method, is there an indication of how interviews were conducted?)*			

6.	**Did the study have enough participants to minimize the play of chance?** *Consider:* - *if the result is precise enough to make a decision* - *if there is a power calculation. This will estimate how many subjects are needed to produce a reliable estimate of the measure(s) of interest.*			
7	**How are the results presented and what is the main result?** *Consider:* - *if, for example, the results are presented as a proportion of people experiencing an outcome such as risks, or as a measurement, such as mean or median differences, or as survival curves and hazards* - *how large this size of result is and how meaningful it is* - *how you would sum up the bottom-line result of the trial in one sentence*			
8.	**Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?** *Consider:* - *if there is an in-depth description of the analysis process* - *if sufficient data are presented to support the findings*			
9.	**Is there a clear statement of findings?** *Consider:* - *if the findings are explicit* - *if there is adequate discussion of the evidence both for and against the researchers' arguments*			

	- *if the researcher have discussed the credibility of their findings* - *if the findings are discussed in relation to the original research questions*			
10.	**Can the results be applied to the local population?** *HINT*: *Consider whether* - *The subjects covered in the study could be sufficiently different from your population to cause concern* - *Your local setting is likely to differ much from that of the study*			
11.	**How valuable is the research?** *Consider:* - *if the researcher discusses the contribution the study makes to existing knowledge (e.g. do they consider the findings in relation to current practice or policy,or relevant research-based literature?)* *if the researchers have discussed whether or how the findings can be transferred to other populations*	Write coment here		

1. Crtical Appraisal untuk artikel wahyudi

No.	**Screening Questions**	Yes	Can't tell	No
1.	**Did the study address a clearly focused issue?** *HINT: A question can be focused in terms of:* *– the population(s) studied* *– the health measure(s) studied (e.g., risk factor, preventive behavior, outcome*	√		
2.	**Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question?** *HINT: Consider* - *Is a descriptive/cross-sectional study an appropriate way of answering the question?* - *Did it address the study question?*	√		
	Detailed Questions	Yes	Can't tell	No
3.	**Were the subjects recruited in an acceptable way?** *HINT: We are looking for selection bias which might compromise the generalizability of the findings:* *- Was the sample representative of a defined population?* *- Was everybody included who should have been included?*	√		
4.	**Were the measures accurately measured to reduce bias?** *HINT: We are looking for measurement or classification bias:* *- Did they use subjective or objective measurements?* *- Do the measures truly reflect what you want them to (have they been validated)?*	√		
5.	**Were the data collected in a way**	√		

	that addressed the research issue? *Consider:* - *if the setting for data collection was justified* - *if it is clear how data were collected (e.g., interview, questionnaire, chart review)* - *if the researcher has justified the methods chosen* - *if the researcher has made the methods explicit (e.g. for interview method, is there an indication of how interviews were conducted?)*			
6.	**Did the study have enough participants to minimize the play of chance?** *Consider:* - *if the result is precise enough to make a decision* - *if there is a power calculation. This will estimate how many subjects are needed to produce a reliable estimate of the measure(s) of interest.*		√	
7	**How are the results presented and what is the main result?** *Consider:* - *if, for example, the results are presented as a proportion of people experiencing an outcome such as risks, or as a measurement, such as mean or median differences, or as survival curves and hazards* - *how large this size of result is and how meaningful it is* - *how you would sum up the bottom-line result of the trial in one sentence*	√		

8.	**Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?** *Consider:* - *if there is an in-depth description of the analysis process* - *if sufficient data are presented to support the findings*	√		
9.	**Is there a clear statement of findings?** *Consider:* - *if the findings are explicit* - *if there is adequate discussion of the evidence both for and against the researchers' arguments* - *if the researcher have discussed the credibility of their findings* - *if the findings are discussed in relation to the original research questions*	√		
10.	**Can the results be applied to the local population?** *HINT*: *Consider whether* - *The subjects covered in the study could be sufficiently different from your population to cause concern* - *Your local setting is likely to differ much from that of the study*	√		
11.	**How valuable is the research?** *Consider:* - *if the researcher discusses the contribution the study makes to existing knowledge (e.g. do they consider the findings in relation to current practice or policy,or relevant research-based*	Write coment here Ya, peneliti telah mendiskusikan kontibusi penelitian terhadap pengetahuan yang ada dan peneliti juga telah membahas bahwa hasil penelitiannya dapat dijadikan dasar atau acuan untuk penelitian selanjutnya.		

	literature?) - *if the researchers have discussed whether or how the findings can be transferred to other populations*	

2. Crtical Appraisal untuk artikel Breslin

No.	**Screening Questions**	Yes	Can't tell	No
1.	**Did the study address a clearly focused issue?** *HINT: A question can be focused in terms of:* *– the population(s) studied* *– the health measure(s) studied (e.g., risk factor, preventive behavior, outcome*	√		
2.	**Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question?** *HINT: Consider* - *Is a descriptive/cross-sectional study an appropriate way of answering the question?* - *Did it address the study question?*	√		
	Detailed Questions	Yes	Can't tell	No
3.	**Were the subjects recruited in an acceptable way?** *HINT: We are looking for selection bias which might compromise the generalizability of the findings:* *- Was the sample representative of a defined population?* *- Was everybody included who should have been included?*	√		
4.	**Were the measures accurately measured to reduce bias?** *HINT: We are looking for measurement or classification bias:* *- Did they use subjective or objective measurements?* *- Do the measures truly reflect what you want them to (have they been validated)?*	√		
5.	**Were the data collected in a way**	√		

	that addressed the research issue? *Consider:* - *if the setting for data collection was justified* - *if it is clear how data were collected (e.g., interview, questionnaire, chart review)* - *if the researcher has justified the methods chosen* - *if the researcher has made the methods explicit (e.g. for interview method, is there an indication of how interviews were conducted?)*			
6.	**Did the study have enough participants to minimize the play of chance?** *Consider:* - *if the result is precise enough to make a decision* - *if there is a power calculation. This will estimate how many subjects are needed to produce a reliable estimate of the measure(s) of interest.*	√		
7	**How are the results presented and what is the main result?** *Consider:* - *if, for example, the results are presented as a proportion of people experiencing an outcome such as risks, or as a measurement, such as mean or median differences, or as survival curves and hazards* - *how large this size of result is and how meaningful it is* - *how you would sum up the bottom-line result of the trial in one sentence*	√		

8.	**Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?** *Consider:* - *if there is an in-depth description of the analysis process* - *if sufficient data are presented to support the findings*	√		
9.	**Is there a clear statement of findings?** *Consider:* - *if the findings are explicit* - *if there is adequate discussion of the evidence both for and against the researchers' arguments* - *if the researcher have discussed the credibility of their findings* - *if the findings are discussed in relation to the original research questions*	√		
10.	**Can the results be applied to the local population?** *HINT*: *Consider whether* - *The subjects covered in the study could be sufficiently different from your population to cause concern* - *Your local setting is likely to differ much from that of the study*	√		
11.	**How valuable is the research?** *Consider:* - *if the researcher discusses the contribution the study makes to existing knowledge (e.g. do they consider the findings in relation to current practice or policy,or relevant research-based*	Write coment here Ya, peneliti telah mendiskusikan kontibusi penelitian terhadap pengetahuan yang ada		

	literature?) - *if the researchers have discussed whether or how the findings can be transferred to other populations*	

3. Crtical Appraisal untuk artikel Elita

No.	**Screening Questions**	Yes	Can't tell	No
1.	**Did the study address a clearly focused issue?** *HINT: A question can be focused in terms of:* *– the population(s) studied* *– the health measure(s) studied (e.g., risk factor, preventive behavior, outcome*	√		
2.	**Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question?** *HINT: Consider* - *Is a descriptive/cross-sectional study an appropriate way of answering the question?* - *Did it address the study question?*	√		
	Detailed Questions	Yes	Can't tell	No
3.	**Were the subjects recruited in an acceptable way?** *HINT: We are looking for selection bias which might compromise the generalizability of the findings:* *- Was the sample representative of a defined population?* *- Was everybody included who should have been included?*	√		
4.	**Were the measures accurately measured to reduce bias?** *HINT: We are looking for measurement or classification bias:* *- Did they use subjective or objective measurements?* *- Do the measures truly reflect what you want them to (have they been validated)?*	√		

5.	**Were the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?** *Consider:* - *if the setting for data collection was justified* - *if it is clear how data were collected (e.g., interview, questionnaire, chart review)* - *if the researcher has justified the methods chosen* - *if the researcher has made the methods explicit (e.g. for interview method, is there an indication of how interviews were conducted?)*	√		
6.	**Did the study have enough participants to minimize the play of chance?** *Consider:* - *if the result is precise enough to make a decision* - *if there is a power calculation. This will estimate how many subjects are needed to produce a reliable estimate of the measure(s) of interest.*	√		
7	**How are the results presented and what is the main result?** *Consider:* - *if, for example, the results are presented as a proportion of people experiencing an outcome such as risks, or as a measurement, such as mean or median differences, or as survival curves and hazards* - *how large this size of result is and how meaningful it is* - *how you would sum up the*	√		

	bottom-line result of the trial in one sentence			
8.	**Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?** *Consider:* - *if there is an in-depth description of the analysis process* - *if sufficient data are presented to support the findings*	√		
9.	**Is there a clear statement of findings?** *Consider:* - *if the findings are explicit* - *if there is adequate discussion of the evidence both for and against the researchers' arguments* - *if the researcher have discussed the credibility of their findings* - *if the findings are discussed in relation to the original research questions*	√		
10.	**Can the results be applied to the local population?** *HINT*: *Consider whether* - *The subjects covered in the study could be sufficiently different from your population to cause concern* - *Your local setting is likely to differ much from that of the study*	√		
11.	**How valuable is the research?** *Consider:* - *if the researcher discusses the contribution the study makes to existing knowledge (e.g. do they consider the findings in relation to current practice or*	Write coment here Ya, peneliti telah mendiskusikan kontibusi penelitian terhadap pengetahuan yang ada		

	policy,or relevant research-based literature?) - *if the researchers have discussed whether or how the findings can be transferred to other populations*	

4. Crtical Appraisal untuk artikel Chaiyakulsil

No.	**Screening Questions**	Yes	Can't tell	No
1.	**Did the study address a clearly focused issue?** *HINT: A question can be focused in terms of:* *– the population(s) studied* *– the health measure(s) studied (e.g., risk factor, preventive behavior, outcome*	√		
2.	**Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question?** *HINT: Consider* - *Is a descriptive/cross-sectional study an appropriate way of answering the question?* - *Did it address the study question?*	√		
	Detailed Questions	Yes	Can't tell	No
3.	**Were the subjects recruited in an acceptable way?** *HINT: We are looking for selection bias which might compromise the generalizability of the findings:* *- Was the sample representative of a defined population?* *- Was everybody included who should have been included?*	√		
4.	**Were the measures accurately measured to reduce bias?** *HINT: We are looking for measurement or classification bias:* *- Did they use subjective or objective measurements?* *- Do the measures truly reflect what you want them to (have they been validated)?*	√		
5.	**Were the data collected in a way**	√		

	that addressed the research issue? *Consider:* - *if the setting for data collection was justified* - *if it is clear how data were collected (e.g., interview, questionnaire, chart review)* - *if the researcher has justified the methods chosen* - *if the researcher has made the methods explicit (e.g. for interview method, is there an indication of how interviews were conducted?)*			
6.	**Did the study have enough participants to minimize the play of chance?** *Consider:* - *if the result is precise enough to make a decision* - *if there is a power calculation. This will estimate how many subjects are needed to produce a reliable estimate of the measure(s) of interest.*	√		
7	**How are the results presented and what is the main result?** *Consider:* - *if, for example, the results are presented as a proportion of people experiencing an outcome such as risks, or as a measurement, such as mean or median differences, or as survival curves and hazards* - *how large this size of result is and how meaningful it is* - *how you would sum up the bottom-line result of the trial in one sentence*	√		

8.	**Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?** *Consider:* - *if there is an in-depth description of the analysis process* - *if sufficient data are presented to support the findings*	√		
9.	**Is there a clear statement of findings?** *Consider:* - *if the findings are explicit* - *if there is adequate discussion of the evidence both for and against the researchers' arguments* - *if the researcher have discussed the credibility of their findings* - *if the findings are discussed in relation to the original research questions*	√		
10.	**Can the results be applied to the local population?** *HINT*: *Consider whether* - *The subjects covered in the study could be sufficiently different from your population to cause concern* - *Your local setting is likely to differ much from that of the study*	√		
11.	**How valuable is the research?** *Consider:* - *if the researcher discusses the contribution the study makes to existing knowledge (e.g. do they consider the findings in relation to current practice or policy,or relevant research-based*	Write coment here Ya, peneliti telah mendiskusikan kontibusi penelitian terhadap pengetahuan yang ada dan peneliti juga memaparkan bahwa hasil penelitiannya dijadikan acuan untuk penelitian selanjutnya.		

	literature?) - *if the researchers have discussed whether or how the findings can be transferred to other populations*	

5. Crtical Appraisal untuk artikel Vredebregt

No.	**Screening Questions**	Yes	Can't tell	No
1.	**Did the study address a clearly focused issue?** *HINT: A question can be focused in terms of:* *– the population(s) studied* *– the health measure(s) studied (e.g., risk factor, preventive behavior, outcome*	√		
2.	**Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question?** *HINT: Consider* - *Is a descriptive/cross-sectional study an appropriate way of answering the question?* - *Did it address the study question?*	√		
	Detailed Questions	Yes	Can't tell	No
3.	**Were the subjects recruited in an acceptable way?** *HINT: We are looking for selection bias which might compromise the generalizability of the findings:* *- Was the sample representative of a defined population?* *- Was everybody included who should have been included?*	√		
4.	**Were the measures accurately measured to reduce bias?** *HINT: We are looking for measurement or classification bias:* *- Did they use subjective or objective measurements?* *- Do the measures truly reflect what you want them to (have they been validated)?*	√		
5.	**Were the data collected in a way**	√		

	that addressed the research issue? *Consider:* - *if the setting for data collection was justified* - *if it is clear how data were collected (e.g., interview, questionnaire, chart review)* - *if the researcher has justified the methods chosen* - *if the researcher has made the methods explicit (e.g. for interview method, is there an indication of how interviews were conducted?)*			
6.	**Did the study have enough participants to minimize the play of chance?** *Consider:* - *if the result is precise enough to make a decision* - *if there is a power calculation. This will estimate how many subjects are needed to produce a reliable estimate of the measure(s) of interest.*	√		
7	**How are the results presented and what is the main result?** *Consider:* - *if, for example, the results are presented as a proportion of people experiencing an outcome such as risks, or as a measurement, such as mean or median differences, or as survival curves and hazards* - *how large this size of result is and how meaningful it is* - *how you would sum up the bottom-line result of the trial in one sentence*	√		

8.	**Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?** *Consider:* - *if there is an in-depth description of the analysis process* - *if sufficient data are presented to support the findings*	√		
9.	**Is there a clear statement of findings?** *Consider:* - *if the findings are explicit* - *if there is adequate discussion of the evidence both for and against the researchers' arguments* - *if the researcher have discussed the credibility of their findings* - *if the findings are discussed in relation to the original research questions*	√		
10.	**Can the results be applied to the local population?** *HINT*: *Consider whether* - *The subjects covered in the study could be sufficiently different from your population to cause concern* - *Your local setting is likely to differ much from that of the study*	√		
11.	**How valuable is the research?** *Consider:* - *if the researcher discusses the contribution the study makes to existing knowledge (e.g. do they consider the findings in relation to current practice or policy,or relevant research-based*	Write coment here Ya, peneliti telah mendiskusikan kontibusi penelitian terhadap pengetahuan yang ada dan peneliti juga memaparkan bahwa hasil penelitiannya dijadikan acuan untuk penelitian selanjutnya.		

	literature?) - *if the researchers have discussed whether or how the findings can be transferred to other populations*	