

# LAMPIRAN

## Lampiran 1 SK Pembimbing



**UNIVERSITAS GALUH**  
**FAKULTAS ILMU KESEHATAN**  
SI KEPERAWATAN – SI KEBIDANAN – PROFESI NERS – PROFESI BIDAN  
Kampus : Jalan. R.E. Martadinata No. 150 Ciamis 46274 Nomor Kontak: 0821-1790-9060  
website: fikes.unigal.ac.id / e-mail: fikes@unigal.ac.id

**SURAT KEPUTUSAN**  
**DEKAN FAKULTAS ILMU KESEHATAN UNIVERSITAS GALUH**  
**NOMOR : 66 /401/SK/AK/D/XI/2025**  
**TENTANG**  
**PENGANGKATAN PEMBIMBING KARYA ILMIAH AKHIR NERS (KIAN)**  
**PROGRAM STUDI PENDIDIKAN PROFESI NERS TAHUN AKADEMIK 2025/2026**  
**FAKULTAS ILMU KESEHATAN UNIVERSITAS GALUH**

**DEKAN FAKULTAS ILMU KESEHATAN UNIVERSITAS GALUH**

- MENIMBANG** : 1. Bahwa untuk kelancaran kegiatan Bimbingan Karya Ilmiah Akhir Ners (KIAN) perlu diangkat pembimbing Karya Ilmiah Akhir Ners (KIAN).
2. Bahwa untuk legalitas pembimbing dalam melakukan kegiatan bimbingan Karya Ilmiah Akhir Ners perlu di terbitkan Surat Keputusan Dekan.
- MENGINGAT** : 1. Undang-undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2012 tentang Pendidikan Tinggi;
1. Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 4 Tahun 2014 tentang Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Tinggi dan Pengelolaan Pendidikan Tinggi;
2. Permendikbud nomor 3 Tahun 2020 tentang Standar Nasional Perguruan Tinggi;
3. Keputusan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Nomor 184/U/2001 tentang Pedoman Pengawasan, Pengendalian dan Pembinaan Program Diploma, Sarjana dan Pascasarjana di Perguruan Tinggi;
4. Surat Keputusan Yayasan Pendidikan Galuh Ciamis Nomor 1 Tahun 2025 tentang Statuta Universitas Galuh;
5. Peraturan Rektor Universitas Galuh Nomor 1 Tahun 2025 tentang Pedoman Akademik Universitas Galuh Tahun 2025;
6. Surat Keputusan Rektor Universitas Galuh Nomor : 262/4123/SK/G/VIII/2023 Tanggal 26 Agustus 2023 tentang Pemberhentian dan Pengangkatan Dekan Fakultas Ilmu Kesehatan Universitas Galuh Masa Jabatan 2023-2027;
- MEMPERHATIKAN** : Surat Ajuan dari Ketua Program Studi Ilmu Keperawatan Fakultas Ilmu Kesehatan Universitas Galuh Nomor 86/1490/SP/AK/Ka.Prodi\_Kep/XI/2025 perihal Permohonan SK Pembimbing KIAN.
- MEMUTUSKAN**
- MENETAPKAN** :
- PERTAMA** : Nama : **YUYUN RAHAYU**  
Nomor Pokok : **1490125025**  
Program Studi : Pendidikan Profesi Ners
- KEDUA** : Mengangkat Pembimbing KIAN mahasiswa seperti yang tertulis pada diktum pertama sebagai berikut:  
Pembimbing I : **Siti Rohimah, S.Kep., Ners., M.Kep.**  
Pembimbing II : **Nina Rosdiana, S.Kp., M.Kep.**
- KETIGA** : Tugas dan wewenang pembimbing KIAN:  
a. Pembimbing KIAN ditugaskan untuk membimbing dan mengarahkan, dan memberikan masukan kepada mahasiswa dalam proses penulisan KIAN hingga selesai.  
b. Dosen Pembimbing wajib memastikan bahwa KIAN yang disusun sesuai dengan standar akademik yang berlaku di Program Studi Profesi Ners Fakultas Ilmu Kesehatan Universitas Galuh  
c. Pembimbingan KIAN dilaksanakan secara berkala sesuai dengan ketentuan yang berlaku.
- KEEMPAT** : Surat Keputusan ini berlaku sejak tanggal ditetapkan hingga mahasiswa menyelesaikan KIAN dan dinyatakan lulus sidang KIAN, dan apabila di kemudian hari ternyata terdapat kekeliruan dalam Surat Keputusan ini, akan dilakukan perbaikan sebagaimana mestinya.

Ditetapkan : Ciamis  
Pada Tanggal : 6 November 2025  
Dekan



**Dr. Tiara R. S. Kep., Ners., MM., M.Kep.**  
NIDK-11.3112770275

## Lampiran 2 JBI Checklist



### JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL TOOL JBI CHECKLIST FOR COHORT STUDIES

Assessor : Yuyun Rahayu  
 Study Author : Maddani et al.,  
 Date of Appraisal : 17 April 2026  
 Study Title : *Evaluation of the quality of cardiopulmonary resuscitation provided by the emergency response team at a tertiary care hospital*  
 Study Year : 2022

| No. | Internal Validity                                                                                          | Yes | No | Unclear | N/A |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|-----|
| 1.  | Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population?                                        | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 2.  | Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups?               | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 3.  | Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?                                                     | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 4.  | Were confounding factors identified?                                                                       | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 5.  | Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?                                                   | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 6.  | Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)? | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 7.  | Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?                                                    | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 8.  | Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur?                    | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 9.  | Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored?          |     | ✓  |         |     |
| 10. | Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized?                                                  |     | ✓  |         |     |
| 11. | Was appropriate statistical analysis used?                                                                 | ✓   |    |         |     |

|                    |           |         |
|--------------------|-----------|---------|
| Overall appraisal: | Include ✓ | Exclude |
|--------------------|-----------|---------|

|                                          |
|------------------------------------------|
| Comments: layak dilakukan review (81,8%) |
|------------------------------------------|



**JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL TOOL**  
**JBI CHECKLIST FOR COHORT STUDIES**

Assessor : Yuyun Rahayu  
 Study Author : Uppiretla et al.,  
 Date of Appraisal : 17 April 2026  
 Study Title : *Effects of Chest Compression Fraction on Return of Spontaneous Circulation in Patients with Cardiac Arrest; a Brief Report*  
 Study Year : 2020

| No. | Internal Validity                                                                                          | Yes | No | Unclear | N/A |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|-----|
| 1.  | Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population?                                        | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 2.  | Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups?               |     |    | ✓       |     |
| 3.  | Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?                                                     | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 4.  | Were confounding factors identified?                                                                       | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 5.  | Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?                                                   | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 6.  | Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)? | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 7.  | Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?                                                    | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 8.  | Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur?                    | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 9.  | Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored?          |     | ✓  |         |     |
| 10. | Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized?                                                  |     | ✓  |         |     |
| 11. | Was appropriate statistical analysis used?                                                                 | ✓   |    |         |     |

|                    |           |         |
|--------------------|-----------|---------|
| Overall appraisal: | Include ✓ | Exclude |
|--------------------|-----------|---------|

|                                          |
|------------------------------------------|
| Comments: layak dilakukan review (72,7%) |
|------------------------------------------|



**JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL TOOL**  
**JBI CHECKLIST FOR COHORT STUDIES**

**Assessor** : Yuyun Rahayu  
**Study Author** : Alqudah et al.,  
**Date of Appraisal** : 17 April 2026  
**Study Title** : *The Impact Of A High-Performance Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation Protocol On Survival From Out-Of Hospital Cardiac Arrest Switessed By Paramedics*  
**Study Year** : 2022

| No. | Internal Validity                                                                                          | Yes | No | Unclear | N/A |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|-----|
| 1.  | Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population?                                        | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 2.  | Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups?               | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 3.  | Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?                                                     | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 4.  | Were confounding factors identified?                                                                       | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 5.  | Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?                                                   | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 6.  | Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)? | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 7.  | Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?                                                    | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 8.  | Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur?                    | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 9.  | Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored?          | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 10. | Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized?                                                  |     |    | ✓       |     |
| 11. | Was appropriate statistical analysis used?                                                                 | ✓   |    |         |     |

|                           |                  |               |
|---------------------------|------------------|---------------|
| <b>Overall appraisal:</b> | <b>Include ✓</b> | <b>Exlude</b> |
|---------------------------|------------------|---------------|

|                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Comments:</b> layak dilakukan review (90,9%) |
|-------------------------------------------------|



**JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL TOOL**  
**JBI CHECKLIST FOR COHORT STUDIES**

**Assessor** : Yuyun Rahayu

**Study Author** : Chen et al.

**Date of Appraisal** : 17 April 2026

**Study Title** : *The Effect of Implementing Mechanical Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation Devices on Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest Patients in an Urban City of Taiwan*

**Study Year** : 2021

| No. | Internal Validity                                                                                          | Yes | No | Unclear | N/A |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|-----|
| 1.  | Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population?                                        | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 2.  | Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups?               | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 3.  | Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?                                                     | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 4.  | Were confounding factors identified?                                                                       | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 5.  | Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?                                                   | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 6.  | Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)? | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 7.  | Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?                                                    | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 8.  | Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur?                    | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 9.  | Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored?          |     | ✓  |         |     |
| 10. | Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized?                                                  | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 11. | Was appropriate statistical analysis used?                                                                 | ✓   |    |         |     |

|                           |                  |                |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| <b>Overall appraisal:</b> | <b>Include ✓</b> | <b>Exclude</b> |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------|

|                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Comments:</b> layak dilakukan review (90,9%) |
|-------------------------------------------------|



**JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL TOOL**  
**JBI CHECKLIST FOR ASSESSMENT OF RISK OF BIAS FOR**  
**RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIALS**

**Assessor** : Yuyun Rahayu  
**Study Author** : Goharani et al.,  
**Date of Appraisal** : 17 April 2026  
**Study Title** : *Real-Time Compression Feedback For Patients With In-Hospital Cardiac Arrest: A Multi-Center Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial*  
**Study Year** : 2019

| No. | Internal Validity                                                                                                                                                                    | Yes | No | Unclear | N/A |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|-----|
| 1.  | Was true randomization used for assignment of participants to treatment groups?                                                                                                      | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 2.  | Was allocation to treatment groups concealed?                                                                                                                                        | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 3.  | Were treatment groups similar at the baseline?                                                                                                                                       | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 4.  | Were participants blind to treatment assignment?                                                                                                                                     | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 5.  | Were those delivering the treatment blind to treatment assignment?                                                                                                                   |     | ✓  |         |     |
| 6.  | Were treatment groups treated identically other than the intervention of interest?                                                                                                   | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 7.  | Were outcome assessors blind to treatment assignment?                                                                                                                                | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 8.  | Were outcomes measured in the same way for treatment groups?                                                                                                                         | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 9.  | Were outcomes measured in a reliable way                                                                                                                                             | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 10. | Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analysed?                                                    | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 11. | Were participants analysed in the groups to which they were randomized?                                                                                                              | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 12. | Was appropriate statistical analysis used?                                                                                                                                           |     | ✓  |         |     |
| 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? | ✓   |    |         |     |

|                           |                  |                |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| <b>Overall appraisal:</b> | <b>Include ✓</b> | <b>Exclude</b> |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------|

|                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Comments:</b> layak dilakukan review (84,6%) |
|-------------------------------------------------|



**JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL TOOL**  
**JBI CHECKLIST FOR COHORT STUDIES**

**Assessor** : Yuyun Rahayu  
**Study Author** : Breuer-kaiser et al.  
**Date of Appraisal** : 17 April 2026  
**Study Title** : *Use of CPR Feedback Devices To Treat Out-Of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest In Germany: Associated With Improved ROSC-Rates, But Infrequent Usage, In A Registry-Based Analysis Of 107,548 Cases*  
**Study Year** : 2024

| No. | Internal Validity                                                                                          | Yes | No | Unclear | N/A |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|-----|
| 1.  | Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population?                                        | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 2.  | Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups?               | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 3.  | Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?                                                     | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 4.  | Were confounding factors identified?                                                                       | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 5.  | Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?                                                   | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 6.  | Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)? | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 7.  | Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?                                                    | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 8.  | Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur?                    | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 9.  | Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored?          |     | ✓  |         |     |
| 10. | Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized?                                                  | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 11. | Was appropriate statistical analysis used?                                                                 | ✓   |    |         |     |

|                           |                  |                |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| <b>Overall appraisal:</b> | <b>Include ✓</b> | <b>Exclude</b> |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------|

|                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Comments:</b> layak dilakukan review (90,9%) |
|-------------------------------------------------|



**JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL TOOL**  
**JBI CHECKLIST FOR COHORT STUDIES**

Assessor : Yuyun Rahayu  
Study Author : Vaillancourt et al.  
Date of Appraisal : 17 April 2026  
Study Title : *The Impact of Increased Chest Compression Fraction on Survival for Out-of-Hospital Cardiac arrest Patients with a Non-Shockable Initial Rhythm*  
Study Year : 2021

| No. | Internal Validity                                                                                          | Yes | No | Unclear | N/A |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|-----|
| 1.  | Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population?                                        | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 2.  | Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups?               | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 3.  | Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?                                                     | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 4.  | Were confounding factors identified?                                                                       | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 5.  | Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?                                                   | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 6.  | Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)? | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 7.  | Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?                                                    | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 8.  | Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur?                    | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 9.  | Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored?          |     | ✓  |         |     |
| 10. | Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized?                                                  |     | ✓  |         |     |
| 11. | Was appropriate statistical analysis used?                                                                 | ✓   |    |         |     |

|                    |           |         |
|--------------------|-----------|---------|
| Overall appraisal: | Include ✓ | Exclude |
|--------------------|-----------|---------|

|                                          |
|------------------------------------------|
| Comments: layak dilakukan review (81,8%) |
|------------------------------------------|



**JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL TOOL**  
**JBI CHECKLIST FOR COHORT STUDIES**

Assessor : Yuyun Rahayu  
Study Author : Oh et al.  
Date of Appraisal : 17 April 2026  
Study Title : *ROSC Rates And Live Discharge Rates After Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation By Different CPR Teams- A Retrospective Cohort Study*  
Study Year : 2017

| No. | Internal Validity                                                                                          | Yes | No | Unclear | N/A |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|-----|
| 1.  | Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population?                                        | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 2.  | Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups?               | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 3.  | Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?                                                     | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 4.  | Were confounding factors identified?                                                                       | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 5.  | Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?                                                   | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 6.  | Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)? | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 7.  | Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?                                                    | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 8.  | Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur?                    | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 9.  | Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored?          |     | ✓  |         |     |
| 10. | Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized?                                                  |     | ✓  |         |     |
| 11. | Was appropriate statistical analysis used?                                                                 | ✓   |    |         |     |

|                    |           |         |
|--------------------|-----------|---------|
| Overall appraisal: | Include ✓ | Exclude |
|--------------------|-----------|---------|

|                                          |
|------------------------------------------|
| Comments: layak dilakukan review (81,8%) |
|------------------------------------------|



**JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL TOOL**  
**JBI CHECKLIST FOR ASSESSMENT OF RISK OF BIAS FOR**  
**RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIALS**

**Assessor** : Yuyun Rahayu  
**Study Author** : Vahedian-azimi et al.  
**Date of Appraisal** : 17 April 2026  
**Study Title** : *Effect Of The Cardio First Angel™ Device On CPR Indices: A Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial*  
**Study Year** : 2016

| No. | Internal Validity                                                                                                                                                                    | Yes | No | Unclear | N/A |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|-----|
| 1.  | Was true randomization used for assignment of participants to treatment groups?                                                                                                      | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 2.  | Was allocation to treatment groups concealed?                                                                                                                                        | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 3.  | Were treatment groups similar at the baseline?                                                                                                                                       | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 4.  | Were participants blind to treatment assignment?                                                                                                                                     |     |    | ✓       |     |
| 5.  | Were those delivering the treatment blind to treatment assignment?                                                                                                                   |     | ✓  |         |     |
| 6.  | Were treatment groups treated identically other than the intervention of interest?                                                                                                   | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 7.  | Were outcome assessors blind to treatment assignment?                                                                                                                                | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 8.  | Were outcomes measured in the same way for treatment groups?                                                                                                                         | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 9.  | Were outcomes measured in a reliable way                                                                                                                                             |     |    | ✓       |     |
| 10. | Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analysed?                                                    | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 11. | Were participants analysed in the groups to which they were randomized?                                                                                                              |     | ✓  |         |     |
| 12. | Was appropriate statistical analysis used?                                                                                                                                           | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 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? | ✓   |    |         |     |

|                           |                  |                |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| <b>Overall appraisal:</b> | <b>Include ✓</b> | <b>Exclude</b> |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------|

|                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Comments:</b> layak dilakukan review (76,9%) |
|-------------------------------------------------|



**JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL TOOL**  
**JBI CHECKLIST FOR COHORT STUDIES**

**Assessor** : Yuyun Rahayu  
**Study Author** : Suratinah  
**Date of Appraisal** : 17 April 2026  
**Study Title** : Efektivitas RJP Mekanik Dengan Manual Terhadap Kejadian Return Of Spontaneous Circulation (ROSC) Pada Pasien Henti Jantung Di IGD RSUD Pasar Minggu  
**Study Year** : 2022

| No. | Internal Validity                                                                                          | Yes | No | Unclear | N/A |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|-----|
| 1.  | Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population?                                        | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 2.  | Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups?               | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 3.  | Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?                                                     | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 4.  | Were confounding factors identified?                                                                       |     | ✓  |         |     |
| 5.  | Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?                                                   |     | ✓  |         |     |
| 6.  | Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)? | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 7.  | Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?                                                    | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 8.  | Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur?                    | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 9.  | Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored?          | ✓   |    |         |     |
| 10. | Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized?                                                  |     | ✓  |         |     |
| 11. | Was appropriate statistical analysis used?                                                                 | ✓   |    |         |     |

|                           |                  |                |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| <b>Overall appraisal:</b> | <b>Include ✓</b> | <b>Exclude</b> |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------|

|                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Comments:</b> layak dilakukan review (72,7%) |
|-------------------------------------------------|

## Lampiran 3 Lembar Konsultasi Pembimbing



**UNIVERSITAS GALUH**  
**FAKULTAS ILMU KESEHATAN**  
**PENDIDIKAN PROFESI NERS**  
 TERAKREDITASI "A" OLEH: ILMU-PTKes  
 Jl. R.E. Martadinata No. 150 Tlp. (0265) 774435 Ciumis 46274  
 Website: [fikes.unigal.ac.id](http://fikes.unigal.ac.id), email: [fikes@unigal.ac.id](mailto:fikes@unigal.ac.id)

### LEMBAR KONSULTASI

Nama mahasiswa : Yuyun rahayu  
 Pembimbing I : Siti Rohimah, S.Kep., Ners., M.Kep  
 Judul : Studi Literatur: Efektivitas *High Quality* CPR Terhadap Keberhasilan ROSC Pada Pasien Henti Jantung

| No. | Hari/Tanggal         | Pokok Bahasan yang Diskusikan                    | Saran Pembimbing                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | Paraf Pembimbing |
|-----|----------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1.  | Senin, 20 April 2026 | JUDUL KATA PENGANTAR DAFTAR BAB I BAB II BAB III | 1. Rapiakan konsistensi gaya penulisan<br>2. Samakan tabulasi, lengkap NIK, nomorikan semua literatur penulisan benar dan konsisten<br>3. Abstrak lengkap<br>4. Lembaran daftar tabel, daftar bagan dan daftar lampiran<br>5. Perbaiki pengantar teraklar dengan gap penelitian<br>6. Rapiakan rumusan masalah<br>7. Buat peta jalan, rumusan dan tujuan khusus<br>8. Mublat pokok lebih difokuskan<br>9. BAB II perlu dipaparkan dan difokuskan pada hal-hal yang mendukung review<br>10. Tegaskan jenis review<br>11. Perbaiki silah cooperation jadi comparison atau tidak dipaparkan<br>12. Jelaskan lebih rinci proses deduplikasi, skimming, judul, abstrak, full text, dan alasan eksklusi<br>13. Perluas keyword, misalnya memasukkan istilah seperti "clear compression quality", "survival outcome", "OHCA", dan "IHCA"<br>14. Critical appraisal lebih detail lagi |                  |
| 2.  | Sabtu, 25 April 2026 | BAB III dan BAB IV BAB IV BAB II                 | 1. Memperbaiki ketidakefektifan tabel dan narasi<br>2. Memperbaiki penulisan berlatensi status (misal: "survival outcome")<br>3. Menyederhanakan kerangka konsep                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                  |



**UNIVERSITAS GALUH**  
**FAKULTAS ILMU KESEHATAN**  
**PENDIDIKAN PROFESI NERS**  
 TERAKREDITASI "A" OLEH: ILMU-PTKes  
 Jl. R.E. Martadinata No. 150 Tlp. (0265) 774435 Ciumis 46274  
 Website: [fikes.unigal.ac.id](http://fikes.unigal.ac.id), email: [fikes@unigal.ac.id](mailto:fikes@unigal.ac.id)

| No. | Hari/Tanggal        | Pokok Bahasan yang Diskusikan                                   | Saran Pembimbing                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Paraf Pembimbing |
|-----|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 3.  | Selasa, 06 Mei 2026 | DAFTAR PUSTAKA ABSTRAK DAN ABSTRACT BAB IV BAB V DAFTAR PUSTAKA | 1. Gunakan satu bentuk buku dan konsisten dalam penulisan<br>2. Bedakan menyederhanakan semua secara spesifik<br>3. Menode pencarian masih terdapat rumus<br>4. Hasil masih terdapat rumus<br>5. Hasil menyederhanakan jumlah final artikel secara lebih kuat<br>6. Abstract bahasa Inggris masih perlu grammar perbaikan<br>7. Pengantar penulisan<br>8. Revisi keampulan<br>9. Format APA belum konsisten<br>10. Kapitalisasi judul belum seragam<br>11. UJI belum rapi<br>12. DOI belum standar |                  |
| 4.  | Sabtu, 06 Mei 2026  |                                                                 | ACC SIDANG KIAN                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                  |



**UNIVERSITAS GALUH**  
**FAKULTAS ILMU KESEHATAN**  
**PENDIDIKAN PROFESI NERS**  
 TERAKREDITASI "A" OLEH: ILMU-PTKes  
 Jl. R.E. Martadinata No. 150 Tlp. (0265) 774435 Ciumis 46274  
 Website: [fikes.unigal.ac.id](http://fikes.unigal.ac.id), email: [fikes@unigal.ac.id](mailto:fikes@unigal.ac.id)

### LEMBAR KONSULTASI

Nama mahasiswa : Yuyun rahayu  
 Pembimbing II : Nina Rosdiana, S.Kep., M.Kep  
 Judul : Studi Literatur: Efektivitas *High Quality* CPR Terhadap Keberhasilan ROSC Pada Pasien Henti Jantung

| No. | Hari/Tanggal       | Pokok Bahasan yang Diskusikan           | Saran Pembimbing                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Paraf Pembimbing |
|-----|--------------------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1.  | Rabu, 06 Mei 2026  | JUDUL BAB II dan BAB III BAB III BAB IV | 1. Pembuan judul cover sesuaikan dengan panduan<br>2. Dibuat lagi semua kata atau kalimat bahasa Inggris ditulis sesuai panduan<br>3. Perbaiki kepala tabel sesuaikan panduan<br>4. Jelaskan proses screening dengan menggunakan kriteria inklusi<br>5. Jaman latar lagi apakah sesuai dengan kriteria inklusi atau tidak |                  |
| 2.  | Sabtu, 09 Mei 2026 |                                         | 1. Rumus rumus<br>2. Rumus rumus rumus<br>3. Rumus PICO<br>4. Rumus PICO<br>5. Rumus rumus rumus rumus rumus                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                  |
| 3.  |                    |                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                  |



**UNIVERSITAS GALUH**  
**FAKULTAS ILMU KESEHATAN**  
**PENDIDIKAN PROFESI NERS**  
 TERAKREDITASI "A" OLEH: ILMU-PTKes  
 Jl. R.E. Martadinata No. 150 Tlp. (0265) 774435 Ciumis 46274  
 Website: [fikes.unigal.ac.id](http://fikes.unigal.ac.id), email: [fikes@unigal.ac.id](mailto:fikes@unigal.ac.id)

### LEMBAR KONSULTASI

Nama mahasiswa : Yuyun rahayu  
 Pembimbing II : Nina Rosdiana, S.Kep., M.Kep  
 Judul : Studi Literatur: Efektivitas *High Quality* CPR Terhadap Keberhasilan ROSC Pada Pasien Henti Jantung

| No. | Hari/Tanggal | Pokok Bahasan yang Diskusikan | Saran Pembimbing                                                | Paraf Pembimbing |
|-----|--------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 3.  | 12/5/26      |                               | - Rumus kepastian lebih ke pembuat rumus<br>- Rumus rumus rumus |                  |
| 4.  | 20/5/26      |                               | - Rumus rumus rumus<br>- Rumus rumus                            |                  |