

LAMPIRAN**Lampiran 1. JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Analytical Cross Sectional Studies**

Reviewer: Date:

Author: Year : _____ Record Number: _____

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Were confounding factors identified?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. 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 2. JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Systematic Reviews

Reviewer : Date :

Author : Year : Record Number :

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Is the review question clearly and explicitly stated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Were the inclusion criteria appropriate for the review question?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Was the search strategy appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Were the sources and resources used to search for studies adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Were the criteria for appraising studies appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Was critical appraisal conducted by two or more reviewers independently?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Were there methods to minimize errors in data extraction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Were the methods used to combine studies appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Were recommendations for policy and/or practice supported by the reported data?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Were the specific directives for new research appropriate?	<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. JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for *Quasy Experimental Design*

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 4. Prisma Checklist**PRISMA CHECKLIST**

TITLE		
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.
ABSTRACT		
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.
INTRODUCTION		
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).
METHODS		
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.

IR - PERPUSTAKAAN UNIVERSITAS AIRLANGGA

Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I^2) for each meta-analysis.	
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	
RESULTS			
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).	

IR - PERPUSTAKAAN UNIVERSITAS AIRLANGGA

Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).	
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	
FUNDING			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.	

Lampiran 5. Bukti pencarian jurnal

Database Scopus

Brought to you by [Airlangga University](#)



Scopus

[Search](#) [Sources](#) [Lists](#) [SciVal](#) ↗



[Create account](#)

[Sign in](#)

1,125 document results

(TITLE-ABS-KEY((**causa** OR **factors** OR **risk** AND **factors**)) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY((**suicide** OR **self** AND **immolation** OR **self** AND **destruction** OR **self** AND **harm** OR **suicide**)) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY((**ideation** OR **thought** OR **concept** OR **design**)) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY((**youth** OR **adolescent** OR **young** OR **teenager**))) AND DOCTYPE(**ar** OR **re**) AND PUBYEAR > 2014

[Edit](#) [Save](#) [Set alert](#) [Set feed](#)

Search within results...



[Documents](#) [Secondary documents](#) [Patents](#)

[View Mendeley Data \(21656\)](#)

Refine results

[Limit to](#)

[Exclude](#)

[Analyze search results](#)

[Show all abstracts](#) Sort on: [Date \(newest\)](#)

[All](#) ▾

[Export](#)

[Download](#)

[View citation overview](#)

[View cited by](#)

[Add to List](#)



Brought to you by [Airlangga University](#)

Scopus

[Search](#) [Sources](#) [Lists](#) [SciVal](#) ↗[Create account](#)[Sign in](#)

365 document results

(TITLE-ABS-KEY((causa OR factors OR risk AND factors)) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY((suicide OR self AND immolation OR self AND destruction OR self AND harm OR suicide)) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY((ideation OR thought OR concept OR design)) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY((youth OR adolescent OR young OR teenager))) AND DOCTYPE(ar OR re) AND PUBYEAR > 2014 AND (LIMIT-TO (ACCESSTYPE(OA)))

[Edit](#) [Save](#) [Set alert](#) [Set feed](#)

Refine results

[Limit to](#)[Exclude](#)[Documents](#) [Secondary documents](#) [Patents](#)[Analyze search results](#)[Show all abstracts](#) Sort on: [Date \(newest\)](#)

All

[Export](#)[Download](#)[View citation overview](#)[View cited by](#)[Add to List](#)

Database ProQuest

Access provided by
UNIV AIRLANGGA - MAIN LIBRARY

Basic Search Advanced Search Publications Browse Databases (9)

ab((factors OR risk factor OR causa)) AND ab((self immolation OR self destruction OR self harm OR suicide)) AND ab((ideation OR thought OR concept OR design)) AND ab((youth OR adolescent OR young OR teenager))

Additional limits - Date: After 01 January 2015; Source type: Scholarly Journals; ... Show all

Did you mean [risk factor OR cause](#)) AND ab((self immolation ...?


227 results Modify search Recent searches Save search/alert

Sorted by
Relevance

Limit to
 Full text
 Peer reviewed

Source type

Select 1-100

1  **Self-Harm among Young People Detained in the Youth Justice System in Sri Lanka** Full Text
Hettiarachchi, Lushan V; Kinner, Stuart A; Tibble, Holly; Borschmann, Rohan.
International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health; Basel Vol. 15, Iss. 2, (Feb 2018): 209.
...use, and psychosocial **risk factors**. Strategies for identifying and preventing...
...of **self-harm** in detained **youth** (and even fewer in low- and middle-income...
...We examined the prevalence and correlates of **self-harm** in a sample of 181...

Abstract/Details Full text Full text - PDF (315 KB) Show Abstract

Database ScienceDirect



Journals & Books



Register

Sign in

Brought to you by:
Airlangga University

Find articles with these terms



Year: 2015-2020 X

Title, abstract, keywords: (factors OR risk factors) AND (self destruction OR self harm OR ... X

Advanced search

143 results

Set search alert

Refine by:

 Subscribed journals

Years

 2020 (42)

 2019 (31)

 2018 (17)

Show more v

Article type

143 results

Refine filters

sorted by *relevance* | [date](#)

Search alert

 Download selected articles [Export](#)
sorted by *relevance* | [date](#)
 Research article ● Full text access

Sexual orientation differences in non-suicidal self-injury, suicidality, and psychosocial factors among an inpatient psychiatric sample of adolescents

Psychiatry Research, February 2020, ...

Jessica R. Peters, Ethan H. Mereish, Maya A. Krek, Adam Chuong, ... Shirley Yen

[Download PDF](#) [Abstract](#) v [Export](#) v

 Research article ● Full text access

Differentiating Adolescent Suicide Attempters and Ideators: A Classification Tree Analysis of Risk Behaviors

Journal of Adolescent Health, *In press, corrected proof*, Available online 21 June 2020

Alexis M. Mav Fwa K. Czvyz Bradv T. West

Feedback