

LAMPIRAN

Lampiran 1 Critical Appraisal For Quasi-Experimental Studies

JBIC Critical Appraisal Checklist for Quasi-Experimental Studies

Reviewer _____ Date _____

Author _____ Year _____ Record Number _____

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Is it clear in the study what is the 'cause' and what is the 'effect' (i.e. there is no confusion about which variable comes first)?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar?	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Was there a control group?	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure?	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Were the outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Overall appraisal: Include ☐ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Comments (Including reason for exclusion) :

Lampiran 2 Critical Appraisal for Randomized Controlled Trials

JBIC Critical Appraisal Checklist for Randomized Controlled trials

Reviewer _____ Date _____

Author _____ Year _____ Record Number _____

	Yes	No	Unclear	NA
1. Was true randomization used for assignment of participants to treatment groups?	☐	☐	☐	☐
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 treatment blind to treatment assignment?	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Were outcomes assessors blind to treatment assignment?	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Were treatment groups treated identically other than the intervention of interest?	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Were participants analyzed in the groups to which they were randomized?	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Were outcomes measured in the same way for treatment groups?	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	☐	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Overall appraisal: Include ☐ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

Lampiran 3 Critical Appraisal for Cohort Studies

Jbi Critical Appraisal Checklist For Cohort Studies

Reviewer_____Date_____

Author_____Year_____Record Number_____

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicabl e
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 ☐ Seek further info ☐

Comments (Including reason for exclusion) :

JBIC Critical Appraisal Checklist for Quasi-Experimental Studies

Reviewer 1 Date 25/04/2021

Author Ulfiana et al Year 2019 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)?	√	☐	☐	☐
2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar?	√	☐	☐	☐
3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	√	☐	☐	☐
4. Was there a control group?	√	☐	☐	☐
5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure?	√	☐	☐	☐
6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	√	☐	☐	☐
7. Were the outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	√	☐	☐	☐
8. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	√	☐	☐	☐
9. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	√	☐	☐	☐
Overall appraisal: Include ☐ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐				
Comments (Including reason for exclusion) : -				

JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Randomized Controlled trials

Reviewer 2 Date 25/04/2021

Author Nematollahi et al Year 2016 Record Number _____

	Yes	No	Unclear	NA
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 treatment blind to treatment assignment?	√	☐	☐	☐
6. Were outcomes assessors blind to treatment assignment?	√	☐	☐	☐
7. Were treatment groups treated identically other than the intervention of interest?	√	☐	☐	☐
8. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up	√	☐	☐	☐
9. Were participants analyzed in the groups to which they were randomized?	√	☐	☐	☐
10. Were outcomes measured in the same way for treatment groups?	√	☐	☐	☐
11. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	√	☐	☐	☐
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?	√	☐	☐	☐

Overall appraisal: Include ☐ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Comments (Including reason for exclusion) : -

JBIC Critical Appraisal Checklist for Quasi-Experimental Studies

Reviewer 3 Date 25/04/2021

Author Phu et al Year 2019 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)?	√	☐	☐	☐
2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar?	☐	√	☐	☐
3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	√	☐	☐	☐
4. Was there a control group?	√	☐	☐	☐
5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure?	√	☐	☐	☐
6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	√	☐	☐	☐
7. Were the outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	√	☐	☐	☐
8. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	√	☐	☐	☐
9. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	√	☐	☐	☐

Overall appraisal: Include ☐ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Comments (Including reason for exclusion) : Nomor 2 dalam artikel jumlah pembagian kelompok tidak serupa

JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Randomized Controlled trials

Reviewer 4 Date 25/04/2021

Author Zouita et al, Year 2020 Record Number _____

	Yes	No	Unclear	NA
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 treatment blind to treatment assignment?	☐	☐	☐	✓
6. Were outcomes assessors blind to treatment assignment?	☐	☐	☐	✓
7. Were treatment groups treated identically other than the intervention of interest?	✓	☐	☐	☐
8. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up	✓	☐	☐	☐
9. Were participants analyzed in the groups to which they were randomized?	✓	☐	☐	☐
10. Were outcomes measured in the same way for treatment groups?	✓	☐	☐	☐
11. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	✓	☐	☐	☐
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?	✓	☐	☐	☐

Overall appraisal: Include ☐ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

Nomor 3 dalam pembagian kelompok tidak sama jumlahnya.

Nomor 4, 5, dan 6 tidak dijelaskan dalam artikel terkait prosedur kerahasiaan terhadap responden, pemberi perawatan dan penilai study

JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist For Cohort Studies

Reviewer 5 Date 25/04/2021

Author Maritz et al Year 2016 Record Number _____

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
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 ☐ Seek further info ☐

Comments (Including reason for exclusion) : :

Nomor 1 dan 2 tidak dibagi menjadi dua grup

Nomor 4 dan 5 tidak dijelaskan terkait faktor perancu

JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Randomized Controlled trials

Reviewer 6 Date 25/04/2021

Author Dohrn et al Year 2016 Record Number _____

	Yes	No	Unclear	NA
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 treatment blind to treatment assignment?	☐	☐	☐	√
6. Were outcomes assessors blind to treatment assignment?	☐	☐	☐	√
7. Were treatment groups treated identically other than the intervention of interest?	√	☐	☐	☐
8. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up	√	☐	☐	☐
9. Were participants analyzed in the groups to which they were randomized?	√	☐	☐	☐
10. Were outcomes measured in the same way for treatment groups?	√	☐	☐	☐
11. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	√	☐	☐	☐
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?	√	☐	☐	☐

Overall appraisal: Include ☐ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

Nomor 5 dan 6 tidak dijelaskan dalam artikel terkait prosedur kerahasiaan terhadap pemberi perawatan dan penilai study

JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Randomized Controlled trials

Reviewer 7 Date 25/04/2021

Author Miko et al Year 2017 Record Number _____

	Yes	No	Unclear	NA
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 treatment blind to treatment assignment?	☐	☐	☐	√
6. Were outcomes assessors blind to treatment assignment?	☐	☐	☐	√
7. Were treatment groups treated identically other than the intervention of interest?	√	☐	☐	☐
8. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up	√	☐	☐	☐
9. Were participants analyzed in the groups to which they were randomized?	√	☐	☐	☐
10. Were outcomes measured in the same way for treatment groups?	√	☐	☐	☐
11. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	√	☐	☐	☐
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?	√	☐	☐	☐

Overall appraisal: Include ☐ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

Nomor 4, 5 dan 6 tidak dijelaskan dalam artikel terkait prosedur kerahasiaan terhadap peserta, pemberi perawatan dan penilai study

JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Randomized Controlled trials

Reviewer 8 Date 25/04/2021

Author Hafstrom et al., Year 2016 Record Number _____

	Yes	No	Unclear	NA
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 treatment blind to treatment assignment?	☐	☐	☐	✓
6. Were outcomes assessors blind to treatment assignment?	☐	☐	☐	✓
7. Were treatment groups treated identically other than the intervention of interest?	✓	☐	☐	☐
8. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up	✓	☐	☐	☐
9. Were participants analyzed in the groups to which they were randomized?	✓	☐	☐	☐
10. Were outcomes measured in the same way for treatment groups?	✓	☐	☐	☐
11. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	✓	☐	☐	☐
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?	✓	☐	☐	☐

Overall appraisal: Include ☐ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

Nomor 3 dalam pembagian kelompok tidak sama jumlahnya.

Nomor 4, 5, dan 6 tidak dijelaskan dalam artikel terkait prosedur kerahasiaan terhadap responden, pemberi perawatan dan penilai study

JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist For Cohort Studies

Reviewer 9 Date 25/04/2021

Author Maixnerová et al Year 2020 Record Number _____

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
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 ☐ Seek further info ☐

Comments (Including reason for exclusion) : :

Nomor 4 dan 5 tidak dijelaskan terkait faktor perancu

JBIC Critical Appraisal Checklist for Quasi-Experimental Studies

Reviewer 10 Date 25/04/2021

Author Faidah et al Year 2020 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)?	√	☐	☐	☐
2. Were the participants included in any comparisons similar?	√	☐	☐	☐
3. Were the participants included in any comparisons receiving similar treatment/care, other than the exposure or intervention of interest?	√	☐	☐	☐
4. Was there a control group?	√	☐	☐	☐
5. Were there multiple measurements of the outcome both pre and post the intervention/exposure?	√	☐	☐	☐
6. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	√	☐	☐	☐
7. Were the outcomes of participants included in any comparisons measured in the same way?	√	☐	☐	☐
8. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	√	☐	☐	☐
9. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	√	☐	☐	☐
Overall appraisal:	Include ☐	Exclude ☐	Seek further info ☐	
Comments (Including reason for exclusion) :				

LEMBAR BIMBINGAN SKRIPSI

Nama Mahasiswa : Dina Muhyina Nur Rizqiana

NIM : 131911123047

Nama Pembimbing : Dr. Retno Indarwati, S.Kep., Ns., M.Kep

No	Tanggal	SARAN DAN PERTIMBANGAN PEMBIMBING	TANDA TANGAN
1	29-03-2021	1. Di Bagian BAB 1 MSKS (Masalah, Skala, Kronologi dan Solusi) lebih diperhatikan 2. Bab 1, alinea 1 fokus pada gangguan keseimbangan 3. Prevalensi gangguan keseimbangan/jatuh lebih spesifik 4. Pada tabel 2.2. bagian intervensi diberikan keterangan <i>balance exercise</i> 5. Perbedaan keseimbangan dinamis dan keseimbangan statis pada keseimbangan postural	
2	17-04-2021	1. Perbaiki tujuan umum, kata “Untuk” dihilangkan 2. Perbaiki penulisan dibagian outcome pada tabel kriteria inklusi dan enklusi, langsung “keseimbangan lansia”	
3	29-04-2021	1. Lanjut ke bab 4 dan 5	
4.	09-05-2021	1. Jurnal harus lebih diperhatikan lagi, lebih baik jurnal internasional, jurnal nasional minimal SINTA 3	
5	21-05-2021	ACC SEMINAR HASIL	

Surabaya, 24 Mei 2021



Dr. Retno Indarwati, S.Kep.Ns.,M. Kep
NIP. 1978031620081220002

LEMBAR BIMBINGAN SKRIPSI

Nama Mahasiswa : Dina Muhyina Nur Rizqiana

NIM : 131911123047

Nama Pembimbing : Elida Ulfiana, S.Kep., Ns., M.Kep

No	Tanggal	SARAN DAN PERTIMBANGAN PEMBIMBING	TANDA TANGAN
1	29-03-2021	1. Lengkapi awal bagian proposal skripsi 2. Perbaiki penulisan “Latar Belakang” bukan menggunakan kapital semua 3. Bab 1, Paragraf belum menunjukkan masalah penelitian. Fokus pada masalah penelitian, keseimbangan lansia, penatalaksanaan balance exercise 4. Skala data fokus pada kasus gangguan keseimbangan, resiko jatuh dan yang relevan dengan masalah 5. Gunakan sumber/referensi yang terbaru 6. Perbaiki tujuan penelitian 7. Kata kunci pencarian dalam bahasa indonesia 8. Bagian kriteria inklusi dan enklusi, untuk intervensi yaitu <i>balance exercise</i>, study design menggunakan <i>experimen dan random controlle trial</i> 9. Di diagram flow, kata jurnal diganti “artikel” 10. Daftar pustaka diperbaiki	
2	17-04-2021	1. Semua Nama tabel tidak cetak tebal tanpa menggunakan garis vertikal 2. Setelah proses seleksi judul dan abstrak seharusnya di lihat fullteksnya yang diseleksi 3. Lanjut ke bab 4 dan 5, tambahkan abstrak	
3	29-04-2021	1. Perbaiki penulisan, line spasi dan sebagainya sesuai panduan	
4.	09-05-	1. Bagian abstrak difokuskan pada	

IR - PERPUSTAKAAN UNIVERSITAS AIRLANGGA

	2021	penerapan balance excercise yang bagaimana, diterapkan kepada siapa dan dapat meningkatkan apa saja. 2. Bagian diagram flow dari 17 artikel di eksklusi 7 artikel, tambahkan 1 kotak excluded nya 3. Daftar pustaka menggunakan mendeley 4. Perbaiki penulisan sesuai panduan	
5	21-05-2021	ACC SEMINAR HASIL	

Surabaya, 24 Mei 2021



Elida Ulfiana, S.Kep., Ns., M.Kep
NIP. 197910132010122001

CATATAN REVISI SKRIPSI

Nama Mahasiswa : Dina Muhyina Nur Rizqiana

NIM : 13191112307

No	Halaman	BAB	SARAN PERBAIKAN	HASIL REVISI
1	32	4	1. Tentang 1 artikel yg tidak memiliki pengaruh balance exercise terhadap keseimbangan lansia, dijelaskan lebih rinci sehingga jelas apakah faktor yg membuat tidak berpengaruh itu balance exercise nya atau karena respondennya memiliki ostioporosis, atau ada faktor lain	Sudah diperbaiki sesuai saran

Surabaya, 24 Mei 2021

Pembimbing 1



Dr. Retno Indarwati, S.Kep.Ns.,M. Kep
NIP. 1978031620081220002

CATATAN REVISI SKRIPSI

Nama Mahasiswa : Dina Muhyina Nur Rizqiana

NIM : 131911123047

No	Halaman	BAB	SARAN PERBAIKAN	HASIL REVISI
1	32	4	1. Penjelasan dari berbagai latihan balance exeecise di setiap artikel dijelaskan lebih rinci kembali, semisal gerakan apa saja yang dilakukan, urutannya bagaimana, durasinya bagaimana.	Sudah diperbaiki sesuai saran

Surabaya, 24 Mei 2021

Pembimbing 2



Elida Ulfiana, S.Kep., Ns., M.Kep
NIP. 197910132010122001

CATATAN REVISI SKRIPSI

Nama Mahasiswa : Dina Muhyina Nur Rizqiana

NIM : 131911123047

No	Halaman	BAB	SARAN PERBAIKAN	HASIL REVISI
1	11	2	1. Untuk menentukan yg 50% JBI itu dari mana, jelaskan lebih rinci nilai 50% berdasarkan pertimbangan apa	Sudah diperbaiki sesuai saran
2	-	-	2. Masih banyak kalimat yang tidak bisa dipahami karena terjemahan dari bahasa inggris ke bahasa indonesia	Sudah diperbaiki sesuai saran
	11	2	3. Resiko Bias, masing-masih diberikan penjelasan secara lebih rinci	Sudah diperbaiki sesuai saran

Surabaya, 24 Mei 2021

Ketua Penguji



Dr. Joni Hariyanto, S.Kp., M. Si
NIP. 1978031620081220002