

CONTOH PENGISIAN FORM REVISI PROPOSAL SKRIPSI

Nama : Ferika Indarwati

NIM : 12345678910

Judul Skripsi : Point prevalence study on peripheral intravenous catheter insertion and care in paediatric patients in Indonesia

No	Saran Penguji	Respon mahasiswa	Bukti Revisi
Contoh			
1	Minor recommendations to clarify points related to the background of the use of PIVC and reasons for difficulty in care.	Thank you for the feedback, We have deleted the word hospitals in this sentence to clarify use of PIVC (page 1): Nearly two billion PIVCs are used globally. in hospitals.	This sentence was added in page 1 paragraph three to clarify the reasons for difficulty in care: Varied developmental stages in children, including cognitive development, physical conditions such as small veins, stranger anxiety, potential difficulties in cooperation during insertion, and patient's clinical presentation such as poor perfusion, presence of sepsis or other circulatory conditions, complicate PIVC placement and care.
2	Provide further comments here: Opportunity to discuss how the validated checklist was validated. Did not see reference to a validated tool, yet in the abstract the checklist was identified as a validated checklist.	Thank you for the suggestions. We agree that providing further explanations on how the research instrument was validated will improve the research replicability and/or reproducibility	The reference of the validated checklist was supplied in page 6: The questionnaire has been forward and backward translated into Indonesian and checked for its validity and reliability in the Indonesian context (Indarwati et al., 2022a). We also added this paragraph below in the Research variables and instruments section (page 5-6): The six-step forward and backward translation method adapted from Sousa and Rojjanasrirat (2011) was used to validate the questionnaires. Two translators were involved in the translation process. Three-panel experts rated the instrument's content validity using a four-point rating scale. Item and scale level content validity index and kappa index were calculated. Ten-panel members of the target population evaluated the questionnaire regarding feasibility, clarity, logical sequence, and formatting. The translation process indicated relatively low discrepancies between translators except for semantic equivalence where there were nine discrepancies found in the forward translation of the checklist. The semantic discrepancies were less prevalent in the backward translation, with only one item reported during the process. The item validity index showed relatively high agreement between experts. The face validity indicated that the instrument was easy to understand and presented logically (Indarwati et al., 2022a).

Keterangan:

***Respon mahasiswa** (bisa berupa jawaban atas pertanyaan penguji, persetujuan ataupun sanggahan terhadap masukan ataupun saran penguji)

***Bukti Revisi**

(Tuliskan revisi anda dan sebutkan halaman dimana revisi dilakukan)

