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|  |  |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Abstrak** |  |

**Latar Belakang:** [Latar belakang topik yang ditinjau, permasalahan utama yang dibahas, serta urgensi atau relevansi dilakukan tinjauan naratif. Jelaskan secara jelas tujuan dari narrative review ini.]

**Metode:** [Deskripsi singkat mengenai metode pencarian literatur (termasuk database yang digunakan, kata kunci, rentang waktu, kriteria inklusi/eksklusi). Tidak perlu sedetail systematic review, namun tetap harus transparan dalam menjelaskan proses seleksi referensi.]

**Hasil:** [Pemaparan temuan dari penelusuran literatur, termasuk sintesis naratif dan analisis temuan utama. Sertakan diskusi kritis terhadap hasil, perbandingan dengan literatur lain, serta pembahasan mengenai relevansi klinis atau praktis.]

**Kesimpulan:** [Ringkasan dari temuan utama. Sertakan implikasi terhadap praktik, penelitian, atau kebijakan, serta berikan saran untuk studi atau tinjauan lanjutan.]

Kata kunci: [katakunci1, katakunci2, katakunci3, katakunci 4, …]

**[Title of the article: end with study’s design]**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Abstract** |  |

**Background:** [Background of the topic under review, the main problem addressed, and the urgency or relevance of conducting a narrative review. Clearly state the objective(s) of the narrative review.]

**Methods:** [A brief description of the literature search method (including databases used, keywords, time range, inclusion/exclusion criteria). It does not need to be as detailed as a systematic review but should remain transparent regarding the reference selection process]

**Results:** [Presentation of findings from the literature search, including narrative synthesis and analysis of key findings. Provide critical discussion of the results, comparison with other literature, and discussion of clinical or practical relevance.]

**Conclusion:** [A summary of the key findings. Include implications for practice, research, or policy, and offer suggestions for future studies or reviews.]

Keywords: [keyword1, keyword2, keyword3, keyword 4, …]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Pendahuluan** |  |

[Bagian ini sebaiknya singkat. Selalu ditulis dalam bentuk naratif, bukan dalam bentuk poin atau penomoran

Mulailah dengan gambaran umum mengenai topik yang lebih luas atau isu klinis yang menjadi latar pentingnya tinjauan ini. Sertakan data epidemiologi yang relevan, tren global atau lokal, atau pengamatan klinis untuk menekankan signifikansi dari isu tersebut. Jelaskan mengapa topik ini dianggap penting saat ini, kurang diteliti, kontroversial, atau memiliki relevansi klinis yang tinggi.

Fokuskan bahasan dengan mengidentifikasi permasalahan utama, kesenjangan pengetahuan, atau inkonsistensi dalam literatur saat ini. Soroti kurangnya konsensus, praktik yang terus berkembang, atau area yang masih memiliki bukti ilmiah yang terbatas atau tersebar di berbagai disiplin ilmu.

Jelaskan secara jelas tujuan dari narrative review. Nyatakan apa yang ingin ditinjau, dirangkum, atau dijelaskan melalui tulisan ini. Berbeda dengan artikel penelitian orisinal yang mengajukan hipotesis, pendahuluan dalam narrative review sebaiknya menjelaskan cakupan tinjauan, pertanyaan yang ingin dijawab, serta relevansinya secara klinis, ilmiah, atau kebijakan.]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Metode** |  |

[Bagian ini harus ditulis sedetail mungkin. Dalam bagian Metode, penulis perlu memberikan penjelasan singkat namun jelas mengenai proses yang dilakukan untuk menyusun narrative review. Jelaskan dari mana sumber literatur diperoleh. Sebutkan database yang digunakan, seperti PubMed, Google Scholar, ScienceDirect, ProQuest, atau sumber lain yang relevan dengan topik. Cantumkan kata kunci utama yang digunakan untuk mencari artikel. Penjelasan ini membantu pembaca memahami fokus pencarian literatur.

Uraikan kriteria yang digunakan untuk memilih artikel yang ditinjau, misalnya tahun publikasi, jenis artikel (penelitian asli, review, laporan kasus), bahasa, atau ketersediaan full-text. Jelaskan secara singkat bagaimana proses seleksi dilakukan (misalnya: penyaringan judul dan abstrak, pembacaan full-text), serta bagaimana penulis mensintesis atau mengelompokkan informasi dari berbagai sumber. Sebutkan jumlah artikel yang akhirnya diikutkan dalam review dan, jika relevan, karakteristik umum dari studi yang dimasukkan.]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Hasil dan Pembahasan** |  |

[Dalam narrative review, bagian Hasil dan Pembahasan tidak digunakan untuk melaporkan temuan eksperimen baru, melainkan untuk menyajikan sintesis terstruktur dari literatur yang ada. Bagian ini sebaiknya disusun berdasarkan tema utama, subtopik, atau isu konseptual yang relevan dengan fokus tinjauan.

Setiap subjudul mewakili aspek penting dari topik yang dibahas dan membantu memandu pembaca melalui area kunci yang relevan.

Alih-alih mencantumkan hasil tiap studi secara individual, penulis didorong untuk menyajikan tren umum, menyoroti kesepakatan dan perbedaan antar sumber, serta memberikan interpretasi terhadap literatur secara keseluruhan. Narasi yang disusun dengan baik akan mengidentifikasi di mana bukti ilmiah kuat, di mana masih terdapat perbedaan, dan di mana kesenjangan pengetahuan signifikan masih ada. Dengan demikian, review ini tidak sekadar mendeskripsikan studi, tetapi secara kritis berinteraksi dengan temuan dan implikasinya.

Untuk menjaga koherensi dan kejelasan, penulis sebaiknya mensintesis informasi dari berbagai sumber di bawah setiap bagian tematik. Diskusi dapat diperkaya dengan kerangka teori, perbandingan antar populasi atau metodologi, dan komentar tentang relevansi klinis atau ilmiah dari temuan. Jika perlu, tabel atau diagram konseptual dapat digunakan untuk meringkas data atau klasifikasi kompleks secara visual; namun, penekanan utama tetap pada sintesis naratif, bukan pelaporan numerik.

Elemen penting dalam bagian diskusi adalah evaluasi kritis terhadap studi-studi yang ditinjau. Penulis sebaiknya menunjukkan keterbatasan desain studi, inkonsistensi metodologi, atau bias potensial yang dapat memengaruhi interpretasi hasil. Pendekatan reflektif ini menambah kredibilitas review dan menunjukkan kedalaman akademik.

Akhirnya, narasi harus menghubungkan antara literatur yang ditinjau dengan praktik klinis, arah penelitian, atau kebijakan kesehatan yang lebih luas. Penulis diharapkan menguraikan bagaimana bukti yang dikumpulkan dapat memperkaya pemahaman saat ini, kontroversi apa yang masih ada, serta studi lanjutan apa yang dibutuhkan untuk memajukan bidang tersebut. Pada akhir bagian ini, pembaca seharusnya memperoleh pemahaman yang utuh dan kontekstual mengenai topik, yang didukung oleh integrasi literatur yang mendalam dan bijaksana.]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Kesimpulan** |  |

[Kesimpulan dari sebuah narrative review berfungsi sebagai sintesis akhir dari literatur yang ditinjau dan tidak seharusnya sekadar mengulang poin-poin yang telah dibahas sebelumnya. Sebaliknya, bagian ini harus memberikan ringkasan yang jelas dan padat mengenai temuan-temuan paling penting yang dihasilkan dari analisis naratif. Bagian ini juga harus mencerminkan pesan utama dari tinjauan dan menekankan kontribusinya terhadap pemahaman topik.

Mulailah dengan menyatakan kembali tujuan utama dari review secara singkat, diikuti dengan rangkuman wawasan kunci atau pola-pola temuan yang diidentifikasi dari berbagai literatur. Hal ini mencakup penekanan terhadap area di mana bukti ilmiah sudah kuat dan mapan, serta area di mana masih terdapat kontroversi atau ketidakpastian. Alih-alih menyampaikan informasi baru, kesimpulan harus menggabungkan materi yang telah ditinjau menjadi perspektif akhir yang koheren.

Penting pula bagi kesimpulan untuk membahas implikasi praktis atau teoretis dari temuan. Dalam bidang klinis atau terapan, hal ini dapat mencakup bagaimana bukti yang ada dapat mendukung praktik terbaik, membantu pengambilan keputusan, atau membimbing perawatan pasien. Dalam topik yang lebih konseptual atau ilmu dasar, kesimpulan dapat mencakup usulan pengembangan model, hipotesis baru, atau hubungan antara area riset yang sebelumnya terpisah.

Selain itu, kesimpulan juga harus mengidentifikasi arah penelitian selanjutnya secara jelas. Ini dapat berupa saran terkait desain studi, populasi yang masih kurang diteliti, atau perbaikan metodologi yang dapat meningkatkan kualitas bukti dalam bidang tersebut. Saran yang disusun dengan baik menunjukkan refleksi kritis dan memastikan bahwa review ini berkontribusi terhadap perkembangan wacana ilmiah yang berkelanjutan.

Pada akhirnya, kesimpulan yang kuat akan memberikan pembaca pemahaman yang jelas tentang keadaan pengetahuan saat ini, pentingnya topik yang dibahas, serta bagaimana narrative review ini telah memperluas wawasan dalam bidang tersebut. Kesimpulan sebaiknya ringkas—biasanya terdiri dari satu hingga tiga paragraf—dan ditulis dengan cara yang memperkuat koherensi serta tujuan keseluruhan dari naskah ilmiah.]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Ucapan Terima Kasih** |  |

Para penulis tidak memiliki ucapan terima kasih yang perlu disampaikan.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Dukungan Dana dan Sponsor** |  |

Penelitian ini tidak menerima hibah atau dukungan pendanaan khusus dari lembaga pendanaan di sektor publik, komersial, maupun nirlaba.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Konflik Kepentingan** |  |

Para penulis menyatakan bahwa mereka tidak memiliki konflik kepentingan yang berkaitan dengan publikasi artikel ini.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Pernyataan Ketersediaan Data** |  |

Semua data yang mendukung temuan penelitian ini tersedia dari penulis korespondensi atas permintaan yang wajar.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Kontribusi Penulis** |  |

Seluruh penulis berkontribusi secara signifikan dalam penyusunan dan perancangan penelitian, pengumpulan data, analisis, serta interpretasi hasil. Semua penulis berpartisipasi dalam penulisan dan revisi naskah secara kritis untuk isi intelektual yang penting, menyetujui versi akhir yang akan diterbitkan, serta bertanggung jawab atas seluruh aspek penelitian ini.
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**Tabel**

Tabel 1. Perbandingan Literatur

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Penulis (Tahun)** | **Judul Artikel** | **Tujuan Penelitian** | **Desain Penelitian** | **Intervensi** |
| Korkusuz *et al*. (2023) | *Effectiveness of External Oblique Intercostal Plane Block in Abdominal Surgery* | Menilai efektifitas EOIPB bilateral sebagai bagian dari multimodal analgesia | RCT, tersamar ganda, n=80 | EOIPB + multimodal vs Multimodal Analgesia |
| - |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |

Tabel 2. …

**Keterangan Gambar**

Gambar 1. [Scale for the Assessment of Narrative Review Articles – SANRA].

Gambar 2. …

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | [Title of the article: Narrative Review] |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| NARRATIVE REVIEW | |
|  | |
|  |
|  |



DOI : XXX.XXX.XXXXX

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Abstract** |  |

**Background:** [Background of the topic under review, the main problem addressed, and the urgency or relevance of conducting a narrative review. Clearly state the objective(s) of the narrative review.]

**Methods:** [A brief description of the literature search method (including databases used, keywords, time range, inclusion/exclusion criteria). It does not need to be as detailed as a systematic review but should remain transparent regarding the reference selection process]

**Results:** [Presentation of findings from the literature search, including narrative synthesis and analysis of key findings. Provide critical discussion of the results, comparison with other literature, and discussion of clinical or practical relevance.]

**Conclusion:** [A summary of the key findings. Include implications for practice, research, or policy, and offer suggestions for future studies or reviews.]

Keywords: [keyword1, keyword2, keyword3, keyword 4, …]

**[Judul Artikel: Tinjauan Naratif]**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Abstrak** |  |

**Latar Belakang:** [Latar belakang topik yang ditinjau, permasalahan utama yang dibahas, serta urgensi atau relevansi dilakukan tinjauan naratif. Jelaskan secara jelas tujuan dari narrative review ini.]

**Metode:** [Deskripsi singkat mengenai metode pencarian literatur (termasuk database yang digunakan, kata kunci, rentang waktu, kriteria inklusi/eksklusi). Tidak perlu sedetail systematic review, namun tetap harus transparan dalam menjelaskan proses seleksi referensi.]

**Hasil:** [Pemaparan temuan dari penelusuran literatur, termasuk sintesis naratif dan analisis temuan utama. Sertakan diskusi kritis terhadap hasil, perbandingan dengan literatur lain, serta pembahasan mengenai relevansi klinis atau praktis.]

**Kesimpulan:** [Ringkasan dari temuan utama. Sertakan implikasi terhadap praktik, penelitian, atau kebijakan, serta berikan saran untuk studi atau tinjauan lanjutan.]

Kata kunci: [katakunci1, katakunci2, katakunci3, katakunci 4, …]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Introduction** |  |

[This part should be brief. Always write in narrative form, do not write in bulleted or numbered layout.

Begin with a general overview of the broader topic or clinical issue that frames the importance of the review. Provide relevant epidemiological data, global or local trends, or clinical observations to emphasize the significance of the issue. Explain why this topic is timely, under-researched, controversial, or clinically relevant.

Narrow the focus by identifying key problems, knowledge gaps, or inconsistencies in the current literature. Highlight the lack of consensus, evolving practices, or areas where evidence remains insufficient or scattered across various disciplines.

Clearly define the objective of the narrative review. State what the review aims to explore, summarize, or clarify. Rather than proposing a hypothesis like in original research, the introduction should outline the scope of the review, the questions it addresses, and its clinical, scientific, or policy relevance.]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Methods** |  |

[This part should be written as detailed as possible. In the Methods section, the author needs to provide a brief yet clear explanation of the process undertaken to compile the narrative review. Explain where the literature sources were obtained from. Mention the databases used, such as PubMed, Google Scholar, ScienceDirect, ProQuest, or other sources relevant to the topic. State the main keywords used to search for articles. This explanation helps readers understand the focus of the literature search. Describe the criteria used to select articles for review, such as publication year, type of article (original research, review, case report), language, or full-text availability. Briefly explain how the selection process was conducted (e.g., title and abstract screening, full-text reading) and how the authors synthesized or grouped information from various sources. Mention the number of articles ultimately included and, if relevant, the general characteristics of the included studies.]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Results and Discussion** |  |

[In a narrative review, the Results and Discussion section serves not to report new experimental findings but to present a structured synthesis of the existing literature. This section should be organized around major themes, subtopics, or conceptual issues relevant to the focus of the review. Each subheading represents a critical aspect of the topic and helps guide the reader through the key areas of interest.

Rather than listing individual study outcomes, authors are encouraged to summarize overarching trends, highlight agreements and disagreements among sources, and provide interpretations of the literature as a whole. A well-crafted narrative should identify where the evidence is strong, where it is conflicting, and where significant gaps in knowledge still exist. In this way, the review does not simply describe studies but critically engages with their findings and implications.

To maintain coherence and clarity, authors should synthesize information from multiple sources under each thematic section. The discussion can be enriched by including theoretical frameworks, comparisons between population groups or methodologies, and commentary on the clinical or scientific relevance of the findings. Where appropriate, tables or conceptual diagrams may be included to visually summarize complex data or classifications; however, the emphasis remains on textual synthesis rather than numerical reporting.

An important element of the discussion is the critical appraisal of the studies being reviewed. Authors should point out limitations in study designs, inconsistencies in methodology, or potential biases that may influence the interpretation of results. This reflective approach adds credibility to the review and demonstrates scholarly depth.

Finally, the narrative should draw connections between the reviewed literature and broader clinical practice, research directions, or health policy. Authors are expected to outline how the collected evidence informs current understanding, what controversies or unresolved questions remain, and what future studies are needed to advance the field. By the end of this section, the reader should have a comprehensive and well-contextualized view of the topic, supported by a thoughtful integration of the literature.]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Conclusion** |  |

[The conclusion of a narrative review serves as the final synthesis of the literature and should not merely repeat points already discussed. Instead, it should provide a clear and concise summary of the most important findings derived from the narrative analysis. This section should reflect the core message of the review and emphasize its contribution to the understanding of the topic.

Begin by restating the main objective of the review in brief, followed by a summary of key insights or patterns identified across the literature. This includes highlighting areas where the evidence is strong and well-established, as well as where controversies or uncertainties persist. Rather than presenting new information, the conclusion should consolidate the reviewed material into a coherent final perspective.

It is essential that the conclusion also discusses the practical or theoretical implications of the findings. In clinical or applied fields, this may include how the evidence can inform best practices, support decision-making, or guide patient care. In more conceptual or basic science topics, it may involve refining existing models, proposing new hypotheses, or suggesting links between disconnected areas of research.

Furthermore, the conclusion should identify clear directions for future research. This may include recommendations for study designs, populations that remain understudied, or methodological improvements that could enhance the quality of evidence in the field. Well-formulated suggestions for future inquiry demonstrate critical reflection and ensure the review contributes to ongoing scholarly discourse.

Ultimately, a strong conclusion leaves the reader with a clear understanding of the current state of knowledge, the significance of the topic, and how the narrative review has advanced insight within the field. It should be concise—typically one to three paragraphs—and written in a way that reinforces the coherence and purpose of the entire manuscript.]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
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