

THE FONT TYPE OF THE TITLE IS TIMES NEW ROMAN, 12 pt

First Author¹, Second author², Third author³, and so forth (Times New Roman, 9pt)

*Corresponding author email: xxxxxxxx@ukwms.ac.id

DOI:

This template is a guideline format to write a **Narrative Review** for Journal of Widya Medika Junior (JWMJ) that has been adjusted to the writing style of JWMJ. A narrative review is a type of literature review that allows you to explore and interpret a body of research without being confined to rigid protocols. Narrative review articles, which are not preferred except in specific cases (and **should be written by specialty experts**), generally contain an unstructured Abstract. The **unstructured** Abstract should summarize the same items and must include at least a general description of the search methodology used to supplement and support research for the article, but will not have formal results. Abstract should be written in no more than 250 words transcribed in 1 (one) paragraph and there should be keywords below the abstract consist of 3–5 specific terms that are occasionally used in the manuscript. Avoid the use of citation and abbreviation on Abstract. You're not collecting data for meta-analysis or replicating someone else's process step-by-step. Instead, you're constructing a clear, compelling story about what has already been published on your topic. Your job is to select relevant sources, group them meaningfully, and draw insights that help others understand the landscape of a field. This is your opportunity to connect the dots, highlight key debates, and identify gaps. Authors should follow the provided guidelines. The page numbers of JWMJ consist of 3 to 12 pages maximum. Should there be foreign terms that have not yet been standardized, write it in *Italic*. The font type is Times New Roman, 10 pt, single spaced. All tables and figures should be separated from the text. Tables should be submitted in Microsoft Word format (.docx) and completed with figure legend. Figures should be submitted in TIFF or JPEG format with clear captions. Make sure not to change the style of this template, including font type and size, spaces, indent hanging, et cetera.

ABSTRACT

Abstracts for narrative reviews should include the following separate sections: Purpose of review, sources of information, methods (how was the information integrated, analyzed and synthesized?), key findings. Be selective but substantive and include key recommendations, suggestions, and questions on which no suggestion could be made and limitations.

Keywords: 3–5 key words that identify what the research topic. (Capital letter is only used in the first keyword, separated by semicolons (;) and not stopped by a full stop after the last keyword, keywords should be arranged alphabetically).

Article history: Received, Revised, Accepted, Online

¹ Undergraduate Student, Faculty of Medicine, Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University, Surabaya, Indonesia.

² Department of xxxxxxxx, Faculty of Medicine, Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University, Surabaya, Indonesia.

³ Department of xxxxxxxx, Faculty of Medicine, Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University, Surabaya, Indonesia.

INTRODUCTION

Provides context for the reviewed topic and explains why it is important. Narrative reviews can be used to introduce an original research manuscript or review a critical topic for a scholarly journal. Clearly states the general question the review aims to address or the specific purpose of the literature review. It indicates the main area of discussion and the reason for the review. Briefly outlines the boundaries of the review, the types of literature to be discussed, and the time period if relevant.

METHODS

Although not as stringent as systematic reviews, including this section improves transparency and reduces bias. It helps to describe how the literature was searched and selected. This can include: Databases used (e.g., PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science), keywords or search strategies employed, general inclusion/exclusion criteria (e.g., study types, language, publication date range). However, narrative reviews typically have greater flexibility in literature search and identification criteria compared to systematic reviews. The process of writing a good narrative review involves framing a research question, deciding the most suitable methodology, going through literature, representing evidence, and preparing a draft.

DISCUSSION

This is the main part of the narrative review where the relevant literature is presented and discussed. The structure can vary depending on the topic, but it often involves organizing literature into thematic sub-sections. For medical topics, this could be divided by epidemiology, etiopathogenesis, clinical and laboratory features, management, and complications. Authors should not merely summarize but synthesize information, identify patterns, debates, and limitations within the literature. Authors should also provide a critical appraisal of existing research. Provide a general interpretation of the findings and their significance, justifying this interpretation with the evidence presented.

Write Sub-title If Needed

Comparing findings from various studies. For many narrative reviews, it might be preferable to

integrate the results and discussion, concurrently discussing major issues in the body of the text.

CONCLUSION

Summarizes the main points of the review and reiterates the key contributions or messages of the article. It should explain the importance or relevance of the observations to clinical practice, policy, or future research. This section can also highlight limitations of the review and the field, methodological issues, implications, and future directions for the reader. Mention any key limitations and strengths of the data analyzed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

To express gratitude to those who helped with the literature search, arrangement of materials or in the writing process (but whose contributions were too small to be justified as co-authors), as well as to the organization/funding agency and its funding program.

REFERENCES

Using Vancouver Style. The minimal number of references should be 20, and 80% of them should be up to date (published during the last 10 years). References from journals are preferred, at least 80%. Authors is recommended to use reference management software.

Journal

1. Stevens I. Surgery for trauma patients. *Surgeon Profession Journal*. 2008;3(1):48–55. doi:10.5266/spj.3.1.4855
2. Aminuddin N, Hamid HB. Predictors of deviant behavior justification among Muslims: Sociodemographic factors, subjective well-being, and perceived religiousness. *Islam. Guid. Couns. J*. 2021;4(2):144–57. doi:10.25217/igcj.v4i2.1814
3. Ghani NH, Yusop Z, Mat Amin Z, Siaw Yin T. Hydrology method for environmental flows assessment of Johor River Basin under regulated and non-regulated conditions. *Environmental and Toxicology Management*. 2022;2(2):1–9. doi:10.33086/etm.v2i2.3423

Book

Series

4. Bhattacharjee M. *Notes of Infinite Permutation Groups*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics. No. 1698. New York: Springer; 1998.

Edition

5. Agustinus I, I'tishom R, Pramesti MPB. *Biologi Reproduksi Pria*. 1st ed. Surabaya: Airlangga University Press; 2019.

Chapter or section of a book

6. Sarvasti D. Penilaian klinis PKVA. In: Arso IA, Ambari AM, Hartopo AB, Santoso A, Radi B, Sarvasti D, editors. *Panduan Prevensi Penyakit Kardiovaskular Aterosklerosis*.

Jakarta: Perhimpunan Dokter Spesialis Kardiovaskular Indonesia; 2022. p. 93–113.

Proceeding

7. Fitriyah FK, Purwoko B. Youth narcissistic and aggression: A challenge for guidance and counseling service in University. In: *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Education Innovation (ICEI 2017)*. 2018;173:109–11. doi:10.2991/icei-17.2018.29

<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Thesis/</u>	<u>Master's</u>
<u>Thesis/Dissertation</u>		

8. Marianne A. Struktur modal dan profitabilitas pada perusahaan garmen busana [Undergraduate thesis]. Universitas Persada; 2013. Available from: <https://e-persada-library.ac.id/view/21347>

Online News/Website

9. Adit A. Penjelasan Mendikbud terkait 3 aspek asesmen nasional pengganti UN 2021 [Internet]. Kompas.com; 2020 Oct 8 [cited 2025 Jun 10]. Available from: <https://edukasi.kompas.com/read/2020/10/08/095454871/penjelasan-mendikbud-terkait-3-aspek-asesmen-nasional-pengganti-un-2021?page=all>
10. Dinas Pariwisata Kota Palembang. Penyesuaian tarif masuk tempat wisata [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2025 Jun 10]. Available from: <https://officialpariwisatapalembang.co.id/abc123>

(Article's title)... (Last name) (First letter of first and second name), (Author 2), (Author 3)

TABLES AND FIGURES EXAMPLES

Place all of the tables and figures in the final page.

Small Table

Table 1. The caption uses sentence case, with Times New Roman font family, 9 pt

Age	n	%	Median (minimum– maximum)
17–25	16	69.57	
26–45	6	26.09	23 (17–47)
46–50	1	4.35	
Total	23	100	

The table uses 1.0 spacing, align center. The categories are bolded. Write the description below the table. For large tables, specify the table in the first sentence (e.g. Table 3 shows...).

Table 3. The caption uses sentence case, with Times New Roman font family, 9 pt

Domain	Question	Group		Mean diff.	p-value
		SMILE Pro	Non-surgical Optical Correction (K/L)		
Visual function	1	50.21±11.76	47.44±10.43	2.77	0.755 [*]
	Symptom	47.53±10.71	42.73±7.82	4.8	0.087 [*]
	Convenience	53.85±7.47	45.27±13.95	8.58	0.030 [*]
Health concerns	4	51.52±13.24	36.19±8.73	15.33	<0.001 [*]
	5	55.06±10.03	42.8±11.63	12.26	<0.001 [*]
	6	58.96±11.16	37.82±8.36	21.14	<0.001 [*]
	7	48.88±12.31	34.93±13.76	13.95	0.004 [*]
	8	50.76±10.4	47.03±12.2	3.73	0.209 [*]
	9	51.57±10.54	40.92±12.99	10.65	0.002 [*]
	10	59.17±11.55	41.49±10.6	17.68	<0.001 [*]
	11	54.48±13.12	37.44±7.59	17.04	<0.001 [*]
	12	40.31±12.15	38.71±12.58	1.6	0.559 [*]

(Article's title)... (Last name) (First letter of first and second name), (Author 2), (Author 3)

Well-being	13	45.1±12.14	43.45±12.26	1.65	0.541 [*]
	14	67.04±11.65	48±18.55	19.04	<0.001 [*]
	15	60.45±20.33	45.54±16.68	14.91	0.032 [*]
	16	63.7±17.96	47.76±13.72	15.94	0.002 [*]
	17	61.91±15.12	43.32±15.32	18.59	<0.001 [*]
	18	61.06±13.87	41.94±16.68	19.12	<0.001 [*]
	19	49.62±14.6	36.76±16.14	12.86	0.004 [*]
	20	57.71±16.26	44.6±16.99	13.11	0.008 [*]
Composite Score		54.22±6.05	42.16±4.96	12.06	<0.001 [#]

K, Glasses; L, Contact lenses; SMILE Pro, *small incision lenticule extraction pro*; ^{*}Wilcoxon-Mann Whitney; [#]Independent t test

Large Table

Figures



Figure 1. The caption must be below the image, with the font Times New Roman, 9 pt.