An Analysis of The Financial Performance The Regional Public Service Agency at RSUD dr. Doris Sylvanus using Financial Ratios

Purwadi Yustistianto[1], Alexandra Hukom[2], Dicky Ompusunggu[3]

{purwadiwisnu@gmail.com[1], alexandra.hukom@feb.upr.ac.id[2], dickyperwira@feb.upr.ac.id}

Faculty of Economic and Business Development, Universitas Palangka Raya, Indonesia[1,2,3]

Abstract. The purpose of this research was to see how the 2018-2022 financial performance was at RSUD dr. Doris Sylvanus who has implemented the BLUD financial management pattern by using financial ratios. Tthis study using the method of documentation with secondary data. The data used was in the form of financial reports which are then analyzed using financial ratio analysis techniques according to the Director General of Treasury Regulation Number Per-22/PB/2020. The financial performance of dr. Doris Sylvanus in 2018 was 64.47%, in 2019 it was 66.32%, in 2020 it was 52.63%, in 2021 it was 71.05% and in 2022 it was 60.53%. It can be concluded that the financial performance achievements of dr. Doris Sylvanus, in 2018 in the medium criteria, in 2019 in the medium criteria, in 2020 in the medium criteria, in 2021 in the good criteria and in 2022 is included in the medium criteria.

Keywords: financial performance, pattern of BLUD financial management, analysis of financial ratios

1 Introduction

Reforming state finances to become performance-based prompted the government to issue Government Regulation Number 74 of 2012 concerning Amendments to Government Regulation Number 23 of 2005 concerning Financial Management of Public Service Bodies. In the Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 79 of 2018 concerning Regional Public Service Agencies it is explained that BLUD is a system implemented by regional service/agency technical implementing units in providing services to the wider community where in its implementation it has flexibility in financial management as an exception to regional financial management provisions in general. Flexibility in financial management at hospitals is expected to improve service performance and financial performance, so they can provide optimal health services and compete [6].

World Health Organization (WHO) on January 31 2020 has declared a global health emergency status, the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic situation that hit China has

experienced an increase in cases and has spread between countries very quickly. In Indonesia itself, on March 2, 2020 the government also designated it as a Covid-19 Extraordinary Event (KLB). According to Yuniarti [34], seriously mentioned by the Central Statistics Agency that economic growth since August 1st quarter 2020 was minus up to 5.32%, this proves the huge influence of Covid-19 on economic growth in Indonesia. In addition to having an impact on economic growth, Covid-19 also has a profound impact on the performance of organizations including public sector organizations (government agencies).

As a Referral Hospital in Central Kalimantan, of course the burden on dealing with Covid-19 patients is getting higher. Hadi Machbudiansyah [12], argued that the realization of declining revenues or income has an impact on the hospital's cash flow. If this is disturbed it will make the operational burden of the hospital increase, and if this continues it can cause health services for the community to be stopped.

With these facts, it is necessary to evaluate financial performance so that it becomes an evaluation in order to improve the quality of service to the public. According to Molintas [20], that financial performance is an analysis carried out to see the extent to which a company/agency has implemented financial implementation rules properly and correctly. Assessment of financial performance can be done by assessing audited financial statements using analytical techniques, namely financial ratio analysis techniques. based on Regulation of the Director General of Treasury Number Per-22/PB/2020 concerning the Second Amendment to Regulation of the Director General of Treasury Number Per-36/PB/2016 concerning Guidelines for the Performance Assessment of Public Service Agencies in the Field of Health Services. Where the financial ratios used are Cash Ratio, Current Ratio, Collection Period, Fixed Asset Turnover, Return on Fixed Assets, Equity Returns (Return on Equity), Calculation of Inventory Turnover Ratio, Calculation of the Ratio of PNBP (Non-Tax State Revenue) to Operational Costs and Calculation of Patient Cost Subsidy Ratio. This is in accordance with research conducted Rosi Yuliana [26], where in measuring the financial performance of the Regional Public Service Agency of the General Hospital dr. Fauziah Bireuen uses cash ratio, current ratio, collecting period, fixed asset turnover, return on fixed assets, return on equity, inventory turnover, non-tax state income, and ratio to operational costs.

Based on the description above, the authors see the importance of analyzing the financial performance of government agencies that have implemented the BLUD Financial Management Pattern, so the authors conducted a study entitled " An Analysis of The Financial Performance The Regional Public Service Agency at RSUD dr. Doris Sylvanus using Financial Ratios".

The purpose of this research was carried out to see how the financial performance in 2018 - 2022 at RSUD dr. Doris Sylvanus, who has implemented the BLUD Financial Management Pattern, uses financial ratios.

2. Research Methods

2.1 Research methods

The type of method used in this research was a case study. According to Kriyantono (2020), the case study method is a research method that uses various data sources that can be used as research material, describe, and explain comprehensively various aspects of individuals, groups, a program, organization, or event systematically. Case studies according to Mulyana in Kriyantono [10], can also be used by researchers as an effort to examine a number of variables regarding a case.

2.2 Data

The data used in this research was secondary data in the form of Audited Financial Statements for the 2018-2022 fiscal year, sourced from dr. Doris Sylvanus.

2.3 Method of collecting data

Method of data collection in this study using the method of documentation with secondary data. That is, the data used was obtained indirectly from other parties.

2.4 Data analysis method

By using financial ratio instruments in accordance with the Director General of Treasury Regulation Number Per-22/PB/2020 regarding the Second Amendment to the Regulation of the Director General of Treasury Number Per-36/PB/2016 concerning Guidelines for the Performance Assessment of Public Service Agencies in the Field of Health Services, then the financial performance of a BLU can be measured and its performance assessed. The steps used in this financial performance appraisal are:

a. Perform calculations of financial ratios on Audited Financial Statements for the 2018-2022 period. Then, give a score to the resulting ratio value. Ratios and scores in evaluating financial performance are adjusted to the Director General of Treasury Regulation Number Per-22/PB/2020.

b. Add up the scores obtained. The score is adjusted to the existing indicators in the performance appraisal of the financial aspect of the financial ratio sub-aspect. Then, measuring the level of achievement of financial performance, by comparing the resulting total score with the specified maximum score, as follows:

$$\text{Financial Performance Score} = \frac{\text{Total Score ratio analysis calculation results}}{\text{Total Maximum Indicator Score}} \times 100\%$$

(1)

c. Draw conclusions from the results of the financial performance appraisal.

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Financial ratio analysis

Assessment of financial performance uses financial ratios to the financial statements of the BLUD RSUD dr. Doris Sylvanus was carried out from 2018 - 2022. The results of the analysis will provide information about the weaknesses and strengths of the BLUD of RSUD dr. Doris Sylvanus, where the stages in assessing financial performance are as follows:

3.2 Calculation of the Cash Ratio (Cash Ratio)

Table 1. Cash ratio calculation results [20].

Year	Cash and Cash Equivalents (Rp)	Short Term Liabilities (Rp)	Cash Ratio (%)	Ups and down)	Score
2018	18,659,002,131.60	34,225,826,031.00	54,52		0.25
2019	33,930,446,733.32	30,069,374,314.00	112.84	106.98	0.50
2020	60,362,374,642.53	31,162,855,201.18	193.7	71,66	1.50
2021	143,301,983,392.53	68,142,771,221.00	210,3	8.57	1.50
2022	126,434,673,575.53	47,613,803,662.00	265.54	26,27	2.00

Based on table 1, it can be seen from the calculation results from 2018 - 2022 the value of the Cash Ratio has increased. The table shows that the value of the cash ratio for 2018 was 54.52%, 2019 was 112.84%, 2020 was 193.70%, 2021 was210.30% and in 2022 it will be 265.54%. The value of the cash ratio increased for 2019 by 106.98%, for 2020 by 71.66%, for 2021 by 8.57% and for 2022 by 26.27%. The percentage shown in the calculation results above produces a score for in 2018 it was 0.25, in 2019 it was 0.50, in 2020 it was 1.50, in 2021 it was 1.50, and in 2022 it was 2.00.

3.3 Calculation of Current Ratio

Table 2. Current Ratio Calculation Results [20].

Year	Current Assets (Rp)	Short Term Liabilities (Rp)	Current Ratio (%)	Ups and down)	Score
2018	87,270,369,171.93	34,225,826,031.00	254.98		1.00
2019	84,430,634,684.32	30,069,374,314.00	280.79	10,12	1.00
2020	99,281,980,268.56	31,162,855,201.18	318.59	13.46	1.00
2021	236,161,429,909.47	68,142,771,221.00	346.57	8.78	1.00
2022	182,071,408,076.85	47,613,803,662.00	382,39	10.34	1.50

Based on table 2, it can be seen from the calculation results from 2018 - 2022 the value of the Current Ratio has increased. The table shows that the current ratio for 2018 was 254.98%, 2019 was 280.79%, 2020 was 318.59%, 2021 was 346.57% and 2022 was 382.39%. The current ratio increased by 10.12% in 2019, 13.46% in 2020, 8.78% in 2021 and 10.34% in 2022.The percentage shown in the calculation results above produces a score for in 2018 it was 1.00, in 2019 it was 1.00, in 2020 it was 1.00, in 2021 it was 1.00 and in 2022 it was 1.50.

3.4 Accounts Receivable Collection Period Ratio Calculation

Table 3. Calculation Results of Accounts Receivable Collection Period Ratios [20].

Year	Accounts Receivable x 360 (Rp)	Operating Income (Rp)	Receivable Collection Period Ratio (Days)	Ups and down)	Score
2018	17,672,856,651,720.00	24,834,316,306.00	711.63		0.00
2019	11,526,423,144,480.00	23,475,717,092.00	490.99	(31.00)	0.00
2020	5,585,947,145,640.00	23,141,677,633.00	241.38	(50,84)	0.00
2021	21,551,416,442,280.00	27,476,521,823.00	784.36	224.95	0.00
2022	10,980,150,625,800.00	33,744,111,376.00	325,39	(58,51)	0.00

Based on table 3, it can be seen from the calculation results from 2018 - 2022 the value of the Receivables Collection Period Ratio has fluctuated. The table shows the number of days needed to collect receivables to be converted into revenue in 2018, namely 711.63 days, in 2019, namely 490.99 days, in 2020, namely 241.38 days, in 2021, namely 784.36 days, and in 2022, namely 325.39 days. The value of the receivables collection period ratio decreased for 2019 by 31.00%, for 2020 by 50.84%, and for 2022 by 58.51%. Meanwhile, the increase will only be in 2021 of 224.95%. The percentage shown in the calculation results above produces a score for in 2018 it was 0.00, in 2019 it was 0.00, in 2020 it was 0.00, in 2021 it was 0.0 and in 2022 it was 0.00.

3.5 Calculation of Fixed Asset Turnover Ratio

Table 4. Calculation results of the Fixed Asset Turnover Ratio [20].

Year	Operating Income (Rp)	Fixed Assets (Rp)	Fixed Asset Turnover Ratio (%)	Ups and down)	Score
2018	174,514,692,933.00	17,533,518,145.46	995.32		2.00
2019	133,508,318,824.72	18,357,981,978.46	727,25	(26.93)	2.00
2020	172,759,817,042.21	27,897,268,220.46	619,27	(14.85)	2.00
2021	327,601,569,486.00	35,721,776,476.46	917.09	48.09	2.00
2022	240,562,267,449.00	67,827,222,214.46	354.67	(61,33)	2.00

Based on table 4, it can be seen from the calculation results from 2018 - 2022 the value of the Fixed Asset Turnover Ratio has fluctuated. The table shows the fixed asset turnover ratio for 2018 of 995.32%, 727.25% for 2019, 619.27% for 2020, 917.09% for 2021 and 354.67% for 2022. The value of the fixed asset turnover ratio decreased for 2019 by 26.93%, for 2020 by 14.85%, and for 2022 by 61.33%. Meanwhile, only 48.09% will increase in 2021.The percentage shown in the calculation results above produces a score for in 2018 it was 2.00, in 2019 it was 2.00, in 2020 it was 2.00, in 2021 it was 2.00, and in 2022 it was 2.00.

3.6 Calculation of Return on Fixed Assets

Table 5. Result of Calculation of Return on Fixed Assets [20].

Year	Surplus/Deficit before Profit/Loss Post (Rp)	Fixed Assets (Rp)	Return on Fixed Assets (%)	Ups and down)	Score
2018	19,964,474,279.33	17,533,518,145.46	113.86		2.00
2019	2,612,098,230.39	18,357,981,978.46	14,23	(87.50)	2.00
2020	- 12,239,160,341.94	27,897,268,220.46	-43.87	(408,34)	0.00
2021	73,253,740,792.61	35,721,776,476.46	205.07	567,42	2.00
2022	- 19,885,529,805.32	67,827,222,214.46	-29.32	(114.30)	0.00

Based on table 5, the results of calculations from 2018 - 2022 have fluctuated the value of the Return on Fixed Assets Ratio. The table shows the ratio of return on fixed assets for 2018 was 113.86%, 2019 was 14.23%, 2020 was -43.87%, 2021 was 205.07% and 2022 was -29.32%. The return on fixed assets ratio decreased for 2019 by 87.50%, for 2020 by 408.34%, and for 2022 by 114.30%. Meanwhile, only 567.42% will increase in 2021The percentage shown in the calculation results above produces a score for in 2018 it was 2.00, in 2019 it was 2.00, in 2020 it was 0.00, in 2021 it was 2.00, and in 2022 it was 0.00.

3.7 Calculation of Return on Equity

Table 6. Return on Equity Calculation Results [20].

Year	Surplus/Deficit before Profit/Loss Post (Rp)	Equity - Surplus/Deficit before Profit/Loss Items (Rp)	Return on Equity (%)	Ups and down)	Score
2018	19,964,474,279.33	16,334,368,900.59	122,22		2.00
2019	2,612,098,230.39	40,752,455,138.62	6,41	(94,76)	1.60
2020	12,239,160,341.94	60,682,964,079.51	-20,17	(414,67)	0.00
2021	73,253,740,792.61	84,597,168,305.72	86.59	529,33	2.00
2022	19,885,529,805.32	155,040,094,801.15	-12.83	(114.81)	0.00

Based on table 6, it can be seen that the calculation results from 2018 - 2022 have fluctuated the value of the Return on Equity Ratio. The table shows the rate of return on investment owned to generate profits for 2018 of 122.22%, 2019 of 6.41%, 2020 of -20.17%, 2021 of 86.59% and 2022 of - 12.83%. The return on equity ratio decreased for 2019 by 94.76%, for 2020 by 414.67% and for 2022 by 114.81%. Meanwhile, only 529.33% will increase in 2021.The percentage shown in the calculation results above produces a score forin 2018 it was 2.00, in 2019 it was 1.60, in 2020 it was 0.00, in 2021 it was 2.00, and in 2022 it was 0.00.

3.8 Calculation of Inventory Turnover Ratio

Table 7. Inventory Turnover Ratio Calculation Results [20].

Year	Total Inventory x 365 (Rp)	BLU Revenue (Rp)	Inventory Turnover (days)	Ups and down)	Score
2018	7,124,835,975,615.45	174,514,692,933.00	40,83		1.50
2019	6,746,056,247,295.00	133,508,318,824.72	50,53	23.77	1.00
2020	8,542,126,308,615.95	179,714,019,981.21	47,53	(5.93)	1.00
2021	12,042,956,308,038.10	333,061,147,448.48	36,16	(23,93)	1.50
2022	9,174,755,375,156.80	242,520,553,332.70	37,83	4.63	1.50

Based on table 7, it can be seen from the calculation results from 2018 - 2022 the value of the Inventory Turnover Ratio has fluctuated. The table shows the time needed to turn inventory into income for 2018, namely 40.83 days, for 2019, namely 50.53 days, for 2020, namely 47.53 days, for 2021, for 36.16 days, and for 2022, for 37.83 day. The value of the inventory turnover ratio increased for 2019 by 23.77% and for 2022 by 4.63%. Meanwhile, the decline occurred in 2020 by 5.93% and in 2021 by 23.93%. The percentage shown in the calculation results above produces a score for in 2018 it was 1.50, in 2019 it was 1.00, in 2020 it was 1.00, in 2021 it was 1.50, and in 2022 it was 1.50.

3.9 Calculation of the Ratio of PNBP (Non-Tax State Revenue) to Operational Costs

Table 8. Results of Calculation of the Ratio of PNBP to Operational Costs [20].

Year	PNBP Revenue (Rp)	Operational Cost (Rp)	Ratio of PNBP to Operational Costs (%)	Ups and down)	Score
2018	174,514,692,933.00	154,550,218,653.67	112.92		2.50
2019	133,508,318,824.72	130,896,220,594.33	102	(9,67)	2.50
2020	179,714,019,981.21	191,953,180,323.15	93.62	(8,21)	2.50
2021	333,061,147,448.48	254,347,828,693.39	130.95	39,87	2.50
2022	242,520,553,332.70	260,447,797,254.32	93,12	(28,89)	2.50

Based on table 8, it can be seen from the calculation results from 2018 - 2022 that the PNBP Ratio value has fluctuated. The table shows the ratio of PNBP to Operational Expenses for 2018 of 112.92%, 2019 of 102.00%, 2020 of 93.62%, 2021 of 130.95% and 2022 of 93.12%. The ratio of PNBP to operating expenses decreased for 2019 by 9.67%, for 2020 by 8.21% and for 2022 by 28.89%. Meanwhile, only 39.87% will increase in 2021.The percentage shown in the calculation results above produces a score forin 2018 it was 2.50, in 2019 it was 2.50, in 2020 it was 2.50, in 2021 it was 2.50, and in 2022 it was 2.50.

3.10 Calculation of Patient Cost Subsidy Ratio

Table 9. Results of Calculation of Patient Cost Subsidy Ratio [20].

Year	Total Patient Cost Subsidies (Rp)	BLUD Revenue (Rp)	Patient Cost Subsidy Ratio (%)	Ups and down)	Score
2018	4,681,735,935.00	174,514,692,933.00	2.68		1.00
2019	6,698,623,123.00	133,508,318,824.72	5.02	87.03	2.00
2020	12,993,905,227.00	179,714,019,981.21	7,23	44,11	2.00
2021	9,998,640,090.00	333,061,147,448.48	3.00	(58,48)	1.00
2022	20,931,970,183.00	242,520,553,332.70	8,63	187.5	2.00

Based on table 9, it can be seen from the calculation results from 2018 - 2022 the value of the Patient Cost Subsidy Ratio has increased. Where is the patient fee subsidy ratio for 2018 of 2.68%, 5.02% for 2019, 7.23% for 2020, 3.00% for 2021 and 8.63% for 2022. The patient cost subsidy ratio increased for 2019 by 87.03%, for 2020 by 44.11% and for 2022 by 187.50%. Meanwhile, it only decreased in 2021 by 58.48%. The percentage shown in the calculation results above produces a score for in 2018 it was 1.00, in 2019 it was 2.00, in 2020 it was 2.00, in 2021 it was 1.00, and in 2022 it was 2.00.

3.11 Performance Assessment Results

Table 10. Recapitulation of Financial Ratio Calculation Results [20].

No	Ratio Type	Indicator Score	Score				
			2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
1	Cash Ratio	2.00	0.25	0.50	1.50	1.50	2.00
2	Current Ratio	2.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.50
3	Receivable Collection Period Ratio	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	Fixed Asset Turnover	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
5	Return on Fixed Assets	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	0.00
6	Return on Equity	2.00	2.00	1.60	0.00	2.00	0.00
7	Inventory Turnover	2.00	1.50	1.00	1.00	1.50	1.50
8	Ratio of PNBP to Operational Costs	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50
9	Patient Cost Subsidy Ratio	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00
	Total Score	**19.00**	**12.25**	**12.60**	**10.00**	**13.50**	**11.50**

Based on the table above, the authors conclude in the table the results of the BLUD dr. Doris Sylvanus, as follows:

Table 11. Financial Performance Assessment Results [20].

Year (1)	Total Score (2)	Maximum Score (3)	Annual Performance (4) = (2)/(3) x 100%	Criteria	Predicate
2018	12.25		64,47	Medium	BBB
2019	12,6		66,32	Medium	BBB
2020	10	19	52,63	Medium	BB
2021	13.5		71.05	Good	A
2022	11.5		60,53	Medium	BBB

Assessment of the financial performance of the BLUD dr. Doris Sylvanus Year 2018 - 2022 relies on the weight of the total score produced. The results of the financial performance assessment at the BLUD dr. Doris Sylvanus shows that the performance value fluctuates, as can be seen from the not yet maximal score obtained from the required maximum score indicator shown in Table 11. The score obtained has increased its performance in 2018 - 2022 namely for Cash Ratio, Current Ratio, Inventory Turnover Ratio and Ratio Patient subsidies. The score obtained must be maintained for its performance in 2018 - 2022, namely the Receivables Collection Period Ratio, Fixed Asset Turnover Ratio, and the Ratio of Non-Tax State Revenue to Operational Costs.

The financial performance of the BLUD dr. Doris Sylvanus in 2018 reached a score level of 12.25 or reached 64.47% of the required maximum score so that it was classified as a average category, in 2019 it reached a score level of 12.60 or reached 66.32% of the maximum required score so that it was classified as a average category , in 2020 it reached a score level of 10.00 or reached 52.63% of the required maximum score so that it was classified as a average category, in 2021 it reached a score level of 13.50 or reached 71.05% of the required maximum score so that it was classified as a good category and year 2022 reaches a score level of 11.50 or reaches 60.53% of the maximum score required so that it is classified as the average category.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusion

Based on calculations of financial ratio analysis of financial reports for 2018 - 2022 BLUD RSUD dr. Doris Sylvanus, the authors draw the conclusion that the results of the analysis of cash ratios, current ratios and patient cost subsidy ratios are getting better every year. The ratio of Accounts Receivable Collection Period has decreased although it has not been able to provide a score that is close to and/or equal to the required score. It is important to maintain and increase this momentum so that the value of the receivables collection period tends to decrease because if the receivables collection period increases, there is concern about the liquidity level of the BLUD RSUD dr. Doris Sylvanus will be disturbed because to make receivables in cash requires time related to the smooth payment.

Furthermore, on the fixed asset turnover ratio, the ratio of PNBP to operational costs where the level of effectiveness and efficiency of the BLUD of RSUD dr. Doris Sylvanus in generating income by using fixed assets and the effective use of costs must be maintained and improved.

The ratio performance that must be increased is the return on fixed assets ratio and the return on equity ratio, even in 2020 and 2022 the resulting ratio will be negative. This happened because of the burden incurred by the BLUD of RSUD dr. Doris Sylvanus is greater than the income earned, causing a deficit. In addition, the addition of spending on fixed assets was not effective, so it was not able to increase the revenue of the BLUD dr. Doris Sylvanus significantly.

The results of the financial performance assessment of the BLUD dr. Doris Sylvanus as a whole, in 2018 reached a score level of 12.25 or reached 64.47% so that it was classified as a medium category, in 2019 it reached a score level of 12.60 or reached 66.32% so that it was classified as a medium category, in 2020 it reached a score level of 10 .00 or reaching 52.63% so that it is classified as a medium category, in 2021 it will reach a score level of 13.50 or reach 71.05% so that it is classified as a good category and in 2022 it will reach a score level of 11.50 so that it is classified as a medium category.

4.2 Suggestion

Based on the conclusions from the results of the analysis carried out, the suggestion that the writer can give is to make financial reports a decision-making tool by the BLUD Directors of RSUD dr. Doris Sylvanus to support financial performance improvement. BLUD dr. Doris Sylvanus is also expected to be able to maintain and increase the level of liquidity, with what has been achieved so far in generating current assets including cash and cash equivalents by exploring new potentials for hospital income, both from making short-term investments, opening new superior services , conduct joint operations with other parties, reviewing the tariffs that have been set and the utilization of regional property through the utilization of regional property and/or optimizing regional property by not changing the status of ownership to obtain income and not reducing the quality of public services which is the obligation of the BLUD of RSUD dr. Doris Sylvanus. Another important thing is also to improve cost control by spending planned costs and in accordance with the Budget Business Plan because this step will minimize the occurrence of deficits and have an impact on improving financial performance and finally improve supervision and evaluation of the management of receivables, inventory and debts of the BLUD RSUD dr. Doris Sylvanus, so that in the future there will be improvements in its management.

References

[1]   Amins, Achmad: Manajemen Kinerja Pemerintah Daerah. LaksBang PRESSindo, Yogyakarta (2012)

[2]   Amir Machmud dan H. Rukmana: Bank Syariah, Teori, Kebijakan, dan Studi Empiris di Indonesia. Jakarta (2016)

[3]   Fahmi, Irham: Analisis Kinerja Keuangan. Alfabeta, Bandung (2012)

[4]   Fahmi, Irham: Analisa Kinerja Keuangan. Alfabeta, Bandung (2014)

[5]   Fahmi, I.: Analisis Kinerja Keuangan: Panduan bagi Akademisi, Manajer, dan Investor dan Menganalisis Bisnis dari Aspek Keuangan. Alfabeta, Bandung (2018)

[6]   Freddy Semuel Kawatu, Cecilia Lelly Kewo: Regional Public Service Agency's Financial Management Implementation in Walanda Maramis North Minahasa Public Hospital. Vol. 5(3). International Journal of Accounting & Finance in Asia Pasific (IJAFAP). (2022)

[7]   Hanafi, Mamduh. M., Halim, Abdul: Analisis Laporan Keuangan Edisi ke5. UPP STIM YKPN, Yogyakarta (2016)

[8]   Hery: Analisis Laporan Keuangan: Integrated and Comprehensive Edition Cetakan Ketiga. PT. Gramedia, Jakarta (2018)

[9]   Kasmir: Analisis Laporan Keuangan. PT Raja Grafindo Persada, Depok (2018)

[10]   Kriyantono, R.: Teknik praktis riset komunikasi kuantitatif dan kualitatif disertai contoh praktis Skripsi, Tesis, dan Disertai Riset Media, Public Relations, Advertising, Komunikasi Organisasi, Komunikasi Pemasaran. Prenadamedia Group, Rawangmangun (2020)

[11]   L, M. Samryn: Pengantar Akuntansi-Metode Akuntansi untuk Elemen Laporan Keuangan Diperkaya dengan Perspektif IFRS & Perbankan. Edisi Pertama. PT RajaGrafindo Persada, Jakarta (2015)

[12]   Machbudiansyah, Hadi, Ardi Paminto, and Yana Ulfah: Comparisonal Analysis of Financial Performance before and During the Covid-19 Pandemic at the Blud of the Atma Husada Mahakam Regional Mental Hospital in Samarinda. Vol. 4(4), pp. 13498-13505. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal. (2021)

[13]   Mahmudi: Manajemen Kinerja Sektor Publik Ed2. UPP STIM YKPN, Yogyakarta (2015)

[14]   Mahmudi: Manajemen Kinerja Sektor Publik Ed3. UPP STIM YKPN, Yogyakarta (2019)

[15]   Mahsun, Mohamad: Pengukuran Kinerja Sektor Publik. BPFEYogyakarta, Yogyakarta (2014)

[16]   Mardiasmo: Akuntansi Sektor Publik. Andi Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta (2009)

[17]   Munawir, S.: Analisis Informasi Keuangan, Liberty, Yogyakarta (2012)

[18]   Munawir: Analisis Laporan Keuangan. Cetakan Kelima Belas. Liberty, Yogyakarta (2015)

[19]   Moeheriono: Pengukuran Kinerja Berasis Kompetensi. Ghalia Indonesia, Bogor (2012)

[20]   Molintas, Mohammad Rifa'I. M., Muhammad Yunus Kasim, and Juliana Kadang: Analysis Of Financial Performance In Undata Hospital Central Sulawesi. Vol. 1(1). Proceedings International Conference Faculty of Economics Alkhairaat University. (2023)

[21]   Noviana Julita, Arif Makhsun, Endang Asliana: Tentang Penilaian Kinerja Keuangan BLUD menggunakan Rasio Keuangan pada RSUD Abc berdasarkan Peraturan Dirjen Perbendaharaan Nomor Per-36/PB/2016. (2019)

[22]   Peraturan Dirjen Perbendaharaan Nomor Per-22/PB/2020 tentang pedoman penilaian kinerja Badan Layanan Umum Bidang Layanan Kesehatan.

[23]   Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia Nomor 79 Tahun 2018 tentang Badan Layanan Umum Daerah.

[24]   Peraturan Menteri Keuangan Nomor 217/PMK.05 tahun 2015 tentang Pernyataan Standar Akuntansi Pemerintahan Berbasis Akrual Nomor 13 tentang Penyajian Laporan Keuangan Badan Layanan Umum.

[25]   Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 74 Tahun 2012 tentang Perubahan Atas Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 23 Tahun 2005 tentang Pengelolaan Keuangan Badan Layanan Umum.

[26]   Rosi Yuliana, Ghazali Syamni, Murhaban, Rasyimah: Financial Performance Analysis before and after Status Change to Regional Public Service Agency of General Hospital dr.Fauziah Bireuen, Indonesia.Vol. 292. 1st Aceh Global Conference. (2018)

[27]   Surakhmad, Winarno: Pengantar Interaksi Belajar Mengajar, Dasar dan Teknik Metodologi Pengajaran. Tarsito, Bandung (1982)

[28]   Sony Yuwono dkk.: Petunjuk Praktis Penyusunan Balanced Scorecard Menuju Organisasi yang Berfokus Pada Strategi. Gramedia Pustaka Utama, Jakarta (2008)

[29]   Sutrisno: Manajemen Keuangan Teori Konsep dan Aplikasi. Ekonisia, Yogyakarta (2012)

[30]   Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 2004 tentang Perbendaharaan Negara.

[31]   Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 44 Tahun 2009 tentang Rumah Sakit.

[32]   Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 23 Tahun 2014 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah.

[33]   Veithzal Rivai: Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Untuk Perusahaan Dari Teori Ke Praktek. Rajagrafindo persada, Bandung (2013)

[34]   Yuniarti, Rita, Dini Paryanti, and Ajeng Tejaningsih: Analysis of financial performance and services performance before and during the Covid-19 pandemic (case study at Bayu Asih Hospital Purwakarta). Vol. 32(3), pp. 6103-6112. Turkish Journal of Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation, (2020)