

MMAT Quality Appraisal [43] — Youth Participatory Video Across School and Community Programmes: A Scoping Review of Engagement, Agency and Well-Being Outcomes

Sebastiano Caceffo, Miriam Belluzzo, Anna Lisa Amodeo and Alessia Cervini

Screening questions (apply to all studies first)

Criterion	Judgement	Notes
S1. Are there clear research questions?	Yes / No / Can't tell	
S2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	Yes / No / Can't tell	

Reference: MMAT criteria by category

Qualitative studies:

- 1.1 Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?
- 1.2 Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?
- 1.3 Are the findings adequately derived from the data?
- 1.4 Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?
- 1.5 Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?

Randomized controlled trials RCT:

- 2.1 Is randomization appropriately performed?
- 2.2 Are the groups comparable at baseline?
- 2.3 Are there complete outcome data?
- 2.4 Are outcome assessors blinded to the intervention provided?
- 2.5 Did the participants adhere to the assigned intervention?

Quantitative non-randomised studies:

- 3.1 Are the participants representative of the target population?
- 3.2 Are measurements appropriate regarding both the outcome and intervention (or exposure)?
- 3.3 Are there complete outcome data?
- 3.4 Are the confounders accounted for in the design and analysis?
- 3.5 During the study period, is the intervention administered (or exposure occurred) as intended?

Quantitative descriptive studies:

- 4.1 Is the sampling strategy relevant to address the research question?
- 4.2 Is the sample representative of the target population?
- 4.3 Are the measurements appropriate?
- 4.4 Is the risk of nonresponse bias low?
- 4.5 Is the statistical analysis appropriate to answer the research question?

Mixed methods studies:

- 5.1 Is there an adequate rationale for using a mixed methods design to address the research question?
- 5.2 Are the different components of the study effectively integrated to answer the research question?
- 5.3 Are the outputs of the integration of qualitative and quantitative components adequately interpreted?
- 5.4 Are divergences and inconsistencies between quantitative and qualitative results adequately addressed?
- 5.5 Do the different components of the study adhere to the quality criteria of each tradition of the methods involved?

Blazek & Hraňová [44]

Screening questions

Criterion	Judgement	Notes
S1. Are there clear research questions?	Partially	The paper does not present formally stated research questions but rather a set of exploratory aims: to examine the diversity of motivations and benefits among actors (young participants, researcher, practitioner) in a participatory video project, and to explore the intersubjective relationships that emerge during the process.
S2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	Yes	Ethnographic reflections co-authored by the researcher and practitioner, regular group evaluations conducted throughout the video-making process, and individual follow-up interviews with young participants provide data adequate to explore the stated exploratory aims.

Study design category (MMAT): Qualitative

Criterion	Judgement	Notes / justification
1.1 Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	Yes	An ethnographic, reflexive qualitative approach is well suited to capturing the intersubjective dynamics, shifting motivations, and relational complexities among researcher, practitioner, and young participants that the paper seeks to understand.
1.2 Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	Yes	Data collection combined first-hand ethnographic observation and reflection by both co-authors, regular collective evaluations with the group during the video-making process, and individual interviews with young participants after project completion, together capturing multiple perspectives and stages of the process.
1.3 Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	Partially	Findings are substantiated by direct quotations and detailed narrative reflections, but the paper does not describe a systematic or transparent analytic procedure (e.g., coding strategy, thematic analysis steps), limiting the ability to fully assess how themes were derived.
1.4 Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	Yes	Interpretations regarding diverse motivations, shifting group dynamics, and layered benefits are consistently illustrated with verbatim quotations from young participants, the practitioner, and the researcher's own reflective account.
1.5 Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?	Can't tell	While the multiple data sources (ethnographic reflection, group evaluations, interviews) are clearly integrated into the narrative, the absence of an explicit account of the analytic process makes it difficult to fully judge the coherence between data collection, analysis, and the interpretations presented

Boni et al. [27]

Screening questions

Criterion	Judgement	Notes
S1. Are there clear research questions?	Yes	The paper states a clear aim: to analyse the extent to which the participatory video process contributed to expanding the capabilities and agency of the young participants, framed through the capability approach (Sen, 1999).
S2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	Yes	Primary sources (three final videos, video-interviews with each participant, facilitators' notes) and secondary sources (social media posts, documents, and other project materials) provide data adequate to examine capability and agency expansion as stated in the research aim.

Study design category (MMAT): Qualitative

Criterion	Judgement	Notes / justification
1.1 Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	Yes	A qualitative case study approach, combining participatory video production with video-interviews and participant observation, is well suited to exploring subjective experiences of capability and agency expansion within a specific socio-political context.
1.2 Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	Yes	Data collection triangulated primary sources (final videos, individual video-interviews, facilitators' notes taken during discussions) with secondary sources (social media posts, documents, project materials), providing multiple complementary perspectives on the participatory process.

1.3 Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	Yes	Findings were derived through an iterative process of group discussions among the four co-authors (who had different roles as facilitator, trainer, and participant observer), combined with peer-review meetings and discussions with other researchers in the wider European project consortium.
1.4 Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	Yes	Interpretations regarding the expansion of the capability for voice and awareness capability, and the limitations of the capability to aspire and agency, are consistently substantiated with verbatim quotations from participants and detailed descriptions of video content and screenings.
1.5 Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?	Yes	There is strong coherence: the multiple data sources (videos, interviews, notes) were explicitly analysed together against an agreed theoretical framework (the capability approach), reinforced through iterative peer discussion within the research team and the broader project consortium.

Davies et al. [37]

Screening questions

Criterion	Judgement	Notes
S1. Are there clear research questions?	Yes	Three explicit research questions are stated: (a) students' experience of the School Engagement Programme (SEP) and its influence on views about science and career aspirations; (b) the SEP's influence on students' understanding of and attitudes toward the research institute and health research; and (c) how the participatory video (PV) process could nurture further engagement with the institute and SEP.
S2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	Yes	Data comprised student-produced videos (22 films across four schools) and detailed participant observation notes collected by two researchers over an 8-week period, providing rich, first-hand evidence adequate to address all three stated research questions.

Study design category (MMAT): Qualitative

Criterion	Judgement	Notes / justification
1.1 Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	Yes	Combining participatory video with participant observation, drawing on an ethnographic perspective, is well suited to exploring students' evolving understanding, attitudes, and experiences of engagement over an extended period.
1.2 Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	Yes	Data collection combined student-led film production (22 videos across four purposively sampled schools) with detailed participant observation notes taken by two researchers across initial workshops and four follow-up sessions per school, capturing both content and process.
1.3 Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	Yes	A thematic framework approach was used, involving familiarisation with the data, coding, and organisation into matrix charts enabling systematic comparison across the face-to-face, less intensive, and control groups; a combination of inductive and deductive coding generated four overarching themes, three predetermined and one emergent.
1.4 Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	Yes	Interpretations are consistently substantiated with verbatim quotations from student films and observation notes, alongside a detailed summary table (Table 2) linking each film to specific observational findings.
1.5 Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?	Yes	Strong coherence is evident: the two data sources (video outputs and observation notes) were collected in tandem throughout the same iterative process, analysed jointly using a consistent thematic framework, and interpreted with explicit reference back to the three stated research questions, including reflexive discussion of potential biases (e.g., acquiescence bias)

Eastwood et al. [45]

Screening questions

Criterion	Judgement	Notes
S1. Are there clear research questions?	Yes	The study explicitly explores participatory video (PV) as a tool for (a) providing new insights on young people's experience of greenspace, (b) enabling meaningful and transformative human–nature interactions, and (c) building efficacy, with the

		specific case study inductively investigating the impacts of the PV process on these outcomes.
S2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	Yes	Six complementary data sources—researchers' observational and reflection notes, workshop session data (participatory mapping, storyboard brainstorming), direct feedback from teachers and young people, the three final films, and semi-structured interviews with support staff and young people—provide data adequate to address the stated research aims.

Study design category (MMAT): Qualitative

Criterion	Judgement	Notes / justification
1.1 Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	Yes	An inductive, qualitative case-study approach combining participatory video, participant observation, and semi-structured interviews is well suited to exploring young people's experiences, perceptions, and behavioural changes in relation to local greenspace over an extended engagement process.
1.2 Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	Yes	Multiple methods were triangulated across the three stages of the PV process, including observational fieldnotes, workshop data (mapping, storyboarding), oral/written feedback (mood meters, feedback sessions), the final films, and semi-structured interviews with three support staff and two young people, together capturing both process and outcome.
1.3 Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	Yes	Data were coded inductively in NVivo 12 through an initial review generating broad themes (Greenspace Experience, PV for Monitoring and Evaluation, the PV Process, Film Content and Feedback), followed by development of a more detailed coding framework, providing a transparent and systematic analytic procedure.
1.4 Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	Yes	Interpretations of changes in perceptions, behaviour, confidence and engagement are extensively substantiated with verbatim quotations from young people and staff, supported by summary tables linking specific themes to illustrative quotes.
1.5 Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?	Yes	Strong coherence is evident: the six data sources were collected concurrently throughout the same three-stage process, coded within a single inductive framework, and interpreted with explicit cross-referencing between observational notes, film content, and interview accounts, including researchers' reflection on initial apprehensions (e.g., regarding the predominance of violence in the films).

Fales [28]

Screening questions

Criterion	Judgement	Notes
S1. Are there clear research questions?	No	The paper does not formulate explicit research questions; it is framed as an autoethnographic and theoretical reflection on the ethical, aesthetic, and political challenges of representing "paperlessness" through participatory, feminist and decolonial filmmaking practice, rather than as an empirical study addressing defined questions.
S2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	No	No systematic data collection is reported; the paper draws on the author's personal reflections, selected participant comments gathered informally after workshops, and theoretical engagement with film theory and critical scholarship, rather than on data generated to answer pre-defined research questions.

Study design category (MMAT): Qualitative

Criterion	Judgement	Notes / justification
1.1 Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	Can't tell	No research question is stated; the autoethnographic and reflective approach is coherent with the author's stated aim of critically examining her own filmmaking practice, but this does not constitute a research question in the empirical sense.
1.2 Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	No	No systematic data collection method is described; the account is based on the author's personal recollections, selected quotations from participants collected informally, and secondary theoretical sources, without an explained collection protocol.

1.3 Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	Can't tell	The paper does not describe an analytic procedure (e.g., coding or thematic analysis); reflections and theoretical claims are illustrated with selected quotations and personal narrative, but the process by which conclusions were derived is not made explicit.
1.4 Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	Partially	Some interpretive claims are illustrated with participant quotations (e.g., the comment by Roma activist Miguel Lebbiati) and detailed narrative description of the workshop process, but much of the discussion relies on theoretical argumentation [75,81-83] rather than on data-grounded evidence.
1.5 Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?	No	As no formal data collection or analysis procedure is reported, coherence between these elements cannot be assessed in MMAT terms; the paper's coherence lies instead in its theoretical and narrative argumentation as a piece of practice-based, autoethnographic writing.

Gurman et al. [46]

Screening questions

Criterion	Judgement	Notes
S1. Are there clear research questions?	Partially	The paper does not state formal research questions but clearly articulates its aim: to analyse qualitative evaluation data from the Through Our Eyes (TOE) participatory video project to assess its contribution to reducing gender-based violence (GBV) and harmful traditional practices (HTP) in conflict-affected settings.
S2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	Yes	The dataset comprised 94 transcripts from 18 focus group discussions ($n=125$) and 76 key informant interviews with project team members, partner agency representatives, service providers and community members, providing rich and diverse data adequate to address the stated evaluative aim.

Study design category (MMAT): Qualitative

Criterion	Judgement	Notes / justification
1.1 Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	Yes	A qualitative evaluation approach, drawing on focus groups and key informant interviews, is well suited to capturing participants' perceptions, attitudinal and behavioural changes, and community dynamics related to GBV and HTP following the participatory video intervention.
1.2 Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	Yes	Data collection combined 18 focus group discussions across four demographic categories (younger/older men and women) with 76 key informant interviews across five country sites, using interview guides tailored by respondent type and conducted in local languages by trained team members familiar with the sensitive nature of GBV.
1.3 Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	Yes	The first two authors applied a grounded theory approach, using an iterative process to identify predominant cross-cutting themes rather than approaching the data with predetermined themes, and organised coded data systematically using ATLAS.ti 6.
1.4 Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	Yes	Interpretations regarding increased awareness of women's rights and dismantling of the culture of silence are extensively substantiated with detailed verbatim quotations from a wide range of respondent types across all five country sites.
1.5 Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?	Yes	Strong coherence is evident: data collection, grounded theory-based coding, and interpretation are clearly aligned, and the authors transparently discuss limitations affecting this coherence, including non-uniform data collection across sites and potential self-report bias among respondents with personal investment in the project.

Hanna & Kucharczyk [38]

Screening questions

Criterion	Judgement	Notes
S1. Are there clear research questions?	No	The piece does not formulate a research question; it presents itself as an "example of best practice" describing a participatory film-making project with migrant

		learners aged 9–10 in a Cape Town primary school, aimed at producing a film to encourage schools to be more inclusive of learners from migration backgrounds.
S2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	No	No systematic data collection or research question is described; the account draws on the researcher's and practitioner's own experience of running five 90-minute sessions (visual/discussion methods) followed by two 90-minute film-making sessions, described narratively rather than analysed as research data

Study design category (MMAT): Qualitative

Criterion	Judgement	Notes / justification
1.1 Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	Can't tell	No research question is stated; the described approach (participatory visual methods followed by collaborative film-making) is coherent with the stated aim of producing an inclusive-practice film output, but this is a project description rather than a research question addressed through a qualitative design.
1.2 Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	Can't tell	The account describes the sequence of sessions (picturebook discussion, photo walks, film brainstorming and production) but does not specify a data collection protocol (e.g., fieldnotes, recordings, transcripts) or how material was systematically gathered for research purposes.
1.3 Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	No	No analytic procedure is reported; the piece is narrative and reflective, recounting the process and challenges (e.g., managing expectations, working in an unfamiliar school) rather than presenting findings derived through a stated analysis.
1.4 Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	Can't tell	The reflections on children's engagement with film-making versus photography, and on the practical challenges faced, are illustrative and experience-based, but not systematically substantiated with data excerpts or evidence in the way expected of an empirical qualitative study.
1.5 Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?	No	As no formal data collection, coding or analysis procedure is described, coherence between these elements cannot be assessed using MMAT criteria; the coherence of the piece lies instead in its narrative structure as a practice reflection

Haynes & Tanner [56]

Screening questions

Criterion	Judgement	Notes
S1. Are there clear research questions?	Yes	Clear research questions on PV's efficacy for enabling youth influence on DRR policy/action and for increasing learning/knowledge communication.
S2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	Yes	Participant observation, workshops, pre/post questionnaires and focus groups provide data adequate to address the stated questions.

Study design category (MMAT): Mixed methods

Criterion	Judgement	Notes / justification
5.1 Is there an adequate rationale for using a mixed-methods design to address the research question?	Yes	Explicit rationale: combining participant observation, participatory workshops, focus groups and pre/post questionnaires to capture both process and impact.
5.2 Are the different components of the study effectively integrated to answer the research question?	Can't tell	Qualitative and quantitative strands (questionnaire counts vs narrative accounts) are reported largely in parallel rather than analytically integrated.
5.3 Are the outputs of the integration of qualitative and quantitative components adequately interpreted?	Partially	Quantitative shifts (e.g., number of adults citing mining as a cause) are reported descriptively; limited analytical interpretation of the integration itself.
5.4 Are divergences and inconsistencies between quantitative and qualitative results adequately addressed?	Can't tell	No explicit discussion of discrepancies between qualitative and quantitative strands.

5.5 Do the different components of the study adhere to the quality criteria of each tradition involved?	Partially	Qualitative component well handled; quantitative component (pre/post questionnaire) not validated and not described in terms of reliability/validity.
--	-----------	---

Hoechner [47]

Screening questions

Criterion	Judgement	Notes
S1. Are there clear research questions?	Yes	The author explicitly states her aim: to reflect on the limits of participatory research as a tool for empowerment, to describe the risks stigmatised groups (the almajirai, traditional Qur'anic students) may incur by participating in filmmaking, and to consider to what extent, if at all, such participation can foster social change.
S2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	Yes	Data comprised fieldnotes collected during 13 months of ethnographic fieldwork, stories narrated or written down during the script writing process, and discussions about how the almajirai wished to be represented on screen, generated through a 12-week participatory docudrama production process with nine young participants across three schools

Study design category (MMAT): Qualitative

Criterion	Judgement	Notes / justification
1.1 Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	Yes	An ethnographic, reflexive qualitative approach combining participant observation with participatory filmmaking is well suited to exploring the lived experience, risks, and empowerment potential of participation for a stigmatised group, and to critically interrogating the researcher's own positionality within the process
1.2 Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	Yes	Data collection combined long-term ethnographic fieldwork (13 months, including 4 months in a rural site and 9 months in an urban site), fieldnotes, script-writing materials, group discussions about desired self-representation, and post-project informal follow-up conversations with participants, offering a rich and multi-stranded evidential base.
1.3 Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	Yes	Interpretations regarding participants' ambivalent experiences of empowerment, vulnerability, and strategic self-representation are systematically derived from detailed, transparently reported episodes and verbatim statements collected throughout the production process, including negative or complicating instances (e.g., disputes over payment, rumours).
1.4 Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	Yes	Claims are consistently substantiated with rich descriptive detail and direct quotations (e.g., participants' end-credit statements, the "dairekta" anecdote, and the "one doesn't tell one's superior" quote), and the author explicitly reflects on alternative explanations and her own potential misjudgements.
1.5 Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?	Yes	Strong coherence is evident: the reflexive analysis draws consistently on the same fieldwork and production-process data throughout, explicitly situates findings within the socio-political context (e.g., "spoils politics," suspicion of Western-funded projects) to explain participants' behaviour, and critically revisits the author's own assumptions and decisions across the account.

Jefferis & Theron [57]

Screening questions

Criterion	Judgement	Notes
S1. Are there clear research questions?	Yes	Clear aim: to critically reflect on the value of CBPV to explore and advocate for resilience in black South African adolescent girls.
S2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	Yes	Videos, drawings, reflective discussions and researcher journals provide data adequate to address the stated aim.

Study design category (MMAT): Qualitative

Criterion	Judgement	Notes / justification
1.1 Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	Yes	Social Ecology of Resilience Theory [84] and critical psychology explicitly frame the choice of CBPV as method.
1.2 Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	Yes	Research journal, field notes, photographic records, interviews, meeting minutes, transcribed participant reflections.
1.3 Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	Yes	Inductive thematic content analysis [85], with explicit acknowledgement of some deductive elements (SERT-informed).
1.4 Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	Yes	Themes illustrated with direct participant quotes and researcher field observations.
1.5 Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?	Yes	Tentative themes scrutinised by the wider P2RP research team; credibility check reported.

Lamb [39]

Screening questions

Criterion	Judgement	Notes
S1. Are there clear research questions?	Yes	The author explicitly formulates her research question: "What would it look like to begin health policy processes with awareness of colonial legacies, and especially affective attunement to the ways in which they affect Indigenous young peoples' everyday lives?"
S2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	Partially	The analysis draws on narrative vignettes from a single interview with Sarah Flicker plus published secondary sources about the Taking Action! Project; while rich and illustrative, this second-hand, single-informant dataset offers a narrower empirical basis than a primary study designed to directly answer the stated question

Study design category (MMAT): Qualitative

Criterion	Judgement	Notes / justification
1.1 Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	Yes	A reflexive, interpretive qualitative approach — combining interview narrative with feminist and affect theory — is appropriate for exploring the affective and interpersonal dimensions of colonial legacies in health policy processes, which is not easily captured through quantitative measures.
1.2 Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	Partially	The core data collection method (one reflexive interview with a single visual researcher, conducted as part of a larger "go ask" methodology within the Networks for Change project) is clearly described, but is a narrow, single-source basis supplemented by the author's re-analysis of externally published materials rather than her own comprehensive fieldwork.
1.3 Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	Yes	The author's interpretive claims are closely and transparently tied to specific excerpts from the interview (e.g., the public health nurse anecdote, "Talasias's Story" transcript), with an explicit interpretive framework (affective relations, cultural safety, threshold knowledge) applied systematically to the material.
1.4 Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	Yes	Interpretations are substantiated through close, line-by-line reflexive analysis of specific quotations (e.g., "This was a waste of time," "I really thought you were going to do harm reduction"), explicitly linking each to relevant theoretical constructs.
1.5 Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?	Yes	There is clear coherence between the single interview data source, the reflexive/autoethnographic analytic approach explicitly declared by the author, and the interpretation offered, with the author transparently acknowledging the second-hand nature of her account and its interpretive limitations throughout.

Loebach et al. [48]

Screening questions

Criterion	Judgement	Notes
S1. Are there clear research questions?	Yes	The study explicitly aims to understand how digital media and technology affect the well-being of Indigenous youth, and to explore youth-produced filmmaking as an effective medium for communicating their technology-related experiences and challenges.
S2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	Yes	Data comprised eight months of workshops, semi-structured interviews, group discussions, field notes/observations, and three youth-produced digital story films, providing rich material directly relevant to understanding youth perspectives on digital media and well-being.

Study design category (MMAT): Qualitative

Criterion	Judgement	Notes / justification
1.1 Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	Yes	A participatory, decolonised digital storytelling approach is well suited to eliciting Indigenous youths' own perspectives on digital media and mental health in a culturally sensitive, agency-affirming way, consistent with critical Indigenous research methodologies [86,87] explicitly adopted by the authors
1.2 Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	Yes	Multiple, well-documented data sources were triangulated: recorded semi-structured interviews, group discussions/workshops over eight months, participant observation with field notes, and the youth-produced films themselves, with clear procedures for recruitment, informed consent, and ethical safeguards
1.3 Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	Yes	Findings on the "double-edged sword" nature of digital media, the emergence of the "keyboard warrior" concept, and individual differences in coping strategies are systematically illustrated through multiple, convergent participant voices and cross-checked against team reflections.
1.4 Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	Yes	Interpretations are consistently grounded in extensive verbatim quotations from participants and facilitators, and the authors explicitly acknowledge limitations and cultural missteps (e.g., the Seven Grandfather Teachings framework not resonating with all participants), enhancing credibility.
1.5 Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?	Yes	There is strong coherence: the participatory, decolonising methodological framework described at the outset is consistently reflected in the data collection procedures, the co-produced analysis with community partners, and the final interpretation, which explicitly returns to the "deep paradox" framework guiding the research.

McAra [49]

Screening questions

Criterion	Judgement	Notes
S1. Are there clear research questions?	Yes	The author explicitly frames her inquiry around understanding factors that mobilise participants' sense of agency, and concludes by returning to the question of: <i>how a collaborative design approach can broker, mobilise and sustain practitioner-participant interaction.</i>
S2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	Yes	Data were generated through a 14-month single case study involving contextual immersion, participatory design workshops, semi-structured interviews and an activity-based focus group, directly targeting the dynamics of rapport, trust and participant agency the research question addresses.

Study design category (MMAT): Qualitative

Criterion	Judgement	Notes / justification
1.1 Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	Yes	A reflexive single case study drawing on Participatory Action Research and relational ethics [61,60] is well suited to capturing the situated, experiential and evolving nature of researcher-participant rapport and agency, which would be difficult to access through non-qualitative means.
1.2 Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	Yes	Multiple complementary qualitative methods were used across an extended fieldwork period, including contextual immersion, participatory design workshops, Participatory Video/Direct Animation sessions, and detailed fieldwork diary entries, providing rich and longitudinal data on group dynamics.

1.3 Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	Yes	Key insights (e.g., participants' self-deprecating strategies, the shift from participant to co-researcher, the desire for individual recognition within collaborative roles) are consistently illustrated through detailed, verbatim field-note excerpts and specific episodes involving named pseudonymous participants (e.g., Hailey)
1.4 Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	Yes	Interpretive claims are grounded in thick, reflexive description of specific episodes (e.g., the inter-school competition win, the Direct Animation workshops) and are explicitly linked to theoretical concepts such as relational ethics and situated knowledge, with the author transparently revising her own assumptions over time.
1.5 Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?	Yes	There is strong coherence: the reflexive case-study methodology outlined at the outset is consistently applied across the two fieldwork phases described, and the concluding interpretation directly ties back to the theoretical framework and empirical episodes reported throughout

Park et al [50]

Screening questions

Criterion	Judgement	Notes
S1. Are there clear research questions?	Yes	The study explicitly states two aims: 1) to evaluate the feasibility of a youth participatory video production programme for smoking prevention; and 2) to examine whether participatory video production changed smoking-related outcomes, specifically intention not to smoke.
S2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	Yes	Data include attendance/satisfaction checklists, pre- and post-intervention standardised smoking intention surveys (YRBS, Youth Group Member Survey), and semi-structured pre/post interviews, directly matching the feasibility and effectiveness aims.

Study design category (MMAT): Mixed-methods

Criterion	Judgement	Notes / justification
5.1 Is there an adequate rationale for using a mixed-methods design to address the research question?	Yes	The authors explicitly justify the concurrent embedded experimental mixed methods design as needed to provide "a comprehensive understanding of both the process and outcomes of the intervention," combining feasibility (qualitative/descriptive) and effectiveness (quantitative) aims.
5.2 Are the different components of the study effectively integrated to answer the research question?	Yes	Qualitative and quantitative strands were both embedded within the same single-group pre-post intervention and explicitly triangulated, with the authors comparing qualitative themes and quantitative outcomes to see how they supported one another.
5.3 Are the outputs of the integration of qualitative and quantitative components adequately interpreted?	Yes	The discussion interprets both strands jointly: qualitative themes (active engagement, personal growth, agentic participation) are used to explain and contextualise the significant quantitative reduction in smoking intention, giving a coherent combined narrative.
5.4 Are divergences and inconsistencies between quantitative and qualitative results adequately addressed?	Can't tell	The paper does not explicitly discuss any divergence between the qualitative and quantitative findings; the two strands are presented as complementary and mutually supportive throughout, but no formal analysis of inconsistency is reported.
5.5 Do the different components of the study adhere to the quality criteria of each tradition involved?	Yes	The quantitative component follows recognised standards (validated YRBS and Youth Group Member Survey instruments, appropriate non-parametric Wilcoxon test given non-normal data), while the qualitative component follows established rigour strategies (reflective notebook, audit trail, multi-researcher consensus coding, inductive thematic analysis)

Rao et al. [51]

Screening questions

Criterion	Judgement	Notes
-----------	-----------	-------

S1. Are there clear research questions?	Yes	The study explicitly states its objective: <i>to explore the central role of community participation in documenting and transmitting indigenous knowledge about the role of locally available foods in improving dietary diversity.</i>
S2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	Yes	Data include thematic content analysis of 49 youth-produced films, in-depth semi-structured interviews with the 10 filmmakers, and focus group discussions with over 100 viewers across 4 screenings, directly addressing how participatory filmmaking documents and transmits food knowledge

Study design category (MMAT): Qualitative

Criterion	Judgement	Notes / justification
1.1 Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	Yes	A participatory action research approach combining thematic content analysis, interviews and focus groups is well suited to exploring how marginalised Santhal youth document and transmit indigenous food knowledge and negotiate power relations, consistent with the study's explicit theoretical framing around participation and agency.
1.2 Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	Yes	Data collection is clearly described and multi-stranded: systematic thematic content analysis of all 49 films using a structured coding table, semi-structured interviews with all 10 filmmakers, and focus group discussions with viewers across 4 of 28 screenings, supplemented by detailed process documentation.
1.3 Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	Yes	The five themes (responding to perceived needs, showcasing communal identity, passive advocacy, culture in the making, reviving traditional practices) are systematically derived using a constant comparative method and thematic template, with explicit tracking of theme prevalence across the three project phases.
1.4 Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	Yes	Interpretive claims are consistently substantiated with extensive verbatim quotations from filmmakers and audience members (e.g., the acacia soap film, the banwar rat gender-norm question, the "primitive" shame quote), directly linking evidence to interpretation.
1.5 Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?	Yes	There is strong coherence between the participatory action research framework outlined at the outset, the systematic thematic analysis of films and interviews/focus groups, and the interpretation, which explicitly traces the evolution of themes across training phases and links back to the power-relations framework guiding the study.

Royds [52]

Screening questions

Criterion	Judgement	Notes
S1. Are there clear research questions?	Yes	The author explicitly poses her research questions: whether the exchange of participatory media between children in different cultural/socio-economic contexts risks confirming prejudices, what contextual factors shape positive or negative learning outcomes, and how attention to critical literacy and listening can inform the possibilities and constraints of participatory media for global education.
S2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	Yes	Data comprised 72 child-to-child video interviews, 24 ranking charts with written explanations, 4 researcher-led interviews with children, and 10 researcher-led interviews with teachers, providing rich and directly relevant material on children's experiences and interpretations of the participatory video exchange.

Study design category (MMAT): Qualitative

Criterion	Judgement	Notes / justification
1.1 Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	Yes	A comparative, participatory qualitative case study design, drawing on participatory media theory and critical global citizenship frameworks [66,88], is well suited to exploring how culturally diverse children interpret and make sense of participatory video exchanges.

1.2 Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	Yes	Multiple complementary methods were used, including child-to-child video interviews, individual ranking activities with written explanations, and semi-structured interviews with both children and teachers, with a clearly described sample (27 children aged 10–14 across Australia, Timor-Leste, Sri Lanka and Vietnam).
1.3 Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	Yes	Six thematic categories (e.g., developing confidence, learning technical skills, friendship) were systematically identified from the most frequently repeated phrases in interviews, and interpretations of development narratives and "listening across difference" are consistently traced back to specific participant quotations.
1.4 Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	Yes	Interpretive claims are richly substantiated with verbatim quotations from named (pseudonymous) child and teacher participants (e.g., Olan, Sarah, Allen, teachers John, Mark and Jenny), and the author explicitly contextualises and problematises these quotes against the theoretical framework.
1.5 Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?	Yes	There is strong coherence: the participatory, comparative case-study design outlined at the outset is consistently reflected in the data collection (interviews and ranking activities co-designed with children), the thematic analysis, and the interpretation, which explicitly returns to the theoretical concepts of listening, voice and critical global citizenship introduced early in the article.

Tang & Jardine [55]

Screening questions

Criterion	Judgement	Notes
S1. Are there clear research questions?	Yes	Research aims clearly stated: to explore meanings of physical activity through a strengths-based, PAR approach with youth.
S2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	Yes	Multiple triangulated data sources (videos, interviews, focus groups, evaluation interviews, research journals) adequately address the stated aims.

Study design category (MMAT): Qualitative

Criterion	Judgement	Notes / justification
1.1 Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	Yes	PAR grounded explicitly in Indigenous Research Methodology [89] and Freirean critical consciousness [75]; well justified for the study's aims.
1.2 Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	Yes	Multiple methods triangulated: youth-produced videos, unstructured interviews, community focus groups, semi-structured evaluation interviews, research journals.
1.3 Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	Yes	NVivo-supported thematic analysis [90]; coding scheme co-verified with community partner (CWP).
1.4 Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	Yes	Extensive direct quotations support each subtheme; interpretations closely tied to participant voice.
1.5 Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?	Yes	Coding scheme reviewed with CWP in a follow-up trip; further peer-reviewed by a university colleague familiar with the community [91].

Tilleczek & Loebach [53]

Screening questions

Criterion	Judgement	Notes
S1. Are there clear research questions?	No	The paper does not formulate explicit empirical research questions; it is framed as a theoretical and reflective essay exploring "the veracity of videography with, for

		and by youth" through retrospective discussion of two filmmaking projects, rather than as a study designed to answer defined research questions.
S2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	No	No systematic data collection or analysis is reported; the paper draws on the authors' own retrospective reflections on their filmmaking process, project documentation, and engagement with theoretical/humanities literature [86,92,93,94] rather than on data generated to answer pre-defined research questions.

Study design category (MMAT): Qualitative

Criterion	Judgement	Notes / justification
1.1 Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	Can't tell	No research question is stated; the reflective, first-person account of two videography projects is coherent with the authors' stated aim of exploring the "veracity" and ethics of participatory videography, but this is not a research question in the empirical sense.
1.2 Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	No	No systematic data collection method is described; the account relies on the authors' own retrospective narrative of the filmmaking processes (e.g., workshop activities, ethics consultations, editing meetings) rather than an explained data collection protocol.
1.3 Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	Can't tell	The paper does not describe an analytic procedure; reflections on "what is gained, lost and unsettled" in youth videography are illustrated through narrative description of the two projects and theoretical argumentation, but the process by which conclusions were derived is not made explicit.
1.4 Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	Partially	Some interpretive claims are illustrated with specific project details (e.g., the shift from researcher-led editing in "Lost in the Woods" to youth-led editorial control in the Mi'kmaq project), but much of the argument relies on theoretical and philosophical framing [86,92,93,95] rather than on data-grounded evidence.
1.5 Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?	No	As no formal data collection or analysis procedure is reported, coherence between these elements cannot be assessed in MMAT terms; the paper's coherence instead lies in its theoretical and narrative argumentation as a reflective piece on practice-based videography.

Tripon [54]

Screening questions

Criterion	Judgement	Notes
S1. Are there clear research questions?	Yes	The study explicitly states a main research question ("how do students, teachers, and mentors in the EdTech Mentor Project experience and make sense of using digital tools to enhance education?") together with five specific research objectives concerning engagement, challenges, inclusion/exclusion patterns, project effectiveness, and actionable insights.
S2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	Yes	Data collection combined semi-structured interviews with 45 participants (20 students, 15 teachers, 10 mentors), participatory video, and field notes, directly targeting participants' lived experiences and perceptions of digital tool integration as required by the research question

Study design category (MMAT): Qualitative

Criterion	Judgement	Notes / justification
1.1 Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	Yes	Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis is explicitly and appropriately justified as suited to exploring "how individuals make sense of their personal and social worlds," matching the study's aim of understanding lived experiences of digital tool integration.

1.2 Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	Yes	Data collection combined semi-structured interviews (with a described interview guide) and participatory video across three purposefully sampled stakeholder groups (students, teachers, mentors), with clear procedures for consent, recording, transcription and anonymisation.
1.3 Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	Yes	The paper details a transparent five-step IPA coding process (immersion, line-by-line coding using NVivo, theme development, interpretative analysis, triangulation with member checking), from which four clearly defined themes emerged.
1.4 Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	Yes	Each theme and subtheme is extensively substantiated with numerous direct, attributed participant quotations from students, teachers and mentors, closely linking interpretation to the raw qualitative evidence.
1.5 Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?	Yes	There is strong coherence: the IPA framework introduced at the outset is systematically followed through data collection, coding, triangulation of interviews with participatory video, member checking, and the final thematic narrative, which explicitly links back to the study's aims and SDG4 framing.