Supplemental File 1. Supplementary material for the article "Community Based Participatory Research in peacebuilding: A literature review". This file contains Supplemental Tables 1–6: objectives of the implementation of CBPR in contexts of peace and conflict (Supplemental Table 1), methodological tools (Supplemental Table 2), benefits (Supplemental Table 3), challenges (Supplemental Table 4), a summary of the 20 included studies (Supplemental Table 5) and an illustrative example of the coding process (Supplemental Table 6). The geographic distribution of the included studies is shown in Figure 2 of the main article.

Supplemental Table 1.
Objectives of the implementation of CBPR in contexts of peace and conflict

Objective	**Description**	**Authors**
Resilience in conflict contexts.	Identify culturally rooted indicators of youth resilience in post-war northern Uganda	(Vindevogel et al., 2015)
	Fostering a sense of security, psychological well-being and resilience in children in conflict situations	(Veronese et al., 2022)
Governance and peacebuilding mechanisms	Establish shared accountability structures for the outcomes of peace interventions, fostering empowerment as a basis for sustainable peace	(Hancock, 2023)
	To analyse the role of international cooperation in the creation of knowledge in the post-conflict, developing hybrid models to produce knowledge for peace	(Nupia & Valencia Espinosa, 2023)
Participatory interventions in gender violence	Strengthening community capacity to address intimate partner violence	(White et al., 2013)
	Design interventions that respond to the needs of survivors of gender-based violence	(Poleshuck et al., 2018)
	Exploring the intersection of intimate partner violence and vulnerability to HIV between sex workers and their partners	(Blanchard et al., 2017)
	Explore immigrant and refugee women's experiences of family violence, identifying barriers and facilitators of support services	(Vaughan et al., 2015)
	Implement participatory research within domestic violence care programs	(Nnawulezi et al., 2019)
	Develop accessible and effective interventions to address sexual violence through community engagement and collective learning	(Wolferman et al., 2019)
Design of youth violence programmes	Co-design youth violence prevention programs with community leaders	(Leff et al., 2010)
	Develop a hospital intervention to reduce the recidivism of youth violence	(Snider et al., 2010)
	Evaluate youth violence prevention programs co-created with communities	(Le et al., 2011)
	Explore how young people affected by sexual violence understand and express resistance from participatory creative methods	(Warrington, Langhoff & Warnock, 2024)
Community experiences of overcoming conflict.	Applying a community-based, participatory approach to crime and violence prevention	(Stalker et al., 2020)
	Defining gun violence through lived experiences in the community, strengthening local networks	(Hausman & Becker, 2000)
	Reducing violence against health workers through citizen science approaches	(Ferrari et al., 2023)
Participatory interventions for peace in the school context.	Develop contextual knowledge about schools in conflict situations, strengthening the role of teachers as peacebuilding agents	(Lozano et al., 2023)
	Develop and implement a faith-based mental health	(Kataoka et al.,

	intervention for children exposed to violence, from a faith-based school setting	2006)
Development of instruments from participatory approaches.	Adapt psychometric scales used in youth intervention and violence prevention programs, to define indicators of success from the perspective of communities	(Hausman et al., 2013)

Source: Authors' creation

Supplemental Table 2.
Methodological tools for the implementation of CBPR in contexts of peace and conflict

Methodological tools	Authors
Bibliographic narratives	(Lozano et al., 2023)
Focus groups	(Ferrari et al., 2023; Hausman et al., 2013; Kataoka et al., 2006; Leff et al., 2010; Poleshuck et al., 2018; Stalker et al., 2020; Vaughan et al., 2015; Vindevogel et al., 2015; Wolferman et al., 2019)
Program pilots	(Leff et al., 2010)
Committees with community representation	(Blanchard et al., 2017; Kataoka et al., 2006; Poleshuck et al., 2018; Wolferman et al., 2019)
Controlled Trials	(Ferrari et al., 2023; Kataoka et al., 2006)
Historical chronologies	(Vindevogel et al., 2015)
Development and adaptation of scales	(Hausman et al., 2013; White et al., 2013)
Community Mapping	(Hausman & Becker, 2000; Snider et al., 2010; Stalker et al., 2020; Veronese et al., 2022; Vindevogel et al., 2015)
Participatory Classification Methodology	(Vindevogel et al., 2015)
Transect Walk	(Veronese et al., 2022; Vindevogel et al., 2015)
Rapid Participatory Evaluation	(Hausman & Becker, 2000)
Interviews	(Ferrari et al., 2023; Hausman & Becker, 2000; Nnawulezi et al., 2019; Stalker et al., 2020; Vaughan et al., 2015; Veronese et al., 2022)
Community validation sessions	(Hancock, 2023; Hausman et al., 2013; Hausman & Becker, 2000; Snider et al., 2010; Wolferman et al., 2019)
Ethnography	(Wolferman et al., 2019)
Surveys	(Le et al., 2011; Wolferman et al., 2019)
Art-based participatory methods	(Vaughan et al., 2015; Warrington, Langhoff & Warnock, 2024)
Structured observation	(Ferrari et al., 2023; Stalker et al., 2020)
Cost-effectiveness evaluation	(Ferrari et al., 2023)
Longitudinal Case Study	(Blanchard et al., 2017)
Collaborative thematic analysis	(Blanchard et al., 2017; Snider et al., 2010)
Brainstorming	(Snider et al., 2010)
Workshops with researchers	(Nupia & Valencia Espinosa, 2023)

Source: Authors' creation

Supplemental Table 3.
Benefits of implementing CBPR in contexts of peace and conflict

Benefits	Authors
Fosters trust, collaboration and community empowerment through participation and dialogue, empowering local communities and enhancing stakeholder engagement through shared reflection and action.	(Blanchard et al., 2017; Ferrari et al., 2023; Hancock, 2023; Hausman et al., 2013; Hausman & Becker, 2000; Kataoka et al., 2006; Le et al., 2011; Leff et al., 2010; Nnawulezi et al., 2019; Nupia & Valencia Espinosa, 2023; Poleshuck et al., 2018; Snider et al., 2010; Stalker et al., 2020; Vaughan et al., 2015; Veronese et al., 2022;

	Vindevogel et al., 2015; Warrington, Langhoff & Warnock, 2024; White et al., 2013; Wolferman et al., 2019)
Promotes greater community ownership, sustainability and relevance of results by integrating local perspectives and partnerships between different actors	(Blanchard et al., 2017; Ferrari et al., 2023; Hancock, 2023; Hausman et al., 2013; Hausman & Becker, 2000; Kataoka et al., 2006; Le et al., 2011; Leff et al., 2010; Lozano et al., 2023; Poleshuck et al., 2018; Stalker et al., 2020; White et al., 2013)
Strengthens skills development and community resilience through the participatory research process itself.	(Ferrari et al., 2023; Hancock, 2023; Lozano et al., 2023; Nnawulezi et al., 2019; Snider et al., 2010; Stalker et al., 2020; Vindevogel et al., 2015; Wolferman et al., 2019)
Contributes to the development of policies, programmes and interventions based on locally identified needs.	(Blanchard et al., 2017; Ferrari et al., 2023; Hausman et al., 2013; Hausman & Becker, 2000; Kataoka et al., 2006; Le et al., 2011; Leff et al., 2010; Poleshuck et al., 2018; Snider et al., 2010; Stalker et al., 2020; Vaughan et al., 2015; Veronese et al., 2022; Warrington, Langhoff & Warnock, 2024)
Improves peacebuilding strategies through interdisciplinary and context-sensitive approaches.	(Hancock, 2023; Lozano et al., 2023; Nupia & Valencia Espinosa, 2023)
Promote the closing of the gap between academic and community knowledge through participatory techniques by generating culturally relevant data.	(Nnawulezi et al., 2019; Nupia & Valencia Espinosa, 2023)

Source: Authors' creation

Supplemental Table 4.
Challenges of implementing community-based participatory research in peace and conflict contexts

Limitation	Authors
High demand for time, personnel and training by stakeholders which could affect their continued participation in the process.	(Blanchard et al., 2017; Ferrari et al., 2023; Hausman et al., 2013; Hausman & Becker, 2000; Nnawulezi et al., 2019; Nupia & Valencia Espinosa, 2023; Poleshuck et al., 2018; Snider et al., 2010; Stalker et al., 2020; Vaughan et al., 2015; Veronese et al., 2022; Warrington, Langhoff & Warnock, 2024; White et al., 2013; Wolferman et al., 2019)
Challenges in reconciling scientific rigour with community knowledge.	(Blanchard et al., 2017; Hausman et al., 2013; Leff et al., 2010; Nupia & Valencia Espinosa, 2023)
Difficulty in balancing research objectives with the urgent needs of the community	(Hausman & Becker, 2000; Leff et al., 2010; Nupia & Valencia Espinosa, 2023; Stalker et al., 2020)
Emotional and ethical cost to staff and participants.	(Ferrari et al., 2023; Le et al., 2011; Lozano et al., 2023; Nnawulezi et al., 2019; Poleshuck et al., 2018; Snider et al., 2010; Vaughan et al., 2015; Warrington, Langhoff & Warnock, 2024)
Limited generalization due to context-specific findings.	(Hancock, 2023; Vaughan et al., 2015; Vindevogel et al., 2015)
Logistical challenges in coordinating activities with community participation.	(Blanchard et al., 2017; Kataoka et al., 2006; Leff et al., 2010; Lozano et al., 2023; Snider et al., 2010; Stalker et al., 2020)
Possible cultural or social desirability biases that affect participants' responses, interactions, and interpretation	(Snider et al., 2010; Stalker et al., 2020; Veronese et al., 2022; Vindevogel et al., 2015)

of participatory exercises.	
Limitations in the establishment of mechanisms for the long-term monitoring of Community initiatives	(Hancock, 2023; Hausman et al., 2013; Hausman & Becker, 2000; Le et al., 2011)
Persistence of power asymmetries despite participatory objectives between the different actors	(Blanchard et al., 2017; Ferrari et al., 2023; Hancock, 2023; Hausman & Becker, 2000; Nupia & Valencia Espinosa, 2023; Warrington, Langhoff & Warnock, 2024)
Administrative and financing difficulties limiting the flexibility and adaptation of participatory methodologies	(Ferrari et al., 2023; Kataoka et al., 2006; Nupia & Valencia Espinosa, 2023; Warrington, Langhoff & Warnock, 2024)

Source: Authors' creation

Supplemental Table 5.
Summary of the 20 studies included in the systematic literature review

Author (year)	**Country / region**	**Conflict context**	**Study population**	**CBPR approach & main methodological tools**	**Key objective**
Hausman & Becker (2000)	United States	Community / armed violence	Community residents	Rapid Participatory Appraisal: semi-structured interviews, network mapping, qualitative analysis	Use participatory research to plan the evaluation of violence-prevention programmes
Kataoka et al. (2006)	United States	Community violence (Latino immigrant children)	Children, parents, faith community	Parent focus groups, community committee, adaptation of an evidence-based intervention	Develop a faith-based mental-health intervention for children exposed to violence
Leff et al. (2010)	United States	Youth violence	Urban adolescents, community leaders	Focus groups, pilot testing, organisational site assessments	Co-design the PARTNERS youth-violence prevention/leadership programme
Snider et al. (2010)	Canada	Youth violence	Youth, parents, community youth workers	Concept Mapping (brainstorming, sorting, rating) via mixed methods	Develop an emergency-department-based youth-violence intervention
Le et al. (2011)	United States	Youth violence (Asian/immigrant)	Immigrant youth and community	Community mobilisation, surveys, programme evaluation	Prevent youth violence among Asian and immigrant populations
Hausman et al. (2013)	United States	Youth violence	Community partners	Adaptation of psychometric scales; community-defined indicators	Develop community-relevant outcome measures for violence-prevention programmes
White et al. (2013)	United States	Intimate partner violence (ethnic-minority women)	Ethnic-minority women	CBPR; culturally grounded instrument adaptation	Understand IPV in specific cultural contexts and strengthen community capacity
Vaughan et al. (2015) – ASPIRE	Australia	Family violence (immigrant & refugee women)	Immigrant and refugee women, service providers	In-depth interviews, key-informant interviews, focus groups, Photovoice	Understand the dynamics of violence against immigrant and refugee women
Vindevogel et al. (2015)	Uganda	Post-war / armed conflict	Youth, parents, elders, leaders, teachers	Participatory classification: historical chronologies, community mapping, transect tours, group discussions	Develop a culturally sensitive conceptualisation of youth resilience
Blanchard et al. (2017)	India	IPV & HIV vulnerability (sex work)	Female sex workers and male partners	Longitudinal qualitative case study; collaborative thematic analysis	Pursue authenticity while exploring IPV and HIV vulnerability
Poleshuck et al. (2018)	United States	Intimate partner violence (with depression/pain)	Survivors; community advisory board	Focus groups; community advisory board co-design	Develop an innovative treatment paradigm for IPV survivors
Nnawulezi et al. (2019)	United States	Domestic violence	Domestic-violence program staff	Negotiated participatory processes; interviews	Obtain ecologically valid data within crisis-support settings
Wolferman et al. (2019)	United States	Sexual violence (campus)	Students; advisory board	Community advisory board, ethnography, surveys	Reflect on board practice in a campus sexual-violence project

Stalker et al. (2020) – Thrive	United States	Community violence / crime	Residents, law enforcement, cross-sector stakeholders	Interviews, focus groups, geomapping, structured observation	Assess and plan the Thrive community violence-reduction initiative
Veronese et al. (2022)	Palestine	Military / political violence	Palestinian children	Interactive maps, walk-along interviews, transect routes	Examine children's human (in)security and psychological well-being
Hancock (2023)	International (UN Peacebuilding Fund settings)	Post-conflict peacebuilding	Local actors and donors	Community-Based Monitoring and Evaluation; participatory data collection	Develop accountable, collaborative peacebuilding evaluation
Lozano et al. (2023)	Colombia	Armed conflict / post-conflict (schools)	Teachers in conflict-affected zones	Individual and collective biographical narratives	Position teachers as peacebuilding agents from schools
Nupia & Valencia Espinosa (2023)	Colombia	Peacebuilding (knowledge co-production)	Researchers; international cooperation actors	Workshop with researchers; document analysis of research proposals	Understand mechanisms of knowledge co-production in peace research
Ferrari et al. (2023)	Democratic Republic of Congo & Iraq	Violence against healthcare in crisis settings	Health-care workers and community	Citizen science; interviews, structured observation, co-designed code of conduct; stepped-wedge RCT; cost-effectiveness	Reduce violence against health-care workers via a co-designed intervention
Warrington, Langhoff & Warnock (2024)	England	Sexual violence (young people)	Young people affected by sexual violence	Creative and participatory arts-based methods (incl. Photovoice)	Enable safe, participatory research on 'resistance'

Source: Authors' creation.

Supplemental Table 6.

Illustrative example of the coding process

The excerpts below are paraphrased illustrations, reconstructed from the published sources cited, showing how raw text was translated into descriptive codes and grouped into the broader categories reported in the Results section. One example is given for each of the four categories (objectives, methodological tools, benefits and challenges). They are provided for methodological transparency; the corresponding author holds the full coding spreadsheet with the original text segments extracted during analysis.

Illustrative text segment	**Descriptive code**	**Broader category (theme)**
"Young people, parents and community leaders jointly identified the local signs that indicate that a young person is coping well after war" (paraphrased from Vindevogel et al., 2015).	Community-defined indicators of resilience	Resilience in conflict contexts (Objectives)
"Children and researchers walked through their neighbourhood together, marking on maps the places they perceived as safe or unsafe" (paraphrased from Veronese et al., 2022).	Walking and mapping with participants	Dialogic and creative techniques (Methodological tools)
"Researchers and community members held repeated joint sessions to design the intervention together, building rapport over time" (paraphrased from Hausman & Becker, 2000).	Shared, iterative design process	Fosters trust, collaboration and community empowerment (Benefits)
"The evaluation required additional staff time and training that had not been budgeted for at the outset" (paraphrased from Stalker et al., 2020).	Unplanned resource and time demand	High demand for time, personnel and training (Challenges)
"Community leaders were consulted on the interpretation of findings before dissemination" (paraphrased from Hancock, 2023).	Community involvement in interpreting results	Promotes greater community ownership (Benefits)

Source: Authors' creation

References

Blanchard, A. K., Nair, S. G., Thalinja, R., Srikantamurthy, H. S., Ramanaik, S., Javalkar, P., Pillai, P., Isac, S., Collumbien, M., Heise, L., Bhattacharjee, P., & Bruce, S. G. (2017). Pursuing Authenticity from

Process to Outcome in a Community-Based Participatory Research Study of Intimate Partner Violence and HIV Vulnerability in North Karnataka, India. *Qualitative Health Research*, *27*(2), 204–214. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732316654871

Ferrari, G., Lwamushi, S. M., Balaluka, G. B., Lafta, R. K., Schindler, C., Bugugu, D., Lurhangire, E., Tediosi, F., Mendoza, J. R., & Merten, S. (2023). Understanding context of violence against healthcare through citizen science and evaluating the effectiveness of a co-designed code of conduct and of a tailored de-escalation of violence training in Eastern Democratic Republic of Congo and Iraq: a study protocol for a stepped wedge randomized controlled trial. *Trials*, *24*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-023-07839-3

Hancock, L. (2023). Peacebuilding Accountability: The United Nations Peacebuilding Fund and Community-Based Monitoring and Evaluation. *Negotiation Journal*, *39*(4), 427–453. https://doi.org/10.1111/nejo.12442

Hausman, A. J., Baker, C. N., Komaroff, E., Thomas, N., Guerra, T., Hohl, B. C., & Leff, S. S. (2013). Developing Measures of Community-Relevant Outcomes for Violence Prevention Programs: A Community-Based Participatory Research Approach to Measurement. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *52*(3–4), 249–262. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-013-9590-6

Hausman, A. J., & Becker, J. (2000). Using Participatory Research to Plan Evaluation in Violence Prevention. *Health Promotion Practice*, *1*(4), 331–340. https://doi.org/10.1177/152483990000100410

Kataoka, S. H., Fuentes, S., O'Donoghue, V. P., Castillo-Campos, P., Bonilla, A., Halsey, K., Avila, J. L., & Wells, K. B. (2006). A community participatory research partnership: The development of a faith-based intervention for children exposed to violence. *Ethnicity & Disease*, *16*, 89–97. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16681132/ Retrieved September 9, 2026.

Le, T. N., Arifuku, I., Vuong, L., Tran, G., Lustig, D. F., & Zimring, F. (2011). Community Mobilization and Community-Based Participatory Research to Prevent Youth Violence Among Asian and Immigrant Populations. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *48*(1–2), 77–88. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-010-9413-y

Leff, S. S., Thomas, D. E., Vaughn, N. A., Thomas, N. A., MacEvoy, J. P., Freedman, M. A., Abdul-Kabir, S., Woodlock, J., Guerra, T., Bradshaw, A. S., Woodburn, E. M., Myers, R. K., & Fein, J. A. (2010). Using community-based participatory research to develop the PARTNERS youth violence prevention program. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships : Research, Education, and Action*, *4*(3), 207–216. https://doi.org/10.1353/cpr.2010.0005

Lozano, M., Mendoza Toraya, M., Montaña, D., & Parra Sandoval, R. (2023). Participatory research, biographical narratives and peacebuilding: An experience with teachers in Tolima, Colombia. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *125*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104054

Nnawulezi, N., Sullivan, C. M., Marcus, S., Young, L., & Hacskaylo, M. (2019). Negotiating Participatory Research Processes With Domestic Violence Program Staff to Obtain Ecologically Valid Data. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *34*(23–24), 4817–4837. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519871535

Nupia, C. M., & Valencia Espinosa, L. (2023). Understanding mechanisms of knowledge co-production in peace research projects supported by international cooperation. *Tapuya: Latin American Science, Technology and Society*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/25729861.2023.2236507

Poleshuck, E., Mazzotta, C., Resch, K., Rogachefsky, A., Bellenger, K., Raimondi, C., Thompson Stone, J., & Cerulli, C. (2018). Development of an Innovative Treatment Paradigm for Intimate Partner Violence Victims With Depression and Pain Using Community-Based Participatory Research. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *33*(17), 2704–2724. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516628810

Snider, C. E., Kirst, M., Abubakar, S., Ahmad, F., & Nathens, A. B. (2010). Community-based participatory research: Development of an Emergency department-based youth violence intervention using concept mapping. *Academic Emergency Medicine*, *17*(8), 877–885. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1553-2712.2010.00810.x

Stalker, K. C., Brown, M. E., Evans, C. B. R., Hibdon, J., & Telep, C. (2020). Addressing Crime, Violence, and Other Determinants of Health through Community-Based Participatory Research and Implementation Science. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *66*(3–4), 392–403. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12438

Vaughan, C., Murdolo, A., Murray, L., Davis, E., Chen, J., Block, K., Quiazon, R., & Warr, D. (2015). ASPIRE: A multi-site community-based participatory research project to increase understanding of the dynamics of violence against immigrant and refugee women in Australia. *BMC Public Health*, *15*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-2634-0

Veronese, G., Cavazzoni, F., Fiorini, A., Shoman, H., & Sousa, C. (2022). Human (in)security and psychological well-being in Palestinian children living amidst military violence: A qualitative participatory research using interactive maps. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, *48*(1), 159–169. https://doi.org/10.1111/cch.12917

Vindevogel, S., Ager, A., Schiltz, J., Broekaert, E., & Derluyn, I. (2015). Toward a culturally sensitive conceptualization of resilience: ParticipatorY research with war-affected communities in northern Uganda. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, *52*(3), 396–416. https://doi.org/10.1177/1363461514565852

Warrington, C., Langhoff, K., & Warnock, B. (2024). The role of arts-based methods in supporting safe and participatory research addressing sexual violence with young people. *Health Education Journal*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/00178969241299750

White, J. W., Yuan, N. P., Cook, S. L., & Abbey, A. (2013). Ethnic Minority Women's Experiences with Intimate Partner Violence: Using Community-Based Participatory Research to Ask the Right Questions. *Sex Roles*, *69*(3–4), 226–236. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-012-0237-0

Wolferman, N., Hunter, T., Hirsch, J. S., Khan, S. R., Reardon, L., & Mellins, C. A. (2019). The advisory board perspective from a campus community-based participatory research project on sexual violence. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action*, *13*(1), 115–119. https://doi.org/10.1353/cpr.2019.0014