

Where interesting debates may be developed is on the more controversial aspects of her life – her bulimia, her addictions and her ill-fated relationship with Blake Fielder-Civil. This may well focus on the selection and use of particular footage.

Interestingly we also only hear the interviewees and never see them. Kapadia would have spoken to these people and recorded their thoughts digitally and then used them to underscore his images.

What it also exposes is the way that even before Winehouse became famous, her existence was being documented. The key debates here are to do with Kapadia's focus in telling the story that he wanted to tell. Might have he done this differently? How would this have changed the emphasis of the film?

*Amy* is clearly the work of a number of filmmakers and Kapadia's skill as a filmmaker is really seen in the editing room. He has amassed a great deal of archive footage from media sources and placed these alongside more personal filmic insights into Winehouse's life.

In Kapadia's film there is very little actual original footage shot. This seems to largely consist of captioned establishing shots of London – either with a helicopter or a drone. These few shots are very clearly digital and offer a brief counterpoint to the rest of the film's style.

The manipulation and crucially the montage effect of the using the footage alongside the interviews is what give the film its power.

The combination of both analogue and some early digital recordings of Amy Winehouse from her friends and in some cases her family do offer a revealing perspective on her childhood, adolescence and the early part of her career.