

Profile of the interviewed: Postdoctoral Researcher in Computer Science, focusing on digital ethics and digital humanities

Q1: Clarity – Are the descriptions of the concerns clear and unambiguous? Would you suggest any modifications?

Yes, the descriptions are clear, but modifications are suggested overall.

- In *transparency and explainability*: clarify in the description, what do u mean by decisions? Are decisions for how you verify my age or how you manage my data?
- *Fairness* can be renamed as *Bias*. You can have fairness in multiple ways, e.g., when you have transparency already, and so as if you have no bias and no discrimination, you have fairness.
- Remove *social inclusion* from *accessibility and social inclusion*, and add it to the discussion. It is a consequence that u will have automatically once you have other concerns.
- Remove *trust and social acceptance*, and add in discussion, again, it is a consequence of other concerns
- Remove the part in the description of fairness and discrimination, *or significant reduction of accuracy*, and make accuracy a standalone ethical concern. Also, you talk about accuracy in safety and security, so it's an overlap in the description of fairness and discrimination.
- In *consent granting and autonomy*, autonomy also matches other concerns. You can see it is also okay here, but you can see if you can change; it's okay both ways.

Q2: Relevance – Are the concerns relevant in the context of age verification systems? Would you remove any of them?

Yes, although they are all relevant, I would remove some, like *trust*, *social acceptance*, and *social inclusion*. I would add accuracy as a concern in itself.

Q3: Actionability – Can these concerns realistically be addressed in age verification systems?

Yes, they must be addressed.

Q4: **Completeness** – Are these concerns comprehensive enough to address the ethical aspects of age verification systems? Would you include others?

Accuracy can be added. The rest of them are enough.