

Ofcom Youth Advisory Board

10th April 2026

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Frequency of encountering harmful content	4
Ways in which young people encounter harmful content.....	6
Effects of harmful content on young people	9
Current categories of harmful content.....	13
Emerging categories of harmful content	14
Young people’s views on social media, and the proposed ban for under 16s	15
Follow-up responses	18

Introduction

The Children's Commissioner for England is Dame Rachel de Souza. She has a statutory duty to promote and protect children's rights in accordance with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Ofcom is the regulator for communications in the UK. One of its responsibilities is to make sure online sites and apps are safe, especially for children. This includes ensuring that children are not seeing things that they shouldn't when they go online.

Ofcom commissioned the Children's Commissioner's Office to organise and run a youth panel to ensure that children's voices were at the heart of Ofcom's Online Safety Code. The Ofcom Youth Advisory Board had its first meetings at the end of 2025 and meets approximately every six weeks through a combination of online and in-person sessions, creating opportunities for young people to share their views and experiences and inform the development of online safety policy and regulation.

This report summarises the discussion from an in-person meeting on 10th April 2026, attended by 10 young people, aged 14 to 17-years-old, from the Youth Advisory Board. The session reviewed harmful content categories under the Online Safety Act and explored whether the current framework reflects the harms that children and young people experience online and whether emerging harms should be given greater considerations. The categories of harmful content are:

- Primary Priority Content (PPC) – pornographic content, suicide and self-harm content, eating disorder content.
- Priority Content (PC) – abuse and hate content, violent content, bullying content, dangerous stunts and challenges content, harmful substances content.
- Non-Designated Content (NDC) – body stigma content, depression content.

This report presents the views shared by members of the Youth Advisory Board and highlights the key themes raised during the session to support Ofcom's ongoing consideration of online harms affecting children and young people.

Frequency of encountering harmful content

The group was split into two smaller groups and given different questions to discuss.

Below is a summary of the main themes that were discussed in both groups.

What kind of harmful content do you think people your age might come across online?

The young people acknowledged that social media can be addictive, but that screentime measurements are not a productive measure of social media usage, as they use their phones for a range of productive tasks outside of social media. They discussed how algorithms will feed more positive content if they engage with it, however it will also feed more negative content if they engage with it.

*“I think there is a clear issue, it's quite explicit that young people are being exposed to harmful content. There's a clear pattern here whereby, if you see content, or are exposed to content, or search specific content of a specific nature, the algorithm will present it to you recurringly on a weekly rate, even then a daily basis.” – **Girl, 16***

They recognised that content that falls in the Primary Priority Content and Primary Content categories are usually blocked through searches, however this is not always blocked on their feeds.

*“When I searched it up, it said that the content was 18 plus, and it was just a video about this cool Diet Coke can. But because it had the word diet in it wouldn't let me search it up. But, it was happily serving me content on my feed, that it wouldn't let me go looking for” – **Girl, 15***

They felt that social media can influence political opinions, and that this is becoming increasingly relevant with votes at sixteen. They discussed how political content targets specific demographics, creating echo chambers, and contributing to polarisation amongst young people.

“And definitely with current events, the way current events are characterised online is quite interesting. Definitely from a political point of view, because that's what really young people are

*basing their political views from. I definitely think that's contributing to a lot of polarisation.” – **Girl, 14***

Have you ever come across something online that you felt was harmful for children or young people?

The young people discussed how they are more likely to see harmful content that is viral, and that viral challenges or trends can lead to dangerous behaviours offline. They described how seeing this content at a young age can influence people later in life, giving an example of how dangerous driving content can influence young people before they have learnt to drive.

*“I feel like we need to talk about it more, and we need the algorithms to recognise how dangerous these things are, because it only pushes things for them to go viral, it doesn't consider the safety.” – **Girl, 16***

Some of the young people described seeing violent content from films showing on their feeds, and footage from police body cameras. They also discussed how AI can create harmful content that is viewed by younger audiences.

*“With AI, I don't know which category it fit in because it's just kind of disturbing stuff, if that makes sense. Or creepy stuff, which they're on sites for younger people, so it's obviously going to be more disturbing for them.” – **Girl, 17***

How often do you think people your age see harmful content?

A number of participants felt that many young people rely on social media for news and current affairs. They acknowledged that information found through social media is not always accurate, and described how inaccurate information can shape attitudes, reinforce prejudice and contribute to radicalisation.

*“A lot of young people don't really like going to the news in terms of their source. They want to go to TikTok and Instagram to find out what's going on. But then when you go on there, you see different people's opinions that might not be right or factual and that's the only thing you are getting so that's worse.” – **Girl, 17***

They discussed how social media is designed to make users spend more time on it and therefore it feeds increasingly shocking content. They reflected on how repeated exposure can lead to desensitisation, making violence appear less shocking over time. Young people also discussed viral incidents and news events being repeatedly reposted online, meaning many young people encounter graphic content before seeing reports through traditional media sources.

“The Charlie Kirk thing was quite a lot of people were seeing the real thing that happened. I mean, thankfully I didn't see that, but I know a lot of people who did. And I can't really believe that that was able to get onto social media and to sort of be reposted by different people. So that was quite crazy.”
– **Girl, 14**

They described how desensitisation to this harmful content can have a negative effect on young people, creating a “nihilistic” view of the world and negatively impact their mental health.

“I definitely think people get quite radicalised by just seeing that everything's terrible, like quite nihilistic sort of worldview. And then I think that does contribute to real life things that happen.” – **Girl, 14**

Ways in which young people encounter harmful content

The group was split into two smaller groups and given different questions to discuss.

Group 1 discussed ways in which young people encounter harmful content. Below is a summary of the main themes that were discussed in Group 1.

Group 1

Where do you tend to encounter harmful content? On which platforms or features?

The young people described how they often encounter harmful videos on X and recognised that regulation on that platform takes a long time.

“I'd definitely say X is quite a good source in a sense, if you want to find that sort of content, which is not good itself. But then you'll find these unredacted videos of the stuff happening and it's not very

*good at all, and the moderation takes very long to actually act upon when the video is posted.” – **Boy, 17***

They discussed how harmful content is often found in comment sections or chat forums on platforms such as Discord and felt that these spaces are less regulated than main feeds on social media. Content they described appearing in these sections include racist and homophobic comments, and sexual bots.

*“I think also if you are part of a minority or something, you are more, I feel like you get a lot of racist comments or homophobic. There's a lot of homophobia in comment sections in particular, and I think it's just normalised.” – **Boy, 17***

*“There are bots that are like sexual bots, and they will write usually in smaller videos, so more people see it and then they'll say, ‘go to my bio’, or ‘text me’” – **Boy, 17***

Snapchat was also recognised as a platform that young people may encounter unknown adult users through the main feed.

*“Snapchat spotlights in particular...it's predominantly young people, and I feel like then you get a lot of older people who are wanting to do weird stuff. It's like a breeding ground for them.” – **Boy, 17***

The young people felt that TikTok was the safest platform in terms of encountering harmful content, describing how harmful content usually appears only after a significant amount of time has been spent on the platform.

How do you come across harmful content? Is it random or due to searches, recommendations, trending pages, or shared by others?

The young people felt that they were most likely to come across harmful content accidentally when scrolling on social media, rather than through searches. They said that they were only five to 10 percent likely to come across harmful content deliberately, compared with 10 to 70 percent likely to come across harmful content that is unavoidable, such as viral content. They said that reporting and resetting suggested content on the platforms can help. They described settings that warn about harmful content before viewing it and felt that content with such warnings should be removed from platforms.

They recognised that age settings on social media platforms will only work if young people are truthful about their age.

"It gives you a warning saying, 'the following content is harmful, so you may want to skip it', but I don't understand why they don't remove it from the app in the first place." – Girl, 16

They spoke about how algorithms are set to be addictive, and so will have a certain shock factor to the content it shows. They described how viral content can be unavoidable, and young people are likely to come across harmful content on social media before seeing it through traditional news sources.

They reflected on viral trends that encourage dangerous behaviour, noting that increasingly extreme content is often rewarded on engagement-driven platforms. They referred to previous challenges that resulted in serious injuries and deaths, expressing concern that harmful trends are often promoted because they generate views and engagement.

"I know someone who I think it was their [relative], they did do one of these trends and they did pass away from it. And it was because of [their] friend group that [they] felt [they] had to do it. I think there was a big thing within one of the local schools, they were all doing trends like this. So, I'd say it is pressure for some people if they haven't had the right warnings about it." – Girl, 17

Peer pressure was identified as a key factor to engaging with harmful content and they described situations where young people felt pressure to participate in trending behaviours. Some participants highlighted how younger users may join challenges simply to fit in or avoid feeling excluded.

"You see a trend on TikTok and you want to copy it and you want to do it even if it's harmful to you." – Girl, 14

They discussed how harmful substances content is frequently glamorised online, particularly through influencers and lifestyle content and some noted advertising and promotional content.

"I think a lot of content to do with vaping and drinking, I feel like that's very idolised and it looks very glamorous on the social media and especially trends people do. Which obviously influences what people might do." – Boy, 17

They described how algorithms tailor content based on the user's gender, though highlighted that content is often not tailored to age groups. Body image content was recognised as presenting differently in feeds for boys and girls.

"I think there's a lot of body image stuff, which is definitely completely different for boys and girls. I think that a lot of girls probably see a lot of body image [content]. I definitely know people who see a lot of that quite frequently. But then I think that's also becoming a thing for boys as well, but in quite a different way." – **Girl, 14**

Some of the group felt that young people's involvement in harmful online trends or content can be exaggerated in the news, or by parents and carers, with some describing how they hear about some harmful trends from adults first.

"I feel like a lot of this is, especially news outlets and stuff, they exaggerate a lot of it. But I feel like a lot of it that's really exaggerated, you don't really see, I think especially for Primary Priority Content social media companies are pretty good at cutting things off. I think it's more of the content which is disguised as other things and which on initial observation you might not see it as very harmful, but with its interaction and with its interpretation becomes harmful." – **Boy, 17**

The young people wrote down how much percentage of harmful content they see online is discovered deliberately or accidentally, and how much is unavoidable. Their responses are below:

- Deliberate – 10%, accidental – 60%, unavoidable – 30%
- Deliberate – 5%, accidental – 30%, unavoidable – 65%
- Deliberate – 5-10%, accidental – 70-80%, unavoidable – 15%
- Deliberate – 5%, accidental – 40%, unavoidable – 10%
- Deliberate – 10%, accidental – 70%, unavoidable – 40%

Effects of harmful content on young people

The group was split into two smaller groups and given different questions to discuss.

Group 2 discussed the effects that harmful content can have on young people. Below is a summary of the main themes that were discussed in Group 2.

Group 2

How does seeing harmful content make young people feel, even if you scroll past it quickly?

The young people described how Non-Designated Content, such as body stigma content and depression content, may not appear harmful to a young person when they first encounter it but how the harm comes from repeated exposure and desensitisation.

"I also think that it's more just how many, 'what I eat in the day' can you watch before you start looking at what you eat in the day? Although that is not in itself harmful, it can have quite a bit of effect on a young person." – **Girl, 15**

They highlighted how algorithms often amplify these themes over time. They described a process where seemingly positive content can gradually become more restrictive, appearance-focused or harmful. They explained that young people may not initially recognise this content as harmful, making it particularly difficult to identify.

"I feel like body positivity might come up on your 'for you page', and it's going to be talking about how other people's bodies are good, and as a young child, you might decide to watch the video through, and because you decide to watch the whole video, the algorithm's going to give you more videos like that. It might start to get more and more negative, or it'll have a slight impression. So, it might look positive, but there will be something negative in the video. As you keep getting fed these videos, you'll start thinking, even though people are saying, 'my body is good now, I should be comfortable with how I am right now', but people weren't accepting of your body before, so they're saying that this problem, shouldn't be a problem. It makes you think that there was a problem in the first place and then you get more negative thoughts in your head, and then you start searching for more things related." – **Girl, 16**

The group discussed trends such as "bring back bullying", noting that many young people no longer recognise this type of content as harmful because of how frequently they encounter it. They noted

that harmful behaviour is often disguised as humour, reducing the likelihood that peers will challenge it.

"I know there's hashtags that go around, like 'bring back bullying' which obviously is really horrible, but I wouldn't say that many of my peers would class that as content that was harmful. I know that it's quite difficult to judge if a trend will become something that could cause death or loss of life. I know that because it's so normalised in our society, because the children see it so often, the feed and the increased scrolling time than would be a few years back, I know that because there's so much of it, it's harder to work out if it could be harmful or if it isn't." – Girl, 15

The young people described comment sections as particularly problematic, with many suggesting that harmful content is more likely to appear within comments than in original posts. They highlighted examples of racism and ableism, and general hostility becoming normalised online.

"If you're part of one of these groups, you might get more videos tailored towards that group, but then comment sections, there's going to be a be a lot of harmful content within that, or hateful content. Whether it's ableism, racism... I know everyone has something to say about everyone I feel like in the comment sections." – Girl, 17

Are there any benefits from seeing certain types of harmful content in particular circumstances?

The groups discussed how some content can help young people understand their experiences and feel less isolated. However, they recognised that there is nuance between raising awareness of issues versus keeping people safe from issues they might not otherwise know about.

"There are benefits of content where people are sharing information about their experiences. But it can cause harm to some children, but then can help and raise awareness for others, which I think is really difficult to control." – Girl, 15

"I would say that with feeds, it's quite difficult contention, because if someone's explaining and talking about an eating disorder, for a child that didn't know that kind of thing existed, they are now suddenly aware that there's an option out there. Then for the children who are recovering from that, hearing someone talk about it could be so beneficial. So, there are benefits of content where people are

sharing information about their experiences, but it can cause harm to some children, but then can help and raise awareness for others, which I think is really difficult to control. " – Girl, 15

They also discussed how some content that is harmful can be beneficial in a supportive environment, for example images that help educate on knife crime within a school setting.

Thinking about young people your age and other children who are older or younger than you, do you think some groups might be more affected by harmful content than others?

Young people described how they can be exposed to Primary Priority Content, such as suicide and self-harm content, when scrolling on their feeds. They discussed how this type of content usually has warning but felt that content that needs a warning should not be on a platform at all.

"Usually when I'm when I'm on my 'for you page', and something harmful comes up sometimes. For example, someone talking about suicidal thoughts, sometimes I'll just get those. It will give me a warning saying that the following is harmful. I don't understand why they don't just take it off. It gives you a warning saying, 'the following content is harmful, so you may want to skip it', but I don't understand why they don't remove it from the app in the first place." – Girl, 16

The group felt that harmful content may have a more negative impact on those with lived experience, than it would on those who are younger and may not understand the harm. They felt that whilst younger children may not immediately be affected by harmful content that they do not understand, they may be impacted by becoming desensitised to harmful content over time.

"They're so young, and they have all of these feelings that they don't really know how to translate, they may look at this content and try and project onto it and try and relate with it. So, it might set them on the wrong path. I also feel like, because they're so young, if they see something harmful, they're more likely to make a joke out of it. A lot of kids I know in year seven, they've got phones and because they don't understand a lot of things, they'll look at things online that are quite harmful, and they decide to make a joke out of it." – Girl, 16

The transition age between primary school and secondary school was identified as a particularly vulnerable age, as well as older teens who may already be under stress from other factors such as

schoolwork. They believed that schools should teach how to navigate harmful content on social media, and that protection needs to be in place for everyone including those who are over eighteen, expressing that harmful content should not be available online for any age group.

Current categories of harmful content

The whole group discussed the current categories of harmful content, and if they thought the content within each category is correct.

Do you think the Primary Priority Content is correct?

The young people felt that content inciting abuse or hatred, particularly discrimination of race or gender should be included in Primary Priority Content, as they believe that young people under eighteen are impressionable and may be influenced by this content which will result in real world consequences.

The young people suggested that harmful substances content should be within Primary Priority Content, as drug misuse is illegal. Ofcom clarified that drug misuse content is already illegal for everyone.

The group questioned why some harms, such as self-harm content, is included within Primary Priority Content category, when it is sometimes depicted on TV shows and therefore young people are exposed to this content elsewhere. Ofcom explained that in the Primary Priority Content category, self-harm content refers to content that provides specific instructions on behaviours that are harmful.

The young people questioned if dangerous stunts should remain included in the Priority Content category, as some sports may be considered dangerous but might not be considered as harmful content, for example parkour. Ofcom explained that in this category, it is the intention behind the stunt that indicates if it is harmful content, for example people taking things too far versus people not intending for things to be dangerous.

They also discussed how many young children use their parents' or carers' devices and are then exposed to harmful content on their parents' social media feeds. They felt that some content should

be banned for all users to prevent this from happening, or more controls within apps to help prevent this type of exposure to harmful content.

Does it make sense to have two categories of content in the Act or should all content be treated the same?

The young people felt that the Primary Priority Content is very clear, and that Priority Content and Non-Designated Content were not. They expressed that having two categories would be good and might prevent people from suddenly being exposed to harmful content when they turn eighteen, which could have a more harmful impact.

They discussed how some of the Non-Designated Content can be beneficial, especially for young people who can see or share with others experiencing similar issues to them but highlighted that it would be beneficial for more content to include signposting to relevant support services.

The group also discussed how some content online comes with warning labels or is blurred to prevent younger people from seeing it. They felt that this entices young people to watch the content, and that if something needs a warning it should not be on a platform at all. They felt that young people need to be educated on harmful content, rather than expected to scroll past.

Emerging categories of harmful content

The whole group discussed what they think are emerging categories of harmful content online.

Are there any other forms of content that platforms should be protecting children from? Should they prevent all children from seeing that kind of content or just certain ages?

An emerging harm identified by the young people was misogynistic 'manosphere' content. They described this content as promoting hostility towards women and girls, harmful relationship attitudes and gender stereotypes. They highlighted how this content often appears within self-improvement, finance, lifestyle or humour content and therefore may not be immediately recognised as harmful, however is increasingly becoming a subculture of its own.

AI and misinformation were also recognised as a significant emerging harm. The young people described how some AI content is labelled as inaccurate but expressed that there needs to be more regulation and that AI content should always be labelled as such. They discussed how young people are increasingly relying on AI to complete small tasks, rather than thinking for themselves. They also discussed how AI often validates the users' views and ideas rather than challenging them, and how this can lead to radicalisation. The group described how schools teach about the ethics of AI, and its impact on the environment, but highlighted how there are different types of AI, and feel that some social media platforms create 'unnecessary' AI chatbots. They felt that it would be safer for AI chatbots to be neutral, without a personalisation or personality function.

The group felt that misinformation should be included in the online harm categories, as the consequences of misinformation can be severe, for example causing people to think negatively towards a specific group of people or encouraging harmful behaviour. Other examples of content with misinformation included money scams, pyramid schemes and certain conspiracy theory content.

The young people highlighted that body stigma content can be hard to recognise, but that repeated exposure can be harmful. They felt that some body image content can be educational, for example seeing healthy bodies can be positive, however they felt that this content can have negative impacts and might lead children to worry about their bodies. They expressed that seeing body stigma content once a young person turns eighteen can have a negative effect, and that this content should have a more educational aspect, or signpost to supportive services.

Young people's views on social media, and the proposed ban for under 16s

What are your favourite kinds of online content?

The group were asked what their favourite content to consume online was, their responses are below:

- Finance content, money management and investment banking opportunities
 - Old houses and country estates
-

- History content
- Keeping in touch with long distance friendships
- Documentary content
- Movies updates and travel vlogs
- Dog content
- Book content and recommendations
- Funny voice overs

One thing you would like to change about social media?

The group were asked what the one thing is they would like to change about social media. Their responses are below:

- More funding into real life places children can hang out, youth centres, gyms, parks, city centres.
 - Creating more opportunities for children to hang out in person and tackling wider societal issues will help people get off social media and have more critical thinking skills
 - People using social media in the best interest
 - People telling the truth on social media
 - Less online hate, and people using social media to harm others
 - Fact checked information
 - Regulation of comment sections
 - Adding 'manosphere' content as a category of harmful content
 - Social media ban
-

Views on banning social media for under 16s

The group felt that a ban on social media does not address the root cause of issues online and expressed that they felt the problem was users who post harmful content. Some of the group felt that a ban only delays the problem, as once a young person turns sixteen, they will then be exposed to harmful content. They felt that social media should be more regulated, making it a safer space for all users.

Some of the group felt that platforms with short form content should be banned for all users, as they believe this is feeding into social media addiction. There was a discussion about some platforms being valuable and insightful and how banning all platforms may not be beneficial, with YouTube as a popular example of an educational platform, and WhatsApp to keep in touch with people. The group felt that social media companies should be held accountable, rather than banning young people from using the platforms.

They discussed how young people might still be able to access social media platforms even with a ban in place, through the use of VPNs or use on an adult's phone. Some said that although they support a ban, they recognise that it would be difficult to control and monitor. They felt that users should be held more accountable for the content they post online and suggested linking personal identification to social media accounts.

Written responses:

- I believe social media should not be banned for under 16's, but rather, it should be regulated. I believe this because social media can provide valuable insights to under-16s on a variety of topics and be a different approach to learning. However, if social media companies cannot be fully regulated as of now, then it should be banned. However once adequate regulation is possible, the ban of social media for under-16s should be lifted.
- I think it's a good idea, but I don't think messaging apps or YouTube should be a part of it. The only issue is that it's been so integrated into everyday life, so people won't let go and children will probably find another way to get on it, which is why I think something like kids YouTube should be used for everything.

- Messaging apps or things like using YouTube in schools or for education shouldn't be banned, as needed for contact and education. TikTok, Instagram etc maybe – mindless / addicting / harmful / need other options.
- Yes – a ban, also encouragement of more parent managing / education. If not a ban, more control of the algorithm could be a solution. Makes sense to ban during developmental years, it is addictive and can produce a warped worldview.
- BAN for EVERYONE – communication apps allowed e.g. WhatsApp, not content addictive driven apps – too much nuance already / hard to discriminate what is harmful – political content & echo chambers already too dangerous.
- A ban is not feasible – access to parents' phones / VPN / forbidden fruit / Has positives – YouTube or any platform education.
- Banning social media for under 16s is good but not good, the best idea is to restrict them from going to websites, and letting them know when and what to know, also to feed them the information of good and bad as they grow up in schools.
- I believe there should be a ban on certain content not social media as a whole. By distracting the brain and processing content that is light-hearted it can cause dopamine production which can relieve stress. Too much can be bad though, as it can be draining.
- You aren't addressing the problem at hand by banning social media. It isn't the children's fault but the tech companies and the people promoting and posting these harmful content posts. Banning social media won't solve the root cause. There are some benefits but that won't solve the idea that they will finally be able to view the content.

Follow-up responses

Following the session, one of the young people sent a response via email with their thoughts on the categories of harmful content. Their response is below.

***Girl, 15:** I wanted to briefly summarise a few points I raised [in the meeting], especially around how harmful content is experienced by younger users in practice.*

A key issue is the role of algorithmic recommendation systems. Content that is more extreme, polarising, or emotionally charged is often amplified because it performs well, which in turn incentivises creators to produce increasingly radicalised material. This creates a feedback loop where harmful content is not only present but systematically promoted. Alongside this, I think there is a growing sense of normalisation and apathy among younger audiences. Harmful content is often not immediately recognised as such particularly when it is embedded within trends (e.g. “what I eat in a day” or “glow-up” content). Because it appears routine and aspirational, users continue engaging with it without an initial negative reaction, leading to cumulative impact over time.

This is important because the harm is not always immediate or explicit, but gradual shaping perceptions of body image, identity, and social expectations in ways that are difficult to detect early on.

I also briefly mentioned the increasing overlap between this type of content and broader ideological narratives, including gender-based content, which I have outlined in a separate note.

I wanted to follow on with a more in-depth explanation on what I think should be added to the act. Hopefully this is of use to you.

Following discussion on the review of content categories within the Online Safety Act, I wanted to propose the inclusion of certain forms of “manosphere” content within the Priority Content for Children (PC) category.

At present, this type of content does not appear to sit clearly within existing classifications. While it is generally legal, it can still present a meaningful risk to younger users, particularly due to how it is produced and distributed.

By “manosphere” content, I am referring to material that promotes misogynistic narratives, frames women as inferior or adversarial, or encourages entitlement and hostility within gender relationships. This content is often presented in informal or aspirational formats (e.g. advice, humour, self-improvement), which can make it less immediately recognisable as harmful.

A key concern is the role of algorithmic amplification. Engagement driven systems tend to promote increasingly polarised content, meaning that users including children can be progressively exposed to more extreme gender-based narratives over time. This creates a pathway from relatively mild content to more explicit forms of misogyny.

There is also a risk of normalisation. Research from organisations such as Internet Matters indicates that children do not always identify harmful content immediately, particularly when it aligns with existing trends or is presented as entertainment. As a result, repeated exposure can have a cumulative impact on attitudes towards gender, relationships, and identity.

In this context, the harm is not typically immediate or illegal, but attitudinal and developmental which aligns with the intent behind the Priority Content for Children category.

Including this type of content within PC could support:

- *Reduced algorithmic amplification of misogynistic content to under-18s*
- *Stronger platform accountability for recommendation systems*
- *Clearer guidance on identifying and mitigating gender-based harms that are currently under classified*

Given the increasing visibility of this content among younger audiences, I believe this represents a gap in the current framework that could be addressed through classification within PC.



**11th Floor, 64 Victoria Street
London, SW1E 6QP**

www.childrenscommissioner.gov.uk

 [@childrenscommissioner](https://www.instagram.com/childrenscommissioner)

 [@ChildrensComm](https://twitter.com/ChildrensComm)