

Title: Themes appendix for “Fact-checking at a crossroads: Fact checkers’ perspectives on Community Notes, AI integration, and design recommendations”

Authors: Basak Bozkurt (1), Mohsen Mosleh (1,2), Helen Margetts (1)

Date: July 7<sup>th</sup>, 2026

Note: The material contained herein is supplementary to the article named in the title and published in the Harvard Kennedy School (HKS) Misinformation Review.

---

## Appendix B: Themes

*Table B1. Summary of themes.*

Theme	Description	Research Questions
CN as a promising but poorly implemented system	Participants saw Community Notes as a promising way to scale contextual information and broaden participation in verification, but noted that inconsistent quality, opaque governance, and uneven participation limit its effectiveness.	RQ1
CN as a complement to professional fact-checking	Participants framed CN as a complement to professional fact-checking, providing speed and scale for less complex claims, while experts address complex or high-stakes misinformation.	RQ1
AI Note Writers: Speed and scale with factuality risks	Participants saw AI Note Writers as enabling faster and more scalable notes but raised concerns about factual errors and the need for human review.	RQ2
Hybrid verification	Participants proposed hybrid verification systems that integrate community contributions with professional oversight.	RQ3