**Writing instruction: Write a response in which you discuss what specific evidence is needed to evaluate the argument and explain how the evidence would weaken and strengthen the argument.**

At/upon first glance, it might appear rational to concur with (argument). And, objectively, (supporting argument). Upon closer inspection/for further examination, however, it becomes obvious/glaring that quite amount of extra evidence is indispensable to either weaken or strengthen (argument).

(Argument detail1). However, (opposing detail1). Without evidence to eliminate these factors being able to justify (argument detail1), the suggestion is untenable.

Moreover, (argument detail2), but without mentioning (opposing detail2). In order to rationalize (argument detail2), only (argument detail2) is far from enough.

A further flaw is that (opposing detail3). To warrant this recommendation, …

Certainly, it is not unreasonable that (argument). (Argument), nevertheless, is unlikely to justify the proposal unless additional information is given. There are, for instance, at least three pieces of information needing to be added: (opposing detail1); (opposing detail2); and (opposing detail3).

**Writing instruction: Write a response in which you discuss what questions would need to be answered in order to decide whether the recommendation is likely to have the predicted result. Be sure to explain how the answers to these questions would help to evaluate the recommendation.**

The author suggested that (argument). However, the assumption has left many questions unanswered for such prediction / these inferences invite questions whose answers will assist in evaluating the argument.

The first question is that we need to know (question1). (Argument detail1). However, (opposing detail1).

On the same line/similarly, we do not have any information about (question2). (Opposing detail2). To put it more exact for this concept, we need to know (question2).

Furthermore, in the recommendation, (argument detail3). This is true for sure since (supporting argument). However, it is only at face value in a statistic assumption. First of all, (question3). Secondly, (question4). Thirdly, (question5).

In sum, before adopting the recommendation, there are still many questions left unanswered above for the predicted result. Thus, I will be more convinced if questions mentioned are answered by author, such as (question1), (question2) as well as (question3).

**Writing instruction: Write a response in which you examine the stated and/or unstated assumptions of the argument. Be sure to explain how the argument depends on these assumptions and what the implications are for the argument if the assumptions prove unwarranted.**

The argument is based on one premise that (assumption). With such premise, (argument). However, these assumptions made, whether being stated or unstated, have implications that need to be examined and proved for a sound argument / it needs to be explained from the implications as well as from stated or unstated assumptions to prove warranted for the conclusion.

First, the assumption says (assumption1). In some cases, this is not sensible enough to make the final conclusion for the statement. (Opposing assumption1). The hidden assumption ought to be stated so as to confirm the final deduction.

Second, the assumption also indicates the fact that (assumption2) is surely not right. As we all know, in a good comparison each condition should be the same. (Opposing assumption2). This data is insufficient and not warrant any further result. Thus, the argument is not persuasive.

Third, the assumption indicates (assumption3). It can be true, and if it is, the final conclusion that (argument) will be certified. In spite of it, this condition may fail. (Opposing assumption3). If it is known to be the case, the final conclusion is certainly worth doubting.

Even though (assumption), we still cannot suggest that (argument). Thus, this statement is flawed and it certainly does not provide enough assumptions to prove it warranted.