The author provides no evidence that … is the reason for …

The arguer fails to establish a causal relationship between … and …

This editorial falsely fabricates a causal link/pattern that … caused ….

The editor may mask/conceal/disguise other possible factors, which are … .

The argument assumes a causal relationship of … with …, whereas only a correlation has been indicated.

The arguer’s reasoning linking … with … seems reasonable on the surface, but it may not be true after further scrutiny.

There is no information available to justify any causal relationship between … and ….

Any further linkage of these two phenomena-- … and … --requires more evidence and is not justified by the data so far available.

It does not naturally warrant the conclusion that … has significantly contributed, and thus is causal to …

This observed phenomenon that …, actually says little more than that these two events are synchronic to each other and that is all.

A direct correlation between … and … does not necessarily prove that the former causes the latter.

Comprehensive analysis is necessary to identify the actual causes of …

The author fails to consider and rule out other factors that might account for …

To find the exact causes of …, examination should be applied to all the factors that have significant impact on …

While a high correlation is strong evidence of a causal relationship, in itself it is not sufficient.

We do not have any evidence suggesting that … will cause …

Contingencies such as … can all lead to …

The arguer oversimplifies the factors that would influence …

The arguer oversimplifies the importance of …

It is expected/anticipated that …. will inevitably lead to …

The arguer attempts to extract a general principle from a specific case.

The arguer supports the conclusion by over-generalizing from a specific piece of evidence that ….

The example cited is insufficient to warrant …, because there is no reason to believe that the data drawn from … is representative of …

The arguer draws a conclusion that is broader in scope than is warranted by the evidence advanced.

The arguer infers from what has been observed to the case under exceptional conditions to what is principle true.

The arguer uses a few exceptional cases as the basis for a claim about what is true in general.

The argument attributes a characteristic of an individual member of a group to the group as a whole.

The author generalizes from what is true in one region of space to what must be true in all regions of space.

While it is true that …, this is not true for everyone.

By relying on the national survey to support its conclusion, the argument depends on the assumption that this nationwide survey can represent a specific region within this nation.

The nationwide study showing that … does not necessarily apply to …

The arguer assumes that what is true of a group as a whole is necessarily true of each member of that group.

The argument assumes that what is true of group of people taken collectively is also true of any individual within that group.

Concerning the first benchmark, the arguer falsely takes it as the key indicator of the overall performance of …

…, …, …, …, and … are not reliable standards to choose between … and …. Further, this argument should better evaluate more factors like …, …, and …

The editorial fails to take into account possible difference between …

The argument simply equates … with …

The problem is that the two situations are not similar enough to justify the analogical deduction.

The speaker fails to indicate what portion of ….

The argument relies on the figures--…, …, and …. But these numbers are too imprecise to support the conclusion drawn.

The statistical evidence that … is too vague to be informative. The result of the study, therefore, is incomplete to be conclusive.

When samples are used to make general claims about a particular group, the samples should be close enough in time to the generalization they are used to support, so that historical changes will not invalidate the generalization.

Since the arguer makes a claim about … in general, the sample for the survey should be able to represent all …

In order to establish a strong correlation between … and …, the study’s sample must be sufficient in size representative of …

From the survey quoted in the argument, however, we find no sign of such procedures for random sampling, and have good reason to doubt if the sample is representative enough to reflect the general attitudes of all workers as a whole.

The argument fails to indicate what portion of the people surveyed actually responded; the smaller this portion, the less reliable the results.

Yet we are told nothing about the way the poll was conducted and how well it represented the public opinions.

The arguer generalizes on the basis of a sample consisting of atypical cases.

The fact that … does not prove that …

The fact that … does not support the claim that …

The fact that … does not ensure that …

The fact that … lends no support to the conclusion that …

The fact that … does not necessarily imply that …

The mere fact that … is insufficient evidence to conclude that …

The fact that … accomplishes nothing toward bolstering the recommendation that …

The author assumes that … But it may not be the case.

The argument rests on the gratuitous assumption that …

The arguer’s conclusion depends on the questionable assumption that …

The arguer fails to provide enough information concerning …

The reasoning that … is open to doubt.

Another assumption in short of legitimacy is that …

The evidence provided in this argument is not sufficient to validate the assumption that …

The arguer draws a hasty conclusion which is based on inadequate evidence about …

The evidence it cites is inconsistent with the hypothesis that …

Nor does the mere fact that … lends significant support to …

Even assuming …, it is nevertheless impossible to assess the author’s broader contention that …

Even if the arguer can substantiate all of the foregoing assumptions, the arguer’s assertion that … is still unwarranted.

Although this is entirely possible, the argument provides no evidence to support this assumption that …

While this may be true in some cases, but it is equally possible that …

But, since the editorial provides no evidence to substantiate this assumption it is equally possible that …

This scenario is quite possible, especially considering that …

On the one hand, the author overlooks the possibility that …; on the other hand, perhaps …

Common sense and experience tells us this is not the case, and that a variety of other factors, such as …, also play major roles.

If this is the case, it provides an alternative explanation for the fact that …

The argument fails to rule out the possibility that …

The author fails to consider other likely possibilities that …

The argument omits factors such as …

**E/S**

Lacking more specific information about how …, it is impossible to assess …

Unless the author can demonstrate that …, the author’s concern about these issues is unfounded.

Unless …, there is a good chance …

Therefore, any decision aimed at addressing the problem of … must be based on more thorough investigation to gather sufficient data in order to narrow down and locate the actual causes of the problem.

The conclusion reached in this argument is invalid and probably misleading.

The article fails to account for the alternative explanations for …, thus the article’s author cannot make any sound recommendation to …

Since the application has not adequately responded to this concern, his claim that … is untenable.

Since the editorial fails to rule out these and other possible explanations for …, I cannot accept any conclusions about …

Without eliminating this possibility, the author cannot rely on the national survey to conclude that …

Given these possible scenarios, the fact that … proves nothing about …

Any of these scenarios, if true, would cast considerable doubt on the argument’s conclusion that …

Without weighing revenue against expenses the argument’s conclusion is premature at best.

Absent either a clear definition of the term or dear evidence that …, the author’s contention that … is simply unjustified.

Lacking evidence of a sufficiently representative sample, the author cannot justifiably rely on the study to draw any conclusion whatsoever.

The author must consider and eliminate this and other possible reasons why …. Otherwise, I cannot accept the author’s implicit claim that …

This single sample is insufficient to draw any general conclusion about …

Without additional samples from diverse geographic locations, I cannot accept the author’s sweeping generalization about …

In short, lacking evidence that conditions on the two … are relatively similar, the author cannot convince me on the basis of …’s experience that …

Absent additional information about the cited studies, these studies lend no credible support to the conclusion that …

Without such evidence, the argument can be rejected out of hand.