The article points out that the restriction of the first three buildings of the Sunnyside Towers complex can possibly diminish the cost from water, drawing a seemingly reasonable conclusion that the limitation of water flow showerheads will raise the corporation's profits. But the author fails to offers confirmed answers for his/her concluding yet unwarranted saying, though he/she indicates few report about the problem form shower reduction emerged after the adjustment in addition. Holding an opposing viewpoint, I would demonstrate further discussion on the questions to doubt the passage as below.

According to the article, the limitation of three buildings from the Sunnyside Towers complex is supposed to save money for the Corporation, whereas some questions still remain when it comes to decide whether the measure in the rest buildings in the Sunnyside Towers complex can work as well as that in the first three buildings. This assumption, based on insufficient evidence, can easily be challenged by some hidden possibilities as presented latter. In first, unaffected residents in the Sunnyside Towers may care more about their personal health comparing to the effected, and they would like to spend extra time on shower if the water is limited, which may cause larger usage of water. Secondly, the people live in the rest buildings do not take shower as much as those in the first three apartments, it would be suitable to figure out the life habit of people live in Sunnyside Towers to verify the actual condition. Given these two possible happenings, taking into account the discussed proposition seems misleading and unnecessary.

(AMPSE)

Aside from, some questions still remain. To prove the reasonableness of cutting water support to save money, the author reason a supposition that the residents are satisfied with the new measure and they will continue to live in the Sunnyside Towers complex, which relating to the profit of the Corporation. Though author's state stands on the basic of no report about the problem form shower reduction can be seen besides a few complaints about low water pressure, to clarify such deduction demands to reply to unrevealed questions. For one thing, people probably disgust the limitation of water flow, yet they barely have time to report their unsatisfiction to the owner of the department. Or they even fail to notice the way to feeback the problem, for the other. Or perhaps, they directly choose to leave away and move to another apartment without reporting their thought and reason of the departure. To wrap up, more prudent inspection, like doing some face-to-face investigation to learn the real thought of the residents, should be taken before making such excessively slipshod judgment.

(AMEPS)

Besides the previous discussion, I would like to put my eyes on another crucial question relating to the author’s slant. For all we know that reducing the cost always leads to increasing the profit, however, such commonly thinking excludes some exception like the customers' interest of the department may lose as they are told about the low water flow of showreheads. Whether such action can really bring immense income is beyond me. In fact, the mention about limiting the flow of water in the apartment to bring large interest, playing an pivotal role when it comes to determine the feasibility of the problem in this analysis, tends to be undependable. That is to say, the author's comprehending and exporting of such issue are oversimplified and thoughtless, thereby requiring more consideration about the relation between the diminish of water flow and the gain of profit.

(APMES)

For the final evaluation, we can summarily figure out the argument's lack of logical inference and cautious investigation, neither of which becomes separable as forming a convincing and persuading article. To better the article, the owner of departments should do more survey to find out the life style of people live in Sunnyside Towers complex, learn the real thought of the residents and to check how much money, indeed, such action can bring.

CON the limitation of water flow showerheads will raise the corporation's profits

M1: the restriction of the first three buildings of the Sunnyside Towers complex is supposed to save money for the Corporation.)

A1: the measure in the rest buildings in the Sunnyside Towers complex can work as well as that in the first three buildings

P1: the people live in the rest buildings do not take shower as much as those in the first three apartments.

P2: uneffected residents in the Sunnyside Towers care more about their personal health when comparing to the effected, and would like to spend extra time on shower if the water is limited, which may cause larger usage of water.

S1: figure out the life habit of people live in Sunnyside Towers

M2: no report about the problem form shower reduction can be seen besides a few complaints about low water pressure.

A2: the residents are satisfied with the new measure and they will continue to live in the Sunnyside Towers complex, which relating to the profit of the Corporation.

P1: People disgust the limitation of water flow, yet they barely have time to report their unsatisfiction to the owner of the department.

P2: Or they even fail to notice the way to feeback the problem.

P3: They directly choose to leave away and move to another apartment without reporting their thought and reason of the departure.

S2: do some face-to-face investigation to learn the real thought of the residents

CON: the adjustment of showerheads can make great money savings for the corporation.

M : Cut down the flow of water in the appartment seems to bring large interest

A3: reducing the cost regularly lead to increasing the profit

P3: the customers' interest of the department may lose as they are told about the low water flow of showreheads.

S : Consider more about the relation between the diminish of water flow and and the gain of profit.