

Section 1:

#1 (First paragraph) Strengths:

- Powerful emotional imagery that effectively sets up the stakes of your argument
- Strong use of sensory details to create a visceral connection with readers

Weaknesses: Emotional Appeal Overreliance → While your opening paragraph creates a compelling emotional scene, it needs stronger connection to your main argument about animal testing. The vivid description of "grey eyes devoid of hope" and "gaunt body cold and lifeless" could be more impactful if you explicitly linked it to how animal testing prevents such scenarios.

Exemplar: "Imagine walking through hospital corridors, past rooms filled with suffering patients, knowing that without the medical advances made possible through animal testing, this would be the reality for countless more families."

#2 (Third paragraph) Strengths:

- Clear topic sentence that establishes the main point about human deaths
- Logical progression of ideas supporting the necessity of animal testing

Weaknesses: Structure Coherence → Your paragraph introduces multiple important points but doesn't fully develop them. The shift from discussing medical progress to human euthanasia creates a disconnect. When you write "After all, isn't medicine meant to save humans?", you introduce a new idea without sufficient support.

Exemplar: "Animal testing remains fundamental to medical progress precisely because it allows researchers to develop and refine treatments safely before human trials, ultimately fulfilling medicine's primary purpose: saving human lives."

#3 (Fourth paragraph) Strengths:

- Effective use of specific examples (rats, bubonic plague)
- Strong counterargument addressing the practical value of animal testing

Weaknesses: Argument Development → Your comparison between medical testing and pest control dilutes your main argument. The statement "they are harmful to society and useful in no way whatsoever" undermines your earlier points about their scientific value.

Exemplar: "While some may view all animal life as equal, the controlled use of animals in medical testing has led to breakthroughs that have saved millions of human lives, making it fundamentally different from arbitrary harm."

Actionable Task: Revise your fourth paragraph by creating a clear distinction between the scientific necessity of animal testing and general attitudes toward animals. Focus on developing one strong argument about their medical value rather than discussing their broader societal worth.

Score: 44/50

Section 2:

#1 Envision a dystopian world, trudging past thousands of hospital rooms – the monotonous weeping, blending into soft weeping beading in suspension as you come closer and closer to the naked soul of death itself. You look into the room of your child, ~~his~~ [their] screaming faint from exhaustion as ~~his~~ [their] grey eyes devoid of hope and joy. You feel the suffering cascading down ~~his~~ [their] body, ~~his~~ [their] gaunt body cold and lifeless. Horror, ache, and pain coursing through your face as you ~~inevitably sign of~~ [inevitably sign] your child's death warrant, giving your last words like a pen to an obituary. ~~The surgeon who has feebly operated countless times on your child lies tiredly~~ [The exhausted surgeon, who has operated countless times on your child, watches helplessly], watching all medical advancements peel back; unearthing decades of medical breakthroughs, watching, with sunken eyes, watching the unraveling of the modern Dark Ages.

This is our reality if we ban animal testing. Taking away this medical necessity will only lead to ill-fated treachery. If we ~~illegalize~~ [make] animal testing ~~it~~ [illegal, this] will cause countless human deaths, waste an insurmountable amount of potential vaccines, and cause much more trouble than it could have ever intended. To save the future of medicine, humanity, and millions of human lives – animal ethicality is the last problem we should take into account.

#2 First and foremost, if we make animal testing illegal – it will cause millions of human deaths; turning the medical community back to mere sticks and stones. Animal testing is a staple of practicing medicine, as they serve as a convenient and quick way to test drugs – not needing them to volunteer or submit themselves. They are available anytime and anywhere and ~~without doubt or protest~~ [without resistance], making them both efficient and in high quantity. Taking this away will destroy medical progress, making advancement much slower and more hazard-prone. After all, isn't medicine meant to save humans? If we instead test on humans, it's contradictory to what medicine was intended for – and can even cause human pain and life-long trauma, considering that it is much more difficult to euthanize humans than animals. Is this really what is 'ethical'?

#3 Furthermore, it will waste the life-changing potential of so many vaccines. If we can't test on animals, humans will be left alone in a time of crisis without a vaccine, and the notation of 'experimental' will likely deter many potential volunteers. Not only that, but revolutionary

vaccines need a lot of tests, sacrificing many human lives alongside saving. Even though many may consider animals 'equal' to humans, without medical testing capabilities, many are turned just into another pest. Take for example rats, they eat food and assisted in the bubonic plague – killing millions of lives. Without medical testing, they will simply continue to deplete food supplies and spread diseases, and with no emotionally redeeming qualities like a cat or a dog would have, they are harmful to society and useful in no way whatsoever. If we don't allow animal testing, many animal lives will be meaningless and slaughtered regardless, many humans will be either ~~traumatized~~ [traumatised] or in excruciating pain, and groundbreaking medical research will lie to collect dust in the tome of medical history.

On the contrary, people may say that animals have lives too and should be valued equally as a human soul. This, though, is not necessarily true – as some animals simply do not have *value* in our economy, serving only as pests and experimental subjects. Take this into consideration – are 3 rats worth 3 humans? Are 15 beetles worth 15 prosperous human lives? Is a billionaire worth a bee? And even if they are worth the same, is testing on 5 fish to save millions ethical? From a practical standpoint, the answer is no, but the creation of this law insinuates that even a single rat can equate to a billion humans, contrary to the beliefs put behind the law. The meaning of ethical is different behind each eye, and sacrificing humanity at the cost of cows that were destined to be eaten anyways fair? Additionally, animal testing equates to a measly fraction of the amount of animals that are harvested for religions, eaten and sold on a daily basis – making it so that this impact is insignificant. Animals are eaten and experience unbearable agony out in the wild anyways, making our efforts worthless. And physically, it is impossible to make everyone stop eating animals or sell them – then is it really worth it to stop animal testing that may even be harmless and beneficial?

In conclusion, we clearly shouldn't stop animal testing as ~~it's~~ [its] impact isn't broad or deep at all, it comes at the cost of many human lives and paves the way to a stockpile of wasted medical potential. It can also accelerate medical progress, save more lives and even be beneficial to the animals. ~~After all~~ [After all], many vaccines are made especially for animals, so aren't we actually destroying their lives? Clearly, animal testing should be legal.