

Section 1:

Part #1 (First paragraph): Strengths:

- Powerful opening scenario creating vivid imagery of a devastating health crisis
- Strong thesis statement clearly stating your position on animal testing

Weaknesses: Topic Development → Your opening paragraph, while engaging, could be more focused on introducing the main arguments that you'll develop later. The scenario, while compelling, takes up most of the paragraph before reaching your thesis statement. Consider specific phrases like "All colour was flushed out of the patient's face" which, while evocative, delay the presentation of your main points.

Exemplar: "The devastating consequences of prohibiting animal testing could lead to a healthcare crisis where parents face unthinkable choices, scientists struggle to develop life-saving treatments, and medical innovation stagnates. This is why I fervently believe that banning animal testing would be detrimental to society."

Part #2 (Second paragraph): Strengths:

- Clear topic sentence that directly supports your thesis
- Logical progression of ideas showing the relationship between animal testing and medical advancement

Weaknesses: Argument Structure → Your reasoning would benefit from more specific examples of how animal testing has contributed to medical breakthroughs. The phrase "researching and testing innovative ideas would be nearly impossible" needs concrete support to strengthen your argument.

Exemplar: "Without animal testing, crucial medical developments like insulin for diabetes or vaccines for deadly diseases would have been impossible to safely develop, leaving us vulnerable to countless preventable deaths."

Part #3 (Final paragraph): Strengths:

- Strong emotional appeal in discussing the cost-benefit analysis
- Effective concluding vision of a positive future

Weaknesses: Balance → Your conclusion shifts abruptly between discussing animal testing and describing a pollution-free future. The connection between "Electric powered towers" and your main argument about animal testing isn't clearly established.

Exemplar: "While the ethical cost of animal testing must be acknowledged, the potential to save billions of human lives through medical advancement presents a compelling argument for its controlled continuation, leading us toward a future where both human and animal welfare can be optimised."

Actionable Task: Rewrite your opening paragraph focusing on introducing your three main arguments (medical innovation, pandemic prevention, and cost-benefit analysis) while maintaining one strong scenario instead of multiple examples.

Score: 42/50

Section 2:

#1 Helpless parents signed off their child's death certificates, the world spiralling into a relentless, unforgiving, bubonic plague. The once populous streets teeming with noise transformed into a bare-bone path where nobody dared to walk. Numerous different test vials full of potential antidotes sat quietly in labs, scientists refusing to test them on animals as rodents and insects walked freely through the almost abandoned streets, unaware of the full-scale epidemic crisis. Innovative medical technology sat half-baked, only mere blue-prints, the government refusing to continue its development and implementation. All colour was flushed out of the patient's face as they lay lifeless, one of the many victims who succumbed to the devastating chronic disease. ~~This stark scenario illustrates the potential consequences if governments make the decision to prohibit the use of animal testing.~~ [This stark scenario illustrates the potential consequences of governments prohibiting animal testing.] This is why I fervently believe that governments banning animal testing and experimenting altogether would not be a sagacious plan. This is because prohibiting animal testing would restrict the creation of innovative medical technology, it could launch the world into a world-wide epidemic, and the suffering of one animal is well worth sparing the torment of billions. Therefore, ~~in my opinion~~, I ardently believe that banning animal testing and experimenting is not a wise idea.

#2 To begin with, refusing to test animals would restrict the innovation of critical medical technology. If animal testing was prohibited, it would be exceptionally difficult to safely test new medical technological advancements or theories. Consequently, this would leave us vulnerable and susceptible to a plethora of diseases and plagues with little to no way to counter them. Furthermore, banning animal testing would limit our knowledge of the human body, as researching and testing innovative ideas would be nearly impossible, setting our development in medicinal technology and methods back by decades. This in turn would leave us even more vulnerable as viruses would grow stronger and we would be left stranded with poor,

under-developed medical technology. Isn't it insurmountably clear that banning animal testing would ultimately lead to a decline in the development of medicinal knowledge and technology, leaving us wide-open for unknown viruses and cataclysmic plagues to take full advantage of our weaknesses?

Secondly, the banning of animal testing could potentially lead to a world-wide pandemic. As I mentioned before, banning animal testing could lead to under-development in medical technology and knowledge, leaving us vulnerable to viruses and plagues. If this went on, it could very well turn into a full-scale, world-wide pandemic. After emerging victorious after a devastating battle with COVID-19, we were battle-scarred and lost many people who were unfortunate victims of the virus. Now, it could be even worse, with a stronger, more resistant virus attacking when our advancements in medical technology would be restricted. For example, the Black Death, an infamous bubonic plague that wiped out half of Europe's current population at the time (50 million people) caught many by surprise, causing panic and disorder. Luckily, the Europeans were able to bounce back by implementing strict rules to stop the plague from spreading. However, if this happened again on a bigger scale, innocent people would lose their jobs and kids would have to once again go through the perils of home learning. Many would be traumatised and panic-stricken, desperate to find a way to make ends meet. Isn't it clear that if animal testing was banned, it could potentially send the world into a full-scale pandemic, devastating myriads of people?

#3 Finally, the pain and suffering of one animal is definitely worth saving torture and pain of the 8 billion people that inhabit this world. As I described in my opening paragraph, many would suffer to the hands of a disastrous plague if the government banned animal testing. The world would spiral into shrouded darkness, many dying, just because we didn't have the nerve to kill a rat or two. Though the animal can't consent to being tested on, the bottom line is that it could save many humans, dare I say, the entire race, just for a few deaths of minor animals. Electric powered towers stood tall as the radiant heat of the sun glinted warmly. The smart city was home to many, giving shelter and protection to humans and animals alike. Innovative technologies were already being developed by the second, and not a single whiff of air was filled with pollution. ~~This clearly shows that~~ [This vision demonstrates how] humans have the capability to change the world for the better, or the worst, and though we've done some horrible things to our planet, the death of a single animal could very well be a game changer, to change the world and make it a better place, because all animals and humans deserve a future like that.