Section 1:

#1 (First paragraph: "Every year, millions of people... they should be mandated over human-driven cars.")

Strengths:

- Your opening grabs attention by presenting the serious problem of road accidents and human error
- You clearly state your main argument at the end of the paragraph

Underdeveloped Reasoning → Your paragraph jumps from saying we have the technology to saying we must use it, but you haven't explained why being able to do something means we must do it. The sentence "If we are technologically capable of reducing this harm, then we have a responsibility to do it" needs more support to convince readers. Why does having the ability create a duty? This logical step is missing from your argument.

Exemplar: *"If we possess the technology to prevent thousands of deaths each year, we have a moral duty to implement it. Just as we mandate seatbelts and speed limits because they save lives, we should embrace autonomous vehicles for the same reason."*

#2 (Second paragraph: "Unlike humans, autonomous vehicles... unsafe machines and tools in workplaces.")

Strengths:

- You provide specific examples of how autonomous vehicles work better than human drivers
- Your comparison between humans and technology is clear and easy to follow

Confusing Comparison → The workplace analogy at the end doesn't make sense. You write "Allowing safer alternatives to go to waste rather than using them on the road is just like putting unsafe machines and tools in workplaces." This is backwards because you're comparing NOT using something safe with USING something unsafe. The logic reverses itself, which confuses readers instead of helping them understand your point.

Exemplar: *"Refusing to adopt autonomous vehicles when they are safer than human drivers is like choosing to ignore safety equipment in dangerous workplaces – both decisions put lives at unnecessary risk."*

#3 (Fourth paragraph: "Some critics would argue... need for freedom.")

Strengths:

- You acknowledge what people who disagree might say, which makes your argument stronger
- You take a firm position on the issue

Shallow Rebuttal → Your response to the freedom concern lacks depth. When you write "dozens of lives could be saved by just a single autonomous car," you don't actually address why removing people's choice is acceptable. You simply state that safety matters more than freedom without explaining how society should balance these two important values or what this change would mean for people's lives.

Exemplar: *"While personal freedom is important, it cannot extend to activities that endanger others. We already accept this principle with drink-driving laws and speed limits. Mandating autonomous vehicles is simply applying the same logic – protecting the community takes precedence when individual choices create serious risks for others."*

■ Your piece presents a clear position on autonomous vehicles, but your arguments need more development to be truly convincing. You make good points about safety and benefits, but you don't explain them deeply enough. For example, in your first paragraph, you need to show why having technology creates a responsibility, not just state that it does. Additionally, your second paragraph's workplace comparison confuses rather than clarifies your point – work on making your comparisons match your argument properly. Also, when you address critics in the fourth paragraph, you should engage more thoughtfully with the freedom concern by explaining how societies already balance safety and personal choice in other areas.

Overall Score: 41/50

Section 2:

#1 → Every year, millions of people are killed by road accidents, with the majority of them being caused by human error, whether it's distraction, poor judgement, fatigue or intoxication. If we are technologically capable of reducing this harm, then we have a responsibility to do it. Autonomous vehicles offer exactly those benefits, and for that reason, they should be mandated over human-driven cars.

#2 → Unlike humans, autonomous vehicles do not get tired, frustrated or distracted. They will obey traffic laws, react faster than any person could, and ~~even possibly~~ [possibly even] communicate with other vehicles before a collision occurs. As the technology continues to advance, evidence can show how autonomous vehicles can greatly outperform humans in safety and efficiency. ~~Allowing safer alternatives to go to waste rather than using them on the road is just like putting unsafe machines and tools in workplaces.~~ [Refusing to implement safer alternatives on our roads is comparable to knowingly using hazardous equipment in workplaces – both represent failures to prioritise safety when better options exist.]

~~Above that~~ [Beyond that], mandating autonomous vehicles would transform the city. Traffic would be reduced with practical driving patterns, and would lower fuel ~~and gas~~ [and] emissions. Fewer accidents would also lift the burden from local hospitals and emergency services. Additionally, it would increase the mobility for elderly and disabled people, which would mean better social inclusion.

#3 → Some critics would argue that mandating autonomous vehicles would eliminate personal freedom and the joy of driving for some. While this is understandable, it overlooks the fact that dozens of lives

could be saved by just a single autonomous car. When your own personal choice endangers others, regulation is necessary. In this case, preserving the lives of many outweighs the need for freedom.

In conclusion, mandating autonomous vehicles is not a matter of choice ▪ [–] it is a necessity to prioritise safety, health and sustainability. When autonomous vehicles are proven trustworthy and safer, replacing ~~ordinary~~ [conventional] cars with them would be the only responsible step forward.