
Section 1

#1 Opening paragraph ("Every fatal car crash leaves behind..." to "...is responsible.")

Strengths:

- Your opening creates a strong emotional connection by describing the impact of road deaths on families
- You clearly state your position and set up the argument's direction

Underdeveloped Reasoning → Your introduction jumps quickly from the emotional appeal to the main claim without fully explaining why autonomous vehicles are the specific solution needed. The connection between "human debacle" and autonomous cars needs clearer development. You write "the question is no longer whether autonomous vehicles are possible" but you haven't yet shown your reader why this technology specifically addresses the problem better than other safety measures like better driver education, stricter enforcement of road rules, or improved road design.

Exemplar: ***After establishing the human cost of road deaths, you could add: "Unlike previous safety measures that rely on human compliance, autonomous vehicles remove human error entirely from the equation, offering a technological solution to a persistently human problem."***

#2 Second paragraph ("To begin with, the main reason..." to "...fatal mistakes.")

Strengths:

- You provide specific statistics (94% of crashes caused by human error) to support your claim
- You acknowledge and respond to opposing viewpoints about AI limitations

Incomplete Counterargument Response → While you mention that opponents raise concerns about ethical judgement and software failures, your response doesn't fully address these worries. You state that autonomous vehicles "do not suffer from distraction, fatigue or emotional decision-making," but this doesn't answer the concern about software failures or biased algorithms. The phrase "the reality is they still can be better drivers than all humans" lacks evidence. Your reader might wonder: what happens when the technology fails? How do we know autonomous systems will always make the right choice in unexpected situations?

Exemplar: ***"While software malfunctions remain a possibility, studies show that even with current technology, autonomous systems make fewer critical errors per kilometre travelled than human drivers, and unlike human mistakes, technological failures can be identified, fixed, and prevented across all vehicles simultaneously."***

#3 Fourth paragraph ("Finally, autonomous vehicles offer..." to "...outweigh the costs.")

Strengths:

- You provide a specific statistic (35% better traffic flow) to support your environmental claims
- You connect environmental benefits to economic benefits effectively

Vague Economic Claims → Your paragraph makes broad statements about economic benefits without concrete details. Phrases like "lower healthcare costs" and "less economic loss from road trauma" tell your reader what will improve, but not by how much or based on what evidence. The statement "the initial transition may be expensive" acknowledges a counterpoint but dismisses it too quickly with "the long-term savings...far outweigh the costs" without any numbers or timeframes. Your reader needs more specific information to understand the actual economic impact.

Exemplar: ***"Studies estimate that autonomous vehicles could reduce healthcare costs related to road trauma by billions of dollars annually, as emergency room visits and long-term injury treatments decrease substantially with fewer crashes."***

■ Your piece presents a clear argument with a logical structure that moves from safety to accessibility to environmental concerns. However, you could strengthen your writing by providing more detailed evidence for your claims and developing your responses to opposing viewpoints more thoroughly. When you make a claim like "autonomous vehicles are better drivers," show your reader the research or real-world testing that proves this. Additionally, your body paragraphs would benefit from deeper exploration of each point—instead of moving quickly through multiple benefits, spend more time explaining how each benefit actually works in practice. Also, consider connecting your ideas more smoothly between paragraphs; for instance, after discussing safety in paragraph two, you could link to accessibility by explaining how safer roads particularly benefit vulnerable populations. Your conclusion effectively reinforces your main argument, but the body needs more substance to fully convince your reader.

Score: 42/50

Section 2:

#1 No More Mistakes: Why ~~we must mandate~~ [We Must Mandate] ~~autonomous cars~~ [Autonomous Cars]!

Every fatal car crash leaves behind more than twisted metal and police reports. It leaves behind the kind of silence, that shatters lives.[—] The [the] silence that includes empty dinner tables and bedroom doors never to be opened again.[,] ~~The~~ [the] kind of silence caused by an ordinary decision to drive. But the human error to speed or to glance at a phone becomes irreversible. Each year, over 1.2 million lives are lost on the world's roads, not to fate, but to human debacle. Labelling these deaths as "accidents" softens a truth we would rather avoid. They are predictable, preventable, and systemic. As technology advances, the question is no longer whether autonomous vehicles are possible, but whether continuing to rely on human drivers is ethically defensible. If our goal is to reduce suffering, provide gateways for non-drivers and reduce traffic congestion, then embracing and ultimately requiring autonomous vehicles is not radical. It is responsible.

#2 To begin with, the main reason we must mandate autonomous cars is because of the major flaw in the current system,[:] the human driver. The truth has often been softened, but there is no denying that

human error is nearly always responsible for car crashes that claim multiple lives. For example, the NHTSA reports that 94% of crashes are caused by human error, mainly due to distraction, speeding, fatigue, and poor decision-making. Opponents of mandating autonomous vehicles raise a valid concern.[:] Driving [driving] is a complex social activity that requires ethical judgment [judgement], adaptability and the ability to respond to unpredictable human behaviour, qualities that current artificial intelligence may not fully replicate. They also argue that software failures or biased algorithms could introduce new, systemic risks. However, despite these concerns, autonomous vehicles do not suffer from distraction, fatigue or emotional decision-making. They do not text while driving, drive under the influence or misjudge speed in moments of stress. Instead, they rely on constant sensor input, real-time data processing and algorithms designed to prioritise [prioritise] safety above all else. Unlike humans, autonomous systems maintain perfect attention every second they are on the road. While it is true robot's [robots] may not be able to respond to irregular human behaviour, the reality is they still can be better drivers than all humans. ~~The truth isby removing~~ [By removing] the most unreliable component from the driving equation,~~[ ] the human driver~~,[—] we drastically reduce the likelihood of fatal mistakes.

Furthermore, mandating autonomous vehicles would increase mobility and social inclusion. Millions of people are currently unable to drive due to age, disability or medical conditions. For example, 30% of adults don't drive~~and that's~~ [, and that's] not counting vision~~impaired~~ [impaired,] disabled or under~~16~~ [16-year-old] people. Autonomous cars would provide independence to elderly Australians, people with vision impairments and those with physical disabilities, allowing them to participate more fully in society. This increased accessibility would reduce reliance on public transport and carers, improving quality of life while easing pressure on existing infrastructure. In this sense, autonomous vehicles are not merely a technological upgrade, but a social equaliser.

#3 Finally, autonomous vehicles offer significant environmental and economic benefits. By communicating with one another and optimising routes, they can reduce traffic congestion, fuel consumption and emissions. For example, as well documented in scientific journals~~up to~~ [, up to] 35% better traffic flow will be possible with autonomous vehicles. Additionally, fewer crashes would mean lower healthcare costs, reduced strain on emergency services and less economic loss from road trauma. While the initial transition may be expensive, the long-term savings, both financial and human, far outweigh the costs.

In conclusion, mandating autonomous cars is not about eliminating human freedom, but about preventing human suffering. Road deaths are not inevitable, and continuing to accept them when safer alternatives exist is ethically indefensible. Autonomous vehicles offer a future with fewer empty chairs at dinner tables and fewer silences that linger for lifetimes. If we truly value human life, then no more "mistakes" should be an option we are willing to tolerate.