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# The Prompt Response Template

## Paragraph 1: Introduction

In the editorial/article titled “\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_” that appears in \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (*publication/source*) on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (*day/month/year*), the author \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ argues that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (*summarize author’s central thesis*). To support this thesis, the author presents the following key points: The author is ☐ right ☐ partially right ☐ wrong, because \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (*state your overall judgment or thesis about the argument*).

### Paragraph 2: First Supporting Argument and Analysis

The author’s first main argument is that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (*summarize argument*). This argument is weakened by the fallacy of ☐ hasty generalization ☐ appeal to emotion ☐ anecdotal evidence ☐ other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, because \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (*explain why the argument lacks fairness, accuracy, clarity, etc.).* Additionally, the author fails to consider \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (*mention a missing perspective or critical point*).

### Paragraph 3: Second Supporting Argument and Analysis

The second argument the author presents is that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. This reasoning reflects the fallacy of ☐ false cause ☐ slippery slope ☐ stereotyping ☐ other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, which undermines its logical strength. The argument lacks ☐ relevance ☐ depth ☐ breadth, because \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (*critique the evidence, assumptions, or logic*).

### Paragraph 4: Third Supporting Argument and Analysis

Finally, the author claims that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. This argument contains the fallacy of ☐ ad hominem ☐ false dilemma ☐ red herring ☐ other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. Rather than focusing on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, the author distracts with \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. This undermines the ☐ fairness ☐ logic ☐ objectivity of the position and ignores the fact that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (*provide a counterpoint or overlooked dimension*).

### Paragraph 5: Conclusion

To conclude, the author’s arguments suffer from several critical thinking fallacies, including \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, and \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (list fallacies discussed). These weaken the overall effectiveness of the text. Although the topic deserves thoughtful discussion, the author’s position should be ☐ rejected ☐ accepted ☐ revised, because \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_(*summarize your final academic reason*).