

Body:**Example in Sample Paper****Why it's a good example**

<p>CLAIM (REASON) 1: Single focus point that the entire body paragraph will center around. It is what you are trying to prove in the paragraph.</p>	<p>“Understandably but unfortunately, general practitioners in the U.S. are required to obtain a waiver to prescribe buprenorphine”</p>		<p>States the difficulties of prescribing buprenorphine to people in the U.S. throughout the entire paragraph talks about the accessibility of the drug.</p>
<p>LOGIC/CONNECTION: Why are you making this claim at this point in your paper? How is this claim related to other nearby claims? Line of reasoning.</p>	<p>“General practitioners and addiction centers in France approach rehabilitating heroin addicts differently, but, medicinally, both of them primarily use buprenorphine (Vignau 24), and both of them are equally effective at rehabilitation (Vignau 25).”</p>		<p>In the body paragraph before it introduces the drug buprenorphine at the end of it so it makes logical sense that the next paragraph would highlight buprenorphine.</p>
<p>EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT: Evidence should support the claim and give the reader multiple perspectives on the topic.</p>	<p>“This hinders heroin addicts’ accessibility to buprenorphine-prescribing general practitioners, as there is no guarantee that credentialed physicians are in their area.”</p>		<p>Gives evidence that supports the claim This is one perspective on this issue</p>
<p>HOW WILL YOU USE IT?: Connection between claim and evidence. Should not be a summary.</p>	<p>“The U.S. could do away with the waiver. However, this policy change would not be perfect, as the waiver does decrease the likelihood of buprenorphine falling into incompetent hands.”</p>		<p>These sentences discuss the viability of this evidence and explores the counter claim.</p>
<p>EVIDENCE THAT CHALLENGES THIS IDEA: Counter-arguments... What do some of the other voices have to say?</p>	<p>“However, this policy change would not be perfect, as the waiver does decrease the likelihood of buprenorphine falling into incompetent hands.”</p>		<p>The author provides an argumentative transition word to introduce a counterclaim and explains the challenging argument to their solution.</p>
<p>HOW WILL YOU ADDRESS IT?: What logic or evidence will you offer to address the concern? Remember, you don’t always need to refute. You can confirm, concede, qualify, adjust, re-challenge, re-define, etc.</p>	<p>“On a different but not completely unrelated note, France’s socialized health system ensures that its populace has unobstructed access to healthcare, making rehabilitation more accessible.”</p>	<p>“Considering this, it can be argued that the U.S. is in need of broad, large-scale reforms to its health system.”</p>	<p>The author used evidence from another source (France’s health system) to support the policy change, validating their suggestion for health care reform in the U.S.</p>

Body:**Example in Sample Paper****Why it's a good example**

<p>CLAIM (REASON) 1: Single focus point that the entire body paragraph will center around. What you are trying to prove.</p>	<p>“Gun supporters believe that the modification of gun laws is unethical because it conflicts with the rights given to Americans by the Constitution.”</p>		<p>States the beliefs that gun supporters have to better off their argument for the unethical perspective</p>
<p>LOGIC/CONNECTION: Why are you making this claim at this point in your paper? How is this claim related to other nearby claims? Line of reasoning.</p>	<p>“Claims that the right to bear arms is an individual right, so the state cannot create stricter laws to limit that right”</p>		<p>Subclaims throughout the body paragraph that link to the main claim of the paragraph enhance the line of reasoning by adding to the flow of the paper</p>
<p>EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT: Evidence should support the claim and give the reader multiple perspectives on the topic.</p>	<p>“They argue that, even though some human rights may be taken out of context due to periodization, “the hands of our representatives are tied to the Bill of Rights,” which shows that the second amendment is inalienable”</p>	<p>“According to David DeGrazia . . . one limitation of this argument is that “all rights are limited in scope and at least most rights are subject to overriding.”</p>	<p>Evidence gives multiple perspectives and supports the claim.</p>
<p>HOW WILL YOU USE IT?: Connection between claim and evidence. Should not be a summary.</p>	<p>“Being an individual right, it cannot be restricted or overruled because of the requests of the public.”</p>	<p>“In other words, even though it fails to mention if it applies to the right to bear arms, rights may not be protected by the law.”</p>	<p>Connects the claim and the evidence. Expands on the evidence and goes deeper into the ideas presented by the claims.</p>
<p>EVIDENCE THAT CHALLENGES THIS IDEA: Counter-arguments... What do some of the other voices have to say?</p>	<p>“Alternatively, in the opinion of Michael Boylan, PhD and Department of Philosophy at Marymount University, it is unethical to make stricter gun laws solely due to the potential harm that guns may cause, since anything can be dangerous is used improperly (Boylan).”</p>	<p>“This exemplifies that the damage is caused by the persons, not by the object.”</p>	<p>Uses “alternatively” as a transition word that highlights it is a counterclaim and provides credible sources for support. The author included another sentence to clearly identify the counter argument.</p>
<p>HOW WILL YOU ADDRESS IT?: What logic or evidence will you offer to address the concern? Remember, you</p>	<p>“Making gun laws stricter would not guarantee a decrease in deaths; it would only decrease the number of deaths caused by guns.”</p>	<p>“After all, as the National Rifle Association, a nonprofit organization that advocated for gun rights, one stated, “gun</p>	<p>The author refutes the counter claim by explaining how stricter gun laws would not decrease the number</p>

don't always need to refute. You can confirm, concede, qualify, adjust, re-challenge, re-define, etc.		don't kill people, people do" (LaFollette). "	of deaths. Lastly, they cite another source that supports the original claim.
---	--	---	---