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The six sentence argument (6SA) is an exercise that helps you train your critical thinking skills. This document ex- plains the concept of the exercise and teaches you how to conduct the exercise step by step. After completing this introduction, you can start participating in a 6SA exercise in class. Estimated workload for completion is 30 minutes for reading and 60 minutes for the assignments.

# Background

The 6SA exercise draws on two key ideas. First, the idea that writing is an excellent way to clarify your thoughts and to make them visible to yourself. Therefore, the 6SA exercise is a writing exercise. Second, the idea that crit- ical thinking means reflecting on the way you think, or in other words “thinking about thinking”. Therefore, the exercise includes a peer review, where you reflect on arguments written by others. The fundamental goal of the exercise is to develop a more critical perspective towards your own thinking and writing.

The 6SA exercise proceeds in two major steps. First, you write an argument in response to a **case**. This case con- fronts you with a decision situation where you are required to take a stance. You argue for your stance using a **structure of exactly six sentences**. Second, you review several 6SAs written by your peers. You evaluate whether their argument is sound by scoring each sentence against a detailed **grading guideline**. At the end of the exercise, you receive the peer reviews of your own 6SA, giving you a quantitative assessment as well as de- tailed feedback how your argument was received and evaluated by your peers.

The exercise will help you to achieve two specific **learning goals:**

* 1. to be able to express an argument in a logical structure of six sentences
  2. to be able to provide detailed and constructive feedback on a six sentence argument

The following chapters prepare you for doing a 6SA exercise in five steps.

1. Learn about the 6SA structure
2. Write your first 6SA (includes assignment)
3. Learn about the grading criteria
4. Grade your own 6SA (includes assignment)

Practice applying the grading criteria using pre-graded examples (includes assignment)

# The 6SA Structure

A 6SA is a mini-essay of six sentences that conveys one statement, supports it with one reason, and heads oﬀ one important challenge. A 6SA is written in response to a case that contains a decision situation (see next section for an example). The structure of a 6SA is strictly pre-deﬁned and each sentence fulﬁlls a speciﬁc function within the whole argument. It is based on the so-called theory of convincing arguments (Toulmin 1958). In the following, the speciﬁc function of each sentence is explained:

1. The **introduction** presents the topic of the 6SA. You guide your reader to the decision situation of the case.
2. The **position** states the course of action you decide to argue for. You can choose any position as long as it responds to the decision situation.
3. The **reason** supports the stated position. You need to choose the most compelling reason you can express in one sentence.
4. The **challenge** anticipates a point of criticism that a reader might voice concerning the reason. The idea is to strengthen your argument by preempting criticism.
5. The **rebuttal** provides an answer to the challenge, for example by limiting the position to certain situations. The purpose is to inform your reader that your have weighed the pros and cons of the position.
6. The **conclusion** sums up the argument and states the result of your reasoning. It should rest ﬁrmly on the previous sentences and avoid introducing new information.

#### The Word Limit

As an additional challenge, each sentence may not exceed 20 words in length. The word limit challenges you to fo- cus on the points you want to make in each sentence. As a result, your argument will be concise and brief. Below are some tips that are helpful to adhere to the word limit:

ﬁrst write a rough draft, then redraft by excluding everything that is non-essential to your argument, to eventually focus only on the core points

learn to ‘prune’ your sentences and ﬁnd ways to make the same point with fewer words. It usually helps to use active language and avoid passive voice (e.g. “I suggest to…” instead of “it is suggested that…”)

The word limit can sometimes conﬂict with a clever point you wish to make. However, solving these conﬂicts and focusing on the essentials is part of the exercise. The ability to focus on the core points is essential to work with the 6SA structure. It is also an ability that is important in practical situations, where your audience (your col- leagues, your boss, your teacher) usually appreciates if you can make your point brief.

# Writing your ﬁrst 6SA

Each 6SA exercise begins with a case. Those cases will generally present you with a situation that requires a de- cision or an opinion. The cases should be sufficiently rich and detailed to give rise to a number of viable alterna- tives and there is not one correct answer. In order to create a concrete situation, writing assignment should spec- ify your role as an author and the audience you are addressing.

#### Assignment: Read the following case and write your first 6SA in response:

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Case |
| Duolever[1] is a large food and consumer product company that sees itself as a leader in corporate sustain- ability. One important raw material for Duolever is palm oil. Palm oil is controversial, because it’s produc- tion is often associated with forest destruction and the loss of habitat for Chimpanzees. To avoid being part of that controversy, Duolever has a policy of buying palm oil only from suppliers that adhere to sustainable production practices set forth by the roundtable on sustainable palm oil (RSPO). Duolever is a founding member of the RSPO, and is one of the largest buyers of certified palm oil.  In the past few days, Duolever’s CEO has received hundreds of petition letters, criticizing Duolever for sourcing palm oil from Bilmar, one of Duolever’s most important palm oil suppliers. Bilmar controls not on- ly 45% of the palm oil market, it is also the best performing supplier in terms of RSPO certification and ad- herence to sustainable standards, according to an assessment of Duolever’s in-house sustainability team. While most of Bilmar’s palm oil is produced in Indonesia and Malaysia, the petition aims at a small number of new plantations, which have been established only recently in Nigeria.  *Dear CEO of Duolever,*  *The forests of Cross River State in Nigeria are a hotspot of biodiversity and home to the Cross River Goril- la, the most critically endangered primate in Africa. Furthermore, thousands of villagers in the region live sustainably from the harvests of their small plots. This is now at risk because of Bilmar’s current massive expansion of its plantations. Satellite images show that deforestation, which has accelerated across all of Bilmar’s Nigerian holdings, is encroaching on protected areas such as Cross River National Park. We Rain- forest Society has published a detailed study with maps, satellite images and photos documenting the de- struction. We call on Bilmar to halt its unsustainable palm oil production immediately. Given that Duolever has committed to sourcing only sustainable palm oil, we call on Duolever to stop sourcing palm oil from Bil- mar.*  The CEO has forwarded this letter to you as a member of Duolever’s sustainable business team. She is ask- ing you whether and how to deal with the request to stop sourcing from Bilmar. Please answer her using the 6SA format, providing a well-supported recommendation for action. |

Before you start writing, brainstorm a little bit what you would recommend in this situation, based on your gut feeling. Next, look at the 6SA structure and make notes for each sentence. When you have a plan how the argu- ment is going to play out, start writing.

You can use the following table to write you first 6SA:

#1 Introduction

#2 Position

#3 Reason

#4 Challenge

#5 Rebuttal

#6 Conclusion

1. This case is based on actual events involving Unilever, Wilmar, and the NGO Rainforest Rescue in 2013. The case was adapted and shortened for this introduction. In order to avoid misrepresenting the organizations in- volved, the names were changed. Please do not cite this case as evidence of real events.

# Grading Criteria and Feedback

After writing a 6SA, you will review several 6SAs written by fellow students who have dealt with the same case. This should be organized as a double-blind peer review, meaning that you don’t know whose 6SAs you are re- viewing, and your reviewers also don’t know they are reviewing your 6SA. This ensures that only the quality of the argument is relevant. Most likely, you will be working with a peer review software platform to organize the submission of your 6SA and the allocation of reviews.

To conduct the peer review, you need to know and understand the grading criteria, which are listed on the fol- lowing page. The general principle is that each sentence is evaluated on its own against two criteria: a formal cri- terion and a quality criterion. The first criterion asks whether the sentence fulfills its formal function in the argu- ment, as specified in the 6SA structure. The second criterion assesses the quality with which the sentence per- forms its function.

Your task is to decide whether the criteria are fulfilled. To aid your assessment, each criterion has a question that you can answer with yes or no. So for example for the introduction, can you answer “what is this argument about?” (1 point if the answer is yes) and “why should I read this?” assuming the role of the recipient in the case (1 additional point if the answer is yes). Note that the quality criterion can only be applied when the formal crite- rion is fulfilled. In other words, if the introduction is not an introduction, it is not useful to evaluate how effective it is in attracting the reader’s attention.

Before you score a sentence, check whether it fulfills the precondition (Sentence has 20 words or less and is clearly comprehensible). The word limit is simple, if the sentence has more than twenty words, it scores automat- ically zero points. If the language is vague, try to understand what the writer is trying to say as best as you can, write in your comments what you think the sentence is trying to say and proceed with scoring. If the sentence is incomprehensible to you, explain why you cannot comprehend the sentence and assign zero points.

To summarize, each sentence can be awarded 0, 1, or 2 points, and in total a 6SA can score 12 points. 0 points None of the criteria fulfilled OR the precondition is not fulfilled

* 1. point Only the formal criterion is fulfilled
  2. points Both the formal and the quality criterion is fulfilled

#### The Grading Criteria

Precondition Sentence has 20 words or less and is clearly comprehensible. If this precondition is not fulfilled, the sentence scores zero points.

* + 1. The introduction clearly states the topic of the argument. *Can you answer: What is the*

#1 Introduction *argument about?*

* + 1. The introduction attracts the reader’s attention in the context of the case. *Can you answer,*

*assuming the role of the recipient in the case: Why should I read this?*

1. The position fits the argument’s introduction (#1) *Is this a position that applies to the*

#2 Position

#3 Reason

#4 Challenge

#5 Rebuttal

*decision situation established in the introduction (#1)?*

1. The position explicitly identifies the actors and objects in the context of the case. *Is it clear who is supposed to do what?*
2. The reason explains why the position (#2) is a good choice. *Do you understand why someone might take this position (#2)?*
3. The reason is plausible in the context of the case. *Do you accept this reason? If not, why not?*
4. The challenge articulates one point of criticism concerning the reason (#3). *Does the anticipated criticism really apply to the supportive reason (#3)?*
5. The challenge identifies a central weakness of the reason that is plausible in the context of the case. *Do you accept this as a central point of criticism? If not, which other, more important challenge would you suggest?*
6. The rebuttal states a response that refutes or qualifies the challenge (#4). *Does the rebuttal apply to the challenge (#4)?*
7. The rebuttal is plausible in the context of the case. *Do you accept the rebuttal as sufficient to dismiss the criticism (#4)? If not, why not?*

#6 Conclusion

1. Summarizes the argument on the basis of previously presented information (#1–#5). *Does the conclusion avoid introducing new arguments or information?*
2. The conclusion reinforces the position and emphasizes its relevance in the context of the case. *Does the conclusion motivate you to follow the author’s advice?*

In addition to the grading criteria, there are three additional guidelines for grading 6SA:

* 1. Each sentence is graded on its own. Mistakes or shortcomings in one sentence should not affect the grading of another sentence. For instance, if you do not accept the reason (#3), a well-written conclusion (#6) would still be awarded full marks, even if it reiterates that reason.
  2. The quality criterion (i.e. the second criterion) for the reason, the challenge, and the rebuttal requires those statements to be plausible in the context of the case. As a reviewer, you must judge whether a statement is plausible in the context of the case, i.e., whether you find it convincing when assuming the role of the recipient in the case. If a statement does not convince you, you need to explain why. A typical problem is that a statement is not based on a source that you accept as reliable. Sources that are typically acceptable are the case description, lecture material and readings, and other reputable and relevant publications.
  3. Note that the challenge (#4) must aim at the reason (#3), not at the position (#2). This strengthens the overall argument, because it forces the writer to explain why they support the position they chose rather than explaining why they disapprove of an alternative position.

#### Providing feedback

Just as important scoring is providing a comment for each sentence that explains your score. This is extremely useful for the author, because it provides an explanation why a certain point was awarded or not. But it is also beneficial for yourself. The key insights of this exercise come from learning to pinpoint what exactly the problems are in a 6SA. If you are able to identify the right problems when reviewing someone’s 6SA, you will al- so be able to identify them in your own 6SA. If you can provide good reviews to others, you can also take a criti- cal perspective towards your own writing.

Reviews should be written constructively and in a polite tone. Don’t underestimate how harsh negative feedback can sound in an anonymous review. At the same time, the reviews need to be honest. No one benefits from feed- back that glosses over the problems. On some software platforms (e.g. peergrade.io), authors can rate the feed- back they get, incentivizing reviewers to provide high quality feedback. But apart from that, giving good feed- back is a really valuable skill in many situations, and you can use exercise to practice how to do it well.

Finding a way to describe shortcomings without sounding harsh may take some time. Below are some tips what you might include in a peer review:

Assume you are collaborating with the author on this text Explain in some detail why you don’t award a point

Seek clarification on unclear points in order to show how the author might be misunderstood Make suggestions for improvement wherever you feel you can help

End your review on an encouraging note

As a rule of thumb, aim to spend about 20 minutes on each review.

#### Assignment: Evaluate your own 6SA (from the previous assignment) against the grading criteria.

5

Assessing 6SAs

By now, you know the 6SA structure and the grading criteria. Before you assess your colleagues’ 6SAs in class, it is important to practice the application of the grading criteria. For this purpose, this chapter presents three 6SA examples for you to score. All examples come from the same assignment that was presented in the case of this training manual. Testing yourself with this interactive exercise will ensure that you understand the grading criteria and that you are equipped to assess your peers’ work.

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Assignment |
| Grade the 6SAs in the appendix according to the grading criteria. Do your assessment on your own without looking at the solutions. Also include comments, as if you were doing a real review. Each time you have completed a review, compare your assessment with the solution on the following pages. |

Note: If your assessment aligns with the assessment prepared by the inventors of this exercise, you are ready to go. If you have major disagreements, take another look at the grading criteria. If there are only one or two points of disagreement, that’s fine. The grading criteria are designed to be clear and objective, but they also leave room for interpretation. That’s why every 6SA is evaluated by several reviewers.

#### Final remarks

Avoiding frustration

There are some potential sources of frustration when working with the 6SA. Below are three common sources of frustration recommendations on how to avoid them.

There is no right and no wrong. When you can argue for anything (using 6SA or other techniques), and even your teacher is not able to tell you the correct answer, it may seem that it does not really matter what you think. That is absolutely not the case, because no matter how many opinions, there is only action that is taken. Other opinions should encourage you to evaluate your own opinion, but if you remain convinced that you are right, stay passionate about promoting your recommended action. One possibility to resolve a multitude of opinions is a democratic vote.

I was misunderstood. It can happen that you really thought about a case and came up with good ideas, but the reviewers did not appreciate them. Somehow they did not see the merit of your thinking, or did not bother to really understand it. The responsibility for avoiding this experience is shared between you and your reviewers (see next point for reviewers). For you, negative reviews can be a hint that you did not succeed in bringing your clever points across. That’s okay, the exercise is there to work on that. Keep trying to express your good ideas in such a way that others see how good they are.

I got useless / mean feedback. It can happen that you spend a lot of time writing a 6SA, but a reviewer does not take the time to give you a proper review. Or, perhaps a reviewer spots actual problems, but makes comments that are extremely harsh. If this happens, take a break and then try to deal with the feedback very objectively by extracting just what is useful for you – forget about the rest. If you have the opportunity to rate the feedback, make use of that option. If you feel this is putting at a disadvantage in terms of grades, you may also consider notifying your teacher. However, above all, write your feedback in a positive way that avoids these frustrations.

#### Limitations and Next Steps

The 6SA exercise is designed to help you structure your thinking, practice giving constructive feedback, and to develop a more critical perspective on your own thinking and writing. Hopefully, you progress towards these goals as you work with the 6SA. However, the exercise also has limitations. For example, structuring an argu- ment in six sentences is only one of many ways to present a convincing argument. You could also do it in five or
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seven sentences. Also, six sentences with twenty word does not allow to present very elaborate arguments, for example by outlining several reasons that support a decision.

We recommend to see the 6SA as an exercise to practice the basics. Think of it as doing fitness training in order to improve as a soccer player. Mastering the exercise equips you with basic skills that help you perform better in thinking and writing. For example, you learn how to organize your thoughts in a structure. If it becomes easy for you to express your thoughts in six sentences, you can go on and express them in any other structure. Also, you learn to give feedback and to anticipate feedback. That can help you to communicate more effectively in many practical situations, especially in the workplace. Finally, you practice to take a critical distance towards your own thinking and writing. Taking that distance puts you in a position to evaluate and improve the way you form opinions and take decisions. This is a skill that not many people have.

What you take out of the exercise also depends on your current level of skill. If you do not have a lot of writing experience, learning to work with the 6SA structure will need a lot of attention at the beginning. As you become comfortable with the structure, your attention will shift towards the peer review component. If you already have a lot of writing experience, you will probably be able to master the structure quickly, and find most value in do- ing and receiving peer reviews.

If you feel the 6SA exercise does not go far enough, there are many ways in which you can build on it. For exam- ple, you can extend a six sentence argument into a six paragraph essay, if you want to develop an argument with more detail and background. You can also use six sentence arguments to prepare for discussions and debates. Or, you can dig deeper into the philosophy of what makes reasons and arguments convincing. The following ref- erences below are a good place to further explore this topic.

Ennis, R.H., 1996. Critical Thinking, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. Fisher, A., 2011. Critical Thinking, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [www.criticalthinking.org](http://www.criticalthinking.org/)

We hope this document, and the exercise, is useful for you. If you would like to provide feedback to the inventors of this exercise, please consider participating in this survey: [www.blabla.com](http://www.blabla.com/)

# Appendix

The Appendix contains three 6SAs, with a template for your scoring and the three corresponding “solutions” that are correctly scored and reviewed.

# Example 1

**# Six Sentence Argument Score Review Comments**

1. Over 6,000 letters urge Duolever to protect Nigeria’s forests by buying no more palm oil from Bilmar, our largest supplier.
2. We should respond by immediately stop buying Nigerian palm oil and by pressuring Bilmar to halt their plans in Nigeria.
3. Any other reaction will damage our reputation persistently and let our Strategy for Sustainability appear as an empty promise.
4. However, we would risk losing our most important and shortly irreplaceable supplier of RSPO-certified palm oil.
5. Since without us, Bilmar could not sell large portions of their produced palm oil, the aforementioned risk is manageable.
6. To protect our good reputation, we should stop sourcing Nigeria palm oil from Bilmar until they have improved.

**Overall Score and Assessment:**

# Solution 1

**# Six Sentence Argument Score Review Comments**

1. Over 6,000 letters urge Duolever to protect Nigeria’s forests by buying no more palm oil from Bilmar, our largest supplier.
2. We should respond by immediately stop buying Nigerian palm oil and by pressuring Bilmar to halt their plans in Nigeria.
3. Any other reaction will damage our reputation persistently and let our Strategy for Sustainability appear as an empty promise.

However, we would risk losing our most important and shortly

2 Function: Clearly outlines the problem that this 6SA is about.

Quality: Bringing up the letters makes the problem current and attracts attention

2 Function: Recommendation applies perfectly to the situation of the case and the introduction. Quality: Clearly specifies who should do what.

2 Function: Provides a reason why #2 is a good choice.

Quality: This is convincing, because indeed Duolever has built up a reputation which is at risk.

Function: This is a challenge to #3, it highlights the costs and risks of maintaining the good

1. irreplaceable supplier of RSPO-certified palm oil. 2

reputation.

Quality: In my view, this is the key challenge.

1. Since without us, Bilmar could not sell large portions of their produced palm oil, the aforementioned risk is manageable.
2. To protect our good reputation, we should stop sourcing Nigeria palm oil from Bilmar until they have improved.

2 Function: Yes, clear point to counter #4

Quality: This is a fair point. As a large buyer, Duolever has leverage.

2 Function: This summarizes the argument without introducing new points Quality: It emphasizes the action and the reason. It motivates me to take action.

**Overall: This is an excellent 6SA and it makes a good recommendation. I wonder, if it**

**Overall Score and Assessment: 12**

**is really necessary to stop sourcing, or whether threatening to stop sourcing would be enough. But nevertheless, this is a point well made.**

# Example 2

**# Six Sentence Argument Score Review Comments**

1. The Nigerian forest of Cross River State is being deforested by Bilmar, one of our key suppliers for palm oil.
2. Duolever made a commitment to buy 100% certified sustainable palm oil by 2015 and expends effort to achieve this goal
3. As a founding member of RSPO, Duolever is working to make the palm oil production environmentally sustainable
4. Critics may question Bilmar’s willingness to change their behavior, due to their power by controlling 45% of the market
5. Duolever, one of the largest palm oil buyers, can force Bilmar to produce according to the sustainability criteria
6. Duolever should intensify its efforts to make the palm oil production sustainable by using their power on the RSPO

**Overall Score and Assessment:**

# Solution 2

**# Six Sentence Argument Score Review Comments**

The Nigerian forest of Cross River State is being

1. deforested by Bilmar, one of our key suppliers for palm 2 oil.

Duolever made a commitment to buy 100% certified

1. sustainable palm oil by 2015 and expends effort to 0

achieve this goal

As a founding member of RSPO, Duolever is working to

1. make the palm oil production environmentally 1

sustainable

Critics may question Bilmar’s willingness to change their

1. behavior, due to their power by controlling 45% of the 0

market

1. Duolever, one of the largest palm oil buyers, can force 2

Bilmar to produce according to the sustainability criteria

1. Duolever should intensify its efforts to make the palm oil 0

production sustainable by using their power on the RSPO

**Overall Score and Assessment:** 5

Function: This statement makes clear what the argument will be about.

Quality: It makes the the deforestation salient to the CEO saying that it concerns “our key supplier”. You might consider turning it around: our supplier is accused of deforestation in Nigeria. But the point is giv- en.

Function: Sentence #2 is not really a position because you are not recommending an action, you are stating what Duolever already did. I think this statement could be a reason for cutting ties to Bilmar – but you don’t recommend that explicitly.

Quality: –

Function: It is difficult to evaluate this reason, because it’s unclear which position it should support. But I accept that being a founding member of the RSPO could be a relevant reason for Duolever to take action, for example to uphold their commitment to sustainability.

Quality: I cannot evaluate the quality, because I don’t know what action you recommend.

Function: This is a very nice point, but I don’t see it as a challenge to the reason in #3. Sentence 3 does not suggest that Duolever is pushing Bilmar to change its behavior.

Quality: –

Function: This rebuttal is a direct counter point to # 4.

Quality: It convinces me that a large buyer can influence a large supplier. I probably would have written “could” instead of can though.

Function: This conclusion says that Duolever should use its powers in the RSPO, but the argument did not explain to me how that would work. So, I think the conclusion presents new information, rather than summarizing.

Quality: –

Overall Comment:I think you make some good points, but the argument does not flow very well, primarily because you don’t state a clear position in #2. I think you are suggesting that Duolever should use its buying power to force Bilmar to comply, which is a good idea, but it does not become clear.

# Example 3

**# Six Sentence Argument Score Review Comments**

1. Bilmar deforestation for palm oil sourcing can have a huge impact on the Duolever’s reputation.
2. Duolever should use its position to force Bilmar to stop deforestation for palm oil production.

The perpetration of buying palm oil from

1. unsustainable source could result in a loss of credibility and reputation.

As the chair member of the RSPO, Duolever is

1. firmly committed to stop rainforest destruction due to palm oil sourcing.

However, if Bilmar does not commit to source

1. sustainably, it may be difficult to find other reliable supplier.

In conclusion, Duolever commitment to the

1. sustainable cause seems to be a winning strategy in the long run.

**Overall Score and Assessment:**

# Solution 3

**# Six Sentence Argument Score Review Comments**

1 Bilmar deforestation for palm oil sourcing can have a huge impact on the Duolever’s reputation.

2 Function: Explains what the argument will be about.

Quality: The threat to reputation attracts my attention. Well done.

2 Duolever should use its position to force Bilmar to stop deforestation for palm oil production.

2 Function: Yes, this position responds to the introduction with a concrete recommendation Quality: It specifies who should do what.

3 The perpetration of buying palm oil from unsustainable 2 source could result in a loss of credibility and reputation.

I am not so sure what you mean with perpetration. I assume you mean “buying palm oil from unsustainable sources could hurt reputation”

Function: Yes, this supports the position in #2

Quality: This is a convincing reason for me. Clearly, given the petition mail, there is a reputational risk. You might have mentioned that explicitly, but it is a fair point nevertheless.

As the chair member of the RSPO, Duolever is firmly

1. committed to stop rainforest destruction due to palm oil 0 sourcing.

Function: To me, this is not a challenge of #3. It seems more like a further support of #3. Given that Duolever is part of the RSPO, its reputation is even more at stake.

Quality: –

1. However, if Bilmar does not commit to source sustainably, 0 Function: This reads like a challenge, but it’s in the place of the rebuttal. It’s a good challenge, but as a

it may be difficult to find other reliable supplier. rebuttal I cannot give any points.

In conclusion, Duolever commitment to the sustainable cause seems to be a winning strategy in the long run. 0

6

Function: This does not summary the argument. For example, it does not mention what Duolever should do. Instead, it claims that a sustainable commitment is a “winning strategy”. This is new information and I am not sure what it means.

Quality: –

**Overall Score and Assessment:** 6 Overall Comment: