

Solutions

2.1 A. A pre-existing completion difference supplies a self-selection explanation. B and C have no stated connection to the outcome; D measures satisfaction rather than causal effect. A does not prove the session had no effect. It weakens the inference that the observed group difference establishes the claimed cause.

3.1 A necessary accessibility bridge is that no applicant is unable to understand the guide's relevant instructions. Negating it gives at least one applicant unable to understand them; the universal prevention argument loses its stated support. Accessibility is weaker than actual reading, and neither alone guarantees that every action is performed correctly. A comparison showing fewer errors among comparable applicants using the guide would strengthen an effectiveness claim, while still not proving zero errors for every applicant. Other necessary assumptions, such as instructions covering the possible errors, are valid when their negation is tied to the exact universal claim.

Local review checklist: follow every response instruction; support the answer with the stated evidence; explain rejected alternatives or an opposing view; check scope, restrictions and clarity. For writing, this is a formative checklist, not an official rubric score.