

Many people consider marijuana as a magical herb and nature's gift. However, since the US congress listed marijuana in Schedule 1 of the Controlled Substances Act, the use of marijuana has become a popular debate topic. While the proponents of medical marijuana claim that marijuana is effective to treat cancer, AIDS, and other severe diseases, the opponents argue that marijuana is not approved and dangerous. However, the opponents' strong argument suggests that marijuana should not be a medical option.

Commented [1]: Marijuana is not approved by whom?

Commented [2]: Good hook and background information! ☐

Commented [3]: Your stance on the issue is not clear. Which one are you claiming has the strongest argument?

Commented [4]: From whom?

Firstly, marijuana lacks approval. According to the opponents' argument, Paul Terpeluk, the Medical Director of Employee Health Services at Cleveland Clinic states, "In the world of healthcare, a medication is a drug that has endured extensive clinical trials, public hearings and approval by the U.S Food & Drug Administration (FDA)." and Terpeluk further acknowledges that medical marijuana does not have either one of those properties. This implies that it is not wise to use marijuana as a medical option because it is disapproval by the FDA.

Commented [5]: Either one of which properties? Here, you mentioned their elements e.g. clinical trials, public hearings and FDA approval. Clarification is needed here.

Secondly, marijuana is unsafe. The opponents claim that marijuana is "addictive, leads to harder drug use, interferes with fertility, impairs driving ability..." and the medical team at Cleveland Clinic says that "there are better alternatives." This means that marijuana is detrimental to humans. For example, it would confuse the drivers and cause car accidents if they consume marijuana while driving.

Commented [6]: Your textual evidence does not support this claim. Your expert did not state that it was disapproved by FDA. Be sure that your ideas are connected.

Commented [7]: and impairs...

Commented [8]: Remember, in your explanation, you are not providing examples. You are simply explaining your textual evidence in terms of how it connects to your main idea.

On the contrary, the proponents of medical marijuana state that marijuana has multiple benefits. Chanda Macias, MBA, PHD, the owner and CEO of National Healing Holistic Center says, "Scientific data supports its use to treat specific ailments or conditions - research has shown, for example, that it's an exceptionally effective treatment for seizures and chronic pain." However, Macias does not provide the source of the data and research. Macias's claim would cause people to doubt the effectiveness of marijuana. Moreover, it can be inferred that Macias's preference of marijuana is based on financial gains as Macias is the owner of a treatment center that heavily uses marijuana.

Commented [9]: How so? This idea is not clear. Please clarify or delete.

Thus, it is easily stated that medical marijuana is a bad option because it is unsafe and not approved by the FDA. It is everyone's responsibility to reach out to the medical practitioners for advice. It is also critically important to use medicine under proper regulations.

Commented [10]: You should be reemphasizing your stance here. Which side of the argument are you for? This should be clearly stated in your thesis and conclusion.