

Because of vs. due to

Do I lose my appetite *because of* a stomachache, or do I lose my appetite *due to* a stomachache?

That's a trap I often see writers fall into, particularly when reading scholarly works. Too often, writers want to use the more formal sounding "due to" when they should be using "because of."

According to <u>Kelli Trungale</u> of the University of Houston-Victoria, "due to" modifies nouns and often follows "to be" verbs (is, was, were, am, etc.).

Example: My loss of appetite was due to a stomachache.

In this case, "due to" modifies "stomachache" and follows the to be verb, "was."

"Because of," on the other hand, modifies verbs.

Example: I lost my appetite because of a stomachache.

In this case, "because of" modifies the verb, "lost."

Thanks to Lois Edwards for suggesting this topic.