As for your thesis statements, you’re still just making observations.

Think of provoking an argument or getting people to demand of you (when they read your debatable claim) "Oh, yeah ... prove it!"

A better approach is to think of your supports as being your PATH TO VALIDATION, in other words the route you take to support and substantiate the argument (claim) you've fashioned.

The debatable claim is the heart of the thesis statement.

It is what your essay will be about.

So it must be strong -- it cannot be worded as an observation.

It must take a stand. It does NOT merely announce a topic.

It indicates you have a strong opinion -- and it begins the process of revealing your critical thinking skills.

Your Reference Sentence identifies not only the work or ideas you will be responding to, it sets up your Thesis Statement.

The Reference Sentence identifies the author, the type of work, the title of the work, AND your distilled interpretation of either an idea expressed in the work or an aspect of the writer's craft you wish to address,

The Thesis Statement immediately follows the Reference Sentence and responds to those ideas or techniques you wish to focus upon.

The Thesis Statement articulates a judgment of those idea(s) or technique(s) and expresses it as a debatable claim (an argument) -- and then adds to it the minimum of three supporting topics that provide the PATH TO VALIDATION.

Accordingly, the Thesis Statement reveals to the Reader/Grader your subject and also the scope of your essay (into what depth you'll go) and the direction you'll take to back up your claim.

Imagine you're on the JUDGE JUDY television program -- and you are in her court because you bought a used car from someone and paid them $2000 for it. However, they tell Judge Judy that you never gave them a dime and they're asking for that she force you to give them not only the two thousand dollars they say you owe PLUS another two thousand for their pain and suffering.
Judge Judy is fair and impartial and looks for evidence to back up a claim. She asks your opponent for proof and they offer mutual testimony that you took the car and never paid for it.

Judge Judy turns to you and asks for your defense -- and you assert: "The plaintiffs deserve nothing but jail time because they lied to the court when they assert they were never paid -- and now you set up the direction of your path to validation by listing the three areas of supporting evidence that will get Judge Judy to side with the defendant (you) -- because a copy of the cancelled check from the issuer's bank demonstrates the check was given to them, the paperwork from their bank indicates the day and time the recipients signed the check and deposited in their account, and a variety of unimpeachable independent third-party sources confirm the transaction took place.

Okay -- you have a claim: The plaintiffs deserve nothing but jail time because they lied to the court when they assert they were never paid

and you have three areas of substantiating evidence: 1) a copy of the cancelled check from the issuer's bank demonstrates the check was given to them, 2) the paperwork from their bank indicates the day and time the recipients signed the check and deposited in their account, and 3) a variety of unimpeachable independent third-party sources confirm the transaction took place

The three specific evidence under the first area could include: A) an affidavit from the branch manager of the defendant's bank confirming a check was written on an account in good standing, B) the account was debited $2000 when the check was cashed, and C) there's a verified copy of the cancelled check offered in evidence to show the details of the transaction.

The second area of supporting evidence could include a subpoenaed representative from the plaintiffs' bank who (under examination) will verify: A) the plaintiffs have an open account at the bank, B) that they signed and deposited the defendant's check on a particular day and were credited the full $2000 to their balance, and C) there's a verified copy of the cancelled check offered in evidence to show the details of the transaction.

The third area of supporting evidence from a variety of unimpeachable independent third-party sources confirm the transaction took place: A) a subpoenaed representative from the Department of Motor Vehicles will attest to the act you registered and paid for the vehicle's registration with a check from the defendant's bank (as previous testimony will confirm), B) a subpoenaed representative from the Automobile Club of Southern California will give sworn testimony that the defendant registered the vehicle for insurance purposes and confirms the Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) as proof it was the same car at the center of the contested argument, and C) a wealth of paper evidence that
demonstrates the state recognized the sale transaction -- signed by both plaintiffs and the defendant, the issuance of a pink slip ownership pontificate in the name of the defendant -- as well as insurance documents and payment receipts for insurance, and affidavits and receipts from mechanics who first verified the condition of the car prior to sale and then performed repairs after the sale.

Compared to the unsubstantiated claims of the plaintiffs -- who use only hearsay evidence from one another to back up their bogus claim, Judge Judy not only sides with you and dismisses their claim, but then holds them in contempt of her court and refers them to the local district attorney to be prose cued for perjury and false testimony to a magistrate. Moreover, she informs you that you can now sue them for defamation of character and false witness in civil court.

Your process of critical thinking wins the day. (Yay!)

Let's fix up your Thesis Statement.

Let's presume what you offer now is more of a distillation of your interpretation for Hamlet's indecisiveness.

Now you need to make a judgment about Hamlet's indecisiveness -- can you support it or will you come against it.

You will express that judgment as a debatable claim -- if you support Hamlet's action, you might express a debatable claim in this manner:

Overwhelmed by his father's death and his mother's lack of mourning before her precipitous marriage to her brother-in-law, Hamlet's indecisiveness must delay any attempt to take revenge for Old Hamlet's murder and risk the perception of indecisiveness ...

That is a qualifying clause before the debatable claim ("Overwhelmed by his father's death and his mother's lack of mourning before her precipitous marriage to her brother-in-law ...") that establishes both Hamlet's grief and his obvious grief and disappointment, but focuses the Reader/Grader on WHY Hamlet has not acted. (Your topics of support will answer WHAT, WHY, or HOW -- and all three topics of supports must be in the same category)

Your claim ("Hamlet's indecisiveness must delay any attempt to take revenge for Old Hamlet's murder and risk the perception of indecisiveness...") articulates a STRONG OPINION on Hamlet's actions. It can be contested, it can be debated -- people can disagree with this judgment.
Now you need your path to validation which I've already indicated has been set up as a way of substantiating WHY Hamlet delays taking action, so the minimum of three topics could be because:

A) he must be certain that Old Hamlet's ghost is, in fact, his father's spirit and it tells him the truth rather than being a demon masquerading as his father's ghost and goading him into committing a murderous act upon his uncle that will earn Hamlet a one-way ticket to Hell,

B) he must be certain that his uncle did, in fact, kill Old Hamlet in the fashion the ghost describes, and

C) he must then do away with his uncle in a manner that will not guarantee Claudius an immediate pass into Heaven while Old Hamlet wallows in the depths of Purgatory for who-knows-how-long

Then under each supporting topic, you can find external expert opinion on specific aspects (evidences) of how each topic works to support and substantiate your thesis claim that Hamlet MUST delay action and risk the perception of indecisiveness.

Follow the prescribed Formal Outline Structure -- and you'll have no trouble finding scholars and other experts who you can use to back up your interpretation of hamlet's motivations and your claim as to why he MUST delay taking action.