

1.3012. Fusion, the process through which heat and light are produced by the sun, has been studied by scientists, some of whom have attempted to mimic the process in their laboratories by blasting a container of liquid solvent with strong ultrasonic vibrations.

- Fusion, the process through which heat and light are produced by the sun, has been studied by scientists,
- Fusion, the process through which the sun produces heat and light, which has been studied by scientists,
- Scientists have studied fusion, the process the sun uses to produce heat and light, and
- Scientists have studied fusion, the process the sun uses to produce heat and light,
- The study of fusion, the process through which the sun produces heat and light, by scientists,

The original sentence describes fusion as a *process* studied by scientists. The underlined portion of the sentence correctly ends with the word *scientists*. This is necessary because the non-underlined portion of the sentence beginning *some of whom* is a modifier that describes what some of those scientists have attempted to do. Modifiers describing nouns must be placed as close as possible to the nouns that they describe.

(A) **CORRECT.** This choice is correct for the reasons outlined above.

(B) This choice is a sentence fragment. *The process through which* and *which has been studied* are modifiers; the sentence no longer contains a verb for the subject *fusion*.

(C) The last word of this choice, *and*, creates two independent clauses: *Scientists have studied fusion* and *some of whom have attempted*. The phrase *some of whom* can only be used if it is placed immediately adjacent to its antecedent, *scientists*. A better choice would have been "some of them" since the pronoun "them" does not need to be placed immediately adjacent to its antecedent ("Scientists have studied and some of them have attempted.").

(D) In moving the word *scientists* from the end of the opening clause to the beginning, this choice creates a misplaced modifier. The non-underlined portion of the sentence that begins *some of whom* is a modifier describing the scientists; this modifier must be placed as close as possible to the noun that it modifies (*scientists*). However, in this choice this modifier is incorrectly placed adjacent to *heat and light*.

(E) This choice is a sentence fragment. *The process through which* and *by scientists* are modifiers; the sentence no longer contains a verb for the subject *study*.

2.3008 The emerging field of architectural climatology centers on the potential of as-yet-undeveloped architecture and landscaping to alter, redirect, or dissipate weathersystems; for instance, hurricanes prevented from forming by artificial "reefs" of precisely shaped marine platforms.

- systems; for instance, hurricanes prevented from forming by artificial "reefs" of precisely shaped marine platforms
- systems; for example, artificial "reefs" of precisely shaped marine platforms that could prevent hurricanes from forming
- systems, such as hurricanes, which artificial "reefs" of precisely shaped marine platforms prevent forming
- systems, such as artificial "reefs" of precisely shaped marine platforms that can prevent

hurricanes from forming

- systems; for example, hurricanes could be prevented from forming by artificial "reefs" of precisely shaped marine platforms

(A) The portion after the semi-colon (*for instance, ... platforms*) is not a complete sentence.

(B) The portion after the semi-colon (*for example, ... forming*) is not a complete sentence.

(C) *Which ... "reefs" ... prevent forming* is unidiomatic; *from* is needed between *prevent* and *forming*. *Prevent* appears in the present tense, illogically implying that the artificial reefs—which don't yet exist, according to the earlier part of the sentence—already prevent the formation of hurricanes.

(D) The construction *such as artificial "reefs"* illogically implies that artificial reefs are weather systems. Additionally, the use of *can* in the present tense (as opposed to *could*) illogically implies that the artificial reefs—which don't yet exist, according to the earlier part of the sentence—do already exist.

(E) **CORRECT.** The semicolon is properly used to separate two complete sentences. *Could* is correctly used to describe a hypothetical consequence.

3.3007 While the thorns of all roses are protective, dissuading predators from feeding on the flowers' blooms, unlike roses that grow in temperate climates, though, the thorns of desert roses also serve as reservoirs for water to forestall the ever-present threat of dehydration.

- While the thorns of all roses are protective, dissuading predators from feeding on the flowers' blooms, unlike roses
- All roses' protective thorns dissuade predators from feeding on their blooms; unlike those
- The thorns of all roses are protective, dissuading predators from feeding on the flowers' blooms; unlike those of roses
- While all roses' thorns are protective, they dissuade predators from feeding on the flowers' blooms; unlike those of roses
- The thorns of all roses are protective and dissuade predators feeding on their blooms, however, unlike those

The first part of the sentence describes a feature that all roses have in common; the second draws a distinction between temperate-climate roses and desert roses. The comparison signaled by *unlike* should be constructed carefully so as to preserve parallelism without distorting the intended message of the sentence.

(A) The use of both *while* and *though* is redundant. The comparison is not parallel; *unlike roses, the thorns of desert roses*. The sentence illogically compares *roses* grown in one area to *the thorns of* another type of rose.

(B) The comparison is illogical: *unlike those that grow in temperate climates, the thorns of desert roses serve*. Parallelism dictates that *those* should refer to *thorns*, illogically suggesting that *thorns*, not whole roses, grow in temperate climates. Even if *those* is taken to stand for *the thorns of desert roses*, the meaning is still illogical because, according to the sentence, *desert roses* do not grow in temperate regions.

(C) **CORRECT.** The portion of the sentence preceding the semicolon is a complete sentence that correctly uses the adverbial modifier *dissuading* to elaborate on the idea that thorns are protective. The comparison in the second clause is parallel, using *those* to stand for *thorns* and thereby creating a comparison between [*the thorns*] of roses that grow in temperate regions and the thorns of desert roses.

(D) The portion of the sentence preceding the semicolon doesn't make sense. *While* draws a *contrast* between the notion that *thorns are protective* and the idea that *they dissuade predators* from feeding on rose blooms—but the second idea supports the first one; it is not in contrast.

(E) When *and* is used to connect two thoughts, those two thoughts do not need to be related to each other. It doesn't make sense, though, to say that *the thorns are protective and, separately, the thorns dissuade predators*. Rather, *the thorns are protective because they persuade predators*. The sentence also contains an idiom error. The predators are *dissuaded from* doing something; this sentence lacks the word *from*. Finally, the comparison is illogical: *unlike those that grow in temperate climates, the thorns of desert roses serve*. Parallelism dictates that *those* should refer to *thorns*, illogically suggesting that *thorns*, not whole roses, grow in temperate climates. Even if *those* is taken to stand for *the thorns of desert roses*, the meaning is still illogical because, according to the sentence, *desert roses* do not grow in temperate regions.

4.3006 According to a recent study, Earth's magnetic north pole is moving away from Alaska and toward Siberia so rapidly, within 50 years, that the swirling green auroras of the Northern Lights might be visible in cities as far south as Rome, which is located at 41° north latitude.

- rapidly, within 50 years, that the swirling green auroras of the Northern Lights might be visible in cities as far south as Rome, which is
- rapidly, within 50 years, people may be able to see the swirling green auroras of the Northern Lights in cities as far south as Rome and
- rapidly that, within 50 years, the swirling green auroras of the Northern Lights may be visible from cities as far south as Rome,
- rapidly such that, within 50 years, people might be able to see the swirling green auroras of the Northern Lights from cities as far south as Rome, and
- rapidly that, within 50 years, the swirling green auroras of the Northern Lights might be visible by people in cities far to the south; such as Rome,

This sentence reports the striking findings of a research study: Earth's magnetic north pole is moving so fast that the Northern Lights may be visible from new locations within 50 years. The modifier *within 50 years* describes something that will happen in the future, so it cannot be referring to the fact that the *north pole is (now) moving* in a certain way. Rather, it must describe the study's conclusion that the Northern Lights will be visible from other locations in future.

(A) The modifier *within 50 years* illogically describes the present movement of Earth's magnetic north pole rather than the predicted future outcome.

(B) In this sentence, *Earth's ... rapidly* and *people ... latitude* are both complete sentences, creating two problems. First, the overall construction is a run-on sentence, containing no conjunction to properly connect the two sentences. Second, the placement of *within 50 years* between the two clauses makes it unclear what that phrase is intended to describe. Finally, the use of *and* at the end of this choice makes the meaning redundant, since "as far south as Rome" and "at the same latitude as Rome" are identical concepts.

(C) CORRECT. In this sentence, *within 50 years* is properly used to describe what will happen in the future. *As far south as Rome* is idiomatically correct, and the final modifier correctly describes Rome.

(D) The combination of *so* and *such* is redundant and unidiomatic. The use of *and* at the end of this choice makes the meaning redundant, since "as far south as Rome" and "at the same latitude as Rome" are identical concepts.

(E) The construction *visible by people* is unidiomatic and should be phrased as *visible to people*. The part of this

sentence following the semicolon is a modifier, not a complete sentence (independent clause), thus creating a sentence fragment.

5.2983 Energized by its new coaching staff, the team already won twice as many games this year as last year, even though several games still remain to be played this year.

- already won twice as many games this year as did last year, even though
- has already won twice as many games this year as last year, even if
- already won twice as many games this year as it did last year, even if
- has already won twice as many games this year as did last year, even though
- has already won twice as many games this year as last year, even though**

According to context, the team described in the sentence has already achieved twice the number of wins that it achieved during last year's season and, as can be deduced from the last clause, the season is not yet over. The past tense *won* is not appropriate, as it implies the season is over. Use the present perfect *has won*.

The comparison should be expressed properly in parallel. Finally, *even if* implies a conditional statement, which does not make sense in this context. *even though* is the correct transition.

(A) The past tense *won* is inappropriate; it implies that this year's season is over, contradicting the given context. In the construction *...as did last year*, the subject of *did* is *last year*, illogically suggesting that *last year* is a team that was able to win games.

(B) The preposition *if* does not make sense in this context.

(C) The past tense *won* is inappropriate; it implies that this year's season is over, contradicting the given context. The preposition *if* does not make sense in this context.

(D) In the construction *...as did last year*, the subject of *did* is *last year*, illogically suggesting that *last year* is a team that was able to win games.

(E) CORRECT. This sentence creates a proper comparison between *the team has won ... this year* and *last year*. The present perfect *has won* is properly used for a series of events that is ongoing through the present timeframe. Finally, the conjunction (*even*) *though* properly connects complete clauses.

6.2982 **RESIDENTS** of Iqaluit, the largest town in the Canadian territory of Nunavut, pay as much as four times the prices paid for grocery items by residents of large Canadian cities, most of which enter the town only by sealift.

- the prices paid for grocery items by residents of large Canadian cities
- the price of what large Canadian city residents pay for grocery items
- what residents of large Canadian cities pay for grocery items**
- of what large Canadian city residents pay for grocery items
- the cost of the grocery items purchased by large Canadian cities' residents

According to this sentence, residents of the Arctic town of Iqaluit pay much higher prices than do their counterparts in Canada's large cities. To make a proper comparison, *four times...* must be followed by a noun, or equivalent phrase, for the price paid by Canadians living in cities. Also, it is clear from context that the modifier *most of which...* describes *grocery items*, so *grocery items* must come directly before that modifier.

(A) In this choice, *most of which enter...* is attached to *large Canadian cities*, illogically suggesting that entire cities are sealifted into Iqaluit.

(B) *What ... residents pay* already signifies a price, so *the price of what...* illogically suggests that this price itself has a price. *Large Canadian city residents* seems to refer to large people living in Canadian cities, rather than to residents of large cities as intended.

(C) CORRECT. The noun phrase *what residents ... pay* represents the price paid by city residents, so *four times what residents ... pay* is properly constructed. The modifier *most of which enter...* correctly modifies *grocery items*.

(D) *Four times of...* is unidiomatic. *Large Canadian city residents* seems to refer to large people living in Canadian cities, rather than to residents of large cities as intended.

(E) In this choice, *most of which enter...* is attached to *large Canadian cities' residents*, illogically suggesting that Canadians from larger cities, rather than groceries, are sealifted into Iqaluit. The construction *the grocery items purchased by...* illogically suggests that residents of Iqaluit and of larger cities are somehow paying for *the same items* (not just identical items).

7.2970 Many English adjectives, when included in questions, indicate a bias although their opposites do not; for example, questions beginning with "how close," a construction implying that whatever is under discussion is nearby, but those beginning with "how far" do not necessarily carry the implication of long distance.

- although their opposites do not; for example, questions beginning with "how close," a construction implying that whatever is under discussion is nearby, but those beginning with "how far" do not necessarily carry the implication of long distance
- unlike their opposites; for example, by beginning a question with "how close," speakers imply that whatever is under discussion is nearby, but they do not necessarily imply a long distance in beginning them with "how far."
- while their opposites do not; for instance, questions beginning with "how close" imply that whatever is being discussed is nearby, but those beginning with "how far" do not necessarily imply a long distance.
- that their opposites lack; in the case of speakers who begin questions with "how close," for instance, it is implied that whatever is under discussion is nearby, but for those who begin questions with "how far" there is no corresponding implication of long distance.
- that their opposites do not; for instance, when speakers begin questions with "how close," implying that whatever is being discussed is nearby, but when they begin questions with "how far" a long distance is not necessarily implied.

(A) The portion of the sentence following the semicolon is not a complete sentence. The first portion (*questions beginning*) contains a noun that could be the subject but no verb follows here or later in the sentence; *a construction implying* is merely a modifier, describing "how close." The second portion begins with the conjunction *but*, indicating that there should be two complete sentences, one before and one after the *but*. There is a complete sentence

afterwards but not before. (For example, a correct sentence might say "she suggested going out for dinner but he was too tired." The portion before the *but* and the portion after the *but* are each complete sentences.)

(B) The phrase *a bias unlike their opposites* creates an illogical comparison between *a bias* and the *opposites* (as opposed to a comparison between *some adjectives* and their *opposites*). In addition, due to parallel structure, the plural pronoun *them* appears to refer to the singular *question*. (Also note that it is generally a bad idea to use the three forms *they*, *them*, and *their* to refer to different nouns in a single sentence. In this case, *they* refers to *speakers* while *them* is intended to refer to *questions*.)

(C) **CORRECT.** The first clause correctly expresses the idea that some adjectives create a bias, even though their opposites don't. The two examples after the semicolon (*questions beginning with... imply... and those beginning with... do not imply*) are parallel. The plural pronoun *those* correctly refers to the plural noun *questions*.

(D) The expression *that their opposites lack* does not accurately convey the intended meaning. The intended meaning is that the opposite adjectives have no bias at all, but this wording simply suggests that they don't have the bias that the original adjectives have (perhaps the opposites have a different bias?). The wordings *in the case of speakers* and *For those* results in an illogical meaning, suggesting that the bias or lack of bias refers to the speakers themselves rather than to the significance of their questions.

(E) The expression *that their opposites do not* does not accurately convey the intended meaning. The intended meaning is that the opposite adjectives have no bias at all, but this wording simply suggests that they don't have the bias that the original adjectives have (perhaps the opposites have a different bias?). The portion of the sentence following the semicolon is not a complete sentence. The first portion (*when speakers begin*) is a subordinate clause (because it starts with the word *when*). The second portion begins with the conjunction *but*, indicating that there should be two complete sentences, one before and one after the *but*. There is a complete sentence afterwards but not before. (For example, a correct sentence using *when* might say "when she suggested going out for dinner, he said that he was too tired." A correct sentence using *but* might say "she suggested going out to dinner but he was too tired.")

8.2969 Even though the original text of the U.S. Constitution, adopted in 1787, mandated that any U.S. president or senator ~~must~~ be an American citizen, ~~but~~ the Constitution did not contain a definition of citizenship itself until the Fourteenth Amendment was ratified on July 28, 1868.

- Even though the original text of the U.S. Constitution, adopted in 1787, mandated that any U.S. president or senator ~~must~~ be an American citizen, but the Constitution did not contain a definition of citizenship itself until the Fourteenth Amendment was ratified on July 28, 1868.
- The original text of the U.S. Constitution, which was adopted in 1787, specifies any U.S. president or senator ~~who must be an American citizen~~, although the Constitution did not actually define citizenship until the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment on July 28, 1868.
- In the original text of the U.S. Constitution that was adopted in 1787, it is specified that any U.S. president or senator be an American citizen; ~~an actual definition, however, did not exist until the Fourteenth Amendment was ratified on July 28, 1868.~~
- When the U.S. Constitution was adopted in 1787, its original text specified that any U.S. president or senator must be an American citizen, ~~but that citizenship itself would not be defined until the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment on July 28, 1868.~~
- **Although the original text of the U.S. Constitution, adopted in 1787, mandates that any**

U.S. president or senator be an American citizen, citizenship itself was not actually defined in the Constitution until July 28, 1868, when the Fourteenth Amendment was ratified.

This sentence presents two facts. First, the original text of the Constitution refers to the idea of citizenship; second, the word citizenship was not actually defined in the Constitution until quite a while later. Together, these statements present irony, as the original Constitution refers to a concept that is not actually defined in it; therefore, the sentence should use a transition that appropriately expresses the contrast between the actual situation and what might have been expected.

(A) The verb *mandated* is a "bossy" verb and must be followed by the subjunctive *be*; *must be* is incorrect. In addition, this choice redundantly uses *even though* and *but*, both signal the same contrast.

(B) The wording *the Constitution specifies any U.S. president or senator who must be an American citizen* illogically implies that the original Constitution actually names specific presidents and senators. Instead, the sentence should use the word *that*: the Constitution specifies that (a certain thing should happen).

(C) The verb *specify* should not be followed by the subjunctive mood (*be*); rather, the sentence would need to say something like *it is specified (or it specifies) that any U.S. president or senator must be* (something). In the last clause, the phrase *an actual definition* is vague; it is not entirely clear that this refers to the definition of *citizenship*. (We only know this because we have already read the original sentence!)

(D) The combination of the past tense (*specified*) and the modifier *when* illogically implies that the original text of the Constitution now says something else, in the present. (It is possible to amend an original text, but the *original* text is still the original text; the changed text is the amended text.) This choice also creates the parallel structure *specified that X but that Y*. While this is structurally correct, it doesn't make sense: it implies that the Constitution of 1787 indicated that a definition of citizenship would be provided 79 years in the future, on July 28, 1868.

(E) CORRECT. *Mandates* appears properly in the present tense, as the original text of the Constitution still exists (and still says the same things), and is correctly followed by the command subjunctive (since *mandates* is a bossy verb). The word *although* properly indicates the contrast between the two clauses. Finally, the past tense (*was not defined, was ratified*) is used correctly to describe past actions

9.2968 On any city street in today's world one will encounter more women who wear pants than skirts, yet, just two or three generations ago, when police forced actress Marlene Dietrich to leave Paris in 1945, for she had dared to wear pants on the street.

- one will encounter ~~more women who wear pants than skirts~~, yet, just two or three generations ago, when police forced actress Marlene Dietrich to leave Paris in 1945, for she had dared to wear
- ~~more women have been encountered wearing pants than skirts~~, yet it was only in 1945, just two or three generations ago, when police forced actress Marlene Dietrich to leave Paris to dare wearing
- one has encountered ~~more women wearing pants than skirts~~, yet, only two or three generations ago, it was in 1945 that Marlene Dietrich, the actress, was forced to leave Paris by police because she dared to wear
- ~~more women who wear pants than women who wear skirts~~ will be encountered, yet in

1945, just two or three generations ago, when actress Marlene Dietrich was forced by police to leave Paris to dare wearing

- one will encounter more women wearing pants than wearing skirts, yet it was only two or three generations ago, in 1945, that actress Marlene Dietrich was forced by police to leave Paris for daring to wear

This sentence presents a contrast between two situations. Today, it is extremely common for women to wear pants; only a couple of generations ago, however, this was considered shocking. These two ideas are connected by the transition *yet*, which properly expresses the contrast between them. For the sentence to function properly, it must contain a correct comparison in the first clause, and it must contain properly placed modifiers and correct idioms in the second.

(A) This choice is not a complete sentence. The word *yet* should be used to connect two independent clauses (complete sentences), but the portion following *yet* is not a complete sentence. The word *just* introduces a modifier, the word *when* introduces a subordinate clause, and the word *for* introduces yet another modifier; none of these is a stand-alone sentence.

(B) The present perfect *have been encountered* is inappropriate, as the sentence is intended to make a general observation, not an observation about specific past circumstances. *It was ... in 1945... when* is an incorrect idiom; the correct idiom is *It was in 1945 that*. The infinitive *to dare* wrongly suggests that Marlene Dietrich left Paris in order to be able to wear pants elsewhere. Finally, the combination of *dare* and an *-ing* form is unidiomatic.

(C) The present perfect *has encountered* is inappropriate, as the sentence is intended to make a general observation, not an observation about specific past circumstances. The modifier *only two or three generations ago* appears to describe the following clause (*it was in 1945 that...*), illogically implying that the timeframe of this event has actually changed over the last couple of generations. The modifier *by police* should be placed next to the action *was forced*, not the action *to leave*. Although adverbial modifiers are not generally required to be placed right next to the actions they modify, they should not be placed next to the wrong action. In this case, she *was forced by police*. She did not *leave by police*.

(D) The construction *will be encountered* is illogical: it seems to suggest that wearing pants makes a woman more likely to encounter other people, rather than the intended meaning. The infinitive *to dare* wrongly suggests that Marlene Dietrich left Paris in order to be able to wear pants elsewhere, and the combination of *dare* and an *-ing* form is unidiomatic. Finally, this choice is not a complete sentence. The word *yet* should be used to connect two independent clauses (complete sentences), but the portion following *yet* is not a complete sentence. The words *in* and *just* introduce modifiers, and the word *when* introduces a subordinate clause; none of these is a stand-alone sentence.

(E) **CORRECT.** The first clause contains a correct comparison between *wearing pants* and *wearing skirts* (note that the word *women* does not need to be repeated). The modifier *in 1945* is properly placed next to *only two or three generations ago*, the idea that it describes in more specific terms. Finally, *for daring to wear* is idiomatically correct.

10.2953 The "blown film" technique—which inflates huge bubbles in high-temperature cylindrical masses of molten plastic in order to expand—has the capability to produce PLASTIC SHEETS or tubes that are as large as the entire building in which the process occurs.

- The "blown film" technique—which inflates huge bubbles in high-temperature cylindrical masses of molten plastic in order to expand—has the capability to produce PLASTIC SHEETS or tubes that are as large as the entire building
- ~~By inflating~~ a huge bubble in a cylindrical mass of molten plastic at high temperatures, thus ~~expanding the plastic~~, the "blown film" technique has the ability to produce

a PLASTIC SHEET or tubes the same size as the building

- In order to expand large masses of molten plastic, the "blown film" technique, in which a huge bubble is inflated in a high-temperature cylindrical mass of the plastic; this technique can produce PLASTIC SHEETS or tubes ~~equal to~~ the entire building's size

- The "blown film" technique—in which a huge bubble is inflated in a cylindrical mass of molten plastic at a high temperature, causing the plastic to expand—can produce a PLASTIC SHEET or tube as large as the entire building

- ~~Involving huge bubbles that are blown into cylindrical masses of molten plastic at high temperatures—thereby expanding the plastic—the "blown film" technique produces~~ a PLASTIC SHEET or tube that is capable of ~~having an entire building's size~~

This sentence gives two different types of information about the "blown film" manufacturing technique: how it works (a bubble is blown in a mass of molten plastic, causing the plastic to expand) and what it can produce (exceptionally large plastic sheets or tubes).

The sentence should be phrased in a way that makes these relationships clear, with modifiers used appropriately.

(A) The modifier *which inflates...* applies to the preceding subject, *the "blown film" technique*, thus illogically suggesting that the technique itself, rather than some machine or its operators, can inflate bubbles. The modifier *in order to expand* applies to the preceding clause (*which inflates huge bubbles...*), suggesting the nonsensical notion that the blown-film technique itself is trying to expand. *has the capability to produce* is not as concise as the phrase *can produce*.

(B) The initial modifier *By inflating...* applies to the following subject, *the "blown film" technique* him, thus illogically suggesting that the technique itself, rather than some machine or its operators, can inflate bubbles. *has the ability to produce* is not as concise as *can produce*.

(C) The portion of this choice before the semicolon is a sentence fragment; it consists only of a noun phrase (*the "blown film" technique*), preceded and followed by modifiers. Furthermore, as a result of the rearrangement of words at the end of this choice, the modifier *in which the process occurs* now illogically modifies *the building's size* rather than *the building*.

(D) CORRECT. The modifier *in which...* is properly used to describe the blown-film technique. The passive *is inflated* is correctly used to describe the inflation of the bubble, as the actual mechanism that inflates the bubble is not mentioned (nor is it important) in the sentence. The modifier *causing the plastic to expand* correctly describes an immediate consequence of the action in the preceding clause. Overall, the core sentence states logically that *The blown-film technique... can produce* a plastic sheet or tube with the characteristics described.

(E) The modifier *Involving huge bubbles...*, while grammatically valid, is unacceptably vague: it states only that the blown-film technique *involves* such bubbles (in *some* capacity). In other words, this sentence allows for the possibility that the blown-film technique uses bubbles produced arbitrarily in some other, unnamed, process, rather than that the generation of the bubbles is a fundamental aspect of the blown-film technique. The modifier *that is capable of...* modifies *a plastic sheet or tube*; while this modification is also grammatically acceptable, it doesn't make sense,

as it implies that the plastic sheet or tube might change sizes (up to some maximal capability) once it has been produced.

An entire building should be *the entire building*, as the sentence is meant to convey the idea that the plastic sheet or tube can have the size of the building in which it is produced; *an entire building in which the process occurs* instead refers, illogically, to an arbitrarily chosen building equipped for the blown-film process. Finally, as a result of the rearrangement of words at the end of this choice, the modifier *in which the process occurs* now illogically modifies *building's size* rather than *building*.

11.2952 During the rule of Emperor Claudius, which was known for his military expeditions against the German tribes of the Chauci and Catti, the population of ancient Rome exceeded any city in the Roman Empire.

- which was known for his military expeditions against the German tribes of the Chauci and Catti, ~~the population of ancient Rome exceeded any~~
- known for his military expeditions against the German tribes of the Chauci and Catti, ~~the population of ancient Rome was exceeded by no other~~
- which was known for his military expeditions against the German tribes of the Chauci and Catti, ~~the population of ancient Rome exceeded that of any~~
- known for his military expeditions against the German tribes of the Chauci and Catti, ~~ancient Rome exceeded any~~
- known for his military expeditions against the German tribes of the Chauci and Catti, the population of ancient Rome exceeded that of any other

The original sentence draws an illogical comparison between “the population of ancient Rome” and “any city in the Roman Empire.” First of all, a population of one city can only be compared to the population of another city. Also, the second term of the comparison must refer to “any other city,” since Rome was obviously also a city in the Roman Empire.

The underlined portion of the sentence begins with a relative clause that describes “Emperor Claudius,” a person. The relative pronoun “which” is incorrect, since “which” only introduces phrases that modify things.

(A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence.

(B) This choice draws an illogical comparison between the “the population of ancient Rome” and “no other city” and introduces the wordy passive construction “was exceeded.”

(C) This answer choice incorrectly uses “which” to refer to “Emperor Claudius.” It also states that the “population of ancient Rome” was greater than “that of any city,” rather than “that of any other city,” thus illogically implying that the population of Rome was greater than even the population of Rome.

(D) This answer choice states that “ancient Rome” was greater than “any city in the Roman Empire,” rather than “any other city in the Roman Empire,” thus illogically implying that the city exceeded itself. Also, by failing to mention the population as the parameter of comparison, this answer choice introduces ambiguity and fails to retain the intended

meaning of the original sentence.

(E) CORRECT. This answer choice draws a logical comparison between “the population of ancient Rome” and “that of any other city,” uses active voice, drops the wordy and incorrect construction “which was,” and retains the intended meaning of the original sentence.

12.2947 The new rules in the school's code of conduct—including penalties for children hoarding candy and rewards for those sharing it—has been criticized to encourage children to share opportunistically rather than altruistically.

- hoarding candy and rewards for those sharing it—has been criticized to encourage
- who hoard candy and reward those who share—have been criticized for encouraging
- hoarding candy and rewarding them when they share—have been criticized because of encouraging
- hoarding candy, rewarding those who share it—has been criticized for encouraging
- who hoard candy and rewards for those who share it—have been criticized on the grounds that they encourage

This sentence describes two features of the new rules. First, they include penalties for children who hoard candy; second, they include rewards for children who share the candy. To express these ideas effectively, the sentence should employ proper parallelism. Idiomatic expressions should be used correctly. Finally, the sentence should contain a main verb that agrees with the plural subject *rules*.

(A) The modifier *to encourage...*, while not ungrammatical, is nonsense here: it suggests that the *purpose* of criticizing the new rules is “to encourage children to share opportunistically rather than altruistically”. Instead, the sentence should state basically the opposite: the critics claim that the *rules* encourage this kind of behavior. Also, the singular verb *has been criticized* does not agree with the plural subject *rules*.

(B) The noun *penalties* is not parallel to the verb *reward*. (Instead, there is parallelism between *hoard* and *reward*, illogically suggesting that the children who hoard candy “reward those who share”.)

(C) *Hoarding candy* is not parallel to *when they share*, and *penalties* is not parallel to *rewarding*. The pronoun *them* appears to refer to the previously mentioned *children hoarding candy*, rather than to children in general. Finally, *because of encouraging* is unidiomatic.

(D) *Penalties* is not parallel to *rewarding*. Furthermore, *rewarding* is expressed as a modifier, illogically suggesting that, *by* hoarding candy, the selfish children are somehow causing the altruistic children to be rewarded. Finally, the singular verb *has been criticized* does not agree with the plural subject *rules*.

(E) CORRECT. *Penalties* and *rewards* are properly parallel, as are *children who hoard candy* and *those who share it*. The plural verb *have been criticized* agrees with the plural subject *rules*. *On the grounds that they encourage...* is idiomatically correct and clarifies the basis of the criticism.

13.2945 Chicago-style" deep-dish PIZZA must have its crust, which resembles a pie crust more than a traditional pizza-style flatbread, baked alone before toppings are added, and so takes longer to prepare it than most other types of pizza.

- "Chicago-style" deep-dish pizza must have its crust, which resembles a pie crust more than a traditional pizza-style flatbread, ~~baked alone before toppings are added~~, and so takes longer to prepare it than most other types of pizza.
- The crust of "Chicago-style" deep-dish pizza is more similar to a pie crust than to a traditional pizza-style flatbread and must be baked alone before adding toppings, ~~thus taking longer to prepare than most other types of pizzas.~~
- "Chicago-style" deep-dish pizza takes longer to prepare than most other types of pizza ~~because of its crust~~, resembling a pie crust more than a traditional pizza-style flatbread, ~~must be baked~~ alone before adding toppings.
- "Chicago-style" deep-dish pizza takes longer to prepare than most other types of pizza because its crust, which is more like a pie crust than like a traditional pizza-style flatbread, must be baked alone before toppings are added.
- Because its crust is ~~more like a pie crust than a traditional pizza-style flatbread~~, "Chicago-style" deep-dish pizza must have its crust baked alone before toppings are added, ~~and so~~ takes longer than most other types of pizzas to prepare it.

This sentence presents an interesting fact about Chicago-style pizza—it takes longer to cook than other types of pizza—and explains why: its crust must be baked separately before any toppings can be added.

To express this idea correctly and effectively, the sentence must create a comparison between *Chicago-style deep-dish pizza* and *other types of pizza*. The idea that deep-dish crust is more like pie crust than like traditional pizza crust should be expressed in a clear and unambiguous comparison. Finally, pronouns, if present, must be used correctly.

(A) This sentence states that *Chicago-style deep-dish pizza... takes longer to prepare it*. Here, the pronoun *it* does not have a sensible antecedent. (Literally, the sentence is stating that the deep-dish pizza can prepare "it"; of course, a pizza itself cannot prepare anything.) The comparison *resembles a pie crust more than a traditional pizza-style flatbread* is ambiguous; it could imply that the the Chicago-style crust is more like a pie crust than *like* a flatbread (the intended meaning), but could also be interpreted as meaning that the Chicago-style crust *resembles* a pie crust more than *does* a flatbread. Finally, the wording *must have its crust... baked* doesn't make sense. Taken literally, this wording suggests that the pizza itself requests or demands that the crust be baked.

(B) The subject of this sentence is *The crust...*, rather than the Chicago-style pizza itself. This choice thus creates an illogical comparison, involving just the *crust* of the Chicago-style pizza but involving "most other types of pizzas" in their entirety. Also, the action of *adding* (in *before adding toppings*) must refer back to the subject -- illogically implying that the Chicago-style pizza crust can actually add toppings to itself.

(C) *Because of* should be followed by just a noun (or a noun with modifiers), but, here, it is followed by an entire clause. The resulting construction—*because of its crust... must be baked...*—is not a proper sentence. Additionally, the action of *adding* (in *before adding toppings*) must refer back to the subject—illogically implying that the Chicago-style pizza crust can actually add toppings to itself. Finally, the comparison *resembles a pie crust more than a*

traditional pizza-style flatbread is ambiguous; it could imply that the the Chicago-style crust is more like a pie crust than *like* a flatbread (the intended meaning), but could also be interpreted as meaning that the Chicago-style crust *resembles* a pie crust more than *does* a flatbread.

(D) CORRECT. Overall, this choice creates a proper sentence consisting of two clauses connected by *because*. Both comparisons (*Chicago pizza takes longer to prepare than most other types of pizza* and *...is more like a pie crust than like a flatbread*) are correct and unambiguous. Finally, the sentence properly expresses the idea that toppings *are added* to the crust (by someone else).

(E) The comparison *more like a pie crust than a traditional pizza-style flatbread* is ambiguous; it could imply that the the Chicago-style crust is more like a pie crust than *like* a flatbread (the intended meaning), but could also be interpreted as meaning that the Chicago-style crust *resembles* a pie crust more than *does* a flatbread. The wording *must have its crust... baked* doesn't make sense; taken literally, this wording suggests that the pizza itself requests or demands that the crust be baked. Finally, this sentence states that *Chicago-style deep-dish pizza... takes longer to prepare it*. Here, the pronoun *it* does not have a sensible antecedent. (Literally, the sentence is stating that the deep-dish pizza can prepare "it"; of course, a pizza itself cannot prepare anything.

214.2944 Among the sports played primarily by women in the United States is field hockey, which is one of the most popular men's sports in South Asia, and volleyball, the sport of many male athletes in Europe and South America.

- Among the sports played primarily by women in the United States is field hockey, which is one of
- In the United States, among the sports played primarily by women are field hockey, one of
- Played in the United States primarily by women, field hockey is among
- Sports played primarily by women in the United States, including field hockey, one of
- One of the sports played in the United States primarily by women is field hockey, among

This sentence is intended to highlight a contrast: in the United States, field hockey and volleyball are primarily women's sports, but, in other areas of the world, they are heavily contested by men. To convey this message effectively, the sentence must employ several grammatical elements properly.

First, modifiers must be carefully placed. For instance, the construction *played primarily by women in the United States*, present in the original prompt, suggests the interpretation that *women in the United States* constitute most of the participants in these sports—an illogical interpretation, given the immediately following facts. The sentence must therefore be rearranged to clarify the idea that in the United States these are primarily women's sports, but elsewhere they are not.

Second, *field hockey... and volleyball* is a compound noun. Therefore, if this noun is the subject of a verb in the sentence, that verb must be plural.

Finally, *field hockey* and *volleyball* are both followed by descriptive modifiers; ideally, those modifiers should be expressed in forms that are as similar as possible.

(A) The singular verb *is* does not agree with the plural noun *field hockey... and volleyball*. Additionally, the modifiers describing field hockey and volleyball (*which is one of...* and *the sport of...*) are not expressed in similar forms. Finally, the modifier *in the United States* appears to describe *women*, thus illogically implying that American women make up most of the world's field hockey and volleyball players.

(B) CORRECT. In this sentence, the modifier *In the United States* is clearly placed so as to modify the entire following clause, clarifying the idea that the status of field hockey and volleyball as women's sports is a phenomenon limited to the United States (and not illogically implying that American women constitute most of the world's field hockey and volleyball players). The plural subject *field hockey... and volleyball* is correctly paired with the plural verb *are*. Finally, the modifiers following *field hockey* and *volleyball* are both appositive modifiers, strengthening the cohesiveness of that parallel structure.

(C) This choice creates the complete clause *field hockey is among the most popular men's sports in South Asia*. As a result, the element following "and"—consisting only of *volleyball* and a modifier—is not parallel to anything, and the resulting construction is a run-on sentence. In addition, the modifier *Played in the United States primarily by women*, which is intended to describe both sports, appears to describe only *field hockey*.

(D) The modifier *in the United States* appears to describe *women*, thus illogically implying that American women make up most of the world's field hockey and volleyball players. Additionally, this choice creates a sentence fragment. The noun *sports* is followed only by modifiers; there is no main verb.

(E) The singular verb *is* does not agree with the plural noun *field hockey... and volleyball*. Additionally, this choice illogically describes field hockey and volleyball as "one of the sports...", but these are in fact two different sports.

25m