

1.2943 In deciding between a low-deductible medical insurance plan, which has higher monthly premiums but with more predictable out-of-pocket costs, or a high-deductible plan, which has lower premiums but with more variable and potentially higher out-of-pocket costs, it is important that patients consider the likelihood that they will need medical treatment or expensive prescription medications during the term of the plan.

- which has higher monthly premiums but with more predictable out-of-pocket costs, or a high-deductible plan, which has lower premiums but with more variable and potentially higher out-of-pocket costs, it is important that patients consider the likelihood that they will need
- with higher monthly premiums but more predictable out-of-pocket costs, as compared to a high-deductible plan, with lower premiums but with out-of-pocket costs that are more variable and potentially higher, patients should consider their likelihood of needing
- with higher monthly premiums but more predictable out-of-pocket costs, and a high-deductible plan, with lower premiums but more variable and potentially higher out-of-pocket costs, patients should consider whether they are likely to need
- which not only has higher monthly premiums but also has more predictable out-of-pocket costs, and a high-deductible plan, with lower premiums but with more variable and potentially higher out-of-pocket costs, patients should consider whether it is likely that they will need
- with higher monthly premiums but more predictable out-of-pocket costs, or a high-deductible plan, with lower premiums but more variable and potentially higher out-of-pocket costs, it is important for patients to consider the likelihood of their needing

This sentence describes a consideration that patients should take into account when deciding between two types of medical insurance plans. To express its message most effectively, the sentence should describe the two different plans in terms that are as parallel as possible. In addition, to be idiomatic, "between" must be paired with "and". Finally, the sentence should not use unnecessarily wordy language to express its point.

(A) *With more predictable out-of-pocket costs* is not parallel to *higher monthly premiums*; nor is *with more variable and potentially higher out-of-pocket costs* parallel to *which has lower premiums*. The pairing of *between* and *or* is unidiomatic. Finally, the initial modifier *In deciding between...* should be followed directly by the subject *patients*, but, in this sentence, it is not.

(B) The pairing of *between* and *as compared to* is unidiomatic. The phrase *out-of-pocket costs that are more variable and potentially higher* is both unnecessarily wordy and not parallel to the preceding *lower premiums*. (Both problems would be remedied if it were written instead as *more variable and potentially higher out-of-pocket costs*.) Finally, *their likelihood...* is awkward and inaccurate, since the *likelihood* itself is not something that belongs to the patients.

(C) CORRECT. The descriptions of the two plans—*with higher monthly premiums but more predictable out-of-pocket costs* and *with lower premiums but more variable and potentially higher out-of-pocket costs*—are written in parallel. Moreover, the two elements within each description are also written in parallel. *Between* is correctly paired with *and*, according to idiomatic convention. The initial modifier *In deciding between...* is followed directly by the subject *patients*, as required.

(D) The description of the first plan (*which not only has... but also has...*) is not only unnecessarily wordy, but also unlike the description of the second (*with ... and with ...*); the sentence would be more effective if both were written in the style of the latter. The idiom *not only... but also ...*, while not grammatically incorrect, is nonsense in this context: that idiom should describe two ideas that reinforce each other, but, here, the two ideas that follow *not only...* and *but also...* contrast with each other.

(E) The pairing of *between* and *or* is unidiomatic. Additionally, the initial modifier *In deciding between...* should be followed directly by the subject *patients*, but, in this sentence, it is not.

2.2942 A group of FBI investigators, in connection with the 1975 disappearance of Teamsters leader Jimmy Hoffa, are searching a small area of a rural Milford Township horse farm.

- A group of FBI investigators, in connection with the 1975 disappearance of Teamsters leader Jimmy Hoffa, are searching a small area of a rural Milford Township horse farm.
- A group of FBI investigators, in connection with the 1975 disappearance of Teamsters leader Jimmy Hoffa, is searching a rural Milford Township horse farm, a small area within.
- A group of FBI investigators, searching a small area of a rural Milford Township horse farm, is connected with the 1975 disappearance of Teamsters leader Jimmy Hoffa.
- A group of FBI investigators, in connection with the 1975 disappearance of Teamsters leader Jimmy Hoffa, is searching a small area of a rural Milford Township horse farm.
- A small area of a rural Milford Township horse farm is being searched by a group of FBI investigators in connection with the 1975 disappearance of Teamsters leader Jimmy Hoffa.

This sentence contains a subject - verb agreement issue. "A group" is the subject and it is a collective noun which is singular. The verb "are" does not refer to the FBI investigators; it refers to "a group" and therefore should be singular.

A group	of FBI investigators		
	in connection with the 1975 disappearance	of Jimmy Hoffa	
are searching.	a small area	of a farm	rural
			Milford Township
			Horse

The core-modifier tree helps clarify that it is the collective noun group (singular) and not the FBI investigators doing the search and therefore should be followed by the singular verb "is."

Additionally, the original sentence incorrectly attaches the modifier "in connection with the 1975 disappearance of Teamsters leader Jimmy Hoffa" to "A group of FBI investigators." The modifier should be placed so that it correctly modifies the search of the property.

(A) This answer choice repeats the original sentence and is incorrect.

(B) The verb "is" now correctly refers to "A group" but a new error has been introduced. "A small area" has been placed after horse farm. This change implies that the whole horse farm is the subject of the search. Also, "small area within" is awkward.

(C) By changing "in connection with" to "is connected with," this choice incorrectly implies that the investigators were

involved in some manner with the disappearance.

(D) In this sentence, “in connection with...” incorrectly modifies “A group of FBI investigators.”

(E) CORRECT: The subject and verb of this sentence match (“A small area... is being searched”) and “in connection with” correctly modifies the entire preceding clause.

The correct answer is (E).

3.2937A recent report from the Bureau of Justice states although only a fraction of a percent of the American population is in prison, approximately one out of every thirty two Americans are either in prison or on PAROLE or PROBATION.

- although only a fraction of a percent of the American population is in prison, approximately one out of every thirty two Americans are either in prison or on PAROLE or PROBATION.
- that while less than a percent of the American population is in prison, one out of every thirty two Americans are either in prison, on PAROLE, or on PROBATION.
- that although less than one out of every one hundred American people are in prison, more than three percent of Americans are either in prison, on parole, or on probation.
- that while only a fraction of a percent of the American population is in prison, one out of every thirty two Americans is either in prison, on parole, or on probation.**
- while only a fraction of a percent of the American population is in prison, one out of every thirty two Americans is either in prison, on parole, or probation.

The primary purpose of this sentence is to describe the two recent findings in a report from the Bureau of Justice. The sentence uses the bossy verb “states” to introduce the two findings. The verb “states” must be followed by “that.” Each of these findings is a stand-alone clause, meaning they each contain their own subject verb pairing. Further, the second clause introduces a parallel structure with a list of three items and the word “or”.

(A) This sentence incorrectly omits the word “that”, which is necessary for the bossy verb “states” when followed by a clause. Additionally, the sentence incorrectly matches the subject-verb pairing in the phrase “one out of every thirty two Americans are”. The subject of this sentence is the singular noun “one”, whereas the verb is the plural noun “are”.

(B) The sentence incorrectly matches the subject-verb pairing in the phrase “one out of every thirty two Americans are”. The subject of this sentence is the singular noun “one”, whereas the verb is the plural noun “are”.

(C) The sentence incorrectly matches the subject-verb pairing in the phrase “one out of every one hundred American people are”. The subject of this sentence is the singular noun “one”, whereas the verb is the plural noun “are”.

(D) CORRECT. This sentence correctly uses the conjunction “that” after the bossy verb “states”, correctly pairs the subjects and verbs within the two clauses, and correctly uses parallelism with “in prison, on parole, or on probation.”

(E) This sentence incorrectly omits the word “that”, which is necessary for the bossy verb “states” when followed by a clause. Additionally, the sentence breaks parallelism with the phrase, “is either in prison, on parole, or probation”. The first two items in the list are the preposition phrases “in prison” and “on parole”, whereas the last item is the noun “probation”.

4.3936 Studies of the rotational velocity of a galaxy at various distances from their center of mass have shown that ninety percent of the universe’s mass could exist in the form of dark matter.

- rotational velocity of a galaxy at various distances from their center of mass have shown that ninety percent of the universe’s mass could exist in the form of

- rotational velocity of galaxies at varying distances from their centers of rotation have shown that as much as ninety percent of the mass of the universe exists in the form of
- rotational velocity of galaxies at varying distances from their center of mass has shown that up to ninety percent of the mass of the universe is made of
- rotational velocity of galaxies at varying distances from their rotational centers has shown that as much as ninety percent of universal mass might exist as
- galactic rotation at various distances from the galactic center of rotation have shown up to ninety percent of the mass over the universe exist in the form of

The primary purpose of this sentence is to discuss the findings of a group of studies, namely, that much of the mass of the universe exists as dark matter. The main subject and verb of the sentence are therefore “Studies...have shown”. The findings of the study are described by the clause “that as much as...”, containing the subject-verb pairing “ninety percent...exists”.

(A) This sentence incorrectly uses the plural pronoun “their” to refer back to the singular antecedent “galaxy”.

(B) CORRECT. This sentence correctly matches both subject verb pairings.

(C) This sentence incorrectly pairs the singular verb phrase “has shown” with the plural noun “studies”.

(D) This sentence incorrectly pairs the singular verb phrase “has shown” with the plural noun “studies”.

(E) This sentence incorrectly pairs the singular subject “ninety percent” with the plural verb “exist”. Further, this sentence incorrectly states, “studies have shown up to ninety percent” (omitting the word “that” from the answer) implying that the studies themselves revealed ninety percent instead of revealing that ninety percent exists. In order to correctly pair the findings of the studies to the entire clause, the word “that” must be inserted.

5.2934 Stimulants, such as caffeine, can eliminate pain and fatigue and enhance alertness, but, if used continuously for long periods, can cause users to develop tolerance and even addiction.

- pain and fatigue and enhance alertness, but, if used continuously for long periods, can cause users to develop tolerance and even addiction
- pain, fatigue, and enhanced alertness; if used continuously for long periods, though, users can develop tolerance and even addiction to them
- pain, fatigue, and enhance alertness; people having used them continuously for long periods, though, can develop tolerance and even addiction to them
- pain and fatigue while enhancing alertness, but, if used continuously for long periods, users can develop tolerance and even addiction to them
- pain and fatigue, and also enhancing alertness; however, people using them continuously for long periods can develop tolerance and even addiction

The sentence juxtaposes certain positive and negative effects of stimulants. There are two positive effects cited—(a) the elimination of pain and fatigue, and (b) the enhancement of alertness. On the other hand, negative effects—the development of tolerance and/or addiction—are also cited.

The two positive effects should appear in a parallel structure. The sentence should also use a proper transition to express the contrast between the positive and negative effects. Finally, the sentence must use modifiers accurately;

specifically, “if used continuously...” must properly refer to the stimulants themselves, not to their users.

(A) CORRECT. This choice may at first appear to have an unusual structure—specifically, it may appear to be of the form *x or y or z*—but, on closer inspection, that’s not the construction at work here. Instead, this choice properly places two positive effects of stimulants—*eliminate pain and fatigue* and *enhance alertness*—in parallel. The first “and” connects *pain* and *fatigue* within the first of the two parallel structures, while the second “and” connects the two parallel structures themselves; therefore, both instances of “and” are necessary.

The modifier *if used...* properly refers to the subject of the clause, i.e., *stimulants*. Finally, *can cause...* is the second half of a compound verb (*can eliminate... but... can cause...*), whose subject is *stimulants* as required by context.

(B) In this choice, *pain*, *fatigue*, and *enhanced alertness* are all placed in parallel. This construction is nonsense, as it suggests that stimulants can eliminate all three of these phenomena. (In context, it is clear that stimulants *produce*, rather than eliminate, enhanced alertness.) Additionally, the modifier *if used continuously for long periods...* illogically describes the subject of the following clause, which is *users*. In context, that modifier should describe *stimulants*, not *users*.

(C) The nouns *pain* and *fatigue* are not parallel to the verb *enhance*. Additionally, the modifier *having used...* is illogical here. It is the process of using the stimulants themselves—not the retrospective fact of *having used them*—that leads to tolerance or addiction.

(D) The modifier *if used continuously for long periods...* illogically describes the subject of the following clause, which is *users*. In context, that modifier should describe *stimulants*, not *users*.

(E) *Eliminate* and *enhancing* are not parallel. 6.2933 The new “e-waste” salvage company collects electronic waste items, such as old cellular telephones and broken personal music players, discarding them as trash, to transport them to state facilities for recycling.

- players, discarding them as trash, to transport
- players, that have been discarded as trash and transports
- players that are discarded, as trash in order to transport
- players, which have been discarded as trash and transport
- players, that are discarded as trash and transport

The context of this sentence indicates one particular, reasonable interpretation: the company collects waste items *that have been thrown in the trash* (by others) and takes those items to recycling facilities. The sentence must be written with modifiers that properly convey this meaning, rather than another, less logical interpretation. In addition, *collect* and *transport* both refer to actions undertaken by the salvage company, so both should be expressed in forms that have *the ... salvage company* as their subject or agent.

(A) While this version of the sentence is not ungrammatical, it is nonsense. The modifier *discarding them as trash* suggests that the salvage company itself discards the electronic items as trash. Not only does this idea contradict the immediately following words—the company wouldn’t be able to take the materials for recycling if it trashed them—but it also violates the clear context of the sentence. According to context, the salvage company collects items that *other people* have discarded.

(B) CORRECT. The non-essential modifier *such as old cellular telephones and broken personal music players*, which gives additional detail about *electronic waste items*, is properly enclosed in commas. If this modifier is removed, the resulting sentence contains the compound verb *collects ... and transports ...*, both parts of which properly refer to actions undertaken by the salvage company.

(C) If the non-essential modifier (enclosed between commas) is removed from this sentence, the remaining sentence suggests that the salvage company “collects electronic waste items ... *as trash* in order to transport...” This interpretation violates the clear context of the sentence. The salvage company does not collect the items *as trash*; rather, it collects items that *others* have trashed, but that are *not* actually trash, so that those items may be recycled.

(D) The verbs *collects* and *transport* both describe actions undertaken by the salvage company. Both of these verbs should thus be singular, since *salvage company* is singular. Since *transport* is a plural verb, this version of the sentence is ungrammatical.

(E) The verbs *collects* and *transport* both describe actions undertaken by the salvage company. Both of these verbs should thus be singular, since *salvage company* is singular. Since *transport* is a plural verb, this version of the sentence is ungrammatical.

7.2931 Mercury lacks a substantial atmosphere unlike the other planets in the solar system, having such small size and proximity to the sun.

- Mercury lacks a substantial atmosphere unlike the other planets in the solar system, having such
- Unlike the other planets in the solar system, Mercury lacks a substantial atmosphere due to its
- Unlike all the planets in the solar system, Mercury has no substantial atmosphere; because of its
- Mercury lacks a substantial atmosphere unlike all the planets in the solar system: it has a
- Unlike the other planets in the solar system, Mercury has no substantial atmosphere; because it has such

The major topics in this problem are connecting punctuation and comparisons, as indicated by the colon/semicolons and the word “unlike”, respectively. Anytime an answer choice contains a semicolon, an independent clause must appear on both sides of the semicolon. A colon should equate two parts of the sentence, so there should be a logical connection between the two parts with the second part providing examples or further clarification. As for the comparison, the items that are being compared should be logically and structurally comparable; in this case, the appropriate comparison is between Mercury and the other planets in the solar system.

(A) This choice appears to compare Mercury’s atmosphere to the planets.

(B) CORRECT. There are no punctuation issues to deal with, and the comparison is properly drawn between Mercury and the other planets.

(C) There is no independent clause after the semicolon. This choice also compares Mercury to “all the planets”, which is improper because Mercury is one of the planets. Mercury cannot be compared to itself in this way.

(D) Although there is not a grammatical mistake presented by the colon, the second half of the sentence does not have the obvious logical connection to the first half that would be required if the colon were used properly. This choice also appears to compare Mercury’s atmosphere to the planets.

(E) There is no independent clause after the semicolon.

8.2908 Independent contractors pay higher taxes and paid less consistently than are statutory employees, but they, unlike statutory employees, are freely allowed to perform the same type of work for multiple businesses.

- taxes and paid less consistently than are statutory employees, but they, unlike statutory employees, are freely allowed to
- taxes and are paid less consistently than statutory employees; unlike statutory employees, though, independent contractors are free to
- taxes, are paid less consistently than statutory employees, and, unlike statutory employees, they may freely
- taxes and are paid less consistently than are statutory employees; in addition, unlike statutory employees, independent contractors can freely

- taxes and paid less consistently than are statutory employees; moreover, unlike statutory employees, they are allowed to

The sentence describes several differences between the situation of independent contractors and that of statutory employees. The first two observations depict the situation of independent contractors as less favorable than that of statutory employees, but the reverse is true of the final observation; therefore, the sentence must properly express the contrast between the first two observations and the last one. Additionally, the first two observations—each of which describes a relative disadvantage faced by independent contractors—should be written in parallel.

(A) *And* links the constructions *pay...* and *paid...* These constructions are not parallel: the first is a verb phrase, but the second is a participial modifier. The helping verb *to be* (appearing here as *are*) cannot be used to stand for an action verb, so the construction *are statutory employees* is not parallel to *pay higher taxes*. The adverb *freely* is incorrectly placed; it is intended to describe the act of performing similar work for other companies, but, in its current location, it illogically modifies "allowed". Finally, the modifier *unlike statutory employees* is used to modify a pronoun (*they*) rather than a noun, resulting in an awkward and unacceptable construction.

(B) **CORRECT.** The two disadvantages faced by independent contractors are properly represented by two parallel verbs (*pay...* and *are paid...*), and the transition *though* is appropriately used to describe the contrast between the first two observations and the last.

(C) This construction contains a list of three constructions (*pay..., are paid..., and they may freely...*) that is incorrect in terms of both meaning and grammar. The construction *x, y, and z* makes no sense here, since the last observation contrasts with the first two; the same list is also grammatically nonparallel, since *pay* and *paid* are verbs but *they may...* is a full clause with a subject and a verb.

(D) The transition *in addition* implies that the following statement reinforces the idea(s) stated earlier; in this sentence, the last observation contrasts with the first two, so *in addition* is inappropriate.

(E) *And* links the constructions *pay...* and *paid...* These constructions are not parallel: the first is a verb phrase, but the second is a participial modifier. The helping verb *to be* (appearing here as *are*) cannot be used to stand for an action verb, so the construction *are statutory employees* is not parallel to *pay higher taxes*. Finally, the transition *moreover* implies that the following statement reinforces the idea(s) stated earlier; in this sentence, the last observation contrasts with the first two, so *moreover* is inappropriate.

9.2907 The division of the day into twenty-four hours, rather than into some other number of periods, are essentially random, and most people can scarcely imagine dividing the day in any other way.

- hours, rather than into some other number of periods, are essentially random, and most people can scarcely imagine dividing the day
- hours is essentially random, unlike some other number of periods, and yet most people can scarcely imagine the day being divided
- hours, unlike some other number of periods, is essentially random, despite the fact that people can scarcely imagine the day being divided
- hours, rather than into some other number of periods, is essentially random, yet most people can scarcely imagine dividing the day
- hours are essentially random, unlike other numbers of periods; people can scarcely imagine the day being divided

The sentence presents two contrasting notions about the division of the day into 24 hours: it is essentially random, but, nevertheless, people have difficulty imagining alternate possibilities. To be effective, the sentence must include a transition that indicates this contrast. In addition, descriptions must appear in locations that are logical.

(A) The plural verb *are* does not agree with the singular subject *division*. *And* is an inappropriate transition, as it does not indicate the contrast in the sentence.

(B) The placement of *unlike some other number of periods* illogically suggests that a division of the day into any number of periods other than 24 would not be random. Also, *imagine the day being divided* is an inappropriate

construction; it suggests that there is a day actually *being divided* (in the timeframe of the sentence) and that people have difficulty imagining that actual calendar day.

(C) In this sentence, *unlike* creates a nonparallel comparison between *the division...* and *some other number of periods*. *Despite* is used illogically: the sentence should describe people's reaction to something *despite* the inherent qualities of that thing, not the other way around. Finally, *imagine the day being divided* is an inappropriate construction; it suggests that there is a day actually *being divided* (in the timeframe of the sentence) and that people have difficulty imagining that actual calendar day.

(D) CORRECT. The connector *rather than* creates a properly parallel comparison between *into twenty-four hours* and *into some other number of periods*. The conjunction *yet* properly connects the two clauses in a way that indicates the contrast between them. Additionally, the first clause correctly states that the *division* of the day is random.

(E) The placement of *unlike other numbers of periods* illogically suggests that a division of the day into any number of periods other than 24 would not be random. The semicolon is an inappropriate transition, as it does not indicate the contrast in the sentence. Finally, *imagine the day being divided* is an inappropriate construction; it suggests that there is a day actually *being divided* (in the timeframe of the sentence) and that people have difficulty imagining that actual calendar day

10.2904 At Tuesday's press conference Ms. Franco, who headed her country's antiterrorism committee for eight years, criticized airlines for simply banning items that had already been used in prior hijacking attempts without making a significant effort or anticipating the means of future attempts.

- who headed her country's antiterrorism committee for eight years, criticized airlines for simply banning items that had already been used in prior hijacking attempts without making a significant effort or anticipating
- the former head of her country's antiterrorism committee for eight years, criticized airlines that had banned items simply used in prior attempts at hijacking and had not made a significant effort to anticipate
- the former eight-year head of her country's antiterrorism committee, criticized airlines simply for banning items that had already been used in hijacking attempts and made no significant effort in anticipating
- who headed her country's antiterrorism committee for eight years, criticized airlines for simply banning items used in prior hijacking attempts and making no significant effort to anticipate
- who had for eight years headed her country's antiterrorism committee, criticizing airlines that had simply banned items already used in previous hijacking attempts, made no significant effort at anticipating

The intended purpose of the sentence is to convey two different grounds on which Ms. Franco criticized airlines. First, the airlines had simply banned items used in previous hijacking attempts; second, they had made no significant effort to anticipate the particulars of future attempts. For the sentence to be effective, it should place these two criticisms in parallel, avoiding constructions that mistakenly attribute the airlines' actions to Ms. Franco herself. In addition, the sentence should be worded so as to avoid redundancy.

(A) The use of both "already" and "prior" is redundant. In addition, "anticipating the means" is placed in parallel with "making a significant effort," illogically suggesting that those two constructions represent independent ideas. The airlines didn't make a significant effort to do what? They didn't make a significant effort *to* anticipate the means of future attempts.

(B) The combination of "former" and "for eight years" is illogical; the original sentence indicated that Ms. Franco was the head of the committee for 8 years. "The *former* head for eight years" would refer to the period of time *after* she ceased to be the head of the committee; in other words, she was the head for some unspecified period of time, but she left the job eight years ago. This information was included to demonstrate her credentials in criticizing the airlines,

but knowing how long ago she left the job does not establish her credentials. In addition, the adverb "simply" is inappropriately placed; it is meant to describe the airlines' act of banning previously used items, and so should be placed in front of "banned."

(C) This version of the sentence places "criticized" and "made" in parallel – thus illogically suggesting that Ms. Franco herself (the subject of both verbs) "made no significant effort." The sentence must be structured so as to make clear that the *airlines*, not Ms. Franco, failed to make such an effort. The adverb "simply" is inappropriately placed; it is meant to describe the airlines' act of banning previously used items, and so should be placed in front of "banning." Finally, "former eight-year head" is awkward and unclear.

(D) CORRECT. The first modifier provides additional description of Ms. Franco's background; the past tense is appropriately used to describe a state that prevailed during a definite interval in the past. The two grounds on which Ms. Franco criticized the airlines – banning and making – are expressed properly in parallel. Finally, the adverb "simply" is appropriately placed in front of banning, the act that it is intended to describe.

(E) "Criticizing" is written as a modifier, illogically suggesting that Ms. Franco had spent her entire eight-year term criticizing the airlines. Moreover, if the modifiers are removed from the sentence, the remaining subject and verb are "Ms. Franco" and "made" – thus illogically suggesting that Ms. Franco herself, rather than the airlines, "made no significant effort."

11.2903 Scientific language often employs common words in ways that clash with the general usage, such as "temperate"; this term is generally used to refer to mild, pleasant weather, but climatologists use it in regions where summers are hot, winters are harsh, and extreme climatic variation.

- often employs common words in ways that clash with the general usage, such as "temperate"; this term is generally used to refer to mild, pleasant weather, but climatologists use it in regions where summers are hot, winters are harsh
- often employs common words in ways that clash with their general usage; for instance, the term "temperate," which in general usage refers to mild, pleasant weather, is used by climatologists to describe regions with hot summers, harsh winters**
- employs common words often and in ways that clash with general usage; specifically, the term "temperate" is generally used for mild, pleasant weather, and by climatologists to refer to regions with hot summers, harsh winters
- employs common words in ways that often clash with general usage, as when climatologists use "temperate," a term generally used to refer to mild, pleasant weather, to characterize regions where summers are hot, winters are harsh
- employs common words in ways that often clash with their general usage; climatologists in particular use the term "temperate" -- which generally refers to mild, pleasant weather - - in describing regions with hot summers and harsh winters

This sentence presents a general phenomenon -- that scientists often use words in ways that differ markedly from those words' everyday usage -- and follows the phenomenon with the concrete example of the term "temperate." The example is illogical, however, in that it suggests that climatologists only use the term when they are physically located in temperate regions ("use it in regions...").

(A) The modifier "such as..." is separated from the noun that it actually describes ("common words") by an entire clause, so it is used incorrectly. The modifier "in regions..." illogically suggests that climatologists only use the term when they are physically located in temperate regions. Finally, the structures "summers are hot" and "winters are harsh," which are clauses, are not parallel to the noun phrase "extreme climatic variation."

(B) CORRECT. The adverb "often" is correctly placed next to "employs," the verb that it describes. The connector "for instance" properly conveys the idea that the following words are a specific example of the phenomenon described. Finally, the three characteristics of so-called temperate regions -- hot summers, harsh winters, and extreme climatic variation -- are properly written in parallel.

(C) The intended meaning is that scientific usage often clashes with common usage, not that scientists use common words frequently; the placement of "often" before "and" in this choice illogically indicates the latter interpretation. "Specifically" is an inappropriate connector; it suggests that the entire phenomenon applies only to the case of the word "temperate," rather than that "temperate" is simply one example of many. Finally, "...and byclimatologists" is not parallel to anything that precedes it.

(D) The adverb "often" is incorrectly placed; here, it modifies "clash," illogically suggesting that the usages in question sometimes clash with common usage and sometimes don't. While not ungrammatical, "when" illogically suggests that the entire phenomenon previously described is something that occurs, in general, *when* climatologists happen to use the word "temperate." Finally, the structures "summers are hot" and "winters are harsh," which are clauses, are not parallel to the noun phrase "extreme climatic variation."

(E) The adverb "often" is incorrectly placed; here, it modifies "clash," illogically suggesting that the usages in question sometimes clash with common usage and sometimes don't. The three characteristics of temperate regions are presented in the structure "A and B, and C", which is not a correct way to express three parallel ideas.

12.2902 At last month's meeting Mr. Iqbal, the chair of a business association for immigrants, described the most significant problems he had experienced in adapting to his new country's business regulations and outlined several actions that he had taken to deal with those problems.

- had experienced in adapting to his new country's business regulations and outlined several actions that he had taken to deal
- experienced, adapted to the business regulations of his new country, and outlined several actions that had been taken in his dealing
- had experienced in adapting to the business regulations of his new country and in outlining several actions that he had taken in dealing
- experienced while adapting to his new country's business regulations and outlining several actions taken in his dealing
- experienced in adapting to his new country's business regulations and outlined several actions with which he had taken in dealing

The intended purpose of the sentence is to describe two things that Mr. Iqbal did at the meeting: First, he described some problems that he had faced in adapting to a new business climate, and, second, he outlined the actions he had taken in order to handle those problems. To make sense, the sentence must place these two things in parallel. The sentence should also specify that Mr. Iqbal himself took the actions described, rather than that they simply *were taken* (by some unknown actor).

(A) CORRECT. This sentence properly places Mr. Iqbal's two actions ("described" and "outlined") in parallel. The past perfect verbs "had experienced" and "had taken" are appropriately used for two actions that had been completed by, but still had a tangible effect on, the situation described in the sentence. The phrase "in adapting" is properly used to describe problems that Mr. Iqbal had experienced in the process of adapting to the regulations, and the phrase "to deal" is properly used to describe the goal or intent of Mr. Iqbal's subsequent actions.

(B) This sentence places "adapted" in parallel with "described" and "outlined." Not only does this construction illogically suggest that Mr. Iqbal adapted to his new country's business regulations during the meeting itself, but it also removes the modifier from the verb "experienced," resulting in a sentence that no longer provides a context for the problems that Mr. Iqbal experienced. In addition, the passive form "had been taken," while not grammatically incorrect, fails to convey that Mr. Iqbal himself took the actions described.

(C) This sentence places "in outlining" in parallel with "in adapting" -- illogically suggesting that Mr. Iqbal experienced significant problems not just in adapting to the new regulations, but also in talking about his resultant actions.

(D) This sentence places "outlining" in parallel with "adapting." As a result, the second item reads: "Mr. Iqbal described the most significant problems he experienced while outlining several actions..." This meaning is illogical. Mr. Iqbal outlined certain actions he had taken; he did not discuss problems he encountered *while in the act of outlining* his actions. Moreover, the past participle "taken," while not grammatically incorrect, fails to convey that Mr. Iqbal himself took the actions described.

(E) "With which" is unidiomatic: people take actions (they don't "take with" actions); the correct idiom is actions (that) he had taken

13.2901 Although many video games are situated in fantasy worlds quite unlike our own, others feature human characters that embark on careers, get married, have their own children, just as real people do.

- that embark on careers, get married, have their own children, just as real people do
- who embark on careers, just like real people, to get married and have children of their own
- who, just like real people, begin to embark on careers; they also get married, having children of their own
- who embark on careers, just like real people getting married, and have children of their own
- who, just like real people, embark on careers, get married, and have children of their own**

The sentence describes a contrast between two types of video games: on the one hand, games set in fantasy worlds that are nothing like the real world, and, on the other hand, games featuring lifelike human characters who engage in mundane activities. The sentence should properly imply that all three of the actions described—embarking on careers, getting married, and having children—are reminiscent of real people's actions. Also, since these three actions are separate and presumably of equal priority, they should appear in a proper parallel structure.

(A) This sentence uses the relative pronoun *that* to refer to human characters; it should use *who* instead. Additionally, the given list of three actions (*embark on careers, get married, have their own children*), is missing the word *and*, resulting in an unacceptable sentence construction.

(B) In this answer choice, the modifier "just like real people" is incorrectly placed. It seems to describe only the action of embarking on careers; it should describe *all* of the human characters' listed actions. The modifier *to get married*, while not grammatically incorrect, is nonsensical: it illogically suggests that the characters embark on careers for the purpose of getting married and having children.

(C) The modifier "just like real people" seems to describe only the action of getting up to go to work; it should describe *all* of the human characters' listed actions. The use of both *begin* and *embark* is redundant; for the sentence to be logical, it must contain only one of these words. Finally, the modifier *having...*, while grammatically acceptable, is nonsensical. It implies that the characters have children *while* getting married or, alternatively, that the act of getting married *causes* the characters to have children; neither interpretation makes sense, so the modifier is incorrect.

(D) The modifier "just like real people" seems to describe only the act of embarking on careers (since the other two actions appear in a separate clause); in context, it should describe *all* of the human characters' listed actions. Furthermore, "just like real people getting married" is presented as a single modifier, creating two problems. First, it illogically implies that the act of embarking on careers is typical of people who are getting married at the time; second, because *getting married* is attached to *real people*, the sentence no longer implies that the video-game characters get married.

(E) CORRECT. The modifier "just like real people" is placed in front of the compound verb phrase (*embark on careers, get married, and have children...*); it therefore describes that entire phrase, as intended. Furthermore, that list is written with *so* that the three verbs *embark, get, and have* are properly in parallel.

14.2900 The javelin has a sharp point, which is more obviously dangerous than the discus; moreover, the discus is actually more likely to injure bystanders because, especially when wet, it can slip out of the thrower's hand and fly in a random trajectory.

- javelin has a sharp point, which is more obviously dangerous than the discus; moreover,
- javelin has a sharp point and is obviously more dangerous than the discus; however,
- javelin's sharp point is obviously more dangerous than the discus, even though
- javelin's sharp point makes it obviously more dangerous than the discus, even though

- javelin, with its sharp point, is more obviously dangerous than the discus; however,

This sentence describes a contrast between appearance and reality: the javelin *seems* more dangerous than the discus, because of its physical appearance, but the discus is actually more likely to injure bystanders. The sentence must express this contrast with an appropriate transition. Additionally, the adverb *obviously* must be placed with care: if *obviously* is placed in front of *more dangerous*, then the resulting sentence contradicts itself. The intended meaning is not that the javelin is actually more dangerous, but, rather, that the danger posed by the javelin is more obvious than that posed by the discus; therefore, *obviously* should be placed directly in front of *dangerous*.

(A) The relative pronoun *which* refers to *a sharp point*, thus setting up a comparison between *a sharp point* and *the discus*. This comparison is nonparallel; the sentence should compare the discus with the javelin itself, not with the javelin's point. The connector *moreover*, while acceptable from the standpoint of pure grammar, is illogical, since the following observation does not reinforce the preceding one.

(B) This sentence is self-contradictory: it begins by stating that the javelin is "obviously more dangerous" than the discus, but then describes the discus as more dangerous. Additionally, the connector *and* illogically suggests that the obviousness of the danger posed by the javelin is independent of its having a sharp point.

(C) This version sets up a comparison between *the javelin's sharp point* and *the discus*. This comparison is nonparallel; the sentence should compare the discus with the javelin itself, not with the javelin's point. Also, this sentence is self-contradictory: it begins by stating that the javelin is "obviously more dangerous" than the discus, but then describes the discus as more dangerous.

(D) This sentence is self-contradictory: it begins by stating that the javelin is "obviously more dangerous" than the discus, but then describes the discus as more dangerous. This version also sets up a comparison between *the javelin's sharp point* and *the discus*. This comparison is nonparallel; the sentence should compare the discus with the javelin itself, not with the javelin's point.

(E) CORRECT. This choice places *obviously* in front of *dangerous*, correctly conveying the intended idea that the danger posed by the javelin is more obvious than that posed by the discus. The modifier *with its sharp point* is correctly used to explain why the javelin is so obviously dangerous. Finally, the second clause is introduced by *however*, a transition that correctly indicates the contrast between the two clauses.