

## SOLUTIONS

### Subject Verb Agreement

1.

- The original sentence supplies the plural verb construction “have risen” for the singular subject “price.” Further, the phrase “have risen and will continue to rise” is redundant. Finally, the original sentence uses the plural pronoun “their” to refer to the singular subject “management.”
- (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence.
- (B) This answer corrects the pronoun issue, but suffers from the lack of agreement between the subject “the price” and the verb “have risen.” This answer choice also retains the redundant and wordy construction “have risen and will continue to rise.”
- (C) **CORRECT.** This answer replaces the redundant construction “have risen and will continue to rise” with the more concise “will continue to rise.” This change is possible without any loss of content, since using “will continue to rise” already implies that the price of oil and fuel components has been increasing to date. Further, this modification resolves the subject-verb agreement issue in the original sentence. Finally, this answer choice replaces the plural pronoun “their” with the article “the,” thus remedying the original lack of agreement between the noun “management” and pronoun “their.”
- (D) While supplying the appropriate singular verb “has risen” for the singular subject “the price,” this choice is wordy and retains the incorrect pronoun “their” from the original sentence.
- (E) While resolving the issues of redundancy and subject-verb agreement, this answer uses the plural pronoun “their” to refer to the singular noun “management.”

2.

- The original sentence states that “a higher interest rate is only one of the factors...that keeps...” The clause “that keeps the housing market from spiraling out of control” is describing the word “factors.” Since “factors” is plural noun and “keeps” agrees with singular nouns, we need to find a sentence that replaces “keeps” with “keep”. Also, “like it did earlier in the decade” is incorrect. When comparing clauses (i.e., a phrase containing a subject and a verb), we must use “as” instead of “like.” For example, “She sings like her mother” and “She sings as her mother does” are both correct, but “She sings like her mother does” is not.
- (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence.  
(B) **CORRECT.** This choice remedies the verb agreement issue by using the singular “keep.” It also correctly changes the comparison word from “like” to “as.”  
(C) This subject-verb issue with “keeps” remains.  
(D) The subject-verb issue is remedied, however, the comparison is a faulty one. “Like” is used to compare two nouns and here the second part of the comparison is “earlier in the decade.” The phrase “it did” is needed here to logically complete the comparison, in which case, “as” must be used to draw the comparison.  
(E) The subject-verb issue is remedied, however, the word “as” should be used instead of “like.”

3.

- This sentence correctly matches the singular subject "Daughters of the American Revolution" with the singular verb "admits." Note that the subject is the organization (singular) rather than the many individual "daughters" (plural). "Only" correctly modifies "women who can prove...," indicating that neither men nor women without genealogical ties to an American patriot are admitted as members of the organization.

**(A) CORRECT.** This sentence is correct as written.

(B) This choice incorrectly matches the singular subject "Daughters of the American Revolution" with the plural verb "admit."

(C) In this choice, the adverb "only" has been deleted from the sentence, changing the meaning. The sentence now implies that the organization may admit the people mentioned (women who can prove lineal descent....) as well as other people not mentioned. The original intent of the sentence was to indicate the eligibility requirement for membership.

(D) This choice incorrectly matches the singular subject "Daughters of the American Revolution" with the plural verb "admit."

(E) In this choice, the adverb "only" modifies "from a patriot of the American Revolution," nonsensically indicating that to be eligible for membership in the organization, women can have no ancestors other than a single patriot.

4.

- The primary issue with this question is subject-verb agreement. The subject is "consumption," which is singular (and note that "consumption" is not underlined, so the subject will be singular in the correct answer). Any verbs associated with this subject, therefore, also must be singular. In the original sentence, they are both plural ("trigger" and "cause").
- (A) This choice is incorrect because it repeats the original sentence.
- (B) Although this sentence makes two changes from the original sentence, neither one fixes the subject-verb agreement problem; the singular subject, "consumption," is still paired with two plural verbs, "trigger" and "cause."
- **(C) CORRECT.** This choice correctly pairs the singular subject, "consumption," with two plural verbs, "triggers" and "causes."
- (D) This sentence corrects the first of the two verbs ("triggers") by making it singular to match the singular subject, "consumption," but the second verb ("cause") is still plural.
- (E) This sentence corrects the second of the two verbs ("causes") by making it singular to match the singular subject, "consumption," but the first verb ("trigger") is still plural.

5.

The "government," the singular subject of the underlined clause, requires the singular verb "justifies" and the singular pronoun "its." Additionally, since "medical care and schooling" are examples of services, they should be delineated by "such as" rather than "such like."

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

(B) This choice incorrectly uses the plural pronoun "justifies" to refer to government. Additionally, it is redundant to state "too costly and expensive."

(C) The plural verb "justify" and the plural pronoun "their" incorrectly refer to the singular "government." Also, basic services "like" medical care and schooling is unidiomatic.

(D) The plural verb "justify" incorrectly refers to the singular "government."

Additionally, "too costly and expensive" is redundant, and medical care and schooling are two services rather than "a service."

**(E) CORRECT.** The singular subject "government" is properly accompanied by the singular verb "justifies" and the singular pronoun "its." Furthermore, the phrase "such basic services as medical care and schooling" is idiomatically correct.

6.

The singular subject in the original sentence, "the governor's team," agrees with the singular verb phrase "has not been."

**(A) CORRECT.** This choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.

(B) The subject-verb relationship is incorrect. The singular subject of the sentence, "the governor's team," does not agree with the plural verb phrase "have not been."

(C) The subject-verb relationship is incorrect. The singular subject of the sentence, "the governor's team," does not agree with the plural verb phrase "have not been."

Also, the subject pronoun "she" has no antecedent. The subject pronoun "she" cannot refer back to the possessive noun, "governor's." Only possessive pronouns, such as "her," can refer to possessive nouns. Finally, the phrase "her proposal on controversial education reform" changes the original meaning. This phrasing implies that the education reform is controversial. However, it is clear in the original sentence that it is the governor's proposal that is controversial, not education reform itself.

(D) The subject pronoun "she" has no antecedent. The subject pronoun "she" cannot

refer back to the possessive noun, "governor's." Only possessive pronouns, such as "her," can refer to possessive nouns.

(E) The subject pronoun "she" has no antecedent. The subject pronoun "she" cannot refer back to the possessive noun, "governor's." Only possessive pronouns, such as "her," can refer to possessive nouns. Also, the phrase "her proposal on controversial reform in education" changes the original meaning. This phrasing implies that the education reform is controversial. However, it is clear in the original sentence that it is the governor's proposal that is controversial, not education reform itself. Finally, the phrase "to make comments" is not as concise as the original "for comment."

7.

The original sentence contains several errors. First, it is incorrect to refer to "the amount of car accidents" because "amount of" is used only with uncountable quantities, such as "amount of salt." Since accidents are countable, the correct quantity reference is "the number of car accidents." Second, the original sentence compares "the amount of accidents" to "accidents caused by faulty wiring." The correct (i.e., logically and structurally parallel) comparison is between the number of one type of accident and the number of another type of accident. Third, the present perfect "have been relaxed" is incorrectly used. This action occurred exclusively in the past, so the simple past "were relaxed" is needed.

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

(B) First, it is incorrect to refer to "the amount of car accidents" because "amount of" is used only with uncountable quantities, such as "amount of salt." Since accidents are countable, the correct quantity reference is "the number of car accidents." Second, this choice compares "the amount of accidents" to "accidents caused by faulty wiring." The correct (i.e., logically and structurally parallel) comparison is between the number of one type of accident and the number of another type of accident. Finally, the antecedent of the plural pronoun "those" is ambiguous: it could refer to "car accidents" or "faulty brakes."

(C) The plural verb "have increased" does not agree with the singular subject "the number."

(D) This choice compares "the number of car accidents caused by faulty brakes" to "accidents caused by faulty wiring." The correct (i.e., logically and structurally parallel) comparison is between "the number of car accidents caused by faulty brakes" to "the number of car accidents caused by faulty wiring." Third, the past perfect "had been relaxed" can only be correctly used to indicate that the regulations were relaxed prior to some other action in the past. In this sentence, there is no other past action, so the use of the past perfect tense cannot be justified and the simple past "were relaxed" should be used instead.

**(E) CORRECT.** "The number" is correctly used to refer to car accidents, a countable quantity. Also, a logically and structurally parallel comparison is made between "the number of car accidents caused by faulty brakes" to "the number caused by faulty wiring." Finally, this choice uses the correct simple past "were relaxed."

8.

The original sentence is correct. The plural verb "are" agrees with the plural subject "engravings". The idiom "of interest to" is correct.

**(A) CORRECT.** The original sentence is correct as written.

(B) This is incorrect because it uses "are interests...for" instead of the correct idiom. The placement of "both" is awkward.

(C) The placement of "both" distorts the meaning of the sentence, by making it seem as if there are only two Hogarth engravings. "Are...interesting to" sounds

casual compared to the preferred idiom.

(D) The singular verb "is" fails to agree with the plural subject "engravings".

(E) The singular verb "is" fails to agree with the plural subject "engravings".  
The phrase "interesting for" is unidiomatic.

9.

This sentence discusses characteristics of "the banana," a singular subject. Thus, the plural verb "are" is incorrect. Additionally, the phrase "considered to be" is unidiomatic. In standard written English, "considered" is accompanied by neither a preposition nor a verb. Finally, the relative pronoun "that" makes it seem that a particular banana, rather than bananas in general, contains high levels of potassium.

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

**(B) CORRECT.** This choice correctly uses the singular verb "is" with the singular subject "banana," and correctly uses "considered" without an accompanying preposition or verb. Additionally, the relative pronoun "which" properly introduces a non-restrictive clause that indicates all bananas, rather than one specific banana, contain high levels of potassium.

(C) The plural verb "contain" is incorrectly paired with the singular subject "banana." Additionally, "considered to be" is unidiomatic.

(D) The relative pronoun "which" is incorrectly used to introduce a restrictive clause. Also, the sentence seems to indicate that certain bananas, rather than all bananas, contain high levels of potassium.

(E) This choice incorrectly uses the unidiomatic "considered to be."

10.

First, the subject of the main clause is "the increase in unemployment rates," which is singular. Yet, the verb in the main clause is "are forcing," which is plural. Second, "significantly increased retail prices as well as energy costs" is both awkward and unclear. The logical inference is that the energy costs have increased as well, but this is not clear from the grammar that "significantly increased" modifies "energy costs" in addition to "retail prices." This phrase could also be more elegantly expressed.

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

(B) The subject of the main clause here is "the increase in rates of unemployment," which is singular, but the verb is "have been forcing," which is plural. However, the replacement of "as well as" with "and" is an improvement over the original sentence because it more clearly links "significant increases" and "energy costs."

**(C) CORRECT.** The subject of the main clause is "the increase in unemployment rates" and the corresponding verb is "is forcing," which are both singular. The phrase "coupled with significant increases in both retail prices and energy costs" is elegant and clearly links "significant increases" to "energy costs" through the use of "both."

(D) The subject of the main clause is "the increase in unemployment rates" and the corresponding verb is "is forcing," which are both singular. However, the phrase "coupled with significantly increased retail prices as well as energy costs" is still awkward and unclear.

(E) The subject of the main clause is "the increase in unemployment rates" and the corresponding verb is "had been forcing," which are both singular. However, "had

been forcing" is in the past perfect tense, which requires two past actions, one of which must occur earlier than the other. This is not the case here. Moreover, the correct idiom is "both X and Y" and not "both X as well as Y."

11.

The original sentence supplies the incorrect plural verb "are" to refer to the singular subject "growth."

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

(B) This answer choice uses the unidiomatic construction "numbers of vehicles" rather than the appropriate idiom "the number of vehicles." Furthermore, the plural verb "are" does not agree with the singular subject "growth."

**(C) CORRECT.** This answer choice supplies the correct singular verb "is" to refer to the singular subject "growth." In addition, this choice uses the appropriate idiomatic construction "the number of vehicles."

(D) This answer choice uses the unidiomatic construction "numbers of vehicles" rather than the appropriate idiom "the number of vehicles."

(E) In this answer choice, the plural verb "are" does not agree with the singular subject "growth." Furthermore, the possessive phrase "vehicles' numbers" is awkward and unidiomatic. The appropriate idiom is "the number of vehicles."

12.

The original sentence contains two flaws. First, "what had become known as the Underground Railroad" is incorrectly in the past perfect tense ("had become"). The past perfect is used to describe a past event that occurred before another past event. In this case, however, the "Underground Railroad" did not become known as such (or known as anything at all) until after it was created, and there is no past action that occurs afterward that would justify the use of the past perfect tense. Second, the subject of the sentence is "Harriet Tubman" only; phrases such as "along with," "accompanied by," and "as well as" do not create plural subjects (only "and" allows for the formation of a plural subject). Yet, the verb used in the original sentence is "were," which suggests a plural subject. Instead, the correct verb form "was" is necessary in order to agree with the singular subject "Harriet Tubman."

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

(B) This choice corrects the verb tense by replacing the past perfect with the conditional "would become known" (used to express the future from the point of view of the past: "I said yesterday that I would go to the store today.") However, it does not correct the subject-verb agreement problem (retaining "were").

(C) This choice does not correct the verb tense issue, retaining the incorrect past perfect tense. It does correct the subject-verb agreement by replacing "were" with "was."

(D) This choice uses the incorrect and awkward verb phrase "has been becoming," which incorrectly suggests that the labeling of the Underground Railroad continues to the present day. However, it does correct the subject-verb agreement by replacing "were" with "was."

**(E) CORRECT.** This choice corrects the verb tense by replacing "had become" with "would become." Moreover, it corrects the subject-verb agreement issue by replacing "were" with "was."

13.

The main subject of the sentence, the singular "the number," requires a singular verb to maintain subject-verb agreement. Therefore, the plural "have decreased" is incorrect.

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

(B) The main subject of the sentence, the singular "the number," requires a singular verb to maintain subject-verb agreement. Therefore, the plural "have been reduced" is incorrect. In addition, "been reduced" is a passive verb, implying that some external force acted to reduce the number of telegrams delivered. The active verb "decreased" would be preferable, since it indicates simply that the change occurred.

**(C) CORRECT.** The main verb of the sentence, the singular "has decreased," maintains subject-verb agreement with the singular "the number."

(D) The passive voice "been reduced" implies that some external force acted to reduce the number of telegrams delivered. The more concise active voice "decreased" is preferable, since it indicates simply that the change occurred. The phrase "down to" is redundant of "reduced."

(E) The phrase "down to" is redundant of "decreased."

14.

The original sentence contains a subject-verb agreement issue. The singular noun "analysis" does not agree with the plural verb "provide."

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

**(B) CORRECT.** This choice correctly uses the singular verb "provides" to agree with the singular noun "analysis."

(C) This choice contains incorrect subject-verb agreement. The singular noun "analysis" does not agree with the plural verb "provide." In addition, the singular noun "animal" does not agree with the plural verb "use."

(D) This choice correctly uses the singular verb "provides" to agree with the singular noun "analysis." However, the singular noun "animal" does not agree with the plural verb "use."

(E) This choice contains incorrect subject-verb agreement. The singular noun "analysis" does not agree with the plural verb "provide." Moreover, the use of the phrase "animals, like humans" sets up a comparison between animals and humans. This nonsensically suggests that humans are not a type of animal. Moreover, the comparison distorts the meaning of the sentence by suggesting that *all* animals use a hierarchical structure of communication. In contrast, the use of the phrase "animals other than humans" in the original sentence implies that *some* animals (though not necessarily *all* animals), in addition to humans, use a hierarchical structure of communication.

15.

The original sentence supplies the correct singular verb “is likely” for the singular subject “the number of graduates.” The sentence also employs the concise and idiomatic form “is likely to double.”

**(A) CORRECT.** This answer choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.

(B) This answer choice supplies the incorrect plural verb “are likely” that does not agree with the singular subject “the number of graduates.” Further, this answer choice uses the wordy and unidiomatic construction “to increase by twice” rather than the concise and idiomatic form “to double.”

(C) This answer choice uses the incorrect plural verb “are likely” that does not agree with the singular subject “the number of graduates.”

(D) While the verb construction “will double” is more concise than the original “is likely to double,” this change incorrectly alters the meaning of the sentence by implying that the expected increase in the interest in “a career in financial services” is certain rather than merely “likely,” as stated in the original sentence.

(E) This answer choice employs the wordy and unidiomatic construction “to increase by twice” rather than the concise and idiomatic form “to double.” Further, the verb “will increase” implies that the expected increase in the interest in “a career in financial services” is certain rather than merely “likely,” as stated in the original sentence. This change incorrectly alters the original meaning of the sentence.

16. The subject of the sentence is “one of the most problematic ethnic groups”, a singular noun. The verb, however, is “were,” which is plural. We need to find a choice that uses a singular verb instead.

(A) This choice is the same as the original sentence.

(B) This choice does not correct the subject-verb issue; it still uses “were” to refer to “group.”

(C) This choice uses the singular “was,” but the simple past is not the appropriate tense here because of the ongoing nature of the problem. Moreover, “the reunified Germany’s most problematic ethnic groups” is an awkward construction.

**(D) CORRECT.** This choice uses the singular “has been,” which is also in the present perfect tense, indicating the ongoing nature of the problem. Moreover, “in terms of cultural and economic assimilation” is a more idiomatic and elegant phrasing than that of the original.

(E) This choice does not correct the subject-verb issue; it uses “have been” to refer to “group.”

17.

The original sentence contains an incorrect subject-verb relationship. While it may seem the subject of this sentence is “environmental organizations, homeowners, and small business owners,” the actual subject is the singular “lobbying effort.” Therefore, the plural verb “have” is incorrect.

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

(B) The subject-verb relationship is incorrect. While it may seem the subject of this sentence is “environmental organizations, homeowners, and small business owners,” the actual subject is the singular “lobbying effort.” Therefore, the plural verb “have” is incorrect. Additionally, this choice contains the incorrect idiom “awareness about” instead of “awareness of.” The end of this sentence is unnecessarily wordy: “pending legislation dealing with the environment.” A more concise wording is preferable.



**Awareness of is the right idiom not awareness about.**

(C) While the subject-verb relationship issue is corrected by using the verb “has” to agree in number with the singular subject “lobbying effort,” the incorrect idiom “awareness about” is used instead of “awareness of.”

**(D) CORRECT.** The verb “has” agrees in number with the singular subject “lobbying effort” and the correct form of the idiom, “awareness of,” is used. The end of the sentence, “pending environmental legislation,” is clear and concise.

(E) The end of this choice, “environmental legislation that is still pending,” is unnecessarily wordy.

**18.**

**When describing the similarities between unlike things, the idiom “compare to” is used. When describing the differences between like things, the idiom “compare with” is used.**

In this sentence, differences between two like things, a tropical cyclone systems and subtropical cyclone systems, are discussed. Therefore, the idiom “in comparison with” is the correct choice.

(A) CORRECT. The sentence is correct as written.

(B) The singular verb “has” does not agree with the plural subject “systems.”

(C) The choice moves the phrase “located farther from the center” to a new position, which alters the meaning of the sentence. The original meaning states that the winds are located farther from the center of the storm. This sentence states that the zone is located farther from the winds, which is nonsensical.

(D) “In comparison to” is not the correct idiom to use when describing the differences between like things; the correct idiom is “in comparison with.”

(E) “In comparison to” is not the correct idiom to use when describing the differences between like things; the correct idiom is “in comparison with.” The singular verb “has” does not agree with the plural subject “systems.”

19.

The original sentence contains no errors. The superlative “richest” correctly describes “families.” The verbs “leaves” and “walks” agree with the singular subject, “the patriarch.”

(A) **CORRECT.** This choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.

(B) This choice has a verb error; “leave” and “walk” are plural and do not agree with the singular subject, “the patriarch.”

(C) This choice has a verb error; “walk” is plural and does not agree with the singular subject, “the patriarch.”

(D) This choice has a verb error; “leave” is plural and does not agree with the singular subject, “the patriarch.” Also, this choice incorrectly uses quantity expressions. “Richer” is incorrect, as the comparative form is used when discussing groups of two. “Richest” is correct for groups of three or more.

(E) This choice incorrectly uses quantity expressions. “Richer” is incorrect, as the comparative form is used when discussing groups of two. “Richest” is correct for groups of three or more.

## MODIFIER

1. The modifying phrase “although covered in about 11 inches of snow” at the beginning of this sentence should be followed by the noun the modifier refers to, “the runway.” The original sentence illogically suggests that “aviation officials” were covered in about 11 inches of snow. Additionally, the plural subject “conditions” does not agree with the singular verb “was acceptable.”

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

(B) The modifying phrase “although covered in about 11 inches of snow” at the beginning of this sentence should be followed by the noun the modifier refers to, “the runway.” Note that in the noun phrase “the runway conditions,” the word “runway” acts as an adjective modifying the noun “conditions.”

(C) This choice incorrectly uses the redundant phrase “during the time of” instead of “during.” Further, the placement of “according to aviation officials” makes it unclear whether the officials stated that the runway was “covered in about 11 inches of snow” or that “the runway was in acceptable condition.”

(D) **CORRECT.** The modifying phrase “although covered in about 11 inches of snow” is correctly followed by the noun the modifier refers to, “the runway.” Additionally, the phrase “according to aviation officials” is placed at the end of the sentence, unambiguously referring to the main clause (“the runway was in acceptable condition”).

(E) The modifying phrase “although covered in about 11 inches of snow” at the beginning of this sentence should be followed by the noun the modifier refers to, “the runway.”

2. The original sentence contains a misplaced modifier. The modifying phrase “Discouraged by new data that show increases in toxic emissions from domestic factories” is meant to modify the noun “shareholders.” Therefore, “shareholders” should be placed directly after “factories.” Instead, it seems that the “searches” are “Discouraged by new data,” which is not logical. Additionally, the passive construction “are being conducted by” is unnecessarily wordy.

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

(B) The modifying phrase “Discouraged by new data that show increases in toxic emissions from domestic factories” is meant to modify the noun “shareholders.” Therefore, “shareholders” should be placed directly after “factories.” Instead, it seems that the “searches” are “Discouraged by new data,” which is not logical. Also, the passive construction “are being conducted by” is unnecessarily wordy. Finally, the placement of “who are looking for alternative investment opportunities” after “companies” makes it seem that the “companies” are “searching for alternative investment opportunities.” According to the original sentence, the “shareholders” are looking for these “opportunities,” not the “companies.”

(C) While the misplaced modifier issue is corrected by placing “shareholders” adjacent to the modifying phrase, the past perfect form of the verb, “had begun,” is used unnecessarily. In fact, the use of “had begun” implies that the “shareholders” had begun searching for new investment opportunities before the discouraging data were released. This is not the intended meaning of the sentence. Also, “investment opportunities outside of the manufacturing industry” is wordy when compared with “alternative investment opportunities.”

(D) The placement of “the nation’s leading manufacturing companies” adjacent to the modifying phrase makes it seem that these companies are “Discouraged by new data,” which changes the meaning of the sentence. The original meaning is further compromised by “companies are searching.” The “shareholders” are searching for new opportunities, not the companies.

**(E) CORRECT.** The misplaced modifier issue is corrected by placing “shareholders” adjacent to the modifying phrase. It is clear that the “shareholders” are “searching,” and not the companies. The active voice “are searching” replaces the wordy passive construction “searches. . . are being conducted by.” Finally, the phrase “alternative investment opportunities” is clear and concise.

3. The original sentence incorrectly separates the modifier “Found in the wild only in Australia and New Guinea” from the noun described by this modifier, “kangaroos,” thus illogically suggesting that “powerful legs” rather than “kangaroos” “are found in the wild.” Modifiers should always be placed immediately next to the nouns that they describe.
- (A) This answer choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence.
- (B) The answer choice incorrectly separates the modifier “Found in the wild only in Australia and New Guinea” from the noun described by this modifier, “kangaroos,” thus illogically suggesting that “powerful legs” rather than “kangaroos” “are found in the wild.” In addition, the construction “mammals that are large” is unnecessarily wordy; a simpler and more concise form, “large mammals” would be preferred.
- (C) The answer choice incorrectly separates the modifier “Found in the wild only in Australia and New Guinea” from the noun described by this modifier, “kangaroos,” thus illogically suggesting that “powerful legs” rather than “kangaroos” “are found in the wild.” In addition, by introducing the relative pronoun “those” that refers to “powerful legs,” this answer choice illogically attempts to draw a comparison between “kangaroos” and “legs” of other animals, rather than the animals themselves.
- (D) CORRECT.** This answer choice correctly places the appropriate noun “kangaroos” immediately after the modifier “Found in the wild only in Australia and New Guinea.” In addition, this answer choice is clear, concise, and free of

the redundancies present in other answers.

(E) While this answer choice remedies the original problem with the modifier, it uses the awkward and wordy verb construction “being distinguished” rather than the more concise and direct verb “distinguished.” Furthermore, the construction “mammals that are large” is unnecessarily wordy; a simpler and more concise form “large mammals” would be preferred.

4.

The original sentence begins with a modifier “Responding to growing demand for high-end vehicles,” but this modifier has no logical subject within the main clause. The subject of the sentence should be the people or organizations that respond to this growing demand.

Moreover, the pronoun “they” is ambiguous, as it could grammatically refer either to the interiors or to the models. We know that the intended antecedent of “they” is the *cars*, so we need to find a choice that makes this intention clear. Finally, the modifier “that are so luxurious” should be placed immediately after “interiors,” not “models”; otherwise, an alternative phrasing without this modifier should be found.

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

(B) The choice repeats the original modifier error: the subject of the modifier is not present in the sentence.

(C) This choice repeats the original pronoun error: “they” is ambiguous and could refer to either interiors or models. Also, the modifier “that are so luxurious” is placed incorrectly.

(D) This choice repeats both the original modifier error and the original pronoun error. Also, “interior” should be plural.

**(E) CORRECT.** This choice correctly introduces “auto makers” as the subject of the sentence and also corrects the pronoun error by replacing “they” with “these cars.” Note that the use of the synonym “cars” avoids both the awkward repetition of “models” and the ambiguity of the pronoun “they.”

5.

This sentence begins with a modifier, yet leaves absent who will be applying optimization techniques (This is termed a “dangling” modifier.) Also, the sentence is unnecessarily wordy in its use of the phrases “ought to” and “in both the short and long terms.”

(A) This choice incorrectly repeats the original sentence.

**(B) CORRECT.** The sentence correctly places “a company’s managers” adjacent to the modifier such that the meaning is clear, and the sentence is otherwise concise.

(C) This answer does not correct the original modifier error. It also weakens the sentence by replacing the active voice with the passive voice in its use of “can be determined by company managers.” The sentence’s concluding use of “goals, both short and long term” is awkward.

(D) This answer does not correct the original modifier error. In this choice, the phrase “may be possible” is unnecessary and weakens the sentence. This choice also incorrectly uses the word “these,” as the products have not been referenced earlier in the sentence.

(E) This sentence resolves the modifier issue, but incorrectly uses the word “these,”

as the products have not been referenced earlier in the sentence. This choice is also wordy in its use of "ought to" and "in both the short and long term."

6.

The original sentence contains several errors. First, the opening modifier "given its authoritative coverage of other science topics" describes the textbook as a whole, yet the subject of the main clause is "the textbook's chapter on genetics." **Second, the relative pronoun "which" is used here to modify the entire clause "the textbook's chapter on genetics is surprisingly tentative." "Which" must modify the immediately preceding noun only; it cannot modify the action of an entire clause, as it does here.**

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

(B) The modifier issue is not corrected here, since "the chapter" remains the subject of the main clause (as opposed to "the textbook"). However, this choice does correct the misuse of "which" by replacing it with "leading."

(C) The modifier issue is corrected here by making "the textbook" the subject of the main clause. However, the misuse of "which" is retained. The relative pronoun "which" is used here to modify the entire clause "the textbook's chapter on genetics is surprisingly tentative." "Which" must modify the immediately preceding noun only; it cannot modify the action of an entire clause, as it does here.

**Also, the phrase "surprising and tentative" implies that the chapter on genetics is both "surprising" and "tentative," two characteristics that are independent of one another. However, it is clear in the original sentence that "surprisingly" is meant to be an adverb that modifies the adjective "tentative." The chapter is "surprisingly tentative," not "surprising and tentative."**

(D) The modifier issue is not corrected here, since "the textbook's chapter" is the subject of the main clause (as opposed to "the textbook").

**Moreover, the verb "leads" is incorrectly parallel with "is" when it should be subordinate (e.g., "leading"). This makes it less clear that doubting the author's scholarship is a result of the tentativeness of the chapter on genetics.**

**(E) CORRECT.** The modifier issue is corrected here by making "the textbook" the subject of the main clause. Moreover, "which" is replaced by "leading," thus eliminating the incorrect use of "which" while preserving the meaning of the sentence.

7.

- This original sentence is correct as written. The word "fossils" is correctly placed as the subject of the opening modifier "hailed as a key discovery in the science of evolution." Also, the plural noun "fossils" agrees with the plural verb "provide."

**(A) CORRECT.** This choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.

- (B) In this choice, "a large scaly creature" is incorrectly placed as the subject of the opening modifier "hailed as a key discovery in the science of evolution." The fossils of the creature – not the creature itself – were discovered. Moreover, the phrase "a large scaly creature . . . provides fossils that are a possible link" distorts the meaning of the sentence by nonsensically suggesting

that the creature "provides" its fossils; in fact the fossils were simply discovered by scientists.

(C) In this choice, "a large scaly creature" is incorrectly placed as the subject of the opening modifier "hailed as a key discovery in the science of evolution."

The fossils of the creature – not the creature itself – were discovered.

- (D) This choice correctly places the word "fossils" as the subject of the opening modifier "hailed as a key discovery in the science of evolution." However, this choice incorrectly employs the singular verb "provides," which does not agree with the plural noun "fossils."

(E) This choice subtly changes the meaning of the original sentence. The use of the word "and" in the phrase "the fossils resemble . . . and provide" creates two distinct points: first, that the fossils resemble  $x$ , and, second, that the fossils provide  $y$ . In contrast, in the original phrase "the fossils of a large scaly creature resembling both a fish and a land-animal provide evidence of . . .," the focus is clearly on how the fossils provide evidence. The modifying phrase "resembling both a fish and a land-animal" demonstrates how the fossils provide that evidence – it is not intended as a separate, unrelated point.

8.

The modifying phrase "hoping to alleviate some of the financial burdens..." begins this sentence and should be followed immediately by the noun the modifier refers to, "the county government." However, the original sentence illogically suggests that "property taxes" were hoping to alleviate the financial burdens. Additionally, the phrase "raised by an eleven percent increase" contains a redundancy; either "raised by eleven percent" or "increased by eleven percent" would be more concise and correct. Finally, the passive construction "property taxes...were raised...by the county government" is wordier than the preferred active construction "the county government...raised...property taxes."

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

(B) The modifying phrase "hoping to alleviate..." should be followed immediately by the noun the modifier refers to, "the county government." However, this choice illogically suggests that "property taxes" were hoping to alleviate the financial burdens. Also, the passive construction "property taxes...were raised...by the county government" is wordier than the preferred active construction "the county government...raised...property taxes."

(C) The phrase "raised...by an eleven percent increase" contains a redundancy; either "raised by eleven percent" or "increased by eleven percent" would be more concise and correct.

(D) The phrase "last year raised by eleven percent property taxes" is awkward, since "property taxes," the object, do not immediately follow the verb "raised." The meaning would be clearer if it were phrased "raised property taxes by eleven percent last year."

**(E) CORRECT.** This choice is the most concise and correct. "The county government" correctly follows the modifying phrase "hoping to alleviate..." The concise phrase "raised...by eleven percent" is used. Finally, the active construction "the county

government...raised...property taxes” replaces the wordier passive construction “property taxes...were raised...by the county government.”

9. The sentence begins with the modifier “In order to properly evaluate a patient’s state of mind and gain informed consent prior to surgery.” This modifier logically should apply to the modified noun “the operating physician,” as it is the operating physician who must evaluate a patient’s state of mind and gain informed consent. In other words, “in order to do X” most properly expresses the intention of the subject of the sentence, and so the subject should be “the operating physician.” The original sentence is incorrect, as the modifier is incorrectly followed by “a substantial period of time” as opposed to “the operating physician.”

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

(B) In this sentence, the modifier is followed by the compound subject “the operating physician and the patient.” This choice incorrectly suggests that it is both the operating physician and the patient that must evaluate the patient’s state of mind and gain informed consent, as opposed to the physician alone. Also, the final phrase in the sentence, “thus ensuring full awareness...” does not clarify exactly *whose* full awareness is ensured (the awareness must clearly be the *patient’s*).

(C) This choice places “the patient” immediately after the initial modifier, illogically and incorrectly suggesting that the patient him or herself will evaluate the patient’s state of mind. In addition, the pronouns “he or she” are ambiguous; they could refer to the patient or to the physician.

**(D) CORRECT.** This choice places the proper subject, “the operating physician,” adjacent to the opening modifier. Additionally, it is 100% clear that the *patient* is to be made fully aware of the pros and cons of undergoing the surgical procedure.

(E) This choice correctly uses “the operating physician” as the subject of the sentence, resolving the modifier issue. However, the pronouns “he or she” incorrectly refer to “the operating physician,” suggesting that it is the physician, rather than the patient, who must be made fully aware of the pros and cons of undergoing the surgical procedure.

10.

In the original sentence, the modifier “whose eyes and noses are peaking out...” incorrectly refers to “shallows.” When used to introduce a noun modifier, “whose” always refers to the immediately preceding noun. In this case, the author intends to refer to the “crocodiles,” not the “shallows.”

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

(B) The modifier “whose eyes and noses peak out...” incorrectly refers to “shallows.” When used to introduce a noun modifier, “whose” always refers to the immediately preceding noun. In this case, the author intends to refer to the “crocodiles,” not the “shallows.” Further, the past tense “encountered” is inconsistent with the present tense “participate.” When there is no compelling reason to change tenses, consistency is preferred. Also, the past tense “encountered” seems to imply that these encounters have already happened. However, it is clear from the original

sentence that the encounters are ongoing occurrences for “vacationers who participate in guided boat tours.”

(C) The modifier “whose eyes and noses peak out...” incorrectly refers to “shallows.” When used to introduce a noun modifier, “whose” always refers to the immediately preceding noun. In this case, the author intends to refer to the “crocodiles,” not the “shallows.” Further, the past perfect “had encountered” is used incorrectly. The past perfect tense should only be used to specify the first of two past events. Here, there are no past events.

**(D) CORRECT.** The adverbial modifier “with eyes and noses peaking out” correctly modifies the verb “lurking.” **As this example shows, adverbial modifiers do not need to be placed adjacent to the verbs they modify.** Further, the present tense “encounter” is consistent with the present tense “participate.”

(E) While the adverbial modifier “with eyes and noses that are peaking out” correctly modifies the verb “lurking,” this phrasing is unnecessarily wordy. The more concise “with eyes and noses peaking out” is preferred.

11.

The original sentence begins with a modifier (“Before its independence”) that clearly describes India, though the subject of the main clause is Britain. Moreover, “ruled India as a colony” is wordy and the verb “ruled” is in the simple past when it would be better in the past perfect (two past actions, one of which was earlier). Finally, “they” has no grammatical antecedent and “would” is not a proper tense here (the simple past is required).

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

(B) Britain should not be the recipient of the modifier “Before its independence.”

(C) The pronoun “they” has no logical antecedent. Logically it probably refers to the British, but the British do not appear in the sentence. Also the past perfect tense would have been preferable here (had been ruled) since the ruling occurred before the relinquishing of the power.

(D) The phrase “ruled as a colony by Britain” is awkward and unclear. The placement of the modifier “by Britain” makes it unclear that the ruling is being done by Britain.

**(E) CORRECT.** This correctly places India as the recipient of the opening modifier. The past perfect is utilized to indicate that different times in the past. Notice that the word “ruled” has been removed from this answer choice, however, this did not result in a change of meaning. To be a colony of the British is to be ruled by the British. The exclusion of the pronoun “its” in the beginning of the sentence (see answer choices A and C) is incidental. **The sentence would have been correct with the pronoun “its” as well.**

12.



The original sentence uses the introductory adjective modifier “used until the end of the Second World War”; The U-boat, the subject of the modifier, should immediately follow the modifying phrase. Additionally, the expression “both military or civilian” is unidiomatic; the correct idiom is “both military and civilian.”

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

**(B) CORRECT.** The noun “U-boat” properly functions as the subject of the modifying phrase. Additionally, the idiomatic “both military and civilian” is properly used at the end of the sentence.

(C) This choice changes the intended meaning of the original sentence to one that is nonsensical. The U-boat, a boat, cannot “employ the German army” to do anything. Furthermore, the “both military or civilian” construction is unidiomatic.

(D) This choice incorrectly uses “the German army” as the subject of the introductory phrase. Additionally, this choice creates a verb tense error by unnecessarily switching to the past perfect “had employed” and a parallelism error by using the “**both military and the civilian**” construction.

(E) This choice uses the present perfect tense “has been employed,” incorrectly indicating that U-boats are still used by the German army. Furthermore, the “both military and also civilian” is unidiomatic.

13.

The original sentence begins with an opening modifier that correctly modifies the nationwide admission of students.

**(A) CORRECT.** This choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.

(B) The use of the initial modifier in this choice is correct. However, the adjective “nationwide” is incorrectly applied to students, when it is meant to apply to the admission process.

(C) Here, the modifier is adjacent to the subject “colleges and universities,” incorrectly suggesting that colleges and universities are taken for granted as opposed to the admission process.

(D) This sentence incorrectly uses the pronoun “them” to refer to the “admission” which is a singular subject. The use of the pronoun “their” is also unclear as the antecedent could be construed to be “colleges and universities” as opposed to the intended antecedent, “students.”

(E) Using the word “and” at the end of the underline makes the meaning of this sentence less clear by failing to draw an appropriate contrast between the current state of taking the nationwide admission of students for granted and the fact that it is a relatively recent phenomenon. A more appropriate word choice would be “but”: “Most people now take for granted..., *but* it is a relatively recent phenomenon.”

14.

The original sentence is correct. “Famous because of ‘The Godfather’” and “near to those he most trusted” correctly modify “a town,” which modifies Corleone. Noun modifiers must be next to the nouns that they describe. This choice contains no other errors.

- (A) **CORRECT.** This answer choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.
- (B) This choice contains a modification error; "famous because of 'The Godfather'" incorrectly describes the prosecutor. Noun modifiers modify the closest available noun.
- (C) This choice contains a modification error; "famous because of 'The Godfather'" incorrectly describes the mobster. Noun modifiers modify the closest available noun.
- (D) This choice contains a modification error; "near to those he most trusted" incorrectly describes the prosecutor. Noun modifiers modify the closest available noun.
- (E) The modification is correct in this choice. "Famous because of 'The Godfather'" correctly modifies "Corleone". However, this sentence is unnecessarily wordy, "was the town that the ailing mobster came to take refuge in" is much less concise than "the ailing mobster came to take refuge in Corleone" without making the meaning clearer.

15.

The original sentence is correct. The modifiers "Herman Melville" and "Walt Whitman" are restrictive – they are necessary to restrict the scope of the words "author" and "poet" respectively – and hence the use of comma pairs to set off the modifiers is not appropriate here. In addition, the context of the sentence implies that the men continue to be icons of American literature since they are beloved by generations both past and present; hence the use of the present tense "are" is appropriate.

**(A) CORRECT.** The original sentence is correct as written.

(B) The modifiers "the author" and "the poet" for "Herman Melville" and "Walt Whitman" respectively are non-restrictive – they are not necessary to identify the subjects and only serve to add information – and hence should be set off with comma pairs (e.g., "Herman Melville, the author, and Walt Whitman, the poet, ....")

(C) The phrases "The author named Herman Melville" and "the poet named Walt Whitman" are unnecessarily wordy. In addition, an icon of something has implied greatness; hence, the phrase "great icon" is redundant.

(D) The restrictive modifiers "Herman Melville" and "Walt Whitman" are improperly set off by comma pairs.

(E). The modifiers "the author" and "the poet" are non-restrictive and properly set off with comma pairs. The tense of the verb "had been" is not appropriate since it is implied by the context of this sentence that the men continue to be icons of American literature.

16.

This sentence tests two modifiers. First, "only" correctly modifies "when" Rousseau believed "man is good." Second, "that" is incorrectly used to introduce a non-essential modifier. "That" is used only with essential modifiers and is not separated from the rest of the sentence by a comma. "Which" is used when introducing non-essential modifiers and these modifiers are separated from the rest of the sentence by a comma.

- (A) The sentence is incorrect because it repeats the original answer.
- (B) The new placement of the adverb "only" unacceptably changes the meaning of the sentence. The original sentence indicated the "only" circumstance in which "man is good." This answer choice, however, indicates that man is the "only" good creature in a certain circumstance. In addition, "that" should only be used to introduce essential modifiers that are not separated from the rest of the sentence by a comma. "Which" is required in this case.
- (C) The new placement of the adverb "only" unacceptably changes the meaning of the sentence. The original sentence indicated the "only" circumstance in which "man is good." This answer choice, however, indicates the "only" circumstance in which "man is corrupted." In addition, "that" should only be used to introduce essential modifiers that are not separated from the rest of the sentence by a comma. "Which" is required in this case.
- (D) This answer corrects the second modifier by changing "that" to "which," the appropriate start to a non-essential modifier. However, the new placement of the adverb "only" unacceptably changes the meaning of the sentence. The original sentence indicated the "only" circumstance in which "man is good."

This answer choice, however, indicates that man is the "only" good creature in a certain circumstance.

- **(E) CORRECT.** This choice keeps the original (and correct) placement of the adverb "only" and also corrects the "that vs. which" modifier mistake by replacing "that" with "which," the appropriate relative pronoun to employ to start a non-essential modifier.

17.

The opening clause "though the language of *Beowulf* is practically incomprehensible to contemporary readers," correctly modifies the main clause "careful linguistic analysis reveals a multitude of similarities to modern English." Moreover, all verbs are in the correct tenses and all nouns are properly modified. There are no errors in the original sentence.

- **(A) CORRECT.** This choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.
- (B) This choice begins with the unidiomatic "despite that it."
- **"Despite" must be followed by either a noun ("despite extreme hunger...") or a verb ("despite having been fired..."). It cannot be followed by a relative pronoun ("despite that...").**
- Moreover, the opening clause seems to modify "careful linguistic analysis," which is the subject of the main clause, creating an illogical meaning (that the analysis is incomprehensible to contemporary readers).
- (C) "Though being practically incomprehensible" is wordy; "being" is unnecessary here. Moreover, the main clause seems to imply that "the language of *Beowulf*" performed the "careful linguistic analysis," thus creating an illogical meaning.
- (D) "Though *Beowulf* has a language that is practically incomprehensible" is wordy. The original "though the language of *Beowulf* is practically incomprehensible" is more concise. Moreover, "a multitude of similarities are revealed to modern English" seems to imply that the "similarities" were revealed to "modern English" when the correct meaning is that that "similarities to modern English" were revealed.
- (E) "*Beowulf* reveals through careful linguistic analysis" illogically implies that *Beowulf* carried out the analysis.

18.

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 long modifier that describes what some of those scientists have attempted to do. Modifiers describing nouns must be adjacent to the nouns that they describe.

- **(A) CORRECT.** This choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.
- (B) This choice incorrectly shortens the modifier that describes fusion to "the heat and light produced by the sun." This distorts the meaning of the sentence by incorrectly stating that fusion is the "heat and light" produced by the sun. In fact, fusion is the "process" used by the sun to produce heat and light; fusion is not the "heat and light" itself. This is made clear by the use of the word "process" in the non-underlined portion of the sentence in the phrase "to mimic the process in their laboratories."
- (C) This choice describes fusion as "the process through which heat and light are produced by the sun." The use of the doubly passive construction "through which . . . are produced by" produces an unnecessarily wordy modifier.

Though a passive construction may be correct, a more active construction is preferable if it is provided.

- (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 immediately adjacent to the noun that it modifies ("scientists"). However, in this choice this modifier is incorrectly placed adjacent to "heat and light."
- (E) 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" (unlike "whom") does not need to be placed immediately adjacent to its antecedent ("Scientists have studied . . . and some of them have attempted . . .").

19.

This sentence has poor parallelism, due to the placement of the word "crops." It seems to indicate that there were three types of crops (grape, celery and chili pepper) that had been destroyed, but that sugar beet and walnut had been destroyed entirely, rather than just the crops of those plants.

- Pests had destroyed grape, celery, chili pepper crops, sugar beet and walnut in the region, but in the 1880s, more effective pest-control methods saved the citrus industry.  
(A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. **OK.**
- Pests had destroyed grape, celery, chili pepper, sugar beet and walnut crops in the region, but in the 1880s, more effective pest-control methods saved the citrus industry.
- **(B) CORRECT.** The word "crop" is placed correctly after the list of crop types. The modifier "in the 1880s" correctly modifies the last phrase in the sentence, indicating only that the citrus industry was saved in the 1880s. By using the past perfect "had destroyed," this sentence indicates that the other crops had been destroyed at some time prior to the 1880s. The later past event uses the simple past tense, whereas the earlier past event uses the past perfect tense. This time line of events matches the meaning in the original sentence.
- Pests had destroyed grape, celery, chili pepper, sugar beet and walnut crops in the region, but more effective pest-control methods **that** were introduced in the 1880s saved the citrus industry.
- **The citrus industry was saved in the 1880s. As per the sentence above, we know that the methods were introduced in the 1880's but have no idea when the citrus industry was saved.**
- (C) The modifying phrase "that were introduced in the 1880s" refers to the "methods" immediately preceding the phrase. This alters the meaning of the sentence, since "in the 1880s" no longer modifies "saved the citrus industry." The simple past tense indicates "saved" happened sometime in the past, but not necessarily in that particular decade.

**The modifier uses the relative pronoun "that," but "that" should only introduce essential modifiers. "Which" is a better choice here, since the modifying phrase is non-essential.**

- In the 1880s, pests destroyed grape, celery, chili pepper, sugar beet and walnut crops in the region **and** more effective pest-control methods saved the citrus industry.
- (D) The placement of the modifier “In the 1880s” and the use of two simple past verbs “destroyed” and “saved,” indicate that both occurred in that decade. The original sentence indicates only that the citrus industry was saved in the 1880s, and by using the past perfect “had destroyed” indicates that the other crops had been destroyed at some time prior to the 1880s. The original sentence used the word “but” to indicate a contrast, yet this sentence alters the meaning by using “and” instead.
- In the 1880s, more effective pest-control methods saved the citrus industry from what was destroying grape, celery, chili pepper, sugar beet and walnut crops in the region.
- (E) The use of the phrase “what was destroying” is an awkward way to refer to “pests.” Also, the placement of the modifier “In the 1880s” and the use of the past progressive “was destroying” indicates that the destruction was ongoing in that decade. The original sentence indicates only that the citrus industry was saved in the 1880s, and by using the past perfect “had destroyed” indicates that the other crops had been destroyed at some time prior to the 1880s.

20.

In the original sentence, “was” does not need to be repeated after “nor.” Moreover, “having been won over...” incorrectly modifies “classical guitar” (the subject of the preceding clause) instead of Segovia.

- (A) This choice is the same as the original sentence.
- (B) This choice does not correct the modifier issue.
- **(C) CORRECT.** This choice corrects the “nor” issue as well as the modifier issue. Now it is clear that it was Segovia who was won over by the instrument’s sound.
- (D) This choice is incorrect because the phrase “classical guitar did not have prestige nor was it performed...” is both unidiomatic (“not ... nor” is incorrect) and unparallel (“did not have....nor was it performed”).
- (E) This choice is incorrect because it repeats “was” after “nor” and because it implies that Segovia was won over by the sound of the instrument in the mid-twentieth century, while the original sentence makes clear that this happened at some earlier point.

21.

The original sentence suggests that Feynman’s introduction covered “physics designed for undergraduate students.” This is nonsensical; rather the *course* is designed for undergraduate students and covers the general topic of physics.

- (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence.
- (B) Beginning the sentence with “for undergraduate students” is awkward and unclear. The verb phrase “being a comprehensive introduction...” following the comma seems illogically to modify “the physicist Richard Feynman.” With the use of the unnecessary “being,” this creates the awkward suggestion that “the physicist” was “a comprehensive introduction.” (Remember that “being” is almost always wrong on the GMAT.)
- (C) The sentence’s meaning is unclear due to the use of many prepositional phrases with no punctuation: “In a two-year course” followed by “by the physicist

Richard Feynman" and later, "to undergraduate students" and "to modern physics." Also, the subject of this passive sentence is "a comprehensive introduction." It would make more sense for Feynman to be the subject, since he was actively doing something: "presenting." Finally, the use of "presenting" with the passive construction introduces a verb tense error; Feynman is not currently "presenting" the course, rather, the course was presented by Feynman.

(D) The use of both "introduction" and "introduced" is redundant: it suggests that Feynman "introduced a comprehensive introduction."

**(E) CORRECT.** The placement of the prepositional phrase "in a two-year course designed for undergraduate students" at the beginning of the sentence clarifies the meaning: a physics course was designed for the students. The construction of the rest of the sentence is straightforward: the subject (the person doing the action) "the physicist Richard Feynman," the verb (what he actually did) "presented," and the object (what he presented) "a comprehensive introduction to modern physics."

22.

The original sentence begins with a misplaced modifier. It is the domestic cat that descended from the wildcat. We need to find a choice that expresses this correctly.

- (A) This choice is the same as the original sentence.
- (B) The original modifier issue has been corrected. However, the phrase "which is an exceedingly short time" has no referent ("4,000 years ago" is not a time span but a specific moment).
- (C) The original modifier issue has been corrected. However, the phrase "has been scarcely sufficient..." incorrectly refers to the domestic cat.
- (D) The original modifier issue has been corrected. However, the phrase "that has scarcely been sufficient..." incorrectly modifies "genetic evolution". Also "the marked physical changes that transformed the animal" is redundant. Compare to E: "the marked physical changes in the animal," a much tighter way of conveying the same information.
- **(E) CORRECT.** This choice correctly rearranges the opening modifier to place the words "the domestic cat" immediately next to the modifier "descended from the African wildcat."

## Parallelism

1.

The list of creators, "by a professional writer, a blogger, and by individual users" violates the principle of parallelism in two ways. First, while "a professional writer" and "a blogger" are singular, the third element in the list, "individual users," is plural. Second, the word "by" introduces the first and third elements in the list ("by a professional writer . . . by individual users") but not the second element in the list ("a blogger"). To create a parallel sentence, the word "by" should introduce the entire list and should not be repeated. In addition to the parallelism problem, the subject of the underlined portion is the singular "market" which does not agree with the plural verb phrase "are expanding."

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

(B) This choice fails to resolve the subject-verb agreement issue, as the singular "market" does not agree with the plural verb phrase "are expanding." In addition, this

choice fails to maintain parallel structure because the word "by" introduces the first and third elements in the list of creators ("by professional writers . . . by individual users") but not the second element ("bloggers"). To create a parallel sentence, the word "by" should introduce the entire list and should not be repeated.

(C) This choice has proper subject-verb agreement since the singular "market" agrees with the singular verb phrase "is expanding." However, the list of 3 types of creators is not written in parallel form. While "a professional writer" and "a blogger" are singular, the third element in the list, "individual users," is plural.

(D) The phrase "created by professional writers, bloggers, and individual users" lists elements in parallel form. However, this choice fails to resolve the subject-verb agreement issue, as the singular "market" does not agree with the plural verb phrase "are expanding."

**(E) CORRECT.** The phrase "created by professional writers, bloggers, and individual users" lists elements in parallel form. Each element in the list is plural and the entire list is introduced by the word "by" which is correctly not repeated. In addition, the singular subject "market" agrees with the singular verb phrase "is expanding."

## 2.

This sentence contains three parallel elements: "the unusual confluence," "an unpredictable backdrop," and "the camaraderie." Additionally, the introductory modifying phrase "originally developed by ancient Hawaiians" correctly modifies the noun "surfing."

**(A) CORRECT.** This choice properly follows rules of parallel construction and uses the introductory phrase to correctly modify the noun "surfing."

(B) The introductory modifying phrase "originally developed by ancient Hawaiians" incorrectly describes "surfing's appeal" rather than surfing itself. Additionally, the pronoun "its" has no clear antecedent to refer to.

(C) The introductory modifying phrase "originally developed by ancient Hawaiians" incorrectly describes "surfing's appeal" rather than surfing itself. Furthermore, the third element of the sentence, "developing camaraderie among people," is not parallel to the other two elements.

(D) This choice lacks clarity of meaning by stating "a backdrop that is unpredictable and that is, by turns, gracefully and serenely violent and formidable." The original intent of the sentence is to use the adjectives graceful, serene, violent, and formidable to describe surfing's "unpredictable backdrop"; this choice improperly separates this into two distinct ideas. Additionally, this choice incorrectly changes the adjectives "graceful" and "serene" to adverbs "gracefully" and "serenely"; thus, the adverbs incorrectly modify the adjectives "violent" and "formidable" rather than the noun "backdrop."

(E) The plural pronoun "their" incorrectly refers to the plural noun "people," making it seem that people, rather than surfing, contain the three parallel elements found in the sentence.

## 3.

The original is correct. The equivalent elements, "that growth had accelerated..." and "that the policy makers remain..." are parallel clauses beginning with "that." The verb tenses are also correct; the action that occurred in the most distant past ("had picked up pace") uses the past perfect; the later past event ("statement also said") uses the simple past. Also, "few" is correct, since it modifies the quantifiable noun "signs."

**(A) CORRECT.** This choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.



(B) This choice is not parallel; "that" is required before "growth had accelerated..." to make it parallel to "that the policy makers remain..."

(C) This choice is not parallel; "that growth had accelerated..." is not parallel to "the policy makers remain..." Moreover, "little" is incorrect; since "signs" are countable, "few" is required.

(D) This choice is parallel, but the syntax is incorrect. **"That" can be colloquially omitted after the verb "said," but not in formal writing.** Also, "little" should be replaced by "few."

(E) This choice is parallel, but incorrectly uses the simple past, "accelerated." This action is the earlier past event, as it must have occurred before the Fed commented on the trend. The earlier of multiple past events must use the past perfect.

4.

The original sentence begins with a simple present tense statement, "clean teams can protect sensitive data" that is followed by three verb phrases that are logically parallel in the sentence, and so should be structurally parallel as well. The sentence maintains a parallel construction, using the "-ing" form of each verb (assessing, helping, supporting). Finally, the sentence is clear and concise.

**(A) CORRECT.** The first choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.

(B) This sentence unnecessarily introduces the connecting phrases "while also" and "as well as"; these phrases are wordy, not grammatically required, and do not improve the clarity of the sentence. The concluding phrase "to support the negotiations" is not parallel with the earlier verb phrases, and incorrectly uses the article "the," which is unclear given that negotiations were not referenced earlier.

**(C) The conjunction "and" joins the first verb phrase with the original statement, which changes the original meaning of the sentence; the correct "while" indicating that the teams can protect sensitive data even while using it.**

The first and second verb phrases use the simple present tense ("assess" and "help"). However, the last phrase "and supporting relevant negotiations" completely breaks the parallelism and is thus incorrect. Also, this choice is unnecessarily wordy in two ways: It uses the phrase "the rationale of a deal from a business perspective" as opposed to "business rationale" in earlier choices, and it introduces the word "relevant" which adds no meaning, as clearly only relevant negotiations are to be supported.

(D) The second verb phrase, "help to develop a business plan of integration" is structurally not parallel to the equivalent phrases that begin with "facilitating" and "supporting." Also, that phrase is wordier without making the meaning clearer. In addition, this choice incorrectly uses the article "the," which is unclear given that negotiations were not referenced earlier. Finally, this choice is unnecessarily wordy in its use of "facilitating the assessment" in place of simply "assessing."

(E) Here, "helping to develop an integrated plan for the business" is not parallel to "assist" and "support," as it must be. Also, the first verb phrase is awkward in its use of "assist the assessment" and "the deal's business rationale" where no particular deal is being discussed.

5.

The original sentence contains several errors. First, the construction "X rather than Y" requires parallelism between X and Y, but the original sentence pairs an active verb ("accept") with a passive one ("was sent"). Second, the use of "if" in this context is incorrect. On the GMAT, "if" is used only to introduce conditional clauses (e.g. "if X, then Y"). Here, "whether" should be used instead of "if" to indicate uncertainty about reaching India by traveling west.

(A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence.  
(B) The construction "X rather than Y" requires parallelism between X and Y, but this choice pairs an active verb ("accepting") with a passive one ("was sent"). Second, the use of "if" in this context is incorrect. On the GMAT, "if" is used only to introduce conditional clauses (e.g. "if X, then Y"). Here, "whether" should be used instead of "if" to indicate uncertainty about reaching India by traveling west.

**(C) This choice begins with "instead of," which is incorrectly used to compare the verbs "accepting" and "sailed." When comparing verbs, "rather than" is the correct choice.**

**(D) CORRECT.** This choice uses the construction "X rather than Y" to correctly compare the parallel active verbs "accept" and "sailed." The uncertainty about reaching India by traveling west is correctly indicated by the word "whether."

(E) This choice begins with "instead of," which is incorrectly used to compare the verbs "accepting" and "sailed." When comparing verbs, "rather than" is the correct choice.

Even if "instead of" were correct, the construction "X instead of Y" requires parallelism between X and Y, but this choice pairs an active verb ("accepting") with a passive one ("was sent"). Finally, the use of "if" in this context is incorrect. On the GMAT, "if" is used only to introduce conditional clauses (e.g. "if X, then Y"). Here, "whether" should be used instead of "if" to indicate uncertainty about reaching India by traveling west.

6.

The original sentence expresses the main verb "attended" in the past tense and the two subordinate actions in the form of the gerund. This construction correctly indicates that "receiving" and "developing" followed as a consequence of Einstein's attendance of "the Swiss Federal Polytechnic School in Zurich."

**(A) CORRECT.** This answer choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.

(B) This answer choice breaks the correct parallelism of "receiving" and "developing" present in the original sentence.

(C) This answer choice expresses all the verbs in the underlined portion in the same form: "attended," "received," and "developed." This change alters the original meaning of the sentence by making these actions independent and sequential rather than demonstrating that "receiving" and "developing" occurred as a consequence of the fact that "Albert Einstein attended the Swiss Federal Polytechnic School in Zurich." Further, this answer choice introduces the redundant pronoun "he" that unnecessarily repeats the subject of the sentence and breaks parallelism.

(D) This answer choice makes "attended" and "received" parallel, leaving "developing" as a subordinate action. This change alters the meaning of the sentence, as described above in the explanation for choice (C). Moreover, there is no "and" between "attended" and "received," as there should always be between the items in a two-item list.

(E) This answer choice creates an incomplete sentence that lacks the main verb and consists merely of a series of gerunds: "attending," "receiving," and "developing."

7.

The original sentence correctly employs parallel structure in the expression "both x and y." The two items are logically parallel in that both "draining resources" and "diminishing productivity" are direct ways in which spam has hurt companies. The two items are also structurally parallel in that both phrases begin with a gerund ("draining" and "diminishing") followed by objects ("company resources" and "employee productivity").

**(A) CORRECT.** This choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.

(B) This choice incorrectly places "both" after the word "draining" such that the two elements in the expression "both x and y" are not logically parallel. The expression "both x and y" now reads "both company resources . . . and diminishing employee productivity." The second element ("diminishing employee productivity"), unlike the first element ("company resources"), is a way in which spam has hurt companies. The "draining" of company resources, not the "company resources" themselves, has hurt companies. Moreover, the two items in the expression are no longer structurally parallel: the first element is a noun phrase ("company resources") whereas the second element is a gerund followed by an object ("diminishing employee productivity").

(C) This choice incorrectly places "both" after the word "draining" such that the two elements in the expression "both x and y" are not logically parallel. The expression "both x and y" now reads "both company resources . . . and diminishing employee productivity." The second element ("diminishing employee productivity"), unlike the first element ("company resources"), is a way in which spam has hurt companies. The "draining" of company resources, not the "company resources" themselves, has hurt companies. Moreover, the two items in the expression are no longer structurally parallel: the first element is a noun phrase ("company resources") whereas the second element is a gerund ("diminishing") followed by a somewhat awkward and wordy clause ("how productive its employees are").

(D) In this choice, the two items in the expression "both x and y" are not structurally parallel: the first element is a gerund followed by an object ("draining company resources") whereas the second element is a clause consisting of a noun ("the productivity) and passive verb construction ("is diminished").

(E) In this choice, the two items in the expression "both x and y" are not structurally parallel: the first element is a gerund ("draining") followed by an object ("company resources") whereas the second element is a gerund ("diminishing") followed by a somewhat awkward and wordy clause ("how productive its employees are").

**Additionally, the antecedent to the pronoun "its" is unclear, as "its" structurally could refer to "the problem" or "junk mail" as well as the more logical "company."**

8.

The original sentence intends to identify a sparrow by the fact that it lives in cypress groves, eats certain berries, and has certain coloring. All these facts about the sparrow must be presented in parallel form. However, in the original sentence, these facts are presented in different forms. We need to find a choice that presents them all in parallel fashion. Moreover, "whose coloring is different from all other sparrows" is incorrect. The sparrow's coloring is different from the coloring of other sparrows, not from the sparrows themselves. We need to find a choice that makes this clear.

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

**(B) CORRECT.** This choice remedies the parallelism issue: "lives only in...., is almost wholly... and has coloring..." The comparison issue is also remedied: "has coloring different from **that** of all other sparrows." The comparison is now logically drawn between the coloring of the new species and the coloring ("that") of other species.

(C) This answer choice remedies neither the parallelism issue ("living..., is almost..., and whose coloring") nor the illogical comparison (coloring and sparrows).

(D) While this answer choice remedies the comparison, the parallelism issue persists from the original sentence.

(E) This parallelism issue has been remedied in this answer choice, but the illogical

comparison has not. In addition, the correct idiomatic expression is "different from," not "different than."

9.

The original sentence contains two errors. First, the expression "from X to Y" requires that X and Y be in parallel form. Here, however, "having an enigmatic smile" and "her association with the rich and powerful families of Europe" are not parallel. The first is a verb construction while the second is a noun construction. Since the second construction is not underlined, the first construction must be altered. Second, the clause **"which was never explained"** incorrectly uses the simple past "was never explained." Instead, it should be in the present perfect ("has never been explained") because the potential for an explanation began in the past and continues to the present.

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

(B) The parallelism error is not corrected here: "from having an enigmatic smile" is the same as in the original sentence. However, the present perfect tense ("has never been explained") is correctly used here.

(C) The parallelism error is corrected here: "her enigmatic smile" is parallel with "her association with the rich and powerful families of Europe." However, "for which there has never been an explanation" is wordy.

**(D) CORRECT.** Here, "her enigmatic smile" is parallel with "her association with the rich and powerful families of Europe." Moreover, "which has never been explained" is concise and properly in the present perfect tense.

(E) The parallelism error is not corrected here: "having an enigmatic smile" is the same as in the original sentence. Moreover, "for which there has never been an explanation" is wordy.

10.

A list of three things is underlined in the original sentence, indicating the need to test the sentence for parallelism. According to the non-underlined portion of the sentence, the three verbs starting each item in the list indicate how the substance (tryptophan) helps people to fall asleep: by "reducing", "relaxing" and "regulating." At first glance, it appears that these 3 verbs - each ending in "ing" - are nicely parallel. However, consider that the list is introduced by the preposition "by." It should read "by x, y, and z" where x, y, and z are parallel. Instead, the list reads "by x, y, and in z." The use of the word "in" to introduce the third element in the list throws off the parallelism and creates a nonsensical phrase: "by . . . in regulating."

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

(B) This choice does not correct the original parallelism error; it still uses "in" to introduce the third item in the list. Moreover, that third item--"the regulation of"--is no longer in the "ing" form, further distorting the parallel structure. Finally, the choice creates a new problem. "By" is sufficient to introduce the three items in the list; "by means of" is redundant.

(C) This choice correctly omits the word "in" when introducing the third item on the list. However, the phrase "regulation of" is no longer parallel with the "ing" endings of the first two items on the list.

**(D) CORRECT.** This choice corrects the original error by omitting the word "in" when introducing the third item on the list. The three items now follow the parallel structure "by x, y, and z."

(E) This choice corrects the original error by omitting the word "in" when introducing the third item on the list. The three items now follow the parallel structure "by x, y, and

z." The choice creates a new problem, however. "By" is sufficient to introduce the three items in the list; "by means of" is redundant.

11.

The comparison in this sentence between "undergoing a gastric bypass" and "to commit to a new lifestyle" is not parallel. To be parallel, the comparison should either be "undergoing" is "committing" or "to undergo" is "to commit." Furthermore, neither instance of the pronoun "they" has a clear antecedent, since there is no noun to which either "they" could refer. Finally, the "not only X nor Y" construction is unidiomatic; the proper construction is "not only X but also Y."

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

(B) Neither instance of the pronoun "they" in this choice has a clear antecedent.

(C) In this choice, "undergoing" is not parallel with "to commit." Additionally, the plural pronoun "they" is incorrectly used to refer to the singular noun "the patient."

Moreover, the "not only X but also Y" construction requires X and Y to be parallel, but "will no longer be permitted" is not parallel to "they will not be allowed."

(D) This choice incorrectly uses the unidiomatic "not only X nor Y." Additionally, the plural pronoun "they" incorrectly refers to the singular noun "the patient."

**(E) CORRECT.** This choice properly compares "to undergo" to "to commit," correcting the initial error in parallelism. Additionally, the idiomatic "not only X but also Y" is used correctly.

12.

The three listed behaviors of companies that successfully establish operations abroad are logically parallel; therefore, they should be structurally parallel. In the original sentence, the first activity "protect with consistency their intellectual property" is not structured in parallel fashion to the second and third activities. Also, the phrase "empower local managers with aggression" suggests that the local managers are being given the quality of aggression, which is not contextually appropriate; "aggression" is better applied to the act of empowering the managers, not to the managers themselves.

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

(B) This choice incorrectly uses the relative pronoun "**which**." "Which" should be used for noun modifiers, whereas here "which" is incorrectly used to introduce a set of clauses that are integral to the sentence. Also, the second activity "lobby government officials without tiring" is not structured in parallel fashion to the first and third activities.

(C) This sentence fails to follow an appropriate parallel structure as it lists the three activities of companies that are successful abroad. Also, the phrase "empower aggressive local managers" suggests that the local managers are aggressive which is not contextually appropriate; "aggressive" is better applied to the act of empowering the managers, not to the managers themselves.

**(D) CORRECT.** The three logically parallel activities in this sentence are structurally similar and the sentence is clear and concise.

(E) This choice incorrectly begins with the phrase "of which", which suggests that the operations of the company may be established abroad by a third party other than the company itself. Also, the three logically parallel activities are not structured in parallel fashion.

13.

The phrase “is giving protection to the continent’s ecozone” is not parallel in structure to “was signed in 1959 by 12 countries,” “prohibits any military activity” and “supports scientific research.” Equivalent elements, such as these, must have parallel structures.

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

**(B) CORRECT.** The phrase “protects the continent’s ecozone” is parallel in structure with “was signed in 1959 by 12 countries,” “prohibits any military activity” and “supports scientific research.”

(C) The verb construction “had being signed” is awkward and grammatically incorrect.

**(D) The clause “which was signed in 1959 by 12 countries prohibiting any military action ....” changes the meaning of the sentence to state that the countries, rather than the treaty, are doing the prohibiting, supporting and protecting.**

(E) The modifier “having been signed in 1959 ...” is not parallel with verb phrases “prohibits ..., supports ..., and protects....” In addition, the entire modifier introduced by the word “having” is grammatically incorrect; verb phrases must be preceded by a relative pronoun such as “which.”

14.

In the original sentence, the use of “which” incorrectly implies that the key interest rate has the curious effect, when in fact it is the raising of the interest rate that does. Also, “lowering housing prices instead of raise them” is not a parallel construction. **And it is preferable to use “rather than” with verbs, in place of “instead of,” which is better used with nouns.**

(A) This choice is the same as the original sentence.

**(B) CORRECT.** This choice remedies the incorrect use of “which.” Moreover, it contains the parallel construction “lowering housing prices rather than raising them.” Finally, “rather than” is correctly used here in place of “instead of.”

(C) This choice corrects the parallelism issue, but it still incorrectly uses “which” and “instead of.”

(D) This choice incorrectly uses “which.”

(E) This choice incorrectly uses “instead of” and contains the unparallel construction “lowering housing prices instead of raise them.”

15.

The original sentence contains the construction “from X to Y,” which requires parallelism between X and Y. In this case, X is the regular noun phrase “practical communication,” but Y is the gerund “establishing”. (A gerund is an “-ing” form of a verb acting as a noun, such as in the sentence “Swimming is fun.”) We need to find a choice that puts both X and Y in the same grammatical form. Note that the difference

between "people **engaged** in the same task" and "people **engaging** in the same task" is minimal. Both forms are valid.

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

(B) This answer choice changes X to a gerund and Y to a regular noun phrase. X and Y are still not parallel.

(C) Adding the word "the" in front of Y here doesn't change the fact that the regular noun phrase is not parallel to the gerund.

(D) This answer choice changes X to a gerund but Y to "hierarchy established," which is not parallel to X.

**(E) CORRECT.** This choice correctly changes Y to a regular noun phrase "the establishment of hierarchy," so that this phrase is now parallel to X, "practical communication." **It is not necessary that both phrases have the article "the."**

16.

The original sentence contains a list of factors that kept the settlers from surviving their first winter in Virginia: "inadequate food supplies, harsh weather, and an inability to communicate with Native Americans." In lists of examples, all the examples must be parallel (in the same form). In this case, all the examples are nouns. This presents no error.

**(A) CORRECT.** This choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.

(B) This choice is incorrect because "that they were unable to communicate with Native Americans" is a clause rather than a noun, thus violating the parallelism.

(C) This choice is incorrect because "and because they were unable to communicate with Native Americans" is a clause rather than a noun, thus violating the parallelism.

(D) This choice is incorrect because "and being unable to communicate with Native Americans" is a verb construction rather than a noun, thus violating the parallelism.

(E) This choice is incorrect because "and lacking an ability to communicate with Native Americans" is a verb construction rather than a noun, thus violating the parallelism.

17.

The great achievements are presented in a list. "The art of Michelangelo" and "the inventions of Edison" are parallel to each other, but "Shakespeare's plays" must be changed to "the plays of Shakespeare" to make the third achievement parallel to the first two.

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

(B) This choice has parallel structure, but uses an illogical reference. While Michelangelo, Edison, and Shakespeare are great people, they, by themselves, do not represent great achievements; their achievements do.

(C) This choice has parallel structure, but it has been rewritten in the passive voice which is usually less preferred than the active voice of the original sentence. A more critical error, however, is that the meaning of the sentence has been changed to make the assertion that the achievements of the three men somehow represent *all* great achievements in human history.

**(D) CORRECT.** This choice has parallel structure, which corrects the only error of the original sentence.

(E) While this choice uses correct parallel structure, the meaning of the sentence has

been changed to make the assertion that the achievements of the three men somehow represent *all* great achievements in human history.

## COMPARISONS

1.

The original sentence incorrectly uses “Like” to compare two clauses: “Like many of his contemporaries did, Bob Dylan wrote songs.” “Like” can be used to compare nouns, but not phrases containing verbs (clauses).

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

(B) As used in this sentence, “like” seems to compare the noun “songs” with the noun “contemporaries,” implying that Bob Dylan’s “songs” were similar to his “contemporaries.” This comparison is illogical, as songs cannot be compared with people.

**(C) CORRECT.** “As” is correctly used to compare two phrases containing verbs.

(D) The modifying phrase “Like the songs of his contemporaries” incorrectly modifies the adjacent noun “Bob Dylan,” implying that Bob Dylan is similar to the songs of his contemporaries. Songs cannot be logically compared with people.

(E) While “as” is correctly used to compare two phrases containing verbs, the subject pronoun “he” incorrectly refers back to the possessive noun “Bob Dylan’s.” Only possessive pronouns can be used to refer to possessive nouns.

2.

This sentence has four errors. First, the subordinate clause “whose funeral was sparsely attended being buried in an unmarked communal grave” is awkward grammatically and ambiguous in meaning; the clause could be interpreted to mean that the funeral was sparsely attended at the time Mozart was being buried, or it could be interpreted to mean that the funeral was sparsely attended because Mozart was buried in an unmarked grave. Second, it is not clear whether the possessive “Beethoven’s” refers to “funeral” or to “grave.” Third, the sentence makes an illogical comparison between Mozart and either Beethoven’s funeral or Beethoven’s grave. Finally, the prepositional phrase “near the graves of Schubert and Brahms” is a misplaced modifier. Since it immediately follows “cemetery,” it appears to describe the location of the cemetery rather than that of the grave.

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

(B) First, the subordinate clause “whose funeral was sparsely attended being buried in an unmarked communal grave” is grammatically awkward and ambiguous in meaning. Second, while the introduction of “funeral” makes the possessive “Beethoven’s” unambiguous, the sentence still illogically compares “Mozart” to “Beethoven’s funeral.” Finally, the past tense is used illogically in the clause “his final resting place was ....” Since this clause discusses Beethoven’s *final* resting place, it describes a state of being that is still true today; hence, the use of the present tense is appropriate to describe where Beethoven’s body currently *lies*.

(C) “Mozart” is followed by two clauses, “whose funeral was sparsely attended” and “he was buried in an unmarked communal grave.” The second of these clauses is incorrect because: 1) it should be a *subordinate* clause modifying Mozart, and should therefore start with “who was buried”, and 2) it should be *parallel* to the first clause, and should therefore start with “who was buried”, and 3) it should not make the illogical assertion that “Unlike Mozart, he [Mozart] was buried....”.

(D) This choice makes an illogical comparison between “Mozart” and “Beethoven’s



funeral." In addition, the prepositional phrase "near the graves of Schubert and Brahms" is a misplaced modifier. Since it immediately follows "cemetery," it appears to describe the location of the cemetery rather than that of the grave.

**(E) CORRECT.** "Mozart" is now modified by two subordinate clauses, "whose funeral was attended..." and "who was buried ....," each properly introduced by the relative pronouns "whose" and "who" respectively. In addition, "Mozart" is now logically compared to "Beethoven." Finally, the phrase "near the graves of ..." unambiguously modifies "lies buried."

3.

**The original makes a comparison between car sales in 2004 and this January. However, the comparison is of prepositional phrases, which must be compared using "as," not "like," which is used to compare nouns. ("Like" would be correctly used to compare one year to another, for example, "Like 2004, 2005 was a good year.")**

Also, this sentence has an idiomatic error. The idiom "as often as" must be written out and cannot be contracted to "as often." Finally, the phrasing "car sales to first-time buyers as often as to return customers" is awkward and should be recast.

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

(B) This choice incorrectly uses the comparison term "Like." Also, the idiom "as often" is incorrect; it should be "as often as."

(C) This sentence uses the correct idiom, "as often as." However, the pronoun "it" does not have an antecedent, as "sales" (as well as "buyers") is plural. Finally, "and it" weakens the syntax and meaning of the first part of the sentence.

**(D) CORRECT.** This choice clearly compares sales in the two years. The idiom "as often as" is correctly written and is placed in a comparison of actions (i.e., "first-time buyers bought cars") rather than in a comparison of prepositional phrases, which is more awkward.

(E) The idiom "as often" is incorrect; it should be "as often as."

4.

The original has an improper comparison. Comparisons must relate logically parallel elements. This sentence compares "the Civil War" to "soldiers in Vietnam." It must compare "soldiers" to "soldiers" or "war" to "war." In this case, it would have to be war to war because the meaning is that in those wars, Smith & Wesson equipped soldiers.

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

**(B) CORRECT.** This choice correctly compares logically parallel elements: "the Civil War to the Vietnam war." It contains no other errors.

(C) This choice does compare logically parallel elements: "soldiers in the Civil War and soldiers in Vietnam." However, this comparison undermines the meaning because the meaning is that in those wars, Smith & Wesson equipped soldiers. Thus, the correct comparison would compare "war" to "war." Furthermore, this comparison is incorrectly structured; idiomatically, it should not employ "and soldiers" but should be structured "from soldiers in the Civil War to soldiers in Vietnam."

(D) This choice does compare logically parallel elements: "soldiers in the Civil War and soldiers in Vietnam." However, this comparison undermines the meaning because the meaning is that in those wars, Smith & Wesson equipped soldiers. Thus, the correct comparison would compare "war" to "war." Also, the ending "to" is incorrect; idiomatically that comparison must be structured as "both the soldiers and the sailors."

(E) This choice correctly compares logically parallel elements: “the Civil War and the Vietnam war.” However, this comparison is incorrectly structured; idiomatically, it should not employ “and the Vietnam war” but should be structured “from the Civil War to the Vietnam war.”

5.

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 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.

6.

The intent of the sentence is to compare counterfeiting today to counterfeiting in the past, using difficulty as the measure. In the original sentence, the comparison is correctly drawn between “today...counterfeiting is” and “it [counterfeiting] was at the time of the Civil War.” Additionally, the use of “despite” accurately conveys the main point that although some new technologies are available, counterfeiting is nevertheless more difficult than it once was.

**(A) CORRECT.** The original sentence is correct as written.

(B) The intent of the sentence is to compare counterfeiting today to counterfeiting in the past. **In this sentence, the placement of “today” after “high resolution scanners and printers” could lead to a misunderstanding about what occurs “today”: the equipment, or perhaps the wide availability of the equipment, rather than the counterfeiting itself.**

(C) This sentence is missing “today,” which clearly indicated in the original sentence when the counterfeiting with scanners and printers occurs. The first instance of the pronoun “it” has also been dropped, creating an illogical comparison between an act, “counterfeiting,” and a time, “at the time of the Civil War.” A correct comparison could have been between “today” and “the time of the Civil War”: “...counterfeiting is more

difficult today than at the time of the Civil War..."

(D) An illogical comparison is made between an act, "counterfeiting," and a time, "when it was estimated."

(E) The point of the original sentence is that counterfeiting is more difficult today "despite," not "because of," the technology that is available.

7.

The original sentence incorrectly says "can be roaring", when the appropriate present-tense verb form is "can roar". The sentence also makes the mistake of using a singular possessive pronoun ("its") to refer to a plural antecedent ("lions and tigers").

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

**(B) CORRECT.** This choice corrects the verb problem in the original sentence by replacing "can be roaring" with "can roar". This choice corrects the pronoun problem by using the plural possessive pronoun "their" instead of "its".

(C) This choice incorrectly uses "who", instead of "which", to refer to lions and tigers.

**On the GMAT the pronoun "who" is reserved for human beings; animals and things are referred to using "which".** Another mistake in this answer choice is the inclusion of the redundant word "differently".

(D) This choice makes the mistake of using a singular possessive pronoun ("its") to refer to a plural antecedent ("lions and tigers").

**(E) This answer choice illogically makes it seem as if the hyoid bones of lions and tigers vibrate, and thereby create roaring sounds, independently of whether the lion or tiger actually wants to roar.**

**The use of the singular "a roar" is also inappropriate, because it appears to suggest that many lions and tigers collectively emit just one roar.**

8.

The original sentence contains a faulty comparison: it compares the military of the United States to Japan, rather than to Japan's military.

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

(B) This choice repeats the comparison error in the original sentence. Additionally, this choice creates a pronoun error by using the plural pronoun "their" to refer to the singular "United States."

(C) This choice corrects the comparison error by comparing the military of the United States to "that" of Japan. However, this choice includes a pronoun error by using the plural pronoun "their" to refer to the singular "United States."

**(D) CORRECT.** This choice correctly compares the military of the United States to "Japan's"; although "military" is not explicitly stated, the possessive form implies that it refers to Japan's military. Additionally, the singular pronoun "its" correctly refers to the singular "United States."

(E) This choice unnecessarily shifts to the present perfect tense "has been larger," which is not parallel with the present tense verb "shoulders" in the main clause of the sentence. Furthermore, a military is a singular entity, whereas "those of Japan" incorrectly refer to something plural.

9.

The original sentence correctly makes a comparison between the income levels of working adults who were average students and the income levels of students who were exceptional students. These two elements are logically parallel, and thus should be structurally parallel. However, this sentence is problematic in its use of the term

"those adults," since the pronoun "those" is both unnecessary and not parallel in this context. Also, the phrase "of exceptional academic abilities" is not precisely parallel to the phrase "of average academic ability" in the non-underlined portion of the sentence. As this sentence makes a comparison, the two elements should be as parallel as possible.

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

(B) This choice correctly uses "those" to refer to income levels, enabling a correctly framed comparison. However, it incorrectly uses the past perfect tense "had been," which is unjustified by the sentence and is not parallel to the simple past tense "were" used earlier to describe students of average academic ability. Finally, "exceptionally able students academically" is both unparallel and awkward.

**(C) CORRECT.** The pronoun "those" is correctly used to refer to income levels, enabling a properly drawn comparison. Additionally, the simple past tense verb "were" is parallel to the verb "were" in the non-underlined portion of the sentence.

(D) This choice incorrectly compares income level to adults, rather than the proper comparison between income levels and income levels.

(E) This choice incorrectly uses the past perfect tense "had been," which is unjustified and also not parallel to the non-underlined simple past tense verb "were."

10.

**Demand in is preferred to demand for in such a usage. Like there is a lot of demand of IT professionals in the BPO industry, not FOR.**

**The original sentence contains several errors. First, "less availability" is incorrect when not used in a direct comparison: it begs the question "Less than what?"** "Decreased availability" would be better here.

**Second, "greater demand" also begs the question "greater than what?"** "Increased demand" would be better.

**Third, "Demand for scientific research" implies that the research is in demand, when in fact it is the platinum. "Demand in scientific research" would be better.**

**Fourth, "remains consistently expensive" is redundant.** "Remains expensive" would be enough to convey the idea.

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

(B) This choice is incorrect because while it replaces the "greater demand" with "increased demand," it leaves "less availability." "Demand for scientific research" should be changed to "demand in." The redundancy of "consistently" remains, and a illogical comparison is drawn between platinum and "that of gold." It is unclear what the "that" refers to.

**(C) CORRECT.** This choice replaces "less availability" with "decreased availability" and "greater demand" with "increased demand." The word "consistently" is removed, and "demand for" is changed to "demand in."

(D) This choice incorrectly keeps "Demand for scientific research," which should be changed to "demand in scientific research"

(E) This choice is incorrect because, while it replaces the "less availability" with "decreased availability," it leaves "greater demand." "Remains at a consistently high price" is redundant. It is also more concise to compare the platinum to the gold, rather than the high price (of platinum) to "that of the gold" as is attempted in E.

11.

The word "although" at the beginning of the sentence signals that the underlined portion must draw a comparison between the impact of management decisions and the impact of government policy and industrial sector on a company's performance. The original sentence correctly draws this comparison with the phrase "at least as great an impact."

**UNNOTICED:** Also, "government policy," "industrial sector," and "management decisions" are all correctly parallel (which is required because they are part of the same comparison).

(A) **CORRECT.** This choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.

(B) This choice tells us only about the impact of management decisions ("have a great impact") rather than drawing a comparison between the impact of management decisions and the impact of government policy and the industrial sector of a company. Also, "decisions by management" is wordy and nonparallel to "government policy."

(C) This choice tells us only about the impact of management decisions ("have a great impact") rather than drawing a comparison between the impact of management decisions and the impact of government policy and the industrial sector of a company. Additionally, "manager decisions" is awkward relative to the more commonly used term "management decisions." **Finally, decisions do not "impact on" performance; they impact performance.**

(D) This choice tells us only about the impact of management decisions ("have a great impact") rather than drawing a comparison between the impact of management decisions and the impact of government policy and the industrial sector of a company. "Decisions by a company's management" is wordy and redundant, as "a company" is repeated in the non-underlined portion of the sentence.

(E) This choice does draw a comparison between the impact of management decisions and the impact of government policy and industry sector on company performance; it does not do so in parallel form, however. The comparison also changes the original meaning of the sentence. In addition, the phrase "what a company's management decides" is wordy and redundant, as "a company" is repeated in the non-underlined portion of the sentence.

12.

First, the sentence begins with the comparison "unlike most other species of cat," which must be completed with another species of cat. However, the comparison is completed with "the claws of the cheetah," thus creating an invalid comparison. Second, "regardless of being domesticated or not" is wordy and awkward. Third, the pronoun "it" requires a singular antecedent, yet the only available antecedent is "the claws of the cheetah," which is plural. Remember, "the claws of the cheetah" is not the same as "the cheetah" itself. Finally, "in that way" is casual and imprecise.

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

(B) **CORRECT.** The comparison is completed here with "the cheetah," creating a valid comparison. The pronoun issue is resolved by eliminating the pronoun entirely.

The awkward phrase "regardless of being domesticated or not" is replaced by the more elegant "domestic or wild." And "in that way" is replaced by "in that respect," which is more appropriate to the tone of the sentence.

(C) The comparison is completed here with "the cheetah's claws," thus creating an invalid comparison. The pronoun "it" still lacks a viable singular antecedent. And the phrase "regardless of domestication or not" is no less awkward than the original phrase. This choice does, however, replace "in that way" with "in that respect."

(D) The comparison here is completed with "the claws of the cheetah," thus creating an invalid comparison. The pronoun "it" still lacks a viable singular antecedent. The casual phrase "in that way" still remains. This choice does, however, replace the awkward "regardless of being domesticated or not" with the more elegant "domestic or wild."

(E) The comparison here is completed with "the cheetah," creating a valid comparison. The awkward phrase "regardless of being domesticated or not" is replaced by "domestic or wild." However, the pronoun "it" is replaced by "they," which refers to the claws and changes the emphasis of the sentence to a comparison of the claws instead of a comparison of the animals, which was the intent of the original sentence.

13.

The original sentence correctly contrasts "antigenic shift" and "antigenic drift" in a parallel format. In addition, the connection punctuation, a semi-colon, is used correctly to connect two complete sentences.

**(A) CORRECT.** The sentence is correct as written.

(B) This choice uses the incorrect comparison phrase "different than"; the correct phrase is "different from." In addition, the comparison "antigenic shift refers to..." is not parallel to "the natural mutation of... known as antigenic drift." Finally, the simple comma between "influenza" and "different" provides an inadequate transition between the two parts of the sentence; the addition of a conjunction such as "and is" (e.g., "... influenza, [and is] different ...") is necessary here.

(C) The comparison "antigenic shift refers to..." is not parallel to "the natural mutation of... known as antigenic drift."

(D) This choice uses the incorrect comparison phrase "different than"; the correct phrase is "different from." In addition, the simple comma between "influenza" and "different" provides an inadequate transition between the two parts of the sentence; the addition of a conjunction such as "and is" (e.g., "... influenza, [and is] different ...") is necessary here.

(E) This choice creates a sentence fragment by incorrectly using a semi-colon when the second half of the sentence ("in contrast to antigenic drift...") is not a complete sentence.

14.

The original sentence contains a faulty comparison. "Nonfiction books" is either illogically compared to "the public's appetite," or improperly used to suggest that "nonfiction books" are examples of "documentary films." The proper comparison should be between the public's "appetite" for x and its "appetite" for y.

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

(B) In this choice, "nonfiction books" is illogically compared to the public's "appetite." The proper comparison should be between the public's "appetite" for x and its "appetite" for y. Moreover, the use of the comparison word "as" is incorrect. "As" is used to compare verb phrases, not nouns; in this case, two nouns ("appetite" and "interest") are compared so the comparison word "like" should be used instead.

(C) This choice logically compares the public's "appetite" for documentary films to its "interest" in nonfiction books. However, the use of the comparison word "as" is incorrect. "As" is used to compare verb phrases, not nouns; in this case, two nouns ("appetite" and "interest") are compared so the comparison word "like" should be used instead.

(D) This choice logically compares the public's "appetite" for documentary films to its "interest" in nonfiction books. However, this choice incorrectly uses the plural pronoun "their" to refer to the singular noun "the public."

**(E) CORRECT.** This choice logically compares the public's "appetite" for documentary films to its "interest" in nonfiction books.

15.

The original sentence begins with the comparison "unlike Mars." What follows must therefore be a logical comparison to the planet Mars. However, the sentence compares "Mars" to "the surface of Earth." This is not a logical comparison. We can compare "Mars" to "Earth" or "the surface of Mars" to "the surface of Earth," but it is not logical to compare one planet to the surface of another planet.

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

(B) This choice compares "Mars" to "Earth's surface," an illogical comparison.

**(C) CORRECT.** This choice compares "the surface of Mars" to "that of Earth," a logical comparison.

(D) This choice compares "Mars" to "water," an illogical comparison.

(E) This choice compares "that of Mars" to "Earth." In this context, it is not clear what "that of Mars" refers to, since there is no other possessive construction in the sentence.

16.

The items in a list require parallelism. In this sentence, "Martin Luther King Jr. won" applies to each item in the list, which works for the first two items but does not work for the third, "was the most famous leader..."

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

**(B) CORRECT.** "The most famous leader of the American civil rights movement" is no longer placed in a list with the two prizes won; instead, it is correctly used as a clause modifying "Martin Luther King Jr." The two prizes ("Nobel Peace Prize" and "Presidential Medal of Freedom") are in correct parallel format.

(C) This sentence corrects the original parallelism error but introduces a new error. "The most famous leader of the American civil rights movement" is no longer placed in a list with the two prizes won; instead, it is correctly used as a clause modifying "Martin Luther King Jr." However, "won the Nobel Peace Prize and he won the

Presidential Medal of Freedom" is unnecessarily wordy; because the two are both prizes, they should be more concisely presented in parallel format.

(D) The items in a list require parallelism. The first two items ("the most famous leader..." and "the winner of...") are parallel but the third item, "he won the Presidential Medal of Freedom," is not.

(E) "As well as the Presidential Medal of Freedom, too" is redundant.

17.

The original contains a grammatical error; "like many entertainers" should be "like many **other** entertainers." Musicians are a type of entertainer, and "other" must be used to indicate common membership in a larger group.

(A) Incorrect, as it repeats the original sentence.

(B) This choice correctly employs "other" to indicate the common membership in a larger group, i.e. entertainers. However, an introductory modifier describes the first available noun. Here, "like many other entertainers" incorrectly modifies "tax evaders and members." Also, using "tax evaders" and "the members. . ." as the compound subject distorts the intended meaning. Finally, the ending "that" does not clearly refer to "tax evaders."

(C) This choice makes the intended meaning ambiguous. The intended meaning of the original is that members of the association, like many other entertainers, no longer want to be tax evaders. Here, the meaning is that these members no longer want to be tax evaders, as many entertainers, a separate group, are. "Other" should be used to indicate the larger common membership.

(D) Here, a modification error distorts the meaning. The intended meaning of the original is that members of the association, like many other entertainers, no longer want to be tax evaders. This choice says that these musicians no longer wanted to resemble tax evaders and other entertainers.

**(E) CORRECT.** Here, the introductory modifier correctly and clearly describes the noun that immediately follows it, and the use of "other" properly shows their common membership in the larger group.

## Pronoun

1.

The pronoun "them" in the phrase "prevent them from moving" clearly refers to "businesses," the immediately preceding plural noun. However, when the pronoun "them" is used again in the phrase "consider them vital economic development tools," its antecedent is unclear; logically, the pronoun refers to the "tax breaks," but based on its position in the sentence (near the plural noun "businesses" and the first "them" which refers back to businesses) "them" here illogically refers to the businesses. Moreover, the phrase "award to businesses" (award to x) is wordy and could be shortened to the more concise and idiomatic "award businesses" (award x).

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

(B) In placing "consider" at the beginning of the sentence, this choice is able to avoid a second use of the pronoun "them," thereby correcting the pronoun issue. It also correctly replaces "award to businesses" with the more idiomatic "award businesses." However, the use of the phrase "to be" in this context is unidiomatic. The proper idiom is "consider x y" not "consider x to be y." In this case "consider tax breaks . . . vital tools" is idiomatic, while "consider tax breaks to be . . . vital tools" is not.

(C) This choice correctly replaces "award to businesses" with the more idiomatic "award businesses." However, it does not solve the pronoun problem from the original



sentence. The pronoun "them" in the phrase "prevent them from moving" clearly refers to "businesses," the immediately preceding plural noun. Yet, when the pronoun "them" is used again in the phrase "consider them vital economic development tools," its antecedent is unclear; logically, the pronoun refers to the "tax breaks," but based on its position in the sentence (near the plural noun "businesses" and the first "them" which refers back to businesses) "them" here illogically refers to the businesses.

**(D) CORRECT.** In placing "consider" at the beginning of the sentence, this choice is able to avoid a second use of the pronoun "them," thereby correcting the pronoun issue. It also correctly replaces "award to businesses" with the more idiomatic "award businesses."

(E) This choice avoids any pronoun ambiguity by replacing the second "them" in the original sentence with the phrase "tax breaks." However, the repetition of "tax breaks" (which is repeated again later in the sentence) makes this choice somewhat wordy. More significant, the use of the phrase "to be" in this context is unidiomatic. The proper idiom is "consider *x y*" not "consider *x to be y*." In this case "consider tax breaks vital tools" is idiomatic, while "consider tax breaks to be vital tools" is not.

2.

This sentence has a pronoun agreement error. Subject and object pronouns cannot refer back to possessive nouns; they must refer only to subject and object nouns. The subject in this sentence is "Agatha Christie's travels," not Agatha Christie herself. The first instance of "her" is correct because this pronoun is used as a possessive: "her [Agatha Christie's] archaeologist husband." However, the second instance of "her," an object pronoun, is incorrect: "inspired her [Agatha Christie, who is not an object in this sentence] to write..."

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

(B) This choice illogically states that the travels inspired the novels themselves, rather than inspiring Christie to write the novels.

(C) This choice introduces a false cause-effect statement. The original meaning indicates that Christie traveled because her husband was an archaeologist.

According to this choice, however, Christie *used their travels as inspiration* because her husband was an archaeologist, which is clearly illogical.

(D) This choice seems to indicate that Christie and her husband were inspired to write the novels together. This cannot be the case because this choice also clearly states that they are "her mystery novels," not both of theirs.

**(E) CORRECT.** This choice corrects the original pronoun agreement error by moving the second instance of "her" in front of "mystery novels," which changes it from an object pronoun to a possessive pronoun: "Agatha Christie's travels...her [Agatha Christie's] mystery novels..."

3.

The subject of the sentence is "the United States Navy", which is singular. However, in the underlined portion, the Navy is incorrectly replaced by the plural pronouns "they" and "their."

(A) This choice is the same as the original sentence.

(B) This choice incorrectly uses the plural pronouns "they" and "their."

**(C) CORRECT.** This choice correctly uses "it" and "its" to refer to "the United States Navy."

(D) This choice incorrectly uses the plural pronouns "they" and "their."

(E) This choice incorrectly uses the plural pronoun "their" though it does correctly use the singular pronoun "it."

4.

In the original sentence, the subject pronoun *he* cannot refer to the possessive noun *Anders Celsius*' (note the apostrophe). Possessive nouns such as *Anders Celsius*' may only be the antecedents of possessive pronouns, such as *his*. Further, the use of the relative pronoun *where* to describe *the scale* is incorrect since the pronoun *where* can refer only to physical locations.

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

**(B) CORRECT.** This answer choice corrects the original pronoun issue by replacing the subject pronoun *he* with the possessive pronoun *his*, which can legally refer to the possessive noun *Anders Celsius*'. Furthermore, the relative pronoun *which* in the phrase *in which* correctly refers to the immediately preceding noun *a scale*.

(C) By using the relative pronoun *which* in place of *where*, this answer choice corrects one of the two pronoun problems in the original sentence. However, the subject pronoun *he* cannot refer to the possessive noun *Anders Celsius*'.

(D) In this answer choice, the semicolon is used incorrectly to connect two clauses, only one of which can stand alone. Specifically, the phrase *reversing the scale to its present form after his death in 1744* is not an independent clause and cannot follow the semicolon.

(E) In this answer choice, the use of the relative pronoun *where* to describe *the scale* is incorrect since this pronoun can refer only to physical locations. Furthermore, by replacing the original passive construction *was reversed* with the active form *reversed*, this answer choice illogically suggests that "a scale" changed itself rather than was changed by others. While the active form is more concise, the use of the passive construction in this case is warranted by the original content of the sentence.

5.

The original sentence is problematic in a number of ways. First, its use of the pronoun "they" is incorrect in the first instance. The first "they" should refer to the federal judge, who is singular. Hence, the use of the plural pronoun "they" is incorrect, particularly when viewed in conjunction with the second pronoun "their" which correctly refers to the lawyers. Also, the sentence is unnecessarily wordy, with "in order to" detracting from the sentence's conciseness. "Damages against their client" is unidiomatic.

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

(B) This answer choice corrects the pronoun issue. However, this sentence is even more unnecessarily wordy and awkward, replacing "economic damages" with "damages of an economic nature." Also, "the client" is an awkward use of the article "the" given that "the client" refers to the patent holder, which appears in the sentence.

(C) The sentence incorrectly retains the first "they" pronoun error, though it omits the use of the second "their." Also, "the client" is an awkward use of the article "the" given that "the client" refers to the patent holder, which appears in the sentence.

(D) This choice's use of "them" incorrectly suggests that the lawyers are to be protected from economic harm rather than their client, the patent holder.

**(E) CORRECT.** This sentence remedies the pronoun issue, and uses "their" correctly in the second part of the sentence. It is also clear and concise.

6.

The original sentence contains pronoun agreement inconsistencies. Both uses of the plural "their" refer to the singular "carrier." The pronouns must be changed to singular

because of the presence of “her family” in the non-underlined section, since any non-underlined portions of the sentence are correct.

(A) Incorrect, as it repeats the original sentence.

**(B) CORRECT.** The pronouns that refer to “carrier” are all singular -- each “their” is now “her.” These “her’s” agree with the singular “carrier” as well as with the “her” in the non-underlined section at the end of the sentence.

(C) This choice corrects the pronoun agreement error. The pronouns that refer to “carrier” are all singular -- each “their” is now “her.” These “her’s” agree with the singular “carrier” as well as with the “her” in the non-underlined section at the end of the sentence. However, “which” is incorrect; “which” relative clauses describe the noun immediately before them, but “which secrets are hard to keep” in this case logically should not be referring to “Bedouin world.” In this sentence, “in which” would be correct usage.

(D) This choice corrects the pronoun agreement error. The pronouns that refer to “carrier” are all singular -- each “their” is now “her.” These “her’s” agree with the singular “carrier” as well as with the “her” in the non-underlined section at the end of the sentence. However, “families” does not agree with “family” in the non-underlined section, as it must.

(E) In this choice, “carriers” and each “their” agree, as they are all plural. However, the plural noun and pronouns do not agree with “her family” in the non-underlined section at the end of the sentence. Also, “which” is incorrect; “in which” would be correct.

7.

The plural subject in the original sentence, “dermestid beetles,” does not agree in number with the singular pronoun “its,” which appears in the non-underlined part of the sentence. In order to correctly agree with “its,” the subject must be singular: “the dermestid beetle.”

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

(B) The plural subject “dermestid beetles” does not agree in number with the singular pronoun “its,” which appears in the non-underlined part of the sentence. In order to correctly agree with “its,” the subject must be singular: “the dermestid beetle.” Also, the present tense verb “pull” is incorrectly consistent with the present tense verb “feed.” In this case, verb consistency is undesirable as it separates “feed” and “pull” into two independent and sequential actions: the beetles “feed on the decaying flesh” and “pull with...mouthparts.” The logical meaning of the sentence, as dictated by the original version, is that the “pulling” occurs *as part* of the main verb “feed,” not *independent* of it.

(C) While the singular subject “the dermestid beetle” correctly agrees in number with the singular pronoun “its,” the present tense verb “pulls” is incorrectly consistent with the present tense verb “feeds.” In this case, verb consistency is undesirable as it separates “feeds” and “pulls” into two independent and sequential actions: the beetle “feeds on the decaying flesh” and “pulls with...mouthparts.” The logical meaning of the sentence, as dictated by the original version, is that the “pulling” occurs *as part* of the main verb “feeds,” not *independent* of it.

**(D) CORRECT.** The singular subject “the dermestid beetle” correctly agrees in number with the singular pronoun “its.” Also, the form “pulling” correctly implies that “pulling with its mouthparts” occurs as part of the main verb “feeds,” not independent of it.

(E) The singular subject “the dermestid beetle” correctly agrees in number with the singular pronoun “its.” However, the present tense verb “pulls” is incorrectly

consistent with the present tense verb “feeds.” In this case, verb consistency is undesirable as it separates “feeds” and “pulls” into two independent and sequential actions: the beetle “feeds on the decaying flesh” and “pulls with...mouthparts.” The logical meaning of the sentence, as dictated by the original version, is that the “pulling” occurs *as part* of the main verb “feeds,” not *independent* of it. Also, the use of the pronoun “it” is unnecessarily wordy; the subject of the verb “pulls,” “the dermestid beetle,” is clear without the use of “it.”

8.

The modifier “which at its fullest growth scarcely exceeds . . .” contains two words--the singular pronoun “its” and the singular verb “exceeds”--that suggest that the subject of the modifier is singular. Both of these words are incorrect since the subject of this modifier is actually the plural noun “Brussels sprouts.”

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

(B) This choice incorrectly uses the singular pronoun “its” to refer to the plural noun “Brussels sprouts.”

(C) In this choice, the singular verb “exceeds” does not agree with the plural pronoun “their” (which refers to the plural subject “Brussels sprouts”).

(D) The plural pronoun “their” and the plural verb “exceed” correctly refer to the plural noun “Brussels sprouts.” However, the use of the phrase “scarcely exceed a walnut’s large size” distorts the meaning of the original phrase “scarcely exceeds a large walnut in size.” In the original, it is clear that the comparison is between the size of a Brussels Sprout and the size of a large walnut. In this choice, the comparison is changed to one between the size of a Brussels sprout and the size of any walnut, all of which, according to this choice, are large.

**(E) CORRECT.** This choice correctly uses the plural pronoun “their” and the plural verb “exceed” to refer to the plural noun “Brussels sprouts.”

9.

The original sentence uses the incorrect plural pronoun “their” to refer to the singular noun “management.” Similarly, the second plural pronoun “they” is also inconsistent with its singular antecedent “management.”

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

(B) This answer choice corrects one of the original pronoun errors by changing the plural pronoun “their” to the singular pronoun “its,” but fails to correct the second pronoun problem, retaining the plural pronoun “they,” which is inconsistent with the singular noun “management.”

(C) This answer choice uses the unidiomatic construction “to plan on” rather than the correct idiom “to plan to.”

**(D) CORRECT.** This answer choice correctly uses the singular pronoun “its” to refer to the singular noun “management,” and eliminates the use of the incorrect plural pronoun “they.”

(E) In this answer choice, the plural pronoun “their” does not agree with the singular noun “management.”

10.

The subject of the initial clause is the “play,” which must therefore be the subject of the main part of the sentence (after the comma). The correct pronoun to use to refer to an inanimate thing is “it” rather than “he.”

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

**(B) CORRECT.** This choice correctly uses the pronoun "it" to refer to the inanimate thing "play."

(C) This choice incorrectly uses the pronoun "he" to refer to the inanimate thing "play." In addition, the correct idiom is "considered X" rather than "considered to be X." Finally, the phrase "resulted in condemnation by contemporaries" is awkward compared with the original sentence, and does not make clear exactly what or who (is it the play or the person?) is being condemned.

(D) This choice correctly uses the pronoun "it" to refer to the inanimate thing "play" but introduces the object pronoun "him" which cannot refer to a possessive noun. Logically, the pronoun "him" should refer to Moliere but Moliere is not in the sentence; only "Moliere's satirical play" is in the sentence. In addition, the correct idiom is "considered X" rather than "considered to be X." Finally, the phrase "resulted in condemnation of him by contemporaries" is awkward and wordy compared with the original sentence, and also changes its meaning by asserting that the person, rather than the play, was condemned.

(E) This choice correctly uses the pronoun "it" to refer to the inanimate thing "play" but introduces the object pronoun "him" which cannot refer to a possessive noun. Logically, the pronoun "him" should refer to Moliere but Moliere is not in the sentence; only "Moliere's satirical play" is in the sentence. Finally, the sentence seems to suggest that the play did the actual condemning.

11.

The antecedent of the pronoun "they" is "artwork". But "they" is plural and "artwork" singular, so we need to find a choice that changes "they" to "it". Moreover, "people who a trip to a major city may be too expensive for" is incorrect. It should be "people for whom..."

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

(B) The pronoun "they" is incorrect, as is the construction "people who a trip to a major city may be too expensive for."

(C) The construction "people who a trip to a major city may be too expensive for" is incorrect.

**(D) CORRECT.** The pronoun "it" correctly refers to the singular antecedent "artwork" and "for whom a trip to a major city may be too expensive" is the correct modifier of people.

(E) The pronoun "it" is correct, but the construction "people who a trip to a major city may be too expensive for" is not.

12.

In the original sentence, the plural pronoun "they" has no clear antecedent. It is trying to refer to the United Nations, which is a singular noun. Additionally, on the GMAT, "if" is used for a conditional idea, while "whether" is used for an alternative or possibility. In this sentence, the United Nations is choosing between two possibilities: either it will recognize the legitimacy of a new government or it will not. Thus, "whether" is the appropriate word.

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

**(B) CORRECT.** This choice correctly resolves the pronoun issue, and is the only answer choice that avoids serious problems.

(C) The use of “deciding” as opposed to the infinitive “decide” is appropriate, but this sentence incorrectly separates the modifier “that assumed power through violence” from the modified noun “government,” making this choice awkward and incorrect.

(D) In this choice, “if” is incorrectly used to distinguish between alternatives. Furthermore the non-restrictive relative pronoun “which” is used to introduce a restrictive clause. Because the clause “that assumed power through violence” is essential to the meaning of the sentence, “that” must introduce the clause. Conversely, “which” is used to introduce nonessential elements.

(E) In this choice, the pronoun “they” has no clear antecedent, since the United Nations is a singular entity.

13.

The original sentence contains a pronoun error. The pronoun “they” requires a plural antecedent though there is none in the sentence; “State Assembly” is singular and “they” cannot be used to refer to the politicians collectively since they were not mentioned in the sentence.

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

(B) The pronoun “they” is incorrect here because there is no plural antecedent. Moreover, the phrase **“agree about” is unidiomatic; “agree on” should be used instead.**

(C) The singular pronoun “it” correctly refers to the singular noun “the State Assembly.” However, the phrase “agree about” is unidiomatic; “agree on” should be used instead.

(D) The use of “the Assemblymen” instead of “they” corrects the original pronoun problem by eliminating the pronoun “they” altogether. However, the phrase “agree about” is unidiomatic; “agree on” should be used instead.

**(E) CORRECT.** The use of “the Assemblymen” instead of “they” corrects the original pronoun problem by eliminating the pronoun “they” altogether.

14.

**Claim to/to be....**

The original sentence contains several errors. First, the relative pronoun “which” cannot be used to modify the action of the preceding clause, as it does here (“which has resulted in...”). Instead, it must be used to modify the immediately preceding noun only. In this case, that noun is “influence,” which cannot be described as resulting in a “political climate.” It is the loss of that influence that has resulted in the “political climate” described in the sentence, not the influence itself.

**Second, “that some analysts claim to favor management” is incorrect. If we remove “some analysts claim” from the sentence, we are left with “a political climate that...to favor management.” This is incorrect. We need “to favor” to agree with “a political climate that.”**

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

**(B) CORRECT.** This choice corrects the relative pronoun error by replacing "which has resulted" with "resulting." Moreover, "favors" agrees with "a political climate that..."

(C) This choice does not correct the relative pronoun error. Moreover, it does not correct the verb error.

**It replaces "to favor" with "that favors," creating the illogical sequence "a political climate that...that favors."**

(D) This choice corrects the relative pronoun error by replacing "which has resulted" with "resulting." However, it does not correct the verb error.

**It replaces "to favor" with "to be in favor of," creating the illogical sequence "a political climate that...to be in favor of."**

(E) This choice does not correct the relative pronoun error. Moreover, it does not correct the verb error. It does not replace "to favor." Additionally, "has been claimed by some analysts" is unnecessarily in passive voice and is wordy.

15. This question uses the incorrect pronoun "where" to refer to "informal talent marketplaces." "Where" is used to refer to physical locations, but the "talent marketplaces" are a metaphorical construct, not an actual geographical location. In this case, "in which" is the appropriate construction.

The original answer choice also utilizes unnecessary turns of phrase in its use of "best employees junior to them," as well as "assignments that they find most attractive," both of which use excessive language and could be expressed more succinctly.

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

(B) This choice correctly changes "where" to "in which" but incorrectly uses the conjunction "and" between the terms "strive" and "identify," suggesting that the two terms denote two distinct activities, as opposed to the intended single activity of identifying the best junior employees. Also, "assignments that they find most attractive" are unnecessarily wordy.

(C) This answer repeats the original pronoun error ("where").

(D) This choice incorrectly uses the conjunction "and" between the terms "strive" and "identify," suggesting that the two terms denote two distinct activities, as opposed to the intended single activity of identifying the best junior employees.

(E) **CORRECT** This choice correctly changes "where" to "in which" and also rephrases the sentence more concisely ("best junior employees"; "most attractive assignments").

16.

**(A) CORRECT.** The original sentence is correct as written.

**Future generations .... Will remember**

(B) The word "like" is used incorrectly to introduce an example. Using "like" alters the meaning of the sentence, implying that William Pereira's designs were simply "similar to" the designs for "Reap the Wind." It is preferable to use the word "including." The present tense "remember" is incorrectly used with the subject "future generations." The original sentence was correct to use the future tense "will remember."

(C) The word "like" is used incorrectly to introduce an example. Using "like" alters the meaning of the sentence, implying that William Pereira's designs were simply "similar to" the designs for "Reap the Wind." It is preferable to use the word "including." The antecedent of the pronoun "that" is the plural "movie set designs," so the plural pronoun "those" should have been used.

(D) The antecedent of the pronoun "that" is the plural "movie set designs," so the

plural pronoun “those” should have been used.

(E) The present tense “remember” is incorrectly used with the subject “future generations.” The original sentence was correct to use the future tense “will remember.”

17.

The original sentence has a pronoun reference error. The plural “they” is supposed to refer to “army.” Like many collective nouns, “army” is singular. **Furthermore, “all” is unnecessary.**

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

(B) This choice contains a pronoun reference error. The plural “they” is supposed to refer to “army,” a singular noun.

**(C) CORRECT.** Here, the singular “it” correctly refers to the singular “army.” This choice contains no other errors.

(D) This choice contains a pronoun reference error. The plural “their” cannot refer to Stonewall Jackson, nor to the singular “army.” Also, the “all” is unnecessary.

(E) This choice correctly employs the singular “it” to refer to the singular “army.” However, this choice is a run-on sentence. A comma is not enough to separate two independent clauses.



## Verbs

1.

In the original sentence, "While the stock market was bouncing back" implies that something else was taking place simultaneously in the past, but the rest of the sentence is in present tense ("U.S. families are still reeling"). In addition, the phrasing "between 2001 to 2004" is incorrect; the correct idiom is either "between X and Y" or "from X to Y" (and, in this case, we must use "from X to Y" since only the first word is underlined).

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

(B) "While the stock market bounced back" implies that the next action took place simultaneously in the past, but the next verb ("are still reeling") is in the present tense. In addition, this is a run-on sentence; the comma after the word "recession" should be a semi-colon.

(C) This sentence incorrectly uses "between X to Y." The correct idiom must be "from X to Y."

**(D) CORRECT.** This choice remedies the mis-matched tenses by pairing the present perfect "has bounced back," which indicates an action began in the past and has continued into the present, with the present tense "are still reeling." In addition, it uses the correct idiom ("from X to Y").

(E) "While the stock market bounced back" implies that the next action took place simultaneously in the past, but the next verb ("are still reeling") is in the present tense.

2.

One problem with this sentence is that the first clause of an "if x, then y" sentence should not contain the conditional verb "would". The other problem is that the tense of the second clause is incorrect. This is an "if x, then y" sentence in which the first clause concerns a possible future event, and the second clause concerns a predicted consequence of that event. The first clause should therefore be in the present tense, and the second clause should be in the simple future tense ("it will attract").

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

(B) The first clause of this version is incorrect because: (1) it still contains "would", and (2) there is no good reason to use the passive voice ("be opened") here. The second clause is incorrect because it changes the meaning of the sentence by saying that the store would merely "be able to" attract holiday shoppers.

(C) "If it was opening" is always incorrect. For a possible future event in an "if" clause, you should normally use the present tense and the indicative mood: "If it opens". [If you wanted to indicate skepticism about the possibility that the store will open, you *could* use the subjunctive mood. But the correct way to do that would be to say "If it opened" or "If it were to open" or "If it were opening".]

The second clause of this sentence is also incorrect, as explained in (B).

(D) "If it was to open" is always incorrect. As noted for (C), you should normally say "If it opens". [If you wanted to change the meaning of the sentence, which is not a good

idea in sentence correction problems, you could use the subjunctive mood. But the correct way to do that would be to say "If it opened" or "If it were to open" or "If it were opening".]

In the second clause, "also" is unnecessary and somewhat illogical. The action in the second clause will happen, if it happens at all, as a later result of what happens in the first clause. The word "also" contains a suggestion of simultaneity that is inappropriate in this context.

**(E) CORRECT.** We now have a correct "if x, then y" sentence, in which the first clause is in the present tense and the second clause is in the simple future tense.

3.

The phrase "recent global boom" describes something that began in the past and is continuing into the present; hence, the present perfect tense "has led" is more appropriate than the simple present tense "leads." In addition, "such as" is preferred to "like" when introducing examples.

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

(B) The singular subject "boom" does not agree with the plural verb "have led."

(C) The meaning of the sentence has changed because this choice states that the number of "thieves" has increased rather than the number of "thefts." In addition, "such as" is preferred to "like" when introducing examples.

**(D) CORRECT.** This choice correctly uses the present perfect tense "has led" to indicate that the boom began in the past and is continuing into the present, and also to properly indicate that the boom started before the rise in theft. In addition, "such as" is preferred to "like" when introducing examples.

(E) The present perfect tense "has led" is more appropriate than the present progressive tense "is leading" because although the present progressive indicates an action or state that is continuing, it does not properly indicate the relative time sequence of the boom and the subsequent rise in the theft of metal objects.

4.

The sentence makes clear that the timeframe in question is "the past several years." Since the action began in the past but continues to the present, the appropriate tense is the present perfect (for example, "have walked", "have eaten", etc.)

(A) This choice incorrectly uses the conditional tense "would feel," which is inappropriate here to indicate an actual occurrence.

(B) This choice incorrectly uses the future tense "will feel," which is inconsistent with the past and present nature of the event.

**(C) CORRECT.** The present perfect "have felt" correctly indicates that the orchestras began to feel the pressure in the past and continue to feel the pressure in the present.

(D) This choice incorrectly uses the simple present tense "feel," which does not indicate that the action began in the past and continues to the present.

(E) This choice incorrectly uses the present tense "are feeling," which does not address the past nature of the sentence.

5.

The expression "as though" introduces a supposition that is *contrary to fact* (the pipe is not a twig). Such suppositions must be expressed in the *subjunctive mood*. For example, in the phrase "I wish I were rich," the verb "were" is in the subjunctive because the phrase expresses a desire contrary to fact. The appropriate singular form of the verb "to be" in the subjunctive mood is "were."

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

(B) "Like" should not be used to introduce the comparative clause "a twig does." The word "as" should be used instead. "Like" is used to compare nouns only.

(C) The verb "is" is not appropriate for the subjunctive mood. The appropriate singular form of the verb "to be" in the subjunctive mood is "were."

(D) The verb "was" is not appropriate for the subjunctive mood. The appropriate singular form of the verb "to be" in the subjunctive mood is "were." In addition, this choice changes the meaning of the sentence. While the original sentence asserts that it is possible for rust to deteriorate a steel pipe to the point where it *will* snap easily, this choice asserts only that it is possible for rust to deteriorate the pipe to a point where it *might* snap, i.e., it implies a somewhat lesser degree of possible deterioration.

(E) CORRECT. This choice correctly uses the subjunctive "were."

6.

The past perfect "had believed" is correct because it is the earlier of two past actions (the later action is "proved," which is in the simple past tense). The main clause is correctly written in active voice. The clause "an imaginary substance whose..." correctly modifies "phlogiston."

•

- (A) CORRECT. This choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.
- (B) The simple past "believed" is incorrect because it is the earlier of two past actions and should be in the past perfect tense instead: "had believed." Moreover, "was an imaginary substance released by combustion" is unnecessarily in passive voice.

**Finally, the construction "and its properties were not fully understood" is incorrectly parallel with "phlogiston was released by combustion" rather than subordinate to it, as in the original sentence; this also creates ambiguity around the pronoun "its" which could refer to either combustion or phlogiston.**

**Here parallelism is not needed.**

- (C) The placement of "phlogiston" immediately after the opening clause incorrectly implies that phlogiston had been imaginary until Lavoisier proved otherwise. Moreover, the sentence is unnecessarily in the passive voice.
- (D) This sentence is unnecessarily in the passive voice. Moreover, "was believed" is incorrectly in the simple past tense. It should instead be in the past perfect tense ("had been believed"), because it is the earlier of two past actions.

- (E) This sentence correctly uses the past perfect "had believed" but its construction incorrectly implies that scientists had believed that phlogiston was imaginary.

7.

The non-underlined portion of the sentence utilizes the present perfect tense "have . . . predicted" to indicate that the analysts have and continue to predict the development of democratic institutions in China. In the original sentence, the present perfect tense is also utilized in "has . . . followed" to describe the pattern of democracy following industrial development. However, the sentence clearly refers to the past with the phrase "throughout the 20th century," making the use of the present perfect tense incorrect, as the activity cannot be continuing if it occurred in the past and ended at the end of the 20th century.

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

(B) CORRECT. This choice correctly uses the simple past tense in reference to the pattern of democracy following industrial development in the 20th century, and is otherwise clear and concise.

(C) This choice utilizes the past perfect construction "had . . . followed." This is incorrect, as the past perfect tense requires that another action occurred in the later past, as noted by the use of the simple past tense. There is no such later past action in the original sentence.

(D) The simple present tense "follows" is incorrect in reference to a pattern that occurred "throughout the 20th century," which is in the past.

(E) This choice correctly uses the simple past tense form of the verb. However, here "general" is incorrectly used to modify "industrial development" as opposed to being used to describe the pattern of democracy following industrial development; moreover, the meaning of "general industrial development" is unclear.

8.

In the original sentence, the verb "had implemented" is in the past perfect tense, indicating that this event occurred at some point before the commissioner spoke. The verb "will try", however, is in the simple future. When the future is indicated from the point of view of the past, the simple future is not used. Instead, the conditional is required. For example, "The man said that he would buy a new car" is preferable to "The man said that he will buy a new car." We need to find a conditional verb. Moreover, the pronoun "it" begins a new clause and thus requires repetition of "that" in order to make clear, using parallel structure, that this new clause is still something that the commissioner said. For example, "The man said **that he would buy a new car and that he would drive it everywhere**" is preferable to "The man said **that he would buy a new car and he would drive it everywhere.**"

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

(B) This choice does not offer the conditional "would try", though it does offer another "that". The past tense "tried" is definitely wrong here because the trying will happen "in the future" according to the original sentence. Thus this choice changes the meaning unacceptably.

(C) This choice uses the past perfect tense "had tried" where the conditional "would try" is preferred. An extra "that" is needed to make the two clauses "the government had..." and "it had tried" parallel.

(D) This is a tempting choice as it fixes the verb tense to the conditional "would." However, the tense is technically "conditional perfect" (*would have tried*), which is not the proper tense. Moreover, an extra "that" is needed to make the two clauses "the government had..." and "it would try" parallel.

(E) CORRECT. This choice provides the plain conditional tense and another "that".

9.

The past perfect ("had been born") is used when there are two past actions and we want to indicate which one happened first. In the underlined portion of the sentence, however, the other verb, "would take," is not in the past tense, so we need to use the simple past "was born." (Remember that we always use the most simple tenses allowed; the perfect tenses, and other complicated tenses, are used only when required by the sentence structure.) The second half of the sentence stands in contrast to the first half, in which the simple past "launched" is correctly paired with the past perfect "had seen."

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

(B) This choice changes both the first and second verbs to simple past ("took" and "was born," respectively). In this circumstance, we have two events that took place at different times in the past, which requires use of the past perfect to indicate which event happened first. The dictionary's "birth" obviously happens before its completion, so correct usage would be that the "Dictionary had been born."

**In B, if it is 'had been born', it will become CORRECT.**

(C) The present participle "being" is used with the progressive tense to indicate a continuing or ongoing action. Logically, however, the Dictionary's *start* must have been at a single point in time, rather than over the course of the book's development.

(D) CORRECT. This choice correctly uses the simple past "was born." A more complicated past tense is not required because the other verb "would take," is not in the past tense.

(E) This choice incorrectly adopts the construction "was about to be born," which conflicts with the non-underlined portion of the sentence. The first half of the sentence indicates that the project was "launched" in 1860 in the past tense, making any reference to the book being "about to be born" at some future point in time incorrect.

10.

The original sentence incorrectly utilizes the past perfect tense in its use of "had contributed." The past perfect tense demands that the simple past tense also be used in the sentence to refer to another action that occurred in the past but after the action referred to by the past perfect tense. Here, the sentence uses the present perfect tense "has cited" and the present participle "estimating," but does not use the simple past tense to refer to another action in the later past.

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

(B) This choice is awkward in its use of the structure "Overcomplexity, increasing mobility . . . , and poor financial planning . . . have been cited" as this structure leads to the use of the passive voice, which is less preferable than the active voice. It is also problematic in its use of both the past tense "estimated" and the present perfect tense "have been cited" to refer to the recent study; the verb tenses should be consistent in their treatment of the study.

(C) This choice incorrectly places the modifying phrase "Citing overcomplexity, increasing mobility . . . and poor financial planning" adjacent to "less than half of American workers," incorrectly suggesting that it is less than half of American

workers, and not a recent study, that cites these factors as causes for a lack of contribution to retirement plans. This choice also repeats the original verb tense error with "had contributed."

(D) This choice repeats the original verb tense error with "had contributed."

(E) CORRECT. This choice correctly uses both the present participle ("Citing . . .") and the present perfect ("has estimated") to refer to the recent study, as well as the present tense "contribute" in reference to the study findings. The phrase "Citing overcomplexity, increasing mobility . . . , and poor financial planning," is correctly used here as a modifier for "a recent study."

11.

The original sentence correctly uses the passive construction "is produced," which is necessary because of the later construction "by the exposure of the metal to the oxygen in the atmosphere." Changing this verb to the active voice would create an illogical sentence: "Aerugo...produces...by the exposure of the metal to the oxygen in the atmosphere."

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

(B) "Produces" is incorrectly in the active voice, making "by the exposure of the metal to the oxygen in the atmosphere" illogical. Moreover, "that" and "which" are unnecessary.

(C) "Produces" is incorrectly in the active voice, making "by the exposure of the metal to the oxygen in the atmosphere" illogical.

(D) "Produces" is incorrectly in the active voice, making "by the exposure of the metal to the oxygen in the atmosphere" illogical. Moreover, both instances of "that" are unnecessary.

(E) "Is produced" is correctly used in the passive voice. However, both instances of "which" are unnecessary.

12.

The original sentence is correct as written. It correctly uses the past tense passive verb form "was backed." In this context, the simple past tense is appropriate since there is no need to indicate any complex time sequence. Further, the passive construction "was backed by" is required to indicate that the currency was supported by something else: fixed assets.

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

(B) This choice incorrectly uses the past perfect tense "had been backed." The past perfect form (indicated by the word "had") should only be used in a sentence that contains two past actions or events; the earlier past action takes the past perfect tense, while the later past action takes the simple past tense. In this sentence, there is only one past event; therefore, the use of the past perfect tense is unnecessary and incorrect.

(C) This choice incorrectly changes the passive construction "was backed by" into the active "was backing," thereby distorting the meaning of the sentence. The original sentence indicated that the currency was backed by the fixed assets, not, as is suggested here ("paper currency was . . . backing"), that the fixed assets were backed by the currency.

(D) This choice incorrectly uses the past perfect tense and the active voice in the construction "had backed." The past perfect form (indicated by the word "had") should only be used in a sentence that contains two past actions or events; the earlier past action takes the past perfect tense, while the later past action takes the simple past

tense. In this sentence, there is only one past event; therefore, the use of the past perfect tense is unnecessary and incorrect. Moreover, the active construction "had backed" distorts the meaning of the sentence. The original sentence indicated that the currency was backed by the fixed assets rather than, as is suggested here ("paper currency had . . . backed"), that the fixed assets were backed by the currency.

(E) This choice incorrectly uses the present perfect tense "has been backed." The present perfect form (indicated by the word "has" or "have") should only be used to indicate an action or event that started in the past and continues into or remains true in the present. Since, according to the sentence, paper currency is no longer backed by fixed assets, the use of the present perfect tense is inappropriate.

13.

The sentence incorrectly uses the past perfect verb phrase "had been showing up." The past perfect is only used when a sentence involves two past events; the past perfect tense ("had . . .") is used for the earlier past event while the simple past tense is used for the later past event. However, in this sentence there is no second event that takes place in the past. Therefore, the past perfect cannot be used.

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

(B) This choice incorrectly uses the past perfect verb phrase "had been showing up." The past perfect is only used when a sentence involves two past events; the past perfect tense ("had . . .") is used for the earlier past event while the simple past tense is used for the later past event. However, since, in this sentence, there is no second event that takes place in the past, the past perfect cannot be used. In addition, this choice uses the phrase "as factors in traffic arrests." The plural "factors" is incorrect since "sleeping pills" represent only one factor in traffic arrests.

(C) CORRECT. This choice correctly uses the present perfect tense "have been showing up" to indicate an event that started in the past and continues into the present. This choice also correctly uses the phrase "as a factor" rather than "as factors" because sleeping pills constitute only one factor in arrests.

(D) This choice correctly uses the present perfect tense "have been showing up" to indicate an event that started in the past and continues into the present. However, this choice incorrectly uses the phrase "as factors in traffic arrests." The plural "factors" is incorrect since "sleeping pills" represent only one factor in traffic arrests.

(E) This choice correctly uses the present perfect tense "have been showing up" to indicate an event that started in the past and continues into the present. However, the phrase "sleeping pills have been showing up . . . in traffic arrests" nonsensically suggests that the pills themselves have shown up in traffic arrests. In fact, the pills have shown up as a factor in traffic arrests (while the pills themselves are safely hidden in the driver's stomach).

14.

The original contains a tense error. The past perfect, "Although he had resisted" is correct because it is the earlier of two past actions, as it must have occurred before he led the uprising. Past perfect is used to identify the earliest past time period. All other past time periods should use the simple past.

(A) The original has the aforementioned tense error.

(B) CORRECT. As discussed above, the earlier action uses the past perfect, and the later past event uses the simple past.

(C) This choice incorrectly resolves the tense error, as "had led" is the later past event and "resisted" is the earlier one. Thus, "led" and "had resisted" should be employed.

- (D) The expression "was earlier known as T. E. Lawrence" is wordy and makes the meaning less clear. He became "known" (famous) as Lawrence of Arabia rather than by his birth name. Also, making "was known" the main verb of the sentence changes the meaning of the sentence, since now the "although he had resisted" clause is nonsensically contrasted to the main clause: "was earlier known as T. E. Lawrence."  
 (E) The pronoun "they" has no plural antecedent; pronouns must have a clear reference and agree with that antecedent in number.

The original sentence correctly uses the past perfect form "had had" to establish a chronology of two past events; it is clear that Howard Stern "had had success" (past perfect) prior to the moment in the past when he "opted out" (simple past) of terrestrial broadcasting.

- (A) CORRECT. This choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.  
 (B) The present perfect form "has had" incorrectly implies that Howard Stern continues to have success broadcasting on terrestrial airwaves, even after opting out of terrestrial broadcasting. The present perfect form is used for events that began in the past and continue into the present; the past perfect "had had" must be used to indicate the earliest of multiple past events.  
 (C) The use of the simple past "he had" fails to establish a time-ordering of the two past events; the past perfect form of the verb is needed to indicate that Howard Stern "had had success" (past perfect) prior to the moment in the past when he "opted out" (simple past) of terrestrial broadcasting. Also, "even though" is unnecessarily wordy. The more concise "though" is preferred.

(D) "Having had" is an accepted alternative past perfect construction and thus is grammatically correct. However, the use of "having had" implies that Howard Stern "opted out of terrestrial broadcasting" *as a result* of "having had" success with terrestrial broadcasts. The logical meaning of the sentence is that he "opted out" *despite his previous success, not because of it.*

**GOOD meaning change twist.**

- (E) "Having achieved" is an accepted alternative past perfect construction and thus is grammatically correct. However, the use of "having achieved" implies that Howard Stern "opted out of terrestrial broadcasting" *as a result* of "having achieved" success with terrestrial broadcasts. The logical meaning of the sentence is that he "opted out" *despite his previous success, not because of it.*

**GOOD meaning change twist.**

16. There are three actions in the underlined portion of the sentence. The logical time line is that (1) the noodle shop owners (allegedly) colluded to fix their prices, so (2) the price of a bowl of noodles suddenly increased, causing (3) the allegations against the noodle shop owners. All three actions took place in the past. The original sentence uses the simple past "rose" to indicate that the second action took place in the past. The construction "rose...prompting allegations" correctly indicates the cause and effect relationship between the second and third actions. Finally, the use of the past perfect "had colluded" correctly indicates that the alleged collusion took place prior to the other two past actions.

- (A) CORRECT. The original sentence avoids all of the errors in the other choices.  
 (B) The construction "rose...and prompts" fails to convey the cause and effect relationship between the price increase and the leveling of allegations against the noodle shop owners. Furthermore, the use of the present tense "prompts" is incorrect: according to the original sentence, the allegations have already



been made.

(C) The use of the past perfect “had risen” and the simple past “colluded” reverses the time line of events, illogically suggesting that the prices increased before the noodle shop owners colluded to raise their prices.

(D) The use of the past perfect “had risen” with the past perfect “had colluded” illogically suggests that the price increase and the alleged collusion occurred simultaneously. Furthermore, when correctly using the past perfect tense, the sentence must also have some other action in the simple past tense; here there is no such simple past action.

(E) The verb “to rise” is an irregular verb. The simple past tense is not “raised,” but rather “rose.”

17.

“The jury,” a collective singular noun, requires a singular verb. The sentence correctly uses the singular “has been sequestered” to refer to the jury.

**(A) CORRECT.** This choice correctly uses the singular “has been sequestered” to refer to “jury.”

(B) This choice incorrectly uses the plural “have been sequestered” to refer to the singular “jury.”

(C) This choice correctly uses the singular verb “has been sequestered,” but incorrectly adds the plural pronoun “them” to refer to the singular “jury.”

(D) This choice incorrectly uses the plural “have been sequestered” to refer to the singular “jury.” Additionally, the plural pronoun “them” incorrectly refers to the singular “jury,” and the phrase “in an attempt” is awkward and unnecessary.

(E) This choice incorrectly uses the plural pronoun “them” to refer to the singular “jury.” Additionally, “the leaks” changes the original intent of the sentence by suggesting that specific leaks of information would be shared with the press.

18.

The original contains a verb mood error. “If adolescence was” is improper subjunctive. “Was” should not be used in an “if” clause indicating a hypothetical condition. “If adolescence were” is correct.

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

(B) This choice has a verb mood error. “Was” should not be used in an “if” clause indicating a hypothetical condition; “were” would be correct. Also, the plural “they” can not refer to the singular “adolescence.”

(C) This choice correctly employs the subjunctive mood by stating “if adolescence were.” However, the plural “they” can not refer to the singular “adolescence.”

**(D) CORRECT.** The “if” clause properly uses the subjunctive mood, “if adolescence were.” The singular “it” refers to the singular “adolescence.”

(E) This choice correctly employs the subjunctive mood by stating “if adolescence were.” However, “being one” is wordy and awkward; using “it” is preferable. “Being” is virtually always wordy and incorrect.

19.

The non-underlined portion of the sentence contains the phrase “ordered that,” which requires a clause containing the subjunctive mood. However, the original sentence uses “should be tested” instead of the subjunctive “be tested.” In addition, it is illogical to test a lake or stream “for mercury levels”: this implies that one is testing to see

whether mercury levels exist. Instead, one would “test the mercury levels” of the lake or stream, measuring the amount of mercury.

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

(B) The active construction “all lakes and streams should have their mercury levels tested” is illogical: lakes and streams cannot do such a thing, rather a person would have to test the mercury levels of the lakes and streams.

(C) This choice correctly uses the subjunctive “be tested.” However, the placement of the prepositional phrase “for all lakes and streams” after “be tested” is awkward and can be misinterpreted to mean that the testing is “for” or “on behalf of” the lakes and streams. Instead, one would test “the mercury levels of all lakes and streams.”

(D) The non-underlined portion of the sentence contains the phrase “ordered that,” which requires a clause containing the subjunctive mood. However, this choice uses “should be tested” instead of the subjunctive “be tested.”

**(E) CORRECT.** This choice correctly uses the subjunctive “be tested,” and correctly references the testing of “mercury levels,” replacing the incorrect “tested for mercury levels.”

## Idioms

1. The purpose of this sentence is to contrast pigments used in modern oil paints with the pigments used in older paints. The original sentence uses the wordy expression “are different than,” but the idiomatic expression is “are different from,” and the more concise “differ from” would be even better. In addition, the statement “...X are different than Y because...” is misleading due to the use of “because”: it implies that because the pigments used in modern oil paints are more lightfast and vibrant, they are different (in some unspecified way) from the pigments used in older paints. However, the intended meaning is that the pigments differ “in that” one is more lightfast and vibrant. Secondly, “the ones” can be replaced with the more concise “those.” Finally, the antecedent of the plural pronoun “they” is ambiguous: “they” could refer to the older pigments or to the modern pigments.

## USE of “IN THAT”

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

**(B) CORRECT.** To make the comparison, the concise and accurate “X differ from Y in that...” construction is used. The concise “those” is used instead of “the ones.” The pronoun ambiguity in the original sentence has been eliminated by using “the modern ones” instead of “they.”

(C) This choice uses the wordy expression “are different than,” but the idiomatic expression is “are different from,” and the more concise “differ from”

would be even better. In addition, the statement "...X are different than Y because..." is misleading due to the use of "because": it implies that because the pigments used in modern oil paints are more lightfast and vibrant, they are different (in some unspecified way) from the pigments used in older paints. However, the intended meaning is that the pigments differ "in that" one is more lightfast and vibrant.

(D) This choice uses the wordy and awkward "X are different from Y...on account of being Z" to explain why the pigments are different. In general, the use of "being" on the GMAT is incorrect, because there is typically a more economical way of phrasing the same thing. Here, the concise construction "X differ from Y...in that..." would be preferred.

(E) The statement "...X differ from Y because..." is misleading due to the use of "because": it implies that because the pigments used in modern oil paints are more lightfast and vibrant, they differ (in some unspecified way) from the pigments used in older paints. However, the intended meaning is that the pigments differ "in that" one is more lightfast and vibrant. Secondly, "the ones" can be replaced with the more concise "those." Finally, the antecedent of the plural pronoun "they" is ambiguous: "they" could refer to the older pigments or to the modern pigments.

2.

The original sentence uses the unidiomatic phrase "to do it" to refer to the action of "letting the art go." The proper idiom is "to do so." Additionally, the word "where," which can be used to describe only physical locations, is incorrectly used to describe a time ("in the future"); the word "when" should be used instead.

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

(B) This choice correctly uses the idiomatic phrase "to do so" to refer to the action of "letting the art go." However, it incorrectly uses the plural pronoun "them" to refer to the singular noun "art." Moreover, the word "where," which can be used to describe only physical locations, is incorrectly used to describe a time ("in the future"); the word "when" should be used instead.

(C) This choice correctly employs the word "when" to describe a time "in the future." However, it incorrectly uses the plural pronoun "them" to refer to the singular noun "art." Moreover, the phrase "to do it" is unidiomatic; "to do so" is required instead.

**(D) CORRECT.** This choice correctly uses the idiomatic phrase "to do so" to refer to the action of "letting the art go." Additionally, the word "when" is properly used to describe a time "in the future."

(E) This choice correctly uses the word "when" to describe a time "in the future." However, the phrase "to do it" is unidiomatic; "to do so" is required instead.

3.

In the original sentence, "Jack Nicklaus" is clearly modified by "who solidified...in 1986." Also, the correct form of the idiom "regarded as" is used. Finally, the superlative "best" is correctly used to compare more than two golfers: Jack Nicklaus and Tiger Woods are "regarded as two of the *best*" golfers among *all* the golfers in the history of the sport.

**(A) CORRECT.** This choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.

(B) The idiom “regarded to be” is incorrect. The correct form of the idiom is “regarded as.” Further, the comparative “better” is incorrectly used to compare more than two golfers. The superlative “best” is needed to compare more than two golfers: Jack Nicklaus and Tiger woods are regarded as two of the *best* golfers among *all* the golfers in the history of the sport.

(C) The modifying phrase “who solidified his legendary status...in 1986” incorrectly modifies the plural subject “Tiger Woods and Jack Nicklaus.” Noun modifiers beginning with “who” always refer to the directly preceding noun. In this case, the directly preceding noun is the plural “Tiger Woods and Jack Nicklaus.” Consequently, the singular pronoun “his” in the modifying phrase incorrectly refers to the plural “Tiger Woods and Jack Nicklaus.” Further, the idiom “regarded to be” is incorrect. The correct form of the idiom is “regarded as.”

(D) The modifying phrase “who solidified his legendary status...in 1986” incorrectly modifies the plural subject “Tiger Woods and Jack Nicklaus.” Noun modifiers beginning with “who” always refer to the directly preceding noun. In this case, the directly preceding noun is the plural “Tiger Woods and Jack Nicklaus.” Consequently, the singular pronoun “his” in the modifying phrase incorrectly refers to the plural “Tiger Woods and Jack Nicklaus.” Further, the idiom “regarded as being” is incorrect. The correct form of the idiom is “regarded as.” Finally, the comparative “better” is incorrectly used to compare more than two golfers. The superlative “best” is needed to compare more than two golfers: Jack Nicklaus and Tiger woods are regarded as two of the *best* golfers among *all* the golfers in the history of the sport.

(E) The singular pronoun “his” in the modifying phrase “Solidifying his legendary status...in 1986” does not agree with the adjacent plural subject “Jack Nicklaus and Tiger Woods.”

4.

The original sentence contains the correct idiom “to derive X from Y,” where X and Y are both nouns. In this sentence, the use of the noun phrase “the laying of private television” maintains consistency and parallelism with the noun “benefit” mentioned earlier in the sentence.

**(A) CORRECT.** This choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.

(B) The verb “to derive from” requires noun objects. Here, “laying” is not a noun. Moreover, “the public land” is not idiomatic; it should be “public land.”

(C) The correct idiom is “to derive X from Y,” not “to derive X by Y.” Moreover, “the public’s land” is unnecessary when “public land” would suffice.

(D) “To derive from” is correct in this choice. The wordy and unidiomatic construction “private television cables being laid on public land” fails to provide a noun that would ensure consistency with the noun “benefit” mentioned earlier in the sentence.

(E) The correct idiom is “to derive X from Y,” not “to derive X by Y.” Moreover, “land that was public” is wordy; “public land” is more concise.

5.

When referring to y as the potential outcome of x, the correct idiom is “x’s potential to y.” This sentence incorrectly phrases the idiom as “a hurricane’s potential of destroying or damaging.” When referring to the use of y to determine x, the correct idiom is “x is determined by y.” This sentence incorrectly phrases the idiom as

“potential ... is determined from wind speeds.” Finally, there is a subtle distinction between the idiom “so x as to y” and “x is enough to y.” The original sentence uses the idiom “so x as to y” to indicate that characteristic x is so extreme in the particular case that y results. In contrast, the idiom “x is enough to y” is used when x is the criteria by which an ability to achieve y is measured. Thus, if a sentence stated that “a category 5 storm has wind speeds high enough to blow away small buildings,” this would convey a *different* meaning: that wind speeds are the criteria by which one measures the ability to blow away small houses.

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

(B) When referring to the use of y to determine x, the correct idiom is “x is determined by y.” This sentence incorrectly phrases the idiom as “potential ... is determined from wind speeds.” The change from the original idiom “wind speeds so high as to...” to the idiom presented in this sentence “high enough to...” changes the original meaning of the sentence; it conveys that wind speeds are the criteria by which one measures the ability to blow away small houses. The idiom “so x as to y” is required instead to match the original meaning: that characteristic x (the wind speed) is so extreme in the particular case (a category 5 storm) that y results (small houses are blown away).

(C) When referring to y as the potential outcome of x, the correct idiom is “x’s potential to y.” This sentence incorrectly phrases the idiom as “a hurricane’s potential of destroying or damaging.”

(D) The idiom “high enough to blow away small buildings” changes the original meaning; it conveys that wind speeds are the criteria by which one measures the ability to blow away small houses. The idiom “so x as to y” is required instead to match the original meaning: that characteristic x (the wind speed) is so extreme in the particular case (a category 5 storm) that y results (small houses are blown away).

**(E) CORRECT.** All idioms in the sentence are used correctly.

6.

The idiom “x is cited as y” can also be phrased “cite x as y,” as in this sentence. However, the original sentence incorrectly introduces the unnecessary verb “being.”

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

(B) This choice does not use the correct idiom “cite x as y,” instead introducing the unidiomatic form “cite x to be y.”

(C) This choice does not use the correct idiom “cite x as y,” instead introducing the unidiomatic form “cite x as if they were y.” In addition, the phrase “as if they were” properly refers only to hypothetical situations rather than the concrete example in this sentence.

(D) This choice does not use the correct idiom “cite x as y,” instead introducing the unidiomatic form “cite x for y.” In addition, the phrasing “that they should not” is unnecessarily more wordy than “not to.”

**(E) CORRECT.** This choice uses the correct idiom “cite x as y.”

7.

The original sentence correctly uses the simple past tense “contributed” to refer to an event that occurred in the past. Furthermore, the original sentence correctly uses “such as” to refer to specific baritone singers who made a contribution to the popularization of the “crooning” style of singing.

**(A) CORRECT.** As explained above, this choice uses the proper verb tense and is idiomatically correct.

(B) This choice is wordy, awkward, and redundant. Since the 1930s is a decade, there is no reason to state “of the decade.” Similarly, if baritone singers such as Bing Crosby and Russ Columbo contributed, it is unnecessary to say they “decided” to

contribute. Furthermore, this choice makes two errors in idiomatic construction: the “and also” construction is unidiomatic – the word “also” should be eliminated, and “contribute in” should be “contribute to.”

(C) This choice uses the unidiomatic “like” to refer to specific baritone singers. On the GMAT, “like” means “similar to,” while “such as” refers to specific examples.

(D) Stating “the beginning of the 1930s commencement” is redundant, since “beginning” and “commencement” are synonyms. Furthermore, this choice incorrectly uses “like” instead of the idiomatic “such as” to refer to specific baritone singers.

Finally, it incorrectly shifts to the past perfect “had contributed,” which would only be correct if they “had contributed” prior to some other action in the simple past tense; here there is no such simple past tense verb.

(E) In this choice, “contributed in” is unidiomatic; the proper construction is “contributed to.” Furthermore, this choice incorrectly uses the past perfect “had contributed,” which would only be correct if they “had contributed” prior to some other action in the simple past tense, such as “the 1930s commenced.” This verb tense usage reverses the intended order of events: this choice clearly indicates that they contributed “not long after” the 1930s commenced.

8.

The incorrect idiom “prefer X over Y” is used twice in the original sentence: “...not only prefer rigorous courses...over those that require less work, but also science and math courses over those in the humanities.” The correct form of the idiom is “prefer X to Y.” Also, the original sentence incorrectly uses “like” to introduce examples of rigorous courses. “Such as” is the correct phrase to introduce examples. “Like” should not be used to begin a list of examples, but rather to make a comparison between nouns.

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

**(B) CORRECT.** The examples of rigorous courses, “honors and advanced placement courses,” are correctly introduced with the phrase “such as.” Also, the correct form of the idiom “prefer X to Y” is used, as is the correct idiom “not only X but also Y.” This sentence is written in the basic form “...prefer not only A to B, but also X to Y,” which is clear and idiomatically sound.

(C) The incorrect idiom “not only X but Y” is used: “...prefer not only rigorous courses...but they prefer...” The correct form of the idiom is “not only X but also Y.” Also, this choice incorrectly uses “like” to introduce examples of rigorous courses. “Such as” is the correct phrase to introduce examples. “Like” should not be used to begin a list of examples, but rather to make a comparison between nouns. Finally, the use of “they prefer” is repetitive and unnecessarily wordy.

(D) The incorrect idiom “prefer X more than Y” is used twice: “...prefer not only rigorous courses...more than those that require less work, but also science and math courses more than those in the humanities.” The correct form of the idiom is “prefer X to Y.”

(E) The incorrect idiom “prefer X more than Y” is used twice: “...prefer not only rigorous courses...more than those requiring less work, and also science and math courses more than those in the humanities.” The correct form of the idiom is “prefer X to Y.” Also, the incorrect idiom “not only X and also Y” is used: “...prefer not only rigorous courses...and also science...” The correct form of the idiom is “not only X but also Y.”

9.

The underlined portion of the sentence introduces two idioms: "made possible by" and "both X and Y." The former idiom is incorrectly presented in the sentence as "made possible because of."

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

**(B) CORRECT.** This choice uses both idioms correctly: "made possible by" and "both X and Y."

(C) This choice corrects the first idiom ("made possible by") but introduces a new error by removing "both" and replacing it with "and also." The construction "by... and also" requires the idiom "by X and also by Y."

(D) This choice repeats the original idiom error "made possible because of" and also introduces a new error by removing "both" and replacing it with "and also." The construction "because of... and also" requires the idiom "because of X and also because (of) Y."

(E) This choice presents the incorrect idiom ("made possible as a result of") rather than the correct idiom, "made possible by."

9.

The original sentence uses the correct idiom "to consider X Y" and draws a logical and structurally parallel comparison between two nouns: "a trend" and "a sign."

- **(A) CORRECT.** This answer choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.
- (B) This answer choice uses the unidiomatic construction "to consider X as Y."
- (C) This answer choice uses the unidiomatic and redundant construction "to consider X to be Y."
- (D) This answer choice uses the proper idiomatic construction "to consider X Y" but introduces the plural pronoun "their," which illogically refers to the plural noun "analysts" rather than the company.
- (E) This answer choice uses the unidiomatic construction "to consider X as being Y."

10. The original sentence contains several errors. First, the phrase "remembered because of" is unidiomatic; **the correct idiomatic construction is "remembered for."** Second, "like" is incorrect because the Guggenheim is a specific example and the use of "such as" would be more appropriate to introduce examples. Third, the sentence incorrectly suggests that "the Guggenheim Museum" is a "design." More properly, the sentence should discuss the design "for" the museum.

- (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence.
- **(B) CORRECT.** "Because of" is replaced by "for." "Like" is replaced by "such as." And the use of "the one for" makes clear that the design is for the museum and is not the museum itself.
- (C) This choice does not correct "because of." Moreover, it incorrectly implies that the museum itself is a design. However, the use of "such as" in place of "like" is correct.
- (D) This choice does not correct "because of." **Moreover, the relative pronoun "that" lacks a clear antecedent. It would be correct to say "The design for the house, like that for the factory, is beautiful," for example. But such a parallel structure does not exist in this sentence.** However, the use of "such as" in place of "like" is correct.
- (E) This choice does not correct "like." Moreover, the possessive construction "Guggenheim Museum's" is awkward and unidiomatic. However, the use of "for" rather than "because of" is correct.

11.

There are three problems in the original sentence. First, the comparison is highlighting a difference in the effect of television on children, as measured by test scores. The original sentence uses the idiom "compared to," but the correct idiom for highlighting differences is "compared with."

To highlight differences between similar things, use compare with

To highlight similarities between different things, use compare to

Second, comparisons must compare logically parallel things, but this sentence compares "children whose parents speak English as a second language" with "those (children, presumably) who are native English speakers" themselves. Logic tells us that a child can both in both of these categories: a child who is a native English speaker can have parents who speak English as a second language. Thus, these are not parallel categories.

Finally, the antecedent of the pronoun "those" is ambiguous; "those" could refer to "children" or "parents."

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

(B) Although this choice uses the correct idiom ("compared with") to compare differences between the two groups and resolves the pronoun issue by replacing "those" with "children," it continues to compare "children whose parents speak English as a second language" with "children who are native English speakers."

(C) This choice uses the correct idiom ("compared with") to compare differences between the two groups but incorrectly compares "children whose parents speak English as a second language" with all "native English speakers."

(D) Although this choice makes a clear comparison between two similar or parallel things (children of two different groups of parents), the comparison is highlighting a difference, so the correct idiom is "compared with" rather than "compared to."

Moreover, it does not resolve the pronoun issue because it retains the ambiguous "those."

**(E) CORRECT.** This choice uses the correct idiom "compared with" and correctly compares "children whose parents speak English as a second language" with the logically parallel "children whose parents are native English speakers." Moreover, it resolves the pronoun issue by replacing "those" with "children."

12.

The original sentence fails to correctly complete the idiomatic structure "a result not of X, but of Y," incorrectly suggesting that sustainable weight loss is itself a healthy lifestyle as opposed to a result of a healthy lifestyle. The second "of" (before "a healthy lifestyle") is necessary to complete the structure. Also, "self-deprivation" and "adopting an extreme diet" are nonparallel; because these two items are a "result of" the same thing, they should be structurally similar.

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

- **(B) CORRECT.** This choice completes the idiom "a result not of X, but of Y" correctly by inserting the second "of," making sustainable weight loss a result of a healthy lifestyle. Also, "self-deprivation" and "the adoption of an extreme diet" are both nouns, and are treated in parallel fashion.
- (C) This sentence fails to follow the idiomatic form "a result not of X, but of Y."
- (D) This sentence fails to follow the idiomatic form "a result not of X, but of Y." In addition, the expression "depriving oneself" is awkward.
- (E) This sentence fails to follow the idiomatic form "a result not of X, but of Y." In addition, the expression "depriving oneself" is awkward.



13.

The phrase "require a 60 percent minimum alcohol concentration for the killing of" is wordy and unidiomatic. The proper idiom takes the more concise form "require X to Y."

- (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence.
- (B) This choice incorrectly uses the unidiomatic and wordy form "require that there be X to Y." The proper idiom is "require X to Y."
- (C) This choice incorrectly uses the unidiomatic and wordy form "require that X be Z to Y." The proper idiom is "require X to Y."
- **(D) CORRECT.** The choice uses the proper idiom "require X to Y" where X is the noun phrase "a 60 percent minimum alcohol concentration" and Y is the verb infinitive "kill."
- (E) This choice incorrectly uses the unidiomatic and wordy form "require that there be X for Y." The proper idiom is "require X to Y."

14.

The original sentence contains the unidiomatic "considered as being". The correct idiom is simply "considered", as in "I considered you a friend." Also, "was the subject...over the years" is incorrect. The sentence should use the present perfect "has been the subject," since the speculation began in the past and continues to the present. Finally, "attributed by" is not the correct idiom for this sentence. It should be "attributed to."

- (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence.
- (B) This choice repeats the original idiom error "considered as," though it corrects the other two errors.
- (C) This choice repeats the original idiom error "considered to be" (with a slight variation) as well as the verb tense error "was."
- **(D) CORRECT.** This choice corrects all of the original errors: "considered" instead of "considered as"; "has been" instead of "was"; and "attributed to" instead of "attributed by."
- (E) This choice repeats the original idiom error "considered to be" (with a slight variation) as well as the verb tense error "was." It also introduces new errors: "or any other language" was removed from the sentence entirely, which changes the meaning; "over the years" is placed awkwardly; and "he had not been" is in the past perfect tense, when the correct tense is simple past.

15.

There are two errors with this sentence. First, the singular subject "incidence" does not agree with the plural verb "correlate." Second, the proper idiom is "correlate ... with" rather than "correlate ... to."

- (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence.
- (B) The proper idiom is "correlated with" rather than "correlated to."
- (C) The singular subject "incidence" does not agree with the plural verb "correlate."
- (D) The proper idiom is "correlate ... with" rather than "correlate ... to."
- (E) CORRECT.** This choice corrects both errors in the original sentence. The singular "incidence" agrees with the singular "correlates," and the proper idiom, "correlate ...with" is employed.

16.

The original sentence contains several errors. First, the pronoun "he" has no antecedent. It is meant to refer to Beethoven, yet Beethoven himself does not appear in the sentence. Instead, we have "Beethoven's traditional status." Second, the verb "to consider" should not be followed by "to be." The correct form of the idiom is "X is considered Y," not "X is considered to be Y."

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

(B) The idiom is correct here ("he is considered the last great composer..."), but the pronoun is not; the pronoun "he" has no antecedent. It is meant to refer to Beethoven, yet Beethoven himself does not appear in the sentence. Instead, we have "Beethoven's traditional status."

(C) The pronoun issue is corrected here: "his status" replaces "Beethoven's traditional status" and "Beethoven" replaces "he." However, the idiom "considered as being the last great composer" is not correct; "as being" is not needed. The correct form of the idiom is "X is considered Y," not "X is considered as being Y."

**(D) CORRECT.** The pronoun issue is corrected here: "his traditional status" replaces "Beethoven's traditional status" and "Beethoven" replaces "he." The idiom is also correct here: "Beethoven is considered the last great composer..."

(E) The pronoun issue is corrected here: "he" refers clearly to "Beethoven." However, "he is considered to be the first great Romantic composer" and "consider Beethoven as the last great composer" are both unidiomatic. The correct forms of the idiom are "X is considered Y" and "consider X Y": "he is considered the first great Romantic composer" and "consider Beethoven the last great composer."

17.

The original sentence contains the words "poor enough that it closed..." However, "[Adjective] enough that [Clause]" is an incorrect idiomatic form. The proper idiom with a clause is "so [Adjective] that [Clause]." In this case, the sentence should read "so poor that..."

In addition, the placement of "only" is incorrect. "Only" should be placed immediately before the word it modifies. In this case, "only" modifies "two weeks," so it should be placed immediately before "two weeks."

Note that the correct answer does change the verb from active to passive voice ("it was closed"), which is generally slightly less preferable. However, every other answer choice is demonstrably wrong.

Moreover, the very slight difference in meaning between "it closed" and "it was closed" is minor enough to allow without tripping the alarm of "altered intent."

Also, note that every choice contains the word "it" (which refers to "the new play," the topic if not the grammatical subject of the sentence). Thus, pronouns are not an issue in this problem.

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

(B) The idiom "X enough to Y" should be replaced with "so X that Y," and the word "only" should be directly in front of the time phrase it modifies, "two weeks."

(C) The word "only" should be directly in front of the time phrase it modifies: "two weeks."

**(D) CORRECT.** This proper idiom "so X that Y" is used, and the word "only" comes directly in front of the time phrase it modifies, "two weeks." The passive voice expression "it was closed" is perfectly acceptable.

(E) As in choice (C), the word "only" should be directly in front of the time phrase it modifies: "two weeks."

## Numerical Idioms

1.

The original sentence incorrectly uses the phrase "numbers of" instead of the correct expression "number of."

- (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence.
- (B) This choice correctly replaces "numbers of" with "number of." However, the present perfect tense verb "having had" is incorrectly used. The present perfect tense is used to indicate an event that started in the past and remains true in the present. Since this sentence simply defines the term "polydactyly," the present perfect tense is inappropriate. Instead, in order to maintain parallel structure, the phrase "is termed polydactyly" must be preceded by a noun phrase; the word **"having" is a gerund, a verb that acts as a noun, and is therefore appropriate to open that phrase.**
- (C) CORRECT. This choice correctly replaces "numbers of" with "number of."
- (D) This choice correctly replaces "numbers of" with "number of." However, the phrase beginning with the infinitive form "to have" is not parallel with the phrase "is termed polydactyly." To maintain parallel structure the phrase "is termed polydactyly" must be preceded by a noun phrase; the word "having" is a gerund, a verb that acts as a noun, and is therefore appropriate to open that phrase.
- (E) This choice incorrectly uses the phrase "numbers of" instead of the correct expression "number of." Moreover, the phrase beginning with the infinitive form "to have" is not parallel with the phrase "is termed polydactyly." To maintain parallel structure the phrase "is termed polydactyly" must be preceded by a noun phrase; the word "having" is a gerund, a verb that acts as a noun, and is therefore appropriate to open that phrase.
- The original sentence uses the incorrect quantity expression "the amount" rather than the appropriate "the number" to describe the countable noun "systems." The construction "the amount" can be used to describe only non-countable nouns, such as "water," "ice," and "information," while "the number" can be used to describe countable nouns. **Furthermore, the original sentence uses the incorrect expression "more expensive" to describe "prices." While goods or services can be more or less expensive, their prices can be only higher or lower.**
- **For example, you wouldn't say "This price is more expensive than that one"; instead, you would say "This price is higher than that one."**
- (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence.
- (B) CORRECT. This answer choice supplies the proper quantitative expression "the number" to refer to the countable noun "systems" and replaces the incorrect phrase "more expensive" with the proper adjective "higher" that should be used to describe "prices."
- (C) This answer choice uses the incorrect phrase "the numbers of." Correct phrases can include the plural "a number of" or the singular "the number of" (which is the correct usage in this sentence) but will never include "the numbers of."
- (D) This answer choice uses the incorrect expression "more expensive" to describe "prices." While goods or services can be more or less expensive, their prices can be only higher or lower.

- (E) This answer choice uses the incorrect quantity expression “the amount” rather than the appropriate “the number” to describe the countable noun “systems.” The construction “the amount” can be used to describe only non-countable nouns, such as “water,” “ice,” and “information.”

3.

While “like” correctly compares the two nouns “indicators” and “growth rate,” “amount of” incorrectly modifies the countable noun “resources.” “Amount of” is applied to both components of the compound noun: “amount of time and (amount of) resources.”

“Amount of” can be used to modify uncountable nouns, such as “time,” but not countable nouns, such as “resources.” “Number of” should be used to modify countable nouns.

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

(B) “Amount of” incorrectly modifies the countable noun “resources.” “Amount of” is applied to both components of the compound noun: “amount of time and (amount of) resources.” “Amount of” can be used to modify uncountable nouns, such as “time,” but not countable nouns, such as “resources.” “Number of” should be used to modify countable nouns. Further, “just like” is unnecessarily wordy. The more concise “like” is preferred.

(C) While “number of” correctly modifies the countable noun “resources,” “like” incorrectly compares two verb phrases: “like other...indicators are, the growth rate...is.” “Like” can be used to compare nouns, but not verb phrases. “As” should be used to compare verb phrases.

(D) “As” is correctly used to compare two verb phrases: “as other...indicators are, the growth rate...is.” However, “amount of” incorrectly modifies the countable noun “resources.” “Amount of” is applied to both components of the compound noun: “amount of time and (amount of) resources.” “Amount of” can be used to modify uncountable nouns, such as “time,” but not countable nouns, such as “resources.” “Number of” should be used to modify countable nouns.

(E) CORRECT. “As” correctly compares two verb phrases: “as other...indicators are, the growth rate...is.” Further, “number of” correctly modifies the countable noun “resources.”

4.

The word “many” is used to modify countable items, for example “many apples.” For uncountable things, the modifier “much” should be used, as in “much money.” Here, the quantity word refers to the “tort costs.” **It would be correct to say that the “costs of x are as much as the costs of y.” It could also be correct to say that “costs of x are as many as the costs of y,” but only if referring to the number of types of costs (e.g. fixed, variable, tax-deductible, etc.), rather than the amount of the expenses.** Here, since it is the amount that is compared, “as much as” should replace “as many as” in the original sentence. Additionally, “tort costs” are illogically compared to the year “1990,” rather than to “tort costs in 1990.”

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

•

(B) This choice correctly uses “as much as” to compare the amount of the costs. However, the comparison is still incomplete: “tort costs” are illogically compared to the year “1990,” rather than to “tort costs in 1990.”

(C) CORRECT. The phrase “twice the amount spent in 1990” modifies \$260 billion, correctly conveying the idea that in 1990 the amount spent was \$130 billion.

(D) The plural pronoun “those” cannot refer to the singular “a number,” which is the logical antecedent.

•

**“Those” could refer to “tort costs,” but if that is the case, then a comparison is illogically drawn between \$260 billion and tort costs. The logical comparison would be between \$260 billion and the amount of the tort costs in 1990. The construction is wordy and awkward, with the**

possessive “of 1990’s” having no following noun to clearly possess.  
(not fully followed)

(E) The construction is wordy and awkward, with the possessive “of 1990’s” having no following noun to clearly possess.

5.

There are two errors in the original sentence. First, the expression “causing the result of” is nonsensical; it is impossible for something “to cause the result of” something else. Either “an event *causes* an effect,” “an event *results in* an effect,” or “an effect *is the result of* an event.” Second, the expression “as many as” refers to a portion of the “population,” which is an uncountable noun (i.e., one cannot say “one population, two population”); hence, the correct expression here is “as much as” rather than “as many as.”

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

(B) The expression “causing the result of” is nonsensical; it is impossible for something “to cause the result of” something else. This choice does correctly use “as much as” rather than “as many as” to refer to the unquantifiable noun “population.”

(C) CORRECT. This choice correctly uses the expression “as much as” rather than “as many as” to refer to the uncountable noun “population.” In addition, this choice uses the grammatical form “Poor weather ... created meager harvests resulting in X and Y” where the entire phrase beginning with “resulting” directly modifies “harvests,” and where X, “mass starvation ...,” and Y, “the elimination of ...” are parallel to each other in structure.

(D) The expression “as many as” refers to a portion of the “population,” which is an uncountable noun; hence, the correct expression here is “as much as” rather than “as many as.” In addition, the construction “Poor weather...created meager harvests... and resulted in mass starvation ...” changes the meaning of the sentence slightly by asserting that the poor weather, rather than the meager harvests, was the direct cause of the starvation and the elimination of some of the population.

(E) The expression “as many as” refers to a portion of the “population,” which is an uncountable noun; hence, the correct expression here is “as much as” rather than “as many as.”

6.

The original sentence incorrectly uses the modifier “less” to refer to the countable plural noun “engineers.” The modifier “less” can be applied only to non-countable nouns, for example “less water” or “less evidence.” By contrast, countable nouns, such as “engineers,” should be described by the modifier “fewer” rather than “less.” In addition, the phrase “less skilled engineers” can be easily misconstrued to assert that the engineers in the job pool have declined in skills rather than in quantity.

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

(B) CORRECT. This choice properly uses “fewer” rather than “less.”

(C) The plural verb “have resulted” does not agree with the singular subject “the ... number.”

(D) The past perfect tense “had resulted” is not appropriate here because it should be used only in combination with another verb that describes a subsequent action; the past perfect tense is used to make it clear that the event it describes happened before another event in the past (“The train had just left [earlier event] when we arrived at the station [subsequent event].”). The present perfect form “has resulted” is

appropriate here because it describes an event which started in the past and is still continuing. In addition, the modifier “fewer” should be used instead of “less.”  
(E) The plural verb “have resulted” does not agree with the singular subject “the ... number.” In addition, the modifier “fewer” should be used instead of “less.”

7. The original sentence contains one error; the plural “their” can not refer to the singular “administration.”

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

(B) This choice repeats the original error; the plural “their” can not refer to the singular “administration.” Furthermore, the plural “have increased” does not agree with “administration.”

**(C) CORRECT.** Choice C correctly employs the singular “has increased” and “its”; both agree with the singular “administration.”

(D) This choice correctly uses the singular “has increased” and “its”; both agree with the singular “administration.” **However, the use of “amount” is incorrect. “Amount is used for uncountable quantities. “Fines” are countable, and so “number” should be used.**

(E) Choice E incorrectly uses “amount.” “Amount is used for uncountable quantities. “Fines” are countable, and so “number” should be used. Also, the plural “have increased” and the plural “their” cannot refer to the singular “administration.”



8.

The sentence compares "the portion of the interest" set aside to fund x to "that" (the portion of the interest) set aside to fund y. **Since the "portion of the interest" is a singular quantity, it cannot be described using the phrase "more numerous," which can be used only for plural nouns. (A countable plural noun such as "students" could be described as "more numerous." For example, one could say "The merit-scholarship students are more numerous than the athletic-scholarship students.") To compare a singular quantity, the phrase "greater than" should be used instead.**

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

(B) This choice incorrectly uses the modifier "more numerous" to describe the singular quantity "the portion of interest." Moreover, the plural verb "are" does not agree with the singular subject "the portion of interest."

**(C) CORRECT.** This choice correctly uses the phrase "greater than" to compare two singular quantities: "The portion of interest" set aside to fund x "is greater than that" set aside to fund y.

(D) While this choice correctly uses the word "greater" to compare two singular quantities, it incorrectly omits the word "than" thereby creating an incomplete comparison: "The portion of interest . . . set aside to fund [x] is greater that set aide to fund [y]."

(E) This choice correctly uses the phrase "greater than" to compare two singular quantities: "The portion of interest" set aside to fund x "is greater than that" set aside to fund y. However, the plural verb "are" does not agree with the singular subject "the portion of interest."

9.

The original sentence uses the correct idiomatic construction “planning to provide.” Additionally, the appropriate quantity modifier “fewer” is used to refer to the countable noun “incentives.”

**(A) CORRECT.** This answer choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.

(B) This answer choice uses the incorrect quantity modifier “less” to refer to the countable noun “incentives.” The modifier “less” can be applied only to non-countable nouns, for example “less water” or “less evidence.” Countable nouns, such as “incentives,” should be described by the modifier “fewer” rather than “less.”

(C) This answer choice uses the unidiomatic construction “to plan on.” The appropriate idiom is “to plan to.”

(D) This answer choice also uses the less idiomatic construction “planning on.” The singular verb “is planning” does not agree with the plural subject “nations.”

**Additionally, the use of “which” is incorrect in this context. “Which” should only be used to introduce a modifier that is not integral to the meaning or structure of the sentence; here, the fact that France is one of the 4 nations planning to provide tax incentives is the main purpose of the sentence, and the omission of the language following “which” would result in an incomplete sentence.**

(E) This answer choice supplies the incorrect singular verb construction “is planning” that does not agree with the plural subject “nations.” (as “nations” is followed by the correct relative pronoun, “that”, the verb must agree with the plural noun immediately preceding “that”). Furthermore, this answer choice uses the incorrect quantity modifier “less” to refer to the countable noun “incentives.” The modifier “less” can be applied only to non-countable nouns, for example “less water” or “less evidence.” Countable nouns, such as “incentives,” should be described by the modifier “fewer” rather than “less.”

10.

The original sentence correctly uses the superlatives “least” and “fewest,” rather than the comparatives “less” and “fewer,” to relate the amount of media coverage and the number of votes received by *three* candidates. Also, this sentence correctly uses a form of less, “least,” to modify the non-countable noun “media coverage” and a form of few, “fewest,” to modify the countable noun “votes.”

(A) **CORRECT.** This choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.

(B) The comparative form “less” incorrectly relates the amount of media coverage received by three candidates. “Less” should be used to make comparisons between two entities, not three. Further, the comparative form “fewer” incorrectly relates the number of votes received by three candidates. Again, the comparative form should be used only to make comparisons between two entities.

(C) The comparative form “less” incorrectly relates the amount of media coverage and the number of votes received by three candidates. “Less” should be used to make comparisons between two entities, not three. Also, “less” incorrectly modifies the countable noun “votes.” “Less” should be used to modify non-countable nouns while a form of “few,” in this case “fewest,” should be used to modify countable nouns.

(D) “Less” incorrectly modifies the countable noun “votes.” “Less” should be used to modify non-countable nouns while a form of “few,” in this case “fewest,” should be used to modify countable nouns.

(E) The phrases “smallest amount of media coverage” and “smallest number of votes” are unnecessarily wordy. The more concise phrases “least media coverage” and “fewest votes” are preferred.

11.

In the original sentence, “much” incorrectly references the quantity of female graduate students. Students are countable, so “many” is the correct term. Additionally, “as 1981” incorrectly completes the comparison, illogically comparing the number of people (the “198,113 female science and engineering graduate students”) to a year (“1981”).

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

(B) “As 1981” incorrectly completes the comparison, illogically comparing the number of people (the “198,113 female science and engineering graduate students”) to a year (“1981”).

(C) **CORRECT.** “Double the figure” places the emphasis on the number of female graduate students, and correctly completes the comparison between the number of people in one year (198,133 in 2003) and the number of people in another year (the figure for 1981).

(D) “What it was” is wordy, awkward, and unclear. **The singular pronoun “it” has no clear antecedent.**

(E) “Double that of 1981’s” is wordy, awkward, and unclear.

**The singular pronoun “that” has no clear antecedent. The possessive “1981’s” is not followed by a noun to possess.**

## Meaning Clarity

1.

The original sentence says something that differs from the logical intent. The verb “should” implies obligation; in this sentence, it indicates that one person in the United States *ought* to experience a coronary event every 26 seconds, as though the person deserves it, or, for that matter, as though any one person could continue indefinitely to have such frequent heart attacks. The American Heart Association clearly means that some person in the United States *will* experience a coronary event roughly every 26 seconds.

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

(B) “Should” suggests that a person *ought* to experience a coronary event, rather than that a person *will*. Furthermore, “every 26 seconds” is an approximation, but the phrase “once in every 26 seconds” is too precise for the situation, suggesting coronary events occur with predetermined frequency.

(C) “Every 26 seconds” is an approximation, but the phrase “one person in the United States once in every 26 seconds” is too precise for the situation, suggesting that a specific person will suffer coronary events on a predetermined schedule. Furthermore, “once in” is wordy and unnecessary.

(D) CORRECT. In this sentence, “will experience a coronary event” is free of the unintended connotations of “should experience a coronary event.”

(E) “Should” suggests that a person *ought* to experience a coronary event, rather than that a person *will*.

2.

The original sentence contains two problems. First, “towering a hundred feet over brownstone units” is unclear and implies the absurd meaning that the glass apartments are located directly over brownstone units in different buildings. Second, the verb “accentuated” should be in the present tense, since the earlier use of the present perfect tense (“have embraced”) implies that the embracing is still happening, and therefore that the ethic *accentuates* the lives in the general present. Incidentally, in this context, “by choosing” and “in choosing” have nearly identical meanings; as a result, this split is immaterial.

(A) Incorrect, as it repeats the original sentence.

- (B) This choice repeats the errors from the choice (A) and adds another. The adjective “seeming” is incorrect, since adjectives modify nouns; it is not “seeming professionals,” but “seemingly younger... professionals.” An adverb must be used to describe an adjective.
- (C) CORRECT. Using “in hundred-foot towers instead of” rather than “towering a hundred feet over” makes the intended meaning clearer. Also, the verb “accentuates” is in the proper tense (present).
- (D) The verb “accentuated” should not be in the past tense, as noted above.
- (E) In this choice, “towering a hundred feet over brownstone units” is unclear and implies the absurd meaning that the glass apartments are located directly over brownstone units in different buildings. The adjective “seeming” is incorrect, as noted earlier in choice B. An adverb must be used to describe an adjective. **Finally, the participle “accentuating” should arguably be replaced with the relative clause “that accentuates”; following a comma,**

**the participle implies that the professionals are doing the accentuating, rather than the design ethic. This change of meaning is inadvisable.**

3.

The original sentence contains a misplaced modifier, which alters the intended meaning of the sentence. The modifying phrase “Nearly 2000 years after its initial construction” incorrectly modifies “the United Nations,” the adjacent noun. However, it is the “Roman aqueduct” that was constructed nearly 2000 years earlier, not “the United Nations.” Further, “declared the Roman aqueduct...to be a Heritage of Humanity” uses an incorrect idiom: “declare X to be Y.” The correct form of the idiom is: “declare X Y.”

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

(B) This sentence implies that it was the deterioration of the aqueduct that prompted the “Spanish government to begin renovations.” However, the intended meaning, as dictated by the original sentence, is that the United Nations’ declaration prompted the renovations. Further, “declared the Roman aqueduct...to be a Heritage of Humanity” uses an incorrect idiom: “declare X to be Y.” The correct form of the idiom is: “declare X Y.”

(C) The modifying phrase “After being declared...in 1985” incorrectly modifies the adjacent noun “Spanish government.” It is not the “Spanish government” that was declared a Heritage of Humanity, but rather the “Roman aqueduct.” Additionally, the modifying phrase “which had been deteriorating...” incorrectly modifies the immediately preceding noun, “Segovia.” Again, it was not “Segovia” that had been deteriorating, but rather the “Roman aqueduct.”

**(D) The verbs “declared” and “prompted” are written with parallel structure. This changes the original meaning of the sentence by making these actions independent and sequential. However, the intended meaning is that the “prompting” occurred not independently of the declaration, but as a consequence of the declaration. Further, “declared the Roman aqueduct...to be a Heritage of Humanity” uses an incorrect idiom: “declare X to be Y.” The correct form of the idiom is: “declare X Y.”**

**(E) CORRECT.** This sentence is clear in meaning. The modifying phrase “which had been deteriorating...” correctly modifies the immediately preceding noun “aqueduct.” Also, the phrase “prompting the Spanish government...” is subordinate to “declared,” making it clear that the “prompting” occurred as a result of the declaration. Finally, “declared the Roman aqueduct...a Heritage of Humanity” uses the correct form of the idiom: “declared X Y.”

4.

**The original sentence does not contain any errors. The verb clause “was an underground remnant of Earth’s earliest days” is correct in tense (simple past “was”) and number (singular “molten rock” paired with singular “was”). Moreover, the modifier “sporadically erupting through volcanoes” correctly modifies “an underground remnant of Earth’s earliest days.”**

- (A) CORRECT. This choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.
- (B) This choice unnecessarily and incorrectly changes the simple past “was” to the past perfect “had been,” which is used only when describing the earlier of two past actions. Moreover, the use of “and” here equates the geologists’ false understanding of lava with the fact that it sometimes erupts through volcanoes.
- (C) This choice improperly uses the relative pronoun “which” to modify “Earth’s earliest days” instead of “molten rock known as lava.”

- (D) This choice incorrectly changes the simple past "was" to the conditional "would be." Moreover, the use of "that" implies that eruption through volcanoes was part of what the geologists erroneously believed about lava.
- (E) In this choice, "having sporadically erupted" incorrectly places this modifier in the past tense, implying that lava no longer erupts through volcanoes.

5.

The given sentence is correct as written. "The residents of" a certain place is the proper idiom. It is also correct to refer to the residents living in the "area" of the Chesapeake Bay, rather than in the Bay itself.

- (A) CORRECT. The original sentence is correct as written.
- (B) This answer incorrectly implies that the residents are living "in" the Bay itself as well as the area surrounding the Bay. (Note that if we were talking about residents with houseboats or the like, they would be living "on" the Bay, not "in" it.)
- (C) This answer implies that the residents reside only in or on the Bay itself rather than near it or around the Bay area; though there may be some residents living on boats, the meaning of the original sentence indicates it was not intended to be limited to those living in or on the Bay. In addition, logic dictates that the residents cannot live "in" the Bay.
- (D) "Around the vicinity of" is both redundant and the incorrect idiom; to live in the "vicinity" of a landmark already includes the area "around" that landmark. The correct idiom is "in the vicinity of."
- (E) "Living in and around the Chesapeake Bay area" is redundant; living "in" a particular "area" implies living "around" that same area.

6.

The original sentence contains several errors. First, "household appliances and automobiles" are specific examples of durable goods, so they ought to be introduced with "such as" instead of "like." Similarly, "food and shelter" are specific examples of non-durable goods, so "like" is used incorrectly there, too. Second, the use of "if" in this context is incorrect. On the GMAT, "if" is used only to introduce conditional clauses (e.g. "if X, then Y"). Here, the author should have used "whether" instead of "if" to indicate uncertainty about the health of the overall economy. Third, it is illogical to say that "spending...is a cyclical pattern". The author clearly means that spending follows a cyclical pattern. Finally, the author's intent is to make a comparison between spending on durable goods and spending on non-durable goods, but the original sentence incorrectly compares "spending on durable goods" to "non-durable goods."

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

(B) First, "household appliances and automobiles" are specific examples of durable goods, so they ought to be introduced with "such as" instead of "like." Similarly, "food and shelter" are specific examples of non-durable goods, so "like" is used incorrectly there, too. Additionally, it is illogical to say that "spending...is a cyclical pattern". The author clearly means that "spending" follows a "cyclical pattern."

(C) CORRECT. The specific examples of durable and non-durable goods are correctly introduced with "such as." The comparison is made in a logically and structurally parallel way: "spending on durable goods...follows a cyclical pattern" is parallel to "spending on non-durable goods...remains constant."

(D) The phrasing of this choice is wordy and awkward, and "determines the cyclical pattern of spending on durable goods" is not structurally parallel to "non-

durable spending ... remains constant." Finally, "non-durable spending" has a nonsensical meaning; it is the goods that are non-durable, and the author's intent was to refer to spending on such goods. **NOT parallel.**

- (E) "Food and shelter" are specific examples of non-durable goods, so they ought to be introduced with "such as" instead of "like." Also, this choice states that "non-durable goods...remain constant" when what is meant is that "spending on non-durable goods...remains constant."

7.

The original sentence correctly compares a characteristic of top-performing sales organizations with that of other sales organizations. However, the original sentence is unnecessarily wordy in its use of "they have a tendency" as well as "in the direction of" and "is the case." Moreover, the use of the present perfect verb construction "have concentrated" is inappropriate, since the simple present tense is sufficient to describe a regular feature of "sales organizations."

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

(B) This choice is clear and concise. However, in its use of "toward other sales organizations," this choice does not draw the correct and logical comparison between the behavior of top sales organizations and the behavior of other sales organizations. Instead, this choice illogically compares the level of resources concentrated on certain important customers and the resources directed toward other sales organizations. Finally, the construction "concentrate more resources to" is unidiomatic; the appropriate idiom is "to concentrate on."

(C) This choice incorrectly draws a comparison between the level of resources concentrated on a number of important customers and the resources directed towards other sales organizations in its use of "as opposed to other sales organizations." The correct comparison is between the behavior of top sales organizations and that of other sales organizations.

(D) CORRECT. This choice correctly draws a comparison between a characteristic of top sales organizations and that of other sales organizations, and is otherwise clear and concise.

(E) This choice incorrectly draws a comparison between the level of resources directed toward a number of important customers and the resources directed toward other sales organizations in its use of "as opposed to." The correct comparison is between top sales organizations and other sales organizations.

8.

**In C, D and E, the two it's have to mean the same thing, which is not the case.**

- The meaning of the original sentence is clear: If passengers are not deterred by a significant fare increase, the airline industry must be doing well. The original sentence also uses concise language ("price-sensitive passengers") to make its point. Additionally, the pronoun "it" in the original sentence clearly refers to the fact that passengers are not deterred by a significant fare increase.
- (A) CORRECT. This choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.
- (B) This choice incorrectly replaces the concise phrase "price-sensitive passengers" with the wordy alternative "passengers who are price-sensitive."
- (C) In this choice, the pronoun "it" is used initially to refer to a fare increase. In the non-underlined portion of the sentence, a second "it" is used to refer not to a fare increase, but to the fact that a fare increase does not deter price-

sensitive passengers. The use of the pronoun "it" is incorrect in this answer choice as it causes the antecedent to be unclear for the second "it" in the non-underlined portion of the sentence. Also, "acting as a deterrent" is unnecessarily wordy, and the use of the term "may raise" suggests that the airlines are being given permission to increase their fares.

- (D) In this choice, the pronoun "it" is used initially to refer to a fare increase. In the non-underlined portion of the sentence, a second "it" is used to refer not to a fare increase, but to the fact that a fare increase does not deter price-sensitive passengers. The use of the pronoun "it" is incorrect in this answer choice as it causes the antecedent to be unclear for the second "it" in the non-underlined portion of the sentence. Also, the use of the term "may raise" suggests that the airlines are being given permission to increase their fares.
- (E) In this choice, the pronoun "it" is used initially to refer to a fare increase. In the non-underlined portion of the sentence, a second "it" is used to refer not to a fare increase, but to the fact that a fare increase does not deter price-sensitive passengers. The use of the pronoun "it" is incorrect in this answer choice as it causes the antecedent to be unclear for the second "it" in the non-underlined portion of the sentence.

9. In the original sentence, the pronoun "his" lacks a clear antecedent, making it unclear whether it was "Lewis Latimer" or "Thomas Edison" who "became known for his invention of the light bulb." In fact, the plural phrase "Lewis Latimer and Thomas Edison" leads us to expect a plural pronoun later on; if we only wish to refer to "Thomas Edison," we should position the modifying phrase so as to refer to "Thomas Edison" only.

Also, the construction "who became known for his invention" is wordy and could be replaced by the more concise form "known for his invention."

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

(B) This answer choice replaces the wordy construction "who became known for his invention" with the more concise form "known for his invention," but retains the original ambiguity stemming from the lack of a clear antecedent for the pronoun "his."

**(C) CORRECT.** By placing the modifier "known for his invention of the light bulb" immediately after "Thomas Edison" and prior to the introduction of "Lewis Latimer," this answer choice resolves the original ambiguity and makes it clear that the pronoun "his" refers to "Thomas Edison" rather than "Lewis Latimer." The construction "known for his invention" is also more concise than the original form "who became known for his invention."

(D) This answer choice illogically states that it was the "pioneering research" rather than "Thomas Edison" that became "known for his invention of the light bulb," thus altering the original meaning of the sentence. Further, this answer choice retains the original problem of ambiguity by failing to provide a clear antecedent for the pronoun "his."

(E) This answer choice uses the passive construction "research that was conducted by Thomas Edison" rather than the more direct and concise form "research of Thomas Edison." Further, while the placement of the modifier "who became known for his invention of the light bulb" next to Thomas Edison and prior to the introduction of "Lewis Latimer" resolves the ambiguity, the phrase "who became known for his invention" is wordy; the more concise form "known for his invention" is preferable.

- 10.



The original sentence contains the pronoun "them" but it is not grammatically clear whether the pronoun's antecedent is "bowers of sticks and twigs" or "females." Logically, we know that the antecedent is "bowers", so we need to find a replacement that makes this clear. Moreover, the bowerbird does not derive its name from the fact that it builds bowers, but from the bowers themselves.

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

**(B) CORRECT.** This choice rewrites the sentence to make it clear that the name derives from the bowers and not from the fact of building them, and it also eliminates the pronoun "them" and instead refers to "structures" to make the relationship clear.

(C) This choice does not make it clear that the males build the bowers and decorate them. Instead, it seems to suggest that the bowers exist on their own and that the male uses only the flowers and vegetation to attract females.

(D) This choice uses the phrase "having decorated them" improperly. It is not necessary to use "having" in this context because the sentence describes an ongoing event, not one that occurred in the past.

(E) This choice is in the passive voice, which is not preferable to active voice when a grammatical active version (such as B) is also offered. **Moreover, the placement of the modifier "that are built by the males" incorrectly implies the sticks and twigs are built by the males.** Also the phrase "and decorated with flowers and other vegetation to attract females" seems to further imply that the sticks and twigs are also decorated with flowers...

11.

The initial connecting word "although" indicates a change of direction will occur later in the sentence, but the subsequent connecting word "and" incorrectly allows the sentence to continue in the same direction instead of introducing a contrast.

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

(B) This choice also uses the incorrect connecting word "and" when the initial "although" indicates a change of direction is necessary. In addition, "it" has an unclear antecedent; it could be referring back to "book" or "lifetime."

**(C) CORRECT.** This choice correctly removes the connecting word "and," enabling the change of direction indicated by "although" to take place successfully.

(D) This choice uses a semicolon incorrectly. Semicolons require each clause before and after the semicolon to be complete sentences, and here "Although reclusive author Harper Lee wrote just one book in her lifetime" is not a complete sentence. In addition, "it" has an unclear antecedent; it could be referring back to "book" or "lifetime."

(E) This choice uses a semicolon incorrectly. Semicolons require each clause before and after the semicolon to be complete sentences, and here "Although reclusive author Harper Lee wrote just one book in her lifetime" is not a complete sentence.

12. There are several errors in the original sentence. First, "some scientists suggest the moon..." illogically indicates that the moon is the object of the verb "suggest." The scientists are not suggesting the moon, rather they are suggesting something about the moon. Second, "formed out of" is wordier than the preferred idiom "formed from." Finally, the relative pronoun "which" must refer to the immediately preceding noun, suggesting illogically in this case that "the Earth" was dislodged by a meteor. It is more likely that the author intends to say that "a part" of the Earth was dislodged, or that "the moon" was dislodged from the Earth.

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

**(B) CORRECT.** This choice begins with “some scientists suggest that the moon was formed...” clearing up the confusion from the original sentence about what the scientists are suggesting. Second, this choice uses the preferred idiom “formed from.” The modifying phrase “that had perhaps been dislodged” correctly refers to “part of the Earth.”

(C) The use of the active verb “formed” is incorrect here because it illogically suggests that “part of the Earth” had an active role in forming the moon.

(D) First, “some scientists suggest the moon...” illogically indicates that the moon is the object of the verb “suggest.” The scientists are not suggesting the moon, rather they are suggesting something about the moon. Second, “formed out of” is wordier than the preferred idiom “formed from.”

(E) The scientists suggest that two actions occurred: “the moon had been formed” and “part of the Earth...had been dislodged.” Both of these actions took place in the distant past, and it is logical to infer that the part was dislodged, and later the moon was formed from it. However, this choice uses the past perfect tense for both actions, incorrectly indicating that the part was dislodged and the moon simultaneously formed. Furthermore, the past perfect tense is only used correctly to indicate that one action took place prior to some other action in the simple past tense; this sentence has no verbs in the simple past tense, so the use of the past perfect tense is not warranted.

13.

The original sentence incorrectly compares the work of Byron and Shelley to poets. In addition, the use of “which” in the original sentence incorrectly implies that “themes of love and beauty” gave rise to Romanticism.

(A) This choice is the same as the original sentence.

**(B) CORRECT.** The comparison is correctly drawn between Byron and Shelley and “other poets.” Moreover, the original problematic use of “which” has been corrected.

(C) This choice incorrectly compares “other poets” to “Byron and Shelley’s work.”

(D) This choice incorrectly uses “like” to compare verb clauses. Instead, “as” would be appropriate here. Moreover, parallelism requires that the comparison be made between “the work of Byron and Shelley” and “the work of other poets” or between “Byron and Shelley” and “other poets.” Instead, we have “the work of Byron and Shelley” and “other poets.”

(E) This choice is awkward and wordy. Moreover, the verb “was” incorrectly refers to “the works of Byron and Shelley.”

14.

The sentence begins with a modifier: “quarried from a site over five miles away”. This clearly describes stone. However, the subject of the modifier in the original sentence is “scientists.” This is incorrect. We need to find a choice that places some kind of stone as the subject of the modifier.

(A) This choice is the same as the original.

(B) While the opening modifier correctly modifies "the massive stone blocks," the phrase "because of how" seems to imply that the prehistoric Britons' method of transporting the stones is known.

(C) This choice incorrectly uses "scientists" as the subject of the opening modifier.

**(D) CORRECT.** "Massive stone blocks" is correctly placed as the subject of the modifier.

(E) While the opening modifier correctly modifies "the massive stone blocks," this sentence omits reference to the prehistoric Britons and contains the awkward phrase "due to being transported".

## Concision

1.

The original sentence contains two instances of redundant wording. First, we have "typically causes death within 3 to 5 years of the onset of symptoms, on average..." "Typically" and "on average" are both supplying the same information and are, therefore, redundant. In addition, the word "although" at the beginning of the sentence indicates that a contrast will appear later in the sentence. In the second half, we also have "in contrast," which supplies the same information as "although." Again, this is redundant.

- 
- (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence.
- 
- (B) This choice removes "typically," thereby eliminating the first redundancy problem with "typically" and "on average." However, the sentence retains "in contrast." Since "although" is not underlined and cannot be removed from the sentence, "in contrast" must be removed in order to eliminate the redundancy.
- 
- (C) CORRECT. This choice removes "on average," thereby eliminating the first redundancy problem with "typically" and "on average." This choice also removes "in contrast," thereby eliminating the second redundancy problem with "although" and "in contrast."
- 
- (D) This choice removes "typically," thereby eliminating the first redundancy problem with "typically" and "on average." The new placement of "average," however, incorrectly alters the meaning of the sentence, implying that sufferers will die within 3 to 5 years of the worldwide average onset, rather than within 3 to 5 years of the onset of their own disease. In addition, we still have the second redundancy problem ("although" and "by contrast") and a new problem is created by the use of "by contrast." In this usage, "in contrast" is the correct idiom.
-

- (E) This choice removes "in contrast," thereby eliminating the second redundancy problem with "although and "in contrast." However, "typically" and "average" are both still present in the sentence and are, therefore, still redundant. In addition, the new placement of "average" incorrectly alters the meaning of the sentence, implying that sufferers will die within 3 to 5 years of the worldwide average onset, rather than within 3 to 5 years of the onset of their own disease.

2.

The original sentence incorrectly uses the present perfect "has fluctuated" rather than the simple past "fluctuated" to describe a completed action that occurred in the past. Furthermore, the use of "annual amount" and "per year" is repetitive and wordy. Finally, the original sentence uses the redundant construction "whether or not" rather than the more concise "whether."

- (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence.
- (B) In this answer choice, the use of "annual amount" and "per year" is repetitive and wordy. Also, this answer choice uses the redundant construction "whether or not" rather than the more concise "whether."
- (C) The use of the possessive pronoun "its" is redundant in the phrase "its rapid economic growth" because the non-underlined "of the province" that follows already indicates that the "rapid economic growth" belongs to the province.
- (D) This answer choice uses the redundant construction "whether or not" rather than the more concise "whether."
- (E) CORRECT. This answer choice correctly uses the simple past "fluctuated" to describe a completed action that occurred in the past. Furthermore, this answer avoids the use of "per year," a construction that is redundant after an earlier reference to "the annual amount of precipitation." Finally, this answer choice replaces the wordy and unidiomatic phrase "whether or not" with the more concise "whether."

3.

In the original sentence, the use of both "the process" and "the method" creates an unnecessary repetition. Both refer to the same digital remastering procedure; only one reference to this procedure is needed.

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

(B) The use of both "the process" and "the way" creates an unnecessary repetition. Both refer to the same digital remastering procedure; only one reference to this procedure is needed.

(C) CORRECT. This choice uses only one reference to the digital remastering procedure: "the process." Also, "process by which" is concise and idiomatically sound.

(D) "Digital remastering occurs when..." changes the meaning of the sentence. This phrasing implies that digital remastering occurs *as a result of* the converting, editing, and filtering of the analog sound recordings. However, the intended meaning is that the process of digital remastering *is* the converting, editing, and filtering of these recordings.

(E) The subject "digital remastering" lacks a main verb, resulting in an incomplete sentence. The subject is modified by "the process by which analog sound recordings are converted...and filtered to enhance the overall quality of the sound," but this non-essential modifier cannot substitute for a main action.

4.

The sentence has several errors of concision. First, the structure “X is of ... importance which is why Y is a ... prerequisite” is awkward and wordy, and can be more concisely written as follows: “Because [X is ... important], [Y is ... necessary].” Second, both “some importance” and “necessary prerequisite” are redundant: if something is “important” it has “some importance”; similarly, a “prerequisite” is by definition “necessary.”

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

(B) The singular verb “is” does not agree with the plural subject “records.” In addition, the plural verb “are” does not agree with the singular subject “background check.” Finally, the phrase “necessary prerequisite” is redundant.

(C) CORRECT. The redundant and passive clause “X is of significant importance to investment banks” is replaced by the more concise and active clause “they [investment banks] consider X important.” In addition, the redundant and passive clause “a background check is a necessary prerequisite [of investment banks]” is replaced by the more concise and active “investment banks require background checks.” Finally, the entire sentence is rewritten in the concise form “Because X, Y.”

(D) The phrase “some importance” is redundant and wordy. In addition, the meaning of the sentence has been changed to state that “many” of the employees underwent a background check; the original sentence asserted that the background check was required, and, therefore, was submitted to by all.

(E) The structure “the reason X is because Y” is redundant. The proper idiom is either “the reason X is Y” or “Y is because X.” In addition, it is not clear whether the pronouns “they” and “their” refer to “investment banks” or “applicants.”

5.

The original is correct and clear, and the parallel structure of “looking. . .finding. . .defending” is concise.

(A) CORRECT.

- (B) This choice has an awkward and wordy construction. “Acting in the defense of the group” is wordier than “defending the group” without making the meaning clearer. It also makes the choice less parallel: “looking. . .finding. . .acting in the defense.” Furthermore, the passive construction “may be encouraged by,” is unnecessarily wordy. Finally, the ending phrase “on behalf of the group” is unnecessary.
- (C) This choice changes the meaning. “Encourages” implies a certainty that “may encourage” does not. Also, “looking. . .finding. . .the defense” is less parallel than “looking. . .finding. . .defending.”
- (D) This choice is wordy and lacks clarity. Beginning with the long dependent clause “whether looking for food, finding a nest, or defending the group,...” detracts from the clarity. Also, the ending phrase “when doing such activities” is wordy and unnecessary.
- (E) This choice uses the wordier passive construction “may be encouraged” instead of the active construction “may encourage.” This choice uses the less concise “acting in the defense of the group” instead of “defending the group.” This change also makes the choice less parallel: “looking. . .finding. . .acting in the defense.”

6.

The original sentence suffers from three redundancies. First, the verb “to find” is redundant of “seeking.” Second, the phrase “once in every 4 weeks” is wordy and can be replaced with the more concise form “every 4 weeks” without any loss of content.

Finally, the construction “exactly the same” is repetitive, since the word “the same” already implies exact equivalence.

- (A) This answer choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence
- (B) In this answer choice, the phrase “once in every 4 weeks” is wordy and can be replaced with the more concise form “every 4 weeks” without any loss of content. Moreover, the construction “exactly the same” is repetitive, since the word “the same” already implies exact equivalence. “In a row 3 times” is awkward.
- (C) **CORRECT.** This answer choice corrects all of the original redundancies, thus creating a concise and idiomatic sentence. Specifically, the repetitive construction “seeking to find alternative explanations” is reduced to the simpler form “seeking alternative explanations.” Further, the redundant phrase “once in every 4 weeks” is replaced with the more concise construction “every 4 weeks.” Finally, the wordy phrase “exactly the same” is replaced with the more concise construction “the same.”
- (D) In this answer choice, the construction “exactly the same” is repetitive, since the word “the same” already implies exact equivalence.
- (E) This answer choice corrects the original problems but introduces the redundant pronoun “he” in the second part of the sentence, thus unnecessarily repeating the original subject “Jean-Baptiste Lamarck.” Furthermore, the construction “the same identical results” is redundant; the adjective “identical” can be omitted without any loss of content.

7.

#### **Essential for not essential in**

The original sentence contains the redundant phrase “essential key” where “essential” would suffice. In addition, the phrase “essential . . . in the survival” is unidiomatic. The proper idiom is “essential for the survival.”

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

(B) This choice correctly uses the idiom “essential . . . for the survival.” However, the phrase “essential key” is redundant; something “key” is by definition “essential.”

**(C) CORRECT.** This choice replaces the redundant phrase “an essential key” with the more concise “is essential.” In addition, the idiom “essential . . . for the survival” replaces the unidiomatic “essential . . . in the survival.”

(D) This choice replaces the redundant phrase “an essential key” with the more concise “is essential.” However, it uses the unidiomatic “essential in the survival” instead of the idiomatic “essential for the survival.”

(E) This choice replaces the redundant phrase “an essential key” with the more concise “is essential.” However, the phrase “is essential the survival” is nonsensical without a connecting preposition between “essential” and “the survival.”

8. The original sentence is clear, and is phrased in the most economical way.

**(A) CORRECT.** This choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.

(B) The phrase “actually increases” has a stronger meaning than the author

intended - that high vitamin E consumption “may actually increase” certain risks.

(C) The phrasing of “certain illnesses may be at a higher risk” is awkward and has an unintended meaning. It is not the illnesses that are at higher risk, but rather people who consume too much vitamin E. In addition, the placement of the modifying phrase “according to recent studies” is awkward, seemingly referring to a “balanced diet” when it should be modifying vitamin E intake. Finally, “if vitamin E is taken in excess of a balanced diet” should read “if vitamin E is taken in excess of *that (vitamin E) found naturally in* a balanced diet.”

(D) “The intake of vitamin E...may actually increase developing certain illnesses” is awkward and has an unintended meaning. It would be more accurate to state that excess intake of vitamin E may increase *the risk of* developing certain illnesses. Even if this choice had the correct meaning, the choice of words would still have been faulty: it should read “increase the development of certain illnesses” not “increase developing certain illnesses.”

(E) “Vitamin E...may actually increase the development risk of certain illnesses” is awkward and has an unintended meaning. It would be more accurate to state that excess *intake of* vitamin E may actually increase the risk. Additionally, “the development risk of certain illnesses” is misleading; it should be “the risk of (a person) developing certain illnesses.”

9.

“Whether” is the most concise way to indicate that researchers and theorists are debating between alternative causes of the pandemic.

**(A) CORRECT.** This sentence is correct as written for the reason stated above.

(B) “Whether or not” is redundant; “whether” by itself indicates the full meaning.

(C) “About whether” is both redundant and awkward.

(D) “As to whether” is both redundant and awkward.

(E) “If” is used to indicate a condition or a future possibility, but this sentence is not indicating either of these things. “Whether,” which introduces a choice or an alternative, is the correct usage.

10.

There are three errors in the sentence. First, the plural subject “foods” does not agree with the singular verb “makes.” Second, the pronoun “they” has an ambiguous referent: it could refer either to “foods” or “people.” Third, “the reason X is because Y” is redundant.

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

(B) The plural subject “foods” does not agree with the singular verb “makes.” In addition, it is not clear to what “a rise in temperature” is being compared; a clearer and more logical comparison is “a chemical *that stimulates ... as does* a rise in temperature.”

(C) The pronoun “they” has an ambiguous referent: it could refer either to “foods” or “people.”

**In addition, the clause “a rise in temperature does” should be introduced by “as” rather than “like,” which, in this context, should be used to introduce a noun. The correct forms of the idiom are “X behaves *like* Y,” “X behaves *as Y does*,” or “X behaves *as does* Y.”**

**(D) CORRECT.** The choice corrects all three errors in the original sentence. The plural “foods” agrees with the plural “make.” The ambiguous “they” is replaced by “these foods,” and the redundant construction “the reason X is because Y” is gone.

(E) The pronoun “they” has an ambiguous referent: it could refer either to “foods” or “people.” In addition, the clause “the reason X is because Y” is redundant. The correct forms of the idiom are “X is because Y” and “the reason X is Y.”

11.

This sentence correctly uses the idiomatic construction “so x that y” where y is a subordinate clause that explains or describes x: “so large that its collective appetite...” The possessive pronoun “its” clearly refers to the “super-colony,” which is correctly modified by the adjective “large.”

**(A) CORRECT.** The original sentence is correct as written.

(B) The use of the noun “size” instead of the adjective “large” results in a more awkward and wordy alternative to the original sentence. The subordinate clause “its collective appetite...” should be introduced by “that.” Additionally, “competing” does not have the same meaning as “competitive.”

(C) The construction “so x as to y,” presented here as “so large as to cause...” is not a correct idiom.

(D) The construction “such is the size of the cooperative super-colony comprising individual colonies” is an awkward and wordy alternative to the original “individual colonies cooperate in a super-colony so large.” The subordinate clause “its collective appetite...” should be introduced by “that.” Additionally, “competing” does not have the same meaning as “competitive.”

(E) The construction “there is so much size to the individual colonies’ cooperative super-colony” is an awkward and wordy alternative to the original “individual colonies cooperate in a super-colony so large.”

12.

The original sentence contains multiple errors. First, the opening modifier, “In preparation for the cold winter months,” needs to be followed by the noun it is



modifying. Second, "it was" is wordy and unnecessary. Third, "usual custom" is redundant. Fourth, "it" occurs before its antecedent, which is awkward. Finally, "as much meat *that*" is the incorrect idiom; it should be "as much meat as."

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

**(B) CORRECT.** This answer corrects all five errors in the original sentence.

(C) This choice repeats all of the original errors, with the exception of the "it" pronoun error.

(D) This choice repeats the "usual custom" redundancy error.

(E) This choice repeats the first two errors and also introduces two new errors. First, "usually" should be "usual." Second, "which" introduces a noun modifier that must touch the noun it modifies, but this modifier is not next to the word "meat."

## Punctuation

1.

To be logical, each independent clause of this sentence must use chronological order; to be clear, each clause must avoid wordy or awkward phrasing. "Found even in ancient Egyptian mummies" is a logically and grammatically correct way to begin the sentence, and this modifying phrase is correctly followed immediately by the noun it modifies, "the parasitic Guinea worm." The clauses before and after the semicolon are both independent, as required.

(A) CORRECT. The original sentence is correct as written.

(B) "Being the focus of a global public health campaign since 1986" is an awkward construction that should be replaced by the more direct "became the focus of a global public health campaign in 1986." The phrases "being ...since 1986" and "found even in ancient Egyptian mummies" are presented in an illogical and ungrammatical sequence. The clause before the semicolon is not independent; rather, it is a modifying phrase with nothing to modify. The connecting punctuation should be a comma, to make it clear that "being the focus...mummies" modifies "the parasitic Guinea worm."

(C) "Having been" suggests that the focus on the disease came chronologically before the worms were found in ancient Egyptian mummies. The semicolon is used correctly only if the clauses before and after the semicolon are each independent. Therefore, the phrase "parasitic Guinea worm" must be used before the semicolon; otherwise, the pronoun "it" has no logical antecedent. Also, "frequency of the parasitic Guinea worm" is incorrect; the frequency cannot be eradicated.

(D) Progressive verb forms "being found" and "having been" illogically suggest continuous action and fail to establish a logical event sequence. Moreover, this choice is expressed in a manner that is wordy and awkward. Also, "frequency of the parasitic Guinea worm" is incorrect; the frequency cannot be eradicated.

(E) Progressive verb forms "Having been found" and "being" illogically suggest continuous action and fail to establish a logical event sequence. Moreover, this choice is expressed in a manner that is wordy and awkward.

2.

The original sentence contains several errors. **First, the pronoun "their" logically refers to alpacas; however, since the word *alpacas* is in possessive form, it is an awkward antecedent for any pronoun (although it is technically legal to refer to a possessive noun with a possessive pronoun such as "their").**

•  
Second, the singular verb "fetches" is paired with the plural noun phrase "five pounds of fleece." Third, the use of the semicolon is improper. A semicolon can correctly be

used to separate two independent clauses (subject + verb). Here, however, what follows the semicolon is not a clause since it can not stand alone as a sentence.

- (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence.
- (B) This choice does not remedy the pronoun issue, merely replacing "their" with "its". The "its" now seems to refer to "fleece"; however, it is not the market value of the fleece to which the Alpacas' fleece is being compared. This choice also does not correct the subject-verb or semicolon problems.
- **(C) This choice does not remedy the pronoun issue, merely replacing "their" with "its". The "its" now seems to refer to "fleece"; however, it is not the market value of the fleece to which the Alpacas' fleece is being compared.**
- 
- This choice does fix the semicolon issue. Nevertheless, the construction **"while... even though..." is awkward**, since it presents two successive contrasts. The subject-verb issue ("pounds fetch") has been corrected.
- (D) CORRECT. The pronoun issue is solved by replacing the pronoun "the animal's." The semicolon correctly separates two independent clauses. The "while" correctly separates two contrasting ideas, and the verb "fetch" agrees with "pounds."
- (E) The subject-verb disagreement remains ("pounds fetches"). Moreover, describing "worth" as "little" is awkward in this context; a better choice would be "low." Nonetheless, the pronoun issue is remedied by replacing "their" with "the animal's". The semicolon is used correctly here (two clauses).

### 3.

- **Active voice indicates 1. labor market is stifling itself 2. government regulations are imposed by it.**
- The original sentence is problematic in its use of the possessive pronoun "its." The antecedent to "its" is the "labor market," which incorrectly and illogically suggests that the labor market is somehow possessing or passing government regulations itself. In addition, the original sentence incorrectly uses active rather than passive voice to describe the effects imposed on the "labor market" by government regulations, thus illogically suggesting that the "labor market" itself is stifling functioning, rather than being stifled by other forces.
- (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence.
- (B) This choice incorrectly uses a comma to connect two independent clauses, thus creating a run-on sentence. Two independent clauses must be connected either by a conjunction, such as "and" or "but," or by a semicolon.
- (C) This choice incorrectly uses "stifled" to modify the labor market itself, as opposed to its functioning. Also, "variously restrict" is awkward; various is used more appropriately to modify "government regulations," rather than the manner in which the regulations restrict worker hiring and firing.
- (D) In order to properly use a semicolon, both the clause before and after the semicolon must be independent clauses or sentences, and the clauses must be closely related in meaning. In this choice, the underlined portion, though grammatically correct, does not stand alone as an effective independent clause. Also, the pronoun "its" lacks a clear antecedent.
- (E) CORRECT. This answer choice correctly uses the semicolon to connect two independent but closely related clauses. In addition, the pronoun "its" clearly and unambiguously refers to the "labor market."

4.

The original sentence incorrectly uses a comma to join two independent clauses. As is the case with the two clauses in this sentence ("The relationship...is still unclear" and "this is because some studies show...while others do not"), independent clauses contain a subject and a verb and can stand alone as independent sentences. While semicolons can join two independent clauses, commas cannot. Further, "this is because" is unnecessarily wordy.

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

(B) CORRECT. The semicolon correctly connects two independent clauses. Also, the singular verb "is" agrees in number with the singular subject "relationship."

(C) The plural verb "are" does not agree in number with the singular subject "relationship."

(D) While "is" agrees in number with the singular subject "relationship," the colon is used incorrectly in this choice. **Colons must be preceded by independent clauses. Independent clauses contain a subject and a verb and can stand alone as independent sentences. In this case, however, the colon is preceded by "The relationship...is still unclear because," which is not a clause that can stand alone as an independent sentence.**

(E) While the semicolon correctly connects two independent clauses, and while "is" agrees in number with the singular subject "relationship," "the reason is that" is unnecessarily wordy. The more concise version in answer choice (B) is preferred.

5. The original sentence correctly uses a colon to connect "three important physical ideas" with the list of these ideas. Also, the listed items "the concept of inertia, the relationship between force and acceleration, and the coupled nature of forces" are concise and parallel: "the concept...the relationship...the coupled nature."

**(A) CORRECT.** This choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.

(B) The semicolon is used incorrectly to connect "three important physical ideas" with the list of these ideas. Semicolons are used only to connect two related ideas that can each stand alone as independent clauses. In this case, "the concept of inertia...that forces were coupled in nature" is not an independent clause. Also, the phrase "and that forces were coupled in nature" is not parallel in structure to "the concept...the relationship."

(C) The semicolon is used incorrectly to connect "three important physical ideas" with the list of these ideas. Semicolons are used only to connect two related ideas that can each stand alone as independent clauses. In this case, "the concept of inertia...that forces were coupled in nature" is not an independent clause. Also, the phrase "force and acceleration were related" is not parallel in structure to "the concept...and the coupled nature."

(D) The use of the comma between "physical ideas" and "the concept" incorrectly connects "three important physical ideas" with the list of these ideas. In fact, the comma changes the meaning of the sentence entirely. **Instead of stating that Newton introduced three ideas and then listing these ideas, this sentence implies that Newton introduced four separate things: "three important physical ideas, the concept of inertia, the relationship between force and acceleration, and the coupled nature of forces." The use of the comma inadvertently makes all four items equal members of the list. In addition, "he also introduced" is unnecessarily**

**wordy and breaks up the parallel structure of the list of items.**

(E) The phrase “three important ideas that were physical in nature” is unnecessarily wordy. The preferred phrase, because of its concision, is “three important physical ideas.”

6.

The original sentence correctly uses the semicolon to connect two closely related independent clauses, both of which can stand alone. Furthermore, by starting each of the two clauses with time references, “In the 1980s” and “in the 1990s,” the original sentence creates a parallel construction. Finally, the reference to “this proportion” unambiguously indicates that the increase in the second part of the sentence refers to the proportion of “advertising revenues” in the structure of profits, thus maintaining clarity of expression.

**(A) CORRECT.** This answer choice is correct as it repeats the original sentence.

(B) This answer choice suffers from two errors. First, the verb construction “increased by 57%” incorrectly alters the meaning of the original sentence, implying that “57%” indicates the relative magnitude of the increase rather than the new proportion of “advertising revenues” in the structure of “operating profits.” Second, the pronoun “they” lacks a clear antecedent and could be interpreted to refer either to “operating profits” or to “advertising revenues.”

(C) This answer choice creates a run-on sentence by joining two independent clauses with a comma, rather than with a semicolon or with a connecting conjunction. Further, the pronoun “they” lacks a clear antecedent and could be interpreted to refer either to “operating profits” or to “advertising revenues.”

(D) This answer choice incorrectly uses a semicolon to connect two clauses, only one of which can stand alone. The phrase “increasing to 57% in the 1990s” is not an independent clause and cannot follow the semicolon. **Furthermore, by moving the time reference “in the 1990s” from the beginning of the second clause to the end, this answer choice violates parallelism with the non-underlined portion of the sentence that begins with another time reference “In the 1980s.”** This question involves parallelism – ELUSIVE at first sight.

(E) In this answer choice, the relative pronoun “which” is used incorrectly. Clauses introduced by the relative pronoun “which” can refer only to the immediately preceding noun. In this case, the relative pronoun “which” refers to “a typical local newspaper,” thus illogically suggesting that “a typical local newspaper” was the subject of the increase. Finally, by moving the time reference “in the 1990s” from the beginning of the second clause to the end, this answer choice does not maintain parallel structure with the non-underlined portion of the sentence that begins with the time reference “In the 1980s.”

7.

A semicolon is used to separate 2 clauses that can stand alone. The semicolon is used incorrectly here because the first clause--“Congestion pricing, the practice of charging a fee for driving into the busiest areas of a city at the busiest times;”--cannot stand by itself. In addition, the phrase “more support from economists than do politicians” nonsensically suggests that the comparison is between “congestion pricing” and “politicians”, incorrectly indicating that economists support the former more than they do the latter. In fact, the sentence intends to compare the level of support for congestion pricing among economists to the level of support for congestion pricing among politicians.

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

**(B) CORRECT.** This choice correctly removes the semicolon and the word “it” and replaces them with a comma, thereby creating one complete sentence. The phrase “the practice of charging a fee for driving into the busiest areas of a city at the busiest times” becomes a modifier set off by commas. In addition, by repeating the word “among,” this choice clarifies that support for congestion pricing “among economists” is being compared to that “among politicians.”

(C) By repeating the word “among,” this choice clarifies that support for congestion pricing “among economists” is being compared to that “among politicians.” However, this choice incorrectly uses a semicolon, which can only be used with an independent clause. The clause “Congestion pricing, the practice of charging a fee for driving into the busiest areas of a city at the busiest times” is not independent because it cannot stand by itself as a sentence.

(D) This choice correctly removes the semicolon and the word “it” and replaces them with a comma, thereby creating one complete sentence. The phrase “the practice of charging a fee for driving into the busiest areas of a city at the busiest times” becomes a modifier set off by commas. However, the phrase “more support from economists than do politicians” nonsensically suggests that the comparison is between “congestion pricing” and “politicians”, incorrectly indicating that economists support the former more than they do the latter. In fact, the sentence intends to compare the level of support for congestion pricing among economists to the level of support for congestion pricing among politicians.

(E) By repeating the word “among,” this choice clarifies that support for congestion pricing “among economists” is being compared to that “among politicians.” However, this choice incorrectly keeps the word “it” while replacing the semicolon with a comma. This creates a run-on sentence in that the subject is unnecessarily repeated (“Congestion pricing . . . it has more support”).

## 8.

### **Parallelism: Beginning – leading.**

The original sentence utilizes a semicolon, the proper use of which has two requirements: 1. The clauses before and after the semicolon must be able to function as independent sentences; and 2. the clauses must be closely related in terms of subject matter. Here, the second clause refers back to the first clause, both requirements are satisfied, and the semicolon is used properly. However, the verb form in the second clause is nonparallel to the verb form in the 1st clause (“beginning . . . leads”). Though the lack of parallelism is grammatically permissible between two independent clauses, the construction is awkward. Additionally, “the growing pension liabilities” in the 1st part of the sentence is incorrect in its use of the article “the,” as the pension liabilities were not referenced earlier in the sentence.

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

(B) Here, the plural pronoun “their” is used correctly, referring to the plural antecedent “municipal governments.” However, the second clause “leading local politicians . . .” does not function as an independent sentence, making the use of the semicolon improper.

(C) In this answer choice, the verbs are not parallel (“beginning . . . leads”). As a result, the second part of the sentence is awkward and incorrect, as the use of a comma instead of a semicolon means that both verbs now appear in the same

sentence. Also, “the growth in their pension liabilities” is wordy.

**(D) CORRECT.** The plural pronoun “their” is properly used to refer to the plural antecedent “municipal governments,” and the verb “leading” is parallel to the verb “beginning” in the non-underlined portion of the sentence.

(E) This answer choice is problematic because the verbs are not parallel (“beginning . . . leads”). As a result the second part of the sentence is awkward and incorrect, as the use of a comma instead of a semicolon means that both verbs now appear in the same sentence.

## SC Mixed Test Explanations

### Solutions

1. The original sentence begins with a modifier (“though considered aesthetically primitive at the time”) that logically addresses Rousseau's art. But the grammatical subject of the modifier is Rousseau himself. This is incorrect. Moreover, the use of “like” in the phrase “painted like he was naive” is incorrect. “Like” is not synonymous with “as if”. For example, “She dances like she's never heard music before” is incorrect, but “She dances as if she's never heard music before” is correct. (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. **(B) CORRECT.** Henri Rousseau's canvasses are correctly placed as the subject of the opening modifier. Additionally, “naive” functions as an adjective describing “style” thereby replacing the incorrect phrase “like he were naive.” (C) This choice incorrectly places Henri Rousseau (instead of his paintings) as the subject of the opening modifier “though considered aesthetically primitive . . .” Additionally, the phrase “style that has become an icon of Post-Impressionism” is incorrect. Rousseau, not his style, later became an icon. (D) The phrase “style that was later iconic of Post- Impressionism” is both awkward (“iconic of”) and incorrect. Rousseau, not his style, later became an icon. (E) The subject “the canvases of Henri Rousseau are icons of Post-Impressionism” is incorrect. Rousseau, not his style, later became an icon. Moreover, this choice incorrectly uses “due to” where “because of” would be needed. “Due to” functions as an adjectival phrase and is used to modify a noun (e.g., His failure was due to his laziness.). “Because of” functions as an adverbial phrase and is used to modify a verb or verb phrase (e.g., He failed because of his laziness.).
2. The original sentence contains several errors. First, “differences in” is not properly used to compare two explicit things. For example, “The difference in color is more important than the difference in size” is correct, but “The difference in the color of the apple and the color of the pear...” is not correct. Instead, it should be “The difference between the color of the apple and the color of the pear...” Second, after the construction “it is essential that”, one must use the subjunctive mood. In this case, “ascends” (which is indicative, not subjunctive) should be “ascend”. Third, the plural pronoun “they” is used to refer to “a diver”, which is singular. (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. (B) This choice incorrectly uses the plural pronoun “they” to refer to the singular noun “a diver.” (C) This choice incorrectly uses “differences in” where “difference between” is required. Additionally, it uses the indicative mood “ascends” where the subjunctive mood (“ascend”) is required. Finally, the construction “the human body's internal pressure and that of the ocean” is not parallel. (D) This choice incorrectly uses “differences in” where “difference between” is required. Additionally, the plural pronoun “they” incorrectly refers to the singular

noun "a diver." Finally, the construction "the human body's internal pressure and that of the ocean" is not parallel. **(E) CORRECT.** The phrase "difference between" correctly replaces "differences in." Additionally, the verb "ascend" is in the subjunctive mood. Finally, the singular pronoun "he" correctly refers to the singular "a diver."

3. The original sentence contains the wordy and awkward construction "the reasons why the Civil War was triggered." Also, the correct idiom is "to regard X as Y", not "to regard X to be Y". (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. **(B) CORRECT.** This choice uses the concise phrase "what triggered the Civil War" and uses the idiomatic phrase "regard slavery as the sole cause" (regard X as Y). (C) This choice incorrectly uses the unidiomatic "slavery is not regarded . . . to be the sole cause." Also, the main clause has been rewritten in the passive voice unnecessarily. (D) This choice contains the redundancy "reasons why" and the awkward phrasing "despite research remaining." (E) This choice incorrectly introduces an ambiguous pronoun ("it") that could refer either to slavery or to the Civil War.
  
4. The original sentence contains several errors. First, the proper idiom is "to regard as" not "to regard to be". Second, the initial modifier "regarded by analysts to be the result of tensions during the Cold War" should modify "sales" and not "the spy novel." Third, the proper idiom is "to perceive as" not "to perceive like". (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. (B) The modifier "regarded by analysts to be the result of tensions during the Cold War" incorrectly describes the spy novel when it should modify sales of the spy novel. Moreover, the modifier use of "regarded . . . to be" is unidiomatic. (C) The modifier "regarded by analysts as the result of tensions during the Cold War" incorrectly describes the spy novel when it should modify sales of the spy novel. Additionally, the phrase "perceived the U.S.S.R like" is unidiomatic. (D) The modifier "reaching the zenith of its sales in the 1960s" incorrectly describes the spy novel when it should modify sales of the spy novel. **(E) CORRECT.** "Sales" is correctly positioned as the subject of the opening modifier. Additionally, the phrases "regarded by analysts as . . ." and "perceived the U.S.S.R as" are idiomatic.
  
5. The subject of the original sentence is "the number of acres", which is singular. The main verb, however, is "have increased", which is plural. We need to find a choice that replaces "have" with "has". Moreover, the phrase "due to" is incorrect in this context. "Due to" is a phrase that must describe a noun. "The fire was due to drought" is correct, but "There was a fire due to drought" is not. When describing a verb phrase, "because of" is preferable: "There was a fire because of drought." (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. (B) The plural verb "have been" does not agree with the singular subject "the number of acres." Additionally, the passive voice "have been increased" is incorrect. Finally, the phrase "due to drought . . ." is unidiomatic since "because of" (not "due to") should be used to modify the verb phrase "have become an ongoing threat." (C) The modifier "which has become an ongoing threat . . ." contains the singular verb "has" which does not agree with the plural subject "wildfires." (D) The phrase "due to drought . . ." is unidiomatic since "because of" (not "due to") should be used to modify the verb phrase "have become an ongoing threat." **(E) CORRECT.** The singular verb "has" agrees with the singular subject "the number of acres." Additionally, "because of drought . . ." is properly used to modify the verb phrase "have become an ongoing threat."
  
6. The original sentence contains the idiom "not only" which must be paired with "but also" (not simply "also") in order to be idiomatic. Moreover, in the expression "not only X, but also Y", X and Y must be in parallel form. The two elements "for the

convenience . . ." and "it ushered . . ." are not in parallel form. (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. (B) This choice incorrectly uses a semicolon to separate a dependent clause and an independent clause. A semicolon can only be used to separate two independent clauses (i.e., clauses that can stand alone). Further, "not only" is unidiomatic when used without "but also." **(C) CORRECT.** This choice contains the proper idiom pairing "not only" with "but also." Both elements of the idiom are followed by the phrase "because it . . ." thereby creating a parallel structure. (D) This choice contains the unidiomatic pairing of "not just" with "but also." Additionally, the two elements "for the convenience . . ." and "because it ushered . . ." are not in parallel form. (E) This choice contains the awkward and unidiomatic phrase "not only in addition" which obscures the meaning of the sentence.

7. The original sentence contains a lot of clauses in a confusing order. We need to find an answer choice that rephrases the sentence in a clear and concise manner. Also, the phrase "though now eaten in large quantities around the world and harmless" contains two elements that are not parallel. Moreover, "including belladonna" is incorrect left dangling. It should be "which includes belladonna." Finally, "itself" could refer either to "tomato" or to "belladonna". (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. (B) The pronoun "it" is ambiguous as it could refer either to "the nightshade family" or "belladonna" or "tomato." Additionally, the phrase "though now eaten in large quantities around the world and harmless" contains two elements that are not parallel. (C) The phrase "including belladonna" does not properly modify anything. **(D) CORRECT.** The opening phrase contains the two parallel elements "eaten in large quantities . . ." and "known to be harmless." The phrase "which includes belladonna" correctly modifies the "nightshade family." Finally, the pronoun "it" unambiguously refers to the tomato. (E) The phrase "including belladonna" does not properly modify anything.
  
8. The word "being" is unnecessary in the opening modifier "being one of the most significant developments . . ." Moreover, the past perfect verb "had turned" coupled with the simple past verb "was" reverses the chronological order of the events. The tenses run counter to the logic of the sentence by incorrectly suggesting that the invention of the cotton gin happened before the cotton cloth became expensive. (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. (B) The words "have been" are unnecessary in the opening modifier. The fact that "have been" is in the present perfect tense also incorrectly suggests that the invention of the cotton gin is somehow ongoing. (C) This choice incorrectly alters the meaning of the sentence by using the phrase "despite its previous expense" in place of the phrase "despite the fact that it had previously been expensive." "Expense" and "expensive" have different meanings. The word "expense" simply means "cost" so this choice essentially states that the cotton gin was now affordable despite its previous cost. This does not convey the fact that the previous cost was *high* (expensive). **(D) CORRECT.** The modifier "one of the most significant developments of the nineteenth century" eliminates the unnecessary word "being." The simple past verb "turned" coupled with the past perfect "had previously been" correctly expresses the fact that cotton cloth "turned into an affordable commodity" after it "had previously been expensive." The later past event uses the simple past tense, whereas the earlier past event uses the past perfect tense. (E) The word "being" is unnecessary in the opening modifier. Additionally, in the expression "from a previously expensive commodity to an affordable one" the word "previously" is redundant since its meaning is already contained in the expression "from X to Y."



9. The original sentence contains several errors. First, the subject of the original sentence is "the lead attorney and his assistant", yet the corresponding verb is "was injured". The subject and the verb do not agree in number – one is plural, the other singular. Second, "despite" is not properly used with a verb phrase. Instead, it requires a noun or noun phrase. For example, "Despite eating the apple..." is not correct, but "Despite his eating the apple..." is correct. Third, "injured seriously enough to warrant medical attention" is incorrect in this context. "X enough to Y" is used when the emphasis is on Y. "So X as to Y" is used when the emphasis is on X. For example, "I am tall enough to touch the ceiling" implies that the focus is on the fact of being able to touch the ceiling. "So tall as to be able to touch the ceiling" implies that the focus is on the fact of being tall. Finally, the use of the pronoun "him" is ambiguous, since it could refer to either the attorney or his assistant. (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. **(B) CORRECT.** It eliminates the subject-verb agreement issue and ensures that "despite" is followed by a noun ("the fact"). Additionally, the choice uses the correct expression "so X as to Y" to emphasize the seriousness of the injury. Finally, the sentence is reworked to avoid pronoun ambiguity. (C) The pronoun "him" has an ambiguous antecedent, since it could refer either to the attorney or his assistant. (D) The singular verb "was" does not agree with the plural subject "the lead attorney and his assistant." Additionally the phrase "injured seriously enough to warrant immediate medical attention" incorrectly emphasizes the medical attention over the seriousness of the injury, (E) The pronoun "him" has an ambiguous antecedent, since it could refer either to the attorney or his assistant. Additionally, the word "despite" is incorrectly followed by the verb "entering" instead of a noun or noun phrase.
10. The original sentence incorrectly omits "that" following the verb "suggest." Moreover, it contains the incomplete construction "as . . . or worse than" (missing the second "as"). (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. (B) This choice incorrectly omits "that" following the verb "suggest" and it contains the unnecessary word "just." Moreover, it contains the incomplete construction "as . . . or even worse than" (missing the second "as"). **(C) CORRECT.** This choice correctly uses the word "that" to introduce a clause that follows the verb "suggest." Also, it contains the complete construction "as . . . as or worse than." (D) This choice incorrectly omits "that" following the verb "suggest." (E) This choice contains the incomplete construction "as . . . if not worse than" (missing the second "as").
11. The original sentence uses the relative pronoun "that" where "who" is preferred because the antecedent is a group of people. Also, the prepositional phrase "by a gentile Dutch couple" is placed in such a way as to suggest that the occupation was carried out by the couple. Finally, the pronoun "they" is ambiguous – it could refer to the family or to the couple. (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. (B) This choice incorrectly uses the relative pronoun "that" to refer to a group of people. Additionally, the pronoun "they" is ambiguous - it could refer to the family or to the couple. (C) The use of the object pronoun "whom" makes "a girl and her family" the object of the clause "a gentile Dutch couple hid;" however "a girl and her family" are the subject of the next clause "were eventually discovered." This is a mismatch. **(D) CORRECT.** It correctly uses the pronoun "who" to refer to a girl and her family. Additionally, the phrase "by a gentile Dutch couple" is placed immediately after "who were hidden" to clarify the meaning. Finally, the ambiguous pronoun issue is avoided altogether. (E) The pronoun "they" is ambiguous - it could refer to the family or to the couple.

12. The original sentence contains several errors. First, "carbon monoxide levels in the atmosphere" is wordy. Second, "grew by enough of an increased percentage" is wordy and redundant. Third the singular pronoun "it" incorrectly refers to the plural "levels". Fourth, the final clause of the sentence--"and it caused the average surface temperature to rise"--is disjointed from the main clause. (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. (B) This choice uses the unnecessarily wordy phrase "increased by enough of a percentage." **(C) CORRECT.** The sentence is made more concise by rewriting "carbon monoxide levels in the atmosphere" as "Levels of atmospheric carbon monoxide" and "grew by enough of an increased percentage" as "increased sufficiently." The choice also eliminates the pronoun "it" from the sentence and reworks the final clause--"causing the average surface temperature to rise"-- as a modifier, thereby more clearly connecting it to the main clause. (D) This choice uses the unnecessarily wordy phrase "increased by a sufficient percentage." It also uses "which" to refer to the action of the preceding clause, though "which" grammatically refers only to the immediately preceding noun (in this case, "Earth"). (E) This choice alters the position of "during the twentieth century" and thereby changing the meaning of the sentence. In this choice "during the twentieth century" modifies the carbon monoxide levels instead of describing when those levels "increased." This distorts the meaning by leaving open the possibility that twentieth century carbon monoxide levels "increased enough" during some other time period (e.g., the 21st century).
13. The original sentence begins with a modifier ("having lived in Tahiti...") that clearly describes Paul Gauguin. Yet, the subject of the main clause is the impersonal "it". We need to find a choice that makes Gauguin himself the subject of the main clause. Moreover, the clause "where life was slow and relaxed" logically modifies Tahiti, though it's placement in the sentence modifies "several years". We need to find a choice that places this modifier after Tahiti. Finally, "upon returning" is awkward. "Upon his return" would be better. (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. (B) This choice incorrectly uses "it" as the subject of the opening modifier "having lived in Tahiti . . ." Additionally, it uses the awkward phrase "upon returning." (C) The modifier "where life was slow and relaxed" incorrectly modifies "years" instead of "Tahiti." **(D) CORRECT.** "Paul Gauguin" is placed as the subject of the opening modifier "having lived in Tahiti." Additionally, the modifier "where life was slow and relaxed" is correctly placed next to its subject, "Tahiti." (E) The phrase "because of the hectic pace" is left dangling at the end of the sentence; it is unclear that Paris is the subject of this phrase.
14. The original sentence contains several errors. First, the construction "by hiring more teachers and an increase in the amount of funding for books" is not parallel. We have a verb phrase paired with a noun. It would be better to have two verb phrases or two nouns, since both play the same role in the sentence. Second, "doing this" is incorrect. A verb phrase cannot be replaced by a pronoun such as "this" or "it". Instead, it must be replaced by "so". For example, "I enjoy swimming at night, but doing so is dangerous" is preferable to "I enjoy swimming at night, but doing it is dangerous." Finally, the "amount of funding" is somewhat wordy and could be replaced by the more concise "funding." (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. **(B) CORRECT.** It contains two parallel verb phrases, "hiring more teachers" and "increasing funding for textbooks and other supplies." Additionally "doing so" correctly replaces "doing this" and the concise "funding" is used in place of "amount of funding." (C) The noun phrase "a hiring of more teachers" is not parallel with the verb phrase "increasing the amount of funding for textbooks and other

supplies." Additionally, "amount of funding" is wordy. (D) This choice incorrectly uses "doing this" instead of "doing so" to refer back to the verb phrase "hiring . . ." Additionally, "amount of funding" is wordy. (E) The verb phrase "hiring more teachers" is not parallel with the noun phrase "an increase in funding for textbooks and other supplies."

15. The original sentence begins with a modifier ("starting at age four") that describes Mozart. Yet, the subject of the main clause is Mozart's father. We need to find a choice that makes Mozart himself the subject. Moreover, the pronoun "him" has no grammatical antecedent, since it is meant to refer to Mozart despite the fact that Mozart is not actually present in the sentence (we have "Mozart's father" instead). Finally, the pronoun "his" is somewhat ambiguous: does it refer to Mozart (who, again, is not in the sentence) or to his father? (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. (B) "Mozart's father" serves illogically as the subject of the opening modifier "starting at age four." Additionally, the pronoun "his" is ambiguous in that it could refer to the boy or the father. **(C) CORRECT.** "Mozart" is correctly placed as the subject of the opening modifier "starting at age four." Additionally, the phrase "his own" clarifies that the musical talents in question are those of the subject, Mozart. (D) This choice incorrectly uses the verb "was," which does not match the ongoing nature of the modifier "starting at age four." Additionally, the pronoun "his" is ambiguous in that it could refer to Mozart or his father. (E) "Mozart's father" serves illogically as the subject of the opening modifier "starting at age four." Additionally, the pronoun "him" has no grammatical antecedent, since it is meant to refer to Mozart despite the fact that Mozart is not actually present in the sentence (we have "Mozart's father" instead).
16. The original sentence contains several errors. First, the preferred idiom is "forbid X to do Y" and not "forbid X from doing Y". Second, the placement of the adverbial modifier "for the next three years" suggests that it modifies "link." However, the legislation does not forbid an Internet connection that "links" for the next three years; it "forbids" for the next three years raising Internet connection taxes. (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. (B) This choice incorrectly uses "forbid X from doing Y" instead of the idiomatic "forbid X to do Y." **(C) CORRECT.** This choice correctly uses the idiom "forbids X to do Y." Additionally "for the next three years" is correctly placed next to the verb it modifies, "forbids." (D) This choice creates an awkward sentence by using "forbidding to X Y" (where Y is the awkward noun "the raising of taxes") instead of the idiomatic "forbid X to do Y." (E) This choice incorrectly uses "forbid X from doing Y" instead of the idiomatic "forbid X to do Y."
17. The original sentence contains a clause beginning with "which" that logically describes the result of lower employment rates. However, as written, this clause seems to describe the result of "a drop in investment" because "which" modifies the noun just before it. We need to find a replacement that makes the causal relationship clear. Additionally, the phrase "causes people to cut consumer spending" is wordy and somewhat illogical since the people are the consumers. A more concise way to say this would be "causes cutbacks in consumer spending." Finally, the use of "back" is redundant, as it is implied by the word "cycle". (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. (B) The use of "which" incorrectly suggests that "dropping investment" "causes people to cut consumer spending" when, in fact, the employment rates cause this phenomenon. Additionally, the phrase "causes people to cut consumer spending" is wordy and the use of "back" is redundant, as it is implied by the word "cycle". **(C) CORRECT.** This choice makes clear, through the use of the

plural verb "cause", that the employment rates are responsible for the cutbacks in spending. Further it uses the concise phrase "cutbacks in consumer spending" and eliminates the redundant word "back." (D) This choice contains the wordy phrase "causing people to cut consumer spending" and the redundant phrase "lead back." Moreover, the words "causing" and "starting" illogically refer back to the economic recession. In fact, the falling employment rates, not the economic recession, cause the cutbacks in consumer spending and start the cycle of layoffs. (E) The words "causing" and "starting" illogically refer back to the economic recession. In fact, the falling employment rates, not the economic recession, cause the cutbacks in consumer spending and start the cycle of layoffs.

18. The original sentence contains several errors. First, if we remove the clause "which is the more conventional approach for someone new to financial planning", we have "Instead of buying stocks and bonds, real estate has become increasingly..." This is not parallel. We need to find a replacement that indicates the alternative to buying stocks and bonds. Second, on the GMAT "instead of" is reserved for nouns and "rather than" for verbs. So in this case, it would be better to say "Instead of stocks and bonds" or "rather than buy stocks and bonds." (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. (B) This choice incorrectly uses "instead of" to introduce a verb ("buying"). (C) The phrase "rather than buying stocks and bonds" is not parallel to the phrase "real estate has become . . ." **(D) CORRECT.** This choice correctly uses "rather than" to introduce the verb "buy" and sets up the proper comparison between buying stocks and bonds and turning to real estate. (E) This choice incorrectly pairs "instead of stocks and bonds" with "young people have shown . . ." This illogically implies that young people, instead of stocks and bonds, have shown an increasing attraction to real estate.
19. The original sentence contains the incomplete idiom "not only...but." The complete idiom is "not only...but also" (where "also" is not separated from "but"). Moreover, the combination of "require that" and "cannot" is incorrect. The construction "require that" necessitates the subjunctive mood for any verbs in the following clause. (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. **(B) CORRECT.** The phrase "not only that principals . . . not share . . . but also that they not buy or sell" is an idiomatic and parallel structure ("not only that x not y but also that x not z"). Additionally, the verb phrase "not share" is correctly in the subjunctive mood. (C) The verb phrase "cannot buy or sell" is in the indicative mood, not in the subjunctive mood (which is necessary for verbs following the construction "require that"). Additionally, the words "but" and "also" are separated by the words "that they", unnecessarily breaking the idiom "not only . . . but also." (D) The verb phrase "are not allowed" is in the indicative mood, not in the subjunctive mood (which is necessary for verbs following the construction "require that"). (E) The verb phrases "cannot share" and "cannot buy or sell" are in the indicative mood, not in the subjunctive mood (which is necessary for verbs following the construction "require that"). Additionally, the words "but" and "also" are separated by the word "they", unnecessarily breaking the idiom "not only . . . but also."
20. The subject of the original sentence is "what", which can be singular or plural depending on the context. In this case, in the opening clause "what concern scientists", the plural verb "concern" follows "what." Additionally, "what" serves as the subject of the main clause, "what . . . are the risks." If we flip this around, we get "the risks are . . . what." The plural noun "risks" forms the complement of "what." Thus, we have a situation where the verb of the what-clause ("concern") and the complement of

the main clause ("the risks") are both plural; thus, the verb of the main clause should also be plural. The original verb "are" is therefore correct. However, the original sentence is incorrect because the second half of the sentence is not structurally parallel. The first and third risks are introduced using the word "that" while the second risk is not. (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. (B) This choice incorrectly uses the singular verb "is" when the word "what" acts as a plural subject in this context. **(C) CORRECT.** The main clause uses the plural verb "are" and each of the three risks is introduced with the word "that", thereby creating a parallel structure. (D) This choice incorrectly uses the singular verb "is" when the word "what" acts as a plural subject in this context. Additionally, the second half of the sentence is not structurally parallel. The first and third risks are introduced using the word "that" while the second risk is not. (E) The three risks are not written in parallel form. The first risk is introduced by the preposition "of" (the risk of polar ice caps. . .). The preposition "of" is also implied in the second (the risk of seas . . .). However, the third risk is introduced with the preposition "that" (the risk that violent weather patterns . . .).

21. The original sentence begins with the modifier "Famed for his masterful use of irony," which requires a person as its subject. However, in the original sentence, "many of Guy de Maupassant's short stories" is the subject. Moreover, the phrase "due to the author slowly revealing" is awkward. (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. (B) The pronoun "he" must have a person as its antecedent, yet there is no person in the sentence. Remember that "he" cannot refer to "Guy de Maupassant" here, since the name is part of a possessive phrase: "Guy de Maupassant's short stories". The author himself is not grammatically present in the sentence. (C) The opening modifier "famed for using irony in a masterful way" incorrectly modifies "short stories" instead of Guy de Maupassant himself. It also contains the awkward phrase "because of the author slowly revealing." **(D) CORRECT.** This choice remedies the flawed modifier by rewriting the sentence to avoid it. This choice also replaces the awkward phrase "due to the author's revealing" with "evidenced in the slow revelation." (E) This choice incorrectly uses the pronoun "he" without a grammatical antecedent in the sentence.
22. The original sentence incorrectly pairs an infinitive ("to approach") with a clause ("that they should...") in the construction "either X or Y." Moreover, the use of "like" in the phrase "to approach mathematics like a creative activity" is incorrect. "As" should be used instead. (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. (B) While this choice does contain proper parallel structure, it incorrectly uses "like" instead of "as" in the phrase "to approach mathematics like a creative activity". **(C) CORRECT.** The construction "either X or Y" requires parallelism between X and Y. In choice C, both X and Y are parallel infinitive phrases ("to approach . . ." and "to force . . ."). (D) This choice incorrectly pairs a clause ("that they should...") with an infinitive ("to approach") in the construction "either X or Y." (E) While this choice does create a parallel construction, it awkwardly begins the parallel elements with the words "that they" instead of the infinitive "to." Moreover, this choice incorrectly uses "like" instead of "as" in the phrase "to approach mathematics like a creative activity".
23. The original sentence contains several flaws. First, the past perfect "had been" is unnecessary here because there is only one past event. Second, "high enough" implies that the oxygen deprivation was a goal of the Incas. Third, "it" in this context is ambiguous: is it the altitude or the city that makes tourists sick? Finally, "sick with" is incorrect. It should be "sick from." (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original

sentence. (B) This choice incorrectly uses the past perfect "had been." Additionally, the pronoun "it" is ambiguous in this context and the phrase "so high of an altitude" is awkward. (C) This choice incorrectly uses the phrases "high enough altitude" and "sick with." **(D) CORRECT.** The simple past verb "was" correctly replaces the past perfect verb "had been." The phrase "such a high altitude" replaces "high enough altitude." The sentence is rewritten to avoid ambiguity by removing the pronoun "it." Finally, this choice uses the phrase "sick from" in place of the unidiomatic "sick with." (E) This choice incorrectly uses the awkward phrase "so high of an altitude." Additionally, the pronoun "it" in this context is ambiguous.

24. The original sentence introduces the main clause with "though viewed from a distance", which sets up the expectation of a contradiction that never materializes. For example, "Though sleepy, the child stayed awake" is correct, whereas "Though sleepy, the child may have eaten soup" is not. Also, "when viewed up close" is placed in such a way as to illogically suggest that the rings are composed of icy ringlets as a result of being viewed up close. Finally, "appear to be" is redundant. (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. (B) This choice incorrectly introduces the main clause with "though." Additionally, the placement of "when viewed up close" illogically suggests that the rings are composed of icy ringlets as a result of being viewed up close. (C) This choice incorrectly uses the redundant phrase "appears to be." Additionally, the use and placement of the words "when viewed up close, they are . . ." illogically suggests that the rings are composed of icy ringlets as a result of being viewed up close. **(D) CORRECT.** This choice replaces "though" with "when" and shortens "appear to be" to "appear." Further, its use of the phrase "closer viewing reveals" clearly indicates that the close viewing only reveals (not causes) the composition of the rings. (E) This choice incorrectly introduces the main clause with "though." Additionally, the placement of "if viewed up close" illogically suggests that the rings are composed of icy ringlets as a result of being viewed up close.

25. The original sentence contains several errors. First, the pronoun "it" is used to refer to the film, but the film has not been mentioned in the sentence. Instead "the sequel's poor critical reception" has been mentioned. This is not the same as the film, so the pronoun "it" has no grammatical antecedent and must be changed. Second, the phrase "at least as good or even better than" is incomplete: there should be another "as" after "good". Third, the cinematography and acting are being compared to the "original". What is meant here is that the cinematography and acting in the sequel are as good as the cinematography and acting in the original. This must be changed. (A) This choice is incorrect as it repeats the original sentence. (B) The pronoun "it" has no grammatical antecedent and the phrase "at least as good or even better" is missing the second "as" after "good." **(C) CORRECT.** This choice replaces "it" with "film", adds the missing "as", and makes clear that the acting and cinematography in the sequel are compared to the acting and cinematography in the original. (D) The pronoun "it" has no grammatical antecedent and the phrase "at least as good or even better" is missing the second "as" after "good." (E) This choice introduces the possessive redundancy "those of the original's." One could say either "those of the original" or "the original's", but using both is redundant.

26. **The correct answer is E.** The original sentence begins with a modifier "In response to growing demand for high-end vehicles" but this modifier has no logical subject within the main clause. Moreover, the pronoun "they" is ambiguous, as it could grammatically refer to either the interiors or to the cars. We know that the intended antecedent of "they" is the cars, so we need to find a choice that makes this clear.

The only choice that remedies both issues without creating any new ones is E.

27. The correct answer is E. The original sentence contains a subject-verb problem: "the spectacular rise and fall of Napoleon" is a plural noun, but the corresponding verb "was" is singular. Moreover, "having been created" is unnecessarily complex. "Created by" would have been sufficient. Finally, it is not the "toppled monarchy" that created the vacuum but rather the fact that the monarchy was toppled. Choice A repeats the original sentence. Incorrect. Choice B does not correct the subject-verb problem. Incorrect. Choice C corrects the subject-verb problem but not the "toppled monarchy" issue. Incorrect. Choice D does not correct the subject-verb issue. Incorrect. Choice E corrects all the problems without creating any new ones. **Correct.**
28. **The correct answer is D.** The subject of the original sentence is "the mountain cornfloss," which is singular. However, the main verb is "grow," which is plural. We need to replace "grow" with "grows". Moreover, "thought of as being" is wordy and awkward. We need to find a more elegant way to phrase this. Choice D corrects the subject-verb issue and also finds a more economical phrasing in "and thought to be".
29. **The correct answer is A.** The original sentence contains no errors. Choice B changes the meaning from "may actually increase" to "actually increases". Incorrect. Choice C is wordy and awkwardly phrased. Incorrect. Choice D is wordy and awkwardly phrased. Incorrect. Choice E is wordy and awkwardly phrased. Incorrect.
30. The original sentence uses the verb singular verb "is" with the plural noun "western states". Moreover, the phrase "the more people that move to western states" is not parallel with "the more pressure on water resources becomes increasingly great." These two parts of the idiomatic construction "the more x, the more y" need to be in the same form. We need to find a replacement. Choice A is the same as the original sentence. Incorrect. Choice B repeats the subject-verb mistake of the original and does not rectify the parallelism issue. Incorrect. Choice C makes the parallelism even worse by beginning with a phrase "with more people moving to western states" that is not capable of sustaining the "the more x, the more y" construction. Incorrect. Choice D avoids the subject-verb problem but does not remedy the parallelism issue, since "the more that people move" is not parallel with "the greater the pressure on water resources becomes". Incorrect. Choice E remedies the subject-verb problem and deals with the parallelism issue with the pair of phrases "the more people move to western states" and "the greater the pressure on water resources becomes." **Correct.**
31. **The correct answer is B.** The original sentence begins with a comparison ("Unlike lions and tigers"). However, the comparison drawn is between great cats (lions and tigers) and hyoid bones of domestic felines. This is not the correct comparison. We need a choice that draws the comparison between great cats and domestic cats. Moreover, the pronoun "their" is ambiguous: grammatically, it could refer to either lions and tigers or hyoid bones. We need a choice that eliminates the ambiguity. The only choice to address all the issues is B.
32. **The correct answer is D.** The original sentence contains several errors. First, "with an emphasis on color and form at the expense of exact duplication of detail" is a modifier. In this case, however, it modifies "art historians" instead of the logically appropriate "Impressionism." Second, the verb "had evolved" is in the past perfect tense when it should be in the simple past, since it is paired with "have suggested", which is in present perfect. Choice A is the same as the original sentence. Incorrect. Choice B does not remedy the modifier issue, though it does fix the tense problem.

Incorrect. Choice C remedies the modifier issue, though it does not fix the tense problem. Incorrect. Choice D remedies the modifier issue and the tense problem. Correct. Choice E remedies the modifier issue, but creates an awkward passive construction. Incorrect.

33. The sentence begins with a comparison: "Unlike modern irrigation techniques". But it compares those techniques to "the ancient Romans." This is not a valid comparison. Since we cannot change the comparison, we must find a choice that offers something that can logically be compared to irrigation techniques. **Choice B is correct.** This correctly compares irrigation techniques. Choice A illogically compares irrigation techniques to the ancient Romans. Choice C is incorrect. While this sentence correctly compares irrigation techniques, it awkwardly states that the Roman methods "were" systems of canals. In contrast, choice B more accurately states that the Roman methods "consisted" of systems of canals. Choice D illogically compares irrigation techniques to the ancient Romans. Choice E is incorrect. Like choice C, this sentence correctly compares irrigation techniques, but it awkwardly states that the Roman methods "were" systems of canals.
34. **Choice C is correct.** The modifier "rather than confining the animals to cages" correctly describes the subject "the zoo." Answer choice A incorrectly uses "zoo's lions" as the subject of the opening modifier "rather than confining the animals to cages." This implies that the zoo's lions made the choice not to confine themselves to cages. Answer choice B is incorrect because it uses the wordy and awkward phrases "in which the animals currently live" and "in a mimic of their". Answer choice D incorrectly uses "zoo's lions" as the subject of the opening modifier "rather than confining the animals to cages." This implies that the zoo's lions made the choice not to confine themselves to cages. Answer choice E is incorrect because "zoo" is singular but is matched with "their," a plural pronoun.
35. **The correct answer is C.** The first verb phrase of the sentence "can serve as camouflage" must be parallel with what follows "or". In the original sentence, however, "can serve as camouflage" and "to warn predators" are not parallel. Choice A is incorrect because of faulty parallelism. Choice B is incorrect because of faulty parallelism. Choice D is parallel because it fits the construction "as X or as Y." However, choice D also contains the incorrect construction "predator's warning" instead of the better "warning to predators" (the warning is to the predators; it doesn't belong to the predators). D also incorrectly uses "which", which should refer only to the previous noun, not to an entire action or clause. Choice E is incorrect because of faulty parallelism.
36. The correct answer is E. First, the subject of the sentence is "capital gains tax," which is singular. The verb, however, is "have been being", which is plural. So we need to find a choice that contains a singular verb. On this basis we can eliminate A, B, and C. Second, the verb "has been being" is incorrect in this case. We do not need "being" to indicate that the tax became the subject of debate at some point in the recent past and has continued to be the subject of debate up to the present time.
37. The correct answer is E. The sentence begins with the modifier "the first woman elected to Congress..." But the subject of that modifier is "many people" instead of "Jeanette Rankin", as it should be. Eliminate A, B, and D. C is incorrect because "considered as" is unidiomatic. It should be "considered" or "regarded as". The best answer is E.
38. The correct answer is E. The original sentence is incorrect because the phrase "it is more closely related to the common raccoon than any member of the bear



family" is ambiguous: the author clearly means that the panda is more closely related to the raccoon than to any bear, but the sentence could be read to mean that the panda is more closely related to the raccoon than any bear is related to the raccoon. This eliminates answer choices A and C. D is incorrect because it implies that the panda is more closely related to the raccoon than any bear is related to the raccoon. This is not what the author intends. Also, "because of" is preferable to "due to" in this sentence. "Due to" functions as an adjectival phrase and is used to modify a noun (e.g., His failure was due to his laziness.). "Because of" functions as an adverbial phrase and is used to modify a verb or verb phrase (e.g., He failed because of his laziness.). In this case, the modified phrase is "refer to the panda as a bear." Since this is a verb phrase, "because of" is required. Eliminate A and B ("due to").