

<i>past perfect</i>	POINT ACTIONS-have a direct bearing on some second past timeframe	Over half of the firm's employees had left the building by the time the fire started.
<i>past perfect</i>	actions don't have a direct bearing on the present	Yesterday James smelled good, since he had taken a shower the day before.
COMMA that	the comma will ALWAYS belong to a different, unrelated construction (such as a modifier) inserted between the noun and "that".	"that" is NOT supposed to be preceded by a comma, but it could be - IF the comma belongs to another modifier that intervenes before "that". for instance: i'm looking for a TV that costs less than \$200. you can write i'm looking for a TV, with a remote, that costs less than \$200. here it appears that there's a "comma + that", but this is mostly an illusion: the comma before "that" isn't actually part of the main structure at all. it's used only to block off the modifier.
<i>w/o COMMA that</i>	you have to use logic and common sense to figure out what is being modified.	1.Logical decision-making in rats that run through mazes has helped shed light on the cognition used by simple animals. 2.Logical decision-making in rats that resembles the thought processes of young children has helped shed light on the cognition used by simple animals
<i>parallel clauses</i>	EXCEPTION-"you should make parallel structures look as much like each other as possible."	residents who make noise after hours or whose pets destroy communal property will be fined.
<i>that + CLAUSE</i>	that + CLAUSE can substitute for a noun.	1.i believe two things. 2.i believe that two things are true.
<i>past perfect</i>	if had VERBED is used to describe a state in which something existed, or some activity/action/event that was a regular occurrence, then it may indeed describe something that persisted into the timeframe of another past action	1.by the time Kyle saw the doctor, he had been sick for 5 days. 2.Kyle, who had played football for over 15 years, finally received a championship ring

<i>had been VERBing - generally</i>	to describe an action that was literally going on, non-stop, up to (and possibly through) the timeframe of a past event	Kyle, who had been playing football for over 4 hours, was physically exhausted.
<i>parallel verbs</i>	grammatically, ALL verbs are equivalent.any verb can, potentially, be parallel to any other verb— depending on context.	Leonard started the program last month and will finish it next month.
<i>excepting</i>	used to preface negative exceptions to positive statements.	1.excepting a few bits of dialogue, nothing in the text is understandable
		2.excepting some of the dialogue, everything in the play is beautifully written
<i>so x as to y</i>	could have been written correctly a(2nd example)	so debilitating is it as to become an economic drain on many developing countries.
		it is so debilitating as to become an economic drain on many developing countries.
<i>that</i>	DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUN	1.That cat hissed at me. (Implies that I'm pointing to / indicating a particular cat)
		2.I don't agree with that idea. (The speaker is responding to an idea that someone else just stated, and it's clear which idea we're talking about).
	RELATIVE PRONOUN	1.The giraffe that stuck its head in my window startled me.(These clauses can modify nouns)
		2.I know that you threw the water balloon at me. (they can function as objects)
<i>more than</i>	e.g., all of the following are correct:	i can lift more weight at the gym than my brother.
		i can lift more weight at the gym than my brother can.
		i can lift more weight at the gym than in my basement.
<i>more than-TWO INSTANCES IN WHICH YOU CAN'T JUST USE A NOUN:</i>	1) VERB TENSE SHIFT	Correct-Heating-oil prices are expected to be higher this year than they were last year
		Incorrect-Heating-oil prices are expected to be higher this year than last year

	2) AMBIGUITY	<p>Correct-1) i know more about shakespeare than does my brother --> i'm a bigger shakespeare nerd than my brother is.</p> <p>Correct-2) i know more about shakespeare than about my brother --> my brother and i were separated at birth, so i know more about shakespeare than i do about him.</p> <p>Incorrect-i know more about shakespeare than my brother</p>
Rate	measure/characteristics	Rate of change in commodity prices is indicative of a highly volatile market.
	price	Rates for gold have been consistently increasing.
COMMA + -ING	immediate consequence	the bullet entered Smith's brain, killing him instantly --> this is an immediate and automatic consequence; if the bullet does this, then smith will be killed.
		john scored 90 on the most recent test, raising his overall average by two points --> again, an immediate and automatic consequence; if john gets this score, there will automatically be the stated consequence for his average.
COMMA + -ING	the subject of the clause that's being modified must also be the subject of the -ING form.	using a siphon, gasoline can be transferred from a car's tank to a gas can.--> here, "using a siphon" does modify the action of the following clause, but it doesn't have a legitimate subject -- i.e., the following clause doesn't say who is using a siphon-Incorrect
		using a siphon, a stranded driver can transfer gasoline from a car's tank to a gas can.--> here, the modifier correctly modifies the following action, but it also has a proper subject ("a stranded driver").
AS A FACT	not meant to indicate a hypothetical situation	no matter how big or tall you may be, we have a suit for you.
		However much United States voters may agree that there is a waste in government and that the government as a whole spends beyond its means, it is difficult to find broad support for a movement towards a minimal state
However much	however much" is sometimes used as the object of a verb, in which case its use is similar to that of "as much as	i am willing to pay however much it costs to get that thing.
		i am willing to pay as much as it costs to get that thing.

However much X happens	regardless of the degree to which X happens". There's no implication that X will happen to a great degree, or at all	However much you may betray me, I will still love you --> I'll still love you IF you betray me, even to a great degree. But you might not betray me at all.
unless-clause	Generally, the verb in an unless-clause should be in the SIMPLE PRESENT TENSE.	correct- John will not attend unless Mary ATTENDS.
		incorrect- John will not attend unless Mary will attend.
VerbING	since __ing forms are also nouns	The greatest challenge for many authors is writing the first few words of a book. /He took Annette's growling dog out for a walk
because of ____ing NOUN	because of ____ing NOUN" is a perfectly acceptable structure	because of diminishing returns, i don't get as much interest from my bank account anymore
capable/capability		She is capable of running swiftly.
		She has the capability to run swiftly.
		incorrect- She has the capability of a gazelle.
QUALIFIED /UNQUALIFIED	QUALIFIED	I will support you, but only if you do some favors for me in return --> this is a QUALIFIED declaration of support; it is qualified by the requirement of favors in return.
		I will support you no matter what you do --> this is an UNQUALIFIED declaration of support.
xxx happens consistently	if the message is 'xxx happens consistently these days', then that message should be expressed in the present:	xxx happens consistently (NOT 'is happening consistently
When vs If	When ____" ALWAYS refers to the timeframe of " ____	When you return the goods, your money will be refunded.-->"- The first sentence implies that your money will be refunded immediately when you return the goods. No delay. The refund occurs in the timeframe of the return--that's the point of "when".
		If you return the goods, your money will be refunded.-->The second sentence, on the other hand, carries no implication whatsoever about when the money will be given back. This sentence can be true even if you have to wait months or years to get the money back!

<p>participle (verbal adjective) VS gerund (verbal noun)</p>	<p>means it's just an adjective -- "cars" doesn't suddenly become singular if we put "yellow" in front of it.</p>	<p>having good friends is a wonderful thing is different because "having" is a gerund (verbal noun), not a participle (verbal adjective). You can use gerunds that don't have objects ("Running is fun!") and gerunds that do have objects ("Running circles around your opponents is fun!"), and in every case it's singular. Note that you COULD have "Running and jumping ARE both fun</p>
<p>Enough</p>	<p>to such a degree that</p>	<p>sentence ("I went to ShopRite enough to taste jalapenos") doesn't work</p> <p>Correct-It was cold enough that my toes turned blue. / It was so cold that my toes turned blue.</p> <p>Correct-It was cold enough that you could see your breath in the air. / It was so cold that you could...</p> <p>Correct-It was cold enough that the county cancelled school for the day. / It was so cold that the county...</p> <p>Correct-It's warm enough for ice cream --> I've been wanting ice cream, and I've been waiting for it to get sufficiently warm to justify my getting some.</p> <p>Correct-It's sunny enough for a picnic --> Hooray, finally we can have a picnic!</p> <p>Correct-It's cold enough for a fire --> We've been freezing and waiting for it to get cold ENOUGH that it justifies our lighting a fire.</p>
<p>so + adj + that</p>	<p>if the emphasis is on a quality described by an adjective ("tall" • in this example), then it's more compact and stylistically better to write "so + adj + that" •</p>	<p>Don is so tall that he can reach the top shelf without any effort....></p> <p>"so ADJ/ADV that ..." is</p> <p>* used to emphasize the extreme quality of ADJ/ADV</p> <p>* followed by some consequence of that extreme quality</p>
<p>such + adj + noun + that</p>	<p>if the quality itself is embodied by a noun rather than by an adjective</p>	<p>Tom is such a hermit that he hasn't left his house in two years.-->in that sentence, the quality is actually described by a noun ("hermit" •), so there is no option to use the "so + adj + that" • construction.</p>

so ADJ as to VERB	you don't use so ADJ as to VERB unless the VERB describes some sort of state/condition. i.e., if the verb is an action verb, this construction generally isn't used.	i am so ugly as to be viscerally repulsive to women. --> this works, because the verb "to be" • describes a state/condition. INCORRECT-i am so ugly as to repel women on sight. --> you generally wouldn't see this in good writing, as "repel" • is an action verb; the sentence would probably be written as "i am so ugly that i repel women on sight."(CORRECT).
so as to	indirect intention	Joe bought a gym membership so as to become more attractive to women.-->the act of buying a gym membership itself is not going to make joe instantly more attractive to women (women do not swoon over a man's gym membership card). instead, there are plenty of implied intermediate steps between "by a gym membership" • and "be more attractive" •; the use of "so as to" • implies that there are such intermediate steps in the process.
to be competitive	personality traits.>than about actual competition	My sister is very competitive.-->to be competitive" is more about personality traits ("My sister is very competitive") than about actual competition. i.e., "x competes" implies that x actually competes, while "x is competitive" implies only that x wants to compete (but may or may not actually get the chance).
x competes	x actually competes	x competes implies that x actually competes, while "x is competitive" implies only that x wants to compete (but may or may not actually get the chance).
purpose	A purpose is an active intention	A purpose is an active intention.-->You're trying to DO something."Not doing something" isn't an active intention.If this idea were phrased in an active way — —i.e., with the purpose of avoiding competition with xxxx — —then it would make sense.
avoiding prosecution.	(avoiding prosecution) is an active endeavor.Avoiding prosecution is actually an ACTIVE GOAL.	It actually requires that you DO things. (e.g., destroying evidence; intimidating witnesses; taking advantage of legal loopholes; etc.)

not being prosecuted	Not being prosecuted is something that basically just is, unless you're actually being prosecuted.	not being prosecuted" applies equally well to things like sleeping, dancing, eating pizza, etc. (These activities definitely do not quality as "avoiding prosecution", though.)
Since xxxx, yyyy /Yyyy since xxx		yyyy' should be.....'has/have __ed' if its timeframe is 'up to the present' or ...'had __ed' if its timeframe is 'up to some past point' (= NOT 'up to the present') .xxxx' is normally a date or a past-tense construction.
who(m), where, whether, why	words that suggest questions'	whether Earth will grow warmer --> suggests the question 'Will Earth grow warmer?'
parallelism	parallelism you should match words of the same kind	what form of government the new country will adopt --> suggests 'What form of government will the new country adopt?'
That	"That" modifies the preceding noun through this modifying clause and acts as the subject of this clause.	what he knows and who spoke to him --> parallel (two 'words that suggest questions' as explained above) what he knows and the people who spoke to him --> nope the things he knows and who spoke to him --> nope the things he knows and the people who spoke to him --> parallel (two normal nouns)
	"That" connects two clauses. It acts as a connector. Each clause connected by 'that' requires its own subject and verb pair.	Mary made claims that pertain to her achievements in high school. Retailers do not approve of the apps that allow shoppers to perform immediate price-comparison by scanning a product on the shelf.
		The analysts strongly believe that the manufacturing sector will continue to act as a drag on gross domestic product in the third quarter and that the improvement is unlikely until regional structural issues are addressed and the broader global backdrop brightens. Mary found certain evidence that even the Crime Scene Investigators (CSI) could not find.

idiom	dated to be/dated at	Incorrect-Rock samples taken from the remains of an asteroid about twice the size of the 6-mile-wide asteroid that eradicated the dinosaurs have been dated to be 3.47 billion years old and thus are evidence of the earliest known asteroid impact on Earth
		Correct-Rock samples taken from the remains of an asteroid about twice the size of the 6-mile-wide asteroid that eradicated the dinosaurs have been dated at 3.47 billion years old and thus are evidence of the earliest known asteroid impact on Earth
that	that' is a connector that' is modifying the noun 'evidence	Mary found certain evidence that even the Crime Scene Investigators (CSI) could not find
		Mary found certain evidence that even could not be found by the Crime Scene Investigators (CSI)
present perfect/simple past	the present perfect (has/have VERBed) is used if the event still has a tangible impact or influence on, or relevance to, the present state of affairs	if the two of you are actually talking about marriage, he will probably say "i have been married three times".
	the simple past is used if the event does NOT have any tangible impact/influence/relevance in the present	if the two of you are NOT directly talking about marriage or its consequences -- for instance, he is just enumerating members of his family -- he will probably say "i was married three times"
comma+ and	it's quite possible to have a comma in front of "and"• in a construction that's not an independent clause, if that comma belongs to some other construction (such as a modifier).you can't block off a modifier with a comma on only one side	i bought bananas and grapes --> normal parallel structure; there shouldn't be a comma here.
		i bought bananas, which were on sale, and grapes. --> here there is a comma in front of "and"•, but that comma belongs to the green modifier.

Comma+ING	chain of causation	i dropped the groceries onto the floor, scaring the baby.-->this is another "modifying the entire action" type of modifier.what scared the baby? well, my dropping the groceries onto the floor did.did *i* directly scare the baby? no.
pronouns	pronouns can refer to objects of preposition	The framers of the US Constitution did not anticipate the challenges it would face in a post-industrial world.
		The novels of James Joyce reflect his fascination with both word origins and patterns of verbal association.
ACT OF HAVING or the ACT OF BEING	correct usages:	HAVING too many friends can be a burden.
		HAVING more cars than I can use, I don't mind lending them to friends. <- even this usage is doubtful. It's better to say "since I have..."
laws	correct (___ing)	laws specifying long jail sentences for drunk drivers --> correct (___ing), since that's what the laws actually specify.
	incorrect	laws to specify long jail sentences for drunk drivers --> incorrect (that's not the ultimate purpose of the laws)
	correct	laws to discourage drunk driving --> correct (this IS actually the ultimate purpose of the laws)
to	"to" to indicate purpose but if they are smaller parts of some larger construction, then you may have to look at other things.	i eat eggs and cottage cheese with every meal to promote muscle growth.--> in this sentence, you can't look at "meal to promote...", because that is not actually a construction. the construction is : (i eat eggs and cottage cheese (with every meal)) (to promote muscle growth).so, in this case, the infinitive "to promote" applies to the entire preceding clause, not to the noun in front of it.
ING modifier without a comma	That kind of modifier should describe the noun that comes before it.	This restaurant will provide free food to runners finishing the marathon. (correct)--> "Finishing the marathon" describes the runners.

-ING modifiers WITH commas		I dropped the groceries onto the floor, scaring the dog. (correct)--> The floor didn't scare the dog. What scared the dog was my dropping the groceries on the floor.
	incorrect. Without meaning, grammar doesn't even exist.	This restaurant will provide free food to runners, finishing the marathon.--> Nonsense; implies that the restaurant is running a marathon while providing food.
	incorrect	I dropped the groceries onto the floor scaring the dog.--> Nonsense; implies that the floor scared the dog.
to	"to sell clothes"used as a noun.	My plan is to sell clothes
	subject of a sentence	To know my dog is to love him.
estimated	Idiom	Paleontologists believe that fragments of a primate jawbone unearthed in Burma and estimated to be 40 to 44 million years old provide evidence of a crucial step along the evolutionary path that led to human beings.-->the word "estimated", which must be followed by "to be." A certain number of these little rules will occur on Test Day, so you should do your best to learn them in small groups as you continue to study (as opposed to trying to memorize 100s of them all at once).
as well as	don't follow 'as well as' with a verb.be suspicious of any choice in which 'as well as' is followed by something other than a noun. (if you can't see any other reason to eliminate, use this as a guessing method.	Diesel engines burn as much as 30% less fuel than gasoline engines of comparable size, as well as emitting far less carbon dioxide gas and far fewer of the other gases that have been implicated in global warming.
		His review was insightful as well as thorough--->i wouldn't elevate this to the status of a 'rule', since as well as is also widely used to connect other things, such as adjectives
that [verb]s	that [verb]s" implies that [verb]ing is a permanent or fundamental aspect of the noun that's described.	if i tell you that i have friends who work in finance, i'm implying that finance is their long-term career.

[verb]ing	.[verb]ing", on the other hand, implies that it's temporary and can/will change	on the other hand, if i tell you that i have friends working in finance, then there is no such implication (e.g., maybe they'll quit tomorrow and become consultants, or form a startup, or retire and move to a tropical island).
parallelism	Just a result of the fact that, well, not everything in the world can be expressed in exactly the same way.	We argue just as often and about the same things as the couple next door.-> "(Just as) often" is an adverb. "About the same things" doesn't contain a literal adverb, but it acts the same way (both modifiers describe "argue". There's no adverb that means "about the same things", so this is about as good as you're going to get here.
sentence + "as" + noun(s)	the noun(s) normally describe the significance of whatever was described in the sentence.	the restaurant owner gave free meals to veterans on Veterans' Day, as a token of appreciation for their service to the country.
comma + __ing follows only a noun	Namely, if comma + __ing follows only a noun, rather than a full sentence/clause, then it modifies only that noun. (It can't do anything else!)	Roberta, having just finished her first marathon, collapsed onto the floor.--->Here, "having..." just describes Roberta. However, it still needs to have a fundamental relationship to the following part (i.e., she collapsed because she had just run 26.2 miles).
that are	there's no real difference here. so, the first one is marginally better, if only because it's more concise.rest assured that such a small difference will NEVER be the sole basis for the elimination of an answer choice	items produced by this machine are guaranteed to be accurately sized items that are produced by this machine are guaranteed to be accurately sized.--->there's no real difference here. so, the first one is marginally better, if only because it's more concise. rest assured that such a small difference will NEVER be the sole basis for the elimination of an answer choice.
were VERBing	were VERBing" implies that the process was going on at the time, but that it didn't necessarily finish. in this context, that is at best questionable	tom's mother was cutting his hair before the guests arrived --> this makes it sound as though tom's mother didn't finish cutting his hair. tom's mother cut his hair before the guests arrived --> she finished the job.
that	if you have a noun referring to a feeling or an idea, than you're always going to need to use "that" if a description of that feeling or idea follows.	the notion that his own family would vote against him confidence that the economy will improve

THAT	if "THAT" is used to start a modifier (as it is here), then it works with both singular and plural nouns.	The key that opens the main door is on the table.
		The keys that open the office doors are on the table.
THAT	if "THAT" is a pronoun appearing in a parallel structure, then it must represent a singular noun	The economy of country X is stronger than that of country Y --> correct
		The governmental institutions of country X are stronger than that of country Y --> INCORRECT (must be "those")
nouns	Because they refer to different nouns in the sentence. Here's the core of the sentence:	The trenches have yielded evidence that societies arose.--->The trenches have been doing something (present perfect) but the societies arose in the past).
having	this modifier is equivalent to saying have been cut... (if it's attached to something in the present or future tense), or had been cut... (if it's attached to something in the past tense).in general, you're going to find that modifiers with "having..." are somewhat rare, because they will usually (not always!) be written with "who"/"that" when possible. for instance, the sentence above -- while not incorrect as is -- would most likely be written instead as Students who have finished...	Students having finished Math 101 and 102 are eligible to take Math 201. --> this is like saying "students who have finished..."; this tense actually makes sense here.
a "___ing" modifier	If a "___ing" modifier DOES NOT follow a comma, then it should modify a noun.	I told Susan to be wary of pickpockets, watching her purse. --> I was watching Susan's purse (presumably to prevent theft) while I warned her about pickpockets.
		I told Susan to be wary of pickpockets watching her purse. --> If there are pickpockets watching Susan's purse, she should be suspicious.

<p>parallelism</p>	<p>parallelism within the commas ("a strong defense... as well as an important body of work...") b/c both descriptions refer to the papers.</p>	<p>The Federalist papers, a strong defense of the United States Constitution as well as an important body of work in political science, represent the handiwork of three different authors.---->Present perfect tense is for an action that started in the past and is either still going on or still true today. This sentence fits the latter category - the data presented is still true (45k in 1979, 34k last year). Notice also the parallelism from [number, date] to [number, date];</p>
<p>present perfect tense</p>	<p>present perfect tense is primarily used to depict an event that has happened at some unspecific time before the current time.</p>	<p>Now a days, the new Governments always rollback the changes that have been implemented by the old Governments. - The clause in present perfect (that have been implemented by the old Governments) is modifying changes</p> <p>In El Nino, changes combine to allow the warm water that has accumulated in the western Pacific to flow back to the east. - The clause in present perfect (that has accumulated in the western Pacific) is modifying warm water</p> <p>Everyday, the Sun clears the mist that has been accumulated by the low temperatures of the night. - The clause in present perfect (that has been accumulated by the low temperatures of the night) is modifying mist</p>
<p>Meaning</p>	<p>grammatically fine, but clearly distort the meaning of the original sentence.</p>	<p>In the capacity of Rousseau, Tolstoi rebelled against the unnatural complexity of human relations in modern society.</p> <p>Considered as Rousseau, Tolstoi rebelled against the unnatural complexity of human relations in modern society.</p> <p>As Rousseau, Tolstoi rebelled against the unnatural complexity of human relations in modern society.</p> <p>As was Rousseau's, Tolstoi's rebellion was against the unnatural complexity of human relations in modern society.</p>

<i>comparison</i>	Case 1:	John has more ice cream than Mary. Implied comparison: John has more ice cream than Mary [HAS ICE CREAM]. The words in brackets are omitted, but their presence is understood.
	Case 2:	John has fewer apples than oranges. Implied comparison: John has fewer apples than [HE HAS] oranges. The words in brackets are omitted, but their presence is understood.
<i>comparison</i>	action to action	Julia was able to climb the tree as fast as her brothers did.
	noun to noun	Land values in most parts of the pinelands rose almost as fast as those outside the pinelands.
<i>comparison</i>	WITHOUT the 'did'	we could read the sentence as meaning that julia climbed the tree as fast as she climbed up her brothers' backs.if there's any ambiguity in the version that doesn't feature a verb, then throw the verb in there to resolve the ambiguity (even if one of the 2 ambiguous meanings is a bit farfetched - remember that ambiguity is ambiguity, and that we aren't supposed to use 'common sense' to resolve meanings). so, in the sentence about julia WITHOUT the 'did', we could read the sentence as meaning that julia climbed the tree as fast as she climbed up her brothers' backs. a bit strange, but not meaningless or ungrammatical, so we must consider it a genuine ambiguity. therefore, we need the verb.
	with "did"	Julia was able to climb the tree as fast as her brothers did.
<i>comparison</i>	verb to verb	Incorrect-Because my little son does not perceive the things systematically, as I, he may notice details that I ignore.
		Correct-Because my little son does not perceive the things systematically, as I do, he may notice details that I ignore.

<p><i>a genuinely ambiguous</i></p>	<p>two meaning</p>	<p>Josh has known tim longer about stephanie. this can mean two things: (1) josh has known tim longer than josh has known stephanie; (2) josh has known tim longer than stephanie has known tim. --->he reason why both of these meanings are legitimate sentences is that they are both perfectly parallel: (1) is parallel because the parallel elements are tim and stephanie (both people, both in the same context), and (2) is also parallel because the parallel elements are josh and stephanie (both people, both in the same context).</p>
<p><i>itself</i></p>	<p>if you say "the NOUN itself" or "the NOUNS themselves", the point is usually to make some sort of comparison with something that is NOT in the same category as the NOUN/NOUNS.</p>	<p>Smith's books were not as infamous as Smith himself. the "himself" here is used to solidify this comparison between two things that would normally not be comparable, i.e., smith and his books.</p>
<p><i>possessives</i></p>	<p>possessives are adjectives</p>	<p>those boys' unruly behavior is a result of unorthodox parenting.---->since you used an apostrophe on boys', that's not a noun -- possessives are adjectives -- and so the subject becomes unruly behavior</p>
<p><i>Like</i></p>	<p>If you have a noun modifier ("Like the grassy fields,"), it must immediately be followed by a noun</p>	<p>Like the grassy fields of the United States, the swamps of Florida are slowly disappearing. Like the grassy fields and old pastures of the northeastern United States that the upland sandpiper needs for feeding and nesting when it returns in May after wintering in the Argentine Pampas, the bird itself is vanishing>"Like the grassy fields, etc. . . .," creates a modifier. This modifier must be followed by the thing that is like the grassy fields.</p>
<p><i>extra preposition</i></p>	<p>you need to include a preposition to give a clear understanding of what needs to be parallel for proper meaning. In some cases an extra preposition (or other part of speech) is optional</p>	<p>I am thinking of pizza and (of) ice cream. as a result of (x and y) and of z: As a result of residential/industrial development AND a result of changes proper meaning Error: as a result of (a and b)(y and z): As a result of residential/industrial development and changes</p>

<p><i>Singular/plural</i></p>	<p>There's no point in considering this issue in isolation, since the GMAT will never hand you a single sentence and ask you whether it is correct.</p> <p>The GMAT is a multiple-choice test. So, there are only two possibilities: 1/ You have to choose between "the bird" and "the birds"; 2/ No such issue is in play.</p>	<p>If you have to make this decision, then, for presumably obvious reasons, "the bird" (singular) is better than "the birds" (plural).</p>
<p><i>like</i></p>	<p>in the sentence "like X, Y does zzzz", the whole point is that both X and Y do zzzz (though they may or may not have anything else in common).</p>	<p>Like my brother, I enjoy stupid jokes. —> both my brother and i enjoy dumb jokes. (this may be the only thing we have in common.)</p>
<p><i>does/do/did</i></p>	<p>the purpose of does/do/did is to serve not as a helping verb but as a SUBSTITUTE for an antecedent verb.</p>	<p>Since 1990 the global economy HAS GROWN more than it DID during the 10000 years from the beginning of agriculture to 1950....>Conveyed meaning: Since 1990 the global economy HAS GROWN more than it GREW during the 10000 years from the beginning of agriculture to 1950. ...>Implication: On the GMAT, does/do/did and its antecedent verb can be in different forms.</p>
		<p>Wrong: Our cars were designed to inspire envy, and they ARE. Implied meaning: Our cars were designed to inspire envy, and they are [inspiring envy]. Here, the participle in brackets -- inspiring -- has been omitted. A PARTICIPLE may be omitted only if it appears in the same form earlier in the sentence. In the sentence above, inspiring does not appear in the first clause; hence, it cannot be omitted from the second clause.</p>

<p>omitted-Comparison</p>	<p>Structure</p>	<p>A reader might make the following interpretation: While it costs about the same to run nuclear plants as other types of power plants [cost]... The intended comparison is as follows: While it costs about the same to run nuclear plants as [to run] other types of power plants... ..>since a reader might be confused, eliminate the answer choice. Since a reader might misinterpret the intended meaning, look for an answer choice that makes the comparison clear.</p>
<p>comparisons</p>	<p>comparison sentences automatically compare things that are actually comparable to each other</p>	<p>French bulldog puppies cost more than Samoyed puppies. French bulldog puppies cost more than Samoyed puppies do. ^^ These sentences discuss the cost of purchasing the puppies themselves.</p> <hr/> <p>French bulldog puppies cost less to feed than Samoyed puppies. French bulldog puppies cost less to feed than Samoyed puppies do. ^^ These sentences discuss the cost of feeding the dogs, not the cost of purchasing them.</p> <hr/> <p>You do need a certain degree of parallelism. (E.g., here, "do" needs a verb, "cost", to which it can be parallel.) Beyond that, though, it's mostly just common sense.</p> <p>If for some reason you wanted to compare the cost of feeding one of the puppies with the cost of purchasing the other one -- for whatever reason -- then you'd have to write a sentence that's very specific about that intention. E.g., It costs more to purchase a French bulldog puppy than to feed a Samoyed for ten years.</p>
<p>EQUIVALENT</p>	<p>EQUIVALENT means equal in VALUE, function, or meaning.</p>	<p>Equivalent to = ADJECTIVE + PREPOSITION: Critics claim that the new law is EQUIVALENT TO censorship. Equivalent of = NOUN + PREPOSITION: One grapefruit is the nutritional EQUIVALENT OF two lemons.</p>

<p>MORE AND GREATER confusion</p>		<p>correct -The cost of pen is greater than the cost of pencil--->you're missing "a" in front of the nouns. but that's a non-issue, since the gmat does not test "a"/"an"/"the".</p>
		<p>correct -The weight of our kitty is greater than the weight of their kitty---->theoretically correct, although no decent writer would ever write this sentence (you'd see "Our cat is heavier than theirs" instead)</p>
		<p>correct -The number of birds breeding this year is greater than that of last year---->"that of last year", on the other hand, creates non-parallelism, because there's nothing "of this year"</p>
		<p>correct -The pen costs more than a pencil.---->random observation: you have two examples labeled</p>
		<p>correct-The amount of water is greater than the amount of juice. The clarity of water is greater than that of juice.</p>
		<p>incorrect-There are more number of birds breeding this year than last year.</p>
		<p>incorrectThe number of cats we have is more than the cats they have</p>
		<p>incorrect-The weight of our kitty is more than theirs.</p>
		<p>[quote]The fraction of the population who smoke is greater than those who do not [smoke].</p> <p>three big errors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "those" has no noun to stand for. • even if such a noun were present, the sentence would still be non-parallel ("a fraction is greater than these people"). • idiomatically, "greater than" can never be followed by people/things, irrespective of parallelism. ("greater than ____" only works if " ____" is a numerical quantity.

<p>greater</p>	<p>the best rule i've found is to test the legitimacy of placing "greater" BEFORE the noun (i.e., as an adjective), vs. the legitimacy of placing "more" BEFORE the noun (i.e., as an adjective)</p>	<p>the gyrfalcon has greater numbers --> this is ok the gyrfalcon has more numbers --> this doesn't make sense</p> <p>therefore, "greater" is the preferred version.</p> <p>try this if you ever run into this issue again; it will almost certainly work.</p>
<p>x is more than y</p>	<p>You're unlikely to see #5 (BirdsA are more than birdsB in country.)("x is more than y") in any official sentences.</p>	<p>The following usages are ok: "- "Besides y, there are additional components to x" (Human thought is more than information processing; it also incorporates emotions and intuition at every step.) "- "...is more than [adjective/description]" (This apartment building is more than 100 years old.) If x and y are quantities, you'll see "x is greater than y".</p>
<p>compared to/with" (or similar constructions, including "in comparison to", "as compared to/with", etc.)</p>	<p>if you have a sentence that says "compared to/with" (or similar constructions, including "in comparison to", "as compared to/with", etc.), then the sentence CANNOT also use a comparison word, such as more, less, greater, prefer, better, worse, X times as much, etc.</p>	<p>examples: this year's unemployment rate of 12% is three times as great compared to the rate in 1994 --> incorrect (redundant)</p> <p>the correct way to write it: this year's unemployment rate is 12%, compared to 4% in 1994 i.e., you just come out and SAY the statistics, and then give "compared to".</p>

<p>Being</p>	<p>from what we've seen, "being" can be ok as long as at least one of the following 2 conditions obtains:</p> <p>(1) it is part of a PASSIVE-VOICE construction (note that such constructions require a form of "to be", so, if the passive voice is in the -ing form, that form will manifest as "being"); or</p> <p>(2) it is used as a ING noun (i.e., the action of "being something" is treated as a NOUN in the sentence).</p> <p>most, but not all, of these nouns form of a construction in the passive voice, as discussed in #1 above.</p>	<p>Being followed by paparazzi 24 hours a day has caused many celebrities to become extremely hostile to strangers. (source: i made this up on the spot) (note that this is both --> it's a passive-voice ING noun!)</p> <p>During the 1950s, as part of their therapy, young polio victims learning to live with their disabilities were helped to practice falling, so that they could learn to fall without being hurt. (source: gmat prep) (again, passive voice ING noun)</p> <p>According to one expert, the cause of genetic irregularities in many breeds of dog is not so much that dogs are being bred for looks or to meet other narrow criteria as that the breeds have relatively few founding members. (source: gmat prep) (passive; not ING noun)</p> <p>Being heavily committed to a course of action, especially one that has worked well in the past, is likely to make an executive miss signs of incipient trouble or misinterpret them when they do appear. (source: gmat prep; also in the OG verbal supplement) (ING noun; not passive)</p>
<p>initial modifier that begins with an adjective</p>	<p>this sort of modifier -- an initial modifier that begins with an adjective -- should fulfill the following two requirements:</p> <p>(1) the adjective should refer to the subject that follows the comma;</p> <p>(2) the description in the modifier should have some sort of easily understandable relationship to whatever is described in the following clause</p>	<p>for instance:</p> <p>Fresh from the tree, the mangoes were difficult to eat because they were not yet ripe. --> requirement (1): "fresh (from the tree)" describes the mangoes. --> requirement (2): the fact that the mangoes were fresh from the tree is directly related to the fact that they were not yet ripe enough to eat.</p> <p>same thing here: Less successful after she emigrated to New York than she had been in her native Germany, photographer Lotte Jacobi nevertheless earned a small group of discerning admirers, and her photographs</p>

		<p>were eventually exhibited in prestigious galleries across the United States</p> <p>--> requirement (1): "less successful" does describe photographer lotte jacobi.</p> <p>--> requirement (2): note the relationship between the description in the modifier ("less successful than she had been in her native germany") and the description in the following clause -- note especially the word "nevertheless"•, which makes it explicitly clear that the sentence is focused on the relationship between these two ideas.</p>
compared to germany	<p>if you have "compared to germany"•, then the context of the sentence must actually have an intended comparison between germany and some other place.</p>	<p>the unemployment rate in county x is 5%, compared to 8% in county y (a correct sentence)</p> <p>--> note that this sentence actually compares what it is intended to compare. i.e., "compared to 8%"• is actually sensible, because the intended comparison is actually between the two percentage values.</p>
although" and "nevertheless	<p>Although has essentially the same function as "but". nevertheless=in spite of that</p>	<p>Jake studied for the test but nevertheless failed>it is a perfectly respectable sentence, so there doesn't seem to be anything objectionable about combining "although" and "nevertheless".</p>
some of which	<p>'some of them...' is not nearly so restricted. this modifier CAN work like 'some of which...', but it can also modify more distant nouns, such as the previous subject.</p>	<p>e.g., Twenty employees moved abroad, some of them going to the Middle East and the rest going to Asia. this sentence works.</p> <p>if you try to replace 'some of them' with 'some of WHOM', though, it no longer works. (comma + ... + 'whom' has the same restrictions as 'which', except in regard to persons rather than things.)</p>
AMBIGUITY	<p>* if you have 2 ANSWER CHOICES THAT DIFFER ONLY IN THE PRESENCE/ABSENCE OF A LITTLE WORD, then CHANCES ARE THAT THE LITTLE WORD IS NECESSARY. i can't guarantee this 100%, but LOOK FOR AN AMBIGUITY that arises if</p>	<p>analogy: i know more about shakespeare than my brother ambiguous. two ways we can resolve this problem by adding little words: 1) i know more about shakespeare than does my brother --> i'm a bigger shakespeare nerd than my brother is. 2) i know more about shakespeare than about my brother --> my brother and i were</p>

	<p>the little word is omitted. * if the little word isn't the _sole_ difference between 2 answer choices, then try to concentrate on the other differences between the answer choices first.</p>	<p>separated at birth, so i know more about shakespeare than i do about him. same deal.</p>
Comparisons	<p>Comparisons don't require the same form of a verb.</p>	<p>E.g., I am taller than my brother>is a perfectly valid comparison. It doesn't matter that am would conjugate differently for my brother (my brother is). It's still the same verb. In fact, this latitude even extends to versions with helping verbs. E.g., Sarah eats faster than her brother ever could>is also a legitimate sentence; you don't specifically need to write could eat.</p>
Interpretation	<p>Example 1: The US spends more money on health care than Canada</p>	<p>Interpretation 1: The US spends more money on health care than [the US spends money on] Canada. Interpretation 2: The US spends more money on health care than Canada [spends money on health care]. While the second interpretation seems to be the intended meaning, both interpretations are reasonable.</p>
Clarity/parallelism-Comparison	<p>Rule 1: Clarity The comparison must be crystal clear. If more than one interpretation is reasonable, then the comparison must be clarified. Generally, adding just a word or two will make the comparison crystal clear.</p> <p>Rule 2: Parallelism Generally, we compare PARALLEL FORMS. One CLAUSE is compared to another CLAUSE. One VERB is compared to another VERB.</p>	<p>Quote: Example 2: The critic XY described the performance as more important to popular music concert history than was any other performance<-- wrong Here, was (verb) lacks a preceding parallel form. Since was must be compared to a preceding verb, the sentence above is not viable. The following would be correct: According to the critic, John's performance WAS more important to popular music concert history than WAS any other performance.</p>

<p>Like vs As</p>	<p>Here's another way of thinking about it: Generally, you use 'as' to compare VERBS or WAYS in which things happen. Generally, you use 'like' THINGS (nouns).</p> <p>So the first example in this thread uses 'as' because of the comparison between VERBS/WAYS ('as it was of...'). Notice that, if the sentence were written in a manner that compared nouns or noun phrases (such as 'The goal of the current generation, LIKE THAT OF previous generations, is...'), then you'd use 'like'.</p> <p>In your most recent example, the two things being compared are most definitely things (nouns) - the appetite for this and the appetite for that. There are no verbs in the comparison at all, so you use 'like' for sure.</p>	<p>According to a recent poll, owning and living in a freestanding house on its own land is still a goal of a majority of young adults, as it was of earlier generations</p>
<p>those</p>	<p>those of • -- in this construction, you have to have some NOUN for which "those" can actually stand.</p>	<p>for instance: the fats in olive oil are more healthful than THOSE in canola oil. --> those, "those" • stands for fats.</p>

<p>ambiguity</p>	<p>if you have 2 ANSWER CHOICES THAT DIFFER ONLY IN THE PRESENCE/ABSENCE OF A LITTLE WORD, then CHANCES ARE THAT THE LITTLE WORD IS NECESSARY.</p> <p>this is a really, really, really strong bias, like over 90% likely. if you see two such choices, then you should REALLY think twice before picking the one without the "little word"</p> <p>i can't guarantee this 100%, but LOOK FOR AN AMBIGUITY that arises if the little word is omitted.</p> <p>* if the little word isn't the <u>sole</u> difference between 2 answer choices, then try to concentrate on the other differences between the answer choices first.</p>	<p>in no other music festival did jimi hendrix cause such a spectacle as woodstock.</p> <p>this is ambiguous. there are two possible interpretations:</p> <p>(1) ...as IN woodstock (this is analogous to the intended meaning of the posted problem)</p> <p>(2) ...as DID woodstock (i.e., you're comparing the spectacle caused by jimi hendrix to the spectacle caused by woodstock itself)</p>
<p>Comparisons</p>	<p>Rule tested- Parallelism (ellipsis)</p> <p>This is a case of ellipsis in comparison. In this some words omitted from the sentence to make it more concise. Both noun and verb can be omitted. The omitted words should be present in the first part of the sentence in the same form.</p>	<p>Jim's pen is brighter than Alex's (pen). - Correct! ("pen" is implied)</p> <p>Jim is smarter than Alex (is). - Correct! ("is" is implied)</p> <p>The omission of a noun for concision is straightforward. Just make sure that the 2 nouns in the sentence can be logically compared. But there are certain exceptions when you are deciding</p>
	<p>Tense Shift</p> <p>If the verb tense changes from the first to the second half of the sentence, then the verb must not be omitted in the second half.</p>	<p>· You look more beautiful this year than last year. - Incorrect</p> <p>· You look more beautiful this year than you did last year.- Correct</p>

	<p>Meaning Ambiguity-</p> <p>Do not omit the verb if doing so will make the sentence's meaning ambiguous.</p>	<p>I love my dog more than my friend. - Incorrect</p> <p>Here, the intended meaning could be that I love my dog more than I love my friend, OR that I love my dog more than my friend does. Since the omission of the verb in the second half of the sentence distorts the meaning, this sentence is incorrect on the GMAT.</p> <p>.</p> <p>I love my dog more than I love my friend.- Correct!</p> <p>.</p> <p>I love my dog more than my friend does.- Correct!</p>
<p><i>past perfect</i></p>	<p>as long as there's something to serve as the second past time marker - to which the action referenced in the past perfect is relevant - you can use the past perfect.</p>	<p>at the beginning of the 1991 track season, the world record in the men's long jump had stood for almost 23 years.</p>
		<p>Retailers reported moderate gains in their November sales, as much because their sales a year earlier had been so bad as because shoppers were getting a head start on buying their holiday gifts</p>
<p><i>awkward</i></p>	<p>The bolded portion is an aside that gives a reason for the main clause (why retailers gained moderate gains in November sales). They use an awkward construction that follows:</p>	<p>Sales in November increased.</p> <p>Sales in November increased because of X.</p> <p>Sales in November increased because of X and Y.</p> <p>Sales in November increased, as much because Y as because X.</p>

<p>background</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • __ing modifiers suggest that the noun is currently, but not permanently, "__ing". e.g., People working in the oil and gas industry have suffered from the recent collapse in oil prices. (= people who are working in the industry right now, with no expectation that they'll make a career of it) • "who/that + (present tense)" modifiers suggest that the noun is, at its very core, a noun "who/that does xxxx"--in other words, that doing xxx is part of the identity of that noun. e.g., People who work in the oil and gas industry tend to live far from cities. (= people whose career is in oil and gas)
<p>having __ed</p>	<p>with that background ^^, you can probably see why "having __ed" is usually problematic</p>	<p>e.g., People having seen this movie... People who have seen this movie... the first of these is basically impossible, because "having seen this movie" can't be a temporary state. once you've seen it, you've seen it, and then, for the rest of your life on earth, you're someone who has seen that movie.</p>
<p>having __ed</p>	<p>Correct usage of having __ed</p>	<p>ok, here's an example. i lived in miami about fifteen years ago.</p> <p>consider: I live in Miami. RIGHT NOW this sentence is FALSE. (right now i live in los angeles.)</p> <p>I have lived in Miami. RIGHT NOW this sentence is TRUE (and it will remain true in perpetuity—it's clearly impossible for this to become false.)</p> <p>for the same reason, i could not write a present-tense sentence (about myself) with , living in miami</p> <p>but i absolutely CAN write a present-tense sentence about myself with , having lived in miami</p>

		<p>e.g., Ron, having lived in Miami, is frustrated by the early closing times of California nightclubs. (lots of clubs in miami are open until 6-8am) totally valid sentence.</p>
<p>Modifiers - Use it or Lose It</p>	<p>Basically, modifiers on the GMAT serve two purposes:</p> <p>1) A decision point for you to eliminate misplaced modifiers</p> <p>or</p> <p>2) Extra description for the GMAT to use to make it harder for you to find the true decision point</p>	<p>In the first case, you'll "use it" - identify the improper modifier and eliminate the answer choice.</p> <p>In the second case, you should "lose it" -- if the modifier is correct, then you can read as though it weren't there and reduce the word count that you need to read.</p> <p>As an example, answer choice A says:</p> <p>Unlike the United States, where farmers can usually depend on rain or snow all year long, the rain...</p> <p>Well, "where farmers..." is a modifier - and because "where" logically modifies the place (the US), it's a proper modifier. Because it works, you should "lose it", leaving you with:</p> <p>Unlike the United States, the rains...</p> <p>This should clearly be incorrect - the main reason that the GMAT might have left you with doubt is that the in-between "where" modifier distanced the initial "Unlike the US" modifier from the subject "rains".</p>
<p>subordinating conjunctions</p>	<p>"subordinating conjunctions") can be placed just as well at the beginning of a whole sentence as between two clauses.</p> <p>coordinating conjunctions</p>	<p>for instance, both of the following sentences are fine:</p> <p>even though i was third in line, i had to wait two hours to be served. i had to wait two hours to be served, even though i was third in line.</p> <hr/> <p>there is, however, a different group of conjunctions that indeed can't be placed at the beginning of a sentence. these are the so-called "coordinating conjunctions" -- and, but, yet, and so on.</p> <p>for instance, the following sentence is ok... i was third in line, but i still had to wait two</p>

		<p>hours to be served. ... but under no circumstances can you write a sentence like But xxxxx, yyyyy.</p>
<p>comparison</p>		<p>Unlike smog, which in Mexico City is often dense enough to hospitalize or even kill asthmatic children, humidity is not inherently dangerous. --> This sentence is a comparison between ALL smog (not just the smog in Mexico City) and humidity. The issue with choice E is that it's structured the same way, mistakenly suggesting a reference to all such tubes in the first part of the sentence.</p> <p>... versus Unlike the smog in Mexico City, which is often dense enough to hospitalize or even kill asthmatic children, the air pollution in Houston has never threatened human life. --> Now it's just "Mexico City smog vs. Houston air pollution".</p>
<p>two sentences look alike</p>	<p>As long as thing #1 and thing #2 are complete sentences, technically, you have grammatical parallelism.</p>	<p>What should be pretty obvious here, though, is that it's better if the two sentences look alike" especially if they express similar or corresponding ideas.</p> <p>E.g., If you return your library books late, you will accrue fines on your account. If your library books are returned late, fines will be accrued on your account. vs. If you return your library books late, fines will be accrued on your account. If your library books are returned late, you will accrue fines on your account.</p> <p>All four of these sentences are grammatically sound, and all four have reasonable meanings, but it should nonetheless be absolutely clear that the first two are much better than the last two.</p>

<p><i>NOUN in which</i></p>	<p>completely different issues.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to judge "NOUN in which...", just ask yourself, Can I write "in this/that NOUN?" e.g., <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – i can put jewelry in a box. so, the box in which i put jewelry is ok. – i can pay taxes in a certain year. so, the year in which i paid the taxes is ok. – on the other hand, you don't do things in a date; you do them on a date, or at a date. so, you can't say "the date in which i finished the course". (you could use "on which" or "at which".)
<p><i>When</i></p>		<p>"When ____" ALWAYS refers to the timeframe of " ____".</p> <p>E.g., When you return the goods, your money will be refunded. If you return the goods, your money will be refunded.</p> <p>"- The first sentence implies that your money will be refunded immediately when you return the goods. No delay. The refund occurs in the timeframe of the return--that's the point of "when".</p> <p>"- The second sentence, on the other hand, carries no implication whatsoever about when the money will be given back. This sentence can be true even if you have to wait months or years to get the money back!</p>
<p><i>many of whom</i></p>	<p>"many of whom" is not a subject pronoun; it's a relative pronoun. it has EXACTLY the same grammar as plural "which"</p>	<p>if you understand why i adopted two dogs, which weigh approximately 100 pounds each or i adopted two dogs, each of which weighs approximately 100 pounds</p>
<p><i>many of them</i></p>	<p>by contrast, if the sentence had contained "many of them", then it would be a run-on.</p>	<p>*i adopted two dogs, they weigh approximately 100 pounds each is a run-on sentence (--> incorrect). for the same reason, *i adopted two dogs, each of them weighs approximately 100 pounds and *... a population of only 4 million people,</p>

		many of them are members of hill tribes... would also be run-on sentences (--> incorrect).
which	it's "each of which", not just "which". "each" (and therefore "each of which") is singular.	viz.: the dogs are large. each of the dogs is large.
compared to/with	here's how to use it: a sentence that uses "compared to/with"• should explicitly mention both items in the comparison.If you see "compared to/from", the issue is whether the comparison makes sense. The issue will NOT involve grammar.	for instance: the unemployment rate in county X is 6 percent, compared to 11 percent in neighboring county Y. this is a correct sentence; note that it explicitly mentions both of the statistical quantities in the comparison.
it" and "they" (and their various forms""its, their, them, etc.)	The pronouns "it" and "they" (and their various forms""its, their, them, etc.) stand for a noun with all attached modifiers.	So, if a sentence contains "the energy produced is France", then it CANNOT just stand for "energy". It has to stand for the energy produced in France. This is the entire reason for the existence of these pronouns""to demonstrate that we're still talking about exactly the same thing. If you want to just pick out the noun""and leave out the following qualifiers/modifiers""then you have to use "that" or "those" as a pronoun instead. E.g., you can compare "the energy produced in France" with "that produced in Germany".
while	If "while" comes before a complete sentence, then, ideally, it should imply BOTH simultaneity AND contrast.	If "while" comes before a complete sentence, then, ideally, it should imply BOTH simultaneity AND contrast. While HOV (high-occupancy vehicle) lanes do serve the laudable purpose of encouraging carpooling, they also reduce the number of lanes available to solo drivers, increasing both congestion and air pollution. If "while" comes before a modifier, it serves only to indicate simultaneity.

		<p>You shouldn't send text messages while driving.</p>
<p><i>parallel</i></p>	<p>here are two kinds of parallel signals: ONE-PART (such as "and", "or", "but"), and TWO-PART (such as "not only ... but also", "both ... and").</p> <p>when you have PARALLELISM WITH A ONE-PART SIGNAL, the only words that are "locked in" are the ones directly FOLLOWING the signal.</p> <p>as long as you can find the corresponding structure in the other part, then the parallelism is fine.</p>	<p>examples: i worked in nevada and florida. i worked in nevada and in florida.</p> <p>BOTH OF THESE ARE FINE.</p> <p>reasons: in the first, the part that's "locked in" by the signal and is just florida. therefore, the parallel construction would be just nevada. since that construction is there, the sentence is parallel: i worked in nevada and florida.</p> <p>in the second, the part that's "locked in" by the signal and is in florida. therefore, the parallel construction would be just in nevada. since that construction is there, the sentence is parallel: i worked in nevada and in florida.</p> <p>--</p> <p>for completely analogous reasons, this sentence would be fine either with or without your second "that":</p> <p>an increase that would amount to roughly five miles per gallon and would represent...</p>

		<p>an increase that would amount to roughly five miles per gallon and that would represent...</p>
<p><i>parallelism</i></p>	<p>remember -- when it comes to what should be included in parallel structures, the only words that MUST be included are words that follow signals. there's no signal in front of the left-hand part here, so you just take whatever is in parallel with the right- hand part.</p>	<p>more examples: I've lived in Minnesota and Florida. --> correct I've ilved in Minnesota and in Florida. --> also correct</p> <p>here, again, there's no signal on the left-hand side. since the only signal is "and", which marks the right-hand parallel structure, you have to process the parallelism here from right to left. in the first example, the right-hand structure is "florida" ... so you take "minnesota" as the left-hand structure (ignoring "in"). in the second example, the right-hand structure is "in florida" ... so you take "in minnesota" as the left-hand structure.</p> <p>if there are signal words in front of both</p>

		<p>parallel structures, though, then you don't have this freedom -- you have to judge the parallelism from what is present after both signal words.</p> <p>I've lived in both Minnesota and Florida. --> correct (minnesota is after "both", florida is after "in")</p> <p>I've ilved in both Minnesota and in Florida. --> incorrect (minnesota is after "both", in florida is after "in")</p>
<i>capable of VERBing</i>	the correct idioms are "capable of VERBing" and "ability to VERB"	The results of two recent unrelated studies support the idea that dolphins may share certain cognitive abilities with humans and great apes; the studies indicate dolphins as capable of recognizing themselves in mirrors – an ability that is often considered a sign of self-awareness – and to grasp spontaneously the mood or intention of humans.
<i>indicate</i>	Both of the examples are correct	<p>this test indicates the presence of the drug</p> <p>this test indicates that the drug is present</p>
<i>parallel</i>	remember that [b]parallel elements must be PARALLEL IDEAS -- they must be two of the same type of thing/action/idea.	<p>"(of) recogniz(ing)" is something that dolphins can do.</p> <p>"(of) grasp(ing)" is also something that dolphins can do.</p> <p>therefore, these are the parallel elements.</p> <p>"of self-awareness" and "of grasping" are completely different things -- one refers to the meaning of a sign, while the other is an action that dolphins can carry out -- so it makes no sense to consider these as parallel elements.</p>

<p>wordiness</p>	<p>the issue isn't "wordiness" -- this is actually an incorrect idiom. (note that there are indeed some choices that are "wordy", but "wordiness" will never, ever, be the only thing that's wrong with a choice.)</p>	<p>the correct version is "the ability TO (VERB)". the incorrect version is "the ability OF (VERBing)".</p> <p>pure idiom issue -- notice that the correct and incorrect versions have exactly the same number of words, so wordiness doesn't enter into the equation at all.</p>
<p>consider</p>	<p>if you mean to say that X is classified as a Y, then you just say "X is considered Y".</p> <p>(alternatively, you can say "X is considered to be Y", although that extended version isn't normally used unless the former results in ambiguity or difficult language.)</p> <p>if that's the intended meaning, then it's incorrect to write "X is considered as Y".</p>	<p>on the other hand, you can use "considered as" in a different context: namely, if you mean to say that you are only considering a certain aspect of something/someone.</p> <p>for instance, let's say that there's an absolutely horrible piece of art called "The Stand", but that this horrible piece of art also makes a profound political statement. (i'm just making this up -- i have no knowledge of any actual art by this name.)</p> <p>then you can write:</p> <p>"the stand" is entirely worthless when considered as a work of art, but of historical importance when considered as a political statement.</p> <p>i haven't seen this use of "considered as" on the actual gmat, but it can't hurt to be aware of its existence.</p>
<p>due to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • if replacing "due to" with "caused by" creates a workable sentence, then "due to" is correct. • if replacing "due to" with "because of" creates a workable sentence, then "due to" is incorrect. <p>presuming that you have an adequate understanding of "caused by" and "because of", any further examples would be superfluous-- especially given that you already provided, and correctly analyzed, a perfectly good example in your last post!</p>	<p>"I suffered a fracture due to the fall" is correct sentence or incorrect?</p> <p>It seems correct to me because</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) when replacing "caused by" with "due to", it still makes sense. 2) "due to the fall" modifies fracture.

<i>because and "due to"</i>	<p>Modifiers describe things. That's their function -- to give you extra information about something.</p> <p>If you know this, then it's obvious that "because" and "due to", by themselves, are not modifiers -- they don't give any information about anything!</p>	<p>"Because a truck flipped over" and "due to the fall", on the other hand, actually describe things. They give information.</p>
<i>Because and "due to"</i>	<p>"Because" and "due to", by themselves, ARE NOT modifiers. (If you understand that a "modifier" is an additional description that explains or describes something, then you'll already know this -- it's clear that these words by themselves can't describe anything.)</p>	<p>"Because xxxxx", where xxxxx is a sentence, is a single modifier.</p> <p>"Because of xxxxx", where xxxxx is a noun (possibly with some modifiers of its own), is a single modifier.</p> <p>"Due to xxxxx", where xxxxx is a noun (possibly with some modifiers of its own), is a single modifier.</p>
<i>Because</i>		<p>I was two hours late to the meeting due to the six mile traffic....>It has to describe the noun "meeting".</p> <p>Nonsense. A meeting is not "due to traffic".</p> <p>I was two hours late to the meeting because of the six mile traffic.....>This time, it describes the entire preceding sentence/action/idea.</p> <p>That makes perfect sentence, because the green thing is the reason why I was late to the meeting.</p>
<i>modifiers</i>	<p>modifiers can contain subjects and verbs of their own, sure.</p>	<p>for many modifiers, in fact, this is actually obligatory.</p> <p>e.g., in a which modifier, which is always the subject of a verb that's also part of the modifier.</p>
<i>ED and -ING verbs</i>	<p>ED and -ING verbs after commas are most commonly a modifier that modifies the main clause of the sentence:</p>	<p>They won the football game, scoring 28 points. (how did they win?)</p> <p>They won the football game, followed by a massive celebration. (what happened after they won?)</p>

<p>present perfect will also admit the past perfect</p>	<p>almost every construction that admits the present perfect will also admit the past perfect under different circumstances, and vice versa.</p>	<p>for the last five years, i have been nauseated every morning. for five whole years before i went to see dr. smith, i had been nauseated every morning...>you clearly can't just memorize that "for"• goes with xxxxx tense -- but, if you understand the basic pointers above, the use of these tenses should make sense. in the first sentence, we are talking about a state that has persisted (or recurring action, depending on how you want to think about it) up to the present. in the second sentence, we are talking about a state/action that persisted up until the definite timeframe of the sentence.</p>
<p>DEDICATED NOUN FORM</p>	<p>if you are ever given a choice between a DEDICATED NOUN FORM of an action and the corresponding GERUND form of the action, you should always go for the dedicated noun form. notice that this doesn't mean that you should automatically reject all -ING forms of those actions, since some of them are not gerunds; some of them are modifiers, in which case you should absolutely use the -ING form.</p>	<p>Every year, the running of the Boston Marathon attracts hundreds of thousands of spectators. --> this is correct, since there is no dedicated noun form (like "runnage").</p> <p>People running the Boston Marathon are generally in very good physical shape. --> also correct; this is a modifier.</p> <p>The performing of certain dance moves requires years of practice. --> inferior, though not technically incorrect</p> <p>The performance of certain dance moves requires years of practice. --> correct, and better than the previous version</p> <p>People performing dance moves extremely skillfully often appear to be exerting less effort than they really are. --> correct; this "performing" is a modifier.</p>
<p>verb tense</p>	<p>In fact, verb tense is one hundred percent meaning and zero percent grammar. From the standpoint of grammar, all verbs are equivalent.</p>	<p>As soon as you've established that something is (or should be) a verb, you're done with grammar. From that point onward, it's all context. (If you have to decide between a verb and something that's not a verb""e.g., "swam" vs. "swimming"" then that's going to be a grammatical issue.) <<<."to have ___ed" is the only past-tense version of "to ___".>>></p>

<p><i>they seemed/appeared to</i></p>	<p>in any case, though, you DO have to use an infinitive after "appear" or "seem" in this sort of construction. and if you think about it, this is as past-tense as an infinitive can get. so that's why you have to use it.</p>	<p>If you say "they seemed/appeared to...", then, no matter how remote the event is (in time), you use this construction.</p> <p>for instance: it seems that the students cheated on the exam (normal past tense in this construction) but... the students seem to have cheated on the exam (not here)</p>
<p><i>X in that Y</i></p>	<p>X in that Y is a LIMITING STATEMENT. in these statements, x is usually something very general, but then the sentence LIMITS that statement to the scope of whatever Y is.</p>	<p>joe is a typical teenager in that he likes to watch a great deal of television. --> MEANING: joe shares one thing with typical teenagers: namely, he likes to watch a lot of tv.</p>
<p><i>X because Y</i></p>	<p>X because Y means that there is an actual CAUSE-EFFECT RELATIONSHIP, in which Y is/was the actual CAUSE of X.</p>	<p>joe is a typical teenager because he likes to watch a great deal of television. --> MEANING: joe's tv shows have actually CAUSED him to BECOME LIKE other teenagers.</p>
<p><i>also</i></p>	<p>if you "drop the modifier", then also doesn't make sense anymore.</p>	<p>Ron, one of the most prolific posters on the MGMAT forum, is also a GMAT course instructor. --> again, if you were to remove the modifier, you would also have to remove "also".</p>
<p><i>(identical sentences)</i></p>	<p>Your car is bigger than my car. Your car is bigger than mine.</p>	<p>The resale value of your car is greater than the resale value of my car. The resale value of your car is greater than the resale value of mine. The resale value of your car is greater than that of my car. The resale value of your car is greater than that of mine. (all identical)</p>

<p>including</p>	<p>the idea is hard to put into words, but here's my best attempt: when 'which' follows a plural noun, it describes something about those nouns themselves, NOT about the group that they form.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • '...tools, including screwdrivers' means that the GROUP contains screwdrivers. • '...tools, which include screwdrivers' means that THE TOOLS THEMSELVES (NOT the group) contain screwdrivers. 	<p>examples:</p> <p>I went to Home Depot and bought several tools, including screwdrivers. --> i bought a bunch of tools. some of those tools were screwdrivers.</p> <p>I went to Home Depot and bought several multi-tools, which include screwdrivers. --> each multi-tool actually includes screwdrivers. i.e., screwdrivers are components of these multi-tools.</p>
<p>which</p>	<p>from what we've seen - if you have "which" following "noun1 + preposition + noun2", then "which" can refer to noun1 only if noun2 is grammatically ineligible. otherwise it automatically refers to noun2.</p>	<p>So, for instance, both of these (beginnings of) sentences work:</p> <p>New treatments for cancer, which is the leading killer of American adults over 65, ...</p> <p>New treatments for cancer, which are often too expensive for patients to afford, ...</p>
<p>AMBIGUOUS PRONOUN</p>	<p>not all ambiguous pronouns are incorrect!</p>	<p>1) if you see an AMBIGUOUS PRONOUN that is REPLACED BY THE CORRECT NOUN in OTHER ANSWER CHOICES, then ELIMINATE the ambiguous pronoun and keep the specific noun. for an example, see problem 68 in the blue verbal supplement, in which "them" is split against "these companies".</p> <p>HOWEVER,</p> <p>2) if you see an ambiguous pronoun that is NOT replaced by the correct noun in any of the other answer choices, then DON'T eliminate! for an example, see problem 21 in the blue verbal supplement (in which the correct answer contains a technically ambiguous pronoun).</p>

<p>but</p>	<p>here are 2 similar, but CORRECT, structures. note that they have completely different grammar, so this isn't as simple as you might think it is.</p>	<p>(1) renowned for his creative genius in many other countries(,) but almost completely unknown in his own nation, rodrigo was content to make music without amassing a large fortune or playing large concerts.</p> <p>the "but" connects 2 parallel modifiers, both of which modify "rodrigo". this one would be ok with or without the comma (hence the parentheses around that comma).</p> <p>(2) after three games, the Bulldogs were on the brink of elimination, but they proceeded to win the next four games in a row, advancing to the semifinal.</p> <p>here "but" is being used as a coordinating conjunction, connecting 2 independent clauses. (note that "COMMA + advancing..." is just an adverbial modifier -- you can eliminate this without affecting the grammar of the remaining sentence.)</p> <p>the correct structure here is SENTENCE1 + , + but + SENTENCE2. (there's another comma within each of SENTENCE1 and SENTENCE2, but that's irrelevant to the "but" situation.)</p> <p>i.e., you can parse the sentence as SENTENCE1: after three games, the Bulldogs were on the brink of elimination , but SENTENCE2: they proceeded to win the next four games in a row, advancing to the semifinal</p>
-------------------	---	--

<p>when / while</p>	<p>this is something that will not be tested on this exam (since it would give native speakers of english--who could judge it correctly by ear--a very unfair advantage).</p> <p>Basically, English uses present forms in many contexts where one would logically expect the future.</p>	<p>perhaps most commonly, "when i go to school tomorrow, i will pick up your books" (NOT "when i will go...")</p> <p>note that you're not given a choice about that (there's no choice with a future verb).</p> <p>Ms. Chambers is among the forecasters who predict that the rate of addition to arable lands will drop while the rate of loss rises</p>
<p>as</p>	<p>"as" can be used as a preposition (I just did it right there) to denote "in the role of".</p>	<p>I like the movie Star Wars, especially since it has Harrison Ford as Han Solo or perhaps closer to the sentence posted Even though we aren't dating anymore, I still think of you as a friend. So, some people still value the iguana in the role of a game animal. Not everybody does.</p>
<p>verb change</p>	<p>is to be" change the meaning of the original</p>	<p>The Gorton-Dodd bill requires that that banks disclose to customers how long access to funds from their deposited check is to be delayed-Incorrect for multiple reason</p> <p>Your access is to be delayed. (bad) Your access will be delayed. (acceptable)</p>
<p>the -ed things</p>	<p>you have to use context. the -ed things can be verbs -- but they can also *not* be verbs.</p>	<p>Yves Saint Laurent designed women's jackets with internal pockets, a feature previously found only on men's jackets. --> here, "designed" is a verb.</p> <p>Women's jackets with internal pockets, first designed by Yves Saint Laurent, reflected the growing presence of women in the workplace. --> here, "designed" is a modifier, not a verb.</p>
<p>according to</p>	<p>that's a phrase you use when you name the person or source from which some information/opinion/etc. comes.</p>	<p>according to GMAC, the GMAT exam is designed to measure test-takers' reasoning abilities, not their knowledge of particular content.</p>

<p>modifiers</p>	<p>(when modifiers are separated by commas, the meaning of the sentence without the modifiers must still make sense, and the remaining parts must have the same meaning as in the original sentence.)</p>	<p>MUCH more importantly —</p> <p>DO NOT 'make your own versions' of GMAC's sentences. really. don't do it.</p> <p>the GMAT only tests 1-2% of the things that can actually go wrong with english sentences (and even that may be an overestimate). when random users try to 'edit' these sentences, the result is almost always incorrect — for reasons that the GMAT doesn't test.</p> <p>making your own examples is good, but they should be...</p> <p>...1/ your own examples, ...2/ SIMPLE examples, each illustrating only ONE concept (that is actually tested on this exam).</p> <p>as far as the official problems are concerned, the given answer choices should offer more than enough challenges already.</p>
<p>LIFE CYCLE</p>	<p>A living thing cannot have more than one life cycle</p>	<p>Incorrect: a tiger's life cycles Correct: a tiger's LIFE CYCLE</p>
<p>unequal comparison</p>	<p>The comparison should be from campaign to campaign. It cannot be between the Russian campaign on one hand and all the campaigns put together on the other hand</p>	<p>Incorrect-Although Napoleon's army entered Russia with far more supplies than in their previous campaigns , it had provisions for only twenty-four days.</p>
		<p>Incorrect-Simla apple has more nutrients than in other apples.....>an unequal comparison</p>
<p>Idiom</p>	<p>'in at least 6,000 years' is incorrect idiomatic usage in this context.</p>	<p>Incorrect-Along the major rivers that traverse the deserts of northeast Africa, the Middle East, and northwest India, the combination of a reliable supply of water and good growing conditions both encouraged farming traditions that, in places, endure in at least 6,000 years.</p> <p>I started working at e-GMAT in 2012. (To refer to a point of time) I have worked at e-GMAT for 2 years. (To show a time duration)</p>

<p>Pronoun ambiguity</p>		<p>1/ a criminal is a person. "it" can't be a person.</p> <p>2/ Pronoun ambiguity is not tested on this exam.</p> <p>3/ Pronoun ambiguity is not tested on this exam.</p> <p>this latter point is worth mentioning twice. don't burden yourself with things that, for the purposes of this exam, aren't actually things.</p> <hr/> <p>if the following 2 things are true ...</p> <p>1/ in context, it's obvious what the pronoun SHOULD stand for</p> <p>2/ the pronoun is actually allowed to stand for that thing (e.g., "it" = singular noun that's not a person)</p> <p>... then the pronoun is fine.</p> <hr/> <p>see above-- keep it simple! as long as the pronoun (1) stands for something that's obvious in context and (2) is actually allowed (per grammar rules) to stand for that thing... it's fine. end of story.</p>
<p>stylistically flawed</p>	<p>It is a very formal expression used to say what you are writing or talking about, especially in business letters</p>	<p>e.g. I am writing to you in reference to the job opening in your department.</p>
	<p>The expression "it is in reference" used here is stylistically flawed</p>	<p>Incorrect-Although the term "psychopath" is popularly applied to an especially brutal criminal, in psychology it is in reference to people apparently incapable of feeling compassion or the pangs of conscience.</p>
<p>can/could</p>	<p>We need to examine the rest of the sentence in order to determine how could is being used.</p>	<p>I can tell you this: could has more than one use. In the sentence below, could is the past tense of can:</p> <p>Yesterday John could run fast, but today he can't. (Yesterday John was able to run fast, but today he is unable to run fast.)</p> <p>Another use is to express possibility:</p> <p>If John had the energy, he could run fast. (It is possible for John to run fast, but he does not have the energy.)</p>

<p>And /Although</p>	<p>specifically:</p> <p>* you should use AND to join the statements whose meanings ARE SIMILAR or REINFORCE EACH OTHER.</p> <p>* you should use ALTHOUGH to set off a CONTRASTING statement.</p>	<p>Although still continuing elsewhere, polio has been eradicated in the United States and could be brought into the country by visitors.....>makes no sense, because "although" is put in front of something that doesn't completely contrast with the following clause, and "and" is used to connect two elements that DO contrast.</p> <p>Although eradicated in the United States, polio continues elsewhere and could be brought into the country by visitors.....> uses the connectors properly.</p>
<p>correct usage</p>	<p>Polio, it continues elsewhere ...</p> <p>this isn't correct usage; it's like having a sentence with two subjects.</p> <p>i have no idea what this construction is actually called, but you should recognize it as incorrect; i've seen it in a couple of different official problems.</p>	<p>here are a couple more examples of the same incorrect construction:</p> <p>my brother, he is a consultant. (wrong)</p> <p>The Estadio Atanasio Girardot, it is where two major teams of Medellin play their home games. (wrong)</p>
<p>although</p>	<p>if it's attached directly to a subject, an "although" modifier can contain just an adjective, or a thing that acts as an adjective</p>	<p>e.g.,</p> <p>Although exhausted, Jim managed to keep himself awake for the duration of his three-hour drive home.</p> <p>or</p> <p>Jim, although exhausted, managed to keep himself awake for the duration of his three-hour drive home.</p> <p>both correct</p>
<p>verb</p>	<p>In the right context, any verb can be parallel to any other verb. (There's only one exception -- a singular verb can't be parallel to a plural verb, because parallel verbs have the same subject.)</p>	

<p>parallel</p>	<p>* If you have 2 verbs, then, grammatically, they're parallel.</p> <p>* Tense depends entirely on context.</p>	<p>MOST IMPORTANTLY</p> <p>* Remember that parallelism is comparative. It's a beauty contest. You don't have to judge each "contestant" individually -- you just have to pick the winner.</p> <p>So, if you see (A) "I like to swim, lift weights, and participate in marathons" and (B) "I like to swim, lift weights, and run marathons", it should be quite obvious that B is better than A, because swim/lift/run is clearly better than swim/lift/participate.</p> <p>The point of SC is that all of the main topics are pretty simple. (The challenge lies in recognizing and isolating the things that are wrong, not in understanding how they work.) If you're encountering a great deal of complexity, then you may be accidentally introducing that complexity yourself.....>This is something you already inherently understand. (Try reading off a list of things, and see what kind of gestures you make while reading the list -- without even thinking about it. Those gestures show that you have an in-built understanding of "parallelism".) However, it's essentially impossible to make "rules" for which things should be parallel. You have to rely on that pre-existing sense of "thing #1", "thing #2", etc.</p>
<p>modifier</p>	<p>the structure of the modifier is perfectly acceptable, but its meaning is nonsense.</p>	<p>Coming home from school, the wind blew me off my bike.</p> <p>--> incorrect (nonsense). there's nothing structurally wrong here, but this sentence says that the wind was "coming home from school" when it decided to knock me off the bike.</p> <p>for that sentence to work, "coming home from school" must be followed by "i" (Coming home from school, I was blown off my bike by the wind).</p>
<p>WOULD AND "COULD"</p>	<p>Usage #1</p> <p>"Would" • is the past tense of "will" •, and "could" • is the past tense of "can" •.</p>	<p>e.g.</p> <p>According to his most recent advertisement, Mookie the Bookie can predict with 100% accuracy which teams will win next week's games.</p> <p>vis-À -vis</p>

		His October 2, 1982, advertisement declared that Mookie the Bookie could predict with 100% accuracy which teams would win the following week's games.
	<p>Usage #2 "Would" • and "could" • are used to describe hypothetical situations that are not true, or are extremely unlikely. (since these situations are hypothetical -- i.e., they never happened -- they don't really have a timeframe.)</p>	<p>e.g. If I had one million dollars, I could buy 800,000 hamburgers at the gas station. If I had one million dollars, I would donate 800,000 hamburgers to the county food bank.</p>
<i>adjective clause</i>	<p>That story you wrote was very good.</p> <p>Here "you wrote" is an adjective clause describing "story." While it might be clearer (especially in the case of a long relative clause, such as in the above OG question) to include a "that" before "you wrote," it's not required. If set off by commas, though, you'll always see a relative pronoun, most likely "which:"</p>	<p>That story, you wrote, was very good (wrong) That story, which you wrote, was very good (right)</p>

<p>OAs in the OG12</p>	<p>GMAC frequently places an adverb between a helping verb and the verb being helped.</p>	<p>following examples are all from OAs in the OG12:</p> <p>are IN EFFECT told have NEVER been sighted can HARDLY be said can CONSTANTLY change have RECENTLY discovered were EVENTUALLY exhibited were FIRST aired can QUICKLY analyze would LATER make are CLOSELY related has ALREADY stimulated is WIDELY accepted</p> <p>Thus, would IN THE PAST have conceded is in keeping with GMAC's rules.</p>
<p>that</p>	<p>Here "that" is used as a conjunction to connect two clauses. Note that it is not used as a relative pronoun here.</p> <p>So in such cases when there is no ambiguity about the meaning of the sentence, we can safely omit that</p>	<p>However, in certain other cases, omitting that may not be a good idea. For example:</p> <p>1: He was told yesterday the inspection team left for the project. - Ambiguous 2: He was told yesterday that the inspection team left for the project. - Clear - yesterday describes when he was told. 3: He was told that yesterday the inspection team left for the project. - Clear - yesterday is part of second clause and now describes when the team left. 3B: He was told that the inspection team left for the project yesterday. - Better version of sentence 3.</p> <p>So essentially you may "omit" when it plays the role of a conjunction as long as the MEANING is clear.</p>
<p>x and y</p>	<p>Remember"" When you have "x and y" (unless it's part of something like "between x and y"), each of "x" and "y" should make sense alone in the sentence.</p>	<p>In B, the parallel parts are "to distinguish..." and "to make..." Try these: it hampers the ability of some children to distinguish discrete sounds and words it hampers the ability of some children to make sense of speech Good.</p> <p>In D, the parallel parts are "hampers..." and</p>

		<p>"results..."</p> <p>it hampers the ability of some children to distinguish discrete sounds and words (fine)</p> <p>it results in not making sense of speech (not fine, for the reason stated above)</p>
preferences	<p>you shouldn't think of "preferences" in SC, because "preferences" are basically not things that exist.</p>	<p>you should think of SC ONLY in terms of...</p> <p>... things that are right vs, things that are wrong,</p> <p>... clear COMPARISONS between answer choices on a single problem (= answer choices that are clearly better vs. answer choices that are clearly worse).</p> <p>"preferences" should not enter the picture.</p>
distinguish	<p>If the word distinguish is used to compare two entities, i.e. point out differences between two entities, then the correct idiom is distinguish between x and y.</p>	<p>Colorblind people are not able to distinguish between green objects and red objects when these objects are placed in a pattern.</p> <p>However, note the use of "distinguish" in the following sentence:</p> <p>Excessively colorblind people cannot distinguish colors at all.</p> <p>In this sentence, distinguish implies "manage to discern".</p>
COMMA + -ING	<p>COMMA + -ING modifiers ALWAYS modify the entire preceding clause. they cannot be used in any other way, ever.</p> <p>one of the ways that they can be used is to introduce an action that took place during the action described in the main clause.</p>	<p>for instance: johnny ran down the street, flapping his arms wildly.</p>
NO COMMA + -ING,	<p>if you have NO COMMA + -ING, then the preceding noun is modified.</p>	<p>here's a legitimate example of that:</p> <p>Rey pointed a picture of a dolphin swimming in a blue lagoon.</p> <p>in this case, it's just the dolphin that swims, so we use a NO COMMA + -ING structure to modify "dolphin".</p>

<p><i>not just a "gmac thing"</i></p>	<p>this is very common and normal usage, by the way; it's not just a "gmac thing".</p>	<p>for instance, the footrace is a universal form of human competition --> this sentence is ok; clearly, it doesn't refer to just one footrace involving all mankind.</p>
<p><i>"comma + ing" modifier</i></p>	<p>the "comma + ing" modifier should only be used when:</p>	<p>(A) it MODIFIES THE ENTIRE ACTION of the preceding clause, and it APPLIES TO THE SUBJECT of that clause;</p> <p>AND</p> <p>(B) one of the following is true: (1) the "ing" action is SIMULTANEOUS with, and SUBORDINATE to, the main action; - i ran down the sidewalk, flapping my arms wildly (2) the "ing" action is a DIRECT AND IMMEDIATE CONSEQUENCE of the main action. - i got a 100 on the most recent exam, bringing my average up to 91 (3) the "ing" action DESCRIBES the main action, in some other extremely direct way (illustration, example, explanation, etc.)</p>
<p><i>whom or "who"</i></p>	<p>A great way to determine whether to use "whom" or "who" is to turn the sentence into a question and answer it with "he" or "him".</p>	<p>the Glass House Mountains in Queensland, Australia, were sighted in 1770 by the English navigator Captain James Cook, by whom they were named supposedly because its sheer wet rocks glistened like glass.</p> <p>(B) by whom they were named supposedly and their</p> <p>(D) who so named them supposedly because their>For example, for (B) we'd ask "by whom were the mountains named?" We'd answer: "they were named by HIM"; since we use "him", "whom" is correct.</p> <p>For (D) we'd ask "who named them?" We'd answer: "HE did." Since we answer with "he", "who" is correct.</p>

<p>"now" + some phrase as a modifier</p>	<p>if you're going to use "now" + some phrase as a modifier, then "now" must accurately modify the action and timeframe of the preceding clause.</p>	<p>e.g. James is expanding the scope of his job search, now looking in Malaysia and Thailand as well as in Singapore --> this sentence is correct, because "now looking in..." actually modifies (describes) the way in which james "is expanding his search".</p> <p>Incorrect-The gyrfalcon, an Arctic bird of prey, has survived a close brush with extinction, now with numbers five times greater than when the use of DDT was sharply restricted in the early 1970s here, now with numbers five times greater than does NOT modify the idea of "surviving a close brush with extinction"; instead, it is a much later situation, far removed from (and in considerable contrast to) the near-extinction. therefore, a modifier is inappropriate here; a separate clause, written in a different tense (as in the correct answer), is a better solution.</p>
<p>run-on sentence</p>	<p>a run-on sentence (= complete sentence + comma + complete sentence). not ok.</p>	<p>The gyrfalcon, an Arctic bird of prey, has survived a close brush with extinction, its numbers ARE now fivefold what they were when the use of DDT was sharply restricted in the early 1970's.</p>
<p>modifier</p>	<p>grammatically ok, but it doesn't make sense</p>	<p>The gyrfalcon, an Arctic bird of prey, has survived a close brush with extinction, its numbers now fivefold what they were when the use of DDT was sharply restricted in the early 1970's.</p> <p>this choice is grammatically ok, but it doesn't make sense -- you've created a modifier that doesn't actually modify anything.</p> <p>the point of "its numbers are now fivefold..." is to create a contrast with the previous clause (which says that the bird almost went extinct at one point), not to describe/modify it. so you can't use a modifier here.</p>

		<p>Incorrect-The hiker was stranded on the mountain and nearly starved to death, eating only 300 calories a day and losing twenty pounds in two weeks. Makes sense.</p> <p>[i]The hiker was stranded on the mountain and nearly starved to death, now eating extra-large meals to gain the weight back. Separate thoughts, Doesn't make sense with a modifier.</p>
<p>modifiers</p>	<p>1/ these modifiers generally describe the entire preceding action/clause (much as "comma + __ing" modifiers do).</p>	<p>verbs are basically meaningless without their subjects, so there's automatically going to be a close relationship to the subject, too. (not a separate principle; it's just not possible to "describe an action" without describing how the subject does that action.) e.g., in the chaco canyon sentence, "with up to 75 xxxx" is a description of how the settlements were built "on a spectacular scale" — — but also applies to the subject ("the anasazi settlements") itself.</p>
	<p>2/ modifiers can describe either a noun or an action.</p>	<p>I like fish sandwiches with garlic sauce ("with garlic sauce" describes the sandwiches, not my appreciation of them)</p> <p>I eat fish sandwiches with great enthusiasm ("with great enthusiasm" describes how i eat the sandwiches, not the sandwiches themselves)</p> <p>the above not a special property of "with", by the way; the same applies to other prepositions. e.g., I don't know anyone in Texas ("in texas" describes "anyone") I bought this book in Texas ("in texas" describes "i bought the book")</p>
<p>grammar/mechanics</p>	<p>"now" is an adverb. like other adverbs and modifiers, it has no effect on the surrounding grammar.</p>	<p>in general, though, i don't think this kind of structure could make sense. consider: • if "now" is included, then, presumably, the previous part describes something in the past. (if the sentence is already talking about the present, there's no reason to include "now".) ...but... • __ing modifiers must adopt the timeframe</p>

		<p>of the sentence to which they're attached.</p> <p>these ideas are fundamentally contradictory. (if the __ing modifier is appropriate, then "now" will be redundant; if "now" is necessary, then the __ing modifier won't work.)</p>
mathematically different.	<p>both of these are things, although they are mathematically different.</p>	<p>if joey is 10 years old, then... ... if i'm 5 times as old as joey, then i'm 50. ... if i'm 5 times older than joey, then i'm 60. (in this case, 5 times joey's age is the amount by which i'm OLDER than joey.)</p> <p>in other words, "N times older than" is the same as "N + 1 times as old as".</p>
"extra credit" knowledge:	<p>there ARE constructions that can stand for the abstract information in an entire clause (unlike pronouns, which are limited to standing for actual nouns). chief among these are the COMMA + NOUN modifiers.</p>	<p>here's an example: studies have shown that X is 60 percent of Y, a finding that has shocked most observers. studies have shown that X is 60 percent of Y; this finding has shocked most observers. --> both correct. note that "a finding", following the comma, or "this finding", standing alone after the semicolon, stands for the entirety of the clause that comes before it; you couldn't use "which" here, because "which" would automatically refer to Y.</p> <p>because studies have shown that X is 60 percent of Y, this finding has shocked most observers. --> incorrect. the presence of "because" at the beginning of the first clause means you can't use "this finding" anymore. i don't have any idea what the actual rule is here, but i do know with 100% certainty that these constructions are allowed and disallowed respectively</p>
approach		<p>remember that the approach is hierarchical: 1) CORRECTNESS 2) CLARITY</p> <p>these are not on equal footing - correctness supersedes clarity.</p> <p>in other words: if 4 of the choices in a SC problem are</p>

		<p>WRONG, then it doesn't matter whether the 1 correct choice changes the meaning.</p> <p>in this problem, 4 of the choices are WRONG. (a) is redundant (provisions ... provide), and (c) (d) (e) contain grammatical/usage errors.</p> <p>since (b) is the only choice that is grammatically sound, it really makes no difference whether its meaning is exactly the same as that of the original.</p>
modifier	<p>however, the fact remains that the -ING form is still derived from a verb, and so still needs to have some sort of subject. in other words, the subject of the clause that's being modified must also be the subject of the -ING form.</p>	<p>hence, why sentences like this are wrong: using a siphon, gasoline can be transferred from a car's tank to a gas can. --> here, "using a siphon" does modify the action of the following clause, but it doesn't have a legitimate subject -- i.e., the following clause doesn't say who is using a siphon. vs. using a siphon, a stranded driver can transfer gasoline from a car's tank to a gas can. --> here, the modifier correctly modifies the following action, but it also has a proper subject ("a stranded driver"). you need both.</p>
COMMA -ING modifier after a clause	<p>two problems with that choice:</p> <p>1) when you use a COMMA -ING modifier after a clause**, you should actually satisfy TWO requirements: -- the modifier should modify the action of the preceding clause, as you have stated; AND -- the subject of the preceding clause should also make sense as the agent of the -ING action.</p>	<p>examples: Joe broke the window, angering his father. --> this sentence makes sense, because it correctly implies that joe "angered his father". the window was broken by Joe, angering his father. --> this sentence doesn't make sense, because it implies that the window (i.e., not joe himself) angered joe's father.</p> <p>my brother tricked me, disappointing Dad --> implies that dad is disappointed in my brother for tricking me (and not necessarily disappointed in me for being tricked). i was tricked by my brother, disappointing Dad --> implies that dad is disappointed in me because i fell for my brother's trick (and not that he's disappointed in my brother for tricking me).</p>

<p>noun + , + __ing</p>	<p>If you have noun + , + __ing, then the __ing describes that initial noun. I.e., if there are other nouns in modifier(s) attached to that noun, then comma + __ing DOES NOT describe those closer nouns.</p>	<p>e.g., The father of the two boys, arriving at the courthouse, was xxxxxx. --> This sentence unambiguously states that the father was arriving at the courthouse.</p> <p>It's important that the construction work this way, because there aren't very many other modifiers with similar functionality.</p>
<p>already</p>	<p>In a suitable context, "already" can work with present (or future) constructions.</p>	<p>Even though he has only known how to sew for two years, Valentin is already one of the best-known young fashion designers in his home country.</p> <p>By the time I arrive back home, my wife will already be gone.</p>
<p>comma + __ing structure</p>	<p>In the comma + __ing structure, the subject should be, among all possible nouns, the one most directly responsible for the " __ing" result. However, the relation will usually still be indirect. (If the noun directly performs the action, then a normal subject+verb construction will almost always make more sense.)</p>	<p>E.g., Crime has decreased in our neighborhood, leading to an increase in property values. —> The __ing makes sense with the action, but not with the subject. Aggressive police patrols have decreased crime in our neighborhood, leading to an increase in property values. —> This makes sense. The police patrols didn't directly increase the property values—but they did so indirectly, by reducing crime.</p>
<p>X can be Y"</p>	<p>You can't modify "X can be Y" with a definite consequence. Doesn't make sense.</p>	<p>This sort of thing could make sense if it were written in a form that, well, makes sense. Here are a couple of ways it could work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • X can be used as a basis for Y, a situation that has the potential to cause disputes. ("can be" ... "has the potential to" ... ok, now that makes sense.) • X has/have been used as a basis for Y, leading to international disputes. (Better, since the __ing is actually presented as a result of something that happened. Still a little weird, though, since X isn't the most appropriate subject.)

<p>and'</p>	<p>unless it is coupled with some sort of explanatory transition word ('and thus...'; 'and so...'; etc.), the word 'and' implies that you are talking about two SEPARATE things.</p>	<p>e.g., Today there was unusually heavy traffic on the highway and I was late to work. --> the point of this sentence is 'Here are two bad things that happened today.' --> in this sentence, the traffic IS DEFINITELY NOT the reason why i was late.</p> <p>Today there was unusually heavy traffic on the highway and so I was late to work. --> this sentence states that i was late to work BECAUSE OF the traffic.</p>
<p>comma __ing' modifier</p>	<p>remember, the 'comma __ing' modifier is a tool that exists specifically for the purpose of DIRECTLY giving more information about ACTIONS. the relationship to the SUBJECT must be indirect.</p>	<p>consider: i dropped the bags onto the floor, scaring the dogs.</p> <p>what scared the dogs? ...my ACTION of dropping the bags onto the floor.</p> <p>did i DIRECTLY scare the dogs? ...no.</p> <p>this is the point.</p> <p>if you ask 'WHOSE ACTION is the __ing modifier most closely describing?', then the answer should be the preceding subject.</p>
<p>comma + __ing</p>		<p>this should not be 'sometimes'. this should be ALWAYS. Always always always.</p> <p>this whole notion – 'the noun didn't directly do this; the ACTION did this' – is the ENTIRE PURPOSE of the 'comma + __ing' construction.</p> <p>in other words, we are dealing with a construction developed specifically to say 'i'm not talking directly about the subject; i'm talking about the action.'</p>

<p><i>because</i></p>	<p>as far as the "because" stuff -- i don't know any of the grammar terms you're using, but it's best to ignore them anyway since they clearly contribute no value to the discussion.</p>	<p>here's an analogy: Because Shelly has pink hair, her neighbors are scared of her. Because Shelly has pink hair, her appearance scares her neighbors. these sentences make logical sense.</p> <p>Because Shelly has pink hair, her pink hair scares her neighbors. Because Shelly has pink hair, her hair color scares her neighbors. these sentences DON'T make logical sense.</p> <p>if you understand why the last two sentences are illogical, then the problem with "because xxxxxxx, this finding" is exactly the same.</p> <p>If you still don't understand, then it's best to just let this issue go. this is a very minor issue, and it's not worth countless hours and hours of your time.</p>
<p><i>"comma + ing" modifier</i></p>		<p>the "comma + ing" modifier should only be used when:</p> <p>(A) it MODIFIES THE ENTIRE ACTION of the preceding clause, and it APPLIES TO THE SUBJECT of that clause;</p> <p>AND</p> <p>(B) one of the following is true: (1) the "ing" action is SIMULTANEOUS with, and SUBORDINATE to, the main action; - i ran down the sidewalk, flapping my arms wildly (2) the "ing" action is a DIRECT AND IMMEDIATE CONSEQUENCE of the main action. - i got a 100 on the most recent exam, bringing my average up to 91 (3) the "ing" action DESCRIBES the main action, in some other extremely direct way (illustration, example, explanation, etc.)</p>

<p>COMMA -ING modifier</p>	<p>it's true that a COMMA -ING modifier must modify the preceding clause -- IF it is actually preceded by a clause! if a COMMA -ING modifier just follows a noun (almost always the subject of the sentence), then it will just modify that noun.</p>	<p>e.g. james, flailing his arms, yelled obscenities at the fleeing bird. here, "flailing his arms" just modifies "james".</p>
<p>by + VERBing</p>		<p>To express THE PROCESS by which an action is performed, we use by + VERBing: John made a fortune BY INVESTING wisely. To express WHO OR WHAT performs an action, we use by + NOUN: A fortune was made BY JOHN.</p>
<p>adverb</p>		<p>extended ik'stendid adjective made larger; enlarged: an extended kitchen and new balcony. • lasting longer than is usual or expected; prolonged: an extended period of time.</p> <p>The recently extended run of "Wicked" on Broadway has now reached its 1000th week. [1st definition] The recent extended sales slump could result in bankruptcy. [2nd definition]</p> <p>In the first example, someone has purposely extended the run of something, and that extension occurred recently.</p> <p>In the second example, "extended" merely means "lasting longer than is usual". This is the only meaning that makes sense, because no one would purposely extend a sales slump. It's a bad thing!</p>
<p>Each/Every</p>	<p>you SHOULD know that "each" can also be used as a noun, while "every" cannot.</p>	<p>for instance, the following two sentences are correct: * he wrote three symphonies, each of which is about half an hour long when played at the intended tempo. * he wrote three symphonies; each is about half an hour long when played at the intended tempo.</p>

		note that "every" CANNOT be used to replace "each" in these sentences (unless you follow it with something like "one").
<i>semicolons</i>	semicolons can also be used, in place of commas, to separate the elements of a list. this isn't done at random; it's done when the elements of the list are long, or when those elements themselves contain commas (in which case the sentence might be impossible to read without semicolons).	e.g., The players were separated into three groups of four: A, B, C, and D; M, N, O, and P; and W, X, Y, and Z. in this sentence, trying to separate the elements with commas would clearly be a bad idea.
<i>*must*</i>	if it is followed by a decently long modifier, then you <i>*must*</i> use the latter of these. for instance,	i know more about shakespeare than my brother does i know more about shakespeare than does my brother both correct BUT i know more about shakespeare than my brother, who has never studied british literature, does --> this sentence is basically unreadable (you'll have to read it several times before you can make any sense of "does"•), so it's unacceptable. i know more about shakespeare than does my brother, who has never studied british literature --> correct.
<i>prepositional phrases</i>	prepositional phrases are marvelously flexible. they just need to be positioned in a place where they are clear, unambiguous, and as close as possible to their intended referent.	People protested against slavery, in their homes and in the streets. --> this is a correct sentence in which this kind of modifier modifies an entire clause. when it comes to problems like this, you don't even have to have precise rules for how the modifiers work. instead, just look at the modifier placement in each choice RELATIVE to the other choices, and go for the choice(s) in which the modifier is placed closest to what it's actually talking about.

<p><i>analogy is completely 100% correct.</i></p>	<p>y</p>	<p>Ron Please explain the structure of the last part.I am not able to comprehend it.</p> <p>" the army of terra cotta warrier took 700,000 artisans more than 35 years to complete. "</p> <p>Can you please make it clear using examples.</p> <p>Are both (1) 700000 artisans and (2) more than 36 years - objects of the verb "took" where 1st one is the indirect object of took and 2nd one is direct object. and is it similar to The project took them several years to complete</p>
<p><i>idiomatic usage</i></p>		<p>The chalice was buried to keep from being stolen. The chalice was buried to keep it (the chalice) from being stolen.</p> <p>In the former instance, when an action is done "to keep from" some other action, the implication is that the subject in question purposely did the first action in order to prevent the second action from occurring. Did the chalice bury itself to keep from being stolen? Nope. Smile</p> <p>A correct usage might be: I hid myself to keep from having to do the dishes after dinner.</p> <p>Vs. "to keep IT from" means that something or someone else performed an action on something to keep seem other action from happening to that something. Someone buried the chalice to keep the chalice from being stolen.</p>

<p><i>an effort to ___' vs. 'an effort that has ___'</i></p>		<p>if you're describing the goal/purpose of the 'effort' – as in this sentence – then you should use the first of these, since 'to ___' is specifically used for goals/purposes.</p> <p>the second of these doesn't express the idea that '___' is actually THE POINT OF the effort. in actual praxis, in fact, this latter construction is just as likely to describe results that diverge from the original purpose.</p> <p>e.g., The government's effort to outlaw Drug X had the unintended effect of making Drug X more popular. --> THE POINT of the 'effort' was to outlaw the drug. --> however, its actual effect was quite different.</p>
<p><i>for xxxx years'</i></p>	<p>for xxxx years' can describe only an action, not a noun.</p>	<p>e.g., Jack lived in Bangkok for 15 years. (correct sentence) here 'for 15 years' is describing the action (Jack lived in Bangkok). that is the only thing it's allowed to do.</p>
<p><i>modifiers.</i></p>		<p>I eat tons of chocolate, my favorite flavor of ice cream.</p> <p>In the example above, chocolate = my favorite flavor of ice cream. The phrase my favorite flavor of ice cream is giving us additional information about the noun chocolate. For this reason, we say that the phrase my favorite flavor of ice cream is in apposition to the noun chocolate.</p> <p>Here's another:</p> <p>Lady Gaga, a very popular singer, tours the world often.</p> <p>In the example above, Lady Gaga = a very popular singer. So a very popular singer is in apposition to Lady Gaga.</p> <p>In the SC above, one of Kirchoff's laws = an observation about electric current first made</p>

		<p>in 1845 and now included in virtually every textbook of elementary physics. The phrase after the comma is giving additional information about one of Kirchoff's laws. So the phrase is in apposition to one of Kirchoff's laws.</p>
		<p>One more thing. Each of the following is grammatically correct:</p> <p>A) Lady Gaga, who is a very popular singer, tours the world often.</p> <p>In the sentence above, the pronoun who refers to Lady Gaga.</p> <p>B) Lady Gaga, a very popular singer, tours the world often.</p> <p>In the sentence above, the noun phrase a very popular singer is in apposition to Lady Gaga.</p> <p>Notice that answer choice B is shorter. Using the appositive construction instead of the pronoun construction saves a few words and makes the sentence shorter.</p> <p>All things being equal, shorter is better.</p> <p>So answer choice B is the better -- and safer -- answer choice.</p>
and	<p>Generally, when a conjunction such as and serves to connect one extended that-clause to another, the second that should not be omitted.</p>	<p>With regard to this rule, E should read as follows: one of Kirchoff's laws THAT was an observation about electric current, first made in 1845, and THAT is now included in virtually every textbook of elementary physics.</p>
COMMA + VERBed		<p>Generally, COMMA + VERBed serves to refer to the nearest preceding noun. E: electric current, first made in 1845 Here, made seems to modify current -- the nearest preceding noun -- implying that electric CURRENT was first MADE in 1845. Not the intended meaning.</p> <p>NO COMMA + VERBed does NOT have to refer to the nearest preceding noun.</p>

		<p>OA: an observation about electric current first made in 1845</p> <p>Here, made serves to modify an observation, implying that AN OBSERVATION was first MADE in 1845.</p>
<p>Which</p>		<p>"Which" can do either of these things.</p> <p>New treatments for cancer, which are often prohibitively expensive, are only seldom covered by medical insurance. ("which" = "new treatments for cancer")</p> <p>New treatments for cancer, which ranks among the leading causes of death in North America, are a high priority for research budget administrators. ("which" = "cancer")</p> <p>As these examples illustrate, you'll have to use common sense to determine which of the two is modified.</p>
<p>modifier with a preposition.</p>	<p>you cannot end a modifier with a preposition.</p>	<p>so: dioxins that north americans are exposed to -- > INCORRECT dioxins to which north americans are exposed --> correct. etc.</p>
		<p>basically, it's ok to omit "that" if the sentence is still legitimately parallel without it. for instance: food that is nutritious for cats but that is poisonous for dogs food that is nutritious for cats but is poisonous for dogs food that is nutritious for cats but poisonous for dogs all correct.</p> <p>hand signs that natives use and that appear in local rituals --> correct. these are both [i]that-clauses that modify "hand signs", so the parallel structure works. BUT hand signs that natives use and appear in local rituals --> INCORRECT. the second of these doesn't work because the</p>

		<p>right-hand component of the parallel structure is appear in local rituals (i.e., active verb whose subject is "hand signs"). there is no verb in the left-hand side that is parallel to this, so this makes no sense.</p>
<p>which</p>	<p>I can see what you're saying here, but nouns that are modified by prepositional phrases can still be the referent of 'which' even if they are a few words distant from it. This usually happens when the immediately preceding noun is grammatically incompatible with the verb after "which".</p>	<p>I can see what you're saying here, but nouns that are modified by prepositional phrases can still be the referent of 'which' even if they are a few words distant from it. This usually happens when the immediately preceding noun is grammatically incompatible with the verb after "which".</p> <p>For example: "The picture of my brothers, which was taken last year in Mexico, is one of my favorites."</p> <p>You might object to this sentence on the grounds that 'which' might be taken to modify 'brothers'. And, in a strict sort of way, you'd be right. But here's the catch: There's really no other reasonable way to write this sentence. You just can't get 'picture' next to the 'which' clause without creating total nonsense, or splitting the sentence into 2 smaller sentence-ettes. plus, 'brothers' is plural, and is incompatible with 'which WAS'.</p> <p>This is an interesting point, though, and subtle at that.</p>

<p>"whether" vs. "if"</p>	<p>Most people use "if" these days when they should be using "whether."</p>	<p>"whether" vs. "if" Most people use "if" these days when they should be using "whether."</p> <p>Use "whether" when you're trying to say "whether or not": I want to know whether you're going to the party with me. Yes or no?</p> <p>Use "if" when you're trying to convey an "if, then" sense: If you're going to the party, (then) let me know.</p> <p>When I use "and" in a sentence, the two items connected by the "and" do not have to be related to each other. I want to know whether you will continue to drink milk and study.</p> <p>Both are things that I want to know whether you will continue to do... but that's as far as they are related.</p> <p>If the two things are related, then you can use something other than "and" to connect them. For example: I want to know whether you will continue to drink milk to study (whether you are lactose intolerant).</p> <p>There is a subtle meaning change here yes - though this one does not exactly mimic that other one up above.</p> <p>Here's another one: I want to know whether people will continue to visit Mars and see martians after their antennae are removed.</p> <p>I want to know whether people will continue to visit Mars. I want to know whether people will continue to see martians after their antennae are removed.</p>
----------------------------------	---	---

		<p>The above two sentences contain the full meaning of both parts of the sentence. Notice anything odd about that second one? Is the question really whether the martians will become invisible after their antennae are removed? (Well, we are talking about martians, so maybe that's possible! Wink)</p> <p>What would fix the meaning of that second part?</p> <p>Ah - slightly changing the original meaning would fix that. I want to know whether people will continue to visit Mars TO see martians after their antennae are removed. That makes more sense!</p> <hr/> <p>I want to know whether people will continue to visit Mars. I want to know whether people will continue to see martians after their antennae are removed.</p> <p>The above two sentences contain the full meaning of both parts of the sentence. Notice anything odd about that second one? Is the question really whether the martians will become invisible after their antennae are removed? (Well, we are talking about martians, so maybe that's possible! Wink)</p> <p>What would fix the meaning of that second part?</p> <p>Ah - slightly changing the original meaning would fix that. I want to know whether people will continue to visit Mars TO see martians after their antennae are removed. That makes more sense!</p>
--	--	---

<i>pronoun</i>	In this context, the pronoun shouldn't be there at all, so there's no such thing as "correctly used" vs. "incorrectly used". It shouldn't be used.	<p>It's like this: Here is the song that you're going to sing. (correct) Here is the song that you're going to sing it. (incorrect) Again, there's no meaningful question of whether it is "used correctly" -- it shouldn't be there in the first place.</p>
<i>modifier</i>	This kind of modifier can do more than one thing.	<p>* It can describe the noun that comes before. The plover feeds by cleaning bits of food out of the mouth of the alligator, a predator that could devour the bird at any time. (A plover is a kind of bird.) Here, "a predator" is playing the same role as "which" would. The difference is that it adds extra information: it's the first mention that the alligator is a predator.</p> <p>* It can also describe the entire idea of the preceding sentence. (There's no need to nail down exactly what it modifies in this case; it modifies the entire sentence.) The plover feeds by cleaning bits of food out of the mouth of the alligator, a relationship that benefits both animals. Here, we're describing the entire sentence. The plover benefits by getting food; the alligator, by getting free dental care.</p> <p>To decide which of those uses is in play"" as for any other construction with multiple uses"" you have to use a bit of common sense, along with the context of the sentence.</p>
<i>analogy:</i>		<p>I was a high-school teacher until 2004. this makes sense all by itself.</p> <p>I had been a high-school teacher until 2004. alone, this is nonsense; it doesn't work unless i provide further context, i.e., something that happened in 2004 (or later) to which my tenure as a high-school teacher was directly relevant.</p>

<p>modifiers</p>	<p>here's the deal with sentences like that: When modifiers are separated by commas, they're not part of the core of the sentence. In other words, the sentence has the same meaning"" though with less descriptive detail""if they are removed.</p>	<p>For instance, My room is behind the third door, which is painted green. --> My room is door #3. I'm just noting that it's green to help you find it, but it's the third door, regardless of whether the modifier is there.</p> <p>Vs. My room is behind the third door that is painted green. --> My room is the third green door. It may be door #99, but it's the third door that is green. Note that it's impossible to remove this modifier without corrupting the sentence. The resulting sentence will still be grammatically sound, but it will say something altogether different.</p> <p>That's the background.</p> <p>Once you understand that, you can see what the issue is with the sentence you quoted. Specifically, references should still make sense if modifiers between commas are taken out. Try removing the modifier there. See what happens to the pronoun.</p>
<p>by 1945"</p>	<p>"by 1945" is a totally different animal. that construction is specifically used for exactly the same kinds of context where "has/have __ed" and "had __ed" are appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • completion of an action by a certain point • ongoing action up to a certain point 	<p>"Right: By 1945, the United States HAD BEEN at war for several years."</p>

<p>modifier</p>	<p>here are two more examples (both correct) in which common sense directs the modifier to different nouns:</p>	<p>the library has instituted a new method of sorting CDs that will make certain genres of music easier to find. --> here, "that will make..." refers to the method of sorting.</p> <p>the library has instituted a new method of sorting CDs that won't fit into any of the traditional musical genres. --> here, "that won't fit..." refers to the cd's, not the method.</p>
<p>while</p>	<p>* the connector "while" • doesn't make sense. there are two possible meanings of "while" •: (1) contrast, or (2) simultaneity. neither of these interpretations makes any sense in the case at hand. ('while' should always be used to connect two things that happen / are true in the same timeframe. this is true regardless of whether a contrast is present.)</p>	<p>Incorrect-Surpassing Wall Street's estimates, the report of the computer company showed strong second-quarter earnings, and, for the purpose of increasing sales further, they announced the first in a series of price cuts.</p> <p>* the modifier "surpassing wall street's estimates" • incorrectly applies to the report; the implication is that the report itself surpassed wall street's estimates. this doesn't make sense.</p> <p>* the modifier "for the purpose of increasing sales further" • seems to apply to the action of announcing the price cuts. this is incorrect; this modifier should apply to the price cuts themselves.</p> <p>* "they" • doesn't refer to anyone in particular, since the computer company is singular.</p>
<p>modifier</p>	<p>a modifier must be blocked off by commas either on both sides or on neither side.</p>	<p>Incorrect-Surpassing Wall Street's estimates, the report of the computer company showed strong second-quarter earnings, and, for the purpose of increasing sales further, they announced the first in a series of price cuts.</p>
<p>...while announcing that (xxx)</p>	<p>the "xxx" part -- the entire rest of the sentence -- is a complete sentence. "while announcing that + (complete sentence)" can be thrown onto another sentence as a modifier.</p>	

modifier	when it comes to modifier placement, you should just judge the answer choices RELATIVE to each other.	
control		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you control a variable, then you actually exert influence on that variable. E.g., Smith's data are questionable because he did not adequately control the ambient temperature during his experiments. -> Smith needed to DO something TO the temperature (= probably keep it constant). He didn't do an adequate job in this regard. • If you control for a variable, then you're NOT exerting an influence on it, because you're unable, or else unwilling, to do so. Instead, you strategically choose data points to normalize or eliminate the effect of that variable. E.g., People addicted to narcotics or opiates do not typically lead lives similar to those of non-addicts; as a result, it is often extremely difficult to control for such factors as diet, sleep, exercise, and risk aversion in studying the consequences of drug addiction. -> To make a valid study of the consequences of drug addiction, we need to find drug addicts whose lives are (drug use notwithstanding) fundamentally similar to those of non-addicts. (E.g., if we compare drug addicts who eat a poor diet to non-addicts who eat a better diet, it's impossible to tell whether any observed differences are due to the drugs, the dietary differences, or both.) Finding such people is difficult, making it hard to perform valid studies. The point here is that we DON'T "control" diet, sleep, exercise, and so on, most likely for ethical reasons. Instead, we try to control FOR these things--basically the next-best option.
that	When you use the above, take care not to confuse "that" at the beginning of a modifier with "that" as a pronoun in a comparison.	Starting a modifier, "that" can describe either singular or plural things. I have the phone that you left on the table. I have the coins that you left on the table.

	<p>If it's a pronoun in a comparison, "that" can only be singular, and must be changed to "those" for plural.</p>	<p>If it's a pronoun in a comparison, "that" can only be singular, and must be changed to "those" for plural.</p> <p>The sales tax rate in Nevada is lower than that in California.</p> <p>Residents of Seattle are, on average, taller than those of New York.</p>
which	<p>"which" is used at beginning of a modifier it can describe singular and plural.</p>	<p>It's both.</p> <p>The mattress, which was only one month old, was already beginning to sag.</p> <p>The mattresses, which were only one month old, were already beginning to sag.</p>
	<p>"which" is used as pronoun it can refer to singular</p>	<p>"which" is used as pronoun it can refer to singular</p> <p>Still both.</p> <p>It is easy to tell which of these 100 people is the tallest.</p> <p>It is easy to tell which of these 100 people are women.</p>
COMMA + which on the GMAT:		<p>Regarding the use of COMMA + which on the GMAT:</p> <p>If which has a SINGULAR verb, then it should refer to the nearest preceding SINGULAR noun.</p> <p>If which has a PLURAL verb, then it should refer to the nearest preceding PLURAL noun.</p> <p>To illustrate:</p> <p>Barbara Jordan did not become a nationally recognized figure until 1974, when she participated in the HEARINGS on the impeachment of President Richard Nixon, which WERE televised nationwide.</p> <p>Here, which has a plural verb (were), so it's clear that it refers not to impeachment but to HEARINGS (the nearest preceding plural noun).</p> <p>COMMA + VERBing serves to indicate an</p>

		<p>action happening at the same time as the preceding clause.</p>
<i>that /which</i>		<p>"Which' is considered a non-restrictive modifier, so in this case, it should follow a comma. For example, I can write "My birch tree, which I planted in the front yard two years ago, is now six feet tall."</p> <p>If I use 'that' I would not insert a comma, because 'that' is a restrictive modifier. So I could also write, "The birch tree that I planted in the front yard two years ago is now six feet tall."</p> <p>The two sentences are both correct, but mean different things - in the first, I'm saying I only have one birch tree, and this tree happens to be in my front yard. In the second case, I'm suggesting that I have multiple birch trees, but I'm only writing about the one in my front yard. As far as the GMAT is concerned, we just need to know that 'which' follows a comma in this case, and 'that' does not. E has no comma preceding 'which.'</p>
<i>that</i>		<p>In both of these, the correct comparison would be the equivalent "I ate an earlier breakfast than I did most days" not "I ate an earlier breakfast than that I ate most days."</p> <p>In the second example, "that" refers to a specific breakfast, which makes no sense.</p>
<i>rather than/instead of</i>		<p>X instead of Y typically implies that Y had been expected, but X happened INSTEAD. John chose a pen instead of a pencil. Implication: John had been expected to choose a pencil, but he chose a pen INSTEAD.</p> <p>X rather than Y typically implies that X is preferred to Y. John chose a pen rather than a pencil. Implicated: John PREFERRED a pen. This is the intended meaning of the SC above: Doctors do not want to face the threats of lawsuits. They PREFER to retire early.</p>

<p>As <clause></p>	<p>As <clause> is not a modifying phrase: as could be replaced by since or because</p>	<p>As I could not go to the supermarket yesterday, my children had to eat breakfast cereal for dinner</p> <p>However, we write</p> <p>As head of the zoning committee, Irene rejected hundreds of applications...</p>
<p>when</p>		<p>here's another example: On Saturday afternoon, when I was visiting my grandparents, an earthquake struck. again, i don't know the formal grammar analysis here. it's clear that "when" is modifying (on) Saturday afternoon, which is a time period, so you're all good here.</p> <p>more generally, you should avoid an over-emphasis on naming things -- because the whole skill set of naming things is completely irrelevant to this exam. all you need is functional knowledge; i.e., you just have to be able to USE these constructions. it's immaterial whether you can name them.</p> <p>as an analogy: do you know what all the parts of a window are called? probably not. does this mean you can't open, close, or fix a window? of course not.</p> <p>same goes for sentences. the only things you really have to be able to name are the super-basic building blocks (noun, verb, clause, etc.) as far as these sorts of unique or eccentric examples are concerned, there's no need to waste your time on terminology; just learn how they do work and how they don't work.</p>
<p>each' AFTER the comma</p>		<p>analogy: the USA comprises 50 states, each of which is united by a federal government --> wrong (the implication is that each state has its own federal government) the USA comprises 50 states, all of which are united by a federal government --> correct the USA comprises 50 states, (all) united by a</p>

		federal government --> correct, whether you have 'all' or not
so that		the phrases "so that" and "in that" would modify some kind of action, as in "He went to the store so that he could find Amy" or "It was a bad move in that it resulted in him getting dumped by Amy." We don't have an action we want to modify here
by		<p>this "by" must be part of a passive construction; e.g., I want to prevent my jewelry from being stolen by burglars while I'm on vacation.</p> <p>this kind of thing would theoretically work with a dedicated noun form (e.g., I want to install a system that will prevent theft by burglars).</p>
		<p>e.g. if 500 people actually died IN an explosion, you could write 500 people were killed by the explosion.</p> <p>on the other hand, if some or all of these people didn't actually die in the explosion itself, but died from other causes related to the explosion -- e.g., the explosion released carbon monoxide, which ultimately killed them later -- then that sentence would be inaccurate. in this case, you could write 500 people were killed [i]as a result of the explosion[/i].</p>
to + verb	"to + verb" should express the purpose or goal of whatever is described in the preceding clause.	<p>Three times a week Matt lifts weights(,) to improve his strength. for what purpose/goal is matt lifting? to improve his strength. (correct sentence)</p> <p>now consider the following: *Three times a week Matt lifts weights(,) to perform most exercises in three sets of 8-10 repetitions each. this sentence is incorrect, because "to perform..." is not the purpose/goal of the lifting--it IS the lifting. thus, "to perform..." is incorrect because it's nonsense. in other words, here we're elaborating upon the action just described. "elaborate upon the</p>

		<p>action just described" is one of the functions of a "comma+ing" construction, so we may use such a construction here: Three times a week Matt lifts weights, performing most exercises in three sets of 8-10 repetitions each. (correct sentence)</p>
that	<p>the command subjunctive is used only for wishes, demands, requests, and other related things - which comprise a very tiny fraction indeed of all 'that'-clauses.</p>	<p>consider the following very familiar constructions: the idea that he wrote that paper by himself is ridiculous. i don't think that he is mature enough to understand the theme of the book. etc. these are definitely not subjunctive clauses, nor are the majority of other clauses starting with 'that'. it is, however, important that you be able to recognize subjunctive clauses when they do appear (like this one!)</p>
which is that	<p>the construction "which is that..." is unnecessarily wordy. (they won't create a choice that is ONLY incorrect because of wordiness, but excessive wordiness is a warning sign that something else is probably wrong, too.)</p>	<p>e.g. G's hypothesis which is that X happens... --> excessively wordy (and contains a misuse of "which", as you pointed out above) G's hypothesis that X happens... --> better i couldn't believe my friend's story that was about his weekend in Vegas --> unnecessarily wordy i couldn't believe my friend's story about his weekend in Vegas --> better</p>
"there is..."		<p>consider the difference between the following two sentences: first-aid supplies are in the drawer --> we already know that there are first-aid supplies; the point is to specify where they are located. there are first-aid supplies in the drawer --> the point is to specify the existence of the first-aid supplies (their location is an afterthought).</p> <hr/> <p>same thing is going on here: different mental functions are located in different parts of the brain --> we already know that there are different mental functions; the hypothesis is that they are located in different parts of the brain (THIS</p>

		<p>MAKES SENSE, since the existence of different mental functions is obvious to anyone)</p> <p>there are different mental functions located in different parts of the brain --> this statement emphasizes the existence, not the location, of the different mental functions. that's the wrong emphasis.</p>
<i>that</i>		<p>even if you change "which" to "that", you get an essential modifier. that's a problem semantically, since an essential modifier NARROWS THE MEANING of the sentence.</p> <p>e.g. my friend in barbados will let us stay at his house --> this implies that i only have one friend in barbados.</p>
<i>"linked to"</i>		<p>In sentences describing an association between possible cause and effect, or describing where people think something might originate, I've usually seen "linked to". E.g., High intake of refined carbohydrates has been linked to the onset of cancer.</p> <p>I wouldn't use "linked with" for this sort of thing, but I can't tell you whether GMAC would. (I'd use "linked with" in the more literal sense, e.g., Highway 101 links San Francisco with San Jose.)</p>
<i>"Which"</i>		<p>"Which" can do either of these things.</p> <p>New treatments for cancer, which are often prohibitively expensive, are only seldom covered by medical insurance. ("which" = "new treatments for cancer")</p> <p>New treatments for cancer, which ranks among the leading causes of death in North America, are a high priority for research budget administrators. ("which" = "cancer")</p> <p>As these examples illustrate, you'll have to use common sense to determine which of the two is modified.</p>

<p>parallel</p>	<p>As long as the core elements are parallel, it doesn't matter how much decoration is on them. It also doesn't matter if one element is more extensively decorated than the other one.</p>	<p>E.g., I have a bicycle and a truck. I have a bicycle and a big red truck with a rusted-out body, two broken windows, and an engine that's gone 400,000 miles. Both parallel.</p> <p>Remember, language is a tool for expressing real-life ideas. In the real world, quite often, we just have more things to say about one thing than about another thing.</p>
<p>and</p>	<p>right, but, when "and" is paired with a connector, the meaning of "two separate things" no longer holds.</p>	<p>e.g.,</p> <p>Today there was a traffic jam and I was late to work. (here, "and" implies that these incidents are NOT related. "Here are 2 bad things that happened today.")</p> <p>Today there was a traffic jam and so I was late to work. (cause-effect relationship)</p> <p>in this example, the addition of "so" produces a meaning that's not only different, but in fact specifically excluded by the first formulation.</p>
<p>Aim</p>		<p>Aim to vs Aim at Vs with Aim of</p> <p>Aim to (idiom) Meaning - Try or intend to do something. e.g : We aim to please our customers, or She aims to fly to California. Correct usage: aim to + verb</p> <p>With the Aim Of: b. Joe is writing the book with the aim of finishing it by the end of this month. Note:With the aim to is unidiomatic</p> <p>Aim at (idiom) Meaning - Direct a missile or criticism at something or someone; to plan, intend or to have as one's purpose e.g: In his last speech the President took aim</p>

		<p>at the opposition leader. He aims at finishing tomorrow.</p>
<p>context</p>	<p>grammar is determined by context! if you take the context away, grammatical structures become meaningless!</p>	<p>in other words, what's troubling about the question you've asked here is that (it appears) you don't think it matters what words are in the spots you've designated as a, b, etc. the specific words make all the difference in the world, because the context determines what is SUPPOSED to be parallel in the first place.</p> <p>for example, consider the following: i spent all day napping, eating, and reading books and magazines --> CORRECT this sentence describes three things that i did: (1) nap, (2) eat, and (3) read books and magazines. notice that #3 here is one activity, so this is actually the way in which the structure must be written in order to make sense.</p> <p>i spent all day napping, eating, reading books, and magazines --> INCORRECT these are not four different things, so it makes no sense to write them as four parallel constructions.</p> <p>i spent all day napping, eating, and reading books and writing songs --> INCORRECT these are actually four different activities, so they need to be written as a traditional list of four (a, b, c, and d). in this version, "reading books and writing songs" is written as though it were one activity; that's actually two different activities.</p> <p>i spent all day napping, eating, reading books, and writing songs --> CORRECT four different activities, expressed correctly as a list of four separate parallel constructions.</p>

<p><i>Although/Even When</i></p>		<p>"Although normally docile, elephants in captivity have been known to attack their trainers."</p>
		<p>Incorrect-Under high pressure and intense heat, graphite, the most stable form of pure carbon, changes into the substance commonly referred to as diamond and remains in this way although the heat and pressure are removed.</p>
		<p>Correct Intended meaning-Under high pressure and intense heat, graphite, the most stable form of pure carbon, changes into the substance commonly referred to as diamond and remains thus even when the heat and pressure are removed.</p>
		<p>As for "although" and "even when", the idea being expressed is that the carbon remains a diamond even in the absence of the conditions that caused the change. By saying "although heat and pressure are removed", it makes it sound like that is a definite event. I don't think we can guarantee that.</p> <p>This is a good example of when using the difference between the two "best" answers in your own sentence can help:</p> <p>"The successful GMAT student stays calm even when confronted with confusing questions."</p> <p>"The successful GMAT student stays calm although confronted with confusing questions."</p>
<p><i>first clause</i></p>		<p>COMMA + CONJUNCTION + SUBJECT + VERB implies a new, independent clause. In B, since and they use is preceded by a comma, we have to assume that use is the main verb of a separate, independent clause and is NOT serving to complete the first clause.</p> <p>For use to serve as a continuation of the first clause, the sentence would need to say:</p> <p>The normative model suggests that executives examine a firm's conditions...and</p>

		<p>THAT they use....</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The normative model suggests that executives examine a firm's conditions...and use...</p>
<p>"and", or "but",</p>	<p>Basically, when you have "and", or "but", or anything else that separates two thoughts from one another, that word forms a "boundary" that modifiers can't cross.</p>	<p>E.g., You should fill the form out, with blue or black ink, and then sign your name at the bottom. --> "With blue or black ink" describes how you should fill out the form. It doesn't necessarily describe how you should sign the form.</p> <p>You should fill the form out and then, with blue or black ink, sign your name at the bottom. --> You should sign the form with blue or black ink. No information about how you should fill it out.</p>
<p>can</p>	<p>This sentence is talking about a hypothesis about what executives actually do</p>	<p>E.g., The cracks in the building's facade suggest that it can collapse at any time. --> perfectly logical. we're talking about what might happen.</p>
<p>__ in __ing / __ to __</p>	<p>No, "use __ in __ing" is a perfectly respectable construction, provided that it actually makes sense. If "x" is a tool or process that's directly involved in doing "y", then the second version is better, because it conveys that idea. However, if "x" is NOT such a tool and makes only an indirect contribution, then "use __ to __" is wrong, while the first version can work.</p>	<p>E.g., Matthew used nothing but Pepsi bottle caps to make his 100-foot-tall sculpture of VÃinÃmÃinen. (i.e., the sculpture is actually made of bottle caps)</p> <p>But... Matthew, who is afraid of heights, made extensive use of meditation techniques in making his 100-foot-tall sculpture of VÃinÃmÃinen. Here, "to make" would be wrong, because meditation plays no part in the actual construction of a sculpture. This version, on the other hand, correctly conveys the indirect contribution of meditation, presumably to counter the sculptor's fear of heights.</p>

<p>EVERY important topic in SC is a RELATIONSHIP</p>		<p>EVERY important topic in SC is a RELATIONSHIP. The GMAT doesn't test "single-point decisions" at all!</p> <p>What I mean is this: When you find a split/difference, you should have to look elsewhere in the sentence to resolve the issue. E.g., if you see a split between a plural verb and a singular verb, you'll have to find the subject—which will be somewhere else. If you see a pronoun issue, you'll have to find the noun referent—which will be somewhere else. If you see one of two parallel structures, you'll have to find the other one—which will be somewhere else. Etc.</p> <p>If you do see a "single-point" split, it is nearly 100% likely to have been put there as a distraction.</p>
<p>Rather than/Instead of</p>	<p>"Rather than" is used for contrast, you're correct. "Instead of" is used in a similar context, and can be interchangeable.</p>	<p>He wanted to see an action film rather than a comedy.</p> <p>He wanted to see an action film instead of a comedy.</p>
<p>independent OF</p>	<p>We use "independent OF" when we talk about two processes or situations that don't depend on each other. This phrase conveys the meaning similar to that of "unaffected by." "Independent FROM", on the other hand, means "not ruled by another country/person."</p>	

<p><i>preposition</i></p>	<p>No preposition is warranted.</p>	<p>All of the following are correct: the amount allocated THIS YEAR the amount allocated LAST YEAR the amount allocated THE PREVIOUS YEAR</p> <p>the amount allocated THIS WEEK the amount allocated LAST WEEK the amount allocated THE PREVIOUS WEEK</p> <p>the amount allocated TODAY the amount allocated YESTERDAY the amount allocated TUESDAY the amount allocated THE PREVIOUS DAY.</p>
<p><i>A study has found that</i></p>	<p>"A study has found that..." can be put in front of ANY tense, as long as the resulting meaning makes sense.</p>	<p>A study has found that most of the world's languages will go extinct in the next 100 years.</p> <p>A study has found that the dinosaurs once dominated the earth.</p> <p>A study has found that the human body excretes surplus calories on a ketogenic diet, rather than storing them as fat.</p>
<p><i>Initial phrases</i></p>		<p>Initial phrases describing timeframes always describe actions, not nouns, so it's immaterial which noun follows them.</p> <p>E.g., In 1993, I graduated from high school. This sentence is fine. (It certainly does not imply that I have no existence outside of the year 1993.)</p> <p>In fact, just look at this: In 1993, _____ I don't think a noun even could make sense here. It's pretty clear that you're describing an entire action/clause. Something had to have happened in 1993.</p>
<p><i>"a" or "the"</i></p>		<p>nope. that isn't a noun.</p> <p>if that were a noun, it would have to have "a" or "the" in front of it.</p> <p>xxxxxxxxxxxxx, a finding that revolutionized many fields of study.</p> <p>xxxxxxxxxxxxx, the finding that led to the government's ban on Chemical Y.</p>

		<p>also, you can just look at the way the word is used in the sentence -- it's used in the same way as "They found that...".</p> <p>if you put a noun there—like "result" or "statistic"—the sentence won't make any sense at all.</p>
<p><i>changes in the measured strain/changes in measurements of the strain</i></p>		<p>remember that you have to read these sorts of things VERY, VERY LITERALLY.</p> <p>* if you say "changes in the measured strain", then this means that the measured strain (i.e., the strain itself) has changed.</p> <p>* if you say "changes in measurements of the strain", then this means that only the measurements have changed. in other words, there is no implication as to whether the actual strain has changed; only the measurements have changed.</p> <p>the first of these is better, for two reasons: (1) it's the meaning of the original sentence. remember that you are not allowed to change the original meaning, unless the original meaning is nonsense. (2) it's parallel to the other things in the sentence. the other things in the sentence are GEOLOGICAL EVENTS; you have to stick to the script. changes in the strain itself are geological changes. changes in measurements of the strain, however, are not geological changes, and that's unacceptable parallelism.</p>
<p><i>like</i></p>		<p>"like" compares nouns.</p> <p>if you write that X can think like Y, then the comparison is between "X" and "Y" (both of which/whom can think in a certain way).</p>
<p><i>infinitive</i></p>		<p>Here is the generally accepted principle: When two infinitive structures are connected by and, or, except, but, than, or as, it is normal practice to omit to in the second clause.</p>

<p>NOT X BUT Y</p>		<p>When not serves to negate a verb, it must FOLLOW the helping verb or linking verb: john DID not play the clarinet. John WILL not attend the party. John WAS not tall. In every case, not follows the helping verb or linking verb.</p> <p>This rule holds true even when not serves as part of the idiom NOT X BUT Y. OA: The earliest writing WAS probably not a direct rendering of speech but more than likely began as a separate and distinct symbolic system of communication. Here, not correctly follows the linking verb was.</p>
<p>Although /Whereas</p>		<p>"Although xxxx, yyyy" implies that, given xxxx, we normally wouldn't expect yyyy--but yyyy is true nonetheless. e.g., Although I left home twenty minutes late, I still arrived at work on time. --> the point is that, given my late departure, i could reasonably have been expected to be late to work. nonetheless, for some reason, i still managed to make it on time.</p> <p>"Whereas xxxx, yyyy", on the other hand, is used to present two things that contrast in some way, but are essentially unrelated to each other. e.g., Whereas Dartmouth is in a remote area with harsh winters, Stanford is in a large metropolitan area whose climate is mild year-round. --> it would make no sense to write this sentence with "although", because neither observation would yield any expectation about the other.</p>

<p>which</p>	<p>The fact that "which" is so severely restricted is, in fact, the entire reason why "which" is notable!</p> <p>Most modifiers have more flexibility. If all modifiers were constrained in this way, then most descriptive sentences would become impossible to write.</p>	<p>The same principle applies to ___, who/whom/whose ...</p> <p>It also applies to modifiers that have little words in front of who/whom/whose/which. E.g., it applies to ___, to which ... ___ of which ... ___, to whom ... ___ each of whom ... ___, because of which ... and so on.</p>
<p>rule of coordinate conjunctions</p>		<p>The simple rule of coordinate conjunctions is that they join</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. two words ; e.g.: 'Jack and Jill' went up the hill 2. two phrases: e.g. : Jack wants 'to eat the cake and(to) keep it too', and 3. two ICs. E.g: Jack wants to play football with a hockey ball and Jill wants to play basketball with a hockey ball
<p>SC PROTOCOL</p>	<p>i take it one step further: i actually formalize "look for parallelism" as part of the FIRST step of ANY sentence correction problem.</p> <p>because finding parallelism is so important - and also so common - i've come up with the following PROTOCOL for solving sentence correction problems:</p>	<p>SC PROTOCOL</p> <p>step 1: READ the sentence, and look for two things: - look for the general meaning of the sentence - look for PARALLELISM</p> <p>look in 2 ways: * signal words * CONTEXT</p> <p>step 2: look for SPLITS among the answer choices - make sure that you don't mistake "fake splits" (i.e., word rearrangements that aren't substitutes for each other) for real splits.</p> <p>step 3: criticize things that are wrong with individual answer choices (even if they are not part of splits)</p>

<p><i>ambiguous pronouns</i></p>	<p>not all ambiguous pronouns are incorrect!</p>	<p>so here's the simplest way of making the decision:</p> <p>1) if you see an AMBIGUOUS PRONOUN that is REPLACED BY THE CORRECT NOUN in OTHER ANSWER CHOICES, then ELIMINATE the ambiguous pronoun and keep the specific noun. for an example, see problem 68 in the blue verbal supplement, in which "them" is split against "these companies".</p> <p>HOWEVER,</p> <p>2) if you see an ambiguous pronoun that is NOT replaced by the correct noun in any of the other answer choices, then DON'T eliminate! for an example, see problem 21 in the blue verbal supplement (in which the correct answer contains a technically ambiguous pronoun). or see the problem in this thread!</p> <p>also: in general, OBJECTS OF PREPOSITIONS are very rarely the antecedents of pronouns. (i won't say never -- but rarely enough that, if you have to make a random guess, this is probably a pretty good standard by which to make such a guess.) for instance: if you have "the cat in the box", then it is very unlikely that a pronoun will be able to stand for "box".</p>
<p><i>rephrased</i></p>		<p>that construction is technically ok, but it's basically unreadable, and no decent writer would ever write it. instead, you'd see that same idea rephrased into a different order, e.g., It became obvious that if A went away, then B would take its place.</p> <p>and, no, there's nothing wrong with putting "that" in front of a clause starting with "if", as long as it's actually a legitimate clause.</p>

<p><i>actually/inadvertently</i></p>		<p>these aren't very abstract concepts -- "actually" means "in reality", and "inadvertently" means "not on purpose".</p> <p>hmm</p> <p>i'll just try to make another example: James plays an alcoholic on stage, but has never even had a drink in real life. --> this sentence makes sense. james (presumably an actor) plays the role of an alcoholic in a play/movie/whatever, but james doesn't actually drink alcohol in real life.</p> <p>James plays an alcoholic on stage, who has never even had a drink in real life. --> this sentence doesn't make sense. it is inadvertently (= contrary to actual intentions) implying that the stage character has never had a drink before. (that's nonsense, since the stage character is an alcoholic.)</p>
<p><i>(al)though + adjective</i></p>		<p>If you just have "(al)though + adjective", it should come in one of the following 2 places:</p> <p>1/ In front of the entire sentence (Al)though exhausted from work, Sarah still played with the dogs for two hours when she got home.</p> <p>2/ After the subject (usually I've seen just "though" here, not "although") The two men, though not trained as pilots, were able to land the plane safely.</p>

<p><i>"to do" and "for doing"</i></p>		<p>Cherry gave two examples:</p> <p>"She has to go home to do the housework". "She has to go home for doing the housework".</p> <p>These really do not have the same meaning. An English speaker would use the first construction only for this sentence. You will not hear an English speaker say the second. Here is why...</p> <p>The first will be understood to mean "She has to go home IN ORDER TO DO the housework;" or, "She has to go home BECAUSE SHE NEEDS TO DO the housework." And this is, in fact, what we mean.</p> <p>The second will be understood to mean "She has to go home AS A CONSEQUENCE FOR DOING the housework;" or, "She DID THE HOUSEWORK, AND SO she had to go home." And this doesn't make sense.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Look at it in another set of examples. Any verb may be substituted for "do":</p> <p>"to X" (to sleep, to love, to give, etc.) "for X-ing" (for sleeping, for loving, for giving, etc.)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. He was sent home early from school TO SLEEP.2. He was sent home early from school FOR SLEEPING. <p>The first means the teacher sent the student home IN ORDER TO sleep. He looked tired, and the teachers were merciful. They suggested that he go home FOR THE PURPOSE OF sleep.</p> <p>In the second, the teacher sent the student home BECAUSE HE SLEPT in class. Going home was a CONSEQUENCE for sleeping when he should have stayed awake.</p> <p>The only time these are interchangeable is when one of the following is true:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The meaning of "in order to" and "as a consequence for" will mean the same thing: <p>Ex. A: "He was paid \$1000 TO BUILD the wall." Ex. B: "He was paid \$1000 FOR BUILDING the wall."</p> <p>And, even here, be careful. The first (as Cherry pointed out) means he was paid BEFORE the work was done. The second means he was paid AFTER the work was done.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. The meaning is about the INTENDED PURPOSE or SUGGESTED PURPOSE of an item (or person): <p>Ex. A: "A hammer can be used TO REMOVE nails."</p>
--	--	--

		Ex. B: "A hammer can be used FOR REMOVING nails."
None		Examples: None of the money was stolen from my wallet. None of the documents were stolen from the bank. The exception mentioned is: "(Technically, none of + plural noun can take either a singular or a plural verb form.)"

		<p>No examples are given in the book, so I just made some up. I can't promise that they are correct, but they sound reasonable to me.</p> <p>None of the tourists have taken pictures. (of plural - plural verb) None of us sings well enough to perform in public. (of plural -singular verb) None of the listeners seem to mind our singing, though. (of plural - plural verb) None of these sentences is a wonderful example! (of plural -singular verb)</p> <p>As a native English speaker, I'm noticing that the mental image conjured by these sentences is determined by the choice of verb number.</p> <p>When the verb is singular, I imagine the object of the preposition as individuals: Individually, not one person among us sings well enough... Individually, each sentence is not a wonderful example.</p> <p>When the verb is plural, I imagine the object of the preposition as a collection of many things: All the listeners are fine with our singing...All of the tourists have refrained from taking pictures.</p> <p>It's truly a fine distinction, and one not likely to be tested by the GMAT. After all, if all of the tourists have refrained from taking pictures, then isn't it also true that each tourist individually refrained from taking pictures? Such a minor difference. The GMAT might take advantage of the freedom to use either a plural or singular verb after none of + plural noun, but there's NO WAY you will ever have to make a judgement call about it.</p>
--	--	---

<p>gerund</p>	<p>A gerund is a VERBing that serves as a NOUN.</p>	<p>Case 1: John likes the woman's dancing. Here, dancing is a gerund serving as the DIRECT OBJECT of likes, while the woman's is an ADJECTIVE serving to describe dancing. What type of DANCING? THE WOMAN'S dancing. Since the direct object of likes is DANCING, the conveyed meaning is that John likes THE DANCING. To convey that the woman is performing the gerund action, we use a possessive: THE WOMAN'S dancing.</p> <p>Case 2: John likes the woman dancing. Here, the woman serves as the DIRECT OBJECT of likes, while dancing is not a gerund but an ADJECTIVE serving to describe the woman. What type of WOMAN? The woman DANCING. Since the direct object of likes is THE WOMAN, the conveyed meaning is that John likes THE WOMAN. Since dancing here is not a gerund but a MODIFIER, a possessive is not warranted.</p>
<p>Verb+ING</p>		<p>examples: my brother, who ate bagel bites for breakfast every single day of his high school career, graduated in 1994. --> correct; his eating bagel bites had no impact on his graduation date. my brother ate bagel bites for breakfast every single day of his high school career, graduating in 1994. --> incorrect; these are two unrelated observations, but this construction erroneously implies some sort of relationship.</p>

<p>"X of Y, which..."</p>	<p>here's the basic summary: if you have "X of Y, which..." then: * if Y works as the antecedent of "which", then "which" should stand for Y. * if Y doesn't work as the antecedent, but "X of Y" DOES work, then "which" can stand for "X of Y".</p> <p>--</p> <p>i feel your pain, though. this problem is definitely a case of "learn surprising lessons from the correct answers, but never question the officially correct answers."</p>	<p>occasionally, when it is completely unambiguous, "which" can refer to a whole NOUN PHRASE that immediately precedes the comma. in this case, this noun phrase is "X's letters to Y". (note that this noun phrase, as a unit, does immediately precede the comma.)</p> <p>also, note the complete lack of grammatical ambiguity: "which" can't refer to dickinson, who is a person, and it's also followed by a plural verb. both of these pieces of evidence point to the noun phrase "X's letters to Y".</p>
<p>** WARNING **</p>		<p>** WARNING **</p> <p>for non-native speakers of english (as well as every other language in the world -- this is not a unique feature of english), verb tenses are MUCH harder than any other aspect of the language. in fact, it's almost impossible for any non- native speaker of any language to master verb tenses fully and completely. even when an intelligent speaker has been using his or her second language exclusively for decades, he or she will still routinely make verb-tense errors.</p> <p>therefore: DO NOT study verb tense until you have 100% MASTERED the other MAJOR sc topics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * parallelism * pronoun use * subject-verb agreement * modifier placement <p>if you cannot identify these error types literally one hundred percent of the time, then do not study other error types -- especially verb tense (which should be the</p>

		absolute bottom priority for non-native speakers) -- until you can.
parallelism	(While you're at it, note also that the tenses are different—another issue that is 100% context, and that also has no bearing on the parallelism.)	<p>E.g., Ray joined the Air Force in 1989 and will be discharged in 2019. It should be clear that "joined" belongs in the active (Ray went and enlisted—HE did it), but that "will be discharged" belongs in the passive (that must be done by his superior officer(s)). Parallelism is satisfied as long as there are any two verbs. The rest is context.</p> <p>(While you're at it, note also that the tenses are different—another issue that is 100% context, and that also has no bearing on the parallelism.)</p>
it construction		<p>if you see "IT + is/was/seems/etc. + _____ + THAT + clause" or "IT + is/was/seems/etc. + _____ + TO + verb" or a construction derived from one of these, then the "it" DOES NOT have to stand for a noun.</p> <p>examples: it is obvious that we are going to be late. it was difficult to drive because of the rain. the rain made it difficult to drive (note that this is a construction derived from the one above it) etc.</p> <p>all of these constructions are correct; none of these instances of "it" have to stand for a noun. (note the necessary presence of "that" or "to" in each of these constructions.) ALL other pronouns on the gmat must stand for nouns.</p> <p>in order to confirm your knowledge of this type of construction -- and your ability to differentiate it from normal pronouns that have to stand for nouns -- take a look at OG12 problem 57 (i'm not allowed to reproduce that problem here, per copyright rules).</p>

		<p>in that problem, there are four instances of "it" in the answer choices. two of them are examples of the construction above, and are thus exempt from having to stand for nouns; the other two are normal pronouns that must stand for nouns (and are thus incorrect, since there are no adequate referents present). see if you can tell which are which.</p>
<p>redundant</p>		<p>what is definitely INCORRECT about these choices is their redundant construction. analogy:</p> <p>to me, black and yellow are the best colors. black and yellow are my favorite colors. --> each of these two sentences is correct. neither is redundant.</p> <p>[i]to me, black and yellow are my favorite colors. --> redundant; this sentence says exactly the same thing twice.</p>
<p>as a means of/a means to</p>		<p>Means' is used in two idiomatically correct expressions as noted below. These expressions however have different meanings:</p> <p>x {as a means of} y = x is a type of y x {as a means to} y = x is a method to achieve y</p> <p>For example: Walking is a means of exercise. Some people use walking as a means to stay fit.</p> <p>We will now put this in the context of the sentence in question:</p> <p>City is stressing arts as a means to greater economic development The usage of expression as a means to is appropriate here since "arts" is a method to achieve "greater economic development.</p> <p>Thus, whenever you have to make the decision between using "as a means to" or "as</p>

		<p>a means of" always check which of the two meanings will make sense: "a type of" or "a method to achieve"</p>
parallelism		<p>As I always say, read the sentence carefully and understand its meaning. As you completely understand the meaning you will be able to determine what constitutes a list in each of these sentences.</p> <p>"Cities are stressing the arts as a means to greater economic development and investing millions of dollars" In this sentence the list is as follows: Cities are 1: Stressing... 2: Investing... Thus, to maintain parallelism you should use "investing".</p> <p>"Some ppl are running as a means to stay fit and remaining healthy." In this sentence the list is as follows: As a means to 1: Stay fit 2: Remaining healthy. Thus, to maintain parallelism you should use "remain healthy".</p>
not only-but also		<p>the idiom is not 'not only-but also'. It is 'not-but'. So, whatever is repeated after 'not' should be repeated after 'but' . Hence, it is 'not by' and 'but by' which has been used in B. Also, remember if you have 'just', it is always followed by 'also'. Hence, the correct format is 'not just by-but also by'</p>
WITHOUT 'A'/'AN', you DO NOT use a comma.	<p>this is a special idiom. if you preface someone's name with a noun describing their occupation (or other word describing what that person does), WITHOUT 'A'/'AN', you DO NOT use a comma.</p>	<p>if there's an article, you DO use a comma.</p> <p>if it's an adjective, you DO use a comma.</p> <p>example: Jazz pianist and composer Thelonious Monk ... --> correct A jazz pianist and composer, Thelonious Monk ... --> correct Creative and original, Thelonious Monk ... --> correct</p>

<p><i>both X and Y and "X and Y"</i></p>		<p>for the purposes of this exam, "both X and Y" and "X and Y" are equivalent.</p> <p>the difference is purely stylistic. "both" is included (1) if "X" and "Y" are long (= long enough to make the sentence difficult to read without "both"), or (2) for rhetorical reasons, such as emphasis.</p> <p>style issues are not tested on this exam, so you only have to know that...</p> <p>..."X and Y" is a legitimate parallel structure, ..."both X and Y" is also a legitimate parallel structure.</p> <p>end of story.</p>
		<p>incidentally, if "X and Y" is used to describe a relationship between X and Y, then "both" CANNOT be used.</p> <p>if you want, you can just memorize this. the reason, though, is that "both X and Y" implies that both "X" and "Y" can be described individually by whatever the sentence says.</p> <p>as a test, you can make 2 sentences, one using "X" individually and one using "Y" individually, and see whether those sentences make sense (and deliver the same meaning as the original). if you get nonsense by using "X" and/or "Y" individually, then "both X and Y" can't be used.</p> <p>e.g.,</p> <p>between X and Y ("between both X and Y" is incorrect) note that "between X" and "between Y" are nonsense constructions.</p> <p>X and Y are the same ("both X and Y are the same" is incorrect) note that "X is the same" makes no sense.</p> <p>X and Y share several traits ("both X and Y share..." is incorrect, unless you mean that each of them shares things with other, unnamed, entities)</p>

		<p>note that "X shares..." doesn't make sense, unless the meaning of the sentence is fundamentally different from "X and Y share...".</p>
<p>while + VERbing</p>		<p>while + VERbing is an example of a VERBLESS clause: a dependent clause in which the subject and verb are omitted. Generally, the implied verb will be in the SAME TENSE as the verb in the main clause.</p> <p>John ate dinner while watching TV. Conveyed meaning: John ate dinner while {he was} watching TV.</p> <p>Every night, John eats dinner while watching TV. Conveyed meaning: Every night, John eats dinner while [he is] watching TV.</p>
<p>although</p>		<p>Here's the deal with "although":</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * If Although xxxxx comes BEFORE the main sentence, the "xxxxx" can be ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ... an adjective (Although exhausted, Rob continued to work); ... a modifier describing the following subject (Although in considerable debt already, Tom spent two thousand dollars on a new designer suit); ... an entire sentence. * If although xxxxx comes AFTER the main sentence, the "xxxxx" must be another sentence in its own right. <hr/> <p>As long as we're on the topic, there's also "though".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Though can do everything that although can do (as listed above). * Off the top of my head, there's one extra job "though" can perform that "although" can't. Specifically, it can separate two adjectives, or other descriptions, that contrast with each other. Dogos Argentinos are beautiful, though

		<p>dangerous, dogs. Ray looked happy, though exhausted.</p>
modifiers		<p>Again, I don't know these terms, but you're putting "but" in the same box as "although" and "while". That's incorrect. "But" is like "and" and "yet", not like "while" and "although".</p> <p>The principal difference is that the latter kind can go in front of the whole thing (While xxxxx, yyyy) OR in the middle (Xxxxx, while yyyy).</p> <p>The former kind can't do both; only the second. I.e., sentences like But xxxxx, yyyy or And xxxxx, yyyy are impossible.</p> <p>Also, you're asking what is "modified" by these kinds of things"" another fundamental misunderstanding. The whole point of these constructions is that they are NOT modifiers.</p> <p>Think about what a modifier is. It's a piece of description that has to be "stuck onto" some noun or action""because it's not already a sentence. It's a PIECE of a sentence, and that's why it has to "modify" something IN a complete sentence.</p> <p>The job of things like and/but/yet and although/while, etc., is to link two already complete sentences. As such, they are not modifiers at all; they just indicate the relationship between the two sentences.</p>
When/even though		<p>even though' —i can tell you with %99.9 certainty that this should come only before an entire sentence.</p> <p>'when' — can do all of the first 3 things; also NOT subject to the last restriction (e.g., you can write sentences like Peter calls me when in desperate situations, or Molly says stupid things when drunk).</p>