

(65%) hard

To meet the rapidly rising market demand for fish and seafood, suppliers are growing fish twice as fast as their natural growth rate, cutting their feed allotment by nearly half and raising them on special diets.

(A) their natural growth rate, cutting their feed allotment

(B) their natural growth rate, their feed allotment cut

(C) growing them naturally, cutting their feed allotment

(D) they grow naturally, cutting their feed allotment

(E) they grow naturally, with their feed allotment

Solution:

(A) To meet the rapidly rising market demand for fish and seafood, **suppliers are growing fish** twice as **fast** as **their natural growth rate**, cutting their feed allotment by nearly half and raising them on special diets.

>> Compare growing **fish** with **rate**. Illogical comparison.

in this case, you have a **problem of redundancy**:

a RATE can't be FAST.

* the *rate* can be *high*

* the *increase itself* can be *fast*.

similarly,

a height can't be tall (a person can be tall, or a height can be greater than...)

a bank account can't be rich (a person can be rich, or a bank account can contain a large amount of money)

etc.

(B) To meet the rapidly rising market demand for fish and seafood, **suppliers are growing fish** twice as **fast** as **their natural growth rate**, their feed allotment cut by nearly half and raising them on special diets.

>>> Same as (A). Illogical comparison between **fish** and growth **rate**. And redundancy of "a rate is fast"

lest you think this is just a matter of excessive nitpicking on our part, this difference is corroborated by several official problems.



is there a difference between their, them and they in this question that makes one right over the other?

>>> each of those is actually used correctly.

"their" is a possessive.

"them" is the object of a verb (in the case where it's used here, it's the object of "growing")

"they" is a subject.

actually, in the thousands of official problems that i've seen, i have seen a total of ZERO problems in which a pronoun is incorrect because it's in the wrong case (subject/object/possessive). For instance, i have NEVER seen a problem in which a sentence is wrong because it uses, say, "them" instead of "they". So at this point i would bet good money that they will never test that.

The closest thing i've ever seen is a couple of problems that incorrectly use "it" where the context would dictate "itself", or vice versa.

.....

(C)

To meet the rapidly rising market demand for fish and seafood, **suppliers are growing** fish twice as fast as **growing** them naturally, cutting their feed allotment by nearly half and raising them on special diets.

>> this suggests that even natural growth still has to be performed by the suppliers.

"growing them naturally" is illogical.

In this construction, "them" (= fish) is the OBJECT of "growing". **This implies that someone else must be growing the fish -- which doesn't make sense if we're talking about natural growth.**

The suppliers is not growing the fish. The fish grows naturally. (meaning/logic)

notice that the correct answer contains "they grow naturally", a more accurate description of what actually happens -- the fish just grow, by themselves.

.....

(D) **To meet the rapidly rising market demand for fish and seafood, suppliers are growing fish twice as fast as they grow naturally, cutting their feed allotment by nearly half and raising them on special diets.**

are the pronoun they and thier are correctly refering to thier antecedent?? i am confused beacause 'They', is close to 'suppliers' so, it may refer to supplier.

>>> this is a good point -- the correct answer to this problem, yet again, contains a pronoun that is technically ambiguous.

however, as we've seen again and again and again and again, **not all ambiguous pronouns are**

incorrect!

so here's the simplest way of making the decision:

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".

HOWEVER,

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!

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".

see #29 in the blue verbal supplement, choices (a) and (b).

in the problem at hand, "they" is not split against "(those) fish", so we can't confidently eliminate it.

(D) **To meet the rapidly rising market demand for fish and seafood, suppliers are growing fish twice as fast as they grow naturally, cutting their feed allotment by nearly half and raising them on special diets.**

Here, **they** is referring to **fish** not **suppliers**.

gmac is frustratingly inconsistent on the topic of pronouns and their antecedents -- i.e., it's pretty much impossible to formulate simple rules about pronoun ambiguity -- so that is a nice workaround.

It's very important to know that there are lots and lots and lots (and lots) of correct official answers that technically contain ambiguous pronouns.

.....

(E) To meet the rapidly rising market demand for fish and seafood, suppliers are growing fish twice as fast as they grow naturally, with their feed allotment cut by nearly half and raising them on special diets.

>>> the construction "...with their allotment cut..." is also problematic by itself, too, **because there's no indication of WHO is cutting the feed allotment.**

moreover, this construction implies that the suppliers AREN'T cutting the feed allotment.

The intended meaning is **the suppliers is cutting their (fish) feed allotment.** So we should use comma + __ing, as in the correct answer.

(D) To meet the rapidly rising market demand for fish and seafood, **suppliers** are growing fish twice as fast as they grow naturally, **cutting** their feed allotment by nearly half and raising them on special diets.

>> Here, "comma + __ing" refers back to the subject of the clause "suppliers". But in case of (E), "comma + with" does not refer back to the subject.

"Comma + ing" always refer back to the subject BUT "comma + with" do not refer back to the subject.

Parallelism issue:

To meet the rapidly rising market demand for fish and seafood, suppliers are growing fish twice as fast as their natural growth rate, cutting their feed allotment by nearly half **and raising** them on special diets.

(A) their natural growth rate, **cutting** their feed allotment

(B) their natural growth rate, their feed allotment cut

(C) growing them naturally, **cutting** their feed allotment

(D) they grow naturally, **cutting** their feed allotment

(E) they grow naturally, with their feed allotment

and is a parallel marker. You must look at the parallelism whenever you see a parallel marker. Here (B) and (E) is not parallel.
