

## TENSES

### 1. B

Simple past is sufficient, no need for past perfect, as there is just 1 event in the past. So, C and D go out. A, D and E say "people of Mississippi... were people who OR had been people who OR were a people which" – repeated use of 'people' is redundant. Hence, out. E also says 'people which' → as 'which' is an inanimate pronoun and cannot be used to refer to people. Additionally, 'culture' cannot be 'Caddo-speaking'; only people can – this problem is there in A, D and E.

### 2. A

Only people can be natives of a place – animals etc. are native to – so B, C, E go out. The phrase 'in an attempt' must be followed by an infinitive (to improve wildlife diversity)– this problem is there in C, D and E. B, E also talk about "attempts" in plural, whereas there's only 1 attempt. D and E also improperly use "introduce to" – you can use this only for people. For e.g. Ram introduced his wife to his boss. This isn't the intended meaning in this context. Thus, A is the correct answer.

### 3. E

The survey 'has revealed' – present perfect tense; so, the rest of the sentence must match this. i.e. investment advisors 'have elected' is correct – A, B go out. The parallel structure here is 'Doctors have elected to X ('retire early') rather than Y ('deal with') – A, B, D violate this. The correct idiom is 'elected to retire' and not 'elected retiring' → infinitive form. Thus, E is the correct answer.

### 4. E

Present Perfect tense is required as the condition of the decree has never been applied until now – so, 'was' is wrong. A, B, C are out. D is a sentence fragment and lacks a main verb. Since "under the decree" is already mentioned in the non-underlined part of the sentence, there is no need to mention "whereby" too – redundant. Thus, E is the correct answer.

**5. A**

B: tense mismatch. 'has increased' & 'predicted'. Missing 'will' at the end.

C: tense mismatch. 'will' is used to make a prediction about the future, as is true in this case. C incorrectly uses 'would'.

'Because' can modify a clause, while 'due to' can only modify nouns. The clause here is 'the target will/would be raised again in May'. 'due to' can modify nouns, not clauses. So options D and E are out.

Thus, A is the correct answer.

**6. D**

This question uses a bossy word 'demand' – therefore, the command subjunctive is in action here. The rule of the subjunctive is that we use the raw form: (be + verb) without 'should'. Thus, A and B are incorrect. B and C say "laws should revise" – but laws cannot revise on their own, they have to be revised by someone. So, these options also go out. In E, "contractual agreement of discrimination" makes no sense. Thus, D is the correct answer

## IDIOMS

**1. C**

The right idiom is "Between X and Y". And the only option that uses this form is "C".

**2. C**

The idiom that is spotted here is "ability to". This leaves us only with C and E. The next difference between the options is the beginning of the options viz. "known to have" and "known in the ability". The former is a standard construction as people are known to have some abilities. Therefore, the answer would be Option C.

**3. D**

There are other legitimate forms of this idiom – 'not only X but also Y'. They are – 'not only X but Y' and 'not just X but also Y'. These coordinating conjunctions require perfect parallelism between X and Y. Option A breaks this parallelism because 'did' is not parallel to 'it also caused'. Also, 'create' and 'gave' (must have been 'give') are not parallel. ('Not only did progressive clearing gave residents ...' is grammatically incorrect.) Option B implies that 'farmlands' gave residents cheap houses and furniture – illogical. Option C is a sentence fragment (this becomes clear if we remove the non-essential modifier – 'creating farmlands ...'). Option D is the correct answer. This puts 'created' and 'gave' in parallel. 'but' here is used to introduce a new independent clause – that is parallel with the first clause. Option E does not have perfect parallelism between 'created' and 'it caused'. Also, the modifier – 'giving residents cheap houses' – does not make sense. 'giving residents cheap houses and furniture' functions neither as a subordinator or as an effect of the clause preceding it.



('giving residents cheap houses and furniture' has no bearing on 'creating farmlands'.)  
Another thing to note is that – in these coordinating conjunctions X and Y reinforce each other. However, in options A, B and E – X is a positive effect whereas Y is a negative effect.

**1. E**

'Cellars' is plural – so 'it' is wrong – A and B are incorrect. Ending part of underlined portion has to be parallel to "moss was growing" – so C and D are also out. You may wonder "Isn't there a pronoun ambiguity in options C, D and E?" However, the official answer is E – from this, our takeaway is that pronoun ambiguity on the GMAT isn't an absolute rule. There are many official answers with ambiguous pronouns. Therefore, don't eliminate options based on ambiguity alone – try to identify at least one other grammatical or logical issue with each incorrect answer choice.

**2. B**

Option A is wrong because X and Y is a compound subject that is considered plural. However, it uses the singular form of the verb "Exists". Option C is also eliminated due to the same reason. D and E make the answer unnecessarily wordy.

**3. D**

Let us look at an analogy – if we say that all prime numbers are not even, then this statement would be incorrect. (Note that '2' is also a prime number). Options A, B and C all incorrectly imply that none of the events were broadcast. 'socialist party convention Budapest' is a horribly long adjective for 'events'. It would be better to use the possessive form – 'socialist party convention's' to serve as an adjective. 'Budapest events' is too restrictive. It seems to imply that the events were exclusive to Budapest. (for example – Tirupati Laddoos.)

**4. D**

The subject there is compound (X, Y and Z) and hence usage of the verb has is inappropriate. Therefore, Options A, B and C are eliminated. Option E uses "as well as" and "and" that makes the sentence structure redundant.

**5. D**

The underlined verb here is "exhibits" and the corresponding subject in the prepositional phrase is "animals". Hence due to SVA, Options A and B can be eliminated. Option E can be eliminated due to the change in meaning because of the phrase "has been expanded and includes". Out of the remaining options, Option C doesn't follow parallelism and this can be seen in the phrase "either using the right hand or the left hand". This leaves us with Option D.

**6. B.**

The sentence structure is 'the Huarpes established their community based on X, Y and Z'. A (the cultivation... the harvesting... utilizing), C (cultivating... harvesting... the utilizing), D (cultivation, the harvest, utilizing) and E (cultivation, harvest, utilized) all violate this structure. 'such as' is the right idiom for citing examples, not 'like' – this is incorrect in A, C and E.

**7. C**

We are talking about similar categories of men in 2 diff time frames and not the same men; improper use of "those" in options A and B. In A, B, D and E, it says "with children working outside their hometowns" OR "children who work outside their hometowns" – the working outside can apply to both men and children – so, ambiguity. D has an "even though" which seems to imply a contrast, where there is none. "with" makes it sound as though the two events are simultaneous – but they are not. Hence, E is out.

**8. C**

This sentence has a compound subject – two items joined by 'and': "commanding personality and choices of topic." This is plural – so was, has etc are wrong – A and B are out. This plural subject needs a plural pronoun 'they' and not singular pronoun 'it'. – so D is also out. The same issue is present in A also. It is clear from the sentence that Hopkins lived in the past – therefore, simple past tense 'were' is required to refer to this. Option D unnecessarily uses the past perfect whereas option E incorrectly uses the present perfect. Thus, C is the correct answer.

**9. A**

The idiom is "increased by 'x' number of times / 'x' times. The only option that uses the right form is A.

**10. A**

In Option B, the phrase "dollars were minted as coins" is awkward and the pronoun "it" is inappropriate. Same is the case with Option E. Option C makes it sound as though the dollars minted between 1979 and 1981 are unpopular. Option D also has the same error.