

SECTION-A: ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Passage 1:

Q1. Correct option: A (*Difficulty: Hard*)

Line reference: L1, L5–L7, L13–L16.

The passage opens by asserting that experience shapes the brain (L1, L5–L7) and culminates in a reflective caution about digital applications' impact on cognition (L16), framed by evidence of use-dependent growth and underuse-related "shutting down" (L13–L14). Option **A** synthesizes these strands: lifelong experience-dependence, the risks of underuse, and a call to reflect on digital disruption.

Why not B? It contradicts L11–L12, where adult brains **do** show plasticity; the author does not dismiss concerns.

Why not C? The text explicitly extends beyond vision: taxi-driver spatial memory (L9–L11) and speech therapy in late life (L12).

Why not D? The author urges **reflection**, not prohibition or technophobia (see the measured "pause and ponder" in L16).

Q2. Correct option: C (*Difficulty: Hard*)

Line reference: L7.

"Plasticity" is used to mean the brain's **malleability/adaptiveness**—its structure/functions shaped by experience. Option **C** nails the context: synonym "malleability/adaptiveness" and antonym "rigidity/fixity," which would deny experience-driven change.

Why not A? "Elasticity" can be metaphorically near, but "neurogenesis" (new neuron formation) is **not** an antonym of plasticity; it's a different process entirely.

Why not B? The passage rejects the "childhood-only" limitation (L11–L12). "Maturation" isn't the conceptual opposite of plasticity.

Why not D? "Transparency/opacity" are semantic mismatches in this neuroscientific context.

Q3. Correct option: D (*Difficulty: Hard*)

Line reference: L6, L14.

The text shows that circuits can become **functionally** "dead" despite intact anatomy (L6) and warns that underuse can "shut down" regions (L14). Option **D** captures this: use-dependent **functional atrophy** ("use-it-or-lose-it").

Why not A? "Irreversible death at any age" overstates the claim and ignores L12's rehabilitation example (speech therapy aiding recovery).

Why not B? The author urges caution, not inevitability of universal harm.

Why not C? Immediate erasure after any reduction is an exaggeration; the passage emphasizes **sustained** deprivation/underuse, not instant loss.

Q4. Correct option: B (*Difficulty: Medium-Hard*)

Line reference: L11–L12.

"This also explains" (L12) most directly refers to the demonstrated **adult plasticity** shown just before (L11): repeated activation → structural change. That insight explains how therapy can drive recovery.

Why not A? Bus drivers are a **contrast** group; their routine (L10) is not the antecedent of "this."

Why not C? The author questions the static/decline assumption (L8) by presenting contrary evidence.

Why not D? The street count (L9) is background detail, not the explanatory mechanism for speech recovery.

Q5. Correct option: A (*Difficulty: Hard*)

Line reference: L3–L4, L10–L11.

The animal studies show **deprivation** → reduced function (L3–L4), whereas taxi drivers show **practice-driven, time-correlated enlargement** (L10–L11). Option **A** maps both: calculator reliance = underuse → fluency decline (deprivation analogue), abacus training = intensive practice → measurable strengthening (experience-dependent growth) proportional to hours.

Why not B? It posits a paradox (more reading yet worse vocabulary; improvement without study) unsupported by

the passage's use-dependence logic.

Why not C? Rest without training leading to superior performance contradicts the practice-benefit relationship.

Why not D? Avoidance improving outcomes ignores the central theme that **engagement** drives capability.

Q6. Correct option: D (*Difficulty: Medium-Hard*)

Line reference: L16 (with context from L13–L14).

The author urges us to “pause and ponder” digital apps’ cognitive effects (L16), grounded in evidence that experience sculpts the brain (L13) and underuse can “shut down” functions (L14). Option **D** reflects this **cautious, reflective** stance—mindful agency, not panic or cheerleading.

Why not A? There is no ban-the-tech rhetoric.

Why not B? No celebration; the tone is cautionary.

Why not C? The final paragraph is **normative**—it invites deliberation, not mere summary.

Q7. Correct option: A (*Difficulty: Medium-Hard*)

Line reference: L10.

The study found **local enlargement of the posterior hippocampus**, with changes **strongly correlating** to time navigating without aids; bus drivers, who repeat fixed routes, showed **no changes** (L10). Option **A** reproduces these specifics.

Why not B? It misidentifies the region (anterior vs posterior) and reverses which group changed.

Why not C? The correlation with navigation time is explicit; equality across groups is false.

Why not D? The passage says nothing about spinal cord neurogenesis; it confines findings to hippocampal structure.

Passage snapshot

This passage argues that **experience sculpts the brain** throughout life (neural plasticity). Classic animal experiments show that **sensory deprivation** can render pathways functionally inert despite intact anatomy. The **London taxi-driver study** extends this to adults, linking intensive spatial navigation to **posterior hippocampal enlargement** and motivating therapy effects (e.g., post-stroke speech). The author then cautions that the **pervasive use of digital applications** disrupts how our brains interact with the world and merits reflective scrutiny. The tone is **evidence-led and cautionary**, not alarmist.

How to read this passage (approach)

- **Map the structure:** (1) animal evidence → (2) adult human evidence → (3) general principle (“use it or lose it”) → (4) normative caution about digital tech.
- **Track claims vs. evidence:** note where the author **infers** from studies (plasticity) and where the author **advises** action (pause & ponder).
- **Mark definitions:** “plasticity” is defined in situ as experience-driven change in structure/function.
- **Watch contrast sets:** taxi drivers vs. bus drivers; used vs. underused circuits.
- **Spot the conclusion signalers:** rhetorical question + “pause and ponder” flags the **main implication**.

Per-question playbook

1. Main idea (Ans: A) Look for **opening thesis + closing injunction**. The first paragraph defines plasticity; the last asks readers to reflect on digital apps’ cognitive effects—combine both to get A.

2. Vocabulary—“plasticity” (Ans: C) Use **in-passage definition** (“brain’s structure and functions are shaped by experience”) to pick **malleability/adaptiveness** and oppose it with **rigidity/fixity**.

3. Implication—“shutting down” (Ans: D) Tie “functionally dead” pathways (intact anatomy) to a **use-it-or-lose-it** principle; avoid extreme, absolute claims (irreversible death/inevitable damage).

4. Grammar—referent of “this” (Ans: B) Antecedent sits just before the sentence: **adult neural plasticity** shown by imaging changes with repeated activation—hence speech therapy’s efficacy.

5. Analogy (Ans: A) Match **deprivation → decline** (calculator reliance) and **intensive practice → structural/functional gain** (abacus training correlated with hours), mirroring animals and taxi drivers.

6. Author’s stance (Ans: D) Identify **normative but measured** language (“pause and ponder”)—not ban-tech, not cheerleading; it’s a **cautionary reflection** grounded in plasticity.

7. Factual detail (Ans: A) Retrieve **specifics**: **posterior hippocampal enlargement** **correlates** with navigation time; **bus drivers no change**. Reject options that flip region, group, or add spinal cord claims.

Elaborate logical brief

Premises / Evidence

1. **Animal deprivation studies:** Sewing one eye shut during a critical period yields reduced neuronal responses for that eye; the open eye's cortical representation **grows**.
2. **Functional vs. structural:** Pathways can be **physically intact** yet **functionally dead** without stimulation.
3. **Adult human evidence:** **London taxi drivers** show **posterior hippocampal enlargement** correlated with time navigating without aids; **bus drivers** (repetitive routes) show **no change**.
4. **Clinical corollary:** **Speech therapy** can help regain function in late life, consistent with adult plasticity.
5. **Generalization:** Experience is essential across **perception, motor control, memory, and decision-making**; **underuse** can shut down regions.

Intermediate Inferences

- **Plasticity persists into adulthood**; it is **experience-dependent** and **domain-general** (not only vision).
- **Use-dependent atrophy** and **practice-dependent growth** are both plausible outcomes.
- **Interventions** that repeatedly activate target circuits can produce **functional improvements**.

Conclusion / Author's Claim

- Given plasticity, the **pervasive takeover by digital applications** that alters brain–environment interactions **could reshape cognition**; we should **critically reflect** and exercise **mindful agency**.

Arguments (structure)

- **Inductive:** From multiple empirical cases (animals + humans) → general principle of plasticity.
- **Practical-normative:** From principle ("experience shapes brain") → policy/behavioral implication ("pause and ponder" digital habits).

Assumptions (unstated but necessary)

- The **mechanisms** shown in specific studies generalize to **broader cognitive domains**.
- **Digital applications** significantly **change the pattern and quality** of environmental engagement (e.g., offloading memory, reducing spatial/navigation demands).
- Altered engagement patterns are **sufficiently strong** to produce **measurable neural/cognitive effects** over time.

Potential paradoxes / tensions

- **Productivity vs. plasticity:** Tech can enhance certain skills while **diminishing others** (e.g., GPS improves convenience but may reduce spatial mapping practice).
- **Anatomy vs. function:** Structures may be **intact** yet **under-functioning**—rehab can reverse some deficits.

Inference types (GMAT/LSAT-style)

- **Causal inference:** Repeated activation → structural change; underuse → functional decline.
- **Analogy:** From taxi drivers' hippocampi to other skill domains; from animal deprivation to human under-engagement.
- **Policy inference:** If tech changes engagement patterns, **cognitive profiles** will follow; therefore, **intentional use** matters.

Passage 2:

Q8. Correct option: C (Difficulty: Hard; Line: L19, with support from L12–L18)

The essay argues that the Court's two orders expose systemic inadequacies (L2–L3, L7) and that humane policy must ensure safe public access (L13), institutional compassion (rehoming, shelters, humane euthanasia where necessary: L14), and legislative overhaul (replace 1960 Act, classifications, mandated standards: L15–L16), plus costing, veterinary cadre, waste management, and anti-abandonment penalties (L17–L18). The warning that, absent these, India will "trade visible menace for invisible neglect" (L19) clinches the thesis.

Why not A? It rejects shelters outright and subordinates safety; the author supports **regulated** shelters and safe public spaces (L13, L16).

Why not B? The author says ABC updates (2023) are **insufficient** without 70% sterilisation (L6) and calls for new statute (L15).

Why not D? The author rebuts objections to shelters by asserting they can work if properly resourced (L9–L10), not that they are unworkable.

Q9. Correct option: A (Difficulty: Medium; Line: L14)

"Compassion is not **annulled**..." (L14) uses **annulled** to mean "made null/invalidated." Thus synonym = **nullified/invalidated**; antonym = **affirmed/upheld**—i.e., compassion remains valid even if dogs are removed from roads.

Why not B? “Softened/hardened” concerns intensity, not validity; it misses the legal/operative sense of annul.

Why not C? “Celebrated/mourned” is an affective contrast irrelevant to the operative validity in context.

Why not D? “Delayed/expedited” is temporal, not about voiding/validating a principle.

Q10. Correct option: B (*Difficulty: Medium; Lines: L2–L3*)

The passage states the Court **on August 11, 2025** ordered rounding up and confinement (L2) and **eleven days later** allowed release **after vaccination and deworming**, retaining aggressive or rabid dogs (L3).

Why not A? It invents a date and bans any release, contradicting L3’s conditional release.

Why not C? L4–L5 say India bears one of the **heaviest** rabies burdens, with real family costs, not low burden.

Why not D? ABC update year is **2023** (L6), and coverages **have not crossed 70%** in major cities (L11), the opposite of the claim.

Q11. Correct option: C (*Difficulty: Medium; Line: L11*)

In “if canine facilities are in **squalor** — **which** may have motivated the Court to change course — ...” (L11), the **which** clause most directly refers to the **squalor** itself—the poor conditions of canine facilities possibly prompting the Court’s reversal.

Why not A or B? Neglect and fragmentation are listed as **causes** of squalor later in the sentence, not the thing that “may have motivated” the Court.

Why not D? Cattle institutions are mentioned separately as a contrast/example (L10), not as the antecedent of “which.”

Q12. Correct option: D (*Difficulty: Hard; Lines: L15–L18*)

The recommended architecture: replace the outdated **1960 Act** (L15), **classify** dogs (adoptable/shelter-bound/unfit) and **mandate** minimum-standard municipal shelters (L16), **count** strays and **cost** upkeep realistically (L17), and buttress with a **national veterinary cadre**, **better waste management**, and **penalties** for abandonment (L18). Option D mirrors these planks in order.

Why not A? Criminalising feeding and ad-hoc rescues lack classifications, standards, or costing—contrary to L16–L18.

Why not B? Outsourcing to NGOs without legal architecture or enforcement ignores the statutory and systemic supports the author demands (L15–L18).

Why not C? Minimal vaccination plus mass release repeats the weaknesses already flagged (L6–L7) and omits systemic supports (L15–L18).

Q13. Correct option: C (*Difficulty: Medium; Lines: L1, L7, L12–L16*)

The author calls the Court’s attempt “earnest, even if inadequate” (L1) and praises the August 11 order for acknowledging inadequacy in dense settlements (L7). He insists cultural perspectives matter (L12) **but** cannot override safe public access (L13), urging a new statute, classifications, and standards (L15–L16). That is a balanced, reform-oriented stance embedding safety **and** compassion within institutions.

Why not A? The author does not dismiss cultural perspectives; he situates them within rights (L12–L13).

Why not B? It misreads the reversal as proof of harmlessness and endorses status quo ABC, which the author finds inadequate (L6–L7, L15).

Why not D? He endorses humane euthanasia **only** for incurably aggressive/ill animals (L14), not mass euthanasia.

Q14. Correct option: A (*Difficulty: Medium-Hard; Lines: L19 with support from L11*)

“Trading **visible menace** for **invisible neglect**” (L19) implies that without systemic reforms, moving dogs off streets into underfunded, opaque facilities simply **displaces** harm: fear/injuries in public may fall, but hidden cruelty, disease, and costs persist (cf. squalor risk, L11). Option A captures this displacement logic.

Why not B? The passage never claims removal **automatically** solves rabies or family burdens; it demands comprehensive supports (L15–L18).

Why not C? The line warns against neglect **in shelters**, not against shelters per se.

Why not D? Ecological-niche worries appear earlier (L11) but L19’s contrast is about **visibility** vs **neglect**, not solely niche dynamics.

Passage snapshot (4–5 lines)

This editorial argues that India’s current approach to free-roaming dogs is inadequate: the Supreme Court’s two August 2025 orders expose systemic gaps in the Animal Birth Control (ABC) regime and urban governance. The

author balances **compassion** (rehoming, humane care/euthanasia where necessary) with **public safety** (unfearful access to streets). The proposed fix is statutory overhaul: replace the 1960 PCA Act logic with a modern law that **classifies dogs, mandates regulated municipal shelters, counts strays, costs upkeep**, and is supported by a **national veterinary cadre, waste management, and anti-abandonment penalties**. Without this, India risks swapping the “**visible menace**” of street danger for the “**invisible neglect**” of squalid institutions.

How to read this passage (exam approach)

- **Map the structure:** (i) Court’s orders & context → (ii) rabies burden & ABC limits (70% threshold) → (iii) objections to shelters and rebuttal → (iv) rights framing (safe public spaces) → (v) **policy blueprint** and final warning.
- **Separate evidence vs. prescription:** facts (rabies, coverage, orders) vs. **normative plan** (new statute, standards, costing).
- **Track contrasts:** compassion **and** safety; street risk **vs** institutional neglect.
- **Spot cue words:** “significant because...”, “however...”, “Without these measures...” —these signal the author’s **main claim**.

Per-question playbook (1–3 lines each)

8. Main idea (Ans: C) Scan opening and closing: the piece begins with the Court’s oscillation and ends with “Without these measures...,” which encapsulates the **system redesign** the author wants. Pick the option that **integrates** statute, shelters, counting, costing, and rights.

9. Vocabulary—“annulled” (Ans: A) Use the legal/operative sense: does removing dogs **void** compassion? The author says no; so **nullified/invalidated** ↔ **affirmed/upheld** fits best, not emotional or temporal pairs.

10. Factual detail (Ans: B) Timeline question: note **two orders**—Aug 11 rounding up; 11 days later limited release after vaccination/deworming, with aggressive/rabid retained. Eliminate options that alter dates, years (ABC 2023), or misstate rabies burden.

11. Grammar—referent of “which” (Ans: C) Resolve the nearest plausible antecedent: “which may have motivated the Court to change course” points to **squalor** in canine facilities, not the general neglect/fragmentation (those are **causes** of squalor).

12. Similar logic/policy design (Ans: D) Match the full blueprint: modern statute + **classification** + **mandated standards** + **counting & costing** + **vet cadre, waste management, penalties**. Reject partial/NGO-only or ad-hoc scenarios.

13. Author’s stance (Ans: C) Tone is **earnest but reformist**: appreciates the Court’s intent, deems it insufficient, and urges **institutional compassion + public safety** via law and infrastructure—not sentimentality or mass euthanasia.

14. Inference—“visible menace vs invisible neglect” (Ans: A) Infer displacement, not solution: removing dogs to **under-resourced** shelters hides the problem if institutions are opaque/squalid. So the risk is **hidden cruelty/disease/cost**, not automatic public-health victory.

Elaborate logical brief (GMAT/LSAT/GRE/CLAT style)

Premises / Evidence

1. **Judicial context:** Two orders (Aug 11 confinement; 11 days later conditional release) reflect an earnest but shifting attempt to balance interests.
2. **Public-health burden:** India has a **heavy rabies load**; low-income households are disproportionately harmed; ABC Rules (updated 2023) are **ineffectual without ~70% sterilisation**.
3. **Operational reality:** Objections to shelters (overcrowding, disease, ecological imbalance) mirror the very administrative deficits that hamper ABC: **neglect, fragmentation, under-resourcing**.
4. **Rights framing:** Cultural attachment to street dogs matters, but cannot override the **human right to safe public space**.
5. **Feasibility cues:** India already runs large **cattle** institutions; properly resourced canine shelters with **veterinary standards, space norms, and oversight** are feasible.
6. **Policy proposal:** Replace the **PCA 1960** approach with a modern statute to **classify dogs** (adoptable/shelter-bound/unfit), **mandate municipal shelters** with minimum standards, **count strays, cost upkeep** accurately, and back it with a **national veterinary cadre, better waste management, and anti-abandonment penalties**.
7. **Warning:** Absent these measures, India trades **street-level menace** for **institutional neglect**.

Inferences

- **Coverage threshold:** Sub-70% sterilisation undermines ABC outcomes; therefore, **capacity & governance**, not mere rules, drive results.
- **Institutional design** matters more than **ideology** (pro- or anti-shelter); with resources and standards, shelters can meet welfare and safety aims.

- **Rights reconciliation:** Compassion is **compatible** with removal from roads if humane rehoming/sheltering is assured.

Conclusions

- The current framework is **insufficient** for dense Indian cities; a **modern, standards-led statute + infrastructure** is required.
- Without system reform, policy merely **displaces** risk from streets to opaque facilities.

Argument structure

- **Diagnosis** (facts + failures) → **Evaluation** (Court's actions are earnest but inadequate) → **Prescription** (comprehensive statute + capacity) → **Consequence** (avoid displacement of harm).
- **Principled balancing:** human safety + animal welfare via institutions, not slogans.

Assumptions (implicit)

- Properly resourced shelters are **administratively attainable** and scalable.
- **Classification** improves triage and outcomes (adoption vs. long-term care vs. humane euthanasia).
- Accurate **censuses** and **true costing** will enable sustainable budgeting and oversight.
- A **national veterinary cadre** and **waste-management reforms** are politically/financially feasible.

Potential paradoxes / tensions

- **Compassion vs. safety:** Removing dogs from roads may feel uncompassionate, yet institutional care **can increase welfare** compared to street survival—provided standards are met.
- **Visibility bias:** Street risk is obvious; institutional neglect is hidden—hence the “visible vs. invisible” trade-off.
- **Ecological niches:** Removing dogs may open niches for other species; the solution needs **ecosystem-aware waste management**, not merely sheltering.

Passage 3:

Q15. Correct option: C (Difficulty: Hard; Line: L7)

The core arc threads a local Liverpool welfare-and-repatriation case into larger imperial anxieties about **precedent** (“succession of cases...prevent their recurrence,” L7), then situates this against decades-long patterns: warnings about Cuba (L8), repatriation claims (L9), illegal-transit complaints (L10), revolutionary concerns (L11), and finally the **opposition** to recruiting Indian labour for Cuba (L16). Option **C** integrates these strands: a case study revealing systemic worries and policy resistance across the empire.

Why not A? No evidence of promoting permanent settlement in Liverpool; the Board was **obliged** to care or repatriate (L2–L3), not to settle labour markets.

Why not B? London did **not** prioritise Cuban labour; the narrative culminates in **opposition** from the Government of India's Home Department (L16).

Why not D? The text shows the reverse: Spanish planters petitioned (L13), but Indian authorities resisted (L16); there's no enthusiastic promotion of free movement by colonial India.

Q16. Correct option: A (Difficulty: Medium; Line: L2)

“**Destitute**” in context denotes extreme poverty and lack of means, triggering legal obligations for care (L2). Thus the best synonym is **impoverished/penniless**, and the antonym is **solvent/self-sufficient**.

Why not B? “Itinerant/nomadic” relates to movement patterns, not economic incapacity that activates welfare duties.

Why not C? “Disloyal/treacherous” concerns allegiance, not material condition.

Why not D? “Transient/temporary” is a duration attribute; again, unrelated to financial means or legal eligibility for assistance.

Q17. Correct option: B (Difficulty: Easy-Medium; Line: L5)

The passage states that, after providing food and accommodation and seeking guidance (L4), the High Commissioner **recommended repatriation** because the men wished to return and **agreed to share the cost** (L5). Option **B** tracks these steps precisely.

Why not A? The Board **did** contact the High Commissioner (L4), and there is no unilateral deportation without consultation or cost share.

Why not C? The High Commissioner did **not** insist on the men staying; he endorsed repatriation (L5).

Why not D? Local care was lawful and actually provided (L2, L4); repatriation was an **option** (L3), not the only lawful path.

Q18. Correct option: C (*Difficulty: Medium; Line: L7*)

“**Their recurrence**” refers to a feared **succession of cases of the kind** (L7)—i.e., similar episodes of destitute Indian subjects requiring assistance/repatriation. The Assistant Secretary’s phrasing expressly links recurrence to the **category of cases**, not to letters or police encounters.

Why not A? The anxiety is not about general police approaches but about the **case-type** repeating (L7).

Why not B? Letters are merely vehicles; the concern is the **substantive** recurrence of like cases.

Why not D? Complaints from the US/Canada appear later (L10) and relate to Cuba; L7 addresses the **Liverpool-type** welfare/repatriation precedent.

Q19. Correct option: D (*Difficulty: Hard; Line: L16*)

Spanish planters petitioned to import Indian labour (L13–L15), but the Government of India’s **Home Department** **strongly opposed** the plan (L16). Option **D** mirrors this: private economic pressure + petition → central governmental **opposition** to exposing subjects to such recruitment.

Why not A? Authorisation “without scrutiny” runs counter to the described opposition (L16).

Why not B? Conscription is alien to the facts and miscasts civil labour as military service.

Why not C? Mandating permanent migration pathways in response to a private consortium reverses the documented governmental stance (opposition, L16).

Q20. Correct option: C (*Difficulty: Medium; Line: L9*)

The piece is archival and balanced: it juxtaposes a Liverpool case with empire-wide concerns—repatriation claims from Cuba (L9), illegal-transit complaints (L10), revolutionary fears (L11)—and closes on policy resistance to Cuban recruitment (L16). Option **C** captures this evidence-driven weave.

Why not A? No advocacy for mass migration to Cuba; the narrative shows governmental **opposition** (L16).

Why not B? There’s no fiscal polemic against welfare; the Board’s obligations are neutrally described (L2–L4).

Why not D? Neither Britain nor Cuba is portrayed as frictionless settlement zones; the text emphasises **administrative anxieties** and contested proposals.

Q21. Correct option: A (*Difficulty: Medium-Hard; Line: L7*)

The Assistant Secretary seeks to avoid a “succession of cases” and prevent **their recurrence** (L7), signalling fear of setting a **precedent** that could multiply similar claims, with cost-sharing and coordination implications for imperial offices. Option **A** states this administrative-precedent logic.

Why not B? There’s no intent to criminalise destitution; the Board remains obliged to assist (L2).

Why not C? The very act of flagging the case to the Government of India’s department shows it is **not** merely local (L7).

Why not D? The text does not imply police discipline; the concern is **policy recurrence**, not misconduct.

Passage snapshot (4–5 lines)

A small Liverpool case—destitute Punjabi men seeking a way home—triggers a wider story about imperial migration control. Local law obliged the Board of Guardians to feed/shelter them; the High Commissioner recommended **repatriation** and agreed to share costs. London officials then worried about **precedent**, fearing a “succession of cases.” The narrative widens to Cuba: repeated **repatriation requests**, illegal **transit** complaints, revolutionary concerns, and, crucially, Spanish planters’ bids to import Indian labour—**opposed** by the Government of India.

How to read this passage (exam approach)

- **Map the scaffold:** (1) Liverpool episode → (2) official anxiety about recurrence → (3) longer Cuba backdrop → (4) planters’ petitions → (5) Government of India’s opposition.
- **Track actors & powers:** Board of Guardians, High Commissioner, London officials, Government of India’s Home Department.
- **Separate fact from stance:** descriptive archival tone culminating in policy **resistance** to Cuban recruitment.
- **Exploit chronology & causality:** dates (“from the 1880s,” “in 1881”) and cause-effect (“raised alarm” → “prevent recurrence”).

Per-question strategy notes (1–3 lines each)

15 (Main idea) — Correct: C - Synthesize the **local case** with the **empire-wide concerns** (repatriation burdens, illegal transit, revolution) and the **final stance** (opposition to Cuban labour recruitment). Avoid choices that claim enthusiastic promotion or permanent settlement.

16 (Vocab: “destitute”) — Correct: A - Use the legal context: destitution **triggers welfare obligations**; pick “impoverished/penniless” vs “solvent/self-sufficient.” Don’t confuse mobility (itinerant) with means.

17 (Factual steps) — Correct: B - Follow the sequence: Board **feeds/shelters** + seeks guidance → High Commissioner **recommends repatriation** (since men want to return) + **cost sharing**. Eliminate claims of refusal or forced settlement.

18 (Pronoun reference: “their recurrence”) — Correct: C - Anchor the referent to the nearest logical plural: **similar cases** of destitute Indian subjects needing assistance/repatriation, not letters or police encounters.

19 (Analogy / institutional dynamic) — Correct: D - Find the option that mirrors **petition by economic actors** (planters) + **central governmental opposition** (Government of India). Reject scenarios that grant easy approvals or shift to military conscription.

20 (Author’s stance & method) — Correct: C - Identify the **document-driven** narration linking an English poor-law case to imperial migration control and culminating in **opposition** to recruitment—neither advocacy for mass migration nor fiscal polemic.

21 (Inference: precedent concern) — Correct: A - Infer administrative logic: granting repatriation may **invite more claims**, amplifying cost/coordination burdens; not criminalising poverty or blaming police.

Elaborate logical brief (GMAT/LSAT/GRE/CLAT style)

Premises / Evidence

1. **Liverpool episode**: Destitute Punjabi men; local Board legally obliged to provide relief; High Commissioner advises **repatriation** and shares costs.
2. **Official anxiety**: Assistant Secretary warns against a “succession of cases” and urges measures to prevent **recurrence**.
3. **Cuba backdrop (1880s onward)**: Frequent Indian **repatriation requests** from Cuba; family claims for deceased relatives’ assets.
4. **Security/sovereignty concerns**: U.S./Canada complain Cuba is a **transit point** for illegal entry; reports flag Cuba as a **revolutionary hub** in the 1910s.
5. **Labour petitions vs. policy**: Spanish planters seek Indian workers from nearby colonies; **Government of India’s Home Department opposes** the proposal (1881).

Inferences

- A **granted precedent** (cost-shared repatriation) risks **policy contagion**—more stranded subjects will seek the same remedy.
- Imperial authorities perceive Cuba as a **risk nexus** (labour exploitation, illegal migration, revolution), motivating **restrictive migration policy**.
- The state’s **duty of care** at the poor-law level coexists with a **macro policy** of discouraging certain migrations.

Conclusions

- The passage’s through-line: a **micro-case** reveals **macro anxieties**; ultimately the Government of India **resists** opening a pipeline of Indian labour to Cuban plantations.
- Policy goal: **contain recurrence** of assistance-seeking cases and avoid creating permissive channels that complicate imperial control.

Arguments (structure)

- **Narrative induction**: concrete case (Liverpool) → general concern (recurrence) → broader evidence (Cuba patterns) → decisive stance (official opposition).
- **Causal links**: humanitarian relief → precedent risk → migration governance choices.

Assumptions (implicit)

- Administrative decisions **signal** policy and thereby **shape behaviour** (precedent effect).
- Repatriation cases and illegal transit are sufficiently **elastic** to grow if perceived as solvable at the Crown’s expense.
- Importing Indian labour to Cuba would **expose** subjects to exploitation/instability and **strain** imperial management.

Potential paradoxes / tensions

- **Humanitarian vs. deterrence**: Offering compassionate repatriation today may **encourage** tomorrow’s caseload.

- **Local obligation vs. imperial strategy:** Poor-law duties can **conflict** with global migration control priorities.
- **Economic demand vs. subject protection:** Planters' needs collide with the Home Department's **protective restraint**.

Passage 4:

Q22. Correct option: C (*Difficulty: Hard; Line: L3 with support from L1–L2, L9–L15*)

The passage anchors Malaysia's **megadiversity** (L1) and forest/protected-area footprint (L2), then argues this **makes it spectacular** for wildlife watching (L3). It proceeds to marquee taxa and sites (L4–L12) and emphasises that **in-the-wild, guided experiences** surpass sanctuary visits for immediacy (L9–L10, L15–L16). Option **C** synthesises these threads.

Why not A? The text praises Sepilok (L7–L8) but explicitly states that **nothing matches** wild sightings (L9).

Why not B? The author affirms—not downplays—biodiversity and recommends multiple terrestrial sites (L10–L12, L15–L16).

Why not D? It never claims guided tourism is unnecessary; rather, it **endorses** guided tours (L9–L10, L16).

Q23. Correct option: D (*Difficulty: Medium; Line: L6*)

"**Refuge**" contextually denotes a **place of safety/shelter** for the Malayan tiger. "Sanctuary/safe haven" is the closest synonym; the antonym is **exposure/peril**, the opposite condition for a critically endangered species.

Why not A? "Vantage/overlook" concern viewpoint, not protection.

Why not B? "Corridor/bottleneck" are movement/flow terms; not core to "refuge" as safety.

Why not C? "Frontier/hinterland" are spatial-political, not safety vs danger.

Q24. Correct option: B (*Difficulty: Easy–Medium; Lines: L4, L11*)

The passage explicitly says **around 750 bird species**, with **10 hornbill species** (L4), and calls **Royal Belum** the **best place** to see hornbills, with **Tasik Kenyir** close behind (L11).

Why not A? Sepilok is "the world's largest orangutan sanctuary" (L7); Cameron Highlands is mentioned for mountain peacock-pheasant (L12), not orangutan release.

Why not C? Taman Negara is "**at least 130 million years old**" (L15), not 13 million; Mount Tahan is the **highest in Peninsular Malaysia** (L15), not Borneo.

Why not D? Figures invert the text: forest **>50%** (L2) and protected **~14%** (L2), not the reverse.

Q25. Correct option: A (*Difficulty: Medium; Line: L9 with antecedent in L7–L8*)

"**These**" in L9 follows directly after the Sepilok paragraph (L7–L8) about **orangutans**; the author then contrasts sanctuary viewing with **seeing these** (i.e., orangutans) in the wild.

Why not B? Hornbills appear in L4 and are revisited later (L11), but "these" is deictically tied to the immediately preceding subject.

Why not C/D? Elephants and tapirs (L5) and the great slaty woodpecker (L4) are not the immediate antecedents of "these" in the discourse structure.

Q26. Correct option: C (*Difficulty: Medium–Hard; Lines: L7–L9, L10, L16*)

The author values Sepilok (L7–L8) **but** insists **wild** encounters outshine sanctuary viewing (L9), recommending guided tours (L10, L16). Option **C** mirrors this duality: centres provide close education, while guided field experiences deliver authenticity and diversity.

Why not A/D? Both reject the text's hierarchy by claiming captive settings surpass wild experiences—contrary to "nothing matches" (L9).

Why not B? Suggests treks are unnecessary; the author champions treks and guided hikes (L13–L16).

Q27. Correct option: A (*Difficulty: Medium; Lines: L1–L3, L9–L16*)

The tone is **enthusiastic yet grounded**: macro context (megadiversity, forest cover, protected areas—L1–L2) linked to **site-specific guidance** (Kinabatangan, Royal Belum, Fraser's Hill, Taman Negara—L10–L16). It **privileges wild, guided** encounters over captive ones (L9–L10).

Why not B? No ban is urged; hiking is encouraged (L13–L16).

Why not C? The piece is not a transport manual; it's natural-history guidance.

Why not D? The author explicitly points to dependable hornbill zones (L11).

Q28. Correct option: A (Difficulty: Medium; Line: L15)

By stressing **ancient age** (≥130 million years) and offering a **spectrum** of experiences (canopy walkways to multi-day Mount Tahan treks), the text implies a **tiered** design: casual exposure to canopy ecology and deeper immersion for committed trekkers, matching the forest's scale/antiquity.

Why not B? The author never says wildlife is scarce or discourages guided treks; instead they **encourage** them (L16).

Why not C? The age claim is ecological/geological, not a replanting programme.

Why not D? No such prohibitions are stated; the walkways/treks are presented as available (L15–L16).

Passage snapshot (4–5 lines)

This travel–natural history piece pitches Malaysia as a **megadiverse, heavily forested** country whose protected areas make it an elite wildlife destination. After spotlighting marquee birds (incl. hornbills) and mammals (orangutans, pygmy elephants, Malayan tiger), it praises Sepilok's sanctuary role but insists that **guided, in-the-wild sightings surpass captive/semi-wild viewing**. The author then offers a **site map** (Kinabatangan, Royal Belum, Tasik Kenyir, Fraser's Hill/Cameron Highlands) and closes with **Taman Negara's antiquity (≥130M years)** and a tiered menu of hikes. Tone: **enthusiastic yet grounded**; difficulty: **medium** (detail retrieval + inference).

How to read this passage (exam approach)

- **Outline the spine:** macro context (megadiversity/forest/protection) → species roll-call → sanctuaries vs wild → specific hotspots → Taman Negara's age + hiking spectrum.
- **Tag superlatives & numbers** (“~750 birds”, “10 hornbills”, “world's largest” sanctuary, “≥130 million years”).
- **Watch evaluative pivots:** “However, nothing matches seeing...” signals the stance on **wild vs sanctuary**.
- **Link claims to places:** which site for orangutans, hornbills, peacock-pheasant; which park is largest/oldest.

Per-question strategy notes (1–3 lines each)

22 (Main idea) → C - Fuse the opening macro facts with the “nothing matches wild” pivot and the tour/site recommendations. Eliminate options that dismiss biodiversity or deny the need for guides.

23 (Vocab: “refuge”) → D - Read in safety/welfare sense for an endangered species: **sanctuary/safe haven vs exposure/peril**. Avoid movement or geography metaphors (corridor/frontier).

24 (Factual detail) → B - Lift exact data: **~750 birds / 10 hornbills**; **Royal Belum** best for hornbills with **Tasik Kenyir** close behind. Check numbers/places; reject flipped figures and wrong peaks/ages.

25 (Pronoun “these”) → A - Resolve deictic to the immediately prior subject—the **orangutans** of the Sepilok paragraph—then contrast with wild sightings.

26 (Analogy: sanctuary good, wild better) → C - Choose the template that values education at a centre but prioritises **guided field encounters** for authenticity and variety. Discard choices that say “skip wild” or “treks unnecessary”.

27 (Author's stance & method) → A - Identify **enthusiastic yet evidence-based guidance** knitting macro ecology with site-specific advice; emphasis on **ethical guided wild** over captive.

28 (Inference: age + trail design) → A - Ancient forest + spectrum of routes ⇒ **tiered visitor experiences** from canopy tasters to strenuous immersion; no ban/prohibition claims.

Elaborate logical brief (GMAT/LSAT/GRE/CLAT style)

Premises / Evidence

1. **Macro ecology:** Malaysia is **megadiverse**; >50% forested; ~14% protected.
2. **Faunal richness:** **~750 bird species, 10 hornbill species** (incl. rhinoceros hornbill); flagship mammals incl. **orangutans** and the **Malayan tiger** (last refuge).
3. **Sanctuary role:** **Sepilok**—the world's largest orangutan sanctuary—rehabilitates and reintroduces.
4. **Value judgment:** “However, nothing matches seeing **these...** in the wild” → **guided wildlife tours** recommended.
5. **Where to go:** **Kinabatangan** (orangutans), **Royal Belum** (best hornbills) with **Tasik Kenyir** close; **Fraser's Hill/Cameron Highlands** (mountain peacock-pheasant).
6. **Taman Negara:** Malaysia's **largest NP**; rainforest **≥130M years**; offers **canopy walkways to multi-day treks** (e.g., **Mount Tahan**, highest in Peninsular Malaysia).

Inferences

- **Sanctuary vs wild:** Centres are valuable for rehab/education, but **wild sightings** provide superior immediacy and ecological authenticity.
- **Tiered design:** The park's range of trails implies **graduated engagement**—from casual visitors to committed trekkers.

- **Guides add value:** Given complexity/scale, guided tours likely enhance probability and ethics of encounters.

Conclusions

- Malaysia's **ecological base + protected infrastructure** → one of the best regions for **guided, in-the-wild wildlife watching**; sanctuaries complement, not replace, field experiences.
- **Taman Negara's antiquity** and route diversity are aligned to match visitors' commitment levels.

Arguments (structure)

- **Context → Exemplars → Evaluation → Prescription:** macro biodiversity → species/sites → "wild > sanctuary for immediacy" → go with **guided tours** in specified hotspots.
- **Authority via specifics:** numbers/superlatives and place-names serve as credibility anchors.

Assumptions (implicit)

- Guided tours are **responsible/ethical** and improve sightings/impact compared to unguided attempts.
- Sanctuary viewing, though close, is **less authentic** than observing animals in natural behaviour patterns.
- Infrastructure (walkways/treks) is **compatible** with conservation when managed.

Potential paradoxes / tensions

- **Access vs authenticity:** Sanctuaries offer proximity; wild offers authenticity—both are recommended but **ranked**.
- **Ancient forest vs visitor pressure:** Very old ecosystems hosting **modern infrastructure** (walkways/treks) require careful balance.
- **Man-made lake (Tasik Kenyir) aiding hornbill viewing:** human-altered habitats can sometimes improve detectability.

Passage 5:

Q29. Correct option: A (Difficulty: Hard; Line: L18)

The passage culminates in a prescriptive appeal—"The world cannot allow Israel to continue devastating Gaza any further" (L18)—after laying out evidence: IPC's formal famine declaration (L4–L6), blockade and direct control of aid (L9–L11), killings at food centres (L12–L13), escalation despite outrage and a ceasefire acceptance (L14), and an alleged **intent to destroy** Palestinian society (L16). Option **A** alone synthesises that evidentiary chain into a thesis plus injunction.

Why not B? The piece **does** assign responsibility repeatedly (L8–L13, L16) and is not agnostic.

Why not C? It is not a narrow administrative critique of the GHF; the policy frame is broader (blockade, control, lethal force, L9–L13).

Why not D? The text asserts policies **have worsened hunger**, not merely warned of it (L9–L11).

Q30. Correct option: B (Difficulty: Medium; Line: L3)

"Token concerns" (L3) means **perfunctory/nominal** expressions lacking meaningful effect; the fitting antonym is **substantive/meaningful**. Thus **B** matches both the contextual synonym and the antonym.

Why not A? "Ceremonial/formalistic" is close, but "diplomatic/neutral" is not the **opposite** of token; it describes stance, not depth/impact.

Why not C? "Abundant/plentiful" contradicts the sense; the passage critiques **insufficiency**, not excess.

Why not D? "Empathetic/compassionate" misreads tone—"token" criticises **superficiality**, not empathy level; "indifferent/apathetic" isn't the precise antonym of token's **lack of substance**.

Q31. Correct option: C (Difficulty: Medium; Line: L9)

The text says that in **March 2025** Israel imposed a **total three-month blockade** (L9), and later, upon allowing limited food, the **GHF replaced** the UN-led distribution (L10). **C** reproduces these facts.

Why not A? L4 explicitly says the IPC **confirmed** a man-made famine; it did not refuse.

Why not B? L13 states **more than 1,300** deaths at food centres since May, not fewer than 200.

Why not D? Blockade since **2007** (L8), and UN distribution was **replaced** (L10), so both claims are false.

Q32. Correct option: D (Difficulty: Easy; Line: L10)

In "**When it began allowing a limited amount of food...**" (L10), the antecedent is **Israel**, the only subject controlling entry and then easing to permit limited food.

Why not A? The GHF appears as a consequence of that allowance; it did not do the allowing.

Why not B? The UN was the **previous** distributor and is not the actor here.

Why not C? Hamas is not the grammatical antecedent in this sentence and is not said to control inbound goods.

Q33. Correct option: A (Difficulty: Hard; Line: L14)

Option **A** parallels the passage's causal chain: warnings → blockages and control (L9–L11) → lethal distribution sites (L12–L13) → **international outrage + mediation-backed truce** (Qatar/Egypt) yet **intensified** operations (L14). It captures the **policy → harm → condemnation → escalation** arc.

Why not B/C/D? Each **reverses** or **sanitises** causality—showing improved outcomes, independent audits, or safe queue management—contradicting the text's account of worsening harm and escalation (L11–L14).

Q34. Correct option: B (Difficulty: Medium-Hard; Line: L4)

The voice is **editorial and accusatory**, not neutral: a **man-made famine** is declared (L4–L6); Israeli policies (blockade, control of aid, lethal force) are indicted (L9–L13); the piece assigns **intent to destroy** (L16) and ends with a **normative** call (L18). Option **B** alone captures tone (condemnatory), method (data + moral argument), and purpose (prescriptive).

Why not A? The text is plainly not neutral (L16, L18).

Why not C? It does not defend crowd-control or GHF; it condemns killings and replacement of UN mechanisms (L10–L13).

Why not D? The piece is deeply political and moral, not a logistics brief (L4–L6, L9–L18).

Q35. Correct option: A (Difficulty: Medium; Line: L6)

The IPC's mortality rate "**two in every 10,000 daily**" (L6), alongside "**one in five households** extreme shortages" and "**a third or more** children acutely malnourished" (L5), indicates a **Stage-5-type** humanitarian collapse in plain terms: mortality and malnutrition consistent with a **famine-level** emergency. **A** states that the pattern reflects systemic deprivation, fitting the passage's "man-made famine" framing (L4).

Why not B? The data are population-level, not a single-site anomaly (L5–L6).

Why not C? The text says this is the **first officially declared famine in West Asia** (L4), not seasonal variation.

Why not D? The metrics do not imply improvement and the option adds an irrelevant exclusion; the passage stresses **worsening** conditions (L9–L14).

Passage snapshot (4–5 lines)

This editorial assembles **multiple strands of evidence** (IPC declaration, blockade chronology, control of aid logistics, killings at food centres) to argue that Gaza is undergoing a **man-made famine**. It assigns **political responsibility** primarily to Israeli policy choices and says symbolic ("token") responses from allies have been ineffective. The piece closes with a **prescriptive injunction** that the world must not allow further devastation. Tone: **strongly condemnatory, data-referencing**; difficulty: **medium-hard** (tight timelines, causal chaining, stance detection).

How to read this passage (approach)

- **Map the chain:** warnings → IPC confirmation → policy steps (blockade → GHF replacing UN) → humanitarian outcomes (hunger, deaths at centres) → reaction (outrage/ceasefire offer) → **escalation** → concluding call to action.
- **Tag numbers:** "one in five households...", "a third or more children...", "two in 10,000 daily", ">1,300 deaths", "three-month blockade".
- **Separate fact vs. opinion:** IPC figures and dates = facts; claims like "intent to destroy" = editorial inference.
- **Spot stance markers:** words like "man-made", "token", "cannot allow" signal authorial judgment.

Per-question strategy notes (1–3 lines each)

29 (Main idea) — Correct: A - Synthesize **evidence + conclusion:** IPC famine metrics + blockade/aid control + deaths → author's **injunction** that the world must not permit further devastation. Avoid answers that narrow blame to logistics or soften the conclusion.

30 (Vocab: "token") — Correct: B - Read "token" as **perfunctory/nominal**; look for an antonym that stresses **substance/meaningfulness**. Don't confuse tone (diplomatic/neutral) with **depth**.

31 (Factual detail) — Correct: C - Track the **timeline:** March 2025 three-month **total blockade** → later **limited food** → **GHF replaces** UN distribution. Eliminate options that contradict IPC's famine confirmation or the casualty count.

32 (Pronoun reference "it") — Correct: D - Resolve the subject that **controls entry** of goods: **Israel**. GHF appears only after the allowance; the UN is the displaced actor.

33 (Analogy / logic) — Correct: A - Match the full causal arc: **dismiss warnings → block supplies → swap neutral agency for loyalist → lethal distribution points → outrage/mediation → intensification**. Reject scenarios with improved outcomes or lifted restrictions.

34 (Author's stance) — Correct: B - Identify **condemnatory editorial** framing (man-made famine, responsibility attribution, prescriptive close). Avoid “neutral brief” or “defence of methods.”

35 (Inference from metrics) — Correct: A - Use IPC thresholds: high malnutrition + daily mortality ⇒ **systemic famine-level emergency**, not localized glitches or seasonal variance.

Elaborate logical brief (GMAT/LSAT/GRE/CLAT style)

Premises / Evidence

1. **Repeated warnings** from NGOs, doctors, civil defence about looming famine.
2. **IPC confirmation** of a “man-made famine” with quantified prevalence and mortality (≥20% households extreme shortage; ≥⅓ children acutely malnourished; ~2/10,000 daily deaths).
3. **Policy chronology**: long-standing blockade (since 2007) → **tightened** after Oct 7, 2023 → **total 3-month blockade** (Mar 2025) → limited food allowed while **GHF replaces** UN distribution.
4. **Outcomes**: acute hunger for hundreds of thousands; **>1,300 killed** at food centres; **attacks intensified** despite outrage and ceasefire acceptance via mediators.
5. **Editorial claim**: intent extends beyond defeating Hamas; it targets **Palestinian life and society**.

Intermediate inferences

- **Causal linkage**: blockade + control of distribution ⇒ **systemic deprivation** consistent with IPC famine criteria.
- **Agency inference**: replacing an established UN mechanism with GHF shifts **control and accountability**, not merely logistics.
- **Policy-to-harm escalation**: continuing/intensifying operations despite a ceasefire proposal suggests **intent beyond stated aims**.

Conclusions

- The crisis is a **man-made famine**; responsibility is principally tied to Israeli policy.
- **Global normative action** is required: “the world cannot allow” further devastation.

Argument structure

- **Evidence aggregation** (metrics, timeline, fatal events) → **Causal argument** (policy → famine) → **Moral attribution** (intent to destroy) → **Call to action** (injunction to the world).

Assumptions (implicit)

- IPC classification is **credible and decisive** for declaring famine.
- Replacing the UN with GHF **reduced neutrality/effectiveness**, worsening access.
- Killings at food centres are **policy-linked**, not isolated crowd incidents.
- International pressure could **constrain** the policy trajectory (hence the injunction).

Potential paradoxes / tensions

- **Aid control vs humanitarian aims**: a body named “Humanitarian Foundation” associated with **lethal crowd control**.
- **Ceasefire acceptance vs intensified attacks**: diplomatic progress coexists with **military escalation**.
- **Visibility vs causality**: deaths at distribution points are highly visible; **mortality from malnutrition+disease** is less visible but central to famine designation.

Passage 6:

Q36. Correct option: A (Difficulty: Hard; Line: L23 with support from L3–L4, L16–L18, L24)

The passage charts a clinician’s movement from **scepticism** (L3) to cautious openness (L4) and anchors the plausibility of conch-blowing in **airway muscle training** with **scientific backing** (L23) and evidence that exercises can help **mild–moderate** OSA (L24). It simultaneously keeps **standard treatments** central (L16–L18).

Why B? Overstates: nowhere does the author recommend **replacing** CPAP; CPAP remains the **gold standard** (L17).

Why C? Minimises danger; OSA is serious with neurocognitive and cardiometabolic risks (L13–L15).

Why D? Contradicted by L19–L20 (lifestyle helps) and L23–L24 (exercises have backing).

Q37. Correct option: B (Difficulty: Medium; Line: L7)

“Novel” here means **new/original**; its antonym in this context is **familiar/established**. The sentence contrasts long-standing cultural use (L6) with a **new** therapeutic suggestion (L7).

Why A? “Ornate/plain” describes style, not temporal/innovative status.

Why C? “Speculative/factual” concerns evidentiary status, not newness.

Why D? “Symbolic/literal” concerns meaning type, not novelty.

Q38. Correct option: C (Difficulty: Medium; Line: L17 with support from L16, L18)

The text defines standard care as keeping the airway open (L16). **CPAP** delivers steady airflow acting like an **internal splint** (L17); options also include **oral appliances** (jaw advancement), **tonsil/adenoid surgery**, and **electrical stimulation** methods (L18).

Why A? Misdefines CPAP (“partial”) and falsely claims abandonment; CPAP is “**gold standard**” (L17).

Why B? Mischaracterises priorities; CPAP and oral devices remain central (L16–L18).

Why D? Lifestyle helps (L19–L20) but is not said to **suffice for severe** OSA; the text keeps device/surgical options in play (L16–L18).

Q39. Correct option: D (Difficulty: Medium; Line: L7)

The clause “the suggestion that it might help” points back to the **conch shell** used as a trumpet (i.e., the **practice of blowing it**) introduced in L5 and framed as **novel** when tied to therapy (L7).

Why A? The condition doesn’t “help” itself.

Why B? Cultures are not the referent; the novelty is therapeutic application, not anthropological usage.

Why C? “Airway muscle training” is named later (L23) as a concept; the pronoun precedes that label and refers to the **conch-blowing practice**.

Q40. Correct option: A (Difficulty: Medium-Hard; Line: L22 with support from L23–L24)

L22 explains that blowing through a narrow opening **trains** upper-airway muscles; L23 states this training has **scientific backing**; L24 notes improvements in **mild–moderate** OSA. Option A mirrors this **mechanism → evidence → adjunct** framing.

Why B? Headphones don’t address airway patency; apnoea is not mere noise-arousal.

Why C? Relaxes tissues—the passage warns alcohol/smoking make tissues **floppier** (L20), worsening symptoms.

Why D? Avoiding exercise has no mechanistic link to preventing airway collapse; the text recommends **training**, not deconditioning (L22–L24).

Q41. Correct option: B (Difficulty: Medium; Line: L23 with support from L3–L4, L16–L18, L24)

The author’s tone is **clinical and cautious**: from **scepticism** (L3) to measured openness (L4), grounded in **scientific backing** (L23) and modest outcome claims (improvements in mild–moderate OSA, L24). CPAP remains the **gold standard** with other options listed (L16–L18).

Why A? Overclaim: no replacement of CPAP is advocated; CPAP is affirmed (L17).

Why C? Opposite: targeted exercises are explicitly supported (L23–L24).

Why D? The piece is not cultural only; it makes **medical** claims and mechanisms (L22–L24).

Q42. Correct option: A (Difficulty: Medium; Line: L22 with support from L24)

From L22’s mechanism—blowing trains upper-airway muscles—and L24’s evidence—exercises can improve **mild–moderate** OSA—the reasonable inference is that **conch-blowing could serve as a targeted adjunct**. It does **not** supplant standard therapy.

Why B? Guarantees/cure claims are absent; severity gradation matters (L24).

Why C? Misreads physiology: collapse relates to **insufficient** tone; relaxation can worsen it (cf. L20).

Why D? Behavioural/mechanical training is **explicitly** supported (L23–L24); electrical stimulation is only one option (L18).

Passage snapshot (4–5 lines)

A sleep-medicine clinician reacts skeptically to a newsy claim—**blowing a conch shell** for sleep apnoea—then moves to cautious openness. The passage explains **obstructive sleep apnoea (OSA)**, its risks, and **standard care** (CPAP as gold standard, oral devices, surgery, hypoglossal stimulation), plus **lifestyle** levers (weight, alcohol, smoking). It introduces **airway-muscle training**: blowing through a narrow opening can strengthen upper-airway tone. Bottom line: conch-blowing may be a **plausible adjunct** for **mild–moderate** OSA; it **does not replace** established therapies.

How to read this (exam approach)

- **Trace the arc:** skepticism → mechanism (airway training) → evidence → scope limits (mild–moderate) → place in the treatment ladder (adjunct to CPAP et al.).
- **Underline definitions** (OSA, CPAP) and **comparatives** (“gold standard”, “nothing replaces”).
- **Separate facts vs. stance:** data about risks and treatments vs. the author’s **cautious** endorsement of a narrow role for conch-blowing.
- **Watch qualifiers** (“might”, “could”, “adjunct”) and **mechanism words** (tone, splint, stimulation).

Per-question notes (1–3 lines each)

36 (Main idea) → A - Fuse the stance shift (skepticism → cautious openness) with treatment hierarchy: CPAP remains **primary**, conch-blowing sits as **adjunct** via airway-muscle training—especially for **mild–moderate** OSA.

37 (Vocab: “novel”) → B - Contrast “practice isn’t new” with “what’s **novel** is its medical use”: pick **new/original** vs **familiar/established**—not style or literal/symbolic pairs.

38 (Standard care) → C - Match the full list and mechanism: **CPAP** = steady airflow “internal splint”; plus **oral advancement devices, tonsil/adenoid surgery, and electrical stimulation**. Reject the misdefinition “continuous partial”.

39 (Pronoun “it”) → D - Resolve to the nearest meaningful antecedent that “might help”: the **conch-blowing practice** (conch used like a trumpet), not “airway training” (named later).

40 (Analogy) → A - Keep the **mechanism and role** intact: small-aperture training strengthens upper-airway muscles, can **improve** mild–moderate OSA, and remains **adjunct** to primary treatments. Headphones/herbal tea/avoid-exercise don’t target patency.

41 (Stance & method) → B - Clinician’s caution: evidence-aware, limited endorsement, **no replacement** of CPAP; recognizes lifestyle and device/surgical options.

42 (Inference) → A - Translate mechanism → implication: conch-blowing **could** help as targeted strengthening, especially for **mild–moderate** OSA; avoid absolute cure claims or dismissal of behavioral therapy.

Elaborate logical brief (GMAT/LSAT/GRE/CLAT style)

Premises / Evidence

1. **Condition:** OSA = repetitive upper-airway collapse; causes arousals, desaturations, and risks (accidents, hypertension, heart disease).
2. **Standard of care:** **CPAP** (gold standard) + **oral appliances, tonsil/adenoid surgery, electrical stimulation**.
3. **Lifestyle:** weight loss helps; alcohol/smoking worsen floppiness → poorer tone.
4. **Mechanism:** blowing through a narrow opening **trains** upper-airway muscles to stay **open/firm** (airway-muscle training).
5. **Evidence class:** studies show **oropharyngeal exercises** can improve **mild–moderate** OSA.

Inferences

- If airway-muscle training improves OSA, then **conch-blowing**—a practical instantiation of that training—**may** confer benefit.
- Benefits are most plausible where **tone deficits** dominate (mild–moderate OSA), not where collapse is severe or multifactorial.
- Adjunctive measures do **not** obviate the need for CPAP or other definitive therapies in appropriate patients.

Conclusions

- The author endorses **cautious exploration** of conch-blowing as an **adjunct** within a clinician-guided plan, **maintaining** the primacy of established treatments and lifestyle changes.

Argument types

- **Mechanistic analogy:** conch-blowing ≈ other narrow-aperture or oropharyngeal exercises.
- **Inductive:** from studies on targeted exercises → tentative applicability of conch-blowing.
- **Qualification:** scope limited to **mild–moderate** cases; language hedged (“may”, “could”).

Assumptions (implicit)

- Conch-blowing **adequately recruits** the same muscle groups as validated exercises.
- Patients can practice with **adherence and safety** (no undue pressure/ear issues).
- Any cultural practice can be **standardized** into a repeatable therapeutic protocol.

Potential paradoxes / tensions

- **Traditional object vs modern therapy:** a beach shell entering evidence-based care.
- **Relaxation vs tone:** many bedtime habits relax muscles (alcohol) while this approach seeks **firmness**—opposite physiological goals.

- **Severity gap:** patients most eager for non-device options may have **severe** OSA—precisely where conch-blowing is **least** likely to suffice.

Passage 7:

Q43. Correct option: A (*Difficulty: Hard; Line: L15–L17*)

The thesis rejects prohibition as the optimal tool (L5, L6–L8) and foregrounds multiple **costs**: economic (L9–L11), fiscal (L12–L13), and investment-sentiment/policy-credibility (L14). The culminating recommendation is **regulation** rather than a ban—“more considered/prudent approach... light-touch... clarity, checks, redressal” (L15–L17). **A** alone synthesises these strands.

Why not B? It endorses prohibition despite the passage’s explicit doubts (L5, L6–L8) and contrary economic/fiscal evidence (L9–L14).

Why not C? Misreads GST data; the author says revenues **rose 412%** post-28% GST (L13) and warns a ban will **hurt** finances (L12).

Why not D? The ban covers both **skill and chance** (L2); the option reverses this and invokes a rationale not in the text.

Q44. Correct option: B (*Difficulty: Medium; Line: L1*)

“**Fell** blow” is idiomatic for **deadly/grievous**; the natural antonym is **benign/beneficial**, the opposite of ruinous impact. **B** aligns with the collocation and tone of L1.

Why not A? Inverts sense (gentle ≠ fell); “harsh/severe” is the **synonym**, not the antonym.

Why not C? “Accidental/unplanned” addresses intent, not severity.

Why not D? “Minor/trivial” is antonymic but lacks a matching strong synonym; the pair doesn’t fit the idiom.

Q45. Correct option: C (*Difficulty: Medium; Line: L2, L13, L14*)

C faithfully compiles facts: ban covers **skill + chance**; ad/promo prohibited (L2); GST receipts **rose 412%** to ₹6,909 cr from ₹1,349 cr (L13); EY investments ₹22,931 cr (L14).

Why not A? Inverts PwC numbers—text says ₹16,500 cr (2023) rising to ₹26,500 cr (2028) (L10).

Why not B? Rate is **28%**, not 18%; collections rose, not fell (L13).

Why not D? Offshore markets are **beyond jurisdiction**, **harder** to police (L6–L7), the opposite of the claim.

Q46. Correct option: D (*Difficulty: Easy; Line: L6–L7*)

“**This**” refers to the immediately preceding causal condition: a ban **driving** activity to **unregulated/offshore** markets **beyond Indian jurisdiction** (L6), which “will make it harder to address” concerns (L7).

Why not A/B/C? None is the antecedent in the syntactic/logic chain; the referent is the **offshoring** of activity due to the ban, not GST, PwC projections, or parliamentary debate.

Q47. Correct option: A (*Difficulty: Hard; Line: L6–L8, L9–L13, L17*)

The passage’s core logic is **prohibition → offshoring/illegality → weaker oversight + worse harms → fiscal/economic damage → argue for regulated clarity**. **A** mirrors that chain precisely and culminates in a supervised/licensing alternative (cf. L17).

Why not B/C/D? They claim prohibitions/nationalisation/curfews cleanly achieve aims **without** displacement or harm—contradicting L6–L8 and the cautionary thrust of the piece.

Q48. Correct option: B (*Difficulty: Medium; Line: L15–L17*)

The tone is a **critical, evidence-driven editorial**: it flags social harms (L2–L4) yet argues bans underperform (L6–L8) and impose **economic/fiscal/investment** costs (L9–L14). The prescriptive close urges a **prudent, light-touch regulatory** design with **clarity, checks, and grievance redressal** (L15–L17).

Why not A? The author explicitly questions bans (L5–L8).

Why not C? It is not neutral; it advocates a path (L17).

Why not D? No boosterism; the tone is policy-analytic, not promotional.

Q49. Correct option: C (*Difficulty: Medium; Line: L14*)

“**Capricious**” policy = **erratic/whimsical**, unsettling investors; the antonym is **consistent/steadfast** policy, which would inspire confidence. **C** fits the investment-sentiment warning in L14.

Why not A/B/D? These address unrelated axes (spending legality/opacity), not volatility vs reliability of policymaking.

Q50. Correct option: D (*Difficulty: Medium; Line: L8*)

By saying history is **replete** with failed bans/prohibitions/controls (L8), the author implies the **current ban will likely miss its aims**, strengthening the case for **regulatory** solutions. **D** captures that inference and links it to the passage's concluding recommendations (L15–L17).

Why not A? The author **relies** on historical analogy to argue policy, not dismiss it.

Why not B? Recommends **more ban**, contrary to the lesson drawn (L8).

Why not C? The author does **not** propose dormancy; they actively prescribe regulatory architecture (L17).

Passage snapshot (4–5 lines)

This editorial argues that a **total ban** on online money games (skill + chance) is a **blunt, counter-productive tool**. It will likely **push activity offshore**, reduce oversight, destroy jobs/revenues, and rattle investor confidence—despite the government's concerns about addiction, fraud, and losses. The piece points to **data** (PwC revenues, GST collections up **412%**, EY investments) and India's **poor historical record** with bans. It recommends a **"light-touch" regulatory framework** with clarity, checks/balances, and grievance redressal instead of prohibition.

How to read this passage (exam approach)

- **Trace the logic chain:** harms cited → proposed instrument (ban) → predicted consequences (offshoring, revenue/job hit, credibility loss) → data support → **policy alternative** (light-touch regulation).
- **Tag the numbers & proper nouns:** ₹16,500 → ₹26,500 (PwC), **412%** GST jump to ₹6,909 cr, **₹22,931 cr** investments (EY), 28% GST.
- **Spot stance markers:** "replete with examples... never achieved", "capricious", "more considered approach".
- **Differentiate diagnosis vs remedy:** social harms acknowledged; disagreement is about **means**, not **ends**.

Per-question strategy notes (1–3 lines each)

43 (Main idea / recommendation) → A - Synthesize costs (economic, fiscal, credibility) with the prescriptive close: **regulate lightly with safeguards** rather than ban. Reject options that defend prohibition or misread GST effects.

44 (Vocab: "fell blow") → B - Read the idiom in context of industry impact: **deadly/grievous** vs **benign/beneficial**. Don't drift to intent ("accidental") or degree ("minor/trivial") mismatches.

45 (Detail check) → C - Lift exact facts: ban covers **skill + chance**, ad/promo prohibited; **412%** GST rise to **₹6,909 cr** (from ₹1,349 cr); **₹22,931 cr** investments. Eliminate flipped numbers/rates and the "easier enforcement" claim.

46 (Pronoun "This") → D - Anchor antecedent to the preceding clause: the **shift to unregulated/offshore markets** makes addressing concerns harder—not GST, PwC, or debate.

47 (Analogy) → A - Map the causal script: **ban → offshoring/illegality → weaker control + revenue/job loss → recommend supervised/licensed regime**.

48 (Stance & method) → B - Identify a **critical, evidence-driven editorial** advocating **light-touch regulation**; it is neither a blanket pro-ban piece nor a neutral abstract.

49 (Vocab: "capricious") → C - Investor-sentiment context: **erratic/whimsical** policy vs **consistent/steadfast** policy. Other pairs miss the volatility axis.

50 (Inference) → D - "Replete with failed bans" ⇒ this ban will **likely** miss its aims → strengthens case for **regulation over prohibition**. Avoid choices that call history irrelevant or recommend a bigger ban.

Elaborate logical brief (GMAT/LSAT/GRE/CLAT style)

Premises / Evidence

1. **Policy act:** Parliament passes a bill effectively **banning** online money games (skill + chance) and **prohibiting advertising/promotion**.
2. **Government rationale:** addiction, mental-health harms, financial losses; risks of **fraud/money-laundering**.
3. **Historical premise:** India's record shows bans/controls **"almost never"** achieve stated aims.
4. **Economic data:** PwC—segment **₹16,500 cr (2023)** → projected **₹26,500 cr (2028)**; GST at **28%** led to a **412%** rise to **₹6,909 cr** in six months; EY—**₹22,931 cr** invested (2019–Dec 2023).
5. **Jurisdictional premise:** bans **offshore** activity beyond Indian reach, **weakening oversight**.

Inferences

- **Causal:** Prohibition ⇒ displacement to **offshore/illegal** markets ⇒ **harder** to police harms; also **erodes** tax take, jobs, and credibility.
- **Prudential:** Since fiscal flows surged post-GST, a ban likely **reduces** revenues without solving harms.

2026

- **Policy design:** A **light-touch regulatory** regime (clear rules, KYC/AML, audits, grievance redressal) better aligns enforcement capacity with social goals.

Conclusions

- A sweeping ban is a **misfiring instrument**; India should adopt **regulation with checks/balances** and robust redressal rather than prohibition.

Argument structure

- **Acknowledgement of harms** → **Critique of instrument** (ban) with history + economics + jurisdiction → **Prescriptive alternative** (light-touch regulation).
- Relies on **inductive accumulation** of evidence and **comparative policy reasoning**.

Assumptions (implicit)

- Offshoring will be **material** and **non-trivial** (i.e., users will switch).
- Regulators can implement **effective oversight** (KYC/AML, advertising norms, age-gating, spending caps).
- Investment/jobs/tax effects are **sensitive** to legal certainty and will deteriorate under prohibition.
- Addiction and laundering are **more manageable** under a **regulated** framework than under a ban-driven black market.

Potential paradoxes / tensions

- **Moral urgency vs practical efficacy:** a ban **signals resolve** yet **undercuts** enforcement by pushing activity offshore.
- **Revenue vs harm reduction:** high GST collections could **coexist** with social harms; the question is **which** regime best mitigates both.
- **Credibility vs flexibility:** swift bans show decisiveness but create a **capricious policy** image that chills capital.

SECTION B: - CURRENT AFFAIRS (INCLUDING GENERAL KNOWLEDGE)

Q51. Answer: C. July 1, 2024 [Difficulty: Easy]

Explanation: These three laws, replacing the IPC, CrPC, and Evidence Act, were enacted to create a citizen-centric legal framework and came into force on **July 1, 2024**

- Options A and B predate the actual implementation.
- Option D is too late, post the effective date.

Q52. Answer: D. Jasprit Bumrah [Difficulty: Easy]

Explanation:

India clinched the title in the 2024 T20 World Cup, with **Jasprit Bumrah** earning **Player of the Series** honours.

Q53. Answer: B. Egypt, Ethiopia, Iran, UAE, and Indonesia [Difficulty: Medium]

Explanation:

BRICS expanded in 2024 to include **Egypt, Ethiopia, Iran, and the UAE**, and **Indonesia** joined in January 2025

Q54. Answer: A. China in 2026, India in 2027 [Difficulty: Easy]

Explanation: India and China agreed to support each other's BRICS summits: **China will back India's hosting in 2026**, and **India will reciprocate in 2027**

Q55. Answer: B. Home Affairs [Difficulty: Medium]

Explanation: The **Registrar General of India (RGI)** operates under the **Ministry of Home Affairs**

Q56. Answer: A. Exercise Maitree [Difficulty: Medium]

Explanation: **Exercise Maitree** is the long-standing joint military drill between India and Thailand

Q57. Answer: B. August 23 – Chandrayaan-3 successful soft-landing [Difficulty: Medium]

Explanation: National Space Day in India is celebrated on **August 23**, commemorating the **Chandrayaan-3** successful soft-landing on the Moon

Q58. Answer: A. Naya Bharat [Difficulty: Easy]

Explanation: The **national theme** for India's **79th Independence Day in 2025** was "**Naya Bharat**", reflecting the vision of a developed India.

Q59. Answer: B. Bridging Research, Innovation, and Policy for a Sustainable Future [Difficulty: Medium]

Explanation: The **TRIPS 2025** (Technology, Research, Innovation, and Policy Summit) at IIT Kanpur carried the theme: **Bridging Research, Innovation, and Policy for a Sustainable Future**

Q60. Answer: D. 50% tariff on Indian exports [Difficulty: Easy]

Explanation: The U.S. imposed an additional **25% tariff**, making the total duty **50%** on Indian-origin goods, citing India's increased imports of Russian oil.

Q61. Answer: B. INS Udaygiri and INS Himgiri [Difficulty: Medium]

Explanation: The Indian Navy commissioned two advanced stealth frigates—**INS Udaygiri and INS Himgiri**—at Vizag, marking the first simultaneous induction of such warships from different shipyards

Q62. Answer: C. Serengeti 2.0 [Difficulty: Hard]

Explanation: Interpol's "Serengeti 2.0" operation (June–August 2025) resulted in 1,209 arrests, recovery of nearly US\$97.4 million, and seizure of costly crypto-mining equipment across Africa and the UK.

Q63. Answer: B. Media access for international journalists [Difficulty: Medium]

Explanation: The Media Freedom Coalition urged Israel to grant journalists immediate access to Gaza, citing safety and transparency concerns during escalating conflict.

Q64. Answer: B. Steam atmospheres over exotic phases of water on sub-Neptunes [Difficulty: Hard]

Explanation: Researchers modeled "steam worlds"—sub-Neptune exoplanets with steamy atmospheres over phases of water neither liquid nor gas, expanding our understanding beyond our solar system

Q65. Answer: D [Difficulty: Medium]

Explanation:

- **Option D is correct:** Article 326 provides for universal adult suffrage, and the **61st Constitutional Amendment, 1988**, reduced the voting age from 21 to 18 years. Moreover, the **right to vote is a statutory right**, not a fundamental right, and can be amended by ordinary law of Parliament.
- **Option A is incorrect:** The voting age is 18, not 21.
- **Option B is incorrect:** It was the **61st Amendment**, not the 42nd, that reduced the age.
- **Option C is incorrect:** Right to vote is a statutory right, not a fundamental right.

Q66. Answer: B. Grand Collar of the National Order of the Southern Cross [Difficulty: Medium]

Explanation:

- **Option B is correct:** The Indian PM was awarded Brazil's highest civilian honor, the **Grand Collar of the National Order of the Southern Cross**.
- **Option A** (Order of Rio Branco) is another Brazilian order but not the highest civilian award.
- **Option C** (Order of the Rising Sun) is Japan's honor.
- **Option D** (Order of Prince Henry) is Portugal's civilian award.

Q67. Answer: D. Australia and United Kingdom [Difficulty: Medium]

Explanation:

- **Option D is correct:** The **Geelong Treaty** is a landmark 50-year defence cooperation agreement signed between **Australia and the UK** under **AUKUS Pillar I**.
- **Option A:** The US is a founding member of AUKUS but not part of this bilateral treaty.
- **Option C:** UK–New Zealand ties are strong but not under AUKUS Pillar I.
- **Option B:** Australia–Canada are both Commonwealth nations, but no such defence treaty exists under AUKUS.

Q68. Answer: B. The US contributes nearly 8% of UNESCO's budget, and its exit may create geopolitical space for powers like China. [Difficulty: Medium]

Explanation:

- **Option B is correct:** The US exit marks its **third withdrawal from UNESCO**, and as it contributes ~8% of the body's budget, the decision is expected to **create space for China's influence** while weakening multilateralism.
- **Option A is incorrect:** This is the **third** US exit, not the first.
- **Option C is incorrect:** The reason cited was UNESCO's "woke and divisive causes" and "anti-Israel bias," not purely budgetary.
- **Option D is incorrect:** The move weakens, rather than strengthens, trust in multilateral institutions.

Q69. Answer: A. It was established under the Rome Statute adopted in 1998 and entered into force in 2002. [Difficulty: Easy]

Explanation:

- **Option A is correct:** The ICC was established by the **Rome Statute (1998, effective 2002)** as the first permanent international court to prosecute crimes such as genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and aggression.
- **Option B is incorrect:** The ICC headquarters are in **The Hague, Netherlands**, not Geneva.
- **Option C is incorrect:** India is **not a party** to the Rome Statute.
- **Option D is incorrect:** The ICC is **not a UN body**; it is an independent institution, though it has a cooperative relationship with the UN.

Q70. Answer: B. Iceland is ranked first, while Russia is ranked the least peaceful country at 163rd [Difficulty: Medium].

Explanation:

- **Option B is correct:** The Global Peace Index ranked **Iceland as the most peaceful** nation (first place), while **Russia ranked 163rd** as the least peaceful.
- **Option A is incorrect:** India is ranked **115th**, not 163rd.
- **Option C is incorrect:** South Asia is the **second least peaceful region**, not the most peaceful.
- **Option D is incorrect:** India's rank (115th) keeps it far from the top 50, showing deterioration in peace levels.

Q71. Answer: C. GENIUS Act [Difficulty: Hard]

Explanation:

- **Option C is correct:** The **GENIUS Act** was passed in the US to regulate **stablecoins**, such as Tether (USDT), which is pegged to the dollar.
- **Option A (STABLE Act):** A different proposal, not the current law.
- **Option B (CRYPTO Act) and Option D (DIGITAL Act):** Not actual legislations related to stablecoins.

Q72. Answer: B. Vanuatu [Difficulty: Medium]

Explanation:

- **Option B is correct:** The Pacific Island nation of **Vanuatu**, supported by over 130 countries, spearheaded the request to the UNGA in 2023 to seek an ICJ advisory opinion on climate obligations.
- **Option A (Fiji), C (Tuvalu), and D (Samoa)** are also Small Island Developing States (SIDS) active in climate advocacy but did not lead this particular ICJ initiative.

Q73. Answer: B. Operation Rising Lion [Difficulty: Hard]

Explanation:

- **Option B is correct:** The Israel Defense Forces (IDF) launched **Operation Rising Lion**, a major strike against Iran's nuclear and missile programs.
- **Option A (Operation Desert Storm):** Refers to the 1991 Gulf War led by the US.
- **Option C (Operation Iron Fist):** A generic term, not linked to this event.
- **Option D (Operation Protective Edge):** Was an Israeli operation in Gaza (2014), not against Iran.

Q74. Answer: A. To serve as a global alternative to institutions like the ICJ and the Permanent Court of Arbitration [Difficulty: Hard]

Explanation:

- **Option A is correct:** China established the **IOMed** as a global dispute resolution mechanism, projecting it as an **alternative** to traditional institutions like the **International Court of Justice (ICJ)** and the **Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA)**.
- **Option B:** WTO already has a Dispute Settlement Body; IOMed is not related to trade regulation.
- **Option C:** Climate change disputes are mediated under UNFCCC, not IOMed.
- **Option D:** BRICS has its own New Development Bank (NDB) but not IOMed.

Q75. Answer: C. Divya Deshmukh [Difficulty: Medium]

Explanation:

- **Option C is correct:** **Divya Deshmukh** made history by becoming the **first Indian woman** to win the **FIDE Women's World Cup**, defeating Koneru Humpy in Batumi, Georgia.
- **Option A (Tania Sachdev)** and **Option D (Bhakti Kulkarni)** are top Indian chess players but have not won this title.
- **Option B (Dronavalli Harika)** is a strong Indian GM but hasn't claimed the Women's World Cup either.

Q76. Answer: C. 36th Amendment Act, 1975 [Difficulty: Hard]

Explanation:

- **Option C is correct:** Sikkim became a **full-fledged State** of India through the **36th Constitutional Amendment Act, 1975**.
- **Option B (35th Amendment Act, 1974):** Earlier gave Sikkim the status of an **Associate State** under Article 2A.
- **Option A (34th Amendment Act, 1973):** Concerned land reforms in Kerala, not Sikkim.
- **Option D (42nd Amendment Act, 1976):** Known as the "Mini-Constitution," it brought major structural changes but not Sikkim's statehood.

Q77. Answer: B. Mizoram [Difficulty: Medium]

Explanation:

- **Option B is correct:** The Chief Minister of **Mizoram** officially declared the state as **fully literate**, making it the first in India to achieve **full functional literacy**.
- **Option A (Kerala):** Known as the first state to achieve universal literacy earlier, but not functional literacy in this context.
- **Option C (Tripura)** and **Option D (Himachal Pradesh)** have high literacy rates but have not achieved full functional literacy.

Q78. Answer: B. It was founded by Joseph Pulitzer, a Hungarian-American journalist, and first awarded in 1917. [Difficulty: Medium]

Explanation:

- **Option B is correct:** The Pulitzer Prize was established by **Joseph Pulitzer** (Hungarian-American journalist and newspaper publisher) and first awarded in **1917**. It is administered by **Columbia University, New York City**.
- **Option A is incorrect:** It is not awarded by Harvard University.
- **Option C is incorrect:** It recognizes journalism, letters, and music—not politics/economics specifically.
- **Option D is incorrect:** It predates WWII and was not instituted by the UN.

Q79. Answer: C. 2017 [Difficulty: Easy]

Explanation:

- **Option C is correct:** India, along with Pakistan, was elevated from **observer status (2005)** to **full membership of the SCO in 2017**.
- **Options A and B:** India was still an observer during these years.
- **Option D:** Too late—by 2019 India was already a full member

Q80. Answer: C. Turmeric [Difficulty: Medium]

Explanation:

- **Option C is correct:** India holds the distinction of being the largest **producer, consumer, and exporter of turmeric**, often referred to as the “golden spice.”
- **Option A (Cardamom):** India is a major producer but not the largest globally (Guatemala leads in exports).
- **Option B (Pepper):** Vietnam is the largest producer and exporter, not India.
- **Option D (Clove):** Indonesia dominates clove production, not India.

SECTION C: - LOGICAL REASONING

Q81) Answer: A (Easy)

Detailed Explanation (8–9 lines). From the statement “Hina sits two places anticlockwise from Arjun,” H is positioned at A–2. Equivalently, **Arjun is two places clockwise from Hina** (reverse the move around a circle). Hence the person two clockwise from Hina must be **Arjun**. You can also confirm within the fully derived layout (shown below in later explanations): B–H–C–A–D–G–F–E (clockwise from Bhavna). From Hina at the second position, two steps clockwise land on Arjun. Why others fail: Bhavna is one step anticlockwise from Hina in the final arrangement, not two clockwise; Cyrus is immediately clockwise of Hina (only one step), and Divya is three steps clockwise, not two.

Q82) Answer: D (Medium)

Detailed Explanation. Using the consistent arrangement (clockwise): **B–H–C–A–D–G–F–E**. Counting clockwise from Bhavna (B) to Arjun (A) passes **Hina** then **Cyrus** in that order. Therefore **both Hina and Cyrus** sit between B and A clockwise. Why others fail:

- A (Divya alone) is at A+1 position, not between B and A.
- B (Hina alone) omits Cyrus, who also lies between.
- C (Cyrus alone) omits Hina, who also lies between.

Q83) Answer: A (Medium)

Detailed Explanation. From the same arrangement, starting at **Arjun** and moving clockwise to **Farah**, the intervening seats are **Divya** and **Gopal** — that’s **exactly two persons**. Structural reason: the clues force **Cyrus opposite Farah** and **Eshan opposite Arjun**, pinning the arcs so that A and F are separated by two clockwise seats. Why others fail: three persons is too many; one person is too few; adjacency contradicts the fixed opposites implied by the constraints.

Q84) Answer: D (Medium)

Detailed Explanation. Opposites forced by the clues are: **Cyrus ↔ Farah** (given), **Arjun ↔ Eshan** (given), **Bhavna ↔ Divya**, and **Hina ↔ Gopal** (these follow once the circle is completed consistently). Thus **A (C, F)** and **B (A, E)** are each true; **C (D, G)** is **false** (they are adjacent, not opposite). Therefore the only correct selection is **D (“Both A and B”)**.

Q85) Answer: A (Hard)

Detailed Explanation. One consistent resolution (up to rotation) that satisfies all ten statements is: **B–H–C–A–D–G–F–E** (clockwise). Sketch of deductions:

- Put B at 1 (without loss). “Arjun three clockwise from Bhavna” → A at 4.
- “Counting clockwise from Bhavna, exactly one between B and C” → C at 3.
- “Cyrus opposite Farah” → F at 7.
- “Hina two anticlockwise from Arjun” → H at 2.
- “Divya third clockwise from Hina” → D at 5.
- “Gopal immediately clockwise of Divya” → G at 6.
- “Eshan opposite Arjun” → E at 8.
- Check the non-opposite condition for B/H vs F, and the E ↔ G anticlockwise spacing; both hold. Only **Option A** matches this order exactly; B/C/D misplace one or more neighbors/opposites.

Q86. Answer: A (Easy)

Detailed Explanation:

- From Premise 2, there exist some **raptors** that are **migratory birds** (“some R are M” gives existence).
- Premise 3 says **no migratory birds are nocturnal** (M and N are disjoint). So those “some R that are M” are **not nocturnal**.

- Therefore, **some raptors are not nocturnal** (\therefore “some R are not N”) — this is exactly option **A**. The “middle term” here is **migratory birds**, linking raptors to (not) nocturnal via Premise 3.
- Why **B** fails: Premise 4 makes all **owls nocturnal** ($O \subseteq N$) while Premise 3 makes **migratory birds** disjoint from **nocturnal**; hence **no owl** can be a migratory bird, so we cannot assert “some owls are migratory birds.”
- Why **C** fails: We have no link from **harriers** to **nocturnal**; indeed Premises 2–3 support the existence of **raptors not nocturnal**, so asserting all harriers (a subset of raptors) are nocturnal contradicts the direction of information.
- Why **D** fails: From “All harriers are raptors” (Premise 1) and “Some raptors are migratory birds” (Premise 2), we cannot distribute the “some” to the **harriers** subset; it could be the “some raptors” that are migratory are **not** harriers. So “Some harriers are migratory birds” does **not** follow.

Q87. Answer: B (Medium)

Detailed Explanation:

- Premise 2 gives existence: **some venture-backed firms are profitable** ($V \cap P \neq \emptyset$).
- Premise 3: **no profitable firms are insolvent** ($P \subseteq \neg I$).
- Combine: some **venture-backed** firms are **profitable**, and profitable firms are **not insolvent** \Rightarrow **some venture-backed firms are not insolvent** — option **B**. The middle term **profitable** bridges venture-backed to not-insolvent.
- Why **A** fails: From “All fintech startups are venture-backed” (Premise 1) and “Some venture-backed are profitable” (Premise 2), we cannot conclude the “some profitable” are fintech startups; they could be other venture-backed firms.
- Why **C** fails: Premise 4 only says **some insolvent firms are bootstrapped** ($I \cap B \neq \emptyset$). It does **not** say all bootstrapped are insolvent; the converse does not follow.
- Why **D** fails: There is no premise linking fintech startups and bootstrapped firms; we cannot assert **no F** are **B** without a disjointness premise between V and B or similar.

Q88. Answer: C (Hard)

Detailed Explanation:

- Premise 4 provides existence: **some ceramic vases are museum artifacts** ($C \cap M \neq \emptyset$).
- Premise 1: **no ceramic vases are shatterproof** ($C \subseteq \neg S$).
- Therefore, those **some** items that are both **ceramic vases** and **museum artifacts** are **not shatterproof** \Rightarrow **some museum artifacts are not shatterproof** — option **C**. The term **ceramic vases** functions as the bridge between **museum artifacts** and **not shatterproof**.
- Why **A** fails: We do not have any premise asserting that **any** museum artifacts are shatterproof; Premise 1 actually blocks that for the ceramic subset.
- Why **B** fails: We cannot universalize; only the ceramic-vase subset of museum artifacts is proven non-shatterproof. Other museum artifacts might be shatterproof; Premise 3 even says **some shatterproof items are modern**, and they could be museum artifacts.
- Why **D** fails: Premise 3 says **some shatterproof items are modern** ($S \cap \text{Modern} \neq \emptyset$). It does **not** say **all modern items are shatterproof**; reversing “some” to “all” is invalid.

Q89. Answer: D (Medium)

Detailed Explanation:

- Premise 2 gives existence: **some readers are critics** ($R \cap C \neq \emptyset$).
- Premise 3: **no critics are pacifists** ($C \subseteq \neg Q$).
- Therefore, those **some readers** who are **critics** are **not pacifists** \Rightarrow **some readers are not pacifists** — option **D**. The middle term **critics** links readers to “not pacifists.”
- Why **A** fails: From “All poets are readers” (Premise 1) and “Some readers are critics” (Premise 2), the “some” could be non-poet readers; we cannot assert “some poets are critics.”
- Why **B** fails: Premise 4 says **some pacifists are teachers**. Since Premise 3 says **no critics are pacifists**, those teachers (from Premise 4) cannot simultaneously be critics by that route; nothing else connects teachers to critics.
- Why **C** fails: We cannot universalize to “no teachers are critics”; we only learned that the **pacifist** teachers (from Premise 4) are not critics (due to Premise 3). Other teachers could still be critics.

Q90. Answer: A (Hard)**Detailed Explanation:**

- Premise 4: **some cloud databases are proprietary tools** ($D \cap P \neq \emptyset$).
- Premise 1: **all cloud databases are scalable systems** ($D \subseteq S$) — helpful context but not yet decisive.
- Premise 3: **no open-source systems are proprietary tools** ($O \subseteq \neg P$), equivalently **all proprietary tools are not open-source** ($P \subseteq \neg O$).
- Combine Premises 4 and 3: those **some cloud databases** that are **proprietary** are **not open-source** \Rightarrow **some cloud databases are not open-source** — option A.
- Why B fails: Nothing states **all scalable systems are cloud databases**; Premise 1 only provides the subset the other way (cloud DBs \subseteq scalable), not equality.
- Why C fails: From Premises 4 and 1, those proprietary cloud databases are **indeed scalable**; so we get **some proprietary tools are scalable systems**, not **not scalable**. Hence C contradicts the derived possibility.
- Why D fails: Premise 2 says **some scalable systems are open-source**; but without a link that any cloud databases are among those open-source systems (and Premise 4 actually points to proprietary cloud DBs), we cannot assert **some open-source systems are cloud databases**.

Q91. Answer: A (Difficulty: Hard)**Detailed Explanation:**

- From Premise 2, there exists at least one **precision device** that is **battery-powered** (“Some PD are BP” asserts existence).
- Premise 3 says **no battery-powered devices are zero-emission** ($BP \subseteq \neg ZE$). Hence the specific PD from Premise 2 is **not** zero-emission.
- Therefore, **some precision devices are not zero-emission** \Rightarrow option A follows. Here **battery-powered** is the *middle term* linking PD to not-ZE via Premise 3.
- Premise 4 ($ZE \subseteq R$) is background: it doesn’t change that $BP \cap ZE = \emptyset$.
- **Why B fails:** From Premise 1 ($QS \subseteq PD$) and Premise 2 (“some PD are BP”), it does **not** follow that the “some PD” are QS; they could be other PD (illicit particular-to-subset inference).
- **Why C fails:** Premise 4 gives $ZE \subseteq R$, not its converse; “All recyclable are ZE” is an illicit converse.
- **Why D fails:** From Premise 3 we only know $BP \cap ZE = \emptyset$; nothing says $BP \subseteq R$. Even with $ZE \subseteq R$, BP could or could not be recyclable—we cannot assert existence of BP that are R.

Q92. Answer: B (Difficulty: Hard)**Detailed Explanation:**

- Premise 2: **Some law graduates are researchers** ($LG \cap R \neq \emptyset$).
- Premise 3: **No researchers are court clerks** ($R \subseteq \neg CC$).
- Combining, those specific **law graduates** who are **researchers** are **not court clerks** \Rightarrow **Some law graduates are not court clerks** (option B). Here **researchers** is the *middle term* bridging LG to not-CC.
- Premise 1 ($PL \subseteq LG$) and Premise 4 (some CC are PT) are consistent but not needed to derive B.
- **Why A fails:** From $PL \subseteq LG$ and “Some LG are R”, we cannot transfer the “some” down to PL; the “some LG” could all be non-paralegal law grads.
- **Why C fails:** We can only infer **some** LG are not CC; universal “No paralegals are court clerks” needs a link between PL and CC that we don’t have.
- **Why D fails:** Premise 4 talks about **court clerks** who are PT, while Premise 3 makes R disjoint from **court clerks**; nothing connects PT directly to R to assert existence of PT that are R.

Q93. Answer: C (Difficulty: Hard)**Detailed Explanation:**

- Premise 2: **Some electric cars are autonomous vehicles** ($EC \cap AV \neq \emptyset$).
- Premise 3: **All autonomous vehicles are connected cars** ($AV \subseteq CC$).
- Therefore those **some electric cars** that are **AV** are also **connected cars** \Rightarrow **Some connected cars are electric cars** (option C). The *middle term* **autonomous vehicles** links EC to CC.
- **Why A fails:** We would need $EC \cap \neg CC \neq \emptyset$, but Premise 2 + 3 only guarantee $EC \cap CC \neq \emptyset$; nothing asserts any EC outside CC.

- **Why B fails:** No link from **electric cars** to **manual transmissions**; Premise 1 only says $MT \cap AV = \emptyset$, not that EC and MT are disjoint.
- **Why D fails:** From Premise 3 we know $AV \subseteq CC$; the converse "All CC are AV" is not given, so universalizing is invalid.

Q94. Answer: D (Difficulty: Medium)

Detailed Explanation:

- Premise 2: **Some policy analysts are data scientists** ($PA \cap DS \neq \emptyset$).
- Premise 3: **No data scientists are lobbyists** ($DS \subseteq \neg L$).
- Therefore, those **some policy analysts** who are **data scientists** are **not lobbyists** \Rightarrow **Some policy analysts are not lobbyists** (option D). Here **data scientists** is the *middle term* linking PA to not-L.
- Premise 1 ($CP \subseteq PA$) and 4 (some L are C) do not alter this existential deduction.
- **Why A fails:** From $CP \subseteq PA$ and "Some PA are DS", we cannot infer that any of those "some PA" are CP; the particular may lie outside CP.
- **Why B fails:** Premise 4 gives **some lobbyists are consultants**; since $DS \cap L = \emptyset$ (Premise 3), those identified consultants (who are lobbyists) cannot be DS; there's no other bridge from C to DS.
- **Why C fails:** We only proved **some** PA are not L; we lack grounds to claim **no** PA are L (unwarranted universalization).

Q95. Answer: A (Difficulty: Hard)

Detailed Explanation:

- Premise 2: **Some protected sites are coastal areas** ($PS \cap CA \neq \emptyset$).
- Premise 3: **No coastal areas are noise-free zones** ($CA \subseteq \neg NFZ$).
- Hence, those **some protected sites** that are **coastal** are **not noise-free** \Rightarrow **Some protected sites are not noise-free zones** (option A). Here **coastal areas** acts as the *middle term* linking PS to not-NFZ.
- Premise 1 ($HB \subseteq PS$) and 4 (some NFZ are BS) are consistent but not needed for the deduction.
- **Why B fails:** From $HB \subseteq PS$ and only "some PS are CA," we cannot jump to "all HB are CA."
- **Why C fails:** Premise 4 says some NFZ are BS; with Premise 3, NFZ is disjoint from CA, so those particular BS are **not** CA; nothing ensures any BS are CA.
- **Why D fails:** Premise 4 expressly states **some** NFZ are BS, contradicting the universal negative "No BS are NFZ"; thus D cannot follow.

Q96. Answer: C (Medium) - The authority compares pilot-corridor collision rates to a **system-wide** pre-pilot baseline to infer "safer overall." For that inference to hold, **exposure must be comparable**: the pilot corridors' risk profile (lane width, pedestrian density, sightlines, turn complexity, etc.) must be appropriately **normalized** against the baseline. Option C states precisely this comparability requirement; without it, lower collisions could merely reflect safer infrastructure or selection effects, not autonomy.

- **Why A is wrong:** City-wide enforcement and signal timing changed during the pilot; these might matter, but even if they did, their **system-wide** nature could equally reduce the baseline risk elsewhere. What we **must** assume is representativeness/comparability, not the absence of any enforcement effect.
- **Why B is wrong:** Interventions preventing crashes would still count toward **system safety**; many AV evaluations treat the safety driver as part of the system. The conclusion "safer overall" does not require assuming interventions never averted crashes.
- **Why D is wrong:** Severity and frequency can diverge (e.g., fewer crashes but more severe, or vice versa). The authority's claim rests on **frequency**; no necessity to treat severity as a proxy.
- In sum, without Option C's comparability, the authority's conclusion could be an artifact of **corridor selection** and infrastructure differences rather than autonomy.

Q97. Answer: B (Hard)

We must reconcile **faster delivery** with **lower satisfaction** and shifts in complaint types. Option B explains that mandatory **signature-on-delivery** for high-value orders increases the probability of a **failed first attempt**, triggering reattempts and coordination hassles; with weekend first-attempts rising, **availability mismatches** grow. This produces more "missed delivery" and "inconvenient timing" complaints even as "late delivery" complaints plunge, thereby lowering overall satisfaction despite speed gains.

- **Why A is wrong:** UI salience could matter, but nothing in the logs ties satisfaction decline to app issues; moreover, the **composition** of complaints moved specifically toward delivery-attempt failures.
- **Why C is wrong:** Competitors' promotions might affect **value perception**, yet the complaint taxonomy pinpoints **operational frictions** (missed attempts), not price envy.
- **Why D is wrong:** A sampling shift could affect absolute scores, but the operational pattern (late ↓, missed ↑) maps directly to the **policy change**; mere rural oversampling doesn't predict that signature-specific complaint profile.
- Therefore, B directly **resolves** the paradox by aligning the changed policy with the observed complaint mix and satisfaction drop.

Q98. Answer: A (Easy) - Last year's mix (EA 1,200 @ 80% = 960; RD 3,800 @ 40% = 1,520) yielded ~2,480 enrolls before melt, roughly meeting a ~2,400 target after a modest decline—an overall yield near 50% (2,480/5,000). This year, with **fewer high-yield EA admits (900)** and **more lower-yield RD admits (4,200)**, the weighted average yield will **tend to fall** unless compensated. Because the binding priority waitlist is **capped at 5% of the enrolled class** (and thus limited in how much it can raise the average), the Dean's "no decline" claim can hold **only if** (i) RD yield **exceeds 40%** or (ii) the binding waitlist contributes **at least** its 5% cap to pull the blended yield back up. That is exactly Option A.

- **Why B is wrong:** EA already has very high yield; raising it to 85% adds at most 45 extra enrolls (0.05×900), too marginal to guarantee **no decline** given the large RD pool. Not necessary.
- **Why C is wrong:** The **count** of admits is not the issue; the **weighted yield** is. You could exceed last year's admits yet keep or raise yield if RD yield rises; conversely, you could admit fewer but with worse yield and still decline.
- **Why D is wrong:** The Dean's claim concerns **yield**, not class size; increasing the target class does nothing to preserve **percentage** yield unless mix/yields change.
- Thus, the must-have condition is the **contingent improvement/compensation** captured in A.

Q99. Answer: D (Hard) - The ministry's causal and efficiency claims hinge on the broadcast program driving score gains. Option D presents a **randomized** study that directly varies radio access/content and finds **no significant gain** versus controls. Randomized evidence trumps quasi-experimental rollouts by **eliminating selection and confounding** (e.g., preexisting radio ownership, differing teacher availability), thereby **undercutting** the ministry's causal inference and its efficiency narrative.

- **Why A is wrong:** Increased educational TV among participants introduces a **confound** suggesting other inputs may explain gains; this weakens causality somewhat, but not as decisively as a **null RCT** showing no effect when the program is isolated.
- **Why B is wrong:** Fade-out challenges **durability**, not whether short-run gains were efficiently produced. The ministry argued "efficient boost," which could, in theory, be short-term yet still efficient.
- **Why C is wrong:** Heterogeneous effects (gains concentrated among radio-owners; attendance drops among non-owners) question **equity** and net social benefit, but they do not **most** undermine the core claim that the broadcast **caused** average gains.
- Therefore D most powerfully weakens by replacing observational associations with **causal null results**.

Q100. Answer: A (Medium)

To credit the carbon tax (and not weather or new hydro) as the **primary** cause, we need evidence of **broad-based reductions** not explained by heating demand or power-mix shifts. Option A shows that after controlling for weather, **weather-insensitive heavy industries** (cement, steel) also exhibit significant declines versus trend. That pattern is exactly what a price on carbon would predict (internalized emissions costs), and it **cannot** be attributed to a mild winter; it also sits outside the electricity-sector effect of the hydro plant.

- **Why B is wrong:** If manufacturing **shifted into M**, that would raise output and make reductions **harder**, not easier—this complicates attribution but doesn't directly support the tax as primary cause.
- **Why C is wrong:** Quantifying hydro's displacement (10%) actually **strengthens the alternative explanation** that the power-sector change drove the decline; it undercuts, not supports, the tax-as-primary claim.
- **Why D is wrong:** Self-reported conservation is noisy, prone to desirability bias, and concentrated in households; it doesn't isolate impacts in **industrial** emissions (the bulk of the 12% decline).
- Hence A best **strengthens** the government's attribution to the carbon tax.

Q101. Answer: C — (difficult) - The superintendent attributes the extra 3-point gain (12 vs 9) to **tablets**. For that causal leap to hold, the observed improvement cannot be a statistical artifact of the treated group starting **below average** and naturally drifting upward (**regression to the mean**). Option C asserts exactly this necessity: that the baseline deficit did not mechanically predispose larger short-term gains. Without that, the conclusion is undercut because low-baseline groups often exhibit outsized early movement independent of the treatment. Option A is not necessary: unequal **usage** of the item bank could itself be the mechanism by which tablets worked (tablets might have increased practice frequency), so equal usage is not required for causation. Option B is too broad: even if freezing transfers improved scores countywide, that common shock would affect both groups; it does not explain the **difference-in-gains** unless it differentially helped tablet schools, which B does not assert. Option D is plausible but not **required**; increased observations might raise scores via coaching, but the superintendent's claim could still be true even if principals observed more, so long as that effect is mediated by or enabled through the tablet rollout (e.g., dashboard data prompting visits). Therefore, preventing the regression-to-mean alternative (C) is the **necessary** assumption to preserve the tablets-cause-gain inference.

Q102. Answer: B — (medium)

The paradox is that removing curbside parking (seemingly harming drivers) coincided with **higher** retail activity. Option B resolves it by showing that the policy **shifted the access mix**: faster, more frequent buses and wider sidewalks increased the flow of **non-driving** customers (transit riders and pedestrians), while outdoor seating likely captured spontaneous foot traffic. The higher **unique** pedestrian count and more transactions (with slightly smaller baskets) fit a pattern of **more visits, lower average spend per visit**—exactly what you'd expect from increased pass-by traffic. Option A is irrelevant to access channels and provides no mechanism connecting street design to more customers. Option C posits a loyalty program but offers no evidence; even if present, we'd still need to explain the pedestrian counter increase and the timing with street changes. Option D concerns signals several blocks away and lacks a direct link to these two retail blocks' **walk/transit** improvements; it also does not predict increased **pedestrian** counts. Thus B most plausibly integrates all observed shifts—more visitors, more transactions, slightly smaller tickets—by channel substitution toward transit and walking.

Q103. Answer: D — (difficult)

Causation requires ruling out baseline differences and contemporaneous shocks. Option D confirms that **randomization worked**, balancing tenure, manager quality, and initial satisfaction across mentored and waitlisted **high-risk** hires. Given the large differential (9% vs 20% attrition) **within the randomized high-risk cohort**, balanced covariates make mentorship the most credible cause. Option A identifies a common theme in exits but does not connect mentorship to reduced attrition; it's diagnostic, not causal. Option B notes mentor quality but without showing how that quality is **distributed** across treatment and control; if high-rated mentors cluster in certain teams or if mentees differ, confounding remains. Option C introduces a **second** intervention affecting low-risk hires, which could muddy overall attrition trends rather than strengthen the specific mentorship effect among high-risk hires. By establishing internal validity (balanced groups via randomization) where the effect is observed, D most directly fortifies the causal claim that mentorship—not selection—reduced attrition among those most likely to leave and thereby pulled down the firm's overall rate.

Q104. Answer: C — (medium)

The NGO's inference is observational and vulnerable to **confounding** (income, walkability, gym density, produce availability). Option C shows that once key confounders are controlled, the cafeteria–BMI link **vanishes**, strongly suggesting cafeterias are **not** the active cause of lower BMI; rather, healthier towns host both more cafeterias and lower BMI for other reasons. Option A is consistent with demand but does not address causality on BMI. Option B, a randomized incentive vs **produce vouchers**, is informative but ambiguous: if both arms ate healthier, equal BMI is not dispositive; moreover, vouchers may be a strong counterfactual intervention, not a true “no-treatment” control, muddying direct inference about cafeterias alone. Option D shows higher nutrition knowledge in cafeteria towns, which could itself be a confound causing both cafeteria entry and lower BMI; it does not **undermine** the NGO's claim as directly as C does. Because C demonstrates statistical insignificance after controlling for salient covariates, it most cleanly **breaks** the causal link the NGO proposes and thereby weakens the conclusion.

Q105. Answer: B — (easy)

Last year: 1,600 initial offers \times 62% = 992 acceptances, plus ~76 acceptances from the binding waitlist (95% of 80), totaling ~1,068 before melt and ending at exactly 1,000. This year: fewer initial offers (1,400) mechanically lowers expected acceptances **unless** acceptance rates rise or the expanded binding waitlist (capped at **15% of enrolled seats** \approx 150) backfills. The only pathway consistent with **not reducing** the overall acceptance rate while also **not overshooting** 1,000 seats is that the stipend bump selectively lifts acceptance among those likeliest to respond—top-decile candidates with competing offers—thereby improving the **weighted acceptance rate** on the reduced initial pool, with the binding list used as a precise buffer. Option B captures this requirement explicitly. Option A could help, but it is not **necessary**: the Board might hit 1,000 with fewer than 10% from the waitlist if initial acceptance rises enough due to the stipend. Option C arbitrarily caps total offers; the assertion concerns **rates**, not counts—exceeding 1,700 could still preserve or raise the rate depending on mix. Option D imposes a condition on non-top-decile candidates that is irrelevant if the **marginal** lift from the top decile suffices; their acceptance could even rise slightly without affecting the conclusion. Therefore, B states the must-hold mechanism: a targeted acceptance lift among the responsive segment that offsets reduced initial offers while respecting the 1,000-seat cap.

Q106. Answer: A — (difficult)

To credit **WFH** as the driver of higher closing rates in pilot branches, we must rule out contemporaneous changes that **asymmetrically** advantaged those branches. Option **A** states precisely this necessity: the lead-scoring model and CRM retraining (both introduced during the pilot window, and with retraining available to pilots sooner) did **not** disproportionately boost pilot branches' closing rates relative to non-pilot branches. If they **did**, then the observed improvement could be **attributable** to those changes rather than to WFH, defeating the attribution. Option **B** is irrelevant to sales causality: whether backlog fell due to defects or staffing does not establish the sales closing-rate mechanism. Option **C** is too strong and not necessary; managers' tenure might matter, yet if tenure were **balanced** across pilot and non-pilot branches, or if its effect were small relative to the gain, the WFH conclusion could still stand without asserting "no effect." Option **D** (high WFH enthusiasm) could explain **morale**, but the executives' claim concerns **causation** of revenue uplift, not employee sentiment; WFH could drive performance even if enthusiasm waned, and high enthusiasm does not secure causal identification. The indispensable assumption is the **non-differential impact** (or controlled impact) of the **other** Q2 interventions across pilot and non-pilot branches—captured only by **A**. Without it, the attribution to WFH is **invalid** because the pilot bundled multiple confounded changes whose effects could masquerade as "WFH gains."

Q107. Answer: B — (medium)

The paradox is **fewer vehicles** crossing the cordon yet **longer car commutes**. Option **B** resolves this by pointing to **capacity-reducing** factors: lane closures remove lanes; a higher share of **heavy delivery trucks** early in the peak lowers effective flow rates; and **signal priority** for buses/ambulances reallocates green time **away from cars**. Together, even with fewer vehicles, the **service rate** of the road network for private cars falls, producing longer car travel times. This also aligns with observed **bus speed gains** and ridership increases. Option **A** (trip postponement) could shift demand temporally but doesn't explain **higher average** car times **within** the charged window. Option **C** misreads the direction: if bus ridership increased, the claim about reduced foot traffic contradicts the typical link between transit and pedestrian flows; and it does not connect to car travel time mechanisms. Option **D** mentions car-pool lanes and telework but offers no network-level reason for longer **car** trips in the presence of lower volumes; fewer car-pool users do not inherently lengthen general traffic unless lanes were reallocated, which D does not assert. B integrates **all** stated interventions—lane closures, truck mix, and signal priority—into a coherent explanation that reconciles the data without challenging the reduced entries.

Q108. Answer: B — (easy)

To strengthen the causal claim, we want evidence that directly ties the **deposit** to the **specific** litter categories it targets, while ruling out storms, tourism, or generic cleanup effects. Option **B** does exactly that: it shows the decline in Coastshire is **concentrated** in **deposit-eligible beverage containers**, with **non-eligible** categories changing little relative to the neighbor. This **category-specific** pattern is the signature of a deposit-driven effect and is hard to reconcile with storms (which would move **all** loose items), tourism (which would likely raise beverage litter if anything), or bigger volunteer crews (which should reduce **all** categories similarly). Option **A** (overall plastic sales down 4%) is weak and broad—non-beverage plastics are outside the deposit; a small sales dip cannot explain a **32%** litter drop. Option **C** (more volunteers) threatens validity: it suggests **measurement** bias or cleanup effort as the driver, not policy; it **does not** strengthen causality. Option **D** (storm location) is orthogonal: even if the biggest storm hit the neighbor,

Coastshire still had storms; without the category pattern, storms could remain a confound. Only **B** furnishes **targeted**, difference-in-differences style evidence consistent with a **deposit** mechanism and inconsistent with the main alternative explanations.

Q109. Answer: A — (difficult)

The reported 8-point user advantage is susceptible to **self-selection**: adopters had higher baseline self-efficacy and better home support. Option **A** nullifies the causal claim by showing that when usage is **randomized and mandatory** (thus eliminating selection), gains are statistically **indistinguishable** from a credible **business-as-usual** control (teacher-curated worksheets). This directly challenges “the tutor caused the 8-point lift,” indicating the observed gap likely reflects **who** chose the tutor, not **what** the tutor did. Option **B** (club enrollment) signals another confound but is correlational and does not decisively attribute the 8 points to non-tutor inputs. Option **C** (parental oversight) similarly indicates background advantages among users; again, it hints at selection but lacks the **experimental** force of A. Option **D** (45 minutes in lab) explains why the gap is **smaller** in scheduled blocks but does not undermine the core claim; lower dose could reduce effect size even if the tool worked. Only **A** replaces correlation with a **randomized** comparison showing **no** effect relative to an active control, thereby most powerfully **weakening** the company’s causal interpretation and cautioning against a district-wide contract based solely on the observational gap.

Q110. Answer: B — (medium)

From the passage: LD outperforms PL on the primary endpoint; HD does **not** beat LD; AEs are dose-related, with **more** AEs at HD than LD. These facts jointly imply that **efficacy is comparable** (LD \approx HD on primary/secondary endpoints) while **toxicity is worse** at HD. Therefore, the **benefit–risk** trade-off is **better** for LD than for HD—exactly what **B** states—and this inference is independent of the underpowered subgroup caveat (which concerns **who** benefits, not the **aggregate** comparison presented). Option **A** overreaches: the passage never says HD is ineffective versus **placebo**; it says HD does not **outperform LD**, not that HD equals PL. Option **C** asserts a cause (underpowered subgroups) for the lack of HD superiority without evidence; the text calls subgroups exploratory, not explanatory. Option **D** is unwarranted: receptor occupancy tracked dose as expected (LD reached target, HD near-maximal), so the marker behaves plausibly; nothing here invalidates it. Thus **B** is the strongest supported inference because it logically follows from the stated **efficacy equivalence** (HD \approx LD) and **higher AE burden** at HD, making LD the rational Phase-3 dose from a benefit–risk perspective.

Q111. Answer: d) Neither I nor II follows — (difficult)

The data show a larger **decline** in absences in retrofitted schools (–18%) relative to non-retrofitted (–5%), but several **confounds** remain: a milder influenza season (system-wide downward pressure), **nonrandom placement** of filters in older buildings with higher baselines (opening the door to **regression to the mean**), and potential differences in health practices correlated with building age or district management. From these facts alone, we cannot conclude that the **majority** of the reduction is **caused** by filters (Claim I); at best, filters are **consistent** with the difference, but causation requires stronger identification (e.g., randomized assignment or robust controls). Claim II is a sweeping **policy generalization** to “all public buildings” and to “efficiency,” neither of which is supported: cost data, heterogeneous building types, and non-school usage patterns are missing; moreover, external validity from older-school districts to **all** public buildings is unproven.

- **Why a) Only I follows is wrong:** The difference-in-differences is **suggestive** but not dispositive; baseline imbalance and mild-flu season jointly mean filters may explain **some** part but not demonstrably the **majority**.
- **Why b) Only II follows is wrong:** Efficiency claims need **cost-effectiveness** evidence and generalizability; neither is provided.
- **Why c) Both follow is wrong:** Each claim independently fails: I fails on causality identification; II fails on external validity and cost.
- **Why d) is right:** With unresolved confounds and absent cost/generalization evidence, **neither** conclusion is logically compelled by the matrix; the correct stance is epistemic restraint.

Q112. Answer: b) Among the marginally rejected applicants, expected profit was non-positive — (difficult)

Profitability rises only if **savings** from fewer defaults among **approved loans** exceed **lost** contribution from now-rejected borrowers who **would have repaid** (plus any second-order cross-sell effects). Option **(b)** states a **necessary** condition: the **marginal rejects** (those flipped from “approve” to “reject” by the new screen) must not be profit-positive

in expectation. If they were profit-positive, then rejecting them destroys profit that could **offset or exceed** savings from avoided defaults, jeopardizing the profitability claim.

- **Why a) is wrong:** Processing cost per application could even rise modestly while profitability still **improves**, if net credit losses fall enough; thus (a) is **not necessary**.
- **Why c) is wrong:** More cross-sell among **approvals** would help, but management's conclusion did **not** rely on such an increase, nor is it necessary; profitability could improve **without** cross-sell lift if avoided losses dominate.
- **Why d) is wrong:** Higher average bureau scores among approvals are **correlated** with lower default but are neither **sufficient** nor **necessary** for profitability; the key is marginal expected profit, not an average score shift.
- **Why b) is right:** It encodes the indispensable **opportunity-cost** check—lost interest from true-positive rejects cannot exceed saved losses from fewer false positives—without which the “defaults down \Rightarrow profit up” inference is invalid.

Q113. Answer: a) Pass-holders' repeat entry pulled down per-visit revenue — (difficult)

We must explain **higher attendance** alongside **lower revenue per visit** despite a posted price **increase**. Option (a) posits that the **household pass** (flat annual fee, unlimited entries, and free late-night tours) attracted **high-frequency** visitors. This mechanism **increases** headcount (many visits by the same households) while **diluting** revenue per visit (the flat fee is amortized over many entries), perfectly reconciling the pattern even in the presence of higher list prices for non-pass entrants. The free tours further incentivize additional visits without extra revenue, compounding the average decline.

- **Why b) is wrong:** Shifting **high-spend tourists** would tend to **raise** revenue per visit, the opposite of what we see; it does not address the per-visit decline.
- **Why c) is wrong:** More adults and fewer students **should** raise per-visit revenue (students pay less or were discounted), again opposite to the observation.
- **Why d) is wrong:** It focuses only on first-time visitors; even if their per-visit revenue rose, the **aggregate** average fell, which d) cannot explain without the repeat-entry dilution that (a) provides.
- **Why a) is right:** It offers a **coherent substitution** in pricing architecture—flat-fee, high-frequency usage—that simultaneously increases **attendance** and depresses **average revenue per head**, resolving the paradox.

Q114. Answer: a) Offline adopters reverted; unaffected maintained gains — (difficult)

Causality requires disentangling telemedicine from hospital **quality** advantages (nurse ratios, cardiology units). Option (a) uses an **exogenous shock** (random cyberattack) that **suspended** telemedicine in a subset of adopters, creating a **natural experiment**. If readmissions **rebounded** in the forced-offline adopters while staying low in uninterrupted adopters, that **within-adopter divergence** strongly implicates telemedicine as the **active** ingredient, not static hospital quality. This is a powerful **difference-in-differences** pattern conditional on prior adoption.

- **Why b) is wrong:** Non-adopters starting a reconciliation initiative **complicates** cross-group comparisons but does not preferentially support telemedicine; if anything, it gives non-adopters tools to improve.
- **Why c) is wrong:** A statewide decline in severity would reduce readmissions **everywhere**, weakening the unique attribution to telemedicine.
- **Why d) is wrong:** It restates a **baseline confound** (better nurse ratios) that threatens attribution rather than strengthening it.
- **Why a) is right:** It provides **time-series** evidence tied to an **exogenous interruption** among the same hospitals, isolating the telemedicine mechanism and powerfully **buttressing** the department's claim.

Q115. Answer: a) Weather-/economy-normalization erases the difference — (difficult)

The utility attributes a 7% peak drop to meters and time-of-use pricing. Option (a) shows that once we **normalize** for **weather** (coolest summer) and **macroeconomic contraction**, the utility's peak reduction is **statistically indistinguishable** from the neighbor's 6.5% decline **without** pricing—suggesting common exogenous factors explain the change. This directly **undercuts** the causal inference by demonstrating the effect survives **no better** than a control lacking the intervention.

- **Why b) is wrong:** Self-reported conservation is **subjective** and compatible with **no actual difference** once normalized; it does not undermine the alternative explanations.
- **Why c) is wrong:** A rise in **off-peak** demand is consistent with **load shifting**, not necessarily a reduction in **peak** attributable to pricing; it neither targets the key comparison nor refutes exogenous drivers.

- **Why d) is wrong:** Low ad engagement does not speak to actual **tariff salience** (bills, SMS, in-home displays) or to weather/economy; it is at best weakly diagnostic.
- **Why a) is right:** It replaces raw year-over-year comparison with a **counterfactual-aware** analysis; if, after proper controls, the treated and untreated regions look the same, the original causal claim is **substantially weakened**.

Q116. Answer: (B)

Explanation: The *Act of God* defence applies when damage is caused by natural forces so unprecedented that no reasonable foresight or care could prevent it. Here, a 200-year unprecedented rainfall qualifies. Therefore, Arjun is not liable.

- (A) Incorrect: Strict liability is not absolute; exceptions apply.
- (C) Incorrect: Foreseeability does not extend to unprecedented natural events.
- (D) Incorrect: Not all natural disasters qualify, only those unforeseeable and irresistible.

Difficulty: Hard

Q117. Answer: (B)

Explanation: Absolute liability is stricter than strict liability—no defence applies, even for acts of God or third-party interference. By storing hazardous substances, Shakti Fertilizers bore complete responsibility.

- (A) Incorrect: Act of God is a defence only in strict liability, not absolute liability.
- (C) Incorrect: Compliance with safety standards does not absolve liability.
- (D) Incorrect: Proof of negligence is unnecessary; liability is automatic.

Difficulty: Hard

Q118. Answer: (C)

Explanation: Absolute liability is unaffected by sabotage or third-party interference. Since the enterprise engaged in inherently dangerous activity, liability remains fixed.

- (A) Incorrect: Third-party interference is a defence only to strict liability.
- (B) Incorrect: Foreseeability is irrelevant to absolute liability.
- (D) Incorrect: Negligence is unnecessary for absolute liability.

Difficulty: Hard

Q119. Answer: (D)

Explanation: The Supreme Court in *MC Mehta* held that even State-run enterprises cannot claim sovereign immunity in hazardous activities. Absolute liability applies to all operators equally.

- (A) Incorrect: Sovereign immunity does not cover hazardous activities.
- (C) Incorrect: Negligence is irrelevant in absolute liability.
- (B) Incorrect: Damages are not capped merely because the operator is state-owned.

Difficulty: Hard

Q120. Answer: (B)

Explanation: Judicial independence forms part of the Basic Structure. Any amendment undermining it is unconstitutional.

Difficulty: Hard

Q121. Answer: (A)

Explanation: The ban on the documentary cannot be sustained because Article 19(2) permits restrictions on free speech only when there is a **direct and proximate nexus** between the expression and the harm sought to be prevented. In *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India* (2015), the Supreme Court clarified that vague or speculative claims of possible disturbance are not enough—the restriction must address speech that either incites violence or has a **clear, imminent danger of public disorder**.

Here, the government's justification that the film would "erode the morale of the armed forces" is too abstract and remote. Criticism of corruption in defence procurement is legitimate political expression and part of democratic

accountability. It does not create an immediate risk of mutiny, violence, or public disorder. Therefore, the restriction fails the test of **reasonableness** and **proportionality** under Article 19(2).

- (A) is wrong because although “security of the State” is a valid ground, the connection must be concrete and proximate, not hypothetical.
- (C) is wrong because the State cannot censor mere criticism of its decisions; only speech that directly threatens security can be restricted.
- (D) is wrong because free speech is not absolute—it is subject to Article 19(2), but this case doesn’t satisfy those grounds.

Difficulty: Hard

Q122. Answer: (B)

Explanation: In *Fagan v. Metropolitan Police Commissioner* (1969), mens rea arising during a continuing act satisfied concurrence. Here, Vijay’s act of keeping the car on Prakash’s foot continued until he reversed. When mens rea formed (deliberate refusal), the act was still ongoing, making him liable.

- (A) is wrong because liability doesn’t vanish if mens rea forms later.
- (C) is wrong: injury severity is irrelevant to concurrence.
- (D) is wrong because initial intent is not essential if act continued.

Difficulty: Hard

Q123. Answer: (C)

Expanded Explanation: Courts (e.g., *Deepak Gulati v. State of Haryana* 2013) distinguish between breach of promise and false promise. Consent is vitiated only if it is shown the accused never intended marriage from the start—then deception invalidates consent, making intercourse rape under Section 375 IPC. If intent existed initially but later failed, it is not rape but breach of promise.

- (A) is too broad: not every false promise vitiates consent.
- (B) is wrong: apparent consent is irrelevant if induced by fraud.
- (D) is wrong: false promises can invalidate consent if initial intention is absent.

Difficulty: Hard

Q124. Answer: (C)

Explanation: While treaties are not self-executing in India (*Jolly George Varghese*), courts have often used them as interpretive aids when construing fundamental rights (e.g., *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan*, 1997, which relied on CEDAW). The right to life under Article 21 has been expansively interpreted to include dignity, shelter, and livelihood (*Olga Tellis*). Hence, even in the absence of enabling legislation, courts may harmonise constitutional rights with India’s international commitments, provided they do not contradict domestic law.

- (A) is wrong: treaties do not automatically override Indian law.
- (B) is incomplete: though direct enforcement requires legislation, courts can still interpret rights in line with treaties.
- (D) is wrong: the SC has read shelter into Article 21 in multiple cases.

Difficulty: Hard

Q125. Answer: (B)

Explanation: Criminal conspiracy under Section 120A IPC requires agreement. Presence or passive acquiescence is insufficient. Imran’s silence without overt or tacit agreement does not prove mens rea. Courts insist on evidence of participation beyond passive attendance.

- (A) is wrong: presence is not participation.
- (C) is wrong: laughter alone doesn’t prove agreement.
- (D) is wrong: conspiracy is complete on agreement, no overt act needed (except when conspiracy is only to commit legal act by illegal means).

Difficulty: Hard

Q126. Answer: (A)

Explanation:

Section 66C IT Act penalises fraudulent use of another’s credentials with dishonest intent. Sneha used Pooja’s password

2026

to siphon money and changed alerts to conceal it. Her intent to “repay later” is irrelevant—dishonesty includes temporary deprivation.

- (B) is wrong: repayment intent doesn’t erase fraudulent use.
- (C) is wrong: cybercrimes attract criminal penalties, including imprisonment.
- (D) is wrong: laptop access ≠ consent to banking password.

Difficulty: Hard

Q127. Answer: (A)

Explanation:

Unless immediate emergency exists, doctors must seek informed consent. Acting in “best interests” is insufficient without disclosure. Here, cancer treatment was not an immediate emergency.

Difficulty: Hard

Q128. Answer: (B)

Explanation: *Indra Sawhney v. Union of India* capped reservations at 50%, absent exceptional circumstances. The state’s justification (“preventing brain drain”) is socio-economic but not extraordinary under equality jurisprudence. Thus, 75% quota violates Article 14.

- (A) is wrong: state preference is permissible only within 50%.
- (C) is wrong: state autonomy isn’t unlimited.
- (D) is wrong: reservations are not unconstitutional per se.

Difficulty: Hard

Q129. Answer: (D)

Explanation: Qualified privilege covers good faith communications in employment references, but malice negates it (*Horrocks v. Lowe*). Mr. Verma acted with personal grudge, showing malice. Hence, privilege defence fails.

- (A) is wrong: privilege isn’t absolute.
- (C) is wrong: privilege doesn’t protect knowingly false statements.
- (B) is wrong: privilege extends beyond legal proceedings.

Difficulty: Hard

Q130. Answer: (A)

Explanation: Public nuisance (IPC s.268; tort law) is substantial interference with public rights. Community health harm outweighs economic utility (*Ratlam Municipality v. Vardhichand*). Public benefit cannot excuse damage to health and environment.

- (B) is wrong: “public benefit” ≠ defence.
- (C) is wrong: industries have no blanket immunity.
- (D) is wrong: nuisance liability doesn’t require proof of negligence.

Difficulty: Hard

Q131. Answer: (B)

Expanded Explanation:

False imprisonment arises when liberty is unlawfully restrained. Detention must rest on reasonable suspicion. Mere alarm beep without corroboration doesn’t justify two hours of confinement. Good faith belief alone is insufficient.

- (A) is wrong: guards’ power is limited.
- (C) is wrong: good faith ≠ reasonable suspicion.
- (D) is wrong: private detention isn’t always unlawful, but must be reasonable.

Difficulty: Hard

Q132. Answer: (A)

Explanation: In *R v. Smith* and *R v. Cheshire*, courts held original assailant remains liable unless medical treatment is so grossly negligent it becomes sole cause. Here, stabbing remained operative cause; negligence was contributory but not sole. Anil is guilty of homicide.

- (B) is wrong: negligence didn’t break chain.
- (C) is wrong: hurt liability understates causal connection.

- (D) is wrong: doctor's negligence doesn't absolve assailant.

Difficulty: Hard

Q133. Answer: (A)

Expanded Explanation: Article 21 guarantees liberty; pre-trial detention must be exceptional. In *Nikesh Tarachand Shah v. Union of India* and *Hussainara Khatoon*, the SC stressed "bail is the rule, jail the exception." Denial merely for deterrence or gravity, without trial progress, violates presumption of innocence.

- (B) is wrong: gravity is relevant but cannot justify indefinite custody.
- (C) is wrong: extraordinary sureties ≠ justification for prolonged denial.
- (D) is wrong: economic offences don't automatically warrant denial.

Difficulty: Hard

Q134. Answer: A – Thursday (Medium)

Explanation: Indian is fixed on Tuesday (8). Japanese is two days after Indian (6) → Thursday. Since A is immediately before B (1) and B is Friday or Saturday (5), the only way to place A right before B while keeping Japanese on Thursday is A on Thursday, B on Friday. Thus A–Thursday is Japanese.

Q135. Answer: D – Lebanese – Wednesday (Medium)

Explanation: C is on Wednesday (2) and is not Italian (2). From the placements: Vegan is Monday (6), Indian Tuesday (8), Japanese Thursday (6→8), and Mexican goes with E (7) which will be Saturday (see Q136). That leaves Italian and Lebanese for Wednesday and Friday. Because C is not Italian, C must be Lebanese on Wednesday; consequently, Friday takes Italian (with B).

Q136. Answer: D – Saturday (Easy)

Explanation: From Q134, A–Thu and B–Fri. With Vegan–Mon, Indian–Tue, C–Wed, the only remaining day is Saturday. Clue (7) says Mexican is on the same day as E, and (4) requires E later than F—Saturday is the latest available day, so E–Saturday and hence Mexican–Saturday.

Q137. Answer: D (Easy)

Detailed Explanation:

From (1)–(4), you get the consecutive block Leela → Mohan → Nisha → Pooja → Rohan in that order. Statement (5) fixes Omar opposite Mohan, and (6) fixes Tara opposite Nisha. With (7) placing Kabir immediately before Leela (anticlockwise), the full circle becomes Kabir – Leela – Mohan – Nisha – Pooja – Rohan – Omar – Tara. Opposite pairs are then (Leela,Rohan), (Mohan,Omar), (Nisha,Tara), (Pooja,Kabir). No option matches one of these guaranteed opposite pairs. A (Leela,Tara) are not opposite; B (Nisha,Kabir) are not opposite; C (Pooja,Rohan) are adjacent, not opposite.

Q138. Answer: B (Easy)

Detailed Explanation: Using the derived order Kabir – Leela – Mohan – Nisha – Pooja – Rohan – Omar – Tara, start at Kabir and move clockwise to Pooja. The people strictly between them are Leela, Mohan, Nisha — exactly 3. Hence B. Options A/C/D miscount the intervening seats.

Q139. Answer: A (Easy)

Detailed Explanation: From (1)–(4), immediately clockwise after Leela comes Mohan, Nisha, Pooja, Rohan. From (5) & (6), Omar must be opposite Mohan and Tara opposite Nisha, leaving Kabir immediately anticlockwise of Leela by (7). Thus the clockwise cycle beginning at Leela is Leela → Mohan → **Nisha → Pooja → Rohan → Omar → Tara → Kabir**, which is **Option A**. **B** swaps Nisha and Pooja; **C** runs the reverse direction and breaks adjacencies; **D** swaps Omar/Rohan positions relative to Pooja.

Q140. Answer: B (Medium)

Detailed Explanation: From (6), **Eklavya** is at an extreme; from (7), **Heena** is immediately to his left, so they must occupy the **right end pair** (... Heena, Eklavya). From (8), **Gaurav** is at the **other** extreme, i.e., the **left** end. Filling the central block via (1)–(5) gives the final order **Gaurav – Chirag – Anita – Bharat – Deepa – Farida – Heena – Eklavya**. Hence the extreme right is **Eklavya**.

Q141. Answer: B (Medium)

Detailed Explanation: In the final order **Gaurav (1) – Chirag (2) – Anita (3) – Bharat (4) – Deepa (5) – Farida (6) – Heena (7) – Eklavya (8)**, the people strictly between **Chirag (2)** and **Heena (7)** are **Anita (3), Bharat (4), Deepa (5), Farida (6) – four persons**. Thus **B** is correct. The other counts misread the spacing.

Q142. Answer: B (Medium)

Detailed Explanation: From the constructed line, adjacent pairs include **(Gaurav,Chirag), (Chirag,Anita), (Anita,Bharat), (Bharat,Deepa), (Deepa,Farida), (Farida,Heena), (Heena,Eklavya)**. Among the options, only **Anita and Bharat** are listed as an adjacent pair, so **B** is correct. **A** are separated by **Farida**; **C** are separated by **Anita and Bharat**; **D** are separated by **Heena**.

Q143. Answer: C. 5th (Medium)

Explanation: Tech=3rd and Wellness=4th (Clue 2). Alia=1st (Clue 4). Farhan is immediately **above** Publicity and is **not** Tech/Wellness (Clue 3), so Publicity must be **5th** and Farhan **6th**. Charu is the Publicity lead (Clue 1) ⇒ **Charu on 5th**. Deepak (Treasury) must be below Charu ⇒ **2nd** fits. All placements now match the table above.

Q144. Answer: B. Esha (Easy)

Explanation: Tech sits on **3rd** (Clue 2). Wellness is **one floor above** Tech ⇒ **4th**. With Alia fixed on 1st (Logistics) and Deepak on 2nd (Treasury), the **4th-floor** resident is **Esha**, so **Esha = Wellness**. Farhan is neither Tech nor Wellness (Clue 3), and Bharat can't be Wellness (Clue 5).

Q145. Answer: C. Bharat – Tech (Medium)

Explanation: From Clue 2, **Tech = 3rd floor**. Bharat is barred from Treasury and Wellness (Clue 5), leaving **Tech** as the only match for him once Deepak=Treasure(2nd) and Esha=Wellness(4th) are set. Therefore **Bharat on 3rd heading Tech**.

Q146. Answer: D. 2 km, West (Medium)

Explanation:

- Step 1: Ravi moves **3 km north**.
- Step 2: Turns **left** → faces **west**, walks **4 km**.
- Step 3: Turns **left** again → faces **south**, walks **3 km**. Now vertically, he is back at the **same east–west line** as the starting point.
- Step 4: Turns **right** (from south → west), walks **2 km**.

Final position: Net displacement = **6 km west** of the vertical line through start, but also returned to starting latitude. Starting point (0,0); final (–6,0). Distance = **6 km**. Distance = 6 units west.

Q147. Answer: A. Facing South, 4 km away (Hard)

Explanation:

- Start at (0,0), facing **east**.
- Step 1: 5 km east → (5,0).
- Step 2: Turn **right** (south), 3 km → (5,–3).
- Step 3: Turn **right** (west), 7 km → (–2,–3).
- Step 4: Turn **right** (north), 3 km → (–2,0).
- Step 5: Turn **left** (from north → west), 2 km → (–4,0).

Final coordinates: (–4,0). Facing **West**. Distance from origin = $\sqrt{(-4)^2 + 0^2} = 4 \text{ km}$. Hence **West, 4 km**.

Q148. Answer: a) — (difficult)

The core structure: **change the measurement rule → observe a favorable change in the metric → infer underlying reality improved**. In the police case, reclassifying “non-injury assaults” out of the “serious incidents” denominator produces an **accounting drop** without any established change in actual victimization or patrol efficacy.

- **Why (a) is correct:** Lowering the GPA threshold inflates the count of “Dean’s List” students by definitional fiat. Concluding that ability has risen mistakes a **category change** for a **substantive improvement**—precisely

the KPI fallacy in the policing passage. The logical skeleton matches: **relabeling/threshold shift** \Rightarrow **metric movement** \Rightarrow **unwarranted causal claim** about true quality/safety.

- **Why (b) is incorrect:** Here, **detection** capability improves, moving the metric **against** the evaluator's interest (defect rate rises). The inference "quality worsened because defects rose" could actually be false because of **surveillance bias**—but it is the *opposite* direction of the city's case (they made the metric easier; (b) makes measurement stricter). The mapping is not isomorphic.
- **Why (c) is incorrect:** Mortality declines **with no coding change** or case-mix shift; inferring effectiveness could still be premature (needs controls), but it does **not** hinge on **redefinition** of the metric. The flaw type differs (causal attribution without randomization), not the taxonomy manipulation in the original.
- **Why (d) is tempting but wrong:** Reclassifying product categories and inferring "electronics demand is down" from a **departmental revenue** dip *can* mirror reclassification error. However, in retail, departmental demand **composition** could genuinely shift if accessories cannibalize electronics or if **total** store demand falls; the analogy is weaker unless it's stipulated that total revenue stayed constant and only **categorical placement** changed. Option (a) is the **cleaner** structural twin: a **threshold** change manufacturing an apparent improvement.
Hence, **(a)** best captures the officials' reasoning error grounded in **metric redefinition** rather than real-world change.

Q149. Answer: a) — (difficult)

To **undermine** the causal claim, we want evidence that, when **selection bias** and local demand shocks are neutralized, the program's effect **disappears**. Option **(a)** provides exactly that: in districts where scarce seats were allocated by **lottery** among eligible applicants, trained and untrained groups are **ex ante comparable**. If their employment outcomes are statistically **indistinguishable**, the headline 10-point gap from observational comparisons is likely driven by **selection** (motivation, baseline skills) or **contemporaneous hiring booms**, not by the training itself. This is classic internal-validity evidence.

- **Why (b) is incorrect:** Better interview performance among trained candidates **could** coexist with **no net employment lift** if hiring constraints bind, firms favor experience, or the marginal productivity signal is weak. It does not directly negate causality; if anything, it mildly **supports** it.
- **Why (c) is weaker:** Concentration of gains where industrial parks boomed suggests **demand confounding**, which **does** erode causal claims—but it remains **correlational** and is compatible with a program that helped participants capture those new jobs. It's not as dispositive as a randomized no-effect.
- **Why (d) is weaker:** Baseline employment differences indicate **selection**, but without a design that equalizes observables and unobservables, we cannot quantify the bias. It raises suspicion; it doesn't decisively refute causality.
Because (a) replaces observational comparisons with a **quasi-experimental** counterfactual showing **no treatment effect**, it most powerfully **weakens** the leaders' attribution.

Q150. Answer: b) — (difficult)

Oriole's claim — "the four-day week increased productivity"—competes with **composition** and **mix** explanations: culling the bottom 5% and pausing low-margin lines can raise output/employee **even if** individual-hour efficiency is unchanged. The **necessary** assumption is that these **non-schedule** changes did **not** account for **most** of the observed 8% gain **relative to the but-for world** without the schedule shift. That is exactly what **(b)** states. If layoffs and product pruning explain the bulk of the improvement, the schedule attribution collapses.

- **Why (a) is not necessary:** An exogenous demand bump (viral marketing) could raise **throughput**, but productivity (output per employee) can still rise from the schedule change via focus/deep-work gains; conversely, even with a demand bump, attribution might still hold if analysts adjust for it. It's **useful** to rule out, but not **logically required** for the claim to be true.
- **Why (c) is not necessary:** Well-being is instrumentally relevant but **orthogonal** to causal identification; productivity could rise without self-reported well-being moving (measurement error, lag, or stoicism), so (c) isn't required.
- **Why (d) is not necessary:** Competitor flat productivity is **context**, not a logical prerequisite. Oriole's internal mix/selection could differ; the claim doesn't rely on industry-relative statements.
Thus, the indispensable bridge between correlation and causation is the **exclusion** (or bounded contribution) of **composition/mix** effects—captured only by **(b)**—without which the schedule attribution is ungrounded.

