

1. **Diamond Enterprises is a store in Apisville that sells specialty luxury items. For several years, Diamond reaped substantial profits and was considering building branch stores in nearby counties. Stibium Industries, for several years the single largest employer in Apisville and the surrounding region, abruptly closed its plant last year, causing widespread unemployment. Only a fraction of the former Stibium workers have found new jobs, and many of these at much lower wages. Early this year, Diamond Enterprises has filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy, citing the closure of Stibium as one of the primary causes.**

Which of the following inferences is best supported by the passage?

- (A) Diamond Enterprises would have avoided bankruptcy if it had followed through with the plan to build branch stores during its more prosperous years.
- (B) Stibium's management team had a corporate account with Diamond Enterprises, and ordered several luxury items used in business meetings and to entertain prospective clients.
- (C) Diamond's direct competitors, in Apisville and in the surrounding region, are much larger than Diamond, and therefore benefitted substantially from the conditions that arose after Stibium closed.
- (D) The closure of Stibium resulted in a loss of revenue for Diamond Enterprises.
- (E) After Stibium Industry closed, Diamond Enterprises was the single largest employer in Apisville.

1.Sol: The credited answer is (D).

We know Diamond had high profits before Stibium closed, and we know it was close to bankruptcy after Stibium closed, citing Stibium's closure as one of the primary causes. There, in some way, as a result of Stibium closing, Diamond lost revenue. Consider the opposite of (D): If Stibium closed, and that caused no revenue loss for Diamond, then how on earth could Diamond cite the closure of Stibium as one of the causes of its plummet from high profits to bankruptcy? The opposite of (D) is a scenario that makes no sense, so (D) is an unavoidable inference, very well supported.

Choice (A) is a tempting answer. Would branches of other Diamond stores in other towns have reaped profits, enough to avoid the bankruptcy mentioned? Perhaps. That's certainly a plausible possibility, but we don't know for sure. If we don't know for sure, it's not a good inference. (A) is incorrect.

Choice (B) is way too specific in the kind of assumptions it makes. It seems that Diamond was getting some kind of revenue from Stibium, but was it the management buying perks? or rank-and-file workers buying treats for themselves? We don't know. Anything that spins a highly specific story is too much to infer strictly from the information in the prompt. (B) is incorrect.

Choice (C) makes too many assumptions — does this specialty store Diamond have direct competitors in the region? if so, are these competitors larger? was "being larger" an advantage in the economic conditions that resulted from Stibium's closure? There are too many things we don't know, so we can draw a clear inference. (C) is incorrect.

Choice (E) is entirely unfounded. We have no idea how big Diamond is, and we have no idea what other employers Apisville might have. (E) is incorrect.

(D) is by far the best answer.

2. **After several years of vaccinating all of the citizens of this state for Tacitus' Disease, a highly infectious virus, state hospitals have cut costs by no longer administering this vaccine, starting at the beginning of this year. A state senator defended the position, arguing that after several years with zero incidence of the disease in the state, its citizens were no longer at risk. This is a flawed argument. Our state imports meats and produce from countries with high incidences of diseases for which our country has vaccines. Three years ago, when we reduced the use of the Salicetiococcus vaccines, a small outbreak of Salicetiococcus among young children, fortunately without fatalities, encouraged us to resume use of the previous vaccines. The public health official's statements, if true, best support which of the following as a conclusion?**

- (A) Young children of the state will be at risk for Tacitus' Disease.
- (B) Some of the meats imported to this state do not have adequate refrigeration during the shipping process.
- (C) Tacitus' Disease is a much deadlier disease than Salicetiococcus, and has a correspondingly higher fatality rate.
- (D) No food products produced within the state bear any contaminants that could lead to either Tacitus' Disease or Salicetiococcus.
- (E) The cost of providing all citizens of the state with the Tacitus' Disease vaccine places an

undue burden on the budget of state health agencies.

2.Sol: The credited answer is (A).

We know the citizenry currently is immune because of the vaccine. If they stop immunizing folks, the unvaccinated ones, i.e. the young children, would be vulnerable to this “highly infectious” diseases. We don’t know for sure that they will definitely get Tacitus’ Diseases, but we certainly know that their unvaccinated immune systems would be “at risk” for it. This is a well-supported conclusion.

Choice (B) is tempting. We know the countries that export meat & produce to this state have many of these diseases. It is suggested that these imports could constitute a vector for Tacitus’ disease into the state. We don’t know whether diseases could be introduced through these imports, but even if they are, there’s no reason to conclude meats are unrefrigerated. Unrefrigerated meat spoils very quickly, which suggest that it never could be sold once it arrived here. Furthermore, refrigerator doesn’t destroy viruses — they can simply remain dormant until they thaw. We have no grounds for concluding this. (B) is incorrect.

Choice (C) is unsubstantiated: we have no way to compare the infection rates. (C) is incorrect.

Choice (D) might be tempting, but we just don’t know. The whole population has been immune to Tacitus’ disease for years, because they all have been vaccinated. We don’t know by what pathways the Tacitus’s disease virus might be entering the population. We have no reason to assume this. (D) is incorrect.

Choice (E) is not a solid conclusion. We know that it cost something for the state hospitals to provide the Tacitus’ disease vaccine. Was this cost high? Did it place an economic burden on the state health services? We don’t know. We have no grounds for drawing this specific conclusion. (E) is incorrect.

3. XYZ Corporation has two divisions, both of which performed consistently over the last five years. The Interment Services Division accounted for approximately 30% of the corporation’s transactions and 50% of the corporation’s profits; the Toxic Household Products Division accounts for the balance. The statements above support which of the following inferences about XYZ Corporation over the last five years?

A) Measured in dollars, the total profits for XYZ Corporation have remained stable over the last five years.

- B) Interment Services is an increasingly competitive field, while Toxic Household Products are a largely untapped market.
- C) The Toxic Household Products Division yields a lower average profit per transaction than does the Interment Services Division.
- D) XYZ Corporation’s Toxic Household Products line has remained consistent over the past five years.
- E) Most families will, over a given five-year period, spend more money on Interment Services than on Toxic Household Products.

3.Sol Only one of these answer choices MUST be true; let’s take a look at the options:

- A. We only know about percentages, or proportions, so we can’t draw inferences about dollar amounts.
- B. No information is provided about competition for either Interment Services or Toxic Household Products.
- C. This is the correct choice; Interment Services has a profit to transactions ratio of 50%:30%, or 5:3, while Toxic Household Products has a ratio of 50%:70%, or 5:7. Therefore, the Toxic Household Products Division is doing more than twice as many transactions as the Interment Services Division, but yielding the same profits.
- D. Product lines are not discussed, and therefore can’t be the subject of an inference.
- E. Per-family spending is never mentioned, so we can’t infer anything about it.

There’s a pattern here: if it’s not mentioned, an inference can’t be drawn about it. Inferences MUST be supported by the evidence provided.

4. Barry’s Barbecue is a restaurant chain that advertises itself as a safe place for diners with food allergies to eat. At Barry’s, whenever a diner books a reservation and mentions a food allergy, the kitchen staff is prohibited from preparing multiple dishes on the same grill. This ensures that there is no cross-contamination between dishes, but also can result in longer wait times as fewer meals can be prepared than would be the case under normal circumstances.

Which of the following is best supported by the information above?

- A) The kitchen staff at Barry’s sometimes prepares multiple dishes on the same grill.
- B) Diners with food allergies are generally willing to be patient with longer wait times in order to avoid cross-contamination between dishes.
- C) Not all restaurants follow food allergy precautions to avoid cross-contamination between multiple dishes.

- D) Barry's will not make special kitchen accommodations for diners who do not make a reservation.
- E) Limiting cross-contamination from multiple dishes on the same grill is the most effective way to avoid issues for diners with food allergies.

4.Sol. Correct answer:1)

The kitchen staff at Barry's sometimes prepares multiple dishes on the same grill.

With Inference questions, the correct answer has to fit the "must be true" standard, meaning that it has to be proven based on the passage; incorrect answers "could be true" but are not necessarily true based only on the information in the passage.

Here choice "The kitchen staff at Barry's sometimes prepares multiple dishes on the same grill." fits that standard largely because of the phrase "under normal circumstances" at the end of the stimulus. If the prohibition on preparing multiple dishes on the same grill is different from "under normal circumstances," then it must be true that "sometimes" (note: "sometimes" is a very low bar to clear for proof) multiple dishes are prepared on the same grill. Choice "The kitchen staff at Barry's sometimes prepares multiple dishes on the same grill." is therefore correct.

In contrast, notice the strong language within choice "Barry's will not make special kitchen accommodations for diners who do not make a reservation.", that the restaurant categorically will not make kitchen accommodations (of any type) if a diner does not make a reservation. From the stimulus you know of one particular accommodation that will be made under a reservation, but you cannot conclude that there are no other possible accommodations, or that the restaurant wouldn't try to make that accommodation if someone were to arrive without a reservation.

Choice "Not all restaurants follow food allergy precautions to avoid cross-contamination between multiple dishes." could possibly be true ("not all" is another low bar of proof) but as this stimulus only tells you about one particular accommodation that one particular restaurant makes, you just do not have evidence to support this. (Note that while "not all" is a low bar, "food allergy precautions" is fairly broad: if every restaurant, for example, takes one small precaution like washing its dishes at high heat, that would be enough to rule out "Not all restaurants follow food allergy precautions to avoid cross-contamination between multiple dishes.")

Choice "Limiting cross-contamination from multiple dishes on the same grill is the most effective way to avoid issues for diners with food allergies." is a classic example of an Inference answer choice simply going too far, using "the most effective" when

you simply do not have information to rank different precautions.

And choice "Diners with food allergies are generally willing to be patient with longer wait times in order to avoid cross-contamination between dishes." is another example of a choice that might well be true, but does not have any proof in the stimulus.

5. A candy company conducted market research through a survey and a subsequent taste test. In the survey, 27% of respondents said they preferred dark chocolate, 28% said they preferred white chocolate, and 45% said they preferred milk chocolate. But when the same group participated in a taste test of the company's new product line, 60% preferred dark chocolate.

Which of the following can be inferred from the information above?

- A) Some people who preferred milk chocolate in the taste test had initially stated a preference for white chocolate in the survey.
- B) Most participants expressed a different preference in the taste test than they had indicated in the survey.
- C) Some people who stated a preference for white chocolate in the survey preferred dark chocolate in the taste test.
- D) The survey participants were generally inaccurate regarding their chocolate preferences.
- E) Some people who stated a preference for milk chocolate in the survey preferred dark chocolate in the taste test.

5. Sol. Correct answer: 5)

Some people who stated a preference for milk chocolate in the survey preferred dark chocolate in the taste test

This inference problem forces you to do some math to determine which answer must be true. You know from the given information that some preferences were different between the survey and the taste test (dark chocolate went from 27% to 60%, from the lowest value to the highest, so some people must have changed their preferences from either milk or white chocolate), but each answer choice will require some analysis to determine whether it "could be true" (incorrect answer) or "must be true" (correct).

Choice "The survey participants were generally inaccurate regarding their chocolate preferences." is the qualitative answer and certainly could be true, but isn't necessarily. What if this company simply has lousy white and milk chocolate, but very good dark chocolate? The respondents could have been very accurate in relaying their general preferences, but those preferences just didn't hold in this particular case. So choice "The survey participants

were generally inaccurate regarding their chocolate preferences." is incorrect.

Choice "Some people who stated a preference for white chocolate in the survey preferred dark chocolate in the taste test." is more quantitative. It certainly could be true but doesn't have to be. You know that dark chocolate went from 27% to 60%, so it picked up a net gain of 33%. This could be true if some of that gain came from white and some from milk. But since you do not have the taste test totals from white and milk you can play with different combinations. Suppose all who said dark in the survey said dark in the taste test, and then 33% defected from milk to dark. That would leave white unchanged and still give you 60% dark, just with 28% white and now 12% milk. So choice B is not necessarily true and is therefore incorrect.

Choice "Some people who preferred milk chocolate in the taste test had initially stated a preference for white chocolate in the survey." does not have to be true, either. You know that 33% of respondents switched to dark chocolate, but you do not know for certain that anyone switched between white and milk. As you will see with choice "Some people who stated a preference for milk chocolate in the survey preferred dark chocolate in the taste test."...

Choice "Some people who stated a preference for milk chocolate in the survey preferred dark chocolate in the taste test." must be true. You need a net gain of 33% moving from either white or milk to dark. And since only 28% preferred white chocolate, you can't get that 33% gain unless at the very least 5% of people changed from milk to dark.

Choice "Most participants expressed a different preference in the taste test than they had indicated in the survey." is incorrect because, again, the minimum change is 33%. All the statements could be true if everyone who liked dark in the survey stuck with dark in the taste test, and then 33% moved to dark from milk. That case satisfies all of the facts but leaves more than half of survey responses intact, thereby invalidating choice "Most participants expressed a different preference in the taste test than they had indicated in the survey.". Choice "Some people who stated a preference for milk chocolate in the survey preferred dark chocolate in the taste test." is correct.

- 6. Among the most effective ways to increase sales of an online service is to offer some form of free trial for users to experiment with before they purchase the full service. The benefit of such a practice is to encourage sales in individuals who would not buy the product without having tried it first.**

Which of the following is best supported by the information given above?

Possible Answers:

- A) Online services that are easily adapted to free trial versions sell better than do online services that are not readily distributed as free trials.
- B) The number of people who see the free trial as an acceptable replacement for buying the online service is not greater than the number of people who buy the online service because of their experience within the free trial.
- C) In calculating the total number of an online service sold, free trials are generally included as zero-dollar sales rather than as a separate category.
- D) Because the cost of offering a free trial can be high, companies are often resistant to offering free trials, especially free trials that offer all features included within the paid version of the online service.
- E) The number of sales for a given online service is directly proportional to the number of visitors to the online service's website, a number that tends to increase if a free trial is offered.

6. Sol. Correct answer: 2)

The number of people who see the free trial as an acceptable replacement for buying the online service is not greater than the number of people who buy the online service because of their experience within the free trial.

As with any inference question, your job here is to understand the information given and to choose an answer choice guaranteed by the text. You are told in this stimulus to this question that free trials are meant to increase sales of the full version of an online service by giving users who would not buy the service without trying it first a chance to experiment with it. Choice "The number of people who see the free trial as an acceptable replacement for buying the online service is not greater than the number of people who buy the online service because of their experience within the free trial." is the only answer choice that is guaranteed by the text. If the number of people who find that the free trial was a good substitute is bigger than the number of people who are incentivized to buy the full online service because of the free trial, then the ability to experiment before you try the full service would not only be meaningless, it would be counter to the reason that companies offer free trials.

Among the other answers, choice "Because the cost of offering a free trial can be high, companies are often resistant to offering free trials, especially free trials that offer all features included within the paid version of the online service." can be eliminated

because there is no information about what makes companies more or less likely to offer free trials. Choice "In calculating the total number of an online service sold, free trials are generally included as zero-dollar sales rather than as a separate category." can be eliminated because there is no information given about the spread of companies' free versus paid sales. Choice "The number of sales for a given online service is directly proportional to the number of visitors to the online service's website, a number that tends to increase if a free trial is offered." can be eliminated because there is no information about whether the two values are directly proportional at all. Choice "Online services that are easily adapted to free trial versions sell better than do online services that are not readily distributed as free trials." can be eliminated for similar reasons to choice "Because the cost of offering a free trial can be high, companies are often resistant to offering free trials, especially free trials that offer all features included within the paid version of the online service.". there is no information about the importance of the ease of creating a free trial.

- 7. Last year, more copies of accounting software programs were sold than in any previous year. For the first time ever, most of the copies sold were not sold to accountants but rather to individuals doing their own taxes or planning their own family budgets. However, the most-purchased copy of accounting software was a program designed for accountants performing corporate audits.**

Which of the following is most strongly supported by the information above?

- A) More non-accountants purchased accounting software last year than in any previous year.
- B) At least some non-accountants purchased the most-purchased copy of software last year.
- C) Last year there were more copies of accounting software sold to non-accountants than in any previous year.
- D) Last year more accounting software was sold to corporations than in any previous year.
- E) Last year fewer copies of accounting software were purchased by accountants than in the previous year.

7. Sol. Correct answer: 3)

Last year there were more copies of accounting software sold to non-accountants than in any previous year.

The answer to this Inference problem is "Last year there were more copies of accounting software sold to non-accountants than in any previous year.". Remember - in an Inference question the correct answer must be true based on the premises, and "Last year there were more copies of accounting

software sold to non-accountants than in any previous year." can be proven by the facts. You know that 1) the total number of copies of accounting software was its greatest ever and that 2) the percentage that non-accountants purchased was its greatest ever (the first time over 50%). So non-accountants purchased their greatest-ever share of the greatest-ever total, meaning that they must have purchased their greatest number of copies of accounting software ever.

Among the incorrect answer choices:

"Last year more accounting software was sold to corporations than in any previous year." very well might be true, but cannot be proven. What if the growth in accounting software was entirely due to non-accountants (perhaps this was the first-ever year that a program like TurboTax was available, and so the non-accountant software surged while several accountants went out of business and didn't purchase anything)?

"At least some non-accountants purchased the most-purchased copy of software last year." also could be true, but you certainly cannot prove it. What if the most-sold software was a must-buy for any corporation but had no appeal to individuals?

"More non-accountants purchased accounting software last year than in any previous year." is close, but note the precision in language there: all the premises are about the number of copies sold, whereas "More non-accountants purchased accounting software last year than in any previous year." draws a conclusion about the number of purchasers. What if the number of purchasers stayed the same or even decreased, but each purchaser bought multiple different copies (maybe TurboTax came with a "add on Quicken for a dollar" promotion and almost everyone who purchased one piece of software last year bought two this year?).

And "Last year fewer copies of accounting software were purchased by accountants than in the previous year." of course does not have to be true as there is no proof for it anywhere. You know that the highest total number of copies of accounting software was sold so it is difficult to believe that fewer were sold to non-accountants, and that's the only real evidence you have to get close to this conclusion.

- 8. Meditation can lead to reduced stress, increased concentration, and a longer life. And contrary to what many skeptics believe, regular meditation is more important than the duration of each session. While longer sessions produce better results, all the benefits listed above are possible from daily meditation sessions that are as short as ten minutes.**

Which of the following is best supported by the statement above?

- A) It is possible to achieve as much of a gain in life expectancy from ten minutes of meditation per day as from less frequent meditation sessions of an hour or longer.
- B) People who meditate for ten minutes each day will live longer than those who meditate less frequently.
- C) Meditating less frequently than once per day will lead to less positive benefits than meditating daily.
- D) Daily meditation sessions of an hour or longer can increase one's life expectancy.
- E) Meditation is only effective if it is performed on a daily basis.

8. Sol. Correct answer: 4)

Daily meditation sessions of an hour or longer can increase one's life expectancy.

With any Inference question, you must select the answer choice that must be true based on the information in the passage. Here, several choices might seem very likely, but the "must be true" standard is crucial for inferences.

Choice "Daily meditation sessions of an hour or longer can increase one's life expectancy." must be true. The premises state that "while longer sessions produce better results, all of the above benefits (including a longer life) are possible from daily-ten minute sessions." From that, you can infer that longer sessions (an hour vs. ten minutes) would at least produce the same benefits, if not better. Additionally, note the easier-to-prove word "can" in "can increase one's life expectancy." This is much easier to prove than "will" or "only," words you see in other answer choices.

Among the other choices, choice "Meditation is only effective if it is performed on a daily basis." goes too far with "only." While the last sentence suggests that daily sessions are effective, the previous sentence uses "regular meditation" (so not necessarily "daily"), and ultimately there is nothing to suggest that even infrequent sessions are completely ineffective.

Choice "People who meditate for ten minutes each day will live longer than those who meditate less frequently." goes too far with the prediction "will" - for one, the argument doesn't give enough information to compare daily ten-minute sessions with, say, five-days-per-week hour-long sessions. But just as damning is the word "will" - predictions are just very hard to prove. Can you conceive of a situation in which people who meditate for ten minutes each day live shorter (too much radiation from their Headspace app?)? If so, "will" is not necessarily true.

Choice "It is possible to achieve as much of a gain in life expectancy from ten minutes of meditation per day as from less frequent meditation sessions of an hour or longer." is wrong for similar reasons as "Meditation is only effective if it is performed on a daily basis." is wrong: the hard fact is that "regular" meditation is more important than the duration of each session, but "regular" does not necessarily mean "daily" so this comparison is impossible to make without further information. For the same reason, choice "Meditating less frequently than once per day will lead to less positive benefits than meditating daily." is also incorrect.

9. Gingivitis is a disease that occurs around the teeth and that can lead to periodontitis, a condition that causes tissue destruction in the gums and even tooth loss. Studies show that diets high in vitamin C can help to both prevent gingivitis and treat periodontitis. Which of the following is best supported by the statements above?

- A) Increasing the amount of vitamin C in one's diet has helped some periodontitis patients reduce the severity of that condition.
- B) People whose diets are high in vitamin C are less likely to contract periodontitis than those whose diet are low in vitamin C.
- C) A periodontitis treatment plan that does not include vitamin C is less effective than a plan that does.
- D) Some people suffering from periodontitis do so without having contracted gingivitis.
- E) Periodontitis is a condition only contracted by those who have previously contracted gingivitis.

9. Sol. Correct answer: 1)

Increasing the amount of vitamin C in one's diet has helped some periodontitis patients reduce the severity of that condition.

This Inference problem demonstrates the importance of the "Must Be True" standard for CR inferences. With Inference problems, you want to attack the answer choices looking to exploit small flaws, and eliminate accordingly.

Choice "People whose diets are high in vitamin C are less likely to contract periodontitis than those whose diet are low in vitamin C." is too general and emphatic a conclusion. Even though vitamin C itself can help to prevent or treat these conditions, one cannot conclude that those who consume vitamin C will be less likely to contract those conditions. Consider a hypothetical: it could be that vitamin C alone would help, but that vitamin C is often present in sugar-containing foods and most people with high vitamin C levels are also guilty of a high sugar diet that leads to even quicker gum disease.

Choice "People whose diets are high in vitamin C are less likely to contract periodontitis than those whose diet are low in vitamin C." may very well be true, but if you can create a hypothetical with a case in which it would not be true, you can eliminate it.

"Periodontitis is a condition only contracted by those who have previously contracted gingivitis." is similar: it seems like it's probably true, since you're told that gingivitis "can lead to periodontitis" but you don't know that it's the only thing that can lead to the condition (as choice "Some people suffering from periodontitis do so without having contracted gingivitis." suggests). Since you're unsure whether gingivitis is the only cause, or just one of multiple potential causes, you can eliminate both "Periodontitis is a condition only contracted by those who have previously contracted gingivitis." and "Some people suffering from periodontitis do so without having contracted gingivitis."

Choice "A periodontitis treatment plan that does not include vitamin C is less effective than a plan that does." is also not proven. There may be other plans that do not include vitamin C but that are extremely effective. Note the language in the last sentence of the stimulus, that vitamin C "can help to treat periodontitis." "Can help" is soft language that leaves plenty of room for another treatment program to be even more helpful.

Choice "Increasing the amount of vitamin C in one's diet has helped some periodontitis patients reduce the severity of that condition." is correct, in large part because of similarly soft language. If vitamin C can help treat the condition, that means that it must have helped at least some patients in treatment. That's an easy bar to get over, and since you know for a fact that vitamin C is helpful, you can clear that bar. Choice "Increasing the amount of vitamin C in one's diet has helped some periodontitis patients reduce the severity of that condition." is correct.

10. Health insurance rates have been steadily increasing in this country for decades. Though health insurance companies paid for a smaller percentage of claims last year than they did ten years ago, the overall rise in the number of claims still means that more money is being paid out, and the companies compensate for this by hiking their rates.

From the information above, it can be inferred that ten years ago

- A) profits made by health insurance companies were similar to profits made by health insurance companies last year.
- B) fewer people made health insurance claims than was the case last year.

- C) the percentage of health insurance claims that were unpaid was less than last year's percentage.
- D) health insurance companies paid a greater percentage of their claims than they paid twenty years ago.
- E) more claims were not paid by insurance companies than were not paid last year.

10.Sol. Correct answer: 3)

the percentage of health insurance claims that were unpaid was less than last year's percentage.

The stimulus states that "...health insurance companies paid for a smaller percentage of claims last year than they did ten years ago." This means that the companies had a greater percentage of unpaid claims last year. Put another way, they had a smaller percentage of unpaid claims ten years ago, which is what choice "the percentage of health insurance claims that were unpaid was less than last year's percentage." says.

Choice "fewer people made health insurance claims than was the case last year." is incorrect because the number of people making claims is never mentioned. One person can make several claims, so we cannot draw any inferences about the number of people.

"more claims were not paid by insurance companies than were not paid last year." is wrong because the overall number of claims and the percentage of claims not paid were both lower ten years ago. Since they were both lower, their product (Total * Percentage) would also be lower, disproving the statement that more claims were not paid.

Answer "health insurance companies paid a greater percentage of their claims than they paid twenty years ago." is incorrect because we do not have any way of knowing the difference in the percentage of claims paid for these two periods (ten years ago versus twenty years ago).

Answer "profits made by health insurance companies were similar to profits made by health insurance companies last year." is incorrect since we already know that the companies have compensated for paying more real dollars by hiking their rates, but there are too many other factors involved in determining profit to make this comparison.

11. A television news network has recently been criticized for failing to give as much time to individuals who do not believe climate change is occurring as they do to scientists who believe climate change is occurring, even though the network does give equal time to all sides of the debates over immigration, tax reform, and gun policy. The network claims that they only give equal time to both sides of a debate when one side cannot be definitively proven by existing scientific research.

Which of the following can be correctly inferred from the information given above?

- A) No individuals who spoke on the network and who did not believe climate change was occurring were scientists.
- B) The television news network believes that it is important to avoid debate on scientific discoveries.
- C) There are no effective counter arguments against climate change that might sway viewers to believe that climate change is not occurring.
- D) The television news network believes that the existence of climate change has been definitely proven by existing scientific research.
- E) If the news network gave the same time it gave to scientists to individuals who don't believe in climate change, it would increase its ratings.

11. Sol. Correct answer: 4)

The television news network believes that the existence of climate change has been definitely proven by existing scientific research.

Whenever you are asked to make an inference from an argument remember that inferences don't need to be interesting or surprising - they only need to be guaranteed.

The argument here states that a television network has been criticized for not giving as much time to climate change deniers as it does to those who believe in climate change even though they do give equal time to all sides of the debates surrounding other issues like tax reform and immigration. The network claims that this is because they only give equal time if one side of the debate cannot be definitively proven by science.

Since the network does not give equal time to both sides of the climate change debate, that means that people at the network believe that it fits the exception given and that one side (the side that believes in climate change) has been definitively proven by science, which matches answer choice "The television news network believes that the existence of climate change has been definitely proven by existing scientific research."

Among the other answers, "The television news network believes that it is important to avoid debate on scientific discoveries." can be discarded because while the network does not give equal time for all sides of the debate in some cases, it does not provide a blanket dismissal of debating all scientific discovery. Choice "There are no effective counter arguments against climate change that might sway viewers to believe that climate change is not occurring." can be eliminated since while the network believes the science has been settled, this is not the same thing as claiming that no one will be

swayed by the arguments against climate change. Choice "No individuals who spoke on the network and who did not believe climate change was occurring were scientists." is a bit harder to eliminate since the stimulus tells you that the people who believe that climate change is occurring are scientists, but it doesn't specifically say that the individuals who don't believe in climate change aren't scientists, so "No individuals who spoke on the network and who did not believe climate change was occurring were scientists." can be eliminated. Choice "If the news network gave the same time it gave to scientists to individuals who don't believe in climate change, it would increase its ratings." can also be eliminated since even though some people criticize the network for its current policy, it is unknown how a change in policy would affect overall criticism of the network (and in turn how that would effect ratings).

12. A computer equipped with fingerprint recognition software, which denies access to a computer to anyone whose fingerprint is not on file, identifies a person's fingerprint by analyzing not only the detailed structure of the fingerprint, but also such characteristics as the level of pressure upon which the finger is placed on the scanner and the finger's skin tone. Even the most adept computer hackers cannot duplicate all the characteristics the software analyzes.

Which of the following can be logically concluded from the passage above?

- A) The fingerprint recognition software is so sensitive that many authorized users are often denied legitimate access.
- B) It is not possible for any top computer hacker to gain access to a computer equipped with the recognition software solely by virtue of skill in replicating the structure of fingerprints.
- C) Fingerprint recognition software has taken many years and tremendous investment to develop and perfect.
- D) Computers equipped with the recognition software will soon be installed in most financial firms that deal with sensitive electronic information.
- E) Use of the recognition software is largely impractical due to the time it takes to record and analyze a fingerprint.

12. Sol. Correct answer: 2)

It is not possible for any top computer hacker to gain access to a computer equipped with the recognition software solely by virtue of skill in replicating the structure of fingerprints

The correct answer to this question is "It is not possible for any top computer hacker to gain access to a computer equipped with the recognition software solely by virtue of skill in replicating the structure of fingerprints.". This is an INFERENCE question, requiring the test taker to choose the correct answer that must be true based on the information provided in the stimulus. "Use of the recognition software is largely impractical due to the time it takes to record and analyze a fingerprint." is incorrect as the passage provides no information with regard to the speed of recording and analyzing the fingerprint; as such, no related conclusion can be drawn. "Computers equipped with the recognition software will soon be installed in most financial firms that deal with sensitive electronic information." is incorrect as the passage provides no information with regard to the installation of computers that possess the software in specific locations; as such, no related conclusion can be drawn. "It is not possible for any top computer hacker to gain access to a computer equipped with the recognition software solely by virtue of skill in replicating the structure of fingerprints." This is the correct answer. The passage states that the software detects more characteristics than those that the most successful hackers are able to duplicate; as such, we can conclude it would be impossible for any top hacker to gain access to a protected computer solely by replicating one of multiple characteristics analyzed by the software. "Fingerprint recognition software has taken many years and tremendous investment to develop and perfect." is incorrect as the passage provides no information with regard to the time and investment costs associated with the development of the software; as such, no related conclusion can be drawn. "The fingerprint recognition software is so sensitive that many authorized users are often denied legitimate access." is incorrect as the passage provides no information with regard to errors produced by the software; as such, no related conclusion can be drawn.

- 13. If the minimum wage increases again, MacDowell's will have to increase the prices it charges for its products. And if that happens, MacDowell's has a choice: it can spend more on advertising to attract more customers, or its sales and profitability will decrease. But since the extra advertising costs will simply raise total expenses, increasing those costs will still result in an overall decrease in profitability. Which one of the following conclusions can be logically drawn from the statements above?**

- A) MacDowell's will be unable to maintain its current profitability if the minimum wage increases.
- B) MacDowell's will see its profitability increase if the minimum wage does not increase.
- C) Unless the minimum wage increases, MacDowell's will continue to remain profitable.
- D) If MacDowell's sees a reduction in its profitability, that means that the minimum wage has increased.
- E) If the minimum wage increases, MacDowell's will no longer be able to remain profitable.

13. Sol. Correct answer: 1)

MacDowell's will be unable to maintain its current profitability if the minimum wage increases. Because this is an Inference question, the degree of proof for the correct answer is that the correct answer **MUST BE TRUE**. Because of that:

Choice "Unless the minimum wage increases, MacDowell's will continue to remain profitable." is incorrect because you're not told what happens if the minimum wage does not increase. This prediction is hard to make, then: suppose the minimum wage stayed flat but a disease was traced to MacDowell's ingredients or a fire burned down its top-grossing store. There are plenty of ways for profitability to be cut even if the minimum wage stays flat.

Choice "If the minimum wage increases, MacDowell's will no longer be able to remain profitable." is incorrect because it goes too far. You know that profitability will decrease, but not that it will go away entirely.

Choice "MacDowell's will see its profitability increase if the minimum wage does not increase." is incorrect for similar reasons to choice "Unless the minimum wage increases, MacDowell's will continue to remain profitable.". There are plenty of factors aside from the minimum wage that could decrease profitability, so choice "MacDowell's will see its profitability increase if the minimum wage does not increase." is not necessarily true.

Choice "MacDowell's will be unable to maintain its current profitability if the minimum wage increases." is correct. Because you're told in the argument that, of the two options that would face MacDowell's in the event of a minimum wage increase, both will decrease profitability, you know it to be true that a wage increase will cut profitability.

Choice "If MacDowell's sees a reduction in its profitability, that means that the minimum wage has increased." is incorrect for similar reasons to "Unless the minimum wage increases, MacDowell's will continue to remain profitable." and "MacDowell's will see its profitability increase if the minimum wage does not increase.". Plenty of other

factors can lead to a decrease in profitability, so that decrease on its own does not allow you to infer that it was specific to a minimum wage hike.

- 14. Most pain relievers come with warnings against continuous use longer than 7 consecutive days. While some people might be able to safely use a particular pain reliever for a longer period of time, many people will begin to experience side effects if the warnings are ignored.**

The information above most strongly supports which of the following?

- A) A physician should not advise any patient to take any pain reliever for a period of longer than 7 consecutive days.
- B) People who are sensitive to one type of pain reliever should not attempt to use a different pain reliever.
- C) Anyone who wants to maximize their natural health and well-being should avoid pain relievers entirely.
- D) At least some people who take pain relievers for longer than 7 days will experience side effects.
- E) Any side effects experienced by a patient who has taken a pain reliever for fewer than 7 consecutive days cannot be the result of the pain reliever.

14. Sol. Correct answer: 4)

At least some people who take pain relievers for longer than 7 days will experience side effects.

This is an Inference question. In isolation, the phrase in the question stem, “most strongly supports”, could hint at either a Strengthen question or an Inference question. However, when we take the stem in its entirety, the structure of the problem begins to unfold. Remember: premises always support conclusions. Thus, if the information in the answer choices supports the argument above, the answer choices must be premises and the conclusion is found in the argument (leading us to believe the problem is a Strengthen question.) On the other hand, if the information in the body of the question supports the answer choices below, the argument’s conclusion must be found in the answer choices (leading us to believe the problem is an Inference question.) Since the question stem indicates that the information “above” is supporting answer choices below, the answer choices must be potential conclusions. This must be an Inference question.

Two primary insights can be gleaned reading the body of the question. First, since we are looking at an Inference question, our first line of defense is the “no new information” filter. Remember that valid conclusions must always (not just sometimes) be

true, and therefore must be based entirely on the information found in the premises. Conclusions containing new information not found anywhere in the argument may or may not be true. The second insight is closely linked to the first. Throughout the entire body of the question, a lot of fuzzy, non-specific words are used: “most pain relievers”, “some people”, and “many people.” They describe subgroups of the total, and are very nebulous, especially when you contrast such phrases with “all pain relievers” or “all people.” Therefore, valid conclusions that go beyond these vague categorizations may or may not be true. Believing you can conclude something about “all people” when you only know about “some people” is a logical error known as overgeneralization. Once we recognize this trick of the Testmaker, it becomes relatively easy to spot many of the wrong answer choices.

Answer choice “A physician should not advise any patient to take any pain reliever for a period of longer than 7 consecutive days.” is a classic example of overgeneralization. Notice how this conclusion focuses on “any patient” taking “any pain reliever.” The body of the question only tells us about “most people” and “most pain relievers”. This conclusion goes beyond what we know, and therefore is not necessarily true.

Answer choice “People who are sensitive to one type of pain reliever should not attempt to use a different pain reliever.” includes new information not contained in the body of the question. The evidence in the top part of the question contains nothing about people being “sensitive” to one type of pain reliever. Therefore, we cannot make a conclusion about something we don’t have information on. Answer choice “People who are sensitive to one type of pain reliever should not attempt to use a different pain reliever.” is not necessarily true.

Answer choice “At least some people who take pain relievers for longer than 7 days will experience side effects. contains no new information, and remains within the fuzzy scope of the original statements. The body of the question tells us that “many people” who take painkillers for longer than 7 days experience side effects. The conclusion that “at least some people” will experience side effects is well within the information given. “At least some people who take pain relievers for longer than 7 days will experience side effects.” is basically a restate of information already given, so we can clearly conclude it must be true. “At least some people who take pain relievers for longer than 7 days will experience side effects.” is the right answer.

The conclusion in answer choice “Any side effects experienced by a patient who has taken a pain

reliever for fewer than 7 consecutive days cannot be the result of the pain reliever.” also uses extreme scope limiters not justified by the original evidence. It refers to “any side effects” that “cannot” be the result of pain relievers. This goes well beyond the scope. The problem only tells us about side effects caused by a subset of pain relievers. It makes no mention of side effects not caused by pain relievers. Answer choice “Any side effects experienced by a patient who has taken a pain reliever for fewer than 7 consecutive days cannot be the result of the pain reliever.” fails the “no new information” filter. We cannot make a conclusion about something we don’t have information on. Answer choice “Any side effects experienced by a patient who has taken a pain reliever for fewer than 7 consecutive days cannot be the result of the pain reliever.” is not necessarily true.

Answer choice “Anyone who wants to maximize their natural health and well-being should avoid pain relievers entirely.” contains all sorts of new information not contained in the original evidence. The body of the question makes no mention on how to “maximize your natural health and well-being”, nor does it give us any criteria for when we should avoid pain relievers. (For example, could it be possible that the advantages of taking pain relievers could outweigh the side effects, even if we had to deal with these negative consequences?) “Anyone who wants to maximize their natural health and well-being should avoid pain relievers entirely.” cannot be a valid conclusion.

15. The price of health insurance as a percentage of an individual’s overall monthly income does not necessarily indicate quality of care. If it did, individuals who spent a greater percentage of their income on health insurance would receive better quality of care, or vice versa.

If the statements above are all true, which of the following can be properly inferred on the basis of them?

- A) It is probable that individuals who spend more on health insurance in fact get a lower quality of care than do those who spend less on health care.
- B) Individuals who spend the greatest percentage of their income on health insurance never receive high quality of care from medical providers.
- C) If individuals receiving free or reduced cost health insurance from the government were removed from the sample, there would be a strong correlation between cost and quality of care.

- D) Reducing an individual’s spending on health insurance as a percent of their income will not necessarily lead to lower quality of care.
- E) Looking at the dollar amount spent on health insurance rather than the percentage would show a correlation between amount of money spent and quality of care.

15. Sol. Correct answer: 4)

Reducing an individual’s spending on health insurance as a percent of their income will not necessarily lead to lower quality of care.

Whenever a CR question asks for something that can be “properly inferred” from a critical reasoning argument, remember that your job is to fully understand the argument presented and then look for the answer choice that is guaranteed by the information presented. Remember, the information doesn’t have to be interesting - it just needs to be something that must be true given the information presented.

In this case, you are told there’s no correlation between the percentage of an individual’s income spent on healthcare and the quality of healthcare they receive. (Further, if it did exist, the argument states that either individuals who spend a greater percentage of their income on health insurance would get better or worse quality of care.)

The only real information that you have here is the fact that increased (or decreased) spending on health insurance as a percentage of income does not “necessarily indicate quality of care.” You don’t have any information on absolute amounts spent on health insurance or about the health insurance itself. From this, you can eliminate “If individuals receiving free or reduced cost health insurance from the government were removed from the sample, there would be a strong correlation between cost and quality of care.”, which deals with eliminating a particular type of health insurance from the sample and “Looking at the dollar amount spent on health insurance rather than the percentage would show a correlation between amount of money spent and quality of care.”, which deals with absolute dollar amounts. Choice “It is probable that individuals who spend more on health insurance in fact get a lower quality of care than do those who spend less on health care.” can also be eliminated since you are told that there is no correlation in either direction.

Between “Individuals who spend the greatest percentage of their income on health insurance never receive high quality of care from medical providers.” and “Reducing an individual’s spending on health insurance as a percent of their income will not necessarily lead to lower quality of care.”, choice “Individuals who spend the greatest percentage of their income on health insurance never receive high quality of care from medical providers.” can be

eliminated since there is just no way to prove that individuals who spend a large percentage of their income on health insurance never get quality care from medical providers - the entire point of the argument is that there is no correlation.

Choice "Reducing an individual's spending on health insurance as a percent of their income will not necessarily lead to lower quality of care." must be correct. If there is no correlation between spending on health insurance as a percentage of income, then reducing spending on health insurance as a percent of income may or may not affect quality of care. The words here "will not necessarily lead to lower quality of care" are particularly important, since it links back to the argument that there is just no way to tell.

16. When the defendant in a trial chooses not testify, the jury is not supposed to view this as evidence of the defendant's guilt or innocence. Rather, the jury should base its decision on the evidence that is presented throughout the trial. Nevertheless, jurors will often take the failure of a defendant to testify as evidence of that defendant's guilt.

Which of the following conclusions can most properly be drawn from the information above?

- A) Some jurors refuse to take a defendant's refusal to testify into consideration when deciding guilt or innocence.
- B) Most defendants who refuse to testify in their trials are, in fact, guilty.
- C) The rules should be modified to require defendants to testify regardless of their guilt or innocence.
- D) A defendant would sometimes be better served by testifying at trial rather than by choosing not to testify.
- E) The fact that a defendant refuses to testify is sometimes unfairly considered by a jury as evidence of guilt.

16. Sol. Correct answer: 5)

The fact that a defendant refuses to testify is sometimes unfairly considered by a jury as evidence of guilt.

This is an inference question. The correct answer must be true. From the stimulus we know that the jury is not supposed to consider the fact that a defendant does not testify as evidence of guilt or innocence. And yet, jurors do take the refusal to testify as evidence of guilt. This means that choice "The fact that a defendant refuses to testify is sometimes unfairly considered by a jury as evidence of guilt." must be true, the fact that a defendant

refuses to testify is unfairly seen by some jurors as evidence of guilt.

Choice "Most defendants who refuse to testify in their trials are, in fact, guilty." could be false, there is no indication of whether those who refuse to testify are guilty. Choice "The rules should be modified to require defendants to testify regardless of their guilt or innocence." indicates what "should" happen. This is a recommendation and is not something that must be true, even if it does seem logical. Choice "A defendant would sometimes be better served by testifying at trial rather than by choosing not to testify." could be true, a defendant might be better served by testifying, but it could be false as well. This is a prediction and it is very difficult for a prediction to be must be true. Choice "Some jurors refuse to take a defendant's refusal to testify into consideration when deciding guilt or innocence." seems very plausible. Jurors are not supposed to take a defendant's not testifying into account. It is logical to think that at least some jurors would follow this rule. However, it is not clear that this is the case. This does not reach the standard of must be true. The stimulus still allows the possibility that every juror takes the fact of not testifying into account.

17. About one-quarter of 'Top 50' business schools in the United States have acceptance rates of over 30 percent. Because of the higher acceptance rate, students admitted to these programs tend to have GMAT scores under 650, undergraduate grade point averages below 3.4, and work experience of less than four years.

Which of the following can be inferred from the passage above?

Possible Answers:

"Top 50" business schools tend to accept students with undergraduate grade point averages under 3.4. Work experience is not the most important criterion for admission to a "Top 50" business school.

It is possible for a business school whose accepted students have average GMAT scores under 650 to be "Top 50".

Most students whose GMAT scores are below 650 tend to have undergraduate grade point averages under 3.4.

Accepting over 30 percent of applicants can help a business school move into the "Top 50".

17. Correct answer:

It is possible for a business school whose accepted students have average GMAT scores under 650 to be "Top 50".

This inference question makes you choose between a guaranteed (and almost boring) answer choice and

answer choices that tend to over-generalize from the information given in the prompt. As with any inference question, it is important to pay careful attention to word play within the answers. In this case, it forces you to differentiate between two groups: 'Top 50' business schools in general and the subset of 'Top 50' business schools discussed in the prompt.

For answer choice "Accepting over 30 percent of applicants can help a business school move into the 'Top 50'." , raising the acceptance rate has nothing to do with the quality of the school or its applicants. The argument doesn't give any information about what it takes to become a top 50 School – eliminate "Accepting over 30 percent of applicants can help a business school move into the 'Top 50'."

Although "Most students whose GMAT scores are below 650 tend to have undergraduate grade point averages under 3.4." is tempting, the argument does not make a connection between all students whose GMAT scores are below 650 and who have grade point averages under 3.4. While this connection might be true for the students admitted to the schools discussed, the argument doesn't address GMAT takers in general, so this inference is not guaranteed.

Similarly, answer choice "'Top 50' business schools tend to accept students with undergraduate grade point averages under 3.4." over generalizes and tries to extrapolate general tendencies among all 'Top 50' business schools from the information given about one fourth of that group. Because there is no indication that you can extrapolate from the information given, "'Top 50' business schools tend to accept students with undergraduate grade point averages under 3.4." is not a proper inference.

Answer choice "Work experience is not the most important criterion for admission to a 'Top 50' business school." also makes the mistake of over-generalization. While some 'Top 50' schools admit students without much work experience, that does not mean that work experience isn't the most important criterion for any 'Top 50' business school, as suggested in "Work experience is not the most important criterion for admission to a 'Top 50' business school.'"

Answer choice "It is possible for a business school whose accepted students have average GMAT scores under 650 to be 'Top 50'." is almost guaranteed by the argument. If admitted students at 25% of the 'Top 50' business schools tend to have scores around 650, it is possible that the average for those schools will be around 650. Since "It is possible for a business school whose accepted students have average GMAT scores under 650 to be 'Top 50'." only requires that it be possible, it is a proper inference and is the correct answer

18. The continual use of chemical sprays in an effort to rid a house of insects has two unintended results that are particularly dangerous. First, chemical sprays often kill spiders, which are natural predators of most other insects found in the house. Second, chemical sprays often give rise to insects that are largely resistant to the sprays, since those insects that survive a particular spray will be the ones that are most resistant to the spray and will most prolifically breed spray-resistant offspring.

From the passage above, it can be inferred that the usefulness of chemical sprays can be improved by doing which of the following, assuming each is realistically possible?

Possible Answers:

- 1)Spraying only a portion of the house at a time
- 2)Planting trees outside of the house to attract certain insects that typically are resistant to chemical sprays
- 3)Increasing the amount that is sprayed
- 4)Alternating the use of a variety of chemical sprays used
- 5)Using only sprays that are more chemically stable

18. Correct answer:

Alternating the use of a variety of chemical sprays used

The argument states that there are two unintended results of spraying chemicals in the home. Chemicals kill spiders, which would normally kill other insects found in the home. Second, insects become resistant to the chemicals over the course of generations. The correct answer will solve (or at least mitigate) one of these two problems, thus increasing the effectiveness of the chemical sprays (the goal of the question). Remember that for any inference question that inferences must be guaranteed. This may mean that they are not interesting and may add information that seems almost identical to what is given in the argument.

Remember that it's often to find what is wrong with an answer choice than finding what works about it. Answer choice "Using only sprays that are more chemically stable" doesn't address anything to do with the spiders or insects becoming resistant, so it can be eliminated. Alternating the chemical spray used "Alternating the use of a variety of chemical sprays used" does address the insects becoming resistant. This will improve the effectiveness of the chemical sprays, so "Alternating the use of a variety of chemical sprays used" is the correct answer.

For completion, make sure that "Increasing the amount that is sprayed", "Spraying only a portion of the house at a time", and "Planting trees outside of the house to attract certain insects that typically are resistant to chemical sprays" can be eliminated.

"Increasing the amount that is sprayed" can be eliminated because increasing the amount sprayed doesn't address the problem of resistance and may make more spiders die. "Spraying only a portion of the house at a time" can be eliminated since, while spraying one portion of the house at a time might seem like it might address the issue of resistance, it doesn't. Planting trees that house resistant insects "Planting trees outside of the house to attract certain insects that typically are resistant to chemical sprays" would be counterproductive.

19. Fretter Appliances sold more refrigerators in 2015 than in any previous year, and most of the refrigerators it sold that year were purchased by residents of Oakland County. However, most refrigerators purchased by residents of Oakland County in 2015 were not purchased from Fretter Appliances.

Which of the following conclusions can be logically drawn from the statements above?

Possible Answers:

Residents of Oakland County purchased more refrigerators in 2015 than in any previous year.

At least some residents of Oakland County purchased refrigerators from stores not located within Oakland County in 2015.

Fretter Appliances sold more refrigerators to residents of Oakland County in 2015 than it did in any previous year.

In 2015, more refrigerators were purchased by residents of Oakland County than were sold by Fretter Appliances.

At least one store in Oakland County sold more refrigerators in 2015 than Fretter Appliances did.

19. Correct answer:

In 2015, more refrigerators were purchased by residents of Oakland County than were sold by Fretter Appliances.

This Inference problem forces you to deal with the provided statistics, which guarantee that choice B must be true. To prove that, you could use a variable for the number of refrigerators that Fretter sold to residents of Oakland County (let's call it x) or you can borrow a tool from your Word Problems / Quantitative toolkit and pick a number (such as 50). You know that most (so $> 1/2$) of the refrigerators that Fretter sold were to residents of Oakland County. So the number of refrigerators that Fretter sold in total must be less than $2x$, or less than 100.

You also know that more than $1/2$ of the refrigerators sold to residents of Oakland County were NOT from Fretter. So Fretter's x (or 50) refrigerators are less than half of Oakland County's refrigerator sales. Oakland County's sales then are $> 2x$, or > 100 . This allows you to directly compare

the two totals: The number of total Fretter sales is less than the number of total Oakland County sales. Choice "In 2015, more refrigerators were purchased by residents of Oakland County than were sold by Fretter Appliances." is therefore proven.

Among the incorrect answer choices:

With choice "At least one store in Oakland County sold more refrigerators in 2015 than Fretter Appliances did.", recognize that no one store had to sell more in Oakland County than Fretter in order for Fretter's sales to be less than 50% of the county's. Several smaller stores could add up to that $>50\%$ amount.

With choice "Residents of Oakland County purchased more refrigerators in 2015 than in any previous year.", there is just no information to draw this conclusion: Fretter's 2015 was its greatest ever, but you don't have any information about Oakland County's historical sales.

Choice "Fretter Appliances sold more refrigerators to residents of Oakland County in 2015 than it did in any previous year." can be eliminated by considering extreme cases when picking numbers. If this year Fretter sold 100 refrigerators overall (its best year ever) and 51 in Oakland County (more than half its total sales), you could still have Fretter selling 90 last year (consistent with 2015 as its highest ever sales) with all 90 of them coming from Oakland County (just a much higher percentage of its sales coming from Oakland County in a previous year).

And choice "At least some residents of Oakland County purchased refrigerators from stores not located within Oakland County in 2015." is a choice that seems likely to be true, but that has no proof anywhere in the stimulus. On Inference questions, if you can't find direct proof, the answer choice is not necessarily true and must be eliminated.

20. The National Academy of Sciences (NAS) recommends a specific daily intake for vitamin C, as greatly exceeding that amount is dangerous. Many vitamin-fortified foods contain 100% of this recommended daily intake for vitamin C in one serving, an amount defined on the package by the manufacturer. However, most consumers overestimate the amount of one serving for these foods, ingesting two to four times what is considered one serving by the manufacturer.

Which of the following is most supported by the information above?

Possible Answers:

- 1)Manufacturers need to change the amount listed as one serving on the packaging for vitamin-fortified foods.
- 2)People should avoid taking supplemental vitamin C if they are eating vitamin-fortified foods.
- 3)Any person eating vitamin-fortified foods will receive the daily intake for vitamin C that is recommended by the National Academy of Sciences.
- 4)Most people eating vitamin-fortified foods are consuming dangerous amounts of vitamin C.
- 5)Some people eating vitamin-fortified foods exceed the daily intake for vitamin C that is recommended by the National Academy of Sciences.

20. Correct answer:

Some people eating vitamin-fortified foods exceed the daily intake for vitamin C that is recommended by the National Academy of Sciences.

This question stem is asking you to form a conclusion based on the information given, so you must pick the one answer that is guaranteed. As is true for all inference style questions, you should use process of elimination by evaluating each potential conclusion.

For "Most people eating vitamin-fortified foods are consuming dangerous amounts of vitamin C.", you do know that "most consumers overestimate the amount of one serving for these foods, ingesting two to four times what is considered one serving by the manufacturer" so it is safe to say that most people get more than their daily intake as recommended by the NAS. However, to be dangerous the recommended amounts must be "greatly exceeded" and we have no idea if "two to four times" meets that threshold. As a result this is not a proper inference.

For "Manufacturers need to change the amount listed as one serving on the packaging for vitamin-fortified foods.", there is no proof given in the stimulus that manufacturers need to do anything. While it is true that many consumers overestimate the amount of one serving, this does not allow you to conclude that manufacturers need to make a change (maybe the consumers just need to get better at estimating!). This type of prescription is virtually impossible to prove in an inference style question.

For "Any person eating vitamin-fortified foods will receive the daily intake for vitamin C that is recommended by the National Academy of Sciences.", the word "any" makes this easy to eliminate. We know that many, but not necessarily all, vitamin fortified foods contain 100% of the recommended vitamin C and that "most" consumers overestimate a serving. However, this still leaves open the possibility that some people are eating vitamin-fortified foods that do not contain vitamin C or that they are not getting a full serving's worth.

For "Some people eating vitamin-fortified foods exceed the daily intake for vitamin C that is recommended by the National Academy of Sciences.", you know with certainty that most consumers are eating 2-4 servings of vitamin-fortified foods containing vitamin C, which provides more than 100% of the recommended amount. Since you only need to prove one person has consumed more than a serving of these foods to be sure of this conclusion, it must be true and "Some people eating vitamin-fortified foods exceed the daily intake for vitamin C that is recommended by the National Academy of Sciences." is correct.

For "People should avoid taking supplemental vitamin C if they are eating vitamin-fortified foods.", this is a similar prescription to what you saw in "Manufacturers need to change the amount listed as one serving on the packaging for vitamin-fortified foods.". There might be many reasons why someone wants or needs to take a vitamin C supplement even if they are eating the vitamin-fortified foods. Maybe their doctor wants them to have lots of extra vitamin C or maybe they are eating the vitamin-fortified foods that do not contain 100% of the recommended amount. This is not a proper inference