CLAT Gurukul — By Ready For Exam

Daily RC & CR Sheet — Answers, Skills & Examiner Notes — 31 October 2026

20 Qs · 0 Min
Answer key + skill tags + examiner notes

ANSWER KEY — 31 OCTOBER 2026

Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
B	D	A	C	A	C	B	D	A	B
Q11	**Q12**	**Q13**	**Q14**	**Q15**	**Q16**	**Q17**	**Q18**	**Q19**	**Q20**
D	A	C	B	D	A	C	B	D	C

READING COMPREHENSION

Q1 B Main idea MED

The passage moves in four steps. It first rejects the engineers' assumption that every jam has a visible cause and cites the 2008 ring-track experiment. It then explains the mechanism, in which each driver brakes slightly harder than the one ahead so that a disturbance grows as it propagates. The third paragraph calls the jam an 'emergent property' of the system and says that urging care achieves little. The last paragraph describes a trial in which one smooth vehicle improved flow, with a measured caution about real roads. Option B carries all of these moves: emergence from ordinary delays, remedies aimed at the pattern, and the early evidence for smoother vehicles. Option A contradicts the claim that no individual is at fault. Option C says widening eliminates jams, when the author says it may only postpone them. Option D reverses the author's verdict on the bottleneck assumption.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A attracts students who read 'driver behaviour' and jump to blame; the passage says the instability arises even among careful drivers, so the main point is the opposite.

Q2 D Inference HARD

The passage says that 'when traffic is dense' each driver reacts to the car ahead after a delay, and that disturbances then grow as they propagate. It adds that widening a road 'may merely postpone the density at which waves begin to form'. The word 'postpone' implies a threshold: below it the flow is stable, above it waves form without any collision or closure. Option D states exactly this and goes no further than the text. Option A is contradicted by the observation that the instability arises 'even among careful drivers whose delays are perfectly ordinary', so prompt reaction does not prevent it. Option B overreaches: the trial involved a single vehicle among twenty cars, and the author warns against generalising to real roads. Option C is unsupported; the passage links wave movement to the flow of traffic, not to the force of the first brake.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B is the attractive wrong answer because the trial result sounds like a cure; but one vehicle in twenty in controlled conditions licenses no claim about 'any real motorway' or 'entirely'.

Q3 A Detail retrieval EASY

This is a direct-retrieval question and the answer sits in the second paragraph. The author writes that a small tap on the brakes 'forces the next to brake a little harder, because she has already closed the gap and must now shed the difference as well'. She adds that each successive driver 'overshoots by a margin, so the disturbance grows as it propagates', and that by the tenth or twentieth car a flicker of hesitation has become a full stop. Option A restates that chain of amplification faithfully. Option B introduces visibility of brake lights, which the passage never mentions. Option C attributes the growth to deliberate gap-widening, whereas the delay is a reflex and not a strategy. Option D has the wave travelling forward and blames a bottleneck, both of which the passage denies; it says the wave moves against the flow and that the jam has no bottleneck.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D tempts those who carry the engineers' old bottleneck assumption into the question; the opening paragraph has already set that assumption aside.

Q4 C Weaken HARD

The researchers' suggestion is that a lone smooth vehicle absorbs disturbances and so calms the whole stream behind it. The mechanism works only if the cars behind it actually follow it. Option C breaks that link: if drivers overtake the slower vehicle, they exit its influence, and the wave-damping effect cannot propagate backwards. It also matches the author's own caution about real roads. Option A concerns the vehicle's fuel use, but the passage claims the saving applies to the whole stream, so the vehicle's own consumption is irrelevant to the suggestion. Option B compares the frequency of jams on two kinds of road, and says nothing about whether a smooth vehicle can reduce them. Option D describes the design of an earlier experiment, which, if anything, shows that jams arose even under orders to drive steadily, and so supports the case for pattern-level remedies.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the trap: it sounds like a defect in the trial vehicle, but the claim being tested concerns flow across the entire stream and not the vehicle's own efficiency.

Q5 A Analogy / structural parallel ELITE

The phantom jam has four features: no external cause, a reaction by each participant to the one just before, a slight overshoot at each step, and a disturbance that grows as it passes through the chain. Option A reproduces all four. The trader who sells a little more than the last trader is the driver who brakes a little harder than the last driver, and the rout is the full stop. Options B and C are ordinary

NAME: _____ ROLL NO: _____ BATCH: _____

bottleneck cases, with a visible breakdown or a single open gate, which is the very explanation the author says engineers wrongly applied to phantom jams. Option D has a single identifiable culprit who invents and spreads the rumour deliberately, and so contradicts the passage's claim that 'no individual is at fault'. A good analogy must preserve the mechanism and not merely the outcome of a queue or spread.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B is the attractive wrong answer because it also involves a chain of people waiting, but it has a breakdown at one point, and that is exactly what a phantom jam lacks.

Q6 C Main idea MED

The first paragraph sets aside the 'library' picture and introduces reconsolidation. The second draws the consequence that remembering is 'not a read-only operation' but also an act of rewriting. The third discusses therapeutic promise, and the fourth supplies limits (resistant memories, inconsistent human results) and an ethical risk. Option C names every part: the mechanism, the promise, and the limits and risks. Option A reverses the author's position, since the library model is the one being dismantled. Option B overstates: trials reduced the physical alarm while the memory remained, so 'erase' is wrong, and the author counsels caution, not urgent adoption. Option D elevates a supporting example to the main theme and replaces a measured closing remark with a sweeping claim that testimony is 'always' unreliable.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B is attractive because the third paragraph is the most hopeful part; but a reader who stops there misses the whole fourth paragraph, which governs the author's overall verdict.

Q7 B Inference / author's attitude to evidence HARD

The author calls Loftus's studies 'older' and says they 'now look less like a curiosity of suggestion and more like a predictable consequence of how storage works'. That phrase signals that the earlier results are not overturned but explained: if recall reopens a memory and lets it absorb present information, a leading question at the moment of recall would be expected to alter it. Option B captures that shift from curiosity to expected consequence. Option A reverses the relationship; reconsolidation supports the possibility of alteration. Option C imports deliberate lying, a notion absent from the passage, which concerns honest but altered memory. Option D contradicts the word 'predictable', since the studies are said to bear directly on the way memory is stored. The answer depends on noticing the comparative 'less like… more like', which marks reinterpretation.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the trap for readers who think any new mechanism must displace an old result; the author uses reconsolidation to vindicate the earlier findings, not to refute them.

Q8 D Tone MED

Tone questions are settled by the author's verbs and qualifiers. In the third paragraph he says clinicians were 'quick to see therapeutic promise' and reports that some participants no longer felt the physical alarm, so he is not dismissive. In the fourth he opens with 'Caution is nevertheless warranted' and lists resistant memories, a narrow window, inconsistent human results and failures to replicate, and then adds an ethical worry. The closing sentence calls the picture 'neither a cure nor a threat'. That balance is guarded interest, which is option D. Option A is wrong because the results in human beings are said to be less consistent. Option B is wrong because the animal studies are where the effect was first demonstrated. Option C is wrong because the author clearly judges: he warns and qualifies throughout the final paragraph.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C is the attractive wrong choice for students who read 'neither a cure nor a threat' as indifference; that phrase is a considered verdict, not an absence of one.

Q9 A Negative / unsupported statement HARD

In an 'NOT supported' question, three options paraphrase the text and one contradicts it. Option B paraphrases the fourth paragraph: 'the window of vulnerability is narrow' and the effect depends on 'details of timing'. Option C is stated in the third paragraph, where trials 'paired the recall of a traumatic event with a drug that dampens stress responses'. Option D restates the ethical point that a technique able to soften the memory of abuse could be used to 'blunt a witness's recollection of it'. Option A claims reliable reproduction in humans across all memories, but the author says that 'very old or very strong memories seem resistant', that human results are 'less consistent' than animal ones, and that there have been failures to replicate. It is therefore unsupported, and in fact contradicted by the passage.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is the attractive wrong answer because it sounds alarming and speculative; yet the passage says it 'could in principle' happen, so it is supported.

Q10 B Figurative / implied meaning ELITE

A comparison between memory and testimony works only through the feature they share. Testimony is an account given at a particular time, to a particular audience, in particular circumstances, and it is shaped by them. The author says memory is the same: the act of recalling happens in the present and can revise the trace using present information, as the second paragraph argued. Option B expresses this as interpretation made now rather than replay. Option A overstates, because 'an account' does not mean 'fabricated entirely'; the passage never says memories are fictions. Option C ranks testimony above memory, whereas the simile equates them. Option D imports a claim of success which the fourth paragraph denies, since the technique is limited, inconsistent and ethically fraught. The simile therefore points to the present-tense, constructed character of both.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the trap for readers who equate 'reconstruction' with 'fabrication'; the author says memory is rewritten, not invented from nothing.

CRITICAL REASONING

Q11 D Main conclusion MED

The author opens by granting that the commissioner's table 'is accurate', and then says the conclusion 'does not follow'. The second and third paragraphs supply two reasons: issues miss other uses (footfall, reading rooms), and issues were depressed by the corporation's own halving of acquisitions. The final paragraph recommends measuring first. The main conclusion is therefore that the merger case is unproven, which is option D. Option A is the commissioner's position, which the author rejects. Option B is wrong because the author explicitly accepts the table as accurate. Option C overstates a supporting point into a general theory of libraries; the author says only that issues understate use, and does not claim that books are no longer central. The conclusion is the claim the premises are meant to support, not one of the premises.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the trap for students who pick the most prominent claim in the first paragraph; that claim is the argument under attack, not the author's conclusion.

Q12 A Assumption (necessary) HARD

The commissioner moves from 'issues have fallen and cost per issue has risen' to 'people have stopped using' the buildings. That jump requires a bridging premise: that issues track use, or value. If issues could fall while use and value held steady, the argument would collapse. Option A states the bridge. A negation test confirms it: if a fall in issues did not indicate lower value, the commissioner's case would lose its force. Option B is not needed; the case could stand on the existing cost figures even if future savings were uncertain. Option C is tempting, but the commissioner never mentions footfall, and the argument can work with issues alone as a proxy. Option D states a stronger principle than the argument requires, since it speaks of majority use, while the commissioner speaks only of buildings 'people have stopped using'.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C is the attractive wrong answer: it sounds like the natural companion of the issues figure, but the argument does not need footfall to fall, only issues to stand for use.

Q13 C Weaken (causal) HARD

The author's causal claim is that the halving of acquisitions budgets explains the fall in issues. The standard way to weaken a cause-effect claim is to show the effect occurs without the supposed cause. Option C does exactly that: if branches whose budgets were untouched also saw issues fall by about the same amount, something other than the budget cut is probably responsible. Option A concerns the seasonal pattern of footfall and does not bear on why issues fell. Option B concerns the rent, which affects the cost-per-issue figure but not the cause of the fall in issues. Option D confirms the accuracy of the table, which the author has already granted in the second paragraph ('The table is accurate'), so it leaves the causal claim exactly where it stood. Only C attacks the link between cause and effect.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is the trap: it sounds damaging to the author but merely repeats a point he concedes in the second paragraph.

Q14 B Strengthen HARD

The claim is that issues capture only part of the use of a branch, since many users never borrow. Evidence that strengthens it must show substantial use that issues do not record. Option B gives exactly this: on an ordinary day the reading rooms held far more people than the number of borrowers. Option A suggests that borrowers may have moved to the central library, which, if anything, supports the commissioner's view that demand for the branches fell. Option C concerns punctual returns and says nothing about uses other than borrowing. Option D compares rents with private reading rooms; it bears on cost but not on how much use the branches get. The strengthening fact must close the gap between the measure (issues) and the thing measured (use), and only B does that.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the attractive wrong answer because it also mentions issues and the six years, but it explains the decline as a transfer of demand and so favours the commissioner.

Q15 D Parallel reasoning ELITE

The author's argument has two strands: the measure captures only one kind of use (issues, not reading-room visits) and the decline in the measure was produced by the decision-maker's own earlier cut (acquisitions halved). Option D reproduces both strands. The enrolment register ignores meals and evening classes, which is the first strand, and enrolment fell after the department stopped replacing teachers, which is the second. Option A attacks the arithmetic of the cost figures, whereas the author accepts that the table is accurate. Option B has only the first strand, because it points to other uses but gives no self-inflicted cause of the low match count. Option C has only the second strand, since it shows the operator's cut caused the fall but does not claim that ridership omits other uses. Parallel questions require matching all the moves, and not merely the topic of closure.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C is the attractive wrong answer because the self-inflicted decline is the most vivid part of the original; but it drops the argument's other half, the unrecorded uses.

Q16 A Main conclusion MED

The first paragraph reports the department's claim. The second shows a rival explanation: the average improved because referrals rose and complicated diagnoses fell. The third says the measure leaves out the sickest patients. The fourth separates the author's position from a blanket attack on bonuses: 'To say so is not to condemn bonuses', and he says spreading the model would spread 'its blind spot'. So the conclusion is that the result does not prove the bonus works and that extension should wait for proper measurement. Option A says this. Option B contradicts the fourth paragraph, which explicitly refuses to condemn bonuses. Option C wrongly calls the reduction a statistical error; the author accepts the figure and disputes its meaning. Option D proposes a remedy that the author never mentions, so it is an unsupported addition.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B is the attractive wrong answer for students who read the critical tone as total opposition; the author expressly says he is not condemning bonuses.

Q17 C Assumption (necessary) HARD

The department infers from a lower median wait that the bonus 'works'. That inference holds only if the lower wait means better service for the patients in the queue, and not a different patient mix. The author's whole counter-argument targets this gap, which shows that it is the department's hidden premise. Negating option C ('the fall merely reflects a change in whom specialists see') destroys the department's conclusion, so it is necessary. Option A is an extreme claim about what specialists would do without a bonus, and the department's case does not require it. Option B is a comparison of patient values that the department never makes. Option D is an extreme and cynical claim about all referrals that the author does not make either; he says referral stops counting against the specialist, not that referral is never in the patient's interest.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B is the trap: it sounds like the sort of thing a target-driven official might believe, but the department's inference does not need patients to rank speed above quality.

Q18 B Weaken HARD

The author's worry is that complicated cases, once referred, face a journey and further queues, so reach treatment later than before. To weaken this, we need evidence that referred patients are in fact treated sooner. Option B supplies it: a fast track at the medical college means the referred patient may reach treatment faster than if he had waited at Rampur. Option A speaks of specialists' awareness, which is consistent with the author's own claim that they have 'learned what the measure covers'. Option C is a general property of the median and does not concern referred patients. Option D concerns what other states have published and has no bearing on what happens to referred patients in Rampur. A weakener must disturb the link between referral and delay, and only B does so.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the attractive wrong answer: it sounds like a pro-scheme fact, but awareness of waiting times is exactly what the author expects the bonus to produce.

Q19 D Flaw in reasoning HARD

The department's note says that a target met so conspicuously 'has changed behaviour', and it proceeds to extend the scheme. The flaw is that it equates hitting the target with achieving the purpose behind the target: shorter measured waits are taken to mean better care. The author's second and third paragraphs expose this by showing how the number can move while care for the sickest patients does not improve. Option D names this flaw (a proxy mistaken for the goal). Option A is about the median's blind spot, which is not the author's point; his point is about who leaves the queue. Option B names a generalisation flaw that a reader might apply, but the department's core error is the proxy confusion, not the number of hospitals. Option C is wrong since the department cites a measured result, not specialists' opinions.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B is the attractive wrong answer because 'one hospital to the whole state' is a standard flaw; the passage, however, spends all its energy on the proxy-versus-goal gap.

Q20 C Principle / justification ELITE

The author's argument is that the waiting-time average can be improved by changing which patients are counted, which happens when difficult cases are referred and leave the queue. A principle that justifies his criticism must say that a target is unreliable when it can be met by altering the served population. Option C states precisely that, and it also explains why the author proposes a measure that follows referred patients to the end. Option A concerns consent to targets, which the passage does not raise. Option B concerns who is paid, and the author nowhere complains about the recipients of the bonus. Option D is a principle the author would reject, since his concern is the sickest patient; accepting it would undermine his reasoning and favour the department. The right principle is the one that licenses the specific inference drawn.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is the trap: it is phrased as a general fairness principle, but it points the opposite way, because the author's anxiety is for the most vulnerable user.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. Plural of 'criterion'? — **criteria**
2. Synonym of 'ephemeral'? — **short-lived; transient**
3. Antonym of 'candid'? — **evasive; guarded**
4. 'Neither of the two boys __ present.' (is/are) — **is**
5. One word: a person who loves books — **bibliophile**
6. Meaning of 'ubiquitous'? — **found everywhere**
7. Idiom: 'to burn the midnight oil'? — **to work late into the night**
8. Correct spelling: accomodate or accommodate? — **accommodate**
9. Affect or effect: which is usually the noun? — **effect**
10. Meaning of 'obfuscate'? — **to make unclear or confusing**
11. Synonym of 'magnanimous'? — **generous; forgiving**
12. Idiom: 'a red herring'? — **a misleading clue**
13. 'He insisted __ paying the bill.' (preposition) — **on**
14. '__ people attended today.' (Fewer/Less) — **Fewer**
15. One word: fear of enclosed spaces — **claustrophobia**
16. Meaning of 'perfunctory'? — **done routinely, without care**
17. Antonym of 'verbose'? — **concise**
18. Meaning of 'to eke out'? — **to make last by careful use**
19. 'The school __ spoke to us.' (principal/principle) — **principal**
20. Meaning of 'laconic'? — **using very few words**
21. Idiom: 'to bite the bullet'? — **to face something unpleasant bravely**
22. Synonym of 'intransigent'? — **uncompromising**
23. Legal Latin: 'sub judice'? — **under judicial consideration**
24. Legal Latin: 'amicus curiae'? — **friend of the court**
25. 'Each of the students __ a book.' (has/have) — **has**
26. Meaning of 'equivocal'? — **open to more than one interpretation**
27. Antonym of 'benevolent'? — **malevolent**
28. Prefix 'anti-' means? — **against**
29. Legal Latin: 'ad hoc'? — **for this purpose only**
30. Legal Latin: 'per se'? — **by itself; in itself**
31. Meaning of 'sanguine'? — **optimistic**
32. Difference: 'mitigate' means? — **to lessen the severity of**