CLAT Gurukul — By Ready For Exam

Daily RC & CR Sheet — Answers, Skills & Examiner Notes — 5 November 2026

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

ANSWER KEY — 5 NOVEMBER 2026

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

READING COMPREHENSION

Q1 B Main idea MED

The passage has a clear arc. The first paragraph poses a puzzle: the brain has no ordinary lymphatic vessels, so how does it clear waste? The second and third paragraphs describe the mouse experiments, which traced a route along arteries, through astrocyte-lined channels and out along veins, and found that 'fluid moved through them far faster' in sleep and anaesthesia. The fourth paragraph then withholds confidence: human brains are much larger, imaging is indirect, and the dye experiments may have 'exaggerated the effect'. The author concludes that the pathway's 'size, its dependence on sleep and its role in disease remain open'. The keyed option captures both halves, the discovery and the uncertainty. The first option claims human confirmation that the text denies. The third turns a puzzle into a myth the text never calls one. The fourth says the system was disproved, whereas the author says its existence is 'widely accepted'.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The first option tempts students who stop reading after the third paragraph; it states as proven in humans what the fourth paragraph calls unsettled.

Q2 D Inference HARD

An inference must follow from what the text says without adding new claims. The fourth paragraph reports that 'some laboratories have asked whether the original dye experiments, which involved injected pressure and anaesthetic drugs, exaggerated the effect'. If the conditions of the experiment may have inflated the effect, then the faster clearance recorded in sleep may be partly an artefact of those conditions. That is exactly what the keyed option says, and it uses the cautious word 'may', as the passage does. The first option is the very claim the author calls unsupported: a single poor night leaving the brain 'dirty'. The second contradicts the second paragraph, which says the plumbing is run by glial cells 'rather than by vessels of its own'. The third attributes a motive, deliberate exaggeration, to the researchers; the text says only that the drugs and pressure might have had that effect, not that they were used for it.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The third option is attractive because it reuses the words 'anaesthetic' and 'exaggerated', but it swaps a possible side effect for a deliberate purpose.

Q3 A Tone / attitude MED

Tone questions are answered by the author's verbs and qualifiers. Of the popular accounts the author writes that they 'quickly did so', that 'some went further', and that 'the evidence does not yet support such confidence'. That is criticism, but it is limited: the same paragraph grants that 'a clearance pathway exists is now widely accepted'. So the author accepts the finding and doubts the extrapolation, which is what 'cautiously critical' means. The second option is too harsh: the author never calls the discovery an artefact, only asks whether the effect was exaggerated in size. The third reverses the author's stance, since the 'dirty brain' claim is the example of overconfidence. The fourth ignores the fact that the author plainly evaluates the accounts by testing them against the evidence; a writer who was indifferent would not say that the evidence 'does not yet support' them. The paragraph is a measured correction, not a rejection and not a shrug.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The second option attracts students who confuse doubt about the size of an effect with denial of the effect; the author keeps the pathway and questions only the claims.

Q4 C Vocabulary in context HARD

To be 'tempted' to do something is to feel its pull while a reason for restraint remains. Applied to a conclusion, the word marks it as attractive and apparently supported, yet not quite earned. The context confirms this reading. The sentence follows evidence that waste proteins were cleared faster in sleep, so the conclusion is natural; but the next paragraph begins by saying that popular accounts 'quickly did so', and that 'the evidence does not yet support such confidence'. The author is therefore signalling a conclusion that goes a step beyond what was shown. The first option makes it 'firmly established', which removes the idea of temptation altogether. The second makes it 'obviously false', but the author calls it tempting precisely because it is plausible. The fourth treats it as compelled, whereas temptation implies a choice that could have been refused. Only the third keeps both the appeal and the caution.

NAME: _____ ROLL NO: _____ BATCH: _____

Examiner's note — the trap: The first option tempts students who read 'tempting' as 'convincing'; a convincing conclusion would not need the author's later warning.

Q5 B Evaluate evidence ELITE

The doubt in the fourth paragraph is specific: the dye experiments 'involved injected pressure and anaesthetic drugs', and so may have 'exaggerated the effect'. To answer that doubt, new evidence must show that the effect survives when pressure and drugs are removed. The keyed option does so: methods free of both, still finding faster clearance in natural sleep, would show that the effect is not an artefact of the original conditions. The first option concerns a different doubt, the difference in brain size between mice and humans, and it merely repeats a fact the author already gives. The third option shows only that astrocytes are widespread, which bears on whether a glymphatic system could exist, not on whether the original effect was inflated. The fourth, about disturbed sleep and amyloid-beta in patients, would if anything cut the link between sleep and clearance, and it does not address the experimental conditions at all.

Examiner's note — the trap: The first option looks relevant because it also appears in the fourth paragraph, but it answers the size objection, not the objection about injected pressure and drugs.

Q6 C Main idea MED

The passage first defines the illusion of explanatory depth, with the zip as the example. It then offers three reasons for it, extends it to policy opinions, and finally argues that the illusion should not be 'eliminated' because relying on others' knowledge is how 'a finite brain copes'. It ends with the 'modest' remedy of trying to explain a thing before defending a view. The keyed option joins the three strands: the feeling of understanding is inflated (the illusion), it is natural and useful (the fourth paragraph), and explanation is the test (the remedy). The first option turns a specific cognitive illusion into general vanity about intelligence, which the passage never discusses. The second imports schools and politics debate, topics the author does not raise. The fourth reverses the finding: the participants' ratings fell sharply once they tried to explain, so use produced less knowledge than it seemed to. The passage is about the gap, not about the quality of knowledge from use.

Examiner's note — the trap: The fourth option attracts students who notice the 'familiar' in the second paragraph but miss that the whole study showed familiarity overstating understanding.

Q7 A Inference HARD

The third paragraph contrasts two groups. Those asked to explain 'step by step, how it would work' discovered their ignorance, lost confidence and moderated their views. Those asked 'merely to list reasons' showed 'no such softening, since reasons can be recited without any grasp of mechanism'. From this contrast it follows that reason-giving does not test mechanism-knowledge the way explaining does, which is the keyed option. The second option over-generalises: the passage says that exposing ignorance made views more moderate, not that every moderate view comes from deeper understanding, and the word 'always' is unsupported. The third reverses the direction of the finding; it concerns those who could not explain, and it says nothing of a hardening of views among those who could. The fourth introduces childhood teaching, a cause that the passage never discusses. Inference questions reward the option that restates the contrast between the two groups without adding anything.

Examiner's note — the trap: The second option is tempting because softened views and understanding are linked in the passage, but 'always' converts a result for one group into a universal law.

Q8 D Weaken ELITE

The remedy is: 'before defending a view, try to explain how the thing works', so that one finds 'where the knowing stops'. The remedy is meant to produce humility and, as the third paragraph reported, moderation. It would be undermined if the attempt, when it fails, made people more rigid, because then the remedy would produce entrenchment in exactly the cases where it is needed. The keyed option states this. The first option, that most people can explain correctly, would make the remedy unnecessary for those people but would not show that it fails for the rest, and it also conflicts with the findings reported. The second option compares accuracy across two kinds of subject and says nothing about whether the attempt to explain changes anyone's view. The third concerns people who decline to defend views and has no bearing on the effect of explaining. Only the fourth attacks the link between the attempt and the improved outcome that the remedy relies on.

Examiner's note — the trap: The first option attracts students who read 'weaken' as 'argue against the passage's finding'; the question asks about the remedy's effect, not the prevalence of the illusion.

Q9 B Vocabulary in context MED

The sentence belongs to the second explanation of the illusion: the world 'stores' knowledge. A zip works because it is well designed, and the user, seeing it work, feels that the understanding of how it works is his own. The 'competence' of the object is thus its ability to do what it is for. The keyed option expresses this ability, and adds the useful phrase 'whatever the user happens to understand', which captures the mistake being described. The first option offers the legal sense of competence, as when a court is competent to hear a case; it is a real meaning of the word, but an object has no jurisdiction. The third confuses the word with 'competition', a tempting echo in sound. The fourth uses the old sense of a 'competence' as a sufficient income, which fits a person but not a zip fastener. The test for vocabulary in context is to put the meaning back into the sentence and check that the argument still holds.

Examiner's note — the trap: The first option is tempting for law students because 'competence' has a firm legal meaning, but a zip cannot have jurisdiction.

Q10 A Structure / purpose HARD

The first paragraph defines the illusion with a device; the second explains why it arises; the third begins 'The illusion is not confined to gadgets', which announces an extension to a new domain, public policy. The evidence also changes: not ratings of understanding of devices, but confidence and moderation of views after attempted explanations. The fourth paragraph then draws the lesson that matters for decisions. So the third paragraph widens the scope and raises the stakes, as the keyed option says. The second option claims refutation, but nothing in the third paragraph disputes the earlier explanations; it assumes them. The third option invents a counterexample about familiarity, whereas the policy findings are consistent with the illusion and not opposed to it. The fourth option reverses the evidence, since the effort to explain weakened conviction instead of strengthening it. A structure question is best answered by asking what the paragraph adds to the paragraphs on either side of it.

Examiner's note — the trap: The fourth option attracts students who remember that the policy studies were surprising; the surprise lies in how far the illusion extends, not in a rival theory.

CRITICAL REASONING

Q11 D Main conclusion MED

A main conclusion is the claim that the other statements are offered to support and that itself supports nothing further. The editorial opens with its position: physicians 'should be barred from accepting any gift from drug companies, however small'. The surveys, the meal studies and the reciprocity research are all offered as reasons. The sentence beginning 'Since an influence that cannot be detected…' restates the position as a conclusion: 'the only reliable safeguard is to remove the gifts altogether'. The keyed option states that conclusion together with its reason. The first option is a premise, the study finding about meals and prescribing. The second is a sub-conclusion, a reply to one particular alternative, disclosure, which serves the main conclusion by clearing a rival remedy out of the way. The third is part of the supporting analogy, offered to show that the logic is already accepted elsewhere. Asking 'what is all of this for?' leads to the ban.

Examiner's note — the trap: The second option attracts students because it is stated emphatically with 'it adds'; it is an intermediate step that supports the ban, not the ban itself.

Q12 C Assumption (causal) HARD

The editorial moves from a correlation, 'physicians who receive more industry meals prescribe more of the sponsor's branded drugs', to a cause: the meals produce the bias. That step is valid only if the correlation is not explained in the other direction, namely by doctors who already favour a company's drugs being the ones who attend its dinners, or whom its representatives choose to feed. The keyed option denies that alternative, and if it were false the evidence would not show that gifts influence anyone. The first option adds a motive for the companies, but the argument needs no view about their design. The second compares knowledge among doctors and is not used anywhere. The fourth contradicts the editorial's own claim, which is that the influence works 'below conscious awareness' and so does not involve knowing choice. An assumption can be tested by negating it: if the doctors were already inclined, the editorial's chain of reasoning would break at once.

Examiner's note — the trap: The fourth option appeals to those who see the word 'obligation'; but the editorial says the influence is unconscious, so a knowing repayment is not required.

Q13 B Weaken HARD

The editorial's answer to the education objection has a conditional form: 'if the education is valuable, hospitals and professional bodies should fund it'. The answer assumes that such bodies can and will do so. The keyed option attacks that assumption: if no hospital or professional body in many regions has the money, then banning the gifts would end the training instead of moving its funding to a cleaner source. The first option concerns caps on value, which do not touch the education point, and the editorial found effects at modest values anyway. The third describes some countries where judges accept hospitality, which at best challenges the analogy, not the reply on education. The fourth says that the sessions are good, but the editorial already grants that 'the education is valuable', and its reply works even then. A weakener must reach the specific step it is asked about; only the second option reaches this one.

Examiner's note — the trap: The fourth option tempts students because it supports the critics, yet it grants only what the editorial has already conceded in its conditional.

Q14 A Principle / justify ELITE

The editorial rejects disclosure for two stated reasons: it 'leaves the gift in place', and it may 'license the recipient to feel that the debt has been discharged'. Behind both lies the earlier claim that the influence cannot be detected by the person influenced. The principle that links these is the keyed one: if the bias cannot be detected by those affected, reporting it does not cure it, so the practice itself must go. The second option runs the other way, since it would accept the doctors' own claims of immunity, which the editorial's first argument discredits. The third concerns extending rules across professions; it relates to the judges' analogy, not to disclosure. The fourth favours light burdens and would, if anything, support disclosure, since disclosure is lighter than a ban. A justifying principle must fit the reasons the author gives, not merely the topic, and only the first option matches both reasons.

Examiner's note — the trap: The third option attracts students who link the judges' paragraph to the ban; the question, however, concerns why disclosure is rejected, which that paragraph does not address.

Q15 C Flaw / analogy HARD

An argument from analogy is sound only to the extent that the two cases are alike in the respects that matter. The editorial says that 'other professions already accept this logic', and gives judges as the instance. But it offers no showing that a physician's relation to a drug company resembles a judge's relation to a litigant: the judge decides a dispute between parties who are adverse to each other; the physician makes many small prescribing choices and the company is not a party to the treatment. The keyed option names this gap. The first option misdescribes the passage, which cites no survey of judges. The second says the editorial assumes judges are never influenced, but the editorial's point is the reverse, that judges are barred whatever their own confidence. The fourth says the rule is peculiar to one profession, but the editorial uses it to show a general logic, and states only that 'other professions' accept it.

Examiner's note — the trap: The fourth option attracts students who recall 'other professions' in the text; the flaw is the unargued similarity between the two relationships, not the number of professions.

Q16 A Main conclusion MED

The author states the conclusion in the last two sentences: until a board can show its internal grades are not linked to social background, abolishing the external paper 'trades a visible and equal unfairness for an invisible and unequal one', and 'reforming the examination, by testing reasoning instead of recall, is the better course'. The keyed option reproduces that conditional preference. The second option is the advocates' claim, which the author concedes as 'fair' in the opening paragraph but does not adopt; to say that teachers know pupils well is not to say that their grades are fairer. The third also states the advocates' case, and the author in fact calls the paper 'crude' only to defend its even-handedness. The fourth overstates the doubt about moderation: the author says it 'adds an administrative burden that few state boards have shown the capacity to carry', not that it is unworkable everywhere. Look for the position the author argues toward, not those he reports.

Examiner's note — the trap: The second option attracts students because the author says 'both points are fair'; conceding a point is not drawing a conclusion from it.

Q17 B Assumption HARD

The author's central comparison is that the paper's errors are 'not aimed at anyone in particular' while a teacher's errors 'fall unevenly'. This requires that the external paper be free of systematic bias against some group, however many random errors it makes. If anonymous marking were itself tilted, for example towards pupils from schools that drill for recall, the comparison of fairness would collapse. The keyed option supplies this premise. The first option claims that teachers are corrupt, but the author speaks of judgement being 'bent' in 'a fraction of cases', which is a claim about bias, not about corruption by public servants in general. The third is about popularity, which the argument never considers. The fourth contradicts the author, who says that 'few state boards have shown the capacity' to run moderation. An assumption is a gap in the chain that the author needs filled; the gap here lies in the fairness of the examination itself.

Examiner's note — the trap: The first option tempts students who read 'bend' as corruption; the author's claim is about unconscious unevenness, which needs no dishonesty.

Q18 D Weaken HARD

The author's claim is that internal assessment brings an unequal unfairness that is hidden. The author also names the test that would answer it: show that internal grades are not systematically linked to social background 'once her attainment is accounted for'. The keyed option reports exactly this result in some states, which weakens the fear that internal assessment must carry such bias. The first option concerns external examinations, and a gap in attainment between affluent and poorer pupils is not bias in the grading, so it neither helps nor hurts the author. The second option strengthens the author, since it is evidence of the favouritism that the passage fears. The third refers to published guidance, which says nothing about whether grades turn out biased in practice; guidance can exist and still be applied unevenly. A weakener must bring evidence on the actual pattern of results, and only the fourth does.

Examiner's note — the trap: The first option attracts students who think any social gap undermines the examination; a gap in scores is not a gap in how fairly scripts were marked.

Q19 C Role of a statement HARD

The third paragraph begins 'It may be replied that moderation... can remove the bias', which is an objection the author expects. The reply is the statement in question: moderation 'is itself a form of external examination, applied to the teachers instead of the pupils', and it 'adds an administrative burden'. So the remedy to be offered in place of the paper turns out to be a version of the paper, plus extra cost. That is what the keyed option says. The first option reverses the thrust of the passage: the author never concedes that internal assessment has no weaknesses. The second option supports the advocates, whereas the statement is made against their remedy. The fourth contradicts the next clause, in which the author says that few boards have the capacity. When a question asks for the role of a statement, locate the claim it answers and the claim it prepares; here it answers the objection and prepares the final paragraph's call for reform.

Examiner's note — the trap: The second option attracts students who notice that the sentence discusses teachers; it is used against, not for, the advocates' remedy.

Q20 D Parallel reasoning ELITE

The author's reasoning has a recognisable structure: an existing instrument is crude but applies the same standard to everyone; the proposed replacement relies on personal knowledge that will sway results unevenly, harming the least influential; therefore keep the existing instrument and reform it, rather than replace it. The keyed option reproduces each step: a crude test with a single yardstick, interviews in which acquaintance 'sways decisions unevenly', and the conclusion to retain and improve. The first option is a different argument, from the merit of a new instrument (cheat-proof tests) to dropping another one, and has no comparison of even-handedness. The second argues from occasional error to abandoning a review system, which is almost the opposite structure, since it removes a check and relies on discretion. The third argues from an inconvenience to a lottery, and nothing in it concerns unequal bias. Parallel reasoning is matched by structure, not by subject.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The first option is the nearest in subject, since it also concerns university selection, but its structure is an argument from a new tool's virtues, not from a rival method's uneven bias.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. Which section of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 lists the essentials of a valid contract? — **Section 10: free consent, competent parties, lawful consideration and object, not expressly declared void**

2. Under the Indian Contract Act, what is the status of an agreement with a minor? — **Void ab initio (Mohori Bibee v Dharmodas Ghose, 1903)**

3. Which section of the Indian Contract Act deals with compensation for loss caused by breach? — **Section 73**

4. Year of the Transfer of Property Act? — **1882**

5. Which section of the Transfer of Property Act defines a mortgage? — **Section 58**

6. Which section of the Transfer of Property Act governs gifts? — **Section 122**

7. Meaning of 'caveat emptor'? — **Let the buyer beware**

8. Meaning of 'quid pro quo'? — **Something in return for something**

9. Meaning of 'nemo judex in causa sua'? — **No one should be a judge in his own cause**

10. Meaning of 'audi alteram partem'? — **Hear the other side**

11. Which Act, passed in 2009, makes elementary education a right? — **The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009**

12. Which amendment inserted Article 21A? — **The 86th Amendment, 2002**

13. Which Directive Principle deals with early childhood care and education? — **Article 45**

14. Which Fundamental Duty requires parents to provide education for children aged 6 to 14? — **Article 51A(k)**

15. Which commission (1964-66) was headed by D.S. Kothari? — **The Education Commission, which recommended the 10+2+3 pattern**

16. In which year was Wood's Despatch issued? — **1854**

17. What school structure does NEP 2020 propose? — **5+3+3+4**

18. Who propounded the categorical imperative? — **Immanuel Kant**

19. Which philosopher's veil of ignorance is a test of fairness? — **John Rawls**

20. Who wrote the Nicomachean Ethics? — **Aristotle**

21. Which two thinkers are associated with classical utilitarianism? — **Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill**

22. Who coined the term cognitive dissonance? — **Leon Festinger**

23. Pavlov's experiments demonstrated which kind of learning? — **Classical conditioning**

24. Who proposed the hierarchy of needs? — **Abraham Maslow**

25. Which hormone, secreted by the pineal gland, regulates the sleep-wake cycle? — **Melatonin**

26. Which supporting brain cells line the channels of the glymphatic system? — **Astrocytes**

27. One word: one who speaks many languages? — **Polyglot**

28. Meaning of the idiom 'the ball is in your court'? — **It is your turn to act or decide**