CLAT Logical Reasoning

Sample Paper – 1

Duration: 24 Minutes **Maximum Marks: 24**

Instructions

- This paper contains **24** Multiple Choice Questions (Single Correct Answer), modelled on the Logical Reasoning section of **CLAT** (Common Law Admission Test).
- Each correct answer carries **+1 mark**. There is **a negative marking of 0.25 marks** for every incorrect answer; unattempted questions carry no penalty.
- The paper has **four passages**, each presenting a short argument and followed by **six** questions. Answer **only** on the basis of the reasoning in the passage; do not use any outside information or opinion of your own.
- CLAT is an offline pen-and-paper (OMR) test with no sectional time limit; attempt this practice paper in one timed sitting of about **24 minutes**.
- Use of mobile phones, calculators, dictionaries, or electronic gadgets is strictly prohibited.

Passage I

Directions (Q1–Q6): Read the following passage and answer the questions that follow. Base your answers only on the reasoning in the passage.

The city's health department reports that rates of obesity and type-2 diabetes among adults have climbed steadily over the past decade. Over the same years, the quantity of sugary soft drinks sold in the city has roughly doubled. A single large bottle of such a drink can contain more added sugar than a person should have in an entire day, and doctors note that regularly drinking so much sugar adds a great many empty calories to the diet and strains the body's handling of blood sugar.

A columnist argues that the city should act. Sugary drinks, she writes, are a leading driver of the rise in obesity and diabetes. A tax that noticeably raises their shelf price

would make people buy fewer of them; and as people drink less sugar, the upward march of these diseases would slow. She therefore urges the city council to impose a steep tax on all sugary soft drinks in order to protect the public's health. She adds that the money raised could fund free sports facilities, though she treats this as a welcome side benefit rather than the main reason for the tax.

Q1. Which of the following is the main conclusion of the columnist's argument?

(A) Sugary soft drinks contain more added sugar than a person should consume in a day.

(B) The city council should impose a steep tax on all sugary soft drinks.

(C) The money raised by the tax should be spent on free sports facilities.

(D) Obesity and type-2 diabetes have been rising in the city for a decade.

Q2. The columnist's argument depends on which of the following assumptions?

(A) A tax on sugary drinks would raise enough money to build many sports facilities.

(B) Obesity and diabetes have no cause other than sugary soft drinks.

(C) A rise in the shelf price of sugary drinks will in fact lead people to buy fewer of them.

(D) Doctors are the only people qualified to advise the city council on matters of health.

Q3. Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the columnist's argument?

(A) In three comparable cities that introduced a steep tax on sugary drinks, sales of those drinks fell by nearly a third and stayed low.

(B) Many residents of the city say they enjoy the taste of sugary soft drinks.

(C) The city has successfully taxed tobacco products in the past.

(D) Sugary drinks are cheaper to produce than most fruit juices.

Q4. Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the columnist's argument?

(A) The tax would be awkward for small shopkeepers to calculate at the counter.

(B) Some people who drink sugary drinks are of perfectly healthy weight.

(C) A few council members have said they personally dislike introducing new taxes.

(D) After the tax, buyers simply switched to untaxed packaged fruit juices that contain just as much sugar.

Q5. Which of the following is best supported by the passage?

(A) The city's diabetes problem will disappear entirely once the tax is imposed.

(B) If a tax failed to reduce how much sugar people consume, the columnist's case for it would be weakened.

(C) Sugary drinks are the only unhealthy item sold anywhere in the city.

(D) The council has already decided to reject the proposed tax.

Q6. In the argument, the statement that sugary drinks are a leading driver of the rise in obesity and diabetes serves as:

(A) a premise supporting the recommendation that the city tax those drinks.

(B) the main conclusion that the rest of the passage is meant to prove.

(C) an objection that the columnist goes on to reject.

(D) an unrelated fact included only for background colour.

Passage II

Directions (Q7–Q12): Read the following passage and answer the questions that follow. Base your answers only on the reasoning in the passage.

When the software firm Larkfield allowed its staff to work from home three days a week, the change proved popular. A year later, the operations manager circulated a memo

of concern. Since the shift to home working, he noted, the share of projects delivered on or before their deadline had dropped from about ninety per cent to seventy per cent. The manager concluded that employees are simply less productive when they work from home, and he recommended that the firm require all staff to return to the office five days a week.

Others in the firm were not convinced. They pointed out that the year of home working had also been a year of rapid change for Larkfield. The firm had taken on several new clients whose projects were larger and more technically demanding than anything it had handled before, and many came with unusually tight deadlines fixed by the clients. Two experienced team leads had also left during the year and had not yet been replaced. The staff survey taken at the year's end, meanwhile, recorded the highest satisfaction scores the firm had ever seen.

Q7. What is the main conclusion the operations manager draws?

(A) Staff satisfaction at the firm has never been higher.

(B) The firm has taken on larger and more demanding projects.

(C) Two experienced team leads left the firm during the year.

(D) The firm should require all staff to return to the office five days a week.

Q8. The manager's argument assumes which of the following?

(A) Employees dislike filling in staff satisfaction surveys.

(B) Home working saves employees money on commuting.

(C) The fall in on-time delivery was caused by home working rather than by the other changes of that year.

(D) The firm cannot afford to replace the two team leads who left.

Q9. Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the manager's conclusion?

(A) Teams at the firm that kept working fully in the office saw no drop in their on-time delivery rate over the same year.

(B) The staff who worked from home reported that they enjoyed it.

(C) The firm's main competitor also allows its staff to work from home.

(D) Home internet connections are on average slower than office connections.

Q10. Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the manager's conclusion?

(A) Some employees occasionally check personal messages during the working day.

(B) The projects taken on during the year of home working were far larger and carried much tighter client deadlines than the firm's earlier work.

(C) The office building is located far from where most of the staff live.

(D) The manager has never personally worked from home.

Q11. Which of the following is best supported by the passage as a whole?

(A) Home working always improves the quality of a firm's software.

(B) The firm will certainly lose its new clients if staff return to the office.

(C) If the harder projects and the loss of team leads explain the drop, forcing a return to the office need not restore the on-time rate.

(D) Staff satisfaction is the only thing the firm should care about.

Q12. The manager's reasoning is most vulnerable to the criticism that it:

(A) treats a fall that merely happened after home working began as though home working must have caused it.

(B) relies on figures that the passage says were invented.

(C) assumes that no employee has ever missed a deadline before.

(D) depends on the personal opinion of a single client.

Passage III

Directions (Q13–Q18): Read the following passage and answer the questions that follow. Base your answers only on the reasoning in the passage.

A recent study of Meadowvale mapped the tree cover of every neighbourhood and compared it with temperature readings taken across the city during last summer. The study found a clear pattern: neighbourhoods with a greater share of their area shaded by trees recorded lower average summer temperatures than neighbourhoods with little tree cover. In the leafiest districts, mid-afternoon readings were several degrees cooler than in the barest ones.

On the strength of this finding, a member of the city council has proposed a plan. The city, she argues, should plant thousands of trees along its hottest, most exposed streets. Because tree cover goes together with lower temperatures, planting trees on those streets will bring their temperatures down and make them more bearable in summer. She points to the study as proof that more trees mean a cooler street.

Critics of the plan note that the leafy neighbourhoods in the study differ from the bare ones in several other ways. They tend to be the wealthier parts of Meadowvale, with wider roads, more open parkland, larger gardens, and buildings finished in pale materials that reflect rather than absorb the sun. The barest streets, by contrast, are narrow, densely built, and lined with dark surfaces that store heat through the day.

Q13. Which of the following is the main conclusion of the council member's argument?

(A) The city should plant thousands of trees along its hottest, most exposed streets.

(B) Leafy neighbourhoods in Meadowvale tend to be wealthier than bare ones.

(C) Mid-afternoon temperatures vary from one part of the city to another.

(D) The study measured the tree cover of every neighbourhood in the city.

Q14. The council member's argument assumes that:

(A) every resident of Meadowvale wants to see more trees planted.

(B) trees are cheaper to plant than they are to remove later.

(C) the study measured winter temperatures as well as summer ones.

(D) trees can in fact be established and grown along the hottest, most exposed streets.

Q15. Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the council member's argument?

(A) Residents of Meadowvale say they find tree-lined streets more attractive.

(B) A neighbouring city that planted trees along its hottest roads recorded a clear drop in temperature on exactly those roads over the next few summers.

(C) Trees shed their leaves during the winter months.

(D) The study was carried out by well-known and respected scientists.

Q16. Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the council member's argument?

(A) Some residents of the leafy neighbourhoods also own air conditioners.

(B) Newly planted trees take several years of care before they grow tall.

(C) The cooler readings in leafy neighbourhoods were fully explained by their wider roads, parkland and pale, heat-reflecting buildings, not by the trees.

(D) The hottest streets are among the busiest in the whole city.

Q17. Which of the following is best supported by the passage?

(A) Meadowvale will never be able to cool its hottest streets by any means.

(B) Wealthy neighbourhoods are always cooler than poor ones in every city.

(C) If the temperature difference is really due to the other features of leafy areas, planting trees alone might not cool the hottest streets.

(D) Trees have no effect whatever on the temperature of a street.

Q18. Which of the following arguments is most similar in its reasoning to the council member's argument?

(A) Every swan observed so far has been white, so the next swan observed will probably be white too.

(B) Students who own many books tend to score highest in exams, so giving every student more books will raise their exam scores.

(C) This medicine cured my headache and my neighbour's, so it is a reliable cure for headaches.

(D) All the shops on this street close on Sunday, so this particular shop will be closed on Sunday.

Passage IV

Directions (Q19–Q24): Read the following passage and answer the questions that follow. Base your answers only on the reasoning in the passage.

Online shoppers increasingly decide what to buy by looking at star ratings. Studies of shopping websites show that, on average, a product displaying a high average rating and many five-star reviews sells noticeably more units than a similar product with a low rating or few reviews. Shoppers, it seems, treat a strong rating as a quick sign that a product is worth their money.

A marketing consultant draws a lesson for sellers from this. Since products with more positive reviews sell more, he tells his clients, the surest way for any seller to increase sales is to gather as many glowing five-star reviews as possible and push the average rating as high as it will go. He advises them to email every customer asking for a top rating and to offer small discounts to those who leave five stars.

Some sellers who tried this were surprised by the result. Shoppers today are increasingly aware that ratings can be manipulated. On several sites, products carrying a suspiciously large flood of five-star reviews, especially reviews that are short and similar in wording, are now widely assumed by buyers to be faked, and many shoppers deliberately avoid them in favour of products whose reviews look more mixed and believable.

Q19. What is the main conclusion of the marketing consultant's advice?

(A) Online shoppers increasingly decide what to buy by looking at star ratings.

(B) Sellers should offer small discounts to customers who leave reviews.

(C) The surest way for a seller to increase sales is to gather as many five-star reviews as possible and push the average rating as high as it will go.

(D) Products with a low average rating tend to sell fewer units.

Q20. The consultant's advice assumes that:

(A) shoppers will continue to treat a high star rating as a trustworthy sign of quality.

(B) every seller can comfortably afford to offer discounts.

(C) five-star reviews are always more detailed than one-star reviews.

(D) shopping websites will never remove the star-rating system.

Q21. Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the consultant's advice?

(A) Some sellers enjoy reading the reviews that their customers leave.

(B) Writing a short review takes a customer only a minute or two.

(C) Star ratings are displayed near the top of most product pages.

(D) In controlled tests, when the very same product was shown with a higher average rating, a significantly larger share of shoppers chose to buy it.

Q22. Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the consultant's advice?

(A) A few customers never leave reviews of any kind.

(B) Many shoppers now assume that products with a flood of similar five-star reviews are faked, and deliberately avoid them.

(C) Some products are sold in physical shops as well as online.

(D) Writing fake reviews is against the published rules of most websites.

Q23. Which of the following is best supported by the passage as a whole?

(A) Star ratings will soon disappear from shopping websites altogether.

(B) No shopper anywhere ever trusts a five-star review.

(C) Physical shops always outsell online shops.

(D) If shoppers distrust reviews that look manipulated, simply piling up five-star reviews need not increase a seller's sales.

Q24. The consultant's reasoning is most open to the objection that it:

(A) treats a high rating, which may be a result of a product genuinely being good, as though it were the cause of higher sales.

(B) denies that shoppers ever look at star ratings at all.

(C) assumes that no product has ever received a five-star review.

(D) relies on sales figures that the passage says were made up.

Detailed Solutions

Q1.

Solution

What is asked: the main conclusion, that is, the single claim the whole argument is put forward to support.

Reasoning: The columnist gives several facts (rising disease, doubled sales, sugar per bottle) as reasons. These reasons all build towards one recommendation. That recommendation is that the council should impose a steep tax on sugary drinks. Everything else in the passage is offered to support this call to act.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: This is a supporting fact about sugar content, not the point being argued for.
- Option C: The sports-facilities point is expressly called a side benefit, not the main aim.
- Option D: The rise in disease is background evidence, not the conclusion.

Final Answer: The recommendation to tax is the conclusion $\Rightarrow$ B

Answer: (B) Go Back to Q1

Q2.

Solution

What is asked: the unstated assumption the argument needs in order to work.

Reasoning: The argument runs: tax raises price, higher price means people buy fewer drinks, less sugar means slower disease. The very first link in that chain is that a higher price will actually cut how much people buy. If a price rise did not reduce buying, the whole chain would collapse. So the argument must assume that a higher shelf price does reduce the quantity bought.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The revenue point is only a side benefit; the health argument does not rest on it.
- Option B: The argument needs sugary drinks to be *a* leading cause, not the *only* cause.
- Option D: The argument nowhere needs doctors to be the only qualified advisers.

Final Answer: The price-cuts-buying link is the needed assumption ⇒ C

Answer: (C) Go Back to Q2

Q3.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most strengthens the argument for the tax.

Reasoning: The weak point is whether a tax really makes people buy fewer sugary drinks. Evidence that this has happened elsewhere would directly support that link. Option A reports that in comparable cities such a tax cut sales by nearly a third and kept them low. This is real evidence that the tax works as the columnist claims, so it strengthens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: People enjoying the taste, if anything, suggests they may keep buying despite the tax.
- Option C: Success at taxing tobacco is a different product and does not show this tax will cut sugar intake.
- Option D: Relative production cost says nothing about whether buyers respond to the tax.

Final Answer: Evidence the tax cut sales elsewhere strengthens it ⇒ A

Answer: (A) Go Back to Q3

Q4.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most weakens the argument.

Reasoning: The argument assumes that taxing sugary drinks lowers people's total sugar intake. Option D says buyers simply moved to untaxed fruit juices with just as much sugar. If that happened, total sugar intake would not fall at all, even though sugary-drink sales dropped. That breaks the link between the tax and the health goal, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: A little inconvenience for shopkeepers does not touch whether the tax improves health.
- Option B: A few healthy-weight drinkers do not undo a general link between

sugar and disease.
- Option C: Council members disliking taxes is a political point, not evidence about the effect.

Final Answer: A switch to equally sugary juices defeats the aim $\Rightarrow$ D

Answer: (D) Go Back to Q4

Q5.

Solution

What is asked: the statement best supported by the passage.

Reasoning: The columnist's whole case rests on the tax reducing how much sugar people consume. It follows that if the tax did not reduce sugar consumption, that case would be undermined. Option B states exactly this conditional, which the argument's own structure supports. So B is the best-supported statement.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: "Disappear entirely" is far stronger than anything the passage claims.
- Option C: The passage never says sugary drinks are the only unhealthy item sold.
- Option D: Nothing says the council has already decided to reject the tax.

Final Answer: The conditional about reduced sugar is supported $\Rightarrow$ B

Answer: (B) Go Back to Q5

Q6.

Solution

What is asked: the role played by one particular statement in the argument.

Reasoning: The statement that sugary drinks are a leading driver of obesity and diabetes is a reason offered. It is used to support the final recommendation that the city should tax those drinks. A claim offered in support of the conclusion is a premise. So the statement functions as a premise for the recommendation.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: The main conclusion is the call to tax, not this claim.
- Option C: It is asserted as true and relied upon, not raised as an objection to

reject.

- Option D: It is central to the reasoning, not mere background colour.

Final Answer: It supports the recommendation, so it is a premise $\Rightarrow$ A

Answer: (A) Go Back to Q6

Q7.

Solution

What is asked: the manager's main conclusion.

Reasoning: The manager notes a fall in on-time delivery and infers a cause, then makes a recommendation. The recommendation is the point his memo is meant to establish. That recommendation is that all staff should return to the office five days a week. The rest is evidence and inference leading to it.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The satisfaction score is raised by others, not the manager's conclusion.
- Option B: The larger projects are a point made by the critics, not the manager.
- Option C: The departure of team leads is background, again raised by the critics.

Final Answer: The call to return to office is the conclusion $\Rightarrow$ D

Answer: (D) Go Back to Q7

Q8.

Solution

What is asked: the assumption on which the manager's argument depends.

Reasoning: The manager moves from "on-time delivery fell after home working began" to "home working caused it". That step works only if nothing else during the year caused the fall. So he must assume the fall was due to home working and not to the other changes of that year. Option C states exactly this needed assumption.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Whether staff dislike surveys is irrelevant to the productivity claim.

- Option B: Commuting savings do not bear on the cause of the delivery drop.
- Option D: Affordability of replacements is not something his argument needs.

Final Answer: He assumes home working, not other changes, caused the drop $\Rightarrow$ C

Answer: (C) Go Back to Q8

Q9.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most strengthens the manager's conclusion.

Reasoning: His claim is stronger if home working, rather than the year's other changes, explains the drop. Option A says office-only teams had no drop over the same year. That points to home working as the difference that mattered, since teams facing the same year but staying in the office were unaffected. This supports his causal claim, so it strengthens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: Enjoyment of home working says nothing about productivity.
- Option C: What a competitor does is irrelevant to Larkfield's cause.
- Option D: A general fact about internet speed is weak and indirect next to the office-team comparison.

Final Answer: Office-only teams holding steady points to home working $\Rightarrow$ A

Answer: (A) Go Back to Q9

Q10.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most weakens the manager's conclusion.

Reasoning: The manager blames home working for the fall in on-time delivery. Option B offers a rival cause: the projects that year were far larger with much tighter deadlines. Harder work with tighter deadlines could by itself lower on-time delivery, whether or not staff worked from home. This rival explanation undercuts his causal claim, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Occasionally checking messages is minor and could happen in the office too.
- Option C: A distant office is a reason for, not against, home working.
- Option D: The manager's own experience does not bear on the cause of the drop.

Final Answer: Harder projects offer a rival cause $\Rightarrow$ B

Answer: (B) Go Back to Q10

Q11.

Solution

What is asked: the statement best supported by the passage as a whole.

Reasoning: The passage sets the manager's causal claim against rival causes raised by others. If those rival causes (harder projects, lost team leads) really explain the drop, then removing home working would not address them. So forcing a return to the office need not restore the on-time rate. Option C draws exactly this supported conclusion.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: "Always improves quality" is far too strong and unsupported.
- Option B: "Certainly lose its clients" is an overstatement the passage does not back.
- Option D: The passage does not say satisfaction is all that matters.

Final Answer: A return to office need not fix the on-time rate $\Rightarrow$ C

Answer: (C) Go Back to Q11

Q12.

Solution

What is asked: the flaw the reasoning is most open to.

Reasoning: The manager sees that delivery fell after home working started and concludes home working caused it. Treating "after this" as "because of this" is the post hoc error. Since other changes occurred in the same period, the timing alone does not prove cause. Option A names exactly this flaw.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: The passage does not say the figures were invented; they are treated as real.
- Option C: The argument does not assume no deadline was ever missed before.
- Option D: It rests on delivery data, not on one client's opinion.

Final Answer: It confuses "after" with "because of" $\Rightarrow$ A

Answer: (A) Go Back to Q12

Q13.

Solution

What is asked: the main conclusion of the council member's argument.

Reasoning: The council member cites the study's correlation as her reason. She uses it to urge a specific action. That action is to plant thousands of trees along the hottest, most exposed streets. This recommendation is what her argument is meant to establish.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: The wealth of leafy areas is a point made by the critics, not her conclusion.
- Option C: Temperature variation is background data, not the point argued for.
- Option D: What the study measured is a premise, not the conclusion.

Final Answer: The plan to plant street trees is the conclusion $\Rightarrow$ A

Answer: (A) Go Back to Q13

Q14.

Solution

What is asked: an assumption the plan depends on.

Reasoning: The plan is to lower street temperatures by planting trees on the hottest, most exposed streets. For the plan to make any sense, trees must actually be able to grow there. If trees could not be established on such exposed streets, planting them could not cool anything. So the argument assumes trees can in fact be grown along those streets, which is option D.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The plan does not require that every resident wants trees.
- Option B: The cost of removing trees is irrelevant to the cooling claim.
- Option C: Winter readings play no part in the summer-cooling argument.

Final Answer: Trees must be able to grow on those streets $\Rightarrow$ D

Answer: (D) Go Back to Q14

Q15.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most strengthens the plan.

Reasoning: The doubt is whether planting trees actually causes cooling, or whether the correlation is due to other factors. Option B reports that another city planted trees on its hottest roads and saw temperatures fall on exactly those roads. That is direct evidence that planting trees, by itself, lowers street temperature. So it strengthens the council member's argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Finding tree-lined streets attractive says nothing about temperature.
- Option C: Leaf-shedding in winter, if anything, is a mild point against summer-long cooling.
- Option D: The scientists' reputation supports the correlation, not the causal leap to planting.

Final Answer: A city that planted trees and cooled those roads strengthens it $\Rightarrow$ B

Answer: (B) Go Back to Q15

Q16.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most weakens the plan.

Reasoning: The argument leaps from "leafy areas are cooler" to "trees cause the cooling". Option C says the cooler readings were fully explained by other features (wide roads, parkland, pale buildings), not the trees. If those features, not the trees, cause the cooling, then planting trees on bare streets need not cool them. This removes the basis for the plan, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: A few air conditioners do not explain a whole neighbourhood's cooler average.
- Option B: Slow growth is a delay, not a reason the trees will fail to cool.
- Option D: Busy streets being hot does not address whether trees would cool them.

Final Answer: The cooling was due to other features, not trees $\Rightarrow$ C

Answer: (C) Go Back to Q16

Q17.

Solution

What is asked: the statement best supported by the passage.

Reasoning: The critics point out that leafy areas differ from bare ones in several heat-related ways besides trees. If those other features are the real cause of the temperature difference, then trees alone may not cool the hottest streets. Option C states precisely this cautious, supported conditional. It follows directly from the critics' point.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: "Never able by any means" is far stronger than the passage warrants.
- Option B: "Always cooler in every city" is a sweeping claim the passage does not support.
- Option C is correct; Option D: "No effect whatever" overstates the case, since the passage does not deny trees any cooling role.

Final Answer: Trees alone might not cool the hottest streets $\Rightarrow$ C

Answer: (C) Go Back to Q17

Q18.

Solution

What is asked: the argument whose reasoning most closely parallels the council member's.

Reasoning: Her reasoning is: two things go together (trees and cooler temper-

atures), so adding the first will produce the second, ignoring other differences. Option B has the same shape: books and high scores go together, so giving more books will raise scores. Both leap from a correlation to a causal remedy, overlooking confounding factors (such as wealth or study habits). So option B is the closest parallel.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: This is simple prediction from past cases, not a correlation-to-cause leap.
- Option C: This generalises from a couple of successes; it is weak induction, not the confounded-correlation pattern.
- Option D: This applies a known general rule to a case; the reasoning is valid, not the flawed pattern.

Final Answer: The books-and-scores argument matches the pattern $\Rightarrow$ B

Answer: (B) Go Back to Q18

Q19.

Solution

What is asked: the main conclusion of the consultant's advice.

Reasoning: The consultant starts from the fact that better-rated products sell more. He turns this into advice for sellers. His advice, the point he is making, is that the surest way to increase sales is to gather as many five-star reviews as possible and push the rating up. That recommendation is his conclusion.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: This is the opening fact he reasons from, not his conclusion.
- Option B: Offering discounts is a suggested method, a sub-point, not the main claim.
- Option D: This is another background fact, not the advice itself.

Final Answer: Piling up five-star reviews is the surest route, his conclusion $\Rightarrow$ C

Answer: (C) Go Back to Q19

Q20.

Solution

What is asked: the assumption behind the consultant's advice.

Reasoning: His advice works only if a high rating keeps drawing buyers in. That requires shoppers to go on treating a high rating as a trustworthy sign of quality. If shoppers stopped trusting high ratings, piling them up would not raise sales. So the advice assumes continued trust in high ratings, which is option A.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: Whether every seller can afford discounts is a practical detail, not the core assumption.
- Option C: The advice does not depend on five-star reviews being more detailed.
- Option D: It does not need the rating system to last forever, only to be trusted now.

Final Answer: It assumes shoppers keep trusting high ratings $\Rightarrow$ A

Answer: (A) Go Back to Q20

Q21.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most strengthens the advice.

Reasoning: The advice assumes that a higher rating causes more sales. Option D describes a controlled test: the same product, shown with a higher rating, was bought by more shoppers. Holding the product fixed and changing only the rating isolates the rating as the cause of the extra sales. This directly supports the causal claim, so it strengthens the advice.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Sellers enjoying reviews has nothing to do with sales.
- Option B: The ease of writing a review does not show ratings drive sales.
- Option C: Where ratings appear on the page is minor next to a controlled causal test.

Final Answer: A controlled test isolating the rating strengthens it $\Rightarrow$ D

Answer: (D) Go Back to Q21

Q22.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most weakens the advice.

Reasoning: The advice is to amass as many five-star reviews as possible. Option B says shoppers now assume products with a flood of similar five-star reviews are faked and avoid them. If following the advice makes buyers suspicious and drives them away, the tactic backfires and does not raise sales. That directly attacks the advice, so it most weakens it.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: A few non-reviewers do not undermine the strategy overall.
- Option C: Some products also being sold in shops is beside the point about online ratings.
- Option D: A rule against fake reviews is weaker; it does not show the tactic loses genuine buyers the way B does.

Final Answer: Buyers avoiding suspiciously over-rated products defeats the tactic $\Rightarrow$ $\boxed{\text{B}}$

Answer: (B) Go Back to Q22

Q23.

Solution

What is asked: the statement best supported by the passage as a whole.

Reasoning: The passage pairs the advice with the fact that shoppers now distrust manipulated-looking reviews. If shoppers distrust reviews that look manipulated, then simply amassing five-star reviews may not raise sales and could even lower them. Option D states this supported conditional exactly. It follows from combining the advice with the buyers' new wariness.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The passage does not predict ratings will disappear.
- Option B: "No shopper ever" is far too absolute; only some grow suspicious.
- Option C: Nothing supports a claim about physical shops always outselling online ones.

Final Answer: Piling up reviews need not raise sales if buyers distrust them $\Rightarrow$ $\boxed{\text{D}}$

Answer: (D) Go Back to Q23

Q24.

Solution

What is asked: the objection the reasoning is most open to.

Reasoning: The consultant sees that high-rated products sell more and concludes that raising the rating will raise sales. But a high rating may simply be the *result* of a product being genuinely good, and it is the quality that drives both the rating and the sales. Treating the rating as the cause, when it may be an effect of quality, mistakes an effect for a cause. Option A names exactly this objection.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: The argument does not deny that shoppers look at ratings; it relies on it.
- Option C: It never assumes no product has received a five-star review.
- Option D: The passage treats the sales figures as genuine, not invented.

Final Answer: It mistakes a possible effect of quality for the cause of sales $\Rightarrow$ $\boxed{\text{A}}$

Answer: (A) Go Back to Q24

Answer Key

Q	Ans	Q	Ans	Q	Ans	Q	Ans	Q	Ans
1	B	2	C	3	A	4	D	5	B
6	A	7	D	8	C	9	A	10	B
11	C	12	A	13	A	14	D	15	B
16	C	17	C	18	B	19	C	20	A
21	D	22	B	23	D	24	A		