

Broad Categories:

NC

RR

RW

WR

WW

Sub Categories:

Wrong premise:

1. Error propagation: Premise taken from previous wrong conclusion.
2. Misinterpretation: Misinterpretation of passage, options or previously concluded steps in premise.

Wrong conclusion:

1. Insufficient information: Draws conclusions based on insufficient information and misses important information such as passage conditions.
2. Wrong assumption: Assumes conditions which leads to wrong conclusion.
3. Contradiction: Draws Conclusion that contradicts a previous premise
4. Misinterpretation: Misinterpretation of passage, options or previously concluded steps in premise [prominent for passage based problems].
5. Hallucination: Considers out of context information leading to wrong conclusion
6. Wrong Reasoning: Gives wrong conclusion irrespective of premise [prominent for clue and arrangement based problems].
7. Error propagation: Conclusion drawn from wrong premise.

Reasoning Chains

Llama-3

Wrong Reasoning chains

Problem-1

Is correct: false

Passage: A provincial Go team coach selects 4 of the 7 players from E, F, G, H, J, K and M to participate in the professional league. The selection must meet the following conditions? E or F has one person to participate, but not both. One of J or K will participate, but not both. If J participates, then G participates. Unless F participates, M does not participate.

Question: Which of the following listed players cannot participate in the game together?

Options:

- A. E and J
- C. E and M
- B. F and G
- D. F and J

Reasoning chains:

Step-by-step solution:

1. The coach selects 4 players from E, F, G, H, J, K, and M. We have the following conditions:
 - E or F has one person participate, but not both.
 - One of J or K will participate, but not both.
 - If J participates, then G participates.
 - Unless F participates, M does not participate.

[RR]

2. We need to find out which group of players cannot participate in the game together. Let's analyze each option given:

- A: E and J
- B: E and M
- C: F and G
- D: F and J

[RR]

3. Let's consider option A: E and J. According to the conditions, if J participates, then G also participates.

[NC]

So, in this case, E and G will also be part of the team. This doesn't necessarily mean that E and J cannot participate together. So, we need to consider other options as well.

[RR]

4. Now let's consider option B: E and M. The condition states that unless F participates, M does not participate. This means if E participates, M can participate if F is also participating. So, E and M can participate together if F is also in the team. So, this option is not necessarily a pair that cannot participate together.

[RR][-RW, premise is correct, but while arriving to the conclusion, it missing on(does not consider) some already provided information necessary to arrive to the conclusion, and hence incorrect conclusion][or the premise is insufficient] [Insufficient information]

5. Next, let's consider option C: F and G. The condition states that unless F participates, M does not participate. This means if F participates, then M can participate as well.

[RR]

Now, the condition also states that if J participates, then G participates. This means that if F participates, then G will also participate.

[RW, Right premise, but wrong conclusion because of wrong interpretation of the premise]

[RW- Misinterpretation]

So, this option is not necessarily a pair that cannot participate together.

[WR, the conclusion of the previous statement taken as premise was wrong, but based on that premise, it arrives to correct conclusion]

[WR Error propagation]

6. Now, let's consider option D: F and J. The condition states that one of J or K will participate, but not both. This means that if J participates, then K cannot participate, and vice versa.

[RR]

Also, the condition states that if J participates, then G participates. However, the condition states that unless F participates, M does not participate. This means if J participates, then F must also participate to allow M to participate.

[RW, the premise is correct but it gave misleading information as conclusion instead of ending.]

[Hallucination]

This creates a contradiction because the condition states that one of J or K will participate, but not both, but in this case, both F and J are participating, and also G will participate as J participates. So, F and J cannot participate in the game together.

[WW as the premise(conclusion of the previous statement) is wrong and in conclusion it considers unwanted information and hence leading to incorrect conclusion]

[Hallucination]

7. After analyzing all options, we can conclude that option D: F and J is the pair that cannot participate in the game together.

[WW as premise (conclusion of the previous statement) is wrong leading to wrong conclusion]

[WW Error propagation, error propagation]

Final Answer: D

Correct answer: B

Problem 2

Is correct: False

Passage: There are 6 scholars F, G, J, L, M, and N, who will speak at a logical meeting, and the speeches are arranged in the following order? (1) Each speaker speaks only once, and only once at the same time By.(2) Three speakers speak before lunch, and the other three speak after lunch.(3) G must speak before lunch.(4) Only one speaker is between M and N.(5) F speaks in the first or third place.

Question: If L speaks before lunch and M is not the sixth speaker, the speaker immediately after M must be?

Options:

- A.F
- C.J
- B.G
- D.N

Reasoning Chains:

Step-by-step solution:

1) From statement (5), we know F speaks in the first or third place. Since there are three speakers before lunch, and G must speak before lunch (statement 3), F can either be the first speaker or the third speaker before lunch.

[RR]

2) From statement (4), only one speaker is between M and N. This implies that M and N cannot be in the first and second positions or the fourth and fifth positions.

[RR]

3) Since L speaks before lunch (statement 2), and there are three speakers before lunch, the order of the first three speakers must be L, G, and either F or another speaker. e

[RW, Draws conclusion without sufficient information possibly based on incomplete information or assumption]

[Hallucination]

If F is the third speaker, then the order of the first three speakers is L, G, F.

[WW, premise(derived from conclusion of the previous statement) is incorrect and hence arrives at an incorrect conclusion.]

[WW, Error Propagation, Error Propagation]

If F is not the third speaker, then the order of the first three speakers is L, G, and another speaker. [WW, premise(derived from conclusion of the first sentence of step 3) is incorrect and hence arrives at an incorrect conclusion.]

[WW, Error Propagation, Error propagation]

4) Since M is not the sixth speaker, M must be in the second, third, or fourth position.

[RR]

If M is in the second position, then the order of the first two speakers is L, M.

[WW, premise(derived from first sentence of step 3) is incorrect and hence arrives at an incorrect conclusion.]

[WW, Error Propagation, Error propagation]

However, this is not possible since there is only one speaker between M and N (statement 4). Therefore, M is not in the second position.

[WW Premise(derived from The previous sentence) is wrong, it draws conclusion due to misinterpretation of premise.]

[WW, Error Propagation, Misinterpretation]

5) If M is in the third position, then the order of the first three speakers is L, G, M.

[WW, premise(derived from first sentence of step 3) is incorrect and hence arrives to incorrect conclusion.]

[WW, Error Propagation, Error propagation]

However, this is not possible since F speaks in the first or third place (statement 5), and F is not in the third position.

[WR Premise(derived from previous sentence) is wrong]

[Error Propagation]

6) Therefore, M is in the fourth position. If the order of the first four speakers is L, G, F, M, then N must be in the fifth position, and J must be in the sixth position.

[WW premise is incorrect(previous sentences), incorrect conclusion because of incorrect premise and missing on(does not consider) some already provided information necessary to arrive to the conclusion(clue 4)]

[WW, Error Propagation, Insufficient information]

However, this is not possible since L speaks before lunch (statement 2), and 'there are only three speakers before lunch.

[WW Premise(Previous sentence) is wrong, incorrect conclusion because of incorrect premise and misinterpretation of premise]

[WW, Error Propagation, misinterpretation]

7) Therefore, the order of the first four speakers is L, G, M, F.

[WW, premise(previous sentence) is wrong, leading to wrong conclusion]

[WW, Error Propagation, Error Propagation]

Since M is in the fourth position, the speaker immediately after M is F. --ww,

[WW, Error Propagation, Error Propagation]

Final Answer: A

Correct Answer: C

Problem 3

Is correct: False

Passage: To treat a person fairly is to treat him without prejudice. But our friends usually hope that we regard their interests as more important than others. In this way, considering that we always strive to maintain friendship with our friends, we cannot treat our friends fairly.

Question: The above argument must assume which of the following?

Options:

- A. When dealing with interpersonal relationships between non-friends, people can remain impartial.
- B. The ideal of justice has nothing to do with dealing with most relationships.
- C. Keeping close friends with some people is very important in one's life.
- D. A person cannot be fair to someone at the same time and will regard his interests as more important than others.

Reasoning Chains:

Step-by-step solution:

1. The argument states that treating a person fairly means treating them without prejudice.
This is a standard definition of fairness.

[NC]

2. The argument also states that our friends usually hope that we regard their interests as more important than others.

[NC]

This implies that when it comes to friends, we tend to give them preferential treatment.

[RR]

3. The argument then concludes that considering we always strive to maintain friendship with our friends, we cannot treat them fairly.

[NC]

This means that the idea of treating friends fairly is compromised by our desire to maintain the friendship.

[RR]

4. To understand why this argument is valid, we need to consider the underlying assumption.

[NC]

The assumption is not that people can't be fair in general (A), nor is it that fairness is not relevant in most relationships (B).

[RR]

The assumption is rather that maintaining close friendships is important in life (C).

[RW, Misinterpretation of premise and hence wrong conclusion]

[RW, misinterpretation]

5. The argument implies that if we were to treat our friends fairly, without giving them preferential treatment, we would likely damage the friendship.

[RW, Misinterpretation of premise and hence wrong conclusion]

[RW, misinterpretation]

This suggests that the relationship between fairness and friendship is complex, and that fairness may not be the most important consideration in friendships.

[WW premise(previous sentence) is incorrect hence incorrect conclusion]

[WW, Error propagation, Error Propagation]

6. Therefore, the argument assumes that keeping close friends with some people is very important in one's life (C).

[WW premise(previous sentence) is incorrect hence incorrect conclusion]

[WW, Error propagation, Error Propagation]

This assumption is necessary to explain why we can't treat our friends fairly.

[WW premise(previous sentence) is incorrect hence incorrect conclusion]

[WW, Error propagation, Error Propagation]

Final Answer: C

Correct Answer: D

Problem 4

Is correct: False

Passage: Both Zhang Fei and Li Bai applied for the MBA this year. There are four assertions about their exams? (1) They have at least one exam; (2) Zhang Fei is not necessarily exam; Bai did pass the exam; (4) Not that Zhang Fei might fail the exam. The final admission result shows that two of the four assertions are true and two are false.

Question: Which of the following results can be derived from the above conditions?

Options:

- A.Zhang Fei was admitted, but Li Bai was not.
- B.Both Zhang Fei and Li Bai were admitted.
- C.Zhang Fei and Li Bai failed the exam
- D.Li Bai was admitted, but Zhang Fei was not.

Reasoning Chains:

Step-by-step solution:

1. The question states that there are four assertions about the exams of Zhang Fei and Li Bai, and two of them are true while the other two are false.

2. Let's analyze the assertions:

- (1) They have at least one exam: This is a basic fact, so it's likely to be true.
- (2) Zhang Fei is not necessarily passed the exam: This statement is a bit ambiguous, but it implies that Zhang Fei might fail the exam.
- (3) Li Bai did pass the exam: This is a direct statement, so it's likely to be true.
- (4) Not that Zhang Fei might fail the exam: This statement is a negation of assertion (2), so it implies that Zhang Fei might pass the exam.

3. Now, let's consider the possible combinations of true and false assertions:

- If assertions (1), (2), and (3) are true, then assertion (4) must be false, which means Zhang Fei might fail the exam. In this case, Li Bai was admitted, but Zhang Fei was not.
- If assertions (1), (2), and (4) are true, then assertion (3) must be false, which means Li Bai might fail the exam. In this case, Zhang Fei was admitted, but Li Bai was not.
- If assertions (1), (3), and (4) are true, then assertion (2) must be false, which means Zhang Fei passed the exam. In this case, both Zhang Fei and Li Bai were admitted.
- If assertions (2), (3), and (4) are true, then assertion (1) must be false, which means neither Zhang Fei nor Li Bai took the exam. This is not possible, as both of them applied for the MBA.

4. Based on the above analysis, the only possible result is that Li Bai was admitted, but Zhang Fei was not.

Final Answer: D

Correct Answer: A

Problem 5 [Doubt]

Is correct: False

Passage: The intelligence department intercepted the three pieces of cryptographic information sent by the terrorists. After analysis by cryptographers, "Alingoits Doximayo Makasey" means "kidnapping student (host) hostage", and "Huholikaso Makasey Mugbudengs" means "hostage holding (see) "Reporter", "Mugbudengs Ftoufgke Alingoits" means "kidnapping reporters away".n

Question: Regarding the meaning of the relevant words in this cryptographic language, which of the following statements may be true?

Options:

- A. "Doximayo" means "hostage"
- B. "Mugbudengs" means "kidnapping".
- C. "Doximayo" means "student"

D.I don't know what they mean.

Reasoning Chains:

Step-by-step solution:

1. We are given the cryptographic information sent by the terrorists, which has been analyzed by cryptographers. The meanings of the given phrases are:

- "Alingoits Doximayo Makasey" means "kidnapping student (host) hostage"
- "Huholikaso Makasey Mugbudengs" means "hostage holding (see) "Reporter""
- "Mugbudengs Ftoufgke Alingoits" means "kidnapping reporters away"

[NC]

2. We are asked to find the meaning of the relevant words in this cryptographic language. Specifically, we need to determine the meaning of the words "Doximayo" and "Mugbudengs".

[RR]

3. Looking at the first phrase, "Alingoits Doximayo Makasey" means "kidnapping student (host) hostage". From this, we can infer that "Doximayo" is related to the word "student" because it is part of the phrase that means "kidnapping student".

[WW, wrong conclusion because arrived at a conclusion based on insufficient information][or the premise is insufficient]

4. Similarly, looking at the second phrase, "Huholikaso Makasey Mugbudengs" means "hostage holding (see) "Reporter"".

[NC]

From this, we can infer that "Mugbudengs" is related to the word "Reporter" because it is part of the phrase that means "hostage holding (see) "Reporter"".

[WR, arrived at a conclusion based on insufficient information][or the premise is insufficient]

5. However, looking at the third phrase, "Mugbudengs Ftoufgke Alingoits" means "kidnapping reporters away". From this, we can infer that "Mugbudengs" is also related to the word "Reporter" because it is part of the phrase that means "kidnapping reporters".

[WR, arrived at a conclusion based on insufficient information][or the premise is insufficient]

6. Based on the above analysis, we can conclude that "Doximayo" means "student" and "Mugbudengs" means "Reporter".

[WW premise(conclusions of last two sentences) is partially incorrect hence wrong conclusion.]

7. Therefore, the correct answer is:

Final Answer: C

Correct Answer: B

Problem 6

Is correct: False

Passage: There are voters in favor of all candidates"

Question: The above argument cannot be derived?

Options:

- A.All candidates have votes in favor.
- B.Some voters favored some candidates.
- C.All voters favor all candidates.
- D.Not all voters disapprove of all candidates.

Reasoning Chains:

Step-by-step solution:

1. The given argument is: "There are voters in favor of all candidates."

This statement implies that each candidate has at least one voter in their favor.

[RR]

2. The argument cannot be used to derive a statement that is universally applicable to all voters or all candidates.

[RR]

For example, it cannot be concluded that all voters favor all candidates, as some voters might not favor all candidates.

[RR]

3. Similarly, it cannot be concluded that all candidates have votes in favor, as some candidates might not have any voters in their favor.

[RW right premise but made mistake while drawing conclusion due to Misinterpretation of premise or Wrong Reasoning]

This is because the argument only guarantees that each candidate has at least one voter in their favor, not that all candidates have voters.

[RW right premise but made mistake while drawing conclusion due to Misinterpretation of premise or Wrong Reasoning]

4. Option B, "Some voters favored some candidates," is a tautology and can be derived from the given argument.

[RR]

This is because the argument states that there are voters in favor of all candidates, which implies that some voters favored some candidates.

[RR]

5. Option D, "Not all voters disapprove of all candidates," can also be derived from the given argument.

[RR]

This is because if there are voters in favor of all candidates, it implies that not all voters disapprove of all candidates.

[RR]

6. Therefore, the argument cannot be used to derive a universally applicable statement about all voters or all candidates.

[RR]

The correct answer is the one that cannot be derived from the given argument.

[RW incorrect conclusion because of wrong reasoning]

Final Answer: A

Correct Answer: C

Problem 7

Is correct: False

Passage: Since the emperor, the official history of China has been the diary of the emperor's own family. That is the standard image of the emperor. To understand the true face of the emperor, one must also read Ye Shi, which is a portrayal of the emperor's life.

Question: Which of the following statements is the assumption upon which the above argument relies?

Options:

- A.All the official history records are personal matters of the emperor's family.
- B.Only by reading wild history can you know the little-known privacy of the emperor.
- C.Only by combining Zhengshi and Yesi can we see the true face of the emperor.
- D.The official history records the emperor's major affairs, while the wild history describes the emperor's daily affairs.

Reasoning Chains:

Step-by-step solution:

To find the assumption upon which the argument relies, let's break down the given text and analyze the relationship between the official history, the diary of the emperor's family, and Ye Shi.

[NC]

1. The official history of China is presented as the diary of the emperor's own family.

[NC]

This suggests that the official history is focused on the emperor's major affairs or official actions.

[RR]

2. The standard image of the emperor is based on the official history, implying that this image may not be comprehensive or accurate.

[RR]

3. To understand the true face of the emperor, one must also read Ye Shi, which is a portrayal of the emperor's life.

[NC]

This implies that Ye Shi provides a more detailed or personal account of the emperor's life.

[RR]

Given these points, the argument is suggesting that the official history (the diary of the emperor's family) only provides a partial view of the emperor's life, focusing on official matters, while Ye Shi offers a more comprehensive view by describing the emperor's daily affairs.

[RR]

Step-by-step analysis of the choices:

A. This choice is too broad and doesn't directly relate to the argument. The official history may not be limited to personal matters of the emperor's family.

[RR]

B. This choice is misleading, as it implies that "wild history" (Ye Shi) is the only source for knowing the emperor's little-known privacy. However, the argument suggests that Ye Shi provides a more comprehensive view, not just the emperor's privacy.

[RR]

C. This choice is close, but it's not the assumption upon which the argument relies. The argument doesn't imply that combining Zhengshi and Ye Shi is the only way to see the true face of the emperor.

[RW, right premise but while drawing conclusion it misinterprets the premise or makes mistakes during reasoning.]

D. This choice accurately captures the assumption of the argument. The official history records the emperor's major affairs, while Ye Shi describes the emperor's daily affairs, implying that the two sources provide different perspectives on the emperor's life.

[RW, right premise but while drawing conclusion it misinterprets the premise or makes mistakes during reasoning as it goes too narrow.]

Final Answer: D

Correct Answer: C

Gemini

Problem1

Is correct: False

Passage: The company sent three young staff members to the South for business trip. The three of them happened to be sitting in a row. At least one of the two people sitting on the right side of 24 years old was 20 years old. 20 years old. At least one of the two people sitting on the left of the accountant is a salesperson, and one of the two people sitting on the right of the salesperson is also a salesperson.

Question: So what are the three young people on business?

Options:

- A. 20-year-old accountant, 20-year-old salesperson, 24-year-old salesperson
- B. 20-year-old accountant, 24-year-old salesperson, 24-year-old salesperson
- C. 24-year-old accountant, 20-year-old salesperson, 20-year-old salesperson
- D. 20-year-old accountant, 20-year-old accountant, 24-year-old salesperson

Reasoning Chains:

Step-by-step solution:

1. **Analyze the age clue:** "At least one of the two people sitting on the right side of 24 years old was 20 years old." This tells us the 24-year-old cannot be sitting in the rightmost seat. They must be in the middle or leftmost seat.

[RW 24 year old will be the leftmost, so wrong conclusion due to wrong reasoning]

[RW, wrong reasoning]

2. **Analyze the first job clue:** "At least one of the two people sitting on the left of the accountant is a salesperson." This means the accountant cannot be in the leftmost seat. They must be in the middle or rightmost seat.

[RW the accountant will be the leftmost, so wrong conclusion due to wrong reasoning]

[RW, wrong reasoning]

3. **Combine age and first job clues:** Since the 24-year-old can't be on the right and the accountant can't be on the left, the only possible arrangement so far is: [? , 24-year-old accountant, ?]

[WW premise(previous two sentence) is wrong and hence wrong conclusion]

[WW Error propagation, Error propagation]

4. **Analyze the second job clue:** "One of the two people sitting on the right of the salesperson is also a salesperson."

[NC]

Since the middle seat is already occupied by the accountant, this clue tells us that the salesperson and the other salesperson must be sitting to the right and left of the middle, respectively. This confirms there are two salespeople.

[WW premise(conclusionin step 3) is wrong and hence wrong conclusion]

[WW Error propagation, Error propagation]

5. **Final deduction:** We now know there are two salespeople and one accountant, and the accountant is 24. The remaining two people are salespeople and at least one is 20. The only option that fits is a 20-year-old salesperson and another 20-year-old salesperson.

[WW premise(conclusion of step 3 an 4) is wrong and hence wrong conclusion]

[WW Error propagation, Error propagation]

Final Answer: 3

Correct Answer: 1

Problem 2

Is correct: False

Passage: A unit conducted the year-end assessment and after democratic voting, five people were identified as candidates for the first prize. In the selection of five in four, the following factors need to be considered? 1) At least one person of Bing and ding is selected. 2) If E is selected, then A and B are also selected. 3) A maximum of 2 people are selected.

Question: According to the above statement, it can be concluded that who is not in the fourth?

Options:

- A.A.
- B.B.
- C.C.
- D.Ding.

Reasoning Chains:

Step-by-step solution:

Let's denote the five candidates as A, B, C, Ding, and E. We need to select four people for the prize, considering the given conditions.

1. **At least one of Bing and Ding must be selected.** This means we can't have a group of four that excludes both Bing and Ding.

[RR]

2. **If E is selected, then A and B must also be selected.** This means if E is in, A and B must also be in. Since we are selecting four people, if E is selected, the fourth person must be either Bing or Ding (due to condition 1).

[RR]

3. **A maximum of 2 people can be selected from Bing, Ding, and C combined.** This is the most restrictive condition.

[RR]

Let's analyze the possibilities:

* **If E is selected:** Then A and B are also selected.

[NC]

The fourth person must be either Bing or Ding. This gives us two possible combinations: {A, B, E, Bing} or {A, B, E, Ding}. Both satisfy condition 3.

[RR]

* **If E is not selected:** We need to select four people from A, B, C, Bing, and Ding.

[RR]

Condition 1 means at least one of Bing and Ding must be included.

[RR]

Condition 3 means at most two of Bing, Ding, and C can be selected.

[RR]

* If we select only one of Bing or Ding, we could have groups like {A, B, C, Bing} or {A, B, C, Ding}. These satisfy all conditions.

[RR]

* If we select both Bing and Ding, we can't include C (due to condition 3), leaving us with {A, B, Bing, Ding}. This also satisfies all conditions.

[RW right premise(Sentences above) but wrong conclusion due to wrong reasoning]

[RW wrong reasoning]

Notice that C is never *required* to fulfill any of the conditions.

[RR]

All other members are necessary in some combination.

[WW premise (taken from previous combinations is wrong) and hence wrong conclusion]

[WW, Error propagation, Error Propagation]

Therefore, C can be excluded in the final four.

[WW premise (taken from previous combinations is wrong) and hence wrong conclusion]

[WW, Error propagation, Error Propagation]

Final Answer: 3

Correct Answer: 4

Problem 3

Is correct: False

Passage: The person in charge of the relevant department said that pilots will be carried out in some areas this year to prepare for the system and policy preparations for the comprehensive clean-up of "small property houses", and require all localities to confirm the registration and certification of rural collective land. All small-property houses are not subject to registration and are not protected by law. Therefore, this newly built house in Hexi Village is not protected by law.

Question: Which of the following is true will most weaken the above argument.

Options:

- A. This newly built house in Hexi Village has been tacitly approved by relevant departments
- B. This newly built house in Hexi Village is a small property house
- C. This newly built house in Hexi Village is built on rural collective land
- D. Some of the newly built houses in Hexi Village are not small property houses

Reasoning Chains:

Step-by-step solution:

The argument concludes that the newly built house in Hexi Village is not protected by law because all small-property houses are not subject to registration.

[NC]

To weaken this argument, we need to find an option that suggests this specific house *might* be protected by law, despite the general rule about small-property houses.

[RR]

1. Tacit approval by relevant departments suggests possible legal recognition, directly contradicting the conclusion that the house isn't protected.

[RW Right premise but incorrect conclusion, because it goes too narrow possibly because of wrong reasoning.]

[RW wrong reasoning]

2. Confirming that the house *is* a small property house strengthens the original argument, not weakens it.

[RR]

3. Being built on rural collective land is irrelevant to the argument about legal protection based on registration.

[RR]

The prompt already states that localities must confirm registration of rural collective land, but that small property houses are not subject to registration *regardless* of land type.

[IRR]

4. The existence of other types of houses in Hexi Village has no bearing on the legal status of *this* specific house.

[RW Right premise but incorrect conclusion, because it goes too narrow possibly because of misinterpretation of premise but mainly because of wrong reasoning.]

[RW wrong reasoning]

Final Answer: 1

Correct Answer: 4

Problem 4

Is correct: False

Passage: According to a report, in the year to March, mainland Chinese buyers became the second largest group of foreign buyers buying US real estate, with a transaction volume of US \$ 9 billion, second only to Canada. This is 23% higher than the previous year's USD 7.3 billion transaction volume and 88% higher than the previous year's USD 4.8 billion transaction volume. Some people think that there are more and more rich people in China who are transferring their property abroad.

Question: Which of the following is true is the best argument against the above argument

Options:

- A? Many Chinese people buy homes for their children to study in the US
- B? Although the turnover has increased by 23%, the volume of Chinese buyers has not increased this year
- C. There are groups of real estate speculators among the wealthy Chinese who have speculated in Beijing and Shanghai
- D. The risk of the US real estate market has been small in recent years and has a certain function of value preservation and appreciation

Reasoning Chains:

Step-by-step solution:

The argument states that the increase in Chinese investment in US real estate is due to more rich Chinese people transferring their property abroad. We need to find an option that weakens this connection.

[NC]

- 1. If many Chinese buy homes for their children studying in the US, it weakens the argument that the purchases are solely due to wealthy individuals transferring assets.

[RW right premise but wrong conclusion due to wrong reasoning]

It suggests an alternative, valid reason for the increased purchases.

2. This option *could* weaken the argument. If the volume of buyers hasn't increased, but the total transaction volume *has*, it implies that the *average* purchase price has gone up.

[RR]

This could be due to existing wealthy Chinese buyers investing more, *or* it could be due to a smaller number of *even wealthier* individuals entering the market. It doesn't definitively weaken the original argument.

[RW right premise but wrong conclusion due to wrong reasoning]

3. This option provides a *possible* explanation for *some* of the investment, but doesn't weaken the overall premise that more wealthy Chinese are transferring property abroad. Speculators could also be part of this group.

[RR]

4. This strengthens the argument. If the US real estate market is seen as low-risk and appreciating, it makes it *more* attractive for wealthy individuals to transfer assets there.

[RR]

Option 1 most directly challenges the connection between increased real estate purchases and wealthy Chinese transferring property abroad by presenting a plausible alternative motive.

[WW premise (taken from previous sentence) is wrong]

Final Answer: 1

Correct Answer: 2

Problem 5

Is correct: False

Passage: A national academic conference held by a society receives nearly 1,000 conference papers each time. In order to ensure the quality of the conference communication papers, the academic conference organizing committee decided to select only 10% of the papers from the conference papers as conference communication papers each time.

Question: The decision of the academic conference organizing committee is most likely based on which of the following assumptions?

Options:

- A. There is always a certain percentage of paper quality in every conference paper submitted.

B.The number of conference papers received each time in the future will not change significantly.

C.90% of conference papers do not meet the quality of conference papers.

D.The academic conference organizing committee can make accurate judgments on the quality of the paper.

Reasoning Chains:

Step-by-step solution:

The organizing committee's decision hinges on their ability to distinguish between high-quality papers suitable for presentation and those that are not.

[RR]

The 10% figure implies a belief that only a small fraction of submissions meet their standards.

[RR]

This directly relates to their ability to assess quality.

[RR]

Option 1 is incorrect. While there's likely a distribution of quality, the decision doesn't depend on a fixed percentage of *good* papers existing but on their ability to *identify* them.

[RW wrong conclusion due to misinterpretation or wrong reasoning]

Option 2 is incorrect. The number of submissions is irrelevant to the committee's judgment of quality. They're selecting 10% *regardless* of the total number.

[RR]

Option 3, while likely true given the selection rate, isn't the core assumption.

[RR]

The decision isn't based on *knowing* 90% are bad, but on their confidence in identifying the 10% that *are* good.

[RR]

Option 4 directly addresses the committee's ability to judge quality, which is the foundation of their selection process.

[RW wrong conclusion due to misinterpretation or wrong reasoning]

Final Answer: 4

Correct Answer: 1

Gemini Correct chain

Problem 1

Is correct: True

Passage: Researchers recently discovered that there is an area called the thalamus pillow deep in the human brain, which is like an information desk operator, responsible for sorting out the external stimulus information and focusing human attention on the most important for behavior and survival Information. The researchers pointed out that this discovery is expected to bring new treatments for disorders such as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and schizophrenia caused by lack of attention.

Question: Which of the following is assumed by the above argument?

Options:

- A. Some schizophrenia are not caused by lack of attention
- B. Visual information is only transmitted through the visual cortex to obtain a neural network to transmit
- C. Researchers have developed a new technology that can directly track the communication between the nerve cortex in the visual cortex and thalamus occipital region
- D. The brain cannot process too much information in detail at the same time, and will only selectively focus on the things most relevant to the behavior

Reasoning Chains:

Step-by-step solution:

The argument states that the thalamus pillow sorts information and focuses attention on what's important for survival and behavior.

[NC]

It then connects this function to potential treatments for attention deficit disorders.

[NC]

This implies that the brain filters information and doesn't process everything in detail simultaneously, focusing only on the most relevant information.

[RR]

The connection to attention disorders reinforces this assumption.

[RR]

Let's look at the options:

1. This is not assumed. The argument suggests *some* cases are linked to attention deficits, not that *all* are.

[RR]

2. This is unrelated to the thalamus pillow's role in attention.

[IRR]

3. This describes a research method, not an assumption underlying the argument.

[IRR]

4. This directly reflects the argument's premise about the thalamus pillow filtering information and prioritizing what's relevant for behavior and survival.

[IRR]

Final Answer: 4

Correct Answer: 4

Problem 2

Is correct: True

Passage: In recent years, graduate entrance examinations have continued to heat up. Correspondingly, a variety of postgraduate counseling classes have emerged, especially English and political counseling classes are almost a must for the postgraduates. Xiaozhuang, who has just started working, also intends to take the postgraduate entrance exam, so Xiaozhuang must take English tutoring classes

Question: Which of the following can best strengthen the above argument

Options:

A.If you take an English tutoring class, you can pass the graduate entrance exam

B.Only those who intend to take the graduate entrance exam will participate in the English tutoring class

C.Even if you take an English tutoring class, you may not be able to pass the graduate entrance exam

D.If you do not participate in the English tutoring class, you cannot pass the graduate entrance exam

Reasoning Chains:

Step-by-step solution:

The argument concludes that Xiaozhuang **must** take English tutoring classes. We need to find the option that strengthens this "must" the most.

[NC]

1. This option helps, but doesn't make it a **must**. It just says taking a class **can** lead to passing. Xiaozhuang could potentially pass without the class.

[RR]

2. This option is irrelevant. It talks about who takes the classes, not whether Xiaozhuang *needs* to take them.

[RR]

3. This weakens the argument. It suggests the class isn't necessary.

4. This option makes it a *must*. It states that *without* the class, Xiaozhuang *cannot* pass. This directly supports the conclusion.

[RR]

Final Answer: 4

Correct Answer: 4

Problem:

Is correct:

Passage:

Question:

Options:

Reasoning Chains:

Correct Answer:

Problem:

Is correct:

Passage:

Question:

Options:

Reasoning Chains:

Correct Answer:

Problem:

Is correct:

Passage:

Question:

Options:

Reasoning Chains:

Correct Answer:

Problem:

Is correct:

Passage:

Question:

Options:

Reasoning Chains:

Correct Answer:

Problem:

Is correct:

Passage:

Question:

Options:

Reasoning Chains:

Correct Answer:

Problem:

Is correct:

Passage:

Question:

Options:

Reasoning Chains:

Correct Answer:

Problem:

Is correct:

Passage:

Question:

Options:

Reasoning Chains:

Correct Answer:

Problem:

Is correct:

Passage:

Question:

Options:

Reasoning Chains:

Correct Answer:

Llama-3 Correct chains

Problem-1

Is correct: True

Passage: Research shows that people who rarely take antibiotics have a stronger immune system than people who take antibiotics regularly. However, there is no evidence that taking antibiotics weakens the immune system.

Question: Which of the following, if correct, will best reconcile the inconsistencies between the information in the question?

Options:

- A. Some people often take antibiotics because their doctors prescribe antibiotics for both viral and bacterial infections.
- B. People with strong immunity rarely contract diseases that people usually treat with antibiotics.
- C. Despite the many side effects of antibiotics, some people still use these drugs.

D. People with poor immunity can hardly recover from bacterial infections without taking antibiotics.

Reasoning Chain:

Step-by-step solution:

1. The question presents a seeming contradiction: people who rarely take antibiotics have a stronger immune system, but there's no evidence that taking antibiotics weakens the immune system.

[RR]

This indicates that we need to find a reason why people who rarely take antibiotics have a stronger immune system, which is not directly related to the effect of antibiotics on the immune system.

[RR]

2. Let's analyze each option:

- Option A suggests that people take antibiotics regularly because their doctors prescribe them for both viral and bacterial infections.

[NC]

This is a plausible reason why people who take antibiotics regularly might not have stronger immune systems, as they're treating conditions that their immune systems can't handle on their own.

[in that case option A would be the right answer] [misinterpretation of premise(option)]

[RW misinterpretation]

- Option B implies that people with strong immunity rarely contract diseases that people usually treat with antibiotics.

[RR]

This option seems to explain why people who rarely take antibiotics have stronger immune systems, as they're less likely to need antibiotics in the first place.

[RR]

- Option C mentions the side effects of antibiotics but doesn't directly address the relationship between antibiotic use and immune system strength.

[RR]

- Option D suggests that people with poor immunity need antibiotics to recover from bacterial infections, but this doesn't explain why people who rarely take antibiotics have stronger immune systems.

[RR]

3. Based on this analysis, the most relevant option is B, as it provides a logical explanation for why people who rarely take antibiotics have stronger immune systems.

[RR]

Final Answer: B

Problem-2

Is correct: True

Passage: Some people talked about the photos of the abuse of captives by the US military? "If you don't want to be caught on the spot when doing stupid things, don't do stupid things."

Question: Which of the following sentences is different from the above sentence?

Options:

- A. If you do stupid things, be prepared to be caught on the spot while doing stupid things.
- B. Only by not being stupid can we avoid being caught on the spot when doing stupid things.
- C. Either you are caught on the spot when you are stupid, or you do n't do stupid things.
- D. If you are caught on the spot when doing stupid things, consider yourself unlucky.

Reasoning Chain:

Step-by-step solution:

1. The given sentence is: "If you don't want to be caught on the spot when doing stupid things, don't do stupid things." This sentence implies a cause-and-effect relationship where not doing stupid things prevents being caught on the spot.

[NC]

2. Now, let's examine each option:

A: "If you do stupid things, be prepared to be caught on the spot while doing stupid things."
- This sentence also implies a cause-and-effect relationship, but it's in the opposite direction. It's saying that doing stupid things will lead to being caught on the spot.

[RR]

B: "Only by not being stupid can we avoid being caught on the spot when doing stupid things." - This sentence is similar to the original sentence. It's also implying that not being stupid (or not doing stupid things) is the way to avoid being caught on the spot.

[RR]

C: "Either you are caught on the spot when you are stupid, or you don't do stupid things." - This sentence presents two options: being caught on the spot when being stupid or not doing stupid things. It's a bit different in tone and presentation, but it still conveys the same idea as the original sentence.

[RR]

D: "If you are caught on the spot when doing stupid things, consider yourself unlucky." - This sentence is different from the original sentence. Instead of implying a cause-and-effect relationship, it's offering a reaction or an attitude towards being caught on the spot.

[RR]

3. Based on the analysis, the sentence that stands out as different from the original sentence is D. It's the only one that doesn't present a cause-and-effect relationship or a direct advice.

[RR]

Final Answer: D

Problem-3

Is correct:True

Passage: It is difficult to keep the deep part of the wound free from bacterial infections, even high-efficiency antibiotics cannot kill the bacteria living deep in the wound. However, many doctors have wrapped the wound with a sweet substance such as sucrose to remove the bacteria deep in the wound.

Question: If any of the following is true, it is most helpful to explain why sucrose kills bacteria deep in the wound?

Options:

A.Bacteria deep in the wound thrive in a humid environment, and sucrose has a dehydrating effect.

B.Many kinds of bacteria take sucrose as a nutrient, and when they get sugar, they multiply quickly.

C.Some foods containing sucrose can weaken the effects of certain antibiotics.

D.High-efficiency antibiotics have only been developed recently, and the use of sucrose to treat wounds has a long history.

Reasoning Chain:

Step-by-step solution:

1. The problem statement mentions that high-efficiency antibiotics cannot kill the bacteria deep in the wound, which implies that the bacteria are resistant to antibiotics.
2. The statement also mentions that doctors have wrapped the wound with a sweet substance such as sucrose to remove the bacteria deep in the wound, indicating that sucrose has some effect on the bacteria.
3. To determine why sucrose kills bacteria deep in the wound, we need to consider the properties of sucrose and its effects on bacteria.
4. Option A suggests that sucrose has a dehydrating effect, which could potentially harm bacteria. This is a plausible explanation, as many bacteria thrive in humid environments and would be affected by dehydration.
5. Option B suggests that bacteria take sucrose as a nutrient and multiply quickly, which would not explain why sucrose would be effective in killing bacteria.
6. Option C mentions that sucrose can weaken the effects of certain antibiotics, but this does not explain how sucrose itself kills bacteria.
7. Option D mentions that the use of sucrose to treat wounds has a long history, but this does not provide any information about how sucrose affects bacteria.
8. Considering these options, the most plausible explanation for why sucrose kills bacteria deep in the wound is that it has a dehydrating effect, making it difficult for bacteria to thrive.

Final Answer: A

Correct Answer:

a

Problem 4

Is correct: True

Passage: David is a senior CEO, he made up his mind to go to a company with the best pay. Huizhong Company and Kangtuo Company intend to hire him. The two companies have the same treatment in other respects, only the salary is slightly different. The conditions provided by Huizhong Company are? half a year's salary is 500,000 US dollars, and the salary is increased by 50,000 US dollars every six months. Kang Tuo's conditions are? annual salary of 1 million US dollars, annual salary increase of 200,000 US dollars.

Question: Which one of the following correctly describes David's choice?

Options:

- A.David will go to Cantor because he will get \$ 150,000 more in two years.
- B.David will go to Huizhong Company because he will get more than 50,000 US dollars every year.
- C.David will go to Cantor because he will spend an extra \$ 50,000 per year.
- D.David will go to Huizhong Company because he will spend an extra \$ 70,000 every year.

Reasoning Chain:

Step-by-step solution:

To determine which company David will choose, let's first calculate the total salary for both companies over a two-year period.

For Huizhong Company:

- Half a year's salary is 500,000 US dollars.
- The salary is increased by 50,000 US dollars every six months.
- So, the salary for the first six months is 500,000 US dollars.
- The salary for the next six months is 550,000 US dollars ($500,000 + 50,000$).
- The salary for the next six months is 600,000 US dollars ($550,000 + 50,000$).
- The salary for the next six months is 650,000 US dollars ($600,000 + 50,000$).
- The salary for the next six months is 700,000 US dollars ($650,000 + 50,000$).
- The salary for the next six months is 750,000 US dollars ($700,000 + 50,000$).
- The salary for the next six months is 800,000 US dollars ($750,000 + 50,000$).
- So, the total salary for two years is $500,000 + 550,000 + 600,000 + 650,000 + 700,000 + 750,000 + 800,000 = 4,050,000$ US dollars.

For Kang Tuo Company:

- Annual salary is 1 million US dollars.
- Annual salary increase is 200,000 US dollars.
- So, the salary for the first year is 1 million US dollars.
- The salary for the second year is 1.2 million US dollars ($1 \text{ million} + 200,000$).
- So, the total salary for two years is $1,000,000 + 1,200,000 = 2,200,000$ US dollars.

Comparing the total salaries, Huizhong Company offers a higher salary over a two-year period (4,050,000 US dollars vs 2,200,000 US dollars).

Now, let's evaluate the options:

- Option A: David will go to Huizhong Company because he will get \$ 150,000 more in two years. This option is incorrect because Huizhong Company offers a higher salary than Kang Tuo Company.
- Option B: David will go to Huizhong Company because he will get more than 50,000 US dollars every year. This option is correct because Huizhong Company offers a higher salary than Kang Tuo Company.
- Option C: David will go to Kang Tuo Company because he will spend an extra \$ 50,000 per year. This option is incorrect because Huizhong Company offers a higher salary than Kang Tuo Company.
- Option D: David will go to Huizhong Company because he will spend an extra \$ 70,000 every year. This option is incorrect because the salary increase for Huizhong Company is not \$ 70,000 per year.

Final Answer: B

Correct Answer: B

Problem 5

Is correct: True

Passage: On the African grassland, a ferocious leopard can catch almost any antelope that it decides to hunt. And once the antelope does not stare at the hungry leopard, its best chance of escape is that the leopard quickly finds another animal as its target. Therefore, antelopes follow the group activities to reduce the risk of being eaten by leopards.

Question: Which of the following is the assumption on which the above argument is based?

Options:

- A. Leopards depend on predators for their livelihood.
- B. The sheer number of antelopes in the antelope flock can prevent leopard attacks.
- C. Leopards cannot eat the entire antelope flock at once.
- D. On the African grasslands, leopards are the main natural enemies of antelopes.

Reasoning Chains:

Step-by-step solution:

To find the assumption on which the argument is based, let's analyze the given information and the conclusion step by step.

1. The argument states that a ferocious leopard can catch almost any antelope it decides to hunt. This means that leopards are a significant threat to antelopes.
2. The argument also mentions that antelopes have a better chance of escape if they don't stare at the leopard. This implies that leopards are attracted to antelopes that stare at them.
3. The conclusion is that antelopes follow group activities to reduce the risk of being eaten by leopards.

Now, let's examine the given choices to find the assumption on which the argument is based:

A: Leopards depend on predators for their livelihood. - This is not mentioned in the argument, so it's unlikely to be the correct answer.

B: The sheer number of antelopes in the antelope flock can prevent leopard attacks. - This is a possible explanation for why antelopes follow group activities, but it's not explicitly stated in the argument.

C: Leopards cannot eat the entire antelope flock at once. - This is a crucial assumption in the argument. If leopards could eat the entire flock at once, there would be no benefit to antelopes in following group activities.

D: On the African grasslands, leopards are the main natural enemies of antelopes. - While this is implied in the argument, it's not the specific assumption on which the conclusion is based.

Based on the analysis, the most likely assumption is that leopards cannot eat the entire antelope flock at once, which allows antelopes to benefit from following group activities.

Final Answer: C

Correct Answer: C

