1) Answer: C
Explanation: Among the given options, the one in option C is the best assumption. If we try to negate this statement into "Monetary penalties do not discourage countries from emitting excessive carbon," then it does not make sense for the United Nations to form an international treaty to penalize countries with excessive carbon emissions.

2) Answer: B
Explanation: Option B is the best assumption among the given options. If we try to negate this statement into "The occurrence of the next economic recession cannot be predicted using large quantities of data and statistical procedures," then the given statement fails. In particular, it becomes senseless for the government to invest in supercomputers that can compute large quantities of data and complicated statistical procedures if these things cannot predict the next economic recession.

3) Answer: B
Explanation: Option B is the best assumption for the given statement. Try to ask why the company has to include a qualifying exam to hire more competent applicants. You can answer this question sufficiently with "because passing a qualifying exam helps select competent applicants."

4) Answer: B
Explanation: Let us start by identifying the form of the premises to see what valid argument form we can invoke:

An increase in tourist arrivals means more budget allocated for the renovation of transportation and accommodation facilities like airports, hotels, restaurants, and roadways (If P then Q)

You might be wondering how the statement qualifies as an *"If P then Q"* statement. Well, if you try to write it as *"If there's an increase in tourist arrivals, then more budget will be allocated for the renovation of transportation and accommodation facilities like airports, hotels, restaurants, and roadways."* Notice that this statement's thought is the same as the original one.

The 2020 annual budget of AppleCrown City for the renovation of transportation and accommodation facilities was reduced (If not Q)

Notice that the premises are in a form as the premises in a modus tollens. This means that the best conclusion must be in the form, *Therefore, not P*.

Among the given options, it's option B (there's a decrease in tourist arrivals to AppleCrown City) that satisfies this form.

Thus, the answer is B.

5) Answer: A
Explanation: The given premises are actually in the same form as those in a disjunctive syllogism.

- *To be qualified as the most outstanding player of the decade, the player must either have an individual score of not less than 1000 or won at least five championships.*(*Either P or Q*).
- *John Smith was able to score 850 only but was hailed as the most outstanding player of the decade (Not P)*.

Since the premises seem to follow the form of the premises in a disjunctive syllogism, then the conclusion should be in the form, *Therefore, Q*.

The statement following this form is option A *(John Smith won more than five championships)*.