The reading asserts that how Agnostids may have lived or what they ate or how they behaved. The lecturer however finds the idea dubious and casts doubt on the reason proposed by the reading passage.

The author argues that agnostids may hunted smaller prays. Conversely the lecturer brings up the idea that other arthopods swim in the ocean have large eyes for searching and finding the prays. We know that having a great vision is a good ability to find prays. But agnostids have very small and tiny eyes even they may be blind. Another theory is that they may have some special sensors instead of their eyes for find prays but there is no evidence to prove this idea. Consequently they did not have been pradators. So this matter can roll out this theory that angostids were pradator.

Furthermore the reading passage holds the view that agnostides may have been seafloor dwellers. On the contrary the professor underlines the fact that seafloor dwellers can not move fast or move far in a large geographical area. So they are stay at localize area where they been generated. and as a result dwellers occupy small area. But agnostids can move very fast and they spread in larg area. This ability is unusual for seafloor dwellers. As a result this evidence can rolls out that the angostids were be dwellers.

Finally the reading asserts that agnostids were parasites. In the contrast the speaker dismisses this issue due to the fact that the parasites have small population and their population must stay in a certain limit. because a larg population of them can easily kill host micro organisms they need. but angostids’ population was very large. So this matter roll out that they were parasite.
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