The reading asserts that there are three feasible solutions to reliably prevent the frog population from diminishing drastically and, in turn, save the nutrient cycles and energy flows in which they involve. The lecturer, however, finds the idea dubious and casts doubt on the methods proposed by the reading passage.

The writer first claims that had the use of agricultural pesticides near the frog’s natural environments forbidden; this reduction could have been manageable. Conversely, the professor underlines the fact that the proposed restriction of pesticides is neither fair nor beneficial. Since, as the farmers are forced to stop using pesticides in the agricultural fields, the harvest declines considerably as a result of an uncontrollable increase of various, thus, in comparison with ones whose lands are not in the vicinity of the frog’s habitats suffer a significant loss of investments.

Furthermore, the reading passage holds the view that a project can be held to avoid infection and also cure the frogs which have already been infected with fungus. On the contrary, the lecturer brings the idea that not only is there a large scale of the population that requires this treatment, so it is not plausible to capture them individually and apply the treatment, but also it is not a guarantee for not passing this disease to offspring. Therefore, it is a time-consuming cycle that must be repeated again and again; thus, it is not economically advisable.

Finally, it is stated in the article that had a law been passed for limitation of human activity in the frog’s habitat, the population of these spices would have been retrievable. In contrast, the speaker dismisses this issue due to the fact that the main problem which threatens their natural surroundings is not excessive water usage or drainage the wetlands by humans, but global warming which is the primary cause of environmental destruction. Thus, although it is a remarkable suggestion, it may not be practical for saving the frog population.
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