The reading passage claims that many frog species have diminished regarding to their environmental changes, however, the lecturer finds all the ideas dubious and presents some evidence to refute them all.

The author argues that chemical products like pesticides, which are used for preserving agricultural products from invasive insects, can have a harmful effect on the frogs' health system. Thus, if the usage of the pesticides restricted legally, it would definitely improve the quality of frogs' health. Conversely, the lecturer brings up the idea that reduction in the pesticides usage is not practical; and farmers in the areas adjacent to frogs' habitats would stay behind in competition with other areas due to the higher loss of their crops regarding to the considerations of not using the pesticides on their farms.

Furthermore, the reading passage holds the view that fungus infections can lead to the reduction of frog population. It believes that antifungal treatments can solve this problem and save these animals. On the contrary, the professor underlines the fact that the idea of treating every individual frog is unattainable, and it is not cost-benefit. Besides, the treatment cannot stop infection not to pass through the next generation.

Finally, the writer asserts that the human activities, over usage of water for instance, threaten the natural habitats of the frogs. Thus, it could be helpful to better protecting frogs' water habitats. In contrast, the speaker dismisses this issue due to the fact that the main factor which is influencing the natural habitats is global warming. It can be considered as a real threat and more likely to have the principle role in the alteration of frogs' natural habitats.