The reading passage asserts that decreasing frog population has harmful effects on their environment; therefore, three methods are presented to prevent this issue. The lecture, however, finds the idea dubious and casts doubt on the reasons proposed by the reading passage.

Firstly, the author argues that pesticides which are used to prevent crops from attacking insects have harmful effects on frogs; therefore, it should be prevented from using pesticides near frog's habitats. Conversely, the lecture brings up the idea that decreasing pesticides to prevent from destroying frog's habitats is not be fair and economical because pesticides are efficacious in decreasing crop loses and lead farmers to stay in competitive market. Preventing from pesticides gives rise to crop loses in that area.

Furthermore, the reading passage holds the view that a fungus can lead to the death of frogs; hence, by applying antifungal medication on a large scale, this deadly effect would be decreased. On the contrary, the professor underlies the fact that using the medication arises problems. According to the lecture, using the medication should perform individually; therefore, applying such treatment for each frog would be complicated and very expensive.

Finally, the passage asserts that frog's habitats are threatened due to human activities, and if these activities were managed better, the frogs would recover. In contrast, the speaker dismisses this issue due the fact that although preventing from human activities can be advantageous, these factors are not remarkable in declining frog population. According recent studies, global warming has more effect in destroying frog's habitat than human factors.