The reading offers several methods to solve the problem of declining frogs populations that are useful to protect humans by eating harmful insects. The lecture, however, finds these methods dubious and casts doubt on the reasons proposed by the reading passage.

The author argues that the pesticides which are used by farmers to prevent insects from damaging farms crops must be prohibited, because these pesticides serve breathing problem for frogs. Conversely the lecture brings up the idea that this method is not economically practical. If farmers in an area don’t use the pesticides, they will lose their crops, so they couldn’t compete with farmers from another areas, and couldn’t stay in the market.

Furthermore, the reading passage holds the view that frogs skins must be protected from fungus by several new methods including antifungal medication and treatments that kill the fungus with heat. On the contrary, the professor underlines the fact that antifungal medication must be applied to each frog in a large scale, so this treatment is incredibly complicated. And also the lecture says that this method must apply to new generations of frogs again and again, because this treatment don’t protect frogs from passing fungus onto their offspring.

Finally, the reading asserts that human activities such as: more use of water or draining wetlands to make them suitable for development, threatened the frogs natural habitats. The speaker says protect of wetlands from excessive usage of water and developments is good idea, but the real threat for frogs habitats is the global warming. In recent decades, global warming casing to reduce wetlands and extinct many species.