The reading gives three fundamental solutions for preventing the decrease in population and even extinction of the frogs. The lecturer, however, finds the idea dubious and casts doubt on them.

The author argues that the law should ban farmers from using the pesticide which is a harmful substance for frogs. Conversely, the lecturer brings up the idea that this method economically is neither practical nor fair. Because if the farmers do not use this substance, they will lose more crops in this competitive market, and this method has many disadvantages.

Furthermore, the reading holds the view that applying some treatments on frogs' skin may be useful against the infection of fungus which infects frogs' bodies. On the contrary, the lecturer states that if they want to use this treatment they should apply it on the skin of every individual frog. Therefore, capturing and treating is both complicated and expensive. Moreover, they should do it for every new generation.

Finally, the reading says that they should protect the frogs' habitat like lakes and marshes from water overuse. In contrast, the lecturer asserts that the problem is not excessive water use, but the major problem is global warming. Global warming is a problem that causes the disappearance of wetlands and causes the extinction of many species for many decades. So prohibiting humans from using water does not play a pivotal role in this problem.
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