The reading proposed three solutions to the problem related to the decline in the frog population. The writer finds all the ideas dubious and presents some evidence to refute them all.

The author argues that spread of pesticides from farmlands to frogs habitats is one of the reasons that leads to the decline in the frog populatoin since these pesticiedes attack nervous system and cause them breathing problems ultimately. Therefore, the writer think that substantiating laws against using pesticides may help. Conversely, The lecturer disagrees with that claim, considering the fact that this will not be economical to farmers and it will lead to a sever disadvantage when they want to compete with farmers from other areas.

Furthermore, the reading passage asserts that since fungus thinkens the skin of frogs which will cause them to die due to the dehydration, antifungul medication and treatments that kill fungus with heat can be helpful and It sould be done in large scale to cushion frogs from infection. On the contrary, the professor states that in this method we should consider frogs individually and when we try this mean in a large scale mode, it will cause us difficulty. Besides, taken to the account frogs offsprings , treatment should be applied to generations of frogs; hence, it will not be practical.

Finally, the writer asserts that lakes and marshes should be better protected since these are frogs habitats and excessive water use and development should not be allowed. In contrast, the speaker believes that it is not the main reason behind this problem and if one to solve their habitats problem, he should pay close attention to the global warming because the real treat is that.
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