The reading claims that frog species have declined in numbers or even gone extinct because their environment were changed. And provides some solutions to solve of declining in frog population. However, the lecturer finds all ideas dubious and present some evidence to refute them all.

the author argues that laws should prohibited farmers from using harmful pesticides near frog habitats because these chemical components spread into neighboring and attack the frog nerves system. Conversely, the lecturer brings up the idea that preventing farmers from using pesticides is not economical and fair. Pesticides used to prevent insects from damaging crops; thus, farmers disadvantageous of such laws and they lose more and more crops.

Furthermore, the reading passage hold the view that several ways to treat fungus which causes of frog dehydration including antifungal medication. On the contrary, the professor underlines the fact that researchers should treat each frog individually and in large scale this solution is complicated and expensive. Also, these treatments could not prevent offspring from fungus and the researchers should treat again and again in new generation.

Finally, the reading asserts that key water habitats were protected from excessive water use and development. So, many frog species would recover. In contrast, the speaker dismisses this issue due to the fact that human activities such as excessive water use and draining of wetlands is not the major point to threat the frog natural habitats. In fact, the global warming is the cause of disappearing many wetlands recently.
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