The author of the article proposed three different ways to solve the problem of frog populations declining. The lecturer on the other hand casts doubt about these solutions and asserts that they are none practical.

First, it is mentioned in the reading that frogs are being damaged by pesticides. These pesticides which are originated from farmlands can enter the frog's body and attack the nervous system and as a result cause breathing difficulties to frogs. The author thinks that some laws should prevent the farmers to use damaging pesticides. However, the lecturer rejects this idea by saying that reducing pesticides is not ecconomicaly possible. The farmers, in order to remain competative with other farmers have to use these pesticides that help them maintain their corpses. If these laws apply, it will cause the farmers to lose their products.

Secondly, the author states that fungus is another major factor in declining frog populations by making their skin thick, so they may have problem with absorbing water and die from lack of water. Recently, researchers have found medical treatments which kill these fungi, and the author thinks that it should be used in a large scale. In contrast, the lecturer refutes this by mentioning that these medicines have to be applied individually to each frog because they are hard to capture. Besides that, this solution would not solve the problem of spreading the fungus and has to be applied to each generation of frogs which could be complicated and expensive.

Finally, the article mentions that these frogs are dependent on water to lay their eggs in. Many of these water habitats are endangered by human activities and the writer believes it has to be stopped. The lecturer, on the other hand, says although this may be good for the environment, the major issue still is global warming and prohibiting the human interference is not going to solve this problem.
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