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The main idea of both the passage and the lecture is about methods of preventing a decline in frog populations. In this line of thought, the reading states that since the reducing or extinction frog population has detrimental effects on the ecosystems, some practices should be taken to protect frogs. The lecturer, on the other hand, categorically refutes all the three episodes of arguments mentioned in the passage, believing that none of these strategies are practical.

First of all, the author brings up the idea that since the use of pesticides by farmers is harmful for frogs, some laws should be made against using these substances near the frogs’ habitats. The lecturer, in contrast, posits that eliminating pesticides are neither practical nor fair. Farmers can stay in competitive markets by using pesticides. Getting farmers with strict regulation causes face severe disadvantages. Farmers will lose lots of their crops, however other farmers who live in the other area can profit from pesticides.

Second, the author holds the view that the fungus which spread around the world have fatal effects on the frog population. Applied some ways to kill the fungus, the frogs will protect from fungus’ infection. The speaker, however, argues that each frog encounters fungus, and apply treatments to the large scale of frogs is too difficult. She also says that, when frogs reproduce, scientists have to implement the treatments for each generation, which would be very complicated and prohibitively expensive.

Third, the author of the assay avers that since frogs lay their eggs in water, protecting marshes and lakes from human activities would be very helpful for them. The professor, conversely, rebuts that human activities are not the biggest threat for frogs but global warming. Global warming has adversely affected many wetlands and made them be disappeared.
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