**TPO 48\_Integrated**

The reading passage points out that different methods proposed by some scientists could be significantly helpful to stop declining of frogs' population. To support this, three major arguments are presented, which, however, are considered flawed by the lecturer and therefore she rejects them.

First, the author puts forward the idea that pesticides have some harmful substances for frogs and these materials could escalate the breathing process of frogs and shorten their lives. So, the writer thinks that some laws are needed to limit number of used pesticides by the farmers. In contrast, the professor dismisses this contention, saying that limiting usage of pesticides is not economical and fair for farmers. This is because, by strict laws peasants will have to use more crops to keep their products in high level and this process could be expensive for them.

Second, the reading passage claims that discovered ways to treat or prevent frogs' infection such as antifungal medication could be beneficial for frogs' health. By contrast, the lecturer refutes this assertion, stating that mentioned treatment process is extremely difficult because doctors have to find each frog and vaccinate them one by one. Not only that, but this treatment's method could not pass to the frogs' offspring and doctors should repeat such treatment activities for their offspring. Additionally, this process will not be cost effective and economical.

Finally, yet importantly, the reading claims that human activity should be controlled in order to preserve frogs in the natural ecology. However, the professor believes that the human activities are not the major threat for frogs' habitat. She mentions that global warming is the principal factor, threatening frogs' habitat and population.
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