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Abstract

Human-driven environmental changes are affecting wildlife across the globe. These challenges do not influence species or populations to the same extent and therefore a comprehensive evaluation of organismal health is needed to determine their ultimate impact. Evidence suggests that telomeres (the terminal chromosomal regions) are sensitive to environmental conditions and have been posited as a surrogate for animal health and fitness. Evaluation of their use in an applied ecological context is still scarce. Here, using information from molecular and occupational biomedical studies, we aim to provide ecologists and evolutionary biologists with an accessible synthesis of the links between human disturbances and telomere length. In addition, we perform a systematic review and meta-analysis on studies measuring telomere length in wild/wild-derived animals facing anthropogenic disturbances. Despite the relatively small number of studies to date, our meta-analysis revealed a significant small negative association between disturbances and telomere length (−0.092 [−0.153, −0.031]; n = 28; k = 159). Yet, our systematic review suggests that the use of telomeres as a biomarker to understand the anthropogenic impact on wildlife is limited. We propose some research avenues that will help to broadly evaluate their suitability: (i) further causal studies on the link between human disturbances and telomeres; (ii) investigating the organismal implications, in terms of fitness and performance, of a given telomere length in anthropogenically disturbed scenarios; and (iii) better understanding of the underlying mechanisms of telomere dynamics. Future studies in these facets will help to ultimately determine their role as markers of health and fitness in wildlife facing anthropogenic disturbances.
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INTRODUCTION

There is ample evidence that human population growth and its increasing ecological footprint are driving dramatic environmental changes for wildlife worldwide (Ceballos et al., 2020; Diffenbaugh & Field, 2013). Human-driven environmental changes often take place at a faster pace than historical environmental shifts, which can constrain the development of adaptive responses, and thus reduce individual performance and population resilience (Hendry et al., 2017; Saaristo et al., 2018). Evaluating how organisms cope with anthropogenic disturbance is therefore crucial to devise appropriate conservation plans (Brooks et al., 2006; Brum et al., 2017). To that aim, a broad number of molecular markers have been used across taxa and within different fields (e.g., ecotoxicology: Chapman, 2002; conservation physiology: Wikelski & Cooke, 2006), and some of them have arisen as surrogates of an individual’s condition and fitness, hereafter called “biomarkers.” The use of biomarkers has its origin in human toxicology, and when applied to wildlife management or assessment, it aims to evaluate whether organisms have been, or currently are being, exposed to human-derived disturbances or stressors, and whether this exposure has a negative impact on the individuals’ health and future performance. Ideally, a given biomarker should not only provide information about the stress-induced homeostatic response, which may be adaptive, but it also should provide an inference of a measure of impairment, i.e., a link with health or fitness (Calow & Forbes, 1998). This deterministic approach can be challenging in natural populations, as differences in life-history trajectories between individuals, but also population-specific evolutionary processes, can make it difficult to delineate the response to a specific human disturbance (e.g., Whitehead et al., 2017).

The quantification of parameters linked to endocrine pathways, immune response or cellular damage, such as oxidative stress, have largely been used to evaluate the impact of human activities on natural populations (e.g., Beaulieu & Costantini, 2014; Burger et al., 2007; Huggett, 2018; Madliger et al., 2015, 2018; Ohmer et al., 2021; Figure 1). In addition to the use of these biomarkers, the estimation of the length of telomeres (the terminal chromosomal regions) has recently been suggested as a tool for assessing the link between environmental disturbance, physiology and fitness (Beaulieu & Costantini, 2014; Gormally & Romero, 2020; Madliger et al., 2018). However, despite the increase in the number of studies measuring telomeres in wildlife, our knowledge is still far behind the endocrine, immunological or oxidative stress metrics (Figure 1), among other markers. Recent reviews have highlighted the relevance of telomeres in toxicology (Shoeb et al., 2020), and specifically in environmental toxicology (Louzon et al., 2019); and several studies have started to include telomere estimates to understand the impacts of other global threats to biodiversity such as urbanization. A comprehensive evaluation of the link, or the lack thereof, between the exposure to anthropogenic disturbances and telomere dynamics will help to determine whether telomeres can be considered a biomarker in this context.

Here, we synthesize and evaluate the use of telomeres in studies addressing the impact of human disturbances on wild and wild-derived animals, hereafter wildlife. First, we provide a brief overview of the implications of telomeres at the organismal level (for previous and more extensive reviews on the topic see, e.g., Giraudet et al., 2019; Young, 2018), followed by a synthesis of their methodological and theoretical advantages in comparison with relatively well-established physiological biomarkers. We then introduce the mechanistic link between the most common pollutants derived from human disturbances, such as metallic elements or organic compounds, and telomere dysfunction, drawing on knowledge from molecular and human occupational and environmental medicinal studies. We follow up with a systematic review and meta-analysis of the available publications investigating whether human disturbances alter wildlife telomeres, i.e., from specific chemical pollutants to the effect of urbanization, as an exemplification of broad human interventions. Finally, we discuss the possible limitations and future perspective on the use of telomeres in ecotoxicological and human-disturbance studies.

FIGURE 1 Number of publications per year (from 1999 to 2020) measuring either immune (blue), endocrine (orange) or oxidative stress (green) parameters in the left y-axis, or telomere length (grey) in the right y-axis, in wild animal populations coping with anthropogenic-origin disturbances. The search was done in March 2021 in Web of Knowledge and using the following string: (“biomarker”; i.e., “immune,” “endocrine,” oxidative stress” or “telomere,” respectively) AND (pollut* OR disturb* OR anthrop* OR pestic* OR contam* OR biotic* OR abiotic*) NOT (human* OR domestic* OR captiv* OR plant* OR aquacultur*)
derived from human studies (Mather et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2018). In the field of ecology and evolutionary biology, telomeres were initially considered as a potential marker of organismal chronological age and lifespan (e.g., Haussmann & Vleck, 2002; Nakagawa et al., 2004), with applications for wildlife conservation management (Nakagawa et al., 2004). However, almost two decades after these pioneering studies, the view of telomeres as a chronological age marker has been disregarded and, instead, telomeres are considered as a proximate cause of life history and physiological trade-offs (see, e.g., Young, 2018). In addition, evidence from wildlife populations is accumulating on the importance of environmental cues in the observed within-species variation in telomere length (e.g., Angelier et al., 2018; Burraco et al., 2021; Debes et al., 2016; Dupoué et al., 2017), together with apparent fitness-related benefits of maintaining longer telomeres across an individual’s lifetime (Barrett et al., 2013; Bauch et al., 2014; Eastwood et al., 2019; Sudyka et al., 2014). Moreover, recent laboratory studies have evidenced their causative role in ageing and health links; for example, in modified laboratory mice, longer telomeres are associated with less DNA damage or low cholesterol, together with longer survival (e.g., Muñoz-Lorente et al., 2019). Therefore, the measurement of telomere length is gaining attention in ecological and environmental studies as a potential molecular marker on the overall health status of wild organisms.

In contrast to other molecular markers such as endocrine, immune or oxidative stress parameters, telomeres are predicted to be less sensitive to immediate disturbances, such as handling or circadian cycles, and, therefore, they could provide information about wildlife exposure to medium- or long-term disturbances (Gormally & Romero, 2020). Moreover, the measurement of telomere length in minimally invasive tissues such as blood, buccal swabs or tissue punches (e.g., ear and patagium, or feathers) has been shown to be a reliable metric of the telomere length in other tissues at the organismal level (e.g., Ashgar et al., 2016; Debes et al., 2016; Kärkkäinen et al., 2020; Kesäniemi et al., 2019; Power et al., 2021; Reichert et al., 2013; Rollings et al., 2019; Turbill et al., 2013). This makes telomeres an attractive metric for wildlife studies where access to certain tissues is limited in natural populations.

3 | INFLUENCE OF ANTHROPOGENIC DISTURBANCES ON TELOMERE STRUCTURE AND ITS MAINTENANCE MECHANISMS

Occupational and environmental medicine research has presented telomeres as a chromosomal region sensitive to human-derived stressors in a broad sense, and in particular to chemical pollutants. Despite potential limitations of these studies, they provide interesting insights into the mechanisms behind anthropogenic disturbances and telomere dysfunction. In Box 1, we synthesize the biology of telomeres, introducing the molecular structures and mechanisms of maintenance that are more likely to be affected by human activity. In this section, we aim to provide ecologists, and environmental and evolutionary biologists with an accessible overview of how exposure to pollutants of concern links to those molecular pathways and structures described in Box 1, for natural populations. This mechanistic overview aims to aid the interpretation of telomere dynamics in wildlife exposed to anthropogenic disturbances, but also to encourage the study of new pathways in future research within the field.

3.1 | Chemical pollution (organic and inorganic)

Environmental pollution, via a plethora of inorganic and organic compounds such as metals, POPs (persistent organic compounds), or pesticides and pharmaceuticals, represents one of the main human-driven threats for wildlife. Some chemical pollutants, such as metals, are naturally found in the environment, but because of human activities, their concentration can reach much higher levels and become toxic. Furthermore, organisms cannot metabolize most of these substances into less toxic compounds, therefore facilitating their bioaccumulation (mostly in adipocytes, de Wit, 2002), which, together with their long residence times in air, water or soils, could increase the hazard and risk of toxicity (e.g., Arnold et al., 2014; Lv et al., 2019).

3.1.1 | Metallic/metalloid trace elements (MTE)

The exposure to metals can induce reactive oxygen species (ROS) production, induce genotoxicity and inhibit DNA repair mechanisms (Figure 2). Hence, these compounds could affect telomere length or its dynamics either acting in isolation or via interaction with other xenobiotics (e.g., Vriens et al., 2019). For example, in humans, chronic exposure to arsenic can result in carcinogenic manifestations and involve telomere elongations; this is partially attributed to an increase in telomerase activity (Jimenez Villarreal et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2003) but also to ALT (alanine transaminase) pathways or epigenetic modifications (Bhattacharjee et al., 2020; Figure 2). Nonetheless, high exposure to arsenic has also been linked to telomere shortening via increased oxidative stress (Zhang et al., 2003). In contrast, lead and cadmium have been systematically associated with shorter telomeres because of their ability to cause oxidative damage (DNA, proteins and lipids) or to impair the DNA repair machinery (Hartwig, 2010; Figure 2). Moreover, MTEs could increase telomere shortening directly and indirectly, namely via mitochondrial impairment and dysfunction (Meyer et al., 2013). It remains controversial whether mitochondrial ROS are able to diffuse across the cytoplasm (Cleaver et al., 2014; Hoffmann et al., 2004; Zhang & Wong, 2021), but it has recently been shown that ROS derived from mitochondria could indeed be responsible for telomere dysfunction (Qian et al., 2019). Furthermore, it is plausible that mitochondrial dysfunction alone, in response to environmental pollutants, could trigger cellular senescence i.e., MIDAS (mitochondrial dysfunction-associated senescence) (Wiley et al., 2016; Figure 2), increasing cellular turnover and telomere shortening.
BOX 1  What are telomeres and how does their regulatory machinery work?

Our understanding of telomere structure and the pathways involved in the regulation of its length is key to interpret an individual’s telomere length in relation to anthropogenic disturbances (see Section 3). Telomeres constitute a highly conserved system involved in the maintenance of genome stability and replication (Blackburn, 1991). In vertebrates, telomeres are noncoding regions that consist of double-stranded G-rich DNA repeats ending in a single-stranded 3’ overhang. These repeats are bound to the shelterin/telosome complex, which is composed of six proteins in most vertebrates (TRF1, TRF2, RAP1, TIN2, TPP1 and POT1; Figure 2). This protein complex helps to stabilize the telomere structure and prevents chromosome ends from being identified as a DNA double-strand break (Griffith et al., 1999; de Lange, 2005). Nonetheless, telomeres shorten during each cell division as a result of the normal process of DNA replication, the so-called “end replication problem” (Harley et al., 1990). This replicative shortening eventually destabilizes the shelterin/telosome complex, thus exposing the chromosome end and triggering the cellular replicative senescence signal. This process is characterized by activation of pathways related to the DNA damage response (e.g., p53 and p16; Figure 2) and can finally lead to cellular ageing (Jacobs & de Lange, 2004). Adjacent to the telomere structure are the subtelomeric regions, which, in contrast to telomeres, contain a low density of genes. Among other functions, genes contained in the subtelomeric regions are involved in the transcription of long noncoding RNA, named TERRA, playing a significant role in the regulation of telomere length, telomerase activity and telomeric heterochromatin (Luke & Lingner, 2009). Similar to telomeres, subtelomeres are rich in epigenetic marks such as DNA methylation or histone modifications (Figure 2), and therefore altered methylation/demethylation patterns in subtelomeric promoters can modify transcription levels and induce telomere length variation and dysfunction (Blasco, 2007).

Eukaryotes have developed strategies to counteract telomere shortening after each cell division, and the most common way is through the action of the enzyme telomerase. Telomerase is a reverse transcriptase formed by two main components (the catalytic domain TERT, and a noncoding RNA, TER; Figure 2), which elongates telomeres by synthesizing telomeric DNA repeats (Greider & Blackburn, 1989). Although telomerase activity may be a key component in attaining cellular immortality, in humans this enzyme is often repressed in somatic cells, whereas it is mostly expressed in highly proliferative ones such as germ cells, embryonic stem cells and haematopoietic cells (Blackburn et al., 2015). The inactivation of telomerase in post-embryonic stages may be a mechanism to avoid cancer development, as upregulated telomerase activity is associated with the development of a high number of tumours (Shay, 2016). Oncogenic studies have also observed that a proportion of tumour cells can maintain their chromosome-end integrity in the absence of telomerase (Cesare & Reddel, 2010). These cells can use one or more mechanisms that involve DNA recombination events to maintain their telomere length, referred to as alternative lengthening of telomere pathways or ALT (Bryan et al., 1997).

Therefore, the telomere length of an individual represents an equilibrium between the loss of terminal telomeric repeats with each DNA replication, the integrity of the shelterin/telosome complex and the addition of telomeric repeats by telomerase. However, not all the telomere loss is attributable to the “end replication problem.” In vitro studies suggest that oxidative stress plays a major role in the remaining loss at the cellular level (Richter & Zglinski, 2007; Von Zglinski, 2002). Reactive oxygen species (ROS) seem to induce single strand breaks and lead to telomere loss (Figure 2), either directly at the telomeric regions or as intermediates in lesion repair (Von Zglinski, 2002). This can be partially explained by the nucleotide composition of the telomeric repeats. Telomeres are rich in guanine (G-rich strand, Figure 2), which is the most easily oxidized of the natural bases (converted to 8-oxoG) and a preferred site for iron binding and iron-mediated Fenton reactions—a source of ROS (e.g., Oikawa et al., 2001). Cells are relatively efficient in repairing the DNA damage produced by daily cellular insults, but this process seems to be less efficient in telomeres (e.g., Kruk et al., 1995). Externally induced mild-oxidative stress might promote the accumulation of telomeric single-strand breaks (SSBs, Figure 2), which will eventually accelerate telomere shortening and lead to premature cellular senescence (Barnes et al., 2019; Correia-Melo et al., 2014). Also, acute oxidative stress or genotoxic agents could induce double-strand breaks (DSBs, Figure 2), which are more difficult to repair and can trigger a persistent DNA damage response in the cell, inducing a replicative senescence independently of telomere length (e.g., Fumagalli et al., 2012; reviewed inVictorelli & Passos, 2017). However, it is important to note that, at the organismal level (i.e., in vivo), the causal role of oxidative stress in telomere loss is far from being established. Current studies on this only partially support this hypothesis (e.g., Boonekamp et al., 2017; reviewed in Reichert & Stier, 2017), although a recent meta-analysis in nonhuman vertebrates suggests a link between the mechanisms to minimize the oxidative damage inflicted by ROS and telomere loss (Chatelain et al., 2020). Further mechanistic experiments are needed to fully understand the relationship between telomere loss and oxidative stress at the organismal level.
3.1.2 Persistent organic pollutants (POPs)

In light of the available epidemiological studies, exposure to POPs is generally associated with shorter telomeres (reviewed by Liu et al., 2021), although this may depend on the particular compound or exposure intensity (e.g., Callahan et al., 2017; Shin et al., 2010; Vriens et al., 2019). Metabolism of POPs can induce oxidative stress via the production of ROS as by-products, and can also alter the mitochondrial redox status and function, such as via oxidative damage (Liu et al., 2020; Figure 2). Moreover, telomere dysfunction due to exposure to POPs may also be driven by reduced telomerase activity (e.g., Senthilkumar et al., 2011) or by the upregulation of TERRA (Yuan et al., 2018). Nonetheless, exposure to certain POPs, such as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or poly- and perfluoroalkyl substances...
dysfunction (Figure 2), is suggested to upregulate telomerase activity, via decreasing TERT inhibition, and ultimately leading to longer telomeres (Huang et al., 2019; Figure 2). However, the observed telomere lengthening (or lack of change) in organisms coping with POP exposure can be a hormetic response to pollutant concentration, as observed in response to PCBs (Shin et al., 2010) or to arsenic (Zhang et al., 2003).

3.2 | Radiation

Radiation refers to the emission of energy in the form of particles or waves. The energy of radiation is often classified either as nonionizing (lower frequency and energy) or ionizing (higher frequency and energy), and defines its ability to penetrate solid matter, including biological structures. Overall, studies suggest telomeres are key elements in the process of radiation-induced carcinogenesis, either via direct damage to their structure (including shelterin proteins), or via its maintenance mechanisms. However, the mechanisms behind the effects of each type of radiation are yet not fully understood. Big data studies will help to infer how exposure to each radiation type has negative consequences both at the molecular and at the organismal level.

3.2.1 | Nonionizing radiation

Nonionizing radiation does not have sufficient energy to ionize atoms, but it can be biologically hazardous because it induces the excitation of biological molecules. This is the case of the ultraviolet (UV) radiation that is not absorbed by ozone. Telomeres are hypersensitive to damage following UV radiation (Figure 2) as they form cyclobutene pyrimidine dimers (CPDs), which are mutagenic and lethal (Cadet et al., 2005). The repair mechanisms of these photo-products involve the excision of the damaged segments and opposite CPDs in proximity could mimic double-strand break, triggering a DNA damage response (Witkin, 1976). Therefore, cells might use a lesion-tolerance strategy rather than repair the CPDs in order to prevent double-strand breaks and continue proliferating without accelerating telomere shortening (Rochette & Brash, 2010).

3.2.2 | Ionizing radiation

Although rare, wildlife can be threatened by high levels of ionizing radiation after a nuclear accident or in scenarios where radioactive elements are naturally present. Ionizing radiation can directly damage DNA during or shortly after exposure to the radioactive particles (Figure 2). Even so, telomeres represent a small proportion of the nuclear DNA and therefore the probability that radioactive particles interact with the telomeres is rather low. In contrast, the radioactive particles can interact with other cellular components generating free radicals and ROS, and thus potentially inducing telomere dysfunction (Figure 2). Several studies have found altered telomere dynamics and telomerase expression in humans exposed to acute ionizing radiation (Lustig et al., 2016; Sishc et al., 2015; Yoshida et al., 2016). However, the cohort consequences of these effects are far from clear, as for example denoted by an overall lack, at the whole-genome level, of transgenerational effects of exposure to Chernobyl ionizing radiation (Yeager et al., 2021).

3.3 | Air pollution

Air pollution via particulate matter (PM) or nitrogen oxides (NOx), but also via persistent organic compounds such as PCBs and others (see Section 3.1 for details), are among the most common sources of pollution in anthropogenic landscapes (e.g., Hochella et al., 2019; Moll et al., 2019). Their relationship with telomere dysfunction arises via oxidative stress and ROS formation. In particular, PM can induce an oxidative stress state either transporting ROS to the body via inhalation and/or through the catalytic generation of ROS (Bates et al., 2019). Both processes could eventually lead to DNA damage, increases in cell proliferation or apoptosis, and overall shorter telomeres (Gutiérrez-Castillo et al., 2006; Peixoto et al., 2017). Epidemiological studies on humans show that exposure to PM does not only alter telomere dynamics in those tissues directly exposed to the stressor such as lung or skin cells, but also in peripheral blood and in the placenta (Liu et al., 2021). In addition, increases in telomere length have been reported in peripheral blood in response to short-term PM exposure, and although the mechanisms are not fully understood, these seem to be independent of telomerase expression via methylation on its promoter (Dionis et al., 2011). Therefore, exposure to PM can include systemic effects and influence telomere dynamics in early life (Martens et al., 2017), although these effects can take place in a complex way, probably linked to the nature of the particles.

3.4 | Light and noise pollution

In contrast to the large number of studies on the effect of PM or chemical pollutants on telomeres, the consequences of artificial light at night (ALAN) or noise exposure on telomere length have been less explored. This is probably the result of being often an overlooked source of pollution in human populations, only regarded as a risk under certain circumstances (e.g., Münzel et al., 2021). Conversely, ALAN and noise exposure are a current concern with important implications for wildlife populations (e.g., Duquette et al., 2021; Sanders et al., 2021). Therefore, it is not surprising that empirical studies linking these two pollutants and telomere length are based on wildlife studies. Although the mechanisms behind the effects of ALAN and noise pollution on telomere dysfunction might not be straightforward, these might respond to indirect pathways linked to increases in oxidative stress and subsequent ROS production, for example due to altered circadian rhythms (e.g., Cai et al., 2020; Sardon Puig et al., 2018; Wilking et al., 2013). However, the studies currently available
(mostly in birds, see Table 1; e.g., Grunst et al., 2020; Grunst et al., 2019; Injaian et al., 2019) indicate that noise and light pollution only subtly affect telomere dynamics, although the combination of several stressors might magnify telomere dysfunction.

4 | SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS ON WILDLIFE TELOMERE LENGTH FACING ANTHROPOGENIC DISTURBANCES

4.1 | Literature search, data extraction and effect size calculation

To synthesize and assess research gaps and biases in current knowledge of wildlife telomere length in ecotoxicological and anthropogenic disturbance studies, on March 6, 2021, we systematically searched the peer-reviewed scientific literature using Web of Science and the following string: (telomere) AND (pollut* OR disturb* OR anthrop* OR pestic* OR contam* OR biotic* OR abiotic*). We restricted the search to those studies in nonhuman organisms and focused on those performed at the organismal level in wild or wild-derived populations, and cell culture-based studies were excluded in subsequent steps. We also excluded those studies in which telomere length was not reported. The initial search produced 1,239 studies that were screened for duplication, and those studies in nonrelevant disciplines or topically irrelevant based on reading titles and abstracts were filtered out (n\_excluded = 1,132; see Figure S1). After compiling the remaining results into a database, we screened 63 studies of which 35 were retained (n\_excluded = 28; Figure S1). We excluded six of those studies as they did not directly measure telomere length or were conducted in study systems under strong artificial selection (mainly studies on laboratory rodents), and we identified, screened and included three records via other sources, resulting in a final 31 studies in the review in Table 1.

From the studies in Table 1, we extracted information regarding the study subject (taxonomic group, species and developmental stage of the individuals), study condition (field or laboratory) and design (wild or captive populations, use of the natural variation or experimental approaches, number of telomere measurements per individual, sampled tissue and method of telomere measurement) and anthropogenic disturbance information (type of disturbance in a broad sense). The complete list of moderators, its detailed description and levels are shown in Table S1. In addition, where possible, we extracted statistical information from each study to transform the association between an anthropogenic disturbance and telomere length using Fisher’s transformation for among-study comparison (Zr, the effect size). This was achieved using the means, sample sizes and standard deviations, t-values, F-values or correlation coefficients and following standard equations (Koricheva et al., 2013; Nakagawa & Cuthill, 2007). Effect sizes assessing categorical predictor variables (e.g., those measuring telomere length in polluted and control habitat or condition) were first transformed into standardized mean differences (Cohen’s d, Cohen, 2013) and then to Pearson’s correlation coefficient (r) before applying Fisher’s transformation (Nakagawa & Cuthill, 2007). Where a categorical predictor had multiple levels (e.g., a gradient of anthropogenic habitat), we used the two extremes of the environmental gradient for analysis. Where more than one effect size could be calculated from the same data due to reporting of multiple statistical outputs, we followed the order of preference: (i) mean telomere differences between anthropogenic and control or correlation coefficients between telomere and anthropogenic disturbance, (ii) coefficient of correlation and (iii) inferential statistics (e.g., F-value, t-value). Where necessary, data extraction was conducted from figures using WEBPLOTDIGITIZER (Rohatgi, 2021). From each study, we also extracted the direction of the relationship between telomeres and anthropogenic disturbance, either negative for a decrease or faster shortening, or positive for telomere length elongation or maintenance. When no information was available for the calculation of the effect sizes of interest, we contacted the corresponding authors and four authors provided us with the required data or information. Full or partial extraction of relevant data was possible from the published material of 28 studies (90% of all the studies included in Table 1) and we obtained a total of 159 effect sizes (k; see figure S1).

4.2 | Meta-analysis and publication bias

We used phylogenetic multilevel meta-analytic mixed-effect models for testing the overall effect of anthropogenic disturbances on telomere length, in addition to the effects of each of the seven ad hoc selected moderators (Table S1). For that aim, we used the package METAFORE version 2.1.0 (Viechtbauer, 2010) in R version 3.5.2. (R Core Team, 2018). In each model, we used the effect size (Zr) as the dependent variable along with the sampling variance associated with each effect size, which is (n − 3)\(^{-1}\). We first fitted an intercept-only model to estimate the overall effect (i.e., meta-analytic mean). We then subsequently built individual meta-analytic models to examine the effects of moderators of interest (Table S1), where levels had four or more studies and 12 effect sizes. In all models we included the study ID as a random factor, which encompasses effect sizes extracted from the same study, and species ID, as some species occurred in multiple studies. Residual variance was modelled by adding an observation ID as a random factor (Harrison, 2014). To minimize the nonindependence of the estimates, we included the species phylogeny in the models as a random effect, using a phylogenetic relatedness correlation matrix (e.g., Chamberlain et al., 2012; Sánchez-Tójar et al., 2020). To this aim, we built a phylogeny by retrieving the phylogenetic relationships from the Open Tree of Life (Hinchliff et al., 2015) using the package rotl (Michonneau et al., 2016). We estimated branch lengths using Grafen’s method (Grafen, 1989) using the function “compute.brln” (part of package Paradis & Schliep, 2019). We present estimates (i.e., means) with their 95% confidence intervals (CI) in square brackets throughout and the mean effect size is considered significantly different from zero if the
TABLE 1  Summary of the systematic review of studies linking telomere length and anthropogenic-origin disturbances, including direct or indirect actions, such as pollution, urbanization or habitat fragmentation, on nonhuman animals

| Species         | Field/lab. | Exp./corr. | Develop. stage | Type of Anthropogenic Disturbance | Summary of the relationship between telomere length (TL) and/or dynamics (TD) and the disturbance | Tissue          | Reference                      |
|-----------------|------------|------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| Amphibian Nanorana parkeri | Lab. Exp. | Larval | Oxygen | TL: no differences | heart, liver, muscle | Han et al. (2018) |
| Aves Cephus grylle mandtii | Field Corr. | Adult | Hg, PCBs, DDTs, HCH, HCB, PBDEs, PFAS | TL: negative with pesticides | RBCs | Eckbo et al. (2019) |
| Aves Haliaeetus albicilla | Field Corr. | Nestling | POPs (several) | TL: no change | RBCs | Sletten et al. (2016) |
| Aves Hydrobates pelagicus | Field Corr. | Nestling-adult | Human presence level | TL and TD: no differences/change | RBCs | Watson et al. (2015) |
| Aves Larus hyperboreus | Field Corr. | Adult | PFAS | TL and TD: no differences with many organic pollutants, TD: slower shortening with PFTeDA | RBCs | Sebastiano et al. (2020) |
| Aves Milvus milvus | Field Corr. | Nestling | Lead and mercury | TL: no differences | RBCs | Powolny et al. (2020) |
| Aves Parus major | Field Corr. | Nestling | Urbanization | TL: no differences | RBCs | Biard et al. (2017) |
| Aves Parus major | Field Exp. | Nestling | light | TL and TD: no differences/change | RBCs | Grunst et al. (2019) |
| Aves Parus major | Field Corr. | Nestling | Road proximity, metals (Pb, Cd, As, Cu, Zn) | TL: no differences with proximity to road or with metal concentration, TD: negative with road proximity | RBCs | Grunst et al. (2020) |
| Aves Parus major | Field Corr. | Nestling | Noise | TL: negative among small, but not large, brood members | RBCs | Grunst, Grunst, Pinxten, et al. (2020) |
| Aves Parus major | Field Exp. | Nestling | Light | TD: no change | RBCs | Ouyang et al. (2017) |
| Aves Parus major | Field Exp. | Nestling | Urbanization | TL: negative | RBCs | Salmón et al. (2016) |
| Aves Parus major | Field Corr. | Juvenile-adult | Urbanization | TL: selective disappearance of birds with shorter telomeres in urban birds. TD: slower shortening in urban birds | RBCs | Salmón et al. (2017) |
| Aves Parus major | Field Exp./corr. | Nestling | As, Cd, Ni, Pb, Cu | TL: no differences | RBCs | Sánchez-Virosta et al. (2020) |
| Aves Parus major, Ficedula hypoleuca | Field Corr. | Nestling-adult | Metals (As, Pb, Cd, Cu, Ni), calcium, metallothioneins | Parus major TL: shorter in contaminated area. Ficedula hypoleuca TL: no differences | liver | Stauffer et al. (2017) |

(Continues)
| Species | Field/lab. | Exp./corr. | Develop. stage | Type of Anthropogenic Disturbance | Summary of the relationship between telomere length (TL) and/or dynamics (TD) and the disturbance | Tissue | Reference |
|---------|------------|------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|-----------|
| Aves P. domesticus | Field | Exp. | Nestling | Noise pollution | TL: shorter with noise | RBCs | Meillère et al. (2015) |
| Aves R. tridactyla | Field | Corr. | Adult | POPs (organochlorine pesticides and polychlorobiphenyls) | TL: negative with oxychlordane (females), unchanged for other POPs | RBCs | Blévin et al. (2016) |
| Aves R. tridactyla | Field | Corr. | Adult | PFASs | TL: no differences. TD: elongation over 2 years | RBCs | Blévin et al. (2017) |
| Aves T. bicolor | Field | Exp. | Nestling | Traffic noise | TD: faster shortening with noise | RBCs | Injaian et al. (2019) |
| Aves T. bicolor | Field | Exp. | Adult | Aerial vehicles | TD: no change | RBCs | Scholten et al. (2020) |
| Aves T. guttata | Lab. | Exp. | Nestling–adult | Traffic noise | TL and TD: shorter and faster shortening, respectively, in juveniles | RBCs | Dorado-Correa et al. (2018) |
| Aves T. guttata | Lab. | Exp. | Adult | "Cocktail" of metals (Pb, Cr, As, Cu, Ni, Co, Cd) | TL: negative in feather | RBCs and feather | Saulnier et al. (2020) |
| Aves T. merula | Field | Corr. | Juvenile–adult | Urbanization | TL: negative | RBCs | Ibáñez-Álamo et al. (2018) |
| Aves Z. capensis | Lab. | Exp. | Adult | Drinking water salinity | TL: no change | RBCs | Sabat et al. (2019) |
| Fish C. peled | Lab. | Exp. | Adult | Noise | TL: tissue and exposure-time dependent brain, muscle, dorsal fin, gonads | | |
| Fish G. occitaniae | Field | Corr. | Adult | Combination of trace metals (Al, As, Co, Pb, Zn, Ni, Cd, Cr, Cu) | TL: no differences | pelvic fin | Petitjean et al. (2020) |
| Fish S. cephalus | Field | Corr. | Juvenile–adult | Urbanization, pollutants (PAHs, phthalate esters, pyrethroids, OCPs, PCBs, PBDEs) | TL: negative with Σphthalate | pelvic fin | Molbert, Angelier, et al. (2021) |
| Gastropoda C. aspersus | Lab. | Exp. | Subadult | PAHs, Cd, Hg | TL: no differences | haemolymph | Louzon et al. (2020) |
| Mammal C. Torquatus | Field | Corr. | Juvenile, subadult and adult | Coal | TL: negative | liver, kidney, muscle, skin | Matzenbacher et al. (2019) |
| Mammal M. glareolus | Field | Corr. | Adult | Ionizing radiation | TL: negative in testis and liver, no relation in brain, heart, ovary | testis, liver, brain, heart, ovary | Kesäniemi et al. (2019) |
95% CI did not overlap with it. We investigated inconsistency across studies by estimating the heterogeneity $I^2_{\text{total}}$ and the equivalent for each random effect following Senior et al. (2016) and implemented in the function “$\text{i2}_{\text{ml}}$” (metafor R package, Viechtbauer, 2010). Heterogeneity refers to the unexplained variation among effect sizes after accounting for sampling variance, and $I^2$ values around 25%, 50% and 75% are considered as low, moderate and high levels of heterogeneity, respectively (Higgins et al., 2003). We also estimated the percentage of heterogeneity explained by the moderators in each model using $R^2_{\text{marginal}}$ (Nakagawa & Schielzeth, 2013). Results of the intercept-only model and moderators were graphically represented as orchard plots using the r package orchard version 0.0.0.9 (Nakagawa, Lagisz, Jennions, et al., 2021; Nakagawa, Lagisz, O’Dea, et al., 2021). To check for possible publication bias we performed two extra multilevel meta-regressions with the same random structure as above but using as moderator either (i) the square root of the inverse sampling variance (precision; a variant of an Egger’s regression based on Nakagawa & Santos, 2012) to test for small-study bias (Nakagawa, Lagisz, Jennions, et al., 2021; Nakagawa, Lagisz, O’Dea, et al., 2021); or (ii) year of study publication mean-centred for time-lag bias (Koricheva & Kulinskaya, 2019).

4.3 | Results and discussion of the systematic review and meta-analysis

Due to conserved molecular structure and maintenance pathways, we may expect a similar outcome in wildlife (particularly in response to chemical pollution) as in the human literature, that is an overall negative effect on telomere length in response to anthropogenic disturbances, which could lead to premature ageing with subsequent negative consequences for individuals’ performance and lifespan. Our systematic review indicates that more than a third of the studies provide equivocal support for a negative effect of anthropogenic disturbances on telomeres; that is, they find a few, from an array of analysed pollutants/disturbances, to be associated with telomeres, or they report developmental stage or sex-specific effects (11 out of 28 studies; Table 1, e.g., Blévin et al., 2016; Dorado-Correa et al., 2018; Stauffer et al., 2017). However, the meta-analytic mean for all the effect sizes ($k = 159$) revealed a significant negative association between anthropogenic disturbance and telomere length/change, although the effect was small and with an overall moderate heterogeneity (estimate: $-0.092 [-0.153, -0.031]$; $I^2_{\text{total}} = 53.3$%; Figure 3a). This result concurs with a recent meta-analysis on stressors and telomere length across nonhuman vertebrates, where the stressor category “human disturbance” was also negatively associated with telomere length (18 studies; $k = 55$; estimate: $-0.29 [-0.46, -0.12]$; Chatelain et al., 2020).

Further analyses classifying the effect sizes in three broad anthropogenic disturbance categories indicated a negative effect on telomere length for organic pollutants (estimate: $-0.104 [-0.208, -0.006]$; Figure 3b) and those under the category “others” (including ALAN, noise and urbanization; estimate: $-0.088 [-0.161, -0.015]$;
However, for the category “Metallic Elements” (i.e., studies on the exposure to elements such as Zn, As or Cu), the estimate 95% CI overlapped zero (estimate: $-0.070 \ [-0.164, 0.025]$; Figure 3b). Post-hoc Wald tests revealed statistically significant differences between the categories ($p < .05$ in all cases), although the type of anthropogenic disturbance as a moderator only accounted for 1.3% of the heterogeneity (Table S2). Regarding the study characteristics, correlational or field studies show a significant negative effect on telomeres (“Correlational”: $-0.096 \ [-0.170, -0.023]$; Figure 3c; “Field”: $-0.110 \ [-0.185, -0.034]$; Figure S3a), which contrast with the observed pattern for experimental and studies under captive conditions (“Experimental”: $-0.083 \ [-0.178, 0.013]$; Figure 3d).
Both experimental and captive studies investigating the impact of anthropogenic disturbance on telomere lengths are scarce (n = 13 and 6 studies respectively; Table 1) and often looked at acute or subchronic effects, as opposed to correlational and field studies that are based on organisms with a medium to long history of exposure, and hence are more likely to detect an effect on telomeres (Table 1).

One third of the reviewed studies are based on measurements of telomere change, namely a longitudinal approach consisting of more than one telomere length estimate per individual over time (n = 10, e.g., Blévin et al., 2017; Dorado-Correa et al., 2018; Kirby et al., 2019). The meta-analytic estimate for longitudinal studies included zero (“Change” estimate: −0.029 [−0.115, 0.058]; Figure 3d), in contrast to those studies based on one telomere length measurement per individual that showed an overall negative effect of the anthropogenic disturbances (“Length” estimate: −0.098 [−0.158, −0.038]; Figure 3d). This pattern may be the result of the lower number of effect sizes for telomere change (k = 22 vs. 137 for telomere length), but it could also correspond to the short time between samples in most of the studies reporting telomere change (Ouyang et al., 2017; Scholten et al., 2020) or the reduced fraction of species lifespan covered, for example only the nestling period (e.g., Grunst et al., 2019). Alternatively, the selective disappearance of individuals with a certain telomere length in the studied populations could also explain the observed pattern (e.g., Salomons et al., 2009). Indeed, we lack longitudinal studies of wildlife that simultaneously evaluate telomeres across an organism’s lifespan as well as address the impact of anthropogenic disturbances (e.g., Salmón et al., 2017).

Studies of humans and wildlife suggest that most of the telomere loss within an individual occurs during the early life stages (e.g., Asghar et al., 2015; Factor-Litvak & Susser, 2015; Heidinger et al., 2012; Louzon et al., 2020) and, therefore, we expected a stronger effect during that stage in response to anthropogenic disturbances. However, we did not find a significant effect of the developmental stage at which telomere length was measured (“Early” estimate: −0.050 [−0.133, 0.032]; “Juvenile” estimate: −0.135 [−0.278, 0.008]; “Adult” estimate: −0.065 [−0.141, 0.011]; Figure 3b), and there were no differences among the developmental stage levels (all p-values of post-hoc comparisons were >.090). It is possible that the small number of studies and the discrepancy across them regarding the analysed tissue and taxonomic groups or species-specific developmental differences might have masked effects in this respect.

Current knowledge suggests differences between the telomere biology (including the underlying maintenance and repair mechanisms) of endotherms and ectotherms (reviewed in Olsson et al., 2018). Contrary to endotherms, telomerase expression is not repressed in the somatic tissues of many ectothermic species, characterized by indeterminate growth (Gomes et al., 2010); thus, replicative senescence could theoretically be minimized in this group. Our meta-analysis indicates a negative effect of anthropogenic stressors on telomeres of endotherms but not ectotherms (“Endotherm” estimate: −0.106 [−0.180, −0.031]; “Ectotherm” estimate: −0.067 [−0.198, 0.064]; Figure 3c). This could be explained by the constitutive expression of the enzyme telomerase throughout ectotherms’ lifetime and also by the upregulation of the mechanisms that may counteract or buffer the negative effects of anthropogenic disturbances on telomeres (e.g., telomerase, antioxidative activities, mitochondrial efficiency; Burraco et al., 2020). Nonetheless, our understanding of the telomere maintenance mechanisms in non-model species is limited and the number of studies conducted in ectotherms in response to anthropogenic disturbances remains very low to be able to obtain a clear conclusion (n = 4 in this review, all cross-sectional studies).

Regarding the effect of the telomere length measurement method, the association between telomeres and anthropogenic disturbance was negative regardless of the method (“qPCR” estimate: −0.080 [−0.146, −0.013]; “TRF” estimate: −0.201 [−0.366, −0.037]; Figure 3e), although the estimate for TRF was significantly more negative than for qPCR (QM2 11.20, p = .004). Similar methodological differences have been reported previously (e.g., see Kärkkäinen et al., 2021; Wilbourn et al., 2018). We cannot disregard the differences between methods in the small number of studies and effect sizes using the TRF technique (n = 4 studies, k = 24), and more studies are needed to elucidate the observed pattern. Finally, we did not detect any publication bias for small studies (slope: −0.000 [−0.008, 0.007], p = .945; R2 marginal = 8.1 × 10−5; Figure S4a) or time-lag (slope: 0.025 [−0.003, 0.054], p = .077; R2 marginal = .099; Figure S4b).

5 | PERSPECTIVES ON TELOMERES AS BIOMARKERS OF THE EFFECTS OF ANTHROPOGENIC DISTURBANCES

Our systematic review and meta-analysis suggest that telomere length is proving itself to be an integrative marker to evaluate the overall effects of anthropogenic disturbances on wildlife. However, and importantly, this effect is small, and stressor- and taxon-dependent, which is in accordance with previous studies, for example on adversity and general stressors in humans and wildlife (Chatelain et al., 2020; Pepper et al., 2018). We cannot reach a conclusion about the adequacy of telomeres as a biomarker sensu stricto, that is as an indicator of the impact of experienced conditions on individual health and a predictor of future performance. So far, we lack key information on the causal relationship between specific disturbances and the organismal response in terms of telomeres. Moreover, we are in need of studies exploring the link between telomere length and individuals’ fitness or performance in anthropogenically influenced scenarios, which has been done only recently in a handful of studies and with a mixed results (Kirby et al., 2019; Louzon et al., 2020; Salmón et al., 2017; Scholten et al., 2020; Sebastiano et al., 2020). Both are critical aspects for the broad implementation of telomeres in the estimation of ecological risk (Calow & Forbes, 1998; Forbes et al., 2006; Timbrell, 1998).
5.1 | Need for causality between disturbances and telomere length

The involvement of telomeres in health and fitness is frequently discussed in the literature, where telomeres are often suggested as a noncausal biomarker of cumulative damage in other biological structures (e.g., Young, 2018). This criticism responds to the difficulty in manipulating telomere length itself. Some experimental work has shown that the manipulation of telomere length is possible, for example via strains selected for telomere length (Muñoz-Lorente et al., 2019) or the direct manipulation of telomere length using certain drugs, often via telomerase activation (reviewed in Criscuolo et al., 2018). These manipulations are difficult in wild and wild-derived captive populations or not adequate in certain species with active telomerase expression across their life course (e.g., Au et al., 2009; Bousman et al., 2003; Kesäniemi et al., 2019).

To fully understand the role of telomerases as a biomarker of anthropogenic disturbances we need, in addition to health and lifespan implications, to be able to predict the direction of the telomere dynamics (i.e., shortening or lengthening) in response to anthropogenic disturbances. This could be investigated by the manipulation of the disturbance instead, such as pollutant levels (see e.g., Parolini et al., 2016). Our literature synthesis evidences the lack of experimental studies in this respect and, despite our meta-analysis suggesting an overall small decrease in telomere length in response to disturbances (Figure 3a), the response in experimental studies is far from clear (Figure 3b,c). Some study systems present opportunities in this respect as the manipulation of anthropogenic disturbance levels can be done during early development. Moreover, when telomeres are measured in minimally invasive tissues, it could be possible to track the telomere length and performance of the experimental individuals, providing information on the long-term and fitness implications (Figure 4). Some recent studies have started to include telomere length measurements in experiments using realistic levels of organic pollutants in fish (Molbert, Agostini, et al., 2021), amphibian larvae (Cheron et al., 2022) and avian embryos (Parolini et al., 2021). Further implementation of telomere length measurements in this context, combined with longitudinal designs and fitness or performance metrics, will clearly help to evaluate the role of telomerases as a biomarker (see below and Section 5.2; Figure 4).

In some cases, manipulation of the anthropogenic disturbance is not possible, either because the work is carried out in sensitive species/populations or because of disturbance complexity (e.g., urbanization intensity). In those cases, although correlative, a longitudinal measurement of telomere length could still provide a valuable approach to the within-individual trajectory of telomere length in response to a given disturbance (Figure 4). Longitudinal designs would allow differentiation of between- and within-individual effects of the anthropogenic disturbance on telomeres and simultaneously minimize the effects of environmental conditions or differential survival (e.g., McLennan et al., 2017; Salmón et al., 2017). This approach gains further relevance in light of the benefits that telomere change might have over telomere length as a predictor of survival (Boonekamp et al., 2014; Salomons et al., 2009; Wood & Young, 2019). Therefore, coupling information from multiple telomere measurements per individual over time, together with a corresponding estimate on the degree of disturbance, will be an advancement from the common single- (or two point) based correlational studies. Nonetheless, wild organisms are often exposed to a mixture of anthropogenic disturbances, for example regarding chemical pollution (Blévin et al., 2016; Dietz et al., 2019), and the specific contribution to telomere length of each disturbance may still need to be evaluated. Spatial and temporal replications may also help to understand the relative contribution of disturbances to the telomere dynamics of wild populations. In natural conditions, the allocation of resources to different life-history traits (e.g., growth or timing of reproduction) may also partially explain the within-individual variation in telomere length in response to anthropogenic disturbances, and hence they should ideally be considered. In addition, where possible, it is important to account for different stages that characterize the life cycle of many species, i.e., early-life, adulthood or senescence (Figure 4), in the sampling design. This is of particular interest in studies of long-lived organisms or those undergoing metamorphosis, but also if we consider that the fitness implications of telomeres may be age-dependent.

5.2 | Include performance or fitness proxies

As highlighted by our systematic review, the vast majority of studies do not have information on the fitness or performance consequences of telomere length differences as a result of exposure to anthropogenic disturbances (but see, e.g., Louzon et al., 2020; Salmón et al., 2017; Sebastiano et al., 2020). This is an important point as the power of biomarker use in wildlife lies in the reliability in making inferences, based on a given measurement, about an individual’s past stress exposure or of the long-term consequences of stress. We acknowledge that the lack of information on the organismal implications of telomers in ecotoxicological and environmental studies often resides in the complexity to get such estimates in natural or wild-derived populations. Indeed, this lack of information is not exclusive but a recurrent issue in the ecological literature on telomeres. Fortunately, studies are (slowly) adding information on the link between individual quality and telomere length (Angelier et al., 2019; Cheron et al., 2021; Le Vaillant et al., 2015). For a given species, evidence for the explanatory power of telomeres is therefore a prerequisite for integrating telomere length information within an ecological context, and to implement this knowledge in conservation strategy. Therefore, new studies exploring, in anthropogenic scenarios, how a given telomere length relates to individual performance, such as foraging efficiency or postnatal growth, or to individual fitness, via proxies such as reproductive output or mortality risk, will aid our understanding of the role of telomerases as a biomarker (Figure 4).
5.3 | Further considerations

Similar to other molecular markers, the use of telomeres has limitations when applied to wild organisms, such as storage of the biological material (i.e., to avoid DNA degradation, Eastwood et al., 2018; Reichert et al., 2017), or purely analytical factors (e.g., Morinha et al., 2020). Therefore, it is important to accurately validate the technique for telomere estimation in a given species (e.g., Aubert et al., 2012; Nussey et al., 2014). For instance, the telomeric motif (see Box 1 and Figure 2) can also be present within the chromosomes (i.e., interstitial telomeric sequences, ITSs), in addition to the chromosome’s extremes (i.e., the telomeres sensu stricto). Not all the telomere measurement techniques consider these ITSs, and their number or presence may be species-specific or vary among individuals or generations.
populations within a species (Foote et al., 2013). In addition, their biological implications at the organismal level remain unclear. Other biological characteristics, such as the change with age or the within-individual repeatability, have also been shown to be sensitive to the method employed in telomere estimation (Atema et al., 2019; Kärkkäinen et al., 2021; Remot et al., 2021). Therefore, these technical limitations could influence any inferences about past stress exposure or future long-term consequences for a given telomere length if not considered beforehand.

Furthermore, it is important to stress that an individual’s telomere length represents an equilibrium between telomere loss and the activity of the telomere repair and maintenance mechanisms (see Box 1), and the latter two are rarely quantified in wildlife or wild-derived organisms (e.g., Kesäniemi et al., 2019). As discussed in Section 3, some genotoxic agents are often expected to induce telomere elongation, which is probably linked to the upregulation of some repair machinery. Therefore, in many cases it remains difficult to interpret the telomere dynamics (shortening or lengthening) without an understanding of the regulatory mechanisms’ beneath. In wildlife, the observed outcome in terms of telomere length in response to anthropogenic disturbances could indicate an upregulation/downregulation of the telomere protecting mechanisms, but also just inadequate repair (i.e., direct telomere attrition). Combining telomere length estimates together with metrics of their maintenance, protection, or repair, such as telomerase or oxidative stress, will provide a step forward when evaluating the responses of wildlife to anthropogenic actions and simultaneously facilitate adequate evaluation of telomeres as a biomarker in this context (Kesäniemi et al., 2019; Matzenbacher et al., 2019; Figure 4). Moreover, the implications for individuals’ health and fitness of environmentally induced telomere elongation, or lack of telomere loss, are still unknown (Sebastiano et al., 2020), and this represents a promising research avenue for future environmental, evolutionary and ecological studies (Criscuolo et al., 2018; Smith et al., 2021).

6 | CONCLUSIONS

It is increasingly acknowledged that molecular and physiological tools are useful for evaluating wildlife health and performance in response to anthropogenic disturbances. Although the implementation of telomeres in this context is relatively recent, and the number of available studies is still small, our synthesis and meta-analysis do confirm that, overall, wildlife telomere length is negatively affected by human-derived disturbances. This is a promising step towards implementing telomere assessment in an applied context. However, we have also detected some important limitations that need to be considered to definitively evaluate telomere length as a biomarker of the impact of anthropogenic disturbances on wildlife. These limitations reside in the lack of experimental studies assessing the effects, in terms of telomere length, on exposure to realistic levels of disturbance. Moreover, only a handful of studies have explored the link between telomere length and the subsequent organismal fitness and performance in anthropogenic scenarios, which makes any inference of the consequences of a given telomere length difficult. Finally, we ignore the relative importance for telomere length of the mechanisms involved in their maintenance, protection, repair or damage in response to anthropogenic stressors. We will not be able to evaluate the use of telomeres as a health and fitness biomarker in natural populations until all these aspects are thoroughly covered. Although some of the most recent research in the field has moved in a promising direction, we hope this work can serve as a steppingstone for further work in this respect.
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