



HAL
open science

Do Telomeres Influence Pace-of-Life-Strategies in Response to Environmental Conditions Over a Lifetime and Between Generations?

Mathieu Giraudeau, Frédéric Angelier, Tuul Sepp

► **To cite this version:**

Mathieu Giraudeau, Frédéric Angelier, Tuul Sepp. Do Telomeres Influence Pace-of-Life-Strategies in Response to Environmental Conditions Over a Lifetime and Between Generations?. *BioEssays*, 2019, 41 (3), pp.1800162. 10.1002/bies.201800162. hal-03011551

HAL Id: hal-03011551

<https://hal.science/hal-03011551v1>

Submitted on 18 Nov 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **Do telomeres influence pace-of-life-strategies in response to environmental conditions over**
2 **a lifetime and between generations?**

3

4 ¹GIRAUDEAU Mathieu, ²ANGELIER Frederic and ³SEPP Tuul

5

6 ¹CREEC, 911 Avenue Agropolis, BP 6450134394 Montpellier Cedex 5, France and MIVEGEC,

7 UMR IRD/CNRS/UM 5290, 911 Avenue Agropolis, BP 6450134394 Montpellier Cedex 5,

8

France.

9 ²CNRS CEBC-ULR, UMR 7672, Villiers en Bois, 79360, Beauvoir sur Niort, France

10 ³Institute of Ecology and Earth Sciences, University of Tartu, Vanemuise 46, 51014 Tartu,

11 Estonia

12

13 ABSTRACT

14 The complexity of the physiological phenotype currently prevents us from identifying an
15 integrative measure to assess how the internal state and environmental conditions modify life-
16 history strategies. We propose that shorter telomeres should lead to a faster pace-of-life where
17 investment in self-maintenance is decreased as a means of saving energy for reproduction, but at
18 the cost of somatic durability. Inversely, longer telomeres would favor an increased investment
19 in soma maintenance and thus a longer reproductive lifespan (i.e. slower pace-of-life). Under our
20 hypothesis, telomere dynamics could be such an integrative mediator, which would assemble the
21 information about oxidative stress levels, inflammation status and stress reactivity, and relate this
22 information to the potential lifespan of the organism and its pace-of-life strategy. The signaling
23 function of telomere dynamics could also reach over generations, a phenomenon in which the
24 telomere lengths of gametes would provide a channel through which offspring would receive
25 information about their environment early in their development, hence
26 increasing the possibilities for developmental plasticity.

27

28 **1 Ecological conditions favor particular life-history strategies.**

29 The pace-of-life syndrome hypothesis suggests that a given set of ecological conditions
30 favors a particular life-history strategy that could in turn affect a whole series of coevolved
31 reproductive, behavioral and physiological traits in animals (Martin *et al.*, 2006; Réale *et al.*,
32 2010; Wikelski *et al.*, 2003). Organisms on the slow end of the pace-of-life axis classically
33 exhibit slower growth and development, lower breeding rate and longer lifespans, whereas those
34 on the fast end tend to show opposite patterns (Robinson *et al.*, 2010). This fast-to-slow
35 continuum relies on the idea that organisms have to allocate limited resources towards competing
36 life-history traits (i.e., life-history trade-offs, Stearns, 1992; Roff, 1992).

37 The pace-of-life therefore appears to be at least partly flexible, able to respond to current
38 environmental challenges, maximizing individual fitness under specific environmental
39 conditions (Martin *et al.*, 2007; Martin *et al.*, 2006; Niemelä *et al.*, 2013; Réale *et al.*, 2010).
40 There is now substantial evidence regarding the existence of such modulation of pace-of-life at
41 the individual (Hooper *et al.*, 2017; Barbosa *et al.*, 2018), population (Charmantier *et al.*, 2017,
42 Sepp *et al.*, 2017) and species levels (Wiersma *et al.* 2007) and even within an individual
43 lifetime, depending, for example, on factors such as age or health status (i.e. terminal investment,
44 Clutton-Brock, 1984, Bonneaud *et al.* 2004; Velando *et al.* 2006). For example, both predation
45 risk and parasite pressure can lead to a faster pace-of-life (Stephenson *et al.*, 2015; LaManna &
46 Martin, 2016), while abundant food supply coupled with reduced predator pressure can lead to a
47 slower pace-of-life (Ricklefs & Cadena, 2007). However, we are still lacking detailed knowledge
48 about the modulators that integrate information about the internal and external environment,
49 leading to individually variable life-histories (Williams *et al.* 2010; Montiglio *et al.*, 2018).

50

51 **2 Several mediators of pace-of-life have been proposed**

52 A few decades ago, metabolism has been suggested as the main driver of an animal's
53 pace-of-life (reviewed in Williams *et al.*, 2010), mainly because metabolism is closely linked to
54 several crucial life-history stages (reproduction, growth, molt, etc.) and is also involved in ageing
55 processes (metabolic activities are known to create reactive oxygen species and oxidative
56 damage that can jeopardize longevity). There is now evidence that the link between metabolism
57 and the pace of life is, however, more complex than previously thought, especially because other
58 central physiological systems are involved in life-history decisions and may even modulate the
59 impact of metabolism on life-history traits (e.g. Speakman *et al.*, 2004). More recently, other
60 organismal systems have therefore been suggested to be possible modulators of an organism's
61 pace of life, widening our understanding of the possible links between environment and drivers
62 of pace-of-life. For example, several endocrine mechanisms (e.g., hormones like testosterone and
63 glucocorticoids) are known to mediate the relationship between environmental conditions,
64 internal state, and life-history decisions (Ricklefs & Wikleski 2002; Wingfield & Sapolsky,
65 2003, Bokony *et al.*, 2009; Hau *et al.*, 2010). These mechanisms are thought to mediate several
66 life-history trade-offs (Angelier & Wingfield 2013; Taff & Vitousek 2016), such as the balance
67 between reproductive investment and future survival (the cost of reproduction) and they are
68 certainly involved in the adjustment of the pace-of-life to specific environmental conditions. The
69 pace-of-life has also been linked with other physiological and behavioural systems, such as
70 immunity (Martin *et al.* 2007; Tieleman 2018), personality (Reale *et al.* 2010), or oxidative
71 status (Selman *et al.*, 2012). However, here again, the link between these systems and life-history
72 strategies is not always straightforward and there is now a general agreement that the direction of
73 these relationships may depend on the environmental context (e.g. Schoenle *et al.*, 2018).

74 Importantly, all these systems seem to be functionally interconnected; for example,
75 stress-coping endocrine mechanisms are known to be linked with metabolism (Landys *et al.*,
76 2006), immunity (Martin 2009), oxidative stress (Costantini *et al.*, 2011), and personality (Hau &
77 Goymann 2015). Altogether, these multiple physiological and behavioural systems interact to
78 determine a complex physiological phenotype, which probably governs allocation processes and
79 pace-of-life ('the physiology/life-history nexus' *sensu* Ricklefs & Wikelski 2002).
80 Unfortunately, the complexity of this physiological phenotype currently prevents us from
81 identifying an integrative measure to assess how the internal state and environmental conditions
82 may modify the pace of life. To contribute to understanding this problem, we need to identify a
83 biological marker that: (1) is affected by life-history events (e.g. the cost of reproduction) and
84 environmental conditions (e.g. infection); (2) is functionally connected to all the behavioural and
85 physiological systems governing life-history decisions; (3) reliably predicts remaining lifespan.
86 Here, we propose that telomere length and telomere dynamics could be such an alternative and
87 integrative mediator of environmental cues, leading to long-term changes in pace-of-life. Under
88 this hypothesis, telomeres would assemble the information about oxidative stress levels,
89 inflammation status, personality, and stress axis reactivity, and relate this information directly to
90 the potential lifespan of the organism and its pace-of-life.

91

92 **3 A new hypothesis: The telomere messenger hypothesis**

93 Telomeres are regions of non-coding, but highly structured DNA at the end of eukaryotic
94 chromosomes, consisting of tandem repeated highly conserved DNA sequence (Hausmann &
95 Marchetto 2010). Telomeres shorten at each cell division, resulting in shorter telomeres in older
96 organisms, and telomere shortening with aging in most animals (Hausmann *et al.* 2003, it

97 should be noted however that telomere does not shorten in every species, Kipling and Cooke
98 1990). Notably, telomere shortening is slower in longer-lived animals than in shorter-lived
99 animals (Dantzer & Fletcher, 2015). Telomeres also shorten when cells are exposed to
100 environmental stressors (pollution, inflammation, Haussmann & Marchetto 2010). Vulnerability
101 to environmental stressors and direct link to cellular processes related to aging make telomeres
102 and their shortening rate a likely, yet understudied candidate for a mediator of pace-of-life.
103 Under the telomere messenger hypothesis, telomeres would gather information about the
104 environmental factors that cause oxidative damage, inflammation, and physiological stress
105 responses within the organism, and relate this information directly to the potential lifespan of the
106 organism and its pace-of-life strategy (Figure 1). Shorter telomeres should lead to a “thrifty
107 phenotype” (i.e. a faster pace-of-life) where investment in self-maintenance is decreased as a
108 means of saving energy. A lowered maintenance effort would then free up resources for growth
109 and reproduction, but at the cost of long-term function and/or somatic durability (Eisenberg
110 2011). Inversely, longer telomeres would favor an increased investment in soma maintenance
111 and thus a longer reproductive lifespan (i.e. a slower pace-of-life).

112 While the role of telomeres as environmental messengers has not been suggested before, the idea
113 that telomere length and attrition rate may be internal regulators of life-history trajectory was
114 recently proposed by Young (2018), under the life-history regulation hypothesis. According to
115 Young (2018), the telomere-attrition-mediated link between current and future reproduction is
116 probably not maintained by mechanistic constraints. Since, at the mechanistic level, telomere
117 attrition can be effectively avoided by the action of the telomerase enzyme that can extend
118 telomeres via the addition of terminal telomeric repeats (Cong *et al.*, 2002), telomere shortening
119 is probably not a proximate cause of life-history trade-offs. Instead, it might be an adaptive

120 strategy that allows individuals to adjust their life-history strategies. While the cancer
121 surveillance hypothesis (telomere-shortening-induced apoptosis in cells that constitute a cancer
122 risk, de Lange and Jacks, 1999, Shay 2016) is currently the predominant adaptive explanation for
123 telomere attrition, life-history regulation hypothesis offers an alternative, non-exclusive
124 explanation. According to the life-history regulation hypothesis, telomere attrition and/or the
125 accumulation of telomeric DNA damage, and their consequence for cell fates, allow adaptive
126 regulation of organismal-level physiology, behaviour and life history in response to age-related
127 declines in somatic integrity (Young 2018).

128

129 **4 Telomere dynamics might be an integrative mediator linking environmental conditions**
130 **to pace-of-life strategies.**

131 Current evidence of how environmental conditions that are known to affect pace-of-life
132 strategies are associated with changes in telomere length and attrition are limited. One of the
133 environmental factors that determines optimal pace-of-life is predation rate (Reznick *et al.*, 1990,
134 Roff, 1992, Stearns, 1992). Numerous studies have now shown that predation influences growth
135 rate (Bjaerke *et al.* 2014), start of reproduction and number of offspring (Stibor, 1992), and
136 fecundity (Jennions and Telford, 2002) of prey species. The effect of predator pressure on
137 telomere dynamics have been studied in several model systems. For example, spadefoot toad
138 (*Pelobates cultripes*) tadpoles had shorter telomeres in the presence of predators, but
139 metamorphosed to larger body size and had larger fat bodies, which increased their short-term
140 survival odds, and can be described as an indicator of faster pace-of-life (Burraco *et al.* 2017).
141 Similarly, perceived predation risk (degree of nest crypsis) affected telomere length in hatching
142 common eiders (*Somateria mollissima*), in which chicks hatching from uncovered nests have

143 shorter telomeres (Noreikiene *et al.*, 2017). The telomere-messenger hypothesis provides an
144 adaptive explanation for these results. Hence, under high predation pressures, shorter telomeres
145 would favor a fast pace-of life strategy and an increased investment in reproduction. In addition
146 to predators, parasites are known to affect the pace-of-life of individuals. It is predicted that
147 parasitism should always favor increased allocation to host reproduction (Gandon *et al.*, 2002),
148 leading to, for example, decreased size at maturation (Ohlberg *et al.*, 2011) or increased rate of
149 growth and offspring production (Thornhill *et al.*, 1996). As parasite infections are known to
150 affect telomere length (i.e. Ilmonen *et al.*, 2008, Asghar *et al.*, 2015), we hypothesize that
151 telomeres could be a link between changes in pace-of-life and population-level parasite pressure.
152 Recent studies have also indicated a link between habitat pollution and faster telomere
153 shortening in wild animals (i.e. Blevin *et al.*, 2016, Salmon *et al.*, 2016). Studies in humans have
154 suggested that this link between environmental pollution and telomere shortening might be
155 mediated by a reduced telomerase activity (Dioni *et al.*, 2011, Senthilkumar *et al.*, 2011). Under
156 the telomere-messenger hypothesis, this increased telomere attrition in polluted environments
157 would favor a fast pace-of-life to maximize individual fitness in an environment where survival
158 prospects are limited due to increased genomic mutation and oxidative stress levels. Supporting
159 this idea, a recent study showed that insecticide pollution in aquatic environment reduced the
160 life-span and increased the number of generations per year in macroinvertebrates (Mondy *et al.*,
161 2016). However, the direct link between environmental pollution, telomere length, and pace-of-
162 life remains to be studied.

163 Telomere attrition rates are often faster during the growth phase than later in life, and faster
164 growth is associated with reduced lifespan (reviewed by Monaghan & Ozanne, 2018). For
165 example, a study on Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) indicated that faster-growing fish had shorter

166 telomeres and telomeres shortened faster if the growth occurred in a harsher environment
167 (McLennan *et al.*, 2016). While telomere loss has been suggested to be a cost of faster growth,
168 and a physiological link between growth rate and lifespan, the causal role of telomeres in
169 determining the lifespan of an organism is still under question (reviewed by Young *et al.*, 2018).
170 The signaling role of telomeres could provide an adaptive explanation for greater sensitivity of
171 telomere length to environmental factors and physiological state early in life. Under the
172 environmental matching hypothesis, early developmental conditions optimize phenotypes
173 through developmental phenotypic plasticity, while there are often costs and constraints to
174 changing phenotypes (including life-history strategies) later in life (Krause *et al.*, 2017).
175 According to the telomere-messenger hypothesis, developmental conditions would provide cues
176 for appropriate pace-of-life, since an environment that favors fast growth might also favor earlier
177 maturation and faster reproduction. In this sense, faster telomere attrition rate during fast growth
178 can be considered not a cost, but an internal switch towards faster pace-of-life. While, to our best
179 knowledge, telomere attrition during development has never been discussed in the framework of
180 environmental matching, the telomere-messenger hypothesis provides a link between early
181 developmental conditions and pace-of-life of the individual.

182 The role of telomeres as messenger of life-history decisions might be strongly impacted by the
183 telomere length, the rate of telomere erosion and the telomerase biology of any given species.
184 However, in support of our hypothesis, lifespan seems generally associated with telomere length
185 at the intraspecific level (Heidinger *et al.* 2012, Asghar *et al.* 2015) and with telomere erosion at
186 the inter-specific levels in species as different as birds and mammals (Hausman *et al.* 2003,
187 even if some species seem to not show any telomere shortening (Kipling and Cooke 1990)).
188 Given that telomere length strongly differs between species, it is thus possible that the rate of

189 telomere shortening more than the actual telomere length might be the variable influencing life-
190 history decisions. In addition, it is also possible that the threshold telomere value -- which is
191 associated with mortality -- may vary between species (depending on other physiological
192 systems).

193

194 **5 Telomere length in gametes might act as messenger of pace-of-life strategies**

195 Under our hypothesis, the external-to-internal-environment signaling function of telomere
196 dynamics could also reach over generations. Parental environment is predictive of the
197 environment likely to be faced by their offspring, and trans-generational cues would provide an
198 effective channel through which offspring could receive adequate information very early in their
199 development (Monaghan 2008, Engquist & Reinhold, 2016). While non-genetic parental effects
200 (influence of parental investment level on offspring telomere dynamics) have been considered to
201 play a role in phenotypic plasticity as an environmental matching strategy, the telomere length of
202 gametes could provide an even earlier information about parental environment, thereby
203 increasing the possibilities for developmental plasticity (Eisenberg et al. 2018). We thus propose
204 that, while telomere length is restored to some extent during gametogenesis and in the embryo
205 after fertilization (Turner and Hartshorne 2013), this level of reset depends on environmental
206 conditions and parental phenotypes. For example, fathers' age has a strong impact on sperm
207 telomere length, and telomere length in embryos and offspring (Kimura et al. 2008, Noguera et
208 al. 2018). In addition, a recent study in a long-lived bird, the black-browed albatross
209 (*Thalassarche melanophrys*) showed that younger parents produced offspring with shorter
210 telomeres (Dupont et al., 2018), which could indicate that breeding at an early age (a fast pace-
211 of-life trait) is linked to shorter telomere length. These parental effects are proposed to be an

212 adaptive signal of the expected age of reproduction in the environment offspring are born into
213 (Eisenberg et al. 2011).

214

215 **6 Is the telomere-messenger hypothesis currently supported, and how can it be further** 216 **tested?**

217 *6.1 Shorter telomeres seem to favor a “spendthrift” phenotype*

218 Several approaches might now be used to study the telomere-messenger hypothesis and test if
219 and how telomere length and attrition might act as mediators of pace-of-life strategies. The first
220 step is observational and would consist in measuring if within-population variations in telomere
221 length and attrition are related to differences in life history strategies (investment in self
222 maintenance vs reproduction). Ideally, these studies would use wild populations of known age
223 individuals to account for the effect of chronological age on breeding performance or
224 physiological performance (i.e. immune capacity, Palacios et al. 2011). To the best of our
225 knowledge, only a handful of studies have used this approach so far to measure the potential
226 association between parental telomere length at the time of breeding and reproductive
227 investment. Recently, Bauer et al. (2018) have shown, in a population of dark-eyed juncos
228 (*Junco hyemalis*) where chronological age and telomere length are not significantly related, that
229 individuals with shorter telomeres laid their first clutch earlier in the season. Given that breeding
230 earlier in the season is generally associated with a better reproductive success (Price *et al.* 1988,
231 Williams 2012) but also with costs (i.e. reduced survival prospect, Brown and Brown 1999,
232 Sheldon *et al.* 2003), we propose that this study supports our idea that shorter telomeres should
233 favor a “spendthrift” phenotype characterized by an increased investment in reproduction.
234 Similarly, known-age common terns (*Sterna hirundo*) with shorter telomeres arrived and

235 reproduced earlier in the season and had more chicks in the nest (Bauch *et al.* 2013), female tree
236 swallows (*Tachycineta bicolor*) with longer telomeres fledged a smaller proportion of chicks
237 (Belmaker 2016) and both males and females with longer telomeres had lighter nestlings
238 (Ouyang *et al.* 2016). However, Le Vaillant *et al.* (2015) found that king penguins (*Aptenodytes*
239 *patagonicus*) with longer telomeres arrived earlier in the colony to breed and tended to have
240 higher breeding success. In addition, telomere length was not a significant predictor of the
241 investment in sexual signal coloration in male common yellowthroats (*Geothlypis trichas*, Taff
242 and Freeman-Gallant 2017) and in male Australian painted dragons (*Ctenophorus pictus*,
243 Giraudeau *et al.* 2016). However, in both of these cases, telomere length was measured several
244 months after the start of the breeding season (Giraudeau *et al.* 2016) or after the molt period
245 (Taff and Freeman-Gallant 2017) and a better examination of the telomere-messenger hypothesis
246 would consist in measuring how telomere length measured before the development of sexual
247 signals predicts investment in coloration.

248 When looking at the association between telomere length and self-maintenance, we found
249 three studies supporting our hypothesis showing that individuals with longer telomeres
250 developed stronger antioxidant defenses. Wild-derived house mice (*Mus musculus*) with longer
251 telomeres had higher superoxide dismutase-activity and more glutathione than mice with shorter
252 telomeres (Stauffer *et al.* 2018), barn swallows (*Hirundo rustica*) with longer telomeres had a
253 better antioxidant capacity (TAC, Total Antioxidant Capacity, Khoriauli *et al.* 2017) and
254 breeding female pied flycatcher (*Ficedula hypoleuca*) had better antioxidant defenses (TAS,
255 Total Antioxidant Status, Lopez-Arrabe *et al.* 2018). A fourth study where these two traits have
256 been measured during development in great tits (*Parus major*) however found no significant
257 relationships between antioxidants defenses and telomere length (Stauffer *et al.* 2017).

258 At the moment, most of the studies looking for relationships between disease exposure and
259 telomere dynamics have compared telomere length and attrition in sick vs healthy individuals
260 (Asghar *et al.* 2015, Sebastiano *et al.* 2017) and, to the best of our knowledge, only one study has
261 assessed how telomere length predicts investment in the immune response and the ability to cope
262 with disease. Wild-derived house mice (*Mus musculus musculus*) experimentally infected with
263 *Salmonella enterica* strains that cleared the infection by the termination of the experiment had
264 significantly longer telomeres at the beginning of the experiment than those that were still
265 infected. In addition, individuals with relatively long telomeres at the beginning of the
266 experiment had lower bacterial loads at termination (Ilmonen *et al.* 2008), suggesting that higher
267 proliferation capacity of leukocytes increases the efficiency of fighting infection (Weng *et al.*
268 1995). All together, these results from observational studies seem to support the idea that long
269 telomeres favor a thrifty strategy with a reduced investment in reproduction but an increased
270 allocation of resources toward self-maintenance processes.

271

272 **6.2 We now need experimental studies to test the telomere messenger hypothesis**

273 Given the cross-sectional nature of the studies discussed above and the potential for a third
274 variable (i.e. oxidative stress) to influence both telomere length and pace-of-life strategies
275 without any direct and causal relationships between these two, it is also essential to use an
276 experimental approach to test our hypothesis. To this end, a variety of molecules available to
277 manipulate telomere length through an activation of the telomerase activity (see Criscuolo *et al.*
278 2018 for an exhaustive list of these molecules) might represent exciting tools to explore the
279 potential role of telomeres length as mediators of life-history strategies. For example, TA-65 (a
280 chemical compound extracted from the dried root of *Astragalus Membranaceus* that activates

281 telomerase) has been successfully used in mice and zebra finches (*Taeniopygia guttata*) to
282 experimentally increase the average telomere length in adults (Bernardes de Jesus *et al.* 2011,
283 Reichert *et al.* 2014) and reduce telomere attrition in developing chicks of house sparrows
284 (*Passer domesticus*) (BJ Heidinger 2017, unpublished data). In all these studies, the TA-65 was
285 orally administered daily and an important step to use this compound in field studies would be
286 the development and validation of slow release implants as is often done in physiological
287 ecology (Criscuolo *et al.* 2018). In addition, future studies should validate the generality of the
288 TA-65 action given that the positive effect of this compound on telomere length has only been
289 measured in blood so far and that blood telomere length does not seem to be correlated with
290 telomere length in other tissues (Asghar *et al.* 2016). Nonetheless, experiments where pace-of-
291 life strategies (i.e. breeding investment, self-maintenance (antioxidant defenses, immune
292 capacity)) are measured in response to an experimental manipulation of telomere length in adults
293 and/or during development would represent the ultimate test of our hypothesis. In addition,
294 manipulations of gamete telomere length in artificial insemination experiments would allow us to
295 test if the potential signaling function of telomere dynamics could also reach over generations.
296 We predict that offspring from gametes with longer telomeres would show a reduced/delayed
297 investment in reproduction but better antioxidant defenses and responses against pathogens.

298

299 **7 Conclusion**

300 While it is known that environmental cues can lead to changes in pace-of-life strategies within
301 species and even populations, the knowledge about the modulators that integrate information
302 about the environment and lead to individually variable life-histories is still lacking. We propose
303 that telomere length and/or attrition could be such an integrative mediator, combining the

304 information not only of internal physiological processes, but also of environmental cues, leading
305 to long-term changes in life-history strategies. Our telomere-messenger hypothesis provides an
306 adaptive explanation to the shortening of telomeres under harsh environmental conditions (i.e.
307 high predation pressure, high parasite prevalence, polluted environment), leading to a switch
308 towards a faster pace-of-life, with reduced investment in self-maintenance and increased
309 investment in current reproduction. In this context, it is noteworthy that telomeres seem to be
310 especially sensitive to environmental conditions during the development, which is also the life-
311 stage with the greatest phenotypic plasticity in terms of life-history strategies. While several
312 correlative studies seem to support our hypothesis, experimental evidence testing this hypothesis
313 still needs to be gathered. We suggest that studies manipulating telomere length at the early
314 developmental stages and following up with a study of longitudinal effects on life-history traits,
315 but also studies reaching over generations, could be a promising way to test this hypothesis. In
316 addition, studies manipulating environmental conditions simultaneously with telomere length
317 could provide valuable information about the adaptive role of telomeres as mediators of life-
318 history strategies. While the intriguing idea that telomere attrition could be an adaptive strategy
319 as opposed to a cost of cellular activity is still relatively new and untested, we suggest that as a
320 trait vulnerable to environmental conditions and linked to the lifespan of the organisms, telomere
321 attrition should not be overlooked as a possible mediator of pace-of-life.

322

323 **Acknowledgment**

324 This study was supported by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research, the innovation
325 programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreements no. 701747 to T.S. and no.
326 746669 to M.G and by the Estonian Research Council grant IUT34-8.


327

328 **Figure 1:** Conceptual model illustrating the relationships between environmental cues, telomere

329 attrition and pace of life strategies. Blue arrows indicate known relationships and red ones

330 indicate relationships proposed under the telomere-messenger hypothesis.

331



332

333

334

335

336 **8 References**

- 337 1. L. B. Martin, D. Hasselquist, M. Wikelski, *Oecologia*, **2006**, *147*, 565.
338
- 339 2. D. Reale, D. Garant, M. M. Humphries, P. Bergeron, V. Careau, P. O. Montiglio, *Phil.*
340 *Trans. R. Soc. B* **2010**, *365*, 4051.
341
- 342 3. M. Wikelski, L. Spinney, W. Schelsky, A. Scheuerlein, E. Gwinner, *Proceedings of the*
343 *Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, **2003**, *270*, 2383.
344
- 345 4. W. D. Robinson, M. Hau, K. C. Klasing, M. Wikelski, J. D. Brawn, S. H. Austin, C.
346 Tarwater, R. E. Ricklefs, *The Auk*, **2010**, *127*, 253.
347
- 348 5. S. C. Stearns, **1992**, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
349
- 350 6. D. Roff, **1992**, New York: Chapman & Hall. 548 p.
351
- 352 7. L. B. Martin, Z. M. Weil, R. J. Nelson, *Ecology* **2007**, *88*, 2516.
353
- 354 8. P. T. Niemelä, A. Vainikka, J. T. Forsman, O. J. Loukola, R. Kortet. *Ecology and*
355 *Evolution* **2013**, *3*, 457.
356
- 357 9. K. Hooper, F. Spagopoulou, Z. Wylde, A. A. Maklakov, R. Bonduriansky,
358 *Evolution*, 2017, *71*, 671.
359
- 360 10. M. Barbosa, A. E. Deacon, M. J. Janeiro, I. Ramnarine, M. B. Morrissey, A. E.
361 Magurran, *Proc. R. Soc. B*, **2018**, *285*, 20171499.
362
- 363 11. Charmantier, V. Demeyrier, M. Lambrechts, S. Perret, A. Grégoire, *Frontiers in Ecology*
364 *and Evolution*, **2017**, *5*, 53.
365
- 366 12. T. Sepp, K. J. McGraw, A. Kaasik, M. Giraudeau, *Global change biology*, **2018**, *24*,
367 1452.
368
- 369 13. P. Wiersma, A. Munoz-Garcia, A. Walker, J. B. Williams, *Proceedings of the National*
370 *Academy of Sciences*, **2007**, *104*, 9340.
371
- 372 14. T. H. Clutton-Brock, *The American Naturalist*, **1984**, *123*, 212.
373
- 374 15. Bonneaud, J. Mazuc, O. Chastel, H. Wester Dahl, G. Sorci, *Evolution*, **2004**, *58*, 2823.
375
- 376 16. A. Velando, H. Drummond, R. Torres, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B:*
377 *Biological Sciences*, **2006**, *273*, 1443.
378
- 379 17. J. F. Stephenson, C. van Oosterhout, J. Cable, *Biology Letters*, **2015**, *11*, 20150806.
380

- 381 18. J. A. LaManna, T. E. Martin, *Ecology Letters*, **2016**, *19*, 403.
382
383 19. R. E. Ricklefs, C. D. Cadena, *Ecology Letters*, **2007**, *10*, 867.
384
385 20. J. B. Williams, R. A. Miller, J. M. Harper, P. Wiersma, *Integrative and comparative*
386 *biology* **2010**, *50*, 855.
387 21. P. O. Montiglio, M. Dammhahn, G. D. Messier, D. Réale, *Behavioral Ecology and*
388 *Sociobiology*, **2018**, *72*, 116.
389
390 22. J. R. Speakman, D. A. Talbot, C. Selman, S. Snart, J. S. McLaren, P. Redman, E. Krol,
391 D. M. Jackson, M. S. Johnson, M. D. Brand, *Aging cell*, **2004**, *3*, 87.
392
393 23. R. E. Ricklefs, M. Wikelski, *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **2002**, *17*, 462.
394
395 24. J. C. Wingfield, R. M. Sapolsky, *Journal of neuroendocrinology* **2003**, *15*, 711.
396
397 25. V. Bokony, A. Z. Lendvai, A. Liker, F. Angelier, J. C. Wingfield, O. Chastel, *The*
398 *American Naturalist*, **2009**, *173*, 589-598.
399
400 26. M. Hau, R. E. Ricklefs, M. Wikelski, K. A. Lee, J. D. Brawn, *Proceedings of the Royal*
401 *Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, **2010**, *277*, 3203.
402
403 27. F. Angelier, J. C. Wingfield, *General and Comparative Endocrinology* **2013**, *190*, 118.
404
405 28. C. Taff, M. N. Vitousek, *Trends in ecology & evolution*, **2016**, *31*, 476.
406
407 29. B. I. Tieleman, *Behavioral ecology and sociobiology*, **2018**, *72*, 55.
408
409 30. C. Selman, J. D. Blount, D. H. Nussey, J. R. Speakman, *Trends in ecology & evolution*
410 **2012**, *27*, 570.
411
412 31. L. A. Schoenle, C. Zimmer, M. N. Vitousek, *Integrative and comparative biology* **2018**,
413
414 32. M. M. Landys, M. Ramenofsky, J. C. Wingfield, *General and comparative*
415 *endocrinology*, **2006**, *148*, 132.
416
417 33. L. B. Martin, *General and comparative endocrinology*, **2009**, *163*, 70.
418
419 34. Costantini, V. Marasco, A. P. Møller, *Journal of Comparative Physiology B* **2011**, *181*,
420 447.
421
422 35. M. Hau, W. Goymann, *Frontiers in zoology* **2015**, *12*, S7.
423
424 36. M. F. Haussmann, N. M. Marchetto, *Current Zoology* **2010** *56*, 714.
425

- 426 37. M. F Hausmann, D. W. Winkler, K. M. O'Reilly, C. E. Huntington, I. C. T. Nisbet, C.
427 M. Vleck, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, **2003**,
428 270, 1387.
- 429
- 430 38. Kipling, H. J. Cooke. *Nature* **1990**, 347, 400 – 402.
- 431
- 432 39. Dantzer, Q. E. Fletcher, *Experimental Gerontology*, **2015**, 71, 38-47.
- 433
- 434 40. D. T. Eisenberg, *American Journal of Human Biology* **2011**, 23, 149.
- 435
- 436 41. J. Young, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **2018**, 373, 20160452
- 437
- 438 42. Y. S. Cong, W. E. Wright, J. W. Shay, *Microbiol. Mol. Biol. Rev.* **2002**, 66, 407.
- 439
- 440 43. de Lange, T. Jacks, *Cell*, **1999**, 98, 273.
- 441
- 442 44. J. W. Shay, *Cancer Discov.* **2016**, 6, 584
- 443
- 444 45. D. N. Reznick, H. Bryga, J. A. Endler, *Nature* **1990**, 346, 357.
- 445
- 446 46. O. Bjærke, T. Andersen, J. Titelman, *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **2014**, 510, 15-24.
- 447
- 448 47. H. Stibor, *Oecologia* **1992**, 92, 162.
- 449
- 450 48. M. Jennions, S. Telford, *Oecologia* **2002**, 132, 44.
- 451
- 452 49. P. Burraco, C. Díaz-Paniagua, I. Gomez-Mestre, *Scientific reports*, **2017**, 7, 7494.
- 453
- 454 50. K. Noreikiene, M. Öst, M. W. Seltmann, W. Boner, P. Monaghan, K. Jaatinen, *Canadian*
455 *Journal of Zoology* **2017**, 95, 695.
- 456
- 457 51. S. Gandon, P. Agnew, Y. Michalakis, *The American Naturalist* **2002**, 160, 374.
- 458
- 459 52. J. Ohlberger, Ø. Langangen, E. Edeline, E. M. Olsen, I. J. Winfield, J. M. Fletcher, J. B.
460 James, N. C. Stenseth, L. A. Vøllestad, *Proc. R. Soc. B* **2011**, 278, 35.
- 461
- 462 53. J. A. Thornhill, J. T. Jones, J. R. Kusel, J.R. *Parasitology* **1996**, 93, 443.
- 463
- 464 54. P. Imonen, A. Kotrschal, D. J. Penn, *PloS one*, **2008**, 3, e2143.
- 465
- 466 55. M. Asghar, D. Hasselquist, B. Hansson, P. Zehindjiev, H. Westerdahl, S.
467 Bensch, *Science*, **2015**, 347, 436.
- 468
- 469 56. P. Blévin, F. Angelier, S. Tartu, S, Ruault, P, Bustamante, D. Herzke, B, Moe, C, Bech,
470 G. W. Gabrielsen, J. O. Bustnes, O. Chastel, *The Science of the total environment* **2016**.
471 563, 125.

472
473 57. P. Salmón, J. F. Nilsson, A. Nord, S. Bensch, C. Isaksson, *Biology Letters* **2016**, *12*,
474 20160155.
475
476 58. L. Dioni, M. Hoxha, F. Nordio, M. Bonzini, L. Tarantini, B. Albeti, A. Savarese, J.
477 Schwartz, P. A. Bertazzi, P. Apostoli, L. Hou, L. Hou, *Environmental health*
478 *perspectives*, **2011**, *119*, 622.
479
480 59. P. K. Senthilkumar, A. J. Klingelutz, J. A. Jacobus, H. Lehmler, L. W. Robertson, G.
481 Ludewig, *Toxicology letters* **2011**, *204*, 64.
482
483 60. C. P. Mondy, I. Muñoz, S. Dolédec. *Science of The Total Environment* **2016**, *572*, 196.
484
485 61. P. Monaghan, S. E. Ozanne. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **2018**, *373*, 20160446.
486
487 62. D. McLennan, J.D. Armstrong, D. C. Stewart, S. Mckelvey, W. Boner, P. Monaghan, N.
488 B. Metcalfe, *Mol. Ecol.* **2016**, *25*, 5425.
489
490 63. E. T. Krause, O. Krüger, H. Schielzeth, *Animal Behaviour* **2017**, *128*, 103.
491
492 64. B. J. Heidinger, J. D. Blount, W. Boner, K. Griffiths, N. B. Metcalfe, P. Monaghan.
493 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **2012**, *109*, 1743-1748.
494 65. P. Monaghan, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B*, **2008**, *363*, 1635.
495
496 66. L. Engqvist, K. Reinhold, *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **2016**, *7*, 1482.
497
498 67. D. T. Eisenberg, C. W. Kuzawa, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B*, **2018**, *373*, 20160442.
499
500 68. S. Turner, G. M. Hartshorne. *MHR: Basic science of reproductive medicine*, **2013**, *19*,
501 510-518.
502
503 69. M. Kimura, L. F. Cherkas, B. S. Kato, S. Demissie, J. B. Hjelmberg, M. Brimacombe, A.
504 Cupples, J. L. Hunkin, J. P. Gardner, X. B. Lu, X. J. Cao, M. Sastrasin, M. A. Province,
505 S. C. Hunt, K. Christensen, D. Levy, T. D. Spector, A. Aviv. *PLoS Genetics* **2008**, *4*.
506
507 70. J. C. Noguera, N. B. Metcalfe, P. Monaghan, *Proc Biol Sci.* **2018**, *285*, 1874.
508
509 71. S. M. Dupont, C. Barbraud, O. Chastel, K. Delord, S. Ruault, H. Weimerskirch, F.
510 Angelier, *PLoS ONE*, **2018**, *13*, e0193526.
511
512 72. M. G. Palacios, D. W. Winkler, K. C. Klasing, D. Hasselquist, C. M.
513 Vleck, *Ecology*, **2011**, *92*, 952.
514
515 73. C. M. Bauer, J. L. Graham, M. Abolins-Abols, B. J. Heidinger, E. D. Ketterson, T. J.
516 Greives *The American Naturalist*, **2018**, *191*, 777.
517

- 518 74. T. Price, M. Kirkpatrick, S. J. Arnold. *Science* **1988**, 240, 798.
519
520 75. T. D. Williams, **2012**, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
521
522 76. C. R. Brown, M. B. Brown. *Condor*, **1999**, 101, 230.
523
524 77. B. C. Sheldon, L. E. B. Kruuk, J. Merila, *Evolution* **2003**, 57, 406.
525
526 78. C. Bauch, P. H. Becker, S. Verhulst, *Proc. R. Soc. B*, **2013**, 280, 20122540.
527
528 79. Belmaker, The role of telomere length in Tree Swallow behavior and life history. **2016**,
529 PhD thesis, Cornell University.
530
531 80. J. Q. Ouyang, A. Z. Lendvai, I. T. Moore, F. Bonier, M. F. Haussmann, *Integrative and*
532 *comparative biology*, **2016**, 56, 138.
533
534 81. M. Le Vaillant, V. A. Viblanc, C. Saraux, C. Le Bohec, Y. Le Maho, A. Kato, F.
535 Criscuolo, Y. Ropert-Coudert, *Polar Biology*, **2015**, 38, 2059-2067.
536
537 82. C. Taff, C. R. Freeman- Gallant, *Ecology and evolution*, **2017**, 7, 3436.
538
539 83. M. Giraudeau, C. R. Friesen, J. Sudyka, N. Rollings, C. M. Whittington, M. R. Wilson,
540 M. Olsson, *Biology letters*, **2016**, 12, 20160077.
541
542 84. J. Stauffer, B. Panda, P. Ilmonen, P. *Mechanisms of ageing and development* **2018**, 169,
543 45.
544
545 85. L. Khoriauli, A. Romano, M. Caprioli, M. Santagostino, S. G. Nergadze, A. Costanzo, D.
546 Rubolini, E. Giulotto, N. Saino, M. Parolini, *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, **2017**,
547 71, 124.
548
549 86. J. López-Arrabé, P. Monaghan, A. Cantarero, W. Boner, L. Pérez-Rodríguez, J. Moreno,
550 *Physiological and Biochemical Zoology* **2018**, 91, 868.
551
552 87. J. Stauffer, B. Panda, T. Eeva, M. Rainio, P. Ilmonen, *Science of the Total*
553 *Environment*, **2017**, 575, 841.
554
555 88. M. Sebastiano, M. Eens, F. Angelier, K. Pineau, O. Chastel, D. Costantini, *Conservation*
556 *physiology* **2017**, 5, 1.
557
558 89. N. P. Weng, B. L. Levine, C. H. June, R. J. Hodes, *Proceedings of The National*
559 *Academy Of Sciences*, **1995**, 92, 11091.
560
561 90. F. Criscuolo, S. Smith, S. Zahn, B. J. Heidinger, M. F. Haussmann, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc.*
562 *B*, **2018**, 373, 20160440.
563

564 91. Bernardes de Jesus, K. Schneeberger E. Vera, A. Tejera, C. B. Harley, M. A. Blasco,
565 *Aging Cell*, **2011**, *10*, 604–621.
566
567 92. S. Reichert, P. Bize, M. Arrive, S. Zahn, S. Massemmin, F. Criscuolo, *Exp. Gerontol.* **2014**,
568 *52*, 36.
569
570 93. M. Asghar, V. Palinauskas, N. Zaghdoudi-Allan, G. Valkiūnas, A. Mukhin, E. Platonova,
571 A. Farnet, S. Bensch, D. Hasselquist, *Proc. R. Soc. B* **2016**, 283, 20161184.
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583