Research Paper

Meta-analytic evidence for the anti-aging effect of hormesis on *Caenorhabditis elegans*

Tao Sun^{1,3}, Huifeng Wu^{1,2,4}, Ming Cong^{1,4}, Junfei Zhan^{1,3}, Fei Li^{1,4}

¹CAS Key Laboratory of Coastal Environmental Processes and Ecological Remediation, Yantai Institute of Coastal Zone Research (YIC), Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS); Shandong Key Laboratory of Coastal Environmental Processes, YICCAS, Yantai 264003, P. R. China
 ²Laboratory for Marine Fisheries Science and Food Production Processes, Qingdao National Laboratory for Marine Science and Technology, Qingdao 266237, P. R. China
 ³University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, P. R. China
 ⁴Center for Ocean Mega-Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Qingdao 266071, P. R. China

Correspondence to: Huifeng Wu, Fei Li; email: http://www.mei.ac.cnKeywords: hormesis, anti-aging, aging, Caenorhabditis elegans, meta-analysisReceived: November 6, 2019Accepted: January 12, 2020Published: February 7, 2020

Copyright: Sun et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 3.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

ABSTRACT

Mild stress-induced hormesis, as a promising strategy to improve longevity and healthy aging, meets both praise and criticism. To comprehensively assess the applicability of hormesis in aging intervention, this metaanalysis was conducted focusing on the effect of hormesis on *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Twenty-six papers involving 198 effect size estimates met the inclusion criteria. Meta-analytic results indicated that hormesis could significantly extend the mean lifespan of *C. elegans* by 16.7% and 25.1% under normal and stress culture conditions (p < 0.05), respectively. The healthspan assays showed that hormesis remarkably enhanced the bending frequency and pumping rate of worms by 28.9% and 7.0% (p < 0.05), respectively, while effectively reduced the lipofuscin level by 15.9% (p < 0.05). The obviously increased expression of *dauer formation protein-16* (1.66-fold) and its transcriptional targets, including *superoxide dismutase-3* (2.46-fold), *catalase-1* (2.32-fold) and *small heat shock protein-16.2* (2.88-fold) (p < 0.05), was one of the molecular mechanisms underlying these positive effects of hormesis. This meta-analysis provided strong evidence for the anti-aging role of hormesis, highlighting its lifespan-prolonging, healthspan-enhancing and resistance-increasing effects on *C. elegans*. Given that *dauer formation protein-16* was highly conservative, hormesis offered the theoretical possibility of delaying intrinsic aging through exogenous intervention among humans.

INTRODUCTION

Hormesis, a biphasic dose-response characterized by low-dose stimulation and high-dose inhibition, is now considered as a significant toxicological concept to account for the beneficial effects of mild stress [1, 2]. The concept of hormesis arouses great interest, because it is a near-universal and reproducible phenomenon with profound implications for the clinical trial, drug discovery and risk assessment [3]. As a beneficial compensatory response triggered by mild stress, hormetic individuals generally exhibit better performance than the untreated controls, and the potential anti-aging effect of hormesis has attracted more attention [4, 5]. It seems promising to apply hormesis in aging intervention, which is evidenced by multiple studies, like the beneficial effects of moderate exercise-induced hormesis on body function and aging-related diseases [6]. However, there are still considerable debates regarding the origin and mechanisms of aging and hormesis, such as the conflicting evidence related to the role of ROS in aging [7, 8], and the hormetic effect manifested by stressinduced cost-free benefits or trade-offers with other fitness traits [9, 10]. More importantly, the application of hormesis in aging therapy and interventions is in its infancy, and there are limited investigations in this field [11]. Therefore, the anti-aging effect of hormesis remains controversial [4].

Some researchers indicated the anti-aging effect of hormesis, and considered it as an overcompensation response to the disruption in homeostasis [12]. According to the investigations, hormesis could not only contribute to homeostasis re-establishment, but also strengthen the defense system and immune function by inducing expression of molecular chaperones and immunologic factors with potential anti-aging effect [13, 14]. However, others argued that hormesis might accelerate aging rather than delay it. They proposed that the appearance of hormesis was often accompanied by mild or severe cell damages [15]. Because hormesis could significantly promote the rate of cell proliferation, the occurrence of damages could not be recognized and repaired by the immune system timely and exactly, thereby resulting in damage accumulation and aging acceleration [16, 17]. There is an antinomy between hormesis and anti-aging: hormesis is considered to delay aging, but also accelerate it [18]. Hence, further explorations are needed to determine whether hormesis can delay aging.

At present, most researchers take a wait-and-see attitude to hormetic treatment for human health, due to the contradictory evidence. It is meaningful to conduct a systematic assessment on the existed evidences in the absence of large-scale empirical research on the correlation between hormesis and aging/anti-aging. Meta-analysis is a powerful tool to synthesize multiple or even conflicting evidence to get a clear and reliable final-evidence, achieving the purpose of quantitative review [19]. The application of meta-analytic method contributed a lot to clarifying whether a treatment had anti-aging effect. For example, Liu et al [20] combined 18 studies regarding the effect of growth hormone supplementation on aging, indicating that growth hormone was not only an invalid anti-aging therapy, but also associated with high rates of adverse events. Peterson et al [21] pooled 47 studies about the relationship between resistance exercise and muscular strength, identifying their positive correlation, thereby resistance exercise was a viable strategy to prevent aging-related muscular weakness. On these grounds, in order to thoroughly assess the effect of hormesis on aging, in this work, 26 papers documenting the changes of aging-related indicators induced by hormesis in *Caenorhabditis elegans* (a significant model organism in aging research due to its unique biological features like short life cycle, strong reproductive ability and clear genetic background [22]) were meta-analyzed. This study highlighted the positive effects of hormesis on lifespan, healthspan and stress resistance in *C. elegans*. These findings may be discrepant with human clinical experiments. However, it is predictable that low-level stress treatment, as a potential aging intervention strategy, has a bright future.

RESULTS

Overview of included studies

The combinations of relevant effect size estimates were summarized in Figure 1. Substantial heterogeneities were observed among included studies (p < 0.01), due to the exploratory nature of animal studies (Figures 2–7). Further sensitivity analysis showed that the meta-analytic results were stable and unchanged (Supplementary Figure 1). Moreover, Egger's test indicated that there was no obvious publication bias except the indicator of bend frequency (Supplementary Figure 2).

Hormesis and mean lifespan

This meta-analysis indicated that hormetic effect could significantly extend the mean lifespan of wild-type worms, with an increase of 16.7% (Random-effect model; SMD = 1.24, 95% CIs = 0.77, 1.70; p < 0.05) (Figures 1A and 2) under normal culture condition and 25.1% (Random-effect model; SMD = 1.94, 95% CIs = 0.93, 2.96; p < 0.05) (Figures 1E and 6) under stress culture condition.

Hormesis and healthspan

Compared to untreated controls, hormesis could not only remarkably improve the bend frequency by 28.9% (Random-effect model; SMD = 1.74, 95% CIs = 1.38, 2.09; p < 0.05) (Figures 1B and 3) and the pumping rate by 7.0% (Random-effect model; SMD = 0.74, 95% CIs = 0.24, 1.23; p < 0.05) (Figures 1C and 4), but also obviously bring down the lipofuscin level by 15.9% (Random-effect model; SMD = -1.80, 95% CIs = -2.73, -0.86; p < 0.05) (Figures 1D and 5).

Hormesis and DAF-16-related genes

To further explore the underlying mechanisms of hormesis, the mRNA levels of *daf-16* and its targeted genes were evaluated including *superoxide dismutase-3* (*sod-3*), *catalase-1* (*ctl-1*) and *small heat shock protein-16.2* (*hsp-16.2*). Compared with control groups, the transcript levels of these genes were increased up to 1.66-, 2.46-, 2.32- and 2.88-folds in hormesis groups (Random-effect model; p < 0.05), respectively (Figure 7).

DISCUSSION

Lifespan, as a precisely calculable and highly credible parameter, has proven to be an excellent proxy for measuring the rate of aging [23, 24]. In this study, the lifespan-prolonging effect of hormesis under normal culture condition directly reflected the anti-aging effect of hormesis at the individual level. Consistently, the lifespan-prolonging effect of hormesis was also identified in other model organisms. Yu et al [25] reported that hyperbaric normoxia-induced (2 atm absolute pressure with 10% O₂) hormesis could extend the mean lifespan in Drosophila melanogaster by 12% to 14%. Musa et al [26] denoted that hormetic effect triggered by heat shock (34 °C for 3 h) elongated the median replicative lifespan of budding yeast by 50%. More importantly, in mammalian rats, moderate exercise-induced hormesis prolonged the median lifespan by 9% to 19% [27]. However, it was worthy to note that the lifespan extension effect of hormesis was tightly associated with the genetic background in D. melanogaster [28]. In other words, the lifespan-prolonging in one line could be lifespan-limiting in other lines [28]. In the current study, only wild-type nematodes were included, thus effectively preventing the influence of genetic background on the meta-analytic results.

Healthspan describes the length of health life before the age-associated decline, which is species-specific

and hardly defined [23, 29]. Based on the characteristics of C. elegans, three quantified indicators, including bend frequency, pumping rate lipofuscin level, were selected as and the representations to determine the effect of hormesis on healthspan [23]. Specifically, bend frequency was in line with neurotoxicity level [30], pumping rate suggested food intake ability [31], and lipofuscin level reflected intensity of lipid peroxidation [32]. In this study, sufficient evidence for the healthspanenhancing effect of hormesis was observed, in which hormesis not only significantly improved the bend frequency and the pumping rate of C. elegans, but also obviously reduced the lipofuscin level. The positive role of hormesis in healthspan indicated the possibility of applying hormesis in improving healthy aging in C. elegans.

Stress resistance is an integral component of aging studies, and the ability of *C. elegans* to resist the external and internal perils is generally correlated with the length of lifespan [23]. In this study, the stress resistance is corresponding to the mean lifespan of *C. elegans* under stress (e.g. oxidation, heat, cold or UV-irradiation) culture condition. Some aging theories constructed a framework, proposing that the enhanced stress resistance was a direct cause of lifespan extension, like the free radical theory of aging [23, 33, 34]. The positive



Figure 1. Relative changes of involved indicators. (A–E) denoted the relative changes of mean lifespan, bend frequency, pumping rate, lipofuscin level and stress resistance of *Caenorhabditis elegans* in hormesis groups compared to control groups, while (F) represented the combined relative change of each indicator based on random-effect model. The number of worms included in each indicator was shown in its corresponding graph. Data were presented by mean with 95% CIs.

connection between stress resistance and lifespan was vividly manifested in this study. The significant prolongation of mean lifespan of C. elegans in hormesis group under stress culture condition suggested the resistance-increasing effect of hormesis. Consistently, the improvement in resilience of hormesis has also been identified in some clinical trials. For example, the lowdose radiation was effective for the treatment of inflammations [35], and repeated moderate exercise strengthened anti-oxidative defense [36]. As commented by Gems et al [37], hormesis does not kill us, just makes us stronger.

In *C. elegans*, DAF-16 is the major downstream target of the insulin/IGF-1 signaling pathway (IIS) that acts as the forkhead Box O (FoxO) transcription factor regulating lifespan and resistance [38, 39]. In this study, the mRNA levels of *daf-16* and its targeted genes were evaluated including *sod-3*, *ctl-1* that both conduced to the oxidative stress response, and *hsp*-

16.2 that contributed to heat shock response [38, 40-42]. The obviously increased expressions of these genes were highly corresponding to longer lifespan and higher resistance among hormetic nematodes, suggesting that the lifespan-prolonging and resistance-increasing effects of hormesis were mediated through *daf-16* activation. Moreover, Blagosklonny [18] proposed that aging was driven by over-activated signal-transduction pathways (e.g. Target of Rapamycin (TOR)) instead of the accumulation of molecular damage. If so, the antiaging effect of hormesis could be perfectly explained.

Overall, in *C. elegans*, strong evidence for the antiaging effect of hormesis was identified. The lifespanprolonging, healthspan-enhancing and resistanceincreasing effects of hormesis revealed the anti-aging role of hormesis at individual level, while the activated expression of DAF-16-related genes reflected the antiaging role of hormesis at molecular level.

ID				SMD (95% CI)	Weigh
Akhoon et al., 2016				0.69 (0.43, 0.95)	3.03
Chou et al., 2019		•		4.54 (4.38, 4.71)	3.05
				2.23 (2.11, 2.34)	3.05
			+	8.00 (7.74, 8.27)	3.03
Kim et al., 2010	-			1.21 (0.90, 1.51)	3.02
Kogure et al., 2017		*		4.58 (4.36, 4.80)	3.04
Olsen et al., 2006				0.39 (0.09, 0.69)	3.02
	*			0.39 (0.08, 0.70)	3.02
	-			0.70 (0.43, 0.98)	3.03
	+			0.62 (0.33, 0.91)	3.02
	-			0.78 (0.49, 1.06)	3.02
	+			0.36 (0.08, 0.63)	3.03
	+			-0.06 (-0.33, 0.22)	3.03
	+			0.44 (0.13, 0.74)	3.02
Pandey et al., 2018	•			0.28 (0.07, 0.49)	3.04
Pietsch et al., 2011	٠			0.76 (0.66, 0.86)	3.05
				0.79 (0.68, 0.90)	3.05
				0.54 (0.43, 0.65)	3.05
Rathor et al., 2015	-			1.08 (0.79, 1.37)	3.02
Rathor and Pandey, 2018				0.98 (0.75, 1.21)	3.04
Schmeisser et al., 2013	•			0.30 (0.19, 0.41)	3.05
Shanmugam et al., 2018	•			0.76 (0.55, 0.98)	3.04
Shukla et al., 2012	•			0.95 (0.76, 1.14)	3.04
Urban et al., 2017	•			0.20 (0.12, 0.28)	3.06
Wang et al., 2010b	•			1.27 (1.03, 1.50)	3.03
Wu et al., 2019				4.50 (3.98, 5.02)	2.95
Yanase and Ishii, 2008	•			0.24 (0.08, 0.40)	3.05
Zhang et al., 2015	•			0.58 (0.44, 0.73)	3.05
Zhao et al., 2017	•			1.22 (1.04, 1.40)	3.04
Zhou et al., 2017	•			0.57 (0.34, 0.80)	3.04
Zhu et al., 2016	-			0.10 (-0.25, 0.46)	3.00
	-			0.44 (0.08, 0.80)	3.00
	-			0.44 (0.08, 0.80)	3.00
Overall (I-squared = 99.6%, p = 0.000)	\diamond			1.24 (0.77, 1.70)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis					
I					

Figure 2. Association of hormesis and mean lifespan. The diamond represented the combined effect size of mean lifespan. The reddotted-line was invalid, and if the diamond did not intersect with it, meaning that hormesis could significantly extend (on the right) or limit (on the left) the mean lifespan of *C. elegans* (p < 0.05).



Figure 3. Association of hormesis and bend frequency. The pooled effect size of bend frequency was shown by the diamond. The diamond did not intersect with the red-dotted-line, indicating that hormesis could remarkably improve (on the right) or reduce (on the left) the bend frequency of *C. elegans* (p < 0.05).



Figure 4. Association of hormesis and pumping rate. The diamond was the pooled effect size of pumping rate. The diamond did not intersect with the red-dotted-line, suggesting that hormesis could obviously enhance (on the right) or reduce (on the left) the pumping rate of *C. elegans* (p < 0.05).



Figure 5. Association of hormesis and lipofuscin level. The combined effect size of lipofuscin level was shown by the diamond. The diamond did not intersect with red-dotted-line, indicating that hormesis could significantly increase (on the right) or decrease (on the left) the lipofuscin level of *C. elegans* (p < 0.05).

Study			%
ID		SMD (95% CI)	Weight
Chou et al., 2019		3.46 (3.31, 3.62)	6.70
	•	3.45 (3.30, 3.61)	6.70
		• 6.23 (5.99, 6.47)	6.69
Kim et al., 2010	*	1.75 (1.44, 2.06)	6.67
Kishimoto et al., 2017	+	0.84 (0.52, 1.17)	6.67
	+	0.82 (0.45, 1.20)	6.65
	+	0.62 (0.26, 0.99)	6.65
Urban et al., 2017		0.00 (-0.11, 0.12)	6.71
Wang et al., 2010b	+	-0.01 (-0.26, 0.24)	6.69
Zhang et al., 2015	•	0.45 (0.30, 0.60)	6.70
Zhao et al., 2017	•	0.51 (0.28, 0.73)	6.69
		9.46 (8.69, 10.23)	6.46
Zhou et al., 2017	+	0.35 (0.02, 0.67)	6.67
	+	0.58 (0.28, 0.87)	6.67
	+	0.86 (0.54, 1.19)	6.67
Overall (I-squared = 99.7%, p = 0.000)	\diamond	1.94 (0.93, 2.96)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis			
I 10.2		1	

Figure 6. Association of hormesis and stress resistance. The diamond showed the pooled effect size of stress resistance, which did not intersect with the red-dotted-line, indicating hormesis could obviously increase (on the right) or decrease (on the left) the stress resistance of *C. elegans* (p < 0.05).

Apparently, all of these involved indicators supported the application of hormesis in aging intervention in *C*. *elegans*. It is still unclear to what extent the applicability can be transferred from model organisms to humans [4, 11]. However, given that *daf-16* was highly conservative [43, 44], hormesis provided the theoretical possibility of delaying intrinsic aging through exogenous intervention among humans.

CONCLUSIONS

The lifespan-prolonging, healthspan-enhancing and resistance-increasing effects of hormesis were identified in *C. elegans*. The consistently positive findings across different aging indicators demonstrated that hormesis was a promising modulator of aging. The significant activation of *daf-16* and its target genes, including *sod-3*, *ctl-1* and

daf-f8 Athcor et al., 2016 Rathor et al., 2017 Sub et al., 2017 Zhou et al., 2017 Zhu et al., 2017 Sub et al., 2017 Sub et al., 2017 Sub et al., 2017 Sub et al., 2017 Zhu et al., 2017 Sub et al., 2016 Sub et al., 2017 Sub et al., 2016 Sub et al., 2017 Sub et al., 2017 Sub et al., 2018 Rathor et al., 2018 Rathor et al., 2018 Rathor et al., 2017 Kroheng et al., 2018 Rathor et al., 2017 Kroheng et al., 2018 Rathor et al., 2017 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.2%, p = 0.000) daf 1 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.5%, p = 0.000) daf 1 Subtotal (I-squaret = 98.5%, p =	Study ID	ES (95% CI)	% Weight
Subtolal (I-squared = 99.2%, p = 0.000) Ø 1.86 (1.50, 1.82) 100.00 sod-3 Akhoon et al., 2019 5.63 5.71 5.65 Kogure et al., 2017 2.57 (1.56, 1.87) 5.65 5.70 Rathor and Pandey, 2018 2.00 (1.55, 1.25) 5.70 5.70 Subtoal (I-squared = 98.2%, p = 0.000) 3.53 (1.33, 1.32) 5.74 Subtoal at al., 2017 2.00 (1.55, 1.25) 5.70 Zhang et al., 2017 2.00 (1.55, 1.25) 5.78 Zho et al., 2017 2.00 (1.55, 1.75) 5.77 Subtoal (I-squared = 98.9%, p = 0.000) 1.82 (1.41, 1.83) 5.78 Zhang et al., 2017 2.00 (1.53, 1.35) 5.73 Subtoal (I-squared = 98.9%, p = 0.000) 4.41 4.42 (2.43, 1.06) 3.07 Chan et al., 2017 2.46 (2.30, 2.82) 100.00 4.41 4.42 (2.43, 1.06) 3.07 Subtoal (I-squared = 98.9%, p = 0.000) 4.41 4.42 (2.43, 3.06) 9.64 4.41 9.85 Zhang et al., 2015 2.36 (1.55, 1.16) 9.72 3.38 (1.45, 4.60) 9.80 Zhang et al., 2015 2.36 (1.45, 4.60) 9.80 1.37 (1.41, 4.61) 9.82 <td>daf-16 Akhoon et al., 2016 Rathor et al., 2015 Rathor and Pandey, 2018 Xu et al., 2017 Zhang et al., 2015 Zhou et al., 2017 Zhu et al., 2016</td> <td>1.89 (1.60 .2.18) 2.50 (2.14 .2.86) 2.06 (1.95 .2.16) 5.95 (4.51 ,7.39) 1.42 (1.02 .1.83) 1.42 (1.02 .1.83) 1.42 (1.02 .1.83) 1.01 (0.86 .1.17) 0.86 (0.84 .0.88) 1.10 (1.05 ,1.15) 1.81 (1.64 .1.97) 2.50 (2.32 .2.69) 1.19 (1.15 ,1.32) 1.28 (1.07 .1.49) 1.27 (1.15 ,1.38) 1.79 (1.69 ,1.89) 1.86 (1.72 .2.00) 1.49 (1.06 ,1.92) 1.86 (1.72 .2.00) 2.25 (2.08 .2.42)</td> <td>$\begin{array}{c} 4.54\\ 4.19\\ 5.22\\ 0.99\\ 3.97\\ 5.02\\ 5.09\\ 5.34\\ 5.32\\ 5.04\\ 4.98\\ 5.33\\ 4.90\\ 5.19\\ 5.24\\ 5.14\\ 5.14\\ 5.14\\ 5.34\\ 3.84\\ 5.14\\ 5.03\\ \end{array}$</td>	daf-16 Akhoon et al., 2016 Rathor et al., 2015 Rathor and Pandey, 2018 Xu et al., 2017 Zhang et al., 2015 Zhou et al., 2017 Zhu et al., 2016	1.89 (1.60 .2.18) 2.50 (2.14 .2.86) 2.06 (1.95 .2.16) 5.95 (4.51 ,7.39) 1.42 (1.02 .1.83) 1.42 (1.02 .1.83) 1.42 (1.02 .1.83) 1.01 (0.86 .1.17) 0.86 (0.84 .0.88) 1.10 (1.05 ,1.15) 1.81 (1.64 .1.97) 2.50 (2.32 .2.69) 1.19 (1.15 ,1.32) 1.28 (1.07 .1.49) 1.27 (1.15 ,1.38) 1.79 (1.69 ,1.89) 1.86 (1.72 .2.00) 1.49 (1.06 ,1.92) 1.86 (1.72 .2.00) 2.25 (2.08 .2.42)	$\begin{array}{c} 4.54\\ 4.19\\ 5.22\\ 0.99\\ 3.97\\ 5.02\\ 5.09\\ 5.34\\ 5.32\\ 5.04\\ 4.98\\ 5.33\\ 4.90\\ 5.19\\ 5.24\\ 5.14\\ 5.14\\ 5.14\\ 5.34\\ 3.84\\ 5.14\\ 5.03\\ \end{array}$
$ \begin{array}{c} $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $$	Subtotal (I-squared = 99.2%, p = 0.000)	1.66 (1.50 , 1.82)	100.00
Xu et al., 2017 Zhang et al., 2017 Zhang et al., 2017 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.9%, p = 0.000) ct+1 Kronberg et al., 2017 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.9%, p = 0.000) ct+1 Kronberg et al., 2018 Rathor and Pandey, 2018 Urban et al., 2017 Zhang et al., 2017 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.5%, p = 0.000) hsp-16.2 Akhoon et al., 2017 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.5%, p = 0.000) hsp-16.2 Akhoon et al., 2017 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.5%, p = 0.000) hsp-16.2 Akhoon et al., 2017 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.5%, p = 0.000) hsp-16.2 Akhoon et al., 2017 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.5%, p = 0.000) hsp-16.2 Akhoon et al., 2017 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.5%, p = 0.000) hsp-16.2 Akhoon et al., 2017 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.5%, p = 0.000) hsp-16.2 Akhoon et al., 2017 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.5%, p = 0.000) hsp-16.2 Akhoon et al., 2017 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.5%, p = 0.000) hsp-16.2 Akhoon et al., 2017 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.5%, p = 0.000) hsp-16.2 Akhoon et al., 2017 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.5%, p = 0.000) hsp-16.2 Akhoon et al., 2017 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.0%, p = 0.000) NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis	sod-3 Akhoon et al., 2016 Chou et al., 2019 Kogure et al., 2017 Kronberg et al., 2018 Rathor et al., 2018 Shukla et al., 2018 Shukla et al., 2012	$\begin{array}{c} 1.69 \left(1.36 \ , 2.01 \right) \\ 3.75 \left(3.51 \ , 3.99 \right) \\ 1.56 \left(1.26 \ , 1.87 \right) \\ 3.85 \left(3.68 \ , 4.01 \right) \\ 2.57 \left(2.19 \ , 2.96 \right) \\ 0.80 \left(0.55 \ , 1.05 \right) \\ 2.00 \left(1.75 \ , 2.26 \right) \\ 3.53 \left(3.33 \ , 3.72 \right) \\ 1.56 \left(1.47 \ , 1.65 \right) \\ 1.04 \left(0.69 \ , 1.39 \right) \\ 0.90 \left(0.59 \ , 1.21 \right) \\ 0.90 \left(0.59 \ , 1.21 \right) \\ 1.52 \left(1.41 \ , 1.63 \right) \end{array}$	5.63 5.71 5.65 5.75 5.58 5.70 5.70 5.70 5.74 5.78 5.61 5.65 5.78 5.65 5.78
Curr 3.20 (2.63, 3.78) 9.13 Rathor and Pandey, 2018 2.94 (2.59, 3.30) 9.54 Urban et al., 2017 3.8 (4.12, 4.63) 9.67 Zhang et al., 2015 3.8 (4.12, 4.63) 9.45 Zhang et al., 2015 3.30 (1.63, 4.60) 6.82 Zhao et al., 2017 3.03 (1.45, 4.60) 6.28 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.5%, p = 0.000)	Xu et al., 2017 Zhang et al., 2015 Zhao et al., 2017 Zhou et al., 2017 Zhou et al., 2017 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.9%, p = 0.000)	2.18 (1.94, 2.43) 1.62 (1.17, 2.07) 1.03 (0.90, 1.15) 8.24 (643, 10.06) 6.17 (4.06, 8.28) 6.17 (4.06, 8.28) 1.30 (1.18, 1.42) 2.46 (2.00, 2.52)	5.70 5.50 5.77 3.07 2.63 3.29 5.78 100.00
The set al., 2015 The set al., 2015 Zhao et al., 2017 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.5%, p = 0.000) <i>hsp-16.2</i> Akhoon et al., 2016 Akhoon et al., 2016 1.60 (1.31, 1.88) Raihor and Pandey, 2018 1.60 (1.31, 1.88) Shukla et al., 2010b 2.32 (1.66, 2.98) Zhao et al., 2017 1.306 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.0%, p = 0.000) 0.52 (1.50, 3.55) None et al., 2017 1.306 Zhao et al., 2017 2.52 (1.56, 3.55) Zhao et al., 2017 2.53 (2.47, 2.80) NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis 100.00	Kronberg et al., 2018 Rathor and Pandey, 2018 Urban et al., 2017	 3.20 (2.63 . 3.78) 2.94 (2.59 . 3.30) 4.38 (4.12 . 4.63) 0.96 (0.53 . 1.39) 1.09 (0.68 . 1.49) 1.91 (1.09 . 2.73) 	9.13 9.54 9.67 9.41 9.45 8.52 0.80
hsp-16.2 Akhoon et al., 2016 Rathor and Pandey, 2018 Shukia et al., 2012 Wang et al., 2010b Zhao et al., 2015 Zhou et al., 2017 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.0%, p = 0.000) NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis	Zhang et al., 2015 Zhao et al., 2017 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.5%, p = 0.000)		9.69 9.72 6.28 8.78 100.00
	hsp-16.2 Akhoon et al., 2016 Rathor and Pandey, 2018 Shukla et al., 2010 Wang et al., 2010 Zhao et al., 2017 Zhao et al., 2017 Zhou et al., 2017 Subtotal (I-squared = 98.0%, p = 0.000) NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis	1.60 (1.31, 1.88) 4.04 (3.80, 4.27) 1.93 (1.82, 2.04) 2.52 (1.50, 3.55) 4.22 (2.77, 5.67) 4.49 (2.57, 6.41) 2.83 (2.47, 2.80) 2.88 (2.13, 3.62)	16.92 17.06 17.30 13.05 10.44 8.02 17.21 100.00
-10.4 0 10.4	-10.4 0	 10.4	

Figure 7. Relative expression levels of Dauer formation protein-16-related genes. The diamond indicated the combined effect size of DAF-16-related genes, which did not intersect with the red-dotted-line, indicating hormesis could obviously increase (on the right) or decrease (on the left) the expression of these genes (p < 0.05). Abbreviation: *daf-16, dauer formation protein-16; sod-3, superoxide dismutase-3; ctl-1, catalase-1; hsp-16.2, small heat shock protein-16.2*.

hsp-16.2, was one of the potential molecular mechanisms driving these beneficial effects of hormesis

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Proposal registration and searching strategy

The review protocol was registered in the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) with the reference number of CRD42019117838.

Three electronic databases were searched, including Medline, Embase and the Cochrane Library, using the combination keywords: ("hormesis" OR "hormetic" OR "biphasic" OR "preconditioning" OR "conditioning" OR "adaptive response" OR "acclimation response" OR "stress response" OR "dose response" OR "doseresponse") AND ("anti-ageing" OR "antiageing" OR "anti-aging" OR "antiaging" OR "ageing" OR "aging" OR "life" OR "lifespan" OR "extend" OR "extending" OR "extension" OR "prolong" OR "prolonging" OR "prolongation" OR "longevity" OR "survival" OR "resistance" OR "healthspan" OR "health span" OR "bend" OR "bending" OR "pump" OR "pumping" OR "lipofuscin" OR "pigment") AND ("Caenorhabditis elegans" OR "C. elegans" OR "worm" OR "nematode"), publishing in English or Chinese. Additionally, gray literatures such as conference papers and references listed were also searched using the above keywords via Index to Scientific and Technical Proceedings, Web of Science and Baidu Scholar.

Inclusion criteria

The titles, abstracts and keywords of all retrieved papers were preliminarily separately screened by two researchers (T. Sun and J. Zhan). Then, the full texts of potentially qualified papers were downloaded and independently reviewed for inclusion according to the following criteria: (i) original research paper; (ii) designed at least one control group and one hormesis group; (iii) the experimental animals were healthy C. elegans; (iv) reported at least one outcome induced by hormesis about aging/anti-aging in wild-type worms; (v) the sample size of each study and the mean value with standard deviation (SD)/standard error (SE) of each outcome were available. If a paper involving missing data, an inquiry email was sent to the correspondence author for the raw data. However, if the data were not available within one month, the paper would be excluded. Then cross-checking was conducted, with disagreements settled by discussion, or consultation with the third researchers. After the final selection, 198 effect size estimates (including 33 and 15 for mean lifespan under normal condition and stress condition respectively, 36 for bend frequency, 32 for pumping rate, 24 for lipofuscin level, and 58 for mRNA expression level of *dauer formation protein-16 (daf-16)* and its target genes) involving 26 papers met the inclusion criteria, and were retained in this meta-analysis (see Supplementary Table 1).

Data analysis

This meta-analysis was performed using the STATA v12.0 software (Stata Corporation, College Station, TX, USA). Chi-squared-based I^2 test was conducted to evaluate the heterogeneity among studies, with the values I^2 of 25%, 50% and 75% representing low, moderate and high degrees, respectively [45]. If the value of I^2 was greater than 50%, the random-effect model based on the method proposed by DerSimonian and Laird would be adopted to account for the high heterogeneity among studies [46], followed by "leave-one-out" sensitivity analysis to test the robustness of meta-analytic results, or else, the fixed-effect model based on inverse variance method would be used [47]. Egger's linear regression test would be used for quantitatively estimating the risk of publication bias [45]. The unbiased estimate of effect size was in accordance to Cohen's standardized mean difference (SMD) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) [45]. The significance level was set at p < 0.05.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful for helpful advice given by the administrators of PROSPERO and its funder, National Institute for Health Research (NIHR).

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflicts of interest

FUNDING

This work was supported by the grants from the Young Taishan Scholars Program of Shandong Province for Prof. Huifeng Wu (tsqn201812115), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (21677173) and the Youth Innovation Promotion Association CAS (2017255).

REFERENCES

- Calabrese EJ, Baldwin LA. Defining hormesis. Hum Exp Toxicol. 2002; 21:91–97. <u>https://doi.org/10.1191/0960327102ht217oa</u> PMID:<u>12102503</u>
- Calabrese EJ. The emergence of the dose-response concept in biology and medicine. Int J Mol Sci. 2016; 17:2034.

https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms17122034 PMID:27929392

 Calabrese EJ, lavicoli I, Calabrese V. Hormesis: why it is important to biogerontologists. Biogerontology. 2012; 13:215–35. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10522-012-9374-7</u>

PMID:22270337

- Rattan SI. Hormesis for healthy aging. In: Rattan SI, Kyriazis M, editors. The science of hormesis in health and longevity. UK: Academic Press; 2019. pp. 201–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-814253-0.00018-8
- Calabrese EJ, Mattson MP. How does hormesis impact biology, toxicology, and medicine? NPJ Aging Mech Dis. 2017; 3:13. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41514-017-0013-z</u> PMID:<u>28944077</u>
- Rattan SI. Hormesis in aging. Ageing Res Rev. 2008; 7:63–78. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arr.2007.03.002</u> PMID:<u>17964227</u>
- Blagosklonny MV. Aging: ROS or TOR. Cell Cycle. 2008; 7:3344–54. https://doi.org/10.4161/cc.7.21.6965 PMID:18971624
- Russell EG, Cotter TG. New insight into the role of reactive oxygen species (ROS) in cellular signaltransduction processes. Int Rev Cell Mol Biol. 2015; 319:221–54. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.ircmb.2015.07.004</u>

PMID:<u>26404470</u>

- McClure CD, Zhong W, Hunt VL, Chapman FM, Hill FV, Priest NK. Hormesis results in trade-offs with immunity. Evolution. 2014; 68:2225–33. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.12453</u> PMID:<u>24862588</u>
- Le Bourg É, Rattan SI. Hormesis and trade-offs: a comment. Dose Response. 2014; 12:522–24. <u>https://doi.org/10.2203/dose-response.14-</u> 054.LeBourg PMID:25552954
- 11. Le Bourg É. Mild stress-induced hormesis. In: Rattan SI, Kyriazis M, editors. The science of hormesis in health and longevity. UK: Academic Press; 2019. pp. 25–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-814253-0.00002-4
- Calabrese EJ, Dhawan G, Kapoor R, lavicoli I, Calabrese V. Hormesis: a fundamental concept with widespread biological and biomedical applications. Gerontology. 2016; 62:530–35. https://doi.org/10.1159/000441520 PMID:26535577
- 13. Rattan SI, Kryzch V, Schnebert S, Perrier E, Nizard C. Hormesis-based anti-aging products: a case study of a novel cosmetic. Dose Response. 2013; 11:99–108. https://doi.org/10.2203/dose-response.11-054.Rattan

PMID:23548988

 Cui J, Yang G, Pan Z, Zhao Y, Liang X, Li W, Cai L. Hormetic response to low-dose radiation: focus on the immune system and its clinical implications. Int J Mol Sci. 2017; 18:E280. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms18020280

PMID:28134809

- Mägdefrau AS, Ludwig K, Weigel C, Köse N, Guerra GM, Dakhovnik A, Kosan C. DNA-damage-induced hormetic responses. In: Rattan SI, Kyriazis M, editors. The science of hormesis in health and longevity. UK: Academic Press; 2019. pp. 149–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-814253-0.00013-9
- 16. Wang L, Zou W, Zhong Y, An J, Zhang X, Wu M, Yu Z. The hormesis effect of BDE-47 in HepG2 cells and the potential molecular mechanism. Toxicol Lett. 2012; 209:193–201. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.toxlet.2011.12.014</u> PMID:22233939
- López-Otín C, Blasco MA, Partridge L, Serrano M, Kroemer G. The hallmarks of aging. Cell. 2013; 153:1194–217. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2013.05.039</u> PMID:<u>23746838</u>
- Blagosklonny MV. Hormesis does not make sense except in the light of TOR-driven aging. Aging (Albany NY). 2011; 3:1051–62. <u>https://doi.org/10.18632/aging.100411</u> PMID:<u>22166724</u>
- Gurevitch J, Koricheva J, Nakagawa S, Stewart G. Metaanalysis and the science of research synthesis. Nature. 2018; 555:175–82. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/nature25753</u> PMID:29517004
- 20. Liu H, Bravata DM, Olkin I, Nayak S, Roberts B, Garber AM, Hoffman AR. Systematic review: the safety and efficacy of growth hormone in the healthy elderly. Ann Intern Med. 2007; 146:104–15. <u>https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-146-2-200701160-00005</u> PMID:17227934
- 21. Peterson MD, Rhea MR, Sen A, Gordon PM. Resistance exercise for muscular strength in older adults: a metaanalysis. Ageing Res Rev. 2010; 9:226–37. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arr.2010.03.004</u> PMID:<u>20385254</u>
- 22. Johnson TE. Advantages and disadvantages of *Caenorhabditis elegans* for aging research. Exp Gerontol. 2003; 38:1329–32. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exger.2003.10.020</u> PMID:<u>14698813</u>
- 23. Keith SA, Amrit FR, Ratnappan R, Ghazi A. The C.

elegans healthspan and stress-resistance assay toolkit. Methods. 2014; 68:476–86. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymeth.2014.04.003</u> PMID:24727065

- 24. Kenyon CJ. The genetics of ageing. Nature. 2010; 464:504–12. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08980</u> PMID:<u>20336132</u>
- 25. Yu S, Lee E, Tsogbadrakh B, Son GI, Kim M. Prenatal hyperbaric normoxia treatment improves healthspan and regulates chitin metabolic genes in *Drosophila melanogaster*. Aging (Albany NY). 2016; 8:2538–50. <u>https://doi.org/10.18632/aging.101084</u> PMID:<u>27777382</u>
- 26. Musa M, Perić M, Bou Dib P, Sobočanec S, Šarić A, Lovrić A, Rudan M, Nikolić A, Milosević I, Vlahoviček K, Raimundo N, Kriško A. Heat-induced longevity in budding yeast requires respiratory metabolism and glutathione recycling. Aging (Albany NY). 2018; 10:2407–27. <u>https://doi.org/10.18632/aging.101560</u> PMID:30227387
- Navarro A, Gomez C, López-Cepero JM, Boveris A. Beneficial effects of moderate exercise on mice aging: survival, behavior, oxidative stress, and mitochondrial electron transfer. Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol. 2004; 286:R505–11. <u>https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpregu.00208.2003</u> PMID:<u>14615275</u>
- 28. Sarup P, Loeschcke V. Life extension and the position of the hormetic zone depends on sex and genetic background in *Drosophila melanogaster*. Biogerontology. 2011; 12:109–17. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10522-010-9298-z</u> PMID:<u>20711813</u>
- 29. Tissenbaum HA. Genetics, life span, health span, and the aging process in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2012; 67:503–10. <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/gls088</u> PMID:<u>22499764</u>
- 30. Wang D, Xing X. Assessment of locomotion behavioral defects induced by acute toxicity from heavy metal exposure in nematode *Caenorhabditis elegans*. J Environ Sci (China). 2008; 20:1132–37. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/S1001-0742(08)62160-9</u> PMID:<u>19143322</u>
- Pandey S, Tiwari S, Kumar A, Niranjan A, Chand J, Lehri A, Chauhan PS. Antioxidant and anti-aging potential of Juniper berry (*Juniperus communis* L.) essential oil in *Caenorhabditis elegans* model system. Ind Crops Prod. 2018; 120:113–22. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2018.04.066</u>

32. Leomanni A, Schettino T, Calisi A, Gorbi S, Mezzelani M, Regoli F, Lionetto MG. Antioxidant and oxidative stress related responses in the Mediterranean land snail Cantareus apertus exposed to the carbamate pesticide Carbaryl. Comp Biochem Physiol C Toxicol Pharmacol. 2015; 168:20–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpc.2014.11.003

PMID:25451076

- 33. Harman D. Aging: a theory based on free radical and radiation chemistry. J Gerontol. 1956; 11:298–300. <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/geronj/11.3.298</u> PMID:<u>13332224</u>
- 34. Johnson TE, Lithgow GJ, Murakami S. Hypothesis: interventions that increase the response to stress offer the potential for effective life prolongation and increased health. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 1996; 51:B392–95. https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/51A.6.B392
 - PMID:8914487
- 35. Kojima S, Tsukimoto M, Shimura N, Koga H, Murata A, Takara T. Treatment of cancer and inflammation with low-dose ionizing radiation: three case reports. Dose Response. 2017; 15:1559325817697531. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/1559325817697531</u> PMID:28539853
- 36. Radak Z, Chung HY, Koltai E, Taylor AW, Goto S. Exercise, oxidative stress and hormesis. Ageing Res Rev. 2008; 7:34–42. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arr.2007.04.004</u> PMID:<u>17869589</u>
- 37. Gems D, Partridge L. Stress-response hormesis and aging: "that which does not kill us makes us stronger". Cell Metab. 2008; 7:200–03. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmet.2008.01.001 PMID:<u>18316025</u>
- Zhang J, Lu L, Zhou L. Oleanolic acid activates daf-16 to increase lifespan in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 2015; 468:843–49. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbrc.2015.11.042</u> PMID:<u>26592451</u>
- 39. Jensen VL, Gallo M, Riddle DL. Targets of DAF-16 involved in *Caenorhabditis elegans* adult longevity and dauer formation. Exp Gerontol. 2006; 41:922–27. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exger.2006.06.058</u> PMID:<u>17055208</u>
- 40. Murphy CT, McCarroll SA, Bargmann CI, Fraser A, Kamath RS, Ahringer J, Li H, Kenyon C. Genes that act downstream of DAF-16 to influence the lifespan of Caenorhabditis elegans. Nature. 2003; 424:277–83. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/nature01789</u> PMID:<u>12845331</u>
- 41. Hartwig K, Heidler T, Moch J, Daniel H, Wenzel U.

Feeding a ROS-generator to *Caenorhabditis elegans* leads to increased expression of small heat shock protein HSP-16.2 and hormesis. Genes Nutr. 2009; 4:59–67.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s12263-009-0113-x PMID:<u>19252938</u>

- 42. Kronberg MF, Clavijo A, Moya A, Rossen A, Calvo D, Pagano E, Munarriz E. Glyphosate-based herbicides modulate oxidative stress response in the nematode *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Comp Biochem Physiol C Toxicol Pharmacol. 2018; 214:1–8. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpc.2018.08.002</u> PMID:<u>30142450</u>
- 43. van der Horst A, Burgering BM. Stressing the role of FoxO proteins in lifespan and disease. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol. 2007; 8:440–50. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm2190</u> PMID:<u>17522590</u>
- 44. Wang X, Zhang J, Lu L, Zhou L. The longevity effect of echinacoside in *Caenorhabditis elegans* mediated

through daf-16. Biosci Biotechnol Biochem. 2015; 79:1676–83. https://doi.org/10.1080/09168451.2015.1046364 PMID:26027643

- Higgins JP, Green S. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions. 2011. <u>http://handbook.cochrane.org</u>
- 46. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Control Clin Trials. 1986; 7:177–88. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/0197-2456(86)90046-2</u> PMID:<u>3802833</u>
- Deeks JJ, Altman D, Bradburn MJ. Statistical methods for examining heterogeneity and combining results from several studies in meta-analysis. In: Egger M, Smith GD, Altman DG, editors. Systematic reviews in health care: meta-analysis in context. UK: BMJ Publishing Group; 2001. pp. 285–312. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470693926.ch15

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Supplementary Figures





D

Meta-analyasis random-effects estimates (linear form) Study ommitted







Supplementary Figure 1. "Leave-one-out" sensitivity analyses. (A–E) denoted the "leave-one-out" sensitivity analyses of mean lifespan, bend frequency, pumping rate, lipofuscin level and stress resistance, respectively. (F) was the summary of the significant re-test after omitting one study. As shown in (F), the meta-analytic results of all indicators were stable.











I





I





I





Supplementary Figure 2. Publication bias assessments. (A–E) showed the publication bias assessments of mean lifespan, bend frequency, pumping rate, lipofuscin level and stress resistance, respectively, while (F) summarized the risk of publication bias of each indicator. The sub-graph (I) was the funnel plots that directly exhibited the risk of publication bias. The sub-group (II) was the Egger's test expressed by line form that could quantitatively evaluate the risk of publication bias. Statistically significant publication bias was considered when the value of *p* was less than 0.05. *represented the appearance of significant publication bias (p < 0.05).

Supplementary References

- Akhoon BA, Pandey S, Tiwari S, Pandey R. Withanolide A offers neuroprotection, ameliorates stress resistance and prolongs the life expectancy of *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Exp Gerontol. 2016; 78:47–56. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exger.2016.03.004</u> PMID:<u>26956478</u>
- Chou WY, Lin YC, Lee YH. Short-term starvation stress at young adult stages enhances meiotic activity of germ cells to maintain spermatogenesis in aged male *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Aging Cell. 2019; 18:e12930. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/acel.12930</u> PMID:<u>30816005</u>
- Kim J, Shirasawa T, Miyamoto Y. The effect of TAT conjugated platinum nanoparticles on lifespan in a nematode *Caenorhabditis elegans model*. Biomaterials. 2010; 31:5849–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biomaterials.2010.03.077 PMID:20434216
- Kishimoto S, Uno M, Okabe E, Nono M, Nishida E. Environmental stresses induce transgenerationally inheritable survival advantages via germline-to-soma communication in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Nat Commun. 2017; 8:14031. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms14031</u> PMID:<u>28067237</u>
- Kogure A, Uno M, Ikeda T, Nishida E. The microRNA machinery regulates fasting-induced changes in gene expression and longevity in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. J Biol Chem. 2017; 292:11300–09. <u>https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M116.765065</u> PMID:<u>28507100</u>
- Kronberg MF, Clavijo A, Moya A, Rossen A, Calvo D, Pagano E, Munarriz E. Glyphosate-based herbicides modulate oxidative stress response in the nematode *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Comp Biochem Physiol C Toxicol Pharmacol. 2018; 214:1–8. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpc.2018.08.002</u> PMID:<u>30142450</u>
- Olsen A, Vantipalli MC, Lithgow GJ. Lifespan extension of *Caenorhabditis elegans* following repeated mild hormetic heat treatments. Biogerontology. 2006; 7:221–30. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10522-006-9018-x</u> PMID:<u>16826446</u>
- Pandey S, Tiwari S, Kumar A, Niranjan A, Chand J, Lehri A, Chauhan PS. Antioxidant and anti-aging potential of Juniper berry (*Juniperus communis* L.) essential oil in *Caenorhabditis elegans* model system. Ind Crops Prod. 2018; 120:113–22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2018.04.066
- 9. Pietsch K, Saul N, Chakrabarti S, Stürzenbaum SR, Menzel R, Steinberg CE. Hormetins, antioxidants and

prooxidants: defining quercetin-, caffeic acid- and rosmarinic acid-mediated life extension in *C. elegans*. Biogerontology. 2011; 12:329–47. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10522-011-9334-7 PMID:21503726

- Rathor L, Akhoon BA, Pandey S, Srivastava S, Pandey R. Folic acid supplementation at lower doses increases oxidative stress resistance and longevity in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Age (Dordr). 2015; 37:113. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11357-015-9850-5</u> PMID:26546011
- Rathor L, Pandey R. Age-induced diminution of free radicals by Boeravinone B in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Exp Gerontol. 2018; 111:94–106. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exger.2018.07.005</u> PMID:30004006
- Schmeisser S, Schmeisser K, Weimer S, Groth M, Priebe S, Fazius E, Kuhlow D, Pick D, Einax JW, Guthke R, Platzer M, Zarse K, Ristow M. Mitochondrial hormesis links low-dose arsenite exposure to lifespan extension. Aging Cell. 2013; 12:508–17. https://doi.org/10.1111/acel.12076 PMID:23534459
- 13. Govindan S, Amirthalingam M, Duraisamy Κ, Govindhan Τ, Sundararaj N, Palanisamy S. Phytochemicals-induced hormesis protects Caenorhabditis elegans against a-synuclein protein aggregation and stress through modulating HSF-1 and SKN-1/Nrf2 signaling pathways. Biomed Pharmacother. 2018: 102:812-22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopha.2018.03.128 PMID:29605769
- Shukla V, Yadav D, Phulara SC, Gupta MM, Saikia SK, Pandey R. Longevity-promoting effects of 4-hydroxy-Eglobularinin in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Free Radic Biol Med. 2012; 53:1848–56. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.freeradbiomed.2012.08.594</u> PMID:23000058
- Urban N, Tsitsipatis D, Hausig F, Kreuzer K, Erler K, Stein V, Ristow M, Steinbrenner H, Klotz LO. Non-linear impact of glutathione depletion on *C. elegans* life span and stress resistance. Redox Biol. 2017; 11:502–15. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.redox.2016.12.003</u> PMID:<u>28086197</u>
- 16. Wang D, Liu P, Xing X. Pre-treatment with mild UV irradiation increases the resistance of nematode *Caenorhabditis elegans* to toxicity on locomotion behaviors from metal exposure. Environ Toxicol Pharmacol. 2010a; 29:213–22. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.etap.2010.01.002</u> PMID:<u>21787605</u>

- 17. Wang X, Wang X, Li L, Wang D. Lifespan extension in *Caenorhabditis elegans* by DMSO is dependent on *sir-2.1* and *daf-16*. Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 2010b; 400:613–18.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbrc.2010.08.113</u>
 PMID:20828537
- Wang D, Xing X. Pre-treatment with mild metal exposure suppresses the neurotoxicity on locomotion behavior induced by the subsequent severe metal exposure in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Environ Toxicol Pharmacol. 2009; 28:459–64. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.etap.2009.07.008</u> PMID:21784043
- 19. Wu ZQ, Li K, Ma JK, Li ZJ. Effects of ethanol intake on anti-oxidant responses and the lifespan of *Caenorhabditis elegans*. CYTA J Food. 2019; 17:288–96. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/19476337.2018.1564794</u>
- 20. Xu J, Guo Y, Sui T, Wang Q, Zhang Y, Zhang R, Wang M, Guan S, Wang L. Molecular mechanisms of anti-oxidant and anti-aging effects induced by convallatoxin in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Free Radic Res. 2017; 51:529–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/10715762.2017.1331037 PMID:28503972
- 21. Yanase S, Ishii N. Hyperoxia exposure induced hormesis decreases mitochondrial superoxide radical levels via Ins/IGF-1 signaling pathway in a long-lived age-1 mutant of *Caenorhabditis elegans*. J Radiat Res

(Tokyo). 2008; 49:211–18. https://doi.org/10.1269/jrr.07043 PMID:<u>18285659</u>

 Yu X, Zhao W, Ma J, Fu X, Zhao ZJ. Beneficial and harmful effects of alcohol exposure on *Caenorhabditis elegans* worms. Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 2011; 412:757–62. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbrc.2011.08.053</u>

PMID:<u>21871869</u>

- Zhang J, Lu L, Zhou L. Oleanolic acid activates *daf-16* to increase lifespan in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 2015; 468:843–49. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbrc.2015.11.042</u>
 PMID:26592451
- 24. Zhao X, Lu L, Qi Y, Li M, Zhou L. Emodin extends lifespan of *Caenorhabditis elegans* through insulin/IGF-1 signaling pathway depending on DAF-16 and SIR-2.1. Biosci Biotechnol Biochem. 2017; 81:1908–16. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/09168451.2017.1365592</u> PMID:<u>28831863</u>
- 25. Zhou L, Fu X, Jiang L, Wang L, Bai S, Jiao Y, Xing S, Li W, Ma J. Arbutin increases *Caenorhabditis elegans* longevity and stress resistance. PeerJ. 2017; 5:e4170. <u>https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.4170</u> PMID:29340230
- 26. Zhu CJ, Peng Y, Tong ZH, Lu LY, Cui YH, Yu HQ. Hormetic effect and mechanism of imidazolium-based ionic liquids on the nematode *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Chemosphere. 2016; 157:65–70. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2016.05.007</u> PMID:27209554

Supplementary Table

Please browse Full Text version to see the data of Supplementary Table 1

Supplementary Table 1. The basic information of included papers.