Distinguishing the causative effects of biological diversity on disease from other anthropogenic change effects.

John Texa*

Department of Microbiology and Biotechnology, University of Helsinki, Finland

Abstract

Anthropogenic processes, including as land usage, population harvesting, species introductions, and climate change, have changed the Earth's ecosystems. These anthropogenic actions significantly affect plant and animal populations, which alters how zoonotic infections they carry are transmitted. The preservation of biodiversity might be a beneficial strategy for both preserving ecosystem health and safeguarding population health, although there isn't much causal data to back this up. Four questions must be addressed in order to determine whether conservation is a practical public health intervention: Is there a broad, causal connection between biodiversity and the spread of pathogens, and if so, which way? Does a rise in the overall illness load originate from increased pathogen variety and diverse hosts? Here, we will talk about.

Keywords: Biodiversity, Ecosystem, Biosynthesis.

Introduction

Most of the Earth's ecosystems have changed as a result of the need to feed, clothe, and house mankind. The most prevalent anthropogenic practises involve altering natural landscapes for agriculture and development, introducing non-native species accidentally or on design, and taking direct advantage of wild populations. These actions have significantly changed the make-up of biotic communities, and occasionally (but not always), they lessen regional diversity. Ecosystems have been significantly altered by human activities, which include include changes in the microclimate and vegetation structure, nutrient cycling, water purification, and the advent of infectious illnesses [1].

Due to the simultaneous loss of biodiversity and rise in new disease events, the effects of anthropogenic processes on the spread of infectious illnesses have attracted a lot of attention in the last ten years. If there is a causal relationship between these two processes, protecting biodiversity may benefit people by lowering their chance of contracting zoonotic diseases. The causality and generality of connections between biodiversity and the risk of contracting zoonotic diseases have, however, come into dispute. Whether conservation efforts will improve overall human well-being, including effects on the entire burden of infectious diseases as well as other implications on physical, mental, and societal well-being, is a fundamental topic. Reintroducing species and preserving, restoring, or altering habitat are the two most frequently suggested interventions to increase biodiversity that we take into account when evaluating biodiversity conservation measures. When certain species (or groups of species) are the objective of habitat alteration, there can be both an increase and a decrease in the number of diverse hosts. Reduced abundance of a species might result in an increase in diversity indices, such as community evenness [2].

Anthropogenic change effects

Increased agricultural production and urbanisation have significantly altered biological ecosystems, lowering the richness of vertebrate species in many regions. Although there are many ways that land use affects disease, researchers have concentrated on figuring out if depletion of biodiversity will result in an increase or decrease in disease risk hypothesis referred to as the "dilution impact" and "amplification effect," respectively. The term "dilution effect" comes from the mechanism proposed for the Lyme disease system; it is hypothesised that the presence of less competent host species in communities of highly competent hosts (white-footed mice, eastern chipmunks, and shrews) will "dilute" the transmission of the Lyme disease bacterium to larval ticks by these species, reducing the prevalence of infection in nymph ticks [3].

There are several theories put forth to explain how diversity may affect transmission and have an amplification or dilution effect. Changes in host and vector contact rates, abundance, vital rates, and infectiousness are some of these mechanisms. As host diversity and composition change, either dilution or amplification for each pathway may take place. In comparison to undisturbed environments, anthropogenically altered habitats typically include more introduced species, smaller-bodied species, and fewer large predators. If a species is an amplifying or diluting host, it will depend on qualities like contact rates, infectiousness for each pathogen, and effects on other host and vector species. Data from several pathogen systems and multiple investigations of the same pathogen

Correspondence to: John Texa, Department of Microbiology and Biotechnology, University of Helsinki, Finland, E-mail: johnt@helsinki.fi

Received: *26-Jan-2023, Manuscript No. AAJBP-23-88991;* ***Editor assigned:*** *30-Jan-2023, PreQC No. AAJBP-23-88991(PQ);* ***Reviewed:*** *13-Feb-2023, QC No. AAJBP-23-88991;* ***Revised:*** *20-Feb-2023, Manuscript No. AAJBP-23-88991(R);* ***Published:*** *27-Feb-2023, DOI: 10.35841/aajbp-7.1.132*

Citation: *Texa J. Distinguishing the causative effects of biological diversity on disease from other anthropogenic change effects. 2023;7(1):132*

system are required to determine whether growing biodiversity will lead to dilution or amplification and how spatial and ecological variety affect transmission [4].

The fact that the link is typically nonlinear, may be unimodal, and peaks at some intermediate level of variety for most diseases presents an additional hurdle in determining the causality and generality of associations between diversity and disease risk. The possibility of some viruses persisting is frequently low when environments are so badly damaged that there aren't many host species left. For instance, because there are no deer, minimal leaf litter, and consequently few ticks in downtown New York City, the chance of contracting Lyme disease is almost zero. Before initiating an intervention, it is obviously crucial to ascertain which side of the peak a given place sits on in order to lower disease risk by preserving or restoring biodiversity [5].

Conclusion

Ecosystems on Earth are continuously being changed by humans. High and rising living standards in developed and fast growing nations lead to, correspondingly, increased energy use, biotic homogeneity, converting more land to agriculture, and urbanisation. New difficulties arise as a result of these changes, including the introduction of novel infections from wildlife, the spread of novel host species to new continents and islands, the increase or reduction of animal populations due to changes in land use, and the warming and changing of temperatures.

References

1. Foley JA, DeFries R, Asner GP, et al. Global consequences of land use. sci. 2005;309(5734):570-4.
2. Keesing F, Holt RD, Ostfeld RS. Effects of species diversity on disease risk. Ecol letters. 2006;9(4):485-98.
3. Dirzo R, Young HS, Galetti M, et al. Defaunation in the Anthropocene. Sci. 2014;345(6195):401-6.
4. Cardinale BJ, Duffy JE, Gonzalez A, et al. Biodiversity loss and its impact on humanity. Nat. 2012;486(7401):59-67.
5. Keesing F, Belden LK, Daszak P, et al. Impacts of biodiversity on the emergence and transmission of infectious diseases. Nat. 2010;468(7324):647-52.

Citation: *Texa J. Distinguishing the causative effects of biological diversity on disease from other anthropogenic change effects. 2023;7(1):132*