



This is a repository copy of *Defining an ageing-related pathology, disease or syndrome: international consensus statement*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/218288/>

Version: Published Version

Article:

Short, E. orcid.org/0000-0001-5050-589X, Adcock, I.M., Al-Sarireh, B. et al. (224 more authors) (2025) Defining an ageing-related pathology, disease or syndrome: international consensus statement. *GeroScience*, 47 (2). pp. 1713-1720. ISSN 2509-2715

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11357-024-01315-9>

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>



Defining an ageing-related pathology, disease or syndrome: International Consensus Statement

Emma Short · ICCARP · Stuart Calimport ·
Barry Bentley

Received: 21 June 2024 / Accepted: 9 August 2024
© The Author(s) 2024

Abstract Around the world, individuals are living longer, but an increased average lifespan does not always equate to an increased health span. With advancing age, the increased prevalence of ageing-related diseases can have a significant impact on health status, functional capacity and quality of life. It is therefore vital to develop comprehensive classification and staging systems for ageing-related pathologies, diseases and syndromes. This will allow societies to better identify, quantify, understand and meet the healthcare, workforce, well-being and socioeconomic needs of ageing populations, whilst supporting the development and utilisation of interventions to prevent or to slow, halt or reverse the progression of ageing-related pathologies. The

foundation for developing such classification and staging systems is to define the scope of what constitutes an ageing-related pathology, disease or syndrome. To this end, a consensus meeting was hosted by the International Consortium to Classify Ageing-Related Pathologies (ICCARP), on February 19, 2024, in Cardiff, UK, and was attended by 150 recognised experts. Discussions and voting were centred on provisional criteria that had been distributed prior to the meeting. The participants debated and voted on these. Each criterion required a consensus agreement of $\geq 70\%$ for approval. The accepted criteria for an ageing-related pathology, disease or syndrome were (1) develops and/or progresses with increasing chronological age; (2) should be associated with, or contribute to, functional decline or an increased susceptibility to functional decline and (3) evidenced by studies in humans. Criteria for an ageing-related pathology, disease or syndrome have been agreed by an international consortium of subject experts. These criteria will now be used by the ICCARP for the classification and ultimately staging of ageing-related pathologies, diseases and syndromes.

International Consortium for the Classification of Ageing-Related Pathologies (ICCARP)

ICCARP: all listed members of the ICCARP are co-authors of this paper. See details at end of manuscript.

E. Short (✉) · S. Calimport · B. Bentley
Cardiff School of Technologies, Cardiff Metropolitan
University, Cardiff, UK
e-mail: eshort@cardiffmet.ac.uk

E. Short
Department of Cellular Pathology, Swansea Bay
University Health Board, Swansea, UK

S. Calimport · B. Bentley
Collaboration for the Advancement of Sustainable Medical
Innovation (CASMI), University College London, London,
UK

B. Bentley
Center for Engineering in Medicine and Surgery, Harvard
Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

B. Bentley
Department of Surgery, Massachusetts General Hospital,
Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

B. Bentley
Shriners Children's, Boston, MA, USA

Keywords Ageing-related pathology · Disease · Syndrome · Ageing · Longevity

Introduction

The World Health Organization has reported that around the world, people are living longer, and that every country is experiencing growth in both the number and the proportion of older people in the population [1]. Despite increasing average longevity, evidence suggests that the proportion of years lived in good health has remained broadly constant, which implies that some of the additional years of life are spent in poorer health [1] and many individuals live with multimorbidity. Ageing is characterised *inter alia* by the time-related progressive accumulation of damage, which can occur at molecular, cellular, tissue, organ and system levels. This can have a detrimental effect on an individual's intrinsic capacity and can impact physiological, cognitive, psychological and social functioning, and/ or socioeconomic status and productivity levels.

Over recent decades, research has led to a significant increase in the understanding of the biological features of ageing, but this has not yet been translated into clinically relevant classification and staging systems for ageing-related pathologies. In the International Classification of Diseases, 11th revision (ICD-11) [2], there is a causality code related to ageing (XT9T) [2–4] to classify entities ‘caused by biological processes which persistently lead to the loss of organism's adaptation and progress in older ages’ [2] and a code under ‘General symptoms, signs or clinical findings’ (MG2A) for ‘ageing associated decline in intrinsic capacity’ [2]. Furthermore, there are several entities that are described as being associated with increasing age, for example photoageing of the skin, intrinsic ageing of the skin or hearing loss. However, the existing approach to ageing-related pathologies is superficial and non-standardised.

In 2019, Calimport et al. called for the systematic and comprehensive classification and staging of ageing-related pathologies at the metabolic, tissue, organ and systemic levels [5]. It was recommended that such a classification system should be adopted by the ICD to guide policy and practice as well as to enable

appropriate clinical guidance, systems, resources and infrastructure [5]. However, progress in developing such classification and staging systems has been slow, and there is an urgent need for accelerated efforts to identify, characterise, name and classify ageing-related pathologies, diseases and syndromes.

To this end, the International Consortium for the Classification of Ageing-Related Pathologies (ICCARP) was established in 2023, comprising 16 international working groups, initially to develop the classification systems. The ICCARP is led by a research team at Cardiff Metropolitan University. Fourteen working groups have been structured on a system-specific basis: audiovestibular; breast; cardiovascular; dermatology; endocrine and metabolic; gastrointestinal, pancreatic, hepatobiliary; gynaecology; immunology; musculoskeletal; nephrology; neurology; ophthalmology; respiratory and urology. In addition, there are scientific advisory and standardisation groups. Overall, the working groups comprise around 300 clinicians, research scientists and allied health professionals who are recognised subject experts in their fields.

Methods

The hybrid International Consensus Meeting to Define an Ageing-Related Pathology, Disease or Syndrome was hosted in Cardiff, UK, on February 19, 2024. Before the meeting, the primary research team (Dr Emma Short, Dr Barry Bentley and Dr Stuart Calimport, Cardiff Metropolitan University) had developed five potential criteria to define an ageing-related pathology, disease or syndrome:

1. Must develop/progress with increasing age.
2. Must cause functional decline.
3. Must predict mortality.
4. Evidenced by studies in humans.
5. Mendelian disorders are excluded.

These criteria were distributed to all ICCARP working group members 1 month before the meeting, for comments and feedback. Based on the feedback received during this initial consultation period, a sixth criterion was added:

6. Should not be primarily accounted for by an extrinsic carcinogen/environmental toxin/infectious agent/injury.

One hundred fifty working group members attended the meeting, representing 65 different institutions from 15 countries. Most individuals participated virtually (93%). Each criterion was debated sequentially, and where relevant, refined wording was suggested. At the end of each discussion, participants were invited to vote as to whether they agreed with the criterion. Voting options were “Yes”, “Yes with reservations”, “No” and “Abstain”. Reservations raised were subsequently discussed, and participants were re-pollled where modified wording had been proposed. Voting was performed through a Teams anonymous online poll for the virtual attendees and through the raising of hands for in-person attendees. Each criterion required a consensus agreement of $\geq 70\%$ for approval, consisting of “Yes” or “Yes with reservations”.

Results

The criteria for defining an ageing-related pathology, disease or syndrome that were accepted were (1) develops and/or progresses with increasing chronological age, (2) should be associated with, or contribute to, functional decline or an increased susceptibility to functional decline and (3) evidenced by studies in humans.

Develops and/ or progresses with increasing chronological age

The first criterion was agreed by 97% of the consortium.

There was considerable discussion surrounding whether the criterion should include a specific age-related threshold. For example, it was suggested that the criterion should explicitly state that it was referring to pathologies of adulthood. However, it was acknowledged that “adulthood” potentially has different definitions, including a chronological age of 18 years or when an individual reaches skeletal maturity or at the end of puberty, and it was highlighted that the maturation of different body systems can occur at different chronological ages. Furthermore,

it was recognised that several chronic diseases traditionally thought of as “older age-related diseases”, for example type 2 diabetes mellitus, are now being observed in younger populations [6] and that some ageing-related pathologies can even be present from the time of conception. It is vital that pathologies can be identified at very early stages for purposes of reversal or prevention of progression.

The conclusion was to avoid an arbitrary cutoff point since some phenomena attributed to ageing can be identified in chronologically young individuals. It would not be appropriate to exclude such individuals from clinically relevant classification and staging systems.

Should be associated with, or contribute to, functional decline or an increased susceptibility to functional decline

There was 99% agreement with the inclusion of criterion 2, with the understanding that functional decline refers to a decrement in physiological, physical, cognitive or socioeconomic functioning, but the working groups would define the specific details on a system-specific basis.

The original suggestion, “must cause functional decline” was reformulated based on several points raised by the working group members. “Must” was considered too restrictive, so was amended to “should”. It was reinforced that ageing-related pathologies do not always cause functional decline, but rather, some play a contributory role, alongside other contributory factors, and some do not directly result in functional decline but are associated with functional decline or have a bi-directional relationship. Furthermore, it was acknowledged that some ageing-related pathologies might be silent, especially if there is functional reserve within the system, and will only become apparent if there is an additional insult or an additional pathology develops. For example, clonal haematopoiesis can be clinically silent [7], but it can manifest as a patient becoming systemically unwell because of an infection (the additional insult), even if it does not develop into myelodysplasia or leukaemia. To recognise this, the criterion was reworded to include “increased susceptibility to functional decline”.

Whilst some participants suggested that ageing-related functional decline should be defined as

“decline that is irreversible”, this was rejected by the majority of the consortium, who agreed that functional decline may be transient or chronic but need not be permanent, for example it may be reversed following an intervention. Whilst some functional decline may be irreversible at the current time, this is not always true, and it is hoped that some declines could be halted or reversed once mechanistic causes are identified.

Evidenced by studies in humans

92% of the consortium agreed with criterion 3.

It is recognised that whilst data from animal studies may provide supporting evidence and can help understand disease mechanisms and develop treatments, it is imperative that there is significant evidence from studies in humans. The ICD is a classification system for humans only and, as such, relies on evidence from studies in humans.

Rejected criteria and further discussions

Mortality

The criterion “Must predict mortality” was rejected. Whilst 8% of voters supported this criterion and 54% felt that it should be included as part of criterion 2, the 70% threshold was not met. Initially, it was highlighted that mortality is a given, so if a mortality-related criterion were to be included, a more appropriate wording might be “Associated with an increased risk of mortality”. This would reflect the notion that the incidence of death in a population or cohort with a specific ageing-related pathology, disease or syndrome would be higher than in a pathology-free cohort and/or that ageing-related pathologies shorten life.

However, following extensive discussion, the consortium felt that, on balance, it would be inappropriate to accept a mortality-based criterion. This was on the basis that many ageing-related pathologies or diseases do not have a direct impact on risk of death but may have a moderating role, for example hearing loss or osteoarthritis, and that there are many confounding factors involved in the risk of death.

Inherited/ Mendelian disorders

The original criterion “Mendelian disorders are excluded” had been suggested primarily to exclude diseases or disorders that develop as a result of a highly penetrant, monogenic variant. However, such diseases may have underlying mechanisms that are also observed in ageing-related pathologies, and it could be clinically important to classify and stage such changes, in all contexts. Furthermore, inherited genetic variants, even if they have not yet been identified or are of very low penetrance, can contribute to disease susceptibility, and cannot be ignored in the era of personalised medicine and targeted therapies. The initial criteria would have potentially excluded most progeroid syndromes, which would not be appropriate.

82% of voters disagreed with the inclusion of the suggested criterion; therefore, it was rejected.

Should not be primarily accounted for by an extrinsic carcinogen/environmental toxin/infectious agent/injury

It was agreed not to exclude pathologies, diseases or syndromes that are primarily accounted for by an extrinsic carcinogen, environmental toxin, infectious agent or injury. This criterion was rejected by 77% of voters on the basis that it is simply not possible to discount the impact of extrinsic or environmental influences on the pathogenesis of many ageing-related pathologies. However, it is acknowledged that there may be specific pathologies, diseases or syndromes that could be excluded by the working groups. For example, the cardiovascular group may decide to include cardiac valve insufficiency as a general ageing-related disease but may exclude insufficiency directly caused by rheumatic fever or acute bacterial endocarditis.

Frailty

During the Consensus Meeting, there were lengthy discussions surrounding the concept of frailty and whether it should be included, in some way, as a criterion. The term frailty generated debate partly because there are different definitions of frailty, “Frailty is a distinctive health state related to the ageing process in which multiple body systems gradually

lose their in-built reserves” (British Geriatric Society) [8] or “Frailty is a state of increased vulnerability to poor resolution of homeostasis following a stress event, which increases the risk of adverse outcomes including falls, delirium and disability” (Clegg et al.) [9]. Furthermore, different tools are used to measure frailty, for example the Edmonton Frail Scale (EFS) [10] or the Rockwood Clinical Frailty Scale [11] and there is currently no one agreed operational definition.

Frailty is typically accepted as being a syndrome that results in a decreased ability to cope with a stressor [12], and this effectively has been captured in Criterion 2: “Should be associated with, or contribute to, functional decline or an increased susceptibility to functional decline”. In addition to this, not all ageing-related pathologies increase the risk of frailty or are associated with frailty. Therefore, a frailty-based criterion was not accepted.

Only 59 consortium members supported the inclusion of a criterion such as “Should be associated with an increased rate of mortality or frailty” (54 votes) or “Should be associated with an increased risk of frailty” (5 votes).

Conclusions and future research

The accepted criteria for an ageing-related pathology, disease or syndrome have now been determined and will be used by the ICCARP as the basis for all future classification work. It is important to highlight that the accepted criteria refer to biological and physiological ageing. This project seeks to identify, define and classify pathologies characterised by specific potentially quantifiable changes within cells, tissues and organs, with the acknowledgement that such changes may have a mosaic distribution. The criteria will be re-evaluated in the future to ensure they are still valid in the context of any new research findings.

The next stage of the project is to identify all pathologies that meet the above criteria and to develop proposals for grouping and naming such entities as part of a comprehensive classification system of ageing-related pathologies. This will be done by the system-specific working groups, whilst recognising that there will be several overarching cross-discipline themes that will impact all body systems.

Once the classification phase of the project is complete, this will be followed by defining the criteria for the staging parameters and biomarkers, and to identify these, where possible, for the classified entities. It is recognised that, currently, there may not be clinically validated methods for quantifying many of the pathologies that are classified, and even if there are methods of quantification, there may not be the evidence to determine how severity of a pathology correlates with clinical outcomes. However, it is hoped that, where possible, a systematic approach to identifying and defining biomarkers and staging parameters, for ageing-related pathologies will enable more precise and tailored interventions for ageing populations. Ultimately, such advancements are expected to enhance quality of life and extend health span, demonstrating significant personal, societal, economic and healthcare benefits.

Acknowledgements International Consortium for the Classification of Ageing-Related Pathologies (all listed members are paper co-authors):

Professor Ian M. Adcock,³ Professor Bilal Al-Sarireh², Professor Ann Ager⁴, Professor Ramzi Ajjan⁵, Dr Naveed Akbar⁶, Professor Michael A. Akeroyd⁷, Dr Ghada Alsaleh⁶, Dr Ghada Al-Sharbatee⁸, Dr Kambiz Alavian³, Mr Winfried Amoaku⁷, Professor Julie Andersen⁹, Professor Chrystalina Antoniadis⁶, Professor Mark J. Arends¹⁰, Professor Sue Astley¹¹, Dr Denize Atan¹², Professor Richard Attanoos¹³, Professor Johannes Attems¹⁴, Professor Steve Bain¹⁵, Professor Konstantinos Balaskas^{16, 17}, Dr Gabriel Balmus^{18, 19}, Professor Manohar Bance¹⁸, Dr Thomas M. Barber^{20, 21}, Dr Ajoy Bardhan²², Professor Karen Barker⁶, Professor Peter Barnes³, Dr Gemma Basatemur¹⁸, Professor Adrian Bateman²³, Professor Moises Evandro Bauer²⁴, Dr Christopher Bellamy¹⁰, Professor Edwin van Beek¹⁰, Professor Ilaria Bellantuono²⁵, Dr Emyr Benbow¹¹, Professor Sunil Bhandari^{26, 27}, Dr Rahul Bhatnagar^{12, 28, 29}, Professor Philip Bloom³, Professor Dawn Bowdish³⁰, Dr Melissa Bowerman^{31, 32}, Dr Melanie Burke⁵, Professor Roxana Carare²³, Dr Emma Victoria Carrington³, Dr Jorge Iván Castillo-Quan³³, Professor Peter Clegg³⁴, Professor James Cole¹⁷, Dr Carlo Cota³⁵, Professor Paul Chazot³⁶, Professor Christopher Chen³⁷, Professor Ying Cheong²³, Dr Gary Christopher¹⁵, Professor George Church³³, Dr David Clancy³⁸, Professor Paul Cool³¹, Professor Del Galdo³, Dr Mayank Dalakoti³⁹, Professor Soumit Dasgupta^{34, 40}, Dr Colleen Deane²³, Dr Devesh Dhasmana⁴¹, Professor Stefan Dojcinov^{2, 15}, Dr Monia Di Prete⁴², Dr Huaidong Du⁶, Dr Niharika A Duggal²², Dr Toby Ellmers³, Professor Costanza Emanuelli³, Professor Mark Emberton¹⁷, Professor Jorge D. Erusalimsky¹, Professor Laurence Feldmeyer⁴³, Dr Alexander Fleming⁴⁴, Dr Karen Forbes⁵, Dr Thomas C. Foster⁴⁵, Dr Daniela Frasca⁴⁶, Dr Ian Frayling⁴, Dr Daniel Freedman⁴⁷, Professor Tamas Fülöp⁴⁸, Professor Georgina Ellison-Hughes⁴⁹, Professor Gus Gazzard^{17, 50}, Professor Christopher George¹⁵, Professor Jesus Gil^{3, 51}, Professor Richard Glassock⁵², Professor Rob Goldin³, Dr John Green⁴

- ¹³, Professor Robyn Guymer⁵³, Dr Hasan Haboubi^{13, 15}, Professor Lorna Harries⁵⁴, Professor Simon Hart²⁷, Professor Douglas Hartley⁷, Mr Sebi Hasaballa, Dr Christin Henein^{16, 17, 55}, Dr Maggie Helliwell, Dr Emily Henderson¹², Professor Rakesh Heer³, Dr Kristofer Holte⁵⁶, Professor Iskander Idris⁷, Professor David Isenburg¹⁷, Dr Juulia Jylhävä^{57, 58}, Dr Ahmed Iqbal²⁵, Professor Simon W. Jones²², Professor Rajesh Kalaria¹⁴, Professor Venkateswarlu Kanamarlapudi¹⁵, Professor Werner Kempf⁵⁹, Dr Alexandra J. Kermack⁶⁰, Dr Jemma Kerns³⁸, Dr Albert Koulman¹⁸, Dr Adnan H. Khan^{23, 61}, Mr James Kinross³, Dr Katarina Klaucaane⁶², Dr Yamini Krishna^{34, 63}, Professor Harinderjit Singh Gill⁶⁴, Dr Edward Lakatta⁶⁵, Professor Ezio Laconi⁶⁶, Dr Alpar Lazar⁶⁷, Professor Christian Leeuwenburgh⁴⁵, Dr Samantha Leung⁶⁸, Dr Xuan Li¹⁸, Dr Ian van der Linde⁶⁹, Professor Luísa V. Lopes⁷⁰, Professor Antonello Lorenzini, Professor Andrew Lotery²³, Professor Pedro Machado¹⁷, Dr Sarah Mackie^{5, 71}, Professor Paolo Madeddu¹², Professor Andrea Maier⁷², Dr Krishna Mukkanna¹³, Dr Pinelopi Manousou^{3, 73}, Oonagh Markey⁷⁴, Professor Claudio Mauro²², Professor Barry McDonnell¹, Professor Reinhold J. Medina³⁴, Dr Soma Meran⁴, Dr Claudia Metzler-Baddeley⁴, Professor Ignor Meglinski⁷⁵, Dr Neta Milman⁷⁶, Professor Dr Christina Mitteldorf⁷⁷, Professor Ruth Montgomery⁷⁸, Dr Andrew Conway Morris¹⁸, Dr Beda Mühleisen⁷⁹, Dr Abhik Mukherjee⁷, Professor Andrew Murray¹⁸, Professor Scott Nelson⁸⁰, Professor Anna Nicolaou¹¹, Dr Alexander Nirenberg⁸¹, Professor Simon Noble⁴, Dr Lisa S. Nolan⁴⁹, Dr Meritxell Nus¹⁸, Dr Canh Van On, Dr Victor Osei-Lah⁸², Professor Mandy Peffers³⁴, Mr Antony Palmer⁶, Dr Donald Palmer⁸³, Dr Laura Palmer¹², Professor William Parry-Smith³¹, Professor Graham Pawelec^{84, 85}, Dr Shahaf Peleg⁸⁶, Dr Ranmith Perera⁸⁷, Professor Andrew Pitsillides⁸³, Professor Christopher J. Plack^{11, 38}, Dr Franze Progatzyk⁶, Dr. Sonja Pyott⁴⁹, Dr Kaukab Rajput⁸⁸, Dr Sameera Rashid⁸⁹, Dr J. Arjuna Ratnayaka²³, Dr Sudhira A.B. Ratnayake^{34, 40}, Professor Manuel Rodriguez-Justo¹⁷, Professor Arianna Carolina Rosa⁹⁰, Professor Andrew Rule⁹¹, Professor Gareth J. Sanger⁹², Professor Ian Sayers⁷, Professor Andrew Saykin⁹³, Dr Dinesh Selvarajah²⁵, Professor Jaswinder Sethi²³, Professor Cathy Shanahan⁴⁹, Professor Shai Shen-Orr⁷⁶, Dr Carl Sheridan³⁴, Professor Paul Shiels⁸⁰, Dr Kastytis Sidlauskas⁹², Prof Sobha Sivaprasad¹⁶, Professor Judith Sluimer^{10, 94, 95}, Professor Gary Small⁹⁶, Professor Peter Smith²³, Dr Rebecca Smith³, Dr Sarah Snelling⁶, Professor Ioakim Spyridopoulos¹⁴, Dr. Ramasamy Srinivasa Raghavan⁹⁷, Professor David Steel^{14, 98}, Professor Karen P Steel⁴⁹, Professor Claire Stewart⁹⁹, Dr Keeron Stone^{1, 100}, Dr Selvarani Subbarayan¹⁰¹, Professor Mark Sussman¹⁰², Dr Jonas Svensson⁵⁷, Dr Vyshnavi Tadanki, Dr Ai Lyn Tan^{5, 71}, Professor Rudolph E. Tanzi^{33, 103}, Dr Amanda Tatler⁷, Dr Adriana A. S. Tavares¹⁰, Dr Tengku Amatullah Madeehah Tengku Mohd¹⁰⁴, Dr Ana Tiganescu⁵, Dr James Timmons⁹², Professor Jeremy Tree¹⁵, Dr Drupad Trivedi¹¹, Professor Emmanuel A. Tsochatzis¹⁷, Dr Dialehti Tsimpida²³, Dr Elisabeth J Vinke¹⁰⁵, Professor Anna Whittaker¹⁰⁶, Dr Neeru A. Vallabh³⁴, Dr Kristin Veighey²³, Dr Zoe C. Venables^{107, 108}, Dr Reddy Venkat¹⁷, Professor Meike W. Vernooij¹⁰⁵, Dr Chris Verschoor⁸⁵, Dr Manlio Vinciguerra^{99, 109}, Dr Vesna Vukanovic¹⁵, Professor Vladyslav Vyazovskiy⁶, Professor James Walker⁵, Dr Richard Wakefield⁵, Dr Adam J. Watkins⁷, Dr Anthony Webster⁶, Dr Caroline Weight³⁸, Professor Birgit Weinberger¹¹⁰, Professor Susan L. Whitney¹¹¹, Dr Rosalind Willis²³, Professor Jacek M. Witkowski¹¹², Dr Leonard L.L. Yeo³⁷, Professor Tham Yhi Chung³⁷, Dr Emma Yu¹⁸, Professor Michael Zemel¹¹³
1. Cardiff Metropolitan University, UK
 2. Swansea Bay University Health Board, UK
 3. Imperial College, UK
 4. Cardiff University, UK
 5. University of Leeds, UK
 6. Oxford University, UK
 7. University of Nottingham, UK
 8. Wessex Deanery, UK
 9. Buck Institute for Research on Ageing, California, USA
 10. University of Edinburgh, UK
 11. University of Manchester, UK
 12. University of Bristol, UK
 13. Cardiff and Vale University Health Board, UK
 14. Newcastle University, UK
 15. Swansea University, UK
 16. Moorfields Eye Hospital, UK
 17. University College London, UK
 18. University of Cambridge, UK
 19. Transylvanian Institute of Neuroscience, Cluj-Napoca, Romania
 20. Warwick University, UK
 21. University Hospitals Coventry and Warwickshire NHS Trust, UK
 22. University of Birmingham, UK
 23. University of Southampton, UK
 24. Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil
 25. University of Sheffield, UK
 26. Hull University Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, UK
 27. Hull York Medical School, UK
 28. North Bristol NHS Trust
 29. University of Southern Denmark, Denmark
 30. McMaster University, Canada
 31. Keele University, UK
 32. Robert Jones and Agnes Hunt Orthopaedic Hospital, Oswestry, UK
 33. Harvard Medical School, USA
 34. University of Liverpool, UK
 35. San Gallicano Dermatological Institute, Rome
 36. Durham University, UK
 37. National University of Singapore, Singapore
 38. Lancaster University, UK
 39. National University Heart Centre, Singapore
 40. Alder Hey Children's Hospital, UK
 41. St Andrew's University, UK
 42. San Gallicano Dermatological Institute, Rome, UK
 43. Bern University Hospital, Switzerland
 44. Kinexum, USA
 45. University of Florida, USA
 46. University of Miami Miller School of Medicine, USA
 47. Surrey and Sussex NHS Trust, UK
 48. University of Sherbrooke, Canada
 49. Kings College London, UK
 50. NIHR Biomedical Research Centre, UK
 51. MRC Laboratory of Medical Sciences, UK
 52. Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA, USA
 53. Centre for Eye Research Australia, University of Melbourne, Australia
 54. University of Exeter, UK

55. National Institute for Health Research Biomedical Research Centre for Ophthalmology, UK
56. Royal Victoria Hospital, Belfast, UK
57. Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden
58. University of Tampere, Tampere, Finland
59. University Hospital Zurich, Switzerland
60. University of Surrey, UK
61. The University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, USA
62. St Thomas's Hospital, London, UK
63. Liverpool University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, UK
64. University of Bath, UK
65. National Institute on Aging, NIH, USA
66. Università di Cagliari, Italy
67. University of East Anglia, UK
68. Lagan Valley Hospital, UK
69. Anglia Ruskin University, UK
70. Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal
71. Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, UK
72. University of Amsterdam, Netherlands
73. Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, UK
74. Loughborough University, UK
75. Aston University, UK
76. Technion Israel Institute of Technology, Israel
77. University Medical Center Goettingen, Germany
78. Yale School of Medicine, USA
79. University of Basel, Switzerland
80. University of Glasgow, UK
81. Australasian College of Cutaneous Oncology, Docklands, Victoria, Australia
82. Portsmouth Hospitals University NHS Trust, UK
83. Royal Veterinary College, UK
84. University of Tübingen, Germany
85. Health Sciences North Research Institute, Sudbury, ON, Canada
86. FBN Dummerstorf, Germany
87. Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, UK
88. Great Ormond Street Hospital, UK
89. The Christie NHS Foundation, UK
90. University of Turin, Italy
91. Mayo Clinic, USA
92. Queen Mary University of London, UK
93. Indiana University School of Medicine, USA
94. Maastricht University Medical Center, Maastricht, The Netherlands
95. RWTH Aachen University, Medical Faculty, Aachen, Germany
96. Hackensack Meridian School of Medicine, USA
97. Royal Surrey NHS Foundation Trust, UK
98. Sunderland Eye Infirmary, UK
99. Liverpool John Moores University, UK
100. National Cardiovascular Research network, Wales, UK
101. University of Aberdeen, UK
102. San Diego State University, USA
103. Massachusetts General Hospital, USA
104. Universiti Sains Islam, Malaysia
105. Erasmus MC University Medical Centre Rotterdam, Netherlands
106. University of Stirling, UK
107. Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital, UK
108. Norwich Medical School, UK
109. Medical University of Varna, Varna, Bulgaria
110. Universität Innsbruck, Institute for Biomedical Ageing Research, Austria
111. University of Pittsburgh, USA
112. Medical University of Gdańsk, Poland
113. University of Tennessee, Kinexum, Harpers Ferry, West Virginia, USA
114. Shriners Children's, Boston, MA, USA

Funding This project was supported by a Longevity Impetus Grant from Norn Group.

Declarations

Conflict of interest ACM sits on the scientific advisory board of Cambridge Infection Diagnostics and has received speaking fees from Biomerieux, Fischer and Paykel, Thermo Fisher and Boston Scientific. AAST declares submission of two patent applications (PCT/EP2019/066546 and PG450503GB/YR), one of which is currently being explored with Life Molecular Imaging. AAST has an active collaboration with Unilever. AAST is a recipient of a Wellcome Trust Technology Development Award (221295/Z/20/Z) focused on understanding synaptic changes over the course of a lifespan; and a CZI grant DAF2021-225273 and grant <https://doi.org/10.37921/690910twdfoo> from the Chan Zuckerberg Initiative DAF, an advised fund of Silicon Valley Community Foundation (funder <https://doi.org/10.13039/100014989>). AL has received financial support from Amgen, Apellis, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Eyebio, Outlook Therapeutics, Kriya and Roche. AN has received research grants from the BBSRC, BHF, Boots plc, SkinBioTherapeutics, Unilever, AstraZeneca and Waters, and provided consultancy for Intercos. AS receives support from multiple NIH grants (P30 AG010133, P30 AG072976, R01 AG019771, R01 AG057739, U19 AG024904, R01 LM013463, R01 AG068193, T32 AG071444, U01 AG068057, U01 AG072177 and U19 AG074879). He has also received support from Avid Radiopharmaceuticals, a subsidiary of Eli Lilly (in kind contribution of PET tracer precursor) and participated in Scientific Advisory Boards (Bayer Oncology, Eisai, Novo Nordisk and Siemens Medical Solutions USA, Inc) and an Observational Study Monitoring Board (MESA, NIH NHLBI), as well as External Advisory Committees for multiple NIA grants. He also serves as Editor-in-Chief of Brain Imaging and Behavior, a Springer-Nature Journal. BLB sits on the scientific advisory board of Five Alarm Bio Ltd. Cambridge, UK. EJRVB is advisory board member of DeepHealth, a member of the steering committee of an Astra Zeneca sponsored study (PINPOINT) and owner of QCTIS Ltd (a Radiology consulting company). GB is the founder, director and CEO of Function RX Ltd. GP has acted as a consultant for Novartis, Roche, Pfizer, GlaxoSmithKline, Immatics and Astellas. He is a member of the Scientific Advisory Boards of Repair Biotechnologies, Inc., ImmuneAGE Bio, Inc., MoglingBio, Inc., SENS Foundation, Alpine Institute of Zurich, XPRIZE Health span. He owns equity in ImmuneAGE Bio, Inc. HSG (Harinderjit Singh Gill) has acted as a consultant for Smith & Nephew and Invibio. JG has acted as a consultant for Unity Biotechnology, Geras Bio, Myricx Pharma and Merck KGaA. Pfizer and Unity Biotechnology have funded research in JG's lab (unrelated to the work presented here). JG owns equity in Geras Bio. JG is a named inventor in MRC

and Imperial College patents, both related to senolytic therapies. LH is the founder, director and CSO of SENISCA Ltd. PB has received research funding and/or one-off payments for advisory boards and/or speaker honoraria from: Iridex, Glaukos & BVI (EndoOptiks). PMM has received consulting/speaker's fees from Abbvie, BMS, Celgene, Eli Lilly, Galapagos, Janssen, MSD, Novartis, Orphazyme, Pfizer, Roche and UCB, all unrelated to this manuscript, and is supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), University College London Hospitals (UCLH) and Biomedical Research Centre (BRC). RAA reports institutional research grants, honoraria, education support or consulting fees from Abbott Diabetes Care, AstraZeneca, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Eli Lilly, GlaxoSmithKline, Menarini Pharmaceuticals, Merck Sharp & Dohme and Novo Nordisk. RG sits on advisory boards of Roche, Genentech, Belite Bio, AbbVie, Apellis, Astellas, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Ocular Therapeutix, Complement therapeutics, Character Bioscience. SLM has provided consultancy on behalf of her institution for Roche/Chugai, Sanofi, AbbVie, AstraZeneca, Pfizer; investigator on clinical trials for Sanofi, GSK, Sparrow; speaking/lecturing on behalf of her institution for Roche/Chugai, Vifor, Pfizer, UCB, Novartis, Fresenius Kabi and AbbVie; chief investigator on STERLING-PMR trial, funded by NIHR; patron of the charity PMRGCAuk. No personal remuneration was received for any of the above activities. Support from Roche/Chugai to attend EULAR2019 in person and from Pfizer to attend ACR Convergence 2021 virtually. SLM is supported in part by the NIHR Leeds Biomedical Research Centre (NIHR203331). The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NIHR, the NIHR Leeds Biomedical Research Centre, the National Health Service or the UK Department of Health and Social Care. SS (Sobha Sivaprasad) has received financial support from AbbVie, Amgen, Apellis, Astellas, Bayer, Biogen, Boehringer Ingelheim, Eyebiotech, Eyepoint Pharmaceuticals, Iveric Bio, Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Nova Nordisk, Optos, Ocular Therapeutix, Kriya Therapeutics, Ocutech, Roche, Stealth Biotherapeutics and Sanofi. SSO holds is a consultant and holds equity in CytoReason. WA Consultancies/Advisory Board Memberships: Abbvie, Allergan, Alimera, Bayer, Novartis, Roche. Educational travel grants from Abbvie, Allergan, Alimera, Bayer, Novartis, Roche. Research grants from Allergan, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bayer.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

References

1. Ageing and Health. 2022. Available online: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ageing-and-health>. Accessed 29 Apr 2024.
2. ICD11. Available online: <https://icd.who.int/en>. Accessed 29 Apr 2024.
3. Calimport SRG, Bentley BL. Aging classified as a cause of disease in ICD-11. *Rejuvenation Res.* 2019;22(4):281. <https://doi.org/10.1089/rej.2019.2242>.
4. Khaltourina D, Matveyev Y, Alekseev A, Cortese F, Ioviță A. Aging fits the disease criteria of the International Classification of Diseases. *Mech Ageing Dev.* 2020;189:111230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mad.2020.111230>.
5. Calimport SRG, Bentley BL, Stewart CE, Pawelec G, Scuteri A, Vinciguerra M, Slack C, Chen D, Harries LW, Marchant G, Fleming GA, Conboy M, Antebi A, Small GW, Gil J, Lakatta EG, Richardson A, Rosen C, Nikolich K, Wyss-Coray T, Steinman L, Montine T, de Magalhães JP, Campisi J, Church G. To help aging populations, classify organismal senescence. *Science.* 2019;366(6465):576–8. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aay7319>.
6. Lawrence JM, Divers J, Isom S, Saydah S, Imperatore G, Pihoker C, Marcovina SM, Mayer-Davis EJ, Hamman RF, Dolan L, Dabelea D, Pettitt DJ, Liese AD, SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study Group. Trends in prevalence of type 1 and type 2 diabetes in children and adolescents in the US, 2001–2017. *JAMA.* 2021;326(8):717–27. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2021.11165>. (Erratum in: *JAMA.* 2021 Oct 5;326(13):1331).
7. Jaiswal S, Ebert BL. Clonal hematopoiesis in human aging and disease. *Science.* 2019;366(6465):eaan4673. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aan4673>.
8. Turner G. Introduction to frailty. Fit for frailty part 1. 2014. Available online: <https://www.bgs.org.uk/resources/introduction-to-frailty>. Accessed 29 Apr 2024.
9. Clegg A, Young J, Iliffe S, Rikkert MO, Rockwood K. Frailty in elderly people. *Lancet.* 2013;381(9868):752–62. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(12\)62167-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)62167-9). (Erratum in: *Lancet.* 2013 Oct 19;382(9901):1328).
10. The Edmonton Frail Scale. Available online: <https://edmontonfrailscale.org>. Accessed 29 Apr 2024.
11. Moorhouse P, Rockwood K. Frailty and its quantitative clinical evaluation. *J R Coll Physicians Edinb.* 2012;42(4):333–40. <https://doi.org/10.4997/JRCPE.2012.412>.
12. Xue QL. The frailty syndrome: definition and natural history. *Clin Geriatr Med.* 2011;27(1):1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cger.2010.08.009>.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.