

# Measuring and modeling interventions in aging

Nicholas Stroustrup<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Centre for Genomic Regulation (CRG)  
The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology  
Dr. Aiguader 88, Barcelona 08003, Spain*

<sup>b</sup>*Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF), Barcelona, Spain*

---

## Abstract

At the physiological level, aging is neither rigid nor unchangeable. Instead, the molecular and mechanisms driving aging are sufficiently plastic that a variety of diverse interventions—dietary, pharmaceutical, and genetic—have been developed to radically manipulate aging. These interventions, shown to increase the health and lifespan of laboratory animals, are now being explored for therapeutic applications in humans.

This clinical potential makes it especially important to understand how, quantitatively, aging is altered by lifespan-extending interventions. Do interventions delay the onset of aging? Slow it down? Ameliorate only its symptoms? Perhaps some interventions will alter only a subset of aging mechanisms, leading to complex and unintuitive systemic outcomes. Statistical and analytic models provide a crucial framework in which to interpret the physiological responses to interventions in aging.

This review covers a range of quantitative models of lifespan data and places them in the context of recent experimental work. The careful application of these models can help experimentalists move beyond merely identifying statistically significant differences in lifespan, to instead use lifespan data as a versatile means for probing the underlying physiological dynamics of aging.


- 
- Death involves the final collapse of vital physiological networks, and the timing of this collapse provides a systems-level measure of aging.
  - Many useful models of lifespan data common in the clinical literature are rarely used in basic research studies of aging.
  - Many familiar models, like the Gompertz parametric model, are accurate only when empiric data conforms to specific geometric patterns, which is often not the case.
  - Semi-parametric models allow interventions in aging to be tested with fewer assumptions about the empiric data.
  - Frailty models extend parametric and semi-parametric approaches to more accurately account for unmeasured heterogeneity.
  - Competing risk models and mixture models provide a formal framework for studying complex aging processes.

---

*Email address:* [nstroustrup@post.harvard.edu](mailto:nstroustrup@post.harvard.edu) (Nicholas Stroustrup)

Douglas Adams once said that “There is an art to flying, or rather a knack. The knack lies in learning how to throw yourself at the ground and miss.” Immortality requires learning a similar knack: you must first be born and then subsequently avoid dying forever. This is challenging in part because there are many different causes of death to avoid—accidents, infections, cancer, heart disease, neurodegenerative disorders—and because our bodies slowly change in ways that make most of these causes of death increasingly probable (Fig. 1). As the risks of occurrence for different diseases increase, their contributions add up to produce a doubling in all-cause mortality risk approximately every eight years [1]. The physiological changes producing these increases in disease-specific mortality risk remain uncertain, motivating intense research into the molecular, cellular, and systems biology of aging.

The mathematics governing increases in the risk of death are non-trivial and can appear obscure or arcane to experimental biologists who may lack formal training in probability theory and statistics. Yet a general understanding of the models used to analyze lifespan data are nevertheless important for molecular, cell, and systems biologists. In a clinical context, the mathematics and statistical models of lifespan highlight the many challenges ahead for lifespan-extending therapeutics—reducing the risk of death one or a small number of causes of death generally yields only a small effect on lifespan. For example, it is estimated that curing all cancers would produce less than a five percent extension of average lifespan—less than four years [2]. The reason for this is intuitive—elderly patients, cured of a particular disease, remain highly likely to succumb to any of multiple other diseases, and so live (on average) only a little longer—but the statistics are nearly impenetrable for non-specialists. In the laboratory, much of the molecular and cell biologic work today remains focused on mechanisms whose involvement in aging was at least initially justified by those mechanisms’ effect on lifespan. Experimental researchers need to be critical judges of this evidence.



**Figure 1: Systems-level measurement of complex physiological processes.** The risk of death from the seven most frequent causes of non-accidental death is shown, corresponding to 70% of all deaths reported in the USA in 2015 [1]. Cause-specific risks (*colored lines*) sum up to produce the all-causes hazard function (*black*). Each cause exhibits distinctive age-dependent effects, though substantial correlations exist among the causes.

## 1. Describing aging using hazard and survival functions

Most analysis of lifespan data are grounded in study of two related mathematical functions—the survival curve and the hazard function. The hazard function provides an intuitive measure of the risk of death—the probability that typical individual who is currently alive will soon die. This probability is much higher in older individuals compared to younger ones, usually interpreted as evidence of some physiological weakness or susceptibility to death shared among old individuals not present in the young. The rate of increase in this risk of death can be used as a quantitative measure of some underlying “rate of aging”. In the last forty years, it has become very clear that this increase does not emerge from some universal natural law. The shape of hazard functions is a product of evolutionary forces and varies enormously between species [3]. In fact, a mammal, the naked mole rat, has recently been shown to exhibit a nearly constant hazard function [4]. Formally, the hazard function is defined as a conditional probability,  $h(t) = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} P(t < T \leq t + \Delta t | T > t)$  and is often estimated and plotted as the rate  $h(t) = P(t < T \leq t + \Delta t) / P(T > t)$ .

The survival curve is a distinct function that, intuitively, describes the fraction of a population remaining alive over time. At the start of an observational period, this fraction is by definition 1, and the fraction drops each time an individual dies. The survival function is formally defined as the cumulative probability of remaining life,  $S(t) = P(T > t)$ . This cumulative probability of remaining alive risk of death obviously must be related to the risk of death at any time, and they are via the relation  $S(t) = \exp(-\int_0^t h(\tau) d\tau)$ . In this way, though the hazard function often provides a clearer visualization of patterns in mortality, any model of lifespan data can be equivalently stated in terms of the survival function.

## 2. Identifying changes in lifespan with non-parametric methods

Often, the analysis of lifespan data consists solely of the application of a non-parametric test, used to identify statistically significant changes in lifespan, Common methods including the log-rank, Wilcoxon, and the modified Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) tests, all of which ask whether two populations lifespan correspond to the same underlying survival and hazard function. These tests make relatively few assumptions on statistical properties of the underlying lifespan data, and so have remained in continuous use for decades without substantial modification. However, the lack of assumptions lead to a lack of interpretability—most non-parametric tests can show that lifespan has been altered, but not how it has been altered. Recently, non-parametric approaches have been developed to distinguish changes in mean lifespan from changes in the variation in lifespan, as part of a pace-shape framework [5].

## 3. Modeling the hazard function with parametric models

Parametric models go beyond non-parametric models by positing that lifespan data can be accurately described by simple mathematic functions with a small number of free parameters. In data where this assumption holds, parametric functions allow researchers to describe complex data sets according a small number of parameters, providing straightforward geometric interpretations of how interventions effect lifespan. For example, the commonly used Gompertz model assumes that populations exhibit hazard functions that increases exponentially over time (Fig. 2 a-d), following a straight line on a log-linear plot. This model has been shown to provide an adequate approximation for to some human populations [6, 7] as well as some invertebrate populations [8, 9]. Yet, the shape of hazard functions vary enormously between species [3] and despite its popularity, the Gompertz model is frequently out-performed by several other parametric forms. These include the Weibull model, that assumes a polynomial increase in the risk of death over time (Fig. 2 e-f) and also provides good fits for various non-living systems [10], as well as the inverse-Gaussian model (Fig. 2 g-h) which has a compelling theoretic grounding in the statistical physics governing Brownian motion [11, 12]. Other

parametric alternatives include Gompertz-makeham, log-logistic, and log-normal models. Parameter estimates can be obtained by a variety of methods [13, 14], with maximum-likelihood estimation approaches [15] almost always producing the most accurate results.


Many different explanations have been proposed as to why physiological aging processes might yield particular parametric forms of mortality data. The more quantitative of these theories draw on a mix of reliability theory [16], complex networks theory [17], and statistical physics [18], and this area remains a topic of active research. One interpretation shared among most parameterizations involves a single timescale or rate parameter that uniquely governs the time-dependent increase of the hazard functions for example the Gompertz  $b$  parameter, the Weibull  $\beta$  parameter, and the Inverse Gaussian  $\lambda$  parameter. These timescale parameters are used to quantify a population’s “rate of aging, a measure of some average speed at which philologically young individuals change into old individuals. This rate of aging is then distinguished from other model parameters that describe aspects of aging distinct from essential rate, allowing interventions to be qualitatively categorized according to their distinct effects on different parameters [19, 20, 9, 21], [22]•. Most of the common parametric models can be viewed as differing first in the interpretation of their non-timescale parameter and second in the quality of their approximation of empirical data. The major limitation to parametric methods is that for most data sets, there does not exist a single unambiguously best parameterization for the underlying empirical data. In cases where different parameterizations can equally well approximate empirical data, the different parameterizations provide multiple, discordant interpretations of the same underlying data. The most common reason for this are later in the frailty section.

#### 4. Modeling changes in lifespan with semi-parametric methods


Semi-parametric models improve on parametric approaches by eliminating the necessity of picking one simple mathematical function to represent survival and hazard functions. Semi-parametric models parameterize only the action of the intervention itself hence the name semi-parametric and thereby provide a more flexible means for making relative statements comparing two populations. Theory would predict that semi-parametric methods require larger population sizes compared to parametric methods to achieve the same statistical power and significance. However these costs are often minor concerns [23] compared to the broader issues of empirical suitability inherent in fully parametric approaches.

The two most common families of semi-parametric models are Proportional Hazards (PH) models and Accelerated Failure Time (AFT) models. Proportional hazards models assume interventions alter the hazard function to produce a time-independent proportional increase or decrease in the risk of death. In practice, this means that PH models assume that an intervention will produce a vertical shift of the hazard function when plotted on log-linear axes, just as a change in the Gompertz  $a$  or the Weibull  $\beta$  parameter does. (Fig. 3 a-b). PH models are formally defined by the relation  $h_1(t) = \lambda h_0(t)$ , where  $h_1(t)$  is the hazard function of a population exposed to some intervention with  $h_0(t)$  as the control group. PH models are widely used in clinical research and therefore a deep literature exists exploring their behavior in diverse contexts [24, 25]. Multivariate statistical methods based on PH, for example Cox regression, have been developed to allow researchers to evaluate the combined influence of multiple influencers of lifespan simultaneously, including one or more interventions, environmental factors that may vary between groups, and potential differences between experimental replicates [26]•. PH models often provide good approximations of empirical data [27], [28]•[22]•, and a variety of approaches exist to identify and compensate for deviations from proportional hazards, including segmenting time or allowing continuously time-varying hazard ratios [29]. These compensations all increase the population sizes necessary to identify statistically significant effects. Additive hazards (AH) models, assuming  $h_1(t) = \Delta h + h_0(t)$  have also been suggested [30].

Accelerated failure time models, in contrast to PH models, assume interventions produce a temporal rescaling of aging, stretching or compressing survival curves such that  $S_1(t) = S_0(\lambda t)$  (Fig. 3



**Figure 2: Parametric models of lifespan data.** Various simple functions have been proposed to approximate empiric lifespan data, shown as models of survival functions (*left*) and (*right*) hazard functions. Median lifespan is marked as a single point on each corresponding curve. Geometric regularities in the influence of various parameters are marked with gray arrows. **a-b.** The Gompertz distribution is commonly employed with the parameter  $a$  that determines the risk of death in animals of zero age and  $b$  that determines the rate of increase in risk over time. **c-d.** The alternate parameterization of the Gompertz model removes the implicit and often missed time-scale dependence of the  $a$  parameter, allowing changes in initial mortality and changes in doubling time to be isolated, and allowing the Gompertz to function to model both changes in proportional hazards and changes in timescale. **e-f.** The Weibull distribution models hazard functions that increase as a polynomial of time (as opposed to as an exponential of time as in Gompertz). Weibull hazard functions therefore form straight lines when plotted on log-log axes, rather than log-linear axes. **g-h.** Inverse Gaussian distributions exhibit inherently decelerating hazard functions, and provide a link between lifespan data to the theory of Weiner Processes and Brownian motion.



**Figure 3: Semi-parametric models of lifespan data.** Semi-parametric models model differences between populations in a way that does not depend on any particular parametric form of the survival curve of hazard function. **a-b.** Proportional hazards functions assume that two populations’ hazard functions are offset by a constant ratio. **c-d.** Accelerated Failure time models assume that two populations’ survival curves are related by a temporal scaling, corresponding to simultaneous shift of the hazard functions, up and to the right such that  $h_1(t) = \lambda h_0(\lambda t)$  **e-f.** Accelerated Failure time models are easily modified to model populations whose survival distributions are shifted (rather than scaled) in respect to time. **g-h.** The existence of heterogeneity within a population in respect to the risk of death produces a deceleration, or leveling-off of the hazard function and a corresponding long-tail of the survival function.

c-d). AFT models offer an intuitive physical interpretation, that interventions extend lifespan by decreasing the rate of the underlying physiological or cell biologic processes that determine the timing of death. This is equivalent to a change in the Gompertz  $b$  or Weibull  $\beta$  parameters. AFT regression models provide accurate approximations for lifespan-altering interventions in a variety of organisms, including yeast[31], flies [5]•, nematodes [28]•, and mice [32].

Like PH models, AFT methods function well in a multivariate context, making them particularly useful for analyzing the effects multiple interventions applied simultaneously. They provide a rigorous means for accounting for potentially confounding effects of environmental factors and differences between experimental replicates[33]. Unlike PH models, AFT models produce residual distributions that take the same time units as the death time provided, allowing residuals to subsequently be used as a time-standardized lifespan distribution for qualitative comparisons between different populations[28]•. AFT models therefore allow the rate of aging to be quantified in much the same way as parametric methods or pace-shape non-parametric methods, but in the context of multivariate generalized linear regression. In cases where interventions do not slow the aging process, but rather delay it by a fixed interval to produce a rigid shift (rather than a scaling) of the survival curve, interventions can be modeled using similar methods assuming  $S_1(t) = S_0(t - \Delta_\tau)$  (Fig. 3 e-f).

## 5. Accounting for heterogeneity within groups with frailty models

Basic parametric forms like Gompertz and Weibull are often employed with the implicit assumption that all individuals in a population age according to the same parameter set. This assumption is often difficult to prove empirically heterogeneity in respect to one or more parameters can exist, with some subpopulations aging consistently differently than others. Even within isogenic populations of laboratory animals housed in controlled laboratory conditions, individuals are found to substantial physiological variation [34, 35, 36, 37], with some subpopulations appearing to age consistently faster

than others [38] ,[39]••. Heterogeneity can also be produced when individuals respond unevenly to an intervention. Lifespan-extending interventions have been shown to produce variable response even among isogenic individuals [40] ,[41]•,[42].


The effect of the heterogeneity on the hazard and survival functions can be accurately modeled even when it cannot be explicitly measured. This is accomplished by assuming the effect of the unmeasured heterogeneity takes a simple parametric form as it varies between individuals. The effect is then incorporated in parametric or semi-parametric model and referred to as a frailty or random effect term. A simple Gompertz model, for example, can be modified to account for heterogeneity in its  $a$  parameter by adding a gamma-distributed  $Z$  random variable with a mean of 1 and an unknown variance of  $\sigma$ , such that  $h(t) = Z(\sigma)a \exp(t/b)$ [43]. In this way, parametric and semi-parametric models can be modified to account for unmeasured heterogeneity by adding an single additional parameter.

Heterogeneity of this kind produces a clear effect on hazard functions a progressive deceleration of hazard functions relative to the basic underlying parametric form[44], leading in some cases to a plateauing (flattening) of the hazard functions at advanced ages (Fig. 3 g-h). This deceleration arises as a consequence of high-frailty, high-risk subpopulations dying earlier than low-frailty, low-risk sub-populations. As the high-risk individuals die off, the remaining population increasingly consists of relatively low-risk individuals. This change in the populations' composition counteracts the increasing risk of individuals, producing to a quasi-stationary state in which the hazard rate appears flat [45]. Unmeasured heterogeneity will always cause empiric data to deviate from the parametric forms expected for homogeneous populations. This severely limits the practical application of simple two parameter Gompertz or Weibull models[44, 46, 47], [28]•. To make matters worse, most parametric models are most easily distinguished by their behavior at late ages, at the tail of the parametric probability distribution, exactly the place where heterogeneity has the greatest effect. The confounding effects of frailty therefore introduces fundamental limits to any argument that one parametric particular parametric form has greater empiric justification than any other [28]• [48].

## 6. Accounting for multiple causes of death with competing risk models

Competing risks models explore the idea that though an organism can die only once, it remains at risk of dying from multiple possible causes up until the moment that one particular cause kills it. In this way, competing risk models provide a framework for studying the complexities of aging, in which distinct molecular and cellular processes influence multiple aspects of health and aging. These models are most intuitively applied in populations in which individuals are suffering simultaneously from several potentially fatal diseases for example cancer patients with cardiovascular conditions [49]. The somewhat ghoulish interpretation is that the different causes of death are “competing to kill each individual, hence the name. Competing risk models provide a way to disentangle the effects of interventions that exert distinct influences on different causes of death. For example, Cox regression and AFT regression models can be formulated to identify and quantify the simultaneous action of an intervention on multiples risk of death, in cases where those causes are measured[50].

Two incarnations of competing risks differ in their interpretation. The most basic and common interpretation assumes that all individuals share the same risks for each causes of death. Therefore, these competing risk models describe the outcome of physiological changes experienced in the same way by all individuals in a population that nevertheless produce qualitatively heterogeneous outcomes. Alternately, competing risk models have been developed to describe situations where risks differ within populations, and most notably in cases where the risk of death from certain causes are pre-determined early in life. Such models, generally called Mixture models (Fig 4c-d), are of particular contemporary interest, as it is becoming increasingly clear that even in isogenic populations, subpopulations exist that age in distinctive ways [51]••[52, 53, 54]. Formally, competing risk models are generally applied to data in which each death time  $T$  is paired with a label  $C_i$  describing the cause of death. An intuitive decomposition of the all-cause hazard represents it as a sum of cause-specific hazard functions,  $h(t) = \sum_i h_i(t)$ ,  $= \sum \lim P(t < T + \Delta t | T > t, C = C_i)$  [25] as shown in Figures 1 and 4a-b. Notably,



**Figure 4: Modeling different types of heterogeneity.** Several techniques exist to describe heterogeneity between individuals within a population and over time during the aging process. **a-b.** Competing risk models describe the effect that multiple causes of death have on a population’s hazard function. Here, three statistically-independent causes of death exhibit different temporal dynamics. One cause emph(blue) shows a constant risk over time, another cause (*green*) increases slowly with age and a third (*red*) increases rapidly later in life. The cause-specific hazard functions of each cause sum to produce the all-cause hazard function and survival curve (*black*). **c-d.** In some cases, the cause of death of an individual may be pre-determined early in life, producing distinct subpopulations dying from distinct causes of death. Here, thirty percent of individuals die early according to one cause of death (*red*) and the remainder die according to a second cause (*blue*). In this case, the hazard functions do not strictly add. **e-f.** Survival and hazard functions can be modeled with a ”changepoint” that separates distinct phases of aging. Though geometrically compelling, the biological interpretation of segmented hazards is often problematic, as the break-point time must be uncorrelated with each individual’s death time.



the Gompertz-Makeham model is equivalent to a competing risks model with two risks, a time dependent Gompertz hazard  $h_1(t) = a \exp(bt)$  and a time independent hazard  $h_2(t) = c$  that sum to produce a population-level hazard  $h(t) = a \exp(bt) + c$ .

Competing risk models were originally developed as an analytic tool for interpreting lifespan data. However, the assumptions required to accomplish this task have proven to be particularly informative for experimental researchers attempting to understand the physiological basis of aging. Are different causes of death influenced equally by interventions in aging? Can genetically defined aging pathways be contextualized in respect to their mutual dependence or independence in influencing different causes of death? These questions can be rendered empirically testable by rephrasing them as assumptions of competing risk models. Recent work [28]• [51]••,[55]•,[56] demonstrates the promise of competing risk models to describe aging phenomena working at longer timescales, where different physiological changes throughout life interact to determine the timing of death and the shape of hazard functions and survival curves.

## 7. Describing multi-stage aging processes

The physiological changes driving aging may vary over the course of an individual's lifespan. For example, recent work has identified two phases of aging distinguished according to changes in movement and behavior, transitions in gut permeability[57]••, changes in rate of apparent morphologic changes[39]••, transcriptomic changes, [58, 59] ,[60]••, protein aggregation [61, 62],and differences in susceptibility to early-life[51] or late-life [63]•• bacterial infection. It remains an open question and active area of research as to how to best quantitatively model these phases. The physiological distinctions between some phases may not correspond to distinct phases of the hazard function, in which case no substantial changes are needed in survival analysis. In other cases, where individuals in each state have a distinctive risk of death, a class of multi-state models often called illness-death models are applicable [64].

## 8. Biphasic and segmented hazard functions

A class of models have been proposed that separate aging into distinct phases relative to some landmark specified in chronological time [65]. For example, hazard functions are separated into two time periods with a break-point or "change point" linking the two (Fig 4.e-f) [66, 67, 68]. These segmented hazard models will necessarily provide better fits than unsegmented models as they have more free parameters. However, their biological interpretation is problematic. For a hazard rate to change at a specific chronologic time, that time must be determined either by some external factor, e.g. a change in environment or diet or by some internal physiological process. In this latter case, this internal physiological process specifying the change-point must necessarily be uncorrelated with the processes that determine lifespan. Multi-phasic parametric fits of hazard functions necessarily require some individuals to die before the change-point and some afterward otherwise the change-point would not be observed. However, change-point models also require that all living individuals synchronously change in their risk of death at the change-point. This creates the apparent contradiction where timing of the change-point must have a distinct physiological basis from the timing of death, even though the change-point describes a change in the hazard function, itself a description of the timing of deaths. In most instances, the simpler and more philologically plausible interpretation is that biphasic features in lifespan distributions emerge as an epi-phenomenon emerging from the action of competing risks or the existence of distinct sub-populations. Biphasic hazard models may also simply be an over-fitting or mis-fitting of empiric data resulting from a poor choice of parametric form. For example a biphasic Gompertzian hazard function may be more simply modeled by a single inverse Gaussian distribution, or by a single Gompertzian phase incorporating an extra parameter to account for frailty effects.

## 9. Summary

Aging research is undergoing a period of rapid discovery and characterization of genetic, pharmaceutical, and dietary interventions in aging. Several of these therapies are being explored for translational potential, and lifespan data from human clinical trials may soon be available in which patients' survival is altered by molecular perturbation of basic aging processes. This growing abundance of lifespan data demands the thoughtful application of statistical methods.

For new projects, familiar analytic techniques should be re-evaluated. In particular, experimentalists should recognize that the Gompertz hazard parameterization became standard decades ago, long before the high-resolution data needed to validate it became available. Experimentalists should, as an alternative, consider frailty-corrected Gompertz distributions or semi-parametric methods like AFT or PH regression. Where parametric analyses are justified, best-practice maximum likelihood fitting methods should be employed. Finally, competing risks and mixture models should seriously be considered in situations where multiple aging processes may influence one or more outcomes in aging. Employing this broad tool set of analytic approaches, experimentalists can move beyond humble significance testing to instead use lifespan data as a versatile means for studying the physiological dynamics of aging.

## 10. Acknowledgments

I thank members of my group as well as Javier Apfeld for stimulating discussions and feedback on the manuscript. I further acknowledge the support of the Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness (MEIC) to the EMBL partnership, the Centro de Excelencia Severo Ochoa, and the CERCA Programme / Generalitat de Catalunya. This work was supported by the MEIC Excelencia award BFU2017-88615-P, and by an award from the Glenn Foundation for Medical Research.

## 11. Work Cited

### References

- [1] S. Murphy, J. Xu, K. Kochanek, S. Curtin, E. Arias, Deaths: Final Data for 2015, National Vital Statistics Reports 66 (6).
- [2] J. Mackenbach, A. Kunst, H. Lautenbach, Y. Oei, F. Bijlsma, Gains in life expectancy after elimination of major causes of death: revised estimates taking into account the effect of competing causes., *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health* 53 (1) (1999) 32–37.
- [3] O. R. Jones, A. Scheuerlein, R. Salguero-Gómez, C. G. Camarda, R. Schaible, B. B. Casper, J. P. Dahlgren, J. Ehrlén, M. B. García, E. S. Menges, et al., Diversity of ageing across the tree of life, *Nature* 505 (7482) (2014) 169.
- [4] J. G. Ruby, M. Smith, R. Buffenstein, Naked mole-rat mortality rates defy Gompertzian laws by not increasing with age, *Elife* 7 (2018) e31157.
- [5] R. C. Archer, U. Basellini, J. Hunt, S. J. Simpson, P. L. Kwang, A. Baudisch, Diet has independent effects on the pace and shape of aging, *Biogerontology* 19 (2018) 1–12.
- [6] Y. V. Pakin, S. Hrisanov, Critical analysis of the applicability of the Gompertz-Makeham law in human populations, *Gerontology* 30 (1) (1984) 8–12.
- [7] J. W. Vaupel, J. R. Carey, K. Christensen, T. E. Johnson, A. I. Yashin, N. V. Holm, I. A. Iachine, V. Kannisto, A. A. Khazaeli, P. Liedo, et al., Biodemographic trajectories of longevity, *Science* 280 (5365) (1998) 855–860.

- [8] M. Tatar, J. Carey, J. Vaupel, Long-Term Cost of Reproduction with and without Accelerated Senescence in *Callosobruchus Maculatus*: Analysis of Age-Specific Mortality., *Evolution; international journal of organic evolution* 47 (5) (1993) 1302.
- [9] W. Mair, P. Goymer, S. Pletcher, L. Partridge, Demography of dietary restriction and death in *Drosophila*., *Science* 301 (2003) 1731–1733.
- [10] H. Rinne, *The Weibull Distribution: A Handbook*, CRC Press, ISBN 9781420087444, URL <https://books.google.es/books?id=6wdcTfiLNS4C>, 2008.
- [11] J. Weitz, H. Fraser, Explaining mortality rate plateaus, *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 98 (26) (2001) 15383–15386.
- [12] O. Aalen, H. K. Gjessing, Understanding the Shape of the Hazard Rate: A Process Point of View, *Statistical Science* 16 (2001) 1–22.
- [13] A. Lenart, et al., The Gompertz distribution and maximum likelihood estimation of its parameters: a revision, *MPDIR Work Pap* 49 (2012) 0–19.
- [14] J. P. de Magalhães, L. Thompson, I. de Lima, D. Gaskill, X. Li, D. Thornton, C. Yang, D. Palmer, A reassessment of genes modulating aging in mice using demographic measurements of the rate of aging, *Genetics* 208 (4) (2018) 1617–1630.
- [15] C. Jackson, flexsurv: A Platform for Parametric Survival Modeling in R, *Journal of Statistical Software* 70 (8) (2016) 1–33.
- [16] L. Gavrilov, N. Gavrilova, The reliability theory of aging and longevity., *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 213 (4) (2001) 527–545.
- [17] D. C. Vural, G. Morrison, L. Mahadevan, Aging in complex interdependency networks, *Phys. Rev. E* 89 (2014) 022811.
- [18] B. Strehler, A. Mildvan, General Theory of Mortality and Aging, *Science* 132 (3418) (1960) 14–21.
- [19] D. Wu, J. R. Cypser, A. I. Yashin, T. E. Johnson, Multiple mild heat-shocks decrease the Gompertz component of mortality in *Caenorhabditis elegans*, *Experimental gerontology* 44 (9) (2009) 607–612.
- [20] M. E. Giannakou, M. Goss, J. Jacobson, G. Vinti, S. J. Leivers, L. Partridge, Dynamics of the action of dFOXO on adult mortality in *Drosophila*, *Aging cell* 6 (4) (2007) 429–438.
- [21] A. Samuelson, C. Carr, G. Ruvkun, Gene activities that mediate increased life span of *C. elegans* insulin-like signaling mutants, *Genes and Development* 21 (22) (2007) 2976–94.
- [22] B. G. Hughes, S. Hekimi, Different mechanisms of longevity in long-lived mouse and *Caenorhabditis elegans* mutants revealed by statistical analysis of mortality rates, *Genetics* 204 (3) (2016) 905–920.
- [23] A. F. Bokov, L. S. Manuel, A. Tirado-Ramos, J. A. Gelfond, S. D. Pletcher, Biologically relevant simulations for validating risk models under small-sample conditions, in: *Computers and Communications (ISCC), 2017 IEEE Symposium on*, IEEE, 290–295, 2017.
- [24] J. Singer, J. Willett, *Applied Longitudinal Data Analysis: Modeling Change and Event Occurrence*, Oxford University Press, Incorporated, ISBN 9780199864980, URL <https://books.google.es/books?id=sQt5oAEACAAJ>, 2003.

- [25] J. Kalbfleisch, R. Prentice, *The Statistical Analysis of Failure Time Data*, Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics, Wiley, ISBN 9781118031230, URL <https://books.google.es/books?id=BR4Kq-a1MIMC>, 2011.
- [26] M. Lucanic, W. T. Plummer, E. Chen, J. Harke, A. C. Foulger, B. Onken, A. L. Coleman-Hulbert, K. J. Dumas, S. Guo, E. Johnson, et al., Impact of genetic background and experimental reproducibility on identifying chemical compounds with robust longevity effects, *Nature communications* 8 (2017) 14256.
- [27] B. Conti, M. Sanchez-Alavez, R. Winsky-Sommerer, M. C. Morale, J. Lucero, S. Brownell, V. Fabre, S. Huitron-Resendiz, S. Henriksen, E. P. Zorrilla, et al., Transgenic mice with a reduced core body temperature have an increased life span, *Science* 314 (5800) (2006) 825–828.
- [28] N. Stroustrup, W. E. Anthony, Z. M. Nash, V. Gowda, A. Gomez, I. F. López-Moyado, J. Apfeld, W. Fontana, The temporal scaling of *Caenorhabditis elegans* ageing, *Nature* 530 (7588) (2016) 103.
- [29] Y. Hagar, J. J. Dignam, V. Dukic, Flexible modeling of the hazard rate and treatment effects in long-term survival studies, *Statistical methods in medical research* 26 (5) (2017) 2455–2480.
- [30] O. O. Aalen, Further results on the non-parametric linear regression model in survival analysis, *Statistics in medicine* 12 (17) (1993) 1569–1588.
- [31] P. Liu, M. Acar, The generational scalability of single-cell replicative aging, *Science advances* 4 (1) (2018) eaao4666.
- [32] W. Swindel, Accelerated failure time models provide a useful statistical framework for aging research, *Experimental Gerontology* 44 (2009) 190–200.
- [33] N. Stroustrup, B. Ulmschneider, Z. Nash, I. Lpez-Moyado, J. Apfeld, W. Fontana, The *Caenorhabditis elegans* Lifespan Machine, *Nature Methods* 10 (2013) 665–70.
- [34] Z. Pincus, T. C. Mazer, F. J. Slack, Autofluorescence as a measure of senescence in *C. elegans*: look to red, not blue or green, *Aging (Albany NY)* 8 (5) (2016) 889.
- [35] V. Tiku, C. Jain, Y. Raz, S. Nakamura, B. Heestand, W. Liu, M. Späth, H. E. D. Suchiman, R.-U. Müller, P. E. Slagboom, et al., Small nucleoli are a cellular hallmark of longevity, *Nature Communications* 8 (2017) 16083.
- [36] L. A. Herndon, P. J. Schmeissner, J. M. Dudaronek, P. A. Brown, K. M. Listner, Y. Sakano, M. C. Paupard, D. H. Hall, M. Driscoll, Stochastic and genetic factors influence tissue-specific decline in ageing *Caenorhabditis elegans*., *Nature* 419 (6909) (2002) 808–814.
- [37] L. Cannon, A. C. Zambon, A. Cammarato, Z. Zhang, G. Vogler, M. Munoz, E. Taylor, J. Cartry, S. I. Bernstein, S. Melov, et al., Expression patterns of cardiac aging in *Drosophila*, *Aging cell* 16 (1) (2017) 82–92.
- [38] Z. M. Harvanek, M. A. Mourao, S. Schnell, S. D. Pletcher, A computational approach to studying ageing at the individual level, *Proc. R. Soc. B* 283 (1824) (2016) 20152346.
- [39] W. B. Zhang, D. B. Sinha, W. E. Pittman, E. Hvatum, N. Stroustrup, Z. Pincus, Extended twilight among isogenic *C. elegans* causes a disproportionate scaling between lifespan and health, *Cell systems* 3 (4) (2016) 333–345.
- [40] S. L. Rea, D. Wu, J. R. Cypser, J. W. Vaupel, T. E. Johnson, A stress-sensitive reporter predicts longevity in isogenic populations of *Caenorhabditis elegans*, *Nature genetics* 37 (8) (2005) 894.

- [41] D. Bensaddek, V. Narayan, A. Nicolas, A. Brenes Murillo, A. Gartner, C. J. Kenyon, A. I. Lamond, Micro-proteomics with iterative data analysis: Proteome analysis in *C. elegans* at the single worm level, *Proteomics* 16 (3) (2016) 381–392.
- [42] A. Mendenhall, M. M. Crane, P. M. Tedesco, T. E. Johnson, R. Brent, *Caenorhabditis elegans* Genes Affecting Interindividual Variation in Life-span Biomarker Gene Expression, *Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biomedical Sciences and Medical Sciences* 72 (10) (2017) 1305–1310.
- [43] O. Aalen, Effects of frailty in survival analysis, *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* 3 (1994) 227–243.
- [44] J. W. Vaupel, K. G. Manton, E. Stallard, The impact of heterogeneity in individual frailty on the dynamics of mortality, *Demography* 16 (3) (1979) 439–454.
- [45] D. Steinsaltz, S. N. Evans, Markov mortality models: implications of quasistationarity and varying initial distributions, *Theoretical Population Biology* 65 (4) (2004) 319–337.
- [46] J. W. Vaupel, J. R. Carey, Compositional interpretations of medfly mortality, *Science* 260 (1993) 1666–1666.
- [47] O. O. Aalen, Effects of frailty in survival analysis, *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* 3 (3) (1994) 227–243.
- [48] J. Vanfleteren, A. De Vreese, B. Braeckman, Two-parameter logistic and Weibull equations provide better fits to survival data from isogenic populations of *Caenorhabditis elegans* in axenic culture than does the Gompertz model., *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 53 (1998) B393–403; discussion B404–398.
- [49] P. C. Albertsen, J. A. Hanley, D. F. Gleason, M. J. Barry, Competing risk analysis of men aged 55 to 74 years at diagnosis managed conservatively for clinically localized prostate cancer, *Jama* 280 (11) (1998) 975–980.
- [50] P. C. Austin, D. S. Lee, J. P. Fine, Introduction to the analysis of survival data in the presence of competing risks, *Circulation* 133 (6) (2016) 601–609.
- [51] Y. Zhao, A. F. Gilliat, M. Ziehm, M. Turmaine, H. Wang, M. Ezcurra, C. Yang, G. Phillips, D. McBay, W. B. Zhang, et al., Two forms of death in ageing *Caenorhabditis elegans*, *Nature communications* 8 (2017) 15458.
- [52] J. W. Vaupel, A. I. Yashin, Heterogeneity’s ruses: some surprising effects of selection on population dynamics, *The American Statistician* 39 (3) (1985) 176–185.
- [53] H. Suda, T. Shoyama, Y. Shimizu, Analyzing observed or hidden heterogeneity on survival and mortality in an isogenic *C. elegans* cohort, *Biophysics* 5 (2009) 59–66.
- [54] C. Shi, A. M. Runnels, C. T. Murphy, Mating and male pheromone kill *Caenorhabditis* males through distinct mechanisms, *elife* 6.
- [55] E. R. Galimov, R. E. Pryor, S. E. Poole, A. Benedetto, Z. Pincus, D. Gems, Coupling of rigor mortis and intestinal necrosis during *C. elegans* organismal death, *Cell reports* 22 (10) (2018) 2730–2741.
- [56] S. F. Leiser, G. Jafari, M. Primitivo, G. L. Sutphin, J. Dong, A. Leonard, M. Fletcher, M. Kaerberlein, Age-associated vulval integrity is an important marker of nematode healthspan, *Age* 38 (5-6) (2016) 419–431.

- [57] E. Dambroise, L. Monnier, L. Ruisheng, H. Aguilaniu, J.-S. Joly, H. Tricoire, M. Rera, Two phases of aging separated by the Smurf transition as a public path to death, *Scientific reports* 6 (2016) 23523.
- [58] D. M. Eckley, C. E. Coletta, N. V. Orlov, M. A. Wilson, W. Iser, P. Bastian, E. Lehrmann, Y. Zhang, K. G. Becker, I. G. Goldberg, Transcriptome States Reflect Imaging of Aging States, *The Journals of Gerontology: Series A* .
- [59] K. Jovic, M. G. Sterken, J. Grilli, R. P. Bevers, M. Rodriguez, J. A. Riksen, S. Allesina, J. E. Kammenga, L. B. Snoek, Temporal dynamics of gene expression in heat-stressed *Caenorhabditis elegans*, *PLoS one* 12 (12) (2017) e0189445.
- [60] D. Angeles-Albores, D. H. Leighton, T. Tsou, T. H. Khaw, I. Antoshechkin, P. W. Sternberg, The *Caenorhabditis elegans* Female-Like State: Decoupling the Transcriptomic Effects of Aging and Sperm Status, *G3: Genes, Genomes, Genetics* 7 (9) (2017) 2969–2977.
- [61] A. Ben-Zvi, E. A. Miller, R. I. Morimoto, Collapse of proteostasis represents an early molecular event in *Caenorhabditis elegans* aging, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106 (35) (2009) 14914–14919.
- [62] D. C. David, N. Ollikainen, J. C. Trinidad, M. P. Cary, A. L. Burlingame, C. Kenyon, Widespread protein aggregation as an inherent part of aging in *C. elegans*, *PLoS biology* 8 (8) (2010) e1000450.
- [63] K. Podshivalova, R. A. Kerr, C. Kenyon, How a mutation that slows aging can also disproportionately extend End-of-Life Decrepitude, *Cell reports* 19 (3) (2017) 441–450.
- [64] P. K. Andersen, N. Keiding, Interpretability and importance of functionals in competing risks and multistate models, *Statistics in medicine* 31 (11-12) (2012) 1074–1088.
- [65] A. Noura, K. Read, Proportional hazards changepoint models in survival analysis, *Applied statistics* (1990) 241–253.
- [66] T. E. Johnson, D. Wu, P. Tedesco, S. Dames, J. W. Vaupel, Age-specific demographic profiles of longevity mutants in *Caenorhabditis elegans* show segmental effects, *The Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences* 56 (8) (2001) B331–B339.
- [67] A. I. Michalski, T. E. Johnson, J. R. Cypser, A. I. Yashin, Heating stress patterns in *Caenorhabditis elegans* longevity and survivorship, *Biogerontology* 2 (1) (2001) 35–44.
- [68] S. Baeriswyl, M. Diard, T. Mosser, M. Leroy, X. Manière, F. Taddei, I. Matic, Modulation of aging profiles in isogenic populations of *Caenorhabditis elegans* by bacteria causing different extrinsic mortality rates, *Biogerontology* 11 (1) (2010) 53.