

# **Universal Mortality Law and Immortality**

**Mark Ya. Azbel'**

**School of Physics and Astronomy, Tel-Aviv University,**

**Ramat Aviv, 69978 Tel Aviv, Israel;**

**Max-Planck-Institute für Festkörperforschung – CNRS,**

**F38042 Grenoble Cedex 9, France**

## **Abstract**

Well protected human and laboratory animal populations with abundant resources are evolutionary unprecedented. Physical approach, which takes advantage of their extensively quantified mortality, establishes that its dominant fraction yields the exact law, which is universal for all animals from yeast to humans. Singularities of the law demonstrate new kind of stepwise adaptation. The law proves that universal mortality is an evolutionary byproduct, which at any given age is reversible, independent of previous life history, and disposable. Life expectancy may be extended, arguably to immortality, by minor biological amendments in the animals. Indeed, in nematodes with a small number of perturbed genes and tissues it increased 6-fold (to 430 years in human terms), with no apparent loss in health and vitality. The law relates universal mortality to specific processes in cells and their genetic regulation.

PACS numbers: 87.10.+e; 87.90.+y; 87.23.Cc; 89.75.-k

Keywords: universal biological law, lifespan, immortality, evolution

**1. Mortality and physics.** Biological diversity evolved in evolutionary selection of the fittest via death of the frail. In the wild competition for sparse resources is fierce, and only relatively few genetically fittest animals survive to their evolutionary “goal”- reproduction. There are no evolutionary benefits from genetically programmed death or survival of very few survivors significantly beyond reproductive age.

Well protected human and laboratory animal populations with abundant resources are evolutionary unprecedented and “unanticipated“. Living conditions, phenotypes, genotypes, tissues of laboratory animals may be manipulated [1-5] and become biologically unusual. It was argued [6] that their mortality is a disposable evolutionary byproduct. Indeed, in 2001 Switzerland only 1 girl died at 5, 9, and 10 years; 5 from 4 to 7 and from 9 to 13 years; 10 or less from 2 till 17 years; no more than 16 from 2 till 26. Statistics is similar in all 1999-2002 Western developed countries [7]. Such low values of a stochastic quantity strongly suggest its zero value, at least in lower mortality groups. Yeast mortality was zero during half of its mean life span [3]. Similarly, only 2 (out of 7500) dietary restricted flies died at 8 days [4]. None of 1368 nematodes with changes in small number of their genes and tissues [5] died till 25 days (90 years in human terms). Mean life expectancy doubled with improving (medical included) conditions in humans [7]; increased 2.4-fold with genotype change in *Drosophila* [2], and 6-fold (to "human" 430 years), with no apparent loss in health and vitality, in nematodes [5]. The very existence of the maximal lifespan remains biologically controversial: it was claimed in [8] and challenged in [5, 9].

Luckily, unusual mortality in protected populations is well quantified. Knowledge of human mortality is crucial for economics, taxation, insurance, etc. Its study was started in 1693 by Halley (of the Halley comet) and followed in 1760 by Euler [10]. In developed countries human birth and death are accurately registered for well over a century. By now demographers accumulated millions of highly reliable mortality data [7]. Biodemographers collected them for animals from yeast to mammals- see, e. g., [11]. Extensive and readily available data allow one to establish, with approach characteristic of physics rather than of biology or demography, and without any biological assumptions, the exact universal law for a dominant fraction of mortality in protected populations. The law reduces a multitude of hardly quantifiable environmental and population factors (in humans they are uncontrollably non-stationary and heterogeneous) to few specified parameters. It is the same for all animals from single cell yeast to humans. Recent experiments are consistent with predictions (first made empirically [6]), which include a possibility of immortality. Universality of the law allows one to biophysically (experimentally and theoretically) study its mechanism in the simplest case of, e.g., yeast, and relate it to processes in and genetics of a cell.

**2. Universal law and immortality.** Demographic life tables present millions of accumulated mortality data in different countries over their history (see, e.g., [7]). The data list, in particular, “period” probabilities  $q(x)$  (for survivors to  $x$  years) and  $d(x)$  (for live newborns) to die between the ages  $x$  and  $(x+1)$ ; the probability  $l(x)$  to survive to  $x$  for live newborns; the life expectancy  $e(x)$  at the age  $x$  for males and females who died in a given country and calendar year. The tables also present [7] the data and procedures which allow one to calculate “cohort” probabilities for those who were born in a given calendar year. To estimate and forecast period mortality,

demographers developed over 15 approximations [12]. Biodemographers similarly approximated animal mortality [11]. Populations, their conditions and heterogeneity are different, yet each approximation reduces period mortality of any given population to few parameters. So, I conjecture that under certain conditions a dominant fraction of period mortality in all heterogeneous populations is accurately related to a specific number of parameters. Such conjecture is sufficiently restrictive to derive this universal relation and its conditions. Chose “additive” mortality variables, which are the averages of their values in different population groups of the same age. If the population consists of the groups with the number  $N^G(x)$  of survivors to age  $x$  (in years for humans, days for flies, etc) in a group  $G$ , then the total number of survivors  $N(x)$  is the sum of  $N^G(x)$  over all  $G$ . If  $c_G$  is the ratio of the population and  $\lambda^G(x)$  is the survivability to  $x$  in the group  $G$ , then the probability  $l(x)$  to survive to  $x$  for live newborns is  $l(x) = N(x)/N(0) = \sum c_G \lambda^G(x) = \langle \sum \lambda^G(x) \rangle$ , i.e. the average of  $\lambda^G(x)$  over all groups. The most age specific additive variable is  $d(x) = \lambda(x) - \lambda(x+1)$ . The most time specific additive variable is  $d(0)$  which depends on the time from conception to  $x=1$  only. Since the probability to die at the age  $x$  is  $q(x) = \lambda(x)d(x)$  and  $l(0) = 1$ , so “infant mortality”  $q(0) = d(0)$ . In the simplest case (which may easily be generalized) of one variable, universality implies that the relation between  $d(x)$  and  $q(0)$  (here and on  $d$  and  $q$  denote the period fractions which yield the universal law) is the same as the relation between their values in any of the groups in the interval. So, if  $d(x) = f_x[q(0)]$ , then  $d^G(x) = f_x[q^G(0)]$ . Since additive  $d(x) = \langle d^G(x) \rangle$ ,  $q(0) = \langle q^G(0) \rangle$ , so  $\langle f_x[q^G(0)] \rangle = f_x(\langle q^G(0) \rangle)$ . According to a simple property of stochastic variables, if any average of an analytical function is equal to the function of the average, then the function is linear. However, linearity is inconsistent with experimental  $d(x)$  vs  $q(0)$  - see, e.g., Fig. 1. Thus, universality restricts heterogeneity of  $q(0)$  to certain segments

(which must be finite to allow for at least some population heterogeneity). This implies piecewise linear dependence: in the  $j$ -th interval (denote its population as an “echelon”),  $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$ ,

$$d(x) = d_j(x) = a_j(x)q(0) + b_j(x) \text{ when } q_j < q^G(0) < q_{j+1} \quad (1)$$

Thus, the universal law must have singularities at echelon boundaries. When infant mortality  $q(0)$  of an echelon reaches its boundary, it homogenizes. Since, by Eq. (1),  $d(x)$  at all ages reduce to infant mortality, they simultaneously reach the interval boundary and, together with  $q(0)$ , homogenize there. (Two such “ultimate” boundaries are well known:  $q(x) = 0$  implies that nobody dies at, and  $\lambda(x) = 0$  implies that nobody survives beyond, the age  $x$ ). At any age  $d_j(x) = d_{j+1}(x)$  when  $q(0) = q_{j+1}$ . This reduces all  $d_j(x)$  to  $(J+1)$  universal functions of  $x$  and  $(J-1)$  universal constants.

Consider an arbitrarily heterogeneous population. Suppose its fractions and the fractions of its infant mortality  $q(0)$  in the  $j$ -th echelon are correspondingly  $c_j$  and  $f_j = c_j q_j(0)/q(0)$ . Then  $d(x) = \sum c_j d_j(x)$  reduces to the universal dependence on these parameters and  $q(0)$ :

$$d(x) = aq(0) + b; \quad a = \sum f_j a_j; \quad b = \sum c_j b_j; \quad (2)$$

where  $0 < c_j, f_j < 1$ ;  $\sum c_j = \sum f_j = 1$ . (Here and on the argument  $x$  is skipped in  $a$  and  $b$ ).

By Eq. (2), in a general case the universal law reduces mortality to population specific parameters  $c_j, f_j$  and  $q(0)$ ; to species specific constants  $q_j$  and functions  $a_j, b_j$  of age  $x$ . Piecewise linear  $d(x)$  vs  $q(0)$  is indeed observed for humans and flies; homogenization at the crossovers was also verified [6].

The number of population specific parameters in Eq. (2) depends on the heterogeneity of the population. If it reduces to a single echelon, then, by Eq. (1),  $d(x)$  vs  $q(0)$  is universal. Suppose a population is distributed at two, e.g., the 1-st and 2-nd, echelons with the concentrations  $c_1$  and  $c_2 = 1 - c_1$  correspondingly. Then

$$q(0) = c_1 q_1(0) + (1-c_1)q_2(0); \quad d(x) = c_1 d_1(x) + (1-c_1)d_2(x) \quad (3)$$

By Eqs. (1-3),  $q_1(0) = \alpha_1 q(0)$ ,  $q_2(0) = \alpha_2 q(0)$ , where

$$c_1 = (b_2 - b)/(b_2 - b_1); \quad \alpha_1 = (a - a_2)/[c_1(a_1 - a_2)]; \quad \alpha_2 = (a_1 - a)/[(1 - c_1)(a_1 - a_2)]. \quad (4)$$

The crossover to the next non-universal segment occurs when, e.g.,  $q_1(0)$  reaches the intersection  $q_2 = (b_2 - b)/(a_1 - a_2)$  of the first and second universal segments in Eq. (1). Then  $q_1(0) = q_2$  implies, by Eqs. (1) and (4), that  $d^I(x) = a_1 q^I(0) + b_1$  [a subscript  $I$  denotes an intersection in Eq. (2)]. By Eq. (1), this intersection falls on the first universal linear segment or its extension. Thus, in all two echelon populations, Eq. (2) crossovers are situated at universal segments, and this universality is the criterion of any such population. Remarkably, demographic data [7] demonstrate that, except for few irregular years, this is the case in most developed countries (e. g., 1948–1999 Austria, 1921–1996 Canada, 1921–2000 Denmark, 1841–1898 England, 1941–2000 Finland, 1899–1897 France, 1956–1999 West Germany, 1906–1998 Italy, 1950–1999 Japan, 1950–1999 Netherlands, 1896–2000 Norway, 1861–2000 Sweden, 1876–2001 Switzerland)-see examples in Fig. 2 and Section 4 for more details. The intersections of their  $d(x)$  vs  $d(0)$  piecewise linear approximations determine 5 echelons of the universal (i.e. the same for all countries, thus for all humans) law, presented in Fig. 2. A general case (when the population is distributed at more than two universal segments) is more complicated, and may refine Fig. 2, but it also reduces to the universal law and the echelon fractions<sup>1</sup>.

---

1. The search for universal mortality law went on since 1825 [13], but with inadequate mathematical tools. Equation (1) demonstrates that the law reduces to specified echelons and must have singularities at their boundaries.

---

Empirical study [6] demonstrates that species as remote from humans as protected populations of flies also yield the universal law (possibly with a different number of echelons due to different developmental stages-see [14] for more details). Most remarkable and challenging is the same (when properly scaled with the species-specific values of  $q_j$ ) dependence of human and fly functions  $a_j, b_j$  on age  $x$  [6], which suggests its universality for all animals.

**3. Maximal life span and immortality.** When  $q(0)=0$ , then the universal law (see examples in Fig. 2) extrapolates  $d(x)$ , and thus, by Eq. (1),  $b_1(x)$  to zero when  $4 < x < 80$ . Complemented with the universality, this is consistent with possibly zero (till certain old age) mortality  $q(x)=d(x)/l(x)$ , thus zero  $d(x)$  and  $b_1(x)$ , demonstrated in Section 1 for humans, flies, drosophila, nematodes, single cell yeast. Higher accuracy may change these “empirical” zeroes into small universal values. Alternatively, if  $b_1(x)=0$  prior to a certain age  $x=x^*$  or until  $x=x^{**}$ , then, according to a well known mathematical theorem, either  $b_1(x)$  must have a singularity at, e.g.,  $x=x^{**}$ , or  $b_1(x)=0$  at any age also beyond  $x^{**}$ . The latter case implies ultimate immortality. Consider mortality data.

Human maximal lifespan, which remains  $\sim 120$  years since ancient Rome (where birth and death data were mandatory on the tombstones) to present time, implies human maximal mean life span [8, 14, 15], and thus non-zero minimal mortality, in old age. In contrast, a small number of perturbed genes and tissues increased mean life span in nematodes 6-fold (to 430 years in human terms!), with no apparent loss in health and vitality. (One wonders how their cumulative damage, e.g., mutation accumulation, is eliminated). Such large increase suggests a possibility (by directed biological intervention) of unlimited lifespan extension. Universality implies this must be true in all animals, single cell yeast included.

The universal law (1) maps on phase equilibrium. Present Eq. (1) as

$$d(x)=d^{(j)}(x)=Cd^{(j)}(x)+(1-C)d^{(j+1)}(x), \quad (5)$$

where

$$d^{(j)}(x) = a_j(x)q^{(j)} + b_j(x) \quad (6)$$

This suggests a possible mechanism of universal mortality:  $d^{(j)}(x)$  may be interpreted as the universal “equation of state” of the  $j$ -th “phase” and  $C$  as its “concentration” determined by  $q(0) = d(0)$ . By Eq. (5), an echelon reduces to two phases; by Eqs. (2,5), an arbitrary population reduces to  $(J+1)$  phases. The transformation of multiple environmental factors into phase concentrations and universal equations of state suggests fine universal genetic regulation, and calls for extensive physical (theoretical and experimental) and biological study.

**4. Predictions and their verification.** According to Eq. (1), at any given age echelon mortality is as reversible as “infant” mortality, with the relaxation time  $\sim 1$  year for humans, 1 day for flies, etc. So, it has short memory of the previous life history, and rapidly (within few percent of the life span) adjusts to current living conditions.

Indeed, following unification of East and West Germany, within few years mortality in the East declined toward its levels in the West, especially among elderly, despite 45 years of their different life histories [9]. Dietary restriction resulted in essentially the same robust increase in longevity in rats [1] and decrease in mortality in *Drosophila* [2], whenever restriction was switched on, i.e. independent of the previous “dietary” life history. However, when dietary restriction changes to full feeding, longevity remains higher than in the control group of animals fully fed throughout life. Also, when fly temperature was lowered from 27 C to 18 C or vice versa, the change in mortality, driven by life at previous temperature, persisted in the switched flies compared to the control ones. Such long memory of the life history may be related to



insufficiently slow changes in temperature or feeding. It calls for comprehensive tests of short mortality memory in, and thus of rapid (compared to life span) mortality adaptation to, such conditions.

Following the decrease in infant mortality with improving (medical and biological included) conditions, mortality of a homogeneous cohort may be reset to its value at a much younger age. Indeed, mortality of the female cohort, born in 1900 in neutral Norway, beyond 17 years of age monotonically decreased till 40 when it reversed to its value at 12 years. Then it little changed till 50 years. Only at 59 it restored its value at 17 years, i.e. 42 years younger. (The cohort probability  $q(x)$  to die at any age  $x$  is calculated according to ref. 7 procedures and data). Dietary restriction, switched on day 14 [4], in 3 days restored *Drosophila* mortality at 7 days, i.e. 2.5 times younger. Thus, under certain conditions, predicted short memory and reversal of mortality to much younger age are observed in flies, rats, and humans; vanishing and very low mortality is seen in yeast, biologically amended nematodes, flies, and humans. This is inconsistent [14] with evolutionary theories [16, 17] of mortality.

Quantitative verification of the universality, which complements Section 2, calls for two comments. Demo- and biodemographic data present age in years for humans, days for flies, etc. A non-stationary  $q(0)$  is close to infant mortality if it changes relatively little within such time. This defines “regular” (in contrast to “irregular”) conditions. They allow for the change in infant mortality which is very large (~50-fold [7]) and rapid on the life span scale. Stochastic inaccuracy of  $d(x)$  data is  $\sim 1/D^{1/2}$  where  $D$  is the number of deaths in the population of a given age in given conditions. When demographic fluctuations are consistent with this inaccuracy, denote the population as “well protected”.

Mortality, especially in diverse conditions, is by far the best quantified for humans. This allows for comprehensive test of Eqs. (1,2). Equation (2) implies piecewise linear  $d(x)$  vs  $q(0)$ . Populations in 18 developed countries over their entire history [7] (except for the years during, and immediately after, major wars, epidemics, food and water contamination, etc.), are well protected and regular. Over 3000 their male and female curves of  $d(x)$  vs the same calendar year  $q(0)$  may be approximated with several linear segments (further increase in the number of segments little changes the relative mean squared deviation from experimental curves) and reduced to the universal law<sup>2</sup>-see examples in Fig. 2. Equation (6) presents certain phase

---

2. Until  $\simeq 65$  years,  $d(x)$  decreases when  $q(0)$  increases. Beyond  $\simeq 85$  years,  $d(x)$  increases together with  $q(0)$ . In between,  $d(x)$  exhibits a well pronounced maximum (smeared by generic fluctuations). Consider the origin of such dependence of  $d(x)=l(x)q(x)$  on age  $x$ . When living conditions improve, the probability  $l(x)$  for a newborn to survive to  $x$  increases, while the probability  $q(x)$  to die at  $x$  decreases. In young age the probability to survive to  $x$  is close to 1,  $d(x)$  is dominated by  $q(x)$ , and thus monotonically decreases together with  $q(0)$ . For sufficiently old age, low probability to reach  $x$  dominates. It increases with improving living conditions, i.e. with decreasing  $q(0)$ , thus  $d(x)$  increases with decreasing  $q(0)$ . At an intermediate age, when improving living conditions sufficiently increase survival probability,  $d(x)$  increase is replaced with its decrease. Then  $d(x)$  has a maximum at a certain value of  $q(0)$ . Biological intervention may yield the new lowest mortality echelon, which will dominate future mortality and its law, provide better statistics in old age, and imply the  $d(x)$  maximum at any age.

---

equilibrium as its possible mechanism, whose scaling parameters are related to biology and genetics of (presumably specific) cells. Clearly, physicists may be best qualified to test this mechanism in the case of, e.g., single cell yeast; verify the universality of its mortality law; if necessary, to refine the law with more additive parameters and estimate the contribution of non-universal mortality (for humans this may be done with existing life tables); to develop a microscopic model of

universal mortality and transformation of a multitude of external and internal parameters into its scaling parameters; to establish the nature of these parameters. (For more details see [14]).

**5. Conclusions.** Every new field in physics introduced unanticipated concepts and laws. Even thermodynamics of classical particles with reversible mechanics yielded irreversibility. However, biophysicists reduce complex live systems to conventional models.

Presented physics-based approach demonstrates that mortality of protected populations is dominated by a new kind of a law, whose universality for species as diverse as humans and yeast is unprecedented. The law which did not change despite drastically different biology and evolution, is their conservation law. The mechanism which is common to all animals, from humans to single cell yeast, reduces mortality to processes in a cell.

The law implies accurate, reversible, rapid, stepwise mortality adjustment to current environment. It maps onto adiabatically changing phase equilibrium. Phase boundaries manifest and quantify the “rungs” in the universal “ladder” of mortality adaptation to extrinsic and intrinsic changes. The law suggests that universal mortality is an evolutionary byproduct which may be eliminated (by directed biological

intervention), which is inconsistent [14] with all evolutionary theories [16, 17] of mortality. Yet, this is consistent with Kenyon et al [5] who increased mean life span of nematodes six-fold (to 430 years in human terms) with no apparent loss in health and vitality.

Aging may be addressed [5] by examining level of activity of surviving animals, quantifying their dynamics, and studying correlation with, and relation to, the universal mortality. Presented approach is applicable to other quantifiable biological phenomena.

**Acknowledgments.** I am very grateful to I. Kolodnaya for assistance. Financial support from A. von Humboldt award and R. & J. Meyerhoff chair is highly appreciated.

### Figure Captions

Fig. 1. The period probabilities for live newborn 1950-1999 Japanese females to die between 60 and 61 (open squares), 80 and 81 (triangles), 95 and 96 (diamonds) years of age vs. infant mortality  $q(0)$ . Their relative mean squared deviations from piecewise linear approximations (straight lines) are 2.4%, 2.3% and 10%.

Fig. 2. Universal law for  $d(80)$  and  $d(60)$  (upper and lower curves, thick lines) vs.  $q(0)$ . Diamonds and squares exemplify intersections of non-universal linear segments for (from left to right) England (two successive intersections), France, Italy and Japan, Finland, Netherlands, Norway, Denmark, France, England. Thin lines extend the universal linear segments. Note that  $d(80) = 0$  and  $d(60) = 0$  when  $q(0) = 0$ .

## References

+ Permanent address

1. Yu B.P., Masoro, E.J., McMahon C. A., J. Gerontology 40, 657 (1985)
2. Curtsinger J. W., et al. Science 258, 461 (1992).
3. Jazwinski, S. M. et al. Exp. Gerontol. 33, 571 (1998); Shama S. et al, Exp. Cell Research 245, 379 (1998)
4. Mair, W., P. Goymer, S.D. Pletcher, L. Partridge, Science, **301**, 1731 (2003)
5. Arantes-Oliveira, A., Berman, J.R., Kenyon, C., Science 302, 611 (2003)
6. Azbel', M.Ya., PNAS USA **96**, 3303, 15368 (1999); Exp Geront. 37, 859 (2002)
7. Human Mortality Database. Univ. of California, Berkeley (USA) and MPI of Demographic Research (Germany), [http:// www.mortality.org](http://www.mortality.org) (2003)
8. Strehler B.L., Mildvan A.S., Science 132, 14 (1960); Carnes, B.A., Olshansky, S.J., **36**, 419 (2001); Carnes, B. R., Olshansky S. J., Grahn, D., Biogerontology 4, 31 (2003).
9. Vaupel, J. W., Carey, J. R., Christiansen, K., Science **301**, 1679 (2003)
10. Halley, E., Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. **17**, 596 (1693); Euler, L., History de l'Academy Royale des Sciences et Belle – Letters, 144 (1760).
11. Carey, J. R., Applied demography for biologists, Oxford univ. press, N.Y. (1993).
12. Coale, A.J., Demeny, P., Vaughan, B. Regional Model Life Tables and Stable Populations, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Academic Press, New York . (1993)
13. Gompertz, B., Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A **115**, 513 (1825); Pearl, R., Miner, J.R., Q. Rev. Biol. **10**, 60 (1935); Deevey, E.S. Jr., Q. Rev. Biol., 283 (1947); Olshansky, S.J., Carnes, B.A., Demography **34**, 1 (1997)
14. Azbel', M. Ya. <http://arxiv.org/abs/q-bio.QM/0403007>

15. Azbel' M.Ya., Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B **263**, 1449 (1996)
16. Charlesworth, B., Evolution in Age-Structured Population, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1994); Finch, C.E., Kirkwood, T.B.L, Chance, Development and Aging, Oxford University Press, Oxford (2000); Kirkwood, T.B.L., and Austad, S. N. Nature **408**, 233 (2000)
17. Stauffer, D., In: Lassig, M., Valleriani, A. (Eds.), Biological Evolution and Statistical Physics, Springer, Berlin (2002).

FIG. 1






FIG. 2

