

Viewpoint: We still haven't agreed on the definition of biological aging. That needs to change

I've been committed to understanding the biology of aging since I was a teenager, and my education and career took aim at this problem from many angles. One aspect that still perplexes me is that there isn't a good, easily communicable answer to this simple question: What is biological aging?

When it comes to biological aging research ... scientists finally have a pretty good understanding of the major components of aging. But there's no consensus definition of it that consolidates the existing framework.

Why do we need such a definition of biological aging? A good definition can grab the essential characteristics of an entity and put them to good use.

...

The myriad definitions of [biological aging](#) help identify some necessary components of it. But an aggregated mash-up won't guarantee a formally correct and useful definition. Identifying the content itself is not enough, especially when dealing with such a complex and lifelong process. Just because we have found most of the puzzle pieces does not mean we can put the puzzle together without a clue to its shape.

...

A confident answer to the question "What is biological aging?" in humans will help us ensure that complexity does not hide any magical mysteries. Controlling that complexity to maximize a [healthy lifespan](#) wouldn't need a magic wand, either.

[Read the original post](#)