
Wisdom as Infrastructure: A New Architecture for Longevity and Regeneration

Desirée C. T. Cox

Founder and CEO, HEALinc (USA and Bahamas); Chair, National Longevity and Regenerative Therapies Board (LARTA Board) (Bahamas); Affiliate Member, Graduate Faculty, School of Graduate Studies, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
E-mail: dr.desireecox@gmail.com

Received 25 July 2026; Accepted 12 August 2026

Abstract

Longevity science and regenerative medicine have moved the limits of translational medicine. The sciences of aging and age-related diseases, cell and gene therapies, biomaterials, digital phenotyping, and artificial intelligence are expanding what can be measured and modified across the life course. Yet the field's decisive bottleneck may no longer be discovery alone. Technical capacity is advancing faster than the institutional capacity to decide what should count as progress, how uncertainty should be governed, and how biological gains become durable and equitably distributed human benefit.

This perspective advances the proposition that wisdom is infrastructure. Wisdom is defined here not as intuition or individual authority, but as the organized capacity to integrate heterogeneous evidence, deliberate explicitly about values, anticipate consequences across time, and implement innovation with the people and systems it will affect.

The perspective situates this proposition within a broader architecture of human flourishing and proposes a translational human flourishing framework comprising six integrative and interdependent domains: biological integrity and plasticity; functional capacity and resilience; agency, purpose,

International Journal of Translational Science, 2026, 49–70.

doi: 10.13052/ijts2246-8765.2026.002

© 2026 River Publishers

and meaning; social connection and participation; enabling environments; and ethical governance and equity.

The framework does not displace mechanistic, disease-specific, or regulatory endpoints. It connects them to the full causal pathway through which an intervention becomes meaningful in a human life. A research agenda is proposed around multidomain outcomes, longitudinal trajectories, implementation and equity, governance indicators, learning health systems, and place-based translational ecosystems.

The central claim is deliberately ambitious but empirically bounded: longevity and regenerative medicine will fulfill their promise only when the infrastructures that accelerate innovation are matched by infrastructures that give innovation direction, legitimacy, memory, and human purpose.

Abbreviations

HRQoL: health-related quality of life

LHS: learning health system

PROMs: patient-reported outcome measures

PROMIS: patient-reported outcome measurement information system

RE-AIM: reach, effectiveness, adoption, implementation, and maintenance

THFF: translational human flourishing framework

Keywords: Translational science, longevity, regenerative medicine, human flourishing, systems biology, implementation science, responsible innovation, health equity.

1 When Discovery Becomes a Design Problem

Scientific fields rarely announce the moment at which accumulation of knowledge becomes transformational. More often, the shift becomes visible only when established questions seem too small for emerging capabilities. Translational longevity science is approaching such a moment. The field is no longer concerned only with describing aging or compensating for its consequences. Instead, it is increasingly asking whether biological trajectories can be measured, stratified and, in selected contexts, modified.

This transition is being driven by a convergence of sciences of longevity, aging, and age-related diseases, regenerative biology, cell and gene therapies, biomaterials, high-dimensional molecular profiling, digital biomarkers,

and computational medicine. Contemporary accounts of precision medicine anticipate the integration of genomic, omic, clinical, digital, psychosocial, and exposure-related information to guide interventions across heterogeneous aging trajectories (Kroemer et al., 2025). The expanding hallmarks of aging have also provided a powerful map of interacting cellular and molecular processes that may become targets for prevention or treatment (López-Otín et al., 2023).

This shift reveals that translation is not a linear passage from laboratory to bedside, but a dynamic, iterative process in which discovery, clinical care, policy implementation, and lived experience continually inform one another (Woolf, 2008). Each stage changes the questions that can be asked in all other phases of the process. A technically successful intervention may alter a molecular target without improving function. It may improve function without being affordable, acceptable, or sustainable. It may generate early benefits while creating delayed risks that existing follow-up systems are poorly designed to detect.

The next translational bottleneck is therefore also a design problem. What outcomes should count as success? Over what time horizon? Whose values should shape those outcomes? Who carries uncertainty while evidence matures? What forms of governance allow innovation to move with urgency without moving beyond trust?

These are not peripheral questions to be addressed after the science is complete. They help determine what science is undertaken, how it is interpreted, and whether it ultimately becomes human progress.

This perspective argues that wisdom should be treated as infrastructure. The proposition is not mystical or anti-technological. It names the institutional capacity to connect knowledge with judgment, possibility with responsibility, and discovery with the conditions required for benefit to endure.

Laboratories, biobanks, data platforms, manufacturing systems, and regulation make translation possible.

Wisdom gives that translation direction.

2 The Unfinished Meaning of Longevity

Modern longevity discourse has already moved beyond lifespan alone. The compression-of-morbidity hypothesis proposed that the onset of chronic disease and disability might be delayed more than death, reducing the proportion of life spent with major morbidity (Fries, 1980). The sciences of aging

and age-related diseases extends this logic by targeting mechanisms that contribute to several age-related conditions rather than treating each disease as an isolated event.

The World Health Organization similarly defines healthy aging through functional ability: the capacity to be and do what people value, shaped by intrinsic capacity, environment, and the interaction between them (World Health Organization, 2020).

These developments are important, but the meaning of longevity remains unfinished. Across the field, scientists and clinicians increasingly recognize that longevity cannot be measured by years alone: a longer life is not necessarily a better life when those additional years are marked by severe disability, social isolation, treatment burden, diminished agency, or exclusion from care. At the same time, medicine should not claim authority to define one ideal form of the good life. The capabilities tradition emphasizes people's substantive freedom to pursue lives they value (Sen, 1999), while empirical work on human flourishing identifies domains that include health, meaning, relationships, and material stability (VanderWeele, 2017).

Both approaches suggest that longevity should be evaluated not only by duration, but by what additional years make possible. This is not an invitation to replace clinical endpoints with a vague measure of happiness. Mortality, morbidity, safety, target engagement, and disease-specific outcomes remain indispensable. The translational horizon should, however, also include physical and cognitive function, independence, participation, perceived vitality, treatment burden, social connection, and the durability of benefit.

The emerging biology of health itself points toward organizational features such as resilience, homeostatic maintenance, and the capacity to respond to perturbation (López-Otín and Kroemer, 2021). Biomarkers of biological age may support stratification and serve, after adequate validation, as intermediate endpoints. They are maps, not the territory. No single clock captures the full multidimensional process of human aging (Ferrucci et al., 2020; Horvath and Raj, 2018).

Preclinical studies of cellular reprogramming are revealing that selected cellular and epigenetic states may be more malleable than once assumed. This plasticity opens important scientific possibilities, but it should not be conflated with unrestricted biological reversibility (Ocampo et al., 2016). The field must therefore remain expansive in its vision while exacting in its interpretation of the evidence.

Biology is responsive; it is not infinitely programmable.

3 Regeneration as a Different Logic of Medicine

Regenerative medicine has been defined as the replacement or regeneration of human cells, tissues, or organs to restore or establish normal function (Mason and Dunnill, 2008). However, its deeper significance lies in the logic it introduces.

The mechanical metaphor of the body as a machine, while historically productive, has reached the limits of what it can explain. The body is not merely a machine awaiting repair. It is a living, adaptive, intelligent system. A machine may be repaired by replacing a defective component. A living system, by contrast, must sense, interpret, integrate, and adapt to an intervention through interconnected signaling networks, immune responses, mechanical forces, and environmental conditions in which life unfolds.

Regeneration is therefore not only a product category. It is a different way of thinking about therapeutic causation.

Repair and regeneration are not mutually exclusive. Repair may restore integrity through compensation or scarring; regeneration may more closely reproduce original structure and function; and many clinical interventions involve both. The scientifically relevant questions are what has been restored, by which mechanism, with what fidelity, for how long, and with what consequences for the person. Established and emerging strategies include transplantation, engineered tissues, biomaterials, gene and cell therapies, and approaches that recruit endogenous repair (Mao and Mooney, 2015).

The promise of cell therapies also illustrates why the vision must remain evidence-bound. Mesenchymal stromal cell products can exert immunomodulatory and trophic effects, yet variation in source tissue, manufacturing, potency assays, dose, route, and recipient context has contributed to heterogeneous clinical findings (Galipeau and Sensébé, 2018). A regenerative claim cannot rest on the identity of a cell or the plausibility of a mechanism alone. It requires reproducible characterization, manufacturing consistency, controlled evidence, pharmacovigilance, and transparent reporting of both negative and positive results.

A flourishing orientation strengthens rather than weakens that standard. It asks whether restored biology becomes lived capability. Improved tissue structure matters, but so do mobility, cognition, fatigue, confidence, participation, and the ability to resume valued roles.

It also recognizes that regeneration occurs within environments. Nutrition, rehabilitation, stress exposure, housing, caregiver support, and continuity of care can amplify or diminish biological gains. The translational task is

to trace the entire causal chain from molecular intervention to durable human benefit.

4 From Parts to Relationships

The biomedical model has delivered some of modern medicine's greatest achievements: antibiotics, vaccines, surgery, intensive care, medical imaging, and targeted therapies. Its achievements remain indispensable. Yet every paradigm eventually reaches the boundary of what it can explain, and those limits become visible when a framework that explains part of the human organism is mistaken for an account of the whole. Engel's biopsychosocial critique, systems biology, and network medicine each challenged the assumption that complex outcomes can be understood by isolating parts from the relationships that organize them (Engel, 1977; Kitano, 2022; Barabási et al., 2011). Complexity science adds that interventions may produce nonlinear effects and alter the very systems into which they are introduced (Plsek and Greenhalgh, 2001).

For longevity and regenerative medicine, the practical implication is clear: the unit of translation is not the molecule alone, but the molecule-in-a-system; not the cell alone, but the cell-in-a-tissue, a person, a care pathway, and a social environment. Context is not noise surrounding the intervention. It is part of the causal architecture of its effect.

Connection is therefore more than a value or a social preference. At the biological level, function depends on coordinated communication among cells, tissues, and organs. At the translational level, progress depends on relationships among disciplines, clinicians, regulators, manufacturers, funders, patients, and communities. These are analogous principles, not identical mechanisms. Their shared lesson is that isolated excellence is insufficient when outcomes emerge from interaction.

The word *architecture* is used here in this precise sense: the patterned arrangement of conditions, relationships, and feedback loops that makes some outcomes more likely than others.

Translational science is consequently a form of relational design. It must build not only interventions, but the systems capable of learning from, governing, and sustaining them.

5 Wisdom as Infrastructure

Infrastructure is usually visible: laboratories, clean rooms, biobanks, data platforms, regulatory pathways, trained workforces, and financing. A second

layer, less visible but equally consequential, determines how evidence is integrated, whose values enter decisions, how uncertainty is carried through time, and whether innovation remains connected to those it is intended to serve.

This is the layer described here as wisdom infrastructure.

Wisdom is not proposed as an individual trait that some leaders possess and others lack. A translational system should not depend on the exceptional judgment of a charismatic person. It should make good judgment more likely, more transparent, more contestable, and more correctable.

Operationalizing wisdom as infrastructure requires four interdependent institutional functions.

5.1 Integration: Making Evidence Coherent

Translational decisions rarely depend on one kind of evidence. They require synthesis across mechanism, animal models, manufacturing data, early-phase trials, comparative effectiveness research, real-world evidence, qualitative inquiry, and patient experience.

Integration means testing external validity, reconciling conflicting findings, identifying missing populations, and distinguishing an exploratory signal from a clinically actionable result. It also requires epistemic humility.

Wisdom begins by refusing to confuse the volume of data with the depth of understanding.

5.2 Discernment: Making Values Explicit

Evidence can estimate effects; it cannot independently determine which effects deserve priority, what level of uncertainty is acceptable, or how benefits and burdens should be distributed.

A translational longevity and regenerative medicine program must decide whether success is defined by disease-free survival, preserved independence, reduced caregiver burden, restored participation, or some combination of these outcomes – and what degree of improvement across them constitutes meaningful benefit. Those choices are already present whenever endpoints, comparators, and follow-up periods are selected.

Value-sensitive judgment makes them visible rather than allowing them to remain disguised as purely technical decisions.

5.3 Stewardship: Governing Consequences Across Time

Emerging technologies create uncertainties that cannot always be eliminated before first use. Responsible innovation therefore requires anticipation,

reflexivity, inclusion, and responsiveness as evidence changes (Stilgoe et al., 2013).

In regenerative and longevity medicine, stewardship includes registries, traceability, long-term surveillance, predefined stopping rules, independent review, manufacturing controls, and plans for delayed adverse effects.

The established requirements of ethical clinical research – social value, scientific validity, fair participant selection, favorable risk-benefit assessment, independent review, informed consent and respect for participants – are not obstacles to innovation. They are conditions for innovation that deserves trust (Emanuel et al., 2000).

5.4 Participation: Designing Translation with People

An intervention may demonstrate efficacy under ideal conditions, yet fail to achieve meaningful impact if it is unaffordable, unacceptable, difficult to deliver, poorly aligned with local health systems, or incapable of being scaled and distributed.

Achieving global access to the emerging medicine of longevity and regeneration therefore requires both the science and the art of implementation. Success must be judged not only by whether an intervention works, but by whether it can reach diverse populations, be adopted and delivered with appropriate fidelity, remain feasible and affordable across different settings, and generate benefits that can be sustained over time (Proctor et al., 2011; Glasgow et al., 1999).

The translational pathways for longevity and regenerative medicine must be intentionally designed and stewarded from the outset as a participatory process. Patients, clinicians, scientists, entrepreneurs, legal and regulatory experts, cross-disciplinary communities, and operational leaders should be engaged early enough to help define the problem, shape the intervention, identify the outcomes that matter, and develop delivery models that are feasible, trusted, and responsive to local context (Boaz et al., 2018; Slattery et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2021; Bate and Robert, 2006).

People are not the last mile of translation. They are co-designers of the pathways and part of the intelligence that makes successful translation possible.

Together, these functions give operational content to the phrase wisdom is infrastructure. They allow a program to be assessed for multidisciplinary evidence review, transparent decision criteria, independent oversight, community representation, uncertainty management, institutional memory, and equitable access planning.

Wisdom is what prevents acceleration from becoming drift.

6 Toward an Architecture of Human Flourishing

The phrase “architecture of human flourishing” is used here to name a translational research problem, not a completed doctrine. It asks which biological, psychological, social, environmental, and institutional conditions make people more capable of living lives they value.

Personalized medicine asks: which treatment, for which person, at which time? The architecture of human flourishing asks the larger question: what conditions must exist for that person – and the systems around them – to become more capable of living well?

Architecture, in this context, does not imply rigid control or the engineering of a single optimized human state. Precision medicine has greatly advanced our ability to ask which intervention is most likely to benefit which person, at what time, and on the basis of which biological and clinical characteristics. The perspective developed here begins with that achievement but extends the inquiry beyond treatment selection. It asks not only what an intervention does to a patient, but what it makes possible in a life: what configuration of biological, psychological, social, environmental, and institutional conditions enables a person to adapt, exercise agency, participate, create meaning, and flourish over time (Collins and Varmus, 2015; Reuben and Tinetti, 2012; Beard et al., 2016; Entwistle and Watt, 2013).

Efficacy and conventional clinical outcomes remain necessary, but they are not sufficient. The language of outcomes tends to foreground prespecified measures observed at defined points in time; flourishing is better understood as a multidimensional, relational and evolving trajectory. Similarly, in this context, optimization can imply movement towards a predetermined maximum, whereas flourishing admits multiple forms of living well and emerges through the interaction of individual capabilities, relationships, and enabling environments (Reuben and Tinetti, 2012; Beard et al., 2016; Entwistle and Watt, 2013; Coast et al., 2008; Huber et al., 2011; Whitson et al., 2016).

The proposed translational human flourishing framework, or THFF, therefore does not simply add more outcomes to personalized medicine. It widens the unit of translation from the treatment-person match to the dynamic architecture through which a biological effect becomes durable lived capability. Across six interdependent domains, it enables investigators to examine patterns and degrees of benefit, identify the conditions that amplify or constrain

those benefits, make underlying value assumptions explicit, and locate where translation succeeds, is interrupted or becomes inequitably distributed (Beard et al., 2016; Entwistle and Watt, 2013; Coast et al., 2008; Huber et al., 2011; Whitson et al., 2016; National Research Council, 2011).

6.1 Biological Integrity and Plasticity

This domain includes molecular and cellular mechanisms, physiological regulation, tissue structure, target engagement, product quality, biological age measures, and safety.

It preserves the precision of biomedical science while treating plasticity as an empirical property that varies by tissue, age, disease state, and intervention.

6.2 Functional Capacity and Resilience

Function connects biological change to performance: mobility, strength, cognition, sensory capacity, activities of daily living, and recovery after stressors.

Resilience concerns the ability to maintain or regain function after perturbation. Longitudinal trajectories may reveal more than a single time point because an intervention may change recovery, variability, or rate of decline.

6.3 Agency, Purpose, and Meaning

Agency includes the actual and perceived ability to make choices, manage health, and pursue valued goals. Purpose concerns a durable sense of direction and significance.

Observational studies associate purpose with mortality and other health outcomes, although causality and confounding require caution (Alimujiang et al., 2019). These measures should never imply that people can overcome structural disadvantage through attitude alone.

6.4 Social Connection and Participation

Social relationships are associated with mortality risk and a range of health outcomes (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2010). Translational evaluation should ask whether an intervention enables participation in family, work, learning, culture and community, or whether its cost and treatment burden produce new forms of exclusion.

6.5 Enabling Environments

Functional ability emerges through the interaction between intrinsic capacity and environment (World Health Organization, 2020). Housing, transportation, nutrition, digital access, rehabilitation, income security, caregiver support, and clinical infrastructure can determine whether a biological benefit becomes a durable life benefit.

Social conditions are therefore moderators and implementation variables, not background noise. Without explicit attention, advanced medicine may reproduce inequities rooted in the distribution of power, money, and resources (Marmot et al., 2008).

6.6 Ethical Governance and Equity

This domain asks who sets priorities, who is represented in evidence generation, who bears risk, who gains access, and how accountability is maintained.

Ethical governance extends beyond consent, conflict-of-interest management, data rights, affordability, benefit sharing, and post-market surveillance. It begins upstream, in the architecture of the evidence itself: whose biology is studied, whose experience is represented, and whose benefits and risks become visible. Preclinical research should account for sex as a biological variable – alongside age, genetic background, disease stage, and other relevant sources of biological heterogeneity. Clinical trials should enroll populations representative of those expected to receive the intervention and prospectively assess whether safety, efficacy, dose requirements, and durability differ across clinically relevant groups (Institute of Medicine, 2013; Woods et al., 2025).

Historically, biomedical research relied disproportionately on male animals and male-derived cells, partly because female hormonal cycles were assumed to introduce excessive variability and experimental complexity. Surveys documented substantial male bias across biomedical fields, yet subsequent analyses found that female rodents are not generally more variable than males, even when the stage of the estrous cycle is not controlled (Stokols et al., 2008; National Research Council, 2015).

The consequences of overlooking sex may be mechanistic, translational, and clinical. Male and female mice have been shown to recruit different immune pathways in neuropathic pain (Collins and Varmus, 2015). In regenerative research, the sex of stem and progenitor cells has influenced proliferation, extracellular-matrix expression and regenerative performance

(Reuben and Tinetti, 2013; Beard et al., 2016). In clinical pharmacology, sex-related differences in zolpidem exposure and response contributed to regulatory changes in recommended starting doses (Entwistle and Watt, 2013; Coast et al., 2008).

Equity, therefore, is not a final checkpoint after efficacy has been established. It is a condition of valid and generalizable science – from the selection of cells and animal models, through trial recruitment and prespecified subgroup analysis, to regulatory review and post-market surveillance. Equity begins before access. It begins in the evidence. It shapes recruitment, comparators, delivery models, external validity, and the legitimacy of the enterprise.

Finally, the domains are recursive. A therapy may change a biomarker without improving function. Functional improvement may not enhance agency if treatment burden is overwhelming. Agency may not become participation when the environment is inaccessible.

Conversely, a modest biological effect may generate substantial value when rehabilitation, social support, and enabling environments are aligned.

Validated systems such as PROMIS can support measurement across physical, mental, and social domains (Cella et al., 2010), but qualitative methods remain essential for outcomes that standardized instruments fail to anticipate.

Table 1 translates the framework into practical questions, illustrative indicators, and the principal governance concerns that should remain visible throughout translation. The measures are examples rather than a mandatory battery; selection should be proportionate to the intervention, population, stage of development, and prespecified causal pathway.

7 Research Program in the Next Translational Era

The THFF becomes scientifically useful only if its assumptions are made testable. Five priorities could move it from an organizing idea to a framework for the next era in translational research.

First, intervention-specific core outcome sets should connect mechanism, clinical effect, function, and patient-valued benefit without creating measurement overload. A regenerative intervention for sarcopenia, for example, might include product characterization, target engagement, muscle strength, mobility, fatigue, participation, adverse events, and treatment burden. Each measure should have a place in a prespecified causal model.

Table 1 Translational human flourishing framework: domains, questions, and safeguards

Domain	Translational Question and Illustrative Indicators	Principal Governance Concern
Biological integrity and plasticity	Question: Does the intervention alter the intended mechanism safely and reproducibly? Illustrative indicators: Target engagement; validated biomarkers; physiology; tissue structure; product quality; adverse events	Surrogate validity; manufacturing consistency; delayed harm
Functional capacity and resilience	Question: Does biological change preserve or restore performance and recovery? Illustrative indicators: Mobility; strength; cognition; activities of daily living; recovery trajectories; frailty or resilience measures	Clinically meaningful change; follow-up duration; access to rehabilitation
Agency, purpose, and meaning	Question: Does the intervention expand the capacity to make choices and pursue valued goals? Illustrative indicators: Self-efficacy; perceived control; treatment burden; purpose; goal attainment	Medicalization of meaning; coercive optimization; misplaced responsibility
Social connection and participation	Question: Does the benefit enable valued roles, relationships, and contribution? Illustrative indicators: Social functioning; loneliness; work or education participation; caregiver impact	Exclusion; unequal treatment burden; cultural validity
Enabling environments	Question: Are the conditions present for the benefit to become durable in daily life? Illustrative indicators: Affordability; transportation; housing; nutrition; digital access; continuity of care	Structural inequity; geographic reach; opportunity cost
Ethical governance and equity	Question: Is innovation governed transparently and are benefits and risks fairly distributed? Illustrative indicators: Representation; consent quality; registry completeness; conflict management; subgroup reach; affordability	Fair selection; accountability; data rights; benefit sharing

Note: Indicators are illustrative and should be selected in relation to the intervention, population, translational stage, and prespecified causal pathway.

Second, longevity and regeneration require designs capable of capturing trajectories, durability, and delayed effects. Extended follow-up, registry linkage, remote monitoring, and repeated measures of function may be essential. Adaptive designs can refine dose or subgroup selection, but adaptation must remain statistically disciplined and ethically governed.

Third, multidomain relationships should be tested rather than assumed. Does a change in a biological clock predict function? Does improved function translate into participation? Which environmental conditions mediate or suppress the benefit? These questions identify the points at which translation fails and protects the field from treating surrogate movement as proof of human value.

Fourth, implementation and equity should enter development early. Feasibility, workforce, supply chains, cost, acceptability, and reach should be investigated before a therapy is optimized for a delivery environment that few systems can reproduce. A learning health system can connect routine care, data, and continuous improvement so that implementation becomes a source of evidence rather than the end of research (Institute of Medicine, 2013).

Fifth, governance itself should be studied as part of the intervention system. Indicators might include representation on advisory bodies, time to safety-signal detection, registry completeness, transparency of decision rationales, management of conflicts, and responsiveness to new evidence. Comparative studies could test whether participatory governance improves trust, recruitment, retention, adoption, or equitable reach.

Clinics, communities, and cities are increasingly being proposed as real-world testbeds for understanding how biological, behavioral, social, and environmental exposures shape healthspan and resilience (Woods et al., 2025). Such settings create an opportunity to study the architecture around an intervention, not only the intervention itself. The objective is not one grand flourishing index. It is a more faithful causal map of how scientific benefit is created, sustained, or lost.

8 Translational Ecosystems: From Convening to Living Laboratory

Translation is an ecosystem property. No laboratory, discipline, or institution contains all the capabilities needed to move a longevity or regenerative intervention from mechanism to safe, sustained, and equitable use. Team science benefits from shared goals, clear roles, integrative leadership, collaboration planning, and organizational support (Stokols et al., 2008; National Research

Council, 2015). Productive disagreement is not a failure of collaboration; it is valuable when institutions possess the trust and methods required to learn from it.

Because translational ecosystems depend on sustained exchange, the design of scientific convening matters. Conferences are often treated primarily as dissemination endpoints: findings are presented, contacts are exchanged, and participants disperse. A deliberately curated convening, however, can function as translational infrastructure – bringing scientists, clinicians, regulators, manufacturers, investors, patients, students, and policymakers into the relationships through which assumptions are challenged, shared language develops, unresolved questions become visible, and new collaborations emerge.

Relationships are not soft infrastructure. They are part of the causal architecture through which knowledge moves.

A scientific special issue arising from such a convening can also do more than preserve proceedings. It can make an emerging field's questions visible, place divergent perspectives in productive proximity, and create an intellectual record from which subsequent experiments, standards, and partnerships can grow.

In that sense, this *HEALinc Global Summit Special Edition* can be understood not simply as an archive of presentations, but as connective tissue within a developing translational community.

Place-based ecosystems offer a related opportunity. A defined region can connect clinical sites, laboratories, regulators, public health, rehabilitation, education, investment, and community partners within relatively short feedback loops. Small states and island jurisdictions may be able to coordinate across sectors with unusual proximity while also facing constraints in workforce, infrastructure, specialist capacity, market size, and climate vulnerability. Their value should not be assumed from scale or speed alone.

A credible place-based ecosystem requires robust regulation, independent ethics review, international-quality manufacturing and laboratory standards, interoperable data, emergency planning, local workforce development, reciprocal community benefit and long-term surveillance. Its success is judged not by the number of companies attracted or procedures delivered, but by the quality of evidence generated, patient safety, local capacity created, equitable global access and contribution to global knowledge.

The value of a jurisdiction lies not in its permissiveness, but in its capacity to become a well-governed learning environment – one that generates trusted

evidence, pioneers responsible and equitable pathways to global access, and catalyzes the development of translational ecosystems in other jurisdictions.

9 Ambition with Guardrails

A visionary field requires guardrails precisely because its possibilities are consequential.

The first risk is conceptual inflation. Medicine cannot and should not claim jurisdiction over every dimension of a good life. Purpose, spirituality, creativity, love, and moral development may matter deeply to health and flourishing, but they arise through culture, relationships, and personal commitment. They should be investigated with appropriate methods, not converted into compulsory clinical norms.

The second risk is optimization pressure. Language about activation and potential can stigmatize disability, dependence, aging, or ordinary human limitation. Flourishing must be compatible with vulnerability and diverse forms of embodiment. The aim is not to produce one permanently high-performing model human. It is to expand genuine opportunity, reduce avoidable suffering, and support plural lives that people themselves value.

The third risk is inequitable innovation. High-cost therapies can absorb attention and resources while prevention, primary care, rehabilitation, and social supports remain underfunded. Translational programs should examine opportunity costs and resist presenting technological intervention as a substitute for action on structural determinants of health (Chen et al., 2021). Advanced therapies and population health can reinforce one another, but only if their relationship is deliberately governed.

The fourth risk is premature certainty. Longevity markets can amplify mechanistic plausibility, biomarker shifts, and uncontrolled case series faster than evidence accumulates. Regulatory agility must remain joined to scientific validity, consent, independent review, transparent claims, and enforceable learning obligations (Emanuel et al., 2000). Where uncertainty is high, language should be narrow, surveillance long, and correction visible.

Finally, no flourishing framework should be presumed culturally complete. Domains and measures must be co-developed and tested across settings. Autonomy, family obligation, work, spirituality, community, and material security may carry different weight in different lives.

Science should be ambitious about the questions it asks and modest about the universality of its answers.

10 The Future Worth Translating

The first great achievement of modern medicine was to convert disease from fate into an object of intervention. The next challenge is to make health – not merely the absence of pathology, but the capacity for resilience, agency, connection, and meaningful participation – an equally rigorous object of translation.

Longevity science and regenerative medicine can help create that future, but technological power alone will not determine whether it arrives. Success will depend on systems capable of connecting mechanism to function, function to lived capability, innovation to trustworthy governance, and benefit to equitable access.

Wisdom as infrastructure names that requirement.

It means building durable capacities for integration, discernment, stewardship, and participation alongside laboratories, algorithms, manufacturing, and regulation. The proposed translational human flourishing framework offers one way to organize the full pathway through which a scientific intervention becomes a human outcome.

The future of medicine will be shaped not only by what biology allows us to edit, grow, measure, or predict, but by the institutions we build to decide what those capabilities are for.

Translational science is therefore also an act of intergenerational stewardship. Its task is not only to carry discovery forward, but to make discovery worthy of the future it will help create.

References

- A. Alimujiang, A. Wiensch, J. Boss, et al., “Association between life purpose and mortality among US adults older than 50 years,” *JAMA Netw. Open*, vol. 2, p. e194270, 2019, doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.4270.
- A.-L. Barabási, N. Gulbahce, and J. Loscalzo, “Network medicine: a network-based approach to human disease,” *Nat. Rev. Genet.*, vol. 12, pp. 56–68, 2011, doi: 10.1038/nrg2918.
- P. Bate and G. Robert, “Experience-based design: from redesigning the system around the patient to co-designing services with the patient,” *Quality and Safety in Health Care*, vol. 15, pp. 307–310, 2006, doi: 10.1136/qshc.2005.016527.
- J. R. Beard, A. Officer, I. A. de Carvalho, et al., “The world report on ageing and health: a policy framework for healthy ageing,” *Lancet*, vol. 387, pp. 2145–2154, 2016, doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(15)00516-4.

- J. B. Becke, B. J. Prendergast, and J. W. Liang, "Female rats are not more variable than male rats: a meta-analysis of neuroscience studies," *Biol. Sex Differ.*, vol. 7, p. 34, 2016, doi: 10.1186/s13293-016-0087-5.
- A. K. Beery and I. Zucker, "Sex bias in neuroscience and biomedical research," *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.*, vol. 35, pp. 565–572, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2010.07.002.
- A. Boaz, S. Hanney, R. Borst, A. O'Shea, and M. Kok, "How to engage stakeholders in research: design principles to support improvement," *Health Research Policy and Systems*, vol. 16, p. 60, 2018, doi: 10.1186/s12961-018-0337-6. This paper presents organizational, practical and values-based principles for sustained stakeholder engagement throughout research rather than isolated consultation.
- D. Cella, W. Riley, A. Stone, et al., "The Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System developed and tested its first wave of adult self-reported health-outcome item banks: 2005–2008," *J. Clin. Epidemiol.*, vol. 63, pp. 1179–1194, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.04.011.
- E. Chen, G. Neta, and M. C. Roberts, "Complementary approaches to problem solving in healthcare and public health: implementation science and human-centered design," *Translational Behavioral Medicine*, vol. 11, pp. 1115–1121, 2021, doi: 10.1093/tbm/ibaa079.
- J. Coast, R. D. Smith, and P. Lorgelly, "Should the capability approach be applied in health economics?," *Health Econ.*, vol. 17, pp. 667–670, 2008, doi: 10.1002/hec.1359.
- F. S. Collins and H. Varmus, "A new initiative on precision medicine," *N. Engl. J. Med.*, vol. 372, pp. 793–795, 2015, doi: 10.1056/NEJMp1500523.
- B. M. Deasy, A. Lu, J. C. Tebbets, et al., "A role for cell sex in stem cell-mediated skeletal muscle regeneration: female cells have higher muscle regeneration efficiency," *J. Cell Biol.*, vol. 177, pp. 73–86, 2007, doi: 10.1083/jcb.200612094.
- E. J. Emanuel, D. Wendler, and C. Grady, "What makes clinical research ethical?," *JAMA*, vol. 283, pp. 2701–2711, 2000, doi: 10.1001/jama.283.20.2701.
- G. L. Engel, "The need for a new medical model: a challenge for biomedicine," *Science*, vol. 196, pp. 129–136, 1977, doi: 10.1126/science.847460.

- V. A. Entwistle and I. S. Watt, "Treating patients as persons: a capabilities approach to support delivery of person-centered care," *Am. J. Bioeth.*, vol. 13, pp. 29–39, 2013, doi: 10.1080/15265161.2013.802060.
- L. Ferrucci, M. Gonzalez-Freire, E. Fabbri, et al., "Measuring biological aging in humans: a quest," *Aging Cell*, vol. 19, p. e13080, 2020, doi: 10.1111/accel.13080.
- J. F. Fries, "Aging, natural death, and the compression of morbidity," *N. Engl. J. Med.*, vol. 303, pp. 130–135, 1980.
- J. Galipeau and L. Sensébé, "Mesenchymal stromal cells: clinical challenges and therapeutic opportunities," *Cell Stem Cell*, vol. 22, pp. 824–833, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.stem.2018.05.004.
- R. E. Glasgow, T. M. Vogt, and S. M. Boles, "Evaluating the public health impact of health-promotion interventions: the RE-AIM framework," *Am. J. Public Health*, vol. 89, pp. 1322–1327, 1999, doi: 10.2105/AJPH.89.9.1322.
- D. J. Greenblatt, J. S. Harmatz, N. N. Singh, et al., "Gender differences in pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of zolpidem following sublingual administration," *J. Clin. Pharmacol.*, vol. 54, pp. 282–290, 2014, doi: 10.1002/jcph.220.
- J. Holt-Lunstad, T. B. Smith, and J. B. Layton, "Social relationships and mortality risk: a meta-analytic review," *PLoS Med.*, vol. 7, p. e1000316, 2010, doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000316.
- S. Horvath and K. Raj, "DNA methylation-based biomarkers and the epigenetic clock theory of ageing," *Nat. Rev. Genet.*, vol. 19, pp. 371–384, 2018, doi: 10.1038/s41576-018-0004-3.
- M. Huber, J. A. Knottnerus, L. Green, et al., "How should we define health?," *BMJ*, vol. 343, p. d4163, 2011, doi: 10.1136/bmj.d4163.
- Institute of Medicine, *Best Care at Lower Cost: The Path to Continuously Learning Health Care in America*. National Academies Press, Washington, DC, 2013, doi: 10.17226/13444.
- H. Kitano, "Systems biology: a brief overview," *Science*, vol. 295, pp. 1662–1664, 2002, doi: 10.1126/science.1069492.
- G. Kroemer, A. B. Maier, A. M. Cuervo, et al., "From geroscience to precision geromedicine: understanding and managing aging," *Cell*, vol. 188, pp. 2043–2062, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2025.03.011.
- Y. Li, Y. Wen, M. Green, et al., "Cell sex affects extracellular matrix protein expression and proliferation of smooth muscle progenitor cells derived from human pluripotent stem cells," *Stem Cell Res. Ther.*, vol. 8, p. 156, 2017, doi: 10.1186/s13287-017-0606-2.

- C. López-Otín and G. Kroemer, “Hallmarks of health,” *Cell*, vol. 184, pp. 33–63, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2020.11.034.
- C. López-Otín, M. A. Blasco, L. Partridge, M. Serrano, and G. Kroemer, “Hallmarks of aging: an expanding universe,” *Cell*, vol. 186, pp. 243–278, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2022.11.001.
- A. S. Mao and D. J. Mooney, “Regenerative medicine: current therapies and future directions,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, vol. 112, pp. 14452–14459, 2015, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1508520112.
- M. Marmot, S. Friel, R. Bell, T. A. J. Houweling, and S. Taylor, “Closing the gap in a generation: health equity through action on the social determinants of health,” *Lancet*, vol. 372, pp. 1661–1669, 2008, doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(08)61690-6.
- C. Mason and P. Dunnill, “A brief definition of regenerative medicine,” *Regen. Med.*, vol. 3, pp. 1–5, 2008, doi: 10.2217/17460751.3.1.1.
- National Institutes of Health, “Consideration of sex as a biological variable in NIH-funded research,” Notice NOT-OD-15-102, 2015.
- National Research Council, *Toward Precision Medicine: Building a Knowledge Network for Biomedical Research and a New Taxonomy of Disease*. National Academies Press, Washington, DC, 2011, doi: 10.17226/13284.
- National Research Council, *Enhancing the Effectiveness of Team Science*, N. J. Cooke and M. L. Hilton, eds. National Academies Press, Washington, DC, 2015, doi: 10.17226/19007.
- A. Ocampo, P. Reddy, P. Martinez-Redondo, et al., “In vivo amelioration of age-associated hallmarks by partial reprogramming,” *Cell*, vol. 167, pp. 1719–1733.e12, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2016.11.052.
- P. E. Plsek and T. Greenhalgh, “Complexity science: the challenge of complexity in health care,” *BMJ*, vol. 323, pp. 625–628, 2001, doi: 10.1136/bmj.323.7313.625.
- E. Proctor, H. Silmere, R. Raghavan, et al., “Outcomes for implementation research: conceptual distinctions, measurement challenges, and research agenda,” *Adm. Policy Ment. Health*, vol. 38, pp. 65–76, 2011, doi: 10.1007/s10488-010-0319-7.
- D. B. Reuben and M. E. Tinetti, “Goal-oriented patient care – an alternative health outcomes paradigm,” *N. Engl. J. Med.*, vol. 366, pp. 777–779, 2012, doi: 10.1056/NEJMp1113631.
- A. Sen, *Development as Freedom*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1999.
- P. Slattery, A. K. Saeri, and P. Bragge, “Research co-design in health: a rapid overview of reviews,” *Health Research Policy and Systems*, vol. 18,

- p. 17, 2020, doi: 10.1186/s12961-020-0528-9. This overview supports the potential value of co-design for researchers, practitioners, research processes and outcomes, while appropriately noting that its long-term impact still requires more systematic evaluation.
- R. E. Sorge, J. C. S. Mapplebeck, S. Rosen, et al., “Different immune cells mediate mechanical pain hypersensitivity in male and female mice,” *Nat. Neurosci.*, vol. 18, pp. 1081–1083, 2015, doi: 10.1038/nn.4053.
- J. Stilgoe, R. Owen, and P. Macnaghten, “Developing a framework for responsible innovation,” *Res. Policy*, vol. 42, pp. 1568–1580, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.respol.2013.05.008.
- D. Stokols, K. L. Hall, B. K. Taylor, and R. P. Moser, “The science of team science: overview of the field and introduction to the supplement,” *Am. J. Prev. Med.*, vol. 35, pp. S77–S89, 2008.
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration, “Risk of next-morning impairment after use of insomnia drugs: FDA requires lower recommended doses for certain drugs containing zolpidem,” *Drug Safety Communication*, 2013.
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Study of Sex Differences in the Clinical Evaluation of Medical Products: Draft Guidance for Industry*, 2025.
- T. J. VanderWeele, “On the promotion of human flourishing,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, vol. 114, pp. 8148–8156, 2017, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1702996114.
- H. E. Whitson, W. Duan-Porter, K. E. Schmader, M. C. Morey, H. J. Cohen, and C. S. Colón-Emeric, “Physical resilience in older adults: systematic review and development of an emerging construct,” *J. Gerontol. A Biol. Sci. Med. Sci.*, vol. 71, pp. 489–495, 2016, doi: 10.1093/gerona/glv202.
- T. Woods, N. Palmarini, L. Corner, et al., “Cities, communities and clinics can be testbeds for human exposome and aging research,” *Nat. Med.*, vol. 31, pp. 1066–1068, 2025, doi: 10.1038/s41591-025-03519-8.
- S. H. Woolf, “The meaning of translational research and why it matters,” *JAMA*, vol. 299, pp. 211–213, 2008, doi: 10.1001/jama.2007.26.
- World Health Organization, *Decade of Healthy Ageing: Baseline Report*. World Health Organization, Geneva, 2020.

