AUCTORES
Globalize your Research

Aging and Geriatric Research
Ernst R. von Schwarz *

Open Access

Research Article

Biological Age Testing Kits: Valid Health Tool or Market Gimmick?

Ernst R. von Schwarz [1,2,3]*, Julian Lloyd Bruce [3], Laurent Cleenewerck de Kiev [3]

[1]Cedars Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA.

[2]Stem Cell & Anti-Aging Institute, Beverly Hills, CA, USA.

[3]Euclid University, Washington DC.

***Corresponding Author:** Ernst R. von Schwarz, Stem Cell & Anti-Aging Institute 324 S. Beverly Drive, #711, Beverly Hills, CA 90212, USA.

Received Date: April 04, 2024 | **Accepted Date:** April 22, 2024 | **Published Date:** April 28, 2024

Citation: Ernst R. von Schwarz, Julian Lloyd Bruce, Laurent Cleenewerck de Kiev, (2025), Biological Age Testing Kits: Valid Health Tool or Market Gimmick?, *Aging and Geriatric Research*, 2(1); **DOI:10.31579/jagr.2025/002**

Abstract:

The concept of biological age, which reflects an individual's functional and molecular state, has gained prominence in anti-aging research and clinical management. The validity and utility of biological age testing kits are explored, including the use of epigenetic clocks, telomere dynamics, and blood-based biomarkers. Epigenetic clocks analyze DNA methylation patterns and demonstrate strong associations with mortality risk and age-related diseases but face challenges related to tissue specificity, ethnic diversity, and technical variability. Telomere length is a marker of cellular aging influenced by genetic and environmental factors, limiting its utility. Blood-based biomarkers offer a cost-effective alternative but require further clinical validation.

This article critically reviews the scientific basis of these testing modalities and evaluates the growing market for consumer-grade biological age kits. It highlights gaps in methodological standardization, questions surrounding clinical relevance, and the ethical concerns tied to commercialization and patient interpretation. The authors argue that while biological age testing holds considerable promise for personalized health monitoring, it currently lacks the reliability needed for widespread clinical use. By synthesizing recent advances and identifying key limitations, the article offers a balanced assessment of the field and outlines research and policy priorities necessary to improve the reproducibility, accessibility, and clinical utility of biological age assessment tools.

Key words: aging research; anti-aging, biologic age tests; mortality; epigenetic clocks; telomere dynamics; blood-based biomarkers; dna methylation

1 Introduction

Aging is an inevitable biological process marked by the gradual decline in physiological function over time. While chronological age measures the time since birth, it does not fully capture the differences in aging rates among individuals. On the other hand, biological age indicates a person's functional and molecular state compared to their chronological peers, providing a more precise gauge of overall health, resilience, and vulnerability to age-related diseases. This concept of biological aging considers genetic predispositions, environmental exposures, and lifestyle factors, offering a more nuanced perspective on the aging process [1].

The philosophy behind assessing biological age arises from the understanding that aging is not uniform among individuals or across populations. Two people with the same chronological age might exhibit vastly different physiological conditions, with one showing signs of premature aging and the other maintaining youthful biological markers. This discrepancy highlights the need to move beyond simple time-based metrics to a deeper exploration of aging at the cellular and molecular levels. By focusing on biological age, researchers and clinicians aim to predict longevity better, prevent disease, and develop targeted interventions to slow or reverse aging processes.

The study of biological age is more than just an academic pursuit; it is a cornerstone of modern anti-aging research. Understanding biological aging at a fundamental level enables scientists to explore therapeutic strategies to extend health span, the period of life spent in good health while delaying the onset of age-related diseases. Whether through pharmacological interventions like senolytics, lifestyle modifications like diet and exercise, or novel gene therapies, the ability to assess biological age provides a foundation for optimizing human longevity [8].

Based on published literature, we discuss the effectiveness and limitations of these testing methods, the financial incentives and ethical concerns surrounding their commercialization, and the implications for clinical practice.

Methods

A targeted literature review was conducted to evaluate the scientific and clinical foundations of biological age testing kits. Sources were identified through searches of PubMed, Google Scholar, Web of Science, and ScienceDirect, using terms such as “biological age,” “epigenetic clocks,” “telomere length,” “blood-based biomarkers,” and “aging biomarkers.”

Inclusion criteria were: peer-reviewed articles published in English within the last ten years (with a focus on the most recent five), human studies, and relevance to biological age estimation using validated methodologies.

Exclusion criteria include: non-peer-reviewed materials, animal studies without clear clinical translation, and articles lacking methodological detail.

Results

Although a universal standard for measuring biological age has not yet been established, several methodologies have emerged as leading indicators in aging research. One well-validated approach uses epigenetic clocks, which estimate biological age by analyzing DNA methylation patterns and chemical modifications to DNA that regulate gene expression. These clocks, such as Horvath's multi-tissue clock, Grim Age, and Dunedin PACE, have shown strong associations with mortality risk and age-related diseases, making them powerful tools for aging assessment [2-4].

Another biological age estimation is telomere dynamics, which reflects the progressive loss of telomere genetic material, the protective caps at the ends of chromosomes, over successive cell divisions. Gradual telomere shortening is a hallmark of aging, with shorter telomere length linked to an increased risk of cardiovascular disease, cancer, and neurodegenerative conditions [40]. However, while telomere length offers valuable insights into cellular aging, its variability across tissues and individuals limits its reliability as a standalone biomarker [5].

In addition to epigenetic and telomeric measures, blood-based biomarkers have become accessible and cost-effective tools for estimating biological age. These biomarkers include inflammatory markers like C-reactive protein (CRP) and interleukin-6 (IL-6), metabolic markers like glucose and lipid profiles, and hormonal markers like insulin-like growth factor 1 (IGF-1) [6]. Recent studies utilizing machine learning models have demonstrated that composite biomarker panels can predict biological age with high accuracy and sensitivity to age-related physiological decline [7].

Epigenetic Clocks

Epigenetic clocks provide a powerful means of estimating biological age by analyzing molecular changes, particularly DNA methylation patterns, that accumulate over time. Biological aging is a complex process driven by intricate molecular alterations, and among these, epigenetic modifications have emerged as one of the most reliable biomarkers of aging. DNA methylation, an epigenetic modification in which methyl groups are added to DNA molecules, plays a significant role in regulating gene expression. Over time, predictable changes in DNA methylation patterns occur, making them valuable for assessing the aging trajectory of individuals. DNA methylation age (DN Am Age) has thus become one of the most widely used indices for estimating biological age and understanding age-related disease risk [9].

In recent years, computational models leveraging machine learning algorithms trained on extensive DNA methylation datasets have significantly advanced the accuracy of biological age estimation. These models focus on specific CpG sites, regions in the genome where a guanine nucleotide follows a cytosine nucleotide because these sites exhibit consistent methylation changes as individuals age. Researchers have developed increasingly precise epigenetic clocks by identifying CpG sites that strongly correlate with chronological age and training algorithms on large datasets [9]. Machine learning techniques such as elastic-net regression play a crucial role in selecting CpG sites that are strong predictors of biological age. The Dunedin PACE clock,

for example, was constructed using longitudinal data from the Dunedin Study cohort, where changes in 19 biomarkers of organ-system integrity were tracked over two decades. Researchers distilled this longitudinal measure of aging into a single-time-point DNA methylation biomarker, creating an algorithm that accurately estimates the pace of aging in individuals [4].

To improve the generalizability of epigenetic clocks, researchers have ensured that training datasets encompass a diverse range of tissue types and populations [2]. This approach allows the models to capture aging patterns applicable across biological contexts. For example, Horvath’s multi-tissue epigenetic clock was developed using DNA methylation data from 51 different tissues and cell types, making it one of the most versatile epigenetic clocks available [2]. While early models primarily relied on DNA methylation data, recent advancements have led to the integration of additional aging-related biomarkers, including blood plasma proteins and metabolic indicators. Grim Age and Dunedin PACE incorporate biomarkers such as plasma proteins, inflammation markers, and metabolic signatures, improving predictive accuracy. Grim Age, in particular, was designed to predict the levels of seven plasma proteins and overall lifespan, making it a more comprehensive assessment tool for biological age [3, 4].

Epigenetic clocks offer more than just age estimation; they also measure epigenetic age acceleration, which is the difference between an individual's biological and chronological age. Positive acceleration indicates that a person's biological age is higher than their chronological age. For instance, the Illumina 450K array was applied to analyze genome-wide DNA methylation in blood samples from around 2,000 individuals aged 50 to 90. It used a validated epigenetic clock algorithm to determine each participant's biological age and compared these estimates to their chronological ages. Over a follow-up period of 10 years, the authors found that each additional year of epigenetic age acceleration was linked to an 8% increase in all-cause mortality risk. Moreover, participants with higher age acceleration were significantly more likely to develop age-related conditions such as cardiovascular disease, cancer, and neurodegenerative disorders. These findings highlight the potential of epigenetic age acceleration as a robust biomarker for predicting overall health outcomes and disease risk [3].

Additionally, Mendelson et al. found that individuals with accelerated epigenetic age exhibited elevated levels of fibrinogen and plasminogen activator inhibitor-1 (PAI-1), which play a role in coagulation and cardiovascular health. These findings suggest that epigenetic age acceleration may contribute to an increased risk of thrombosis, cardiovascular disease, and systemic inflammation [10].

Metabolic syndrome is also a significant factor in premature biological aging. A study conducted by Föhr et al. examined the relationship between metabolic dysfunction and epigenetic aging using Grim Age and Dunedin PACE clocks. The study revealed that metabolic syndrome is associated with accelerated epigenetic aging, independent of lifestyle factors such as physical activity, smoking, and alcohol consumption. One possible explanation is that excessive fat accumulation triggers oxidative stress and chronic inflammation, leading to changes in DNA methylation patterns. The study specifically observed increased DNA m PAI-1, a biomarker linked to adipose tissue inflammation. These findings highlight the importance of metabolic health in aging and suggest that targeted therapeutic interventions may help mitigate premature aging and reduce the risk of age-related diseases [11].

Beyond their role in aging research, epigenetic clocks are being increasingly used to assess the impact of interventions on biological aging. Researchers are exploring how lifestyle factors, dietary patterns, and pharmaceutical treatments influence the trajectory of epigenetic aging. A study in COVID-19 survivors exhibited changes in their epigenetic age, suggesting that infection-induced inflammation may accelerate biological aging [12]. Similarly, daily omega-3 supplementation over three years reduced biological aging markers, indicating a potential role for omega-3 fatty acids in slowing epigenetic aging [41]. Dietary interventions have also been shown to influence epigenetic aging [13]. A study involving identical twins, where one followed a vegan diet while the other consumed an omnivorous diet, found that the vegan twin had a lower biological age, as measured by DNA methylation patterns [42]. This finding suggests that plant-based diets exert rejuvenating effects at the molecular level, possibly due to their anti-inflammatory and antioxidant properties. Additionally, adherence to heart-healthy behaviors, such as regular physical activity, stress reduction, and sufficient sleep, has been associated with slower epigenetic aging [14].

Lifestyle changes may counteract genetic predispositions to accelerated aging, highlighting the importance of environmental factors in determining biological age. Involving 1,200 participants aged 40 to 75, researchers used DNA methylation markers and epigenetic clock algorithms to compare biological and chronological ages. Genetic predispositions were assessed via polygenic risk scores, while lifestyle data were collected through detailed questionnaires. Over a 5-year follow-up, the study found that participants with higher genetic risk who maintained healthier lifestyles showed significantly lower epigenetic age acceleration than those with less favorable lifestyles [15].

Telomere Dynamics

Telomeres, the protective caps at the ends of chromosomes, are composed of repetitive DNA sequences and associated proteins that play a critical role in maintaining genomic stability. Over successive cell divisions, telomeres undergo progressive shortening due to the end-replication problem and oxidative damage, leading to genomic instability and cellular senescence. This shortening process has garnered significant scientific interest, as telomere length is a potential biomarker for biological aging and has been linked to various age-related diseases [18].

Recent publications have further elucidated how telomere shortening contributes to cellular senescence and organismal aging, establishing it as a recognized driver of age-related decline. Telomere dysfunction is implicated in several conditions associated with normal aging, highlighting its critical role in maintaining genomic stability and overall health. In addition to its intrinsic biological mechanisms, telomere length is influenced by various external factors, including genetics, lifestyle, and environmental exposures. Chronic stress, for example, has been linked to accelerated telomere shortening, increasing susceptibility to diseases such as cardiovascular disease and diabetes. Conversely, healthy lifestyle habits, such as regular physical activity, a balanced diet, and effective stress management, have been associated with preserved telomere length, promoting cellular longevity, and possibly reducing the risk of age-related diseases [19].

Furthermore, individuals of the same age with the shortest telomeres have a higher hazard ratio for all-cause mortality than those with the longest telomeres. Telomere length is also related to the incidence, progression, and disease-specific mortality of individual age-related diseases, such as cardiovascular disease, type 2 diabetes, cancer, and Alzheimer's disease [20].

Recent research has shed light on the connection between leukocyte telomere length (LTL) and disease-specific mortality. A comprehensive cohort study utilizing data from the UK Biobank, which included over 472,000 participants, examined the associations between LTL and various causes of death. The study discovered that shorter LTL was associated with a modest increase in overall mortality risk (hazard ratio [HR], 1.08; 95% CI, 1.07-1.09). More significant associations were found for specific diseases, such as respiratory (HR, 1.40; 95% CI, 1.34-1.45), digestive (HR, 1.26; 95% CI, 1.19-1.33), and musculoskeletal disorders (HR, 1.51; 95% CI, 1.35-1.92). Notably, the link between shorter LTL and liver-related mortality remained significant even after adjusting for lifestyle factors like alcohol consumption. This suggests that telomere length may influence disease susceptibility independently of certain behavioral factors [20].

Further studies have explored the complex role of LTL in various diseases. For instance, research indicates that shorter LTL is associated with an increased risk of cardiovascular diseases, type 2 diabetes, and certain cancers [21]. However, the relationship between LTL and cancer risk appears to be cancer-type specific. A study utilizing genetic risk scores found that shorter LTL was associated with a decreased risk of several cancers, including multiple myeloma, chronic lymphocytic leukemia, and kidney cancer. In contrast, an increased risk was observed for other cancers, such as leukemia [22]. These findings suggest that the role of telomere length in cancer development is complex and may vary depending on the cancer type.

Additionally, a study focusing on individuals with metabolic syndrome (MetS) found that shorter telomere length was associated with increased risks of death from cardiovascular disease and all causes over a 17-year follow-up period [20].

Blood-based Biomarkers

Blood-based biomarkers are among the most easily accessible indicators of biological age. Numerous studies have demonstrated the ability of blood-based biomarkers to detect differences in biological age in populations of young, healthy individuals before the onset of diseases associated with accelerated aging. This allows these biomarkers to assess an individual's overall health and aging status, thereby providing a novel approach to predicting biological age. Some of the most informative blood-based markers include inflammatory, metabolic, and hormonal markers [25].

Bortz et al. conducted a study using a dataset of 57 blood-based biomarkers to estimate biological age, aiming to develop a practical and cost-efficient alternative to existing methods like epigenetic clocks and telomere length measurements. By integrating standard clinical assay panels with machine learning models, the authors estimated biological age based on an individual's mortality risk. The study found that age values ranged from 20 years younger to 20 years older than an individual's chronological age, highlighting the strong aging signals present in blood biomarkers. Key biomarkers such as C-reactive protein (CRP), albumin, and glucose levels were mainly associated with accelerated aging, reinforcing the role of inflammation, metabolism, and cardiovascular health's role in aging [26].

The study concluded that combining multiple blood-based biomarkers with machine learning significantly improved biological age prediction. When analyzed using computational models, the researchers emphasized that routine blood tests could provide an accessible and scalable method for estimating biological age [26]. This approach offers a potential foundation for personalized aging interventions, allowing for the development of targeted therapeutics and lifestyle modifications to slow aging and reduce the risk of age-related diseases.

Recent research has delved into developing biomarker indices composed of plasma proteins to predict health outcomes independent of chronological age. A study utilizing data from the UK Biobank Pharma Proteomics Project analyzed approximately 3,000 plasma proteins from over 40,000 individuals. The authors developed models to predict the 10-year likelihood of developing 218 common and rare diseases. Notably, the models' predictive accuracy for 67 diseases surpassed traditional diagnostic methods based on standard clinical information. For instance, the study identified specific blood proteins present at higher levels in individuals who later developed multiple myeloma, a type of bone cancer, up to a decade before clinical diagnosis [27]. These findings suggest that plasma proteomic signatures can serve as practical intermediate phenotypes, potentially guiding interventions to modify the course of aging and prevent disease onset.

Similarly, others developed a proteomic aging clock by analyzing plasma proteins associated with age using a machine learning model to analyze blood samples from a large cohort of participants in the UK Biobank, comprising 45,441 individuals aged 40-70. The authors identified 204 proteins that accurately predicted chronological age. Remarkably, a subset of just 20 proteins captured 91% of the age-prediction accuracy of the larger model [28].

The proteomic clock was validated in two additional biobanks: the China Kadoorie Biobank (3,977 participants, aged 30-80 years) and FinnGen (1,990 participants, aged 20-80 years), demonstrating its robustness across diverse genetic and geographic populations. This clock was considered a predictor of health outcomes independent of chronological age. Specifically, individuals whose proteomic age was higher than their chronological age had an increased risk of developing 18 chronic diseases, including diabetes, neurodegenerative conditions, cancer, and diseases of the heart, liver, kidney, and lung [29].

Effectiveness and Limitations of Testing

Advancements in the assessment of biological age have led to the development of various testing methodologies, including blood-based biomarker analysis, epigenetic clocks, and consumer-oriented testing kits. These methods aim to estimate an individual's biological age more precisely, which may differ significantly from chronological age due to genetic, environmental, and lifestyle factors. While these tests offer intriguing insights into aging and health, their effectiveness and clinical utility remain subjects of ongoing research and debate. Among these approaches, epigenetic clocks, which estimate biological age based on DNA methylation changes, have garnered significant attention. A study funded by the National Institute on Aging evaluated the predictive power of epigenetic clocks for health outcomes in older adults, concluding that while they offer valuable insights, traditional factors such as demographics, socioeconomic status, mental health, and lifestyle behaviors remain stronger predictors of health and longevity [30]. The Glasgow-Karolinska Clock, developed by a team of European researchers, was also designed to improve aging assessments in clinical settings. Despite validation across healthy and diseased tissues, researchers emphasized further refinement before epigenetic clocks can be widely adopted in medical practice [31].

Blood-based biomarker analysis has also shown promise in assessing biological age. A large-scale study using data from the UK Biobank analyzed 60 circulating blood biomarkers from over 306,000 participants. It developed an Elastic-Net-derived Cox model incorporating 25 selected biomarkers to predict mortality risk. This model achieved a concordance index (C-Index) of 0.778, outperforming the well-known PhenoAge model (C-Index of 0.750), demonstrating that biological age estimates could vary by as much as 20 years relative to an individual's chronological age [26]. These findings suggest that blood-based biomarker panels can detect physiological deterioration and estimate biological age more accurately than chronological measures alone. However, their clinical translation requires further validation to ensure consistent and reproducible results across diverse populations. Similarly, Tally Health introduced "CheekAge," a non-invasive cheek swab test designed to predict biological age by analyzing cells from the inner cheek. Shokhirev & Haggerty demonstrated that CheekAge results correlated with mortality risk and were comparable to blood-based DNAm PhenoAge [32]. Despite these promising findings, such consumer-oriented tests' clinical significance and long-term reliability remain uncertain.

The growing market for epigenetic age testing is exemplified by consumer-oriented testing kits, such as those reviewed in the Top 5 Epigenetic Age Tests on Spannr.com. These commercially available at-home tests analyze DNA methylation patterns to estimate biological age and provide users with personalized reports. The reviewed tests include Novos Age, which employs the DunedinPACE Rate of Aging Clock, and Index by Elysium Health, which integrates a proprietary approach developed in partnership with Illumina. MyDNAge, using Dr. Steve Horvath's Epigenetic Aging Clock, analyzes over 2,000 biomarkers to estimate biological age, while the TallyAge test incorporates lifestyle and health factors to generate customized assessments. TruAge COMPLETE offers a comprehensive analysis, including biological age, telomere length, and rate of aging, along with personalized health consultations [33]. Although these tests offer accessible insights into biological aging, concerns remain regarding their accuracy, reproducibility, and clinical relevance. Variability in laboratory methodologies, data normalization techniques, and biomarker selection can impact test reliability, leading to inconsistencies in biological age estimates.

Discussion

Despite the promise of biological age testing, significant challenges remain. A review published in Frontiers in Genetics highlighted that while telomere shortening is a hallmark of cellular senescence and organismal aging, its utility as a standalone biomarker is limited due to high interindividual variability and the influence of genetic and environmental factors [34]. Likewise, while biological age tests based on DNA methylation and blood biomarkers have demonstrated strong associations with aging-related traits and disease risks, their ability to capture the complexity of aging remains an open question. Aging is a multifactorial process influenced by genetics, inflammation, metabolism, and external stressors, making it challenging to create a single, definitive biomarker of biological age. Consequently, while these emerging testing methodologies hold great potential, further research is required to refine their predictive accuracy, improve their clinical applicability, and establish standardized protocols that ensure their reliability in research and healthcare settings.

One of the primary limitations in applying epigenetic clocks is the tissue-specific nature of DNA methylation patterns. Many epigenetic clocks have been developed using blood-based DNA methylation data, which may not fully capture aging processes occurring in other tissues. As a result, their accuracy declines when applied to tissue types not included in the model's training data [9]. Additionally, many epigenetic clocks operate under the assumption that DNA methylation changes occur constantly throughout life. However, research indicates that methylation rates fluctuate at different life stages, making age predictions less reliable in younger or older individuals [9]. Another challenge is the limited ethnic diversity in epigenetic clock training datasets. Most existing clocks have been developed using data from populations of European descent, raising concerns about their applicability to other ethnic groups. DNA methylation patterns can vary significantly due to genetic, environmental, and lifestyle factors, and a study focusing on Chinese cohorts found that their age-related DNA methylation changes differed from those observed in European populations [2]. This finding highlights the need for population-specific epigenetic clocks to ensure accurate biological age estimation across diverse groups. Additionally, technical variability in DNA methylation measurement platforms and data processing methods can introduce noise into epigenetic age estimates, reducing the precision and reproducibility of results [16].

To address these challenges, researchers are working to develop more comprehensive and robust epigenetic clocks that incorporate data from multiple tissue types and ethnically diverse populations. Advanced statistical models that account for non-linear methylation changes and integrate multi-omics data, such as transcriptomic and proteomic information, may enhance the accuracy of biological age predictions [17]. Continuous validation and refinement of these models are essential to improve their reliability as biomarkers of biological aging. Future directions will likely focus on refining these models, improving their predictive power, and exploring their use in guiding personalized interventions to slow aging and prevent age-related diseases.

Up-to-date research has provided a more nuanced understanding of telomere length as a biomarker for aging. While telomere shortening is a recognized hallmark of cellular senescence and organismal aging, its utility as a standalone indicator is limited. Variability in telomere length among individuals, influenced by genetic predispositions and environmental exposures, complicates its application in clinical settings. A recent review emphasized that telomere length offers a rough estimate of the aging rate and may not serve as a clinically significant risk marker for age-related pathologies and mortality [23]. The evidence suggesting telomere length as a biomarker of aging in humans is equivocal, with some studies failing to find significant correlations between telomere length and mortality risk in the elderly [24]. These inconsistencies highlight the need for more longitudinal studies to assess the relationship between telomere dynamics and aging-related parameters.

Factors such as oxidative stress, inflammation, and lifestyle choices can also accelerate telomere attrition, further complicating telomere length as a solitary biomarker [24]. Consequently, while telomere length remains a valuable component in the study of aging, relying solely on it for assessing biological age or predicting age-related disease risk is inadequate. A comprehensive approach that includes multiple biomarkers and considers individual variability is essential for accurate assessment.

The commercialization of biological age testing has created a lucrative industry, with companies marketing at-home test kits that claim to provide precise insights into an individual's aging trajectory. These tests often capitalize on the growing interest in longevity science and the public's desire to optimize health and extend lifespan. However, the financial motivations behind these products raise ethical concerns, particularly when test manufacturers overpromise results or fail to disclose the limitations of their methodologies [35]. Companies profit from a largely unregulated market where scientific rigor varies significantly between products by offering consumers the ability to assess their biological age, often for substantial fees.

The primary issue with many of these testing kits is that they present biological age as an absolute and definitive measure of one's health and aging status. While research supports the utility of biomarkers such as DNA methylation patterns, telomere length, and blood-based markers in estimating biological age, these methods are not foolproof. Genetic variability, environmental exposures, and daily fluctuations in biological markers can influence test results, leading to inconsistent and misleading outcomes. Despite these uncertainties, companies continue to market their tests as highly reliable, creating a false sense of accuracy that misleads consumers [36].

For patients, receiving an unexpectedly high biological age result can be alarming, causing unnecessary distress, anxiety, or even panic. Many individuals, particularly those who invest significant time and money into maintaining their health, view biological age as a reflection of their longevity. When results suggest premature aging, it can lead to excessive worry, self-doubt, and unwarranted lifestyle changes. Some patients may react by obsessively altering their diet, exercise regimen, or supplement intake to "reverse" their biological age, often with little scientific evidence that such interventions will significantly alter their test results. Others may feel resigned to the fate of accelerated aging, leading to psychological distress, frustration, and dissatisfaction with their perceived health status [37].

Physicians increasingly find themselves at the center of these concerns as patients bring their biological age test results to medical consultations, seeking validation or corrective action. This burdens healthcare professionals to temper expectations and provide a balanced perspective on what these tests measure. Physicians must explain the limitations of biological age assessments, emphasizing that they are estimates based on evolving scientific models rather than definitive predictors of health or lifespan. This process requires considerable time and effort, as patients who have invested emotionally and financially in these tests may resist hearing that their results are not as conclusive or predictive as they were led to believe [38].

Additionally, the proliferation of misleading biological age tests can erode trust between patients and healthcare providers. When physicians dismiss unreliable results or attempt to clarify the uncertainties of biological aging, some patients may feel that their concerns are being invalidated. In contrast, those receiving reassuring results from test kits may develop a false sense of security, potentially neglecting essential medical screenings or ignoring other risk factors contributing to aging and disease. This dynamic creates a complex challenge for clinicians, who must navigate patient anxieties while reinforcing evidence-based medicine over commercial claims [38].

The responsibility for addressing these concerns extends beyond individual physicians to regulatory bodies and scientific institutions. Administrative oversight is recommended to ensure that biological age test manufacturers provide transparent, science-backed information on the accuracy and limitations of their products. Without such regulation, companies will continue to exploit consumer fears and aspirations, prioritizing financial gain over scientific integrity. Until more robust standards are established, it remains essential for healthcare professionals to guide patients in interpreting their biological age results with caution, encouraging informed decision-making rather than reactionary responses based on potentially misleading data [39].

Over the next decade, biological age testing kits are poised to become integral tools in both personalized medicine and population-level health management. Recent longitudinal studies have demonstrated that epigenetic clocks such as Grim Age and Dunedin PACE can reliably predict mortality and the onset of age-related diseases across diverse populations, even outperforming traditional clinical metrics in certain contexts [4, 12]. Concurrently, proteomic and blood-based biomarker models have shown increasing utility in forecasting disease onset up to ten years in advance, with predictive accuracy that often exceeds conventional diagnostic approaches [27]. With the proliferation of at-home test kits and decreasing costs of high-throughput omics technologies, biological age assessments may soon serve as routine screening tools in primary care, wellness programs, and longevity clinics. However, this expansion will likely depend on ongoing validation efforts, standardization of methodologies, and clear regulatory guidelines to ensure their clinical reliability and ethical deployment. As precision aging becomes a cornerstone of health optimization strategies, these kits may evolve from niche consumer products to essential instruments in preventive health frameworks.

Conclusion

Epigenetic clocks, telomere dynamics, and blood-based biomarkers offer promising methods for estimating biological age, but each approach has limitations. Epigenetic clocks, though powerful, face challenges related to tissue specificity, ethnic diversity, and technical variability. While a recognized marker of cellular aging, telomere length is influenced by genetic and environmental factors, limiting its standalone utility. Blood-based biomarkers provide accessible insights but require further validation for clinical application.

The provision of transparent, science-backed information and stronger regulatory oversight is evident to prevent misleading claims and ensure consumer trust. While biological age testing kits hold significant promise, ongoing research and refinement are essential to enhance their accuracy, reliability, and clinical relevance in optimizing human longevity and health span.

Declarations:

Ethics approval and consent to participate: No human or animal subjects were used in this literature review; therefore, ethical approval and participation consent are unnecessary.

Consent for publication: No personal details, images, or videos of any individual were included in this manuscript.

Availability of data and material: Not applicable.

Competing interests: No conflicts of interest.

Funding: No external funding was received to conduct this research.

Authors' contributions: Ernst R. von Schwarz, MD, PhD is the primary author, along with Julian Bruce who together conducted the initial research and drafted of the manuscript. Laurent Cleenewerck de Kiev, PhD, FRSPH performed significant editing and additional research to tie the manuscript together before final review and approval by all three authors.

Acknowledgements: There are no acknowledgements.

Studies involving plants: Not applicable, as this study does not involve plants.

References

1. Mayo Clinic Staff. "Understanding the Difference Between Biological Age and Chronological Age." Mayo Clinic Press, 2023.
2. Horvath, S. (2013). "DNA methylation age of human tissues and cell types." Genome Biology, 14(10), R115.
3. Lu, A. T., Quach, A., Wilson, J. G., Reiner, A. P., Aviv, A., & Raj, K. (2019). "DNA methylation GrimAge strongly predicts lifespan and healthspan." Aging, 11(2), 303–327.
4. Belsky, D. W., Caspi, A., Corcoran, D. L., Sugden, K., Poulton, R., Arseneault, L., Baccarelli, A., Chamarti, K., Gao, X., Hannon, E., Harrington, H., Houts, R., Kothari, M., Kwon, D., Mill, J., Schwartz, J., Vokonas, P., Wang, C., Williams, B. S., & Moffitt, T. E. (2022). DunedinPACE, a DNA methylation biomarker of the pace of aging. eLife, 11, e73420.
5. Zhu, X., Han, W., Xue, W., Zou, Y., Xie, C., Du, J., & Jin, G. (2016). The association between telomere length and cancer risk in population studies. Scientific Reports, 6, 22243.
6. Franceschi, C., Garagnani, P., Parini, P., Giuliani, C., & Santoro, A. (2018). Inflammaging: a new immune–metabolic viewpoint for age-related diseases. Nature Reviews Endocrinology, 14(10), 576–590.
7. Putin, E., Mamoshina, P., Aliper, A., Korzinkin, M., Moskalev, V., & Zhavoronkov, A. (2016). "Deep biomarkers of human aging: Application of deep neural networks to biomarker development." Aging, 8(5), 1021–1033.
8. Belsky, D. W., Caspi, A., Arseneault, L., et al. (2020). "Quantification of biological aging in young adults." Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 112(30), E4104–E4110.
9. Bell, C. G., Lowe, R., Adams, P. D., Baccarelli, A. A., Beck, S., Bell, J. T., Christensen, B. C.,et.al. (2019). DNA methylation aging clocks: challenges and recommendations. Genome Biology, 20(1), 249.
10. Mendelson, M. M., Marioni, R. E., Joehanes, R., Liu, C., Hedman, Å. K,et.al. (2017). Association of Body Mass Index With DNA Methylation and Gene Expression in Blood Cells and Relations to Cardiometabolic Disease: A Mendelian Randomization Approach. PLoS Medicine, 14(1), e1002215.
11. Föhr, T., Tolvanen, A., Nevalainen, T., Sarin, A.-P., Hovatta, I., Ollikainen, M., & Kaprio, J. (2023). Metabolic syndrome and epigenetic aging: a twin study. International Journal of Obesity, 47(1), 103–111.
12. Quach, A., Levine, M. E., Tanaka, T., Lu, A. T., Chen, B. H., Ferrucci, L., Ritz, B., Bandinelli, S., Neuhouser, M. L., Beasley, J. M., Snetselaar, L.,et.al. (2017). "Epigenetic clock analysis of diet, exercise, education, and lifestyle factors." Aging, 9(2), 419–446.
13. Bischoff-Ferrari, H. A., Vellas, B., Rizzoli, R., Kressig, R. W., Da Silva, J. A., Blauth, M., Kanis, J. A., & Group, D. S. (2025). Individual and additive effects of vitamin D, omega-3, and exercise on epigenetic clocks: A randomized controlled trial. Nature Aging, 5(2), 123–131.
14. Dwaraka, V. B., Landry, M. J., Gardner, C. D., & Spector, T. D. (2024). Unveiling the epigenetic impact of vegan vs. omnivorous diets on aging: Insights from the Twins Nutrition Study (TwiNS). BMC Medicine, 22(1), 315.
15. Fiorito, G., & McCrory, C. (2018). Epigenetics and cardiovascular aging: The role of lifestyle factors. Journal of the American Heart Association, 7(12), e008651.
16. Technical variability across the 450K, EPICv1, and EPICv2 DNA methylation microarrays. Clinical Epigenetics, 2024.
17. Li, X., Ploner, A., Wang, Y., Magnusson, P. K. E., Reynolds, C., Finkel, D., Pedersen, N. L., Jylhävä, J., & Hägg, S. (2020). Longitudinal trajectories, correlations and mortality associations of nine biological ages across 20-years follow-up. eLife, 9, e51507.
18. Mather, K. A., Jorm, A. F., Parslow, R. A., & Christensen, H. (2011). Is Telomere Length a Biomarker of Aging? A Review. The Journals of Gerontology: Series A, 66A(2), 202–213.
19. Shammas, M. A. (2011). Telomeres, Lifestyle, Cancer, and Aging. Current Opinion in Clinical Nutrition & Metabolic Care, 14(1), 28–34.
20. Zhan, Y., Clements, M. S., Roberts, R. O., & Vassilaki, M. (2018). Association of Telomere Length With Risk of Disease and Mortality. JAMA Network Open, 1(6), e183692.
21. Haycock, P. C., Heydon, E. E., Kaptoge, S., Butterworth, A. S., Thompson, A., & Willeit, P. (2014). Leucocyte telomere length and risk of cardiovascular disease: systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ, 349, g4227.
22. Gao, K., Wei, C., & Du, H. (2020). Assessing the Relationship Between Leukocyte Telomere Length and Cancer Risk Using Genetic Risk Scores in the UK Biobank and TCGA Cohorts. Frontiers in Genetics, 11, 583106.
23. Vaiserman, A., & Krasnienkov, D. (2021). Telomere Length as a Marker of Biological Age: State-of-the-Art, Open Issues, and Future Perspectives. Frontiers in Genetics, 11, 630186.
24. Demanelis, K., Jasmine, F., Chen, L. S., Chernoff, M., Tong, L., Delgado, D., Zhang, C., Shinkle, J., Sabarinathan, M., Lin, H., Hur, J., & Pierce, B. L. (2020). Determinants of telomere length across human tissues. Science, 369(6509), eaaz6876.
25. Levine, M. E., Lu, A. T., Quach, A., Chen, B. H., Assimes, T. L., Bandinelli, S., Hou, L., Baccarelli, A. A., Stewart, J. D., Li, Y., Whitsel, E. A., Wilson, J. G., Reiner, A. P., Aviv, A., Lohman, K., Liu, Y., Ferrucci, L., & Horvath, S. (2018). An epigenetic biomarker of aging for lifespan and healthspan. Aging, 10(4), 573–591.
26. Bortz, J., Guariglia, A., Klaric, L., Tang, D., Ward, P., Geer, M., Chadeau-Hyam, M., Vuckovic, D., & Joshi, P. K. (2023). Biological age estimation using circulating blood biomarkers. Communications Biology, 6(1), 56.
27. Carrasco-Zanini, J., Scott, R. A., & Langenberg, C. (2024). Proteomic signatures improve risk prediction for common and rare diseases. Nature Medicine, 30(7), 1472–1483.
28. Argentieri, M. A., Zhan, Y., Wang, Q., Pedersen, N. L., & Hägg, S. (2024). Proteomic aging clock predicts mortality and risk of common age-related diseases in diverse populations. Nature Medicine, 30(7), 1472–1483.
29. Lehallier, B., Gate, D., Schaum, N., Nanasi, T., Lee, S. E., Yousef, H., ... & Wyss-Coray, T. (2019). Undulating changes

in human plasma proteome across lifespan are linked to disease. Nature Medicine, 25(12), 1843–1850.
30. National Institute on Aging. (2022). Age estimated by changes to DNA can help predict health outcomes, mortality in older adults. National Institute on Aging.
31. Erlandsson, H., Shiels, P. G., Stenvinkel, P., & Bacos, K. (2023). Epigenetic clocks indicate that kidney transplantation and not dialysis mitigate the effects of renal ageing. Journal of Internal Medicine, 294(5), 789–802.
32. Shokhirev, M. N., & Haggerty, L. (2024). CheekAge, a next-generation epigenetic buccal clock, is predictive of mortality in human blood. Frontiers in Aging, 4, 1460360.
33. "Top 5 Epigenetic Age Tests." Spannr, 2023.
34. Muezzinler, A., Zaineddin, A. K., & Brenner, H. (2013). A systematic review of leukocyte telomere length and age in adults. Ageing Research Reviews, 12(2), 509–519.
35. Policy Horizons Canada. (2024). The commercialization of biological data: Implications for privacy, ethics, and security. Government of Canada.
36. Kraus, L. M., Kothari, P. H., & Kimmel, M. (2019). Ethical, legal, and social implications of epigenetic clocks in non-medical applications. Environmental Epigenetics, 5(3), dvz018.
37. Aubrey, A. (2024, February 5). You can order a test to find out your biological age. Is it worth it? National Public Radio (NPR).
38. Belsky, D. W., Caspi, A., Cohen, H. J., Kraus, W. E., Ramrakha, S., Poulton, R., & Moffitt, T. E. (2020). Impact of early personal-history characteristics on the Pace of Aging: Implications for clinical trials of therapies to slow aging and extend healthspan. eLife, 9, e63420 /
39. Stefanska, B., & MacEwan, D. J. (2022). Ethical, legal, and social issues in epigenetics research and personalized medicine. Clinical Epigenetics, 14, 63.
40. Blackburn, E. H., Epel, E. S., & Lin, J. (2015). Human telomere biology: A contributory and interactive factor in aging, disease risks, and protection. Science, 350(6265), 1193–1198.
41. Bischoff-Ferrari, H.A., et al. (2025). Omega-3 fatty acids and vitamin D slow biological aging in older adults. News-Medical.
42. Spivack, E. (2024). This Twin Study Reveals A Shocking Benefit from a Vegan Diet. Inverse.

DOI:10.31579/jagr.2025/002