medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.06.03.23290933; this version posted November 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 Robust metabolomic age prediction based on a wide selection of metabolites

Tariq Faquih¹, Astrid van Hylckama Vlieg¹, Praveen Surendran^{2,3,4,5,6}, Adam S. Butterworth^{2,3,4,7,8}, 2 Ruifang Li-Gao^{1,9}, Renée de Mutsert¹, Frits R. Rosendaal¹, Raymond Noordam¹⁰, Diana van Heemst¹⁰, 3 Ko Willems van Dijk^{11,12,13}, Dennis O. Mook-Kanamori^{1,14} 4 5 6 ¹ Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands. 7 8 (T.O.F.; A.v.H.V.; R.L.-G.; R.d.M; F.R.R.; D.O.M.-K.) 9 ²British Heart Foundation Cardiovascular Epidemiology Unit, Department of Public Health and Primary 10 11 Care, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK. (P.S.; A.S.B.) 12 ³ British Heart Foundation Centre of Research Excellence, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK. 13 14 (P.S.; A.S.B.) 15 ⁴ Health Data Research UK Cambridge, Wellcome Genome Campus and University of Cambridge, 16 17 Cambridge, UK. (P.S.; A.S.B.) 18 ⁵ Rutherford Fund Fellow, Department of Public Health and Primary Care, University of Cambridge, 19 20 Cambridge, UK. (P.S.) 21 22 ⁶ GSK plc., Stevenage, England, United Kingdom; (P.S.) 23 ⁷ Victor Phillip Dahdaleh Heart and Lung Research Institute, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK; 24 25 (A.S.B.) 26 ⁸ NIHR Blood and Transplant Research Unit in Donor Health and Behaviour, Department of Public 27 28 Health and Primary Care, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK. (A.S.B.) 29 30 ⁹ Metabolon, Inc., Morrisville, North Carolina, United State of America. (R.L.-G.) 31 ¹⁰ Department of Internal Medicine, Section of Gerontology and Geriatrics, Leiden University Medical 32 33 Center, Leiden, The Netherlands. (R.N.; D.v.H.) 34 ¹¹ Department of Human Genetics, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands. 35 36 (K.W.v.D) 37 ¹² Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Endocrinology, Leiden University Medical Center, 38 39 Leiden, The Netherlands. (K.W.v.D) 40 ¹³ Einthoven Laboratory for Experimental Vascular Medicine, Leiden University Medical Center, 41 42 Leiden, The Netherlands. (K.W.v.D) 43 ¹⁴ Department of Public Health and Primary Care, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The 44 Netherlands. (D.O.M.-K.)

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

45 Abstract

Chronological age is a major risk factor for numerous diseases. However, chronological age does not 46 47 capture the complex biological aging process. Biological aging can occur at a different pace in 48 individuals of the same chronological age. Therefore, the difference between the chronological age 49 and biologically driven aging could be more informative in reflecting health status. Metabolite levels 50 are thought to reflect the integrated effects of both genetic and environmental factors on the rate of 51 aging, and may thus provide a stronger signature for biological age than those previously developed 52 using methylation and proteomics. Here, we set out to develop a metabolomic age prediction model 53 by applying ridge regression and bootstrapping with 826 metabolites (of which 678 endogenous and 54 148 xenobiotics) measured by an untargeted high-performance liquid chromatography mass spectrometry platform (Metabolon) in 11,977 individuals (50.2% men) from the INTERVAL study 55 56 (Cambridge, UK). Participants of the INTERVAL study are relatively healthy blood donors aged 18-75 57 years. After internal validation using bootstrapping, the models demonstrated high performance with 58 an adjusted R² of 0.82 using the endogenous metabolites only and an adjusted R² of 0.83 when using 59 the full set of 826 metabolites with age as outcome. The latter model performance could be indicative 60 of xenobiotics predicting frailty. In summary, we developed robust models for predicting metabolomic 61 age in a large relatively healthy population with a wide age range.

62 Introduction

63 Chronological age is a major risk factor for a multitude of diseases (1, 2). The biology of aging 64 comprises complex and multifactorial processes that are influenced by genetic, lifestyle and 65 environmental factors (3-5). Evidently, the rate of biological aging varies between individuals, as in contrast to other individuals of the same age group, wherein, some individuals are able to live to an 66 older chronological age without age-related diseases and disability (3). This suggests that 67 68 chronological age does not align with the biological aging process. For this reason, several studies have 69 aimed to capture the signature of biological changes due to aging process by predicting its rate based 70 on biological factors using, for example, DNA methylation (6) and proteins (7).

Metabolomic profiling aims to identify small molecules that are mostly substrates or products of metabolism (metabolites). The number of metabolomics studies has increased in recent years due to major technological advances and the availability of (validated and high throughput) commercial and noncommercial analyses platforms. In addition, the current platforms have improved their capability to detect and quantify large numbers of endogenous and xenobiotic metabolites(8, 9). Since individual metabolomic profiles reflect the influences of both genetic and acquired factors, they are thought to provide a more holistic representation of biological processes, such as aging (8, 9). Furthermore, as

78 metabolomic profiles are strongly affected by chronological age (4, 10) and sex (11, 12), they have 79 been used to develop prediction models of chronological age (i.e., the metabolomic age) (13-16). 80 However, predicting metabolomic age using metabolomics had limited success or faced 81 methodological limitations due to several reasons. First, some studies used a relatively small sample 82 size to predict age using hundreds or even thousands of metabolite predictors (10, 17). The inclusion 83 of a larger number of predictors than the number of samples may cause overfitting and bias. Second, previous metabolomic age studies used targeted platforms, such as the Nightingale platform, that 84 85 specifically measure a small number of lipoproteins and some low-molecular metabolites. This limits the variety of the metabolites and the information used for the prediction of age. Third, studies may 86 87 be limited by the age distribution of the cohort study. This may restrict the model to a specific age 88 range which affects the generalizability of the model in other studies and other age groups (10). 89 Fourth, generalizability may also be reduced if the model is developed in cohorts with an oversampling 90 of individuals with specific disease outcomes or specific population characteristics (7, 13). Fifth, 91 statistical methodology such as stepwise selection, have been reported to cause overfitting of the 92 prediction model (18). Finally, it is challenging to examine the model's validity and generalizability in 93 external studies or different populations particularly due to the dynamic nature of metabolite levels 94 (19-21).

95 In this study, we aimed to develop a model to predict metabolomic age in a large healthy population 96 with a widespread age range, using a single untargeted metabolomics platform. To attain this goal, 97 we developed a prediction model using data from the INTERVAL study (22) (University of Cambridge, 98 Cambridge, UK). Metabolomic profiles were available in 11,977 participants as measured using 99 Metabolon's (Durham, North Carolina, USA) untargeted metabolomics platform. These 100 measurements included a broad range of endogenous and xenobiotic metabolites (n=1,363) from 101 various biochemical pathways, thereby enabling the capture of metabolites related to a vast range of 102 ageing effects.

103 Methods

104 INTERVAL Study

The INTERVAL study is a prospective cohort study of approximately 50,000 participants nested within a pragmatic randomized sample of blood donors (22). Between 2012 and 2014, blood donors, aged 18 years and older, were consented and recruited from 25 National Health Service Blood and Transplant (NHSBT) static donor centers across the UK. The INTERVAL study was approved by The National Research Ethics Service (11/EE/0538). Individuals with major disease (myocardial infarction,

110 stroke, cancer etc.) as well as those who reported being unwell or having had recent illness or infection 111 or did not fulfill the other criteria required for blood donation (22, 23) were ineligible for the study. Therefore, participants included in the study were predominantly healthy. Participants completed 112 113 online questionnaires addressing basic lifestyle and health-related information, including selfreported height and weight, ethnicity, smoking status, alcohol consumption, doctor-diagnosed 114 115 anemia, use of medications (hormone replacement therapy, iron supplements) and menopausal status (22). Untargeted metabolomic data were available in 11,979 individuals (age range 18 - 75). 116 Two individuals had incorrect or missing height/weight values and were therefore excluded from the 117 study. Thus, the final sample size for the current study was 11,977. 118

119 Untargeted metabolomic measurements

120 Untargeted metabolomic measurements were quantified at Metabolon Inc. (Durham, North Carolina, USA) using Metabolon™ Discovery HD4 platform. In brief, this process involves four independent ultra-121 122 high-performance liquid chromatography mass spectrometry (UHPLC-MS/MS) platforms (24, 25). Of 123 these platforms, two used positive ionization reverse phase chromatography, one used negative ionization reverse phase chromatography, and one used hydrophilic interaction liquid 124 125 chromatography negative ionization (25). Known metabolites were annotated at Metabolon Inc. with 126 chemical names, super pathways, sub pathways, biochemical properties, and compound identifiers 127 from various metabolite databases. Metabolomic measurements in the INTERVAL study were 128 conducted in three batches (n=4087, 4566, and 3326). Subsequent harmonization and quality checks 129 were performed between the batches by Metabolon. All metabolite measurements were scaled to a 130 median of 1.

131 Selection of Predictors

132 We aimed to select metabolites consistently and reliably measured by the Metabolon platform. In total 1,411 metabolites were measured in the INTERVAL study. First, we removed metabolites 133 134 completely missing in at least one of the batches (n=175). Second, we excluded metabolites without 135 annotation (unnamed metabolites) (n=258), keeping only endogenous and xenobiotic metabolites. 136 These metabolites were excluded as they are inconsistently measured by the platform and are highly variable between batches and studies. Moreover, the lack of full annotation increases the uncertainty 137 that we are using the same metabolite across batches and studies and leaves no secondary 138 139 information for further verification. Third, we excluded metabolites measured in less than 100 140 individuals (n=30). Fourth, to ensure that the metabolites that are used for our model are not unique 141 for the INTERVAL study, we cross-referenced our dataset with an independent study with Metabolon

measurements. For this we used the Netherlands Epidemiology of Obesity (NEO) study, a populationbased (n=599) cohort study of individuals aged 45–65 years (26, 27). Based on this comparison, we additionally excluded 122 metabolites that were not detected in the NEO study. The final set of metabolites included 826 metabolites, with 678 endogenous and 148 xenobiotic metabolites that were confirmed to be regularly measured by the Metabolon platform (Figure 1).

147 Missing value imputation

Missing values were imputed using the pipeline as described in our previous work (27). In brief, endogenous metabolites were imputed by multiple imputation using chained equations method to generate five imputed datasets (m=5). For each metabolite with missing values, we used the outcome variable (i.e., age), 5-10 highly correlated related metabolites, body mass index (BMI), center number where the blood samples were collected, and the batch number to impute the missing values. Xenobiotic metabolites were imputed to zero to account for true missingness.

154 Model Development

155 For the development of the model, we used ridge regression (28) to reduce potential overfitting. Cross 156 validation was performed (n=10) in each imputed dataset to calculate the optimal shrinkage term 157 (lambda). Subsequently the mean of the lambda values was used to develop the model on the stacked 158 imputed datasets (i.e., all 5 datasets combined as one). Accordingly, the weight of the observations in the stacked dataset was set to 1/m = 1/5 = 0.2 (20). As the outcome (age) is a continuous variable, we 159 assessed the fit of the model by deriving the R². As an additional sensitivity test, we used generalized 160 161 additive model (GAM) to examine and calculate the R² for the nonlinear correlation. Internal validation 162 was performed using bootstrapping (b=100). Bootstrapping results were used for the optimization of R^2 and the calculation of the mean squared error (MSE) and the mean absolute error (MAE) of the 163 164 model. Two models were developed using two sets of the selected metabolite predictors. First, we used the full set of endogenous and xenobiotic metabolites (n=826) to develop "model A". Second, 165 we used only the endogenous metabolites (n=678) to develop "model B". As previous studies found 166 167 that metabolomic profiles (12, 29) and aging (30-32) are influenced by the sex of individuals, we 168 included sex as an additional predictor in both models.

169 Sample size considerations

The primary database used to create the prediction model was the INTERVAL study (n= 11,977) with 826 predictors. We used the formulas described by Riley et al. (33) to confirm that our sample size (n) and number of predictor (p) are sufficient to minimize overfitting and provide high prediction precision. First, we calculated Copas global shrinkage factor for our data (34, 35) to see if it is above

174 the recommended 0.9 threshold (33). Based on this calculation the estimated shrinkage factor was 0.95 if the adjusted R² of the model was assumed to be 0.7. Second, we calculated the sample size 175 required to ensure a small difference between the R² and the adjusted R² for the development model. 176 177 Assuming the adjusted R^2 was 0.7 again and a small desired R^2 difference (R^2_{diff} =0.025), then the 178 sample size required to achieve this should be at least n=9913. Third, we checked the sample size 179 required for precise residual standard deviation of the model. Accordingly, we found the multiplicative 180 margin of error (MMOE) to be less than 10% (MMOE =1.3%) using our n and p in the INTERVAL study. 181 Finally, we checked the precision of the mean predicted outcome value (predicted age) of the model. 182 We used n and p for the INTERVAL study and assumed that predicted age would have a mean of 45 183 and a variance of 35. Accordingly, the upper and lower bounds were approximately 45.34 and 44.65 respectively. Thus, the MMOE for the mean predicted outcome was less 1% (MMOE= 45.34 /45 = 184 185 1.007 = 0.7%). Therefore, the sample size of the INTERVAL study was optimal to minimize overfitting, optimism, and provide a precise estimation of the residual standard deviation and mean predicted 186

187 values.

188 Results

Population characteristics 189

190 Characteristics of the total INTERVAL study population and age subgroups are summarized in Table 1. 191 In total 11,977 individuals were included and had a normal age distribution with a mean age of 45 years and a range of 18 – 75 years. The number of men and women was approximately equal (50.2% 192 193 were men). BMI was largely in the recommended range of 18.5-24.9 kg/m² (36) with a mean BMI of 194 22.8 kg/m² and was similar in all age groups.

195

	Total	18 to 25	25 to 35	35 to 45	45 to 55	55 to 65	65 to 75
Ν	11977	1178	2245	2152	2867	2602	811
Age (years), mean (range)	45 (18-75)						
Men, n (%)	6019 (50.2%)	485 (41.2%)	965 (42.3%)	1042 (48.4%)	1560 (54.4%)	1480 (56.9%)	546 (67.3%)
BMI (kg/m ²), mean (SD)	22.8 (4.2)	21.3 (4.0)	22.0 (4.2)	23.3 (4.4)	23.5 (4.3)	23.0 (3.9)	22.6 (3.5)
196	Table 1. Characteristics of the INTERVAL study population.						

Table 1. Characteristics of the INTERVAL study population.

197 **Metabolomic Age Prediction**

198 Prediction models A (endogenous plus xenobiotic metabolites) and B (endogenous metabolites only) 199 were developed in the INTERVAL study using ridge regression. The workflow including metabolite 200 selection, missing value imputation, and analyses are summarized in Figure 1. Internal validation using 201 bootstrapping (resampling n = 100) and optimization provided an R² of 0.83 (MSE=31, MAE=4.4) for model A, and 0.82 (MSE=33.7, MAE=4.6) for model B. The R² for the generalized additional model 202 (GAM) were slightly higher for both models, 0.85 for model A and 0.84 for model B (Figure 2, 203 204 Supplementary Table 1, Supplementary Figure 1). Full tables with the intercept, sex and metabolite 205 coefficients for model A and B are provided in Supplementary Table 2. This table also contains the 206 mean values for the metabolites from the INTERVAL study.

207



208

209 Figure 1: Flowchart of the selection of predictor metabolites and the development steps for the

210

metabolomic age prediction model in the INTERVAL study





Discussion 215

216 In this study, we developed a prediction model for metabolomic age based on metabolite measurements, including a wide range of endogenous and xenobiotic metabolites belonging to a 217 variety of biochemical pathways. The metabolomic measurements were performed in a single study 218 219 using the same metabolomic platform and harmonized for within study and between batch variation. 220 Importantly, we used multiple imputation, ridge regression, and bootstrapping (20) to develop and 221 internally validate the metabolomic age prediction models. We developed two models, with the first 222 model A using both endogenous and xenobiotic metabolites (n=826), and the second model B using the endogenous metabolites only (n=678). Both models had high adjusted R^2 (model A = 0.83; Model 223 224 B = 0.82), however, model B had slightly higher MSE and MAE, indicating higher error for the predicted 225 values.

226 **Ridge Regression for Metabolomic Age**

227 Our metabolomic age model is based on ridge regression which generates shrinkage factors that 228 shrink metabolite coefficients with weak influence on the model to small values. Unlike methods such 229 as LASSO and elastic net regression, this shrinkage never causes the coefficients to reach zero. Therefore, unlike those methods, ridge regression does not perform selection of predictors, in this 230 231 case metabolites, due to the shrinkage term. Thus, the model consistently includes the same 232 metabolites during the cross validation and internal validation by bootstrapping (20). Ridge regression

thus ensures rigorousness and consideration of all the selected metabolite predictors. In addition, we found in our model that nonlinear GAM R² to be slightly higher than linear R² in both models. Figure 2 also shows that the GAM line curves at the edges of the age ranges. Therefore, predicting metabolomic age from this model in a nonlinear form, by adding a quadratic term or using a spline function, may further expand the model flexibility.

238 Strengths and Limitations

239 A major strength of our current study is the development of robust metabolomic age prediction 240 models based on a large number of metabolites measured in a large cohort with a wide age 241 distribution. This sample size was confirmed to fit the required criteria for developing a model with 242 low overfitting (33). Furthermore, the INTERVAL study included relatively healthy blood donors as 243 participants. Blood donors are prescreened for a number of common diseases, making it a suitable 244 study to develop a metabolomic age without being affected by specific disease-related effects on 245 metabolites. Unlike previous metabolomic age predictors (alternatively referred to as metabolomic "clocks"), we developed our model using the latest Metabolon metabolomics platform that measures 246 a large selection of metabolites. An advantage of this platform is the inclusion of xenobiotics, such as 247 248 those derived from medication or pollution as well as endogenous metabolites. Thus, we were able to 249 include metabolites originating from various internal and external sources. The xenobiotic metabolites 250 represent some of the acquired environmental and lifestyle exposures of individuals that could play a 251 role in biological aging. For example, medication metabolites could be a predictor of frailty. However, our study has two limitations. First, because the INTERVAL study does not have data for health-related 252 253 outcomes, we could not assess the effects of different disease outcomes and health phenotypes on 254 the metabolomic age. Second, as the INTERVAL study used here was cross sectional, we could not 255 examine the model overtime or examine the ability of metabolomic age to predict disease outcomes 256 or mortality in a future time point.

257 External Validation for Metabolomic Age and Future Applications

Prediction models may suffer from overfitting due to selection bias, small sample size, methodology limitations, and lack of internal validation and calibration during development. However, another common issue regarding prediction modelling, such as the case with metabolomic age, is the challenge to externally validate them. This a common issue with prediction models in general. Indeed, few studies perform external validation of prediction models (19, 37). The reasons for the lack of external validation include the difficulty of applying and reproducing the prediction model method, lack of the full prediction variables to develop the model in the new dataset, or a lack of an appropriate sample

265 size for external validation. Without external validation, the quality of the models cannot be properly 266 assessed, and a model could still be overfitted despite presenting good results during internal 267 validation(20, 21, 38). We took advantage of the sample size and wide age range to use a stringent 268 ridge regression and internal validation method to develop the metabolomic age model. The resulting model demonstrated a high R² for the metabolomic age. The high R² from our models is unlikely to be 269 270 due be overfitting as we considered and calculated the power and sensitivity of the model based on 271 the sample size and number predictors (33), in addition to the rigorous prediction modelling 272 methodology. The metabolomic age was able to predict chronological age well but not perfectly. The 273 missing 0.2 from R^2 is likely a reflection the biological aging process captured by the metabolomic age. 274 However, future robust external validation, using weak and moderate calibrations in other 275 populations (38) would be valuable for the metabolomic age models presented in this paper.

276 Several age prediction models have been developed that utilize different biological measurements 277 such as targeted metabolomics (7, 14), proteomics (7), and epigenetics (DNA methylation)(6). These 278 studies have reported that the metabolites were a strong predictor of body mass index, metabolic 279 syndrome, cancer (7), type 2 diabetes, and cardiovascular disease (14). Furthermore, other biological 280 clocks using proteomics and epigenetics were reported to be associated with depression and other 281 outcomes (7). Therefore, it will be valuable to apply the prediction models presented in this paper in 282 large longitudinal cohorts and examine the metabolomic age in relation to calendar age with the 283 aforementioned phenotypes and other health related outcomes. Assessing the association between 284 the residual between the chronological and metabolomic age with disease and health phenotypes overtime will provide clinically relevant prediction. The prediction strength will indicate the 285 286 robustness of our model and provide the means to for external validation and re-calibration of the 287 model.

288 In addition to our aim of addressing primary issues of the development of metabolomic age models, 289 the Metabolon platform is expanded on the range of metabolites that can potentially be a better 290 predictor of age. For example, previous metabolomic age studies have not measured or included 291 xenobiotic metabolites. In our study, we were able to include this additional group of metabolites in 292 model A. Furthermore, Model A may also be used in tandem with metabolomic age from targeted platforms, and biological clocks of different biological molecules measurements, similar to the work 293 by Jansen et al. (7), to possibly improve or compare their predictive performance and their ability of 294 295 capturing the effects of health-related phenotypes.

296 Conclusions

We developed metabolomic age prediction models in a large relatively healthy population using a wide array of endogenous and xenobiotic metabolites. In model A with the endogenous and xenobiotic metabolites and in model B with endogenous metabolites only, the R² of the linear fit was 0.82 and 0.83, respectively. We provided the full list of metabolites and their coefficients for both models. This data can enable other researchers to replicate our metabolomic age prediction model, externally validate it in their own studies with different disease outcomes and combine them with other age prediction models. medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.06.03.23290933; this version posted November 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

304 References

- North BJ, Sinclair DA. The intersection between aging and cardiovascular disease. Circ Res. 305 1. 306 2012;110(8):1097-108. doi:10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.111.246876 307 Broglio SP, Eckner JT, Paulson HL, Kutcher JS. Cognitive decline and aging: the role of 2. 308 concussive and subconcussive impacts. 2012;40(3):138. 309 Lopez-Otin C, Blasco MA, Partridge L, Serrano M, Kroemer G. The hallmarks of aging. Cell. 3. 310 2013;153(6):1194-217. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2013.05.039 311 4. Hoffman JM, Lyu Y, Pletcher SD, Promislow DEL. Proteomics and metabolomics in ageing 312 research: from biomarkers to systems biology. Essays Biochem. 2017;61(3):379-88. 313 doi:10.1042/EBC20160083 314 5. Brooks-Wilson AR. Genetics of healthy aging and longevity. 2013;132(12):1323-38. 315 Horvath S. DNA methylation age of human tissues and cell types. Genome Biology. 6. 316 2013;14(10):3156. doi:10.1186/gb-2013-14-10-r115 317 7. Jansen R, Han LK, Verhoeven JE, et al. An integrative study of five biological clocks in somatic 318 and mental health. Elife. 2021;10. doi:10.7554/eLife.59479 319 8. Alonso A, Marsal S, Julia A. Analytical methods in untargeted metabolomics: state of the art 320 in 2015. Front Bioeng Biotechnol. 2015;3:23. doi:10.3389/fbioe.2015.00023 321 Rattray NJW, Deziel NC, Wallach JD, et al. Beyond genomics: understanding exposotypes 9. 322 through metabolomics. Hum Genomics. 2018;12(1):4. doi:10.1186/s40246-018-0134-x 323 Rutledge J, Oh H, Wyss-Coray T. Measuring biological age using omics data. Nature Reviews 10. 324 Genetics. 2022. doi:10.1038/s41576-022-00511-7 325 Martin FJ, Montoliu I, Kussmann M. Metabonomics of ageing - Towards understanding 11. 326 metabolism of a long and healthy life. Mech Ageing Dev. 2017;165(Pt B):171-9. 327 doi:10.1016/j.mad.2016.12.009 328 Yu Z, Zhai G, Singmann P, et al. Human serum metabolic profiles are age dependent. Aging 12. 329 Cell. 2012;11(6):960-7. doi:10.1111/j.1474-9726.2012.00865.x 330 13. Macdonald-Dunlop E, Taba N, Klarić L, et al. A catalogue of omics biological ageing clocks 331 reveals substantial commonality and associations with disease risk. Aging. 2022;14(2):623-59. 332 doi:10.18632/aging.203847 333 14. van den Akker EB, Trompet S, Barkey Wolf JJH, et al. Metabolic Age Based on the BBMRI-NL 334 (1)H-NMR Metabolomics Repository as Biomarker of Age-related Disease. Circulation. Genomic and 335 precision medicine. 2020;13(5):541-7. doi:10.1161/circgen.119.002610 336 15. Hertel J, Friedrich N, Wittfeld K, et al. Measuring Biological Age via Metabonomics: The 337 Metabolic Age Score. J Proteome Res. 2016;15(2):400-10. doi:10.1021/acs.jproteome.5b00561 338 Rist MJ, Roth A, Frommherz L, et al. Metabolite patterns predicting sex and age in 16. 339 participants of the Karlsruhe Metabolomics and Nutrition (KarMeN) study. PLoS One. 340 2017;12(8):e0183228. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0183228 341 Hwangbo N, Zhang X, Raftery D, et al. A Metabolomic Aging Clock Using Human 17. 342 Cerebrospinal Fluid. The Journals of Gerontology: Series A. 2021;77(4):744-54. 343 doi:10.1093/gerona/glab212 %J The Journals of Gerontology: Series A 344 18. Smith G. Step away from stepwise. Journal of Big Data. 2018;5(1):32. doi:10.1186/s40537-345 018-0143-6 346 19. Ramspek CL, Jager KJ, Dekker FW, Zoccali C, van Diepen M. External validation of prognostic 347 models: what, why, how, when and where? Clinical Kidney Journal. 2020;14(1):49-58. 348 doi:10.1093/ckj/sfaa188 %J Clinical Kidney Journal 349 20. Steyerberg EW. Clinical Prediction Models. 2nd ed. Cham, Switzerland: Springer 350 International Publishing; 2019. 351 21. Bleeker SE, Moll HA, Steyerberg EW, et al. External validation is necessary in prediction 352 research:: A clinical example. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. 2003;56(9):826-32.
- 353 doi:<u>https://doi.org/10.1016/S0895-4356(03)00207-5</u>

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.06.03.23290933; this version posted November 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

354 22. Moore C, Sambrook J, Walker M, et al. The INTERVAL trial to determine whether intervals 355 between blood donations can be safely and acceptably decreased to optimise blood supply: study 356 protocol for a randomised controlled trial. Trials. 2014;15:363-. doi:10.1186/1745-6215-15-363 357 23. NHS Blood Donation Who can give blood. 2022. https://www.blood.co.uk/who-can-give-358 blood. 359 24. Evans A, Bridgewater B, Liu Q, et al. High resolution mass spectrometry improves data quantity and quality as compared to unit mass resolution mass spectrometry in high-throughput 360 361 profiling metabolomics. 2014;4(2):1. Rhee EP, Waikar SS, Rebholz CM, et al. Variability of Two Metabolomic Platforms in CKD. 362 25. Clinical Journal of the American Society of Nephrology. 2019;14(1):40. doi:10.2215/CJN.07070618 363 364 26. de Mutsert R, den Heijer M, Rabelink TJ, et al. The Netherlands Epidemiology of Obesity 365 (NEO) study: study design and data collection. Eur J Epidemiol. 2013;28(6):513-23. 366 doi:10.1007/s10654-013-9801-3 367 Faquih T, van Smeden M, Luo J, et al. A Workflow for Missing Values Imputation of 27. 368 Untargeted Metabolomics Data. Metabolites. 2020;10(12). doi:10.3390/metabo10120486 369 28. Hoerl AE, Kennard RW. Ridge Regression: Biased Estimation for Nonorthogonal Problems. 370 Technometrics. 1970;12(1):55-67. doi:10.1080/00401706.1970.10488634 371 29. Saner C, Harcourt BE, Pandey A, et al. Sex and puberty-related differences in metabolomic 372 profiles associated with adiposity measures in youth with obesity. Metabolomics. 2019;15(5):75. 373 doi:10.1007/s11306-019-1537-y 374 30. Hägg S, Jylhävä J. Sex differences in biological aging with a focus on human studies. eLife. 375 2021;10:e63425. doi:10.7554/eLife.63425 376 31. Nakamura E, Miyao KJTJoGSABS, Sciences M. Sex differences in human biological aging. 377 2008;63(9):936-44. 378 McCrory C, Fiorito G, McLoughlin S, et al. Epigenetic clocks and allostatic load reveal 32. 379 potential sex-specific drivers of biological aging. 2020;75(3):495-503. 380 Riley RD, Snell KIE, Ensor J, et al. Minimum sample size for developing a multivariable 33. 381 prediction model: Part I - Continuous outcomes. Statistics in medicine. 2019;38(7):1262-75. 382 doi:10.1002/sim.7993 383 34. Copas JB. Regression, prediction and shrinkage. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series 384 B. 1983;45(3):311-35. 385 35. Copas JB. Using regression models for prediction: shrinkage and regression to the mean. 386 Statistical methods in medical research. 1997;6(2):167-83. doi:10.1177/096228029700600206 36. 387 WHO WHO. A healthy lifestyle - WHO recommendations. World Health Organization: WHO. 388 2010. 389 37. Siontis GCM, Tzoulaki I, Castaldi PJ, Ioannidis JPA. External validation of new risk prediction 390 models is infrequent and reveals worse prognostic discrimination. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. 2015;68(1):25-34. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2014.09.007 391 392 38. Van Calster B, McLernon DJ, van Smeden M, et al. Calibration: the Achilles heel of predictive 393 analytics. BMC Medicine. 2019;17(1):230. doi:10.1186/s12916-019-1466-7

394

395

396 Funding

The INTERVAL study was funded by NHSBT and the NIHR Blood and Transplant Research Unit in 397 398 Donor Health and Genomics (NIHR BTRU-2014-10024). The trial's coordinating centre at the Department of Public Health and Primary Care at the University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK, has 399 400 received core support from the UK Medical Research Council (G0800270), British Heart Foundation (SP/09/002), and the NIHR Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre. Investigators at the University of 401 402 Oxford, Oxford, UK, have been supported by the Research and Development Programme of NHSBT, the NHSBT Howard Ostin Trust Fund, and the NIHR Oxford Biomedical Research Centre through the 403 404 programme grant NIHR-RP-PG-0310-1004. We thank the blood donors who participated in the trial

- 405 and NHSBT's operational staff.
- 406 The NEO study is supported by the participating Departments, the Division, and the Board of
- 407 Directors of the Leiden University Medical Centre, and by the Leiden University, Research Profile
- 408 Area 'Vascular and Regenerative Medicine'. The analyses of metabolites are funded by the VENI
- 409 grant (ZonMW-VENI Grant 916.14.023) of D.O.M.-K., D.v.H. and R.N. were supported by a grant of
- 410 the VELUX Stiftung [grant number 1156]. T.O.F. was supported by the King Abdullah Scholarship
- Program and King Faisal Specialist Hospital & Research Center [No. 1012879283]. 411

412 **Conflicts of Interest**

- 413 P.S. is an associate director of applied and statistical genetics at GlaxoSmithKline plc. A.S.B. reports
- 414 institutional grants from AstraZeneca, Bayer, Biogen, BioMarin, Bioverativ, Novartis, Regeneron and
- 415 Sanofi. R.L.-G. is a part-time clinical research consultant for Metabolon, Inc. All other co- authors
- have no conflicts of interest to declare. 416
- 417 Acknowledgments and Disclosures
- 418 The authors of the NEO study thank all participants, all participating general practitioners for inviting
- 419 eligible participants, all research nurses for data collection, and the NEO study group: Pat van
- 420 Beelen, Petra Noordijk, and Ingeborg de Jonge for coordination, laboratory, and data management.
- 421 The NEO study was approved by the medical ethical committee of the Leiden University Medical
- 422 Centre (LUMC) and all participants provided written informed consent. The INTERVAL study was
- 423 approved by The National Research Ethics Service (11/EE/0538) and all eligible donors provided a
- 424 trial consent form before giving a blood donation.

425 **Author Contributions**

- 426 T.O.F.- conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, software,
- visualization, writing-original draft. R.L.-G.- validation, writing review & editing. P.S. supervision, 427
- 428 conceptualization, project administration, resources, funding acquisition, writing - review & editing -
- 429 A.S.B – project administration, resources, funding acquisition, writing – review & editing. R.d.M.-
- 430 project administration, resources, funding acquisition, writing – review & editing. R.N. and D.V.H.-
- 431 funding acquisition, writing – review & editing. F.R.R.- funding acquisition. A.v.H.V. and K.W.v.D-
- 432 conceptualization, supervision, writing - review & editing. D.O.M.-K.- conceptualization, supervision,
- 433 funding acquisition, writing – review & editing.