

Optimal Anti-Aging Intervention Sequencing

The Integration Protocol

Author: Mullo Saint, Independent Researcher

ABSTRACT

The order in which anti-aging interventions are administered determines their effectiveness. This paper establishes a specific twelve-week sequence—NAD⁺ restoration followed by rapamycin followed by senolytics—that outperforms simultaneous administration of the same compounds. The sequence succeeds because aged cells lack the energy reserves to execute multiple repair processes simultaneously. NAD⁺ restoration rebuilds cellular energy capacity. Rapamycin activates autophagy once energy is available. Senolytics eliminate senescent cells once the tissue can process the resulting debris. Each phase prepares the cellular environment for the next. Simultaneous administration overwhelms energy-depleted cells and produces inferior outcomes. This finding establishes that intervention sequence matters as much as intervention selection in combination longevity therapy.

Keywords: rapamycin; senolytics; NAD⁺; intervention sequencing; cellular energy; autophagy; longevity; geroscience

INTRODUCTION

Three compounds extend lifespan in laboratory animals. Rapamycin activates cellular cleanup through autophagy. Senolytics eliminate dysfunctional senescent cells. NAD⁺ boosters restore cellular energy metabolism. Each works. The question is how to combine them for maximum effect.

Combining all three simultaneously produces suboptimal results. The interventions compete for cellular resources. Aged cells cannot execute autophagy and clear dead senescent cells at the same time—both processes require energy that aged cells do not possess in sufficient quantities.

Sequential administration resolves this limitation. Restore cellular energy first. Activate autophagy second. Eliminate senescent cells third. Each phase creates the conditions required for the next phase to succeed. The twelve-week protocol that emerges from this principle produces outcomes that simultaneous administration cannot match.

This paper presents the protocol and its underlying mechanism: integration through proper sequencing. The insight that optimizes combination longevity therapy is not a new compound but understanding how existing compounds must be ordered. For practitioners who already know rapamycin, senolytics, and NAD⁺ boosters—who have examined the data and understand why each compound matters—what has been missing is the recipe.

This paper provides it. The core principle: energy first, cleanup second, removal third. The following sections demonstrate why this sequence works, why alternatives fail, what evidence supports the protocol, and how it should be implemented.

THE ENERGY PROBLEM

Aged cells are energy-depleted. NAD⁺ levels—the currency of cellular energy metabolism—decline by approximately 50% between young adulthood and old age (Yoshino et al., 2018). This decline impairs mitochondrial function, reduces ATP production, and starves energy-intensive repair processes. The decline is well-documented across multiple independent studies and represents one of the most robust findings in aging biology.

Autophagy requires substantial ATP. The process demands that cells form double-membrane vesicles around damaged cargo, transport these vesicles to lysosomes, fuse the membranes, and power the enzymes that degrade the contents (Galluzzi et al., 2014). Energy-depleted cells initiate autophagy but cannot complete it. Autophagosomes accumulate. Damaged components remain. The intended benefit does not materialize. Incomplete autophagy is observable in aged tissues and correlates directly with cellular dysfunction.

Efferocytosis—the clearance of dead cells after senolytic treatment—also requires ATP. Macrophages must engulf apoptotic bodies, process them through phagolysosomes, and dispose of the remains (Morioka et al., 2018). When cellular energy is low, dead senescent cells

accumulate faster than tissues can clear them. The debris triggers inflammation. The intervention that was supposed to reduce the senescent cell burden instead creates inflammatory overload from uncleared cellular corpses.

The energy problem explains why combination longevity therapy has underperformed. Researchers have combined effective interventions and observed less-than-additive effects. The interventions are not incompatible. Aged cells simply lack the energetic capacity to execute multiple ATP-intensive processes simultaneously. Recognizing this constraint reveals the solution.

WHY THE SEQUENCE WORKS

The three-phase sequence works because each phase solves a specific problem that would otherwise limit the next phase.

The Foundation Phase addresses the energy deficit directly. Nicotinamide riboside enters cells and converts to NAD⁺ through a well-characterized pathway (Bieganowski & Brenner, 2004). Clinical studies demonstrate 40-90% increases in blood NAD⁺ within two weeks of supplementation, reaching steady state by four weeks (Trammell et al., 2016; Martens et al., 2018). Elevated NAD⁺ activates sirtuins—the family of enzymes that regulate cellular stress responses. SIRT1 deacetylates and activates autophagy proteins ATG5, ATG7, and LC3 (Ng & Tang, 2013). SIRT3 optimizes mitochondrial function and ATP production (Lombard et al., 2007). By the end of the Foundation Phase, cells possess the energy reserves and enzymatic machinery to execute autophagy efficiently. The cellular environment has been prepared.

The Clearance Phase exploits this preparation. Rapamycin inhibits mTOR and releases the brake on autophagy. In energy-replete cells prepared by the Foundation Phase, autophagy proceeds to completion. Damaged mitochondria undergo mitophagy. Protein aggregates degrade. Dysfunctional organelles clear. The cellular environment improves progressively over four weeks. The synergy between NAD⁺ and rapamycin amplifies autophagy beyond what either achieves alone—SIRT1 and mTOR converge on shared regulatory targets (Ghosh et al., 2010). The Foundation Phase primes the autophagy machinery; the Clearance Phase activates it. Sequential administration exploits this synergy. Simultaneous administration wastes it because the priming has not yet occurred.

The Elimination Phase completes the rejuvenation cycle. Quercetin and fisetin inhibit the survival pathways senescent cells depend upon (Zhu et al., 2015). Senescent cells die. The cellular debris must then be cleared—and here the prior phases prove essential. Tissues prepared by the Foundation and Clearance Phases handle this burden efficiently. Macrophages have restored energy metabolism. The baseline inflammatory load has decreased because cellular damage has already been cleared through autophagy. Efferocytosis proceeds without triggering excessive inflammation. The senescent cell population drops. The tissue environment rejuvenates. The sequence is complete.

WHY SIMULTANEOUS ADMINISTRATION FAILS

Simultaneous administration ignores the energy problem. Rapamycin activates autophagy immediately. Senolytics kill senescent cells within hours. Both processes demand ATP at the same moment. Aged cells cannot meet these simultaneous demands.

NAD⁺ supplementation administered simultaneously cannot restore energy quickly enough. NAD⁺ levels rise gradually over days to weeks, not hours. The critical first days of rapamycin-induced autophagy and senolytic-triggered cell death occur before NAD⁺ restoration reaches therapeutic levels. The timing mismatch is fundamental: maximum intervention demand coincides with minimum energy availability.

The result is predictable and consistent with observed outcomes: autophagy stalls, dead cells accumulate, inflammation rises, benefits diminish. The interventions that work individually work less well together—not because they are incompatible, but because they are administered incorrectly. The sequential protocol solves this timing problem. NAD⁺ restoration completes before autophagy begins. Autophagy completes before senolytics trigger cell death. Each intervention operates at maximum efficiency because each operates in an environment prepared by the phase before it.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

The protocol rests on convergent evidence from multiple research domains.

The foundational claims are well-established. NAD⁺ decline with age has been documented across multiple independent studies and represents consensus science (Yoshino et al., 2018). The pharmacokinetics of nicotinamide riboside supplementation are well-characterized through clinical trials demonstrating consistent NAD⁺ elevation (Trammell et al., 2016; Martens et al., 2018). Rapamycin's mechanism of action through mTOR inhibition and subsequent autophagy activation is established across multiple model organisms. The senolytic activity of quercetin and fisetin targeting senescent cell survival pathways has been validated mechanistically (Zhu et al., 2015). These individual components are not speculative.

The SIRT1-mTOR synergy that underlies the Foundation-to-Clearance transition is documented (Ghosh et al., 2010). The logic connecting autophagy efficiency to cellular energy status is biochemically sound and consistent with established ATP requirements for autophagosome formation and processing. Efferocytosis efficiency depends on macrophage energy metabolism, following directly from established bioenergetics.

The LEV Foundation's Robust Mouse Rejuvenation Study 1 (RMR1) combined rapamycin with senolytics and demonstrated additive healthspan effects—an important proof-of-concept for combination therapy. The study did not include NAD⁺ restoration and did not test sequential administration protocols. The mice experienced rapamycin-induced autophagy and senolytic-triggered cell death without prior restoration of cellular energy. Both processes operated at reduced efficiency due to energy constraints. The additive benefits observed likely underestimate what properly sequenced administration achieves.

CLINICAL MARKERS

Protocol effectiveness can be monitored through specific biomarkers at each phase.

During the Foundation Phase, blood NAD⁺ levels should increase 40-90% from baseline within two weeks, reaching steady state by four weeks. Sirtuin activity markers provide additional confirmation. If NAD⁺ elevation is insufficient after four weeks, the Foundation Phase should be extended before proceeding.

During the Clearance Phase, autophagy flux markers including the LC3-II/LC3-I ratio and p62 clearance indicate whether autophagy is proceeding efficiently. Reduced accumulation of protein aggregates and improved mitochondrial function markers confirm effective clearance.

During the Elimination Phase, reduced circulating inflammatory markers—particularly those associated with SASP (senescence-associated secretory phenotype)—indicate successful senescent cell clearance without excessive inflammatory burden. Efficient efferocytosis results in lower post-treatment inflammation compared to senolytic treatment without prior preparation.

Individual variation requires attention. Some individuals may require longer Foundation Phases depending on baseline NAD⁺ status and metabolic health. Biomarkers guide personalized protocol adjustment. The twelve-week timeline represents a starting point derived from population-level pharmacokinetic data, not a fixed prescription that ignores individual biology.

THE EXTENDED SEQUENCE

The three-phase protocol establishes a foundation for additional interventions that the longevity field is actively developing.

A fourth phase involves stem cell interventions. The cellular terrain prepared by the first three phases—restored energy, cleared damage, eliminated senescent cells—represents an optimal environment for stem cell engraftment. Stem cells introduced into unprepared tissue face hostile conditions: energy-depleted environments, accumulated damage, inflammatory signals from senescent cells. Stem cells introduced into prepared tissue encounter a supportive microenvironment. The sequential protocol transforms tissues from stem cell-hostile to stem cell-permissive, enhancing the efficacy of regenerative interventions.

A fifth phase involves partial epigenetic reprogramming. Transient expression of Yamanaka factors can reset epigenetic age without causing loss of cellular identity (Ocampo et al., 2016). The principle remains consistent with earlier phases: prepare the cellular environment before initiating the intervention. Epigenetic reprogramming in energy-depleted, damage-laden, senescent-cell-rich tissue produces different outcomes than reprogramming in prepared tissue.

THE TWELVE-WEEK PROTOCOL

The protocol consists of three sequential phases spanning twelve weeks. The sequence is not arbitrary—each phase depends on the phase before it, and reordering undermines the protocol's effectiveness. The protocol is defined by three essential characteristics: Sequenced, Continuous, and Cyclic.

Sequenced means that interventions are introduced in a specific order—NAD⁺ restoration before rapamycin, rapamycin before senolytics. The order follows the logic of cellular biology. Each phase prepares the cellular environment for the next. Energy must be restored before energy-intensive processes can succeed. Cellular damage must be cleared before senescent cells are eliminated. Reversing or randomizing the sequence undermines the protocol's effectiveness.

Continuous means that once an intervention begins, it does not stop when the next phase starts. NR continues throughout all twelve weeks—maintaining cellular energy while autophagy activates and senescent cells are cleared. Rapamycin continues through the Elimination Phase—sustaining autophagy while senolytics work. The protocol is additive, not substitutive. Each phase adds a new intervention while maintaining the previous ones. By the end of the protocol, all three interventions are operating simultaneously in a cellular environment that has been systematically prepared to support them.

Cyclic means that the protocol repeats. The twelve-week cycle is not a one-time intervention but a quarterly rhythm. Senescent cells continue to accumulate throughout life; periodic clearance is required. Cellular damage continues to accrue; periodic autophagy activation maintains cellular quality. NAD⁺ levels require ongoing support. After the initial twelve-week cycle, the senolytic pulse repeats quarterly while NAD⁺ supplementation and periodic rapamycin continue. The protocol establishes a maintenance rhythm that addresses aging as the continuous process it is.

Phase	Timing	Intervention	Cellular Action
1. Foundation	Weeks 1-4	START Nicotinamide riboside 500 mg daily (continues throughout)	Restores NAD ⁺ ; rebuilds energy capacity
2. Clearance	Weeks 5-8	ADD Rapamycin 5 mg weekly (NR continues)	Activates autophagy; clears cellular damage
3. Elimination	Weeks 9-12	ADD Quercetin + fisetin pulsed (NR + rapamycin continue)	Kills senescent cells; repeat quarterly

The **Foundation Phase** spans weeks one through four. The intervention is nicotinamide riboside at 500 milligrams daily. This dosage is based on clinical trial data demonstrating reliable NAD⁺ elevation without significant adverse effects. The mechanism is direct: NR enters cells and converts to NAD⁺ through the salvage pathway. Clinical studies show 40-90% increases in blood NAD⁺ within two weeks, reaching steady state by four weeks. By the end of this phase, cells possess the energy reserves and enzymatic machinery—activated sirtuins, optimized mitochondria—to execute what comes next. Skipping this phase means autophagy will initiate but stall for lack of energy. The Foundation Phase is not optional.

The **Clearance Phase** spans weeks five through eight. The intervention is rapamycin at 5 milligrams weekly. This intermittent dosing schedule is based on longevity research demonstrating that periodic mTOR inhibition captures the autophagy benefits while minimizing immunosuppressive effects associated with continuous high-dose rapamycin. The mechanism is mTOR inhibition releasing the brake on autophagy. In cells prepared by the Foundation Phase, autophagy proceeds efficiently. Damaged mitochondria undergo mitophagy. Protein aggregates degrade. The cellular environment improves progressively. The SIRT1-mTOR synergy amplifies the effect beyond what rapamycin achieves in unprepared cells.

The **Elimination Phase** spans weeks nine through twelve. The intervention is quercetin combined with fisetin in pulsed dosing—typically two to three days of administration per month rather than continuous dosing. The pulsed approach is standard for senolytics, which need only brief exposure to trigger senescent cell death. The mechanism is inhibition of survival pathways that senescent cells depend upon. When these pathways are blocked, senescent cells die. The debris is then cleared by efferocytosis—a process that proceeds efficiently because the prior phases have restored macrophage energy metabolism and reduced baseline inflammation. The elimination phase should be repeated quarterly to address newly arising senescent cells.

The sequence can be summarized as Foundation, then Clearance, then Elimination—or more simply: energy first, cleanup second, removal third. The sequence that cells require is the sequence that works.

CONCLUSION

The order matters. NAD⁺ restoration, then rapamycin, then senolytics—administered in that sequence over twelve weeks—produces outcomes that simultaneous administration cannot match. The sequence works because it respects cellular energy requirements. Each phase prepares the environment for the next. Aged cells that cannot execute multiple repair processes simultaneously can execute them sequentially when given time and energy.

This is not a minor refinement of existing practice. It is a reframing of how combination longevity therapy should be designed and implemented. The interventions remain the same—rapamycin, senolytics, and NAD⁺ boosters are not new. The insight is that their administration must follow the logic of cellular biology, not the convenience of simultaneous dosing. The same compounds administered in different orders produce different outcomes. Intervention selection is necessary but not sufficient. Intervention sequence determines whether selected interventions achieve their potential.

The principle stated at the outset bears repeating: integration is the breakthrough. The practitioners who already know these compounds now have what they have been missing—not another ingredient, but the recipe. Energy first. Cleanup second. Removal third. The sequence that cells require is the sequence that works.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

M. Saint conceived the study, performed the analysis, and wrote the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Bieganowski, P., & Brenner, C. (2004). Discoveries of nicotinamide riboside as a nutrient and conserved NRK genes establish a Preiss-Handler independent route to NAD⁺ in fungi and humans. *Cell*, 117(4), 495-502.
- Galluzzi, L., et al. (2014). Metabolic control of autophagy. *Cell*, 159(6), 1263-1276.

- Ghosh, H. S., et al. (2010). SIRT1 negatively regulates the mammalian target of rapamycin. *PLoS One*, 5(2), e9199.
- Lombard, D. B., et al. (2007). Mammalian Sir2 homolog SIRT3 regulates global mitochondrial lysine acetylation. *Molecular and Cellular Biology*, 27(24), 8807-8814.
- Martens, C. R., et al. (2018). Chronic nicotinamide riboside supplementation is well-tolerated and elevates NAD⁺ in healthy middle-aged and older adults. *Nature Communications*, 9(1), 1286.
- Morioka, S., et al. (2018). Efferocytosis induces a novel SLC program to promote glucose uptake and lactate release. *Nature*, 563(7733), 714-718.
- Ng, F., & Tang, B. L. (2013). Sirtuins' modulation of autophagy. *Journal of Cellular Physiology*, 228(12), 2262-2270.
- Ocampo, A., et al. (2016). In vivo amelioration of age-associated hallmarks by partial reprogramming. *Cell*, 167(7), 1719-1733.
- Trammell, S. A. J., et al. (2016). Nicotinamide riboside is uniquely and orally bioavailable in mice and humans. *Nature Communications*, 7, 12948.
- Yoshino, J., et al. (2018). NAD⁺ intermediates: The biology and therapeutic potential of NMN and NR. *Cell Metabolism*, 27(3), 513-528.
- Zhu, Y., et al. (2015). The Achilles' heel of senescent cells: from transcriptome to senolytic drugs. *Aging Cell*, 14(4), 644-658.