THE ARISING

HEALTH INTELLIGENCE / ARISING HEALTH

FRONTIERS / 07

Rebuilding What Is Lost

Stem-cell-derived islets, neural conversion, and the difference between replacement and rejuvenation.



Alive. Awake. Aware.

John Griffin, MD / Arising Health

READING EDITION / OCTOBER 25, 2026

How to read this companion

Primary records and abstracts for the 2025 islet study and 2026 cellular conversion study checked October 25, 2026. Not a comprehensive safety review, regulatory assessment or endorsement of commercial stem-cell services.

Evidence is attached to the question it answers. Human clinical effects, observational associations, animal experiments, cellular measurements and computational proposals are kept distinct. This reading copy is not individual medical advice.

In this booklet

01 A replacement that performs a job

02 The harms belong beside the result

03 Watching a cell become something else

04 A family of technologies, not one treatment

Follow the evidence

Each chapter identifies the sources supporting its factual claims. Direct primary-source links and review limitations appear in the reference section. Study dates are retained even when older work provides context for a newer story.

01 / A replacement that performs a job

Evidence for this chapter: 1. Source details and direct links appear at the end.

The most meaningful question in cell therapy is not simply whether a new cell survives. It is whether the cell performs the job the person needs, safely and for long enough to matter.

A 2025 New England Journal of Medicine report tested that question using zimislecel, an allogeneic stem-cell-derived islet-cell therapy for type 1 diabetes. The small phase 1–2 study included 14 participants with at least 12 months of follow-up: two received a half dose and 12 received the full dose evaluated in the principal efficacy analysis.

At baseline, C-peptide was undetectable in all participants. After infusion, its detection provided evidence of engraftment and islet function. Among the 12 full-dose participants, all were free of severe hypoglycemic events and had HbA1c below 7%. Ten of the 12 were not using exogenous insulin at day 365.

That is a remarkable functional observation in a small study. It is not proof of a durable cure for every person with type 1 diabetes. The analyses were interim and not pre-specified, and there was no randomized control group.

02 / The harms belong beside the result

Evidence for this chapter: 1. Source details and direct links appear at the end.

All participants received immunosuppressive therapy. That requirement is central to the interpretation: the transplanted cells and the treatment needed to support them form a complete clinical intervention.

Neutropenia was the most common serious adverse event, occurring in three participants. Two deaths were reported: one from cryptococcal meningitis and one from severe dementia with agitation in the setting of progression of pre-existing neurocognitive impairment. Reporting these events is essential. The abstract alone is

not a basis for independently assigning or dismissing treatment causality.

A responsible account therefore holds the functional gains and serious events together. It does not describe the treatment as merely receiving new insulin-producing cells, nor does it erase the substantial uncertainty created by the small sample and short follow-up.

Longer observation, larger studies, transparent safety reporting and carefully defined eligibility are needed to determine how the balance of benefit and burden develops. A change in one-year insulin use cannot by itself answer every question about long-term complications, immune risks or quality of life.

03 / Watching a cell become something else

Evidence for this chapter: 2. Source details and direct links appear at the end.

Some experiments are remarkable because they make a hidden transition observable. In this study, researchers converted blood-cell precursors into induced neural stem cells and followed changes in both cellular identity and DNA-based age estimates.

The donors ranged from newborns to 101 years old. The experimental intervention happened in cultured cells, not in those people. That distinction is the foundation of the story, not a qualification to append after a rejuvenation headline.

Two changes unfolding together

The investigators used SOX2 and cMYC to convert erythroid progenitors toward a neural stem-cell state without passing through a pluripotent stage. As conversion continued, epigenetic-clock readings became much younger relative to the donors' ages.

The abstract reports that cells from older donors retained approximately 13% of the original donor-age estimate at earlier passages and 5% at later passages. These are properties of a clock

applied to changing cell populations. They do not describe the biological age of the donor's body or establish that the same percentage of aging was reversed.

Why the slow pace is useful

The changes continued over several weeks, including under conditions that inhibited proliferation. Differences in gene expression between cells from younger and older donors diminished with time. Acquisition of a more complete neural stem-cell signature continued beyond the appearance of an early marker.

That extended timeline gives researchers a way to separate events that would be difficult to distinguish in a rapid transition. Which changes accompany identity? Which precede the age-reading shift? Which are required for the new cells to function appropriately?

A model is not yet a treatment

The study did not transplant these cells into patients or demonstrate repaired memory, restored nerves or longer life. A youthful molecular signature also does not establish freedom from tumor risk or unwanted cell behavior.

Those boundaries matter especially in a field where "stem cells" can refer to very different products and procedures. The origin of a cell, the method used to produce it, its identity, purity and behavior after administration all affect whether a clinical application is plausible.

The value here is a research model that makes a complicated transition easier to study. Seeing the process is not the same as controlling it safely in a person. It is one of the steps that could eventually make a better, more precise experiment possible.

04 / A family of technologies, not one treatment

Evidence for this chapter: 1, 2. Source details and direct links appear at the end.

The islet study and the blood-cell conversion study occupy different places in the evidence landscape. One reports functional outcomes after an intervention in people. The other examines changes in cells in the laboratory. They should not be merged into a single claim that stem cells reverse human aging.

Even within clinical cell therapy, the identity of the cells matters. Their source, differentiation state, manufacturing process, delivery site and surrounding treatment can change the risk-benefit profile. Evidence for one product is not automatically evidence for another product advertised with the same broad vocabulary.

For readers, the useful question is what the cells are expected to do–and whether the study showed them doing it in the relevant setting. C-peptide, insulin independence, a neural marker and an epigenetic-age reading are not interchangeable endpoints.

The promise of regenerative medicine is clearest when restoration is concrete. A particular function, in a defined person, with measurable benefit and carefully observed harm: that is how an ambitious cellular idea becomes a clinical result worth building on.

Sources & review scope

1. Stem Cell-Derived, Fully Differentiated Islets for Type 1 Diabetes
September 4, 2025 journal issue; background evidence
Small phase 1–2 single-arm interim clinical study
PubMed · PMID 40544428
Primary record and complete abstract checked October 25, 2026; full-text/supplement appraisal not completed in this pass.

2. Protracted Fate Acquisition and Epigenetic De-Aging During Induced Neural Stem Cell Conversion of Human Blood Cells
October 2026 journal issue
Laboratory human-cell conversion study
PubMed · PMID 42829448
Primary record and complete abstract checked October 25, 2026; full-text/supplement appraisal not completed in this pass.

Illustrations are conceptual editorial art, not photographs of study results or anatomical diagrams. The Horizon and supporting celestial themes are reused from the approved Arising visual collection.