How to Cite:
Alotaibi, F. M., Almazam, A. A., Alenizi, S. Z., Alanazi, Maryam H., Lamfon, Nahid A., Albalawi, A. E. A., Al-Nasser, N. S., & Altheyab, S. A. (2018). Exploring the human microbiome: Its role and impact on overall health and disease prevention. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, *2*(S1), 129–153. https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v2nS1.15085

Exploring the human microbiome: Its role and impact on overall health and disease prevention

Fahdah Mehsan Alotaibi
KSA, National Guard Health Affairs

Abdulrhman Ali Almazam
KSA, National Guard Health Affairs

Saleh Zuwayel Alenizi
KSA, National Guard Health Affairs

Maryam Helal Alanazi
KSA, National Guard Health Affairs

Nahid Ahmad Lamfon
KSA, National Guard Health Affairs

Ali Eid Atallah Albalawi
KSA, National Guard Health Affairs

Nasser Suliman Al-Nasser
KSA, National Guard Health Affairs

Sultan Abdulaziz Altheyab
KSA, National Guard Health Affairs

***Abstract*---Background:** The human microbiome has emerged as a pivotal factor in health and disease, significantly influencing various physiological processes and disease outcomes. Despite advances in microbiome research, the integration of microbiome knowledge into clinical practice remains limited. This review aims to elucidate the role of the microbiome in health and disease, emphasizing its potential for disease prevention, diagnosis, and treatment. **Aim:** To provide a comprehensive overview of the human microbiome's structure, function, and impact on overall health and disease prevention. The review seeks to bridge the gap between microbiome research and clinical application, facilitating a better understanding among medical professionals. **Methods:** The review synthesizes findings from recent microbiome studies, including those from large-scale initiatives such as the Human Microbiome Project and the MetaHIT consortium. It

Manuscript submitted: 01 Jan 2018, Manuscript revised: 09 Jan 2018, Accepted for publication: 15 Jan 2018

examines various methodologies used to study microbiome structure and function, including 16S rRNA sequencing, metagenomics, metatranscriptomics, proteomics, and metabolomics. **Results:** The review highlights the diverse roles of the microbiome in health, such as its impact on immune system development, metabolic processes, and disease prevention. It also discusses the implications of microbiome research for various diseases, including infectious diseases, inflammatory bowel diseases, obesity, and cardiovascular conditions. Key findings include the microbiome's influence on drug metabolism, immune responses, and disease susceptibility. **Conclusion:** Understanding the human microbiome offers significant potential for advancing medical practice through personalized medicine and targeted therapies. Despite challenges in translating microbiome research into clinical applications, ongoing research and technological advancements promise to enhance our ability to diagnose, prevent, and treat diseases based on microbiome insights.

***Keywords*---**Human microbiome, disease prevention, microbiome research, microbial communities, health impacts, metagenomics.

Introduction

The recent introduction of the National Microbiome Initiative by the United States highlights the significant progress in microbiome science over the past decade (1). An understanding of how intricate microbial communities influence the pathogenesis of various diseases carries considerable implications for disease prevention, diagnosis, and treatment. However, due to the limited inclusion of microbiome studies in traditional premedical and medical curricula (2), both practicing physicians and trainees often struggle to grasp the growing emphasis on the microbiome within clinical practice. This review is designed to assist medical professionals in comprehending the fundamental aspects of microbiome research and to provide a broad overview of how insights into microbial community structure and function might eventually transform medical practice. Although the review cannot cover every topic in detail due to the broad range of biomedical disciplines involved, it cites high-quality reviews for further exploration of specific areas of interest. One challenge in understanding the impact of microbial communities on human health stems from the distinct historical development of this field compared to standard microbiology and infectious diseases taught in medical training. Initial insights into microbial roles in human health were based on the germ theory of disease, as proposed by Louis Pasteur and refined by Robert Koch and others (3). This early research concentrated on microbes as pathogens—Koch’s postulates aimed to identify specific microbes as disease-causing agents. This approach focused on the attributes of individual microorganisms that disrupted host homeostasis, leading to significant medical advancements and the development of public health practices and antibiotics (4). Simultaneously, research into environmental microbiology—studying microbes in soil and seawater—revealed that these organisms are typically found in complex communities rather than in isolation (5). These microbiologists, often aligning more closely with ecology and

evolutionary biology, contributed to a broader understanding of microbial communities. Historically, medical considerations of microbial communities were confined to the alimentary tract, where microbes were viewed as commensals (see Box 1)—organisms benefiting from close association with hosts without affecting them positively or negatively. Recent realizations suggest that this relationship may be more reciprocal (6).

Medical researchers have recognized that the methodologies developed by environmental microbiologists for studying microbial communities are applicable to human-associated microbiomes. Large-scale initiatives such as the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Human Microbiome Project and the MetaHIT consortium were established to advance this research (7, 8). As the study of human-associated microbial communities has evolved, researchers have had to adopt new perspectives and terminologies. This review begins by clarifying common topics, terms, and definitions to facilitate understanding. The term "microbiome" refers to the complex community of microbes inhabiting a specific body site (9), such as the gut microbiome and its association with health and disease states. This review uses "microbiota" to refer specifically to the microorganisms present at a site, while "microbiome" encompasses both the microbes and their environment (10). For instance, the gut microbiome includes not only the microbes but also the host's epithelial cells, immune components, and both microbial and host-derived metabolites. Although early research predominantly focused on bacteria due to the sequencing methods available, recent studies have started to explore the roles of viruses and fungi within the microbiota. The distinction between "microbiome" and "microbiota" is not merely semantic but crucial for understanding the diverse functions of microbial communities. The indigenous microbiota can perform various functions through their metabolic activities and interactions with the host (11). Despite their smaller genomes compared to the host, microbiota may possess greater collective metabolic capabilities (12). Some metabolic processes involve contributions from both microbes and hosts, while others are unique to the microbiota. For example, the intestinal microbiota can ferment resistant starch to produce short-chain fatty acids, which impact the host in multiple ways (15).

For instance, butyrate, a short-chain fatty acid, serves as the primary energy source for colonic enterocytes and exerts a range of effects on host physiology, including anti-inflammatory and antitumor activities (16). Another notable example of how the metabolic activities of indigenous microbiota can impact host health involves the metabolism of small molecules such as pharmaceuticals (17). Microbial metabolism can influence the bioavailability of certain oral medications, as demonstrated with the cardiac glycoside digoxin (18). Due to digoxin's narrow therapeutic range, variations in its bioavailability can significantly affect the risk of toxicity. Recent research indicates that specific strains of the bacterium *Eggerthella lenta* can reduce digoxin levels through the cardiac glycoside reductase operon (18). Host-microbe co-metabolism also includes the conversion of bile salts and bile acids within the gut (19). These compounds, synthesized in the liver and secreted as conjugated bile salts, can undergo microbial transformations in the intestine, producing unconjugated and secondary bile acids. Although these metabolites differ in activity from their parent compounds, the host has evolved mechanisms to recognize and respond to them similarly to

how it responds to short-chain fatty acids produced by bacteria. Farnesoid X receptors (FXRs) are nuclear hormone receptors that respond to bile acids (20). Activation of FXRs and other bile acid receptors can influence various physiological processes. Since bile acids are the end products of cholesterol metabolism, changes in bile acid metabolism can affect cholesterol and lipid metabolism. Alterations in the gut microbiota are linked to modified lipid metabolism, and FXR agonists are being investigated as potential treatments for metabolic disorders such as obesity, insulin resistance, liver fibrosis, and non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (21, 22).

The indigenous microbiota also affects epithelial and systemic responses, including immune system development and function. Germ-free animals exhibit underdeveloped peripheral lymphoid organs and immune responses (24), but colonization with a complex microbiota or specific members of the normal microbiota can reverse this immature state (25, 26). Furthermore, mucosal epithelia adjust their expression of mucus and nutrient receptors and undergo differentiation in response to the microbiota (27-29). Conversely, the host epithelium and immune system can modify the microbiota's structure and function (30). Additionally, recent studies have shown that the microbiota can influence antitumor responses to immunotherapies targeting checkpoint blockades, such as cytotoxic T lymphocyte-associated protein 4 (CTLA-4) or programmed cell death 1 (PD-1) (31, 32). These altered immunotherapeutic responses are associated with specific microbiota members, though the exact mechanisms remain unclear. A final global function attributed to the indigenous microbiota is colonization resistance, where the microbiota protects the host from colonization by and disease from potentially pathogenic microbes (33). The mechanisms underlying this resistance are still being investigated but likely involve a combination of metabolic activities, such as short-chain fatty acid production, direct competition for nutrients, and immunologic effects on the host (34). In summary, a delicate and complex symbiosis exists between mammalian hosts and their microbial partners. Disruptions to this symbiosis can lead to a range of adverse health outcomes for both the host and the microbiota, as will be discussed further below.

Human Microbiome:

Several techniques are employed to examine various aspects of the indigenous microbiota, and numerous comprehensive reviews of these methods are available (35, 36). These techniques can be categorized into those that assess the structure (analogous to anatomical studies) and those that evaluate the function (similar to physiological assessments) of the microbiota. While anatomical studies provide information about the structural characteristics of an organism or its components, physiological assessments offer insights into functional dynamics. Although physiological function can sometimes be inferred from structural observations, a direct measurement of function is essential for accurate physiological assessment. Many of these techniques have capitalized on advances in high-throughput nucleic acid sequencing technology, which emerged from the Human Genome Project. Given the involvement of NIH-sponsored genome centers, the alignment of the Human Microbiome Project with this earlier effort to map the human genome is unsurprising. Sequence-based techniques, which eliminate the

need for microbial cultivation, have proven invaluable for understanding the role of indigenous microbes in health and disease (37). Nevertheless, a comprehensive assessment of microbial function and the ability to test specific hypotheses necessitates additional techniques. Microbial cultivation remains a crucial aspect of microbiome studies (38-40). Future therapeutic strategies targeting the microbiota may involve using specific microbes to replace absent ones, which relies on the isolation and propagation of these microbes. Therefore, to understand the roles of microbes in health, it is essential to identify which microbes are present and their specific activities within their environment. The following section will discuss common techniques used to study the microbiome and their application in investigating the structure and function of indigenous microbiota.

Microbial Structure

A range of techniques is available for delineating the structure of microbial communities, which involves cataloging the microbes present and determining their relative abundances. One of the most common methods for enumerating microbes is through the analysis of the gene encoding the RNA component of the small ribosomal subunit (16S rRNA) (41-43). This sequence-dependent method does not require microbial cultivation (44). DNA is extracted from a sample of the microbial community, and polymerase chain reaction (PCR) primers targeting broadly conserved regions of the 16S gene are used to amplify a wide array of microbial species present. These PCR amplicons are then subjected to high-throughput DNA sequencing. Although a detailed discussion of this analysis is beyond the scope of this review (for extensive reviews, see 45-47), the analysis can be summarized in broad principles. The analysis of 16S data involves grouping sequences into discrete bins to establish a taxonomy. Two primary methods are employed for this purpose. The first method compares all DNA sequences within a given analysis, grouping them into operational taxonomic units (OTUs) based on predefined degrees of sequence similarity (see Box 1). Each OTU can be associated with known bacteria, though OTUs often serve as proxies for specific microbes within the community, irrespective of formal taxonomic classification. The second method involves comparing each 16S sequence individually to a reference database, classifying sequences into predefined bins. Both methods have their advantages and limitations (46), but generally, they produce consistent observations regarding community structure. Importantly, robust biological insights can be gained from 16S analysis, and these insights are not reliant on the specific data analysis technique used.

In terms of human health, 16S analysis is utilized to compare microbial communities between individuals with and without specific diseases in a cross-sectional study. Longitudinal analyses can also be conducted to monitor changes in microbiota structure in response to treatments or disease progression (48). While powerful and informative, 16S analysis does not directly assess microbial function. Although methods have been developed to infer potential functions based on microbial community structure (49), such inferences are typically hypothesis-generating rather than definitive. For instance, the presence of an OTU corresponding to *Escherichia coli* in a 16S analysis must be interpreted with caution, as it could represent anything from a probiotic strain to a benign

indigenous *E. coli*, or a pathogenic variant such as *E. coli* O157. The 16S gene provides phylogenetic information about bacteria within a community but does not elucidate the functional capabilities encoded by their genomes.

Assaying Potential Microbial Function:

As previously noted, obtaining the complete genome sequence of a specific bacterial species can reveal insights into its potential functions. Similarly, metagenomic sequence analysis has been developed to evaluate the functional potential of an entire microbial community (50, 51). This process begins with extracting community DNA, and rather than amplifying specific phylogenetic markers using PCR, the entire DNA sequence of the community is directly sequenced using high-throughput technologies (47). This sequencing approach produces a comprehensive catalog of all the genomes present within the microbial community. Analysis of either the metagenome or the genomes of individual community members offers insights into the community's potential functional capabilities. The relative abundance of specific metabolic pathways identified in the metagenome can help predict the community's functional potential (12). However, this approach only provides a potential functional catalog; the next section will explore methods for directly assessing the actual functions of a microbiome.

Measuring In Situ Microbial Function

The final category of analytical techniques for studying the microbiome involves direct measurement of functional output. Metatranscriptomic analysis, a sequence-based technique, assesses the proportion of the microbial metagenome being expressed at a given time under specific conditions (37). This technique involves sequencing RNA transcripts to identify all actively expressed genes via reverse transcriptase-mediated RNA sequencing. When combined with metagenomic data, the metatranscriptome provides a snapshot of functionally active genes at a specific moment. Additionally, two other techniques, proteomic and metabolomic analyses, are frequently employed to measure the direct effects of transcriptional activity on the metabolic environment of the microbiome. These techniques utilize advanced mass spectrometry to quantify the relative abundance of proteins and metabolites (including peptides, oligosaccharides, and lipids) within a microbiome (12-53). This analysis typically encompasses metabolites originating from the host that undergo co-metabolism by the microbiota, providing a true measure of the metabolic environment within the microbiome.

Conceptual Framework for Microbiome Study:

The early initiatives of the Human Microbiome Project and related efforts, which commenced approximately a decade ago, were primarily focused on establishing normative boundaries for microbial communities present on and within the human body (8-56). The goal was to define what constitutes a "normal" microbial state, thereby enabling the identification of associations between deviations from this normalcy and various diseases.

Variability in Microbiota and Its Implications:

Initial studies of the human microbiota revealed significant variability in microbial communities among individuals without apparent clinical disease (57). This variation can be partly attributed to the methodologies employed in these studies, which predominantly used nucleic acid sequencing techniques, particularly 16S rRNA gene analysis, with limited metagenomic analysis. This variability underscores the complexity of the relationship between microbial community structure and function. It has become apparent that different microbial communities, as identified by 16S analysis, can exhibit similar functional profiles (58). Even when examining functional capacity through metagenomic sequences, the functional redundancy across diverse taxonomic groups can lead to similar functional outputs.

Disease Associations with the Microbiome:

1. Infectious Diseases:

The study of the microbiome has significant implications for understanding infectious diseases. A notable example is Clostridium difficile infection, which has long been recognized as a condition where disruption of the normal microbiota plays a critical role in disease pathogenesis (64). While the link between antibiotic use and C. difficile infection has been well established (65), recent research has focused on elucidating the mechanisms behind this association. Specifically, the role of the microbiota in bile salt and bile acid metabolism has been explored (66, 67). Intestinal microbes can de-conjugate and convert bile salts into various forms, some of which influence C. difficile spore germination and growth (67-69). This insight has spurred interest in novel treatments such as fecal microbiota transplantation, aimed at restoring normal microbial diversity and function (70). The intestinal microbiota's influence extends beyond C. difficile infection. It affects several other infections and inflammatory conditions:

- **Bacteremia Risk**: In patients undergoing allogeneic stem cell transplantation, the microbiota's status is associated with the risk of developing bacteremia (71-73).
- **Pulmonary Inflammation**: In sepsis and acute respiratory distress syndrome, gastrointestinal microbes have been found in the lungs, potentially driving pulmonary inflammatory responses (74).
- **Surgical Healing**: The composition of the gut microbiota may impact the healing of surgical intestinal anastomoses (75).

These observations highlight the microbiota's potential roles in treatment, diagnosis, and prognosis of various diseases.

Inflammatory Bowel Diseases (IBD)

1. Role of the Microbiota in IBD

Inflammatory bowel diseases (IBD), including Crohn’s disease and ulcerative colitis, are characterized by a dysregulated inflammatory response in the intestines. Unlike infectious diseases where specific pathogens are identified, no single pathogen has been definitively linked to IBD. Instead, the intestinal

microbiota is thought to contribute to the disease pathogenesis in predisposed individuals (76). Research has consistently shown that the microbiota in patients with IBD differs significantly from that in healthy individuals (59-78). Early studies utilized culture-independent methods such as 16S rRNA sequencing and fluorescent in situ hybridization to reveal distinct microbial communities in IBD patients compared to controls. While these studies established strong associations, their cross-sectional nature made it challenging to determine causation. More recent research has sought to address causation by examining patients at the initial onset of the disease and by studying specific subtypes of IBD, such as pouchitis following total colectomy (60, 62, 80). Mouse models of IBD have been instrumental in elucidating the mechanisms through which the microbiota might contribute to disease development (81-83). Genetic susceptibility studies further highlight the role of host immunity in IBD, showing that genetic variations affecting microbial interactions are linked to an increased risk of the disease (84, 85). Thus, IBD is a complex condition where both host and microbial factors, and their interactions, play critical roles.

Obesity and Metabolic Diseases

2. Microbiota and Metabolic Conditions

The relationship between the intestinal microbiota and metabolic diseases, such as obesity and diabetes, has garnered significant attention. Landmark studies a decade ago identified an association between obesity and specific microbiota profiles in both humans and animal models (86, 87). This interplay between host and microbial factors in obesity is highlighted by studies involving leptin-deficient animals, though the precise mechanisms remain not fully understood (88-90). Recent meta-analyses suggest that the direct association between microbiota and obesity may be weaker than initially thought (91). Nonetheless, the microbiota does influence nutrient processing in the intestine. For instance, microbial products like short-chain fatty acids and bile acids can affect the expression of metabolic regulatory peptides such as glucagon-like peptide 1 and peptide YY (92). Research has also started to uncover how the microbiota affects host energy metabolism (93, 94). Dietary modifications can impact the microbiota, creating a complex system where both intrinsic and extrinsic factors influence metabolic health (95). Additionally, disruptions to the microbiota through factors like antibiotic use have been linked to an increased risk of metabolic syndrome and obesity (96, 97).

3. Microbial Metabolism and Cardiovascular Disease

Recent studies have explored how microbial metabolism affects other organ systems. A key example involves trimethylamine N-oxide (TMAO), a metabolite associated with cardiovascular disease risk. Intestinal microbiota metabolize dietary choline into TMAO, and modulation of the microbiota to increase dietary choline has been shown to prevent enhanced atherosclerosis (98). This research provides a potential mechanism linking dietary habits, microbiota composition, and cardiovascular disease. These insights into the microbiota's role in metabolic disorders and cardiovascular disease illustrate the broader impact of microbial communities on overall health.

Lung Disease and the Microbiota

1. The Lung Microbiota

Traditionally, the lungs were considered sterile environments. However, recent studies employing culture-independent methods have revealed that both the upper and lower respiratory tracts are inhabited by a low biomass of diverse microbes (99, 100). This discovery has led to a reconsideration of the role of these microbes in lung health and disease. Early studies questioned the significance of this low-density microbial presence in healthy lungs, but more recent research indicates that the composition of the lung microbiota can influence the basal inflammatory state even in healthy individuals (102). This suggests that the microbial communities in the lungs may play a more active role than previously thought.

2. Microbial Communities in Lung Diseases

- **Cystic Fibrosis:** Patients with cystic fibrosis (CF) often experience chronic colonization by pathogenic organisms. Recent findings have expanded our understanding of the lung microbiota in CF patients, revealing a more diverse microbial community than previously recognized (103). This diversity might impact disease pathogenesis, with interactions among microbes potentially influencing the progression of CF. For example, certain bacteria may help degrade excess mucin in CF, potentially supporting the growth of typical pathogens (106).
- **Asthma and Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD):** The role of microbial communities in asthma and COPD is an area of active research. While early studies primarily identified associations, more recent work is exploring how the lung microbiota might drive inflammatory responses central to these diseases (107-111). Understanding these interactions could provide insights into the causal relationships between microbial communities and lung inflammation.
- **Acute and Chronic Rhinosinusitis:** The upper respiratory tract also hosts a diverse microbial community. Research has investigated how polymicrobial interactions contribute to acute and chronic rhinosinusitis. For instance, an increased abundance of *Corynebacterium tuberculostearicum* was observed in patients with sinusitis, and its pathogenic potential was confirmed in mouse models (113). This study highlights how certain microbes can become enriched in disease states and how other members of the microbiota might mediate resistance to colonization by pathogenic organisms (113).
- **Viral and Bacterial Upper Respiratory Tract Infections:** The status of the upper respiratory tract microbiota may influence susceptibility to both viral and bacterial infections. Acute upper respiratory tract infections, such as those caused by rhinovirus, can alter the microbiota, potentially increasing the risk of secondary infections, such as otitis media and pneumonia (116). This interaction underscores the complex relationship between the microbiota and respiratory infections. The re-examination of microbial communities in the lungs has unveiled a more intricate relationship between the microbiota and respiratory health. Understanding the role of these microbes in various lung diseases is

crucial for developing new therapeutic strategies and improving our overall comprehension of respiratory diseases.

Emerging Treatments: The Microbiome as a Therapeutic Target:

The microbiome's potential as a therapeutic target stems from its role in various diseases, either through a deficiency in beneficial functions or the presence of detrimental microbial activities. Although current successes are limited, several promising strategies are being explored to leverage the microbiome for disease treatment and prevention. Here are some key approaches:

1. Antibiotics

- **Traditional Use:** Historically, antibiotics have been used empirically to treat conditions like hepatic encephalopathy, irritable bowel syndrome, and pouchitis. The aim was to correct microbial imbalances or overgrowths, but this approach lacks precision due to the unpredictability of how antibiotics affect specific microbial communities (117-119).
- **Targeted Antibiotics:** Recent developments include antibiotics designed to minimize disruption to the indigenous microbiota. For instance, fidaxomicin, used for treating *Clostridium difficile* infection, has been shown to have a lower impact on the gut microbiota and a reduced rate of recurrent disease (120). This highlights the importance of antibiotic stewardship in preserving microbiota diversity and preventing resistance (121-122).
- **Bacteriophage Therapy:** Bacteriophages, which are viruses that specifically target bacteria, offer a potential alternative with minimal off-target effects. Though still in development, bacteriophages could selectively target pathogens without disrupting the broader microbiome, though they can lead to resistant bacterial strains that may have reduced virulence (123-125).

2. Probiotics and Live Microbial Biotherapies

- **Definition and Historical Use:** Probiotics are live microorganisms that, when administered in adequate amounts, are believed to confer health benefits. Despite the historical use of probiotics, such as *Lactobacillus* and *Bifidobacterium*, many have not been rigorously validated for specific therapeutic claims (126-128). Regulatory agencies often categorize them as dietary supplements rather than drugs, which complicates their development and standardization.
- **Clinical Trials and Efficacy:** Probiotics have been tested for conditions like acute gastroenteritis, antibiotic-associated diarrhea, and *C. difficile* infection. While some studies suggest benefits, others, including large randomized controlled trials, have shown mixed results or lack efficacy (129-132). This variability underscores the need for more precise testing and validation of probiotic strains and their mechanisms of action.
- **Rationally Chosen Therapeutics:** Advances in microbiome research are enabling the development of probiotics based on specific mechanisms of action. For example, understanding the role of bile acid metabolism in *C. difficile* infection has led to trials of bile acids and related compounds as

potential treatments (66-133). This approach aims to create more targeted and effective live biotherapeutics.

The exploration of the microbiome as a therapeutic target offers exciting possibilities for treating and preventing a variety of diseases. Current strategies include refining antibiotic use, developing bacteriophage therapies, and advancing probiotic treatments based on mechanistic understanding. As research progresses, these approaches may lead to more effective and targeted therapies, improving outcomes for patients and expanding the role of the microbiome in medicine.

Prebiotics and Diet Therapy:
Prebiotics:

Prebiotics are non-digestible carbohydrates designed to selectively stimulate the growth and/or activity of beneficial microbes in the gut. They work by providing a food source that favors the growth of these microbes, enhancing their functions. For instance, prebiotics such as inulin and oligosaccharides promote the growth of beneficial bacteria that produce short-chain fatty acids like butyrate. Butyrate and other short-chain fatty acids are important for gut health, as they support the integrity of the gut barrier and have anti-inflammatory effects (135).

- **Synbiotics:** Combining prebiotics with probiotics, known as synbiotics, aims to enhance the efficacy of both by providing the beneficial microbes (probiotics) with the nutrients they need (prebiotics) to thrive. This approach seeks to improve the overall microbial balance and function in the gut (136).
- **Dietary Interventions:** Broader dietary changes can also impact the microbiome. For instance, exclusive enteral nutritional (EEN) therapy has shown success in treating pediatric Crohn's disease by using a precisely defined liquid diet. This therapy has been effective in inducing remission, although long-term adherence is challenging. EEN significantly affects the gut microbiota's structure and function, although the exact mechanisms and benefits are still under investigation (137-138).

Microbial Restoration:

Microbial restoration involves replacing or restoring a dysfunctional microbial community. One prominent method is fecal microbiota transplantation (FMT), which involves transferring a healthy individual's fecal material to a patient with a microbiota-associated disease. This approach has been used for various conditions, primarily *Clostridium difficile* infection (CDI).

- **History and Application of FMT:** The concept of fecal transplantation dates back to ancient times, but modern FMT began gaining attention in the 20th century. The first clinical use for CDI was reported in 1958. Recent studies have refined FMT procedures, exploring different fecal preparations and delivery methods (143-149). FMT has demonstrated a high success rate in treating recurrent CDI, which is linked to the restoration of a healthy microbiota and competition against the pathogen (145-147).

- **Challenges and Limitations:** Despite its success in CDI, FMT has not shown consistent results in other conditions like obesity and inflammatory bowel disease (IBD). The effectiveness of FMT in CDI is partly attributed to the presence of spore-forming organisms that are crucial in combating *C. difficile*. This may not translate to other conditions, where the required microbial community might differ (150-152).
- **Future Directions:** The ongoing research aims to optimize FMT techniques and identify which conditions might benefit from this approach. The success of FMT in CDI provides a foundation for exploring its potential in other diseases, though each condition may require a tailored microbial community for effective treatment.

Prebiotics and dietary interventions offer promising strategies for modifying the microbiome to support beneficial microbial functions and improve health outcomes. Fecal microbiota transplantation represents an advanced form of microbial restoration with proven efficacy in treating recurrent CDI, though its application to other conditions remains uncertain. Continued research into these therapies is essential for understanding their mechanisms and expanding their use in treating various diseases.

Conclusion

The exploration of the human microbiome represents a transformative frontier in medical science, reshaping our understanding of health and disease. Historically, microbiology focused on pathogens in isolation, with early research predominantly centered around identifying disease-causing microbes. This approach, while foundational, largely overlooked the complex interplay of microbial communities within the human body. Recent advancements have shifted the focus toward understanding the microbiome as an integral component of human physiology, revealing its profound impact on health and disease. The human microbiome comprises a diverse array of microorganisms, including bacteria, viruses, and fungi, which collectively influence numerous physiological processes. These microbes contribute to nutrient metabolism, immune function, and protection against pathogenic infections. The review underscores the importance of differentiating between microbiota (the microorganisms) and microbiome (the microorganisms and their environment) to fully appreciate their collective roles. This distinction is crucial for interpreting research findings and developing targeted interventions. Research has demonstrated that disruptions to the microbiome, whether through antibiotics, diet, or disease, can lead to various health issues. For example, alterations in the gut microbiome are linked to conditions such as inflammatory bowel disease (IBD), obesity, and metabolic disorders. The microbiome's role in drug metabolism also highlights its potential to influence therapeutic outcomes and side effects. Studies have shown that specific microbiota can affect the efficacy and safety of medications, such as the cardiac glycoside digoxin, by modulating its bioavailability. Emerging treatments leveraging microbiome insights include probiotics, targeted antibiotics, and bacteriophage therapy. Probiotics, while historically used, require more rigorous validation to establish their efficacy. Targeted antibiotics and bacteriophage therapy offer promising alternatives by minimizing disruption to the microbiota and specifically targeting pathogenic microbes. These approaches illustrate the

potential for microbiome-based therapies to revolutionize treatment paradigms. Despite the significant progress, several challenges remain. Integrating microbiome research into clinical practice requires overcoming barriers such as variability in microbial communities, complexity in interpreting microbiome data, and the need for standardized therapeutic interventions. Continued research and technological advancements are essential for addressing these challenges and harnessing the full potential of microbiome science. In conclusion, the human microbiome represents a critical aspect of health and disease, with the potential to transform medical practice through personalized and targeted therapies. By bridging the gap between research and clinical application, we can better understand and leverage the microbiome to improve health outcomes and disease prevention.

References

1. Johnson-King, B., & Terry, S. F. (2016). Future of microbiomes through the National Microbiome Initiative. Genetic Testing and Molecular Biomarkers, 20(9), 561-562. https://doi.org/10.1089/gtmb.2016.29022.sjt
2. Melber, D. J., Teherani, A., & Schwartz, B. S. (2016). A comprehensive survey of preclinical microbiology curricula among US medical schools. Clinical Infectious Diseases, 63(2), 164-168. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciw262
3. Koch, R. (1890). An address on bacteriological research. British Medical Journal, 2(1546), 380-383.
4. Gradmann, C. (2014). A spirit of scientific rigour: Koch's postulates in twentieth-century medicine. Microbes and Infection, 16(10), 885-892. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micinf.2014.08.012
5. Gibbons, S. M., & Gilbert, J. A. (2015). Microbial diversity--exploration of natural ecosystems and microbiomes. Current Opinion in Genetics & Development, 35, 66-72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gde.2015.10.003
6. Casadevall, A., & Pirofski, L. A. (2015). What is a host? Incorporating the microbiota into the damage-response framework. Infection and Immunity, 83(1), 2-7. https://doi.org/10.1128/IAI.02627-14
7. Li, J., Jia, H., Cai, X., et al. (2014). An integrated catalog of reference genes in the human gut microbiome. Nature Biotechnology, 32(8), 834-841. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.2942
8. Proctor, L. M. (2016). The National Institutes of Health Human Microbiome Project. Seminars in Fetal & Neonatal Medicine, 21(6), 368-372. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.siny.2016.05.002
9. Marchesi, J. R., & Ravel, J. (2015). The vocabulary of microbiome research: A proposal. Microbiome, 3, 31. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-015-0094-5
10. Whipps, J. M., Lewis, K., & Cooke, R. C. (1988). Mycoparasitism and plant disease control. In M. N. Burge (Ed.), Fungi in Biological Control Systems (pp. 161-188). Manchester University Press.
11. Tremaroli, V., & Backhed, F. (2012). Functional interactions between the gut microbiota and host metabolism. Nature, 489(7415), 242-249. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11552
12. Manor, O., Levy, R., & Borenstein, E. (2014). Mapping the inner workings of the microbiome: Genomic- and metagenomic-based study of metabolism and metabolic interactions in the human microbiome. Cell Metabolism, 20(5), 742-752. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmet.2014.07.021

13. Duffy, L. C., Raiten, D. J., Hubbard, V. S., et al. (2015). Progress and challenges in developing metabolic footprints from diet in human gut microbial cometabolism. The Journal of Nutrition, 145(5), 1123S-1130S. https://doi.org/10.3945/jn.114.194936
14. Hooper, L. V., Xu, J., Falk, P. G., et al. (1999). A molecular sensor that allows a gut commensal to control its nutrient foundation in a competitive ecosystem. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 96(17), 9833-9838. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.96.17.9833
15. Cockburn, D. W., & Koropatkin, N. M. (2016). Polysaccharide degradation by the intestinal microbiota and its influence on human health and disease. Journal of Molecular Biology, 428(24), 3230-3252. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2016.06.021
16. Wong, J. M., de Souza, R., Kendall, C. W., et al. (2006). Colonic health: Fermentation and short chain fatty acids. Journal of Clinical Gastroenterology, 40(3), 235-243. https://doi.org/10.1097/00004836-200603000-00015
17. Spanogiannopoulos, P., Bess, E. N., Carmody, R. N., et al. (2016). The microbial pharmacists within us: A metagenomic view of xenobiotic metabolism. Nature Reviews Microbiology, 14(5), 273-287. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro.2016.17
18. Haiser, H. J., Gootenberg, D. B., Chatman, K., et al. (2013). Predicting and manipulating cardiac drug inactivation by the human gut bacterium Eggerthella lenta. Science, 341(6145), 295-298. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1235872
19. Ridlon, J. M., Kang, D. J., & Hylemon, P. B. (2006). Bile salt biotransformations by human intestinal bacteria. Journal of Lipid Research, 47(2), 241-259. https://doi.org/10.1194/jlr.R500013-JLR200
20. Wahlstrom, A., Sayin, S. I., Marschall, H. U., et al. (2016). Intestinal crosstalk between bile acids and microbiota and its impact on host metabolism. Cell Metabolism, 24(1), 41-50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmet.2016.05.005
21. Fiorucci, S., & Distrutti, E. (2015). Bile acid-activated receptors, intestinal microbiota, and the treatment of metabolic disorders. Trends in Molecular Medicine, 21(11), 702-714. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molmed.2015.09.001
22. Alawad, A. S., & Levy, C. (2016). FXR agonists: From bench to bedside, a guide for clinicians. Digestive Diseases and Sciences, 61(12), 3395-3404. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10620-016-4334-8
23. Rooks, M. G., & Garrett, W. S. (2016). Gut microbiota, metabolites and host immunity. Nature Reviews Immunology, 16(6), 341-352. https://doi.org/10.1038/nri.2016.42
24. Olson, G. B., & Wostmann, B. S. (1966). Lymphocytopoiesis, plasmacytopoiesis and cellular proliferation in nonantigenically stimulated germfree mice. The Journal of Immunology, 97(2), 267-274.
25. Sefik, E., Geva-Zatorsky, N., Oh, S., et al. (2015). Individual intestinal symbionts induce a distinct population of RORγ+ regulatory T cells. Science, 349(6251), 993-997. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa9420
26. Round, J. L., & Mazmanian, S. K. (2009). The gut microbiota shapes intestinal immune responses during health and disease. Nature Reviews Immunology, 9(5), 313-323. https://doi.org/10.1038/nri2515

27. Schaedler, R. W., Dubs, R., & Costello, R. (1965). Association of germfree mice with bacteria isolated from normal mice. The Journal of Experimental Medicine, 122(1), 77-82. https://doi.org/10.1084/jem.122.1.77
28. Stappenbeck, T. S., Hooper, L. V., & Gordon, J. I. (2002). Developmental regulation of intestinal angiogenesis by indigenous microbes via Paneth cells. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 99(24), 15451-15455. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.202604299
29. Hooper, L. V. (2004). Bacterial contributions to mammalian gut development. Trends in Microbiology, 12(4), 129-134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2004.01.001
30. Bonder, M. J., Kurilshikov, A., Tigchelaar, E. F., et al. (2016). The effect of host genetics on the gut microbiome. Nature Genetics, 48(11), 1407-1412. https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.3663
31. Sivan, A., Corrales, L., Hubert, N., et al. (2015). Commensal Bifidobacterium promotes antitumor immunity and facilitates anti-PD-L1 efficacy. Science, 350(6264), 1084-1089. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac4255
32. Vetizou, M., Pitt, J. M., Daillère, R., et al. (2015). Anticancer immunotherapy by CTLA-4 blockade relies on the gut microbiota. Science, 350(6264), 1079-1084. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad1329
33. Vollaard, E. J., & Clasener, H. A. (1994). Colonization resistance. Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy, 38(3), 409-414. https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.38.3.409
34. Lawley, T. D., & Walker, A. W. (2013). Intestinal colonization resistance. Immunology, 138(1), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2567.2012.03616.x
35. Bassis, C. M., Young, V. B., & Schmidt, T. M. (2013). Methods for characterizing microbial communities associated with the human body. In D. N. Fredricks (Ed.), The human microbiota: How microbial communities affect health and disease (pp. 51-74). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118409855.ch2
36. Walker, A. W. (2016). Studying the human microbiota. Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology, 902, 5-32. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31248-4_2
37. Di Bella, J. M., Bao, Y., Gloor, G. B., et al. (2013). High throughput sequencing methods and analysis for microbiome research. Journal of Microbiological Methods, 95(3), 401-414. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mimet.2013.08.011
38. Allen-Vercoe, E. (2013). Bringing the gut microbiota into focus through microbial culture: Recent progress and future perspective. Current Opinion in Microbiology, 16(6), 625-629. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2013.09.008
39. Lagier, J. C., Armougom, F., Million, M., et al. (2012). Microbial culturomics: Paradigm shift in the human gut microbiome study. Clinical Microbiology and Infection, 18(12), 1185-1193. https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-0691.12023
40. Sommer, M. O. (2015). Advancing gut microbiome research using cultivation. Current Opinion in Microbiology, 27, 127-132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2015.08.004
41. Schloss, P. D., & Handelsman, J. (2004). Status of the microbial census. Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews, 68(4), 686-691. https://doi.org/10.1128/MMBR.68.4.686-691.2004

42. Pace, N. R., Stahl, D. A., Lane, D. J., et al. (1985). Analyzing natural microbial populations by rRNA sequences. ASM News, 51(1), 4-12.
43. Woese, C. R., & Fox, G. E. (1977). Phylogenetic structure of the prokaryotic domain: The primary kingdoms. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA, 74(11), 5088-5090. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.74.11.5088
44. Frank, D. N., & Pace, N. R. (2008). Gastrointestinal microbiology enters the metagenomics era. Current Opinion in Gastroenterology, 24(1), 4-10. https://doi.org/10.1097/MOG.0b013e3282f2b0e8
45. Debelius, J., Song, S. J., Vazquez-Baeza, Y., et al. (2016). Tiny microbes, enormous impacts: What matters in gut microbiome studies? Genome Biology, 17, 217. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-016-1086-x
46. Westcott, S. L., & Schloss, P. D. (2015). De novo clustering methods outperform reference-based methods for assigning 16S rRNA gene sequences to operational taxonomic units. PeerJ, 3, e1487. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.1487
47. Morgan, X. C., & Huttenhower, C. (2014). Meta'omic analytic techniques for studying the intestinal microbiome. Gastroenterology, 146(6), 1437-1448.e1. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2014.01.049
48. Faust, K., Lahti, L., Gonze, D., et al. (2015). Metagenomics meets time series analysis: Unraveling microbial community dynamics. Current Opinion in Microbiology, 25, 56-66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2015.04.004
49. Langille, M. G., Zaneveld, J., Caporaso, J. G., et al. (2013). Predictive functional profiling of microbial communities using 16S rRNA marker gene sequences. Nature Biotechnology, 31(9), 814-821. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.2676
50. Handelsman, J., Rondon, M. R., Brady, S. F., et al. (1998). Molecular biological access to the chemistry of unknown soil microbes: A new frontier for natural products. Chemistry & Biology, 5(10), R245-R249. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1074-5521(98)90108-9
51. Streit, W. R., & Schmitz, R. A. (2004). Metagenomics--the key to the uncultured microbes. Current Opinion in Microbiology, 7(5), 492-498. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2004.08.002
52. Verberkmoes, N. C., Russell, A. L., Shah, M., et al. (2009). Shotgun metaproteomics of the human distal gut microbiota. ISME Journal, 3(2), 179-189. https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2008.108
53. Bjerrum, J. T., Wang, Y., Hao, F., et al. (2015). Metabonomics of human fecal extracts characterize ulcerative colitis, Crohn's disease, and healthy individuals. Metabolomics, 11(1), 122-133. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11306-014-0677-3
54. Turnbaugh, P. J., Ley, R. E., Hamady, M., et al. (2007). The human microbiome project. Nature, 449(7164), 804-810. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature06244
55. Proctor, L. M. (2011). The Human Microbiome Project in 2011 and beyond. Cell Host & Microbe, 10(4), 287-291. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chom.2011.10.001
56. Gevers, D., Knight, R., Petrosino, J. F., et al. (2012). The Human Microbiome Project: A community resource for the healthy human microbiome. PLoS Biology, 10(8), e1001377. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1001377

57. Human Microbiome Project. (2012). Structure, function and diversity of the healthy human microbiome. Nature, 486(7402), 207-214. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11234
58. Theriot, C. M., Koenigsknecht, M. J., Carlson, P. E. Jr, et al. (2014). Antibiotic-induced shifts in the mouse gut microbiome and metabolome increase susceptibility to Clostridium difficile infection. Nature Communications, 5, 3114. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms4114
59. Frank, D. N., St Amand, A. L., Feldman, R. A., et al. (2007). Molecular-phylogenetic characterization of microbial community imbalances in human inflammatory bowel diseases. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA, 104(34), 13780-13785. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0706625104
60. Gevers, D., Kugathasan, S., Denson, L. A., et al. (2014). The treatment-naive microbiome in new-onset Crohn's disease. Cell Host & Microbe, 15(3), 382-392. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chom.2014.02.005
61. Kemppainen, K. M., Ardissone, A. N., Davis-Richardson, A. G., et al. (2015). Early childhood gut microbiomes show strong geographic differences among subjects at high risk for type 1 diabetes. Diabetes Care, 38(2), 329-332. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc14-0850
62. Young, V. B., Raffals, L. H., Huse, S. M., et al. (2013). Multiphasic analysis of the temporal development of the distal gut microbiota in patients following ileal pouch anal anastomosis. Microbiome, 1(1), 9. https://doi.org/10.1186/2049-2618-1-9
63. Morgan, X. C., Tickle, T. L., Sokol, H., et al. (2012). Dysfunction of the intestinal microbiome in inflammatory bowel disease and treatment. Genome Biology, 13(9), R79. https://doi.org/10.1186/gb-2012-13-9-r79
64. Bartlett, J. G., Onderdonk, A. B., Cisneros, R. L., et al. (1977). Clindamycin-associated colitis due to a toxin-producing species of Clostridium in hamsters. Journal of Infectious Diseases, 136(5), 701-705. https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/136.5.701
65. Bartlett, J. G., Chang, T. W., Gurwith, M., et al. (1978). Antibiotic-associated pseudomembranous colitis due to toxin-producing clostridia. New England Journal of Medicine, 298(9), 531-534. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM197803092981003
66. Weingarden, A. R., Chen, C., Bobr, A., et al. (2014). Microbiota transplantation restores normal fecal bile acid composition in recurrent Clostridium difficile infection. American Journal of Physiology - Gastrointestinal and Liver Physiology, 306(3), G310-G319. https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpgi.00282.2013
67. Theriot, C. M., Bowman, A. A., & Young, V. B. (2016). Antibiotic-induced alterations of the gut microbiota alter secondary bile acid production and allow for Clostridium difficile spore germination and outgrowth in the large intestine. mSphere, 1(1), e00045-15. https://doi.org/10.1128/mSphere.00045-15
68. Wilson, K. H. (1983). Efficiency of various bile salt preparations for stimulation of Clostridium difficile spore germination. Journal of Clinical Microbiology, 18(5), 1017-1019. https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.18.5.1017-1019.1983
69. Sorg, J. A., & Sonenshein, A. L. (2010). Inhibiting the initiation of Clostridium difficile spore germination using analogs of chenodeoxycholic acid, a bile acid.

Journal of Bacteriology, 192(19), 4983-4990. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.00610-10
70. Rao, K., & Young, V. B. (2015). Fecal microbiota transplantation for the management of Clostridium difficile infection. Infectious Diseases Clinics of North America, 29(1), 109-122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idc.2014.11.009
71. Brandl, K., Plitas, G., Mihu, C. N., et al. (2008). Vancomycin-resistant enterococci exploit antibiotic-induced innate immune deficits. Nature, 455(7209), 804-807. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature07250
72. Ubeda, C., Taur, Y., Jenq, R. R., et al. (2010). Vancomycin-resistant Enterococcus domination of intestinal microbiota is enabled by antibiotic treatment in mice and precedes bloodstream invasion in humans. Journal of Clinical Investigation, 120(12), 4332-4341. https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI43918
73. Taur, Y., Xavier, J. B., Lipuma, L., et al. (2012). Intestinal domination and the risk of bacteremia in patients undergoing allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. Clinical Infectious Diseases, 55(7), 905-914. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/cis580
74. Dickson, R. P., Singer, B. H., Newstead, M. W., et al. (2016). Enrichment of the lung microbiome with gut bacteria in sepsis and the acute respiratory distress syndrome. New Microbes and New Infections, 13, 161-169. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmicrobiol.2016.113
75. Shogan, B. D., Smith, D. P., Christley, S., et al. (2014). Intestinal anastomotic injury alters spatially defined microbiome composition and function. Microbiome, 2(1), 35. https://doi.org/10.1186/2049-2618-2-35
76. Sartor, R. B. (2008). Microbial influences in inflammatory bowel diseases. Gastroenterology, 134(2), 577-594. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2007.11.059
77. Peterson, D. A., Frank, D. N., Pace, N. R., et al. (2008). Metagenomic approaches for defining the pathogenesis of inflammatory bowel diseases. Cell Host & Microbe, 3(5), 417-427. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chom.2008.05.001
78. Li, E., Hamm, C. M., Gulati, A. S., et al. (2012). Inflammatory bowel diseases phenotype, C. difficile, and NOD2 genotype are associated with shifts in human ileum associated microbial composition. PLoS ONE, 7(11), e26284. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0026284
79. Swidsinski, A., Weber, J., Loening-Baucke, V., et al. (2005). Spatial organization and composition of the mucosal flora in patients with inflammatory bowel disease. Journal of Clinical Microbiology, 43(7), 3380-3389. https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.43.7.3380-3389.2005
80. Morgan, X. C., Kabakchiev, B., Waldron, L., et al. (2015). Associations between host gene expression, the mucosal microbiome, and clinical outcome in the pelvic pouch of patients with inflammatory bowel disease. Genome Biology, 16(1), 67. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-015-0637-x
81. Huttenhower, C., Kostic, A. D., & Xavier, R. J. (2014). Inflammatory bowel disease as a model for translating the microbiome. Immunity, 40(6), 843-854. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.immuni.2014.05.013
82. Gkoskou, K. K., Deligianni, C., Tsatsanis, C., et al. (2014). The gut microbiota in mouse models of inflammatory bowel disease. Frontiers in Cellular and Infection Microbiology, 4, 28. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcimb.2014.00028

83. Wirtz, S., & Neurath, M. F. (2007). Mouse models of inflammatory bowel disease. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 59(11), 1073-1083. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2007.07.003
84. Ogura, Y., Bonen, D. K., Inohara, N., et al. (2001). A frameshift mutation in NOD2 associated with susceptibility to Crohn's disease. Nature, 411(6837), 603-606. https://doi.org/10.1038/35079114
85. Hugot, J. P., Chamaillard, M., Zouali, H., et al. (2001). Association of NOD2 leucine-rich repeat variants with susceptibility to Crohn's disease. Nature, 411(6837), 599-603. https://doi.org/10.1038/35079107
86. Ley, R. E., Turnbaugh, P. J., Klein, S., et al. (2006). Microbial ecology: Human gut microbes associated with obesity. Nature, 444(7122), 1022-1023. https://doi.org/10.1038/4441022a
87. Turnbaugh, P. J., Ley, R. E., Mahowald, M. A., et al. (2006). An obesity-associated gut microbiome with increased capacity for energy harvest. Nature, 444(7122), 1027-1031. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05414
88. Rajala, M. W., Patterson, C. M., Opp, J. S., et al. (2014). Leptin acts independently of food intake to modulate gut microbial composition in male mice. Endocrinology, 155(2), 748-757. https://doi.org/10.1210/en.2013-1085
89. Turnbaugh, P. J., Hamady, M., Yatsunenko, T., et al. (2009). A core gut microbiome in obese and lean twins. Nature, 457(7228), 480-484. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature07540
90. Jumpertz, R., Le, D. S., Turnbaugh, P. J., et al. (2011). Energy-balance studies reveal associations between gut microbes, caloric load, and nutrient absorption in humans. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition, 94(1), 58-65. https://doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.110.010132
91. Sze, M. A., & Schloss, P. D. (2016). Looking for a signal in the noise: Revisiting obesity and the microbiome. mBio, 7(3), e01018-16. https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.01018-16
92. Greiner, T. U., & Bäckhed, F. (2016). Microbial regulation of GLP-1 and L-cell biology. Molecular Metabolism, 5(8), 753-758. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molmet.2016.05.012
93. Trabelsi, M. S., Daoudi, M., Prawitt, J., et al. (2015). Farnesoid X receptor inhibits glucagon-like peptide-1 production by enteroendocrine L cells. Nature Communications, 6, 7629. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms8629
94. Parseus, A., Sommer, N., Sommer, F., et al. (2016). Microbiota-induced obesity requires farnesoid X receptor. Gut. https://doi.org/10.1136/gutjnl-2016-312504 (Note: Complete publication details needed)
95. Ussar, S., Griffin, N. W., Bezy, O., et al. (2015). Interactions between gut microbiota, host genetics and diet modulate the predisposition to obesity and metabolic syndrome. Cell Metabolism, 22(3), 516-530. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmet.2015.07.007
96. Cho, I., Yamanishi, S., Cox, L. M., et al. (2012). Antibiotics in early life alter the murine colonic microbiome and adiposity. Nature, 488(7409), 621-626. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11400
97. Livanos, A. E., Greiner, T. U., Vangay, P., et al. (2016). Antibiotic-mediated gut microbiome perturbation accelerates development of type 1 diabetes in mice. New Microbes and New Infections, 13, 161-170. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmicrobiol.2016.140

98. Wang, Z., Klipfell, E., Bennett, B. J., et al. (2011). Gut flora metabolism of phosphatidylcholine promotes cardiovascular disease. Nature, 472(7341), 57-63. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09922
99. Bassis, C. M., Erb-Downward, J. R., Dickson, R. P., et al. (2015). Analysis of the upper respiratory tract microbiotas as the source of the lung and gastric microbiotas in healthy individuals. mBio, 6(1), e00037-15. https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.00037-15
100. Venkataraman, A., Bassis, C. M., Beck, J. M., et al. (2015). Application of a neutral community model to assess structuring of the human lung microbiome. mBio, 6(1), e02284-14. https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.02284-14
101. Charlson, E. S., Bittinger, K., Haas, A. R., et al. (2011). Topographical continuity of bacterial populations in the healthy human respiratory tract. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, 184(9), 957-963. https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.201104-0655OC
102. Segal, L. N., Clemente, J. C., Tsay, J. C., et al. (2016). Enrichment of the lung microbiome with oral taxa is associated with lung inflammation of a Th17 phenotype. New Microbes and New Infections, 13, 16031. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmicrobiol.2016.31
103. Huang, Y. J., & LiPuma, J. J. (2016). The microbiome in cystic fibrosis. Clinical Chest Medicine, 37(1), 59-67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccm.2015.10.003
104. Carmody, L. A., Zhao, J., Schloss, P. D., et al. (2013). Changes in cystic fibrosis airway microbiota at pulmonary exacerbation. Annals of the American Thoracic Society, 10(2), 179-187. https://doi.org/10.1513/AnnalsATS.201211-107OC
105. Zhao, J., Schloss, P. D., Kalikin, L. M., et al. (2012). Decade-long bacterial community dynamics in cystic fibrosis airways. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA, 109(5), 5809-5814. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1120577109
106. Flynn, J. M., Niccum, D., Dunitz, J. M., et al. (2016). Evidence and role for bacterial mucin degradation in cystic fibrosis airway disease. PLoS Pathogens, 12(6), e1005846. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1005846
107. Huang, Y. J., Erb-Downward, J. R., Dickson, R. P., et al. (2017). Understanding the role of the microbiome in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: Principles, challenges, and future directions. Translational Research, 179, 71-83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trsl.2016.06.007
108. Sze, M. A., & Morris, A. (2016). Launching into the deep: Does the pulmonary microbiota promote chronic lung inflammation and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease pathogenesis? American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, 193(8), 938-940. https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.201512-2329ED
109. Huang, Y. J., Nariya, S., Harris, J. M., et al. (2015). The airway microbiome in patients with severe asthma: Associations with disease features and severity. Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, 136(4), 874-884. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaci.2015.05.044
110. Huang, Y. J., & Boushey, H. A. (2015). The sputum microbiome in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease exacerbations. Annals of the American Thoracic Society, 12(Suppl 2), S176-S180. https://doi.org/10.1513/AnnalsATS.201506-319AW

111. Yadava, K., Pattaroni, C., Sichelstiel, A. K., et al. (2016). Microbiota promotes chronic pulmonary inflammation by enhancing IL-17A and autoantibodies. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, 193(9), 975-987. https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.201504-0779OC
112. Anderson, M., Stokken, J., Sanford, T., et al. (2016). A systematic review of the sinonasal microbiome in chronic rhinosinusitis. American Journal of Rhinology & Allergy, 30(2), 161-166. https://doi.org/10.2500/ajra.2016.30.4320
113. Abreu, N. A., Nagalingam, N. A., Song, Y., et al. (2012). Sinus microbiome diversity depletion and Corynebacterium tuberculostearicum enrichment mediates rhinosinusitis. Science Translational Medicine, 4(151), 151ra24. https://doi.org/10.1126/scitranslmed.3003783
114. Cope, E. K., Goldberg, A. N., Pletcher, S. D., et al. (2016). A chronic rhinosinusitis-derived isolate of Pseudomonas aeruginosa induces acute and pervasive effects on the murine upper airway microbiome and host immune response. International Forum of Allergy & Rhinology, 6(12), 1229-1237. https://doi.org/10.1002/alr.21819
115. Schenck, L. P., Surette, M. G., & Bowdish, D. M. (2016). Composition and immunological significance of the upper respiratory tract microbiota. FEBS Letters, 590(22), 3705-3720. https://doi.org/10.1002/1873-3468.12455
116. Hofstra, J. J., Matamoros, S., van de Pol, M. A., et al. (2015). Changes in microbiota during experimental human rhinovirus infection. BMC Infectious Diseases, 15, 336. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-015-1081-y
117. Bajaj, J. S. (2016). Review article: Potential mechanisms of action of rifaximin in the management of hepatic encephalopathy and other complications of cirrhosis. Alimentary Pharmacology & Therapeutics, 43(Suppl 1), 11-26. https://doi.org/10.1111/apt.13435
118. Li, J., Zhu, W., Liu, W., et al. (2016). Rifaximin for irritable bowel syndrome: A meta-analysis of randomized placebo-controlled trials. Medicine (Baltimore), 95(47), e2534. https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.0000000000002534
119. Perencevich, E. N., & Burakoff, R. (2006). Use of antibiotics in the treatment of inflammatory bowel disease. Inflammatory Bowel Diseases, 12(7), 651-664. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.MIB.0000225330.38119.c7
120. Louie, T. J., Miller, M. A., Mullane, K. M., et al. (2011). Fidaxomicin versus vancomycin for Clostridium difficile infection. New England Journal of Medicine, 364(5), 422-431. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa0910812
121. Langdon, A., Crook, N., & Dantas, G. (2016). The effects of antibiotics on the microbiome throughout development and alternative approaches for therapeutic modulation. Genome Medicine, 8(1), 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13073-016-0294-z
122. Pettigrew, M. M., Johnson, J. K., & Harris, A. D. (2016). The human microbiota: Novel targets for hospital-acquired infections and antibiotic resistance. Annals of Epidemiology, 26(5), 342-347. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2016.02.007
123. Nobrega, F. L., Costa, A. R., Kluskens, L. D., et al. (2015). Revisiting phage therapy: New applications for old resources. Trends in Microbiology, 23(4), 185-191. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2015.01.006
124. Orndorff, P. E. (2016). Use of bacteriophage to target bacterial surface structures required for virulence: A systematic search for antibiotic

alternatives. Current Genetics, 62(6), 753-757. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00294-016-0603-5
125. Vandenheuvel, D., Lavigne, R., & Brussow, H. (2015). Bacteriophage therapy: Advances in formulation strategies and human clinical trials. Annual Review of Virology, 2, 599-618. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-virology-100114-054915
126. Reid, G. (2016). Probiotics: Definition, scope and mechanisms of action. Best Practice & Research Clinical Gastroenterology, 30(1), 17-25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpg.2015.12.001
127. Kaufmann, S. H. (2008). Elie Metchnikoff's and Paul Ehrlich's impact on infection biology. Microbes and Infection, 10(15), 1417-1419. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micinf.2008.08.012
128. Sanders, M. E. (2008). Probiotics: Definition, sources, selection, and uses. Clinical Infectious Diseases, 46(Suppl 2), S58-S61. https://doi.org/10.1086/523341
129. Goldenberg, J. Z., Lytvyn, L., Steurich, J., et al. (2015). Probiotics for the prevention of pediatric antibiotic-associated diarrhea. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 12, CD004827. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD004827.pub4
130. Schnadower, D., Finkelstein, Y., & Freedman, S. B. (2015). Ondansetron and probiotics in the management of pediatric acute gastroenteritis in developed countries. Current Opinion in Gastroenterology, 31(1), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1097/MOG.0000000000000132
131. Ollech, J. E., Shen, N. T., Crawford, C. V., et al. (2016). Use of probiotics in prevention and treatment of patients with Clostridium difficile infection. Best Practice & Research Clinical Gastroenterology, 30(1), 111-118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpg.2016.01.002
132. Allen, S. J., Wareham, K., Wang, D., et al. (2013). Lactobacilli and bifidobacteria in the prevention of antibiotic-associated diarrhea and Clostridium difficile diarrhea in older inpatients (PLACIDE): A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicenter trial. The Lancet, 382(9890), 1249-1257. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)61218-0
133. Howerton, A., Patra, M., & Abel-Santos, E. (2013). A new strategy for the prevention of Clostridium difficile infections. Journal of Infectious Diseases, 207(10), 1498-1504. https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jit068
134. Koropatkin, N. M., Cameron, E. A., & Martens, E. C. (2012). How glycan metabolism shapes the human gut microbiota. Nature Reviews Microbiology, 10(5), 323-335. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro2746
135. Louis, P., Flint, H. J., & Michel, C. (2016). How to manipulate the microbiota: Prebiotics. Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology, 902, 119-142. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31248-4_9
136. Gibson, G. R., & Roberfroid, M. B. (1995). Dietary modulation of the human colonic microbiota: Introducing the concept of prebiotics. Journal of Nutrition, 125(6), 1401-1412.
137. Quince, C., Ijaz, U. Z., Loman, N., et al. (2015). Extensive modulation of the fecal metagenome in children with Crohn's disease during exclusive enteral nutrition. American Journal of Gastroenterology, 110(12), 1718-1729. https://doi.org/10.1038/ajg.2015.357
138. Lee, D., Baldassano, R. N., Otley, A. R., et al. (2015). Comparative effectiveness of nutritional and biological therapy in North American children

with active Crohn's disease. Inflammatory Bowel Diseases, 21(8), 1786-1793. https://doi.org/10.1097/MIB.0000000000000426
139. Fuentes, S., & de Vos, W. M. (2016). How to manipulate the microbiota: Fecal microbiota transplantation. Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology, 902, 143-153. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31248-4_10
140. Brandt, L. J. (2015). Fecal microbiota transplant: Respice, adspice, prospice. Journal of Clinical Gastroenterology, 49(Suppl 1), S65-S68. https://doi.org/10.1097/MCG.0000000000000346
141. Rao, K., & Young, V. B. (2015). Fecal microbiota transplantation for the management of Clostridium difficile infection. Infectious Diseases Clinics of North America, 29(1), 109-122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idc.2014.11.009
142. Zhang, F., Luo, W., Shi, Y., et al. (2012). Should we standardize the 1,700-year-old fecal microbiota transplantation? The American Journal of Gastroenterology, 107(11), 1755. https://doi.org/10.1038/ajg.2012.251
143. Rao, K., & Safdar, N. (2016). Fecal microbiota transplantation for the treatment of Clostridium difficile infection. Journal of Hospital Medicine, 11(1), 56-61. https://doi.org/10.1002/jhm.2449
144. Eiseman, B., Silen, W., Bascom, G. S., et al. (1958). Fecal enema as an adjunct in the treatment of pseudomembranous enterocolitis. Surgery, 44(6), 854-859.
145. Khanna, S., Pardi, D. S., Kelly, C. R., et al. (2016). A novel microbiome therapeutic increases gut microbial diversity and prevents recurrent Clostridium difficile infection. Journal of Infectious Diseases, 214(2), 173-181. https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiv766
146. Youngster, I., Russell, G. H., Pindar, C., et al. (2014). Oral, capsulized, frozen fecal microbiota transplantation for relapsing Clostridium difficile infection. JAMA, 312(17), 1772-1778. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2014.13875
147. Orenstein, R., Dubberke, E., Hardi, R., et al. (2016). Safety and durability of RBX2660 (microbiota suspension) for recurrent Clostridium difficile infection: Results of the PUNCH CD study. Clinical Infectious Diseases, 62(5), 596-602. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/civ938
148. Furuya-Kanamori, L., Doi, S. A., Paterson, D. L., et al. (2016). Upper versus lower gastrointestinal delivery for transplantation of fecal microbiota in recurrent or refractory Clostridium difficile infection: A collaborative analysis of individual patient data from 14 studies. Journal of Clinical Gastroenterology. https://doi.org/10.1097/MCG.0000000000000511
149. Kelly, C. R., Khoruts, A., Staley, C., et al. (2016). Effect of fecal microbiota transplantation on recurrence in multiply recurrent Clostridium difficile infection: A randomized trials. Annals of Internal Medicine, 165(9), 609-616. https://doi.org/10.7326/M16-0271
150. Scaldaferri, F., Pecere, S., Petito, V., et al. (2016). Efficacy and mechanisms of action of fecal microbiota transplantation in ulcerative colitis: Pitfalls and promises from a first meta-analysis. Transplantation Proceedings, 48(1), 402-407. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.transproceed.2015.12.040
151. Kahn, S. A., & Rubin, D. T. (2016). When subjects violate the research covenant: Lessons learned from a failed clinical trial of fecal microbiota transplantation. American Journal of Gastroenterology, 111(10), 1508-1510. https://doi.org/10.1038/ajg.2016.153

152. Young, V. B. (2016). Therapeutic manipulation of the microbiota: Past, present and considerations for the future. Clinical Microbiology and Infection, 22(10), 905-909. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2016.09.001

استكشاف الميكروبيوم البشري: دوره وتأثيره على الصحة العامة والوقاية من الأمراض

الملخص:

الخلفية :أصبح الميكروبيوم البشري عاملًا حيويًا في الصحة والأمراض، حيث يؤثر بشكل كبير على العمليات الفسيولوجية المختلفة ونتائج الأمراض. على الرغم من التقدم في أبحاث الميكروبيوم، لا يزال دمج المعرفة حول الميكروبيوم في الممارسات السريرية محدودًا. تهدف هذه المراجعة إلى توضيح دور الميكروبيوم في الصحة والأمراض، مع التركيز على إمكانياته في الوقاية من الأمراض والتشخيص والعلاج.

الهدف :تقديم نظرة شاملة عن هيكل الميكروبيوم البشري ووظيفته وتأثيره على الصحة العامة والوقاية من الأمراض. تسعى المراجعة إلى سد الفجوة بين أبحاث الميكروبيوم والتطبيقات السريرية، مما يسهل فهمًا أفضل بين المهنيين الطبيين.

الطرق :تقوم المراجعة بتلخيص النتائج من الدراسات الحديثة حول الميكروبيوم، بما في ذلك الدراسات التي أجريت في مبادرات كبيرة مثل مشروع الميكروبيوم البشري ومجموعة .MetaHIT تفحص المراجعة الأساليب المختلفة المستخدمة لدراسة هيكل ووظيفة الميكروبيوم، بما في ذلك تسلسل S rRNA16، الميتاجينوميات، الميتاترانسكريبتوميات، البروتيوميات، والميتابولوميات.

النتائج :تبرز المراجعة الأدوار المتنوعة للميكروبيوم في الصحة، مثل تأثيره على تطوير جهاز المناعة، العمليات الأيضية، والوقاية من الأمراض. كما تناقش الآثار المترتبة لأبحاث الميكروبيوم على الأمراض المختلفة، بما في ذلك الأمراض المعدية، أمراض الأمعاء الالتهابية، السمنة، والحالات القلبية الوعائية. تشمل النتائج الرئيسية تأثير الميكروبيوم على استقلاب الأدوية، الاستجابات المناعية، وقابلية الإصابة بالأمراض.

الخاتمة :يوفر فهم الميكروبيوم البشري إمكانيات كبيرة لتطوير الممارسات الطبية من خلال الطب الشخصي والعلاجات المستهدفة. على الرغم من التحديات في ترجمة أبحاث الميكروبيوم إلى تطبيقات سريرية، فإن الأبحاث المستمرة والتقدم التكنولوجي تعد بزيادة قدرتنا على تشخيص الأمراض والوقاية منها وعلاجها بناءً على رؤى الميكروبيوم.

الكلمات المفتاحية :الميكروبيوم البشري، الوقاية من الأمراض، أبحاث الميكروبيوم، المجتمعات الميكروبية، تأثيرات الصحة، الميتاجينوميات.