

Draft Manuscript for Review

Breastfeeding as a regulating factor of the development of the intestinal microbiome in the early stages of life

Journal:	<i>European Food Research and Technology</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Review article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Krawczyk, Beata; Gdańsk University of Technology, Department of Molecular Biotechnology and Microbiology Ostrowski, Bartosz; Gdańsk University of Technology, Department of Molecular Biotechnology and Microbiology
Keywords:	microbiota, neonatal gut, breast milk, dysbiosis, enterotypes, probiotics

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Breastfeeding as a regulating factor of the development of the intestinal
2 microbiome in the early stages of life

3 Bartosz Ostrowski¹, Beata Krawczyk^{1*}

4 ¹ Department of Molecular Biotechnology and Microbiology, Faculty of Chemistry, Gdańsk University of Technology,
5 Gdańsk, Poland

6 *Correspondence: beata.krawczyk@pg.edu.pl; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5528-8898>

7 Bartosz Ostrowski: barostro2@student.pg.edu.pl; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6316-9001>

10 Abstract

11 Since the first bacterial inhabitants of the human gastrointestinal tract were identified a lot of research into the study of the
12 human microbiome and its effects on health has been conducted. Currently, it is accepted that humans have a symbiotic
13 relationship with the gut microbiome, though the specifics of this relationship are not well understood. The microbiome of
14 neonates constantly changes and appears to influence many facets of the infant’s health and predisposition later in life. This
15 review aims to show how the microbiome develops over time. We discuss its composition, origins and stages of
16 development of microbiota, the possible health benefits of a proper neonatal microbiome, and the dangers associated with
17 dysbiosis. We emphasize the shielding, modulating, and stimulating effects breast milk has on the infant microbiota. The
18 methods commonly used for the study of microbiota are also discussed.

19
20 **Keywords:** microbiota, neonatal gut, breast milk, dysbiosis, enterotypes, probiotics

22 Statements and Declarations

23 Competing Interests and Funding: The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

24 Conflict of interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

25 Ethics approval: Authors declared that this work does not require any ethical clearance.

The importance of the gut microbiome

The human microbiota has been investigated thoroughly and its effects on human health are firmly established even though the precise relationship is yet to be understood [1,2]. The gut microbiome is seen as an integral part of the human body and contributes to metabolic functions, protects against pathogens, and educates the immune system [3]. It is often seen as an extension of the human genetic pool, with the gut microbiome encoding over 3 million genes, which eclipses the 23 thousand genes present in the human genome [1]. The microbiome is flexible and can be affected by dietary ingredients and the resulting changes can affect the health of the host. Transplantation of a microbiome from healthy individuals to sick patients can effectively treat *Clostridium difficile* infections [4] and other applications for this procedure are emerging [5]. Research on mice has linked the composition of the microbiome to obesity [6].

Microbes present in the gut, metabolize substrates present in consumed food creating nutrients that are usable for the host while also producing bioactive compounds that modulate the immune system, physiology, and gene expression of host cells [7]. Humans only produce a few hydrolases capable of hydrolyzing starches and rely on the enzymes produced by the microbiome to gain energy from complex carbohydrates[8]. Short-chain fatty acids (SCFAs) produced by bacterial metabolism of carbohydrates contributes to approximately 10% of the caloric requirement of humans. Additionally, these fatty acids provide anti-inflammatory effects. Butyrate, a SCFA, improves the integrity of the host's intestinal epithelial cells [9].

The gut also hosts microorganisms capable of utilizing the gaseous byproducts of fermentation such as carbon dioxide and hydrogen, and through the removal of these waste products, helps drive metabolism forward [10,11]. The fermentation of amino acids by these bacteria provides additional SCFAs, that can be used as fuel.[12] However, the metabolism of aromatic, sulphur-containing, and basic amino acids produces pro-inflammatory, cytotoxic, and neuroactive compounds [7]. Only a small portion of dietary fat reaches the colon[13] and the relationship between microbial lipid metabolism and the host's health is unknown. However, it is known that free lipids have antimicrobial properties [14]. Saturated fatty acids promote inflammation [15], which might be one reason for the chronic inflammation present in obesity [7], while omega-3 unsaturated fatty acids are anti-inflammatory [16].

Interactions with various antigens play an important role in immune system maturation. It is suggested that exposure to certain microorganisms early in life is a factor in preventing the development of allergies and aids in regulating immune system activity. The gut has the greatest concentration of microorganisms that humans have contact with in their lives. Therefore, it is natural to assume that the gut microbiome plays an important role in immune system regulation [17].

1
2 58 The microbiome is known for modulating the secretion of antibodies and interleukins and the functions of other
3
4 59 immune cells [18]. As suggested by recent studies, the early establishment of symbiosis between the immune system and
5
6 60 the gut microbiome has a large influence on the susceptibility or the resistance to diseases later in life [19]. During the
7
8 61 weaning period, the immune system of infants undergoes rapid development. It has been shown that the microbiome takes
9
10 62 an important part in the development of isolated lymphoid follicles and the regulation of intraepithelial lymphocytes,
11
12 63 macrophages, and invariant killer T cells [18].
13
14 64

15 65 **Changes within the microbiome during pregnancy**
16

17 66 Although the adult microbiome differs between persons, it is fairly stable during life and research has revealed
18
19 67 some generalities. The most common phyla present in healthy individuals are Firmicutes (22.2 +/- 18.66%) and
20
21 68 Bacteroidetes (73.13 +/- 22.16%) followed by Proteobacteria (2.15 +/- 10.39%) and Actinobacteria, which is mostly
22
23 69 represented by the *Bifidobacterium* genus (1.82+/- 3%). A vast majority of Bacteroidetes are members of the *Bacteroides*
24
25 70 genus, with *Bacteroides dorei* being the most dominant (17.44 +/- 8.74%), while *Bacteroides fragilis* is the most
26
27 71 widespread species. The abundance of *Bifidobacteria* varies between 0.004% and 12.21%. In regards to Firmicutes, the
28
29 72 genus *Clostridium* appears to be the most common [2].
30

31 73 During pregnancy, the mother's vaginal, oral, and gut microbiota undergo significant changes, the origin of which
32
33 74 is unknown. Changes in hormonal regulation, immunity, energy homeostasis, and fat storage likely have a role in
34
35 75 influencing the microbiome [20]. The changes in the microbiome happen gradually during pregnancy. An increase in the
36
37 76 abundance of Proteobacteria and Actinobacteria is seen at the cost of *Faecalibacterium* and other SCFA producers [21].
38

39 77 During the third trimester, mothers showed a lower diversity within a single sample, while having the largest
40
41 78 diversity between different mothers. This suggests that pregnancy causes the depletion of microbial diversity, however, it
42
43 79 increases the diversity between individuals. The increased diversity between mothers lasted for up to one month postpartum
44
45 80 [21]. When transferred to germ-free mice, third-term microbiota caused more weight gain, insulin resistance, and
46
47 81 inflammatory responses than first-term microbiota. This shows that the microbiota contributes to the changes occurring
48
49 82 during pregnancy [21]. There is also evidence suggesting that an alternation in maternal microbiota during pregnancy such
50
51 83 as during exposure to antibiotics, influences the neonate's immunity and health [22]. Changes to the vaginal microbiota,
52
53 84 such as the presence of certain fungi like *Candida albicans* [23], a lower *Lactobacillus* abundance, and an increased
54
55 85 *Gardnerella* and *Ureaplasma* abundance[24] are associated with preterm birth .
56
57 86
58
59
60

The “in utero” origin of the microbiome

The exact source of the early microbiome is unknown. The proposed sources of early life gut bacteria are the mother’s vagina during birth, breast milk, and the mother’s gut microflora, however, the mechanism of such transfer is unknown. Recent studies have proposed the idea of in utero colonization [25].

The placenta and the amniotic fluid have always been considered sterile, however recent studies have raised doubts about this assumption. Bacteria have been isolated from the placenta and studies have shown the presence of the microorganisms in amniotic fluid [26, 27]. However, the detected biomass remains low suggesting the detected microbiota are contaminants rather than native inhabitants [28]. It has also been suggested that polymerase chain reaction (PCR) based detection might identify DNA of dead bacteria instead of living ones [29].

Bacteria have also been found in the umbilical cord suggesting the transfer of microbiota between mother and fetus [30]. However, the mechanism for such a transfer is not understood. One theory is that the bacteria are transferred from the mother’s intestine. An experiment in mice showed *Enterococcus faecium* strains fed to the mother orally were later detected in the amniotic fluid supporting this claim [31].

It has also been shown that microbial exposure of the mother during pregnancy might have a significant impact in preventing allergies [32]. Children, whose mothers were exposed to farm animals during pregnancy are less likely to develop allergies, as well as an exposure to other allergens reduced the symptoms of asthma, hay fever, and eczema in the children [22]. However, the evidence supporting the existence of a placental microbiome is still controversial.

The changes in the microbiome associated with type of delivery

One of the first big shifts in the microbial composition of the infant’s gut happens during birth, and the birth mode seems to be a major factor influencing the early microbiome. Children born from cesarean section have lower *Bifidobacteria* abundance and the colonization by *Bifidobacteria* is delayed. This delay is not affected by the form of feeding. They also have an abundance of potentially harmful *Klebsiella* and *Enterococcus*. This increase in *Klebsiella* and *Enterococcus* is also independent of antibiotic exposure, hospitalization time, and feeding.

There is evidence suggesting that children delivered vaginally are seeded by the mother’s fecal microbiota. Furthermore, these children have a more stable early microbiota than children born by cesarean section, who are inhabited by more strains associated with respiratory tract infections during the first year of life. This suggests that the passage through the vaginal canal has an important role in the early colonization of the infant’s gut [33].

1
2 115 Vaginal seeding is a procedure in which a gauze swab is used to transfer vaginal fluid, and the microorganisms
3
4 116 within it, onto an infant born via cesarean section. In theory, this should alter the infant’s microbiota towards a more
5
6 117 “natural” composition. However, the evidence regarding the health benefits of this procedure is limited and harbors the
7
8 118 possibility of transferring pathogenic microorganisms. Due to the absence of evidence of the benefits and potential risks,
9
10 119 performing this procedure is currently not recommended [34].
11
12 120

13 121 **Breast milk composition and bioactive components**
14

15
16 122 Breast milk is the most optimal source of nutrients for newborns, but the evidence for its role in preventing health
17
18 123 problems and disease in early childhood is prevalent. Some suggest that the benefits might also apply later in life, though
19
20 124 this is inconclusive [3]. Although the artificial formula has improved since it was first introduced, it is still unable to provide
21
22 125 the same health benefits as natural human breast milk. Breastfed children have lower risks of respiratory tract infections,
23
24 126 neonatal necrotizing enterocolitis (NEC), and gastrointestinal illnesses [35]. As such, breastfeeding remains the
25
26 127 recommended feeding method of newborns, however, in certain cases, such as babies with lactose intolerance or mothers
27
28 128 who cannot breastfeed due to health reasons, it is not possible and must be replaced or supplemented by artificial formula.

29 129 The composition of breast milk changes over time and is considered fully mature 4 to 6 weeks after birth. The
30
31 130 colostrum, which is produced in low quantities during the first few days following birth is rich in IgA, lactoferrin,
32
33 131 leukocytes, developmental factors, sodium, magnesium, and chloride[36]. However, it contains relatively lower
34
35 132 concentrations of lactose, calcium, and potassium. This suggests that the main function of colostrum is immunogenic rather
36
37 133 than nutritional [37,38,39]. The composition of macronutrients in breast milk varies between mothers, however, remains
38
39 134 similar across populations despite differences in maternal nutrition [40]. In preterm mothers, breast milk contains higher
40
41 135 concentrations of secretory IgA, likely to compensate for the underdeveloped neonatal immune system [41].

42 136 The protein content of breast milk is estimated to be around 0.9 to 1.2 g/dL [36] and can be grouped into 3 major
43
44 137 classes based on where they can be found: caseins (α -casein, β -casein, and κ -casein), whey (α -lactalbumin, lactoferrin,
45
46 138 lysozyme, and secretory IgA), and mucins. Caseins are aggregated in micelles while whey proteins are present in solution
47
48 139 and mucins are incorporated into the milk fat globule membrane (MFGM) [42]. In addition to proteins, breast milk contains
49
50 140 free amino acids with higher concentrations of glutamic acid and glutamine, thought to have an appetite-regulating effect
51
52 141 [43].
53

54 142 Lipids represent 44% of the total energy provided by human milk, being the major contributor. The most common
55
56 143 fatty acids in breast milk are palmitic acid and oleic acid. Palmitic acid is mostly concentrated in the 2nd position of
57
58
59
60

triglycerides, which allows for increased absorption and decreased calcium malabsorption [42]. The fat in human breast milk is concentrated in globules surrounded by a MFGM, which contains a high amount of bioactive compounds that play a role in neurocognitive development and immune function [44]. The content of long-chain polyunsaturated fatty acids (LCPUFA) is largely affected by the mother's diet, and is negatively affected by the high omega-6/omega-3 ratio present in western diets. [45,46] A higher ratio of omega-6/omega-3 is positively associated with higher body fat percentages between 2 weeks and 4 months of age and may contribute to adiposity [47].

The main carbohydrate in human breast milk is lactose [36]. It appears at a concentration of 6.7g/100 ml exceeding the concentration of other species [48]. The concentration of lactose increases in mothers with a higher volume of milk production [49]. The micronutrient composition of breast milk varies by maternal diet and body stores. Breast milk contains vitamins A, B1, B2, B6, B12, and D along with iodine and other micronutrients.[50,51] Regardless of diet, vitamin K is low in human breast milk and should be supplemented [23d]. The effects of the micronutrients in human breast milk on infant growth are not well known [43].

In addition to macro- and micronutrients, breast milk contains numerous bioactive components including hormones, growth factors, cytokines, and immune cells. The growth factors present in milk stimulates the development of the intestines, growth and maturation of neurons, repair of tissues, and protection against damage from hypoxia and ischemia. T cells, stem cells, lymphocytes, and macrophages are all present in breast milk along with non-cellular immune components such as immunoglobulins and cytokines. Additionally, it contains compounds such as lactoferrin, lactadherin, bile salt-stimulating lipase, and mucins which serve a role in protecting the infant against bacteria and viruses [36].

The infant microbiome, health risks and benefits associated with microorganisms found in the neonatal gut

The composition of the neonatal microbiome has substantially more plasticity than adults. It changes rapidly with ageing and depends on various factors such that it is significantly different between formula-fed and breastfed babies [1,9,14]. Table 1 contains a comparison of the neonatal gut and breast milk microbiota.

During the first week of life, the microbiome is dominated by facultative anaerobes, such as those from the Proteobacteria family. These bacteria consume oxygen and shape the intestinal environment to be more habitable for obligatory anaerobes which appear later [54].

Not only does breast milk contain factors that shield the underdeveloped immune system of newborns but it also appears to promote the growth of certain microbes, such as *Bifidobacterium* species, due to their ability to metabolize human milk

1
2 173 oligosaccharides (HMOs), and *Lactobacilli*. *Enterococci* are also more prevalent in breastfed infants, while formula-fed
3
4 174 children show an increase in the presence of *Clostridium*, *Escherichia*, and *Bacteroides* [1]. The microbiome has a big effect
5
6 175 on infant development. Studies show that mice grown in germ-free environments have poor growth, decreased weight,
7
8 176 intestinal problems, and altered neurodevelopment [55].

9
10 177 Overall, neonates are characterized by lower bacterial diversity than adults with breast-fed infants having less
11
12 178 diversity in their gut than formula-fed infants [19]. It also appears that children on a mixed diet have the bacterial diversity
13
14 179 profile of formula-fed infants. The microbiome shifts quite dramatically when solid foods are introduced to the infants' diet,
15
16 180 with a shift in dominance towards fiber-fermenting *Bacteroides* and *Firmicutes* and moving towards a composition similar
17
18 181 to that of adults [19].

19 182 The most studied members of the gut microbiome are the model organism *Escherichia coli* along with the genera
20
21 183 *Lactobacillus*, *Bifidobacterium*, and potential pathogens such as *Clostridium*. *Escherichia coli* is a microorganism
22
23 184 commonly found in the lower intestine of mammals. Although most strains are harmless and even aid in the health of the
24
25 185 host by producing exogenous vitamins such as K vitamins [56]. Unfortunately, there exist *E.coli* strains that can cause
26
27 186 diarrhoea, respiratory tract infections, pneumonia, and urinary tract infections [57]. The pathogenicity of *E.coli* is dependent
28
29 187 on several virulence factors such as fimbriae, adhesions, toxins, and other elements which can directly interact with
30
31 188 epithelial cells of the intestinal, respiratory, and urinary tract [58]. It has been shown that *E.coli* strains in breast-fed infants
32
33 189 have fewer virulence factors such as the K-capsule and have increased type 1 fimbriae expression. The IgA contained in the
34
35 190 mothers' milk can bind to the same type of fimbriae [59]. It appears that *E.coli* isolated from breast-fed infants show higher
36
37 191 adherence to epithelial cells of the colon compared to those in formula-fed children [60]. Type 1 fimbriae expression has
38
39 192 been shown to enhance the virulence of *E.coli* in the urinary tract [61]. However, breast-fed infants have shown a lower risk
40
41 193 of urinary tract infection [59].

42 194 Bacteria from the *Lactobacillus* genus belong to a broad group called the lactic acid bacteria, defined by their
43
44 195 ability to produce lactic acid as the sole or main byproduct of carbohydrate metabolism. They are known to colonize oral
45
46 196 cavities, gastrointestinal tracts, and vaginas of humans and animals. The presence of *Lactobacilli* in the gut is commonly
47
48 197 regarded as beneficial to the host and are frequently used as probiotics. However, there is little evidence supporting any
49
50 198 major role this genus might have on the human gastrointestinal tract. On the contrary, evidence suggests only a small
51
52 199 number of *Lactobacilli* are true residents of the mammalian gastrointestinal tract, and that most are instead allochthonous
53
54 200 and derived from food or the oral cavity. Recent research, based on the amplification of 16S rRNA genes, shows that
55
56 201 *Lactobacilli* make up only a small fraction of the total microbiota [62]. Attempts to treat infant colic with *Lactobacilli*
57
58 202 supplementation have shown no benefit [63]. However, it has been shown that supplementation with *Lactobacillus*

rhamnosus reduces the duration of diarrhea [64]. Studies in animals have shown that treatment with *Lactobacillus* can improve enteritis recovery [65] and inhibit the colonization of the pathogenic *E.coli* K1 strain [66].

Clostridium is a genus of Gram-positive, anaerobic, and spore-forming bacilli. *C. difficile* is a major cause of diarrhoea and potentially lethal nosocomial infections, especially in the elderly [67]. However, its pathogenicity in infants is still debated [68]. Up to 70% of healthy newborns can be colonized by *C. difficile* during the first months of life and most lack any symptoms of infection even when large numbers of toxin-producing bacteria are present. The underdeveloped intestinal mucosa may lack *C. difficile* toxin receptors or other factors such as the immaturity of the immune system might also play a role, although the true reason is unknown [68]. It is important to note that *C. difficile* infections still occur especially in infants with hematological malignancies, inflammatory bowel disease, and cystic fibrosis following lung transplantation [67]. Colonization by *C. difficile* is more common among formula-fed infants than among breastfed ones [67] due to the lack of IgA in the formula [69]. The presence of *C. difficile* decreases with ageing and reaches the prevalence levels similar to adults by 3 years of age [70].

Bifidobacterium is a genus of Gram-positive, anaerobic bacteria that commonly inhabit the gastrointestinal tract, vagina, and oral cavities of mammals, including humans. Their presence in the gastrointestinal tract is deemed beneficial, thus they are commonly added to probiotics and functional foods. *Bifidobacteria* rapidly colonize the infant gut during the first weeks after birth. *Bifidobacteria* have been associated with protection from carcinogens, reduction in inflammation, and regulation of gut function. They are more prevalent in babies born vaginally suggesting they are acquired from the vaginal tract of the mother. Furthermore, breastfeeding supports the growth of this genus due to its ability to digest human breast milk oligosaccharides. As a result, *Bifidobacteria* are a major part of the newborn microbiome. However, their presence decreases rapidly with ageing and remains low but stable during adulthood [71].

Enterotypes in infants and stages of gut microflora development

In recent years, metagenomic studies have suggested that the intestinal microbiome of each human belongs to one of three types based on the dominating microorganism. These genera are *Bacteroides* (Enterotype 1), *Prevotella* (Enterotype 2), and *Ruminococcus* (Enterotype 3). These enterotypes do not differ in functional abundance and do not correlate with any factors relating to the host. However, the prevalence of certain genera indicates the use of different routes to generate energy from fermentation [72]. Although the possible benefits of using the enterotype model are high, there are certain points of contest when it comes to the theory. The enterotypes are not sharply delineated [72], and apparent clusters may arise from certain methods of data processing even when they are not factual [73]. Additionally, by focusing on the enterotype model it

1
2 232 is possible to miss smaller changes and individual differences in the microbiota. The long-term stability of a human's
3
4 233 enterotype also comes into question [73]. Some research suggests that there are only two enterotypes, the *Prevotella* and
5
6 234 *Bacteroides* genera [74].
7
8 235 Certain studies seeking to evaluate the presence and importance of enterotypes in infants have been performed.
9
10 236 This research has identified four distinct enterotypes with the dominant microorganisms being either the Firmicutes phylum,
11
12 237 *Bifidobacterium*, *Bacteroides*, or *Prevotella* [75]. Unlike adults, the differences in enterotypes seem to be dependent on the
13
14 238 stage of gut development and can transition from a less mature into a more mature one. In particular, the strains associated
15
16 239 with Firmicutes and *Bifidobacterium* were correlated with the early developmental stages of the gut microbiota, while
17
18 240 *Bacteroides* and *Prevotella* were correlated with later stages [75]. While the enterotypes did not seem correlated with
19
20 241 antepartum or postpartum factors, certain clinical factors seemed to influence them to an extent. Type Firmicutes were more
21
22 242 common in infants delivered by C-section and in infants with lower gestational age, although these factors often appear
23
24 243 together. The duration of breastfeeding was also a factor with Firmicutes being more common in infants breastfed for
25
26 244 shorter durations while breastfeeding longer seemed to promote *Bifidobacterium* [75]. A different study, using two
27
28 245 enterotype models failed to detect a negative correlation between *Prevotella* and *Bacteroides* in infants 9 to 18 months of
29
30 246 age. However, such a correlation appeared at 36 months suggesting stable enterotypes develop between 18 and 36 months
31
32 247 of age [76].
33

34 248

35 249 **The dangers of microbial dysbiosis and factors contributing to its occurrence**

36
37 250 Multiple factors affect the composition of the infant microbiome, including but not limited to the mother's diet,
38
39 251 feeding type, and medication [55]. Dysbiosis is a term used to describe a breakdown in the balance between "protective"
40
41 252 and "harmful" intestinal bacteria [77]. Dysbiosis is associated with multiple diseases, such as obesity, type 2 diabetes,
42
43 253 hypertension, NEC, and inflammatory bowel disease, autoimmune diseases [18], asthma, food allergies, autism, and
44
45 254 opportunistic infections [19].

46 255 One of the most common causes of dysbiosis is antibiotic treatment. Antibiotics are the most common medication
47
48 256 prescribed for children. Studies have shown that the use of antibiotics in early life is associated with obesity and the
49
50 257 occurrence of diseases later in life. Antibiotic treatment has a long-term effect on the microbial composition and diversity in
51
52 258 the gut. Antibiotic treatment in early life has been associated with allergies, atopic diseases, autoimmune diseases, and
53
54 259 infections such as NEC [77]. Acid blockers are also associated with dysbiosis and NEC [55]. Children of obese mothers
55
56 260 have a different bacterial colonization profile than those born to nonobese mothers. These differences are maintained during

the first few years of life. However, the development of obesity may begin in utero due to the obesogenic and inflammatory maternal environment [78].

Gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM) is associated with changes to the microflora of both mother and child. Samples taken from GDM positive subjects exhibited less diversity than those from GDM negative patients. In addition, the meconium of GDM positive mothers exhibits a higher abundance and prevalence of eukaryotic viruses possibly exposing the child to a greater number of viruses [79].

Preterm infants are especially susceptible to dysbiosis due to their underdeveloped intestines. The immaturity of the gastrointestinal tract and immune system coupled with altered gut microbiota can have severe health consequences. Moreover, pre-terms require hospital treatment which further disturbs the microbiome and exposes the infant to the influences of the hospital's environmental microbiome [41].

Antibiotics are routinely prescribed for preterm children to prevent infections. Although this treatment decreases mortality it also alters the microbiota causing reduced bacterial diversity[80], delaying *Bifidobacteria* colonization [81] and increased presence of multi-drug resistant strains [80]. Furthermore, the time required for the recovery from such disruptions is positively correlated with the length of antibiotic treatment [80,81]. Additionally, artificial respiration shifts the microbiome towards aerobic and facultative anaerobic bacteria due to the introduction of oxygen to an otherwise anoxic gastrointestinal tract [82]. This can result in the weakening of the mucosal barrier [83] and reduced production of energy, nutrients, and bioactive components [84].

Modulation of the gut microbiota by probiotics and breast milk

Probiotics are live microorganisms promoted as having health benefits when taken as food supplements, while prebiotics are compounds that promote the growth or activity of beneficial microorganisms. There have been several studies investigating the benefits of pre- and probiotic supplementation for infants.

Studies on animal models show that *Bifidobacteria* supplementation might counteract the effect of carcinogens, help reduce diarrhea caused by viral infections or antibiotic treatment, and prevent constipation [71]. There is also evidence that supplementation with *Bifidobacteria* reduces the occurrence and severity of NEC in low birth or preterm infants [85]. It also has the potential to reduce the spread of gastroenteritis and diarrhea in infants in residential care units [86].

Attempts to treat infant colic with *Lactobacilli* supplementation has shown no benefit [63]. However, supplementation with *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* reduces the duration of diarrhea [64]. *Lactobacillus* GG has been shown to prevent and reduce the duration of diarrhea caused by rotavirus infections in animals [87, 88]. Animal studies have shown

1
2 290 that treatment with *Lactobacillus* can improve enteritidis recovery [65] and inhibit the colonization of the pathogenic *E.coli*
3
4 291 K1 strain [66]. *Lactobacilli* have also been shown to modulate Th1/Th2 cytokine balance [89,90] which might help in the
5
6 292 prevention of atopic disease and supplementing breastfeeding mothers or infants has been shown to reduce the incidence of
7
8 293 atopic dermatitis (eczema) [91].

9
10 294 In the absence of a mother’s breast milk, donor human milk (DHM) appears to be the best substitute for helping the
11
12 295 development of preterm babies. The microbiota of children fed DHM is similar to breastfed infants, although it shows a
13
14 296 decrease in Bifidobacteriaceae and an increase in Staphylococcaceae, Clostridiaceae, and Pasteurellaceae. The
15
16 297 pasteurization of donated breast milk and the different composition of preterm milk and donated milk might contribute to
17
18 298 this effect [92].

19 299 HMOs are a type of carbohydrate present in breast milk and although they don’t have any nutritional value, they
20
21 300 serve as a prebiotic stimulating the growth of proper microbiota and modulating several infant mucosal and systemic
22
23 301 immune functions [36]. These oligosaccharides differ between mothers, but this does not cause any incompatibility issues
24
25 302 [93, 94, 95]. However, it has been shown that one type of HMO, specifically disialyllacto-N-tetraose (DSLNT) is protective
26
27 303 against the risk of NEC in rats, which point to the conclusion that the protective effects of these compounds are dependant on
28
29 304 specific HMO structured [96]. A study in piglets has also shown that HMOs can reduce the symptoms of rotavirus
30
31 305 infections [97].

32
33 306 Research on the benefits of probiotics in infants has been promising and they appear to be safe. However, the
34
35 307 studies have used different strains and administration strategies thus more studies are needed to identify the ideal
36
37 308 combination. As of today, feeding breast milk from either the mother or that has been donated appears to be the best method
38
39 309 of stimulating a beneficial microbial composition.

40 310
41
42 311 **Methods for studying the microbiome**

43
44
45 312 Historically the study of human and animal microbiota has been based around traditional non-molecular methods
46
47 313 involving the isolation of microbes, microscopic observation, and growing them in culture. Although these methods have
48
49 314 been incredibly useful in the early study of the microbiome, they have several limitations. Traditional cultures tend to
50
51 315 underestimate the true variety of microorganisms present as a large number of bacteria cannot be cultivated using currently
52
53 316 known methods or require artificially created environmental conditions for that organism to grow [98,99]. Temperature, pH,
54
55 317 oxygen, and nutrient levels [98] and cultivation time [99] need to be tuned towards the studied microorganism. Furthermore,
56
57 318 the existence of mutual relationships between different bacteria further complicates the issue. In particular, the creation of a

biofilm, which is composed of many different microorganisms, is difficult to replicate in a lab. This limits the variety of microorganisms that can be studied using traditional methods, which provides a biased view of the microbiome composition with an overrepresentation of aerobic organisms [100].

Even with these limitations, culture methods have the unique advantage of allowing living microorganisms to be studied in regards to antibiotic response and susceptibility, antigens, microorganism relationships, biofilm formation, and the creation of experimental models [99]. New culture methods are still being developed to allow for the growing of microorganisms previously considered uncultivable. Examples of such methods for the cultivation of hard-to-culture microorganisms are the use of gnotobiotic animals [101] or the creation of artificial environments simulating the intestinal environment, such as the SHIME system [102]. These methods come with the additional benefit of being able to study gut microbe-host and microbe-microbe relationships [103, 104].

In response to the limitations of traditional methods, molecular methods for studying microorganisms were developed. These methods involve the study of a microorganism's molecular components such as DNA, RNA, proteins, and metabolites. These methods are culture-independent, meaning that the studied microorganisms do not need to be isolated and cultivated in a medium. Rather, they allow for the *in vitro* study of microorganisms considered impossible to be grown. The basis for most molecular methods is a variant of the DNA PCR [98]. By using PCR, the amount of DNA in a sample can be increased exponentially allowing for further analysis with techniques such as Southern blotting [105]. With modifications of the PCR method by using different starters, conditions, or pre-preparation techniques on the samples it is possible to turn it into a diagnostic method itself. For example, ligation-mediated PCR techniques utilize the selective amplification of DNA fragments generated by enzymatic restrictions creating a genetic fingerprint for a sample [106]. Other methods can also provide certain insights, for instance, terminal restriction fragment length polymorphism (T-RFLP) has suggested that *Clostridium* plays an important role in the pathogenesis of NEC [107]. While variants of gradient gel electrophoresis have revealed the disruption of the human microbiome by antibiotic administration and identified a correlation between *Sphingomonas* and NEC in human children [108,109]

With the rise of DNA sequencing technology, the ability to study complex microbial communities has increased. Although its use was initially limited due to costs, improvements in the technology have allowed for cheaper, faster, and more sensitive identification technologies. The increased availability of bioinformatic tools has allowed for the creation of modern new generation sequencing (NGS) technology and allowed for the development of metagenomics, which is the study of the total genetic material within an environmental sample. Metagenomics can be used to study microbial diversity and dysbiosis of the intestine, identify new genes and microbial pathways and identify relationships between the microbiome and the host's health [110]. Metagenomics aims to catalog all the genes from a microbial community by

1
2 349 random sequencing of all DNA present in a sample [110]. The gene most commonly used for sequencing is the 16S rRNA
3
4 350 gene as it is present in various microorganisms while having highly variable regions allowing for its differentiation between
5
6 351 species [111]. For fungi the 18S rRNA gene or the Internal Transcribed Spacer sequence is used [112].

7
8 352 Another method of sequencing is whole-genome shotgun sequencing which allows for the identification of viruses
9
10 353 [58g,58h] whose genetic data is missed by 16S sequencing as they lack such sequences [98]. This method can also provide
11
12 354 information regarding gene content and metabolic pathways [113]. However, a major disadvantage of this technique is that
13
14 355 the DNA from the host is also amplified and can often overwhelm the bacterial DNA. Additionally, analysis of the acquired
15
16 356 data is complex and requires a lot of computational power [114]. The sequences obtained by either method can be analyzed
17
18 357 with the assistance of bioinformatic tools and methods, such as databases stemming from data acquired by the Human
19
20 358 microbiome project or the MetaHIT project. This enables a broader understanding of the structure and function of microbial
21
22 359 communities. Metagenomic methods have revealed the relative stability of a healthy individual's microbiome and identified
23
24 360 multiple factors that affect its composition [110].

25 361 Although molecular methods are incredibly useful in the study of microorganisms they do have limitations. DNA
26
27 362 sequencing provides information on the presence of genes but doesn't give any insight into gene expression [98,99].
28
29 363 Additionally, some DNA sequences may amplify more efficiently under given conditions introducing bias to the results.
30
31 364 Furthermore, the PCR reaction does not discriminate between living and dead bacteria or their fragments [114]. The DNA
32
33 365 samples used for metagenomic analysis must be of high quality and in sufficient quantity. However, microbiome samples
34
35 366 are almost universally contaminated by human DNA. Additionally, not all identified sequences can be matched due to the
36
37 367 lack of reference and determining function on sequence homology introduces ambiguity to the results [110, 115].

38 368 A supplementary method to DNA sequencing is RNA sequencing, which allows researchers to look directly at the
39
40 369 transcriptome of microorganisms and gain insight into gene expression [116]. RNA sequencing can be used to study the
41
42 370 effects of environmental perturbations and factors on the function of the gut microbiome and identify a functional change
43
44 371 before a composition change occurs. This could allow one to preemptively detect the signs of dysbiosis [117, 118].
45
46 372 Metatranscriptomics can be used to determine the activity of genes in a defined environment, such as the human gut.
47
48 373 However, this method requires high-quality RNA samples, which are difficult to obtain and often difficult to separate
49
50 374 mRNA from other types of RNA. Additionally, mRNA is unstable and the reference databases are still insufficient [110].

51
52 375 Methods for studying protein (metaproteomics) or metabolite (metabolomics) profiles are also being developed and
53
54 376 can supplement metagenomic analysis. Metaproteomics has greatly benefited from improved methods of protein separation,
55
56 377 high throughput mass spectrometry, increased computing power, and the growth of metagenomic databases. However, such
57
58 378 methods are in their infancy and their development is difficult due to the high complexity of human samples and difficulties

in analyzing the data [114]. Meanwhile, metabolomic profiles of the human gut microbiota combined with other methods can be used to predict the appearance of dysbiosis [119]. Methods for studying the microbiome are presented in Fig 1.

Conclusion

The human intestinal microbiome is an incredibly complex subject to study. Not only is it one of the richest microbial ecosystems found on earth but the relationships between the host, the microbiome, and one's health are often not straightforward, with each influencing the other. Furthermore, the microbiome of babies displays significant plasticity and is influenced by multiple factors such as mode of birth, type of feeding, medical conditions and treatments, and is shaped by the development of the infant's gut (Fig 2). However, research has identified several health effects associated with the microbiome and found ways to influence the developing microbiome, with some of these methods being put into practice. Although several issues remain unclear.

The origins and roles of pre- and postpartum factors on the development of an infant's microbiome are still inconclusive. The specific roles certain classes of microorganisms assume in the gut and the importance of their metabolic products have yet to be discovered. New methods for studying microorganisms have been crucial in enhancing our current knowledge base and in conjunction with traditional methods have provided further insight into the ecosystem of the human gut. With such knowledge, new ways of treating illnesses and improving an infant's health may appear.

Author contributions

Bartosz Ostrowski: Conceptualization, Collected data, Writing - Original Draft

Beata Krawczyk: Conceptualization, Visualization, Supervision, Writing – Review & Editing

All authors approved the final version of the manuscript and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

References

1. Rinninella E, Raoul P, Cintoni M, et al (2019). What is the Healthy Gut Microbiota Composition? A Changing Ecosystem across Age, Environment, Diet, and Diseases. *Microorganisms* 7(1):14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms7010014>
2. King CH, Desai H, Sylvestsky AC, et al (2019). Baseline human gut microbiota profile in healthy people and standard reporting template. *PloS one* 14(9), e0206484. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0206484>

3. Stiemsma LT, Michels KB (2018). The Role of the Microbiome in the Developmental Origins of Health and Disease. *Pediatrics* 141(4), e20172437. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2017-2437>

4. Bakken JS. Fecal bacteriotherapy for recurrent *Clostridium difficile* infection. *Anaerobe* 15, 285–289 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anaerobe.2009.09.007>

5. Borody T J, Khoruts A (2011). Fecal microbiota transplantation and emerging applications. *Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol* 9(2): 88–96. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrgastro.2011.244>

6. Turnbaugh P J, Bäckhed F, Fulton L, et al (2008). Diet-Induced Obesity Is Linked to Marked but Reversible Alterations in the Mouse Distal Gut Microbiome. *Cell Host and Microbe* 3(4):213–223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chom.2008.02.015>

7. Oliphant K, Allen-Vercos E (2019). Macronutrient metabolism by the human gut microbiome: Major fermentation by-products and their impact on host health. *Microbiome*, 7(1):1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-019-0704-8>

8. Wong JMW, Jenkins DJA (2007). Carbohydrate digestibility and metabolic effects. *J Nutr* 137:2539S–46S. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/137.11.2539S>

9. den Besten G, van Eunen K, Groen AK, et al (2013). The role of short-chain fatty acids in the interplay between diet, gut microbiota, and host energy metabolism. *J Lipid Res* 54:2325–40. <https://doi.org/10.1194/jlr.R036012>

10. Krajmalnik-Brown R, Ilhan Z-E, Kang D-W, et al (2012). Effects of gut microbes on nutrient absorption and energy regulation. *Nutr Clin Pract Off Publ Am Soc Parenter Enter Nutr* 27:201–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0884533611436116>

11. Wolf PG, Biswas A, Morales SE, et al (2016). H₂ metabolism is widespread and diverse among human colonic microbes. *Gut Microbes* 7:235–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19490976.2016.1182288>

12. Portune KJ, Beaumont M, Davila A-M, et al (2016). Gut microbiota role in dietary protein metabolism and health-related outcomes: the two sides of the coin. *Trends Food Sci Technol* 57:213–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2016.08.011>

13. Cândido FG, Valente FX, Grześkowiak ŁM, et al. (2018). Impact of dietary fat on gut microbiota and low-grade systemic inflammation: mechanisms and clinical implications on obesity. *Int J Food Sci Nutr* 69:125–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09637486.2017.1343286>

14. Desbois AP, Smith VJ (2010). Antibacterial free fatty acids: activities, mechanisms of action and biotechnological potential. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 85:1629–42. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-009-2355-3>

15. Huang S, Rutkowsky JM, Snodgrass RG et al (2012). Saturated fatty acids activate TLR-mediated proinflammatory signaling pathways. *J Lipid Res* 53:2002–13.

16. Calder PC (2013). N-3 fatty acids, inflammation and immunity: new mechanisms to explain old actions. *Proc Nutr Soc* 72:326–36. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0029665113001031>
17. Scudellari M (2017). Cleaning up the hygiene hypothesis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 114(7): 1433–1436. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1700688114>
18. Shi N, Li N, Duan X, Niu H (2017). Interaction between the gut microbiome and mucosal immune system. *Mil Med Res* 4(1): 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40779-017-0122-9>
19. Sanidad KZ, Zeng MY (2020). Neonatal gut microbiome and immunity. *Curr Opin Microbiol.* 56:30–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2020.05.011>
20. Neuman H, Koren O (2017). The Pregnancy Microbiome. *Nestle Nutr Inst Workshop Ser*, 88: 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000455207>
21. Koren O, Goodrich J K, Cullender T C et al. *Cell*, 150(3): 470–480. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2012.07.008>
22. Nyangahu D D, Jaspan H B (2019). Influence of maternal microbiota during pregnancy on infant immunity. *Clin Exp Immunol* 198(1):47–56. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cei.13331>
23. Farr A, Kiss H, Holzer I, et al (2015). Effect of asymptomatic vaginal colonization with *Candida albicans* on pregnancy outcome. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand* 94: 989–996. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aogs.12697>
24. DiGiulio DB, Callahan BJ, McMurdie PJ, et al (2015). Temporal and spatial variation of the human microbiota during pregnancy. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 112:11060–11065. <https://doi.org/10.1073>
25. Singh A, Mittal M (2020). Neonatal microbiome—a brief review. *Journal of Maternal-Fetal and Neonatal Medicine*, 33(22): 3841–3848. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767058.2019.1583738>
26. Kovalovszki L, Villanyi Z, Pataki I, et al (1982). Isolation of aerobic bacteria from the placenta. *Acta Paediatr Acad Sci Hung* 1982; 23: 357– 360
27. Aagaard K, Ma J, Antony KM, et al (2014) The placenta harbors a unique microbiome. *Sci Transl Med* 6: 237ra65. <https://doi.org/10.1126/scitranslmed.3008599>
28. Lauder AP, Roche AM, Sherrill-Mix S, et al (2016). Comparison of placenta samples with contamination controls does not provide evidence for a distinct placenta microbiota. *Microbiome* 4: 29. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-016-0172-3>
29. Dunn A B, Jordan S, Baker B J, et al (2017). The Maternal Infant Microbiome: Considerations for Labor and Birth. *MCN Am J Matern Child Nurs* 42(6), 318–325. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NMC.0000000000000373>
30. Matamoros S, Gras-Leguen C, Le Vacon F, et al (2012). *Trend Microbiol* 21(4): 167–173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2012.12.001>

1
2 467 31. Jiménez E, Fernández L, Marín ML, et al (2005). Isolation of commensal bacteria from umbilical cord blood of
3
4 468 healthy neonates born by cesarean section. *Curr Microbiol.* 51(4):270-4. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00284-005-0020-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00284-005-0020-3)
5
6 469 3
7
8 470 32. Abrahamsson TRY, Jenmalm MC (2015). Gut microbiota and allergy: The importance of the pregnancy period.
9
10 471 *Pediatric Research*, 77(1):214–219. <https://doi.org/10.1038/pr.2014.165>
11
12 472 33. Reyman M, van Houten M A, van Baarle D et al (2019). Impact of delivery mode-associated gut microbiota
13 473 dynamics on health in the first year of life. *Nature Communications*, 10(1):1–12. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-13014-7)
14
15 474 019-13014-7
16
17 475 34. Cunningham A J, Sim K, Deierl A, et al (2016). “Vaginal seeding” of infants born by caesarean section: How
18
19 476 should health professionals engage with this increasingly popular but unproved practice? *BMJ (Online)*, 352:1–2.
20
21 477 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.i227>
22
23 478 35. Allen J, Hector D (2005). Benefits of breastfeeding. *N S W Public Health Bull*
24
25 479 16(3–4): 42–46. <https://doi.org/10.1071/nb05011>
26
27 480 36. Ballard O, Morrow A L (2013). Human milk composition: nutrients and bioactive factors. *Pediatr Clin North Am*
28
29 481 60(1):49–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pcl.2012.10.002>
30
31 482 37. Castellote C, Casillas R, Ramirez-Santana C, et al. (2011) Premature delivery influences the immunological
32 483 composition of colostrum and transitional and mature human milk. *J Nutr* 141(6):1181–7.
33
34 484 <https://doi.org/10.3945/jn.110.133652>
35
36 485
37
38 486 38. Pang WW, Hartmann PE (2007). Initiation of human lactation: secretory differentiation and secretory activation. *J*
39
40 487 *Mammary Gland Biol Neoplasia* 12(4):211–21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10911-007-9054-4>
41
42 488 39. Kulski JK, Hartmann PE (1981). Changes in human milk composition during the initiation of lactation. *Aust J Exp*
43
44 489 *Biol Med Sci* 59(1):101–14. <https://doi.org/10.1038/icb.1981.6>
45
46 490 40. Prentice A. Regional variations in the composition of human milk. In: Jensen RG, editor. *Handbook of milk*
47
48 491 *composition*. San Diego (CA): Academic Press, Inc; 1995. p. 919.
49
50 492 41. Henderickx JGE, Zwiittink RD, Van Lingen RA, et al (2019). The preterm gut microbiota: An inconspicuous
51
52 493 challenge in nutritional neonatal care. *Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol* 9:1–12.
53
54 494 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcimb.2019.00085>
55
56 495 42. Mosca F, Gianni ML (2017). Human milk: composition and health benefits. *Pediatr Med Chir* 39(2): 155.
57 496 <https://doi.org/10.4081/pmc.2017.155>
58
59
60

43. Eriksen KG, Christensen SH, Lind MV, et al (2018). Human milk composition and infant growth. *Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care* 21(3): 200–206. <https://doi.org/10.1097/MCO.0000000000000466>
44. Timby N, Domellöf M, Lönnerdal B, et al (2017). Supplementation of infant formula with bovine milk fat globule membranes. *Adv Nutr* 8:351–355. <https://doi.org/10.3945/an.116.014142>
45. Valentine CJ, Morrow G, Pennell M, et al (2012). Randomized controlled trial of docosahexaenoic acid supplementation in midwestern U.S. Human milk donors. *Breastfeed Med* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/bfm.2011.0126>.
46. Martin MA, Lassek WD, Gaulin SJ, et al (2012). Fatty acid composition in the mature milk of Bolivian forager-horticulturalists: controlled comparisons with a US sample. *Matern Child Nutr* 8(3):404–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8709.2012.00412.x>
47. Much D, Brunner S, Vollhardt C, et al (2013). Breast milk fatty acid profile in relation to infant growth and body composition: results from the INFAT study. *Pediatr Res* 74:230–237
48. Andreas NJ, Kampmann B, Mehring Le-Doare K, et al (2015). Human breast milk: a review on its composition and bioactivity. *Early Hum Dev* 91:629–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2015.08.013>
49. Nommsen LA, Lovelady CA, Heinig MJ, et al (1991). Determinants of energy, protein, lipid, and lactose concentrations in human milk during the first 12 mo of lactation: the DARLING Study. *Am J Clin Nutr* 53(2):457–65. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/53.2.457>
50. Greer FR (2001). Do breastfed infants need supplemental vitamins? *Pediatr Clin North Am* 48(2):415–23.
51. Allen LH (2012). B vitamins in breast milk: relative importance of maternal status and intake, and effects on infant status and function. *Adv Nutr* 3(3):362–369. <https://doi.org/10.3945/an.111.001172>
52. La Tuga M S, Stuebe A, Seed PC (2014). A review of the source and function of microbiota in breast milk. *Semin Reprod Med*. 32(1):68–73. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0033-1361824>
53. Gritz EC, Bhandari V (2015). The human neonatal gut microbiome: a brief review. *Front Pediatr* 3:17. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fped.2015.00017>
54. Shin NR, Whon TW, Bae JW (2015). Proteobacteria: Microbial signature of dysbiosis in gut microbiota. *Trends Biotechnol* 33(9):496–503. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2015.06.011>
55. Underwood MA, Mukhopadhyay S, Lakshminrusimha, S et al (2020). Neonatal intestinal dysbiosis. *J Perinatol* 40(11):1597–1608. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41372-020-00829-2>

1
2 526 56. Bentley R, Meganathan R (1982). Biosynthesis of vitamin K (menaquinone) in bacteria. Microbiol Rev 46(3):241–
3 280. <https://doi.org/10.1128/mr.46.3.241-280.1982>
4 527
5
6 528 57. Percival SL, Williams DW (2013) *Escherichia coli*. In: Microbiology of Waterborne Diseases: Microbiological
7 Aspects and Risks: Second Edition Elsevier. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-415846-7.00006-8
8 529
9
10 530 58. Mainil J (2013). *Escherichia coli* virulence factors. Vet Immunol Immunopathol 152(1–2):2–12.
11 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetimm.2012.09.032>
12 531
13 532 59. Hanson LA (2004). Protective effects of breastfeeding against urinary tract infection. Acta Pædiatr 93: 154–156.
14 Stockholm. ISSN 0803-5253 <https://doi.org/10.1080/08035250310022586>
15 533
16
17 534 60. Slavikova M, Lodinova-Zadnikova R, Adlerberth I, et al (1995). Increased mannose-specific adherence and
18 colonizing ability of *Escherichia coli* 083 in breastfed infants. Adv Exp Med Biol 371(A): 421–423.
19 535 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-1941-6_88
20 536
21
22 537 61. Connell H, Agace W, Klemm P, et al (1996). Type 1 fimbrial expression enhances *Escherichia coli* virulence for
23 the urinary tract. PNAS:93(18), 9827–9832. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.93.18.9827>
24 538
25
26 539 62. Walter J (2008). Ecological role of *Lactobacilli* in the gastrointestinal tract: Implications for fundamental and
27 biomedical research. Appl Environ Microbiol 74(16):4985–4996. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00753-08>
28 540
29
30 541 63. Sung V, Hiscock H, Tang MLK, et al (2014). Treating infant colic with the probiotic *Lactobacillus reuteri*: Double
31 blind, placebo controlled randomised trial. BMJ (Online), 348:1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g2107>
32 542
33
34 543 64. Guarino A, Guandalini S, Lo Vecchio A (2015) Probiotics for prevention and treatment of diarrhea. J Clin
35 Gastroenterol 49, Suppl 1:S37–S45. <https://doi.org/10.1097/MCG.0000000000000349>.
36 544
37
38 545 65. Higgins SE, Higgins JP, Wolfenden AD, et al (2008). Evaluation of a *Lactobacillus*-based probiotic culture for the
39 reduction of *Salmonella enteritidis* in neonatal broiler chicks. Poultry Science, 87(1):27–31.
40 546 <https://doi.org/10.3382/ps.2007-00210>
41 547
42
43 548 66. Lee DJ, Drongowski RA, Coran AG, et al (2000). Evaluation of probiotic treatment in a neonatal animal model.
44 Pediatr Surg Int 16(4):237–242. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s003830050736>
45 549
46
47 550 67. Lees E A, Miyajima F, Pirmohamed M, & Carrol E D (2016). The role of *Clostridium difficile* in the paediatric and
48 neonatal gut — a narrative review. European Journal of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases, 35(7),
49 1047–1057. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10096-016-2639-3>
50 551
51
52 552 68. Elward A, Brady MT, Bryant K, et al (2020). *Clostridioides difficile* in Neonatal Intensive Care Unit Patients: A
53 Systematic Review. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention National Center for Zoonotic and Emerging
54 553
55
56 554
57
58
59
60

- Infectious Diseases Division of Healthcare Quality Promotion. P. 1–10. <https://www.cdc.gov/hicpac/reviews/cdiff-nicu/index.html>
69. Bridgman SL, Konya T, Azad MB, et al (2016) High fecal IgA is associated with reduced *C. difficile* colonization in infants, *Microbes Infect* 18(9):543–549. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micinf.2016.05.001>.
70. Schutze GE, Willoughby RE (2013). *Clostridium difficile* infection in infants and children. *Pediatrics* 131(1): 196–200. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2012-2992>
71. O’Callaghan A, van Sinderen D (2016). *Bifidobacteria* and their role as members of the human gut microbiota. *Frontiers Microbiol*, 7(JUN). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2016.00925>
72. Arumugam M, Raes J, Pelletier E, et al (2011). Enterotypes of the human gut microbiome. *Nature* 473(7346): 174–180. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09944>
73. Knights D, Ward TL, Mckinlay CE, et al (2017). Rethinking “Enterotypes”. *Cell Host Microbe* 16(4):433–437. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chom.2014.09.013>
74. Wu GD, Chen J, Hoffmann C, et al (2011). Linking long-term dietary patterns with gut microbial enterotypes. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*: 334(6052), 105–108. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1208344>
75. Xiao L, Wang J, Zheng J, et al (2021). Deterministic transition of enterotypes shapes the infant gut microbiome at an early age. *Genome Biol* 22(1):243. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-021-02463-3>
76. Bergström A, Skov TH, Bahl MI, et al (2014). Establishment of intestinal microbiota during early life: A longitudinal, explorative study of a large cohort of Danish infants. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 80(9): 2889–2900. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00342-14>
77. Tamboli CP, Neut C, Desreumaux P, et al (2004). Dysbiosis in inflammatory bowel disease. *Gut*, 53(1):1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1136/gut.53.1.1>
78. Li M, Monaco MH, Wang M et al (2014). Human milk oligosaccharides shorten rotavirus-induced diarrhea and modulate piglet mucosal immunity and colonic microbiota. *ISME J* 8: 1609–1620. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2014.10>
79. Garcia-Mantrana I, Collado MC (2016). Obesity and overweight: Impact on maternal and milk microbiome and their role for infant health and nutrition. *Mol Nutr Food Res* 60(8):1865–1875 <https://doi.org/10.1002/mnfr.201501018>
80. Dardas M, Gill SR, Grier A, et al (2014). The impact of postnatal antibiotics on the preterm intestinal microbiome. *Pediatr Res* 76:150–158. doi: 10.1038/pr.2014.69

1
2 586 81. Zwittink RD, Renes IB, van Lingen RA, et al (2018). Association between duration of intravenous antibiotic
3 administration and early-life microbiota development in late-preterm infants. Eur. J. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. Dis.
4 587 37:475–483. [https://doi: 10.1007/s10096-018-3193-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10096-018-3193-y)
5 588
6 589 82. Shaw AG, Sim K, Randell P, et al. (2015). Late-onset bloodstream infection and perturbed maturation of the
7 gastrointestinal microbiota in premature infants. PLoS ONE. 10:e0132923. [https://doi:](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0132923)
8 590 10.1371/journal.pone.0132923
9 591
10 592 83. Duffy LC (2000). Interactions mediating bacterial translocation in the immature intestine. J. Nutr 130:432S–436S.
11 593 [https://doi: 10.1093/jn/130.2.432S](https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/130.2.432S)
12 594
13 595 84. Brooks B, Mueller RS, Young JC et al (2015). Strain-resolved microbial community proteomics reveals
14 simultaneous aerobic and anaerobic function during gastrointestinal tract colonization of a preterm infant. Front
15 Microbiol 6:654. [https://doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2015.00654](https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2015.00654)
16 596
17 597 85. Deshpande GC, Rao SC, Keil AD, et al (2011). Evidence-based guidelines for use of probiotics in preterm
18 neonates. BMC Medicine, 9(92): 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1741-7015-9-92>
19 598
20 599 86. Bin-Nun A, Bromiker R, Wilschanski M, et al (2005). Oral probiotics prevent necrotizing enterocolitis in very low
21 birth weight neonates. J Pediatr 147(2):192–196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2005.03.054>
22 600
23 601 87. Zhang Z, Xiang Y, Li N, et al (2013). Protective effects of *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* GG against human rotavirus-
24 induced diarrhoea in a neonatal mouse model. Pathog Dis. 67(3):184-191. doi: 10.1111/2049-632X.12030.
25 602
26 603 88. Liu F, Li G, Wen K, et al (2013). *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* GG on rotavirus-induced injury of ileal epithelium in
27 gnotobiotic pigs. J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr 57(6):750-8. [https://doi: 10.1097/MPG.0b013e3182a356e1](https://doi.org/10.1097/MPG.0b013e3182a356e1).
28 604
29 605 89. Won TJ, Kim B, Song DS, et al (2011), Modulation of Th1/Th2 balance by *Lactobacillus* strains isolated from
30 Kimchi via stimulation of macrophage cell line J774A.1 In Vitro. J Food Sci 76:H55-H61.
31 606 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-3841.2010.02031.x>
32 607
33 608 90. Toori A, Toori S, Fujiwara S, et al (2007). *Lactobacillus acidophilus* strain L-92 regulates the production of Th1
34 cytokine as well as Th2 cytokines. Allergol Int 56(3):293-301. <https://doi.org/10.2332/allergolint.O-06-459>
35 609
36 610 91. Isolauri E, Arvola T, Sutas Y, et al. (2000). Probiotics in the management of atopic eczema. Clin Exp Allergy
37 30:1604–1610. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2222.2000.00943.x>
38 611
39 612 92. Parra-Llorca A, Gormaz M, Alcántara C, et al (2018). Preterm gut microbiome depending on feeding type:
40 Significance of donor human milk. Fron Microbiol 9: 1376. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2018.01376>
41 613
42 614 93. Newburg DS, Ruiz-Palacios GM, Morrow AL. Human milk glycans protect infants against enteric pathogens.
43 Annu Rev Nutr 2005;25:37–58. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.nutr.25.050304.092553>
44 615
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

94. Morrow AL, Ruiz-Palacios GM, Jiang X, et al (2005). Human-milk glycans that inhibit pathogen binding protect breast-feeding infants against infectious diarrhea. *J Nutr* 135(5):1304–7. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/135.5.1304>
95. Gabrielli O, Zampini L, Galeazzi T, et al (2011). Preterm milk oligosaccharides during the first month of lactation. *Pediatrics* 128(6):e1520–31. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2011-1206>
96. Jantscher-Krenn E, Zhrebtsov M, Nissan C, et al (2012). The human milk oligosaccharide disialyllacto-N-tetraose prevents necrotising enterocolitis in neonatal rats. *Gut* 61(10):1417–25. <https://doi.org/10.1136/gutjnl-2011-301404>
97. Li M, Monaco M H, Wang M, et al (2014). Human milk oligosaccharides shorten rotavirus-induced diarrhea and modulate piglet mucosal immunity and colonic microbiota. *ISME Journal*, 8(8): 1609–1620. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2014.10>
98. Arnold JW, Roach J, Azcarate-Peril MA (2016) Emerging Technologies for Gut Microbiome Research. *Trends Microbiol* 24(11):887–901. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2016.06.008>
99. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, et al (2017) Environmental Chemicals, the Human Microbiome, and Health Risk: A Research Strategy. National Academies Press (US) Bookshelf ID: NBK481560 doi:10.17226/24960
100. Sarangi AN, Goel A, Aggarwal R (2019). Methods for studying gut microbiota: a primer for physicians. *J Clin Exp Hepatol* 9(1):62–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jceh.2018.04.016>
101. Fritz JV, Desai MS, Shah P, et al (2013) From meta-omics to causality: Experimental models for human microbiome research. *Microbiome* 1(1):14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2049-2618-1-14>
102. Van de Wiele T, Van den Abbeele P, Ossieur W, et al (2015). The simulator of the human intestinal microbial ecosystem (SHIME®). In: Verhoeckx K, Cotter P, López-Expósito I, Kleiveland C, Lea T, Mackie A, Requena T, Swiatecka D, Wichers H, editors. *The Impact of Food Bioactives on Health: in vitro and ex vivo models* [Internet]. Cham (CH): Springer; 2015. Chapter 27. PMID: 29787058.
103. Faith JJ, Rey FE, O'Donnell D, et al (2010). Creating and characterizing communities of human gut microbes in gnotobiotic mice. *ISME J* 4:1094–1098. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2010.110>
104. Faith JJ, Ahern PP, Ridaura VK, et al (2014) Identifying gut microbe-host phenotype relationships using combinatorial communities in gnotobiotic mice. *Sci Transl Med* 6, 220ra11. <https://doi.org/10.1126/scitranslmed.3008051>
105. Blaut M, Collins MD, Welling GW et al (2002) Molecular biological methods for studying the gut microbiota: the EU human gut flora project. *Br. J. Nutr.* 87 (Suppl. 2), S203–S211. <https://doi.org/10.1079/BJNBJN/2002539>

1
2 646 106. Krawczyk B, Kur J, Stojowska-Swędryńska K et al (2016). Principles and applications of Ligation Mediated PCR
3
4 647 methods for DNA-based typing of microbial organisms. *Acta Biochim Pol.* 63(1):39-52.
5
6 648 https://doi.org/10.18388/abp.2015_1192
7
8 649 107. Azcarate-Peril MA, Foster DM, Cadenas MB, et al (2011). Acute necrotizing enterocolitis of preterm piglets is
9
10 650 characterized by dysbiosis of ileal mucosa- associated bacteria. *Gut Microbes* 2:234–243.
11
12 651 <https://doi.org/10.4161/gmic.2.4.16332>
13
14 652 108. Donskey CJ, Hujer AM, Das SM, et al (2003) Use of denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis for analysis of the
15
16 653 stool microbiota of hospitalized patients. *J. Microbiol. Methods* 54: 249–256. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-7012(03)00059-9)
17 654 [7012\(03\)00059-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-7012(03)00059-9)
18
19 655 109. Stewart CJ, Nelson A, Scribbins D, et al (2013) Bacterial and fungal viability in the preterm gut: NEC and sepsis.
20
21 656 *Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed.* 98, F298–F303. <https://doi.org/10.1136/archdischild-2012-302119>
22
23 657 110. Lepage P, Leclerc MC, Joossens M, et al (2013). A metagenomic insight into our gut’s microbiome. *Gut*,
24
25 658 62(1):146–158. <https://doi.org/10.1136/gutjnl-2011-301805>
26
27 659 111. Janda JM, Abbott SL (2007). 16S rRNA gene sequencing for bacterial identification in the diagnostic laboratory:
28
29 660 pluses, perils, and pitfalls. *J Clin Microbiol.* 45(9):2761-2764. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.01228-07>
30
31 661 112. Houpihan P, Raoult D (2002). Traditional and molecular techniques for the study of emerging bacterial diseases:
32
33 662 one laboratory's perspective. *Emerg Infect Dis* 8(2): 122–131. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid0802.010141>
34
35 663 113. Palmero D, Rodríguez JM, de Cara M et al. (2011) Fungal microbiota from rain water and pathogenicity of
36
37 664 *Fusarium* species isolated from atmospheric dust and rainfall dust. *J Ind Microbiol Biotechnol* 38:13–20.
38 665 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10295-010-0831-5>
39
40 666 114. Kolmeder CA, de Vos WM (2014). Metaproteomics of our microbiome - developing insight in function and
41
42 667 activity in man and model systems. *J Proteomics*, 97:3–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jprot.2013.05.018>
43
44 668 115. Larsen PE, Dai Y (2015). Metabolome of human gut microbiome is predictive of host dysbiosis. *GigaScience*,
45
46 669 4(1):1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13742-015-0084-3>
47
48 670 116. Morgan XC, Huttenhower C (2014) Meta’omic analytic techniques for studying the intestinal microbiome.
49
50 671 *Gastroenterology* 146:1437-1448.e1. <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2014.01.049>
51
52 672 117. Franzosa EA, Morgan XC, Segata N, et al (2014). Relating the metatranscriptome and metagenome of the human
53
54 673 gut. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 111:E2329–E2338. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319284111>
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2 674 118. El Aidy S, Kleerebezem M (2013). Molecular signatures for the dynamic process of establishing intestinal host-
3
4 675 microbial homeostasis: potential for disease diagnostics? *Curr Opin Gastroenterol.* 29:621–627.
5
6 676 <https://doi.org/10.1097/MOG.0b013e328365d365>
7
8 677 119. Larsen PE, Dai Y (2015). Metabolome of human gut microbiome is predictive of host dysbiosis. *GigaScience*,
9
10 678 4(1):1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13742-015-0084-3>
11 679
12
13 680
14
15 681
16
17 682
18
19 683
20
21 684
22
23 685
24
25 686
26
27 687
28
29 688
30
31 689
32
33 690
34
35 691
36 692
37
38 693
39
40 694
41
42 695
43
44 696
45
46 697
47
48 698
49
50 699
51
52 700
53
54 701
55 702
56
57 703
58
59
60

Table 1. Comparison of bacteria commonly found in breast milk [52] and the infant’s intestine [53].

Phylum	Genera	Breast milk	Neonatal intestine
Firmicutes	<i>Staphylococcus</i>	+	+
	<i>Streptococcus</i>	+	+
	<i>Veillonella</i>	+	+
	<i>Enterococcus</i>	+	+
	<i>Gemella</i>	+	-
	<i>Clostridium</i>	+	+
	<i>Lactobacillus</i>	+	+
	<i>Eubacterium</i>	-	+
	<i>Ruminococcus</i>	-	+
	<i>Peptostreptococcus</i>	-	+
Actinobacteria	<i>Propionibacterium</i>	+	+
	<i>Actinomyces</i>	+	-
	<i>Corynebacterium</i>	+	+
	<i>Bifidobacterium</i>	+	+
	<i>Streptomyces</i>	-	+
Proteobacteria	<i>Pseudomonas</i>	+	-
	<i>Sphingomonas</i>	+	-
	<i>Serratia</i>	+	-
	<i>Escherichia</i>	+	+
	<i>Enterobacter</i>	+	+
	<i>Ralstonia</i>	+	-
	<i>Bradyrhizobium</i>	+	-
	<i>Klebsiella</i>	-	+
	<i>Acinetobacter</i>	-	+
	<i>Desulfovibrio</i>	-	+
Bacteroidetes	<i>Prevotella</i>	+	+
	<i>Bacteroides</i>	-	+

Fig 1. Methods used for the study of microbiome. Legend: T-RFLP - Terminal restriction fragment length polymorphism; WGS - Whole Genome Sequencing

Fig 2. Source of the infant microbiome. The figure shows the influence of the mother's microbiota and the environmental microbiota on the bacterial colonization of newborns and infants.

For Peer Review




Fig.1 Methods used for the study of microbiome. Legend: T-RFLP - Terminal restriction fragment length polymorphism; WGS - Whole Genome Sequencing

173x156mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Fig 2. Source of the infant microbiome. The figure shows the influence of the mother's microbiota and the environmental microbiota on the bacterial colonization of newborns and infants.

173x97mm (300 x 300 DPI)