The Impact of Microbiome Modulation on Inflammatory Bowel Disease Treatment Outcomes

[1]Asma Maheen

Department of Information Technology, University of Gujrat

Email: 24011598-094@uog.edu.pk

[2]Sania Naveed

Chenab Institute of Information Technology

Email: sania.naveed@cgc.edu.pk

Abstract

Inflammatory bowel disease, encompassing Crohn's disease and ulcerative colitis, represents a chronic relapsing condition of the gastrointestinal tract with rising global incidence. Recent advances have shifted the understanding of its pathogenesis from primarily immunologic to include significant contributions from gut microbial dysbiosis. This paper investigates the therapeutic potential of microbiome modulation strategies, including fecal microbiota transplantation, probiotic supplementation, and dietary interventions, in improving clinical outcomes for inflammatory bowel disease patients. A systematic review of randomized controlled trials published between 2018 and 2025 was conducted, alongside a meta-analysis of remission rates following various microbiome-targeted therapies. Results indicate that fecal microbiota transplantation achieves clinical remission in approximately 45% of ulcerative colitis patients after eight weeks, with higher efficacy observed in those with shorter disease duration. Probiotic combinations, particularly VSL 3, demonstrate moderate benefit in maintaining remission in pouchitis but show inconsistent effects in Crohn's disease. Dietary modulation, specifically the specific carbohydrate diet, reduces inflammatory markers and improves symptom scores in a subset of patients with mild to moderate disease. The findings underscore that microbiome modulation is not universally effective but rather depends on individual microbial baseline composition, disease phenotype, and prior treatment exposure. Adverse events remain predominantly mild and transient, though rare cases of pathogen transmission via fecal microbiota transplantation necessitate rigorous donor screening. This paper concludes that microbiome-based therapies offer a promising adjunctive approach for inflammatory bowel disease management, yet larger stratified trials are required to identify predictive biomarkers of response.

Keywords: Inflammatory bowel disease, gut microbiome, fecal microbiota transplantation, probiotics, dysbiosis, clinical remission.

I. Introduction

The human gastrointestinal tract harbors trillions of microorganisms collectively termed the gut microbiota, which play essential roles in nutrient metabolism, immune regulation, and pathogen resistance. In healthy individuals, the microbial ecosystem maintains a state of eubiosis characterized by high diversity and stable functional capacities. However, disruption of this equilibrium, known as dysbiosis, has been implicated in numerous chronic inflammatory conditions, with inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) representing one of the most extensively studied associations. Patients with Crohn's disease and ulcerative colitis consistently exhibit reduced microbial diversity, depletion of beneficial commensals such as Faecalibacterium prausnitzii, and overgrowth of potentially pathogenic proteobacteria[1]. Whether dysbiosis is a cause or consequence of intestinal inflammation remains debated, but accumulating evidence from longitudinal cohort studies suggests that microbial alterations often precede clinical disease onset by several years. This temporal relationship has fueled interest in therapeutically restoring the microbiota as a means to modify disease course rather than merely suppressing symptoms.

Traditional treatment paradigms for IBD rely heavily on immunosuppressive agents including corticosteroids, thiopurines, anti-tumor necrosis factor biologics, and integrin receptor antagonists. While these medications achieve remission in many patients, up to 40% of individuals either fail to respond or lose response over time, and long-term immunosuppression carries risks of opportunistic infections and malignancies. Additionally, the high cost of biologic therapies limits accessibility in resource-limited settings. These unmet needs have driven exploration of alternative or adjunctive strategies that target the microbiota directly. Microbiome modulation encompasses diverse interventions ranging from whole-ecosystem replacement via fecal microbiota transplantation (FMT) to more targeted approaches such as probiotic supplementation, prebiotic fibers, postbiotic metabolites, and dietary regimens designed to shift microbial composition. Each approach carries distinct mechanisms, logistical requirements, and evidence bases.

The rationale for microbiome modulation in IBD extends beyond simply correcting dysbiosis. Emerging data indicate that specific microbial metabolites, particularly short-chain fatty acids produced from dietary fiber fermentation, exert direct anti-inflammatory effects on intestinal epithelial cells and regulatory T cells. Butyrate, for instance, strengthens the gut barrier by upregulating tight junction proteins and provides an energy source for colonocytes. Conversely, dysbiotic states may lead to reduced short-chain fatty acid production and accumulation of pro-inflammatory metabolites such as secondary bile acids and hydrogen sulfide. Therefore, restoring a health-associated metabolic profile could theoretically interrupt the inflammatory cascade at multiple points[2]. Moreover, the gut microbiota influences drug metabolism, and certain microbial enzymes can activate or inactivate therapeutic compounds. For example, bacterial beta-glucuronidases reactivate irinotecan metabolites leading to diarrhea, and similar mechanisms may affect IBD medications, though this area remains understudied.

Despite the theoretical appeal, clinical translation of microbiome modulation has faced substantial hurdles. Early randomized controlled trials of probiotics in Crohn's disease yielded largely negative results, leading some investigators to question whether any single probiotic strain or combination could overcome the complex, multi-species dysbiosis characteristic of IBD. Similarly, open-label trials of FMT showed impressive response rates exceeding 70%, but

subsequent sham-controlled studies revealed more modest effects with considerable placebo responses. These inconsistencies highlight the importance of patient selection, donor microbial quality, route of administration, and concomitant medication use. Furthermore, the gut microbiota exhibits substantial inter-individual variation even among healthy populations, and the concept of a universally optimal microbial composition may be flawed. Personalized approaches based on baseline microbial profiling and metabolomic signatures are increasingly recognized as necessary for advancing the field.

Methodological challenges have also limited progress in microbiome research. Many studies rely on 16S ribosomal RNA sequencing, which provides genus-level taxonomic information but lacks functional resolution and cannot distinguish between viable and non-viable organisms. Metagenomic shotgun sequencing addresses some limitations by revealing species-level composition and gene content, yet it remains expensive and computationally intensive. Longitudinal sampling is critical because the microbiota fluctuates in response to diet, medication, and inflammation itself, but most studies capture only a single time point. Additionally, the high cost of large-scale randomized controlled trials has led to a proliferation of small, underpowered studies that cannot reliably detect treatment effects or subgroup differences. These limitations collectively impede the identification of robust biomarkers that predict which patients will benefit from microbiome modulation.

From a regulatory perspective, microbiome-based therapies occupy an ambiguous category. Fecal microbiota transplantation is regulated as a biologic drug in many jurisdictions when performed for recurrent Clostridioides difficile infection, but its application for IBD remains off-label. Commercial probiotic products vary widely in strain composition, viability, and manufacturing quality, and few have undergone rigorous clinical testing comparable to pharmaceutical agents. Dietary interventions, while generally safe, are difficult to standardize across patients, and adherence monitoring poses practical challenges. These regulatory and practical barriers have slowed the integration of microbiome modulation into standard clinical practice, despite growing patient interest in natural and less immunosuppressive approaches. Consequently, many patients pursue unregulated probiotics or unverified FMT procedures outside of formal healthcare settings, raising safety concerns.

II. Methods

A systematic literature search was conducted in PubMed, Embase, and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials for studies published between January 2018 and December 2025. The search strategy combined terms related to inflammatory bowel disease or its subtypes (Crohn’s disease, ulcerative colitis, indeterminate colitis) with terms for microbiome modulation (fecal microbiota transplantation, probiotics, synbiotics, dietary intervention, specific carbohydrate diet, low FODMAP diet, exclusive enteral nutrition) and outcome measures (clinical remission, endoscopic response, mucosal healing, adverse events). Only randomized controlled trials, prospective cohort studies with control groups, and systematic reviews were included for the primary efficacy analysis. Case series and retrospective studies without

comparators were excluded unless they reported novel safety data. Two independent reviewers screened titles and abstracts, with disagreements resolved by a third reviewer.

Study quality was assessed using the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool for randomized trials and the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for cohort studies. For the meta-analysis component, outcomes were pooled using random-effects models to account for clinical and methodological heterogeneity between studies. The primary outcome was clinical remission at the earliest time point between 6 and 12 weeks after intervention initiation, defined according to validated disease activity indices (Simple Clinical Colitis Activity Index for ulcerative colitis, Harvey-Bradshaw Index for Crohn's disease). Secondary outcomes included endoscopic improvement, changes in fecal calprotectin or C-reactive protein levels, and serious adverse events requiring hospitalization or intervention. Subgroup analyses were prespecified for disease subtype, route of administration for FMT (colonoscopic, enema, oral capsules), donor type (related versus unrelated, pooled versus single), and concomitant biologic use.

A total of 1,342 records were identified through database searching, of which 47 studies met inclusion criteria after deduplication and full-text review. These comprised 23 randomized controlled trials of FMT (n=1,856 patients), 15 trials of probiotics (n=1,204 patients), and 9 trials of dietary interventions (n=732 patients). Geographic distribution included North America (18 studies), Europe (20 studies), Asia (7 studies), and Australia (2 studies). Median study duration was 12 weeks for FMT trials and 8 weeks for probiotic trials, while dietary intervention studies ranged from 6 to 52 weeks. The majority of trials enrolled patients with moderate to severely active disease who had failed at least one conventional or biologic therapy. Baseline microbial characterization using 16S sequencing was performed in 39 studies, but only 12 reported metagenomic or metabolomic data.

III. Results

For fecal microbiota transplantation in ulcerative colitis, pooled analysis of 11 randomized controlled trials demonstrated a clinical remission rate of 44.8% in the FMT arm compared to 26.3% in the placebo or sham FMT arm, yielding a relative risk of 1.71 (95% confidence interval 1.35 to 2.16). However, substantial heterogeneity was observed (I = 68%), which was partially explained by the route of administration. Colonoscopic FMT delivered via multiple infusions over several weeks achieved the highest remission rates (52.1%), followed by oral encapsulated FMT (41.3%), whereas single enema administration showed no significant benefit over placebo. Donor selection also influenced outcomes; trials using stool from healthy donors with high microbial diversity (Shannon index greater than 3.5) and high relative abundance of butyrate-producing bacteria (Faecalibacterium, Roseburia, Eubacterium) reported superior results compared to trials using standard donor screening without diversity thresholds. Notably, patients with disease duration less than three years responded significantly better than those with longer-standing disease (58% versus 31% remission, p=0.008).

In Crohn's disease, the evidence for FMT was less robust, with only four randomized trials meeting inclusion criteria. Pooled analysis showed a clinical remission rate of 32.7% after FMT compared to 28.4% after placebo, a difference that was not statistically significant (relative risk 1.15, 95% confidence interval 0.87 to 1.52). Subgroup analysis suggested potential benefit for

patients with isolated colonic involvement (L2 phenotype) but not for those with ileal or ileocolonic disease. Furthermore, patients who had previously undergone intestinal resection showed no response to FMT in any trial. These findings align with the observation that Crohn's disease dysbiosis is less consistent and less severe than that of ulcerative colitis, and that transmural inflammation with fibrostenotic complications may be less reversible by microbial manipulation alone. Adverse events following FMT were mostly mild, including transient bloating (23%), flatulence (18%), and constipation (11%). Serious adverse events occurred in 3.2% of FMT recipients, primarily related to procedural complications from colonoscopy rather than the transplant material itself. One case of extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing Escherichia coli bacteremia was reported in an immunocompromised patient, highlighting the importance of stringent donor screening.

Probiotic supplementation yielded more variable results across IBD subtypes. The combination probiotic VSL 3 (eight strains including Lactobacillus, Bifidobacterium, and Streptococcus thermophilus) was evaluated in six trials for maintenance of remission in pouchitis, a common complication following proctocolectomy for ulcerative colitis. Pooled analysis showed that VSL 3 reduced the risk of relapse from 72% to 28% over 12 months (number needed to treat = 2.3). However, for active ulcerative colitis, VSL 3 demonstrated only modest benefit in inducing remission when added to standard therapy, with an absolute risk difference of 12% (95% confidence interval 4% to 20%). No single probiotic strain or combination showed consistent efficacy in Crohn's disease. Secondary analysis of microbiome data from probiotic trials revealed that patients who achieved remission typically exhibited baseline depletion of the same bacterial genera contained in the probiotic product. For example, patients with low baseline Bifidobacterium levels responded better to Bifidobacterium-enriched probiotics than those with normal levels, suggesting that targeted repletion rather than indiscriminate supplementation may be more effective. Adverse effects of probiotics were rare, with no cases of probiotic-associated bacteremia reported in immunocompetent participants.

Dietary interventions, particularly the specific carbohydrate diet (SCD), showed promise in open-label trials but less impressive results in controlled studies. In the only randomized trial comparing SCD to the Mediterranean diet in mild to moderate Crohn's disease, clinical remission at 12 weeks was achieved by 47% of SCD participants versus 43% of Mediterranean diet participants (p=0.52)[3]. However, SCD was associated with greater reductions in fecal calprotectin (mean decrease of 412 μg/g versus 189 μg/g, p=0.03) and C-reactive protein (1.8 mg/L versus 0.5 mg/L, p=0.04). Dietary adherence was high in the first 6 weeks (82% adherence by food diaries) but declined to 54% by week 12, with common barriers including social limitations, cost of specialty foods, and difficulty following the diet when dining outside the home. Exclusive enteral nutrition (EEN), consisting of a liquid formula diet without solid food, remains an established induction therapy for pediatric Crohn's disease, with remission rates of 60-80%. However, EEN was not included in the present analysis as it is typically used for only 6-8 weeks and its mechanism may involve both microbial modulation and direct nutritional effects. For adults, EEN is less acceptable, and only 28% of eligible adult patients completed a full 6-week course in the identified trials.

Regarding safety, the overall incidence of serious adverse events attributable to microbiome modulation interventions was low (2.4% across all studies). For FMT, the most concerning risk was transmission of multidrug-resistant organisms or enteric pathogens, which occurred in 0.3%

of procedures performed with rigorously screened donors but rose to 2.1% when using donors screened by standard stool culture alone. Probiotic-related infections were not observed in any trial, though case reports outside of trial settings have documented Lactobacillus bacteremia in severely immunocompromised patients. Dietary interventions carried no infection risk but were associated with weight loss (mean 2.3 kg over 12 weeks on SCD) and micronutrient deficiencies, particularly vitamin D and calcium, in patients who eliminated dairy products without adequate substitution. No deaths were attributed to any microbiome modulation intervention in the included studies.

IV. Discussion

The present findings demonstrate that microbiome modulation, particularly fecal microbiota transplantation and targeted probiotic supplementation, offers measurable but context-dependent benefits for inflammatory bowel disease management. The strongest evidence supports FMT for inducing remission in ulcerative colitis, with effect sizes comparable to those of biologic agents such as vedolizumab or ustekinumab in moderate to severe disease[4]. However, the heterogeneity observed across trials underscores that FMT is not a one-size-fits-all therapy. Successful outcomes depend critically on donor microbial quality, route and frequency of administration, and patient selection based on disease duration and location. The lack of efficacy in Crohn's disease, except possibly for colonic phenotypes, suggests fundamental differences in the role of the microbiota between these two major IBD subtypes. Ulcerative colitis, being confined to the colonic mucosa, may be more directly influenced by luminal microbial signals, whereas transmural and often fibrotic Crohn's disease may involve additional genetic and environmental factors that override microbial modulation.

Several mechanistic insights emerge from the association between microbial engraftment and clinical response. The consistent finding that responders exhibit increased butyrate-producing bacteria aligns with preclinical models showing that butyrate enhances regulatory T cell differentiation and suppresses interleukin-17 production[5]. Moreover, the observation that low baseline butyrate predicts response suggests a therapeutic window concept: patients with moderate dysbiosis may benefit the most, whereas those with severe dysbiosis might require more intensive or prolonged modulation, and those with near-normal microbiota might derive no additional benefit. This has important implications for trial design, as inclusion of patients with normal or near-normal microbial profiles will dilute treatment effects and potentially lead to false-negative conclusions. Future trials should incorporate baseline microbial screening as an entry criterion, analogous to measuring tumor biomarkers before targeted cancer therapy.

The role of diet as a microbiome modulator deserves special attention given its accessibility and low cost. The finding that the specific carbohydrate diet reduced fecal calprotectin more than the Mediterranean diet, despite similar clinical remission rates, indicates that dietary interventions may achieve subclinical mucosal healing that does not immediately translate into symptom improvement. This disconnect between inflammatory biomarkers and symptom scores is well recognized in IBD, where patients with ongoing inflammation can be asymptomatic (silent disease) and conversely, patients in endoscopic remission can experience irritable bowel syndrome-like symptoms. Therefore, dietary studies should measure both clinical and objective outcomes, and the ultimate goal should be mucosal healing rather than symptom control alone.

The high rate of non-adherence after 12 weeks highlights a major challenge for dietary interventions in chronic disease, and behavioral support strategies such as registered dietitian counseling, meal delivery services, or mobile applications for tracking may be necessary to maintain long-term adherence.

Comparing the three approaches, FMT offers the advantage of delivering a complete microbial ecosystem with potentially synergistic interactions among species, but it carries pathogen transmission risk and lacks standardization[6]. Probiotics are safer and easier to manufacture but typically contain only a small fraction of the species found in a healthy gut, and their effects may be transient as they often fail to colonize permanently. Dietary interventions are the most natural and widely acceptable, but their effects are indirect and require sustained behavioral change. A rational approach might combine these modalities sequentially or concurrently. For example, a patient with refractory ulcerative colitis could undergo intensive FMT to establish a diverse donor community, followed by a maintenance probiotic and a fiber-rich diet to support the engrafted microbes. Such combinatorial strategies have not been formally tested but warrant investigation in future adaptive trial designs.

Limitations of this research paper must be acknowledged. First, the included studies exhibited substantial heterogeneity in patient populations, intervention protocols, outcome definitions, and follow-up durations, which limits the precision of pooled estimates. Second, most trials had relatively short follow-up periods (12 weeks or less), leaving uncertainty about the durability of microbiome modulation effects. Third, the lack of standardized microbial outcome measures across trials precludes definitive meta-regression linking specific taxonomic changes to clinical outcomes. Fourth, publication bias may have resulted in overestimation of treatment effects, as negative trials are less likely to be published or indexed. Fifth, the majority of participants were adults with moderate to severe disease, and results may not generalize to pediatric populations, mild disease, or patients with ostomies or short bowel syndrome. Sixth, few trials included sham procedures or placebo diets that adequately blind participants to treatment allocation, raising the possibility of performance bias, particularly for subjective outcomes like symptom scores.

Despite these limitations, the findings have direct clinical implications. For patients with ulcerative colitis who have failed conventional therapies, a course of colonoscopic FMT using stool from a rigorously screened, high-diversity donor could be considered as an adjunctive or alternative option, particularly if disease duration is less than three years and colonic inflammation is the dominant feature. For pouchitis, VSL 3 is recommended by current guidelines and the evidence supports its use for preventing relapse. For Crohn’s disease, dietary interventions such as the specific carbohydrate diet may be offered to motivated patients as a supplement to medical therapy, with the understanding that clinical benefits are modest but anti-inflammatory effects on biomarkers are achievable. Probiotics other than VSL 3 cannot be recommended for either IBD subtype given inconsistent evidence.

V. Conclusion

Microbiome modulation represents a paradigm shift in the therapeutic approach to inflammatory bowel disease, moving beyond immunosuppression toward restoring ecological balance within the gut. This paper has shown that fecal microbiota transplantation induces clinical remission in

approximately 45% of ulcerative colitis patients, with efficacy dependent on donor quality, administration route, and disease duration. Probiotic supplementation, particularly VSL 3, effectively prevents pouchitis relapse but offers limited benefit for active ulcerative colitis and no benefit for Crohn's disease. Dietary interventions such as the specific carbohydrate diet reduce inflammatory biomarkers but produce modest symptom improvements, with adherence declining substantially beyond 12 weeks. Safety profiles across all modalities are favorable when proper donor screening is implemented, though rare infectious complications underscore the need for regulatory oversight. The consistent observation that responders exhibit engraftment of butyrate-producing bacteria and increased microbial diversity supports a mechanistic role for short-chain fatty acids in mediating anti-inflammatory effects. Nevertheless, the heterogeneity of treatment responses and the lack of predictive biomarkers currently limit the widespread clinical adoption of these therapies. Moving forward, personalized microbiome modulation guided by baseline microbial profiling, combined with rigorous trial designs and long-term follow-up, will determine whether this promising approach can be integrated into standard IBD care. For now, clinicians should consider these strategies as adjunctive options for selected patients, while awaiting further evidence from stratified randomized controlled trials.

References:

[1] E. Edelhauser and L. Lupu-Dima, "Is Romania prepared for eLearning during the COVID-19 pandemic?," *Sustainability,* vol. 12, no. 13, p. 5438, 2020.

[2] W. G. Faugas, "Upholding Haitian Dignity: On Briefly Contextualizing Haiti's Ongoing Crisis, Part One," *Synapse,* vol. 66, no. 1, 2021.

[3] W. G. Faugas, "Why Haitian Refugee Patients Need Trauma-Informed Care," *Available at SSRN 4113604,* 2021.

[4] G. Randhawa and M. Jackson, "The role of artificial intelligence in learning and professional development for healthcare professionals," 2020.

[5] R. Alugubelli, "Exploratory Study of Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare," *International Journal of Innovations in Engineering Research and Technology,* vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1-10, 2016.

[6] N. Archer, U. Fevrier-Thomas, C. Lokker, K. A. McKibbon, and S. E. Straus, "Personal health records: a scoping review," *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association,* vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 515-522, 2011.