1	Correlation	between	faecal	microbial	taxa	and	ulcerative	colitis	in	different	phases	of
---	-------------	---------	--------	-----------	------	-----	------------	---------	----	-----------	--------	----

- 2 disease activity in a north Indian cohort
- 3 Garima Juyal¹*[#], Ajit Sood², Vandana Midha³, Arshdeep Singh², Dharmatma Singh²,
- 4 Ramit Mahajan², Vijay Verma^{4\$}, Rakesh Bhatnagar^{1§}, Mohan C Joshi⁵

5 Affiliations

- 6 1. School of Biotechnology, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India
- 7 2. Department of Gastroenterology, Dayanand Medical College and Hospital,
- 8 Ludhiana, India
- 9 **3.** Department of Medicine, Dayanand Medical College and Hospital, Ludhiana, India
- 4. Division of Medical Bio-informatics, Indian Council of Medical Research, New
 Delhi 110029, India
- 12 5. Multidisciplinary Centre for Advanced Research and Studies (MCARS), Jamia
- 13 Millia Islamia, New Delhi, India.
- [#]Present Address- Department of Genetics, University of Delhi South Campus,
 Benito Juarez Marg, New Delhi, India
- ^{\$}Present Address- North Florida Research and Education Centre (NFREC)/Institute
- 17 of Food and Agricultural Sciences (UF/IFAS), University of Florida, Quincy 32351,

18 FL, USA

- 19 [§]Present Address-Amity University Rajasthan, Jaipur
- 20 *Corresponding author
- 21
- 22

23 Abstract

Background and Aims: A link between gut microbiota and Ulcerative colitis (UC) has been established in several studies. However, only a few studies have examined specific changes in microbiota associated with different phases of disease activity in UC. In this study, we attempted to identify differentially abundant taxa between (i) UC patients and healthy controls and (ii) different phases of disease activity, in a genetically distinct north Indian (NI) population.

Methods: 16S rRNA (V3–V4) sequencing of 105 patients with UC [newly diagnosed (n=14); patients in remission (n=36) and active disease (relapse, n=55)]; and 36 healthy controls was performed and analysed.

33 **Results:** Lower gut microbial diversity; enrichment of lactate-producing bacteria namely 34 Streptococcus, Bifidobacterium and Lactobacillus; and depletion of butyrate-producing 35 bacteria (e.g., Lachnospiraceae and Ruminococcaceae), were observed among UC patients. 36 Subgroup analysis revealed differential abundance of *Escherichia-Shigella*, *Streptococcus*, 37 Enterococcus and Faecalibacterium in newly diagnosed UC patients. No discrete microbial features were observed between patients in remission and those with active disease. Co-38 39 occurrence network analysis revealed a mutualistic association between opportunistic 40 pathogens and Bifidobacterium and Lactobacillus and antagonistic relationship with butyrate-41 producers.

42 **Conclusion:** This first faecal microbiome study among NI UC cohort elucidated 43 dysanaerobiosis; loss of short chain fatty acid producers and enrichment of inflammation 44 associated microbes; population specific differential microbial genera; and a potential 45 microbial signature for early dysbiosis.

46

48 Introduction

49 Historically considered to be a disease of the western world, ulcerative colitis (UC), has emerged as a global disease ¹. The etiology of UC is multifactorial. However it is believed 50 51 that a complex dynamic interplay between genetic factors, environmental influences and intestinal microbiota drives chronic inflammation, characteristic of UC ^{2,3}. The conventional 52 treatment strategies focus on inducing and maintaining remission and preventing disease 53 related complications by targeting the dysregulated immune system⁴. In the past decade 54 55 however, the intestinal microbiota has unfolded as a crucial integrant in the pathogenesis of 56 UC. Novel microbiota targeted therapies therefore have made inroads into the current treatment paradigms as alternative/adjunctive therapies 5,6 . 57

Several microbiome studies, primarily from Western countries, have demonstrated differences in the faecal microbial profile between UC patients and healthy individuals ⁷. However there is paucity of data from developing countries. In light of the differences in genetic predisposition to IBD across ethnically divergent populations ⁸, and their interactions with non-genetic factors predominantly diet, on the development and clinical spectrum of UC, it is imperative to survey the gut microbiome from genetically, culturally and socially divergent populations.

In the current study, we analysed the faecal microbial composition in UC patients and healthy controls of north Indian (NI) origin. Since UC is an emerging disease in developing countries, in contrast to the western world where it has reached a plateau (prevalence equilibrium), we propose that characterizing the gut microbiome of a UC cohort from a developing country like India provides a unique opportunity to identify early microbial markers.

71 Materials and Methods

72 Cohort

Consecutive patients (age >18 years) with an established diagnosis of UC ⁹ attending the 73 74 outpatient clinic at Dayanand Medical College and Hospital, Ludhiana, India between 75 January 2016 and December 2017 were categorized into two groups i.e. newly diagnosed 76 [patients with active disease (defined as Mayo clinic score >2) diagnosed within four weeks 77 of enrolment with no prior exposure to treatment for UC (including corticosteroids, 5-78 aminosalicylates (5-ASA), immunomodulators and biologics); and previously diagnosed 79 (diagnosed >6 months prior to enrolment and on standard of care pharmacotherapy for UC). 80 Patients in this group were further divided into two sub-groups: relapse: previously 81 diagnosed UC with active disease and remission: previously diagnosed UC in clinical 82 remission (defined as Mayo clinic score ≤ 2 , with each sub-score ≤ 1 and endoscopic sub-83 score of 0). In patients with clinical symptoms of active disease, a limited sigmoidoscopy was 84 performed for endoscopic evidence of disease activity. Infections like *Clostridioides difficile*, 85 cytomegalovirus (CMV) and/or Epstein Barr virus (EBV) were tested in patients with active disease. Clinical details including patient demographics, disease characteristics and treatment 86 87 history were recorded. Patients with age <18 years, Crohn's colitis, indeterminate colitis, C. 88 difficile infection, co-infection with CMV or EBV, co-morbid illnesses such as severe heart, 89 lung, or neurological disease, and active malignancies, antibiotic use during the month before 90 inclusion and diagnosis of UC between 4 weeks to 6 months prior to enrolment were 91 excluded. Adult (age >18 years), unrelated volunteers who had no comorbidities or disorders 92 known to be associated with changes in gut microbiota, served as **healthy controls**.

5

94 Faecal DNA extraction and 16S rRNA sequencing

95 Faecal samples were collected from patients and healthy controls at the hospital settings. The 96 samples were labelled using unique patient specific codes, homogenized and stored at -80°C 97 within 2 hours. DNA was extracted from faecal samples as a non-invasive proxy for the gut 98 microbiome using DNeasy PowerLyzer PowerSoil Kit (Qiagen/MO BIO cat# 12855-50) as 99 per manufacturer's protocol. For profiling microbiome composition, the V3-V4 hyper-100 variable region of the bacterial 16S rRNA gene was sequenced on Illumina Miseq platform 101 using a commercial facility.

102 Data analysis

Paired-end reads were merged using FLASH ¹⁰ with a minimum and maximum overlap of 103 104 30bp and 250bp respectively. Low base quality (average $Q \ge 34$) reads were removed using 105 toolkit 0.0.13 (http://hannonlab.cshl.edu/fastx_toolkit/). De-replication fastx was performed in VSEARCH¹¹ for the identification of unique sequences. A *de novo* approach in 106 VSEARCH¹¹ was used to remove chimeric sequences. Bacterial community composition of a 107 108 sample was achieved using closed_reference Operational Taxonomic Unit (OTU) picking method in UCLUST¹². In this method sequencing reads were clustered based on 97% 109 110 similarity to form OTU and subsequently one representative sequence from each OTU was 111 picked. Any OTU that had a count of 1 in a single sample (identified as singletons) was removed. Taxonomy assignment was done using RDP classifier ¹³ against Silva-132 database 112 113 at 97% similarity. OTU table was then normalized to the same depth. Alpha and Beta 114 diversity indices were estimated and distance metrics were represented as principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) plots using QIIME1.9.1¹⁴. Hierarchical clustering and Co-115 occurrence network analysis were performed using ClustVis¹⁵ and SParse InversE 116 Covariance Estimation for Ecological Association Inference (SPIEC-EASI) program in R¹⁶ 117 118 respectively. Both these methods are detailed in **Supplementary text**.

Shapiro–Wilk normality test was used to test the distribution of data. The bacterial numbers were transformed into relative percentages for statistical analysis. Significant differences in alpha and beta diversity were tested using Mann-Whitney T-test and PERMONOVA respectively. Significant differences in the relative abundance between groups were computed using Mann-Whitney test and p<0.05 was considered statistically significant after Bonferroni correction.

126 **Results**

127 Patient characteristics and 16S rRNA amplicon sequencing data

128 A total of 105 UC patients comprising three subgroups i.e. newly diagnosed, n=14; Relapse, 129 n=55; Remission, n=36 and 36 healthy controls were included in the study (Table 1). 130 Sequencing of V3-V4 region of faecal DNA samples yielded a total of $114200323 \pm$ 131 478237.89 (sum \pm SD) paired-end reads with a read length of 268.37 \pm 23.80 (mean \pm SD) 132 [Table 2a]. After removing low quality reads, chimera sequences and singleton, a total of 133 300467 ± 221183.15 (mean \pm SD) and 458981.08 ± 112054.93 (mean \pm SD) sequencing 134 reads were obtained in UC patients and healthy controls, respectively [Table 2a]. The 135 sequence reads were normally distributed across samples (p<0.001) [Table 2b].

136 Microbial composition in UC patients differs from that of controls

137 Sequencing reads were rarefied to 20,000 sequences per sample to control for variations in 138 sequencing depth. Significant low alpha diversity was observed in UC patients compared to 139 healthy controls [Shannon Index (Pcorrected<9.7E-14); Chao1 (Pcorrected<3.5E-14); number of 140 observed species (Pcorrected <3.5E-14) [Figures. 1a-c]. Beta diversity showed significant 141 dissimilarity in the compositional structure of bacterial communities between UC patients 142 and healthy controls (**PERMONOVA p=0.001**; Figure 2). Tight clustering in healthy 143 controls indicated high gut microbial compositional similarity among themselves compared 144 to UC patients [Figure 2a]. However, a scattered distribution among UC represented 145 heterogeneity underlying disease pathogenesis [Figure 2b]. No differences in diversity was 146 observed among the three UC subgroups. However, significant alpha diversity differences 147 were observed between the three UC subgroups and healthy controls [Supplementary Figs.

148 **1-2].**

8

149 Overall distribution of predominant phyla that contributed to >99% of the total taxonomy 150 based on median abundance in UC patients and healthy controls is depicted in Figure 3a. The 151 most abundant phylum in healthy controls was Firmicutes which accounted for $58.4 \pm 8.1\%$ 152 (median abundance \pm SD) followed by Bacteroidetes (21.8 \pm 9.6%), Actinobacteria (9.1 \pm 153 10.9%) and Proteobacteria $(2.1 \pm 4.1\%)$. On the other hand in UC cohort, Firmicutes 154 contributed 57.7 \pm 19.9% followed by Actinobacteria (18.3 \pm 14.0%), Bacteroidetes (5.14 \pm 155 20.4%) and Proteobacteria (1.7 \pm 11.4%) [Figure 3a]. Of these, the relative abundance of 156 Actinobacteria, Bacteroidetes and Tenericutes significantly differed (P_{corrected}<0.05) between 157 UC patients and healthy controls [Figure 3b]. When compared independently with healthy 158 controls, Bacteroidetes and Actinobacteria were found significantly altered across the three 159 UC subgroups. In addition, significant difference in the abundance of Bacteroidetes 160 (P_{corrected}=0.05) was observed between newly diagnosed and remission groups (Figs. 4a-b). 161 At the genus level, we observed 11 genera in UC patients and 20 genera in healthy controls 162 representing >1.0 % of the total OTUs (Figure 5) which reiterates higher diversity and

richness in the heathy group. Among these, relative abundance of 18 were significantly 163 164 altered [$P_{corrected} < 0.05$] in UC patients compared to healthy controls [Figure 6a]. In the 165 subgroup analysis, we observed nine genera in newly diagnosed, 13 in remission and 11 in 166 relapse which represented >1.0 % of the total OTUs [Figure 5b]. Of these, only four namely 167 uncultured_Bacteroidetes, Escherichia-Shigella, Enterococcus, and Ruminococcaceae were 168 significantly altered [P_{corrected}<0.05] across the three subgroups [Figure 6b]. Furthermore, on 169 comparing the three UC subgroups independently with healthy controls, 19 genera were 170 found to be significantly altered ($P_{corrected} < 0.05$) (Figure 6b). The p-value of altered taxa and 171 their abundance are presented in Table 3.

To validate the differential abundance of nitrate reducing bacteria in the faeces of UC patientsand healthy controls nitrate reduction activity was determined using nitrate broth [detailed in

9

supplementary text]. Significant increase in the number of nitrate reducing bacteria per
gram of faeces was observed in UC patients compared to healthy controls (P_{corrected}=E-08).
However, no differences were observed across the three UC subgroups [Supplementary
Figure 3].

178 Hierarchical clustering reveals newly diagnosed UC as a unique clad

179 Clustering analysis categorized UC patients and healthy controls into distinct clads based 180 upon differential OTU abundance (>1%) at genus level and heat maps are represented in **Fig** 181 **7a**. Barring four, the remaining genera were found to be statistically significant in the 182 abundance analysis [**Table 3**]. Further, cluster analysis also illustrated that newly diagnosed 183 UC patients formed a distinct clad compared to remission, relapse and healthy controls [**Fig** 184 **7b**].

185 Co-occurrence network analysis reveals enrichment of pathobionts in UC patients

186 A total of 115-116 pruned OTUs were included for co-occurrence network analysis to study 187 their potential relationships in different pathological contexts among UC patients. Such 188 analysis gives an initial cue on the structure of the community and how metabolite cross-189 feeding/metabolic dependency and nutritional preferences contribute to microbial assemblage 190 and their maintenance. This analysis revealed (a) Streptococcus, Escherichia-Shigella, 191 Bifidobacterium, Lactobacillus and Faecalibacterium in newly diagnosed; (b) Streptococcus, 192 Lactobacillus, Prevotella in relapse; (c) Streptococcus, Blautia and Erysipelotrichaceae in 193 remission; and d) Ruminococaccae, Bifidobacterium, Prevotella and Bacteroides in healthy 194 controls, to be the predominant taxa in the networks [Figure 8].

196 **Discussion**

Gut microbial dysbiosis in terms of alteration in composition, reduction in biodiversity and consequently loss of metabolic and immune homeostasis has been associated with development of UC ¹⁷. To date, most of the published studies on UC from India have been largely based on either quantification of specific bacteria in tissue biopsy or faecal samples ^{18–20} or 16S rRNA analysis of limited tissue biopsy samples ^{19,21}. To our knowledge, this report is the first description of faecal microbiota profile of NI UC patients which provides a snapshot of the alterations of the microbiota in different phases of disease.

204 We report that the ethnically distinct NI UC population exhibited a marked reduction in the 205 bacterial diversity and significant alteration in the structure of faecal bacterial community as 206 compared to healthy controls [Figures. 1 & 2] lending support to the well noted central 207 feature of dysbiosis in UC pathology. We found significant loss of genera comprised of 208 dominant anaerobes alongside expansion of subdominant facultative anaerobes suggestive of a disruption in anaerobiosis in the gut lending support to oxygen hypothesis ²², discussed in 209 210 the later section. Each of these genera has been discussed below in detail. Findings from 211 subgroup analyses have been discussed in the subsequent section.

212 UC patients vs healthy controls

213 Loss of SCFA producing taxa: We observed a significant loss of anaerobic SCFA 214 producing bacteria in UC patients compared to healthy controls [Table 3; Figure 6a]. This is in consonance with previous studies from European and Asian populations ^{7,23,24}. SCFAs are 215 216 organic products mainly composed of acetate, propionate, and butyrate produced after 217 fermentation of dietary fibers and resistant starches in the colon. They act as signaling 218 molecules and regulate different biological processes, including the promotion of gut 219 integrity, immune response, reduction of pathogenic bacterial population; and prevention of unwanted infiltration of bacteria from lumen to lamina propria^{25,26}. This suggests that lower 220

221 abundance of SCFA-producing bacteria in UC patients may favour a shift towards an 222 inflammation-promoting microbiome, thereby enhancing host inflammation and modifying 223 the disease behaviour. This is in line with oxygen hypothesis which posits that chronic 224 inflammation of intestinal walls results in extravasation of blood from ulcerated tissue which 225 leads to increased release of hemoglobin carrying oxygen and reactive oxygen species into 226 the intestinal lumen, which in turn creates a microenvironment that favors expansion of 227 facultative anaerobes. The resulting decrease in anaerobes (which release anti-inflammatory 228 compounds) leads to increased inflammation, establishing a positive feedback loop that accelerates the disease process 22 . 229

230 Enrichment of potentially harmful bacteria: A significant enrichment of Streptococcus, a 231 lactic acid-producing bacteria (LAB) was observed in UC patients [Table 3, Figure 6] which is in line with earlier reports ^{27–29}. Some species of this bacterium have shown to induce or 232 promote pro-inflammatory response in macrophages, human tissue, and intestine ²⁹ 233 234 suggesting that metabolites and structural components of *Streptococcus* and immune cells are 235 at direct/indirect interplay and lead to excessive inflammation. In a recent study, increased 236 abundance of f_Streptococcaceae among IBD patients was correlated with proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) ^{3,30}. However, in our case none of the UC patients were using PPIs 237 238 suggesting other factors responsible for *Streptococcus* abundance. Interestingly, evidences 239 are now emerging and pointing to association between higher levels of gut inflammation in IBD patients and increase in bacteria typical of the oral cavity ²⁸. Although oral microbes are 240 241 innately resistant to colonization in healthy guts, it has been proposed that inflammation or 242 strain-specific adaptation (including antibiotic resistance and virulence genes) of oral 243 microbes allows their colonization in the gut resulting in exaggerated inflammatory response ³¹. Therefore, it would be interesting to further explore the link between oral microbiome and 244 245 UC.

246 The other enteric anaerobes which were found to be enriched in UC patients were also LABs 247 namely *Bifidobacterium* and *Lactobacillus* [Table 3, Figure 6]. These findings are in stark contrast to majority of earlier studies from west ^{7,23,32}. However, enrichment of these bacteria 248 249 have been reported in the faecal and tissue biopsy samples of active UC patients from Chinese and Russian populations ^{33,34}. Such observed differences reinforce the potent role of 250 251 host genetics in determining the composition of the gut microbiota. This derives support from 252 recent reports documenting a) that differences in microbiota are highly impacted by the ethnic background ³⁵; b) microbiota is partly heritable as evidenced in studies analysing both 253 concordant and discordant twins for IBD ³⁶; c) influence of genomic loci on several microbial 254 255 genera in mice ³⁷; and d) specific variants of the NOD2 associated with changes in the abundance of the f_Enterobacteriaceae in IBD patients ³⁸. Importantly, evidences now 256 257 emerging pinpoint that these commensals have the potential to become opportunistic or promote colonization of other pathobionts and elicit immunostimulatory effects ^{39,40}. For 258 259 instance, a recent study in mice demonstrated that the introduction of a single commensal 260 species, Lactobacillus reuteri, was sufficient to exacerbate experimmental autoimmune encephalomyelitis in a genetically susceptible host ⁴¹. This suggests that these "good" 261 262 commensals can become "bad" and can cause unwarranted immune stimulation in genetically susceptible individuals reiterating the likely effect of host genetics on microbiome 263 composition. Other than host genetics, differential selection pressure through diet ^{42,43}; 264 265 disease characteristics; and persistent use of 5-ASA (which changes the colonic luminal pH 266 and hence promote growth of *Bifidobacterium* and *Lactobacillus*)³⁵, could be the non-genetic 267 factors that may have contributed on the gut microbial assemblage. Considering the global 268 uniformity of treatment modalities it seems that effect of disease modifying drugs on 269 expansion of these genera is minimal. A few recent studies which have shown that disease

13

270 activity, 5-ASA dosage or addition of glucocorticoids had no impact on the microbial stability

- ⁴⁴ lend support to this.
- 272 Subgroup analysis

273 Early dysbiosis hallmark

274 To avoid the confounding effects of long-standing disease, disease modifying agents (such as 275 medication), and co-morbid conditions which could have potential effect on microbiome 276 composition, treatment naïve newly diagnosed UC patients were analysed in relation to 277 treatment experienced patients [remission and relapse] and healthy controls in this study. An 278 over-representation of Escherichia-Shigella, Enterococcus and Streptococcus in newly 279 diagnosed UC patients which is in line with prior studies from both adult ⁷ and paediatric ⁴⁵ 280 UC patients was notable [Table 3]. Escherichia-Shigella and Enterococcus have been 281 reported to have the ability to adhere to and invade intestinal epithelial cells, leading to an inflammatory immune response ⁴⁶. Besides other SCFA producing taxa, *Faecalibacterium*, a 282 283 dominant species in the gut microbiota of healthy subjects and which has anti-inflammatory 284 properties was found to be significantly depleted in newly diagnosed UC patients [Table 3]. 285 The reduction of extremely oxygen-sensitive *Faecalibacterium* and increase in facultative 286 anaerobes reiterates increased oxidative stress in lumen (oxygen hypothesis, discussed 287 above). F. prausnitzii, the sole species of Faecalibacterium has been suggested to be an important regulator of intestinal homeostasis 47 and its association with IBD has been 288 established in several gut microbial studies ^{7,23}. 289

Similar to studies investigating paediatric patients with IBD, the association of *Enterococcus*, *Escherichia*, *Streptococcus*, and *Faecalibacterium* with newly diagnosed adult UC patients observed in this study may represent an early dysbiotic shift triggering disease. This may imply that these genera could be considered as early non-invasive faecal biomarkers for

294 epithelial dysfunction which includes inflammation, aggravated intestinal injury and

295 increased intestinal permeability.

297 No microbial shift between UC patients in remission and relapse

298 Gut microbial profiling during different phases of disease activity in UC has been explored in only a few studies with inconsistent and conflicting results ⁷²³. In the present study, no 299 significant differences were found between disease activity and faecal microbiota (except 300 301 uncultured Bacteroidetes) [Table 3; Figures 6b, 7b]. Consistent with our observation, a few 302 earlier studies have shown no microbial differences between inactive and active UC patients ^{44,48}. Additionally, no significant alteration in the bacterial abundances in relation to disease 303 activity were observed in UC patients of European origin³. Similar trends were also observed 304 305 in two other independent longitudinal studies wherein gut microbiota in UC patients 306 remained highly stable regardless of disease stage, disease activity or treatment escalation ^{44,49}. Thus, associations identified in previous cross-sectional studies may more likely reflect 307 308 inter-individual variation rather than disease activity. No discrete microbial features between 309 remission and relapse groups may highlight the high level of host genetic and gut microbial 310 heterogeneity. Therefore, to unravel robust shifts in the microbiota related to disease activity 311 species/strain mapping and metabolite profiling may be essential.

312 Streptococcus- a persistent pathobiont across the three UC subgroups

313 No differential abundance of *Streptococcus* was observed across the three UC subgroups. 314 However, on comparing these subgroups independently with healthy controls we observed 315 significant enrichment of Streptococcus in newly diagnosed patients and those in relapse 316 [Table 3]. Although not statistically significant, *Streptococcus* was found to be higher in 317 remission group compared to healthy [Figure 6]. The enrichment of *Streptococcus* across the 318 three UC subgroups [Figs. 6-8] suggest that colonization of *Streptococcus* is not transient but 319 resilient (despite treatment regimen or dietary modifications) and thus has a continued role in 320 disease pathology. Of note, the positive correlation of Streptococcus with Lactobacillus, 321 Bifidobacterium and Escherichia-Shigella as evident in our co-occurrence analysis [Figure 8]

16

322 suggests mutualistic association among them and validates the relative abundance findings

323 [Figure 6; Table 3].

324 Enrichment of nitrate reducing bacteria as an indicator of inflammation

325 Culture-based analysis showed an increased abundance of nitrate reducing bacteria in the 326 faces of UC patients compared to healthy controls. These bacteria are capable of converting 327 nitrate to nitrite which are further reduced to nitric oxide and ammonia (nitrogen reactive 328 species). It is now widely believed that oxidants, including free radicals, such as nitric oxide, 329 play a key role in the initiation and perpetuation of inflammation and in the subsequent tissue damage in IBD ^{50,51}. No significant differences in nitrate reducing activity was observed 330 331 among the three UC subgroups, however the activity in each subgroup was found to be 332 significantly higher compared to healthy controls [Table 3; Supplementary Figure 3]. 333 While *Escherichia-Shigella* and *Enterococcus* attributed to a higher nitrate reducing activity 334 in newly diagnosed UC patients, Bifidobacterium and Lactobacillus, which have been recently reported to have nitrate reducing activity ⁵², may explain higher activity among 335 336 patients in remission and relapse. Interestingly, the latter derives support from a recent study 337 from India wherein significant enrichment of Lactobacilli was observed in the faecal samples 338 of active UC patients compared to healthy controls and their level significantly reached close to controls during remission 19,32 . These observations confirm increased oxidative stress in the 339 340 gut lumen; and independently validates our observations.

Acknowledging the modest sample size, the significant associations of bacterial taxa (as detailed above) with UC, identified in the present study require replication in larger, independent cohorts of matched ethnicity. However, the high concordance between our findings and several other reports discussed above clearly indicate that our study is well powered. Furthermore, the limitation that 16S rRNA sequence analysis does not enable species/strain assignment, high-resolution mapping of gut microbiome in NI UC patients is

highly encouraged. This will unravel more robust disease endotype specific associations
driven by select strains which may serve as biomarker. The search for relevant
uncultured/unnamed species will expand our knowledge on their relevance in the
pathogenesis of UC.

351 In summary, this first sequencing based faecal microbiome analysis in a NI UC cohort 352 revealed reduced bacterial diversity and altered composition. Most of the genera identified in 353 our study have shown recurring association with UC across ethnically and geographically 354 distinct populations despite differences in methodology, bio-specimens and reference 355 databases used. Our observations may imply that a) restoration of health promoting SCFA 356 producing bacteria could be a pragmatic solution for mitigating disease; and b) Escherichia-357 Shigella, Enterococcus and Streptococcus could serve as non-invasive microbial signatures 358 for inflammation of high clinical utility. Higher abundance of Bifidobacterium and 359 Lactobacillus among NI UC patients suggest inherent population specific differences in 360 disease pathogenesis driven by host genetics, diet and environmental attributes. Their 361 relationship with UC pathogenesis however warrants further investigations. A deeper 362 understanding of how bacterial genera identified in this study are involved in interactions 363 with host genetics, diet and lifestyle factors etc. either by regulating microbial pathways or by 364 production of specific metabolites may facilitate identification of robust prognostic and 365 diagnostic markers and for better microbial based therapeutic interventions.

366

367

368

370 Ethical consideration

371	The Institutional ethics review board of Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi and
372	Dayanand Medical College and Hospital, Ludhiana approved the study (IEC numbers
373	2017/SERB Young Scientist/125 and DMCH/R&D/2015/238 respectively) approved the
374	study. Written informed consent was obtained from each participant.

375 Funding

- 376 The financial assistance for this work was provided by Science and Engineering
- Research Board, New Delhi, vide F. NO. SB/YS/LS-191/2014 to GJ.

378 Acknowledgements

- 379 The authors thank Prof. Thelma BK, Department of Genetics, University of Delhi
- 380 South Campus for critical discussions throughout the study; MedGenome Labs Ltd.
- 381 for 16S rRNA sequencing service; Mr. Vikas for logistic support at Dayanand
- 382 Medical College and Hospital, Ludhiana, India; MCJ acknowledges funding support
- from DBT/Wellcome Trust Intermediate grant (IA/I/15/2/502086).

384 Data availability

The data underlying this article will be shared on reasonable request to the corresponding author.

387 Competing interests

388 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

389 Authors' contributions

GJ, AjS and VM conceived and designed the study; AjS and VM recruited clinical
samples and clinical data; GJ performed faecal DNA isolation, data analysis,
interpretation of data, wrote the first draft and secured funding; AS and RM
contributed to patient follow-up, clinical data acquisition; DS to sample collection

394	and clinical data acquisition; VV set up the data analysis pipeline and performed
395	independent data analysis; RKB provided infrastructure and other support for
396	conducting the study to GJ as a SERB fellow; MCJ provided critical scientific and
397	technical inputs throughout the study; All authors contributed to manuscript writing
398	and approved the final submitted version.

20

400 Legends

416

- 401 Table 1. Baseline clinical characteristics of UC patients enrolled in the study
- 402 Table 2 Sequencing reads obtained a) before and after quality control and b)
- 403 distribution of sequencing reads after quality control
- **Table 3. Relative abundance of top genera (>1% prevalence) in healthy controls,**
- 405 total UC patients and UC subgroups
- 406 Figure. 1 Alpha diversity metrics of fecal bacterial communities in UC and
- 407 healthy controls. Whisker box plots illustrate (A) species diversity; and (B) species
- richness between the UC patients and healthy controls. Rarefaction curve (C) shows
- the observed species at various sequencing depths in UC patients and healthycontrols. * represents Bonferroni corrected Mann-Whitney p value.
- Figure. 2 Beta diversity analysis based on the overall structure of the faecal
 microbiota of UC patients and healthy controls.
- Principal Coordinate Analysis (PCoA) of UC patients and healthy controls based on
 (A) unweighted and (B) weighted UniFrac metric and (C) Bray Curtis dissimilarity.
 Percentages on the x-axis and y-axis correspond to the percent variation in gut
- 417 patients show significant dissimilarity from healthy controls (p=0.001
 418 PERMONOVA).

microbiome compositions explained by PC1 and PC2. The gut microbiota of UC

Figure. 3 Taxonomic diversity of faecal microbiota composition at the phylum level among UC patients compared to healthy (A) Distribution of faecal microbiota composition and (B) Inter-individual variation of predominant phyla based on their relative abundance. * represents Bonferroni corrected Mann-Whitney p value.

424	Figure. 4 Taxonomic diversity of faecal microbiota composition at the phylum
425	level within UC subgroups compared to healthy (A) Distribution of faecal
426	microbiota composition and (B) Inter-individual variation of predominant phyla
427	based on their relative abundance. * represents Bonferroni corrected Mann-Whitney p
428	value.
429	Figure. 5 Taxonomic diversity of faecal microbiota composition at the genus
430	level (A) total UC patients and (B) UC subgroups compared to healthy * represents
431	Bonferroni corrected Mann-Whitney p value.
432	Figure. 6 Differential abundances of microbial genera representing >1.0% of
433	total OTUs (A) UC patients and (B) UC subgroups compared to healthy. * represents
434	Bonferroni corrected Mann-Whitney p value.
435	Figure. 7 Hierarchical clustering analysis of genera representing >1.0% of total
436	OTUs (A) all UC patients and (B) UC subgroups compared to healthy. The color
437	code indicates relative abundance of OTUs ranging from red (high) to blue (low). The
438	OTUs were transformed to $(\ln(x + 1))$ values, rows were centered and vector scaling
439	was applied using ClustVis.
440	Figure. 8 Co-occurrence networks analysis of microbial genera based upon its
441	relative abundance (A) Newly Diagnosed, (B) Relapse, (C) Remission and (D)
442	Healthy. Each node represents genus and is uniquely colored. The size of each node
443	is proportional to the abundance of the genus in log scale. Line between two nodes
444	represents correlation; green and red lines indicate positive and negative association
445	respectively. Predominant network in UC subtypes and healthy controls is
446	represented with dotted circle.

447 Supplementary Figure. 1 Alpha diversity metrics of fecal bacterial communities

448 in UC subgroups and healthy controls. Whisker box plots represent comparison of

22

(A) species diversity and (B) species richness between the three UC subgroups and
healthy controls. Rarefaction curve (C) shows the observed species at various
sequencing depths in three UC subgroups and healthy controls. * represents
Bonferroni corrected Mann-Whitney p value.

450

453 Supplementary Figure. 2 Beta diversity analysis based on the overall structure

454 of the fecal microbiota between UC subgroups and healthy controls

455 Principal Coordinate Analysis (PCoA) of UC subgroups i.e. newly diagnosed (red),

456 remission (blue) and relapse (orange) and healthy controls (green) based on (A) 457 unweighted and (B) weighted UniFrac metric and (C) Bray Curtis dissimilarity. Each 458 point in the plots represents the composition of the faecal microbiome of one 459 individual and distances indicate degree of similarity to other individuals. The closer 460 the spatial distance of the sample, the more similar the species composition of the 461 sample. Percentages on the x-axis and y-axis correspond to the percent variation in 462 gut microbiome compositions explained by PC1 and PC2. No significant differences 463 among the three UC subgroups were observed.

464 Supplementary Figure. 3 Relative nitrate reducing activity

465 Whisker box plots illustrate relative absorbance (620nm) per gram of faeces observed 466 in nitrate broth of (A) UC patients and healthy and (B) UC subgroups. Each dot 467 represents relative absorbance in a sample. The bottom, middle, and top boundaries 468 of each box represent the first, second (median), and third quartiles of the relative 469 absorbance. The whiskers (lines extending from the top and bottom of the box and 470 ending in horizontal cap) extend to points within 1.5 times the interquartile range. 471 The points extending above the whiskers are outliers. *represents Mann-Whitney 472 Bonferroni corrected p value.

474 **References**

- 1. Snell A., Segal J., Limdi J., Banerjee R. Inflammatory bowel disease in India:
- 476 challenges and opportunities. *Frontline Gastroenterol* 2020:flgastro-2020-101500.
- 477 Doi: 10.1136/FLGASTRO-2020-101500.
- 478 2. Loddo I., Romano C. Inflammatory Bowel Disease: Genetics, Epigenetics, and
- 479 Pathogenesis. *Front Immunol* 2015;**6**. Doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2015.00551.
- 480 3. F I., A VV., MJ B., J F., D G., MC V., et al. Interplay of host genetics and gut
- 481 microbiota underlying the onset and clinical presentation of inflammatory bowel
- 482 disease. *Gut* 2018;**67**(1):108–19. Doi: 10.1136/GUTJNL-2016-312135.
- 483 4. Dubinsky MC. Reviewing treatments and outcomes in the evolving landscape of
- 484 ulcerative colitis. *Postgrad Med* 2017;**129**(5):538–53. Doi:
- 485 10.1080/00325481.2017.1319730.
- 486 5. de Fátima Caldeira L., Borba HH., Tonin FS., Wiens A., Fernandez-Llimos F.,
- 487 Pontarolo R. Fecal microbiota transplantation in inflammatory bowel disease patients:
- 488 A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2020;**15**(9). Doi:
- 489 10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0238910.
- 490 6. Ghouri YA., Richards DM., Rahimi EF., Krill JT., Jelinek KA., DuPont AW.
- 491 Systematic review of randomized controlled trials of probiotics, prebiotics, and
- 492 synbiotics in infammatory bowel disease. *Clin Exp Gastroenterol* 2014;**7**:473–87. Doi:
- 493 10.2147/CEG.S27530.
- 494 7. Pittayanon R., Lau JT., Leontiadis GI., Tse F., Yuan Y., Surette M., et al. Differences
- 495 in Gut Microbiota in Patients With vs Without Inflammatory Bowel Diseases: A
- 496 Systematic Review. *Gastroenterology* 2020;**158**(4):930-946.e1. Doi:
- 497 10.1053/J.GASTRO.2019.11.294.

24

- 498 8. Park SC., Jeen YT. Genetic Studies of Inflammatory Bowel Disease-Focusing on
- 499 Asian Patients. *Cells* 2019;**8**(5):404. Doi: 10.3390/cells8050404.
- 500 9. Maaser C., Sturm A., Vavricka SR., Kucharzik T., Fiorino G., Annese V., et al.
- 501 ECCO-ESGAR Guideline for Diagnostic Assessment in IBD Part 1: Initial diagnosis,
- 502 monitoring of known IBD, detection of complications. *J Crohns Colitis*
- 503 2019;**13**(2):144–64. Doi: 10.1093/ECCO-JCC/JJY113.
- 504 10. Magoč T., Salzberg SL. FLASH: Fast length adjustment of short reads to improve
- genome assemblies. *Bioinformatics* 2011;**27**(21):2957–63. Doi:
- 506 10.1093/bioinformatics/btr507.
- 507 11. Rognes T., Flouri T., Nichols B., Quince C., Mahé F. VSEARCH: A versatile open
- source tool for metagenomics. *PeerJ* 2016;**2016**(10). Doi: 10.7717/peerj.2584.
- 509 12. Edgar RC. Search and clustering orders of magnitude faster than BLAST.

510 *Bioinformatics* 2010;**26**(19):2460–1. Doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btq461.

- 511 13. Wang Q., Garrity GM., Tiedje JM., Cole JR. Naïve Bayesian classifier for rapid
- assignment of rRNA sequences into the new bacterial taxonomy. *Appl Environ*

513 *Microbiol* 2007;**73**(16):5261–7. Doi: 10.1128/AEM.00062-07.

514 14. Caporaso JG., Kuczynski J., Stombaugh J., Bittinger K., Bushman FD., Costello EK.,

515 et al. QIIME allows analysis of high-throughput community sequencing data. *Nat*

- 516 *Methods* 2010:335–6. Doi: 10.1038/nmeth.f.303.
- 517 15. Metsalu T., Vilo J. ClustVis: A web tool for visualizing clustering of multivariate data
- 518 using Principal Component Analysis and heatmap. *Nucleic Acids Res*
- 519 2015;**43**(W1):W566–70. Doi: 10.1093/nar/gkv468.
- 520 16. Kurtz ZD., Müller CL., Miraldi ER., Littman DR., Blaser MJ., Bonneau RA. Sparse
- 521 and Compositionally Robust Inference of Microbial Ecological Networks. *PLoS*

522		Comput Biol 2015;11(5). Doi: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004226.
523	17.	Nishida A., Inoue R., Inatomi O., Bamba S., Naito Y., Andoh A. Gut microbiota in the
524		pathogenesis of inflammatory bowel disease. Clin J Gastroenterol 2018. Doi:
525		10.1007/s12328-017-0813-5.
526	18.	Verma R., Verma AK., Ahuja V., Paul J. Real-time analysis of mucosal flora in
527		patients with inflammatory bowel disease in India. J Clin Microbiol
528		2010; 48 (11):4279–82. Doi: 10.1128/JCM.01360-10.
529	19.	Kedia S., Rampal R., Paul J., Ahuja V. Gut microbiome diversity in acute infective
530		and chronic inflammatory gastrointestinal diseases in North India. J Gastroenterol
531		2016:660–71. Doi: 10.1007/s00535-016-1193-1.
532	20.	Kumari R., Ahuja V., Paul J. Fluctuations in butyrate-producing bacteria in ulcerative
533		colitis patients of North India. World J Gastroenterol 2013;19(22):3404–14. Doi:
534		10.3748/wjg.v19.i22.3404.
535	21.	Walujkar SA., Kumbhare S V., Marathe NP., Patangia D V., Lawate PS., Bharadwaj
535 536	21.	Walujkar SA., Kumbhare S V., Marathe NP., Patangia D V., Lawate PS., Bharadwaj RS., et al. Molecular profiling of mucosal tissue associated microbiota in patients
535 536 537	21.	Walujkar SA., Kumbhare S V., Marathe NP., Patangia D V., Lawate PS., Bharadwaj RS., et al. Molecular profiling of mucosal tissue associated microbiota in patients manifesting acute exacerbations and remission stage of ulcerative colitis. <i>World J</i>
535 536 537 538	21.	Walujkar SA., Kumbhare S V., Marathe NP., Patangia D V., Lawate PS., Bharadwaj RS., et al. Molecular profiling of mucosal tissue associated microbiota in patients manifesting acute exacerbations and remission stage of ulcerative colitis. <i>World J Microbiol Biotechnol</i> 2018; 34 (6). Doi: 10.1007/s11274-018-2449-0.
535 536 537 538 539	21. 22.	 Walujkar SA., Kumbhare S V., Marathe NP., Patangia D V., Lawate PS., Bharadwaj RS., et al. Molecular profiling of mucosal tissue associated microbiota in patients manifesting acute exacerbations and remission stage of ulcerative colitis. <i>World J</i> <i>Microbiol Biotechnol</i> 2018;34(6). Doi: 10.1007/s11274-018-2449-0. Henson MA., Phalak P. Microbiota dysbiosis in inflammatory bowel diseases: In silico
535 536 537 538 539 540	21. 22.	 Walujkar SA., Kumbhare S V., Marathe NP., Patangia D V., Lawate PS., Bharadwaj RS., et al. Molecular profiling of mucosal tissue associated microbiota in patients manifesting acute exacerbations and remission stage of ulcerative colitis. <i>World J</i> <i>Microbiol Biotechnol</i> 2018;34(6). Doi: 10.1007/s11274-018-2449-0. Henson MA., Phalak P. Microbiota dysbiosis in inflammatory bowel diseases: In silico investigation of the oxygen hypothesis. <i>BMC Syst Biol</i> 2017;11(1):1–15. Doi:
535 536 537 538 539 540 541	21.	 Walujkar SA., Kumbhare S V., Marathe NP., Patangia D V., Lawate PS., Bharadwaj RS., et al. Molecular profiling of mucosal tissue associated microbiota in patients manifesting acute exacerbations and remission stage of ulcerative colitis. <i>World J</i> <i>Microbiol Biotechnol</i> 2018;34(6). Doi: 10.1007/s11274-018-2449-0. Henson MA., Phalak P. Microbiota dysbiosis in inflammatory bowel diseases: In silico investigation of the oxygen hypothesis. <i>BMC Syst Biol</i> 2017;11(1):1–15. Doi: 10.1186/S12918-017-0522-1/FIGURES/6.
535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542	21.22.23.	 Walujkar SA., Kumbhare S V., Marathe NP., Patangia D V., Lawate PS., Bharadwaj RS., et al. Molecular profiling of mucosal tissue associated microbiota in patients manifesting acute exacerbations and remission stage of ulcerative colitis. <i>World J</i> <i>Microbiol Biotechnol</i> 2018;34(6). Doi: 10.1007/s11274-018-2449-0. Henson MA., Phalak P. Microbiota dysbiosis in inflammatory bowel diseases: In silico investigation of the oxygen hypothesis. <i>BMC Syst Biol</i> 2017;11(1):1–15. Doi: 10.1186/S12918-017-0522-1/FIGURES/6. Caenepeel C., Tabib NSS., Vieira-Silva S., Vermeire S. Review article: how the
535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543	21.22.23.	 Walujkar SA., Kumbhare S V., Marathe NP., Patangia D V., Lawate PS., Bharadwaj RS., et al. Molecular profiling of mucosal tissue associated microbiota in patients manifesting acute exacerbations and remission stage of ulcerative colitis. <i>World J</i> <i>Microbiol Biotechnol</i> 2018;34(6). Doi: 10.1007/s11274-018-2449-0. Henson MA., Phalak P. Microbiota dysbiosis in inflammatory bowel diseases: In silico investigation of the oxygen hypothesis. <i>BMC Syst Biol</i> 2017;11(1):1–15. Doi: 10.1186/S12918-017-0522-1/FIGURES/6. Caenepeel C., Tabib NSS., Vieira-Silva S., Vermeire S. Review article: how the intestinal microbiota may reflect disease activity and influence therapeutic outcome in
535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544	21.22.23.	 Walujkar SA., Kumbhare S V., Marathe NP., Patangia D V., Lawate PS., Bharadwaj RS., et al. Molecular profiling of mucosal tissue associated microbiota in patients manifesting acute exacerbations and remission stage of ulcerative colitis. <i>World J</i> <i>Microbiol Biotechnol</i> 2018;34(6). Doi: 10.1007/s11274-018-2449-0. Henson MA., Phalak P. Microbiota dysbiosis in inflammatory bowel diseases: In silico investigation of the oxygen hypothesis. <i>BMC Syst Biol</i> 2017;11(1):1–15. Doi: 10.1186/S12918-017-0522-1/FIGURES/6. Caenepeel C., Tabib NSS., Vieira-Silva S., Vermeire S. Review article: how the intestinal microbiota may reflect disease activity and influence therapeutic outcome in inflammatory bowel disease. <i>Aliment Pharmacol Ther</i> 2020;52(9):1453–68. Doi:

26

546	24.	Zakerska-Banaszak O., Tomczak H., Gabryel M., Baturo A., Wolko L., Michalak M.,
547		et al. Dysbiosis of gut microbiota in Polish patients with ulcerative colitis: a pilot

- 548 study. Sci Rep 2021;11(1):2166. Doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-81628-3.
- 549 25. Venegas DP., De La Fuente MK., Landskron G., González MJ., Quera R., Dijkstra G.,
- 550 et al. Short chain fatty acids (SCFAs)mediated gut epithelial and immune regulation
- 551 and its relevance for inflammatory bowel diseases. Front Immunol
- 552 2019;10(MAR):277. Doi: 10.3389/FIMMU.2019.00277/BIBTEX.
- 553 26. Deleu S., Machiels K., Raes J., Verbeke K., Vermeire S. Short chain fatty acids and its
- 554 producing organisms: An overlooked therapy for IBD? *EBioMedicine* 2021;66. Doi:
- 555 10.1016/J.EBIOM.2021.103293.
- 556 27. Alam MT., Amos GCA., Murphy ARJ., Murch S., Wellington EMH., Arasaradnam
- 557 RP. Microbial imbalance in inflammatory bowel disease patients at different
- 558 taxonomic levels. Gut Pathog 2020 121 2020;12(1):1-8. Doi: 10.1186/S13099-019-
- 559 0341-6.

- 560 28. Bartlett A., Gullickson RG., Singh R., Ro S., Omaye ST. The Link between Oral and
- 561 Gut Microbiota in Inflammatory Bowel Disease and a Synopsis of Potential Salivary

562 Biomarkers. Appl Sci 2020, Vol 10, Page 6421 2020;10(18):6421. Doi:

- 10.3390/APP10186421. 563
- 564 29. Heidarian F., Noormohammadi Z., Asadzadeh Aghdaei H., Alebouyeh M. Relative 565 abundance of Streptococcus spp. and its association with disease activity in
- 566 inflammatory bowel disease patients compared with controls. Arch Clin Infect Dis
- 567 2017;**12**(2). Doi: 10.5812/archcid.57291.
- 568 30. Imhann F., Bonder MJ., Vila AV., Fu J., Mujagic Z., Vork L., et al. Proton pump 569 inhibitors affect the gut microbiome. Gut 2016;65(5):740-8. Doi: 10.1136/GUTJNL-

570 2015-310376.

571	31.	Schirmer M., Denson L., Vlamakis H., Franzosa EA., Thomas S., Gotman NM., et al.
572		Compositional and Temporal Changes in the Gut Microbiome of Pediatric Ulcerative
573		Colitis Patients Are Linked to Disease Course. Cell Host Microbe 2018;24(4):600-
574		610.e4. Doi: 10.1016/J.CHOM.2018.09.009.
575	32.	Kedia S., Ahuja V. Epidemiology of Inflammatory Bowel Disease in India: The Great
576		Shift East. Inflamm Intest Dis 2017;2(2):102–15. Doi: 10.1159/000465522.
577	33.	Gryaznova MV., Solodskikh SA., Panevina AV., Syromyatnikov MY., Dvoretskaya
578		YD., Sviridova TN., et al. Study of microbiome changes in patients with ulcerative
579		colitis in the Central European part of Russia. Heliyon 2021;7(3):e06432. Doi:
580		10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06432.
581	34.	Wang W., Chen L., Zhou R., Wang X., Song L., Huang S., et al. Increased proportions
582		of Bifidobacterium and the Lactobacillus group and loss of butyrate-producing bacteria
583		in inflammatory bowel disease. J Clin Microbiol 2014;52(2):398–406. Doi:
584		10.1128/JCM.01500-13.
585	35.	Ventura RE., Iizumi T., Battaglia T., Liu M., Perez-Perez GI., Herbert J., et al. Gut
586		microbiome of treatment-naïve MS patients of different ethnicities early in disease
587		course. Sci Reports 2019 91 2019;9(1):1–10. Doi: 10.1038/s41598-019-52894-z.
588	36.	Willing BP., Dicksved J., Halfvarson J., Andersson AF., Lucio M., Zheng Z., et al. A
589		pyrosequencing study in twins shows that gastrointestinal microbial profiles vary with
590		inflammatory bowel disease phenotypes. Gastroenterology 2010;139(6). Doi:
591		10.1053/J.GASTRO.2010.08.049.
592	37.	Leamy LJ., Kelly SA., Nietfeldt J., Legge RM., Ma F., Hua K., et al. Host genetics and
593		diet, but not immunoglobulin A expression, converge to shape compositional features

594 of	f the gut	microbiome	e in an advance	d intercross popu	lation of	mice.	Genome Bi	ol
--------	-----------	------------	-----------------	-------------------	-----------	-------	-----------	----

- 595 2014;**15**(12):552. Doi: 10.1186/S13059-014-0552-6.
- 596 38. Knights D., Silverberg MS., Weersma RK., Gevers D., Dijkstra G., Huang H., et al.
- 597 Complex host genetics influence the microbiome in inflammatory bowel disease.
- 598 *Genome Med* 2014;**6**(12):1–11. Doi: 10.1186/S13073-014-0107-1/FIGURES/6.
- 599 39. Kittana H., Gomes-Neto JC., Heck K., Geis AL., Segura Muñoz RR., Cody LA., et al.
- 600 Commensal Escherichia coliStrains can promote intestinal inflammation via
- 601 differential interleukin-6 production. *Front Immunol* 2018;9(OCT). Doi:
- 602 10.3389/fimmu.2018.02318.
- 40. Rocha-Ramírez LM., Pérez-Solano RA., Castañón-Alonso SL., Moreno Guerrero SS.,
- 604 Ramírez Pacheco A., García Garibay M., et al. Probiotic Lactobacillus Strains
- Stimulate the Inflammatory Response and Activate Human Macrophages. *J Immunol Res* 2017;**2017**. Doi: 10.1155/2017/4607491.
- 41. He B., Hoang TK., Tian X., Taylor CM., Blanchard E., Luo M., et al. Lactobacillus
- reuteri Reduces the Severity of Experimental Autoimmune Encephalomyelitis in Mice
- 609 by Modulating Gut Microbiota. *Front Immunol* 2019;**10**(MAR):385. Doi:
- 610 10.3389/FIMMU.2019.00385.
- 42. Paesani C., Salvucci E., Moiraghi M., Fernandez Canigia L., Pérez GT. Arabinoxylan
 from Argentinian whole wheat flour promote the growth of Lactobacillus reuteri and
 Bifidobacterium breve. *Lett Appl Microbiol* 2019;68(2):142–8. Doi:
- 614 10.1111/LAM.13097.
- 43. Singh RK., Chang HW., Yan D., Lee KM., Ucmak D., Wong K., et al. Influence of
- diet on the gut microbiome and implications for human health. *J Transl Med 2017 151*
- 617 2017;**15**(1):1–17. Doi: 10.1186/S12967-017-1175-Y.

29

618 44. Öhman L., Lasson A., Strömbeck A., Isaksson S., Hesselmar M., Simrén	M., et al.
--	------------

- Fecal microbiota dynamics during disease activity and remission in newly diagnosed
- and established ulcerative colitis. *Sci Reports 2021 111* 2021;**11**(1):1–8. Doi:
- 621 10.1038/s41598-021-87973-7.
- 45. Zhuang X., Liu C., Zhan S., Tian Z., Li N., Mao R., et al. Gut Microbiota Profile in
- Pediatric Patients With Inflammatory Bowel Disease: A Systematic Review. *Front Pediatr* 2021:626232. Doi: 10.3389/fped.2021.626232.
- 46. Pickard JM., Zeng MY., Caruso R., Núñez G. Gut Microbiota: Role in Pathogen
- 626 Colonization, Immune Responses and Inflammatory Disease. *Immunol Rev*
- 627 2017;**279**(1):70. Doi: 10.1111/IMR.12567.
- 47. Cao Y., Shen J., Ran ZH. Association between faecalibacterium prausnitzii reduction
 and inflammatory bowel disease: A meta-analysis and systematic review of the

630 literature. *Gastroenterol Res Pract* 2014;**2014**. Doi: 10.1155/2014/872725.

- 48. Wills ES., Jonkers DMAE., Savelkoul PH., Masclee AA., Pierik MJ., Penders J. Fecal
- microbial composition of ulcerative colitis and Crohn's disease patients in remission
- and subsequent exacerbation. *PLoS One* 2014;**9**(3). Doi:
- 634 10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0090981.
- 49. Clooney AG., Eckenberger J., Laserna-Mendieta E., Sexton KA., Bernstein MT.,
- 636 Vagianos K., et al. Ranking microbiome variance in inflammatory bowel disease: a
- large longitudinal intercontinental study. *Gut* 2021;**70**(3):499–510. Doi:
- 638 10.1136/GUTJNL-2020-321106.
- 639 50. Menezes-Garcia Z., Do Nascimento Arifa RD., Acúrcio L., Brito CB., Gouvea JO.,
- Lima RL., et al. Colonization by Enterobacteriaceae is crucial for acute inflammatory
- 641 responses in murine small intestine via regulation of corticosterone production. *Gut*

642	<i>Microbes</i> 2020; 11 (6):1531–46. Doi: 10.1080/19490976.2020.1765946.
-----	--

- 643 51. Zeng MY., Inohara N., Nuñez G. Mechanisms of inflammation-driven bacterial
- 644 dysbiosis in the gut. *Mucosal Immunol* 2017:18–26. Doi: 10.1038/mi.2016.75.
- 52. Tiso M., Schechter AN. Nitrate Reduction to Nitrite, Nitric Oxide and Ammonia by
- 646 Gut Bacteria under Physiological Conditions. *PLoS One* 2015;**10**(3):e0119712. Doi:
- 647 10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0119712.







::

Tenericutes

p=1.9 e-08*



- Firmicutes
 Bacteroidetes
 Actinobacteria
 Proteobacteria
 Tenericutes
- Unclassified
- Patescibacteria
- Verrucomicrobia
- Spirochaetes
- Epsilonbacteraeota
- Lentisphaerae
- Fusobacteria







a 0.60	Sifidobacterium ::		Lactobacillus	Streptococcus	0.70	Prevotella	Blautia	h Rifidahastarium u	0.30	Lactobacillus	o Far Streptococcus	0.70 Prevotella	Blautia	0.17 Firmicutes upcul.
² 0.45	p=0.0003	0.70	p=0.004	0.52 p=0.001	 ğo.50	p=3.6e-05	9 p=0.0001	0.525 <u>p=0.004</u> 8 <u>p=0.04</u>	0.25 p=0.01	0.70 9 0.50	0.450 p=0.01 *	0.60 0.50 p=0.005	0.25 p=0.001	0 6 0.12 p=7.7e-09
epur	"T	10.50	-1.	10.37			- <u>1</u> 0.20	P	ep 0.201	T the second	p=0.02	p=0.001	p=0.05	p=5.3e-05
ge 0.30		-Reo. 30.	4	e0.22	- de 0.30	<i>₁</i>	nge	a 0.225	R0.15	lande land	e 0.225	R 0.20		p=3.7e-06 "
Re	ँ दिंग	a.20	4	a.07	a 0.10		Rei L	2 0.075			2 0.075		2 0.05 £ 1 1 1	0.02 J
0.15		0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	-0.075		-0.10	0.000	-0.1	0.00	0.00
0.00	Healthy UC		Healthy UC	Healthy	UC	Healthy UC	Healthy ÜC	Jeans House assor action	and a start where as a start	Heater and Sola crission solapse	Health and boy or so a seast	treating and any one any one season	Health and Carlo Charles of Person	HOTO AND CONSOL ADDO
0.70	Dialister _	0.18	Dorea	Ruminococcacea	·	Roseburia .	0.05 Coprococcus	Hen de	a stern der a	10 42	10 4	4°°° 45	40 00	40 4
80.50	p=3.7 e-05	g0.14	0=0.0004	0.30 80.22 ** p=5.4	e-10 0.20	p=3.5e-12	p=2.4e-10	0.45 Dialister p=3.2 e-05	0.18 Dorea	0.30 Ruminococcaceae	0.20 Roseburia	0.04 Coprococcus	0.17 Ruminococcus	8 0.14 Tenericutes_uncul, p=6.3e-07
upu		Lepu 10	p=0.0004	20.20	- B0.15		50.03 ····	p=0.0003	p=0.006	0.25 p=0.0001	p=8.9e-11 ⊆ 0.15. p=9.7e-08	0.03 p=7.8e-08 p=5.6e-05	0.15 p=1.9e-07 c 0.12 = p=3.2e-05	p=5.7e-05
a 0.30		de . o oc	.1	- Q0.15	:· 육0.10		i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	0.22		p=1.3e-06"	p=6.0e-07	p=5.3e-05	p=7.9e-06	p=5.9e-05
a.10		Rel	··	20.10		di la	0.01	9 0.15	60.0 %	0.10 (=) p=0.02	te	0.01	0.05	
0.00		0.02		0.00	3. 0.00		0.00	0.07	0.00 * 🛓 🔹 🎍	² 0.05		^{60.007}	2 0.02	0.00
_	Healthy UC		Healthy UC	Healthy	UC	Healthy UC	Healthy UC	8 & B. E.	& 3 B A	0.00	4 9 9	0.00	0.00	5 3 5 8
								5 10 a S	5 3 3 5	A . 8 . 8	5 3 3 3	8 39 5 8	S 37 5 5	5 5 5 30
0.17	Ruminococcus _	0.12	achnospiraceae	0.07 Alloprevotella	0.40 F	ïrmicutes_other	0.09 Bacteriodetes_uncul.	Heart Seatt Seatt Seatt Seatt	Health and an and an and	Hearth and and an and a second	treater again on acristo gainty	Health early boos annihit seast	Hearth Day Remain Restor	Hearth Barrish Repairs
0.17 8 0.15	p=5.6 e-10	0.12 La 0.10. 0.09.	p=1.2 e-09	0.07 Alloprevotella g 0.06 p=1.3 e	0.40 F	irmicutes_other	0.09 Bacteriodetes_uncul. 일 0.07 p=6.4 e-10	Honor Lachanospiraceae .	vert the second second	Harris Contraction of the second seco	tearring and a second	Harrison and Articles	1.90 Bacteroides_uncul	u.25 Rikenellaceae+RC9
0.17 0.15 0.12 0.10	p=5.6 e-10	0.12 La a0.10 up 0.09 pu 0.07	p=1.2 e-09	0.07 Alloprevotella 0.06 p=1.3 e 0.05	0.40 F	irmicutes_other	0,09 Bacteriodetes_uncul. 8 0.07 p=6.4 e-10 9 0.06 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	epose .	+e ² ² ² / ₂	u.35 Escherickia-Shigella	440 ³⁵ , 10 ⁴⁰ 94, 10	+e ^{0,504} +e ^{0,504} 0.40 <i>Firmicutes_other</i> ===e ^{0,006} =======	0.90 Bacteroides_uncul 0.90 0 Bacteroides_uncul 0.75 p=2:5e-08 0.000 0001	ye ^{μθ} ^T _{μθ} ^{μθ} ^K _φ ^{μθ^K} _φ ^{μθ^K _φ^{μθ^K} _φ^{μθ^K _φ^{K^K _φ^{μθ^K _φ^{K^K _φ^{K^K}}}}}}</sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup>
0.17 0.15 0.10 0.10 0.07	p=5.6 e-10	0.12. La 0.0.0 0.00.0 0.07. 0.06- 0.04- 0.04-	achnospiraceae p=1.2 e-09 	0.07 Alloprevotella a) 0.06 p=1.3 e b) 0.04 b e 0.03 c i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	-09 0.40 F	irmicutes_other	0.09 Bacteriodetes_uncul. 20.07 p=6.4 e-10 20.06 20.04 20.04 20.04	80.12 0.09 p=2.5e-06 p=3.1e-06	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	eport ep	+Harton Alexand Bar and Bar an	$\begin{array}{c} +e^{2i\theta^{TM}} e^{i\theta^{TM}} e^{i\theta^{TM$	top top <thtop< th=""> <thtop< th=""> <thtop< th=""></thtop<></thtop<></thtop<>	40 ⁰⁰ μ ⁰
0.17 0.15 0.10 0.10 veri 0.07 0.05 0.02	Ruminococcus	0.12 La 30.10 0.09 0.07 ng 0.06 	p=1.2 e-09	0.07 Alloprevotella 0.06 0.006 0.005 0.03 0.03 0.03 0.02 0.01	•09 •09 •000 •000 •000 •000 •000 •000 •	irmicutes_other	0.09 Bacteriodetes_uncul. 0.07 p=6.4 e-10 0.06 0.04 0.03 ref. 1 0.03	0.12 Lachanospiraceae . 4.000 p-2.5e-06 19.0.06 p-2.5e-06 19.0.06 "p-2.3e-05 19.0.06 "p-2.3e-05		ve ^{pgender} ve ^{pgender} 0.35 Escherichia-Shigella 0.25 pp0.20 p=0.01 p=0.02 p=0.02 p=0.02 p=0.02	+Half of the second sec	0.40 Firmicutes_other 0.40 Firmicutes_other 0.20 T	$\begin{array}{c} 0.90\\ 0.75\\ \hline 0.75\\ \hline 0.75\\ \hline 0.75\\ \hline p=0.0001\\ \hline p=0.0001\\ \hline p=0.0001\\ \hline p=0.04, \end{array}$	ye ⁰⁷ ze ⁰⁴⁷ ze ⁰⁴⁷ ze ⁰⁴⁷ ze ⁰⁴⁷ 0.25 Rikenellaceae-RC9 =3.0e-05 =
0.17 a) 0.15 0.12 0.07 0.07 0.05 0.02 0.00	P=5.6 e-10	0.12 0.10 0.09 0.07 0.06 -0.04 0.03 0.01 0.00	achnospiraceae p=1.2 e-09 	0.07 Alloprevotella 0.06 pp=1.3 0 0.05 pp=1.3 0 0.04 +	0.40 F 0.30 0.20 0.20 0.10 0.00	irmicutes_other	0.09 Bacteriodetes_uncul. 0.07 p=6.4 +10 0.04 0.01 0.01	0.12 0.12 0.09 0.06 0.06 0.06 0.06 0.06 0.06 0.06 0.06 0.06 0.06 0.06 0.06 0.06 0.06 0.05 0.06 0.05 0.06 0.05	0.07 9 0.05 19 0.03 19 0.01 19 0.01 10 0.02 10 0.0	$\begin{array}{c} \text{upd} & \text{def} & \text{def} & \text{def} & \text{def} & \text{def} \\ 0.55 & \text{Escherichia-Shigella} \\ 0.25 & \text{upd} & \text{upd} & \text{upd} & \text{upd} & \text{upd} \\ 0.05 & \text{upd} & \text{upd} & \text{upd} & \text{upd} & \text{upd} \\ 0.01 & \text{upd} \\ 0.01 & \text{upd} $		under 1 and	0.90 Bacteroides_uncul p=-2.5e-08 p=-0.040 0.55 p=-0.040 p=-0.04	4 μ ^{dr} μ ^{dr} μ ^{dr} μ ^{dr} μ ^{dr} μ ^{dr} 0.25 <i>Rikenellaceae.RC9</i> 0.20 <u>p=3.0e-05</u> <u>p=0.01</u> y=0.01 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=0.001 y=
0.17 0.15 0.12 0.07 0.07 0.05 0.02 0.00	Ruminococcus p=5.6 e-10 	0.12 48 0.10 0.00 0.07 0.06 0.03 0.01 0.00	achnospiraceae p=1.2 e-09 Healthy UC	0.07 0.006 0.006 0.00 0.00 0.01 0.00	-09 -09 -09 -09 -00 -00 -00 -00	irmicutes_other	0.09 Bacteriodetes_uncul. 0.07 p=6.4 +10 0.04 0.01 0.00 Healthy UC	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.2 0.00 0.2 0.00 0.2 0.2	0.07 9 0.06 19 0.01 19 0.01 19 0.01 19 0.01 19 0.01 19 0.01 19 0.01 10 ± ± ± ± ± ± ± ± ± ± ± ± ± ± ± ± ± ± ±	0.35 0.35 Escherichia-Shigella 0.05 0	• 0.7 0.6 0.7 0.6 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7	und ²⁰ pho ²⁰ pho ²⁰ de ²⁰ 0.40) Firmicutes_other 0.20 0.20 1.21 pho ²⁰ 0.20 0.00 - p=0.006 - p=	upper page <	$\begin{array}{c} \sqrt{2} \frac{1}{2} $
0.17 0.15 0.12 0.07 0.07 0.05 0.02 0.00 0.17 0.02	Ruminococcus p=5.6 e-10 Healthy UC irmicutes_uncul	0.12 44 p0.10 w0.09 p0.07 q0.06 v0.03 0.01 0.00 0.14 0.12	Achnospiraceae p=1.2 e-09 Healthy UC Tenericutes_uncul	0.07 0.07 0.06 0.06 0.05 0.02 0.01 0.00 0.02 0.01 File Rikenellaceae Rikenellaceae	-09 -09 -09 -09 -09 -00 -0.10 -0.10 -0.10 -0.10 -0.10 -0.10	irmicutes_other	0.09 Bacteriodetes_uncul. 80.07 p=6.4 e-10 90.06 T 90.03 T 0.01 T 0.00 Healthy			understring of an and a start of		0.40 Frimicutes_other 0.40 Primicutes_other p=0.006 10.00 1	$\begin{array}{c} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	4.4 m m m m m m m m m m m m m m m m m m
0.17 a) 0.15 b) 0.12 b) 0.10 b) 0.10 b) 0.07 b) 0.05 b) 0.07 b) 0.05 b) 0.07 b) 0.05 b) 0.07 b) 0.05 b) 0.07 b) 0.12 b) 0.12 b) 0.12 b) 0.15 b) 0.07 b) 0.05 b) 0.05 b	Ruminococcus	0.12 44 a0.10 aue 0.09 pp 0.07 dg 0.06 ja 0.04 au 0.01 0.01 0.00 0.14 au 0.12 up 0.10	Achnospiraceae	0.07 Alloprevotels 50.05 p=1.3 (50.05 p=1.3 (5	-09 -09 -09 -09 -09 -00 -0.10 -0.10 -0.10 -0.10 -0.10 -0.10 -0.10 -0.10 -0.10 -0.10 -0.00	irmicutes_other	0.09 Bacteriodetes_uncul. 0.09 p=6.4 e-10 0.00 p=6.4 e-10 0.01 p=0.4 e-10 0.00 p=0.4 e-10 0.01 p=0.4 e-10 0.00 p=0.4 e-	40 ²⁰ m ²⁰	under the second secon	$\begin{array}{c} u^{def}_{per} - \frac{def}{def} - \frac{def}{def} - \frac{def}{def} - \frac{def}{def} \\ 0.35 \\ g_{0} 0.35 \\ g_{0} 0.25 \\ g_{0} 0.25 \\ g_{0} 0.00 \\ g_{0} 0.10 \\ g_{0} 0.00 \\ g_{0} 0.00$		$\begin{array}{c} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	0.90 0.90 0.60 0.60 0.45 0.00 0.15 0.00	$\begin{array}{c} \sqrt{2} \frac{1}{2} $
0.17 30.15 0.12 0.10 9,007 0.05 0.02 0.00 0.17 0.15 0.02 0.00	Ruminococcus	0.12 La a0.10 pupp.0.07 unq0.06 e 0.04 0.03 0.01 0.00 0.14 0.10 unp0.08	achnospiraceae p=1.2 e-09 Healthy UC Tenericutes_uncut p=1.8 e-09 T	0.07 Alloprevotella 0.07 0.05 p=1.3 (0.05 0.05 p=1.3 (0.04 p=1.3 (0.01 p=1.3 (-09 00.00 00.00 00.00 00.00 00.00 0	Healthy UC	0.09 Bacteriodetes_uncul. 0.09 p=6.4 e-10 0.00 0.01 0.00 Healthy UC	website <	under the second secon	understrington 0.35 0.35 0.35 0.35 0.00 0	- - - - - - - - - -	$\begin{array}{c} u^{0} \frac{1}{2} \frac$	0.90 80.075 0.60 0.45 0.00 0.45 0.00 0.45 0.00 0.45 0.00 0.45 0.00 0.45 0.00 0.45 0.00 0.45 0.00 0.45 0.00 0.00 0.45 0.00	$\begin{array}{c} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$
0.17 a) 0.15 a) 0.15 a) 0.12 a) 0.10 e) 0.07 a) 0.05 a) 0.07 a) 0.05 a) 0.07 a) 0.07 a	Ruminococcus	0.12 4 0.10 4 0.10 4 0.10 4 0.10 4 0.00 4 0.01 4 0.00 4	achnospiraceae p=1.2 e-09 Healthy UC Tenericutes_uncut.	0.07 Alloprevotella 0.07 Alloprevotella 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.02 Participation 0.01 0.01 0.00 Healthy Healthy 0.02 p=0.00 0.02 p=0.00 0.01 0.02 p=0.00 0.01 0.02 p=0.00 0.01 0.02 p=0.00 0.01 0.02 p=0.00 0.01 0.02 p=0.00 0.02 p=0.00 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05	-09 -09 -09 -00 -0,	irmicutes_other	0.09 Bacteriodetes_uncul. 0.09 p=6.4 e-10 0.06 0.00 0.01 0.00 Healthy UC	40 ²⁰ m ²⁰	• def de	understring and service and s	+d ^d _d ^d , d ^d ,	$\begin{array}{c} u^{0} \frac{1}{2} \frac$	0.90 80.001 0.97 0.90 0.95 0.00 0.97 0.05 0.00 0.15 0.00 0.05 0.00 0.15 0.00 0.05 0.00 0.05 0.00 0.05 0.00 0.05 0.00 0.05 0.00 0.05 0.00 0.05 0.00 0.05 0.00 0.05 0.00 0.05 0.0	v d ^{ad} _u d ^{ad} ^b _u d ^{ad} ^b _u d ^{ad} ^b _u d ^{ad} ^b u
0.17 20.15 0.12 0.07 	Ruminococcus	0.12 4 0.10 4 0.10 4 0.10 4 0.09 0.09 0.04 0.04 0.01 0.00 0.14 0.00 0.14 0.08 0.06 0.00	Achnospiraceae	0.07 Alloprevotella g 0.06 p=1.3 (g 0.06 p=1.3 (g 0.06 p=1.3 (g 0.06 p=1.3 (g 0.02 p=	-09 -09 -09 -00 -00 -00 -00 -00	irmicutes_other	0.09 Bacteriodetes_uncul. 0.09 p=6.4 e-10 0.06 0.04 0.01 0.00 Healthy UC	40 ²⁰ m ²⁰	• def de	understrington 0.35 0.35 0.35 0.35 0.35 0.00 0		$\begin{array}{c} u^{\mu} \frac{1}{2} \frac$	0.90 Bacteroides_uncul 0.90 0.45 0.00 0.45 0.00 0.45 0.00 0.45 0.00 0.45 0.00 0.45 0.00 0.45 0.00 0.45 0.00 0.45 0.00 0.	2000 2000
0.17 20.15 20.12 0.10 0.07 30.0.02 0.02 0.015 0.02 0.015 0.02 0.07 0.05 0.02 0.05 0.02 0.05	Ruminococcus p=5.6 e-10 Healthy UC irrincutes_uncul p=8.1 e-11 	0.12 4 0.10 4 0.10 4 0.10 4 0.09 0.09 0.04 0.04 0.04 0.00 0.11 0.00 0.11 0.00 0.10 0.08 0.06 0.08 0.06 0.08 0.00 0.09 0.00	Achnospiraceae p=1.2 e-09 Healthy UC Tenericutes_uncut p=1.8 e-09 	0.07 Alloprevotella g0.06 p=1.3 (g0.06 p=1.3 (-09 -09 -09 -00 -00 -00 -00 -00	Healthy UC	0.09 Bacteriodetes_uncul. 0.09 p=6.4 e-10 0.06 0.01 0.00 Healthy UC	40 ²⁰ m ²⁰	• ####################################	understrington 0.35 Escherickie-Shigelle 0.00 0.0		+ d ² ¹ / ₁ ² / ₁	0.90 Bacteroides_uncul 0.90 0.05 0.00 0.05 0	200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200

					_				
а			Rikenellaceae-RC9		b _		I	Escherichia-Shiaella	а
			Alloprevotella					Enterococcus	
			Tenericutes_uncultur	red				Bifidobacterium	1.5
			Firmicutes unculture	ed				Lactobacillus	
			Lachnospiraceae					Streptococcus	-
			Dorea					Dialister	0.5
			Ruminococcus		r			Coprococcus	
			Coprococcus					Ruminococcaceae	0
			Bacteroidetes uncult	ured				Roseburia	-0.5
			Blautia	area				Bacteroides	0.0
			Roseburia	0.6				Lachnospiraceae	-1
			Dialister	0.4				Firmicutes_uncultur	red
			Provotella	0.4				Ruminococcus	
			Ruminococcoco	0.2				Tenericutes_uncult	ured
			Strantosocous	0				Rikenellaceae-RC9	
				0.2				Bacteroidetes_uncu	ultured
				-0.2				Alloprevotella	
			Firmicutes_other	-0.4				Dorea	
			Bifidobacterium	-0.6				Prevotella	
	Healthy	UC			1			Blautia	
								Faecalibacterium	
								Firmicutes_other	

 Newly
 Remission Relapse

