Effect of neonatal administration of *Lactiplantibacillus plantarum* ATCC 202195 on stool iron content and iron status in infants in Dhaka, Bangladesh

Afreen Z. Khan[a, b], Anjan K. Roy[c], Huma Qamar[a], Lisa G. Pell[a], Karen M. O'Callaghan[d], Shafiqul A. Sarker[c], Abdullah A. Mahmud[c,1], Rashidul Haque[c], Sharmin Akter[c], Shamima Sultana[c], Daniel E. Roth[a, b, e,*], Rubhana Raqib[c*].

[a]Centre for Global Child Health and SickKids Research Institute, Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Canada.

[b]Department of Nutritional Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

[c]International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research (icddr,b), Dhaka, Bangladesh.

[d]Department of Nutritional Sciences, King's College London, London, United Kingdom

[e]Department of Paediatrics, Hospital for Sick Children and University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

[1]Current Affiliation: Shield Pharmaceuticals Corp. Ronkonkoma, NY 11779, USA

* Contributed equally as co-senior authors.

Corresponding author: Daniel E. Roth, Department of Paediatrics, The Hospital for Sick Children and University of Toronto, 686 Bay Street, Toronto, ON, M5G 0A4, Canada; 416-813-7654 ext. 328807; daniel.roth@sickkids.ca

List of Abbreviations

AAS	Atomic absorption spectrophotometry
ATCC	American type culture collection
CBL	Clinical Biochemistry Lab
CI	Confidence interval
EBF	Exclusively breastfed/Exclusive breastfeeding
FOS	Fructooligosaccharide
icddr,b	International Centre for Diarrheal Disease Research, Bangladesh
ID	Iron deficiency
IDA	Iron deficiency anemia
IP	Investigational product
INTL	Immunobiology, Nutrition and Toxicology Laboratory (INTL)
LMIC	Low- or middle-income country
LP1	*Lactiplantibacillus plantarum* ATCC 202195 without FOS for 1 day
LP1+FOS	*Lactiplantibacillus plantarum* ATCC 202195 with FOS for 1 day
LP202195	*Lactiplantibacillus plantarum* ATCC 202195

LP7	*Lactiplantibacillus plantarum* ATCC 202195 without FOS for 7 days
LP7+FOS	*Lactiplantibacillus plantarum* ATCC 202195 with FOS for 7 days
MCHTI	Maternal and Child Health Training Institute
MFSTC	Mohammadpur Fertility Services and Training Centre
SD	Standard deviation
SGA	Small for gestational age
WHO	World Health Organization

Abstract

Background: Lactobacillus probiotics may enhance host iron bioavailability, offering a potential strategy to address iron deficiency; however, evidence of such effects in infants is lacking.

Objective: To examine whether neonatal administration of *Lactiplantibacillus plantarum* ATCC 202195 (LP202195), with or without fructooligosaccharide (FOS), reduces stool iron content and improves iron status in young infants in Dhaka, Bangladesh.

Methods: This study was a secondary analysis of a randomized placebo-controlled trial in which infants, 0-4 days of age, were randomly allocated to one of five groups: placebo, 1- or 7-day regimens of LP202195, with or without FOS. Fecal iron was quantified in stool samples collected at 14 days postnatal age (n=307) and serum ferritin concentration was measured at 2 months postnatal age (n= 251). Effects of the 1- and 7-day LP202195 regimens were estimated using linear regression and reported as mean percent differences relative to placebo, with 95% confidence intervals (95%CI).

Results: In the combined analysis irrespective of FOS co-administration, there were no differences in fecal iron concentrations following 1-day (% difference=9.8%, 95%CI: -19%, 49%; P=0.54) or 7-days (% difference= -6.1%, 95%CI: -31%, 28%; P=0.69) of LP202195 administration, relative to placebo (geometric mean concentration=4.3mg Fe/100g dry stool (95%CI:3.3, 5.6); n=53). There were no effects of LP202195 administration on serum ferritin concentration following the 1-day (% difference=2.4%, 95%CI: -22%, 35%; P=0.86) or 7-day (% difference=1%, 95% CI: -23%, 33%; P=0.94) regimen, relative to placebo (geometric mean concentration=189 ng/mL (95%CI: 155, 232); n=55). Inferences were unchanged when intervention groups were disaggregated by FOS co-administration (P>0.05 for all).

Conclusions: LP202195, when administered neonatally as a probiotic alone or synbiotic with FOS for 1 or 7 days, did not affect stool iron (2 weeks of age) or iron status (2 months of age) in Dhaka, Bangladesh.

Clinical Trial Registry: ClinicalTrials.gov identifier: NCT05180201

Keywords: iron; probiotics; *L. plantarum*; microbiota; ferritin; iron deficiency; fecal iron; iron absorption; iron status

30 **Introduction**

31 Iron deficiency (ID) is common during early childhood and can have irreversible adverse effects
32 on neurodevelopment[1, 2]. Daily oral iron supplementation reduces the risk of ID, anemia, and
33 iron deficiency anemia in children aged 4 to 23 months[3]. However, iron stores in term,
34 exclusively breastfed infants are generally assumed to be sufficient until 4 to 6 months of age[4-
35 7]; for this reason, the World Health Organization (WHO) only recommends routine iron
36 supplementation for infants aged 6 months and older in low- and middle-income countries
37 (LMICs) where there is a high prevalence of ID and anemia[8]. WHO also recommends a daily
38 intake of 30-60mg elemental iron along with 0.4mg folic acid in pregnancy, starting soon after
39 conception, for preventing maternal anemia, low birthweight and preterm birth[9]. Yet, many
40 infants in LMICs may be iron deficient at an earlier age (< 6 months) due to the greater risk of
41 preterm birth and low birthweight, which are associated with lower iron stores at birth[10].
42 Additionally, iron absorption is more likely to be impaired in populations living in LMICs due to
43 a higher burden of infection and chronic inflammation[10, 11], thereby contributing to the risk of
44 ID. Since most intestinal bacteria rely on iron for survival and virulence [12], there is competition
45 between intestinal microbes and their human host for iron in the gastrointestinal tract, whereby
46 excess intraluminal iron may promote the proliferation of pathogenic bacteria rather than benefit
47 the host[13].

48 While iron supplementation and fortification strategies have shown benefits in reducing the
49 prevalence of ID and anemia in infants and young children[14], the safety of iron-containing
50 interventions has been questioned in some LMIC settings with high rates of malaria and/or other
51 infections, where clinical trials have linked exogenous iron to an increased risk of serious adverse
52 events including deaths and hospital admissions[15], and bloody diarrhea[16]. Iron interventions

53 may negatively impact the gut microbiota composition by increasing the abundance of potentially
54 pathogenic bacteria and decreasing the abundance of commensal bacteria, which may contribute
55 to intestinal inflammation[13, 17]. Alternative interventions that safely improve iron status are
56 therefore of interest and may have particular applicability in early infancy before the age when
57 routine iron supplementation is recommended.

58 Lactobacilli probiotics are iron-independent and have the potential to improve iron absorption in
59 the human intestine[18-20] through multiple pathways, including alteration of gut microbiota
60 composition, decreased intestinal pH, and the production of metabolites that promote iron
61 solubility[18]. The co-administration of iron and lactobacilli-containing probiotic regimens has
62 been shown to improve iron absorption in animal models[21] and in human females of
63 reproductive age[18, 22, 23], but such benefits have not been observed to date in pediatric
64 populations[24, 25]. Little is known about the effect of probiotic administration alone on
65 gastrointestinal iron absorption without co-administration of an exogenous iron source, and no
66 studies have explored the effect of probiotic administration in early infancy on iron status or
67 markers of iron absorption or excretion.

68 Here, we conducted a nested sub-study within a randomized placebo-controlled clinical trial of
69 *Lactiplantibacillus plantarum* ATCC 202195 (LP202195), hereafter referred to as the SEPSiS LP
70 trial, to examine if LP202195 with and/or without fructooligosaccharide (FOS), for 1- or 7-days,
71 affects stool iron content at 14 days postnatal age and serum ferritin at 60-days postnatal age in
72 young infants in Dhaka, Bangladesh[26].

73 In the context of an RCT, whereby average prenatal endowment of iron stores and postnatal iron
74 intake are assumed to be similar across the intervention groups, we expected that a relatively lower

75 stool iron content in infants in the intervention group compared to placebo would indicate reduced
76 intraluminal excess iron and lower stool iron losses, thereby serving as an indirect indicator of
77 greater fractional iron absorption. We further anticipated that an increase in iron absorption
78 following LP intervention would manifest as a greater mean ferritin concentration in the
79 intervention group relative to placebo at 2 months of age.

80 **Methods**

81 Study design and participants

82 This study was nested within a randomized, placebo-controlled trial involving neonatal oral
83 administration of LP202195, with or without FOS, for 1- or 7-days (ClinicalTrials.gov ID:
84 NCT05180201). Recruitment, eligibility screening, and enrollment into the SEPSiS LP trial has
85 been previously described[26]. In brief, infants were recruited, screened, and enrolled at two
86 government hospitals in Dhaka, Bangladesh: Maternal and Child Health Training Institute
87 (MCHTI) and Mohammadpur Fertility Services and Training Centre (MFSTC). Participants were
88 randomly assigned to one of five intervention groups: placebo; LP202195 without FOS for 1 day
89 (LP1); LP202195 with FOS for 1 day (LP1+FOS); LP202195 without FOS for 7 days (LP7); or
90 LP202195 with FOS for 7 days (LP7+FOS). Infants were eligible to participate in the primary trial
91 if they were: delivered in MCHTI or MFSTC; 0 to 4 days of age (day of birth was defined as day
92 0); weighed ≥1500g at birth; orally feeding at the time of eligibility assessment; and, their caregiver
93 intended to reside within the study catchment area until the infant was ≥60 days postnatal age. To
94 be eligible for inclusion in this nested sub-study, SEPSiS LP trial participants (infants) were
95 required to have a stored stool sample aliquot collected at 14 days postnatal age timepoint and/or
96 a stored blood sample aliquot collected at the scheduled 60-day visit. Stool iron was quantified in

97 samples collected from the first 307 infants enrolled in the SEPSiS LP trial for whom at least 2g
98 of a day 14 stool sample was available.

99 Intervention

100 Active investigational product (IP) vials consisted of either 10^9 colony forming units of LP202195
101 with 150 mg FOS and 100 mg of maltodextrin (synbiotic regimen), or 10^9 colony forming units of
102 LP202195 and 250 mg of maltodextrin only (probiotic regimen). Placebo-containing IP vials
103 contained 250 mg of maltodextrin. IPs were preferentially reconstituted in 3mL of human milk
104 (hand-expressed from mother); alternatively, 3mL of sterile water or a mixture of water and human
105 milk (total 3 mL) were also permitted. IP was orally administered to infants by study personnel
106 and efforts were made to administer the IP once per day for seven consecutive days up to a
107 maximum of seven doses per participant between 0-21 days of age[26].

108 Data and specimen collection

109 All data were collected in the SEPSIS LP trial during hospital/clinic and home visits, via
110 standard data collection forms and clinical measurements, using an electronic data capture
111 system[26]. Study personnel used standard questionnaires at enrollment and/or hospital records
112 to collect information related to maternal age at delivery, gestational age at delivery, mode of
113 delivery, gravidity, birthweight, infant sex, maternal education, maternal occupation, enrollment
114 site and asset index. Breastfeeding status was defined using feeding-related data collected at
115 study visits up to 14 days of age. Asset index of the participants was based on infants enrolled in
116 both the SEPSiS LP trial (including infants in this sub-study) as well as a linked observational
117 cohort.

118

119 In the SEPSiS LP trial, infant stool samples were routinely collected at enrollment (postnatal days
120 0-4) and on postnatal days 4, 5 or 7 (randomly assigned), 10, 14, 21, 28, 42, 60, 90, and 180
121 (rescheduled when necessary)[26]. The 14-day postnatal age sample was selected for stool iron
122 assessment as it was expected that most infants would have completed the probiotic/synbiotic or
123 control intervention regimen prior to this age. The 14-day postnatal age sample could be collected
124 up to a maximum age of postnatal day 20. All stool samples were collected by trained study
125 personnel from a sanitized plastic sheet where they were homogenized, aliquoted, placed in the
126 vapour phase of liquid nitrogen within 20 minutes of defecation, and transported to the
127 International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh (icddr,b) for storage at ≤-70C
128 until analysis.

129 Venous blood samples were collected at the day 60 visit (or if necessary, rescheduled to a later
130 date up to day 180 of age), and processed at MCHTI or MFSTC as described previously[26], and
131 processed to extract serum before transfer to icddr,b for storage at <-70C until analysis.

132 Laboratory analysis

133 Fecal iron content was measured using an atomic absorption spectrometry (AAS) assay with the
134 Flame method that was optimized and validated in the Immunobiology, Nutrition and Toxicology
135 Laboratory (INTL) at icddr,b. Infant stool samples used for optimization and validation were
136 collected as part of an observational cohort study (ClinicalTrials.gov ID: NCT04012190) that was
137 conducted within the same catchment area as the SEPSiS LP trial. Details on the optimization and

138 validation of the assay, its performance characteristics, and the methods and results of pilot testing
139 are provided in the supplemental materials (**Tables S1-S5, Figure S1**).

140 Frozen serum samples were thawed at room temperature, homogenized, divided into 1 to 2g
141 aliquots, and then lyophilized in a freeze dryer (VirTis Freezemobile 12XL, Virtis Co, NY, USA)
142 for 2-3 days. The weight of the lyophilized stool sample was measured daily, until a consistent
143 weight (up to 2 decimal places) was obtained, indicating that all water had been removed from the
144 sample. Finally, samples were ashed in a muffle furnace under the following conditions: 100°C
145 for 1 hour, 200°C for 1 hour, 500°C for 2 hours and 600°C for 2 hours. The ashing procedure was
146 repeated every day for up to 3 days. Ashing was considered complete when the sample was entirely
147 white in colour, without the presence of any black residue. Ashed samples, alongside the
148 appropriate controls (rice flour and pooled stool samples as described in Supplementary Material)
149 were reconstituted in 2mL of 0.2N hydrochloric acid immediately prior to iron quantification using
150 the AAS-7000 Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer (Shimadzu, Maryland, USA), equipped
151 with a flame (air-acetylene flame), furnace and dual-background correction function. An iron-
152 specific hollow cathode lamp was used as the light source. Absorbances were measured at a
153 wavelength of 248.3nm. Iron concentrations were determined using a standard curve prepared
154 from five dilutions of an iron stock solution ranging from 0.1 to 4.0mg/L. For absorbances below
155 the lower limit of quantification (LLOQ) of 2mg/L, values were imputed at one half the LLOQ.

156 Serum ferritin was quantified using an automated chemiluminescence assay kits (007P65030,
157 Abbott) on an Abbott Alinity I analyzer, in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. The
158 between-and within-assay CVs were 5.82% and 2.78%, respectively, with a reportable range of
159 1.98 – 167.56ng/ml and an LLOQ of 1.98ng/ml.

160 Statistical analysis

161 The distributions of variables across trial arms were visualized using histograms, k-density plots,
162 and boxplots, as appropriate. Continuous normally and non-normally distributed variables were
163 summarized using means (with standard deviations, SD) or medians (with 25th and 75th
164 percentiles), respectively. Categorical variables were described as the frequencies and proportions
165 in each category. Study outcomes (i.e., stool iron and serum ferritin) were natural log-transformed
166 to approximate a normal distribution for analyses, and average biomarker concentrations in each
167 of the placebo and intervention groups were expressed as geometric means with 95% confidence
168 intervals (CI).

169 Primary analyses were conducted using an intention-to-treat (ITT) approach, whereby participants
170 who received the LP1 or LP1+FOS intervention were combined to create a single LP1 intervention
171 group. Similarly, participants who received LP7 or LP7+FOS were combined to create a single
172 LP7 intervention group. To examine the effect of probiotic administration (as 1- or 7-day
173 regimens) on stool iron content and iron status, unadjusted linear regression models were fitted
174 using intervention groups as the categorical exposure variable and the ln-transformed biomarker
175 of interest as the continuous outcome measure. Effect estimates were back-transformed and
176 reported as mean percent differences and 95%CIs for each intervention group relative to placebo.
177 In further analyses, the combined intervention groups (1- or 7-day regimens) were disaggregated
178 to examine the effect of each probiotic regimen (i.e., with or without FOS) relative to placebo,
179 using the same modeling approach as in the primary analyses.

180 In supplementary analyses, we conducted subgroup analyses stratified by selected infant
181 characteristics (sex, breastfeeding pattern up to 14 days of age, mode of delivery, and birthweight).

182 We further examined these selected infant characteristics as effect-modifiers of the intervention
183 effect on the primary outcome (stool iron concentration) by introducing interactions of the
184 hypothesized modifiers with intervention group in the linear regression model. For this analysis,
185 breastfeeding pattern up to 14 days postnatal age was dichotomized as exclusively breastfed (EBF)
186 and not EBF, as most infants during the first 2 weeks after delivery received only human milk,
187 resulting in a very small sample size in the other feeding-related sub-groups (e.g., partially,
188 predominantly, or not breastfed) (see Supplementary Material).

189 In a further supplementary analysis, separate unadjusted linear regression models were used to
190 examine associations between the primary outcome (stool iron concentration) and each of the
191 following covariates of interest: infant sex, breastfeeding pattern up to 14 days of age, mode of
192 delivery and birthweight. The purpose of this exploratory analysis was to examine if the outcome
193 measure captured meaningful between-infant variation in stool iron content (as also discussed in
194 relation to the assay pilot testing described in the Supplementary Material).

195 **Results**

196 Among 519 infants enrolled in the SEPSiS LP trial, 395 (76%) infants were included in this sub-
197 study: 145 infants had only a day-14 stool sample, 88 infants had only a day-60 serum sample
198 (actual sample collection ranged from day 60 to 194, whereby ~91% of samples were collected by
199 3 months of age) and 162 infants had both a day-14 stool sample and a day-60 serum sample
200 (**Figure 1**). Therefore, in total, 307 participants contributed a stool iron measurement and 251
201 participants contributed a serum ferritin measurement (**Figure 1**). Baseline characteristics were
202 generally similar across the intervention groups (**Table 1**). No infants had a diarrheal event during
203 the IP administration period and no infants were reported to have received any iron supplements
204 during the first two weeks postnatal age.

205 **Table 1. Participant characteristics, by intervention group (n=307)[1]**

Characteristics	Placebo (n= 53)	LP1 (n= 132)	LP7 (n= 122)
Maternal age at delivery (years), median (25th, 75th)	23 (21, 27)	23 (20, 27)	23 (20, 28)
Gestational age at delivery (weeks), median (25th, 75th)[2]	40 (38, 41)	39 (38, 40)	39 (38, 40)
Mode of delivery, n (%)			
Vaginal	29 (55)	62 (47)	59 (48)
C-section	24 (45)	70 (53)	63 (52)
Gravidity (n), median (25th, 75th)	2 (1, 3)	2 (1, 3)	2 (1, 2)
Birthweight (g), mean ± SD	2930 ± 338	2927 ± 374	2894 ± 344
Infant sex, n (%)			
Male	28 (53)	80 (61)	57 (47)
Female	25 (47)	52 (39)	65 (53)
Breastfeeding status up to age 14 days, n (%)[3]			
EBF	30 (57)	97 (73)	99 (81)
Predominant BF	15 (28)	21 (16)	15 (12)
Partial BF	7 (13)	14 (11)	7 (5.7)
No BF	1 (1.9)	0 (0)	1 (0.82)
Maternal education			
None	2 (3.8)	5 (3.8)	10 (8.2)
Primary incomplete	7 (13)	27 (20)	16 (13)
Primary complete	3 (5.7)	15 (11)	12 (9.8)
Secondary incomplete	23 (43)	36 (27)	38 (31)
Secondary complete or higher	18 (34)	49 (37)	46 (38)
Maternal occupation			
Work inside home	50 (94)	123 (93)	116 (95)
Work outside home	3 (5.7)	9 (6.8)	6 (4.9)
Enrollment site			
MCHTI	15 (28)	39 (30)	39 (32)
MFSTC	38 (72)	93 (70)	83 (68)
Asset index quintile, n (%)			
1 (lowest)	13 (25)	29 (22)	24 (20)
2	12 (23)	27 (20)	23 (19)
3	8 (15)	33 (25)	32 (26)
4	8 (15)	24 (18)	21 (17)
5 (highest)	12 (23)	19 (14)	22 (18)

[1] Only infants who contributed stool iron content data (n=307), the study primary outcome, are reflected in this table.
[2] Due to missing gestational age data, n=51, n=131, and n=120 in placebo, LP1 and LP7 groups, respectively.
[3] Breastfeeding pattern was derived using the infant's breastfeeding status up to and including the 14-day stool collection visit, which may have occurred up to 21 days of age.

SD, Standard Deviation; EBF, Exclusively breastfed; BF, Breastfed; MCHTI, Maternal Child Health Training Institute; MFSTC, Mohammadpur Fertility Services and Training Centre

206 Among 307 participants with a fecal iron measurement in a day-14 stool sample (range: 0.1 to 95.6
207 mg Fe/100g dry stool), there was no effect of the 1- or 7-day regimens of LP202195 compared to
208 the placebo group on fecal iron content (**Table 2**). Among 251 participants with serum ferritin
209 measured in a day-60 serum sample (range: 9.6 to 1219 ng/ml), there was no effect of 1- or 7-day
210 regimens of LP202195 on serum ferritin concentrations at 2 months of age (Table 2). Inferences
211 were unchanged in disaggregated analysis of groups based on FOS co-administration (i.e., with or
212 without FOS), such that there were no effects of the intervention on either day-14 stool iron or
213 day-60 serum ferritin concentrations in any intervention group compared to placebo (**Table S6**).
214

Table 2. Effect of 1- and 7-day regimens of LP202195 (with and without FOS) on stool iron and serum ferritin concentrations[1]

	Placebo		**1-Day Intervention**			**7-Day Intervention**		
	n	Geometric Mean (95% CI)	n	% Difference (95% CI)	*p*	n	% Difference (95% CI)	*p*
Stool Iron Concentration at 14 days of age (mg Fe/100g dry stool)	53	4.3 (3.3, 5.6)	132	9.8 (-19, 49)	0.54	122	-6.1 (-31, 28)	0.69
Serum Ferritin Concentration at 60 days of age (ng/mL)	55	189 (155, 232)	99	2.4 (-22, 35)	0.86	97	1 (-23, 33)	0.94

[1] Effect estimates are reported as % mean differences (with 95% CI) relative to placebo, estimated using linear regression models with intervention group as the categorial exposure variable.

215 There was no significant modification of the effects of the 1- or 7-day regimen of LP202195, with
216 and without FOS, on infant stool iron concentration at 14 days postnatal age, in analyses in

217 subgroups of participants stratified by sex, breastfeeding status, mode of delivery, and birthweight,

218 and none of these factors significantly modified the intervention effect (**Table 3**).

219 **Table 3. Effect of LP202195, with and without FOS, for 1- or 7-days, relative to placebo, on**
220 **infant stool iron concentration at 14-days, by sex, breastfeeding status, mode of delivery or**
221 **birthweight strata[1]**

	Placebo		**1- Day Intervention Group**			**7-Day Intervention Group**		
	n	Geometric Mean (95% CI)	n	% Difference (95% CI)	p^2	n	% Difference (95% CI)	p^2
Sex								
Male	28	3.8 (2.8, 5.3)	80	25 (-16, 86)	0.37	57	14 (-25, 73)	0.21
Female	25	4.8 (3.1, 7.5)	52	-5.6 (-41, 52)		65	-23 (-51, 22)	
Breastfeeding status								
EBF	30	4.3 (3.2, 5.8)	97	-6.5 (-33, 31)	0.06	99	-6.7 (-34, 31)	0.95
Not EBF	23	4.3 (2.6, 6.9)	35	71 (-10, 223)		23	-4.8 (-53, 92)	
Mode of delivery								
Vaginal	29	3.9 (2.9, 5.1)	62	7.4 (-31, 67)	0.98	59	-3.2 (-38, 51)	0.78
C-Section	24	4.8 (3, 7.9)	70	8.3 (-29, 65)		63	-11 (-42, 36)	
Birthweight[3]								
Normal birthweight	49	4.1 (3.1, 5.5)	114	15 (-16, 57)	0.36	103	-4.5 (-31, 32)	0.55
Low birthweight	4	6.3 (3.6, 11)	18	-31 (-78, 123)		19	-31 (-78, 121)	

[1]Effect estimates were calculated from linear regression models, with placebo as the reference group.
[2]Point estimates and 95% CIs are from separate regression models for each subgroup of a covariate.
[3]P-values were from a single model for each covariate, used to test the interaction effect, whereby males, EBF, vaginal delivery and normal birthweight (≥2500g) were reference groups. P<0.05 was considered a statistically significant interaction effect.
[3]Normal birthweight was defined as a weight of ≥2500g measured at birth, and low birthweight was defined as a weight of <2500g measured at birth.
EBF, Exclusively breastfed

222 In supplementary analyses, stool iron concentrations were significantly lower among infants who
223 were exclusively breastfed compared to those who were not, but stool iron concentrations did not
224 vary significantly by sex, mode of delivery, or birthweight in unadjusted analyses (**Table 4**).

Table 4. Associations of perinatal factors with stool iron concentration at 14 days of age

Factor	N_A;N_B[1]	% Difference (95% CI)	*p*
Male (vs Female)	165;142	6.8 (-14, 32)	0.55
EBF (vs not EBF)	226;81	-23 (-40, -2.7)	0.03
Vaginal delivery (vs C-section)	150;157	-18 (-34, 1.4)	0.066
Normal birthweight (vs low birthweight)	266;41	-3.8 (-30, 32)	0.81

[1]N_A: sample size in primary sub-group; N_B: sample size in the reference subgroup (identified in parentheses in column to the left)

EBF, Exclusively breastfed

Given the negative association between EBF and stool iron content, and acknowledging that EBF was not evenly distributed across the intervention groups, we conducted a covariate-adjusted model for the primary outcome with adjustment for EBF status at 14 days of age; this post-hoc analysis did not change the primary inferences such that there was no effect of the intervention on fecal iron following 1 day (% difference=15%, 95%CI: -15%, 56%; *P*=0.37) or 7 days (% difference=0.22%, 95%CI: -27%, 37%; *P*=0.99) of probiotic and/or synbiotic administration.

225 **Discussion**

226 The administration of lactobacilli-containing probiotics represents a potential strategy for
227 mitigating risk of iron deficiency by increasing iron absorption[18-20]. If proven effective,
228 probiotic supplementation may offer an attractive strategy for prevention of iron deficiency in
229 high-risk settings in infants below 6 months of age, when risk of iron deficiency is high but routine
230 iron supplementation is not yet recommended. However, in this study among infants in Dhaka,
231 Bangladesh, we did not find an effect of LP202195, when administered with and/or without FOS
232 for 1- or 7-days, on stool iron concentration at 14 days or serum ferritin at 60 days postnatal age.

233 The LP202195 probiotic strain used in the present nested sub-study was selected based on the
234 findings of Panigrahi *et al*., which demonstrated that this strain reduced the risk of neonatal sepsis
235 in India[27]. However, effects of probiotics are species- and strain-specific[28]. To date, most
236 evidence in support of the role of probiotics in improving iron absorption has stemmed from
237 research using *L. plantarum* strain 299v, for which potential mechanisms of action include
238 alteration of intestinal microbiota composition, lowering of intestinal pH and production of
239 metabolites that increase iron solubility[18, 20]. It is possible that the LP202195 strain does not
240 substantially affect iron absorption, whereas findings may have differed with use of alternative
241 strains (such as 299v). It is also plausible that a longer duration of probiotic administration is
242 necessary to produce measurable effects on iron status, or that the iron absorption-promoting
243 effects of LP202195 are only realized if it is co-administered with an exogenous iron source, as
244 has been demonstrated in other studies[18, 20]. Hence, the null intervention effect shown in the
245 present study may be because the effect was negligible during the early postnatal period when
246 infants primarily consume human milk and their iron status is largely determined by prenatal
247 maternal-fetal transfer. However, two pediatric studies of lactobacilli, conducted in comparatively

248 older children, did not show improvements in iron status in the probiotic group, even when co-
249 administered with iron: among a population of pre-school children in Brazil with a high prevalence
250 of anemia, serum ferritin decreased in response to an iron fortified fermented beverage
251 supplemented with *Lactobacillus acidophilus* but increased in the control group without the
252 probiotic [24]; and, in predominantly iron sufficient 8-14 months old Thai children, there was no
253 effect on fractional iron absorption in response to single serving of an iron-fortified follow-up
254 formula with a synbiotic (*Limosilactobacillus reuteri* and galactooligosaccharide)[25].Our
255 findings alongside these two aforementioned studies, suggest a lack of benefit of lactobacilli-
256 containing probiotics on iron uptake in young children. However, overall interpretation of the
257 effect of probiotic/synbiotic administration on iron uptake and status in this age group is limited
258 by heterogeneity in study designs, probiotic/synbiotic strains, outcome measurements and iron
259 status prior to intervention.

260 To assess unabsorbed intestinal iron to which gut microbiota are exposed, we measured fecal iron
261 concentration using AAS. However, the literature is limited in terms of the most appropriate
262 analytical methods to measure stool iron, particularly in pediatric cohorts where small stool sample
263 volumes may fail to meet assay requirements[29]. Due to a paucity of stool iron data from pediatric
264 populations, meaningful detection limits are also unavailable[29]. In preparation for this study, we
265 optimized and validated a stool iron measurement assay suitable for samples collected from young
266 infants. Our observed mean and range of stool iron concentration at 14 days postnatal age (4.3 mg
267 Fe/100g dry stool, range of 0.1 to 95.6mg Fe/100g dry stool) was consistent with results previously
268 reported for infants close to the age of our sample population in Chile and England[30, 31]. For
269 example, Pizarro *et al*. reported that infants 3 to 15 months old in Chile had stool iron levels of
270 8.9mg Fe/100g stool when fed non-iron fortified formula and 27mg Fe/100g stool when iron-

271 fortified formula was consumed[30]. Similarly, newborn infants aged 7 to 10 days in England who
272 received iron-fortified formula had an average stool iron concentration of 9.2mg Fe/100g
273 stool[31]. Numerous factors are known to affect stool iron concentration including diet, intestinal
274 microbiota, inflammation, and intestinal sloughing and bleeding[18, 32], which may explain the
275 wide range of stool iron concentrations among infants in the present study. Stool iron
276 concentrations were significantly lower among infants who were EBF (74%) within the first 14
277 days compared to those who were not EBF (26%); this finding is likely explained by the iron
278 present in fortified infant formula, which is at higher concentrations but less bioavailable than the
279 iron in human milk[5]. When interaction effects were tested, none of the factors included in the
280 analysis, including breastfeeding status, significantly modified the intervention effect, although
281 we recognize the small sample size of the non-EBF group was a major limitation of the subgroup
282 analyses. Nonetheless, the negative association between breastfeeding status and stool iron was in
283 the direction expected, thereby supporting robustness of the outcome measure. It is hence unlikely
284 that the effect of the intervention was biased to the null due to inadequate precision of the outcome
285 measure.

286 We also measured serum ferritin at ~2 months of age, whereby the mean serum ferritin
287 concentration was 191ng/ml with a range of 9.6 to 1219ng/ml, consistent with the expected range
288 for term-born infants of 8-112ng/ml and 6-880ng/ml as reported by Larsson *et al*. in cord blood
289 and 4-month old infants respectively[33, 34]. Although fetal iron endowment primarily determines
290 iron stores in early infancy, iron absorption is tightly regulated. Human milk has low
291 concentrations yet highly bioavailable dietary iron, but when iron stores are sufficient (reflected
292 by high ferritin), absorption is downregulated[1], limiting the potential for early probiotic
293 interventions to meaningfully affect iron status.

294 There were several limitations of this study. First, the day-14 timepoint was selected for primary
295 stool iron content analyses as most infants were expected to have completed the 7-day IP regimen
296 by 14-days postnatal. However, the low but highly bioavailable iron content of human milk, as
297 discussed above, likely contributed to the overall low stool iron levels observed, limiting our
298 ability to detect an effect at such an early age. Data on maternal iron supplementation, maternal
299 iron status, and cord blood ferritin concentration were not available but may have influenced infant
300 iron stores; however, given the randomized design of the study, these factors are expected to have
301 been evenly distributed across intervention groups and therefore we do not expect variation in
302 baseline iron stores to have biased results of the primary analysis. As a nested sub-study within a
303 trial that was not designed to examine stool iron and status, the resources available to analyze stool
304 samples were limited to one stool sample per infant; we were therefore unable to assess stool iron
305 trajectories over time. Finally, the low sample size limited the inferences in sub-group analyses.

306 In conclusion, LP202195 when administered as either a probiotic or synbiotic regimen did not
307 affect early measures of stool iron (2 weeks of age) or iron status (2 months of age). Other probiotic
308 strains, initiation at an older age and/or longer duration of probiotic administration, or
309 combinations of probiotics/synbiotics with supplemental iron, warrant further investigation.
310

Acknowledgements

This study was conducted as AZK's doctoral research and therefore was reported in the PhD thesis. AZK and DER conceptualized the study; AZK, DER, RR, and AKR designed the study; RR, AKR and SA conducted laboratory analyses; AZK and HQ performed statistical analyses; AZK and LGP wrote the first draft of the paper; AZK, AKR, HQ, LGP, KMOC, SAS, AAM, RH, SA, SS, DER and RR edited and reviewed the paper. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

Investigational products were provided by International Flavors & Fragrances Inc. (IFF), but the company was not involved in the study design, implementation, data analysis, manuscript preparation, or publication decision. The authors are thankful to all SEPSiS project investigators and staff for their contributions to the design and implementation of the LP trial.

Ethical Approval

This study was a sub-study of a randomized, placebo-controlled trial involving neonatal oral administration of LP202195, with or without FOS, for 1- or 7-days, which was approved by the ethical review committees at icddr,b (ERC protocol no. PR-20139), the Bangladesh Institute of Child Health, Dhaka Shishu Hospital, the ethical governing body for the Child Health Research Foundation (ERC protocol no. BICH-ERC-02-02-2019), the Directorate General of Drug Administration (DGDA), Bangladesh (DGDA/CTP-04/2016/672), and the Research Ethics Board at The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Canada (REB no. 1000072200). Additionally, ethical approval was also obtained for this sub-study from the ethical review committees at

icddr,b (ERC protocol no. PR-21099), and the Research Ethics Board at The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Canada (REB no. 1000078635).

Data Availability

De-identified data, code files, and all additional information required to reanalyze the data presented in this manuscript have been deposited at Borealis, The Canadian Dataverse Repository and will be made publicly available as of the date of publication. https://doi.org/10.5683/SP3/RJUT53

Sources of support

This work was supported by The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (INV-007389 and GR-02268). The funders had no role in the design or implementation of the study, or the analyses, interpretation of findings, and the decision to publish the results.

Author Disclosures

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

References

347 [1] Burke RM, Leon JS, Suchdev PS. Identification, prevention and treatment of iron
348 deficiency during the first 1000 days. Nutrients. 2014;6(10):4093-114.

349 [2] Beard JL. Why iron deficiency is important in infant development. J Nutr.
350 2008;138(12):2534-6.

351 [3] Pasricha SR, Hayes E, Kalumba K, Biggs BA. Effect of daily iron supplementation on
352 health in children aged 4-23 months: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised
353 controlled trials. Lancet Glob Health. 2013;1(2):e77-e86.

354 [4] McCarthy EK, Ni Chaoimh C, Hourihane JO, Kenny LC, Irvine AD, Murray DM, et al.
355 Iron intakes and status of 2-year-old children in the Cork BASELINE Birth Cohort Study.
356 Matern Child Nutr. 2017;13(3).

357 [5] Dorea JG. Iron and copper in human milk. Nutrition. 2000;16(3):209-20.

358 [6] Baker RD, Greer FR, Committee on Nutrition American Academy of P. Diagnosis and
359 prevention of iron deficiency and iron-deficiency anemia in infants and young children (0-3
360 years of age). Pediatrics. 2010;126(5):1040-50.

361 [7] Maguire JL, Salehi L, Birken CS, Carsley S, Mamdani M, Thorpe KE, et al. Association
362 between total duration of breastfeeding and iron deficiency. Pediatrics. 2013;131(5):e1530-7.

363 [8] World Health Organization. Guideline: Daily iron supplementation in infants and
364 children. Geneva: World Health Organization. 2016.
365 https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241549523.

366 [9] WHO. Guideline: Daily iron and folic acid supplementation in pregnant women. Geneva,
367 World Health Organization, . 2012.

368 [10] Balarajan Y, Ramakrishnan U, Ozaltin E, Shankar AH, Subramanian SV. Anaemia in
369 low-income and middle-income countries. Lancet (London, England). 2011;378(9809):2123-35.

370 [11] Armitage AE, Moretti D. The Importance of Iron Status for Young Children in Low- and
371 Middle-Income Countries: A Narrative Review. Pharmaceuticals (Basel). 2019;12(2).

372 [12] Litwin CM, Calderwood SB. Role of iron in regulation of virulence genes. Clin
373 Microbiol Rev. 1993;6(2):137-49.

374 [13] Jaeggi T, Kortman GA, Moretti D, Chassard C, Holding P, Dostal A, et al. Iron
375 fortification adversely affects the gut microbiome, increases pathogen abundance and induces
376 intestinal inflammation in Kenyan infants. Gut. 2015;64(5):731-42.

[14] Low M, Farrell A, Biggs BA, Pasricha SR. Effects of daily iron supplementation in primary-school-aged children: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Cmaj. 2013;185(17):E791-802.

[15] Sazawal S, Black RE, Ramsan M, Chwaya HM, Stoltzfus RJ, Dutta A, et al. Effects of routine prophylactic supplementation with iron and folic acid on admission to hospital and mortality in preschool children in a high malaria transmission setting: community-based, randomised, placebo-controlled trial. Lancet. 2006;367(9505):133-43.

[16] Soofi S, Cousens S, Iqbal SP, Akhund T, Khan J, Ahmed I, et al. Effect of provision of daily zinc and iron with several micronutrients on growth and morbidity among young children in Pakistan: a cluster-randomised trial. Lancet. 2013;382(9886):29-40.

[17] Zimmermann MB, Chassard C, Rohner F, N'Goran E K, Nindjin C, Dostal A, et al. The effects of iron fortification on the gut microbiota in African children: a randomized controlled trial in Cote d'Ivoire. Am J Clin Nutr. 2010;92(6):1406-15.

[18] Vonderheid SC, Tussing-Humphreys L, Park C, Pauls H, OjiNjideka Hemphill N, LaBomascus B, et al. A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis on the Effects of Probiotic Species on Iron Absorption and Iron Status. Nutrients. 2019;11(12).

[19] Rusu IG, Suharoschi R, Vodnar DC, Pop CR, Socaci SA, Vulturar R, et al. Iron Supplementation Influence on the Gut Microbiota and Probiotic Intake Effect in Iron Deficiency-A Literature-Based Review. Nutrients. 2020;12(7).

[20] Zakrzewska Z, Zawartka A, Schab M, Martyniak A, Skoczeń S, Tomasik PJ, et al. Prebiotics, Probiotics, and Postbiotics in the Prevention and Treatment of Anemia. Microorganisms. 2022;10(7).

[21] Skrypnik K, Bogdanski P, Schmidt M, Suliburska J. The Effect of Multispecies Probiotic Supplementation on Iron Status in Rats. Biol Trace Elem Res. 2019;192(2):234-43.

[22] Hoppe M, Onning G, Berggren A, Hulthen L. Probiotic strain Lactobacillus plantarum 299v increases iron absorption from an iron-supplemented fruit drink: a double-isotope cross-over single-blind study in women of reproductive age. Br J Nutr. 2015;114(8):1195-202.

[23] Hoppe M, Onning G, Hulthen L. Freeze-dried Lactobacillus plantarum 299v increases iron absorption in young females-Double isotope sequential single-blind studies in menstruating women. PLoS One. 2017;12(12):e0189141.

[24] Silva MR, Dias G, Ferreira CL, Franceschini SC, Costa NM. Growth of preschool children was improved when fed an iron-fortified fermented milk beverage supplemented with Lactobacillus acidophilus. Nutr Res. 2008;28(4):226-32.

[25] Scheuchzer P, Sinawat S, Donzé AS, Zeder C, Sabatier M, Garcia-Garcera M, et al. Iron Absorption from an Iron-Fortified Follow-Up Formula with and without the Addition of a Synbiotic or a Human-Identical Milk Oligosaccharide: A Randomized Crossover Stable Isotope Study in Young Thai Children. J Nutr. 2024;154(10):2988-98.

[26] Pell Lisa G, Qamar H, Bassani Diego G, Heasley C, Funk C, Chen C-Y, et al. Neonatal administration of Lactiplantibacillus plantarum ATCC 202195 with or without fructooligosaccharide in Bangladesh: a placebo-controlled randomized trial. mSphere. 2025;0(0):e01032-24.

[27] Panigrahi P, Parida S, Nanda NC, Satpathy R, Pradhan L, Chandel DS, et al. A randomized synbiotic trial to prevent sepsis among infants in rural India. Nature. 2017;548(7668):407-12.

[28] Hill C, Guarner F, Reid G, Gibson GR, Merenstein DJ, Pot B, et al. Expert consensus document. The International Scientific Association for Probiotics and Prebiotics consensus statement on the scope and appropriate use of the term probiotic. Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2014;11(8):506-14.

[29] Khan AZ, Badar S, O'Callaghan KM, Zlotkin S, Roth DE. Fecal Iron Measurement in Studies of the Human Intestinal Microbiome. Curr Dev Nutr. 2022;6(10):nzac143.

[30] Pizarro F, Amar M, Stekel A. Determination of iron in stools as a method to monitor consumption of iron-fortified products in infants. Am J Clin Nutr. 1987;45(2):484-7.

[31] Fairweather-Tait SJ, Balmer SE, Scott PH, Minski MJ. Lactoferrin and iron absorption in newborn infants. Pediatr Res. 1987;22(6):651-4.

[32] Yilmaz B, Li H. Gut Microbiota and Iron: The Crucial Actors in Health and Disease. Pharmaceuticals (Basel). 2018;11(4).

[33] Larsson SM, Hillarp A, Hellström-Westas L, Domellöf M, Lundahl T, Andersson O. When age really matters; ferritin reference intervals during infancy revisited. Scandinavian Journal of Clinical and Laboratory Investigation. 2019;79(8):590-4.

[34] Gallahan S, Brower S, Wapshott-Stehli H, Santos J, Ho TTB. A Systematic Review of Isotopically Measured Iron Absorption in Infants and Children Under 2 Years. Nutrients. 2024;16(22).