Gut microbiome diversity measures for metabolic conditions: a systematic scoping review

Chatpol Samuthpongton¹, Tanawin Nopsopon² & Krit Pongpirul^{2,3,4}

¹Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

²Department of Preventive and Social Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

³Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA

⁴Bumrungrad International Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand

Correspondence to

Dr Krit Pongpirul, Department of Preventive and Social Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok 10330, Thailand; doctorkrit@gmail.com

Words: 2,733 words, Abstract 237 words, 2 figures, 2 tables

ORCID

Chatpol Samuthpongton <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4135-3617>

Tanawin Nopsopon <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0428-973X>

Krit Pongpirul <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3818-9761>

ABSTRACT

Objective Evidence on the association between the gut microbiome and metabolic conditions has been increasing during the past decades. Unlike the straightforward identification of beneficial non-pathogenic bacteria as a potential probiotic for clinical use, the analysis of gut microbiome diversity is more complex and required a better understanding of various measures. We aim to summarize an elaborated list of gut microbiome diversity measures.

Design Systematic search was conducted in three databases: PubMed, Embase, and Cochrane Central Register of Clinical Trials for randomized controlled trials, quasi-experimental and observational studies for the relationship between gut microbiota and metabolic diseases published in 2019 with the English language.

Results The measurement methods of alpha diversity and beta diversity were explored. Of 5929 potential studies, 47 were included in the systematic review (14632 patients). Of 13 alpha diversity measures, the Shannon index was the most commonly used in 37 studies (78.7%), followed by Chao1 index (19 studies), Operational Taxonomic Unit (OTU) richness (15 studies), Simpson index (13 studies), and Abundance-based Coverage Estimators (ACE) index (10 studies). Of 2 beta diversity measures, the UniFrac was the most commonly used in 24 studies (unweighted 17 studies and weighted 16 studies), followed by Bray-Curtis dissimilarity (16 studies).

Conclusion Various measurement of gut microbiome diversity have been used in the literature. All measurements have unique characteristics, advantages, and disadvantages which lead to different usage frequency. The measures were chosen considering cost, simplicity, and types of research.

Keywords: gut microbiome; gut microbiome diversity; microbiome diversity measures; metabolic conditions; systematic scoping review

Significance of this study

What is already known on this subject?

- ▶ Alpha diversity, including Shannon index diversity, chao1 diversity, etc., is the average species diversity within a habitat type at a local scale while beta-diversity, such as Bray-Curtis dissimilarity and UniFrac, indicates the differentiation between microbial communities from different environments.
- ▶ Alpha- and beta-diversity are the two most diverse measures of gut microbiota diversity with no consensus on which measurement methods should be used in metabolic condition study.

What are the new findings?

- ▶ Distinct characteristics, advantages, and disadvantages of each microbiome diversity measurement method lead to a variety of usage frequencies in metabolic condition studies. Shannon diversity is the most widely used alpha diversity while there is no predilection for beta diversity.

How might it impact on clinical practice in the foreseeable future?

- ▶ Further researchers on metabolic condition with microbiome diversity measurement will have impartial evidence on which measurement methods are most rationally appropriate for their studies regarding simplicity, cost, and efficacy.

INTRODUCTION

Gut microbiota are microorganisms that live in several areas of the body, especially in the gastrointestinal tract. The number of human microbiota, including bacteria, fungus, and virus is approximately 1,000,000,000 - 10,000,000,000 microbial cells, with the ratio of microbial cells to human cells being 1:1.^{1 2} The dominant bacterial phyla in the human gastrointestinal tract are Firmicutes, Bacteroidetes, Actinobacteria, and Proteobacteria.³ Current research has found associations between microbiota and systemic diseases, particularly type I and type II diabetes, obesity, and metabolic syndrome which related with immune response processes.⁴

Nowadays, the identification of dominant microbial communities is increasing with the invention of high throughput sequencing technology. The most important and widely used diversities are alpha-diversity and beta-diversity.⁵ Alpha diversity, including Shannon index diversity, chao1 diversity, etc., is the average species diversity within a habitat type at a local scale while beta-diversity, such as Bray-Curtis dissimilarity and Unifrac, indicates the differentiation between microbial communities from different environments.⁶ Both diversities consider two aspects of a community: the number of different organisms in a sample, and the range of abundances for each one.⁷

Many researchers have found the relationship between gut microbiota and metabolic diseases by diversity analysis.⁸ However, there was no systematic study focused on the most widely used method for diversity measurement of the association between gut microbiota and metabolic diseases. This systematic scoping review aimed to discuss and compare the measurement methods of microbiome diversities that are widely used in current research.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Registration of protocol

This study was conducted following the recommendations of the Preferred Reporting Items of Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Extension for Scoping Review (PRISMA-ScR) statement. We registered the systematic review with OSF The Open Science Framework (registration: osf.io/ux2fs).

Data sources and searches

PubMed, Embase, and Cochrane Central Register of Clinical Trials were used to search for articles published in 2019 in the English language. The terms “gastrointestinal microbiome”, “gut microbiome”, “microbiota”, and “microflora” were used in combination with “diversity”, “richness”, “evenness”, and “dissimilarity” as the keywords for literature search along with their synonyms. The search strategy is presented in detail in the online supplemental appendix 1. Additionally, the reference lists of included articles were searched, as well as related citations from other journals via Google Scholar.

Study selection

For this systematic scoping review, we worked with an information specialist to design an appropriate search strategy to identify original peer-reviewed articles of randomized controlled trials, quasi-experimental, and observational studies evaluating gut microbiome diversity in patients with a diagnosis of metabolic disease including metabolic syndrome, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, dyslipidemia, obesity, and nonalcoholic fatty liver disease

(NAFLD). Article screening was done by two independent reviewers (CS and TN) for eligible studies. Discrepancies between two reviewers were resolved by consensus.

Data extraction

Data extraction was done by two independent reviewers (CS and TN) for published summary gut microbiome diversity index. Discrepancies between two reviewers were resolved by consensus. We extracted the following data: (1) study characteristics (authors, study type, journal name, contact information, country, and funding), (2) patients characteristics (sample size, type of metabolic disease, and mean age), (3) outcomes (measurement methods of alpha and beta diversity of gut microbiome) as well as any other relevant information. All relevant text, tables, and figures were examined for data extraction. We contacted the authors of the study with incompletely reported data. If the study authors did not respond within 14 days, we conducted analyses using the available data.

Data synthesis and analysis

The primary outcome was measurement methods of alpha and beta diversity of gut microbiome. We synthesized the overall usage of gut microbiome diversity index whether alpha and beta diversities had been measured in included studies and which index had been used. We then provided subgroup analyses based on study design, type of metabolic disease, geographical location, and country income.

RESULTS

Study selection

The database search identified 5,929 potential records. After removing duplicates, 4,119 titles passed the initial screen, and 535 theme-related abstracts were selected for further full-text articles assessed for eligibility (figure 1). A total of 488 were excluded as the following: 338 non peer-reviewed, 65 wrong outcomes, 25 protocol, 22 wrong publication year, 8 duplicate, 8 in vitro, 7 wrong population, 6 review articles, 4 letter to editor, 3 non-English, and 2 editorial. 47 studies were eligible for the data synthesis.

(figure 1 about here)

Study characteristics

Of 47 included studies, there were 33 observational studies,⁹⁻⁴¹ nine randomized controlled trials,⁴²⁻⁵⁰ and five quasi-experimental studies (table 1).⁵¹⁻⁵⁵ The number of patients per study ranged from 12 to 6,627, with a total of 14,632 patients. The mean age of patients varied from day of life 3 to 69 years old. There were 28 studies focused on obesity,^{3 11 12 16 18 22 24-28 30-34 36 38 39 43 44 46 49-53 55} 12 studies on type II diabetes mellitus,^{3 10 14 15 17 21 26 40 43 45 47} ⁵⁵ four studies on hypertension,^{13 24 37 40} four studies on NAFLD,^{22 33 38 41} three studies on metabolic syndrome,^{31 48 51} three studies on gestational diabetes mellitus,^{19 20 29} two studies on dyslipidemia,^{23 42} and a study on type I diabetes mellitus.⁹

According to WHO region, there were 21 studies conducted in Western Pacific Region,^{8 9 11-24 31 32 41 46 52} 14 studies in European Region,^{27-30 33 42-44 47 48 51 53-55} 10 studies in Region of the Americas,^{25 34-40 45 50} and two studies conducted in Eastern Mediterranean Region.^{26 49} According to the World Bank,⁵⁶ there were 27 studies

146 conducted in high-income countries,^{9 11 27-36 38-44 47 48 50 51 53-55 57} 19 in upper-middle income

147 countries,^{10 12-25 30 45 49 52} and one in low-middle income countries.²⁶

148 **Table 1. Characteristics of Included Studies**

Author	Country	Income Level	WHO Regions	Study design	n	Population	Mean age (SD)
Robinson ¹¹	Australia	HICs	Western Pacific	Observational	22	22 Obesity/Overweight	with Ketonuria Med 33 (IQR 29-38), without Med 32 (IQR 29-33)
Harbison ⁹	Australia	HICs	Western Pacific	Observational	88	47 T2DM, 41 Control	Med 10.9 (Range 4.8-26.7)
Horvath ⁴³	Austria	HICs	European	RCT	26	26 T2DM with Obesity	60 (NR)
Liu T ¹⁰	China	UMICs	Western Pacific	Observational	6627	495 IFG, 304 T2DM, 5828 Control	51.8 (NR)
Lv ¹²	China	UMICs	Western Pacific	Observational	28	9 Overweight/Obesity, 10 Normal, 9 Lean	22.03 (1.32)
Mushtaq ¹³	China	UMICs	Western Pacific	Observational	80	50 HT, 30 Control	61.8 (10.6)
Nuli a ¹⁴	China	UMICs	Western Pacific	Observational	60	20 T2DM, 20 Impaired glucose regulation, 20 Control	NR
Nuli b ¹⁵	China	UMICs	Western Pacific	Observational	561	145 T2DM, 138 IFG, 278 Control	47.08 (10.43)
Qiu ¹⁶	China	UMICs	Western Pacific	Observational	55	28 Obesity, 27 Control	37.75 (12.54)
Tao ¹⁷	China	UMICs	Western Pacific	Observational	56	14 DN, 14 T2DM without DN, 28 Control	50.84 (12.30)
Wang ¹⁸	China	UMICs	Western Pacific	Observational	46	26 Obesity 20 Healthy	34.2 (10.1)
Wu ¹⁹	China	UMICs	Western Pacific	Observational	49	23 GDM, 26 Non-GDM	GDM Mean 36 (IQR 32-38.5), Non-GDM Mean 32.5 (IQR 30-35)
Xu ²⁰	China	UMICs	Western Pacific	Observational	61	30 GDM, 31 Control	33.0 (4.5)
Zhang ²¹	China	UMICs	Western Pacific	Observational	180	130 T2DM, 50 Healthy	58.7 (9.4)
Zhao ²²	China	UMICs	Western Pacific	Observational	58	25 Obesity with NAFLD, 18 Obesity only, 15 Healthy	13.7 (1.8)
Zheng ²³	China	UMICs	Western Pacific	Observational	99	36 DLP, 63 Healthy	36 (NR)
Zhou ⁵²	China	UMICs	Western Pacific	Quasi-exp	30	30 Obesity or Overweight	47.9 (5.4)
Zuo b ²⁴	China	UMICs	Western Pacific	Observational	49	34 HT, 15 Healthy	HT Med 54.5 (IQR 49.25, 57.75), Healthy Med 58 (IQR 52, 60)
Cuesta-Zuluaga ²⁵	Colombia	UMICs	Americas	Observational	441	30% Obesity (132), 41% Central Obesity (180), 59% HT (259)	41 (1)
Kern ⁴⁴	Denmark	HICs	European	RCT	88	88 Overweight or Obesity	Med 36 (IQR 30, 41)
Salah ²⁶	Egypt	LMICs	Eastern Mediterranean	Observational	60	25 Obesity with T2DM, 25 Obesity only, 5 T2DM only, 5 Control	43.9 (13.3)
Olsson ²⁷	France	HICs	European	Observational	58	34 Obesity, 24 non-Obesity	42.3 (16.3)
Seck ²⁸	France	HICs	European	Observational	56	17 Obesity, 39 Lean	NR
Frost ⁵⁵	Germany	HICs	European	Quasi-exp	12	12 T2DM with Obesity	57.2 (NR)
Kellerer ⁵³	Germany	HICs	European	Quasi-exp	17	17 Morbid Obesity	41.8 (9.1)
Ejtahed ⁴⁹	Iran	UMICs	Eastern Mediterranean	RCT	36	36 Non-Diabetic Obese Woman	36 (7)
Conterno ⁴²	Italy	HICs	European	RCT	62	62 Hypercholesterolemia	48.5 (9.0)
Ponzo ²⁹	Italy	HICs	European	Observational	29	29 GDM Offspring	3-5 Day of Life
Uemura ⁴⁶	Japan	HICs	Western Pacific	RCT	44	44 Obesity	62.7 (8.8)
Vera ⁴⁵	Mexico	UMICs	Americas	RCT	81	81 T2DM	Range 30-60
Bakker ⁵¹	Netherlands	HICs	European	Quasi-exp	20	10 Obesity with Metabolic Syndrome, 10 Lean	43.6 (17.2)
vanBommel ⁴⁷	Netherlands	HICs	European	RCT	44	44 T2DM	NR
Belkova ³⁰	Russia	UMICs	European	Observational	30	12 Obesity, 18 Normal weight	14.6 (1.6)
Koo ³¹	Singapore	HICs	Western Pacific	Observational	35	5 Metabolic Syndrome, 9 Obesity, 2 T2DM, 22 Central Obesity	Med 39 (Range 22-70)
Velikonja ⁴⁸	Slovenia	HICs	European	RCT	43	43 Metabolic syndrome/High risk for Metabolic Syndrome	52.07 (7.71)
Kim ⁴¹	South Korea	HICs	Western Pacific	Observational	766	313 NAFLD, 453 Control	44.9 (8.1)
Romo-Vaquero ⁵⁴	Spain	HICs	European	Quasi-exp	249	49 Obesity/Overweight, 200 Healthy	42.6 (11.5)
Lin ³²	Taiwan	HICs	Western Pacific	Observational	20	20 Obesity	37.11 (10.0)

Astbury ³³	UK	HICs	European	Observational	141	65 Biopsy-proven NASH, 76 Healthy	64.19 (2.96)
Faucher ³⁴	USA	HICs	Americas	Observational	21	15 Obesity, 6 Normal	29.7 (5.1)
Fei ³⁵	USA	HICs	Americas	Observational	655	229 Obesity, 149 Overweight, 277 Normal	34.9 (6.4)
Karvonen ⁵⁰	USA	HICs	Americas	RCT	502	149 Obesity, 353 Normal	3 (NR)
Maskarinec ³⁷	USA	HICs	Americas	Observational	1735	30.3% Obesity, 40.4% Overweight, 29.3% Normal	69 (NR)
Schwimmer ³⁸	USA	HICs	Americas	Observational	124	87 Biopsy-proven NAFLD, 37 Obesity without NAFLD	NAFLD Med 12 (IQR 10,14), Obesity without NAFLD Med 13 (IQR 11,14)
Shen ³⁹	USA	HICs	Americas	Observational	26	26 Severe Obesity	NR
Stanislawski ³⁶	USA	HICs	Americas	Observational	152	103 Obesity, 49 Control	34.0 (12.2)
Sun ⁴⁰	USA	HICs	Americas	Observational	529	35.1% HT	55.3 (3.4)

149 DLP, dyslipidemia; DN, diabetes nephropathy; GDM, gestational diabetes mellitus; HICs, high-
150 income countries; HT, hypertension; IFG, impaired fasting glucose; IQR, interquartile range;
151 LMICs, lower-middle-income countries; Med, median; NAFLD, nonalcoholic fatty liver disease;
152 NR, not reported; Quasi-exp, quasi-experimental; RCT, randomized controlled trial; SD, standard
153 deviation; T1DM, type I diabetes mellitus; T2DM, type II diabetes mellitus; UMICs, upper-middle-
154 income countries; WHO, World Health Organization.

Gut microbiome diversity measures

Of 47 included studies, there were 35 studies reported both alpha and beta diversities, 12 studies reported alpha diversity only, and no study reported beta diversity only. Of 13 alpha diversity measures, the Shannon index was the most commonly used in 37 studies (78.7%),^{10-24 26 28-36 38 40 41 44-48 50 52 53 57} followed by Chao1 index (19 studies),^{10-13 15-18 23 24 27 29 30 32 35 42 43 48 52} Operational Taxonomic Unit (OTU) richness (15 studies),^{9 10 12 13 17 25-28 34 35 49 50 52 53} Simpson index (13 studies),^{12 13 15-17 20 23 30 31 46 49 52 55} Abundance-based Coverage Estimators (ACE) index (10 studies),^{12 13 15 17 18 20 30 32 52 54} Observed species (9 studies),^{13-15 17 18 20 29 36 52} Faith's Phylogenetic diversity (7 studies),^{18 36 39 41 47 51 52} Phylogenetic diversity (5 studies),^{10 16 27 55 58} Good's coverage (3 studies),^{12 13 18} Pielou's evenness index (2 studies),^{24 27} Amplicon Sequence Variant (ASV) richness (2 studies),^{41 44} inversed Simpson index (2 studies),^{9 34} and Fisher alpha index (1 study).³⁴

Of 2 beta diversity measures, the UniFrac was the most commonly used in 24 studies including unweighted UniFrac (17 studies),^{12 14 18 20 21 25-27 29 33-35 39 41 45 52 57} and weighted UniFrac (16 studies),^{12 13 16-18 20 25 26 34 35 37 41 44 48 51 53} followed by Bray-Curtis dissimilarity (16 studies).^{11 16 17 19 20 23 31 38 40-44 47 49 55} The summary result was shown in table 2 and result for each included study was provided in online supplemental appendix 2.

168 **Table 2.** Gut microbiome diversity index usage in metabolic disease articles

	No. of Studies	Alpha-diversity													Beta-diversity		
		OTU richness	Shannon	ACE index	Chao index	Observed species	Simpson	Fisher	Pielou's evenness	ASV richness	Faith	PD	Good's coverage	Inverse Simpson	unweighted UniFrac distances	weighted UniFrac Distance	Bray-Curtis distances
Total	47	15 (31.9%)	37 (78.7%)	10 (21.3%)	19 (40.4%)	9 (19.1%)	13 (27.7%)	1 (2.1%)	2 (4.3%)	2 (4.3%)	7 (14.9%)	5 (10.6%)	3 (6.4%)	2 (4.3%)	17 (36.2%)	16 (34.0%)	16 (34.0%)
Study design																	
Observational	33	12 (36.4%)	28 (84.8%)	8 (24.2%)	15 (45.5%)	8 (24.2%)	9 (27.3%)	1 (3.0%)	2 (6.1%)	1 (3.0%)	4 (12.1%)	4 (12.1%)	3 (9.1%)	2 (6.1%)	15 (45.5%)	12 (36.4%)	10 (30.1%)
Quasi-exp	5	1 (20.0%)	2 (40.0%)	2 (40.0%)	1 (20.0%)	1 (20.0%)	2 (40.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (40.0%)	1 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	2 (40.0%)	1 (20.0%)
RCT	9	2 (22.2%)	7 (77.8%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (22.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (11.1%)	1 (11.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (11.1%)	2 (22.2%)	5 (55.6%)
Metabolic diseases																	
DLP	2	0 (0.0%)	1 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (100.0%)
GDM	3	0 (0.0%)	3 (100.0%)	1 (33.3%)	1 (33.3%)	2 (66.7%)	1 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (66.7%)	1 (33.3%)	2 (66.7%)
HT	4	2 (50.0%)	3 (75.0%)	1 (25.0%)	2 (50.0%)	1 (25.0%)	1 (25.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)	2 (50.0%)	1 (25.0%)
Metabolic syndrome	3	0 (0.0%)	2 (66.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (66.7%)	1 (33.3%)
NAFLD	4	1 (25.0%)	4 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)	1 (25.0%)	1 (25.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (50.0%)	1 (25.0%)	2 (50.0%)
Obesity	28	11 (39.3%)	20 (71.4%)	6 (21.4%)	10 (35.7%)	3 (10.7%)	8 (28.6%)	1 (3.6%)	1 (3.6%)	1 (3.6%)	5 (17.9%)	3 (10.7%)	2 (7.1%)	1 (3.6%)	10 (35.7%)	11 (39.3%)	8 (28.6%)
T1DM	1	1 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
T2DM	12	3 (25.0%)	10 (83.3%)	2 (16.7%)	4 (33.3%)	3 (10.7%)	4 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (16.7%)	2 (16.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (33.3%)	3 (25.0%)	5 (41.7%)
WHO Region																	
Americas	10	4 (40.0%)	8 (80.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (10.0%)	1 (10.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (10.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (10.0%)	6 (60.0%)	4 (40.0%)	2 (20.0%)
Eastern Mediterranean	2	2 (100.0%)	1 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)
European	14	3 (21.4%)	9 (64.3%)	2 (14.3%)	6 (42.9%)	1 (7.1%)	2 (14.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (7.1%)	1 (7.1%)	2 (14.3%)	2 (14.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (21.4%)	4 (28.6%)	5 (35.7%)
Western Pacific	21	6 (28.6%)	19 (90.5%)	8 (38.1%)	12 (57.1%)	7 (33.3%)	10 (47.6%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.8%)	1 (4.8%)	3 (14.3%)	3 (14.3%)	3 (14.3%)	1 (4.8%)	7 (33.3%)	7 (33.3%)	8 (38.1%)
Country income																	
HICs	27	7 (25.9%)	19 (70.4%)	2 (7.4%)	8 (29.6%)	2 (7.4%)	3 (11.1%)	1 (3.7%)	1 (3.7%)	2 (7.4%)	5 (18.5%)	3 (11.1%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (7.4%)	8 (29.6%)	8 (29.6%)	10 (37.0%)
LMICs	1	1 (100.0%)	1 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (100.0%)	1 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)
UMICs	19	7 (36.8%)	17 (89.5%)	10 (21.3%)	11 (57.9%)	7 (36.8%)	10 (52.6%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (5.3%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (10.5%)	2 (10.5%)	3 (15.8%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (42.1%)	7 (36.8%)	6 (31.6%)

169 ACE, abundance-based coverage estimators; ASV, amplicon sequence variant; DLP, dyslipidemia; GDM, gestational diabetes mellitus;
 170 HICs, high-income countries; HT, hypertension; LMICs, low-middle-income countries; NAFLD, nonalcoholic fatty liver disease; OTU,
 171 operational taxonomic unit; PD, phylogenetic diversity; Quasi-exp, quasi-experimental; RCT, randomized controlled trial; T1DM, type I
 172 diabetes mellitus; T2DM, type II diabetes mellitus; UMICs, upper-middle-income countries; WHO, World Health Organization.

173

Study design and gut microbiome diversity measures

Most common microbiome alpha-diversity measures for observational studies and randomized controlled trials were Shannon diversity in 28 observational studies (84.8%),^{10-24 26 28-31 33-38 40 41} and 7 RCTs (77.8%) respectively.^{43-48 50} Most common microbiome alpha-diversity measures for quasi-experimental were Shannon diversity,^{52 53} ACE index,^{52 54} Simpson index,^{52 55} and Faith's Phylogenetic diversity in 2 studies (40%).^{51 52} Good's coverage (3 studies),^{12 13 18} and Pielou's evenness index (2 studies) were reported only in observational studies.^{27 52}

Most common microbiome beta-diversity measures were different among study designs. For observational studies, unweighted Unifrac was most common with reported in 45.5% of included observational studies,^{12 14 18 20 21 25-27 29 33-35 37 39 41} Bray-Curtis dissimilarity for randomized controlled trials (55.6%),^{42-44 48 49} and weighted Unifrac for quasi-experimental studies (40%).^{51 53}

Type of metabolic diseases and gut microbiome diversity measures

Most common microbiome alpha-diversity for all metabolic diseases was Shannon diversity. Most common microbiome beta-diversity measures for obesity and type II diabetes mellitus were weighted Unifrac (39.3%),^{12 16 17 25 26 34 35 44 51 53 57} and Bray-Curtis dissimilarity (33.3%) respectively.^{17 43 47 55}

Geographical location and gut microbiome diversity measures

Most common microbiome alpha-diversity for studies in Western Pacific, European, and America Regions was Shannon diversity. Most common microbiome alpha-diversity for Eastern Mediterranean Region was OTU richness. Good's coverage (3 studies) were used only in Western Pacific Region.^{12 13 18}

Most common microbiome beta-diversity measures for Western Pacific, European and America were Bray-Curtis dissimilarity (38.1%),^{11 16 17 19 20 23 31 41} Bray-Curtis dissimilarity (35.7%),^{42-44 47 55} and unweighted Unifrac (60%) respectively.^{25 34 35 37 39 45} For microbiome beta-diversity measures for Eastern Mediterranean, all beta-diversity were equal in number (1 study, 50%).

Country income and gut microbiome diversity measures

Most common microbiome alpha-diversity for all type of country incomes was Shannon diversity. Amplicon Sequence Variant (ASV) richness (2 studies),^{41 44} and inversed Simpson index (2 studies) were both used in only HICs.^{29 36} Good's coverage (3 studies) were used only in UMICs.^{12 13 18}

There was a variation of most common microbiome beta-diversity measures among different country incomes. For HICs, Bray-Curtis dissimilarity was the most common beta diversity measure (37%),^{11 31 38 40-44 47 55} unweighted Unifrac for UMICs (42.1%),^{12 14 18 20-22 25 45 52} and both weighted and unweighted Unifrac for LMIC (100%).²⁶

DISCUSSION

To our knowledge, this is the first systematic review evaluating the choice of gut microbiome diversity measurements in patients with metabolic conditions. The systematic review process identified 47 articles that met the inclusion and exclusion criteria. A meta-analysis was not performed due to the purpose of this study to identify the usage of gut microbiome diversity measurement in metabolic diseases studies. The result suggested that there were variations in measures of gut microbiome diversity in the metabolic disease literatures. For alpha-diversity, there were 13 different measurement methods used for the analysis of gut microbiota. The Shannon index was the most commonly used which presented in 37 studies (78.7%) while other methods including Chao1 index, Operational Taxonomic Unit (OTU) richness, Simpson index, Faith's Phylogenetic diversity, and Abundance-based Coverage Estimators (ACE) index were used only 20-40%. For beta-diversity, the UniFrac was the most commonly used which assessed in 24 studies (unweighted 17 studies and weighted 16 studies), followed by Bray-Curtis dissimilarity (16 studies). All beta-diversity measures were used in a similar quantity.

Alpha diversity measures the diversity within a sample diversity and is based on the relative abundance of taxa; for example, species or OTUs.⁵⁹ Alpha diversity are used to identify the richness (number of taxonomic groups), evenness (distribution of abundances of the groups), or both. There are three subtypes of alpha diversity by purpose of estimation including richness estimators, richness and evenness estimators, and phylogenetic richness estimators. The difference between these estimators was shown in online supplemental table 1. Species richness refers to the number of different species present in a community while evenness compares the uniformity of the population of the species (figure 2).

(figure 2 about here)

Of all included studies, Shannon diversity was the most common alpha diversity measurement. Shannon diversity is an example of the richness and evenness estimators which the value of diversity increases both when the number of species increases and when evenness increases. It is a measurement of entropy and the uncertainty of the sampling outcome. Shannon diversity also contemplates the relative abundances of different species.⁶⁰ The advantages of Shannon diversity are simplicity and appropriateness for the community dominant by two or three species. However, Shannon diversity weighs more on species richness which causes measure of the character of the species abundance distribution (evenness) less sensitive.

Another richness and evenness estimator is Simpson's diversity. The advantage of Simpson's diversity is simplicity while the drawback is insensitivity of the species richness measurement. Due to simplicity and ability to measure both richness and evenness, Shannon diversity and Simpson's diversity are widely used in all studies.⁵⁸

Another type of the estimators is the richness estimator which includes OTU richness, Chao1 index, and ACE index. OTU richness is defined as the count of different species represented in a community. Similar to Shannon and Simpson's diversity, the advantage of OTU richness is simplicity which makes OTU richness in top three of alpha diversity measurement usage. However, the disadvantage of OTU richness is sensitivity to sample size. In our studies, Chao1 index was used in 19 studies (40.4%) and ACE index in 10 studies (21.3%). Richness estimators evaluate the total richness of a community.⁶¹ Chao1 and ACE have been developed to estimate richness from abundance data. They are the indicators of species richness that is sensitive to rare OTUs. Chao1 is based on the theory that rare species provide the most information about the number of missing species

which is useful for rare species and performs accurately if the sample size is reasonably large. Therefore, Chao1 index is particularly useful for the low-abundance species while the drawback is underestimation of rich and highly heterogeneous species.

Finally, phylogenetic diversity (PD) is defined as the connecting of all organisms in a phylogenetic tree which estimates diversity across a tree and provides a phylogenetic analog of taxonomic diversity.⁶² PD provides a convenient, evolutionary measure of diversity that does not depend on the ability to identify species count which ultimately leads to a complex and relatively stable community of microorganisms.⁶³ However, the limitation is lack of sequence data for the large majority of species which requires a molecular laboratory with proper facilities, thus the cost is inevitably high.⁶⁴

Beta-diversity is the measure for differences between samples from different groups. The overall community composition and structure are identified by this measure. Beta-diversity in our research including Unifrac distance and Bray-Curtis dissimilarity are similar in usage quantities. "UniFrac" considers the phylogenetic relationships between the microbes found in two samples (Similar to phylogenetic diversity) which provides a convenient measure of diversity that does not depend on the ability to identify species count.⁶⁵ It estimates differences between samples or groups based on phylogenetic distance. Unifrac distance is divided into unweighted and weighted Unifrac. Unweighted UniFrac is the fraction of branch lengths between all microbes in both samples that are different between the samples.^{65 66} Weighted UniFrac is similar to unweighted UniFrac but takes the abundances of microbes in the samples into account. Weighted UniFrac is largely impacted by the abundances of the microbes while unweighted UniFrac does not take abundance into account. Both unweighted Unifrac and weighted Unifrac are used to determine whether communities were significantly different. Unweighted Unifrac is sensitive to detect

microbial richness changes in rare species while weighted Unifrac can incorporate the abundance information and reduce the rare species' contribution. However, both measures should not be used as a distance metric for multivariate statistical analyses.^{66 67}

Bray-Curtis dissimilarity shows the microbes' abundances which are shared between two samples. Bray-Curtis dissimilarity quantifies the dissimilarity between two samples or groups ranged from 0 to 1 which is not a true distance. For example, if both samples have the same number of microbes at the same abundance, their dissimilarity will equal zero. On the other hand, the dissimilarity will equal 1 if two samples have definitely no shared microbes. The benefit of Bray-Curtis dissimilarity is that it gives more weight to common species. Moreover, Bray-Curtis dissimilarity is simple and doesn't make assumptions about genetic relationships.⁶⁸

There were several limitations in this systematic scoping review. First, this systematic scoping review aims to provide evidence on the usage of gut microbiome diversity measurement in metabolic diseases studies, thus meta-analysis is not planned to perform. Second, this study focused on the gut microbiome diversity measures in patients with metabolic conditions only. The generalizability should be considered when applying the results in studies on other diseases.

In conclusion, this systematic scoping review and meta-analysis provided the first evidence on the gut microbiome Diversity Measures for Metabolic Conditions. Alpha-diversity and beta-diversity are innovative tools for gut microbiota analysis. Various measurement of gut microbiome diversity have been used in the literature. All measurements have unique characteristics, advantages, and disadvantages which lead to different usage frequency. The measures were chosen considering cost, simplicity, and types of research.

306

307 **Acknowledgement** The authors are thankful to the Prince Mahidol Award Youth Program
308 and Professor Nijasri C. Suwanwela for their research and academic assistance, as well as
309 Miss Pim Sermsaksasithorn for providing mental support.

310 **Contributors** CS, and KP conceived and designed the research. CS and TN performed data
311 acquisition, analyzed and interpreted data, and drafted the manuscript. KP made critical
312 revisions related to important intellectual content of the manuscript. All authors have read
313 and approved the final version of manuscript.

314 **Funding** No funding.

315 **Competing interests** None declared.

316 **Patient consent for publication** Not required.

317 **Ethics approval** The study required no Ethics Committee approval as long it is a
318 systematic review study and no human subject was directly involved.

319 **Data availability statement** All data relevant to the study are included in the article or
320 uploaded as supplementary information.

321 **Supplemental material**

322 Supplemental appendix 1. Full search strategy

323 Supplemental appendix 2. Measurement methods for each included study

324 Supplemental table 1. Estimator characteristics

Reference

1. Kim BS, Jeon YS, Chun J. Current status and future promise of the human microbiome. *Pediatr Gastroenterol Hepatol Nutr* 2013;16(2):71-9. doi: 10.5223/pghn.2013.16.2.71 [published Online First: 2013/09/07]
2. Kho Z, Lal S. The Human Gut Microbiome - A Potential Controller of Wellness and Disease. *Front Microbiol* 2018;9:1835. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2018.01835 [published Online First: 2018/08/30]
3. Rinninella E, Raoul P, Cintoni M, et al. What is the Healthy Gut Microbiota Composition? A Changing Ecosystem across Age, Environment, Diet, and Diseases. *Microorganisms* 2019;7(1) doi: 10.3390/microorganisms7010014 [published Online First: 2019/01/13]
4. Pang SQ, Luo ZT, Wang CC, et al. Effects of Dioscorea polystachya 'yam gruel' on the cognitive function of diabetic rats with focal cerebral ischemia-reperfusion injury via the gut-brain axis. *J Integr Neurosci* 2020;19(2):273-83. doi: 10.31083/j.jin.2020.02.69
5. Wagner B, Grunwald G, Zerbe G, et al. On the Use of Diversity Measures in Longitudinal Sequencing Studies of Microbial Communities. *Front Microbiol* 2018;9:1037. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2018.01037 [published Online First: 2018/06/07]
6. Walters K, Martiny J. Alpha-, beta-, and gamma-diversity of bacteria varies across habitats. *PLoS One* 2020;15(9):e0233872. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0233872 [published Online First: 2020/09/24]
7. Youssef NH, Ashlock-Savage KN, Elshahed MS. Phylogenetic diversities and community structure of members of the extremely halophilic Archaea (order Halobacteriales) in multiple saline sediment habitats. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2012;78(5):1332-44. doi: 10.1128/aem.07420-11 [published Online First: 2011/12/20]
8. Shen G, Wu J, Ye B, et al. Gut Microbiota-Derived Metabolites in the Development of Diseases. *Can J Infect Dis Med Microbiol* 2021;2021:6658674. doi: 10.1155/2021/6658674 [published Online First: 2021/01/29]
9. Harbison J, Roth-Schulze A, Giles L, et al. Gut microbiome dysbiosis and increased intestinal permeability in children with islet autoimmunity and type 1 diabetes: A prospective cohort study. *Pediatric diabetes* 2019;20(5):574-83. doi: 10.1111/pedi.12865 [published Online First: 2019/05/14]
10. Liu T, Chen X, Xu Y, et al. Gut microbiota partially mediates the effects of fine particulate matter on type 2 diabetes: Evidence from a population-based epidemiological study. *Environment international* 2019;130:104882. doi: 10.1016/j.envint.2019.05.076 [published Online First: 2019/06/16]
11. Robinson H, Barrett H, Gomez-Arango L, et al. Ketouria Is Associated with Changes to the Abundance of Roseburia in the Gut Microbiota of Overweight and Obese Women at 16 Weeks Gestation: A Cross-Sectional Observational Study. *Nutrients* 2019;11(8) doi: 10.3390/nu11081836 [published Online First: 2019/08/11]
12. Lv Y, Qin X, Jia H, et al. The association between gut microbiota composition and BMI in Chinese male college students, as analysed by next-generation sequencing. *The British journal of nutrition* 2019;122(9):986-95. doi: 10.1017/s0007114519001909 [published Online First: 2019/08/10]
13. Mushtaq N, Hussain S, Zhang S, et al. Molecular characterization of alterations in the intestinal microbiota of patients with grade 3 hypertension. *International journal of molecular medicine* 2019;44(2):513-22. doi: 10.3892/ijmm.2019.4235 [published Online First: 2019/06/08]
14. Nuli R, Azhati J, Cai J, et al. Metagenomics and Faecal Metabolomics Integrative Analysis towards the Impaired Glucose Regulation and Type 2 Diabetes in Uyghur-Related Omics. *Journal of diabetes research* 2019;2019:2893041. doi: 10.1155/2019/2893041 [published Online First: 2019/12/13]

15. Nuli R, Cai J, Kadeer A, et al. Integrative Analysis Toward Different Glucose Tolerance-Related Gut Microbiota and Diet. *Frontiers in endocrinology* 2019;10:295. doi: 10.3389/fendo.2019.00295 [published Online First: 2019/06/14]
16. Qiu D, Xia Z, Deng J, et al. Glucocorticoid-induced obesity individuals have distinct signatures of the gut microbiome. *BioFactors (Oxford, England)* 2019;45(6):892-901. doi: 10.1002/biof.1565 [published Online First: 2019/10/08]
17. Tao S, Li L, Li L, et al. Understanding the gut-kidney axis among biopsy-proven diabetic nephropathy, type 2 diabetes mellitus and healthy controls: an analysis of the gut microbiota composition. *Acta Diabetol* 2019;56(5):581-92. doi: 10.1007/s00592-019-01316-7 [published Online First: 2019/03/20]
18. Wang F, Bai R, Yan W, et al. Differential composition of gut microbiota among healthy volunteers, morbidly obese patients and post-bariatric surgery patients. *Exp Ther Med* 2019;17(3):2268-78. doi: 10.3892/etm.2019.7200 [published Online First: 2019/03/15]
19. Wu Y, Bible P, Long S, et al. Metagenomic analysis reveals gestational diabetes mellitus-related microbial regulators of glucose tolerance. *Acta diabetologica* 2020;57(5):569-81. doi: 10.1007/s00592-019-01434-2 [published Online First: 2019/12/11]
20. Xu Y, Zhang M, Zhang J, et al. Differential intestinal and oral microbiota features associated with gestational diabetes and maternal inflammation. *American journal of physiology Endocrinology and metabolism* 2020;319(2):E247-e53. doi: 10.1152/ajpendo.00266.2019 [published Online First: 2020/01/01]
21. Zhang F, Wang M, Yang J, et al. Response of gut microbiota in type 2 diabetes to hypoglycemic agents. *Endocrine* 2019;66(3):485-93. doi: 10.1007/s12020-019-02041-5 [published Online First: 2019/08/15]
22. Zhao Y, Zhou J, Liu J, et al. Metagenome of Gut Microbiota of Children With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Frontiers in pediatrics* 2019;7:518. doi: 10.3389/fped.2019.00518 [published Online First: 2020/01/11]
23. Zheng W, Ma Y, Zhao A, et al. Compositional and functional differences in human gut microbiome with respect to equol production and its association with blood lipid level: a cross-sectional study. *Gut pathogens* 2019;11:20. doi: 10.1186/s13099-019-0297-6 [published Online First: 2019/06/07]
24. Zuo K, Li J, Xu Q, et al. Dysbiotic gut microbes may contribute to hypertension by limiting vitamin D production. *Clinical cardiology* 2019;42(8):710-19. doi: 10.1002/clc.23195 [published Online First: 2019/05/18]
25. de la Cuesta-Zuluaga J, Mueller N, Álvarez-Quintero R, et al. Higher Fecal Short-Chain Fatty Acid Levels Are Associated with Gut Microbiome Dysbiosis, Obesity, Hypertension and Cardiometabolic Disease Risk Factors. *Nutrients* 2018;11(1) doi: 10.3390/nu11010051 [published Online First: 2018/12/29]
26. Salah M, Azab M, Ramadan A, et al. New Insights on Obesity and Diabetes from Gut Microbiome Alterations in Egyptian Adults. *Omics : a journal of integrative biology* 2019;23(10):477-85. doi: 10.1089/omi.2019.0063 [published Online First: 2019/10/08]
27. Olsson L, Poitou C, Tremaroli V, et al. Gut microbiota of obese subjects with Prader-Willi syndrome is linked to metabolic health. *Gut* 2020;69(7):1229-38. doi: 10.1136/gutjnl-2019-319322 [published Online First: 2019/10/16]
28. Seck E, Senghor B, Merhej V, et al. Salt in stools is associated with obesity, gut halophilic microbiota and Akkermansia muciniphila depletion in humans. *International journal of obesity (2005)* 2019;43(4):862-71. doi: 10.1038/s41366-018-0201-3 [published Online First: 2018/09/13]
29. Ponzio V, Ferrocino I, Zarovska A, et al. The microbiota composition of the offspring of patients with gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM). *PloS one* 2019;14(12):e0226545. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0226545 [published Online First: 2019/12/17]

30. Belkova N, Nemchenko U, Pogodina A, et al. Composition and Structure of Gut Microbiome in Adolescents with Obesity and Different Breastfeeding Duration. *Bulletin of experimental biology and medicine* 2019;167(6):759-62. doi: 10.1007/s10517-019-04617-7 [published Online First: 2019/10/28]
31. Koo S, Chu C, Khoo J, et al. A pilot study to examine the association between human gut microbiota and the host's central obesity. *JGH open : an open access journal of gastroenterology and hepatology* 2019;3(6):480-87. doi: 10.1002/jgh3.12184 [published Online First: 2019/12/14]
32. Lin B, Lin W, Huang C, et al. Changes of gut microbiota between different weight reduction programs. *Surgery for obesity and related diseases : official journal of the American Society for Bariatric Surgery* 2019;15(5):749-58. doi: 10.1016/j.soard.2019.01.026 [published Online First: 2019/04/03]
33. Astbury S, Atallah E, Vijay A, et al. Lower gut microbiome diversity and higher abundance of proinflammatory genus *Collinsella* are associated with biopsy-proven nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. *Gut microbes* 2020;11(3):569-80. doi: 10.1080/19490976.2019.1681861 [published Online First: 2019/11/08]
34. Faucher M, Greathouse K, Hastings-Tolsma M, et al. Exploration of the Vaginal and Gut Microbiome in African American Women by Body Mass Index, Class of Obesity, and Gestational Weight Gain: A Pilot Study. *Am J Perinatol* 2020;37(11):1160-72. doi: 10.1055/s-0039-1692715 [published Online First: 2019/06/27]
35. Fei N, Bernabé B, Lie L, et al. The human microbiota is associated with cardiometabolic risk across the epidemiologic transition. *PloS one* 2019;14(7):e0215262. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0215262 [published Online First: 2019/07/25]
36. Stanislawski M, Dabelea D, Lange L, et al. Gut microbiota phenotypes of obesity. *NPJ biofilms and microbiomes* 2019;5(1):18. doi: 10.1038/s41522-019-0091-8 [published Online First: 2019/07/10]
37. Maskarinec G, Hullar M, Monroe K, et al. Fecal Microbial Diversity and Structure Are Associated with Diet Quality in the Multiethnic Cohort Adiposity Phenotype Study. *J Nutr* 2019;149(9):1575-84. doi: 10.1093/jn/nxz065 [published Online First: 2019/06/13]
38. Schwimmer J, Johnson J, Angeles J, et al. Microbiome Signatures Associated With Steatohepatitis and Moderate to Severe Fibrosis in Children With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Gastroenterology* 2019;157(4):1109-22. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2019.06.028 [published Online First: 2019/07/01]
39. Shen N, Caixàs A, Ahlers M, et al. Longitudinal changes of microbiome composition and microbial metabolomics after surgical weight loss in individuals with obesity. *Surg Obes Relat Dis* 2019;15(8):1367-73. doi: 10.1016/j.soard.2019.05.038 [published Online First: 2019/07/13]
40. Sun S, Lulla A, Sioda M, et al. Gut Microbiota Composition and Blood Pressure. *Hypertension (Dallas, Tex : 1979)* 2019;73(5):998-1006. doi: 10.1161/hypertensionaha.118.12109 [published Online First: 2019/03/25]
41. Kim H, Joo E, Cheong H, et al. Gut Microbiota and Risk of Persistent Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Diseases. *Journal of clinical medicine* 2019;8(8) doi: 10.3390/jcm8081089 [published Online First: 2019/07/28]
42. Conterno L, Martinelli F, Tamburini M, et al. Measuring the impact of olive pomace enriched biscuits on the gut microbiota and its metabolic activity in mildly hypercholesterolaemic subjects. *European journal of nutrition* 2019;58(1):63-81. doi: 10.1007/s00394-017-1572-2 [published Online First: 2017/11/11]
43. Horvath A, Leber B, Feldbacher N, et al. Effects of a multispecies synbiotic on glucose metabolism, lipid marker, gut microbiome composition, gut permeability, and quality of life in diabetes: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled pilot study. *European journal*

- of nutrition 2020;59(7):2969-83. doi: 10.1007/s00394-019-02135-w [published Online First: 2019/11/16]
44. Kern T, Blond M, Hansen T, et al. Structured exercise alters the gut microbiota in humans with overweight and obesity-A randomized controlled trial. *International journal of obesity* (2005) 2020;44(1):125-35. doi: 10.1038/s41366-019-0440-y [published Online First: 2019/08/31]
45. Medina-Vera I, Sanchez-Tapia M, Noriega-López L, et al. A dietary intervention with functional foods reduces metabolic endotoxaemia and attenuates biochemical abnormalities by modifying faecal microbiota in people with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes & metabolism* 2019;45(2):122-31. doi: 10.1016/j.diabet.2018.09.004 [published Online First: 2018/09/30]
46. Uemura M, Hayashi F, Ishioka K, et al. Obesity and mental health improvement following nutritional education focusing on gut microbiota composition in Japanese women: a randomised controlled trial. *European journal of nutrition* 2019;58(8):3291-302. doi: 10.1007/s00394-018-1873-0 [published Online First: 2018/12/14]
47. van Bommel E, Herrema H, Davids M, et al. Effects of 12-week treatment with dapagliflozin and gliclazide on faecal microbiome: Results of a double-blind randomized trial in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes & metabolism* 2020;46(2):164-68. doi: 10.1016/j.diabet.2019.11.005 [published Online First: 2019/12/10]
48. Velikonja A, Lipoglavšek L, Zorec M, et al. Alterations in gut microbiota composition and metabolic parameters after dietary intervention with barley beta glucans in patients with high risk for metabolic syndrome development. *Anaerobe* 2019;55:67-77. doi: 10.1016/j.anaerobe.2018.11.002 [published Online First: 2018/11/06]
49. Ejtahed H, Tito R, Siadat S, et al. Metformin induces weight loss associated with gut microbiota alteration in non-diabetic obese women: a randomized double-blind clinical trial. *European journal of endocrinology* 2019;180(3):165-76. doi: 10.1530/eje-18-0826 [published Online First: 2018/12/13]
50. Karvonen A, Sordillo J, Gold D, et al. Gut microbiota and overweight in 3-year old children. *International journal of obesity* (2005) 2019;43(4):713-23. doi: 10.1038/s41366-018-0290-z [published Online First: 2018/12/21]
51. Bakker G, Schnitzler J, Bekkering S, et al. Oral vancomycin treatment does not alter markers of postprandial inflammation in lean and obese subjects. *Physiological reports* 2019;7(16):e14199. doi: 10.14814/phy2.14199 [published Online First: 2019/08/20]
52. Zhou T, Chen J, Chen Y, et al. Ligustrum robustum Intake, Weight Loss, and Gut Microbiota: An Intervention Trial. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med* 2019;2019:4643074. doi: 10.1155/2019/4643074 [published Online First: 2019/05/22]
53. Kellerer T, Brandl B, Büttner J, et al. Correction to: Impact of Laparoscopic Sleeve Gastrectomy on Gut Permeability in Morbidly Obese Subjects. *Obesity surgery* 2021 doi: 10.1007/s11695-021-05439-1 [published Online First: 2021/05/01]
54. Romo-Vaquero M, Cortés-Martín A, Loria-Kohen V, et al. Deciphering the Human Gut Microbiome of Urolithin Metabotypes: Association with Enterotypes and Potential Cardiometabolic Health Implications. *Molecular nutrition & food research* 2019;63(4):e1800958. doi: 10.1002/mnfr.201800958 [published Online First: 2018/11/25]
55. Frost F, Storck L, Kacprowski T, et al. A structured weight loss program increases gut microbiota phylogenetic diversity and reduces levels of Collinsella in obese type 2 diabetics: A pilot study. *PloS one* 2019;14(7):e0219489. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0219489 [published Online First: 2019/07/19]
56. World Bank Country and Lending Groups 2021 [Available from: <https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups>].
57. Maskarinec G, Hullar M, Monroe K, et al. Fecal Microbial Diversity and Structure Are Associated with Diet Quality in the Multiethnic Cohort Adiposity Phenotype Study. *The*

- 526 *Journal of nutrition* 2019;149(9):1575-84. doi: 10.1093/jn/nxz065 [published Online First:
527 2019/06/13]
- 528 58. Kim B, Shin J, Guevarra R, et al. Deciphering Diversity Indices for a Better Understanding of
529 Microbial Communities. *J Microbiol Biotechnol* 2017;27(12):2089-93. doi:
530 10.4014/jmb.1709.09027 [published Online First: 2017/10/17]
- 531 59. McMurdie PJ, Holmes S. phyloseq: an R package for reproducible interactive analysis and
532 graphics of microbiome census data. *PLoS One* 2013;8(4):e61217. doi:
533 10.1371/journal.pone.0061217 [published Online First: 2013/05/01]
- 534 60. Lemos L, Fulthorpe R, Triplett E, et al. Rethinking microbial diversity analysis in the high
535 throughput sequencing era. *J Microbiol Methods* 2011;86(1):42-51. doi:
536 10.1016/j.mimet.2011.03.014 [published Online First: 2011/04/05]
- 537 61. Shen T-J, Chao A, Lin C-F. Predicting the Number of New Species in Further Taxonomic
538 Sampling. *Ecology* 2003;84(3):798-804.
- 539 62. Faith DP. Conservation evaluation and phylogenetic diversity. *Biological Conservation*
540 1992;61(1):1-10. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207\(92\)91201-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207(92)91201-3)
- 541 63. Garson J, Plutynski A, Sarkar S. The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Biodiversity:
542 Taylor & Francis 2016.
- 543 64. O'Dwyer J, Kembel S, Green J. Phylogenetic diversity theory sheds light on the structure of
544 microbial communities. *PLoS Comput Biol* 2012;8(12):e1002832. doi:
545 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002832 [published Online First: 2013/01/04]
- 546 65. Lozupone C, Hamady M, Knight R. UniFrac--an online tool for comparing microbial
547 community diversity in a phylogenetic context. *BMC Bioinformatics* 2006;7:371. doi:
548 10.1186/1471-2105-7-371 [published Online First: 2006/08/09]
- 549 66. Chen J, Bittinger K, Charlson E, et al. Associating microbiome composition with environmental
550 covariates using generalized UniFrac distances. *Bioinformatics* 2012;28(16):2106-13. doi:
551 10.1093/bioinformatics/bts342 [published Online First: 2012/06/20]
- 552 67. Lozupone C, Lladser M, Knights D, et al. UniFrac: an effective distance metric for microbial
553 community comparison. *Isme j* 2011;5(2):169-72. doi: 10.1038/ismej.2010.133 [published
554 Online First: 2010/09/10]
- 555 68. Morgan X, Huttenhower C. Chapter 12: Human microbiome analysis. *PLoS Comput Biol*
556 2012;8(12):e1002808. doi: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002808 [published Online First:
557 2013/01/10]
558

559 **Figure legends**

560 Figure 1. Flow chart diagram presenting the study selection with Preferred Reporting Items

561 for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines

562 Figure 2. Community A and community B have the same species richness, five species

563 each. The organisms in community A are more evenly distributed than in community B

PRISMA 2009 Flow Diagram