



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Gastrointestinal infections*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/124282/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Wilcox, MH orcid.org/0000-0002-4565-2868 (2018) *Gastrointestinal infections*. *Current Opinion in Gastroenterology*, 34 (1). pp. 1-2. ISSN 0267-1379

<https://doi.org/10.1097/MOG.0000000000000413>

(c) 2017, Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. All rights reserved. This is an author produced version of a paper published in *Current Opinion in Gastroenterology*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy. The final, published version is available at: <https://doi.org/10.1097/MOG.0000000000000413>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Editorial

Gastrointestinal Infections

Mark H. Wilcox

This section contains timely reviews of three topical subjects. The use of probiotics to prevent *C. difficile* infection (CDI) is a controversial area, with conflicting data, and a paucity of robust, controlled, appropriately powered, clinical trials to provide a clear picture. Mills et al examine the evidence for the use of probiotics, including recent clinical trial data and new approaches to microorganism based therapy for CDI.¹ A new systematic review and meta-analysis concluded that probiotic use may reduce the rate of CDI in high risk populations by as much as 50%. Nevertheless, prior clinical trials, and indeed meta-analyses have yielded conflicting results.³⁻⁵ Notably, meta-analyses of the efficacy of probiotics aggregate data from studies employing different microorganisms, formulations and dosages. Furthermore, individual study deficiencies, including some that have high influence on the conclusions of the reviews,⁶ are often not addressed. Lastly, the largest randomized controlled trial of a probiotic combination product of lactobacilli and bifidobacteria showed no benefit in the prevention of *C. difficile* infection.⁷

Mills et al. also helpfully review potentially promising new approaches to the prevention of CDI including probiotic and prebiotic combinations, strains that directly inhibit *C. difficile*, modulation of bile acid metabolism to augment colonization resistance, microbiome niche competition, and bacteriophage therapy.¹ In addition, they consider ongoing developmental programmes to produce regulated products, including stool-derived products, purified spore preparations, and sterile fecal filtrates, as alternatives to faecal microbiota transplantation (FMT). The hope is that such products can achieve the efficacy of FMT, without the need to obtain and screen donor samples, and with an improved (long term safety) risk-benefit profile.

Karkey and colleagues, who have considerable experience of working in the developing countries, review the evolution of antimicrobial resistance in *Salmonella Typhi*.⁸ They note

that resistance to first and second line antibiotics is common and leads to treatment failure of typhoid. Chloramphenicol was the first widely used antibiotic for typhoid fever, but as resistance emerged to this agent, and to ampicillin and co-trimoxazole, fluoroquinolones became the drugs of choice. In turn, widespread fluoroquinolone resistance has led to increased use of azithromycin and third generation cephalosporins. In turn, reports of resistance to the latter antibiotics are increasingly occurring. Ironically, there is a reversion to chloramphenicol and co-trimoxazole (and now sometimes to fluoroquinolones) susceptibility in *S. Typhi* in some settings. However, a particular concern is the continuing spread of a multi-drug resistant clone of *S. Typhi* (H58, also known as genotype 4.3.1) across and between countries. Hence, the possible role of newer antibiotics and of vaccines gains added impetus.

The third topic in this section is the increasing role of molecular-based assays for the routine detection of gastrointestinal pathogens.⁹ These assays permit rapid and sensitive detection of gastrointestinal pathogens, but the significance of some of the positive results, especially for potential as opposed to proven pathogens can be confusing. The absence of defined interventions in many such instances means there can often be questionable value of identifying a possible cause for diarrhoeal or other gastrointestinal symptoms. Crucially, also, assay accuracy, the repertoire and so cost of the target organisms, and workflow considerations mean that there is not a one size fits all solution for these molecular detection panels. Clearly, thorough evaluation of these is needed to determine their cost-effectiveness, and thus whether/which panels can replace conventional enteric microbiological methods. Notably, the ability to detect hitherto 'missed' possible causes of gastrointestinal infection may revolutionise the surveillance of these frequent causes of morbidity across both developing and developed countries.

References

1. Mills JP, Rao K, Young VB. Probiotics for Prevention of *Clostridium difficile* Infection. *Curr Opin Gastroenterol* 2017; please add details
2. Shen NT, et al. Timely Use of Probiotics in Hospitalized Adults Prevents *Clostridium difficile* Infection: A Systematic Review With Meta-Regression Analysis. *Gastroenterology*, 2017. 152(8): p. 1889-1900.e9.

3. Evans CT, Johnson S. Prevention of Clostridium difficile infection with probiotics. Clin Infect Dis 2015; 60: Suppl 2: S122-S128.
4. Ollech JE, Shen NT, Crawford CV, Ringel Y. Use of probiotics in prevention and treatment of patients with Clostridium difficile infection. Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol 2016; 30: 111-8.
5. Vernaya M, McAdam J, Hampton MD. Effectiveness of probiotics in reducing the incidence of Clostridium difficile-associated diarrhea in elderly patients: a systematic review. JBI Database System Rev Implement Rep 2017; 15: 140-64.
6. Wilcox MH, Sandoe JA. Results of study of probiotic yoghurt drink to prevent antibiotic-associated diarrhoea are not widely applicable. eBMJ 13 July 2007. <http://www.bmj.com/cgi/eletters/335/7610/80>. BMJ 2007; 335: 171.
7. Allen SJ, Wareham K, Wang D, et al. Lactobacilli and bifidobacteria in the prevention of antibiotic-associated diarrhoea and Clostridium difficile diarrhoea in older inpatients (PLACIDE): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicentre trial. Lancet 2013; 382: 1249-57.
8. Abhilasha Karkey A, Thwaites GE, Baker S. The evolution of antimicrobial resistance in Salmonella Typhi. Curr Opin Gastroenterol 2017; please add details
9. Macfarlane-Smith LR, Ahmed S, Wilcox MH. Molecular versus culture-based testing for gastrointestinal infection. Curr Opin Gastroenterol 2017; please add details