

1 **Prebiotics in infant nutrition: a critical appraisal**

2 **Lorenzo Morelli^{1,*}, Vania Patrone¹, Angelo Pietrobelli^{2,3}**

3 Authors affiliations:

4 ¹ DiSTAS, Department for Sustainable Food Process, Facoltà di Scienze Agrarie, alimentari e
5 ambientali, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Piacenza – Cremona, Italy

6 ²Department of Surgical, Dentistry, Gynecology and Pediatrics, University of Verona – Verona,
7 Italy

8 ³Pennington Biomedical Research Center, Baton Rouge, LA, USA.

9

10 *Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.

11

12 **Abstract:** Supplementation of infant formula with ingredients potentially able to manage, in a way
13 positive for the host, the gut microbiota of infants, is nowadays widely used by infant food
14 producers.

15 The impact of this class of compounds, named prebiotics, on gut microbiota composition, was
16 initially measured on the enrichment of *Bifidobacterium* and *Lactobacillus* spp., but the use of
17 culture-independent analytical techniques has allowed to establish that a larger number of intestinal
18 microorganisms are affected by the ingestion of prebiotics.

19 However, despite a relevant number of scientific publications, actually there is no consensus on the
20 amount of prebiotics to be administered daily, the potentially different actions exerted by prebiotics
21 which differ in biochemical structures, as well as the impact of different percentages of the same
22 prebiotics when used in mixtures and/or combination.

23 This paper is aimed to critically review the available data on the use of prebiotics in infant formula,
24 with special attention paid to identify a link between, the dosage used, the mixture composition and
25 the observed outcomes, keeping in mind the influences in nutrition quality and growth influence.

26

27 **Keywords:** Prebiotics; Infant Nutrition; Infant formula; Gut microbiota; *Lactobacillus*;
28 *Bifidobacterium*; Fructo-oligosaccharides; Galacto-oligosaccharides; Polidextrose; Acidic
29 oligosaccharides.

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42 **1. Introduction**

43 The concept of prebiotic as a “nondigestible food ingredient that beneficially affects the host
44 by selectively stimulating the growth and/or activity of one or a limited number of bacterial species
45 already resident in the colon, and thus improves host health” dates back to 1995 [1]. Prebiotics are
46 then considered a specific fuel that indigenous probiotic bacteria can utilize to grow. Most
47 commonly known and characterized prebiotics are fructo-oligosaccharides (FOS), galacto-
48 oligosaccharides (GOS), inulin, lactulose, and breast milk oligosaccharides [2]. FOS are able to
49 cross the digestive lumen, undigested and unabsorbed, to reach the ascending colon unmodified,
50 where they will be metabolized by the resident probiotic component of the microbiota. Overall,
51 oligosaccharides have a long history of use as food ingredients able to provide health benefits.

52 On this scenario, however, from the initial 1995 definition, several attempts to modify and/or
53 improve the prebiotic definition have been done. In 2003, Reid et al. [3] defined prebiotics “non-
54 digestible substances that provide a beneficial physiological effect on the host by selectively
55 stimulating the favorable growth or activity of a limited number of indigenous bacteria”. In 2004,
56 the definition of prebiotics was further modified “selectively fermented ingredients that allow
57 specific changes, both in the composition and/or activity in the gastrointestinal microflora that
58 confers benefits upon host well-being and health” [4]. In 2007 the Food and Agricultural
59 Organization (FAO) of the United Nations organized a Technical Meeting to update the definition
60 of prebiotics. The outcome of this meeting was the following definition: “a non-viable food
61 component that confers a health benefit on the host associated with modulation of the microbiota”
62 [5]. In 2010 Gibson et al. [6] defined the narrower category of “dietary prebiotics” as “a selectively
63 fermented ingredient that results in specific changes in the composition and/or activity of the
64 gastrointestinal microbiota, thus conferring benefit(s) upon host health”. In 2015, Bindels et al. [7]
65 proposed that specificity requirements should be removed on the basis of reports showing that
66 multiple taxa, rather than particular species, were enriched by prebiotics. This proposal led to
67 another definition of a prebiotic as “a non-digestible compound that, through its metabolization by

68 microorganisms in the gut, modulates the composition and/or activity of the gut microbiota, thus,
 69 conferring a beneficial physiological effect on the host". In 2017 Gibson et al. [8] defined prebiotic
 70 a substrate that is selectively utilized by host microorganisms conferring a health benefit. This
 71 definition expands the concept of prebiotics to possible applications to body sites other than the
 72 gastrointestinal tract, and diverse categories other than food, while the requirement for selective
 73 microbiota-mediated mechanisms was retained.

74 A common point of all definitions is that prebiotics differ from dietary fibers, which promote
 75 the growth of a wide variety of gut microorganisms, as they selectively serve as nutrients for
 76 beneficial microorganisms harbored by the host, including administered probiotic strains and
 77 indigenous (resident) microorganisms. Therefore a prebiotic should not be broadly metabolized but
 78 elicit a metabolism biased towards health-promoting microorganisms within the indigenous
 79 ecosystem. Due to the fact that the concept of prebiotics is not so clearly defined and remains a
 80 controversy, Table 1 summarized all the definitions in order to give the insights of definition and
 81 have the ambitious to derive at the end a unique and accepted definition.

82

83 **Table 1.** The concept of prebiotic over time

Definition	Authors	Reference
A nondigestible food ingredient that beneficially affects the host by selectively stimulating the growth and/or activity of one or a limited number of bacterial species already resident in the colon, and thus improves host health	Gibson & Roberfroid, 1995	[1]
Nondigestible substances that provide a beneficial physiological effect on the host by selectively stimulating the favourable growth or activity of a limited number of indigenous bacteria	Reid et al., 2003	[3]
A selectively fermented ingredient that allows specific changes, both in the composition and/or activity in the gastrointestinal microflora that confers benefits upon host wellbeing and health	Gibson et al., 2004	[4]
A nonviable food component that confers a health benefit on the host associated with modulation of the microbiota	Pineiro et al., 2008	[5]
A selectively fermented ingredient that results in specific changes in the composition and/or activity of the gastrointestinal microbiota, thus conferring benefit(s)	Gibson et al., 2010	[6]

upon host health		
A nondigestible compound that, through its metabolization by microorganisms in the gut, modulates composition and/or activity of the gut microbiota, thus conferring a beneficial physiological effect on the host	Bindels et al., 2015	[7]
A substrate that is selectively utilized by host microorganisms conferring a health benefit	Gibson et al., 2017	[8]

84

85 As regards gut health and microbiota management, the other side of the coin are probiotics
86 whose definition seems to have reached, after more than half century from its first usage [9], a
87 consensus among the scientific community as “live microorganisms that, when administrated in
88 adequate amounts, confer a health benefit on the host” to exert a wide range of effects [10]. The
89 Panel confirmed that, although some mechanisms might be shared between strains belonging to the
90 same species/genus, health effects are strain-specific and claims of specific benefits must be
91 determined at the strain level. Moreover, to exert the desired effect, any probiotic must be delivered
92 at a functional dose, and the Panel stressed that to establish a clear association between any
93 substance, including probiotics, and a desired effect it is important to examine dose response,
94 among other criteria. It is thus interesting to note that, while probiotics are well described in term of
95 adequate amount and specific role/effect as well as type of microorganisms, the definitions of
96 prebiotics proposed to date have not considered either the specificity of the chemical composition of
97 the prebiotic or its dosage. This is reflected by the heterogeneity of the studies available on
98 prebiotics which differ a lot in terms of amount/dose and type of prebiotics administrated, making
99 direct comparison among results very difficult and not really focused also in meta-analysis and
100 systematic reviews [11].

101 Because there are on the market a wide range of prebiotics, the aim of this paper is to offer a
102 critical appraisal of the existing literature about the clinical outcomes of these gut-directed
103 ingredients in the age 0-12 months, when they are used as a supplement to formula milk.

104 **2. Methods**

105 Only randomized controlled trials (RCT) were eligible for inclusion. Enrolled subjects have to
106 be aged 0-12 months; studies on preterm and unhealthy subject were included. Only full paper
107 written in English were retained for analysis.

108 Studies in which prebiotics were not administered as an ingredient of formula, for example in
109 capsules, were discarded. Studies in which synthetic human milk oligosaccharides were used were
110 excluded.

111 A number of RCTs described the same study population but focused on different outcome
112 measures; they were considered as separate reports and treated individually.

113 A search with the keywords “infants” and prebiotic(s)” and “formula” filtered for “clinical
114 trials” in the databases PubMed, Scopus, Web Of Science, retrieved 145 items, after filtering for
115 duplications, papers not in English, letters or not full papers..

116 Among them a further selection of 71 was done, discarding those dealing with probiotics
117 synbiotics , those enrolling subjects older than 12 months of age , subjects in severe pathological
118 conditions , or those out of scope of this paper (18) for specific reasons (see Supplementary
119 Table.1)

120

121 **3. Results**

122 3.1. *Studies assessing the effects of a single prebiotic ingredient*

123 Table S2 is devoted to the outcomes obtained when a single probiotic ingredient has been
124 tested in human trials.

125 Results obtained when GOS are used as only prebiotic ingredient, at the dosage of 0.4 g/100
126 mL [12–14] suggested that that at this dosage this prebiotic could have an impact on the microbiota
127 composition; fecal parameters such stool consistency and volume are also positively affected, while
128 GOS-supplemented formulas do not seem to exert any effect on the frequency of defecation.
129 Parameters related to health, such as the incidence of infections or allergic manifestations [14,15],

130 are not influenced by GOS supplementation, even when a slightly higher dose (0.5 g/100 mL) is
131 used [15].

132 GOS dosed at 0.8 g/100 mL in the very first weeks of life seem to cause watery stools [13]
133 and this observation could be used as starting point to establish a safety upper level of
134 supplementation; this note is also supported by data provided in 2014 by Williams et al. [13]. These
135 authors, in a trial conducted in United States in 2007-2008 with a formula supplemented with 0.8
136 g/100 mL of GOS, reported a higher percentage of very soft stools in treated infants.

137 Positive results additional to alteration of microbiota and stool composition are reported by
138 Giovannini et al. [12] as they recorded a lower incidence of colic in the supplemented group of
139 infants with respect to the control group.

140 Additionally, Paganini et al. [16] found a lower abundance of virulence and toxin genes in
141 GOS-treated group when compared with the control and Fe only groups. Underwood et al. [17], on
142 the other hand, did not detect significant increases in bifidobacteria compared with baseline in
143 preterm infants dosed with GOS.

144 Turning to fructan prebiotics, among the 5 papers which reported the use of FOS as single
145 prebiotic ingredient [18–22], only Kapiki et al. [20] showed significant, consistent effects on
146 microbiota, in particular on the abundance of bifidobacteria, using 0.4 g/100 mL; a dose of 0.3
147 g/100 mL [18,20,21], is most likely enough for FOS to have a positive influence on stool
148 characteristics.

149 The use of kestose, a fructo-oligosaccharide, has been reported by Shibata et al. [23] to have
150 a positive influence on SCORAD scores of atopic infants. Two papers [24,25] reported the use of
151 fructans derived from agave (*Agave tequilana* Weber cv. Azul). After a safety assessment in
152 healthy, full-term babies [24] two ingredients were assessed for impact on immune response, serum
153 ferritin, C-reactive protein, bone metabolism, and gut bacteria changes. Analysis were performed at
154 20 – 27 days, and three months of age. The authors state that there were statistically significant

155 differences for the groups of infants fed only with infant formula and with formula enriched with
156 these fructans.

157 As far as inulin is concerned, Kim et al. [26] assessed the effects of native inulin in formula-
158 fed babies on gut microbiota, pH, consistency and amount of feces, and on frequency of defecation
159 at a daily dosage of about 5 g/d. The consumption of inulin increased significantly the content of
160 *Bifidobacterium* in the feces of formula-fed babies compared to control, but neither the frequency of
161 defecation nor stool consistency were affected by the consumption of inulin.

162 In the study by Ciosa-Monasterolo et al. [27], oligofructose-enriched inulin at a dose of 0.8
163 g/100 mL was tested, and the authors found a tendency towards higher *Bifidobacterium* cell counts,
164 with a significant higher frequency of depositions and a softer consistency of stools [28].

165
166 *3.2. Studies assessing the effects of combinations of prebiotic ingredient: not strictly gut-related*
167 *clinical outcomes of GOS/FOS administration*

168 A group of papers, all of them with a very similar clinical design and a dosage of GOS/FOS
169 of 0.8 g/100 mL, was devoted to establish a link between the use of this ingredient and immune
170 response (Table S3). Moro et al. [29] reported that 102 infants in the prebiotic group and 104
171 infants in the placebo group (all of them at risk for atopy) completed the study (duration: 6 months).
172 Ten infants in the intervention group and 24 infants in the control group developed atopic
173 dermatitis. Prebiotic supplementation was also producing a significantly higher number of fecal
174 bifidobacteria compared with placebo (maltodextrin) group. An hydrolyzed protein formula was
175 used in both groups.

176 The same design has been used by van Hoffen et al. [30] to assess the effect of GOS/FOS on
177 the immune response in infants at risk for allergy. An hypoallergenic whey formula with either 0.8
178 g/100 mL or 0.8 g/100 mL maltodextrin (placebo) were used for 6 months. At 6 months of age,
179 plasma samples were collected from the 41 treated infants and the 43 subjects of the placebo group.

180 GOS/FOS supplementation resulted into a significant reduction of total IgE, IgG1, IgG2 and IgG3,
181 but not of IgG4 amount. The authors concluded that GOS/FOS supplementation could be a method
182 to limit the atopic development.

183 An additional study on the effect of supplementation of GOS/FOS on plasma markers of
184 allergic disease in infants at risk for allergy was published by Schouten et al. [31]; also in this study
185 hypoallergenic whey formula containing 0.8 g/mL of the GOS/FOS mixture was administered for 6
186 months to 34 infants, while the control group (n=40) received maltodextrin; all of them at risk for
187 atopy. In this paper immunoglobulin free light-chain (Ig-fLC) was checked as a marker of allergic
188 disease. Results supported a positive role of GOS/FOS as in infants receiving the prebiotic mixture,
189 the Ig-fLC levels were significantly lower compared to the placebo-fed infants.

190 MacDonald et al. [32] by means of an 8-week open-label, single-arm, pilot intervention study
191 in 9 infants (8-week median age) tried to establish a role for prebiotics (GOS/FOS 0.8 g/100mL)
192 added to a protein substitute suitable for infants with Phenylketonuria. All infants exhibited
193 microbiota dominated by bifidobacteria, although no statistically significant change from baseline
194 was observed at study endpoint.

195 Arslanoglu et al. [33] showed a preventive effect of the prebiotic mixture GOS/FOS against
196 infections during the first 6 months of life. In this study the cumulative incidence of all types of
197 recurring infections was significantly lower in the GOS/FOS group; prebiotic mixture was used as
198 an ingredient of a hypoallergenic formula. The dose used was 0.8 g/100 mL.

199 Bisceglia et al.[34] published a paper aimed to investigate the effect of dietary
200 supplementation with prebiotics on moderate hyperbilirubinaemia in healthy, term infants. Seventy-
201 six consecutive newborns were randomly assigned to receive a formula containing 0.8 g/100 mL
202 GOS/FOS supplement or maltodextrins as placebo for 28 days. Bilirubin levels and daily defecation
203 frequency was also recorded. A statistically significant lower transcutaneous bilirubin was detected

204 in neonates receiving prebiotics, from 72 h of life, till the end of the dietary intervention (day 28).
205 Treated infants also showed a higher frequency of defecation, when compared to neonates on
206 placebo, over all the duration of dietary intervention.

207 The dose of 0.4 g/100 mL has been used by Bruzzese et al. [35] in order to reduce the
208 incidence of intestinal and respiratory infections in healthy infants. In this massive study 352
209 subjects were enrolled and fed with the prebiotic formula or the control one for a period of one year.
210 The incidence of gastroenteritis and the number of children with multiple antibiotic courses/year
211 was lower in the supplemented group than in the controls.

212 A few other studies tested the effects of mixtures of GOS/FOS with atypical dosages, i. e.
213 different from the concentrations 0.4-0.8 g/100 mL (Table S4).

214 Brunser et al. [36] evaluated the effects on intestinal microbiota composition of infants but
215 after an amoxicillin treatment for upper respiratory tract infections. This study is of particular
216 relevance for the purpose of this review, in fact the mixture used was oligofructose and inulin in
217 70/30 proportion by weight (and not 9:1), at a dosage of 0.45 g/100 mL after formula
218 reconstitution. This dosage showed that infants fed a milk formula supplemented with prebiotics
219 had higher counts of bifidobacteria and lactobacilli than those fed the same formula but without the
220 prebiotics. The total fecal bacterial count population returned to the levels before amoxicillin
221 administration without differences between the groups, confirming that prebiotics do not influence
222 the recovery of the total flora.

223 A dose different from the 0.4-0.8 g/100 mL was also used by Alliet et al. [37]: these authors
224 used GOS/FOS in a 9:1 ratio but a dose of 0.6 g/100 mL. Aim of this study was the evaluation of
225 prebiotics consumption related to cholesterol and triacylglycerol levels in infants. The study was
226 organized into 3 arms: breast fed, standard formula and the same formula supplemented with
227 GOS/FOS. Among the 187 infants which completed the study the total cholesterol and LDL levels

228 were significantly lower in the formula-fed groups than in the breast-fed infants but there were no
229 significant differences between the formula-fed groups. Authors concluded that there are no
230 differences in total cholesterol and LDL cholesterol in infants receiving an infant formula with
231 GOS/lcFOS (with this dosage) from infants receiving a control infant formula.

232

233 3.3. *Studies assessing the effects of combinations of prebiotic ingredient: intestinal effects of* 234 *GOS/FOS*

235 The majority of papers reporting the use of GOS/FOS in a 9:1 ratio, were aimed to assess the
236 impact of this prebiotic mixture on microbiota composition of full term infants, with special
237 emphasis on lactobacilli, bifidobacteria, enterobacteriaceae and clostridia as well as on defecation
238 frequency and stool parameters (Table S5).

239 Moro et al., in two different clinical trials [38,39] used two levels of prebiotics (0.4 and 0.8
240 g/100 mL) to supplement infant formula in 180 infants in order to identify the most active dose in
241 promoting a microbiota composition close to that one on breast fed babies. After these preliminary
242 steps, and since the paper of Knol et al. [40], the selected dosage seemed to be the 0.8 g/100 mL and
243 used in the majority of papers. Knol et al. [40] analysed by means of plate counts and fluorescent in
244 vivo hybridization (FISH) the stools of 19 infants treated with the GOS/FOS mixture in comparison
245 with 19 infants fed breast milk and 15 fed the control formula. In addition to bacterial counts
246 several stool parameters were assessed such as lactate, short-chain fatty acids (acetate, propionate),
247 pH, stool consistency. All of them were more close to parameters detected in breast-fed babies
248 mainly when the 0.8 g/100 mL was used. An increase in frequency of defecation was noticed by
249 Moro et al. [38] only in infants receiving the 0.8 g/100 mL dose.

250 Haarman & Knol in two following papers used a quantitative PCR approach to evaluate
251 species-specific changes in *Bifidobacterium* [41] and *Lactobacillus* [42] in full-term babies fed with

252 a formula containing 0.8 g/100 mL of the GOS/FOS mixture. In both articles this analytical
253 approach showed that the prebiotic mixture supports species that are dominant in breast-fed babies.

254 Bakker-Zierikzee et al. [43] compared the effects of GOS/FOS 0.8 g/100 mL in 19 infants to
255 the impact of the use of a probiotic *Bifidobacterium* in the early stage of life (5 to 16 weeks). The
256 only significant difference was higher fecal acetate ratio and lactate concentration and a lower pH at
257 16 weeks.

258 Costalos et al. [44], using a dose of dose of 0.4 g/100 mL, found a significantly higher stool
259 frequency and softer consistency in the prebiotic group while these outcomes were noticed only in
260 the group treated with 0.8 g/mL in the paper by Moro et al. [38]. On the other hand, this paper [44]
261 confirms that, at this dosage, no statistically significant differences are detectable in the bacterial
262 counts. In addition, Holscher et al. [45] also using the low dose of 0.4 g/100 mL reported that feces
263 from infants fed with prebiotics had a higher absolute number and proportion of bifidobacteria
264 when compared to control formula and they did not differ from breast-fed infants.

265 On the contrary, Vivatvakin et al. [46] using the low dosage reported better scores of
266 gastrointestinal comfort in infants fed a whey-predominant formula containing long chain
267 polyunsaturated fatty acids and GOS/FOS, when compared to infants fed a control casein-
268 predominant formula without additional ingredients. Healthy, full-term infants were randomized to
269 receive exclusively either experimental (n=67) or control formula (n=69) from 30 days to 4 months
270 of age; exclusively breast-fed infants (n=67) served as reference. Compared to the control, the
271 experimental group had less hard stools as well as a microbiota composition closer to that of the
272 breast-fed group.

273 Veereman-Wauters et al. [47] reported results of a mixture of two types of fructose-based
274 oligosaccharides (long and short chain 50:50) administered at a dose of either 0.4 or 0.8 g/100 mL
275 and the GOS/FOS mixture administered at 0.8 g/100 mL. The study lasted for 28 days and subjects
276 enrolled were 81, divided into 3 treatments groups and one control, plus a reference group of 29
277 breast-fed infants. The authors reported that all the 3 prebiotic groups maintained soft stools, only

278 slightly harder than those of breast-fed infants but the control group (formula without prebiotics)
279 had significantly harder stools at weeks 2 and 4. The total number of fecal bacteria increased in all
280 of the prebiotic groups. In the groups supplemented with 8 g/100 mL, *Bifidobacterium* counts were
281 significantly higher and were comparable with the breast-fed group.

282 Salvini et al. [48] recruited 20 newborns of hepatitis C virus-infected mothers who decided
283 not to breast-feed. These neonates were randomly assigned to either a formula with 0.8 g/100 mL
284 of a GOS/FOS or a placebo formula (maltodextrin). Measured outcomes were anthropometric data,
285 microbiological analysis of fecal samples, and blood leukocyte population. Prebiotic
286 supplementation resulted in more fecal bifidobacteria and lactobacilli compared with the placebo
287 group. These differences between the groups were maintained during the second half of the first
288 year without any prebiotic supplementation, supporting a long lasting effect of the prebiotic
289 treatment.

290 Holscher et al. [45] enrolled full-term, formula-fed (FF) infants compared to a breast-fed
291 group (BF). FF infants were randomized to consume a partially hydrolyzed whey formula with or
292 without 0.4 g/100 mL GOS/FOS. Fecal bacteria, pH, and SCFA were assessed at baseline, 3
293 weeks, and 6 weeks. Feces from infants fed prebiotics had a higher absolute number and proportion
294 of bifidobacteria which did not differ from that of BF infants. Notably, the established bifidogenic
295 effect of GOS/FOS did not result in any differences in infant growth parameters compared to
296 control infant formula without prebiotics and/or probiotics [49].

297 Dasopoulou et al. [50] published a study similar to those of Indrio et al. [51,52] testing the
298 hypothesis that prebiotics could alter motilin and gastrin secretion and reduce lipids in healthy
299 preterms. Outcomes were positive as mean motilin increase compared with the control group while
300 gastrin remained high in both groups.

301 The most recent development of the use of GOS/FOS at 0.8 g/100 mL is their addition to a
302 formula milk fermented with *Bifidobacterium breve* and *Streptococcus thermophilus* [53,54]. Huet
303 et al. [53] studied safety and tolerance of the combination of partly fermented infant milk formula

304 and GOS/FOS in healthy term infants enrolled before 28 days of age and followed up to 17 weeks
305 of age. Four hundred and thirty infants were divided into 4 groups: (1) formula with scGOS/lcFOS,
306 (2) formula + GOS/FOS +15% fermented formula, (3) formula + GOS/FOS +50% fermented
307 formula, (4) formula + 50% fermented formula, in order to check the daily weight gain during
308 intervention and to monitor infants' anthropometrics data, formula intake, number, and safety.
309 Physiological and bacterial data were obtained from stool samples collected at baseline and at the
310 end of the trial. Results showed equivalence of weight gain while no differences were observed in
311 other controlled parameters. Supplementation with GOS/FOS provided beneficial effects such as a
312 lower pH, lower *Clostridium difficile* levels, and higher secretory immunoglobulin A levels.

313 Vandeplas et al. [54] using the same sample size than above assessed the impact of this
314 combination among formula, fermented formula and prebiotic on colic. After 4 weeks of treatment
315 the research group demonstrated a reduced overall incidence of infantile colic in group 3 GOS/FOS
316 +50% FERM, better than in group 1 and 4, suggesting a dose response for the fermented formula.

317 The mixture GOS/FOS 9:1 has been also used also in feeding of preterm infants (Table S6).

318 Boehm et al. [55] used a dosage (i.e. 1 g/100 mL) higher than those used in full term infants
319 (0.4 or 0.8 g 100/mL); not surprisingly, they demonstrated a strong bifidogenic effect of prebiotic-
320 supplemented formula as well as a positive impact on stool frequency.

321 Mihatsch, et al. [56] used the same dosage to evaluate tolerability and the capacity of
322 prebiotics to reduce stool viscosity and accelerate gastrointestinal transport, in order to improve
323 feeding tolerance. Both these parameters were positively affected by the prebiotic supplementation
324 in the 10 treated infants compared to the same number of control subjects.

325 Indrio et al. [52] measured gastric electrical activity and the gastric emptying time in 10
326 preterm neonates fed with a formula containing 0.8 mg/100 mL GOS/FOS. After a feeding period
327 of 15 days, both parameters were significantly improved when compared to the 10 infants of the
328 placebo group. These results were confirmed in a larger study of the same research group [51]

329 involving 49 preterm newborns. After an intervention period of 30 days, infants administered 0.8
330 mg/100 mL GOS/FOS showed a percentage of EGG slow wave propagation and a gastric half
331 emptying time similar to those of breast-fed infants.

332 Modi et al. [57] performed a large study in preterm infants (79 control and 71 useful for the primary
333 outcome) using formula plus prebiotics to augment insufficient maternal milk volume; the prebiotic
334 milk was dosed at 0.8/100 mL. The primary outcome was set in a total milk intake of 150 mL/kg/d;
335 no significant differences were found in this outcome from trial entry to 28 days, while some
336 benefits were recorded for secondary outcomes.

337 Armanian et al. [58] evaluated if prebiotics have benefits for the management of
338 hyperbilirubinemia in preterm neonates. The prebiotic group displayed lower bilirubin level and
339 peak bilirubin level than the placebo group over the study period. In addition, stool frequency was
340 significantly increased in the prebiotic group.

341 3.4. *Studies assessing the effects of combinations of prebiotic ingredients: effects of prebiotic* 342 *mixtures based on polydextrose (PDX)*

343 Considerable research has been devoted to investigate the potential effects of polydextrose
344 (PDX) in association with galacto-oligosaccharides (Table S7).

345 The first paper reporting data on the use of polydextrose as a prebiotic for infant was
346 published in 2007 by Ziegler and coworkers [59]. The study evaluated 2 different combinations of
347 prebiotic ingredients, PDX, GOS and lactulose (LOS), at 2 different intake levels on growth and
348 tolerance in healthy term infants up to 120 days of age. Dosage was 0.4 g/100 mL (PG4) of a
349 prebiotic blend containing PDX and GOS in a 50:50 ratio (74 subjects) or 0.8 g/100 mL (PG8) of a
350 prebiotic blend containing PDX, GOS, and LOS, 50:33:17 ratio (76 subjects); a control group (76
351 subjects) fed with the same formula without any prebiotic supplementation was also enrolled. The
352 authors reported that : “There were no statistically significant differences among the 3 formula

353 groups for weight growth rate or length growth rate at any time point. Significant differences in
354 stool consistency were detected among the 3 formula groups at 30, 60, and 90 days of age with the
355 supplemented formula groups having looser stools than the control group. A statistical difference
356 was detected among the formula groups in 3 categories of adverse events: diarrhea (control vs
357 PG4), eczema (PG4 vs control; PG4 vs PGL8), and irritability (control vs PGL8)".

358 Nakamura et al. [60] using the same trial design with the addition of a breast-fed reference
359 group and focusing on the bacterial composition of gut microbiota, reported the lack of adverse
360 effects in treated infants, and a stool consistency significantly softer or looser in the breast fed
361 group than in all of the groups that received formula. As regards the bacterial communities they
362 noticed that individual profiles tended to cluster by subject rather than by group.

363 The following five papers all used the PDX/GOS dose of 0.4g/100 mL in a 1:1 ratio of
364 PDX/GOS.

365 Scalabrin et al.[61], in a study in which 230 infants completed the protocol, showed that
366 consuming PDX/GOS resulted in softer stools than control at all times . Using qPCR, bacterial
367 counts in PDX/GOS were closer to those of the breast-fed group.

368 Ashley et al.[62] published a paper in which the PDX/GOS mixture was compared to the
369 same amount (0.4 g/100 mL) of GOS only. The noticed softer stools for infants in the PDX/GOS
370 and GOS groups versus control till 90 days but this positive remark remained 120 days for the
371 PDX/GOS group only.

372 Hicks et al. [63] investigated the effect of PDX/GOS supplementation on calcium absorption
373 in infants fed a formula containing or not prebiotics and in comparison with a group of human
374 milk-fed (HM) infants. The authors did not observe any significant effect of prebiotics on calcium
375 absorption or other markers of bone mineral metabolism.

376 Pärtty et al. [64] used the PDX/GOS supplementation in preterm infants in comparison with
377 the supplementation of a probiotic *Lactobacillus*. Both supplementation lasted for the first 2 months
378 of life while infants were followed up for 1 year. The major result reported was that infants
379 classified as excessive criers were significantly less in the prebiotic and the probiotic groups (no
380 significant differences between the two treatments) than in the placebo group.

381 Finally, Luoto et al. [65] also using a cohort of preterm infants and the same
382 prebiotic/probiotic comparison, hypothesized that early prebiotic or probiotic supplementation
383 could reduce the risk of virus-associated respiratory tract infections (RTIs) during the first year of
384 life. A significantly lower incidence of RTIs, including those due to rhinovirus, was detected in
385 infants receiving prebiotics compared with those receiving placebo.

386 3.5. *Studies assessing the effects of combinations of prebiotic ingredients: effects of GOS/FOS in*
387 *association with pectin hydrolysate-derived acidic oligosaccharides (pAOS)*

388 The addition to formula of with 0.2 g/100 mL acidic oligosaccharides (pAOS), derived from
389 citrus pectin by enzymatic hydrolysis, was studied for the first time by Fanaro et al. [66] (Table S8).
390 Three groups were enrolled: a placebo group (maltodextrins, 16 subjects), a pAOS group (16
391 subjects) and a reference group (15 subjects) with pAOS supplementation together with 0.6
392 g/100mL GOS/FOS 9:1. The only positive outcome detected in the pAOS treated infants was a
393 stool consistency significantly softer in comparison with the group fed the standard formula. In
394 infants fed the three oligosaccharides, bifidobacteria and lactobacilli counts were increased, the
395 stool frequency was significantly higher while stool consistency scores were the lowest of the 3
396 groups.

397 Also Magne et al. [67] used the 0.6 g/100 mL dose of GOS/FOS; these authors checked the
398 impact of the 3 oligo-containing prebiotics on microbiota composition and also in this case, while
399 the presence of GOS/FOS positively altered gut microbiota composition, the further addition of
400 pAOS does not seem to have any effects.

401 A further evaluation of this 3 faceted prebiotic supplementation has been published in 2001
402 by Piemontese et al. [68]; in this work, also aimed to established safety and gut impact of this new
403 prebiotic formulation, the dose of 0.8 g /100 mL of GOS/FOS was used. Growth, tolerance and
404 adverse events were assessed at 8, 16, 24 and 52 weeks of age in three groups of infants. The
405 prebiotic and control groups showed similar anthropometric parameters at each study point. The
406 stool consistency in the prebiotic group was softer than in the control group at 8, 16 and 24 weeks
407 and closer to that of the breast-feeding group. There was no difference in the incidence of adverse
408 events between the two formula groups.

409 After these preliminary papers a full range of studies (6 out of the total 15 selected for our
410 analysis) has been published on the potential use of this 3 components prebiotic formula in preterm
411 infants.

412 Focus on the potential role of this mixture in preterm infants was put by Westerbeek and
413 coworkers in 5 following papers [69–73] .

414 As regards infectious morbidity [69] the authors reported that enteral supplementation of
415 GOS/FOS/pAOS does not significantly reduce the risk of serious infectious morbidity in preterm
416 infants even if they noticed a tendency toward a lower incidence of infections, especially for those
417 caused by endogenous bacteria. The two papers of 2011 were centered on the effects on intestinal
418 inflammation, as measured by fecal IL-8 and calprotectin [70] as well as on intestinal permeability
419 of preterm infants [71]. Conclusions of both paper were not positive: the use of this mixture of
420 prebiotics does not enhance the reduction of intestinal permeability in the first week of life [71] and
421 the levels of fecal IL-8 and calprotectin are not positively affected.

422 A more recent paper on the use of this prebiotic mixture in preterm infants has been published
423 by the same group [72]; this paper was aimed to investigate the fecal microbiota and intestinal
424 microenvironment in preterm infants. In this case authors noticed an increase in the postnatal
425 intestinal colonization, even if the extensive use of broad-spectrum antibiotics in preterm infants

426 has a negative impact on of all component of the intestinal microbiota, then hampering and
427 delaying the normal microbiota development.

428 In the same year the same group [73] tested 113 preterm infants to establish a potential link
429 between the use of these prebiotics and the vaccine antibody response. The selected vaccination was
430 a diphtheria, tetanus, acellular pertussis, polio and *Haemophilus influenzae* type b combination
431 vaccine. The outcomes were negative as geometric mean titers were not different after prebiotic
432 supplementation at 5 months of life and therefore authors' conclusions were that enteral
433 supplementation of GOS/FOS/pAOS does not improve the immunization response in preterm
434 infants.

435 These outcomes confirmed those reported two years before by Stam et al.[74] with a similar
436 vaccine as they conclude that “ no effect of prebiotics supplementation on vaccination specific
437 antibody levels was found in children up to the age of 12 months; the vaccine specific antibody
438 levels in infants fed the study prebiotics or a control diet were similar during the first year of life”.

439 The mixture GOS/FOS/pAOS was, on the contrary, positively tested in allergic infants;
440 Gruber et al. [75] assessed the impact of formula with this supplementation on the occurrence of
441 atopic dermatitis in the first year of life. In this case healthy term infants with low atopy risk were
442 recruited before the age of 8 weeks. A total of 414 infants were randomized to the prebiotic group,
443 416 infants to the control group (no prebiotics) and 300 infants were the reference breast-fed group.
444 At the first birthday, atopic dermatitis occurred in significantly fewer infants from the prebiotic
445 group than from the control group and the cumulative incidence of atopic dermatitis in the prebiotic
446 group was in the low range of the breast-feeding group. Authors conclude that the number needed
447 to prevent 1 case of atopic dermatitis by supplementation of prebiotics was 25 infants.

448 Opposite results were obtained by Boyle et al. [76] as regards eczema incidence. Infants with
449 a family history of allergic disease were randomized to be fed with an active (n = 432) or control (n
450 = 431) formula until 6 months of age and the primary outcome was cumulative incidence of eczema
451 by 12 months. Eczema occurred by 12 months at 28.7% in both groups. Prebiotic formula did not

452 change most immune markers but reduced cow's milk-specific IgG1 and increased regulatory T-cell
453 and plasmacytoid dendritic cell percentages.

454 Also a third paper published by Niele et al. [77] reported no effects when the 3 prebiotic
455 mixture is administered to potentially allergic infants. A short-term supplementation of
456 GOS/FOS/pAOS was administered during the first postnatal weeks. Incidence of allergic and
457 infectious diseases was assessed by validated questionnaires. The incidence of atopic dermatitis,
458 bronchial hyper-reactivity and infections of the upper and lower respiratory tract as well as
459 gastrointestinal diseases was not different between the groups.

460 Infections occurrence in prebiotic treated groups was investigated by van Stuijvenberg et al.
461 [78] The objective of the study was to assess the number of fever episodes in the first year of life.
462 No effect of adding specific prebiotics to standard formula feeding was found in reducing the
463 number of fever episodes..

464

465 **4. Discussion**

466 In 2012 the European Society for Paediatric Gastroenterology Hepatology and Nutrition
467 (ESPGHAN) underlined that the available scientific data suggest that formula supplemented with
468 prebiotics and administered to healthy infants do not raise safety concerns with regard to growth
469 and adverse effects.

470 The same evaluation has been recently presented by Skorka et al [11] as regards growth and
471 tolerance parameters, so confirming the same statements of all most recent reviews [79–85]. Then
472 the following considerations will be focused only on the efficacy of prebiotics as functionally active
473 ingredients of infant formula.

474 Effects on stool: consistency.

475 Softer stool consistency is reported in substantially all papers that have checked this outcome,
476 even in papers in which components more likely to have a bulking, fiber-like effects are absent
477 [13,14,18,20,62]. Quite significantly, for the evaluation of a dose-related effect, FOS seems to have

478 effect on consistency when dosed at 0.3 g/100 mL and not at a dose of 0.15 g/100 mL [18] while
479 GOS, even if dosed at 0.4 g 100/mL seem to reduce consistency of stools in two trials [13,14] but
480 not in another [12].

481 However, a more significant difference about the incidence of hard stool has been reported
482 when more than one prebiotic is used and at a higher dose: GOS/FOS are more active when dosed
483 at 0.8 g/100 mL when compared to 0.4 g/mL [39,40,44].

484 The addition of pAOS to GOS/FOS does not seem to have an additional impact on stool
485 consistency when compared to results for GOS/FOS [66]; the addition to PDX to GOS resulted in
486 stool consistency very close to those reported for GOS/FOS [59,62].

487 Effects on stool: frequency.

488 Reports on a positive impact on frequency are less frequent than the previous ones regarding
489 consistency. Higher frequency were reported for FOS [18,20] GOS [14] GOS/FOS/pAOS [66] and
490 in preterm [55,56].

491 Gut –related effects: microbiota composition.

492 Substantially all papers reported some positive effects on the counts of bifidobacteria and
493 lactobacilli, regardless of the kind of prebiotic, the daily dose and the length of treatment. The few
494 papers reporting no increase in bifidobacteria used a low dosage [43] or pAOS alone [66]. However,
495 this general observation is in contrast with the reported outcomes “outside the gut” : as it will be
496 showed below, outcomes related to immune system, allergy, infections are definitely more dose
497 related. This could suggest that prebiotics have an impact on gut microbiota components different
498 from those generally analyzed in all the published papers and that these still undetermined
499 components of the intestinal bacterial ecosystems are the real responsible for the positive effects of
500 prebiotics.

501 Gut –related effects: intestinal discomfort.

502 Colic is one of the most common intestinal discomfort for infants; a potential role of the use
503 of prebiotic substances in reducing colics has been reported by authors using GOS only at a low

504 dosage [12] but also with GOS/FOS used in a fermented formula [54]. Reduction of excessive
505 crying was also reported by using PDX/GOS [64] or GOS/FOS at 0.8 g/100 mL supplemented to a
506 fermented formula [54] but also with the simple addition of 0.4 g/100 mL GOS [12]. Incidence of
507 diarrhea was reduced also when the 0.4 g/100 mL dose was used [35].

508 Effects on the immune system and infections.

509 The effects on the immune systems seem those in which a marked effect of the dose could be
510 observed.

511 Effects on the immune system and infections: allergy.

512 Improvements of the SCORAD evaluations have been reported for kestose [86] administered
513 at 2 g/day but, quite interestingly for the scope of this paper, authors were unable to establish a link
514 with the bifidobacteria counts. Quite interestingly, no changes in the incidence of allergy was
515 noticed when 0.4 g/100 mL were used [14] as well as 0.6 g/100 mL [87]. Trials with GOS/FOS
516 reported positive outcomes for atopy when the dose of 0.8 mg/ 100 mL was used [29] as well as for
517 higher secretory immunoglobulin A levels [53], and serum immunoglobulin levels [30]. The
518 addition of pAOS to GOS/FOS was reported to have no [74,77] or marginal effects [76].

519 Effects on the immune system and infections: infections.

520 The dose of 0.8 mg/100 mL has been shown to be active in reduction of all types of infections [33].
521 No effect on infections incidence for pAOS/GOS/FOS [69,77,88]. No effect on infections incidence
522 for GOS/FOS dosed lower than 0.8 g/100 mL [14].

523 Effects on preterm infants.

524 A number of papers reported the outcomes of prebiotic supplementation in preterm infants
525 [20,50–52,56–58,69–73,77,88]. No problems of tolerance and safety were reported, regardless of
526 the prebiotic mixture and dose used, even when a very high dose of GOS/FOS [56], higher than
527 those used in full term infants (0.4 or 0.8 g 100/mL) was aimed to evaluate tolerability and reduce
528 stool viscosity and accelerate gastrointestinal transport, in order to improve feeding tolerance. Both

529 these parameters were positively affected by the prebiotic supplementation in the 10 treated infants
530 compared to the same number of control subjects.

531 As regards efficacy, there are conflicting reports about the use of prebiotic ingredients in this
532 specific population group. Absence of results were reported by Modi et al. [57] when GOS/FOS at
533 the usual dose of 0.8 g/100 mL was fed to a large (79 subjects) cohort of preterm infants, with the
534 aim to obtain a total milk intake of 150 mL/kg; on the contrary, the same prebiotic preparation [58]
535 provided an increase of stool frequency, an improvement of feeding tolerance and reduction of
536 bilirubin level; Indrio et al. [51,52] reported positive outcomes for gastric motility, results
537 confirmed by Dasopoulou et al. [50]. Absence of positive outcomes was also reported for the use of
538 the pAOS/GOS/FOS mixture formulation in a series of papers by Westerbeek and coworkers [69–
539 71,88], by van den Berg et al. [73] and Niele et al. [77], with the exception of positive outcomes
540 recorded for stool gut microbiota characteristics [66,68,89].

541 **5. Conclusions**

542 In this paper we have tried to critically evaluate the outcomes, as reported by authors, of the
543 use of prebiotic ingredients in feeding infants aged 0-12 months.

544 The overall appraisal on a potential dose effect on stool consistency and frequency is that a
545 0.3 g/100 mL for fructans and 0.8 g/100 mL for GOS/FOS seem to be the amount of choice in
546 providing significant improvements of these two parameters, but lower doses and different
547 composition of the prebiotic mixture have been shown to have positive effects. It could be possible,
548 in a way similar to that describe for probiotics [10] to define these effects as “widespread”.

549 More “rare” or “specific” are the effects on the immune system, allergy and the incidence of
550 infections. The core information for this statement derives from the worth of papers dealing with the
551 use of GOS/FOS at 0.8 g/100 mL, while the use of additionally components such as pAOS or PDX
552 does not seem to have any significant effect.

553 Prebiotics in preterm infants seem to have little or no impact; however this could be due to a
554 lack of a significant number of studies in large cohorts.

555 From the microbial ecology point of view what could be concluded by the vast amount of data
556 collected is that, while it is likely that any addition of prebiotic could induce some changes in the
557 composition of the gut microbiota, a clinical significance could be achieved only with some specific
558 prebiotic formulation and doses, and this specificity could be worthwhile to be addressed in the
559 definition of the word “prebiotic”.

560 Moreover, studies using the most updated techniques of Next Generation Sequencing, and the
561 analysis of the microbiome composition and not of the microbiota only, are necessary to really
562 understand the role of these ingredients in infant feeding.

563 The most recent studies [90–94] clearly supported the concept that gut microbiota of infants is
564 more complex than a *Bifidobacterium* /*Lactobacillus* ecosystem. Evaluation of the impact of
565 prebiotics on the strictly anaerobic population, such as Ruminococci, Lachnospiraceae, *Blautia*,
566 could be the relevant target for new research and clinical trials.

567 **Supplementary Materials**

568 Table S1: List of all the references considered for the review.

569 Table S2: Human trials assessing the effects of a single prebiotic ingredient.

570 Table S3: The link between GOS/FOS administration and infant immune system.

571 Table S4: Effects of GOS/FOS with atypical dosages.

572 Table S5: Intestinal effects of GOS/FOS in term infants.

573 Table S6: Intestinal effects of GOS/FOS in preterm infants.

574 Table S6: Effects of polydextrose in association with other prebiotic ingredients.

575 Table S8: Trials assessing the effects of pectin hydrolysate-derived acidic oligosaccharides (pAOS)
576 combined with GOS/FOS.

577 **Author Contributions**

578 M.L. developed the concept for the manuscript and wrote the first draft. V.P. and A.P. provided
579 critical feedback and revised the text. All the authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

580 **Conflicts of Interest**

581 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

582

583

584

585

586 **References**

587 1. Gibson, G. R.; Roberfroid, M. B. Dietary modulation of the human colonic microbiota:
588 introducing the concept of prebiotics. *J. Nutr.* **1995**, *125*, 1401–12,
589 doi:10.1093/jn/125.6.1401.

590 2. Roberfroid, M. Prebiotics: the concept revisited. *J. Nutr.* **2007**, *137*, 830S–7S,
591 doi:10.1093/jn/137.3.830S.

592 3. Reid, G.; Sanders, M. E.; Gaskins, H. R.; Gibson, G. R.; Mercenier, A.; Rastall, R.;
593 Roberfroid, M.; Rowland, I.; Cherbut, C.; Klaenhammer, T. R. New scientific paradigms for
594 probiotics and prebiotics. *J. Clin. Gastroenterol.* **2003**, *37*, 105–18.

595 4. Gibson, G. R.; Probert, H. M.; Loo, J. Van; Rastall, R. A.; Roberfroid, M. B. Dietary
596 modulation of the human colonic microbiota: updating the concept of prebiotics. *Nutr. Res.*
597 *Rev.* **2004**, *17*, 259–75, doi:10.1079/NRR200479.

598 5. Pineiro, M.; Asp, N.-G.; Reid, G.; Macfarlane, S.; Morelli, L.; Brunser, O.; Tuohy, K. FAO
599 Technical Meeting on Prebiotics. *J. Clin. Gastroenterol.* **2008**, *42*, S156–S159,
600 doi:10.1097/MCG.0b013e31817f184e.

601 6. Gibson, G. R.; Scott, K. P.; Rastall, R. A.; Tuohy, K. M.; Hotchkiss, A.; Dubert-Ferrandon,
602 A.; Gareau, M.; Murphy, E. F.; Saulnier, D.; Loh, G.; Macfarlane, S.; Delzenne, N.; Ringel,
603 Y.; Kozianowski, G.; Dickmann, R.; Lenoir-Wijnkoop, I.; Walker, C.; Buddington, R.
604 Dietary prebiotics: current status and new definition. *Food Sci. Technol. Bull. Funct. Foods*

- 605 **2010**, 7, 1–19, doi:10.1616/1476-2137.15880.
- 606 7. Bindels, L. B.; Delzenne, N. M.; Cani, P. D.; Walter, J. Towards a more comprehensive
607 concept for prebiotics. *Nat. Rev. Gastroenterol. Hepatol.* **2015**, 12, 303–10,
608 doi:10.1038/nrgastro.2015.47.
- 609 8. Gibson, G. R.; Hutkins, R.; Sanders, M. E.; Prescott, S. L.; Reimer, R. A.; Salminen, S. J.;
610 Scott, K.; Stanton, C.; Swanson, K. S.; Cani, P. D.; Verbeke, K.; Reid, G. Expert consensus
611 document: The International Scientific Association for Probiotics and Prebiotics (ISAPP)
612 consensus statement on the definition and scope of prebiotics. *Nat. Rev. Gastroenterol.*
613 *Hepatol.* **2017**, 14, 491–502, doi:10.1038/nrgastro.2017.75.
- 614 9. Fuller, R. Probiotics in man and animals. *J. Appl. Bacteriol.* **1989**, 66, 365–78.
- 615 10. Hill, C.; Guarner, F.; Reid, G.; Gibson, G. R.; Merenstein, D. J.; Pot, B.; Morelli, L.; Canani,
616 R. B.; Flint, H. J.; Salminen, S.; Calder, P. C.; Sanders, M. E. Expert consensus document.
617 The International Scientific Association for Probiotics and Prebiotics consensus statement on
618 the scope and appropriate use of the term probiotic. *Nat. Rev. Gastroenterol. Hepatol.* **2014**,
619 11, 506–14, doi:10.1038/nrgastro.2014.66.
- 620 11. Skórka, A.; Pieścik-Lech, M.; Kołodziej, M.; Szajewska, H. Infant formulae supplemented
621 with prebiotics: Are they better than unsupplemented formulae? An updated systematic
622 review. *Br. J. Nutr.* **2018**, 119, 810–825, doi:10.1017/S0007114518000120.
- 623 12. Giovannini, M.; Verduci, E.; Gregori, D.; Ballali, S.; Soldi, S.; Ghisleni, D.; Riva, E.;
624 PLAGOS Trial Study Group Prebiotic effect of an infant formula supplemented with galacto-
625 oligosaccharides: randomized multicenter trial. *J. Am. Coll. Nutr.* **2014**, 33, 385–93,
626 doi:10.1080/07315724.2013.878232.
- 627 13. Williams, T.; Choe, Y.; Price, P.; Katz, G.; Suarez, F.; Paule, C.; Mackey, A. Tolerance of

- 628 formulas containing prebiotics in healthy, term infants. *J. Pediatr. Gastroenterol. Nutr.* **2014**,
629 *59*, 653–8, doi:10.1097/MPG.0000000000000513.
- 630 14. Sierra, C.; Bernal, M.-J.; Blasco, J.; Martínez, R.; Dalmau, J.; Ortuño, I.; Espín, B.; Vasallo,
631 M.-I.; Gil, D.; Vidal, M.-L.; Infante, D.; Leis, R.; Maldonado, J.; Moreno, J.-M.; Román, E.
632 Prebiotic effect during the first year of life in healthy infants fed formula containing GOS as
633 the only prebiotic: a multicentre, randomised, double-blind and placebo-controlled trial. *Eur.*
634 *J. Nutr.* **2015**, *54*, 89–99, doi:10.1007/s00394-014-0689-9.
- 635 15. Boženský, J.; Hill, M.; Zelenka, R.; Skýba, T. Prebiotics do not influence the severity of
636 atopic dermatitis in infants: A randomised controlled trial. *PLoS One* **2015**, *10*, 1–8,
637 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0142897.
- 638 16. Paganini, D.; Uyoga, M. A.; Kortman, G. A. M.; Cercamondi, C. I.; Moretti, D.; Barth-
639 Jaeggi, T.; Schwab, C.; Boekhorst, J.; Timmerman, H. M.; Lacroix, C.; Karanja, S.;
640 Zimmermann, M. B. Prebiotic galacto-oligosaccharides mitigate the adverse effects of iron
641 fortification on the gut microbiome: a randomised controlled study in Kenyan infants. *Gut*
642 **2017**, *66*, 1956–1967, doi:10.1136/gutjnl-2017-314418.
- 643 17. Underwood, M. A.; Kalanetra, K. M.; Bokulich, N. A.; Mirmiran, M.; Barile, D.; Tancredi,
644 D. J.; German, J. B.; Lebrilla, C. B.; Mills, D. A. Prebiotic oligosaccharides in premature
645 infants. *J. Pediatr. Gastroenterol. Nutr.* **2014**, *58*, 352–60,
646 doi:10.1097/MPG.0000000000000211.
- 647 18. Euler, A. R.; Mitchell, D. K.; Kline, R.; Pickering, L. K. Prebiotic effect of fructo-
648 oligosaccharide supplemented term infant formula at two concentrations compared with
649 unsupplemented formula and human milk. *J. Pediatr. Gastroenterol. Nutr.* **2005**, *40*, 157–64.
- 650 19. Brunser, O.; Figueroa, G.; Gotteland, M.; Haschke-Becher, E.; Magliola, C.; Rochat, F.;
651 Cruchet, S.; Palframan, R.; Gibson, G.; Chauffard, F.; Haschke, F. Effects of probiotic or

- 652 prebiotic supplemented milk formulas on fecal microbiota composition of infants. *Asia Pac.*
653 *J. Clin. Nutr.* **2006**, *15*, 368–376.
- 654 20. Kapiki, A.; Costalos, C.; Oikonomidou, C.; Triantafyllidou, A.; Loukatou, E.; Pertrohilou, V.
655 The effect of a fructo-oligosaccharide supplemented formula on gut flora of preterm infants.
656 *Early Hum. Dev.* **2007**, *83*, 335–9, doi:10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2006.07.003.
- 657 21. Khoshoo, V.; Sun, S. S.; Storm, H. Tolerance of an enteral formula with insoluble and
658 prebiotic fiber in children with compromised gastrointestinal function. *J. Am. Diet. Assoc.*
659 **2010**, *110*, 1728–1733, doi:10.1016/j.jada.2010.08.011.
- 660 22. Xia, Q.; Williams, T.; Hustead, D.; Price, P.; Morrison, M.; Yu, Z. Quantitative analysis of
661 intestinal bacterial populations from term infants fed formula supplemented with fructo-
662 oligosaccharides. *J. Pediatr. Gastroenterol. Nutr.* **2012**, *55*, 314–320,
663 doi:10.1097/MPG.0b013e3182523254.
- 664 23. Shibata, R.; Kimura, M.; Takahashi, H.; Mikami, K.; Aiba, Y.; Takeda, H.; Koga, Y. Clinical
665 effects of kestose, a prebiotic oligosaccharide, on the treatment of atopic dermatitis in infants.
666 *Clin. Exp. Allergy* **2009**, *39*, 1397–1403, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2222.2009.03295.x.
- 667 24. López-Velázquez, G.; Díaz-García, L.; Anzo, A.; Parra-Ortiz, M.; Llamosas-Gallardo, B.;
668 Ortiz-Hernández, A. A.; Mancilla-Ramírez, J.; Cruz-Rubio, J. M.; Gutiérrez-Castrellón, P.
669 Safety of a dual potential prebiotic system from Mexican agave “Metlin® and Metlos®”,
670 incorporated to an infant formula for term newborn babies: a randomized controlled trial.
671 *Rev. Invest. Clin.* *65*, 483–90.
- 672 25. López-Velázquez, G.; Parra-Ortiz, M.; Mora, I. D. la M.-D. la; García-Torres, I.; Enríquez-
673 Flores, S.; Alcántara-Ortigoza, M. A.; Angel, A. G.-D.; Velázquez-Aragón, J.; Ortiz-
674 Hernández, R.; Cruz-Rubio, J. M.; Villa-Barragán, P.; Jiménez-Gutiérrez, C.; Gutiérrez-
675 Castrellón, P. Effects of Fructans from Mexican Agave in Newborns Fed with Infant

- 676 Formula: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Nutrients* **2015**, *7*, 8939–51,
677 doi:10.3390/nu7115442.
- 678 26. Kim, S. H.; Da, H. L.; Meyer, D. Supplementation of infant formula with native inulin has a
679 prebiotic effect in formula-fed babies. *Asia Pac. J. Clin. Nutr.* **2007**, *16*, 172–177.
- 680 27. Closa-Monasterolo, R.; Gispert-Llaurado, M.; Luque, V.; Ferre, N.; Rubio-Torrents, C.;
681 Zaragoza-Jordana, M.; Escribano, J. Safety and efficacy of inulin and oligofructose
682 supplementation in infant formula: Results from a randomized clinical trial. *Clin. Nutr.* **2013**,
683 *32*, 918–927, doi:10.1016/j.clnu.2013.02.009.
- 684 28. Nowacki, J.; Lee, H.-C.; Lien, R.; Cheng, S.-W.; Li, S.-T.; Yao, M.; Northington, R.; Jan, I.;
685 Mutungi, G. Stool fatty acid soaps, stool consistency and gastrointestinal tolerance in term
686 infants fed infant formulas containing high sn-2 palmitate with or without oligofructose: a
687 double-blind, randomized clinical trial. *Nutr. J.* **2014**, *13*, 105, doi:10.1186/1475-2891-13-
688 105.
- 689 29. Moro, G.; Arslanoglu, S.; Stahl, B.; Jelinek, J.; Wahn, U.; Boehm, G. A mixture of prebiotic
690 oligosaccharides reduces the incidence of atopic dermatitis during the first six months of age.
691 *Arch. Dis. Child.* **2006**, *91*, 814–9, doi:10.1136/adc.2006.098251.
- 692 30. van Hoffen, E.; Ruiters, B.; Faber, J.; M'Rabet, L.; Knol, E. F.; Stahl, B.; Arslanoglu, S.;
693 Moro, G.; Boehm, G.; Garssen, J. A specific mixture of short-chain galacto-oligosaccharides
694 and long-chain fructo-oligosaccharides induces a beneficial immunoglobulin profile in
695 infants at high risk for allergy. *Allergy* **2009**, *64*, 484–7, doi:10.1111/j.1398-
696 9995.2008.01765.x.
- 697 31. Schouten, B.; Van Esch, B. C. A. M.; Kormelink, T. G.; Moro, G. E.; Arslanoglu, S.; Boehm,
698 G.; Knippels, L. M. J.; Redegeld, F. A.; Willemsen, L. E. M.; Garssen, J. Non-digestible
699 oligosaccharides reduce immunoglobulin free light-chain concentrations in infants at risk for

- 700 allergy. *Pediatr. Allergy Immunol.* **2011**, 22, 537–42, doi:10.1111/j.1399-3038.2010.01132.x.
- 701 32. MacDonald, A.; Cochrane, B.; Wopereis, H.; Loveridge, N. Specific prebiotics in a formula
702 for infants with Phenylketonuria. *Mol. Genet. Metab.* **2011**, 104 Suppl, S55-9,
703 doi:10.1016/j.ymgme.2011.09.015.
- 704 33. Arslanoglu, S.; Moro, G. E.; Boehm, G. Early supplementation of prebiotic oligosaccharides
705 protects formula-fed infants against infections during the first 6 months of life. *J. Nutr.* **2007**,
706 137, 2420–4, doi:10.1093/jn/137.11.2420.
- 707 34. Bisceglia, M.; Indrio, F.; Riezzo, G.; Poerio, V.; Corapi, U.; Raimondi, F. The effect of
708 prebiotics in the management of neonatal hyperbilirubinaemia. *Acta Paediatr.* **2009**, 98,
709 1579–81, doi:10.1111/j.1651-2227.2009.01387.x.
- 710 35. Bruzzese, E.; Volpicelli, M.; Squeglia, V.; Bruzzese, D.; Salvini, F.; Bisceglia, M.; Lionetti,
711 P.; Cinquetti, M.; Iacono, G.; Amarri, S.; Guarino, A. A formula containing galacto- and
712 fructo-oligosaccharides prevents intestinal and extra-intestinal infections: an observational
713 study. *Clin. Nutr.* **2009**, 28, 156–61, doi:10.1016/j.clnu.2009.01.008.
- 714 36. Brunser, O.; Gotteland, M.; Cruchet, S.; Figueroa, G.; Garrido, D.; Steenhout, P. Effect of a
715 milk formula with prebiotics on the intestinal microbiota of infants after an antibiotic
716 treatment. *Pediatr. Res.* **2006**, 59, 451–6, doi:10.1203/01.pdr.0000198773.40937.61.
- 717 37. Alliet, P.; Scholtens, P.; Raes, M.; Hensen, K.; Jongen, H.; Rummens, J.-L.; Boehm, G.;
718 Vandenplas, Y. Effect of prebiotic galacto-oligosaccharide, long-chain fructo-
719 oligosaccharide infant formula on serum cholesterol and triacylglycerol levels. *Nutrition*
720 **2007**, 23, 719–23, doi:10.1016/j.nut.2007.06.011.
- 721 38. Moro, G.; Minoli, I.; Mosca, M.; Fanaro, S.; Jelinek, J.; Stahl, B.; Boehm, G. Dosage-related
722 bifidogenic effects of galacto- and fructooligosaccharides in formula-fed term infants. *J.*

- 723 *Pediatr. Gastroenterol. Nutr.* **2002**, *34*, 291–5.
- 724 39. Moro, G. E.; Mosca, F.; Miniello, V.; Fanaro, S.; Jelinek, J.; Stahl, B.; Boehm, G. Effects of
725 a new mixture of prebiotics on faecal flora and stools in term infants. *Acta Paediatr. Suppl.*
726 **2003**, *91*, 77–9.
- 727 40. Knol, J.; Scholtens, P.; Kafka, C.; Steenbakkens, J.; Gro, S.; Helm, K.; Klarczyk, M.;
728 Schöpfer, H.; Böckler, H.-M.; Wells, J. Colon microflora in infants fed formula with galacto-
729 and fructo-oligosaccharides: more like breast-fed infants. *J. Pediatr. Gastroenterol. Nutr.*
730 **2005**, *40*, 36–42.
- 731 41. Haarman, M.; Knol, J. Quantitative real-time PCR assays to identify and quantify fecal
732 Bifidobacterium species in infants receiving a prebiotic infant formula. *Appl. Environ.*
733 *Microbiol.* **2005**, *71*, 2318–24, doi:10.1128/AEM.71.5.2318-2324.2005.
- 734 42. Haarman, M.; Knol, J. Quantitative real-time PCR analysis of fecal Lactobacillus species in
735 infants receiving a prebiotic infant formula. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2006**, *72*, 2359–65,
736 doi:10.1128/AEM.72.4.2359-2365.2006.
- 737 43. Bakker-Zierikzee, A. M.; Alles, M. S.; Knol, J.; Kok, F. J.; Tolboom, J. J. M.; Bindels, J. G.
738 Effects of infant formula containing a mixture of galacto- and fructo-oligosaccharides or
739 viable Bifidobacterium animalis on the intestinal microflora during the first 4 months of life.
740 *Br. J. Nutr.* **2005**, *94*, 783–90.
- 741 44. Costalos, C.; Kapiki, A.; Apostolou, M.; Papatoma, E. The effect of a prebiotic
742 supplemented formula on growth and stool microbiology of term infants. *Early Hum. Dev.*
743 **2008**, *84*, 45–9, doi:10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2007.03.001.
- 744 45. Holscher, H. D.; Faust, K. L.; Czerkies, L. A.; Litov, R.; Ziegler, E. E.; Lessin, H.; Hatch, T.;
745 Sun, S.; Tappenden, K. A. Effects of prebiotic-containing infant formula on gastrointestinal

- 746 tolerance and fecal microbiota in a randomized controlled trial. *JPEN. J. Parenter. Enteral*
747 *Nutr.* **2012**, *36*, 95S–105S, doi:10.1177/0148607111430087.
- 748 46. Vivatvakin, B.; Mahayosnond, A.; Theamboonlers, A.; Steenhout, P. G.; Conus, N. J. Effect
749 of a whey-predominant starter formula containing LCPUFAs and oligosaccharides
750 (FOS/GOS) on gastrointestinal comfort in infants. *Asia Pac. J. Clin. Nutr.* **2010**, *19*, 473–80.
- 751 47. Veereman-Wauters, G.; Staelens, S.; Van de Broek, H.; Plaskie, K.; Wesling, F.; Roger, L.
752 C.; McCartney, A. L.; Assam, P. Physiological and bifidogenic effects of prebiotic
753 supplements in infant formulae. *J. Pediatr. Gastroenterol. Nutr.* **2011**, *52*, 763–71,
754 doi:10.1097/MPG.0b013e3182139f39.
- 755 48. Salvini, F.; Riva, E.; Salvatici, E.; Boehm, G.; Jelinek, J.; Banderali, G.; Giovannini, M. A
756 specific prebiotic mixture added to starting infant formula has long-lasting bifidogenic
757 effects. *J. Nutr.* **2011**, *141*, 1335–9, doi:10.3945/jn.110.136747.
- 758 49. Szajewska, H.; Ruszczyński, M.; Szymański, H.; Sadowska-Krawczenko, I.; Piwowarczyk,
759 A.; Rasmussen, P. B.; Kristensen, M. B.; West, C. E.; Hernell, O. Effects of infant formula
760 supplemented with prebiotics compared with synbiotics on growth up to the age of 12 mo: a
761 randomized controlled trial. *Pediatr. Res.* **2017**, *81*, 752–758, doi:10.1038/pr.2017.5.
- 762 50. Dasopoulou, M.; Briana, D. D.; Boutsikou, T.; Karakasidou, E.; Roma, E.; Costalos, C.;
763 Malamitsi-Puchner, A. Motilin and gastrin secretion and lipid profile in preterm neonates
764 following prebiotics supplementation: a double-blind randomized controlled study. *JPEN. J.*
765 *Parenter. Enteral Nutr.* **2015**, *39*, 359–68, doi:10.1177/0148607113510182.
- 766 51. Indrio, F.; Riezzo, G.; Raimondi, F.; Bisceglia, M.; Cavallo, L.; Francavilla, R. Effects of
767 probiotic and prebiotic on gastrointestinal motility in newborns. *J. Physiol. Pharmacol.* **2009**,
768 *60*, 27–31, doi:10.1016/j.iccn.2010.07.001.

- 769 52. Indrio, F.; Riezzo, G.; Raimondi, F.; Francavilla, R.; Montagna, O.; Valenzano, M. L.;
770 Cavallo, L.; Boehm, G. Prebiotics improve gastric motility and gastric electrical activity in
771 preterm newborns. *J. Pediatr. Gastroenterol. Nutr.* **2009**, *49*, 258–61,
772 doi:10.1097/MPG.0b013e3181926aec.
- 773 53. Huet, F.; Abrahamse-Berkeveld, M.; Tims, S.; Simeoni, U.; Beley, G.; Savagner, C.;
774 Vandenplas, Y.; Hourihane, J. O. Partly Fermented Infant Formulae With Specific
775 Oligosaccharides Support Adequate Infant Growth and Are Well-Tolerated. *J. Pediatr.*
776 *Gastroenterol. Nutr.* **2016**, *63*, e43-53, doi:10.1097/MPG.0000000000001360.
- 777 54. Vandenplas, Y.; Ludwig, T.; Bouritius, H.; Alliet, P.; Forde, D.; Peeters, S.; Huet, F.;
778 Hourihane, J. Randomised controlled trial demonstrates that fermented infant formula with
779 short-chain galacto-oligosaccharides and long-chain fructo-oligosaccharides reduces the
780 incidence of infantile colic. *Acta Paediatr.* **2017**, *106*, 1150–1158, doi:10.1111/apa.13844.
- 781 55. Boehm, G.; Lidestri, M.; Casetta, P.; Jelinek, J.; Negretti, F.; Stahl, B.; Marini, A.
782 Supplementation of a bovine milk formula with an oligosaccharide mixture increases counts
783 of faecal bifidobacteria in preterm infants. *Arch. Dis. Child. Fetal Neonatal Ed.* **2002**, *86*,
784 F178-81.
- 785 56. Mihatsch, W. A.; Hoegel, J.; Pohlandt, F. Prebiotic oligosaccharides reduce stool viscosity
786 and accelerate gastrointestinal transport in preterm infants. *Acta Paediatr.* **2006**, *95*, 843–8,
787 doi:10.1080/08035250500486652.
- 788 57. Modi, N.; Uthaya, S.; Fell, J.; Kulinskaya, E. A randomized, double-blind, controlled trial of
789 the effect of prebiotic oligosaccharides on enteral tolerance in preterm infants
790 (ISRCTN77444690). *Pediatr. Res.* **2010**, *68*, 440–5, doi:10.1203/PDR.0b013e3181f1cd59.
- 791 58. Armanian, A. M.; Barekatin, B.; Hoseinzadeh, M.; Salehimehr, N. Prebiotics for the
792 management of hyperbilirubinemia in preterm neonates. *J. Matern. Fetal. Neonatal Med.*

- 793 **2016**, *29*, 3009–13, doi:10.3109/14767058.2015.1113520.
- 794 59. Ziegler, E.; Vanderhoof, J. A.; Petschow, B.; Mitmesser, S. H.; Stolz, S. I.; Harris, C. L.;
795 Berseth, C. L. Term infants fed formula supplemented with selected blends of prebiotics
796 grow normally and have soft stools similar to those reported for breast-fed infants. *J. Pediatr.*
797 *Gastroenterol. Nutr.* **2007**, *44*, 359–64, doi:10.1097/MPG.0b013e31802fca8c.
- 798 60. Nakamura, N.; Gaskins, H. R.; Collier, C. T.; Nava, G. M.; Rai, D.; Petschow, B.; Russell,
799 W. M.; Harris, C.; Mackie, R. I.; Wampler, J. L.; Walker, D. C. Molecular ecological
800 analysis of fecal bacterial populations from term infants fed formula supplemented with
801 selected blends of prebiotics. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2009**, *75*, 1121–8,
802 doi:10.1128/AEM.02359-07.
- 803 61. Scalabrin, D. M. F.; Mitmesser, S. H.; Welling, G. W.; Harris, C. L.; Marunycz, J. D.;
804 Walker, D. C.; Bos, N. A.; Tölkö, S.; Salminen, S.; Vanderhoof, J. A. New prebiotic blend
805 of polydextrose and galacto-oligosaccharides has a bifidogenic effect in young infants. *J.*
806 *Pediatr. Gastroenterol. Nutr.* **2012**, *54*, 343–52, doi:10.1097/MPG.0b013e318237ed95.
- 807 62. Ashley, C.; Johnston, W. H.; Harris, C. L.; Stolz, S. I.; Wampler, J. L.; Berseth, C. L. Growth
808 and tolerance of infants fed formula supplemented with polydextrose (PDX) and/or
809 galactooligosaccharides (GOS): double-blind, randomized, controlled trial. *Nutr. J.* **2012**, *11*,
810 38, doi:10.1186/1475-2891-11-38.
- 811 63. Hicks, P. D.; Hawthorne, K. M.; Berseth, C. L.; Marunycz, J. D.; Heubi, J. E.; Abrams, S. A.
812 Total calcium absorption is similar from infant formulas with and without prebiotics and
813 exceeds that in human milk-fed infants. *BMC Pediatr.* **2012**, *12*, 118, doi:10.1186/1471-
814 2431-12-118.
- 815 64. Pärty, A.; Luoto, R.; Kalliomäki, M.; Salminen, S.; Isolauri, E. Effects of early prebiotic and
816 probiotic supplementation on development of gut microbiota and fussing and crying in

- 817 preterm infants: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *J. Pediatr.* **2013**, *163*,
818 1272-7.e1–2, doi:10.1016/j.jpeds.2013.05.035.
- 819 65. Luoto, R.; Ruuskanen, O.; Waris, M.; Kalliomäki, M.; Salminen, S.; Isolauri, E. Prebiotic
820 and probiotic supplementation prevents rhinovirus infections in preterm infants: a
821 randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *J. Allergy Clin. Immunol.* **2014**, *133*, 405–13,
822 doi:10.1016/j.jaci.2013.08.020.
- 823 66. Fanaro, S.; Jelinek, J.; Stahl, B.; Boehm, G.; Kock, R.; Vigi, V. Acidic Oligosaccharides
824 from Pectin Hydrolysate as New Component for Infant Formulae: Effect on Intestinal Flora,
825 Stool Characteristics, and pH. *J. Pediatr. Gastroenterol. Nutr.* **2005**, *41*, 186–190,
826 doi:10.1097/01.mpg.0000172747.64103.d7.
- 827 67. Magne, F.; Hachelaf, W.; Suau, A.; Boudraa, G.; Bouziane-Nedjadi, K.; Rigottier-Gois, L.;
828 Touhami, M.; Desjeux, J.-F.; Pochart, P. Effects on faecal microbiota of dietary and acidic
829 oligosaccharides in children during partial formula feeding. *J. Pediatr. Gastroenterol. Nutr.*
830 **2008**, *46*, 580–8, doi:10.1097/MPG.0b013e318164d920.
- 831 68. Piemontese, P.; Gianni, M. L.; Braegger, C. P.; Chirico, G.; Grüber, C.; Riedler, J.;
832 Arslanoglu, S.; van Stuijvenberg, M.; Boehm, G.; Jelinek, J.; Roggero, P.; MIPS 1 Working
833 Group Tolerance and safety evaluation in a large cohort of healthy infants fed an innovative
834 prebiotic formula: a randomized controlled trial. *PLoS One* **2011**, *6*, e28010,
835 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0028010.
- 836 69. Westerbeek, E. A.; van den Berg, J. P.; Lafeber, H. N.; Fetter, W. P.; Boehm, G.; Twisk, J.
837 W.; van Elburg, R. M. Neutral and acidic oligosaccharides in preterm infants: a randomized,
838 double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **2010**, *91*, 679–86,
839 doi:10.3945/ajcn.2009.28625.
- 840 70. Westerbeek, E. A. M.; Mørch, E.; Lafeber, H. N.; Fetter, W. P. F.; Twisk, J. W. R.; Van

- 841 Elburg, R. M. Effect of neutral and acidic oligosaccharides on fecal IL-8 and fecal
842 calprotectin in preterm infants. *Pediatr. Res.* **2011**, *69*, 255–8,
843 doi:10.1203/PDR.0b013e318206fd25.
- 844 71. Westerbeek, E. A. M.; van den Berg, A.; Lafeber, H. N.; Fetter, W. P. F.; van Elburg, R. M.
845 The effect of enteral supplementation of a prebiotic mixture of non-human milk galacto-,
846 fructo- and acidic oligosaccharides on intestinal permeability in preterm infants. *Br. J. Nutr.*
847 **2011**, *105*, 268–74, doi:10.1017/S0007114510003405.
- 848 72. Westerbeek, E. A. M.; Slump, R. A.; Lafeber, H. N.; Knol, J.; Georgi, G.; Fetter, W. P. F.;
849 van Elburg, R. M. The effect of enteral supplementation of specific neutral and acidic
850 oligosaccharides on the faecal microbiota and intestinal microenvironment in preterm infants.
851 *Eur. J. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. Dis.* **2013**, *32*, 269–76, doi:10.1007/s10096-012-1739-y.
- 852 73. van den Berg, J. P.; Westerbeek, E. A. M.; van der Klis, F. R. M.; Berbers, G. A. M.;
853 Lafeber, H. N.; van Elburg, R. M. Neutral and acidic oligosaccharides supplementation does
854 not increase the vaccine antibody response in preterm infants in a randomized clinical trial.
855 *PLoS One* **2013**, *8*, e70904, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0070904.
- 856 74. Stam, J.; van Stuijvenberg, M.; Garssen, J.; Knipping, K.; Sauer, P. J. J. A mixture of three
857 prebiotics does not affect vaccine specific antibody responses in healthy term infants in the
858 first year of life. *Vaccine* **2011**, *29*, 7766–72, doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2011.07.110.
- 859 75. Grüber, C.; van Stuijvenberg, M.; Mosca, F.; Moro, G.; Chirico, G.; Braegger, C. P.; Riedler,
860 J.; Boehm, G.; Wahn, U.; MIPS 1 Working Group Reduced occurrence of early atopic
861 dermatitis because of immunoactive prebiotics among low-atopy-risk infants. *J. Allergy Clin.*
862 *Immunol.* **2010**, *126*, 791–7, doi:10.1016/j.jaci.2010.07.022.
- 863 76. Boyle, R. J.; Tang, M. L.-K.; Chiang, W. C.; Chua, M. C.; Ismail, I.; Nauta, A.; Hourihane, J.
864 O. B.; Smith, P.; Gold, M.; Ziegler, J.; Peake, J.; Quinn, P.; Rao, R.; Brown, N.; Rijnierse,

- 865 A.; Garssen, J.; Warner, J. O.; PATCH study investigators Prebiotic-supplemented partially
866 hydrolysed cow's milk formula for the prevention of eczema in high-risk infants: a
867 randomized controlled trial. *Allergy* **2016**, *71*, 701–10, doi:10.1111/all.12848.
- 868 77. Niele, N.; van Zwol, A.; Westerbeek, E. A. M.; Lafeber, H. N.; van Elburg, R. M. Effect of
869 non-human neutral and acidic oligosaccharides on allergic and infectious diseases in preterm
870 infants. *Eur. J. Pediatr.* **2013**, *172*, 317–23, doi:10.1007/s00431-012-1886-2.
- 871 78. van Stuijvenberg, M.; Eisses, A. M.; Grüber, C.; Mosca, F.; Arslanoglu, S.; Chirico, G.;
872 Braegger, C. P.; Riedler, J.; Boehm, G.; Sauer, P. J. J. Do prebiotics reduce the number of
873 fever episodes in healthy children in their first year of life: a randomised controlled trial. *Br.*
874 *J. Nutr.* **2011**, *106*, 1740–8, doi:10.1017/S0007114511004053.
- 875 79. Rao, S.; Srinivasjois, R.; Patole, S. Prebiotic supplementation in full-term neonates: a
876 systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Arch. Pediatr. Adolesc. Med.* **2009**, *163*,
877 755–64, doi:10.1001/archpediatrics.2009.94.
- 878 80. Mugambi, M. N.; Musekiwa, A.; Lombard, M.; Young, T.; Blaauw, R. Synbiotics, probiotics
879 or prebiotics in infant formula for full term infants: a systematic review. *Nutr. J.* **2012**, *11*,
880 81, doi:10.1186/1475-2891-11-81.
- 881 81. Osborn, D. A.; Sinn, J. K. H. Prebiotics in infants for prevention of allergy. *Cochrane*
882 *database Syst. Rev.* **2013**, CD006474, doi:10.1002/14651858.CD006474.pub3.
- 883 82. Vandenplas, Y.; De Greef, E.; Veereman, G. Prebiotics in infant formula. *Gut Microbes*
884 **2014**, *5*, 681–7, doi:10.4161/19490976.2014.972237.
- 885 83. Cuello-Garcia, C.; Fiocchi, A.; Pawankar, R.; Yepes-Nuñez, J. J.; Morgano, G. P.; Zhang,
886 Y.; Agarwal, A.; Gandhi, S.; Terracciano, L.; Schönemann, H. J.; Brozek, J. L. Prebiotics for
887 the prevention of allergies: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled

- 888 trials. *Clin. Exp. Allergy* **2017**, *47*, 1468–1477, doi:10.1111/cea.13042.
- 889 84. La Fata, G.; Rastall, R. A.; Lacroix, C.; Harmsen, H. J. M.; Mohajeri, M. H.; Weber, P.;
890 Steinert, R. E. Recent Development of Prebiotic Research-Statement from an Expert
891 Workshop. *Nutrients* **2017**, *9*, doi:10.3390/nu9121376.
- 892 85. Lei, W.-T.; Shih, P.-C.; Liu, S.-J.; Lin, C.-Y.; Yeh, T.-L. Effect of Probiotics and Prebiotics
893 on Immune Response to Influenza Vaccination in Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-
894 Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Nutrients* **2017**, *9*, 1175, doi:10.3390/nu9111175.
- 895 86. Shibata, R.; Kimura, M.; Takahashi, H.; Mikami, K.; Aiba, Y.; Takeda, H.; Koga, Y. Clinical
896 effects of kestose, a prebiotic oligosaccharide, on the treatment of atopic dermatitis in infants.
897 *Clin. Exp. Allergy* **2009**, *39*, 1397–403, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2222.2009.03295.x.
- 898 87. Raes, M.; Scholtens, P. A. M. J.; Alliet, P.; Hensen, K.; Jongen, H.; Boehm, G.; Vandenplas,
899 Y.; Rummens, J. L. Exploration of basal immune parameters in healthy infants receiving an
900 infant milk formula supplemented with prebiotics. *Pediatr. Allergy Immunol.* **2010**, *21*, e377-
901 85, doi:10.1111/j.1399-3038.2009.00957.x.
- 902 88. Westerbeek, E. A. M.; van Elburg, R. M.; van den Berg, A.; van den Berg, J.; Twisk, J. W.
903 R.; Fetter, W. P. F.; Lafeber, H. N. Design of a randomised controlled trial on immune
904 effects of acidic and neutral oligosaccharides in the nutrition of preterm infants: carrot study.
905 *BMC Pediatr.* **2008**, *8*, 46, doi:10.1186/1471-2431-8-46.
- 906 89. Westerbeek, E. A. M.; Hensgens, R. L.; Mihatsch, W. A.; Boehm, G.; Lafeber, H. N.; van
907 Elburg, R. M. The effect of neutral and acidic oligosaccharides on stool viscosity, stool
908 frequency and stool pH in preterm infants. *Acta Paediatr.* **2011**, *100*, 1426–31,
909 doi:10.1111/j.1651-2227.2011.02295.x.
- 910 90. Sagheddu, V.; Patrone, V.; Miragoli, F.; Puglisi, E.; Morelli, L. Infant Early Gut

- 911 Colonization by Lachnospiraceae: High Frequency of Ruminococcus gnavus. *Front. Pediatr.*
912 **2016**, *4*, 57, doi:10.3389/fped.2016.00057.
- 913 91. Sagheddu, V.; Patrone, V.; Miragoli, F.; Morelli, L. Abundance and Diversity of
914 Hydrogenotrophic Microorganisms in the Infant Gut before the Weaning Period Assessed by
915 Denaturing Gradient Gel Electrophoresis and Quantitative PCR. *Front. Nutr.* **2017**, *4*, 29,
916 doi:10.3389/fnut.2017.00029.
- 917 92. Piacentini, G.; Peroni, D.; Bessi, E.; Morelli, L. Molecular characterization of intestinal
918 microbiota in infants fed with soymilk. *J. Pediatr. Gastroenterol. Nutr.* **2010**, *51*, 71–6,
919 doi:10.1097/MPG.0b013e3181dc8b02.
- 920 93. Timmerman, H. M.; Rutten, N. B. M. M.; Boekhorst, J.; Saulnier, D. M.; Kortman, G. A. M.;
921 Contractor, N.; Kullen, M.; Floris, E.; Harmsen, H. J. M.; Vlieger, A. M.; Kleerebezem, M.;
922 Rijkers, G. T. Intestinal colonisation patterns in breastfed and formula-fed infants during the
923 first 12 weeks of life reveal sequential microbiota signatures. *Sci. Rep.* **2017**, *7*, 8327,
924 doi:10.1038/s41598-017-08268-4.
- 925 94. Chang, J. Y.; Shin, S. M.; Chun, J.; Lee, J.-H.; Seo, J.-K. Pyrosequencing-based molecular
926 monitoring of the intestinal bacterial colonization in preterm infants. *J. Pediatr.*
927 *Gastroenterol. Nutr.* **2011**, *53*, 512–9, doi:10.1097/MPG.0b013e318227e518.
- 928