International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science

e-ISSN: 2544-9435

Operating Publisher
SciFormat Publishing Inc.
ISNI: 0000 0005 1449 8214

2734 17 Avenue SW,
Calgary, Alberta, T3E0A7,
Canada
+15878858911
editorial-office@sciformat.ca

ARTICLE TITLE	THE MICROBIOME–HOST AXIS IN CANCER THERAPY: MECHANISMS SHAPING IMMUNOTHERAPY EFFICACY AND TREATMENT TOXICITY
DOI	https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.2(50).2026.5462
RECEIVED	03 March 2026
ACCEPTED	08 May 2026
PUBLISHED	15 May 2026
LICENSE	The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.**

THE MICROBIOME–HOST AXIS IN CANCER THERAPY: MECHANISMS SHAPING IMMUNOTHERAPY EFFICACY AND TREATMENT TOXICITY

Jędrzej Łysiak *(Corresponding Author, Email: jedrzejlysiak@gmail.com)*
University Clinical Hospital No. 2 PMU in Szczecin, Szczecin, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0005-5798-3620

Amin Abdulgater
University Clinical Hospital No. 2 PMU in Szczecin, Szczecin, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0000-3782-5776

Gabriela Stępień
University Clinical Hospital No. 2 PMU in Szczecin, Szczecin, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0006-4505-5162

Urszula Przewoźna
University Clinical Hospital No. 2 PMU in Szczecin, Szczecin, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0003-2186-6604

Wiktoria Urowska
St. Vincent de Paul Hospital, Gdynia, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0000-4167-4798

Paulina Osuch-Tomaszewska
University Clinical Hospital No. 2 PMU in Szczecin, Szczecin, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0002-4204-0273

Magdalena Kossmann
St. Vincent de Paul Hospital, Gdynia, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0003-2822-6669

Laura Szalewska
University Clinical Hospital No. 2 PMU in Szczecin, Szczecin, Poland
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9529-7593

Julia Burtowicz
Collegium Medicum Nicolaus Copernicus University in Bydgoszcz, Bydgoszcz, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0004-5598-4833

Izabela Kazubek-Fuksiewicz
Medical University of Silesia, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0000-4433-2638

ABSTRACT

Background: Modern oncology is undergoing a paradigmatic shift, moving away from viewing tumors as isolated tissue masses toward perceiving them as elements of a complex, multispecies ecosystem. Central to this environment are the gut microbiota and the recently characterized intratumoral microbiome, both of which serve as critical regulators of host-tumor dynamics.

Aim: This review aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of the microbiome-host axis, specifically evaluating its role in shaping anti-tumor immunity and modulating the efficacy and toxicity of current chemotherapy and immunotherapy regimens.

Materials and Methods: A systematic synthesis was conducted utilizing 57 seminal literature sources. The analysis incorporates high-impact data published up to early 2026, focusing on longitudinal clinical cohorts, metagenomic functional profiling, and mechanistic models of host-microbe crosstalk.

Results: Specific bacterial consortia and their bioactive metabolites—notably inosine, short-chain fatty acids, and tryptophan derivatives—are identified as essential prerequisites for the success of immune checkpoint inhibitors. Beyond systemic immunity, the review highlights the role of bacterial enzymes, such as cytidine deaminase, in local drug degradation and chemoresistance. Furthermore, the emerging "micro-genderome" is established as a pivotal factor in driving sex-specific variations in therapeutic response and toxicity profiles.

Conclusions: Microbiome stratification and therapeutic modification represent a necessary evolution in personalized oncology. Integrating microbial monitoring into standard clinical protocols is essential for protecting a patient's "microbial capital," thereby maximizing survival rates and long-term quality of life for cancer survivors.

KEYWORDS

Gut Microbiome, Immunotherapy, Chemotherapy Toxicity, Intratumoral Microbiome, Short-Chain Fatty Acids, Inosine, Personalized Oncology, Immune Checkpoint Inhibitors

CITATION

Jędrzej Łysiak, Amin Abdulgater, Gabriela Stępień, Urszula Przewoźna, Wiktoria Urowska, Paulina Osuch-Tomaszewska, Magdalena Kossmann, Laura Szalewska, Julia Burtowicz, Izabela Kazubek-Fuksiewicz. (2026) The Microbiome–Host Axis in Cancer Therapy: Mechanisms Shaping Immunotherapy Efficacy and Treatment Toxicity. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 2(50). doi: 10.31435/ijitss.2(50).2026.5462

COPYRIGHT

1. Introduction: The Microbiome as the Human "Second Genome"

For decades, the microorganisms inhabiting the human body were treated primarily as commensals or potential pathogens. However, the groundbreaking metagenomic studies of the last decade have necessitated a fundamental redefinition of the human organism as a "holobiont"—a multispecies complex where microbial inhabitants dictate the physiological and pharmacological fate of the host. The human gut alone contains trillions of microbes, possessing a genetic diversity that dwarfs our own by a factor of at least 100 to 1, leading to its formulation as the human "second genome" (Almeida et al., 2021).

The complexity of this ecosystem, encompassing thousands of species of bacteria, viruses, and fungi, is of fundamental importance for the body's homeostasis. A specific place in this hierarchy is occupied by the intestinal microbiota, which functions as the primary "training ground" for the adaptive immune system, shaping its reactivity from the earliest stages of neonatal life (Gensollen et al., 2016; Arrieta et al., 2014). In the context of oncology, the microbiome has ceased to be merely a background for neoplastic processes. It has become an active player influencing carcinogenesis, disease progression, and the clinical outcome of treatment (Bhatt et al., 2017).

This phenomenon is particularly evident in the case of immunotherapy, where the presence of specific bacterial taxa determines whether a patient will respond to immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs) or exhibit primary resistance (Zitvogel et al., 2018; Helmink et al., 2019). The biological reality of 21st-century medicine is that we are not treating a human patient in isolation; we are treating an integrated system where microbial signals "tune" the host's capacity to recognize and eliminate malignant cells.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Study Design and Search Strategy (revised)

This study was conducted as a narrative mechanistic review with a structured literature search to provide a comprehensive and up-to-date synthesis of the microbiome–host axis in cancer therapy. A systematic search of the literature was performed across three major electronic databases: PubMed/MEDLINE, Embase, and Scopus. The search period spanned from January 2010 to March 2026, reflecting the rapid development of high-throughput sequencing technologies and the emergence of oncomicrobiomics as a distinct field.

The search strategy combined Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) and free-text terms using Boolean operators to identify relevant studies. The primary search string included combinations of the following terms: ("pediatric oncology" OR "childhood cancer" OR "hematological malignancies" OR "solid tumors") AND ("gut microbiome" OR "intratumoral microbiota" OR "dysbiosis") AND ("immunotherapy" OR "immune checkpoint inhibitors" OR "chemotherapy toxicity" OR "hematopoietic stem cell transplantation") AND ("metabolomics" OR "short-chain fatty acids" OR "inosine" OR "xenometabolism").

The selection of studies was guided by relevance to mechanistic insights and clinical applicability rather than formal systematic inclusion criteria. Priority was given to high-impact original research, clinical studies, and key review articles that contributed to the understanding of microbiome-mediated modulation of anti-cancer therapies.

To ensure comprehensive coverage, additional records were identified through manual screening of reference lists from seminal publications and recent meta-analyses ("snowballing").

2.2. Selection Criteria (Inclusion and Exclusion)

To maintain the highest level of clinical and molecular relevance, specific eligibility criteria were applied:

Inclusion Criteria: (1) Original research articles, clinical trials, and high-impact systematic reviews published in peer-reviewed journals; (2) Studies involving pediatric (ages 0–21) or adult oncology cohorts where the mechanistic pathways (e.g., A_{2A} receptor signaling) were directly translatable; (3) Research utilizing advanced microbial profiling techniques, including 16S rRNA gene sequencing, shotgun metagenomics, and liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry (LC-MS) for metabolomics.

Exclusion Criteria: (1) Non-peer-reviewed preprints, conference abstracts, and case reports with a sample size of $n < 5$ (unless describing a novel mechanistic discovery); (2) Studies focusing exclusively on non-malignant conditions without a relevant immunological framework; (3) Articles not available in English.

2.3. Data Extraction and Synthesis

From an initial pool of several hundred records, 57 primary sources were selected based on their methodological rigor and contribution to the mechanistic understanding of the microbiome-host axis. Data extraction focused on:

1. **Taxonomic Signatures:** Identifying specific "responder" vs. "non-responder" microbial profiles.
2. **Biochemical Pathways:** Mapping the production of metabolites (SCFAs, inosine, indole derivatives) and bacterial enzymes (e.g., cytidine deaminase).
3. **Clinical Outcomes:** Correlating microbial diversity with survival rates, infection risk, and toxicity (GVHD, mucositis).

The synthesis of these data was performed using a "Mechanistic Framework Analysis," grouping findings into systemic immune modulation, local tumor microenvironment changes, and xenobiotic metabolism.

2.4. Ethical Approval and Considerations

As this study is a systematic review of previously published literature and does not involve primary data collection from human or animal subjects, formal ethical approval was not required. All analyzed data were sourced from studies that had previously obtained appropriate institutional review board (IRB) approvals and informed consent from participants. The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical standards of the Declaration of Helsinki.

3. The Ontogeny of Immunity and the Microbiome: Foundations of Surveillance

The body's capacity to combat malignancies is inextricably linked to the early colonization of the gastrointestinal tract. Research indicates that exposure to microorganisms during critical developmental windows "programs" T lymphocytes and regulatory T cells (Tregs), which has long-term implications for immune surveillance (Tamburini et al., 2016; Korpela & de Vos, 2018). For instance, species within the *Clostridium* genus are crucial for the induction of colonic Tregs, which prevents excessive inflammatory states that could otherwise promote leukemogenesis or solid tumor development (Atarashi et al., 2011).

This "microbial education" ensures that the host immune system can distinguish between self, commensal, and malignant antigens—a balance that is frequently upended in the oncogenic state. Disruptions to this process, often triggered by excessive early-childhood antibiotic therapy, lead to persistent dysbiosis, which correlates with an increased later-life risk of metabolic and neoplastic diseases (Becattini et al., 2016). Furthermore, the diversity of the microbiota, dictated by geography and lifestyle, suggests that our innate ability to fight cancer may be partially environmentally conditioned, reflecting the deep evolutionary tie between the host and its microbial partners (Yatsunenko et al., 2012).

4. Oncomicrobiomics: Mechanisms of Therapeutic Influence

The influence of the microbiome on cancer treatment is realized through three primary pathways: drug metabolism (xenometabolism), modulation of the tumor microenvironment (TME), and systemic activation of immunity (Ma et al., 2019; Roy & Trinchieri, 2017).

4.1. Xenobiotic Metabolism and Toxicity

Intestinal bacteria possess a unique enzymatic arsenal capable of modifying the chemical structure of anti-cancer drugs. A classic example is the role of microbial β-glucuronidases in the metabolism of irinotecan (CPT-11). Following hepatic detoxification, irinotecan is excreted into the gut, where bacterial enzymes can reactivate it, leading to severe mucosal injury and diarrhea (Wallace et al., 2010; Alexander et al., 2017). Studies have shown that specific microbial signatures allow for the prediction of drug-induced toxicity, which has a direct impact on the therapeutic window and patient compliance (Guthrie et al., 2017; Zimmermann et al., 2019).

Unfortunately, these interactions can be highly detrimental in the context of intensive treatments like hematopoietic stem cell transplantation (HSCT). Dysbiosis induced by broad-spectrum antibiotics significantly worsens the prognosis of these patients, increasing the risk of mortality through the loss of protective commensals that maintain intestinal barrier integrity (Weber et al., 2017; Taur et al., 2014; Holler et al., 2014).

4.2. The Intratumoral Microbiome: A New Frontier of Knowledge

The discovery that bacteria reside within tumor tissues has revolutionized our understanding of the TME. The seminal work of Nejman and colleagues (2020) demonstrated that various types of cancer possess a cell-type-specific intracellular microbiome. These bacteria are not merely "passengers"; they actively shape the cellular heterogeneity of the tumor (Galeano Niño et al., 2022).

The metabolic plasticity of the intratumoral microbiome is most vividly illustrated in the context of chemotherapy resistance. A landmark study by Geller et al. (2017) revealed that bacteria—primarily Gamma-proteobacteria—residing within pancreatic tumors express a long isoform of the enzyme cytidine deaminase (CDA). This enzyme metabolizes gemcitabine ($2',2'$-difluorodeoxycytidine) into its inactive form, $2',2'$-difluorodeoxyuridine, effectively shielding the tumor from the drug. Experimental models have shown that eliminating these bacteria with antibiotics can restore gemcitabine efficacy, suggesting that future oncology protocols must target both the malignant cells and their microbial protectors.

5. The Microbiome-Immune Checkpoint Axis: Determinants of Success

The efficacy of ICIs, specifically those targeting the PD-1/PD-L1 and CTLA-4 pathways, is significantly influenced by the composition of the gut microbiota (Gopalakrishnan et al., 2018; Routy et al., 2018; Matson et al., 2018). Primary resistance to ICIs can often be attributed to an abnormal microbiome composition. Patients with a higher abundance of *Akkermansia muciniphila* or species from the *Ruminococcaceae* family show significantly better clinical outcomes and enhanced antigen presentation (Derosa et al., 2022; Vétizou et al., 2024).

Conversely, the use of antibiotics has been consistently linked to reduced ICI efficacy, as it depletes the commensal species necessary for priming the systemic immune response (Zitvogel et al., 2018). Cross-cohort meta-analyses confirmed that specific gut microbiome signatures are universally associated with ICI response, suggesting that the "responder" microbiome is a distinct and identifiable biological entity (Lee et al., 2022).

6. Mechanistic Insights: From Correlation to Causation through Metabolomics

To move beyond mere associations, current research focuses on bioactive metabolites produced by the microbiota that cross the epithelial barrier to modulate systemic immunity. These molecules act as a "chemical language" through which the microbiome tunes the metabolic and functional fitness of immune cells.

6.1. Short-Chain Fatty Acids (SCFAs) and T-cell Fitness

SCFAs, primarily butyrate, propionate, and acetate, are the fermentation products of dietary fiber by commensal anaerobes (Koh et al., 2016). In oncology, SCFAs—particularly butyrate—act as systemic mediators of immune stability (Tan et al., 2014). Butyrate functions as a histone deacetylase (HDAC) inhibitor, enhancing the acetylation of the *FOXP3* locus, which is essential for the differentiation and stability of regulatory T cells (T_{regs}) (Mathewson et al., 2016).

Furthermore, recent evidence suggests that SCFAs modulate the metabolic fitness of $CD8^+$ T cells. Luu et al. (2021) demonstrated that butyrate enhances the production of granzyme B and $IFN-\gamma$ by increasing the availability of acetyl-CoA for the citric acid cycle, thereby improving the capacity of T cells to infiltrate and eliminate tumor cells. This relationship between fiber intake, SCFA production, and ICI response is now a major focal point of clinical nutrition in oncology (Park et al., 2022; Spencer et al., 2021).

6.2. Inosine and the A_{2A} Receptor Signaling Axis

One of the most profound mechanistic discoveries involves the purine nucleoside inosine. Research by Mager et al. (2020) and expanded by Dey et al. (2023) identified that specific bacteria, such as *Bifidobacterium pseudolongum*, produce inosine, which enters the systemic circulation. Inosine acts as a context-dependent stimulatory ligand by binding to the adenosine A_{2A} receptor ($A_{2A}R$) on the surface of T cells.

This interaction triggers a sophisticated intracellular signaling cascade. Typically, adenosine binding to $A_{2A}R$ is immunosuppressive; however, in the presence of immune checkpoint blockade and T-cell receptor (TCR) stimulation, inosine-induced $A_{2A}R$ signaling enhances T_h1 differentiation. This effect is mediated through the protein kinase A (PKA) pathway, which "re-tunes" the T cell's metabolic state, allowing it to bypass the inhibitory signals of the tumor microenvironment. This mechanistic 'rheostat' explains why high *Bifidobacterium* counts serve as a potent predictor of anti-PD-L1 efficacy.

6.3. Tryptophan Metabolism and AhR Signaling

The catabolism of dietary tryptophan by the microbiota produces indole derivatives (e.g., indole-3-aldehyde) that engage the aryl hydrocarbon receptor (AhR). This signaling pathway is critical for balancing mucosal reactivity and maintaining the integrity of the intestinal barrier via the secretion of Interleukin-22 (IL-22) (Zelante et al., 2013). By modulating the AhR axis, the microbiota can influence the level of systemic inflammation, which in turn dictates the tolerability and success of immunotherapy (Rooks & Garrett, 2016).

7. Hematological Malignancies and Graft-Versus-Host Disease (GVHD)

The impact of the microbiome is perhaps most critical in patients undergoing allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation (HSCT). In this high-stakes setting, the gut microbiota is a primary determinant of survival and the development of GVHD (Taur et al., 2014). Metagenomic analyses have shown that a loss of intestinal diversity is an independent risk factor for transplant-related mortality (Holler et al., 2014).

Specific taxa, such as the genus *Blautia*, are associated with a significant reduction in GVHD-related deaths due to their production of anti-inflammatory metabolites (Jenq et al., 2015). Conversely, the expansion of *Enterococcus* species, driven by therapy-induced lactose availability in the gut, exacerbates intestinal inflammation and lethal GVHD (Stein-Tharinger et al., 2019). This highlights that even simple dietary sugars can shift the microbial balance toward a lethal state in immunocompromised hosts.

8. Fecal Microbiota Transplantation (FMT) and Microbial Engineering

The ultimate proof of the microbiome's role comes from interventional studies. In 2021, landmark clinical trials demonstrated that FMT from ICI-responders could overcome primary resistance in patients with refractory melanoma (Davar et al., 2021; Baruch et al., 2021). These studies proved that transferring a "responder" microbiome can reprogram the TME, inducing a shift toward a therapy-sensitive state.

Moving beyond whole-stool transplants, next-generation "living medicines" involve engineered bacteria. These strains are designed to home into the hypoxic regions of solid tumors and deliver therapeutic payloads, such as cytokines or prodrug-converting enzymes (CDA inhibitors), directly to the site of malignancy (Zheng et al., 2024). This approach combines the spatial specificity of the intratumoral microbiome with the power of synthetic biology, minimizing the risk of systemic toxicity and pathogen transmission (DeFilipp et al., 2019).

9. The Microbiota-Gut-Brain Axis in Oncology

A critical dimension of oncomicrobiomics is the bidirectional communication network between the gut and the brain, involving neural, endocrine, and immune signaling (Cryan et al., 2019). In cancer patients, systemic inflammation triggered by dysbiosis contributes to common symptoms such as depression, anxiety, and "chemo-brain" (cognitive impairment). The translocation of microbial products across a "leaky gut" stimulates microglial activity in the brain via pro-inflammatory cytokines (Rooks & Garrett, 2016). Stabilizing the gut microbiome may thus enhance not only therapeutic efficacy but also the psychological resilience and quality of life of patients.

10. Temporal Dynamics and Infection Risk: The Hospitalized Patient

The microbiome of hospitalized cancer patients is highly volatile. Galloway-Peña et al. (2020) demonstrated that oral and gut microbiomes undergo rapid temporal changes due to antibiotics, dietary shifts, and chemotherapy. In pediatric oncology, specifically in children with acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL), the composition of the gut microbiome predicts infection risk (Hakim et al., 2018). High abundances of *Enterococcaceae* and low diversity correlate with neutropenic fever and sepsis, suggesting that "microbial monitoring" could serve as an early warning system in clinical wards (Taur & Pamer, 2014).

11. Long-term Survivorship: The Legacy of Treatment-Induced Dysbiosis

As survival rates improve, the "microbial scar" left by intensive oncology treatments (Palleja et al., 2018) becomes a major concern. Childhood cancer survivors often exhibit altered microbiomes for years after therapy (Zhang et al., 2022), which is associated with an increased risk of metabolic syndrome, obesity, and cardiovascular complications. This persistent dysbiosis maintains a state of chronic low-grade inflammation, suggesting that survivorship care must include "microbial rehabilitation" through targeted diets and probiotics to prevent late-onset chronic diseases.

12. The "Micro-Genderome": Sexual Dimorphism in Oncomicrobiomics

An emerging frontier is the role of sexual dimorphism, or the "micro-genderome." Evidence suggests that the gut microbiome reacts differently to oncological stressors in males and females due to interactions with sex hormones (estrogens and androgens). Estrogens influence gut permeability and the expression of tight junction proteins, while androgens can modulate the abundance of specific "responder" taxa.

Studies have indicated that the association between microbial diversity and ICI response may be sex-dependent, potentially due to the different ways male and female immune systems respond to microbial "adjuvants" (Lee et al., 2022). Integrating these sex-specific microbial signatures into precision medicine is essential for ensuring equitable and optimized care for all patients.

13. Discussion: The Convergence of Metagenomics and Clinical Decision Making

The integration of the microbiome into clinical oncology represents one of the most complex challenges in modern medicine. As we move from descriptive metagenomics toward mechanistic interventions, several critical layers of analysis emerge. The variability of the human gut microbiome across age and geography (Yatsunenko et al., 2012) implies that a "one-size-fits-all" microbial therapy is unlikely to succeed. For example, a microbial signature that predicts ICI response in a Western cohort might not hold true for patients in East Asia or sub-Saharan Africa due to differences in baseline diversity and habitual dietary intake.

The methodology behind microbiome characterization is also evolving. While early studies relied on 16S rRNA sequencing, current standards involve shotgun metagenomics, providing a higher resolution of bacterial strains and their functional potential (Almeida et al., 2021). This functional capacity—the "metabolic potential" of the microbiome—is often more predictive of therapy success than the mere taxonomic presence of certain species. For instance, the ability of the microbiome to produce short-chain fatty acids (Koh et al., 2016) or catabolize tryptophan (Zelante et al., 2013) is what ultimately modulates the host's immune system.

13.1. Reevaluating Antibiotic Stewardship in Oncology

The detrimental effects of broad-spectrum antibiotics on ICI and HSCT outcomes cannot be overstated. When antibiotics deplete commensal species like *Bifidobacterium* or *Akkermansia*, they effectively "blind" the immune system, preventing it from recognizing tumor antigens (Zitvogel et al., 2018; Weber et al., 2017). This necessitates a radical rethink of antibiotic stewardship in oncology wards. Clinicians must weigh the immediate risk of infection against the long-term risk of therapy failure, particularly as bacterial enzymes like β-glucuronidases interfere with drug safety. The work of Taur and Pamer (2014) suggests that instead of blunt antibiotic use, we may soon employ "precision antimicrobials" or bacteriophages. Phages can be engineered to target specific pathobionts—such as *Fusobacterium nucleatum*—while leaving the beneficial, ICI-supporting commensals intact.

13.2. The Role of the Oral-Gut Axis

Recent evidence suggests that the gut microbiome is not the only microbial player in oncology. The oral microbiome—often the source of bacteria that translocate to the gut and tumors—plays a significant role in temporal variability (Galloway-Peña et al., 2020). Bacteria common in the oral cavity are known to migrate to colorectal and pancreatic tumors, where they promote chemoresistance and suppress T-cell activity (Geller et al., 2017). This highlights the need for a "whole-body" microbial assessment, where oral health and gut health are managed as a single integrated system to prevent the "seeding" of the tumor microenvironment with pro-tumorigenic bacteria.

14. Nutritional Interventions as Targeted Therapy

The findings of Spencer et al. (2021) regarding dietary fiber have profound implications. If simple dietary shifts can significantly alter ICI response, then clinical nutritionists must become core members of the oncology team. However, the "dietary paradox"—where high-fiber diets help but commercial probiotics might hinder (Spector et al., 2022)—illustrates the complexity of these interactions.

Commercial probiotics often lack the strain diversity needed to populate a dysbiotic gut and may compete with the indigenous bacteria required for therapy success. Future protocols must prioritize "food-as-medicine" approaches, focusing on prebiotic-rich diets that foster the growth of favorable species like *Bifidobacterium* and *Akkermansia*.

15. Ethical and Safety Considerations in FMT and Bioengineering

The case of drug-resistant *E. coli* bacteremia following FMT (DeFilipp et al., 2019) serves as a stark warning. As we move toward larger clinical trials for FMT in cancer (Davar et al., 2021; Baruch et al., 2021), screening processes for donors must be incredibly rigorous, covering multi-drug resistant organisms (MDROs) and latent viral pathogens.

Furthermore, the use of engineered bacteria (Zheng et al., 2024) introduces ethical questions regarding "living medicines." How do we ensure these bacteria do not escape into the environment or transfer their modified genes to the patient’s commensal flora? These regulatory and biosafety hurdles must be cleared before synthetic biology can become a routine part of the oncology arsenal.

16. Conclusion: A New Paradigm for Cancer Care

The collective evidence presented in this work underscores that the microbiome is an inseparable component of the human oncological landscape. From the early-life programming of the immune system (Gensollen et al., 2016) to the real-time modulation of immunotherapy resistance (Davar et al., 2021), the microbiome acts as a master orchestrator of the host-tumor interaction (Roy & Trinchieri, 2017).

We have moved beyond the realization that "microbes matter" to a detailed mechanistic understanding of how metabolites like inosine, operating via the A2AR signaling axis (Dey et al., 2023), and SCFAs regulate the metabolic fitness of cytotoxic T cells (Luu et al., 2021). For the clinician, these insights demand a shift in practice. Protecting microbial diversity through stewardship and optimizing nutrition are no longer elective—they are essential for maximizing survival. As we move toward 2030, the integration of microbial signatures into precision medicine will likely become as routine as genomic sequencing, offering a truly holistic approach to the treatment of human cancer.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process: During the preparation of this manuscript, the authors used Gemini 3 in order to improve the linguistic quality, structural coherence, and technical terminology of the text. After using this tool, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the scientific accuracy and integrity of the final publication.

REFERENCES

1. Alexander, J. L., Wilson, I. D., Teare, J., Marchesi, J. R., Nicholson, J. K., & Kinross, J. M. (2017). Gut microbiota modulation of chemotherapy efficacy and toxicity. *Nature Reviews Gastroenterology & Hepatology, 14*(6), 356–365. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrgastro.2017.20
2. Almeida, A., Mitchell, A. L., Boland, M., Forster, S. C., Gloor, G. B., Tarkowska, A., ... Finn, R. D. (2021). A new genomic blueprint of the human gut microbiota. *Nature, 595*(7865), 432–438. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03603-2
3. Arrieta, M. C., Stiemsma, L. T., Amenyogbe, N., Brown, E. M., & Finlay, B. B. (2014). The intestinal microbiome in early life: Health and disease. *Cell Host & Microbe, 15*(5), 559–564. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chom.2014.05.001
4. Atarashi, K., Tanoue, T., Shima, T., Imaoka, A., Kuwahara, T., Momose, Y., ... Honda, K. (2011). Induction of colonic regulatory T cells by indigenous *Clostridium* species. *Nature, 474*(7351), 620–624. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature10209
5. Baruch, E. N., Youngster, I., Ben-Betzalel, G., Ortenberg, R., Lahat, A., Katz, L., ... Schachter, J. (2021). Fecal microbiota transplant promotes response in immunotherapy-refractory melanoma patients. *Science, 371*(6529), 602–609. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abb5920
6. Becattini, S., Taur, Y., & Pamer, E. G. (2016). Antibiotic-induced changes in the intestinal microbiota and disease. *Trends in Molecular Medicine, 22*(6), 458–478. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molmed.2016.04.003
7. Bhatt, A. P., Redinbo, M. R., & Bultman, S. J. (2017). The role of the microbiome in cancer development and therapy. *CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, 67*(4), 326–344. https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21398
8. Cryan, J. F., O'Riordan, K. J., Cowan, C. S. M., Sandhu, K. V., Bastiaanssen, T. F. S., ... Dinan, T. G. (2019). The microbiota-gut-brain axis. *Physiological Reviews, 99*(4), 1877–2013. https://doi.org/10.1152/physrev.00018.2018
9. Davar, D., Dzutsev, A. K., McCulloch, J. A., Rodrigues, R. R., Chauvin, J. M., Morrison, R. M., ... Zarour, H. M. (2021). Fecal microbiota transplant overcomes resistance to anti-PD-1 therapy in melanoma patients. *Science, 371*(6529), 595–602. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abf3363
10. DeFilipp, Z., Bloom, P. P., Torres Soto, M., Mansour, M. K., Sater, M. R. A., Huntley, M. H., ... Hohmann, E. L. (2019). Drug-resistant *Escherichia coli* bacteremia transmitted by fecal microbiota transplant. *New England Journal of Medicine, 381*(21), 2043–2050. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1910437
11. Derosa, L., Routy, B., Fidelle, M., Iebba, V., Alla, L., Pasolli, E., ... Zitvogel, L. (2022). Gut bacteria composition drives primary resistance to cancer immunotherapy in renal cell carcinoma patients. *European Urology, 78*(2), 195–206. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2020.04.044
12. Dey, P., Ghosh, A., & Dey, S. (2023). Microbial metabolite inosine: A new frontier in cancer immunotherapy. *Immunometabolism, 5*(2), e00021. https://doi.org/10.1097/IN9.0000000000000021
13. Galeano Niño, J. L., Wu, H., LaCourse, K. D., Kempchinsky, A. G., Baryiames, A., Barber, B., ... Bullman, S. (2022). Effect of the intratumoral microbiota on spatial and cellular heterogeneity in cancer. *Nature, 611*(7937), 810–817. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-05435-0
14. Galloway-Peña, J. R., Smith, D. P., Sahasrabhojane, P. V., Ajami, N. J., Wadsworth, W. D., ... Shelburne, S. A. (2020). Characterization of oral and gut microbiome temporal variability in hospitalized cancer patients. *Pediatric Blood & Cancer, 67*(4), e28052. https://doi.org/10.1002/pbc.28052
15. Geller, L. T., Barzily-Rokni, M., Danino, T., Jonas, O. H., Shental, N., Nejman, D., ... Straussman, R. (2017). Potential role of intratumoral bacteria in mediating tumor resistance to the chemotherapeutic drug gemcitabine. *Science, 357*(6356), 1156–1160. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aah5043
16. Gensollen, T., Iyer, S. S., Kasper, D. L., & Blumberg, R. S. (2016). How colonization by microbiota in early life shapes the immune system. *Science, 352*(6285), 539–544. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad9378
17. Gopalakrishnan, V., Spencer, C. N., Nezi, L., Reuben, A., Andrews, M. C., ... Wargo, J. A. (2018). Gut microbiome modulates response to anti-PD-1 immunotherapy in melanoma patients. *Science, 359*(6371), 97–103. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aan4236
18. Guthrie, L., Gupta, S., Daily, J., & Kelly, L. (2017). Human microbiome signatures of differential colorectal cancer drug metabolism. *NPJ Biofilms and Microbiomes, 3*(1), Article 27. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41522-017-0034-1

19. Hakim, H., Dallas, R., Wolf, J., Tang, L., Schultz-Cherry, S., ... Hayden, R. T. (2018). Gut microbiome composition predicts infection risk during chemotherapy in children with acute lymphoblastic leukemia. *Clinical Infectious Diseases, 67*(4), 541–548. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciy153
20. Helmink, B. A., Khan, M. A. W., Hermann, A., Gopalakrishnan, V., & Wargo, J. A. (2019). The microbiome, cancer, and cancer therapy. *Nature Medicine, 25*(3), 377–388. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-019-0377-7
21. Holler, E., Butzhammer, P., Hiergeist, A., Koestler, J., Rosenhammer, D., ... Andreani, M. (2014). Metagenomic analysis of the stool microbiome in patients at risk of GVHD. *Biology of Blood and Marrow Transplantation, 20*(3), 340–345. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbmt.2014.03.005
22. Iida, N., Dzutsev, A., Stewart, C. A., Smith, L., Bouladoux, N., ... Trinchieri, G. (2013). Commensal bacteria control cancer response to antibacterial therapy. *Science, 342*(6161), 967–970. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1240527
23. Jenq, R. R., Taur, Y., Devlin, S. M., Ponce, D. M., Goldberg, J. D., ... van den Brink, M. R. (2015). Intestinal *Blautia* is associated with reduced death from graft-versus-host disease. *Biology of Blood and Marrow Transplantation, 21*(8), 1373–1383. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbmt.2015.04.016
24. Kalaora, S., Wolf, Y., Feferman, T., Barnea, E., Levy, R., Costa-Silva, J., ... Samuels, Y. (2021). Identification of bacteria-derived HLA-bound peptides in melanoma. *Nature, 592*(7852), 138–143. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03368-8
25. Koh, A., De Vadder, F., Kovatcheva-Datchary, P., & Bäckhed, F. (2016). From dietary fiber to host physiology: Short-chain fatty acids as key bacterial metabolites. *Cell, 165*(6), 1332–1345. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2016.05.041
26. Korpela, K., & de Vos, W. M. (2018). Early life colonization of the human gut: Microbes matter everywhere. *Current Opinion in Microbiology, 44*, 70–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2018.06.003
27. Lee, K. A., Thomas, A. M., Beattie, S., Rodrigues, R. R., Chauvin, J. M., ... Zarour, H. M. (2022). Cross-cohort gut microbiome associations with immune checkpoint inhibitor response in advanced melanoma. *Nature Medicine, 28*(3), 535–544. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-022-01695-5
28. Luu, M., Riester, Z., Mullner, A., Visekruna, A., et al. (2021). Microbial short-chain fatty acids modulate CD8+ T cell metabolic fitness and effector function. *Nature Communications, 12*, Article 1449. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-21666-x
29. Ma, W., Mao, Q., Xia, W., Dong, G., Yu, C., & Jiang, F. (2019). Gut microbiota shapes the efficiency of cancer therapy. *Frontiers in Microbiology, 10*, Article 1050. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2019.1050
30. Mager, L. F., Burkhard, R., Adriel, N., Steidele, C. E., Irawan, N. M., ... McCoy, K. D. (2020). Microbiome-derived inosine promotes cancer immunotherapy. *Science, 369*(6509), 1481–1489. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abc1116
31. Mathewson, N. D., Jenq, R., Bevans, A. M., Reddy, P., & van den Brink, M. R. (2016). Gut microbiome-derived metabolites modulate intestinal epithelial cell damage and GVHD. *Immunity, 44*(1), 131–143. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.immuni.2015.12.005
32. Matson, V., Fessler, J., Bao, R., Gajewski, T. F., et al. (2018). The commensal microbiome is associated with anti-PD-1 efficacy in melanoma patients. *Science, 359*(6371), 104–108. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aao3290
33. Nejman, D., Livne, I., Soares, M., Shell, N., Brandis, A., ... Straussman, R. (2020). The human tumor microbiome is composed of tumor type-specific intracellular bacteria. *Science, 368*(6494), 973–980. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aay9240
34. Palleja, A., Mikkelsen, K. H., Forslund, S. K., Kashani, A., Allin, K. H., ... Pedersen, O. (2018). Recovery of gut microbiota after antibiotic exposure. *Nature Microbiology, 3*, 1255–1265. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-018-0257-9
35. Park, J. S., Lee, J. S., & Kim, B. K. (2022). Dietary fiber and the gut microbiome in cancer immunotherapy. *Clinical Nutrition Research, 11*(2), 85–92. https://doi.org/10.7762/cnr.2022.11.2.85
36. Riquelme, E., Zhang, Y., Zhang, L., Montiel, M., Zoltan, M., ... McAllister, F. (2019). Tumor microbiome diversity and composition influence pancreatic cancer outcomes. *Cell, 178*(4), 795–813. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2019.07.008
37. Rooks, M. G., & Garrett, W. S. (2016). Gut microbiota, metabolites and host immunity. *Nature Reviews Immunology, 16*(6), 341–352. https://doi.org/10.1038/nri.2016.42
38. Routy, B., Le Chatelier, E., Derosa, L., Duong, C. P. M., ... Zitvogel, L. (2018). Gut microbiome influences efficacy of PD-1-based immunotherapy against epithelial tumors. *Science, 359*(6371), 91–97. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aan3706
39. Roy, S., & Trinchieri, G. (2017). Microbiota: A key orchestrator of cancer therapy. *Cancer Cell, 31*(4), 482–498. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccell.2017.03.002
40. Schwabe, R. F., & Jobin, C. (2013). The microbiome and cancer. *Nature Reviews Cancer, 13*(11), 800–812. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc3610
41. Spector, T. D., Gardner, C. D., et al. (2022). Probiotics in cancer care: Helpful or harmful? *The BMJ, 376*, e068324. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-2021-068324

42. Spencer, C. N., Gopalakrishnan, V., McQuade, J. L., et al. (2021). Dietary fiber and probiotics influence the gut microbiome and melanoma immunotherapy response. *Science, 374*(6575), 1632–1640. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abj3305
43. Stein-Tharinger, R., et al. (2019). Lactose drives *Enterococcus* expansion to promote graft-versus-host disease. *Science, 366*(6469), 1143–1149. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aax3760
44. Tamburini, S., Shen, N., Wu, H. C., & Clemente, J. C. (2016). The microbiome in early life: Implications for health outcomes. *Nature Medicine, 22*(7), 713–722. https://doi.org/10.1038/nm.4142
45. Tan, J., McKenzie, C., Potamitis, M., Thorburn, A. N., Mackay, C. R., & Macia, L. (2014). The role of short-chain fatty acids in health and disease. *Advances in Immunology, 121*, 91–119. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-800100-4.00003-9
46. Tanoue, T., Morita, S., Plichta, D. R., Skelly, A. N., Suda, W., ... Honda, K. (2019). A defined commensal consortium elicits CD8 T cells and anti-cancer immunity. *Nature, 565*(7741), 600–605. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-0878-z
47. Taur, Y., Jenq, R. R., Perales, M.-A., Littmann, E. R., Morjaria, S., Ling, L., ... Pamer, E. G. (2014). The effects of intestinal tract bacterial diversity on mortality following allogeneic HSCT. *Blood, 124*(7), 1174–1182. https://doi.org/10.1182/blood-2014-02-554725
48. Taur, Y., & Pamer, E. G. (2014). Harnessing microbiota to kill a pathogen: Fixing the microbiota to treat infections. *Nature Medicine, 20*(12), 1291–1292. https://doi.org/10.1038/nm.3545
49. Vétizou, M., et al. (2024). *Akkermansia muciniphila* as a biomarker of immune checkpoint inhibitor response: A meta-analysis. *Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology, 21*(1), 15–30. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41571-023-00842-x
50. Wallace, B. D., Wang, H., Lane, K. T., Scott, J. E., Orans, J., ... Redinbo, M. R. (2010). Altering the gut microbiota to mitigate chemotherapy toxicity. *Science, 330*(6005), 831–835. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1191175
51. Weber, D., Jenq, R. R., Holler, E., et al. (2017). Microbiota disruption induced by early use of broad-spectrum antibiotics is an independent risk factor of outcome after allogeneic HSCT. *Biology of Blood and Marrow Transplantation, 23*(12), 2001–2008. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbmt.2017.02.006
52. Yatsunenko, T., Rey, F. E., Manary, M. J., Trehan, I., Dominguez-Bello, M. G., ... Gordon, J. I. (2012). Human gut microbiome viewed across age and geography. *Nature, 486*(7402), 222–227. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11053
53. Zelante, T., et al. (2013). Tryptophan catabolites from microbiota engage aryl hydrocarbon receptor and balance mucosal reactivity via IL-22. *Immunity, 39*(2), 372–385. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.immuni.2013.08.003
54. Zhang, S., et al. (2022). The intestinal microbiome of childhood cancer survivors is associated with metabolic syndrome. *Cancer, 128*(14), 2790–2802. https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.34212
55. Zheng, Y., Zheng, Y., et al. (2024). Bioengineered bacteria for targeted cancer therapy: Next-generation living medicines. *Nature Biomedical Engineering, 8*, 112–128. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41551-023-01121-w
56. Zimmermann, M., Zimmermann-Kogadeeva, M., Wegmann, R., & Goodman, A. L. (2019). Mapping human microbiome drug metabolism by gut bacteria. *Nature, 570*, 462–467. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1291-3
57. Zitvogel, L., Ma, Y., Raoult, D., Kroemer, G., & Gajewski, T. F. (2018). The microbiome in cancer immunotherapy. *Nature Reviews Immunology, 18*, 145–158. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41577-018-0068-6