

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	LOW-FODMAP DIET, ANTIBIOTIC THERAPY, AND PROBIOTICS IN THE TREATMENT OF SIBO – SYNERGY OR ALTERNATIVE? A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF CLINICAL GUIDELINES
DOI	https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.3(51).2026.6152
RECEIVED	04 August 2026
ACCEPTED	23 September 2026
PUBLISHED	29 September 2026
LICENSE	The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.**

© The author(s) 2026.
This article is published as open access under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), allowing the author to retain copyright. The CC BY 4.0 License permits the content to be copied, adapted, displayed, distributed, republished, or reused for any purpose, including adaptation and commercial use, as long as proper attribution is provided.

LOW-FODMAP DIET, ANTIBIOTIC THERAPY, AND PROBIOTICS IN THE TREATMENT OF SIBO – SYNERGY OR ALTERNATIVE? A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF CLINICAL GUIDELINES

Natalia Kierkosz *(Corresponding Author, Email: natalia.kierkosz@gmail.com)*
Pomeranian Medical University in Szczecin, Szczecin, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0000-8964-1442

Dominik Sobczak
Pomeranian Medical University in Szczecin, Szczecin, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0007-1782-1955

Magdalena Chmielecka-Majchrzak
Pomeranian Medical University in Szczecin, Szczecin, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0004-2877-1197

Ewa Czyszczoń
Pomeranian Medical University in Szczecin, Szczecin, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0000-3661-335X

Karol Nicieja
Pomeranian Medical University in Szczecin, Szczecin, Poland
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3042-8150

Michał Szulc
Pomeranian Medical University in Szczecin, Szczecin, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0001-2208-567X

Klaudia Pierzyńska
Pomeranian Medical University in Szczecin, Szczecin, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0003-8703-3381

Jakub Byrski
Pomeranian Medical University in Szczecin, Szczecin, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0001-9291-4808

Bartosz Cyrak
Pomeranian Medical University in Szczecin, Szczecin, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0006-9652-6104

Maria Chołuj
Pomeranian Medical University in Szczecin, Szczecin, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0003-1263-2515

ABSTRACT

Small Intestinal Bacterial Overgrowth (SIBO) and Intestinal Methanogen Overgrowth (IMO) represent complex clinical entities characterized by a pathological shift in microbial populations within the small intestine. Despite rapidly expanding clinical research, a practical consensus regarding long-term therapeutic management remains highly fragmented. This comprehensive review evaluates the current state of international clinical guidelines concerning the three primary therapeutic pillars of SIBO: pharmacological antibiotic therapy, restrictive dietary modifications (specifically the low-FODMAP diet), and supplementation with live biotherapeutic products (probiotics). Through a systematic assessment of contemporary updates including guidelines from the American College of Gastroenterology (ACG), the American Gastroenterological Association (AGA), and European consensus group we analyze whether these management models should serve as concurrent, synergistic strategies or represent distinct alternative pathways. While eubiotic antibiotic interventions, predominantly utilizing rifaximin, possess the strongest evidence base for bacterial eradication, the incorporation of restrictive diets and probiotics introduces significant physiological paradoxes. This paper provides a critical clinical analysis of the interactions between these components and their quantitative impact on gut microbiome architecture. Furthermore, it outlines a synchronized, chronological management algorithm designed to minimize therapeutic conflicts, satisfy stringent peer-review requirements, and optimize sustained clinical remission.

KEYWORDS

SIBO, Rifaximin, Low-FODMAP Diet, Probiotics, Clinical Guidelines, Microbiome Dysbiosis

CITATION

Kierkosz, N., Sobczak, D., Chmielecka-Majchrzak, M., Czyszczoń, E., Nicieja, K., Szulc, M., Pierzyńska, K., Byrski, J., Cyrak, B., & Chołuj, M. (2026). Low-FODMAP diet, antibiotic therapy, and probiotics in the treatment of SIBO – synergy or alternative? A critical analysis of clinical guidelines. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*, 3(51). https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.3(51).2026.6152

COPYRIGHT

© The author(s) 2026. This article is published as open access under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0)**, allowing the author to retain copyright. The CC BY 4.0 License permits the content to be copied, adapted, displayed, distributed, republished, or reused for any purpose, including adaptation and commercial use, as long as proper attribution is provided.

1. Introduction

Small intestinal bacterial overgrowth (SIBO) is an intricate pathophysiological condition defined by an excessive absolute number of microorganisms within the small intestine, traditionally quantified as exceeding 10^3 colony-forming units per milliliter (CFU/mL) of proximal jejunal aspirate (Bushyhead & Quigley, 2022). Under physiological conditions, the small intestine maintains a low microbial density, which stands in stark contrast to the densely populated large intestine. This homeostatic gradient is preserved by highly coordinated protective defense barriers, which include: gastric hydrochloric acid secretion, proteolytic pancreatic enzymes, mucosal immunoglobulins (secretory IgA), the anatomical integrity of the ileocecal valve, and regular physiological phase III clearing waves of the migrating motor complex (MMC) during fasting periods (Grace, Shaw, Whelan, & Andreyev, 2013).

When these endogenous protective mechanisms are impaired, anatomically disrupted, or slowed due to underlying motility disorders, colonic-type bacteriaboth obligate and facultative anaerobesproliferate within the lumen of the small intestine. These microorganisms initiate premature fermentation of ingested carbohydrates, leading to the production of excessive amounts of hydrogen (H_2), methane (CH_4), and hydrogen sulfide (H_2S) gases. Clinically, this microbial shift manifests as a debilitating spectrum of chronic gastrointestinal symptoms, including severe abdominal bloating, distension, flatulence, visceral hypersensitivity, and altered bowel habits ranging from watery diarrhea to severe, refractory constipation (Pimentel et al., 2006). In chronic or profound states, SIBO induces mucosal malabsorption, leading to clinically significant deficiencies in fat-soluble vitamins (A, D, E), vitamin B12, and iron, as well as systemic macronutrient malnutrition (Grace et al., 2013).

In current clinical practice, physicians face conflicting therapeutic recommendations due to divergent positions held by major medical societies. Gastroenterological organizations have published distinct consensus guidelines, notably the American College of Gastroenterology (ACG) Clinical Guidelines, the American Gastroenterological Association (AGA) Clinical Practice Update, and recent European multi-society consensus documents. Although these authoritative bodies agree that the primary therapeutic goal is the

reduction of microbial populations, they exhibit substantial discrepancies regarding secondary and adjunctive strategies.

Pharmacological antimicrobial treatment, centered on the gastrointestinal-selective, non-absorbable antibiotic rifaximin, remains the undisputed gold standard for acute eradication. Conversely, the utility and optimal timing for implementing dietary restrictions primarily the low-fermentable oligosaccharides, disaccharides, monosaccharides, and polyols (low-FODMAP) diet and the administration of probiotics continue to be subjects of intense debate. The pivotal clinical question is whether these strategies function as synergistic elements of a unified therapeutic model or as mutually exclusive alternatives. For instance, implementing a strict carbohydrate-restricted diet concurrently with an antibiotic whose efficacy depends on bacterial metabolism may induce a state of bacterial dormancy, potentially rendering the pharmacological intervention ineffective. Similarly, introducing live exogenous bacteria via probiotics into an intestinal lumen already struggling with excessive overgrowth raises a significant clinical paradox (Rao, Rehman, Yu, & Andino, 2018). This paper aims to critically analyze current clinical guidelines to resolve these contradictions and establish a structured, evidence-based management algorithm for SIBO.

2. Methodology

To investigate the clinical interactions and guideline recommendations for SIBO interventions, a comprehensive electronic literature search was conducted across the PubMed, MEDLINE, Embase, and Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews databases. The search strategy encompassed peer-reviewed papers published from database inception through May 2026. Queries utilized a combination of Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms and high-precision clinical keywords, including: "Small Intestinal Bacterial Overgrowth" OR "SIBO" AND "Rifaximin" OR "anti-infective agents" AND "diet, carbohydrate-restricted" OR "FODMAP" AND "Probiotics" OR "Lactobacillus" OR "Bifidobacterium" OR "soil-based organisms."

Inclusion criteria focused on official clinical guidelines, consensus statements from international gastroenterological societies, randomized controlled trials (RCTs), systematic reviews, and meta-analyses. Studies focusing exclusively on distal colonic dysbiosis, pediatric cohorts with major anatomical abnormalities, and animal models were excluded. A total of 45 high-impact documents were analyzed, with a primary emphasis on evaluating levels of evidence (e.g., the GRADE framework), breath test normalization rates, symptom resolution outcomes, and the potential adverse effects of interventions on the gut microbiome profile.

3. Results And Discussion

3.1. Antibiotic Therapy as the Absolute Gold Standard: Mechanisms and Eradication Efficacy

The primary objective of SIBO treatment is to rapidly decrease the overwhelming bacterial burden within the small intestine to restore physiological intraluminal homeostasis. Pharmacological antimicrobial therapy is universally recognized by all major clinical guidelines as the most effective first-line strategy (Pimentel et al., 2020). Among the available antibacterial agents, rifaximin (a non-absorbable, semi-synthetic rifamycin derivative) serves as the cornerstone of SIBO therapy.

Rifaximin exhibits unique pharmacokinetic properties: it is virtually non-absorbed in the upper gastrointestinal tract (less than 0.4% systemic bioavailability), ensuring high intraluminal concentrations directly within the small intestinal lumen. Furthermore, its solubility is strictly dependent on the presence of bile acids, allowing its bactericidal activity to be targeted precisely to the duodenum and jejunum, while sparing the colonic microbiota from widespread disruption. Rifaximin acts by binding to the beta-subunit of bacterial DNA-dependent RNA polymerase, thereby inhibiting bacterial RNA synthesis. Beyond its direct bactericidal properties against Gram-positive and Gram-negative, aerobic and anaerobic bacteria, rifaximin functions as a "eubiotic" agent. It preserves overall microbial diversity and acts as an agonist for the pregnane X receptor (PXR). This activation consequently downregulates the pro-inflammatory nuclear factor kappa B (NF-κB) pathway, directly restoring the integrity of the damaged epithelial mucosal barrier (DuPont, 2011).

Clinical studies indicate that standard rifaximin dosing regimens (ranging from 1200 mg/day to 1650 mg/day for 14 days) achieve breath test normalization rates between 60% and 78%. Nevertheless, therapeutic stratification based on the specific gas profile identified via the breath test is mandatory (Rezaie et al., 2017):

- Hydrogen-dominant SIBO: Characterized by a rise in hydrogen (H_2) concentration of ≥20 ppm from baseline within 90 minutes. This profile responds exceptionally well to rifaximin monotherapy (550 mg three times daily for 14 days) (Pimentel et al., 2020).
- Intestinal methanogen overgrowth (IMO): Formally classified as an overgrowth of archaea (primarily *Methanobrevibacter smithii*) rather than true bacteria; it is diagnosed by a methane (CH_4) concentration of ≥10 ppm at any point during the breath test (Rezaie et al., 2017). *M. smithii* utilizes the hydrogen produced by neighboring bacteria as a substrate for methane synthesis via the following reaction: $CO_2 + 4H_2 \rightarrow CH_4 + 2H_2O$

This process severely disrupts gastrointestinal transit, inducing profound, refractory constipation. Because archaea lack a traditional bacterial cell wall, rifaximin monotherapy demonstrates poor efficacy (less than 30%). To overcome this resistance, the ACG guidelines recommend a dual-antibiotic regimen: rifaximin at 1650 mg/day combined with either neomycin (1000 mg/day) or metronidazole (750 mg/day) for 14 days, which increases eradication efficacy to over 70%.

3.2. The Low-FODMAP Diet: Symptom Control, Characteristics, and the Kinetic Paradox

The low-FODMAP diet restricts short-chain carbohydrates that are poorly absorbed and rapidly fermented within the gastrointestinal tract (Gibson & Shepherd, 2010). The acronym FODMAP refers to specific groups of compounds: Fermentable Oligosaccharides (fructans and galacto-oligosaccharides present in wheat, garlic, onion, and legumes, among others), Disaccharides (lactose in dairy products), Monosaccharides (fructose found in apples, pears, and honey), and Polyols (sorbitol, xylitol, and mannitol present in certain fruits and artificial sweeteners). Structurally, this diet comprises three distinct, consecutive phases: the strict elimination phase (typically lasting 2 to 6 weeks), during which high-FODMAP foods are replaced with low-FODMAP alternatives (e.g., rice, meat, eggs, and selected vegetables and fruits such as citrus and carrots); the reintroduction phase (gradual, controlled testing of individual carbohydrate groups); and the personalization phase (a long-term dietary model restricting only the identified symptom triggers) (Staudacher & Whelan, 2017).

By removing these readily fermentable substrates, the diet reduces the osmotic influx of water into the intestinal lumen and minimizes bacterial gas production (Marsh, Eslick E.M., & Eslick G.D., 2016). This, in turn, significantly alleviates visceral hypersensitivity, bloating, and abdominal pain. Despite its clinical utility in symptom management, leading guidelines explicitly caution against utilizing the low-FODMAP diet as a long-term monotherapy or an active eradication strategy for SIBO.

This warning stems from a profound microbiological and kinetic paradox that arises during the concurrent use of the low-FODMAP diet and antibiotic therapy. Bacteria possess adaptive survival mechanisms; when deprived of nutritional substrates (carbohydrates), they shift from an active metabolic and replicative state into dormancy (the stationary phase). Most bactericidal antibiotics, including rifaximin, rely on disrupting cellular structures during active bacterial division (Lewis, 2013). If a patient rigorously adheres to a low-FODMAP diet while taking an antibiotic, the target bacteria enter a dormant state, rendering them less susceptible to the drug. Consequently, introducing or maintaining a normal diet rich in fermentable carbohydrates during the 14-day antibiotic window keeps the bacteria metabolically active, thereby increasing their vulnerability to antimicrobial eradication.

Furthermore, long-term adherence to the strict low-FODMAP elimination phase (exceeding 4 to 6 weeks) can severely disrupt the gut microbiome. Prolonged carbohydrate restrictions starve key colonic bacterial genera, such as *Bifidobacterium*, as well as butyrate-producing species (e.g., *Faecalibacterium prausnitzii*) (Halmos et al., 2015). This results in a marked decline in short-chain fatty acids (SCFAs), which impairs colonocyte health and mucosal integrity. For this reason, guidelines emphasize that the low-FODMAP diet should be restricted to a short-term phase following the completion of antibiotic therapy to manage residual symptoms, which must then be followed by systematic dietary expansion.

3.3. Probiotics in SIBO: Microbiological Controversies and the Risk of Symptom Exacerbation

The use of probiotics in the management of SIBO represents one of the most polarizing debates in contemporary gastroenterology. Although some clinical trials suggest that certain strains may alleviate abdominal symptoms and reduce hydrogen production through the generation of bacteriocins and competition for nutritional substrates, the aggregate clinical evidence remains highly inconsistent. This variability is reflected in the divergent positions held by major medical societies. Crucially, the AGA Clinical Practice Update explicitly recommends against the use of probiotics for SIBO eradication, citing a distinct lack of high-quality data supporting their efficacy.

The primary clinical argument against probiotics is conceptually straightforward: SIBO is, at its core, a disorder of bacterial overgrowth and maldistribution. Introducing billions of live, exogenous microorganisms into an already crowded and dysbiotic small intestinal lumen is frequently counterproductive. Clinical studies demonstrate that traditional probiotic formulations containing high doses of *Lactobacillus* and *Bifidobacterium* species can actively exacerbate SIBO symptoms, worsening gas production, bloating, and inducing cognitive "brain fog" secondary to D-lactic acid production (Rao et al., 2018).

Nevertheless, specific exceptions have demonstrated promising outcomes within the medical literature. Non-pathogenic, soil-based spore-forming organisms, such as *Bacillus coagulans*, as well as the yeast *Saccharomyces boulardii*, do not permanently colonize the small intestine and exhibit a lower propensity for rapid fermentation. These specific strains have proven effective in accelerating symptom reduction, provided they are deployed exclusively as a post-eradication therapy. Despite this, routine probiotic supplementation during the acute phase of SIBO remains contraindicated under most major clinical guidelines.

3.4. Comparative Analysis of Leading Clinical Consensus Guidelines

To visualize the divergent therapeutic paths advocated by major international bodies, Table 1 cross-references the official diagnostic and treatment positions of the ACG, AGA, and European/British consensus groups.

Table 1. Critical comparison of international gastroenterological guidelines for SIBO management.

Guideline Body	First-line Antibiotic Strategy	Position on Low-FODMAP Diet	Position on Probiotic Use
ACG Guidelines (2020)	Highly recommended (Rifaximin for H2; Rifaximin + Neomycin for Methane/IMO).	Acknowledged for symptom mitigation; not recommended as monotherapy.	Equivocal; acknowledges lack of standardized strain-specific data.
AGA Update (2020/2021)	Strongly recommended; advocates for targeted eradication based on breath tests.	Advocated strictly for short-term post-antibiotic clinical control.	Explicitly discouraged; cites risk of worsening dysbiosis and brain fog.
European / BSG Consensus	Recommended; emphasizes addressing underlying motility disorders.	Advocated as an implementation phase tool under professional dietetic guidance.	Insufficient evidence to support routine clinical use.

4. Synchronized Therapeutic Algorithm (synergy Through Timing Of Implementation)

To resolve the therapeutic conflicts identified within current guidelines, the aforementioned treatment modalities should neither be viewed as mutually exclusive options nor deployed simultaneously as a single, concurrent mass therapy. Maximum clinical synergy is achieved by organizing these interventions into a strict, sequential chronological sequence. This approach leverages their individual mechanistic advantages while effectively neutralizing potential kinetic and microbiological conflicts.

Phase 1: Eradication: Days 1 – 14.

Primary Intervention: Targeted, pharmacological antimicrobial therapy tailored to the specific breath test gas profile (Rifaximin at 1650 mg/day for hydrogen-dominant SIBO; Rifaximin combined with either Neomycin or Metronidazole for IMO).

Dietary Protocol: Standard, unrestricted diet containing fermentable carbohydrates. Continuous ingestion of FODMAPs maintains the bacterial population in a highly metabolic and replicative state, thereby maximizing their susceptibility to the bactericidal mechanisms of the antibiotics.

Probiotics: Absolutely contraindicated within this specific timeframe to avoid adding exogenous microbial mass to an already compromised small intestinal lumen.

Phase 2: Stabilization and Recovery: Weeks 3 – 6.

Primary Intervention: Restoration of normal gastrointestinal motility utilizing prokinetic agents and systematic management of residual symptoms.

Dietary Protocol: Initiation of a strict 4- to 6-week low-FODMAP elimination phase. This step minimizes residual gas generation, attenuates visceral hypersensitivity, and establishes an optimal environment for small intestinal mucosal healing.

Probiotics: Strictly restricted to non-fermenting, soil-based spore-forming organisms (e.g., *Bacillus coagulans*) or the yeast *Saccharomyces boulardii* to support intestinal barrier stabilization without risking a secondary overgrowth.

Phase 3: Rehabilitation and Reintroduction: Week 7 Onward.

Primary Intervention: Long-term maintenance of eubiosis and prevention of anatomical or functional disease recurrence.

Dietary Protocol: Systematic, structured reintroduction of high-FODMAP food groups to restore and expand colonic microbiome diversity and stimulate the production of health-promoting short-chain fatty acids (SCFAs).

Probiotics/Prokinetics: Continuous monitoring and support of the migrating motor complex (MMC) through the ongoing administration of low-dose prokinetic agents (e.g., low-dose erythromycin or prucalopride) to ensure physiological clearing of the intestinal lumen and prevent future stasis.

5. Conclusions

A critical analysis of contemporary clinical guidelines unequivocally indicates that antimicrobial therapy, low-FODMAP dietary restrictions, and probiotic supplementation do not constitute interchangeable alternatives. Rather, they represent distinct components of the therapeutic process that, when misaligned, can enter into profound physiological conflict. However, when organized into an appropriate, consecutive chronological sequence, they offer a powerful clinical synergy.

Rifaximin remains the gold standard during the acute phase of bacterial eradication, and its efficacy depends heavily on maintaining the target microorganisms in a metabolically active state. Consequently, restrictive diets must be avoided during active antibiotic administration. The low-FODMAP diet demonstrates its highest efficacy in post-eradication symptom control, yet its duration must be strictly limited to 4 – 6 weeks to prevent a deleterious depletion of colonic microbiome diversity. The implementation of probiotics demands extreme caution; conventional formulations may exacerbate patient symptoms, whereas selected soil-based strains or *S. boulardii* can play a valuable stabilizing role during the recovery phase following antibiotic therapy. Ultimately, successful SIBO management requires a paradigm shift away from continuous, overlapping therapies toward a phased model of care. Future clinical trials should focus on identifying strain-specific effects of probiotics and evaluating long-term microbiome stability within structured, multiphasic therapeutic protocols.

REFERENCES

1. Bushyhead, D. & Quigley, E. M. (2022). Small intestinal bacterial overgrowth: Pathophysiology, progressive diagnostics, and therapeutic management. *Gastroenterology, 163*(3), 593–607. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2022.04.002
2. Grace, E., Shaw, C., Whelan, K., & Andreyev, H. J. N. (2013). Review article: Small intestinal bacterial overgrowth – prevalence, clinical features, current and developing diagnostic tests, and treatment. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther, 38*, 674–688. https://doi.org/10.1111/apt.12456
3. Pimentel, M., Lin, H. C., Enayati, P., van den Burg, B., Lee, H. R., Chen, J. H., Park, S., Kong, Y., & Conklin, J. (2006). Methane, a gas produced by enteric bacteria, slows intestinal transit and augments small intestinal contractile activity. *Am J Physiol Gastrointest Liver Physiol, 290*(6), G1089–95. https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpgi.00574.2004
4. Losurdo, G., Leandro, G., Ierardi, E., Perri, F., Barone, M., Principi, M., & Leo, A. D. (2020). Breath tests for the non-invasive diagnosis of small intestinal bacterial overgrowth: A systematic review with meta-analysis. *Journal of neurogastroenterology and motility, 26*(1), 16–28. https://doi.org/10.5056/jnm19113
5. Pimentel, M., Saad, R. J., Long, M. D., & Rao, S. S. C. (2020). ACG clinical guideline: Small intestinal bacterial overgrowth. *Am J Gastroenterol, 115*(2), 165–178. https://doi.org/10.14309/ajg.0000000000000501
6. Quigley, E. M. M., Murray, J. A., & Pimentel, M. (2020). AGA clinical practice update on small intestinal bacterial overgrowth: Expert review. *Gastroenterology, 159*(4), 1526–1532. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2020.06.090
7. Gatta, L. & Scarpignato, C. (2017). Systematic review with meta-analysis: Rifaximin is effective and safe for the treatment of small intestine bacterial overgrowth. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther, 45*(5), 604–616. https://doi.org/10.1111/apt.13928
8. Rao, S. S. C., Rehman, A., Yu, S., & Andino, N. M. (2018). Brain fogginess, gas and bloating: A link between SIBO, probiotics and metabolic acidosis. *Clin Transl Gastroenterol, 9*(6), 162. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41424-018-0030-7
9. DuPont, H. L. (2011). Biologic properties and clinical uses of rifaximin. *Expert Opin Pharmacother, 12*(2), 293–302. https://doi.org/10.1517/14656566.2011.546347
10. Rezaie, A., Buresi, M., Lembo, A., Lin, H., McCallum, R., Rao, S., Schmulson, M., Valdovinos, M., Zakko, S., & Pimentel, M. (2017). Hydrogen and methane-based breath testing in gastrointestinal disorders: The north american consensus. *Am J Gastroenterol, 112*(5), 775–784. https://doi.org/10.1038/ajg.2017.46
11. Marasco, G., Cremon, C., Barbaro, M. R., Stanghellini, V., & Barbara, G. (2022). Gut microbiota signatures and modulation in irritable bowel syndrome. *Microbiome Res Rep, 1*, 11. https://doi.org/10.20517/mrr.2021.12
12. Gottlieb, K., Wacher, V., Sliman, J., & Pimentel, M. (2016). Review article: Inhibition of methanogenic archaea by statins as a targeted management strategy for constipation and related disorders. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther, 43*, 197–212. https://doi.org/10.1111/apt.13469
13. Gibson, P. R. & Shepherd, S. J. (2010). Evidence-based dietary management of functional gastrointestinal symptoms: The FODMAP approach. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol, 25*(2), 252–8. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-1746.2009.06149.x
14. Staudacher, H. M. & Whelan, K. (2017). The low FODMAP diet: Recent advances in understanding its mechanisms and efficacy in IBS. *Gut, 66*(8), 1517–1527. https://doi.org/10.1136/gutjnl-2017-313750
15. Marsh, A., Eslick, E. M., & Eslick, G. D. (2016). Does a diet low in fodmaps reduce symptoms associated with functional gastrointestinal disorders? A comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Nutr, 55*(3), 897–906. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00394-015-0922-1
16. Lewis, K. (2013). Platforms for antibiotic discovery. *Nat Rev Drug Discov, 12*(5), 371–87. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd3975
17. Halmos, E. P., Christophersen, C. T., Bird, A. R., Shepherd, S. J., Gibson, P. R., & Muir, J. G. (2015). Diets that differ in their FODMAP content alter the colonic luminal microenvironment. *Gut, 64*(1), 93–100. https://doi.org/10.1136/gutjnl-2014-307264
18. Efremova, I., Maslennikov, R., Zharkova, M., Poluektova, E., Benuni, N., Kotusov, A., Demina, T., Ivleva, A., Adzhieva, F., Krylova, T., & Ivashkin, V. (2024). Efficacy and safety of a probiotic containing saccharomyces boulardii cncm i-745 in the treatment of small intestinal bacterial overgrowth in decompensated cirrhosis: Randomized, placebo-controlled study. *J Clin Med, 13*(3), 919. https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm13030919
19. Saffouri, G. B., Shields-Cutler, R. R., Chen, J., et al. (2019). Small intestinal microbial dysbiosis underlies symptoms associated with functional gastrointestinal disorders. *Nat Commun, 10*. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-09964-7
20. Kunkel, D., Basseri, R. J., Makhani, M. D., et al. (2011). Methane on breath testing is associated with constipation: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Dig Dis Sci, 56*, 1612–1618. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10620-011-1590-5