

# Journal Pre-proof

Microbiome research in practice: priorities for clinical translation and impact

Anastasia Theodosiou, Debby Bogaert, David Cleary, Paul-Enguerrand Fady, Conor Feehily, Jack Gilbert, Beth Greenhough, Luca Guardabassi, Lindsay Hall, Toni Harman, Ed Kuijper, Sarah Lebeer, Jamie Lorimer, Tim Spector, Chrissie Jones



PII: S1198-743X(26)00026-1

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2026.01.021>

Reference: CMI 4293

To appear in: *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*

Received Date: 6 October 2025

Revised Date: 21 January 2026

Accepted Date: 23 January 2026

Please cite this article as: Theodosiou A, Bogaert D, Cleary D, Fady P-E, Feehily C, Gilbert J, Greenhough B, Guardabassi L, Hall L, Harman T, Kuijper E, Lebeer S, Lorimer J, Spector T, Jones C, Microbiome research in practice: priorities for clinical translation and impact, *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2026.01.021>.

This is a PDF of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form. As such, this version is no longer the Accepted Manuscript, but it is not yet the definitive Version of Record; we are providing this early version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that Elsevier's sharing policy for the Published Journal Article applies to this version, see: <https://www.elsevier.com/about/policies-and-standards/sharing#4-published-journal-article>. Please also note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2026 Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases.

**Anastasia Theodosiou**

University of Glasgow, School of Infection and Immunity

**Debby Bogaert**

University of Edinburgh MRC Centre for Inflammation Research, Centre for Inflammation Research

**David Cleary**

University of Birmingham, Institute of Microbiology and Infection

**Paul-Enguerrand Fady**

Centre for Long-Term Resilience, Biosecurity Policy

**Conor Feehily**

University of Glasgow, School of Infection and Immunity

**Jack Gilbert**

University of California San Diego, Department of Pediatrics

**Beth Greenhough**

University of Oxford, School of Geography and the Environment

**Luca Guardabassi**

University of Copenhagen, Department of Veterinary Disease Biology; Ross University School of Veterinary Medicine, Department of Biomedical Sciences

**Lindsay Hall**

University of Birmingham, Institute of Microbiology and Infection; University of Birmingham, Department of Microbes, Infection and Microbiomes; School of Infection, Inflammation and Immunology; Quadram Institute Bioscience.

**Toni Harman**

Alto Films, Microbirth

**Ed Kuijper**

LUMC, Medical Microbiology

**Sarah Lebeer**

University of Antwerp, Bioscience Engineering

**Jamie Lorimer**

University of Oxford, School of Geography and the Environment

**Tim Spector**

King's College London, Department of Twin Research and genetic epidemiology

**Chrissie Jones**

University of Southampton, Clinical and Experimental Sciences

Journal Pre-proof

## **Microbiome research in practice: priorities for clinical translation and impact**

### **Authors**

Theodosiou AA, Bogaert D, Cleary DW, Fady PE, Feehily C, Gilbert JA, Greenhough B, Guardabassi L, Hall LJ, Harman T, Kuijper EJ, Lebeer S, Lorimer J, Spector TD, Jones CE

Corresponding author: Theodosiou AA, anastasia.theodosiou@glasgow.ac.uk

### **Abstract**

**Background:** Rapid advances in microbiome science have sparked clinical and commercial enthusiasm for interventions, yet translation into practice risks outpacing both mechanistic understanding and the infrastructure required for safe adoption.

**Objectives:** To outline a coordinated research, clinical, social, and policy agenda for advancing safe, effective, and equitable microbiome-based interventions.

**Sources:** We convened an interdisciplinary Royal Society-funded expert workshop (Leeds, UK, October 2024) with international leaders in microbiome science, clinical trials, regulation, and social science. Thematic analysis of workshop discussions and written contributions identified priority domains for translation.

**Content:** Three intersecting priorities emerged: scientific credibility, practical viability, and stakeholder engagement. Scientific credibility demands investment in multiomic and strain-level characterisation of host-microbiome interactions on a large scale, benchmarking of clinical and microbiological endpoints, and harmonisation of trial conduct and reporting. Clinical adoption requires fit-for-purpose regulation, diversified investment to address funding bottlenecks, and coordinated capacity building. Meaningful stakeholder engagement with clinicians, patients, policymakers, and the public is essential to foster confidence, develop clinically relevant research questions, and ensure equitable implementation of any new technology.

**Implications:** To realise the clinical impact of microbiome interventions, sustained collaboration across disciplines is essential. This Review offers a translational roadmap and actionable priorities to accelerate safe, effective, and equitable microbiome-based interventions – ensuring the field fulfils its clinical potential and delivers real-world impact.

### **Introduction**

The microbiome is increasingly recognised as a modifiable determinant of health, and recent years have seen a welcome shift in focus from observed associations to mechanistically-informed clinical interventions<sup>1</sup>. Faecal microbiota transplantation (FMT) is now embedded in clinical guidelines for recurrent *Clostridioides difficile* infection (CDI)<sup>2</sup>, and the first licensed medicinal products derived from healthy stool donors have reached the market<sup>3</sup>. Several live biotherapeutic products (LBPs) have now completed Phase 2 trials for conditions including CDI, inflammatory bowel disease (IBD), rheumatoid arthritis, type 2 diabetes, and graft-versus-host disease<sup>4,5</sup>. Trials are also underway testing the clinical utility of prebiotics (microbe-specific nutrients), postbiotics (microbial metabolites), synbiotics (mixtures of live microbes and their nutrients)<sup>6,7</sup>, and dietary interventions<sup>8</sup>. Although most research focuses on the gut microbiome, there is also growing interest in modulating the respiratory, urogenital and skin microbiomes to improve health<sup>9,10</sup>.

Beyond therapy, microbiome characterisation also holds promise for disease prediction and diagnosis, with independently validated machine learning models demonstrating predictive accuracy for

colorectal cancer, IBD, and cardiovascular disease<sup>11</sup>. Moreover, microbiome interventions are being explored across broader One Health contexts, including tackling antimicrobial resistance in livestock, suppressing root diseases in plants, and addressing ecological and agricultural challenges<sup>12</sup>. In veterinary medicine, clinical guidelines recommend FMT as an adjunctive microbial-directed therapeutic for canine parvovirus enteritis, canine acute diarrhoea, and chronic enteropathy in both dogs and cats<sup>13</sup>.

Despite this progress, barriers to meaningful clinical application persist. International regulation of microbiome-based therapies remains fragmented<sup>14</sup>, and consensus is lacking across core scientific concepts including definitions of microbiome health<sup>15</sup>, choice of biomarkers<sup>16</sup>, methodological standards<sup>17</sup>, and assessment of safety<sup>18</sup>. Meanwhile, public and commercial interest continues<sup>19</sup>, with enthusiasm often surpassing available evidence and infrastructure. For example, the proliferation of direct-to-consumer microbiome testing has prompted concerns around interpretability, reproducibility, and clinical oversight<sup>20,21</sup>.

To move from promise to practice, microbiome-based interventions must be grounded in robust, hypothesis-driven science, evaluated through reproducible clinical trials, and implemented via effective and equitable systems. At the same time, they must be acceptable to end users, including patients, clinicians, and policymakers. Clinical translation therefore demands a coherent interdisciplinary agenda to bring about scientific innovation, coordinated regulation, sustainable funding, and meaningful longitudinal stakeholder engagement.

To define actionable priorities, we convened a Royal Society-funded expert workshop in October 2024, including international leaders in microbiome science, clinical trials, regulation, and social science. While informed by speaker presentations and facilitated discussions, this manuscript is not a proceedings report; rather, it synthesises thematic analysis of audio-recorded discussions, presentations, and anonymised written contributions from speakers and delegates (Appendix). The resulting manuscript provides a roadmap for translational readiness, and our recommendations span three intersecting priority domains: scientific credibility, practical viability and stakeholder engagement (Box). This is a call to action for funders, regulators, researchers, and clinicians to align around a unified agenda aimed at unlocking the translational potential of the microbiome.

### **Priority 1: Scientific credibility**

#### Mechanistic insights and causality

Understanding how exactly the microbiome influences health and disease remains a central challenge demanding greater functional and phenotypic characterisation of both individual microbes and microbial communities. Metagenomic and multiomic analyses, incorporating metatranscriptomics, metaproteomics, metabolomics, and metaculturomics, are increasingly applied for the discovery of mechanisms<sup>22</sup>. Looking ahead, we encourage approaches that apply quantitative analysis<sup>23</sup>, differentiate live from dead organisms<sup>24</sup>, consider 3D spatial biogeography<sup>25</sup>, and include underexplored components like fungi<sup>26</sup>, viruses<sup>27</sup>, phages<sup>28</sup>, archaea<sup>29</sup>, protozoa and helminths<sup>30</sup>. While desirable and feasible, these approaches pose considerable technical, financial and analytical challenges. Approach-specific considerations also underscore enduring disciplinary silos that fragment expertise, and highlight the pressing need for cross-specialty collaboration and education.

Translating any mechanistic discoveries into clinically meaningful insights requires careful consideration of confounding factors and rigorous validation. Diet, age, ethnicity, and comorbidities are important confounders that need to be considered, particularly where post-hoc microbiome analyses are performed opportunistically on existing datasets<sup>31</sup>. Further, the broader human exposome – the cumulative set of environmental exposures across the life course – interacts

dynamically with host and the microbiome, and should be considered when controlling for confounders and independently validating mechanistic work. On the other hand, while mechanistic insight is critical for biological understanding, it should not be a precondition for clinical application, provided an intervention's safety and efficacy can be reproducibly demonstrated.

### Biomarkers and clinical endpoints

Defining robust microbial and clinical metrics is fundamental to translating microbiome science into clinical practice. Yet the field lacks consensus on which measures are meaningful, reproducible, and predictive of health outcomes. Commonly used indicators – such as alpha/beta diversity, relative abundance of taxa, or presence/absence of specific microbes – are convenient but poorly standardised across studies, and are rarely validated for diagnostic use. Different pipelines and algorithms generate divergent results, and the current flexibility often comes at the cost of collapsing biological complexity, resulting in poor specificity, sensitivity, and reproducibility across labs and studies<sup>32</sup>.

To move beyond taxonomic profiling and blunt relative abundance metrics, microbiome research is increasingly shifting toward phenotypic and functional biomarkers that provide both mechanistic insight and clinical utility. These include microbial gene transcriptional heterogeneity, strain-level genetic signatures, and metabolite production profiles. For example, microbe-derived short-chain fatty acids (SCFAs), which are integral to host immunity and metabolism, can be predicted using community-scale metabolic modelling approaches<sup>33</sup>. Advances in multiomic profiling allow simultaneous interrogation of microbial activity and host responses, improving the resolution of host-microbe interaction signatures<sup>34</sup>. In parallel, computational methods such as quantitative metagenomics and spike-in standards are helping to derive absolute abundances from compositional data, addressing long-standing analytical limitations and enabling more reliable identification of biomarkers and threshold effects<sup>23</sup>. These advances are already facilitating reporting of common health ranked microbes, rather than change in diversity, in relation to health outcomes<sup>35</sup>. When validated in large, diverse, longitudinal cohorts with high-quality metadata, these tools have the potential to underpin predictive models of disease risk, enable therapeutic stratification, and assess intervention efficacy – thereby advancing the translational readiness of the field.

Rather than chasing universal biomarkers or a single definition of 'microbiome health,' the field should shift toward stratified, context-specific profiles. These should account for age, sex, geography, and comorbidities<sup>15</sup>. Achieving sufficient granularity requires large discovery and validation cohorts, comprehensive metadata, better biobanking and harmonised international consortia. Examples such as the Million Microbiomes from Humans Project reflect the desirability of this approach at scale.

It is also important to consider how microbiome endpoints function alongside clinical endpoints. For microbiome-based interventions intended to act upstream of symptomatic disease, early-phase trials may require endpoints that capture short-term, subclinical, or mechanistic changes in host-microbiome function. These are not proposed as substitutes for traditional outcomes (e.g. disease incidence, symptom burden, hospitalisation, treatment response), which ultimately determine patient benefit and regulatory approval, but as translationally relevant intermediates that can de-risk and guide development of new treatment strategies. The nature of such endpoints will necessarily vary with disease and intervention. In gastroenterology, they may include strain engraftment (including abundance and duration of carriage), SCFA production, mucosal immunophenotyping, and gut permeability markers, such as lipopolysaccharide binding protein<sup>36</sup>; in metabolic disease, improvements in insulin sensitivity or inflammatory tone; in allergy and immunology, desensitisation profiles or cytokine responses; and in oncology, modulation of treatment toxicity or immunotherapy responsiveness. Conversely, clinical endpoints may capture benefit not evident microbiologically, such as reduction in antibiotic exposure, bacteraemia and length of stay following FMT in patients colonised with multidrug-resistant organisms, despite only modest decolonisation rates<sup>37</sup>.

From a translational perspective, the goal is therefore pluralistic and phased: mechanistic and subclinical endpoints can inform early efficacy and dose-finding, and help identify which interventions merit progression to larger trials powered for clinical outcomes, with the latter remaining essential for regulatory approval and clinical adoption.

#### Methodological harmonisation

Heterogeneity in study methods remains one of the largest barriers to progress, with variability spanning every stage of the research pipeline: study design, sample handling, nucleic acid extraction, sequencing protocols, choice of controls (including synthetic microbial community standards), use of model organisms, bioinformatic pipelines, and data visualisation. This impedes meta-analyses and reproducibility, and makes it difficult for scientists, clinicians, and regulators to reach consensus. Heartening progress has already been made towards greater methodological harmonisation, including the International Human Microbiome Standards (IHMS) group, the Microbiome Quality Control (MBQC) project, the development of DNA and whole cell reference reagents for evaluating DNA extraction protocols, and the emergence of international knowledge-sharing networks such as EurFMT<sup>17,38</sup>.

Yet total harmonisation is neither feasible nor desirable. Project-specific considerations – such as niche biomass, composition or expected longitudinal dynamics – may necessitate different methods, and prescriptive guidelines risk stifling innovation in a rapidly evolving field. We advocate for a shift in norms: embracing diverse approaches alongside transparent reporting and justification of methods. Tools such as the STORMS reporting checklist<sup>39</sup> and detailed STAR protocols<sup>40</sup> are an important step forward. Further, we urge harmonised training through shared curricula, open-access protocols, and building a collective understanding of methodological trade-offs. Trial design and statistical analysis plans should be preregistered on platforms like [ClinicalTrials.gov](https://www.clinicaltrials.gov), and negative results should be published. Machine learning may offer a partial solution by integrating heterogeneous datasets, although this cannot compensate for opaque upstream methods.

#### Clinical trial design

While the above issues apply broadly across microbiome research, clinical trials introduce distinct challenges. Intervention type – whether LBPs, probiotics, prebiotics, postbiotics, synbiotics, phages, diet, or FMT (Table) – has major implications for trial design. Within each modality, key decisions include strain selection, delivery route, pharmacokinetics/pharmacodynamics, suitable placebo, target disease, and target population demographics and co-morbidities. These decisions are often shaped by path dependency and legacy practices – for example, use of commercially available probiotic strains with limited mechanistic rationale; repurposing of trial protocols in studies targeting unrelated diseases; and selection of target niche based on ease of sampling and analysis. This tendency is reinforced by risk-averse regulation, which favours established protocols with known safety records over novel approaches that may be more scientifically appropriate but lack precedent. We advocate for a more rigorous approach that prioritises hypothesis-driven design grounded in clinical need, plausible mechanisms, niche-specific biology, and host-microbe interactions, balanced against feasibility in real-world settings.

Given the high dimensionality inherent to microbiome research, absence of standardised endpoints, and novelty of proposed treatments, meaningful power calculations can be challenging or even impossible. Ideally, clinical trials should include large samples with long-term follow-up. Nevertheless, smaller trials can yield meaningful results, particularly if comparable methods are employed to facilitate meta-analysis, or pragmatic trial designs including cross-over studies. Platform trial designs may also improve efficiency, enabling sequential or parallel testing of multiple microbiome-targeted interventions within specific patient groups, while leveraging shared controls and infrastructure<sup>41</sup>. Additional challenges are encountered when testing microbiome interventions such as bacteriophage

therapy, where highly personalised matching of phages to infecting organisms limits the applicability of traditional trial designs.

Potential microbiome interventions may target conditions managed outside clinical microbiology, including gastroenterology, rheumatology, haematology, neurology, oncology and paediatrics. Early involvement of specialty clinicians in trial design is therefore essential to ensure feasibility, appropriate participant selection, and clinically meaningful endpoints. Initiatives may originate from microbiome researchers, industry, or specialty clinicians themselves, but durable translation requires shared leadership across disciplines.

Ultimately, building scientific credibility means going beyond association: investing in mechanisms, robust biomarkers, transparent methods, and hypothesis-driven trials (see Box for detailed recommendations).

## **Priority 2: Practical viability**

### Regulation, safety and quality control

Microbiome-based interventions face fragmented regulation that is not fit-for-purpose. Depending on jurisdiction, indication, and manufacturing process, the same product may be classified as a food supplement, medicinal product, human tissue, or biological agent (Table). This is particularly problematic for modalities that do not fit clearly into current regulation, such as microbial consortia, bacteriophages, donor breastmilk and inactivated preparations (such as postbiotics)<sup>14</sup>. Regulatory and manufacturing infrastructure remains underdeveloped in many low- and middle-income countries, raising further concerns around equity and safety.

Regulatory designation acts as a double-edged sword. Probiotics regulated as food or supplements face fewer entry barriers, disincentivising generation of robust efficacy data, and simultaneously preventing meaningful health claims even when data are robust. Conversely, LBPs and microbiota transplants are subject to stricter regulation and manufacturing standards, improving rigour but also raising practical and significant financial barriers to progress. Lessons from FMT highlight the stakes<sup>42</sup>: despite clear efficacy in recurrent CDI, regulatory ambiguity and stringent donor screening have restricted clinical application. Stringent regulatory barriers also hinder the adoption of microbiome interventions in livestock. Under EU Feed Regulation (EC) No 767/2009, FMT and other faecal derivatives are prohibited in food-producing animals, reflecting concerns over pathogen transmission<sup>43</sup>. Yet given pressures to reduce antimicrobial use, a supportive framework is needed to enable safe innovation in this space.

While it may not be possible, or even desirable, to achieve a unified international framework governing all classes of microbiome-based interventions, existing gaps and inconsistencies require plugging urgently. Bespoke regulation should prioritise rigorous demonstration of safety and efficacy, and should be flexible enough to foster innovation, specific enough to give industry, consumers and regulators confidence in new therapies, and agile enough to respond to novel developments such as the new era of postbiotics. Encouragingly, appetite for international harmonisation around safety and oversight is emerging, including new EU regulation which will explicitly classify human microbiome materials as Substances of Human Origin (SoHO) within a unified regulatory framework<sup>44</sup>, and an international consensus statement cautioning against clinical use of microbiome tests that lack robust validation<sup>20</sup>.

Quality control is a further bottleneck, particularly for live consortia (e.g. inherent batch-to-batch variability) and organisms requiring anaerobic cultivation, cold-chain storage, spore preparation, or strain-specific potency assays<sup>45</sup>. Facilities able to achieve Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP) production remain scarce, and industry standards for viability, purity and dose remain heterogeneous.

For interventions such as bacteriophage therapy, different countries have adopted divergent approaches, ranging from full GMP to GMP-like or even magistral preparations produced in pharmacies, with resulting implications for access, scalability and regulatory oversight<sup>46</sup>. We advocate for shared international capacity-building, to safeguard quality alongside equitable access.

#### Funding, commercialisation and intellectual property

Translational readiness requires a viable funding and marketing model. Despite over \$3 billion investment in microbiome-related companies as of 2019<sup>47</sup>, field enthusiasm has cooled. Indeed, several early leaders, such as 4D Pharma, Evelo Biosciences, and Finch Therapeutics, have either ceased operations or discontinued Phase 3 trials<sup>5</sup>. Only two faecally-derived human microbiota products have reached market, with prohibitively high per-dose prices (especially compared to alternatives such as FMT), reflecting steep development attrition and costs. The current intellectual property landscape further compounds these issues, and it is unclear whether patents on naturally occurring organisms or their products can be defended if infringed<sup>48</sup>.

Nonetheless, creative approaches are emerging. The consumer-supported research infrastructure developed by ZOE, for example, demonstrates how large-scale data collection (current database comprising over 300,000 subjects across USA and UK) and personalised insights can sustain high-cost research even when the end product is a lifestyle intervention rather than a licensable drug<sup>49</sup>. To accelerate translation, increase equitable access to products, and reduce reliance on industry, we argue for strategic public investment – including regional and international microbiome research clusters and pooled manufacturing capacity – as well as greater recognition by charitable and governmental funding bodies of the importance of interventional microbiome research. Publicly-funded production models already exist, including FMT produced and delivered within UK National Health Service facilities, demonstrating the feasibility of regulated, non-commercial approaches. Such public or hybrid models may be particularly relevant in low- and middle-income settings, where commercial incentives are weaker but public health need is high. In this context, lessons may be drawn from related sectors, including the long-standing role of institutes like Butantan in Brazil in producing vaccines, antitoxins, and immunoglobulins at scale and low cost<sup>50</sup>.

In summary, translation will only succeed if regulation, manufacturing capacity, and funding models evolve together (see Box for detailed recommendations).

### **Priority 3: Stakeholder engagement**

#### Embedding social science and public engagement

Scientific and practical advances are necessary but insufficient to achieve meaningful clinical translation. We advocate strongly for patient and public involvement and engagement (PPIE) from the outset and throughout, rather than as a subordinate downstream add-on to siloed research agendas<sup>51</sup>. In this way, engagement should shape not just how results are communicated to end-users, but which research questions, methods and implementation strategies are prioritised, and who benefits from the translation of microbiome research into clinical practice. Large, methodologically robust citizen-science studies demonstrate the feasibility and value of involving public contributors in research design, execution, and dissemination – such as the Isala project analysing the vaginal microbiomes of over 3,000 Belgian women<sup>52</sup>. This study employed a co-creative approach, including citizen involvement in defining study aims and target audience, tailored outreach, cultivation of trust, leveraging social media, use of personalised feedback and self-sampling.

To ensure that such work is not an afterthought, funding for engagement and biosocial activities should be considered as part of translational planning. The Human Genome Project provides a

powerful precedent, demonstrating how international interdisciplinary commitment fostered the growth of ethical, legal and social implications (ELSI) research as a global field of study hand-in-hand with scientific progress<sup>53</sup>. This aligns with broader recognition of the importance of PPIE research, as highlighted by the recent UK Patient Involvement Strategy<sup>54</sup>.

Engagement must also challenge entrenched biases in microbiome science – particularly the disproportionate focus on white, Western, industrialised populations. This is not only essential for improving scientific robustness and generalisability, but also for advancing research equity. We must avoid unhelpfully broad categorisations (e.g. ‘non-white’, ‘non-Western’) and language that invokes racial or colonial undertones (e.g. microbiome ‘rewilding’ that presents populations from which microbes will be sourced as ‘primitive’ or ‘closer to nature’)<sup>55</sup>. Ensuring equitable access to microbiome-based interventions must also be a core translational priority. Without deliberate planning, these interventions could reinforce existing structural determinants of health, since socioeconomic inequalities can shape both health outcomes and unequal access to novel therapies.

Public-facing communication must be anchored in safety and evidence, avoiding opaque technicality, reductive oversimplification, and alienating moralisation (e.g. shaming parents over caesarean delivery, formula feeding or antibiotic use). Clinical microbiome translation will need to work with lay understandings of microbes and the microbiome, and must also consider evolving public discourse<sup>56</sup>. Where germ theory traditionally framed microbes as dangerous and in conflict with human health, rising awareness of ‘antibiotic blowback’ (e.g. antimicrobial resistance) has led to more ecologically-informed conceptions of microbes, including the notion of ‘using life to manage life’<sup>57</sup>. We must also remain alert to the risks of ‘naturalness bias,’ previously associated with vaccine hesitancy<sup>58</sup>, which may fuel public interest in unregulated and potentially harmful microbiome ‘biohacking’ practices like do-it-yourself FMT or extreme diets<sup>59</sup>.

#### Uptake into policy and clinical practice

In addition to safe and effective products, appropriate regulation and infrastructure, and societal engagement, meaningful clinical microbiome translation requires buy-in from both the medical and policy communities. Scientific literacy amongst policymakers is often limited, compounded by high rates of staff turnover and competing priorities<sup>60</sup>. Meaningful influence requires the microbiome research community to pursue the right channels in the right ways: targeting Parliamentary standing committees, inquiries, or individuals with relevant expertise, and presenting succinct briefs with actionable recommendations rather than long, overly technical reports.

Despite growing evidence of the microbiome’s role in health, clinician knowledge gaps remain a recognised barrier to implementation<sup>61</sup>. To counter this, we advocate for formal integration of microbiome science into medical school curricula and postgraduate training<sup>62</sup>. Further, pharmaceutically-induced microbiome disruption (‘microbiotoxicity’) is not included in regulatory toxicology, and is therefore often missing from drug testing, licensing and prescribing guidance<sup>63</sup>. The UK House of Lords Consumer Products (Control of Biocides) Bill, which explicitly cites microbiotoxicity as a threat to human health, signals early appetite for microbiome-mindful legislative progress<sup>64</sup>.

In short, true translational readiness demands trust and inclusion: public voices, equitable access, and clinical and policy buy-in (see Box for detailed recommendations).

#### Conclusions

The microbiome has moved from discovery to intervention, but translation into meaningful clinical and societal impact remains constrained by scientific uncertainty, fragmented regulation, and uneven stakeholder engagement. Our Royal Society workshop highlighted that progress requires action across three intersecting domains. First, scientific credibility must be strengthened through

deeper mechanistic insight, robust biomarkers, and transparent, harmonised methods that allow comparison across studies without stifling innovation. Second, practical viability demands regulatory clarity, investment in manufacturing and trial infrastructure, and sustainable funding models that can withstand commercial volatility. Third, stakeholder engagement – from patients and clinicians to policymakers and the wider public – is essential to ensure that microbiome interventions are safe, equitable, and relevant to societal needs.

By aligning scientific innovation with regulatory preparedness and inclusive engagement, the field can move beyond isolated proof-of-concept trials toward reproducible, affordable, and globally accessible microbiome interventions. The agenda we outline provides a translational roadmap to ensure that microbiome research fulfils its clinical promise, to deliver tangible health benefits for people, animals, and societies worldwide.

### **Acknowledgments**

We are grateful to the Royal Society for funding and organising the workshop on which this Review is based. We thank all the workshop delegates for their invaluable contributions, which shaped the themes and conclusions presented here: Omololu Aleji, Rebecca Cusack, Matthew Dalby, Sheena Fraser, Arya Gupta, Jorge Gutierrez-Merino, Jon Guy, Natalie Haywood, Maddison James, Aisling Kenny, Daniella Lucena, Jack Lynch, Gloria Mate-Koncz, Pratyush Nayak, Marcin Pekalski, Geraint Rogers, Jon Vernon, Clare Wall, Sarah Walpole, Alice Westwood.

### **Authorship**

AAT and CEJ conceptualised, designed and led the study, including the selection of methodologies. AAT acquired funding (Royal Society Theo Murphy Scientific Meeting Grant), with input from DB and CEJ. AAT, CEJ, DB and DWC designed the workshop, including speaker selection, programme development and session chairing. Workshop administration was carried out by AAT and the Royal Society. AAT curated and analysed the workshop data and drafted the first version of the manuscript. All authors presented at the Royal Society workshop, contributed to manuscript revisions, and approved the final version.

### **Transparency declaration**

The Royal Society covered travel, accommodation and dining costs for invited speakers and chairs (all named authors on this paper) to attend the meeting, but no honoraria were paid. DB has received speaker fees from OM Pharma and funding from GSK for an unrelated research project, and is Treasurer and Board Member of the International Society for Pneumonia and Pneumococcal Disease. BG has received support from the ESRC Festival of Social Science, University of Oxford John Fell Fund, and Economic and Social Research Council (ES/N006968/1). JAG has received consulting and travel fees from Bened Life and Almond Board of California for scientific advisory board activities, has stocks in BiomeSense Inc and Holobiome Inc, and is President of Applied Microbiology International. JL has received payments to the University of Oxford from the Canadian Institute for Advance Research to support research costs. SL is a voluntary academic board member of the International Scientific Association on Probiotics and Prebiotics and a scientific advisor for Freya Biosciences, and has received research funding from different companies (but none are involved in this manuscript). TDS is a co-founder, share-holder and part-time employee of ZOE Ltd, a gut nutrition company with a commercial test kit.

**BOX. Expert recommendations to accelerate microbiome translational readiness****Priority 1: Scientific Credibility***Mechanistic Insights and Causality*

- Prioritise causal understanding through multiomic analyses, spatial and longitudinal dynamics, live-dead differentiation, and inclusion of non-bacterial taxa (fungi, viruses, archaea, phages, helminths and protozoa).
- Challenge entrenched disciplinary silos via deliberate cross-specialty collaboration.
- Do not allow mechanistic uncertainty to delay translation when safety and efficacy are well-demonstrated.

*Biomarkers and Clinical Endpoints*

- Complement alpha diversity and single-taxon metrics with phenotypic and functional biomarkers (e.g. gene expression and metabolite profiles).
- Develop context-specific definitions of microbiome health using large, diverse cohorts and harmonised, comprehensive metadata curation.
- Adopt pluralistic outcomes that integrate microbial, clinical, behavioural, and societal endpoints.

*Methodological Harmonisation*

- Promote transparent reporting (e.g. STORMS checklist, STAR protocols) and justification of methods over rigid standardisation.
- Invest in harmonised training and open-access protocols to facilitate comparison and validation.
- Encourage pre-registration, method comparison, and publication of negative results.

*Clinical Trial Design*

- Base trials on hypothesis-driven, niche-specific, and biologically plausible designs, rather than convenience or conventional wisdom.
- Improve representation across biological niches and underserved demographics.
- Embrace pragmatic designs for small-sample or hard-to-power trials, such as cross-over studies or meaningful meta-analysis.

**Priority 2: Practical Viability***Regulation, Safety, and Quality Control*

- Develop fit-for-purpose regulation to ensure safety without stifling innovation, aligning evidentiary standards with the ability to make health claims.
- Close gaps and inconsistencies between jurisdictions to promote equitable access across diverse patient groups and geographies (including low and middle-income countries).
- Invest in manufacturing and quality control infrastructure, including Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP) production facilities and harmonised viability and purity standards.

*Funding, Commercialisation and Intellectual Property*

- Reduce over-reliance on industry by increasing public and philanthropic investment in trial funding and infrastructure.
- Support national and international microbiome research clusters to share capacity-building and lower costs.
- Clarify intellectual property frameworks to allow innovation to flourish alongside open science.

**Priority 3: Stakeholder Engagement***Embedding social science and public engagement*

- Fund engagement work with public and social scientists, shaping research from design to dissemination.
- Actively address representational bias and avoid reductive, racially coded framings.
- Anchor communication in safety and evidence, avoiding moralisation and hype.

*Uptake into policy and clinical practice*

- Engage policymakers via concise, actionable briefs targeted at relevant committees and inquiries.
- Integrate microbiome science into medical education and professional training.
- Incorporate microbiome considerations into clinical practice and prescribing guidance.

**TABLE. Microbiome-based interventions: classes, definitions and regulation**

Class	Definition	Regulation	References
Probiotic	Live microorganisms which, when administered in adequate amounts, confer a health benefit on the host	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Generally treated as foods / food supplements (if ingested) or consumer / cosmetic products (if applied topically), not as medicinal products, unless a specific health or disease modifying claim is made.</li> <li>•EU (EFSA): Must demonstrate Qualitative Presumption of Safety to be included in food.</li> <li>•USA (FDA): Requires premarket approval as a food additive, or be qualified as Generally Recognised As Safe.</li> <li>•Japan (MHLW): Classed as Foods for Specified Health Uses (require approval by the Consumer Affairs Agency) or Foods with Function Claims (no approval required).</li> </ul>	7,65
Prebiotic	A substrate that is selectively utilized by host microorganisms conferring a health benefit		
Postbiotic	A preparation of inanimate microorganisms and/or their components that confers a health benefit on the host		
Synbiotic	A mixture comprising live microorganisms and substrate(s) selectively utilized by host microorganisms that confers a health benefit on the host		
Microbiome transplant	The transfer of biologic material containing a minimally manipulated community of microorganisms from a human donor to a human recipient (including autologous use), with the intent to beneficially affect the microbiome of the recipient	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Regulatory classification varies broadly internationally, including investigational biological agent (USA), human tissue (Belgium, Italy), medicinal product (UK), or medical procedure (Scandinavia).</li> <li>•EU: From 2027, human-derived microbiome products will be classed as Substances of Human Origin, alongside human tissues.</li> <li>•USA: Requires IND application for all uses except CDI refractory to standard therapies.</li> </ul>	42,44,66,67
Live biotherapeutic product	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•USA (FDA): A biological product that: 1) contains live organisms, such as bacteria; 2) is applicable to the prevention, treatment, or cure of a disease or condition of human beings; and 3) is not a vaccine</li> <li>•EU (PhEur): A medicinal product containing live microorganisms (bacterial or yeasts) for human use</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Generally regulated as medicinal products, including testing, production standards, licensing and post-marketing surveillance.</li> <li>•EU (EMA): LBPs regulated by CHMP, with microbiological purity standards.</li> <li>•USA: Regulated as biologics under Biologics License Application.</li> </ul>	68–70
Microbiome-derived therapies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Derived from a donor's microbiome, but processed and standardised into a defined product (including spore preparations).</li> <li>•Not strictly considered LBPs (which are single strains or consortia characterised to strain-level, rather than donor-derived communities).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Generally treated as medicinal biological products.</li> <li>•Only licensed products to date are VOWST and Rebyota.</li> </ul>	3

CDI: *Clostridioides difficile* infection; CHMP: Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use; EFSA: European Food Safety Authority; EMA: European Medicines Agency; FDA: Food and Drug Administration; IND: Investigational new drug; LBP: live biotherapeutic product; MHLW: Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare of Japan; PhEur: European Pharmacopoeia.

**APPENDIX.**

## Workshop design and thematic analysis methods

This Review is based on an interdisciplinary expert meeting funded by a Royal Society Theo Murphy Scientific Meeting Grant, awarded through a competitive application process. These grants support small, residential UK-based workshops designed to accelerate emerging scientific fields through deep, structured, and interdisciplinary discussion.

The workshop, *Microbiome manipulation for health: building a shared narrative*, was held in Leeds, UK on 21-22 October 2024, and convened international experts to identify key scientific, regulatory, and translational priorities in microbiome-based interventions. Participants were invited through Royal Society communications and targeted outreach. The final meeting included four academic chairs, 11 invited speakers, and 21 discussants, representing diverse expertise across clinical medicine, microbiology, bioinformatics, social science, policy, industry, filmmaking, and parent advocacy. Attendees ranged from early-career researchers to senior international leaders, with representation from the UK, USA, Denmark, the Netherlands, and Belgium.

All attendees were invited to respond anonymously to a single open-ended question: “*What do you think are the most important priorities in microbiome manipulation for health?*” Responses were collected via Google Forms, available from 10 days before the event until one month afterward. A QR code linking to the form was displayed throughout the meeting, and attendees were encouraged to submit multiple responses to reflect evolving perspectives. All responses were time-stamped to enable temporal mapping relative to the event.

Verbal consent was obtained to capture audio recordings of all discussions. Recordings were transcribed using Looppanel, an AI-assisted platform capable of detecting speaker turns and suggesting thematic tags. Transcripts were reviewed line-by-line by the lead author to ensure accuracy and correct speaker attribution.

Thematic analysis was conducted in several stages. The lead author first reviewed all expert presentation slides, audio transcripts and written responses to identify emergent high-level themes. Through an iterative open coding process, these were refined into a structured framework of core themes and subthemes. Transcripts and survey responses were systematically tagged using this framework, with areas of consensus and divergence noted across stakeholder groups. The final thematic structure directly informed the manuscript.

All chairs and invited presenters were co-authors. They reviewed and approved the thematic framework prior to manuscript drafting. The first draft was written by the lead author and revised with input and approval from all co-authors.

No formal ethical approval was required for this workshop. We are deeply grateful to all discussants, whose insights and reflections greatly enriched the meeting and helped shape the conclusions presented here. We also thank the Royal Society for its generous funding and organisational support throughout.

## REFERENCES.

1. Ratiner K, Ciocan D, Abdeen SK, Elinav E. Utilization of the microbiome in personalized medicine. *Nat Rev Microbiol*. 2024;22(5):291-308. doi:10.1038/s41579-023-00998-9
2. van Prehn J, Reigadas E, Vogelzang EH, et al. European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases: 2021 update on the treatment guidance document for *Clostridioides difficile* infection in adults. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2021;27 Suppl 2:S1-S21. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2021.09.038
3. Benech N, Barbut F, Fitzpatrick F, et al. Update on microbiota-derived therapies for recurrent *Clostridioides difficile* infections. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2024;30(4):462-468. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2023.12.007
4. Gilbert JA, Azad MB, Bäckhed F, et al. Clinical translation of microbiome research. *Nat Med*. 2025;31(4):1099-1113. doi:10.1038/s41591-025-03615-9
5. Pribyl AL, Hugenholtz P, Cooper MA. A decade of advances in human gut microbiome-derived biotherapeutics. *Nat Microbiol*. 2025;10(2):301-312. doi:10.1038/s41564-024-01896-3
6. Al-Habsi N, Al-Khalili M, Haque SA, Elias M, Olqi NA, Al Uraimi T. Health Benefits of Prebiotics, Probiotics, Synbiotics, and Postbiotics. *Nutrients*. 2024;16(22):3955. doi:10.3390/nu16223955
7. Salminen S, Collado MC, Endo A, et al. The International Scientific Association of Probiotics and Prebiotics (ISAPP) consensus statement on the definition and scope of postbiotics. *Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2021;18(9):649-667. doi:10.1038/s41575-021-00440-6
8. Shoer S, Shilo S, Godneva A, et al. Impact of dietary interventions on pre-diabetic oral and gut microbiome, metabolites and cytokines. *Nat Commun*. 2023;14(1):5384. doi:10.1038/s41467-023-41042-x
9. Theodosiou A, Dorey R, Read R, Jones C. The infant pharyngeal microbiomes: origin, impact and manipulation. *Curr Opin Infect Dis*. 2020;33(6):548-555.
10. Oh J, Voigt AY. The human skin microbiome: from metagenomes to therapeutics. *Nat Rev Microbiol*. Published online August 4, 2025. doi:10.1038/s41579-025-01211-9
11. Su Q, Liu Q, Lau RI, et al. Faecal microbiome-based machine learning for multi-class disease diagnosis. *Nat Commun*. 2022;13(1):6818. doi:10.1038/s41467-022-34405-3
12. Proctor LM, Dore J, Maguin E, Wannerberger K, Vincent C. A global partnership to advance the microbiome in human, plant, animal, and planetary health. *Lancet Microbe*. 2025;6(8):101120. doi:10.1016/j.lanmic.2025.101120
13. Winston JA, Suchodolski J, Gaschen FP, et al. Clinical Guidelines for Fecal Microbiota Transplantation in Companion Animals. *Advances in Small Animal Care*. 2024;5(1):79-107. doi:10.1016/j.yasa.2024.06.006

14. Rodriguez J, Cordaillat-Simmons M, Pot B, Druart C. The regulatory framework for microbiome-based therapies: insights into European regulatory developments. *NPJ Biofilms Microbiomes*. 2025;11(1):53. doi:10.1038/s41522-025-00683-0
15. Joos R, Boucher K, Lavelle A, et al. Examining the healthy human microbiome concept. *Nat Rev Microbiol*. 2025;23(3):192-205. doi:10.1038/s41579-024-01107-0
16. Rodriguez J, Hassani Z, Alves Costa Silva C, et al. State of the art and the future of microbiome-based biomarkers: a multidisciplinary Delphi consensus. *Lancet Microbe*. 2025;6(2):100948. doi:10.1016/j.lanmic.2024.07.011
17. Sergaki C, Anwar S, Fritzsche M, et al. Developing whole cell standards for the microbiome field. *Microbiome*. 2022;10(1):123. doi:10.1186/s40168-022-01313-z
18. Metris A, Walker AW, Showering A, et al. Assessing the safety of microbiome perturbations. *Microb Genom*. 2025;11(5):001405. doi:10.1099/mgen.0.001405
19. Vijaykumar S, Raamkumar AS, McCarty K, Mutumbwa C, Mustafa J, Au C. Themes, communities and influencers of online probiotics chatter: A retrospective analysis from 2009-2017. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(10):e0258098. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0258098
20. Porcari S, Mullish BH, Asnicar F, et al. International consensus statement on microbiome testing in clinical practice. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2025;10(2):154-167. doi:10.1016/S2468-1253(24)00311-X
21. Rodriguez J, Cordaillat-Simmons M, Badalato N, et al. Microbiome testing in Europe: navigating analytical, ethical and regulatory challenges. *Microbiome*. 2024;12(1):258. doi:10.1186/s40168-024-01991-x
22. Muller E, Shiryan I, Borenstein E. Multi-omic integration of microbiome data for identifying disease-associated modules. *Nat Commun*. 2024;15(1):2621. doi:10.1038/s41467-024-46888-3
23. Zaramela LS, Tjuanta M, Moyne O, Neal M, Zengler K. synDNA-a Synthetic DNA Spike-in Method for Absolute Quantification of Shotgun Metagenomic Sequencing. *mSystems*. 2022;7(6):e0044722. doi:10.1128/msystems.00447-22
24. Emerson JB, Adams RI, Román CMB, et al. Schrödinger's microbes: Tools for distinguishing the living from the dead in microbial ecosystems. *Microbiome*. 2017;5(1):86. doi:10.1186/s40168-017-0285-3
25. Mondragón-Palomino O, Pocevičiute R, Lignell A, Griffiths JA, Takko H, Ismagilov RF. Three-dimensional imaging for the quantification of spatial patterns in microbiota of the intestinal mucosa. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2022;119(18):e2118483119. doi:10.1073/pnas.2118483119
26. Zhang F, Aschenbrenner D, Yoo JY, Zuo T. The gut mycobiome in health, disease, and clinical applications in association with the gut bacterial microbiome assembly. *Lancet Microbe*. 2022;3(12):e969-e983. doi:10.1016/S2666-5247(22)00203-8

27. Cao Z, Sugimura N, Burgermeister E, Ebert MP, Zuo T, Lan P. The gut virome: A new microbiome component in health and disease. *EBioMedicine*. 2022;81:104113. doi:10.1016/j.ebiom.2022.104113
28. Rybicka I, Kaźmierczak Z. The human phageome: niche-specific distribution of bacteriophages and their clinical implications. *Appl Environ Microbiol*. 2025;91(6):e0178824. doi:10.1128/aem.01788-24
29. Chibani CM, Mahnert A, Borrel G, et al. A catalogue of 1,167 genomes from the human gut archaeome. *Nat Microbiol*. 2022;7(1):48-61. doi:10.1038/s41564-021-01020-9
30. Bogza A, King IL, Maurice CF. Worming into infancy: Exploring helminth-microbiome interactions in early life. *Cell Host Microbe*. 2024;32(5):639-650. doi:10.1016/j.chom.2024.04.009
31. Vujkovic-Cvijin I, Sklar J, Jiang L, Natarajan L, Knight R, Belkaid Y. Host variables confound gut microbiota studies of human disease. *Nature*. 2020;587(7834):448-454. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2881-9
32. Lehr K, Oosterlinck B, Then CK, et al. Comparison of different microbiome analysis pipelines to validate their reproducibility of gastric mucosal microbiome composition. *mSystems*. 2025;10(2):e0135824. doi:10.1128/msystems.01358-24
33. Gilbert JA, Quinn RA, Debelius J, et al. Microbiome-wide association studies link dynamic microbial consortia to disease. *Nature*. 2016;535(7610):94-103. doi:10.1038/nature18850
34. Farias Amorim C, Lovins VM, Singh TP, et al. Multiomic profiling of cutaneous leishmaniasis infections reveals microbiota-driven mechanisms underlying disease severity. *Sci Transl Med*. 2023;15(718):eadh1469. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.adh1469
35. Asnicar F, Manghi P, Fackelmann G, et al. Gut micro-organisms associated with health, nutrition and dietary interventions. *Nature*. Published online December 10, 2025:1-9. doi:10.1038/s41586-025-09854-7
36. Camilleri M. The Leaky Gut: Mechanisms, Measurement and Clinical Implications in Humans. *Gut*. 2019;68(8):1516-1526. doi:10.1136/gutjnl-2019-318427
37. Ghani R, Mullish BH, McDonald JAK, et al. Disease Prevention Not Decolonization: A Model for Fecal Microbiota Transplantation in Patients Colonized With Multidrug-resistant Organisms. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2021;72(8):1444-1447. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa948
38. Anwar S, Lamaudiere M, Hassall J, et al. DNA reference reagents isolate biases in microbiome profiling: a global multi-lab study. *mSystems*. 10(11):e00466-25. doi:10.1128/msystems.00466-25
39. Mirzayi C, Renson A, Genomic Standards Consortium, et al. Reporting guidelines for human microbiome research: the STORMS checklist. *Nat Med*. 2021;27(11):1885-1892. doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01552-x

40. Odendaal ML, Chu MLJN, Arp K, et al. Protocol for microbial profiling of low-biomass upper respiratory tract samples. *STAR Protoc.* 2025;6(2):103740. doi:10.1016/j.xpro.2025.103740
41. Bloom PP, Chung RT. The future of clinical trials of gut microbiome therapeutics in cirrhosis. *JHEP Rep.* 2025;7(1):101234. doi:10.1016/j.jhepr.2024.101234
42. Yadegar A, Bar-Yoseph H, Monaghan TM, et al. Fecal microbiota transplantation: current challenges and future landscapes. *Clin Microbiol Rev.* 2024;37(2):e0006022. doi:10.1128/cmr.00060-22
43. European Union. *Regulation (EC) No 767/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 July 2009 on the Placing on the Market and Use of Feed, Amending European Parliament and Council Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 and Repealing Council Directive 79/373/EEC, Commission Directive 80/511/EEC, Council Directives 82/471/EEC, 83/228/EEC, 93/74/EEC, 93/113/EC and 96/25/EC and Commission Decision 2004/217/EC.* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2009/767/oj>
44. Elias JJ, Lacetera N, Macis M, Ockenfels A, Roth AE. Quality and safety for substances of human origins: scientific evidence and the new EU regulations. *BMJ Glob Health.* 2024;9(4). doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2024-015122
45. Fekete EE, Figeys D, Zhang X. Microbiota-directed biotherapeutics: considerations for quality and functional assessment. *Gut Microbes.* 2023;15(1):2186671. doi:10.1080/19490976.2023.2186671
46. Verbeken G, Pirnay JP. European regulatory aspects of phage therapy: magistral phage preparations. *Current Opinion in Virology.* 2022;52:24-29. doi:10.1016/j.coviro.2021.11.005
47. Li D, Gao C, Zhang F, et al. Seven facts and five initiatives for gut microbiome research. *Protein Cell.* 2020;11(6):391-400. doi:10.1007/s13238-020-00697-8
48. MacLeod I. The scope and infringement of patents claiming strains of bacteria. *Access Microbiol.* 2022;4(8):acmi000449. doi:10.1099/acmi.0.000449
49. ZOE. *Whitepaper: An Overview of Our Science.*; 2023. <https://zoe.com/whitepapers/overview>
50. Ho PL, Miyaji EN, Oliveira MLS, et al. Economical Value of Vaccines for the Developing Countries—The Case of Instituto Butantan, a Public Institution in Brazil. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2011;5(11):e1300. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0001300
51. Greenhough B, Read CJ, Lorimer J, et al. Setting the agenda for social science research on the human microbiome. *Palgrave Commun.* 2020;6(1):18. doi:10.1057/s41599-020-0388-5
52. Ahannach S, Van Hoyweghen I, Verhoeven V, Lebeer S. Citizen science as an instrument for women's health research. *Nat Med.* 2024;30(12):3445-3454. doi:10.1038/s41591-024-03371-2

53. Dolan DD, Lee SSJ, Cho MK. Three decades of ethical, legal, and social implications research: Looking back to chart a path forward. *Cell Genom.* 2022;2(7):100150. doi:10.1016/j.xgen.2022.100150
54. MHRA. Patient Involvement Strategy: One Year On. GOV.UK. 2023. Accessed September 6, 2025. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/patient-involvement-strategy-one-year-on/patient-involvement-strategy-one-year-on>
55. Nieves Delgado A, Baedke J. Does the human microbiome tell us something about race? *Humanit Soc Sci Commun.* 2021;8(1):97. doi:10.1057/s41599-021-00772-3
56. Greenhough B, Dwyer A, Grenyer R, Hodgetts T, McLeod C, Lorimer J. Unsettling antibiosis: how might interdisciplinary researchers generate a feeling for the microbiome and to what effect? *Palgrave Commun.* 2018;4(1):149. doi:10.1057/s41599-018-0196-3
57. Lorimer J. *The Probiotic Planet: Using Life to Manage Life.* University of Minnesota Press; 2020. doi:10.5749/j.ctv19cw9vg
58. Ji LJ, Lappas CM, Wang X qiang, Meier BP. The Naturalness Bias Influences Drug and Vaccine Decisions across Cultures. *Med Decis Making.* 2023;43(2):252-262. doi:10.1177/0272989X221140803
59. Lorimer J. Hookworms Make Us Human: The Microbiome, Eco-immunology, and a Probiotic Turn in Western Health Care. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly.* 2019;33(1):60-79. doi:10.1111/maq.12466
60. Fady PE. Policy in practice: Pathways to maximizing microbiologists' impact in UK policymaking. *Sustain Microbiol.* 2025;2(1):qvaf002. doi:10.1093/sumbio/qvaf002
61. Arshad MS, Saqlain M, Majeed A, et al. Cross-sectional study to assess the healthcare professionals' knowledge, attitude and practices about probiotics use in Pakistan. *BMJ Open.* 2021;11(7):e047494. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-047494
62. Melby MK, Mylabathula S, Azad MB, et al. Public Health Microbiome Curriculum: Looking Below the Tip of the Iceberg for Approaches to Population Health. *Microb Biotechnol.* 2025;18(6):e70160. doi:10.1111/1751-7915.70160
63. Theodosiou AA, Fady PE, Bennett N, Read RC, Bogaert D, Jones CE. Microbiotoxicity: A call to arms for cross-sector protection of the human microbiome. *J Infect.* 2025;90(2):106408. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2025.106408
64. House of Lords. *Consumer Products (Control of Biocides) Bill [HL].* <https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3767>
65. Iwatani S, Yamamoto N. Functional food products in Japan: A review. *Food Science and Human Wellness.* 2019;8(2):96-101. doi:10.1016/j.fshw.2019.03.011
66. Merrick B, Allen L, Masirah M Zain N, Forbes B, Shawcross DL, Goldenberg SD. Regulation, risk and safety of Faecal Microbiota Transplant. *Infect Prev Pract.* 2020;2(3):100069. doi:10.1016/j.infpip.2020.100069

67. Hoffmann DE, Palumbo FB, Ravel J, Rowthorn V, von Rosenvinge E. A proposed definition of microbiota transplantation for regulatory purposes. *Gut Microbes*. 2017;8(3):208-213. doi:10.1080/19490976.2017.1293223
68. Ducarmon QR, Kuijper EJ, Olle B. Opportunities and Challenges in Development of Live Biotherapeutic Products to Fight Infections. *J Infect Dis*. 2021;223(12 Suppl 2):S283-S289. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiaa779
69. EDQM (European Pharmacopoeia). *General Monograph on Live Biotherapeutic Products*.; 2019.
70. FDA. Early Clinical Trials with Live Biotherapeutic Products: Chemistry, Manufacturing, and Control Information; Guidance for Industry. Published online 2016.