FUNCTIONAL GI DISEASE

Efficacy of Probiotics in Irritable Bowel Syndrome: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis



Vivek C. Goodoory,^{1,2,*} **Mais Khasawneh**,^{1,2,*} Christopher J. Black,^{1,2} Eamonn M. M. Quigley,³ Paul Moayyedi,⁴ and Alexander C. Ford^{1,2}

¹Leeds Gastroenterology Institute, St. James's University Hospital, Leeds, United Kingdom; ²Leeds Institute of Biomedical and Clinical Sciences, University of Leeds, Leeds, United Kingdom; ³Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Lynda K. and David M. Underwood Center for Digestive Disorders, Houston Methodist Hospital and Weill Cornell Medical College, Houston, Texas; and ⁴Gastroenterology Division, McMaster University, Health Sciences Center, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

This article has an accompanying continuing medical education activity, also eligible for MOC credit, on page e15. Learning Objective: Upon completion of this CME activity, successful learners will be able to understand the efficacy and safety of probiotics in treating symptoms of irritable bowel syndrome.

BACKGROUND & AIMS: Some probiotics may be beneficial in irritable bowel syndrome (IBS), but differences in species and strains used, as well as endpoints reported, have hampered attempts to make specific recommendations as to which should be preferred. We updated our previous meta-analysis examining this issue. METHODS: MEDLINE, EMBASE, and the Cochrane Controlled Trials Register were searched (up to March 2023). Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) recruiting adults with IBS, comparing probiotics with placebo were eligible. Dichotomous symptom data were pooled to obtain a relative risk of global symptoms, abdominal pain, or abdominal bloating or distension persisting after therapy, with a 95% confidence interval (CI). Continuous data were pooled using a standardized mean difference with a 95% CI. Adverse events data were also pooled. RESULTS: We identified 82 eligible trials, containing 10,332 patients. Only 24 RCTs were at low risk of bias across all domains. For global symptoms, there was moderate certainty in the evidence for a benefit of Escherichia strains, low certainty for Lactobacillus strains and Lactobacillus plantarum 299V, and very low certainty for combination probiotics, LacClean Gold S, Duolac 7s, and Bacillus strains. For abdominal pain, there was low certainty in the evidence for a benefit of Saccharomyces cerevisae I-3856 and Bifidobacterium strains, and very low certainty for combination probiotics, Lactobacillus, Saccharomyces, and Bacillus strains. For abdominal bloating or distension there was very low certainty in the evidence for a benefit of combination probiotics and Bacillus strains. The relative risk of experiencing any adverse event, in 55 trials, including more than 7000 patients, was not significantly higher with probiotics. CONCLUSIONS: Some combinations of probiotics or strains may be beneficial in IBS. However, certainty in the evidence for efficacy by GRADE criteria was low to very low across almost all of our analyses.

Keywords: Irritable Bowel Syndrome; Meta-analysis; Probiotics; Abdominal Pain; Abdominal Bloating.

I rritable bowel syndrome (IBS) is a disorder of gut-brain interaction, characterized by abdominal pain in association with abnormal stool form or frequency.^{1,2} The condition affects approximately 5% of the global population,^{3,4} and has a substantial impact on the individual, the health service, and

society as a whole. People with IBS have reduced social functioning and impaired quality of life, to a similar or worse degree to that seen in people with organic disease.⁵ Direct costs to the health service are substantial, estimated to be in excess of £1 billion in the United Kingdom,⁶ and ability to work is impaired,⁷ leading to other costs to society. People with IBS would accept considerable risks from a hypothetical medication in return for cure of their symptoms.⁸

Because the pathophysiology of IBS remains incompletely understood,⁹ medical treatment is usually based on targeting the principal symptom(s) reported by the patient.¹⁰ However, even when drugs are directed to the predominant abnormality of bowel habit experienced, their efficacy is modest.^{11,12} The fact that approximately 10% of people with IBS report that their symptoms commenced after an acute enteric infection,¹³ known as postinfection IBS, has led to the concept that alterations in the gut microbiome may be involved in its pathophysiology. Some investigators have reported that small intestinal bacterial overgrowth may be present in people with symptoms suggestive of IBS,¹⁴ and others have shown that the colonic microbiome is altered in patients with IBS, when compared with healthy controls.¹⁵⁻ ¹⁸ In addition, treatments that change the microbiota, such as antibiotics or fecal microbiota transplant,^{19,20} may be

beneficial in a subset of patients with IBS. Probiotics are defined as "live microorganisms that, when administered in adequate amounts, confer a health benefit on the host."²¹ Although multiple probiotics have been tested in IBS in randomized controlled trials (RCTs), understanding of

*Authors share co-first authorship.

© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of the AGA Institute. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Abbreviations used in this paper: Cl, confidence interval; FDA, Food and Drug Administration; IBS, irritable bowel syndrome; IBS-C, irritable bowel syndrome with constipation; IBS-D, irritable bowel syndrome with diarrhea; RCT, randomized controlled trial; RR, relative risk; SD, standard deviation; SMD, standardized mean difference.

Most current article

WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Irritable bowel syndrome is a chronic disorder of gut-brain interaction that impacts greatly on the quality of life of patients. Probiotics may be efficacious for treatment but the evidence is conflicting.

NEW FINDINGS

For global symptoms, there was moderate certainty for benefit of *Escherichia* strains, low certainty for *Lactobacillus* strains and *Lactobacillus plantarum* 299V, and very low certainty for combination probiotics and *Bacillus* strains. For abdominal pain, there was low certainty for benefit of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* I-3856 and *Bifidobacterium* strains, and very low certainty for combination probiotics, *Lactobacillus*, *Saccharomyces*, and *Bacillus* strains.

LIMITATIONS

Few trials were low risk of bias and there was heterogeneity between studies and evidence of publication bias in some of our analyses.

CLINICAL RESEARCH RELEVANCE

Future randomized controlled trials could focus on some of the species and strains, or combinations thereof, that appear promising from the data reported here but should also report their methodology and data analysis in sufficient detail to remove any concerns about potential within-trial bias.

BASIC RESEARCH RELEVANCE

Future studies could focus on some of the species and strains, or combinations thereof, to establish the mechanism(s) in which they help alleviate symptoms of irritable bowel syndrome.

which probiotics may be beneficial is limited. We, and others, have attempted to resolve these uncertainties in previous evidence synthesis exercises examining the efficacy of probiotics in IBS,^{10,22–28} but because of the limited number of trials reporting similar outcome measures, in our own prior meta-analyses we pooled global symptoms and abdominal pain together as a single endpoint.^{22–24} This, together with the small size of some trials, and the multitude of strains, species, and doses of probiotic used in individual RCTs, means that making recommendations concerning which probiotics, or combinations of probiotics, are beneficial according to IBS subtype or individual symptom has been difficult to date. In an attempt to resolve remaining uncertainties, we performed an updated systematic review and meta-analysis incorporating all newly identified trials since the prior version,²⁴ and evaluating the following as separate efficacy endpoints: global symptoms, abdominal pain, and abdominal bloating or distension. We also assessed efficacy according to IBS subtype.

Materials and Methods

Search Strategy and Study Selection

We updated our previous systematic review and metaanalysis examining the efficacy of probiotics in IBS.²⁴ We searched MEDLINE (2017 to March 2023), EMBASE and EMBASE Classic (2017 to March 2023), and the Cochrane central register of controlled trials. We searched conference proceedings (Digestive Diseases Week, American College of Gastroenterology, United European Gastroenterology Week, and the Asian Pacific Digestive Week) between 2017 and 2022 to identify trials published only in abstract form. Finally, we performed a recursive search using the bibliographies of all eligible articles.

We considered RCTs examining the efficacy of at least 7 days of any probiotic, or combinations of probiotics (where more than 1 species or strain was contained within a single preparation), compared with placebo, in patients \geq 16 years with IBS as eligible for inclusion (Supplementary Table 1). We included cross-over RCTs, if efficacy data related to the first phase, prior to crossover, were available. The diagnosis of IBS could be based on either a physician's opinion or symptom-based diagnostic criteria, supplemented by the results of investigations to exclude organic disease, where studies deemed this necessary. Trials had to report response to therapy as either a dichotomous endpoint or continuous data. Dichotomous assessment was via an assessment of global IBS symptoms (eg, subjective adequate relief of overall IBS symptoms, or a specific threshold of improvement on a total IBS symptom score), abdominal pain, or abdominal bloating or distension after completion of therapy. Continuous data of interest were global IBS symptom scores, abdominal pain scores, or abdominal bloating or distension scores at study end. We contacted first and senior authors of studies if additional information or data were required.

We searched the literature to identify studies on IBS with the terms: *irritable bowel syndrome* and *functional diseases*, *colon* (both as medical subject heading [MeSH] and free text terms), and *IBS*, *spastic colon*, *irritable colon*, or *functional* adj5 *bowel* (as free text terms). We combined these using the set operator AND with studies identified with the following terms: *Saccharomyces*, *Lactobacillus*, *Bifidobacterium*, *Escherichia coli*, or *probiotics* (both as MeSH and free text terms). We applied no language restrictions. Two investigators (either Vivek C. Goodoory or Mais Khasawneh, and Alexander C. Ford) evaluated all abstracts independently. We obtained full texts of all potentially eligible papers and evaluated them according to our eligibility criteria, using predesigned forms. We translated foreign language articles, where necessary. We resolved disagreements between investigators by discussion.

Outcome Assessment

Our primary outcomes of interest were the effects of probiotics compared with placebo on persistence of global IBS symptoms, abdominal pain, or abdominal bloating or distension after completion of therapy. Our secondary outcomes of interest were the effects of probiotics on global IBS symptom scores, abdominal pain scores, or abdominal bloating or distension scores and the total number of patients experiencing 1 or more adverse events associated with probiotics vs placebo.

Data Extraction

Two reviewers (Vivek C. Goodoory or Mais Khasawneh, and Alexander C. Ford) extracted all data independently onto a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet (XP professional edition; Microsoft Corp, Redmond, WA) as dichotomous outcomes (global IBS symptoms persistent or unimproved, abdominal pain persistent or unimproved, or abdominal bloating or distension persistent or unimproved) or mean symptom scores at study end, along with a standard deviation (SD). If studies assessed response to therapy according to dichotomous endpoints, for example a 50point decrease in the IBS severity scoring system, or a 30% improvement in the global symptom or abdominal pain score, being achieved or not achieved, we extracted these data. Otherwise, if investigators reported mean symptom scores at baseline and mean scores at the end of treatment, along with an SD, we imputed dichotomous responder and nonresponder data, according to the methodology described by Furukawa et al.²⁹ For example, a 30% improvement in global symptom score is determined from the following formula: number of participants in each treatment arm at final follow-up \times normal SD. The latter corresponds to (70% of the baseline mean global symptom score - follow-up mean global symptom score score) / follow-up SD. We resolved any disagreements between investigators by discussion. Where trials used different probiotic strains within the same trial or different doses of the same probiotic, we extracted these separately, wherever possible. In most cases, these RCTs used different strains of probiotics, meaning that data were pooled in separate analyses, hence placebo arms were not double counted.

We also extracted the following clinical data for each trial: setting (primary, secondary, or tertiary care-based), country of origin, probiotic used (including species and strain where applicable), duration of therapy, criteria used to define IBS, outcome measures used to define symptom improvement or cure following therapy, proportion of female patients, and proportion of patients according to predominant stool pattern (IBS with constipation [IBS-C], diarrhea [IBS-D], or mixed bowel habits). We extracted data in accordance with intention-to-treat principles, assuming all dropouts were treatment failures. However, if the number of patients randomized originally in each treatment arm was unclear, we analyzed data from all evaluable patients. For adverse events, we analyzed data using the safety population, which included patients receiving at least 1 dose of probiotic or placebo, where available.

Risk of Bias and Quality of Evidence Assessment

We used the Cochrane risk of bias tool for RCTs to assess quality and risk of bias.³⁰ Two investigators (Vivek C. Goodoory or Mais Khasawneh, and Alexander C. Ford) performed this independently, with disagreements resolved by discussion. We recorded the method used to generate the randomization schedule and conceal treatment allocation, as well as whether blinding was implemented for participants, personnel, and outcomes assessment, whether there was evidence of incomplete outcomes data, and whether there was evidence of selective reporting of outcomes.

Data Synthesis and Statistical Analysis

We used a random effects model to pool data to give a more conservative estimate of the efficacy of probiotics in IBS.³¹ We expressed efficacy as a pooled relative risk (RR) of persistence of global symptoms, abdominal pain, or abdominal bloating or distension, with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). This approach has been shown to be the most stable, compared with an RR of improvement, or using the odds ratio.³² For symptom

endpoints, we performed subgroup analyses based on particular combinations, species, and strains of probiotic, and by IBS subtype, where these data were reported. We also reported a standardized mean difference (SMD) in global or individual IBS symptom scores at study end, with 95% CIs. Finally, we pooled adverse events data with RRs and 95% CIs.

We assessed heterogeneity, which is variation between individual study results that has not occurred due to chance, using both the I^2 statistic with a cutoff of \geq 50%, and the χ^2 test with a *P* value <.10, used to define a significant degree of heterogeneity.³³ We used Review Manager version 5.4.1 (The Cochrane Collaboration 2020)³⁴ to generate Forest plots of pooled RRs for primary and secondary outcomes with 95% CIs, as well as funnel plots. We assessed the latter for evidence of asymmetry, and therefore possible publication bias or other small study effects, using the Egger test,³⁵ if there were sufficient (>10) eligible studies included in the meta-analysis, in line with recommendations.³⁶ We used a *P* value <.10 to define presence of possible publication bias or other small study effects. Where there appeared to be a benefit of probiotics over placebo in analyses containing more than 1 RCT, we assessed the level of certainty of evidence according to GRADE criteria.³⁷ We downgraded certainty if any of high or uncertain risk of bias in individual trials, inconsistency between trial results, evidence of publication bias, or imprecision were present.

Results

We identified 1815 citations, of which 72 published articles appeared relevant, and we retrieved these for further assessment. Forty-three of these were excluded for various reasons (Supplementary Figure 1). When combined with the 53 articles included in the prior version, therefore, there were 82 eligible articles in total, as detailed in the Supplementary Materials,^{e1–e82} 29 of which we identified from the updated literature search.^{e42,e51,e52,e57-e82} Agreement between reviewers for assessment of newly identified trial eligibility was good (kappa statistic = 0.75). These 82 trials involved 10,332 patients. The proportion of women in trials ranged between 9% and 100%. Thirty-nine trials used a combination of probiotics, 17 Lactobacillus species, 9 Saccharomyces, 4 Bifidobacterium, 4 Bacillus, 3 either Lactobacillus or Bifidobacterium, 2 E. coli, 1 Streptococcus, 1 Blautia, 1 Clostridium, and 1 either Lactobacillus or a combination probiotic. Detailed characteristics of included RCTs and endpoints extracted are provided in Supplementary Table 2. Twentyfour trials were at low risk of bias across all domains (Supplementary Table 3).^{e4,e6,e11,e15,e16,e20,e22,e24-e26,e35,e36} 9,e41,e45,e48,e55-e57,e59,e66,e71,e81

Efficacy of Probiotics in Terms of Effect on Persistence of Global Symptoms and Global Symptom Scores

There were 32 RCTs comparing combination probiotics with placebo, ^{e4,e5,e13-e15,e17,e18,e20-e22,e26-e29,e35-e37,e39-e41,e43,} e45,e49,e54,e56,e58,e67,e74,e75,e77,e79,e81 evaluating 3369 patients, which gave outcomes as a dichotomous variable. There was very low certainty in the evidence by GRADE criteria for a

m 2003	Probio Events	tics Total	Contr Events	ol Total W	/eight	Risk Ratio M-H, Random, 95%	CI Y	'ear	Risk Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G
nin 2000	8	12	8	13	2.0%	1.08 (0.60, 1	95] 2	003	<u> </u>	000000
ajander 2005 ajander 2008	21	52 43	34 28	51 43	3.2%	0.61 (0.41, 0. 0.68 (0.45, 1	89 2 011 2	005		
ang 2008	12	15	14	15	4.0%	0.86 [0.64, 1.	14] 2	008	-+	
nck 2008	47	149	92	148	4.1%	0.51 [0.39, 0.	66] 2	008		
rouauit-Hoiowacz 2008 grawal 2009	33	53	31	53	3.8%	1.06 [0.78, 1.	45 2	008		
illiams 2009	9	28	16	28	1.8%	0.56 [0.30, 1.	05] 2	009		
ong 2009	16	36	17	34	2.4%	0.89 [0.54, 1.	46] 2	009		
mren 2010 ingel-Kulka 2011	23	37	27	37	3.7%	0.85 [0.62, 1.	011 2	010		
ondergaard 2011	25	32	23	32	4.0%	1.09 [0.82, 1.	44] 2	011	+	
ichail 2011	1	15	5	9	0.3%	0.12 [0.02, 0.	87] 2	011 +		
ha 2012 n 2013	13	25	22	25	3.0%	0.59 [0.39, 0.	.88] 2 591 2	012	100	
oberts 2013	70	92	67	92	5.0%	1.04 [0.88, 1.	24] 2	013	+	
egtrup 2013	32	67	38	64	3.7%	0.80 (0.58, 1.	11] 2	013		
oon 2014	8	25	15	24	1.7%	0.51 [0.27, 0.	98] 2	014		
udidi 2014	17	21	12	19	3.0%	1 28 [0.86 1	94 2	014		
orenzo-Zuniga 2014	38	55	23	29	4.2%	0.87 [0.67, 1.	13] 2	014	-+	
afari 2014	8	54	29	54	1.6%	0.28 [0.14, 0.	55] 2	014 -		
on 2015	10	39	16	42	1.7%	0.67 [0.35, 1.	30] 2	015		
audacher 2017	13	26	20	27	2.7%	0.68 [0.43, 1.	05] 2	017		0000000
haque 2018	125	181	157	179	5.4%	0.79 [0.70, 0.	88] 2	018	+	
onfrate 2020	7	15	9	10	2.0%	0.52 [0.29, 0.	93] 2	020		
Jran 2021 krzydło-Radomańska 2021	13	25	14	50 26	1.7%	0.93 [0.49, 1.	881 2	021 021		
ack 2022	159	191	171	198	5.6%	0.96 [0.89, 1.	05] 2	022	+	
uteja 2022	15	24	21	29	3.2%	0.86 [0.59, 1.	27] 2	022	-+	
ai 2023	47	145	92	145	4.1%	0.51 (0.39, 0.	67] 2	023	T	
otal (95% CI)		1733		1636 10	00.0%	0.78 [0.71. 0.	87]		•	
otal events	957	-	1147			,				
eterogeneity: Tau² = 0.05; C	hi ² = 107.2	7, df = 3	1 (P < 0.	00001); I²	= 71%	,		0.1 0	2 0.5 1 2 5	10
 Blinding of participants an Blinding of outcome asse Incomplete outcome data Selective reporting (reporti 	id personn ssment (d (attrition bi ing bias)	el (perfo etection as)	bias)	bias)						
) Other bias			202							
Pro Study or Subgroup Ever	biotics	Event	ntrol s Total	Woight	мн	Risk Ratio	Voar	N	Risk Ratio	Risk of Bias
Nobaek 2000	19 30	2	3 30	7.4%		0.83 [0.59, 1.16]	2000		-+	
Viedzielin 2001	11 20	1	7 20	6.0%		0.65 [0.42, 1.00]	2001			
Niv 2005	18 27	1	7 27	6.6%	,	1.06 [0.71, 1.57]	2005			
Simren 2006 Ducrotte 2012	18 29	10	1 29	7.0%	2	0.86 [0.60, 1.23]	2006		-T	
Farup 2012	6 9	10	3 7	2.1%		1.56 [0.59, 4.11]	2012			
Dapoigny 2012	19 26	1	6 26	6.7%	,	1.19 [0.81, 1.74]	2012		- -	
Stevenson 2014	30 54	1	6 27	6.6%	•	0.94 [0.63, 1.39]	2014		-	
_yra 2016 1 Chiissen 2016	25 30	9	9 41	7 9%	2	1.03 [0.91, 1.18]	2016			
Cremon 2018	16 20	1	9 20	9.0%		0.84 [0.66, 1.07]	2018			
2bin 2019	12 30	1	6 30	4 700						
51111 2010			0 00	4.7 70	·	0.75 [0.43, 1.30]	2018		<u> </u>	
Dh 2019	7 28	1	6 27	3.3%	,	0.75 [0.43, 1.30] 0.42 [0.21, 0.86]	2018	_	<u> </u>	
Dh 2019 Lewis 2020 Sadrin 2020	7 28 53 95 7 40	1 5 1	6 27 3 95 2 40	4.7 % 3.3% 8.8% 2.7%		0.75 [0.43, 1.30] 0.42 [0.21, 0.86] 1.00 [0.78, 1.29] 0.58 [0.26, 1.33]	2018 2019 2020 2020	-		
Dh 2019 Lewis 2020 Sadrin 2020 Jung 2022	7 28 53 95 7 40 1 18	1 5 1	6 27 3 95 2 40 4 9	4.7 % 3.3% 8.8% 2.7% 0.6%		0.75 [0.43, 1.30] 0.42 [0.21, 0.86] 1.00 [0.78, 1.29] 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 0.13 [0.02, 0.96]	2018 2019 2020 2020 2022			
5011 2019 Lewis 2020 Sadrin 2020 Jung 2022	7 28 53 95 7 40 1 18	1 5 1	6 27 3 95 2 40 4 9	4.7% 3.3% 8.8% 2.7% 0.6%		0.75 [0.43, 1.30] 0.42 [0.21, 0.86] 1.00 [0.78, 1.29] 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 0.13 [0.02, 0.96]	2018 2019 2020 2020 2022			
50112018 Lewis 2020 Sadrin 2020 Jung 2022 Fotal (95% CI)	7 28 53 95 7 40 1 18 833	15	6 27 3 95 2 40 4 9 665	4.7% 3.3% 8.8% 2.7% 0.6% 100.0%		0.75 [0.43, 1.30] 0.42 [0.21, 0.86] 1.00 [0.78, 1.29] 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 0.13 [0.02, 0.96] 0.84 [0.72, 0.98]	2018 2019 2020 2020 2022		•	
binit 2019 ewis 2020 Sadrin 2020 lung 2022 Fotal (95% CI) Total events 4eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.05; Fest for overall effect: Z = 2.	7 28 53 95 7 40 1 18 833 496 ; Chi ² = 48. .22 (P = 0.)	1 5 1 29, df = 03)	6 27 3 95 2 40 4 9 665 1 15 (P <	4,7 % 3.3% 8.8% 2.7% 0.6% 100.0% 0.0001);	l²= 69	0.75 [0.43, 1.30] 0.42 (0.21, 0.86] 1.00 [0.78, 1.29] 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 0.13 [0.02, 0.96] 0.84 [0.72, 0.98]	2018 2019 2020 2020 2022		0.5 2 5 1 robiotics Favours control	
hini 2019 b. 2019 ewis 2020 Jung 2022 fotal (95% CI) fotal events 4 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.05; fest for overall effect Z = 2. <u>Risk of bias legend</u> A) Random sequence gen B) Allocation concealment C) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of outcome as E) Incomplete outcome da F) Selective reporting (repc G) Other bias	7 28 53 96 7 40 1 18 833 496 ; Chi ² = 48 .22 (P = 0.) heration (s t (selection and perso sessment ta (attrition pring bias	46 29, df = 03) election bias) nnel (p (detect bias))	6 27 3 95 2 40 4 9 665 1 15 (P < 15 (P < 15 (P <	4.7 % 3.3% 8.8% 2.7% 0.6% 100.0% 0.0001);	, , , , , , , , , , , ,	0.75 [0.43, 1.30] 0.42 [0.21, 0.86] 1.00 [0.78, 1.29] 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 0.13 [0.02, 0.96] 0.84 [0.72, 0.98] %	2018 2019 2020 2020 2022 2022		0.5 1 2 5 1 robiotics Favours control	
Init 2016 bh 2019 ewis 2020 Jung 2022 fotal (95% CI) Total events 4 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.05; Fest for overall effect Z = 2. <u>Risk of bias legend</u> A) Random sequence gen B) Allocation concealment C) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of outcome as E) Incomplete outcome da F) Selective reporting (repo G) Other bias	7 28 53 95 7 40 1 18 833 496 ; Chi ² = 48 .22 (P = 0.) heration (s i (selection and perso sessment ta (attrition porting bias	46 29, df = 03) election bias) nnel (p (detect bias)) Co	6 27 3 95 2 40 4 9 665 1 15 (P < 15 (P < n bias) erformar ion bias)	4.7 % 3.3% 8.8% 2.7% 0.6% 100.0% 0.0001);	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	0.75 [0.43, 1.30] 0.42 [0.21, 0.86] 1.00 [0.78, 1.29] 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 0.13 [0.02, 0.96] 0.84 [0.72, 0.98] %	2018 2019 2020 2020 2022 2022		0.5 1 2 5 1 robiotics Favours control	Risk of Bias
Init 2016 h 2019 Lewis 2020 Jung 2022 fotal (95% CI) fotal events 4 4 eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.05; fest for overall effect: Z = 2; <u>Risk of bias legend</u> A) Random sequence gen B) Allocation concealment C) Blinding of participants E) Incomplete outcome das E) Incomplete outcome das E) Incomplete outcome das E) Neopyelle reporting (repo G) Other bias Pro- tudy or Subgroup Every Vonwell 2006	7 28 53 95 7 40 1 18 833 496 ; Chi ² = 48 .22 (P = 0.) heration (st (selection (selection (selection tha (attrition orthog bias obiotics <u>ints Tota</u>	46 29, df = 03) election bias) nnel (p (detect bias)) Con	6 27 3 95 2 40 4 9 665 1 1 15 (P < 1 bias) erformar ion bias) erformar s Tota	4.7 % 3.3% 8.8% 2.7% 0.6% 100.0% 0.0001); nce bias)	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	0.75 [0.43, 1.30] 0.42 [0.21, 0.86] 1.00 [0.76, 1.29] 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 0.13 [0.02, 0.96] 0.84 [0.72, 0.98] % Risk Ratio , Random, 95% CI	2018 2019 2020 2020 2022 2022 2022	0.1 0.2 Favours p	Risk Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bias
Join 2019 Join 2019 Lewis 2020 Join 2020 Joing 2022 Fotal (95% CI) Total events 4 Leterogeneity, Tau ² = 0.05; Fest for overall effect. Z = 2; Risk of blas legend A) Random sequence gen B) Allocation concealment D) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of outcome as: D) Blinding of outcome as: D) Slinding of outcome as: D) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of substraint Frequency and the substraint of the	7 28 53 95 7 40 1 18 833 496 ; Chi= 48 .22 (P = 0.) heration (s (selection and perso sessment ita (attritior orting bias obiotics ints Tota 143 27(26 ki)	1 5 29, df = 03) election bias) nnel (p ibias)) Coo <u>I Even</u>	6 27 3 95 2 40 4 9 665 1 1 15 (P < 1 bias) erformar ion bias) erformar 54 9 2 49 62	4.7 % 3.3% 8.8% 2.7% 0.6% 100.0% 0.0001); 0.0001); 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 17.9%	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	0.75 [0.43, 1.30] 0.42 [0.21, 0.86] 1.00 [0.76, 1.29] 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 0.13 [0.02, 0.96] 0.84 [0.72, 0.98] % Risk Ratio <u>, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.90 [0.74, 1.11] 0.55 [0.40, 0.75]	2018 2019 2020 2020 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022		Risk Ratio	To Risk of Bias A B C D E F G C D E F G
Solid 2016 Solid 2016 Lewis 2020 Solid 2020 Jourg 2022 Fotal (95% CI) Total events 4 - deterogeneity, Tau ² = 0.05; Fest for overall effect: Z = 2. Risk of bias legend A) Random sequence gen B) Allocation concealment C) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of outcome as: D) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of subgroup Prev Vindey of Subgroup Prev Vhorwell 2006 Suglielmetti 2011 Tinto-Sanchez 2017 Tinto-Sanchez 2017	7 28 53 95 7 400 1 18 833 496 (Chi² = 48	1 5 29, df = 03) election bias) nnel (p (detect bias)) Coo Even) 1 2 48 29, df = 1 29, df = 03)	6 27 3 95 2 40 4 9 665 1 :15 (P < 1	4.7% 3.3% 8.8% 2.7% 0.6% 100.0% 0.0001); 0.0001); 17.9% 17.9% 2.35	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	0.75 [0.43, 1.30] 0.42 [0.21, 0.86] 1.00 [0.78, 1.29] 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 0.13 [0.02, 0.96] 0.84 [0.72, 0.98] % %	2018 2019 2020 2020 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022		Risk Ratio M.H. Random, 95% Cl	Hisk of Bias A B C D E F G C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C
Ann 2016 bh 2019 ewis 2020 lung 2022 fotal (95% CI) fotal events 4-teterogeneity: Tau ^a = 0.05; fest for overall effect Z = 2. <u>Risk of bias legend</u> A) Random sequence gen B) Allocation concealment () Blinding of participants D) Blinding of outcome as: E) Incomplete outcome da F) Selective reporting (repo G) Other bias Protection Subgroup Event Norwell 2006 Suglielmetti 2011 Tinto-Sanchez 2017 evens 2020	7 28 53 95 7 40 1 18 833 496 .22 (P = 0.) t (selection and perso sessment ita (attrition tia (attrition tia (attrition tia (attrition tia (attrition) ta (at	1 5 46 29, df = 03) election bias) nnel (p (detect bias)) Coo Coo 2, df = 03) (detect bias) (detect bias)) (detect bias)) (detect bias)) (detect bias) (det	6 27 3 95 2 40 4 9 665 11 15 (P <	4.7 % 3.3% 8.8% 2.7% 0.6% 0.0001); 0.0001]; 0.00	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	0.75 [0.43, 1.30] 0.42 [0.21, 0.86] 1.00 [0.78, 1.29] 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 0.13 [0.02, 0.96] 0.84 [0.72, 0.98] % Kisk Ratio I, Random, 95% CI 0.90 [0.74, 1.11] 0.55 [0.40, 0.75] 1.15 [0.91, 1.45]	2018 2019 2020 2020 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022		Risk Ratio M.H, Random, 95% Cl	Hisk of Bias A B C D E F G C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C
b) 2019 ewis 2020 3adrin 2020 lung 2022 fotal (95% CI) fotal (95% CI) 4 deterogeneity. Tau* E 0.05; fest for overall effect. Z = 2; Risk of blas legend A) Random sequence gen B) Allocation concealment C) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of participants G) Other bias G) Other bias Pre- Yhorwell 2006 guilelmetti 2011 into-Sanchez 2017 ewis 2020 undresen 2020 Sanchez 2017	7 28 53 95 7 400 1 18 833 496 :Chi≢ = 48 22 (P = 0.) heration (st (selection and perso sessment ita (attritior orting bias obiotics ints Tota ints Tota 9 20 9 22 9 22 9 22 9 22 9 22 9 22 9 22 9 22 9 22 9 22 9 24 143 277 9 24 147 221	1 466 29, df = 03) election blas) nnel (p (detect blas)) Co <u>I Even</u>) <u>2</u> , df = 03)	6 27 3 95 2 40 665 67 1 15 1 15 1 15 1 15 1 15 1 15 1 15 1 15 1 15 1 15 1 15 1 15 1 15 1 15 1 15 1 16 1 15 1 16 1 16 1 16 1 16 1 16 1 16 1 16 1 16 1 16 1 16 1 16 1 16 1 17 1 16	4.7 % 3.3% 8.8% 2.7% 0.06% 100.0% 0.0001); 0.0001); 100.0%	t <u>M-F</u>	0.75 [0.43, 1.30] 0.42 [0.21, 0.86] 1.00 [0.76, 1.29] 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 0.13 [0.02, 0.96] 0.84 [0.72, 0.98] % Risk Ratio <u>Random, 95% CI</u> 0.90 [0.74, 1.11] 0.55 [0.40, 0.75] 0.64 [0.36, 1.16] 0.55 [0.40, 0.75] 0.64 [0.36, 1.16] 0.82 [0.74, 0.92]	2018 2019 2020 2020 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022		Risk Ratio M.H. Random, 95% Cl	Hore C D E F G
Join 2019 Lewis 2020 Jadrin 2020 Iung 2022 fotal (95% CI) Total events 4eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.05; Fest for overall effect: Z = 2; Risk of bias legend A) Random sequence gen B) Allocation concealment D) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of outcome as: D) Blocation concealment D) Blinding of outcome as: D) Blocation concealment G) Other bias O Other bias VapuleIIN2 VapuleIIN2 VapuleIIN2 VapuleIIN2 VapuleIIN2 VapuleIIN2 VapuleIIN2 VapuleIIN2 VapuleIN2	7 28 53 95 7 400 1 18 833 496 (Chi ² = 48 .22 (P = 0.) heration (st (selection and perso sessment ita (attrition orting bias obiotics <u>ents Tota</u> 143 277 26 1 92 61 92 61 95 147 221 668	1 48 29, df = 03) electior bias)) Coo <u>I Even</u>) <u>1</u> ; 1	6 27 3 95 2 40 665 1 15 (P < rion bias) erformar ts Totaa 54 93 49 62 49 62 49 62 49 222 49 22 49 2	4 / 73 3.3% 8.8% 2.7% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 2.23.5% 2.17.9% 2.23.5% 2.27.9% 2.22.9% 2.22.9% 2.22.9% 2.22.9% 2.22.9% 2.22.9% 2.22.9% 2.22.9% 2.22.9% 2.22.9% 2.22.9% 2.22.9% 2.22.9% 2.22.9% 2.23.9% 2.35% 2	i <u>M.I</u> 5 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	0.75 [0.43, 1.30] 0.42 [0.21, 0.86] 1.00 [0.76, 1.29] 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 0.13 [0.02, 0.96] 0.84 [0.72, 0.98] % Risk Ratio <u>, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.90 [0.74, 1.11] 0.55 [0.40, 0.75] 0.64 [0.36, 1.16] 1.15 [0.91, 1.45] 1.15 [0.91, 1.45] 0.82 [0.67, 1.021]	2018 2019 2020 2020 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022		Risk Ratio	Hisk of Bias A B C D E F G O O O O E O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O
Solid 2016 Solid 2016 Lewis 2020 Solid 2020 Jourg 2022 Fotal (95% CI) Total events 4 Heterogeneity, Tau* = 0.05; Fest for overall effect: Z = 2. Risk of bias legend A) Random sequence gen B) Allocation concealment C) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of outcome as: D) Blinding of outcome as: D) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of subcome as: D) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of subcome as: D) Blinding of subcome as: Discome as: D) Blinding of subcome as: Discome as: Discome as: Discome as: Dinotosancher Distrope as: <td>7 28 53 95 7 40 1 18 833 496 .22 (P = 0.) heration (st (selection orting bias obiotics mits Tota 143 277 26 60 9 22 61 99 147 221 668 386</td> <td>1 48 29, df = 03) election bias)) Coo <u>I Even</u>) <u>1</u> 34</td> <td>6 27 3 95 2 40 665 1 1 15 (P ≤ 10 bias) erformar on bias) ntrol ts Tota 49 6 53 95 54 92 49 62 53 95 54 92 49 5 49 5 10 5 11 5 11 5 12 5 10 5 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10</td> <td>4 / 73 3.3% 8.8% 2.7% 0.6% 100.0% 0.0001); 100.0% 100.</td> <td>i <u>M.I</u>² = 69</td> <td>0.75 [0.43, 1.30] 0.42 [0.21, 0.86] 1.00 [0.78, 1.29] 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 0.13 [0.02, 0.96] 0.84 [0.72, 0.98] % % % % Risk Ratio <u>, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.90 [0.74, 1.11] 0.55 [0.40, 0.75] 0.84 [0.36, 1.16] 1.15 [0.91, 1.45] 0.82 [0.74, 0.92] 0.82 [0.67, 1.02]</td> <td>2018 2019 2020 2020 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022</td> <td></td> <td>Risk Ratio M.H. Random, 95% Cl</td> <td>Here and a second seco</td>	7 28 53 95 7 40 1 18 833 496 .22 (P = 0.) heration (st (selection orting bias obiotics mits Tota 143 277 26 60 9 22 61 99 147 221 668 386	1 48 29, df = 03) election bias)) Coo <u>I Even</u>) <u>1</u> 34	6 27 3 95 2 40 665 1 1 15 (P ≤ 10 bias) erformar on bias) ntrol ts Tota 49 6 53 95 54 92 49 62 53 95 54 92 49 5 49 5 10 5 11 5 11 5 12 5 10 5 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	4 / 73 3.3% 8.8% 2.7% 0.6% 100.0% 0.0001); 100.0% 100.	i <u>M.I</u> ² = 69	0.75 [0.43, 1.30] 0.42 [0.21, 0.86] 1.00 [0.78, 1.29] 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 0.13 [0.02, 0.96] 0.84 [0.72, 0.98] % % % % Risk Ratio <u>, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.90 [0.74, 1.11] 0.55 [0.40, 0.75] 0.84 [0.36, 1.16] 1.15 [0.91, 1.45] 0.82 [0.74, 0.92] 0.82 [0.67, 1.02]	2018 2019 2020 2020 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022		Risk Ratio M.H. Random, 95% Cl	Here and a second seco
Join 2019 Lewis 2020 Jadrin 2020 Jung 2022 fotal (95% CI) Total events 4eterogeneity, Tau ² = 0.05; Fest for overall effect: Z = 2; Risk of bias leggend A) Random sequence gen B) Allocation concealment C) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of outcome as: D) Blinding of outcome as: D) Blinding of outcome as: D) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of outcome as: D) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of subgroup Eve Vhorwell 2006 suglielmetti 2011 Into-Sanchez 2017 Indersen 2020 ordal (95% CI) otal events featrogeneity. Tau ² = 0.4;	7 28 53 95 7 400 1 18 833 496 (Chi ² = 48 .22 (P = 0.) heration (st (selection and perso sessment ita (attrition orting bias obioticts mits Tota 143 27(26 62 9 22 61 99 147 221 668 386 Chi ² = 15. 82 (P = 0.)	1 48 29, df = 03) election bias)) Coo <u>1 Even</u>) ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ;	6 27 3 95 1 15 (P < 665 1 15 (P < 1 15 (P < 1 15 (P < 1 15 (P < 1 16	4 / 7% 3.3% 8.8% 2.7% 0.6% 100.0%	t <u>M-</u> F 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	0.75 [0.43, 1.30] 0.42 [0.21, 0.86] 1.00 [0.78, 1.29] 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 0.13 [0.02, 0.96] 0.84 [0.72, 0.98] % %	2018 2019 2020 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022	0.1 0.2 Favours p	Risk Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI	To
Join 2010 Join 2010 Lewis 2020 Join 2020 Join 2020 Join 2020 Iong 2022 Total events 4 Jeterogeneity: Tau* = 0.05; Test for overall effect: Z = 2. Risk of bias legend A) Random sequence gen B) Allocation concealment D) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of participants D) Blinding of participants Pretudy or Subgroup Pretudy or Subgroup Videor Subgroup Event Pretudy or Subgroup Teves Vhorwell 2006 Junito-Sanchez 2017 Jointo-Sanchez 2017 Jointo-Sanchez 2017 Jointa events 2020 Jointal (95% CI) Jointal events Hetrogeneity: Tau* = 0.04;	7 28 53 95 7 400 1 18 833 496 .22 (P = 0.1 heration (st (selection) and perso sessment ta (attrition) sessment ta (attrition) 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	1 5 29, df = 03) election bias) nnel (p (detect bias)) Coo Evenn 5 ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ;	6 27 3 95 1 15 (P < 1 16 (P <	 4.7% 3.3% 8.8% 2.7% 0.6% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 17.39 17.39 22.09 27.99 100.09 10.09 10.09 	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	0.75 [0.43, 1.30] 0.42 [0.21, 0.86] 1.00 [0.78, 1.29] 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 0.13 [0.02, 0.96] 0.84 [0.72, 0.98] % Risk Ratio I, Random, 95% CI 0.90 [0.74, 1.11] 0.55 [0.40, 0.75] 0.64 [0.36, 1.16] 1.15 [0.91, 1.45] 0.82 [0.67, 1.02]	2018 2019 2020 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022	0.1 0.2 Favours p	Risk Ratio M.H. Random, 95% CI	Hisk of Bias A B C D E F G H H C D

(F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)
 (G) Other bias

Figure 1. (A) Forest plot of RCTs of combination probiotics vs placebo in IBS: RR of persistence of global IBS symptoms. (B) Forest plot of RCTs of probiotics using Lactobacillus strains vs placebo in IBS: RR of persistence of global IBS symptoms. (C) Forest plot of RCTs of probiotics using Bifidobacterium strains vs placebo in IBS: RR of persistence of global IBS symptoms.

Fable	1.Efficacy	of Probiotics in	Terms of	Persistence of	Global Sym	ptoms in	Irritable Bowel S	Syndrome
--------------	------------	------------------	----------	----------------	------------	----------	-------------------	----------

	Number of trials	Number of patients	RR of persistence of global symptoms (95% Cl)	P value for the difference	I^2 (P value for χ^2)
All patients					
All combination probiotics	32	3369	0.78 (0.71–0.87)	<.001	71% (<.001)
VSL#3	4	155	0.78 (0.53-1.16)	.23	47% (.13)
Lactobacillus paracasei ssp paracasei F19, Lactobacillus acidophilus La5, and Bifidobacterium lactis Bh12	3	269	0.92 (0.76–1.11)	.38	14% (.31)
Enterococcus faecalis DSM16440 and Escherichia coli DSM17252	2	686	0.71 (0.33–1.51)	.37	97% (<.001)
LacClean Gold S	2	130	0.59 (0.37-0.93)	.02	0% (.56)
Duolac 7s	2	76	0.62 (0.43-0.89)	.009	0% (.62)
All Lactobacillus strains	16	1498	0.84 (0.72-0.98)	.03	69% (<.001)
Lactobacillus plantarum 299V	5	453	0.73 (0.59–0.92)	.007	59% (.04)
All Bifidobacterium strains	5	1161	0.82 (0.67–1.02)	.07	74% (.004)
Bifidobacterium bifidum MIMBb75	2	565	0.69 (0.46-1.04)	.07	83% (.01)
All Bacillus strains	3	216	0.44 (0.34–0.57)	<.001	0% (.48)
All Saccharomyces strains	2	469	0.94 (0.80-1.11)	.49	0% (.86)
All Escherichia strains	2	418	0.86 (0.79-0.93)	<.001	0% (.78)
All Blautia strains	1	366	0.93 (0.84-1.03)	.15	N/A
All Clostridium strains	1	200	0.80 (0.64–0.99)	.04	N/A
All Streptococcus strains	1	54	0.72 (0.53-0.99)	.04	N/A
Patients with IBS-D					
All combination probiotics	13	1272	0.78 (0.67–0.92)	.002	69% (<.001)
VSL#3	2	49	0.42 (0.04-4.85)	.49	82% (.02)
Duolac 7s	2	76	0.62 (0.43-0.89)	.009	0% (.62)
All Lactobacillus strains	4	157	0.57 (0.36-0.89)	.01	27% (.25)
All Saccharomyces strains	2	169	0.99 (0.76–1.28)	.92	0% (.81)
All Clostridium strains	1	200	0.80 (0.64–0.99)	.04	N/A
All Blautia strains	1	202	0.94 (0.82-1.08)	.36	N/A
All Escherichia strains	1	54	1.00 (0.57–1.74)	1.00	N/A
All Bifidobacterium strains	1	44	0.64 (0.36–1.16)	.14	N/A
All Bacillus strains	1	40	0.57 (0.31–1.05)	.07	N/A
Patients with IBS-C					
All combination probiotics	4	295	1.01 (0.89–1.14)	.87	8% (.35)
All Saccharomyces strains	1	180	0.82 (0.62-1.08)	.16	N/A
All Blautia strains	1	164	0.92 (0.78–1.07)	.26	N/A
All Escherichia strains	1	35	0.84 (0.41–1.73)	.64	N/A

CI, confidence interval; IBS, irritable bowel syndrome; IBS-C, IBS with constipation; IBS-D, IBS with diarrhea; N/A, not applicable; RR, relative risk.

benefit in terms of persistence of global symptoms (RR of global symptoms persisting = 0.78; 95% CI, 0.71-0.87) (Figure 1A, Table 1, and Supplementary Table 4), with significant heterogeneity between studies ($I^2 = 71\%$, P < .001), and statistically significant asymmetry detected in the funnel plot (Egger test, P = .02), suggesting publication bias or other small study effects. In terms of the different combinations tested (Table 1), 4 RCTs used VSL#3 in 155 patients, which was no more efficacious than placebo (RR, 0.78; 95% CI, 0.53-1.16).^{e4,e26,e56,e79} Three trials used the same combination of Lactobacillus paracasei ssp paracasei F19, Lactobacillus acidophilus La5, and Bifidobacterium lactis Bb12 in 269 patients,^{e22,e28,e35} with no benefit over placebo (RR, 0.92; 95% CI, 0.76-1.11). Two RCTs, which when pooled together demonstrated efficacy, used a combination of Bifidobacterium longum, B. bifidum, B. lactis, Lactobacillus acidophilus, Lactobacillus rhamnosus, and Streptococcus thermophiles, known as

LacClean Gold S, in 130 patients (RR, 0.59; 95% CI, 0.37–0.93).^{e45,e49} By GRADE criteria, certainty in the evidence was very low (Supplementary Table 5). There was very low certainty in evidence for a benefit of a 7-strain combination of 3 *Bifidobacterium*, 3 *Lactobacillus*, and 1 *Streptococcus*, Duolac 7s, in 2 trials in 76 patients (RR, 0.62; 95% CI, 0.43 to 0.89) (Supplementary Table 6).^{e29,e36} Although global symptom scores were lower with combination probiotics than placebo in 20 trials containing 1685 patients (SMD, -0.36; 95% CI, -0.52 to -0.20) (Supplementary Figure 2 and Supplementary Table 7), none of the different combinations, when assessed individually, was superior to placebo.

There was low certainty in the evidence for a benefit of *Lactobacillus* strains, used in 16 trials (1498 patients),^{e2,e3,e7,} e^{10,e31-e33,e44,e47,e50,e57,e60,e65,e69,e71,e76} compared with placebo (RR, 0.84; 95% CI, 0.72–0.98) (Figure 1*B*, Table 1, and

Supplementary Table 8), with significant heterogeneity between studies ($I^2 = 69\%$; P < .001) but no funnel plot asymmetry (Egger test, P = .53). When only the 5 RCTs that used *Lactobacillus plantarum* 299V were considered in the analysis,^{e2,e3,e10,e32,e44} which contained 453 subjects, the RR of symptoms persisting was again lower with active therapy (0.73; 95% CI, 0.59–0.92) (Table 1), although heterogeneity persisted ($I^2 = 59\%$; P = 0.04). Certainty in the evidence was low (Supplementary Table 9). *Lactobacillus* strains were no more efficacious than placebo for continuous global symptom scores in 8 trials containing 542 patients (SMD, -0.01; 95% CI, -0.18 to 0.16) (Supplementary Figure 2 and Supplementary Table 7). In pooled data, *L. plantarum* 299V also had no effect on continuous global symptom scores.

Bifidobacterium strains were studied in 5 RCTs (1161 patients),^{e11,e24,e55,e66,e69} with no benefit over placebo (RR, 0.82; 95% CI, 0.67–1.02) (Figure 1*C* and Table 1). Two trials used the same strain, *B. bifidum* MIMBb75, in 565 patients, but this was not superior to placebo (RR, 0.69; 95% CI, 0.46–1.04) (Table 1).^{e24,e66} However, when only the 4 trials at low risk of bias across all domains were studied, global symptoms were improved (RR, 0.76; 95% CI, 0.63–0.93).^{e11,e24,e55,e66} *Bifidobacterium* strains were no more efficacious than placebo for continuous global symptom scores in 4 trials containing 666 patients (SMD, –0.27; 95% CI, –0.72 to 0.18) (Supplementary Figure 2 and Supplementary Table 7).

Certainty in the evidence was very low for a benefit of Bacillus strains over placebo in 3 RCTs, containing 216 patients (RR, 0.44; 95% CI, 0.34-0.57) (Table 1 and Supplementary Table 10).^{e59,e64,e73} When continuous data were pooled, global symptom scores were lower with Bacillus strains in 2 trials containing 148 patients (SMD, -1.43; 95% CI, -2.47 to -0.39) (Supplementary) Figure 2 and Supplementary Table 7). Saccharomyces cerevisiae was used in 2 RCTs, e23,e53 containing 469 patients, but was not superior to placebo (RR, 0.94; 95% CI, 0.80-1.11) and Escherichia strains were assessed in 2 trials (418 patients),^{e19,e34} with moderate certainty in the evidence for a benefit compared with placebo (RR, 0.86; 95% CI, 0.79-0.93) (Table 1 and Supplementary Table 11). Results of other single species trials are reported in Table 1 and all dichotomous results for persistence of global symptoms in Supplementary Figure 3.

Efficacy of Probiotics in Terms of Effect on Persistence of Global Symptoms According to IBS Subtype

There were 13 RCTs of combination probiotics in 1272 patients with IBS-D.^{e4,e17,e26,e27,e29,e36,e40,e49,e54,e58,e74,e77,e81} Overall, global symptoms were improved with combination probiotics in IBS-D (RR, 0.78; 95% CI, 0.67–0.92) (Table 1), with significant heterogeneity between studies $(I^2 = 69\%; P < .001)$ but no evidence of funnel plot asymmetry (Egger test, P = .28). Two trials used VSL#3 in 49 patients, which was no more efficacious than placebo (RR, 0.42; 95% CI, 0.04–4.85),^{e4,e26} and 2 RCTs Duolac 7s in 76 patients, with an improvement in global symptoms (RR, 0.62; 95% CI, 0.43–0.89).^{e29,e36} There were 4 trials using *Lactobacillus* strains, again with an improvement in global symptoms in 157 patients (RR, 0.57; 95% CI, 0.36–0.89).^{e31,e60,e65,e76} Other results are provided in Table 1. There were only 7 trials conducted in patients with IBS-C,^{e18,e34,e37,e49,e53,e77,e82} and none of the combinations of probiotics or individual species were superior to placebo (Table 1).

Efficacy of Probiotics in Terms of Effect on Persistence of Abdominal Pain and Abdominal Pain Scores

There were 32 separate trials of combination probiotics that reported efficacy in terms of persistence of abdominal pain, e4,e5,e9,e12-e14,e17,e18,e20-22,e26,e28-e30,e35,e36,e42,e43,e45,e48,e49, 52,e54,e58,e67,e72,e74,e75,e77,e79,e81 containing 3469 patients. There was very low evidence of certainty for a benefit of combination probiotics for abdominal pain (RR of persistence of abdominal pain, 0.72; 95% CI, 0.64-0.82) (Figure 2A, Table 2, and Supplementary Table 12) with significant heterogeneity between studies ($l^2 = 72\%$; P < .001) and funnel plot asymmetry (Egger test, P = .003). When data were pooled from trials using the same combination, none of the individual combinations were superior to placebo (Table 2). Abdominal pain scores were lower with combination probiotics than placebo in 25 trials containing 2043 patients (SMD, -0.30; 95% CI, -0.45 to -0.14) (Supplementary Figure 4 and Supplementary Table 13), but again none of the different combinations considered alone was superior to placebo.

Eleven trials evaluated *Lactobacillus* strains in 1183 patients, ^{e2,e3,e16,e50,e52,e57,e65,e70,e71,e76,e80} with very low certainty in the evidence for a benefit over placebo (RR, 0.59; 95% CI, 0.45–0.76) (Figure 2*B*, Table 2, and Supplementary Table 14). There was significant heterogeneity between studies ($I^2 = 73\%$; P < .001) and evidence of funnel plot asymmetry (Egger test, P = .02). Three RCTs used *L. plantarum* 299V in 220 patients, ^{e2,e3,e80} with no benefit (RR, 0.45; 95% CI, 0.15–1.35) (Table 2). Abdominal pain scores were lower with *Lactobacillus* strains than placebo in 7 trials containing 888 patients (SMD, -0.32; 95% CI, -0.52 to -0.13) (Supplementary Figure 4 and Supplementary Table 13), and with *L. plantarum* 299V in 3 trials containing 364 patients (SMD, -0.47; 95% CI, -0.68 to -0.27).

Nine trials used Saccharomyces strains in 1744 patients, e23,e25,e38,e46,e53,e62,e63,e68,e78 with very low certainty in the evidence for a benefit over placebo (RR, 0.75; 95% CI, 0.57–0.99) (Figure 2C, Table 2, and Supplementary Table 15), with significant heterogeneity between studies ($l^2 = 89\%$; P < .001). This effect was limited to Saccharomyces cerevisae I-3856, used in 5 RCTs in 1482 (RR, 0.64; 95% CI, 0.45 to patients 0.90) (Table 2),^{e46,e53,e63,e68,e78} with low certainty in the evidence (Supplementary Table 16). Saccharomyces strains were no more efficacious than placebo for continuous abdominal pain scores in 6 trials containing 510 patients (SMD, -0.47; 95% CI, -1.13 to 0.20) (Supplementary Figure 4 and Supplementary Table 13), with no effect by strain.

Α	Probio	tics	Contro	ol		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio	Risk of Bias
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total E	Events	Total 12	Weight 2.2%	M-H, Random, 95% CI Ye	ear M-H, Random, 95% Cl	ABCDEFG
Kajander 2005	25	52	34	51	3.7%	0.72 [0.51, 1.02] 20	105	
Kim 2006	11	20	13	20	2.7%	0.85 [0.51, 1.41] 20		
Enck 2008	41	149	82	148	3.9%	0.50 [0.37, 0.67] 20	108	
Zeng 2008	11	15	15	15	3.8%	0.74 [0.54, 1.02] 20		
Drouault-Holowacz 2008 Hong 2009	13	53 36	26	53 34	3.2%	0.81 [0.52, 1.24] 20 0.65 [0.38, 1.09] 20	109	
Agrawal 2009	11	17	15	17	3.4%	0.73 [0.50, 1.08] 20	109	
Williams 2009 Simren 2010	9 20	28	15 22	28	3.3%	0.60 [0.32, 1.14] 20		
Sondergaard 2011	18	32	19	32	3.2%	0.95 [0.62, 1.44] 20	111	
Michail 2011 Cui 2012	2	15 37	4	23	0.6%	0.30 [0.07, 1.32] 20	112	
Cha 2012	13	25	15	25	2.8%	0.87 [0.53, 1.42] 20	112	
Ko 2013 Beatrup 2013	3 52	14	9 50	12	1.1%	0.29 [0.10, 0.82] 20	113	
Sisson 2014	69	124	41	62	4.3%	0.84 [0.66, 1.07] 20	114	
Yoon 2014 Shavakhi 2014	11	25	15	24	2.6%	0.70 [0.41, 1.21] 20		
Yoon 2015	15	39	20	42	2.7%	0.81 [0.49, 1.34] 20	15	
Wong 2015	13	20	15	22	3.2%	0.95 [0.62, 1.47] 20	115	
Hod 2017	39	52	29	52	3.9%	1.32 [0.98, 1.77] 20	117 +	
Ishaque 2018	15	181	57	179	2.6%	0.26 [0.15, 0.44] 20	118	
Bonfrate 2020	4	15	8	10	1.4%	0.33 [0.48, 1.12] 20	20	
Turan 2021	21	50	23	50	3.1%	0.91 [0.59, 1.42] 20	21	
Skrzydło-Radomanska 2021 Mack 2022	16	25 191	24 129	26 198	3.8%	0.69 [0.51, 0.95] 20	121	
Tuteja 2022	16	24	19	29	3.4%	1.02 [0.69, 1.50] 20	122	
Bai 2023	40	145	90	145	4.0%	0.44 [0.33, 0.60] 20	123	
Total (95% CI)		1775		1694	100.0%	0.72 [0.64, 0.82]	•	
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.08: C	782 hi² = 111 1	0 df= 31	1020 (P < 0)	00001)	1 ² = 72%			-
Test for overall effect: Z = 5.06	(P < 0.00	001)					0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 Favours probiotics Favours contro	10 I
Risk of bias legend								
(A) Random sequence gener	ation (sele	ction bia	s)					
(B) Allocation concealment (s (C) Blinding of participants and	election bi	as) el (nerfor	mance	hias)				
(D) Blinding of outcome asse	ssment (d	etection k	oias)					
(E) Incomplete outcome data (E) Selective reporting (report)	(attrition bi ng bias)	ias)						
(G) Other bias	ing blue,							
B Prol	piotics	Cont	rol			Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio	Risk of Bias
Study or Subgroup Even	ts lotal	Events	Total	Weig	ht M-H	, Random, 95% Cl Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	ABCDEFG
Study or Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001	1 21 20 1 20	Events 25 7	Total 30 20	Weig 14.4 1.5	<u>ht M-H</u> % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 [0.63, 1.12] 2000 0.14 [0.02, 1.06] 2001	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Study or Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008	1 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	Events 25 7 13	Total 30 20 20	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4	<u>ht M-H</u> % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 [0.63, 1.12] 2000 0.14 [0.02, 1.06] 2001 0.31 [0.12, 0.78] 2008	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	A B C D E F G • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Study or Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016	ts lotal 21 30 1 20 4 20 18 53 50 260	Events 25 7 13 43 82	Total 30 20 20 52 131	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 12.4 16.2	ht M-H % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 [0.63, 1.12] 2000 0.14 [0.02, 1.06] 2001 0.31 [0.12, 0.78] 2008 0.41 [0.28, 0.61] 2016 0.92 [0.78, 1.09] 2018	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Study or Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 Lyra 2016 1: Cremon 2018 11	Iotal 21 30 1 20 4 20 18 53 50 260 12 20	Events 25 7 13 43 82 16	Total 30 20 20 52 131 20	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 12.4 16.2 12.0	<u>ht M-H</u> % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 [0.63, 1.12] 2000 0.14 [0.02, 1.06] 2001 0.31 [0.12, 0.78] 2008 0.41 [0.28, 0.61] 2016 0.92 [0.78, 1.09] 2018 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 2018	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	A B C D E F G • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Study of Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 11 Cremon 2018 0h 2019	Iotal 21 30 1 20 4 20 18 53 50 260 12 20 10 28	Events 25 7 13 43 82 16 17	Total 30 20 52 131 20 27	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 12.4 16.2 12.0 9.4	<u>ht M-H</u> % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 (0.63, 1.12) 2000 0.14 (0.02, 1.06) 2001 0.31 (0.12, 0.78) 2008 0.41 (0.28, 0.61) 2016 0.92 (0.78, 1.09) 2016 0.75 (0.49, 1.14) 2018 0.75 (0.32, 1.01) 2019	M-H, Random, 95% CI	A B C D E F G •••••••• •••••••• •••••••• ••••••••
Study or Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 1 Cremon 2018 Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 Martoni 2020	ts lotal 21 30 1 20 4 20 18 53 50 260 12 20 10 28 7 40 55 113	Events 25 7 13 43 82 16 17 12 95	Total 30 20 52 131 20 27 40 112	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 12.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 6.4 15.7	<u>ht M-H</u> 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1%	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 (0.63, 1.12) 2000 0.14 (0.02, 1.06) 2001 0.31 (0.12, 0.78) 2008 0.41 (0.28, 0.61) 2016 0.97 (0.78, 1.09) 2016 0.75 (0.49, 1.14) 2018 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.707) 2020	M-H, Random, 95% CI	
Study of Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 11 Cremon 2018 10 Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 Martoni 2020 UH 4ag 2022	ts lotal 21 30 1 20 4 20 18 53 50 260 12 20 10 28 7 40 55 113 6 60	Events 25 7 13 43 82 16 17 12 95 16	Total 30 20 52 131 20 27 40 112 60	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 12.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 6.4 15.7 5.9	ht <u>M-H</u> % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 [0.63, 1.12] 2000 0.14 [0.02, 1.06] 2001 0.31 [0.12, 0.78] 2008 0.41 [0.28, 0.61] 2016 0.42 [0.78, 1.09] 2016 0.57 [0.49, 1.14] 2018 0.57 [0.42, 1.10] 2019 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 2020 0.57 [0.47, 0.70] 2020 0.58 [0.46, 0.88] 2022	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Study or Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 1: Cremon 2018 1: Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 Martoni 2020 1: UH Hag 2022 Jung 2022	ts lotal 21 30 1 20 4 20 18 53 50 260 12 20 10 28 7 40 55 113 6 60 0 18	Events 25 7 13 43 82 16 17 12 95 16 5	Total 30 20 52 131 20 27 40 112 60 9	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 12.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 6.4 15.7 5.9 0.8	ht M-H % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 (0.63, 1.12) 2000 0.14 (0.02, 1.06) 2001 0.31 (0.12, 0.78) 2008 0.41 (0.28, 0.61) 2016 0.42 (0.78, 1.09) 2016 0.57 (0.48, 1.14) 2018 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.32, 0.04) 2014 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.58 (0.68, 0.222 0.05 (0.00, 0.78)	M-H, Random, 95% CI	
Study or Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 1: Cremon 2018 0 Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 Martoni 2020 UHaq 2022 Jung 2022 Total (95% CI)	Its Iotal 21 30 1 20 4 20 18 53 50 260 10 28 7 40 55 113 66 600 662 662	Events 25 7 13 43 82 16 17 12 95 16 5	Total 30 20 52 131 20 27 40 112 60 9 521	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 12.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 6.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 100.0	1 ht M-H 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1%	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 (0.63, 1.12) 2000 0.14 (0.02, 1.06) 2001 0.31 (0.12, 0.78) 2008 0.41 (0.28, 0.61) 2016 0.42 (0.78, 1.09) 2016 0.75 (0.49, 1.14) 2018 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.32, 0.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.32, 0.03) 2021 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.32, 0.03) 2021 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.59 (0.47, 0.70) 2022 0.59 (0.45, 0.76] 2022	M.H, Random, 95% CI	
Study or Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 1: Cremon 2018 0 Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 Martoni 2020 UI-Haq 2022 Jung 2022 Total (95% CI) Total events 2	15 Iotal 21 30 1 20 18 53 50 260 12 20 10 28 7 40 555 113 6 60 0 18 642 34	Events 25 7 13 43 82 16 17 12 95 16 5	Total 30 20 52 131 20 27 40 112 60 9 521	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 12.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 6.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 100.0	ht M-H % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 (0.63, 1.12) 2000 0.14 (0.02, 1.06) 2001 0.31 (0.12, 0.78) 2008 0.41 (0.28, 0.61) 2016 0.42 (0.78, 1.09) 2016 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.47, 0.70) 2020 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.47, 0.70) 2020 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.47, 0.70) 2022 0.59 (0.45, 0.76) 2022	M.H, Random, 95% CI	
Study or Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 1: Cremon 2018 Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 Martoni 2020 Ul-Haq 2022 Jung 2022 Total (95% CI) Total events 2 Heterogeneily, Tau ² = 0.10, Test for overall effect Z = 4.1	Its Iotal 21 30 1 20 4 20 18 53 50 260 12 20 10 28 7 40 55 113 6 60 0 18 662 84 Chi² = 36. 32 (P < 0.6)	Events 25 7 13 43 82 166 17 12 95 16 5 331 71, df = 1 0001)	Total 30 20 52 131 20 27 40 112 60 9 521	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 12.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 6.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 100.0 0.0001	Int M-H % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% C1 Year 0.84 (0.63, 1.12) 2000 0.14 (0.02, 1.06) 2001 0.31 (0.12, 0.78) 2008 0.41 (0.28, 0.61) 2016 0.92 (0.78, 1.09) 2016 0.75 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.57 (0.47, 0.70) 2020 0.57 (0.47, 0.70) 2022 0.59 (0.45, 0.76) 9%	M.H, Random, 95% Cl	
Study or Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 1: Cremon 2018 0 Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 Martoni 2020 1: UI-Haq 2022 Jung 2022 Total (95% CI) Total events 2: Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 0.10; Test for overall effect: Z = 4.1	15 fortal 21 30 1 20 4 20 18 53 50 260 12 20 10 28 7 40 55 113 6 60 0 18 642 642 84 Chi² = 36. 20 (P < 0.0)	Events 25 7 13 43 82 16 17 12 95 16 5 16 5 35 16 5 71, df = 1 0001)	Total 30 20 52 131 20 27 40 112 60 9 521 10 (P <	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 12.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 6.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 100.0 0.0001	Int M-H % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 (0.63, 1.12) 2000 0.14 (0.02, 1.06) 2001 0.31 (0.12, 0.78) 2008 0.41 (0.28, 0.61) 2016 0.92 (0.78, 1.09) 2016 0.92 (0.78, 1.09) 2016 0.57 (0.49, 1.14) 2018 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.47, 0.70) 2022 0.58 (0.16, 0.89) 2022 0.59 (0.45, 0.76) 36 % 36	M-H, Random, 95% CI	
Study of Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 11 Cremon 2018 0h Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 Martoni 2020 10 Ul-Haq 2022 Jung 2022 Jung 2022 Total (95% CI) Total events 2 Heterogeneity, Tau ² = 0.10; Test for overall effect Z = 4.1 Risk of bias legend	15 fortal 21 30 1 20 4 20 18 53 50 260 12 20 12 20 10 28 7 40 55 113 6 60 0 18 642 642 64 Chi² = 36. 12<(P < 0.0	Events 25 7 13 43 82 16 17 12 955 16 5 16 5 331 71, df = 1 0001)	Total 30 20 52 1311 20 27 40 112 60 9 521 10 (P <	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 12.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 6.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 100.0 0.0001	Int M-H % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 (0.63, 1.12) 2000 0.14 (0.02, 1.06) 2001 0.31 (0.12, 0.78) 2008 0.41 (0.28, 0.61) 2016 0.92 (0.78, 1.09) 2016 0.92 (0.78, 1.09) 2016 0.75 (0.49, 1.14) 2018 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.47, 0.70) 2020 0.57 (0.47, 0.70) 2022 0.05 (0.00, 0.78) 2022 0.05 (0.00, 0.78) 2022 0.59 (0.45, 0.76) %	M-H, Random, 95% CI	
Study of Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Mezzasalma 2016 1: Cremon 2018 0h Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 Martoni 2020 UI-Haq 2022 Jung 2022 Total (95% CI) Total events 2 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.10, Test for overall effect Z = 4.1 Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment	15 Iortal 21 30 1 20 4 20 18 53 50 260 12 20 10 28 7 40 55 113 6 60 0 18 642 642 84 Chi² = 36. 02 (P < 0.0	Events 25 7 133 43 82 16 17 12 95 16 5 16 5 331 71, df = 1 0001) election I bias)	Total 30 20 52 131 20 27 40 112 60 9 521 10 (P < 1) 521 10 (P < 1)	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 12.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 6.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 100.0	Int M-H % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 [0.63, 1.12] 2000 0.14 [0.02, 1.06] 2001 0.31 [0.12, 0.78] 2008 0.41 [0.28, 0.61] 2016 0.42 [0.78, 1.09] 2016 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 2020 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.16, 0.88] 2022 0.57 [0.32, 1.04] 2018 0.57 [0.49, 1.14] 2020 0.57 [0.47, 0.70] 2020 0.58 [0.16, 0.88] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 36 % 36	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Study of Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 11 Cremon 2018 11 Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 Martoni 2020 UI-Haq 2022 Jung 2022 Total (95% Cl) Total events 2 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.10, Test for overall effect: Z = 4.1 Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Binding of participants a	Ist Iortal 21 30 1 20 4 20 18 53 50 260 12 20 12 20 10 28 6 60 0 18 65 113 6 60 0 18 662 34 chi² = 36. 32 (P < 0.0	Events 25 7 13 43 82 16 17 12 95 16 5 3311 71, df = 1 0001) election I bias) nnel (pei	Total 30 20 20 52 131 20 131 20 132 60 9 521 10 (P <	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 12.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 6.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 100.0 0.0001 	Int M-H % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 [0.63, 1.12] 2000 0.14 [0.02, 1.06] 2001 0.31 [0.12, 0.78] 2008 0.41 [0.28, 0.61] 2016 0.42 [0.78, 1.09] 2016 0.57 [0.49, 1.14] 2019 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 2020 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.16, 0.88] 2022 0.59 [0.47, 0.70] 2020 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 36 % 36	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Study of Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 11 Cremon 2018 0h 2019 Sadrin 2020 11 UH Hag 2022 11 Jung 2022 Total (95% Cl) Total events 2 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.10; Test for overall effect: Z = 4.1 Risk of blas legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants a (D) Blinding of participants (D) Blinding of outcome adat	Ist I ontain 21 300 1 20 4 20 18 533 550 2600 10 28 7 40 0 18 662 60 34 662 34 612 = 36. 2012 = 36. 22 (P < 0.0	Events 25 7 13 43 82 166 17 12 95 16 5 3311 71, df = 1 0001) election I bias) nnel (per (detection bias)	Total 30 200 21 22 131 20 22 131 20 21 40 112 60 9 521 10 (P < 1)	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 12.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 6.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 100.0 0.0001	Int M-H % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 [0.63, 1.12] 2000 0.14 [0.02, 1.06] 2001 0.31 [0.12, 0.78] 2008 0.41 [0.28, 0.61] 2016 0.92 [0.78, 1.09] 2016 0.57 [0.49, 1.14] 2018 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 2020 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 2020 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 2022 0.57 [0.47, 0.70] 2022 0.59 [0.47, 0.70] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 302	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Study or Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 11 Cremon 2018 0h Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 UH Hag 2022 Jung 2022 Jung 2022 Total (95% Cl) Total events 2 Heterogeneity, Tau" = 0.10; Test for overall effect. Z = 4.1 Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants s (D) Blinding of participants s (E) Incomplete outcome dat (F) Selective reporting (repo	Ist I ortain 21 300 1 200 4 20 18 533 50 2600 12 20 12 20 12 20 10 28 7 40 0 18 662 60 0 18 642 642 84 Chi² = 36. Chi² = 36. 22 (P < 0.0	Events 25 7 13 43 82 16 17 12 955 16 5 331 71, df = 1 0001) election I bias) nnel (per (detectio bias)	Total 30 20 20 20 131 20 131 20 131 20 131 20 131 20 131 20 131 20 112 60 9 9 521 100 (P < 1	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 12.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 6.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 100.0 0.0001	<u>Int M.H</u> % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 [0.63, 1.12] 2000 0.14 [0.02, 1.06] 2001 0.31 [0.12, 0.78] 2008 0.41 [0.28, 0.61] 2016 0.42 [0.78, 1.09] 2016 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 2020 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 2020 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 2020 0.57 [0.32, 0.03] 2022 0.56 [0.00, 0.78] 2022 0.57 [0.47, 0.70] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] %	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Study of Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 Lyra 2016 11 Cremon 2018 Oh Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 UH Hag 2022 Jung 2022 Total (95% CI) Total events Test for overall effect. Z = 4.1 Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants a (D) Blinding of outcome ass (F) Selective reporting (repo (G) Other bias	Ist initial 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 50 260 260 12 20 10 28 6 60 0 18 34 662 34 602 CPI ² = 36. 302 02 CP < 0.0	Events 265 7 13 43 82 16 17 7 12 25 16 5 16 5 16 5 16 5 16 5 16 10001) 29 5 9 10001) 29 5 9 10001 20 5 20 5	Total 30 20 20 20 131 522 131 100 9 521 000 9 521 00 100 P bias)	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 12.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 6.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 100.0 0.0001	Int M.H % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 (0.63, 1.12) 2000 0.14 (0.02, 1.06) 2001 0.31 (0.12, 0.78) 2008 0.41 (0.28, 0.61) 2016 0.42 (0.78, 1.09) 2016 0.42 (0.78, 1.09) 2016 0.52 (0.78, 1.09) 2016 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.32, 0.03) 2022 0.56 (0.00, 0.78) 2022 0.57 [0.47, 0.70] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] %	M-H, Random, 95% CI	
Study of Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 1. Cremon 2018 Sadrin 2020 Martoni 2020 UL-Haq 2022 Jung 2022 Total (95% CI) Total events 2 Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 0.10; Test for overall effect Z = 4.1 <u>Risk of bias legend</u> (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants : (D) Blinding of outcome ass (E) Incomplete outcome dat (F) Selective reporting (repo (G) Other bias	Ist initial 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 50 260 260 12 20 10 28 6 60 0 18 6 60 0 18 6 60 0 18 6 60 0 18 6 60 0 18 6 60 0 18 6 60 0 18 602 (P < 0.0	Events 255 7 13 43 82 16 17 7 12 95 16 16 5 331 771, df = 1 bias) 771, df = 1 bias) honel (per (detection 1) bias)	Total 300 20 20 20 21 20 22 131 20 27 40 112 60 9 521 100 (P <)	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 12.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 100.0 0.0001 100.0	Int M.H % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 (0.63, 1.12) 2000 0.14 (0.02, 1.06) 2001 0.31 (0.12, 0.78) 2008 0.41 (0.28, 0.61) 2016 0.42 (0.78, 1.09) 2016 0.42 (0.78, 1.09) 2016 0.45 (0.49, 1.14) 2018 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2022 0.56 (0.00, 0.78) 2022 0.59 (0.45, 0.76) %	M.H, Random, 95% CI	A B C D E F G •
Study of Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Mezzasalma 2016 1////////////////////////////////////	Its Iortail 21 300 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 10 28 7 40 55 113 6 60 0 18 65 133 6 60 0 18 62 34 Chi² = 36. 32 (P < 0.0	Events 255 7 13 43 43 82 16 17 12 95 166 5 3311 71, df = 1 10001) election 1 election nnel (per detection bias) nnel (per detection bias) itics Total E 25 25	Total 300 20 20 20 20 20 120 20 131 20 201 21 202 131 202 27 400 9 521 112 60 9 521 00 (P < 1)	Weig 14.4 15.5 12.4 12.4 12.4 12.0 9.4 6.4 15.7 9.9 0.8 100.0 0.0001 0.00001 0.00001 10.00000 10.00000 10.00000 10.00000 10.00000 10.00000 10.00000 10.00000 10.00000 10.00000 10.00000 10.00000000 10.0000000000	Int M.H % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% C1 Year 0.84 (0.63, 1.12) 2000 0.14 (0.02, 1.06) 2001 0.31 (0.12, 0.78) 2008 0.41 (0.28, 0.61) 2016 0.41 (0.28, 0.61) 2016 0.42 (0.78, 1.09) 2016 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.57 (0.47, 0.70) 2020 0.57 (0.47, 0.70) 2022 0.59 (0.45, 0.376) % % %	M-H, Random, 95% CI	A B C D E F G $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Study of Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Mezzasalma 2016 11 Cremon 2018 Oh Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 Martoni 2020 Martoni 2020 Ul-Haq 2022 Jung 2022 Total events 2 Heterogeneity, Tau ² = 0.10; Test for overall effect Z = 4.1 Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants : (D) Blinding of outcome ass (E) Incomplete outcome dat (F) Selective reporting (repoint) (G) Other bias C Study or Subgroup Kabir 2011 Choi 2011	Ist initial 1 21 300 1 20 1 200 1 20 1 200 1 20 20 1 200 16 53 50 260 10 28 7 40 55 113 6 60 0 18 53 163 662 34 Chi² = 36. 22 (P < 0.0	Events 255 7 13 43 82 16 17 12 955 16 5 10001) 10001) 10001) election II blas) 1 ibias) 1 1 10001 1 1 1 10001 1 1 1 1 10001 1 1 1 1 1 10001 1	Total 300 20 20 20 131 20 141 20 152 112 60 9 521 112 10 (P < 1)	Weig 14.4 15.5 12.4 12.4 12.4 12.0 9.4 6.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 100.0 0.00001 0.00000 0.000000 0.0000000000	Int <u>M.H</u> % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 [0.63, 1.12] 2000 0.14 [0.02, 1.06] 2001 0.31 [0.12, 0.78] 2008 0.41 [0.28, 0.61] 2016 0.42 [0.78, 1.09] 2016 0.45 [0.26, 1.31] 2019 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 2020 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 9%	M-H, Random, 95% CI	A B C D E F G
Study of Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Mezzasalma 2016 11 Cremon 2018 Oh Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 Martoni 2020 Martoni 2020 Jung 2022 Jung 2022 Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI) Total events Peterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.10, Test for overall effect: Z = 4.1 Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment: (C) Bilinding of participants : (B) Bilinding of outcome ads (C) Other bias C Study or Subgroup Kabir 2011 Chabas 2014 Pinoton (Champheue 2015 Chabas 2014	ts iordai 1 21 300 1 200 1 200 1 200 1 200 1 200 1 200 1 200 1 200 1 6 53 50 260 1 2 200 1 2 200 1 2 60 1 2 200 1 2 60 1 2 60 6 60 0 18 6 60 0 0 18 6 60 0 0 18 6 60 0 0 18 6 60 6 60 0 0 18 6 60 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7	Events 265 7 133 82 166 5 167 5 165 5 166 5 166 5 166 5 166 5 166 5 166 5 166 5 166 5 166 5 166 5 166 5 166 177 122 195 166 167 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 10	Total 300 20 20 20 522 131 200 122 60 112 60 9 521 10 (P < 1)	Weig 14.4 15.7 14.4 15.7 12.0 9.4 12.0 9.4 14.6 12.0 9.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 100.0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Int M.H % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 [0.63, 1.12] 2000 0.14 [0.02, 1.06] 2001 0.31 [0.12, 0.78] 2008 0.41 [0.28, 0.61] 2016 0.42 [0.78, 1.09] 2016 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 2020 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.46, 0.38] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.70] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 36 % 36	M.H, Random, 95% Cl	A B C D E F G •
Study of Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 11 Cremon 2018 0h Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 Martoni 2020 0h Martoni 2020 10 Total events 2 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.10, Test for overall effect. Z = 4.1 Risk of blas legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment: (C) Blinding of participants a: (C) Blinding of participants (repo (G) Other blas C Study or Subgroup Kabir 2011 Kabir 2011 Abbas 2014 Pineton de Chambrun 2015 Spiller 2016	Ist initial 1 21 300 1 200 1 200 1 200 1 200 18 533 500 260 12 200 100 28 7 40 55 1133 6 600 0 18 662 84 662 84 Chi² = 36. 32 chaid perso essament a (attrition ind perso) essament a (attrition ind set) revents 18 300 23 46 32 46 135	Events 265 2 7 3 3 43 82 16 6 3 16 5 5 3311 71, df = 1 10001) election 1 election 1 bias) 1 35 45 37 100 37 102 192	Total 300 20 20 20 131 20 131 20 131 20 27 40 9 9 521 521 bias) forman rforman n bias) 10 Contraction 31 16 56 5140 140	Weig 14.4 15.7 14.4 15.7 12.0 9.4 14.6 12.0 9.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 100.0 0.0001 107 107 107 107 107 107 107	Int M.H % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 [0.63, 1.12] 2000 0.14 [0.02, 1.06] 2001 0.31 [0.12, 0.78] 2008 0.41 [0.28, 0.61] 2016 0.42 [0.78, 1.09] 2016 0.45 [0.26, 1.33] 2020 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.70] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 36 % 36 1.64 [0.91, 2.44] 20 0.76 [0.82, 2.11] 2019 0.57 [0.32, 1.34] 20 0.57 [0.47, 0.70] 2022 0.56 [0.00, 0.78] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 36 % 36 1.64 [0.91, 2.44] 20 0.76 [0.88, 2.11] 20 0.82 [0.62, 1.08] 20 0.82 [0.63, 0.61] 20 0.84 [0.83, 0.61] 20 0.84 [0.83, 0.61] 20	M-H, Random, 95% CI	A B C D E F G
Study or Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 11 Cremon 2018 11 Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 Martoni 2020 11 Oth 2019 Sadrin 2020 Jung 2022 Total events Total events 22 Heterogeneity: Tau*= 0.10, Test for overall effect: Z = 4.1 Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment: (C) Blinding of participants a: (B) Bliocation concealment: (C) Blinding of participants a: (C) Blinding of participants a: (D) Blinding of outcome assats (F) Selective reporting (reporting (reporting) (For 2011 Kabir 2011 Choi 2011 Abbas 2014 Pineton de Chambrun 2015 Spiller 2016 AJ-assim 2019 Hele 2016 AJ-assim 2019	Ist initial 1 21 300 1 200 1 200 1 200 1 200 18 533 500 2600 12 200 100 28 6 600 0 18 6 600 0 18 6 600 0 18 6 600 0 18 6 600 0 18 6 600 10 28 Chi² = 36. 302 (P < 0.00	Events 255 7 7 33 82 16 6 7 12 95 5 3311 71, df = 1 10001) election 1 election 1 blas) incs Total E 35 45 37 100 192 15 192 15	Total 300 20 201 20 131 20 131 20 131 20 100 (P 9 521 521 bias) forman rforman n 101 (P 1 11 1 56 56 5140 140 15 56 5140 140	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 12.0 9.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 10.0 12.0 0.9 12.0 0.9 12.0 0.9 12.0 0.9 12.0 0.9 12.0 0.9 12.0 0.9 12.0 0.9 12.0 0.9 12.0 0.9 12.0 0.9 12.0 0.9 12.0 0.9 12.0 0.9 12.0 0.9 12.0 0.9 12.0 0.9 12.0 0.9 10.0	Int M.H % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 (0.63, 1.12) 2000 0.14 (0.02, 1.06) 2001 0.31 (0.12, 1.06) 2008 0.41 (0.28, 0.61) 2016 0.92 (0.78, 1.09) 2016 0.75 (0.49, 1.14) 2018 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2022 0.56 (0.00, 0.78) 2022 0.57 (0.43, 1.04) 2022 0.57 (0.43, 1.14) 2022 0.57 (0.47, 0.70) 2022 0.57 (0.47, 0.70) 2022 0.59 (0.45, 0.76) 2022 0.59 (0.45, 0.76) 2022 0.59 (0.45, 0.76) 30 % 1.56 (0.81, 2.11) 20 0.36 (0.88, 2.11) 20 0.97 (0.73, 1.29) 20 1.36 (0.88, 1.21) 20 0.94 (0.83, 1.06) 20 0.94 (0.83, 1.06) 20 0.92 (0.27, 0.27) 0.92 (0.27)	M-H, Random, 95% Cl H-H, Random, 95% Cl	A B C D E F G $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet $
Study or Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 Lyra 2016 11 Cremon 2018 Oh Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 UH 4ag 2022 Jung 2022 Jung 2022 Total (95% Cl) Total events 2 Heterogeneity, Tau" = 0.10; Test for overall effect: Z = 4.1 Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants : (D) Blinding of participants : (D) Blinding of subgroup Kabir 2011 Chiective reporting (repo (G) Other bias C Study or Subgroup Kabir 2011 Chiector 2014 Pineton de Chambrun 2015 Spiller 2016 AJ-Jassim 2019 Helo 2019 Gavathri 2020	Ist Initial 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 10 28 6 60 0 18 6 60 0 18 6 60 0 18 662 64 02 (P < 0.0	Events 255 7 7 33 43 82 16 17 12 95 5 311 71 10001) 95 96 16 5 16 5 16 5 16 5 16 5 16 5 16 5 16 5 10001) ics 35 45 37 100 192 15 177 17 52	Total 300 20 20 20 20 20 20 521 00 (P <)	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 12.0 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 15.7 5.9 10.0	Int M.H % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 (0.63, 1.12) 2000 0.14 (0.02, 1.06) 2001 0.31 (0.12, 0.76) 2008 0.41 (0.28, 0.61) 2016 0.41 (0.28, 0.61) 2016 0.42 (0.78, 1.09) 2016 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.32, 0.89) 2022 0.50 (0.04, 0.76) 2022 0.50 (0.04, 0.76) 2022 0.50 (0.04, 0.76) 2022 0.59 (0.45, 0.76) Ye % 1.64 (0.91, 2.94) 20 0.97 (0.73, 1.29) 20 1.56 (0.82, 1.12) 20 0.97 (0.73, 1.29) 20 1.86 (0.82, 1.11) 2019 0.97 (0.73, 1.29) 20 1.68 (0.82, 1.11) 20 0.97 (0.73, 1.29) 20 1.80 (0.82, 1.10) 20 0.91 (0.83, 1.06) 20 0.92 (0.82, 1.06) 20 <td>M-H, Random, 95% CI</td> <td>A B C D E F G</td>	M-H, Random, 95% CI	A B C D E F G
Study or Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 Lyra 2016 1 Cremon 2018 0 Oh 2019 Sadin 2020 Martoni 2020 1 UL-Haq 2022 Jung 2022 Total events 2 Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 0.10; Test for overall effect Z = 4.1 Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants : (D) Blinding of outcome ass (E) Incomplete outcome dat (F) Selective reporting (repo (G) Other bias C Study or Subgroup Kabir 2011 Abas 2014 Pineton de Chambrun 2015 Spiller 2016 AJ-Jassim 2019 Helo 2019 Gayathri 2020 Mourey 2022	Ist Iortail 21 300 1 20 4 20 18 53 50 260 10 28 7 40 55 113 6 60 0 18 642 642 84 662 84 662 84 662 84 662 84 662 84 662 84 662 84 662 84 662 84 662 84 30 23 30 23 46 33 46 135 4 4 4 11 129	Events 255 7 13 43 82 16 6 7 12 95 6 6 3131 71, df = 1 1 10001) election I bias) 10 10 ics 35 37 100 192 15 177 22 30	Total 300 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 212 131 20 112 20 521 10 (P < 1)	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 15.7 5.9 10.0	Int M.H % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 (0.63, 1.12) 2000 0.14 (0.02, 1.06) 2001 0.31 (0.12, 0.78) 2008 0.41 (0.28, 0.61) 2016 0.42 (0.78, 1.09) 2016 0.52 (0.78, 1.09) 2016 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2022 0.57 (0.32, 0.03) 2022 0.56 (0.00, 0.78) 2022 0.57 (0.47, 0.70) 2022 0.59 (0.45, 0.76) % MH-H, Random, 95% CI Ye 1.64 (0.91, 2.94) 20 0.97 (0.73, 1.29) 20 1.36 (0.88, 2.111) 20 0.82 (0.62, 1.08) 20 0.82 (0.62, 1.08) 20 0.92 (0.62, 1.08) 20 0.92 (0.61, 0.64) 20 0.93 (0.13, 0.64) 20 0.93 (0.20, 0.62) 20	M.H, Random, 95% Cl H.H, Rand	A B C D E F G
Study of Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Mezzasalma 2016 1////////////////////////////////////	Its Iortail 21 300 1 200 1 200 18 533 50 260 10 28 7 40 55 113 6 60 0 18 65 133 6 60 0 18 642 34 Chi² = 36. 22 (P < 0.0	Events 255 7 133 43 82 16 17 12 95 16 5 16 5 16 5 16 16 5 16 16 5 16 16 17 12 95 16 16 16 17 1001) blas) Intel (detection l) blas) Intel (detection l) blas) Intel (detection l) 100 117 100 100 100 100 100 100	Total 300 20 20 20 20 52 131 20 20 521 112 60 9 521 10 (P <)	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 0.9 4.4 1.5 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0	Int M.H % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 [0.63, 1.12] 2000 0.14 [0.02, 1.06] 2001 0.31 [0.12, 0.78] 2008 0.41 [0.28, 0.61] 2016 0.47 [0.28, 0.61] 2016 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 2020 0.57 [0.32, 1.07] 2019 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 30 %	M.H, Random, 95% CI	A B C D E F G
Study of Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Mezzasalma 2016 1////////////////////////////////////	Its Iortail 21 300 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 10 28 7 40 55 113 6 60 0 18 642 34 Chi³ = 36. 22 (P < 0.0	Events 265 7 13 43 82 16 5 17 12 95 16 5 16 5 16 5 16 5 16 5 16 5 16 5 1	Total 300 20 20 20 20 52 131 20 20 60 9 521 10 (P <)	Weig 14.4 15.5 5.4 12.4 12.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 15.5 12.0 9.4 15.5 10.0	Int M.H % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 [0.63, 1.12] 2000 0.14 [0.02, 1.06] 2001 0.31 [0.12, 0.78] 2008 0.41 [0.28, 0.61] 2016 0.42 [0.78, 1.09] 2016 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 2020 0.57 [0.32, 1.07] 2019 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 30 % 4.11 M.H. Random, 95% CI Ye 1.64 [0.91, 2.94] 20 0.97 [0.73, 1.29] 20 0.97 [0.73, 1.29] 20 0.92 [0.73, 1.29] 20 0.92 [0.73, 1.29] 20 0.94 [0.83, 1.06] 20 0.94 [0.83, 1.06] 20 0.95 [0.24, 0.82] 20 0.95 [0.24, 0.82] 20 0.97 [0.26, 0.48] 20 0.97 [0.26, 0.48] 20 0.97 [0.26, 0.48] 20 0.97 [0.26, 0.48] 20 0.97 [0.26, 0.48]	M.H, Random, 95% CI	A B C D E F G
Study or Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Mezzasalma 2016 11 Cremon 2018 Oh Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 Martoni 2020 Ul-Haq 2022 Jung 2022 Total (95% CI) Total events 2 Heterogeneily, Tau ² = 0.10, Test for overall effect Z = 4.1 Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment: (C) Blinding of participants : (B) Blinding of outcome ads (C) Other bias C Study or Subgroup Kabir 2011 Abas 2014 Pineton de Chambrun 2015 Spiller 2016 AJ-assim 2019 Helz 0201 Abas 2014 Pineton de Chambrun 2015 Spiller 2016 AJ-assim 2019 Gayathri 2020 Mourey 2022 Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.14; C	Ist Iortan 1300 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 20 260 10 28 7 40 55 113 6 60 0 18 53 55 55 113 6 60 0 18 53 23 6 60 0 18 61 32 (P < 0.0	Events 256 7 133 82 166 5 16 5 16 5 16 5 16 5 16 5 16 5 16	Total 300 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 21 20 21 20 112 20 521 10 (P <	Weig 14.4 14.4 1.5 5.4 1.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 6.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 100.0 0.00001 0.0000 0.00001 0.00001 0.0000 0.00001 0.00001 0.00001 0.00001 0.00000 0.00001 0.00000 0.00000000 0.00000000 0.00000000	Int M.H % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 [0.63, 1.12] 2000 0.14 [0.02, 1.06] 2001 0.31 [0.12, 0.78] 2008 0.41 [0.28, 0.61] 2016 0.42 [0.78, 1.09] 2016 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 2020 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.16, 0.38] 2022 0.57 [0.47, 0.70] 2020 0.57 [0.47, 0.70] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 36 % 36 M-H, Random, 95% CI Ye 1.64 [0.91, 2.94] 20 0.97 [0.73, 1.29] 20 0.92 [0.62, 1.08] 20 0.92 [0.62, 1.08] 20 0.92 [0.62, 1.08] 20 0.94 [0.83, 0.66] 20 0.93 [0.72, 0.48] 20 0.35 [0.20, 0.62] 20 0.35 [0.20, 0.62] 20 0.35 [0.20, 0.62] 20 0.35 [0.27, 0	M.H, Random, 95% Cl	
Study or Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2018 Lyra 2018 1 Cremon 2018 1 Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 Martoni 2020 1 Martoni 2020 1 Total events 2 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.10, Test for overall effect Z = 4.1 Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants a (D) Blinding of participants a (D) Blinding of outcome ads (F) Selective reporting (repo (G) Other bias C Study or Subgroup Kabir 2011 Abbas 2014 Pineton de Chambrun 2015 Spiller 2016 AJassim 2019 Helo 2019 Gayathri 2020 Mourey 2022 Total events Heterogeneiky: Tau ² = 0.14; C Test for overall effect Z = 2.00	ts Iortail 1300 1 21 300 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 10 2 20 10 28 7 40 55 113 6 60 0 18 84 662 84 612 Chi ² = 36. 32 (P < 0.01)	Events 256 7 133 43 82 166 5 167 17 12 95 166 5 166 5 166 5 166 5 166 5 166 5 166 5 166 5 166 5 166 5 166 5 166 5 166 177 122 95 166 5 166 5 166 177 122 95 166 5 166 5 166 177 122 95 166 5 166 177 122 95 166 5 166 177 122 95 166 167 166 177 122 95 166 167 171 122 95 166 167 171 122 195 166 167 171 122 195 166 177 122 195 166 177 122 195 166 177 122 195 166 167 171 122 195 166 167 171 122 195 166 167 171 122 195 166 167 171 172 167 171 172 172 172 172 172 172 17	Total 300 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 21 20 21 20 21 20 21 20 21 20 20 20 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 22 23 24 25 25 25 25	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 1.5 5.4 1.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 6.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 100.0 0.00001 0.000001 0.00000 0.00001 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.000000 0.000000 0.000000 0.000000 0.000000 0.00000000	Int M.H % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 [0.63, 1.12] 2000 0.14 [0.02, 1.06] 2001 0.31 [0.12, 0.78] 2008 0.41 [0.28, 0.61] 2016 0.42 [0.78, 1.09] 2016 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 2020 0.59 [0.47, 0.70] 2022 0.50 [0.47, 0.70] 2022 0.50 [0.45, 0.76] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 202 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 202 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 202 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 202 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 20 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 20 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 20 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 20 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 20 0	M.H, Random, 95% CI	A B C D E F G
Study or Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 11 Cremon 2018 11 Charlon 2020 Martoni 2020 Martoni 2020 11 Martoni 2020 11 Total events 2 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.10, Test for overall effect: Z = 4.1 Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants a (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants a (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants a (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of Datticipants a (C) Study or Subgroup Kabir 2011 Kabir 2011 Abbas 2014 Pineton de Chambrun 2015 Spiller 2016 AJassim 2019 Helo 2019 Gayathri 2020 Mourey 2022 Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.14; C Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.14; C Test for overall effect: Z = 2.01	Ist initial 1300 1 21 300 1 20 18 50 260 12 200 10 28 7 40 55 113 6 60 0 18 534 Chi*= 36. 202 (P < 0.02	Events 25 27 7 33 32 16 7 17 12 95 5 3311 71, df = 1 10001) 0 election 1 0 ics Total E 35 45 37 100 192 230 883 , df = 8 (f , df = 8 (f)	Total 300 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 21 21 20 21 20 20 20 20 2131 20	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 1.5 5.4 12.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 6.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 100.0 0.00001 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.000000 0.000000 0.000000 0.000000 0.000000 0.00000000	Int M.H % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 [0.63, 1.12] 2000 0.14 [0.02, 1.06] 2001 0.31 [0.12, 0.78] 2008 0.41 [0.28, 0.61] 2016 0.92 [0.78, 1.09] 2016 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 2018 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 2020 0.59 [0.45, 0.70] 2022 0.50 [0.00, 0.78] 2022 0.50 [0.00, 0.78] 2022 0.50 [0.04, 0.70] 2022 0.50 [0.04, 0.76] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] Year 1.64 [0.91, 2.94] 20 0.97 [0.73, 1.29] 20 1.36 [0.88, 2.11] 20 0.97 [0.73, 1.28] 20 0.97 [0.38, 1.06] 20 0.92 [0.62, 1.08] 20 0.94 [0.83, 1.06] 20 0.95 [0.20, 6.82] 20 0.95 [0.20, 6.82] 20 0.93 [0.72, 0.97] 20 0.75 [0.57, 0.99] 40	M-H, Random, 95% CI	A B C D E F G $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet $
Study or Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 11 Cremon 2018 Oh Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 Martoni 2020 UH Hag 2022 Jung 2022 Total (95% Cl) Total events 22 Heterogeneily, Tau" = 0.10, Test for overall effect: Z = 4.1 Risk of blas legend (A) Random sequence gene (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants : (C) Blinding of participants : (D) Blinding of outcome adat (F) Selective reporting (repo (G) Other blas C Study or Subgroup Kabir 2011 Ablas 2014 Pineton de Chambrun 2015 Spiller 2016 Al-Jassim 2019 Helo 2019 Gayathri 2020 Mourey 2022 Total (95% Cl) Total (95% Cl) Total events Helerogeneily: Tau" = 0.14; C Test for overall effect: Z = 2.06 Risk of blas legend (A) Random sequence geneil(B) Allocation concealment (B)	Ist Initial 1300 1 21 300 1 201 1 201 1 201 18 350 260 12 201 10 28 662 84 Chi² = 36. 202 (P < 0.0	Events 255 7 13 34 382 16 6 171 12 95 5 16 5 16 5 16 1001) 0 0 0 0 election Innel (per (detection bias)) 0 0 0 0 ics Total E 5 37 100 15 15 15 177 52 230 883 , df = 8 (f 0	Total 300 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 21 20 20 21 20 21 20 21 20 21 20 21 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 152 573 20 573 20 573 20 5573	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 0.9 4 6.4 1.5 7.5 9 0.8 100.0 0.00011 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.0000000 0.000000 0.000000 0.000000 0.00000000	Int M.H % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 (0.63, 1.12) 2000 0.14 (0.02, 1.06) 2001 0.31 (0.12, 1.06) 2008 0.41 (0.28, 0.61) 2016 0.75 (0.49, 1.14) 2018 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.59 (0.45, 0.76] 2022 0.05 (0.00, 0.78) 2022 0.05 (0.00, 0.78) 2022 0.59 (0.45, 0.76] 308 % 1.64 (0.91, 2.94) 20 0.97 (0.73, 1.01) 2019 0.97 (0.73, 1.01) 2019 0.97 (0.73, 1.01) 2019 0.97 (0.73, 1.01) 2022 0.97 (0.73, 1.01) 2019 0.97 (0.73, 1.01) 2019 0.97 (0.73, 1.06) 20 0.92 (0.62, 1.08) 20 0.92 (0.62, 1.08) 20 0.93 (0.72, 0.97) 20 0.94 (0.83, 1.06) 20 0.95 (0.20, 6.22) 20	M.H, Random, 95% CI	A B C D E F G
Study or Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 Lyra 2016 1 Cremon 2018 Oh Oh 2019 Sadin 2020 Martoni 2020 ULHaq 2022 Jung 2022 Total events 2 Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 0.10; Test for overall effect Z = 4.1 Risk of bias leggend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants as (D) Blinding of outcome ass (E) Incomplete outcome dat (F) Selective reporting (repo (G) Other bias C Study or Subgroup Kabir 2011 Abas 2014 Pineton de Chambrun 2015 Spiller 2016 AJ-Jassim 2019 Helo 2019 Gayathri 2020 Mourey 2022 Total events 14erogeneity; Tau ² = 0.14; C Test for overall effect Z = 2.06 Risk of bias leggend (A) Random sequence geneme (B) Allocation concealament (B) Allocation concealament (C) Binding of participants ar	Its Iortail 1300 1 20 14 20 18 53 18 53 50 260 10 28 7 40 55 113 6 60 0 18 53 50 55 113 6 600 0 18 50 260 55 113 6 600 0 18 662 34 Chi² = 36.02 (P < 0.02	Events 255 7 133 82 166 5 171 12 95 5 166 5 3311 71, df = 1 10001) election 1 blas) 1001 101 102 105 105 105 105 105 105 105 105	Total 300 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 212 60 9 521 10 (P < 1	Weig 14.4 1.5 5.4 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 0.9 4 6.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 100.0 0.0001 0.0001 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.000000 0.00000000	Int M.H % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 (0.63, 1.12) 2000 0.14 (0.02, 1.06) 2001 0.31 (0.12, 0.76) 2008 0.41 (0.28, 0.61) 2016 0.41 (0.28, 0.61) 2016 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) 2019 0.58 (0.26, 1.33) 2020 0.57 (0.47, 0.70) 2022 0.56 (0.00, 0.78) 2022 0.59 (0.45, 0.76) % M:H, Random, 95% CI Ye 1.64 (0.91, 2.94) 20 0.97 (0.73, 1.29) 20 1.36 (0.82, 1.11) 20 0.82 (0.62, 1.08) 20 0.82 (0.62, 1.08) 20 0.97 (0.73, 1.29) 20 1.84 (0.91, 2.94) 20 0.97 (0.20, 6.62) 20 0.82 (0.62, 1.08) 20 0.75 (0.57, 0.99] 0.75 (0.57, 0.99] </td <td>M-H, Random, 95% CI</td> <td>A B C D E F G $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet$</td>	M-H, Random, 95% CI	A B C D E F G $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet \bullet$ $\bullet \bullet $
Study or Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 Lyra 2016 1 Cremon 2018 Oh Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 Martoni 2020 Jung 2022 Ut-Haq 2022 Jung 2022 Total events 2 Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 0.10; Test for overall effect Z = 4.1 Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants as (D) Blinding of outcome ass (E) Incomplete outcome dat (F) Selective reporting (repoid) (G) Other bias C Study or Subgroup Kabir 2011 Abbas 2014 Pineton de Chambrun 2015 Spiller 2016 ArJassim 2019 Helo 2019 Gayathri 2020 Mourey 2022 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 0.14; C Test for overall effect Z = 2.00 Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence genene (B) Allocation concealment (S) (C) Blinding of participa	Its Iortail 21 300 1 200 1 200 1 200 1 200 1 200 16 53 50 260 10 28 7 40 55 113 6 600 0 18 84 662 84 50 Chi² = 36. 12<(P < 0.0	Events 256 7 133 43 82 16 17 12 25 16 5 18 17 12 25 16 5 18 17 12 25 16 5 18 17 10001) election I bias) 10001) election I bias) 10001) election I bias) 1000 100 100 100 100 100 100 1	Total 300 20 20 20 20 20 20 21 20 11 20 112 60 9 521 112 60 9 521 10 10 (P <)	Weig 14.4 14.4 15.7 5.4 12.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 100.0 0.0001 15.7 10.0 0.0001 10.0 0.0001 10.0	Int M.H % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 [0.63, 1.12] 2000 0.14 [0.02, 1.06] 2001 0.31 [0.12, 0.78] 2008 0.41 [0.28, 0.61] 2016 0.47 [0.28, 0.61] 2016 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.26, 1.33] 2020 0.57 [0.37, 0.70] 2022 0.58 [0.16, 0.89] 2022 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 36 % 1.64 [0.31, 2.94] 20 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 36 % 1.64 [0.31, 2.94] 20 0.97 [0.73, 1.29] 20 0.97 [0.73, 1.29] 0.92 [0.13, 0.64] 20 0.97 [0.73, 1.29] 0.92 [0.13, 0.64] 20 0.92 [0.13, 0.64] 0.94 [0.83, 1.06] 20 0.35 [0.20, 0.62] 20 0.94 [0.83, 0.72, 0.97] 20 0.35 [0.20, 0.52] 20 0.55 [0.577, 0.99] 0.75 [0.577, 0.99] 0.75 [0.57, 0.99]	Risk Ratio Risk Ratio AH, Random, 95% CI Favours probiotics Favours control	A B C D E F G
Study of Subgroup Even Nobaek 2000 Niedzielin 2001 Sinn 2008 Mezzasalma 2016 Mezzasalma 2016 Lyra 2016 Lyra 2016 11 Cremon 2018 Oh Oh 2019 Sadrin 2020 Martoni 2020 Martoni 2020 Ul-Haq 2022 Jung 2022 Total events 2 Heterogeneity, Tau² = 0.10; Test for overall effect Z = 4.0 Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment: (C) Blinding of participants a: (B) Allocation concealment: (C) Blinding of outcome ass (G) Other bias C Study or Subgroup Kabr 2011 Abbas 2014 Pineton de Chambrun 2015 Spiller 2016 Al-Jassim 2019 Hele 2019 Gayathri 2020 Mourey 2022 Total events Helerogeneity: Tau² = 0.14; C Test for overall effect: Z = 2.01 Total events	Ist Iortail 1300 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 10 28 7 40 55 113 6 60 0 18 53 16 662 64 60 0 67 60 0 18 684 Chi³ = 36. 22 (P < 0.0	Events 25 7 7 13 3 43 82 16 7 13 82 16 5 33 7 1, df = 1 0001) election I bias 17 10001) election I bias 17 100 1 election I bias 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Total 300 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 21 20 21 20 112 60 9 521 10 (P < 1	Weig 14.4 14.4 15.7 5.4 12.4 12.4 14.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 16.2 12.0 9.4 15.7 5.9 0.8 100.0 0.00001 10.0 0.00001 10.0 10	Int M.H % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %	Random, 95% CI Year 0.84 [0.63, 1.12] 2000 0.14 [0.02, 1.06] 2001 0.31 [0.12, 0.78] 2008 0.41 [0.28, 0.61] 2016 0.92 [0.78, 1.09] 2016 0.75 [0.49, 1.14] 2018 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.16, 0.38] 2022 0.57 [0.32, 1.01] 2019 0.58 [0.16, 0.38] 2022 0.59 [0.47, 0.70] 2020 0.59 [0.45, 0.76] 36 % 36 M-H, Random, 95% CI Ye 1.64 [0.91, 2.94] 20 0.97 [0.73, 1.29] 20 0.92 [0.73, 1.04] 20 0.92 [0.73, 1.04] 20 0.92 [0.24, 0.164] 20 0.92 [0.24, 0.164] 20 0.92 [0.24, 0.164] 20 0.93 [0.72, 0.97] 20 0.83 [0.72, 0.97] 20 0.83 [0.72, 0.97] 20	M.H, Random, 95% CI	

Figure 2. (A) Forest plot of RCTs of combination probiotics vs placebo in IBS: RR of persistence of abdominal pain. (*B*) Forest plot of RCTs of probiotics using *Lacto*bacillus strains vs placebo in IBS: RR of persistence of abdominal pain. (C) Forest plot of RCTs of probiotics using Saccharomyces strains vs placebo in IBS: RR of persistence of abdominal pain.

Table 2. Efficacy of Probiotics in Terms of Persistence of Abdominal Pain in Irritable Bowel Syndro

	Number of trials	Number of patients	RR of persistence of abdominal pain (95% Cl)	P value for the difference	I^2 (P value for $\chi^2)$
All combination probiotics	32	3469	0.72 (0.64–0.82)	<.001	72% (<.001)
VSL#3	4	144	0.87 (0.64–1.18)	.36	19% (.29)
Lactobacillus paracasei ssp paracasei F19, Lactobacillus acidophilus La5, and Bifidobacterium lactis Bb12	3	269	0.97 (0.83–1.14)	.74	0% (.91)
Enterococcus faecalis DSM16440 and Escherichia coli DSM17252	2	686	0.67 (0.37–1.22)	.19	92% (<.001)
Bifidobacterium animalis DN173 010, Streptococcus thermophilus, and Lactobacillus bulgaricus	2	308	0.89 (0.70–1.12)	.32	33% (.22)
LacClean Gold S	2	130	0.76 (0.52-1.10)	.14	0% (.72)
Duolac 7s	2	76	0.55 (0.18–1.65)	.28	73% (.05)
All Lactobacillus strains Lactobacillus plantarum 299V	11 3	1183 220	0.59 (0.45–0.76) 0.45 (0.15–1.35)	<.001 .16	73% (<.001) 78% (.010)
All Saccharomyces strains	9	1744	0.75 (0.57–0.99)	.04	89% (<.001)
Saccharomyces cerevisiae I-3856	5	1482	0.64 (0.45-0.90)	.01	93% (<.001)
Saccharomyces boulardii	3	232	1.21 (0.87–1.67)	.26	44% (.17)
All Bifidobacterium strains	3	389	0.78 (0.64–0.95)	.02	37% (.20)
All Bacillus strains	3	212	0.33 (0.23–0.47)	<.001	10% (.33)
All <i>Blautia</i> strains	1	366	0.92 (0.79–1.06)	.25	N/A
All Escherichia strains	1	298	0.87 (0.79–0.95)	.002	N/A
All Clostridium strains	1	200	0.93 (0.76–1.14)	.49	N/A

CI, confidence interval; N/A, not applicable; RR, relative risk.

Finally, there were 3 trials of *Bifidobacterium* strains in 389 patients, e^{24} , e^{55} , e^{70} and 3 trials of *Bacillus* strains in 212 patients. e^{51} , e^{64} , e^{73} Certainty in the evidence for a benefit over placebo for persistence of abdominal pain was low (RR, 0.78; 95% CI, 0.64 to 0.95) and very low (RR, 0.33; 95% CI, 0.23 to 0.47), respectively (Table 2 and Supplementary Tables 17 and 18). *Bifidobacterium* strains were no more efficacious than placebo for abdominal pain scores in 4 trials containing 539 patients (SMD, -0.35; 95% CI, -0.70 to 0.00) but abdominal pain scores were lower with *Bacillus* strains in 3 trials containing 177 patients (SMD, -1.62; 95% CI, -2.36 to -0.87) (Supplementary Figure 4 and Supplementary Table 13). Results of other single species trials are reported in Table 2 and all dichotomous results for persistence of abdominal pain in Supplementary Figure 5.

Efficacy of Probiotics in Terms of Effect on Persistence of Abdominal Bloating or Distension and Abdominal Bloating or Distension Scores

Twenty-six trials of combination probiotics, ^{e4–e6,e9,e12,} e17,e18,e21,e22,e26,e28–e30,e35,e36,e42,e43,e45,e48,e49,e52,e58,e67,e74,e75,e79

containing 2222 patients, reported effect of probiotics on abdominal bloating or distension (Table 3). Overall, there was very low certainty in the evidence for a benefit of combination probiotics over placebo (RR of persistence of abdominal bloating or distension = 0.75; 95% CI, 0.64 to 0.88) (Figure 3 and Supplementary Table 19), with significant heterogeneity between studies ($I^2 = 78\%$, P < 0.001) and funnel plot asymmetry (Egger test, P = .003). Pooling data from trials that used the same combination of probiotics did not demonstrate any efficacious combination (Table 3). Abdominal bloating or distension scores were lower with combination probiotics than placebo in 25 trials containing 1976 patients (SMD, -0.23; 95% CI, -0.39 to -0.07) (Supplementary Figure 6 and Supplementary Table 20). Again, none of the different combinations alone was superior to placebo.

Lactobacillus strains in 723 Five trials used patients, e50,e52,e71,e76,e80 and 5 trials Saccharomyces strains in 641 patients.^{e23,e25,e38,e53,e62} Neither demonstrated a benefit for abdominal bloating or distension (RR, 0.67; 95% CI, 0.43 to 1.04 and 0.87; 95% CI, 0.64 to 1.17, respectively) (Table 3). Lactobacillus strains were not superior to placebo for continuous abdominal bloating or distension scores in 5 trials containing 606 patients (SMD, -0.13; 95% CI, -0.30 to (Supplementary Figure 6 and Supplementary 0.04Table 20). Saccharomyces strains were also no more efficacious than placebo in 4 trials containing 239 patients (SMD, -0.92; 95% CI, -2.00 to 0.17) (Supplementary Figure 6 and Supplementary Table 20).

There was very low certainty in the evidence for a benefit of *Bacillus* strains in 3 RCTs containing 212 patients (RR, 0.41; 95% CI, 0.31 to 0.56) (Table 3 and Supplementary

	Number of trials	Number of patients	RR of persistence of abdominal bloating or distension (95% CI)	P value for the difference	l^2 (P value for χ^2)
All combination probiotics	26	2222	0.75 (0.64–0.88)	<.001	78% (<.001)
VSL#3	5	192	0.65 (0.42-1.02)	.06	52% (.08)
Lactobacillus paracasei ssp paracasei F19, Lactobacillus acidophilus La5, and Bifidobacterium lactis Bb12	3	269	1.02 (0.89–1.18)	.78	0% (.92)
Bifidobacterium animalis DN173 010, Streptococcus thermophilus, and Lactobacillus bulgaricus	2	308	0.86 (0.60–1.26)	.45	71% (.06)
LacClean Gold S	2	130	0.98 (0.67–1.45)	.94	8% (.30)
Duolac 7s	2	76	0.94 (0.61–1.47)	.80	0% (.88)
All Lactobacillus strains	5	723	0.67 (0.43–1.04)	.07	88% (<.001)
All Saccharomyces strains Saccharomyces boulardii	5 3	641 232	0.87 (0.64–1.17) 0.97 (0.77–1.23)	.34 .80	60% (.04) 0% (.79)
All <i>Bacillus</i> strains	3	212	0.41 (0.31–0.56)	<.001	0% (.83)
All Clostridium strains	1	200	0.97 (0.81–1.16)	.75	N/A
All Bifidobacterium strains	1	122	0.66 (0.49–0.88)	.005	N/A

Table 3. Efficacy of Probiotics in Terms of Persistence of Abdominal Bloating or Distension in Irritable Bowel Syndrome

CI, confidence interval; N/A, not applicable; RR, relative risk.

Table 21).^{e51,e64,e73} Abdominal bloating or distension scores were also lower with *Bacillus* strains than placebo in 3 trials containing 177 patients (SMD, -1.26; 95% CI, -2.27 to -0.25) (Supplementary Figure 6 and Supplementary Table 20). Although there was an improvement in abdominal bloating or distension with *B. bifidum* MIMBb75 in 1 RCT (RR, 0.66; 95% CI, 0.49 to 0.88),^{e24} *Bifidobacterium* strains were no more efficacious than placebo for continuous abdominal bloating or distension scores in 3 trials containing 501 patients (SMD, -0.30; 95% CI, -0.68 to 0.09) (Supplementary Figure 6 and Supplementary Table 20). Results of other single species trials are reported in Table 3 and all dichotomous results for persistence of abdominal bloating or distension in Supplementary Figure 7.

Adverse Events

Total adverse events were reported by 55 RCTs, e^{1-e7} , $e^{9,e12,e14-e17,e19-e24,e26,e29,e31,e32,e34,e35,e38-e40,e42-e48,e50,e51,e53,e58}$, $e^{59,e61,e64-e68,e71-e75,e77,e78,e81,e82}$ containing 7448 patients. The RR of experiencing any adverse event was not significantly higher with probiotics (1.05; 95% CI, 0.90–1.22), with significant heterogeneity between studies ($I^2 = 34\%$, P = .03), and evidence of funnel plot asymmetry (Egger test, P = .04).

Discussion

This updated systematic review and meta-analysis has demonstrated that some combinations of probiotics, or specific species and strains, have beneficial effects in IBS. As in our previous meta-analyses, we found some evidence to support the use of some probiotics for global IBS symptoms, abdominal pain, and abdominal bloating or

distension. For global symptoms, there was moderate certainty in the evidence for a benefit of *Escherichia* strains, low certainty for Lactobacillus strains and L. plantarum 299V, and very low certainty for combination probiotics, LacClean Gold S, Duolac 7s, and Bacillus strains. For abdominal pain, there was low certainty in the evidence for a benefit of S. cerevisiae I-3856 and Bifidobacterium strains, and very low certainty for combination probiotics, Lactobacillus, Saccharomyces, and Bacillus strains. For abdominal bloating or distension, there was very low certainty in the evidence for a benefit of combination probiotics and Bacillus strains. Analyses according to stool pattern revealed a paucity of trials of probiotics in IBS-C, meaning their use in patients with subtype is less evidence-based, but combination probiotics and Lactobacillus strains improved global symptoms in IBS-D. Combination probiotics and Bacillus strains improved global symptom scores, abdominal pain scores, and abdominal bloating or distension scores, and Lactobacillus strains improved abdominal pain scores. In some cases, pooling data from RCTs using continuous symptom scores did not yield results that were consistent with dichotomous endpoints. This could be because of increased heterogeneity between studies, the individual ranges of the scores used, differences between treatment arms in baseline scores, or inclusion of nonoverlapping trials in each set of analyses. Finally, adverse events were no more frequent with probiotics than placebo. However, due to a combination of 1 or more of heterogeneity between studies, possible publication bias, risk of bias of studies, and modest efficacy, the level of certainty of evidence would not be graded as anything more than low or very low, according to GRADE criteria,³⁷ in almost all of our analyses.

	Probio	tics	Contr	ol	Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio	Risk of Bias	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	ABCDEFG
Kim 2003	4	12	10	13	2.3%	0.43 [0.18, 1.02]	2003		
Kajander 2005	29	52	34	51	5.0%	0.84 [0.61, 1.14]	2005	-++	
Kim 2005	13	24	16	24	4.1%	0.81 [0.51, 1.29]	2005		
Kim 2006	12	20	15	20	4.2%	0.80 [0.52, 1.24]	2006	++-	
Guyonnet 2007	92	137	91	137	5.7%	1.01 [0.86, 1.19]	2007	+	
Zeng 2008	15	15	15	15	5.9%	1.00 [0.88, 1.13]	2008	+	
Williams 2009	10	28	16	28	3.4%	0.63 [0.35, 1.13]	2009		
Agrawal 2009	11	17	16	17	4.6%	0.69 [0.47, 1.00]	2009		
Simren 2010	21	37	20	37	4.4%	1.05 [0.70, 1.58]	2010		
Michail 2011	3	15	6	9	1.6%	0.30 [0.10, 0.91]	2011	<	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Sondergaard 2011	20	32	21	32	4.6%	0.95 [0.66, 1.38]	2011		
Cui 2012	10	37	16	23	3.3%	0.39 [0.21, 0.70]	2012		
Cha 2012	11	25	12	25	3.3%	0.92 [0.50, 1.67]	2012		
Ko 2013	8	14	7	12	3.0%	0.98 [0.51, 1.89]	2013		
Begtrup 2013	55	67	51	64	5.7%	1.03 [0.87, 1.22]	2013	+	
Yoon 2014	13	25	15	24	3.9%	0.83 [0.51, 1.35]	2014		
Sisson 2014	50	124	31	62	4.9%	0.81 [0.58, 1.12]	2014	+	
Shavakhi 2014	30	66	33	66	4.7%	0.91 [0.64, 1.30]	2014		
Yoon 2015	16	39	14	42	3.5%	1.23 [0.70, 2.18]	2015		
Wong 2015	4	20	10	22	1.9%	0.44 [0.16, 1.18]	2015		
Mezzasalma 2016	8	52	43	52	3.1%	0.19 [0.10, 0.36]	2016	←	
Ishaque 2018	19	181	75	179	4.1%	0.25 [0.16, 0.40]	2018	_ -	
Bonfrate 2020	4	15	7	10	2.0%	0.38 [0.15, 0.97]	2020		
Skrzydło-Radomańska 2021	7	25	10	26	2.5%	0.73 [0.33, 1.61]	2021		
Turan 2021	21	50	20	50	4.0%	1.05 [0.66, 1.68]	2021		
Tuteja 2022	15	24	17	29	4.2%	1.07 [0.69, 1.65]	2022		
Total (95% CI)		1153		1069	100.0%	0.75 [0.64, 0.88]		•	
Total events	501		621						
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.11; Ch	i ² = 112.2	3, df = 1	25 (P < 0.	00001)); I ² = 78%				7
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.54	(P = 0.000	04)						Favours probiotics Favours control	U
Risk of bias legend									

(A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)

(B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)

(C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)

(D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)

(E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)

(G) Other bias

Figure 3. Forest plot of RCTs of combination probiotics vs placebo in IBS: RR of persistence of abdominal bloating or distension.

We performed independent assessment of eligibility and data extraction, in duplicate. We used an intention-to-treat analysis and pooled data with a random effects model, to minimize the likelihood that any beneficial effects of probiotics have been overestimated. We contacted investigators of potentially eligible studies to obtain either dichotomous data or continuous data and imputed dichotomous data from means and SDs to increase the number of trials reporting similar endpoints, increasing the number of trials, and participants, contributing data to each of the analyses. In our previous meta-analyses,^{22–24} we were unable to draw definitive conclusions about the efficacy of specific probiotics because of a small number of trials of some combinations, species, or strains, as well as a lack of uniformity in reporting of endpoints. In this update, because we had more eligible trials and imputed data, we were able to study the efficacy of probiotics according to 3 separate dichotomous endpoints, global IBS symptoms, abdominal pain, and abdominal bloating or distension, as well as effect on global symptom scores, abdominal pain scores, and abdominal bloating or distension scores. Finally, we performed subgroup analyses to assess treatment effect according to combinations of, and individual, probiotics used, as well as predominant stool pattern.

Limitations of this systematic review and meta-analysis arise from the nature of the studies available for synthesis. Only 24 of 82 eligible RCTs were low risk of bias across all domains, and there was significant heterogeneity between trials in many of our analyses, as well as evidence of publication bias, or other small study effects, in some of our analyses. Imputing from continuous symptom data provides only an approximation of dichotomous endpoints, although the methodology we used has been shown to provide near identical RRs to those using original dichotomous data in other studies,²⁹ and allowed us to pool data from an additional 46 RCTs. In addition, even with the imputation of data to derive similar endpoints, the number of trials of each particular combination or strain providing data for the same endpoint was small for some of our analyses. For these reasons, performing analyses considering only low risk of bias trials would not be possible. Trial duration was short, compared with the likely chronicity of symptoms in IBS, with only 5 trials conducted over a 12-week period, ^{e34,e37,e43,e50,e53} which is recommended by guidelines for the design of treatment trials in IBS.³⁸ In addition, few studies adhered to Food and Drug Administration (FDA) endpoints recommended for IBS,³⁹ although as 34 trials were conducted before these were published and many RCTs recruited mixed populations of patients, this would be difficult, as these are subtype specific. Nevertheless, we extracted data for FDA endpoints preferentially, wherever reported.

Our combining of species together could be criticized, as different strains may have different mechanisms of action and, therefore, potentially differ in efficacy. Wherever possible, we attempted to undertake subgroup analysis of trials using the same combination of probiotics or RCTs using the same species and strain. However, this issue may be particularly relevant for Bifidobacterium strains. Four trials of Bifidobacterium strains that were low risk of bias across all domains showed efficacy, or a trend toward a benefit,^{e11,e24,e55,e66} for global symptoms but when pooled with a negative RCT of another strain at high risk of bias,^{e69} there was no overall benefit. When only low risk of bias studies were considered in the analysis, there appeared to be a benefit of *Bifidobacterium* strains for global symptoms. Two of these trials, containing more than 500 patients, demonstrated a benefit of B. bifidum MIMBb75 over placebo for global symptoms,^{e24,e66} but when data from these were pooled in a random effects model, the 95% CI crossed 1. Another RCT conducted in more than 300 patients using Bifidobacterium infantis 35624 demonstrated superiority over placebo for the 1×10^8 colony-forming units per capsule dose,^{e11} but had considerable problems with the formulation of the 1×10^{10} colony-forming units per capsule dose, due to different dissolution characteristics of the capsule compared with the other 2 doses studied. Another RCT of *B. infantis* 35624 1 \times 10⁹ colony-forming units conducted in 302 individuals with abdominal discomfort or bloating at a frequency of 2 or more times per week, but who were not patients with a known diagnosis of IBS, demonstrated a significant reduction in both discomfort and bloating scores after treatment, although this was not superior to placebo.40

There is continued interest in the role of probiotics in the management of IBS, as evidenced by the publication of more than 20 new RCTs since the prior version of this metaanalysis in 2018. Our analyses provide some support for the use of certain probiotics in IBS, and also for particular strains for specific symptoms. However, there is a paucity of data for their use in patients with IBS-C, with only 7 RCTs reporting efficacy in this subtype, and no evidence of efficacy in any of these analyses. Their use in patients with IBS-C is, therefore, not supported by current evidence. Based on this meta-analysis, or the results of individual RCTs, combination probiotics, particularly LacClean Gold S and Duolac 7s, Lactobacillus strains overall, but particularly L. plantarum 299V, B. bifidum MIMBb75, Bacillus strains, Escherichia strains, Clostridium butyricum, and Streptococcus faecium were beneficial for global IBS symptoms. In terms of abdominal pain, some combination probiotics, Lactobacillus and Bifidobacterium strains, S. cerevisiae I-3856, and Bacillus and Escherichia strains improved symptoms. Finally, for abdominal bloating or distension, combination probiotics, Bacillus strains, and B. bifidum MIMBb75 all led to an improvement in symptoms. For the most part, probiotics were safe, with adverse events data provided by 55 trials, including more than 7000 patients.

However, caveats are applicable to most of these suggestions due to the nature of the literature available for review. If gastroenterologists are to be able to recommend probiotics to patients with confidence, a better evidence base is needed. Future RCTs could focus on some of the species and strains, or combinations thereof, that appear promising from the data reported here but they must also adhere to the recommendations for the design of treatment trials in IBS,³⁸ with a minimum treatment duration of 12 weeks. They should also report their methodology and data analysis in sufficient detail to remove any concerns about potential bias within the trial. In addition, even if the use of an FDArecommended endpoint is not feasible as a primary outcome measure, they should at least consider the use of some of the FDA endpoints as secondary outcomes, particularly if they are recruiting only 1 subtype of patients with IBS. Finally, given the lack of clarity concerning efficacy of individual species, strains, or combinations thereof, dose-ranging studies, of which there have been very few to date, may help further elucidate which probiotics are beneficial in IBS.

In summary, this meta-analysis of 82 trials, containing data from more than 10,000 patients, has demonstrated moderate, low, or very low certainty evidence for a benefit of several individual probiotics, or combinations of probiotics, for particular symptoms experienced by patients with IBS. Our use of imputation and contact with original investigators allowed us to pool dichotomous data from more studies than previously, allowing us to draw more meaningful conclusions than prior evidence synthesis exercises in this field where, for the most part, no recommendations concerning efficacy of particular combinations of probiotics or strains could be made. The fact that few of the included studies were low risk of bias across all domains should be borne in mind when making treatment recommendations. As a result of this, and other factors, certainty in the evidence by GRADE criteria was low to very low across almost all our analyses.

Supplementary Material

Note: To access the supplementary material accompanying this article, visit the online version of *Gastroenterology* at www.gastrojournal.org, and at https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2023.07.018.

References

- Mearin F, Lacy BE, Chang L, et al. Bowel disorders. Gastroenterology 2016;150:1393–1407.
- 2. Ford AC, Sperber AD, Corsetti M, et al. Irritable bowel syndrome. Lancet 2020;396:1675–1688.
- Sperber AD, Bangdiwala SI, Drossman DA, et al. Worldwide prevalence and burden of functional gastrointestinal disorders, results of Rome Foundation global study. Gastroenterology 2021;160:99–114.
- Oka P, Parr H, Barberio B, et al. Global prevalence of irritable bowel syndrome according to Rome III or IV criteria: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol 2020;5:908–917.

- Goodoory VC, Guthrie EA, Ng CE, et al. Factors associated with lower disease-specific and generic healthrelated quality of life in Rome IV irritable bowel syndrome. Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2023;57:323–334.
- 6. Goodoory VC, Ng CE, Black CJ, et al. Direct healthcare costs of Rome IV or Rome III-defined irritable bowel syndrome in the United Kingdom. Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2022;56:110–120.
- Goodoory VC, Ng CE, Black CJ, et al. Impact of Rome IV irritable bowel syndrome on work and activities of daily living. Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2022;56:844–856.
- Goodoory VC, Ng CE, Black CJ, et al. Willingness to accept risk with medication in return for cure of symptoms among patients with Rome IV irritable bowel syndrome. Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2022;55:1311–1319.
- **9.** Holtmann GJ, Ford AC, Talley NJ. Pathophysiology of irritable bowel syndrome. Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol 2016;1:133–146.
- Vasant DH, Paine PA, Black CJ, et al. British Society of Gastroenterology guidelines on the management of irritable bowel syndrome. Gut 2021;70:1214–1240.
- 11. Black CJ, Burr NE, Camilleri M, et al. Efficacy of pharmacological therapies in patients with IBS with diarrhoea or mixed stool pattern: systematic review and network meta-analysis. Gut 2020;69:74–82.
- Black CJ, Burr NE, Quigley EMM, et al. Efficacy of secretagogues in patients with irritable bowel syndrome with constipation: systematic review and network metaanalysis. Gastroenterology 2018;155:1753–1763.
- Card T, Enck P, Barbara G, et al. Post-infectious IBS: defining its clinical features and prognosis using an internet-based survey. United European Gastroenterol J 2018;6:1245–1253.
- 14. Ford AC, Spiegel BMR, Talley NJ, et al. Small intestinal bacterial overgrowth in irritable bowel syndrome: Systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2009;7:1279–1286.
- **15.** Durban A, Abellan JJ, Jimenez-Hernandez N, et al. Instability of the faecal microbiota in diarrhoeapredominant irritable bowel syndrome. FEMS Microbiol Ecol 2013;86:581–589.
- Carroll IM, Ringel-Kulka T, Siddle JP, et al. Alterations in composition and diversity of the intestinal microbiota in patients with diarrhea-predominant irritable bowel syndrome. Neurogastroenterol Motil 2012;24:521–530; e248.
- Jalanka-Tuovinen J, Salojarvi J, Salonen A, et al. Faecal microbiota composition and host-microbe cross-talk following gastroenteritis and in postinfectious irritable bowel syndrome. Gut 2014;63:1737–1745.
- Kassinen A, Krogius-Kurikka L, Makivuokko H, et al. The fecal microbiota of irritable bowel syndrome patients differs significantly from that of healthy subjects. Gastroenterology 2007;133:24–33.
- Pimentel M, Lembo A, Chey WD, et al. Rifaximin therapy for patients with irritable bowel syndrome without constipation. N Engl J Med 2011;364:22–32.
- 20. Ianiro G, Eusebi LH, Black CJ, et al. Systematic review with meta-analysis: efficacy of faecal

microbiota transplantation for the treatment of irritable bowel syndrome. Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2019;50:240–248.

- 21. Hill C, Guarner F, Reid G, et al. Expert consensus document. The International Scientific Association for Probiotics and Prebiotics consensus statement on the scope and appropriate use of the term probiotic. Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol 2014;11:506–514.
- 22. Moayyedi P, Ford AC, Brandt LJ, et al. The efficacy of probiotics in the treatment of irritable bowel syndrome: a systematic review. Gut 2010;59:325–332.
- 23. Ford AC, Quigley EM, Lacy BE, et al. Efficacy of prebiotics, probiotics, and synbiotics in irritable bowel syndrome and chronic idiopathic constipation: systematic review and meta-analysis. Am J Gastroenterol 2014; 109:1547–1561.
- 24. Ford AC, Harris LA, Lacy BE, et al. Systematic review with meta-analysis: the efficacy of prebiotics, probiotics, synbiotics and antibiotics in irritable bowel syndrome. Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2018;48:1044–1060.
- Su GL, Ko CW, Bercik P, et al. AGA Clinical Practice Guidelines on the role of probiotics in the management of gastrointestinal disorders. Gastroenterology 2020; 159:697–705.
- 26. Lembo A, Sultan S, Chang L, et al. AGA Clinical Practice Guideline on the pharmacological management of irritable bowel syndrome with diarrhea. Gastroenterology 2022;163:137–151.
- Chang L, Sultan S, Lembo A, et al. AGA Clinical Practice Guideline on the pharmacological management of irritable bowel syndrome with constipation. Gastroenterology 2022;163:118–136.
- Zhang T, Zhang C, Zhang J, et al. Efficacy of probiotics for irritable bowel syndrome: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. Front Cell Infect Microbiol 2022; 12:859967.
- 29. Furukawa TA, Cipriani A, Barbui C, et al. Imputing response rates from means and standard deviations in meta-analyses. Int Clin Psychopharmacol 2005; 20:49–52.
- Higgins JPT, Green S. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions [updated March 2011] Version 5.1.0. Available at: http://handbook-5–1. cochrane.org/ 2011. Accessed March 25, 2023.
- **31.** DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Control Clin Trials 1986;7:177–188.
- **32.** Deeks JJ. Issues in the selection of a summary statistic for meta-analysis of clinical trials with binary outcomes. Stat Med 2002;21:1575–1600.
- **33.** Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, et al. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. BMJ 2003;327:557–560.
- 34. The Cochrane Collaboration 2020. Review Manager. Version 5.4.1. Available at: https://training.cochrane.org. Accessed March 30, 2023.
- **35.** Egger M, Davey-Smith G, Schneider M, et al. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. BMJ 1997;315:629–634.
- **36.** Sterne JA, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JP, et al. Recommendations for examining and interpreting funnel plot

asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials. BMJ 2011;343:d4002.

- Salanti G, Del Giovane C, Chaimani A, et al. Evaluating the quality of evidence from a network meta-analysis. PLoS One 2014;9:e99682.
- Irvine EJ, Tack J, Crowell MD, et al. Design of treatment trials for functional gastrointestinal disorders. Gastroenterology 2016;150:1469–1480.e1.
- Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for industry: irritable bowel syndrome - clinical evaluation of drugs for treatment. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/ media/78622/download.2012. Accessed March 28, 2023.
- 40. Ringel-Kulka T, McRorie J, Ringel Y. Multi-center, double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled, parallelgroup study to evaluate the benefit of the probiotic *Bifidobacterium infantis* 35624 in non-patients with symptoms of abdominal discomfort and bloating. Am J Gastroenterol 2017;112:145–151.

Received April 12, 2023. Accepted July 23, 2023.

Correspondence

Address correspondence to: Alexander C. Ford, MD, Leeds Gastroenterology Institute, Room 125, 4th Floor, Bexley Wing, St. James's University Hospital, Beckett Street, Leeds, United Kingdom LS9 7TF. e-mail: alexf12399@yahoo.com.

Acknowledgments

We thank Dr Cesare Cremon, Dr Giovanni Barbara, and Dr Tao Bai for responding to our queries about their studies and for providing us with extra data.

CRediT Authorship Contributions

Vivek Goodoory, MBChB (Conceptualization: Equal; Data curation: Equal; Formal analysis: Supporting; Methodology: Supporting; Writing – original draft: Supporting; Writing – review & editing: Supporting).

Mais Khasawneh, MBBS (Conceptualization: Equal; Data curation: Equal; Formal analysis: Supporting; Methodology: Supporting; Writing – original draft: Supporting; Writing – review & editing: Supporting).

draft: Supporting; Writing – review & editing: Supporting). Christopher Black, PhD (Conceptualization: Equal; Data curation: Supporting; Formal analysis: Supporting; Methodology: Supporting; Writing – original draft: Supporting; Writing – review & editing: Supporting).

Eamonn Quigley, MD (Conceptualization: Equal; Methodology: Supporting; Writing – original draft: Supporting; Writing – review & editing: Equal).

Paul Moayyedi, PhD (Conceptualization: Equal; Methodology: Supporting; Writing – original draft: Supporting; Writing – review & editing: Equal).

Alexander C. Ford, MD (Conceptualization: Equal; Data curation: Equal; Formal analysis: Lead; Methodology: Equal; Writing – original draft: Lead; Writing – review & editing: Equal).

Conflicts of interest

These authors disclose the following: Eamonn M. M. Quigley: consultant to 4D Pharma, Atmo, Biocodex, Novozymes, Salix, Sanofi, and Vibrant; and research support from 4D Pharma, Atmo, Cindome, Takeda, and Vibrant. Paul Moayyedi: advisory board and speaker for Allergan; and advisory board member for Shire, Takeda, and Salix. The remaining authors disclose no conflicts.

Funding

None.

Data Availability

Data used in this meta-analysis are publicly available.