Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Alina Arulsamy, Monash University, Malaysia

REVIEWED BY Ching Soong Khoo, National University of Malaysia, Malaysia Si Lei Fong, University of Malaya, Malaysia

*CORRESPONDENCE Yuxin Zhang ⊠ baby20050218@163.com

RECEIVED 13 August 2024 ACCEPTED 23 October 2024 PUBLISHED 14 November 2024

CITATION

He X and Zhang Y (2024) Changes in gut flora in patients with epilepsy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front. Microbiol.* 15:1480022. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2024.1480022

COPYRIGHT

© 2024 He and Zhang. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Changes in gut flora in patients with epilepsy: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Xingyan He^{1,2} and Yuxin Zhang^{1*}

¹Department of Pediatrics, Guangdong Provincial People's Hospital (Guangdong Academy of Medical Sciences), Southern Medical University, Guangzhou, Guangdong, China, ²Shantou University Medical College, Shantou, Guangdong, China

Background: Epilepsy is a prevalent chronic neurological disorder that is strongly associated with a wide range of psychological, cognitive and social problems. It affects a significant proportion of the global population and has a number of complex etiologies. A growing body of research indicates that there is a strong association between epilepsy and the gut microbiota. Indeed, a substantial body of research has investigated the potential role of epilepsy in relation to the gut microbiota, examining alterations in the abundance, diversity, and relative abundance of the gut microbiota in patients with epilepsy.

Methods: This study was conducted in accordance with the PRISMA guidelines and included multiple studies that met specific criteria. A keyword search was conducted in the following databases: PubMed, Embase, and Web of Science. The data extraction and quality assessment were conducted by two independent researchers. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the relationship between patients with epilepsy and gut flora was conducted using the R 4.3.4 software.

Results: The results of the analyses indicated that the intestinal flora of patients with epilepsy did not differ significantly in alpha diversity compared to healthy controls. However, the relative abundance of specific flora, such as *Verrucomicrobia* and *Ackermannia* was significantly increased in patients, whereas Lactobacillus was significantly decreased.

Conclusion: The relationship between epilepsy and gut flora is reciprocal. The present meta-analysis demonstrated that there were no statistically significant alterations in the overall characteristics of the intestinal flora of the patients. However, significant changes were observed in the relative abundance of certain phyla and genera. Consequently, it is hypothesized that epilepsy can cause changes in the relative abundance of specific flora in patients. Furthermore, in conjunction with previous studies, it is believed that changes in intestinal flora can also have an effect on seizures. For example, *Lactobacillus* may be a beneficial genus that potentially reduces seizures. Conversely, the effect of Akkermansia is two-sided.

KEYWORDS

epilepsy, intestinal flora, meta-analysis, gut-brain axis, gut microbiome

1 Background

Epilepsy is a chronic and devastating neurological disorder characterized by seizures (Thijs et al., 2019). Epilepsy is often associated with psychological, cognitive, and social consequences (Fisher et al., 2014). Approximately 50 million people and 0.5–1% of children worldwide suffer from epilepsy (Aaberg et al., 2017). The incidence of epilepsy is highest in infancy, with approximately 0.67% of children diagnosed with epilepsy can be broadly categorized into six groups: genetic, structural, metabolic, immunologic, immune, infectious, and unknown factors (Scheffer et al., 2017; Fisher et al., 2017).

Most people with epilepsy live in areas with poor sanitation (World Health Organization, 2024), and environmental factors have been shown to have a significant impact on the composition of the gut microbiota (Gacesa et al., 2022). Prior research has demonstrated that the utilization of antibiotics can potentially exacerbate seizures (Sutter et al., 2015). Furthermore, a high-fat ketogenic diet has been demonstrated to be an efficacious treatment for medically refractory epilepsy (Kwan and Brodie, 2000; Newman, 2000). Additionally, studies have indicated that the gut flora is a mediator of the antiepileptic effects of the ketogenic diet. In conclusion, the role of gut flora in the development or remission of epilepsy is significant. The gut-brain axis has been demonstrated to perceive and respond to alterations in the dynamic ecosystem by translating chemical signals from the environment and gut microbes into neural signals, thereby indicating a pivotal function for the gut microbiota in epileptogenesis (Tremlett et al., 2017).

To date, a number of systematic evaluations have demonstrated an association between epilepsy and the gut microbiota. This systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to examine the relationship between epilepsy and gut flora, with the objective of synthesizing and critically evaluating the available evidence supporting the interaction between gut microbiota and epilepsy, and elucidating potential interventions.

2 Methods

2.1 Search strategy

This systematic review and meta-analysis is conducted in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (Page et al., 2021).

The following keywords were used for the analysis: epilepsy and intestinal flora. The keywords are presented in the following format: Medical Subject Headings + free word. A comprehensive search was conducted in PubMed, Embase, and Web of Science using the keywords "intestinal flora" and "epilepsy" to identify studies involving valuable epilepsy and intestinal flora analyses from database creation to 9 June 2024 (the search strategy refers to Table 1). The search language was English (Figure 1).

2.2 Eligibility criteria

The inclusion criteria were as follows: (1) Control for the type of study design. (2) The study was conducted on patients with primary

The exclusion criteria were as follows: (1) Animal subjects. (2) Non-epileptic subjects. (3) Secondary epilepsy such as post-traumatic epilepsy, post-stroke epilepsy, and postencephalitis epilepsy. (4) Incomplete data that prevented the extraction of raw data for statistical literature. (5) Conference papers, dissertations, and review articles. (6) Non-English papers.

2.3 Data extraction

The data were extracted independently by both authors from the original text or graphs. (1) General characteristics: first author, year of publication, population size, age, diagnosis. (2) Outcome metrics studied: alpha diversity (observed species index, Chao1 index, Shannon index, Simpson index, ACE index), bacterial phylum, bacterial genus.

The data were extracted directly from the original article, or the raw data were requested by email from the corresponding author of the study. In the event of a lack of response from the authors, the GetData chart digitizer was employed to procure pertinent and precise raw data that could not be obtained from the corresponding author (Liu et al., 2017).

2.4 Quality assessment

The potential for bias in the included studies was evaluated using a scale developed by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) for the assessment of cross-sectional studies. Two independent authors evaluated the risk of bias based on the following criteria: (1) Is the source of data specified? (2) Whether the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the exposed and non-exposed groups were clearly defined. (3) Whether the time period for identifying patients was specified. (4) Whether the study population was consecutive. (5) Whether the assessor of subjectively-indicated patient outcomes was isolated from other objective indicators of the patient. (6) Describing any assessments made for quality assurance purposes. (7) Providing explanations for the exclusion of some patients. (8) Describing how confounders were controlled for. Each criterion could be classified as low, unclear, or high risk of bias. Two investigators conducted an independent assessment of the risk of bias and cross-validation. In the event of a discrepancy, a third party was consulted for a resolution after a discussion. The generation of random numbers using tables or computer software was deemed a low-risk method for ensuring the reliability of the random sequence. Methods deemed unreliable, such as those involving the selection of numbers artificially, were considered to pose a high risk, while those with unknown generation methods were considered to be of unclear risk. The potential for the assessor of a patient's subjectively-derived indicators to be isolated from other objective indicators of the patient is contingent upon the rigor of the employed blinding methodology and its correct implementation. A potentially compromised blinding is defined as a failure to report all pre-specified primary outcome indicators during the study period, which is considered high risk; otherwise, it is considered low risk. The failure to report all pre-specified key outcome indicators is regarded as a high-risk factor, whereas the outcome indicators included in the fully published study plan are considered low risk.

TABLE 1 The search strategy.

Embase			
No.	Query	Results	Date
#14	#12 AND #13	553	07-Jun-24
#13	#9 OR #10 OR #11	511865	07-Jun-24
#12	#7 OR #8	132153	07-Jun-24
#11	#5 OR #6	55652	07-Jun-24
#10	#3 OR #4	318515	07-Jun-24
#9	#1 OR #2	356264	07-Jun-24
#8	'alimentary canal flora' OR 'alimentary tract flora' OR 'bowel flora' OR 'bowel microbiota' OR 'digestive canal flora' OR 'digestive tract flora' OR 'enteric flora' OR 'enteric microbiota' OR 'flora, intestine' OR 'gastro intestinal flora' OR 'gastro intestinal canal flora' OR 'gastro intestinal flora' OR 'gastro intestinal microbiota' OR 'gastro intestinal microbiota' OR 'gastro intestinal tract flora' OR 'gastro intestinal flora' OR 'gastro intestinal microbiota' OR 'gastro intestinal microbiota' OR 'intestinal bacteria' OR 'gastro intestinal flora' OR 'intestinal bacterian' OR 'gastro intestinal flora' OR 'intestinal bacteria' OR 'intestinal bacterial flora' OR 'intestinal bacterian' OR 'intestinal flora' OR 'intestinal microbe' OR 'intestinal microbes' OR 'intestinal microbiota' OR 'intestinal microflora' OR 'intestinal microorganism' OR 'intestinal tract flora' OR 'intestine bacteria' OR 'intestine bacteria change' OR 'intestine bacterial flora' OR 'intestine bacteria 'OR 'intestine microbial flora' OR 'intestine microflora' OR 'intestine flora' OR 'intestine bacteria' OR 'intestine microbial flora' OR 'intestine microflora' OR 'intestine bacterial flora'	130315	07-Jun-24
#7	'intestine flora'/exp	111879	07-Jun-24
#6	'convulsion susceptibility' OR 'convulsions' OR 'convulsive action' OR 'convulsive disorder' OR 'convulsive fit' OR 'convulsive motor seizure' OR 'convulsive reaction' OR 'electroconvulsion' OR 'convulsion'	55126	07-Jun-24
#5	'convulsion'/exp	41516	07-Jun-24
#4	'seizure activities' OR 'seizure activity' OR 'seizure disorder' OR 'seizures' OR 'seizure'	312638	07-Jun-24
#3	'seizure'/exp	240303	07-Jun-24
#2	'acute epilepsy' OR 'attack, epileptic' OR 'cerebral seizure, epileptic' OR 'chronic epilepsy' OR 'comitial disease' OR 'convulsion, epileptic' OR 'convulsive epilepsy' OR 'epilepsia' OR 'epilepsy, convulsive' OR 'epileptic' OR 'epileptic attack' OR 'epileptic convulsion' OR 'epileptic disorder' OR 'epileptic fit' OR 'epileptic insult' OR 'epileptic seizure' OR 'epileptic seizure, cerebral' OR 'epileptic syndrome' OR 'epileptic syndromes' OR 'falling sickness' OR 'fit, epileptic' OR 'seizure, epileptic' OR 'sickness, falling' OR 'tardy epilepsy' OR 'epilepsy'	319581	07-Jun-24
#1	'epilepsy'/exp	307005	07-Jun-24

10.3389/fmicb.2024.1480022

Pubmed			
No.	Query	Results	Time
8	<pre>((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((</pre>	164	21:48:26

Pubmed			
No.	Query	Results	Time
7	((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((98,850	21:48:05
6	"Gastrointestinal Microbiome"[Mesh]	44,218	21:42:42
5	(((((((((((Tpilepsy[Tide/Abstract])) OR (Epilepsis[Tide/Abstract])) OR (Epilepsis[Tide/Abstract])) OR (Epilepsis[Tide/Abstract])) OR (Cryptogenic Epilepsie[Tide/Abstract])) OR (Cryptogenic Epilepsie[Tide/Abstract])) OR (Cryptogenic Epilepsie[Tide/Abstract])) OR (Cryptogenic Epilepsie[Tide/Abstract])) OR (Cryptogenic Epilepsie]) OR (Jacksonian Seizure[Tide/Abstract])) OR (Seizure, Subscription]) OR (Seizure, File/Abstract])) OR (Single Seizure]Tide/Abstract])) OR (Seizure, Single[Tide/Abstract])) OR (Seizure, Subscription]) OR (Single Seizure[Tide/Abstract])) OR (Single Seizure]Tide/Abstract])) OR (Atonic Absence Seizure, Atonic Tide/Abstract])) OR (Atonic Absence Seizure, Atonic[Tide/Abstract])) OR (Atonic Absence Seizure, Atonic[Tide/Abstract])) OR (Atonic Absence Seizure, Atonic[Tide/Abstract])) OR (Contral) OR (Seizure, Sizure]Tide/Abstract])) OR (Seizure, Sizure]Tide/Abstract])) OR (Seizure, Sizure]Tide/Abstract]) OR (Seizure, Sizure]Tide/Abstra	2,31,452	21:41:29

10.3389/fmicb.2024.1480022

Pubmed			
No.	Query	Results	Time
4	Cuery ((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((1,48,824	21:40:19
3	"Seizures"[Mesh]	76,300	21:30:51
2	(((((((("Epilepsy"[Mesh]) OR (Epilepsies[Title/Abstract])) OR (Seizure Disorder[Title/Abstract])) OR (Seizure Disorders[Title/Abstract])) OR (Epilepsy, Cryptogenic[Title/Abstract])) OR (Cryptogenic Epilepsy[Title/Abstract])) OR (Cryptogenic Epilepsy[Title/Abstract])) OR (Cryptogenic Epilepsy[Title/Abstract])) OR (Auras[Title/Abstract])) OR (Auras[Title/Abstract]) OR (Auras[Title/Abstract]))	1,40,642	21:29:34
1	"Epilepsy"[Mesh]	1,29,415	21:28:09

(Continued)

10.3389/fmicb.2024.1480022

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Sci			
#	Search Query	Results	Date run
1	TS=(epilepsy) and Preprint Citation Index (Exclude - Database)	187480	Fri Jun 07 2024 10:43:22 GMT+0800 (中国标准时间)
2	<pre>((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((</pre>	70499	Fri Jun 07 2024 10:54:10 GMT+0800 (中国标准时间)
3	#2 OR #1 and Preprint Citation Index (Exclude – Database)	199367	Fri Jun 07 2024 10:54:20 GMT+0800 (中国标准时间)
4	TS=(seizure) and Preprint Citation Index (Exclude – Database)	174688	Fri Jun 07 2024 10:54:54 GMT+0800 (中国标准时间)
5	(((TS=(seizure activities)) OR TS=(seizure activity)) OR TS=(seizure disorder)) OR TS=(seizures) and Preprint Citation Index (Exclude – Database)	174688	Fri Jun 07 2024 10:55:58 GMT+0800 (中国标准时间)
6	#4 OR #5 and Preprint Citation Index (Exclude – Database)	174688	Fri Jun 07 2024 10:56:06 GMT+0800 (中国标准时间)
7	TS=(convulsion) and Preprint Citation Index (Exclude - Database)	13864	Fri Jun 07 2024 10:57:01 GMT+0800 (中国标准时间)
8	((((((TS=(convulsion susceptibility)) OR TS=(convulsions)) OR TS=(convulsive action)) OR TS=(convulsive disorder)) OR TS=(convulsive fit)) OR TS=(convulsive motor seizure)) OR TS=(convulsive reaction)) OR TS=(electroconvulsion) and Preprint Citation Index (Exclude – Database)	16463	Fri Jun 07 2024 10:57:59 GMT+0800 (中国标准时间)
9	#8 OR #7 and Preprint Citation Index (Exclude - Database)	16463	Fri Jun 07 2024 10:58:09 GMT+0800 (中国标准时间)
10	TS=(intestine flora) and Preprint Citation Index (Exclude – Database)	29583	Fri Jun 07 2024 10:59:06 GMT+0800 (中国标准时间)
11	((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((244316	Fri Jun 07 2024 11:03:13 GMT+0800 (中国标准时间)
12	#10 OR #11 and Preprint Citation Index (Exclude – Database)	244316	Fri Jun 07 2024 11:03:20 GMT+0800 (中国标准时间)
13	#3 OR #6 OR #9 and Preprint Citation Index (Exclude – Database)	277754	Fri Jun 07 2024 11:03:37 GMT+0800 (中国标准时间)
14	#13 AND #12 and Preprint Citation Index (Exclude – Database)	537	Fri Jun 07 2024 11:03:43 GMT+0800 (中国标准时间)



2.5 Data analysis

All extracted data were converted to the same unit prior to calculation. Continuous variables were expressed as mean \pm standard deviation (m = median, a = minimum, b = maximum) in accordance with the formula detailed in Supplementary Image 3 (Hozo et al., 2005). The data were analyzed using the R 4.3.3 software. The results were expressed as a Standardized Mean Difference (SMD) with a 95% confidence interval (CI). The presence of heterogeneity was evaluated through the utilization of the chi-square test and the I² statistic. A *p*-value of less than 0.1 and an I² value exceeding 50% were indicative of a considerable probability of heterogeneity within the data. Given the anticipated presence of heterogeneity, a random-effects model was

employed. Furthermore, subgroup analyses were conducted when deemed necessary to facilitate a more comprehensive interpretation of the results. A p-value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

3 Results

3.1 Search results

A total of 1,254 studies were retrieved from Web of Science, PubMed, and Embase on 9 June 2024, following a comprehensive search. Two researchers employed the EndNote software to screen the titles and abstracts of the references, resulting in the removal of 363 duplicates. A total of 845 references were excluded from further consideration as they did not meet the pre-established inclusion criteria. Additionally, 46 potential references were included. Following a full-text review by two researchers, 14 studies were included in the meta-analysis (Table 2).

3.2 Characteristics of the selected studies

The experimental group was diagnosed with epilepsy in 14 studies, eight of which involved children. In five studies, the mean age of the experimental group was less than 18 years, while in seven studies, it was greater than 18 years. In two studies, the mean age could not be calculated due to the lack of specification regarding the age of the control group.

Six studies did not specify the type of epilepsy. Two studies focused on refractory epilepsy in children, two studies investigated drug-resistant and drug-sensitive epilepsy, two studies explored West's syndrome, one study examined focal epilepsy, and the cause of epilepsy in one study was unclear.

The six principal outcome indicators are alpha diversity (Chao1 index, Shannon's index, Simpson's index, and Ace's index), phylum, and genus. These are presented in Table 2.

3.3 Risk of bias assessment

All studies were deemed to have a low risk of bias in terms of the source of information, inclusion and exclusion criteria, assessment of quality valuation, explanation for exclusion of each individual patient, and measures to control for confounders. Thirteen studies were identified as being at high risk of bias with regard to the question of whether the assessor of the patient's subjectivized indicator was isolated from the patient's other objective indicators. In addition, some of the studies were at high risk of bias with respect to whether the subjects were consecutive or not, and whether a time period for identifying the patients was provided. The risk of bias was unclear in terms of whether the subjects were consecutive or not, quality assessment, and control of confounders. In some cases, the risk of bias was unclear.

The overall assessment of risk of bias was low in 11 trials and uncertain in 2 trials (Figure 2).

3.4 Differential assessment of flora outcomes in epileptic and non-epileptic patients

3.4.1 Alpha diversity

In this study, a range of alpha diversity indices were employed to evaluate microbial diversity within a given group. These included estimates of richness (such as the observed species index and the Chao1 index) and indices that combine richness and evenness (such as the Shannon index, the Simpson index and the ACE index) (Figure 3). A total of 12 controlled trials provided data on the Chao1 index of richness. Of these, five trials revealed a significant difference between the epilepsy group and the control group with regard to the Chao1 index. The meta-analysis of this study revealed no significant difference in the SMD of the species index Chao1 (SMD=0.30, p=0.47, 95% CI=-0.52 to 1.11, I² =93%). A subgroup analysis according to age revealed no significant difference between minors (aged <18 years) and adults. The former exhibited a standardized mean difference (SMD) of -0.18 (p=0.73, 95% CI=-1.18 to 0.83, I² = 85%), while the latter displayed a SMD of 0.63 (p=0.30, 95% CI=-56 to 1.86, I² = 95) (Supplementary Images 1, 2).

A total of 10 studies provided data on Shannon's index, and in seven of these studies, a significant difference was observed between the epilepsy group and the control group. In all five studies showing a significant reduction in Shannon's index in the epilepsy group, compared to the control group, the opposite was true in two studies. The results of the meta-analysis demonstrated no statistically significant difference in the SMD of the Shannon index (SMD = -0.92, p=0.14, 95% CI = -2.14 to 0.30, $I^2 = 94\%$), nor in the subgroup analyses (minors: SMD = -0.11, p=0.85, 95% CI = -1.24 to 1.03, $I^2 = 88\%$). The SMD was -1.74 (p=0.10), with a 95% CI of -3.80 to 0.32 and an I² value of 96%.

Seven studies provided data on Simpson's index. Five studies demonstrated a statistically significant difference between patients with epilepsy and a control group. Three of these studies showed a significant increase in Simpson's index in the epilepsy group compared to the control group, while the other two studies yielded opposite results. The meta-analysis of the present study revealed no statistically significant difference in Simpson's index between patients with epilepsy and the healthy population [standardized mean difference (SMD) 0.05, p = 0.96, 95% confidence interval (CI) -2.09 to 2.00, I² = 96.5%]. The ACE index was provided as an indicator of outcome by only three studies. The meta-analysis of these studies showed a non-significant difference (SMD = 2.45, p = 0.06, 95% CI = -0.11 to 5.00, I² = 96.4%).

3.4.2 Phylum of bacteria

The present study identified five distinct clades (Figure 4). The identified clades were *Bacteroidetes*, *Actinobacteria*, *Verrucomicrobia*, *Firmicutes*, and *Proteobacteria*. Additionally, the *Firmicutes*/ *Bacteroidetes* (F/B) ratio was included in the outcome index. The results of the meta-analysis indicated that there was a statistically significant association between *Verrucomicrobia* and the outcome variable (SMD = 0.35, 95% CI 0.08 to 0.62, p = 0.01, $I^2 = 0\%$). No statistically significant differences were observed in the levels or F/B ratios for the remaining clades. Only data on *Acidobacteria* levels were available from the study by Liu et al. (2023), which demonstrated a significant difference between the upper epilepsy group and the control population (SMD = 0.35, p = 0.003, 95% CI = -2.68 to -0.54).

3.4.3 Genera of bacteria

A total of 14 genera have been identified. The identified genera are as follows: Bifidobacterium, Faecalibacterium, Akkermansia, Enterococcus, Collinsella, Streptococcus, Escherichia/Shigella, Veillonella, Clostridium sensu strict, Bacteroides, Klebsiella, Lactobacillus, Enterobacter. Significant differences were observed in TABLE 2 Overall characteristics of the included literature and outcome indicators included in the literature.

References	Years	Exposed group	Age	Alpha-diversity	Phylum	Family
Türay et al. (2023)	2023	Epilepsy	7.8 ± 2.6	Shannon, simpson	-	-
Liu et al. (2023)	2023	Epilepsy	4.8±2.3	Chao1	Acidobacteria Actinobacteria Bacteroidetes Cyanobacteria Firmicutes Proteobacteria Verrucomicrobia	Bifidobacterium Lachnospiracea_incertae_ sedis Faecalibacterium Akkermansia Enterococcus Collinsella Streptococcus Escherichia/Shigella Veillonella Clostridium_ sensu_stricto Bacteroides Klebsiella Lactobacillus Enterobacter
Cui et al. (2022)	2022	Epilepsy	30.16±10.47	Chao1, Shannon, simpson, ace	Actinobacteria Bacteroidetes Proteobacteria	Escherichia/Shigella Enterobacteriaceae_ unclassified Lachnospiraceae_unclassified Bifidobacterium Halomonas Bacteroides Lachnoclostridium Anaerostipes Blautia Clostridia_unclassified Dorea Roseburia Megamonas Erysipelotrichaceae_UCG-003
Dong et al. (2022)	2022	Epilepsy	33.1±9.24	Chao1	-	-
Dai et al. (2022)	2022	Drug-resistant epilepsy, Non- drug-resistant epilepsy	25.46±11.36	Shannon	-	-
Zhou et al. (2022)	2022	Focal epilepsy	6.38 ± 2.01	Chao1, Shannon, simpson, ace	Actinobacteria	Escherichia/Shigella Faecalibacterium
Xu et al. (2021)	2021	WEST syndrome	_	Chao1, Shannon	Firmicutes Actinobacteria Proteobacteria Bacteroidetes Verrucomicrobia	Bifidobacterium Bacteroides Escherichia/ Shigella Veillonella Streptococcus Lachnospiraceae Klebsiella Clostridium_ sensu_stricto Enterococcus Akkermansia Collinsella Faecalibacterium Lactobacillus
Gong et al. (2021)	2021	Refractory epilepsy in children	27.41±8.17	Chao1, simpson	-	Akkermansia Bifidobacterium Enterococcus Actinomyces Subdoligranulum Dialister Alloprevotella Ruminococcaceae
Wan et al. (2021)	2021	WEST syndrome	8.35±3.36	Shanon, simpson	-	Bifidobacterium Veillonella Bacteroides Streptococcus Prevotella Enterococcus Lactobacillus Megasphaera Roseburia
Gong et al. (2020)	2020	Epilepsy	27.42 ± 8.17	Chao1, Shannon, simpson	Firmicutes Actinobacteria Verrucomicrobia Cyanobacteria Nitrospirae	Blautia Bifidobacterium Subdoligranulum Parabacterioides Akkermansia Dialister Eubacterium Dorea Anaerostipes
Lee et al. (2020)	2020	Epilepsy	3.37 ± 1.50	Chao1, Shannon, simpson, ace	-	-
Lindefeldt et al. (2019)	2019	Refractory epilepsy in children	_	Chao1, shannon	Actinobacteria Bacteroidetes Firmicutes Proteobacteria	Bifidobacterium etc.
Peng et al. (2018)	2018	Drug-resistant epilepsy	28.9 ± 11.75	Chao1	-	-
		Non-drug-resistant epilepsy	27.25 ± 12.92	Chao1	-	-
Xie et al. (2017)	2017	Epilepsy	-	Shannon	-	-

-, Not mentioned in relevant literature or data not available.



the abundance of *Akkermansia* (SMD = 0.31, p = 0.02, 95% CI = -0.04 to 0.58, I²=0%) and *Lactobacillus* (SMD = -0.55, p = 0.02, 95% CI = -1.10 to 0.09, I²=0%) between epileptic patients and controls (Figure 5).

Figure 6 illustrates the phylogenetic characteristics of the abundance of taxonomic differences between epileptic and normal populations at the phylum, order and genus levels, with colors indicating different bacterial variants. The colors red, blue and orange indicate increased abundance, decreased abundance and inconsistent variation, respectively.

4 Discussion

In order to identify changes in the diversity, abundance, and homogeneity of the gut microbiota after a diagnosis of epilepsy, as well as possible characteristics of bacteria that reduce seizures, three of the most commonly used databases were searched.

4.1 About alpha-diversity

The present study encompasses 14 high-quality studies (Figure 7), encompassing alpha diversity and relative abundance at the phylum and genus levels. Alpha diversity is associated with the number of species in a local, homogeneous habitat, also referred to as intrahabitat diversity. In the context of the human gut flora, higher alpha diversity is typically indicative of a more complex and diverse microbial community, exhibiting greater metabolic versatility and stability, and a healthier metabolic profile, particularly with regard to drug metabolism (Li et al., 2022; Knight et al., 2018). It is also a marker of intestinal health. The Chao1 index, the Shannon index, the Simpson index, and the ACE index are frequently employed as measures of alpha diversity. The Chao1 index is of particular significance in that it is capable of deriving a theoretical abundance from the number of species observed, which is closer to the true abundance. Furthermore, it is particularly sensitive to rare species. The Shannon index is of significance in that it quantifies the uncertainty in the diversity of the community, that is to say, the difficulty of predicting the species identity of an individual selected at random. The Simpson index is of significance in that it reflects the degree of dominance and the even

distribution of species diversity in the community (Supplementary Presentation 1). In a previous study of gut flora in epileptic patients, Zhou et al. (2022) demonstrated that the alpha diversity of the epileptic group differed significantly from that of the healthy control group, with a notable decrease in the Shannon index and an increase in the Simpson index. Similarly, Xie et al. (2017) reported that the alpha diversity of gut flora in infants with refractory epilepsy was reduced in comparison to healthy subjects. Additionally, Xu et al. (2021) and Gong et al. (2021) demonstrated that there were no statistically significant differences between the refractory epilepsy group and the refractory epilepsy group after ketogenic diet treatment compared to healthy controls. However, the study did indicate a potential trend toward a decrease. Another study by the same author revealed that the alpha diversity index of children in the epilepsy group was significantly lower than that of the family control group (Gong et al., 2020). The results were inconclusive due to the heterogeneity of the samples, the diversity of the experimental approaches, the variability in the etiology of epilepsy, the differing sensitivities to antiepileptic drugs, and the age range of the participants. It is therefore recommended that further studies be conducted using more specialized experiments with larger sample sizes.

4.2 About levels of genus and phylum

This study examines characteristic gut microbiota taxa by selecting flora from multiple studies with sufficient data for metaanalysis. The findings of different studies have yielded disparate conclusions, with some studies even reaching completely opposite conclusions. The two most abundant phyla are Anabaena and Firmicutes (Zhang et al., 2023). A significant decrease in Firmicutes was observed in a study by Cui et al. (2022). This group is complex, comprising intricate sub-phylum, orders, and genera under the genus Firmicutes. Additionally, relatively few studies have been conducted on this group. The Firmicutes/Bacteroidetes (F/B) ratio is regarded as a key indicator for depicting intestinal disorders (Mohamed Qadir and Assafi, 2021). Prior research has revealed an elevated F/B ratio in the intestinal microbiota of individuals diagnosed with epilepsy (Arulsamy et al., 2020), indicating a potential correlation between this alteration in microbiota structure and the production of short-chain fatty acids, which may contribute to the development of severe

hao1	Tatal	Ex	perimental	Total	Maan	Control	Standardised Mean	emp	0.5% (1)	Weight	Weig
ludy	Total	wean	50	Iotai	wean	50	Difference	SIND	95%-01	(common)	(randor
ngting Liu et al. 2023	13	472.06	100.5363	7	524.33	81.7301		-0.53	[-1.47; 0.41]	3.0%	8.0
an Dong et al. 2022	41	339.60	61.0148	30	325.97	72.4174		0.20	[-0.27; 0.68]	11.6%	8.6
uangying Cui et al. 2022	24	514.71	76.4935	50	340.59	17.6711	i: —=	3.78	[2.98; 4.57]	4.1%	8.2
hangci Zhou et al. 2022	10	203.82	52.0198	14	128.94	31.3617		1.76	[0.78; 2.74]	2.7%	7.9
u Xu et al. 2021	29	257.89	160.4524	29	277.42	100.2566		-0.14	[-0.66; 0.37]	9.7%	8.6
n Wan et al. 2021	23	87.73	27.2961	21	97.25	30.2961		-0.33	[-0.92; 0.27]	7.3%	8.5
ue Gong et al. 2021	12	964.38	322 2480	12	503.93	122,8465		1.82	[0.85: 2.80]	2.7%	7.9
hvun Lee et al. 2021	8	166 50	53 8000	32	242 33	46 1639	II	-1.56	[-2 41: -0 71]	3.6%	8 1
ue Congretal 2020	55	353 33	48 5400	46	/10 /8	101 9400		-0.73	[-1.14:-0.33]	15.8%	8.7
aria Lindefeldt et el 2010	10	111 70	50.0950	40	454.44	20 4192		-0.75	[-1.14, -0.00]	2.7%	0.7
	12	000.00	00.0470	12	040.00	55.4105		-0.02	[-1.00, 0.02]	47.0%	0.1
njiao Peng et al. 2018	42	239.92	68.2473	65	216.96	65.7959		0.34	[-0.05; 0.73]	17.0%	8.7
njiao Peng et al. 2018	49	213.50	74.1715	65	216.96	65.7959		-0.05	[-0.42; 0.32]	18.8%	8.7
ommon effect model	318			383				0.07	[-0.09; 0.23]	100.0%	400.0
andom effects model								0.30	[-0.52; 1.11]	•	100.0
eterogeneity: /² = 93%, τ² = 1.9	9331, p <	0.01									
		_									
annon	Total	Expe	rimental SD	Total	Mean	SD SD	Standardised Mean	SMD	95%-01	Weight	Weig (rando
udy	Total	Mean	30	Iotai	wean	30	Difference	SIND	36%-01	(common)	(randoi
vim Türay et al. 2023	20	2.56	0.1530	7	2.52	0.1155	: i =	0.25	[-0.61; 1.11]	6.0%	9.9
angci Zhou et al. 2022	10	3.79	0.3234	14	3.17	0.4587	:; — -	1.47	[0.54; 2.40]	5.2%	9.8
anvuan Dai et al. 2022	10	2.98	0.5800	19	3.57	0.3800		-1.26	[-2.10: -0.42]	6.3%	10.0
angving Cui et al. 2022	24	2.54	0.2365	50	3.40	0.0748	!!	-5.84	[-6.92: -4.76]	3.8%	9.1
Xuetal 2021	29	3 14	0.4995	29	2.87	1 2437		0.28	[-0.24: 0.80]	16.6%	10 :
wunlee et al 2021	23	2 30	0.9000	20	3.28	0.2976	;i]	2 10	[-0.24, 0.00]	5 2%	0.0
Wer at al. 2021	22	2.50	0.0000	32	5.20	0.2370		-2.13	[-3.12, -1.27]	10.270	10.0
i wan et al. 2021	23	4.76	0.6025	21	5.01	0.5111		-0.37	[-0.97; 0.23]	12.5%	10.2
e Gong et al. 2020	55	3.14	0.5900	46	3.39	0.5800		-0.42	[-0.82; -0.03]	28.4%	10.3
rie Lindefeldt et al. 2019	12	4.69	0.7416	12	5.58	0.2554		-1.56	[-2.49; -0.63]	5.1%	9.8
n Xie et al. 2017	14	2.30	0.5856	30	2.16	0.6214	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.23	[-0.41; 0.87]	11.0%	10.2
ommon effect model	205			260			•	-0.50	[-0.71; -0.29]	100.0%	
andom effects model								-0.92	[-2.14; 0.30]	•	100.0
terogeneity: $I^2 = 94\%$, $\tau^2 = 3$.	7181, p <	0.01					-6 -4 -2 0 2 4 6				
		_									
mpson	Total	Mean	erimental SD	Total	Mean	SD	Standardised Mean	SMD	95%-CI	(common)	(randor
,										(,	(
vim Türay et al. 2023	20	0.84	0.0318	7	0.85	0.0173		-0.25	[-1.11; 0.61]	8.9%	12.5
uaizhen Gong et al. 2022	10	0.05	0.0088	14	0.10	0.0207		-2.86	[-4.06; -1.67]	4.6%	12.3
angci Zhou et al. 2022	10	0.05	0.0159	14	0.10	0.0344		-1.58	[-2.53; -0.64]	7.4%	12.5
angying Cui et al. 2022	24	0.28	0.0518	50	0.09	0.0098		6.37	[5.21; 7.53]	4.9%	12.3
vun Lee et al. 2021	 Я	0.20	0.2000	32	15.30	5.4312		-3.02	[-4.06: -1.98]	6.1%	12 4
Wan et al 2021		0.20	0.0445	21	0 04	0.0260		-0.67	[-1 28: -0.06]	17.8%	12.5
e Conglet al 2021	20	0.01	0.0115	10	0.00	0.0406	- {	1 14	[0.27: 2.04]	0 70/	12.1
e Gong et al. 2021	12	0.94	0.0115	46	0.90	0.0490		0.52	[0.27, 2.01]	41 7%	12.5
5 Cong et al. 2020	55	0.12	0.0040	40	0.09	0.0430		0.52	[0.12, 0.92]	+1.770	12.0
mmon effect model	162			196			÷.	0.06	[-0.20; 0.31]	100.0%	
ndom effects model								-0.05	[-2.09; 2.00]	•	100.
erogeneity: $l^2 = 96\%$, $\tau^2 = 8$.	4700, p <	0.01					-6 -4 -2 0 2 4 6				
_		-				Control	Standardis - 1 M			M-:	141-1
e dy	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	(common)	(rando
										, ,	•
ingci Zhou et al. 2022	10	204.76	51.7348	14	84.77	31.3249		2.83	[1.64; 4.02]	19.3%	32.
angying Cui et al. 2022	24	561.00	73.7605	50	358.62	19.6814		4.48	[3.59; 5.36]	35.0%	33.0
run Lee et al. 2020	8	171.00	55.5000	32	167.82	44.6804		0.07	[-0.71; 0.84]	45.7%	33.9
mon effect model	42			96				2 1 4	[1 62. 2 671	100.0%	
ndom effects model	42			30				2.14	[-0.11; 5.00]	100.0%	100
	8495 n -	0.01						2.40	[3, 6.00]	•	
	3495, p <	0.01									
erogeneity: / = 96%, τ = 4.6							-4 -2 0 2 4				
srogeneity: / = 96%, τ = 4.6							-4 -2 0 2 4				

inflammation and complex infections (Bazzocchi et al., 2021; Rodenhouse et al., 2022). However, in the meta-analysis of the present study, the F/B ratio was not significantly different in the epileptic and control groups, which may be related to the small sample size. In this study, there was no significant difference between epileptic patients and healthy controls in the phylum Bacteroidetes, but *Lactobacillus* under *Bacteroidetes* was significantly reduced in the group of epileptic patients, and *Lactobacillus* is able to regulate the balance of the intestinal microbial community, promote the digestion of food and absorption of nutrients, reduce the cholesterol level of the body, and alleviate the intestinal inflammation and infection,. It is also implied that there exists the possibility of decreased intestinal anti-inflammatory capacity in epilepsy patients (Schloissnig et al., 2013). The results of the present study showed a significant increase in *Verrucomicrobia* and subordinate *Akkermansia* in the intestinal microbiota of epileptic patients compared to healthy controls. The abundance of *Verrucomicrobia* is closely related to intestinal health, contributing to glucose homeostasis in the human gut; and also possesses anti-inflammatory properties, which may further aid in intestinal health, as demonstrated by studies showing that a positive correlation between *Verrucomicrobia* and the foxp3 gene, a gene that expresses anti-inflammatory and immunity properties in humans (Yan et al., 2023). *Akkermansia*, which is under the phylum of *Verrucomicrobia*, is present in large quantities under normal

F

ActinobacteriaStudyTotTingting Liu 2023-Guangying Cui 20221Lu Xu et al. 20212Xue Gong et al. 20202Xue Gong et al. 20202Marie Lindefeldt et al. 20191Common effect model1Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 93\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.6794$, p BacteroidetesTotStudyTotTingting Liu 20231Guangying Cui 20222Lu Xu et al. 20212Lu Xu et al. 20212Lu Xu et al. 20211	al Me 13 46. 24 4. 10 1. 29 29. 30 4. 25 0. 12 6. 13 14 15 15 15 15 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16	Experimental an SD 96 34.0430 04 2.8000 88 1.4680 15 23.2300 63 0.4600 91 10.0800 86 7.2115	Total 7 50 14 29 46 46 46 11 203	Mean 36.72 3.84 0.31 27.40 0.11 0.11 10.16	Control SD 26.1030 1.1000 0.2173 23.1300 1.5900 1.5900 11.4860	Standardised Mean Difference	SMD 0.31 1.58 0.07 3.51 0.13 -0.34	95%-Cl [-0.61; 1.24] [-0.38; 0.60] [0.64; 2.53] [-0.44; 0.59] [2.78; 4.25]	Weight (common) 6.6% 23.7% 6.3% 21.2% 10.4%	Weigh (random 13.6% 14.9% 13.6% 14.8% 14.2%
Study Tot Tingting Liu 2023 - Guangying Cui 2022 - Changoi Zhou 2022 - Lu Xu et al. 2021 - Xue Gong et al. 2020 - Xue Gong et al. 2020 - Xue Gong et al. 2020 - Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1 Common effect model 1 Random effects model - Heterogeneity: /² = 93%, τ² = 1.6794, ρ Bacteroidetes - Study Totr Tingting Liu 2023 1 Guangying Cui 2022 2 Lu Xu et al. 2021 2 Lu Xu et al. 2021 2 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1	al Me 13 46. 24 4. 10 1. 29 29. 30 4. 25 0. 12 6. 13 0 < 0.01 I al Mea	an SD 96 34.0430 04 2.8000 88 1.4680 15 23.2300 63 0.4600 91 10.0800 86 7.2115	Total 7 50 14 29 46 46 11 203	Mean 36.72 3.84 0.31 27.40 0.11 0.11 10.16	SD 26.1030 1.1000 0.2173 23.1300 1.5900 1.5900 11.4860		SMD 0.31 0.11 1.58 0.07 3.51 0.13 -0.34	95%-Cl [-0.61; 1.24] [-0.38; 0.60] [0.64; 2.53] [-0.44; 0.59] [2.78; 4.25]	(common) 6.6% 23.7% 6.3% 21.2% 10.4%	(random 13.6% 14.9% 13.6% 14.8% 14.2%
Tingting Liu 2023 Guangying Cui 2022 Changoi Zhou 2022 Lu Xu et al. 2021 Xue Gong et al. 2020 Xue Gong et al. 2020 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 Common effect model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 93\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.6794$, l^2 Bacteroidetes Study Totz Tingting Liu 2023 1 Guangying Cui 2022 2 Lu Xu et al. 2021 2	13 46. 24 4. 10 1. 29 29. 30 4. 25 0. 12 6. 13 0 < 0.01	96 34.0430 04 2.8000 88 1.4680 15 23.2300 63 0.4600 91 10.0800 86 7.2115	7 50 14 29 46 46 46 11 203	36.72 3.84 0.31 27.40 0.11 0.11 10.16	26.1030 1.1000 0.2173 23.1300 1.5900 1.5900 11.4860		0.31 0.11 1.58 0.07 3.51 0.13 -0.34	[-0.61; 1.24] [-0.38; 0.60] [0.64; 2.53] [-0.44; 0.59] [2.78; 4.25]	6.6% 23.7% 6.3% 21.2% 10.4%	13.69 14.99 13.69 14.89 14.89
Tingting Liu 2023 C Guangying Cui 2022 C Lu Xu et al. 2021 2 Lu Xu et al. 2021 2 Xue Gong et al. 2020 2 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1 Common effect model 14 Random effects model 14 Bacteroidetes 5 Study Tota Tingting Liu 2023 1 Guangying Cui 2022 2 Lu Xu et al. 2021 1	13 46. 24 4. 10 1. 29 29. 30 4. 25 0. 12 6. 13 0 < 0.01	96 34.0430 04 2.8000 88 1.4680 15 23.2300 63 0.4600 91 10.0800 86 7.2115	7 50 14 29 46 46 46 11 203	36.72 3.84 0.31 27.40 0.11 0.11 10.16	26.1030 1.1000 0.2173 23.1300 1.5900 1.5900 11.4860		0.31 0.11 1.58 0.07 3.51 0.13 -0.34	[-0.61; 1.24] [-0.38; 0.60] [0.64; 2.53] [-0.44; 0.59] [2.78; 4.25]	6.6% 23.7% 6.3% 21.2% 10.4%	13.69 14.99 13.69 14.89 14.89
Guangying Cui 2022 2 Changoi Zhou 2022 2 Lu Xu et al. 2021 2 Xue Gong et al. 2020 2 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1 Common effect model 14 Random effects model 14 Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 93\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.6794$, l 3 Bacteroidetes 5 Study Total Tingting Liu 2023 1 Guangying Cui 2022 2 Lu Xu et al. 2021 2 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1	24 4. 10 1. 29 29. 30 4. 25 0. 12 6. 13 5 < 0.01 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	04 2.8000 88 1.4680 15 23.2300 63 0.4600 91 10.0800 86 7.2115	50 14 29 46 46 11 203	3.84 0.31 27.40 0.11 0.11 10.16	1.1000 0.2173 23.1300 1.5900 1.5900 11.4860		0.11 1.58 0.07 3.51 0.13 -0.34	[-0.38; 0.60] [0.64; 2.53] [-0.44; 0.59] [2.78; 4.25]	23.7% 6.3% 21.2% 10.4%	14.99 13.69 14.89 14.29
Changci Zhou 2022	10 1. 29 29. 30 4. 25 0. 12 6. 13 0 < 0.01	88 1.4680 15 23.2300 63 0.4600 91 10.0800 86 7.2115	14 29 46 46 11 203	0.31 27.40 0.11 0.11 10.16	0.2173 23.1300 1.5900 1.5900 11.4860		1.58 0.07 3.51 0.13 -0.34	[0.64; 2.53] [-0.44; 0.59] [2.78; 4.25]	6.3% 21.2% 10.4%	13.6% 14.8% 14.2%
Lu Xu et al. 2021 2 Xue Gong et al. 2020 3 Xue Gong et al. 2020 3 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 7 Common effect model 4 Random effects model 4 Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 93\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.6794$, p Bacteroidetes Study Tota Tingting Liu 2023 1 Guangying Cui 2022 2 Lu Xu et al. 2021 1	29 29. 30 4. 25 0. 12 6. 13 0 < 0.01	15 23.2300 63 0.4600 91 10.0800 86 7.2115	29 46 46 11 203	27.40 0.11 0.11 10.16	23.1300 1.5900 1.5900 11.4860		0.07 3.51 0.13 -0.34	[-0.44; 0.59] [2.78; 4.25]	21.2% 10.4%	14.89 14.29
Control in 2021 2 Xue Gong et al. 2020 2 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 2 Common effect model 14 Random effects model 14 Random effects model 14 Bacteroidetes 3 Study Tota Tingting Liu 2023 1 Guargying Cui 2022 2 Lu Xu et al. 2021 2 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1	30 4. 25 0. 12 6. 13 0 < 0.01 I al Mea	63 0.4600 91 10.0800 86 7.2115	46 46 11 203	0.11 0.11 10.16	1.5900 1.5900 11.4860		3.51 0.13 -0.34	[2.78; 4.25]	10.4%	14.29
Xue Gong et al. 2020 2 Xue Gong et al. 2020 2 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1 Common effect model 14 Random effects model 14 Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 93\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.6794$, l Bacteroidetes Study Tingting Liu 2023 1 Guangying Cui 2022 2 Lu Xu et al. 2021 2 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1	25 0. 2 6. 3 ⇒<0.01 al Mea	53 0.4600 91 10.0800 86 7.2115	46 46 11 203	0.11 0.11 10.16	1.5900 1.5900 11.4860		0.13	[2.76, 4.25]	10.4%	14.27
Xue Gong et al. 2020 2 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1 Random effect model 14 Random effects model 14 Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 93\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.6794$, μ Bacteroidetes 5 Study Total Tingting Liu 2023 1 Guangying Cui 2022 2 Lu Xu et al. 2021 1 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1	25 0. 2 6. 3 ⊅<0.01 al Mea	91 10.0800 86 7.2115	46 11 203	0.11 10.16	1.5900 11.4860		-0.34			
Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 14 Random effects model 14 Random effects model 14 Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 93\%, \tau^2 = 1.6794, \mu$ Bacteroidetes Study Tota Tingting Liu 2023 1 Guangying Cui 2022 2 Lu Xu et al. 2021 2 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1	2 6. 3 ⊳<0.01 al Mea	86 7.2115	11 203	10.16	11.4860		-0.34	[-0.36; 0.62]	23.6%	14.9%
Common effect model 14 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 93\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.6794$, μ Bacteroidetes Study Tingting Liu 2023 1 Guangying Cui 2022 2 Lu Xu et al. 2021 2 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1	13 5 < 0.01 	Xperimental	203				0.01	[-1.16; 0.49]	8.3%	14.0%
Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 93\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.6794$, l Bacteroidetes Study Tot: Tingting Liu 2023 1 Guangying Cui 2022 2 Lu Xu et al. 2021 2 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1	o< 0.01 I al Mea	xperimental					0.53	[0.29; 0.77]	100.0%	
Heterogeneity: /* = 93%, τ* = 1.6794, μ Bacteroidetes Study Tot: Tingting Liu 2023 1 Guangying Cui 2022 2 Lu Xu et al. 2021 2 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1	o< 0.01 al Me	Experimental					0.76	[-0.24; 1.76]	•	100.0
Bacteroidetes Study Tot Tingting Liu 2023 1 Guangying Cui 2022 2 Lu Xu et al. 2021 2 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1	l al Mea	Experimental				-4 -2 0 2 4				
Study Tot Tingting Liu 2023 1 Guangying Cui 2022 2 Lu Xu et al. 2021 2 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1	al Mea				Control	Standardised Mean			Weight	Weigl
Tingting Liu 2023 1 Guangying Cui 2022 2 Lu Xu et al. 2021 2 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1		an SD	Total	Mean	SD	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	(common)	(randor
Guangying Cui 2023 2 Guangying Cui 2022 2 Lu Xu et al. 2021 2 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1	2 1	1 8070	7	0.00	2 0000		0.44	[0.40, 1.27]	15.0%	24.7
Guangying Cui 2022 2 Lu Xu et al. 2021 2 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1	3 1.	1.8270		0.00	3.0000		0.44	[-0.49; 1.37]	15.0%	24.7
Lu Xu et al. 2021 2 Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1	4 10.	70 3.8200	50	21.60	2.2900		-3.76	[-4.55; -2.97]	20.8%	25.0
Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1	9 15.4	17.6800	29	13.16	16.4700	i	0.13	[-0.39; 0.64]	48.9%	25.5
	2 41.	39 17.1746	11	19.02	15.8517	i [1.33	[0.41; 2.25]	15.3%	24.7
0	•		07			1 I	0.45	C 0 04- 0 001	400.0%	
Random effects model 7	0		97				-0.45 -0.47	[-0.01; -0.09] [-2.68: 1.741	100.0%	100 0
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 97\%$, $\tau^2 = 4.9022$, p	< 0.01						0.47			
Firmicutes						-4 -2 0 2 4				
Study Tot:	al Me:	xperimental. ח SD	Total	Mean	Control SD	Standardised Mean Difference	SMD	95%-CI	Weight (common)	Weig (rando
,		50	. otal					50,00	()	
Tingting Liu 2023 1	3 39.	33 34.8750	7	36.52	33.2770		0.09	[-0.83; 1.01]	8.2%	18.2
u Xu et al 2021 2	9 31	37 24 4100	29	39.66	28 4000		-0.31	[-0.83·0.21]	25.9%	21.3
	0 47	57 24.4100	20	22.00	40.5000		0.01	[0.00, 0.21]	20.070	21.0
Kue Gong et al. 2020 3	0 47.	12.2500	46	33.50	18.5000		0.85	[0.37; 1.33]	30.1%	21.5
(ue Gong et al. 2020 2	5 38.	96 20.8900	46	33.50	18.5000	:10	0.28	[-0.21; 0.77]	29.0%	21.5
/larie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1	2 23.	05 10.5050	11	47.07	13.7047	ili	-1.91	[-2.92; -0.89]	6.7%	17.4
						li				
Common effect model 10	9		139			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.14	[-0.13; 0.40]	100.0%	
Random effects model							-0.14	[-0.99; 0.72]	•	100.0
Heterogeneity: / ² = 85%, τ ² = 0.8204, ρ	< 0.01					-2 -1 0 1 2				
Proteobacteria	1	Experimental			Control	Standardised Mean			Weight	Weia
Study Tota	al Me	an SD	Total	Mean	SD	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	(common)	(randor
			_			- 10				
i ingting Liu 2023 1	35. 1	10 4.6510	7	26.68	18.6600		-1.81	[-2.91; -0.70]	11.6%	24.7
Guangying Cui 2022 2	4 0.	23 0.0697	50	0.02	0.0038		5.22	[4.23; 6.21]	14.5%	24.9
_u Xu et al. 2021 2	9 19.	38 22.1600	29	19.06	14.6800		0.04	[-0.47; 0.56]	53.7%	25.4
Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 1	2 7.	31 10.7812	11	1.33	8.8549	++++	0.58	[-0.26; 1.42]	20.2%	25.1
Common offect model 7	0		07				0.60	[0 24. 4 07]	100.0%	
Random effects model	0		57				1.01	[-1.90; 3.91]	100.0%	100.0
Heterogeneity: I ² = 97%, τ ² = 8.5833, ρ	< 0.01									
/errucomicrobia	Ex	perimental			Control	-0 -4 -2 0 2 4 0 Standardised Mean			Weight	Weic
Study Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	(common)	(rando
Finantian Line 2000	7.00	46 4070	-	0.00	0.0000	1 1 -	0.54	1040.444	0.404	
ingung Liu 2023 13	7.00	10.1670	(0.00	0.0030		0.51	[-0.43; 1.44]	8.4%	8.4
u Xu et al. 2021 29	4.28	12.3200	29	0.97	4.9200		0.35	[-0.17; 0.87]	27.1%	27.1
Kue Gong et al. 2020 30	1.25	1.0100	46	0.08	4.0800		0.36	[-0.11; 0.82]	34.0%	34.0
Kue Gong et al. 2020 25	1.24	3.5300	46	0.08	4.0800		0.29	[-0.20; 0.78]	30.5%	30.5
common effect model			128				0.35	10.08-0.621	100.0%	
Pandom offects model 9/			120				0.30	0.00, 0.021	100.0%	100
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$. $b = 0.9$	8						0.35	L 0.00, 0.62j	•	100.0
Simulanda a /D 1.1.4						-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1				
innicutes/Bacteroidetes	Ex	perimental			Control	Standardised Mean			Weight	Weig
Study Total	Mean	SD 1	Total	Mean	SD	Difference S	MD	95%-CI	(common)	(rando
ingting Liu 2023 13	37.93	19.0887	7 36	519.00	11.0923	-2073	8.32 [-2	2785.87; -1360.77]	0.0%	31.2
_u Xu et al. 2021 29	2.04	1.3807	29	3.01	1.7243	-0	.62	[-1.14; -0.09]	82.3%	34.4
Marie Lindefeldt et al. 2019 12	0.55	0.6117	11	2.47	0.8646	-2	2.50	[-3.63; -1.36]	17.7%	34.4
Common offerst market - 1-1			47				05	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	400.08	
Common effect model 54			4/			-0	1.35 17 7	[-1.43; -0.47]	100.0%	400 -
						-648	[-	1000.01; 660.18]	•	100.0
teterogeneity: /* = 95%, τ ² = 1295564.61	з8, p < 0.	гı				2000 1000 0 1000 2000				
						-2000 -1000 0 1000 2000				

conditions and is considered to be used as a probiotic (Zhai et al., 2019). The relative abundance of *Akkermansia* is reduced in glucose metabolism, obesity and inflammatory bowel disease (Cani and de Vos, 2017; Rajilić-Stojanović et al., 2013), and studies have shown (Zhai et al., 2019; Derrien et al., 2017) that it promotes intestinal

barrier integrity, increases mucus thickness, and is conducive to metabolic and immune responses. The precise mechanism of interaction between *Akkermansia* and epilepsy remains unclear. Olson et al. (2018) showed that in a mouse model of refractory epilepsy, *Akkermansia* mediated a ketogenic diet-induced protective effect

Using the field methods Using the fie	kkermansia		Expe	rimental			Control	Standardised Mean			Weight	Weigl
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	tudy	lotal	Mean	SD	lotal	Mean	SD	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	(common)	(randon
$ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c}$	ingting Liu 2023	13	7.00	16.1670	7	0.00	0.0030		0.51	[-0.43; 1.44]	8.3%	8.3
us designed al. 2020 30 195 19.50 0.000 46 2.22 38.4800 some officts model 97 128 195 0.700 46 2.22 38.4800 some officts model 97 128 195 0.700 46 2.22 38.4800 some officts model 97 128 195 0.700 46 2.22 38.4800 some officts model 97 128 195 0.700 46 2.22 38.4800 some officts model 97 101 0.001 195 0.105 0.100 0.0020 standow officts model 97 110 0.02 24 0.27 1000 0.0020 standow officts model 98 107 116 300 1055 1500 0.0020 standow officts model 98 107 116 300 1055 1500 0.0020 standow officts model 98 107 116 300 1055 1500 0.0020 standow officts model 98 107 116 300 1055 1500 0.0020 standow officts model 98 107 116 300 1055 1500 0.0020 standow officts model 98 107 116 300 1055 1500 0.0020 standow officts model 108 0.001 100.015 100 0.000 0.0020 standow officts model 108 0.000 0.0020 0.0000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0	u Xu et al. 2021	29	4.10	12.3700	29	0.88	5.0000		0.34	[-0.18; 0.86]	27.1%	27.19
$ \begin a i i 2020 2 i 2 i 2.28 3.4600 4 i 2.22 3 4 2.27 1 2.26 3.35 1 6.450 2 2 1 0.25 1 5.690 7 1 0.00 1 0.02 0 1 0.25 1.30 1 0.04 5.68 1 0.00 1 0.04 0 0.01 0 0.04 0 0.00 0 0.01 0 0.04 0 0.00 0 0.01 0 0.04 0 0.00 0 0.01 0 0.04 0 0.00 0 0.01 0 0.04 0 0.00 0 0.01 0 0.04 0 0.00 0 0.01 0 0.00 0 0.01 0 0.00 0 0.01 0 0.00 0 0.01 0 0.00 0 0.01 0 0.00 0 0.01 0 0.00 0 0$	ue Gong et al. 2020	30	11.95	10.1000	46	2.92	38,4800		0.29	[-0.17: 0.75]	34.1%	34.19
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	ue Gong et al. 2020	25	12.68	34,6000	46	2.92	38,4800		0.26	[-0.23: 0.75]	30.5%	30.5
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $										[]		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	ommon effect model	97			128				0.31	[0.04:0.58]	100.0%	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	andom offects model	57			120				0.31	[0.04; 0.50]	100.070	100.09
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\frac{1}{2}$								0.51	[0.04, 0.30]	•	100.0
Catcher (control Experimental (control Control Sandardised Mean Sandardised Mean Mun Weigh (rade (control Weigh (rade	eterogeneity. $T = 0\%$, $\tau = 0$,	p = 0.97						-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1				
tudy Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Difference SMD $39/2$ -Cl (common) (randominal common) (randominal common) ngling Lu 2023 13 0.22 15.53 164500 29 10.55 11.56 13.64 20 20 12.83 164500 29 10.55 10.6500 20 10.25 13.06 10.22 13.3 0.27 42.18 23.27% 23.28 24.44 20.200 23.28 24.44 20.200 23.28 24.44 20.200 23.28 24.44 20.200 23.28 24.44 20.200 23.28 24.200 23.44 24.200	acteroides		Exc	perimental			Control	Standardised Mean			Weight	Weid
$ \begin{array}{c} \mbox{train} trai$	tudy	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	(common)	(randou
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	luuy	Total	Mean	50	Total	Weall	50	Difference	SIND	3378-01	(connion)	(randoi
	inatina Liu 2023	13	0.92	1 5580	7	0.00	0 0020	: 4	0 70	[-0.25: 1.65]	13.6%	24.9
$ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c}$	uangving Cui et al 2022	24	2 77	1.0000	50	11 55	1 3100		-7 11	[-8 38: -5 84]	7.6%	24.6
$ \begin{array}{c} \text{Arter an OZ1} \\ ar$		24	12.52	16 4500	20	10.05	1.5100		-7.11	[-0.30, -3.04]	1.076	24.0
n man effect model 89 107 asteogramming of 2 start 100 4528 21 225 3.3287 $U = 255$		29	13.55	16.4500	29	10.25	15.6900	: =	0.20	[-0.31; 0.72]	46.1%	25.2
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	in wan et al. 2021	23	8.41	10.4528	21	2.55	3.0287	1	0.73	[0.12; 1.35]	32.1%	25.2
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$												
and endergreity: $f^{2} = 95^{+}$, $f^{2} = 1.1980, p < 0.01$ if dobacterium tudy Tetal Mean SD Tetal Mean SD Tetal Mean SD ungying Cui etal. 2022 24 4.00 2.7900 25 25.44 23.1200 u Xu etal. 2021 22 04 4.00 2.7900 25 25.44 23.1200 u Xu etal. 2021 22 04 4.00 2.7900 25 25.44 23.1200 u Xu etal. 2021 22 04 4.00 2.7900 25 25.44 23.1200 u Xu etal. 2021 22 04 4.00 2.7900 24 0.00057 and confect model 168 224 and confect model 168 224 and methets model at experimental tudy Tetal Mean SD	ommon effect model	89			107				-0.11	[-0.46; 0.24]	100.0%	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	andom effects model								-1.34	[-5.06; 2.38]		100.0
ifidobacterium Experimental Control Standardised Mean Standardised Mean </td <td>eterogeneity: $I^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 1$</td> <td>4.1980, <i>µ</i></td> <td>o < 0.01</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	eterogeneity: $I^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 1$	4.1980, <i>µ</i>	o < 0.01									
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	ifidobacterium		Ev	norimontal			Control	-5 U 5 Standardised Mean			Weight	Waia
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	tudy	Tota		perimentai en	Total	Meen	Control	Difference	emp	95% CI	(common)	/rendo
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	tuay	Tota	Mean	50	Iotai	wean	50	Difference	SIND	35%-01	(common)	(rando
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	ingting Live 2022	13	41.00	22 1440	7	34.40	26 4040	 , ;	0.22	[0.60: 1.16]	E 0%	10 /
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	ingung Liu 2023	10	41.90	33.1410	50	34.40	20.4940		0.23	[-0.09, 1.10]	3.9%	12.1
$ \begin{array}{c} \text{Like is al. 2021} \\ \text{us de Gong et al. 2021} \\ \text{us de Gong et al. 2020} \\ \text{us de Mand } \begin{array}{c} \text{SD} \\ \text{Total} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{Mean} \\ \text{SD} \\ \text{SD} \\ \text{Total} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{Mean} \\ \text{SD} \\ \text{Total} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{Mean} \\ SD$	suangying Cullet al. 2022	24	4.00	2.7900	50	3.35	1.0900	177	0.35	[-0.14; 0.84]	20.7%	12.9
ue de orgental 2021 23 0.49 0.279 23 0.50 0.248 11. $122 0.39 4 2.69 0.4300 46 0.16 13.8800 0.0075 0.072 0.270 0.03 [-0.19, 0.79] 22 0.55 0.0248 0.4300 46 0.16 13.8800 0.030 [-0.19, 0.79] 22 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 22 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 22 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 22 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 22 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 22 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 22 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 22 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 22 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 22 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 22 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 22 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 22 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 20 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 20 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 20 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 20 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 20 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 20 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 20 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 20 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 20 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 20 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 20 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 20 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 20 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 20 0.30 [-0.19, 0.79] 20 0.30 [-0.19, 0.71] 10 0.0% 0.74 [-0.33; 1.81] . 100.0% 0.74 [-0.33; 1.81] . 100.0% 0.74 [-0.33; 1.81] . 100.0% 0.74 [-0.32; 0.29] 13.1% 24.3 0.28 [-0.22, 0.2] 13 3.37 3.3683 7 20 26 19.0400 29 0.72 0.2700 0.74 [-0.22, 24 12.21 5.1700 50 0.72 0.2700 0.41 0.2022 10 3.96 2.3654 14 0.17 0.09973 0.72 0.2700 0.41 0.2022 10 3.96 2.3654 14 0.17 0.09973 0.74 0.22 0.88 [-0.22, 0.80] 52.20 % 25.24 (-$	u Xu et al. 2021	29	24.81	21.7200	29	25.44	23.1200		-0.03	[-0.54; 0.49]	18.8%	12.9
In Ware tal. 2021 23 0.49 0.2799 23 0.50 0.2498 -0.616 13.8900 -0.616 13.8900 -0.616 13.8900 -0.616 13.8900 -0.616 13.8900 -0.616 13.8900 -0.616 13.8900 -0.616 13.8900 -0.616 13.8900 -0.99 [-1.86] -0.11] 6.5% 12. -0.99 [-1.86] -0.11] 6.5\% 12. -0.99 [-1.86] -0.11] 6.5\% 12. -0.99 [-1.86] -0.11] 6.5\% 12. -0.99 [-1.86] -0.11] 6.5\% 12. -0.99 [-1.86] -0.11] 6.5\% 12. -0.99 [-1.86] -0.11] 6.5\% 12. -0.99 [-1.86] -0.11] 6.5\% 12. -0.99 [-1.86] -0.11] 6.5\% 12. -0.99 [-1.86] -0.11] 6.5\% 12. -0.99 [-1.86] -0.11] 6.5\% 12. -0.99 [-1.86] -0.11] 6.5\% 12. -0.99 [-1.86] -0.11] 6.5\% 12. -0.99 [-1.86] -0.11] 6.5\% 12. -0.99 [-1.86] -0.11] 6.5\% 12. -0.99 [-1.86] -0.11] 6.5\% 12. -0.99 [-1.86] -0.91 [-1.92] -0.23] 13.1\% 24. -2 0 2 4 -1.4 20 2 2 4 -1.4 [-0.98] [-0.23] -0.91] -0.95 [-0.17] -1.43 [-2.47] -0.39 [-0.37] -1.43 [-2.47] -0.39] [-0.37] -1.100 [-0.56] [-1.01] -0.91] -0.0\% -0.55 [-1.01] -0.91] -0.0\% -0.55 [-1.01] -0.91] -0.0\% -0.55 [-1.01] -0.91] -0.0\% -0.55 [-1.01] -0.91] -0.0\% -0.55 [-1.01] -0.91] -0.0\% -0.55 [-1.01] -0.91] -0.0\% -0.55 [-1.01] -0.91] -0.0\% -0.55 [-1.01] -0.91] -0.0\% -0.55 [-1.01] -0.91] -0.0\% -0.55 [-1.01] -0.91] -0.0\% -0.55 [-1.01] -0.91] -0.0\% -0.55	ue Gong et al. 2021	12	2 0.24	0.1002	12	0.05	0.0575		2.32	[1.25; 3.39]	4.3%	11.7
ue Gong et al. 2020 30 42.6 9 0.4300 46 0.16 13.8800 ue Gong et al. 2020 25 7.58 36.800 46 0.16 13.8800 tarie Lindefeld et al. 2019 12 7.22 13.3142 11 22.60 16.7126 ommon effects model returgeneity; $l^2 = 93\%$, $r^2 = 2.2308$, $p < 0.01$ Scherichia/Shigella tudy Total Mean SD Total Mean SD memon effects model tudy Total Mean SD Total Mean SD memon effects model tudy Total Mean SD Total Mean SD memon effects model tudy Total Mean SD Total Mean SD tudy Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD	in Wan et al. 2021	23	0.49	0.2799	23	0.50	0.2498		-0.01	[-0.59; 0.57]	14.9%	12.8
ue Gong et al. 2020 25 7.58 36.8900 46 0.16 13.8900 andom effect model 168 224 scherichia/Shigella Experimental Control scherichia/Shigella Experimental Control uagying Cui et al. 2021 29 12.60 18.5300 29 8.50 7.8100 ommon effect model 76 100 andom effect model 76 100 and control 29 12.60 18.5300 29 1.12 5.7700 50 0.77 100 77 actobacillus Experimental Control 388 13.07; 4.69 22.0% 25: L = 2, 2, 0 2 4 L = 2, 0, 0, 5, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 5, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 5, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 5, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 5, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 5, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0,	ue Gong et al. 2020	30	42.69	0.4300	46	0.16	13.8900		3.89	[3.10; 4.67]	8.1%	12.4
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	ue Gong et al. 2020	25	5 7.58	36.8900	46	0.16	13.8900		0.30	[-0.19; 0.79]	20.8%	12.9
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	larie Lindefeldt et al. 2019	12	2 7.22	13.3142	11	22.60	16.7126	ii	-0.99	[-1.86; -0.11]	6.5%	12.2
ommon effect model 168 224 andom effects model $-22 + 22308, p < 0.01$ $-4 - 2 - 0 - 2 - 4$ $0.60 - [0.27; 0.72]$ 100.0% scherichia/Shigella Experimental Control Standardised Mean $0.74 - [-0.33; 1.81]$ $0.72 - [-0.33; 1.81]$ $0.72 - [-0.33; 1.81]$ $0.72 - [-0.33; 1.81]$ $0.72 - [-0.33; 1.81]$ $0.72 - [-0.33; 1.81]$ $0.74 - [-0.33; 1.81]$ $0.74 - [-0.33; 1.81]$ $0.74 - [-0.33; 1.81]$ $0.74 - [-0.33; 1.81]$ $0.74 - [-0.33; 1.81]$ $0.74 - [-0.33; 1.81]$ $0.74 - [-0.33; 1.81]$ $0.74 - [-0.33; 1.81]$ $0.74 - [-0.33; 1.81]$ $0.74 - [-0.33; 1.81]$ $0.72 - [-0.33]$ $0.72 - [-0.33]$ $0.72 - [-0.33]$ $0.72 - [-0.33]$ $0.72 - [-0.33]$ $0.74 - [-0.33; 1.81]$ $0.74 - [-0.33; 1.81]$ $0.74 - [-$												
andom effects model $0.74 [0.33; 1.81]$ $0.74 [0.33; 1.81]$ 100.04 eterogeneity: $r^2 = 93\%, r^2 = 2230, p < 0.01$ Scherichia/Shigella Experimental Control Standardised Mean Mean SD Veight Weight 242 1.232 3.23 1.1.7% 242 1.232 1.232 1.1.7% 242 1.232 1.232 1.1.7% 242 1.232 1.232 1.1.7% 242 1.232 1.232 1.1.1% 1.00.0% 1.232 1.232 1.1.1% 1.232 1.232 1.232 1.232 1.232 1.232 1.232 1.232 1.232 1.232<	ommon effect model	168	3		224			•	0.50	[0.27; 0.72]	100.0%	
$\frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}$	andom effects model								0.74	[-0.33; 1.81]		100.0
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	eterogeneity: $I^2 = 93\%$, $\tau^2 = 2$	2.2308, p	< 0.01									
Shifter (Intra Shigeria tudy Experimental Mean Control Standardised Mean Standardised Mean Weight Mean Weight Weight (common) Weight (crade (common)	scharichia/Shigall	0						-4 -2 0 2 4				
tudyTotalMeanSDTotalMeanSDTotalMeanSDDifferenceSMD 95% -Cl(common)(randoingting Liu2023133.373.3683720.2619.0400-1.43[-2.47; -0.39]13.1%24.1uangying Cui et al.20222412.215.1700500.720.2700-1.43[-2.47; -0.39]13.1%24.1uangying Cui et al.2022103.962.3654140.170.0973-1.43[-2.47; -0.39]13.1%24.1u Xu et al.20212912.6018.5300298.507.8100-1.43[-2.47; -0.39]13.1%24.1ommon effect model76100	schertenia/Singena	a 	Exp	perimental			Control	Standardised Mean			Weight	Weig
$\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}$	tudy	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	(common)	(rando
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	in atime Live 2022	12	2.27	2 2692	7	20.26	10.0400	P	1 42	[2 47: 0 20]	42 40/	24 -
Using regime that $2022 24 12.21 5.7100 50 0.72 0.2700$ hangei Zhou et al. $2022 10 3.96 2.3654 14 0.17 0.0973$ λ u et al. $2021 29 12.60 18.5300 29 8.50 7.8100$ ommon effect model 76 100 and on effect model 76 100 and and on effect model 76 100 and and and and and and and and and and	ngting Liu 2023	13	3.37	3.3683		20.26	19.0400		-1.43	[-2.47; -0.39]	13.1%	24.1
hangic zhou et al. 2022 10 3.96 2.3654 14 0.17 0.09/3 x x u et al. 2022 1 29 12.60 18.5300 29 8.50 7.8100 ommon effect model 76 100 andom effects model 76 100 4 -2 0 2 4 4 -2 0 2 4 1.10 [0.72; 1.48] 100.0% 1.29 [-0.99; 3.67] . 100.1 actobacillus Experimental Control Standardised Mean Difference SMD 95%-Cl (common) (rando ingting Liu 2023 13 0.26 0.5820 7 3.05 4.8400 y x u et al. 2021 29 0.28 0.7600 29 1.12 2.5700 ommon effect model 42 36 andom effects model eterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 0.37$ RE 5 st plot of the genus level	uangying Cui et al. 2022	24	12.21	5.1700	50	0.72	0.2700		3.88	[3.07; 4.69]	22.0%	25.4
$\frac{1}{2} \text{ (xu et al. 2021)} 29 12.60 18.5300 29 8.50 7.8100 29 8.50 7.8100 328 [-0.23; 0.80] 53.2\% 25.50 32.5\% 25.50 32.5\% 25.50 32.5\% 25.50 32.5\% 25.5\% $	hangci Zhou et al. 2022	10	3.96	2.3654	14	0.17	0.0973		2.42	[1.32; 3.52]	11.7%	24.3
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	u Xu et al. 2021	29	12.60	18.5300	29	8.50	7.8100		0.28	[-0.23; 0.80]	53.2%	25.
ommon effect model 76 100 andom effects model 1.10 $[0.72; 1.48]$ 100.0% andom effects model 1.29 $[0.99; 3.67]$. 100.1% sterogeneity: $l^2 = 96\%, \tau^2 = 5.2172, p < 0.01$ 4 -2 0 2 4 actobacillus Experimental Control Standardised Mean ingting Liu 2023 13 0.26 0.5820 7 3.05 4.8400 -0.94 [-1.92; 0.03] 22.3% 22. ommon effect model 42 36 -0.55 [-1.01; -0.09] 100.0% andom effects model 36 -1.5 -1.05 0 0.5 [-1.01; -0.09] . 100.1% eterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 0.37$. .								l ii				
andom effects model 1.29 $[-0.99; 3.67]$ 100.1 eterogeneity: $l^2 = 96\%, \tau^2 = 5.2172, p < 0.01$ -4 -2 0 2 4 aCtobacillus Experimental Control Standardised Mean 0 Weight Weight tudy Total Mean SD Total Mean SD 0 0 ingting Liu 2023 13 0.26 0.5820 7 3.05 4.8400 -0.94 [-1.92; 0.03] 22.3% 22.3 a Xu et al. 2021 29 0.28 0.7600 29 1.12 2.5700 -0.44 [-0.96; 0.08] 77.7% 77.3 ommon effect model 42 36 -1.5 -1.05 0 0.5 [-1.01; -0.09] 100.0% adom effects model 2 36 -1.5 -1.05 0 0.5 [-1.01; -0.09] . 100.0 at point if $l^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 0.37$ -1.5 -1.05 0 0.5 1.5 -1.01; -0.09] . 100.0	ommon effect model	76			100			•	1.10	[0.72; 1.48]	100.0%	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	andom effects model								1.29	[-0.99; 3.57]		100.
-4 -2 0 2 4 -2 0 2 4 -2 0 2 4 -2 0 2 4 -2 0 2 4 -2 0 2 4 -2 0 2 4 -2 0 2 4 -2 0 2 4 -2 0 2 4 0 2 4 0 2 4 0 2 4 0 2 4 0 2 4 0 2 4 0 2 4 0 2 4 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 1	eterogeneity: $I^2 = 96\%$, $\tau^2 = 5$	5.2172, p	< 0.01									
Control Standardised Mean Weight	actobacillus		_					-4 -2 0 2 4				
tudy Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Difference SMD 95%-C1 (common) (rando ingting Liu 2023 13 0.26 0.5820 7 3.05 4.8400 -0.94 [-1.92; 0.03] 22.3% 22.3% 22.3% 22.3% 22.3% 24.4 -0.44 [-0.96; 0.08] 77.7% 77.7% 77.7% -0.44 [-0.96; 0.08] 77.7% 77.7% 77.7% -0.55 [-1.01; -0.09] 100.0% -0.55 [-1.01; -0.09] . 100.0% -0.55 [-1.01; -0.09] . 100.0% -0.55 [-1.01; -0.09] . 100.0% -0.55 [-1.01; -0.09] . 100.0% -0.55 [-1.01; -0.09] . 100.0% -0.55 [-1.01; -0.09] . 100.0% -0.55 [-1.01; -0.09] . 100.0% -0.55 [-1.01; -0.09] . 100.0% -0.55 [-1.01; -0.09] . 100.0% -0.55 [-1.01; -0.09] . 100.0% -0.55 [-1.01; -0.09] . 100.0% -0.55 [-1.01; -0.09] . 100.0% -0.55 5 </td <td>actobacinus</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>perimental</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Control</td> <td>Standardised Mean</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Weight</td> <td>Weig</td>	actobacinus			perimental			Control	Standardised Mean			Weight	Weig
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	ludy	Tota	Mean	n SD	Total	Mean	SD	Difference	SMD	95%-CI	(common)	(rando
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	ingting Liu 2023	13	2 0.26	0 5820	7	3.05	4 8400	i	0.04	[1 92: 0 03]	22.3%	22 <i>'</i>
and or defail. 2021 25 0.25 0.7000 25 1.12 2.5700 -0.44 [-0.50, 0.00] 71.7 № 71. wommon effect model 42 36 andom effects model eterogeneity: J ² = 0%, τ ² = 0, p = 0.37 -1.5 -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 1.5 RE 5 st plot of the genus level	u Yu et al. 2021	20	0.20	0.3020	20	1 1 2	2 5700		0.44	[-1.32, 0.03]	77 70/	77 -
ommon effect model 42 36 -0.55 [-1.01; -0.09] 100.0% andom effects model -1.5 -1.5 0 0.55 [-1.01; -0.09] 0.00 eterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, p = 0.37$ -1.5 -1.5 0 0.5 1 1.5 RE 5 st plot of the genus level -1.5 -1.5 -1.5 -1.5 -1.5 -1.5	u Au Clai. 2021	28	0.20	, 0.7000	29	1.12	2.3700		-0.44	[0.30, 0.00]	11.170	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	ommon offect mod-l		,		20				0.55	[1 01, 0 00]	100.0%	
andom energs model eterogeneity: /² = 0, p = 0.37 -1.5 -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 1.5 RE 5 st plot of the genus level	ommon effect model	44	2		36				-0.55	[-1.01; -0.09]	100.0%	400
$tetrogeneity: l^{2} = 0\%, t^{2} = 0, p = 0.37$ -1.5 - 1 - 0.5 0 0.5 1 1.5 RE 5 st plot of the genus level	andom effects model		_						-0.55	[-1.01; -0.09]	•	100.0
RE5 st plot of the genus level	eterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, p = 0.37	, ,					-1.5 -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 1.5				
RE 5 st plot of the genus level												
st plot of the genus level	₹E 5											





against 6-hz-induced seizures. However, the results of a Mendelian randomized study on epilepsy risk and intestinal flora (Zeng et al., 2023) showed that *Akkermansia* was able to increase the risk of epilepsy. In conclusion, *Akkermansia* has both a protective effect and a pathogenic risk, and therefore its study needs to be further deepened to clarify its specific mechanism of action.

4.3 Interaction of the gut-brain axis

The experimental results included in this study pertain to the changes in gut microbiology that occur subsequent to the diagnosis of epilepsy. However, the specific causal relationship between seizure and gut flora remains unclear. It has been proposed that the gut microbiome may play a role in the etiology of epilepsy (Gong et al., 2020). Medel-Matus et al. demonstrated that altered gut microbiome can trigger seizures by transplanting feces from epileptic mice into non-epileptic mice (Medel-Matus et al., 2018). Lum et al. explored the potential mechanisms of the gut microbiome in the treatment of epilepsy by investigating the effects of a ketogenic diet on the gut microbiome in epileptic patients (Lum et al., 2020). Animal and human studies have demonstrated that γ -aminobutyric acid (GABA) plays a pivotal role in the alteration of intestinal flora in relation to seizures in temporal lobe epilepsy (Goldberg and Coulter, 2013; Avoli et al., 2016). Additionally, these studies have indicated that the intestinal flora may alter neurotransmitter content to facilitate brain-gut interactions via the vagus nerve. Lactobacillus has been demonstrated to modulate mood and central GABA receptor levels via sympathetic nerves (Bravo et al., 2011). It is possible that intestinal flora and their products modulate sympathetic activity by influencing the secretion of enteroendocrine cells (Bonaz et al., 2018). Furthermore, epigenetic modifications of genes have been identified as a contributing factor in the pathogenesis and anti-epileptic mechanisms of epilepsy (Younus and Reddy, 2017). This process is regulated by metabolites associated with gut flora (Reddy et al., 2018). Abnormalities in immune regulation represent a significant contributing factor to seizure. Additionally, immune disorders have the potential to induce alterations in the gut commensal flora (Weis and Round, 2021), suggesting a potential convergence between seizure and gut disorders as a consequence of abnormalities in immune regulation.

The current research on gut flora is primarily concerned with the pathogenesis of various conditions, with treatments for several diagnoses of epilepsy including ketogenic diets, fecal transplants, antibiotic therapy, probiotic supplementation, prebiotics, and interventions targeting antiepileptic drug-flora interactions (Liu et al., 2023; Dahlin and Prast-Nielsen, 2019; Ułamek-Kozioł et al., 2019; Mejía-Granados et al., 2021; Amlerova et al., 2021). Over the past decade, research in the field of gut flora has flourished, resulting in significant advancements. However, it is crucial to acknowledge the intricate composition of the intestinal flora and the intestinal immune environment, as well as their distinctive characteristics across different individuals. This indicates the necessity for caution when extrapolating findings from experimental animals to humans. Firstly, although animal models (e.g., mice) are a valuable resource in research, they differ from humans in terms of immune response, gut structure, etc., which may affect the translation from animal models to humans (Schloissnig et al., 2013; Kaiko et al., 2016; Falony et al., 2016). Secondly, the human gut microbiome comprises over 1,000 microorganisms, with intricate interactions between these microorganisms and their host (Mabwi et al., 2020). This complexity gives rise to challenges in the precise regulation and application of the microbiome. Moreover, it is essential to consider the inter-individual variability observed across different ethnic, gender, and age groups. It is therefore evident that a significant future development in the exploration and improvement of epilepsy treatments will be the investigation of the changes in gut flora that can have a considerable impact on complex populations with significant heterogeneity. This will facilitate a more precise understanding of the interactions between gut flora and health and disease, thereby providing a scientific basis for the development of personalized therapeutic regimens. The last, when translating findings from animal models to human therapeutic applications, it is crucial to ensure the safety and efficacy of the treatment. This necessitates the undertaking of extensive clinical studies and validation.

5 Limitation

It should be noted that this meta-analysis is not without limitations. Firstly, most studies include experimental analyses regarding beta diversity. Since principal component analysis (PCA) is currently the main method of beta analysis, which selects the eigenvectors corresponding to the top few largest eigenvalues based on the magnitude of the eigenvalues, and these eigenvectors are known as the principal components, however, the eigenvalues of the top few eigenvalues of each study were mixed, so meta-analyses were not performed in this study at the level of beta analysis. Secondly, the study included different populations, including geographic location, gender, weight and age. As a result, it was not possible to accurately assess the effect of these confounding factors on the outcome indicators. Thirdly, the length of time the sample was collected was not known. As a consequence, it was not possible to assess the effect of this factor on the outcome indicators. The initial intention of this study was to subgroup all indicators according to age in order to more effectively illustrate the results. However, due to the heterogeneity of the available data, only subgroup analyses were performed for some of the outcomes.

6 Conclusion

The meta-analysis of this study demonstrated that the alteration in alpha-diversity within the intestinal flora of patients with epilepsy was not statistically significant when compared to controls. However, there was a notable increase in *Verrucomicrobia* and its subordinate *Akkermansia*. Furthermore, a notable reduction in Lactobacillus was observed. It is postulated that epilepsy exerts a relatively minor impact on the abundance, homogeneity, and diversity of the intestinal microbiota in patients, whereas a more pronounced influence is exerted on the alteration of the relative abundance of the flora. Furthermore, the collective findings of previous studies indicate that *Lactobacillus* may confer beneficial effects. In contrast, *Akkermansia* are understood to play a complex and multifaceted role, with characteristics that may be two-faced. Given the considerable heterogeneity and restricted sample size, it is imperative to conduct more rigorous methodological studies.

References

Aaberg, K. M., Gunnes, N., Bakken, I. J., Lund Søraas, C., Berntsen, A., Magnus, P., et al. (2017). Incidence and prevalence of childhood epilepsy: a Nationwide cohort study. *Pediatrics* 139:e20163908. doi: 10.1542/peds.2016-3908

Amlerova, J., Šroubek, J., Angelucci, F., and Hort, J. (2021). Evidences for a role of gut microbiota in pathogenesis and management of epilepsy. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* 22:5576. doi: 10.3390/ijms22115576

Arulsamy, A., Tan, Q. Y., Balasubramaniam, V., O'Brien, T. J., and Shaikh, M. F. (2020). Gut microbiota and epilepsy: a systematic review on their relationship and possible therapeutics. ACS Chem. Neurosci. 11, 3488–3498. doi: 10.1021/acschemneuro.0c00431

Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/Supplementary material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Author contributions

XH: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Software, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. YZ: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Software, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

Funding

The author(s) declare that no financial support was received for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Supplementary material

The Supplementary material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmicb.2024.1480022/ full#supplementary-material

Avoli, M., de Curtis, M., Gnatkovsky, V., Gotman, J., Köhling, R., Lévesque, M., et al. (2016). Specific imbalance of excitatory/inhibitory signaling establishes seizure onset pattern in temporal lobe epilepsy. *J. Neurophysiol.* 115, 3229–3237. doi: 10.1152/jn.01128.2015

Bazzocchi, G., Turroni, S., Bulzamini, M. C., D'Amico, F., Bava, A., Castiglioni, M., et al. (2021). Changes in gut microbiota in the acute phase after spinal cord injury correlate with severity of the lesion. *Sci. Rep.* 11:12743. Published 2021 Jun 17. doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-92027-z

Bonaz, B., Bazin, T., and Pellissier, S. (2018). The Vagus nerve at the Interface of the microbiota-gut-brain Axis. *Front. Neurosci.* 12:49. doi: 10.3389/fnins.2018.00049

Bravo, J. A., Forsythe, P., Chew, M. V., Escaravage, E., Savignac, H. M., Dinan, T. G., et al. (2011). Ingestion of Lactobacillus strain regulates emotional behavior and central GABA receptor expression in a mouse via the vagus nerve. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 108, 16050–16055. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1102999108

Cani, P. D., and de Vos, W. M. (2017). Next-generation beneficial microbes: the case of *Akkermansia muciniphila*. *Front. Microbiol.* 8:1765. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2017.01765

Cui, G., Liu, S., Liu, Z., Chen, Y., Wu, T., Lou, J., et al. (2022). Gut microbiome distinguishes patients with epilepsy from healthy individuals. *Front. Microbiol.* 12:696632. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2021.696632

Dahlin, M., and Prast-Nielsen, S. (2019). The gut microbiome and epilepsy. *EBioMedicine* 44, 741-746. doi: 10.1016/j.ebiom.2019.05.024

Dai, Y., Wang, M., Zhong, D., and Xu, X. (2022). *Bacillus subtilis* plays a role in the inhibition of transporter ABCB1 in Caco-2 cells. *Epilepsy Res.* 183:106925. doi: 10.1016/j.eplepsyres.2022.106925

Derrien, M., Belzer, C., and de Vos, W. M. (2017). Akkermansia muciniphila and its role in regulating host functions. *Microb. Pathog.* 106, 171–181. doi: 10.1016/j. micpath.2016.02.005

Dong, L., Zheng, Q., Cheng, Y., Zhou, M., Wang, M., Xu, J., et al. (2022). Gut microbial characteristics of adult patients with epilepsy. *Front. Neurosci.* 16:803538. doi: 10.3389/fnins.2022.803538

Elliott, J., DeJean, D., Clifford, T., Coyle, D., Potter, B. K., Skidmore, B., et al. (2019). Cannabis-based products for pediatric epilepsy: a systematic review. *Epilepsia* 60, 6–19. doi: 10.1111/epi.14608

Falony, G., Joossens, M., Vieira-Silva, S., Wang, J., Darzi, Y., Faust, K., et al. (2016). Population-level analysis of gut microbiome variation. *Science* 352, 560–564. doi: 10.1126/science.aad3503

Fisher, R. S., Acevedo, C., Arzimanoglou, A., Bogacz, A., Cross, J. H., Elger, C. E., et al. (2014). ILAE official report: a practical clinical definition of epilepsy. *Epilepsia* 55, 475–482. doi: 10.1111/epi.12550

Fisher, R. S., Cross, J. H., D'Souza, C., French, J. A., Haut, S. R., Higurashi, N., et al. (2017). Instruction manual for the ILAE 2017 operational classification of seizure types. *Epilepsia* 58, 531–542. doi: 10.1111/epi.13671

Fisher, R. S., Cross, J. H., French, J. A., Higurashi, N., Hirsch, E., Jansen, F. E., et al. (2017). Operational classification of seizure types by the international league against epilepsy: position paper of the ILAE Commission for Classification and Terminology. *Epilepsia* 58, 522–530. doi: 10.1111/epi.13670

Gacesa, R., Kurilshikov, A., Vich Vila, A., Sinha, T., Klaassen, M. A. Y., Bolte, L. A., et al. (2022). Environmental factors shaping the gut microbiome in a Dutch population. *Nature* 604, 732–739. doi: 10.1038/s41586-022-04567-7

Goldberg, E. M., and Coulter, D. A. (2013). Mechanisms of epileptogenesis: a convergence on neural circuit dysfunction. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 14, 337–349. doi: 10.1038/nrn3482

Gong, X., Cai, Q., Liu, X., An, D., Zhou, D., Luo, R., et al. (2021). Gut flora and metabolism are altered in epilepsy and partially restored after ketogenic diets. *Microb. Pathog.* 155:105832. doi: 10.1016/j.micpath.2022.105832

Gong, X., Liu, X., Chen, C., Lin, J., Li, A., Guo, K., et al. (2020). Alteration of gut microbiota in patients with epilepsy and the potential index as a biomarker. *Front. Microbiol.* 11:517797. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2020.517797

Hozo, S. P., Djulbegovic, B., and Hozo, I. (2005). Estimating the mean and variance from the median, range, and the size of a sample. *BMC Med. Res. Methodol.* 5:13. Published 2005. doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-5-13

Kaiko, G. E., Ryu, S. H., Koues, O. I., Pearce, E. L., Oltz, E. M., Stappenbeck, T. S., et al. (2016). The colonic crypt protects stem cells from microbiota-derived metabolites [published correction appears in cell. 2016; 167(4): 1137. Doi:10.1016/j.cell.2016.10.034]. *Cell* 165, 1708–1720. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2016.05.018

Knight, R., Vrbanac, A., Taylor, B. C., Aksenov, A., Callewaert, C., Debelius, J., et al. (2018). Best practices for analysing microbiomes. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 16, 410–422. doi: 10.1038/s41579-018-0029-9

Kwan, P., and Brodie, M. J. (2000). Early identification of refractory epilepsy. N. Engl. J. Med. 342, 314–319. doi: 10.1056/NEJM200002033420503

Lee, K., Kim, N., Shim, J. O., and Kim, G. H. (2020). Gut bacterial dysbiosis in children with intractable epilepsy. *J. Clin. Med.* 10:5. doi: 10.3390/jcm10010005

Li, Z., Zhou, J., Liang, H., Ye, L., Lan, L., Lu, F., et al. (2022). Differences in alpha diversity of gut microbiota in neurological diseases. *Front. Neurosci.* 16:879318. doi: 10.3389/fnins.2022.879318

Lindefeldt, M., Eng, A., Darban, H., Bjerkner, A., Zetterström, C. K., Allander, T., et al. (2019). The ketogenic diet influences taxonomic and functional composition of the gut microbiota in children with severe epilepsy. *NPJ Biof. Microb.* 5:5. doi: 10.1038/ s41522-018-0073-2

Liu, T., Jia, F., Guo, Y., Wang, Q., Zhang, X., Chang, F., et al. (2023). Altered intestinal microbiota composition with epilepsy and concomitant diarrhea and potential indicator biomarkers in infants. *Front. Microbiol.* 13:1081591. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2022. 1081591

Liu, H., Wu, H., Yao, C., et al. (2017). Advanced methods of data extraction for continuous outcomes in meta-analysis. *Chin. J. Evid. Based Med.* 17, 117–121. doi: 10.7507/1672-2531.201612004

Lum, G. R., Olson, C. A., and Hsiao, E. Y. (2020). Emerging roles for the intestinal microbiome in epilepsy. *Neurobiol. Dis.* 135:104576. doi: 10.1016/j.nbd.2019.104576

Mabwi, H. A., Kim, E., Song, D. G., Yoon, H. S., Pan, C. H., Komba, E. V. G., et al. (2020). Synthetic gut microbiome: advances and challenges. *Comput. Struct. Biotechnol. J.* 19, 363–371. doi: 10.1016/j.csbj.2020.12.029

Medel-Matus, J. S., Shin, D., Dorfman, E., Sankar, R., and Mazarati, A. (2018). Facilitation of kindling epileptogenesis by chronic stress may be mediated by intestinal microbiome. *Epilepsia Open.* 3, 290–294. doi: 10.1002/epi4.12114

Mejía-Granados, D. M., Villasana-Salazar, B., Lozano-García, L., Cavalheiro, E. A., and Striano, P. (2021). Gut-microbiota-directed strategies to treat epilepsy: clinical and experimental evidence. *Seizure* 90, 80–92. doi: 10.1016/j.seizure.2021.03.009

Mohamed Qadir, R., and Assafi, M. S. (2021). The association between body mass index and the oral Firmicutes and Bacteroidetes profiles of healthy individuals. *Malays. Fam. Physician.* 16, 36–43. doi: 10.51866/oa1129

Newman, L. (2000). AHRQ's evidence-based practice centres prove viable. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. *Lancet* 356:1990. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(05)72963-9

Olson, C. A., Vuong, H. E., Yano, J. M., Liang, Q. Y., Nusbaum, D. J., and Hsiao, E. Y. (2018). The gut microbiota mediates the anti-seizure effects of the ketogenic diet. *Cell* 174:497. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2018.06.051

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., et al. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

Peng, A., Qiu, X., Lai, W., Li, W., Zhang, L., Zhu, X., et al. (2018). Altered composition of the gut microbiome in patients with drug-resistant epilepsy. *Epilepsy Res.* 147, 102–107. doi: 10.1016/j.eplepsyres.2018.09.013

Rajilić-Stojanović, M., Shanahan, F., Guarner, F., and de Vos, W. M. (2013). Phylogenetic analysis of dysbiosis in ulcerative colitis during remission. *Inflamm. Bowel Dis.* 19, 481–488. doi: 10.1097/MIB.0b013e31827fec6d

Reddy, S. D., Clossen, B. L., and Reddy, D. S. (2018). Epigenetic histone deacetylation inhibition prevents the development and persistence of temporal lobe epilepsy. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 364, 97–109. doi: 10.1124/jpet.117.244939

Rodenhouse, A., Talukder, M. A. H., Lee, J. I., Govindappa, P. K., O'Brien, M., Manto, K. M., et al. (2022). Altered gut microbiota composition with antibiotic treatment impairs functional recovery after traumatic peripheral nerve crush injury in mice: effects of probiotics with butyrate producing bacteria. *BMC. Res. Notes* 15:80. doi: 10.1186/ s13104-022-05967-8

Scheffer, I. E., Berkovic, S., Capovilla, G., Connolly, M. B., French, J., Guilhoto, L., et al. (2017). ILAE classification of the epilepsies: position paper of the ILAE Commission for Classification and Terminology. *Epilepsia* 58, 512–521. doi: 10.1111/epi.13709

Schloissnig, S., Arumugam, M., Sunagawa, S., Mitreva, M., Tap, J., Zhu, A., et al. (2013). Genomic variation landscape of the human gut microbiome. *Nature* 493, 45–50. doi: 10.1038/nature11711

Sutter, R., Rüegg, S., and Tschudin-Sutter, S. (2015). Seizures as adverse events of antibiotic drugs: a systematic review. *Neurology* 85, 1332–1341. doi: 10.1212/WNL.00000000002023

Thijs, R. D., Surges, R., O'Brien, T. J., and Sander, J. W. (2019). Epilepsy in adults. Lancet 393, 689–701. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32596-0

Tremlett, H., Bauer, K. C., Appel-Cresswell, S., Finlay, B. B., and Waubant, E. (2017). The gut microbiome in human neurological disease: a review. *Ann. Neurol.* 81, 369–382. doi: 10.1002/ana.24901

Türay, S., Cangür, Ş., Kahraman, G., Kayabaşı, E., Çetiner, Ö. F., Aydın, B., et al. (2023). Can the gut microbiota serve as a guide to the diagnosis and treatment of childhood epilepsy? *Pediatr. Neurol.* 145, 11–21. doi: 10.1016/j.pediatrneurol.2023.04.006

Ułamek-Kozioł, M., Czuczwar, S. J., Januszewski, S., and Pluta, R. (2019). Ketogenic diet and epilepsy. *Nutrients* 11:2510. doi: 10.3390/nu11102510

Wan, L., Yang, G., Zhang, S., Sun, Y., Li, Z., Wang, J., et al. (2021). Investigation of the association between imbalance of the intestinal flora and infantile spasms: a pilot case-control study. *Transl. Pediatr.* 10, 819–833. doi: 10.21037/tp-20-384

Weis, A. M., and Round, J. L. (2021). Microbiota-antibody interactions that regulate gut homeostasis. *Cell Host Microbe* 29, 334–346. doi: 10.1016/j.chom.2021.02.009

World Health Organization. Epilepsy [fact sheet]. (2024-02-07) (2024). Available at: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/epilepsy (Accessed October 18, 2024).

Xie, G., Zhou, Q., Qiu, C. Z., Dai, W. K., Wang, H. P., Li, Y. H., et al. (2017). Ketogenic diet poses a significant effect on imbalanced gut microbiota in infants with refractory epilepsy. *World J. Gastroenterol.* 23, 6164–6171. doi: 10.3748/wjg.v23.i33.6164

Xu, L., Chen, D., Zhao, C., Jiang, L., Mao, S., Song, C., et al. (2021). Decreased abundance of Akkermansia after adrenocorticotropic hormone therapy in patients with West syndrome. *BMC Microbiol.* 21:126. doi: 10.1186/s12866-021-02189-z

Yan, Y., Li, K., Jiang, J., Jiang, L., Ma, X., Ai, F., et al. (2023). Perinatal tissue-derived exosomes ameliorate colitis in mice by regulating the Foxp 3 + Treg cells and gut microbiota. *Stem Cell Res Ther* 14:43. Published 2023 Mar 20. doi: 10.1186/s13287-023-03263-1

Younus, I., and Reddy, D. S. (2017). Epigenetic interventions for epileptogenesis: a new frontier for curing epilepsy. *Pharmacol. Ther.* 177, 108–122. doi: 10.1016/j. pharmthera.2017.03.002

Zeng, Y., Cao, S., and Yang, H. (2023). Roles of gut microbiome in epilepsy risk: a Mendelian randomization study. *Front. Microbiol.* 14:1115014. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2023.1115014

Zhai, Q., Feng, S., Arjan, N., and Chen, W. (2019). A next generation probiotic, *Akkermansia muciniphila. Crit. Rev. Food Sci. Nutr.* 59, 3227–3236. doi: 10.1080/10408398.2018.1517725

Zhang, Z., Cheng, N., Liang, J., Deng, Y., Xiang, P., Hei, Z., et al. (2023). Gut microbiota changes in animal models of spinal cord injury: a preclinical systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann. Med.* 55:2269379. doi: 10.1080/07853890.2023.2269379

Zhou, C., Gong, S., Xiang, S., Liang, L., Hu, X., Huang, R., et al. (2022). Changes and significance of gut microbiota in children with focal epilepsy before and after treatment. *Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol.* 12:965471. doi: 10.3389/fcimb.2022.965471