

A Meta-analysis of the Effect of Probiotic Lactobacillus sp. as Immunomodulating Inflammatory Responses

Probiyotik Lactobacillus sp.'nin İmmünomodülatör Enflamatuvar Yanıtlar Üzerindeki Etkisinin Meta-analizi

Waode Fifin ERVINA^{1,2}, Sri Pantja MADYAWATI³, Si Iswinarno Doso SAPUTRO⁴, ODodi SAFARI²,
Rury Eryna PUTRI⁵, Salma ZULQAIDA¹

¹Postgraduate School of Universitas Airlangga, Master of Immunology Program, Surabaya, Indonesia

²National Research and Innovation Agency, Cibinong, Indonesia

³Post Graduate School of Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia

⁴Soetomo General Academic Hospital, Surabaya, Indonesia

⁵Postgraduate School of Universitas Airlangga, Master of Forensic Program, Surabaya, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Lactobacillus sp. is considered an indispensable probiotic, and this probiotic has an effective role in maintaining the immune system. We evaluated the effect of the probiotic *Lactobacillus* sp. on modulating inflammation in several cases. In collecting the literature, we used databases from the Web of Science, the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, PubMed, and Embase. Studies that met the inclusion criteria were analyzed using Review Manager (version 5.4). A p-value of <0.05 of the total effect is considered statistically significant. Finally, 1895 references were retrieved and 20 were included in the meta-analysis. This meta-analysis suggested that most cases in this study were healthy elderly who received treatment with *Lactobacillus* sp. *Lactobacillus* sp. has a positive effect on B cells, eosinophils, IgE, NK cells, TNF- α , and IL-10. *Lactobacillus* could regulate the immune system by modulating inflammation in the healthy elderly.

Keywords: Good health and well-being, inflammation response, immune system, *Lactobacillus* sp.

ÖΖ

Lactobacillus sp. vazgeçilmez bir probiyotik olarak kabul edilimektedir ve bağışıklık sisteminin korunmasında etkili bir role sahiptir. Çalışmamızda probiyotik Lactobacillus sp.'nin çeşitli vakalarda enflamasyonu modüle etme üzerindeki etkisini değerlendirdik. Literatür taramasında Web of Science, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, PubMed ve Embase veri tabanlarını kullandık. Dahil edilme kriterlerini karşılayan çalışmalar Review Manager (versiyon 5.4) ile analiz edildi. Toplam etkinin p-değerinin <0,05 olması istatistiksel olarak anlamlı kabul edildi. Son olarak, toplam 1895 referansa ulaşıldı ve 20 tanesi meta-analize dahil edildi. Bu meta-analiz, bu çalışmadaki olguların çoğunun Lactobacillus sp. ile tedavi gören sağlıklı yaşılıar olduğunu göstermiştir. Lactobacillus sp. B hücreleri, eozinofiller, IgE, NK hücreleri, TNF- α ve IL-10 üzerinde olumlu bir etkiye sahiptir ve sağlıklı yaşlılarda enflamasyonu modüle ederek bağışıklık sistemini düzenleyebilir.

Anahtar kelimeler: İyi sağlık ve iyilik hali, enflamasyon yanıtı, bağışıklık sistemi, Lactobacillus sp.

INTRODUCTION

Many studies have shown that probiotics, especially *Lactobacillus* sp., play an effective role in maintaining the immune system. This role is evidenced by the interaction between probiotics and commensal organisms in modulating mucosal immune cells or epithelial cells.

The number of *Lactobacillus* sp. in the small intestine in adults is small, but this number can be increased through food fermentation assisted by short-chain fatty acids. The amount of microbiota found in feces is small, ranging from 0.01% to 0.6% of total counts¹. Some *Lactobacilli*, such as *Ligilactobacillus salivarius*, *Lactobacillus rhamnosus*, and *Lacticaseibacillus paracasei*, were also

Address for Correspondence: S.C. Madyawati, Postgraduate School of Universitas Airlangga, Master of Immunology Program, Surabaya, Indonesia E-mail: sri-p-m@fkh.unair.ac.id ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0002-5864-439X Received: 28 March 2024 Accepted: 03 June 2024 Online First: 13 June 2024

Cite as: Ervina WF. Madyawati SP. Saputro ID. Safari D. Putri RE. Zulqaida S. A Meta-analysis of the Effect of Probiotic Lactobacillus sp. as Immunomodulating Inflammatory Responses. Medeni Med J 2024;39:122-131

Copyright[©] 2024 The Author. Published by Galenos Publishing House on behalf of Istanbul Medeniyet University Faculty of Medicine. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons AttributionNonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License. detected in infants with amounts ranging from 10^5 to 10^8 CFU/g².

Lactobacillus is a genus of rod-shaped, Gram-positive, non-spore forming, facultatively anaerobic bacteria from the phylum *Firmicutes*³. In March 2020, 261 *Lactobacillus* species had been identified and reclassified into 25 genera (including 23 new genera); this was due to their high genotypic, phenotypic, and ecological diversity⁴.

Inflammation occurs not only in diseased conditions but also in aging and obesity. Consuming probiotics can modulate inflammation to balance it. Today, the use of probiotics is becoming popular because many studies have proven the benefits of probiotics in modulating human health. *Lactobacillus* has been widely used in both children and the elderly, and probiotics are not only used as a treatment for disease but also as a prevention. One of the probiotics that is often used in research is *Lactobacillus* sp. and *Bifidobacterium* however this study limits the effectiveness of *Lactobacillus* sp. on the immune system, and the mechanism of *Lactobacillus* sp. in modulating the immune system through the gut microbiome is still unknown.

There have been many studies on *Lactobacillus* probiotics with different strains, proving that *Lactobacillus* has great potential for use in human and murine models. While some clinical studies have been negative or inconclusive⁵, other studies have shown positive results⁶⁻⁸. *Lactobacillus* has shown significant and promising results in treating acute infectious diarrhea and in the prevention of antibiotic-associated diarrhea in human clinical trials⁶. Recent research has examined the use of the probiotic *Lactobacillus* in the treatment and prevention of allergic diseases and allergic rhinitis/ asthma. There have been many studies proving the role of *L. rhamnosus GG* in the prevention of atopic eczema or dermatitis⁹.

Lactobacillus sp. maintains intestinal homeostasis by stimulating regulatory T-cells to produce interleukin (IL)-10 and increasing the expression in a TLR2-dependent manner, thereby inducing B cell production. In some cases of inflammation, *Lactobacillus* sp. has been shown to significantly influence dendritic cells, thereby activating NK cells. *Lactobacillus* sp. plays a dual role, one of which is inhibiting IkB phosphorylation and degradation, thereby preventing NF- κ b translocation which results in decreasing tumor necrosis factor alpha (TNF- α) expression. In allergic cases, *Lactobacillus* sp. inhibits Th2 cytokine production, thereby reducing eosinophil infiltration. The aim of this meta-analysis study was to analyze whether probiotic *Lactobacillus* sp. affects the modulation of the immune system, especially on B cells, eosinophils, immunoglobulin (Ig)E, NK cells , TNF- α , and IL-10, under inflammatory conditions. This study provides more reliable evidence for clinical decisions.

MATERIALS and METHODS

Study Strategy

Four databases serve as reference sources for this analysis: Cochrane Library, Web of Science, Embase, and PubMed. All basic research from this source takes *Lactobacillus* sp. probiotic intervention against the immune system taken from 1992 to 2022. The keywords used for the literature search are *"Lactobacillus"*, "Probiotic", "Immune System", and "Immunity".

Inclusion criteria: (1) clinical study of *Lactobacillus* sp. administered to humans; (2) research using immunological parameters; (3) the data have a mean, standard deviation, and total of samples. Exclusion criteria: (1) meta-analysis studies, reports, reviews, and meeting conclusions; (2) tests on experimental animals, *in vitro* tests, and research other than clinical trials; (3) research without original data; (4) research using prebiotics or other ingredients; (5) non-randomized controlled trials; (6) no measure of immune outcome; (7) not relevant to *Lactobacillus* sp. probiotics and immune system.

Publication bias uses the value from Egger's test; if p>0.05, then there is no publication bias. The determination of publication bias fulfills the following requirements: (1) Random sequence generation; (2) allocation concealment; (3) blinding of participants and personnel; (4) blinding of outcome assessments; (5) incomplete outcome data; (6) selective reporting.

Data Collection

The supporting PRISMA 2019 checklist for this study is available as supporting information¹⁰. Data extracted from journals filtered based on inclusion and exclusion criteria. Some authors independently extracted data, made decisions, and compared their conclusions with those of other studies. If there is a disagreement between studies, a third person (a member of the writing team) is needed to solve the problem through discussion and consultation. During the extraction process of the original data, authentication and reliability are required to avoid bias. Bias caused by the subject will be evaluated as soon as possible. To ensure the reliability of data

extraction and minimize bias and error, the authors conducted systematic training of the experts. The information data obtained from this study were as follows: the type of *Lactobacillus* sp. obtained, the type of disease, and the dose used *Lactobacillus* sp. effect on B cells, NK cells, eosinophils, IgE, IL-10, and TNF- α .

Data Organization and Analysis

Before conducting the meta-analysis, several indicators were standardized. The meta-analysis used Review Manager 5.4 (Cochrane Collaboration Network, London, UK). This study used the Cohen's method, and the effect measure was std. Mean difference. Forest plots were used to detect heterogeneity from the collection of journals obtained. Funnel plots are used for possible publication bias. Sample size, mean difference, and 95% confidence interval (CI) were calculated to analyze the results of the acquired immunological parameters. A p-value < 0.05 of the total effect was assumed to be statistically significant. I² is an indicator that measures the degree of heterogeneity of the total data obtained. If I² <50%, the heterogeneity of the total data obtained is low, so the fixed-effects model is used. Conversely I2>50%, then the heterogeneity of the total data obtained is high so that it uses a random-effects model.

RESULTS

A total of 1895 references were obtained from the four databases shown in Figure 1. A total of 604 references were excluded because they were not relevant =325, duplications =96, and journal reviews =870. Furthermore, several exclusion criteria from references obtained animal trial results =237, no measure immune outcome =160, not randomized clinical trials =187. This metaanalysis study originally used 20 references; however, 10 references have the same authors and title but different parameters of the immune system in Tables 1, 2. Review Manager 5.4 (Cochrane Collaboration Network, London, UK) was used to perform statistical analysis on six indicators: Eosinophils (five studies), B cells (four studies), IgE (seven studies), NK cells (four studies) TNF- α (six studies), and IL-10 (four studies). The mean difference and 95% CI of these indicators are shown in Figures 2-4.

Effect of the Disease

This meta-analysis pooled studies examining several inflammatory diseases and conditions such as atopic dermatitis¹¹⁻¹³, allergic rhinitis¹⁴⁻¹⁶, Japanese cedar pollinosis^{17,18}, human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)¹⁹, healthy elderly²⁰⁻²⁵, inflammatory bowel disease (IBD)²⁶, and hypercholesterolaemic adults. Our study shows that

the most popular reaction to inflammation was in the healthy elderly.

Effect of Probiotic Species

Lactobacillus probiotics have many strains, the most commonly used of which is Lactobacillus casei Shirota (LcS)^{16,25,27}. In addition, the type of strain used to test the effectiveness of Lactobacillus probiotics on the immune system was Lactobacillus plantarum CJLP133¹¹, L. plantarum YIT 0132¹⁴, Lactobacillus acidophilus strain L-92¹⁵, Lactobacillus GG and Lactobacillus gasseri TMC0356¹⁷, L. rhamnosus GR-1¹⁹, L. casei DNI14001²⁰⁻²⁸, L. paracasei NCC 2461²¹, L. gasseri TMC0356²², Lactobacillus reuteri DSM 17938²³, L. salivarius LS01¹³, L. plantarum HSK201¹⁸, L. plantarum L-137²⁴, L. plantarum ECGC 13110402²⁹, Lactobacillus pentosus¹², L. rhamnosus GR-1 and L. reuteri RC-14²⁶, and L. acidophilus³⁰.

Effects of Age

The majority of the population in this study was >50 years old and found in healthy elderly cases^{20-25,30}. Meanwhile, in other studies, the population was 1-13 years old^{11,12} and 18-45 years old^{13,15,16,18,27}.

Effect of Treatment Length Probiotic was Administered

This study shows that the length treatment of *Lactobacillus* probiotic on the immune system was administered 8 weeks, because it considered effective to modulate eosinophil¹⁴, B cell^{20,23}, IgE,^{15,18,27}, NK cell²⁰, IL-10²³, and TNF- α^{23} .

Effect of the Probiotic Form

The most popular forms of *Lactobacillus* probiotic was yogurt^{11,16,19,20,26,28}, and milk^{15,17,18,25,27} than other supplement forms such as juice¹⁴, powder^{13,21,30}, tablet^{12,22,23}, and capsule²⁴.

Effect by Country

The results of the meta-analysis of data collection showed that most countries that intervened with the probiotic *Lactobacillus* are Japan^{14,15,17,18,22,24,27}.

Effect of the Immune System

After an intervention, the 95% CI of eosinophils was -0.50 (the lower limit was <0 and the upper limit was >0). The significant p=0.05 means that *Lactobacillus* has an effect on eosinophils. The mean difference of the total effect was -0.50/mm³, and its 95% CI was -0.99 to -0.01/mm³ (Figure 2a), indicating that *Lactobacillus* could effectively decrease the level of eosinophils and regulate host immunity.



Figure 1. Flowchart of study selection in the meta-analysis. RCT: Randomized controlled trials

For IgE, the 95% CI of IgE was -0.10 (the lower limit was <0 and the upper limit was >0). A significant p=0.56 means that *Lactobacillus* has no significant effect on IgE. The mean difference of the total effect was -0.10/ mm³, and its 95% CI was -0.42 to 0.23 pg/mL (Figure 2b), indicating that *Lactobacillus* could effectively decrease the level of IgE but not significance.

The forest plot of B cells showed that the significant p=0.02 suggests that *Lactobacillus* has an effect on B cells. The mean difference of the total effect was -0,37/ uL, its 95% CI was -0.69 to -0.05/uL in Figure 3a, indicating that *Lactobacillus* could effectively decrease the level of B cells in the treatment group.

The forest plot of NK cells showed that the significant p=0.77 mean that *Lactobacillus* had no significant effect on NK cells, the mean difference of the total effect was $-0.04/\text{mm}^3$, its 95% CI was -0.30 to $0.22/\text{mm}^3$ in Figure 3b,

indicating that *Lactobacillus* could effectively decrease the level of NK cells in the treatment group but not significant.

IL-10, the 95% CI was -0.25 (the lower limit was <0 and the upper limit was >0). The significant p=0.10 indicates that *Lactobacillus* has no significant effect on IL-10. The mean difference of the total effect was -0.25 pg/mL, and its 95% CI was -0.55 to 0.05 pg/mL (Figure 4a), indicating that *Lactobacillus* could effectively increase the level of IL-10 in the treatment group, but the difference was not significant.

After the intervention, the 95% CI of TNF- α -0.12 were -0.50 (the lower limit was <0 and the upper limit was >0). The significant p=0.39 means that *Lactobacillus* has no significant effect on TNF- α . The mean difference of the total effect was -0.12 pg/mL, and its 95% CI was 0.40 to 0.16 pg/mL (Figure 4b), indicating that

No	Author (Reference)	Country	Type of disease	Form of supplement	Age (y)	Duration (weeks)
1	Han et al. ¹¹ , 2012	Korea	Atopic dermatitis	Yogurts	1-13	12
2	Harima-Mizusawa et al. ¹⁴ , 2016	Japan	Allergic rhinitis	Juice	16-65	8
3	Ishida et al. ¹⁵ , 2005	Japan	Allergic rhinitis	Milk	34-36	8
4	Kawase et al. ¹⁷ , 2009	Japan	Japanese cedar pollinosis	Milk	20-57	10
5	Hummelen et al. ¹⁹ , 2011	Canada	HIV	Yogurts	>18	4
6	Parra et al. ²⁰ , 2004	Spain	Healthy person	Yoghurt	51-58	8
7	Bunout et al. ²¹ , 2004	Switzerland	Healthy eldery	Powder	>70	16
8	Miyazawa et al. ²² , 2015	Japan	Healthy eldery	Tablet	50-70	4
9	Mangalat et al. ²³ , 2012	America	Healthy adults	Tablet	19-60	8
10	Drago et al. ¹³ , 2011	Italy	Atopic dermatitis	Powder	10-46	16
11	Tamura et al. ²⁷ , 2007	Japan	Allergic rhinitis	Milk	x=39	8
2	Hasegawa et al.18, 2009	Japan	Japanese cedar polinosis	Milk	x=35	8
13	lvory et al. ¹⁶ , 2008	UK	Allergic rhinitis	Yogurt	18-45	2
14	Hirose et al. ²⁴ , 2006	Japan	Healthy subjects	Capsule	40-64	12
15	Seifert et al. ²⁵ 2011	Germany	Healthy individuals	Milk	18-60	4
16	Meyer et al. ²⁸ 2007	Austria	Healthy young women	Yogurt	22-29	2
17	Costabile et al. ²⁹ , 2017	UK	Hypercholesterolaemic	Capsular	30-65	12
8	Ahn et al. ¹² , 2020	Korea	Atopic Dermatitis	Tablet	2-13	12
19	Baroja et al. ₂₆ , 2007	Canada	Inflammatory bowel disease	Yogurt	26-63	4
20	Ouwehand et al. ³⁰ , 2008	Finland	Healthy elderly	Powder	>65	2

Table 1. Characteristics of the included studies about country, type of disease, form of supplement, age, and duration consumption probiotic.

Table 2. Characteristics of the included studies about gebus of <i>Lactobacillus</i> , dose, and outcome.									
No	Author (Reference)	Genus of Lactobacillus	Dose	Type of immune					
1	Han et al. ¹¹ , 2012	L. plantarumCJLP133	1x10 ¹⁰ CFU	Eosinophil & IgE					
2	Harima-Mizusawa et al. ¹⁴ ,2016	L. plantarum YIT 0132	100 mL	Eosinophil					
3	Ishida et al. ¹⁵ , 2005	L. acidophilus strain L-92	3x10 ¹⁰ CFU	Eosinophils & IgE					
4	Kawase et al. ¹⁷ , 2009	L.GG and L. gasseri TMC0356	1.4×10 ⁸ CFU and 1.0×10 ⁷ CFU	Eosinophils & IgE					
5	Hummelen et al. ¹⁹ , 2011	L. rhamnosus GR-1	15.38×10 ¹⁰ CFU	Eosinophils					
6	Parra et al. ²⁰ , 2004	L. casei DNl14001	10 ⁸ x10 ¹⁰ CFU	B cell & NK cell					
7	Bunout et al. ²¹ , 2004	L. paracasei NCC 2461	10° CFU	B cell & NK cell					
8	Miyazawa et al. ²² , 2015	L. gasseri TMC0356	1.0×10 ⁹ CFU	B cell					
9	Mangalat et al. ²³ , 2012	L. reuteri DSM 17938	5x10 ⁸ CFU	B cell, IL-10 & TNF-α					
10	Drago et al. ¹³ , 2011	L. salivarius LS01	1 x 10° CFU	IgE					
11	Tamura et al. ²⁷ , 2007	L. casei strain Shirota	4x10 ¹⁰ CFU	IgE					
12	Hasegawa et al. ¹⁸ , 2009	L. plantarum strain HSK201	6x1010 CFU	IgE					
13	lvory et al. ¹⁶ , 2008	L. casei Shirota	6.5x10 ⁹ CFU	lgE & TNF-α					
14	Hirose et al. ²⁴ , 2006	L. plantarum L-137	10 mg	NK cell					
15	Seifert et al. ²⁵ , 2011	L. casei Shirota	1.95x1010 CFU	NK cell					
16	Meyer et al. ²⁸ , 2007	L. casei DN114 001	3.7x10 ⁸ CFU	IL-10 & TNF-α					
17	Costabile et al. ²⁹ , 2017	L. plantarum ECGC13110402	2x10 ⁹ CFU	IL-10 & TNF-α					
18	Ahn et al. ¹² , 2020	L. pentosus	1.0×1010 CFU	IL-10					
19	Baroja et al. ²⁶ , 2007	L. rhamnosus GR-1 and L. reuteri RC-14	1x10 ³ CFU and 2x10 ⁷ CFU	TNF-α					
20	20 Ouwehand et al. ³⁰ , 2008 L. acidophilus 2x10° CFU TNF-α								
x=m	r=mean of age II -10: Interleukin 10 TNF-g: Tumor necrosis factor alpha JgF: Immunoglobulin F								

x=mean of age, IL-10: Interleukin 10, TNF-α: Tumor necrosis factor alpha, IgE: Immunoglobulin E

(a	

		Trea		Placebo				Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	1	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Tota	l Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl	
Han, Y. et al 2012		545.1 3	86.4	44	542.9	355.7	39	23.7%	0.01 [-0.43, 0.44]		
Harima-Mizusawa, N. et al 3	2016 2	237.1 1	33.9	17	223.1	157.4	16	18.6%	0.09 [-0.59, 0.78]		
Hummelen, R. et al. 2011		194	37.7	20	237.2	39.6	18	18.5%	-1.10 [-1.78, -0.41]	4 =	
Ishida, Y. et al 2005		320.4	37.6	25	340.1	34.2	24	20.8%	-0.54 [-1.11, 0.03]		
Kawase, M. et al 2009		194	37.7	20	237.2	39.6	18	18.5%	-1.10 [-1.78, -0.41]	*	
Total (95% CI)				126			115	100.0%	-0.50 [-0.99, -0.01]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.22;	Chi ² = 13	.49, df =	4 (P =	0.009)	; l² = 70'	%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.9				,						-1 -0.5 Ó 0.5 1 Treatment Placebo	
(b)											
	Tre	eatment	t		Place	ebo		5	td. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Tre Mean	eatment SD		I Me			Total	s Weight	otd. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	
			Tota		an		Total 19				
	Mean	\$D	Tota 19	9 919.	an	SD		Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI		
Dragoi, L. et al 2011	Mean 579.14	SD 253.63	Tota 19 44	9919. 4 (an 71 369	SD 9.08 1.6	19	Weight 12.6%	IV, Random, 95% CI -1.05 [-1.74, -0.37]		
Dragoi, L. et al 2011 Han, Y. et al 2012	Mean 579.14 5.2	SD 253.63 1.7	Tota 19 44 10	9919. 9919. 9919.	an .71 369 5.2 .07 100	SD 9.08 1.6	19 39	Weight 12.6% 19.3%	IV, Random, 95% Cl -1.05 [-1.74, -0.37] 0.00 [-0.43, 0.43]		
Dragoi, L. et al 2011 Han, Y. et al 2012 Hasegawa, T. et al 2009	Mean 579.14 5.2 320.42	SD 253.63 1.7 64.83	Tota 19 44 10 25	9919. 9919. 9351. 9351.	an .71 369 5.2 .07 108	SD 9.08 1.6 6.54	19 39 9	Weight 12.6% 19.3% 8.8%	IV, Random, 95% Cl -1.05 [-1.74, -0.37] 0.00 [-0.43, 0.43] -0.34 [-1.25, 0.57]		
Dragoi, L. et al 2011 Han, Y. et al 2012 Hasegawa, T. et al 2009 Ishida, Y. et al 2005	Mean 579.14 5.2 320.42 562.2	SD 253.63 1.7 64.83 151.4	Tota 19 44 10 25 10	9919. 9351. 555. 9351.	an 71 369 5.2 .07 100 .04 .77 7	SD 9.08 1.6 6.54 132	19 39 9 24	Weight 12.6% 19.3% 8.8% 15.4%	IV, Random, 95% Cl -1.05 [-1.74, -0.37] 0.00 [-0.43, 0.43] -0.34 [-1.25, 0.57] 0.40 [-0.16, 0.97]		
Dragoi, L. et al 2011 Han, Y. et al 2012 Hasegawa, T. et al 2009 Ishida, Y. et al 2005 K. Ivory 2008	Mean 579.14 5.2 320.42 562.2 1.35	SD 253.63 1.7 64.83 151.4 1.39	Tota 19 44 10 25 10 20	9 919. 4 (0 351. 5 5 0 1. 0 124	an .71 369 5.2 .07 100 .04 .77 4.2	SD 9.08 1.6 6.54 132 1.99	19 39 9 24 10	Weight 12.6% 19.3% 8.8% 15.4% 9.2%	V, Random, 95% Cl -1.05 [-1.74, -0.37] 0.00 [-0.43, 0.43] -0.34 [-1.25, 0.57] 0.40 [-0.16, 0.97] -0.23 [-1.11, 0.65]		
Dragoi, L. et al 2011 Han, Y. et al 2012 Hasegawa, T. et al 2009 Ishida, Y. et al 2005 K. Ivory 2008 Kawase, K. et al 2009	Mean 579.14 5.2 320.42 562.2 1.35 123.1	SD 253.63 1.7 64.83 151.4 1.39 32.9	Tota 19 44 10 25 10 20	9 919. 4 (351. 5 5 0 1. 0 124 5 1	an .71 369 5.2 .07 100 .04 .77 4.2	SD 9.08 1.6 6.54 132 1.99 31.1	19 39 24 10 18 54	Weight 12.6% 19.3% 8.8% 15.4% 9.2% 13.7%	V, Random, 95% Cl -1.05 [-1.74, -0.37] 0.00 [-0.43, 0.43] -0.34 [-1.25, 0.57] 0.40 [-0.16, 0.97] -0.23 [-1.11, 0.65] -0.03 [-0.67, 0.60]		
Dragoi, L. et al 2011 Han, Y. et al 2012 Hasegawa, T. et al 2009 Ishida, Y. et al 2005 K. Mory 2008 Kawase, K. et al 2009 Tamura, M. et al 2007 Total (95% CI)	Mean 579.14 5.2 320.42 562.2 1.35 123.1 198.9	SD 253.63 1.7 64.83 151.4 1.39 32.9 273.8	Tota 19 44 10 25 10 20 55	9 919. 9 351. 5 5 0 1. 0 124 5 1 8	an 71 369 5.2 .07 100 .04 .77 7 4.2 3 60	SD 9.08 1.6 6.54 132 1.99 31.1 247	19 39 24 10 18 54	Weight 12.6% 19.3% 8.8% 15.4% 9.2% 13.7% 21.0%	V, Random, 95% Cl -1.05 [-1.74, -0.37] 0.00 [-0.43, 0.43] -0.34 [-1.25, 0.57] 0.40 [-0.16, 0.97] -0.23 [-1.11, 0.66] -0.03 [-0.67, 0.60] 0.15 [-0.23, 0.52]	IV, Random, 95% Cl	
Dragoi, L. et al 2011 Han, Y. et al 2012 Hasegawa, T. et al 2009 Ishida, Y. et al 2005 K. Ivory 2008 Kawase, K. et al 2009 Tamura, M. et al 2007	Mean 579.14 5.2 320.42 562.2 1.35 123.1 198.9 Chi ² = 12	SD 253.63 1.7 64.83 151.4 1.39 32.9 273.8 2.38, df=	Tota 19 44 10 25 10 20 55	9 919. 9 351. 5 5 0 1. 0 124 5 1 8	an 71 369 5.2 .07 100 .04 .77 7 4.2 3 60	SD 9.08 1.6 6.54 132 1.99 31.1 247	19 39 24 10 18 54	Weight 12.6% 19.3% 8.8% 15.4% 9.2% 13.7% 21.0%	V, Random, 95% Cl -1.05 [-1.74, -0.37] 0.00 [-0.43, 0.43] -0.34 [-1.25, 0.57] 0.40 [-0.16, 0.97] -0.23 [-1.11, 0.66] -0.03 [-0.67, 0.60] 0.15 [-0.23, 0.52]		

Figure 2. Forest plot effect of *Lactobacillus* supplementation on (a) eosinophils and (b) IgE comparing between *Lactobacillus* group (treatment) and placebo group. The statistical method used was Cohen'd, the effect measure was standard mean difference, and the analysis method was the random effects model.

SD: Standard deviation, CI: Confidence interval, IgE: Immunoglobulin E

(a) Std. Mean Difference Treatment Placebo Std. Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV, Fixed, 95% CI IV. Fixed, 95% CI Bunout et al 2004 8.5 3.6 28 10.3 64 28 36.1% -0.34 [-0.87, 0.19] Mangalat et al 2012 23 0.44 23 2.31 0.39 10 18.2% -0.02 [-0.77, 0.72] Miyazawa et al 2015 182.05 63.14 14 205.72 98.76 14 18.1% -0.28 [-1.02, 0.47] Parra et al 2004 11 0.7 23 11.5 0.7 22 27.6% -0.70 [-1.31, -0.10] Total (95% CI) 88 74 100.0% -0.37 [-0.69, -0.05] Heterogeneity: Chi² = 2.07, df = 3 (P = 0.56); I² = 0% -0.5 ά 0.5 Test for overall effect: Z = 2.29 (P = 0.02) Treatment Placebo **(b)** Std. Mean Difference Treatment Placebo Std. Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV, Fixed, 95% CI IV, Fixed, 95% CI 24.5% Bunout, D. et al 2004 28 19.1 0.05 [-0.47, 0.58] 19.6 9.7 8.7 28 Hirose, Y. et al 2006 33.2 12.3 30 35.8 13.9 30 26.1% -0.20 [-0.70, 0.31] Parra, M. D. et al 2004 15.9 1.9 15.9 19.7% 0.00 [-0.58, 0.58] 23 1.7 22 Seifert, S. et al 2011 32 14 34 32 14 34 29.7% 0.00 [-0.48, 0.48] Total (95% CI) 115 114 100.0% -0.04 [-0.30, 0.22] Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.53, df = 3 (P = 0.91); l² = 0% -0.25 ή 0.25 0.5 0.5 Test for overall effect: Z = 0.29 (P = 0.77) Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

Figure 3. Forest plot effect of *Lactobacillus* supplementation on (a) B cells and (b) NK cells comparing between *Lactobacillus* group (treatment) and placebo group. The statistical method used was Cohen'd, the effect measure was standard mean difference, and the analysis method was the fixed effects model.

SD: Standard deviation, CI: Confidence interval

Lactobacillus could effectively decrease the level of TNF- α and regulate host immunity. Only 20 studies met the requirements of Egger's test. Overall, these studies have a low risk of bias due to the incomplete outcome requirements in Figure 5.

DISCUSSION

In recent years, probiotics have attracted extensive attention for treatment because of their low cost and minimal adverse reactions. However, previous studies regarding probiotics have shown limitations such as a small sample size, lack of medical evidence, and

(a)

	Treatment			Placebo				Std. Mean Difference			Std. Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	\$D	Total	Mear	ı S	D To	tal W	/eight	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl		IV, Fixed, 95% CI		
Ahn, S. H. et al 2020	1.24	1.62	41	1.59	3 2.2	1	41 4	47.6%	-0.18 [-0.61, 0.25]				
Costabile, A. et al 2017	66.3	23.07	23	74.21	23.0	7	23 2	26.4%	-0.34 [-0.92, 0.25]				
Mangalat, N. et al 2012	0.18	1.31	23	0.31	1.7	6	10 1	6.2%	-0.09 [-0.83, 0.66]				
Meyer, A. L. et al 2007	55.3	27.1	17	81.2	26	1	6	9.8%	-0.66 [-1.61, 0.30]	•			
Total (95% CI)			104				80 1	00.0%	-0.25 [-0.55, 0.05]		-		
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.07	. df = 3	(P = 0.7	78): I 2 =	0%									
Test for overall effect: Z = 1			-71 -								-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Treatment Placebo		
(b)		Treat	tment			cebo			Std. Mean Differen	се	Std. Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	M	ean	SD T	otal I	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95%	6 CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI		
Baroja, M. L. et al 2007		1.6	0.5	20	1.5	0.3	20						
Costabile, A. et al 2017			4.93			5.23	23			-			
K. Ivory 2008			1.38	10	1.12		10			-			
Mangalat, N. et al 2012			1.58	23		2.41	10						
Meyer, A. L. et al 2007			00.7		396.3	241	6						
Ouwehand, A. C. et al 200	8	3.3	4.5	24	4.3	12.2	23	23.8%	-0.11 [-0.68, 0.	46]			
Total (95% CI)				117			92	100.0%	-0.12 [-0.40, 0.	16]	-		
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.78	, df = 5	(P = 0.3)	88); I ^z =	0%									
Test for overall effect: Z = (-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Treatment Placebo		

Figure 4. Forest plot effect of *Lactobacillus* supplementation on (a) IL-10 and (b) TNF- α comparing between *Lactobacillus* group (treatment) and placebo group. The statistical method used was Cohen'd, the effect measure was standard mean difference, and the analysis method was the fixed effects model.

SD: Standard deviation, CI: Confidence interval, IL-10: Interleukin 10, TNF-a: Tumor necrosis factor



Figure 5. Risk of bias. Quality evaluation of included trials.

incomplete evaluation indicators. Our meta-analysis study mainly focused on the systematic evaluation of the efficacy of *Lactobacillus* on the immune system. This study gathered 20 studies, 10 of which have the same references but different immune cells that have proven the effect of *Lactobacillus* on the immune system, such as B cells, eosinophils, IgE, NK cells, TNF- α , and IL-10. Currently, research proves the immunomodulatory effect of *Lactobacillus* on several diseases such as allergies, IBD, and atopic dermatitis.

Lactobacillus probiotic strains improve the integrity of intestinal defenses, thereby maintaining immune cell tolerance, reducing translocation of bacteria across the intestinal mucosa, and causing disease-coding phenotypes such as gastrointestinal infections, IBD, and irritable bowel syndrome³¹. Probiotics have a significant influence on the intestinal microbiota, which has been proven in experimental animal studies and clinical trials in humans. *Lactobacillus* also plays a significant role in the modulation and production of B cells, eosinophils, IgE, NK cells, TNF- α , and IL-10.

Many studies have proven that consumption of Lactobacillus has a good effect on the body. The probiotic effect is commonly accepted with daily consumption of a minimum of 10⁶ CFU/mL or gram of probiotics³². Consumption of probiotics has different effects on each individual. The effect was based on immunological reactions and symptomatic parameters caused by the amount of Lactobacillus probiotic consumption. Probiotics can be administered orally in the form of capsules^{33,34}, yoghurt^{35,36}, dairy drinks or milk^{15,16,37,38}, and tablets^{39,40}. Our data suggest that the majority of Lactobacillus probiotics are administered in the form of milk. Factors that influence the effectiveness of probiotic consumption are the duration and timing of intake. Moreover, the duration of Lactobacillus consumption in human trials differed from 2 to 12 weeks, and 8 weeks is the most popular time for Lactobacillus treatment. LcS is the most popular strain used for Lactobacillus treatment.

Our data show that age is the inflammatory reaction that triggers the activation of immunological cells. The majority of them are >50 years old. In several studies, aged >50 years, there has been an inflammatory reaction such as activation of TNF- α and IL-6⁴¹⁻⁴³. This study proves the effect of *Lactobacillus* probiotics can modulate inflammatory reactions in healthy 50-year-olds. It showed that *Lactobacillus* probiotics could modulate the activity of B cells, eosinophils, IgE, NK cells, TNF- α , and IL-10. B cells play a role in eliminating incoming bacteria. On the other hand, B cells can also cause autoimmune and allergic diseases⁴⁴. This study proves that *Lactobacillus* impacts reducing the number of B cells. This decrease in B cells is necessary because antibodies can damage the intestinal mucosa. In some cases, such as allergies and autoimmune diseases, B cell activation is very high and can attack other immune cells. The results of our metaanalysis prove that a decrease in *Lactobacillus* plays a role in reducing the activation of B cells.

Several studies using probiotics have proven effective in increasing NK cell activity. Studies have shown that the administration of *L. rhamnosus* HN001 supplements for 3 weeks shows the activity of NK cells in middleaged and elderly populations⁴⁵. Our analysis proves that *Lactobacillus* positivity increases NK cell activation, which means that NK cells are effective for the treatment group. One probiotic that is often used in research trials is the lactic acid bacteria strain, *LcS*, which is currently manufactured in Japan as a commercial beverage. Many studies have shown the immunomodulatory effects of *LcS* on the gut immune system, particularly NK cell activity within the innate immune system⁴⁶.

Our analysis also showed that *Lactobacillus* had a positive result on TNF- α which means that *Lactobacillus* acts as an immunomodulator to decrease TNF- α cells. Probiotics such as *Lactobacillus* can inhibit TNF- α expression, generating an immunosuppressant and anti-inflammatory effect as a response; this statement has been widely reported by other studies. A study showed that the probiotic *Lactobacillus* can reduce TNF- α expression, and treat colitis symptoms⁴⁷.

Like TNF- α , we proved that *Lactobacillus* downregulates IgE. This effect is essential in patients with food allergies because it avoids clinical manifestations with vital consequences for allergic patients. IgE is an amply recognized antibody (immunoglobulin) associated with allergic responses. In different cases, IgE antibodies can bind to allergens and increase host resistance against parasites (helminths and protozoans). Mechanism of IgE as a defense through binding to allergen products and FccRI on basophils and mast cells, antigen and IgE-induced aggregation of FccRI can trigger the release of histamine, proteases, prostaglandins, leukotrienes, chemokines and cytokines⁴⁸.

IL-10 plays a central role in downregulating inflammatory cascades by suppressing the secretion of proinflammatory cytokines. *Lactobacillus* was positive for IL-10 expression. Some studies have revealed the positive effect of *Lactobacillus* sp. in stimulating IL-10.

Current research has demonstrated that administering *L. casei* can modify intestinal microbiota composition and TLR expression and increase IL-10 levels in the colonic mucosa of patients with mild ulcerative colitis⁴⁹.

The strength of this study was that the probiotic *Lactobacillus* sp. is highly effective in the elderly who are >50 years old through modulation of eosinophils and B cells. The limitations of this study: (1) Many studies have examined the effects of *Lactobacillus* sp. probiotics but did not include the mean, standard deviation, and the number of samples, so that studies were excluded from this study; (2) There is little evidence of the effect of probiotic *Lactobacillus* sp. on anti-inflammatory parameters; (3) Only collects a few cases (atopic dermatitis, allergic rhinitis, Japanese cedar pollinosis, HIV, healthy eldery, hypercholestrolaemic, and IBD), so the role of probiotic *Lactobacillus* sp. in other cases is not known.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, our meta-analysis demonstrated that most cases in this study were healthy elderly patients who received treatment with *Lactobacillus* sp. *Lactobacillus* sp. positively affects B cells, eosinophils, IgE, NK cells, TNF- α , and IL-10. This means that *Lactobacillus* could regulate the immune system by modulating inflammation in the healthy elderly.

Acknowledgements: Thank you to the Center of Women Empowerment in Law Enforcement Research Found for funding this study.

Ethics

Author Contributions

Concept: W.F.E., S.P.M., I.D.S., D.S., R.E.P., S.Z., Design: W.F.E., S.P.M., I.D.S., D.S., R.E.P., S.Z., Data Collection and/or Processing: W.F.E., I.D.S., D.S., Analysis and/or Interpretation: W.F.E., S.P.M., D.S., R.E.P., Literature Search: W.F.E., R.E.P., Writing: W.F.E., S.P.M., I.D.S., D.S., R.E.P., S.Z.

Conflict of Interest: The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

Financial Disclosure: This study was funded by the Center of Women Empowerment in Law Enforcement Research Found, Postgraduate School, Airlangga University, for funding this study (project no: 3899/UN3.SPS/PT.01.03/2023).

REFERENCES

 Lebeer S, Vanderleyden J, De Keersmaecker SC. Genes and molecules of lactobacilli supporting probiotic action. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev. 2008;72:728-64.

- Mackie RI, Sghir A, Gaskins HR. Developmental microbial ecology of the neonatal gastrointestinal tract. Am J Clin Nutr. 1999;69:1035S-45S.
- Ibrahim SA. Lactic acid bacteria: Lactobacillus spp.: Other species. 2016. Available from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/ article/abs/pii/B978008100596500857X?via%3Dihub
- Zheng J, Wittouck S, Salvetti E, et al. A taxonomic note on the genus Lactobacillus: Description of 23 novel genera, emended description of the genus Lactobacillus Beijerinck 1901, and union of Lactobacillaceae and Leuconostocaceae. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol. 2020;70:2782-858.
- Ligaarden SC, Axelsson L, Naterstad K, Lydersen S, Farup PG. A candidate probiotic with unfavourable effects in subjects with irritable bowel syndrome: a randomised controlled trial. BMC Gastroenterol. 2010;10:16.
- Sazawal S, Hiremath G, Dhingra U, Malik P, Deb S, Black RE. Efficacy of probiotics in prevention of acute diarrhoea: a metaanalysis of masked, randomised, placebo-controlled trials. Lancet Infect Dis. 2006;6:374-82.
- Isolauri E, Arvola T, Sütas Y, Moilanen E, Salminen S. Probiotics in the management of atopic eczema. Clin Exp Allergy. 2000;30:1604-10.
- 8. Viljanen M, Savilahti E, Haahtela T, et al. Probiotics in the treatment of atopic eczema/dermatitis syndrome in infants: a double-blind placebo-controlled trial. Allergy. 2005;60:494-500.
- Kalliomäki M, Antoine J-M, Herz U, Rijkers GT, Wells JM, Mercenier A. Guidance for substantiating the evidence for beneficial effects of probiotics: prevention and management of allergic diseases by probiotics. J Nutr. 2010;140:713S-21S.
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG; PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. Ann Intern Med. 2009;151:264-9, W64.
- 11. Han Y, Kim B, Ban J, et al. A randomized trial of L actobacillus plantarum CJLP 133 for the treatment of atopic dermatitis. Pediatr Allergy Immunol. 2012;23:667-73.
- Ahn SH, Yoon W, Lee SY, et al. Effects of Lactobacillus pentosus in children with allergen-sensitized atopic dermatitis. J Korean Med Sci. 2020;35:e128.
- Drago L, Iemoli E, Rodighiero V, Nicola L, De Vecchi E, Piconi S. Effects of Lactobacillus salivarius LS01 (DSM 22775) treatment on adult atopic dermatitis: a randomized placebo-controlled study. Int J Immunopathol Pharmacol. 2011;24:1037-48.
- Harima-Mizusawa N, Kano M, Nozaki D, Nonaka C, Miyazaki K, Enomoto T. Citrus juice fermented with Lactobacillus plantarum YIT 0132 alleviates symptoms of perennial allergic rhinitis in a double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Benef Microbes. 2016;7:649-58.
- Ishida Y, Nakamura F, Kanzato H, et al. Clinical effects of Lactobacillus acidophilus strain L-92 on perennial allergic rhinitis: a double-blind, placebo-controlled study. J Dairy Sci. 2005;88:527-33.
- Ivory K, Chambers SJ, Pin C, Prieto E, Arqués JL, Nicoletti C. Oral delivery of Lactobacillus casei Shirota modifies allergeninduced immune responses in allergic rhinitis. Clin Exp Allergy. 2008;38:1282-9.
- Kawase M, He F, Kubota A, et al. Effect of fermented milk prepared with two probiotic strains on Japanese cedar pollinosis in a double-blind placebo-controlled clinical study. Int J Food Microbiol. 2009;128:429-34.

- Hasegawa T, Hirakawa K, Matsumoto T, Toki S, Maeyama Y, Morimatsu F. Efficacy of Lactobacillus plantarum strain HSK201 in relief from Japanese cedar pollinosis. Biosci Biotechnol Biochem. 2009;73:2626-31.
- Hummelen R, Hemsworth J, Changalucha J, et al. Effect of micronutrient and probiotic fortified yogurt on immunefunction of anti-retroviral therapy naive HIV patients. Nutrients. 2011;3:897-909.
- Parra M, Martinez de Morentin B, Cobo J, Mateos A, Martinez J. Daily ingestion of fermented milk containing Lactobacillus casei DN114001 improves innate-defense capacity in healthy middleaged people. J Physiol Biochem. 2004;60:85-91.
- Bunout D, Barrera G, Hirsch S, et al. Effects of a nutritional supplement on the immune response and cytokine production in free-living Chilean elderly. JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr. 2004;28:348-54.
- Miyazawa K, Kawase M, Kubota A, et al. Heat-killed Lactobacillus gasseri can enhance immunity in the elderly in a double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical study. Benef Microbes. 2015;6:441-9.
- Mangalat N, Liu Y, Fatheree NY, et al. Safety and tolerability of Lactobacillus reuteri DSM 17938 and effects on biomarkers in healthy adults: results from a randomized masked trial. PLoS One. 2012;7:e43910.
- Hirose Y, Murosaki S, Yamamoto Y, Yoshikai Y, Tsuru T. Daily intake of heat-killed Lactobacillus plantarum L-137 augments acquired immunity in healthy adults. J Nutr. 2006;136:3069-73.
- Seifert S, Bub A, Franz CM, Watzl B. Probiotic Lactobacillus casei Shirota supplementation does not modulate immunity in healthy men with reduced natural killer cell activity. J Nutr. 2011;141:978-84.
- 26. Lorea Baroja M, Kirjavainen P, Hekmat S, Reid G. Antiinflammatory effects of probiotic yogurt in inflammatory bowel disease patients. Clin Exp Immunol. 2007;149:470-9.
- 27. Tamura M, Shikina T, Morihana T, et al. Effects of probiotics on allergic rhinitis induced by Japanese cedar pollen: randomized double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial. Int Arch Allergy Immunol. 2007;143:75-82.
- Meyer A, Elmadfa I, Herbacek I, Micksche M. Probiotic, as well as conventional yogurt, can enhance the stimulated production of proinflammatory cytokines. J Hum Nutr Diet. 2007;20:590-8.
- 29. Costabile A, Buttarazzi I, Kolida S, et al. An in vivo assessment of the cholesterol-lowering efficacy of Lactobacillus plantarum ECGC 13110402 in normal to mildly hypercholesterolaemic adults. PLoS One. 2017;12:e0187964.
- Ouwehand AC, Tiihonen K, Saarinen M, Putaala H, Rautonen N. Influence of a combination of Lactobacillus acidophilus NCFM and lactitol on healthy elderly: intestinal and immune parameters. Br J Nutr. 2009;101:367-75.
- 31. Lee BJ, Bak Y-T. Irritable bowel syndrome, gut microbiota and probiotics. J Neurogastroenterol Motil. 2011;17:252-66.
- 32. Kechagia M, Basoulis D, Konstantopoulou S, et al. Health benefits of probiotics: a review. ISRN Nutr. 2013;2013:481651.
- Costa D, Marteau P, Amouyal M, et al. Efficacy and safety of the probiotic Lactobacillus paracasei LP-33 in allergic rhinitis: a double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial (GA2LEN Study). Eur J Clin Nutr. 2014;68:602-7.
- 34. Lin W-Y, Fu L-S, Lin H-K, Shen C-Y, Chen Y-J. Evaluation of the effect of Lactobacillus paracasei (HF. A00232) in children (6–13

years old) with perennial allergic rhinitis: a 12-week, doubleblind, randomized, placebo-controlled study. Pediatr Neonatol. 2014;55:181-8.

- 35. Giovannini M, Agostoni C, Riva E, et al; Felicita Study Group. A randomized prospective double blind controlled trial on effects of long-term consumption of fermented milk containing Lactobacillus casei in pre-school children with allergic asthma and/or rhinitis. Pediatr Res. 2007;62:215-20.
- Martínez-Cañavate A, Sierra S, et al. A probiotic dairy product containing L. gasseri CECT5714 and L. coryniformis CECT5711 induces immunological changes in children suffering from allergy. Pediatr Allergy Immunol. 2009;20:592-600.
- 37. Wassenberg J, Nutten S, Audran R, et al. Effect of Lactobacillus paracasei STI1 on a nasal provocation test with grass pollen in allergic rhinitis. Clin Exp Allergy. 2011;41:565-73.
- 38. Snel J, Vissers YM, Smit BA, et al. Strain-specific immunomodulatory effects of Lactobacillus plantarum strains on birch-pollen-allergic subjects out of season. Clin Exp Allergy. 2011;41:232-42.
- 39. Perrin Y, Nutten S, Audran R, et al. Comparison of two oral probiotic preparations in a randomized crossover trial highlights a potentially beneficial effect of Lactobacillus paracasei NCC2461 in patients with allergic rhinitis. Clin Transl Allergy. 2014;4:1.
- Ahmed M, Billoo AG, Iqbal K. Efficacy of probiotic in perennial allergic rhinitis under five year children: A randomized controlled trial. Pak J Med Sci. 2019;35:1538-43.
- Bian A-L, Hu H-Y, Rong Y-D, Wang J, Wang J-X, Zhou X-Z. A study on relationship between elderly sarcopenia and inflammatory factors IL-6 and TNF-α. Eur J Med Res. 2017;22:25.
- 42. Koo EG, Lai LM, Choi GY, Chan MT. Systemic inflammation in the elderly. Best Pract Res Clin Anaesthesiol. 2011;25:413-25.
- De Martinis M, Franceschi C, Monti D, Ginaldi L. Inflammation markers predicting frailty and mortality in the elderly. Exp Mol Pathol. 2006;80:219-27.
- Kelly-Scumpia KM, Scumpia PO, Weinstein JS, et al. B cells enhance early innate immune responses during bacterial sepsis. J Exp Med. 2011;208:1673-82.
- Aziz N, Bonavida B. Activation of natural killer cells by probiotics. For Immunopathol Dis Therap. 2016;7:41-55.
- 46. Matsumoto K, Takada T, Shimizu K, et al. The effects of a probiotic milk product containing Lactobacillus casei strain Shirota on the defecation frequency and the intestinal microflora of sub-optimal health state volunteers: a randomized placebo-controlled crossover study. Biosci Microflora. 2006;25:39-48.
- 47. Pena JA, Versalovic J. Lactobacillus rhamnosus GG decreases TNF-α production in lipopolysaccharide-activated murine macrophages by a contact-independent mechanism. Cell Microbiol. 2003;5:277-85.
- Sariego TH, del Toro DD, Barranco JJ, Arenal A. Can probiotics modulate the cytokines and antibodies levels in food allergy models? A meta-analysis. 2022. DOI:10.21203/rs.3.rs-1777155/v1
- de Moreno de LeBlanc A, Del Carmen S, Zurita-Turk M, et al. Importance of IL-10 modulation by probiotic microorganisms in gastrointestinal inflammatory diseases. ISRN Gastroenterol. 2011;2011:892971.