Metabolic diversity of bacteria and yeast from commercial probiotic products illustrated by phenotypic profiling

Juliana M. Ansari^{1*}, Christine Colasacco¹, Elli Emmanouil¹, Scott Kohlhepp¹, and Olivia Harriott¹

¹Department of Biology, Fairfield University, Fairfield, CT

*corresponding author: Juliana.m.ansari@gmail.com; Current address: Shelton, CT

13 Abstract

14 The number of probiotic products in the marketplace is on the rise, gaining momentum along
 15 with the upsurge in research on the role of the human gut microbiome in health. Although such products
 16 are considered safe for consumption, these probiotic supplements and beverages are not subject to
 17 stringent federal regulation for quality. While only certain strains of probiotic microbes have been
 18 studied for efficacy in clinical trials, the ingredient labels of commercial probiotics do not always list the
 19 strain names. In this study, we investigated the diversity of the bacteria and yeast sold in these products.
 20 From a representative selection of commercially available probiotic supplements and beverages, we
 21 cultured microbes and identified them with standard methods (16S rRNA gene sequencing, mass
 22 spectrometric identification, and Biolog phenotypic profiling), then assessed whether there were strain-
 23 specific differences in nutrient metabolism and tolerance to compounds across the isolates from different
 24 products. *Bacillus coagulans*, *Bacillus subtilis*, *Lactobacillus plantarum*, *Lactobacillus rhamnosus*, and
 25 the yeast *Saccharomyces boulardii* were cultured from 21 commercial probiotic products (fifteen
 26 probiotic supplements and six probiotic beverages). Phenotypic profiling revealed metabolic diversity in
 27 carbon source usage and tolerance to compounds, within species from different probiotics and from
 28 environmental isolates of strains belonging to the same species. Despite this strain level diversity, we
 29 observed that up to half of the probiotic supplements for sale in retail and drugstores only list the
 30 species, but not the specific strain, on the label. This study highlights that existing labeling conventions
 31 for probiotics are insufficient to convey the strain identity and diversity in these products, underscoring
 32 the need for clear strain identification and verification of strain-specific probiotic properties, particularly
 33 when moving toward therapeutic applications of beneficial microbes.

34

35

36

37 **Introduction**

38 A widespread awakening in the public and medical community's interest in commensal bacteria
 39 for promoting health is currently underway. Accelerated by the ease and affordability of rapid DNA
 40 sequencing technology, an avalanche of studies in animal models and humans has linked the
 41 microorganisms living on or in the body to countless health conditions. In the decade since the Human
 42 Microbiome Project was initiated to understand how microbes impact human physiology and disease
 43 [1], hundreds of studies are published each year exploring the roles of the microbiome (the microbial
 44 community inhabiting the human body) in a wide range of diseases. The combination of impacts on
 45 inflammation, immunity, nutrient metabolism, and even behavior may inextricably tie the healthy
 46 balance vs. imbalance (dysbiosis) of the human gut microbiome to one's overall functioning as a healthy
 47 human organism. While the composition of bacterial (and fungal, viral, and protozoan) residents of the
 48 body is being mapped with increasing phylogenetic detail, many of the organisms are novel and the
 49 biological functions of many of their genes remain unknown [2].

50 This tidal wave of studies on the human microbiome has kindled renewed interest in the idea of
 51 adding beneficial bacteria (probiotics) or foods that selectively enhance growth of certain beneficial
 52 microbes (prebiotics) to the diet. Supplementing food with microorganisms is by no means new, with
 53 fermented foods and beverages common in the diets of cultures around the world, yet mainstream
 54 interest and market demand for probiotic foods is growing in parallel with research on the microbiome,
 55 nutrition, and health [3]. The promoted advantage of probiotics is the maintenance or restoration of the
 56 balance between pathogens and healthy necessary bacteria, via mechanisms such as binding to
 57 pathogens, competition for nutrients, antimicrobial production, and modulating the immune system [4].
 58 In addition to their established roles in female reproductive health [5], probiotics have been recognized
 59 for myriad effects on digestive health [6].

Obesity has been shown to be correlated with the microbiota, linked to an imbalance in energy homeostasis, and probiotics and/or prebiotics show potential to address this [7]. According to Salazar et al., prebiotic ingestion by obese women caused an increase in *Bifidobacterium* species, attenuated short-chain fatty acid (SCFA) production and thus abated metabolic factors correlated with obesity [8]. Additionally, the consumption of probiotics has been demonstrated to improve insulin resistance syndrome, type 2-diabetes and non-alcoholic fatty liver disease [6]. **ADD_Science paper T2D.** There is evidence that probiotics assist with the production of vitamin B and necessary organic acids and amino acids, with host absorption of vitamins and minerals, and with the production of enzymes such as esterase, lipase and co-enzymes essential to metabolic processes [6]. The composition of the microbiota is also associated with irritable bowel syndrome (IBS), a chronic disorder associated with abdominal pain, distention and abnormal bowel movements, along with low grade inflammation and alterations to the gut immune system [9]. Substantial evidence indicates the efficacy of specific probiotics for alleviating the symptoms of IBS [10]. Other gastrointestinal disorders such as traveler's diarrhea [11] and antibiotic- associated diarrhea [12], have been shown to be treated or prevented with the introduction of probiotics.

Still, the health claims made by many probiotic foods and supplements are often many steps ahead of the science backing the studies. Despite a growing body of clinical trials supporting the specific benefits of well-established strains [10], more carefully designed and controlled studies are needed [13][14]. This gap between the advertised benefits of probiotics and the evidence to support their efficacy, is due in part to the limited regulation on probiotic supplements, which are categorized by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) as food additives or ingredients rather than drugs. The microbial strains they contain are classified as "GRAS" (generally recognized as safe), but the health claims on packages are not verified by the FDA. With research on beneficial bacteria advancing rapidly, it is expected that if the promise of microbiome-based therapies lives up to projections, then 'precision

probiotics' aiming to prevent or treat certain health conditions may soon be classified as drugs and subjected to more stringent regulatory scrutiny and burden of proof for efficacy. Indeed, the end of the 2010s may represent the calm before the storm of 'next-generation probiotics' or 'bugs as drugs,' discovered from research on healthy microbiomes, that could be used to treat specific diseases.

When probiotics are evaluated for their ability to treat specific conditions in clinical trials, the strains used have demonstrated probiotic properties, yet the strain-level identity of probiotic bacteria is not always provided on the ingredient label [15]. While in some cases probiotic properties are species- or genus-wide [16], this omission raises several concerns, with safety being the foremost. Secondly, for those brands that do not list the strain, it is possible that the included strain does not actually possess the probiotic effects of clinically verified strains. Variability in cultivation and processing during probiotic manufacturing, also raises the possibility that the integrity of the particular probiotic strain is lost over time, through continuous passaging in industrial fermentations. When bacterial populations are cultured repeatedly over time, new stable genetic populations can emerge, such as in ongoing experimental evolution studies of *Escherichia coli* [17] and *Burkholderia cenocepacia* following repeated transfers of the same starting population [18]. It is possible that this could occur after repeated passaging of fast-growing industrial microorganisms, perhaps selecting for better growth under industrial fermentation conditions, and potentially leading to a reduction in their probiotic properties.

Identifying microbes at the strain level and ensuring that their beneficial properties are not lost during the culturing and manufacturing process, is imperative for the live organisms to exert their reported effect. The current study aimed to test how well routine genetic and phenotypic methods of microbial identification could distinguish the microbes in common commercial probiotics at the species and strain level, and to investigate the metabolic differences between the bacterial strains in each product. Three approaches were used to identify each probiotic isolate: amplification and sequencing of the 16S rRNA gene, Matrix Assisted Laser Desorption Ionization Time-of-Flight (MALDI-TOF) mass

spectrometry, and the Biolog Microbial Identification system, a 96-well plate multiplex phenotypic assay consisting of 71 carbon source utilization tests and 23 chemical sensitivity tests [19]. We hypothesized that comparing the phenotypic profiles of these common probiotics would reveal differences in their nutrient metabolism (both across different probiotic species, and among strains of the same species). We also explored the prevalence of certain types of bacteria in the marketplace and compared this to the quantity of published research supporting their beneficial effects.

Methods

Isolation of bacteria from commercial probiotic products

Probiotic products were purchased in 2016-2017, opened within one month of the date of purchase and bottles were stored at 4 °C. “Single-strain” probiotics contained only one species of live microorganism, and “Multi-strain” probiotics contained two or more species listed on the label; however only one isolated microbe was identified from each product. For those in capsule form, the capsule was aseptically emptied into a microcentrifuge tube containing 1 ml of sterile water and mixed thoroughly. Tablets were ground with a sterilized mortar and pestle and combined with sterile water. Probiotic beverages were sampled using sterile swabs, directly from the original bottle. Using a sterile inoculating loop, the sample was streaked for isolation onto the surface of the appropriate agar growth medium. For culturing *Lactobacillus* species and *Bacillus coagulans*, MRS (de Man, Rogosa, and Sharpe) agar was used, and TSA (Tryptic Soy Agar) was used for *Bacillus subtilis*. Yeast were cultured on SDA (Sabouraud Dextrose Agar) or MRS. Agar plates were incubated at 30-33 °C for 48-72 hours aerobically, and individual isolated colonies were identified. For single strain products, a well-isolated colony was inoculated into liquid medium and incubated for 24 hours, then used to make a frozen glycerol stock by mixing 700 µl of the overnight culture with 300 µl of sterile 50% glycerol (final

concentration 15% glycerol) and stored at -80 °C. For multi-strain products, one colony type was selected, and re-streaked for isolation prior to storing as a frozen glycerol stock.

To observe cells from isolated colonies, isolated bacteria were Gram stained following the standard procedure [20] and viewed under oil immersion with the 100x objective lens and photographed. As a preliminary differentiation step between *Lactobacillus* and *Bacillus*, endospore staining was performed on 1-week old cultures following the Schaeffer-Fulton procedure (Harley, 2017). Heat fixed smears were covered with a small piece of paper towel, and placed on a rack over a steaming water bath. Malachite green dye (5%) was added on top of paper and heated for 5-7 minutes, adding fresh stain as liquid evaporated. Slides were rinsed in water, counterstained with safranin for 1 minute, then viewed under oil immersion with the 100x objective lens and photographed.

Antibiotic susceptibility testing

The Kirby-Bauer test for antibiotic susceptibility was followed with minor modifications. The typical medium for this assay is Mueller Hinton, however Mueller Hinton was used for *Bacillus subtilis* and MRS agar used for *Lactobacillus* spp. Using sterile swabs, overnight liquid cultures were spread in a zig-zag pattern to create a “lawn” of growth on large 150-mm agar plates. A 12-place BD BBL Sensi-Disc Dispenser was used to deposit the following antibiotic susceptibility Sensi-discs (BD, Franklin Lakes, NJ) onto the agar surface: Ampicillin (AM10), Bacitracin (B10), Chloramphenicol (C30), Ciprofloxacin (CIP5), Erythromycin (E15), Gentamicin (GM10), Kanamycin (K30), Neomycin (N30), Penicillin (P10), Streptomycin (S10), Tetracycline (Te30), and Vancomycin (VA30). After 24 hours of incubation at 33 °C, zones of inhibition were measured and compared to the known diameter sizes for susceptibility on the reference Zone Diameter Interpretive Chart, updated by the National Committee for Clinical Laboratory Standards, accessed in (Harley, 2017). Susceptibility to each antibiotic was recorded as susceptible (S), resistant (R), or intermediate (I) based on the diameter of the zone of inhibition.

155

156 **BIOLOG Microbial identification and metabolic profiling**

157 Freshly grown (24-48 hr) colonies, from TSA or MRS agar, were used for microbial
158 identification on GenIII microplates with the BIOLOG semi-automated system (Biolog, Hayward, CA)
159 following the manufacturer's instructions. Bacteria were added to the appropriate inoculating fluid and
160 transmittance (T) was measured and adjusted to 90-98% T. For *Lactobacillus* species, Inoculating Fluid
161 C (IF-C) was used. For *Bacillus* and other species, either Inoculating Fluid A or B (IF-A or IF-B) was
162 used. Conditions are listed in **Table S1**. Suspended cells were dispensed with an automatic multichannel
163 pipettor into the GenIII 96-well microplate (100 µl per well). The GenIII microplates were incubated at
164 33 °C for 16-48 hours and read using the MicroLog™ plate reader and associated software (Biolog,
165 Hayward, CA) once the positive control well A10 turned purple (typically at 20-24 hr of incubation).
166 Positive growth responses are indicated by a color change based on redox dye chemistry. Identification
167 is made by the GENIII MicroStation™ software, which compares the phenotypic fingerprint with a
168 fingerprint database of known bacteria [21]. Similarity (SIM) scores are assigned reflecting how well
169 the isolate matches the pattern in the database, and an identification is given if the SIM score is >0.6.
170 Bacterial identifications and SIM scores were recorded, and the plate image was saved for later analysis.
171 The GenIII Microplate reference layout for each microorganism was also saved (see example in **Figure**
172 **2D**). The results from all Biolog plates were transcribed into a single summary table, using a "P" for
173 positive reaction wells (purple), representing growth and utilization of a carbon source . Wells scored by
174 the software as borderline (light color half-moon in Figure 2D, could be positive or negative) [21] were
175 recorded as "h" for half in the results tables.

176 For yeast, colonies grown for 48-72 hour on SDA were inoculated into 10 ml sterile water, and
177 the cell suspension was adjusted to 50% transmittance, then pipetted into the wells of a YT microplate.

178 YT plates were incubated at 26 °C for 24-72 hours, and analyzed at 24, 48, and 72 hours using the
179 MicroLog™ plate reader until an identification was made.

180

181 **PCR amplification and sequencing of 16S rRNA gene**

182 Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) was performed using DNA obtained directly from bacterial
183 colonies. To amplify the near full-length 16S rRNA gene, the primers 27F (5'-
184 AGAGTTTGATCCTGGCTCAG-3') and 1492R (5'-GGTACCTTGTTACGACTT-3') were used. On
185 ice, a Master mix was prepared, containing water, buffer, MgSO₄, dNTPs, and primers following the
186 manufacturer's instructions for HotStart KOD Polymerase (Millipore Sigma, St. Louis, MO). Aliquots
187 of 50 µl of the Master mix were added to labeled 8-strip PCR tubes, and a sterile 100 µl pipette tip was
188 used to pick a pinpoint amount of a bacterial colony and transfer the cells directly into the appropriate
189 PCR tube. Amplification reactions were run on a Bio-rad Thermocycler (Bio-rad, Hercules, CA) using
190 the following cycling conditions: denaturation at 95 °C for 2 minutes, 35 cycles of: [95 °C denaturation
191 for 20 seconds, 48 °C annealing for 20 seconds, 70 °C extension for 35 seconds], followed by a final
192 extension step at 70 °C for 3 minutes. After visualizing the 1450-bp amplicons from each PCR reaction
193 using gel electrophoresis, the PCR amplicons were purified using the QIAquick PCR Purification Kit
194 (Qiagen, Valencia, CA). The DNA purified from the PCR reactions was quantified using a Take3 micro-
195 volume plate with the Gen5 Microplate Reader (Biotek Instruments, Winooski, VT). DNA samples
196 were prepared with forward or reverse primer and PCR products were sequenced by Sanger sequencing
197 at the Yale University DNA Analysis Facility on Science Hill, using an Applied Biosystems Genetic
198 Analyzer (New Haven, CT). The .abi files were downloaded and DNA chromatograms were viewed and
199 trimmed using Geneious bioinformatics software (<http://www.geneious.com/>). Resulting forward and
200 reverse sequences were searched against sequences in the Genbank non-redundant (nr) nucleotide

database using Standard Nucleotide BLAST (blastn), and the top-scoring four hits were recorded for each organism.

Matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization time-of-flight (MALDI-TOF) mass spectrometry

Bacteria from frozen stock cultures were transferred to MRS or TSA plates and incubated at 30°C for 48 hours prior to identification. Proteins were extracted using either the on-target method or by using an ethanol-formic acid protocol described by Friewald & Sauer (2009). Cells from isolated colonies were directly smeared onto a disposable FlexiMass™ DS target plate using a sterile toothpick. One µl of 25% formic acid was added to the spot and allowed to air dry followed by the addition of 1 µl of the α-Cyano-4-hydroxycinnamic acid (CHCA) matrix solution. The CHCA matrix solution contained 50 mg of CHCA dissolved in a 33/33/33 mixture of acetonitrile/ethanol/dH₂O containing a final concentration of 3% trifluoroacetic acid. When the on-target method yielded spectra with poor resolution, proteins were extracted prior to spotting using ethanol and formic acid (Friewald & Sauer 2009). Cells from colonies were dissolved in 300 µl of dH₂O and inactivated by adding 900 µl of room temperature absolute ethanol. The cell suspension was centrifuged twice at 10,000 x g for 2 minutes to remove the supernatant. The pellet was air dried at room temperature for 1 minute and dissolved in 10 µl 70% formic acid. Ten µl acetonitrile was added to the formic acid-cells mixture followed by centrifugation at 10,000 x g for 2 minutes at room temperature. The resulting supernatant containing extracted proteins was transferred to a separate tube. One µl of the supernatant was spotted onto the target plate and overlaid with 1 µl of the matrix.

MALDI-TOF MS was performed on the AXIMA Confidence iD^{Plus} MALDI-TOF Mass Spectrometer (Shimadzu) using Launchpad software version 2.9.1 and the VITEK® MS Plus Spectral Archive and Microbial Identification System™ (SARAMIS) database, V4.12. Samples were analyzed in the positive linear mode with a laser frequency of 50 Hz and within a mass range of 2000-20,000 Da.

225 The acceleration voltage was 20 kV and extraction delay time 200 ns. Spectra were generated from 500
 226 laser shots and each target plate was calibrated before samples were analyzed using *Escherichia coli*
 227 DH5 α . Samples were run in duplicate and spectra acquired by Launchpad were processed by
 228 SARAMIS. Each spectrum was assigned a confidence level based on a comparison to SuperSpectra in
 229 the SARAMIS database. SARAMIS does not assign a taxonomic name if the confidence levels are
 230 below 75%.

231

232 **Probiotic product label analysis and literature searches**

233 To estimate the percentage of products listing specific strains on the label, products were
 234 evaluated from four marketplaces: a major online retailer, two drugstore chains, and a retail superstore
 235 with brick-and-mortar store locations in Shelton, CT. A search for products from the online retailer was
 236 conducted between Jan-April 2017 using the keyword “probiotic” and the name of the following
 237 probiotic microbes: *Bacillus coagulans*, *Bacillus subtilis*, *Lactobacillus acidophilus*, *Lactobacillus*
 238 *plantarum*, *Lactobacillus rhamnosus*, *Bifidobacterium*, and *Saccharomyces boulardii*. At least 20
 239 products for each organism were checked, and if the label image contained a specific strain name or
 240 number, this was recorded. For brick-and-mortar stores (visited in April 2018), we counted unique
 241 products on the shelves in the probiotic section, examined the labels, and recorded the number of
 242 products that listed at least one strain ID on the label. In stores in which a high volume of store-brand
 243 generics was present, the products were only counted individually if the listed organisms were different
 244 from another store-brand product. Note that products found on the shelves at multiple stores were tallied
 245 each time in the count for that store; meaning that the list for each store often contained a high degree of
 246 overlap (particularly of the most popular name-brand probiotics).

247 To assess the representation of each type of probiotic bacteria and yeast in the medical literature,
 248 we performed literature searches of the Pubmed.gov database (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/>)

in March 2018. Keywords used were the genus and species name of each probiotic (for *B. coagulans*, we also included the former name, *Lactobacillus sporogenes*), AND “human.” The filter “Clinical Trial” was selected to count the number of published clinical trials.

Results

Isolation and culturing of probiotic microbes

Pure cultures of bacteria and yeast were isolated from 16 different probiotic supplements, six probiotic beverages, and four environmental sources (Chaas fermented beverage, fruit fly gut, kale, and a leaf). Though most probiotic microorganisms are facultative anaerobes, their aerobic growth was comparable to growth with CO₂ Gaspaks, and further experiments were conducted under aerobic conditions. *Bifidobacterium* spp. were excluded from this investigation due to their strict anaerobic and fastidious growth. The main bacterial species cultured were *B. coagulans*, *B. subtilis*, *L. plantarum*, and *L. rhamnosus*, with typical colony morphology on TSA or MRS agar under aerobic conditions shown in **Figure 1**. While the *Lactobacillus* species have very similar colony appearance (off-white to white, circular, creamy), the two *Bacillus* species are quite distinct, with *B. coagulans* colonies showing irregular edges, translucent tan color, and less robust growth. The colonies of *B. subtilis* have more rapid, spreading growth, and are opaque off-white in color, raised, and wrinkled. Gram staining confirmed that all bacteria were Gram-positive rods. As expected, spore staining revealed that only the *Bacillus* species formed spores (not shown). *B. coagulans* formed visibly stained spores only when the bacteria were grown on TSA, not on MRS. In one single-strain probiotic labeled as “*Bacillus coagulans*,” both *B. coagulans* and *B. subtilis* were cultured repeatedly from the capsule, indicating contamination within the original product.

Identification of isolated microbes

Table 1 summarizes the number of identifications, obtained using each of the three methods, that matched the listed species on the label.

Table 1. Number of correct bacterial species identifications by each method

Name	# of Products tested	Correct ID with 16S sequencing	Correct ID with MALDI	Correct ID with BIOLOG
<i>Bacillus coagulans</i>	4	3	2	0
<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	3	2	3	3
<i>Lactobacillus plantarum</i>	5	4	3	5
<i>Lactobacillus rhamnosus</i>	4	3	4	3
Other <i>Lactobacillus</i> spp.	2	2	0	0
Total	18	14 (78%)	12 (67%)	11 (61%)

The species identifications obtained by each method, for each isolate, are listed in **Table 2**. Each isolate was assigned a Code number to de-identify the product brand. Table 2 includes a total of 26 isolated organisms. For the *S. boulardii* probiotic yeast, the only method used was Biolog identification, and two out of three products listing *S. boulardii* were correctly identified with the Biolog system. This total exceeds the 18 total products listed in Table 1, because it includes microbes for which the identity was unknown prior to analysis (some probiotic yeasts, and environmental isolates from the Chaas fermented beverage, fruit fly gut, and leaves). Seven of the products listed the specific strain identification (Strain ID) on the label: *B. coagulans* GBI-30 6086 (patented as GanedenBc³⁰®), *B. subtilis* DE111, *L. plantarum* 299V, *L. rhamnosus* GG, and *L. rhamnosus* LCR35 (**Table 2**).

Table 2. Species identifications of probiotic microbes using three methods

Source	Code	Label Identification	16S sequence BLAST Result	MALDI Result	Biolog Result
<i>Bacillus coagulans</i>					
Probiotic Beverage	5	<i>Bacillus coagulans</i> GBi-30 6086	<i>Bacillus coagulans</i>	<i>Bacillus coagulans</i>	No ID

Probiotic Beverage	6	<i>Bacillus coagulans</i> GBi-30 6086	<i>Bacillus coagulans</i>	<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	<i>Sporolactobacillus</i> <i>kofuensis</i>
Single-strain Probiotic	8	<i>Bacillus coagulans</i>	contamination: <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> **	<i>Bacillus coagulans</i>	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>paracasei</i>
Single-strain Probiotic	14	<i>Bacillus coagulans</i> GBi-30 6086	<i>Bacillus coagulans</i>	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>pentosus/plantarum</i>	<i>Brochothrix</i> <i>campestris</i>
<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>					
Single-strain Probiotic	9	<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	<i>Bacillus</i> sp. strain BCBT29	<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	<i>Bacillus</i> <i>atrophaeus/subtilis</i>
Multi-strain Probiotic	13	<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>
Multi-strain Probiotic	15	<i>Bacillus subtilis</i> DE111	<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>
ENV: leaf surface	20	N/A (environmental)	N/A	N/A	<i>Bacillus</i> <i>atrophaeus/subtilis</i>
<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>plantarum</i>					
Single-strain Probiotic	2	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>pentosus/plantarum</i>	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>plantarum</i>	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>pentosus/plantarum</i>	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>plantarum</i>
Multi-strain Probiotic	11	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>plantarum</i> complex	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>plantarum</i>	No ID	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>plantarum</i>
Multi-strain Probiotic	12	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>plantarum</i>	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>plantarum</i>	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>plantarum</i>	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>plantarum</i>
Probiotic Beverage	16	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>plantarum</i> 299V	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>plantarum</i>	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>pentosus/plantarum</i>	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>plantarum</i>
ENV: Fruit fly gut	19	N/A (environmental)	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>plantarum</i>	N/A	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>plantarum</i>
<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>rhamnosus</i>					
Single-strain Probiotic	1	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>rhamnosus</i> GG	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>rhamnosus</i>	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>rhamnosus</i>	<i>Weissella viridescens</i>
Multi-strain Probiotic	7	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>rhamnosus</i>	*contamination: <i>S.</i> <i>epidermidis</i>	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>rhamnosus</i>	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>rhamnosus</i>
Single-strain Probiotic	10	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>rhamnosus</i> LCR35	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>rhamnosus</i>	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>rhamnosus</i>	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>rhamnosus</i>
Multi-strain Probiotic	17	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>rhamnosus</i>	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>rhamnosus</i>	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>rhamnosus</i>	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>rhamnosus</i>
ENV: fermented milk beverage "Chaas"	18	N/A (environmental)	<i>Lactobacillus casei</i>	<i>Lactobacillus</i> sp.	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>rhamnosus</i>
Other <i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>spp.</i>					
Single-strain Probiotic	3	<i>Lactobacillus gasseri</i>	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>gasseri</i>	No ID	<i>Streptococcus oralis</i> or <i>Paenibacillus</i> <i>sanguinis</i>

Single-strain Probiotic	4	<i>Lactobacillus acidophilus</i>	<i>Lactobacillus acidophilus</i>	No ID	No ID
YEAST					
Kombucha 1	21	<i>Saccharomyces boulardii</i>	N/A	N/A	<i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae a/Tor.pretorein</i>
Kombucha 2	22	<i>Saccharomyces boulardii</i>	N/A	N/A	<i>Pichia chmeri A</i>
Kombucha 3	23	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>Hanseniospora guillermondii/uvarum</i>
Probiotic rice wine	24	<i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i>	N/A	N/A	<i>Saccharomyces boulardii</i>
Multi-strain probiotic	25	<i>Saccharomyces boulardii</i>	N/A	N/A	<i>Saccharomyces boulardii</i>
ENV: Kale leaf	26	N/A (environmental)	N/A	N/A	<i>Sporidiobolus pararoseus A</i>

295

296

297 Identification by 16S rRNA gene sequencing

298 Molecular identification by sequencing the 16S rRNA gene is currently a routine method of
 299 confirming species identity. The universal primers 27F and 1492R were used to amplify the near full
 300 length 16S gene, using direct colony PCR. Since this gene sequence is generally not variable enough to
 301 distinguish between strains of the same species, we used 16S rRNA sequencing primarily as a quality
 302 control check to ensure that we had indeed isolated the correct species from each product. For those
 303 products listing the Strain ID on the label, the top-scoring BLAST hit of the 16S sequence usually did
 304 not match the exact strain name (with the exception of *L. rhamnosus* strain “GG.”), and the % sequence
 305 identity of the five top-scoring BLAST hits were typically identical (**Table S2**). In most cases, the
 306 nucleotide BLAST search of the forward and the reverse sequences yielded different strain names of the
 307 expected species (**Table S2**). Several of the incorrect IDs (strain codes 7 and 8) may be attributed to
 308 contamination during the procedure (Table 2).

309

310 MALDI-TOF identification

Using Matrix Assisted Laser Desorption Ionization Time of Flight Technology Mass

Spectroscopy (MALDI-TOF), the mass fingerprints of 15 bacteria isolated from commercial probiotics or environmental sources were obtained and identified at the genus and species level. For 12 out of 18 isolated strains the MALDI identification matched that of the probiotic label (**Tables 1+2**). The “Chaas” isolate was a homemade fermentation so the bacterial identity was not labelled; MALDI- TOF MS identified this strain only on the genus level (*Lactobacillus* sp.). All *Bacillus subtilis* isolates were correctly identified by MALDI-TOF MS. *Bacillus coagulans* strains were not as consistently identified by this technique. The probiotic drink isolate (strain 14) was identified as *Lactobacillus pentosus/plantarum*, while the probiotic label indicated the strain was *Bacillus coagulans*. *Bacillus coagulans* (strain 6) was misidentified by MALDI as *B. subtilis*. Several *Lactobacillus* strains were unable to be identified: *L. acidophilus*, *L. gasseri*, and one *L. plantarum* (strain 11.) However, other *L. plantarum* isolates were successfully identified so this species is represented in the SARAMIS database. If a given peptide mass spectrum matched the database with a confidence score <75%, no identification in SARAMIS could be reported; confidence interval scores are provided in **Table S3**.

Biolog Identification & Phenotypic Profiling

Of the 18 probiotic bacterial isolates, 11 were correctly identified using the Biolog Microbial ID system (**Table 1, Table 2**). For 17 of these strains, the expected identity of the bacteria was given on the product label, however the strain isolated from the “Chaas” fermented milk beverage was not known in advance. Among the *Lactobacillus* isolates, *Lactobacillus plantarum* strains were the most amenable to identification with the Biolog system. All of the *L. plantarum* strains isolated from probiotic products were correctly identified, with SIM scores >0.6 (**Table S1**). One *L. rhamnosus* strain yielded an incorrect identification, erroneously reading as *Weissella viridescens*. Neither *L. acidophilus* nor *L. gasseri* were identified correctly with the Biolog assay. For the *Bacillus* strains isolated from probiotics,

335 *Bacillus subtilis* was more readily identified using the Biolog system. Three *B. subtilis* isolates from
 336 different products were accurately identified, while none of the three *B. coagulans* isolates came up as
 337 *B. coagulans*. Factors such as poor growth, use of non-optimal inoculating fluid or medium, or
 338 inappropriate incubation conditions may have had adverse effects on the phenotypic expression pattern.
 339 The time of incubation of the GenIII microplate is critical to a correct identification, as is the growth
 340 medium. While the Biolog manufacturer recommends BUG-B agar, we observed better growth of *B.*
 341 *coagulans* on MRS medium, so MRS was used.

342 **Figure 2** summarizes the results from the Biolog phenotypic profiling for each strain, with
 343 carbon source utilization patterns shown in Figure 2A and tolerance to environmental stressors (acidity,
 344 salt, and various compounds) in Figure 2B. The reference pattern stored in the Biolog GenIII database is
 345 displayed in the top row for each species. The darker color “P” wells indicate a strong positive, while the
 346 lighter “h” wells indicate borderline results (Figure 2D); the preferred carbon sources are typically used
 347 up more rapidly and completely, yielding a dark purple well, while less preferred substrates may be used
 348 more slowly and incompletely[21]. Results of antibiotic susceptibility testing for 12 antibiotics using the
 349 disc diffusion (Kirby-Bauer) method are also included in Figure 2. Strain-specific differences were
 350 observed for all of the species, in both carbon source utilization and environmental stress tolerance.

351 The Biolog system is also capable of identifying fungi such as yeast, using specific YT yeast
 352 plates and the YT database. After optimizing the time and temperature (72 hours at 26 °C), we identified
 353 yeast strains isolated from four probiotic drinks, one probiotic supplement and the surface of a kale leaf
 354 with Biolog YT (**Table 2, Figure 2C**). Three of these (strain codes 21,22, 25) were labelled as
 355 containing *Saccharomyces boulardii*, and the correct identification was obtained for two out of three.
 356 The metabolic utilization patterns of 35 carbon sources were compared for these probiotic yeasts and
 357 can be viewed in **Figure 2C**. The sugars glucose (Well D6/D7), turanose (Well A8), and maltose (A3)
 358 had clear positive growth in the all *S. boulardii* isolates. Inulin (Well A12), a common prebiotic fiber,

was utilized by several strains, although the reference pattern for *S. boulardii* used in the Biolog database is negative for inulin (Figure 2C).

Evaluation of product labels and quantification of published clinical studies

One objective of this project was to estimate the percentage of probiotic products currently on the market that list the specific strain ID of the bacterial or yeast species on the ingredient label. Products available from a major online retailer, at two drugstore chains, and at a retail superstore were evaluated by reading the ingredient label and recording whether or not each product listed an alphanumeric strain ID (often the patented name of the strain). **Table 3** summarizes these product counts from four retail sources. With this approximation we saw that an average of 49% (ranging from 34-69%) of products contained specific strain information on the label.

Table 3. Strain identifications listed on probiotic product labels at retail stores

Store	# products checked	# products with Strain ID	% with Strain ID	% without Strain ID
Major online retailer	121	41	34%	66%
Drugstore 1	28	13	46%	54%
Drugstore 2	21	10	48%	52%
Retail superstore	26	18	69%	31%

To examine the number of clinical studies performed on these probiotic strains, providing context for the amount of evidence supporting their health claims, we searched the biomedical literature database Pubmed.gov, for clinical trial publications on each species. **Figure 3** shows the total counts of published clinical trials for eight common probiotic microbes. The well-established probiotic species, *Lactobacillus acidophilus*, *Bifidobacterium longum*, and *Bifidobacterium infantis* (a substrain of *B. longum*) were included in this literature search despite not being characterized in the current study. As shown in **Figure 3**, *L. acidophilus* and *L. rhamnosus* have each been studied in over 300 clinical trials to

date. In contrast, there are fewer clinical trials published on *Bacillus* probiotics (49 found for *B. coagulans* and 47 for *B. subtilis*). Evaluation of the content or quality of these studies was not performed.

Discussion

We isolated and cultured microbes from commercially available probiotic supplements and beverages and used three approaches to identify the bacteria from these products. We then looked for evidence of strain-level diversity between the isolates using phenotypic profiling. Sequencing of the 16S gene and MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry both yielded accurate identifications for a higher percentage of bacteria than the Biolog assay. Sequencing of the 16S rRNA gene has become a standard molecular identification technique since its introduction in the 1980s [22], but is generally not sufficient for strain typing. MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry is a newer method for rapid identification of bacteria, however it requires that the peptide mass spectra already exist in the database [23]. When comparing 16S sequencing, Biolog identification, and other methods for identifying *Lactobacillus* species, only MALDI mass spectrometry was noted for the ability to identify species at the subspecies, or strain level [24]. A study on 148 strains of *Lactobacillus* species isolated from food found that the MALDI technique generated accurate species identifications more often than 16S PCR (93% accuracy vs. 77% for PCR), and the authors suggest that MALDI should be used in combination with genotypic methods for improved reliability [25]. Sato and colleagues (2017) used MALDI-TOF and repetitive sequence based PCR (rep-PCR) for rapid strain typing of strains of *B. coagulans* [26]. This group found a strong correlation between these two methods to successfully distinguish between closely related strains, and reported that carbohydrate utilization patterns correlated well with the MALDI and rep-PCR results for some phylogenetic clusters [26]. We observed agreement in the results from the three methods, with minor exceptions. For strain 1, MALDI and 16S results were in agreement, correctly identifying *L.*

rhamnosus (**Table 2**), but the Biolog identification of this isolate was *Weissella viridescens*, a lactic acid bacterium (formerly classified as a *Lactobacillus*), often found in fermented foods [27]. Its pattern of carbon source usage is quite similar to the other *L. rhamnosus* strains. For the “Chaas” isolate, 16S sequencing identified this as *L. casei*, while Biolog suggested *L. rhamnosus*. These species are closely related and belong to the *L. casei* group along with *L. paracasei*.

Several other molecular approaches have been used for distinguishing bacteria at the strain level, such as multi-locus sequence typing (MLST), pulsed-field gel electrophoresis (PFGE), or amplified fragment length polymorphism (AFLP). MLST used to be a “gold standard” for differentiating between strains, however this is changing as costs of whole-genome sequencing (WGS) have decreased [28]. PFGE and AFLP have been used to differentiate among probiotic strains of *L. rhamnosus* [29] and *L. plantarum* isolated from various sources [30]. Ceapa and colleagues (2015) identified genotypic clusters of *L. rhamnosus* with AFLP that correlated with functional metabolic clusters determined by Biolog profiling [31]. Due to decreasing costs and improved efficiency, WGS is likely to be the future of microbial strain typing [32]. Phylogenomics approaches have recently been proposed to improve the classification of the diverse *Lactobacillus* genus [33,34], and metagenomic strategies with bioinformatics analyses are in being developed to characterize microbial diversity at the subspecies level in human microbiome communities [35] [36].

Several studies have used comparative genomics to investigate the genetic basis of the probiotic properties and predicted metabolic capabilities of these organisms. Khatri and colleagues compared genomes of *Bacillus coagulans* to *Bacillus subtilis*, and found considerable genetic heterogeneity in *B. coagulans* strains [37], which has been recapitulated in carbohydrate utilization assays [26]. Analyzing the genome of the commercialized *B. coagulans* strain HM-08 uncovered a xylose utilization gene cluster, lending insight to future biotechnological applications for lactic acid production by this strain [38]. Genome analysis has revolutionized the classification and characterization of lactic acid bacteria,

and functional genomics investigation has led to the discovery of novel processes of communication with host cells, that may serve as models for understanding other host-microbe dynamics [39]. Comparative genomics of *Bifidobacterium* species has unveiled substantial diversity carbohydrate metabolism [40] and helped identify the cell surface proteins and exopolysaccharides used to colonize the host intestine [41]. The wide range of polysaccharides used by *B. longum* species has been proposed to aid in their success as early colonizers of the infant gut [42]. By comparing the genome of *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* GG to a less-adherent starter culture strain, a unique genomic island encoding secreted pilins that bind to human intestinal mucus was discovered [43]. These mucus-binding pilins were shown to specifically outcompete vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus faecium* (VRE) due to homology in the binding site [44].

Despite its lower performance to correctly identify probiotic bacteria, the Biolog 96-well plate assay is a valuable tool for rapidly collecting phenotypic data on 71 carbon sources and 23 environmental stressors in one multiplex assay, and illustrates a critical link between prebiotics and probiotics. By comparing the carbon source utilization patterns of the *Lactobacillus* and *Bacillus* species, we can gain insight on shared and unique metabolic properties of these probiotic strains. The most striking difference between the two *Lactobacillus* species compared to the *Bacillus* species, is their overwhelming preference for sugars. *Lactobacillus plantarum* strains showed a very consistent pattern of sugar utilization, with 14 sugar wells having a positive reaction for all five of the strains tested. These results correlate with comparative functional genomics and metabolic profiling studies on *L. plantarum* [30][45]. *L. plantarum* probiotic strains, but not *L. rhamnosus*, utilized the complex polysaccharide, pectin (Well F1), found in the skins of many fruits. This may be related to its prevalence in plant-associated habitats. Pectinolytic enzymes have been characterized in *L. plantarum* [46] and pectin affects the probiotic phenotype of this species *in vitro* [47]. Likewise, *L. plantarum* grew on gentobiose (Well A6), a rare disaccharide found in the gentian family of plants. Only *L. rhamnosus* utilized the

sugar rhamnose (Well C8). The antibiotic susceptibility profiles of *L. rhamnosus* vs. *L. plantarum* are slightly different (**Figure 2**). Like most lactobacilli, they are naturally resistant to vancomycin (Well F10) due to absence of D-ala in the peptide crossbridge of their cell walls [48], but *L. plantarum* strains also displayed resistance to ciprofloxacin. The three *L. rhamnosus* strains tested were susceptible to penicillin.

As a soil microbe subject to nutrient limitation in the environment, *B. subtilis* is known to be much more versatile in its metabolism [49], and this is reflected in its Biolog metabolic profiles. A variety of amino acids are utilized, such as L-alanine (Well E3) and L-aspartic acid (Well E5) (**Figure 2A**). These wells turned purple (positive) more rapidly than some of the sugar wells. *B. subtilis* is the most salt-tolerant of the species investigated, growing at up to 8% NaCl (Well B12), but is more susceptible to antibiotics than the lactobacilli (**Figure 2B**). *Bacillus coagulans*, formerly classified as *Lactobacillus sporogenes* and isolated from spoiled milk in 1915, inhabits ecological niches more similar to lactic acid bacteria than other *Bacillus* spp. [50]. Although the Biolog approach did not correctly identify the *B. coagulans* isolates, their pattern of carbon metabolism is primarily metabolizing sugars, similar to the *Lactobacillus* species, and with the ability to withstand pH 5 (Well A12, **Figure 2B**). While *B. coagulans* is categorized as a “GRAS” ingredient, safety considerations are critical for consumption of *Bacillus subtilis* [15]. It is unclear what the source of *B. subtilis* lacking Strain IDs are, as the Biolog ID of strain 9 (from a single strain probiotic also containing plant extracts) resulted in the same identification, *Bacillus atrophaeus/subtilis*, as the ID for a *B. subtilis* environmental isolate, which we cultured from the surface of a leaf. The profile of this environmental *B. subtilis* was quite similar to the strains from probiotic supplements, with the exception of utilization of quinic acid (well F8), a compound found in plant sources. The spore-forming ability of *Bacillus* species makes them highly stable probiotics that can be easily added to food or gummy supplements, however *B. subtilis* especially merits increased regulation for safety and efficacy.

It is well known that strain-level differences occur in the probiotic properties of microorganisms [51]. From survival in the GI tract (by tolerance to acidic pH and bile salts), to adhesive capacity to intestinal cells, to competition with pathogens and production of bioactive compounds, the capacity and efficiency to perform these functions is often strain-dependent [52][53]. Here we show strain-level differences in several environmental stressors, such as salt tolerance (**Figure 2B**, wells B10-B12) among the *Lactobacillus* strains, and considerable variation in nutritional phenotypes, based on profiling of carbon source usage. There is evidence that these two phenomena are related: the food sources and molecular cues that microbes encounter in their environment affect their expression of proteins and compounds (or community-level behavior such as aggregation and biofilm formation) that convey the probiotic's beneficial effect. Further experiments are needed to measure a correlation between the metabolic profiles and probiotic properties of these particular strains, similar to a study of two lactic acid bacteria from the commercial culture FloraMax®-B11 [54]. Several examples of the relationship between nutrient sources and bacterial probiotic phenotype include: increased resistance of *L. plantarum* to gastric juices when growth with pectin or inulin compared to glucose [47]; differences in cell surface hydrophobicity, cell surface protein and exopolysaccharide production of *L. rhamnosus* grown on fructose, mannose, or rhamnose [55]; and increased the adhesion of *Lactobacillus acidophilus* to mucin or intestinal cells in the presence of fructooligosaccharides (FOS), cellobiose, or polydextrose [56]. The prebiotic cellobiose was shown to change surface layer proteins and increase auto-aggregation in two *Lactobacillus* strains [57].

A thorough understanding of the nutritional preferences of the commensal bacteria for current and next-gen probiotics will be vital for their translation into effective products, and metabolic profiling can help inform the design of “synbiotic” foods (containing probiotics and prebiotics) [58][6] and “biofunctional” foods (in which microorganisms cause the desired biological or physiological effect) [51]. If end-products of microbial metabolism contribute to the health-promoting effect, it will be

imperative that the target microbes have an ample supply of and access to the carbon sources and environmental signals that lead to synthesis of those end-products. For example, plant glucosides from fruit are metabolized by *L. acidophilus*, which then secrete aglycones that exert beneficial effects on the host [59]. Among the wide array of bioactive compounds produced by lactic acid bacteria are B vitamins, gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA), bioactive peptides, bacteriocins, and other complex molecules such as exopolysaccharides [51]. Several other recent review articles summarize the health benefits provided by microorganisms in functional foods [60] and explore the idea of how dietary composition can reshape a healthy microbiome to restore functions lost through the Western diet and lifestyle [61][62][7]. In a randomized clinical trial evaluating dietary interventions for type 2 diabetes mellitus, a high fiber diet altered the composition of the gut microbiota, and greater diversity of carbohydrates was associated with improved clinical outcomes [63]. The authors noted strain-specific effects on which active SFCA-producing bacteria were positive responders to the fiber, such as certain strains of *Faecalibacterium prausnitzii* [63].

While traditional probiotic bacteria (lactobacilli and bifidobacteria) have been the subject of research for decades, less is known about the preferred nutritional requirements of other dominant members of the human gut microbiome. Using defined media, Tramontano and colleagues tested the carbon source utilization of gut commensals (including mucin, carbohydrates, and the inhibition of growth of some by amino acids or SCFAs [64]. ‘Culturomics’ studies combining MALDI-TOF identification with >200 culture conditions optimized for fastidious growth have led to identification of 341 species of bacteria cultured from stool samples and helped optimize culture conditions for these bacteria [65]. Better models to study the gut ecosystem are needed, to understand the context of the metabolic interactions between gut commensals and probiotics.

In conclusion, there is currently a disparity between the composition of marketed probiotics available to consumers and the science backing their claims (**Figure 3**). In the food supplement industry,

the specific strain of a species is not always designated on the label, particularly for the generic, store-brand, or less-established brands. This may be due in part to proprietary restrictions. We found that on average, roughly half of the probiotics examined had the specific strain listed on the label, which varied considerably by store (**Table 3**). Regulatory guidelines differ widely across different countries [66]. Probiotic labeling at the strain level is critical so that consumers and/or healthcare providers can more easily evaluate clinical studies of the probiotic's effects for specific indications [13], even if these properties are shared among all members of a species [16]. This study of common commercially available probiotics highlights the importance of supporting health claims by correctly identifying the microbes in probiotics, and the importance of understanding the ecophysiological needs of a given microbe to enable its beneficial effect (e.g. competition, colonization, flocculation, biofilm, antibiotic production, adhesion, bioactive metabolite production). In the complex milieu of the digestive tract, metabolic profiling of individual microbes and microbial communities can help draw the link between prebiotics, probiotics, and overall digestive health. These insights could bring about strategies for optimizing health and wellness, grounded in nutrition that promotes synergy with our commensal microbiota.

Acknowledgments

We thank Fairfield University biology students in the Fundamentals of Microbiology Lab (Fall 2016) for their contributions to the project, including isolating and characterizing probiotic bacterial strains. We are grateful for assistance from Eunsun Hong, Jenna Massaro, Samantha Porter and Philip Strang, with PCR and BIOLOG microbial identification, and to the Fairfield University Biology lab supervisors Christopher Hetherington and Lenka Biardi for their valuable assistance. We would like to thank Carol Mariani at the Yale University DNA Analysis Facility on Science Hill (New Haven, CT) for assistance with DNA chromatogram interpretation. We also thank Dr. Jillian Smith-Carpenter of the Department of

548 Chemistry & Biochemistry at Fairfield University for guidance and training on the MALDI-TOF
549 instrument, supported by the NSF grant CHE-1624744 awarded to Fairfield University.

550

551 **Conflicts of Interest**

552 None of the authors have any financial conflicts of interest to disclose. Dr. Juliana Ansari contributed to
553 this article in her personal capacity, directly pertaining to research conducted and completed during her
554 employment at Fairfield University. At the time of publication, Dr. Ansari was employed by Dot
555 Laboratories, Inc., however this research publication has no affiliation with the company, nor does it
556 represent the views of the company.

557

References

1. Turnbaugh PJ, Ley RE, Hamady M, Fraser-Liggett CM, Knight R, Gordon JI. The Human Microbiome Project. *Nature*. 2007;449: 804–810. doi:10.1038/nature06244
2. Lloyd-Price J, Abu-Ali G, Huttenhower C. The healthy human microbiome. *Genome Med*. 2016;8: 51. doi:10.1186/s13073-016-0307-y
3. Reid G. The growth potential for dairy probiotics. *Int Dairy J*. Elsevier; 2015;49: 16–22. doi:10.1016/J.IDAIRYJ.2015.04.004
4. Bermudez-Brito M, Plaza-Díaz J, Muñoz-Quezada S, Gómez-Llrente C, Gil A. Probiotic Mechanisms of Action. *Ann Nutr Metab*. 2012;61: 160–174. doi:10.1159/000342079
5. Borges S, Silva J, Teixeira P. The role of lactobacilli and probiotics in maintaining vaginal health. *Arch Gynecol Obstet*. 2014;289: 479–489. doi:10.1007/s00404-013-3064-9
6. Markowiak P, Ślizewska K. Effects of Probiotics, Prebiotics, and Synbiotics on Human Health. *Nutrients*. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute; 2017;9: 1021. doi:10.3390/nu9091021
7. Dahiya DK, Renuka, Puniya M, Shandilya UK, Dhewa T, Kumar N, et al. Gut Microbiota Modulation and Its Relationship with Obesity Using Prebiotic Fibers and Probiotics: A Review. *Front Microbiol*. Frontiers; 2017;8: 563. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2017.00563
8. Salazar N, Dewulf EM, Neyrinck AM, Bindels LB, Cani PD, Mahillon J, et al. Inulin-type fructans modulate intestinal Bifidobacterium species populations and decrease fecal short-chain fatty acids in obese women. *Clin Nutr*. 2015;34: 501–7. doi:10.1016/j.clnu.2014.06.001
9. Rodiño-Janeiro BK, Vicario M, Alonso-Cotoner C, Pascua-García R, Santos J. A Review of Microbiota and Irritable Bowel Syndrome: Future in Therapies. *Adv Ther*. 2018;35: 289–310. doi:10.1007/s12325-018-0673-5
10. Hungin APS, Mitchell CR, Whorwell P, Mulligan C, Cole O, Agréus L, et al. Systematic review: probiotics in the management of lower gastrointestinal symptoms - an updated evidence-based international consensus. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther*. Wiley/Blackwell (10.1111); 2018; doi:10.1111/apt.14539
11. Lee BJ, Bak Y-T. Irritable Bowel Syndrome, Gut Microbiota and Probiotics. *J Neurogastroenterol Motil*. Korean Society of Neurogastroenterology and Motility; 2011;17: 252–266. doi:10.5056/jnm.2011.17.3.252
12. Cai J, Zhao C, Du Y, Zhang Y, Zhao M, Zhao Q. Comparative efficacy and tolerability of probiotics for antibiotic-associated diarrhea: Systematic review with network meta-analysis. *United Eur Gastroenterol J*. 2018;6: 169–180. doi:10.1177/2050640617736987
13. Fijan S. Microorganisms with claimed probiotic properties: an overview of recent literature. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute (MDPI); 2014;11: 4745–67. doi:10.3390/ijerph110504745

14. Nova E, Pérez de Heredia F, Gómez-Martínez S, Marcos A. The Role of Probiotics on the Microbiota: Effect on Obesity. *Nutr Clin Pract*. 2016;31: 387–400. doi:10.1177/0884533615620350
15. Elshaghabee FMF, Rokana N, Gulhane RD, Sharma C, Panwar H. *Bacillus* As Potential Probiotics: Status, Concerns, and Future Perspectives. *Front Microbiol*. 2017;8: 1490. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2017.01490
16. Sanders ME, Benson A, Lebeer S, Merenstein DJ, Klaenhammer TR. Shared mechanisms among probiotic taxa: implications for general probiotic claims. *Curr Opin Biotechnol*. 2018;49: 207–216. doi:10.1016/j.copbio.2017.09.007
17. Lenski RE. Experimental evolution and the dynamics of adaptation and genome evolution in microbial populations. *ISME J*. 2017;11: 2181–2194. doi:10.1038/ismej.2017.69
18. Traverse CC, Mayo-Smith LM, Poltak SR, Cooper VS. Tangled bank of experimentally evolved *Burkholderia* biofilms reflects selection during chronic infections. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*. 2013;110: E250–E259. doi:10.1073/pnas.1207025110
19. Biolog. Gen III MicroPlate Instructions for Use. Hayward, CA. Available: www.biolog.com
20. Harley JP. *Laboratory Exercises in Microbiology*, Tenth Edition. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education; 2017.
21. Biolog I. *Biolog MicroStation System/MicroLog User's Guide*. Hayward, CA; 2010.
22. Lane DJ, Pace B, Olsen GJ, Stahl DA, Sogin ML, Pace NR. Rapid determination of 16S ribosomal RNA sequences for phylogenetic analyses. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 1985;82: 6955–6959. doi:10.1073/pnas.82.20.6955
23. Singhal N, Kumar M, Kanaujia PK, Viridi JS. MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry: an emerging technology for microbial identification and diagnosis. *Front Microbiol*. 2015;6: 791. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2015.00791
24. Herbel SR, Vahjen W, Wieler LH, Guenther S. Timely approaches to identify probiotic species of the genus *Lactobacillus*. *Gut Pathog. BioMed Central*; 2013;5: 27. doi:10.1186/1757-4749-5-27
25. Dušková M, Šedo O, Kšicová K, Zdráhal Z, Karpíšková R. Identification of lactobacilli isolated from food by genotypic methods and MALDI-TOF MS. *Int J Food Microbiol*. 2012;159: 107–14. doi:10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2012.07.029
26. Sato J, Nakayama M, Tomita A, Sonoda T, Hasumi M, Miyamoto T. Evaluation of repetitive-PCR and matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization-time of flight mass spectrometry (MALDI-TOF MS) for rapid strain typing of *Bacillus coagulans*. Natarajaseenivasan K, editor. *PLoS One*. Public Library of Science; 2017;12: e0186327. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0186327
27. Kamboj K, Vasquez A, Balada-Llasat J-M. Identification and significance of *Weissella* species infections. *Front Microbiol. Frontiers*; 2015;6: 1204. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2015.01204

28. Larsen M V, Cosentino S, Rasmussen S, Friis C, Hasman H, Marvig RL, et al. Multilocus sequence typing of total-genome-sequenced bacteria. *J Clin Microbiol. American Society for Microbiology*; 2012;50: 1355–61. doi:10.1128/JCM.06094-11
29. Vancanneyt M, Huys G, Lefebvre K, Vankerckhoven V, Goossens H, Swings J. Intraspecific genotypic characterization of *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* strains intended for probiotic use and isolates of human origin. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2006;72: 5376–5383. doi:10.1128/AEM.00091-06
30. Di Cagno R, Minervini G, Sgarbi E, Lazzi C, Bernini V, Neviani E, et al. Comparison of phenotypic (Biolog System) and genotypic (random amplified polymorphic DNA-polymerase chain reaction, RAPD-PCR, and amplified fragment length polymorphism, AFLP) methods for typing *Lactobacillus plantarum* isolates from raw vegetables and fru. *Int J Food Microbiol.* 2010;143: 246–253. doi:10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2010.08.018
31. Ceapa C, Lambert J, van Limpt K, Wels M, Smokvina T, Knol J, et al. Correlation of *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* Genotypes and Carbohydrate Utilization Signatures Determined by Phenotype Profiling. Elkins CA, editor. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2015;81: 5458–70. doi:10.1128/AEM.00851-15
32. Kwong JC, McCallum N, Sintchenko V, Howden BP. Whole genome sequencing in clinical and public health microbiology. *Pathology.* 2015;47: 199–210. doi:10.1097/PAT.0000000000000235
33. Wuyts S, Wittouck S, De Boeck I, Allonsius CN, Pasolli E, Segata N, et al. Large-Scale Phylogenomics of the *Lactobacillus casei* Group Highlights Taxonomic Inconsistencies and Reveals Novel Clade-Associated Features. Dorrestein PC, editor. *mSystems.* 2017;2: e00061-17. doi:10.1128/mSystems.00061-17
34. Salvetti E, Harris HMB, Felis GE, O'Toole PW. Comparative genomics reveals robust phylogroups in the genus *Lactobacillus* as the basis for reclassification. *Appl Environ Microbiol. American Society for Microbiology*; 2018; AEM.00993-18. doi:10.1128/AEM.00993-18
35. Costea PI, Coelho LP, Sunagawa S, Munch R, Huerta-Cepas J, Forslund K, et al. Subspecies in the global human gut microbiome. *Mol Syst Biol. European Molecular Biology Organization*; 2017;13: 960. doi:10.15252/MSB.20177589
36. Truong DT, Tett A, Pasolli E, Huttenhower C, Segata N. Microbial strain-level population structure and genetic diversity from metagenomes. *Genome Res.* 2017;27: 626–638. doi:10.1101/gr.216242.116
37. Khatri I, Sharma S, Ramya TNC, Subramanian S. Complete Genomes of *Bacillus coagulans* S-lac and *Bacillus subtilis* TO-A JPC , Two Phylogenetically Distinct Probiotics. 2016; 1–25. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0156745
38. Yao G, Gao P, Zhang W. Complete genome sequence of probiotic *Bacillus coagulans* HM-08: A potential lactic acid producer. *J Biotechnol.* 2016;228: 71–72. doi:10.1016/j.jbiotec.2016.04.045
39. Douillard FP, de Vos WM, Kleerebezem M, Vos W de, Purdom E, Francois F, et al. Functional

- genomics of lactic acid bacteria: from food to health. *Microb Cell Fact. BioMed Central*; 2014;13: S8. doi:10.1186/1475-2859-13-S1-S8
40. Odamaki T, Horigome A, Sugahara H, Hashikura N, Minami J, Xiao J, et al. Comparative Genomics Revealed Genetic Diversity and Species/Strain-Level Differences in Carbohydrate Metabolism of Three Probiotic Bifidobacterial Species. *Int J Genomics*. 2015;2015: 1–12. doi:10.1155/2015/567809
41. Bottacini F, van Sinderen D, Ventura M. Omics of bifidobacteria: research and insights into their health-promoting activities. *Biochem J*. 2017;474: 4137–4152. doi:10.1042/BCJ20160756
42. Arboleya S, Bottacini F, O’Connell-Motherway M, Ryan CA, Ross RP, van Sinderen D, et al. Gene-trait matching across the *Bifidobacterium longum* pan-genome reveals considerable diversity in carbohydrate catabolism among human infant strains. *BMC Genomics. BioMed Central*; 2018;19: 33. doi:10.1186/s12864-017-4388-9
43. Kankainen M, Paulin L, Tynkkynen S, von Ossowski I, Reunanen J, Partanen P, et al. Comparative genomic analysis of *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* GG reveals pili containing a human-mucus binding protein. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. National Academy of Sciences*; 2009;106: 17193–8. doi:10.1073/pnas.0908876106
44. Tytgat HLP, Douillard FP, Reunanen J, Rasinkangas P, Hendrickx APA, Laine PK, et al. *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* GG Outcompetes *Enterococcus faecium* via Mucus-Binding Pili: Evidence for a Novel and Heterospecific Probiotic Mechanism. *Appl Environ Microbiol. American Society for Microbiology*; 2016;82: 5756–62. doi:10.1128/AEM.01243-16
45. Buntin N, Hongpattarakere T, Ritari J, Douillard FP, Paulin L, Boeren S, et al. An Inducible Operon Is Involved in Inulin Utilization in *Lactobacillus plantarum* Strains, as Revealed by Comparative Proteogenomics and Metabolic Profiling. Elkins CA, editor. *Appl Environ Microbiol*. 2017;83: e02402-16. doi:10.1128/AEM.02402-16
46. Karam NE, Belarbi A. Detection of polygalacturonases and pectin esterases in lactic acid bacteria. *World J Microbiol Biotechnol*. 1995;11: 559–63. doi:10.1007/BF00286373
47. Nazzaro F, Fratianni F, Orlando P, Coppola R. Biochemical Traits, Survival and Biological Properties of the Probiotic *Lactobacillus plantarum* Grown in the Presence of Prebiotic Inulin and Pectin as Energy Source. *Pharmaceuticals*. 2012;5: 481–492. doi:10.3390/ph5050481
48. Goldstein EJC, Tyrrell KL, Citron DM. *Lactobacillus* Species: Taxonomic Complexity and Controversial Susceptibilities. *Clin Infect Dis. Oxford University Press*; 2015;60: S98–S107. doi:10.1093/cid/civ072
49. Meyer H, Weidmann H, Mäder U, Hecker M, Völker U, Lalk M. A time resolved metabolomics study: the influence of different carbon sources during growth and starvation of *Bacillus subtilis*. *Mol Biosyst*. 2014;10: 1812–23. doi:10.1039/c4mb00112e
50. Clerck E De, Rodriguez-diaz M, Forsyth G, Lebbe L, Logan NA, Devos P, et al. Polyphasic Characterization of *Bacillus coagulans* Strains , Illustrating Heterogeneity within this Species ,

and Emended Description of the Species. 2004;60: 50–60.

51. Linares DM, Gómez C, Renes E, Fresno JM, Tornadijo ME, Ross RP, et al. Lactic Acid Bacteria and Bifidobacteria with Potential to Design Natural Biofunctional Health-Promoting Dairy Foods. *Front Microbiol.* 2017;8: 1–11. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2017.00846
52. Campana R, van Hemert S, Baffone W. Strain-specific probiotic properties of lactic acid bacteria and their interference with human intestinal pathogens invasion. *Gut Pathog. BioMed Central*; 2017;9: 12. doi:10.1186/s13099-017-0162-4
53. Herbel SR, Vahjen W, Wieler LH, Guenther S. Timely approaches to identify probiotic species of the genus *Lactobacillus*. *Gut Pathog.* 2013;5: 27. doi:10.1186/1757-4749-5-27
54. Menconi A, Kallapura G, Latorre JD, Morgan MJ, Pumford NR, Hargis BM, et al. Identification and characterization of lactic Acid bacteria in a commercial probiotic culture. *Biosci microbiota, food Heal. IPEC, Inc.*; 2014;33: 25–30. doi:10.12938/bmfh.33.25
55. Begovic J, Fira D, Terzic-Vidojevic A, Topisirovic L. Influence of carbohydrates on cell properties of *Lactobacillus rhamnosus*. *Cent Eur J Biol. SP Versita*; 2010;5: 103–110. doi:10.2478/s11535-009-0078-1
56. Celebioglu HU, Olesen SV, Prehn K, Lahtinen SJ, Brix S, Abou Hachem M, et al. Mucin- and carbohydrate-stimulated adhesion and subproteome changes of the probiotic bacterium *Lactobacillus acidophilus* NCFM. *J Proteomics.* 2017;163: 102–110. doi:10.1016/j.jprot.2017.05.015
57. Pan M, Kumaree KK, Shah NP. Physiological Changes of Surface Membrane in *Lactobacillus* with Prebiotics. *J Food Sci.* 2017;82: 744–750. doi:10.1111/1750-3841.13608
58. Kearney SM, Gibbons SM. Designing synbiotics for improved human health. *Microb Biotechnol. Wiley/Blackwell* (10.1111); 2018;11: 141–144. doi:10.1111/1751-7915.12885
59. Theilmann MC, Goh YJ, Nielsen KF, Klaenhammer TR, Barrangou R, Abou Hachem M. *Lactobacillus acidophilus* Metabolizes Dietary Plant Glucosides and Externalizes Their Bioactive Phytochemicals. *MBio. American Society for Microbiology*; 2017;8: e01421-17. doi:10.1128/mBio.01421-17
60. Tamang JP, Shin D-H, Jung S-J, Chae S-W. Functional Properties of Microorganisms in Fermented Foods. *Front Microbiol. Frontiers*; 2016;7: 578. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2016.00578
61. Derrien M, Veiga P. Rethinking Diet to Aid Human – Microbe Symbiosis. 2016;xx: 1–13.
62. Conlon MA, Bird AR. The impact of diet and lifestyle on gut microbiota and human health. *Nutrients. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute (MDPI)*; 2014;7: 17–44. doi:10.3390/nu7010017
63. Zhao L, Zhang F, Ding X, Wu G, Lam YY, Wang X, et al. Gut bacteria selectively promoted by dietary fibers alleviate type 2 diabetes. *Science* (80-). 2018;359: 1151–1156.

doi:10.1126/science.aao5774

64. Tramontano M, Andrejev S, Pruteanu M, Klünemann M, Kuhn M, Galardini M, et al. Nutritional preferences of human gut bacteria reveal their metabolic idiosyncrasies. *Nat Microbiol.* Nature Publishing Group; 2018;3: 514. doi:10.1038/s41564-018-0123-9
65. Lagier J-C, Dubourg G, Million M, Cadoret F, Bilen M, Fenollar F, et al. Culturing the human microbiota and culturomics. *Nat Rev Microbiol.* 2018; 1. doi:10.1038/s41579-018-0041-0
66. Arora M, Baldi A. Regulatory categories of probiotics across the globe: a review representing existing and recommended categorization. *Indian J Med Microbiol.* 2015;33 Suppl: 2–10. doi:10.4103/0255-0857.150868

Figure 1. Typical colony morphology of probiotic bacterial colonies grown on agar media.
A: *Bacillus coagulans* on MRS agar, B: *Bacillus subtilis* on TSA, C: *Lactobacillus plantarum* on MRS agar, D: *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* on MRS agar.

A: Utilization of Carbon Sources		Well number
Substrate	Code	
REFERENCE <i>B. coagulans</i> (1E-A) Probiotic Beverage	Negative Control	A1
	Dextrin	A2
	D-Maltose	A3
	D-Trehalose	A4
	D-Cellobiose	A5
	Gentiobiose	A6
	Sucrose	A7
	D-Turanose	A8
	D-Raffinose	B1
	alpha D-Lactose	B2
	D-Maltibiose	B3
	beta Methyl-D-Glucoside	B4
	D-Salicin	B5
	N-Acetyl-D-Glucosamine	B6
	N-Acetyl-D-Mannosamine	B7
	N-Acetyl-D-Galactosamine	B8
	alpha-D-Glucose	C1
	D-Mannose	C2
REFERENCE <i>B. subtilis</i> (1E-B) Probiotic Beverage	D-Fructose	C3
	D-Galactose	C4
	3-Methyl Glucose	C5
	D-Fucose	C6
	L-Fucose	C7
	L-Rhamnose	C8
	D-Sorbitol	D1
	D-Mannitol	D2
	D-Arabinol	D3
	myo-Inositol	D4
	Glycerol	D5
	D-Glucose-6-PO4	D6
	D-Fructose-6-PO4	D7
	D-Aspartic acid	D8
	Gelatin	E1
	Glycyl-L-Proline	E2
	L-Alanine	E3
REFERENCE <i>L. plantarum</i> (1E-C) Probiotic Beverage	L-Arginine	E4
	L-Aspartic acid	E5
	L-Glutamic acid	E6
	L-Histidine	E7
	L-Pyrogutamic acid	E8
	Pectin	F1
	D-Galacturonic acid	F2
	L-Galactonic acid Lactone	F3
	D-Gluconic acid	F4
	D-Glucuronic acid	F5
	Glucuronamide	F6
	Mucic acid	F7
	Quinic acid	F8
REFERENCE <i>L. rhamnosus</i> (1E-D) Probiotic Beverage		
REFERENCE <i>E. coli</i> (1E-E) Probiotic Beverage		

Figure 2. Phenotypic profiling of probiotic bacteria and yeast with Biolog system. P=positive, h=half (borderline positive/negative). **A:** Utilization of carbon sources. **B:** Tolerance to compounds, including antibiotic susceptibility. **C:** Carbon source utilization by yeasts isolated from probiotic drinks. Note that wells on the yeast (YT) plate in C contain different carbon sources than the plate for bacteria (GenIII). **D:** Example Biolog plate diagram showing the reference pattern for *Bacillus subtilis*, pink=positive; half-moon=borderline.

Figure 2C.

Well number		
Substrate	Code	
REFERENCE <i>Saccharomyces boulardii</i>		
Kombucha 1	21	-
Kombucha 2	22	-
Multi-strain probiotic	25	-
Probiotic rice wine	24	-
Kombucha 3 (test culture)	23	-
ENV: surface of Kale leaf	26	-
	A1	- Negative Control
	A2	- Acidic acid
	A3	- Formic Acid
	A4	- Propionic Acid
	A5	- Succinic Acid
	A6	- Succinic Acid mono-methyl
	A7	- L-Aspartic Acid
	A8	- L-Glutamic Acid
	A9	- L-Proline
	A10	- D-Gluconic Acid
	A11	- Dextrin
	A12	- Inulin
	B1	- D-Cellobiose
	B2	- Gentobiose
	B3	- Maltose
	B4	- Maltotriose
	B5	- D-Melezitose
	B6	- D-Melibiose
	B7	- Palatinose
	B8	- D-Raffinose
	B9	- Stachyose
	B10	- Sucrose
	B11	- D-Trehalose
	B12	- Turanose
	C1	- N-Acetyl-D-Glucosamine
	C2	- alpha D-Glucose
	C3	- D-Galactose
	C4	- D-Psicose
	C5	- L-Sorbose
	C6	- Salicin
	C7	- D-Mannitol
	C8	- D-Sorbitol
	C9	- D-Arabitol
	C10	- Xylitol
	C11	- Glycerol
	C12	- Tween 80

1 **Figure 2D**

2

3 **Plate image** © copyright, Biolog, Inc.

4

Figure 3. Number of published clinical trials on eight major probiotic species, cataloged in the Pubmed.gov database as of March 2018.