

1 **Patterned progression of gut microbiota**
2 **predisposes preterm infants to necrotizing**
3 **enterocolitis and late onset sepsis: pilot**
4 **data from a non-Western population**

5 **Jiayi Liu¹, Jianhua Sun², Yuqing Li³, Yi Feng⁴, Liya Pan⁵, Zhoulonglong**
6 **Xie⁶, Zhilong Yan⁷, Jianhua Zhao⁸, and Li Hong⁹**

7 ¹Department of Clinical Nutrition, Shanghai Children's Medical Center, School of
8 Medicine Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China

9 ²Department of Clinical Nutrition, Shanghai Children's Medical Center, School of
10 Medicine Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China

11 ³Department of Clinical Nutrition, Shanghai Children's Medical Center, School of
12 Medicine Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China

13 ⁴Department of Clinical Nutrition, Shanghai Children's Medical Center, School of
14 Medicine Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China

15 ⁵Department of Clinical Nutrition, Shanghai Children's Medical Center, School of
16 Medicine Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China

17 ⁶Department of Clinical Nutrition, Shanghai Children's Medical Center, School of
18 Medicine Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China

19 ⁷Department of Clinical Nutrition, Shanghai Children's Medical Center, School of
20 Medicine Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China

21 ⁸Shanghai Majorbio Bio-Pharm Technology Co., Ltd, Shanghai, China

22 ⁹Department of Clinical Nutrition, Shanghai Children's Medical Center, School of
23 Medicine Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China

24 Corresponding author:

25 Li Hong⁹

26 Email address: hongli@scmc.com.cn

27 **ABSTRACT**

Background and Objectives

Intestinal microbiota dysbiosis might predispose preterm infants to necrotizing enterocolitis(NEC) and late onset sepsis(LOS). In this observational prospective study, we aimed to profile and compare postpartum microbiota progression patterns in non-Western preterm patients with either condition.

Methods

We enrolled preterm infants with gestational age less than 33 weeks and birth weight more than 950g, from July 2013 to December 2014. We began fecal sample collection from the the first stool after birth and prospectively collected until discharge. Bacterial V3 V4 region of 16s rRNA genes from each stool sample were amplified, sequenced and analyzed.

Results

A total of 192 fecal samples from 24 patients were studied, of whom four developed NEC, three LOS; the remaining 17 were used as controls. [The post-partum gut microbiota colonization started to diverge among NEC, LOS and their matched control groups, from the second week after birth. Microbiota of the LOS infants was the least diversified (Shannon index=1.66), while that of the control group was the most diversified(Shannon index=0.88, $p=0.01$). Potentially pathogenic genus *Enterococcus* (20.86%) and *Staphylococcus* (8.67%) were prominent in NEC patients and *Klebsiella* (42.15%) in LOS group. Both two groups addressed lower proportion of *Lactococcus* (7.98% and 13.76% in NEC and LOS group, respectively) than the control group (3.66%).]

Conclusions

Postpartum colonization pattern of gut microbiome might predispose preterm newborns to NEC or LOS, in which reduced diversity of the whole microbiota community and potentially pathogenic genus could have played an essential role in disease progression. Still, more studies are needed to identify etiological strains, underlying mechanisms and correspondent microbial patterns.

INTRODUCTION

Gut microbiota is a key contributor to human health and the dysbiosis of which are proven to be associated with diseases, such as atherosclerosis(Tang et al., 2017), obesity(Bouter et al., 2017), neuropathy(Sarkar et al., 2016), liver diseases(Tilg et al., 2016), etc. Temporal colonization pattern of the intestinal microbiota during early stages of life also provided evidence of its association with early life events, including Type 1 diabetes(Giongo et al., 2011; Vatanen et al., 2018), asthma(Stokholm et al., 2018) and allergy(Madan et al., 2012; Savage et al., 2018). In light of interindividual variability in gut maturity, innate immunity, birth mode and environmental exposures, preterm infants are predisposed to complications post-partum intestinal microbiota development

In preterm infants, necrotizing enterocolitis and late onset sepsis

Necrotizing enterocolitis, characterized by rapid progression, high morbidity and mortality, is one of the most devastating gastrointestinal neonatal emergencies, especially in preterm newborns. Previous studies have suggested well how intestinal microbiota pattern is implicated prior to, during and after the course of this condition. Mai et al. reported an increase in the Proteobacteria and a decrease in the Firmicutes phyla during three to seven days prior to NEC onset (Mai et al., 2011). Zhou et al. found a relatively higher abundance of *Clostridium* and Gamma-Proteobacteria in the proximity of NEC during early and late onset, respectively(Zhou et al., 2015).

late onset sepsis is

Among non-Western population, however, evidence (few studies on?) of microbiota chronological dysbiosis preceding necrotizing enterocolitis or late onset sepsis has been scant so far. Hence, conducting a prospective study among Chinese patients using high-throughput DNA sequencing, we aimed to profile and compare post-postpartum pattern of intestinal microbiota in preterm infants who subsequently developed necrotizing enterocolitis and late onset sepsis, which may be critical in the etiopathogenesis of disease.

METHODS

Ethics

This study was approved by the joint committee of ethics of Shanghai Children's Medical Center, School of Medicine Shanghai Jiao Tong University (SCMCIRB-K2013022). Detailed written informed consent was obtained from the parents prior to fecal sample collection.

Patients

Newly born preterm infants with gestational age less than 33 weeks, birth weight over 950g were enrolled from Neonatal Intensive Care Unit at Shanghai Children's Medical Center from July 2013 to December 2014. The exclusion criteria were 1) diagnosed with early-onset sepsis, 2) hepatic diseases, 3) renal impairment ($\text{Cr} > 88 \mu\text{M}$), 4) diagnosed with intestinal obstruction, 5) in foreseeable need of cardiovascular or abdominal surgeries (except for male circumcision or PDA ligation), 6) estimated parenteral support to supply over 50% of daily caloric intake for more than four days, 7) given intravenous antibiotics administration (except prophylactic regimen of cefotaxime, piperacillin-tazobactam and/or metronidazole), 8) history of oral antibiotics administration, 9) grossly bloody stools at admission, and 10) over five days old.

NEC cases were defined as infants who met the criteria for Stage II and Stage III NEC diagnosis (Bell et al., 1978), including radiographic intestinal dilation, ileus, pneumatosis intestinalis, and/or absent bowel sounds with or without abdominal tenderness, and/or mild metabolic acidosis and thrombocytopenia. LOS cases was diagnosed if 1) an infant had a positive hemoculture or other suspicious loci of infection after 72 hours of life, with septic signs/symptoms reviewed independently by at least two neonatologists, and had been treated with advanced antibiotics (e.g., Meropenem) after diagnosis. Infants with no infectious complications or sepsis were regarded as controls.

Sample collection and handling

Fecal samples collection began from neonatal meconium till discharge. Although we intended to collect fecal samples on a daily basis, due to working shifts and flexible clinical scheduling, we set seven days as the maximum interval between two collections from every infant. Every sample was collected within 30 minutes of defecation from patients' diaper with a sterile spatula. The samples were immediately placed in a cryogenic vial on dry ice and stored at 80°C within 30 minutes without additives. All samples were collected and stored before knowing the diagnosis of respective patients.

DNA extraction and quality control amplification and 16s rRNA gene sequencing

Microbial genomic DNA was isolated from each fecal specimen using the E.Z.N.A.® Soil DNA Kit (Omega Bio-Tek, Norcross, GA, U.S.) according to manufacturer's protocols. The concentration and purity of the DNA were determined by NanoDrop 2000 UV-vis spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific, Wilmington, USA), and the DNA quality was checked by 1% agarose gel electrophoresis.

Broad-range PCR and High-throughput Sequencing of 16s rRNA gene amplicons

The V3-V4 hypervariable regions of the bacterial 16S rRNA gene were amplified from each sample using bacterial/archaeal primers 338F (5'-ACTCCTACGGGAGGCAGCAG-3') and 806R (5'-GGACTACHVGG GTWTCTAAT-3') using thermocycler PCR system (GeneAmp 9700, ABI, USA). The PCR reactions were as follows: 3 min of denaturation at 95°C , 27 cycles of 30 s at 95°C , 30 s annealing at 55°C and 45 s elongation at 72°C , and a final extension at 72°C for 10 min. The PCR reactions were performed in triplicate, with each 20 μL mixture containing 4 μL 5X FastPfu Buffer, 2 μL 2.5 mM dNTPs, 0.8 μL of each primer (5 μM), 0.4 μL FastPfu Polymerase and 10 ng template DNA. The PCR products were extracted from a 2% agarose gel and further purified using the AxyPrep DNA Gel Extraction Kit (Axygen Biosciences, Union City, CA, USA), and quantified using QuantiFluor™-ST (Promega, USA) according to the manufacturer's protocols.

Equimolar amounts of purified amplicons were pooled and paired-end sequenced (2 x 300) on an Illumina MiSeq platform (Illumina, San Diego, USA) according to the standard protocols of Majorbio Bio-Pharm Technology Co. Ltd. (Shanghai, China). The reads were de-multiplexed using the Illumina software and separate FASTQ files were generated for each specimen and deposited to the Sequence Read Archive NCBI under the BioProject accession PRJNA470548. Another public archive repository is available at figshare doi: 10.6084/m9.figshare.7205102

Raw Data Processing

After pyrosequencing, de-multiplexed sequence reads were subjected to quality filtering utilizing Trimmomatic software (version 0.36) (Bolger et al., 2014), and were truncated at any site with an Phred score < 20 over a 50bp-sized window; barcode matching with the primer mismatch from 0 to 2 nucleotides was adopted and reads containing ambiguous characters were removed. After trimming, FLASH (Fast Length Adjustment of Short Read) (Magoč and Salzberg, 2011), a read pre-processing software, assembled and

merged the paired-end reads from fragments and generated >10 bp overlapped, with the dead match ratio 0.2. Unassembled reads were discarded. As a result, 7,472,400 V3-V4 tags of 16S rRNA gene were produced, with an average length of 448 bp.(Table S1)

To fairly compare all the samples at the same sequencing depth, the "sub.sample" command of mothur program(version1.30.1)(Schloss et al., 2009) was used for normalization to the smallest sample size. UCHIME Algorithm detected chimeric sequences, removed chimera to obtain effective reads, which were then sorted by cluster size and processed using Operational Taxonomic Units(OTUs) were clustered with 97% similarity cutoff using USEARCH v7(UPARSE version 7.1). The taxonomy of each 16S rRNA gene sequence was analyzed by RDP Classifier algorithm(Wang et al., 2007) against the Silva (SSU128)(Quast et al., 2012) 16S rRNA database using confidence threshold of 70%. Each sequence was assigned the taxonomy by QIIME(Caporaso et al., 2010). The representative sequences were allocated phylogenetically down to the domain, phylum, class, order, family, and genus levels. The relative abundance of a given taxonomic group was calculated as a percentage of the sequences number belonging to that group divided by the total number of obtained sequences.

Within-sample diversity(alpha diversity) analysis, including Shannon index and Observed species richness (sobs), were obtained using the "summary.single" command of mothur program(version1.30.1)(Schloss et al., 2009). Between-sample diversity(beta diversity) analysis was obtained estimating weighted UniFrac distances between samples.

Statistical and Bioinformatics Analysis

Demographics and Clinical Sample comparisons

Non-parametric tests, including Kruskal-Wallis test and Wilcoxon rank-sum test were used to compare gestational age, birth weight, age when the patients were diagnosed as NEC or LOS and length of stay. Fisher's exact test were used to compare gender ratios among three groups. α level was set as 0.05. All statistical test not involving microbiome 16s rRNA sequencing data was performed using "stats" package using R(v.3.5.1).

Microbiota and Bioinformatics Analyses

Timepoint Determination for the statistical models Our sampling time point for patients was not identical ?? Under this circumstance, to illustrated the continuous longitudinal and repeated nature of the sampling and its relationship with onset and progression of diseases, we seperated the whole sampling span into 7 time intervals:

1. early post-partum(EPP): within 3 days afterbirth
2. early pre-onset(EPO): from the end of EPP to at least four days before disease onset
3. late pre-onset(LPO): from the end of EPO to the start of onset
4. early disease: first third interval of whole disease span
5. middle disease: second third interval of whole disease span
6. late disease: last third interval of whole disease span
7. post disease: from the end of disease to discharge timepoint

Figures

Figures were generated with the "ggpubr"(Kassambara, 2017) and "ggplot2"(Wickham, 2016) packages using R(v.3.5.1)

RESULTS

Patients characteristics

Totally 130 infants met the criteria of our study, and 1698 samples were collected from them. We studied 192 samples from 24 well-sampled preterm infants, including four subsequently diagnosed with NEC (2 in stage IIA and 2 in stage IIB), three with LOS, and 17 matched controls (Table S2). Comparisons showed no significant difference in terms of gestational age, birth weight and gender proportions, diagnosed age among three groups (Table 1). Lenth of stay mong three groups was significantly different however rational since NEC and LOS patients usually require longer period of healthcare because of there worse conditions compared with the control group. All infants were delivered by cesarean section and fed on infant formula. No one was prescribed probiotics during hospitalization.

182 **0.1 Microbiota Diversity**
183 **DISCUSSION**

184 Previous studies have

185 **CONCLUSIONS**

186 Necrotizing enterocolitis, a worldwidely concern that threatern

187 We acknowledge that the sample size is limited since this study is single-center-based and the
188 incidence of both diseases are relatively low: among the 1148 preterm infants admitted within July 2013
189 to December 2014, only five developed NEC.

190 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

191 We appreciate the support from enrolled patients, their families, and all staffs at Shanghai Children's
192 Medical Center.

193 **SOME L^AT_EX EXAMPLES**

194 Use section and subsection commands to organize your document. L^AT_EX handles all the formatting and
195 numbering automatically. Use ref and label commands for cross-references.

196 **Figures and Tables**

197 Use the table and tabular commands for basic tables — see Table 1, for example. You can upload a figure
198 (JPEG, PNG or PDF) using the project menu. To include it in your document, use the includegraphics
199 command as in the code for Figure 1 below.



Figure 1. An example image.

Item	Quantity
Widgets	42
Gadgets	13

Table 1. An example table.

200 **Citations**

201 LaTeX formats citations and references automatically using the bibliography records in your .bib file,
202 which you can edit via the project menu. Use the cite command for an inline citation, like ?, and the citep
203 command for a citation in parentheses (?).

204 **Mathematics**

LaTeX is great at typesetting mathematics. Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n be a sequence of independent and identically distributed random variables with $E[X_i] = \mu$ and $\text{Var}[X_i] = \sigma^2 < \infty$, and let

$$S_n = \frac{X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_n}{n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i^n X_i$$

205 denote their mean. Then as n approaches infinity, the random variables $\sqrt{n}(S_n - \mu)$ converge in distribution
206 to a normal $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$.

207 **Lists**

208 You can make lists with automatic numbering ...

- 209 1. Like this,
210 2. and like this.

211 ... or bullet points ...

- 212 • Like this,
213 • and like this.

214 ... or with words and descriptions ...

215 **Word** Definition

216 **Concept** Explanation

217 **Idea** Text

218 We hope you find write LaTeX useful for your PeerJ submission, and please let us know if you have any
219 feedback. Further examples with dummy text are included in the following pages.

220 **METHODS**

221 Quisque ullamcorper placerat ipsum. Cras nibh. Morbi vel justo vitae lacus tincidunt ultrices. Lorem
222 ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. In hac habitasse platea dictumst. Integer tempus
223 convallis augue. Etiam facilisis. Nunc elementum fermentum wisi. Aenean placerat. Ut imperdiet, enim
224 sed gravida sollicitudin, felis odio placerat quam, ac pulvinar elit purus eget enim. Nunc vitae tortor.
225 Proin tempus nibh sit amet nisl. Vivamus quis tortor vitae risus porta vehicula.

$$\cos^3 \theta = \frac{1}{4} \cos \theta + \frac{3}{4} \cos 3\theta \quad (1)$$

226 Fusce mauris. Vestibulum luctus nibh at lectus. Sed bibendum, nulla a faucibus semper, leo velit
227 ultricies tellus, ac venenatis arcu wisi vel nisl. Vestibulum diam. Aliquam pellentesque, augue quis sagittis
228 posuere, turpis lacus congue quam, in hendrerit risus eros eget felis. Maecenas eget erat in sapien mattis
229 porttitor. Vestibulum porttitor. Nulla facilisi. Sed a turpis eu lacus commodo facilisis. Morbi fringilla,
230 wisi in dignissim interdum, justo lectus sagittis dui, et vehicula libero dui cursus dui. Mauris tempor
231 ligula sed lacus. Duis cursus enim ut augue. Cras ac magna. Cras nulla. Nulla egestas. Curabitur a leo.
232 Quisque egestas wisi eget nunc. Nam feugiat lacus vel est. Curabitur consectetur.

233 Subsection

234 Suspendisse vel felis. Ut lorem lorem, interdum eu, tincidunt sit amet, laoreet vitae, arcu. Aenean faucibus
235 pede eu ante. Praesent enim elit, rutrum at, molestie non, nonummy vel, nisl. Ut lectus eros, malesuada
236 sit amet, fermentum eu, sodales cursus, magna. Donec eu purus. Quisque vehicula, urna sed ultricies
237 auctor, pede lorem egestas dui, et convallis elit erat sed nulla. Donec luctus. Curabitur et nunc. Aliquam
238 dolor odio, commodo pretium, ultricies non, pharetra in, velit. Integer arcu est, nonummy in, fermentum
239 faucibus, egestas vel, odio.

240 **Paragraph** Sed commodo posuere pede. Mauris ut est. Ut quis purus. Sed ac odio. Sed vehicula
241 hendrerit sem. Duis non odio. Morbi ut dui. Sed accumsan risus eget odio. In hac habitasse platea
242 dictumst. Pellentesque non elit. Fusce sed justo eu urna porta tincidunt. Mauris felis odio, sollicitudin sed,
243 volutpat a, ornare ac, erat. Morbi quis dolor. Donec pellentesque, erat ac sagittis semper, nunc dui lobortis
244 purus, quis congue purus metus ultricies tellus. Proin et quam. Class aptent taciti sociosqu ad litora
245 torquent per conubia nostra, per inceptos hymenaeos. Praesent sapien turpis, fermentum vel, eleifend
246 faucibus, vehicula eu, lacus.

247 **Paragraph** Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas.
248 Donec odio elit, dictum in, hendrerit sit amet, egestas sed, leo. Praesent feugiat sapien aliquet odio.
249 Integer vitae justo. Aliquam vestibulum fringilla lorem. Sed neque lectus, consectetur at, consectetur
250 sed, eleifend ac, lectus. Nulla facilisi. Pellentesque eget lectus. Proin eu metus. Sed porttitor. In hac
251 habitasse platea dictumst. Suspendisse eu lectus. Ut mi mi, lacinia sit amet, placerat et, mollis vitae, dui.
252 Sed ante tellus, tristique ut, iaculis eu, malesuada ac, dui. Mauris nibh leo, facilisis non, adipiscing quis,
253 ultrices a, dui.

254 Subsection

255 Morbi luctus, wisi viverra faucibus pretium, nibh est placerat odio, nec commodo wisi enim eget quam.
256 Quisque libero justo, consectetur a, feugiat vitae, porttitor eu, libero. Suspendisse sed mauris vitae
257 elit sollicitudin malesuada. Maecenas ultricies eros sit amet ante. Ut venenatis velit. Maecenas sed mi
258 eget dui varius euismod. Phasellus aliquet volutpat odio. Vestibulum ante ipsum primis in faucibus orci
259 luctus et ultrices posuere cubilia Curae; Pellentesque sit amet pede ac sem eleifend consectetur. Nullam
260 elementum, urna vel imperdiet sodales, elit ipsum pharetra ligula, ac pretium ante justo a nulla. Curabitur
261 tristique arcu eu metus. Vestibulum lectus. Proin mauris. Proin eu nunc eu urna hendrerit faucibus.
262 Aliquam auctor, pede consequat laoreet varius, eros tellus scelerisque quam, pellentesque hendrerit ipsum
263 dolor sed augue. Nulla nec lacus.

264 Reference to Figure 2.

265 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

266 Suspendisse vitae elit. Aliquam arcu neque, ornare in, ullamcorper quis, commodo eu, libero. Fusce
267 sagittis erat at erat tristique mollis. Maecenas sapien libero, molestie et, lobortis in, sodales eget, dui.
268 Morbi ultrices rutrum lorem. Nam elementum ullamcorper leo. Morbi dui. Aliquam sagittis. Nunc
269 placerat. Pellentesque tristique sodales est. Maecenas imperdiet lacinia velit. Cras non urna. Morbi eros
270 pede, suscipit ac, varius vel, egestas non, eros. Praesent malesuada, diam id pretium elementum, eros sem
271 dictum tortor, vel consectetur odio sem sed wisi.

272 Subsection

273 Sed feugiat. Cum sociis natoque penatibus et magnis dis parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus. Ut
274 pellentesque augue sed urna. Vestibulum diam eros, fringilla et, consectetur eu, nonummy id, sapien.
275 Nullam at lectus. In sagittis ultrices mauris. Curabitur malesuada erat sit amet massa. Fusce blandit.
276 Aliquam erat volutpat. Aliquam euismod. Aenean vel lectus. Nunc imperdiet justo nec dolor.

277 Subsubsection

278 Etiam euismod. Fusce facilisis lacinia dui. Suspendisse potenti. In mi erat, cursus id, nonummy sed,
279 ullamcorper eget, sapien. Praesent pretium, magna in eleifend egestas, pede pede pretium lorem, quis
280 consectetur tortor sapien facilisis magna. Mauris quis magna varius nulla scelerisque imperdiet. Aliquam
281 non quam. Aliquam porttitor quam a lacus. Praesent vel arcu ut tortor cursus volutpat. In vitae pede quis
282 diam bibendum placerat. Fusce elementum convallis neque. Sed dolor orci, scelerisque ac, dapibus nec,
283 ultricies ut, mi. Duis nec dui quis leo sagittis commodo.




Figure 2. In-text Picture

Subsubsection

Etiam ac leo a risus tristique nonummy. Donec dignissim tincidunt nulla. Vestibulum rhoncus molestie odio. Sed lobortis, justo et pretium lobortis, mauris turpis condimentum augue, nec ultricies nibh arcu pretium enim. Nunc purus neque, placerat id, imperdiet sed, pellentesque nec, nisl. Vestibulum imperdiet neque non sem accumsan laoreet. In hac habitasse platea dictumst. Etiam condimentum facilisis libero. Suspendisse in elit quis nisl aliquam dapibus. Pellentesque auctor sapien. Sed egestas sapien nec lectus. Pellentesque vel dui vel neque bibendum viverra. Aliquam porttitor nisl nec pede. Proin mattis libero vel turpis. Donec rutrum mauris et libero. Proin euismod porta felis. Nam lobortis, metus quis elementum commodo, nunc lectus elementum mauris, eget vulputate ligula tellus eu neque. Vivamus eu dolor.

Subsection

Nulla in ipsum. Praesent eros nulla, congue vitae, euismod ut, commodo a, wisi. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Aenean nonummy magna non leo. Sed felis erat, ullamcorper in, dictum non, ultricies ut, lectus. Proin vel arcu a odio lobortis euismod. Vestibulum ante ipsum primis in faucibus orci luctus et ultrices posuere cubilia Curae; Proin ut est. Aliquam odio. Pellentesque massa turpis, cursus eu, euismod nec, tempor congue, nulla. Duis viverra gravida mauris. Cras tincidunt. Curabitur eros ligula, varius ut, pulvinar in, cursus faucibus, augue.

Nulla mattis luctus nulla. Duis commodo velit at leo. Aliquam vulputate magna et leo. Nam vestibulum ullamcorper leo. Vestibulum condimentum rutrum mauris. Donec id mauris. Morbi molestie justo et pede. Vivamus eget turpis sed nisl cursus tempor. Curabitur mollis sapien condimentum nunc. In wisi nisl, malesuada at, dignissim sit amet, lobortis in, odio. Aenean consequat arcu a ante. Pellentesque porta elit sit amet orci. Etiam at turpis nec elit ultricies imperdiet. Nulla facilisi. In hac habitasse platea dictumst. Suspendisse viverra aliquam risus. Nullam pede justo, molestie nonummy, scelerisque eu, facilisis vel, arcu.

Curabitur tellus magna, porttitor a, commodo a, commodo in, tortor. Donec interdum. Praesent scelerisque. Maecenas posuere sodales odio. Vivamus metus lacus, varius quis, imperdiet quis, rhoncus a,

309 turpis. Etiam ligula arcu, elementum a, venenatis quis, sollicitudin sed, metus. Donec nunc pede, tincidunt
310 in, venenatis vitae, faucibus vel, nibh. Pellentesque wisi. Nullam malesuada. Morbi ut tellus ut pede
311 tincidunt porta. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Etiam congue neque id dolor.

312 Donec et nisl at wisi luctus bibendum. Nam interdum tellus ac libero. Sed sem justo, laoreet vitae,
313 fringilla at, adipiscing ut, nibh. Maecenas non sem quis tortor eleifend fermentum. Etiam id tortor ac
314 mauris porta vulputate. Integer porta neque vitae massa. Maecenas tempus libero a libero posuere dictum.
315 Vestibulum ante ipsum primis in faucibus orci luctus et ultrices posuere cubilia Curae; Aenean quis mauris
316 sed elit commodo placerat. Class aptent taciti sociosqu ad litora torquent per conubia nostra, per inceptos
317 hymenaeos. Vivamus rhoncus tincidunt libero. Etiam elementum pretium justo. Vivamus est. Morbi a
318 tellus eget pede tristique commodo. Nulla nisl. Vestibulum sed nisl eu sapien cursus rutrum.

319 Nulla non mauris vitae wisi posuere convallis. Sed eu nulla nec eros scelerisque pharetra. Nullam
320 varius. Etiam dignissim elementum metus. Vestibulum faucibus, metus sit amet mattis rhoncus, sapien
321 dui laoreet odio, nec ultricies nibh augue a enim. Fusce in ligula. Quisque at magna et nulla commodo
322 consequat. Proin accumsan imperdiet sem. Nunc porta. Donec feugiat mi at justo. Phasellus facilisis
323 ipsum quis ante. In ac elit eget ipsum pharetra faucibus. Maecenas viverra nulla in massa.

324 Nulla ac nisl. Nullam urna nulla, ullamcorper in, interdum sit amet, gravida ut, risus. Aenean ac
325 enim. In luctus. Phasellus eu quam vitae turpis viverra pellentesque. Duis feugiat felis ut enim. Phasellus
326 pharetra, sem id porttitor sodales, magna nunc aliquet nibh, nec blandit nisl mauris at pede. Suspendisse
327 risus risus, lobortis eget, semper at, imperdiet sit amet, quam. Quisque scelerisque dapibus nibh. Nam
328 enim. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Nunc ut metus. Ut metus justo, auctor at,
329 ultrices eu, sagittis ut, purus. Aliquam aliquam.

330 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

331 So long and thanks for all the fish.

332 REFERENCES

- 333 Bell, M. J., Ternberg, J. L., Feigin, R. D., Keating, J. P., Marshall, R., Barton, L., and Brotherton, T.
334 (1978). Neonatal necrotizing enterocolitis. therapeutic decisions based upon clinical staging. *Annals of*
335 *surgery*, 187(1):1.
- 336 Bolger, A. M., Lohse, M., and Usadel, B. (2014). Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for illumina sequence
337 data. *Bioinformatics*, 30(15):2114–2120.
- 338 Bouter, K. E., van Raalte, D. H., Groen, A. K., and Nieuwdorp, M. (2017). Role of the gut microbiome in
339 the pathogenesis of obesity and obesity-related metabolic dysfunction. *Gastroenterology*, 152(7):1671–
340 1678.
- 341 Caporaso, J. G., Kuczynski, J., Stombaugh, J., Bittinger, K., Bushman, F. D., Costello, E. K., Fierer, N.,
342 Pena, A. G., Goodrich, J. K., Gordon, J. I., et al. (2010). Qiime allows analysis of high-throughput
343 community sequencing data. *Nature methods*, 7(5):335.
- 344 Giongo, A., Gano, K. A., Crabb, D. B., Mukherjee, N., Novelo, L. L., Casella, G., Drew, J. C., Ilonen, J.,
345 Knip, M., Hyöty, H., et al. (2011). Toward defining the autoimmune microbiome for type 1 diabetes.
346 *The ISME journal*, 5(1):82.
- 347 Kassambara, A. (2017). ggpubr:“ggplot2” based publication ready plots. r package version 0.1. 6.
- 348 Madan, J. C., Farzan, S. F., Hibberd, P. L., and Karagas, M. R. (2012). Normal neonatal microbiome
349 variation in relation to environmental factors, infection and allergy. *Current opinion in pediatrics*,
350 24(6):753.
- 351 Magoč, T. and Salzberg, S. L. (2011). Flash: fast length adjustment of short reads to improve genome
352 assemblies. *Bioinformatics*, 27(21):2957–2963.
- 353 Quast, C., Pruesse, E., Yilmaz, P., Gerken, J., Schweer, T., Yarza, P., Peplies, J., and Glöckner, F. O.
354 (2012). The silva ribosomal rna gene database project: improved data processing and web-based tools.
355 *Nucleic acids research*, 41(D1):D590–D596.
- 356 Sarkar, A., Lehto, S. M., Harty, S., Dinan, T. G., Cryan, J. F., and Burnet, P. W. (2016). Psychobiotics and
357 the manipulation of bacteria–gut–brain signals. *Trends in neurosciences*, 39(11):763–781.
- 358 Savage, J. H., Lee-Sarwar, K. A., Sordillo, J., Bunyavanich, S., Zhou, Y., O’connor, G., Sandel, M.,
359 Bacharier, L. B., Zeiger, R., Sodergren, E., et al. (2018). A prospective microbiome-wide association
360 study of food sensitization and food allergy in early childhood. *Allergy*, 73(1):145–152.

361 Schloss, P. D., Westcott, S. L., Ryabin, T., Hall, J. R., Hartmann, M., Hollister, E. B., Lesniewski, R. A.,
 362 Oakley, B. B., Parks, D. H., Robinson, C. J., et al. (2009). Introducing mothur: open-source, platform-
 363 independent, community-supported software for describing and comparing microbial communities.
 364 *Applied and environmental microbiology*, 75(23):7537–7541.
 365 Stokholm, J., Blaser, M. J., Thorsen, J., Rasmussen, M. A., Waage, J., Vinding, R. K., Schoos, A.-M. M.,
 366 Kunø, A., Fink, N. R., Chawes, B. L., et al. (2018). Maturation of the gut microbiome and risk of
 367 asthma in childhood. *Nature communications*, 9(1):141.
 368 Tang, W. W., Kitai, T., and Hazen, S. L. (2017). Gut microbiota in cardiovascular health and disease.
 369 *Circulation research*, 120(7):1183–1196.
 370 Tilg, H., Cani, P. D., and Mayer, E. A. (2016). Gut microbiome and liver diseases. *Gut*, 65(12):2035–2044.
 371 Vatanen, T., Franzosa, E. A., Schwager, R., Tripathi, S., Arthur, T. D., Vehik, K., Lernmark, Å., Hagopian,
 372 W. A., Rewers, M. J., She, J.-X., et al. (2018). The human gut microbiome in early-onset type 1 diabetes
 373 from the teddy study. *Nature*, 562(7728):589.
 374 Wang, Q., Garrity, G. M., Tiedje, J. M., and Cole, J. R. (2007). Naive bayesian classifier for rapid
 375 assignment of rna sequences into the new bacterial taxonomy. *Applied and environmental microbiology*,
 376 73(16):5261–5267.
 377 Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. Springer-Verlag New York.
 378 Zhou, Y., Shan, G., Sodergren, E., Weinstock, G., Walker, W. A., and Gregory, K. E. (2015). Longitudinal
 379 analysis of the premature infant intestinal microbiome prior to necrotizing enterocolitis: a case-control
 380 study. *PloS one*, 10(3):e0118632.