

The Gut Microbiome: Your Inner Ecosystem, Its Signals, and the Science of Restoring Balance

Human Health Strategies® | Patient and family education

Inside the digestive tract, an enormous community is working through the leftovers. Microbes dismantle carbohydrates our own enzymes cannot fully digest, exchange chemical messages, compete for space, and interact with the immune system. Some help make the intestine a difficult neighborhood for pathogens. Others become troublesome when conditions change.

This is not a miniature society with a mayor and a master plan. It is an ecosystem: cooperative in places, competitive in others, and constantly responding to food, medicines, illness, and the body around it. Its connections reach beyond digestion, including signals that can influence metabolism and communication between the gut and brain.

The most remarkable clinical example is also one of medicine's least glamorous. For selected people with repeatedly returning *Clostridioides difficile* infection, restoring a microbial community can help interrupt a dangerous cycle that antibiotics alone have not prevented. That success is real. So are the limits: an effective treatment for one infection is not a universal transplantable cure for every condition associated with gut bacteria.

Understanding this ecosystem makes room for both wonder and practical judgment. The goal is not a sterile intestine, a perfect stool-test score, or the largest possible collection of organisms. It is a functioning relationship between you and the community you carry.

Use this guide alongside professional care. Do not stop a prescribed antibiotic, psychiatric treatment, or inflammatory bowel disease medicine to “protect the microbiome.” Never attempt a fecal transplant yourself. Severe abdominal pain, dehydration, bloody or black stool, or significant diarrhea during or after antibiotics needs medical assessment—not a supplement experiment.

Evidence Summary

- Microbes are numerous, but the familiar cell-count story needs perspective. An influential revised estimate placed bacterial and human cells in the same numerical neighborhood—roughly 38 trillion and 30 trillion in a reference adult man. These are model-based estimates, not a universal ratio. Viruses are acellular and cannot simply be added as “nonhuman cells.” [1] [2]
- The gut ecosystem includes more than bacteria. Archaea, fungi, and viruses—including bacteria-infecting phages—belong in the picture. Their functions and relationships matter more than a single total or diversity score. [2] [3]
- Gut-brain communication is genuine biology; psychiatric treatment claims require separate proof. Neural, immune, hormonal, and metabolic pathways are well supported as a framework. Much causal evidence comes from animals, and human supplement trials remain product- and condition-specific. [4] [5]
- Antibiotics can be lifesaving and ecologically disruptive at the same time. Recovery varies with the drug, person, and measurement. Some changes improve within weeks; other organisms or resistance genes remain altered for months. No universal reset schedule or probiotic restoration protocol has been established. [6] [7] [8]
- Diet offers useful, realistic leverage. Fiber-rich dietary patterns have evidence for human health benefits. A small randomized fermented-food study found changes in microbial diversity and inflammatory markers—not proof that fermented foods cure inflammatory disease. [9] [10]

• Microbiota-based treatment has an established, specific role in recurrent C. difficile. FDA-approved Rebyota and Vowst prevent recurrence in adults following antibiotics for recurrent infection; they are not treatments for an active episode or generic gut-wellness products. Current guidance distinguishes immune status, recurrence history, and specialist treatment of severe illness. [11] [12] [13] [14]

1. Meet the residents: a community, not a colony of “good bacteria”

Microbiota generally means the organisms living in a particular environment. Microbiome is often used more broadly for that community, its genetic material, and its surrounding ecological setting. Usage varies across papers, so it helps to notice what a study actually measured. A DNA survey, a culture of living organisms, and a measurement of microbial chemicals are not interchangeable. [2]

The gut’s bacterial residents attract most attention, partly because researchers have developed powerful tools for studying them. But the supporting cast is substantial:

Member	What makes it interesting	Important qualification
Bacteria	Break down food components, compete for resources, and produce many metabolites	Effects vary by species, strain, location, and circumstances
Archaea	A distinct domain of cellular life; some gut archaea participate in methane-producing metabolism	They are not simply another type of bacterium
Fungi and other microbial eukaryotes	Add another layer of ecological interaction	Presence does not automatically mean infection
Bacteriophages	Viruses that infect bacteria and can influence bacterial communities	They do not infect human cells in the way a human viral pathogen does
Other viruses	Include viruses passing through with food and viruses associated with human hosts	Detecting viral genetic material does not by itself establish disease

These categories are not teams wearing permanent “good” and “bad” jerseys. A normally tolerated organism may cause infection if it enters the bloodstream. A species linked with disease in one setting may coexist harmlessly in another. Even within a named species, strains can differ in genes and behavior. [2] [3]

How many nonhuman cells are there?

The widely cited 2016 analysis by Sender and colleagues estimated approximately 3.8×10^{13} bacterial cells and 3.0×10^{13} human cells for a reference 70-kilogram adult man. Much of the bacterial population was assigned to the colon; red blood cells contributed heavily to the human-cell count. The result put the ratio near one to one rather than ten to one. [1]

That is a useful scale, not a personal census. Body size, sex-related anatomical differences, bowel contents, and assumptions about bacterial concentration affect the calculation. Passing stool can change the estimated ratio without changing your identity or health. Numerical abundance also says little about mass: bacteria are tiny compared with many human cells.

Viruses make the counting problem even more interesting. They are not cells. Their abundance depends on what is counted—free particles, viral genomes within cells, or sequences detected in a sample—and which body site is examined. There is no sufficiently secure single combined count of “bacteria plus viruses in every human” to use as a universal fact. The defensible marvel is already large enough: we live with vast, varied microbial communities whose boundaries and activities are still being mapped. [2] [3]

A stool sample is a view through one window

The digestive tract is not uniform. The mouth, stomach, small intestine, colon, intestinal contents, and mucus-associated surfaces create different habitats. Stool is informative and convenient, but it is not an exhaustive inventory of every intestinal niche. Research comparing stool and mucosal recovery after antibiotics illustrates why sampling location can matter. [15] [8]

This is one reason a “missing” organism on a commercial report may mean less than it appears to. It may be below detection, absent from that sample, or affected by the testing method. A colored chart is not automatically a diagnosis. [16]

2. What the ecosystem does all day

One major task is chemical processing. Some carbohydrates escape digestion in the small intestine and reach microbes farther downstream. Microbial fermentation can produce short-chain fatty acids, including acetate, propionate, and butyrate. Butyrate is an important fuel for colon-lining cells, while these metabolites also participate in receptor signaling and immune regulation. [17]

The process resembles a network of workshops rather than a single factory. One organism's output may become another's input. Two people can carry different collections of species while retaining some overlapping biochemical functions. Conversely, a familiar species name does not guarantee a familiar function if the strains or available nutrients differ. [2]

Another job is colonization resistance: making it harder for an incoming or previously suppressed pathogen to expand. Competition for nutrients and space, interactions with the host, and the chemical environment all contribute. *C. difficile* provides a clinically important example. Antibiotics may suppress the infection while also leaving an ecosystem in which surviving spores can later germinate and toxin-producing bacteria can return. [18]

Microbes also modify compounds made by the body. Bile acids begin as host products involved in digestion; microbial transformations help shape the intestinal bile-acid pool. In the SER-109 trial, establishment of administered microbial species was associated with bile-acid profiles known to inhibit *C. difficile* spore germination. That is a mechanistic clue accompanying a clinical result, not evidence that everyone should buy a bile-acid supplement. [18]

The immune system, meanwhile, must perform an extraordinary balancing act: respond to threats without attacking every ordinary resident or meal. Microbial products and metabolites participate in that conversation. “Boosting immunity” is therefore an imprecise goal. A well-regulated response is more useful than turning every immune dial upward. [17] [10]

Diversity is a description, not a universal health grade

Researchers measure diversity in several ways, including the number of detectable organisms and how evenly they are distributed. Lower diversity accompanies some disease states and antibiotic exposures, and restoration can be informative in a particular clinical setting. But no universal rule says that more detectable species always means a healthier person.

Who is present, what they do, and where they live all matter. The fermented-food trial discussed later is especially instructive: the high-fiber group showed increased capacity for carbohydrate processing without a rise in community diversity. A useful functional change need not move every headline metric. [10]

Similarly, dysbiosis describes an altered microbial community, often relative to a comparison group. It does not name one standardized disease with one test and one cure. The international microbiome-testing consensus emphasizes how limited routine clinical interpretation remains. “Your ecosystem is unbalanced” should be the beginning of a specific explanation, not the end of a sales pitch. [16]

3. The mouth–gut connection: connected, but not identical

Every swallow carries material from the mouth toward the intestine. Yet swallowing an organism does not establish that it survives, grows, or matters clinically. The gastrointestinal tract has physical and chemical barriers, and its resident communities compete with arrivals.

A 2019 strain-resolved metagenomic study by Schmidt and colleagues found evidence of extensive transmission of microbes along the gastrointestinal tract. By comparing fine-grained genetic signatures rather than simply finding the same species name in two places, the researchers could investigate likely sharing between oral and gut communities. The work also reported increased transmission patterns in groups with colorectal cancer and rheumatoid arthritis. [15]

Those are intriguing observations, not proof that oral microbes universally cause those diseases. Illness, medication, diet, altered barriers, or inflammation can make the gut more hospitable to organisms originating in the mouth. Disease may change microbial traffic as well as be influenced by it. A strain-level link is stronger evidence of connection than a broad correlation, but it still does not answer every question about direction or mechanism.

The practical conclusion is refreshingly ordinary: maintain appropriate dental care and have persistent gum or oral problems evaluated. Oral health deserves attention on its own merits. There is no established reason to take antibiotics or attempt to sterilize the mouth merely because a microbiome report lists an “oral” species in stool.

This field may eventually identify targeted interventions for particular diseases. For now, the mouth–gut axis is best understood as a connected ecological route, not a conveyor belt delivering one inevitable diagnosis.

4. The appendix: a possible microbial refuge

The appendix is a narrow pouch attached to the beginning of the large intestine. Its location, lymphoid tissue, and association with microbial biofilms have inspired a compelling idea: it might sometimes act as a protected reservoir, helping preserve organisms that can contribute to recolonization after intestinal disturbance.

In 2007, Bollinger and colleagues proposed the “safe house” hypothesis using anatomy, immune-associated biofilm formation, and the distribution of biofilms in the bowel. A biofilm is a community embedded in a protective matrix, not simply bacteria floating freely in liquid. A sheltered pouch could plausibly preserve such a community when material elsewhere is rapidly flushed away. [19]

Comparative anatomy adds another reason not to dismiss the appendix as meaningless. Reviews describe its repeated appearance in mammalian evolution and associations with immune tissue. Evolutionary persistence and repeated origins make possible functions worth investigating. They do not prove that the organ is indispensable to every modern human or that it reliably rebuilds the gut after antibiotics. [20]

The distinction matters personally. People who have had an appendectomy do not need to assume that their intestinal ecosystem is permanently broken, nor does this hypothesis establish a need for lifelong probiotics. A plausible reservoir is not the same thing as a clinically validated “backup drive.”

Suspected appendicitis is a medical emergency. Increasing abdominal pain, especially with other concerning symptoms, needs prompt assessment. Protecting a hypothetical microbial refuge is never a reason to delay emergency care or indicated surgery. Treatment decisions belong with the medical and surgical team, who may consider surgery or antibiotics depending on the individual case. [21]

The appendix can be scientifically interesting without becoming medically untouchable.

5. How the gut talks to the brain

The gut and brain communicate in both directions. Stress can change digestive function; intestinal events can influence bodily sensations and signaling to the nervous system. Microbes participate in this network, but they are neither the only participants nor tiny puppeteers holding the strings of personality. [4]

There are several overlapping routes:

Neural signaling. The enteric nervous system helps coordinate intestinal activity. Connections involving the vagus nerve and other pathways relay information between the gut and central nervous system. Microbial activity can influence the local environment that these circuits sense. A nerve pathway carrying information is not equivalent to a bacterium transmitting a thought.

Immune signaling. Microbial products can affect immune activity, and immune mediators can communicate with the nervous system. Excessive inflammation can have different consequences from normal immune signaling. The body's barriers, receptors, and regulatory systems help determine the outcome.

Hormonal signaling. Intestinal cells release hormones involved in appetite, metabolism, and other functions. Microbial metabolites can influence enteroendocrine signaling, including pathways involving GLP-1 and peptide YY. That does not make a fermented food equivalent to a prescription medicine targeting a hormone receptor.

Metabolic signaling. Short-chain fatty acids, tryptophan-related compounds, and other metabolites can participate through local, circulating, immune, or neural routes. Effects depend on concentrations, tissues, and context. Describing a pathway is not the same as showing that adding more of one metabolite will improve health. [4] [17]

Bile-acid signaling is another emerging part of this network. Microbial changes to bile acids can alter signaling through receptors and endocrine or immune pathways with possible effects on brain function and appetite. Much of this work is mechanistic or preclinical; manipulating bile acids is not an established do-it-yourself treatment for mood or cognition. [22]

The serotonin story has two compartments

Much of the body's serotonin is produced outside the brain, particularly in the gut. There it contributes to functions such as intestinal signaling and motility. Experiments have shown that gut microbes can influence host peripheral serotonin production; the influential 2015 study by Yano and colleagues used mouse microbiota, germ-free and conventionalized mice, cultured cells, and metabolites, rather than a human treatment trial. Its broad finding was that selected spore-forming microbes and their metabolites can increase host peripheral serotonin production. [23]

The paper also has a published erratum. A representative platelet flow-cytometry plot had been duplicated during formatting for two conditions, and one passage incorrectly said that a mouse group had been conventionalized on postnatal day 42 rather than day 21. The authors corrected the figure and text and stated that the result descriptions, experimental results, and conclusions were unchanged. That is reassuring about the broad mechanistic finding, but it does not remove the larger limits: the work was mainly in mice and cells and did not show that changing a person's microbiome raises brain serotonin or treats a psychiatric disorder. [23]

But serotonin itself does not cross the blood–brain barrier. Peripheral and central serotonin are distinct pools. Tryptophan, a precursor obtained from food, can cross that barrier, and microbial activity may influence its availability and competing metabolic pathways. This creates scientifically plausible connections without turning gut serotonin into a direct shipment of happiness to the brain. [24]

The distinction is more than academic. A stool organism advertised as “serotonin producing” does not establish that taking it will raise brain serotonin or treat depression. Location, chemistry, and clinical outcomes cannot be skipped.

Why mouse discoveries are not human prescriptions

Researchers can manipulate microbial communities in germ-free or antibiotic-treated animals and observe changes in physiology or behavior. Such studies help test mechanisms. They are also conducted under conditions very different from ordinary human life. A mouse behavioral task is not a diagnosis of major depression, and transferring an animal phenotype does not prove that a human disorder has one microbial cause. [4]

Human observational studies add another layer, but people with different diets, medications, sleep patterns, bowel habits, or illnesses can have different microbiomes for many reasons. An association between a microbial pattern and anxiety may reflect causes, consequences, shared influences, or some combination.

Human trials are beginning to test interventions directly. A 2023 pilot trial studied a multistrain probiotic added to ongoing antidepressants in adults with incomplete treatment response. Forty-nine people received an intervention and entered the intention-to-treat analysis. The investigators found encouraging tolerability and some symptom-effect estimates, but the study was designed to inform a larger definitive trial, not establish a replacement for depression treatment. [5]

Systematic reviews also describe promising signals alongside variation in products, populations, and outcomes. A benefit from one studied formulation cannot be assigned to every bottle labeled “psychobiotic.” [25]

For patients, the sensible path is integration: treat digestive symptoms seriously, support nutrition and sleep, and continue evidence-based mental-health care. Microbiome research may add tools. It has not made psychotherapy, psychiatric medication, or urgent help for a mental-health crisis obsolete.

6. Antibiotics: necessary medicine with ecological consequences

An antibiotic can save a life by treating a bacterial infection. Its effects on resident microbes do not make that treatment a mistake. The clinical question is whether the medicine is indicated and appropriately selected—not whether it leaves the microbiome completely untouched.

Antibiotics differ in spectrum, intestinal exposure, and effects on microbial communities. The infection itself, a hospital stay, diet changes, other medicines, and the starting ecosystem can also influence what happens afterward. “I took antibiotics” describes many different biological situations.

Recovery is a process, not a countdown

In a 2018 study, 12 healthy men received an intensive four-day combination of three antibiotics and were followed for six months. Their gut communities returned toward near-baseline composition within about a month and a half. Nevertheless, nine common species present in all participants before treatment remained undetectable in most participants at 180 days. [6]

This small, unusual exposure study should not be converted into a timetable for every prescription. Its lesson is subtler: broad recovery and persistent changes can coexist. “Mostly similar again” is different from “every organism restored.”

An earlier longitudinal study of repeated antibiotic exposure also found individualized and sometimes incomplete recovery. More recent work examining both the microbiome and resistome—the collection of antibiotic-resistance genes—shows that drug effects and their persistence vary. A community can regain a familiar appearance while aspects of its genetic resistance potential remain changed. [26] [7]

Nor does an undetected species necessarily imply a symptom or a permanent health loss. Sequencing measures biological changes; translating each change into a patient outcome requires additional evidence.

What helps after a necessary course?

Start with the actual clinical problem. If symptoms are settling, ordinary food, hydration, and a tolerable return to a varied diet may be more useful than an expensive restoration package. If diarrhea is substantial, persistent, or accompanied by fever, pain, or dehydration, contact the treating clinician. *C. difficile* and other causes need assessment; not all post-antibiotic symptoms are interchangeable “dysbiosis.” [27] [14]

Take antibiotics as prescribed and contact the prescriber about side effects or a possible change in treatment. Do not save leftovers, share them, or independently shorten or prolong a course for microbiome reasons. Future protection includes avoiding unnecessary antibiotics, while still accepting them when their expected benefits justify their risks.

There is no validated universal cleansing phase, reset diet, or species-replacement schedule. Ecological recovery is not improved simply by making the intervention sound more comprehensive.

7. Probiotics, prebiotics, and fermented foods are different tools

A probiotic is a live microorganism administered in an adequate amount with a demonstrated health benefit. A commercial product may contain one strain or several. The label “probiotic” does not mean its benefits have been established for your particular condition.

A prebiotic is a substrate selectively used by host microorganisms that confers a health benefit; not every fiber automatically meets that specific definition. Fermented foods are foods made through microbial activity. Some contain live organisms when eaten, while heating or processing may remove that feature. A fermented food is not automatically a clinically tested probiotic. [28] [29] [10]

Why “replace the good bacteria” is too simple

In a 2018 study, one multistrain probiotic formulation given after antibiotics delayed the reconstitution of participants’ indigenous microbial communities compared with spontaneous recovery. An experimental autologous fecal intervention—using participants’ own previously collected material—showed a different recovery pattern. [8]

This does not prove all probiotics are harmful, and it is not a reason to arrange a personal stool-storage project. The study examined a specific intervention and biological recovery measures, not every possible probiotic or every patient-centered outcome. It does show why colonization, symptom relief, prevention of a specific complication, and restoration of the original community are separate claims.

Guidelines have differed by condition and over time. The AGA’s 2020 probiotic guideline made narrowly formulation-specific suggestions for some settings, while restricting or discouraging use in several others. Its 2026 adult *C. difficile* expert update advises against probiotics for preventing an initial or recurrent *C. difficile* infection. That newer advice should not be replaced by an older, more favorable summary. [30] [14]

For other outcomes, including some forms of antibiotic-associated diarrhea, the evidence must still be examined by population, strain, dose, and endpoint. There is no universal instruction to take any probiotic with every antibiotic.

People who are severely ill, immunocompromised, or otherwise medically vulnerable should discuss live-microbe products with their clinicians. Rare invasive infections and product-quality problems matter more when consequences are serious. “Natural” does not mean unable to enter the bloodstream. [29]

8. Feeding the ecosystem without turning meals into homework

Diet can change microbial activity quickly. In a controlled study, short-term animal-based and plant-based dietary changes altered community features and microbial gene expression. Rapid responsiveness is exciting, but a fast change is not automatically a durable improvement. [31]

The strongest everyday message is broader than any one microbe: emphasize a nutritionally adequate pattern with plant foods and fiber that you tolerate. Systematic reviews associate higher fiber and better carbohydrate quality with favorable health outcomes, supported by intervention evidence for some risk factors. Those benefits should not all be attributed to one microbial mechanism. [9]

Practical sources include beans and lentils, whole grains, vegetables, fruit, nuts, and seeds. There is no need to buy every category at once. An affordable breakfast change or adding a tolerated vegetable can be more sustainable than an elaborate “microbiome protocol.”

Increase fiber gradually. Sudden large increases can create gas and discomfort, and a food that is useful for one person may aggravate symptoms in another. People with bowel narrowing, recent surgery, significant motility problems, or a prescribed diet need individualized advice. A dietitian can help preserve nutrition while working around genuine restrictions.

What the fermented-food trial actually found

In a randomized 17-week study of 36 healthy adults—18 in each dietary group—researchers compared a high-fiber approach with a high-fermented-food approach. The fermented-food group showed increased microbial diversity and reductions in several inflammatory markers. The high-fiber group showed increased microbial carbohydrate-processing capacity, but the primary cytokine-response score did not change. [10]

This was a mechanistically rich but small study, not a trial showing that yogurt or kimchi treats autoimmune disease. Participants were healthy adults, and laboratory markers are not the same as fewer symptoms, hospitalizations, or disease flares.

For someone who enjoys them, ordinary foods such as yogurt with live cultures or fermented vegetables may fit a varied diet. Consider salt, added sugar, allergies, lactose tolerance, and food safety. Immunocompromised people should seek advice about raw, unpasteurized, or home-fermented products. No one must force down a disliked food to qualify for a healthy gut.

The useful mindset is addition and tolerance rather than purity: expand what works, adjust what does not, and avoid ever-tightening restrictions based only on a commercial test. Your intestinal residents do not require a tasting menu with a subscription fee.

9. A medical turning point: transferring an ecosystem

Fecal microbiota transplantation, or FMT, transfers donor-derived intestinal microbial material under medical oversight. Conventional FMT is different from an ordinary probiotic supplement and from a standardized FDA-approved microbiota product. These interventions vary in processing, composition, delivery, evidence, and regulatory status.

Their strongest established use concerns recurrent *C. difficile* infection. Antibiotics remain important for treating the infection. Microbiota-based therapy can then help reduce the risk that it returns.

The 1958 report: a striking observation, not a modern trial

In 1958, surgeon Ben Eiseman and colleagues published a report titled Fecal enema as an adjunct in the treatment of pseudomembranous enterocolitis. A later review describes four patients with antibiotic-associated illness who improved after donor fecal material was administered. [32]

The case series is part of the public medical record, but it needs historical context. It was uncontrolled, tiny, and conducted before modern identification and routine testing of *C. difficile* as the cause of this syndrome. It cannot be treated as four laboratory-confirmed modern CDI cases or a reliable estimate of treatment effectiveness.

Its importance was the observation: material containing an intestinal community appeared to help people with serious intestinal illness. It offered a clue worth testing—and an early glimpse of an approach that would eventually reach randomized trials and regulated treatments.

The 2013 randomized trial: the numbers that changed the conversation

Van Nood and colleagues randomly assigned patients with recurrent *C. difficile* to donor-feces infusion after a short antibiotic regimen and bowel lavage, standard vancomycin alone, or vancomycin with lavage. The primary endpoint was resolution of *C. difficile*-associated diarrhea without relapse at ten weeks. [33]

The reported results were:

Treatment group	Resolution without relapse at the primary assessment
Donor infusion group, after the first infusion	13 of 16 patients: 81%
Vancomycin alone	4 of 13 patients: 31%
Vancomycin with bowel lavage	3 of 13 patients: 23%

Of the three initial nonresponders in the infusion group, two improved after a second infusion from a different donor. That additional treatment is important: it should not be folded into the first-infusion success rate without explanation.

The study had planned 40 patients per group but stopped after 43 randomizations, with 42 patients analyzed. Because most people in both control groups relapsed, the data and safety monitoring board requested an interim efficacy analysis and advised termination under the prespecified Haybittle–Peto stopping rule; both comparisons with donor infusion had $P < 0.001$. It was still a small, open-label, early-stopped trial, and its comparator regimens and delivery approach should not be assumed to represent every current treatment choice. The difference was striking and helped move microbiota restoration from an unusual rescue idea toward a reproducible medical strategy. [33]

From donor material to approved products

Rebyota, fecal microbiota, live-jslm, is a rectally administered product. Vowst, fecal microbiota spores, live-brpk, is an oral spore-based product. Their FDA indications are for preventing recurrence in people aged 18 years and older following antibiotic treatment for recurrent *C. difficile* infection. Neither is approved to treat an active infection. [11] [12]

The two product labels summarize different analyses, so their percentages should not be treated as interchangeable. For Rebyota, FDA integrated a phase 3 placebo-controlled study with phase 2 data in a Bayesian analysis. In phase 3, 262 adults were randomized and treated—177 with Rebyota and 85 with placebo. The integrated model estimated eight-week treatment success, meaning no recurrent CDI diarrhea, at 70.6% with Rebyota versus 57.5% with placebo, a difference of 13.1 percentage points (95% Bayesian credible interval 2.3 to 24.0). At six months, sustained clinical response in phase 3 was 65.5% versus 56.5%; the 9.1-point difference (95% confidence interval " 3.6 to 21.7) was not statistically significant. Because FDA reports modeled percentages rather than raw success counts for the integrated primary analysis, those percentages should not be converted into invented numerators. [11]

For Vowst, the 182-participant randomized trial assigned 89 people to the oral product and 93 to placebo after standard antibiotic treatment and symptom resolution. Recurrence through eight weeks occurred in 11 of 89 (12.4%) versus 37 of 93 (39.8%); adjusted relative risk 0.32 (95% confidence interval 0.18 to 0.58). At 24 weeks the corresponding totals were 19 of 89 (21.3%) versus 44 of 93 (47.3%). These are recurrence rates, not immediate cure rates. Most trial adverse events were mild to moderate and gastrointestinal, but a trial of this size cannot exclude every rare risk. [18] [12]

The products are not interchangeable with a store-bought probiotic, an internet donor, or an unprocessed stool sample. Medical selection, screening, manufacturing, informed consent, and follow-up are part of the treatment—not optional extras.

10. Who should consider microbiota therapy—and who should not?

The AGA's 2024 formal GRADE guideline conditionally suggests selected microbiota-based therapies after antibiotics for recurrent CDI in immunocompetent adults, based on low-certainty evidence. It distinguishes immune status: it conditionally suggests selected conventional FMT for mildly or moderately immunocompromised adults, with very-low-certainty evidence, while suggesting against fecal microbiota-based therapies for recurrence prevention in severely immunocompromised adults. These are clinical categories requiring a clinician's assessment, not a do-it-yourself risk checklist. [13]

The AGA posted a new adult CDI Clinical Practice Update on June 30, 2026, by Monika Fischer, Byron P. Vaughn, Anne F. Peery, and Colleen R. Kelly; the indexed journal article was published online July 1 and in the September 2026 issue of *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology*. This is an expert best-practice review—not a replacement GRADE guideline—and its methods explicitly say that no systematic reviews were performed and the statements have no formal evidence-quality or recommendation-strength ratings. Its actual Best Practice Advice 8 says microbiota-based therapies should be offered after treatment of a second recurrence—the third CDI episode—and may be considered after an initial infection or first recurrence in people at high risk for another recurrence or whose initial episode was particularly morbid or difficult to treat. Earlier consideration does not erase each product's FDA label or individual safety assessment. [14]

There is a separate hospital situation: severe or fulminant CDI not responding adequately to standard treatment. Specialist teams may consider conventional FMT as an adjunct in selected patients. That is not the same as using Rebyota or Vowst to treat acute severe disease; the 2026 update explicitly notes that those products are not approved for that purpose. Urgent medical, infectious-disease, and surgical care remains essential. [13] [14]

People with inflammatory bowel disease require another distinction. A 2026 AGA update supports microbiome-based therapies for recurrent CDI in patients who also have IBD. That is different from offering a transplant to treat Crohn's disease or ulcerative colitis itself. [34]

Why donor safety is nonnegotiable

In 2019, the FDA reported that two immunocompromised adults developed invasive infections with extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing *E. coli* after receiving investigational FMT from the same donor. One died. The donor material had not been tested for those organisms before use. [35]

This was not a theoretical warning. A treatment intended to restore a community transmitted a dangerous member of that community. Screening lowers risk but cannot make biologic material risk-free, and FDA-approved products also carry warnings concerning transmissible infectious agents. [11] [12]

Do not attempt do-it-yourself FMT, even with a donor who seems healthy or is a close relative. Appearance and a routine checkup cannot exclude transmissible pathogens or resistance genes. There is no safe home-screening shortcut.

Beyond C. difficile: promising does not mean established

FMT and other microbiota therapies are being studied for inflammatory bowel disease, metabolic conditions, and numerous other disorders. Some trials offer signals worth pursuing, but donor selection, preparation, dosing, outcomes, and durability vary. The AGA guideline suggests against conventional FMT for IBD or IBS outside clinical trials. [13] [32]

Autism, depression, weight loss, and general “rejuvenation” are not FDA indications for Rebyota or Vowst. A mechanistic link, uncontrolled improvement, or successful mouse experiment does not justify a clinic selling a broadly restorative stool treatment. Participation in a properly reviewed trial is different from paying for an established benefit.

11. Testing, symptoms, and useful next steps

Commercial microbiome reports can be fascinating. They can also imply a level of clinical precision that has not been demonstrated. The international consensus on microbiome testing describes limited evidence for routine clinical usefulness and the need for standardized methods and validated interpretation. There is no universal validated microbiome health score or test-derived diet that fits everyone. [16]

This does not mean all stool testing is useless. Clinician-ordered testing for a suspected infection answers a different question from a broad wellness sequencing panel. *C. difficile* diagnosis requires compatible symptoms and appropriate laboratory interpretation; detecting an organism or gene is not automatically proof that it explains the illness. Current AGA advice also discourages a routine “test of cure” after successful CDI treatment. [14]

A practical plan

1. Identify the problem you want to improve. Pain, diarrhea, constipation, an infection recurrence, and curiosity about microbial diversity are different starting points.
2. Check medicines with the prescribing team. Ask whether an antibiotic is necessary and whether ongoing medicines still have an indication. Do not discontinue them independently.
3. Build a tolerable dietary pattern. Gradually expand fiber-rich foods when appropriate, keep adequate nutrition, and use fermented foods as an option rather than an obligation.
4. Make one manageable change at a time. Track symptoms and daily function rather than trying to optimize every microbial metric.
5. Treat persistent symptoms as a diagnostic question. A microbiome explanation should not replace evaluation for infection, inflammatory disease, medication effects, or other causes.

When to seek care promptly

Get urgent assessment for severe or worsening abdominal pain, a swollen or rigid abdomen, black or bloody stool, fainting, confusion, or inability to keep fluids down. Marked thirst, dizziness, and reduced urination can indicate dehydration. Suspected appendicitis requires immediate care. [27] [21]

Contact a clinician promptly about significant diarrhea during or after antibiotics, high fever, frequent diarrhea, or diarrhea lasting more than two days in an adult. Infants, older adults, pregnant people, and people with weakened immune systems may need earlier assessment. Do not wait for a mailed microbiome report when symptoms suggest acute illness. [27]

Questions to bring to an appointment

- Could my symptoms reflect an infection, a medicine effect, or another diagnosable condition rather than a nonspecific “imbalance”?
- What outcome would a probiotic improve, and which exact strain or product was studied?
- Does my immune status make live-microbe products or FMT riskier?
- After recurrent *C. difficile*, am I a candidate for an approved microbiota product or specialist conventional FMT?
- Is the proposed therapy preventing recurrence, treating an active infection, or being studied for another purpose?

- What evidence supports a recommended stool test, and how would its result change treatment?
- Would a dietitian help me increase variety without aggravating symptoms or compromising nutrition?

Frequently Asked Questions

Am I “more bacteria than human”?

By cell number, bacteria and human cells may be in a similar numerical range, depending on the person and the assumptions used. By mass, the comparison is very different. Neither framing is a measure of personhood; it is an ecological estimate. Viruses are not cells. [1] [2]

Is the appendix essential for rebuilding the microbiome?

It may provide a protected microbial niche, but the safe-house idea is not proof that recovery depends on having an appendix. Appendectomy does not automatically call for supplements, and possible microbial functions must never delay treatment of appendicitis. [19] [20] [21]

How long does recovery after antibiotics take?

There is no single answer. Community-level measures may move toward baseline over weeks, while particular organisms or resistance genes remain altered much longer. Symptoms, community composition, and microbial function do not necessarily recover on the same schedule. [6] [7]

Should everyone take a probiotic?

No. Benefits depend on the indication, organism, formulation, and patient. Vulnerable people can face additional risks. Current AGA adult CDI advice does not recommend probiotics to prevent initial or recurrent infection. [29] [14]

Can gut bacteria treat depression?

They are a serious research target, not an established stand-alone substitute for psychiatric care. Small adjunctive trials have encouraging findings, but larger definitive studies and product-specific evidence are needed. Gut serotonin does not simply cross into the brain. [5] [24]

Can I get a fecal transplant for IBS or general wellness?

Established clinical use centers on selected CDI situations. Conventional FMT for IBS or IBD itself is not recommended outside clinical trials in the AGA guideline, and approved products are not labeled for general wellness. Never attempt a home transplant. [13] [11] [12] [35]

What is the most useful thing to do today?

Choose one practical step: review a persistent symptom with a clinician, add a tolerated fiber-containing food, or ask a specific question about a proposed supplement. The aim is better health and function—not winning a diversity contest.

The bottom line

The gut microbiome is neither a passing fad nor a master explanation for every illness. It is a complex biological partner whose activities can be measured, whose disturbances sometimes matter greatly, and whose restoration has already become effective medicine in a specific setting.

The best approach combines curiosity with proportion: use necessary medicines, feed yourself well, investigate concerning symptoms, and demand condition-specific evidence for commercial claims. There is plenty of wonder in the real science. An ecosystem that helps turn yesterday's lunch into today's chemical conversation does not need magical powers to be extraordinary.

Sources

1. Revised Estimates for the Number of Human and Bacteria Cells in the Body.

PLoS biology | 2016 | Primary quantitative modeling study

<https://europepmc.org/article/MED/27541692>

2. Microbiome definition re-visited: old concepts and new challenges.

Microbiome | 2020 | Peer-reviewed conceptual synthesis; corrected author affiliation

<https://europepmc.org/article/MED/32605663>

3. The Human Gut Virome Is Highly Diverse, Stable, and Individual Specific.

Cell host & microbe | 2019 | Primary longitudinal human virome sequencing study

<https://europepmc.org/article/MED/31600503>

4. The Microbiota-Gut-Brain Axis.

Physiological reviews | 2019 | Comprehensive mechanistic review

<https://europepmc.org/article/MED/31460832>

5. Acceptability, Tolerability, and Estimates of Putative Treatment Effects of Probiotics as Adjunctive Treatment in Patients With Depression: A Randomized Clinical Trial.

JAMA psychiatry | 2023 | Primary pilot randomized double-blind adjunctive trial

<https://europepmc.org/article/MED/37314797>

6. Recovery of gut microbiota of healthy adults following antibiotic exposure.

Nature microbiology | 2018 | Primary small longitudinal healthy-adult antibiotic-exposure study

<https://europepmc.org/article/MED/30349083>

7. Acute and persistent effects of commonly used antibiotics on the gut microbiome and resistome in healthy adults.

Cell reports | 2022 | Primary longitudinal healthy-adult antibiotic study

<https://europepmc.org/article/MED/35417701>

8. Post-Antibiotic Gut Mucosal Microbiome Reconstitution Is Impaired by Probiotics and Improved by Autologous FMT.

Cell | 2018 | Primary controlled human antibiotic-recovery study

<https://europepmc.org/article/MED/30193113>

9. Carbohydrate quality and human health: a series of systematic reviews and meta-analyses.

Lancet (London, England) | 2019 | Series of systematic reviews and meta-analyses

<https://europepmc.org/article/MED/30638909>

10. Gut-microbiota-targeted diets modulate human immune status.

Cell | 2021 | Primary randomized dietary intervention in healthy adults

<https://europepmc.org/article/MED/34256014>

11. REBYOTA: FDA product information and linked prescribing information

U.S. Food and Drug Administration | 2022 approval; current product page accessed 2026-09-23 | Official product page and linked label

<https://www.fda.gov/vaccines-blood-biologics/vaccines/rebyota>

12. VOWST: FDA product information and linked prescribing information

U.S. Food and Drug Administration | 2023 approval; current product page accessed 2026-09-23 | Official product page and linked label

<https://www.fda.gov/vaccines-blood-biologics/vowst>

13. AGA Clinical Practice Guideline on Fecal Microbiota-Based Therapies for Select Gastrointestinal Diseases.

Gastroenterology | 2024 | Formal AGA GRADE clinical practice guideline

<https://europepmc.org/article/MED/38395525>

14. AGA Clinical Practice Update on Management of Clostridioides difficile Infection in Adults: Expert Review

American Gastroenterological Association | AGA page posted 2026-06-30; journal e-publication 2026-07-01; 2026 Sep;24(9):2359-2369 | Peer-reviewed AGA Clinical Practice Update / expert best-practice advice
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/42383946/>

15. Extensive transmission of microbes along the gastrointestinal tract.

eLife | 2019 | Primary strain-resolved human metagenomic study
<https://europepmc.org/article/MED/30747106>

16. International consensus statement on microbiome testing in clinical practice.

The lancet. Gastroenterology & hepatology | 2025 | International expert consensus statement
<https://europepmc.org/article/MED/39647502>

17. The Role of Short-Chain Fatty Acids From Gut Microbiota in Gut-Brain Communication

Frontiers in Endocrinology | 2020 | Mechanistic review
<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/endocrinology/articles/10.3389/fendo.2020.00025/full>

18. SER-109, an Oral Microbiome Therapy for Recurrent Clostridioides difficile Infection.

The New England journal of medicine | 2022 | Primary phase 3 randomized double-blind placebo-controlled trial
<https://europepmc.org/article/MED/35045228>

19. Biofilms in the large bowel suggest an apparent function of the human vermiform appendix.

Journal of theoretical biology | 2007 | Hypothesis and anatomy/biofilm review
<https://europepmc.org/article/MED/17936308>

20. A review of the function and evolution of the cecal appendix

The Anatomical Record | 2023 | Comparative anatomy and evolutionary review
<https://anatomypubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ar.24917>

21. Appendicitis

National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases | undated; accessed 2026-09-23 | Official patient guidance
<https://www.niddk.nih.gov/health-information/digestive-diseases/appendicitis>

22. Gut–Brain Axis and Bile Acid Signaling: Linking Microbial Metabolism to Brain Function and Metabolic Regulation

International Journal of Molecular Sciences | 2025-12-18 | Mechanistic narrative review
<https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC12733927>

23. Indigenous bacteria from the gut microbiota regulate host serotonin biosynthesis.

Cell | 2015 | Primary mechanistic animal and ex-vivo experiments; indexed erratum noted
<https://europepmc.org/article/MED/25860609>

24. Serotonin—Its Synthesis and Roles in the Healthy and the Critically Ill

International Journal of Molecular Sciences | 2021 | Physiology review
<https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC8124334>

25. Probiotics for the treatment of depression and anxiety: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials.

Clinical nutrition ESPEN | 2021 | Systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials
<https://europepmc.org/article/MED/34620373>

26. Incomplete recovery and individualized responses of the human distal gut microbiota to repeated antibiotic perturbation.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America | 2011 | Primary small repeated-antibiotic longitudinal study
<https://europepmc.org/article/MED/20847294>

27. Symptoms & Causes of Diarrhea

National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases | undated; accessed 2026-09-23 | Official patient guidance
<https://www.niddk.nih.gov/health-information/digestive-diseases/diarrhea/symptoms-causes>

28. A roundup of the ISAPP consensus definitions: probiotics, prebiotics, synbiotics, postbiotics and fermented foods

International Scientific Association for Probiotics and Prebiotics | 2021 | Official scientific-association summary linking consensus definitions

<https://isappscience.org/a-roundup-of-the-isapp-consensus-definitions-probiotics-prebiotics-synbiotics-postbiotics-and-fermented-foods>

29. Probiotics: Usefulness and Safety

National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health | undated; accessed 2026-09-23 | Official patient evidence overview
<https://www.nccih.nih.gov/health/probiotics-usefulness-and-safety>

30. Role of probiotics in the management of gastrointestinal disorders

American Gastroenterological Association | 2020 | Official guideline recommendations

<https://gastro.org/clinical-guidance/role-of-probiotics-in-the-management-of-gastrointestinal-disorders/>

31. Diet rapidly and reproducibly alters the human gut microbiome.

Nature | 2014 | Primary short-term controlled human dietary intervention

<https://europepmc.org/article/MED/24336217>

32. Current Status and Future Therapeutic Options for Fecal Microbiota Transplantation

Medicina | 2022 | Narrative review

<https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC8780626>

33. Duodenal infusion of donor feces for recurrent Clostridium difficile.

The New England journal of medicine | 2013 | Primary randomized open-label controlled trial

<https://europepmc.org/article/MED/23323867>

34. Management of Clostridioides difficile infection in IBD

American Gastroenterological Association | 2026 | Official Clinical Practice Update / expert best-practice advice

<https://gastro.org/clinical-guidance/management-of-clostridioides-difficile-infection-in-ibd/>

35. Fecal Microbiota for Transplantation: Safety Communication—Risk of Serious Adverse Reactions Due to Transmission of Multi-Drug Resistant Organisms

U.S. Food and Drug Administration | 2019-06-13 | Official safety communication

<https://www.fda.gov/safety/medical-product-safety-information/fecal-microbiota-transplantation-safety-communication-risk-serious-adverse-reactions-due>