Assessment of Role of Probiotics in the Management of Parkinson's Disease: A Meta-Analysis

Dr. Rasha Alaseili¹, Dr. Ala'a Eideh^{2*}

¹ MPH, The University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan. Email id- r.alaseili@gmail.com
² PhD, University of Manitoba, Canada. Email: aloiee@hotmail.com Received: 26- June -2023 Revised: 12- July -2023 Accepted: 15- August -2023

Abstract

Background: Conventional treatments are related with several difficulties, including dyskinesia, excessive daytime sleepiness, sudden sleep attacks, leg swelling, and discoloration. Therefore, we examine the efficacy of the probiotics in the management of Parkinson's disease (PD).

Methodology: A widespread literature search was accomplished on PubMed, Google Scholar, Wiley as well as Nature of Science databases, covering the period since 2013 to 2023.

Result: A Total 13 studies were comprised in this study. This study shows high quality indication of development in undefined PD rating scale (UPDRS) (Standardize mean difference -1.00 [95% CI -4.07 to 2.07], NMSQ score -4.94 [95% CI -6.95 to -2.92], Quality of life QOL-45.95 [95% CI -52.05 to -39.86], Depression scale -4.57 [95% CI -8.40 to -0.74] as well as Bowel movement (BM)0.40 [95% CI -0.51 to 1.31]. However there is significance found in the Bristol stool score in the placebo group.

Conclusion: Based on the study findings, it can be inferred that probiotics have a beneficial impact on non-motor symptoms, motor function, bowel movement as well as the reduction of depression in individuals with PD. The integration of probiotic supplementation into PD management has the potential to be a cheap and secure complementary treatment option.

Keywords: Dopamine, Probiotics, Parkinson's disease, Neurodegenerative disorder

Introduction

Parkinson's disease (PD) is a neurodegenerative disorder illustrate by the regular degeneration of dopamineproducing neurons in the brain along with the buildup of alpha-synuclein protein [1]. While motor signs like tremors, rigidity as well as bradykinesia are the main diagnostic criteria for PD, non-motor indications can manifest years before the onset of motor symptoms. These non-motor signs, which encompass cognitive decline as well as autonomic dysfunction, can progressively worsen as the illness advances [2, 3].

The prevalence of PD ranges from 5 to over 35 new patients per 100,000 cases each year [4]. The risk of developing PD considerably rises within the age range of 60 to 90. Furthermore, the prevalence of PD also increases with age, affecting almost 4% of men as well as2% of women aged 85 and older [5]. Although the initial mortality rate in PD is not greater, it progressively rises over time [6]. With the aging worldwide populace, the incidence of PD is projected to twice in the coming two deanery [7]. This anticipated increase in prevalence will result in a significant societal and economic burden, unless there are advancements in developing more effective treatments or preventive measures for PD [8].

Multiple research findings have suggested that the inflammatory pathway as well as oxidative stress, which are characterized by an imbalance between beneficial and harmful functions, is involved in the underlying causes of PD [9-11]. The pathology of PD typically starts in the substantia nigra but can disturb the enteric nervous system, emphasizing the connection between the Central Nervous System (CNS) as well as gut [12-14].Patients with PD often experience common motor symptoms, containing postural instability, postural instability, tremor and bradykinesia., along with non-motor indication like depression, gastrointestinal dysfunction, pain and reduced sense of smell, which may evident previous to the inception of motor symptoms [15-17].

Changes in the intestine have a significant effect on the gut-brain axis, which includes the bidirectional system of statement across the CNS as well as the nervous system of the gut. Dietary variables can affect the composition of the gut microbiota, which in rotate affects this axis. [14,18]. In PD patients, there is an disparity in the gut microbiota, categorized by pro-inflammatory bacteria, which leads to increased gut permeability or "leaky gut." This allows inflammatory mediators and bacteria to cross the gut barrier in addition to enter the bloodstream [19]. Additionally, the loss of dopaminergic neurons in the gut contributes to higher levels of pro-inflammatory cytokines [20]. PD cases exhibit a distinct gut microbiota composition contrast to healthy patients, with condensed intensity of prevotellaceae as well as an abundance of Enterobacteriaceae [14, 21]. These microbial imbalances are more pronounced in individuals with severe PD [22].

The secretion of cytokines by probiotic formulations may reduce inflammation [23], and a decrease in ROS could reduce oxidative stress [24].Gram-positive bacteria-based probiotics, comprising eight strains, have demonstrated the ability to regulate the appearance of genes associated to inflammation and neuronal plasticity in brain tissue. Probiotics are living microorganisms that offer health advantages when consumed in adequate quantities. They exhibit potential neuro protective effects, as well as anticancer, antioxidative and anti-inflammatory properties [25]. Research has indicated that probiotics can enhance in cooperation motor plus non-motor signs in individuals as well as animal models of PD. These beneficial results are attained over diverse contrivances, such as the control of inflammatory processes, apoptosis, as well as oxidative stress [26].Considering the probable benefits of probiotics in improving effectiveness as well as QOL for individuals including neurodegenerative conditions, there is a pressing requirement for an up-to-date systematic review or meta-analysis. Such a comprehensive analysis would serve as a reference for all the relevant studies and clinical trials conducted within the last decade, providing valuable insights and guiding future research directions. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the efficiency of probiotics in the management of PD.

Methodology:

The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) 2020 guideline was adhered to when doing the review and meta-analysis assessment.

Search strategy:

We search multiple electronic databases "PubMed, Scopus, Wiley, Google scholar, nature of science, Medline" from 2013 to 2023.Further articles were acquired by conducting citation searches within the list of comprised study as well as assessment articles. The search approach employed in this study was as follows: "Probiotics", "Parkinson's disease", "management", "neuro generative disease", "symbiotic". In addition, relevant studies were identified by reviewing the references of eligible articles. The selection of studies for this meta-analysis took both the inclusion as well as exclusion standards under careful consideration.

Inclusion criteria:

- 1. Randomized control trial.
- 2. Explored in this study is the use of probiotics in the administration in PD cases.
- 3. The scores of PD-related scales, namely the "Parkinson's Disease Questionnaire (PDQ-39), Non-Motor Symptoms Questionnaire (NMSQ), and Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS)", were assessed in this study.
- 4. Full text studies.
- 5. Studies available in English.

Exclusion criteria:

- 1. Non-human study.
- 2. Incomplete data.

- 3. Reviews.
- 4. Cohort studies.

Data analysis:

Cohen's kappa statistic was utilized to assess agreement level among the two reviewers concerning the insertion of studies. In the present research, we conducted statistical calibration of the effect sizes related to the impact of probiotics on PD. Initially, the mean as well as standard deviation (SD) values of changes-from-baseline were computed for both the treatment and control groups. In cases where data were insufficient, the mean as well as SD values of the changes-from-baseline were estimated following the Cochrane Handbook (version 6.3). Separate meta-analyses were performed for trials examining different effects of probiotics, and the effect sizes were represented as standard mean differences (SMD) using a random effects model. Additionally, 95% confidence intervals (CI) were measured for each literature as well as outcome measure to compare the treatment and control groups. All statistical tests conducted in this study were two-sided, as well as a significance level of P<0.05 was deemed as significant. The examination was performed using RevMan software version 5.4.

Table 1: "PRISMA" flow chart for meta-analysis, which involves searching databases as well as registers only.

recognition of researches via registers Databases as well as record



Result

The systematic review initially identified 312 articles through a search. An additional 5 articles were found from cross-references, resulting in a total of 317 articles. Duplicate publications 121 were removed, leaving 196 studies for screening. After a detailed screening process, 98 articles were excluded due to irrelevant 57 studies and 41 incomplete studies to the present analysis. Following the inclusion criteria, 98text

articles were evaluated for the present study. Full-text articles were subsequently removed due to reasons such as non-human studies and reviews/ cohort studies. Finally, overall of 13researches met the conditions as well as were comprised in this meta-analysis. The selected articles spanned from 2013 to 2023 (Table 1).

Quality valuation of incorporated researches:

The present study, we employ RevMan software version 5.4 to measure the risk of bias in included studies. The evaluation involved assessing individual studies across multiple domains and criteria, including selection bias (random sequence generation), performance bias (blinding of cases as well as personnel), attrition bias (incomplete result information), selective exposure (reporting bias), as well as additional biases. Every research was assigned one of three levels of bias risk: low, unclear, as well as high. The total risk calculation for all the involved researches was presented in Figure 5, where risks were categorized as "low risk (+)", "high risk (-)", or else "unclear risk (?)".

According to our research, every study had severe methodological shortcomings in at least one bias domain. The most difficult areas to address were those involving randomization, outcome assessor blinding, as well as ambiguous risk. Particularly, a substantial risk of bias was shown by the fact that 67.95% of the trials had inadequate or no randomization. Additionally, 1.28% of the studies had low outcome assessor blinding, which pointed to a high potential of bias. Additionally, in 30.77% of the assays, it was discovered that the risk of bias was uncertain. These results draw attention to significant methodological flaws in the included studies that could compromise the accuracy and dependability of their conclusions. When assessing the overall results of this review, it is imperative to take these potential limitations into account.



Figure 1: Review authors' percentage assessments of every product's risk of bias across the body of retrieved literature are shown in the Risk of Bias Plot.



Figure 2: Risk of Bias plot: Review the evaluation regarding every study's incorporated risk of bias made by the authors.

Table 2: Features of the involved literatures in the Meta-Analysis803

Yang XD et al. (2022)

Refer ences of auth or	Research strategy	Mean age of cases	Overall cases	Control group	probiotics	Occurrence as well as time	Effects
[27]	Randomized double blind clinical trial	NS	Experimental group=80 patients Control group= 40 patients	Pasteurized, fermented fiber-free milk	Fermented milk containing multiple probiotic strains and prebiotic fiber	every day for four weeks.	Probiotics increased frequency of full bowel movement more than a placebo.
[28]	Randomized double blind clinical trial	Experimental group=71.8 placebo group= 69.5	Experimental group=80 cases placebo group=40 cases	Pasteurized, fermented fiber-free milk	Fermented milk containing multiple probiotic strains as well as prebiotic fibers was used in the experimental group.	Once day for four week	The findings of the study indicate that probiotics demonstrated superior efficacy compared to the placebo in enhancing constipation symptoms in cases with PD.
[29]	Randomized control clinical trial	Experimental group=75.6 placebo group= 69.8	Experimental group=20 cases Placebo group= 20 cases	Trimebutine 200 mg 3 times for every day	Capsule 60 mg Lactobacillus acidophilus Bifidobacterium Infantis	every day for 12 weeks, two times	The study results suggest that trimebutine was more in effect in addressing constipation with unfinished evacuation. On the other hand, probiotics showed comparable effectiveness to trimebutine in reducing stomach pain and bloating.
[30]	Randomized double blind clinical trial	Experimental group=66.7 Control group=66.9	Experimental group=25 patients Control group= 25 cases	Placebo capsule	Capsule 8×109 CFU lactobacillus acidophilus Bifidobacterium bifidum L. reuteri Lactobacillus fermentum (2×109)	one time per day for twelve weeks.	Considerably upgraded gene manifestation stages of IL-1, IL-8, TNF-a, TGF- β as well as PPAR- γ were observed in the probiotics groups. Conversely, the gene expression of VEGF as well as LDLR, as well as the number of inflammation and oxidative stress biomarkers, remained unpretentious.
[31]	A randomized, double-blind, placebo-	Experimental group=68.2	Placebo group=30 cases	Placebo capsule	Capsule 8 × 109 CFU Lactobacillus acidophilus Bifidobacterium bifidum	One time for each day for twelve weeks	The intake of probiotics by cases with PD demonstrated advantageous

	controlled trial	Control group=67.7	Experimental group= 30 cases		Lactobacillus reuteri Lactobacillus fermentum (2 × 109 CFU each)		consequence on the MDS-UPDRS as well as certain metabolic profiles.
[32]	Cross sectional longitudinal study	Probiotic group=70 placebo group=70	Placebo group=40patie nts Probiotic group= 40cases	-	Lactobacillus salivarius, Lactobacillus plantarum ,Lactobacillus acidophilus, Lactobacillus rhamnosus ,Bifidobacteriumanimalis subsp. Lactis, Bifidobacteriumbreve	NS	In vitro studies have indicated that probiotic use can lead to decreased intensities of pro-inflammatory cytokines, oxidative stress, as well as hypothetically address pathogenic bacterial overgrowth. On the other hand, to establish the efficiency of bacteriotherapy in PD, supporting evidence from longitudinal in vivo studies is required
[33]	Randomized double blind clinical trial	Experimental group=69.0 Control group=70.5	Experimental group=22 patients Control group=26 Patients.	Fermented milk	capsule 3 × 1010 CFU Lactobacillus sp. Bifidob acterium sp. fructo-oligosaccharides lactose	Two times per day for eight weeks	PD cases with probiotics showed improvements in bowel opening incidence as well as entire gut transit period.
[34]	Randomized double blind clinical trials	Experimental group=70.9 Control group=68.6	Experimental group=34 patients Control group= 38 patients.	Placebo capsules	Capsule 109 CFU Lactobacillus Acidophilus Lactobacillus reuteri Lactobacillus gasseri Lactobacillus rhamnosus Bifidobacterium bifidum Bifidobacteriumlongum Enterococcus faecalis Enterococcus faecium	One time every day for four weeks	PD patients who received probiotics experienced relief from constipation.
[35]	Randomized clinical trial	Experimental group=68.39 placebo group=66.65	Experimental group= 23cases Placebo group= 23 cases	Nobody	Capsule 5 × 109 CFU Bacillus licheniformis 1 × 107 CFU Lactobacillus acidophilus, Bifidobacteriumlongum, Enterococcus faecalis	3 times each day for four weeks.	Significant improvements were observed in bowel movements, as well as in the PAC-QOL as well as PAC-SYM scores, among participants in the probiotic group
[36]	open-label, single-arm, baseline-	Probiotic group=61.84	Probiotic group=34 cases	Levodopa	PS128 supplementation	Twelve weeks	After twelve weeks of PS128 supplementation in

	controlled trial.	placebo group= 61.84	placebo group= 38 cases.				combination with regular anti- parkinsonian management, there were notable improvements in both the UPDRS motor score and the QOL among cases with PD.
[37]	Randomized double blind clinical trial	Experimental group=66.46 Control group=68.76	Experimental group=48 patients Control group= 34 patients	Maltodextrin	Capsule 3 × 1010 CFU Bifidobacteriumanimalis subsp. lactis	One time every day for twelve weeks	The consumption of probiotics resulted in development in sleep quality, alleviation of anxiety signs, and relief from gastrointestinal distress.
[38]	Randomized double blind clinical trial	NS	Experimental group=63 cases placebo group= 59 cases	Placebo capsule	Fermented milk Encompassing 109 CFU Lactobacillus casei strain	One time for every day for twelve week	The administration of probiotics could potentially be beneficial in dealing non-motor indications of PD.
[39]	Randomized double blind clinical trial	Experimental group=68.2 Placebo group=69.1	Experimental group= 40 cases Placebo group= 40 cases	Maltodextrin	Powder in sachets 5 × 109 CFU Lactobacillus acidophilus Lactobacillus rhamnosus Lactobacillus plantarum Bifidobacteriumlongum Streptococcus thermophil us	One time for each day for twelve weeks	In contrast to the control group, the group getting probiotics demonstrated lower levels of MDA (malondialdehyde), decreased OSI (oxidative stress index) beliefs, reduced depression levels, improved well-being, as well as superior cognitive capacities.

Reactions of probiotics on PD level grade:

In four studies [27, 28, 31, 33], UPDRS Part III motor scores were included as an outcome measure. Significant improvements were observed in the probiotic groups, with a mean modification of -1.00 [95% CI -4.07 to 2.07] and a p-value of 0.33 at the baseline of the studies. After 8 weeks, two studies [31, 33] presented a mean difference of -2.07 [95% CI -3.99 to -0.14]. Overall, the mean difference in UPDRS score across all studies was -1.75 [95% CI -3.34 to -0.16]. Please refer to Figure 1 for graphical representation. The quality of evidence for UPDRS Part III was rated as high using the GRADE method (Table-2)

Two studies [33, 38] included in the analysis stated Non-Motor Symptoms Questionnaire (NMSQ) scores. The investigation demonstrated a significant decrease in NMSQ scores among the probiotic groups, with a mean alteration of -4.94 [95% CI -6.95 to -2.92]. The overall effect size also indicated a statistically significant reduction (p = 0.0007). The quality of indication at NMSQ was rated as high using the GRADE system (Table-2)

QOL outcomes were assessed in five studies, comprising six comparisons. Significant improvements were observed in the probiotic groups, with a mean differentiation of -45.95 [95% CI -52.05 to -39.86]. Among the studies that conducted an eight-week follow-up, only one study [33] reported significant developments in the probiotic groups, with a mean variance of 0.06 [95% CI -14.02 to 14.14]. Additionally, four studies [35-38] pursue following 12 weeks displayed considerable expansions in the probiotic groups, with a mean alteration of -22.78 [95% CI -28.06 to -17.50]. Please refer to the corresponding figure for graphical representation. The feature of indication for QOL outcomes was assessed as adequate using the GRADE system, primarily due to some inconsistency among the included studies (Table-2)

Bowel movement (BM) outcomes were reported in four studies [27, 28, 33, 35], comprising six comparisons. Significant improvements were observed in the placebo groups, with a mean variance of 0.40 [95% CI -0.51 to 1.31]. Among the studies that conducted an eight-week follow-up, two studies [27, 33] reported significant improvements in the placebo groups, with a mean difference of 1.19 [95% CI 0.76 to 1.63]. The quality of evidence for bowel movement (BM) outcomes was originate to be significant.

Depression scale outcomes were assessed in two studies [37, 38], encompassing three comparisons. The probiotic groups exhibited significant improvements, within a mean difference of -4.57 [95% CI -8.40 to -0.74]. In the subset of studies that conducted an eight-week follow-up, two studies reported significant developments in the probiotic groups, with a mean variation of 1.19 [95% CI -2.16 to -0.94]. The value of indication for the depression scale outcomes was deemed significant with a p-value of 0.009.

Two studies, encompassing three comparisons, examined the impact of probiotics on the Bristol stool scale. The results indicated significant improvements in the placebo groups, with a mean alteration of 0.41 (95% CI 0.04 to 0.79). Only one study that included an eight-week follow-up reported significant improvements in the probiotic groups, within a mean variance of 0.80 (95% CI 0.18 to 1.42). Overall, the analysis demonstrated a statistically significant variance in the Bristol stool scale outcomes, with a p-value of 0.002.

	P	robiotic			Placebo			Mean difference	Mean difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
1.1.1 UPDRS (base line)									
Barichella M, et al. (2016)	27.1	14.5	80	28.2	14	40	8.7%	-1.10 [-6.48 , 4.28]	
Ibrahim A, et al. (2020)	16	8.25	22	18	6.37	26	14.1%	-2.00 [-6.23 , 2.23]	
Michela B, et al. (2015)	27.1	14.5	80	28.1	14.2	40	8.6%	-1.00 [-6.43 , 4.43]	
Tamtaji OR et al. (2019)	76.2	37.2	30	60	37.5	30	0.7%	16.20 [-2.70 , 35.10]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			212			136	32.1%	-1.00 [-4.07 , 2.07]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.22	; Chi² = 3.39	9, df = 3 (P = 0.33);	l² = 12%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 0	0.64 (P = 0.5	52)							
1.1.2 8 weeks									
Ibrahim A, et al. (2020)	15	2.5	22	17	4.25	26	67.1%	-2.00 [-3.94 , -0.06]	-
Tamtaji OR et al. (2019)	63.8	35.4	30	71.5	35.3	30	0.8%	-7.70 [-25.59 , 10.19]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			52			56	67.9%	-2.07 [-3.99 , -0.14]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00	; Chi ² = 0.39	9, df = 1 (P = 0.53);	l² = 0%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 2	2.10 (P = 0.0	04)							
Total (95% CI)			264			192	100.0%	-1.75 [-3.34 , -0.16]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00	; Chi ² = 4.10), df = 5 (P = 0.54);	² = 0%					•
Test for overall effect: Z = 2	2.16 (P = 0.0)3)	,						-20 -10 0 10 20
Test for subgroup differenc	es: Chi ² = 0	.33, df =	1 (P = 0.5	6), l ² = 0%	6				Probiotics Placebo
9P				<i>,.</i>					

Figure 1:	The reaction	of probiotics (on UPDRS i	n PD.
rigure 1.	The reaction	or problotics of	UI UI DKS I	$\Pi I D.$

Study or Subgroup	Pi Mean	robiotics SD	Total	F	Placebo SD	Total	Weight	Mean difference	Mean difference
	mean	00	iotai	Mean	00	Iotai	meight		
1.4.1 4 weeks									
Ibrahim A, et al. (2020)	68	11.25	22	71	13.55	26	25.3%	-3.00 [-10.02 , 4.02]	
Yang XD et al. (2022)	-6.33	5.93	63	-1.22	5.93	59	48.7%	-5.11 [-7.22 , -3.00]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			85			85	74.0%	-4.94 [-6.95 , -2.92]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0	00; Chi ² = 0).32, df =	1 (P = 0.5	57); I² = 0%					•
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 4.80 (P <	0.00001)							
1.4.2 8 weeks									
Ibrahim A, et al. (2020)	50	9.62	22	63	14.37	26	26.0%	-13.00 [-19.83 , -6.17]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			22			26	26.0%	-13.00 [-19.83 , -6.17]	•
Heterogeneity: Not applic	cable								•
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 3.73 (P =	0.0002)							
Total (95% CI)			107			111	100.0%	-6.63 [-11.48 , -1.77]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 11.	.45; Chi ² =	5.24, df =	2 (P = 0	.07); I ² = 62	2%				•
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 2.68 (P =	0.007)							-50 -25 0 25 50
Test for subgroup differer	nces: Chi ² :	= 4.92, df	= 1 (P =	0.03), I² = 7	79.7%				Probiotic Placebo

Figure 2: The properties of probiotics on Non motor sign in PD.

	P	robiotic			Placebo			Mean difference	Mean difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
1.3.1 4 weeks									
Sun et al. (2022)	72	16.52	48	125	19.2	34	23.2%	-53.00 [-60.97 , -45.03]	—
Tan AH et al. (2021)	76	19.5	34	112	21.5	38	16.4%	-36.00 [-45.47 , -26.53]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			82			72	39.7%	-45.95 [-52.05 , -39.86]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 7.2	25, df = 1 (F	P = 0.007); I² = 86%	b					•
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 14.77 (P <	< 0.00001)						
1.3.2 8 weeks									
Ibrahim A, et al. (2020)	73	25.2	22	72.94	24.3	26	7.4%	0.06 [-14.02 , 14.14]	_ _
Subtotal (95% CI)			22			26	7.4%	0.06 [-14.02 , 14.14]	◆
Heterogeneity: Not appli	cable								
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.01 (P =	0.99)							
1.3.3 12 weeks									
Du Y, et al. (2022)	10.65	16.53	23	11.57	12.82	23	20.2%	-0.92 [-9.47 , 7.63]	-
Sun et al. (2022)	75	23.5	48	120	26.1	34	12.2%	-45.00 [-56.01 , -33.99]	_ - _
Yang XD et al. (2022)	61.2	22.5	63	92.3	25.1	59	20.5%	-31.10 [-39.58 , -22.62]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			134			116	52.9%	-22.78 [-28.06 , -17.50]	◆
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 44	.47, df = 2 ((P < 0.00)	001); I² =	96%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 8.45 (P <	0.00001)							
Total (95% CI)			238			214	100.0%	-30.28 [-34.12 , -26.43]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 10	2.69, df = 5	(P < 0.0	0001); l² =	= 95%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 15.45 (P <	< 0.00001	I)						-50 -25 0 25 50
Test for subgroup differe	nces: Chi² =	= 50.98, o	if = 2 (P <	0.00001)	, I² = 96.1	%		Favours	s [experimental] Favours [cor

Figure 2.	The	monotion	~f	nuchiotics	~	OOT	:	DD	
rigure 5.	THE	reaction	UI	problotics	on	QUL	111	ID.	,

	Pro	obiotics		F	lacebo			Mean difference	Mean difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
2.1.1 Bowel movement									
Barichella M, et al. (2016)	4.4	1.7	80	4.6	1.8	40	16.1%	-0.20 [-0.87 , 0.47]	
Du Y, et al. (2022)	1.9	1.24	23	0.04	0.64	23	16.8%	1.86 [1.29 , 2.43]	
Ibrahim A, et al. (2020)	2.07	0.73	22	1.96	0.33	26	18.2%	0.11 [-0.22 , 0.44]	+
Michela B, et al. (2015)	4.4	1.7	80	4.6	1.8	40	16.1%	-0.20 [-0.87 , 0.47]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			205			129	67.3%	0.40 [-0.51 , 1.31]	-
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.77;	Chi ² = 34.1	12, df = 3	(P < 0.00	0001); l² = 9	91%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0	.86 (P = 0.3	39)							
2.1.2 8 weeks									
Ibrahim A, et al. (2020)	4.18	1.44	22	2.81	1.06	26	15.7%	1.37 [0.64 , 2.10]	
Michela B, et al. (2015)	3.4	1.2	80	2.3	1.5	40	17.1%	1.10 [0.57 , 1.63]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			102			66	32.7%	1.19 [0.76 , 1.63]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00;	Chi ² = 0.34	l. df = 1 (P = 0.56)	1 ² = 0%				• • •	•
Test for overall effect: Z = 5	.44 (P < 0.0	00001)	,						
Total (95% CI)			307			195	100.0%	0.67 [-0.01 , 1.35]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.63;	Chi ² = 45.6	65. df = 5	(P < 0.00	001); ² = 8	39%			• • •	•
Test for overall effect: Z = 1	.93 (P = 0.0)5)							
Test for subgroup difference	s: Chi ² = 2	.41. df = 1	1 (P = 0.1	2), I ² = 58.	6%			Favours	[experimental] Favours [control

Figure 4: The product of probiotics on Bowel movement (BM) in PD.

Study or Subgroup	P Mean	robiotic SD	Total	F Mean	Placebo SD	Total	Weight	Mean difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Mean difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
1.5.1 4 weeks									
Sun et al. (2022)	18.23	8.13	48	22.8	9.1	34	14.8%	-4.57 [-8.40 , -0.74]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			48			34	14.8%	-4.57 [-8.40 , -0.74]	
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable								-
Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.34 (P =	= 0.02)							
1.5.2 12 Weeks									
Sun et al. (2022)	18.2	9.3	48	21.2	8.9	34	13.8%	-3.00 [-6.98 , 0.98]	
Yang XD et al. (2022)	-1.44	2.14	63	0.08	1.25	59	71.4%	-1.52 [-2.14 , -0.90]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			111			93	85.2%	-1.55 [-2.16 , -0.94]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.00; Chi ² =	0.52, df =	= 1 (P = 0	.47); I ² = 0	%				•
Test for overall effect: Z	= 5.00 (P	< 0.00001)						
Total (95% CI)			159			127	100.0%	-2.17 [-3.80 , -0.55]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.87; Chi ² =	2.84, df =	= 2 (P = 0	.24); I ² = 3	0%				•
Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.62 (P =	= 0.009)							-10 -5 0 5 10
Test for subgroup different	ences: Chi ²	= 2.33, 0	lf = 1 (P =	: 0.13), I ² =	57.0%			Favours	s [experimental] Favours [contro

Figure 5: The outcomes of probiotics on Depression scale in PD.

	Pr	obiotics		F	lacebo			Mean difference	Mean difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
1.2.1 BSS									
Barichella M, et al. (2016)	2.5	1.3	80	2.6	1.4	40	38.8%	-0.10 [-0.62 , 0.42]	-
Sun et al. (2022)	5	1.2	48	4	1.3	34	34.1%	1.00 [0.45 , 1.55]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			128			74	72.9%	0.41 [0.04 , 0.79]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8.08,	df = 1 (P =	0.004); 14	² = 88%						ŀ
Test for overall effect: Z = 2	.15 (P = 0.0	03)							
1.2.2 4 weeks									
Sun et al. (2022)	5	1.1	48	4.2	1.6	34	27.1%	0.80 [0.18 , 1.42]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			48			34	27.1%	0.80 [0.18 , 1.42]	•
Heterogeneity: Not applicat	ole								
Test for overall effect: Z = 2	.52 (P = 0.0	01)							
Total (95% CI)			176			108	100.0%	0.52 [0.20 , 0.84]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.15,	df = 2 (P =	0.01); l ²	= 78%						
Test for overall effect: Z = 3	.15 (P = 0.0	002)							-4 -2 0 2 4
Test for subgroup difference	es: Chi ² = 1	.08, df = '	1 (P = 0.3	0), I ² = 7.1	%				Probiotics Placebo



Discussion

This investigation carried out a thorough in-depth analysis of randomized controlled test that examined impacts of probiotics on cases with PD. The results provide strong evidence supporting the significant development of motor and non-motor PD indications, QOL, bowel movement, UPDRS scores, Bristol stool score as well as depression, through the use of probiotics. Furthermore, the study indicates a moderate level of evidence suggesting that probiotics have a positive impact on gastrointestinal motility and anxiety reduction. Therefore, probiotics demonstrate promising potential as a treatment option for various aspects of PD.

Probiotics have the probable to modulate composition of the microbiota in PD, thereby refining gastrointestinal (GI) function as well as decreasing neuro-inflammation, bacterial translocation, as well as intestinal permeability. Levodopa absorption can be improved by improving GI function with the help of probiotic supplements, which also improve intestinal defence as well as functionality. This improvement in levodopa absorption may help to lessen the cognitive as well as behavioral disorders that are frequently seen in PD, like memory issues, depression, as well as anxiety [40]. Current investigate has stated that probiotic supplementation in PD patients has many advantages, especially when used for managing constipation as well as related symptoms [34].

Constipations

According to, Barichella et al. revealed that fermented milk encompassing probiotic strains showed improvements in constipation between cases with PD [28]. Furthermore, another study found that the management of a multistrain probiotic (Hexbio®) for 8 weeks resulted in improved whole gut transit period as well as improved incidence of bowel actions in PD cases with constivenes [41]. Additionally, research conducted by [32] revealed that probiotic strains increased the stages of anti-inflammatory cytokines while reducing inflammation and oxidative stress in PD [32]. Furthermore, additional studies indicated that dealing with probiotics (specifically Bifidobacteriuminfantisas well as Lactobacillus acidophilus) may alleviate abdominal discomfort as well as bloating to a similar extent as trimebutine, while showing somewhat less improvement in constipation symptoms [29].

Cognitive complications:

As mentioned by, Mehrabani et al. in 2023 [39], it was demonstrated that compared to the control group, the group getting probiotics manifest decrease intensity of MDA (malondialdehyde), lower OSI (oxidative stress index) standards, reduced depression intensity, in addition to improved comfort as well as cognitive facilities. The probiotic strains used in the study included Bifidobacteriumlongum, Lactobacillus acidophilus, Streptococcus

thermophiles, Lactobacillus plantarum as well as Lactobacillus rhamnosus, administered once daily in sachets with a dosage of 5×109 CFU (colony-forming units) for a duration of 4 weeks.

Bowel complications

In a study done by Du et al. in 2022 [35], significant improvements were observed in bowel movements as well as in the PAC-QOL (Patient Assessment of Constipation Quality of Life) and PAC-SYM (Patient Assessment of Constipation-Symptoms) scores among participants in the probiotic group. The study employed capsules containing a combination of Bacillus licheniformis (5×109 CFU), Lactobacillus acidophilus (1×107 CFU), Bifidobacteriumlongum, and Enterococcus faecalis, which were administered three intervals daily for a duration of 4 weeks in the dealing of PD.

Movement illnesses

Supplementation with antioxidant as well as anti-inflammatory substances has opened up new perspectives for the treatment of neurological diseases, including the use of probiotic bacteria. A earlier researches demonstrated that probiotic supplementation comprising Lactobacillus fermentum, Lactobacillus reuteri, Bifidobacteriumlactis, Lactobacillus casei, Bifidobacteriuminfantis as well as Lactobacillus plantarum resulted in reduced stages of inflammatory markers (hs-CRP as well as IL-6) in addition to enlarged levels of the anti-inflammatory marker (IL-10) in cases with multiple sclerosis. Furthermore, the intake of probiotics was related with condensed amount of MDA (malondialdehyde), 8-OHdG, as well as insulin confrontation [31]. Tamtaji et al. [31] demonstrated that a 12-week probiotic intervention among cases with PD had expensive effects on the MDS-UPDRS as well as certain metabolic profiles.

Neuron abnormal functioning

Research has demonstrated that the efficacy of probiotic formulations in various aspects of PD. The probiotic constructionSLAB51 has been revealed enhance Tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) immune reactivity as well as rescue dopaminergic neurons in individually the striatum as well as substantianigra [42]. Furthermore, this probiotic preparation inverted the lessening in dopaminergic transporter intensities along with increased PSD95 expression in trial PD models [42]. In a different study, Alipour Nosrani et al. [43] discovered that a probiotic blend comprising the bacteria Lactobacillus acidophilus, Lactobacillus reuteri, Bifidobacteriumbifidum, as well as Lactobacillus fermentum condensed neuronal degeneration in the substantianigra in an animal model of PD conduct on by 6-OHDA[43]. In PD mice treated with probiotics, TH-positive cells were preserved in the substantianigra [32]. Moreover, A PD animal model has shown that injection of Streptococcus thermophilus CRL 808, Lactobacillus plantarum CRL 2130, along with Streptococcus thermophilus CRL 807 increases the total number of TH-positive cells in the brain [44]. As study done by Srivastav et al. [45] demonstrated the neuro protective efficacy of probiotics in preventing the degeneration of dopaminergic neurons. The positive impact observed with probiotics is associated with up regulation of neurotrophic factors as well as the inhibition of MAO-B. This outcomes show that the probiotics have talent for diverse clinical implementation in managing PD, mainly in mitigatin neurodegenerative results on the dopaminergic neurons. However, it should be noted that the probiotic strain Clostridium butyricum has been shown to exacerbate synaptic deteriorated as well as the harm of dopaminergic neurons in a PD model persuaded by MPTP [46]. On the other hand, in a lipopolysaccharideinduced Parkinson's disease murine model, VSL#3 supplementation was ineffective in deflecting the reduction in the number of dopamine neurons in the substantianigra [47]. In Parkinson disease mice, a significant decrease in postsynaptic density protein-95 (PSD-95) as well as synaptophysin mRNA expression levels was observed in the hippocampus, accompanied by an increase in neuropsin mRNA as well as protein appearance levels. Additionally, there was a decline in CA1 apical spine concentration in PD mice. Nevertheless, administration of B. breve A1 to PD mice rehabilitee CA1 spine thickness to regulates intensities, reversing all these consequence. This outcome suggests that the irregular modifications in hippocampal synaptic plasticity, associated with higher induction of neuropsin, can be hindered by B. breve A1 administration. Treatment with B. breve A1 enabled suppression of fear in PD mice along with corrected the impaired hippocampus synaptic plasticity[48]. According to, Xie and Prasad, the effects of Lacticaseibacillusrhamnosus HA-114 probiotics were determined to be insignificant. And it's shows anxiety-like activities but rather worsened cognitive shortages in an animal model of 6-OHDA-induced PD [47]. On the other hand, it has been demonstrated that oral management of B. breve

A1 reinstate appropriate fear destruction in a murine model of PD [48]. Probiotic enhancement, which includes Bifidobacteriumbifidum, Lactobacillus acidophilus, Lactobacillus fermentumas well as Lactobacillus reuteri, has been suggested to develop certain indications in cases with PD [31]. Hence, we planned to evaluate effectiveness of probiotics with the conventional methods for managing PD. This study conducted a numerical calculation of randomized controlled test to assess the outcomes of probiotics in PD management. The majority of the researches comprised in this meta-analysis demonstrated efficiency of probiotics in managing PD.

Limitations

- 1. The meta-analysis involved employing assessable arithmetical procedures to assess the extensive consequence of the probiotics in individuals by PD in order to provide a comprehensive analysis.
- 2. The present meta-analysis exclusively focused on studies conducted on human subjects, ensuring that the analysis is specific to the results of probiotics in PD cases.

Conclusion

Based on the outcomes of present meta-analysis provide strong and reliable evidence supporting the positive influence of probiotics on non-motor signs, motor function, bowel movement as well as the alleviation of depression in individuals diagnosed with PD. Incorporating probiotic supplementation into the management of PD could probably serve as a cost-effective and safe balancing treatment.

References

- 1. GBD 2016 Parkinson's Disease Collaborators. Global, regional, and national burden of Parkinson's disease, 1990-2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. Lancet Neurol. 2018;17(11):939-953.
- 2. Sung VW, Nicholas AP. Nonmotor symptoms in Parkinson's disease: expanding the view of Parkinson's disease beyond a pure motor, pure dopaminergic problem. Neurologic clinics. 2013;31(3 Suppl):S1–16.
- 3. Radhakrishnan DM, Goyal V. Parkinson's disease: A review. Neurol India 2018;66,suppl S2:26-35.
- Twelves D, Perkins KS, Counsell C. Systematic review of incidence studies of Parkinson's disease. MovDisord. 2003;18(1):19–31.
- 5. Marras C, Beck JC, Bower JH, et al. Prevalence of Parkinson's disease across North America. NPJ Parkinsons Dis. 2018;4:21.
- 6. Pinter B, Diem-Zangerl A, Wenning GK, et al. Mortality in Parkinson's disease: a 38-year follow-up study. MovDisord. 2015;30(2):266–9.
- 7. Dorsey ER, Sherer T, Okun MS, Bloem BR. The Emerging Evidence of the Parkinson Pandemic. Journal of Parkinson's disease. 2018;8(s1):S3–S8.
- 8. Kaltenboeck A, Johnson SJ, Davis MR, et al. Direct costs and survival of medicare beneficiaries with early and advanced Parkinson's disease. Parkinsonism & related disorders. 2012;18(4):321–6.
- 9. Miller RL, James-Kracke M, Sun GY, Sun AY. Oxidative and inflammatory pathways in Parkinson's disease. Neurochem Res. 2009; 34:55–65.
- 10. Hassanzadeh K, Rahimmi A. Oxidative stress and neuroinflammation in the story of Parkinson's disease: could targeting these pathways write a good ending? J Cell Physiol. 2018; 234:23–32.
- 11. Rojas D, Della Pelle F, Del Carlo M, d'Angelo M, Dominguez-Benot R, Cimini A, Escarpa A, Compagnone D. Electrodeposited Prussian Blue on carbon black modified disposable electrodes for direct enzyme-free H2O2 sensing in a Parkinson's disease in vitro model. Sens Actuators B Chem. 2018; 275:402–08.
- 12. Klingelhoefer L, Reichmann H. Pathogenesis of Parkinson disease—the gut-brain axis and environmental factors. Nat Rev Neurol. 2015; 11:625–36.
- 13. Lionnet A, Leclair-Visonneau L, Neunlist M, Murayama S, Takao M, Adler CH, Derkinderen P, Beach TG. Does Parkinson's disease start in the gut? ActaNeuropathol. 2018; 135:1–12.
- 14. Perez-Pardo P, Hartog M, Garssen J, Kraneveld AD. Microbes Tickling Your Tummy: the Importance of the Gut-Brain Axis in Parkinson's Disease. CurrBehavNeurosci Rep. 2017; 4:361–68.
- Cersosimo MG, Raina GB, Pecci C, Pellene A, Calandra CR, Gutiérrez C, Micheli FE, Benarroch EE. Gastrointestinal manifestations in Parkinson's disease: prevalence and occurrence before motor symptoms. J Neurol. 2013; 260:1332–38.
- Massano J, Bhatia KP. Clinical approach to Parkinson's disease: features, diagnosis, and principles of management. Cold Spring HarbPerspect Med. 2012; 2:a008870.
- Lee HM, Koh SB. Many Faces of Parkinson's Disease: Non-Motor Symptoms of Parkinson's Disease. J MovDisord. 2015; 8:92–97.

- 18. Houser MC, Tansey MG. The gut-brain axis: is intestinal inflammation a silent driver of Parkinson's disease pathogenesis? NPJ Parkinsons Dis. 2017; 3:3.
- 19. Gerhardt S, Mohajeri MH. Changes of Colonic Bacterial Composition in Parkinson's Disease and Other Neurodegenerative Diseases. Nutrients. 2018; 10:10.
- 20. Wu HJ, Wu E. The role of gut microbiota in immune homeostasis and autoimmunity. Gut Microbes. 2012; 3:4-14.
- 21. Kalia LV, Lang AE. Parkinson's disease. Lancet. 2015; 386:896-912.
- Lee JY, Tuazon JP, Ehrhart J, Sanberg PR, Borlongan CV. Gutting the brain of inflammation: A key role of gut microbiome in human umbilical cord blood plasma therapy in Parkinson's disease model. J Cell Mol Med. 2019; 23:5466–74.
- 23. Nicola S, Amoruso A, Deidda F, Pane M, Allesina S, Mogna L, Del Piano M, Mogna G. Searching for the Perfect Homeostasis: Five Strains of Bifidobacteriumlongum From Centenarians Have a Similar Behavior in the Production of Cytokines. J ClinGastroenterol. 2016 (Suppl 2, Proceedings from the 8th Probiotics, Prebiotics and New Foods for Microbiota and Human Health meeting held in Rome, Italy on September 13- 15, 2015); 50:S126–30.
- Nowak A, Paliwoda A, Błasiak J. Anti-proliferative, proapoptotic and anti-oxidative activity of Lactobacillus and Bifidobacterium strains: A review of mechanisms and therapeutic perspectives. Crit Rev Food SciNutr. 2019; 59:3456–67.
- 25. Distrutti E et al. Modulation of intestinal microbiota by the probiotic VSL#3 resets brain gene expression and ameliorates the age-related defcit in LTP. PLoS ONE.2014; 9(9):e106503.
- 26. Mirzaei H, et al. Probiotics and the Treatment of Parkinson's Disease: An Update. Cell MolNeurobiol. 2022;42(8):2449-2457.
- Michela B, Pacchetti C, Bolliri C, Cassani E, Iorio L, Pusani C, et al. Double blind, placebo-controlled trial of a fermented milk containing multiple probiotics strains and prebiotic fber for constipation associated with parkinson's disease. JNeurol Sci. 2015; 357: e260.
- Barichella M, Pacchetti C, Bolliri C, Cassani E, Iorio L, Pusani C, et al. Probiotics and prebiotic fber for constipation associated with Parkinson disease: an RCT. Neurology. 2016;87(12):1274–80.
- 29. Georgescu D, Ancusa OE, Georgescu LA, Ionita I, Reisz D. Nonmotor gastrointestinal disorders in older patients with Parkinson's disease: is there hope? ClinInterv Aging. 2016;11:1601–8
- Borzabadi S, Oryan S, Eidi A, Aghadavod E, DaneshvarKakhaki R, Tamtaji OR, et al. The efects of probiotic supplementation on gene expression related to infammation, insulin and lipid in patients with Parkinson's disease: a randomized, double-blind, PlaceboControlled Trial. Arch Iran Med. 2018;21(7):289–95.
- Tamtaji OR, Taghizadeh M, DaneshvarKakhaki R, Kouchaki E, Bahmani F, Borzabadi S, et al. Clinical and metabolic response to probiotic administration in people with Parkinson's disease: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. ClinNutr. 2019;38(3):1031–5.
- Magistrelli, L.; Amoruso, A.; Mogna, L.; Graziano, T.; Cantello, R.; Pane, M.; Comi, C. Probiotics May Have Beneficial Effects in Parkinson's Disease: In vitro Evidence. Front. Immunol. 2019, 10.
- 33. Ibrahim A, Ali RAR, Manaf MRA, Ahmad N, Tajurruddin FW, Qin WZ, et al. Multi-strain probiotics (Hexbio) containing MCP BCMC strains improved constipation and gut motility in Parkinson's disease: a randomised controlled trial. PLoS ONE. 2020;15(12): e0244680.
- 34. Tan AH, Lim SY, Chong KK, Manap MA, Hor JW, Lim JL, et al. Probiotics for constipation in Parkinson disease: a randomized placebo-controlled study. Neurology. 2021;96(5):e772–82.
- 35. Du Y, Li Y, Xu X, Li R, Zhang M, Cui Y, et al. Probiotics for constipation and gut microbiota in Parkinson's disease. Parkinsonism RelatDisord. 2022;103:92–7
- Lu CS, Chang HC, Weng YH, Chen CC, Kuo YS, Tsai YC. The Add-On Effect of Lactobacillus plantarum PS128 in Patients with Parkinson's disease: A Pilot Study. Front Nutr. 2021; 8:650053.
- 37. Sun H, Zhao F, Liu Y, Ma T, Jin H, Quan K, et al. Probiotics synergized with conventional regimen in managing Parkinson's disease. NPJ Parkinsons Dis. 2022;8(1):62.
- Yang XD, He XQ, Xu SQ, Qian VV, Zhang Y, Song YY, et al. Efect of Lactobacillus casei supplementation on clinical response, gut microbiota and faecal metabolites in patients with Parkinson's disease a randomized, doubleblind, placebo-controlled trial. MovDisord. 2020;35(1):S433.
- Mehrabani S, Khorvash F, Heidari Z, Tajabadi-Ebrahimi M, Amani R. The efects of synbiotic supplementation on oxidative stress markers, mental status, and quality of life in patients with Parkinson's disease: a doubleblind, placebo-controlled, randomized controlled trial. J Funct Foods. 2023;100: 105397
- 40. Fahn S Adverse effects of levodopa. OlanowCWLieberman ANeds The Scientific Basis for the Treatment of Parkinson's Disease. Carnforth, England Parthenon Publishing Group1992;89-112.
- 41. Rinne UK Lisuride, a dopamine agonist in the treatment of early Parkinson's disease. Neurology. 1989;39336-339.

- Castelli V, d'Angelo M, Lombardi F, Alfonsetti M, Antonosante A, Catanesi M, Benedetti E, Palumbo P, Cifone MG, Giordano A (2020) Effects of the probiotic formulation SLAB51 in in vitro and in vivo Parkinson's disease models. Aging (Albany, NY)2020; 12(5):4641.
- 43. AlipourNosrani E, Tamtaji OR, Alibolandi Z, Sarkar P, Ghazanfari M, AzamiTameh A, Taghizadeh M, Banikazemi Z, Hadavi R, NaderiTaheri M (2020) Neuroprotective effects of probiotics bacteria on animal model of Parkinson's disease induced by 6-hydroxydopamine: A behavioral, biochemical, and histological study. J Immunoassay Immunochem.2020; 42:106–120.
- 44. Visñuk DP, de Giori GS, LeBlanc JG, de LeBlanc AM Neuroprotective effects associated with immune modulation by selected lactic acid bacteria in a Parkinson's disease model. Nutrition.2020;79:110995.
- 45. Srivastav S, Neupane S, Bhurtel S, Katila N, Maharjan S, Choi H, Hong JT, Choi DY. Probiotics mixture increases butyrate, and subsequently rescues the nigral dopaminergic neurons from MPTP and rotenone-induced neurotoxicity. J NutrBiochem. 2019;69:73-86.
- 46. Rinne UK Early dopamine agonist therapy in Parkinson's disease. MovDisord. 1989;4 (suppl 1) S86-S94.
- 47. Xie C, Prasad AA Probiotics treatment improves hippocampal dependent cognition in a rodent model of Parkinson's disease. Microorganisms. 2020; 8(11):1661.
- 48. Ishii T, Furuoka H, Kaya M, Kuhara T (2021) Oral Administration of probiotic bifidobacteriumbreve improves facilitation of hippocampal memory extinction via restoration of aberrant higher induction of neuropsin in an MPTPinduced mouse model of Parkinson's disease. Biomedicines.2021; 9(2):167.