Supplementary data

Methods

Outcome measures- At baseline, mid-point and end of each intervention arm, venous blood was collected in the morning from all participants following a standardised evening meal (commercially prepared frozen meal adjusted by the dietitian as per the patients' energy and protein requirements) and subsequent overnight fast. Samples were stored at -80°C and then analysed in a single batch. Serum total and free concentrations of both uremic toxins, PCS and IS, were analysed by ultraperformance liquid chromatography (UPLC) using a fluorescence detection method (Waters Corporation, Milford, MA, USA).¹ The free fraction of each toxin was defined as a percentage of total concentration (free serum concentration divided by the total concentration multiplied by 100). Samples were run in duplicates and the coefficient of variation (CV) for the assays ranged from 1.8 to 2.9%.

Serum creatinine, urea, albumin and phosphate were measured using automated laboratory techniques. Renal function was estimated using eGFR calculated from the Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration (CKD-EPI) formula.² Kidney damage was measured using 24-hour urinary protein and albumin and mid-stream urinary kidney injury molecule-1 (Kim-1), as previously described.³ The inflammatory markers interleukin [IL]-1 β , IL-6, IL-10 and tumour necrosis factor- α (TNF α) were measured in serum samples before and after each intervention using electrochemiluminescence immunoassay techniques. The CV for the assays ranged from 0.8 to 12.4%, falling within the acceptable range (<20% CV). In addition, markers of lipid oxidation (total F₂ isoprostanes) and endogenous antioxidant activity (glutathione peroxidise [GPx]) were measured in plasma samples using validated

methods.^{4, 5} Quantification of lipopolysaccharides was undertaken using a Limulus Amebocyte assay (Cambrex, Verviers, Belgium), as described previously.⁶ Changes in patient-reported health and gastrointestinal symptoms were assessed by the validated Short Form-36 (SF-36)^{7, 8} and Gastrointestinal Symptom Rating Scale (GSRS)^{9, 10}.

Gut microbial analysis- Samples were thawed, homogenised and subsampled (~0.15 g), then mixed with 0.6 ml of lysis buffer¹¹ and 0.4 g of zirconium-silica beads (0.1 to 1.0 mm diameter). The samples were homogenized using a Precelly's-24 tissue homogenizer set for 3 cycles at 60 seconds at 5,000 rpm. The samples were centrifuged at 4°C for 5 minutes at 16,300 x g. The supernatant was transferred to a fresh tube, 30 µl proteinase K (20 mg/ml, Promega Life Sciences) added and incubated for 20 minutes at 56C; then the DNA was extracted from this mixture using the LEV-blood DNA kit and a Maxwell 16 MDr automated DNA extraction system (Promega Life Sciences). The resulting sample was treated with RNAse A and the purity and concentration of the DNA preparations were determined using Nanodrop-Lite quantification system (Thermo Scientific). A total of 75 samples passed QC/QA specifications for PCR amplification of the V6-V9 region of the gene encoding 16S rRNA, with dual index bar-coded library construction, and sequencing using the Illumina MiSeq platform, all provided by the Australian Centre for Ecogenomics (ecogenomic.org). The resulting datafiles were analysed using the QIIME software package (v.1.8.0) in support of taxonomic assignments and alpha diversity measures.

Figure S1: Longitudinal response of serum concentrations of indoxyl sulphate to synbiotics over time^a



^a between weeks 3 and 6 the synbiotic dose was doubled





Trend p=0.002 ^a between weeks 3 and 6 the synbiotic dose was doubled



Figure S3: Effect of the synbiotics on relative abundance of bacterial families

^a Families with an abundance of $\geq 1\%$

^b Unspecified members with the order

Figure S4: Effect of the synbiotics on key genus in all analysed patients (n=20) and in antibiotic-free patients (n=15)



Treatment effect (95% CI) derived from regression modelling accounting for period effect ^a Unspecified members with the family

* p<0.01

| Characteristic | All patients who completed the study (n=31) | Antibiotic use (n=10) | No antibiotic use (n=21) | P-value |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| $\Delta \alpha e (vears)$ | <u>(II-31)</u> 69+9 | 70 + 10 | 69 +9 | 0.65 |
| range | 50-82 | 54-82 | 50-82 | 0.05 |
| Male (%) | 19 (61) | 6(60) | 13 (62) | 0.92 |
| White Caucasian (%) | 29 (94) | 10 | 19 (90) | 0.31 |
| Cause of kidney disease (%) Glomerulonephritis Hypertension/vascular Diabetic nephropathy | 4 (13) 7 (23) 11(39) | 0 (0) 3 (30) 5 (50) | 4 (19) 4 (19) 7 (33) | 0.65 |
| BMI (kg/m2) | 28 ± 6 | 29±5 | 28±6 | 0.69 |
| Co-morbidities (treated) Hypertension Hyperlipidemia Number of antihypertensive medications Angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor Angiotensin receptor II blocker Diuretics | $31 (100)26 (84)2.3 \pm 1.17 (23)19 (61)8 (26)$ | $10(100)9 (90)2.5 \pm 1.12 (20)6(60)1 (10)$ | $21(100) 17(81) 2.2 \pm 1.1 5 (24) 13(63) 7 (33)$ | >0.99 0.52 0.55 0.81 0.92 0.17 |
| Smoking history (%) | 17 (55) | 6 (60) | 11(52) | 0.68 |
| EPI GFR (ml/min/1.73m2) | 25 ± 8 | 28 ±9 | 24 ±8 | 0.19 |
| Proteinuria (mg/24hr) Albuminuria (mg/24hr) | 296 (168-1100) 97(21-677) | 160(119-431) 21(7-74) | 838(263-1800) 361(97-1200) | 0.01 0.01 |
| Uremic toxins Total indoxyl sulphate Total p-cresyl sulphate Free indoxyl sulphate Free p-cresyl sulphate IS:PCS ratio | $20 \pm 11 \\ 108 \pm 52 \\ 0.8 \pm 0.4 \\ 3.3 \pm 2.5 \\ 0.24 \pm 0.18$ | $19 \pm 9 \\ 112 \pm 51 \\ 0.8 \pm 0.4 \\ 4.1 \pm 3.4 \\ 0.19 \pm 0.09$ | $21\pm13106\pm530.7\pm0.52.9\pm1.90.26\pm0.21$ | 0.66 0.76 0.87 0.21 0.37 |
| Percent free fraction | | | | |
| Indoxyl sulphate P-cresyl sulphate | 3.9 ± 1.3 2.8 ± 0.9 | 4.3 ±1.8 3.3 ±1.3 | 3.7 ± 1.0 2.6 ± 0.7 | 0.25 0.05 |

Table S1: Baseline characteristics of SYNERGY participants who completed the study by antibiotic use during either intervention (n=31)

BMI, Body mass index; EPI GFR, Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration Glomerular Filtration Rate

Data presented as mean ±SD, median (inter-quartile range), number (%)

^a Differences between antiobiotic use determined using t-test with normally distributed data and Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney with non-normal data

Table S2: Sensitivity and secondary analysis of treatment effect on uremic toxins (µmol/L)

| An completersImage: constraint of the transmission of tra | | All completers | | Antibiotic fues completent | | |
|---|--|--------------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|----------|--|
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | All completers (n=31) | | Antibiotic-free completers $(n=21)$ | | |
| Iteratment enect (95% CI)P-valueIteratment enect (95% CI)P- valuePRIMARY ANALYSIS Total IS | | | | (11-21) | | |
| PRIMARY ANALYSIS $-2 (-5 \text{ to } 1)$ 0.12 $-5 (-8 \text{ to} -1)$ 0.03 Total IS $-2 (-5 \text{ to } 1)$ 0.12 $-5 (-8 \text{ to} -1)$ 0.03 Total PCS $-14 (-27 \text{ to } -2)$ 0.03 $-25 (-38 \text{ to} -12)$ 0.001 SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS Baseline toxins $-2 (-5 \text{ to } 1)$ 0.22 $-4 (-7 \text{ to } 0)$ 0.04 Total PCS $-14 (-27 \text{ to } -1)$ 0.04 $-24 (-36 \text{ to } -11)$ 0.001 Δ Dietary fibre intake $-14 (-27 \text{ to } -1)$ 0.04 $-24 (-36 \text{ to } -11)$ 0.001 Δ Dietary fibre intake $-2 (-5 \text{ to } 1)$ 0.18 $-4 (-9 \text{ to } 0)$ 0.05 Total PCS $-15 (-28 \text{ to } -6)$ 0.02 $-25 (-39 \text{ to } -10)$ 0.01 Δ Dietary Protein intake ^b $-15 (-28 \text{ to } -6)$ 0.02 $-25 (-39 \text{ to } -10)$ 0.01 | | (95% CI) | P-value | (95% CI) | P- value | |
| Total IS Total PCS $-2 (-5 \text{ to } 1)$ 0.12 $-5 (-8 \text{ to} -1)$ 0.03 SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS Baseline toxins Total IS $-14 (-27 \text{ to} -2)$ 0.03 $-25 (-38 \text{ to} -12)$ 0.001 SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS Date of the toxins Total PCS $-2 (-5 \text{ to } 1)$ 0.22 $-4 (-7 \text{ to } 0)$ 0.04 Δ Dietary fibre intake Total IS $-2 (-5 \text{ to } 1)$ 0.04 $-24 (-36 \text{ to} -11)$ 0.001 Δ Dietary fibre intake Total PCS $-2 (-5 \text{ to } 1)$ 0.18 $-4 (-9 \text{ to } 0)$ 0.05 Δ Dietary Protein intake Δ $-15 (-28 \text{ to } -6)$ 0.02 $-25 (-39 \text{ to } -10)$ 0.01 | PRIMARY ANALYSIS | | | | | |
| Total PCS $-14(-27 \text{ to } -2)$ 0.03 $-25(-38 \text{ to } -12)$ 0.001 SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS Baseline toxins Total IS $-2(-5 \text{ to } 1)$ 0.22 $-4(-7 \text{ to } 0)$ 0.04 Total PCS $-14(-27 \text{ to } -1)$ 0.04 $-24(-36 \text{ to } -11)$ 0.001 Δ Dietary fibre intake Total IS $-2(-5 \text{ to } 1)$ 0.18 $-4(-9 \text{ to } 0)$ 0.05 Total PCS $-15(-28 \text{ to } -6)$ 0.02 $-25(-39 \text{ to } -10)$ 0.01 | Total IS | -2 (-5 to 1) | 0.12 | -5 (-8 to-1) | 0.03 | |
| SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS Baseline toxins Total IS $-2 (-5 \text{ to } 1)$ 0.22 $-4 (-7 \text{ to } 0)$ 0.04 Total PCS $-14 (-27 \text{ to } -1)$ 0.04 $-24 (-36 \text{ to } -11)$ 0.001 Δ Dietary fibre intake $-2 (-5 \text{ to } 1)$ 0.18 $-4 (-9 \text{ to } 0)$ 0.05 Total PCS $-15 (-28 \text{ to } -6)$ 0.02 $-25 (-39 \text{ to } -10)$ 0.01 | Total PCS | -14 (-27 to -2) | 0.03 | -25 (-38 to -12) | 0.001 | |
| Baseline toxins Total IS $-2 (-5 \text{ to } 1)$ 0.22 $-4 (-7 \text{ to } 0)$ 0.04 Total PCS $-14 (-27 \text{ to } -1)$ 0.04 $-24 (-36 \text{ to } -11)$ 0.001 Δ Dietary fibre intake Total IS $-2 (-5 \text{ to } 1)$ 0.18 $-4 (-9 \text{ to } 0)$ 0.05 Total PCS $-15 (-28 \text{ to } -6)$ 0.02 $-25 (-39 \text{ to } -10)$ 0.01 | SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS | | | | | |
| Total IS Total PCS $-2 (-5 \text{ to } 1)$ 0.22 $-14 (-27 \text{ to } -1)$ $-4 (-7 \text{ to } 0)$ 0.04 $-24 (-36 \text{ to } -11)$ Δ Dietary fibre intake Total IS $-2 (-5 \text{ to } 1)$ 0.04 $-24 (-36 \text{ to } -11)$ 0.001 Δ Dietary fibre intake Total PCS $-2 (-5 \text{ to } 1)$ 0.18 $-4 (-9 \text{ to } 0)$ 0.05 Δ Dietary Protein intakeb $-15 (-28 \text{ to } -6)$ 0.02 $-25 (-39 \text{ to } -10)$ 0.01 | Baseline toxins | | | | | |
| Total PCS $-14(-27 \text{ to} -1)$ 0.04 $-24(-36 \text{ to} -11)$ 0.001 Δ Dietary fibre intake Total IS $-2(-5 \text{ to} 1)$ 0.18 $-4(-9 \text{ to} 0)$ 0.05 Total PCS $-15(-28 \text{ to} -6)$ 0.02 $-25(-39 \text{ to} -10)$ 0.01 Δ Dietary Protein intake ^b $-2(-5(-1))$ 0.12 $-25(-29 \text{ to} -10)$ 0.01 | Total IS | -2 (-5 to 1) | 0.22 | -4 (-7 to 0) | 0.04 | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Total PCS | -14 (-27 to -1) | 0.04 | -24 (-36 to -11) | 0.001 | |
| Total IS $-2 (-5 \text{ to } 1)$ 0.18 $-4 (-9 \text{ to } 0)$ 0.05 Total PCS $-15 (-28 \text{ to } -6)$ 0.02 $-25 (-39 \text{ to } -10)$ 0.01 Δ Dietary Protein intake ^b $2 (-5 \text{ to } 1)$ 0.12 $-25 (-39 \text{ to } -10)$ 0.01 | Δ Dietary fibre intake | | | | | |
| Total PCS -15 (-28 to -6) 0.02 -25 (-39 to -10) 0.01 Δ Dietary Protein intake ^b 2 (((1 - 1)) 0.12 -25 (-39 to -10) 0.01 | Total IS | -2 (-5 to 1) | 0.18 | -4 (-9 to 0) | 0.05 | |
| Δ Dietary Protein intake ^b | Total PCS | -15 (-28 to -6) | 0.02 | -25 (-39 to -10) | 0.01 | |
| | Δ Dietary Protein intake ^b | | | | | |
| -2(-6 to 1) 0.12 $-5(9-9 to 0)$ 0.03 | Total IS | -2 (-6 to 1) | 0.12 | -5 (9-9 to 0) | 0.03 | |
| Total PCS -14 (-26 to -2) 0.03 -25 (-38 to -11) 0.001 | Total PCS | -14 (-26 to -2) | 0.03 | -25 (-38 to -11) | 0.001 | |
| Δ Kidney function (eGFR) ^c | Δ Kidney function (eGFR) ^c | | | | | |
| Total IS -2 (-5 to 1) 0.13 -5 (-9 to -1) 0.02 | Total IS | -2 (-5 to 1) | 0.13 | -5 (-9 to -1) | 0.02 | |
| Total PCS -14 (-26 to -1) 0.03 -25 (-39 to -11) 0.001 | Total PCS | -14 (-26 to -1) | 0.03 | -25 (-39 to -11) | 0.001 | |
| Analysis using paired t-test ^d | Analysis using paired t-test ^d | | | | | |
| Total IS -3 (-5 to 0) 0.10 -4 (-8 to -1) 0.03 | Total IS | -3 (-5 to 0) | 0.10 | -4 (-8 to -1) | 0.03 | |
| Total PCS -16 (-29 to -3) 0.01 -25 (-37 to -13) <0.001 | Total PCS | -16 (-29 to -3) | 0.01 | -25 (-37 to -13) | < 0.001 | |
| SECONDARY ANALYSIS (n=37) (n=23) | SECONDARY ANALYSIS | (n=37) | | (n=23) | | |
| Mixed model | Mixed model | | | | | |
| Total IS -1(-3 to 0) 0.09 -2 (-4 to 0) 0.02 | Total IS | -1(-3 to 0) | 0.09 | -2 (-4 to 0) | 0.02 | |
| Total PCS -9 (-14 to -3) 0.01 -13 (-18 to -7) <0.001 | Total PCS | -9 (-14 to -3) | 0.01 | -13 (-18 to -7) | < 0.001 | |

 ^a Treatment effect derived from regression modelling accounting for period effect
 ^b Same conclusion when adjusted for estimated protein intake based on 24-hr urinary urea nitrogen equation

^c Same conclusion when adjusted for serum change in serum creatinine ^d Treatment effect without adjusting for period effect

| Pt ID | Time in trial | Indication | AB | Duration (total days) | Daily dose |
|-------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|
| 11 | V2, V3 | Urinary Tract Infection | Trimethoprim | 6 | 900mg |
| 14 | V2 | Chest Infection | Amoxycillin + Clavulanic acid | 10 | 1750/250mg |
| 14 | V5 | Chest Infection | Amoxil | 7 | 1500mg |
| 14 | V6 | Not disclosed | Cephalexin | 7 | 1500mg |
| 20 | V2, V3, V4 | Chest Infection | Amoxycillin + Clavulanic acid | 16 | 1750/250mg |
| 22 | V6 | Infected wound | Cephalexin | 10 | 1000mg |
| 24 | V3 | Not disclosed | Trimethoprim | 14 | 300mg |
| 33 | V2, V3 | Infected wound | Cephlaexin | 20 | 500mg |
| 36 | V2 | Suspected infected wound | Staphlex | 7 | 1000mg |
| 36 | V5 | Suspected Cellulitis | Cephalexin | 5 | 1000mg |
| 38 | V5 | Not disclosed | Cephalexin | 5 | 1000mg |
| 39 | V6 | Lung consolidation | Amoxycillin + Clavulanic acid | 5 | 1750/500mg |
| 41 | V6 | Ear Infection | Cephalexin | 5 | 1000mg |

 Table S3: Summary of antibiotic use during intervention (n=10)

References

- Pretorius, CJ, McWhinney, BC, Sipinkoski, B, Johnson, LA, Rossi, M, Campbell, KL, Ungerer, JP: Reference ranges and biological variation of free and total serum indoxyl- and p-cresyl sulphate measured with a rapid UPLC fluorescence detection method. *Clin Chim Acta*, 419: 122-126, 2013.
- 2. KDIGO: KDIGO 2012 Clinial Practice Guidelines for the Evaluation and Management of Chronic Kidney Disease. *Kidney Int*, 3, 2013.
- Rossi, M, Johnson, DW, Morrison, M, Pascoe, E, Coombes, JS, Forbes, JM, McWhinney, BC, Ungerer, JP, Dimeski, G, Campbell, KL: SYNbiotics Easing Renal failure by improving Gut microbiologY (SYNERGY): a protocol of placebo-controlled randomised cross-over trial. *BMC Nephrol*, 15: 106, 2014.
- 4. Briskey, DR, Wilson, GR, Fassett, RG, Coombes, JS: Optimized method for quantification of total F(2)-isoprostanes using gas chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry. *J Pharm Biomed Anal*, 90: 161-166, 2014.
- Wheeler, CR, Salzman, JA, Elsayed, NM, Omaye, ST, Korte, DW, Jr.: Automated assays for superoxide dismutase, catalase, glutathione peroxidase, and glutathione reductase activity. *Anal Biochem*, 184: 193-199, 1990.
- 6. Brenchley, JM, Price, DA, Schacker, TW, Asher, TE, Silvestri, G, Rao, S, Kazzaz, Z, Bornstein, E, Lambotte, O, Altmann, D, Blazar, BR, Rodriguez, B, Teixeira-Johnson, L, Landay, A, Martin, JN, Hecht, FM, Picker, LJ, Lederman, MM, Deeks, SG, Douek, DC: Microbial translocation is a cause of systemic immune activation in chronic HIV infection. *Nat Med*, 12: 1365-1371, 2006.
- Brazier, JE, Harper, R, Jones, NM, O'Cathain, A, Thomas, KJ, Usherwood, T, Westlake, L: Validating the SF-36 health survey questionnaire: new outcome measure for primary care. *BMJ*, 305: 160-164, 1992.
- Cukor, D, Fruchter, Y, Ver Halen, N, Naidoo, S, Patel, A, Saggi, SJ: A preliminary investigation of depression and kidney functioning in patients with chronic kidney disease. *Nephron Clin Pract*, 122: 139-145, 2012.
- 9. Revicki, DA, Wood, M, Wiklund, I, Crawley, J: Reliability and validity of the Gastrointestinal Symptom Rating Scale in patients with gastroesophageal reflux disease. *Qual Life Res*, **7:** 75-83, 1998.
- Strid, H, Simren, M, Johansson, AC, Svedlund, J, Samuelsson, O, Bjornsson, ES: The prevalence of gastrointestinal symptoms in patients with chronic renal failure is increased and associated with impaired psychological general wellbeing. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*, 17: 1434-1439, 2002.
- 11. Yu, Z, Morrison, M: Improved extraction of PCR-quality community DNA from digesta and fecal samples. *Biotechniques*, 36: 808-812, 2004.