

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

BMJ Open

Efficacy and safety of faecal microbiota transplantation in patients with psoriatic arthritis: protocol for a 6-month, double-blind, randomised placebo-controlled trial

The FLORA trial

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-019231
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	29-Aug-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Kragsnaes, Maja; Odense University Hospital, Department of Rheumatology; University of Southern Denmark, Odense Patient data Explorative Network (OPEN), Department of Clinical Institute Kjeldsen, Jens; Odense University Hospital, Department of Gastroenterology Horn, Hans; Odense University Hospital, Department of Rheumatology Pedersen, Finn; Odense University Hospital, Department of Rheumatology Pedersen, Finn; Odense University Hospital, Department of Gastroenterology Holt, Hanne; Odense University Hospital, Department of Clinical Microbiology Pedersen, Jens Kristian; Odense University Hospital, Department of Clinical Microbiology Holm, Dorte; Odense University Hospital, Department of Clinical Immunology Glerup, Henning; Silkeborg Regional Hospital, Diagnostic Centre Andersen, Vibeke; Hospital of Southern Jutland, IRS-Centre Sonderjylland; University of Southern Denmark, Institute of Molecular Medicine Fredberg, Ulrich; Silkeborg Regional Hospital, Diagnostic Centre Kristiansen, Karsten; University of Copenhagen, Laboratory of Genomics and Molecular Biomedicine, Department of Biology; BGI Christensen, Robin; Frederiksberg and Bispebjerg Hospital, Musculoskeletal Statistics Unit, Parker Institute Ellingsen, Torkell; Odense University Hospital, Department of Rheumatology
Primary Subject Heading :	Rheumatology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Immunology (including allergy)
Keywords:	Psoriasis < DERMATOLOGY, Clinical trials < THERAPEUTICS, Faecal microbiota transplantation, Intestinal microbiota, Psoriatic arthritis

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	SCHOLARONE [™] Manuscripts
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	
20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29	
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39	
40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48	
49 50 51 52 53 54	

2		
3	1	
4		
5	2	
6	2	
7	3	Efficacy and safety of faecal microbiota transplantation in
8		
9	4	patients with psoriatic arthritis:
10		
11	5	protocol for a 6-month. double-blind. randomised placebo-
12	Ū	
13	6	controlled trial
14 1 <i>Г</i>	Ū	
15	7	
10	8	The FLORA trial
17	0	
10	9	
20	10	Kraasnaes $MS^{1,2^*}$ Kieldsen 1 ³ Horn HC^1 Munk HI^1 Pedersen EM^3 Holt HM^4 Pedersen IK^1 Holm
20	10	\mathbb{D}^{V_5} Classing \mathbb{D}^{V_6} And area \mathbb{D}^{V_8} Fradbard \mathbb{D}^6 Kristianson $\mathbb{D}^{9,10}$ Christianson \mathbb{D}^{11} Ellipson \mathbb{T}^1
21	11	DK , Gierup H , Andersen V , Fredberg O , Kristiansen K , Christensen R , Eningsen T .
22	12	
23	12	
25	13	¹ Department of Rheumatology, Odense University Hospital, Denmark.
25	14	² Odense Patient data Explorative Network (OPEN), Department of Clinical Institute, University of Southern Denmark.
20	15	³ Department of Gastroenterology, Odense University Hospital, Denmark.
28	16	⁴ Department of Clinical Microbiology, Odense University Hospital, Denmark.
29	17	⁵ Department of Clinical Immunology, Odense University Hospital, Denmark.
30	18	⁶ Diagnostic Centre, Silkeborg Regional Hospital, Denmark.
31	19	⁷ IRS-Centre Sonderjylland, Hospital of Southern Jutland, Denmark.
32	20	⁸ Institute of Molecular Medicine, University of Southern Denmark.
33	21	⁹ Laboratory of Genomics and Molecular Biomedicine, Department of Biology, University of Copenhagen, Denmark.
34	22	¹⁰ Institute of Metagenomics, BGI-Shenzhen, Shenzhen, China.
35	23	¹¹ Musculoskeletal Statistics Unit, The Parker Institute, Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark.
36	24	
37	25	* Corresponding author email address: maja.kragsnaes@dadlnet.dk.
38		
39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		
51		
52		
55		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
		1

1 ABSTRACT

Introduction: An unbalanced intestinal microbiota may mediate activation of the inflammatory pathways seen in psoriatic arthritis (PsA). A randomised, placebo-controlled trial of faecal microbiota transplantation (FMT) infused into the small intestine of PsA patients with active peripheral disease who are non-responsive to methotrexate (MTX) treatment will be conducted. The objective is to explore clinical aspects associated with FMT performed in PsA patients.

Methods and analysis: The FLORA trial is a randomised, two-centre stratified, double-blind (patient, care provider and outcome assessor), placebo-controlled, parallel-group study. Eighty patients will be included and randomised (1:1) to either placebo (saline) or FMT provided from an anonymous healthy donor. Throughout the study, both groups will continue the weekly self-administered subcutaneous (s.c.) MTX treatment, remaining on the pre-inclusion dosage (15-25 mg/week). The clinical measures of psoriasis and PsA disease activity used include the Health Assessment Questionnaire (2-page DI-HAQ), the Dermatology Quality of Life Index (DLQI), the Spondyloarthritis Research Consortium of Canada (SPARCC) Enthesitis Index, the Psoriasis Area Severity Index (PASI), a dactylitis digit count, a swollen/tender joint count (66/68), plasma C-reactive protein as well as visual analogue scales for pain, fatigue, and patient and physician global assessments. The primary endpoint is the proportion of patients who experience a treatment failure during the 6-month trial period. The number of adverse events will be registered throughout the study.

Ethics and dissemination: This is a proof-of-concept clinical trial and will be performed in agreement with God Clinical Practice standards. Approvals have been obtained from the local Ethics Committee (DK-S-20150080) and the Danish Data Protection Agency (15/41684). The study has commenced in May 2017. Dissemination will be through presentations at national and international conferences and through publications in international peer-reviewed journals.

27
 28 Trial registration number: NCT03058900
 37

- 30 Strengths and limitations of this study
 - This is a double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled trial of faecal microbiota transplantation in psoriatic arthritis (PsA).
 - Subcutaneously administered MTX treatment.
 - The primary endpoint is based on shared decision-making between patient and physician.
 - Associated microbiome analyses can reveal novel insight into the PsA pathogenesis.
 - A limitation of the study is that the content of the faecal transplant suspension cannot be fully standardized.

1 INTRODUCTION

Emerging data suggest a causal relationship between the intestinal microbiota and spondyloarthritis (SpA), thus, linking dysbiosis of the complex microbial communities with SpA pathogenesis.¹⁻⁵ Psoriatic arthritis (PsA) is one of five SpA categories in adults which also include ankylosing spondylitis, undifferentiated arthritis, reactive arthritis and arthritis associated with inflammatory bowel disease. While the association between the gut and the latter two disorders is well established,⁶ only very recently, studies evaluating the faecal microbiota and the presence of subclinical gut inflammation in PsA patients have coupled this disease to a perturbation of the intestinal microbiota composition.⁷⁻¹²

PsA is a distinct, multi-faceted inflammatory disease with a diverse clinical spectrum and a varied disease course.¹³ The clinical manifestations include peripheral arthritis, enthesitis and/or spondylitis combined with more or less severe psoriatic skin involvement, nail psoriasis, and dactylitis.¹⁴ Nearly half of the patients with both early and established PsA also present with extra-musculoskeletal manifestations which can include bowel (16%), ocular, cardiovascular or urogenital involvement.¹⁵ Without disease modifying intervention, 40-60% of PsA patients will develop erosive and deforming joint damage within a few years of disease onset.¹⁶ Methotrexate (MTX) has long been the preferred conventional synthetic disease-modifying anti-rheumatic drug (csDMARD) for initial therapy.¹⁷ However, a substantial number of patients does not benefit from such treatment.¹⁸ Currently, other treatment options may include biological agents such as tumour necrosis factor (TNF- α) inhibitors aiming to block some of the downstream molecular pathways driving the disease.¹⁹ Howbeit, these drugs do not target the cause of PsA, which is believed to be multifactorial comprising genetic, immunological and environmental factors.²⁰ The interplay between these complex aetiological factors has yet to be fully understood.^{21,22}

The classic pathophysiological concept of PsA is that it is an autoimmune disease of the skin and joints and that the pathological processes at both sites are driven by inflammatory responses involving the innate immune system, natural killer cells, T cells, and the expression of pro-inflammatory cytokines, including TNF-α, interleukin (IL)-1, interferon-y, IL-6, IL-12, IL-15, IL-18 and the IL-17/IL-23 axis.²³⁻²⁷ However, although microbial agents including dormant bacteria, bacterial products, mycobacteria and viral antigens have been implicated as potential initiators,^{28,29} the true pathophysiological factors triggering the dysregulated immunological cascade underlying the disease remain to be identified.

Intriguingly, it has recently been suggested that mucosal sites exposed to a high load of bacterial antigens, in particular the gut, may represent the initial site of immunological tolerance break in PsA.³⁰ Indeed, under normal conditions the host and the microbiota live in harmony and benefit from their mutualistic relationship. However, alterations of the normal intestinal microbiota can affect mucosal immunity which, in turn, can induce local inflammation and elicit systemic effects at distant sites.³¹ Mechanisms through which the intestinal microbiota may be involved in the pathogenesis of PsA include an abnormal activation of the gut-associated lymphoid tissue,³² a decrease in regulatory T cell activity,³³ and/or an altered mucosal permeability thus compromising the capacity of the intestine to provide adequate containment of luminal microorganisms and molecules.^{34,35} In support of these theories, several studies have documented subclinical gut inflammation in PsA patients.³⁶⁻⁴¹ Moreover, a recent study reported that several intestinal bacteria including Akkermansia and Ruminococcus were practically absent in PsA

 1 patients. These commensal bacteria are, in fact, known to play an important role in maintaining

2 gut homeostasis.⁴²

4 Rationale

If the gut microbiota is the initiator and/or mediator of the common inflammatory pathways seen in PsA,⁸ modifying the intestinal microbiota could be a novel treatment strategy for this disease.¹⁻ ^{3,43} Faecal microbiota transplantation (FMT) is currently being used to restore the balance of the intestinal flora.^{44,45} Particularly, this procedure has demonstrated more than 90% clinical resolution of recurrent or refractory *Clostridium difficile* infections.⁴⁶⁻⁵⁰ Also, multiple FMTs seem to be able to induce remission in patients with inflammatory bowel disease (IBD).⁵¹ Due to these results, FMT is now being tested as a potential novel treatment for other gastrointestinal and extra-intestinal diseases.⁵² To the best of our knowledge, no study has yet ascertained the efficacy and safety of FMT in patients with inflammatory rheumatic diseases.

20 15 Evidence-based research

To avoid waste of research no new studies should be initiated without a systematic review of the existing evidence.⁵³ We performed a pragmatic search in the biomedical literature via Pubmed combining different related MeSH terms: ("Microbiota"[Mesh] OR "Fecal Microbiota Transplantation"[Mesh] OR "Faecal Microbiota Transplantation"[Mesh] OR "Gastrointestinal Microbiome"[Mesh]) AND (arthritis[tiab] OR "Arthritis"[Mesh] OR "Arthritis, Psoriatic"[Mesh] OR "Arthritis, Reactive" [Mesh] OR "Spondylarthritis" [Mesh] OR "Arthritis, Gouty" [Mesh] OR "Arthritis, Rheumatoid"[Mesh] OR "Psoriasis"[Mesh]). From the search revealing 122 citations it became clear that the majority of papers were reviews/editorials (74 [61%]), where the overall conclusion was that the main challenges are to uncover the cause-effect relationship between the intestinal microbiota and rheumatic diseases, and to investigate the potential of microbiome-targeting strategies.^{1,3,5,6,20,32,43,54-60} Also from the published literature it became evident that to date only three clinical interventional studies trying to modify the intestinal microbiota in arthritis patients have been performed; one in enthesis-related arthritis using probiotics (n = 8),⁶¹ one in juvenile idiopathic arthritis using exclusive enteral nutrition (n = 7),⁶² and one in rheumatoid arthritis patients using probiotics in a placebo-controlled setting (n = 60).⁶³ Following the intervention, the latter two studies showed a moderate anti-inflammatory effect on the number of active joints, on the Disease Activity Score of 28 joints (DAS-28), and on the C-reactive protein concentrations. In the first study reporting no beneficial effects, the probiotics did not change the microbiota. No clinical trials performing FMT on arthritic patients were identified.

Objective

By conducting a double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled trial, the objective of this study is to explore whether FMT is more effective than placebo in reducing disease activity in PsA patients with active peripheral arthritis concomitantly treated with weekly subcutaneously administered MTX. In addition, extensive bacteria taxonomic and metagenomic analyses will be performed on faecal samples before and after the FMT to get an indication of the functional capacity of the intestinal microbiota.

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

Trial design

This is a randomised – patient, physician and outcome-assessor blinded, placebo-controlled, 6month trial, which will be followed by an open-label extension trial for a minimum of 2 years. Patients will be randomly assigned in a 1:1 ratio to receive FMT or placebo (sham procedure). Outcome assessment will be based on follow-up by a rheumatologist and is scheduled to occur after 3 and 6 months (primary end-point evaluation), see Figure 1 and Figure 2.

nt, physician ar. nollowed by an open. sasigned in a 1:1 ratio . primary end-point evaluation), see .





1		
2 3	1	Participants
4	2	Patients fulfilling the inclusion criteria will be offered participation. No treatment with biologics
5	3	within 6 months, and no systemic and/or local intra-articular or peritendinous steroid injections,
6 7	4	or non-MTX csDMARD treatment, or antibiotics are allowed within 3 months of inclusion. Non
8	5	Steroidal Anti-Inflammatory Drugs (NSAIDs) must be paused within 14 days of study inclusion, and
9	6	throughout the 6-month follow-up period. Patients, who do not wish to participate, will be
10 11	7	characterised by sex and age. The recruitment has commenced in May 2017 and will continue until
12	8	2019.
13	9	
14 15	10	Psoriatic arthritis patients
16 17	11	A total of 80 PsA patients will be enrolled, and they will have to meet the following criteria:
18	12	
19 20	12	
21	10	Diagnosis of DsA according to the Classification Criteria for Dsoriatic Arthritic (CASDAD) ⁶⁴
22	14	 Diagnosis of PSA according to the classification criteria for Psonatic Artifictis (CASPAR). Dresence of active peripheral arthritis defined as > 2 swellen joints.
23 24	15	• Presence of active peripheral artificts defined as ≥ 5 swollen joints.
25	10	• Subcutaneously administered MTX treatment (2 15mg/week (maximal tolerable dosage))
26	17	Are 18 to 70 years
27 28	18	• Age 18 to 70 years.
29	19	
30	20	Exclusion criteria:
31 32	21	Other meumatic inflammatory diseases than PSA.
33	22	Clinical suspicion of current axial disease activity.
34	23	History of severe MTX toxicity or allergic reactions.
35 36	24	Biological treatment within the last 6 months.
37	25	 Non-MTX DMARD treatment within 3 months of inclusion.
38	26	 Systemic and/or local intra-articular or peritendinous steroid injections within 3 months of
39 40	27	inclusion.
41	28	NSAIDs within fourteen days.
42	29	Antibiotics within 3 months of inclusion.
43 44	30	 Inflammatory bowel disease, celiac disease, food allergy, or other intestinal diseases.
45	31	 Pregnant or breastfeeding women.
46	32	 Not wishing to participate or unsuited for project evaluation.
47 48	33	
49	34	Stool donors
50 51	25	The steel deper corps will consist of three to five approximate (to the recipient) depers who must
52	25	he healthy as assessed by a screening questionnaire, and he active members of the Danish blood
53	30 27	donor corps age 25 to 55, body mass index between 19.5 and 25 kg/m ² and an average alcohol
54 55	رد در	intake less than 7 (women) or 14 (men) units her week. No alcohol intake within a work of
56	20	donation is allowed and no systemic medication including antibiotics and NSAIDs 6 months prior
57	22	achation is anowed, and no systemic medication including antibiotics and NSAIDS 0 months phot
58 59		
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

to the donation are allowed. The donor must eat a balanced diet (no extreme low- or high-calorie diets), and the donor must not be in a stressful life period. Before joining the stool donor corps, each potential donor will go through a screening process including stool analyses for faecal calprotectin and enteric pathogens (Aeromonas, Campylobacter, C. difficile, diarrhoeagenic Escherichia coli, Salmonella, Shigella, Vibrio, Yersinia enterocolitica, and multidrug-resistant bacteria, parasites including microscopy of ova and cysts, Entamoeba histolytica/dispar (DNA), Cryptosporidium (DNA) and Giardia (DNA), sapovirus (RNA), rotavirus (RNA), human astrovirus (RNA), human adenoviruses (DNA) and noroviruses (RNA), a Helicobacter pylori breath test, blood tests for C-reactive protein (CRP), white blood cell count, haemoglobin, albumin, alanine aminotransferase (ALAT), glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) and coeliac disease, and blood test for infectious agents including current infection with Epstein-Barr virus (IgM) and cytomegalovirus (IgM), hepatitis A, B, C and E, tuberculosis (QuantiFERON[®] TB-Gold test), syphilis, human immunodeficiency virus (ab HTLV1/2), E. histolytica (antibodies) and Strongyloides (antibodies), and a urine test for Chlamydia Trachomatis and Neisseria gonorrhoeae (DNA/RNA). After passing the screening tests, the donor will donate stool for the next month after which, the donor will have to pass the screening programme once more before the stool can be released for transplantation.

19 Interventions

20 Overall study interventions

The FMT will be an add-on strategy for PsA patients with active joint disease despite ongoing treatment with weekly subcutaneously administered MTX. Therefore, all enrolled PsA patients will continue their MTX treatment throughout the study, and they will remain on the same individual dosage that they received at the time of study inclusion (a minimum of 15 mg/week cf. the patient inclusion criteria) in addition to folic acid supplement. Paracetamol and tramadol in recommended dosages are allowed during the trial but no NSAIDs can be taken.

37 ²⁶ 38 27

28 Active and sham comparator

Patients will be randomised into two groups with an allocation ratio of active-to-placebo treatment of 1:1. The active comparator group (n = 40) will have an FMT with healthy donor faeces-suspension (250 mL) containing 50 g donor faeces, saline (NaCl 0.9%) and glycerol (10%), whereas, the sham comparator group (n = 40) will be treated with an identical appearing sham procedure where the transplant solution will consist of 250 mL brown coloured (brown food colourant) isotonic saline (NaCl 0.9%).

36 Preparing the FMT suspension

Donors will collect faeces at home and transport it in a cooling bag to the study site within 1 hour. Faeces will be sieved to remove particulate material, followed by dilution in sterile saline (0.9% NaCl) and 10% glycerol. The FMT suspension will be stored at - 80 °C until use. On the day of the FMT transplantation, the transplant suspension (250 mL) will be thawed to 37 °C and subsequently apportioned into five 50 mL syringes.

1		
2	1	
3	2	FMT procedure
4 5	3	The FMT will take place within 14 days (preferably 7 days) of the baseline clinical examination. The
6	1	evening prior to the FMT patients will take one dose of oral proton-nump inhibitor. They will meet
7	-	at the Department of Castroenterology after a six-hour fast. A total of 250 mL transplant
8	5	at the Department of Gastroenterology after a six-hour fast. A total of 250 mL transplant
9 10	6	suspension (active or placebo) will be installed in the duodenum using an oral-duodenal tube. The
11	/	correct placement of the tube will be confirmed using gastroscopic guidance.
12	8	
13	9	Treatment strategy for FMT non-responders
14	10	Patients who present with increased disease activity during follow-up will, depending on the
15	11	clinical presentation, be offered another treatment strategy which may include local intra-articular
17	12	steroid injections, change to another csDMARD or biological treatment. If the patient accept such
18	13	treatment changes, this will be characterised as FMT treatment failure according to the primary
19	14	outcome definition (one intra-articular steroid injection is allowed).
20 21	15	
22	16	MTX toxicity and drop-outs
23	17	Blood tests for MTX toxicity will be performed in accordance with our current clinical practice. In
24	10	case of MTX toxicity, severe side effects, programmy, or occurrence of infectious disease or other
25	10	diseases that contraindicate MTV treatment MTV decage will be decreased or the treatment will
20	19	diseases that contraindicate will remain in the study (where their condition contraindicates this)
28	20	be paused. These patients will remain in the study (unless their condition contraindicates this),
29	21	and they will be analysed as members of the treatment group to which they were randomised
30	22	using intention-to-treat-type analyses.
21		
31 32	23	
31 32 33	23 24	Outcomes
31 32 33 34	23 24 25	Outcomes Primary Outcome Measure:
31 32 33 34 35	23 24 25 26	Outcomes Primary Outcome Measure: Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
31 32 33 34 35 36 37	23 24 25 26 27	Outcomes Primary Outcome Measure: Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared
31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38	23 24 25 26 27 28	Outcomes Primary Outcome Measure: Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and rheumatologist defined as at least one of the following:
31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39	23 24 25 26 27 28 29	Outcomes Primary Outcome Measure: Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and rheumatologist defined as at least one of the following: • Need for more than one intra-articular glucocorticoid injection due to disease
31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40	23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	Outcomes Primary Outcome Measure: Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and rheumatologist defined as at least one of the following: • Need for more than one intra-articular glucocorticoid injection due to disease activity.
31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42	23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	Outcomes Primary Outcome Measure: Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and rheumatologist defined as at least one of the following: Need for more than one intra-articular glucocorticoid injection due to disease activity. Need for change to other csDMARDs (e.g. oral leflupomide or sulfasalazin)
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 	23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32	 Outcomes Primary Outcome Measure: Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and rheumatologist defined as at least one of the following: Need for more than one intra-articular glucocorticoid injection due to disease activity. Need for change to other csDMARDs (e.g., oral leflunomide or sulfasalazin) according to the undated Danish guideline treatment due to disease activity.
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 	23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 23	 Outcomes Primary Outcome Measure: Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and rheumatologist defined as at least one of the following: Need for more than one intra-articular glucocorticoid injection due to disease activity. Need for change to other csDMARDs (e.g., oral leflunomide or sulfasalazin) according to the updated Danish guideline treatment due to disease activity.
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 	23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 24	 Outcomes Primary Outcome Measure: Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and rheumatologist defined as at least one of the following: Need for more than one intra-articular glucocorticoid injection due to disease activity. Need for change to other csDMARDs (e.g., oral leflunomide or sulfasalazin) according to the updated Danish guideline treatment due to disease activity. Need for biologic treatment according to the updated Danish treatment guideline due to experiment activity.
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 	23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34	 Outcomes Primary Outcome Measure: Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and rheumatologist defined as at least one of the following: Need for more than one intra-articular glucocorticoid injection due to disease activity. Need for change to other csDMARDs (e.g., oral leflunomide or sulfasalazin) according to the updated Danish guideline treatment due to disease activity. Need for biologic treatment according to the updated Danish treatment guideline due to severe disease activity.
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 	23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35	 Outcomes Primary Outcome Measure: Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and rheumatologist defined as at least one of the following: Need for more than one intra-articular glucocorticoid injection due to disease activity. Need for change to other csDMARDs (e.g., oral leflunomide or sulfasalazin) according to the updated Danish guideline treatment due to disease activity. Need for biologic treatment according to the updated Danish treatment guideline due to severe disease activity.
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 	23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36	 Outcomes Primary Outcome Measure: Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and rheumatologist defined as at least one of the following: Need for more than one intra-articular glucocorticoid injection due to disease activity. Need for change to other csDMARDs (e.g., oral leflunomide or sulfasalazin) according to the updated Danish guideline treatment due to disease activity. Need for biologic treatment according to the updated Danish treatment guideline due to severe disease activity.
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 	23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37	 Outcomes Primary Outcome Measure: Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and rheumatologist defined as at least one of the following: Need for more than one intra-articular glucocorticoid injection due to disease activity. Need for change to other csDMARDs (e.g., oral leflunomide or sulfasalazin) according to the updated Danish guideline treatment due to disease activity. Need for biologic treatment according to the updated Danish treatment guideline due to severe disease activity. Secondary Outcome Measures: Change from baseline in the Short Health Assessment Questionnaire (2-page HAQ)^{65,66}
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 	23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38	 Outcomes Primary Outcome Measure: Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and rheumatologist defined as at least one of the following: Need for more than one intra-articular glucocorticoid injection due to disease activity. Need for change to other csDMARDs (e.g., oral leflunomide or sulfasalazin) according to the updated Danish guideline treatment due to disease activity. Need for biologic treatment according to the updated Danish treatment guideline due to severe disease activity. Secondary Outcome Measures: Change from baseline in the Short Health Assessment Questionnaire (2-page HAQ)^{65,66} [Time Frame: Baseline, 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks, 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 	 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 	 Outcomes Primary Outcome Measure: Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and rheumatologist defined as at least one of the following: Need for more than one intra-articular glucocorticoid injection due to disease activity. Need for change to other csDMARDs (e.g., oral leflunomide or sulfasalazin) according to the updated Danish guideline treatment due to disease activity. Need for biologic treatment according to the updated Danish treatment guideline due to severe disease activity. Secondary Outcome Measures: Change from baseline in the Short Health Assessment Questionnaire (2-page HAQ)^{65,66} [Time Frame: Baseline, 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks, 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 	 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 	 Outcomes Primary Outcome Measure: Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and rheumatologist defined as at least one of the following: Need for more than one intra-articular glucocorticoid injection due to disease activity. Need for change to other csDMARDs (e.g., oral leflunomide or sulfasalazin) according to the updated Danish guideline treatment due to disease activity. Need for biologic treatment according to the updated Danish treatment guideline due to severe disease activity. Secondary Outcome Measures: Change from baseline in the Short Health Assessment Questionnaire (2-page HAQ)^{65,66} [Time Frame: Baseline, 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks, 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 	 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 	 Dutomes Primary Outcome Measure: Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and rheumatologist defined as at least one of the following: Need for more than one intra-articular glucocorticoid injection due to disease activity. Need for change to other csDMARDs (e.g., oral leflunomide or sulfasalazin) according to the updated Danish guideline treatment due to disease activity. Need for biologic treatment according to the updated Danish treatment guideline due to severe disease activity. Secondary Outcome Measures: Change from baseline in the Short Health Assessment Questionnaire (2-page HAQ)^{65,66} [Time Frame: Baseline, 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks, 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 	23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41	 Outcomes Primary Outcome Measure: Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and rheumatologist defined as at least one of the following: Need for more than one intra-articular glucocorticoid injection due to disease activity. Need for change to other csDMARDs (e.g., oral leflunomide or sulfasalazin) according to the updated Danish guideline treatment due to disease activity. Need for biologic treatment according to the updated Danish treatment guideline due to severe disease activity. Secondary Outcome Measures: Change from baseline in the Short Health Assessment Questionnaire (2-page HAQ)^{65,66} [Time Frame: Baseline, 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks, 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Change from baseline in the Dermatology Life Quality Index (DLQI) Questionnaire⁶⁷ [Time Frame: 1
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 	23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42	 Dutcomes Primary Outcome Measure: Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and rheumatologist defined as at least one of the following: Need for more than one intra-articular glucocorticoid injection due to disease activity. Need for change to other csDMARDs (e.g., oral leflunomide or sulfasalazin) according to the updated Danish guideline treatment due to disease activity. Need for biologic treatment according to the updated Danish treatment guideline due to severe disease activity. Secondary Outcome Measures: Change from baseline in the Short Health Assessment Questionnaire (2-page HAQ)^{65,66} [Time Frame: Baseline, 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks, 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Change from baseline in the Dermatology Life Quality Index (DLQI) Questionnaire⁶⁷ [Time Frame: 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 	23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42	 Dutcomes Primary Outcome Measure: Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and rheumatologist defined as at least one of the following: Need for more than one intra-articular glucocorticoid injection due to disease activity. Need for change to other csDMARDs (e.g., oral leflunomide or sulfasalazin) according to the updated Danish guideline treatment due to disease activity. Need for biologic treatment according to the updated Danish treatment guideline due to severe disease activity. Secondary Outcome Measures: Change from baseline in the Short Health Assessment Questionnaire (2-page HAQ)^{65,66} [Time Frame: Baseline, 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks, 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)] Change from baseline in the Dermatology Life Quality Index (DLQI) Questionnaire⁶⁷ [Time Frame: 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]

2	1	
3 4	2	Changes from baseline in patient reported gastrointestinal side effects [Time Frame: 1 week, 2
5	2	weeks 3 weeks 4 weeks 3 months $(+/-7 \text{ days})$ 6 months $(+/-14 \text{ days})$
6		
/	4	
9	5	Other non-gastrointestinal patient reported side effects [Time Frame: 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4
10	6	weeks, 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
11 12	7	
13	8	Proportion of patients in each group achieving the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) ⁶⁸
14	9	Response Criteria [Time Frame: 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
15 16	10	
17	10	1. ACR20 response criteria
18	11	II. ACR50 response criteria ⁷⁰
19 20	12	III. ACR70 response criteria ⁷⁰
20	4.2	
22	13	
23	14	Proportion of patients in each group achieving the Psoriatic Arthritis Response Criteria (PsARC) ⁶⁸
24 25	15	[Time Frame: 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
26	16	
27	17	Change from baseline in the Spondyloarthritis Research Consortium of Canada (SPARCC) Enthesitis
28 29	18	L L L L L L L L L L
30	10	days 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
31	15	
32 33	20	71
34	21	Change from baseline in the Psoriasis Area Severity Index (PASI) ¹¹ in the subset of patients who
35	22	have skin psoriasis at baseline [Time Frame: 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
36 37	23	
38	24	Change from baseline in the number of digits affected with dactylitis in the subset of patients who
39	25	have dactylitis at baseline [Time Frame: 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
40 41	26	
42	20	Number of adverse events in each group [Time Frame: 6 months $(\pm/-14 days)$]
43	27	
44 45	28	
46	29	Number of patients with at least one adverse event in each group [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14
47	30	days)]
48 49	31	
50	32	Tertiary (exploratory secondary) outcomes: Proportion of patients in each group achieving changes
51	33	in plasma CRP, changes in tender point count, ⁷² changes in faecal bacteria composition and
52 53	34	metabolism, changes in intestinal permeability, ⁷³ changes in plasma orosomucoid, changes in
54	35	plasma and faecal calprotectin,'* changes in serum 1,25-dihydroxyvitamin D, changes in
55	36	cardiovascular risk factors including Body Mass Index (BMI), blood pressure, plasma triglyceride,
зо 57	37	plasma LDL-cholesterol, plasma HDL-cholesterol, plasma total-cholesterol, and HbA ₁ C levels,
58		
59		For peer review only - http://bmionen.hmi.com/site/about/quidelines.yhtml
60		11

1 changes in specific circulating inflammatory markers (i.e. cytokines, adipokines, and chemokines),

- 2 and macroscopic and microscopic inflammatory changes of the colonic mucosa, see Table 1.
- 4 Safety

The most frequently reported adverse events (AEs) related to FMT are vomiting, belching, mild diarrhoea, abdominal cramping, transient fever and elevated C-reactive protein on the day of the procedure.⁷⁵ A recent systematic review on the adverse events of FMT identified 50 relevant studies with a total of 1,089 patients. In this review, the incidences of serious adverse events (SAEs) for FMT were 2.0% and 6.1% for upper and lower gastrointestinal routes, respectively. The SAEs that probably or possibly were related to FMT included infections (0.7%), IBD flare (0.6%), death (0.3%), auto-immune diseases and FMT procedure related injury.⁷⁶ Although most of the patients included in this review suffered from severe gastrointestinal diseases (C. difficile infection and/or IBD), these findings warrant caution when performing FMT; especially when introducing the procedure in a new patient population. In addition, the potential long term side effects following FMT remains largely unknown.⁷⁷ Still, when strict donor screening is conducted and the procedure is performed by experienced practitioners, FMT is in general considered safe, and even elderly patients with a poor medical condition and multiple co morbidities as well as immunosuppressed patients have been proven to tolerate the FMT procedure well.⁷⁸⁻⁸²

In the present study, we will carefully monitor and evaluate safety by means of open assessment of AEs. All reported or observed AEs are recorded by the investigators, and will be monitored until resolution, stabilisation or until it has been shown that the study intervention is not the cause. The National Cancer Institute Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events, version 4.03 (NIH publication # 09-7473), will be used to grade the severity of adverse events. Gastrointestinal side effects (nausea, vomiting, abdominal pain, number of stools pr. week, stool type (Bristol Stool Chart), blood or mucus in the stool) will be registered by the patients once a week for the first month following the randomised intervention. Routine blood screening for MTX toxicity will normally be performed at week 4, 10, 16, 22 but can be more frequent if decided by the responsible treating rheumatologist depending on symptoms or signs of MTX toxicity. Subject incidence rates of all treatment-emergent AE will be tabulated by system organ class and preferred term. Tables of fatal AEs, SAEs, AEs leading to withdrawal from study, and significant treatment-emergent adverse events, will also be provided. For the long-term extension portion of this study, exposure adjusted event rates will be summarised.

34 Sample size and power considerations

For a comparison of two independent binomial proportions using the Pearson's chi-squared statistic with a Chi-square approximation (a two-sided significance level of 0.05), a sample size of 40 PsA patients per group has a power of 90% (0.895) if we assume that the proportions of treatment failures are 35% (FMT-active group) and 70% (FMT-sham group), respectively. Consequently, the inclusion of 80 PsA patients allocated (1:1) to two treatment arms is believed to be sufficient to reveal any difference of clinical importance between treatment groups (i.e., an NNT <3 patients). Data will be analysed with the STATA statistical package (version 15; StataCorp
 LP), and SAS software (v. 9.4; SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA).

Assuming that there will be some attrition during the 6-month trial period, we also estimated how much drop out would be possible while still having a reasonable statistical power (80%): a total sample size of 62 PsA patients assuming a comparable level of withdrawals (31 patients completing in each group) achieves a power of at least 0.8 with the proportion of treatment failures indicated above; i.e., even if we experience a drop-out rate of 20%, our trial will have 80% chance of detecting the intentional difference between groups

10 Randomisation, allocation concealment and blinding

The randomisation was conducted using central-computer randomisation. Patients will be randomly allocated (1:1) to receive either a FMT or a placebo saline transplant (sham procedure). The randomisation lists was generated by the trial statistician and uploaded to the REDCap database by an independent data manager who will not be involved in any other aspects of the trial. Eligible patients will - after signing informed consent - be assigned randomly in permuted blocks with varying sizes of 4 and 6, according to computer-generated random numbers (SAS programming via SAS PROC PLAN), to undergo either FMT or a saline (sham) procedure using stratification for centre. The randomisation of each patient will be implemented by the local trial coordinator and allocation will be concealed as this is done independent of the pre-determined sequence generation (i.e. randomisation). The patients, care providers and outcome assessors will remain unaware of the group assignments, and only de-identified codes will be used to link participants to their data during the study to maintain their confidentiality.

24 Data collection, management and confidentiality

Data will be entered via a secure web-based electronic clinical report form (eCRF) into a central REDCap⁸³ database hosted by Odense Patient data Explorative Network (OPEN) at Odense University Hospital. Data obtained during the clinical examination will be entered directly into the database. Also, patient questionnaires will be fulfilled directly into the database. Access to the study data will be restricted, and a password system will be utilized to control access. All information about the patients' health and other private matters is covered by confidentiality. The authorisation from the Danish Data Protection Agency has been secured.

33 Statistical methods

The full analysis set will consist of all randomised participants (i.e., the Intention to treat population). Participants will be analysed according to their randomised treatment group. Descriptive statistics will be provided for demographics, and baseline characteristics. The summary statistics of continuous variables will include: N, mean, standard deviation, median, interguartiles, and range. All summaries presenting frequencies and incidences will include counts, % and N, where N is the total number of participants in the corresponding arm.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 15 of 33

BMJ Open

The pre-specified efficacy analyses will be based data from the full-analysis set, which include all patients who underwent randomisation, have had their baseline measurement performed, and who have received the initial transplant (independent of group). The safety analysis set will include all patients who were randomly assigned to a study group and had exposure to a transplant (independent of group). Missing values will be imputed with the of a non-responder imputation by use of the baseline-observation-carried-forward method for measurements made after baseline. Thus, missing data for dichotomous endpoints will also be imputed using a "null responder" imputation, assuming that the patient did not have any benefit from being enrolled in the trial (e.g., for the primary endpoint will assume that the patient had a

10 treatment failure).

Categorical changes for dichotomous end points will be analysed with the use of logistic regression with the model including treatment and centre as class effects. For continuous outcome measures an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) model will be used to analyse mean changes in continuous end points. The model will include treatment, centre, with the baseline value of the relevant variable as a covariate. Sensitivity analyses, will be performed to assess the robustness of the primary analyses, including "worst" and "best" case imputation, repeatedmeasures and multiple-imputation analyses, using model-based approaches; repeated measures linear mixed models will also be used to model the potential group-dependent trajectories over time.

Additionally, completer analyses will be performed on those who complete 6 months of treatment. During follow-up, any medical treatments which could potentially modify the intestinal microbiota including antibiotics will be reported, but will not affect the statistical analysis. Statistical estimates will be calculated as odds ratios (OR) for the dichotomous variables and difference between means for continuous outcomes reported with 95% confidence intervals (95% Cl). Two-sided confidence intervals, and P-values for primary, secondary and exploratory outcomes will be computed and will not be adjusted for multiplicity.

Exploratory stratified analyses will investigate whether the treatment effect varies with I) the faecal microbiota analysis performed at follow-up compared with baseline (+/- long-term changes in the intestinal microbiota and intestinal inflammation); and II) the demographic match (sex, age) between the stool donor and the recipient. Non-responders will represent the outcome group not fulfilling the primary outcome measure. Differences in demographics and baseline disease activity between this treatment-failure subpopulation and the remaining group will be examined in order to identify potential predictors for poor responders. Patients not participating in the follow-up examination will be classified as "drop-outs", and if possible, the reason for not participating will be registered.

Activity/assessment	Pre-study	Visit 1	Week	Visit 2	Visit 3	Visi
	screening	Baseline	1, 2 and 3	1 month	3 months	6 mor
Patients	n = ?	n = 80	n = all	n = all	n = all	n =
Screening log	x					
Inclusion/exclusion form	x					
Consent form		х				
Randomisation		х				
Study-composed questionnaire		х	x	х	х	x
Patient global (VAS 0-100 mm)		х	x	х	х	х
Patient fatigue (VAS 0-100 mm)		х	х	х	x	x
Patient pain (VAS 0-100 mm)		х	х	х	х	х
HAQ		x	x	х	x	x
BASDAI		х			х	x
BASFAI		x			x	X
DLQI		х	х	х	х	х
Gastrointestinal symptom diary		x	x	x	x	x
Eating habits questionnaire		x				
Clinical examination:						
- Height (m)		x				
- Weight (kg)		х			х	x
 Blood pressure (mmHg) 		x			x	X
- Psoriasis Area Severity Index		x			x	X
- SPARCC Enthesitis Score		х			x	x
- Swollen joint count (66)		х			x	x
- Tender Joint count (68)		x			x	X
- Doctors global (VAS 0-100 mm)		X			x	X
- DASIVII - Tender point count		x			X	X
		^			×	×
Plood cample analysis:				^	^	^
- C-reactive protein (mg/L)		×		v	×	V V
- Orosomucoid (g/L)		×		×	×	
- Calprotectin		×		x	x	x
- 1.25-dihydroxyvitamin D (nmol/L)		x		x	x	x
- TSH (miu/L)		х				x
- Hgb (mmol/L)		x				x
- Triglyceride (mmol/L)		х				x
- LDL-cholesterol (mmol/L)		х				x
- HDL-cholesterol (mmol/L)		x				x
 Total-cholesterol (mmol/L) 		x				x
- HbA ₁ C (mmol/mol)		х				x
- HLA-B27 status (+/-)		х				
- Serology tests for Yersinia,		x				
Campylobacter, Salmonella (+/-)						
Faecal calprotectin		х		x	х	X
Faecal microbiota analysis		х		x	x	x
Sigmoidoscopy and mucosa biopsy		х				x
Stool, blood, and urine samples (biobank)		x		x	x	x
Intestinal permeability test		х				x
Intervention (1/ EMT)		v				

3 Table 1. Protocol schedule of forms and procedures

1 ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

This study is designed as a proof-of-concept clinical trial and will be performed in agreement with GCP-standards, and in accordance with the ethical standards of the responsible committee on human experimentation (institutional and national) and with the Helsinki Declaration (64th, 2013). The relevance of the study, the design and the recruitment strategy were evaluated with three patient research partners (PRPs), and alterations especially in primary outcome and recruitment strategy were embedded. Furthermore, a minimum of two PRPs (participating in the study) will be involved in the discussion regarding the progress of the recruitment phase and results, and will be offered the opportunity to comment on the manuscript draft. The Regional Committees on Health Research Ethics for Southern Denmark (DK-S-20150080) and the Danish Data Protection Agency (15/41684) have approved the study protocol, and the trial has been registered with ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT03058900). The Danish Health and Medicines Authority does not classify the FMT procedure as a medical intervention, and has had no objection to the use of FMT for this study and patient category. Thus, no GCP auditing is legally required. A report describing any potential side effects and adverse events will be submitted to the Ethics Committee yearly.

Although the Danish Health Authorities, for the time being, do not classify donor faecal microbiota as tissue, all steps of the stool donor recruitment, stool donation and FMT preparation will be in accordance with the Danish Tissue Law to ensure that the quality and safety standards laid down in the Danish Legislation BEK nr 764 of May 26, 2015 (implementing Directive 2004/23/EC) are met. Three to five stool donors will be recruited from the South Danish Transfusion Service & Tissue Center, Department of Clinical Immunology, Odense University Hospital, and they will be carefully screened for potentially transmissible infections and other conditions associated with gut microbiota function before their stool can be released for FMT. Being a stool donor is voluntary, and no compensation fee will be given. Furthermore, to ensure donor traceability, each patient in the active treatment arm will only receive microbiota from one donor. Also, frozen samples will be clearly labeled with a unique donation code based on the ISBT 128 coding and labeling system, and the release of the final product will adhere to the standards for tissue and blood donation.

Due to the well-documented risk of permanent joint destruction and occurrence of extra-articular manifestations in the PsA disease course, identification of new treatment modalities and biomarkers is essential to help the physician to slow down the disease development or ultimately to prevent it. All PsA patients participating in this study have significant activity in their joint disease despite treatment with the current guideline treatment and first-line drug, MTX, for this condition. This patient population will therefore benefit greatly from new treatment options. Consequently, when weighing the pros and cons of this study, this trial should be performed from a scientific and ethical perspective.

37 Dissemination will occur through presentations at national and international 38 conferences and publications in international peer-reviewed journal(s).

1 DISCUSSION

Recent years have seen growing recognition of the complexity of the role of the microbiota in shaping the immune system and its potential effects for health and disease.^{22,84,85} In particular, the gut bacteria composition has been associated with the pathogenesis of autoimmune and inflammatory diseases.⁸⁶⁻⁸⁹ Intriguingly, an abnormal intestinal bacteria composition has been observed in PsA patients, and this association has fostered theories linking intestinal dysbiosis and PsA joint inflammation.⁹⁰ Still, it remains to be elucidated whether the intestinal dysbiosis and rheumatic disease are causal related,⁵⁵ and if so, whether dysbiosis is an inciting event in the inflammatory process or a consequence of local and/or systemic inflammation.^{54,91} We expect that this double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled trial will shed new light on this highly relevant topic.

This is the first time that the efficacy and safety of FMT is being investigated in MTX immunosuppressed patients with rheumatic diseases. Subsequently, no data on the feasibility of conducting FMTs in the rheumatological setting is, so far, available. Nor do we know whether one FMT will be sufficient, or whether it should be repeated shortly after the first intervention to normalise the alterations of the intestinal microbiota, which would expectedly enhance any potential anti-inflammatory effects. In the present proof-of concept clinical trial, the FMT procedure is considered an add-on to the current guideline intervention and first-line drug, MTX. Therefore, from a pragmatic and ethical perspective, we have decided to perform only one FMT (or sham procedure) in each patient even if we are well aware that this approach may not be adequate to achieve long-lasting effects. Indeed, in patients with inflammatory bowel diseases it appears that performing a frequent dosing-regime repeating the FMT procedure up to five times a week for eight weeks provided the best results.^{51,92,93} Hence, in contrast to the treatment of C. difficile infections where the microbiota is pushed past the point of homeostasis and can be restored following only one FMT,⁴⁷ the chronic nature of PsA and other autoimmune and inflammatory diseases, and the somewhat lesser degree of intestinal dysbiosis, may make the host microbiota more resistant to long-lasting modifications. Nevertheless, we strongly believe that the FMT procedure in the present study will be sufficient to boost the effects of MTX so that the participants who are all MTX-non-responders prior to study enrolment will achieve disease control without needing to add or switch to other non-MTX medication.

In the present trial, the primary endpoint is defined as the occurrence of treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and physician evaluated at 6 months following the randomised intervention (FMT versus sham procedure). Shared decision making is a process in which both patient and health professional make a decision, taking into account the best evidence of available treatment options and the patient's values and preferences. This approach is considered a key element in the management of rheumatic diseases.⁹⁴ In addition to the primary end point evaluation at 6 months, patients will be asked to fill out a weekly questionnaire regarding side effects as well as skin and arthritis symptoms during the first month following the randomised intervention to reveal any short-term effects on patient-reported outcomes.

Next, only patients with active peripheral PsA will be included. One reason for this is
 that this will be the first time that FMT is performed on rheumatic patients. Therefore, it seems

BMJ Open

reasonable only to enrol patients who have not had adequate effect from the initial guideline treatment (MTX), and consequently, on an individual basis could benefit the most from participating in new experimental clinical trials. Also, since patients need to have at least three swollen joints, we expect that we will be able to detect treatment effects of clinical importance. The fact that we do not include recent onset treatment naive patients will, of course, limit our ability to generalise our findings unto the entire PsA patient population. Indeed, in a recent randomised controlled trial of FMT in ulcerative colitis patients, participants with a recent diagnosis (< 1 year) were statistically significantly more likely to respond to FMT compared with those with longer disease duration.⁹² That patients will have to subcutaneously administer MTX for at least three months prior to study enrolment will ensure that low intestinal MTX absorption is excluded as a potential effect modifier for the poor MTX response. In addition, as many drugs, including MTX, seem to affect the intestinal microbiological millieu,⁹⁵⁻⁹⁸ bypassing the intestine during MTX administration will ensure that no local non-disease related effects on the intestinal microbiota will occur.

A great challenge when conducting a trial of FMT is that for the present being there is a lack of both national and international recommendations guiding the regulation and the best clinical practices for donor screening, stool sample handling and preparation of the FMT suspension.⁹⁹⁻¹⁰¹ Indeed, the variability in faecal bacterial communities can complicate or undermine treatment efficacy. This variability stems from both biological variation and variation introduced by sample handling. A recent study reported that oxygen exposure degraded faecal bacterial communities, whereas freeze-thaw cycles and lag time between donor defecation and transplant preparation had much more limited effects.¹⁰² Given that many intestinal bacteria are obligate anaerobe, including many beneficial bacteria potentially possessing anti-inflammatory effects, exposure to oxygen during the preparation of FMT may potentially compromise the therapeutic value of FMT in PsA and other inflammatory diseases. Therefore, although frozen faecal preparations of stool suspended into physiological saline and glycerol have proven just as effective as fresh stool in treating *C. difficile* infections,¹⁰³ the optimal transplant preparation method in treating inflammatory diseases remain to be established.

Our stool handling setup is in line with the prevailing practice, which includes mixing and filtration of the stool suspension and adding saline and glycerol as a cryopreservative before storage at minus 80 °C.¹⁰¹ In addition, we have sought to limit the oxygen exposure during transport by placing the donor stool within a plastic bag, which is subsequently put into a tightly closed small plastic container. Supplementary, during preparation the solution will not be homogenized for more than 10 seconds. Nevertheless, the lack of optimal anaerobe conditions during stool handling could possibly undermine the therapeutic potential of our FMT procedure. Furthermore, although we aim to use 50g of faeces for each transplant, we acknowledge that the exact weight between donations could vary with an estimated +/- 5 g. Also, due to the wide variability in microbial content in stool between donations, the content cannot be fully standardized, and may likely differ between each FMT procedure. However, to meet this challenge we will collect and store samples from each donation which will enable us to determine the microbiota composition of each donation in case some donations prove more effective than others.

Stool donor selection is another important issue that needs to be addressed. The composition of the normal microbiota composition has only recently been mapped,¹⁰⁴ and the existence of a limited number of well-balanced host-microbial symbiotic states, where one or more bacteria species are considered the main functional driver(s), have been identified using clustering of metagenomic sequences.¹⁰⁵ Still, the most favourable donor microbiota composition for treating inflammatory diseases has yet to be determined. Therefore, it also remains to be established whether donors with a high stool bacteria diversity should be preferred over isolation of specific bacteria, or if pooled stool samples from several donors outperforms a single-donor transplant.^{51,106} We have chosen to use only single donations from three to five different anonymous stool donors to ensure donor traceability and to enable us to identify any individual donor-specific microbial effects. Also, since host intrinsic-, environmental-, dietary- and medication factors have been associated with gut bacteria composition and functionality,^{95,96,107,108} the donors must eat a balanced diet, not be overweight or take any medications or be physical or psychological stressed, smoke or consume alcohol during the donation period in order to limit the risk of transferring "abnormal" microbiota to the recipients. These donor criteria have been set for safety reasons, and we acknowledge, that this could potentially limit the inter-donor microbiota diversity due to shared lifestyle characteristics.

Another factor to keep in mind is the concept of matching donor and recipient, which may be of importance for enhancing the colonisation capabilities of the donor microbial communities. In fact, Rossen et al⁹³ did find that in patients with ulcerative colitis, the microbiota of FMT responders shifted to their respective donors, whereas non-responders did not. Li et al¹⁰⁹ reported that donor bacteria strains established extensively in the recipient and persisted for at least 3 months with a negligible decline of donor-strain populations detected between 45 days and 3 months following FMT in metabolic syndrome patients. However, they also found that recipients receiving the same donor transplant displayed varying degrees of microbiota transfer, indicating individual patterns of microbiome resistance and donor-recipient compatibilities. In addition, host genetics is known to effect the gut microbiota,¹¹⁰ and animal models have shown that sex¹¹¹ and age¹¹² also can be potentially modifiers of the gut bacteria composition. These observations may prove to be of importance for the outcome of FMT in inflammatory diseases.¹¹³ However, whether sex- and/or age-matching between donor and recipient is crucial for a successful FMT in humans remains to be enlighten. Therefore, in the present study, no donor-recipient matching will be conducted. However, a subgroup analysis will be performed to reveal any trend that could indicate better results in sex- or age-match cases.

Furthermore, as the interactions between the microbiota and the host are influenced by cooperation and competition between pathogenic and commensal microbes and multiple environmental variables, the lifestyle of the recipient following the FMT may be of importance. Nevertheless, due to the uncertainty of how to define the optimal lifestyle and the lack of knowledge on how different lifestyle factors may interfere with the microbiota, we have decided that the patients in the present study will not have to adhere to any predefined lifestyle "regime" or diet following the randomised intervention. However, every participant will fulfil an eating habit questionnaire at the beginning of the trial.

BMJ Open

Finally, non-bacteria microorganisms such as bacteriophages, viruses and fungi may also be of importance when targeting components of the microbiota or host cells for therapeutic purposes.¹¹⁴⁻¹¹⁶ Other complicating factors may include the composition of other microbiological niches such as the oral, lung, genitourinary, and skin microbiota.^{117,118} Indeed, the latter could likely prove to be of significance in patients with skin psoriasis. However, these factors will not be assessed in the present study.

CONCLUSION

Autoimmune and inflammatory rheumatic diseases are characterised by an abnormal gut bacteria composition. This trial has the potential to substantially expand the growing body of literature on the role of the intestinal microbiota in PsA, thereby enhancing our understanding of cause and effect. The results of this study, when completed, may be exploited for biomarker discovery, and for diagnostic and therapeutic purposes.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

T. Ellingsen, M.S. Kragsnaes, R. Christensen, and J. Kjeldsen conceived and developed the idea for the study. T. Ellingsen and M.S. Kragsnaes are the principal investigators and wrote the first study protocol draft. T. Ellingsen and M.S. Kragsnaes were responsible for all communication with the scientific ethical committee, the Danish Data Protection Agency and the National Health Board. T Ellingsen is the responsible party and sponsor. M.S. Kragsnaes, T. Ellingsen, H.C. Horn, J.K. Pedersen, H.L. Munk, and U. Fredberg sat up the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the psoriatic arthritis patients, and the latter five rheumatologists are conducting all the clinical examinations. J. Kjeldsen, F.M. Pedersen, and H. Glerup discussed and planned the FMT procedure, and they are conducting the FMTs and the sigmoidoscopies (obtaining mucosae tissue samples). D.K. Holm and H.M. Holt helped set up the donor screening programme, and they were responsible for conducting this programme and performing the microbiological and immunological tests. V. Andersen and K. Kristiansen are responsible for the microbiome and omics analyses, and have advised on how the tissue collection should be performed and what kind of tissue would be relevant to collect. R. Christensen has written the analysis plan and will be responsible for the final statistics analyses. In conclusion, all participants designated as authors have contributed to the conception and design of the study, and have critically either drafted or revised the first draft of the study protocol and the protocol paper. Also, all authors have approved the final version before submission.

REGISTRATION

The trial has been registered with ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT03058900).

FUNDING STATEMENT

This work was supported by the Region of Southern Denmark, Odense University Hospital, the Danish Regions, University of Southern Denmark, the Danish Rheumatism Association, the

2	1	Psoriasis Research Fund, and Odense Patient Explorative data Network (OPEN). Musculoskeletal
3	2	Statistics Unit at the Parker Institute, Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg Hospital (R. Christensen), is
4 5	3	supported by a core grant from the Oak Foundation (OCAY-13-309). K. Kristiansen is supported by
6	Д	BGI-Research BGI-Shenzhen China
7	•	
8	5	
9 10	C	
10	6 7	
12	,	None of the team members of this research project has declared any potential conflict of interest.
13	8	
14	0	
16	9	
17		
18	10	A great thanks to Lene Albjerg, biomedical laboratory technologist and quality control manager at
19 20	11	the Dept. of Clinical Immunology, Odense University Hospital, Denmark, for her expertise and
20 21	12	dedicated work regarding the practical handling of the FMT suspension.
22		
23		
24		
25		
20		
28		
29		
30 21		
31		
33		
34		
35		
30 37		
38		
39		
40		
41 42		
43		
44		
45		
46 47		
47		
49		
50		
51 52		
5∠ 53		
55		
55		
56		
57 50		
50 59		

1

1			
2	1		References
3	-		
4	2		
5 6 7	3 4	1.	Scher JU, Littman DR, Abramson SB. Microbiome in Inflammatory Arthritis and Human Rheumatic Diseases. <i>Arthritis Rheumatol</i> . 2016;68:35-45.
8	F	2	Acquite M. Flowaut D. Lip D et al. The role of the gut and microbes in the nathergonesis of
9 10 11	6	Ζ.	spondyloarthritis. Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol. 2014;28:687-702.
12 13	7	3.	Stoll ML. Gut microbes, immunity, and spondyloarthritis. Clin Immunol. 2015;159:134-142.
14	8	4.	Costello ME, Ciccia F, Willner D et al. Intestinal dysbiosis in ankylosing spondylitis. Arthritis
15	9		Rheumatol. 2014.
16			
17	10	5.	Yang L, Wang L, Wang X et al. A Possible Role of Intestinal Microbiota in the Pathogenesis of
18	11		Ankylosing Spondylitis. Int J Mol Sci. 2016;17.
19		_	
20	12	6.	Manasson J, Scher JU. Spondyloarthritis and the microbiome: new insights from an ancient
21	13		hypothesis. <i>Curr Rheumatol Rep</i> . 2015;17:10.
22	1.4	7	Do W/K Debuggebarg K Deceloper C at al. Integrating the nother preside of speed dearth vitig, gut and
23	14	7.	ioint united? Curr Onin Bhoumatel, 2015-27:180, 106
24 25	15		Joint united? Carl Opin Rheamatol. 2015;27:189-196.
25	16	8	Enninga H Konstantinov SR Pennelenbosch MP et al. The microhiome and psoriatic arthritis. Curr
27	17	0.	Rheumatol Rep. 2014:16:407.
28			
29	18	9.	Coit P, Sawalha AH. The human microbiome in rheumatic autoimmune diseases: A comprehensive
30	19		review. Clin Immunol. 2016;170:70-79.
31			
32	20	10.	Ciccia F, Ferrante A, Guggino G et al. The role of the gastrointestinal tract in the pathogenesis of
33	21		rheumatic diseases. Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol. 2016;30:889-900.
34 25			
35 36	22	11.	lito RY, Cypers H, Joossens M et al. Brief Report: Dialister as a Microbial Marker of Disease Activity
37	23		In Spondyloarthritis. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2017;69:114-121.
38	24	12	Enninga H. Sperna Weiland CI. Thio HB et al. Similar Depletion of Protective Faecalibacterium
39	24	12.	prauspitzii in Psoriasis and Inflammatory Bowel Disease, but not in Hidradenitis Suppurativa
40	26		Crohns Colitis 2016
41	20		
42	27	13.	Ritchlin CT, Colbert RA, Gladman DD. Psoriatic Arthritis. N Engl J Med. 2017;376:2095-2096.
43			
44 15	28	14.	Terslev L, Naredo E, Iagnocco A et al. Defining enthesitis in spondyloarthritis by ultrasound: results
46	29		of a Delphi process and of a reliability reading exercise. Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken). 2014;66:741-
47	30		/48.
48	21	15	Polyce P. Janualine S. Vitialle M et al. Extra articular manifectations in provintic arthritic patients
49	37	15.	Clin Rhoumatol 2014
50	52		chin kheunutoi. 2014.
51	33	16.	Gladman DD. Psoriatic arthritis. Dermatol Ther. 2009:22:40-55.
52			,
53	34	17.	Gossec L, Coates LC, De WM et al. Management of psoriatic arthritis in 2016: a comparison of
54 55	35		EULAR and GRAPPA recommendations. Nat Rev Rheumatol. 2016;12:743-750.
55			
57			
58			
59			
60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

2 3	1 2	18.	Kingsley GH, Kowalczyk A, Taylor H et al. A randomized placebo-controlled trial of methotrexate in psoriatic arthritis. <i>Rheumatology (Oxford)</i> . 2012;51:1368-1377.
4			
5	3	19.	Gossec L, Smolen JS, Ramiro S et al. European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR)
0	4		recommendations for the management of psoriatic arthritis with pharmacological therapies: 2015
8	5		update. Ann Rheum Dis. 2016;75:499-510.
9	6	20.	Asquith M, Rosenbaum JT. The interaction between host genetics and the microbiome in the
10	7		pathogenesis of spondyloarthropathies. Curr Opin Rheumatol. 2016;28:405-412.
11			
12	8	21.	Benham H, Robinson PC, Baillet AC et al. Role of genetics in infection-associated arthritis. Best Pract
14	9		Res Clin Rheumatol. 2015;29:213-225.
14			
16	10	22.	Shamriz O, Mizrahi H, Werbner M et al. Microbiota at the crossroads of autoimmunity. Autoimmun
17	11		<i>Rev.</i> 2016;15:859-869.
18		• •	
19	12	23.	Lories RJ, de VK. Is psoriatic arthritis a result of abnormalities in acquired or innate immunity? Curr
20	13		Rheumatol Rep. 2012;14:375-382.
21	1.4	24	Martazavi M. Thiala D. Ditablin C. The joint in provintia orthyitic. Clin Even Decumental, 2015;22:20.25
22	14	24.	Mortezavi M, Thiele R, Ritchin C. The joint in psonatic arthrus. <i>Clin Exp Rheumatol</i> . 2015;33:20-25.
23	15	25	Acosta Felguer MI, Eitzgerald O, Perinheral joint involvement in proviatic arthritic nationals. Clin Evo
24	15	25.	Rheumatal 2015:33:26-30
25	10		Micumatol. 2015,55.20 50.
26	17	26.	Matt P. Lindqvist U. Kleinau S. Up-regulation of CD64-expressing monocytes with impaired
27	18	_0.	FcgammaR function reflects disease activity in polyarticular psoriatic arthritis. Scand J Rheumatol.
28	19		2015:44:464-473.
29			
30	20	27.	Al-Mossawi MH, Ridley A, Kiedel S et al. The role of natural killer cells, gamma delta T-cells and
32	21		other innate immune cells in spondyloarthritis. Curr Opin Rheumatol. 2013;25:434-439.
33			
34	22	28.	Ryan C, Korman NJ, Gelfand JM et al. Research gaps in psoriasis: opportunities for future studies. J
35	23		Am Acad Dermatol. 2014;70:146-167.
36			
37	24	29.	Berthelot JM, de la Cochetiere MF, Potel G et al. Evidence supporting a role for dormant bacteria in
38	25		the pathogenesis of spondylarthritis. <i>Joint Bone Spine</i> . 2013;80:135-140.
39	20	20	Abdellahi Deedee C. Abuseness CD. Cohen III. The metabolis rate of the submission bists in bealth and
40	26	30.	Abdollani-Roodsaz S, Abramson SB, Scher JU. The metabolic role of the gut microbiota in health and
41	27		meumatic disease: mechanisms and interventions. <i>Nat Rev Rheumator</i> . 2016;12:446-455.
42	28	21	Honda K Littman DR. The microbiota in adaptive immune homeostasis and disease. Nature
45 11	20	51.	2016-535-75-84
45	23		2010,000.70 04.
46	30	32.	Ciccia F, Rizzo A, Triolo G. Subclinical gut inflammation in ankylosing spondylitis. Curr Opin
47	31		Rheumatol. 2016;28:89-96.
48			
49	32	33.	Miossec P, Korn T, Kuchroo VK. Interleukin-17 and type 17 helper T cells. N Engl J Med.
50	33		2009;361:888-898.
51			
52	34	34.	Ciccia F, Guggino G, Rizzo A et al. Dysbiosis and zonulin upregulation alter gut epithelial and
53	35		vascular barriers in patients with ankylosing spondylitis. Ann Rheum Dis. 2017.
54			
55 56	36 27	35.	Planta A, Arvikar SL, Strie K et al. Two rheumatoid arthritis-specific autoantigens correlate microbial
50 57	3/		immunity with autoimmune responses in joints. J Clin Invest. 2017.
58			
59			
60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
			=

BMJ Open

2	1	36.	Scher JU, Ubeda C, Artacho A et al. Decreased bacterial diversity characterizes an altered gut
3	2		microbiota in psoriatic arthritis and resembles dysbiosis of inflammatory bowel disease. Arthritis
4	3		Rheumatol. 2014.
5			
6	4	37.	Lindqvist U, Kristjansson G, Pihl-Lundin I et al. Patients with psoriatic arthritis have an increased
7	5		number of lymphocytes in the duodenal mucosa in comparison with patients with psoriasis
8	6		vulgaris. J Rheumatol. 2006;33:924-927.
9			
10	7	38.	Scarpa R, Manguso F, D'Arienzo A et al. Microscopic inflammatory changes in colon of patients with
11	8		both active psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis without bowel symptoms. J Rheumatol. 2000;27:1241-
12	9		1246.
13			
14	10	39.	Van PL, Van den Bosch F, Mielants H et al. Mucosal inflammation in spondylarthritides: past,
15	11		present, and future. Curr Rheumatol Rep. 2011;13:409-415.
10			
17	12	40.	Schatteman L, Mielants H, Veys EM et al. Gut inflammation in psoriatic arthritis: a prospective
10	13		ileocolonoscopic study. J Rheumatol. 1995;22:680-683.
20			
20	14	41.	Ciccia F, Guggino G, Ferrante A et al. Interleukin-9 Overexpression and Th9 Polarization
21	15		Characterize the Inflamed Gut, the Synovial Tissue, and the Peripheral Blood of Patients With
22	16		Psoriatic Arthritis. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2016;68:1922-1931.
23			
25	17	42.	Lin L, Zhang J. Role of intestinal microbiota and metabolites on gut homeostasis and human
25	18		diseases. BMC Immunol. 2017;18:2.
20			
28	19	43.	Gill T, Asquith M, Rosenbaum JT et al. The intestinal microbiome in spondyloarthritis. Curr Opin
29	20		Rheumatol. 2015;27:319-325.
30			
31	21	44.	Kump PK, Krause R, Allerberger F et al. Faecal microbiota transplantation-the Austrian approach.
32	22		Clin Microbiol Infect. 2014;20:1106-1111.
33			
34	23	45.	Cammarota G, Pecere S, Ianiro G et al. Principles of DNA-Based Gut Microbiota Assessment and
35	24		Therapeutic Efficacy of Fecal Microbiota Transplantation in Gastrointestinal Diseases. Dig Dis.
36	25		2016;34:279-285.
37			
38	26	46.	Austin M, Mellow M, Tierney WM. Fecal microbiota transplantation in the treatment of Clostridium
39	27		difficile infections. Am J Med. 2014;127:479-483.
40			
41	28	47.	van NE, Vrieze A, Nieuwdorp M et al. Duodenal infusion of donor feces for recurrent Clostridium
42	29		difficile. <i>N Engl J Med</i> . 2013;368:407-415.
43			
44	30	48.	Cammarota G, Masucci L, Ianiro G et al. Randomised clinical trial: faecal microbiota transplantation
45	31		by colonoscopy vs. vancomycin for the treatment of recurrent Clostridium difficile infection.
46	32		Aliment Pharmacol Ther. 2015;41:835-843.
47			
48	33	49.	Lee CH, Steiner T, Petrof EO et al. Frozen vs Fresh Fecal Microbiota Transplantation and Clinical
49	34		Resolution of Diarrhea in Patients With Recurrent Clostridium difficile Infection: A Randomized
50	35		Clinical Trial. JAMA. 2016;315:142-149.
51			
52 52	36	50.	Li YT, Cai HF, Wang ZH et al. Systematic review with meta-analysis: long-term outcomes of faecal
55	37		microbiota transplantation for Clostridium difficile infection. <i>Aliment Pharmacol Ther</i> . 2016;43:445-
55	38		457.
56			
57			
58			
59			
60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
			24

1			
2	1	51.	Paramsothy S. Kamm MA. Kaakoush NO et al. Multidonor intensive faecal microbiota
3	2	-	transplantation for active ulcerative colitis: a randomised placebo-controlled trial. <i>Lancet</i> .
4	2		2017-380-1218-1228
5	5		
6	1	52	Cui B Feng O Wang H et al Fecal microbiota transplantation through mid-gut for refractory
7		52.	Croba's disaasa: Safaty faasibility and officacy trial results. <i>L Castroantaral Hangtal</i> 2014
8	5		cionin's disease. Safety, leasibility and enicacy that results. J Ousil benter of heputon. 2014.
9	C	БЭ	Lund H. Brunnhuhar K. Juhl C at al. Towards avidance based research, BMU 2016-255-440
10	0	55.	Lund H, Brunningber K, Juni C et al. Towards evidence based research. BiviJ. 2010;555.15440.
11	7	Γ 4	Ciesia E. Formanto A. Triala C. Intertinal durbiasis and innets immuna responses in suisl
12	/	54.	Ciccia F, Ferrante A, Thoio G. Intestinal dysplosis and initiate initiatie responses in axia
13	8		spondyloarthritis. Curr Opin Rheumatol. 2016;28:352-358.
14	0		Des la Dise A Messal III Müllige C Misselsiste e de divertir se substitue e se se 2.0 cm Osis
15	9	55.	Bravo-Blas A, Wessel H, Milling S. Microbiota and arthritis: correlations or cause? Curr Opin
16	10		Rheumatol. 2016;28:161-167.
17			
18	11	56.	Kabeerdoss J, Sandhya P, Danda D. Gut inflammation and microbiome in spondyloarthritis.
19	12		Rheumatol Int. 2016;36:457-468.
20			
21	13	57.	Costello ME, Robinson PC, Benham H et al. The intestinal microbiome in human disease and how it
22	14		relates to arthritis and spondyloarthritis. Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol. 2015;29:202-212.
23			
23	15	58.	Bazso A, Szodoray P, Suto G et al. Importance of intestinal microenvironment in development of
25	16		arthritis. A systematic review. Immunol Res. 2015;61:172-176.
25			
20	17	59.	Taneja V. Arthritis susceptibility and the gut microbiome. FEBS Lett. 2014;588:4244-4249.
27			
20	18	60.	Rosenbaum JT, Lin P, Asquith M et al. Does the microbiome play a causal role in spondyloarthritis?
30	19		Clin Rheumatol. 2014;33:763-767.
31			
22	20	61.	Aggarwal A, Sarangi AN, Gaur P et al. Gut microbiome in children with enthesitis-related arthritis in
22	21		a developing country and the effect of probiotic administration. <i>Clin Exp Immunol</i> . 2017;187:480-
37	22		489.
25			
36	23	62.	Berntson L, Hedlund-Treutiger I, Alving K. Anti-inflammatory effect of exclusive enteral nutrition in
30	24		patients with juvenile idiopathic arthritis. <i>Clin Exp Rheumatol</i> . 2016:34:941-945.
27 20			
20	25	63	Zamani B. Golkar HR. Farshbaf S et al. Clinical and metabolic response to probiotic supplementation
39 40	26		in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Int I
40	27		Rheum Dis 2016:19:869-879
41	27		Mileum Dis. 2010,15.005 075.
42	28	64	Taylor W. Gladman D. Helliwell P. et al. Classification criteria for psoriatic arthritis: development of
43	29	04.	new criteria from a large international study. Arthritis Rheum, 2006:54:2665-2673
44	25		new chiena nom a large methational study. Artimus nicam. 2000,54.2005 2015.
45	30	65	Thorsen H. Hansen TM. McKenna SP et al. Adaptation into Danish of the Stanford Health
40	21	05.	Accessment Questionnaire (HAQ) and the Phoumateid Arthritic Quality of Life Scale (PAQeL). Scand
47	21		Assessment Questionnaire (RAQ) and the Kieumatolic Arthintis Quality of the Stale (RAQ0L). Stand
40	32		J RHEUHIULUI. 2001;50.103-109.
49 50	22		Dradesky V Dental M Delint DV at al. Comparison of the Desviatio Arthritic Quality of Life (DeAQel)
50	33	00.	Brouszky V, Pentek W, Banni PV et al. Comparison of the Psonatic Artifitis Quality of the (PSAQOL)
51	34		questionnaire, the functional status (HAQ) and utility (EQ-5D) measures in psoriatic arthritis: results
52	35		from a cross-sectional survey. Scand J Rheumatol. 2010;39:303-309.
55	26	67	Table de D. Table des Outles et la la Davis de la l'Étable d'United a de la Étable de la tradición de la contra
54	36	67.	Zachariae R, Zachariae C, Ibsen H et al. Dermatology life quality index: data from Danish inpatients
55	37		and outpatients. Acta Derm Venereol. 2000;80:272-276.
50 57			
57 50			
50			
22			For peer review only - http://bmiopen.bmi.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
00			25

1			
2	1	68.	Fransen J, Antoni C, Mease PJ et al. Performance of response criteria for assessing peripheral
3	2		arthritis in patients with psoriatic arthritis: analysis of data from randomised controlled trials of two
4	3		tumour necrosis factor inhibitors. <i>Ann Rheum Dis</i> . 2006:65:1373-1378.
5	-		······································
6	4	69.	Felson DT, Anderson JJ, Boers M et al. American College of Rheumatology. Preliminary definition of
7	5		improvement in rheumatoid arthritis. Arthritis Rheum. 1995;38:727-735.
8			
9	6	70.	Felson DT, Anderson JJ, Lange ML et al. Should improvement in rheumatoid arthritis clinical trials
10	7		be defined as fifty percent or seventy percent improvement in core set measures, rather than
11	8		twenty percent? Arthritis Rheum. 1998;41:1564-1570.
12			
13	9	71.	Faria JR, Aarao AR, Jimenez LM et al. Inter-rater concordance study of the PASI (Psoriasis Area and
14	10		Severity Index). An Bras Dermatol. 2010;85:625-629.
16			
17	11	72.	Jensen OK, Callesen J, Nielsen MG et al. Reproducibility of tender point examination in chronic low
18	12		back pain patients as measured by intrarater and inter-rater reliability and agreement: a validation
19	13		study. BMJ Open. 2013;3.
20			
21	14	73.	Mishra A, Makharia GK. Techniques of functional and motility test: how to perform and interpret
22	15		intestinal permeability. J Neurogastroenterol Motil. 2012;18:443-447.
23			
24	16	74.	Klingberg E, Carlsten H, Hilme E et al. Calprotectin in ankylosing spondylitisfrequently elevated in
25	17		feces, but normal in serum. Scand J Gastroenterol. 2012;47:435-444.
26			
27	18	75.	Kelly CR, Kahn S, Kashyap P et al. Update on Fecal Microbiota Transplantation 2015: Indications,
28	19		Methodologies, Mechanisms, and Outlook. <i>Gastroenterology</i> . 2015;149:223-237.
29	• •		
30	20	76.	Wang S, Xu M, Wang W et al. Systematic Review: Adverse Events of Fecal Microbiota
31	21		Transplantation. PLos One. 2016;11:e01611/4.
32	22	77	Descen NC MacDenald IV, de Vision FM et al. Focal ministration de novel thereau in
33	22	//.	Rossen NG, MacDonalu JK, de vries Elvi et al. Fecal microbiola transplantation as novel therapy in
34	23		gastroenterology. A systematic review. <i>World J Gastroenterol</i> . 2015;21:5359-5371.
35	24	78	Girotra M. Gard S. Anand R. et al. Fecal Microbiota Transplantation for Recurrent Clostridium
30 27	24	70.	difficile Infection in the Elderly: Long-Term Outcomes and Microbiota Changes. Dig Dis Sci
رد در	25		2016-61-3007_2015
20	20		2010,01.3007-3013.
40	27	79	Gweon TG Kim L Lim CH et al. Fecal Microbiota Transplantation Using Upper Gastrointestinal Tract
41	28	75.	for the Treatment of Refractory or Severe Complicated Clostridium difficile Infection in Elderly
42	20		Patients in Poor Medical Condition: The First Study in an Asian Country, Gastroenterol Res Pract
43	30		2016:2016:2687605
44	50		2010,2010.2007.003.
45	31	80.	Agrawal M. Aroniadis OC. Brandt LI et al. The Long-term Efficacy and Safety of Fecal Microbiota
46	32		Transplant for Recurrent, Severe, and Complicated Clostridium difficile Infection in 146 Elderly
47	33		Individuals. J Clin Gastroenterol. 2016:50:403-407.
48			
49	34	81.	Di BS, Gouliouris T, Petrosillo N. Fecal microbiota transplantation (FMT) for Clostridium difficile
50	35		infection: focus on immunocompromised patients. J Infect Chemother. 2015;21:230-237.
51			
52	36	82.	Webb BJ, Brunner A, Ford CD et al. Fecal microbiota transplantation for recurrent Clostridium
53	37		difficile infection in hematopoietic stem cell transplant recipients. Transpl Infect Dis. 2016.
54			
55			
50			
57 50			
50 50			
60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
			26

2 3 4 5	1 2 3	83.	Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R et al. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. <i>J Biomed Inform</i> . 2009;42:377-381.
6 7	4	84.	Thaiss CA, Zmora N, Levy M et al. The microbiome and innate immunity. <i>Nature</i> . 2016;535:65-74.
8 9 10	5 6	85.	McLean MH, Dieguez D, Jr., Miller LM et al. Does the microbiota play a role in the pathogenesis of autoimmune diseases? <i>Gut</i> . 2015;64:332-341.
11	7	96	Longman DS, Vang V, Diobl CE at al. Microbiota, best interactions in museual homeostasis and
12 13	8	80.	systemic autoimmunity. Cold Spring Harb Symp Quant Biol. 2013;78:193-201.
14	9	87.	Shreiner AB. Kao JY. Young VB. The gut microbiome in health and in disease. <i>Curr Opin</i>
15 16	10		Gastroenterol. 2015;31:69-75.
17	11	88.	Hooper LV, Littman DR, Macpherson AJ. Interactions between the microbiota and the immune
18 19	12		system. Science. 2012;336:1268-1273.
20	13	89.	Round JL, Mazmanian SK. The gut microbiota shapes intestinal immune responses during health
21	14		and disease. Nat Rev Immunol. 2009;9:313-323.
22			
24	15	90.	Van de Wiele T, Van Praet JT, Marzorati M et al. How the microbiota shapes rheumatic diseases.
25 26	16		Nat Rev Rheumatol. 2016;12:398-411.
27	17	91.	Butto LF, Haller D. Dysbiosis in intestinal inflammation: Cause or consequence. Int J Med Microbiol.
28	18		2016.
29			
30	19	92.	Moayyedi P, Surette MG, Kim PT et al. Fecal Microbiota Transplantation Induces Remission in
31	20		Patients With Active Ulcerative Colitis in a Randomized Controlled Trial. <i>Gastroenterology</i> .
32	21		2015;149:102-109.
33			
34 35	22 23	93.	Rossen NG, Fuentes S, van der Spek MJ et al. Findings From a Randomized Controlled Trial of Fecal Transplantation for Patients With Ulcerative Colitis. <i>Gastroenterology</i> . 2015;149:110-118.
36	24	04	Smalen IS. Schols M. Braun Let al. Treating axial spanduloarthritic and parinheral spanduloarthritic
37	24	94.	Smolen JS, Schols M, Braun J et al. Treating axial spondyloartinitis and peripheral spondyloartinitis,
38	25		force. Ann Bhoum Dic 2017
39	20		Torce. Ann Rheum Dis. 2017.
40	27	95	Zhernakova A. Kurilshikov A. Bonder MI et al. Population-based metagenomics analysis reveals
41	27	55.	markers for gut microhiome composition and diversity. <i>Science</i> 2016:352:565-569
42	20		markers for gat microsrome composition and arversity. Science: 2010,552.505 505.
44	29	96.	Falony G, Joossens M, Vieira-Silva S et al. Population-level analysis of gut microbiome variation.
45	30		<i>Science</i> . 2016:352:560-564.
46			
47	31	97.	Forslund K, Hildebrand F, Nielsen T et al. Disentangling type 2 diabetes and metformin treatment
48	32		signatures in the human gut microbiota. <i>Nature</i> . 2015;528:262-266.
49			
50	33	98.	Zhang X, Zhang D, Jia H et al. The oral and gut microbiomes are perturbed in rheumatoid arthritis
51	34		and partly normalized after treatment. Nat Med. 2015;21:895-905.
52			
53	35	99.	Woodworth MH, Neish EM, Miller NS et al. Laboratory Testing of Donors and Stool for Fecal
54	36		Microbiota Transplantation for Recurrent C. difficile Infection. J Clin Microbiol. 2017.
55			
50 57	37	100.	Costello SP, Tucker EC, La BJ et al. Establishing a Fecal Microbiota Transplant Service for the
5/ 50	38		Treatment of Clostridium difficile Infection. <i>Clin Infect Dis</i> . 2016;62:908-914.
50 50			
60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1			
2	1	101.	Cammarota G, Ianiro G, Tilg H et al. European consensus conference on faecal microbiota
3	2		transplantation in clinical practice. Gut. 2017;66:569-580.
4			
5	3	102.	Chu ND, Smith MB, Perrotta AR et al. Profiling Living Bacteria Informs Preparation of Fecal
6	4		Microbiota Transplantations. PLoS One. 2017;12:e0170922.
/			
8	5	103.	Satokari R, Mattila E, Kainulainen V et al. Simple faecal preparation and efficacy of frozen inoculum
9	6		in faecal microbiota transplantation for recurrent Clostridium difficile infectionan observational
10	7		cohort study. Aliment Pharmacol Ther. 2015;41:46-53.
12			
13	8	104.	Li J, Jia H, Cai X et al. An integrated catalog of reference genes in the human gut microbiome. <i>Nat</i>
14	9		Biotechnol. 2014;32:834-841.
15	10	405	
16	10	105.	Arumugam M, Raes J, Pelletier E et al. Enterotypes of the human gut microbiome. <i>Nature</i> .
17	11		2011;473:174-180.
18	10	100	Kazarauni A. Wein LM. Europering the Efficiency of Deeled Steels in Facel Microbiote Transplantation
19	12	106.	Kazerouni A, wein Livi. Exploring the Efficacy of Pooled Stools in Fecal Microbiota Transplantation
20	13		for Microbiota-Associated Chronic Diseases. PLos One. 2017;12:e0163956.
21	11	107	Vandanutto D. Falany G. Vigira Silva S at al. Stool consistency is strongly accessibled with gut
22	14 15	107.	microbiota richness and composition, onteretypes and bacterial growth rates. Gut 2016;65:57.62
23	15		microbiota richness and composition, enterotypes and bacterial growth rates. Gut. 2010,05.57-02.
24	16	108	Lev RE The gene-microbe link Nature 2015:518:57
25	10	100.	
26	17	109.	Li SS, Zhu A, Benes V et al. Durable coexistence of donor and recipient strains after fecal microbiota
27	18	2001	transplantation Science 2016:352:586-589
28	10		
29	19	110.	Spor A, Koren O, Ley R. Unravelling the effects of the environment and host genotype on the gut
30 21	20		microbiome. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2011:9:279-290.
27			
32 33	21	111.	Markle JG, Frank DN, Mortin-Toth S et al. Sex differences in the gut microbiome drive hormone-
34	22		dependent regulation of autoimmunity. Science. 2013;339:1084-1088.
35			
36	23	112.	Xiao L, Estelle J, Kiilerich P et al. A reference gene catalogue of the pig gut microbiome. Nat
37	24		Microbiol. 2016;16161.
38			
39	25	113.	Markle JG, Frank DN, Adeli K et al. Microbiome manipulation modifies sex-specific risk for
40	26		autoimmunity. Gut Microbes. 2014;5:485-493.
41			
42	27	114.	Mills S, Shanahan F, Stanton C et al. Movers and shakers: influence of bacteriophages in shaping
43	28		the mammalian gut microbiota. Gut Microbes. 2013;4:4-16.
44	• •		
45	29	115.	Preiffer JK, Virgin HW. Viral immunity. Transkingdom control of viral infection and immunity in the
46	30		mammalian intestine. <i>Science</i> . 2016;351.
47	21	110	Underhill DNA Dearlinger E. Jammung Internations with Dath aganic and Commonsel Europy A Two
48	31	110.	May Street Immunity 2015 42:845 858
49 50	32		Way Street. Inimumity. 2015,43.845-858.
50 51	33	117	Castaling M. Evre S. Most Let al. The skin microbiome in provistic arthritis: methodology
52	34	11/.	development and pilot data. <i>Lancet</i> 2015:385 Suppl 1:S27
52	54		
54	35	118	Scher III Joshua V. Artacho A et al. The lung microbiota in early rheumatoid arthritis and
55	36	110.	autoimmunity. <i>Microbiome</i> , 2016:4:60.
56	37		
57	38		
58			
59			
60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 28





Figure. 1. Flow diagram of the randomised, placebo-controlled trial

174x201mm (192 x 192 DPI)



cand.med. Maja Skov Kragsnæs Odense Universitetshospital Reumatologisk afdeling C Sdr. Boulevard 29 5000 Odense C

De Videnskabsetiske Komitéer for Region Syddanmark

komite@rsyd.dk

25. juni 2015

Projekt-ID: S-20150080 HLP/bss

Forskningsprojekt:

Fæces-mikrobiom-transplantation hos patienter med perifer psoriasisgigt: Et 6-måneders randomiseret, placebo-kontrolleret studie. Eudract nr.: ?

Den Videnskabsetiske Komité for Region Syddanmark har på sit møde den 17. juni 2015 behandlet ovennævnte forskningsprojekt og truffet følgende:

Afgørelse

Komiteen har godkendt projektet på vilkår i henhold til lov nr. 593 af 14. juni 2011 om videnskabsetisk behandling af sundhedsvidenskabelige forskningsprojekter

279x179mm (192 x 192 DPI)

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml



CONSORT 2010 checklist of information to include when reporting a randomised trial*

Section/Topic	ltem No	Checklist item	Reported on page No
Title and abstract			
	1a	Identification as a randomised trial in the title	1
	1b	Structured summary of trial design, methods, results, and conclusions (for specific guidance see CONSORT for abstracts)	2
Introduction			
Background and	2a	Scientific background and explanation of rationale	3-4
objectives	2b	Specific objectives or hypotheses	4
Methods			
Trial design	3a	Description of trial design (such as parallel, factorial) including allocation ratio	5
0	3b	Important changes to methods after trial commencement (such as eligibility criteria), with reasons	-
Participants	4a	Eligibility criteria for participants	8-9
	4b	Settings and locations where the data were collected	
Interventions	5	The interventions for each group with sufficient details to allow replication, including how and when they were	
		actually administered	9-10
Outcomes	6a	Completely defined pre-specified primary and secondary outcome measures, including how and when they were assessed	
	6b	Any changes to trial outcomes after the trial commenced, with reasons	10-11
Sample size	7a	How sample size was determined	12-13
	7b	When applicable, explanation of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines	
Randomisation:			
Sequence	8a	Method used to generate the random allocation sequence	13
generation	8b	Type of randomisation; details of any restriction (such as blocking and block size)	13
Allocation	9	Mechanism used to implement the random allocation sequence (such as sequentially numbered containers),	
concealment		describing any steps taken to conceal the sequence until interventions were assigned	
mechanism			13
Implementation	10	Who generated the random allocation sequence, who enrolled participants, and who assigned participants to	
		interventions	13
Blinding	11a	It done, who was blinded after assignment to interventions (for example, participants, care providers, those	13
CONSORT 2010 checklist		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	Pag

Page 34 of 33

BMJ Open

		assessing outcomes) and how	
	11b	If relevant, description of the similarity of interventions	9
Statistical methods	12a	Statistical methods used to compare groups for primary and secondary outcomes	13-14
	12b	Methods for additional analyses, such as subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses	14
Results			
Participant flow (a	13a	For each group, the numbers of participants who were randomly assigned, received intended treatment, and	
diagram is strongly		were analysed for the primary outcome	6
recommended)	13b	For each group, losses and exclusions after randomisation, together with reasons	6
Recruitment	14a	Dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up	8
	14b	Why the trial ended or was stopped	-
Baseline data	15	A table showing baseline demographic and clinical characteristics for each group	-
Numbers analysed	16	For each group, number of participants (denominator) included in each analysis and whether the analysis was	
		by original assigned groups	-
Outcomes and	17a	For each primary and secondary outcome, results for each group, and the estimated effect size and its	
estimation		precision (such as 95% confidence interval)	-
	17b	For binary outcomes, presentation of both absolute and relative effect sizes is recommended	-
Ancillary analyses	18	Results of any other analyses performed, including subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing	
		pre-specified from exploratory	-
Harms	19	All important harms or unintended effects in each group (for specific guidance see CONSORT for harms)	12
Discussion			
Limitations	20	Trial limitations, addressing sources of potential bias, imprecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses	17-20
Generalisability	21	Generalisability (external validity, applicability) of the trial findings	17-18
Interpretation	22	Interpretation consistent with results, balancing benefits and harms, and considering other relevant evidence	-
Other information			
Registration	23	Registration number and name of trial registry	20
Protocol	24	Where the full trial protocol can be accessed, if available	-
Funding	25	Sources of funding and other support (such as supply of drugs), role of funders	20

*We strongly recommend reading this statement in conjunction with the CONSORT 2010 Explanation and Elaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also recommend reading CONSORT extensions for cluster randomised trials, non-inferiority and equivalence trials, non-pharmacological treatments, herbal interventions, and pragmatic trials. Additional extensions are forthcoming: for those and for up to date references relevant to this checklist, see <u>www.consort-statement.org</u>.

CONSORT 2010 checklist
BMJ Open

Efficacy and safety of faecal microbiota transplantation in patients with psoriatic arthritis: protocol for a 6-month, double-blind, randomised placebo-controlled trial

The FLORA trial

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-019231.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	16-Dec-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Kragsnaes, Maja; Odense University Hospital, Department of Rheumatology; University of Southern Denmark, Odense Patient data Explorative Network (OPEN), Department of Clinical Institute Kjeldsen, Jens; Odense University Hospital, Department of Gastroenterology Horn, Hans; Odense University Hospital, Department of Rheumatology Pedersen, Finn; Odense University Hospital, Department of Rheumatology Pedersen, Finn; Odense University Hospital, Department of Gastroenterology Holt, Hanne; Odense University Hospital, Department of Clinical Microbiology Pedersen, Jens Kristian; Odense University Hospital, Department of Clinical Microbiology Holm, Dorte; Odense University Hospital, Department of Clinical Immunology Glerup, Henning; Silkeborg Regional Hospital, Diagnostic Centre Andersen, Vibeke; Hospital of Southern Jutland, IRS-Centre Sonderjylland; University of Southern Denmark, Institute of Molecular Medicine Fredberg, Ulrich; Silkeborg Regional Hospital, Diagnostic Centre Kristiansen, Karsten; University of Copenhagen, Laboratory of Genomics and Molecular Biomedicine, Department of Biology; BGI Christensen, Robin; Frederiksberg and Bispebjerg Hospital, Musculoskeletal Statistics Unit, Parker Institute Ellingsen, Torkell; Odense University Hospital, Department of Rheumatology
Primary Subject Heading :	Rheumatology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Immunology (including allergy)
Keywords:	Psoriasis < DERMATOLOGY, Clinical trials < THERAPEUTICS, Faecal microbiota transplantation, Intestinal microbiota, Psoriatic arthritis



2		
3	1	
4		
5	2	
6	-	
7	С	Efficacy and safety of faecal microhiota transplantation in
8	5	Effectly and safety of factal finerobiota transplantation in
9		nationts with providin arthritic
10	4	patients with psonatic artifitis.
11		
12	5	protocol for a 6-month, double-blind, randomised placebo-
13		
14	6	controlled trial
15	_	
16	/	
17	8	The FLORA trial
18	9	
19	5	
20	10	Kragsnaes $MS^{1,2^*}$, Kieldsen J^3 , Horn HC^1 , Munk HL^1 , Pedersen FM^3 , Holt HM^4 , Pedersen JK^1 , Holm
21	11	DK^5 Glerun H ⁶ Andersen V ^{7,8} Fredhera Ll ⁶ Kristiansen K ^{9,10} Christensen R ¹¹ Ellingsen T ^{1**}
22	11	DK, Gierup II, Andersen V, Treuberg O, Kristiansen K, enristensen K, Enrigsen T.
23	12	
24		
25	13	¹ Department of Rheumatology, Odense University Hospital, Denmark.
26	14	² Odense Patient data Explorative Network (OPEN), Department of Clinical Institute, University of Southern Denmark.
27	15	³ Department of Gastroenterology, Odense University Hospital, Denmark.
28	16	⁴ Department of Clinical Microbiology, Odense University Hospital, Denmark.
29	17	⁵ Department of Clinical Immunology, Odense University Hospital, Denmark.
30	18	⁶ Diagnostic Centre, Silkeborg Regional Hospital, Denmark.
31	19	⁷ IRS-Centre Sonderjylland, Hospital of Southern Jutland, Denmark.
32	20	⁸ Institute of Molecular Medicine, University of Southern Denmark.
33	21	⁹ Laboratory of Genomics and Molecular Biomedicine, Department of Biology, University of Copenhagen, Denmark.
34	22	¹⁰ Institute of Metagenomics, BGI-Shenzhen, Shenzhen, China.
35	23	¹¹ Musculoskeletal Statistics Unit, The Parker Institute, Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark.
36	24	
37	25	* Corresponding author email address: maja.kragsnaes@dadInet.dk.
38	20	
39	26	** Sponsor email address: torkell.ellingsen@rsyd.dk.
40	27	
41		
42	28	Protocol article version: 02.
43	29	Date: Dec 15, 2017.
44		
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		
51		
52		
53		
54		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

ABSTRACT

Introduction: An unbalanced intestinal microbiota may mediate activation of the inflammatory pathways seen in psoriatic arthritis (PsA). A randomised, placebo-controlled trial of faecal microbiota transplantation (FMT) infused into the small intestine of PsA patients with active peripheral disease who are non-responsive to methotrexate (MTX) treatment will be conducted. The objective is to explore clinical aspects associated with FMT performed in PsA patients.

Methods and analysis: The FLORA trial is a randomised, two-centre stratified, double-blind (patient, care provider and outcome assessor), placebo-controlled, parallel-group study. Eighty patients will be included and randomised (1:1) to either placebo (saline) or FMT provided from an anonymous healthy donor. Throughout the study, both groups will continue the weekly self-administered subcutaneous (s.c.) MTX treatment, remaining on the pre-inclusion dosage (15-25 mg/week). The clinical measures of psoriasis and PsA disease activity used include the Health Assessment Questionnaire (2-page DI-HAQ), the Dermatology Quality of Life Index (DLQI), the Spondyloarthritis Research Consortium of Canada (SPARCC) Enthesitis Index, the Psoriasis Area Severity Index (PASI), a dactylitis digit count, a swollen/tender joint count (66/68), plasma C-reactive protein as well as visual analogue scales for pain, fatigue, and patient and physician global assessments. The primary endpoint is the proportion of patients who experience treatment failure during the 6-month trial period. The number of adverse events will be registered throughout the study.

Ethics and dissemination: This is a proof-of-concept clinical trial and will be performed in agreement with Good Clinical Practice (GCP) standards. Approvals have been obtained from the local Ethics Committee (DK-S-20150080) and the Danish Data Protection Agency (15/41684). The study has commenced in May 2017. Dissemination will be through presentations at national and international conferences and through publications in international peer-reviewed journal(s).

- Strengths and limitations of this study
- 07/ • This is a double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled trial.

Trial registration number at ClinicalTrials.gov: NCT03058900

- Subcutaneously administered MTX treatment.
- The primary endpoint is based on shared decision-making between patient and physician. •
- No feasibility data regarding FMT in rheumatic patients were available when the trial was • designed.
- A limitation of the study is that the content of the faecal transplant suspension cannot be fully standardised.

INTRODUCTION

Emerging data suggest a causal relationship between the intestinal microbiota and spondyloarthritis (SpA), thus, linking dysbiosis of the complex microbial communities with SpA pathogenesis.¹⁻⁵ Psoriatic arthritis (PsA) is one of five SpA categories in adults which also include ankylosing spondylitis, undifferentiated arthritis, reactive arthritis and arthritis associated with inflammatory bowel disease. While the association between the gut and the latter two disorders is well established,⁶ only very recently, studies evaluating the faecal microbiota and the presence of subclinical gut inflammation in PsA patients have coupled this disease to a perturbation of the intestinal microbiota composition.⁷⁻¹²

PsA is a distinct, multi-faceted inflammatory disease with a diverse clinical spectrum and a varied disease course.¹³ The clinical manifestations include peripheral arthritis, enthesitis and/or spondylitis combined with more or less severe psoriatic skin involvement, nail psoriasis, and dactylitis.¹⁴ Nearly half of the patients with both early and established PsA also present with extra-musculoskeletal manifestations which can include bowel (16%), ocular, cardiovascular or urogenital involvement.¹⁵ Without disease modifying intervention, 40-60% of PsA patients will develop erosive and deforming joint damage within a few years of disease onset.¹⁶ Methotrexate (MTX) has long been the preferred conventional synthetic disease-modifying anti-rheumatic drug (csDMARD) for initial therapy.¹⁷ However, the evidence for MTX in PsA is poor, and a substantial number of patients does not benefit from such treatment.¹⁸ Currently, other treatment options may include biological agents such as tumour necrosis factor (TNF- α) inhibitors aiming to block some of the downstream molecular pathways driving the disease.¹⁹ Still, these drugs do not target the cause of PsA, which is believed to be multifactorial comprising genetic, immunological and environmental factors.²⁰ The interplay between these complex aetiological factors has yet to be fully understood.^{21,22}

The classic pathophysiological concept of PsA is that it is an autoimmune disease of the skin and joints and that the pathological processes at both sites are driven by inflammatory responses involving the innate immune system, natural killer cells, T cells, and the expression of pro-inflammatory cytokines, including TNF-α, interleukin (IL)-1, interferon-y, IL-6, IL-12, IL-15, IL-18 and the IL-17/IL-23 axis.²³⁻²⁷ However, although microbial agents including dormant bacteria, mycobacteria, bacterial products and viral antigens have been implicated as potential initiators,^{28,29} the true pathophysiological factors triggering the dysregulated immunological cascade underlying the disease remain to be identified.

Intriguingly, it has recently been suggested that mucosal sites exposed to a high load of bacterial antigens, in particular the gastrointestinal tract, may represent the initial site of immunological tolerance break in PsA.³⁰ Indeed, under normal conditions the host and the microbiota live in harmony and benefit from their mutualistic relationship. However, alterations of the normal intestinal microbiota can affect mucosal immunity which, in turn, can induce local inflammation and elicit systemic effects at distant sites.³¹ Mechanisms through which the intestinal microbiota may be involved in the pathogenesis of PsA include an abnormal activation of the gut-associated lymphoid tissue,³² a decrease in regulatory T cell activity,³³ and/or an altered mucosal permeability thus compromising the capacity of the intestine to provide adequate containment of luminal microorganisms and molecules.^{34,35} In support of these theories, several studies have documented subclinical gut inflammation in PsA patients.³⁶⁻⁴¹ Moreover, a recent

BMJ Open

study reported that several intestinal bacteria including *Akkermansia* and *Ruminococcus* were
 practically absent in PsA patients. These commensal bacteria are, in fact, known to play an

3 important role in maintaining gut homeostasis.⁴²
4

5 Rationale

If the gut microbiota is the initiator and/or mediator of the common inflammatory pathways seen in PsA,⁸ modifying the intestinal microbiota could be a novel treatment strategy for this disease.¹⁻ ^{3,43} Faecal microbiota transplantation (FMT) is currently being used to restore the balance of the intestinal flora.^{44,45} Particularly, this procedure has demonstrated more than 90% clinical resolution of recurrent or refractory *Clostridium difficile* infections.⁴⁶⁻⁵⁰ Also, multiple FMTs seem to be able to induce remission in patients with inflammatory bowel disease (IBD).⁵¹ Due to these results, FMT is now being tested as a potential novel treatment for other gastrointestinal and extra-intestinal diseases.⁵² To the best of our knowledge, no study has yet ascertained the efficacy and safety of FMT in patients with inflammatory rheumatic diseases.

21132216Evidence-based research

To avoid waste of research no new studies should be initiated without a systematic review of the existing evidence.⁵³ We performed a pragmatic search in the biomedical literature via Pubmed combining different related MeSH terms: ("Microbiota"[Mesh] OR "Fecal Microbiota Transplantation"[Mesh] OR "Faecal Microbiota Transplantation"[Mesh] OR "Gastrointestinal Microbiome"[Mesh]) AND (arthritis[tiab] OR "Arthritis"[Mesh] OR "Arthritis, Psoriatic"[Mesh] OR "Arthritis, Reactive" [Mesh] OR "Spondylarthritis" [Mesh] OR "Arthritis, Gouty" [Mesh] OR "Arthritis, Rheumatoid"[Mesh] OR "Psoriasis"[Mesh]). From the search revealing 122 citations it became clear that the majority of papers were reviews/editorials (74 [61%]), where the overall conclusion was that the main challenges are to uncover the cause-effect relationship between the intestinal microbiota and rheumatic diseases, and to investigate the potential of microbiome-targeting strategies.^{1,3,5,6,20,32,43,54-60} Also from the published literature it became evident that to date only nine clinical interventional studies trying to modify the intestinal microbiota in arthritis patients have been performed: One study in SpA patients (n = 63),⁶¹ and one study in enthesis-related arthritis (n = 8) reported no beneficial effects of probiotic therapy, 62 whereas one study in juvenile idiopathic arthritis testing exclusive enteral nutrition administration (n = 7) found a moderate anti-inflammatory effect on active joints.⁶³ Five placebo-controlled trials of probiotic therapy in rheumatoid arthritis patients⁶⁴⁻⁶⁸ (sample size between 26 and 60 patients) reported mixed results.⁶⁹ However, two of these studies demonstrated positive clinical effects of probiotic therapy which included improvement in HAQ-DI pain scale,⁶⁵ improvement in the Disease Activity Score of 28 joints (DAS-28), and improvement on the C-reactive protein concentrations.⁶⁶ No clinical trials performing FMT on arthritic patients were identified.

39 Objective

The objective of this randomised trial is to explore whether FMT is more effective than placebo in
 reducing disease activity in PsA patients with active peripheral arthritis concomitantly treated with
 weekly subcutaneously administered MTX. In addition, extensive bacteria taxonomic and

1 metagenomic analyses will be performed on faecal samples before and after the FMT to get an

2 indication of the functional capacity of the intestinal microbiota.

4 METHODS AND ANALYSIS

5 Trial design

6 This is a randomised – patient, physician and outcome-assessor blinded, placebo-controlled, 6-7 month trial, which will be followed by an open-label extension period for a minimum of 2 years. 8 Patients will be randomly assigned in a 1:1 ratio to receive FMT or placebo (sham procedure). 9 Outcome assessment will be based on follow-up by a rheumatologist and is scheduled to occur 10 after 3 and 6 months (with the latter being the primary end-point evaluation), see Figure 1 and 11 Figure 2.

19 12

13 Participants

Recruitment will take place at Danish rheumatology outpatient clinics, and patients fulfilling the eligibility criteria will be offered participation. No treatment with biologics within 6 months, and no systemic and/or local intra-articular or peritendinous steroid injections, or non-MTX csDMARD treatment, or antibiotics are allowed within 3 months prior to inclusion. Non-Steroidal Anti-Inflammatory Drugs (NSAIDs) must be paused within 14 days of study inclusion. Patients, who do not wish to participate, will be characterised by sex and age. The recruitment has commenced in May 2017 and will continue until 2019.

Psoriatic arthritis patients

A total of 80 PsA patients will be enrolled, and they will have to meet the following eligibility criteria:

26 Inclusion criteria:

- Diagnosis of PsA according to the Classification Criteria for Psoriatic Arthritis (CASPAR).⁷⁰
- Presence of active peripheral arthritis defined as \geq 3 swollen joints.
- Subcutaneously administered MTX treatment (≥ 15mg/week (maximal tolerable dosage)) for a minimum of 3 months prior to study inclusion.
- Age 18 to 70 years.
- 33 Exclusion criteria:
 - Other inflammatory rheumatic diseases than PsA.
- Current axial disease activity or severe peripheral joint activity demanding immediate
 change of treatment or contraindicating placebo treatment for 6 months.
- Inflammatory bowel disease, coeliac disease, food allergy, or other intestinal diseases.
 - Current cancer or severe chronic infections.

1		
2	1	History of severe MTX toxicity or allergic reactions.
4	2	Biological treatment within 6 months prior to inclusion.
5	3	 Non-MTX DMARD treatment within 3 months prior to inclusion.
6 7	4	• Systemic and/or local intra-articular or peritendinous steroid injections within 3 months
8	5	prior to inclusion.
9 10	6	NSAIDs within 14 days prior to inclusion.
11	7	Antibiotics within 3 months prior to inclusion.
12 13	8	Pregnant or breastfeeding women.
14	9	 Not wishing to participate or unsuited for project evaluation.
15 16	10	
16	11	Stool donors
18	11	
19 20	12	The stool donor corps will consist of four anonymous (to the recipient) donors who must be
21	13	healthy as assessed by a screening questionnaire, and be active members of the Danish blood
22	14	donor corps, age 25 to 55, body mass index between 18.5 and 25 kg/m ² , and an average alcohol
23 24	15	intake less than 7 (women) or 14 (men) units per week. No alcohol intake within a week of
24	16	donation is allowed, and no systemic medication including antibiotics and NSAIDs 6 months prior
26	17	to the donation are allowed. The donor must eat a balanced diet (no extreme low- or high-calorie
27	18	diets), and must not be in a stressful life period. Before joining the stool donor corps, each
28 29	19	potential donor will go through a screening process including stool analyses for faecal calprotectin
30	20	and enteric pathogens (Aeromonas, Campylobacter, C. difficile, diarrhoeagenic Escherichia coli,
31	21	Salmonella, Shigella, Vibrio, Yersinia enterocolitica, and multidrug-resistant bacteria, parasites
32	22	including microscopy of ova and cysts, Entamoeba histolytica/dispar (DNA), Cryptosporidium
33	23	(DNA) and Giardia (DNA), sapovirus (RNA), rotavirus (RNA), human astrovirus (RNA), human
35	24	adenoviruses (DNA) and noroviruses (RNA), a Helicobacter pylori breath test, blood tests for C-
36	25	reactive protein (CRP) (acceptable level: < 6.0 mg/L), white blood cell count (acceptable range:
37 38	26	3.50-8.80 10 ⁹ /L), haemoglobin (acceptable range: 8.3-10.5 mmol/L), albumin (acceptable range:
39	27	36-50 g/L), alanine aminotransferase (ALAT) (acceptable range: 10-70 U/L), glomerular filtration
40	28	rate (eGFR) (acceptable level: > 59 mL/min), and coeliac disease, and blood test for infectious
41 42	29	agents including current infection with Epstein-Barr virus (IgM) and cytomegalovirus (IgM),
43	30	hepatitis A, B, C and E, tuberculosis (QuantiFERON [®] TB-Gold test), syphilis, human
44	31	immunodeficiency virus (ab HTLV1/2), E. histolytica (antibodies) and Strongyloides (antibodies),
45	32	and a urine test for <i>Chlamvdia Trachomatis</i> and <i>Neisseria aonorrhoeae</i> (DNA/RNA). After passing
46 47	33	the screening tests, the donor will donate stool for the next month after which, the donor will
48	34	have to pass the screening programme once more before the stool can be released for
49 50	35	transplantation.
50 51 52	36	

37 Interventions

38 Overall study interventions

1 The FMT will be an add-on strategy for PsA patients with active joint disease despite ongoing 2 treatment with weekly subcutaneously administered MTX. Therefore, all enrolled PsA patients will 3 continue their MTX treatment throughout the study, and they will remain on the same individual 4 dosage that they received at the time of study inclusion (a minimum of 15 mg/week cf. the patient 5 inclusion criteria) in addition to folic acid supplement. Paracetamol and tramadol in recommended 6 dosages are allowed during the trial but no NSAIDs can be taken.

8 Active and sham comparator

9 Patients will be randomised into two groups with an allocation ratio of active-to-placebo 10 treatment of 1:1. The active comparator group (n = 40) will have an FMT with healthy donor 11 faeces-suspension (250 mL) containing 50 g donor faeces, saline (NaCl 0.9%) and glycerol (10%), 12 whereas, the sham comparator group (n = 40) will be treated with an identical appearing sham 13 procedure where the transplant solution will consist of 250 mL brown coloured (brown food 14 colourant) isotonic saline (NaCl 0.9%).

22 16 Preparing the FMT suspension

Donors will collect faeces at home and transport it in a cooling bag to the study site within 1 hour. Faeces will be sieved to remove particulate material, followed by dilution in sterile saline (0.9% NaCl) and 10% glycerol. The FMT suspension will be stored at - 80 °C until use. On the day of the FMT transplantation, the transplant suspension (250 mL) will be thawed to 37 °C and subsequently apportioned into five 50 mL syringes.

23 FMT procedure

The FMT will take place within 14 days (preferably 7 days) of the baseline clinical examination. The evening prior to the FMT, patients will take one dose (40 mg) of oral proton-pump inhibitor. They will meet at the Department of Gastroenterology after a six-hour fast. A total of 250 mL transplant suspension (active or placebo) will be installed in the duodenum using an oral-duodenal tube. The correct placement of the tube will be confirmed using gastroscopic guidance.

30 Treatment strategy for non-responders

Patients who present with increased or unacceptable disease activity during the 6-month trial period will, depending on the clinical presentation, be offered another treatment strategy which may include local intra-articular steroid injections, change to another csDMARD or biological treatment. If the patient accepts such treatment changes, this will be characterised as FMT treatment failure according to the primary outcome definition (one intra-articular steroid injection is allowed).

38 MTX toxicity and drop-outs

Blood tests for MTX toxicity will be performed in accordance with our current clinical practice. In
case of MTX toxicity, severe side effects, pregnancy, or occurrence of infectious disease or other
diseases that contraindicate MTX treatment, MTX dosage will be decreased or the treatment will
be paused. These patients will remain in the study (unless their condition contraindicates this),

and they will be analysed as members of the treatment group to which they were randomised
 using intention-to-treat-type analyses.

4 Collection of faecal samples and metagenomics analysis

Fresh faecal samples will be collected by the patient at home using an EasySampler[®] stool collection kit within 24 hours prior to the study visit. Samples will be stored in the patient's freezer until transport to the study site. During transport, samples will be kept on ice in a cooling bag. Upon arrival to the study site, samples will immediately be transferred to the biobank and stored at -80°C. Bacterial DNA will be extracted from the faecal samples following established standard protocols including bead beating using a NucleoSpin soil kit (Macherey-Nagel, Germany) according to manufacturer's instructions. DNA will be sequenced using the BGISEQ-500 Platform which was recently benchmarked against the Illumina platforms showing excellent intra-platform reproducibility and less GC bias than observed using the Illumina platforms (Fang et al. Submitted for publication). The faecal metagenomics bioinformatics analyses will be performed using comprehensive pipelines including the assembly of metagenomics linkage groups/metagenomics species,^{71,72} taxonomic annotation, and extensive functional analyses based on metagenomic species which provides a superior dataset compared to the conventional analyses based on the total gene pool.⁷³

26 19 27 20

20 Intestinal permeability test

After an overnight fasting, patients will provide a urine sample before ingesting 100 mL water containing 10 g of lactulose and 5 g of D-mannitol. All the urine passed in the subsequent 5 hours will be collected into a 2 L plastic container containing 1 mL of chlorohexidine (20 mg/mL) as a preservative. After 3- and 5 hours, the volume of the urine will be measured and a small volume (10 mL) will be preserved and stored at -80°C until analysis. No food or drinking (except for water) will be allowed during the test.^{74,75}

37 27 38 28

28 Outcomes

Primary outcome measure:

30 Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)]

- Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared
 decision making between patient and rheumatologist defined as at least one of the following:
 - Need for more than one intra-articular glucocorticoid injection due to disease activity.
 - Need for change to other csDMARDs (e.g., oral leflunomide or sulfasalazin)
 according to the updated Danish treatment guideline due to disease activity.
 - Need for biologic treatment according to the updated Danish treatment guideline due to severe disease activity.

40 Secondary outcome measures:

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1		
2	1	Change from baseline in the Short Health Assessment Questionnaire (2-page HAQ) ^{76,77}
4	2	[Time Frame: Baseline, 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks, 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14
5	3	days)]
6 7	4	
8	5	Change from baseline in the Dermatology Life Quality Index (DLQI) Questionnaire ⁷⁸ [Time Frame: 1
9	6	week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks, 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
10 11	7	
12	,	Changes from boosting is noticet as ented as the interting side offects [Time From . 1
13	8	Changes from baseline in patient reported gastrointestinal side effects [Time Frame: 1 week, 2 weeks,
14 15	9	weeks, 5 weeks, 4 weeks, 5 months (+/- / days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
16	10	
17 18	11	Other non-gastrointestinal patient reported side effects [Time Frame: 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4
19	12	weeks, 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
20	13	
21 22	14	Proportion of patients in each group achieving the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) ⁷⁹
23	15	Response Criteria [Time Frame: 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
24 25	16	I. ACR20 response criteria ⁸⁰
25 26	17	II ACR50 response criteria 81
27 28		
29	18	III. ACR70 response criteria
30	19	
31 32	20	Proportion of patients in each group achieving the Psoriatic Arthritis Response Criteria (PsARC) ⁷⁹
33	21	[Time Frame: 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
34 25		
36	22	Change from baceline in the Spenduleerthritic Research Concertium of Canada (SDARCC) Enthecitic
37	23	Change from baseline in the spondyloar tintis Research Consortium of Canada (SPARCC) Entresitis Index ⁶⁸ in the subset of patients who have onthecitic at baseline [Time Frame: 2 months (\pm), 7
38 39	24	$(+)^{-1}$
40	25	
41 42	26	
42	27	Change from baseline in the Psoriasis Area Severity index (PASI) ²⁴ in the subset of patients who
44	28	have skin psoriasis at baseline [Time Frame: 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
45 46	29	
47	30	Change from baseline in the number of digits affected with dactylitis in the subset of patients who
48	31	have dactylitis at baseline [Time Frame: 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
49 50	32	
51	33	Number of adverse events in each group [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
52 53	34	
54	35	Number of adverse events in each group leading to discontinuation [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14
55 56	36	days)]
50 57	37	
58		
59 60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
		9

BMJ Open

- Number of patients with at least one adverse event in each group [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14
 days)]

Tertiary (exploratory secondary) outcomes: Proportion of patients in each group achieving changes in plasma CRP, changes in tender point count,⁸³ changes in faecal bacteria composition and metabolism, changes in intestinal permeability, changes in plasma orosomucoid, changes in plasma and faecal calprotectin,⁸⁴ changes in serum 1,25-dihydroxyvitamin D, changes in cardiovascular risk factors including Body Mass Index (BMI), blood pressure, plasma triglyceride, plasma LDL-cholesterol, plasma HDL-cholesterol, plasma total-cholesterol, and HbA₁C levels, changes in specific circulating inflammatory markers (i.e. cytokines, adipokines, and chemokines), and macroscopic and microscopic inflammatory changes of the colonic mucosa, see Table 1.

13 Safety

The most frequently reported adverse events (AEs) related to FMT are vomiting, belching, mild diarrhoea, abdominal cramping, transient fever and elevated C-reactive protein on the day of the procedure.⁸⁵ A recent systematic review on the adverse events of FMT identified 50 relevant studies with a total of 1,089 patients. In this review, the incidences of serious adverse events (SAEs) for FMT were 2.0% and 6.1% for upper and lower gastrointestinal routes, respectively. The SAEs that probably or possibly were related to FMT included infections (0.7%), IBD flare (0.6%), death (0.3%), auto-immune diseases and FMT procedure related injury.⁸⁶ Although most of the patients included in this review suffered from severe gastrointestinal diseases (C. difficile infection and/or IBD), these findings warrant caution when performing FMT; especially when introducing the procedure in a new patient population. In addition, the potential long term side effects following FMT remains largely unknown.⁸⁷ Still, when strict donor screening is conducted and the procedure is performed by experienced practitioners, FMT is in general considered safe, and even elderly patients with a poor medical condition and multiple comorbidities as well as immunosuppressed patients have been proven to tolerate the FMT procedure well.⁸⁸⁻⁹²

In the present study, we will carefully monitor and evaluate safety by means of open assessment of AEs. All reported or observed AEs are recorded by the investigators, and will be monitored until resolution, stabilisation or until it has been shown that the study intervention is not the cause. The National Cancer Institute Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events, version 4.03 (NIH publication # 09-7473), will be used to grade the severity of adverse events. Gastrointestinal side effects (nausea, vomiting, abdominal pain, number of stools pr. week, stool type (Bristol Stool Chart), blood or mucus in the stool) will be registered by the patients once a week for the first month following the randomised intervention. Routine blood screening for MTX toxicity will normally be performed at week 4, 10, 16, 22 but can be more frequent if decided by the responsible treating rheumatologist depending on symptoms or signs of MTX toxicity. Subject incidence rates of all treatment-emergent AE will be tabulated by system organ class and preferred term. Tables of fatal AEs, SAEs, AEs leading to withdrawal from study, and significant treatment-emergent adverse events, will also be provided. For the long-term extension portion of this study, exposure adjusted event rates will be summarised.

2 Sample size and power considerations

When designing this trial, no prior data for FMT efficacy in rheumatic patients were available. However, we found it reasonable to assume that if rheumatic patients should be willing to receive FMT as a future standardised treatment, the procedure should at least provide an effect size well beyond a moderate effect size. Consequently, we decided that at least twice as many PsA patients in the sham group should be treatment failures compared to the FMT group if the procedure should be considered clinical relevant. For a comparison of two independent binomial proportions using the Pearson's chi-squared statistic with a Chi-square approximation (a two-sided significance level of 0.05), a sample size of 40 PsA patients per group has a power of 90% (0.895) if we assume that the proportions of treatment failures are 35% (FMT-active group) and 70% (FMT-sham group), respectively. Consequently, the inclusion of 80 PsA patients allocated (1:1) to two treatment arms is believed to be sufficient to reveal any difference of clinical importance between treatment groups (i.e., an NNT <3 patients).

Assuming that there will be some attrition during the 6-month trial period, we also estimated how much drop-out would be possible while still having a reasonable statistical power (80%): a total sample size of 62 PsA patients assuming a comparable level of withdrawals (31 patients completing in each group) achieves a power of at least 0.8 with the proportion of treatment failures indicated above; i.e., even if we experience a drop-out rate of 20%, our trial will have 80% chance of detecting the intentional difference between groups.

Beyond the primary endpoint, a total sample size of 80 (with a balanced design) corresponds to a sufficient statistical power (82%) to detect a standardised mean difference of 0.65 SD units (i.e. Cohen's effect size) in any of the Patient-Reported Outcome Measures.

Randomisation, allocation concealment and blinding

The randomisation has been conducted using central-computer randomisation. Patients are randomly allocated (1:1) to receive either a FMT or a placebo saline transplant (sham procedure). The randomisation lists were generated by the trial statistician and uploaded to the REDCap database by an independent data manager who is not involved in any other aspects of the trial. Eligible patients will - after signing informed consent - be assigned randomly in permuted blocks with varying sizes of 4 and 6, according to computer-generated random numbers (SAS programming via SAS PROC PLAN), to undergo either FMT or saline (sham) procedure using stratification for centre. The randomisation of each patient will be implemented by the local trial coordinator and allocation will be concealed as this is done independent of the pre-determined sequence generation (i.e. randomisation). The patients, care providers and outcome assessors will remain unaware of the group assignments, and only de-identified codes will be used to link participants to their data during the study to maintain their confidentiality. In case of exceptional circumstances when knowledge of the treatment allocation is essential for further management of the patient, the trial secretary will reveal the assigned intervention to the treating doctor.

 However, patients, trial care providers and outcome assessors will remain blinded as far as possible. Cases of unblinding will be registered and reported.

Data collection, management and confidentiality

Data will be entered via a secure web-based electronic clinical report form (eCRF) into a central REDCap⁹³ database hosted by Odense Patient data Explorative Network (OPEN) at Odense University Hospital. Data obtained during the clinical examination will be entered directly into the database. Also, patient questionnaires will be fulfilled directly into the database. Access to the study data will be restricted, and a password system will be utilized to control access. All information about the patients' health and other private matters is covered by confidentiality. The authorisation from the Danish Data Protection Agency has been secured.

Statistical methods

The full analysis set will consist of all randomised participants (i.e. the intention to treat [ITT] population): Participants will be analysed according to their randomised treatment group; i.e. the ITT has the consequence that participants allocated to a treatment group will be followed up, assessed and analysed as members of that group irrespective of their compliance to the planned treatment. The safety analysis set will include all patients who were randomly assigned to a study group and had exposure to a transplant (independent of group). Descriptive statistics will be provided for demographics and baseline characteristics. The summary statistics of continuous variables will include: N, mean, standard deviation, median, interguartiles, and range. All summaries presenting frequencies and incidences will include counts, percentages, and the total number of participants in the corresponding arm.

The pre-specified efficacy analyses will be based on data from the full-analysis set, which include all patients who underwent randomisation, have had their baseline measurement performed, and who have received the initial transplant (independent of group). Although proper random assignment prevents selection bias, it does not guarantee that the groups will be equivalent at baseline. Any differences in baseline characteristics are, however, the result of chance rather than bias;⁹⁴ thus, the study groups will be evaluated (and presented) at baseline for important demographic and clinical characteristics so that readers can assess how similar they are. However, only cohort studies can be subject to selection bias and confounding due to differences in baseline characteristics between the intervention and comparison groups.⁹⁵

Our strategy for ITT analysis with incomplete observations will be based on the recommendations from White et al⁹⁶:

1: Attempt to follow up all randomised participants, even if they withdraw from allocated treatment.

2: Perform a main analysis of all observed data (data as observed).

3: Perform sensitivity analyses to explore the effect of departures from the assumption made in

the main analysis (Baseline Observation Carried Forward [BOCF] imputations, repeated measures

mixed models, and multiple imputations).

This results in the following steps: Missing values will be imputed with the use of a non-responder imputation by use of the BOCF method for measurements made after baseline. Thus, missing data for dichotomous endpoints will also be imputed using a conservative "null responder" imputation, assuming the patient did not have any benefit from being enrolled in the trial (e.g., for the primary endpoint we will assume that the patient had a treatment failure which is valid based on clinical judgement even if data is not missing at random [NMAR]). Other sensitivity analyses will be including "worst" and "best" case imputation, repeated-measures and multiple-imputation analyses, using model-based approaches; repeated measures linear mixed models will also be used to model the potential group-dependent trajectories over time (i.e. Repeated Mixed Models and Multiple Imputation are valid if data is assumed Missing at Random [MAR]).

11 Categorical data for dichotomous end points will be analysed with the use of logistic 12 regression with the model including treatment and centre as class effects. For continuous 13 outcome measures analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) models will be used to analyse mean changes 14 in continuous end points. All models will include treatment, centre, with the baseline value of the 15 relevant variable as covariates.

Additionally, completer analyses will be performed on those who complete 6 months of treatment. During follow-up, any medical treatments which could potentially modify the intestinal microbiota including antibiotics will be reported, but will not affect the statistical analysis. Statistical estimates will be calculated as odds ratios (OR) for the dichotomous variables and difference between means for continuous outcomes reported with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). Two-sided 95% CIs and P-values for primary, secondary and exploratory outcomes will be computed and will not be adjusted for multiplicity, but will be interpreted cautiously as this is an exploratory trial per se.

Pre-specified exploratory analyses: Stratified analyses will investigate whether the treatment effect varies with I) the faecal microbiota analyses performed at follow-up compared with baseline (+/- long-term changes in the intestinal microbiota and intestinal inflammation); and II) the demographic match (sex, age) between the stool donor and the recipient. Non-responders will represent the outcome group not fulfilling the primary outcome measure. Differences in demographics and baseline disease activity between this treatment-failure subpopulation and the remaining group will be examined to identify potential prognostic factors for poor responders. Patients not participating in the follow-up examination will be classified as "drop-outs", and if possible, the reason for not participating will be registered.

The faecal metagenomics bioinformatics analyses will be performed using comprehensive pipelines including the assembly of metagenomics linkage groups/metagenomics species,^{71,72} taxonomic annotation, and extensive functional analyses based on metagenomic species which provides a superior dataset compared to the conventional analyses based on the total gene pool.⁷³ To identify possible associations, metagenome analysis will be correlated to all clinical parameter. We will use an L1 restricted LASSO procedure to determine the optimal number of features to be tested as described. Analysis of correlations between microbiota taxonomic or functional features, community diversity indices and sample metadata variables will be performed using Spearman correlation tests corrected for multiple tests using the Benjamini-

- Hochberg false discovery rate control procedure. To control for confounders, we will use blocked
 - Spearman tests as implemented in COIN.^{97,98}
 - Data will be analysed with the STATA statistical package (version 15; StataCorp LP),
 - and SAS software (v. 9.4; SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA).

Li Cary, NC, US.

Activity/assessment	Pre-study	Visit 1	Week	Visit 2	Visit 3	Visi
	screening	Baseline	1, 2 and 3	1 month	3 months	6 mor
Patients	n = ?	n = 80	n = all	n = all	n = all	n =
Screening log	x					
Inclusion/exclusion form	x					
Consent form		х				
Randomisation		х				
Study-composed questionnaire		х	x	х	x	х
Patient global (VAS 0-100 mm)		х	х	х	х	х
Patient fatigue (VAS 0-100 mm)		х	x	х	х	x
Patient pain (VAS 0-100 mm)		х	х	х	х	х
HAQ		х	х	x	x	x
BASDAI		х			x	x
BASFAI		Х			X	X
DLQI		х	x	x	х	Х
Gastrointestinal symptom diary		х	x	x	x	x
Eating habits questionnaire		х				
Clinical examination:						
- Height (m)		х				
- Weight (kg)		x			x	x
- Blood pressure (mmHg)		х			x	x
- Psoriasis Area Severity Index		x			X	X
- SPARCE Enthesitis Score		x			x	X
- Swollen Joint count (66)		x			x	X
- Dectors global (VAS 0-100 mm)		x			x	X
- BASMI		×			×	×
- Tender point count		x			x	x
Interview (AFs)		~		×	x	x
Blood sample analysis:				~	~	
- C-reactive protein (mg/L)		x		x	x	x
- Orosomucoid (g/L)		x		x	x	x
- Calprotectin		x		x	x	x
- 1,25-dihydroxyvitamin D (nmol/L)		x		x	x	x
- TSH (miu/L)		x				x
- Hgb (mmol/L)		x				x
- Triglyceride (mmol/L)		x				x
- LDL-cholesterol (mmol/L)		х				x
- HDL-cholesterol (mmol/L)		х				x
- Iotal-cholesterol (mmol/L)		x				x
- HDA_1C (MMOI/MOI)		X				x
- HLA-B27 Status (+/-)		X				
Campulohacter Salmonolla (+/)		X				
Eaecal calprotectin		Y		v	v	
Eacol microbiota analysis		X		X	X	X
Factal IIICI ODIOLA affaitysis		X		X	X	X
Signolaoscopy and mucosa biopsy		X				X
(biobank)		х		x	x	x
Intestinal permeability test		x				х
Intervention (+/- FMT)		х				

3 Table 1. Protocol schedule of forms and procedures

1 ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

This study is designed as a proof-of-concept clinical trial and will be performed in agreement with GCP-standards, and in accordance with the ethical standards of the responsible committee on human experimentation (institutional and national) and with the Helsinki Declaration (64th, 2013). The relevance of the study, the design and the recruitment strategy were evaluated with three patient research partners (PRPs), and alterations especially in primary outcome and recruitment strategy were embedded. Furthermore, a minimum of two PRPs (participating in the study) will be involved in the discussion regarding the progress of the recruitment phase and results, and will be offered the opportunity to comment on the manuscript draft. The Regional Committees on Health Research Ethics for Southern Denmark (DK-S-20150080) and the Danish Data Protection Agency (15/41684) have approved the study protocol. The trial has been registered with ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT03058900) and important protocol modifications will be updated here. The Danish Health and Medicines Authority does not classify the FMT procedure as a medical intervention, and has had no objection to the use of FMT for this study and patient category. Thus, no GCP auditing is legally required. A report describing any potential side effects and adverse events will be submitted to the Ethics Committee yearly. Suspected Unexpected Serious Adverse Reactions (SUSARs) will be reported to the Ethics Committee within 7 days. Based on these reports, the Ethics committee can determine to terminate the trial early. The Danish Patient Compensation Association provides compensations for patients injured in connection to medical clinical trials.

Although the Danish Health Authorities, for the time being, do not classify donor faecal microbiota as tissue, all steps of the stool donor recruitment, stool donation and FMT preparation will be in accordance with the Danish Tissue Law to ensure that the quality and safety standards laid down in the Danish Legislation BEK nr 764 of May 26, 2015 (implementing Directive 2004/23/EC) are met. Four stool donors will be recruited from the South Danish Transfusion Service & Tissue Centre, Department of Clinical Immunology, Odense University Hospital, and they will be carefully screened for potentially transmissible infections and other conditions associated with gut microbiota function before their stool can be released for FMT. Being a stool donor is voluntary, and no compensation fee will be given. Furthermore, to ensure donor traceability, each patient in the active treatment arm will only receive microbiota from one donor. Also, frozen samples will be clearly labelled with a unique donation code based on the ISBT 128 coding and labelling system, and the release of the final product will adhere to the standards for tissue and blood donation.

Due to the well-documented risk of permanent joint destruction and occurrence of extra-articular manifestations in the PsA disease course, identification of new treatment modalities and biomarkers is essential to help the physician to slow down the disease development or ultimately to prevent it. All PsA patients participating in this study have significant activity in their joint disease despite treatment with the current guideline treatment and first-line drug, MTX, for this condition. This patient population will therefore benefit greatly from new treatment options. Consequently, when weighing the pros and cons, this trial should be performed from a scientific and ethical perspective.

56 41 Dissemination will occur through presentations at national and international 57 42 conferences and publications in international peer-reviewed journal(s).

2 DISCUSSION

Recent years have seen growing recognition of the complexity of the role of the microbiota in shaping the immune system and its potential effects for health and disease.^{22,99,100} In particular. the gut bacteria composition has been associated with the pathogenesis of autoimmune and inflammatory diseases.¹⁰¹⁻¹⁰⁴ Intriguingly, an abnormal intestinal bacteria composition has been observed in PsA patients, and this association has fostered theories linking intestinal dysbiosis and PsA joint inflammation.¹⁰⁵ Still, it remains to be elucidated whether the intestinal dysbiosis and rheumatic diseases are causal related,⁵⁵ and if so, whether dysbiosis is an inciting event in the inflammatory process or a consequence of local and/or systemic inflammation.^{54,106} We expect that this double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled trial will shed new light on this highly relevant topic.

This is the first time that the efficacy and safety of FMT is being investigated in MTX immunosuppressed patients with rheumatic diseases. Subsequently, no data on the feasibility of conducting FMTs in the rheumatological setting is, so far, available. Nor do we know whether one FMT will be sufficient, or whether it should be repeated shortly after the first intervention to normalise the alterations of the intestinal microbiota, which would expectedly enhance any potential anti-inflammatory effects. In the present proof-of-concept clinical trial, the FMT procedure is considered an add-on to the current guideline intervention and first-line drug, MTX. Therefore, from a pragmatic and ethical perspective, we have decided to perform only one FMT (or sham procedure) in each patient even if we are well aware that this approach may not be adequate to achieve long-lasting effects. Indeed, in patients with inflammatory bowel diseases it appears that performing a frequent dosing-regime repeating the FMT procedure up to five times a week for eight weeks provided the best results.^{51,107,108} Hence, in contrast to the treatment of C. difficile infections where the microbiota is pushed past the point of homeostasis and can be restored following only one FMT,⁴⁷ the chronic nature of PsA and other autoimmune and inflammatory diseases, and the somewhat lesser degree of intestinal dysbiosis, may make the host microbiota more resistant to long-lasting modifications. Nevertheless, we hope that the FMT procedure in the present study will be sufficient to boost the effects of MTX so that the participants who are all MTX-non-responders prior to study enrolment will achieve disease control without needing to add or switch to other non-MTX medication.

In the present trial, the primary outcome measure is defined as the occurrence of treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and physician evaluated at 6 months following the randomised intervention (FMT versus sham procedure). Shared decision making is a process in which both patient and health professional make a decision, taking into account the best evidence of available treatment options and the patient's values and preferences. This approach is considered a key element in the management of rheumatic diseases.¹⁰⁹ As both patients and the treating rheumatologists are blinded to the randomised intervention, the shared decision making will be unaffected by the type of transplant suspension (active or placebo) installed at baseline. Nevertheless, we acknowledge that our assumption that twice as many PsA patients in the sham group will be treatment failures is ambitious, and that we might miss a smaller and less clinically significant treatment effect of the FMT-procedure. In this

Page 19 of 36

BMJ Open

case, we hope that our secondary outcome measures will be able to detect potential trends of positive effects in PsA subdomains such as enthesitis score, dactylitis count, and PASI skin score. In addition to the primary endpoint evaluation at 6 months, patients will be asked to fill out a weekly questionnaire regarding side effects as well as skin and arthritis symptoms during the first month following the randomised intervention to reveal any short-term effects on patient-reported outcomes.

Next, only patients with active peripheral PsA will be included. One reason for this is that this will be the first time that FMT is performed on rheumatic patients. Therefore, it seems reasonable only to enrol patients who have had inadequate effect from the initial guideline treatment (MTX), and consequently, on an individual basis could benefit the most from participating in new experimental clinical trials. Also, since patients need to have at least three swollen joints, we expect that we will be able to detect treatment effects of clinical importance. The fact that we do not include recent onset treatment naive patients will, of course, limit our ability to generalise our findings unto the entire PsA patient population. Indeed, in a recent randomised controlled trial of FMT in ulcerative colitis patients, participants with a recent diagnosis (< 1 year) were statistically significantly more likely to respond to FMT compared with those with longer disease duration.¹⁰⁷ That patients will have to subcutaneously administer MTX for at least three months prior to study enrolment will ensure that low intestinal MTX absorption is excluded as a potential effect modifier for the poor MTX response. In addition, as many drugs, including MTX, seem to affect the intestinal microbiological millieu,¹¹⁰⁻¹¹³ bypassing the intestine during MTX administration will ensure that no local non-disease related effects on the intestinal microbiota will occur.

A great challenge when conducting a trial of FMT is that for the present being there is a lack of both national and international recommendations guiding the regulation and the best clinical practices for donor screening, stool sample handling and preparation of the FMT suspension.¹¹⁴⁻¹¹⁶ Indeed, the variability in faecal bacterial communities can complicate or undermine treatment efficacy. This variability stems from both biological variation and variation introduced by sample handling. A recent study reported that oxygen exposure degraded faecal bacterial communities, whereas freeze-thaw cycles and lag time between donor defecation and transplant preparation had much more limited effects.¹¹⁷ Given that many intestinal bacteria are obligate anaerobe, including many beneficial bacteria potentially possessing anti-inflammatory effects, exposure to oxygen during the preparation of FMT may potentially compromise the therapeutic value of FMT in PsA and other inflammatory diseases. Therefore, although frozen faecal preparations of stool suspended into physiological saline and glycerol have proven just as effective as fresh stool in treating *C. difficile* infections,¹¹⁸ the optimal transplant preparation method in treating inflammatory diseases remains to be established.

Our stool handling setup is in line with the prevailing practice, which includes mixing and filtration of the stool suspension and adding saline and glycerol as a cryopreservative before storage at -80 °C.¹¹⁶ In addition, we have sought to limit the oxygen exposure during transport by placing the donor stool within a plastic bag, which is subsequently put into a tightly closed small plastic container. Supplementary, during preparation the solution will not be homogenized for more than 10 seconds. Nevertheless, the lack of optimal anaerobe conditions during stool

handling could possibly undermine the therapeutic potential of our FMT procedure. Furthermore, although we aim to use 50 g of faeces for each transplant, we acknowledge that the exact weight between donations could vary with an estimated +/- 5 g. Also, due to the wide variability in microbial content in stool between donations, the content cannot be fully standardized, and may likely differ between each FMT procedure. However, to meet this challenge we will collect and store samples from each donation which will enable us to determine the microbiota composition of each donation in case some donations prove more effective than others.

Stool donor selection is another critical issue that needs to be addressed. The composition of the normal microbiota composition has only recently been mapped,¹¹⁹ and the existence of a limited number of well-balanced host-microbial symbiotic states, where one or more bacteria species are considered the main functional driver(s), have been identified using clustering of metagenomic sequences.¹²⁰ Still, the most favourable donor microbiota composition for treating inflammatory diseases has yet to be determined. Therefore, it also remains to be established whether donors with a high stool bacteria diversity should be preferred over isolation of specific bacteria, or if pooled stool samples from several donors outperforms a single-donor transplant.^{51,121} We have chosen to use only single donations from four different anonymous stool donors to ensure donor traceability and to enable us to identify any individual donor-specific microbial effects. Also, since host intrinsic-, environmental-, and dietary factors as well as pharmaceutical drugs have been associated with gut bacteria composition and functionality,^{110,111,122,123} the donors must eat a balanced diet, not be overweight or take any medications or be physical or psychological stressed, smoke or consume alcohol during the donation period to limit the risk of transferring "abnormal" microbiota to the recipients. These donor criteria have been set for safety reasons, and we acknowledge, that this could potentially limit the inter-donor microbiota diversity due to shared lifestyle characteristics.

Another factor to keep in mind is the concept of matching donor and recipient, which may be of importance for enhancing the colonisation capabilities of the donor microbial communities. In fact, Rossen et al¹⁰⁸ did find that in patients with ulcerative colitis, the microbiota of FMT responders shifted to their respective donors, whereas non-responders did not. Li et al¹²⁴ reported that donor bacteria strains established extensively in the recipient and persisted for at least 3 months with a negligible decline of donor-strain populations detected between 45 days and 3 months following FMT in metabolic syndrome patients. However, they also found that recipients receiving the same donor transplant displayed varying degrees of microbiota transfer, indicating individual patterns of microbiome resistance and donor-recipient compatibilities. In addition, host genetics is known to effect the gut microbiota,¹²⁵ and animal models have shown that sex¹²⁶ and age¹²⁷ also can be potentially modifiers of the gut bacteria composition. These observations may prove to be of importance for the outcome of FMT in inflammatory diseases.¹²⁸ However, whether sex- and/or age-matching between donor and recipient is crucial for a successful FMT in humans remains to be enlighten. Therefore, in the present study, no donor-recipient matching will be conducted. However, a subgroup analysis will be performed to reveal any trend that could indicate better results in sex- or age-match cases.

5541Furthermore, as the interactions between the microbiota and the host are influenced5642by cooperation and competition between pathogenic and commensal microbes and multiple5757

BMJ Open

environmental variables, the lifestyle of the recipient following the FMT may be of importance.
Nevertheless, due to the uncertainty of how to define the optimal lifestyle and the lack of
knowledge on how different lifestyle factors may interfere with the microbiota, we have decided
that the patients in the present study will not have to adhere to any predefined lifestyle "regime"
or diet following the randomised intervention. However, every participant will fulfil an eating habit
questionnaire at the beginning of the trial.

Finally, non-bacteria microorganisms such as bacteriophages, viruses and fungi may
 also be of importance when targeting components of the microbiota or host cells for therapeutic
 purposes.¹²⁹⁻¹³¹ Other complicating factors may include the composition of other microbiological
 niches such as the oral, lung, genitourinary, and skin microbiota.^{132,133} Indeed, the latter could
 likely prove to be of significance in patients with skin psoriasis. However, these factors will not be
 assessed in the present study.

13 In conclusion, this trial has the potential to substantially expand the growing body of 14 literature on the role of the intestinal microbiota in general and PsA in particular. Thereby we 15 anticipate that this study will enhance our understanding of cause and effect. The results of this 16 study, when completed, may be exploited for biomarker discovery, and for diagnostic and 17 therapeutic purposes.

25 18

26
2719AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

T. Ellingsen, M.S. Kragsnaes, R. Christensen, and J. Kjeldsen conceived and developed the idea for the study. T. Ellingsen and M.S. Kragsnaes are the principal investigators and wrote the first study protocol draft. T. Ellingsen and M.S. Kragsnaes were responsible for all communication with the scientific ethical committee, the Danish Data Protection Agency and the National Health Board. T Ellingsen is the responsible party and sponsor. M.S. Kragsnaes, T. Ellingsen, H.C. Horn, J.K. Pedersen, H.L. Munk, and U. Fredberg sat up the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the psoriatic arthritis patients, and the latter five rheumatologists are conducting the clinical examinations. J. Kjeldsen, F.M. Pedersen, and H. Glerup discussed and planned the FMT procedure, and they are conducting the FMTs and the sigmoidoscopies (obtaining mucosae tissue samples). D.K. Holm and H.M. Holt helped set up the donor screening programme, and they were responsible for conducting this programme and performing the microbiological and immunological tests. V. Andersen and K. Kristiansen are responsible for the omics and microbiome analyses, and have advised on how the tissue collection should be performed and what kind of tissue would be relevant to collect. R. Christensen has written the statistical analysis plan and will be responsible for the final statistical analyses. In conclusion, all participants designated as authors have contributed to the conception and design of the study, and they have critically either drafted or revised the first draft of the study protocol and the protocol paper. Also, all authors have approved the final version before submission.

REGISTRATION

40 The trial has been registered with ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT03058900).

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1 FUNDING STATEMENT

2 This work was supported by the Region of Southern Denmark, Odense University Hospital, the

3 Danish Regions, University of Southern Denmark, the Danish Rheumatism Association, the Danish

Psoriasis Research Fund, and Odense Patient Explorative data Network (OPEN). Musculoskeletal
Statistics Unit at the Parker Institute, Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg Hospital (R. Christensen), is
supported by a core grant from the Oak Foundation (OCAY-13-309). K. Kristiansen is supported by

7 BGI-Research, BGI-Shenzhen, China.

9 COMPETING INTEREST STATEMENT

None of the team members of this research project has declared any potential conflict of interest.

13 Great thanks to Lene Albjerg, biomedical laboratory technologist and quality control manager at

14 the Dept. of Clinical Immunology, Odense University Hospital, Denmark, for her expertise and

15 dedicated work regarding the practical handling of the FMT suspension.

1			
2	1		References
3	_		
4	2		
5	2	4	Colore Hill L'Harres DD. Alternation CD. Mitsuchistics in Lefferenzielle. Authorities and Harres Dharres Hill
6	3	1.	Scher JU, Littman DR, Abramson SB. Microbiome in Inflammatory Arthritis and Human Rheumatic
7	4		Diseases. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2016;68:35-45.
8	-	2	Assumptions of the second second as in the second
9	5	۷.	Asquith M, Elewaut D, Lin P et al. The role of the gut and microbes in the pathogenesis of
10	6		spondyloarthritis. Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol. 2014;28:687-702.
11	7	r	Stall ML Cut microhas immunity and spandyloarthritic Clin Immunal 2015,150,124,142
12	/	3.	Stoli ML. Gut microbes, immunity, and spondyloartnintis. <i>Clin immunol</i> . 2015;159:134-142.
13	Q	Л	Costello ME Ciccia E Willper D et al Intestinal dychiosis in ankylosing spondylitis. Arthritis
14 15	0	4.	Rheumatol 2014
15	9		Kiledinator. 2014.
10 17	10	5	Yang L Wang L Wang X et al. A Possible Role of Intestinal Microbiota in the Pathogenesis of
17	11	5.	Ankylosing Spondylitis Int I Mol Sci. 2016:17
10	11		
20	12	6.	Manasson J. Scher JU. Spondyloarthritis and the microbiome: new insights from an ancient
20	13	0.	hypothesis. Curr Rheumatol Rep. 2015:17:10.
22			
23	14	7.	De WK, Debusschere K, Beeckman S et al. Integrating the pathogenesis of spondyloarthritis: gut and
24	15		ioint united? Curr Opin Rheumatol. 2015:27:189-196.
25			
26	16	8.	Eppinga H, Konstantinov SR, Peppelenbosch MP et al. The microbiome and psoriatic arthritis. Curr
27	17		Rheumatol Rep. 2014;16:407.
28			
29	18	9.	Coit P, Sawalha AH. The human microbiome in rheumatic autoimmune diseases: A comprehensive
30	19		review. Clin Immunol. 2016;170:70-79.
31			
32	20	10.	Ciccia F, Ferrante A, Guggino G et al. The role of the gastrointestinal tract in the pathogenesis of
33	21		rheumatic diseases. Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol. 2016;30:889-900.
34			
35	22	11.	Tito RY, Cypers H, Joossens M et al. Brief Report: Dialister as a Microbial Marker of Disease Activity
36	23		in Spondyloarthritis. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2017;69:114-121.
3/			
38	24	12.	Eppinga H, Sperna Weiland CJ, Thio HB et al. Similar Depletion of Protective Faecalibacterium
39 40	25		prausnitzii in Psoriasis and Inflammatory Bowel Disease, but not in Hidradenitis Suppurativa. J
40	26		Crohns Colitis. 2016.
47		40	
43	27	13.	Ritchlin CT, Colbert RA, Gladman DD. Psoriatic Arthritis. N Engl J Med. 2017;376:2095-2096.
44	20	11	Tarelou I. Narada E. Jagnassa A. et al. Defining anthesitic in spanduloarthritic hy ultrasoundurocults
45	20	14.	of a Dolphi process and of a roliability reading everyice. Arthritic Care Bes (Hobelton), 2014(6):741
46	29		of a Delphi process and of a reliability reading exercise. Arthintis Care Res (Hoboken). 2014,00.741-
47	50		746.
48	31	15	Peluso R. Jervolino S. Vitiello M et al. Extra-articular manifestations in psoriatic arthritis natients
49	37	15.	Clin Rheumatol 2014
50	52		
51	33	16.	Gladman DD. Psoriatic arthritis. <i>Dermotol Ther</i> . 2009:22:40-55.
52			
53	34	17.	Gossec L, Coates LC, De WM et al. Management of psoriatic arthritis in 2016: a comparison of
54	35		EULAR and GRAPPA recommendations. Nat Rev Rheumatol. 2016;12:743-750.
55			<i>,</i>
50 57			
57 58			
50			
60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1			
2	1	18.	Kingsley GH, Kowalczyk A, Taylor H et al. A randomized placebo-controlled trial of methotrexate in
3	2		psoriatic arthritis. Rheumatology (Oxford). 2012;51:1368-1377.
4			
5	3	19.	Gossec L, Smolen JS, Ramiro S et al. European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR)
0 7	4		recommendations for the management of psoriatic arthritis with pharmacological therapies: 2015
/ 8	5		update. Ann Rheum Dis. 2016;75:499-510.
9	_		
10	6	20.	Asquith M, Rosenbaum JT. The interaction between host genetics and the microbiome in the
11	7		pathogenesis of spondyloarthropathies. <i>Curr Opin Rheumatol</i> . 2016;28:405-412.
12	0	21	Penham H. Debinson DC. Paillet AC et al. Pole of genetics in infection associated arthritic. Post Pract
13	0	21.	Bennann R, Robinson PC, Balliet AC et al. Role of genetics in infection-associated artificits. Best Pract
14	9		Res Cilli Kileulliuloi. 2015,23.215-225.
15	10	22	Shamriz O Mizrahi H Werbner M et al Microbiota at the crossroads of autoimmunity Autoimmun
16	11		<i>Rev.</i> 2016:15:859-869
17			
18	12	23.	Lories RJ, de VK. Is psoriatic arthritis a result of abnormalities in acquired or innate immunity? Curr
19	13		Rheumatol Rep. 2012;14:375-382.
20			
21	14	24.	Mortezavi M, Thiele R, Ritchlin C. The joint in psoriatic arthritis. <i>Clin Exp Rheumatol</i> . 2015;33:20-25.
23			
24	15	25.	Acosta Felquer ML, Fitzgerald O. Peripheral joint involvement in psoriatic arthritis patients. <i>Clin Exp</i>
25	16		Rheumatol. 2015;33:26-30.
26	47	26	
27	1/	26.	Matt P, Lindqvist U, Kleinau S. Up-regulation of CD64-expressing monocytes with impaired
28	18		FegammaR function reflects disease activity in polyarticular psoriatic arthritis. Scand J Rheumatol.
29	19		2015;44:464-473.
30	20	27	Al-Mossawi MH Ridley A Kiedel S et al. The role of natural killer cells, gamma delta T-cells and
31	20	27.	other innate immune cells in spondyloarthritis Curr Onin Rheumatol 2013:25:434-439
32	21		
27	22	28.	Ryan C. Korman NJ. Gelfand JM et al. Research gaps in psoriasis: opportunities for future studies. J
34	23	_	Am Acad Dermatol. 2014;70:146-167.
36			
37	24	29.	Berthelot JM, de la Cochetiere MF, Potel G et al. Evidence supporting a role for dormant bacteria in
38	25		the pathogenesis of spondylarthritis. <i>Joint Bone Spine</i> . 2013;80:135-140.
39			
40	26	30.	Abdollahi-Roodsaz S, Abramson SB, Scher JU. The metabolic role of the gut microbiota in health and
41	27		rheumatic disease: mechanisms and interventions. <i>Nat Rev Rheumatol</i> . 2016;12:446-455.
42	20	24	Handa K Litteren DD. The minuchists in eductive immune homeostaris and disease. Notwo
43	28	31.	Honda K, Littman DR. The microbiota in adaptive immune nomeostasis and disease. <i>Nature</i> .
44 45	29		2010,555.75-84.
45 46	30	32	Ciccia E Rizzo A Triolo G Subclinical gut inflammation in ankylosing spondylitis Curr Onin
40	31	52.	Rheumatol 2016-28-89-96
48	51		Aneumaton 2010,20.05 50.
49	32	33.	Miossec P, Korn T, Kuchroo VK. Interleukin-17 and type 17 helper T cells. N Engl J Med.
50	33		2009;361:888-898.
51			
52	34	34.	Ciccia F, Guggino G, Rizzo A et al. Dysbiosis and zonulin upregulation alter gut epithelial and
53	35		vascular barriers in patients with ankylosing spondylitis. Ann Rheum Dis. 2017.
54	_		
55	36	35.	Pianta A, Arvikar SL, Strle K et al. Two rheumatoid arthritis-specific autoantigens correlate microbial
56 57	37		immunity with autoimmune responses in joints. <i>J Clin Invest</i> . 2017.
57 58			
50 59			
60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
			23

BMJ Open

2	1	36.	Scher JU, Ubeda C, Artacho A et al. Decreased bacterial diversity characterizes an altered gut
3	2		microbiota in psoriatic arthritis and resembles dysbiosis of inflammatory bowel disease. Arthritis
4	3		Rheumatol. 2014.
5			
6	4	37.	Lindqvist U, Kristjansson G, Pihl-Lundin I et al. Patients with psoriatic arthritis have an increased
7	5		number of lymphocytes in the duodenal mucosa in comparison with patients with psoriasis
8	6		vulgaris <i>I Rheumatol</i> 2006:33:924-927
9	Ũ		
10	7	38	Scarna R. Manguso F. D'Arienzo A et al. Microsconic inflammatory changes in colon of natients with
11	, Q	50.	both active reprincing and reprincing arthritic without howel symptoms. <i>LBheumatol</i> 2000:27:1241-
12	0		1242
13	9		1240.
14	10	20	Van DL. Van dan Basch F. Mialants H at al. Musacal inflammation in spandularthritidas: past
15	10	59.	vali PL, vali deli Bosci F, Mielants Fi et al. Mucosai initattiniation ili sponuyiai tintues. past,
16	11		present, and future. Curr Rheumatol Rep. 2011;13:409-415.
17	4.2		
18	12	40.	Schatteman L, Mielants H, Veys EM et al. Gut inflammation in psoriatic arthritis: a prospective
19	13		ileocolonoscopic study. <i>J Rheumatol</i> . 1995;22:680-683.
20			
21	14	41.	Ciccia F, Guggino G, Ferrante A et al. Interleukin-9 Overexpression and Th9 Polarization
22	15		Characterize the Inflamed Gut, the Synovial Tissue, and the Peripheral Blood of Patients With
23	16		Psoriatic Arthritis. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2016;68:1922-1931.
24			
25	17	42.	Lin L, Zhang J. Role of intestinal microbiota and metabolites on gut homeostasis and human
26	18		diseases. BMC Immunol. 2017;18:2.
27			
28	19	43.	Gill T, Asquith M, Rosenbaum JT et al. The intestinal microbiome in spondyloarthritis. Curr Opin
29	20		Rheumatol. 2015;27:319-325.
30			
31	21	44.	Kump PK, Krause R, Allerberger F et al. Faecal microbiota transplantation-the Austrian approach.
37	22		Clin Microbiol Infect. 2014:20:1106-1111.
32			
34	23	45.	Cammarota G, Pecere S, Ianiro G et al. Principles of DNA-Based Gut Microbiota Assessment and
35	24		Therapeutic Efficacy of Fecal Microbiota Transplantation in Gastrointestinal Diseases. Dia Dis
36	25		2016:34:279-285
37	20		
38	26	46	Austin M Mellow M Tierney WM Fecal microbiota transplantation in the treatment of Clostridium
39	27		difficile infections Am I Med 2014-127-479-483
40	_,		
41	28	47	van NE Vrieze A Nieuwdorn M et al. Duodenal infusion of donor feces for recurrent Clostridium
42	29		difficile N Engl I Med 2013:368:407-415
43	20		
44	30	48	Cammarota G. Masucci L. Janiro G et al. Randomised clinical trial: faecal microbiota transplantation
45	31	.0.	by colonoscopy vs. vancomycin for the treatment of recurrent Clostridium difficile infection
46	32		Aliment Pharmacol Ther. 2015:11:835-843
47	52		Annent Fhathacol Ther. 2013,41.853-843.
48	22	10	Lee CH. Steiner T. Petrof FO. et al. Frozen vs Fresh Fecal Microbiota Transplantation and Clinical
49	31	45.	Resolution of Diarrhea in Patients With Recurrent Clostridium difficile Infection: A Randomized
50	25		Clinical Trial (AMA, 2016)216:142-140
51	30		Cillical IIIal. JAIMA. 2010;313.142-149.
52	26	FO	Li VT. Coi HE. Wang 74 at al. Systematic review with meta analysic long term outcomes of foodal
53	27	50.	Li FI, Cal FIF, Wang ZFI et al. Systematic review with meta-analysis. Joing-term outcomes of faecal
54	37		micropiola transplantation for Clostridium difficile infection. Aliment Pharmacol Ther. 2016;43:445-
55	38		457.
56			
57			
58			
59			
60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

2 3 4 5	1 2 3	51.	Paramsothy S, Kamm MA, Kaakoush NO et al. Multidonor intensive faecal microbiota transplantation for active ulcerative colitis: a randomised placebo-controlled trial. <i>Lancet</i> . 2017;389:1218-1228.
6 7 8	4 5	52.	Cui B, Feng Q, Wang H et al. Fecal microbiota transplantation through mid-gut for refractory Crohn's disease: Safety, feasibility and efficacy trial results. <i>J Gastroenterol Hepatol</i> . 2014.
9 10	6	53.	Lund H, Brunnhuber K, Juhl C et al. Towards evidence based research. BMJ. 2016;355:i5440.
11 12	7	54.	Ciccia F, Ferrante A, Triolo G. Intestinal dysbiosis and innate immune responses in axial
13	8		spondyloarthritis. Curr Opin Rheumatol. 2016;28:352-358.
14 15	9 10	55.	Bravo-Blas A, Wessel H, Milling S. Microbiota and arthritis: correlations or cause? <i>Curr Opin</i> Rheumatol 2016:28:161-167
16 17	10		Kneumutol. 2010,28.101-107.
18	11 12	56.	Kabeerdoss J, Sandhya P, Danda D. Gut inflammation and microbiome in spondyloarthritis.
19 20	12		Micumator mic. 2010, 30.437 400.
21 22	13 14	57.	Costello ME, Robinson PC, Benham H et al. The intestinal microbiome in human disease and how it relates to arthritis and spondyloarthritis. <i>Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol</i> . 2015;29:202-212.
23 24	15	58.	Bazso A, Szodoray P, Suto G et al. Importance of intestinal microenvironment in development of
25	16		arthritis. A systematic review. Immunol Res. 2015;61:172-176.
20	17	59.	Taneja V. Arthritis susceptibility and the gut microbiome. <i>FEBS Lett</i> . 2014;588:4244-4249.
28 29	18	60.	Rosenbaum JT, Lin P, Asquith M et al. Does the microbiome play a causal role in spondyloarthritis?
30 31	19		Clin Rheumatol. 2014;33:763-767.
32	20	61.	Jenks K, Stebbings S, Burton J et al. Probiotic therapy for the treatment of spondyloarthritis: a
33	21		randomized controlled trial. J Rheumatol. 2010;37:2118-2125.
34 35	22	62.	Aggarwal A, Sarangi AN, Gaur P et al. Gut microbiome in children with enthesitis-related arthritis in
36	23		a developing country and the effect of probiotic administration. <i>Clin Exp Immunol</i> . 2017;187:480-
37 38	24		489.
39	25	63.	Berntson L, Hedlund-Treutiger I, Alving K. Anti-inflammatory effect of exclusive enteral nutrition in
40 41	26		patients with juvenile idiopathic arthritis. <i>Clin Exp Rheumatol</i> . 2016;34:941-945.
42	27	64.	Hatakka K, Martio J, Korpela M et al. Effects of probiotic therapy on the activity and activation of
43 44	28		mid meumatoid artinitisa pilot study. <i>Scand J Rheumatol</i> . 2003;32:211-215.
45	29	65.	Mandel DR, Eichas K, Holmes J. Bacillus coagulans: a viable adjunct therapy for relieving symptoms
46	30		of rheumatoid arthritis according to a randomized, controlled trial. BMC Complement Altern Med.
47 48	31		2010;10:1.
49	32	66.	Zamani B, Golkar HR, Farshbaf S et al. Clinical and metabolic response to probiotic supplementation
50	33		in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Int J
51	34		Rheum Dis. 2016;19:869-879.
53 54	35 36	67.	Pineda ML, Thompson SF, Summers K et al. A randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled pilot
55 56 57 58	50		
59			For poor roviou only, http://bmionon.hmi.com/cita/ahout/cividalines.yhtml
60			ror peer review only - http://binjopen.binj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 25

1			
2	1	68	Alinour B. Homayouni-Rad A. Vaghef-Mehrahany F et al. Effects of Lactobacillus casei
3	2	00.	supplementation on disease activity and inflammatory cytokines in rheumatoid arthritis nationts: a
4	2		randomized double blind clinical trial Int I Phoum Dic 2014/17/E10 E27
5	5		
6	1	60	Scharpion A. Kalacinski SI. Can Brabiatic Supplements Improve Outcomes in Phaymatoid Arthritic?
7	4 F	09.	Scholpion A, Kolasinski SL. Can Problotic Supplements improve Outcomes in Kneumatolu Artimus (
8	5		Curr Rileumator Rep. 2017;19.75.
9	C	70	Taular W. Cladman D. Halliwall D at al. Classification aritaria for provintia arthritic development of
10	6	70.	Taylor W, Gladman D, Helliwell P et al. Classification criteria for psoriatic arthritis: development of
11	/		new criteria from a large international study. Arthritis Rheum. 2006;54:2665-2673.
12			
13	8	/1.	Qin J, Li Y, Cai Z et al. A metagenome-wide association study of gut microbiota in type 2 diabetes.
14	9		Nature. 2012;490:55-60.
15			
16	10	72.	Nielsen HB, Almeida M, Juncker AS et al. Identification and assembly of genomes and genetic
17	11		elements in complex metagenomic samples without using reference genomes. Nat Biotechnol.
18	12		2014;32:822-828.
19			
20	13	73.	Li J, Jia H, Cai X et al. An integrated catalog of reference genes in the human gut microbiome. <i>Nat</i>
21	14		Biotechnol. 2014;32:834-841.
27			
23	15	74.	Mishra A, Makharia GK. Techniques of functional and motility test: how to perform and interpret
23	16		intestinal permeability. J Neurogastroenterol Motil. 2012;18:443-447.
25			
26	17	75.	Sequeira IR, Lentle RG, Kruger MC et al. Standardising the lactulose mannitol test of gut
20	18		permeability to minimise error and promote comparability. <i>PLoS One</i> . 2014;9:e99256.
27			
20	19	76.	Thorsen H, Hansen TM, McKenna SP et al. Adaptation into Danish of the Stanford Health
30	20		Assessment Questionnaire (HAQ) and the Rheumatoid Arthritis Quality of Life Scale (RAQoL). Scand
31	21		J Rheumatol. 2001:30:103-109.
37			
32	22	77.	Brodszky V. Pentek M. Balint PV et al. Comparison of the Psoriatic Arthritis Quality of Life (PsAQoL)
31	23		questionnaire, the functional status (HAO) and utility (EO-5D) measures in psoriatic arthritis: results
35	24		from a cross-sectional survey. Scand I Rheumatol. 2010;39:303-309
36	21		non a closs sectional sulvey. scana s nicelinator. 2010,00,005 505.
37	25	78.	Zachariae R. Zachariae C. Ibsen H et al. Dermatology life quality index: data from Danish inpatients
38	26	70.	and outnatients Acta Derm Venereal 2000:80:272-276
30	20		
40	27	79	Fransen L Antoni C Mease PL et al. Performance of response criteria for assessing peripheral
40	28	75.	arthritis in patients with psoriatic arthritis: analysis of data from randomised controlled trials of two
42	20		tumour necrosis factor inhibitors Ann Rheum Dis 2006;65:1373-1378
43	25		
43 ΔΔ	30	80	Felson DT Anderson II Boars M et al American College of Rheumatology Preliminary definition of
45	21	80.	improvement in rhoumatoid arthritic Arthritic Phaum 1005:29:727 725
46	51		Improvement in meunatolu artintis. Artintis Kileum. 1995,58.727-755.
40	27	Q1	Folson DT. Anderson II. Lange MI et al. Should improvement in rhoumateid arthritis clinical trials
47 48	32	01.	he defined as fifty percent or seventy percent improvement in seven set measures, rather than
40	22		be defined as firty percent of sevency percent improvement in core set measures, rather than
50	54		twenty percent? Artificis Rileum. 1998;41.1504-1570.
51	25	07	Faria ID. Aaraa AD. Jimanaa IM at al. Inter rater concerdance study of the DASI (Deprincip Area and
52	35	02.	Faila JR, Aarao AR, Jimenez Livi et al. Inter-rater concordance study of the PASI (Psoriasis Area and
52	36		Severity Index). An Bras Dermatol. 2010;85:625-629.
54	27	02	Jansen OK Collegen I. Nieleen MC et al. Deurschweikilite of tenden neist evensiestien in eksenie leve
55	37	83.	Jensen OK, Callesen J, Nielsen MG et al. Reproducibility of tender point examination in chronic low
56	38		back pain patients as measured by intrarater and inter-rater reliability and agreement: a validation
57	39		stuay. <i>ылу Upen</i> . 2013;3.
58			
59			
60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
-			20

1			
2	1	84.	Klingberg E, Carlsten H, Hilme E et al. Calprotectin in ankylosing spondylitisfrequently elevated in
3	2		feces, but normal in serum. Scand J Gastroenterol. 2012;47:435-444.
4			
5	3	85.	Kelly CR, Kahn S, Kashyap P et al. Update on Fecal Microbiota Transplantation 2015: Indications,
6 7	4		Methodologies, Mechanisms, and Outlook. Gastroenterology. 2015;149:223-237.
8	5	86.	Wang S, Xu M, Wang W et al. Systematic Review: Adverse Events of Fecal Microbiota
9	6		Transplantation. PLoS One. 2016;11:e0161174.
10			
17	7	87.	Rossen NG, MacDonald JK, de Vries EM et al. Fecal microbiota transplantation as novel therapy in
13	8		gastroenterology: A systematic review. World J Gastroenterol. 2015;21:5359-5371.
14	0	00	Circles M. Care S. Anand P. et al. Eacal Microbiota Transplantation for Pocurrent Cloctridium
15	9 10	00.	difficile Infection in the Elderly: Long-Term Outcomes and Microbiota Changes. Dig Dis Sci
16	10		2016-61-3007-3015
17	11		2010,01:3007-3013.
18	12	89.	Gweon TG, Kim J, Lim CH et al. Fecal Microbiota Transplantation Using Upper Gastrointestinal Tract
19	13		for the Treatment of Refractory or Severe Complicated Clostridium difficile Infection in Elderly
20	14		Patients in Poor Medical Condition: The First Study in an Asian Country. <i>Gastroenterol Res Pract</i> .
21	15		2016;2016:2687605.
22			
23	16	90.	Agrawal M, Aroniadis OC, Brandt LJ et al. The Long-term Efficacy and Safety of Fecal Microbiota
25	17		Transplant for Recurrent, Severe, and Complicated Clostridium difficile Infection in 146 Elderly
26	18		Individuals. J Clin Gastroenterol. 2016;50:403-407.
27			
28	19	91.	Di BS, Gouliouris T, Petrosillo N. Fecal microbiota transplantation (FMT) for Clostridium difficile
29	20		infection: focus on immunocompromised patients. J Infect Chemother. 2015;21:230-237.
30	24	0.7	Welde DE De serve A. Fred CD at all Fred et al track and a table to fee and a serve of Charlet d'and
31	21	92.	webb BJ, Brunner A, Ford CD et al. Fecal microbiota transplantation for recurrent Clostridium
32	22		difficile infection in nematopoletic stem cen transplant recipients. Transplangett Dis. 2016.
33 24	23	93	Harris PA Taylor R Thielke R et al. Research electronic data capture (REDCan)a metadata-driven
34 35	23	55.	methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support /
36	25		Biomed Inform. 2009:42:377-381.
37			
38	26	94.	Altman DG, Dore CJ. Randomisation and baseline comparisons in clinical trials. Lancet.
39	27		1990;335:149-153.
40			
41	28	95.	Normand SL, Sykora K, Li P et al. Readers guide to critical appraisal of cohort studies: 3. Analytical
42	29		strategies to reduce confounding. BMJ. 2005;330:1021-1023.
43	20	0.0	Wikite ID, Used as NU, Conservation I at all Charles of fraction of the trade and static standard table
44 45	30	96.	White IR, Horton NJ, Carpenter J et al. Strategy for intention to treat analysis in randomised trials
45 46	31		with missing outcome data. BNJ. 2011;342:040.
40 47	27	97	Liu R. Hong I. Xu X et al. Gut microhiome and serum metabolome alterations in obesity and after
48	32	57.	weight-loss intervention Nat Med 2017:23:859-868
49	55		weight 1055 intervention. <i>Nut Wieu</i> . 2017;23:055 000.
50	34	98.	Pedersen HK, Gudmundsdottir V, Nielsen HB et al. Human gut microbes impact host serum
51	35		metabolome and insulin sensitivity. <i>Nature</i> . 2016;535:376-381.
52			
53	36	99.	Thaiss CA, Zmora N, Levy M et al. The microbiome and innate immunity. <i>Nature</i> . 2016;535:65-74.
54			
55	37	100.	McLean MH, Dieguez D, Jr., Miller LM et al. Does the microbiota play a role in the pathogenesis of
50 57	38		autoimmune diseases? Gut. 2015;64:332-341.
57 58			
59			
60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1			
2	1	101.	Longman RS, Yang Y, Diehl GE et al. Microbiota: host interactions in mucosal homeostasis and
3	2		systemic autoimmunity. Cold Spring Harb Symp Quant Biol. 2013;78:193-201.
4 5	2	102	Chroiner AD, Kee IV, Veune VD. The sut migrahienes in health and in disease. Curr Onin
6	3 1	102.	Shreiner AB, Kao JY, Young VB. The gut microbiome in health and in disease. Curr Opin Gastroenterol. 2015:31:69-75
7	4		Gastioenterol. 2013,51.03-73.
8	5	103.	Hooper LV, Littman DR, Macpherson AJ. Interactions between the microbiota and the immune
9 10	6		system. Science. 2012;336:1268-1273.
10	7	101	Denote the Manual Andrew Country and the state of a sta
12	/	104.	Round JL, Mazmanian SK. The gut microbiota snapes intestinal immune responses during health
13	0		
14	9	105.	Van de Wiele T, Van Praet JT, Marzorati M et al. How the microbiota shapes rheumatic diseases.
15 16	10		Nat Rev Rheumatol. 2016;12:398-411.
17			
18	11	106.	Butto LF, Haller D. Dysbiosis in intestinal inflammation: Cause or consequence. Int J Med Microbiol.
19	12		2016.
20	13	107.	Moayyedi P, Surette MG, Kim PT et al. Fecal Microbiota Transplantation Induces Remission in
21	14		Patients With Active Ulcerative Colitis in a Randomized Controlled Trial. Gastroenterology.
22	15		2015;149:102-109.
24	4.6	400	
25	16 17	108.	Rossen NG, Fuentes S, van der Spek MJ et al. Findings From a Randomized Controlled Trial of Fecal
26	17		Transplantation for Patients with Ocerative Contis. Gastroenterology. 2015,149.110-118.
27	18	109.	Smolen JS, Schols M, Braun J et al. Treating axial spondyloarthritis and peripheral spondyloarthritis,
20	19		especially psoriatic arthritis, to target: 2017 update of recommendations by an international task
30	20		force. Ann Rheum Dis. 2017.
31	24	440	The sector of the state in the sector of the
32	21	110.	Zhernakova A, Kurlisnikov A, Bonder MJ et al. Population-based metagenomics analysis reveals
33 34	22		
35	23	111.	Falony G, Joossens M, Vieira-Silva S et al. Population-level analysis of gut microbiome variation.
36	24		Science. 2016;352:560-564.
37	25	112	Foreland K. Hildebrand F. Nielson Tet al. Disentencling true 2 dispetes and matfermin treatment
38	25 26	112.	signatures in the human gut microhiota. <i>Nature</i> 2015;528:262-266
39 40	20		signatures in the numan gut microbiota. Nature: 2013,520.202 200.
41	27	113.	Zhang X, Zhang D, Jia H et al. The oral and gut microbiomes are perturbed in rheumatoid arthritis
42	28		and partly normalized after treatment. <i>Nat Med</i> . 2015;21:895-905.
43	20	111	Manduranth MILL Neigh ENA Millow NC at all John and an Tasting of Demonstrand Staal for East
44 45	29	114.	Woodworth MH, Neish EM, Miller NS et al. Laboratory Testing of Donors and Stool for Fecal Microbiota Transplantation for Recurrent C difficile Infection J Clin Microbiol 2017
45 46	30		Microbiota transplantation for Recurrent C. unitche infection. J Chin Microbiol. 2017.
47	31	115.	Costello SP, Tucker EC, La BJ et al. Establishing a Fecal Microbiota Transplant Service for the
48	32		Treatment of Clostridium difficile Infection. Clin Infect Dis. 2016;62:908-914.
49			
50 51	33	116.	Cammarota G, Ianiro G, Iilg H et al. European consensus conference on faecal microbiota
52	34		transplantation in clinical practice. Gut. 2017;66:569-580.
53	35	117.	Chu ND, Smith MB, Perrotta AR et al. Profiling Living Bacteria Informs Preparation of Fecal
54	36		Microbiota Transplantations. PLoS One. 2017;12:e0170922.
55			
50 57			
58			
59			
60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 28

2	1	118.	Satokari R, Mattila E, Kainulainen V et al. Simple faecal preparation and efficacy of frozen inoculum
3	2		in faecal microbiota transplantation for recurrent Clostridium difficile infectionan observational
4	3		cohort study. Aliment Pharmacol Ther. 2015:41:46-53.
5			
6	4	119.	Li J. Jia H. Cai X et al. An integrated catalog of reference genes in the human gut microbiome. <i>Nat</i>
7	5		Biotechnol 2014·32·834-841
8	5		
9	6	120	Arumugam M Raes I Pelletier F et al Enterotypes of the human gut microhiome Nature
10	7	120.	2011·473·174-180
11	,		2011,475.174 100.
12	Q	171	Kazerouni A. Wein I.M. Exploring the Efficacy of Pooled Stools in Fecal Microbiota Transplantation
13	0	121.	for Microbiota Associated Chronic Diseases, <i>Dias One</i> 2017;12:e01620E6
14	9		TO MICIODIOLA-ASSOCIATED CHIOTIC DISEASES. FLOS ONE. 2017,12.00105550.
15	10	177	Vandanutta D. Falany C. Viaira Silva S at al. Staal consistency is strongly associated with gut
16	10	122.	valueputte D, Falony G, viena-silva S et al. Stool consistency is strongly associated with gut
17	11		micropiota richness and composition, enterotypes and bacterial growth rates. Gut. 2016;65:57-62.
18	4.2	100	
19	12	123.	Ley RE. The gene-microbe link. Nature. 2015;518:57.
20	10	124	Li CC, Zhu A, Danas V at al. Durable assuriations of demonstration and registrations of the forely strandista
21	13	124.	Li SS, Zhu A, Benes V et al. Durable coexistence of donor and recipient strains after fecal microbiota
22	14		transplantation. Science. 2016;352:586-589.
23			
24	15	125.	Spor A, Koren O, Ley R. Unravelling the effects of the environment and host genotype on the gut
25	16		microbiome. <i>Nat Rev Microbiol</i> . 2011;9:279-290.
26			
27	17	126.	Markle JG, Frank DN, Mortin-Toth S et al. Sex differences in the gut microbiome drive hormone-
28	18		dependent regulation of autoimmunity. Science. 2013;339:1084-1088.
29			
30	19	127.	Xiao L, Estelle J, Kiilerich P et al. A reference gene catalogue of the pig gut microbiome. Nat
31	20		Microbiol. 2016;16161.
32			
33	21	128.	Markle JG, Frank DN, Adeli K et al. Microbiome manipulation modifies sex-specific risk for
34	22		autoimmunity. <i>Gut Microbes</i> . 2014;5:485-493.
35			
36	23	129.	Mills S, Shanahan F, Stanton C et al. Movers and shakers: influence of bacteriophages in shaping
37	24		the mammalian gut microbiota. Gut Microbes. 2013;4:4-16.
38			
39	25	130.	Pfeiffer JK, Virgin HW. Viral immunity. Transkingdom control of viral infection and immunity in the
40	26		mammalian intestine. Science. 2016;351.
41			
42	27	131.	Underhill DM, Pearlman E. Immune Interactions with Pathogenic and Commensal Fungi: A Two-
43	28		Way Street. Immunity. 2015;43:845-858.
44			
45	29	132.	Castelino M, Eyre S, Moat J et al. The skin microbiome in psoriatic arthritis: methodology
46	30		development and pilot data. Lancet. 2015;385 Suppl 1:S27.
47			
48	31	133.	Scher JU, Joshua V, Artacho A et al. The lung microbiota in early rheumatoid arthritis and
49	32		autoimmunity. <i>Microbiome</i> . 2016:4:60.
50	33		
51	34		
52	51		
53	35		
54			
55	36		
56			
57			
58			
59			
60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
			23





BMJ Open



SPIRIT 2013 Checklist: Recommended items to address in a clinical trial protocol and related documents*

Section/item	ltem No	Description	Addressed on page number
Administrative info	ormation	Or .	
Title	1	Descriptive title identifying the study design, population, interventions, and, if applicable, trial acronym	1
rial registration	2a	Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registry	2
	2b	All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set	<u>1-23</u>
Protocol version	3	Date and version identifier	<u>1</u>
unding	4	Sources and types of financial, material, and other support	23
Roles and	5a	Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors	<u>1 and 22</u>
esponsibilities	5b	Name and contact information for the trial sponsor	<u> <u> </u></u>
	5c	Role of study sponsor and funders, if any, in study design; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the report; and the decision to submit the report for publication, including whether they will have ultimate authority over any of these activities	22
	5d	Composition, roles, and responsibilities of the coordinating centre, steering committee, endpoint adjudication committee, data management team, and other individuals or groups overseeing the trial, if applicable (see Item 21a for data monitoring committee)	<u>2</u>

2	Introduction			
3 4 5	Background and rationale	6a	Description of research question and justification for undertaking the trial, including summary of relevant studies (published and unpublished) examining benefits and harms for each intervention	3-4
6 7		6b	Explanation for choice of comparators	<u>4</u>
8 9	Objectives	7	Specific objectives or hypotheses	4-5
10 11 12 13	Trial design	8	Description of trial design including type of trial (eg, parallel group, crossover, factorial, single group), allocation ratio, and framework (eg, superiority, equivalence, noninferiority, exploratory)	5
14 15	Methods: Participa	nts, inte	erventions, and outcomes	
16 17 18 19 20 21	Study setting	9	Description of study settings (eg, community clinic, academic hospital) and list of countries where data will be collected. Reference to where list of study sites can be obtained	<u>8</u>
	Eligibility criteria	10	Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. If applicable, eligibility criteria for study centres and individuals who will perform the interventions (eg, surgeons, psychotherapists)	<u> </u>
22 23 24	Interventions	11a	Interventions for each group with sufficient detail to allow replication, including how and when they will be administered	<u>9-10</u>
23 26 27 28		11b	Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions for a given trial participant (eg, drug dose change in response to harms, participant request, or improving/worsening disease)	<u> 10 </u>
29 30 31		11c	Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any procedures for monitoring adherence (eg, drug tablet return, laboratory tests)	<u>Not applicable</u>
32 33		11d	Relevant concomitant care and interventions that are permitted or prohibited during the trial	<u>8 and 9</u>
34 35 36 37 38	Outcomes	12	Primary, secondary, and other outcomes, including the specific measurement variable (eg, systolic blood pressure), analysis metric (eg, change from baseline, final value, time to event), method of aggregation (eg, median, proportion), and time point for each outcome. Explanation of the clinical relevance of chosen efficacy and harm outcomes is strongly recommended	11-12
40 41 42	Participant timeline	13	Time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any run-ins and washouts), assessments, and visits for participants. A schematic diagram is highly recommended (see Figure)	<u> </u>
43 44 45			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

Page 35 of 36			BMJ Open	
1 2	Sample size	14	Estimated number of participants needed to achieve study objectives and how it was determined, including _ clinical and statistical assumptions supporting any sample size calculations	<u>13-14</u>
3 4 5	Recruitment	15	Strategies for achieving adequate participant enrolment to reach target sample size	8
6 7	Methods: Assignm	ent of i	nterventions (for controlled trials)	
8 9	Allocation:			
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29	Sequence generation	16a	Method of generating the allocation sequence (eg, computer-generated random numbers), and list of any _ factors for stratification. To reduce predictability of a random sequence, details of any planned restriction (eg, blocking) should be provided in a separate document that is unavailable to those who enrol participants or assign interventions	14
	Allocation concealment mechanism	16b	Mechanism of implementing the allocation sequence (eg, central telephone; sequentially numbered,	<u>14</u>
	Implementation	16c	Who will generate the allocation sequence, who will enrol participants, and who will assign participants to	14
	Blinding (masking)	17a	Who will be blinded after assignment to interventions (eg, trial participants, care providers, outcome assessors, data analysts), and how	14
		17b	If blinded, circumstances under which unblinding is permissible, and procedure for revealing a participant's _ allocated intervention during the trial	<u>14</u>
30 31	Methods: Data coll	ection,	management, and analysis	
32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46	Data collection methods	18a	Plans for assessment and collection of outcome, baseline, and other trial data, including any relatedprocesses to promote data quality (eg, duplicate measurements, training of assessors) and a description of study instruments (eg, questionnaires, laboratory tests) along with their reliability and validity, if known. Reference to where data collection forms can be found, if not in the protocol	14
		18b	Plans to promote participant retention and complete follow-up, including list of any outcome data to be	<u>16</u>
			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	
1 2 3	Data management	19	Plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, double data entry; range checks for data values). Reference to where details of data management procedures can be found, if not in the protocol	<u> 14 </u>
--	--------------------------	---------	---	---
5 6 7	Statistical methods	20a	Statistical methods for analysing primary and secondary outcomes. Reference to where other details of the statistical analysis plan can be found, if not in the protocol	<u>15</u>
8 9		20b	Methods for any additional analyses (eg, subgroup and adjusted analyses)	15-16
10 11 12 13		20c	Definition of analysis population relating to protocol non-adherence (eg, as randomised analysis), and any statistical methods to handle missing data (eg, multiple imputation)	<u>15</u>
14 15	Methods: Monitorir	ng		
16 17 18 19 20	Data monitoring	21a	Composition of data monitoring committee (DMC); summary of its role and reporting structure; statement of	<u>18</u>
21 22 23 24		21b	Description of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines, including who will have access to these interim _ results and make the final decision to terminate the trial	18
24 25 26 27 28 29 30	Harms	22	Plans for collecting, assessing, reporting, and managing solicited and spontaneously reported adverse events and other unintended effects of trial interventions or trial conduct	13
	Auditing	23	Frequency and procedures for auditing trial conduct, if any, and whether the process will be independent from investigators and the sponsor	18
31 32	Ethics and dissemi	ination		
33 34 35 36	Research ethics approval	24	Plans for seeking research ethics committee/institutional review board (REC/IRB) approval	<u>18</u>
37 38 39 40 41	Protocol amendments	25	Plans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses) to relevant parties (eg, investigators, REC/IRBs, trial participants, trial registries, journals, regulators)	18
42 43 44 45			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	4

Page 37 of 36

46

BMJ Open

1 2	Consent or assent	26a	Who will obtain informed consent or assent from potential trial participants or authorised surrogates, and how (see Item 32)	14		
3 4 5 6		26b	Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and biological specimens in ancillary studies, if applicable	Not applicable		
7 8 9	Confidentiality	27	How personal information about potential and enrolled participants will be collected, shared, and maintained in order to protect confidentiality before, during, and after the trial	<u>14</u>		
10 11 12	Declaration of interests	28	Financial and other competing interests for principal investigators for the overall trial and each study site	23		
13 14 15	Access to data	29	Statement of who will have access to the final trial dataset, and disclosure of contractual agreements that limit such access for investigators	<u>Not applicable</u>		
16 17 18	Ancillary and post- trial care	30	Provisions, if any, for ancillary and post-trial care, and for compensation to those who suffer harm from trial participation	<u>18</u>		
19 20 21 22 23	Dissemination policy	31a	Plans for investigators and sponsor to communicate trial results to participants, healthcare professionals, the public, and other relevant groups (eg, via publication, reporting in results databases, or other data sharing arrangements), including any publication restrictions	<u>18</u>		
24 25		31b	Authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional writers	22		
26 27 28		31c	Plans, if any, for granting public access to the full protocol, participant-level dataset, and statistical code	<u>Not applicable</u>		
29 30	Appendices					
31 32 33	Informed consent materials	32	Model consent form and other related documentation given to participants and authorised surrogates	<u>18</u>		
34 35 36	Biological specimens	33	Plans for collection, laboratory evaluation, and storage of biological specimens for genetic or molecular analysis in the current trial and for future use in ancillary studies, if applicable	10-11		
37 38 39 40	*It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the SPIRIT 2013 Explanation & Elaboration for important clarification on the items. Amendments to the protocol should be tracked and dated. The SPIRIT checklist is copyrighted by the SPIRIT Group under the Creative Commons "Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported" license.					
41 42 43 44 45			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml		5	

BMJ Open

Efficacy and safety of faecal microbiota transplantation in patients with psoriatic arthritis: protocol for a 6-month, double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled trial

The FLORA trial

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-019231.R2
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	13-Feb-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Kragsnaes, Maja; Odense University Hospital, Department of Rheumatology; University of Southern Denmark, Odense Patient data Explorative Network (OPEN), Department of Clinical Institute Kjeldsen, Jens; Odense University Hospital, Department of Gastroenterology Horn, Hans; Odense University Hospital, Department of Rheumatology Pedersen, Finn; Odense University Hospital, Department of Rheumatology Pedersen, Finn; Odense University Hospital, Department of Gastroenterology Holt, Hanne; Odense University Hospital, Department of Clinical Microbiology Pedersen, Jens Kristian; Odense University Hospital, Department of Clinical Microbiology Holm, Dorte; Odense University Hospital, Department of Clinical Immunology Glerup, Henning; Silkeborg Regional Hospital, Diagnostic Centre Andersen, Vibeke; Hospital of Southern Jutland, IRS-Centre Sonderjylland; University of Southern Denmark, Institute of Molecular Medicine Fredberg, Ulrich; Silkeborg Regional Hospital, Diagnostic Centre Kristiansen, Karsten; University of Copenhagen, Laboratory of Genomics and Molecular Biomedicine, Department of Biology; BGI Christensen, Robin; Frederiksberg and Bispebjerg Hospital, Musculoskeletal Statistics Unit, Parker Institute Ellingsen, Torkell; Odense University Hospital, Department of Rheumatology
Primary Subject Heading :	Rheumatology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Immunology (including allergy)
Keywords:	Psoriasis < DERMATOLOGY, Clinical trials < THERAPEUTICS, Faecal microbiota transplantation, Intestinal microbiota, Psoriatic arthritis



1		
2		
3	1	
4		
5	2	
6		
7	2	Efficacy and safety of faecal microhiota transplantation in
8	J	Emedey and safety of facear finerobiota transplantation in
9		nationts with provintic arthritic.
10	4	patients with psohatic artifitis.
11		and the set form of the set to be table to be a set of the set
12	5	protocol for a 6-month, double-blind, randomised,
13		
14	6	placebo-controlled trial
15	-	
16	/	
17	8	The FLORA trial
18	9	
19	5	
20	10	Kragsnaes MS ^{1,2*} , Kjeldsen J ³ , Horn HC ¹ , Munk HL ¹ , Pedersen FM ³ , Holt HM ⁴ , Pedersen JK ¹ , Holm
21	11	DK^5 Glerun H ⁶ Andersen $V^{7,8}$ Eredhera U^6 Kristiansen $K^{9,10}$ Christensen R^{11} Ellingsen T^{1**}
22		DR, Gerup H, Muersen V, Meuberg O, Knstransen R, , ennstensen R, , Ennigsen F.
23	12	
24		
25	13	¹ Department of Rheumatology, Odense University Hospital, Denmark.
26	14	² Odense Patient data Explorative Network (OPEN), Department of Clinical Institute, University of Southern Denmark.
27	15	³ Department of Gastroenterology, Odense University Hospital, Denmark.
28	16	⁴ Department of Clinical Microbiology, Odense University Hospital, Denmark.
29	17	⁵ Department of Clinical Immunology, Odense University Hospital, Denmark.
30	18	⁶ Diagnostic Centre, Silkeborg Regional Hospital, Denmark.
31	19	⁷ IRS-Centre Sonderjylland, Hospital of Southern Jutland, Denmark.
32	20	⁸ Institute of Molecular Medicine, University of Southern Denmark.
32	21	⁹ Laboratory of Genomics and Molecular Biomedicine, Department of Biology, University of Copenhagen, Denmark.
34	22	¹⁰ Institute of Metagenomics, BGI-Shenzhen, Shenzhen, China.
35	23	¹¹ Musculoskeletal Statistics Unit, The Parker Institute, Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark.
36	24	
37	25	* Corresponding author email address: maja.kragsnaes@dadlnet.dk.
38		
30	26	** Sponsor email address: torkell.ellingsen@rsyd.dk.
40	27	
40		
42	28	Protocol manuscript version: 04.
43	29	Date: Eeb 13, 2018
44	25	
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		
51		
52		
53		
54		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

ABSTRACT

Introduction: An unbalanced intestinal microbiota may mediate activation of the inflammatory pathways seen in psoriatic arthritis (PsA). A randomised, placebo-controlled trial of faecal microbiota transplantation (FMT) infused into the small intestine of PsA patients with active peripheral disease who are non-responsive to methotrexate (MTX) treatment will be conducted. The objective is to explore clinical aspects associated with FMT performed in PsA patients.

Methods and analysis: The FLORA trial is a randomised, two-centre stratified, double-blind (patient, care provider and outcome assessor), placebo-controlled, parallel-group study. Eighty patients will be included and randomised (1:1) to either placebo (saline) or FMT provided from an anonymous healthy donor. Throughout the study, both groups will continue the weekly self-administered subcutaneous (s.c.) MTX treatment, remaining on the pre-inclusion dosage (15-25 mg/week). The clinical measures of psoriasis and PsA disease activity used include the Health Assessment Questionnaire (2-page DI-HAQ), the Dermatology Quality of Life Index (DLQI), the Spondyloarthritis Research Consortium of Canada (SPARCC) Enthesitis Index, the Psoriasis Area Severity Index (PASI), a dactylitis digit count, a swollen/tender joint count (66/68), plasma C-reactive protein as well as visual analogue scales for pain, fatigue, and patient and physician global assessments. The primary endpoint is the proportion of patients who experience treatment failure during the 6-month trial period. The number of adverse events will be registered throughout the study.

Ethics and dissemination: This is a proof-of-concept clinical trial and will be performed in agreement with Good Clinical Practice (GCP) standards. Approvals have been obtained from the local Ethics Committee (DK-S-20150080) and the Danish Data Protection Agency (15/41684). The study has commenced in May 2017. Dissemination will be through presentations at national and international conferences and through publications in international peer-reviewed journal(s).

- Strengths and limitations of this study
- 07/ • This is a double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled trial.

Trial registration number at ClinicalTrials.gov: NCT03058900

- Subcutaneously administered MTX treatment.
- The primary endpoint is based on shared decision-making between patient and physician. •
- No feasibility data regarding FMT in rheumatic patients were available when the trial was • designed.
- A limitation of the study is that the content of the faecal transplant suspension cannot be fully standardised.

INTRODUCTION

Emerging data suggest a causal relationship between the intestinal microbiota and spondyloarthritis (SpA), thus, linking dysbiosis of the complex microbial communities with SpA pathogenesis.¹⁻⁵ Psoriatic arthritis (PsA) is one of five SpA categories in adults which also include ankylosing spondylitis, undifferentiated arthritis, reactive arthritis and arthritis associated with inflammatory bowel disease. While the association between the gut and the latter two disorders is well established,⁶ only very recently, studies evaluating the faecal microbiota and the presence of subclinical gut inflammation in PsA patients have coupled this disease to a perturbation of the intestinal microbiota composition.⁷⁻¹²

PsA is a distinct, multi-faceted inflammatory disease with a diverse clinical spectrum and a varied disease course.¹³ The clinical manifestations include peripheral arthritis, enthesitis and/or spondylitis combined with more or less severe psoriatic skin involvement, nail psoriasis, and dactylitis.¹⁴ Nearly half of the patients with both early and established PsA also present with extra-musculoskeletal manifestations which can include bowel (16%), ocular, cardiovascular or urogenital involvement.¹⁵ Without disease modifying intervention, 40-60% of PsA patients will develop erosive and deforming joint damage within a few years of disease onset.¹⁶ Methotrexate (MTX) has long been the preferred conventional synthetic disease-modifying anti-rheumatic drug (csDMARD) for initial therapy.¹⁷ However, the evidence for MTX in PsA is poor, and a substantial number of patients does not benefit from such treatment.¹⁸ Currently, other treatment options may include biological agents such as tumour necrosis factor (TNF- α) inhibitors aiming to block some of the downstream molecular pathways driving the disease.¹⁹ Still, these drugs do not target the cause of PsA, which is believed to be multifactorial comprising genetic, immunological and environmental factors.²⁰ The interplay between these complex aetiological factors has yet to be fully understood.^{21,22}

The classic pathophysiological concept of PsA is that it is an autoimmune disease of the skin and joints and that the pathological processes at both sites are driven by inflammatory responses involving the innate immune system, natural killer cells, T cells, and the expression of pro-inflammatory cytokines, including TNF-α, interleukin (IL)-1, interferon-y, IL-6, IL-12, IL-15, IL-18 and the IL-17/IL-23 axis.²³⁻²⁷ However, although microbial agents including dormant bacteria, mycobacteria, bacterial products and viral antigens have been implicated as potential initiators,^{28,29} the true pathophysiological factors triggering the dysregulated immunological cascade underlying the disease remain to be identified.

Intriguingly, it has recently been suggested that mucosal sites exposed to a high load of bacterial antigens, in particular the gastrointestinal tract, may represent the initial site of immunological tolerance break in PsA.³⁰ Indeed, under normal conditions the host and the microbiota live in harmony and benefit from their mutualistic relationship. However, alterations of the normal intestinal microbiota can affect mucosal immunity which, in turn, can induce local inflammation and elicit systemic effects at distant sites.³¹ Mechanisms through which the intestinal microbiota may be involved in the pathogenesis of PsA include an abnormal activation of the gut-associated lymphoid tissue,³² a decrease in regulatory T cell activity,³³ and/or an altered mucosal permeability thus compromising the capacity of the intestine to provide adequate containment of luminal microorganisms and molecules.^{34,35} In support of these theories, several studies have documented subclinical gut inflammation in PsA patients.³⁶⁻⁴¹ Moreover, a recent

BMJ Open

study reported that several intestinal bacteria including *Akkermansia* and *Ruminococcus* were
 practically absent in PsA patients. These commensal bacteria are, in fact, known to play an

3 important role in maintaining gut homeostasis.⁴²
4

5 Rationale

If the gut microbiota is the initiator and/or mediator of the common inflammatory pathways seen in PsA,⁸ modifying the intestinal microbiota could be a novel treatment strategy for this disease.¹⁻ ^{3,43} Faecal microbiota transplantation (FMT) is currently being used to restore the balance of the intestinal flora.^{44,45} Particularly, this procedure has demonstrated more than 90% clinical resolution of recurrent or refractory *Clostridium difficile* infections.⁴⁶⁻⁵⁰ Also, multiple FMTs seem to be able to induce remission in patients with inflammatory bowel disease (IBD).⁵¹ Due to these results, FMT is now being tested as a potential novel treatment for other gastrointestinal and extra-intestinal diseases.⁵² To the best of our knowledge, no study has yet ascertained the efficacy and safety of FMT in patients with inflammatory rheumatic diseases.

21132216Evidence-based research

To avoid waste of research no new studies should be initiated without a systematic review of the existing evidence.⁵³ We performed a pragmatic search in the biomedical literature via Pubmed combining different related MeSH terms: ("Microbiota"[Mesh] OR "Fecal Microbiota Transplantation"[Mesh] OR "Faecal Microbiota Transplantation"[Mesh] OR "Gastrointestinal Microbiome"[Mesh]) AND (arthritis[tiab] OR "Arthritis"[Mesh] OR "Arthritis, Psoriatic"[Mesh] OR "Arthritis, Reactive" [Mesh] OR "Spondylarthritis" [Mesh] OR "Arthritis, Gouty" [Mesh] OR "Arthritis, Rheumatoid"[Mesh] OR "Psoriasis"[Mesh]). From the search revealing 122 citations it became clear that the majority of papers were reviews/editorials (74 [61%]), where the overall conclusion was that the main challenges are to uncover the cause-effect relationship between the intestinal microbiota and rheumatic diseases, and to investigate the potential of microbiome-targeting strategies.^{1,3,5,6,20,32,43,54-60} Also from the published literature it became evident that to date only nine clinical interventional studies trying to modify the intestinal microbiota in arthritis patients have been performed: One study in SpA patients (n = 63),⁶¹ and one study in enthesis-related arthritis (n = 8) reported no beneficial effects of probiotic therapy, 62 whereas one study in juvenile idiopathic arthritis testing exclusive enteral nutrition administration (n = 7) found a moderate anti-inflammatory effect on active joints.⁶³ Five placebo-controlled trials of probiotic therapy in rheumatoid arthritis patients⁶⁴⁻⁶⁸ (sample size between 26 and 60 patients) reported mixed results.⁶⁹ However, two of these studies demonstrated positive clinical effects of probiotic therapy which included improvement in HAQ-DI pain scale,⁶⁵ improvement in the Disease Activity Score of 28 joints (DAS-28), and improvement on the C-reactive protein concentrations.⁶⁶ No clinical trials performing FMT on arthritic patients were identified.

39 Objective

The objective of this randomised trial is to explore whether FMT is more effective than placebo in
 reducing disease activity in PsA patients with active peripheral arthritis concomitantly treated with
 weekly subcutaneously administered MTX. In addition, extensive bacteria taxonomic and

1 metagenomic analyses will be performed on faecal samples before and after the FMT to get an

2 indication of the functional capacity of the intestinal microbiota.

4 METHODS AND ANALYSIS

5 Trial design

6 This is a randomised – patient, physician and outcome-assessor blinded, placebo-controlled, 6-7 month trial, which will be followed by an open-label extension period for a minimum of 2 years. 8 Patients will be randomly assigned in a 1:1 ratio to receive FMT or placebo (sham procedure). 9 Outcome assessment will be based on follow-up by a rheumatologist and is scheduled to occur 10 after 3 and 6 months (with the latter being the primary end-point evaluation), see Figure 1 and 11 Figure 2.

19 12

13 Participants

Recruitment will take place at Danish rheumatology outpatient clinics, and patients fulfilling the eligibility criteria will be offered participation. No treatment with biologics within 6 months, and no systemic and/or local intra-articular or peritendinous steroid injections, or non-MTX csDMARD treatment, or antibiotics are allowed within 3 months prior to inclusion. Non-Steroidal Anti-Inflammatory Drugs (NSAIDs) must be paused within 14 days of study inclusion. Patients, who do not wish to participate, will be characterised by sex and age. The recruitment has commenced in May 2017 and will continue until 2019.

Psoriatic arthritis patients

A total of 80 PsA patients will be enrolled, and they will have to meet the following eligibility criteria:

26 Inclusion criteria:

- Diagnosis of PsA according to the Classification Criteria for Psoriatic Arthritis (CASPAR).⁷⁰
- Presence of active peripheral arthritis defined as \geq 3 swollen joints.
- Subcutaneously administered MTX treatment (≥ 15mg/week (maximal tolerable dosage)) for a minimum of 3 months prior to study inclusion.
- Age 18 to 70 years.
- 33 Exclusion criteria:
 - Other inflammatory rheumatic diseases than PsA.
- Current axial disease activity or severe peripheral joint activity demanding immediate
 change of treatment or contraindicating placebo treatment for 6 months.
- Inflammatory bowel disease, coeliac disease, food allergy, or other intestinal diseases.
 - Current cancer or severe chronic infections.

1		
2	1	History of severe MTX toxicity or allergic reactions.
4	2	Biological treatment within 6 months prior to inclusion.
5	3	• Non-MTX DMARD treatment within 3 months prior to inclusion.
6 7	4	• Systemic and/or local intra-articular or peritendinous steroid injections within 3 months
8	5	prior to inclusion.
9 10	6	NSAIDs within 14 days prior to inclusion.
11	7	Antibiotics within 3 months prior to inclusion.
12 13	8	Pregnant or breastfeeding women.
14	9	 Not wishing to participate or unsuited for project evaluation.
15 16	10	
16	11	Stool donors
18	11	
19 20	12	The stool donor corps will consist of four anonymous (to the recipient) donors who must be
21	13	healthy as assessed by a screening questionnaire, and be active members of the Danish blood
22	14	donor corps, age 25 to 55, body mass index between 18.5 and 25 kg/m ² , and an average alcohol
23 24	15	intake less than 7 (women) or 14 (men) units per week. No alcohol intake within a week of
24	16	donation is allowed, and no systemic medication including antibiotics and NSAIDs 6 months prior
26	17	to the donation are allowed. The donor must eat a balanced diet (no extreme low- or high-calorie
27	18	diets), and must not be in a stressful life period. Before joining the stool donor corps, each
28 29	19	potential donor will go through a screening process including stool analyses for faecal calprotectin
30	20	and enteric pathogens (Aeromonas, Campylobacter, C. difficile, diarrhoeagenic Escherichia coli,
31	21	Salmonella, Shigella, Vibrio, Yersinia enterocolitica, and multidrug-resistant bacteria, parasites
32	22	including microscopy of ova and cysts, Entamoeba histolytica/dispar (DNA), Cryptosporidium
33	23	(DNA) and Giardia (DNA), sapovirus (RNA), rotavirus (RNA), human astrovirus (RNA), human
35	24	adenoviruses (DNA) and noroviruses (RNA), a Helicobacter pylori breath test, blood tests for C-
36	25	reactive protein (CRP) (acceptable level: < 6.0 mg/L), white blood cell count (acceptable range:
37 38	26	3.50-8.80 10 ⁹ /L), haemoglobin (acceptable range: 8.3-10.5 mmol/L), albumin (acceptable range:
39	27	36-50 g/L), alanine aminotransferase (ALAT) (acceptable range: 10-70 U/L), glomerular filtration
40	28	rate (eGFR) (acceptable level: > 59 mL/min), and coeliac disease, and blood test for infectious
41 42	29	agents including current infection with Epstein-Barr virus (IgM) and cytomegalovirus (IgM),
43	30	hepatitis A, B, C and E, tuberculosis (QuantiFERON [®] TB-Gold test), syphilis, human
44	31	immunodeficiency virus (ab HTLV1/2), E. histolytica (antibodies) and Strongyloides (antibodies),
45	32	and a urine test for <i>Chlamvdia Trachomatis</i> and <i>Neisseria aonorrhoeae</i> (DNA/RNA). After passing
46 47	33	the screening tests, the donor will donate stool for the next month after which, the donor will
48	34	have to pass the screening programme once more before the stool can be released for
49 50	35	transplantation.
50 51 52	36	

37 Interventions

38 Overall study interventions

1 The FMT will be an add-on strategy for PsA patients with active joint disease despite ongoing 2 treatment with weekly subcutaneously administered MTX. Therefore, all enrolled PsA patients will 3 continue their MTX treatment throughout the study, and they will remain on the same individual 4 dosage that they received at the time of study inclusion (a minimum of 15 mg/week cf. the patient 5 inclusion criteria) in addition to folic acid supplement. Paracetamol and tramadol in recommended 6 dosages are allowed during the trial but no NSAIDs can be taken.

8 Active and sham comparator

9 Patients will be randomised into two groups with an allocation ratio of active-to-placebo 10 treatment of 1:1. The active comparator group (n = 40) will have an FMT with healthy donor 11 faeces-suspension (250 mL) containing 50 g donor faeces, saline (NaCl 0.9%) and glycerol (10%), 12 whereas, the sham comparator group (n = 40) will be treated with an identical appearing sham 13 procedure where the transplant solution will consist of 250 mL brown coloured (brown food 14 colourant) isotonic saline (NaCl 0.9%).

22 16 Preparing the FMT suspension

Donors will collect faeces at home and transport it in a cooling bag to the study site within 1 hour. Faeces will be sieved to remove particulate material, followed by dilution in sterile saline (0.9% NaCl) and 10% glycerol. The FMT suspension will be stored at - 80 °C until use. On the day of the FMT transplantation, the transplant suspension (250 mL) will be thawed to 37 °C and subsequently apportioned into five 50 mL syringes.

23 FMT procedure

The FMT will take place within 14 days (preferably 7 days) of the baseline clinical examination. The evening prior to the FMT, patients will take one dose (40 mg) of oral proton-pump inhibitor. They will meet at the Department of Gastroenterology after a six-hour fast. A total of 250 mL transplant suspension (active or placebo) will be installed in the duodenum using an oral-duodenal tube. The correct placement of the tube will be confirmed using gastroscopic guidance.

30 Treatment strategy for non-responders

Patients who present with increased or unacceptable disease activity during the 6-month trial period will, depending on the clinical presentation, be offered another treatment strategy which may include local intra-articular steroid injections, change to another csDMARD or biological treatment. If the patient accepts such treatment changes, this will be characterised as FMT treatment failure according to the primary outcome definition (one intra-articular steroid injection is allowed).

38 MTX toxicity and drop-outs

Blood tests for MTX toxicity will be performed in accordance with our current clinical practice. In
case of MTX toxicity, severe side effects, pregnancy, or occurrence of infectious disease or other
diseases that contraindicate MTX treatment, MTX dosage will be decreased or the treatment will
be paused. These patients will remain in the study (unless their condition contraindicates this),

BMJ Open

and they will be analysed as members of the treatment group to which they were randomised

Collection of faecal samples and metagenomics analysis

using intention-to-treat-type analyses.

Fresh faecal samples will be collected by the patient at home using an EasySampler[®] stool collection kit within 24 hours prior to the study visit. Samples will be stored in the patient's freezer until transport to the study site. During transport, samples will be kept on ice in a cooling bag. Upon arrival to the study site, samples will immediately be transferred to the biobank and stored at -80°C. Bacterial DNA will be extracted from the faecal samples following established standard protocols including bead beating using a NucleoSpin soil kit (Macherey-Nagel, Germany) according to manufacturer's instructions. DNA will be sequenced using the BGISEQ-500 Platform which was recently benchmarked against the Illumina platforms showing excellent intra-platform reproducibility and less GC bias than observed using the Illumina platforms.⁷¹ The faecal metagenomics bioinformatics analyses will be performed using comprehensive pipelines including the assembly of metagenomics linkage groups/metagenomics species,^{72,73} taxonomic annotation, and extensive functional analyses based on metagenomic species which provides a superior dataset compared to the conventional analyses based on the total gene pool.⁷⁴

Intestinal permeability test

After an overnight fasting, patients will provide a urine sample before ingesting 100 mL water containing 10 g of lactulose and 5 g of D-mannitol. All the urine passed in the subsequent 5 hours will be collected into a 2 L plastic container containing 1 mL of chlorohexidine (20 mg/mL) as a preservative. After 3- and 5 hours, the volume of the urine will be measured and a small volume (10 mL) will be preserved and stored at -80°C until analysis. No food or drinking (except for water) will be allowed during the test.^{75,76}

Outcomes

- Primary outcome measure:
- Treatment failure [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
- Proportion of patients in each group who experience treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and rheumatologist defined as at least one of the following:
 - Need for more than one intra-articular glucocorticoid injection due to disease activity.
 - Need for change to other csDMARDs (e.g., oral leflunomide or sulfasalazin) according to the updated Danish treatment guideline due to disease activity.
 - Need for biologic treatment according to the updated Danish treatment guideline due to severe disease activity.
 - Secondary outcome measures:
 - Change from baseline in the Short Health Assessment Questionnaire (2-page HAQ)^{77,78}
- [Time Frame: Baseline, 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks, 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14
- days)]

1		
2	1	
3 4	2	Change from baseline in the Dermatology Life Quality Index (DLQI) Questionnaire ⁷⁹ [Time Frame: 1
5	3	week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks, 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
6	Л	
/ 8	4	
9	5	Changes from baseline in patient reported gastrointestinal side effects [Time Frame: 1 week, 2
10	6	weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks, 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
11	7	
13	8	Other non-gastrointestinal patient reported side effects [Time Frame: 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4
14	9	weeks, 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
15 16	10	
17	11	Properties of patients in each group achieving the American College of Phaumatology $(ACP)^{80}$
18	11	Proportion of patients in each group achieving the American Conege of Kieumatology (ACK) Posponso Critoria [Timo Framo: 2 months $(+/, 7 days) = 6 months (+/, 14 days)]$
19 20	12	
21	13	I. ACR20 response criteria ⁸¹
22	14	II. ACR50 response criteria ⁸²
23 24	15	M ACP70 response criteria ⁸²
25	15	III. ACIVO response cintena
26 27	16	
27	17	Proportion of patients in each group achieving the Psoriatic Arthritis Response Criteria (PsARC) ⁸⁰
29	18	[Time Frame: 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
30 31	10	
32	19	Change from baseling in the Spandylearthritic Research Consertium of Canada (SDARCC) Enthesitic
33	20	$Lndev^{68}$ in the subset of notion to who have anthesitis at baseline [Time Frame) 2 months (1/ 7
34 35	21	(+/-)
36	22	
37	23	22
38 39	24	Change from baseline in the Psoriasis Area Severity Index (PASI) ⁸³ in the subset of patients who
40	25	have skin psoriasis at baseline [Time Frame: 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
41	26	
42 43	27	Change from baseline in the number of digits affected with dactylitis in the subset of patients who
44	28	have dactylitis at baseline [Time Frame: 3 months (+/- 7 days), 6 months (+/- 14 days)]
45	29	
46 47	30	Number of adverse events in each group [Time Frame: 6 months $(\pm/2, 14)$ days)]
48	21	
49 50	22	Number of adverse quests in each group leading to discontinuation [Time Freme) ϵ months (1/14)
50 51	52 22	dave)]
52	35	
53 54	34	
54 55	35	Number of patients with at least one adverse event in each group [Time Frame: 6 months (+/- 14
56	36	days)]
57 58	37	
58 59		
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Tertiary (exploratory secondary) outcomes: Proportion of patients in each group achieving changes in plasma CRP, changes in tender point count,⁸⁴ changes in faecal bacteria composition and metabolism, changes in intestinal permeability, changes in plasma orosomucoid, changes in plasma and faecal calprotectin,⁸⁵ changes in serum 1,25-dihydroxyvitamin D, changes in cardiovascular risk factors including Body Mass Index (BMI), blood pressure, plasma triglyceride, plasma LDL-cholesterol, plasma HDL-cholesterol, plasma total-cholesterol, and HbA₁C levels, changes in specific circulating inflammatory markers (i.e. cytokines, adipokines, and chemokines), and macroscopic and microscopic inflammatory changes of the colonic mucosa, see Table 1.

10 Safety

The most frequently reported adverse events (AEs) related to FMT are vomiting, belching, mild diarrhoea, abdominal cramping, transient fever and elevated C-reactive protein on the day of the procedure.⁸⁶ A recent systematic review on the adverse events of FMT identified 50 relevant studies with a total of 1.089 patients. In this review, the incidences of serious adverse events (SAEs) for FMT were 2.0% and 6.1% for upper and lower gastrointestinal routes, respectively. The SAEs that probably or possibly were related to FMT included infections (0.7%), IBD flare (0.6%). death (0.3%), auto-immune diseases and FMT procedure related injury.⁸⁷ Although most of the patients included in this review suffered from severe gastrointestinal diseases (C. difficile infection and/or IBD), these findings warrant caution when performing FMT; especially when introducing the procedure in a new patient population. In addition, the potential long term side effects following FMT remains largely unknown.⁸⁸ Still, when strict donor screening is conducted and the procedure is performed by experienced practitioners, FMT is in general considered safe, and even elderly patients with a poor medical condition and multiple comorbidities as well as immunosuppressed patients have been proven to tolerate the FMT procedure well.⁸⁹⁻⁹³

In the present study, we will carefully monitor and evaluate safety by means of open assessment of AEs. All reported or observed AEs are recorded by the investigators, and will be monitored until resolution, stabilisation or until it has been shown that the study intervention is not the cause. The National Cancer Institute Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events, version 4.03 (NIH publication # 09-7473), will be used to grade the severity of adverse events. Gastrointestinal side effects (nausea, vomiting, abdominal pain, number of stools pr. week, stool type (Bristol Stool Chart), blood or mucus in the stool) will be registered by the patients once a week for the first month following the randomised intervention. Routine blood screening for MTX toxicity will normally be performed at week 4, 10, 16, 22 but can be more frequent if decided by the responsible treating rheumatologist depending on symptoms or signs of MTX toxicity. Subject incidence rates of all treatment-emergent AE will be tabulated by system organ class and preferred term. Tables of fatal AEs, SAEs, AEs leading to withdrawal from study, and significant treatment-emergent adverse events, will also be provided. For the long-term extension portion of this study, exposure adjusted event rates will be summarised.

40 Sample size and power considerations

When designing this trial, no prior data for FMT efficacy in rheumatic patients were available. However, we found it reasonable to assume that if rheumatic patients should be willing to receive FMT as a future standardised treatment, the procedure should at least provide an effect size well beyond a moderate effect size. Consequently, we decided that at least twice as many PsA patients in the sham group should be treatment failures compared to the FMT group if the procedure should be considered clinical relevant. For a comparison of two independent binomial proportions using the Pearson's chi-squared statistic with a Chi-square approximation (a two-sided significance level of 0.05), a sample size of 40 PsA patients per group has a power of 90% (0.895) if we assume that the proportions of treatment failures are 35% (FMT-active group) and 70% (FMT-sham group), respectively. Consequently, the inclusion of 80 PsA patients allocated (1:1) to two treatment arms is believed to be sufficient to reveal any difference of clinical importance between treatment groups (i.e., an NNT <3 patients).

Assuming that there will be some attrition during the 6-month trial period, we also estimated how much drop-out would be possible while still having a reasonable statistical power (80%): a total sample size of 62 PsA patients assuming a comparable level of withdrawals (31 patients completing in each group) achieves a power of at least 0.8 with the proportion of treatment failures indicated above; i.e., even if we experience a drop-out rate of 20%, our trial will have 80% chance of detecting the intentional difference between groups.

19Beyond the primary endpoint, a total sample size of 80 (with a balanced design)20corresponds to a sufficient statistical power (82%) to detect a standardised mean difference of210.65 SD units (i.e. Cohen's effect size) in any of the Patient-Reported Outcome Measures.

32 23 Randomisation, allocation concealment and blinding

The randomisation has been conducted using central-computer randomisation. Patients are randomly allocated (1:1) to receive either a FMT or a placebo saline transplant (sham procedure). The randomisation lists were generated by the trial statistician and uploaded to the REDCap database by an independent data manager who is not involved in any other aspects of the trial. Eligible patients will - after signing informed consent - be assigned randomly in permuted blocks with varying sizes of 4 and 6, according to computer-generated random numbers (SAS programming via SAS PROC PLAN), to undergo either FMT or saline (sham) procedure using stratification for centre. The randomisation of each patient will be implemented by the local trial coordinator and allocation will be concealed as this is done independent of the pre-determined sequence generation (i.e. randomisation). The patients, care providers and outcome assessors will remain unaware of the group assignments, and only de-identified codes will be used to link participants to their data during the study to maintain their confidentiality. In case of exceptional circumstances when knowledge of the treatment allocation is essential for further management of the patient, the trial secretary will reveal the assigned intervention to the treating doctor. However, patients, trial care providers and outcome assessors will remain blinded as far as possible. Cases of unblinding will be registered and reported.

Data collection, management and confidentiality

Data will be entered via a secure web-based electronic clinical report form (eCRF) into a central REDCap⁹⁴ database hosted by Odense Patient data Explorative Network (OPEN) at Odense University Hospital. Data obtained during the clinical examination will be entered directly into the database. Also, patient questionnaires will be fulfilled directly into the database. Access to the study data will be restricted, and a password system will be utilized to control access. All information about the patients' health and other private matters is covered by confidentiality. The authorisation from the Danish Data Protection Agency has been secured.

Statistical methods

The full analysis set will consist of all randomised participants (i.e. the intention to treat [ITT] population): Participants will be analysed according to their randomised treatment group; i.e. the ITT has the consequence that participants allocated to a treatment group will be followed up, assessed and analysed as members of that group irrespective of their compliance to the planned treatment. The safety analysis set will include all patients who were randomly assigned to a study group and had exposure to a transplant (independent of group). Descriptive statistics will be provided for demographics and baseline characteristics. The summary statistics of continuous variables will include: N, mean, standard deviation, median, interquartiles, and range. All summaries presenting frequencies and incidences will include counts, percentages, and the total number of participants in the corresponding arm.

The pre-specified efficacy analyses will be based on data from the full-analysis set, which include all patients who underwent randomisation, have had their baseline measurement performed, and who have received the initial transplant (independent of group). Although proper random assignment prevents selection bias, it does not guarantee that the groups will be equivalent at baseline. Any differences in baseline characteristics are, however, the result of chance rather than bias;⁹⁵ thus, the study groups will be evaluated (and presented) at baseline for important demographic and clinical characteristics so that readers can assess how similar they are. However, only cohort studies can be subject to selection bias and confounding due to differences in baseline characteristics between the intervention and comparison groups.⁹⁶

- Our strategy for ITT analysis with incomplete observations will be based on the recommendations from White et al⁹⁷:
- 1: Attempt to follow up all randomised participants, even if they withdraw from allocated

treatment.

2: Perform a main analysis of all observed data (data as observed).

3: Perform sensitivity analyses to explore the effect of departures from the assumption made in

the main analysis (Baseline Observation Carried Forward [BOCF] imputations, repeated measures mixed models, and multiple imputations).

This results in the following steps: Missing values will be imputed with the use of a non-responder imputation by use of the BOCF method for measurements made after baseline. Thus, missing data for dichotomous endpoints will also be imputed using a conservative "null responder" imputation, assuming the patient did not have any benefit from being enrolled in the

trial (e.g., for the primary endpoint we will assume that the patient had a treatment failure which is valid based on clinical judgement even if data is not missing at random [NMAR]). Other sensitivity analyses will be including "worst" and "best" case imputation, repeated-measures and multipleimputation analyses, using model-based approaches; repeated measures linear mixed models will also be used to model the potential group-dependent trajectories over time (i.e. Repeated Mixed Models and Multiple Imputation are valid if data is assumed Missing at Random [MAR]).

7 Categorical data for dichotomous end points will be analysed with the use of logistic 8 regression with the model including treatment and centre as class effects. For continuous 9 outcome measures analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) models will be used to analyse mean changes 10 in continuous end points. All models will include treatment, centre, with the baseline value of the 11 relevant variable as covariates.

Additionally, completer analyses will be performed on those who complete 6 months of treatment. During follow-up, any medical treatments which could potentially modify the intestinal microbiota including antibiotics will be reported, but will not affect the statistical analysis. Statistical estimates will be calculated as odds ratios (OR) for the dichotomous variables and difference between means for continuous outcomes reported with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). Two-sided 95% CIs and P-values for primary, secondary and exploratory outcomes will be computed and will not be adjusted for multiplicity, but will be interpreted cautiously as this is an exploratory trial per se.

Pre-specified exploratory analyses: Stratified analyses will investigate whether the treatment effect varies with I) the faecal microbiota analyses performed at follow-up compared with baseline (+/- long-term changes in the intestinal microbiota and intestinal inflammation); and II) the demographic match (sex, age) between the stool donor and the recipient. Non-responders will represent the outcome group not fulfilling the primary outcome measure. Differences in demographics and baseline disease activity between this treatment-failure subpopulation and the remaining group will be examined to identify potential prognostic factors for poor responders. Patients not participating in the follow-up examination will be classified as "drop-outs", and if possible, the reason for not participating will be registered.

The faecal metagenomics bioinformatics analyses will be performed using comprehensive pipelines including the assembly of metagenomics linkage groups/metagenomics species,^{72,73} taxonomic annotation, and extensive functional analyses based on metagenomic species which provides a superior dataset compared to the conventional analyses based on the total gene pool.⁷⁴ To identify possible associations, metagenome analysis will be correlated to all clinical parameter. We will use an L1 restricted LASSO procedure to determine the optimal number of features to be tested as described. Analysis of correlations between microbiota taxonomic or functional features, community diversity indices and sample metadata variables will be performed using Spearman correlation tests corrected for multiple tests using the Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate control procedure. To control for confounders, we will use blocked Spearman tests as implemented in COIN.^{98,99}

40 Data will be analysed with the STATA statistical package (version 15; StataCorp LP), 55 41 and SAS software (v. 9.4; SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA).

BMJ Open

Activity/assessment	Pre-study	Visit 1	Week	Visit 2	Visit 3	V
	screening	Baseline	1, 2 and 3	1 month	3 months	6 n
Patients	n = ?	n = 80	n = all	n = all	n = all	r
Screening log	x					
Inclusion/exclusion form	x					
Consent form		х				
Randomisation		х				
Study-composed guestionnaire		x	x	x	x	
Patient global (VAS 0-100 mm)		х	x	x	x	
Patient fatigue (VAS 0-100 mm)		x	x	х	x	
Patient pain (VAS 0-100 mm)		х	х	х	х	
HAQ		х	x	x	x	
BASDAI		х			x	
BASFAI		х			x	
DLQI		х	х	х	х	
Gastrointestinal symptom diary		х	x	x	x	
Eating habits questionnaire		x				
Clinical examination:						
- Height (m)		х				
- Weight (kg)		х			x	
 Blood pressure (mmHg) 		х			x	
- Psoriasis Area Severity Index		х			x	
- SPARCC Enthesitis Score		х			x	
- Swollen joint count (66)		х			x	
- Tender joint count (68)		х			x	
- Doctors global (VAS 0-100 mm)		x			x	
- BASMI		x			x	
- Tender point count		X			X	
Interview (AEs)				X	X	_
Blood sample analysis:						
- C-reactive protein (mg/L)		X		x	x	
- Orosofficcold (g/L)		X		X	X	
- 1 25-dibydroxywitamin D (nmol/L)		×		×	×	
- TSH (miu/L)		×		^	^	
- Hgb (mmol/l)		x				
- Triglyceride (mmol/L)		x				
- LDL-cholesterol (mmol/L)		х				
- HDL-cholesterol (mmol/L)		x				
- Total-cholesterol (mmol/L)		х				
- HbA ₁ C (mmol/mol)		х				
- HLA-B27 status (+/-)		х				
- Serology tests for Yersinia,		х				
Campylobacter, Salmonella (+/-)						
Faecal calprotectin		x		х	x	
Faecal microbiota analysis		x		x	x	
Sigmoidoscopy and mucosa biopsy		x				
Stool, blood, and urine samples		Y				
(biobank)		X		X	X	
Intestinal permeability test		x				

Table 1. Protocol schedule of forms and procedures.

1 ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

This study is designed as a proof-of-concept clinical trial and will be performed in agreement with GCP-standards, and in accordance with the ethical standards of the responsible committee on human experimentation (institutional and national) and with the Helsinki Declaration (64th, 2013). The relevance of the study, the design and the recruitment strategy were evaluated with three patient research partners (PRPs), and alterations especially in primary outcome and recruitment strategy were embedded. Furthermore, a minimum of two PRPs (participating in the study) will be involved in the discussion regarding the progress of the recruitment phase and results, and will be offered the opportunity to comment on the manuscript draft. The Regional Committees on Health Research Ethics for Southern Denmark (DK-S-20150080) and the Danish Data Protection Agency (15/41684) have approved the study protocol. The trial has been registered with ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT03058900) and important protocol modifications will be updated here. The Danish Health and Medicines Authority does not classify the FMT procedure as a medical intervention, and has had no objection to the use of FMT for this study and patient category. Thus, no GCP auditing is legally required. A report describing any potential side effects and adverse events will be submitted to the Ethics Committee yearly. Suspected Unexpected Serious Adverse Reactions (SUSARs) will be reported to the Ethics Committee within seven days. Based on these reports, the Ethics committee can determine to terminate the trial early. The Danish Patient Compensation Association provides compensations for patients injured in connection to medical clinical trials.

Although the Danish Health Authorities, for the time being, do not classify donor faecal microbiota as tissue, all steps of the stool donor recruitment, stool donation and FMT preparation will be in accordance with the Danish Tissue Law to ensure that the quality and safety standards laid down in the Danish Legislation BEK nr 764 of May 26, 2015 (implementing Directive 2004/23/EC) are met. Four stool donors will be recruited from the South Danish Transfusion Service & Tissue Centre, Department of Clinical Immunology, Odense University Hospital, and they will be carefully screened for potentially transmissible infections and other conditions associated with gut microbiota function before their stool can be released for FMT. Being a stool donor is voluntary, and no compensation fee will be given. Furthermore, to ensure donor traceability, each patient in the active treatment arm will only receive microbiota from one donor. Also, frozen samples will be clearly labelled with a unique donation code based on the ISBT 128 coding and labelling system, and the release of the final product will adhere to the standards for tissue and blood donation.

Due to the well-documented risk of permanent joint destruction and occurrence of extra-articular manifestations in the PsA disease course, identification of new treatment modalities and biomarkers is essential to help the physician to slow down the disease development or ultimately to prevent it. All PsA patients participating in this study have significant activity in their joint disease despite treatment with the current guideline treatment and first-line drug, MTX, for this condition. This patient population will therefore benefit greatly from new treatment options. Consequently, when weighing the pros and cons, this trial should be performed from a scientific and ethical perspective.

56 41 Dissemination will occur through presentations at national and international 57 42 conferences and publications in international peer-reviewed journal(s).

DISCUSSION

Recent years have seen growing recognition of the complexity of the role of the microbiota in shaping the immune system and its potential effects for health and disease.^{22,100,101} In particular. the gut bacteria composition has been associated with the pathogenesis of autoimmune and inflammatory diseases.¹⁰²⁻¹⁰⁵ Intriguingly, an abnormal intestinal bacteria composition has been observed in PsA patients, and this association has fostered theories linking intestinal dysbiosis and PsA joint inflammation.¹⁰⁶ Still, it remains to be elucidated whether the intestinal dysbiosis and rheumatic diseases are causal related,⁵⁵ and if so, whether dysbiosis is an inciting event in the inflammatory process or a consequence of local and/or systemic inflammation.^{54,107} We expect that this double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled trial will shed new light on this highly relevant topic.

This is the first time that the efficacy and safety of FMT is being investigated in MTX immunosuppressed patients with rheumatic diseases. Subsequently, no data on the feasibility of conducting FMTs in the rheumatological setting is, so far, available. Nor do we know whether one FMT will be sufficient, or whether it should be repeated shortly after the first intervention to normalise the alterations of the intestinal microbiota, which would expectedly enhance any potential anti-inflammatory effects. In the present proof-of-concept clinical trial, the FMT procedure is considered an add-on to the current guideline intervention and first-line drug, MTX. Therefore, from a pragmatic and ethical perspective, we have decided to perform only one FMT (or sham procedure) in each patient even if we are well aware that this approach may not be adequate to achieve long-lasting effects. Indeed, in patients with inflammatory bowel diseases it appears that performing a frequent dosing-regime repeating the FMT procedure up to five times a week for eight weeks provided the best results.^{51,108,109} Hence, in contrast to the treatment of C. difficile infections where the microbiota is pushed past the point of homeostasis and can be restored following only one FMT,⁴⁷ the chronic nature of PsA and other autoimmune and inflammatory diseases, and the somewhat lesser degree of intestinal dysbiosis, may make the host microbiota more resistant to long-lasting modifications. Nevertheless, we hope that the FMT procedure in the present study will be sufficient to boost the effects of MTX so that the participants who are all MTX-non-responders prior to study enrolment will achieve disease control without needing to add or switch to other non-MTX medication.

In the present trial, the primary outcome measure is defined as the occurrence of treatment failure according to shared decision making between patient and physician evaluated at 6 months following the randomised intervention (FMT versus sham procedure). Shared decision making is a process in which both patient and health professional make a decision, taking into account the best evidence of available treatment options and the patient's values and preferences. This approach is considered a key element in the management of rheumatic diseases.¹¹⁰ As both patients and the treating rheumatologists are blinded to the randomised intervention, the shared decision making will be unaffected by the type of transplant suspension (active or placebo) installed at baseline. Nevertheless, we acknowledge that our assumption that twice as many PsA patients in the sham group will be treatment failures is ambitious, and that we might miss a smaller and less clinically significant treatment effect of the FMT-procedure. In this

case, we hope that our secondary outcome measures will be able to detect potential trends of positive effects in PsA subdomains such as enthesitis score, dactylitis count, and PASI skin score. In addition to the primary endpoint evaluation at 6 months, patients will be asked to fill out a weekly questionnaire regarding side effects as well as skin and arthritis symptoms during the first month following the randomised intervention to reveal any short-term effects on patient-reported outcomes.

Next, only patients with active peripheral PsA will be included. One reason for this is that this will be the first time that FMT is performed on rheumatic patients. Therefore, it seems reasonable only to enrol patients who have had inadequate effect from the initial guideline treatment (MTX), and consequently, on an individual basis could benefit the most from participating in new experimental clinical trials. Also, since patients need to have at least three swollen joints, we expect that we will be able to detect treatment effects of clinical importance. The fact that we do not include recent onset treatment naive patients will, of course, limit our ability to generalise our findings unto the entire PsA patient population. Indeed, in a recent randomised controlled trial of FMT in ulcerative colitis patients, participants with a recent diagnosis (< 1 year) were statistically significantly more likely to respond to FMT compared with those with longer disease duration.¹⁰⁸ That patients will have to subcutaneously administer MTX for at least three months prior to study enrolment will ensure that low intestinal MTX absorption is excluded as a potential effect modifier for the poor MTX response. In addition, as many drugs, including MTX, seem to affect the intestinal microbiological millieu,¹¹¹⁻¹¹⁴ bypassing the intestine during MTX administration will ensure that no local non-disease related effects on the intestinal microbiota will occur.

A great challenge when conducting a trial of FMT is that for the present being there is a lack of both national and international recommendations guiding the regulation and the best clinical practices for donor screening, stool sample handling and preparation of the FMT suspension.¹¹⁵⁻¹¹⁷ Indeed, the variability in faecal bacterial communities can complicate or undermine treatment efficacy. This variability stems from both biological variation and variation introduced by sample handling. A recent study reported that oxygen exposure degraded faecal bacterial communities, whereas freeze-thaw cycles and lag time between donor defecation and transplant preparation had much more limited effects.¹¹⁸ Given that many intestinal bacteria are obligate anaerobe, including many beneficial bacteria potentially possessing anti-inflammatory effects, exposure to oxygen during the preparation of FMT may potentially compromise the therapeutic value of FMT in PsA and other inflammatory diseases. Therefore, although frozen faecal preparations of stool suspended into physiological saline and glycerol have proven just as effective as fresh stool in treating *C. difficile* infections,¹¹⁹ the optimal transplant preparation method in treating inflammatory diseases remains to be established.

Our stool handling setup is in line with the prevailing practice, which includes mixing and filtration of the stool suspension and adding saline and glycerol as a cryopreservative before storage at -80 °C.¹¹⁷ In addition, we have sought to limit the oxygen exposure during transport by placing the donor stool within a plastic bag, which is subsequently put into a tightly closed small plastic container. Supplementary, during preparation the solution will not be homogenized for more than 10 seconds. Nevertheless, the lack of optimal anaerobe conditions during stool

Page 19 of 36

BMJ Open

handling could possibly undermine the therapeutic potential of our FMT procedure. Furthermore,

although we aim to use 50 g of faeces for each transplant, we acknowledge that the exact weight

between donations could vary with an estimated +/- 5 g. Also, due to the wide variability in

microbial content in stool between donations, the content cannot be fully standardized, and may

likely differ between each FMT procedure. However, to meet this challenge we will collect and

store samples from each donation which will enable us to determine the microbiota composition

- .

Stool donor selection is another critical issue that needs to be addressed. The composition of the normal microbiota composition has only recently been mapped,¹²⁰ and the existence of a limited number of well-balanced host-microbial symbiotic states, where one or more bacteria species are considered the main functional driver(s), have been identified using clustering of metagenomic sequences.¹²¹ Still, the most favourable donor microbiota composition for treating inflammatory diseases has yet to be determined. Therefore, it also remains to be established whether donors with a high stool bacteria diversity should be preferred over isolation of specific bacteria, or if pooled stool samples from several donors outperforms a single-donor transplant.^{51,122} We have chosen to use only single donations from four different anonymous stool donors to ensure donor traceability and to enable us to identify any individual donor-specific microbial effects. Also, since host intrinsic-, environmental-, and dietary factors as well as pharmaceutical drugs have been associated with gut bacteria composition and functionality,^{111,112,123,124} the donors must eat a balanced diet, not be overweight or take any medications or be physical or psychological stressed, smoke or consume alcohol during the donation period to limit the risk of transferring "abnormal" microbiota to the recipients. These donor criteria have been set for safety reasons, and we acknowledge, that this could potentially limit the inter-donor microbiota diversity due to shared lifestyle characteristics.

of each donation in case some donations prove more effective than others.

Another factor to keep in mind is the concept of matching donor and recipient, which may be of importance for enhancing the colonisation capabilities of the donor microbial communities. In fact, Rossen et al¹⁰⁹ did find that in patients with ulcerative colitis, the microbiota of FMT responders shifted to their respective donors, whereas non-responders did not. Li et al¹²⁵ reported that donor bacteria strains established extensively in the recipient and persisted for at least 3 months with a negligible decline of donor-strain populations detected between 45 days and 3 months following FMT in metabolic syndrome patients. However, they also found that recipients receiving the same donor transplant displayed varying degrees of microbiota transfer, indicating individual patterns of microbiome resistance and donor-recipient compatibilities. In addition, host genetics is known to effect the gut microbiota,¹²⁶ and animal models have shown that sex¹²⁷ and age¹²⁸ also can be potentially modifiers of the gut bacteria composition. These observations may prove to be of importance for the outcome of FMT in inflammatory diseases.¹²⁹ However, whether sex- and/or age-matching between donor and recipient is crucial for a successful FMT in humans remains to be enlighten. Therefore, in the present study, no donor-recipient matching will be conducted. However, a subgroup analysis will be performed to reveal any trend that could indicate better results in sex- or age-match cases.

5541Furthermore, as the interactions between the microbiota and the host are influenced5642by cooperation and competition between pathogenic and commensal microbes and multiple5757

environmental variables, the lifestyle of the recipient following the FMT may be of importance.
Nevertheless, due to the uncertainty of how to define the optimal lifestyle and the lack of
knowledge on how different lifestyle factors may interfere with the microbiota, we have decided
that the patients in the present study will not have to adhere to any predefined lifestyle "regime"
or diet following the randomised intervention. However, every participant will fulfil an eating habit
questionnaire at the beginning of the trial.

7 Finally, non-bacteria microorganisms such as bacteriophages, viruses and fungi may 8 also be of importance when targeting components of the microbiota or host cells for therapeutic 9 purposes.¹³⁰⁻¹³² Other complicating factors may include the composition of other microbiological 10 niches such as the oral, lung, genitourinary, and skin microbiota.^{133,134} Indeed, the latter could 11 likely prove to be of significance in patients with skin psoriasis. However, these factors will not be 12 assessed in the present study.

13 In conclusion, this trial has the potential to substantially expand the growing body of 14 literature on the role of the intestinal microbiota in general and PsA in particular. Thereby we 15 anticipate that this study will enhance our understanding of cause and effect. The results of this 16 study, when completed, may be exploited for biomarker discovery, and for diagnostic and 17 therapeutic purposes.

19 AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

T. Ellingsen, M.S. Kragsnaes, R. Christensen, and J. Kjeldsen conceived and developed the idea for the study. T. Ellingsen and M.S. Kragsnaes are the principal investigators and wrote the first study protocol draft. T. Ellingsen and M.S. Kragsnaes were responsible for all communication with the scientific ethical committee, the Danish Data Protection Agency and the National Health Board. T Ellingsen is the responsible party and sponsor. M.S. Kragsnaes, T. Ellingsen, H.C. Horn, J.K. Pedersen, H.L. Munk, and U. Fredberg sat up the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the psoriatic arthritis patients, and the latter five rheumatologists are conducting the clinical examinations. J. Kjeldsen, F.M. Pedersen, and H. Glerup discussed and planned the FMT procedure, and they are conducting the FMTs and the sigmoidoscopies (obtaining mucosae tissue samples). D.K. Holm and H.M. Holt helped set up the donor screening programme, and they were responsible for conducting this programme and performing the microbiological and immunological tests. V. Andersen and K. Kristiansen are responsible for the omics and microbiome analyses, and have advised on how the tissue collection should be performed and what kind of tissue would be relevant to collect. R. Christensen has written the statistical analysis plan and will be responsible for the final statistical analyses. In conclusion, all participants designated as authors have contributed to the conception and design of the study, and they have critically either drafted or revised the first draft of the study protocol and the protocol paper. Also, all authors have approved the final version before submission.

REGISTRATION

40 The trial has been registered with ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT03058900).

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

FUNDING STATEMENT

This work was supported by the Region of Southern Denmark, Odense University Hospital, the Danish Regions, University of Southern Denmark, the Danish Rheumatism Association, the Danish

Psoriasis Research Fund, Odense Patient Explorative data Network (OPEN), and Fabrikant Vilhelm Pedersen and Hustrus Legat based on the recommendation of the Novo Nordisk Foundation. Musculoskeletal Statistics Unit at the Parker Institute, Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg Hospital (R.

- Christensen), is supported by a core grant from the Oak Foundation (OCAY-13-309). K. Kristiansen
- is supported by BGI-Research, BGI-Shenzhen, China.

COMPETING INTEREST STATEMENT

None of the team members of this research project has declared any potential conflict of interest.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Great thanks to Lene Albjerg, biomedical laboratory technologist and quality control manager at

the Dept. of Clinical Immunology, Odense University Hospital, Denmark, for her expertise and

dedicated work regarding the practical handling of the FMT suspension.

2	1		References
3	C		
4 5	Z		
6	3	1.	Scher JU, Littman DR, Abramson SB. Microbiome in Inflammatory Arthritis and Human Rheumatic
7	4		Diseases. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2016;68:35-45.
8	_	-	
9	5	2.	Asquith M, Elewaut D, Lin P et al. The role of the gut and microbes in the pathogenesis of
10	6		spondyloarthritis. Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol. 2014;28:687-702.
11	7	З	Stoll ML Gut microbes immunity and spondyloarthritis <i>Clin Immunol</i> 2015:159:134-142
12	,	5.	
14	8	4.	Costello ME, Ciccia F, Willner D et al. Intestinal dysbiosis in ankylosing spondylitis. Arthritis
15	9		Rheumatol. 2014.
16			
17	10	5.	Yang L, Wang L, Wang X et al. A Possible Role of Intestinal Microbiota in the Pathogenesis of
18	11		Ankylosing Spondylitis. Int J Mol Sci. 2016;17.
19	10	c	Manageon I. Schar III. Spandylearthritic and the migrahiamay new incident from an ancient
20	12	0.	by pothesis Curr Rheumatol Rep. 2015:17:10
21	15		Trypotnesis. cult the united hep. 2013,17.10.
23	14	7.	De WK, Debusschere K, Beeckman S et al. Integrating the pathogenesis of spondyloarthritis: gut and
24	15		joint united? Curr Opin Rheumatol. 2015;27:189-196.
25			
26	16	8.	Eppinga H, Konstantinov SR, Peppelenbosch MP et al. The microbiome and psoriatic arthritis. Curr
27	17		Rheumatol Rep. 2014;16:407.
28	10	0	Cath D. Caurelles All. The human microhim single in the metric of the immune diseases. A second baseline
29	18	9.	colt P, Sawaina AH. The numan microbiome in rneumatic autoimmune diseases: A comprehensive
31	19		Tevlew. Cim immunol. 2016;170.70-79.
32	20	10.	Ciccia F, Ferrante A, Guggino G et al. The role of the gastrointestinal tract in the pathogenesis of
33	21		rheumatic diseases. Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol. 2016;30:889-900.
34			
35	22	11.	Tito RY, Cypers H, Joossens M et al. Brief Report: Dialister as a Microbial Marker of Disease Activity
36	23		in Spondyloarthritis. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2017;69:114-121.
37	24	10	Facines II. General Weiland CI. This UP at al. Circilar Depletion of Protective Facealite stations
39	24 25	12.	Eppinga H, Sperna Welland G, Thio HB et al. Similar Depletion of Protective Faecalibacterium
40	25		Crohns Colitis 2016
41	20		
42	27	13.	Ritchlin CT, Colbert RA, Gladman DD. Psoriatic Arthritis. N Engl J Med. 2017;376:2095-2096.
43			
44 45	28	14.	Terslev L, Naredo E, Iagnocco A et al. Defining enthesitis in spondyloarthritis by ultrasound: results
45 46	29		of a Delphi process and of a reliability reading exercise. Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken). 2014;66:741-
47	30		/48.
48	21	15	Polyco P. Jonyolino S. Vitiollo M at al. Extra articular manifestations in provintic arthritis nationts
49	32	тэ.	Clin Rheumatol 2014
50	52		
51	33	16.	Gladman DD. Psoriatic arthritis. Dermatol Ther. 2009;22:40-55.
52 53			
54	34	17.	Gossec L, Coates LC, De WM et al. Management of psoriatic arthritis in 2016: a comparison of
55	35		EULAR and GRAPPA recommendations. <i>Nat Rev Rheumatol</i> . 2016;12:743-750.
56			
57			
58			
59 60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
00			21

1			
2	1	18.	Kingsley GH, Kowalczyk A, Taylor H et al. A randomized placebo-controlled trial of methotrexate in
3	2		psoriatic arthritis. Rheumatology (Oxford). 2012;51:1368-1377.
4			
5	3	19.	Gossec L, Smolen JS, Ramiro S et al. European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR)
0 7	4		recommendations for the management of psoriatic arthritis with pharmacological therapies: 2015
, 8	5		update. Ann Rheum Dis. 2016;75:499-510.
9	C	20	And the MADE second states in the follower that have been second to second the second states in the
10	6	20.	Asquith M, Rosenbaum JT. The interaction between nost genetics and the microbiome in the
11	/		pathogenesis of spondyloarthropathies. <i>Curr Opin Rheumatol</i> . 2016;28:405-412.
12	8	21	Benham H. Robinson PC. Baillet AC et al. Role of genetics in infection-associated arthritis. <i>Best Pract</i>
13	9	21.	Res Clin Rheumatol. 2015:29:213-225.
14	-		
15	10	22.	Shamriz O, Mizrahi H, Werbner M et al. Microbiota at the crossroads of autoimmunity. Autoimmun
10 17	11		Rev. 2016;15:859-869.
17			
10	12	23.	Lories RJ, de VK. Is psoriatic arthritis a result of abnormalities in acquired or innate immunity? Curr
20	13		Rheumatol Rep. 2012;14:375-382.
21		~ .	
22	14	24.	Mortezavi M, Thiele R, Ritchlin C. The joint in psoriatic arthritis. <i>Clin Exp Rheumatol</i> . 2015;33:20-25.
23	15	25	Acosta Folguer ML Eitzgerald O Berinheral joint involvement in provintic arthritic patients. Clin Exp.
24	15	25.	Reumatol 2015:33:26-30
25	10		Aneumator. 2013,53.20 30.
26	17	26.	Matt P. Lindqvist U. Kleinau S. Up-regulation of CD64-expressing monocytes with impaired
27 20	18		FcgammaR function reflects disease activity in polyarticular psoriatic arthritis. Scand J Rheumatol.
20 20	19		2015;44:464-473.
30			
31	20	27.	Al-Mossawi MH, Ridley A, Kiedel S et al. The role of natural killer cells, gamma delta T-cells and
32	21		other innate immune cells in spondyloarthritis. Curr Opin Rheumatol. 2013;25:434-439.
33			
34	22	28.	Ryan C, Korman NJ, Gelfand JM et al. Research gaps in psoriasis: opportunities for future studies. J
35	23		Am Acad Dermatol. 2014;70:146-167.
36	24	29	Berthelot IM de la Cochetiere ME Potel Get al Evidence supporting a role for dormant hacteria in
3/	24	25.	the nathogenesis of spondylarthritis <i>Joint Bone Spine</i> 2013;80:135-140
20 20	20		
40	26	30.	Abdollahi-Roodsaz S, Abramson SB, Scher JU. The metabolic role of the gut microbiota in health and
41	27		rheumatic disease: mechanisms and interventions. Nat Rev Rheumatol. 2016;12:446-455.
42			
43	28	31.	Honda K, Littman DR. The microbiota in adaptive immune homeostasis and disease. Nature.
44	29		2016;535:75-84.
45	20	22	Ciesis F. Dirze A. Triele C. Subelinical sut inflormation in anhylesing spandulitis. Curr Onin
46	30 21	32.	Ciccia F, Rizzo A, Thoio G. Subcinical gut initammation in ankylosing spondynus. Curr Opin Recumeted, 2016;28:80.06
47 48	51		Kileumutui. 2010,28.89-90.
49	32	33.	Miossec P. Korn T. Kuchroo VK. Interleukin-17 and type 17 helper T cells. <i>N Enal J Med</i> .
50	33		2009;361:888-898.
51			
52	34	34.	Ciccia F, Guggino G, Rizzo A et al. Dysbiosis and zonulin upregulation alter gut epithelial and
53	35		vascular barriers in patients with ankylosing spondylitis. Ann Rheum Dis. 2017.
54			
55	36	35.	Planta A, Arvikar SL, Strie K et al. Two rheumatoid arthritis-specific autoantigens correlate microbial
50 57	37		immunity with autoimmune responses in joints. J Clin Invest. 2017.
58			
59			
60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 22

2 3 4 5	1 2 3	36.	Scher JU, Ubeda C, Artacho A et al. Decreased bacterial diversity characterizes an altered gut microbiota in psoriatic arthritis and resembles dysbiosis of inflammatory bowel disease. <i>Arthritis Rheumatol.</i> 2014.
6 7 8 9	4 5 6	37.	Lindqvist U, Kristjansson G, Pihl-Lundin I et al. Patients with psoriatic arthritis have an increased number of lymphocytes in the duodenal mucosa in comparison with patients with psoriasis vulgaris. <i>J Rheumatol</i> . 2006;33:924-927.
10 11	7 8	38.	Scarpa R, Manguso F, D'Arienzo A et al. Microscopic inflammatory changes in colon of patients with both active psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis without bowel symptoms. <i>J Rheumatol</i> . 2000;27:1241-
12 13 14	9		1246.
14 15 16	10 11	39.	Van PL, Van den Bosch F, Mielants H et al. Mucosal inflammation in spondylarthritides: past, present, and future. <i>Curr Rheumatol Rep</i> . 2011;13:409-415.
17 18 19	12 13	40.	Schatteman L, Mielants H, Veys EM et al. Gut inflammation in psoriatic arthritis: a prospective ileocolonoscopic study. <i>J Rheumatol</i> . 1995;22:680-683.
20 21 22	14 15	41.	Ciccia F, Guggino G, Ferrante A et al. Interleukin-9 Overexpression and Th9 Polarization Characterize the Inflamed Gut, the Synovial Tissue, and the Peripheral Blood of Patients With
23 24 25	10	42.	Lin L, Zhang J. Role of intestinal microbiota and metabolites on gut homeostasis and human
25 26 27	18		diseases. BMC Immunol. 2017;18:2.
28 29 30	19 20	43.	Gill T, Asquith M, Rosenbaum JT et al. The intestinal microbiome in spondyloarthritis. <i>Curr Opin Rheumatol</i> . 2015;27:319-325.
31 32	21 22	44.	Kump PK, Krause R, Allerberger F et al. Faecal microbiota transplantation-the Austrian approach. <i>Clin Microbiol Infect</i> . 2014;20:1106-1111.
33 34 35 36	23 24 25	45.	Cammarota G, Pecere S, Ianiro G et al. Principles of DNA-Based Gut Microbiota Assessment and Therapeutic Efficacy of Fecal Microbiota Transplantation in Gastrointestinal Diseases. <i>Dig Dis</i> . 2016;34:279-285.
37 38 39 40	26 27	46.	Austin M, Mellow M, Tierney WM. Fecal microbiota transplantation in the treatment of Clostridium difficile infections. <i>Am J Med</i> . 2014;127:479-483.
40 41 42 43	28 29	47.	van NE, Vrieze A, Nieuwdorp M et al. Duodenal infusion of donor feces for recurrent Clostridium difficile. <i>N Engl J Med</i> . 2013;368:407-415.
44 45 46 47	30 31 32	48.	Cammarota G, Masucci L, Ianiro G et al. Randomised clinical trial: faecal microbiota transplantation by colonoscopy vs. vancomycin for the treatment of recurrent Clostridium difficile infection. <i>Aliment Pharmacol Ther</i> . 2015;41:835-843.
48 49 50	33 34 35	49.	Lee CH, Steiner T, Petrof EO et al. Frozen vs Fresh Fecal Microbiota Transplantation and Clinical Resolution of Diarrhea in Patients With Recurrent Clostridium difficile Infection: A Randomized Clinical Trial. <i>JAMA</i> . 2016;315:142-149.
51 52 53 54 55 56	36 37 38	50.	Li YT, Cai HF, Wang ZH et al. Systematic review with meta-analysis: long-term outcomes of faecal microbiota transplantation for Clostridium difficile infection. <i>Aliment Pharmacol Ther</i> . 2016;43:445-457.
57 58 59 60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1			
2	1	51.	Paramsothy S. Kamm MA. Kaakoush NO et al. Multidonor intensive faecal microbiota
3	2	51.	transplantation for active ulcerative colitis: a randomised placebo-controlled trial <i>Lancet</i>
4	2		2017:389:1218-1228
5	5		
6	4	52.	Cui B. Feng O. Wang H et al. Fecal microbiota transplantation through mid-gut for refractory
7	5	01	Crohn's disease: Safety, feasibility and efficacy trial results. J Gastroenterol Hengtol, 2014.
8	•		
9	6	53.	Lund H, Brunnhuber K, Juhl C et al. Towards evidence based research. BMJ. 2016;355:i5440.
10			
11	7	54.	Ciccia F, Ferrante A, Triolo G. Intestinal dysbiosis and innate immune responses in axial
12	8		spondyloarthritis. Curr Opin Rheumatol. 2016;28:352-358.
15			
14	9	55.	Bravo-Blas A, Wessel H, Milling S. Microbiota and arthritis: correlations or cause? Curr Opin
15	10		Rheumatol. 2016;28:161-167.
17			
18	11	56.	Kabeerdoss J, Sandhya P, Danda D. Gut inflammation and microbiome in spondyloarthritis.
19	12		Rheumatol Int. 2016;36:457-468.
20	10		Castelle ME, Debiaser DC, Deckers II et al. The intertional microbiane in human disease and how it.
21	13	57.	Costello ME, Robinson PC, Bennam H et al. The Intestinal microbiome in human disease and now it
22	14		relates to arthritis and spondyloarthritis. Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol. 2015;29:202-212.
23	15	50	Parco A Szodoray B Suto C at al Importance of intestinal microopyironment in development of
24	15	50.	arthritis A systematic review Immunol Res 2015:61:172-176
25	10		artifitis. A systematic review. Inimunor Res. 2013,01.172-170.
26	17	59	Taneia V. Arthritis suscentibility and the gut microhiome FERS Lett 2014:588:4244-4249
27		55.	
28	18	60.	Rosenbaum JT, Lin P, Asquith M et al. Does the microbiome play a causal role in spondyloarthritis?
29	19		Clin Rheumatol. 2014;33:763-767.
30 21			
20	20	61.	Jenks K, Stebbings S, Burton J et al. Probiotic therapy for the treatment of spondyloarthritis: a
32	21		randomized controlled trial. J Rheumatol. 2010;37:2118-2125.
34			
35	22	62.	Aggarwal A, Sarangi AN, Gaur P et al. Gut microbiome in children with enthesitis-related arthritis in
36	23		a developing country and the effect of probiotic administration. <i>Clin Exp Immunol</i> . 2017;187:480-
37	24		489.
38			
39	25	63.	Berntson L, Hedlund-Treutiger I, Alving K. Anti-inflammatory effect of exclusive enteral nutrition in
40	26		patients with juvenile idiopathic arthritis. <i>Clin Exp Rheumatol</i> . 2016;34:941-945.
41		~ ~	
42	27	64.	Hatakka K, Martio J, Korpela M et al. Effects of problotic therapy on the activity and activation of
43	28		mild rneumatoid arthritisa pilot study. Scand J Rheumatol. 2003;32:211-215.
44	20	65	Mandal DR. Fichas K. Halmas I. Bacillus coagulans: a viable adjunct therapy for relieving symptoms
45	20	05.	of requestoid arthritis according to a randomized controlled trial <i>BMC Complement Altern Med</i>
40 47	30		
47 78	51		2010,10.1.
49	32	66.	Zamani B. Golkar HR. Farshbaf S et al. Clinical and metabolic response to probiotic supplementation
50	33		in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Int J
51	34		Rheum Dis. 2016:19:869-879.
52	-		
53	35	67.	Pineda ML, Thompson SF, Summers K et al. A randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled pilot
54	36		study of probiotics in active rheumatoid arthritis. Med Sci Monit. 2011;17:CR347-CR354.
55			
56			
5/			
50 50			
59 60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/quidelines.xhtml

Page 26 of 36

BMJ Open

2	1	68.	Alipour B, Homayouni-Rad A, Vaghef-Mehrabany E et al. Effects of Lactobacillus casei
3	2		supplementation on disease activity and inflammatory cytokines in rheumatoid arthritis patients: a
4	3		randomized double-blind clinical trial. Int J Rheum Dis. 2014;17:519-527.
5			
6	4	69.	Schorpion A, Kolasinski SL. Can Probiotic Supplements Improve Outcomes in Rheumatoid Arthritis?
7	5		Curr Rheumatol Rep. 2017;19:73.
8			
9	6	70.	Taylor W, Gladman D, Helliwell P et al. Classification criteria for psoriatic arthritis: development of
10	7		new criteria from a large international study. Arthritis Rheum. 2006:54:2665-2673.
11			
12	8	71.	Fang C. Zhong H. Lin Y et al. Assessment of the cPAS-based BGISEQ-500 platform for metagenomic
13	9		sequencing. <i>Giaascience</i> . 2017.
14			
15	10	72.	Qin J, Li Y, Cai Z et al. A metagenome-wide association study of gut microbiota in type 2 diabetes.
16	11		Nature, 2012:490:55-60.
17			
18	12	73.	Nielsen HB, Almeida M, Juncker AS et al. Identification and assembly of genomes and genetic
19	13	/ 51	elements in complex metagenomic samples without using reference genomes. Nat Biotechnol
20	1/		
21	14		2014,52.022 020.
22	15	74	Li L lia H Cai X et al. An integrated catalog of reference genes in the human gut microhiome. Nat
23	16	74.	Riotechnol 2014/32/834-841
24	10		Diolectinioi. 2014,52.054-041.
25	17	75	Mishra A. Makharia GK. Techniques of functional and motility test: how to perform and interpret
26	10	75.	intestinal normaphility / Neurogestroonteral Metil 2012;19:442,447
27	10		intestinal permeability. J Neurogustroenteror Motil. 2012,18.443-447.
28	10	76	Sequeira IP, Lentle PG, Kruger MC et al. Standardising the lactulese mannital test of gut
29	20	70.	sequenta in, Lentie KG, Kiuger MC et al. Standardising the lactulose mannitor test of gut
30	20		permeability to minimise error and promote comparability. PLOS One. 2014;9:e99256.
31	21	77	Therean H. Hanson TM. McKenna SD et al. Adaptation into Danish of the Stanford Health
32	21	//.	Accesses and Questionneire (UAQ) and the Dheumateid Arthritic Quelity of Life Coole (DAQeL). Considered
33	22		Assessment Questionnaire (HAQ) and the kneumatoid Arthritis Quality of Life Scale (KAQOL). Scand
34	23		J Rheumatol. 2001;30:103-109.
35	24	70	Decide la M. Decide DV et al. Companient of the Decide in Anthritic Quality of Life (DeA Qui)
36	24	78.	Brodszky V, Pentek M, Balint PV et al. Comparison of the Psoriatic Arthritis Quality of Life (PSAQOL)
37	25		questionnaire, the functional status (HAQ) and utility (EQ-5D) measures in psoriatic arthritis: results
38	26		from a cross-sectional survey. Scand J Rheumatol. 2010;39:303-309.
39	~ 7	70	
40	27	79.	Zachariae R, Zachariae C, Ibsen H et al. Dermatology life quality index: data from Danish inpatients
41	28		and outpatients. Acta Derm Venereol. 2000;80:272-276.
42		~~	
43	29	80.	Fransen J, Antoni C, Mease PJ et al. Performance of response criteria for assessing peripheral
44	30		artnritis in patients with psoriatic arthritis: analysis of data from randomised controlled trials of two
45	31		tumour necrosis factor inhibitors. Ann Rheum Dis. 2006;65:1373-1378.
46			
4/	32	81.	Felson DT, Anderson JJ, Boers M et al. American College of Rheumatology. Preliminary definition of
48	33		improvement in rheumatoid arthritis. Arthritis Rheum. 1995;38:727-735.
49			
50	34	82.	Felson DI, Anderson JJ, Lange ML et al. Should improvement in rheumatoid arthritis clinical trials
51	35		be defined as fifty percent or seventy percent improvement in core set measures, rather than
52 52	36		twenty percent? Arthritis Rheum. 1998;41:1564-1570.
53			
54	37	83.	Faria JR, Aarao AR, Jimenez LM et al. Inter-rater concordance study of the PASI (Psoriasis Area and
55	38		Severity Index). An Bras Dermatol. 2010;85:625-629.
20 57			
5/			
50 50			
59 60			For peer review only - http://bmionen.hmi.com/site/about/quidelines.yhtml
00			25 25

2	1	84.	Jensen OK, Callesen J, Nielsen MG et al. Reproducibility of tender point examination in chronic low
3	2		back pain patients as measured by intrarater and inter-rater reliability and agreement: a validation
4	3		study. BMJ Open. 2013;3.
5			
6	4	85.	Klingberg E, Carlsten H, Hilme E et al. Calprotectin in ankylosing spondylitisfrequently elevated in
7 8	5		feces, but normal in serum. Scand J Gastroenterol. 2012;47:435-444.
9	6	86	Kelly CR, Kahn S, Kashyan P et al. Update on Fecal Microbiota Transplantation 2015: Indications
10	7		Methodologies Mechanisms and Outlook <i>Gastroenterology</i> 2015:149:223-237
11	,		
12	8	87	Wang S. Xu M. Wang W et al. Systematic Review: Adverse Events of Fecal Microbiota
13	9	07.	Transplantation PLoS One 2016:11:e0161174
14	5		
15	10	88	Rossen NG MacDonald IK de Vries FM et al. Fecal microbiota transplantation as novel therapy in
16	11	00.	gastroenterology: A systematic review. World I Gastroenterol. 2015:21:5350-5371
17	11		gasti benterology. A systematic review. Wond J Gustibenterol. 2013,21.3539-3571.
18	10	80	Girotra M. Gard S. Anand P. et al. Eocal Microbiota Transplantation for Pocurrent Clostridium
19	12	69.	difficile Infection in the Elderly Long Term Outcomes and Microbiota Changes. Dig Dis Sci
20	13		
21	14		2016;61:3007-3015.
22	4 5	00	Current TC, King J, Ling CH, et al. Facel Missishinta Transplantation, Using Manage Contraintential Tract
23	15	90.	Gweon TG, Kim J, Lim CH et al. Fecal Microbiota Transplantation Using Upper Gastrointestinal Tract
24	16		for the Treatment of Refractory or Severe Complicated Clostridium difficile Infection in Elderly
25	17		Patients in Poor Medical Condition: The First Study in an Asian Country. <i>Gastroenterol Res Pract</i> .
26	18		2016;2016:2687605.
27			
28	19	91.	Agrawal M, Aroniadis OC, Brandt LJ et al. The Long-term Efficacy and Safety of Fecal Microbiota
29	20		Transplant for Recurrent, Severe, and Complicated Clostridium difficile Infection in 146 Elderly
30	21		Individuals. J Clin Gastroenterol. 2016;50:403-407.
31			
32	22	92.	Di BS, Gouliouris T, Petrosillo N. Fecal microbiota transplantation (FMT) for Clostridium difficile
33	23		infection: focus on immunocompromised patients. J Infect Chemother. 2015;21:230-237.
34			
35	24	93.	Webb BJ, Brunner A, Ford CD et al. Fecal microbiota transplantation for recurrent Clostridium
36	25		difficile infection in hematopoietic stem cell transplant recipients. Transpl Infect Dis. 2016.
37			
38	26	94.	Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R et al. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)a metadata-driven
39	27		methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. J
40	28		Biomed Inform. 2009;42:377-381.
41			
42	29	95.	Altman DG, Dore CJ. Randomisation and baseline comparisons in clinical trials. Lancet.
43	30		1990;335:149-153.
44			
45	31	96.	Normand SL, Sykora K, Li P et al. Readers guide to critical appraisal of cohort studies: 3. Analytical
46	32		strategies to reduce confounding. BMJ. 2005:330:1021-1023.
47	-		
48	33	97.	White IR. Horton NJ. Carpenter J et al. Strategy for intention to treat analysis in randomised trials
49	34		with missing outcome data. <i>BMJ</i> . 2011:342:d40.
50	-		
51	35	98.	Liu R. Hong J. Xu X et al. Gut microbiome and serum metabolome alterations in obesity and after
52	36		weight-loss intervention Nat Med 2017:23:859-868
53	50		weight 1055 intervention. Nut Med. 2017;25:055 000.
54	37	99	Pedersen HK, Gudmundsdottir V, Nielsen HB et al, Human gut microbes impact host serum
55	38	55.	metabolome and inculin consitivity. Nature, 2016;525:376-381
56	50		
57	30	100	Thaiss CA Zmora N Levy M et al. The microhiome and innate immunity. Nature 2016:535:65-74
58	55	100.	maiss of y Emora ity Ecvy in et al. the microsionic and innate inmunity. Natare, 2010,000-74.
59			
60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 26

2	1	101.	McLean MH, Dieguez D, Jr., Miller LM et al. Does the microbiota play a role in the pathogenesis of
3 4	2		autoimmune diseases? Gut. 2015;64:332-341.
5	р	102	Longman DS, Vang V, Dight CE at al. Microhistor bact interactions in museual homeostacis and
6 7	3 4	102.	systemic autoimmunity. Cold Spring Harb Symp Quant Biol. 2013;78:193-201.
8 9	5	103.	Shreiner AB, Kao JY, Young VB. The gut microbiome in health and in disease. <i>Curr Opin</i>
10	0		Gustiventerol. 2015,51.09-75.
11	7	104	Hooper IV Littman DR Machberson AL Interactions between the microbiota and the immune
12 13	8	104.	system. Science. 2012;336:1268-1273.
14	0	105	Pound II Mazmanian SK. The gut microhiota change intertinal immune responses during health
15 16	9 10	105.	and disease. Nat Rev Immunol. 2009;9:313-323.
17			
18	11	106.	Van de Wiele T, Van Praet JT, Marzorati M et al. How the microbiota shapes rheumatic diseases.
19	12		Nat Rev Rheumatol. 2016;12:398-411.
20			
21	13	107.	Butto LF, Haller D. Dysbiosis in intestinal inflammation: Cause or consequence. <i>Int J Med Microbiol</i> .
22	14		2016.
22			
23	15	108.	Moayyedi P, Surette MG, Kim PT et al. Fecal Microbiota Transplantation Induces Remission in
25	16		Patients With Active Ulcerative Colitis in a Randomized Controlled Trial. Gastroenterology.
25	17		2015;149:102-109.
20			
27	18	109.	Rossen NG, Fuentes S, van der Spek MJ et al. Findings From a Randomized Controlled Trial of Fecal
20	19		Transplantation for Patients With Ulcerative Colitis. Gastroenterology. 2015;149:110-118.
29			
31	20	110.	Smolen JS, Schols M, Braun J et al. Treating axial spondyloarthritis and peripheral spondyloarthritis,
37	21		especially psoriatic arthritis, to target: 2017 update of recommendations by an international task
32	22		force. Ann Rheum Dis. 2017.
34			
35	23	111.	Zhernakova A, Kurilshikov A, Bonder MJ et al. Population-based metagenomics analysis reveals
36	24		markers for gut microbiome composition and diversity. Science, 2016:352:565-569.
37			
38	25	112.	Falony G, Joossens M, Vieira-Silva S et al. Population-level analysis of gut microbiome variation.
39	26		Science, 2016:352:560-564.
40	-		
41	27	113.	Forslund K, Hildebrand F, Nielsen T et al. Disentangling type 2 diabetes and metformin treatment
42	28		signatures in the human gut microbiota. <i>Nature</i> . 2015;528:262-266.
43	-		
44	29	114.	Zhang X, Zhang D, Jia H et al. The oral and gut microbiomes are perturbed in rheumatoid arthritis
45	30		and partly normalized after treatment. <i>Nat Med.</i> 2015:21:895-905.
46			
47	31	115.	Woodworth MH. Neish EM. Miller NS et al. Laboratory Testing of Donors and Stool for Fecal
48	32		Microbiota Transplantation for Recurrent C. difficile Infection. J Clin Microbiol. 2017.
49			
50	33	116.	Costello SP. Tucker EC. La BJ et al. Establishing a Fecal Microbiota Transplant Service for the
51	34		Treatment of Clostridium difficile Infection. <i>Clin Infect Dis</i> 2016;62:908-914
52	5.		
53	35	117	Cammarota G. Janiro G. Tilg H et al. European consensus conference on faecal microbiota
54	36	/.	transplantation in clinical practice Gut 2017;66:569-580
55	50		
56	37	118	Chu ND Smith MB Perrotta AR et al Profiling Living Bacteria Informs Preparation of Fecal
57	3, 38	110.	Microhiota Transplantations PLoS One 2017:12:e0170922
58	50		merosota franspiantations. <i>i 200 0/12.2017</i> ,12.2017/0522.
59			
60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 27

1			
2	1	119.	Satokari R. Mattila F. Kainulainen V et al. Simple faecal preparation and efficacy of frozen inoculum
3	2		in faecal microbiota transplantation for recurrent Clostridium difficile infectionan observational
4	2		cohort study Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2015:41:46-53
5	5		
6	4	120	Li L lia H Cai X et al. An integrated catalog of reference genes in the human gut microbiome Nat
7	5	120.	Riotechnol 2014.32.834-841
8	5		
9	6	121	Arumugam M Raes I Pelletier E et al Enterotypes of the human gut microbiome Nature
10	7	121.	2011·473·174-180
11	,		2011,475.174 100.
12	8	122	Kazerouni A. Wein I.M. Exploring the Efficacy of Pooled Stools in Fecal Microbiota Transplantation
13	9		for Microhiota-Associated Chronic Diseases <i>PLoS One</i> 2017:12:e0163956
14	5		
15	10	123.	Vandeputte D. Falony G. Vieira-Silva S et al. Stool consistency is strongly associated with gut
16	11		microbiota richness and composition, enterotypes and bacterial growth rates. <i>Gut.</i> 2016:65:57-62.
17			
18	12	124.	Lev RE. The gene-microbe link. <i>Nature</i> , 2015:518:S7.
19			
20	13	125.	Li SS, Zhu A, Benes V et al. Durable coexistence of donor and recipient strains after fecal microbiota
21	14		transplantation. Science. 2016;352:586-589.
22			
23	15	126.	Spor A, Koren O, Ley R. Unravelling the effects of the environment and host genotype on the gut
24	16		microbiome. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2011;9:279-290.
25			
20	17	127.	Markle JG, Frank DN, Mortin-Toth S et al. Sex differences in the gut microbiome drive hormone-
27	18		dependent regulation of autoimmunity. Science. 2013;339:1084-1088.
20			
30	19	128.	Xiao L, Estelle J, Kiilerich P et al. A reference gene catalogue of the pig gut microbiome. <i>Nat</i>
31	20		Microbiol. 2016;16161.
32			
33	21	129.	Markle JG, Frank DN, Adeli K et al. Microbiome manipulation modifies sex-specific risk for
34	22		autoimmunity. <i>Gut Microbes</i> . 2014;5:485-493.
35			
36	23	130.	Mills S, Shanahan F, Stanton C et al. Movers and shakers: influence of bacteriophages in shaping
37	24		the mammalian gut microbiota. Gut Microbes. 2013;4:4-16.
38			
39	25	131.	Pfeiffer JK, Virgin HW. Viral immunity. Transkingdom control of viral infection and immunity in the
40	26		mammalian intestine. Science. 2016;351.
41			
42	27	132.	Underhill DM, Pearlman E. Immune Interactions with Pathogenic and Commensal Fungi: A Two-
43	28		Way Street. Immunity. 2015;43:845-858.
44	•		
45	29	133.	Castelino M, Eyre S, Moat J et al. The skin microbiome in psoriatic arthritis: methodology
46	30		development and pilot data. Lancet. 2015;385 Suppl 1:S27.
47	24	424	Colore 111 Look and Antonio Antonio The Lange Standards in and the control of the different
48	31	134.	Scher JU, Joshua V, Artacho A et al. The lung microbiota in early rheumatoid arthritis and
49	32		autoimmunity. <i>Microbiome</i> . 2016;4:60.
50	33		
51	34		
52	35		
55 57	55		
55	36		
56			
57			
58			
59			
60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
			LU

|--|

- Figure 1. Flow diagram of the randomised, placebo-controlled trial.
- Figure 2. Participation timeline and characteristics of each visit.

<text>





BMJ Open



SPIRIT 2013 Checklist: Recommended items to address in a clinical trial protocol and related documents*

Section/item	ltem No	Description	Addressed on page number			
Administrative inf	ormation	Or .				
Fitle	1	Descriptive title identifying the study design, population, interventions, and, if applicable, trial acronym	1			
Frial registration	2a	Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registry	2			
	2b	All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set	<u>1-23</u>			
Protocol version	3	Date and version identifier	<u>1</u>			
Funding	4	Sources and types of financial, material, and other support	23			
Roles and	5a	Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors	<u>1 and 22</u>			
esponsibilities	5b	Name and contact information for the trial sponsor	<u> 1 </u>			
	5c	Role of study sponsor and funders, if any, in study design; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the report; and the decision to submit the report for publication, including whether they will have ultimate authority over any of these activities	22			
	5d	Composition, roles, and responsibilities of the coordinating centre, steering committee, endpoint adjudication committee, data management team, and other individuals or groups overseeing the trial, if applicable (see Item 21a for data monitoring committee)	<u>2</u>			
1	Introduction					
--	--	-----	--	---	--	--
3 4 5	Background and rationale	6a	Description of research question and justification for undertaking the trial, including summary of relevant studies (published and unpublished) examining benefits and harms for each intervention	3-4		
6 7		6b	Explanation for choice of comparators	<u>4</u>		
8 9	Objectives	7	Specific objectives or hypotheses	4-5		
10 11 12 13	Trial design	8	Description of trial design including type of trial (eg, parallel group, crossover, factorial, single group), allocation ratio, and framework (eg, superiority, equivalence, noninferiority, exploratory)	5		
14 15	Methods: Participants, interventions, and outcomes					
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Study setting	9	Description of study settings (eg, community clinic, academic hospital) and list of countries where data will be collected. Reference to where list of study sites can be obtained	<u>8</u>		
	Eligibility criteria	10	Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. If applicable, eligibility criteria for study centres and individuals who will perform the interventions (eg, surgeons, psychotherapists)	<u> </u>		
	Interventions	11a	Interventions for each group with sufficient detail to allow replication, including how and when they will be administered	<u>9-10</u>		
23 26 27 28		11b	Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions for a given trial participant (eg, drug dose change in response to harms, participant request, or improving/worsening disease)	<u> 10 </u>		
29 30 31		11c	Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any procedures for monitoring adherence (eg, drug tablet return, laboratory tests)	Not applicable		
32 33		11d	Relevant concomitant care and interventions that are permitted or prohibited during the trial	<u>8 and 9</u>		
34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42	Outcomes	12	Primary, secondary, and other outcomes, including the specific measurement variable (eg, systolic blood pressure), analysis metric (eg, change from baseline, final value, time to event), method of aggregation (eg, median, proportion), and time point for each outcome. Explanation of the clinical relevance of chosen efficacy and harm outcomes is strongly recommended	11-12		
	Participant timeline	13	Time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any run-ins and washouts), assessments, and visits for participants. A schematic diagram is highly recommended (see Figure)	7		
43 44 45			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml			

Page 35 of 36			BMJ Open	
1 2	Sample size	14	Estimated number of participants needed to achieve study objectives and how it was determined, including _ clinical and statistical assumptions supporting any sample size calculations	13-14
3 4 5	Recruitment	15	Strategies for achieving adequate participant enrolment to reach target sample size	8
5 6 7	Methods: Assignment of interventions (for controlled trials)			
, 8 9	Allocation:			
10 11 12 13 14 15	Sequence generation	16a	Method of generating the allocation sequence (eg, computer-generated random numbers), and list of any	<u>14</u>
16 17 18 19	Allocation concealment mechanism	16b	Mechanism of implementing the allocation sequence (eg, central telephone; sequentially numbered,	<u>14</u>
20 21 22	Implementation	16c	Who will generate the allocation sequence, who will enrol participants, and who will assign participants to	14
23 24 25 26	Blinding (masking)	17a	Who will be blinded after assignment to interventions (eg, trial participants, care providers, outcome assessors, data analysts), and how	14
27 28 29		17b	If blinded, circumstances under which unblinding is permissible, and procedure for revealing a participant's _ allocated intervention during the trial	<u>14</u>
30 31	Methods: Data coll	ection,	management, and analysis	
32 33 34 35 36 37	Data collection methods	18a	Plans for assessment and collection of outcome, baseline, and other trial data, including any related _ processes to promote data quality (eg, duplicate measurements, training of assessors) and a description of study instruments (eg, questionnaires, laboratory tests) along with their reliability and validity, if known. Reference to where data collection forms can be found, if not in the protocol	14
38 39 40 41		18b	Plans to promote participant retention and complete follow-up, including list of any outcome data to be	<u>16</u>
42 43 44 45 46			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

BMJ Open

1 2 3	Data management	19	Plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage, including any related processes to promote data quality _ (eg, double data entry; range checks for data values). Reference to where details of data management procedures can be found, if not in the protocol	<u> 14 </u>		
5 6 7	Statistical methods	20a	Statistical methods for analysing primary and secondary outcomes. Reference to where other details of the statistical analysis plan can be found, if not in the protocol	<u>15</u>		
8 9		20b	Methods for any additional analyses (eg, subgroup and adjusted analyses)	15-16		
10 11 12 13		20c	Definition of analysis population relating to protocol non-adherence (eg, as randomised analysis), and any statistical methods to handle missing data (eg, multiple imputation)	<u>15</u>		
14 15	Methods: Monitorir	ng				
16 17 18 19 20	Data monitoring	21a	Composition of data monitoring committee (DMC); summary of its role and reporting structure; statement of	<u>18</u>		
21 22 23 24		21b	Description of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines, including who will have access to these interim _ results and make the final decision to terminate the trial	18		
25 26 27	Harms	22	Plans for collecting, assessing, reporting, and managing solicited and spontaneously reported adverse events and other unintended effects of trial interventions or trial conduct	13		
28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45	Auditing	23	Frequency and procedures for auditing trial conduct, if any, and whether the process will be independent from investigators and the sponsor	18		
	Ethics and dissemination					
	Research ethics approval	24	Plans for seeking research ethics committee/institutional review board (REC/IRB) approval	<u>18</u>		
	Protocol amendments	25	Plans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses) to relevant parties (eg, investigators, REC/IRBs, trial participants, trial registries, journals, regulators)	18		
			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	4		

46

Page 37 of 36

46

BMJ Open

1 2 3 4 5	Consent or assent	26a	Who will obtain informed consent or assent from potential trial participants or authorised surrogates, and how (see Item 32)	14	
		26b	Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and biological specimens in ancillary studies, if applicable	Not applicable	
7 8 9	Confidentiality	27	How personal information about potential and enrolled participants will be collected, shared, and maintained in order to protect confidentiality before, during, and after the trial	14	
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Declaration of interests	28	Financial and other competing interests for principal investigators for the overall trial and each study site	23	
	Access to data	29	Statement of who will have access to the final trial dataset, and disclosure of contractual agreements that limit such access for investigators	Not applicable	
	Ancillary and post- trial care	30	Provisions, if any, for ancillary and post-trial care, and for compensation to those who suffer harm from trial participation	<u>18</u>	
20 21 22 23	Dissemination policy	31a	Plans for investigators and sponsor to communicate trial results to participants, healthcare professionals, the public, and other relevant groups (eg, via publication, reporting in results databases, or other data sharing arrangements), including any publication restrictions	<u>18</u>	
24 25		31b	Authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional writers	22	
26 27 28		31c	Plans, if any, for granting public access to the full protocol, participant-level dataset, and statistical code	Not applicable	
29 30	Appendices				
31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45	Informed consent materials	32	Model consent form and other related documentation given to participants and authorised surrogates	<u>Appendix</u>	
	Biological specimens	33	Plans for collection, laboratory evaluation, and storage of biological specimens for genetic or molecular analysis in the current trial and for future use in ancillary studies, if applicable	10-11	
	*It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the SPIRIT 2013 Explanation & Elaboration for important clarification on the items. Amendments to the protocol should be tracked and dated. The SPIRIT checklist is copyrighted by the SPIRIT Group under the Creative Commons " <u>Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported</u> " license.				
			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml		5