

BMJ Open

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 (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

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

BMJ Open

The role of Probiotics in colorectal cancer patients: A systematic review protocol of randomized controlled trial studies

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-038128
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	02-Mar-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Dikeocha, Ifeoma; Cyberjaya University College of Medical Sciences, Medical science Al-kabis, Abdelkodose; Cyberjaya University College of Medical Sciences, Medical science Hussin, Salasawati; Cyberjaya University College of Medical Sciences, Medical science Alshawsh, Mohammed; University of Malaya Faculty of Medicine, Pharmacology
Keywords:	Gastrointestinal tumours < ONCOLOGY, Microbiology < PATHOLOGY, Clinical trials < THERAPEUTICS

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

The role of probiotics in colorectal cancer patients: A systematic review protocol of randomized controlled trial studies

Dikeocha Ifeoma Julieth¹ Abdelkodose M Al-kabsi¹ Salasawati Hussin¹ Mohammed Abdullah Alshawsh^{2*}

¹ Faculty of Medicine, University of Cyberjaya, Persiaran Bestari 63000 Cyberjaya, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia.

² Department of Pharmacology, Faculty of Medicine, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur 50603, Malaysia

* Correspondence: alshawshmam@um.edu.my ; alshawshmam@yahoo.com *Telephone no. +60379674950

Dikeocha Ifeoma Julieth: 1812-0326@st.cyberjaya.edu.my ; ifeomadikeocha19@gmail.com

Assistant Prof. Dr. Abdelkodose M Al-kabsi: abdelkodose@cyberjaya.edu.my

Associate Prof. Dr. Salasawati Hussin: salasawati@cyberjaya.edu.my

Associate Prof. Dr. Mohammed Abdullah Alshawsh: alshawshmam@um.edu.my ; alshawshmam@yahoo.com

Abstract

Introduction: Colorectal cancer is one of the leading causes of cancer related morbidity worldwide and it has been reported to be associated with poor lifestyle habits which include excess tobacco and alcohol intake as well as genetics and age factors. Probiotics such as the Lactic acid bacteria and Bifidobacterium as well as probiotic containing foods (kombucha, kefir, miso etc.) have received lots of attention as anticancer agents for prevention and treatment. The effects of the administration of probiotics to colorectal cancer patients is the primary goal of this systematic review. The overall aim is to assess how the use of probiotics in colorectal cancer patients helps in the management of colorectal cancer and its effect on the diversity of gut microbiota. The final systematic review will provide a comprehensive evidence base for the use and efficacy of probiotics in colorectal cancer patient care.

Methods and analysis: The systematic review, will be conducted by extensively searching different databases such as PubMed, Web of Science, Scopus, Wiley and ProQuest to identify randomized controlled trials (with no time frame) which relate to the administration of probiotics to colorectal cancer patients. The search strategy will include words like colorectal cancer, probiotics, Bifidobacterium, clinical trials etc. Two reviewers will independently review the studies and also search the reference lists of the eligible studies to obtain more references. Data will be extracted from the eligible studies using standardized data extraction form. After assessing the risk of bias, qualitative analysis will be used to synthesize the systematic review.

Ethics and Dissemination: This is a protocol for a systematic review; therefore, it doesn't require any ethics approval. We intend to disseminate the protocol in a peer reviewed journal.

34 **Keywords:** Probiotics; Colorectal Cancer; Randomized controlled trial studies; Clinical trial;
35 Colon neoplasms.

36 **Strengths and Limitations of this study:**

37 **Strengths and Limitations of this study:**

- 38 • The findings from this systematic review will provide current insight on how
39 probiotics are used either alone or in combination to improve the quality of life of
40 colorectal cancer patients.
- 41 • This study will highlight the efficacy and the underlying mechanism of actions of
42 probiotics against colorectal cancer
- 43 • The results from this review will promote the use of probiotics as an alternative
44 therapy for and management of colorectal cancer.
- 45 • There will be limitations inherent to any systematic review such as the lack of
46 information on outcome variables, as well as the assumption that the evaluation
47 techniques are consistent across studies.
- 48 • Only studies in English language will be included in this systematic review.

49 **Introduction:**

50 Colorectal cancer (CRC) refers to tumors that start in the colon and spreads all the way to the
51 rectum. Different types of colorectal polyps exist, but colorectal cancer usually develops from
52 adenomas. CRC is one of the very common causes of mortality amongst cancer patients
53 worldwide including developed and undeveloped countries but mostly in first world countries. It
54 is predicted that by 2035, over 25 million incidences of CRC will be discovered on a yearly
55 basis.¹ It is also estimated that over 376,000 new cases of colorectal cancer diagnosis as well as
56 approximately 200,000 deaths take place yearly in China.²

57 Colorectal cancer proves to be a silent killer ailment that may not be noticed in time until the
58 cancer has progressed significantly. Symptoms of CRC resemble symptoms of several ailments
59 and is easily misdiagnosed unless a colonoscopy is done. The symptoms of CRC include
60 unexplained anemia, unexplained weight loss, bloating, changes in the bowel movement habits,
61 bloody stool, vomiting and pelvic pain. It has been proven that the initiating events of CRC
62 include TP53 mutation in colorectal cancer associated with colitis (CAC) as well as mutation in
63 sporadic colorectal cancer (SCC).³ Different causes of colorectal cancer have been examined
64 over the years from data collected in cohort-based studies and these findings resemble studies
65 carried out in animal models, The common conclusion is that age, lifestyle choices such as
66 smoking and excessive alcohol intake which can lead to obesity or diabetes, as well as genetic
67 risk factors, contribute to the development of CRC.^{4 5}

68 Colorectal cancer can also be inherited through the genes by inheriting mutated genes that trigger
69 tumor growth, but this only accounts for about 5% of colorectal cancer cases.⁶ In addition,
70 different researchers in their studies have agreed that an increased number of opportunistic
71 bacteria which quickly turn pathogenic such as *Helicobacter pylori*, *Bacteroides fragilis*,
72 *Helicobacter hepaticus*, *enterotoxigenic Escherichia coli*, *Fusobacterium nucleatum*, and

69 *Streptococcus bovis*, can lead to the initiation of adenomas formation that lead to colorectal
70 cancer.⁷

71 Colorectal cancer patients usually undergo surgery to remove cancerous polyps or to remove
72 some part of their colon which have been affected (colon resection). Others undergo
73 chemotherapy or radiotherapy to treat CRC. These treatment options are sometimes unsuccessful
74 or lead to a myriad of severe side effects which increase hospital stay time and sometimes
75 morbidity.⁸

76 Probiotics is redefined by the international scientific association for probiotics and prebiotics
77 (ISAPP) as “live microorganisms which when administered in adequate amounts, confer a health
78 benefit on the host”.⁹ Probiotic microorganisms are special because they are capable of surviving
79 in the human gastrointestinal tract before they get to the colon, where the majority of their
80 metabolic activity is carried out. They include lactic acid producing bacteria (LAB) of the genera
81 *Lactobacillus* and *Bifidobacterium* as well as *Propionibacterium*, *Saccharomyces* and are the
82 major ingredients in yoghurts and other functional foods such as unfermented milks, cheese,
83 kefir, fermented milk.¹⁰

84 On the other hand, prebiotics are usually termed as non-digestible carbohydrates such as inulin
85 and oligosaccharides, soy and resistant starch. Prebiotics is defined by ISAPP as “a substrate that
86 is selectively utilized by host microorganisms to confer health benefit to the host”.⁹ Prebiotics
87 stimulate an increased growth of probiotics by providing a more favorable environment for their
88 growth.¹¹ Leading to a gut environment that promotes the competitive dismissal of opportunistic
89 and potentially pathogenic bacteria which could initiate the beginning of CRC.¹¹ Several studies
90 have shown that the administration of both probiotics and prebiotics as a combination can aid
91 increasingly in improving the conditions of CRC patients especially after colorectal surgery has
92 been performed.^{12 13}

93 Probiotics have been utilized by the traditional healers for the prevention and treatment of
94 different types of illnesses from the simple stomach ache to intestinal neoplasia. In addition
95 various experimental studies have shown that continuous ingestion of probiotic bacteria can
96 enhance the qualitative as well as quantitative components of the gut microbiota.¹⁴ In one
97 instance, the ingestion of *Lactobacillus acidophilus* LA-11, *Lactobacillus plantarum* CGMCC
98 1258, and *Bifidobacterium longum* BL-88 (2.6×10^{14} [CFU]/d) for 16days, resulted in an
99 increase in the diversification of gut microflora and microbial richness in patients suffering from
100 CRC who have been scheduled for colectomy. Eventually, the microbial flora makeup of these
101 individuals improved to resemble that of individuals without CRC.¹⁵ Probiotic bacteria are able
102 to diminish the total quantity of non beneficial disease causing bacteria found in the colon by
103 numerous mechanisms, particularly as regards; rivarly for nutrients, growth factors, and adhesion
104 of the probiotics onto the intestinal cells of the host.¹⁶ Some probiotic bacteria can produce
105 antibacterial substances such as bacteriocins, hydrogen peroxide, lactic acid and reuterin, which
106 decrease the growth or totally eradicate pathogenic bacteria from the colon. The very popular
107 advantages of the consumption and use of probiotics in the management and treatment of
108 diarrhea associated to anti-cancer chemotherapy revolves around the restoration to normal of the
109 intestinal microbiota.¹⁷ The favourable altreatment by probiotic bacteria in the makeup of the gut

110 microbiome is closely associated with the reduced risk of suffering from CRC in the future.¹⁸
 111 Production of short chain fatty acids (SCFA) by probiotics which leads to cell apoptosis is one of
 112 the ways through which probiotics reduce the proliferation of colorectal carcinoma.¹⁹

113 Based on our search on systematic reviews related to our topic, we found out that most of the
 114 systematic reviews which have been done were not entirely specific to colorectal cancer,¹² and
 115 those that are specific to probiotics and colorectal cancer patients focus on one outcome either on
 116 postoperative complications,²⁰ surgical site infection,²¹ diarrhoea from chemotherapy.²² We see
 117 this as a limitation of these studies, hence we intend to study more than one outcome in order to
 118 get a wholistic idea of how probiotics administration affect colorectal cancer patients who are
 119 receiving different types of treatment on different levels.

120 Review Aim

121 To systematically review, assess, and summarize and interpret clinical trials studies on how the
 122 use of probiotics compared to placebo in colorectal cancer patients in helps in the treatment, and
 123 management of colorectal cancer. In addition, this study will critically summarize how probiotics
 124 administration in CRC patients affect the diversity of gut microbiome and patient quality of life.

125 Methods and Analysis

126 This systematic review protocol goes in accordance to the Preferred Reporting Items for
 127 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) guidelines.²³

128 Eligibility Criteria for Included Studies

129 The inclusion criteria include studies on colorectal cancer patients who are were treated with
 130 chemotherapy, radiotherapy or surgery. The included studies must be carried out as randomized
 131 controlled trials with either a comparator group, control group or placebo group. Details of the
 132 inclusion and exclusion criteria that will be used in the systematic review is in Table 1.

133 **Table 1. Eligibility criteria based on PICOS model**

Items based on PICOS model	Eligibility criteria
i. Population, or participants and conditions of interest	Humans, any age, diagnosed with colorectal cancer or colon or rectal cancer and have been treated with probiotics as an intervention and this will include: Colorectal cancer patients who have had colorectal surgery or colon resection or haven't had surgery. Colorectal cancer patients who had or are still undergoing chemotherapy or radiotherapy or not.
ii. Interventions or exposures	Probiotics of any kind (e.g. <i>Lactobacillus</i> , <i>Bifidobacterium</i> , <i>Propionibacterium</i> , <i>Saccharomyces</i> etc.) used on its own or in combination with other probiotics or combination with prebiotics such as inulin or resistant starch etc.
iii. Comparisons or control groups	Placebos, or healthy people of any age, without colorectal cancer.

	Baseline comparison of patients before the intervention
iv. Outcomes of interest	<p><i>Primary outcomes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Effects of probiotics on the diversity of human gut microbiota. -Effects of probiotics on inflammatory biomarkers relevant to CRC. -Immunoregulatory action of probiotics. <p><i>Secondary outcomes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Patient status (improvement/ no improvement of colorectal carcinoma) after administration of probiotics. - Prognosis such as imaging to compare the size of cancer tumour before and after intervention - General health and improvement in quality of life of the patient - Adverse events such as morbidity and mortality
v. Study designs	Clinical trials, randomized clinical trials.
vi. Other exclusion criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articles not in English language. • Reviews • Animal or <i>in vitro</i> work done with probiotics. • Studies not about colorectal cancer or rectal or colon cancer. • Studies not testing the role of probiotics on colorectal cancer or rectal or colon cancer patients.

134 Search strategy

135 The relevant studies will be identified using standard search terms for individual databases.
 136 Randomized controlled trials will be identified from PubMed, Web of Science, Scopus, Wiley
 137 and ProQuest. The search results will be filtered to identify studies only in English. The
 138 bibliography of all included randomized controlled trials will be reviewed to identify any trials
 139 missed during the initial database search. This will be done independently by two reviewers.
 140 Search terms will be used and connected by Boolean AND/OR operators:

141 The search syntax for PubMed will include:

142 1. Probiotic* OR Lactobacillus OR Bifidobacterium OR Propionibacterium OR Saccharomyces
 143 OR "Bacillus coagulans"

144 2. colon OR colorectal OR colonic OR rectal

145 3. cancer OR neopla* OR tumo* OR carcinoma OR malignan*

146 4. clinical trial OR trial* OR "intervention study" OR RCT OR "randomized controlled trial" OR
 147 "randomised controlled trial"

148 5. #2 AND #3

1
2
3 149 6. #1 AND #4 AND #5
4

5 150 The search syntax for other databases will be using similar approach as PubMed or using the
6 151 following merged search terms:

8 152 (Probiotic OR Lactobacillus OR Bifidobacterium OR Propionibacterium OR Saccharomyces OR
9 153 "Bacillus coagulans") AND (colon OR colorectal OR colonic OR rectal) AND (cancer OR
10 154 neopla* OR tumo* OR carcinoma OR malignan*) AND ("clinical trial" OR "intervention study"
11 155 OR "RCT" OR "randomised controlled trial" OR "randomized controlled trial")
12
13

14 156 **Selection process of included studies**

15
16 157 The primary article screening will be carried out independently by two reviewers. Titles and
17 158 abstract of the studies will be screened independently, and the selected studies will be divided
18 159 into three groups: relevant, irrelevant and unsure. The studies which are categorized as irrelevant
19 160 by both reviewers will then be eliminated from the review. The full text of the remaining studies
20 161 will be then reviewed by both reviewers using the eligibility criteria and studies that meet all the
21 162 criteria will be included. In case of discrepancy, the two reviewers will first meet to discuss their
22 163 choices and a final decision will be made. If there is any misunderstanding or conflict a third
23 164 opinion will be sought from the other reviewers and when an agreement is reached, a final
24 165 decision will be made.
25
26

27 166 **Data extraction and Analysis**

28
29 167 Studies meeting the inclusion criteria will be processed for data extraction. Two authors (DIJ and
30 168 MAA) will independently screen title and abstract, and then full text. The data will be extracted
31 169 and recorded in a consistent way using standardized data extraction form. The following data
32 170 will be extracted: study year, author/s, study title, number of participants, stage of colorectal
33 171 cancer, type of probiotic used, dosage of intervention, duration of intervention, control or
34 172 placebo used, primary outcomes, secondary outcomes, conclusion and limitation.
35
36

37
38 173 The search and study framework will be represented using PRISMA flow chart²⁴ and the
39 174 numbers of all included and excluded studies will be reported and the reasons for exclusion of
40 175 studies will be given.
41

42 176 **Assessment of risk of bias of included studies**

43
44 177 The risk of bias will be assessed according to the guidelines of the Cochrane Collaboration using
45 178 ROB tool.²⁵ this tool will be based on the following domains: random sequence generation,
46 179 allocation concealment, adequacy of blinding for participants, blinding of outcome assessment,
47 180 incomplete outcome data and selective reporting, and other sources of bias. RoB 2.0 will be used
48 181 for risk of bias assessment of included study via RevMan version 5.3 software.²⁶ Two reviewers
49 182 independently will carry out the assessment and if there is any conflict, third opinion will be
50 183 obtained from third partner.
51
52

53 184

54 55 185 **Strategy for data synthesis**

1
2
3 186 Initial screening of the relevant studies showed that the outcomes of the included studies are not
4 187 homogenous and cannot be pooled together, therefore meta-analysis most likely will not be
5 188 carried out. Instead, qualitative analysis will be used to synthesize the studies included in the
6 189 systematic review. The quality of all included studies will be assessed by using PRISMA
7 190 checklist²⁴ to ensure that the included studies are of good quality and to ensure that there is no
8 191 publication bias.

11 192 **Patients and public involvement**

13 193 There will be no need to involve patients or members of the general public in the design of this
14 194 systematic review, and no patients or member of the public will be contacted in order to
15 195 complete the systematic review.

17 196 **Ethics and dissemination**

19 197 Findings of this systematic review will be published in a peer-reviewed publication and will be
20 198 presented at a professional conference. Because this is only a protocol, no ethical assessment is
21 199 required.

24 200 **Author Contributions**

26 201 DIJ and MAA contributed to the conception of the study. The systematic review protocol was
27 202 drafted by DIJ and was revised by MAA and AMA. The search strategy was developed by DIJ
28 203 and MAA and will be performed by DIJ and MAA, who will also independently screen the
29 204 potential studies, extract data from the included studies, assess the risk of bias and complete the
30 205 data synthesis. AMA and SH will arbitrate in cases of disagreement and ensure the absence of
31 206 errors. All authors reviewed approved the publication of the protocol.

34 207 **Funding statement**

36 208 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or
37 209 not-for-profit sectors.

39 210 **Competing interests' statement:** NONE

41 211 **Word count:** ≤ 2000 words

43 212 **Data statement section:** Not Applicable

45 213

47 214

49 215

51 216

52 217 **REFERENCES**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
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
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 218 1. dos Reis SA, da Conceição LL, Siqueira NP, et al. Review of the mechanisms of probiotic actions in the
219 prevention of colorectal cancer. *Nutrition Research* 2017;37:1-19. doi:
220 10.1016/j.nutres.2016.11.009
- 221 2. Chen W, Zheng R, Baade PD, et al. Cancer statistics in China, 2015. *CA: a cancer journal for clinicians*
222 2016;66(2):115-32.
- 223 3. Charbonneau MR, Blanton LV, DiGiulio DB, et al. A microbial perspective of human developmental
224 biology. *Nature* 2016;535(7610):48-55.
- 225 4. Shao T, Yang Y-X. Cholecystectomy and the risk of colorectal cancer. *American Journal of*
226 *Gastroenterology* 2005;100(8):1813-20.
- 227 5. Song M, Chan AT. Environmental Factors, Gut Microbiota, and Colorectal Cancer Prevention. *Clinical*
228 *Gastroenterology and Hepatology* 2019;17(2):275-89. doi: 10.1016/j.cgh.2018.07.012
- 229 6. Mármol I, Sánchez-de-Diego C, Dieste AP, et al. Colorectal carcinoma: A general overview and future
230 perspectives in colorectal cancer. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* 2017;18(1) doi:
231 10.3390/ijms18010197
- 232 7. Ai L, Tian H, Chen Z, et al. Systematic evaluation of supervised classifiers for fecal microbiota-based
233 prediction of colorectal cancer. *Oncotarget* 2017;8(6):9546.
- 234 8. Darbandi A, Mirshekar M, Shariati A, et al. The Effects of Probiotics on Reducing the Colorectal Cancer
235 Surgery Complications: A Periodic Review during 2007-2017. *Clinical Nutrition* 2019
- 236 9. Gibson GR, Hutkins R, Sanders ME, et al. Expert consensus document: The International Scientific
237 Association for Probiotics and Prebiotics (ISAPP) consensus statement on the definition and
238 scope of prebiotics. *Nature reviews Gastroenterology & hepatology* 2017;14(8):491.
- 239 10. Uccello M, Malaguarnera G, Basile F, et al. Potential role of probiotics on colorectal cancer
240 prevention. *BMC surgery* 2012;12(S1):S35.
- 241 11. Roberfroid M. Prebiotics: the concept revisited. *The Journal of nutrition* 2007;137(3):830S-37S.
- 242 12. Lytvyn L, Quach K, Banfield L, et al. Probiotics and synbiotics for the prevention of postoperative
243 infections following abdominal surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized
244 controlled trials. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 2016;92(2):130-39. doi: 10.1016/j.jhin.2015.08.028
- 245 13. Kasatpibal N, Whitney JAD, Saokaew S, et al. Effectiveness of Probiotic, Prebiotic, and Synbiotic
246 Therapies in Reducing Postoperative Complications: A Systematic Review and Network Meta-
247 analysis. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2017;64:S153-S60. doi: 10.1093/cid/cix114
- 248 14. Chang J-H, Shim YY, Cha S-K, et al. Effect of Lactobacillus acidophilus KFR1342 on the development of
249 chemically induced precancerous growths in the rat colon. *Journal of medical microbiology*
250 2012;61(3):361-68.
- 251 15. Liu Z, Qin H, Yang Z, et al. Randomised clinical trial: The effects of perioperative probiotic treatment
252 on barrier function and post-operative infectious complications in colorectal cancer surgery - A
253 double-blind study. *Alimentary Pharmacology and Therapeutics* 2011;33(1):50-63. doi:
254 10.1111/j.1365-2036.2010.04492.x
- 255 16. Ku S, Park MS, Ji GE, et al. Review on bifidobacterium bifidum bgn4: Functionality and nutraceutical
256 applications as a probiotic microorganism. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*
257 2016;17(9) doi: 10.3390/ijms17091544
- 258 17. Gamallat Y, Meyiah A, Kuugbee ED, et al. Lactobacillus rhamnosus induced epithelial cell apoptosis,
259 ameliorates inflammation and prevents colon cancer development in an animal model.
260 *Biomedicine and Pharmacotherapy* 2016;83:536-41. doi: 10.1016/j.biopha.2016.07.001
- 261 18. Serban DE. Gastrointestinal cancers: influence of gut microbiota, probiotics and prebiotics. *Cancer*
262 *letters* 2014;345(2):258-70.
- 263 19. Fotiadis CI, Stoidis CN, Spyropoulos BG, et al. Role of probiotics, prebiotics and synbiotics in
264 chemoprevention for colorectal cancer. *World journal of gastroenterology* 2008;14(42):6453-57.
265 doi: 10.3748/wjg.14.6453

- 1
2
3 266 20. Liu PC, Yan YK, Ma YJ, et al. Probiotics Reduce Postoperative Infections in Patients Undergoing
4 267 Colorectal Surgery: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Gastroenterology Research and*
5 268 *Practice* 2017 doi: 10.1155/2017/6029075
6
7 269 21. Skonieczna-Zydecka K, Kaczmarczyk M, Loniewski I, et al. A Systematic Review, Meta-Analysis, and
8 270 Meta-Regression Evaluating the Efficacy and Mechanisms of Action of Probiotics and Synbiotics
9 271 in the Prevention of Surgical Site Infections and Surgery-Related Complications. *Journal of*
10 272 *Clinical Medicine* 2018;7(12) doi: 10.3390/jcm7120556
11 273 22. Lu DX, Yan J, Liu F, et al. Probiotics in preventing and treating chemotherapy-induced diarrhea: a
12 274 meta-analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 2019;28(4):701-10. doi:
13 275 10.6133/apjcn.201912_28(4).0005
14 276 23. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-
15 277 analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *Bmj* 2015;349
16 278 24. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-
17 279 analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Annals of internal medicine* 2009;151(4):264-69.
18 280 25. Sterne JA, Savović J, Page MJ, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised
19 281 trials. *bmj* 2019;366
20 282 26. Collaboration C. Review Manager (RevMan)[Computer Program] Version 5.2. 3. Copenhagen: The
21 283 Nordic Cochrane Centre; 2012. *HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY REVIEW* 2014;17
22
23
24 284

Reporting checklist for protocol of a systematic review.

Based on the PRISMA-P guidelines.

Instructions to authors

Complete this checklist by entering the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.

Your article may not currently address all the items on the checklist. Please modify your text to include the missing information. If you are certain that an item does not apply, please write "n/a" and provide a short explanation.

Upload your completed checklist as an extra file when you submit to a journal.

In your methods section, say that you used the PRISMA-Reporting guidelines, and cite them as:

Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev.* 2015;4(1):1.

		Reporting Item	Page Number
Title			
Identification	#1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	Page 1
Update	#1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	N/A
Registration			
	#2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	Under review by PROSPERO
Authors			
Contact	#3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	Page 1
Contribution	#3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	Page 7

Amendments

[#4](#) If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments

N/A

Support

Sources [#5a](#) Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review

Page 7

Sponsor [#5b](#) Provide name for the review funder and / or sponsor

N/A

Role of sponsor or funder [#5c](#) Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and / or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol

N/A

Introduction

Rationale [#6](#) Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known

Page 3-4

Objectives [#7](#) Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)

Page 4

Methods

Eligibility criteria [#8](#) Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review

Page 4-5

Information sources [#9](#) Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage

Page 5

Search strategy [#10](#) Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated

Page 5-6

Study records - data management [#11a](#) Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review

Page 6

1	Study records -	#11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies	Page 6
2	selection process		(such as two independent reviewers) through each	
3			phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and	
4			inclusion in meta-analysis)	
5				
6				
7				
8	Study records -	#11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from	Page 6
9	data collection		reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in	
10	process		duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming	
11			data from investigators	
12				
13				
14	Data items	#12	List and define all variables for which data will be	Page 6
15			sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any	
16			pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	
17				
18				
19				
20	Outcomes and	#13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be	Page 5
21	prioritization		sought, including prioritization of main and additional	
22			outcomes, with rationale	
23				
24				
25	Risk of bias in	#14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias	Page 6
26	individual studies		of individual studies, including whether this will be done	
27			at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this	
28			information will be used in data synthesis	
29				
30				
31				
32	Data synthesis	#15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be	Page 6
33			quantitatively synthesised	
34				
35				
36	Data synthesis	#15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis,	N/A
37			describe planned summary measures, methods of	
38			handling data and methods of combining data from	
39			studies, including any planned exploration of	
40			consistency (such as I ² , Kendall's τ)	
41				
42				
43				
44	Data synthesis	#15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as	N/A
45			sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	
46				
47				
48	Data synthesis	#15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the	Page 7
49			type of summary planned	
50				
51				
52	Meta-bias(es)	#16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es)	N/A
53			(such as publication bias across studies, selective	
54			reporting within studies)	
55				
56				
57	Confidence in	#17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will	N/A
58	cumulative		be assessed (such as GRADE)	
59				
60				

evidence

None The PRISMA-P checklist is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY 4.0. This checklist can be completed online using <https://www.goodreports.org/>, a tool made by the [EQUATOR Network](#) in collaboration with [Penelope.ai](#)

For peer review only

BMJ Open

The role of Probiotics in colorectal cancer patients: A systematic review protocol of randomized controlled trial studies

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-038128.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	14-May-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Dikeocha, Ifeoma; Cyberjaya University College of Medical Sciences, Medical science Al-kabsi, Abdelkodose; Cyberjaya University College of Medical Sciences, Medical science Hussin, Salasawati; Cyberjaya University College of Medical Sciences, Medical science Alshawsh, Mohammed; University of Malaya Faculty of Medicine, Pharmacology
Primary Subject Heading:	Oncology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Oncology, Pharmacology and therapeutics, Public health
Keywords:	Gastrointestinal tumours < ONCOLOGY, Microbiology < PATHOLOGY, Clinical trials < THERAPEUTICS

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

The role of probiotics in colorectal cancer patients: A systematic review protocol of randomized controlled trial studies

Dikeocha Ifeoma Julieth¹ Abdelkodose M Al-kabsi¹ Salasawati Hussin¹ Mohammed Abdullah Alshawsh^{2*}

¹ Faculty of Medicine, University of Cyberjaya, Persiaran Bestari 63000 Cyberjaya, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia.

² Department of Pharmacology, Faculty of Medicine, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur 50603, Malaysia

* Correspondence: alshawshmam@um.edu.my ; alshawshmam@yahoo.com *Telephone no. +60379674950

Dikeocha Ifeoma Julieth: 1812-0326@st.cyberjaya.edu.my ; ifeomadikeocha19@gmail.com

Assistant Prof. Dr. Abdelkodose M Al-kabsi: abdelkodose@cyberjaya.edu.my; abdelkodose@gmail.com

Associate Prof. Dr. Salasawati Hussin: salasawati@cyberjaya.edu.my

Associate Prof. Dr. Mohammed Abdullah Alshawsh: alshawshmam@um.edu.my ; alshawshmam@yahoo.com

Abstract

Introduction: Colorectal cancer is one of the leading causes of cancer related morbidity worldwide and it has been reported to be associated with poor lifestyle habits which include excess tobacco and alcohol intake as well as genetics and age factors. Probiotics such as the Lactic acid bacteria and Bifidobacterium as well as probiotic containing foods (kombucha, kefir, miso etc.) have received lots of attention as anticancer agents for prevention and treatment. The effects of the administration of probiotics to colorectal cancer patients is the primary goal of this systematic review. The overall aim is to assess how the use of probiotics in colorectal cancer patients helps in the management of colorectal cancer and its effect on the diversity of gut microbiota. The final systematic review will provide a comprehensive evidence base for the use and efficacy of probiotics in colorectal cancer patient care.

Methods and analysis: The systematic review, will be conducted by extensively searching different databases such as PubMed, Web of Science, Scopus, Wiley and ProQuest to identify randomized controlled trials (with no time frame) which relate to the administration of probiotics to colorectal cancer patients. The search strategy will include words like colorectal cancer, probiotics, Bifidobacterium, clinical trials etc. A systematic search of databases was performed between 17 and 20 January 2020. Two reviewers will independently review the studies and also search the reference lists of the eligible studies to obtain more references. Data will be extracted from the eligible studies using standardized data extraction form. After assessing the risk of bias, qualitative analysis will be used to synthesize the systematic review.

Ethics and Dissemination: This is a protocol for a systematic review; therefore, it doesn't require any ethics approval. We intend to disseminate the protocol in a peer reviewed journal.

35 **Keywords:** Probiotics; Colorectal Cancer; Randomized controlled trial studies; Clinical trial;
36 Colorectal neoplasms.

37 **Strengths and Limitations of this study:**

38 **Strengths and Limitations of this study:**

- 39 • The findings from this systematic review will provide current insight on how
40 probiotics are used either alone or in combination to improve the quality of life of
41 colorectal cancer patients.
- 42 • This study will highlight the efficacy and the underlying mechanism of actions of
43 probiotics against colorectal cancer
- 44 • The findings from this review will improve our knowledge of the beneficial
45 effects of probiotics in prevention and management of colorectal cancer.
- 46 • There will be limitations inherent to any systematic review such as the lack of
47 information on outcome variables, as well as the assumption that the evaluation
48 techniques are consistent across studies.
- 49 • Only studies in English language will be included in this systematic review.

46 **Introduction:**

47 Colorectal cancer (CRC) refers to tumors that start in the colon and spreads all the way to the
48 rectum. Different types of colorectal polyps exist, but colorectal cancer usually develops from
49 adenomas. CRC is one of the very common causes of mortality amongst cancer patients
50 worldwide including developed and undeveloped countries but mostly in first world countries. It
51 is predicted that by 2035, over 25 million incidences of CRC will be discovered on a yearly
52 basis.¹ It is also estimated that over 376,000 new cases of colorectal cancer diagnosis as well as
53 approximately 200,000 deaths take place yearly in China.²

54 Colorectal cancer proves to be a silent killer ailment that may not be noticed in time until the
55 cancer has progressed significantly. Symptoms of CRC resemble symptoms of several ailments
56 and is easily misdiagnosed unless a colonoscopy is done. The symptoms of CRC include
57 unexplained anemia, unexplained weight loss, bloating, changes in the bowel movement habits,
58 bloody stool, vomiting and pelvic pain. It has been proven that the initiating events of CRC
59 include TP53 mutation in colorectal cancer associated with colitis (CAC) as well as mutation in
60 sporadic colorectal cancer (SCC).³ Different causes of colorectal cancer have been examined
61 over the years from data collected in cohort-based studies and these findings resemble studies
62 carried out in animal models, The common conclusion is that age, lifestyle choices such as
63 smoking and excessive alcohol intake which can lead to obesity or diabetes, as well as genetic
64 risk factors, contribute to the development of CRC.^{4 5}

65 Colorectal cancer can also be inherited through the genes by inheriting mutated genes that trigger
66 tumor growth, but this only accounts for about 5% of colorectal cancer cases.⁶ In addition,
67 different researchers in their studies have agreed that an increased number of opportunistic
68 bacteria which quickly turn pathogenic such as *Helicobacter pylori*, *Bacteroides fragilis*,
69 *Helicobacter hepaticus*, *enterotoxigenic Escherichia coli*, *Fusobacterium nucleatum*, and

70 *Streptococcus bovis*, can lead to the initiation of adenomas formation that lead to colorectal
71 cancer.⁷

72 Colorectal cancer patients usually undergo surgery to remove cancerous polyps or to remove
73 some part of their colon which have been affected (colon resection). Others undergo
74 chemotherapy or radiotherapy to treat CRC. These treatment options are sometimes unsuccessful
75 or lead to a myriad of severe side effects which increase hospital stay time and sometimes
76 morbidity.⁸

77 Probiotics is redefined by the international scientific association for probiotics and prebiotics
78 (ISAPP) as “live microorganisms which when administered in adequate amounts, confer a health
79 benefit on the host”.⁹ Probiotic microorganisms are special because they are capable of surviving
80 in the human gastrointestinal tract before they get to the colon, where the majority of their
81 metabolic activity is carried out. They include lactic acid producing bacteria (LAB) of the genera
82 *Lactobacillus* and *Bifidobacterium* as well as *Propionibacterium*, *Saccharomyces* and are the
83 major ingredients in yoghurts and other functional foods such as unfermented milks, cheese,
84 kefir, fermented milk.¹⁰

85 On the other hand, prebiotics are usually termed as non-digestible carbohydrates such as inulin
86 and oligosaccharides, soy and resistant starch. Prebiotics is defined by ISAPP as “a substrate that
87 is selectively utilized by host microorganisms to confer health benefit to the host”.⁹ Prebiotics
88 stimulate an increased growth of probiotics by providing a more favorable environment for their
89 growth.¹¹ Leading to a gut environment that promotes the competitive dismissal of opportunistic
90 and potentially pathogenic bacteria which could initiate the beginning of CRC.¹¹ Several studies
91 have shown that the administration of both probiotics and prebiotics as a combination can aid
92 increasingly in improving the conditions of CRC patients especially after colorectal surgery has
93 been performed.^{12 13}

94 Probiotics have been utilized by the traditional healers for the prevention and treatment of
95 different types of illnesses from the simple stomach ache to intestinal neoplasia. In addition
96 various experimental studies have shown that continuous ingestion of probiotic bacteria can
97 enhance the qualitative as well as quantitative components of the gut microbiota.¹⁴ In one
98 instance, the ingestion of *Lactobacillus acidophilus* LA-11, *Lactobacillus plantarum* CGMCC
99 1258, and *Bifidobacterium longum* BL-88 (2.6×10^{14} [CFU]/d) for 16days, resulted in an
100 increase in the diversification of gut microflora and microbial richness in patients suffering from
101 CRC who have been scheduled for colectomy. Eventually, the microbial flora makeup of these
102 individuals improved to resemble that of individuals without CRC.¹⁵ Probiotic bacteria when
103 consumed in adequate quantities are able to diminish the total quantity of non beneficial disease
104 causing bacteria found in the colon by numerous mechanisms, particularly as regards; rivalry for
105 nutrients, growth factors, and adhesion of the probiotics onto the intestinal cells of the host.¹⁶
106 Ingestion of probiotic also inhibits the activity of pathobionts such as *Clostridium perfringens*
107 and *Klebsiella pneumonia* which are potential pathogenic microorganisms and could also be
108 symbiotic microorganisms under certain gut environment conditions.¹⁷ Some probiotic bacteria
109 can produce antibacterial substances such as bacteriocins, hydrogen peroxide, lactic acid and
110 reuterin, which decrease the growth or totally eradicate pathogenic bacteria from the colon. The

1
2
3 111 very popular advantages of the consumption and use of probiotics in the management and
4 112 treatment of diarrhea associated to anti-cancer chemotherapy revolves around the restoration to
5 113 normal of the intestinal microbiota.¹⁸ The favourable alteration by probiotic bacteria in the
6 114 makeup of the gut microbiome is closely associated with the reduced risk of suffering from CRC
7 115 in the future.¹⁹ Production of short chain fatty acids (SCFA) by probiotics which leads to cell
8 116 apoptosis is one of the ways through which probiotics reduce the proliferation of colorectal
9 117 carcinoma.²⁰ Scientific evidence by various *in-vitro* and *in-vivo* studies have concluded that
10 118 various strains of probiotics possess anti-carcinogenic properties via different mechanisms.^{21 22}

11 119 Based on our search on systematic reviews related to our topic, we found out that most of the
12 120 systematic reviews which have been done were not entirely specific to colorectal cancer,¹² and
13 121 those that are specific to probiotics and colorectal cancer patients focus on one outcome either on
14 122 postoperative complications,²³ surgical site infection,²⁴ diarrhea from chemotherapy.²⁵ We see
15 123 this as a limitation of these studies, hence we intend to study more than one outcome in order to
16 124 get a holistic idea of how probiotics administration affect colorectal cancer patients who are
17 125 receiving different types of treatment on different levels. As we will assess several outcomes,
18 126 these outcomes will be categorized and discussed based on if they are primary or secondary
19 127 outcomes. Previously published reviews related to probiotics mostly investigated its effect on
20 128 CRC and the mechanisms through which probiotics ameliorate CRC using diverse models
21 129 including pre-clinical studies, and in-vitro studies.^{26 27} Some reviews also focused more on the
22 130 use of specific probiotic as anticancer adjuvant.²⁸ Our systematic review is unique and different
23 131 from other reviews in which we intend to include only randomized clinical trial studies (RCT)
24 132 and assess the effects of the administration of various types of probiotics on colorectal cancer
25 133 patients.

33 134 **Review Aim**

34
35 135 To systematically review, assess, and summarize and interpret clinical trials studies on how the
36 136 use of probiotics compared to placebo in colorectal cancer patients helps in the treatment, and
37 137 management of colorectal cancer. In addition, this study will critically summarize how probiotics
38 138 administration in CRC patients affect the diversity of gut microbiome and patient quality of life.

40 139 **Methods and Analysis**

41
42 140 This systematic review protocol goes in accordance to the Preferred Reporting Items for
43 141 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) guidelines.²⁹

45 142 **Eligibility Criteria for Included Studies**

46 143 The inclusion criteria include studies on colorectal cancer patients who were treated with
47 144 chemotherapy, radiotherapy or surgery. The included studies must be carried out as randomized
48 145 controlled trials with either a comparator group, control group or placebo group. Details of the
49 146 inclusion and exclusion criteria that will be used in the systematic review is in Table 1.

50 147

51 148

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

149 **Table 1. Eligibility criteria based on PICOS model**

Items based on PICOS model	Eligibility criteria
i. Population, or participants and conditions of interest	<p>Humans, any age, diagnosed with colorectal cancer or with colon cancer or rectal cancer and have been treated with probiotics as an intervention and this will include:</p> <p>Colorectal cancer patients who have had colorectal surgery or colon resection or haven't had surgery. Colorectal cancer patients who had or are still undergoing chemotherapy or radiotherapy or not.</p>
ii. Interventions or exposures	<p>Probiotics of any kind (e.g. <i>Lactobacillus</i>, <i>Bifidobacterium</i>, <i>Propionibacterium</i>, <i>Saccharomyces</i> etc.) used on its own or in combination with other probiotics or combination with prebiotics such as inulin or resistant starch etc.</p>
iii. Comparisons or control groups	<p>Placebos, or healthy people of any age, without colorectal cancer. Baseline comparison of patients before the intervention</p>
iv. Outcomes of interest	<p><i>Primary outcomes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Effects of probiotics on the diversity of human gut microbiota. -Effects of probiotics on inflammatory biomarkers relevant to CRC. -Immunoregulatory action of probiotics. <p><i>Secondary outcomes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Patient status (improvement/ no improvement of colorectal carcinoma) after administration of probiotics. - Prognosis such as imaging to compare the size of cancer tumour before and after intervention - General health and improvement in quality of life of the patient - Adverse events such as morbidity and mortality
v. Study designs	<p>Clinical trials, randomized clinical trials.</p>
vi. Other exclusion criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articles not in English language. • Reviews • Animal or <i>in vitro</i> work done with probiotics. • Studies not about colorectal cancer or rectal or colon cancer. • Studies not testing the role of probiotics on colorectal cancer or rectal or colon cancer patients.

150

151

152 **Search strategy**

153 The relevant studies will be identified using standard search terms for individual databases.
154 Randomized controlled trials will be identified from PubMed, Web of Science, Scopus, Wiley
155 and ProQuest. The search results will be filtered to identify studies only in English. The
156 bibliography of all included randomized controlled trials will be reviewed to identify any trials
157 missed during the initial database search. This will be done independently by two reviewers.
158 Search terms will be used and connected by Boolean AND/OR operators:

159 The search syntax for PubMed will include:

- 160 1. Probiotic* OR Lactobacillus OR Bifidobacterium OR Propionibacterium OR Saccharomyces
161 OR "Bacillus coagulans"
- 162 2. colon OR colorectal OR colonic OR rectal
- 163 3. cancer OR neopla* OR tumo* OR carcinoma OR malignan*
- 164 4. clinical trial OR trial* OR "intervention study" OR RCT OR "randomized controlled trial" OR
165 "randomised controlled trial"
- 166 5. #2 AND #3
- 167 6. #1 AND #4 AND #5

168 The search syntax for other databases will be using similar approach as PubMed or using the
169 following merged search terms:

170 (Probiotic OR Lactobacillus OR Bifidobacterium OR Propionibacterium OR Saccharomyces OR
171 "Bacillus coagulans") AND (colon OR colorectal OR colonic OR rectal) AND (cancer OR
172 neopla* OR tumo* OR carcinoma OR malignan*) AND ("clinical trial" OR "intervention study"
173 OR "RCT" OR "randomised controlled trial" OR "randomized controlled trial")

174 A systematic search of PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, ProQuest and Wiley online library
175 was performed between 17 and 20 January 2020.

176 **Selection process of included studies**

177 The primary article screening will be carried out independently by two reviewers. Titles and
178 abstract of the studies will be screened independently, and the selected studies will be divided
179 into three groups: relevant, irrelevant and unsure. The studies which are categorized as irrelevant
180 by both reviewers will then be eliminated from the review. The full text of the remaining studies
181 will be then reviewed by both reviewers using the eligibility criteria and studies that meet all the
182 criteria will be included. In case of discrepancy, the two reviewers will first meet to discuss their
183 choices and a final decision will be made. If there is any misunderstanding or conflict a third
184 opinion will be sought from the other reviewers and when an agreement is reached, a final
185 decision will be made.

186

187 **Data extraction and Analysis**

188 Studies meeting the inclusion criteria will be processed for data extraction. Two authors (DIJ and
189 MAA) will independently screen title and abstract, and then full text. The data will be extracted
190 and recorded in a consistent way using standardized data extraction form. The following data
191 will be extracted: study year, author/s, study title, number of participants, stage of colorectal
192 cancer, type of probiotic used, dosage of intervention, duration of intervention, control or
193 placebo used, primary outcomes, secondary outcomes, conclusion and limitation.

194 The search and study framework will be represented using PRISMA flow chart³⁰ and the
195 numbers of all included and excluded studies will be reported and the reasons for exclusion of
196 studies will be given.

197 **Assessment of risk of bias of included studies**

198 The risk of bias will be assessed according to the guidelines of the Cochrane Collaboration using
199 ROB tool.³¹ this tool will be based on the following domains: random sequence generation,
200 allocation concealment, adequacy of blinding for participants, blinding of outcome assessment,
201 incomplete outcome data and selective reporting, and other sources of bias. RoB 2.0 will be used
202 for risk of bias assessment of included study via RevMan version 5.3 software.³² Two reviewers
203 independently will carry out the assessment and if there is any conflict, third opinion will be
204 obtained from third partner.

206 **Strategy for data synthesis**

207 Initial screening of the relevant RCT studies showed that most of the outcomes of the included
208 studies are not homogenous and cannot be pooled together, therefore meta-analysis most likely
209 will not be carried out. Instead, a qualitative analysis will be performed to synthesize the studies
210 included in the systematic review as well as a critical appraisal of the outcomes will be
211 considered for all studies. However, after we complete the data extraction of all included studies
212 if we find out that any of the outcomes is homogenous across some of the studies, then a meta-
213 analysis of those selected outcomes will be carried out. The quality of all included studies will
214 be assessed by using PRISMA checklist³⁰ to ensure that the included studies are of good quality
215 and to ensure that there is no publication bias.

216 **Patients and public involvement**

217 There will be no need to involve patients or members of the general public in the design of this
218 systematic review, and no patients or member of the public will be contacted in order to
219 complete the systematic review.

220 **Ethics and dissemination**

221 Findings of this systematic review will be published in a peer-reviewed publication and will be
222 presented at a professional conference. Because this is only a protocol, no ethical assessment is
223 required.

224 Author Contributions

225 DIJ and MAA contributed to the conception of the study. The systematic review protocol was
226 drafted by DIJ and was reviewed by MAA and AMA. The search strategy was developed by DIJ
227 and MAA and will be performed by DIJ and MAA, who will also independently screen the
228 potential studies, extract data from the included studies, assess the risk of bias and complete the
229 data synthesis. AMA and SH will arbitrate in cases of disagreement and ensure the absence of
230 errors. All authors reviewed approved the publication of the protocol.

231 Funding statement

232 This research received no specific grant from commercial or not-for-profit sectors. University of
233 Malaya will support the systematic review study with FRGS grant number FP103-2019A.

234 **Competing interests' statement:** NONE

235 **Word count:** >2500 words

236 **Data statement section:** Not Applicable

237

238

239

240

241 REFERENCES

- 242 1. dos Reis SA, da Conceição LL, Siqueira NP, et al. Review of the mechanisms of probiotic actions in the
243 prevention of colorectal cancer. *Nutrition Research* 2017;37:1-19. doi:
244 10.1016/j.nutres.2016.11.009
- 245 2. Chen W, Zheng R, Baade PD, et al. Cancer statistics in China, 2015. *CA: a cancer journal for clinicians*
246 2016;66(2):115-32.
- 247 3. Charbonneau MR, Blanton LV, DiGiulio DB, et al. A microbial perspective of human developmental
248 biology. *Nature* 2016;535(7610):48-55.
- 249 4. Shao T, Yang Y-X. Cholecystectomy and the risk of colorectal cancer. *American Journal of*
250 *Gastroenterology* 2005;100(8):1813-20.
- 251 5. Song M, Chan AT. Environmental Factors, Gut Microbiota, and Colorectal Cancer Prevention. *Clinical*
252 *Gastroenterology and Hepatology* 2019;17(2):275-89. doi: 10.1016/j.cgh.2018.07.012
- 253 6. Mármol I, Sánchez-de-Diego C, Dieste AP, et al. Colorectal carcinoma: A general overview and future
254 perspectives in colorectal cancer. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* 2017;18(1) doi:
255 10.3390/ijms18010197
- 256 7. Ai L, Tian H, Chen Z, et al. Systematic evaluation of supervised classifiers for fecal microbiota-based
257 prediction of colorectal cancer. *Oncotarget* 2017;8(6):9546.
- 258 8. Darbandi A, Mirshekar M, Shariati A, et al. The Effects of Probiotics on Reducing the Colorectal Cancer
259 Surgery Complications: A Periodic Review during 2007-2017. *Clinical Nutrition* 2019
- 260 9. Gibson GR, Hutkins R, Sanders ME, et al. Expert consensus document: The International Scientific
261 Association for Probiotics and Prebiotics (ISAPP) consensus statement on the definition and
262 scope of prebiotics. *Nature reviews Gastroenterology & hepatology* 2017;14(8):491.

- 1
2
3 263 10. Uccello M, Malaguarnera G, Basile F, et al. Potential role of probiotics on colorectal cancer
4 264 prevention. *BMC surgery* 2012;12(S1):S35.
- 5 265 11. Roberfroid M. Prebiotics: the concept revisited. *The Journal of nutrition* 2007;137(3):830S-37S.
- 6 266 12. Lytvyn L, Quach K, Banfield L, et al. Probiotics and synbiotics for the prevention of postoperative
7 267 infections following abdominal surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized
8 268 controlled trials. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 2016;92(2):130-39. doi: 10.1016/j.jhin.2015.08.028
- 9 269 13. Kasatpibal N, Whitney JAD, Saokaew S, et al. Effectiveness of Probiotic, Prebiotic, and Synbiotic
10 270 Therapies in Reducing Postoperative Complications: A Systematic Review and Network Meta-
11 271 analysis. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2017;64:S153-S60. doi: 10.1093/cid/cix114
- 12 272 14. Chang J-H, Shim YY, Cha S-K, et al. Effect of Lactobacillus acidophilus KFRI342 on the development of
13 273 chemically induced precancerous growths in the rat colon. *Journal of medical microbiology*
14 274 2012;61(3):361-68.
- 15 275 15. Liu Z, Qin H, Yang Z, et al. Randomised clinical trial: The effects of perioperative probiotic treatment
16 276 on barrier function and post-operative infectious complications in colorectal cancer surgery - A
17 277 double-blind study. *Alimentary Pharmacology and Therapeutics* 2011;33(1):50-63. doi:
18 278 10.1111/j.1365-2036.2010.04492.x
- 19 279 16. Ku S, Park MS, Ji GE, et al. Review on bifidobacterium bifidum bgn4: Functionality and nutraceutical
20 280 applications as a probiotic microorganism. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*
21 281 2016;17(9) doi: 10.3390/ijms17091544
- 22 282 17. Vitetta L, Vitetta G, Hall S. Immunological tolerance and function: associations between intestinal
23 283 bacteria, probiotics, prebiotics, and phages. *Frontiers in immunology* 2018;9:2240.
- 24 284 18. Gamallat Y, Meyiah A, Kuugbee ED, et al. Lactobacillus rhamnosus induced epithelial cell apoptosis,
25 285 ameliorates inflammation and prevents colon cancer development in an animal model.
26 286 *Biomedicine and Pharmacotherapy* 2016;83:536-41. doi: 10.1016/j.biopha.2016.07.001
- 27 287 19. Serban DE. Gastrointestinal cancers: influence of gut microbiota, probiotics and prebiotics. *Cancer*
28 288 *letters* 2014;345(2):258-70.
- 29 289 20. Fotiadis CI, Stoidis CN, Spyropoulos BG, et al. Role of probiotics, prebiotics and synbiotics in
30 290 chemoprevention for colorectal cancer. *World journal of gastroenterology* 2008;14(42):6453-57.
31 291 doi: 10.3748/wjg.14.6453
- 32 292 21. de Ameida Brasiel PG, Luquetti SCPD, Peluzio MdCG, et al. Preclinical Evidence of Probiotics in
33 293 Colorectal Carcinogenesis: A Systematic Review. *Digestive diseases and sciences* 2020:1-14.
- 34 294 22. Eslami M, Yousefi B, Kokhaei P, et al. Importance of probiotics in the prevention and treatment of
35 295 colorectal cancer. *Journal of cellular physiology* 2019;234(10):17127-43.
- 36 296 23. Liu PC, Yan YK, Ma YJ, et al. Probiotics Reduce Postoperative Infections in Patients Undergoing
37 297 Colorectal Surgery: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Gastroenterology Research and*
38 298 *Practice* 2017 doi: 10.1155/2017/6029075
- 39 299 24. Skonieczna-Zydecka K, Kaczmarczyk M, Loniewski I, et al. A Systematic Review, Meta-Analysis, and
40 300 Meta-Regression Evaluating the Efficacy and Mechanisms of Action of Probiotics and Synbiotics
41 301 in the Prevention of Surgical Site Infections and Surgery-Related Complications. *Journal of*
42 302 *Clinical Medicine* 2018;7(12) doi: 10.3390/jcm7120556
- 43 303 25. Lu DX, Yan J, Liu F, et al. Probiotics in preventing and treating chemotherapy-induced diarrhea: a
44 304 meta-analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 2019;28(4):701-10. doi:
45 305 10.6133/apjcn.201912_28(4).0005
- 46 306 26. Cruz B, Sarandy MM, Messias AC, et al. Preclinical and clinical relevance of probiotics and synbiotics
47 307 in colorectal carcinogenesis: a systematic review. *Nutrition reviews* 2020
- 48 308 27. Sivamaruthi BS, Kesika P, Chaiyasut C. The Role of Probiotics in Colorectal Cancer Management.
49 309 *Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine* 2020;2020

- 1
2
3 310 28. Vivarelli S, Falzone L, Basile MS, et al. Benefits of using probiotics as adjuvants in anticancer therapy.
4 311 *World Academy of Sciences Journal* 2019;1(3):125-35.
5 312 29. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-
6 313 analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *Bmj* 2015;349
7 314 30. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-
8 315 analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Annals of internal medicine* 2009;151(4):264-69.
9 316 31. Sterne JA, Savović J, Page MJ, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised
10 317 trials. *bmj* 2019;366
11 318 32. Collaboration C. Review Manager (RevMan)[Computer Program] Version 5.2. 3. Copenhagen: The
12 319 Nordic Cochrane Centre; 2012. *HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY REVIEW* 2014;17
13
14
15 320
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
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Reporting checklist for protocol of a systematic review.

Based on the PRISMA-P guidelines.

Instructions to authors

Complete this checklist by entering the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.

Your article may not currently address all the items on the checklist. Please modify your text to include the missing information. If you are certain that an item does not apply, please write "n/a" and provide a short explanation.

Upload your completed checklist as an extra file when you submit to a journal.

In your methods section, say that you used the PRISMA-Preporting guidelines, and cite them as:

Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. Syst Rev. 2015;4(1):1.

		Reporting Item	Page Number
Title			
Identification	#1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	Page 1
Update	#1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	N/A
Registration			
	#2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	Under review by PROSPERO
Authors			
Contact	#3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	Page 1
Contribution	#3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	Page 7

Amendments

[#4](#) If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments

N/A

Support

Sources [#5a](#) Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review

Page 7

Sponsor [#5b](#) Provide name for the review funder and / or sponsor

N/A

Role of sponsor or funder [#5c](#) Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and / or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol

N/A

Introduction

Rationale [#6](#) Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known

Page 3-4

Objectives [#7](#) Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)

Page 4

Methods

Eligibility criteria [#8](#) Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review

Page 4-5

Information sources [#9](#) Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage

Page 5

Search strategy [#10](#) Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated

Page 5-6

Study records - data management [#11a](#) Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review

Page 6

1	Study records -	#11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies	Page 6
2	selection process		(such as two independent reviewers) through each	
3			phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and	
4			inclusion in meta-analysis)	
5				
6				
7				
8	Study records -	#11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from	Page 6
9	data collection		reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in	
10	process		duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming	
11			data from investigators	
12				
13				
14	Data items	#12	List and define all variables for which data will be	Page 6
15			sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any	
16			pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	
17				
18				
19				
20	Outcomes and	#13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be	Page 5
21	prioritization		sought, including prioritization of main and additional	
22			outcomes, with rationale	
23				
24				
25	Risk of bias in	#14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias	Page 6
26	individual studies		of individual studies, including whether this will be done	
27			at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this	
28			information will be used in data synthesis	
29				
30				
31				
32	Data synthesis	#15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be	Page 6
33			quantitatively synthesised	
34				
35				
36	Data synthesis	#15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis,	N/A
37			describe planned summary measures, methods of	
38			handling data and methods of combining data from	
39			studies, including any planned exploration of	
40			consistency (such as I ² , Kendall's τ)	
41				
42				
43				
44	Data synthesis	#15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as	N/A
45			sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	
46				
47				
48	Data synthesis	#15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the	Page 7
49			type of summary planned	
50				
51				
52	Meta-bias(es)	#16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es)	N/A
53			(such as publication bias across studies, selective	
54			reporting within studies)	
55				
56				
57	Confidence in	#17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will	N/A
58	cumulative		be assessed (such as GRADE)	
59				
60				

evidence

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
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
55
56
57
58
59
60

None The PRISMA-P checklist is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY 4.0. This checklist can be completed online using <https://www.goodreports.org/>, a tool made by the [EQUATOR Network](#) in collaboration with [Penelope.ai](#)

For peer review only