Effect of functional food ingredients on gut microbiota in a rodent diabetes model

Ingrid S. Surono¹, Ata Aditya Wardana¹, Priyo Waspodo¹, Budi Saksono², Jessica Verhoeven³,
Koen Venema^{3,*}

¹ Food Technology Department, Faculty of Engineering, Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta,
Indonesia

² Research Center for Biotechnology, Lembaga Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia, Jalan Raya Bogor
Km 46, Cibinong 16911, Indonesia,

³ Centre for Healthy Eating & Food Innovation, Maastricht University - Campus Venlo, Venlo,
The Netherlands

* corresponding author: email: k.venema@maastrichtuniversity.nl; tel.: +31622435111

Abstract

Background: The gut microbiota has been shown to be involved in the development and severity of type 2 diabetes (T2D). The aim of the present study was to test the effect of 4-week functional food ingredient feeding, alone or in combination, on the gut microbiota composition in diabetic rats.

Methods: Streptozotocin(STZ)-induced diabetic rats were treated for 4 weeks with i) native taro starch, ii) modified taro-starch, iii) beet juice, iv) psicose, v) the probiotic *L.plantarum* IS-10506, vi) native starch combined with beet juice, vii) native starch to which beet juice was adsorbed, viii) modified starch combined with beet juice or ix) modified starch to which beet juice was adsorbed, to modulate the composition of the gut microbiota. This composition was evaluated by sequencing the PCR amplified V3-V4 region of the 16S rRNA gene.

Results: The next-generation sequencing showed beneficial effects particularly of taro-starch feeding. Operational taxonomic units (OTUs) related to health (e.g. correlating with low BMI, OTUs producing butyrate) were increased in relative abundance, while OTUs generally correlated with disease (e.g. Proteobacteria) were decreased by feeding taro-starch.

Conclusion: The results of study show that a 4-week intervention with functional food ingredients, particularly taro-derived starch, leads to a more healthy gut microbiota in rats that were induced to be diabetic by induction with STZ.

Keywords: taro-starch, prebiotic, gut microbiota, diabetes model, functional food, obesity

Background

Type 2 diabetes (T2D) increases at a dramatic pace worldwide. The global incidence of T2D is predicted to reach 360 million cases by the year 2030 (1), on a projected world population of 8.5 billion (2). Although it is commonly accepted that an increase in energy intake and a decrease in energy expenditure are the leading causes of obesity and associated with that T2D, metabolic syndrome and cardiovascular disease, recently the gut microbiota has been shown to play a role as well (3-6). The gut microbiota composition and/or activity can be changed using functional food ingredients. The vital role of food for prevention and treatment of T2D needs proper attention, such as in the development of dietary components that positively influence postprandial glycaemia and through this their potential to reduce the impact of T2D. On top of that, effects through the modulation of the gut microbiota need to be considered.

Indonesia is rich in biodiversity, including a variety of local tubers, which are currently underutilized, despite their potential functional properties, and widespread use in the past. One of these interesting tubers is Cocoyam or taro, which belongs to the monocotyledonous family Araceae (the aroids). Taro used to be an important ethnic root crop throughout Asia. It was cultivated and used as a staple crop in various parts of the humid tropics and sub-tropics, as it adapts well to different agro-climatic conditions (7-9). Its utilization is also related to the culture of a region, hence, taro is very important for community-life (10). Keirke et al. (11) reported that Indonesia has the highest taro diversity in the world, and can be found in areas in Borneo, Java, Sumatra, and Sulawesi (12). Taro traditionally was used as an alternative carbohydrate source to reduce dependence on rice. We have shown recently that taro contains resistant starch (RS)

(manuscript submitted for publication), which reaches the colon and can contribute to the modulation of the gut microbiota.

Recently, in an attempt to produce functional foods aimed at low calorie and less sugar intake for T2D, D-psicose, a rare monosaccharide also known as D-allulose, is considered as a substitute for sugar with proven antihyperglycemic, antihyperlipidemic, and anti-inflammatory effects (13, 14).

Probiotics are defined as “life microorganisms, which when administered in adequate amounts, have a beneficial effect on the host” (15). Probiotic strains have been isolated from dadih, a traditional fermented buffalo milk, produced in West Sumatra (16). Dadih has been shown to reduce adiposity, weight gain and adiposity inflammation in high fat induced obese rats (17). The microbes present in dadih, amongst which *L.plantarum* IS-10506 (16, 18, 19), may contribute to this beneficial effect.

Beet juice is rich in including phenolic acids, flavonoids and betalains (20), and beet juice has a high total antioxidant capacity and total polyphenol content (21). Polyphenols including flavonoids, phenolic acids, proanthocyanidins and tannins have been suggested to be able to modify postprandial (hyper)glycaemia (22, 23) by inhibiting carbohydrate digestion, reducing glucose absorption in the intestines, stimulation of insulin release from pancreatic β -cells, modulation of hepatic glucose output, activation of insulin receptors, and/or modulation of glucose uptake in insulin-sensitive cells (24, 25). Polyphenols are not very well absorbed in the

small intestine, and reach the colon where they can modulate the gut microbiota. Therefore, beet juice is an interesting food model to investigate any influence of its bioactive components on the glycaemic response, either by direct inhibition of glucose uptake or by indirect action affecting insulin sensitivity, whether or not through modulation of the gut microbiota.

In a previous submission to the Journal of Ethnic Foods (manuscript number JEFO-D-19-00164, still under revision), we reported the effect of (modified) taro starch, psicose, the probiotic *L.plantarum* IS-10506 and phytonutrients of beet juice, alone or in combination on the gut microbiota composition in streptozotocin-induced T2D rats, in a pilot-study of 1 week of feeding. The aim of the current study is to extend the data with results after 4 weeks of feeding these functional food ingredients.

Materials & Methods

Materials

Streptozotocin (STZ) was purchased from Enzo Life Science (NY, USA). Psicose was from Merck (Darmstadt, Germany). *L.plantarum* IS-10506 was cultured and prepared as described before (16).

***In vivo* animal trial**

Animals and housing

All animal procedures undertaken were approved by Ethic committee of the Faculty of Medicine University of Indonesia (Ref:1196/UN2.F1/ETIK/2018). Male Sprague Dawley rats were purchased from the Animal Experimental Laboratory National Agency of Drug and Food Control (Jakarta, Indonesia) at 6 weeks of age and were allowed to adapt for 14 days. They were housed in individual cages and maintained with a 12-hour light/dark cycle, at 21–23 °C and 55%±5% humidity. All rodents were given ad libitum access to water and commercially available rat normal pellet diet (NPD) purchased from local market, during a 14 days acclimatization period, prior to the dietary manipulation. Subsequently, purified Rodent Diet AIN-93M, a modified AIN-76A standard diet (American Institute of Nutrition) (26) was provided to the rats as a control.

Diets

Native taro starch "HASIL BUMIKU" was purchased from a local supplier (Kusuka Ubiku) in Bantul, Yogyakarta, Central Java, Indonesia. Modified taro-starch was manufactured by the autoclave-cooling method according to a modification of the method of Zhao and Lin (27). In brief, taro starch was blended with distilled water based on the ratio 1:3.5, and the blend was then gelatinized using pressure-heated instrument at 121 °C for 30 minutes and cooled 4 °C, with a repetition of two cycles. Afterwards, the retrogradated starch was dried using a fan-assisted oven at 60 °C for 16 hours after which it was allowed to cool at room temperature for 24 hours, and subsequently grinded, and sieved using a 60 mesh.

Beet juice was adsorbed to both native and modified taro-starch by absorbing beetroot juice, at a ratio of 1:1, and then drying in an oven at 40 °C for 16 hours. Beet juice was adsorbed to both native and modified taro starch by absorbing beetroot juice, at a ratio of 1 : 1, and then drying in

an oven at 40 °C for 16 hours. These were prepared and fed according to the dose of beet juice of 6 ml/day, but in adsorbed beet juice form.

Beet juice (6 ml/day) was also provided separately, as well as in combination with native and modified starch (non-adsorbed). The probiotic *L.plantarum* IS-10506 was given by gavage at 10^{10} colony forming units/day.

Rats were first provided modified AIN-93M by replacing corn starch with the respective taro starch, and replacing sucrose and cellulose with maltodextrin. This ration was provided for 3 days, with 25% incremental increasing dose of the modified AIN (at 75, 50 and 25% commercial rat pellet diet and 25, 50, and 75% dietary intervention formulation for the 3 days, respectively). Beet juice and probiotic were added to AIN-93M diet where applicable by gavage.

Development of type 2 diabetes by STZ-treatment

Four rats in each group were allocated to the dietary treatments. Then the rats were injected intraperitoneally (i.p.) with 120 mg kg⁻¹ nicotinamide in 0.9 % NaCl, followed after 15 minutes by STZ in citrate buffer pH 4.4 (70 mg kg⁻¹), and four days after the STZ injection, fasting and postprandial blood glucose levels were measured using a Freestyle glucose meter (Easy Touch GCU 3 in 1) from a puncture at the tip of the tail. The rats with a fasting glucose of ≥ 100 mg dl⁻¹ and or postprandial blood glucose levels of ≥ 140 mg dl⁻¹ were considered as type 2 diabetic, and those rats which had not yet developed T2D within these 4 days were injected for the second time with 120 mg kg⁻¹ nicotinamide and STZ in citrate buffer pH 4.4 (70 mg kg⁻¹).

149 After confirmation of T2D, the eight week old rats of 190 - 220 g were divided into 10 groups of
150 n=4 each, namely:

- 151 i) AIN-93M (control),
- 152 ii) AIN-93M with two times in a day 3 ml psicose by gavage (psicose),
- 153 iii) AIN-93M with two times in a day 3 ml beetroot juice by gavage (beet juice),
- 154 iv) native taro starch (native starch),
- 155 v) modified taro starch (modified starch),
- 156 vi) native taro starch with beetroot juice adsorbed (native beet adsorbed),
- 157 vii) modified taro starch with beetroot juice adsorbed (modified beet adsorbed),
- 158 viii) native taro starch combined with two times in a day 3 ml beetroot juice by gavage
159 (native + beet),
- 160 ix) modified taro starch combined with two times in a day 3 ml beetroot juice by
161 gavage (modified + beet), and
- 162 x) *L.plantarum* IS-10506 (probiotic).

163 The rats were allowed to continue to feed on their respective diets until the end of the study.
164 Food and water intake were monitored every day. Bodyweight was monitored weekly. The
165 average food intake per rat was calculated. Fecal pellets were collected at the end of one week
166 of feeding, as well as after 4 weeks.

167

168 Extraction of nucleic acids

169 DNA of feces samples was performed using the Quick-DNA™ Fecal/Soil Microbe Miniprep Kit
170 (Zymo Research) according to manufacturer's instructions, using the Precellys 24 tissue

homogenizer (Bertin Instruments, Montigny-le-Bretonneux, France), applying 3 cycles of 30 seconds each, with 5 minute cooling on ice in between.

PCR-amplifying the V3-V4 region of the 16S rRNA gene and next generation sequencing
Illumina 16S rRNA gene amplicon libraries were generated and sequenced at BaseClear (Leiden, the Netherlands). In short, barcoded amplicons from the V3-V4 region of 16S rRNA genes were generated using a 2-step PCR. 10-25 ng isolated genomic DNA was used as template for the first PCR with a total volume of 50 µl using the 341F (5'-CCTACGGGNGGCWGCAG-3') and the 785R (5'-GACTACHVGGGTATCTAATCC-3') primers appended with Illumina adaptor sequences (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA). PCR products were purified and the size of the PCR products were checked on Fragment analyzer (Advanced Analytical Technologies, Heidelberg, Germany) and quantified by fluorometric analysis. Purified PCR products were used for the 2nd PCR in combination with sample-specific barcoded primers (Nextera XT index kit, Illumina). Subsequently, PCR products were purified, checked on a Fragment analyzer (Advanced Analytical Technologies) and quantified, followed by multiplexing, clustering, and sequencing on an Illumina MiSeq with the paired-end (2x) 300 bp protocol and indexing.

Sequence processing and analyses

The sequencing run was analyzed with the Illumina CASAVA pipeline (v1.8.3) with demultiplexing based on sample-specific barcodes. The raw sequencing data produced was processed removing the sequence reads of too low quality (only "passing filter" reads were selected) and discarding reads containing adaptor sequences or PhiX control with an in-house filtering protocol. A quality

assessment on the remaining reads was performed using the FASTQC quality control tool version 0.10.0. Subsequently, the sequences were further analyzed using the Quantitative Insights Into Microbial Ecology (QIIME) software pipeline, version 1.9.1 (28) for α - and β -diversity and (un)weighted principal coordinate analysis. The software package R (3.5.0) (R Core Team, 2013) was used to determine correlations between OTUs and treatments. Statistical analyses were performed with RStudio (1.0.153). Kruskal-Wallis correlations were calculated between OTUs and non-continuous values (treatments). Multiple comparison was corrected using the false discovery rate (FDR), and q -values (adjusted p -values) were considered significantly different at $q < 0.05$.

Results and Discussion

After 4 weeks of treatment with the different diets, the microbiota composition is clearly different than that at baseline (Figure 1A). The principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) plot of the unweighted UniFrac β -diversity analysis (Figure 1A) shows that even after 1 week there are already differences in the gut microbiota, as reported by us before (JEFO submission D-19-00164). We will focus here on the week 4 data. The same PCoA plot, but then with the baseline and week 1 data removed, shows a separation at week 4 by treatment (Figure 1B), but especially when the treatments are clustered by containing starch or not (Figure 1C). This is also the case if only the samples of week 4 are plotted in the unweighted UniFrac β -diversity analysis (Figure 1D and 1E for treatment and starch or not, respectively).

214 Kruskal-Wallis analysis revealed the significant OTUs (corrected for multiple comparisons; q -
215 value < 0.05) that were different between treatment (Figure 2; Table 1A) or whether rats were
216 fed starch or not (Figure 3; Table 1B). Six of the OTUs that were significantly different when
217 tested against treatment (Table 1A), were also different when tested for starch, indicating that
218 starch treatment drove the separation between the samples for these 6 OTUs. The relative
219 abundance (RA) of these 6 OTUs, *Christensenellaceae* R-7 group, *Prevotella* 9, an unknown
220 species of the *Prevotellaceae* family, *Prevotellaceae* UCG-001, and *Ruminococcaceae* UCG-005;
221 and *Ruminococcus* 1, were all increased after starch feeding (Figure 3 A, H-K and M,
222 respectively). However, in most cases the stimulation was higher after modified starch feeding
223 (irrespective of the additional feeding or adsorption of beet juice) than after native starch
224 feeding (Figure 2 A, F-J, respectively). Starch also increased the RA of *Oscillibacter*,
225 *Phascolarctobacterium*, and an uncultured species of the *Ruminococcaceae* family (Figure 3E, G,
226 and L, respectively). These were not significantly different when tested between treatments
227 (although the p -values were < 0.05 for *Phascolarctobacterium* and the *Ruminococcaceae*
228 species, after multiple correction the q -value was not). *Christensenellaceae* has been shown to
229 be were enriched in individuals with low body mass index (29). Members of the
230 *Ruminococcaceae* family (including *Oscillibacter*) have been well known to be involved in the
231 production of butyrate, and important health promoting microbial metabolite (30) produced by
232 the gut microbiota, particularly known to be produced upon starch feeding (31, 32). Members
233 of *Prevotellaceae* are commonly found in the digestive tracts of people who maintain a diet low
234 in animal fats and high in carbohydrates (33). *Phascolarctobacterium* has been associated with
235 low C-reactive protein in premenopausal women (34).

236 Starch feeding led to a reduction in RA of an uncultured species of the *Erysipelotrichaceae*
237 family, *Escherichia-Shigella*, *Klebsiella*, an unknown species of the *Peptostreptococcaceae*
238 family, and *Turicibacter*. Members of the family *Erysipelotrichaceae* (incl. *Turicibacter*) have
239 been shown to be increased in the mouse gut microbiota for mice switched to diets high in fat,
240 and appear to be highly immunogenic and can potentially flourish post-treatment with broad
241 spectrum antibiotics (35, 36). Therefore, a reduction in these OTUs is interpreted to be
242 beneficial. Similarly, the reduction of the RA of the Proteobacteria *Klebsiella* and *Escherichia-*
243 *Shigella* is considered to be beneficial. Moreover, a reduction in *Peptostreptococcaceae*, which
244 has been shown to be over-represented in the guts of colorectal cancer patients (37), appears
245 to be beneficial too.

246 Overall, the changes in relative abundances discussed above induced by tar-starch feeding
247 seem to be beneficial for health, although currently most of the benefits described have been
248 through associations and not cause-and-effect relationships yet.

249 In addition to the OTUs that were significantly different in abundance upon starch feeding,
250 Figure 2 list 4 more OTUs (in addition to the 6 that were also significant when testing for starch
251 feeding) that are significantly different when comparing overall treatments. One of these, an
252 uncultured species of the *Christensenellaceae* family (Figure 2B) seemed to be mostly
253 stimulated by starch, but primarily by modified taro-starch, which may be why it is not
254 significant when comparing for starch feeding versus not. The other 3 are *Clostridium sensu*
255 *stricto* 11, *Holdemania* and an uncultured species of the *Peptococcaceae*. *Clostridium sensu*
256 *stricto* 11 (Figure 2C) is primarily stimulated by native starch (in the presence and absence of
257 beet juice), but also by modified starch with beet juice adsorbed, as well as by feeding

L.plantarum IS-10506. For *Holdemania* no clear health effects have been described. It is reduced (compared to AIN) in native starch and native starch combined with beet juice, and when psicose is fed (Figure 2D). Members of the family *Peptococcaceae* have been associated with stress in pregnant women: higher RA correlated with reduced prenatal stress (38). The RA of the uncultured OTU was primarily increased by modified taro-starch.

Conclusion

In conclusion, particularly taro-starch feeding led to changes in the gut microbiota of the rats with induced diabetes that could be related to beneficial changes to health.

List of abbreviations

AIN: American Institute of Nutrition; BMI: body mass index; FDR: false discovery rate; OTU: operational taxonomic unit; PCoA: principal coordinate analysis; PCR: polymerase chain reaction; QIIME: Quantitative Insights Into Microbial Ecology; RA: relative abundance; RS: resistant starch; STZ: streptozotocin; T2D: type 3 diabetes;

Declarations

Ethics approval

279 All animal procedures undertaken were approved by Ethic committee of the Faculty of
280 Medicine University of Indonesia (Ref:1196/UN2.F1/ETIK/2018).

281

282 *Consent for publication*

283 Not applicable.

284

285 *Availability of data and materials*

286 The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding
287 author on reasonable request.

288

289 *Competing interests*

290 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

291

292 *Funding*

293 The study was funded through a grant from Insentif Riset Sistem Inovasi Nasional (INSINAS) 2019;
294 grant number I8/INS-2/PPK/84/2018. The study was also partly funded by the Centre for Healthy
295 Eating & Food Innovation (HEFI) of Maastricht University – campus Venlo. This research has been
296 made possible with the support of the Dutch Province of Limburg with a grant to HEFI.

297

298 *Authors' contribution*

299 ISS, PW and BS initiated the study, and supervised the animal trial; AAW prepared the taro-
300 starch samples; BS collected the fecal samples; JS and KV analyzed the microbiota composition

in fecal samples; KV performed the bioinformatic analyses and did the statistical analyses; ISS and KV wrote the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Cheng Long for help with statistical analyses in R.

References

1. Wild S, Roglic G, Green A, Sicree R, King H. Global prevalence of diabetes: estimates for the year 2000 and projections for 2030. *Diabetes Care*. 2004;27(5):1047-53.
2. "UN-News". <https://news.un.org/en/story/2015/07/505352-un-projects-world-population-reach-85-billion-2030-driven-growth-developing> 2015. Accessed on March 29, 2020.
3. Lynch SV, Pedersen O. The Human Intestinal Microbiome in Health and Disease. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;375(24):2369-79.
4. Shapiro H, Suez J, Elinav E. Personalized microbiome-based approaches to metabolic syndrome management and prevention. *J Diabetes*. 2017;9(3):226-36.
5. Karlsson FH, Tremaroli V, Nookaew I, Bergstrom G, Behre CJ, Fagerberg B, et al. Gut metagenome in European women with normal, impaired and diabetic glucose control. *Nature*. 2013;498(7452):99-103.
6. Qin J, Li Y, Cai Z, Li S, Zhu J, Zhang F, et al. A metagenome-wide association study of gut microbiota in type 2 diabetes. *Nature*. 2012;490(7418):55-60.

- 322 7. Onwueme IC. The Tropical Tuber Crops—Yams, Cassava, Sweet potato and Cocoyams: John
323 Wiley and Sons, Chichester, UK; 1978.
- 324 8. Asha Devi A. Genetic diversity analysis in taro using molecular markers – an overview. J
325 Root Crops. 2012;38(1):15-25.
- 326 9. Solossa AH, Sastrahidayat IR, Hakim L. Home gardens of the local community surrounding
327 Lake Ayamaru, West Papua province, and its consequences for tourism development and
328 lake conservation. J Biodiv Environ Sci. 2017;3(3):1-11.
- 329 10. Iskandar J, Iskandar BS. Various Plants of Traditional Rituals: Ethnobotanical Research
330 Among The Baduy Community. Biosaintifika: Journal of Biology & Biology Education.
331 2017;9(1):114-25.
- 332 11. Kreike CM, Van Eck HJ, Lebot V. Genetic diversity of taro, *Colocasia esculenta* (L.) Schott, in
333 Southeast Asia and the Pacific. Theor Appl Genet. 2004;109(4):761-8.
- 334 12. Prana MS, Kuswara T. Budidaya Talas: Diversifikasi untuk Menunjang Ketahanan Pangan
335 Nasional (Taro Cultivation: Diversification to Support National Food Security): Bogor:
336 Medikom Pustaka Mandiri; 2002.
- 337 13. Chen J, Huang W, Zhang T, Lu M, Jiang B. Anti-obesity potential of rare sugar d-psicose by
338 regulating lipid metabolism in rats. Food Funct. 2019;10(5):2417-25.
- 339 14. Hossain A, Yamaguchi F, Matsuo T, Tsukamoto I, Toyoda Y, Ogawa M, et al. Rare sugar D-
340 allulose: Potential role and therapeutic monitoring in maintaining obesity and type 2
341 diabetes mellitus. Pharmacol Ther. 2015;155:49-59.

15. FAO. Joint FAO/WHO Working Group on Drafting Guidelines for the Evaluation of Probiotics in Food: Health and nutritional properties of probiotics in food including powder milk with live lactic acid bacteria.; 2001.
16. Surono I, Verhoeven J, Verbruggen S, Venema K. Microencapsulation increases survival of the probiotic *Lactobacillus plantarum* IS-10506, but not *Enterococcus faecium* IS-27526 in a dynamic, computer-controlled in vitro model of the upper gastrointestinal tract. *J Appl Microbiol.* 2018;124(6):1604-9.
17. Kusuma RJ, Azzyati F, Purbarani G, Sulistyorini R, Nofianti F, Huriyati E. Effect of Traditional Fermented Buffalo Milk (Dadih) On Body Weight, Adipose Tissue Mass and Adiposity Inflammation in High Fat-Induced Obese Rats. *EC Nutrition.* 2015;1.3:106-14.
18. Prakoeswa CRS, Herwanto N, Prameswari R, Astari L, Sawitri S, Hidayati AN, et al. *Lactobacillus plantarum* IS-10506 supplementation reduced SCORAD in children with atopic dermatitis. *Benef Microbes.* 2017;8(5):833-40.
19. Surono IS, Martono PD, Kameo S, Suradji EW, Koyama H. Effect of probiotic *L. plantarum* IS-10506 and zinc supplementation on humoral immune response and zinc status of Indonesian pre-school children. *J Trace Elem Med Biol.* 2014;28(4):465-9.
20. Kujala TS, Vienola MS, Klika KD, Loponen JM, Pihlaja K. Betalain and phenolic compositions of four beetroot (*Beta vulgaris*) cultivars. *Eur Food Res Technol.* 2002;214(6):505-10.
21. Wootton-Beard PC, Ryan L. Short communication: a beetroot juice shot is a significant and convenient source of bioaccessible antioxidants. *Journal of Functional Foods.* 2011;3:329–34.

- 363 22. Henquin JC, Rahier J. Pancreatic alpha cell mass in European subjects with type 2 diabetes.
364 Diabetologia. 2011;54(7):1720-5.
- 365 23. Larsson B, Svardsudd K, Welin L, Wilhelmsen L, Bjorntorp P, Tibblin G. Abdominal adipose
366 tissue distribution, obesity, and risk of cardiovascular disease and death: 13 year follow up
367 of participants in the study of men born in 1913. Br Med J (Clin Res Ed).
368 1984;288(6428):1401-4.
- 369 24. Rahimi R, Nikfar S, Larijani B, Abdollahi M. A review on the role of antioxidants in the
370 management of diabetes and its complications. Biomed Pharmacother. 2005;59(7):365-73.
- 371 25. Ishikawa A, Yamashita H, Hiemori M, Inagaki E, Kimoto M, Okamoto M, et al.
372 Characterization of inhibitors of postprandial hyperglycemia from the leaves of Nerium
373 indicum. J Nutr Sci Vitaminol (Tokyo). 2007;53(2):166-73.
- 374 26. Reeves PG, Rossow KL, Lindlauf J. Development and testing of the AIN-93 purified diets for
375 rodents: results on growth, kidney calcification and bone mineralization in rats and mice. J
376 Nutr. 1993;123(11):1923-31.
- 377 27. Zhao X-H, Lin Y. The impact of coupled acid or pullulanase debranching on the formation of
378 resistant starch from maize starch with autoclaving-cooling cycles. European Food
379 Research and Technology. 2009;230:179.
- 380 28. Caporaso JG, Kuczynski J, Stombaugh J, Bittinger K, Bushman FD, Costello EK, et al. QIIME
381 allows analysis of high-throughput community sequencing data. Nat Methods.
382 2010;7(5):335-6.
- 383 29. Goodrich JK, Waters JL, Poole AC, Sutter JL, Koren O, Blekhman R, et al. Human genetics
384 shape the gut microbiome. Cell. 2014;159(4):789-99.

- 385 30. Hamer HM, Jonkers D, Venema K, Vanhoutvin S, Troost FJ, Brummer RJ. Review article: the
386 role of butyrate on colonic function. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther.* 2008;27(2):104-19.
- 387 31. Kovatcheva-Datchary P, Egert M, Maathuis A, Rajilic-Stojanovic M, de Graaf AA, Smidt H, et
388 al. Linking phylogenetic identities of bacteria to starch fermentation in an in vitro model of
389 the large intestine by RNA-based stable isotope probing. *Environ Microbiol.*
390 2009;11(4):914-26.
- 391 32. Rose DJ, Venema K, Keshavarzian A, Hamaker BR. Starch-entrapped microspheres show a
392 beneficial fermentation profile and decrease in potentially harmful bacteria during in vitro
393 fermentation in faecal microbiota obtained from patients with inflammatory bowel
394 disease. *Br J Nutr.* 2010;103(10):1514-24.
- 395 33. Wu GD, Chen J, Hoffmann C, Bittinger K, Chen YY, Keilbaugh SA, et al. Linking long-term
396 dietary patterns with gut microbial enterotypes. *Science.* 2011;334(6052):105-8.
- 397 34. Citronberg JS, Curtis KR, White E, Newcomb PA, Newton K, Atkinson C, et al. Association of
398 gut microbial communities with plasma lipopolysaccharide-binding protein (LBP) in
399 premenopausal women. *ISME J.* 2018;12(7):1631-41.
- 400 35. Greiner T, Backhed F. Effects of the gut microbiota on obesity and glucose homeostasis.
401 *Trends Endocrinol Metab.* 2011;22(4):117-23.
- 402 36. Kaakoush NO. Insights into the Role of Erysipelotrichaceae in the Human Host. *Front Cell*
403 *Infect Microbiol.* 2015;5:84.
- 404 37. Ahn J, Sinha R, Pei Z, Dominianni C, Wu J, Shi J, et al. Human gut microbiome and risk for
405 colorectal cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2013;105(24):1907-11.

38. Hechler C, Borewicz K, Beijers R, Saccenti E, Riksen-Walraven M, Smidt H, et al. Association between Psychosocial Stress and Fecal Microbiota in Pregnant Women. *Sci Rep.* 2019;9(1):4463.

Figure and Table legends

Figure 1. Principal coordinate analysis of unweighed UniFrac of A) baseline (), week 1 () and week 4 samples; B) the same plot, but with baseline and week 1 samples removed, clustered according to treatment; C) same as B but then clustered according to whether rats were fed starch in their diet or not. Focusing on the week 4 data graphs D and E show the unweighed UniFrac clustered according to treatment and whether rats were fed starch in their diet or not, respectively.

Figure 2. Box-plot representation of OTUs that were significantly different ($q < 0.05$; Table 1A) at the genus of family level after Kruskal-Wallis analysis when compared for dietary treatment. A) *Christensenellaceae* R-7 group; B) uncultured species of the *Christensenellaceae* family; C) *Clostridium sensu stricto* 11; D) *Holdemania*; E) uncultured species of the *Peptococcaceae* family; F) *Prevotella* 9; G) unknown species of the *Prevotellaceae* family; H) *Prevotellaceae* UCG-001; I) *Ruminococcaceae* UCG-005; J) *Ruminococcus* 1.

428

429 **Figure 3.** Box-plot representation of OTUs that were significantly different ($q < 0.05$; Table 1B)
430 at the genus of family level after Kruskal-Wallis analysis when compared whether rats were fed
431 starch in their diet or not. A) *Christensenellaceae* R-7 group; B) uncultured species of the
432 *Erysipelotrichaceae* family; C) *Escherichia-Shigella*; D) *Klebsiella*; E) *Oscillibacter*; F) unknown
433 species of the *Peptostreptococcaceae* family; G) *Phascolarctobacterium*; H) *Prevotella* 9; I)
434 unknown species of the *Prevotellaceae* family; J) *Prevotellaceae* UCG-001; K) *Ruminococcaceae*
435 UCG-005; L) uncultured species of the *Ruminococcaceae* family; M) *Ruminococcus* 1; N)
436 *Turicibacter*.

437

438

439 **Table 1.** OTUs that were significantly different ($q < 0.05$) after Kruskal-Wallis analysis, with
440 corresponding p -values and q -values, when compared for treatment (A) or whether rats were
441 fed starch or not (B).

A		
OTU	p-value	q-value
Bacteroidetes;....;D_4__Prevotellaceae;D_5__Prevotella 9	0.0004	0.024
Firmicutes;....;D_4__Clostridiaceae 1;D_5__Clostridium sensu stricto 11	0.0005	0.024
Bacteroidetes;....;D_4__Prevotellaceae;D_5__Prevotellaceae UCG-001	0.0008	0.025
Bacteroidetes;....;D_4__Prevotellaceae;__	0.0014	0.027
Firmicutes;....;D_4__Peptococcaceae;D_5__uncultured	0.0013	0.027
Firmicutes;....;D_4__Christensenellaceae;D_5__Christensenellaceae R-7 group	0.0021	0.029
Firmicutes;....;D_4__Ruminococcaceae;D_5__Ruminococcus 1	0.0018	0.029
Firmicutes;....;D_4__Christensenellaceae;D_5__uncultured	0.0028	0.034
Firmicutes;....;D_4__Ruminococcaceae;D_5__Ruminococcaceae UCG-005	0.0045	0.045
Firmicutes;....;D_4__Erysipelotrichaceae;D_5__Holdemania	0.0041	0.045
B		
Bacteroidetes;....;D_4__Prevotellaceae;D_5__Prevotella 9	1.0E-07	1.0E-05
Bacteroidetes;....;D_4__Prevotellaceae;D_5__Prevotellaceae UCG-001	2.4E-06	7.9E-05
Firmicutes;....;D_4__Ruminococcaceae;D_5__Ruminococcus 1	2.0E-06	7.9E-05
Bacteroidetes;....;D_4__Prevotellaceae;__unknown	8.3E-06	0.0002

Firmicutes;...;D_4__Christensenellaceae;D_5__Christensenellaceae R-7 group	1.1E-05	0.0002
Proteobacteria;...;D_4__Enterobacteriaceae;D_5__Escherichia-Shigella	1.6E-05	0.0003
Firmicutes;...;D_4__Peptostreptococcaceae;__ unknown	8.1E-05	0.0011
Firmicutes;...;D_4__Ruminococcaceae;D_5__Ruminococcaceae UCG-005	0.0002	0.0028
Firmicutes;...;D_4__Ruminococcaceae;D_5__Oscillibacter	0.0004	0.0037
Firmicutes;...;D_4__Erysipelotrichaceae;D_5__uncultured	0.0004	0.0037
Proteobacteria;...;D_4__Enterobacteriaceae;D_5__Klebsiella	0.0004	0.0037
Firmicutes;...;D_4__Ruminococcaceae;D_5__uncultured	0.0005	0.0038
Firmicutes;...;D_4__Erysipelotrichaceae;D_5__Turicibacter	0.0005	0.0038
Firmicutes;...;D_4__Acidaminococcaceae;D_5__Phascolarctobacterium	0.0005	0.0038

442

443

444 **Figure 1.**

449

450

451

452

453

457

458

Figure 3.