International Journal of Health Sciences and Research
www.ijhsr.org ISSN: 2249-9571

Review Article

The Role of Antibiotics in Mucosal Colonization and Invasion with Regards to Gut Microbes

Suhas K Thazha[1], Salesh P Chandrean[2], Zafar Akbar[1], Sumod P George[3]

[1]College of Applied Medical Sciences, Al-Dawadmi, Shaqra University, Ministry of Higher Education, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.
[2]HLL Biotech Ltd. Chennai, India.
[3]College of Applied Medical Sciences, Hail University, Ministry of Higher Education, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Corresponding Author: Suhas K Thazha

ABSTRACT

Mammals are the magnificent organisms, being a complex of vertebrates and microbial cells existing in mutualism. Compact, advanced microbial communities, put together called as the microbiota, occupy a various bunch of slot on the length of the mammalian intestinal tract. The microbiota is a vital element in the event of the immune reaction. The mucosal immune complex consists of molecules, cells, and formed lymphoid structures contracted to supply immunity to pathogens that invade upon mucosal surfaces. Mucosal infection by intracellular pathogens ends up in the initiation of cell-mediated immunity, as manifested by CD^4-positive ($CD4^+$) T helper-type 1 cells, as well as CD^{8+} cytotoxic T-lymphocytes. These reactions are ordinarily accompanied by the synthesis of secretory immunoglobulin A (S-IgA) antibodies, which offers a vial initial line of defense against the infiltration of deeper tissues by these pathogens. Antibiotic treatment alters this delicate balance by inflicting integrative changes within the intestinal microbiota and will cause a homeostatic imbalance through a transformation in the execution of intestinal epithelial cells tight junction proteins, mucin, antimicrobial peptides, and cytokines. Dysregulation of the homeostasis enclosed by vertebrates and their intestinal symbionts has been shown to incline the host to enteric infection. The impact of antibiotics on the host's protecting microbiota and therefore ensuing an increased susceptibility to mucosal infection are poorly understood. Whereas combinations of antibiotics were capable of eliminating culturable bacteria, none of the antibiotic treatments were efficient to sterilize the intestinal tract. During health and within the absence of antibiotic exposure the microbiota will effectively prevent colonization and overgrowth by invasive microbes like pathogens. This development is named 'colonization resistance' and is related to a stable and numerous microbiota in the line up with a controlled lack of inflammation, and includes specific communications between the mucosal immune system and the microbiota. This review summarizes the data concerning the impact of antibiotics in mucosal colonization and invasion with relevant to Gut region. In addition, it will also define evidence that antibiotic use will have an enduring impact on gut microbiota, further as discuss a number of the troublesome aftereffect of exaggerated antibiotic use on gut microorganisms.

Keywords: symbiosis; microbes; microbiota; mucosal immunity; intestinal homeostasis; colonial resistance; antibiotics.

INTRODUCTION

The vertebrate host is conquered by abundant of microbes, as well as bacteria, fungi, parasites, and viruses that live in preponderantly symbiotic accordance with their host. [1-3] The most of these microbes occupy the gastrointestinal (GI) tract [4,5] and a majority of these microbes cannot be

cultured by presently possible methods, necessitating the utilization of molecular access for the identification and quantification of those organisms. [6] The current application of 16S rRNA gene sequences for the study of composite microbial ecosystems has greatly advanced the compassionate of intestinal microbial ecology. [6,7] Recent analyses of the intestinal microbiota recommend that the gut is settled by more than 1,000 different bacterial species that contribute to gastrointestinal tract homeostasis. [4,8] The intestinal microbiotas are concerned in mucosal and immunological growth and development, nutrition, and mucosal protection. [9-11]

Few bacterial members of the microbiota are able of ferment diet- and/or host-derived undigested carbohydrates, also synthesizing vitamins concerned in host energy acquisition. [8] Additionally, the resident intestinal bacteria coordinate immune homeostasis and pathogen clearance. [12,13] The bifacial interaction between the microbiota and the immune system is well balanced in healthy people; however, its breakdown will result in GI diseases, such as inflammatory bowel diseases, also extra-intestinal disorders, as well as metabolic disease. [12] The significance of an entire biota for mucosal invulnerability from bacterial infection has been incontestable with animal models and therefore human host. Sterilized animals have scrubby mucosal and immune development and are extremely vulnerable to enteric infection. [9] Currently, associations between the capability of an enteric pathogen to disturb the microbial ecology of the gut and therefore the ability of the pathogen to cause enteritis are known. [14-16]

In humans, treatment with broadbroad spectrum oral antibiotics might result in the developmentof Clostridium difficile infections, a typical invader of the human gut whose growth is command under control by the conventional biota however that overgrows the biota upon antibiotic utilization. [17,18] Several mouse models of enteritis exploit the utilization of antibiotics to eradicate and/or confuse the indigenous biota to permit consistent enteric infection by various pathogens as well as Salmonella enterica, [19-22] Vibrio cholera, [23] Escherichia coli, [25,26] and Enterococcus faecalis [24] and have incontestable the importance of colonization resistance by an intact microbiota. The result of antibiotics on the intestinal microbiota have typically targeted on analyses of cultivable bacterial species. [25-27]

Recent studies utilize antibiotics to sterilize the gut have used culture methods to recommend the loss of all colonizing bacteria. [28] As a result of a large percentage of the microbiota cannot be cultured, there is a restricted understanding of the effect of antibiotics on intestinal microbial ecology and therefore the relationship between disruption of the microbiota and vulnerable to enteric infection. Additionally, some studies have suggested that the nosocomial infections are aggravated by the presence of antimicrobial resistant bacteria that will increase morbidity rate and therefore associated costs. [29] Widespread use and in the acceptable prescription of broad-spectrum antibiotics has resulted in alterations in susceptibility patterns of microorganisms. [30-38] Some studies showed the soiled shedding onto patients' skin and environmental surfaces that commits to the nosocomial transmission of antibiotic-resistant gram-negative pathogens. [39] Finally, the intestinal tract contributes a vital site for transfer of genes conferring antibiotic resistance. [40]

The arrangement of the microbiota is considerably affected by the utilization of antibiotics that are used extensively, and might result in antibiotic-associated diarrhea and progression of secondary infections such as urinary tract infections. The variance in microbiota distribution is believed to diminish carbohydrate fermentation and weaken metabolism of bile acids, also develop niches for pathogens to

proliferate. An important example of this is Clostridium difficile – associated disease. [41]

A recent study by Sekirovet al. has proved that antibiotic-mediated disruption within the composition, however not total numbers of the intestinal microbiota predisposes mice to greater colonization by Salmonella typhimurium and a lot of severe pathology. [42] This shows that altering the microbiota structure, while not making vacant niches within the microbial community, predisposes the host to enteric infection. Two factors may well be accountable for the greater susceptibility to enteric infection. Antibiotic treatment might lead to selective removal of a group of commensal organisms that function as a barrier to S. typhimurium colonization and/or persistence. Disturbance of the microbiota might result in modification of the mucosal immune response, thereby indirectly affecting Salmonella's ability to root disease. The importance of a healthy microbiota within the maintenance of intestinal homeostasis and defense against enteric infections and, perhaps, even different gastrointestinal diseases such as inflammatory bowel diseases (IBD) may be a conception that is receiving inflated attention. [41]

This review is an associate examination of the role of antibiotics in mucosal colonization and invasion with reference to Gut region. Additionally, it will outline evidence that antibiotic use can have a lasting effect on gut microbiota; also discuss a number of the worrisome consequences of excessive antibiotic use on intestinal microorganisms.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Immune responses and Microbes

Alteration within the composition of microbiota influenced by antibiotic treatment, and people seen in IBD, might result in variable combinations of microbe-associated molecular patterns (MAMPs) exist in the gut. MAMPs are evolutionarily preserved molecules exhibited by each pathogen and commensals that comprise cell surface markers like lipopolysaccharide, polysaccharide A, lipoteichoic acid, and peptidoglycan. MAMP concentrations are recognized by pattern-recognition receptors (PRRs) of dendritic cells, M cells, and intestinal epithelial cells (IECs). [43] A suggestive change in MAMP concentrations might disturb homeostasis of the gut-associated lymphoid tissue through diminishing of the IEC barrier and modification in mucin, cytokine, and antimicrobial peptide production by IECs. As an example, administration of a commensal surface molecule, polysaccharide A, to mice might leads in the suppression of IL- 17 and elevation of IL-10 presentation by CD4+ cells, adequately protect the host from through an experiment persuaded inflammatory bowel disease by Helicobacter hepaticus. [44] It is possible that the majority of the microbiota have similar MAMPs, functioning as interdependency factors [44] to stimulate protective intestinal immune reactions. Probiotics have conjointly shown assurance in reconstructing colonic health, and far focus has been given to potential therapeutic methods for IBD exploitation by these agents. [45] The effective impact of administering symbiosis factors and probiotics possibly involves restoration of modified MAMP concentrations detected by PRRs by the mucosal immune system. Effective modulating intestinal inflammation through alteration in IEC tight junction proteins, mucins, antimicrobial peptides, and cytokines.

Mucus secretion and microorganisms

The use of mucin knockout mice, germ-free mice, and probiotics recommend that the intestinal mucus secretion layer could be a predominant mediator of IEC–commensal interactions, which it perform is essentially affected by the microbes. The mucus secretion layer contains two stratified layers, primarily consisted of the secreted mucin Muc2. [46] The inner layer is of compact composition and lack of

commensal bacteria. [46] The outer layer is constructed as a loose matrix housing commensal bacteria and will serve to segregate antimicrobial proteins. [46] Muc2 knockout mice in prompt to develop inflammatory bowel diseases, implying that deficiency in mucin production results in modified commensal – IEC interactions. The inner mucus secretion layer act as a barrier, which serves to reduce microbic transformation and impede exaggerated immune activation. However, MAMPs are induced to disperse through this layer to provoke the underlying IECs through PRRs. [43] It was shown in germ-free mice, as they reacted to microbial colonization by rising Muc2 sulfate inclusion. [47] Sulfate inclusion of Muc2 happens inside goblet cells before secretion and is assumed to be resistant to enzymatic degradation. Additionally, in vitro analysis of mucin-secreting IECs with a probiotic strain, Lactobacillus plantarum 299v, increased MUC2 execution and suppressed enteric pathogen attachment. [48] Current findings recommend that probiotic strains could defend the host from intestinal inflammation by the introduction of mucus-associated genes, that intensifies the mucus barrier and assure against colonization by enteric pathogens.

A defective mucus barrier may cause an augmented stimulation of IECs by the microbes through marked MAMP diffusion, commensal associate with IECs, and commensal transformation to the underlying lamina propria (LP). Hyper-activity of IECs and commensal translocation might result in interruption of intestinal homeostasis and initiation of an inflammatory response, which may cause increased host pathology and inflammation upon S. Typhimurium infection. [42] Likewise, an abnormal inflammatory reaction to commensals is assumed to be a major part in the etiology of IBD, and deformity in mucin production, persuade by intestinal microbial transformation, might be a mechanism by that this happens.

Intestine Epithelial Cell barrier and Microbes

The intestinal epithelium and its defensive mucus layer are the first line protection against pathogen infiltration and commensal exposure into the underlying LP. Colonization of the gut by probiotics may lead in the protection of the epithelial barrier by preserving tight junction protein expression and preclude apoptosis upon chemically introduced inflammatory bowel diseases. [49] However, modification in the composition of the microbes, over antibiotic administration, might alter the durability of the IEC barrier through changes in tight junction protein expression. Reduced expression of tight junction proteins might increase the permissibility of the IEC barrier permitting commensal exposure into the underlying LP, cause inflammation that is suggestive of IBD.

Intestinal intraepithelial immune cells, composed of natural killer cells and γδTcells, have also been appeared to have a role in preserving the function of IEC barrier. Mean while, intestinal homeostasis, natural killer cells provide support to excrete IL-22 which binds to the IL-22 receptor conveyed particularly on IECs. [50] IL-22 is considered to intervene epithelial innate immunity by supporting the maintenance of IEC-barrier integrity through the introduction of the C-type lectins, RegIIIβ and RegIIIγ. It is conceivable that those innate immune cells react to modifications in MAMP concentrations through raised excretion of pro-inflammatory cytokines and reduced excretion of defensive cytokines like IL-22. This alteration in the intestinal cytokine profile would stimulate inflammation and boost susceptibility to intestinal diseases.

Microbes and Antimicrobial peptide secretion

Defective antimicrobial protection will leads to increased bacterial permeation into the LP resulting in an inflammatory reaction and tissue damage. Antimicrobial proteins excreted by IECs (enterocytes and

paneth cells) consists of defensins, cathelicidins, and C-type lectins (RegIIIβ and RegIIIγ). They function by damaging bacterial surface structures and provide preservation of microbial arrangement. A recent study revealed that execution of a combo of the broad-spectrum antimicrobials metronidazole, neomycin, and vancomycin may cause significant reduction of the microbes and reduced elucidation of RegIIγ by IECs. RegIIIγ expression has been shown to depend on IEC stimulation by microbial and their products. [51] This reduction in both microbes and RegIIIγ might result in raised intestinal colonization by vancomycin-resistant Enterococcus. [52] Significantly, deficient RegIIIγ expression may well be rectified by rendering specific MAMPs post-antimicrobials treatment to selectively trigger IEC PRRs. In addition, MAMPs resembled the lost commensal – IEC communication after metronidazole, neomycin, and vancomycin treatment. [52] In some research found that lipopolysaccharide, however not lipoteichoic acid, stimulation persuaded expression of RegIIIγ and reduced vancomycin-resistant Enterococcus colonization. [52] The capability of MAMP administration to balance RegIIIγ elucidation contributes that the microbes composition encompasses a role in control epithelial innate immunity.

Intestinal homeostasis and Microbes

Microbics-specific changes are possibly recognized by IECs and alternative constituent of the mucosal immune system and will change the expression of IEC tight junction proteins; mucin, antimicrobial peptides, and cytokines. These alterations in innate immunity may lead to or be intensified by exponential regulation of the Th 17 / Treg balance in the LP of the intestine. Ivanovet al proved that C57BL/ 6 mice from commercial vendors, Jackson and Taconic, have considerably totally different numbers of IL-17- stimulating cells within the LP, that correlates to the presence or absence of segmented filamentous bacteria (SFB). [53-54] Taconic mice are rich with SFB and show a significant number of IL-17 producing cells than Jackson mice, that lacks SFB. [54] Transplantation of Taconic mouse intestinal microbes to Jackson mice causes in intestinal colonization by SFB, dramatically increasing the number of IL-17-producing cells in Jackson mice. [53-54] In addition, they proved that utilizing antibiotics to alter the microbial composition in adult mice offered to change the number of IL-17-producing cells in the LP. Treatment with clinical levels of vancomycin could lead to reduced levels of IL-17-producing cells, however, treatment with metronidazole combo with neomycin did not. [53] This has been proved that microbial composition can control the Th 17 / Treg regulation within the LP, an essential process of the host immune reaction.

Mucosal immune system

Antigenic presentation at mucosal sites stimulates mucosal B and T-lymphocytes to transmigrate from the inductive site and resident to different mucosal effector sites. The common mucosal immune system involves orientating of antigen-specific lymphocytes to mucosal effector sites aside from the location wherever initial antigen disclosure occurred. This pathway has nearly solely been cited for S-IgA antibody reactions at mucosal surfaces intercede by B cells, however related occurrence are pretended to require place with T cells. Various administration routes, such as oral, rectal, and intranasal, will bring about systemic mucosal immune reactions. Nevertheless, oral immunization stimulates a higher restricted mucosal response, as reflected by an additional secured homing receptor contour than nasal immunization. Especially, when general immunization the chief orienting receptor on antibody secreting cells is that the L selectin, when oral immunization the αδ4βδ7 integrin, and when nasal immunization a significant portion expressed both the L selectin and the αδ4βδ7 integrin. The evidence that nasal

immunization stimulate antibodies in an immense level of tissues, such as saliva and the urogenital tract, other than oral immunization reflects the additional deprived type of oral immunization. [55]

Incidental data imply the presence of a common mucosal immune system for cell-mediated immunity. [56] The information possible indicates that antigen-specific cytotoxic T-lymphocytes (CTL) reactions at the mucosal surface are imposed by the introduction of CTL regionally and are neither because of migration from a distant location. CTL usually shift to the systemic compartment. It might be proved that the existence of antigen-specific CTL in the general compartment could allow for quick, defensive reactions at any mucosal site, however, more study is required to confirm this conclusion. Specific research is important, as restricted CTL activity at mucosal surfaces might be a built-in mechanism to preserve the mucosal epithelium from injury, a perception supported by the information that pCTL in immunologically allowed sites decline to separate into fully functional CTL, but exposed to antigen. [57] This approach might have a predominant effect on future vaccine development. If mucosal antigen-specific memory CTL responses are determined only after mucosal immunization, ideal protection against pathogens might require the utilization of mucosal vaccine. Nevertheless, generally introduced CTL will produce an antigen-specific mucosal CTL response; additionally, systemic immunization will be utilized for cell-mediated preservation at mucosal surfaces.

Antibiotics and Microbes

A number of aspects might affect gut microbes consisting of Western diet, GI infections, inflammatory diseases, immune deficiencies, and antibiotics. [58] Even though many of these factors will occupy in concert to alter fecal flora, this review particularly target on the impact of antibiotics. Pathogenic organisms are commonly entered into the mammalian host through a gut region that includes viruses, bacteria & parasites and it might cause infection. Most of the antigens encountered by the intestinal immune system are not seem to be derived from pathogens, but also come from other sources like food and commensal bacteria. These antigens are not solely harmless however are after all additionally extremely useful to the host. Protecting nature of the commensal bacteria is adequately illustrated by the contrary impacts of broad-spectrum antibiotics. Those antibiotics might destroy massive number of commensal gut bacteria, thereby making an ecological niche for bacteria that might not well be able to challenge favorably.

Since the arrival of modern sequencing technology, studies of antibiotic utilization on fecal flora used culture-based methods. Given our current perceptive, many of these researches could be considered with great suspicion. Major metagenomic research in this field was done using animal models. These investigations should be explained by great attention because of the possible interspecies variance. Furthermore, many of these studies utilize antibiotic regimen which is not usually used in clinical practice. However, these studies support observation into the effects of specific antibiotics. Human studies targeted on alteration in fecal flora. As a result, there is a question about their pertinence to alteration in mucosa-associated flora.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Mucosal surfaces are distinguished within the gastrointestinal, urogenital, and respiratory tracts and serve as a gateway of access for pathogens. Inflated sanitation and hygiene, the utilization of antibiotics, and childhood vaccination has tremendously reduced the percentage from infectious diseases by the last century. Hence, infectious agents not at all regulated by antibiotics and improved sanitation and hygiene measures would presumably be popular under the present condition.

Antibiotic utilization bears both benefit and risk**.** Antibiotics are usually utilized in the clinic to treat bacterial infections, however, the effects of those drugs on microbial composition and, on intestinal resistance likewise because the ensuing inflated susceptibility to mucosal infection is poorly understood. Diverse antibiotic administration utilization ensued in alteration within the abundance and constituents of the intestinal microbes that were antibiotic specific. Alterations within the intestinal microbic composition, substantial antibiotic usage, might cause diminishing of the Intestinal epithelial cell (IEC) barrier over alteration in mucin, cytokine, and antimicrobial peptide production by IECs. These ensuing disturbances in mucosal innate immunity might cause differential regulation of the Th 17 / Treg balance affecting intestinal immune reactions. Alterations in microbial composition would contribute a host in an event of intestinal homeostatic imbalance and inclined to intestinal infection and probably the other inflammatory bowel diseases. Antibiotic treatment is demanding for the treatment of life-threatening infections, however, misuse of antibiotics might cause the progression of antibiotic resistance in familiar pathogens. Even routine and convenient utilization of antibiotics will have an adverse effect on the host microbial ecosystem that is crucial for host mucosal immunity. Even though antibiotic therapy proceeded in the failure of culturable bacteria, no one of antibiotic combinations proved was capable to decontaminate the gut. The thorough eradication of the bacterial constituent of the intestinal microbes by antibiotics is difficult to accomplish. Likewise, antibiotics may further lead in prolonged unfavorable impacts on the capability of the host to prevent infection**.** Besides**,** antibiotic selective pressure has further undertaken to the development and increase of antibiotic-resistant gram-negative pathogens. The intestinal tract contributes an essential source for the spread of these pathogens. Attachment to accepted infection control measures and adequate antibiotic management are essential control methods.

Subsequent directions and Challenges

The evidence from the investigations about ampicillin and clindamycin decision towards the routine and habitual pattern of imposing oral antibiotics, generally amoxicillin with or without clavulanic acid and clindamycin, for several circumstances that do not need these medicine. Moreover, in the study by Perez et al, parenteral piperacillin-tazobactam further implied to apply some impact. [59] This correlation is uncertain for alternative parenterally executed medicine, however, as antibiotic administrator, high-dose oral amoxicillin and amoxicillin-clavulanic acid are presently recommended for the treatment of otitis media and sinusitis, accordingly. [60,61] Clindamycin is usually utilized in the treatment of skin and soft tissue infections and is the suggested substitute for surgical site infection prophylaxis in penicillin-allergic patients. [62,63] Even though those uses are supported by current treatment regulations, a study has up to now shown that those antibiotics might cause vital impacts on the microbes.

In addition, physician data regarding the suggestions for antibiotic usage is fairly weak. In a very recent survey of medical doctors, the majority of them said they might treat well bacteriuria in things that are not indicated. [64] In addition, a study conducted in long-term care facilities, prescriber choice instead of patient characteristics anticipated the period of antibiotic treatment. [65] Antibiotic administration plan with strong academic elements is needed to assist check these practices. The economic utilization of antibiotics accounts for quite half of the entire utilization within the United States. [66] Transmission of drug-resistant bacteria to humans over the food reservoir has previously happened; antibiotics recommended involved the environment through these activities can also choose for

resistance. [67] In reaction to those problems, in 2012 the government agency (FDA) announced instructions for the explanation to regulate this kind of antibiotic utilization. [67] With the rising data concerning the significance of intestinal microbes in health and disease, we require a lot of information concerning the way to reduce the adverse impacts of antibiotic utilization in order that we are able to target the infectious agent beyond adversely affecting patient health.

The primary obstruction in fighting rising infectious diseases is that the lack of major practical antibiotics and vaccines. [68] Misuse of antibiotics might cause antibiotic-resistant pathogens, more strengthening the requirement for mucosal vaccine development-an efficient disease-prevention weapon. [68] The most effective defense against these abundant mucosal pathogens could be vaccines, ideally, mucosal vaccines are capable of causing both general and mucosal immunity. [68] The mucosal immune system could be a composite and redundant system which provokes extensive quantity of S-IgA beyond cell-mediated immunity at mucosal surfaces to avoid pathogen penetration and inflammation. [68] The mucosal immune system ought to be most effective in supporting immunity against pathogens and bring about lasting lifelong protection over the utilization of attenuated pathogens for vaccines purposes. The unique mucosal vaccines authorized for humans are attenuated pathogens. [68] Future mucosal vaccines may involve vaccine strategies aside from attenuated pathogens. [68]

Further analysis is required to define the potential utility of approaches like careful decontamination of the digestive tract and decontamination of environmental surfaces and of patients' skin and wounds. [69] Subsequent instructions for analysis ought to embrace efforts to establish novel technologies for the management of antibiotic-resistant gram-negative pathogens. [69]

REFERENCES

1. Hooper, L. V., T. Midtvedt, and J. I. Gordon. 2002. How host-microbial interactions shape the nutrient environment of the mammalian intestine. Annu. Rev. Nutr. 22:283–307.
2. Turnbaugh, P. J., R. E. Ley, M. Hamady, C. M. Fraser-Liggett, R. Knight, and J. I. Gordon. 2007. The human microbiome project. Nature 449:804–810
3. Kamada ,N., Nunez, G. 2014. Regulation of the Immune System by the Resident Intestinal Bacteria.Gastroenterology 146:1477-1488.
4. Eckburg, P. B., E. M. Bik, C. N. Bernstein, E. Purdom, L. Dethlefsen, M. Sargent, S. R. Gill, K. E. Nelson, and D. A. Relman. 2005. Diversity of the human intestinal microbial flora. Science 308:1635–1638.
5. Hooper, L. V., and J. I. Gordon. 2001. Commensal host-bacterial relationships in the gut. Science 292:1115–1118.
6. Suau, A., R. Bonnet, M. Sutren, J. J. Godon, G. R. Gibson, M. D. Collins, and J. Dore. 1999. Direct analysis of genes encoding 16S rRNA from complex communities reveals many novel molecular species within the human gut. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 65:4799–4807.
7. Backhed, F., R. E. Ley, J. L. Sonnenburg, D. A. Peterson, and J. I. Gordon. 2005. Host-bacterial mutualism in the human intestine. Science 307:1915–1920.
8. Lozupone CA, Stombaugh JI, Gordon JI, et al. 2012. Diversity,stabilityand resilience of the human gut microbiota. Nature 489:220–230.
9. Gustafsson, B. E. 1982. The physiological importance of the colonic microflora. Scand. J. Gastroenterol. Suppl. 77:117–131.
10. O'Hara, A. M., and F. Shanahan. 2006. The gut flora as a forgotten organ. EMBO Rep.7:688–693.
11. Wostmann, B. S. 1981. The germfree animal in nutritional studies. Annu. Rev. Nutr. 1:257– 279
12. Kamada N, Seo SU, Chen GY, et al. 2013. Role of the gut microbiota in immunity and inflammatory disease. Nat Rev Immunol. 13:321–335.
13. Kamada N, Chen GY, Inohara N, et al. 2013. Control of pathogens and pathobionts by the gut microbiota. Nat Immunol. 14:685–690.

14. Barman, M., D. Unold, K. Shifley, E. Amir, K. Hung, N. Bos, and N. Salzman. 2008. Enteric salmonellosis disrupts the microbial ecology of the murine gastrointestinal tract. Infect. Immun. 76:907–915.
15. Lupp, C., M. L. Robertson, M. E. Wickham, I. Sekirov, O. L. Champion, E. C. Gaynor, and B. B. Finlay. 2007. Host-mediated inflammation disrupts the intestinal microbiota and promotes the overgrowth of Enterobacteriaceae. Cell Host Microbe 2:119–129.
16. Stecher, B., R. Robbiani, A. W. Walker, A. M. Westendorf, M. Barthei, M. Kremer, S. Chaffron, A. J. Macpherson, J. Buer, J. Parkhill, G. Dougan, C. von Mering, and W. D. Hardt. 2007. Salmonella entericaserovar Typhimurium exploits inflammation to compete with the intestinal microbiota. PLoS Biol. 5:e244.
17. Bartlett, J. G., N. Moon, T. W. Chang, N. Taylor, and A. B. Onderdonk. 1978. Role of Clostridium difficile in antibiotic-associated pseudomembranous colitis. Gastroenterology 75:778–782.
18. Kelly, C. P., and J. T. LaMont. 1998. Clostridium difficile infection. Annu. Rev.Med.49:375–390.
19. Barthel, M., S. Hapfelmeier, L. Quintanilla-Martinez, M. Kremer, M. Rohde, M. Hogardt, K. Pfeffer, H. Russmann, and W. D. Hardt. 2003. Pretreatment of mice with streptomycin provides a Salmonella entericaserovarTyphimurium colitis model that allows analysis of both pathogen and host. Infect. Immun. 71:2839–2858.
20. Bohnhoff, M., and C. P. Miller. 1962. Enhanced susceptibility to Salmonella infection in streptomycin treated mice. J. Infect. Dis. 111:117–127.
21. Que, J. U., and D. J. Hentges. 1985. Effect of streptomycin administration on colonization resistance in mice. Infect. Immun. 48:169–174
22. Sekirov, I., N. M. Tam, M. Jogova, M. L. Robertson, Y. Li, C. Lupp, and B. B. Finlay. 2008. Antibiotic-induced perturbations of the intestinal microbiota alter host susceptibility to enteric infection. Infect. Immun. 76:4726–4736
23. Merrell, D. S., and A. Camilli. 1999. The cadA gene of Vibrio choleraeis induce during infection and plays a role in acid tolerance. Mol. Microbiol. 34:836–849.
24. Wells, C. L., R. P. Jechorek, and S. L. Erlandsen. 1990. Evidence for the translocation of Enterococcus faecalis across the mouse intestinal tract. J. Infect. Dis. 162:82–90.
25. Wells, C. L., M. A. Maddaus, R. P. Jechorek, and R. L. Simmons. 1988. Role of intestinal anaerobic bacteria in colonization resistance. Eur. J. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. Dis. 7:107–113.
26. Wells, C. L., M. A. Maddaus, C. M. Reynolds, R. P. Jechorek, and R. L.Simmons. 1987. Role of anaerobic flora in the translocation of aerobic and facultatively anaerobic intestinal bacteria. Infect. Immun. 55:2689– 2694.
27. Miller, C. P., and M. Bohnhoff. 1963. Changes in the mouse's enteric microflora associated with enhanced susceptibility to Salmonella infection following streptomycin treatment. J. Infect. Dis. 113: 59–66.
28. Rakoff-Nahoum, S., J. Paglino, F. Eslami-Varzaneh, S. Edberg, and R. Medzhitov. 2004. Recognition of commensal microflora by Toll-like receptors is required for intestinal homeostasis. Cell 118:229–241.
29. Diaz E, Lorente L, Valles J, Rello J. [Mechanical ventilation associated pneumonia]. Med Intensiva; 34: 318-324.
30. Chastre J, Fagon JY. 2002. Ventilator-associated pneumonia. Am J RespirCrit Care Med.165: 867-903.
31. Chevret S, Hemmer M, Carlet J, Langer M. 1993. Incidence and risk factors of pneumonia acquired in intensive care units. Results from a multicenter prospective study on 996 patients. European Cooperative Group on Nosocomial Pneumonia. Intensive Care Med. 19: 256-264.
32. Haley RW, Hooton TM, Culver DH, Stanley RC, Emori TG, Hardison CD, et al. 1981. Nosocomial infections in U.S. hospitals, 1975-1976: estimated frequency by selected characteristics of patients. Am J Med. 70: 947- 959.
33. Baker AM, Meredith JW, Haponik EF. 1996. Pneumonia in intubated trauma patients. Microbiology and outcomes. Am J RespirCrit Care Med. 153: 343-349.
34. Craig CP, Connelly S. 1984. Effect of intensive care unit nosocomial pneumonia on duration of stay and mortality. Am J Infect Control 12: 233-238.

35. Cunnion KM, Weber DJ, Broadhead WE, Hanson LC, Pieper CF, Rutala WA. 1996. Risk factors for nosocomial pneumonia: comparing adult critical-care populations. Am J RespirCrit Care Med. 153: 158-162.
36. Nseir S, Ader F, Lubret R, Marquette CH. Pathophysiology of airway colonization in critically ill COPD patient. Curr Drug Targets Apr. 12: 514-520.
37. Bercault N, Boulain T. 2001. Mortality rate attributable to ventilator-associated nosocomial pneumonia in an adult intensive care unit: a prospective case-control study. Crit Care Med. 29: 2303-2309.
38. Diaz E, Lorente L, Valles J, Rello J. [Mechanical ventilation associated pneumonia]. Med Intensiva 34: 318-324.
39. Donskey CJ. 2004. The role of the intestinal tract as a reservoir and source for transmission of nosocomial pathogens. Clin Infect Dis. 39:219–26.
40. Salyers AA, Gupta A, Wang Y. 2004. Human intestinal bacteria as reservoirs for antibiotic resistance genes. Trends Microbiol. 12:412–6.
41. WlodarskaM, Finlay BB. 2010. Host immune response to antibiotic perturbation of the microbiota. Nature publishing group. 3: 100-103
42. Sekirov, I et al. 2008. Antibiotic-induced perturbations of the intestinal microbiota alter host susceptibility to enteric infection. Infect immune. 76 **:** 4726 – 4736.
43. Hooper, L . V. 2009. Do symbiotic bacteria subvert host immunity? Nat Rev Microbiol7 **:**367-374
44. Mazmanian ,S .K, Round, J.L . & Kasper, D.L. 2008. A microbial symbiosis factor prevents intestinal inflammatorydisease . Nature 453**:** 620 – 625.
45. Borchers, A. T, Selmi, C, Meyers, F. J., Keen, C. L.&Gershwin, M . E. 2009. Probiotics and immunity. J Gastroenterol. 44**:**26 – 46.
46. Johansson , M . E .et al. 2008. The inner of the two Muc2 mucin-dependent mucus layers in colon is devoid of bacteria .ProcNatlAcadSci USA 105**:**15064 – 15069.
47. Schwerbrock, N. M.et al. 2004. Interleukin 10-defi cient mice exhibit defective colonic Muc2 synthesis before and after induction of colitis by commensal bacteria. Inflamm Bowel Dis. 10**:**811 – 823.
48. Mack, D. R., Michail, S, Wei, S, McDougall, L. & Hollingsworth, M. A .1999. Probiotics inhibit enteropathogenic E. coli adherence in vitro by inducing intestinal mucin gene expression. Am J Physiol. 276**:**G941 – 950.
49. Mennigen, R. et al. 2009. Probiotic mixture VSL # 3 protects the epithelial barrier by maintaining tight junction protein expression and preventing apoptosis in a murine model of colitis. Am J PhysiolGastrointest Liver Physiol. 296**:**1140 – 1149.
50. Zheng, Y. et al. 2008. Interleukin-22 mediates early host defense against attaching and effacing bacterial pathogens . Nat Med. 14**:**282 – 289.
51. Cash, H . L, Whitham, C. V, Behrendt, C. L.&Hooper , L. V. 2006. Symbiotic bacteria direct expression of an intestinal bactericidal lectin. Science (New York, NY) 313**:** 1126 – 1130.
52. Brandl, K. et al. 2008. Vancomycin-resistant enterococci exploit antibiotic-induced innate immune deficits. Nature 455**:**804 – 807.
53. Ivanov, II et al. 2008. Specifi c microbiota direct the differentiation of IL-17-producing T-helper cells in the mucosa of the small intestine. Cell Host Microbe. 4:337 – 349.
54. Ivanov, II et al. 2009. Induction of intestinal Th17 cells by segmented fi lamentousbacteria. Cell 139**:**1 – 14.
55. McGhee JR, Lamm ME, Strober W. 1999. Mucosal immune responses: an overview. In: Mucosal immunology. Ogra PL, Mestecky J, Lamm ME, Strober W, Bienenstock J, McGhee JR, eds. San Diego: Academic Press. :485-506.
56. Gallichan WS, Rosenthal KL. 1996. Long-lived cytotoxic T lymphocyte memory in mucosal tissues after mucosal but not systemic immunization. J Exp Med. 184: 1879-90.
57. Ksander BR, Streilein JW. 1990. Failure of infiltrating precursor cytotoxic T cells to acquire direct cytotoxic function in immunologically privileged sites. J Immunol. 145:2057-63.
58. Clemente JC, Ursell LK, Parfrey LW, Knight R. 2012. The impact of the gut microbiota on human health: an integrative view. Cell 148(6):1258-1270.
59. Perez F, Pultz MJ, Endimiani A, et al. 2011. Effect of antibiotic treatment on establishment and elimination of intestinal colonization by KPC-producing

Klebsiellapneumoniae in mice. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 55(6):2585-2589.
60. Chow AW, Benninger MS, Brook I, et al. 2012. IDSA clinical practice guideline for acute bacterial rhinosinusitis in children and adults. Clin Infect Dis. 54(8):1041-1045.
61. Lieberthal AS, Carrol AE, Chonmaitree T, et al. 2013. The diagnosis and management of acute otitis media. Pediatrics 131:e964-e999.
62. Bratzler DW, Dellinger EP, Olsen KM, et al. 2013. Clinical practice guidelines for antimicrobial prophylaxis in surgery. Am J Health Syst Pharm. 70(3):195-283.
63. Stevens DL, Bisno AL, Chambers HF, et al. 2005. Infectious Diseases Society of America. Practice guidelines for the diagnosis and management of skin and soft-tissue infections. Clin Infect Dis. 41(10): 1373-1406.
64. Drekonja DM, Abbo LM, Kuskowski MA, et al. 2013 Mar 28. A survey of resident physicians' knowledge regarding urine testing and subsequent antimicrobial treatment. Am J Infect Control. [Epub ahead of print]
65. Daneman N, Gruneir A, Bronskill SE, et al. 2013. Prolonged antibiotic treatment in long-term care: role of the prescriber. JAMA Intern Med. 173(8):673-682.
66. Food and Drug Administration. http://www.fda.gov/downloads/ ForIndustry/ UserFees/ Animal Drug User FeeAct ADUFA/UCM338170. pdf.
67. Finley RL, Collignon P, Larsson DG, et al. 2013 Jun 21. The scourge of antibiotic resistance: the important role of the environment. Clin Infect Dis.
68. Frederik W. van Ginkel, Huan H. Nguyen, and Jerry R. McGhee. 2000. Vaccines for Mucosal Immunity to Combat Emerging Infectious Diseases. Emerging Infectious Diseases 6(2):123-130.
69. Curtis J. Donskey. 2006. Antibiotic regimens and intestinal colonization with antibiotic-resistant gram-negative bacilli. antibiotics and gram-negative bacilli CID 43 (Suppl 2):S62-69

How to cite this article: Thazha SK, Chandrean SP, Akbar Z et.al. The role of antibiotics in mucosal colonization and invasion with regards to gut microbes. Int J Health Sci Res. 2019; 9(2):230-240.

******