

Table of Contents

S1: Search Strategy	2
Table S2: Excluded studies and reason for exclusion	4
Table S3: Description of probiotic	5
Table S4: GRADE Meta-analyses	8
Table S5: Sensitivity analysis	11
References	12

S1: Search Strategy

Database search: Medline (Ovid)

Resource: Ovid MEDLINE(R) Epub Ahead of Print, In Process & Other Non-Indexed Citations, Ovid MEDLINE (R) Daily, and Ovid MEDLINE (R) 1946-Present

Date: 11 Dec 2023

No.	Key Words	Results
1	exp Probiotics/	25111
2	probiotic*.tw.	38707
3	1 or 2	43206
4	exp Diarrhea/	58155
5	(diarrhe* or diarrhoe* or diarhe* or diarhoe*).tw.	128373
6	4 or 5	143295
7	exp "Systematic Review"/	246546
8	(systematic adj2 review\$.tw.	322573
9	(systematic adj review).tw.	283779
10	exp Meta-Analysis as Topic/	28733
11	exp Meta-Analysis/	191086
12	meta-analys\$.tw.	282781
13	(meta adj1 analys\$.tw.	282836
14	7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13	491306
15	3 and 6 and 14	361

Database search: Embase (Ovid)

Resource: Embase 1980 to 2023 Week 49

Date: 11 Dec 2023

No.	Key Words	Results
1	exp Probiotics/	54442
2	probiotic*.tw.	47297
3	1 or 2	63560
4	exp Diarrhea/	311641
5	(diarrhe* or diarrhoe* or diarhe* or diarhoe*).tw.	187649
6	4 or 5	359916
7	exp "Systematic Review"/	441289
8	(systematic adj2 review\$.tw.	389638
9	(systematic adj review).tw.	340143
10	exp Meta-Analysis as Topic/	54317
11	exp Meta-Analysis/	298879
12	meta-analys\$.tw.	354393
13	(meta adj1 analys\$.tw.	354452
14	7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13	739983
15	3 and 6 and 14	925

Database search: CDSR (Ovid)

Resource: EBM Reviews - Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2005 to December 6, 2023

Date: 11 Dec 2023

No.	Key Words	Results
1	[exp Probiotics/]	0
2	probiotic*.tw.	178
3	1 or 2	178
4	[exp Diarrhea/]	0
5	(diarrhe* or diarrhoe* or diarhe* or diarhoe*).tw.	1696
6	4 or 5	1696
7	[exp "Systematic Review"/]	0
8	(systematic adj2 review\$.tw.	9849
9	(systematic adj review).tw.	8048
10	[exp Meta-Analysis as Topic/]	0
11	[exp Meta-Analysis/]	0
12	meta-analys\$.tw.	9624
13	(meta adj1 analys\$.tw.	9625
14	7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13	10400
15	3 and 6 and 14	103

Table S2: Excluded studies and reason for exclusion

Author year (ref)	Reason
Pillai A et al., 2008 ¹ Ref	Small data set
Sun X et al.,2023 ² Ref	Small data set
Mc Farland et al. ³ , 2006	Inadequate information

Table S3: Description of probiotic

SI No.	Author, Year	Population	Intervention	Definition for probiotics (by author)	Dose
1.	Agamennone V et al., 2018 ⁴	Any age group	Probiotic dairy products	Dairy products routinely sold in food stores and evaluated as probiotic by the Dutch association Natuur- en Gezondheidsproducten Nederland (NPN, Amersfoort, The Netherland).	NA
2.	Agamennone V et al., 2018 ⁴	Any age group	Probiotic food supplements (Non dairy products)	Food supplements include Probioticum (Wapiti), Winbiotic Pro-AD (Winclove), Probactiol Duo (Metagenics), Advanced Multi-Billion Dophilus (Solgar), and Imutis (Trenker) evaluated as probiotic by the Dutch association Natuur- en Gezondheidsproducten Nederland (NPN, Amersfoort, The Netherland).	NA
3.	Blaabjerg S et al., 2017 ⁵	Outpatients of any age group	Any Probiotics	Probiotics included <i>Lactobacilli spp.</i> , <i>Lactococcus spp.</i> , <i>Bacillus spp.</i> , <i>Bifidobacterium spp.</i> , <i>Saccharomyces spp.</i> , <i>Leuconostoc cremoris</i> , <i>Clostridium spp.</i> , or <i>Streptococcus spp.</i> and used a combination of two or more probiotic strains as intervention.	NA
4.	Blaabjerg S et al., 2017 ⁵	Outpatients of any age group	Any Probiotics	Probiotics included <i>Lactobacilli spp.</i> , <i>Lactococcus spp.</i> , <i>Bacillus spp.</i> , <i>Bifidobacterium spp.</i> , <i>Saccharomyces spp.</i> , <i>Leuconostoc cremoris</i> , <i>Clostridium spp.</i> , or <i>Streptococcus spp.</i> Placebo and used a combination of two or more probiotic strains as intervention.	NA
5.	Hempel S et al., 2012 ⁶	Any age group	Any Probiotics	Probiotics included the genera <i>Lactobacillus</i> , <i>Bifidobacterium</i> , <i>Saccharomyces</i> , <i>Streptococcus</i> , <i>Enterococcus</i> , and/or <i>Bacillus</i> alone or in combination, using live (active or lyophilized) microorganisms in probiotic or synbiotic preparations.	NA
6.	Hempel S et al., 2012 ⁶	Any age group	Genus, <i>Bacillus</i>	NA	55 million CFU/capsule
7.	Hempel S et al., 2012 ⁶	Any age group	Genus, <i>Enterococcus</i>	NA	0.75 billion CFU/capsule
8.	Jafarnejad S et al., 2016 ⁷	Inpatients	Any Probiotics	Probiotics included <i>Lactobacilli (acidophilus, casei, reuteri, bulgaricus, paracasei, plantarum, rhamnosus, salivarius)</i> , <i>Bifidobacteria (bifidum, lactis, longum, breve, clausii, infantis)</i> ,	6–60 million CFU/d

				<i>Enterococci (faecium), Streptococci (thermophiles), and the yeast S.boulardii (alone or in combination with one another).</i>	
9.	Jafarnejad S et al., 2016 ⁷	Elderly	Any Probiotics	Probiotics included <i>Lactobacilli (acidophilus, casei, reuteri, bulgaricus, paracasei, plantarum, rhamnosus, salivarius), Bifidobacteria (bifidum, lactis, longum, breve, clausii, infantis), Enterococci (faecium), Streptococci (thermophiles), and the yeast S.boulardii (alone or in combination with one another).</i>	6–60 million CFU/d
10.	Kale-Pradhan P B et al., 2010 ⁸	Pediatric and adult patients	<i>Lactobacillus</i>	NA	2 billion – 40 billion CFU
11.	Ritchie M L et al., 2012 ⁹	Any age group	Any Probiotics	The type of probiotic used were VSL#3, LGG, <i>S. boulardii</i> , <i>B. infantis</i> , <i>L. acidophilus</i> , <i>L. casei</i> , <i>C. butyricum</i> , <i>E. faecum</i> , <i>L.plantarum</i> , <i>B. lactis</i> and <i>L. acidophilus</i> combined with <i>B. infantis</i> .	NA
12.	Szajewska H et al., 2005 ¹⁰	Adults and children	<i>Saccharomyces boulardii</i>	NA	200mg- 1 gram
13.	Vidlock E J et al., 2012 ¹¹	Any age group patients treated with antibiotics	Any Probiotics	Probiotic species such as <i>Lactobacillus</i> , <i>S. boulardii</i> , <i>Saccaromyces</i> , LGG and <i>Bifidobacterium</i> .	NA
14.	Guo Q et al.,2019 ¹²	Pediatric patients treated with antibiotics	Any Probiotics	Probiotics (of any specified strain or dose) including <i>Bacillus spp.</i> , <i>Bifidobacterium spp.</i> , <i>Clostridium butyricum</i> , <i>Lactobacilli spp.</i> , <i>Lactococcus spp.</i> , <i>Leuconostoc cremoris</i> , <i>Saccharomyces spp.</i> , or <i>Streptococcus spp</i>	NA
15.	Guo Q et al.,2019 ¹²	Pediatric patients treated with antibiotics	Any Probiotics	Probiotics (of any specified strain or dose) including <i>Bacillus spp.</i> , <i>Bifidobacterium spp.</i> , <i>Clostridium butyricum</i> , <i>Lactobacilli spp.</i> , <i>Lactococcus spp.</i> , <i>Leuconostoc cremoris</i> , <i>Saccharomyces spp.</i> , or <i>Streptococcus spp</i>	5 billion CFU
16.	Kale-Pradhan P B et al., 2010 ⁸	Pediatrics (Age < 18 yrs)	<i>Lactobacillus</i>	NA	2 billion – 40 billion CFU
17.	Szajewska H et al., 2006 ¹³	Pediatric inpatients or outpatients	Any probiotics	Any probiotics at any dose	32.2 DDD per 1000 inhabitants per day

18.	Vidlock E J et al., 2012 ¹¹	Pediatric patients treated with antibiotics	Any probiotics	Probiotic species such as <i>Lactobacillus</i> , <i>S. boulardii</i> , <i>Saccaromyces</i> , LGG and <i>Bifidobacterium</i> .	NA
19.	Zhang L et al., 2022 ¹⁴	Elderly on antibiotics	Any probiotic	Any probiotic including <i>Saccharomyces boulardii</i> , <i>Lactobacillus acidophilus</i> and <i>Lactobacillus casei</i> , <i>S. thermophilus</i> , and <i>L. bulgaricus</i> , <i>bifdobacterium</i> and <i>Shirota</i> strain.	NA
20.	Zhang L et al., 2022 ¹⁴	Elderly inpatients	Any probiotic	Any probiotic including <i>Saccharomyces boulardii</i> , <i>Lactobacillus acidophilus</i> and <i>Lactobacillus casei</i> , <i>S. thermophilus</i> , and <i>L. bulgaricus</i> , <i>bifdobacterium</i> and <i>Shirota</i> strain.	NA
21.	Zhang L et al., 2022 ¹⁴	Elderly inpatients	Probiotic given during antibiotic treatment	Any probiotic including <i>Saccharomyces boulardii</i> , <i>Lactobacillus acidophilus</i> and <i>Lactobacillus casei</i> , <i>S. thermophilus</i> , and <i>L. bulgaricus</i> , <i>bifdobacterium</i> and <i>Shirota</i> strain.	NA
22.	Avadhani A et al., 2010 ¹⁵	Adult hospitalized population	Any probiotic	Any probiotics at any dose	NA
23.	Avadhani A et al., 2010 ¹⁵	Adult hospitalized population	Any probiotic	Any probiotics at any dose	NA
24.	Liao W et al., 2020 ¹⁶	Adult inpatients and outpatients	Any probiotic	The probiotics species studied in the trials primarily included <i>Lactobacillus</i> , <i>Saccharomyces</i> , <i>Bifidobacterium</i> , and <i>Streptococcus</i> .	NA
25.	Jafarnejad S et al., 2016 ⁷	Adults	Any probiotic	Probiotics included <i>Lactobacilli</i> (<i>acidophilus</i> , <i>casei</i> , <i>reuteri</i> , <i>bulgaricus</i> , <i>paracasei</i> , <i>plantarum</i> , <i>rhamnosus</i> , <i>salivarius</i>), <i>Bifidobacteria</i> (<i>bifdum</i> , <i>lactis</i> , <i>longum</i> , <i>breve</i> , <i>clausii</i> , <i>infantis</i>), <i>Enterococci</i> (<i>faecium</i>), <i>Streptococci</i> (<i>thermophiles</i>), and the yeast <i>S. boulardii</i> (alone or in combination with one another).	6–60 million CFU/d
26.	Vidlock E J et al., 2012 ¹¹	Adult patients treated with antibiotics	Any probiotic	Probiotic species such as <i>Lactobacillus</i> , <i>S. boulardii</i> , <i>Saccaromyces</i> , LGG and <i>Bifidobacterium</i> .	NA

Table S4: GRADE Meta-analyses

SI No.	Author, year	Population	Intervention	Outcome	No of cases	No of studies	RR (95% CI)	ROB	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Publication bias	Large effect	GRADE	AMSTAR
1	Agamennone V et al., 2018 ⁴	Any age group	Probiotic dairy products	AAD	74	7	1.01 (0.95-1.07)	Serious	Very serious	NA	Serious	NA	No	Very low (+)	Critically low
2	Agamennone V et al., 2018 ⁴	Any age group	Probiotic food supplements (Non-dairy products)	AAD	393	25	0.64 (0.63-0.65)	Serious	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	NA	No	Low (++)	Critically low
3	Blaabjerg S et al., 2017 ⁵	Outpatients of any age group	Any Probiotics	AAD	147	17	0.49 (0.36-0.66)	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	No	No	Moderate (+++)	Low
4	Blaabjerg S et al., 2017 ⁵	Outpatients of any age group	<i>Saccharomyces boulardii</i>	AAD	48	5	0.41 (0.3-0.57)	Very serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious	No	Large	Low (++)	Low
5	Blaabjerg S et al., 2017 ⁵	Outpatients of any age group	<i>Lactobacillus acidophilus</i> and <i>Bifidobacterium lactis</i>	AAD	23	2	0.79 (0.47-1.33)	Not serious	Serious	Not serious	Serious	No	No	Low (++)	Low
6	Blaabjerg S et al., 2017 ⁵	Outpatients of any age group	Any Probiotics	AAD (WHO defined diarrhea)	55	7	0.54 (0.36-0.82)	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious	No	No	Low (++)	Low
7	Cremonini F et al., 2002 ¹⁷	Any age group	<i>Lactobacillus GG</i> , <i>Saccharomyces boulardii</i>	AAD	NA	7	0.3966 (0.275-0.591)	Not serious	Series	Not serious	Serious	No	Very large	Moderate (+++)	Critically low
8	Hempel S et al., 2012 ⁶	Any age group	Any Probiotics	AAD	584	63	0.58 (0.5-0.68)	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	No	No	Moderate (+++)	Moderate
9	Hempel S et al., 2012 ⁶	Any age group	Genera blends	AAD	164	25	0.66 (0.49-0.88)	Serious	Not serious	NA	Not serious	Yes	No	Low (++)	Moderate
10	Hempel S et al., 2012 ⁶	Any age group	Genus, <i>Bacillus</i>	AAD	29	2	0.45 (0.26-0.79)	Serious	Not serious	NA	Serious	No	Large	NA	Moderate
11	Hempel S et al., 2012 ⁶	Any age group	Genus, <i>Enterococcus</i>	AAD	61	3	0.51 (0.38-0.68)	Not serious	Not serious	NA	Serious	Yes	No	Low (++)	Moderate
12	Hempel S et al., 2012 ⁶	Any age group	Genus, <i>Lactobacillus</i>	AAD	174	17	0.64 (0.47-0.86)	Serious	Not serious	NA	Not serious	No	No	Low (++)	Moderate
13	Hempel S et al., 2012 ⁶	Any age group	Genus, <i>Saccharomyces</i>	AAD	142	15	0.48 (0.35-0.65)	Serious	Not serious	NA	Not serious	No	Large	Low (++)	Moderate
14	Jafarnejad S et al., 2016 ⁷	Inpatients	Any Probiotics	AAD	439	22	0.67 (0.58-0.77)	Serious	Not serious	Serious	Not serious	No	No	Low (++)	Low
15	Jafarnejad S et al., 2016 ⁷	Elderly	Any Probiotics	AAD	194	5	0.94 (0.76-1.15)	Very serious	Serious	Serious	Serious	No	No	Very low (+)	Low
16	Jafarnejad S et al., 2016 ⁷	Adults	<i>Lactobacillus sp.</i>	AAD	392	22	0.66 (0.57-0.77)	Serious	Not serious	Serious	Not serious	No	No	Low (++)	Low
17	Jafarnejad S et al., 2016 ⁷	Adults	<i>Saccharomyces boulardii</i>	AAD	282	11	0.5 (0.38-0.64)	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	No	No	Moderate (+++)	Low
18	Jafarnejad S et al., 2016 ⁷	Adults	<i>Bifidobacteria sp.</i>	AAD	113	13	0.77 (0.65-0.92)	Serious	Not serious	Serious	Not serious	No	No	Low (++)	Low
19	Kale-Pradhan P B et al., 2010 ⁸	Paediatric and adult patients	<i>Lactobacillus</i>	AAD	74	10	0.35 (0.19-0.67)	Serious	Not serious	Very serious	Serious	Yes	Very large	Very low (+)	Moderate
20	Ritchie M L et al., 2012 ⁹	Any age group	Any Probiotics	CDAD	NA	6	0.6 (0.41-0.86)	NA	Serious	NA	Not serious	Yes	No	NA	High

21	Szajewska H et al., 2005 ¹⁰	Adults and children	<i>Saccharomyces boulardii</i>	AAD	NA	5	0.43 (0.23-0.78)	NA	Not serious	NA	Serious	NA	Large	NA	High
22	Szajewska H et al., 2015 ¹⁸	Adults and children	<i>Lactobacillus rhamnosus GG</i>	AAD	80	12	0.49 (0.29-0.83)	Serious	Not serious	Serious	Serious	No	Large	Low (++)	High
23	Vidlock E J et al., 2012 ¹¹	Any age group patients treated with antibiotics	Any Probiotics	AAD	306	34	0.53 (0.44-0.63)	Serious	Not serious	Serious	Not serious	No	No	Low (++)	Moderate
24	Guo Q et al., 2019 ¹²	paediatric patients treated with antibiotics	Any Probiotics	AAD	857	33	0.45 (0.36-0.56)	Serious	Not serious	Serious	Not Serious	No	No	Moderate (+++)	High
25	Guo Q et al., 2019 ¹²	paediatric patients treated with antibiotics	Any Probiotics 5 billion CFU	AAD	624	20	0.37 (0.30-0.46)	Serious	Not serious	Serious	Not Serious	No	No	Moderate (+++)	High
26	Guo Q et al., 2019 ¹²	paediatric patients treated with antibiotics	<i>Lactobacillus rhamnosus</i> (strains: GG, ATCC53103 and E/N, Oxy, Pen)	AAD	103	6	0.37 (0.24-0.55)	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not Serious	NA	No	NA	High
27	Kale-Pradhan P B et al., 2010 ⁹	Paediatrics	<i>Lactobacillus</i>	AAD	23	4	0.44 (0.18-1.08)	NA	Not serious	Very serious	Very serious	Yes	Large	NA	Moderate
28	Szajewska H et al., 2015 ¹⁸	Children	<i>Lactobacillus rhamnosus GG</i>	AAD	19	4	0.52 (0.25-1.05)	Serious	Not serious	Serious	Very serious	No	No	Very low (+)	High
29	Szajewska H et al., 2006 ¹³	Paediatric inpatients or outpatients	Any probiotics	AAD	40	6	0.44 (0.25-0.77)	Serious	Not serious	Serious	Serious	NA	Large	Low (++)	High
30	Vidlock E J et al., 2012 ¹¹	Paediatric patients treated with antibiotics	Any probiotics	AAD	71	10	0.48 (0.35-0.65)	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious	No	Large	High (++++)	Moderate
31	Xu H B et al., 2017 ¹⁹	Paediatrics	Bifidobacterium	AAD	NA	30	0.33 (0.29-0.39)	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	No	Very large	Moderate (+++)	Critically low
32	Zhang L et al., 2022 ¹⁴	Elderly on antibiotics	Any probiotic	AAD	311	8	0.99 (0.85-1.14)	Not serious	Not serious	Serious	Very serious	NA	No	Very low (+)	Moderate
33	Zhang L et al., 2022 ¹⁴	Elderly inpatients	Any probiotic	AAD	46	6	0.71 (0.5-1)	Not serious	Not serious	Serious	Very serious	NA	No	Very low (+)	Moderate
34	Zhang L et al., 2022 ¹⁴	Elderly inpatients	Probiotic given during antibiotic treatment	AAD	30	5	0.59 (0.39-0.89)	Not serious	Not serious	Serious	Serious	NA	No	Low (++)	Moderate
35	Avadhani A et al., 2010 ¹⁵	Adult hospitalized population	Any probiotic	AAD	78	8	0.56 (0.44-0.71)	Serious	Not serious	Very serious	Serious	NA	No	Very low (+)	Moderate
36	Avadhani A et al., 2010 ¹⁵	Adult hospitalized population	Any probiotic	CDAD	NA	4	0.29 (0.18-0.46)	Serious	Not serious	Very serious	Serious	Yes	Very large	Very low (+)	Moderate
37	Liao W et al., 2020 ¹⁶	Adult inpatients and outpatients	Any probiotic	AAD	605	36	0.62 (0.51-0.74)	Very serious	Not serious	Serious	Not serious	Yes	No	Very low (+)	Low
38	Jafarnejad S et al., 2016 ⁷	Adults	Any probiotic	AAD	301	25	0.47 (0.4-0.56)	Serious	Not serious	Serious	Not serious	No	Large	Moderate (+++)	Low

39	Vidlock E J et al., 2012 ¹¹	Adult patients treated with antibiotics	Any probiotic	AAD	242	24	0.53 (0.43-0.66)	Very serious	Not serious	Serious	Not serious	No	No	Very low (+)	Moderate
----	--	---	---------------	-----	-----	----	------------------	--------------	-------------	---------	-------------	----	----	--------------	----------

Table S5: Sensitivity analysis

Author, year	Primary analysis			Sensitivity analysis					
	No of studies	RR (95%CI); I ²	GRADE	Excluding high ROB trials			Excluding small-sized studies (i.e., <25th percentile)		
				No of studies	RR (95%CI); I ²	GRADE	No of studies	RR (95%CI); I ²	GRADE
Vidlock E J et al., 2012 ¹¹	10	0.48 (0.44, 0.63); 36%	High (++++)	7	0.42 (0.32, 0.52); I ² =0%	High	7	0.49 (0.34, 0.72) I ² =54.7%	Moderate

References

1. Pillai A, Nelson R. Probiotics for treatment of Clostridium difficile-associated colitis in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev Online*. 2008;(1):CD004611. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD004611.pub2
2. Sun X, Kong J, Zhu S, Liu C. A systematic review and meta-analysis: the therapeutic and preventive effect of Lactobacillus reuteri DSM 17,938 addition in children with diarrhea. *BMC Gastroenterol*. 2023;23(1):141. doi:10.1186/s12876-023-02778-4
3. McFarland LV. Meta-analysis of probiotics for the prevention of antibiotic associated diarrhea and the treatment of Clostridium difficile disease. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2006;101(4):812-822. doi:10.1111/j.1572-0241.2006.00465.x
4. Agamennone V, Krul CAM, Rijkers G, Kort R. A practical guide for probiotics applied to the case of antibiotic-associated diarrhea in The Netherlands. *BMC Gastroenterol*. 2018;18(1):103. doi:10.1186/s12876-018-0831-x
5. Blaabjerg S, Artzi DM, Aabenhus R. Probiotics for the Prevention of Antibiotic-Associated Diarrhea in Outpatients-A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Antibiot Basel Switz*. 2017;6(4). doi:10.3390/antibiotics6040021
6. Hempel S, Newberry SJ, Maher AR, et al. Probiotics for the prevention and treatment of antibiotic-associated diarrhea: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA J Am Med Assoc*. 2012;307(18):1959-1969. doi:10.1001/jama.2012.3507
7. Jafarnejad S., Shab-Bidar S., Speakman J.R., Parastui K., Daneshi-Maskooni M., Djafarian K. Probiotics Reduce the Risk of Antibiotic-Associated Diarrhea in Adults (18-64 Years) but Not the Elderly (>65 Years). *Nutr Clin Pract*. 2016;31(4):502-513. doi:10.1177/0884533616639399
8. Kale-Pradhan PB, Jassal HK, Wilhelm SM. Role of Lactobacillus in the prevention of antibiotic-associated diarrhea: a meta-analysis. *Pharmacotherapy*. 2010;30(2):119-126. doi:10.1592/phco.30.2.119
9. Ritchie ML, Romanuk TN. A meta-analysis of probiotic efficacy for gastrointestinal diseases. *PloS One*. 2012;7(4):e34938. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0034938
10. Szajewska H, Mrukowicz J. Meta-analysis: non-pathogenic yeast Saccharomyces boulardii in the prevention of antibiotic-associated diarrhoea. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther*. 2005;22(5):365-372. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2036.2005.02624.x
11. Videlock EJ, Cremonini F. Meta-analysis: probiotics in antibiotic-associated diarrhoea. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther*. 2012;35(12):1355-1369. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2036.2012.05104.x
12. Guo Q, Goldenberg JZ, Humphrey C, El Dib R, Johnston BC. Probiotics for the prevention of pediatric antibiotic-associated diarrhea. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 20190430th ed. 2019 Apr 30;4(4):Cd004827
13. Szajewska H, Ruszczynski M, Radzikowski A. Probiotics in the prevention of antibiotic-associated diarrhea in children: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Pediatr*. 2006;149(3):367-372.

14. Zhang L, Zeng X, Guo D, Zou Y, Gan H, Huang X. Early use of probiotics might prevent antibiotic-associated diarrhea in elderly (>65 years): a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Geriatr.* 2022;22(1):562. doi:10.1186/s12877-022-03257-3
15. Avadhani A, Miley H. Probiotics for prevention of antibiotic-associated diarrhea and Clostridium difficile-associated disease in hospitalized adults--a meta-analysis. *J Am Acad Nurse Pract.* 2011;23(6):269-274. doi:10.1111/j.1745-7599.2011.00617.x
16. Liao W, Chen C, Wen T, Zhao Q. Probiotics for the Prevention of Antibiotic-associated Diarrhea in Adults: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Placebo-Controlled Trials. *J Clin Gastroenterol.* 2020;55(6):469-480. doi:10.1097/MCG.0000000000001464
17. Cremonini F, Di Caro S, Nista EC, et al. Meta-analysis: the effect of probiotic administration on antibiotic-associated diarrhoea. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther.* 2002;16(8):1461-1467. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2036.2002.01318.x
18. Szajewska H, Kołodziej M. Systematic review with meta-analysis: Lactobacillus rhamnosus GG in the prevention of antibiotic-associated diarrhoea in children and adults. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther.* 2015;42(10):1149-1157. doi:10.1111/apt.13404
19. Xu HB, Jiang RH, Sheng HB. Meta-analysis of the effects of Bifidobacterium preparations for the prevention and treatment of pediatric antibiotic-associated diarrhea in China. *Complement Ther Med.* 2017;33(9308777, c6k):105-113. doi:10.1016/j.ctim.2017.07.001