

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

Investigating the Role of Zinc in Mitigating Blood Lead Levels Toxicity on Gut Microbiome
Diversity: NHANES 2007-2010

Kathyrn R Ayres,¹ Juan P. Liuzzi,² Freeman C. Lewis,³ Huda M. Mobarki⁴

Affiliations

1. Department of Dietetic and Nutrition, Rober Stemples College of Public health and Social Work, Florida International University, 11200 SW 8th St, AHC5, Miami FL 33199: kayre002@fiu.edu (K.R.A)
2. Department of Dietetic and Nutrition, Rober Stemples College of Public health and Social Work, Florida International University, AHC5/325, 11200 SW 8th St, AHC5, Miami FL 33199: jliuzzi@fiu.edu: 305-348-1611
3. Department of Environmental Health Sciences, Robert Stempel College of Public Health and Social Work, Florida International University, 11200 SW 8th St, AHC5, Miami, FL 33199: flewi017@fiu.edu (F.C.L.)
4. Department of Dietetics and Nutrition, Robert Stempel College of Public Health and Social Work, Florida International University, 11200 SW 8th St, AHC5, Miami, FL 33199. Email: hmba003@fiu.edu (H.M.M.)

Abstract

Introduction: Zinc is an essential micronutrient used in many biological functions including maintaining the gut microbial diversity. Many environmental factors, such as

32 lead exposure, have been shown to disrupt diversity. The purpose of this study was to
33 determine whether zinc serves as a protective factor against elevated blood lead levels
34 (BLL) on gut microbiome diversity.

35 Methods: The 2007-2008 and 2009-2010 NHANES datasets were utilized to conduct a
36 cross-sectional complex survey analysis aimed at determining whether zinc intake acts as
37 a protective factor against changes in microbiome diversity associated with BLL, using
38 enterolactone (ENL) as a biomarker. A multiple linear regression was conducted to
39 evaluate whether an interaction between BLL and zinc intake could predict ENL. The
40 model included BLL, zinc intake and their interaction, along with additional covariates
41 such as gender, fiber intake and BMI.

42 Results: BMI, fiber intake, and gender were identified as covariates through diagnostic
43 analysis and stepwise regression and were included in the final model. Sequential
44 variable selection revealed that fiber intake was a confounding variable in the relationship
45 between zinc and ENL levels ($p = 0.543$), while gender was identified as a confounding
46 factor between BLL and ENL levels ($p = 0.173$). After controlling for fiber intake, zinc
47 intake was not significantly associated with predicting microbiome diversity ($p = 0.101$).
48 Additionally, no significant interaction between zinc and BLL was observed in predicting
49 ENL levels ($p = 0.079$).

50 Conclusion: Zinc intake did not play a crucial role in mitigating the toxicity of BLL
51 exposure on gut microbiome diversity. However, the model did reveal important
52 confounding variables, such as gender and fiber intake, which should be considered when
53 using ENL as a biomarker. The public health implications suggest that dietary

54 interventions focusing on fiber intake and managing BMI could be key in maintaining a
55 diverse microbiome.

56

57 **1. Introduction**

58 1.1 Measuring Biodiversity

59 ENL is derived from plant lignans and have been proposed as a biomarker for measuring
60 microbiome diversity.¹ Ligands are metabolized by the gut microbiome into derivatives such as
61 ENL and can be measured in the urine.¹ Higher concentrations of ENL implies a more diverse
62 gut microbial community. This is because their synthesis is only possible after the conversion of
63 several other metabolites that require many species of bacteria in the gut microbiome to be
64 present.¹

65 1.2 Microbiome

66 The gut is home to trillions of microorganisms that include bacteria, fungi, archaea,
67 yeasts, protozoa, and viruses.² Approximately 10^{14} organisms inhabit the microbiota and exist in
68 a symbiotic relationship with the host.² Each individual is colonized with a varying microbial
69 ecosystem. A diverse population of microbiota is associated with a stable microbial environment
70 and positive health outcomes for the host.³ Decreases in commensal bacteria diversity has been
71 found in an array of medical conditions such as inflammatory bowel diseases,³ cognitive decline,
72 emotional health issues,⁴ as well as metabolic and chronic diseases.³

73 This interaction with the host has a systemic impact on health status which is why
74 research into the complex relationship between the gut microbiota and external stressors, such as
75 environmental pollutants, is actively under investigation. Environmental pollutants, chemicals
76 that cause disruption to biological pathways through the exposure of air, water, food, or soil, are

77 one factor that has been identified as a cause of gut dysbiosis and inflammation.⁵ One group of
78 environmental toxicants that have raised concerns of environmental and health experts are heavy
79 metals.

80 1.3 Heavy metals

81 Heavy metals are chemically active in biological pathways.⁶ The absorption of toxic
82 heavy metals, such as lead, can work to derail immunological functions and cause systemic
83 oxidative stress in tissue. This can result in devastating impairment of physiological functions,
84 including the gut. Toxic heavy metals that stay in the microenvironment of the gut disrupt the
85 complex metal-microbe-host interplay.⁶ This disruption to homeostasis has been linked to
86 alterations in the gut microbiome community and its diversity.⁷

87 Yet not all heavy metals are toxic. With a specific density of 7.14 g/cm³, zinc is
88 considered a heavy metal.⁸ Unlike noxious heavy metals, zinc functions as an essential
89 micronutrient in living organisms ranging from complex animal species to simplistic microbes.⁹
90 Twenty percent of the dietary intake of zinc is utilized by microbial bacteria.¹⁰ Zinc's role in
91 maintaining diversity is most likely linked to its ubiquitous nature. Bacteria utilize multiple zinc
92 dependent mechanisms including modulating host defense, antioxidant systems, gene expression,
93 and inhibiting transport of growth-promoting factors.¹¹ Zinc has been shown to be essential in
94 DNA repair, enzymatic reactions, responses to oxidative stress, four different transport systems,
95 and regulatory roles in other physiological processes within the microbiome.¹² Based on the
96 harmful effects that lead has on the gut, including its disruption of bacterial communities, and
97 zinc's involvement in critical pathways within the microbiome, it is plausible that zinc may
98 protect against lead's detrimental effects on gut diversity.

99 1.4 Significance

100 Understanding the functionality of the gut microbiome is critical due to its systemic
101 impact on health. Laboratory studies have confirmed that heavy metal exposure, including lead,
102 reduces gut microbiome diversity.¹³ The present population study is the first to explore the
103 potential protective role of zinc in maintaining this diversity at BLL found in the American
104 population. Zinc may act as an effect modifier, mitigating lead's negative impact on microbiome
105 diversity due to its essential role in numerous biological pathways and its involvement in many
106 taxa of gut bacteria. Additionally, using ENL as a biomarker for microbiome health in this
107 context adds a novel layer to the research, providing a new avenue for understanding the
108 interaction between zinc and lead in relation to gut health.

109 **Research Methods**

110 **4.1 Data**

111 Data from the CDC's NHANES 2007 - 2008 and 2009 - 2010 cycles were used to
112 conduct a cross-sectional analysis. The NHANES datasets, which are based on a cross-
113 sectional study design, employ a multistage, stratified, and clustered sampling approach with
114 survey weights to ensure accurate representation of the American population. These methods
115 were accounted for in the data analysis of this study. Zinc intake was assessed through 24-
116 hour dietary recall interviews, where participants provided detailed reports of their food and
117 beverage consumption. The USDA's Food and Nutrient Database for Dietary Studies was
118 used to calculate the nutrient content, including daily zinc intake, based on these records.
119 Blood lead levels (BLL) were measured using inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry
120 (ICP-MS), a highly accurate method for detecting lead concentrations in whole blood.
121 Microbiome diversity was indirectly assessed through the measurement of ENL, a metabolite
122 produced by gut bacteria, which was collected via urine samples. These data collection

123 methods allowed for a robust analysis of the relationship between zinc intake, BLL, and gut
124 microbiome diversity.

125 Zinc intake, fiber intake, BLL, BMI ENL, age, gender, and creatinine were merged and
126 uploaded into SPSS. ENL was collected in cycles between 1999 – 2010 and supplement
127 intake was collected starting in the 2007-08 cycle. Including supplement intake was deemed
128 important to capture accurate zinc and fiber intakes. This limited the study to the 2 cycles.
129 The two 24-hour recalls for zinc food and supplement intake were both added and averaged
130 to determine total zinc intake. Missing data from food intake was replaced by the means for
131 each cycle. Carry over imputation was used to avoid non-response bias for missing data for
132 supplements because not every participant used supplements. The same was done for fiber
133 intake. Individuals below the age of 18 and older than 50 were removed due to the changes in
134 microbiome diversity at these stages of life.¹⁴ ENL was adjusted for creatinine levels by
135 dividing ENL, measured in ng/dL, by creatinine, measured in mg/dL, resulting in units of
136 ng/mg/dL. This adjustment corrects for differences in urine dilution among individuals.^{1, 15}
137 ENL was also common log transformed to account for its non-normal distribution. Lead
138 levels were measured in the blood in $\mu\text{g/dL}$.

139 2.2 Complex Survey Analysis

140 A complex survey design was accounted for using RStudio's Survey Package in the
141 analysis. Descriptive statistics were run for all variables. Following diagnostic testing, a forward
142 stepwise regression approach was employed to assess the relationships between the covariates
143 and independent variables, focusing on their predictive capacity for ENL levels. An interaction
144 term was incorporated to evaluate whether varying levels of zinc and BLL can predict ENL
145 levels. The final model included BLL and zinc as independent variables, and accounted for fiber

146 intake, BMI, and gender as covariates as well the zinc and BLL interaction term. All statistical
147 analyses and visualizations were performed using RStudio (Version 2023.09.1+494) accessed
148 through Anaconda.

149 **3. Results**

150 3.1 Descriptive

151 After removing missing values, the study included a total of 1,887 participants, with an
152 even distribution of females (51%) and males (49%) (Table 1). Continuous variables revealed all
153 participants had BLL in their system, with BLL concentrations ranging from a minimum of 0.18
154 $\mu\text{g/dL}$ to a maximum of 11.8 $\mu\text{g/dL}$ and an average of 1.24 $\mu\text{g/dL}$. Participants' ages ranged from
155 18 to 48 years, with a mean age of 33.47 years (Table 2). The analysis revealed significant
156 gender differences in several variables. Females had significantly higher levels of ENL than
157 males, with a mean difference of 0.25 (p-value = <0.001). This suggests that females may exhibit
158 greater gut microbiome diversity compared to males. The analysis also found a substantial
159 gender difference in BLL, where males had significantly higher BLL than females, with a mean
160 difference of 0.59 $\mu\text{g/dL}$ (p-value = <0.001). Although there was a significant difference in zinc,
161 this is logical as women's RDA is 8 mg/day and men's is 11 mg/day. Similarly, males consumed
162 significantly more fiber than females, with a mean difference of 2.82 grams (p-value = $2.00\text{e-}06$).
163 Unlike zinc, fiber intake was below the RDA for both men and women (38 grams/day for men
164 and 25 grams/day for women), with average intakes of 17.81 grams/day for men and 14.99
165 grams/day for women. Both men and women's average BMI was considered overweight and did
166 not show a significant difference between genders (Table 3).

167

Table 1: Study Participants

Gender	Proportion	n
Male	0.49	925
Female	0.51	962
Total	1.0	1887

168

Table 2: Descriptive statistics

Variable	Weighted Mean	Weighted SD	Max	Min
Log10_ENL	2.28	0.81	4.47	-0.93
BMI (kg/m ²)	28.16	7.03	68.63	15.49
AGE (years)	33.47	8.99	48	18
Total Fiber (g/day)	16.36	8.09	68.75	1.1
Total Zinc (mg/day)	16.08	9.79	113.02	1.05
BLL (µg/dL)	1.24	0.99	11.8	0.18

169

170

Table 3: Gender specific descriptive statistics

Variable	t-statistic	df	p-value	Male: Mean (SE)	Female: Mean (SE)
Log10_ENL	5.1724	31	< 0.0001	2.147084 (0.0354)	2.400567 (0.030)
Total Fiber (g/day)	-5.829	31	< 0.0001	17.80844 (0.488)	14.98591 (0.307)
Total Zinc (g/day)	-4.0465	31	0.0003	17.23821 (0.534)	14.98044 (0.410)
BMI (kg/m ²)	-0.2622	31	0.7949	28.26989 (0.295)	28.17684 (0.278)
BLL	-11.838	31	< 0.0001	1.55433 (0.053)	0.965175 (0.022)

171

172 3.2 Multiple Linear Regression

173 Table 3 shows a total of 6 regression models were created in the forward stepwise
 174 process. The initial model only considered zinc intake's ability to predict ENL. Zinc showed a
 175 statistically significant positive relationship with ENL ($p = 0.025$). This indicates that higher
 176 levels of zinc are associated with increased ENL levels, albeit the effect is modest. The second
 177 model included lead and zinc. Model 2 identified a significant negative relationship between

178 BLL ($p = 0.0135$). This suggests that higher BLL are associated with lower ENL levels,
179 supporting the hypothesis that lead exposure may adversely affect microbiome diversity. In
180 Model 3, BMI emerged as a significant predictor ($p < 0.001$), indicating that higher BMI is
181 associated with lower ENL levels. The inclusion of gender in Model 4 revealed a significant
182 positive relationship ($p = <0.001$). However, the addition of gender resulted in the loss of
183 significance in BLL. In model 5 fiber replaced the addition of gender as a covariate. Upon its
184 addition zinc lost its significance. Finally in model 6, the interaction term between BLL and zinc
185 was included in the model with all of the covariates. The interaction term between BLL and zinc
186 exhibited a p-value of 0.079, indicating that while it did not reach conventional significance, it is
187 close to the threshold.

188 Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) was used to determine how well the model explains
189 variation in ENL because of the studies complex survey design. Unlike R^2 , which can
190 misleadingly increase with additional variables and does not adequately account for the design
191 effects associated with sampling methods and stratification, AIC helps identify the most effective
192 predictors by penalizing overfitting. In this study, the AIC values ranged from 4226.40 to
193 4340.13. The decreasing AIC values across models suggest that adding variables improves the
194 model's fit. With the exception of the addition a fiber. However, since AIC is used to compare
195 models rather than measure explained variance, it does not indicate how much of the variation in
196 ENL levels is accounted for. This suggests that other unmeasured factors may still influence
197 ENL levels, warranting further investigation.

198

199

Table 4: Forward Stepwise Regression Model Selection with AIC

<i>Step</i>	Variable	Coefficient	SE	t-value	p-value	AIC
1	Intercept	2.200588	0.039038	56.37	< 0.001	4340.13
	Total Zinc	0.00527	0.002232	2.361	0.025	
2	Intercept	2.266742	0.041158	55.075	< 0.001	4334.26
	Total Zinc	0.005365	0.002232	2.403	0.023	
	Lead	-0.05464	0.020815	-2.625	0.014	
3	Intercept	2.853902	0.098997	28.828	< 0.001	4279.94
	Total Zinc	0.004558	0.002305	1.978	0.056	
	Lead	-0.06095	0.019025	-3.203	0.003	
	BMI	-0.02012	0.002849	-7.061	< 0.001	
4	Intercept	2.660036	0.0938	28.359	< 0.001	4244.87
	Total Zinc	0.00595	0.002354	2.527	0.017	
	Lead	-0.0275	0.019667	-1.398	0.173	
	BMI	-0.01989	0.002789	-7.132	< 0.001	
	GENDER2	0.241185	0.050048	4.819	< 0.001	
5	Intercept	2.740478	0.098501	27.822	< 0.001	4270.35
	Total Zinc	0.001632	0.002653	0.615	0.543	
	Lead	-0.06335	0.018641	-3.399	0.002	
	BMI	-0.01957	0.002779	-7.042	< 0.001	
	Total Fiber	0.009044	0.003342	2.706	0.011	

6	Intercept	2.42935	0.104723	23.198	< 0.001	4226.4
	BMI	-0.019	0.002656	-7.152	<0.001	
	GENDER2	0.266067	0.052903	5.029	<0.001	
	Total Fiber	0.01139	0.003406	3.344	0.003	
	Lead	0.023971	0.03494	0.686	0.499	
	Total Zinc	0.006034	0.00355	1.7	0.101	
	Zinc: Lead	-0.00293	0.001604	-1.826	0.079	

201

202 4. Discussion

203 4.1 Enterolactone as a biomarker

204 ENL has been used as a biomarker in research but not as a standard protocol in clinical
205 settings. However, both human and population studies have found reliability with this biomarker.
206 A human study published by (Hullar et al, 2015) investigated the association between the
207 diversity of the microbiome and presence of ENL in premenopausal women.¹ Urine samples
208 were used to quantify ENL and stool samples were obtained to measure diversity in the gut
209 microbiome using 16S rRNA.¹ They concluded metabolism of lignans in the gut is dependent on
210 the presence of a diverse community of microorganisms to perform the series of reactions.¹ A
211 review published by (Lampe, 2003) even predicted that advancements in methodologies for
212 measuring lignans will result in the use of their derivatives as biomarkers in large population-
213 based studies.¹⁶

214 The analysis from this current population study supports that ENL is a reliable biomarker
215 for gut microbiome diversity. The regression model found a positive correlation between fiber
216 and ENL. Fiber intake has shown to increase diversity in the gut microbiome.¹⁷ Inversely,
217 increased BMI, related to obesity, has been associated with decreased diversity in the gut

218 microbiome.¹⁸ BMI was found to have a significantly negative correlation with ENL in the
219 regression model.

220 4.3 Confounding factors

221 When total fiber was added to the model, the significance of zinc was lost, with the
222 coefficient estimate for zinc changing from 0.004558 to 0.001632. This represents a percentage
223 change of approximately 64.25%, indicating that zinc may not have a meaningful impact on ENL
224 levels when fiber is accounted for. The substantial change in the estimate suggests that zinc's
225 apparent influence on ENL was likely an overestimation prior to including fiber in the model,
226 highlighting the importance of considering confounding factors like dietary fiber in future
227 analyses.

228 When gender was incorporated into model the estimate for lead changed from -0.06095
229 to -0.02750, a 54.9% increase, and its significance diminished from ($p = 0.003$) to ($p = 0.1730$).
230 The adjustment for gender revealed a need to account for it as a confounding factor in
231 understanding its influence on ENL levels. Diagnostic tests found that men have significantly
232 higher BLL and lower ENL compared to women. While neither men or women met their fiber
233 intake needs on average, it is possible men's higher exposure to lead coupled with low fiber
234 intake could also contribute to reduced ENL levels. This highlights a complex relationship
235 between the covariate, independent and dependent variables.

236 4.2 Zincs' role in protecting diversity

237 In a linear regression, an interaction between zinc intake and BLL would have suggested
238 that the effect of lead on the outcome (e.g., ENL levels) depended on the level of intake zinc.
239 Specifically, if zinc mitigated the harmful effects of lead, the interaction term would reflect that

240 zinc alters the relationship between lead and the outcome. Although the data did not support a
241 significant interaction between zinc and BLL in their effect on ENL, further investigation may
242 still be warranted. The interaction term was estimated at 0.079, close to the threshold of
243 significance. Future studies could explore other models, such as an ANCOVA, by categorizing
244 zinc and BLL. Additionally, a sensitivity analysis may help identify the biological thresholds at
245 which changes in ENL occur, particularly in response to specific levels of zinc intake or lead
246 toxicity.

247 4.4 Weakness

248 There were several weaknesses of this study to consider. Firstly, this study used self-
249 reported 24-h recalls which may not be as accurate as direct reporting. Also, diversity is
250 influenced by many variables that were not included in this model such as genetics, disease,
251 mode of delivery, infant feeding, medication, exposure to other pollutants and dietary factors.¹⁹
252 The current study included only three covariates and had a high AIC. This supports that other
253 unmeasured factors may significantly influence the outcomes, warranting further exploration.

254 Literature supports that low intake of zinc causes a decrease in diversity through
255 deficiency and high intake causes a decrease in diversity related to toxicity.²⁰ A review
256 published by (Cheng et al., 2023) found a decrease in α -diversity in rat, mice, pigs, and broiler
257 chicken models following zinc deficiency and overload.²¹ The majority of the participants in the
258 present study had optimal zinc intake, meaning these extreme zinc intakes were rare in the data.
259 Also, lead toxicity is low America. This prevented the true relationship of a dose response curve
260 to be fully analyzed and helps to explain the opposing results from other studies. One way to
261 address this would be to utilize data from a population that has higher lead exposure and zinc
262 deficiency rates.

263 Diversity was measured by the concentration of the ENL metabolite which is synthesized
264 after a series of reactions requiring many species of bacteria. This gives a snapshot into the
265 changes in diversity. However, measuring changes in diversity is complex. For a more
266 comprehensive understanding of changes in diversity, bacteria populations are identified through
267 16s rRNA sequencing and analyzed through alpha and beta diversity analysis. Alpha diversity
268 considers richness, evenness, and phylogenetic diversity and beta diversity uses distant metrics to
269 measure communal changes at different taxological levels. ENL is limited to representing only a
270 subset of the microbial community dynamics and may not be accurately capturing the changes in
271 bacterial populations. This is important because the removal of heavy metals from the gut seems
272 to rely on the presence of specific bacteria species.^{22, 23}

273 **5. Conclusion**

274 It was hypothesized that effect modification would be caused by zinc in the relationship
275 between BLL and ENL, however this was not supported in the current analysis, as the interaction
276 between zinc and BLL was not statistically significant. In fact, due to confounding relationships
277 neither zinc nor BLL were found to significantly predict ENL levels in the model. Zinc's
278 potential impact on bacterial diversity may not have been fully captured in this design, and future
279 studies should explore different models, such as ANCOVA and sensitivity analysis, from data
280 with a case control design to better understand these interactions. The data did support that
281 including factors like gender and fiber intake when using ENL as a biomarker is important, as
282 they may confound the relationship between independent and dependent variables. Given
283 discovery that lead may be more toxic than once thought, and the gut microbiome's influence on
284 immune function, nutrient absorption, and inflammation regulation, further investigation is
285 recommended.^{28, 29}

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332

References

333 1. Hullar MAJ, Lancaster SM, Li F, et al. Enterolignan-producing phenotypes are associated with
334 increased gut microbial diversity and altered composition in premenopausal women in the
335 United States. *Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention*. 2015;24(3). doi:10.1158/1055-
336 9965.EPI-14-0262

337 2. Thursby E, Juge N. Introduction to the human gut microbiota. *Biochemical Journal*. 2017;474(11).
338 doi:10.1042/BCJ20160510

339 3. Durack J, Lynch S V. The gut microbiome: Relationships with disease and opportunities for
340 therapy. *Journal of Experimental Medicine*. 2019;216(1). doi:10.1084/jem.20180448

341 4. Lee SH, Yoon SH, Jung Y, et al. Emotional well-being and gut microbiome profiles by enterotype.
342 *Sci Rep*. 2020;10(1). doi:10.1038/s41598-020-77673-z

- 343 5. Singh S, Sharma P, Pal N, et al. Impact of Environmental Pollutants on Gut Microbiome and
344 Mental Health via the Gut–Brain Axis. *Microorganisms*. 2022;10(7).
345 doi:10.3390/microorganisms10071457
- 346 6. Duan H, Yu L, Tian F, Zhai Q, Fan L, Chen W. Gut microbiota: A target for heavy metal toxicity and
347 a probiotic protective strategy. *Science of the Total Environment*. 2020;742.
348 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140429
- 349 7. Gao B, Chi L, Mahbub R, et al. Multi-Omics Reveals that Lead Exposure Disturbs Gut Microbiome
350 Development, Key Metabolites, and Metabolic Pathways. *Chem Res Toxicol*. 2017;30(4).
351 doi:10.1021/acs.chemrestox.6b00401
- 352 8. Gordon SR, Vaishnava S. Zinc supplementation modulates T helper 17 cells via its effect on gut
353 microbiome. *The Journal of Immunology*. 2020;204(1_Supplement).
354 doi:10.4049/jimmunol.204.supp.83.18
- 355 9. Andreini C, Banci L, Bertini I, Rosato A. Counting the zinc-proteins encoded in the human
356 genome. *J Proteome Res*. 2006;5(1). doi:10.1021/pr050361j
- 357 10. Hood MI, Skaar EP. Nutritional immunity: Transition metals at the pathogen-host interface. *Nat*
358 *Rev Microbiol*. 2012;10(8). doi:10.1038/nrmicro2836
- 359 11. Pajarillo EAB, Lee E, Kang DK. Trace metals and animal health: Interplay of the gut microbiota
360 with iron, manganese, zinc, and copper. *Animal Nutrition*. 2021;7(3).
361 doi:10.1016/j.aninu.2021.03.005
- 362 12. Velasco E, Wang S, Sanet M, et al. A new role for Zinc limitation in bacterial pathogenicity:
363 Modulation of α -hemolysin from uropathogenic *Escherichia coli*. *Sci Rep*. 2018;8(1).
364 doi:10.1038/s41598-018-24964-1
- 365 13. Jan AT, Azam M, Siddiqui K, Ali A, Choi I, Haq QMR. Heavy metals and human health: Mechanistic
366 insight into toxicity and counter defense system of antioxidants. *Int J Mol Sci*. 2015;16(12).
367 doi:10.3390/ijms161226183
- 368 14. Wilmanski T, Diener C, Rappaport N, et al. Gut microbiome pattern reflects healthy ageing and
369 predicts survival in humans. *Nat Metab*. 2021;3(2). doi:10.1038/s42255-021-00348-0
- 370 15. Sun Q, Wedick NM, Pan A, et al. Gut microbiota metabolites of dietary lignans and risk of type 2
371 diabetes: A prospective investigation in two cohorts of U.S. women. *Diabetes Care*. 2014;37(5).
372 doi:10.2337/dc13-2513
- 373 16. Lampe JW. Erratum: Isoflavonoid and lignan phytoestrogens as dietary biomarkers (Journal of
374 Nutrition (2003) 133 (956S-964S)). *Journal of Nutrition*. 2003;133(9).
- 375 17. Fu J, Zheng Y, Gao Y, Xu W. Dietary Fiber Intake and Gut Microbiota in Human Health.
376 *Microorganisms*. 2022;10(12). doi:10.3390/microorganisms10122507
- 377 18. Liu BN, Liu XT, Liang ZH, Wang JH. Gut microbiota in obesity. *World J Gastroenterol*. 2021;27(25).
378 doi:10.3748/wjg.v27.i25.3837

- 379 19. Wen L, Duffy A. Factors influencing the gut microbiota, inflammation, and type 2 diabetes.
380 *Journal of Nutrition*. 2017;147(7). doi:10.3945/jn.116.240754
- 381 20. Skalny A V., Aschner M, Lei XG, et al. Gut microbiota as a mediator of essential and toxic effects
382 of zinc in the intestines and other tissues. *Int J Mol Sci*. 2021;22(23). doi:10.3390/ijms222313074
- 383 21. Cheng J, Kolba N, Tako E. The effect of dietary zinc and zinc physiological status on the
384 composition of the gut microbiome in vivo. *Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr*. Published online 2023.
385 doi:10.1080/10408398.2023.2169857
- 386 22. Zhai Q, Qu D, Feng S, et al. Oral Supplementation of Lead-Intolerant Intestinal Microbes Protects
387 Against Lead (Pb) Toxicity in Mice. *Front Microbiol*. 2020;10. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2019.03161
- 388 23. Massoud R, Khosravi-Darani K, Sharifan A, Asadi GH, Zoghi A. Lead and cadmium biosorption
389 from milk by *Lactobacillus acidophilus* ATCC 4356. *Food Sci Nutr*. 2020;8(10).
390 doi:10.1002/fsn3.1825

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412