

A Critical Narrative Review of the Gut–Brain and Microbiome Disruptive Potential of Non-Nutritive Sweeteners and Emulsifiers

Dr. Eugene Capitano, DC, MSc (Neuroscience & Psychology of Mental Health, King's College London), Research interests: gut-brain axis, functional nutrition, and translational microbiome science.

Abstract

Non-nutritive sweeteners (NNS) and dietary emulsifiers are widely used in processed foods marketed as low-calorie, sugar-free, or gut-friendly. While considered safe under current toxicological standards, emerging evidence suggests these additives may disrupt gut microbiota, compromise intestinal and blood-brain barrier (BBB) integrity, and induce neuroimmune activation, raising concern about their inclusion in clinical nutrition products targeting the microbiome or brain health. This review critically evaluates the mechanistic, preclinical, and clinical literature on the effects of commonly used NNS and emulsifiers on gut microbiota composition, microbial metabolism, intestinal permeability, BBB function, and neuroinflammation, and assesses their suitability for inclusion in gut- and brain-targeted formulations. A narrative review approach was employed, synthesizing findings from randomized controlled trials, mechanistic animal and in vitro models, human observational studies, and regulatory reports. Compounds assessed include sucralose, aspartame, acesulfame potassium, saccharin, stevia, polysorbate 80 (P80), carboxymethylcellulose (CMC), lecithins, mono- and diglycerides, carrageenans, and food gums such as xanthan, guar, and gum arabic. Particular focus was given to studies involving gut barrier integrity, microbiome-mediated immune signaling, BBB permeability, and cognitive or metabolic outcomes. Multiple NNS and

emulsifiers, including Ace-K, P80, and CMC, were found to impair glucose tolerance, reduce microbial diversity, increase production of pro-inflammatory microbial molecules (e.g., lipopolysaccharide, flagellin), and weaken epithelial and endothelial tight junctions. Notably, chronic Ace-K exposure altered hippocampal energy metabolism and impaired memory in animal models. P80 and CMC disrupted BBB-related gene expression, induced astrocyte and microglial activation, and accelerated age-related cognitive decline. Even compounds considered inert or prebiotic in some contexts (e.g., gum arabic, sunflower lecithin) demonstrated dose- and context-dependent disruption in mechanistic models. Despite regulatory approval for general use, many NNS and emulsifiers exhibit mechanistic properties that may undermine microbiome balance, gut integrity, and neuroimmune resilience, particularly with chronic or high-dose exposure. These findings underscore the need for stricter evaluation of such compounds in clinical nutrition products, especially those targeting microbiome or neuroprotective benefits.

Keywords: non-nutritive sweeteners, dietary emulsifiers, gut microbiota, intestinal permeability, blood–brain barrier, neuroinflammation, gut–brain axis, microbial diversity

Introduction

The widespread integration of non-nutritive sweeteners (NNS) and dietary emulsifiers into processed foods has raised important questions about their long-term effects on human health, particularly given emerging evidence that these additives may not be metabolically inert (Conz, Salmona, & Diomedea, 2023; Miclotte et al., 2020). Disruptions in the gut microbiome composition and associated changes in intestinal and neuroimmune function are increasingly recognized as playing a pivotal role in metabolic, inflammatory, and neuropsychiatric conditions (Liu et al., 2022; Naimi et al., 2021). Nevertheless, regulatory safety assessments of food

additives often overlook their impact on gut microbial ecology and the health of the gut-brain axis (Warner, 2024). Recent advances in microbiome science and neurogastroenterology have illuminated the critical roles of gut microbiota in host metabolic regulation, immune function, and even central nervous system homeostasis via the gut-brain axis (Liu et al., 2022). Both NNS, such as sucralose, aspartame, saccharin, and acesulfame potassium, and common dietary emulsifiers like polysorbate 80 and carboxymethylcellulose, have been shown in animal models and in vitro studies to alter microbial diversity, disrupt intestinal barrier integrity, modulate neuroimmune signaling, and potentially contribute to neuroinflammatory and metabolic disorders (Chassaing et al., 2015; Naimi et al., 2021). Notably, certain NNS and emulsifiers appear capable of influencing blood-brain barrier permeability and engaging pathways implicated in mood, cognition, and neuropsychiatric health (Burke & Small, 2015; Arnold et al., 2022).

Despite ongoing regulatory approval and widespread inclusion in food products, the context-dependent and at times irreversible impacts of these additives on the gut microbiome and related systemic processes underscore the need for a reevaluation of their long-term safety, especially in populations vulnerable to metabolic or neuropsychiatric diseases (Conz et al., 2023). The microbiome's role as a responsiveness hub and mediator of additive-host interactions suggests that both individual susceptibility and the cumulative effect of chronic exposure should be central considerations for future nutritional guidelines (Suez et al., 2022). This review critically assesses the mechanistic, preclinical, and human data underlying the disruptive potential of NNS and dietary emulsifiers on the gut-brain axis. By synthesizing evidence from recent studies, our aim is to elucidate the microbiome-mediated pathways by which these

ubiquitous food additives may impact host health and identify pressing gaps for further research and regulatory scrutiny.

Methods

This narrative review synthesizes and critically evaluates current evidence on the biological effects of non-nutritive sweeteners (NNS) and dietary emulsifiers on the gut microbiome, intestinal barrier function, neuroinflammation, and the gut-brain axis (Conz, Salmona, & Diomedea, 2023; Naimi et al., 2021). Rather than applying rigid inclusion and exclusion criteria, studies were selected based on their mechanistic relevance and contribution to emerging hypotheses regarding the microbiome- neuroimmune interface (Miclote et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2022). Peer-reviewed publications were identified through keyword-based searches in PubMed, Google Scholar, and ScienceDirect. Search terms included combinations such as "non-nutritive sweeteners," "emulsifiers," "gut microbiota," "intestinal permeability," "lipopolysaccharide," "neuroinflammation," "microglia," "blood-brain barrier," and "depression/anxiety." Additional sources were identified by manually reviewing the reference lists of key reviews and seminal mechanistic studies (Miclote et al., 2020; Conz et al., 2023). The review prioritized studies elucidating molecular and physiological mechanisms, particularly those involving widely used dietary additives such as acesulfame potassium, sucralose, aspartame, saccharin, polysorbate 80, carboxymethylcellulose, and lecithins (Naimi et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2022). Animal and in vitro studies were included if they examined microbiome composition, gut barrier integrity, inflammatory markers, or neurobiological outcomes. Human clinical trials and observational

studies were considered when they reported microbial, metabolic, or cognitive effects associated with these compounds (Conz et al., 2023).

Mechanistic investigations of key pathways—including toll-like receptor 4 (TLR4) signaling, nuclear factor kappa B (NF- κ B) activation, cyclooxygenase-2 (COX-2), senescence-associated secretory phenotype (SASP), and mTORC1—were emphasized to construct a conceptual framework linking dietary exposures to systemic and central nervous system effects (Miclotte et al., 2020). Particular attention was given to studies reporting alterations in gut microbial metabolites, such as lipopolysaccharide (LPS), short-chain fatty acids (SCFAs), and flagellin, alongside neuroimmune outcomes including microglial activation and astrocytic reactivity (Miclotte et al., 2020).

While this review does not claim to be exhaustive, it aims to reflect the current state of the evidence, highlighting relevant mechanistic pathways, clinical implications, and pressing areas for further investigation. The selected studies represent a focused yet diverse body of literature that contributes to a deeper understanding of how common food additives may influence host physiology via microbiome-brain interactions (Naimi et al., 2021; Miclotte et al., 2020).

Composition Is Not Function: Why "No Major Microbiome Change" Does Not Mean Biological Inertness

Microbiome research has increasingly moved beyond the question of which organisms are present toward the more clinically relevant question of what those organisms are doing. Traditional microbiome studies often report alpha diversity, beta diversity, and relative abundance of bacterial taxa. These measures are useful, but they do not fully capture microbial

function, metabolic output, host-microbe signaling, or barrier-level effects. A microbial ecosystem may appear relatively stable by broad taxonomic measures while still producing meaningful changes in short-chain fatty acid production, bile acid metabolism, inflammatory tone, epithelial mucus interaction, intestinal permeability, or glucose regulation (Lavrinenko et al., 2025; Shade & Handelsman, 2012).

This distinction is important when interpreting studies on non-nutritive sweeteners and emulsifiers. A study that reports minimal change in overall microbiome composition does not necessarily demonstrate that an additive is biologically inert. From a translational and clinical perspective, the more important question is whether exposure alters microbial activity or host physiology in a way that may matter over time, particularly in individuals with metabolic vulnerability, inflammatory bowel conditions, altered barrier function, or an already disrupted microbiome (Lavrinenko et al., 2025).

The human trial by Suez et al. (2022) provides a clear example of this issue. In a randomized controlled study of 120 healthy adults, participants consumed saccharin, sucralose, aspartame, or stevia at doses below the acceptable daily intake for two weeks, compared with vehicle and unsupplemented control groups. The study found that each non-nutritive sweetener produced distinct changes in the stool and oral microbiome and plasma metabolome. Importantly, saccharin and sucralose significantly impaired glycemic responses in healthy adults. These effects were not uniform across all participants, supporting the concept that host response may depend partly on baseline microbiome composition and function.

The mechanistic component of the Suez et al. (2022) study further strengthens its relevance. When microbiomes from human responders were transferred into germ-free mice, the recipient mice developed glycemic responses that reflected the human donor phenotype. This finding supports a microbiome-dependent mechanism rather than a simple direct pharmacologic effect of the sweetener alone. In practical terms, the study does not prove that all non-nutritive sweeteners are harmful in all people, but it does challenge the assumption that these compounds are metabolically inert.

This interpretation is consistent with broader microbiome ecology. The concept of a "core microbiome" has evolved beyond the search for a fixed set of shared organisms. A more useful framework recognizes that microbial communities can differ taxonomically while preserving, losing, or altering shared functional capacities. Therefore, functional measures such as metabolomics, metagenomics, transcriptomics, short-chain fatty acid profiles, mucus-barrier effects, immune activation, and host metabolic outcomes may be more informative than taxonomic composition alone (Shade & Handelsman, 2012).

Recent emulsifier research points in the same direction. In a placebo-controlled randomized trial of five dietary emulsifiers, alpha diversity remained stable, yet microbial composition and short-chain fatty acid concentrations were affected during supplementation. Carboxymethylcellulose showed the clearest reduction in short-chain fatty acids, while other emulsifiers showed similar patterns that did not always reach statistical significance. Carrageenan was associated with increased transcellular intestinal permeability during the intervention. These findings illustrate why a narrow focus on diversity scores may underestimate

additive-related effects on microbial function and gut barrier physiology (Wellens et al., 2026).

The available evidence therefore supports a more precise conclusion: non-nutritive sweeteners and emulsifiers should not be treated as a single uniform category, nor should they be assumed to be biologically inert simply because they are low-calorie, non-absorbed, or approved for use. Their effects appear to be ingredient-specific, dose-dependent, and host-context dependent. The most clinically relevant concern is not whether every exposure produces obvious dysbiosis, but whether repeated exposure may alter microbial function, barrier resilience, metabolic signaling, or inflammatory tone in susceptible individuals (Lavrinenko et al., 2025; Suez et al., 2022; Wellens et al., 2026).

For gut- and brain-targeted nutrition products, this distinction is central. A formulation intended to support microbiome integrity, metabolic stability, or gut-brain resilience should be evaluated by a higher standard than basic regulatory toxicology. The precautionary argument is not that every approved additive is proven harmful; it is that ingredients with unresolved effects on microbial function, barrier biology, or host metabolic response may be inappropriate when they are not nutritionally necessary.

Results

Effects of Non-Nutritive Sweeteners (NNS) on the Gut Microbiome and Metabolism

Monk fruit extract (MFE) has demonstrated promising short-term metabolic effects in randomized controlled trials, such as reductions in postprandial glucose (10-18%) and insulin responses (12-22%). However, its long-term safety and broader applicability remain uncertain. A

recent PRISMA-guided systematic review of five high-quality RCTs found no serious adverse events; notably, none of these trials assessed the impact of MFE on gut microbiota, intestinal permeability, or neurocognitive outcomes. Furthermore, the trials were generally of short duration and involved ethnically homogenous populations from Asia and North America, limiting the global relevance of the findings. This raises concerns that genetic and dietary differences across populations may affect metabolic responses and that underrepresentation could mask variability in efficacy or safety profiles (Kaim & Labus, 2025). Although MFE is approved for use in the United States, China, and Canada, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has withheld authorization, citing insufficient toxicological and mechanistic data.

Subchronic animal studies have reported safety concerns, including a 90-day toxicity study in which high-dose male rats exhibited decreased testis weight and irreversible tubular degeneration and atrophy-deemed potentially adverse by the EFSA Panel (Younes et al., 2019). This regulatory divergence underscores the contradiction between localized acceptance based on preliminary findings and the need for more rigorous, long-term safety data (Kaim & Labus, 2025). Claims regarding the antioxidant and anti-inflammatory benefits of MFE's bioactive mogrosides remain unsubstantiated in prospective human studies, and the "natural health" image associated with MFE appears to outpace the current empirical support. Given unresolved issues such as the lack of microbiome or brain-health outcomes, as well as the potential for contamination with bulking agents like erythritol or maltodextrin, it is scientifically prudent to exclude MFE from gut- or neuro-targeted health products until comprehensive, long-term, and more demographically diverse studies are available (Kaim & Labus, 2025).

A landmark multi-arm randomized controlled trial by Suez et al. (2022) evaluated the metabolic and microbiome-mediated effects of four widely used non-nutritive sweeteners- sucralose, saccharin, aspartame, and stevia in 120 healthy, NNS-naive adults. Even at doses below the accepted daily intake, sucralose and saccharin significantly impaired glycemic control, as indicated by increased glucose incremental area under the curve (iAUC) during oral glucose tolerance testing. Aspartame and stevia did not elicit major glycemic changes. All four NNS produced distinct alterations in both gut and oral microbiome composition and function, as indicated by shotgun metagenomic sequencing; these changes were absent in controls, demonstrating active interactions with host microbes. Further, microbiomes transplanted from "top responders" (those most metabolically affected by NNS) into germ-free mice reproduced similar glycemic impairments, confirming a causal link between NNS-induced microbiome changes and host metabolism. Plasma metabolomics also revealed shifts in metabolites-including TCA cycle intermediates and amino acids-that correlated with impaired glucose tolerance and altered microbial pathways. Notably, individual responses to NNS were highly variable and dependent on baseline microbiome composition, underscoring the personalized nature of NNS effects (Suez et al., 2022)

These findings challenge the traditional assumption that NNS are metabolically inert, indicating a more complex and individualized safety profile than previously believed. Even stevia and aspartame, which did not impair glycemia, drove significant functional shifts in the microbiome, suggesting broader potential health implications. The authors propose the microbiome functions as a "responsiveness hub," through which NNS-host interactions are

mediated-a dynamic process inconsistent with the conventional view of NNS as biologically neutral (Suez et al., 2022).

A review by Ruiz-Ojeda et al. (2019) synthesized experimental and clinical evidence, concluding that sucralose, saccharin, and stevia consistently altered gut microbiota composition. Saccharin and sucralose induced notable dysbiosis, reducing beneficial genera such as *Lactobacillus* and *Bifidobacterium* and, in animal models, were linked to proinflammatory responses and impaired glucose tolerance. Steviol glycosides were generally considered compatible with the microbiome but showed weak antimicrobial effects and *Bacteroides* modulation. In contrast, polyols like isomalt, lactitol, and maltitol demonstrated bifidogenic properties, while erythritol and mannitol appeared mostly neutral but potentially disruptive at high doses due to osmotic changes.

Nevertheless, conclusions were limited by reliance on animal and observational studies, which precludes definitive causal inference. Most human studies on NNS are short-term, underpowered, lack diversity, and rarely include long-term metabolic or microbiome endpoints- indicating a need for more robust research. The Suez et al. (2022) study represents a critical advance, demonstrating that even low-dose exposure to sucralose and saccharin can impair glycemic control via microbiome-mediated pathways.

All four sweeteners altered gut and oral microbiota, and fecal microbiota transplantation (FMT) from high-responding individuals into germ-free mice reproduced these glycemic impairments, establishing causality. Notably, the metabolic effects of NNS were highly individualized, depending on baseline microbiome composition. Such evidence challenges the prevailing narrative that NNS are metabolically inert and underscores the need for patient-

specific safety assessments. Given the scarcity of long-term, well-powered human trials and the mechanistically plausible microbiome-host interactions, current safety recommendations—especially for gut-targeted products—may warrant reconsideration in microbiome-sensitive populations.

Functional and Compositional Microbiome Effects of NNS: Insights from Metaproteomics and Systematic Reviews

Recent metaproteomic data have intensified scientific scrutiny over the use of non-nutritive and sugar-substitute sweeteners in microbiome-targeted applications. Wang (2021), in a University of Ottawa master's thesis, provides useful mechanistic support for the view that sweeteners may influence microbial function, not merely microbial composition. Using RapidAIM, an ex vivo human gut-microbiome culturing platform combined with metaproteomics, the study evaluated 20 common sweeteners and found genus-level taxonomic changes across the tested compounds. Functional profiling showed that sugar alcohols and glycoside sweeteners produced larger metaproteomic shifts than several non-caloric artificial sweeteners. Taxon-specific analyses implicated butyrate-producing pathways involving organisms such as *Faecalibacterium*, *Eubacterium*, *Coprococcus*, *Lachnospiraceae*, and *Roseburia hominis*. Because this was an ex vivo thesis study rather than a clinical trial, its findings should be interpreted as mechanistic and hypothesis-generating rather than as direct evidence of human harm.

Blasche et al. (2026) systematically mapped interactions between 25 phylogenetically diverse gut bacterial strains and 39 commercially used sweeteners, tested individually and with commonly co-consumed compounds. Roughly three-quarters of the sweeteners affected the

growth of at least one bacterial strain, and over 100 sweetener–compound interactions were identified. Notably, isosteviol, a steviol-glycoside derivative, acted synergistically with the antidepressant duloxetine to inhibit *Roseburia intestinalis*, a butyrate-producing commensal linked to glucose homeostasis, and *Parabacteroides merdae*. In a synthetic microbial community this combination increased toxicity to epithelial cells and altered secretion of the inflammatory cytokines IL-6 and IL-8 by Caco-2 cells. Given butyrate's vital role in intestinal barrier integrity, immune regulation, and host-microbiota signaling, these findings raise concerns about the implications of habitual sweetener consumption for gut homeostasis. Although the study stops short of clinical conclusions, it contributes to a growing body of evidence that many non-nutritive sweeteners are not microbiota-inert and may exert off-target effects on microbial function that go beyond simple taxonomic alterations.

A recent systematic review by Conz, Salmona, and Diomedea (2023) reinforces growing concerns about the impact of non-nutritive sweeteners (NNS) on the gut microbiota. Synthesizing human clinical trials and animal studies from the past decade, the authors found that widely consumed NNS- including aspartame, sucralose, saccharin, and acesulfame-K-can alter gut microbial composition and metabolic activity. Some short-term human studies reported negligible or no changes in microbial diversity, whereas others found shifts in microbial taxa and function, notably after exposure to saccharin and sucralose. In contrast, animal models more consistently demonstrated pronounced dysbiosis, marked by reductions in beneficial bacteria such as *Lactobacillus*, *Bifidobacterium*, and *Clostridium*, along with increases in potentially pathogenic taxa like *Proteobacteria* and *Escherichia coli*. These microbial changes often co-

occurred with increased intestinal permeability, inflammation, and compromised gut barrier integrity.

The authors emphasize that, although NNS are widely approved based on toxicological data, their effects on the gut microbiome remain insufficiently understood, especially in the context of long-term and habitual use. Notably, the review underscores the need for more robust, long-term, and standardized human studies to clarify the microbiological and metabolic consequences of NNS use, as well as to address individual variation in microbiome responsiveness. Further analysis from Conz et al. (2023) highlighted the divergence in findings among existing studies. While some human trials found no major effects of aspartame or sucralose, others, including the landmark RCT by Suez et al. (2022), identified distinct microbiome and metabolic disruptions, particularly for sucralose and saccharin.

Animal studies were more consistent, revealing that NNS-induced dysbiosis generally involved reductions in beneficial taxa and enrichment of pro-inflammatory or potentially pathogenic bacteria, together with heightened inflammatory markers and increased gut barrier permeability. Importantly, NNS reach the colon intact, allowing direct interaction with the gut microbiota; nonetheless, risk assessment is complicated by high inter-individual variability in response. The findings of Blasche et al. (2026) further corroborate that non-nutritive sweeteners, including plant-derived steviol components, are not microbiota-inert and can perturb butyrate-producing taxa and epithelial signalling

Table 1. Comparative summary of key reviews and experimental studies on non-nutritive sweeteners and the gut microbiome.

Dimension	Blasche et al. (2026)	Ruiz-Ojeda et al. (2019)	Conz et al. (2023)	Synthesis
Study type	Mechanistic in vitro (bacterial strains × sweeteners)	Review of experimental + clinical studies	Review of human + animal evidence	Evidence is mixed by compound and model
Sweeteners	Steviol derivatives and diverse commercial sweeteners	Synthetic NNS, natural sweeteners, polyols	Sucralose, saccharin, aspartame, stevia, Ace-K	Evaluate individually, not as one class
Functional outcome	Growth inhibition; butyrate-producer perturbation; cytokine shifts	Composition and metabolic findings	Microbiome change, glucose regulation	Composition alone may miss activity changes
Key concern	Sweetener–xenobiotic synergy on butyrate producers	Saccharin/sucralose stronger than alternatives	Possible microbiome-mediated effects	Strongest human signal: saccharin/sucralose (Suez et al., 2022)
Limitation	In vitro; not a clinical outcome trial	Heterogeneous, limited long-term RCTs	Narrative synthesis; causality varies	Supports precaution, not universal harm

Effects of Dietary Emulsifiers on Gut Microbiota and Metabolic Health

A recent in vivo and in vitro study by Panyod et al. (2024) systematically evaluated the effects of four widely consumed emulsifiers-lecithin, sucrose fatty acid esters, carboxymethylcellulose (CMC), and mono- and diglycerides (MDGs)-on metabolic health

and gut microbiota composition in mice. The findings revealed that sucrose fatty acid esters and CMC significantly disrupted glucose homeostasis, inducing hyperglycemia, hyperinsulinemia, and elevated HOMA-IR scores. Both emulsifiers also promoted substantial gut microbiota dysbiosis, depleting beneficial taxa such as Muribaculaceae, Faecalibaculum, and Parasutterella and enriching disease-associated genera, including Blautia and Clostridium sensu stricto 1. Lecithin induced a milder metabolic response but still altered microbial composition, notably increasing Streptococcus-a genus linked to inflammatory processes-while depleting Oscillibacter and Turicibacter, taxa associated with butyrate production and intestinal homeostasis.

MDG intake was associated with impaired lipid and glucose metabolism, elevated circulating lipopolysaccharide (LPS), and reduced microbial evenness, suggesting an increased risk of systemic inflammation. Notably, while lecithin, CMC, and sucrose esters did not disrupt the intestinal mucus barrier or promote epithelial invasion, MDGs significantly decreased the distance between luminal bacteria and epithelial cells, raising concerns about mucosal barrier compromise and chronic inflammation. Collectively, Panyod et al. (2024) emphasize that all tested emulsifiers significantly altered gut microbiota α - and β -diversity, and these shifts correlated with key features of metabolic dysregulation.

These results suggest that emulsifiers-once presumed safe under GRAS standards-may contribute to metabolic syndrome via microbiota-host interactions, underscoring the need to reevaluate their widespread inclusion in ultra-processed foods. Although lecithin, particularly from sunflower sources, is often promoted as a cleaner alternative to synthetic

emulsifiers, emerging evidence challenges its presumed neutrality on the gut microbiome. Even though lecithin produced milder metabolic disturbances compared to CMC or MDGs in Panyod et al.'s (2024) study, it still significantly altered microbial community structure, increasing pro-inflammatory genera and reducing beneficial butyrate producers.

Furthermore, these changes in gut microbiota α - and β -diversity were paired with features of metabolic dysregulation. Consequently, inclusion of lecithin-even in its sunflower-derived form-may not be advisable in clinical-grade formulations aimed at supporting gut health or reducing inflammation, particularly in populations with underlying metabolic or gastrointestinal vulnerabilities (Panyod et al., 2024). In a preliminary in vitro study, Dufrusine et al. (2023) examined the cellular and inflammatory effects of two commonly used food emulsifiers (EMI and EMII) on Caco-2 intestinal epithelial cells and THP-1-derived macrophages. Compared to extra virgin olive oil controls, both emulsifiers significantly increased Caco-2 cell proliferation and migration, as demonstrated by MTT and wound healing assays-behaviors indicative of early inflammatory and tumorigenic activity. Emulsifier exposure led to a marked increase in interleukin-6 (IL-6) secretion and, in the case of EMI, also strongly induced CCL2 expression, both cytokines central to intestinal inflammation and implicated in the pathogenesis of inflammatory bowel disease. Conditioned media from emulsifier-treated Caco-2 cells further amplified IL-6 release by macrophages, suggesting a secondary pro-inflammatory effect via epithelial-immune cell signaling.

These findings reinforce growing concerns about emulsifier- triggered mucosal immune activation, highlighting that even "technologically necessary" emulsifiers may pose

inflammatory risks with chronic exposure. Dufrusine et al. (2023) argue for revisiting current food safety assessments to incorporate endpoints sensitive to chronic immune perturbations, beyond conventional toxicological parameters. Sandall et al. (2020) conducted a two-part investigation into the effects of common food emulsifiers on intestinal inflammation in mice, as well as the feasibility of a low-emulsifier diet in individuals with Crohn's disease. In the animal model, chronic administration of CMC, polysorbate-80 (P80), soy lecithin, or gum arabic over twelve weeks led to reduced colonic length-a surrogate marker of intestinal inflammation-with the most pronounced effects observed for CMC and P80. These emulsifiers were also associated with increased body weight and adipose tissue, indicating metabolic consequences beyond inflammation alone.

The parallel human feasibility study demonstrated that adults with stable Crohn's disease maintained high adherence to a low-emulsifier diet for two weeks, successfully eliminating 65 food additives. Adherence resulted in improved gastrointestinal symptoms, enhanced food-related quality of life, and preserved nutritional adequacy. Participants found the intervention acceptable and sustainable. Sandall et al. (2020) conclude that a broad range of emulsifiers -including some not previously studied in vivo-may contribute to gut inflammation, and that restrictive low-emulsifier diets are feasible and safe, warranting further clinical evaluation in inflammatory bowel disease populations (Sandall et al., 2020).

Context- and Dose-Dependence of Natural Emulsifiers and Dietary Gums

Although alginate and its oligosaccharide derivatives (AOS) have demonstrated promising preclinical effects, the current evidence base does not support their inclusion in clinical-grade formulations intended to modulate the human gut microbiome, particularly in individuals with inflammatory or metabolic disorders. In a 15-day animal study, oral administration of calcium alginate aerogels in rats produced no detectable toxicity and modestly shifted microbial composition, most notably increasing Clostridia and Bacteroidia-taxa often associated with butyrate production (Al- Najjar et al., 2021). Similarly, a narrative review by Zhang, Wang, and Li (2023) highlighted anti-inflammatory and prebiotic effects of purified AOS in animal models, including increased short-chain fatty acid (SCFA) production and enrichment of beneficial taxa such as Akkermansia, Lactobacillus, and Faecalibacterium. However, these findings derive primarily from short-term, preclinical studies with limited translational relevance for chronic human use.

No long-term human clinical trials have evaluated alginate emulsifiers or oligosaccharides for safety, microbiome modulation, or efficacy in conditions such as inflammatory bowel disease or metabolic dysfunction. Furthermore, alginate's biological effects may vary substantially with molecular weight, purity, degree of polymerization, and formulation context. Given the absence of validated human data, unclear dose-response relationships, and the need for rigorous characterization of functional outcomes, alginate should not be considered microbiota-targeted or functionally active in the context of clinical nutrition or therapeutic interventions. While no evidence currently suggests harm, the lack of robust, long-term safety and efficacy data renders

alginate unsuitable for daily use in microbiome-focused formulations, especially for vulnerable populations (Al-Najjar et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2023).

A recent mechanistic study by Naimi et al. (2021) systematically evaluated the direct effects of 20 commonly used dietary emulsifiers on human gut microbiota using the MiniBioReactor Array (MBRA) in vitro model (see Table 2 for details). While established synthetic emulsifiers such as carboxymethylcellulose (CMC) and polysorbate 80 (P80) were confirmed to induce long-lasting, deleterious shifts in microbial composition and pro-inflammatory activity, the study revealed that many other emulsifiers-including dietary gums (guar, xanthan, gum arabic, locust bean), carrageenans, diacetyl tartaric acid esters of mono- and diglycerides (DATEM), and glyceryl stearate- exerted similarly harmful effects. These included reductions in microbial diversity, suppression of beneficial taxa (e.g., *Faecalibacterium*, *Oscillibacter*, *Lachnospiraceae*), and increased production of lipopolysaccharide (LPS) and flagellin, both key pro-inflammatory microbial molecules.

Metatranscriptomic analysis demonstrated broad suppression of microbial gene expression, particularly in pathways essential for mucosal health. Although soy and sunflower lecithin exhibited comparatively milder effects in this model, they were not entirely inert. Naimi et al. (2021) concluded that most tested emulsifiers negatively altered gut microbiota composition and function in ways that may predispose to chronic inflammation, particularly under conditions of habitual or cumulative exposure.

Table 2. Microbiome impact matrix for selected dietary emulsifiers and texturizing additives.

Additive	Human evidence	Animal / model evidence	Interpretation	References
Carboxymethylcellulose (CMC)	Limited human intervention data; newer trial suggests lower SCFAs	Strong dysbiosis/barrier signal in animal and MBRA models	Reduced diversity, altered composition, increased pro-inflammatory potential	Naimi et al., 2021; Wellens et al., 2026
Polysorbate 80 (P80)	Limited direct human RCT evidence	Mucus thinning, microbial shifts, inflammation, brain-related effects in mice	Potent dysbiosis and inflammatory signal	Naimi et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2024
Carrageenan	Human crossover data suggest metabolic/permeability concerns in some contexts	Inflammatory and barrier effects in mechanistic models	Ingredient-specific caution warranted	Wagner et al., 2024; Wellens et al., 2026
Soy lecithin	Early human trial suggests possible SCFA effects but limited taxonomic signal	Mixed; generally weaker than CMC/P80	Not proven strongly harmful, but not automatically neutral	Naimi et al., 2021; Wellens et al., 2026
Sunflower lecithin	Sparse human data	Milder shifts than synthetic emulsifiers	Nuance rather than strong harm claims	Naimi et al., 2021
Maltodextrin	Limited human microbiome trial evidence	Mucus-barrier and inflammatory effects in mechanistic models	Barrier-disruptive concern with repeated exposure	Naimi et al., 2021; Zangara et al., 2022
Gum arabic	Human evidence supports prebiotic effects at supplemental doses	Context-dependent effects in additive models	May benefit in controlled dosing; not neutral in processed matrices	Calame et al., 2008; Naimi et al., 2021
Guar / xanthan / other gums	Limited direct clinical evidence as additives	Compound- and dose-dependent microbial shifts	Not a single safety category	Naimi et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2022

Even compounds traditionally considered benign-such as gum arabic, which has shown dose-dependent prebiotic effects in human trials by promoting *Bifidobacterium*, *Lactobacillus*, and SCFA production-elicited dysbiotic and pro-inflammatory responses under high-dose or isolated exposure in vitro. These responses included decreased microbial diversity and increased flagellin production, suggesting that natural emulsifiers are not universally microbiota-friendly, particularly when consumed outside traditional or whole-food contexts (Naimi et al., 2021). The authors emphasized that many positive human trials test such ingredients as targeted supplements, often in individuals with low baseline fiber intake and minimal additive exposure, whereas ultra-processed food environments can produce frequent, multi-emulsifier exposures at levels sufficient to tip the microbial balance toward dysbiosis (Naimi et al., 2021). This distinction is particularly relevant for gum arabic and guar gum, both generally regarded as safe and marketed as microbiome-enhancing fibers. Naimi et al.'s (2021) results do not necessarily contradict prior clinical findings but indicate that gut microbiota responses are dose-, duration-, and co- exposure dependent. What may be beneficial when consumed intermittently or as a standalone supplement may become disruptive under chronic, cumulative exposure-particularly in combination with other additives that share inflammatory potential.

While dietary gums may retain functional value in specific clinical or supplement contexts, their classification as universally benign emulsifiers is no longer tenable. Their microbiome impact should be considered contextual, conditional, and highly individualized. Future research is needed to define safe dose thresholds, characterize additive-additive synergies, and assess habitual consumption risks across diverse populations (Naimi et al., 2021).

Emulsifier Microbiome Impact Summary (Naimi et al., 2021; MBRA in vitro model — no clinical-trial data)

Additive	In vitro (MBRA) effect	Interpretation
Carboxymethylcellulose (CMC)	Reduced diversity; increased LPS/flagellin; compositional shifts	Strongest dysbiosis signature
Polysorbate-80 (P80)	Mucus-degrading shifts; increased LPS; inflammatory potential	Potent inducer of dysbiosis
Carrageenans (iota/kappa/lambda)	Reduced diversity; pro-inflammatory signalling	Strong microbial disruption
Xanthan / guar / locust-bean gums	Reduced diversity; increased LPS/flagellin (dose-dependent)	Not microbiota-neutral under mechanistic testing
Gum arabic	Reduced diversity and increased flagellin in vitro; prebiotic at human supplemental doses	Context- and dose-dependent (Calame et al., 2008)
DATEM, glyceryl stearate, HPMC, sorbitan monostearate	Reduced evenness; suppression of microbial gene expression	Mechanistically disruptive
Soy / sunflower lecithin	Mildest effects; minor compositional shifts	Weaker than synthetic emulsifiers, but not fully inert
Mono- and diglycerides	Minimal shifts in MBRA	Structurally similar to disruptive agents; caution warranted

All effects above are ex vivo (MBRA model); no clinical-trial data exist for these compounds in this study. Maltodextrin is a bulking agent rather than an emulsifier and so is not listed in the emulsifier summary above; however, it was among the compounds tested by Naimi et al. (2021), which reported that it significantly altered microbiota composition and increased inflammatory signalling, with complementary mucus-barrier evidence from Zangara et al. (2022).

Impact of Emulsifiers and Non-Nutritive Sweeteners on Blood-Brain Barrier Integrity and Neuroinflammation

A growing body of evidence indicates that both dietary emulsifiers and non-nutritive sweeteners (NNSs) can compromise blood-brain barrier (BBB) integrity and promote neuroinflammation through a combination of direct central effects and indirect gut microbiota-mediated pathways (Zhang et al., 2024; Arnold et al., 2022; Cong et al., 2013; Burke & Small, 2015; Naimi et al., 2021). Several commonly used emulsifiers, most notably polysorbate 80 (P80) and carboxymethylcellulose (CMC), have been shown to impair BBB integrity in animal models. Chronic dietary P80 exposure reduces key tight junction proteins-ZO-1 and Occludin-in BBB endothelial cells, as confirmed by immunofluorescence and Western blot analyses. Gene expression profiling further supports these structural findings: P80 and CMC downregulate PCDHGA5 (encoding a cadherin-like adhesion protein critical for BBB stability), upregulate ARNO (enhancing vascular permeability), and elevate SPARC expression (linked to increased BBB permeability and endothelial inflammation).

Collectively, these changes weaken barrier function, increasing the potential for peripheral toxins or immune mediators to access the brain (Zhang et al., 2024; Arnold et al., 2022). Beyond barrier disruption, emulsifiers can initiate and sustain neuroinflammation. Chronic P80 intake activates both microglia and astrocytes, increases the proportion of neurotoxic C3⁺ GFAP⁺ astrocytes, and impairs microglial phagocytic capacity. These cellular changes occur alongside elevated levels of pro-inflammatory mediators-including IFN- γ , ICAM-1, IL-17, and CXCL12-following both direct exposure and microbiota transplantation from treated animals, indicating a gut-brain axis mechanism. Transcriptomic analysis reveals enrichment of immune-related

pathways such as PTGS2/COX2 and MIF in the amygdala and hypothalamus, consistent with persistent, low-grade neuroinflammation (Zhang et al., 2024; Arnold et al., 2022).

Impact of Non-Nutritive Sweeteners on BBB Integrity and Neuroinflammation

Among NNSs, acesulfame potassium (AceK/ACK) is distinctive in its ability to cross the BBB and accumulate in brain tissue after chronic exposure in mice. This direct neural penetration disrupts hippocampal energy metabolism and synaptic signaling-manifesting as decreased glycolysis, reduced ATP production, and diminished neurotrophic support (lower BDNF/TrkB and Akt/ERK pathway activity). While classical inflammatory markers are less consistently elevated, these neurometabolic disturbances create a permissive environment for neuroinflammatory cascades, cognitive decline, and heightened vulnerability to injury (Cong et al., 2013; Burke & Small, 2015).

Other NNSs-such as aspartame, saccharin, and sucralose-have not demonstrated robust BBB penetration or direct neuroinflammatory effects at typical human-relevant intakes. However, each has been associated with alterations in gut microbiota and host metabolic function, suggesting an indirect potential to modulate brain health via the microbiota-gut-brain axis (Burke & Small, 2015).

Role of the Gut Microbiota in BBB and Neuroimmune Modulation

Both emulsifiers and select NNSs can significantly reshape gut microbial communities, often increasing the abundance of pro-inflammatory signatures such as lipopolysaccharide (LPS) and flagellin. These microbiota-derived molecules activate systemic immune pathways that, in turn, influence BBB permeability and neuroinflammatory signaling. This indirect route-via

microbiota-gut-brain communication-provides a mechanistically plausible and experimentally supported link between dietary additive exposure and central neuroimmune changes (Zhang et al., 2024; Naimi et al., 2021).

Summary

The available evidence supports a model in which dietary emulsifiers-particularly P80 and CMC-and certain NNSs, most notably AceK, impair BBB integrity either through direct effects on endothelial junction proteins or indirectly via gut microbiota-mediated immune activation. These structural and functional disruptions are accompanied by neuroimmune activation and low-grade brain inflammation, with potential implications for cognitive function and neurological disease risk (Zhang et al., 2024; Arnold et al., 2022; Cong et al., 2013; Burke & Small, 2015; Naimi et al., 2021). Such findings highlight the need for ingredient-specific and population-specific safety assessments, especially in vulnerable individuals or those consuming these additives chronically.

Table 3. Direct and indirect evidence linking selected sweeteners and emulsifiers with brain-relevant outcomes.

Compound	Exposure	Barrier	Neuroimmune	Downstream	References
Polysorbate 80 (P80)	Chronic mouse, ~1% in water	Reduced tight-junction markers; altered barrier genes	Microglial/astrocytic activation; cytokine changes	Dysbiosis, bile-acid shifts, cognitive decline	Zhang et al., 2024; Arnold et al., 2022
Carboxymethylcellulose (CMC)	Chronic mouse, ~1%	Altered BBB-related gene expression	Low-grade inflammation ; neuroimmune changes	Microbiome-mediated inflammation ; barrier vulnerability	Arnold et al., 2022; Holder et al., 2019
Acesulfame	Long-term	CNS	Altered	BBB	Cong et al.,

Compound	Exposure	Barrier	Neuroimmune	Downstream	References
potassium (Ace-K)	mouse	accumulation ; neurometabolic effects	hippocampal energy metabolism; memory effects	crossing; mitochondria l/neurotrophic signalling	2013
Saccharin / sucralose	Human RCT below ADI	No direct human BBB evidence	Indirect via microbiome/metabolic signalling	Impaired glycemia via microbiome-dependent mechanism	Suez et al., 2022
Aspartame	Human and animal; rapidly metabolized	No robust direct BBB evidence	Possible subtle behavioral/metabolic findings	Less microbiome-disruptive than saccharin/sucralose	Suez et al., 2022; Burke & Small, 2015

Gut Barrier Dysfunction, Endotoxemia, and Blood-Brain Barrier Disruption: Mechanistic Insights

Intestinal barrier dysfunction is increasingly recognized as a pivotal factor in the development of systemic and neurological diseases, particularly in the context of dietary influences and gut microbiota alterations. The intestinal barrier consists of multiple protective layers-including intestinal alkaline phosphatase (IAP), mucus, epithelial cells, and antibacterial peptides-which collectively prevent the translocation of bacterial components such as lipopolysaccharide (LPS) into systemic circulation (Ghosh et al., 2020). Disruption of any of these layers, whether through dietary factors (e.g., high-fat diets, alcohol) or gut microbiome dysbiosis, can result in elevated circulating LPS and subsequent immune activation. This is accompanied by increased production of pro-inflammatory mediators such as $\text{TNF}\alpha$, $\text{IL-1}\beta$, and

IL-6, which can further impair barrier integrity and amplify inflammatory signaling (Ghosh et al., 2020).

Once the intestinal barrier is compromised, LPS enters systemic circulation, acting as a potent immune stimulant and contributing to metabolic endotoxemia and chronic inflammatory states. In both human and animal studies, excessive alcohol consumption has been associated with elevated serum LPS and monocyte activation markers, with the magnitude of increase proportional to alcohol intake; abstinence reverses these effects (Liangpunsakul et al., 2017). Similarly, in ruminants and other mammalian models, diets high in rapidly fermentable carbohydrates or non-physiological additives elevate gut-derived LPS, resulting in metabolic endotoxemia, chronic inflammation, and reduced organ function (Khiaosa-ard & Zebeli, 2018).

Chronic systemic exposure to LPS extends its impact beyond peripheral organs to the central nervous system. LPS-induced systemic inflammation can impair blood-brain barrier (BBB) integrity, with downregulation of tight junction proteins and endothelial adhesion molecules identified as central mechanisms (Chmielarz et al., 2024). Even at low concentrations, LPS primes microglia, creating a persistent neuroinflammatory state implicated in neurodegenerative processes (Chmielarz et al., 2024).

Experimental evidence shows that BBB vulnerability to LPS varies by brain region and involves both paracellular and transcytotic transport pathways; some disruption is reversible with cyclooxygenase inhibition (Banks et al., 2015). Inflammatory cytokines induced by systemic endotoxemia, including IL-1 β , IL-6, and TNF α , further compromise BBB tight junctions and perpetuate neuroinflammatory cascades. Across multiple models, dietary emulsifiers, synthetic additives, and certain non-nutritive sweeteners that alter gut microbial diversity or increase LPS-

producing taxa produce effects consistent with those of high-fat diets and alcohol—namely, increased gut permeability, elevated systemic LPS, and downstream BBB disruption (Khiaosa-ard & Zebeli, 2018; Ghosh et al., 2020; Chmielarz et al., 2024). These findings collectively position gut barrier dysfunction and metabolic endotoxemia as key mechanistic links between diet-induced microbiota alterations and neuroinflammatory processes (Ghosh et al., 2020; Chmielarz et al., 2024; Banks et al., 2015).

From Gut Dysbiosis to Neuroinflammation: Emerging Evidence on Sweeteners and Emulsifiers in Modulating Brain Reward Circuits

Current research demonstrates that non-nutritive sweeteners (NNS) and dietary emulsifiers can disrupt the gut microbiome, with growing evidence linking these changes to downstream effects on brain function. These include neuroimmune activation, altered blood-brain barrier (BBB) integrity, and changes in cognitive and behavioral outcomes. While direct human evidence is limited, animal studies and mechanistic work suggest multiple plausible microbiota-gut-brain pathways through which these compounds may influence the central nervous system (CNS).

Alterations in Gut Microbiota Composition and Functional Potential Induced by Non-Nutritive Sweeteners and Emulsifiers

Non-nutritive sweeteners (NNS) and dietary emulsifiers have been consistently shown to disrupt the gut microbiome, altering both microbial diversity and metabolic function. Artificial sweeteners such as sucralose, aspartame, saccharin, and acesulfame potassium significantly reduce beneficial taxa, including *Bifidobacterium* and *Lactobacillus*, while promoting the overgrowth of potentially pro-inflammatory genera such as *Clostridiales* and *Bacteroides* (Suez

et al., 2014; Conz et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2022; Naimi et al., 2021; Ivanovic & Dimitrijevic Brankovic, 2024). These compositional shifts often coincide with functional changes, including increased microbial production of lipopolysaccharide (LPS) and flagellin-potent immune activators that compromise gut barrier integrity (Xiong et al., 2023). NNS-induced dysbiosis is associated with reduced short-chain fatty acid (SCFA) production, impaired gut hormone signaling, and altered glucose metabolism (Suez et al., 2014; Conz et al., 2023). These effects disrupt bidirectional gut-brain communication, influencing satiety, reward perception, and motivational behaviors. For example, sucralose exposure in animal models increases expression of DeltaFosB in the nucleus accumbens and amygdala, suggesting long-term alterations in neural reward circuitry, particularly when combined with heightened endocannabinoid activity (Salaya-Velazquez et al., 2020).

Gut Barrier Dysfunction and Systemic Endotoxemia

The intestinal barrier comprises multiple protective layers-including intestinal alkaline phosphatase (IAP), mucus, epithelial cells, and antimicrobial peptides-that collectively prevent translocation of microbial products into systemic circulation (Ghosh et al., 2020). Disruption of these layers, whether through dietary exposures such as high-fat diets, alcohol, synthetic additives, or NNS- and emulsifier-induced dysbiosis, facilitates the passage of LPS into the bloodstream, leading to metabolic endotoxemia. This state is characterized by elevated circulating LPS and increased production of pro-inflammatory mediators including TNF α , IL-1 β , and IL-6, which can further damage barrier integrity (Ghosh et al., 2020).

Human and animal studies demonstrate that dietary and lifestyle factors directly influence circulating LPS levels. Excessive alcohol consumption correlates with elevated serum LPS and

monocyte activation, with effects reversing upon abstinence (Liangpunsakul et al., 2017). Similarly, in mammalian models, rapidly fermentable carbohydrate-rich diets and certain food additives elevate gut-derived LPS, promoting chronic inflammation and organ dysfunction (Khiaosa-ard & Zebeli, 2018).

Blood-Brain Barrier Disruption and Neuroinflammatory Priming

Once LPS enters systemic circulation, it exerts potent effects on the central nervous system (CNS) by impairing blood-brain barrier (BBB) integrity. LPS downregulates tight junction proteins and endothelial adhesion molecules, increasing paracellular permeability (Chmielarz et al., 2024). Even at low concentrations, LPS can prime microglia, creating a persistent pro-inflammatory state that contributes to neurodegenerative disease progression (Chmielarz et al., 2024). BBB disruption appears region-specific, involving both paracellular and transcytotic transport pathways, and can be partially reversed by cyclooxygenase inhibition (Banks et al., 2015). Pro-inflammatory cytokines generated during endotoxemia-IL-1 β , IL-6, and TNF α -further degrade BBB structure and amplify neuroinflammation.

Neuroimmune Modulation by Emulsifiers

Common emulsifiers, including carboxymethylcellulose (CMC), polysorbate 80 (P80), lecithins, mono- and diglycerides, and carrageenans, reduce α -diversity, shift microbial communities toward mucus-degrading species, and increase gut permeability (Miclote et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2022; Panyod et al., 2024). Although lecithin-particularly sunflower-derived lecithin-is often marketed as a "clean" alternative to synthetic emulsifiers, emerging evidence challenges the assumption that it is microbiota-neutral.

Animal studies demonstrate that chronic P80 and CMC exposure induces microglial activation, astrocytic reactivity, and altered expression of BBB-regulating genes (Arnold et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2024). These neuroimmune changes correspond with behavioral outcomes such as increased anxiety-like behavior, reduced social interaction, and deficits in learning and memory (Holder et al., 2019; Xiong et al., 2023). Furthermore, emulsifier-induced shifts in hypothalamic and amygdala neuropeptide expression suggest secondary effects on reward and motivational pathways.

From Dysbiosis to Altered Brain Reward Circuits

Microbial metabolites and inflammatory mediators generated in dysbiotic states modulate brain function via the microbiota-gut-brain axis. Elevated LPS and flagellin activate Toll-like receptor (TLR) signaling, trigger systemic cytokine release, and impair BBB function (Naimi et al., 2021; Xiong et al., 2023). These immune-driven signals influence dopaminergic, serotonergic, and neuropeptide systems—key regulators of mood, reward sensitivity, and cognition (Warner, 2024; Conz et al., 2023). Neuroimaging studies show that NNS activate reward-related brain regions, including the ventral striatum, but elicit weaker dopaminergic responses than sugar, potentially disrupting reward prediction error processing (Greenberg & St. Peter, 2021; Onalapo & Onalapo, 2018; Yang, 2010). Acesulfame potassium, uniquely, crosses the BBB and accumulates in the hippocampus and cortex, impairing mitochondrial function and memory (Cong et al., 2013).

Animal data further demonstrate that sweetener- or emulsifier-induced microbiota changes are linked to elevated brain inflammatory markers, decreased neurotrophic factor expression, and altered synaptic plasticity (Salaya-Velazquez et al., 2020; Conz et al., 2023).

These effects are context-dependent, dose-dependent, and in some cases reversible with dietary modification or targeted microbiota interventions. Collectively, these results provide converging evidence that both non-nutritive sweeteners and dietary emulsifiers can modulate gut microbiota composition, compromise gut and blood-brain barrier integrity, and influence neuroimmune and neurobehavioral outcomes through microbiota-gut-brain axis pathways. The mechanistic findings across animal and human studies, coupled with consistent patterns of microbial dysbiosis, inflammatory signaling, and neural changes, establish a strong foundation for interpreting the broader implications of these additives for metabolic, neurological, and behavioral health.

Clinical Evidence in Humans and Vulnerable Populations

The strongest clinical evidence does not support a blanket claim that every approved sweetener or emulsifier is harmful in every person. Rather, it supports a more precise conclusion: several commonly used additives are biologically active in humans and can influence microbiome function, glycemic response, short-chain fatty acid production, intestinal permeability, or inflammatory tone under specific conditions.

The most robust non-nutritive sweetener evidence remains the randomized controlled trial by Suez et al. (2022), in which 120 healthy adults who were strict non-consumers of non-nutritive sweeteners were exposed to saccharin, sucralose, aspartame, or stevia below the acceptable daily intake for two weeks. Saccharin and sucralose worsened glycemic responses, all four sweeteners altered the microbiome and metabolome, and fecal transfer into germ-free mice supported a microbiome-dependent mechanism. For emulsifiers, the strongest human signal comes from the double-blind controlled-feeding trial of carboxymethylcellulose by Chassaing et

al. (2022), in which healthy adults consuming 15 g of CMC per day for eleven days showed reduced microbial diversity, an altered fecal metabolome with reductions in short-chain fatty acids, and increased postprandial abdominal discomfort, with mucus-layer encroachment in a subset. The five-emulsifier randomized trial by Wellens et al. (2026) did not detect major inflammatory or metabolic changes over its short exposure, but it did show lower short-chain fatty acid concentrations and a carrageenan-associated permeability signal, illustrating that composition-level stability can mask functional shifts.

Importantly, most of these trials were conducted in healthy or relatively healthy adults, which limits direct conclusions for people with obesity, diabetes, inflammatory bowel disease, metabolic syndrome, neuroinflammatory conditions, or disrupted gut-barrier function. This limitation strengthens rather than weakens the argument for caution: if measurable microbiome, metabolomic, glycemic, or permeability changes can occur in healthy adults over short exposure periods, the clinical relevance may be greater in metabolically vulnerable or microbiome-disrupted populations.

The carrageenan crossover trial by Wagner et al. (2024) is especially informative in this regard. Overall insulin sensitivity did not change significantly across all participants, but the clearest adverse signals, including reduced insulin sensitivity, increased intestinal permeability, and higher C-reactive protein and interleukin-6, appeared specifically in overweight participants. This suggests that host context matters: an additive that appears neutral in a lean, metabolically healthy group may behave differently in individuals with existing metabolic or inflammatory vulnerability.

A necessary counterbalance is the SWEET trial (Pang et al., 2025), a twelve-month multi-centre randomized study in 341 adults with overweight or obesity. Replacing sugar-rich products with sweeteners and sweetness enhancers within a structured healthy diet supported greater weight-loss maintenance and was associated with beneficial gut-microbiota shifts, including increased short-chain fatty acid-producing taxa, without adverse cardiometabolic effects. This trial demonstrates that sweetener effects are context-, ingredient-, diet-, and population-dependent, and that not all additive exposure is clinically harmful, particularly within an otherwise-healthy dietary pattern.

Taken together, the current clinical evidence should not be interpreted as proof of universal harm. It does, however, undermine the assumption that these additives are inert. For products positioned for daily gut, metabolic, or brain-health support, the most defensible formulation standard is precautionary: ingredients with unresolved effects on the microbiome, short-chain fatty acids, intestinal permeability, or metabolic-inflammatory signaling should be avoided when they are not nutritionally necessary, especially in products intended for people with existing metabolic, gastrointestinal, or neuroinflammatory vulnerability.

Discussion

The integration of non-nutritive sweeteners (NNS) and dietary emulsifiers into modern food systems has sparked renewed scrutiny regarding their long-term safety, particularly in the context of gut microbiota composition, intestinal and blood-brain barrier (BBB) integrity, and neuroimmune modulation. Traditionally perceived as metabolically inert and safe under toxicological guidelines, emerging mechanistic and clinical research challenges this assumption-

highlighting context-dependent risks that are especially pronounced in microbiome-sensitive and metabolically vulnerable populations (Conz, Salmona, & Diomedea, 2023; Naimi et al., 2021).

Summary of Key Findings

Consistent evidence across animal and human studies demonstrates that both NNS and emulsifiers can disrupt the ecological balance of the gut microbiome, decrease microbial diversity, and foster the expansion of pro-inflammatory taxa. This dysbiosis frequently leads to increased microbial production of immunostimulatory molecules such as lipopolysaccharide (LPS) and flagellin, which collectively impair the mucosal and endothelial tight junctions fundamental to gut and BBB integrity (Ruiz-Ojeda et al., 2019; Conz et al., 2023; Naimi et al., 2021). Once these barriers are compromised, LPS and other microbial components gain systemic access, activating peripheral immune responses and, ultimately, central neuroimmune pathways that underpin low-grade neuroinflammation—a recognized driver of neurodegenerative conditions, mood disorders, and altered reward processing (Ghosh et al., 2020; Chmielarz et al., 2024).

Mechanistic and Clinical Evidence

Seminal research by Suez et al. (2022) provides causal evidence that even low-dose exposures to common NNS such as sucralose and saccharin can significantly impair glycemic control via the gut microbiome. Their landmark trial and follow-up fecal microbiome transplantation experiments established that NNS-induced dysbiosis itself can precipitate host metabolic dysfunction, directly challenging the narrative that such sweeteners are biologically neutral. The highly individualized metabolic responses observed were contingent on baseline microbiome composition, highlighting the microbiome as a dynamic "responsiveness hub" and

underscoring the need for tailored safety recommendations in clinical nutrition (Suez et al., 2022). Converging systematic and mechanistic reviews further reinforce these concerns. Common sweeteners, including sucralose and acesulfame potassium, consistently reduce beneficial genera such as *Lactobacillus* and *Bifidobacterium*, while enhancing the prevalence of potentially pathogenic and pro-inflammatory bacteria (Ruiz-Ojeda et al., 2019; Conz et al., 2023). Directly, certain additives downregulate key tight junction proteins (e.g., ZO-1, Occludin) and activate microglia and astrocytes, prompting the release of pro-inflammatory cytokines such as IL-1 β , IL-6, and TNF- α (Arnold et al., 2022). Indirectly, additive-induced intestinal permeability increases systemic exposure to LPS, which further compromises BBB integrity and amplifies neuroinflammatory signaling cascades (Banks et al., 2015; Ghosh et al., 2020; Chmielarz et al., 2024).

Neuropsychiatric and Behavioral Links

Beyond metabolic effects, these additives may influence mental health outcomes, including depression, anxiety, and altered reward processing. Animal models provide compelling evidence that both sucrose and saccharin modulate depression- and anxiety-like behaviors, particularly in the context of metabolic dysfunction. Kumar and Chail (2019) demonstrated that chronic sucrose consumption in diabetic mice exacerbated depressive and anxiety-like behaviors, likely via heightened oxidative stress, elevated corticosterone, and monoamine oxidase activity. In contrast, saccharin exposure mitigated these behavioral abnormalities and reduced stress biomarkers, suggesting a potentially protective role in metabolically compromised states.

Similarly, Holder et al. (2019) reported that prolonged exposure to emulsifiers- specifically carboxymethylcellulose (CMC) and polysorbate 80 (P80)-altered gut microbiota

composition, induced low-grade intestinal inflammation, and led to sex-specific behavioral changes in mice. Male mice exhibited increased anxiety-like behavior in the open field test, while female mice showed diminished social interaction. These behavioral alterations were accompanied by region-specific changes in neuropeptides such as agouti-related peptide (AgRP) and α -melanocyte stimulating hormone (α -MSH), indicating that emulsifier exposure may disrupt central pathways involved in mood and social behavior regulation.

Mechanistically, chronic NNS exposure in rodents modulates dopamine signaling in the mesolimbic pathway, alters DeltaFosB expression in the nucleus accumbens, and disrupts glucose and energy metabolism in reward-related brain regions (Salaya-Velazquez et al., 2020). Emulsifier-induced neuroinflammation can further hinder synaptic plasticity and memory (Arnold et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2024). Notably, acesulfame potassium uniquely crosses the BBB, directly impairing hippocampal energy metabolism and reducing neurotrophic signaling, with consequences for both cognition and resilience to injury (Cong et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2024).

Human Evidence and Microbiome Perspective

In humans, evidence remains preliminary and primarily correlational. Miller and Branscum (2021) found that college students reporting high stress consumed significantly greater amounts of NNS, although no direct association with anxiety was observed. These findings suggest a potential bidirectional relationship-where stress may increase NNS consumption, or vice versa-though causality cannot be established. From a microbiome perspective, smaller-scale studies suggest that artificial sweeteners and emulsifiers can promote dysbiosis, attenuate production of beneficial neuroactive metabolites such as short-chain fatty acids (SCFAs) and

tryptophan derivatives, and increase systemically active inflammatory mediators-all of which can influence neuroendocrine signaling and brain function (Conz et al., 2023).

Variability Among Additives and Clinical Implications

Importantly, not all emulsifiers and gums are equally disruptive. While marketed "natural" or prebiotic agents such as gum arabic have shown beneficial effects in supplement trials, recent work makes clear that context, dose, and frequency of exposure are critical determinants of their impact (Calame et al., 2008; Naimi et al., 2021). High and chronic consumption, or intake within complex ultra-processed food matrices, can shift their effect from adaptive to dysbiotic and pro-inflammatory (Naimi et al., 2021; Panyod et al., 2024).

Clinical Rationale for Avoidance in Prebiotic Formulations

From a clinical standpoint, the absence of definitive safety thresholds for many emulsifiers and gums warrants precaution, particularly in populations with existing dysbiosis, increased intestinal permeability, or inflammatory bowel conditions. Mechanistic and preclinical studies show that agents such as CMC, P80, guar gum, xanthan gum, gum arabic, and carrageenan can reduce microbial diversity, deplete beneficial taxa such as *Faecalibacterium*, and increase pro-inflammatory molecules like LPS and flagellin-especially with high, repeated, or cumulative exposure (Naimi et al., 2021). While some agents demonstrate prebiotic potential in controlled settings, their effects in real-world ultra-processed diets may differ markedly. Consequently, excluding potentially disruptive emulsifiers and gums from microbiome-targeted formulations aligns with a risk-averse, microbiome-preserving strategy aimed at supporting microbial diversity, mucosal integrity, and systemic health.

Future Research Directions

Given their ubiquity in modern diets and mounting concerns about possible harm, the absence of long-term, controlled human studies on NNS and emulsifiers represents a pressing research gap. Future work should prioritize longitudinal dietary intervention trials incorporating high-resolution microbiome sequencing, metabolomic and immunological profiling, and advanced neuroimaging to clarify dose-response relationships and reversibility upon withdrawal. Identifying vulnerable subgroups, establishing safe intake thresholds, and exploring mitigation strategies-such as targeted prebiotics, probiotics, or postbiotics-will be essential. In parallel, food labeling regulations and public health policies may require adaptation to limit cumulative additive exposure in at-risk populations and to inform consumers more effectively.

Limitations

Several limitations temper the conclusions of this review. First, much of the mechanistic and neurological evidence, including the blood-brain barrier, neuroinflammation, and reward-circuit findings, derives from animal and in vitro models, which establish biological plausibility but not human causation. Second, the human data are heterogeneous. While Suez et al. (2022) provides randomized, causally-anchored evidence for saccharin and sucralose, recent human emulsifier trials are mixed to null: Wellens et al. (2026) found that emulsifier supplementation lowered short-chain fatty acids but did not increase intestinal or systemic inflammation, and Fitzpatrick et al. (2024) reported that a high-emulsifier diet improved resting barrier function while increasing permeability only under acute stress. Third, this is a narrative rather than a systematic review; studies were selected for mechanistic relevance rather than by pre-registered

criteria, which introduces potential selection bias. Fourth, doses, exposure durations, and food matrices vary widely across the cited literature, limiting direct comparison. These constraints support a precautionary interpretation rather than definitive claims of harm.

Conclusion

The evidence reviewed underscores the need for a paradigm shift in how non-nutritive sweeteners, emulsifiers, and certain dietary gums are evaluated within the context of gut and neuroimmune health. While historically regarded as inert under toxicological frameworks, emerging mechanistic and clinical findings reveal that these additives can disrupt microbial diversity, impair intestinal and blood-brain barrier integrity, and promote systemic and neuroinflammatory responses- particularly in individuals with pre-existing metabolic or gastrointestinal vulnerabilities. The convergence of animal, human, and in vitro data points toward a common pathway of additive-induced dysbiosis and immune activation, with downstream implications for mood regulation, cognition, and metabolic control. Although some compounds, such as gum arabic, may exert context-dependent prebiotic effects, the absence of long-term, dose-response data and the potential for additive-additive interactions argue for a precautionary approach, especially in products marketed for gut or neurological support.

Clinically, this calls for ingredient selection grounded in both demonstrated benefit and minimal evidence of harm, alongside personalized risk assessments that consider baseline microbiome composition. Future research should prioritize rigorous, longitudinal human studies integrating high-resolution microbiome sequencing, metabolomics, and neuroimaging to clarify safety thresholds and identify strategies to mitigate risk. Until such evidence emerges, erring on the side of microbiome preservation, through the exclusion of potentially disruptive

additives,represents not only a prudent formulation strategy but also an ethical imperative for safeguarding both metabolic and mental health in an ultra-processed food environment.

Author Information

Eugene Capitano, BA, BSc, DC, DAc, MSc, ACSM-CPT, ACSM-EIM Chiropractor | Functional Wellness Specialist | Clinical Researcher MSc in Psychology & Neuroscience of Mental Health - King's College London

Eugene Capitano is a clinician-scientist integrating musculoskeletal rehabilitation, exercise physiology, and nutritional neuroscience. He holds a Master of Science in Psychology & Neuroscience of Mental Health from King's College London, is an American College of Sports Medicine-certified Exercise is Medicine(R) practitioner and Personal Trainer, and has over 25 years of clinical experience in chiropractic and functional wellness care. His research and professional focus bridge the gut-brain- muscle axis, exploring how targeted nutrition, resistance training, and mitochondrial health strategies optimize metabolic function and healthy aging.

References

- Ahmad, S. Y., Friel, J., & Mackay, D. (2020). The effects of non-nutritive artificial sweeteners, aspartame and sucralose, on the gut microbiome in healthy adults: Secondary outcomes of a randomized double-blinded crossover clinical trial. *Nutrients*, *12*(11), 1-16.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/nu12113408>
- Al-Najjar, M. A. A., Athamneh, T., AbuTayeh, R., Basheti, I., Leopold, C., Gurikov, P., & Smirnova, I. (2021). Evaluation of the orally administered calcium alginate aerogel on the changes of gut microbiota and hepatic and renal function of Wistar rats. *PLoS ONE*, *16*(4 April 2021). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0247633>
- Arnold, A. R., Chassaing, B., Pearce, B. D., & Huhman, K. L. (2022). Dietary emulsifier consumption alters gene expression in the amygdala and paraventricular nucleus of the

- hypothalamus in mice. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1), 9146. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-13021-7>
- Banks, W. A., Gray, A. M., Erickson, M. A., Salameh, T. S., Damodarasamy, M., Sheibani, N., Meabon, J. S., Wing, E. E., Morofuji, Y., Cook, D. G., & Reed, M. J. (2015). Lipopolysaccharide-induced blood-brain barrier disruption: Roles of cyclooxygenase, oxidative stress, neuroinflammation, and elements of the neurovascular unit. *Journal of Neuroinflammation*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12974-015-0434-1>
- Blank, T., & Prinz, M. (2013). Microglia as modulators of cognition and neuropsychiatric disorders. *GLIA*, 61(1), 62-70. <https://doi.org/10.1002/glia.22372>
- Blasche, S., Periwal, V., Beristain Covarrubias, N., Lindell, A., Roux, I., Kamrad, S., Mozzachiodi, S., Bradley, R., Ozgur, H., Ramachandran, B., Benes, V., & Patil, K. R. (2026). Common xenobiotics modulate gut microbial responses to low-calorie sweeteners in vitro. *Molecular Systems Biology*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44320-026-00225-6>
- Burke, M. V., & Small, D. M. (2015). Physiological mechanisms by which non-nutritive sweeteners may impact body weight and metabolism. *Physiology and Behavior*, 152, 381-388. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2015.05.036>
- Calame, W., Weseler, A. R., Viebke, C., Flynn, C., & Siemensma, A. D. (2008). Gum arabic establishes prebiotic functionality in healthy human volunteers in a dose-dependent manner. *British Journal of Nutrition*, 100(6), 1269-1275. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007114508981447>

- Camilleri, M. (2021). Human intestinal barrier: Effects of stressors, diet, prebiotics, and probiotics. In *Clinical and Translational Gastroenterology* (Vol. 12, Issue 1). Lippincott Williams and Wilkins. <https://doi.org/10.14309/ctg.0000000000000308>
- Chmielarz, M., Sobieszczanska, B., & Sroda-Pomianek, K. (2024). Metabolic Endotoxemia: From the Gut to Neurodegeneration. In *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* (Vol. 25, Issue 13). Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute (MDPI). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms25137006>
- Cong, W. na, Wang, R., Cai, H., Daimon, C. M., Scheibye-Knudsen, M., Bohr, V. A., Turkin, R., Wood, W. H., Becker, K. G., Moaddel, R., Maudsley, S., & Martin, B. (2013). Long-Term Artificial Sweetener Acesulfame Potassium Treatment Alters Neurometabolic Functions in C57BL/6J Mice. *PLoS ONE*, 8(8). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0070257>
- Conz, A., Salmons, M., & Diomedes, L. (2023). Effect of non-nutritive sweeteners on the gut microbiota. *Nutrients* (Vol. 15, Issue 8). MDPI. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu15081869>
- Domingos, A. I., Sordillo, A., Dietrich, M. O., Liu, Z. W., Tellez, L. A., Vaynshteyn, J., Ferreira, J. G., Ekstrand, M. I., Horvath, T. L., de Araujo, I. E., & Friedman, J. M. (2013). Hypothalamic melanin concentrating hormone neurons communicate the nutrient value of sugar. *ELife*, 2013(2). <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.01462>
- Dufresne, B., di Lisio, C., Maurizio, A., Sallese, M., de Laurenzi, V., & Dainese, E. (2023). Influence of food emulsifiers on cellular function and inflammation, a preliminary study. *Frontiers in Nutrition*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnut.2023.1197686>

- Fitzpatrick, J. A., Gibson, P. R., Taylor, K. M., & Halmos, E. P. (2024). The effect of dietary emulsifiers and thickeners on intestinal barrier function and its response to acute stress in healthy adult humans: A randomised controlled feeding study. *Alimentary Pharmacology & Therapeutics*, 60(7), 863–875. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apt.18172>
- Gerasimidis, K., Bryden, K., Chen, X., Papachristou, E., Verney, A., Roig, M., Hansen, R., Nichols, B., Papadopoulou, R., & Parrett, A. (2020). The impact of food additives, artificial sweeteners and domestic hygiene products on the human gut microbiome and its fibre fermentation capacity. *European Journal of Nutrition*, 59(7), 3213-3230. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00394-019-02161-8>
- Ghosh, S. S., Wang, J., Yannie, P. J., & Ghosh, S. (2020). Intestinal barrier dysfunction, LPS translocation, and disease development. *Journal of the Endocrine Society*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.1210/jendso/bvz039>
- Greenberg, D., & St. Peter, J. v. (2021). Sugars and sweet taste: Addictive or rewarding? *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(18). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18189791>
- Holder, M. K., Peters, N. v., Whylings, J., Fields, C. T., Gewirtz, A. T., Chassaing, B., & de Vries, G. J. (2019). Dietary emulsifiers consumption alters anxiety-like and social-related behaviors in mice in a sex-dependent manner. *Scientific Reports*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-36890-3>

- Ivanovic, N., & Dimitrijevic Brankovic, S. (n.d.). EFFECTS OF FOOD ADDITIVES ON GUT MICROBIOTA: WHAT'S NEW IN 2024 This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
- Kaim, U., & Labus, K. (2025). Monk Fruit Extract and Sustainable Health: A PRISMA-Guided Systematic Review of Randomized Controlled Trials. In *Nutrients* (Vol. 17, Issue 9). Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute (MDPI).
<https://doi.org/10.3390/nu17091433>
- Khiaosa-ard, R., & Zebeli, Q. (2018). Diet-induced inflammation: From gut to metabolic organs and the consequences for the health and longevity of ruminants. In *Research in Veterinary Science* (Vol. 120, pp. 17-27). Elsevier B.V.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rvsc.2018.08.005>
- Kumar, M., & Chail, M. (2019). Sucrose and saccharin differentially modulate depression and anxiety- like behavior in diabetic mice: exposures and withdrawal effects. *Psychopharmacology*, 236(11), 3095-3110. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00213-019-05259-3>
- Lavrinenko, A., Greppi, A., Hacki, S., Paramonova, D., & Bokulich, N. A. (2025). Impacts of food additive sweeteners and emulsifiers on the gut microbiome: Research trends and future directions. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 166, 105370.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2025.105370>
- Liangpunsakul, S., Toh, E., Ross, R. A., Heathers, L. E., Chandler, K., Oshodi, A., McGee, B., Modlik, E., Linton, T., Mangiacarne, D., Jiménez, F., Wang, L., & Tu, W. (2017). Quantity of alcohol drinking positively correlates with serum levels of endotoxin and

- markers of monocyte activation. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 4462.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-04669-7>
- Liu, C., Zhan, S., Tian, Z., Li, N., Li, T., Wu, D., Zeng, Z., & Zhuang, X. (2022). Food Additives Associated with Gut Microbiota Alterations in Inflammatory Bowel Disease: Friends or Enemies? In *Nutrients* (Vol. 14, Issue 15). MDPI. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu14153049>
- Miclotte, L., de Paepe, K., Rymenans, L., Callewaert, C., Raes, J., Rajkovic, A., van Camp, J., & van de Wiele, T. (2020). Dietary Emulsifiers Alter Composition and Activity of the Human Gut Microbiota in vitro, Irrespective of Chemical or Natural Emulsifier Origin. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2020.577474>
- Miller, B., & Branscum, P. (2021). Evaluating the Association Between Artificial Sweetener Intake and Indicators of Stress and Anxiety. *International Quarterly of Community Health Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272684X211022150>
- Naimi, S., Viennois, E., Gewirtz, A. T., & Chassaing, B. (2021). Direct impact of commonly used dietary emulsifiers on human gut microbiota. *Microbiome*, 9(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-020-00996-6>
- Onaolapo, A. Y., & Onaolapo, O. J. (2018). Food additives, food and the concept of 'food addiction': Is stimulation of the brain reward circuit by food sufficient to trigger addiction? In *Pathophysiology* (Vol. 25, Issue 4, pp. 263-276). Elsevier B.V.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pathophys.2018.04.002>
- Panyod, S., Wu, W. K., Chang, C. T., Wada, N., Ho, H. C., Lo, Y. L., Tsai, S. P., Chen, R. A., Huang, H. S., Liu, P. Y., Chen, Y. H., Chuang, H. L., Shen, T. C. D., Tang, S. L., Ho, C. T., Wu, M. S., &

- Sheen, L. Y. (2024). Common dietary emulsifiers promote metabolic disorders and intestinal microbiota dysbiosis in mice. *Communications Biology*, 7(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-024-06224-3>
- Ruiz-Ojeda, F. J., Plaza-Diaz, J., Saez-Lara, M. J., & Gil, A. (2019). Effects of Sweeteners on the Gut Microbiota: A Review of Experimental Studies and Clinical Trials. *Advances in Nutrition*, 10, S31-S48. <https://doi.org/10.1093/advances/nmy037>
- Salaya-Velazquez, N. F., López-Mucino, L. A., Mejía-Chávez, S., Sánchez-Aparicio, P., Dominguez-Guadarrama, A. A., & Venebra-Munoz, A. (2020). Anandamide and sucralose change DeltafosB expression in the reward system. *NeuroReport*, 31(3), 240-244.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/WNR.0000000000001400>
- Sandall, A. M., Cox, S. R., Lindsay, J. O., Gewirtz, A. T., Chassaing, B., Rossi, M., & Whelan, K. (2020). Emulsifiers impact colonic length in mice and emulsifier restriction is feasible in people with Crohn's disease. *Nutrients*, 12(9), 1-20.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/nu12092827>
- Shade, A., & Handelsman, J. (2012). Beyond the Venn diagram: The hunt for a core microbiome. *Environmental Microbiology*, 14(1), 4-12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1462-2920.2011.02585.x>
- Suez, J., Cohen, Y., Valdes-Mas, R., Mor, U., Dori-Bachash, M., Federici, S., Zmora, N., Leshem, A., Heinemann, M., Linevsky, R., Zur, M., Ben-Zeev Brik, R., Bukimer, A., Eliyahu-Miller, S., Metz, A., Fischbein, R., Sharov, O., Malitsky, S., Itkin, M., ... Elinav, E. (2022). Personalized

- microbiome-driven effects of non-nutritive sweeteners on human glucose tolerance. *Cell*, 185(18), 3307-3328.e19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2022.07.016>
- Suez, J., Korem, T., Zeevi, D., Zilberman-Schapira, G., Thaïss, C. A., Maza, O., Israeli, D., Zmora, N., Gilad, S., Weinberger, A., Kuperman, Y., Harmelin, A., Kolodkin-Gal, I., Shapiro, H., Halpern, Z., Segal, E., & Elinav, E. (2014). Artificial sweeteners induce glucose intolerance by altering the gut microbiota. *Nature*, 514(7521), 181-186. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13793>
- Thomson, P., Santibanez, R., Aguirre, C., Galgani, J. E., & Garrido, D. (2019). Short-term impact of sucralose consumption on the metabolic response and gut microbiome of healthy adults. *British Journal of Nutrition*, 122(8), 856-862. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007114519001570>
- Tsan, L., Chometton, S., Hayes, A. M. R., Klug, M. E., Zuo, Y., Sun, S., Bridi, L., Lan, R., Fodor, A., Noble, E. E., Yang, X., Kanoski, S. E., & Schier, L. A. (2022). Early-life low-calorie sweetener consumption disrupts glucose regulation, sugar-motivated behavior, and memory function in rats. *JCI Insight*, 7(20). <https://doi.org/10.1172/jci.insight.157714>
- Warner, J. O. (2024). Artificial food additives: Hazardous to long-term health? In *Archives of Disease in Childhood* (Vol. 109, Issue 11, pp. 882-885). BMJ Publishing Group. <https://doi.org/10.1136/archdischild-2023-326565>
- Wellens, J., Vanderstappen, J., Hoekx, S., Vissers, E., Luppens, M., Van Elst, L., Lenfant, M., Raes, J., Derrien, M., Verstockt, B., Ferrante, M., Verbeke, K., Matthys, C., Vermeire, S., & Sabino, J. (2026). Effect of five dietary emulsifiers on inflammation, permeability, and

- the gut microbiome: A placebo-controlled randomized trial. *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology*, 24(4). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cgh.2025.08.005>
- Xiong, R. G., Li, J., Cheng, J., Wu, S. X., Huang, S. Y., Zhou, D. D., Saimaiti, A., Shang, A., Tang, G.
- Y., Li, H. bin, Gan, R. Y., & Feng, Y. (2023). New insights into the protection of dietary components on anxiety, depression, and other mental disorders caused by contaminants and food additives. In *Trends in Food Science and Technology* (Vol. 138, pp. 44-56). Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2023.06.004>
- Yang, Q. (2010). Gain weight by "going diet?" Artificial sweeteners and the neurobiology of sugar cravings Neuroscience 2010. In *YALE JOURNAL OF BIOLOGY AND MEDICINE* (Vol. 83). Younes, M., Aquilina, G., Engel, K. H., Fowler, P., Frutos Fernandez, M. J., Furst, P., Gurtler, R., Gundert-Remy, U., Husoy, T., Mennes, W., Moldeus, P., Oskarsson, A., Shah, R., Waalkens-Berendsen, I., Wolfle, D., Degen, G., Herman, L., Gott, D., Leblanc, J. C., ... Castle, L. (2019). Safety of use of Monk fruit extract as a food additive in different food categories. *EFSA Journal*, 17(12). <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2019.5921>
- Zhang, Z., Wang, X., & Li, F. (2023). An exploration of alginate oligosaccharides modulating intestinal inflammatory networks via gut microbiota. In *Frontiers in Microbiology* (Vol. 14). Frontiers Media S.A. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2023.1072151>
- Zhang, L., Yin, Z., Liu, X., Jin, G., Wang, Y., He, L., Li, M., Pang, X., Yan, B., Jia, Z., Ma, J., Wei, J.,

- Cheng, F., Li, D., Wang, L., Han, Z., Liu, Q., Chen, F., Cao, H., & Lei, P. (2024). Dietary emulsifier polysorbate 80 exposure accelerates age-related cognitive decline. *Brain, Behavior, and Immunity*, 119, 171-187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2024.03.052>
- Chassaing, B., Koren, O., Goodrich, J. K., Poole, A. C., Srinivasan, S., Ley, R. E., & Gewirtz, A. T. (2015). Dietary emulsifiers impact the mouse gut microbiota promoting colitis and metabolic syndrome. *Nature*, 519(7541), 92-96. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14232>
- Chassaing, B., Compher, C., Bonhomme, B., Liu, Q., Tian, Y., Walters, W., Nessel, L., Delaroque, C., Hao, F., Gershuni, V., Chau, L., Ni, J., Bewtra, M., Albenberg, L., Bretin, A., McKeever, L., Ley, R. E., Patterson, A. D., Wu, G. D., Gewirtz, A. T., & Lewis, J. D. (2022). Randomized controlled-feeding study of dietary emulsifier carboxymethylcellulose reveals detrimental impacts on the gut microbiota and metabolome. *Gastroenterology*, 162(3), 743-756. <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2021.11.006>
- Pang, M. D., Kjolbaek, L., Bastings, J. J. A. J., Andersen, S. S. H., Umanets, A., Sost, M. M., Navas-Carretero, S., Reppas, K., Finlayson, G., Hodgkins, C. E., Del Alamo, M., Lam, T., Moshoyiannis, H., Feskens, E. J. M., Adam, T. C. M., Goossens, G. H., Halford, J. C. G., Harrold, J. A., Manios, Y., Martinez, J. A., Blaak, E. E., & Raben, A. (2025). Effect of sweeteners and sweetness enhancers on weight management and gut microbiota composition in individuals with overweight or obesity: The SWEET study. *Nature Metabolism*, 7(10), 2083-2098. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42255-025-01381-z>

Wang, W. (2021). Studying changes of the human gut microbiome in response to sweeteners using RapidAIM [Master's thesis, University of Ottawa]. uO Research.

<https://ruor.uottawa.ca/>