

## Supplementary Material

**Table S1. Sample and clinical characteristics of reviewed studies**

Publication	Country	Rural/Urban	Sample Sizes	Mean Age	Gender	Sample Characteristics	Clinical Assessments
<i>Centenarian Studies</i>							
Biagi et al., 2016	Italy	Urban		SCTN: 106.2 (SD=1.4; range 105-109)		SCTN: 7 in nursing homes, 19 severely disabled, 5 affected by cancer in the past, 3 with cancer at the time of assessment; on variety of medications; BMI for 13 participants: 23.2 (SD=4.2)	None reported
			SCTN: 24	LL: 100.4 (SD=1.4; range 99-104)	SCTN: 6M:18F		
			LL: 15		LL: 1M:14F	SCTN and LL: Physical and cognitive health status matched the majority of Italian centenarians	
			YO: 15	YO: 72.5 (SD=3.7; range 65-75)	YO: 8M:7F		
			ADT: 15		ADT: 7M:8F	YO: from the same regions as SCTN; no info on BMI	
Drago et al., 2012	Italy	Urban		ADT: 30.5 (SD=7.9; range 22-48)		ADT: recruited from the same regions as SCTN; healthy; medication-free; followed Mediterranean diet; no info on BMI	None reported
			CTN: 14	CTN: not reported (range 100-104)	CTN: not reported	CTN: recruited from nursing homes; no history of chronic inflammatory bowel diseases or metabolic diseases; no antibiotics or probiotics one month before sampling period; no info on BMI	
			ADT: 10	ADT: not reported (range 24-57)	ADT: not reported	ADT: no history of chronic inflammatory bowel diseases or metabolic diseases; no antibiotics or probiotics one month before sampling period; no info on BMI	
Kim et al., 2019	Republic of South Korea	Rural	LL: 30	LL: 98.9 (SD=3.4; range 95-108)	LL: 3M:27F	LL: 20 community-dwelling; 10 in rehabilitation hospitals; all from longevity villages; no systemic antibiotic use within one month prior to sampling; no info on BMI	None reported
			YO: 17	YO: 73.6 (SD=3.6; range 67-79)	YO: 10M:7F		
			ADT: 9		ADT: 6M:3F	YO: community-dwelling; recruited from same regions (urbanized towns or longevity villages); no info on BMI	

				ADT: 34.3 (SD=6.5; range 26-43)		ADT: community-dwelling; recruited from same regions (urbanized towns or longevity villages); no info on BMI	
Kong et al., 2016	China	Urban	LL: 67 ADT: 101	LL: 93.3 (SD=3.1; range 90-102) ADT: 62.0 (SD=14.1; range: 24-83)	LL: 26M:41F ADT: 52M:44F	LL: community-dwelling; no info on BMI ADT: recruited from the same regions as LL; no info on BMI	None reported
Rampelli et al., 2013	Italy	Urban	LL: 3 YO: 5 ADT: 1	LL: 100.7 (SD=not reported; range 99-102) YO: 66.4 (SD=not reported; range 59-75) ADT: 38	LL: not reported YO: not reported ADT: not reported	LL: recruited from region in Northern Italy; no info on BMI YO: recruited from the same regions as LL; 3 were offspring of LL; no info on BMI ADT: recruited from same region as LL; no info on BMI All subjects were overlapping with Biagi et al., 2016.	None reported
Tuikhar et al., 2019	India	Rural	LL: 30 ADT internal: 30 ADT external: 30	LL: 99.9 (SD=3.55; range 97-110) ADT internal: 35.8 (SD=6.3; range 28-47) ADT external: 34.8 (SD=7.9; range 22-50)	LL: 15M:15F ADT internal: 12M:18F ADT external: 15M:15F	LL: Chandel and Senapati districts of Manipur state (high centenarian prevalence); no antibiotic treatment within 6 months prior of sampling; no info on BMI ADT internal: recruited from same regions as LL; no antibiotic treatment within 6 months prior of sampling; no info on BMI ADT external: recruited from different regions from LL with low centenarian prevalence (Meitei community of Imphal West district); no antibiotic treatment within 6 months prior of sampling; no info on BMI	None reported
Wu et al., 2019	Italy	Rural	LL: 19 YO: 23	LL: 101.8 (SD=2.0; range 99-107)	LL: 6M:13F YO: 10M:13F	LL: no history of chronic medical conditions; no antimicrobial medication 1 year prior to sampling; BMI: 23.5 (SD=2.8)	None reported

			ADT: 17	YO: 77.2 (SD=6.7; range 68-88)	ADT: 7M:10F	YO: no history of chronic medical conditions; no antimicrobial medication 1 year prior to sampling; BMI: 25.9 (SD=5.2)	
				ADT: 25.5 (SD=4.0; range 21-33)		ADT: no history of chronic medical conditions; no antimicrobial medication 1 year prior to sampling; BMI: 22.8 (SD=5.5)	
Yu et al., 2015	China	Rural	LL: 21  CK: 28	LL: 73.2 (SD=12.7; range 50-95)  CK: 50 (SD=not reported; range not reported)	LL: 10M:11F  CK: Not reported	LL: no antibiotic use 6 months prior to sampling; no hx of gastrointestinal diseases; from Gaotian longevity villages; no info on BMI  CK: control group; no antibiotic use 6 months prior to sampling; no hx of gastrointestinal diseases; no long-living record in their families; no info on BMI	None reported
<i>Lifespan Studies</i>							
Claesson et al. 2012	Ireland	Urban	YO: 178  ADT: 13	YO: 78 (SD=8; 64-102)  ADT: 36 (SD=6; range 28-46)	YO: not reported  ADT: not reported	YO: 83 community-dwelling; 20 day-hospital; 15 short-term rehabilitation hospital care; 60 long-term care facilities; no hx of alcohol abuse or advanced organic disease; no antibiotic treatments or participation in investigational drug evaluation within 30 days prior to sampling; no info on BMI  ADT: control group; no info on matching; no antibiotic treatment within 30 days prior to sampling; no info on BMI	Diet (FFQ, MNA)
Hippe et al., 2011	Austria	Urban	YO: 15  ADT vegetarians: 15  ADT omnivores: 17	YO: 86 (SD=8; range not reported)  ADT vegetarians: 26 (SD=5; range not reported)  ADT omnivores: 24 (SD=2.5; range not reported)	YO: not reported  ADT vegetarians: not reported  ADT omnivores: not reported	YO: institutionalized; BMI: 21.8 (SD=5.1),  ADT vegetarians: BMI 21.0 (SD=2.7)  ADT omnivores: BMI 22.7 (SD= 3.4)	None reported

Hopkins et al. 2002	United Kingdom	Urban		NHYO: not reported (range 68-73)		NHYO: diagnosed with CDAD at the time of sampling; no info on BMI	
			NHYO: 4	YO: not reported (range 67-88)	NHYOL: not reported	YO: no history of gastrointestinal disease; no antibiotic use within 2 months prior to sampling	
			YO: 5		YO: not reported		
			ADT: 7	ADT: not reported (range 21-34)	ADT: not reported	ADT: no history of gastrointestinal disease; no antibiotic use within 2 months prior to sampling	None reported
			CHD: 10	CHD: not reported (range 16 months-7)	CHD: not reported	CHD: no history of gastrointestinal disease; no antibiotic use within 2 months prior to sampling	
Jeffery et al., 2016	Ireland	Urban	YO: 371	YO: 78 (SD=8; range 64-102)	YO: not reported	YO: 179 community-dwelling, 44 day- hospital, 41 in short-term rehabilitation care, 107 in long-term care facilities; no hx of: alcohol abuse, participation in drug intervention, advanced organic disease; no info on BMI	None reported
			ADT: 13	ADT: 36 (SD=6; range 28-46)	ADT: not reported	ADT: no antibiotic treatment within 30 days prior to sampling; no info on BMI	
Kato et al., 2017	Japan	Urban	Age Groups				
			100: 5	100: 101.6 (SD=1.8; range: 100 and up)	100: 0M:5F		
			90: 19		90: 4M:15F		
			80: 51	90: 94.2 (SD=2.7; range 90-99)	80: 17M:34F		
			70: 31		70: 12M:19F		
			60: 42	80: 83.2 (SD=2.4; range 80-89)	60: 14M:28F	All subjects were community-dwelling	None reported
			50: 29		50: 13M:16F		
			40: 37	70: 75.5 (SD=2.9; range 70-79)	40: 13M:24F		
			30: 114		30: 54M:60F		

				60: 64.2 (SD=2.9; range 60-69)	20: 16M:26F		
			20: 42		10: 7M:3F		
			10: 10	50: 53.5 (SD=2.7; range 50-59)	4: 7M:10F		
			4: 17		3: 10M:11F		
			3: 21	40: 43.7 (SD=3.1; range 40-49)	2: 7M:5F		
			2: 12		1: 9M:7F		
			1: 16	30: 34.3 (SD=2.5; range 30-39)			
				20: 25.8 (SD=2.7; range 20-29)			
				10: 14.1 (SD=3.6; range 10-19)			
				4: 5.9 (SD=1.8; range 4-9)			
				3: 2.4 (SD=0.6; range Weaned- 3 years old)			
				2: 0.8 (SD=0.4; Weaning)			
				1: 0.3 (SD=0.1; preweaning)			
			LL: 6		LL: 0M:6F		
			YO: 17	LL: not reported (range 90 and up)	YO: 0M:17F	LL: healthy; no info on BMI	
Kushugulova et al., 2015	Kazakhstan	Not reported	ADT: 6		ADT: 0M:6F	YO: healthy; no info on BMI	None reported
						ADT: healthy; no info on BMI	

				YO: not reported (range 50-70)			
				ADT: not reported (range 30-44)			
Le Roy et al., 2015	Estonia	Urban	YO: 33  ADT: 16	YO: not reported (range 65-81)  ADT: not reported (range 20-48)	YO: not reported  ADT: not reported	YO: generally healthy; followed a standard Western-type diet; no info on BMI  ADT: healthy; followed a standard Western-type diet; no info on BMI	None reported
			Age Groups 100: 6  90: 19  80: 48  70: 15  60: 28  50: 25	100: 101.3 (SD=1.8; range: 100 and up)  90: 94.2 (SD=2.7; range 90-99)  80: 83.3 (SD=2.4; range 80-89)  70: 76.8 (SD=2.1; range 70-79)  60: 63 (SD=2.7; range 60-69)  50: 53.3 (SD=2.6; range 50-59)  40: 43.8 (SD=3.1; range 40-49)	100: 0M:6F  90: 4M:15F  80: 16M:32F  70: 5M:10F  60: 11M:17F  50: 12M:13F  40: 13M:21F  30: 45M:43F  20: 16M:24F  10: 7M:3F  4: 6M:8F  3: 10M:8F  2: 6M:6F  1: 7M:7F		
Odamaki et al., 2016	Japan	Not reported	40: 34  30: 88  20: 40  10: 10  4: 14  3: 18  2: 12  1: 14			All participants were community-dwelling; no info on BMI	None reported

				30: 33.9 (SD=2.3; range 30-39)			
				20: 25.9 (SD=2.7; range 20-29)			
				10: 14.1 (SD=3.6; range 10-19)			
				4: 6.1 (SD=1.9; range 4-9)			
				3: 2.4 (SD=0.6; range Weaned- 3 years old)			
				2: 0.8 (SD=0.4; Weaning)			
				1: 0.3 (SD=0.1; preweaning)			
Odamaki et al., 2018	Japan	Urban	Age Groups	100: 101.3	100: 0M:6F	All subjects were community-dwelling; no info on BMI	None reported
			100: 6	(SD=1.8; range: 100 and up)	90: 4M:15F		
			90: 19				
				90: 94.2	80: 17M:34F		
			80: 51	(SD=2.7; range 90-99)	70: 12M:19F		
			70: 31				
				80: 83.2	60: 14M:28F		
			60: 42	(SD=2.4; range 80-89)	50: 14M:20F		
			50: 34				
				70: 75.5	40: 14M:23F		
			40: 37	(SD=2.9; range 70-79)	30: 56M:61F		
			30: 117				
				60: 64.2	20: 14M:28F		
			20: 42	(SD=2.9; range 60-69)	10: 7M:3F		

			10: 10	50: 53.7 (SD=2.8; range 50-59)	4: 7M:10F  3: 11M:11F		
			3: 22	40: 43.4 (SD=3.1; range 40-49)	2: 8M:4F  1: 7M:6F		
			2: 12				
			1: 13	30: 34.3 (SD=2.6; range 30-39)			
				20: 25.8 (SD=2.6; range 20-29)			
				10: 14.1 (SD=3.6; range 10-19)			
				4: 5.9 (SD=1.8; range 4-9)			
				3: 2.4 (SD=0.6; range Weaned- 3 years old)			
				2: 0.8 (SD=0.4; Weaning)			
				1: 0.3 (SD=0.1; preweaning)			
Pan et al., 2016	China	Rural	LL Bama: 8  LL Nanning: 8	LL Bama: 92 (SD not reported; range 80-99)  LL Nanning: 82.8 (SD not reported; range 80-99)	LL Bama: 3M:5F  LL Nanning: 4M:4F	LL Bama: from Bama (longevity region); healthy; no antibiotic use within 1 month prior to sampling; no info on BMI  LL Nanning: from Nanning (not considered a longevity region); healthy; no antibiotic use within 1 month prior to sampling; no info on BMI	Dietary information (FFQ 23 and China Food Composition)



Ruiz-Ruiz et al., 2019	Spain	Urban	YO: 10	YO: 74.5 (SD=4.2; range 68-81)	YO: 3M:7F	YO: no history of intestinal organic disorders, chronic diseases; no recent antibiotic treatment; no info on BMI	None reported
			ADT: 10	ADT: 35.4 (SD=6.6; range 27-44)	ADT: 5M:5F	ADT: no history of intestinal organic disorders, chronic diseases; no recent antibiotic treatment; no info on BMI	
			CHD: 10	CHD: 3.9 (SD=1.4; range 2-5)	CHD: 5M:5F	CHD: no history of intestinal organic disorders, chronic diseases; no recent antibiotic treatment; no info on BMI	
Singh et al., 2019	USA	Rural	YO: 33	YO: 75.5 (SD=5.7; range 70-82)	YO: 14M:19F	YO: no reported diagnosis of major diseases	None reported
			NHYO: 32	NHYO: 72.7 (SD=3.5; range 70-82)	NHYO: 17M:15F	NHYO: medical hx of CA, CVD, PD, CLD, DM, stroke, or ND	
Cognition Studies							
Anderson et al., 2017	USA	Not reported	YO: 37	YO: 64.6 (SD=7.5; range 50-85)	YO: 10M:27F	YO: community-dwelling; no history of neurological, developmental, or severe psychiatric disorder; no antibiotic or probiotic use within 30 days prior to sampling; no hx of significant gastrointestinal disorder/surgery; no history of alcohol or illicit drug dependence; no history of severe heart, kidney, or liver problems; no info on BMI	Cognitive flexibility (SCWT); Sleep quality (PSQI)
Manderino et al., 2017	USA	Urban	YO: 25	YO: 64.1 (SD=6.5; range 50-85)	YO: 17M:8F	YO: ≤1 impaired score; no info on BMI	Cognitive function (NTB); Global cognitive function (MMSE); attention function (FAB, TMT-A, TMT-B, SCWT); memory (HVLT-R, RCFT); language (FAS)
			NHYO: 18	NHYO: 64.1 (SD=9.4; range 50-85)	NHYO: 12M:6F	All had no hx of neurological, developmental, or severe psychiatric disorder; no antibiotic or probiotic use within 30 days prior to sampling; no history of significant gastrointestinal disorder or surgery; no history of alcohol or illicit drug dependence;	

						no history of severe heart, kidney, or liver problems	
Verdi et al., 2018	United Kingdom	Urban/Rural	YO: 1551	YO: 63 (SD not reported; range 40-89)	YO: 515M:1036F	YO: from TwinsUK British cohort; community-dwelling; no current diagnosis of dementia, BMI: 25.8 (SD=4.7) for 1368 of 1551	Reaction time (DLRT); verbal fluency (Addenbrookes Cognitive Examination III); frailty (Fried phenotype); cognitive function (CANTAB-PAL); mental health (MMSE)
<i>Intervention Studies</i>							
						YO pectin: given pectin extracted from sugar beet pulp; BMI: 25.5 (SD=2.6)	
			YO pectin: 24	YO pectin: 69.5 (SD=3.1; range 65-75)	YO pectin: 15M/9F	YO placebo: given maltodextrin; BMI: 26.2 (SD=2.8)	
			YO placebo: 24	YO placebo: 69.8 (SD=2.4; range 65-75)	YO placebo: 12M:12F	ADT pectin: given pectin extracted from sugar beet pulp; BMI: 23.2 (SD=2.7)	
An et al., 2019	Netherlands	Urban	ADT pectin: 25	ADT pectin: 23.4 (SD=4.5; range 18-40)	ADT pectin: 8M/17F	ADT placebo: given maltodextrin; BMI: 22.6 (SD=2.7)	None reported
			ADT placebo: 27	ADT placebo: 22.8 (SD=4.1; range 18-40)	ADT placebo: 14M/13F	All participants did/were not: have GI diseases, abdominal surgery, use anti-inflammatory drugs, and/or vitamin supplementation within 14 days prior to sampling; use pro-, pre-, or antibiotics in the 90 days prior to the study; pregnant or lactating; smoking; have hx of side effects toward prebiotic supplements; all participants took the supplements twice a day (15g/days)	
Björklund et al., 2011	Finland	Urban	YO synbiotic: 23	YO synbiotic: 71.7 (SD=6.2; range above 65)	YO synbiotic: 5M:19F	YO synbiotic: given synbiotic product comprising of a combination of lactitol and <i>L. acidophilus</i> NCFM group; regular use of NSAID ( $\geq 3$ times per week); no antibiotic use within one month prior to sampling; no info on BMI	None reported
			YO placebo: 24	YO placebo: 70.3 (SD=7.2;	YO placebo: 7M:16F		

				range above 65)		YO placebo: given saccharose; regular use of NSAID ( $\geq 3$ times per week); no critical illness; no antibiotic use within one month prior to sampling; no info on BMI	
						All took capsules twice a day.	
Spaiser et al., 2015	USA	Urban	YO probiotic: 16	YO probiotic: not reported	YO probiotic: not reported	YO probiotic: given capsules containing mixture of <i>Lactobacillus gasseri</i> KS-13, <i>Bifidobacterium bifidum</i> G9-1, <i>Bifidobacterium longum</i> MM2 (1.5 billion viable cells per capsule), potato starch, and silicon dioxide	
			YO placebo: 16	YO placebo: not reported	YO placebo: not reported	YO placebo: given capsules containing potato starch and silicon dioxide	None reported
				YO total: 69.8 (SD=0.7; range 65-80)	YO total: 10M:22F	YO total: capsules were taken twice a day; no immune-enhancing dietary supplements, unpasteurized fermented foods, or non-study probiotics; no antibiotic use within 2 months prior to sampling; non-smokers; no gastrointestinal disease; no chemotherapy within a year of sampling; BMI: 28.0 (SD=0.9)	
Valentini et al., 2014	France, Germany, and Italy	Urban	YO with diet and VSL#3 treatment: 31	YO total: 70.1 (SD=3.9; range 65-85)	YO total: 29M:33F (not reported for each treatment arm)	YO with diet and VSL#3 treatment: given capsules (taken twice daily for 8 weeks) containing 112 billion lyophilized bacteria that included <i>Bifidobacterium infantis</i> DSM 24737, <i>Bifidobacterium longum</i> DSM 24736, <i>Bifidobacterium breve</i> DSM 24732, <i>Lactobacillus acidophilus</i> DSM 24735, <i>Lactobacillus delbrückii</i> ssp. <i>bulgaricus</i> DSM 24734, <i>Lactobacillus paracasei</i> DSM 24733, <i>Lactobacillus plantarum</i> DSM 24730, and <i>Streptococcus thermophilus</i> DSM 2473, microcrystalline cellulose, stearic acid, magnesium stearate, silicon dioxide and coloring agent; followed RISTOMED diet plan for 8 weeks	Inflammation (hsCRP, ESR, WBC, fibrinogen, IL-6, TNF-a, IL-10)
			YO with diet alone: 31	Not reported for each treatment arm			No inflammation subgroup defined by hsCRP < 3 mg/l
						YO with diet alone: followed RISTOMED diet plan for 8 weeks	Low-grade inflammation subgroup defined by hsCRP $\geq 3$ mg/l
						All had no chronic severe diseases; cancers; gastrointestinal diseases requiring treatment;	

---

DM; no current infection and antibiotic treatment, no anti-inflammatory drugs within 4 months prior to sampling; no intake of conventional yoghurt, probiotics, prebiotics and symbiotics or other supposed functional foods within the 3 weeks prior to sampling; BMI for full sample: 26.8 (SD=3.6)

---

**Abbreviations Used:** ADT: adult; BMI: body mass index; CA: cancer; CANTAB-PAL: Cambridge Neuropsychological Test Automated Battery-Paired-Associated Learning Test; CDAD: C. difficile-associated diarrhea; CHD: children; CK: control group; CLD: chronic liver disease; CRP: C-reactive protein; CTN: centenarian group; CVD: cardiovascular disease; DLRT: Deary-Liewald Reaction Time; DM: diabetes; ESR: erythrocyte sedimentation rate; F: female; FAB: Frontal Assessment Battery; FAS: Verbal Association Fluency; FFQ: Food Frequency Questionnaire; FMT: fecal microbiota transplantation; G60:  $\geq 60$  years; GI: gastrointestinal; hs-CRP: high sensitivity C-reactive protein; HVLRT: Hopkins Verbal Learning Test – Revised; hx: history; L60:  $< 60$  years; LL: long-living, oldest-old adults; M: male; MMSE: Mini-Mental State Examination; MNA: mini nutritional assessment; ND: neurodegenerative disease; NHYO: non-healthy young-old adult; NSAID: nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs; NTB: neuropsychological test battery; PD: pulmonary disease; PSQI: Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index; RCDI: recurrent Clostridium difficile infection; RCFT: Rey-Osterrieth Complex Figure Task; SCTN: semi-supercentenarians; SCWT: Stroop Color Word Test; TMT-A: Trail Making Test A; TMT-B: Trail Making Test B; WBC: white blood cell count; YO: young-old adult

---

**Table S2. Microbiome methodology of reviewed studies**

Publication	Sequencing / Genetic Analysis	Alpha-Diversity Assessments	Beta-Diversity Assessments	Differential Abundance / Taxonomic Differences Methods	Functional Analysis Methods
<b>Centenarian Studies</b>					
Biagi et al., 2016	16S rRNA (V3-V4) Illumina MiSeq (2x300 bp paired-end)	N/A	UniFrac (unweighted)	PCR amplification Co-occurrence network analysis Superimposed genus/family abundance on the PCoA plot to identify spatial correlations between samples and bacterial groups	N/A
Drago et al., 2012	16S rDNA pyrosequencing	N/A	N/A	Colony bacteria counts (total aerobes, total anaerobes, <i>enterobacteriaceae</i> , <i>Enterococcus</i> , <i>Staphylococcus</i> , <i>Lactobacillus</i> , <i>Bifidobacterium</i> , <i>Clostridium</i> , <i>Bacteroides</i> , and yeast) Pulsed field gel electrophoresis	N/A
Kim et al., 2019	16S rRNA (V1-V3) pyrosequencing	Observed OTUs Shannon index	Bray-Curtis	Heatmap analyses Random Forests LEfSe	PICRUSt (KEGG orthology)
Kong et al., 2016	16S rRNA (V4-V5) Illumina MiSeq (2x250 bp paired protocol)	Chao index, Observed OTUs Shannon index	Bray-Curtis Jaccard	Random forests	N/A
Rampelli et al., 2013	Shotgun metagenomic sequencing Illumina (no further details)	Simpson index	Euclidean distance	MetaPhlAn	MetaCV pipeline (KEGG orthology)
Tuikhar et al., 2019	16S rRNA (V4-V5) Illumina MiSeq qPCR	Chao1 Shannon index	Bray-Curtis	qPCR ( <i>Prevotellaceae</i> ) Random Forests	LC-MS
Wu et al., 2019	Shotgun metagenomic sequencing Illumina HiSeqX10 PE150 platform (average insert size of 350 bp)	Observed OTUs Shannon index	Bray-Curtis	NMDS MetaPhlan2.0	Humann2 (KEGG orthology)
Yu et al., 2015	16S rRNA (V4) Illumina MiSeq (250bp/300bp paired-end) qPCR	Chao1 Observed OTUs Shannon index	UniFrac (unweighted)	qPCR ( <i>Bacteroides</i> , <i>Bifidobacterium</i> , <i>Enterococcus</i> , <i>Enterobacteriaceae</i> , <i>Clostridium perfringens</i> , <i>Lactobacillus</i> )	N/A
<b>Developmental Aging Studies</b>					
Claesson et al. 2012	16S rRNA (V4) 454 Genome Sequencer FLX Titanium platform	Shannon Index Observed OTUs Phylogenetic diversity	UniFrac (weighted and un-weighted) non-UniFrac (Bray-Curtis, Jaccard, Chisq, Chord, Euclidean, Hamming, Lennon, Ochiai, Pearson, Sorenson, Canberra, Hellinger, Manhattan,	PLS-DA	NMR spectroscopy

			Kulczynski, Morisita, Soergel)		
Hippe et al., 2011	16S rRNA genes and metabolic genes qPCR	N/A	N/A	qPCR ( <i>Clostridium</i> clusters IV and XIVa) Melt curves analyses	Quantification by qPCR
Hopkins et al. 2002	16S rRNA	N/A	N/A	Viable count (total facultative anaerobes, total anaerobes, <i>bifidobacteria</i> , <i>enterococci</i> , <i>C. difficile</i> , <i>enterobacteria</i> , <i>Clostridium perfringens</i> , <i>lactobacilli</i> , <i>Bacteroides</i> , <i>Porphyromonas</i> , <i>Prevotella</i> )	CFA analysis
Jeffery et al., 2016	16S rRNA (V4) 454 Genome Sequencer FLX Titanium platform	Chao1 Shannon Index Simpson Phylogenetic diversity	UniFrac	N/A	N/A
Kato et al., 2017	16S rDNA qPCR	N/A	N/A	qPCR ( <i>B. adolescentis</i> group, <i>B. animalis</i> ssp. <i>Lactis</i> , <i>B. bifidum</i> , <i>B. breve</i> , <i>B. catenulatum</i> group, <i>B. dentium</i> , <i>B. gallinarum</i> group, <i>B. longum</i> group, <i>B. longum</i> ssp. <i>longum</i> , <i>B. minimum</i> , <i>B. mongoliense</i> ) Melt curves analyses	N/A
Kushugulova et al., 2015	16S rDNA 3730 XL DNA Analyzer	N/A	N/A	Not reported	Not reported
Le Roy et al., 2015	16S 23S rRNA intergenic spacer region qPCR	N/A	N/A	N/A	NMR-based metabonomics, O-PLS, model was derived from <sup>1</sup> H-NMR spectra of fecal waters
Odamaki et al., 2016	16S rRNA (V3-V4) Illumina MiSeq qPCR	Chao1 Observed OTUs Shannon index Phylogenetic distance whole tree	UniFrac (weighted and un-weighted)	LefSe qPCR ( <i>Bacteroides uniformis</i> , <i>Bifidobacterium longum</i> , <i>Blautia producta</i> , <i>Escherichia coli</i> , <i>Parabacteroides distasonis</i> )	PICRUSt (KEGG orthology)
Odamaki et al., 2018	16S rRNA (V3-V4) Illumina MiSeq Strain-specific PCR	N/A	N/A	Calculated detection rate of gene families Strain-Specific PCR ( <i>B. longum</i> subsp. <i>Longum</i> )	Comparative genomics (GF defined by Markov Cluster Algorithm)
Pan et al., 2016	16S rRNA (V2-V3) Vector NTI software, Clustal X PCR-DGGE	Shannon-Wiener (only for diversity of genus <i>Lactobacillus</i> )	N/A	DGGE fingerprinting	N/A
Ruiz-Ruiz et al., 2019	N/A	Margalef microbial richness Pielou's evenness Shannon index	N/A	N/A	LC-MS
Singh et al., 2019	16S rRNA (V1-V3) Illumina MiSeq (2x300 bp)	Chao1 Shannon Index	Bray-Curtis	DESeq2 1.12.3	N/A
<b>Cognition Studies</b>					
Anderson et al., 2017	16S rRNA 454 FLX Titanium based strategy	N/A	N/A	Not reported	N/A

Manderino et al., 2017	16S rRNA 454 FLX Titanium based strategy.	N/A	N/A	Not reported	N/A
Verdi et al., 2018	16S rRNA Illumina MiSeq (2x250 bp paired-end)	Chao1 Phylogenetic diversity Observed OTUs Shannon Index	N/A	Not reported	N/A
<b>Intervention Studies</b>					
An et al., 2015	16S rDNA (V5-V6) Illumina HiSeq2500 (2x150 bp)	Faith's phylogenetic diversity Inverse Simpson	Unifrac (weighted and unweighted)	Qubit dsDNA BR Assay Kit with Qubit Fluorometer	Gas chromatography coupled with a flame ionization detector
Björklund et al., 2011	qPCR, non-selective DNA-based method, percent guanine-plus cytosine (%G+C) profiling	N/A	N/A	qPCR ( <i>Atopobium</i> , <i>Bacteroides</i> – <i>Prevotella</i> – <i>Porphyromonas</i> group, <i>Lactobacillus</i> , <i>B. coccoides</i> – <i>E. rectale</i> group, <i>Clostridium</i> cluster XIVab, <i>F. prausnitzii</i> and related strains) G+C content regression analysis	N/A
Spaiser et al., 2015	16S rRNA pyrosequencing qPCR	Chao 1 Observed OTUs	UniFrac	qPCR ( <i>Bifidobacteria</i> , lactic acid bacteria, <i>Escherichia coli</i> )	N/A
Valentini et al., 2014	16S rDNA gene-targeted qPCR ABI model 373A DNA sequencer	N/A	N/A	16S rDNA gene-targeted qPCR ( <i>Clostridium</i> cluster IV, <i>bifidobacteria</i> )	N/A

**Abbreviations Used:** BLAST: Basic Local Alignment Search Tool; CFA: cellular fatty acid; DDGE: denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis; KEGG: Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes; LC-MS: liquid chromatography and mass spectrometry analysis; LEfSe: linear discriminant analysis coupled with effect size measurements; NMDS: nonmetric multidimensional scaling; NMR: nuclear magnetic resonance; O-PLS: orthogonal projection to latent structure; OTU: operational taxonomic unit; PCR: polymerase chain reaction; PCoA: principal coordinates analysis; PLS-DA: partial least squares regression; qPCR: quantitative polymerase chain reaction/real-time polymerase chain reaction; rDNA: ribosomal deoxyribonucleic acid; rRNA: ribosomal ribonucleic acid; V: variable region of 16S rRNA

**Table S3A. Results of studies of the gut microbiome in long-lived individuals**

Authors	Alpha-Diversity ( $\alpha$ )	Beta diversity ( $\beta$ )	Taxonomic Composition	Functional Potential and Metabolites
Biagi et al., 2016	N/A	Different between all possible comparisons of age groups (SCTN, LL, YO, ADT), except between SCTN and CTN (unweighted UniFrac)	<p><b>Changes with aging (SCTN, LL, YO, ADT):</b>  Family: <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Bacteroidaceae</i>, <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Lachnospiraceae</i>, <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Ruminococcaceae</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Synergistaceae</i>, and <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Christensenellaceae</i> with aging; *cumulative relative abundance, no inferential statistics provided</p> <p>Genera: <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Coproccoccus</i>, <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Roseburia</i>, <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Faecalibacterium</i>, <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Bacteroides</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Oscillospira</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Odoribacter</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Butyricimonas</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Eggerthella</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Akkermansia</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Anaerotruncus</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Bilophila</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Bifidobacterium</i> (<math>\downarrow</math> YO and LL, compared to ADT, and <math>\uparrow</math> SCTN); *no inferential statistics provided</p>	N/A
Drago et al., 2012	N/A	N/A	<p><b>CTN vs. ADT:</b>  Family/Genera: CTN <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Enterobacteriaceae</i>, <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Bifidobacteria</i>, <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Bacteroides</i></p> <p>Species: CTN <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Bifidobacterium longum</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Clostridia sensu stricto</i></p>	N/A
Kim et al., 2019	<p><b>LL vs. YO vs. ADT:</b>  No difference across groups (Shannon, observed OTUs)</p> <p><b>Longevity villages vs. Urbanized towns:</b>  No difference between groups (Shannon, observed OTUs)</p> <p><b>LL: CM vs. RH:</b>  No difference between groups (Shannon, observed OTUs)</p>	<p><b>LL vs. YO vs. ADT:</b>  Did not report</p> <p><b>Longevity villages vs. Urban towns:</b>  Different between groups in PCoA (Bray-Curtis); *no inferential statistics reported</p> <p><b>LL: CM vs. RH:</b>  Did not report</p>	<p><b>LL vs. YO vs. ADT:</b>  Phylum: LL <math>\uparrow</math> Verrucomicrobia, compared to YO, and <math>\uparrow</math> Verrucomicrobia, <math>\uparrow</math> Proteobacteria, <math>\uparrow</math> Actinobacteria, compared to ADT; YO <math>\downarrow</math> Bacteroidetes and <math>\uparrow</math> Proteobacteria, compared to ADT</p> <p>Family/Genera: LL <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Faecalibacterium</i>, <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Prevotella</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Escherichia</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Akkermansia</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Clostridium</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Collinsella</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Streptococcus</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> uncultured <i>Christensenellaceae</i>, compared to YO and ADT</p> <p><b>Longevity villages vs. Urban towns:</b>  Phyla: Longevity villages <math>\downarrow</math> Bacteroidetes, <math>\uparrow</math> Firmicutes, compared to urban towns</p> <p>Family/Genera: Longevity villages <math>\downarrow</math> uncultured <i>Lachnospiraceae</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Intestinibacter</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Romboutsia</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Turicibacter</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Eubacterium_g5</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Blautia</i>, <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Lachnospira</i>, <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Roseburia</i>, <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Bacteroides</i>, compared to urban towns; YO in longevity villages <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Ruminococcus_g2</i>, compared to ADT in longevity villages and urban towns; longevity villages <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Lactobacillus</i>, compared to YO/ADT in urban towns; LL <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Dialister</i>, compared to ADT in urban towns</p> <p><b>LL: CM vs. RH:</b>  Phyla: Community-dwelling <math>\uparrow</math> Firmicutes, <math>\uparrow</math> Tenericutes <math>\downarrow</math> Bacteroidetes, <math>\downarrow</math> Proteobacteria, <math>\downarrow</math> Actinobacteria, <math>\downarrow</math> Verrucomicrobia; *proportions, no inferential statistics provided</p> <p>Genera: Community-dwelling <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Faecalibacterium</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Intestinibacter</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Eubacterium_g23</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Lactobacillus</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> unclassified <i>Lachnospiraceae</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Dialister</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Blautia</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Eubacterium_g5</i>, <math>\uparrow</math></p>	<p><b>LL vs. YO vs. ADT:</b>  KEGG Level 1: LL and ADT <math>\uparrow</math> pathways related to metabolism, compared to YO; <math>\downarrow</math> pathways related to genetic information processing in LL, then YO, then ADT; LL and YO <math>\uparrow</math> pathways related to environmental information processing, compared to ADT.</p> <p>KEGG Level 3: 26 metabolic pathways different between groups; of these, LL <math>\uparrow</math> phosphatidylinositol signaling system, compared to YO and ADT; LL and ADT <math>\uparrow</math> glycosphingolipid biosynthesis, compared to YO, and LL <math>\uparrow</math> N-glycan biosynthesis, compared to YO and ADT</p> <p><b>LL: CM vs. RH:</b>  KEGG Level 3: carbohydrate metabolism different between groups (direction not specified).</p>



			Agathobacter, ↑ Holdemanella, ↑ Lachnospira, ↑ Roseburia, ↑ Alloprevotella, compared to rehabilitation hospital	
Kong et al., 2016	LL ↑ observed OTUs, ↑ Chao, ↑ Shannon, compared to ADT; findings validated an independent (Italian) cohort. In RF models, Chao and observed OTUs among top predictors distinguishing LL vs. ADT.	Did not assess between LL vs. ADT; different between Italian and Chinese LL cohorts (Bray-Curtis, Jaccard)	<b>LL vs. ADT:</b> Family/Genera: LL ↑ <i>Ruminococcaceae</i> , ↑ <i>Christensenellaceae</i> , ↑ <i>Clostridium</i> cluster XIVa, ↑ <i>Akkermansia</i>	N/A
Rampelli et al., 2013	N/A	Different between LL and different from YO (Euclidean distance)	<b>LL vs. YO</b> Genera: LL ↑ <i>Escherichia</i> , and ↑ <i>Ruminococcus</i> , compared to YO; YO ↑ <i>Faecalibacterium</i> , ↑ <i>Eubacterium</i> , and ↑ <i>Bifidobacterium</i> , compared to LL	<b>Diversity Findings for KOs:</b> α: No differences between LL and YO for KEGG pathways (Simpson index)  β: LL different from YO and ADT for KEGG pathways (Euclidean distance)  <b>Differential ranking of KEGG pathways related to aging:</b> Aging (LL, YO) associated with ↑ metabolism of aromatic amino acids (tryptophan and phenylalanine), metabolism of amino acids (tyrosine, valine and lysine); ADT profile associated with ↑ metabolism of amino acids (histidine) and carbohydrates (glucose, galactose), pyruvate, and butanoate, and ↑ SCFA production.
Tuikhar et al., 2019	LL ↑ Chao1, compared ADT (both in the same village and external groups); no difference in Shannon index  <b><i>Ruminococcaceae</i> family-specific α-diversity:</b> LL ↑ Chao1 and Shannon index, compared to ADT	Different between LL and ADT (Bray-Curtis)	<b>LL vs. ADT (combined datasets: Indian, Italian, Japanese and Chinese):</b> Family/Genera: LL ↓ <i>Prevotellaceae</i> , ↑ <i>Eggerthella</i> , ↑ <i>Rikenellaceae</i> , ↑ <i>Alistipes</i> , ↑ <i>Porphyromonadaceae</i> , ↑ <i>Parabacteroides</i> , ↑ <i>Porphyromonas</i> , ↑ <i>Odoribacter</i> , ↑ <i>Butyricimonas</i> , ↑ <i>Alicyclobacillaceae</i> , ↑ <i>Alicyclobacillus</i> , ↑ <i>Clostridiaceae</i> , ↑ <i>Finegoldia</i> , ↓ <i>Ruminococcaceae</i> , ↓ <i>Faecalibacterium</i> , ↑ <i>Anaerotruncus</i> , ↑ <i>Enterobacteriaceae</i> , ↑ <i>Desulfovibrionaceae</i> , ↑ <i>Desulfovibrio</i> , ↑ <i>Synergistaceae</i> , ↑ <i>Pyramidobacter</i> , ↑ <i>Verrucomicrobiaceae</i> , ↑ <i>Akkermansia</i> and ↑ <i>Clostridiales</i> Family XI <i>Incertae Sedis</i> , compared to ADT  Species: LL ↑ <i>Alistipes shahii</i> , ↑ <i>Porphyromonas uenonis</i> , ↑ <i>Odoribacter splanchnicus</i> , ↑ <i>Parabacteroides goldsteinii</i> , ↑ <i>Alicyclobacillus acidoterrestris</i> , ↑ <i>Finegoldia magna</i> , ↑ <i>Clostridium aminobutyricum</i> , ↑ <i>Clostridium p_enrichment_culture_clone_7_25</i> , ↑ <i>Clostridium sp_Kas107_1</i> , ↑ <i>Clostridium hathewayi</i> , ↑ <i>Eubacterium siraeum</i> , ↑ <i>Clostridium cellulolyticum</i> , ↑ <i>Clostridium asparagiforme</i> , ↑ <i>Faecalibacterium prausnitzii</i> , ↑ <i>Clostridium methylpentosum</i> , ↑ <i>Anaerotruncus colihominis</i> , ↑ <i>Escherichia albertii</i> , ↑ <i>Pyramidobacter pisciolens</i> , ↑ <i>Akkermansia muciniphila</i> , compared to ADT	109 out of 871 metabolites significantly different between LL and ADT.  <b>Diversity Findings for metabolites:</b> β: LL different from ADT (Bray-Curtis)  <b>Differential abundance of metabolites in LL vs. ADT (Indian dataset):</b> LL ↑ DL-3-Aminoisobutyric acid, ↑ N-Ethylglycine, ↑ gamma-Aminobutyric acid (GABA), ↑ Imidazoleacetic acid, ↑ Niridazole, ↑ Erucic acid, ↑ Dihydroxyphthalic acid, ↑ Nitridazole, ↑ Triacetin, ↑ Goralatide, compared to ADT internal and external; ↓ cyclohexanecarboxylic acid, compared to ADT internal; ↓ 13-cis,16-cis-Docosadienoic acid, compared to ADT external

			<p><b>LL vs. ADT (Indian dataset):</b>  Family/Genera: LL ↑ <i>Rikenellaceae</i>, ↑ <i>Alistipes</i>, ↑ <i>Holdemania</i>, ↑ <i>Fusobacteriaceae</i>, ↑ <i>Fusobacterium</i>, ↑ <i>Proteus</i>, ↓ <i>Prevotellaceae</i>, ↓ <i>Prevotella</i>, compared to ADT</p> <p>Species: LL ↑ <i>Bacteroides caccae</i>, ↑ <i>Clostridium hiranonis</i>, ↑ <i>Clostridium</i> sp_MLG480, ↑ <i>Fusobacterium mortiferum</i>, ↑ <i>Clostridium bifermentans</i>, ↑ <i>Clostridium innocuum</i>, ↓ <i>Prevotella copri</i>, compared to ADT</p> <p><b>Indian vs. Other datasets (Italian, Japanese and Chinese):</b>  Family: Indian ↑ <i>Erysipelotrichaceae</i>, ↑ <i>Enterobacteriaceae</i>, ↑ <i>Lactobacillaceae</i>, ↑ <i>Leuconostocaceae</i>, ↑ <i>Actinomycetaceae</i>, ↑ <i>Corynebacteriaceae</i>, ↓ <i>Rikenellaceae</i>, ↓ <i>Bacteroidaceae</i>, ↓ <i>Porphyromonadaceae</i>, ↓ <i>Bifidobacteriaceae</i>, compared to other three countries</p>	
Wu et al., 2019	No difference across age groups (LL, YO, ADT) (Shannon index, observed OTUs); “core microbiota” (present in >50% samples) of LL ↑ species richness, compared to YO and ADT	LL different from YO and ADT (Bray-Curtis)	<p><b>LL vs. YO vs. ADT:</b>  Phyla: LL ↑ Proteobacteria, compared to YO and ADT; LL ↓ Firmicutes and ↓ Firmicutes/Bacteroidetes ratio, compared to YO</p> <p>Genera: LL ↓ <i>Faecalibacterium</i>, ↓ <i>Ruminococcus</i>, ↓ <i>Corprococcus</i>, ↓ <i>Dorea</i>, ↑ <i>Methanobrevibacter</i>, compared to YO and ADT</p> <p>Species: LL ↓ <i>Faecalibacterium prausnitzii</i>, ↓ <i>Eubacterium rectale</i>, ↑ <i>Bifidobacterium adolescentis</i>, ↓ <i>Ruminococcus</i> sp_5_1_39BFAA, ↓ <i>Dorea longicatena</i>, ↑ <i>Methanobrevibacter smithii</i>, compared to YO and ADT</p>	<p>115 out of 463 gene pathways significantly different among age groups</p> <p><b>Diversity Findings for KOs:</b>  α: LL ↑ Shannon and ↑ observed KOs, compared to YO and ADT; no difference between YO and ADT</p> <p>β: LL different from YO and ADT (Bray-Curtis); no difference between YO and ADT</p> <p><b>Differential abundance of KOs in LL vs. YO vs. ADT:</b>  LL ↑ pathways related to central metabolism (glycolysis, pentose phosphate pathways, and tricarboxylic acid cycle), ↑ anaerobic respiration, ↑ aerobic respiration, ↑ metabolism of and fermentation to SCFAs (propanoate and acetate), ↓ amino acid biosynthesis pathways (e.g., L-lysine-, L-isoleucine- and L-methionine), ↑ aromatic compounds (e.g., L-phenylalanine metabolism and chorismate biosynthesis), ↓ pathways related to carbohydrate degradation, ↑ vitamin B2 and K2 synthesis pathways, ↑ KOs related to phosphotransferase system, F420, and coenzyme M, compared to YO and ADT; LL and YO ↓ vitamin B1 synthesis pathways, compared to ADT</p>
Yu et al., 2015	LL ↑ Chao1 and Shannon index, compared to CK; *only mean,	Different between CK and LL (unweighted UniFrac)	<b>LL vs. CK:</b>	N/A

	SD values reported; no inferential statistics provided		Phylum: LL ↓ Firmicutes, ↑ Bacteroidetes, ↑ Proteobacteria, ↑ Verrucomicrobia, ↑ Spirochaetes, ↑ Synergistetes, ↑ Thermi  Genera: ↑ <i>Escherichia</i> , ↑ <i>Phascolarctobacterium</i> , ↑ <i>Parabacteroides</i> , ↑ <i>Desulfovibrio</i> , ↑ <i>Syntrophomonas</i> , ↑ <i>Novosphingobium</i> , ↓ <i>Faecalibacterium</i>	
--	--	--	--	--

**Abbreviations Used:** ADT: adult; CK: control group; CM: community-dwelling older adults; CTN: centenarian group; KEGG: Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes; KO: Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes (KEGG) orthology; LL: long-living, oldest-old adults; OTU: operational taxonomic unit; PCoA: principal component analysis to reduce dimension of variables; RF: random forest; SCTN: semi-supercentenarians; RH: rehabilitation hospital older adults; SD: standard deviation; YO: young-old adult

**Table S3B. Results of studies of the gut microbiome across the lifespan**

Authors	Alpha-Diversity ( $\alpha$ )	Beta diversity ( $\beta$ )	Taxonomic Composition	Functional Potential and Metabolites
Claesson et al. 2012	<p><b>YO (CM vs. DH vs. RH vs. LS):</b> CM <math>\uparrow</math> microbial diversity (Number unique OTUs, Shannon index, Phylogenetic diversity) and health food diversity, compared to LS; CM <math>\uparrow</math> microbial diversity (Number unique OTUs, Shannon index, Phylogenetic diversity), compared to DH; CM <math>\uparrow</math> microbial diversity (Number unique OTUs, Phylogenetic diversity) and health food diversity, compared to RH; RH <math>\uparrow</math> microbial diversity (Number unique OTUs) and health food diversity, compared to LS</p> <p><b>Dietary groups: DG1 (low fat/high fiber) vs. DG2 (moderate fat/high fiber) vs. DG3 (moderate fat/low fiber) vs. G4 ('high fat/low fiber):</b> Participants with DG1 <math>\uparrow</math> microbial diversity (Number unique OTUs, Shannon index, Phylogenetic diversity) and health food diversity, compared to DG2, DG3, DG4; DG2 <math>\uparrow</math> microbial diversity (number unique OTUs, Phylogenetic diversity) and health food diversity, compared to DG3, DG4; DG2 <math>\uparrow</math> microbial diversity (Number unique OTUs, Shannon index, Phylogenetic diversity, health food diversity), compared to DG3</p>	Different between CM and LS (unweighted and weighted UniFrac); no difference between CM and ADT	<p><b>CM vs. DH vs. RH vs. LS:</b> Phyla: LS <math>\uparrow</math> Bacteroidetes, compared to CM; CM <math>\uparrow</math> Firmicutes, compared to LS</p> <p>Family/Genera: CM <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Coprococcus</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Roseburia</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Lachnospiraceae</i>, compared to LS; LS <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Parabacteroides</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Eubacterium</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Anaerotruncus</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> Lactonifactor, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Coprobacillus</i>, compared to CM</p> <p><b>YO vs. ADT</b> Genus: YO <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Ruminococcus</i>, <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Blautia</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Escherichia/Shigella</i>, compared to ADT</p>	<p><b>CM vs. RH vs. LS:</b> CM <math>\uparrow</math> total predicted gene counts, compared to RH, LS</p> <p><b>Co-inertia analysis of the microbiota and metabolome:</b> CM and RH <math>\uparrow</math> acetate, <math>\uparrow</math> propionate, <math>\uparrow</math> valerate, compared to LS</p> <p><b>CM vs. LS:</b> NMR identification of chemical shifts of metabolites: CM <math>\uparrow</math> butyrate, <math>\uparrow</math> glutarate, <math>\downarrow</math> glycine, <math>\downarrow</math> glucose, <math>\downarrow</math> lipid, relative to LS</p> <p><b>Gene counts for enzymes:</b> CM <math>\uparrow</math> butyrate, <math>\uparrow</math> acetate, <math>\uparrow</math> propionate, compared to LS; RH <math>\uparrow</math> butyrate, <math>\uparrow</math> acetate, compared to LS</p> <p><b>Average sequencing coverage for enzymes:</b> CM <math>\uparrow</math> butyrate, <math>\uparrow</math> acetate, <math>\uparrow</math> propionate, compared to LS; RH <math>\uparrow</math> butyrate, compared to LS</p>
Hippe et al., 2011	N/A	N/A	<p><b>YO vs. ADT omnivores vs. ADT vegetarians:</b> Genus: YO <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Clostridium cluster XIVa</i>, compared to ADT omnivores and ADT vegetarians</p>	<p><b>YO vs. ADT omnivores vs. ADT vegetarians:</b> YO <math>\downarrow</math> butyryl-CoA:acetate CoA-transferase gene, compared to ADT; <math>\uparrow</math> ADT vegetarians, compared ADT omnivores.</p>

			Species: (Melt curve analysis) YO ↓ <i>Eubacterium hallii</i> / <i>Anaerostipes coli</i> , ↓ <i>E. rectale</i> /Roseburia spp., ↓ <i>F. prausnitzii</i> melt peaks, compared to ADT omnivores and ADT vegetarians	
Hopkins et al. 2002	N/A	N/A	<b>Healthy (YO vs. ADT vs. CHD) vs. elderly <i>Clostridium difficile</i>-associated diarrhea (NHYO):</b> Genus: NHYO ↓ <i>Bacteroides</i> , compared to CHD, ADT and YO; NHYO ↑ <i>Lactobacillus</i> , ↑ <i>clostridia</i> , compared to ADT and YO; YO, NHYO ↓ <i>Bifidobacteria</i> , compared to CHD, ADT.  Family: ADT ↓ <i>Enterobacteria</i> , compared to CHD, NHYO	NHYO ↑ Saturated straight chain (20:0), ↑ Unsaturated straight chain (20:1 cis 11), ↓ Saturated straight chain (12:0, 15:0) and absence of the branched chain (15:0 ante and 15:0 iso fatty acids); ADT ↑ branched chain CFA, compared to all other groups; ↑ dimethyl acyl (18:1 cis 11 DMA, 14:0 DMA), compared to CHD and NHYO; ↑ 15:0 ante DMA, compared to other groups; CHD did not have dimethyl acyl (18:0 DMA), unsaturated straight chain (16:1 cis 9), compared to other groups.
Jeffery et al., 2016	↑ stable-microbiota CM, compared to unstable* CM (Shannon diversity); ↑ LS, compared to unstable* LS (Shannon diversity, Chao 1, phylogenetic diversity); ↑ stable-CM, compared to LS (Shannon diversity, Phylogenetic diversity, Simpson diversity)  *Participants in highest quartile of absolute distance between time point T0 (baseline) and T3 (3 months) are denoted as unstable	<b>LS vs. CM:</b> Different between LS and CM (unweighted UniFrac);  <b>DH vs. RH vs. LS vs. CM:</b> DH and RH had microbiota clusters in between LS and CM (unweighted UniFrac)  <b>ADT vs. CM:</b> No difference between ADT and CM (unweighted UniFrac)	N/A	N/A
Kato et al., 2017	N/A	N/A	<b>Pre-weaning to 100 plus years</b> Species: <i>B. longum</i> detected in all groups; Elderly ↑ <i>B. dentium</i> , ↓ <i>B. catenulatum</i> ; Adult ↑ <i>B. adolescentis</i> , ↓ <i>B. breve</i> , ↑ <i>B. gallinarum</i> , ↑ <i>B. catenulatum</i> ; Infant ↑ <i>B. breve</i> , ↓ <i>B. adolescentis</i>	N/A
Kushugulova et al., 2015	N/A	N/A	<b>LL vs. YO vs. ADT</b> Phylum: ADT ↑ Bacteroidetes; YO ↑ Firmicutes; LL ↑ Tenericutes, compared to other groups; *no inferential statistics provided  Species: LL ↓ butyrate-producing and mucin-degrading species, compared with YO, ADT; *no inferential statistics provided	N/A
Le Roy et al., 2015	N/A	N/A	<b>YO vs. ADT</b> YO ↑ <i>L. paracasei</i> , ↑ <i>L. plantarum</i> , ↓ <i>L. salivarius</i> , and ↓ <i>L. helveticus</i> , compared to ADT	<b>Correlation between <i>Lactobacillus</i> and metabolites:</b> ↑ <i>Lactobacillus</i> sp. was associated with ↑ SCFAs: acetate, propionate and butyrate, ↑

				<p>lactic acid, ↑ amino acid: (tyrosine, phenylalanine, leucine, isoleucine, valine and lysine); <i>L. helveticus</i> was associated with ↑ butyrate, ↑ lactate, ↑ glucose</p> <p>No difference between ADT and YO in H-NMR metabolic profiles</p>
Odamaki et al., 2016	↑ with age (Chao1, number of observed species, Shannon index, phylogenetic distance whole tree)	Variation in data due to age (UniFrac distances, both weighted and un-weighted analyses); no differences in gender (UniFrac distances, both weighted and un-weighted analyses)	<p><b>Composition across all ages (0 to 100+):</b> Phyla: With ↑ Age, ↓ Actinobacteria, ↑ Bacteroidetes, ↑ Proteobacteria</p>	<p><b>Infant/Elderly vs. Adult enriched clusters:</b> Pre-weaned infants ↓ xylose transporter Infant/Elderly ↑ drug transporters</p>
Odamaki et al., 2018	N/A	N/A	<p><b>Across age groups (pre-weaning to 100+ age)</b> Species: <i>Blautia wexlerae</i>, <i>Streptococcus salivarius</i>, <i>Bifidobacterium longum</i>; *no inferential statistics provided, detected &gt;50% of participants across age groups</p>	<p><b>Negative correlation between ORF and age:</b> ↓ Number of ORF of <i>B. longum</i> subsp. <i>longum</i> strains with ↑ in the age of participants</p> <p><b>Younger vs. Older (GF enriched in <i>B. longum</i> subsp. <i>longum</i> strains)</b> Older (GF:11) ↓ GF involved in carbohydrate transport and metabolism, compared to infants (GF:22); Adults ↑ GF involved defense mechanisms, transcription and replication, recombination and repair, compared other groups.</p> <p>169 GF enriched in <i>B. Longum</i> subsp. <i>longum</i> strains in younger participants vs. 55 GF enriched in older participants; younger participants ↑ sialidase-encoding cluster, ↑ an α arabinofuranosidase gene cluster, ↑ pNAC3 (a 10 kb plasmid) homologue, ↑ capsule biosynthesis related genes and a Type VII secretion system, ↑ some prophage regions found in the AH1206 episome; infants enriched in sialidase clusters; older ↑ extracellular α-L-arabinofuranosidases, putative multidrug-family ABC transporter (associated two-component system), a genetic cluster (Hsp20-family heat shock chaperone), ↑ prophage regions</p>
Pan et al., 2016	No difference between YO Nanning and YO Bama subjects (only for diversity of genus <i>Lactobacillus</i> ; Shannon-Wiener)	N/A	<p><b>Representative <i>Lactobacillus</i> species in YO:</b> <i>W. confusa</i>, <i>L. mucosae</i>, <i>L. crispatus</i>, <i>L. salivarius</i>, and <i>L. delbrueckii</i></p> <p><b>YO Bama vs. YO Nanning:</b></p>	N/A

			<p>Species: Bama ↑ <i>W. confusa</i>, ↑ <i>L. salivarius</i>, ↓ <i>L. mucosae</i>, compared to Nanning</p> <p><b>Correlations with diet:</b>  Dietary fibers intake ↑ <i>W. confusa</i>, ↑ <i>L. salivarius</i>, ↓ <i>L. mucosae</i>, ↓ <i>L. crispatus</i>; fat intake ↓ <i>L. salivarius</i>, ↑ <i>L. mucosae</i>; protein intake ↑ <i>L. mucosae</i>; carbohydrate ↓ <i>L. mucosae</i></p>	
Ruiz-Ruiz et al., 2019	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><b>Diversity Findings for metabolites:</b>  α: YO ↑ compared to CHD, ADT (microbial richness, Pielou's evenness, Shannon index)</p> <p><b>YO vs. ADT vs. CHD:</b>  YO ↓ tryptophan and indole production with ↑ age; YO ↓ TnaA, ↓ TrpB, ↓ tryptophan, ↓ indole, compared to CHD, ADT</p>
Singh et al., 2019	No difference between YO and NHYO (Shannon, Chao1)	No difference between YO and NHYO (Bray-Curtis)	<p><b>YO vs. NHYO:</b>  Family/Genus: YO ↑ <i>Akkermansia</i>, ↑ <i>Erysipelotrichaceae</i> UCG-003, ↑ <i>Bacteroides</i>, ↓ <i>Streptococcus</i>, ↓ <i>Lactobacillus</i>, ↑ <i>Lachnospiraceae</i> (UCG-005)<sup>1</sup>, ↓ <i>Escherichia</i><sup>1</sup>/<i>Shigella</i><sup>1</sup>, ↑ <i>Cardiobacterium</i>, ↑ <i>Neisseria</i>, ↑ <i>Comamonas</i>, ↑ <i>Capnocytophaga</i>, ↓ <i>Bifidobacterium</i>, ↑ <i>Filifactor</i>, ↑ <i>Fusobacterium</i>, ↑ <i>Propionibacterium</i>, ↑ <i>Haemophilus</i>, ↑ <i>Corynebacterium</i>, ↓ <i>Rothia</i>, ↑ <i>Porphyromonas</i>, ↑ <i>Ruminococcaceae</i> UCG-014, ↑ <i>Prevotella</i> 2, ↑ <i>Peptoclostridium</i>, compared to NHYO;  *no inferential statistics provided</p>	N/A

**Abbreviations Used:** ADT: adult; CFA: cellular fatty acid; CHD: children; CM: community-dwelling older adults; DH: day-hospital older adults; DG: dietary group; DMA: dimethyl acid; GF: gene family; LL: long-living, oldest-old adults; LS: long-stay older adults; NHYO: non-healthy younger-old adult; NMR: nuclear magnetic resonance; ORF: open reading frame; OTU: operational taxonomic unit; RH: rehabilitation hospital older adults; SCFA: short chain fatty acid; TnaA: tryptophanase; TrpB: tryptophan synthase; YO: young-old adult

**Table S3C. Results of studies investigating the relationship of the gut microbiome to cognition in older adults**

Authors	Alpha-Diversity ( $\alpha$ )	Beta diversity ( $\beta$ )	Taxonomic Composition	Functional Potential and Metabolites
Anderson et al., 2017	N/A	N/A	<b>Associations with cognition and sleep:</b> Verrucomicrobia and Lentisphaerae: $\uparrow$ sleep quality.  Verrucomicrobia: $\uparrow$ word reading, processing speed  Lentisphaerae: $\uparrow$ cognitive flexibility; non-significant after accounting for sleep	N/A
Manderino et al., 2017	N/A	N/A	<b>NHYO vs. YO:</b> YO $\downarrow$ Bacteroidetes, $\downarrow$ Proteobacteria, $\uparrow$ Firmicutes, $\uparrow$ Verrucomicrobia, compared to NHYO  <b>Associations with cognition:</b> Phylum: $\uparrow$ Verrucomicrobia showed $\uparrow$ verbal learning, $\uparrow$ visual scanning, $\uparrow$ cognitive set-shifting, $\uparrow$ cognitive flexibility (word reading), $\uparrow$ cognitive flexibility (color naming); $\uparrow$ Firmicutes showed $\uparrow$ spatial perception and visual memory $\uparrow$ memory; $\uparrow$ Bacteroidetes correlated to $\downarrow$ spatial perception and visual memory, $\downarrow$ memory; $\uparrow$ Proteobacteria correlated to $\downarrow$ verbal Recognition/Discrimination, $\downarrow$ FAB, $\downarrow$ FAS	N/A
Verdi et al., 2018	<b>Associations with cognition:</b> $\uparrow$ Chao1, phylogenetic diversity, and observed OTU associated with $\downarrow$ reaction time and $\downarrow$ verbal fluency; the latter was no longer significant after accounting for frailty	N/A	<b>Associations with cognition:</b> Order: $\uparrow$ Burkholderiales associated with $\downarrow$ reaction time Class: $\uparrow$ Betaproteobacteria associated with $\downarrow$ reaction time	N/A

**Abbreviations Used:** FAB: Frontal Assessment Battery; FAS: Verbal Association Fluency; NHYO: non-healthy younger-old adult; OTU: operational taxonomic unit; YO: young-old adult



**Table S3D: Results of studies investigating interventions targeting the microbiome in older adults**

Authors	Alpha-Diversity ( $\alpha$ )	Beta diversity ( $\beta$ )	Taxonomic Composition	Functional Potential and Metabolites
An et al., 2019	<p><b>YO vs. ADT (Baseline):</b> No difference between ADT and YO at baseline (inverse Simpson's index and phylogenetic diversity)</p> <p><b>Pre- vs. Post-Pectin Supplementation:</b> No difference (Faith's PD, inverse Simpson) in both ADT and YO</p>	<p><b>YO vs. ADT (Baseline):</b> Difference between ADT and YO (unweighted UniFrac); no significance difference between ADT and YO (weighted UniFrac)</p> <p><b>Placebo vs. Pectin Supplementation (Baseline):</b> No significant difference (weighted and unweighted UniFrac)</p> <p><b>Pre- vs. Post-Pectin Supplementation:</b> No significant difference (weighted and unweighted UniFrac). Smaller intra-individual (within person) change, compared to Inter-individual (across people) (weighted UniFrac and unweighted UniFrac)</p>	<p><b>YO vs. ADT (Baseline):</b> YO <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Enterorhabdus</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Ruminiclostridium</i> 6, <math>\uparrow</math> uncultured genus within the family Coriobacteriaceae, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Mogibacterium</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Lachnospiraceae</i> (UCG-008), compared to ADT</p> <p><b>YO vs. ADT (Post Pectin Supplementation):</b> YO <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Enterorhabdus</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> uncultured genus within the family Coriobacteriaceae, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Mogibacterium</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Lachnospiraceae</i> UCG-008)</p> <p><b>Pre- vs. Post-Pectin Supplementation:</b> No change in taxonomic composition.</p>	<p><b>YO vs. ADT (Baseline):</b> No significant differences in BCFA or SCFA</p> <p><b>Pre- vs. Post-Pectin Supplementation:</b> No significant differences in BCFA or SCFA (acetic acid, propionic acid, butyric acid, valeric acid, isobutyric acid, isovaleric acid) in YO or ADT</p>
Björklund et al., 2011	N/A	N/A	<p><b>Placebo vs. Synbiotic:</b> Genera: Synbiotic <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Bifidobacterium</i>, <math>\uparrow</math> <i>L. acidophilus</i> NCFM, compared to placebo; both (synbiotic and placebo) <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Clostridium</i> cluster XIVab, <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Blautia coccoides</i>– <i>Eubacterium rectale</i></p>	N/A
Spaiser et al., 2015	<p><b>Placebo vs. Probiotic:</b> No difference between placebo and probiotic groups (Chao1, observed OTUs)</p>	<p><b>Placebo vs. Probiotic:</b> No difference between placebo and probiotic groups (UniFrac)</p>	<p><b>Placebo vs. Probiotic:</b> Genus: Probiotic <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Bifidobacteria</i> and <math>\uparrow</math> lactic acid bacteria, compared to placebo Species: Probiotic <math>\downarrow</math> <i>Escherichia coli</i> and <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Faecalibacterium prausnitzii</i>, compared to placebo</p>	N/A
Valentini et al., 2014	N/A	N/A	<p><b>Diet only vs. Diet+VSL#3 treatment (Low-grade Inflammation Group):</b> Diet+VSL#3 <math>\uparrow</math> <i>Bifidobacterium</i></p> <p><b>Pre- and Post-Diet+VSL#3 treatment:</b> No change in <i>Clostridium</i> cluster IV, <i>Bifidobacterium</i></p>	N/A

			spp.	
--	--	--	------	--

**Abbreviations Used:** ADT: adult; BCFA: branched chain fatty acids; FMT: fecal microbiota transplantation; OTU: operational taxonomic unit; PD: phylogenetic diversity; SCFA: short chain fatty acids; YO: young-old adult