

Treatment of Irritable Bowel Syndrome

Mohammad Abdul Majeed Abdul Ahad^{1*}, Mohammed Yossef Al-Habib², Faisal Rabeea Alanazi³, Fahd Ibrahim M Alhuwaymil⁴, Rawan Nawaf Alrasheedi⁵, Mohammed Ahmed Ashi², Samaher Ibrahim Alaauldeen⁶, Ali Mohammad A Shafei⁷, Hashim Hussain Alnahwi⁸, Sara Salem Alqethami⁶, Abdulrahman Abdalhmead Alkhateeb³, Lujain Abdou Mohammed Al-Sayegh², Sawsan Abdullah Awad Algarni⁹, Saad Abdulsalam Mankrawi¹⁰, Afaf Adeeb Saud Alzahr⁸ and Amjad Awdah Mohammed Alshahrani¹¹

¹Almaarefa College, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

²King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

³King Faisal University, Hofuf, Saudi Arabia

⁴Jordan University of Science and Technology, Irbid, Jordan

⁵Hail University, Saudi Arabia

⁶Umm Al-Qura University, Mecca, Saudi Arabia

⁷King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Science (KSAU-HS), Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

⁸Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University, Dammam, Saudi Arabia

⁹Taif University, Taif, Saudi Arabia

¹⁰Albaha University, Al Bahah, Saudi Arabia

¹¹King Khalid University, Abha, Saudi Arabia

***Corresponding Author:** Mohammad Abdul Majeed Abdul Ahad, Almaarefa College, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

Received: August 23, 2017; **Published:** August 28, 2017

Abstract

Irritable bowel syndrome (IBS) is a chronic and devastating functional gastrointestinal disorder that affects 9%-23% of the population across the world. The percentage of patients pursuing health care related to IBS approaches 12% in primary care practices and is by far the largest subgroup seen in gastroenterology clinics. It has been well recognized that these patients show a poorer quality of life and use the health care system more than patients without this diagnosis. The pathophysiology of IBS is not clear. Many concepts have been put forward, but the exact reason of IBS is still unclear. According to the updated ROME IV standards, IBS is a clinical diagnosis and presents as one of the four predominant subtypes: (1) IBS with constipation (IBS-C); (2) IBS with diarrhea (IBS-D); and (3) mixed IBS (IBS-M); former ROME definitions refer to IBS-M as alternating IBS (IBS-A); (4) unclassified IBS (IBS-U). Through the IBS subtypes, the presentation of symptoms may differ between patients and change over time. Patients report the most stressful symptoms to be abdominal pain, straining, myalgias, urgency, bloating and feelings of severe disease. The difficulty and diversity of IBS presentation makes treatment difficult. Even though there are reviews and guidelines for treating IBS, they focus on the efficacy of medications for IBS symptoms using high-priority endpoints, leaving those of lower priority largely unreported. Accordingly, the purpose of this review is to provide a comprehensive evidence-based review of the diagnosis and treatment of IBS.

Keywords: Irritable Bowel Syndrome; Abdominal Pain; Diagnosis; Treatment; Diarrhea

Introduction

Irritable bowel syndrome (IBS) is a gastrointestinal (GI) disorder described by altered bowel habits in relationship with abdominal inconvenience or agony without detectable structural and biochemical abnormalities [1]. The understanding of IBS has experienced a quick development with scientific advancement, but historically it was perceived over 150 years ago. In 1849, Cumming reported, “The bowels are at one time constipated, another lax, in the same person. How the disease has two such different symptoms I do not profess to explain” [2]. IBS is a common functional bowel disorder that produces a major health care burden and can strictly harm quality of life and is the most frequently diagnosed gastrointestinal condition. The etiology is inadequately comprehended and many elements are included. Understanding the pathogenesis of IBS is essential since the present more up to date pharmacotherapy agents are starting to focus on the known pathophysiologic instruments of IBS. Adjusted gastrointestinal motility, visceral hypersensitivity, bacterial overgrowth, post infectious reactivity, food sensitivity, brain-gut interactions, alteration in fecal micro flora, carbohydrate malabsorption, and intestinal inflammation all have been implicated in the pathogenesis of IBS. Nevertheless, the apparent symptoms from these mechanisms comprise of abdominal pain or anxiety, swelling, diarrhea, and constipation. Not all symptoms are gastrointestinal, for example, weakness is exceptionally normal. Historically, medical administration has concentrated on symptomatic treatment of these individual complaints [3]. Serotonin is generally present in the enterochromaffin cells in the gut and is a noteworthy controller of the peristaltic reflex and sensory relays in the gut [4]. There are two lines of confirmation supporting the view that serotonin regulation is strange in IBS. The arrival of serotonin in plasma seems, by all accounts, to be lessened in those with obstruction dominating (IBS-C) and expanded in diarrhea-predominant IBS (IBS-D) [5]. An imperfection in serotonin signaling was noted in both IBS and ulcerative colitis, with a lessening in typical mucosal serotonin and serotonin transporter immunoreactivity in both diseases [6]. Studies have likewise started to concentrate on the sub-atomic level with serotonin receptor agonists and enemies. The part of psychosocial factors in IBS likewise should be considered on the grounds that these elements impact treatment alternatives and patients’ desires. As indicated by an American Gastroenterology Association (AGA) specialized review [7], inquire about into this zone has yielded four general perceptions. In the first place, mental anxiety worsens gastrointestinal side effects amplifying the seriousness of the runs, stomach distress, et cetera. Next, psychological and psychiatric comorbidity is frequently represented between IBS patients. These psychosocial factors affect the disease experience, patient expectations, and treatment result of IBS patients. Finally, the AGA highlights that these factors also dictate which patients refer to physicians. All these considerations should be kept in mind when considering long-term treatment goals via pharmacotherapy or psychological management.

Functional GI disorders (FGID), most notoriously functional dyspepsia (FD) and IBS, assume a conspicuous position within the “functional somatic syndromes”, together with chronic fatigue syndrome and fibromyalgia, with which they often overlap. FGID are common disorders of which the pathophysiology is partly understood. Psychosocial issues are thought to influence GI sensorimotor function and/or symptom generation in FGID as predisposing, precipitating or perpetuating factors; comorbidity with psychiatric disorders, mostly mood or anxiety syndromes is frequent. Modern epidemiological, psychophysiological and functional brain imaging research has incompletely explained the mechanisms over which these psychosocial factors can act on GI function or symptomatology, although the exact nature of their relationship remains a matter of controversy. The “brain-gut axis” may be abstracted as the bidirectional connection system between the GI tract (with its enteric nervous system) and the brain (central nervous system) through (autonomic) neural, neuroimmune and neuroendocrine trails. Consequently, when gut function is anxious, the reason of this disorder may be found in the GI tract itself or in the modulatory input from the central nervous system via the brain-gut axis [8]. The percentage of patients looking for health care allied to IBS approaches 12% in primary care practices and is by far the largest subgroup seen in gastroenterology clinics [7]. It has been well documented that these patients exhibit a poorer quality of life and utilize the health care system to a greater degree than patients without this diagnosis but have other FGID [9,10]. Patients with IBS visit the doctor more regularly, utilize more diagnostic tests, take more medications, have lower work productivity, are hospitalized more regularly, and consume more overall direct costs than patients without IBS.

Diagnosis

Diagnostic criteria have advanced since 1979 when Manning, *et al.* [10] first distributed their criteria. The progressions have incorporated the Rome I criteria, which were reexamined to the Rome II guidelines [11], and now to the latest Rome III criteria to take into account simplicity of finding. The Rome II criteria express that a patient must have stomach agony or distress for no less than 12 weeks, which require not be continuous, amid the previous 12 mo. This agony or uneasiness must have no less than two of the accompanying three components: help with poop, relationship with an adjustment in stool recurrence, or relationship with an adjustment in stool consistency. The Rome III symptomatic criteria essentially express that a patient must have repetitive stomach torment or inconvenience no less than 3 d/mo in the last 3 mo related with at least two of the accompanying elements: change with poop, beginning related with an adjustment in stool recurrence, or beginning related with an adjustment in stool consistency [3]. A 2009 position proclamation issued by the American College of Gastroenterology (ACG) states that no side effect based criteria have perfect exactness for diagnosing IBS [12]. Hence, the ACG Task Force characterizes IBS as stomach agony or inconvenience that happens in relationship with adjusted inside propensities over a time of no less than 3 mo. Understanding the pathogenesis of IBS is imperative since the present fresher pharmacotherapy operators are starting to focus on the known pathophysiologic components of IBS. Adjusted gastrointestinal motility, instinctive extreme touchiness, post irresistible reactivity, mind gut cooperations, modification in fecal smaller scale verdure, bacterial excess, sustenance affectability, sugar malabsorption, and intestinal aggravation all have been embroiled in the pathogenesis of IBS. Be that as it may, the apparent indications from these components comprise of stomach torment or inconvenience, swelling, the runs, and stoppage. Verifiably, restorative administration has concentrated on symptomatic treatment of these individual protestations. Likewise, our present pharmaceutical collection is generally restricted to treatment for just a single side effect.

As individual side effects are not totally precise in diagnosing IBS, criteria have been created to distinguish a blend of side effects to analyze the condition. Keeping an eye on *et al* [10] proclaimed the first record of this approach. Two of four investigations that have assessed the precision of the Manning criteria proposed they perform well, with an affectability of 78% and specificity of 72%. Kruis, *et al.* [13] built up another arrangement of criteria; three of four investigations that analyzed the exactness of the Kruis side effect score recommended it gives a phenomenal positive prescient incentive with a high affectability (77%) and specificity (89%). The Rome criteria in this manner were created and have experienced three emphases. One examination has assessed the exactness of Rome I criteria, and decided it had an affectability of 71% and specificity of 85%. Studies have exhibited that there are no predictable contrasts in affectability or specificity between Manning, Rome I, and Rome II and bolster the legitimacy of manifestation based IBS criteria [14]. A cross sectional examination by Engsbro, *et al.* [15] investigating the affectability of Rome III criteria in essential care in patients associated with bad tempered gut disorder. In this investigation, an aggregate of 604 patients were alluded and 499 were incorporated (32.8 ± 9.5 years, 75% were female). The Rome III criteria were satisfied by 376 patients (affectability, 0.75; 95%CI: 71% - 79%). Rome III-positive patients all the more oftentimes revealed irritated poop, had a higher manifestation weight, and lower ailment particular wellbeing related personal satisfaction contrasted and Rome III-adverse patients. The different side effect based criteria distinguished marginally extraordinary subpopulations with the most elevated understanding between the Rome II, III and IV criteria [15] (Table 1).

Diagnostic criteria	Symptoms, signs, and laboratory investigations included in criteria
Manning (1978)	IBS is defined as the symptoms given below with no duration of symptoms described. The number of symptoms that need to be present to diagnose IBS is not reported in the paper, but a threshold of three positive is the most commonly used:
	Abdominal pain relieved by defecation
	More frequent stools with onset of pain
	Looser stools with onset of pain
	Mucus per rectum
	Feeling of incomplete emptying
	Patient-reported visible abdominal distension
Kruis (1984)	IBS is defined by a logistic regression model that describes the probability of IBS. Symptoms need to be present for more than two years.
	Symptoms:
	Abdominal pain, flatulence, or bowel irregularity
	Description of character and severity of abdominal pain
	Alternating constipation and diarrhea
	Signs that exclude IBS (each determined by the physician):
	Abnormal physical findings and/or history pathognomonic for any diagnosis other than IBS
	Erythrocyte sedimentation rate > 20 mm/2 h
	Leukocytosis > 10000/cc
	Anemia (Hemoglobin < 12 for women or < 14 for men)
	Impression by the physician that the patient has rectal bleeding
Rome I (1990)	Abdominal pain or discomfort relieved with defecation, or associated with a change in stool frequency or consistency,
	PLUS two or more of the following on at least 25% of occasions or days for 3 mo:
	Altered stool frequency
	Altered stool form
	Altered stool passage
	Passage of mucus
	Bloating or distension
Rome II (1999)	Abdominal discomfort or pain that has two of three features for 12 wk (need not be consecutive) in the last one year:
	Relieved with defecation
	Onset associated with a change in frequency of stool
	Onset associated with a change in form of stool
Rome III (2006)	Recurrent abdominal pain or discomfort three days per month in the last 3 mo associated with two or more of:
	Improvement with defecation
	Onset associated with a change in frequency of stool
	Onset associated with a change in form of stool
Rome IV (2017)	Recurrent abdominal pain on average at least 1 day per week during the previous 3 months that is associated with 2 or more of:
	Related to defecation (may be increased or unchanged by defecation)
	Onset associated with a change in frequency of stool
	Onset associated with a change in form of stool or appearance

Table 1: Summary of diagnostic criteria used to define irritable bowel syndrome.

A consensus panel produced and constantly updates the Rome diagnostic criteria to deliver a standardized diagnosis for research and clinical practice. The Rome IV criteria for the diagnosis of irritable bowel syndrome (IBS) were released in 2016 and necessitate that patients have had recurrent abdominal pain on average at least 1 day per week during the previous 3 months that is associated with 2 or more of the following [16]:

- Related to defecation (may be increased or unchanged by defecation)
- Associated with a change in stool frequency
- Associated with a change in stool form or appearance.

Not at all like the Rome III criteria, the Rome IV criteria just require stomach torment in characterizing this condition; “inconvenience” is never again included attributable to its uncertainty and diverse implications crosswise over societies and languages [16].

Supporting symptoms include the following:

- Altered stool frequency
- Altered stool form
- Altered stool passage (straining and/or urgency)
- Mucorrhea
- Abdominal bloating or subjective distention

Four bowel patterns may be seen with irritable bowel syndrome, and these remain unchanged in the Rome IV classification [2]. These patterns include the following:

- IBS-D (diarrhea predominant)
- IBS-C (constipation predominant)
- IBS-M (mixed diarrhea and constipation)
- IBS-U (unclassified; the symptoms cannot be categorized into one of the above three subtypes).

The helpfulness of these subtypes is easy to refute. Eminently, inside 1 year, 75% of patients change subtypes, and 29% switch between clogging overwhelming IBS and loose bowels prevalent IBS. The Rome IV criteria vary from the Rome III criteria in constructing gut propensities in light of stool shapes exclusively amid days with irregular solid discharges as opposed to on the aggregate number of defecations [16].

Treatment

Treatment of irritable bowel syndrome comprises mainly of giving psychological care and recommending dietary measures. Pharmacologic treatment is adjunctive and must be directed at symptoms, for example, modulation of persistent visceral hyperalgesia [17]. The 2009 American College of Gastroenterologists (ACG) position explanation prescribes tending to non-gastrointestinal side effects and comorbidities to enhance wellbeing related personal satisfaction and also to lessen manifestation seriousness. Proof considered in the position explanation was lacking to suggest prohibition weight control plans or nourishment hypersensitivity testing [12]. The 2014 ACG monograph on the administration of crabby gut disorder and endless idiopathic stoppage discovered inadequate confirmation to prescribe prebiotics or synbiotics, or loperamide, in fractious inside disorder, and no proof that polyethylene glycol enhanced general side effects and torment in influenced patients. There was high caliber of confirmation to help the utilization of antidepressants as a class, and direct nature of proof of with fiber and psyllium, for general symptomatic alleviation in touchy gut disorder. Solid suggestions were ac-

counted for linaclotide and lubiprostone each being better than fake treatment in treating the clogging transcendent ailment subtype [18]. Effective treatment depends on a strong patient-provider relationship. Assure the patient that the nonappearance of an organic pathology indicates a normal life expectancy. Emphasize the expected chronicity of symptoms with periodic exacerbations. Educate the patient to distinguish stressors and to use prevention practises.

Psychological Treatment

Consider psychiatric referral. Past confirmation bolstered change in gastrointestinal (GI) manifestations with fruitful treatment of psychiatric comorbidities, yet ponders by Zijdenbos, *et al.* [19] and Ford, *et al.* [20] show that alert ought to be utilized when translating such information. In a meta-analysis by Zijdenbos, *et al.* of 25 randomized trials comprising of single mental mediations with common care or ridicule intercession in patients more established than 16 years, the creators found that albeit psychological behavioral treatment and relational psychotherapy were taking effect right now after treatment fruition, there was no persuading proof for maintained advantages with any treatment methodology. In this manner, Zijdenbos, *et al.* prescribed that future research should concentrate on momentum irritable bowel syndrome treatment guidelines and their long haul impacts [19].

Ford, *et al.* [20] achieved comparative conclusions with respect to the utilization of mental intercessions in fractious entrail disorder. The creators reasoned that antidepressants are compelling in the treatment of irritable bowel syndrome, yet in spite of the fact that the access information proposes that mental treatments might be of practically identical adequacy, there is less top notch prove for the normal utilization of psychological treatments in patients with IBS. They played out a deliberate survey and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials in adults with IBS; in any case, their choice criteria included trials contrasting antidepressants and fake treatment and additionally those contrasting mental treatments and control treatment or regular care. The agents noticed that the nature of studies was by and large useful for those including antidepressants yet poor for those including mental treatment. A Cochrane systematic review determined that antidepressants developed both irritable bowel symptoms and global assessment scores compared with placebo. Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) and tricyclic antidepressants were both shown to be effective in subgroup analyses [21]. The 2009 American College of Gastroenterologists (ACG) position statement concluded that psychological interventions, cognitive behavioral treatment, dynamic psychotherapy, and hypnotherapy, are more operative than placebo. Relaxation therapy was not operative than usual care. In agreement with the above analysis, study quality was described as low [12]. More recent studies suggest targeting the mediating psychological procedure involved in patients with irritable bowel syndrome, such as illness perceptions, maladaptive coping, and visceral sensitivity [22].

Dietary Treatment

Fiber supplementation may enhance indications of blockage and loose bowels. Individualize the treatment in light of the fact that a couple of patients encounter exacerbated swelling and extension with high-fiber diets. Polycarbophil mixes (e.g. Citrucel, FiberCon) may create less flatulence than psyllium mixes (e.g. Metamucil). The information in regards to the viability of fiber is disputable in light of the fact that 40 - 70% of patients enhance with fake treatment. A Cochrane orderly survey found no advantage of fiber/building specialists on peevish gut disorder side effects or worldwide appraisal [21]. Prudent water admission is suggested in patients who transcendentally encounter blockage. Caffeine evasion may restrain tension and side effect fuel. Vegetable evasion may diminish stomach swelling. Lactose as well as fructose ought to be restricted or stayed away from in patients with these contributing issues. Take care to supplement calcium in patients constraining their lactose intake. Gluten intolerance has been related to irritable bowel syndrome. In a small but important study, patients with irritable bowel syndrome who were well-controlled on a gluten-free diet were rechallenged in a double-blind fashion [23]. Approximately two thirds of these patients had poor symptom control with rechallenge. As with many irritable bowel syndrome studies, the placebo response was high (40%). Particularly, neither intestinal inflammation nor permeability was different among the groups, and no difference in the positivity rate for celiac disease-related HLA haplotypes or antibody markers was noted. Volta, *et al.* evaluated the current evidence and suggest that patients with gluten/wheat sensitivity might be a subset of those with irritable bowel syndrome [24].

Many patients are concerned in dietary manipulation to decline their symptoms. Some different diets have been suggested [25]. Diets low in FODMAPs (fermentable oligosaccharides, disaccharides, monosaccharides, and polyols) hold particular interest in decreasing symptoms of irritable bowel syndrome [26]. Probiotics are very interesting for treating symptoms, but it is uncertain for which patients' probiotics are supportive, and in what form, dose, combination, or strain [27]. A meta-analysis concluded that *Bifidobacterium infantis* may help alleviate some symptoms of irritable bowel syndrome [28]. A systematic review and meta-analysis of 13 articles that assessed the differential expression of intestinal microbiota in 360 patients with this condition compared to 268 healthy controls found down-regulation of bacterial colonization of *Lactobacillus*, *Bifidobacterium*, and *Faecalibacterium prausnitzii* in patients with irritable bowel syndrome [28]. Those with the diarrhea-predominant subtype had considerably different expression of *Lactobacillus* and *Bifidobacterium*. A different systematic review and meta-analysis evaluated 43 articles on probiotics and showed that probiotics helped relieve pain, bloating, and gas [28]; nevertheless, it remains unidentified which probiotic is best.

Regular visits with the clinician improve the patient-provider relationship, particularly in patients who were recently diagnosed with irritable bowel syndrome. Visits can become less regular as patients are educated and reassured.

Conclusion

Irritable bowel syndrome significantly influences the daily life of patients, creates substantial health-related fears and anxieties, and remains unwell understood by patients. In the absence of warning signs, the diagnosis of IBS may regularly be made at the first clinic visit and treatment initiated based on the predominant complaint. A key aspect of any treatment procedure involves educating the patient about his or her condition. Educating patients about IBS and correcting their wrong concerns may help decrease the number of patients pursuing consultation.

Bibliography

1. Drossman DA., *et al.* "Rome III: The Functional Gastrointestinal Disorders". McLean, VA: Degnon Associates (2006).
2. Horwitz BJ and Fisher RS. "The irritable bowel syndrome". *New England Journal of Medicine* 344.24 (2001): 1846-1850.
3. Occhipinti K and Smith JW. "Irritable bowel syndrome: a review and update". *Clinics in Colon and Rectal Surgery* 25.1 (2012): 46-52.
4. Talley NJ. "Serotonergic neuroenteric modulators". *Lancet* 358.9298 (2001): 2061-2068.
5. Dunlop SP., *et al.* "Abnormalities of 5-hydroxytryptamine metabolism in irritable bowel syndrome". *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology* 3.4 (2005): 349-357.
6. Coates MD., *et al.* "Molecular defects in mucosal serotonin content and decreased serotonin reuptake transporter in ulcerative colitis and irritable bowel syndrome". *Gastroenterology* 126.7 (2004): 1657-1664.
7. Drossman DA., *et al.* "AGA technical review on irritable bowel syndrome". *Gastroenterology* 123.6 (2002): 2108-2131.
8. Van Oudenhove L., *et al.* "Psychosocial factors, psychiatric illness and functional gastrointestinal disorders: a historical perspective". *Digestion* 82.4 (2010): 201-210.
9. Whitehead WE., *et al.* "Impact of irritable bowel syndrome on quality of life". *Digestive Diseases and Sciences* 41.11 (1996): 2248-2253.
10. Manning AP., *et al.* "Towards positive diagnosis of the irritable bowel". *British Medical Journal* 2.6138 (1978): 653-654.

11. Drossman DA, *et al.* "Rome II: The Functional Gastrointestinal Disorders: Diagnosis, Pathophysiology, and Treatment: A Multinational Consensus. 2nd edition". McLean, VA: Degnon Associates (2000).
12. Brandt LJ, *et al.* "An evidence-based position statement on the management of irritable bowel syndrome". *American Journal of Gastroenterology* 104.1 (2009): S1-S35.
13. Kruis W, *et al.* "A diagnostic score for the irritable bowel syndrome. Its value in the exclusion of organic disease". *Gastroenterology* 87.1 (1984): 1-7.
14. Whitehead WE and Drossman DA. "Validation of symptom-based diagnostic criteria for irritable bowel syndrome: a critical review". *American Journal of Gastroenterology* 105.4 (2010): 814-821.
15. Engsbro AL, *et al.* "Patients suspected of irritable bowel syndrome--cross-sectional study exploring the sensitivity of Rome III criteria in primary care". *American Journal of Gastroenterology* 108.6 (2013): 972-980.
16. Schmulson MJ and Drossman DA. "What is new in Rome IV". *Journal of Neurogastroenterology and Motility* 23.2 (2017): 151-163.
17. Farzaei MH, *et al.* "The role of visceral hypersensitivity in irritable bowel syndrome: pharmacological targets and novel treatments". *Journal of Neurogastroenterology and Motility* 22.4 (2016): 558-574.
18. Ford AC, *et al.* "American College of Gastroenterology monograph on the management of irritable bowel syndrome and chronic idiopathic constipation". *American Journal of Gastroenterology* 109.1 (2014): S2- S27.
19. Zijdenbos IL, *et al.* "Psychological treatments for the management of irritable bowel syndrome". *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 1 (2009): CD006442.
20. Ford AC, *et al.* "Efficacy of antidepressants and psychological therapies in irritable bowel syndrome: systematic review and meta-analysis". *Gut* 58.3 (2009): 367-378.
21. Ruedert L, *et al.* "Bulking agents, antispasmodics and antidepressants for the treatment of irritable bowel syndrome". *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 8 (2011): CD003460.
22. Knowles SR, *et al.* "Relations between symptom severity, illness perceptions, visceral sensitivity, coping strategies and well-being in irritable bowel syndrome guided by the common sense model of illness". *Psychology Health and Medicine* 22.5 (2017): 524-534.
23. Biesiekierski JR, *et al.* "Gluten causes gastrointestinal symptoms in subjects without celiac disease: a double-blind randomized placebo-controlled trial". *American Journal of Gastroenterology* 106.3 (2011): 508-515.
24. Volta U, *et al.* "Dietary triggers in irritable bowel syndrome: is there a role for gluten?" *Journal of Neurogastroenterology and Motility* 22.4 (2016): 547-557.
25. Gibson PR, *et al.* "Food components and irritable bowel syndrome". *Gastroenterology* 148.6 (2015): 1158-1174.e4.
26. Halmos EP, *et al.* "A diet low in FODMAPs reduces symptoms of irritable bowel syndrome". *Gastroenterology* 146.1 (2014): 67-75.e5.
27. Shanahan F and Quigley EM. "Manipulation of the microbiota for treatment of IBS and IBD--challenges and controversies". *Gastroenterology* 146.6 (2014): 1554-1563.
28. Brenner DM, *et al.* "The utility of probiotics in the treatment of irritable bowel syndrome: a systematic review". *American Journal of Gastroenterology* 104.4 (2009): 1033-1050.

Volume SI Issue 1 August 2017

©All rights reserved by Mohammad Abdul Majeed Abdul Ahad, *et al.*