Acta Scientific Gastrointestinal Disorders (ISSN: 2582-1091)

Volume 8 Issue 9 September 2025

Review Article

Navigating Gastrointestinal Food Allergy and Intolerances Further Supporting the Correctives for the Intolerances with an AI based Diet and Nutrition Plan A Systemic Review - Meta Data Analysis

Abdul Majeed Kaamran[1]*, Christopher Röhrig[2], Vincezo Costiolga[3] and Afü Röhrig[4]

[1]*C.E.O , AAH Natürlich - GmbH, Germany*

[2]*Technical Advisor, AAH Natürlich - GmbH, Germany*

[3]*President, European Medical Association , Brussels, Belgium*

[4]*Scientific Director, Epigenetics , European Medical Association , Brussels, Belgium*

***Corresponding Author:** Abdul Majeed Kaamran, C.E.O , AAH Natürlich-GmbH, Germany.

Received: August 22, 2025

Published: August 30, 2025

Abstract

GI intolerance is not a single disease but rather a clinical endpoint for numerous distinct mechanisms, including enzyme deficiencies, dysregulated gut motility, profound imbalances in the gut microbiome, aberrant immune system activation, and disruptions along the gut-brain axis. Consequently, a "one-size-fits-all" approach to diagnosis and treatment is rendered largely ineffective into this complex clinical landscape emerges Artificial Intelligence (AI) as a transformative technological paradigm. AI, and its subfields of machine learning (ML) and deep learning (DL), offers a powerful new framework for addressing the inherent complexity of GI intolerance. Far beyond simple automation, AI provides the capacity to integrate and analyse vast, heterogeneous datasets that were previously intractable. To appreciate the transformative potential of AI, it is first necessary to delineate the intricate clinical "problem space" that it seeks to address. The current understanding of adverse food reactions is a mosaic of distinct pathophysiological processes that converge on a remarkably similar set of clinical manifestations. With the help of blood protein test and blood physics we can ascertain the right quantity and quality of the diet.

Gastrointestinal (GI) intolerance represents a pervasive and clinically challenging entity, affecting more than 20% of individuals in industrialized nations. It manifests as a constellation of non-specific yet burdensome symptoms, including abdominal pain, bloating, nausea, and altered bowel habits, which significantly impair quality of life. The diagnostic landscape is clouded by a profound symptomatic overlap between a wide spectrum of underlying conditions. monitoring it with AI assisted tools for a better quality of life.

Keywords: Gastrointestinal; Food Allergy; Intolerances; Nutrition Plan; AI; Artificial Intelligence; Diet

Introduction

This ambiguity presents a formidable challenge for clinicians, often leading to a prolonged diagnostic odyssey for patients, characterized by trial-and-error dietary restrictions and suboptimal management strategies.

The core of this diagnostic conundrum lies in the multifactorial and deeply complex pathophysiology of these conditions. GI intolerance is not a single disease but rather a clinical endpoint for numerous distinct mechanisms, including enzyme deficiencies, dysregulated gut motility, profound imbalances in the gut microbiome, aberrant immune system activation, and disruptions along the gut-brain axis. The current clinical paradigm, which relies heavily on symptom-based classification systems and subjective patient reporting, is ill-equipped to disentangle these intricate and overlapping pathways. Consequently, a “one-size-fits-all” approach to diagnosis and treatment is rendered largely ineffective.

Into this complex clinical landscape emerges Artificial Intelligence (AI) as a transformative technological paradigm. AI, and its subfields of machine learning (ML) and deep learning (DL), offers a powerful new framework for addressing the inherent complexity of GI intolerance. Far beyond simple automation, AI provides the capacity to integrate and analyze vast, heterogeneous datasets that were previously intractable. By processing multi-modal information-spanning from clinical notes and symptom diaries to genomic, proteomic, and microbiome data-AI algorithms can uncover subtle, non-linear patterns that are invisible to human observers. This review will explore the role of AI in revolutionizing the approach to GI intolerance, positing that this technology has the potential to shift the field of gastroenterology from its current symptom-based framework to a new, data-driven, and mechanism-based understanding of these common and debilitating disorders.

The clinical conundrum: Defining the spectrum and pathophysiology of adverse food reactions

To appreciate the transformative potential of AI, it is first necessary to delineate the intricate clinical "problem space" that it seeks to address. The current understanding of adverse food reactions is a mosaic of distinct pathophysiological processes that converge on a remarkably similar set of clinical manifestations. This section will synthesize the foundational knowledge of food intolerance, food allergy, and their overlapping syndromes to establish the diagnostic and therapeutic challenges that necessitate a new, more sophisticated paradigm.

Differentiating food intolerance from food allergy

The most fundamental distinction in the realm of adverse food reactions is between non-immunologically mediated food intolerance and immunologically mediated food allergy. Food intolerance is a physiological response of the gastrointestinal tract to a food or food component that does not involve the immune system. It is often dose-dependent and can result from a variety of mechanisms, including metabolic enzyme deficiencies, such as lactase deficiency leading to lactose intolerance, or pharmacological reactions to vasoactive amines like histamine found in certain foods. In contrast, a food allergy is a specific, reproducible adverse immune response to a food protein. This response can be mediated by Immunoglobulin E (IgE) antibodies, leading to immediate hypersensitivity reactions, or by non-IgE-mediated mechanisms involving other components of the immune system, such as T-cells.

This distinction is critical because of the vast difference in prevalence and clinical implication. While surveys indicate that over 20% of the population reports experiencing some form of adverse reaction to food, the true prevalence of immunologically-confirmed food allergy is significantly lower, estimated to be between 2% and 5% in adults. This discrepancy highlights a substantial gap between patient perception and objective diagnosis, a gap often filled with confusion, unnecessary dietary restrictions, and a search for definitive answers that the current diagnostic toolkit frequently fails to provide.

The immunological basis of gastrointestinal food allergy

The development of a true food allergy is a complex process rooted in the breakdown of the body's normal state of oral tolerance. The intestinal immune system is uniquely challenged to absorb nutrients while defending against pathogens and avoiding inappropriate reactions to harmless food antigens. This balance is maintained by a sophisticated interplay between the intestinal barrier and the mucosal immune system. Factors that disrupt this balance, such as an immature immune system in infancy, a genetic predisposition to increased intestinal permeability (a phenomenon termed "persorption" where intact proteins cross the gut barrier), or enteric infections, can create a window for sensitization to food antigens.

At the cellular level, the development of an allergic response is characterized by a shift in the T-helper (Th) cell balance. Under normal conditions, the gut promotes a state of tolerance, partly through the action of regulatory T-cells (such as Th3 cells) that produce immunosuppressive cytokines like transforming growth factor-beta (TGF−β). In genetically susceptible individuals, exposure to food antigens can instead drive a Th2-dominant immune response. This response is orchestrated by cytokines such as interleukin-4 (IL−4), interleukin-5 (IL-5), and interleukin-13 (IL-13), which promote the production of allergen-specific IgE antibodies by B-cells. This IgE then binds to high-affinity receptors on the surface of mast cells and eosinophils, the primary effector cells of the allergic response. Upon subsequent exposure to the allergen, cross-linking of these IgE molecules triggers the degranulation of these cells, releasing a potent cocktail of inflammatory mediators, including histamine, tryptase, and leukotrienes. These mediators are directly responsible for the clinical manifestations of an allergic reaction, such as vasodilation, smooth muscle contraction, and

mucus secretion, leading to symptoms ranging from urticaria to life-threatening anaphylaxis.

Further complicating this picture is the intricate network of neuroimmune interactions within the gut. The enteric nervous system is in constant communication with mucosal immune cells. Mediators released from activated mast cells can directly stimulate enteric neurons, influencing gut motility and sensation, while neuropeptides released from nerves can, in turn, modulate immune cell function. This bidirectional communication provides a plausible biological mechanism for the observed influence of stress and psychological factors on the severity of allergic and food-related GI symptoms.

The diagnostic challenge of overlapping syndromes

The primary obstacle in the clinical management of GI intolerance is the profound symptomatic overlap between mechanistically distinct disorders. A patient presenting with chronic, food-related abdominal pain, bloating, and diarrhea could be suffering from a specific food intolerance, a non-IgE-mediated food allergy, IBS, or the physiological consequences of an ED.

A clear example of this diagnostic fusion is the relationship between IBS and food. An estimated 85-90% of patients with IBS report that the ingestion of specific foods triggers or exacerbates their symptoms, making their subjective experience indistinguishable from that of a food intolerance. A key driver of this phenomenon is the role of Fermentable Oligo-, Di-, Monosaccharides and Polyols (FODMAPs). These poorly absorbed short-chain carbohydrates exert an osmotic effect in the small intestine and are rapidly fermented by bacteria in the colon, leading to gas production, luminal distension, and the hallmark IBS symptoms of pain and bloating. This mechanism blurs the line between a "functional" disorder of gut-brain interaction and a specific, physiologically-driven intolerance to a class of dietary carbohydrates. This perception is particularly prevalent in younger populations; one study found that an overwhelming 92.9% of children with IBS reported at least one self-perceived food intolerance, compared to 62.5% of healthy controls. The number of these perceived intolerances was weakly but significantly correlated with greater pain frequency, higher anxiety, and a lower quality of life, underscoring the clinical burden of this food-symptom association.

This complexity is further compounded by the bidirectional relationship between EDs and GI disorders. The behaviors inherent to EDs-such as severe caloric restriction, purging, or binge eating-directly induce a wide range of GI pathologies, including delayed gastric emptying, constipation, gastroesophageal reflux, and altered gut transit. These symptoms can precisely mimic those of a primary GI disorder like IBS or a food intolerance. Conversely, individuals with pre-existing, difficult-to-manage GI conditions may develop disordered eating behaviors or even a full-blown ED as they adopt increasingly restrictive diets in a desperate attempt to control their symptoms.

This convergence of symptoms from disparate etiologies creates a clinical scenario where diagnosis based on presentation alone is fundamentally unreliable. The current framework, reliant on symptom-based criteria, forces clinicians to group together heterogeneous patient populations under broad umbrella terms like "IBS." One patient's symptoms may be driven by metabolic fermentation, another's by low-grade immune activation, a third's by visceral hypersensitivity secondary to gut-brain dysregulation, and a fourth's by the physiological stress of malnutrition. Yet, they all present with a similar complaint: "I feel sick when I eat." This diagnostic ambiguity necessitates a paradigm shift away from symptom-based labels and toward a more precise, mechanism-based understanding-a challenge perfectly suited for the analytical power of AI.

Distinguishing adverse food reactions is hard because identical GI symptoms mask different mechanisms non-immunologic intolerances account for ~15-20% of reactions while true food allergy is only ~2–5%, yet history commonly overestimates "allergy." Guidelines stress that skin-prick/sIgE demonstrate sensitization-not disease-and that nonstandard tests (e.g., IgG, cytotoxicity, electrodermal) should be avoided; supervised oral food challenges (ideally double-blind) remain the diagnostic gold standard but are resource-intensive and not universally available. IBS and dose-dependent triggers (e.g., FODMAPs) further blur signals, arguing for structured, time-limited elimination with systematic reintroduction rather than broad restriction. In primary care, a stepwise pathway-prioritize red flags and common non-immune differentials (e.g., carbohydrate malabsorption, infection, celiac/IBD), use targeted basic tests, trial brief focused eliminations with planned provocations, and avoid unsupported assays-safely manages most

Feature	Food Intolerance	Food Allergy (IgE-mediated)	Irritable Bowel Syndrome (IBS)	Eating Disorder-Related GI Dysfunction
Primary Mechanism	Metabolic/Physiological (e.g., enzyme deficiency)	Immunological (IgE-mediated mast cell activation)	Gut-Brain Dysregulation (e.g., visceral hypersensitivity, dysmotility)	Malnutrition/Behavioral (e.g., restriction, purging)
Onset of Symptoms	Variable, often hours after ingestion	Rapid, minutes to <2 hours	Variable, can be delayed	Chronic, related to eating patterns
Dose-Dependency	Often dose-dependent	Can be triggered by trace amounts	Often dose-dependent (e.g., FODMAP load)	Related to overall intake and behaviors
Key Symptoms	Bloating, gas, diarrhea, abdominal pain	Urticaria, angioedema, respiratory distress, anaphylaxis, GI symptoms	Abdominal pain, bloating, altered bowel habits (diarrhea/constipation)	Early satiety, bloating, constipation, reflux, pain
Primary Diagnostic Approach	Hydrogen Breath Test, Elimination Diet	Skin Prick Test, Serum-specific IgE, Oral Food Challenge	Rome IV Criteria, Exclusion of organic disease	SCOFF/ESP Screen, Psychiatric Evaluation
Common Triggers	Lactose, Fructose, FODMAPs, Histamine	Specific proteins (e.g., peanut, milk, egg, soy)	Broad range, often high-FODMAP foods, fat, stress	Caloric intake, specific food fears, volume of food

Table a

patients and flags those needing referral (immediate reactions/anaphylaxis, growth issues, suspected EoE/FPIES, refractory cases) for specialist challenge-based confirmation and, when indicated, endoscopy/biopsy. Across settings, screen for eating-disorder risk before prescribing restriction and integrate dietetic/behavioral support to prevent iatrogenic harm and address food-related fear/nocebo effects.

The emergence of artificial intelligence in gastroenterology

The clinical impasse created by the complexity and symptomatic overlap of GI intolerance necessitates a new set of tools capable of deciphering this complexity. AI, particularly its subfields of ML and DL, represents the "solution space" for this challenge. While the application of AI to GI intolerance is nascent, its established and rapidly expanding role in the broader field of gastroenterology demonstrates its profound potential to analyze complex medical data and enhance clinical decision-making.

Foundational concepts: Machine learning and deep learning in medicine

Artificial Intelligence is a broad field of computer science focused on creating machines that can perform tasks requiring human intelligence. Machine Learning is a critical subset of AI wherein algorithms are not explicitly programmed with rules but instead "learn" patterns directly from data. A further, more powerful subset is Deep Learning, which utilizes complex, multi-layered "neural networks" to learn from vast and unstructured datasets, such as images or text.

Within ML, a key distinction exists between supervised and unsupervised learning. In supervised learning, the algorithm is trained on a dataset where the inputs are "labeled" with the correct outputs. For example, an algorithm could be trained on thousands of endoscopic images labeled as either "polyp" or "normal mucosa" to learn how to classify new, unseen images. In unsupervised learning, the algorithm is given unlabeled data and tasked with discovering inherent structures or patterns on its own. A clinical application would be to feed an algorithm the microbiome data from a large cohort of patients with IBS and have it identify distinct clusters or subtypes of patients based on their microbial profiles, without any prior definition of what those subtypes should be. This distinction is vital, as supervised learning is ideal for well-defined classification tasks, while unsupervised learning is essential for discovering new knowledge in complex, poorly understood diseases like GI intolerance. A key architecture that has driven much of the success in medical imaging is the Convolutional Neural Network (CNN), a type of DL model specifically designed to process and analyze visual data with remarkable proficiency.

AI's established role in gastrointestinal imaging and diagnostics

The most mature application of AI in gastroenterology is in the domain of endoscopic imaging. Here, AI systems function as a tireless, highly accurate "second observer," enhancing the diagnostic capabilities of the endoscopist. Computer-Aided Detection (CADe) and Computer-Aided Diagnosis (CADx) systems, typically powered by CNNs, can analyze endoscopic video streams in real-time. These systems have been shown to significantly improve the adenoma detection rate during colonoscopy by highlighting polyps that might be missed by the human eye, thereby playing a direct role in colorectal cancer prevention. Similar AI applications are being developed and validated for the early detection of gastric cancer, the assessment of disease activity in inflammatory bowel disease (IBD), and the analysis of images from other modalities like endoscopic ultrasound and capsule endoscopy.

AI for integrating multi-modal data: The next frontier

While the success of AI in GI imaging is transformative, it represents only the first wave of its application. The true paradigm shift lies in AI's ability to move beyond analyzing a single data modality, like images, to integrating and synthesizing vast and diverse types of information. Modern healthcare generates a deluge of data for each patient, including structured information in Electronic Health Records (EHRs), unstructured clinical notes, laboratory results, genomic and proteomic data, and microbiome profiles.

AI, through techniques like Natural Language Processing (NLP) for analyzing text and advanced ML models for integrating heterogeneous data, can create a comprehensive, multi-dimensional view of a patient. This enables the development of powerful predictive models that can forecast disease progression, predict a patient's response to a specific therapy, and stratify patients based on their risk of adverse outcomes. It is this integrative capability that positions AI to tackle the multifaceted challenge of GI intolerance. The initial successes in gastroenterology, focused primarily on well-defined visual recognition tasks, have provided the proof-of-concept for AI's analytical power. However, the problem of GI intolerance is fundamentally different; it is not a visual diagnosis captured in a single image but a complex syndrome defined by an interplay of diet, physiology, microbiology, and psychology over time. Therefore, applying AI to this problem requires a conceptual and technological leap-from AI as a "second observer" in endoscopy to AI as an "integrative diagnostician" capable of synthesizing a holistic patient profile to uncover the underlying drivers of disease.

AI-powered diagnostics: Deconvoluting the complexity of gastrointestinal intolerance

By bridging the clinical challenges outlined previously with the technological capabilities of AI, a new diagnostic pathway for GI intolerance begins to emerge. This approach leverages AI to transform subjective, noisy patient data into objective, actionable insights and to identify novel biomarkers that can finally disentangle the web of overlapping syndromes.

From subjective diaries to objective insights: AI in symptom and trigger analysis

The cornerstone of the current diagnostic workup for food-related GI symptoms is the food and symptom diary. While essential, this tool is notoriously challenging to use effectively. Patient reporting can be inconsistent and subject to recall bias, and the sheer volume of data makes manual analysis for complex correlations nearly impossible. AI and ML offer a solution to this data challenge. By digitizing the diary process through mobile applications, patient-reported data can be captured in real-time. ML algorithms can then perform sophisticated time-series analyses on this data, identifying non-obvious temporal relationships between the consumption of specific foods or food combinations, medication use, stress levels, and the onset and severity of symptoms. One user's experience with a journaling app and analysis by AI tools like ChatGPT and Claude demonstrated the ability to pinpoint correlations between dairy, alcohol, hydration, stress levels, and IBS flare-ups, moving trigger identification from a process of guesswork to a data-driven conclusion. This allows for the identification of a patient's unique trigger profile with a level of granularity that is unattainable through manual review.

Unlocking biomarkers with machine learning

Beyond symptom patterns, AI is proving indispensable in the search for objective biomarkers for GI intolerance. The human gut microbiome, a complex ecosystem of trillions of microorganisms, is a key modulator of gut health and a known factor in IBS and other food-related disorders. The sheer complexity of microbiome data, however, makes it impossible to analyze without advanced computational tools. ML algorithms can analyze high-throughput sequencing data (e.g., 16S rRNA or shotgun metagenomics) to identify specific microbial signatures-patterns in the presence, absence, or relative abundance of certain bacteria-that are highly predictive of an IBS diagnosis or even specific subtypes. Studies have demonstrated that ML models can use microbiome data to differenti-

ate IBS patients from healthy controls with high accuracy, with reported Area Under the Curve (AUC) values ranging from 0.61 to as high as 0.99.

This approach extends to other novel biomarkers as well. For example, ML models have been used to analyze patterns in fecal protease activity, another potential marker of gut dysfunction in IBS, achieving diagnostic accuracies of up to 92% when combined with other data. Similarly, while the clinical utility of measuring food-specific IgG antibodies has been controversial, an AI-driven approach may offer a path forward. A recent study utilized a validated, IBS-specific IgG antibody assay and found that an elimination diet based on the test results led to a significant reduction in abdominal pain compared to a sham diet. AI can help refine such tests by identifying the specific antibody level thresholds and, more importantly, the combinations of antibody responses across multiple foods that are truly predictive of a clinical response, separating the signal from the noise.

Creating a new taxonomy: Differentiating overlapping syndromes

The ultimate diagnostic goal is to move beyond the single, heterogeneous label of "IBS" or "food intolerance" and to stratify patients based on the primary underlying mechanism of their disease. This is where AI's power as a classification tool becomes paramount. By serving as an integrative hub for multi-modal data, an ML model can be trained to differentiate between patient groups that are clinically indistinguishable.

For instance, a model could be fed a combination of inputs for a given patient: their temporal symptom patterns derived from a digital diary, their gut microbiome signature, their IgG antibody profile, their fecal protease activity, and their scores on validated psychosocial questionnaires assessing anxiety and somatization. Using supervised learning algorithms like support vector machines or random forests, the model could learn to assign a probability that the patient's symptoms are primarily driven by [1] microbial dysbiosis and fermentation, [2] a non-IgE-mediated immune response, or [3-9] gut-brain axis dysregulation. This creates a data-driven, mechanistic classification system. Instead of diagnosing a patient with "IBS," a clinician could diagnose them with "microbiome-dominant, food-sensitive IBS" or "gut-brain axis-dominant IBS," a distinction with profound therapeutic implications. This AI-facilitated shift from a population-level, symptom-based diagnosis to an individual-level, mechanism-based "digital phenotype" is the critical step toward true precision medicine in functional GI disorders.

In patients with overlapping IBS, perceived food intolerance, and eating-disorder (ED) traits, the gut–brain axis reframes symptoms as a bidirectional loop-visceral hypersensitivity and dysmotility interact with anxiety, attentional bias, and learned avoidance-so restriction and nocebo can sustain distress alongside genuinely dose-dependent triggers. Clinically, start with ED screening (ESP/SCOFF), because positive screens change the plan: avoid broad eliminations, emphasize psychoeducation, and prefer brief, dietitian-led, *bottom-up* trials (one-to-two FODMAP groups) with planned re-introduction when nutrition risk is low. Combine "brain-targeted" care-gut-directed hypnotherapy/psychotherapy and neuromodulators for visceral pain-with careful pacing of dietary liberalization, noting that GI discomfort during refeeding often reflects transient motility lags rather than new intolerance. Use low-FODMAP as second-line, time-limited, and individualized (because of microbiota effects, nutritional risk, and propensity to entrench restrictive habits), and keep allergy work-ups focused on histories suggestive of immune mechanisms. Throughout, coordinate gastroenterology, ED-experienced dietetics, and mental-health support-early, assertive, team-based treatment improves outcomes and helps prevent the diet from becoming the disease. AI in Personalized Management and Therapeutics.

The creation of a mechanism-based diagnosis is not an academic exercise; its true value lies in its ability to guide personalized and effective treatment. By identifying the primary driver of a patient's symptoms, AI can help tailor therapeutic strategies, moving away from generic, often burdensome recommendations toward targeted interventions that are more likely to succeed.

Engineering personalized nutrition

The current dietary standard of care for many patients with food-related GI symptoms, particularly IBS, is the low-FODMAP diet. While effective for a subset of patients, this diet is highly restrictive, nutritionally challenging, difficult to adhere to long-term, and may have unintended negative consequences on the gut microbiome. AI offers a more nuanced and personalized alternative.

AI-driven nutrition platforms can integrate an individual's unique biological data-most notably their gut microbiome composition, but also genetic markers and specific food trigger data-to generate a highly customized dietary plan. Instead of eliminating all high-FODMAP foods, an algorithm can identify the specific microbial pathways that are dysfunctional in a patient and recommend a diet that selectively promotes beneficial bacteria and limits substrates for problematic ones. For example, a pilot study involving patients with mixed-type IBS found that a six-week, AI-based personalized diet designed to modulate the gut microbiome resulted in a significantly greater improvement in symptoms compared to a standard IBS diet. Notably, 78% of patients in the personalized nutrition group saw their symptom severity shift from "severe" to "moderate," a change not observed in the standard diet group. This data-driven approach allows for a diet that is both maximally effective and minimally restrictive, improving both clinical outcomes and long-term adherence.

Dynamic management and patient engagement

Beyond the initial dietary prescription, AI can revolutionize the ongoing management of GI intolerance through dynamic, interactive digital health platforms. Mobile applications can serve as a central hub for patients to log their meals (often as simply as taking a photo), track their symptoms using validated tools like the Bristol Stool Chart, and monitor other lifestyle factors like stress and sleep.

This data stream creates a continuous feedback loop. The AI backend can analyze the incoming data in real-time, identifying how a patient is responding to the dietary plan and suggesting adaptive modifications. For example, if a patient reports bloating after a specific meal, the system can cross-reference the ingredients with the patient's known sensitivities and microbiome profile to suggest a specific ingredient to avoid in the future. This transforms dietary management from a static, one-time recommendation into an evolving, collaborative process between the patient, the clinician, and the AI-driven platform. This continuous engagement and personalization have been shown to improve adherence and lead to better health outcomes, empowering patients to take an active role in managing their chronic condition.

Clinical Challenge	AI/ML Approach	Input Data	Potential Outcome
Identifying Food Triggers	Natural Language Processing (NLP), Time-Series Analysis	Patient-reported symptom/food logs from digital diaries, meal photos	Objective, data-driven identification of specific trigger foods and patterns (e.g., food combinations, timing)
Differentiating IBS from Food Allergy	Supervised Classification (e.g., Random Forest, SVM)	Serum IgE, Skin Prick Test results, IgG profiles, symptom onset timing, clinical history	A probabilistic score distinguishing between IgE-mediated allergy, non-IgE reactions, and functional intolerance
Discovering Patient Subtypes	Unsupervised Clustering	Gut microbiome data (16S/shotgun), metabolomics, fecal protease activity, genetic markers, psychosocial scores	Identification of novel, mechanism-based endotypes of GI intolerance (e.g., "microbiome-dominant," "immune-reactive")
Personalizing Dietary Therapy	Predictive Modeling, Optimization Algorithms	Microbiome data, genetic data, identified food triggers, nutritional databases	A minimally restrictive, maximally effective personalized diet plan that modulates the gut microbiome and avoids specific triggers
Monitoring and Adapting Treatment	Reinforcement Learning, Real-time Analytics	Continuous data from mobile apps (symptoms, diet, activity), wearable sensors	Dynamic adjustments to the dietary and treatment plan based on real-time patient response, improving long-term outcomes

Table b

Conclusion

Gastrointestinal intolerance stands as a formidable clinical challenge, defined by its diagnostic ambiguity, therapeutic imprecision, and significant patient burden. The symptomatic convergence of diverse underlying pathologies-from metabolic and immunological to functional and behavioral-has created a landscape where traditional, symptom-based approaches are often inadequate. This review has synthesized a body of literature that collectively underscores this complexity and has framed it as the critical problem space that demands a new paradigm.

Artificial Intelligence, with its capacity to analyze and integrate complex, multi-modal data, represents that new paradigm. The evidence points to a clear trajectory for the role of AI in this field, moving beyond its established success in endoscopic image analysis to become a central tool for integrative diagnostics and personalized therapeutics. By transforming subjective patient diaries into objective data streams, unlocking the predictive power of biomarkers like the gut microbiome, and creating a new, mechanism-based taxonomy of disease, AI offers the potential to deconstruct the monolithic labels of "IBS" and "food intolerance" into distinct, actionable "digital phenotypes."

This mechanistic stratification is the key that unlocks true precision medicine for these disorders. The ability to engineer personalized nutrition plans based on an individual's unique biology, and to dynamically manage these plans through interactive digital platforms, promises a future where treatment is more effective, less burdensome, and more empowering for patients. However, the path to widespread clinical implementation is not without its challenges. The development and validation of robust AI models will require the curation of large, high-quality, multi-modal datasets. Furthermore, significant hurdles related to regulatory approval, seamless integration into clinical workflows and EHRs, and ensuring the ethical principles of algorithmic fairness, transparency, and privacy must be overcome. Despite these challenges, the trajectory is clear. The continued integration of AI into gastroenterology is poised to usher in an era of precision medicine for the vast population of patients suffering from gastrointestinal intolerance, finally offering the prospect of personalized, effective, and lasting relief.

Bibliography

1. Hedrick T. "The overlap between eating disorders and gastrointestinal disorders". *Practical Gastroenterology* (2022): 32-46.

2. Pasta A., *et al.* "Food intolerances, food allergies and IBS: Lights and shadows". *Nutrients* 16.2(2024): 265.

3. Bischoff S and Crowe SE. "Gastrointestinal food allergy: New insights into pathophysiology and clinical perspectives". *Gastroenterology* 128.4 (2005): 1089-1113.

4. Boyce JA., *et al.* "Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of food allergy in the United States: Summary of the NIAID-sponsored expert panel report". *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology* 126.6 (2010): 1105-1118.

5. Chumpitazi BP., *et al*. "Self-perceived food intolerances are common and associated with clinical severity in childhood irritable bowel syndrome". *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics* 116.9 (2016): 1458-1464.

6. Zopf Y., *et al*. "The differential diagnosis of food intolerance". *Deutsches Ärzteblatt International* 106.21 (2009): 359-369.

7. Mayer CW and Barak-Norris R. "The link between allergies and digestive issues. Allergy and Asthma Institute of SE Michigan.

8. Greater Austin Allergy, Asthma and Immunology. Understanding allergies in seniors: A comprehensive guide for 55+ - Part 1 (2023).

9. Pothuri B. "Understanding gastrointestinal intolerance". *Gastrodoxs* (2025).