Reviewer 2.

We are grateful to the reviewer for her/his comments and suggestions

**AU:** Growth performance have been added in the abstract

L 11-26 any comments on performance

L27-41 as before

L38-40 rephrase

On lines 56-57 the sentence is not clear. Please revise it.

On lines 63-64: Other authors evaluated the nutritional composition

[This part L57-63 need e revision since unclear]

**AU:** Thank you for pointing out the mistakes. This part has been rephrased.

L69 during food production

L74 FFPs (s is missing)

Line 72: the diets formulated.

Line 85: ingredients

Line 96: such as piglets

Line 118: “in vivo” in italics.

L142 method??

Line 164: remove “The”

I do not understand the sentence at L216 “count per sample abundance of sequences”.

Line 192: “Feed conversion ratio”, remove the capital letter

**AU:** Thank you for pointing out the mistakes. They have been corrected.

Discussion comments: The discussion of the results is appropriate and clear. However, the difference between traditional and alternative dietary carbohydrates sources should be better highlighted, in order to obtain a clearer connection to the title of the manuscript.

Specifically, considering the difference between TDF and SDF content in the diets, what is the role of the different content of TDF, SDF and IDF of the two diets on large intestinal microbiota of the piglets?
**AU:** Required information have been added to the manuscript. See line 306-311

L298-304: clarify the sentence.

L292,293,294: in vivo and in vitro in italics.

L 300: DF is the SDF or the IDF?

L344: “whit no effect on colonic bacterial population”

L. 349: has been addressed

Conclusions comments: The conclusions are appropriate to the content of the manuscript. L 370 decrease or affected

**AU:** Mistakes have been corrected. Thank you.