Published March 3, 2017

Disappearance of nutrients and energy in the stomach and small intestine, cecum, and colon of pigs fed corn-soybean meal diets containing distillers dried grains with solubles, wheat middlings, or soybean hulls[1]

N. W. Jaworski*[2] and H. H. Stein*†[3]

*Department of Animal Sciences, University of Illinois, Urbana 61801;
and †Division of Nutritional Sciences, University of Illinois, Urbana 61801

ABSTRACT: Disappearance of nutrients and energy in the stomach and small intestine, cecum, and colon of pigs fed diets containing distillers dried grains with solubles (DDGS), wheat middlings, or soybean hulls was determined. A second objective was to test the hypothesis that physical characteristics of dietary fiber in diets are correlated with the digestibility of nutrients and energy. Eight barrows (initial BW = 37.3 ± 1.0 kg) with a T-cannula in the distal ileum and another T-cannula in the proximal colon were allotted to a replicated 4 × 4 Latin square design with 4 diets and 4 periods in each square. The basal diet was a corn-soybean meal diet and 3 additional diets were formulated by substituting 30% of the basal diet with DDGS, wheat middlings, or soybean hulls. Following an 8-d adaptation period, fecal samples were collected on d 9 and 10, and samples from the colon and the ileum were collected on d 11 and 12, and d 13 and 14, respectively. Values for apparent ileal digestibility (AID), apparent cecal digestibility (ACD), and apparent total tract digestibility (ATTD) of nutrients and energy were calculated. Results indicated that ACD and ATTD of soluble dietary fiber was not different regardless of diet indicating that the soluble dietary fiber is mostly fermented in the small intestine or in the cecum. Pigs fed the wheat middlings diet had greater ($P \leq 0.05$) ACD of insoluble dietary fiber compared with pigs fed diets containing DDGS or soybean hulls indicating that the insoluble fiber in wheat middlings may be more fermentable than insoluble fiber in DDGS or soybean hulls. Insoluble dietary fiber disappearance in the colon of pigs fed the soybean hulls diet was greater ($P \leq 0.05$) compared with the DGGS containing diet indicating that insoluble fiber in DDGS are more resistant to fermentation than insoluble fiber in soybean hulls. The ATTD of total dietary fiber in wheat middlings was greater ($P \leq 0.05$) than in DDGS and soybean hulls further indicating that fiber in wheat middlings are more fermentable than fiber in DDGS and soybean hulls. Water binding capacity, bulk density, and viscosity of dietary fiber were not correlated with digestibility of nutrients and energy regardless of the diet. In conclusion, soluble dietary fiber is mostly fermented before reaching the colon whereas insoluble dietary fiber is mostly fermented in the colon, but fiber in wheat middlings is more fermentable than fiber in DDGS or soybean hulls.

Key words: cecum, co-products, dietary fiber, digestibility, energy, pigs

J. Anim. Sci. 2017.95:727–739
doi:10.2527/jas2016.0752

INTRODUCTION

Distillers dried grains with solubles (**DDGS**), wheat middlings, and soybean hulls are co-products that may be used in diets for pigs, but these ingredients contain more dietary fiber and less starch compared with corn (Burkhalter et al., 2001; Urriola et al., 2010; Jaworski et al., 2015). Feeding diets containing more dietary fiber results in pigs obtaining a greater proportion of dietary energy from VFA compared with pigs fed high-starch and low-fiber diets (Bach Knudsen, 2011). Microbial fermentation of dietary fiber varies among sources of fiber and, therefore, VFA production, absorption, and utilization also varies (Urriola et al., 2010). It is believed that a significant part of fiber fermentation occurs in the cecum of pigs, but the extent of the fermentation of specific

[1]Financial support for this research from The National Pork Board (Des Moines, IA) is greatly appreciated.
[2]Current address: Nutreco BV, Boxmeer, The Netherlands.
[3]Corresponding author: hstein@illinois.edu
Received June 24, 2016.
Accepted December 9, 2016.

dietary fiber fractions in different parts of the intestinal tract has not been reported. Whereas ileal and total tract fermentation of different fiber fractions have been reported (Urriola and Stein 2010; Urriola et al., 2010; Sholly et al., 2011; Lærke et al., 2015), data for cecal fermentation have been generated mostly from experiments using the slaughter method (Bach Knudsen et al., 1993; Glitsø et al., 1998; Serena et al., 2008a). To our knowledge, the combination of disappearance of nutrients along the gastrointestinal tract (GIT) using ileal and colon cannulated pigs and a detailed composition of the chemical and physical components of fiber has not been used. Therefore, an experiment was conducted to test the hypothesis that physical characteristics of dietary fiber are correlated with the fermentability of dietary fiber and energy along the gastrointestinal tract of pigs. The objectives were to quantify the disappearance of dietary fiber fractions in the stomach and small intestine, cecum, and colon of pigs and to determine the correlation between physical dietary characteristics and the disappearance of dietary fiber fractions along the gastrointestinal tract of the pig.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The protocol for this experiment was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Animals, Housing, and Diets

Eight barrows (initial BW = 37.3 ± 1.0 kg) that were the offspring of PIC 359 boars and F-46 sows (Pig Improvement Company, Hendersonville, TN) were surgically equipped with 2 T-cannulas. One cannula was placed in the distal ileum according to Stein et al. (1998) and a second cannula was placed in the proximal colon approximately 5 cm distal to the cecocolic junction. After surgery, pigs were housed in individual pens and allowed to recover for 8 d. Each pen had a fully slatted tri-bar floor and was equipped with a feeder and a nipple drinker. Cannulated pigs (initial BW = 41.0 ± 1.5 kg) were allotted to a replicated 4 × 4 Latin square design with 4 diets and 4 14-d periods in each square.

A source of DDGS was procured from One Earth Energy (Gibson City, IL; Table 1). Wheat middlings were obtained from Siemers Milling (Teutopolis, IL) and soybean hulls were procured from Archer Daniels Midland Company (Decatur, IL).

Four experimental diets were prepared. The basal diet was a corn-soybean meal diet (Table 2). Three additional diets were formulated by substituting 30% of the ingredients contributing energy to the basal diet with DDGS, wheat middlings, or soybean hulls. Because not all ingredients in the basal diet contributed energy, the actual inclusion of DDGS, wheat middlings, or soybean hulls was 29.10%. Vitamins and minerals were included in all diets to meet current requirements (NRC, 2012) and titanium dioxide was included in all diets at 0.40% as an indigestible marker.

Feeding and Sample Collection

Pigs were provided feed in an amount equivalent to 3 times the estimated requirement for maintenance energy (i.e., 197 kcal ME/kg$^{0.6}$; NRC, 2012) and daily feed allotments were divided into 2 daily meals that were provided at 0700 and 1600 h. Water was available at all times. The BW of each pig was recorded at the beginning of the experiment and at the end of each period. The initial 8 d of each period was considered the adaptation period to the diet. On d 9 and 10, fecal samples were collected and stored at -20°C immediately after collection. Colon digesta were collected for 8 h on d 11 and 12, whereas ileal digesta were collected for 8 h on d 13 and 14. Digesta were stored at -20°C immediately after collection. The final BW of pigs was 84.7 ± 6.4 kg.

Chemical Analysis

Diets, ingredients, and freeze-dried samples of ileal digesta, colon digesta, and feces were ground through a 1 mm screen in a Wiley mill (model 4; Thomas Scientific, Swedesboro, NJ). All samples were analyzed for DM (Method 930.15; AOAC Int., 2007). Diets and ingredients were analyzed for ash (Method 942.05; AOAC Int., 2007) and acid hydrolyzed ether extract (**AEE**) was determined by acid hydrolysis using 3*N* HCl (AnkomHCl, Ankom Technology, Macedon, NY) followed by crude fat extraction using petroleum ether (AnkomXT15, Ankom Technology). The concentration of GE in all samples was determined using an isoperibol bomb calorimeter (Model 6300, Parr Instruments, Moline, IL). Benzoic acid was the standard for calibration. All diets and ingredients were analyzed for CP using the combustion procedure (Method 990.03; AOAC Int., 2007) on an Elementar Rapid N-cube protein/nitrogen apparatus (Elementar Americas Inc., Mt. Laurel, NJ). Aspartic acid was used as a calibration standard and CP was calculated as N × 6.25. All diets and ingredients were analyzed for AA on a Hitachi AA Analyzer, Model L8800 (Hitachi High Technologies America, Inc., Pleasanton, CA) using ninhydrin for postcolum derivatization and norleucine as the internal standard. Prior to analysis, samples were hydrolyzed with 6*N* HCl for 24 h at 110°C [Method 982.30 E(a); AOAC Int., 2007]. Titanium concentration in all diets, ileal and colonic digesta samples, and fecal sam-

Table 1. Chemical and physical composition of feed ingredients

Item	Corn	Soybean meal	DDGS[1]	Wheat middlings	Soybean hulls
GE, kcal/kg	3822	4204	4518	4034	3692
DM, %	85.89	88.76	85.18	87.38	87.68
Ash, %	1.06	6.54	5.13	4.81	4.18
AEE[1], %	3.27	1.75	9.89	4.24	1.87
CP, %	7.41	47.99	26.45	17.20	9.29
Indispensable AA, %					
Arg	0.34	3.47	1.21	1.08	0.37
His	0.21	1.23	0.71	0.44	0.23
Ile	0.27	2.32	1.08	0.55	0.34
Leu	0.86	3.69	2.94	1.02	0.58
Lys	0.27	3.01	0.92	0.71	0.62
Met	0.15	0.66	0.49	0.23	0.10
Phe	0.35	2.40	1.28	0.66	0.32
Thr	0.25	1.74	0.98	0.49	0.29
Trp	0.05	0.74	0.23	0.20	0.06
Val	0.35	2.43	1.37	0.79	0.41
Dispensable AA, %					
Ala	0.53	2.04	1.76	0.75	0.39
Asp	0.48	5.24	1.65	1.10	0.74
Cys	0.15	0.61	0.45	0.32	0.15
Glu	1.29	8.45	3.29	3.08	0.93
Gly	0.30	2.05	1.17	0.85	0.79
Pro	0.58	2.41	1.92	1.04	0.50
Ser	0.31	1.88	1.08	0.56	0.42
Tyr	0.20	1.68	0.95	0.39	0.32
Total AA, %	7.05	46.18	23.62	14.39	8.24
Carbohydrates, %					
Fructose	0.16	0.10	0.08	0.67	0.24
Glucose	0.36	0.08	0.39	0.91	0.26
Sucrose	1.09	6.33	0.04	1.38	0.28
Maltose	0.31	0.01	0.30	0.11	0.07
Raffinose	0.13	0.94	0.03	1.06	0.08
Stachyose	0.01	4.10	0.02	0.02	0.23
Verbascose	N.D.[2]	0.12	N.D.	N.D.	0.01
Starch	53.93	2.01	2.74	22.20	7.49
ADF	2.53	7.38	17.78	9.76	40.28
NDF	8.07	7.51	36.99	33.16	55.37
ADL	0.47	0.39	4.83	3.14	1.94
Soluble dietary fiber	1.57	1.83	1.74	2.64	5.31
Insoluble dietary fiber	11.84	16.97	36.98	34.47	62.15
Total dietary fiber[3]	13.41	18.80	38.72	37.11	67.46
Cellulose[4]	2.06	6.99	12.95	6.62	38.34
Insoluble hemicelluloses[5]	5.54	0.13	19.21	23.40	15.09
Non-starch polysaccharides[6]	12.94	18.41	33.89	33.97	65.52
Insoluble non-starch polysaccharides[7]	11.37	16.58	32.15	31.33	60.21
Non-cellulosic non-starch polysaccharides[8]	10.88	11.42	20.94	27.35	27.18
Total[9], %	81.14	88.77	83.79	89.71	91.46
DE[10], kcal/kg	3484	3590	2635	2470	1334
Bulk density, g/L	559.75	644.93	442.65	356.57	435.63
Water binding capacity, g/g	1.07	2.81	2.02	2.99	4.22

Continued

Table 1 Continued

[1]DDGS = distillers dried grains with solubles; AEE = acid hydrolyzed ether extract.

[2]N.D. = not detectable.

[3]Total dietary fiber = soluble dietary fiber + insoluble dietary fiber.

[4]Cellulose = ADF – ADL.

[5]Insoluble hemicelluloses = NDF – ADF.

[6]Non-starch polysaccharides = total dietary fiber – ADL.

[7]Insoluble non-starch polysaccharides = non-starch polysaccharides – soluble dietary fiber.

[8]Non-cellulosic non-starch polysaccharides = non-starch polysaccharides – cellulose.

[9]Total = ash + AEE + CP + starch + sugars + oligosaccharides + total dietary fiber.

[10]DE (kcal/kg of DM) = 1161 + (0.749 × GE) – (4.3 × ash) – (4.1 × NDF) (Noblet and Perez, 1993).

ples were determined using an ICP procedure (Method 990.08; AOAC Int., 2007). Samples were prepared using nitric acid-perchloric acid (Method 968.08 D(b); AOAC Int., 2007). Total starch was analyzed in all diets and ingredients by the glucoamylase procedure (Method 979.10; AOAC Int., 2007). Monosaccharides, disaccharides, and oligosaccharides in ingredients and diets were analyzed as described by Cervantes-Pahm and Stein (2010). All samples were analyzed for ADF and NDF using Ankom Technology method 12 and 13, respectively (Ankom[2000] Fiber Analyzer, Ankom Technology), and ADL was analyzed in ingredients and diets using Ankom Technology method 9 (Ankom Daisy[II] Incubator, Ankom Technology). Insoluble and soluble dietary fiber was analyzed in all samples according to Method 991.43 (AOAC Int., 2007) using the Ankom[TDF] Dietary Fiber Analyzer (Ankom Technology).

Physicochemical Analysis

All samples of ingredients and diets were analyzed for water binding capacity (Robertson et al., 2000) and bulk density (Cromwell et al., 2000). Values for water binding capacity were expressed as the amount of water retained by the pellet (g/g; Urriola and Stein, 2010). Viscosity was measured in ileal and colon digesta that was not freeze dried using a Brookfield LV-DV-II+ Viscometer (Brookfield Eng. Lab. Inc., Middleboro, MA) as described by Dikeman et al. (2006) using V-72, V-73, and V-75 spindles over a range of speeds (0.5 to 6 rpm).

Calculations and Statistical Analysis

The concentration of total dietary fiber (insoluble dietary fiber + soluble dietary fiber), cellulose (ADF – ADL), insoluble hemicelluloses (NDF – ADF), non-starch polysaccharides (**NSP**; total dietary fiber – ADL), insoluble NSP (NSP – soluble dietary fiber), and non-

Table 2. Ingredient composition, analyzed nutrients and energy, and physical characteristics of experimental diets

Item	Basal	Basal + DDGS[1]	Basal + wheat middlings	Basal + soybean hulls
Ingredient, %				
Corn	64.50	45.15	45.15	45.15
Soybean meal	32.25	22.58	22.58	22.58
DDGS	–	29.10	–	–
Wheat middlings	–	–	29.10	–
Soybean hulls	–	–	–	29.10
Limestone	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
Dicalcium P	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15
Lysine HCl	0.25	0.18	0.18	0.18
Titanium dioxide	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40
Salt	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40
Vitamin-mineral premix[2]	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20
Analyzed composition				
GE, kcal/kg	3831	3968	3862	3745
DM, %	87.22	87.04	87.44	87.59
Ash, %	5.76	6.01	6.07	6.12
AEE[3], %	3.15	4.97	3.33	2.52
CP, %	20.51	21.27	19.57	15.98
Indispensable AA, %				
Arg	1.38	1.24	1.24	1.01
His	0.55	0.57	0.50	0.43
Ile	0.94	0.91	0.80	0.73
Leu	1.81	2.05	1.54	1.39
Lys	1.37	1.15	1.21	1.13
Met	0.29	0.33	0.27	0.22
Phe	1.03	1.06	0.89	0.78
Thr	0.76	0.78	0.65	0.58
Trp	0.28	0.26	0.25	0.21
Val	1.04	1.07	0.93	0.81
Dispensable AA, %				
Ala	1.02	1.20	0.93	0.81
Asp	2.09	1.87	1.74	1.61
Cys	0.30	0.33	0.29	0.25
Glu	3.67	3.50	3.45	2.77
Gly	0.86	0.90	0.84	0.83
Pro	1.23	1.38	1.13	0.98
Ser	0.85	0.88	0.74	0.69
Tyr	0.68	0.71	0.57	0.54
Total AA, %	20.33	20.34	18.14	16.11
Carbohydrates, %				
Fructose	0.20	0.12	0.37	0.35
Glucose	0.26	0.37	0.60	0.40
Sucrose	2.69	1.80	2.22	1.78
Maltose	0.16	0.18	0.23	0.33
Raffinose	0.39	0.26	0.59	0.28
Stachyose	1.29	0.77	0.91	0.90
Verbascose	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02
Starch	35.09	27.64	32.51	28.83
ADF	3.93	6.43	5.18	15.00
NDF	7.68	16.30	15.01	21.72
ADL	0.45	1.11	1.21	0.88
Soluble dietary fiber	1.49	1.37	2.02	2.21
Insoluble dietary fiber	12.14	19.00	19.06	26.35
Total dietary fiber[4]	13.63	20.37	21.08	28.56
Cellulose[5]	3.48	5.32	3.97	14.12
Insoluble hemicelluloses[6]	3.75	9.87	9.83	6.72
Non-starch polysaccharides[7]	13.18	19.26	19.87	27.68
Insoluble non-starch polysaccharides[8]	11.69	17.89	18.66	26.80
Non-cellulosic non-starch polysaccharides[9]	9.70	13.94	15.90	13.56
Total[10], %	83.16	83.78	87.50	86.07
DE[11], kcal/kg	3393	3429	3270	2959
Bulk density, g/L	638.68	584.13	533.40	574.07
Water binding capacity, g/g	1.47	1.58	1.84	2.21

[1]DDGS = distillers dried grains with solubles.

[2]The vitamin-micromineral premix provided the following quantities of vitamins and micro-minerals per kilogram of complete diet: Vitamin A as retinyl acetate, 11,136 IU; vitamin D3 as cholecalciferol, 2208 IU; vitamin E as DL-alpha tocopheryl acetate, 66 IU; vitamin K as menadione dimethylprimidinol bisulfite, 1.42 mg; thiamin as thiamine mononitrate, 0.24 mg; riboflavin, 6.59 mg; pyridoxine as pyridoxine hydrochloride, 0.24 mg; vitamin B12, 0.03 mg; D-pantothenic acid as D-calcium pantothenate, 23.5 mg; niacin, 44.1 mg; folic acid, 1.59 mg; biotin, 0.44 mg; Cu, 20 mg as copper sulfate; Fe, 126 mg as iron sulfate; I, 1.26 mg as ethylenediamine dihydriodide; Mn, 60.2 mg as manganous sulfate; Se, 0.25 mg as sodium selenite and selenium yeast; and Zn, 124.9 mg as zinc sulfate.

[3]AEE = acid hydrolyzed ether extract.

[4]Total dietary fiber = soluble dietary fiber + insoluble dietary fiber.

[5]Cellulose = ADF – ADL.

[6]Insoluble hemicelluloses = NDF – ADF.

[7]Non-starch polysaccharides = total dietary fiber – ADL.

[8]Insoluble non-starch polysaccharides = non-starch polysaccharides – soluble dietary fiber.

[9]Non-cellulosic non-starch polysaccharides = non-starch polysaccharides – cellulose.

[10]Total = ash + AEE + CP + starch + sugars + oligosaccharides + total dietary fiber.

[11]DE calculated from NRC (2012).

cellulosic NSP (NSP – cellulose) were calculated for all samples. Total nutrient concentration, on an as-fed basis, was calculated as the sum of ash, AEE, total AA, starch, sugars, oligosaccharides, and total dietary fiber. Values for apparent ileal digestibility (**AID**), apparent cecal digestibility (**ACD**), and apparent total tract digestibility (**ATTD**) of nutrients and energy by pigs fed experimental diets were calculated according to Stein et al. (2007). Values for AID, ACD, and ATTD of nutrients and energy in DDGS, wheat middlings, and soybean hulls were calculated by subtracting the contribution of the basal diet to the diets containing DDGS, wheat middlings, or soybean hulls and the AID, ACD, or ATTD of nutrients and energy in DDGS, wheat middlings, and soybean hulls were then calculated by difference (Adeola, 2001).

The ileal, cecal, and total tract flow of nutrients and energy (g or kcal/kg DMI) by pigs fed experimental diets was calculated according to Urriola and Stein (2010). The disappearance of nutrients and energy (g or kcal/kg DMI) in the stomach and small intestine of pigs was calculated by subtracting the flow of nutrients and energy at the ileum from the nutrients and energy in the experimental diets. Cecum disappearance of nutrients and energy was calculated by subtracting the flow of nutrients and energy to the proximal colon from the flow of nutrients or energy at the distal ileum. Disappearance of nutrients and energy by pigs in the colon was calculated by subtracting the flow of nutrients and energy in the feces from the flow of nutrients and energy in the proximal colon. The disappearance of nutrients and energy in the stomach and small intestine, cecum, and colon from DDGS, wheat middlings, and soybean hulls was calculated as the difference between the flow of nutrients and energy from 70.9% of the basal corn-soybean meal diet and the 3 diets containing DDGS, wheat middlings, or soybean hulls.

Viscosity of ileal and cecal digesta was calculated using the Rheocalc software (Brookfield Eng. Lab. Inc., Middleboro, MA). The NLREG statistical software (NLREG, Brentwood, TN) was used to report viscosity measurements in terms of the power law equation (Cervantes-Pahm et al., 2014).

Homogeneity of the variance among treatments was confirmed using the UNIVARIATE procedure of SAS. The BOXPLOT procedure of SAS (SAS Inst. Inc., Cary, NC) was used to check for outliers. However, no outliers were identified. Data were analyzed using the MIXED procedure (SAS Inst. Inc., Cary, NC) using pig and period as the random effects and diet or ingredient as the fixed effect. Means were calculated using the LSMEANS statement in SAS. Differences were evaluated using the PDIFF option. Correlation coefficients among physicochemical characteristics of diets and the AID, ACD, and ATTD of nutrients and energy by pigs fed experimental diets were determined using the CORR procedure (SAS Inst. Inc., Cary, NC). The pig was the experimental unit for all analyses, except that dietary treatment was the experimental unit for correlation analysis. A P-value ≤ 0.05 was used to determine significance among dietary treatments for all outcomes.

RESULTS

All pigs were successfully cannulated at the distal ileum and in the proximal colon. Pigs recovered from surgery without complications and digesta were successfully collected from the cannula in the ileum and in the proximal colon. One pig fed the corn-soybean meal plus soybean hulls diet died in the middle of the adaptation of period 3 due to peritonitis and no samples were collected for this diet in period 3. Therefore, there were only 7 observations for the corn-soybean meal plus soybean hulls diet.

Apparent Ileal, Cecal, and Total Tract Digestibility

The AID of DM and GE was least ($P \leq 0.05$) in the diet containing soybean hulls and greatest ($P \leq 0.05$) in the basal corn-soybean meal diet, and the diet containing wheat middlings had greater ($P \leq 0.05$) AID of DM and GE than the DDGS diet (Table 3). The AID of ADF and soluble dietary fiber was greater ($P \leq 0.05$) in the basal diet compared with diets containing soybean hulls. The AID of insoluble dietary fiber, total dietary fiber, NSP, insoluble NSP, and non-cellulosic NSP was greater ($P \leq 0.05$) in basal and wheat middlings diets compared with DDGS and soybean hulls diets, but the AID of cellulose was less ($P \leq 0.05$) in the soybean hulls diet compared with the basal diet. The diet containing wheat middlings had the greatest ($P \leq 0.05$) AID of NDF and insoluble hemicelluloses compared with the other 3 dietary treatments.

The ACD of DM and GE was least ($P \leq 0.05$) in the diet containing soybean hulls and greatest ($P \leq 0.05$) in the basal corn-soybean meal diet, but the diet containing wheat middlings had greater ($P \leq 0.05$) ACD of DM and GE than the DDGS diet. The ACD of NDF was greater ($P \leq 0.05$) in the wheat middlings diet than in all other diets. The basal diet and the wheat middlings diet had the greatest ($P \leq 0.05$) ACD of insoluble dietary fiber, total dietary fiber, NSP, and insoluble NSP, followed by the diet containing DDGS, whereas the soybean hulls diet had the least ($P \leq 0.05$) ACD of these fractions. The basal diet had greater ($P \leq 0.05$) ACD of cellulose than diets containing DDGS or wheat middlings, whereas the ACD of cellulose in the soybean hulls diet was less ($P \leq 0.05$) than in all other diets.

The basal corn-soybean meal diet had the greatest ($P \leq 0.05$) ATTD of DM and GE, and diets containing DDGS or wheat middlings had greater ATTD of DM and GE ($P \leq 0.05$) than the soybean hull diet. With the exception of insoluble hemicelluloses and cellulose, the basal diet had greater ($P \leq 0.05$) ATTD of all dietary fiber components than the other diets but, but with a few exceptions, no differences among the other diets were observed. The DE was different ($P \leq 0.05$) among diets and was 3430, 3299, 3218, and 2948 kcal/kg in the basal diet, the DDGS diet, the wheat middlings diet, and the soybean hull diet, respectively.

Wheat middlings had the greatest ($P \leq 0.05$) AID of DM and GE followed by DDGS and soybean hulls (Table 4). The AID of NDF, insoluble dietary fiber, total dietary fiber, insoluble hemicelluloses, NSP, insoluble NSP, and non-cellulosic NSP also was greater

Table 3. Apparent ileal, cecal, and total tract digestibility of dry matter, energy, and nutrients in experimental diets

Item	Basal	Basal + DDGS	Basal + wheat middlings	Basal + soybean hulls	SEM	*P*-value
Apparent ileal digestibility, %						
DM	72.6^{a}	56.0^{c}	62.8^{b}	48.9^{d}	1.4	< 0.001
GE	74.6^{a}	60.8^{c}	65.5^{b}	54.7^{d}	1.3	< 0.001
ADF	29.5^{a}	20.6^{ab}	24.5^{a}	10.7^{b}	4.9	0.014
NDF	26.0^{b}	24.1^{b}	38.5^{a}	15.0^{c}	4.2	< 0.001
Soluble dietary fiber	43.9^{a}	5.3^{c}	33.7^{ab}	17.8^{bc}	7.6	0.002
Insoluble dietary fiber	41.2^{a}	23.3^{b}	43.0^{a}	17.6^{b}	3.6	< 0.001
Total dietary fiber	41.5^{a}	22.1^{b}	42.0^{a}	17.6^{b}	3.5	< 0.001
Cellulose	30.2^{a}	17.4^{bc}	24.9^{ab}	9.9^{c}	5.1	0.009
Insoluble hemicelluloses	22.5^{b}	26.4^{b}	46.0^{a}	25.4^{b}	4.0	< 0.001
Non-starch polysaccharides	42.0^{a}	21.4^{b}	43.2^{a}	17.5^{b}	3.6	< 0.001
Insoluble non-starch polysaccharides	41.9^{a}	22.6^{b}	44.3^{a}	17.4^{b}	3.7	< 0.001
Non-cellulosic non-starch polysaccharides	46.5^{a}	22.8^{b}	47.9^{a}	24.9^{b}	4.0	< 0.001
Apparent cecal digestibility, %						
DM	75.7^{a}	61.3^{c}	68.0^{b}	53.3^{d}	1.4	< 0.001
GE	74.6^{a}	61.2^{c}	67.6^{b}	55.7^{d}	1.5	< 0.001
ADF	27.0^{a}	21.9^{ab}	19.3^{b}	8.6^{c}	3.1	< 0.001
NDF	26.6^{b}	23.3^{b}	37.6^{a}	16.0^{c}	2.7	< 0.001
Soluble dietary fiber	67.6	62.1	66.7	67.5	4.5	0.637
Insoluble dietary fiber	48.7^{a}	31.9^{b}	47.6^{a}	22.7^{c}	2.2	< 0.001
Total dietary fiber	50.7^{a}	33.9^{b}	49.4^{a}	26.1^{c}	2.3	< 0.001
Cellulose	30.4^{a}	20.0^{b}	21.5^{b}	7.8^{c}	3.2	< 0.001
Insoluble hemicelluloses	26.1^{bc}	24.3^{c}	47.4^{a}	32.2^{b}	2.9	< 0.001
Non-starch polysaccharides	52.5^{a}	34.1^{b}	51.7^{a}	26.4^{c}	2.3	< 0.001
Insoluble non-starch polysaccharides	50.6^{a}	32.0^{b}	50.1^{a}	22.9^{c}	2.2	< 0.001
Non-cellulosic non-starch polysaccharides	60.4^{a}	39.5^{c}	59.4^{a}	45.3^{b}	2.5	< 0.001
Apparent total tract digestibility, %						
DM	89.1^{a}	82.8^{b}	82.9^{b}	78.3^{c}	0.7	< 0.001
GE	89.5^{a}	83.1^{b}	83.3^{b}	78.7^{c}	0.7	< 0.001
ADF	66.3^{a}	67.2^{a}	40.3^{c}	56.9^{b}	3.7	< 0.001
NDF	63.9	66.2	61.9	63.5	2.1	0.345
Soluble dietary fiber	86.6	84.1	90.1	85.4	3.8	0.122
Insoluble dietary fiber	71.2^{a}	64.1^{b}	64.7^{b}	64.0^{b}	1.9	0.001
Total dietary fiber	72.9^{a}	65.5^{b}	67.1^{b}	65.7^{b}	1.8	< 0.001
Cellulose	72.2^{a}	69.8^{a}	52.7^{c}	60.1^{b}	3.3	< 0.001
Insoluble hemicelluloses	61.3^{b}	65.6^{b}	73.3^{a}	78.0^{a}	2.1	< 0.001
Non-starch polysaccharides	74.7^{a}	66.1^{c}	71.3^{ab}	67.6^{bc}	1.9	< 0.001
Insoluble non-starch polysaccharides	73.1^{a}	64.7^{c}	69.1^{b}	66.0^{bc}	1.9	0.001
Non-cellulosic non-starch polysaccharides	75.5^{a}	64.7^{b}	75.9^{a}	75.3^{a}	1.7	< 0.001
DE, kcal/kg	3430^{a}	3299^{b}	3218^{c}	2948^{d}	27	< 0.001

$^{a–d}$Values within a row lacking a common superscript letter are different ($P < 0.05$).

($P \leq 0.05$) in wheat middlings compared with DDGS and soybean hulls.

Wheat middlings also had the greatest ($P \leq 0.05$) ACD of DM, GE, NDF, insoluble dietary fiber, and total dietary fiber, and soybean hulls had the least ($P \leq 0.05$) ACD of these components. The ACD of ADF was greater ($P \leq 0.05$) in DDGS compared with soybean hulls, and the ACD of soluble dietary fiber, insoluble hemicelluloses, NSP, insoluble NSP, and non-cellulosic NSP were greater ($P \leq 0.05$) in wheat middlings compared with DDGS and soybean hulls.

The ATTD of DM and GE were greater ($P \leq 0.05$) in DDGS and wheat middlings compared with soybean hulls, but wheat middlings had the least ($P \leq 0.05$) ATTD of ADF and cellulose compared with DDGS and soybean hulls. The ATTD of soluble dietary fiber was greater ($P \leq 0.05$) in wheat middlings than in soybean hulls, but DDGS had the least ATTD of soluble dietary fiber. Wheat middlings had the greatest ($P \leq 0.05$) ATTD of total dietary fiber, NSP, insoluble NSP, and non-cellulosic NSP compared with DDGS and soybean hulls. The DE was different (P

Table 4. Apparent ileal, cecal, and total tract digestibility of dry matter, energy, and nutrients in distillers dried grains with solubles (DDGS), wheat middlings, and soybean hulls

Item	DDGS	Wheat middlings	Soybean hulls	SEM	*P*-value
Apparent ileal digestibility, %					
DM	15.7[b]	39.0[a]	-8.1[c]	5.4	< 0.001
GE	29.2[b]	42.4[a]	1.3[c]	4.7	< 0.001
ADF	9.3	15.6	6.7	8.7	0.657
NDF	22.7[b]	44.9[a]	11.0[b]	7.1	0.001
Soluble dietary fiber	-74.3[b]	28.4[a]	-3.1[a]	18.8	0.001
Insoluble dietary fiber	7.7[b]	45.9[a]	5.3[b]	7.0	< 0.001
Total dietary fiber	4.1[b]	44.6[a]	4.5[b]	7.0	< 0.001
Cellulose	4.5	12.2	5.5	10.3	0.752
Insoluble hemicelluloses	35.1[b]	57.2[a]	24.7[b]	7.1	0.001
Non-starch polysaccharides	1.5[b]	46.6[a]	3.8[b]	7.4	< 0.001
Insoluble non-starch polysaccharides	5.5[b]	48.2[a]	4.5[b]	7.4	< 0.001
Non-cellulosic non-starch polysaccharides	-0.5[b]	55.3[a]	2.1[b]	8.3	< 0.001
Apparent cecal digestibility, %					
DM	24.5[b]	47.7[a]	-2.3[c]	5.1	< 0.001
GE	28.0[b]	47.1[a]	2.1[c]	5.4	< 0.001
ADF	11.7[a]	7.2[ab]	3.2[b]	4.2	0.023
NDF	21.1[b]	42.4[a]	11.3[c]	3.3	< 0.001
Soluble dietary fiber	26.8[b]	81.8[a]	50.7[b]	10.7	0.001
Insoluble dietary fiber	17.1[b]	47.8[a]	9.3[c]	3.4	< 0.001
Total dietary fiber	17.6[b]	50.2[a]	13.0[b]	3.5	< 0.001
Cellulose	7.2	4.1	2.1	4.9	0.433
Insoluble hemicelluloses	29.9[b]	57.8[a]	32.5[b]	3.9	< 0.001
Non-starch polysaccharides	16.7[b]	53.5[a]	12.6[b]	3.6	< 0.001
Insoluble non-starch polysaccharides	16.0[b]	51.2[a]	9.0[b]	3.6	< 0.001
Non-cellulosic non-starch polysaccharides	22.0[b]	66.0[a]	24.9[b]	4.9	< 0.001
Apparent total tract digestibility, %					
DM	68.6[a]	68.4[a]	52.7[b]	2.8	< 0.001
GE	64.8[a]	66.3[a]	46.9[b]	3.0	< 0.001
ADF	46.7[a]	8.2[b]	56.6[a]	5.8	< 0.001
NDF	66.6	60.2	63.9	3.5	0.209
Soluble dietary fiber	46.4[c]	116.9[a]	63.5[b]	9.4	< 0.001
Insoluble dietary fiber	55.1	61.6	59.1	3.7	0.069
Total dietary fiber	54.7[b]	65.5[a]	59.4[b]	3.6	0.002
Cellulose	50.1[a]	15.9[b]	59.6[a]	5.7	< 0.001
Insoluble hemicelluloses	84.9	81.9	82.3	2.5	0.535
Non-starch polysaccharides	57.2[b]	72.4[a]	61.4[b]	3.7	0.001
Insoluble non-starch polysaccharides	57.7[b]	68.7[a]	61.2[b]	3.9	0.010
Non-cellulosic non-starch polysaccharides	61.6[b]	86.1[a]	63.3[b]	3.6	< 0.001
DE, kcal/kg	2975[a]	2697[b]	1763[c]	116	< 0.001

[a–c]Values within a row lacking a common superscript letter are different ($P \leq 0.05$).

≤ 0.05) among ingredients and was 2975, 2697, and 1763 kcal/kg in DDGS, wheat middlings, and soybean hulls, respectively.

Disappearance of Nutrients and Energy in the Stomach and Small intestine, Cecum, and Colon

Disappearance of GE and DM before the end of the ileum was greater ($P \leq 0.05$) in pigs fed the corn-soybean meal basal diet than in pigs fed the other diets, and pigs fed the soybean hull diet had the least ($P \leq 0.05$) disappearance of GE and DM in the stomach and small intestine (Table 5). Disappearance of dietary fiber components before the end of the ileum was greater ($P \leq 0.05$) in pigs fed the diet containing wheat middlings, whereas the basal diet had less disappearance of dietary fiber components in the stomach and small intestine compared with the diets containing DDGS or soybean hulls.

The disappearance of soluble dietary fiber in the cecum was greater ($P \leq 0.05$) in the diet containing soybean hulls compared with the basal and the wheat middlings diets, but for all other measured compo-

Table 5. Disappearance of dietary dry matter, energy, and nutrients (g or kcal/kg of DMI) in the stomach and small intestine, cecum, and colon of pigs fed experimental diets

Item	Basal	Basal + DDGS[1]	Basal + wheat middlings	Basal + soybean hulls	SEM	*P*-value
Stomach and small intestine						
DM	633.4[a]	487.6[c]	548.8[b]	428.0[d]	11.9	< 0.001
GE	3276[a]	2769[b]	2894[b]	2337[c]	57	< 0.001
ADF	13.1	15.2	14.4	19.4	3.2	0.328
NDF	22.1[c]	45.2[b]	66.0[a]	38.0[b]	7.2	< 0.001
Soluble dietary fiber	7.5[a]	0.9[b]	7.7[a]	4.5[ab]	1.5	0.002
Insoluble dietary fiber	57.2[b]	50.9[b]	93.9[a]	54.0[b]	7.7	< 0.001
Total dietary fiber	64.6[b]	51.8[b]	101.6[a]	58.4[b]	8.2	< 0.001
Cellulose	11.9	10.7	11.2	17.2	2.7	0.153
Insoluble hemicelluloses	9.2[d]	23.0[b]	51.8[a]	18.9[c]	4.2	< 0.001
Non-starch polysaccharides	63.4[b]	47.3[b]	98.3[a]	56.0[b]	7.9	< 0.001
Insoluble non-starch polysaccharides	55.9[b]	46.4[b]	90.6[a]	51.6[b]	7.4	< 0.001
Non-cellulosic non-starch polysaccharides	51.6[b]	36.5[c]	87.3[a]	38.7[bc]	6.2	< 0.001
Cecum						
DM	30.8	45.8	49.5	43.6	15.9	0.690
GE	26.4	18.5	116.5	72.2	73.8	0.548
ADF	-1.0	1.0	-3.0	-2.9	3.1	0.685
NDF	0.3	-1.3	-2.1	1.8	5.8	0.953
Soluble dietary fiber	4.0[c]	8.9[ab]	7.6[bc]	12.7[a]	2.0	0.012
Insoluble dietary fiber	10.6	18.9	10.3	16.4	8.0	0.720
Total dietary fiber	14.6	27.8	17.9	29.0	8.3	0.389
Cellulose	0.3	1.6	-1.3	-2.5	2.7	0.646
Insoluble hemicelluloses	1.5	-2.4	1.1	4.7	3.2	0.385
Non-starch polysaccharides	15.8	28.4	19.5	29.4	8.7	0.420
Insoluble non-starch polysaccharides	11.9	19.5	11.9	16.8	7.8	0.769
Non-cellulosic non-starch polysaccharides	15.2	26.9	20.5	31.8	6.9	0.095
Colon						
DM	114.8[c]	187.6[b]	128.8[c]	217.3[a]	11.4	< 0.001
GE	647[b]	999[a]	687[b]	977[a]	61	< 0.001
ADF	17.5[c]	33.5[b]	12.1[c]	80.7[a]	4.5	< 0.001
NDF	33.1[c]	80.2[b]	41.6[c]	116.6[a]	6.3	< 0.001
Soluble dietary fiber	3.3	3.5	5.4	4.5	1.0	0.106
Insoluble dietary fiber	31.3[c]	70.3[b]	36.9[c]	123.2[a]	6.7	< 0.001
Total dietary fiber	34.7[c]	73.9[b]	42.4[c]	128.0[a]	7.3	< 0.001
Cellulose	16.4[c]	30.4[b]	13.8[c]	81.9[a]	4.3	< 0.001
Insoluble hemicelluloses	15.3[c]	46.6[a]	29.3[b]	35.5[b]	3.1	< 0.001
Non-starch polysaccharides	33.6[c]	70.8[b]	44.1[c]	129.2[a]	7.1	< 0.001
Insoluble non-starch polysaccharides	30.2[c]	67.3[b]	38.6[c]	124.4[a]	6.6	< 0.001
Non-cellulosic non-starch polysaccharides	17.0[c]	40.3[a]	30.1[b]	46.8[a]	4.7	< 0.001

[a–d]Values within a row lacking a common superscript letter are different ($P \leq 0.05$).

[1]DDGS = distillers dried grains with solubles.

nents, no differences in cecal disappearance among diets were observed. The degradation of DM and most dietary fiber components in the colon was greater ($P \leq 0.05$) in the diet containing soybean hulls compared with the other diets, with the exception that pigs fed the diet containing DDGS had the greatest ($P \leq 0.05$) degradation of insoluble hemicelluloses. The degradation of GE in the large intestine of pigs fed diets containing DDGS or soybean hulls was greater ($P \leq 0.05$) compared with the degradation in the basal diet and the diet containing wheat middlings.

The disappearance of DM and all dietary fiber components before the end of the ileum was greater ($P \leq 0.05$) from wheat middlings compared with DDGS and soybean hulls (Table 6). Disappearance of GE in the stomach and small intestine was greater ($P \leq 0.05$) for wheat middlings compared with soybean hulls.

There were no differences among DDGS, wheat middlings, or soybean hulls in the disappearance of

Table 6. Disappearance of dry matter, energy, and nutrients (g or kcal/kg of DMI) from distillers dried grains with solubles (DDGS), wheat middlings, and soybean hulls in the stomach and small intestine, cecum, and colon of pigs

Item	DDGS	Wheat middlings	Soybean hulls	SEM	*P*-value
Stomach and small intestine					
DM	430.8[b]	549.3[a]	428.0[b]	32.1	0.015
GE	2472[ab]	2896[a]	2333[b]	164	0.050
ADF	14.0	14.4	19.6	3.3	0.289
NDF	43.2[b]	66.2[a]	38.3[b]	7.7	0.006
Soluble dietary fiber	0.3[b]	7.8[a]	4.6[a]	1.5	0.002
Insoluble dietary fiber	45.8[b]	94.2[a]	54.3[b]	7.9	< 0.001
Total dietary fiber	46.0[b]	101.9[a]	58.7[b]	8.3	< 0.001
Cellulose	9.6	11.2	17.3	2.8	0.071
Insoluble hemicelluloses	29.2[b]	51.9[a]	19.0[c]	4.7	< 0.001
Non-starch polysaccharides	41.6[b]	98.6[a]	56.4[b]	8.0	< 0.001
Insoluble non-starch polysaccharides	41.3[b]	90.9[a]	51.9[b]	7.5	< 0.001
Non-cellulosic non-starch polysaccharides	32.0[b]	87.5[a]	39.1[b]	6.5	< 0.001
Cecum					
DM	21.7	26.1	19.5	17.8	0.942
GE	-15.6	87.5	38.9	83.3	0.523
ADF	1.7	-2.2	-2.1	3.4	0.549
NDF	-1.4	-2.3	1.8	6.5	0.871
Soluble dietary fiber	6.0	4.7	9.7	2.1	0.141
Insoluble dietary fiber	11.7	3.0	9.1	9.0	0.699
Total dietary fiber	17.7	7.7	18.9	9.9	0.576
Cellulose	1.4	-1.5	-2.5	3.6	0.533
Insoluble hemicelluloses	-3.4	0.3	4.0	3.7	0.241
Non-starch polysaccharides	17.4	8.3	18.3	9.8	0.623
Insoluble non-starch polysaccharides	11.4	3.7	8.6	8.8	0.746
Non-cellulosic non-starch polysaccharides	16.1	9.6	20.9	7.7	0.361
Colon					
DM	108.5[b]	50.4[c]	137.0[a]	11.8	< 0.001
GE	563[a]	248[b]	530[a]	62	< 0.001
ADF	21.3[b]	-0.1[c]	68.3[a]	4.9	< 0.001
NDF	57.2[b]	18.4[c]	93.2[a]	6.9	< 0.001
Soluble dietary fiber	1.2	3.1	2.1	1.0	0.219
Insoluble dietary fiber	48.4[b]	15.0[c]	101.0[a]	7.4	< 0.001
Total dietary fiber	49.5[b]	18.1[c]	103.3[a]	8.0	< 0.001
Cellulose	19.1[b]	2.4[c]	70.4[a]	5.0	< 0.001
Insoluble hemicelluloses	36.0[a]	18.4[b]	24.6[b]	3.5	0.002
Non-starch polysaccharides	47.3[b]	20.6[c]	105.4[a]	8.0	< 0.001
Insoluble non-starch polysaccharides	46.1[b]	17.4[c]	103.0[a]	7.4	< 0.001
Non-cellulosic non-starch polysaccharides	27.9[a]	18.5[b]	35.0[a]	5.5	0.003

[a–c]Values within a row lacking a common superscript letter are different ($P \leq 0.05$).

DM, GE, or dietary fiber components in the cecum of pigs. However, disappearance of DM and most dietary fiber components in the colon was greater ($P \leq 0.05$) from soybean hulls than from DDGS and wheat middlings, and wheat middlings had the least ($P \leq 0.05$) disappearance of dietary fiber components in the colon. The disappearance of GE in the large intestine of pigs was also less ($P \leq 0.05$) for wheat middlings compared with DDGS and soybean hulls.

Physical Characteristics of Ileal and Cecal Digesta and Feces

The water binding capacity of ileal digesta from pigs fed the diet containing soybean hulls was greater ($P \leq 0.05$) compared with the other 3 diets (Table 7). Ileal digesta viscosity was less ($P \leq 0.05$) in pigs fed the diet containing wheat middlings than in digesta from pigs fed diets containing DDGS or soybean hulls. The water binding capacity of cecal digesta from pigs fed the diet containing soybean hulls was greater ($P \leq 0.05$) than in digesta from all other diets, and water binding capacity of cecal digesta from pigs fed the

Table 7. Viscosity of ileal and cecal digesta and water binding capacity of ileal and cecal digesta and feces from pigs fed experimental diets

Item	Basal	Basal + DDGS[1]	Basal + wheat middlings	Basal + soybean hulls	SEM	*P*-value
Ileal digesta						
Water binding capacity, g/g	2.95[b]	3.12[b]	2.81[b]	3.82[a]	0.32	< 0.001
Viscosity						
Constant, cP	15,675[ab]	19,164[a]	6361[b]	20,516[a]	4218	0.044
Exponent	-1.21	-1.38	-1.01	-1.40	0.14	0.125
R^2	0.92	0.99	0.91	0.96	–	–
Cecal digesta						
Water binding capacity, g/g	1.71[c]	2.03[b]	2.23[b]	2.73[a]	0.11	< 0.001
Viscosity						
Constant, cP	7362	8203	4735	14,822	3405	0.134
Exponent	-0.91	-0.98	-0.92	-1.19	0.14	0.232
R^2	0.96	0.98	0.96	0.99	–	–
Feces						
Water binding capacity, g/g	2.09[c]	2.65[b]	3.07[a]	2.21[c]	0.06	< 0.001

[a–c]Values within a row lacking a common superscript letter are different ($P \leq 0.05$).

wheat middlings or DDGS diets was greater ($P \leq 0.05$) than in digesta from pigs fed the basal diet. The water binding capacity of feces from pigs fed the wheat middlings diet was greater ($P \leq 0.05$) than that of all other diets, but feces from pigs fed the basal diet or the soybean hulls diet had less water binding capacity ($P \leq 0.05$) than feces from pigs fed the DDGS diet.

Correlations between Physical Characteristics and Digestibility

A positive correlation between bulk density of experimental diets and ACD of GE ($r = 0.88$; $P \leq 0.05$) was observed; however, no other correlations between physical characteristics of experimental diets and digestibility were significant. Therefore, only the correlation coefficients between physical characteristics of diets and ACD of nutrients and energy are presented in Table 8.

DISCUSSION

Ingredients used in this experiment had concentrations of nutrients and energy that are in agreement with values reported by NRC (2012). Oil was likely not removed from the DDGS used in this experiment because the DDGS contained 9.89% AEE, which is approximately 3 times greater compared with corn (3.27%). Corn contained 13.41% total dietary fiber and DDGS contained 38.72% total dietary fiber, which is also approximately 3 times more than in corn. Soybean meal, wheat middlings, and soybean hulls contained 18.80, 37.11, and 67.46% total dietary fiber, respectively. The sum of the analyzed values for ash, AEE, carbohydrates, and AA was reasonably close to the analyzed DM in all ingredients, which gives some confidence that ingredients were correctly analyzed.

The ATTD of DM and GE in the corn-soybean meal basal diet and the diet containing DDGS used in the current experiment are in agreement with results from previous research in which a similar corn-soybean meal diet was used (Urriola and Stein, 2010).

Table 8. Correlation coefficients[1] between physical characteristics of experimental diets and apparent cecal digestibility (ACD) of dry matter, energy, and dietary fiber fractions and physical characteristics of cecal digesta from pigs fed experimental diets

	Correlation coefficient							
Item	ACD of DM, %	ACD of GE, %	ACD of soluble dietary fiber, %	ACD of insoluble dietary fiber, %	ACD of total dietary fiber, %	ACD of non-starch polysaccharides, %	Water binding capacity, g/g	Viscosity, cP
Water binding capacity	-0.64	-0.61	-0.31	-0.70	-0.68	-0.66	0.37	0.38
Bulk density	0.87	0.88*	0.86	0.61	0.65	0.65	-0.86	0.48

[1]Correlation coefficients were determined between all variables, but the table has been reduced for brevity.

*$P \leq 0.050$.

The greater ATTD of DM, GE, insoluble dietary fiber, total dietary fiber, and insoluble NSP for the corn-soybean meal basal diet compared with the other 3 diets is likely the reason for the greater DE that was observed in the corn-soybean meal basal diet compared with the other 3 diets. The DE obtained for experimental diets in the current experiment are in agreement with calculated values (NRC, 2012). The ATTD of soluble dietary fiber in experimental diets was, on average, 86.5% and this was in agreement with Urriola and Stein (2010). The average ATTD of soluble dietary fiber was 20% units greater compared with the ATTD of insoluble dietary fiber among experimental diets, thus confirming results indicating that soluble dietary fiber is more fermentable by pigs compared with insoluble dietary fiber (Urriola et al., 2010). Due to the differentiation of components of dietary fiber, it was possible to distinguish the digestibility of the different dietary fiber fractions. The ATTD of cellulose by pigs fed the basal diet or the DDGS diet was greater compared with the ATTD of insoluble hemicelluloses, whereas diets containing wheat middlings and soybean hulls had greater ATTD of insoluble hemicelluloses, NSP, insoluble NSP, and non-cellulosic NSP compared with cellulose. It is possible that this difference is a consequence of cellulolytic enzymes being used in ethanol production, which may render the cellulose in DDGS more susceptible for fermentation in the pig.

The AID, ACD, and ATTD of DM and GE were less in DDGS, wheat middlings, and soybean hulls than in the experimental diets because the ingredients contained more dietary fiber and less starch than the mixed diets. The ATTD of total dietary fiber from DDGS was 54.69% in the current experiment, which is in agreement with the average ATTD of total dietary fiber from 8 DDGS sources (49.5%) obtained by Urriola et al. (2010). The ATTD of most dietary fiber fractions were greater in wheat middlings compared with DDGS and soybean hulls; however, the ATTD of GE was not different between wheat middlings and DDGS, which is likely a consequence of the greater concentration of fat in DDGS compared with wheat middlings.

The AID of dietary fiber fractions in diets and ingredients were relatively low, which is in agreement with data from Bach Knudsen et al. (2013) indicating that the AID of NSP by pigs range from -7 to 40%. The ACD of soluble dietary fiber in diets and ingredients was greater than the AID of soluble dietary fiber, whereas values for the ACD of insoluble dietary fiber were close to values observed for the AID of insoluble dietary fiber. This observation indicates that mainly soluble dietary fiber is fermented in the cecum. However, the ACD of GE was close to the AID of GE in diets and ingredients, which indicates that fermentation of soluble dietary fiber in the cecum has a low energy contribution to the animal. This may be attributed to the relatively low concentration of soluble dietary fiber in the diets and ingredients used in the current experiment.

The observation that the AID of ADF, and calculated dietary fiber fractions (e.g., cellulose, insoluble hemicellulose) determined for some of the diets and ingredients was close to the ACD of ADF, cellulose, and insoluble hemicellulose indicates that the cecal degradation of these fractions is negligible. These observations are in agreement with data obtained using the slaughter procedure that indicated that the AID of NSP, cellulose, and noncellulosic NSP by pigs fed diets differing in fiber type and concentration was greater than the ACD of these components (Serena et al., 2008a). One reason for this may be that the digesta residence time in the stomach and small intestine is much greater than in the cecum (Urriola and Stein, 2010), which may enable microbes in the stomach and small intestine the time needed to ferment some of the fiber fractions. However, the ADF and NDF analysis methods were developed to determine ADF and NDF in very fibrous materials (e.g., hay, straw, soybean hulls) and it is possible that these procedures are not completely accurate when used to analyze ADF and NDF in freeze-dried digesta from ileal and cecal contents. It may be more appropriate to use the TDF procedure to analyze for fiber in intestinal samples, and indeed, the ACD of insoluble, soluble, and total dietary fiber was greater compared with the AID of these fractions.

To our knowledge, this is the first time dietary fiber fermentation has been estimated separately in the cecum and in the colon of pigs. The structure of insoluble dietary fiber fractions is much more hydrophobic and crystalline than soluble dietary fiber, and therefore, microbial fermentation of insoluble dietary fiber fractions occurs more slowly and requires longer retention time compared with soluble dietary fiber (Bach Knudsen and Hansen, 1991; Wilfart et al., 2007). Differences in size and microbial populations of the cecum and the colon also may influence dietary fiber fermentation. The cecum and colon have been reported to be 0.3 and 1.75% of the empty BW of pigs, respectively, and this difference in size indicates the importance of the colon to dietary fiber fermentation (Agyekum et al., 2012). Total viable counts of anaerobic bacteria increase from 10^9 viable counts in the distal ileum to 10^{12} viable counts in pig feces and it is expected that viable counts in the cecum is between the values in the ileum and the colon (Jensen and Jørgensen, 1994).

In contrast with our hypothesis, water binding capacity and bulk density of experimental diets were not correlated with ileal, cecal, or total tract digestibility of nutrients and energy, with the exception that bulk density was positively correlated with ACD of GE. Serena et al. (2008b) also were unable to correlate physicochemical properties of dietary fiber with the digestibility of energy by sows. These observations indicate that under the conditions of this experiment the physical characteristics measured had limited impact on digestibility and fermentation. However, it is possible that a larger sample size is needed to identify such correlations. Nevertheless, in this experiment, digestibility and fermentation of energy and nutrients was mainly determined by chemical characteristics of diets and ingredients.

Overall, ATTD of insoluble dietary fiber in wheat middlings was greater than in DDGS and soybean hulls, but the ATTD of cellulose was less in wheat middlings. However, the energy contribution from cellulose fermentation in wheat middlings is relatively low because wheat middlings has a low concentration of cellulose. Soybean hulls had the greatest concentration of total dietary fiber and the least concentrations of starch and fat and, as a result, fermentation of dietary fiber contributes the majority of the DE in soybean hulls. The energy contribution from dietary fiber fermentation is much less compared with the energy contribution from enzymatic digestion of starch and fat (Nelson and Cox, 2008), which is the reason soybean hulls had the least DE compared with DDGS and wheat middlings.

Conclusion

In contrast to our hypothesis, the physical characteristics of dietary fiber in experimental diets were not correlated with the digestibility of energy or dietary fiber fractions in experimental diets. Soluble dietary fiber is mostly fermented in the cecum of pigs, but this does not contribute a great amount of energy to the pig because of the low concentration of soluble dietary fiber in most swine diets. Insoluble dietary fiber is mostly fermented in the colon of pigs and contributes a significant amount of energy to pigs fed diets containing DDGS, wheat middlings, or soybean hulls because the concentration of insoluble dietary fiber is greater when these co-products are added to a corn-soybean meal diet. Dietary fiber fractions in wheat middlings are more fermentable compared with the dietary fiber fractions in DDGS and soybean hulls; however, the DE in DDGS is similar to that of wheat middlings because of the greater concentration of fat in DDGS compared with wheat middlings. The DE in soybean hulls is mostly attributed to insoluble dietary fiber fermentation in the colon, and this is the reason the DE in soybean hulls is less than in DDGS or wheat middlings.

LITERATURE CITED

Adeola, O. 2001. Digestion and balance techniques in pigs. In: A. J. Lewis and L. L. Southern, editors, Swine nutrition. 2nd ed. CRC Press, Washington, DC. p. 903–916.

Agyekum, A. K., B. A. Slominski, and C. M. Nyachoti. 2012. Organ weight, intestinal morphology, and fasting whole-body oxygen consumption in growing pigs fed diets containing distillers dried grains with solubles alone or in combination with a multienzyme supplement. J. Anim. Sci. 90(9):3032–3040. doi:10.2527/jas.2011-4380

A.O.A.C. International. 2007. Official Methods of Analysis of AOAC Int. 18th ed. Rev. 2. W. Hortwitz and G. W. Latimer, Jr., editors. AOAC Int., Gaithersburg, MD.

Bach Knudsen, K. E. 2011. Triennial growth symposium: Effects of polymeric carbohydrates on growth and development in pigs. J. Anim. Sci. 89(7):1965–1980. doi:10.2527/jas.2010-3602

Bach Knudsen, K. E., and I. Hansen. 1991. Gastrointestinal implications in pigs of wheat and oat fractions. 1. Digestibility and bulking properties of polysaccharides and other major constituents. Br. J. Nutr. 65:217-232. doi: https://doi.org/10.1079/BJN19910082

Bach Knudsen, K. E., B. B. Jensen, and I. Hansen. 1993. Digestion of polysacchraides and other major components in the small and large intestine of pigs fed on diets consisting of oat fractions rich in β-D-glucan. Br. J. Nutr. 70:537-556.

Bach Knudsen, K. E., H. N. Lærke, and H. Jørgensen. 2013. Carbohydrates and carbohydrate utilization in swine. In: L.I. Chiba, editor, Sustainable Swine Nutrition. John Wiley & Sons, Ames, IA. p. 109–135.

Burkhalter, T. M., N. R. Merchen, L. L. Bauer, S. M. Murray, A. R. Patil, J. L. Brent, Jr., and G. C. Fahey, Jr. 2001. The ratio of insoluble to soluble fiber components in soybean hulls affects ileal and total-tract nutrient digestibilities and fecal characteristics of dogs. J. Nutr. 131:1978–1985.

Cervantes-Pahm, S. K., and H. H. Stein. 2010. Ileal digestibility of amino acids in conventional, fermented, and enzyme-treated soybean meal and in soy protein isolate, fish meal, and casein fed to weanling pigs. J. Anim. Sci. 88:2674–2683. doi:10.2527/jas.2009-2677

Cervantes-Pahm, S. K., Y. Liu, and H. H. Stein. 2014. Comparative digestibility of energy and nutrients and fermentability of dietary fiber in eight cereal grains fed to pigs. J. Sci. Food Agric. 94:841–849. doi:10.1002/jsfa.6316

Cromwell, G. L., T. R. Cline, J. D. Crenshaw, T. D. Crenshaw, R. A. Easter, R. C. Ewan, C. R. Hamilton, G. M. Hill, A. J. Lewis, D. C. Mahan, J. L. Nelssen, J. E. Pettigrew, T. L. Veum, and J. T. Yen. 2000. Variability among sources and laboratories in analyses of wheat middlings. J. Anim. Sci. 78:2652–2658. doi:10.2527/2000.78102652x

Dikeman, C. L., M. R. Murphy, and G. C. Fahey, Jr. 2006. Dietary fibers affect viscosity of solutions and simulated human gastric and small intestinal digesta. J. Nutr. 136:913–919.

Glitsø, L. V., G. Brunsgaard, S. Højsgaard, B. Sandström, and K. E. Bach Knudsen. 1998. Intestinal degradation in pigs of rye dietary fibre with different structural characteristics. Br. J. Nutr. 80:457-468.

Jaworski, N. W., H. N. Lærke, K. E. Bach Knudsen, and H. H. Stein. 2015. Carbohydrate composition and in vitro digestibility of dry matter and nonstarch polysaccharides in corn, sorghum, and wheat and coproducts from these grains. J. Anim. Sci. 93:1103–1113. doi:10.2527/jas.2014-8147

Jensen, B. B., and H. Jørgensen. 1994. Effect of dietary fiber on microbial activity and microbial gas production in various regions of the gastrointestinal tract of pigs. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 60:1897–1904.

Lærke, H. N., S. Arent, S. Dalsgaard, and K. E. Bach Knudsen. 2015. Effect of xylanases on ileal viscosity, intestinal fiber modification, and apparent ileal fiber and nutrient digestibility of rye and wheat in growing pigs. J. Anim. Sci. 93:4323-4335.

Nelson, D. L., and M. M. Cox. 2008. Carbohydrates and glycobiology. In: Lehninger Principles of Biochemistry 5th Ed. W. H. Freeman, New York. p. 235-241.

Noblet, J. and J. M. Perez. 1993. Prediction of digestibility of nutrients and energy values of pig diets from chemical composition. J. Anim. Sci., 71: 3389-3398

NRC. 2012. Nutrient Requirements of Swine. 10th rev. ed. Natl. Acad. Press, Washington, DC.

Robertson, J. A., F. D. de Monredon, P. Dysseler, F. Guillon, R. Amado, and J. Thibault. 2000. Hydration properties of dietary fibre and resistant starch: A European collaborative study. Lebensm. Wiss. Technol. 33:72–79. doi:10.1006/fstl.1999.0595

Serena, A., H. Jørgensen, and K. E. Bach Knudsen. 2008a. Digestion of carbohydrates and utilization of energy in sows fed diets with contrasting levels and physicochemical properties of dietary fiber. J. Anim. Sci. 86:2208–2216. doi:10.2527/jas.2006-060

Serena, A., M. S. Hedemann, and K. E. Bach Knudsen. 2008b. Influence of dietary fiber on luminal environment and morphology in the small and large intestine of sows. J. Anim. Sci. 86:2217-2227.

Sholly, D. M., H. Jørgensen, A. L. Sutton, B. T. Richert, and K. E. Bach Knudsen. 2011. Effect of fermentation of cereals on the degradation of polysaccharides and other macronutrients in the gastrointestinal tract of growing pigs. J. Anim. Sci. 89:2096-2105.

Stein, H. H., B. Séve, M. F. Fuller, P. J. Moughan, and C. F. M. de Lange. 2007. Invited review: Amino acid bioavailability and digestibility in pig feed ingredients: Terminology and application. J. Anim. Sci. 85:172–180. doi:10.2527/jas.2005-742

Stein, H. H., C. F. Shipley, and R. A. Easter. 1998. Technical Note: A technique for inserting a T-cannula into the distal ileum of pregnant sows. J. Anim. Sci. 76:1433–1436. doi:10.2527/1998.7651433x

Urriola, P. E., and H. H. Stein. 2010. Effects of distillers dried grains with solubles on amino acid, energy, and fiber digestibility and on hindgut fermentation of dietary fiber in a corn-soybean meal diet fed to growing pigs. J. Anim. Sci. 88:1454–1462. doi:10.2527/jas.2009-2162

Urriola, P. E., G. C. Shurson, and H. H. Stein. 2010. Digestibility of dietary fiber in distillers coproducts fed to growing pigs. J. Anim. Sci. 88(7):2373–2381. doi:10.2527/jas.2009-2227

Wilfart, A., L. Montagne, H. Simmins, J. van Milgen, and J. Noblet. 2007. Sites of nutrient digestion in growing pigs: Effects of dietary fiber. J. Anim. Sci. 85:976–983. doi:10.2527/jas.2006-431