

## Reviewer's report

**Title:** A randomised cross-over trial in healthy adults assessing the effect of emulsification on fatty acid and triacylglycerol absorption from an omega-3 rich oil mixture.

**Version:** 1 **Date:** 25 October 2006

**Reviewer:** Seher Khan

### Reviewer's report:

General

Well written document of an interesting topic

-----  
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1] Page 4 Background "However, even with supplementation it is often difficult to reach the intake required to elicit a nutritional benefit and this may be due to unpalatability of liquid fish oils or inconvenience and cost implications of the consumption of sufficient fish oil capsules. A more palatable version of fish oils presented as emulsions may offer a route to improved compliance in supplementation." Difficult to reach intake and improved compliance-these claims require references

2] Many studies have been reported with emulsified fatty acids, the authors should mention about them and also state clearly why this study was undertaken.

3] Reasons for taking blood at an intervals of 1.5, 3, 4.5, 6, 7.5 and 9 hour after ingestion of oil/emulsion?

5] What standards were used for GC?

6] In Figure legends 2 Fatty acids are not mentioned (page 16)

-----  
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-----  
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.