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Reviewer’s report:

This is a study protocol in which authors wish to present the protocol of a seAFOod Polyp Prevention Trial, which is a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled 2 x 2 factorial ‘efficacy’ study, which will determine whether EPA prevents colorectal adenomas, either alone or in combination with aspirin. The protocol tests an important hypothesis. However, some points need to be clarified.

1. The primary end-point is the number of ‘high risk’ participants with one or more adenomas detected at routine one-year BCSP surveillance colonoscopy – do the authors mean new adenoma? Clarify. If so, how do the authors wish to exclude the possibility that the adenoma missed in the first colonoscopy will not be considered as new adenoma on subsequent colonoscopy? Authors did try to defend this by citing literature. But what method will the authors undertake to avoid this?

2. There are too many secondary end points

3. “A validated Food Frequency Questionnaire (FFQ) is completed at baseline and at the end of the Trial so that any change in dietary #-3 PUFA intake during Trial involvement can be determined” – food frequency questionnaire may have fallacy as it is dependent on recall by the subject.

4. How many colonoscopists will perform colonoscopy? How will the method of colonoscopy be standardized to avoid inter-observer variation and inadequate colonoscopic examination?

5. Number of words in the abstract is more than 300. Are all these according to the style of the journal?

6. Writing style needs to be improved. The paper should be shortened and readability needs to be improved

7. “No adjustment for multiple significance testing was made in the sample size estimate or will be in the analyses” – why?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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