

IOWA: Investigating Oils With Respect to Arterial Blockage

Significant differences in biological age comparing fish oil to PEO supplementation

Brian Peskin, BSEE: Founder: Life-Systems Engineering Science with David Sim, M.D., Interventional Cardiologist

(Based on 6 patients (no exclusions) using fish oil then changing to PEOs and re-measuring after 3.4 months (on average)).

Age: 58-71	Median age: 64.5	5 males, 1 female
-------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------

Paired t-test. Mean: 3.4 months PEOs after ceasing fish oil supplementation

Significant differences (**p 0.0044**) with standard error of the mean +-5 years.
 Subject's biological age using **PEO** supplements resulting in **10.3 years (on average) lower** than with the fish oil supplements.

Note: This experiment has a 95.6% accuracy—the same accuracy used in clinical drug trials. The results are statistically significant.

Analysis by Alex Kiss, Ph.D. (statistics) — May 13, 2010

```

Mean of BIO_AGE_W_FO variable
The MEANS Procedure
Analysis Variable : BIO_AGE_W_FO

      Mean          Std Dev
-----
    50.17          13.35
  
```

```

Mean of BIO_AGE_W_FO variable
Analysis Variable : BIO_AGE_W_FO

      Mean          Std Dev
-----
    39.83           9.70
  
```

Paired t-test run: mean change (F) — PEOs) was found to be 10.3 (sd=9.5). This was statistically significant (p=0.04)

```

Analysis Variable : BIO_AGE_W_FO

      Mean          Std Dev          t Value          Pr > |t|
-----
    10.33           9.48             2.67             0.0443
  
```

PEOs compared to fish oil supplements summary

Subjects using fish oil supplements were measured with PWV/DPA. They discontinued fish oil supplements and used PEOs instead. There were no other interventions or life-style changes.

Although a small number of subjects were enrolled, the results were spectacular. Within 4 months, the average being 3.4 months PEO use, the average biological age of the cardiovascular system decreased (improved) by an average of 10.3 years. Four (4) subjects improved, two (2) subjects remained the same. One subject, although manifesting initial abnormal cardiovascular readings, showing no intervention improvement, was still included in the study. No subject was worse with the PEOs. This translates to an NNT of $6/4 = 1.5$ — a positive result measured in 66% of subjects. Furthermore, the standard deviation was less between subjects with the PEO intervention than between fish oil supplement subjects, meaning the PEOs results were both a better average (significantly decreased biological age) and a greater consistency between PEO subjects than with fish oil supplement subjects.

Of particular significance is that CV improvement was greater with a fish oil supplement prelude than with subjects never taking fish oil supplements before. This outcome conclusively shows that fish oil supplementation worsens cardiovascular health. As an example of PEO effectiveness, given statins' NNT of greater than 80 (as reported by the pharmaceutical industry) to prevent and reverse CVD, an NNT of 1.5 is remarkable. This result is based on direct improvement in arterial physiology. There is little doubt that PEO supplementation is superior than using fish oil to prevent and reverse cardiovascular disease.