

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Response to Dr. David Briskey's reply

Respuesta a la réplica del Dr. David Briskey

We appreciate Dr David Briskey's comments on our article. We do indeed refer to the LipiSpense system, stating that further studies on bioavailability of the LipiSpense system are needed. However, Dr Briskey's literature reference 27 describes a bioavailability test compared to the standard form of PEA, with results that seem to indicate better bioavailability for the LipiSpense system. Therefore, we believe it can be stated that PEA under this oral absorption system, the LipiSpense system, is of benefit and superior to the standard formulation of PEA. In our article, we have not compared the bioavailability of the micronised and ultra-micronised forms with the LipiSpense system, as, to our knowledge, there are no comparative studies between these dosage forms. Here, too, we agree with Dr Briskey. Finally, the enterohepatic cycling that appears to occur with LipiSpense may contribute to better bioavailability of this form.

AUTORES:

Rafael Gálvez Mateos¹ y Antonio Aguilar Ros²

¹Unidad del Dolor. Servicio de Anestesia. Hospital Universitario Virgen de las Nieves. Granada. Profesor Titular. Universidad de Granada, España. ²Facultad de Farmacia. Departamento de Ciencias Farmacéuticas y de la Salud. Grupo de investigación: Atención Farmacéutica y Desarrollo del Medicamento. Universidad San Pablo-CEU, CEU Universities. Madrid, España

CORRESPONDENCE:

Rafael Gálvez Mateos
rafaelgalvez@hotmail.com