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These are interesting cases, which were well-described and discussed. The conclusion and the take-away message are appropriate. The manuscript deserves to be published.
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manuscript is nicely written. There are few typological errors and grammar polishing is required. It will be beneficial for the reader what are you planning to do with the residual mass after RFA.