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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This is an interesting case-report, that gives potentially useful suggestion to palliate neoplastic masses of the eyelid. I have no chriticism about it, but I would suggest to temper the conclusion of the abstract: it is just a case report, and further experiences should be added before proposing MWA as a safe and effective method to treat eyelid masses (as correctly stated by the authors in the Conclusion of the full text).