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**Comments:**

A beautiful, well-illustrated article that, among other things, begins with a meaningful review of moving text semiotics.

From the point of view of the theory of semiotics, the work contains a number of debatable statements and based on them, it seems, not quite successful steps of analysis of specific material that do not lead to convincing conclusions.

1. The authors discuss the dynamics of the park and try to separate the spatial and temporal changes. Since they are not separable, in each case, when considering one aspect, it is necessary to consider the second one and vice versa. Is the separation of spatial and temporal analysis justified in this case? Therefore, the title of the article ("spatial representations") seems to be unsuccessful.

2. Speaking of “multiple semiotic systems in a dialogical interaction with each other”, it would be appropriate not only to refer to Scollon and Scollon 2003, but also to use Y. Lotman's ideas about culture as a mutual translation of several semiotic systems (see, for example, V. V. Ivanov, J. M. Lotman, A. M. Pjatigorski, V. N. Toporov, B. A. Uspenskij. *Theses on the Semiotic Study of Cultures /* Tartu Semiotics Library. Volume 1. Tartu: Tartu University Press, 1998. ISSN 1406-4278).

3. A significant part of the presented material would be interesting to consider as a palimpsest, which would make the discussion more interesting and conceptually complete. I have such an experience of consideration of the garden, however, unfortunately, only in Russian (file attached).

Taking into account these three comments could make the article more interesting for both authors and readers, which would be evidence of the successful work of the editorial board.

Therefore, authors and editors should make a reasonable choice:

- or publish the article in the form it is presented, and thus provide readers with excellent empirical material for self-reflection in the shortest possible time

- either, considering nn. 1-3, to deepen the theoretical analysis of the material and make the article interesting also in this aspect, for which time will be required to implement a minor revision.

Sergey Chebanov