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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes; title could make clear that this is a new approach.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes.

I have only two points for discretionary revisions:
- In analogy to the spaghetti plot and lasagna plot, it might make sense to think of a talking name for the plots proposed in this paper.
- Could the respective lasagna and mosaic plots created for one example to visualize the difference of these plots to those proposed here?
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Quality of written English: Acceptable
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