1. Please show an explanation for the table in p.7 below. (We find this table also in N3426, but also no explanation is there.)
   i. We could not find the author of each column.
   ii. In the document, the number after each script is explained to be a frequency of it, but some of the numbers seem to be miscalculated.

2. The table is difficult for readers to understand. The difficulty comes from the fact that in this document, the number and the name of each script and the script itself are in split tables. Thus it is difficult for readers to connect them. They should be displayed in the same line.

3. The order of scripts seems to be arranged by the amount of strokes. But the criteria for counting the amount of strokes are not trustworthy. When the stroke is bent, the amount of the stroke is counted as two in the most of cases, but some of them seem to be counted as one. Examples are:
   i. The amount of stroke of the script assigned the code 1B01E should be 5 as the final stroke of it is bent. But the script is ordered between the scripts assigned 1B01D and 1B01F, the amount of stroke of which are 4.
   ii. The amount of stroke of the script assigned the code 1B03E is 7, but the script is ordered in the scripts of 5 strokes.
   iii. The amount of stroke of the script assigned the code 1B063 is 7, and the script is ordered in the 7 stroke scripts in the table in p.80, but ordered in the 5 stroke scripts in this table.
   iv. The amount of stroke of the script assigned the code 1B06D is 6, and the script is ordered in the 6 stroke scripts in the table in p.80, but ordered in the 5 stroke scripts in this table.
v. The amount of stroke of the script assigned the code 1B0B5 is 8, and the script is ordered in the 8 stroke scripts in the table in p.84, but ordered in the 7 stroke scripts in this table.

vi. The amount of stroke of the script assigned the code 1B0DC in p.85 and that of 1B107 in p.87 is 9, but they are ordered in the 8 stroke scripts in this table.

p.23

4. The caption of the picture of this coin says that “Coins with graphs in the period of Taipintianguo”, but these two rubbings in the picture are those of the recto and the verso of the same coin, not those of two coins. And we could not assert that this coin was made in Taipintianguo. See below.

p.67

5. The document asserts that the coin was made in the “Taipintianguo” period and the expert in Palace is referred to as a source of this assertion. Please show what is the palace and who is the expert in this document. Zhang Tie Bao (张铁宝), who is an expert of Taipintianguo, now a researcher of Taipintianguo museum in Nanjing, asserts that the coin should not be made in the Taipintianguo period. Please refer his book 『女书的历史与现状--解析女书的新视点』 "The History and Status Quo of Chinese Women's Script" pp.117-126 published in 2005 by 中国社会科学出版社.

6. N3635 says that yin 「英」 is not listed in the code chart because the script is not an original one but a modern one. According to the proposer Zhao Li Ming （赵丽明）, the origin of Nüshu script is Hanzi. Then if we distinguish original and modern Nüshu scripts according to the period in which the scripts were created from Hanzi, we should investigate when the each Nüshu script was created. But such investigation seems to be impossible. If a Nüshu scripts frequently used by 高银仙 (Gao Yin Xian) or 义年华 (Yi Nian Hua) are not categorized as original ones, many of Nüshu scripts are excluded from the code chart as modern ones. The proposer selected the most frequent allograph as a basic script and the frequency of the script yin 「英」 is about seven times as frequent as that of the “original” script in the third column from the left in the table of p.3 of N3449. In the
table, the frequency of the former script is 96, and that of the latter one is 14. When the script yin 「英」 is excluded from the code chart as a modern script, the proposer’s method that the most frequent allograph is selected as a basic script is not applied to the script yin 「英」 and there seems to be a double standard.