

17F24 𧯧 (L2008-3438) [260.13]

The glyph is correct, but the IDS sequence and stroke count given in N4522 p. 459 is incorrect. The IDS sequence should be 𠄎𠄎𠄎𠄎, and the stroke count 12.

17F24	𧯧	𠄎𠄎𠄎𠄎	R154	13	CCCQBEEACC CCQ	𧯧 3438	𧯧 3438	𧯧 3438	𧯧 3362	𧯧 3461	𧯧 3638 3771	𧯧 3657	𧯧 3334
-------	---	------	------	----	-------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-------------------	-----------	-----------

As a result, the code point for this character should be changed from 17F24 to 17F20, and 17F20..17F23 moved to 17F21..17F24.

18316 𧯨 (L2008-5928) [413.14]

The glyph is correct, but the IDS sequence and stroke count given in N4522 p. 564 is incorrect. The IDS sequence should be 𠄎𠄎𠄎, and the stroke count 13.

18317	𧯨	𠄎𠄎𠄎	R257	14	DCBABEEACC CQCQ	𧯨 5928	𧯨 5928	𧯨 5928	𧯨 4983	𧯨 3464	𧯨 4533 4685		𧯨 1703
-------	---	-----	------	----	--------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-------------------	--	-----------

As a result, the code point for this character should be changed from 18316 to 18314, and 18314..18315 moved to 18315..18316.

U+186A1 𧯩 (L2008-0523) [591.14]

U+186A2 𧯪 (L2008-4565) [591.14]

186A2	𧯩	𠄎𠄎	R382	14	ABEABEAACC CQCQ	𧯩 0523	𧯩 0523	𧯩 0523		𧯩 3500	𧯩 5464 5645		𧯩 0290	𧯩 2-122
186A3	𧯪	𠄎𠄎𠄎	R382	14	ABEABEAACC CQCQ	𧯪 4565	𧯪 4565	𧯪 4565	𧯪 0186					

There is only a minor, non-significant glyph difference between these two characters (whether the second stroke is straight as in 186A1 or slightly bent as in 186A2). According to the unification principles used in the proposal document these two characters should have been unified (cf. the unifications of L2008-0042/4537, L2008-0057/4548, L2008-0184/4510, and L2008-1134/4624 discussed in N4522 p. 10 which show the same insignificant glyph differences).

Therefore, 186A2 should be removed, and 186A3..187ED moved to 186A2..187EC. 186A1 should use the 186A2 glyph 𧯪 for consistency with 186A0 𧯩, and its source reference should be changed to L2008-0523-4565.

