Comparison of UTC and DYC glyph
There is no glyph looking like UTC00120 shape, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00120.
UTC00121 might be a modernization of seal script variant described in DYC 041.311. However, DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of modernized shape. Either DYC does not guarantee UTC00121 is correctly modernized shape.
UTC00321 might be a modernization of ZhouWen (籀文) shape exemplified in DYC 047.411. However, DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of modernized shape. Either DYC does not guarantee UTC00321 is correctly modernized shape.
DYC includes no glyph, nor description looking like UTC00322. Furthermore, it is questionable whether UTC00322 is a variant of DYC 051.240.
UTC00320 is a modernization of a seal script variant shown in the description for DYC 054.221. Also DYC shows the modernization shape in the description. Thus DYC is good reference to insist the requirement; “it is required to print 説文解字注”.

However, DYC 054.221 points the seal script shape of “吻” which has incognite shape with UTC00320. There is a room to improve for DYC reference scheme.
UTC00122 is supposed to be a variant of already-coded character U+5448, Taiwanese or Vietnamese shape in ISO/IEC 10646 chart (or, the lengths of 2 horizontal strokes should be matched?). DYC does not show such shape, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of the UTC00122.
UTC00089 might be a (variant of) modernization of GuWen (古文) shape of DYC 062.250. DYC includes very similar glyph. Thus DYC can be a reference to insist the requirement of UTC00089: “it is required to print 説文解字注”.
DYC includes no glyph, nor description looking like UTC00319. Furthermore, it is questionable whether UTC00319 is a variant of DYC 070.231.
UTC00316 is a modernization variant of seal script shown in DYC 074.130. The standard modernization in DYC is different from (and incognite with) UTC00316. Thus, DYC 074.130 is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00316.
UTC00320 is a modernization variant of DYC 103.410 which used in DYC. Thus DYC is good reference to insist the requirement; “it is required to print 説文解字注”.
UTC00093 is a modernization of ZhouWen (籀文) shape of DYC 120.315 which is used in DYC. Thus DYC is good reference to insist the requirement; “it is required to print 説文解字注”.
However, the modernized shape in original description text has no dot. If DYC is a source, the dot should be removed.
UTC00094 is a modernization variant of seal script shown in DYC 136.420. The standard modernization in DYC is different from UTC00094. Thus, DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00094.
UTC00095 is a modernization of GuWen (古文) shape of DYC 137.211. DYC includes no modernized shape for this character, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00095.
UTC00124 is a modernization of GuWen (古文) shape of DYC 137.221. DYC includes no modernized shape for this character, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00124.
UTC00125 is a modernization variant of seal script of DYC 138.130. DYC does not provide such modernization variant, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00125. However, DYC provides the modernized shape of the half of DYC 138.130.
UTC00126 is a modernization variant of seal script of DYC 163.430. Although DYC has a note how to compose DYC 163.430 with modernized radicals (and the components are similar to those of UTC00126), DYC does not provide such modernization variant. Thus DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00126.
UTC00127 is a modernization variant of seal script of DYC 180.150. DYC has a note how to compose DYC 180.150 with modernized radicals, but the component shape is slightly different. DYC does not provide such modernization variant. Thus DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00127.
Although the detailed design requires further discussion to improve the similarity with DYC shape, both of UTC00129 & UTC00128 are used in the description text for DYC 183.220. Thus, DYC is good reference to insist the requirement as: “it is required to print 説文解字注”
UTC00130 might be a modernization of Zhou Wen (籀文) shape exemplified in DYC 200.411. However, DYC provides different modernized shape, so DYC is not a good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00130.
UTC00131 is a modernization variant of seal script of DYC 242.130. Although the shape of UTC00131 is more similar to the seal script shape than standard modernization shape, DYC does not provide any modern glyph looking like UTC00131. Thus DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00131.
Although the detailed design requires further discussion to improve the similarity with DYC shape, UTC00129 is used as a modernized shape for DYC 183.220. Thus, DYC is good reference to insist the requirement as: “it is required to print 說文解字注”
Although the detailed design requires further discussion to improve the similarity with DYC shape, UTC00133 is used as a modernized shape for DYC 267.410. Thus, DYC can be a reference to insist the requirement as: “it is required to print 說文解字注”
UTC00090 & UTC00091 are the modernization variants of GuWen (古文) shape of DYC 270.341. DYC includes no modernized shape for this character, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00090 & UTC00091.
UTC00134 & UTC00135 are the modernization variants of seal script shape of DYC 274.110. UTC00134 is used in the description text, so DYC is good reference to insist the requirement, as: “it is required to print 説文解字注”.
On the other hand, UTC00135 is not used, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement, although similar radicals are used in the note how to compose this character.
UTC00136 is used in 5 times (at least) in the description text for DYC 275.410. Thus DYC is good reference to insist the requirement, as: "it is required to print 説文解字注"
UTC00282 is a modernization of GuWen (古文) variant of DYC 308.441. DYC provide no modernized GuWen shape, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00282.
UTC00286 is a modernization variant of seal script of DYC 341.410. Although the shape of UTC00286 is more similar to the seal script shape than standard modernization shape, DYC does not provide any modern glyph looking like UTC00286. Thus DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00286.
UTC00137 is a modernization of GuWen (古文) variant of DYC 342.112. DYC provide no modernized GuWen shape, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00137.
UTC00138 is a modernization variant of seal script shown in DYC 350.310. Although the description note mentions similar composition, the standard modernization in DYC is different from UTC00138, and no variant glyph looking like UTC00138 is shown. Thus, DYC is not a good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00138.
UTC00139 is a modernization of ZhouWen (籀文) shape exemplified in DYC 351.231, the note of ZhouWen shape suggests quite similar shape. However, DYC provides no modernized glyph looking like UTC00139, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00139.
UTC00140 is a modernization variant of seal script shown in DYC 350.310. Although UTC00140 shape is more similar to seal script shape than the standard modernization shape, and the description note mentions similar composition, the standard modernization in DYC is different from UTC00140, and no variant glyph looking like UTC00140 is shown. Thus, DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00140.
UTC00141 is a modernization variant of seal script shown in DYC 440.410. Although the shape of UTC00141 is slightly similar than the standard modernization, DYC has no variant glyph looking like UTC00141 is shown. Thus, DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00141.
Perhaps the top horizontal stroke is broken by wrong metric for glyph height.

UTC00142 might be a modernization of GuWen (古文) variant of DYC 456.212. DYC provide no modernized GuWen shape, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00142. However, if the shape of UTC00142 is slightly changed, it is almost same with the standard modernization in DYC.
UTC00092 is used as a standard modernization of DYC 458.310. Thus DYC is good reference to insist the requirement, as: “it is required to print 説文解字注”
UTC00143 is a modernization of ZhouWen (籀文) shape exemplified in DYC 484.412, the note of ZhouWen shape suggests quite similar shape. However, DYC provides no modernized glyph looking like UTC00143, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00143.
UTC00144 is a modernization variant of seal script shown in DYC 496.210. DYC has no variant glyph looking like UTC00144 is shown. Thus, DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00144.
UTC00287 is a modernization of seal script variant shown in DYC 496.210. DYC has no modernized glyph looking like UTC00287. Thus, DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00287.
UTC00145 is a modernization of seal script variant shown in DYC 515.111. Although DYC has a note that the composition of the variant is similar to UTC00145, DYC has no modernized glyph looking like UTC00145. Thus, DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00145.
UTC00146 is a modernization variant of seal script shown in DYC 551.210. Although the shape of UTC00146 is slightly similar than the standard modernization, DYC has no variant glyph looking like UTC00146. Thus, DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00146.
UTC00147 is a modernization of GuWen (古文) variant of DYC 575.112. DYC provides no modernized GuWen shape, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00147.
UTC00086 is not found in DYC 627.
UTC00148 is yet-another modernization of seal script of DYC 627.110. DYC provides no modernized glyph looking like UTC00148, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00148.
UTC00149 is a modernization of GuWen (古文) variant of DYC 627.110. DYC provides no modernized GuWen shape, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00149.
UTC00087 is a modernization of GuWen (古文) variant of DYC 637.220. DYC provides no modernized GuWen shape, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00087.

Perhaps the top horizontal stroke is broken by wrong metric for glyph height.
UTC00150 is yet-another modernization of seal script of DYC 642.210. DYC provides no modernized glyph looking like UTC00150, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00150.
UTC00151 is a modernization of GuWen (古文) variant of DYC 643.321. DYC provides no modernized GuWen shape, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00151.

Perhaps the top horizontal stroke is broken by wrong metric for glyph height.
UTC00152 is a modernization of GuWen (古文) variant of DYC 646.121. DYC provides no modernized GuWen shape, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00152.
UTC00153 might be a modernization of GuWen (古文) variant of DYC 656.121. DYC provides no modernized GuWen shape, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00153. Either it is questionable if UTC00153 is correct modernization of GuWen variant.
UTC00323 is a modernization of GuWen (古文) variant of DYC 660.331. DYC provides no modernized GuWen shape, so DYC is not a good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00323. Either it is questionable if UTC00323 is correct modernization of GuWen variant.
UTC00324 is used as the indexing glyph for DYC 665.230, so DYC is good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00324, as:

"it is required to print 説文解字注"
UTC00154 is used as the indexing glyph for DYC 665.230, so DYC is good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00154. However, there is a room to improve the similarity of glyph shapes.

UTC00155 is a modernization of GuWen (古文) variant of DYC 675.410. DYC provides no modernized GuWen shape, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00154.
Perhaps the top horizontal stroke is broken by wrong metric for glyph height.

Although the detailed design requires further discussion to improve the similarity with DYC shape, both of UTC00156 is used in the description text for DYC 678.150. Thus, DYC is good reference to insist the requirement as: "it is required to print 説文解字注"
Although the detailed design requires further discussion to improve the similarity with DYC shape, both of UTC00325 is used in the description text for DYC 678.410. Thus, DYC is good reference to insist the requirement as: "it is required to print 説文解字注"
UTC00157 is a modernization of GuWen (古文) shape of DYC 680.121. DYC shows quite similar glyph in description text, so DYC is good reference to insist the requirement as: "it is required to print 説文解字注". 
UTC00158 is a modernization of GuWen (古文) variant of DYC 694.212. DYC provides no modernized GuWen shape, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00158.
UTC00159 is yet-another modernization of seal script of DYC 722.320. Although there is a note of the composition that suggests quite similar shape, DYC provides no modernized glyph looking like UTC00159, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00159.
UTC00160 is yet-another modernization of seal script of DYC 739.210. Although there is a note of the composition that suggests quite similar shape, DYC provides no modernized glyph looking like UTC00160, so DYC is not good reference to insist the requirement of UTC00160.