As part of the CLICS database project, I reviewed 188 form-concept mappings from the language Sanskrit. Of these, I was able to confirm 110 as correct mappings. In order to confirm a mapping as “true”, I checked 3 parameters:

1. Whether the translation on the DiACL page matched the translation in the dataset.
2. Whether the translation on the DiACL page could be confirmed in the source.
3. Whether the form had been mapped to an appropriate concept set.

I conducted my initial survey of the form-concept mappings with the help of the python script and then reviewed and edited the data on an excel sheet for comparative purposes. I worked with 7 sources, from the source list in the table, that I had access to in the pdf format. I looked up the relevant form by searching the pdf or referring to the index in the source.   
The sources I worked with are:

1. A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European languages

2. Blažek, Václav & Hegedűs, Irén. On the position of Nuristani within Indo-Iranian.

3. Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic. Indo-European Etymological Dictionaries Online. Edited by Alexander Lubotsky.

4. Hrach K. Martirosyan. Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Inherited Lexicon.

5. Rick Derksen. Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon. Indo-European Etymological Dictionaries Online.

6. Michiel de Vaan. Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages

7. Robert Beekes (with the assistance of Lucien van Beek). Etymological Dictionary of Greek.  
  
When any of the stated parameters could not be confirmed, I marked the mapping as “false” and specified one or more of these errors:

1: ‘MISSING': Word is not found in source

2: 'SPELLING': Word is misspelled / spelling variants are not presented in table

3: 'MEANING': Word in DiACL has meaning different from gloss or is not similar enough

4: 'GRAMMAR': Gloss corresponds to different grammatical category

5: 'NO\_CONCEPT: No concept has been identified for the form

6: 'POS': Gloss does not correspond to lexical class of form

7: ‘MISSING\_CONCEPT’: Suitable concept doesn’t exist in the concepticon

8: ‘MISTAKE\_IN\_SOURCE’: Form is mistranslated in the source

Of the 78 mappings I marked as “false”, the overwhelming majority have been marked with the error “MEANING” indicating a discrepancy between the translation given in the data set and the translation provided in DiACL. In some cases, the translation given was completely different (for example the data set states “middle” and DiACL states “wood”), whereas in other cases there seems to have been confusion regarding metaphorical extension (words translated as “stone” mapped to the concept STONE OF FRUIT). Another issue was the mapping of specific forms to larger non-specific concept sets and vice versa (the word “bird” mapped to the concept set HEN). A further source of confusion was when the DiACL had multiple translations for a single form, only some of which I was able to confirm with the source. In such cases, if I was able to confirm the gloss given in the data set with the source, I marked the mapping as “true” and left a comment. The other errors found in my data were “NOCONCEPT” AND “POS” errors, often in combination with the “MEANING” error.