Comparator source checks

The source checks of 29 September 2026 establish what the cited publications report and identify transcription errors and discrepancies within the publications. The evidence-selection date remains 12 September 2026. The source PDFs and verification images are retained privately and are not included in the reproducibility package.

Körtik Tepe: printed values and contexts

Carter et al. (2013), Tables 1–2, were checked against the locally held author's personal copy: printed pp. 559–62, PDF pp. 5–8 (DOI). All 120 contextual rows were checked against Table 1. All 1,560 chemical cells were compared with text recovered by column from Table 2. The rendered pages were inspected to verify signs, brackets, the omitted KT.058 row and apparent outliers.

The checked transcription includes all 13 chemical fields for KT.058, minus signs in 49 other Ba entries, and square brackets around Sr values for KT.044 and KT.106. KT.058's Sr and Ba entries remain [3.1] and [-30.00], including their printed precision. Unbracketed numbers are stored as numbers; bracketed values are stored as text. The publication does not explain the meaning of these brackets or the negative Ba values. They have not been converted to positive measurements, zero or detection limits.

Both the Evidence_Register and Kortik_Artefacts worksheets retain negative level entries in 118 rows and Surface in two rows. Trench, level, stratum and context occupy separate fields. Table 1 labels its level column Level (m) but prints values such as −089 to −119. These entries are retained without inserting decimals or converting units. Sixteen artefact descriptions in each worksheet retain a printed dash that text extraction had misread as the letter e.

KT.117 Sr 624 ppm, KT.046 Sr 113 ppm and KT.005 Zr 641 ppm are printed in Table 2 and remain unchanged. The results text on pp. 560–62 discusses repeated measurements of the two high Sr values without resolving their interpretation. Both tables contain 68 Bingöl B, 36 Bingöl A, 15 Nemrut Dağ and one Muş–Konuk Bekler assignment, totalling 120. The narrative on p. 560 instead reports 67 Bingöl B artefacts. The register retains the table assignments and records this discrepancy.

These checks confirm that the transcription matches the printed tables. They do not validate the laboratory measurements or repeat the source classification.

Hasankeyf Höyük: reported and calculated totals

Carter et al. (2021), Table 4, was checked visually against the local author-copy PDF, p. 10 (DOI). The top-layer row prints 19 Nemrut Dağ, five Bingöl B and one Group 3d, with blank Bingöl A and Muş cells. It gives a total of 27, although the counts for individual sources sum to 25. The discrepancy occurs in the publication.

The seven reported context subtotals sum to 334. The counts for individual sources sum to 332, matching the published grand total: 307 Nemrut Dağ, four Bingöl A, 14 Bingöl B, four Muş and three Group 3d. The reported result remains 307 Nemrut Dağ assignments among 332 analysed pieces.

Table S1 preserves the source counts and the existing total_count field. The reported_total_count field repeats the published totals. Formulas in calculated_source_count sum the five source columns, while reported_minus_calculated records each difference. The Total row also gives the sums of the reported context totals and calculated component totals. Blank source cells are represented as zero. No pieces have been reassigned to reconcile the discrepancy.

This check verifies the transcription and arithmetic of Table 4. It does not resolve the published discrepancy or authenticate the laboratory records.

Göbekli Tepe: Carter et al. (2021)

Section 4 of Carter et al. (2021), visually checked on p. 11 of the local in-press PDF, mentions small quantities of Bingöl and Nemrut Dağ obsidian at Göbekli Tepe and attributes the information to MAX Lab. The article does not publish the underlying Göbekli artefact-level measurements or assignments. It adds a peer-reviewed mention to the evidence history, not an independently auditable local provenance dataset. The reference to Bingöl does not distinguish Bingöl A from Bingöl B.

Jerf el Ahmar: Abbès et al. (2003)

The complete five-page article was checked in text and rendered form. It reports 43 new analyses and one earlier attribution: 42 artefacts assigned to East Göllü Dağ and two to calc-alkaline Bingöl. The paper presents analytical methods, source comparisons, plots and totals, but no complete artefact-by-artefact register. Some context is reported: the two Bingöl pieces came from the same end-PPNA level, one from a communal structure and the other from a domestic house (pp. 163–65). The register therefore distinguishes published source assignment from completeness of the itemised data.

The checked source strings are preserved in Kortik_Table1_transcription.json and Kortik_Table2_transcription.json in this directory. The Bingöl/Solhan model endpoint remains a geographical proxy, not a verified location of the chemically assigned calc-alkaline Bingöl source.

The display label “Published assignments” requires an analytical publication with supporting measurements or geochemical comparisons; an incidental published source mention is insufficient. Completeness of itemised reporting is assessed separately.