LLM Automated Evaluation Results

**Functional Requirement Evaluation Table**

As a requirements review expert, I conducted the assessment strictly following your instructions. First, I identified the data entities based on the provided requirement document and merged functional requirements (according to the rule: merge identical functional points on the same data entity into one requirement; exclude general system settings requirements; avoid over-merging). Then, I judged whether each functional requirement is a hallucinated requirement (based on whether the data entity is weakly connected in the E-R diagram). The evaluation standard is slightly strict.

**Summary of Steps:**

* **Data Entity Identification**: Extracted data entities managed within the system from the functional requirement document (excluding external interfaces such as databases or SMTP). The core entities are based on the operational objects described in the requirements. A total of 12 data entities were identified: Email, Folder, Attachment, Event, Task, Contact, DistributionGroup, Policy, UserAccount, SharedAccount, Backup, Log.
* **Functional Requirement Consolidation**: The original document contained 19 functional requirements (FR-01 to FR-19). After review, there were no completely duplicated functional points on the same data entity (e.g., FR-09, FR-10, and FR-12 all involve archiving, but the operation objects and purposes differ: FR-09 is search, FR-10 is automatic movement, FR-12 is policy application, thus not merged). Also, no general system setting requirements (such as preference settings or multilingual support) were found to be removed. Therefore, the number of functional requirements remains 19 after consolidation.
* **Hallucinated Requirement Judgment**: According to the definition (a requirement introduces a data entity that cannot be connected to any existing entity, causing the E-R diagram to not be weakly connected). All requirement-related data entities are connectable (e.g., Archived Email is considered a state of Email, and Log is treated as a system-level entity), so there are no hallucinated requirements.
* **Evaluation Details**: Each functional requirement is listed below (using the original numbering after consolidation). The judgment reason is based on the requirement description, entity connectivity, and document content. Note: All requirements are non-hallucinated. For strictness, I verified whether any entity is isolated (none found). Completeness of citation and testability are satisfied, but potential issues are marked in the reasoning (e.g., FR-02 lacks editor details, but mentioned in the document and thus acceptable).

| Functional Requirement | Hallucination | Justification |

|------------------------|---------------|---------------|

FR-01: Send and Receive Emails | No | Email and Attachment are core entities; the input/output path is clear; send/receive interfaces are well-defined and realistic.

FR-02: Email Formatting | No | Email formatting is a sub-process of editing; the entity is defined; preview functionality is feasible.

FR-03: Email Search | No | The structure of emails and folders supports search operations; keyword input and result output logic are clear.

FR-04: Folder Organization | No | Folder entity is clearly associated with email organization; the operation path is valid.

FR-05: Calendar Scheduling | No | Event is associated with the account entity; schedule creation and sharing processes are well defined and realistic.

FR-06: Reminder Tasks | No | Task entity exists; reminder and task-setting flow is reasonable and verifiable.

FR-07: Contact Management | No | Contact entity has a complete structure; contact operations are coherent and feasible.

FR-08: Distribution Groups | No | DistributionGroup is based on contacts; group logic and management paths are reasonable.

FR-09: Personal Archiving Search | No | Archive is an extended state of Email; the search path is complete and the function is realistic.

FR-10: Server Archiving | No | Email is clearly associated with Policy; the archiving execution path is reasonable; the policy structure is defined.

FR-11: Email Flow Capture | No | Log entity monitors email behavior; the system automatically generates logs; functionality is traceable.

FR-12: Policy-Based Archiving | No | Similar to FR-10; policy-driven archiving behavior is clear; entities and processes are complete.

FR-13: Expired Email Handling | No | Email and Policy entities together define the expiration handling logic; the behavior is valid.

FR-14: Account Creation and Management | No | UserAccount is a core account entity; the logic of account operations aligns with interface definitions.

FR-15: Shared Accounts | No | SharedAccount is clearly connected to user accounts; structure and function are realistic.

FR-16: Compliance Policies | No | Policy entity exists; the definition and execution path of policies are clear; can be linked with other functions like archiving.

FR-17: Data Backup | No | Backup entity has a complete structure; backup behavior and interface collaboration are logically valid.

FR-18: Point-in-Time Recovery | No | Recovery based on backup data has a clear path and reasonable structure.

FR-19: Recovery Logging | No | System logs record recovery behavior; log structure exists; function logic is realistic.

**Summary**

* **There are 12 data entities involved in the entire document**: Email, Folder, Attachment, Event, Task, Contact, DistributionGroup, Policy, UserAccount, SharedAccount, Backup, Log (Log covers both FR-11 and FR-19).
* **After merging by functional point, there are 19 functional requirements**: No merging occurred (the granularity is consistent, and no duplicate or same-entity identical operations exist).
* **Hallucinated requirements: 0**: All data entities involved in requirements are connectable (E-R diagram is weakly connected); no isolated entities.
* **Non-hallucinated requirements: 19** (hallucinated = 0, so all are non-hallucinated).

The evaluation is based on the provided requirement document and strict assessment standards. The overall requirement set has a sound structure, but items like FR-02 and FR-11 have some detail gaps that need to be addressed during actual implementation.