LLM Automated Evaluation Results

Functional Requirement Evaluation Table

According to your request, I conducted the following processing of the document:

First, data entities were identified from the functional requirements, excluding external data sources or formats from interfaces. Based on the functional descriptions, the core data entities include: Email, Attachment, Folder, Contact, ContactGroup, Task, Reminder, UserMailbox, SharedAccount, PermissionSetting, ArchivingPolicy, BackupRecord, Log, MonitoringData, AuditReport, StorageQuota, EmailLabel, EmailStreamData. A total of 18 data entities (see summary).

Then, functional requirements were merged according to your rule:

Functional points under the same data entity were not merged if they represent different operations (e.g., create/edit/delete are treated as distinct). There were no general configuration requirements like preferences or multilingual support, so none were removed.

After checking, the final number of functional requirements remained 46 (from FR-01 to FR-46) as there were no repetitive functional points, hence no merging occurred.

Third, hallucinated requirements were judged based on the criterion that if a functional operation involved a data entity that cannot be linked to any existing system entity (i.e., results in a disconnected E-R diagram), it is marked as hallucinated. All requirements in this document are associated with system-defined entities, hence 0 hallucinated requirements.

The following is the complete evaluation table. In the table:

“Functional Requirement” refers to the original FR number.

“Hallucinated Requirement” is marked as yes or no.

“Evaluation Reason” gives a brief explanation.

｜Functional Requirement｜Hallucinated Requirement｜Evaluation Reason｜

｜FR-01 (Send Email)｜No｜Clearly involves the Email entity and external SMTP interface; input/output logic is closed and verifiable.｜

｜FR-02 (Receive Email)｜No｜Involves the Email entity and email security protocol interface; logic is complete and consistent with system flow.｜

｜FR-03 (Search Email)｜No｜Defines search conditions and result return; complete entity references; behavior tightly coupled with user actions.｜

｜FR-04 (Create Folder)｜No｜Creation maps directly to the Folder entity; structural operation logic is satisfied.｜

｜FR-05 (Rename Folder)｜No｜Folder name change aligns with user behavior; logic is clear with no structural disconnect.｜

｜FR-06 (Delete Folder)｜No｜Deletion operation aligns with system structure maintenance; ownership logic is clear.｜

｜FR-07 (Add Contact)｜No｜Contact addition fits the communication management logic; structure and behavior are coherent.｜

｜FR-08 (Edit Contact)｜No｜System supports contact update; logic is smooth and reflects real use cases.｜

｜FR-09 (Delete Contact)｜No｜Contact deletion is aligned with user behavior model; entity update is reasonable.｜

｜FR-10 (Create Contact Group)｜No｜Built on existing Contact entity; function chain is clear and business-aligned.｜

｜FR-11 (Manage Contact Group Members)｜No｜Dual-entity operation on ContactGroup and Contact; input/output shows necessity and feasibility.｜

｜FR-12 (Export Group Members)｜No｜Functional path from entity to format transformation; meets user data export needs.｜

｜FR-13 (Create Task)｜No｜Clearly involves Task entity and reminder mechanism; function is complete with well-defined flow.｜

｜FR-14 (Set Task Reminder)｜No｜Dual-entity operation with Task and Reminder; logical path is clear in the description.｜

｜FR-15 (Modify Task Status)｜No｜Status transition behavior is well-structured; entity relation is reasonable; logic is self-consistent.｜

｜FR-16 (Delete Task)｜No｜Task deletion is fully described; data flow is closed; results are logically expected.｜

｜FR-17 (Configure Fine-Grained Permission)｜No｜Involves Permission and rules; description supports system security control.｜

｜FR-18 (Approve Mailbox Application)｜No｜Involves mailbox allocation and user status change; business logic is closed and clear.｜

｜FR-19 (Delete Shared Account)｜No｜Deletion tightly aligns with SharedAccount lifecycle; entity operation logic is clear.｜

｜FR-20 (Set Archiving Policy)｜No｜Policy setup reflects system’s capability of archiving management; defined process is reasonable.｜

｜FR-21 (Policy-based Archiving)｜No｜Categorization tightly binds with archiving policy; function loop is complete.｜

｜FR-22 (Server Archiving Execution)｜No｜Archiving behavior fully reflects system data migration process; entities clearly defined.｜

｜FR-23 (Capture Email Stream)｜No｜Email stream capture is tightly coupled with the entity; description is rational and valuable.｜

｜FR-24 (Process Expired Emails)｜No｜Processing logic for expiration is clear; email lifecycle is fully enclosed.｜

｜FR-25 (Full Backup)｜No｜Involves backup and external transfer interfaces; data migration logic is complete.｜

｜FR-26 (Restore by Timestamp)｜No｜Backup restore uses time indexing; description is complete and operation is reasonable.｜

｜FR-27 (View Backup Logs)｜No｜Log reading fits backup structure; functional path is complete.｜

｜FR-28 (Email Flow Monitoring)｜No｜System’s flow capture mechanism reflects entity operation; monitoring behavior is enclosed.｜

｜FR-29 (Permission Change Audit)｜No｜Audit links with operation logs; functional goal is feasible.｜

｜FR-30 (Expired Email Audit)｜No｜Audit action aligns with compliance need; structured and reasonable description.｜

｜FR-31 (Assign Admin Rights)｜No｜Permission assignment is logical and clear; covers core security management.｜

｜FR-32 (Manage Permissions)｜No｜Support for permission maintenance; structure is reasonable and flexible.｜

｜FR-33 (Verify Backup Integrity)｜No｜Verification focuses on data validity; description matches real-world operations.｜

｜FR-34 (Batch Archiving)｜No｜Covers bulk email archiving path; goal is specific and feasible.｜

｜FR-35 (Mark Email Priority)｜No｜Marking behavior aligns with user interaction; entity update is natural.｜

｜FR-36 (Email Formatting)｜No｜Email formatting consistent with display rules; function is clear and complete.｜

｜FR-37 (System Restore)｜No｜Restore logic utilizes backup data; system description is complete.｜

｜FR-38 (Operation Log Audit)｜No｜Operation log audit is clearly defined; complete data involvement; behavior is enclosed.｜

｜FR-39 (Archived Email Search)｜No｜Search is based on archived data; function target is clear; no structural issue.｜

｜FR-40 (Move Email to Folder)｜No｜Move operation aligns with folder structure; logic path is natural and reasonable.｜

｜FR-41 (Manage Email Tags)｜No｜Tag management clearly shows email categorization; goal is well-defined.｜

｜FR-42 (Email Stream Capture and Monitoring)｜No｜Monitoring logic aligns with entity; function is clear and semantically complete.｜

｜FR-43 (Email Stream Alert Handling)｜No｜Alert behavior follows data capture path; description forms a closed structure.｜

｜FR-44 (Email Compliance Assessment)｜No｜Compliance check is clearly defined; content reflects system supervision capability.｜

｜FR-45 (Email Load Optimization)｜No｜Optimization strategy lacks specific definition; no standard output; incomplete description.｜

｜FR-46 (Archiving Policy Health Evaluation)｜No｜Evaluation method and scoring not defined; goal description not actionable.｜

Summary

The document contains 18 data entities in total: Email, Attachment, Folder, Contact, ContactGroup, Task, Reminder, UserMailbox, SharedAccount, PermissionSetting, ArchivingPolicy, BackupRecord, Log, MonitoringData, AuditReport, StorageQuota, EmailLabel, EmailStreamData.

After merging based on functional points, there are 46 functional requirements in total, as no requirements were merged.

There are 0 hallucinated requirements since all are connected to existing entities and form a weakly connected E-R diagram (e.g., Email, Contact, Task are all structurally related).

All 46 are non-hallucinated requirements.