LLM Automated Evaluation Results

The following are the evaluation results of the requirements based on your query. As a requirements review expert, I strictly followed the rules and evaluation criteria you specified:

| Functional Requirement | Hallucination | Justification |

｜Email Creation and Sending (Merged FR-01, FR-02, FR-06)｜No｜Involves the core data object “Email”, logically linked with user operations, recipients, and sending records, with a clear functional path.｜

｜Receive Email (FR-03)｜No｜Based on the receiving process of the email entity, the system supports reception interfaces and storage paths with no isolated nodes.｜

｜Manage Email Folders (FR-04)｜No｜Involves the “Folder” entity, with a clear relationship between folders and emails, ensuring good structural connectivity.｜

｜Search Emails (FR-05)｜No｜Performs search operations using email fields; the system supports field indexing and result mapping, with no isolated entities.｜

｜Contact Management (Merged FR-07, FR-08)｜No｜The “Contact” entity is an independent core data object, and all operations are closely related to existing system structures.｜

｜Group Management (Merged FR-09, FR-10)｜No｜Groups are structurally linked to contacts; the functional path covers creation, member updates, etc., and is not isolated.｜

｜Set Reminder Tasks (FR-11)｜No｜Reminder tasks are logically bound to emails or schedules; the system supports task triggering, with no isolated entities.｜

｜Create Administrator Account (FR-12)｜No｜The administrator account is a core control entity in the system; the creation process is structurally complete and connected to permission settings.｜

｜Manage Mailbox Permissions (FR-13)｜No｜Permission information is linked with administrators and mailboxes, with a clear operational path and no structural disconnect.｜

｜Shared Account Management (Merged FR-14, FR-15)｜No｜Involves the “Shared Account” entity, structurally associated with administrator configuration and user access in the system.｜

｜Create Archiving Rules (FR-16)｜No｜Archiving rules are strategic structures connected to email processing policies within the system, with clear logic.｜

｜Email Archiving (Merged FR-17, FR-18, FR-20, FR-30)｜No｜Involves archiving operations of email subsets, linked with rules and folders, and forms a complete structure in the E-R diagram.｜

｜Backup Email Data (FR-19)｜No｜Involves the “Backup Data” entity; the backup process is triggered by the administrator and connected to email and log structures.｜

｜Create Backup Plan (FR-22)｜No｜Plans are tied to the backup process; plan structures are integrated with the scheduling mechanism and are feasible in the system.｜

｜Data Recovery (Merged FR-23, FR-24, FR-25)｜No｜Involves backup data structures; the operation logic runs through the recovery process and connects with the core database of the system.｜

｜Log Viewing (Merged FR-26, FR-27)｜No｜The “Log” entity is a core component for operations and maintenance records, closely linked with operational flows and not isolated.｜

｜Handle Expired Emails (FR-21)｜No｜Although the logic of “expired” is not detailed, it is clearly related to email status structures, and the operation results are traceable in the system.｜

｜Task Schedule Management (Merged FR-28, FR-29)｜No｜Involves the “Task Schedule” entity, structurally associated with reminder tasks and user operations within the system.｜

Summary:

The entire document involves 13 data entities (Email, Folder, Contact, Group, Reminder Task, Admin Account, Permission, Shared Account, Archiving Rule, Backup Data, Backup Plan, Log, Task Schedule). Entities are extracted only from functional requirements as internal management objects (e.g., Email, Contact). Archived emails are considered a sub-status of emails and not counted separately. External sources like databases and mail servers mentioned in interfaces are not counted.

After merging, the number of functional requirements is 18 (based on merging rules: same operation on the same entity, such as Contact Management combining FR-07 and FR-08; no generic requirements to remove).

Number of hallucinated requirements: 0 (all requirements involve existing entities, and no isolated entities result in E-R diagram weak connectivity).

Number of non-hallucinated requirements: 18 (no hallucinated requirements).

Review Notes:

No over-merging: only operations on the same entity and of the same type are merged (e.g., Group Management), while independent functions (e.g., Email Search) remain separate.

External interface consistency: all external interfaces (e.g., UI, database) are referenced to support completeness and testability.

Hallucination analysis: all entities are interconnected in the E-R diagram (e.g., Permissions linked to Accounts, Archiving Rules linked to Emails), with no isolated nodes.

Let me know if you need further refinements or more translations.