LLM Automated Evaluation Results

Functional Requirements Evaluation Table

｜Functional Requirement｜Hallucinated Requirement｜Justification｜

｜Asset Registration Function (FR-01)｜No｜Direct interaction with the asset entity, clear logic flow, and system support capabilities｜

｜Asset Transfer Function (FR-02)｜No｜Operation involves asset circulation, complete behavior chain, and clearly mapped in the system｜

｜Asset Return Function (FR-03)｜No｜Return action is associated with asset status change, function design is reasonable｜

｜Asset Information View/Modify Function｜No｜Merged FR-04 and FR-05, both operate on the asset entity for query and edit, logically consistent｜

｜User Management Function｜No｜Merged FR-06/FR-07/FR-08, all operate on the user entity, behavior structure is clear｜

｜User Information View Function (FR-09)｜No｜Viewing operation corresponds directly to user data display, no redundant design｜

｜User Permission Assignment Function (FR-10)｜No｜Function logic is clear, based on the relationship between permissions and users｜

｜User Permission View Function (FR-11)｜No｜Permission query flow is traceable to user operations, supported by system structure｜

｜Approval Process Management Function｜No｜Merged FR-12/FR-13/FR-14, approval-related entities exist, process is clear but lacks extension description｜

｜Approval Record Deletion Function (FR-15)｜No｜Approval record as an existing data object can be identified and deleted｜

｜Asset Report Generation Function (FR-16)｜No｜Although it is part of the system, the output lacks structural definition and operation path is vague｜

｜Asset Report View Function (FR-17)｜No｜Viewing operation maps to report data, behavior boundary is clearly defined｜

｜Transfer Record Management Function (FR-18)｜No｜Record management is bound to transfer actions, supported within the system｜

｜Return Record Management Function (FR-19)｜No｜Return records are clearly present in system logic, functional definition is consistent｜

｜Approval Record Management Function (FR-20)｜No｜Management direction is clear but data structure details are vague, affecting feasibility of further use｜

｜Permission Information Management Function (FR-21)｜No｜Operation purpose is clear, but some behaviors (e.g., obsolete marking) lack contextual definition｜

Summary：

1. Data Entities：Total of 8 (Asset, User, Approval Record, Permission Record, Transfer Record, Return Record, User Permission, Approval Process)

2. Number of Requirements after Merging：16 (Original 21 merged FR-04/05, FR-06/07/08, FR-12/13/14)

3. Hallucinated Requirements：0 (All requirements are linked to core entities)

4. Complete Reference Requirements：12 (4 are incomplete due to undefined parameters)

5. Testable Requirements：12 (4 are untestable due to vague outputs or reliance on undefined parameters)

⸻

Detailed Explanation

1. Hallucinated Requirement Criteria：

All functions are connected to core entities such as asset, user, and approval, and E-R diagrams maintain weak connectivity (e.g., FR-21 permission management is linked to system through user entity). No new isolated entities are introduced (e.g., all “management operations” are extensions of existing entity attributes, not new entities).

Key Improvement Suggestions：

Supplement FR-16 report parameters (e.g., restrict visualization scheme to bar/pie chart).

Explicitly define FR-20 “audit package” file format (e.g., ZIP containing CSV logs).

Refine FR-12 approval type enumeration values (e.g., limit to [asset purchase, expense reimbursement]).