LLM Automated Evaluation Results

Functional Requirement Evaluation Table

According to your instructions, I conducted a comprehensive review of the requirement document for the asset management system. The review process included the following steps:

1. Statistical Data Entity Extraction: Extracted the data entities to be managed within the system from the functional requirements section (external data sources or formats mentioned in external interfaces were excluded). A total of 6 data entities were identified: Asset, User, Approval Record, Report, Business Process Record, User Login Record.

2. Functional Requirement Consolidation: Functional points involving the same data entity were merged according to the rules, and general system settings requirements (such as preferences or multilingual support) were excluded. After review, no general system requirements needed to be excluded. The merging rules emphasized not over-merging (e.g., CRUD operations are not merged), and all functional points targeted different operations or entities, thus no merging was performed. The total number of functional requirements after consolidation remained 22.

3. Hallucinated Requirement Identification: Based on the weak connectivity criteria of E-R diagrams (the data entity involved in a requirement must be associated with existing system entities to avoid isolated nodes). All functional requirements involve data entities that are associated via core entities (such as Asset and User), thus no hallucinated requirements were identified.

The following is the detailed evaluation table. Each functional requirement is represented by a function number and a brief description (refined from the original description). The justification is based on the contents of the document (functional requirements and external interfaces).

｜Functional Requirement｜Hallucinated Requirement｜Justification｜

｜FR-01: Asset Registration｜No｜Involves the asset entity, operation flow is clear, information input can generate records, and the system has support capability｜

｜FR-02: Asset Query｜No｜Involves the asset entity, the logic of query condition and result is clear, and the system can present the output｜

｜FR-03: Asset Modification｜No｜The modification targets the asset entity, input and output match reasonably, and the system logic is clear｜

｜FR-04: Asset Deletion｜No｜The deletion logic is complete, operation boundary is clear, and complies with entity management requirements｜

｜FR-05: User Creation｜No｜The logic for user creation is clear, supports subsequent linkage operations such as email sending, and the system behavior is closed-loop｜

｜FR-06: User Query｜No｜The query flow is consistent with the user entity, the display form is traceable, and there is no isolated logic｜

｜FR-07: User Modification｜No｜User modification clearly produces audit logs, and the flow definition is complete｜

｜FR-08: User Deletion｜No｜Deletion operation forms a closed loop with log output, and the operation structure is reasonable｜

｜FR-09: Approval Record Submission｜No｜The submission operation advances the approval process, and the logic is clearly associated with the data entity｜

｜FR-10: Approval Record Query｜No｜The approval record query logic is reasonable, and input and output paths are consistent｜

｜FR-11: Approval Record Modification｜No｜Involves approval record entity, output update behavior exists, but some parameters are undefined｜

｜FR-12: Approval Record Deletion｜No｜Approval record is an existing entity, deletion path is clear, and the operation is reasonable｜

｜FR-13: Report Generation｜No｜Report generation logic is clear, entity relationships are explicit, and parameter structure is complete｜

｜FR-14: Report Query｜No｜Query operation path is clear, and the output structure can be mapped to entity data｜

｜FR-15: Report Modification｜No｜Report modification involves vague parameter definitions, unclear input-output relationship, and incomplete execution logic｜

｜FR-16: Report Deletion｜No｜Deletion operation clearly defines the log output path, and the system has a response mechanism｜

｜FR-17: Business Process Record Query｜No｜Query logic is consistent with the process entity, and the data structure supports display and parsing｜

｜FR-18: Business Process Record Modification｜No｜The parameters and output logic on which the modification behavior depends are undefined, and the overall flow is unclear｜

｜FR-19: Business Process Record Deletion｜No｜Deletion operation flow is complete, and the behavior and entity have a clear relationship｜

｜FR-20: User Login Record Query｜No｜The query behavior is based on the login record entity, and the data processing path is clear｜

｜FR-21: User Login Record Modification｜No｜Modification involves undefined parameters and system response mechanism, unable to form a valid closed loop｜

｜FR-22: User Login Record Deletion｜No｜Deletion behavior structure is clear, log record path is well-defined, and the system is sufficiently supportive｜

Summary

• A total of 6 data entities are involved in the entire document (Asset, User, Approval Record, Report, Business Process Record, User Login Record).

• After merging identical functional points, there are still 22 functional requirements (no merging performed since all functional points involve different entities or operations).

• There are 0 hallucinated requirements (all involved entities are associated through core asset and user entities, satisfying weak connectivity in E-R diagrams).

• There are 22 non-hallucinated requirements (no hallucinated ones identified).

Evaluation Notes:

The evaluation follows strict standards: hallucinated requirements are judged by ensuring all entities are connected