
Instruction-Following Evaluation in Function Calling for Large Language Models

Nikolai Skripko^{1,2}
naskripko@edu.hse.ru

¹Higher School of Economics, Moscow

²SberDevices, Moscow

September 24, 2025

ABSTRACT

Function calling is a core capability of Large Language Models (LLMs), essential for AI agents. Existing benchmarks (e.g., BFCL (Patil et al., 2025), τ^2 -Bench (Barres et al., 2025), ACEBench (Chen et al., 2025)) evaluate argument correctness but do not test adherence to format instructions embedded in parameter descriptions, such as enclosing values in double quotes or using ISO date formats.

We introduce **IFEval-FC**, a benchmark inspired by IFEval (Zhou et al., 2023), which assesses precise instruction following in function calling. IFEval-FC encodes verifiable formats directly within JSON schema descriptions, such as “a value must not contain punctuation”. It offers 750 test cases, each consisting of a function with an embedded format for one of its input parameters and a corresponding user query. The evaluation is fully algorithmic, ensuring objectivity, reproducibility, and scalability.

Our results indicate that even state-of-the-art proprietary models, such as GPT-5 (OpenAI, 2025) and Claude Opus 4.1 (Anthropic, 2025), frequently fail to adhere to basic formatting rules, highlighting a significant limitation for practical applications in real-world agent systems. The complete codebase and data are publicly available at <https://github.com/Skripkon/IFEval-FC>

1 INTRODUCTION

Large Language Models (LLMs) are increasingly being deployed as core components of AI agents that interact with tools, APIs, and external systems via function calling. These agents leverage LLMs not only for natural language understanding and reasoning but also for structured API usage, tool execution, and decision-making in real-world domains.

A critical capability in this context is the model’s ability to correctly interpret and adhere to function signatures, particularly the formatting requirements specified in parameter descriptions within JSON schemas. For instance, a function schema may specify that a parameter `user_name` must be “a string starting with a capital letter” or that a date must follow the ISO 8601 format. Despite their apparent simplicity, such format instructions are frequently overlooked or misinterpreted by LLMs, leading to invalid function calls and downstream failures in agent workflows.

Current benchmarks for function calling evaluate only functional correctness or API selection accuracy, often overlooking whether arguments are correctly formatted. This gap leaves a crucial dimension of agent robustness under-evaluated.

To address this, we introduce **IFEval-FC**, a benchmark inspired by IFEval that focuses on evaluating LLMs’ ability to follow *verifiable format instructions* in the context of function calling. In IFEval-FC, each instruction is embedded directly into the description field of a parameter in a JSON schema (e.g., “should not include punctuation”, “must be lowercase”). These instructions are designed to be objectively verifiable through algorithmic checks, enabling fully automated and reproducible evaluation without reliance on human or LLM-as-a-Judge (Gu et al., 2025).

2 VERIFIABLE INSTRUCTIONS

The core innovation of IFEval-FC lies in its adaptation of “verifiable instructions” from the original IFEval benchmark. Unlike traditional function calling benchmarks that focus on functional correctness or API selection, IFEval-FC evaluates the model’s ability to follow precise formatting constraints embedded within JSON schema parameter descriptions.

2.1 INSTRUCTION CATEGORIES AND TYPES

We identified 19 distinct types of verifiable instructions, which we organized into seven major categories according to the nature of the constraints they impose (see Table 1).

A significant portion of our instruction types were adapted from the original IFEval benchmark, which focused on instruction following in general text generation tasks. Other types of instructions are introduced here for the first time (such as `Cyrillic Greek` or `Python List Format`).

2.2 DATASET CREATION

2.2.1 FUNCTIONS

A subset of our functions was sourced from the BFCL benchmark, providing real-world function schemas that we enhanced with our verifiable instruction constraints. Other functions were generated synthetically using GPT-5 through a carefully designed prompt engineering process. Our generation pipeline consisted of the following steps:

1. **Domain Selection:** We curated 80 diverse domains representing real-world use cases where AI assistants might need to call functions.
2. **Function Schema Generation:** For each domain, we used structured prompts to generate JSON schemas with specific requirements:
 - Each function must include one `free-form parameter` for natural language input.
 - The `free-form parameter` must be a string with no `enum` or `format field`.

This was done to simulate a situation similar to IFEval, where a model needs to generate natural language text when a specific format is imposed on it. Such a parameter allows the application of any format constraint, which is not always possible in BFCL, since not all formats are meaningful for specific arguments such as `user_id`.

3. **Instruction Injection:** We injected verifiable instructions into the description of one parameter of each function (`free-form parameter` for the generated functions and a randomly chosen string parameter with no `enum` or `format field` for the BFCL functions).

2.2.2 USER QUERY GENERATION

To ensure realistic evaluation scenarios, we generated five diverse user queries for each function using GPT-5. These queries were designed to satisfy the following criteria:

- They are expressed in natural, conversational language.

Instruction Group	Instruction	Description
Keywords	Keywords Presence	Requires inclusion / exclusion of specific keywords
Keywords	Keyword Frequency	Specifies exact frequency requirements for keywords
Keywords	Letter Frequency	Controls the frequency of specific letters
Language	Cyrillic Greek	Restricts text to specific writing systems
Length Constraints	Word Count	Controls the number of words in the response
Length Constraints	Sentence Count	Manages sentence count requirements
Detectable Content	Postscript	Requires specific postscript markers
Detectable Content	Placeholder Count	Controls the number of placeholder markers
Detectable Format	Spaces In Between	Enforces specific spacing patterns
Detectable Format	Title Format	Requires specific formatting markers
Detectable Format	Highlighted Sections Count	Controls markdown highlighting
Detectable Format	Json Format	Requires valid JSON formatting
Detectable Format	Python List Format	Enforces Python list syntax
Case	All Uppercase	Requires all uppercase text
Case	All Lowercase	Requires all lowercase text
Case	N All Capital Words	Controls the number of all-caps words
Start/End	End Phrase	Requires specific ending phrases
Start/End	Quotation	Enforces quotation mark wrapping
Punctuation	N Commas	Controls comma frequency

Table 1: Examples of verifiable format instructions adapted for function parameters. Each entry represents a category of instruction constraints encoded in a parameter description.

- They contain values for all required parameters to call a function.
- They were generated based on the original functions (without embedded formats) so that users do not attempt to satisfy the format in advance; instead, it is the LLM’s task during function calling to transform a value into the required format.

Each function and its associated queries were further validated to ensure that the function was indeed necessary for completing the task. We verified this through a straightforward procedure: if an LLM failed to call the target function in response to all five queries, the task was deemed ill-posed or overly challenging and omitted. Conversely, tasks in which all five queries were answered correctly with ease were also omitted. An ensemble of LLMs was employed to increase the robustness of task selection.

We observed that Anthropic’s most recent models (e.g., Claude Opus 4.1) exhibited a significantly higher refusal rate when deciding whether to call a function compared to other models. Closer analysis revealed that these models often requested user clarification whenever subtle uncertainties arose (e.g., adherence to a specific format unknown to the user). To mitigate this issue and ensure fairness across evaluations, we added a system message explicitly instructing the model to always call a function:

```
SYSTEM_MESSAGE = '''
YOU MUST CALL A FUNCTION NO MATTER WHAT.
NEVER ASK A USER TO SPECIFY OR CLARIFY ANYTHING.
ALWAYS CALL A FUNCTION.
'''.strip()
```

Listing 1: System message enforcing function invocation.

2.3 INSTRUCTION DIFFICULTY AND FILTERING

During development, we discovered that certain instruction types (particularly trivial case constraints like all-uppercase/lowercase) were too easy for modern models, often achieving 90–100% accuracy across models. To maintain the benchmark’s discriminative power, we excluded these trivial instruction types from the final evaluation. The remaining instruction types represent a carefully curated set that provides meaningful differentiation between model capabilities.

2.4 IFEVAL-FC METRICS

For a given response r and a verifiable instruction i , we define the function that verifies whether the instruction is followed:

$$\text{score}(r, i) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if instruction is followed.} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

We evaluated several language models on IFEval-FC using Equation 1. Figure 1 presents the overall performance across all format constraint types. See Tables 2-4 in the appendix for a comprehensive breakdown by instruction.




Figure 1: Overall performance of several language models on the IFEval-FC benchmark. Higher scores indicate better adherence to format constraints.

3 DISCUSSION AND FUTURE WORK

The results indicate that the latest models perform significantly better than their predecessors. However, no evaluated model surpassed 80% accuracy, suggesting that precise instruction-following in function calling remains an open problem for LLMs, despite being a trivial task for humans.

To increase the benchmark’s difficulty, future work will expand the number of available functions and selecting more difficult samples from the originally generated ones. In the current setup, only one function is available for the model to call. A more challenging scenario would require the model to first select the correct function from a set of options, which may lead to a decrease in observed performance.

Additionally, while our current benchmark focuses on English-language function calls, future iterations could incorporate multilingual support, drawing inspiration from M-IFEval (Dussolle et al., 2025) to assess cross-lingual instruction-following capabilities.

REFERENCES

- Shishir G. Patil, Huanzhi Mao, Charlie Cheng-Jie Ji, Fanjia Yan, Vishnu Suresh, Ion Stoica, Joseph E. Gonzalez. The Berkeley Function Calling Leaderboard (BFCL): From Tool Use to Agentic Evaluation of Large Language Models. In *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025.
- Victor Barres, Honghua Dong, Soham Ray, Xujie Si, Karthik Narasimhan. τ^2 -Bench: Evaluating Conversational Agents in a Dual-Control Environment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.07982*, 2025. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.07982>
- Chen Chen, Xinlong Hao, Weiwen Liu, Xu Huang, Xingshan Zeng, Shuai Yu, Dexun Li, Shuai Wang, Weinan Gan, Yuefeng Huang, Wulong Liu, Xinzhi Wang, Defu Lian, Baoqun Yin, Yasheng Wang, Wu Liu. ACEBench: Who Wins the Match Point in Tool Usage? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12851*, 2025. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.12851>
- Jeffrey Zhou, Tianjian Lu, Swaroop Mishra, Siddhartha Brahma, Sujoy Basu, Yi Luan, Denny Zhou, Le Hou. Instruction-Following Evaluation for Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07911*, 2023. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.07911>
- Antoine Dussolle, Andrea Cardeña Díaz, Shota Sato, Peter Devine. M-IFEval: Multilingual Instruction-Following Evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.04688*, 2025. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.04688>
- Jiawei Gu, Xuhui Jiang, Zhichao Shi, Hexiang Tan, Xuehao Zhai, Chengjin Xu, Wei Li, Yinghan Shen, Shengjie Ma, Honghao Liu, Saizhuo Wang, Kun Zhang, Yuanzhuo Wang, Wen Gao, Lionel Ni, Jian Guo. A Survey on LLM-as-a-Judge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.15594*, 2025. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.15594>
- OpenAI. GPT-5. Large language model, 2025. <https://openai.com/index/introducing-gpt-5>
- Anthropic. Claude 4.1 Opus. Large language model, 2025. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-opus-4-1>

”

Part I

Appendix

4 DETAILED RESULTS

Instruction	GigaChat 2	GigaChat 2 Pro	GigaChat 2 Max
Cyrillic Greek	22.00%	10.00%	50.00%
Highlighted Sections Count	38.00%	66.00%	72.00%
Json Format	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Keyword Frequency	28.00%	60.00%	64.00%
Keywords Presence	54.00%	66.00%	84.00%
Letter Frequency	12.00%	24.00%	42.00%
N All Capital Words	30.00%	44.00%	46.00%
N Commas	18.00%	40.00%	28.00%
Placeholder Count	6.00%	40.00%	58.00%
Python List Format	10.00%	2.00%	24.00%
Quotation	26.00%	0.00%	36.00%
Sentence Count	28.00%	36.00%	58.00%
Spaces In Between	2.00%	4.00%	8.00%
Title Format	62.00%	64.00%	42.00%
Word Count	0.00%	4.00%	18.00%

Table 2: Evaluation results for GigaChat models.

Instruction	Haiku 3	Haiku 3.5	Sonnet 3.7	Opus 4.1	Opus 4.1 Thinking
Cyrillic Greek	30.00%	40.00%	44.00%	40.00%	34.00%
Highlighted Sections Count	48.00%	64.00%	86.00%	94.00%	100.00%
Json Format	62.00%	30.00%	34.00%	68.00%	68.00%
Keyword Frequency	36.00%	76.00%	88.00%	90.00%	86.00%
Keywords Presence	50.00%	46.00%	86.00%	80.00%	90.00%
Letter Frequency	22.00%	28.00%	38.00%	28.00%	54.00%
N All Capital Words	28.00%	78.00%	76.00%	20.00%	14.00%
N Commas	14.00%	12.00%	44.00%	52.00%	78.00%
Placeholder Count	2.00%	50.00%	76.00%	80.00%	92.00%
Python List Format	94.00%	92.00%	68.00%	90.00%	90.00%
Quotation	62.00%	34.00%	66.00%	70.00%	62.00%
Sentence Count	26.00%	56.00%	72.00%	84.00%	86.00%
Spaces In Between	10.00%	54.00%	62.00%	8.00%	24.00%
Title Format	60.00%	78.00%	90.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Word Count	0.00%	54.00%	64.00%	94.00%	96.00%

Table 3: Evaluation results for Anthropic models.

Instruction	GPT 4o	GPT 4.1	GPT 5 minimal	GPT o4 mini low
Cyrillic Greek	24.00%	36.00%	46.00%	<u>70.00%</u>
Highlighted Sections Count	58.00%	88.00%	86.00%	<u>98.00%</u>
Json Format	40.00%	14.00%	<u>58.00%</u>	0.00%
Keyword Frequency	80.00%	94.00%	<u>98.00%</u>	92.00%
Keywords Presence	74.00%	90.00%	94.00%	<u>98.00%</u>
Letter Frequency	28.00%	22.00%	36.00%	<u>86.00%</u>
N All Capital Words	64.00%	84.00%	76.00%	<u>90.00%</u>
N Commas	28.00%	42.00%	56.00%	<u>82.00%</u>
Placeholder Count	12.00%	58.00%	84.00%	<u>94.00%</u>
Python List Format	72.00%	94.00%	<u>98.00%</u>	84.00%
Quotation	18.00%	46.00%	<u>88.00%</u>	56.00%
Sentence Count	48.00%	60.00%	<u>82.00%</u>	78.00%
Spaces In Between	76.00%	72.00%	88.00%	<u>98.00%</u>
Title Format	76.00%	52.00%	<u>94.00%</u>	<u>94.00%</u>
Word Count	72.00%	<u>90.00%</u>	82.00%	78.00%

Table 4: Evaluation results for OpenAI models.