\*\*EXTRACTION PHASE:\*\*  
  
Key Information Points from the Conversation:  
1. Speaker 2 is 24 years old.  
2. Speaker 2 previously lived in Rancho Cucamonga, California.  
3. Speaker 2 was diagnosed with a traumatic brain injury (TBI) from a gunshot wound on December 13, 2022.  
4. Speaker 2 previously lived in Fort Riley, Kansas.  
5. Prior to the TBI, Speaker 2 worked on aircraft maintenance as MOS 15 Tango for Blackhawk helicopters in the military.  
6. Speaker 2 later worked in stone masonry and at Spirit Aero Systems.  
7. Speaker 2 and the caregiver were involved in a research session by the University of Southern California to assess suitability for assistive voice technology training.  
8. Speaker 2 demonstrated difficulties with incorrect temporal orientation during the cognitive assessment.  
9. Speaker 2 was able to recall words accurately during the assessment.  
10. Speaker 2 rated himself as fully independent in using Speaker 7 for various tasks despite some contradictions in the conversation.  
11. Some difficulties in understanding were apparent when Speaker 2 incorrectly identified certain dates and information.  
12. Speaker 2 could answer yes/no questions, naming tasks, and perform certain commands for Speaker 7.  
13. Speaker 1, the caregiver, was actively involved in assisting Speaker 2's responses throughout the assessment.  
14. There was no physical examination, diagnostic imaging, or laboratory data presented.  
  
\*\*VERIFICATION PHASE:\*\*  
  
1. \*\*Presence in SOAP Note\*\*:  
 - Points 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13: Present  
 - Point 10: Partially present, but with potential inconsistency.\*  
 - Point 11, 12, 14: Missing or inadequately addressed.  
  
2. \*\*Unsupported Statements in SOAP Note\*\*:  
 - The note states that Speaker 2 could use assistive technology independently, yet during the conversation, contradictions were noted regarding certain abilities with temporal orientation and name/category recalls (Point 10).  
 - The note suggests no medications or allergies mentioned without documentation from the conversation on this point (Point 14 missing).  
  
3. \*\*Inconsistencies Between Sections\*\*:  
 - Discrepancy noted between Subjective and Objective sections regarding the level of cognitive impairments and memory issues (Objective positive insights versus Subjective concerns).  
 - Differing assessments of Speaker 2’s capabilities: Subjective mentions understanding and lack of questions, yet Objective shows cognitive task failures indicating comprehension issues.  
   
4. \*\*Instances of Vague/Generic Documentation\*\*:  
 - The note mentions cognitive communication deficits but lacks specifics about the nature and extent of these deficits beyond general terms.  
 - Terms such as "cooperative and motivated" are non-specific without further qualification.  
  
5. \*\*Improper Terms or Formatting Issues\*\*:  
 - None identified  
  
\*\*SECTION SCORING:\*\*  
  
\*\*Subjective (S):\*\*  
- \*\*Score: 8/10\*\*  
 - Comprehensive background given, but lacks detailed social history specifics and a credible family history context.  
 - -1 point: Incomplete history and ROS.  
 - -1 point: Vague terms (e.g., cooperative and motivated without expansion).  
  
\*\*Objective (O):\*\*  
- \*\*Score: 6/10\*\*  
 - Cognitive assessment noted but lacks detailed reports on other necessary facets such as vitals or addressing missing lab data.  
 - -2 points: Missing physical and lab data + inconsistent assessment evaluation.  
 - -2 points: Vague description of assessment outcomes relative to tasks.  
  
\*\*Assessment (A):\*\*  
- \*\*Score: 6/10\*\*  
 - Differential diagnosis presented, but there are discrepancies in captured independent abilities versus the conversation.  
 - -1 point: Inconsistent identification of cognitive capabilities.  
 - -2 points: Unsupported assumptions on patient’s cognitive understanding and independent functioning.  
 - -1 point: Lack of integration with previous conditions or comprehensive psychological input.  
  
\*\*Plan (P):\*\*  
- \*\*Score: 4/10\*\*  
 - Plan lacks targeted exercises addressing all noticed deficits (i.e., baseline-oriented exercises for improving incorrect date/month recall).  
 - -3 points: Insufficient detail for improvement or stepwise strategies, vague goal setting.  
 - -2 points: Missing follow-up specifics, overly reliant on technology with inconsistent user independence evidence.  
  
\*\*TOTAL DEDUCTIONS AND CAPS APPLICATION:\*\*  
  
- Total Deductions: 10 (from all primary points; capping needed due to excessive deductions)  
- Final Caps for inconsistencies existing between sections: Maximum 6/10  
- Lowest section (Plan) with score of 4 caps overall score at 6/10  
  
\*\*FINAL SCORE CALCULATION:\*\*  
  
SOAP Note Score = MIN(10, 10 - total deductions, lowest section score + 2, all applicable caps)  
  
Final Score = MIN(10, 0 - 10, 6, 6) = 5 (due to maximum deduction and section caps resultant constraints)   
  
\*\*Rating: 5/10\*\*