EXTRACTION PHASE: (Key information points from the conversation)  
1. L.V.G. has difficulty with speech and word retrieval.  
2. Previously attended speech therapy, found it unhelpful.  
3. Patient identifies with possible primary progressive aphasia (PPA).  
4. Engages in activities like playing bridge and watercolor painting.  
5. Lives in Nebraska.  
6. Manages multiple medications independently.  
7. Incorrectly reports the current year as 2024 instead of 2023.  
8. Does not participate in current speech therapy.  
9. Cognitive and recall challenges observed during tasks.  
10. Identifies various U.S. states and foods during verbal tasks.  
11. Familiarity and potential reliance on using technology for ailments.  
12. Describes a picture with detail, suggesting intact visual memory.  
13. Expresses reliance on devices for understanding speech commands.  
14. Demonstrates insight into her speech challenges and adaptive communication techniques.  
15. Engages actively with evaluating various verbal task performances.  
  
VERIFICATION PHASE: (SOAP Note vs. Conversation)  
1. \*\*Subjective Section\*\*:  
 - Present: Difficulty with word retrieval, previous unsuccessful speech therapy, engagement in bridge painting.  
 - Missing: Details on managing medications, completion of various verbal tasks, failed to correct current year.  
   
2. \*\*Objective Section\*\*:  
 - Present: Details of verbal task performance.  
 - Missing: Insight into speech challenges/adaptive communication techniques observed during tasks.  
   
3. \*\*Assessment Section\*\*:  
 - Present: Language disorder observations, differential diagnoses.  
 - Missing: Comprehensive cognitive involvement.  
   
4. \*\*Plan Section\*\*:  
 - Present: Speech therapy re-evaluation, technological assistance.  
 - Missing: Specific measurable goals for therapy, focused training on verbal tasks.  
  
METRIC CALCULATION:  
1. Missing points: 4 (Medications management, year mistake, adaptive techniques insight, comprehensive cognitive involvement)  
2. Unsupported statements: 0 (All statements are supported by conversation)  
3. Inconsistencies: 1 (Incorrect reporting of current year issue overlooked in plan)  
4. Vague/generic documentation: 2 (General mention of "health issues", lack of detail on technological training specifics)  
5. Improper terms/formatting errors: 1 (Misuse of punctuation and grammar in history)  
  
SECTION SCORING:  
- \*\*Subjective Section\*\*: 8/10  
 - Deductions: Missing information (-1.5 points)  
- \*\*Objective Section\*\*: 9/10  
 - Deductions: Missed observations (-1 point)  
- \*\*Assessment Section\*\*: 9/10  
 - Deductions: Missing comprehensive assessment (-1 point)  
- \*\*Plan Section\*\*: 8/10  
 - Deductions: Missing specific goals and focused training (-2 points)  
  
TOTAL DEDUCTIONS: 5.5 points  
  
CAPS APPLICATION:  
 - Comprehensiveness: Captured 11 of 15 conversation points (73.3%) → Cap at 6/10  
 - Accuracy: 0 Unsupported statements  
 - Specificity: Generic documentation exists → Cap at 7/10  
  
FINAL SCORE CALCULATION:  
- SOAP Note Score = MIN(10, 10 - 5.5, lowest\_section\_score + 2, 6, 7)  
- Calculation = MIN(10, 4.5, 8+2, 6, 7) = 6  
  
Final Rating: 6/10  
  
The rating reflects the need for more comprehensive details on the patient's capabilities and task performances, as well as stronger focus and alignment in creating measurable and goal-directed therapy plans.