## **SPSO decision report**



Case:	201908351, Fife NHS Board
Sector:	Health
Subject:	Clinical treatment / diagnosis
Decision:	some upheld, recommendations

## Summary

C submitted a complaint on behalf of their late sibling (A) about the treatment A had received by the board over a five-month period. A had a mass in their abdomen which led to a referral to urology (specialists in the male and female urinary tract, and the male reproductive organs) and later gynaecology (specialists in the female reproductive systems). A was initially diagnosed with pedunculated fibroids (noncancerous growths in the uterus) but it was later found by a different health board that A had cancer. C considered that the treatment provided by the board was unreasonable and led to a delay in A receiving the correct diagnosis.

C complained that the board failed to reasonably diagnose A after they were referred by their GP. We took independent advice from a specialist. We considered that the initial investigations carried out were reasonable, however, after the MRI results were received, the board failed to reasonably respond to this. The MRI result did not match with A's clinical picture and we considered that there was an unreasonable failure that this was not recognised and steps taken to investigate it further in a reasonable timescale. We considered that there was a failure in clinical judgement relating to this. Therefore, we upheld this aspect of C's complaint.

C also complained that the board failed to provide reasonable treatment when A attended A&E. We took independent advice about this complaint. We found that the investigations carried out were reasonable; we noted that further actions could have been taken, but the lack thereof was not in itself unreasonable, given the remit of A&E to only deal with emergency presentations. On balance, we did not uphold this aspect of C's complaint.

## Recommendations

What we said should change to put things right in future:

• Where radiological findings do not fit with the clinical picture a further review should be undertaken.

In relation to complaints handling, we recommended:

• Complaint responses should be accurate and respond to each main point raised.

We have asked the organisation to provide us with evidence that they have implemented the recommendations we have made on this case by the deadline we set.