

## SPSO decision report

**Case:** 201901870, Tayside NHS Board  
**Sector:** Health  
**Subject:** Clinical treatment / diagnosis  
**Decision:** upheld, recommendations

### Summary

C had been seeking treatment for urinary incontinence but said they experienced significant delays and were asked to attend unnecessary appointments. C also raised concerns about the standard of communication and treatment decisions during this period. C told us that they had been unable to work as a result of the failings.

We took independent advice from a consultant urological surgeon (a doctor who specialises in the male and female urinary tract, and the male reproductive organs). We found that when C was referred to gynaecology (specialists in the female reproductive system), no surgical options had been available for the treatment of urinary incontinence in the health board area for a number of years and that this was not explained to C until 21 months after referral, despite C having seen at least two gynaecologists by that time. We also found a lack of organisation in terms of staff identifying and communicating the treatment options available to C and putting a treatment plan in place from an early stage. Therefore, we upheld C's complaint.

### Recommendations

What we asked the organisation to do in this case:

- Apologise to C for failing to provide them with a reasonable standard of care and treatment. The apology should meet the standards set out in the SPSO guidelines on apology available at [www.spsso.org.uk/information-leaflets](http://www.spsso.org.uk/information-leaflets).

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

- Ensure communication by healthcare professionals is of a reasonable standard and meets the relevant guidelines.

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.