

## SPSO decision report

**Case:** 201400430, Greater Glasgow and Clyde NHS Board - Acute Services Division  
**Sector:** health  
**Subject:** clinical treatment / diagnosis  
**Outcome:** not upheld, no recommendations

### Summary

Mr C's son (Master A) was diagnosed with epilepsy in 2013, and was being treated by a consultant neurologist from another NHS board. In January 2014 Master A was having significant episodes, and Mr C's GP contacted hospitals in both NHS boards for advice. The GP received some conflicting advice as, because of his age, Master A was regarded by some services as an adult and by others as a child. The Southern General Hospital said that they dealt with adults and advised the GP to contact the board's children's hospital, but the GP did not do so as they understood that the children's hospital only dealt with younger patients. The board's response to Mr C's complaint indicated that had the GP contacted that hospital, Master A would have been seen there. However, he was not taken to hospital at that time.

Master A's condition did not improve and four days later Mr C took him to A&E at the Southern General Hospital. Master A was assessed and examined, and diagnosed with hyperventilation (abnormally fast breathing), but was not found to have had a seizure. He was discharged without treatment and was told to go to his GP and his consultant neurologist for follow-up (he already had an appointment scheduled with the consultant). Mr C was not satisfied with this and complained to the board about a lack of neurology service. He was dissatisfied with their responses and with the time taken to investigate his concerns.

Our investigation included taking independent medical advice from one of our advisers, who is an A&E consultant. We found that staff assessed and examined Master A appropriately, and that their decisions about discharging him were clinically reasonable. It did take some time for the board to respond to the complaints, but these were complex and involved consulting staff from various departments. For the most part Mr C was kept informed of the progress of the investigation and the timescales set out in NHS Scotland guidance on complaints handling were met. On one occasion this did not happen and we brought this to the board's attention, but we did not uphold Mr C's complaints.