

**SUMMARY of the Decision of the Inquiries, Complaints and Reports Committee
(the Committee)**

Information about the complaints process and the Committee is available at:
<https://www.cpso.on.ca/Public/Services/Complaints>

**Dr. Ngoc Binh Van (CPSO #93752)
(the Respondent)**

INTRODUCTION

The Complainant contacted the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario (the College) to express concern about the Respondent's care. The Complainant took his young children, the Patients, to an urgent care clinic for treatment of warts on their hands and feet. The Respondent was the physician who saw the Patients and provided treatment for their warts with liquid nitrogen.

COMPLAINANT'S CONCERNS

The Complainant is concerned on behalf of the Patients while attending an urgent care clinic that the Respondent failed to properly apply liquid nitrogen to the Patient's warts, resulting in large painful blisters.

COMMITTEE'S DECISION

A Family Practice Panel of the Committee considered this matter at its meeting of August 15, 2018. The Committee required the Respondent to complete a specified continuing remediation and education program (SCERP) with respect to deficiencies in medical record-keeping and relating to CanMEDS role of Communicator (Record-Keeping) consisting of:

- Course in Medical Record Keeping through a course provider acceptable to the College
- Self-study to review and provide written summary of the College's policy, *Medical Records* (#4-12)
- Reassessment six (6) months following completion of the education program to include among other things chart review of 20 charts by an assessor selected by the College.

COMMITTEE'S ANALYSIS

It was acceptable for the Respondent to treat the Patients' warts with liquid nitrogen. Blistering and pain are common side effects of liquid nitrogen treatment. Complications of pain, swelling, and blistering can reasonably be anticipated from liquid nitrogen therapy (thermal injury to the skin) and the fact that these complications occur does not indicate negligence on the part of the treating physician.

The Committee did not take issue with the Respondent's choice of treatment but was concerned about his documentation of the care he provided. The Committee did not find

reassuring the Respondent's explanation for using templates to document his clinical notes, in particular because, while the Respondent documented cardiac and respiratory examinations of both patients, he failed to document the main reason for the Patients' visit, the location and number of warts treated, parental consent to treatment, and the treatment plan.

Given its concerns about the significant shortcomings in the Respondent's record-keeping, and also taking into consideration a concurrent, similar complaint, as well as the Respondent's history with the College, the Committee determined that a SCERP was warranted in this case.