

SUMMARY

Dr. John Bennett (CPSO# 54732)

1. Dispositions

On June 7, 2017, the Inquiries, Complaints and Reports Committee (“the Committee”) ordered diagnostic radiologist Dr. Bennett to complete a specified continuing education and remediation program (“SCERP”), and to attend the College to be cautioned with respect to his interpretation of the breast ultrasound in this case, his communication with the referring physician, and his failure to maintain expected Continuing Professional Development (CPD) (in terms of his failure to be aware of and to adhere to current acceptable guidelines in breast imaging). The SCERP requires Dr. Bennett to:

- complete the American College of Radiology (CAR) course – Breast Imaging Boot Camp;
- review and provide written summaries of the Canadian Association of Radiologists (CAR) *Practice Guideline on Breast Imaging and Intervention*, the College’s policy on *Medical Records*, and the College of Family Physicians of Canada and the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons October 2009 Guide to Enhancing Referrals and Consultations between Physicians;
- meet with a Clinical Supervisor acceptable to the College 8 times over 6 months (at which time the Supervisor will review a minimum of 20 cases of breast imaging to assess for the quality of documentation and reporting); and
- undergo reassessments of his practice by an assessor selected by the College approximately three and nine months following completion of the education program.

2. Introduction

A patient expressed concern about the care she received from Dr. Bennett in relation to a breast ultrasound he interpreted. The patient was diagnosed with stage III breast cancer two months

later, and was concerned that Dr. Bennett did not diagnose the malignancy when he completed his report of her ultrasound.

The Committee obtained an independent opinion (IO) from a diagnostic radiologist, opining on Dr. Bennett's care in this case. The IO provider concluded that Dr. Bennett's care did not meet the standard, that he displayed a lack of skill, knowledge and judgment in the practice of breast ultrasound, and that his deficiencies in this case placed the patient at risk of harm, resulting from a delay in a malignant diagnosis.

Dr. Bennett accepted the IO provider's report, and agreed that he had failed to properly classify the patient's case as suspicious, requiring biopsy. He advised that he reviewed the 2013 Canadian Association of Radiologists (CAR) standards of practice for breast imaging (referenced by the IO provider in her report), and acknowledged that he was not as familiar with them as he should have been. He noted that he had taken steps to improve his practice by registering for a course on breast ultrasounds.

3. Committee Process

A General Panel of the Committee, consisting of public and physician members, met to review the relevant records and documents related to the complaint. The Committee always has before it applicable legislation and regulations, along with policies that the College has developed, which reflect the College's professional expectations for physicians practising in Ontario. Current versions of these documents are available on the College's website at www.cpsso.on.ca, under the heading "Policies & Publications."

4. Committee's Analysis

The Committee noted that the IO provider's report revealed concerns in several important aspects of Dr. Bennett's care in this case, including his knowledge regarding/implementation of current guidelines, his interpretation of the patient's ultrasound, and the adequacy of his reporting.

The Committee concurred with the IO provider's statement that Dr. Bennett's deficiencies in this case placed the patient at risk, in terms of the delayed diagnosis of her aggressive breast cancer.

The Committee noted with concern that Dr. Bennett was the subject of a prior complaint regarding the adequacy of his report writing and that the Committee provided advice in that instance regarding the importance of ensuring that his reports are sufficiently detailed.

The Committee was satisfied that in light of the above, it was appropriate to caution Dr. Bennett and require him to complete education, as set out above.