

The Taktouk Clinic

Inspection report

56 Knightsbridge Court,
12 Sloane Street
London
SW1X 9LJ
Tel: 02072357198
www.drwassimtaktouk.com

Date of inspection visit: 22 March 2023
Date of publication: 03/05/2023

This report describes our judgement of the quality of care at this service. It is based on a combination of what we found when we inspected, information from our ongoing monitoring of data about services and information given to us from the provider, patients, the public and other organisations.

Ratings

Overall rating for this location		Good	
Are services safe?		Good	
Are services effective?		Good	
Are services caring?		Good	
Are services responsive to people's needs?		Good	
Are services well-led?		Good	

Overall summary

This service is rated as Good overall.

The key questions are rated as:

Are services safe? – Good

Are services effective? – Good

Are services caring? – Good

Are services responsive? – Good

Are services well-led? – Good

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at The Taktouk Clinic as part of our inspection programme.

The service is an independent health clinic which specialises in aesthetic medicine and dermatology.

This service is registered with CQC under the Health and Social Care Act 2008 in respect of some, but not all, of the services it provides. There are some exemptions from regulation by CQC which relate to particular types of regulated activities and services and these are set out in Schedule 1 and Schedule 2 of The Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. The Taktouk Clinic provides a range of non-surgical cosmetic interventions, for example anti-wrinkle injections and dermal fillers which are not within CQC scope of registration. Therefore, we did not inspect or report on these services. Our report covers the inspection of thread lifts (a surgical procedure) and the treatment of migraines, hyperhidrosis and masseter hypertrophy with injectables.

The lead GP and a patient coordinator are the registered managers. A registered manager is a person who is registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. Like registered providers, they are 'registered persons'. Registered persons have legal responsibility for meeting the requirements in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and associated Regulations about how the service is run.

Feedback received by the provider about the service was positive and indicated that patients were treated with kindness and respect and staff were knowledgeable and professional.

Our key findings were:

- The service had systems to manage risk so that safety incidents were less likely to happen. When they did happen, the provider learned from them and improved their processes.
- The service reviewed the effectiveness and appropriateness of the care provided. There was evidence of quality improvement activity.
- The service had systems and processes in place to ensure that patients were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- Patients were able to access care and treatment within an appropriate timescale for their needs.
- The service had systems in place to collect and analyse feedback from patients.
- There was a clear leadership structure to support good governance and management.

The areas where the provider **should** make improvements are:

Overall summary

- Improve the system to verify the identity of all patients.

Dr Sean O’Kelly BSc MB ChB MSc DCH FRCA

Chief Inspector of Hospitals and Interim Chief Inspector of Primary Medical Services

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by a CQC lead inspector. The team included a GP specialist advisor who spoke with staff and completed clinical records reviews.

Background to The Taktouk Clinic

The provider, W.T Skin Ltd, provides private aesthetic medicine and dermatology services from the following location in London:

- The Taktouk Clinic, 56 Knightsbridge Court, 12 Sloane Street, London SW1X 9LJ

The location was registered with CQC in August 2021 to provide the regulated activities of Surgical procedures and Treatment of disease, disorder or injury.

The service is a private clinic which specialises in aesthetic medicine and dermatology. Our report covers the inspection of thread lifts (a surgical procedure) and the treatment of migraines, hyperhidrosis and masseter hypertrophy with injectables. The service is available to individuals aged 18 years and over.

The service is open Monday to Friday from 9.30am to 6pm. Appointments can be booked over the telephone or in person.

Details of the service are set out on the website - www.drwassimtaktouk.com

Staff comprise of four medical doctors, a dentist (who offers aesthetic medical treatments only), a patient coordinator, and a clinic manager.

How we inspected this service

This inspection was carried out in a way which enabled us to spend a minimum amount of time on site. This was with consent from the provider and in line with all data protection and information governance requirements.

This included:

- Requesting evidence from the provider.
- Conducting staff interviews with a registered manager and a non-clinical staff member.
- A site visit to review a sample of service user records and consultations and an interview with one of the clinic doctors (a GP) to discuss the findings.

To get to the heart of patients' experiences of care and treatment, we always ask the following five questions:

- Is it safe?
- Is it effective?
- Is it caring?
- Is it responsive to people's needs?
- Is it well-led?

These questions therefore formed the framework for the areas we looked at during the inspection.

Are services safe?

We rated safe as Good because:

Safety systems and processes

The service had clear systems to keep people safe and safeguarded from abuse.

- The provider conducted safety risk assessments. It had appropriate safety policies, which were regularly reviewed and communicated to staff. They outlined clearly who to go to for further guidance. Staff received safety information from the service as part of their induction and refresher training. The service had systems to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse.
- The practice treated patients aged 18 years and over.
- The service worked with other agencies to support patients and protect them from neglect and abuse. Staff took steps to protect patients from abuse, neglect, harassment, discrimination and breaches of their dignity and respect.
- The provider carried out staff checks at the time of recruitment and on an ongoing basis where appropriate. Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks were undertaken where required. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- All staff received up-to-date safeguarding and safety training appropriate to their role. They knew how to identify and report concerns. Staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a DBS check.
- There was an effective system to manage infection prevention and control including annual audits. Legionella risk assessments and maintenance were undertaken by the provider.
- The provider ensured that facilities and equipment were safe and that equipment was maintained according to manufacturers' instructions. There were systems for safely managing healthcare waste.
- The provider carried out appropriate environmental risk assessments which took into account the profile of people using the service and those who may be accompanying them.

Risks to patients

There were systems to assess, monitor and manage risks to patient safety.

- There were arrangements for planning and monitoring the number and mix of staff needed.
- There was an effective induction system for staff tailored to their role.
- Staff understood their responsibilities to manage emergencies and to recognise those in need of urgent medical attention.
- When there were changes to services or staff the service assessed and monitored the impact on safety.
- There were appropriate indemnity arrangements in place.
- There were suitable medicines and equipment to deal with medical emergencies which were stored appropriately and checked regularly.

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

Staff had the information they needed to deliver safe care and treatment to patients.

- Individual care records were written and managed in a way that kept patients safe. The care records we saw showed that information needed to deliver safe care and treatment was available to relevant staff in an accessible way.
- The service had systems for sharing information with staff and other agencies to enable them to deliver safe care and treatment.

Are services safe?

- The service had a system in place to retain medical records in line with Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) guidance in the event that they cease trading.

Safe and appropriate use of medicines

The service had systems for appropriate and safe handling of medicines.

- The systems and arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and equipment minimised risks.
- The lead GP informed us there was minimal prescribing. The service kept prescription stationery securely and monitored its use. The service carried out regular medicines audit to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing.
- The service does not prescribe Schedule 2 and 3 controlled drugs (medicines that have the highest level of control due to their risk of misuse and dependence). Neither did they prescribe schedule 4 or 5 controlled drugs.
- Staff prescribed, administered or supplied medicines to patients and gave advice on medicines in line with legal requirements and current national guidance. Processes were in place for checking medicines and staff kept accurate records of medicines. Where there was a different approach taken from national guidance there was a clear rationale for this that protected patient safety.
- The service implemented an 'age verification policy' whereby photographic identification was requested if there were concerns that the patient was under the age of 18 years. If the patient refused to offer identification then treatment would be refused. Identity verification documents were not routinely requested for new patients registering at the service.

Track record on safety and incidents

The service had a good safety record.

- There were comprehensive risk assessments in relation to safety issues.
- The service monitored and reviewed activity. This helped it to understand risks and gave a clear, accurate and current picture that led to safety improvements.

Lessons learned and improvements made

The service learned and made improvements when things went wrong.

- There was a system for recording and acting on significant events. Staff understood their duty to raise concerns and report incidents and near misses. Leaders and managers supported them when they did so.
- There were adequate systems for reviewing and investigating when things went wrong. The service learned, shared lessons and took action to improve safety in the service. For example, there was evidence of action taken and lessons learned following a near miss when a patient used a faulty door handle.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. The provider encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The service had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents.

When there were unexpected or unintended safety incidents:

- The service gave affected people reasonable support, truthful information and a verbal or written apology.
- They kept written records of verbal interactions as well as written correspondence.

Are services safe?

- The service acted on and learned from external safety events as well as patient and medicine safety alerts. The service had an effective mechanism in place to disseminate alerts to all members of the team including sessional staff.

Are services effective?

We rated effective as Good because:

Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

The provider had systems to keep clinicians up to date with current evidence based practice. We saw evidence that clinicians assessed needs and delivered care and treatment in line with current legislation, standards and guidance (relevant to their service).

- The provider assessed needs and delivered care in line with relevant and current evidence based guidance and standards such as the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) best practice guidelines.
- The doctors had undergone specialist training in their various specialities of aesthetic medicine and dermatology. They maintained up to date knowledge and practice and discussed the latest techniques and treatments at staff meetings.
- Patients' immediate and ongoing needs were fully assessed. As part of the information gathering process, patients were asked about what they wanted to achieve through the procedure sought and their reasons. The doctor would assess whether the patient's expectations were reasonable and the treatment appropriate. Mental capacity and psychological state of the patient were assessed including screening for Body dysmorphic disorder (BDD) (a mental health condition where a person spends a lot of time worrying about flaws in their appearance). The provider could decline to provide the procedure where it was deemed inappropriate or potentially harmful to the patient or where treatment was unlikely to be effective. All staff had undergone training in relation to the Mental Capacity Act.
- If a treatment was agreed upon the doctor would explain the procedure including any associated risks, side effects and the likelihood of a beneficial outcome. Patients were informed of the fees and there was a cooling off period prior to treatment to allow patients time to consider their options and the information provided.
- We saw no evidence of discrimination when making care and treatment decisions.
- Arrangements were in place to ensure that repeat patients were advised and treated appropriately.
- Staff assessed and managed patients' pain where appropriate.

Monitoring care and treatment

The service was actively involved in quality improvement activity.

- The service used information about care and treatment to make improvements. The service made improvements through the use of completed audits. Clinical audit had a positive impact on quality of care and outcomes for patients. For example, there were audits to review treatment outcomes following hyperhidrosis treatment.

Effective staffing

Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to carry out their roles.

- All staff were appropriately qualified. The provider had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff.
- Relevant medical professionals were registered with the General Medical Council (GMC) or General Dental Council (GDC).
- The provider understood the learning needs of staff and provided protected time and training to meet them. Up to date records of skills, qualifications and training were maintained. Staff were encouraged and given opportunities to develop.

Coordinating patient care and information sharing

Are services effective?

Staff worked together, and worked well with other organisations, to deliver effective care and treatment.

- Patients received coordinated and person-centred care. Staff referred to and communicated effectively with other services when appropriate. For example, with a patient's NHS or regular GP if the patient consented to this.
- Before providing treatment, doctors at the service ensured they had adequate knowledge of the patient's health, any relevant test results and their medicines history. Patients were signposted to more suitable sources of treatment where this information was not available to ensure safe care and treatment.
- All patients were asked for consent to share details of their consultation and any medicines prescribed with their registered GP on each occasion they used the service.
- Patient information was shared appropriately (this included when patients moved to other professional services), and the information needed to plan and deliver care and treatment was available to relevant staff in a timely and accessible way. There were clear and effective arrangements for following up on people who had been referred to other services.

Supporting patients to live healthier lives

Staff were consistent and proactive in empowering patients and supporting them to manage their own health and maximise their independence.

- Where appropriate, staff gave people advice so they could self-care.
- Risk factors were identified, highlighted to patients and where appropriate highlighted to their normal care provider for additional support.
- Where patients needs could not be met by the service, staff redirected them to the appropriate service for their needs.

Consent to care and treatment

The service obtained consent to care and treatment in line with legislation and guidance.

- Staff understood the requirements of legislation and guidance when considering consent and decision making.
- Staff supported patients to make decisions. Where appropriate, they assessed and recorded a patient's mental capacity to make a decision.

Are services caring?

We rated caring as Good because:

Kindness, respect and compassion

Staff treated patients with kindness, respect and compassion.

- The service sought feedback on the quality of clinical care patients received. All patients were asked to provide feedback about the quality of care they had received. Patients were also contacted following the procedure to check on how they were progressing.
- Feedback from patients was highly positive about the care and treatment they received and the way they were treated by staff.
- Staff understood patients' personal, cultural, social and religious needs. They displayed an understanding and non-judgmental attitude to all patients.
- The service gave patients timely support and information.

Involvement in decisions about care and treatment

Staff helped patients to be involved in decisions about care and treatment.

- Interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. Patients were also told about multi-lingual staff who might be able to support them. Information leaflets could be requested in easy read formats to help patients be involved in decisions about their care.
- Patient feedback received by the service showed patients felt listened to and supported by staff. Patients reported feeling at ease and cared for.
- Staff communicated with people in a way that they could understand, for example, communication aids and easy read materials were available if required.

Privacy and Dignity

The service respected patients' privacy and dignity.

- Staff recognised the importance of people's dignity and respect.
- Staff knew that if patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs.

Are services responsive to people's needs?

We rated responsive as Good because:

Responding to and meeting people's needs

The service organised and delivered services to meet patients' needs. It took account of patient needs and preferences.

- The provider understood the needs of their patients and improved services in response to those needs. For example, longer appointments were available for patients who required extra time.
- The facilities and premises were appropriate for the services delivered. The service was not accessible to wheelchair users as the premises contained a staircase to access the main clinic area. People were informed of this at the time of booking an appointment and staff could direct people to other local services with wheelchair access.
- At the time of inspection, the service did not have a hearing loop. Following our inspection, the service sent us evidence that a hearing loop had been purchased to assist patients and visitors who use a hearing aid.

Timely access to the service

Patients were able to access care and treatment from the service within an appropriate timescale for their needs.

- Patients had timely access to initial assessment, test results, diagnosis and treatment.
- Waiting times, delays and cancellations were minimal and managed appropriately.
- Patients with the most urgent needs had their care and treatment prioritised.
- Appointments could be made by telephone or in person. Patient feedback had not indicated any concerns about making appointments.
- Referrals and transfers to other services were undertaken in a timely way.

Listening and learning from concerns and complaints

The service took complaints and concerns seriously and responded to them appropriately to improve the quality of care.

- Information about how to make a complaint or raise concerns was available. Staff treated patients who made complaints compassionately.
- The service informed patients of any further action that may be available to them should they not be satisfied with the response to their complaint.
- The service had a complaints policy and procedures in place. The service learned lessons from individual concerns and complaints. It acted as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, learning points were identified to ensure equipment was operating as expected following a patient complaint about the efficacy of a treatment.

Are services well-led?

We rated well-led as Good because:

Leadership capacity and capability

Leaders had the capacity and skills to deliver high-quality, sustainable care.

- Leaders were knowledgeable about issues and priorities relating to the quality and future of services. They understood the challenges and were addressing them.
- Leaders at all levels were visible and approachable. They worked closely with staff and others to make sure they prioritised compassionate and inclusive leadership.
- The provider had effective processes to develop leadership capacity and skills.

Vision and strategy

The service had a clear vision and credible strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients.

- There was a clear vision and set of values. The service had a realistic strategy and supporting business plans to achieve priorities.
- The service developed its vision, values and strategy jointly with staff and external partners (where relevant).
- Staff were aware of and understood the vision, values and strategy and their role in achieving them.
- The service monitored progress against delivery of the strategy.

Culture

The service had a culture of high-quality sustainable care.

- Staff felt respected, supported and valued. They were proud to work for the service.
- The service focused on the needs of patients.
- Leaders and managers acted on behaviour and performance inconsistent with the vision and values.
- Openness, honesty and transparency were demonstrated when responding to incidents and complaints. The provider was aware of and had systems to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour.
- Staff told us they could raise concerns and were encouraged to do so. They had confidence that these would be addressed.
- There were processes for providing all staff with the development they need. This included appraisal and career development conversations. All staff received regular annual appraisals. Staff were supported to meet the requirements of professional revalidation where necessary.
- There was a strong emphasis on the safety and well-being of all staff.
- The service actively promoted equality and diversity. It identified and addressed the causes of any workforce inequality. Staff had received equality and diversity training.

Governance arrangements

There were clear responsibilities, roles and systems of accountability to support good governance and management.

Are services well-led?

- Structures, processes and systems to support good governance and management were clearly set out, understood and effective. The governance and management of partnerships, joint working arrangements and shared services promoted interactive and co-ordinated person-centred care.
- Staff were clear on their roles and accountabilities.
- Leaders had established proper policies, procedures and activities to ensure safety and assured themselves that they were operating as intended.
- The service used performance information which was reported and monitored and management and staff were held to account.
- The information used to monitor performance and the delivery of quality care was accurate and useful. There were plans to address any identified weaknesses.
- The service submitted data or notifications to external organisations as required.
- There were arrangements in line with data security standards for the availability, integrity and confidentiality of patient identifiable data, records and data management systems.

Managing risks, issues and performance

There were clear and effective processes for managing risks, issues and performance.

- There was an effective process to identify, understand, monitor and address current and future risks including risks to patient safety.
- The service had processes to manage current and future performance. Leaders had oversight of safety alerts, incidents, and complaints.
- Clinical audit had a positive impact on quality of care and outcomes for patients. There was clear evidence of action to change services to improve quality.
- The provider had plans in place and had trained staff for major incidents.

Appropriate and accurate information

The service acted on appropriate and accurate information.

- Quality and operational information was used to ensure and improve performance. Performance information was combined with the views of patients.
- Quality and sustainability were discussed in relevant meetings where all staff had sufficient access to information.

Engagement with patients, the public, staff and external partners

The service involved patients, the public, staff and external partners to support high-quality sustainable services.

- The service encouraged and heard views and concerns from the public, patients, staff and external partners and acted on them to shape services and culture. For example, the clinic website had been updated with treatment fees following a patient complaint.
- There were systems to support improvement and innovation work. For example, some of the doctors including the lead GP regularly lectured around their subject areas or were involved in the practical aspects of training other aesthetic medicine practitioners. The clinicians discussed latest techniques and treatments with their peer group.
- Staff could describe to us the systems in place to give feedback. We saw evidence of feedback opportunities for staff.
- The service was transparent, collaborative and open with stakeholders about performance.

Are services well-led?

Continuous improvement and innovation

There were systems and processes for learning, continuous improvement and innovation.

- There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement.
- The service made use of internal and external reviews of incidents and complaints. Learning was shared and used to make improvements.
- Leaders and managers encouraged staff to take time out to review individual and team objectives, processes and performance.
- The service had also won awards for patient care within the field of aesthetic medicine.