

M and H Medicals Ltd

Dr Malkani's Clinic

Inspection report

First floor, 22 Harley Street
London W1G 9PL

Tel: 0207 580 2205

Website: <https://malkanihairinstitute.com/>

Date of inspection visit: 5 March 2019

Date of publication: 16/04/2019

Overall summary

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection on 5 March 2019 to ask the service the following key questions; Are services safe, effective, caring, responsive and well-led?

Our findings were:

Are services safe?

We found that this service was providing safe care in accordance with the relevant regulations.

Are services effective?

We found that this service was providing effective care in accordance with the relevant regulations.

Are services caring?

We found that this service was providing caring services in accordance with the relevant regulations.

Are services responsive?

We found that this service was providing responsive care in accordance with the relevant regulations.

Are services well-led?

We found that this service was providing well-led care in accordance with the relevant regulations.

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory

functions. This inspection was planned to check whether the service was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

Dr Malkani's Clinic provides surgical hair transplant procedures for both men and women.

This service is registered with CQC under the Health and Social Care Act 2008 in respect of the provision of advice or treatment by, or under the supervision of, a medical practitioner, including the prescribing of medicines.

The owner is the registered manager. 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.

Eleven patients provided feedback about the service. All the comments we received were positive about the service, for example describing the doctor as brilliant and skilful.

Our key findings were:

- The clinician was aware of current evidence based guidance and had the skills and knowledge to deliver effective care and treatment.
- The provider had systems in place to protect people from avoidable harm and abuse.

Summary of findings

- The provider had effective systems in place to record, monitor, analyse and share learning from significant events.
- The service had arrangements in place to respond to medical emergencies.
- There was a clear vision to provide a personalised, high quality service.

Dr Rosie Benneyworth BM BS BMedSci MRCGP

Chief Inspector of Primary Medical Services and Integrated Care

Dr Malkani's Clinic

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

Dr Malkani provides surgical hair transplant procedures for both men and women over 18 years of age. The service is situated within a cosmetic hair treatment clinic which is not registered as they do not provide any regulated services. Referrals are received from this clinic. Patients can book appointments by telephone, email or in person.

The service is open 9am to 5pm Monday to Friday and 9am to 1pm on occasional Saturdays. Patients are asked to book an appointment by telephone between 9am and 5pm.

The service estimates that it carries out 2-3 procedures a week.

Patient facilities are provided on the first floor of the building. The staff team include business manager, the lead doctor and two part-time technicians who work when needed.

The provider is registered with CQC to carry out regulated activities of Treatment of disease, disorder and injury and Diagnostic and screening.

We carried out this inspection on 5 March 2019. The inspection team comprised of a CQC inspector and a GP specialist advisor.

Before visiting, we reviewed a range of information we hold about the service and asked the practice to send us some information about the service which we also reviewed.

During our visit we:

- Spoke with the lead surgeon and the business manager.
- Reviewed comment cards where patients had shared their views and experiences of the service in the days running up to the inspection.
- Reviewed documentary evidence relating to the service and inspected the facilities, equipment and security arrangements.
- We reviewed a number of patient records alongside the doctor. We do this to understand how the service assessed and documented patients' needs, consent and any treatment required.

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 formed the framework for the areas we looked at during the inspection.

Are services safe?

Our findings

We found that this service was providing safe services in accordance with the relevant regulations.

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. Staff received safety information from the service as part of their induction and refresher training. The service had systems to safeguard vulnerable adults from abuse. Policies were regularly reviewed and were accessible to all staff. They outlined clearly who to go to for further guidance.
- 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.
- The service maintained appropriate standards of cleanliness and hygiene. The premises were cleaned on a daily basis and we saw cleaning schedules and monitoring systems were in place. There were infection prevention and control protocols which were implemented and reviewed. Staff had received up to date training on these protocols. The provider disposed of clinical waste appropriately.
- The landlord had a range of health and safety and environmental policies in place. The service displayed a

health and safety poster with contact details of health and safety representatives who staff could contact if they had any concerns. Health and safety risk assessments for the premises had been carried out including a legionella risk assessment. Fire safety equipment was regularly tested.

- All electrical and clinical equipment was checked and calibrated to ensure it was safe to use and was in good working order.

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. The provider had identified that they needed a practice manager to focus on the day to day operations and was in the process of recruiting one.
- 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 to cover all potential liabilities.

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.
- The service had a system in place to retain medical records in line with DHSC guidance
- Clinicians made appropriate and timely referrals in line with protocols and up to date evidence-based guidance.

Safe and appropriate use of medicines

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

Are services safe?

- The systems and arrangements for managing medicines, including emergency medicines and equipment minimised risks.
- The service kept prescription stationery securely and monitored its use.
- 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 protects patient safety.

Track record on safety

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

There were systems in place for identifying, investigating and learning from safety incidents. The practice had a clear definition of a 'serious incident' which staff were required to report. It had also encouraged staff to report less serious incidents which might lead to improvement. Action and learning arising from incidents was also reviewed at practice meetings to which all staff were invited. However, the provider has not had any incidents since the clinic opened in April 2017.

The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. The service had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents.

When there were unexpected or unintended safety incidents:

- The provider told us they would give affected people reasonable support, truthful information and a verbal and written apology.
- They kept written records in patients' notes of verbal interactions as well as written correspondence.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

We found that this service was providing effective services in accordance with the relevant regulations.

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).

- Patients' immediate and ongoing needs were fully assessed. Where appropriate this included their clinical needs and their mental and physical wellbeing.
- We saw no evidence of discrimination when making care and treatment decisions.
- Staff assessed and managed patients' pain where appropriate.

Monitoring care and treatment

The service had systems in place to monitor the quality of care and treatment such as peer review of work, discussion of complex cases and monitoring of infection rates. Further, the practice had undertaken audits in relation to gender and hair transplant techniques and the average time taken to carry out hair transplant surgery. The provider told us that as there are various risks involved when using local anaesthetics, they needed to ensure the procedure was carried out in as reasonable time as possible. The results of the first audit showed the average time taken was within the recommended guidelines, however they said they would still aim to reduce the time or at the very least maintain it. These audits would be repeated every six months.

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 professionals were registered with the General Medical Council (GMC) and were up to date with revalidation.

- 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

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, NHS health services.
- Before providing treatment, the doctor ensured they had adequate knowledge of the patient's health, any relevant test results and their medicines history. We saw examples of patients being 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.
- Where patients agreed to share their information, we saw evidence of letters sent to their registered GP in line with GMC guidance.
- 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 have 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.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

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.
- The service monitored the process for seeking consent appropriately.

Are services caring?

Our findings

We found that this service was providing caring services in accordance with the relevant regulations.

Kindness, respect and compassion

Staff treated patients with kindness, respect and compassion.

- Feedback from patients was positive about the way staff treat people
- 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 told about multi-lingual staff who might be able to support them. Information leaflets were available in easy read formats, to help patients be involved in decisions about their care.
- Patients told us through comment cards, that they felt listened to and supported by staff and had sufficient time during consultations to make an informed decision about the choice of treatment available to them.
- Staff communicated with people in a way that they could understand, for example, communication aids and easy read materials were available.

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?

(for example, to feedback?)

Our findings

We found that this service was providing responsive services in accordance with the relevant regulations.

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.
- The facilities and premises were appropriate for the services delivered.

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 and treatment.

- Waiting times, delays and cancellations were minimal and managed appropriately.
- Patients reported that the appointment system was easy to use.
- Referrals and transfers to other services were undertaken in a timely way. For example, if the surgeon found a patient was unsuitable for the procedure they would refer them to a non-surgical service.

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.

- The service had a complaints policy and procedures in place.
- Information about how to make a complaint or raise concerns was available. However, the provider had not received any complaints to date.

Are services well-led?

(for example, are they well-managed and do senior leaders listen, learn and take appropriate action?)

Our findings

We found that this service was providing well-led services in accordance with the relevant regulations

Leadership capacity and capability;

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

- Leadership were knowledgeable about issues and priorities relating to the quality and future of services. They understood the challenges and were addressing them.
- Leadership was visible and approachable and 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, including planning for the future leadership of the service.

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.
- Leadership acted on behaviour and performance consistent with the vision and values.
- The provider was aware of and had systems to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour.

- Staff we spoke with told us they were able to 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 in the last year. Staff were supported to meet the requirements of professional revalidation where necessary. Clinical staff were considered valued members of the team. They were given protected time for professional time for professional development and evaluation of their clinical work.
- 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. Staff felt they were treated equally.

Governance arrangements

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

- 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.
- Leadership had established proper policies, procedures and activities to ensure safety and assured themselves that they were operating as intended.

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. The leader had oversight of safety alerts, incidents, and complaints.
- There was some evidence of action to change services to improve quality. For example, the provider had

Are services well-led?

(for example, are they well-managed and do senior leaders listen, learn and take appropriate action?)

decided to send emails to patients for feedback a few days after the surgery rather than giving them a questionnaire on the day. The provider told us this was to allow patients to give feedback from the comfort of their own home and after a period of reflection.

- 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.
- 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 robust arrangements in line with data security standards for the availability, integrity and confidentiality of patient identifiable data, records and data management systems.

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.

- We saw evidence of feedback opportunities for staff and how the findings were fed back to staff. We also saw staff engagement in responding to these findings.
- We also saw evidence of changes made as a result of feedback from patients.
- The service was transparent, collaborative and open with stakeholders about performance.

Continuous improvement and innovation

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

- There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement. The provider had been a medical expert witness for the GMC since January 2018.
- The service made use of internal and external reviews of incidents and complaints. Learning was shared and used to make improvements.

Leadership encouraged staff to take time out to review individual and team objectives, processes and performance.