

Can You Trust Your Doctor?

Mendelsohn M*

Senior Marketing Consultant/Partner at High Density Hair Transplants, Athens, Greece

*Corresponding author: Mendelsohn M, Senior Marketing Consultant/Partner at High Density Hair Transplants, Athens, Greece, Tel: 02070992139; E-mail: mal@hdht.co.uk

Received date: December 09, 2016; Accepted date: December 15, 2016; Published date: December 22, 2016

Copyright: © 2016 Mendelsohn M. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Citation: Mendelsohn M (2016) Can You Trust Your Doctor? Hair Ther Transplant 6: e109. doi:10.4172/2167-0951.1000e109

Do You Really Trust Your Doctor?

When I was a teen I had an incredible Doctor. Incredible because he could balance the ash on the end of his cigarette until it was at least twice as long as the butt he kept constantly between his lips.

He was one of life's characters. He was a good doctor and I trusted him.

It wasn't until I entered the hair transplant Industry years later that my respect toward some of my 'learned friends' within my industry has diminished somewhat.

Who can blame me? (Mal)practice is rife in my industry!! They may well have named it after me! It's my 'pet' subject.

Nothing's change. The hair transplant industry is as littered by misinformation and misrepresentation as it ever was. In fact, I find myself right in the middle of it!! Let me explain....

Many people choose to have an F.U.E. (Follicular Unit Extraction) hair transplants based on price. Their priority used to be the Clinic and the 'teams' experience but these days it's predominantly the cost.

Then how do does one evaluate the cost when most prospective patients don't even realise that there are 2 entirely different ways of performing f.u.e. (follicular unit extraction)?

The 'legitimate' F.U.E. method is to 'select' the bigger grafts to give patient's as much density/volume as is possible.

The 'alternate' method is to scrap the 'selection' process entirely to save time. The single most valuable aspect of F.U.E. and these guys have 'binned it' and replaced it with a 3rd rate, low-cost version of the 'real' thing?

The 'Selection' Process

'Selection' is when the Doctor and his team scan the patient's scalp, wearing magnifying visors to locate and select the grafts with the bigger numbers 3/4 and 4/5 hair grafts and even 6 hair grafts. This ensures our patient's get the best density/volume results possible.

'Harvested' 4000 hairs using the 'selection' process would have used 1600 grafts and saved the patient 400 wasted grafts. 400 grafts equates to an estimated 1200 extra hairs.

'Density is King' to most patients. You only achieve density by selecting the high content grafts.

Which is why using the 'selection' process 2000 grafts can give patients up to 5200 hairs without graft 'wastage'. Then there's the 'Alternative' method. You may have noticed some of the clinics are advertising 2000 grafts=4000 hairs=£2000?

On the face of it, it sounds like great value for your money. Until you take a closer look at how they do it?

They've have scrapped the 'selection' process. The single most important aspect of the procedure that ensures their patient's achieving good density results. It's gone? Why?

The straight answer is to corner the market and to a degree, they've succeeded. Mostly because people assume that they do what everybody else does, but cheaper?

When the Reality is Very Different.

What they're doing is offering a 'watered-down' version of what the members of The I.S.H.R.S (International Society of Hair Restoration Surgeons) clinics offering AND it's loaded against their patient's best interests.

They have replaced the 'selection' process with predominantly single and 2 hair grafts, 'plucked' ad hoc from the patient's scalp. So their patient gets Lower density/volume result.

Their method of 'harvesting' donor grafts that can waste up to 400 grafts of an average 2000 graft procedure. Simply by using low-density single and 2 hair grafts.

Need a second procedure for 'thickening-up'? There goes another 400 wasted, valuable grafts?

So what at first looks like a great deal 2000 grafts=4000 hair=£2000 is not the value it first seemed?

Who could have envisaged a doctor offering their patient's a procedure they know only too well has had its most valuable assets stripped?

A procedure that can reduce their patient's density/volume results and can waste up to 20% of their patient's potential donor areas.

A procedure that can limit their patient's having further hair transplants. Simply by running out of 'wasted' donor grafts?