International Scholars Journals

International Journal of Medical sociology and Anthropology , ISSN 2756-3820+non, Vol. 14 (2), pp. , June, 2024.
Available Online at www.internationalscholarsjournals.com © International Scholars Journals

Short Communication

The effects of biomedicalization on patient care and societal health practices

Robert Calvin*

Department of Medical Humanities, University of Chile, Santiago, Chile.

Received: 27-May-2024, Manuscript No. IJMSA-24-142086; Editor assigned: 30-May-2024, Pre QC No. IJMSA-24-142086 (PQ); Reviewed: 14-Jun-2024, QC No. IJMSA-24-142086; Revised: 21-Jun-2024, Manuscript No. IJMSA-24-142086 (R); Published: 28-Jun-2024

DESCRIPTION

Biomedicalization is increasing influence of biomedical knowledge, technologies, and perspectives on various aspects of society, particularly related to health and healthcare practices. Biomedicalization refers to the process of increasing the impact of medicine for solving social or non-medical problems. For instance, diseases such as obesity, aging, and mental health are increasingly viewed and managed through biological perspectives, which frequently results in the preference for medical treatments over social or psychological ones (Bassilios et al., 2017). Advances in biomedical technology, such as genetic testing, imaging techniques, and biomedical engineering, have transformed diagnosis, treatment, and prevention strategies. These technologies not only enhance medical capabilities but also influence societal attitudes towards health and illness by providing new ways to know and manage health conditions (Kinchin et al., 2016).

The production and dissemination of biomedical knowledge through research, pharmaceutical development, and medical education have significantly increased. This information affects cultural norms around healthcare practices as well as individual health behaviors and the public's perception of health and illness (Malla et al., 2016). Biomedicalization is closely related to the commercialization of health, where pharmaceutical companies, medical device manufacturers, and healthcare providers play increasingly significant roles in influencing health-related practices and policies. This commercial influence can impact access to healthcare services and the prioritization of medical interventions over other forms of health promotion (McGorry, 2019).

The impact of biomedicalization on societal health practices is multifaceted and can be examined from several perspectives. Biomedicalization often promotes individual responsibility for health outcomes, focusing on preventive measures and obeying medical advice (Richardson et al., 2017). This can lead to increased awareness of personal health risks and the adoption of healthier lifestyles but may also contribute to medicalization of everyday life. In healthcare systems influenced by biomedicalization, Prioritizing medical interventions and technical advancements over comprehensive approaches to health is a common inclination. This can result in neglecting of social determinants and an excessive focus on biological remedies of health, such as housing, education, and income, which are important for managing health inequities (Rickwood et al., 2019).

Health policy is impacted by biomedicalization, which prioritizes pharmaceuticals and advances in medicine as the main ways to solve health issues. This may have an impact on choices made about insurance coverage, financing for healthcare, and regulatory structures, which may exclude non-biomedical ideas of health and disease. Biomedicalization has a significant impact on the public's perception of health and illness because it promotes biomedical knowledge as the main structure for interpreting health-related concerns (Sundberg et al., 2021). This has the potential to change cultural norms around appropriate treatment and intervention modalities as well as attitudes toward complementary or alternative healthcare methods. The ethical implications of biomedicalization include concerns about medicalization of normal human conditions, disparities in access to advanced biomedical technologies, and the influence of commercial interests on healthcare practices. These issues raise concerns about equity, justice, and the appropriate balance between medical interventions and social determinants of health (Thomee et al., 2016).

The biomedical model can reduce complex health issues to biological mechanisms, potentially overlooking socio-cultural factors that contribute to health and illness. Everyday behaviors and experiences may be medicalized, leading to over diagnosis and overtreatment, particularly in areas where medical solutions may not be the most appropriate or effective (Waenerlund et al., 2020). Biomedicalization can exacerbate health inequities by prioritizing advanced medical technologies and treatments that may not be accessible or affordable to all populations (Wissow et al., 2021).

The raise of biomedical information, tools, and attitudes as essential to comprehending and treating health and illness has resulted in a fundamental transformation of society health practices through biomedicalization. It presents issues with equality, ethics, and creating a balance between medical interventions and socioeconomic determinants of health, even while it has resulted in

*Corresponding author.Robert Calvin, Email: robertcl999@gmail.com

amazing advances in medical science and healthcare delivery. Promoting health equity, encouraging integrative approaches to healthcare, and meeting the many health requirements of populations worldwide require an understanding of and critical evaluation of the effects of biomedicalization.

REFERENCES

1. Bassilios B, Telford N, Rickwood D, Spittal MJ, Pirkis J (2017). Complementary primary mental health programs for young people in Australia: Access to Allied Psychological Services (ATAPS) and headspace. Int J Ment Health Syst. 11(1):1-11.
2. Kinchin I, Tsey K, Heyeres M, Cadet-James Y (2016). Systematic review of youth mental health service integration research. Aust J Prim Health. 22(4): 304-315.
3. Malla A, Iyer S, McGorry P, Cannon M, Coughlan H, Singh S, Jones P, et al (2016). From early intervention in psychosis to youth mental health reform: A review of the evolution and transformation of mental health services for young people. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol. 51(3):319-326.
4. McGorry P (2019). Building the momentum and blueprint for reform in youth mental health. Lancet Psychiatry. 6(6):459-461.
5. Richardson LP, McCarty CA, Radovic A, Suleiman AB (2017). Research in the integration of behavioral health for adolescents and young adults in primary care settings: A systematic review. J Adolesc Health. 60(3):261-269.
6. Rickwood D, Paraskakis M, Quin D, Hobbs N, Ryall V, Trethowan J, McGorry P (2019). Australia's innovation in youth mental health care: The headspace centre model. Early Interv Psychiatry. 13(1):159-166.
7. Sundberg LR, Christianson M, Wiklund M, Hurtig AK, Goicolea I (2021). How can we strengthen mental health services in Swedish youth clinics? A health policy and systems study protocol. BMJ Open. 11(10):e048922.
8. Thomee S, Malm D, Christianson M, Hurtig AK, Wiklund M, Waenerlund AK, Goicolea I (2016). Challenges and strategies for sustaining youth-friendly health services - a qualitative study from the perspective of professionals at youth clinics in northern Sweden. Reprod Health. 13(1):147.
9. Waenerlund AK, San Sebastian M, Hurtig AK, Wiklund M, Christianson M, Goicolea I (2020). Assessing the youth-friendliness of youth clinics in northern Sweden: A survey analyzing the perspective of the youth. BMC Health Serv Res. 13(1):159-166.
10. Wissow LS, Platt R, Sarvet B (2021). Policy recommendations to promote integrated mental health care for children and youth. Acad Pediatr. 21(3):401-407.