

Review of: "Biomedical and Healthtech Innovation: The Dilemma Between Purpose, Current Stakeholder Economics, and “Patient” Benefits / Desires — What Might the Future of Health Look Like?"

Patrick Chambers¹

¹ Torrance Memorial Medical Center

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is a timely topic, as incomes shrink and prices explode.

Healthcare bills are fast becoming the number one driver of individual bankruptcies.

The author does an excellent job highlighting the existing dilemma - emphasis on therapeutics over prevention.

Technology and pharmaceuticals dominate decisions and subsequent treatment. The patient has become merely an accessory. The emphasis is wisely centered on healthcare and healthspan v medical care and lifespan.

The author rightfully points out our increasing lifespan comes at the expense of ever more time in the dwindles (low HALE).

He argues that healthspan can best be addressed by a personalized focus on prevention. IMHO, this is the low-hanging fruit for improving healthspan. This approach has already been wildly successful in Nagasaki, which has replaced Okinawa as the longevity capital of Japan and the world with an emphasis on individual health and community health programs outside the more traditional approach - MD office, hospital, ...|. This is rather remarkable, given its urban v rural location and ionizing history. Holistic community healthcare in Japan uses food and supplementation to improve, maintain, and restore health with great success. The health span is 20 to 25 years longer than in the US.

Obesity is mentioned as a significant health hazard. It has many causes, not the least of which is lack of exercise and poor nutrition. But even given better dietary choices, we continue to choose poorly. This is largely an individual problem, or at least one that is under our immediate control, whether or not a stakeholder business model eventually appears. The author nicely links human health with environmental preservation. A healthy environment generally breeds healthier choices.

In summary, the author is to be commended for pushing this topic to the front burner. My only qualm is a slight shortfall in incentivizing the patient to help himself by re-evaluating his own choices.