

Commentary

The healthcare dilemma in market-driven and government-funded systems

Louis Gareth*

Department of Medicine, Uniformed Services University, Bethesda, USA

Received: 21-Aug-2023, Manuscript No. IJMSA-23-118032; Editor assigned: 24-Aug-2023, PreQC No. IJMSA-23-118032 (PQ); Reviewed: 08-Sep-2023, QC No. IJMSA-23-118032; Revised: 15-Sep-2023, Manuscript No. IJMSA-23-118032 (R); Published: 22-Sep-2023

DESCRIPTION

Healthcare is a complex and multifaceted system that plays a critical role in society. It encompasses a wide range of components, from healthcare facilities and providers to insurance and government regulations. The structure and socioeconomics of healthcare are intimately intertwined, influencing one another in profound ways (Celeste et al., 2020). The structure of healthcare systems varies significantly from one country to another. Various models exist, ranging from government-funded, single-payer systems to market-driven, private healthcare systems. These structural differences can have profound impacts on the accessibility, quality, and cost of healthcare services (Dahlgren et al., 2021).

In Single-Payer Model system, the government collects taxes to fund healthcare services for all citizens. The advantages of this model include universal coverage, cost control, and reduced administrative overhead. However, long wait times and potential for rationing can be drawbacks. In Socialized Medicine model, the government not only funds but also operates healthcare facilities and employs healthcare professionals. While this approach can ensure equity, it may suffer from inefficiency and bureaucracy (Khan et al., 2019).

Socioeconomic implications of healthcare structure

The structure of a healthcare system has profound socioeconomic implications, affecting individuals, communities, and the broader economy. In single-payer and universal systems, healthcare is often more accessible to all citizens. This reduces disparities in health outcomes based on income, race, or geographic location. For instance, the United Kingdom's National Health Service (NHS) provides comprehensive care to all residents regardless of their ability to pay, ensuring a high level of equity. However, systems that are driven by the market may lead to uneven access (Leake

et al., 2008). Those with high-quality insurance can access care promptly, while the uninsured or underinsured may delay treatment or go without essential services. This can lead to worse health outcomes for vulnerable populations. Healthcare structure also influences the quality of care. Single-payer systems often focus on cost containment, which can result in centralized decision-making and potentially longer wait times for elective procedures (Martens et al., 2017). Private systems emphasize competition and innovation but may prioritize profitability over patient outcomes. The cost of healthcare is a central concern. Single-payer and government-funded systems often have lower administrative costs due to reduced complexity. However, the government must manage costs to avoid budget overruns.

Market-driven systems may cause private insurers' profit margins and administrative expenses to increase. Despite not achieving superior health results, the United States spends more per person on healthcare than any other developed nation. Market-driven systems can encourage innovation in healthcare. Competition between providers and insurers can drive the development of new treatments and technologies. However, these innovations may not always be accessible to all due to cost considerations (Nascimento et al., 2018).

While government-funded systems have the ability to manage expenses, they might be slower to accept novel technology and therapies, which could restrict patients' alternatives. Health outcomes can be impacted by the way healthcare systems are structured. Longer life expectancy and lower infant mortality rates are common population health statistics in nations with universal or single-payer systems. However, a number of other factors, such as lifestyle and socioeconomic determinants of health, may also have an impact on this connection, indicating that it is not exclusively the result of the healthcare system (Peres et al., 2019).

*Corresponding author. Louis Gareth, E-mail: Louisgareth_g888@gmail.com

Healthcare structure does not exist in isolation. Social determinants of health, such as education, income, and housing, play a crucial role in health outcomes. The healthcare system can either exacerbate or mitigate these determinants. For instance, a lack of insurance in a market-driven system can lead to financial burdens that affect housing and overall well-being (Sanz et al., 2020). The structure of healthcare systems is often deeply influenced by political and ideological factors. Healthcare debates, whether public or private, have the potential to become disruptive and influence national policy. The outcome of these debates can have far-reaching socioeconomic consequences (Singh et al., 2019).

Furthermore, the COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted the importance of healthcare infrastructure and its readiness to manage public health crises. Countries with different healthcare structures have responded in various ways, showcasing the strengths and weaknesses of their respective systems. Socioeconomic factors and the healthcare system's structure are closely related and influence how societies can access, afford, and use healthcare services (Watt et al., 2016). There's no standard model, even though there are many models in use globally. Finding a balance that guarantees affordability, quality, and accessibility while taking into account the unique requirements and preferences of a country's population is crucial.

REFERENCES

1. Celeste RK, Eyjolfsdottir HS, Lennartsson C, Fritzell J (2020). Socioeconomic life course models and oral health: A longitudinal analysis. *J Dent Res.* 99:257-263.
2. Dahlgren G, Whitehead M (2021). The Dahlgren-Whitehead model of health determinants: 30 years on and still chasing rainbows. *Public health.* 199:20-24.
3. Khan S, Barrington G, Bettiol S, Barnett T, Crocombe L (2018). Is overweight/obesity a risk factor for periodontitis in young adults and adolescents?: A systematic review. *Obes Rev.* 19:852-883.
4. Leake JL, Birch S (2008). Public policy and the market for dental services. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol.* 36:287-295.
5. Martens L, de Smet S, Yusof MY, Rajasekharan S (2017). Association between overweight/obesity and periodontal disease in children and adolescents: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Arch Paediatr Dent.* 18:69-82.
6. Nascimento GG, Leite FR, Vestergaard P, Scheutz F, Lopez R (2018). Does diabetes increase the risk of periodontitis? A systematic review and meta-regression analysis of longitudinal prospective studies. *Acta Diabetol.* 55:653-667.
7. Peres MA, Macpherson LM, Weyant RJ, Daly B, Venturelli R, Mathur MR (2019). Oral diseases: a global public health challenge. *Lancet.* 394:249-260.
8. Sanz M, Marco del Castillo A, Jepsen S, Gonzalez-Juanatey JR, D'Aiuto F, Bouchard P, (2020). Periodontitis and cardiovascular diseases: Consensus report. *J Clin Periodontol.* 47:268-288.
9. Singh A, Peres MA, Watt RG (2019). The relationship between income and oral health: A critical review. *J Dent Res.* 98:853-860.
10. Watt RG, Heilmann A, Listl S, Peres MA (2016). London charter on oral health inequalities. *J Dent Res.* 95:245-247.