

Keywords: Palliative care; Multi-agent systems; Chronic illness; Healthcare paradigms; Aging; Healthcare.

Introduction

Palliative care, established in the 1960s, aims to provide quality of life for patients with serious and terminal diagnoses. This interdisciplinary approach addresses physical, psychosocial, and spiritual aspects of care, alleviating the burden of failure and suffering [1]. It complements medical care, often serving as a complementary approach. For example, in HIV, AIDS, and kidney disease, involving a collaborative team of doctors, nurses, and health specialists, a decision to recognize and value the quality of life is a primary goal. Palliative care for chronic illnesses could address the growing epidemic in the US. Despite the benefits, the expansion of palliative care poses challenges such as increased costs and a delayed focus on healthcare [2]. The Multi-Agent System (MAS), utilized in various age groups to assist patients in making decisions, emerges as a potential solution. It is composed of intelligent agents, each with specific goals, capabilities, and knowledge [3]. When paired with a dedicated palliative care factor, like an aging population, the need for a paradigm shift in chronic illnesses through palliative care with MAS support, a holistic care must be considered [4-6]. The prevalence of chronic diseases has surged in the US, affecting approximately 60% of Americans. Contributing factors include increased lifespan, unhealthy lifestyle choices, and genetic predisposition. Healthcare systems, strained by the reactive approach to chronic illnesses, necessitate a shift towards palliative care. While palliative care has a long medical history, the quality of life during end-of-life procedures, the prevalence of chronic diseases requires a more proactive medical system [7-10]. The MAS, with its ability to predict actions for patient health and coordination, is a natural fit for aging populations and chronic diseases. The MAS sociobiology, a proactive system, allows us to take a valuable step towards addressing complex healthcare challenges and making a significant contribution to our lives. Its operational capabilities overcome coordination issues within the healthcare system, providing a comprehensive solution to patient issues. As the US population ages, MAS offers a practical solution for various healthcare sectors, including palliative care, biotechnology,

stakeholders, and digital transformation change.

Conclusion

The aging US population poses increasing challenges for the healthcare system. Expanding palliative care services facilitated by Multi-Agent Systems (MASs) could potentially address the needs of the growing population affected by chronic illnesses, providing a standard of high-quality healthcare. The adoption of MASs might represent a paradigm shift in healthcare, especially with the rising prevalence of chronic diseases. Despite ongoing efforts to prevent chronic diseases, there is a pressing need to enhance treatment for those currently dealing with these conditions. Supported by positive findings from various studies, future research has the potential to re-evaluate MASs as a viable healthcare system could significantly enhance the quality of life for those affected.

References

1. Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

- Pollard AJ, Bijker EM (2021) A guide to vaccinology: From basic principles to new developments. *Nat Rev Immunol* 21: 83-100.
- Karabulutlu EY, Turan GB, Yanmis S (2022) Evaluation of care burden and

Simof Michael, Department of Radiotherapy, Henry Ford Health System, Detroit, United States, E-mail: Simofm@hfhs.org

04-Dec-2023, Manuscript No. jpcm-23-123237; 06-Dec-2023, PreQC No. jpcm-23-123237(PQ); 11-Dec-2023, QC No. jpcm-23-123237; 15-Dec-2023, Manuscript No. jpcm-23-123237(R); 20-Dec-2023, DOI: 10.4172/2165-7386.1000598

Michael S (2023) Revolutionizing Healthcare: Multi-Agent Systems in Palliative Care for Chronic Illness. *J Palliat Care Med* 13: 598.

© 2023 Michael S. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms

-
- preparedness of caregivers who provide care to palliative care patients. *Palliat Support Care* 20: 30-37.
3. Beng TS, Guan NC, Jane LE, Chin LE (2014) Health care interactional suffering in palliative care. *Am J Hosp Palliat Care* 31: 307-314.
 4. Den Hartogh G (2017) Suffering and dying well: on the proper aim of palliative care. *Med Health Care Philos* 20: 413-424.
 5. Abraham J (2000) The role of the clinician in palliative medicine. *JAMA* 283: 116.
 6. ate T, Pearlman R (2019) What we mean when we talk about suffering and why ERIC cassell should not have the last word. *Perspect Biol Med* 62: 95-110.
 7. Wehby GL, Domingue BW, Wolinsky FD (2018) Genetic Risks for Chronic Conditions: Implications for Long-term Wellbeing. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 73: 477-483.
 8. Al-Mahrezi A, Al-Mandhari Z (2016) Palliative Care: Time for Action. *Oman Med J* 31: 161-163.
 9. Meier DE, Brawley OW (2011) Palliative care and the quality of life. *J Clin Oncol* 29: 2750.
 10. Bloom D, Cadarette D (2019) Infectious Disease Threats in the Twenty-First Century: Strengthening the Global Response. *Front Immunol* 10: 549.