

**Foundations • Educational evidence summary**

What is anticholinergic burden, and why does it matter?

This foundation article explains what is anticholinergic burden, and why does it matter?.

UnifiedACB · Published October 3, 2026 · Updated October 4, 2026

[Read the current article](#)

<https://unifiedacb.com/articles/001-what-is-anticholinergic-burden-and-why-does-it-matter/>

A useful concept with a specific boundary

A medication can be prescribed for one purpose while also affecting acetylcholine signaling elsewhere. Anticholinergic burden is a way of organizing that additional medication exposure, particularly when several medicines may contribute. The term helps connect a medication list with questions about tolerability and function. It does not, by itself, establish that a person has experienced harm or identify which medicine caused a symptom.

The first distinction is between a drug's classification and a person's response. A source may place a medication in an anticholinergic category using laboratory findings, literature, expert assessment or clinical observations. A patient's experience also depends on the actual exposure and surrounding illness. Those are related questions, but they require different information. The original [ADS study](#), for example, examined a relationship with serum anticholinergic activity; that objective is different from predicting an individual person's future cognition.

Why one medicine is only part of the picture

Looking at one prescription can miss the surrounding regimen. A bladder medicine, an antidepressant and an occasional nighttime product may be considered separately by different clinicians or by the person taking them. Medication reconciliation brings those exposures into one view. Whether they belong in a particular burden instrument must still be checked against that instrument's definitions.

"Cumulative" can also mean two different things. It may describe several medicines taken during the same period, or exposure accumulated over months and years. A list-based classification obtained today cannot reconstruct years of use. Similarly, a prescription record may show that a medicine was ordered without proving when it was taken. A useful explanation states which of these exposure questions it addresses.

This is why a conversation about burden often starts with ordinary details: the ingredient on the package, formulation, route, frequency, duration and reason for use. These details are not administrative decoration. They establish what exposure the evidence is being asked to describe. Missing details should remain visible until clarified.



What a source score contributes

A scale makes its own rules for classifying medications. The numerical categories can make a long list easier to inspect, but they do not erase the choices made during scale development. A category is meaningful within the source that defines it. It is not automatically interchangeable with an identically numbered category in another instrument.

Consider the difference between a laboratory assay and a published medication list. [Chew and colleagues](#) tested medications under specified laboratory conditions. A list derived from such evidence can be useful, yet the act of displaying a drug on that list does not measure the concentration achieved by the person currently taking it. The assay, the classification and the clinical assessment each contribute a different piece of the explanation.

An explicit source score of zero also needs its source label. It means that the source actually assigned zero. An absent row provides no such finding. Treating every blank cell as zero would make incomplete coverage look like evidence of no activity, which would change the question the source can honestly answer.

How UnifiedACB makes the distinction visible

UnifiedACB shows source observations separately. The [public dataset](#) retains the source version, original medication label, value, evidence state and source locator for each public observation. A preferred medication name helps readers find related records; the original source label remains available so the grouping can be inspected.

The directory therefore supports questions such as “Which source listed this medication?”, “Does another source classify it differently?” and “Is this an explicit zero or a missing entry?” These are more precise than asking whether the website has found a universally correct number. The medication profile and Compare view are ways to examine the evidence trail, while Ask provides an explanation tied to that same trail.

Supplemental geriatric information answers an additional question. The [2023 AGS Beers Criteria](#) describe potentially inappropriate medication use in defined older-adult contexts. A geriatric criterion may depend on dose, route, diagnosis or the reason for treatment. That context belongs beside source-scale evidence, with its own attribution, rather than being converted into another numerical burden value.

From a classification to a useful clinical question

A productive review connects the medication record to a concrete concern. Has a symptom changed after a documented exposure change? Is the same ingredient present in more than one product? Does the source entry apply to this formulation? Are other medicines or illnesses plausible contributors? A burden classification can direct attention to these questions without deciding their answers.

The reason for treatment remains part of that assessment. A medicine may have an important benefit while also creating an exposure concern. The presence of a score does not measure that



benefit, predict what will happen if therapy changes, or determine an appropriate replacement. Those decisions need a clinical review of the whole situation.

What to take away

Read anticholinergic burden as an organized description of medication evidence. Keep the named source attached to its finding, distinguish absent information from explicit zero, and bring actual use into the discussion. The most useful result is a clearer question about exposure and clinical context—not an unsupported promise that one number explains the person.

References

1. Vennard O, Stewart C, Tolia M, Soiza RL, Myint PK. Anticholinergic Medication Burden Scales: A Systematic Review. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2026;74(6):1771-1784. [Source](#)
2. Chew ML, et al. Anticholinergic activity of 107 medications commonly used by older adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2008;56:1333-1341. [Source](#)
3. Carnahan RM, et al. The Anticholinergic Drug Scale as a measure of drug-related anticholinergic burden: associations with serum anticholinergic activity. *J Clin Pharmacol.* 2006;46:1481-1486. [Source](#)
4. Rudolph JL, et al. The anticholinergic risk scale and anticholinergic adverse effects in older persons. *Arch Intern Med.* 2008;168:508-513. [Source](#)
5. Boustani M, et al. Impact of anticholinergics on the aging brain: a review and practical application. *Aging Health.* 2008;4:311-320. [Source](#)
6. Lisibach A, Benelli V, Ceppi MG, et al. Quality of anticholinergic burden scales and their impact on clinical outcomes: a systematic review. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol.* 2021;77(2):147-162. [Source](#)
7. UnifiedACB. Preserved public source-observation dataset, v3.0 RC12 final; inspected for this editorial revision. [Source](#)
8. American Geriatrics Society. 2023 updated AGS Beers Criteria for potentially inappropriate medication use in older adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2023;71:2052-2081. doi:10.1111/jgs.18372. [Source](#)

Explore the evidence

[Ask UnifiedACB](#) about a medication or source, browse the [Medication Library](#), or read the [methodology](#).

Disclosure

Funding: None. Conflict of interest: None declared for the UnifiedACB educational project.

Educational evidence summary. This content does not provide patient-specific medical advice and does not replace clinical judgment, medication reconciliation, or prescribing guidance.