

**Foundations · Educational evidence summary**

How route and formulation can change anticholinergic evidence

This foundation article explains how route and formulation can change anticholinergic evidence.

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

[Read the current article](#)

<https://unifiedacb.com/articles/009-how-route-and-formulation-can-change-anticholinergic-evidence/>

The ingredient name is not the entire exposure

A medication's active ingredient identifies an essential part of the question, but it does not specify how the drug is delivered, how often it is used or which product is involved. Route and formulation can therefore matter even when the preferred medication name remains unchanged. A source that addresses an oral medicine may not establish the same claim for an eye drop or another local preparation.

The task is to preserve that boundary without inventing missing distinctions. It is equally problematic to ignore an explicit qualifier and to manufacture a formulation-specific score that the source never published. UnifiedACB's role is to show the available evidence and the limits of its applicability.

Route describes how the medicine is used

Oral, inhaled, topical, ophthalmic, injectable and transdermal use describe different administration contexts. They may differ in the exposure that reaches particular tissues and in the clinical purpose of treatment. The presence of the same ingredient does not establish that every route was considered by the scale authors.

Source eligibility can make route especially important. The [KABS development methods](#) excluded topical agents from the candidate list. Consequently, the absence of a topical entry cannot be interpreted as a source-assigned zero. The source did not necessarily ask the same question as a clinician reviewing that product.

When a publication does not specify a route, the faithful description is that the route was not specified. Automatically completing it as oral use can make a broad or ambiguous source label appear more precise than the underlying evidence. A reader should be able to distinguish a documented qualifier from an assumption.

Formulation is a separate field

Formulation describes the product form and delivery characteristics, such as an immediate-release tablet, modified-release preparation, solution or patch. It is related to route but is not identical to it.



Two oral products can share an ingredient and route while differing in release characteristics or administration instructions.

An evidence directory should retain formulation wording present in the source. It should not infer that a classification has been experimentally established for every marketed product. Nor should it create different scores solely because products look different. A new formulation-specific assertion needs its own relevant evidence.

This distinction becomes particularly important in medication reconciliation. A historical record may list only the ingredient, while the current package identifies a particular formulation. The unresolved relationship should be clarified before the historical source is treated as a precise description of the current exposure.

Dose qualifications belong to their own source

The [2023 AGS criterion for doxepin](#) specifies total daily doses above 6 mg. That qualification changes how the geriatric criterion should be discussed. It does not retrospectively add dose-specific categories to a source scale whose published doxepin entry did not contain them.

UnifiedACB's [public doxepin profile evidence](#) retains its source-native observations. A supplemental discussion can explain why the daily dose matters for the geriatric criterion while leaving those observations intact. The two layers answer different questions and should remain separately attributed.

A dose threshold also requires the correct exposure input. Tablet strength is not necessarily total daily dose. An as-needed order is not necessarily the amount actually taken. If the available information cannot establish the qualifying condition, the explanation should identify the missing detail rather than assuming that the criterion applies.

A route qualification is not a whole-drug safety verdict

The geriatric source includes route-specific language for certain medicines. When a statement is restricted to oral use, omitting that word broadens the claim. When a local formulation is excluded from a particular criterion, the exclusion does not establish that every possible use of that formulation is free of risk.

The reasoning is symmetric. A source-specific concern should not be generalized beyond its scope, and an exception should not be generalized into reassurance. The appropriate statement describes the criterion, the qualification and what can or cannot be concluded with the available product information.

Why laboratory evidence does not solve every formulation question

The [Chew radioreceptor study](#) demonstrates how experimental activity can depend on tested concentration. It supplies evidence about that assay. It does not provide a ready-made conversion from every commercial formulation to an individual person's central nervous system exposure.



Moving from an ingredient-level classification to product-specific risk would require additional information about exposure, pharmacology and the intended outcome. A directory should not imply that a simple name match performs those steps. The absence of a precise exposure model is a limitation to state, not a reason to calculate an unsupported estimate.

Reading a profile without losing the qualifiers

Start with the exact medication record and read the original source label. Check whether route or formulation is specified in the observation or its notes. Identify the source version, because later documents can change wording or scope. Then read supplemental clinical criteria separately and ask which additional detail determines their applicability.

For Compare, make sure the records being compared represent the intended products. A comparison of ingredients can still be useful, but it should be described as such. It is not automatically a comparison of equal doses, equivalent exposure or equivalent clinical benefit.

For Ask, a focused clarification about route or total daily dose is appropriate when it changes the answer. The purpose is to select the relevant evidence boundary, not to manufacture a patient-level score. Where the source itself remains nonspecific, the answer should say so.

Preserve precision without pretending to know more

Route and formulation information improve interpretation when they are documented and relevant. They cannot rescue a source that did not study the required question. A careful result retains every known qualifier, identifies what is unknown and avoids both overgeneralized warnings and unsupported reassurance.



References

1. Chew ML, et al. Anticholinergic activity of 107 medications commonly used by older adults. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2008;56:1333-1341. [Source](#)
2. 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](#)
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. Jun K, Hwang S, Ah YM, Suh Y, Lee JY. Development of an Anticholinergic Burden Scale specific for Korean older adults. Geriatr Gerontol Int. 2019;19:628-634. doi:10.1111/ggi.13680. [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](#)
9. UnifiedACB. Preserved public source-observation dataset, v3.0 RC12 final; inspected for this editorial revision. [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.