



Geriatrics · Educational evidence summary

Interpreting a low burden score in an older adult

This geriatric evidence summary examines interpreting a low burden score in an older adult.

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

[Read the current article](#)

<https://unifiedacb.com/articles/035-interpreting-a-low-burden-score-in-an-older-adult/>

What exactly is low?

The answer depends on the instrument and what is being described. A low category for one medicine, a low regimen total calculated elsewhere and a list with few available source entries are not the same result. Identify the source version and included medicines before drawing reassurance from the number.

The [UnifiedACB public table](#) preserves medication-level source observations. It does not calculate a universal safety score. A low category should therefore be quoted as a finding from the named source, with its scope intact.

Is low the same as zero?

No. A low nonzero category is still the source's nonzero classification. An explicit zero is a different published finding. Their interpretation depends on the method's definitions rather than an assumption that nearby numbers mean essentially the same thing.

Neither finding proves that the medicine cannot cause adverse effects. An anticholinergic scale addresses a particular construct and does not evaluate every mechanism relevant to treatment.

Is a missing entry reassuring?

It is not a numerical finding at all. The medication may fall outside the source's scope, have an unresolved identity match or lack a publicly available row. The [dataset](#) distinguishes public observations from source metadata and provenance-only information so that these gaps do not become invented zeros.

A result based on incomplete coverage should say which medicines were unscored. Otherwise, a low total can appear to describe the whole regimen when it describes only the available subset.



Could another source classify the medicine differently?

Yes. Source methods and coverage differ. The appropriate response is to show the different observations and explain their provenance. It is not to replace the low value with the highest value automatically or to average the categories into a new result.

The public cetirizine record demonstrates this point: an explicit zero in one identified source coexists with nonzero observations in others. Those [source-specific findings](#) remain distinct. The disagreement is information the reader should see before treating one cell as a universal conclusion.

Can a low burden result coexist with a geriatric concern?

Yes, because a geriatric criterion can address a different mechanism or a particular clinical context. The [AGS criteria](#) are not simply a second version of an ordinal anticholinergic scale. Their dose, route, indication or condition qualifications must be evaluated separately.

The reverse is also relevant: absence from a selected geriatric overlay does not establish safety. A limited overlay and a low scale category cannot be combined into an unqualified statement that a regimen is appropriate.

What if the person has symptoms despite a low result?

The symptoms deserve assessment on their own merits. A source category does not rule out medication effects outside the instrument, an exposure pattern not captured by the list, or a non-medication cause. The clinical history should describe the symptom, its timing and its functional impact.

Check whether the actual products and use were recorded accurately. A nonprescription medicine or more frequent as-needed use may have been missed. Reconciliation can resolve an input problem without assuming that the source classification itself was wrong.

Does low burden mean there is no reason for medication review?

Medication review also concerns indication, benefit, administration difficulty, interactions and the person's priorities. The [WHO polypharmacy report](#) addresses this broader context. Anticholinergic exposure is one component, so a low result cannot close every other question.

At the same time, a low finding should not be ignored or relabeled merely because a higher number seems more cautious. Preserve the source result and explain its limited scope. Accuracy includes avoiding both false reassurance and unsupported escalation.

Check whether the compared results use the same instrument version. A low finding after a source update may reflect revised classification or changed public coverage, not a change in what the person took. The explanation should identify which changed.



How should a low result be documented?

State the instrument and version, the medication or list assessed, the available findings and any uncovered entries. Then describe the clinical question separately. “Low classified exposure under this method” is a bounded observation. “No medication risk” is a much broader claim that the result cannot establish.

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. American Geriatrics Society 2023 Updated AGS Beers Criteria for Potentially Inappropriate Medication Use in Older Adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2023;71:2052-2081. [Source](#)
3. American Geriatrics Society Beers Criteria Alternatives Panel. Alternative Treatments to Selected Medications in the 2023 AGS Beers Criteria. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2025;73:2657-2677. [Source](#)
4. Fox C, et al. Effect of medications with anti-cholinergic properties on cognitive function, delirium, physical function and mortality: a systematic review. *Age Ageing.* 2014;43:604-615. [Source](#)
5. Ruxton K, Woodman RJ, Mangoni AA. Drugs with anticholinergic effects and cognitive impairment, falls and all-cause mortality in older adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Clin Pharmacol.* 2015;80(2):209-220. doi:10.1111/bcp.12617. [Source](#)
6. Egberts A, et al. Anticholinergic Drug Burden and Delirium: A Systematic Review. *J Am Med Dir Assoc.* 2021;22:65-73.e4. [Source](#)
7. UnifiedACB. Preserved public source-observation dataset, v3.0 RC12 final; inspected for this editorial revision. [Source](#)
8. World Health Organization. Medication safety in polypharmacy: technical report. 2019. WHO/UHC/SDS/2019.11. [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.