

**Geriatrics · Educational evidence summary**

Anticholinergic burden and overactive bladder therapies

This geriatric evidence summary examines anticholinergic burden and overactive bladder therapies.

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

Read the current article

<https://unifiedacb.com/articles/040-anticholinergic-burden-and-overactive-bladder-therapies/>

The clinical question includes benefit as well as exposure

Overactive-bladder treatment is intended to improve urinary symptoms that can disrupt daily life. An anticholinergic review should retain that purpose while examining tolerability and other concerns. A source-scale category does not measure urgency, leakage, sleep disruption or the value of symptom relief to the individual.

Bladder antimuscarinics are therefore a useful class for learning how different evidence layers fit together. There are source classifications, product-specific warnings, geriatric criteria and clinical studies with different outcomes and follow-up periods. None should be substituted for the others.

What the source scales can show

In the [preserved public dataset](#), oxybutynin has value 3 in each of its seven represented source versions. Darifenacin has value 3 in its five public source observations, and trospium has value 3 in its three public observations. These statements describe source coverage and classification. They do not imply equal clinical effects at every dose or formulation.

The differing number of observations is also not a ranking of effectiveness or safety. It reflects the public sources represented for each concept. An absent row in another source remains missing, not a lower score or a negative clinical finding.

Compare can help readers inspect those records. It should not transform matching ordinal categories into an assumption that the medicines are interchangeable. The classification is only one dimension of a therapeutic comparison.

Product details change the question

Immediate-release, extended-release, transdermal and other preparations should be distinguished when the evidence requires it. A study of one preparation cannot automatically establish the same outcome for every product containing the ingredient. The source label and route/formulation notes should remain visible.



The [oxybutynin extended-release prescribing information](#) provides a concrete product-level source for contraindications, precautions and administration context. Those details answer questions that an ingredient-level scale entry does not. The label should be consulted for the actual product rather than recreated from an ordinal category.

Actual use is another necessary input. A prescription can describe the intended schedule without proving the amount taken. The clinical review should establish the regimen and relevant changes before interpreting either benefit or a possible adverse effect.

Short-term cognition and long-term dementia are different endpoints

The [SENIOR trial](#) compared solifenacin and oxybutynin with placebo in older people with mild cognitive impairment using a defined crossover design. It is evidence about the tested treatments, participants and cognitive assessments. Its findings should not be broadened into a universal cognitive-safety claim for all bladder-antimuscarinic use.

An absence of a detectable effect on a short-term test does not establish absence of long-term risk. Equally, an observational association with later dementia does not predict what will happen during a short course for a particular person. Study duration and outcome definition are essential to interpretation.

The [cumulative strong-anticholinergic exposure cohort](#) illustrates the historical-exposure question. It was not a randomized head-to-head trial assigning every bladder medicine under equivalent conditions. Using it to create a precise medication ranking would go beyond its design.

What the Beers bladder note actually adds

The [AGS strong-anticholinergic reference list and bladder note](#) call attention to cognitive concerns while acknowledging limitations in comparative evidence. That context should remain visible. It does not justify assigning a new geriatric safety score or treating every drug without a specific overlay entry as safe.

The [AUA/SUFU guideline](#) also places discussion of potential cognitive risk within the treatment conversation for antimuscarinic therapy. The discussion is part of shared clinical decision-making, alongside symptoms and treatment options. It is not a command to choose the medicine with the smallest value in whichever scale is easiest to find.

Compare like with like before drawing a conclusion

A fair medication comparison identifies the indication, product, dose context, route, outcome and time horizon. If those differ across studies, the limitation should be stated rather than concealed behind a common class label. A trial in one population does not automatically establish the same balance in another.



The same discipline applies to published categories. If a source does not distinguish formulations, do not manufacture formulation-specific values. If another source has no public row, do not infer zero. Keep the comparison at the level the evidence supports.

Questions that improve a medication review

Ask what urinary outcome is being improved, which product is actually used, what clinical concern has emerged and which source addresses it. A relevant qualification may require one additional detail about dose, route or condition. The answer should prioritize that detail rather than repeating a generic class-effects paragraph.

The treating team can then consider the overall balance and a follow-up plan. If treatment changes, evaluate the urinary benefit and the specific concern that motivated review. A lower anticholinergic category does not, by itself, establish a better clinical outcome.

The evidence boundary

Bladder antimuscarinics warrant a careful, source-specific discussion because their intended effects and potential concerns can coexist. The most defensible comparison preserves the classifications and explains the product and study differences. It does not promise a universally safest agent or infer personal cognitive risk from a badge.



References

1. 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](#)
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. 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](#)
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. DailyMed. Oxybutynin chloride extended-release tablets. Official prescribing information; set ID 7d2332b4-9e48-4bb2-a2c3-75e16e1d455b. [Source](#)
9. Wagg A, et al. Randomised, multicentre, placebo-controlled, double-blind crossover study investigating the effect of solifenacin and oxybutynin in elderly people with mild cognitive impairment: the SENIOR study. *Eur Urol.* 2013;64:74-81. [Source](#)
10. Gray SL, et al. Cumulative use of strong anticholinergics and incident dementia: a prospective cohort study. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2015;175:401-407. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2014.7663. [Source](#)
11. Cameron AP, et al. The AUA/SUFU Guideline on the Diagnosis and Treatment of Idiopathic Overactive Bladder. *J Urol.* 2024. doi:10.1097/JU.0000000000003985. [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.