



Geriatrics · Educational evidence summary

Anticholinergic burden and antidepressant exposure in later life

This geriatric evidence summary examines anticholinergic burden and antidepressant exposure in later life.

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

Read the current article

<https://unifiedacb.com/articles/042-anticholinergic-burden-and-antidepressant-exposure-in-later-life/>

The treatment history matters to the interpretation

An antidepressant may have been selected after a particular symptom pattern, previous treatment experience and observed response. A source-scale category does not capture that history. In later-life review, the anticholinergic question should be placed alongside the reason for treatment and the benefit the person experiences.

The class is not uniform. A useful article therefore examines medication-specific source observations and relevant qualifications rather than treating every antidepressant as if it had the same pharmacology or clinical role. The purpose is to make the review more precise, not to identify a replacement by score alone.

What the preserved medication records show

The [public amitriptyline record](#) has value 3 across its seven represented source versions. Paroxetine has BAAS 2019 value 3 and value 2 in the other six public source observations. Sertraline has a different pattern, including an explicit KABS 2020 supplement zero, several value-1 observations and Yamada ABS 2023 value 2.

These examples are source findings, not a new comparative trial or a synthesized ranking. They illustrate why the ingredient and source version need to remain attached to the value. “An antidepressant score” is too vague to describe the evidence faithfully.

Agreement across source lists also should not be counted as independent clinical replication. Some instruments may share earlier evidence or development inputs. The number of matching classifications does not quantify the probability that a person will experience a particular adverse effect.

Doxepin requires a qualification that a simple class label misses

The [AGS doxepin criterion](#) retains a threshold above 6 mg/day, rather than treating every doxepin regimen identically. That detail can materially change the geriatric explanation and should be retained whenever the tag is discussed. The indication alone does not establish the actual daily dose.



The [source-scale doxepin observations](#) remain unchanged by that criterion. A low-dose clinical qualification does not create a new ordinal value within a scale that did not publish one. The appropriate presentation keeps the table and the supplemental dose context separate.

This distinction can guide a focused Ask follow-up. If the total daily dose is the missing detail that determines the criterion's applicability, asking for it is more useful than offering the same class paragraph again. If the source lacks formulation detail, the answer should preserve that limit.

Geriatric criteria address more than anticholinergic classification

The [AGS antidepressant-related criteria](#) include contextual concerns that are broader than one ordinal scale. A medicine can require review for a particular syndrome or effect even when its anticholinergic category is lower than another agent's. A low number cannot rule out all medication-related concerns.

The reverse also holds: a strongly classified medication does not tell the reader whether treatment is ineffective or unnecessary. The indication, benefit and consequences of change remain essential. A tag should initiate a clinical question rather than erase the treatment history.

Cognition and mood complicate causal interpretation

Cognitive complaints can coexist with mood symptoms, illness, sleep disruption and medication changes. An observational association between anticholinergic exposure and cognition does not automatically identify which factor explains an individual's complaint. The timeline and the outcome being assessed need to be clear.

The [cumulative strong-anticholinergic exposure study](#) concerns a defined long-term exposure and outcome question. It should not be converted into a prediction about every antidepressant or a single dose. The study's drug selection, duration and design remain part of its interpretation.

For a current clinical concern, record what changed in symptoms and actual use. A medication may have been started because a symptom was already emerging. Without that sequence, the review can confuse the reason for treatment with a consequence of treatment.

Compare products and regimens accurately

Confirm the ingredient, formulation, route and schedule. A changed brand label may represent the same ingredient, while a different formulation can raise a separate exposure question. The source's original wording should remain available so a preferred website name does not imply more specificity than the publication provides.

Also review the rest of the regimen. A sleep, allergy, bladder or other medicine may contribute to the overall concern. Focusing only on the antidepressant because it is the most familiar psychiatric drug can leave the exposure history incomplete.

A review needs a target and a follow-up plan

The treating team can identify the symptom or functional outcome that matters, the medication evidence relevant to it and the treatment benefit that must be preserved. Any proposed change requires a plan appropriate to the medicine and the person. This article does not provide a switching or tapering instruction.



If care changes, assess both the original condition and the concern that prompted review. A lower burden category is not itself evidence of improved mood, cognition or daily function. Clinical outcomes should be observed and documented directly.

The useful distinction

Antidepressant review benefits from medication-specific evidence precisely because the class is diverse. Preserve the source values, explain relevant qualifications and keep the person's treatment response central. The directory supports that discussion by making the evidence traceable, not by turning ordinal categories into an automatic choice of therapy.

References

1. 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](#)
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 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. 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](#)

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.