

**Psychiatry · Educational evidence summary**

Anticholinergic burden in psychiatry

This psychiatry article focuses on anticholinergic burden in psychiatry.

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

Read the current article

<https://unifiedacb.com/articles/046-anticholinergic-burden-in-psychiatry/>

The question behind a psychiatric medication list

A psychiatric regimen usually has a history: a medicine that maintained recovery, another added during a difficult admission, and occasional products used for sleep, allergy, nausea, or movement symptoms. An anticholinergic review asks which of those exposures have relevant source classifications and how confidently they can be connected to a current concern. It does not decide whether an effective psychiatric treatment is unnecessary. This article explains how to use an evidence map without losing the clinical reasons that produced the regimen.

The distinction matters when the concern is concentration. A list can contain several possible contributors while the person also has symptoms of the underlying illness, disrupted sleep, or difficulty participating in testing. A source-specific medication classification is one piece of that assessment. It cannot assign a percentage of the problem to medication, determine the right diagnosis, or tell a clinician which treatment benefit to sacrifice.

Evidence basis and its strongest application

This is a narrative educational review of the cited schizophrenia literature and the source-based structure of UnifiedACB; no new systematic search or patient analysis is reported. The systematic review by Georgiou and colleagues found generally adverse cognitive associations in schizophrenia, while emphasizing heterogeneity in the underlying studies. Its scope supports taking exposure seriously in that population; it does not establish a uniform treatment rule for every psychiatric diagnosis. [Georgiou et al., 2021](#)

Three questions should therefore remain distinct: whether a medicine has been classified by a named source, whether a regimen's exposure is associated with an outcome in a study population, and whether changing that regimen will benefit a particular person. The first is a lookup question. The second requires an appropriate study. The third requires a clinical decision that considers both the concern prompting review and the consequences of altering treatment.

Find the contributors before interpreting the total

Start with the complete medication history, including scheduled treatment, actual as-needed use, and products obtained outside the psychiatric service. A psychotropic-only list may answer which



psychiatric medicines appear in a source while missing another contributor used for an unrelated condition. Conversely, a long list of orders can exaggerate exposure if discontinued prescriptions and unused as-needed medicines are treated as current administration.

It is useful to group entries by purpose: treatment of the psychiatric disorder, management of treatment-related symptoms, and treatment of other conditions. These are review categories, not pharmacologic rankings. Their value is that they reveal who can clarify an indication and which clinical outcome should be considered alongside a possible adverse effect. A medicine used for a movement disorder should not disappear from the review merely because it was added to support another medicine.

Read the source record as a complete statement

UnifiedACB attaches an observation to a medication identity, source label, source version, value, and evidence state. Reading only the number drops much of the information needed to understand it. A discrepancy between sources may reflect different coverage or methods. A missing observation is not a published zero. Neither state authorizes a claim that the medication is free of adverse effects.

For a psychiatric list, inspect the actual contributor rows and any route or formulation note before considering a source-specific burden description. Keep separate columns for separate sources. Averaging ordinal categories would erase the disagreement while creating a number that none of the cited investigators produced. A supplemental geriatric criterion, where applicable, answers another question and should remain outside the scale column.

Connect the evidence to the concern being reviewed

A useful review note names an observable concern, its timing, and the treatment context. “Difficulty following a conversation after an evening as-needed medicine” is more informative than “high burden.” It identifies a question about actual use and timing without asserting causation. “Stable memory difficulty predating the present regimen” raises a different question, even if the same medicines appear in the directory.

The next step is to document competing explanations that would change interpretation. For cognitive complaints, those may include the illness state, sleep, testing conditions, and other medicine effects. For a movement complaint, the relevant assessment may be different. An anticholinergic label should help organize inquiry; it should not make every new symptom fit a single mechanism.

Review can also reveal uncertainty that is administrative rather than pharmacologic: two names for one product, an obsolete order, a route not recorded, or an unclear start date. Resolving these problems makes the medication history more useful even when the available evidence cannot support a treatment change.



From information to a shared clinical discussion

The clinician and patient still need to weigh the medicine's documented benefit, prior treatment experience, present symptoms, and follow-up plan. The directory cannot estimate the probability of relapse after withdrawal or judge whether a past alternative was acceptable. A source classification should therefore enter the discussion as evidence about exposure, accompanied by its limits.

Useful questions are specific: Which current medicines contribute in this named scale? Is the concern temporally related to actual use? Is an adjunct still being used for its original reason? What would be monitored if the prescribing team made a change? Those questions are more actionable than seeking a single "safe" threshold.

Limits of the psychiatric evidence

Psychiatry includes diagnoses, ages, care settings, and treatment courses that are not interchangeable. Findings about cognition in schizophrenia cannot establish effects on mood recovery, anxiety control, adherence, or employment without evidence for those outcomes. Observational associations also leave room for confounding by why a treatment was prescribed.

The practical contribution of UnifiedACB is a traceable account of medication evidence. The clinical contribution comes from joining that account to the person's treatment history, goals, and current assessment, with uncertainty still visible.

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. Georgiou R, et al. Anticholinergic Burden and Cognitive Performance in Patients With Schizophrenia: A Systematic Literature Review. Front Psychiatry. 2021;12:779607. [Source](#)
3. Mancini V, et al. Anticholinergic Burden and Cognitive Function in Psychosis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Am J Psychiatry. 2025;182:349-359. [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.