

**Psychiatry · Educational evidence summary**

Anticholinergic burden and anxiety treatment

This psychiatry article focuses on anticholinergic burden and anxiety treatment.

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

[Read the current article](#)

<https://unifiedacb.com/articles/052-anticholinergic-burden-and-anxiety-treatment/>

A review begins with what “for anxiety” means

“Anxiety medicine” may describe a long-term treatment, a medication used during a specific situation, or a product taken because it feels calming. Those are different exposure histories. A useful anticholinergic review first establishes the actual medicine and how it is used, then asks whether the available source evidence helps explain the concern prompting review.

This guide concerns evidence interpretation. It does not recommend an anxiety regimen or assume that all medicines with a calming or sedating effect are anticholinergic. The clinical aim is to make a precise question possible, not to select treatment from a color or category.

Clarify the target and the time course

Record whether the medicine is intended to address an ongoing disorder, occasional symptoms, a sleep complaint, or a separate condition. Ask what benefit is actually observed and over what period. A prescription label alone may not reflect the current pattern of use or the reason an adjunct remains on the list.

NICE’s anxiety guidance makes treatment choice depend on the particular anxiety condition, preferences, prior response, adverse effects, and interactions. It does not treat a burden category as the decision rule. [NICE CG113](#)

The practical implication is to retain the treatment target in any evidence summary. “Used occasionally before an event” and “taken every evening” should not be collapsed simply because the ingredient name is the same. If the actual use is uncertain, that uncertainty belongs in the record.

Distinguish sedation from anticholinergic classification

A medicine can have effects that matter to alertness without the available source assigning it a high anticholinergic category. Conversely, a source classification does not prove that sedation is the mechanism behind a complaint. The two concepts overlap in clinical discussions but should not be used as synonyms.



When someone describes feeling “foggy,” document the experience before translating it into a mechanism. Does the person mean sleepiness, difficulty remembering information, slowed work, or something else? The answer changes which evidence is relevant. A directory lookup cannot resolve that description on its own.

Include products taken outside the main regimen

Ask about allergy, sleep, and other products used without a regular prescription, as well as medicines prescribed by other clinicians. An ingredient can appear under a familiar brand or in a combination product. Reconciliation should determine what is actually present rather than count every product name as a separate exposure.

A useful review also distinguishes an active product from one kept at home but not recently used. This does not imply that occasional use is harmless. It establishes what exposure question is being asked and prevents an inventory from being mistaken for a daily regimen.

Read the named source before drawing a conclusion

In UnifiedACB, inspect the medication identity, source version, published value, and any formulation note. If a source has no public observation, report that state rather than supplying a value from a different source under the first source’s name. If two sources disagree, keep the difference visible.

The comparison can answer “What does each source report?” It cannot by itself answer “Which medicine is the best anxiety treatment for this person?” That second question depends on clinical evidence and context beyond anticholinergic classification. A lower source category is not a general endorsement of an alternative.

Prepare one focused clinical question

Choose the missing information that would most change interpretation. For an occasional medicine, this may be actual frequency. For a product with a qualified criterion, it may be route or total daily dose. For an unclear treatment role, it may be the current indication. Avoid asking a long list of questions merely because the tool can display several fields.

A practical note might say: “The source record has been identified, but the frequency of actual use is unclear. The concern is next-day concentration. Review of the use pattern and other contributors is needed before attributing the symptom.” This is an illustrative documentation structure, not a report of a real patient.

Keep the limits visible at follow-up

Anxiety itself, sleep, other treatment effects, and changes in daily demands can complicate interpretation of a cognitive complaint. The psychosis references elsewhere in the library do not establish an anxiety-specific causal burden threshold. If a clinician changes treatment, the relevant outcome and the treatment goal should be monitored separately from the source classification.



The useful endpoint is a better treatment conversation: an accurate medication history, a clear concern, and evidence whose scope is understood. A burden score can support that conversation without becoming the whole explanation.

References

1. Georgiou R, et al. Anticholinergic Burden and Cognitive Performance in Patients With Schizophrenia: A Systematic Literature Review. *Front Psychiatry*. 2021;12:779607. [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. 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](#)
4. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Generalised anxiety disorder and panic disorder in adults: management. CG113. Recommendations. [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.