

**Psychiatry · Educational evidence summary**

Anticholinergic burden and functional outcomes in serious mental illness

This psychiatry article focuses on anticholinergic burden and functional outcomes in serious mental illness.

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

Read the current article

<https://unifiedacb.com/articles/057-anticholinergic-burden-and-functional-outcomes-in-serious-mental-illness/>

Function is more than a test score

For a person living with serious mental illness, an important outcome may be managing appointments, studying, working, or carrying out daily tasks. A cognitive test can contribute to understanding those goals, but it is not the same outcome. Anticholinergic research should be read carefully when moving from a measured cognitive association to claims about everyday function.

This article is a narrative appraisal of that distinction and a named functional-capacity study. It reports no new analysis of UnifiedACB users or clinical records. Its aim is to clarify what the published evidence can contribute to a review without promising functional benefit from a change in a burden category.

Three levels of outcome

First, cognitive tests measure performance on defined tasks under assessment conditions. Second, performance-based functional-capacity measures ask whether someone can demonstrate practical skills in a structured setting. Third, real-world functioning reflects what happens in ordinary life, with opportunities, support, symptoms, and environmental constraints also present.

These levels can inform one another, but a favorable result at one level does not prove an equivalent result at the next. A person may demonstrate a skill in an assessment yet have limited opportunity to use it. A daily task may become easier because support changed even if a cognitive measure did not. The outcome definition therefore belongs beside any claim of benefit.

A study focused on functional capacity

Khan and colleagues examined 223 community-dwelling people with schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder in a cross-sectional analysis. Their models related anticholinergic burden to functional capacity while considering cognition and other variables. The study supports investigating functional consequences, but its design cannot establish that reducing exposure causes improvement in real-world functioning. [Khan et al., 2021](#)

The distinction is not a criticism of measuring capacity. It identifies the question that was answered. A structured capacity assessment can be useful precisely because it limits some environmental



variation. That strength also means its result should not be presented as direct measurement of employment, independence, or participation outside the assessment.

Why a regimen association can be difficult to interpret

A more complex treatment history may accompany greater illness-related difficulty. The indication for each medicine, prior response, and the reason an adjunct was added can influence both exposure and functional outcomes. A one-time medication list cannot fully reconstruct those pathways.

Measurement timing also matters. If the exposure window differs from the period represented by the functional measure, the association may be difficult to interpret. An order list, a dispensing record, and actual administration each provide different information. The researcher should state which one was used and what remains unknown.

What a burden score does and does not measure

A source-specific classification summarizes an aspect of medication evidence. It does not directly measure support at home, access to education, financial resources, motivation, or the opportunity to carry out a task. It also may not model dose and timing. Those omissions do not make the score useless; they define its scope.

UnifiedACB keeps the source observations visible so the exposure description can be inspected. It does not combine them into a synthetic functional-risk number. Missing entries remain missing, and an observation from one source is not silently assigned to another source to complete a regimen total.

Interpreting a change over time

Suppose a clinical team changes a regimen for a justified reason and the person later reports easier daily functioning. The report matters, but the explanation still needs care. The illness may have changed, the environment may be different, and several treatments may have been adjusted. A lower burden category alone does not isolate the cause.

A useful record identifies the specific task, the timing of the change, and other relevant events. It also records whether treatment benefit was maintained. This produces a more honest account than treating any improvement as proof that the burden score was the active mechanism.

For research, repeated measurements can help establish temporal order, but they do not automatically remove confounding. The analysis still needs a defined population, exposure window, outcome, and comparison strategy. A prediction model, if proposed, would require separate evaluation rather than inheriting validity from an association study.

Use the evidence to choose better questions

In a clinical discussion, ask which daily activity is difficult and what improvement would matter to the person. Then determine whether medication exposure is a plausible contributor worth reviewing alongside other explanations. The source table can identify classified contributors and disagreements; the functional goal gives that information practical meaning.

In research, avoid combining heterogeneous outcomes under an undifferentiated label of “function.” Describe whether the measure concerns capacity, participation, symptoms, or quality of life. Report a null result on one measure without implying that every relevant outcome is unaffected.



It is also possible for capacity and real-world opportunity to diverge. A person may perform a structured task successfully without having the resources or opportunity to use the skill outside assessment. Another may rely on effective support despite difficulty with a test. These are reasons to name the outcome actually measured and to ask about the person's priorities. A burden association with a capacity measure should not be rewritten as evidence that medication exposure determines independence, employability, or the value of supportive care.

Evidence gaps and conclusion

The cited study does not establish a treatment threshold, a causal pathway for every participant, or a guaranteed effect on independent living. Results in schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder also cannot be assumed to apply to every diagnosis grouped under serious mental illness.

The useful lesson is to keep the destination visible. Anticholinergic evidence can inform review, but meaningful functional benefit must be demonstrated in the outcome people actually care about, with its measurement and context made explicit.

References

1. 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](#)
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. Georgiou R, et al. Anticholinergic Burden and Cognitive Performance in Patients With Schizophrenia: A Systematic Literature Review. *Front Psychiatry*. 2021;12:779607. [Source](#)
4. Khan WU, et al. The Impact of Anticholinergic Burden on Functional Capacity in Persons With Schizophrenia Across the Adult Life Span. *Schizophr Bull*. 2021;47(1):249-257. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbaa093. [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.