

**Pediatrics · Educational evidence summary**

Anticholinergic burden and pediatric polypharmacy

This pediatric review addresses anticholinergic burden and pediatric polypharmacy.

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

[Read the current article](#)

<https://unifiedacb.com/articles/074-anticholinergic-burden-and-pediatric-polypharmacy/>

Count medicines only after deciding what counts as current use

A child's medication record can include daily treatment, rescue medicines, occasional products, and prescriptions no longer used. Calling the list "polypharmacy" does not by itself define the exposure being reviewed. A careful review first establishes which products are current, how they are used, and what each is intended to achieve.

This guide explains how anticholinergic evidence can contribute to that process. It does not propose a maximum number of medicines, a pediatric burden target, or a rule to discontinue treatment. The clinical question is whether the regimen is accurately understood and whether any specific concern needs assessment.

Medication count and burden classification describe different things

A medicine count gives the number of included products under a stated rule. A source-specific burden description adds that source's classifications, subject to its coverage. A complicated schedule can exist without many strongly classified contributors, and a small regimen can include a medicine that warrants careful review.

The two measures should not be treated as interchangeable. If they are used in research, report their definitions separately. If they are used in a clinical discussion, explain what each contributes and what it does not measure about the child's experience.

Build a purpose-based medication map

Group medicines by their documented clinical role, such as treatment of the underlying condition, symptom management, rescue use, or another health problem. These groups organize the review; they are not new pharmacologic categories. Each entry should retain the exact product, route, formulation, instructions, and actual use when known.



The purpose map can reveal duplication or an unclear indication, but it should not assume that several medicines imply inappropriate care. A regimen may address several important needs. The review should preserve those benefits while making any uncertainty or unwanted effects explicit.

Include the products that fragmented records miss

Ask about medicines prescribed by different specialties and products used outside the regular prescription list. Distinguish the same ingredient under two names from two genuinely different products. A source match should follow reconciliation rather than determine it.

Prescription-claims research, such as the Slovenian nationwide study, can describe medication-use patterns but does not necessarily establish actual administration or clinical harm. [Čebren Lipovec et al., 2020](#) The same caution applies when a clinical review begins with an electronic list: the record is an evidence source to reconcile, not automatic proof of daily exposure.

Show coverage alongside source findings

Use the exact source version and preserve each observation's evidence state. If some medicines lack public rows in that source, name the gap. Do not treat unlisted medicines as zero or exclude them from the clinical list merely because they cannot contribute to a calculation.

Coverage is especially important when adult-developed sources are used to organize pediatric medicines. A complete-looking total may represent only part of the regimen. It should not be presented as a validated measure of the child's overall adverse-effect risk.

Connect the map to a specific concern

The review becomes clinically useful when it addresses an actual question: a symptom, an administration difficulty, an uncertain adjunct, or a change after a care transition. Record the concern and timing without assuming a mechanism. Other explanations may require assessment alongside medication exposure.

Choose the missing detail that would most affect interpretation. That may be actual rescue use, the current concentration, or the reason a medicine was continued. Do not create drug-specific explanations simply because the child has several classified medicines; each statement needs appropriate support.

Follow the benefit and concern separately

If the clinical team changes the regimen, record the reason and the outcomes being followed. A lower medicine count or burden description is a process change, not proof that the child feels better or that the underlying condition remains controlled. Those outcomes deserve their own assessment.

A concise review checklist

- Current products and actual use are reconciled.



- The purpose and responsible prescriber are identified where possible.
- Source versions, missing observations, and product qualifications remain visible.
- The clinical concern and intended benefit are stated separately.
- Unresolved questions have an owner and a follow-up plan.

Limits

Neither medication count nor an adult source total is a validated universal pediatric safety measure. This framework helps organize review while preserving the individual treatment context. It does not determine which medicine should be changed or establish that a complex regimen is causing a particular symptom.

References

1. Feinstein JA, et al. Anticholinergic Medications and Parent-Reported Anticholinergic Symptoms in Neurologically Impaired Children. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 2023;65(2):e109-e114. [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. Hong IS, Bishop JR. Anticholinergic use in children and adolescents after initiation of antipsychotic therapy. *Ann Pharmacother*. 2010;44(7-8):1171-1180. [Source](#)
4. Ghezzi E, Chan M, Kalisch Ellett LM, et al. The effects of anticholinergic medications on cognition in children: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sci Rep*. 2021;11:219. [Source](#)
5. Čebroň Lipovec N, Jazbar J, Kos M. Anticholinergic Burden in Children, Adults and Older Adults in Slovenia: A Nationwide Database Study. *Sci Rep*. 2020;10:9337. [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.