

**Pediatrics · Educational evidence summary**

Anticholinergic exposure and cognition in children

This pediatric review addresses anticholinergic exposure and cognition in children.

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

Read the current article

<https://unifiedacb.com/articles/081-anticholinergic-exposure-and-cognition-in-children/>

Read the result at the level it was measured

Parents and clinicians may encounter adult anticholinergic literature and wonder whether it predicts a child's cognitive future. The pediatric evidence needs to be read directly. The key question is not whether every adult finding should be accepted or rejected, but which medicines, populations, outcomes, and exposure conditions were actually studied in children.

This article is a narrative appraisal of the cited pediatric cognition synthesis. It does not rerun its meta-analysis, claim a new systematic search, or estimate risk for a child. The interpretation keeps the published finding separate from the broader questions it cannot answer.

The main finding and its scope

Ghezzi and colleagues included 46 articles in their 2021 meta-analysis. The pooled overall cognitive difference was small and not statistically significant. The studies generally involved relatively short exposure periods and limited polypharmacy, and only a subset of the medicines classified as anticholinergic in the review's source list were represented. Dose reporting was incomplete. These features limit generalization to every pediatric regimen or prolonged combination exposure. [Ghezzi et al., 2021](#)

The result is therefore neither a reason to disregard the evidence nor a universal safety certificate. It directly informs the exposures and outcomes represented in the synthesis. A different question requires evidence that actually addresses it.

What a pooled null result means

A nonsignificant pooled result does not establish that every included study, medicine, or child had exactly no effect. It means the analysis did not demonstrate the specified average association with the available data and method. The uncertainty interval and the scope of the contributing studies remain part of the result.

It is also possible for a pooled estimate to conceal clinically different contexts. That does not justify assuming an unseen harmful subgroup. It does justify asking whether a proposed application



resembles the evidence base and whether a subgroup claim was actually examined rather than invented after the fact.

Medication effects and treatment effects can coexist

A medicine may treat a condition that itself influences test performance. The observed result can reflect the net consequences of treatment under the study conditions. That is a methodological consideration, not proof that an anticholinergic mechanism is beneficial or harmful in every setting.

When interpreting an on-treatment versus off-treatment comparison, ask what else differs between those conditions. The indication, comparison group, assessment interval, and outcome definition determine the conclusion. A source category alone cannot disentangle the beneficial effect of treating a condition from a possible adverse medication effect.

Cognitive tests do not cover every outcome

Formal cognitive performance, caregiver observations, educational participation, and peripheral symptoms are separate outcomes. A study can be reassuring about the outcome measured while leaving other questions unresolved. The article's conclusion should not expand merely because those outcomes are clinically related.

For example, a result about test performance does not establish the absence of constipation or dry mouth. Nor does it supply a forecast of school grades or long-term independence. Those claims need their own measurements and appropriate follow-up. The distinction is particularly important when a family's actual concern is functional rather than a test score.

Why adult results cannot simply be substituted

Adult studies may involve different exposure duration, treatment patterns, baseline conditions, and endpoints. A dementia diagnosis in an older-adult cohort is not the same outcome as a cognitive test in a child. The existence of a shared medication mechanism does not erase those differences in clinical evidence.

The appropriate comparison asks where findings align and where the research questions differ. It does not multiply an adult risk estimate by a child's age or dose. No such transformation is provided or validated by this article.

What UnifiedACB should display

The original source observation should remain attached to its medication identity and version. Pediatric applicability can be described separately, including whether the exact product, age group, exposure pattern, and outcome have supporting evidence. A missing source entry should not be converted into zero, and missing pediatric validation should not be hidden behind a confident color.



The directory's role is to make those distinctions inspectable. It does not generate a synthetic pediatric cognition score or claim that reproducing an adult scale establishes clinical prediction in children. A correct lookup and a valid pediatric outcome model are different achievements.

How to use the finding in a clinical discussion

Begin with the concern in ordinary language: what changed, when it changed, and in which settings it is observed. Reconcile the actual medicine and formulation, including occasional use. Then ask whether the available pediatric evidence resembles that context.

If it does not, state the gap specifically. "Longer exposure to this combination is not answered by the cited studies" is more useful than an unqualified statement that there is no evidence. It identifies the uncertainty without making it a prediction of harm. Treatment decisions still require assessment of benefit and alternatives by the child's clinician.

The way a finding is carried into a conversation matters. A statement that the review did not identify an overall adverse cognitive association in its included studies is tied to an outcome and a body of evidence. "Anticholinergics are safe for children" drops both boundaries and makes a much wider claim. The distinction is especially relevant when the question concerns an unstudied preparation, a longer exposure, several medicines together, or an outcome other than the tests included in the review.

A future review or study may change the evidence base. That possibility does not make the existing review uninformative. It means its conclusion should remain attached to its methods and included evidence so that new findings can be compared transparently. The source classification displayed by UnifiedACB should likewise retain its version rather than being rewritten to match a generalized reading of one outcome review.

Limitations and conclusion

This appraisal does not establish equivalence among medicines, a safe exposure duration, or a validated pediatric burden threshold. It also does not resolve every cause of cognitive difficulty in an individual child. The published pediatric result should be communicated accurately, with its studied context intact.

The strongest interpretation is bounded: the synthesis did not demonstrate an overall adverse cognitive association in its evidence base, while important questions about other products, complex regimens, longer exposure, and noncognitive outcomes remain distinct research tasks.

References

1. 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](#)
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. 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](#)
4. Hong IS, Bishop JR. Anticholinergic use in children and adolescents after initiation of antipsychotic therapy. *Ann Pharmacother*. 2010;44(7-8):1171-1180. [Source](#)
5. 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](#)

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.