

**Methods/Research · Educational evidence summary**

Release governance for a continuously updated medication evidence database

This methods article addresses release governance for a continuously updated medication evidence database.

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

[Read the current article](#)

<https://unifiedacb.com/articles/100-release-governance-for-a-continuously-updated-medication-evidence-database/>

Abstract

A medication evidence resource can change through new publications, corrections, identity decisions, explanatory content, and interface revisions. These changes have different scientific consequences and should not be governed as interchangeable updates. This article sets out a release-governance framework for UnifiedACB, informed by the existing public structure of source-specific observations and documented quality-assurance limits. It is an operational proposal and methodological account, not a new clinical validation study. The framework separates source ingestion, evidence adjudication, presentation changes, verification, and release authorization. It requires retained source versions, explicit missing states, traceable corrections, and a recoverable record of what was published. No new source table, score, or medication classification is introduced by this article. The expected output of a governed release is an auditable relationship between its scientific inputs, implemented changes, completed checks, and remaining uncertainty. A technically successful release would still not establish that any scale is a universal predictor or prescribing rule.

Introduction

Continuous updating creates a tension between keeping information useful and preserving what a previous release meant. A corrected source row may change a medication observation. An alias fix may change discoverability. A new explanation may change how readers understand an unchanged observation. Each can matter, but they require different review questions and different release descriptions.

Governance should make those distinctions visible before publication. Its purpose is to prevent a content or interface update from silently becoming a scientific reinterpretation, and to prevent a scientific correction from disappearing into a generic maintenance note. The framework below describes proposed controls and the existing record structure that supports them.



Methods

Classify the change before implementing it

A proposed release would begin with an inventory of intended changes. Scientific-source changes include adding a publication, correcting extraction, updating a source version, or changing an adjudicated identity relationship. Editorial changes include explanatory text and citations. Presentation changes include navigation, layout, and interaction. A mixed release would identify each component separately.

The inventory would state what remains frozen and what may change. A content-only release, for example, should not alter source-native medication values or missingness states merely because a new article suggests a different interpretation. A scientific change requires its own evidence trail and review, even when the code modification is small.

Preserve source and identity history

New evidence would be captured with its source identity, version, locator, original wording or label, access scope, and relevant qualifications. A correction notice should be linked to the publication it corrects. Whether it changes a specific observation must be established from the actual correction, not inferred from the existence of a notice alone.

The prior record should remain recoverable. A newer source version may supersede a public display choice without erasing the historical publication or the reason for that choice. Identity merges, splits, and alias updates should similarly retain their mapping history, especially when they affect comparisons or the interpretation of missing entries.

Rights and public-reuse restrictions would be checked independently of scientific relevance. A source can be important enough to document while its medication-level rows remain unavailable for public redistribution. Public absence under that constraint is not a zero, and it is not evidence that the publication contained no relevant medicines.

Match review and verification to the change

Scientific extraction would require comparison with the actual source material and a recorded adjudication process appropriate to the change. Editorial review would check that new claims are supported and that study limits are accurately described. Interface review would check whether labels, state, and navigation preserve the intended evidence meaning.

The release record should identify which reviews actually occurred and by whom or by what process. It should not imply independent clinical review merely because automated checks passed. Uncompleted review steps should remain visible rather than be replaced by an optimistic status label.

Verification would compare the candidate release against its declared boundaries. For a content update, source-data hashes and invariant checks can help confirm that scientific records did not change. For a source update, checks should instead explain and validate the intended differences. A



rule that demands every file remain identical would be inappropriate when a documented scientific correction is the authorized objective.

Make publication recoverable and accountable

Before publication, the release process would retain the prior deployed state, the candidate changes, and enough build information to reproduce the intended artifact. A rollback plan should identify what can be restored and how a restoration would be verified. Recoverability is part of release preparation, not something to improvise after a problem appears.

The published change record would distinguish scientific changes from content and presentation changes. It would name affected source versions or evidence records when relevant, summarize completed validation, and state material limitations. Authorization to publish should follow the project's actual approval requirements, with the approved preview or release artifact identifiable.

Results

The existing public dataset separates medication concepts from source observations and retains source-version identifiers, source labels, locators, rating states, and anomaly records. This structure supports traceability and makes it possible to distinguish source disagreement from a display choice. Its presence does not prove that every future release will follow the proposed governance process.

[UnifiedACB public evidence dataset, v3.0 RC12 final](#)

The public QA material also distinguishes internal testing from external clinical validation. That boundary is part of responsible release reporting: engineering checks can establish behavior within their tested scope without establishing patient benefit or a universal clinical threshold. [UnifiedACB: Validation & QA](#)

No new scientific dataset, source extraction, validation cohort, or clinical outcome result was produced for this article. The result is a proposed release framework with explicit review boundaries. It does not claim that a new independent governance audit or two-person clinical sign-off has been completed.

Discussion

A release can be technically reversible while its scientific meaning is difficult to reconstruct. Restoring files is insufficient if the team cannot explain which source version a past answer used. Versioned data, identity mapping, content, and interface behavior should therefore be linked in the release record rather than treated as unrelated maintenance details.

Change classification also helps readers interpret a version number. A richer medication explanation does not necessarily mean the medication's classification changed. A new source observation does not necessarily invalidate an older source. Clear release notes let users distinguish an improved explanation from a changed scientific input and decide whether an earlier analysis needs review.

Corrections deserve a path that preserves both urgency and evidence. A demonstrable factual error should be repaired with a traceable reason and affected scope. Uncertainty about a source should



not be resolved by silently choosing the most reassuring or most alarming category. Where verification is incomplete, the record should state that limitation and avoid manufacturing consensus.

Monitoring after release should focus on meaningful failures: incorrect identities, missing-as-zero displays, broken source links, lost qualifiers, and conversational context errors. A report of such a failure should be reproducible where possible and connected to the release that exhibited it. A cosmetic improvement and a scientific correctness issue need different descriptions even if both are repaired promptly.

Governance also has to remain usable. Excessive ceremony can obscure responsibility as easily as too little documentation. The necessary record is concrete: what changed, why, what evidence supports it, what was checked, who authorized publication when required, and how the previous state can be recovered. The depth of review should follow the consequence of the change.

Limitations

This framework is not an independent audit of organizational practice, a regulatory certification, or a guarantee of error-free releases. It does not prescribe staffing or claim that a specific reviewer arrangement is already in place. Those operational details require explicit project decisions and accurate public representation.

Preserving provenance and passing technical checks cannot resolve all limitations in the underlying literature. Source methods may disagree, population validation may remain incomplete, and access restrictions may limit public detail. Governance should make these constraints durable and visible rather than suggest that a well-managed release has eliminated them.

Conclusion

Treat each release as a documented change to a versioned evidence resource. Preserve scientific history, review the type of change actually proposed, and describe only the validation that was completed. That discipline allows the site to improve while keeping medication values, source distinctions, and unresolved evidence faithful to their origins.



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. Chew ML, et al. Anticholinergic activity of 107 medications commonly used by older adults. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2008;56:1333-1341. [Source](#)
3. Carnahan RM, et al. The Anticholinergic Drug Scale as a measure of drug-related anticholinergic burden: associations with serum anticholinergic activity. J Clin Pharmacol. 2006;46:1481-1486. [Source](#)
4. Rudolph JL, et al. The anticholinergic risk scale and anticholinergic adverse effects in older persons. Arch Intern Med. 2008;168:508-513. [Source](#)
5. Lisibach A, Benelli V, Ceppi MG, et al. Quality of anticholinergic burden scales and their impact on clinical outcomes: a systematic review. Eur J Clin Pharmacol. 2021;77(2):147-162. [Source](#)
6. UnifiedACB. Public evidence dataset. v3.0 RC12 final. Read-only source observations, source registry, and preserved anomaly records. [Source](#)
7. UnifiedACB. Validation & QA. Published internal benchmark scope and limits; RC12 release certification figures. [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.