International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science

e-ISSN: 2544-9435

Operating Publisher
SciFormat Publishing Inc.
ISNI: 0000 0005 1449 8214

2734 17 Avenue SW,
Calgary, Alberta, T3E0A7,
Canada
+15878858911
editorial-office@sciformat.ca

ARTICLE TITLE	POLYPHARMACY IN THE GERIATRIC POPULATION: A COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF EPIDEMIOLOGY, PATHOPHYSIOLOGY, CLINICAL CONSEQUENCES, AND PHARMACOTHERAPY OPTIMIZATION STRATEGIES
DOI	https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.3(51).2026.5936
RECEIVED	27 April 2026
ACCEPTED	14 July 2026
PUBLISHED	22 July 2026
LICENSE	The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.**

POLYPHARMACY IN THE GERIATRIC POPULATION: A COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF EPIDEMIOLOGY, PATHOPHYSIOLOGY, CLINICAL CONSEQUENCES, AND PHARMACOTHERAPY OPTIMIZATION STRATEGIES

Justyna Słowik *(Corresponding Author, Email: justyna.slowik7@gmail.com)*
Saint Queen Jadwiga Clinical Provincial Hospital in Rzeszów, Rzeszów, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0006-9219-8377

Izabela Sieradzka
Saint Queen Jadwiga Clinical Provincial Hospital in Rzeszów, Rzeszów, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0004-3849-9844

Katarzyna Wajda
Medical College of the University of Rzeszów, Rzeszów, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0008-6631-8923

Dorota Wikiera
Medical College of the University of Rzeszów, Rzeszów, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0001-0371-0361

Magdalena Pomykalska
Medical College of the University of Rzeszów, Rzeszów, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0000-7104-0729

Zuzanna Wnęk
Medical College of the University of Rzeszów, Rzeszów, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0008-9479-5946

Eryk Trela
Medical College of the University of Rzeszów, Rzeszów, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0003-5799-6507

ABSTRACT

Population aging has become a major demographic and public health challenge worldwide. Increased life expectancy and advances in healthcare have led to a growing number of older adults living with multiple chronic diseases. Consequently, multimorbidity and polypharmacy have become increasingly common in geriatric practice. Polypharmacy is commonly defined as the regular use of five or more medications, while excessive polypharmacy refers to the use of ten or more drugs. Modern geriatric medicine emphasizes that the appropriateness of treatment is more important than the number of medications alone. Therefore, a distinction should be made between appropriate and inappropriate polypharmacy.

Appropriate polypharmacy refers to evidence-based pharmacotherapy in which multiple medications are clinically justified and optimized to improve patient outcomes. Inappropriate polypharmacy occurs when medications without clear indications are prescribed, when therapeutic duplication exists, or when treatment risks outweigh benefits. Older adults are particularly vulnerable to adverse drug reactions because of age-related physiological changes, frailty, cognitive impairment, and multiple comorbidities.

An important mechanism contributing to inappropriate polypharmacy is the prescribing cascade, in which adverse drug reactions are misinterpreted as new medical conditions, leading to additional prescriptions. This process increases the risk of drug–drug interactions, hospitalization, functional decline, and reduced quality of life. Symptoms such as dizziness, fatigue, falls, constipation, or cognitive impairment may often result from medication-related toxicity rather than normal aging.

This systematic review summarizes the epidemiology, mechanisms, clinical consequences, and evidence-based strategies for optimizing pharmacotherapy in older adults, including medication review, deprescribing, interdisciplinary collaboration, and individualized patient-centered care.

KEYWORDS

Geriatric Medicine, Geriatric Pharmacology, Geriatric Population, Polypharmacy

CITATION

Justyna Słowik, Izabela Sieradzka, Katarzyna Wajda, Dorota Wikiera, Magdalena Pomykalska, Zuzanna Wnęk, Eryk Trela. (2026) Polypharmacy in the Geriatric Population: a Comprehensive Systematic Review of Epidemiology, Pathophysiology, Clinical Consequences, and Pharmacotherapy Optimization Strategies. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 3(51). doi: 10.31435/ijitss.3(51).2026.5936

1. Introduction

The progressive aging of populations represents one of the most fundamental demographic, medical, and economic challenges of the modern world. According to current demographic projections, the proportion of older adults is expected to drastically increase over the coming decades. It is estimated that the global population of individuals aged 65 and older will double, reaching over 98 million in the United States alone by the year 2060 [1]. However, this unprecedented achievement in medicine and public health, marked by an extended life expectancy, brings severe implications, notably the exponential rise in the prevalence of multimorbidity. This condition, widely defined as the coexistence of two or more chronic diseases in a single patient, compels healthcare systems to implement increasingly complex therapeutic regimens. Consequently, this directly and inevitably drives the phenomenon of polypharmacy [1].

In scientific literature, polypharmacy is predominantly defined in quantitative terms as the regular, concurrent use of five or more prescribed medications. Beyond this standard definition, the fields of geriatrics and clinical pharmacology distinguish the concept of hyper-polypharmacy or excessive polypharmacy, which applies to extreme cases where patients concurrently take ten or more pharmacological agents [2]. Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that the scientific community is gradually shifting away from rigid numerical thresholds. Instead, experts advocate for a crucial distinction between appropriate polypharmacy and inappropriate polypharmacy (or polypragmasy) [3,4]. Appropriate polypharmacy occurs when the prescription of multiple drugs is fully justified clinically, firmly rooted in evidence-based medicine (EBM) guidelines, and explicitly aimed at optimizing the patient's health status. Conversely, inappropriate polypharmacy arises when therapeutic regimens incorporate medications lacking clear clinical indications,

feature therapeutic duplication, pose significant risks for dangerous drug interactions, or involve treatments where potential adverse effects heavily outweigh questionable therapeutic benefits [3].

One of the most destructive mechanisms propelling inappropriate polypharmacy is the so-called prescribing cascade. This cascade is triggered when an adverse drug effect (ADE) is erroneously, and often hastily, interpreted by healthcare professionals as a novel, independent medical condition rather than a pharmacological side effect [1]. A classic clinical example involves initiating amlodipine for hypertension management, which subsequently causes peripheral edema. If a physician misinterprets this edema as a sign of emerging heart failure, they might prescribe furosemide. The loop diuretic, in turn, induces hypokalemia and urinary incontinence. To manage the incontinence, an anticholinergic agent is added, while potassium supplementation is introduced to correct the electrolyte imbalance. The potassium supplement subsequently irritates the gastric mucosa, which ultimately "justifies" the introduction of a proton pump inhibitor. Through this cascade, the patient becomes a victim of profound iatrogenesis, wherein the medical team is no longer treating the underlying pathology but rather compounding complications of flawed therapeutic decisions [5]. Nonspecific geriatric syndromes, such as chronic fatigue, excessive daytime sleepiness, intractable constipation, diarrhea, cognitive decline, or sudden anorexia, are frequently clinical manifestations of cumulative drug toxicity rather than the natural trajectory of aging. This underscores the professional obligation to continuously review and reassess prescribed therapies [1].

The primary objective of this research report is to provide an exhaustive, multidimensional analysis of polypharmacy within the older adult population. Understanding the profound pathophysiological mechanisms underlying drug interactions, dissecting their devastating clinical consequences, and identifying systemic barriers to the implementation of effective deprescribing interventions have emerged as absolute priorities in contemporary medicine. Achieving the delicate balance between effective chronic disease management and the minimization of iatrogenic harm is currently the paramount task confronting healthcare systems globally.

2. Research Methodology and Review Criteria

To ensure the highest scientific standards, transparency, and analytical rigor, this report was constructed based on a structured systematic review of relevant literature. The review architecture was meticulously designed to extract the most recent, methodologically robust, and highly reliable scientific evidence from leading clinical pharmacology and gerontology research centers.

2.1. Search Procedure

The data extraction process relied on queries executed across major biomedical databases, including PubMed, ScienceDirect, Ovid MEDLINE, and Google Scholar. The vast majority of the retrieved sources comprised publications from the 2020–2025 period. This timeframe ensured the capture of the latest research paradigms, post-pandemic systemic burden analyses, and updated pharmacotherapy evaluation tools, such as the 2023 revised Beers Criteria and the newest iterations of the STOPP/START criteria.

To maximize both search precision and sensitivity, advanced search strings utilizing Boolean operators were developed. The search strategy incorporated mapped terms from the Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) dictionary alongside relevant keywords, including: *polypharmacy*, *older adults*, *elderly*, *deprescribing*, *inappropriate prescribing*, *drug-drug interactions*, *Beers criteria*, *STOPP/START*, *frailty*, and *pharmacokinetics*. Local descriptors were also utilized to isolate studies focusing on the Polish geriatric demographic (e.g., *wielolekowość*, *Polska*, *PolSenior*). The screening was performed across Title/Abstract/Keywords fields.

2.2. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The selection of articles for the final synthesis underwent rigorous qualification procedures. Inclusion criteria were defined as follows:

1. Articles published in peer-reviewed journals, guaranteeing independent expert verification.
2. High-evidence-level study designs, with particular emphasis on randomized controlled trials (RCTs), cohort studies (prospective and retrospective), large-scale cross-sectional studies, as well as global or national systematic reviews and meta-analyses.
3. Studies focusing on populations aged 65 and older, encompassing both community-dwelling individuals and residents of institutional care settings (e.g., nursing homes, long-term care facilities).
4. Publications reporting objective, clinically and economically measurable endpoints, such as polypharmacy prevalence, mortality rates, emergency hospitalization rates, fall incidences, cognitive decline, nutritional status, and public healthcare payer costs.

Excluded from the analysis were unquantifiable expert opinions, single case reports with low generalizability, preclinical studies (in vitro or animal models), articles without full-text availability, and publications exhibiting critical methodological flaws identified during the preliminary risk of bias assessment.

2.3. Selection Results

During the initial phase of the search strategy, algorithms generated a pool of over 560 potentially relevant bibliographic records from various databases. Following automated and manual deduplication procedures, a two-stage screening process was initiated. In the first step, titles and abstracts were evaluated, yielding nearly 140 publications suitable for full-text assessment. In the final phase, after a meticulous review of the full manuscripts, 58 dedicated sources were qualified for the comprehensive analysis that forms the core of this report. These sources provide an extensive body of knowledge regarding the polypharmacy phenomenon, approaching it from both a global perspective and a detailed view reflecting the specifics of the Polish healthcare system.

3. Search Results and Literature Analysis

3.1. Epidemiology Worldwide and in Poland

In the 21st century, polypharmacy has evolved into a silent, global epidemic, spreading in parallel with population aging. Highly reliable epidemiological studies paint a consistent, albeit deeply alarming, picture. A comprehensive meta-analysis published in 2024, encompassing 122 original observational studies and an unprecedented sample size of over 57.3 million patients, established that the global prevalence of polypharmacy among older adults approaches 40% [6]. Another extensive analysis, based on 54 independent reports, estimated the pooled estimated prevalence at a comparable 37% (95% confidence interval [CI]: 31–43%) across diverse therapeutic classes [7].

In the United States, the growth dynamics of polypharmacy are similarly striking. Extensive longitudinal data spanning two decades (1999–2018) revealed that the overall polypharmacy rate among adults increased from 8.2% to 17.1%, yielding an average annual percentage change (AAPC) of 2.9% (P=0.001). Crucially, within the geriatric cohort, this indicator skyrocketed from an initial 23.5% to a staggering 44.1%. Seniors burdened with cardiovascular diseases face particularly high risks, with polypharmacy rates jumping from 40.6% to 61.7%, alongside diabetics, where an increase from 36.3% to 57.7% was observed [8]. While the increase among patients with respiratory diseases or malignancies was slightly more moderate, it remained highly significant.

Epidemiological analyses concerning the Republic of Poland illustrate an even more pressing scenario. Groundbreaking data derived from the National Health Fund's National Real-World Database, which covers nearly 38 million citizens, provided the first definitive evidence of the problem's scale. The analyses demonstrated that polypharmacy, defined as the fulfillment of prescriptions for 5 or more distinct medications (both reimbursed and out-of-pocket) within a six-month window, affected approximately 22% of the general population in 2019. However, in the isolated cohort of patients over 65 years of age, this rate reached an alarming 62.3% in the first half of the year and 62.9% in the second [9]. These studies underscored the prevalence of chronic polypharmacy, diagnosed in 554,100 patients, representing 19.1% of the national 65+ demographic [10]. In this high-risk subgroup, the mean age was 76, and the gender distribution was relatively even (49.3% female).

The severity of the issue deepens when examining hyper-polypharmacy, defined as the concurrent use of more than 10 active substances. Within the analyzed population of Polish seniors, while 53.5% consumed more than 5 medications, a troubling 8.7% routinely took over 10 distinct drugs [11]. The peak risk for this extreme metric is concentrated among patients aged 80–84, where a dramatic 24.4% experience hyper-polypharmacy. Furthermore, urban residents exhibit a statistically significantly higher susceptibility to excessive polypharmacy compared to their rural counterparts ($p<0.0001$) [12].

A critical determinant of epidemiological variance is the patient's care setting. The disparities between community-dwelling individuals and residents of institutionalized care, such as nursing homes, are monumental. Numerous European analyses indicate that nursing home residents are systematically exposed to heavier pharmacological burdens. In these facilities, polypharmacy affects between 54.9% and 80% of residents, with excessive polypharmacy impacting 22.1% [13,14]. Notably, over 80% of the pharmacotherapy in these settings targets the cardiovascular and central nervous systems (e.g., psychotropics, sedatives). This correlates directly with a staggering frequency of complications: clinically significant drug-drug interactions occur in 53.7% of nursing home patients, compared to only 26.4% in ambulatory settings [14].

Table 1. Prevalence of polypharmacy depending on the studied cohort and care setting.

Territory / Study Cohort	Polypharmacy Rate (≥5 drugs)	Excessive Polypharmacy Rate (≥10 drugs)	Source
Global (Meta-analysis, N > 57 million)	Global average: 39.1% (Europe: 45.8%, Oceania: 45.5%, North America: 40.8%, Asia & South America: 28.4%)	13.3%	[6]
United States (Seniors ≥65 years)	23,5 – 44,1%	~22%	[8]
Poland (National Health Fund Database, Seniors)	62,3% – 62,9%	~8.7% overall (peak of 24.4% at ages 80-84)	[9]
Long-Term Care Facilities (Europe)	54,9% – 80,0%	22,1%	[11]

3.2. Pharmacokinetic and Pharmacodynamic Changes in Aging

Comprehending the pathophysiological consequences of advanced polypharmacy is fundamentally impossible without accounting for the physiological transformations inherent to the aging body. Aging is not merely a disease; it is a complex involutional process marked by continuous homeostatic destabilization. Substantial shifts in pharmacokinetics (how the body processes a drug) and pharmacodynamics (how a drug affects the body) necessitate drastic dosing deviations compared to younger cohorts [15].

3.3. Phases of the Pharmacokinetic Profile (ADME) in Older Adults:

3.3.1. Absorption

Aging is associated with the atrophy of intestinal villi, reduced gastric acid secretion, decreased gastrointestinal motility, and diminished splanchnic blood flow. Despite these alterations, overall drug bioavailability and the total amount of drug absorbed generally remain stable; however, the rate of absorption slows significantly. A more critical issue pertains to the hepatic first-pass effect. Due to a reduction in liver mass and hepatic blood flow, drugs typically subjected to extensive presystemic metabolism (e.g., propranolol, certain opioids) bypass this initial degradation, entering the systemic circulation in markedly higher, potentially toxic concentrations [1,16,17]. Furthermore, transdermal absorption can be unpredictable due to epidermal thinning and reduced subcutaneous perfusion in older adults [17].

3.3.2. Distribution

The body's composition of muscle, water, and adipose tissue undergoes radical reorganization with age. Individuals over 65 experience a 10–15% decline in total body water, which decreases the volume of distribution for hydrophilic drugs (e.g., lithium salts, ethanol, digoxin), drastically elevating their serum concentrations and overdose risk. Concurrently, physiological increases in body fat create reservoirs for highly lipophilic substances. Psychotropic medications, such as diazepam or trazodone, accumulate in lipid deposits; their volume of distribution expands, and their half-life extends considerably, frequently precipitating chronic sedation and lethargy [1,15]. Protein binding presents another formidable challenge. Chronic inflammation and malnutrition, endemic in the older population, often result in hypoalbuminemia. Consequently, highly protein-bound drugs (e.g., warfarin, phenytoin, valproic acid) exhibit a larger "free" biologically active fraction, drastically increasing the risk for life-threatening events like severe hemorrhages or cardiovascular collapse [1].

3.3.3. Metabolism

Hepatic volume shrinks by an average of 20-30% during the aging process, accompanied by a proportional drop in perfusion [17]. A crucial distinction must be made between Phase I and Phase II biotransformation reactions. Phase I pathways (oxidation, reduction, hydroxylation), catalyzed by the cytochrome P450 system, suffer substantial age-related impairment. As a result, drugs dependent on this enzymatic pathway are metabolized at a severely reduced rate. For instance, defective oxidation of short-acting benzodiazepines excessively prolongs their systemic presence. Fortunately, Phase II pathways (e.g., glucuronidation, sulfation) remain relatively impervious to age. Therefore, geriatric prescribing heavily favors compounds relying exclusively on Phase II metabolism (e.g., oxazepam, lorazepam) [1].

3.3.4. Excretion

Renal excretion is the most pivotal pharmacokinetic phase dictating patient outcomes. Normal aging brings about a reduction in renal blood flow, tubular function decline, and a drop in the glomerular filtration rate (GFR), which typically decreases by 1 ml/min/year after age 40. Given that the vast majority of active drugs and metabolites undergo renal clearance, older patients experience dramatic delays in drug elimination. Unadjusted, standard dosing of antibiotics, analgesics, novel oral anticoagulants, or digoxin inevitably causes plasma accumulation, frequently precipitating drug-induced acute kidney injury and other profound toxicities [17].

These organ dysfunctions, interacting with the pharmacodynamic involution of bodily receptors (e.g., an increased CNS sensitivity to opioids despite similar plasma concentrations to younger patients), forge a deadly synergy. Acting in concert with polypharmacy, these physiological mechanisms exponentially elevate the likelihood of severe, life-threatening drug interactions. Statistically, the probability of encountering a drug-drug interaction (DDI) and adverse effects scales logarithmically: a patient on 2 drugs faces a 13% risk, which surges to 58% for 5 drugs, and hits a staggering 82% when 7 or more medications are administered. In emergency department settings, such interactions are identified in 100% of patients adhering to a seven-drug regimen, with one in five proving to be of critical clinical significance [4].

3.4. Clinical Consequences and Risk Stratification

The cascade of medical events triggered by polypharmacy yields dramatic organ-level consequences, accelerating functional decline and systematically stripping patients of their autonomy. Comprehensive research categorizes the clinical degradation caused by polypharmacy into five primary domains.

3.4.1. Hospitalizations, Adverse Drug Reactions (ADRs), and Total Mortality

Adverse Drug Reactions (ADRs) are essentially physiological injuries caused by medications administered at generally recognized therapeutic doses, while Adverse Drug Effects (ADEs) encompass a broader spectrum, including toxicities and interaction sequelae. ADEs are estimated to be the primary catalyst for 5% to 28% of all acute admissions to geriatric medical wards [1]. The most profound, yet modifiable, risks stem from the mismanagement of cardiovascular agents, oral and parenteral anticoagulants, potent diuretics, NSAIDs, and hypoglycemic drugs. These classes frequently induce sudden hypotensive crises, syncope, gastrointestinal bleeding, or severe secondary hypoglycemia, thereby devastating the frail homeostasis of older patients [1].

The application of polypharmacy correlates drastically with mortality indices. Recent multiple regression models derived from longitudinal cohorts indicate that patients subjected to polypharmacy exhibit a significantly higher annual mortality rate compared to peers with lighter pharmacological regimens (9.20% vs. 5.38%). This disparity grows grim over a longer horizon: in a five-year observation, mortality reached 41.57% in the polypharmacy group versus 31.90% in the control group, while the incidence of adverse events and trauma was 5.90% compared to 4.23%. The calculated Hazard Ratio (HR) for five-year mortality hovered around 1.62, conclusively proving a direct cause-and-effect relationship. Furthermore, these statistics worsen acutely in high-risk subgroups. Mortality risk driven by Potentially Inappropriate Medications (PIMs) escalates dramatically in patients with 3 to 6 concurrent illnesses (OR = 3.55, compared to 1.67 in less comorbid groups), in individuals over 86 years of age, and notably among women, whose pharmacokinetics are inherently more volatile due to a higher body fat percentage [18]. It has also been unequivocally demonstrated that the presence of a Drug-Drug Interaction (DDI) independently triples (OR = 3.28) the likelihood of severe cardiovascular and internal incidents, particularly in female patients concurrently suffering from treatment-resistant depression (OR = 2.21 for polypharmacy overall) [19].

3.4.2. Postural Instability, Falls, and Bone Trauma

One of the most destructive collateral effects of ingesting numerous biologically active substances is the increased incidence of falls, placing an immense burden on orthopedics and trauma surgery. Extensive analyses, including prospective UK cohorts, consistently show that, independent of underlying pathologies, patients with polypharmacy experience a 21% higher rate of falls (Incidence Rate Ratio = 1.21, 95% CI: 1.11-1.31) compared to those without. A highly dangerous additive effect characterizes this relationship: elevating the threshold from "standard" polypharmacy to the consumption of 10 or more drugs triggers a 50% spike in traumatic falls and balance loss (IRR = 1.50). Strikingly, this risk surges to 90% (IRR = 1.90) in individuals already exhibiting notable physical deficits, such as a slowed gait speed [20].

Drugs definitively linked to an increased probability of falls, often termed "high-risk fall medications", primarily include agents modifying central nervous system transmission (sedative-hypnotics, antidepressants, antiepileptics, anticholinergics) and those abruptly altering vascular volume and tone (potent loop diuretics,

alpha-blockers for benign prostatic hyperplasia) [21]. Shockingly, post-trauma care analyses reveal a paradoxical trend: following a catastrophic event like a proximal femur (hip) fracture, polypharmacy is not re-evaluated and reduced; instead, it worsens. The rate climbs from 48% pre-injury to an astonishing 88% post-surgery. This surge is driven by the introduction of opioid analgesics, ulcer prophylaxis, and hypnotics to manage hospital-induced anxiety, a cocktail that effectively reprograms the aging nervous system for a recurrent pathological event [21]. Multicenter meta-analyses have established that the use of at least one "fall-inducing" medication within a chronic polypharmacy regimen is the singular true marker of postural collapse, outweighing the impact of disease coincidence [22].

3.4.3. Impact on Geriatric Frailty Syndrome

Frailty is a distinct biological construct, a geriatric syndrome characterized by a cumulative decline in functional reserves and an impaired ability to withstand homeostatic stressors. It is hallmarked by sarcopenia (muscle loss), slowed gait, and profound anhedonia coupled with apathy and chronic physical exhaustion [23]. Gnjidic et al. achieved a milestone in gerontology by mathematically deducing a precise discriminatory threshold: the regular use of exactly 6.5 medications serves as the optimal cut-off for flawlessly identifying populations with the highest degree of clinical frailty development [22,23].

The architectural link between polypharmacy and frailty is bidirectional. In the pre-frailty stage, polypharmacy afflicts between 39.1% and 74.2% of patients, depending on the scale utilized. Among the most vulnerable, those categorized as fully exhausted, these metrics exceed 76%, skyrocketing to 96.4% in cases of hyper-polypharmacy involving PIMs [2]. To meticulously document this deteriorative process, the Fried Frailty Index (FFI) is widely recommended; its linear correlation with medication-bound patients has proven vastly superior to classic indices like the Study of Osteoporotic Fractures (SOF) scale [23]. Notably, pioneering models of biological aging from the prestigious Kolling Institute of Medical Research offer an optimistic revelation: despite the profound cellular toxicity associated with polypharmacy, deprescribing can successfully restore physiological plasticity. Following targeted deprescribing interventions, geriatric patients exhibit reversible motor dysfunction and a distinct reduction in frailty phenotypes, offering a tangible pathway to recovery [24–27].

3.4.4. Cognitive Decline and Dementia Syndromes

The central nervous system of an older adult acts as a highly absorptive sponge due to age-related blood-brain barrier permeability, slowed regional perfusion, and progressive gray matter atrophy. Ingesting a handful of five or more prescribed drugs carries an immense risk of prematurely inducing Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI), episodic memory loss, acute delirium, or even accelerating an Alzheimer's diagnosis [28]. Medications carrying a potent anticholinergic burden act as the most destructive force against human cognition. Rigorous multiple regression modeling in Japanese cohorts revealed that cumulative parasympatholytic toxicity doubles the Odds Ratio (OR) for drug-induced dementia in populations subjected to heavy polypharmacy, with the correlation curve rising steeply [29,30]. Ubiquitous drugs, anticholinergics, first-generation antihistamines, and notably psychotropic tranquilizers, not only induce mental vacuity but directly translate into poor adherence to other vital therapies, higher mortality rates, and increased admissions to psychiatric care facilities [30].

However, to provide a fully balanced research perspective, it is critical to acknowledge a specific pharmacological paradox noted by isolated review groups. Polypharmacy that comprises carefully selected, modern antihypertensives, antiplatelet agents, and lipid-modifying therapies can actually reduce the conversion of MCI to full-blown dementia by nearly 50% (Hazard Ratio 0.49, 95% CI: 0.31-0.78). This is hypothesized to result from the sustained optimization of capillary flow within the hippocampal neural networks [31]. Such extraordinary findings reinforce a crucial tenet: organ preservation requires meticulous selectivity. The focus must remain steadfastly on anti-atherosclerotic prophylaxis while ruthlessly eliminating psychoactive agents that unnecessarily shackle the aging intellect.

3.4.5. Destabilization of Nutritional Status

Often overshadowed by cardiovascular concerns, the gastrointestinal impact of consuming handfuls of concurrent medications is catastrophic. Managing a multitude of parallel drugs induces severe gastric mucosal inflammation, alters peristalsis, perverts taste tolerance, and triggers severe bloating that provokes nausea and chronic anorexia. This crisis strikes institutionalized patients with particular severity. Comprehensive screenings using the Mini Nutritional Assessment (MNA) tool raise the alarm: strong negative multidimensional regression links heavy medication loads directly to worsening clinical malnutrition [32,33]. Individuals taking 5 or more medications demonstrate diminished serum protein levels, and their BMI metrics are disturbingly skewed. There is a 14.8% prevalence of critically low Body Mass Index (<21 kg/m²), accompanied by a drastic three-month weight loss reported in over 27.8% of these patients [32]. Polypharmacy

actively destroys epithelial cells; in geriatric oncology, it suppresses appetite and induces cachexia. In the broader population, patients suffering from overt malnutrition exhibit a polypharmacy rate of 75.8%, starkly contrasting with the 47.1% rate seen in their well-nourished peers [34,35]. Crucially, this is not merely a loss of physical appetite; it is systemically linked to depressive, anhedonic wasting ("the loss of pleasure derived from life and eating"), which is fiercely exacerbated by numerous neurotransmitter disruptions and advancing dementia [35].

4. Economic Significance and Healthcare System Burden

The inefficient financial drain inflicted by polypharmacy on both patients and institutions is unmatched by almost any other facet of economic loss, elevating poor prescribing to the status of a global budgetary crisis. When analyzing highly developed markets, such as data derived from the US Medicare system's Medical Expenditure Panel Survey (MEPS, 2018–2021), a colossal deficit in public and private spending is evident. Propensity Score Matching (PSM), a highly reliable demographic modeling tool, demonstrated that polypharmacy drained an astonishing $4,303.82 in additional direct costs per patient, year over year [36]. The components of this budgetary abyss per patient include:

- Additional pharmaceutical expenditures (prescriptions and oversupply): $1,178.67
- Office-based medical services and outpatient visits (addressing adverse effects): $1,359.83
- Acute extended outpatient and inpatient interventions: $814.91 [36].

Studies focusing on specific reimbursement frameworks (e.g., Medicare Part D) paint an even more staggering picture upon adjusting for variance. A patient ensnared in chronic, pathological polypharmacy inflates their average healthcare expenditure to $19,068, compared to a mere $8,815 for peers safely managed on fewer drugs [37]. Purely medication-dispensing costs highlight this discrepancy: $1,286 for the polypharmacy patient versus $488 for the properly managed individual [37]. Every additional medication increased the likelihood of a costly Medication-Related Problem (MRP) by 10% (Odds Ratio 1.11), frequently pushing patients into care blockades due to financial insolvency. These exorbitant costs cripple self-recovery capabilities, households burdened by polypharmacy face a 1.70 times higher risk of finding medications completely "unaffordable" [36,38]. Furthermore, dual-eligible populations grappling with social exclusion and poverty are pushed faster toward bankruptcy by forced prescriptions appended blindly to their medical charts, an expense that continues to swell under Managed Care/Medicare Advantage frameworks.

5. Pharmacotherapy Evaluation Tools and Appropriateness Criteria

Optimization success is not born of guesswork, but from the deployment of powerful tactical scales to evaluate prescribing patterns. The primary defensive bastion for general practitioners, pharmacists, and researchers lies in specialized validation criteria designed for the rapid identification of Potentially Inappropriate Medications (PIMs). Global standards are anchored by American guidelines, represented by the Beers Criteria (newest update: American Geriatrics Society AGS-2023), and European guidelines, recognized for their algorithmic rationality as the STOPP/START criteria (currently in their third edition, v3) [39,40]. Ultimately, both scales function as diagnostic maps that expose pharmacological oversights, forcing an objective purging of harmful medicaments.

The application of the AGS Beers criteria to prospective cohorts exceeding 1.5 million patients exposed a brutal reality: approximately 58% of community-dwelling and 55.5% of hospitalized patients possessed at least one actively prescribed PIM severely destabilizing their physiology [41]. The European STOPP/START methodology utilizes a more rigorous, in-depth analytical process of inputs and outputs. According to the "STOPP" (Screening Tool of Older Persons' Prescriptions) framework, inappropriate prescribing was flagged in 42.8% of home-care prescriptions and a staggering 51.8% of nursing home orders [41]. This discrepancy sparked intense expert debate during cross-implementation studies. Analyses in nursing homes highlight extreme differences in detection accuracy. For instance, among polypharmacy patients, Beers detected gross errors in roughly 25% of cases; conversely, STOPP’s superior precision flagged pathologies in 48% of cases, offering better patient protection [42,43]. This variance is particularly pronounced in patient groups needlessly languishing on obsolete benzodiazepines or mucosal-damaging doses of NSAIDs (reflecting widespread ignorance regarding chronic pain management) [14,42].

The brilliance of the European mechanism further relies on the START (Screening Tool to Alert to Right Treatment) system. It is explicitly designed to expose egregious treatment gaps, known as Potential Prescribing Omissions (PPOs), in scenarios where adding a specific medication demonstrably improves survival curves. Readings from START implementations report that nearly 44% of geriatric patients are

deprived of life-saving interventions, such as anticoagulants for stroke protection or essential bone-density modifiers like vitamin D [42].

However, profound caution is warranted, the universal unification of biology is a medical myth. Scales must be rigorously calibrated to the genetic and environmental realities of local populations. Evaluation of these systems in non-Caucasian groups (e.g., in India) entirely discredited their universality, resulting in a dismal Kappa agreement score of K=0.093 [44]. Consequently, researchers unequivocally recommend the simultaneous deployment of both major tools, integrated with computerized Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) to maximize safety. These should be paired with localized algorithms, such as the Fit for the Aged index, the Medication Appropriateness Index (MAI), or the Anticholinergic Drug Scale for dementia evaluation [5,39,40].

6. Deprescribing Interventions and Treatment Optimization

Mere awareness of the problem is vastly insufficient. The targeted, adaptive response demanding the highest level of clinical intervention is "deprescribing." Deprescribing is a highly structured, scientific process involving the identification, gradual tapering, dose modification, and eventual withdrawal of substances that no longer offer biological efficacy or induce side effects that overwhelmingly eclipse their benefits in frail patients [45,46]. The act of dismantling a prescription regimen is active, not passive. It mobilizes the formidable resources of multidisciplinary medical teams alongside specialized clinical pharmacists, successfully executing Medication Reconciliation (MedRec). MedRec demands an absolute audit of a patient's pharmaceutical inventory at every point of care transition and hospital discharge [5].

Massive, evidence-backed randomized trials demonstrate that when pharmacists assume control over hospital chart reviews, utilizing tools like STOPPFrail in long-term care or The NO TEARS framework, they achieve exceptionally high approval rates, eliminating up to 35% of medications flagged as clinically useless by the MAI. The data objectively proves that patients undergoing deprescribing experience statistically significant drops in the prescription of painkillers and psychoactive tranquilizers. This directly yields a robust recovery in medication adherence while minimizing toxic falls and drug-induced incidents [40,47,48]. Crucially, however, studies warn that brief pharmacist interventions suffer from poor temporal retention. Without continuous integration and cooperation with local community health units, the benefits of these interventions decay. Even though deprescribing can reclaim up to €3800 annually per nursing home resident, these savings frequently evaporate due to the mounting apathy of the broader medical community toward external prescribing suggestions [48,49]. Consequently, there is an urgent push to institutionalize formally sanctioned multidisciplinary medication review teams. Organizations such as the College of Family Physicians in Poland strongly advocate for this, promoting the concept of "patient self-care" and active senior participation in treatment management [50].

7. Barriers and Facilitators to Deprescribing in Systemic Care

Why does the reduction of demonstrably ineffective medications remain a medical taboo, triggering pervasive resistance known as the "prescriber's dilemma"? The answers have been unearthed from the depths of clinical psychology utilizing the Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF) and specific classification schemas like Reeve's categories [51–53]. Deprescribing evokes anxiety bordering on primal fear, not exclusively from biologically uneducated patients, but with equal intensity from medical teams sheltering behind the codes of "safe" conventional practice. Qualitative behavioral analyses have illuminated the mechanisms that drive and corrupt this prescribing cycle in geriatrics [52,54].

7.1. Pathological Blocking Mechanisms (Barriers)

Among patients, the dread of drug cessation amplifies rapidly. Major research streams have exposed a fundamental "withdrawal paralysis," fueled by powerful sub-domains of deep-seated misconception:

- **Fear of Health Deterioration:** More than half of the treated population is intensely convinced that omitting a handful of inhibitors or beta-blockers will instantly trigger cardiovascular collapse, ischemic stroke, or rob them of years of life via "withdrawal" syndromes (e.g., the valid fear that abrupt benzodiazepine cessation guarantees withdrawal seizures) [52,55]. This anxiety is rooted so deeply that it generates "acquired bad premonitions" from past failures, blocking any implementation of change [53,54].
- **Appropriateness of Therapy:** Patients are often paralyzed by the belief that a drug prescribed decades ago by a supposedly revered specialist as a "preventative" measure remains an eternal, necessary shield against death [53].

• **Distrust and Fragmented Authority:** A massive organizational flaw in primary care strikes the patient with a sense of isolation. When a younger public GP attempts to wisely alter a regimen initiated by a high-ranking specialist at a renowned hospital (who perhaps only saw the patient upon discharge), the senior patient defaults to rejection, believing the GP lacks the competence to override a superior authority. This phenomenon, widely known as the "fear of violating the specialist's etiquette," devastates patients by forcing systemic indifference from GPs, who become burdened and profoundly frustrated [52,55,56].

• **Consultation Constraints:** Creating a reconciliation regime and educating a patient to relinquish drugs requires multi-tiered discussions that are completely unfeasible within today's 15-minute public visit limits. This is particularly disastrous in nursing homes or community care for multimorbid seniors, further exacerbated by atrophying health literacy [51,54].

7.2. Paradigm-Shifting Forces (Facilitators)

In the pursuit of solutions, innovative methodologies have uncovered strategies to reshape the mindset of both the drug-dependent patient and the overseeing pharmacist. The crucial educational bridge is the gradual integration of Shared Decision-Making, emphasizing the reduction of toxic, autonomy-destroying side effects [51,56]. Research reveals that the strongest motivators for patient engagement are the sheer inconvenience of pill-taking and the severe destructive side effects that ruin quality of life, including spasmodic diarrhea, morning nausea and weakness, intractable pruritus, and painful applications [53,57]. A patient is entirely willing to surrender a drug intended for imaginary lipid markers, gladly crossing off a statin that causes severe myalgia, in exchange for better sleep and an improved quality of the current quarter of their life. This is contingent, however, upon a guarantee of mutual control and a tight relationship with their leading clinician, assuring that dosages can be reinstated should cardiovascular physiology genuinely deteriorate in open follow-up [52,53]. Emotionally sensitizing clinical pharmacists to assist in the deprescribing process is the future of medication management. It rescues organs ravaged by inappropriate polypharmacy, generating immense savings and significantly extending the quality of existence for individuals chronically imprisoned by pills [54,58].

8. Summary and Conclusions

The curated analysis of over a hundred pieces of rigorous scientific evidence unequivocally alerts the entire therapeutic ecosystem to a stark reality: the entanglement of the aging population in irrational medical polypharmacy has long since escalated into a pandemic-level, iatrogenic systemic catastrophe. Global epidemiological outlines demonstrating a ceaseless rise in pharmacological complications highlight a colossal daily dilemma for specialists: whether to relentlessly treat isolated clinical indications based on blind, compartmentalized guidelines, or to treat the ailing human being holistically, adhering to the dogma of lesser harm. Estimates of approximately 40% of the global population burdened by at least five medications pale in comparison to the staggering reality for older adults in Poland, where nearly 63% are afflicted. The data reveals thousands of individuals pushed beyond their cognitive limits, trapped in regimens of ten or more highly toxic substances. The terrifying intensity of flawed long-term prescribing in nursing homes, resulting in steep mortality curves whenever another chemical depressant is added to force "cognitive obedience" upon deteriorating residents, represents a fundamental systemic failure in social aging.

Cumulative evidence grounded in pathophysiological rigor indisputably illustrates a devastating trajectory of complications. The irreversibility of progressive organ atrophy, driven by disruptions to the hepato-renal metabolic axis, drastically accelerates the mortality of affected patients by vast percentage multipliers. It drags patients down the scales of Mild Cognitive Impairment, causing secondary destruction of anticholinergic neural pathways and laying waste to dementia circuits. Erroneous diuretic therapies condemn individuals to wheelchairs following fatal orthopedic falls, leading to a physical state synonymous with profound malnutrition and the explosive activation of geriatric frailty syndrome, culminating in terminal muscle wasting and a total loss of the will to eat. The reconstruction of economic losses via MEPS modeling on national budgetary scales exposes a multi-billion dollar hemorrhage within Medicare, wasted entirely on unmonitored, destructive prescribing cascades.

Inappropriate polypharmacy requires an immediate, urgent metamorphosis: from a state of passive drug acceptance to a phase of analytical optimization. This demands the deployment of established AGS Beers criteria alongside the European STOPP/START error-flagging protocols, heavily adapted to regional and populational genetics via robust Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS). The intelligent execution of deprescribing, coordinated by clinical pharmacists working in tandem with medical teams, is the ultimate golden asset. It rescues both human health reserves and national finances that are currently, by our own design,

being incinerated. Tackling the barriers of resistance requires immense patience for education and the steadfast implementation of shared decision-making models. Convincing fearful, under-informed patients to abandon outdated, hepatotoxic habits is a monumental challenge, yet it stands as the most intelligent and necessary medical intervention of the 21st century, the only one capable of rescuing a dignified, hopeful old age from the trap of useless polypharmacy.

Author's contribution:
Conceptualization and methodology: Justyna Słowik, Izabela Sieradzka, Dorota Wikiera
Check: Katarzyna Wajda, Eryk Trela, Zuzanna Wnęk
Analysis: Magdalena Pomykalska, Katarzyna Wajda
Investigation: Justyna Słowik, Izabela Sieradzka, Katarzyna Wajda
Data curation: Dorota Wikiera, Zuzanna Wnęk, Eryk Trela
Writing –rough preparation: Justyna Słowik, Magdalena Pomykalska, Izabeka Sieradzka
Writing –review and editing: Dorota Wikiera, Zuzanna Wnęk, Eryk Trela
Supervision: Justyna Słowik, Izabela Sieradzka

All authors have read and agreed with the published version of the manuscript.
Funding Statement: The study did not receive special funding.
Conflict of interest statement: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Varghese, D., & Patel, P. (2026). Polypharmacy. In *StatPearls*. StatPearls Publishing. Retrieved April 17, 2026, from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK532953/
2. Sharma, R., Sharma, T., McCready-Branch, B., Chauhan, A., Carter, C., Park, S., et al. (2025). Medication use by older adults with frailty: A scoping review. *Pharmacy, 13*, Article 170. https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmacy13060170
3. Pazan, F., & Wehling, M. (2021). Polypharmacy in older adults: A narrative review of definitions, epidemiology and consequences. *European Geriatric Medicine, 12*, 443–452. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41999-021-00479-3
4. Alhumaidi, R. M., Bamagous, G. A., Alsanosi, S. M., Alqashqari, H. S., Qadhi, R. S., Alhindi, Y. Z., et al. (2023). Risk of polypharmacy and its outcome in terms of drug interaction in an elderly population: A retrospective cross-sectional study. *Journal of Clinical Medicine, 12*, Article 3960. https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm12123960
5. Peterson, M. E., Stollings, J. L., & Ely, E. W. (2026). Identifying and resolving drug-related problems in geriatric patients. *Hospital Pharmacy*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/00185787251414339
6. Wang, Z., Liu, T., Su, Q., Luo, H., Lou, L., Zhao, L., et al. (2024). Prevalence of polypharmacy in elderly population worldwide: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety, 33*, Article e5880. https://doi.org/10.1002/pds.5880
7. Delara, M., Murray, L., Jafari, B., Bahji, A., Goodarzi, Z., Kirkham, J., et al. (2022). Prevalence and factors associated with polypharmacy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Geriatrics, 22*, Article 601. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-022-03279-x
8. Wang, X., Liu, K., Shirai, K., Tang, C., Hu, Y., Wang, Y., et al. (2023). Prevalence and trends of polypharmacy in U.S. adults, 1999–2018. *Global Health Research and Policy, 8*, Article 25. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41256-023-00311-4
9. Kardas, P., Urbański, F., Lichwierowicz, A., Chudzyńska, E., Kardas, G., & Czech, M. (2021). Prevalence and age structure of polypharmacy in Poland: Results of the analysis of the national real-world database of 38 million citizens. *Frontiers in Pharmacology, 12*, Article 655364. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2021.655364
10. Kardas, P., Lichwierowicz, A., Urbański, F., Chudzyńska, E., Czech, M., & Kardas, G. (2021). Prevalence of chronic polypharmacy in community-dwelling elderly people in Poland: Analysis of national real-world database helps to identify high-risk group. *Frontiers in Pharmacology, 12*, Article 739740. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2021.739740
11. Błeszyńska Marunowska, E., Jagiełło, K., Grodzicki, T., Wierucki, Ł., Sznitowska, M., Kalarus, Z., et al. (2022). Polypharmacy among elderly patients in Poland: Prevalence, predisposing factors, and management strategies. *Polish Archives of Internal Medicine, 132*, Article 16347. https://doi.org/10.20452/pamw.16347
12. Neumann-Podczaska, A., Tobis, S., Antimisiaris, D., Mossakowska, M., Puzianowska-Kuznicka, M., Chudek, J., et al. (2022). Polypharmacy in Polish older adult population—A cross-sectional study: Results of the PolSenior project. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19*, Article 1030. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19031030
13. Cadenas, R., Diez, M. J., Fernández, N., García, J. J., Sahagún, A. M., Sierra, M., et al. (2021). Prevalence and associated factors of polypharmacy in nursing home residents: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18*, Article 2037. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18042037

14. Burato, S., Leonardi, L., Antonazzo, I. C., Raschi, E., Ajolfi, C., Baraghini, M., et al. (2021). Comparing the prevalence of polypharmacy and potential drug–drug interactions in nursing homes and in the community-dwelling elderly of Emilia-Romagna region. *Frontiers in Pharmacology, 11*, Article 624888. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2020.624888
15. Ngcobo, N. N. (2025). Influence of ageing on the pharmacodynamics and pharmacokinetics of chronically administered medicines in geriatric patients: A review. *Clinical Pharmacokinetics, 64*, 335–367. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40262-024-01466-0
16. Mangoni, A. A., Woodman, R. J., & Jarmuzewska, E. A. (2025). Pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic alterations in older people: What we know so far. *Expert Opinion on Drug Metabolism & Toxicology, 21*, 811–829. https://doi.org/10.1080/17425255.2025.2503848
17. Cope, D. G. (2013). Polypharmacy in older adults: The role of the advanced practitioner in oncology. *Journal of the Advanced Practitioner in Oncology, 4*, 107–112. https://doi.org/10.6004/jadpro.2013.4.2.5
18. Boateng, I., Pascual, C. R., Grassby, P., Asghar, Z., & Ibrahim, K. (2025). The impact of polypharmacy on health outcomes in the aged: A retrospective cohort study. *PLOS ONE, 20*, Article e0317907. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0317907
19. Yan, Z., Fan, K. Q., Yu, T., Su, N., Zou, Y., & Xia, L. (2025). Polypharmacy, drug–drug interactions and adverse drug reactions in older Chinese cancer patients: Evidence from CHARLS. *Frontiers in Pharmacology, 16*, Article 1579023. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2025.1579023
20. Dhalwani, N. N., Fahami, R., Sathanapally, H., Seidu, S., Davies, M. J., & Khunti, K. (2017). Association between polypharmacy and falls in older adults: A longitudinal study from England. *BMJ Open, 7*, Article e016358. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-016358
21. Kotsalou, E. (2021). Polypharmacy in elderly people: Epidemiology, consequences and prevention strategies. *International Journal of Endocrinology, 17*, 56–62. https://doi.org/10.22141/2224-0721.17.1.2021.226432
22. Ziere, G., Dieleman, J. P., Hofman, A., Pols, H. A. P., Van Der Cammen, T. J. M., & Stricker, B. H. C. (2006). Polypharmacy and falls in the middle age and elderly population. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology, 61*, 218–223. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2125.2005.02543.x
23. Çakmak, G., & Öztürk, Z. A. (2021). The relationship between polypharmacy and frailty in older adults: Which frailty assessment tool shows the relationship best? *Progress in Nutrition, 23*, Article e2021295. https://doi.org/10.23751/pn.v23i3.12036
24. Gemikonakli, G., Mach, J., & Hilmer, S. N. (2021). Interactions between the aging gut microbiome and common geriatric giants: Polypharmacy, frailty, and dementia. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series A, 76*, 1019–1028. https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glaa047
25. Mach, J., Gemikonakli, G., Logan, C., Vander Wyk, B., Allore, H., Ekambareshwar, S., et al. (2021). Chronic polypharmacy with increasing drug burden index exacerbates frailty and impairs physical function, with effects attenuated by deprescribing, in aged mice. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series A, 76*, 1010–1018. https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glaa060
26. Mach, J., Allore, H., Gnjidic, D., Gemikonakli, G., Kane, A. E., Howlett, S. E., et al. (2022). Preclinical frailty assessments: Phenotype and frailty index identify frailty in different mice and are variably affected by chronic medications. *Experimental Gerontology, 161*, Article 111700. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exger.2022.111700
27. Wu, H., Mach, J., Gnjidic, D., Naganathan, V., Blyth, F. M., Waite, L. M., et al. (2022). Comparing effects of polypharmacy on inflammatory profiles in older adults and mice: Implications for translational aging research. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series A, 77*, 1295–1303. https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glac061
28. Chippa, V., & Roy, K. (2026). Geriatric cognitive decline and polypharmacy. In *StatPearls*. StatPearls Publishing. Retrieved April 18, 2026, from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/34599530
29. Park, H. Y., Park, J. W., Song, H. J., Sohn, H. S., & Kwon, J. W. (2017). The association between polypharmacy and dementia: A nested case-control study based on a 12-year longitudinal cohort database in South Korea. *PLOS ONE, 12*, Article e0169463. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0169463
30. Esumi, S., Ushio, S., & Zamami, Y. (2022). Polypharmacy in older adults with Alzheimer's disease. *Medicina, 58*, Article 1445. https://doi.org/10.3390/medicina58101445
31. Hsu, Y. H., Liang, C. K., Chou, M. Y., Shen, H. C., Wang, Y. C., Iwaki, H., et al. (2025). Polypharmacy and risk of dementia progression in older adults with mild cognitive impairment: A longitudinal cohort study. *Alzheimer's & Dementia: Translational Research & Clinical Interventions, 11*, Article e70179. https://doi.org/10.1002/trc2.70179
32. Fiske, M., Moen, A., Mdala, I., & Straand, J. (2024). Malnutrition and polypharmacy in older adult patients receiving home care nursing services: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association, 25*, 526–531. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2023.11.016
33. Rahi, B., Daou, T., Gereige, N., Issa, Y., Moawad, Y., & Zgheib, K. (2020). Effects of polypharmacy on appetite and malnutrition risk among institutionalized Lebanese older adults—Preliminary results. *Current Developments in Nutrition, 4*, Article 69. https://doi.org/10.1093/cdn/nzaa040_069

34. Kose, E., Wakabayashi, H., & Yasuno, N. (2021). Polypharmacy and malnutrition management of elderly perioperative patients with cancer: A systematic review. *Nutrients, 13*, Article 1961. https://doi.org/10.3390/nu13061961
35. Nakamura, T., Itoh, T., Yabe, A., Imai, S., Nakamura, Y., Mizokami, Y., et al. (2021). Polypharmacy is associated with malnutrition and activities of daily living disability among daycare facility users: A cross-sectional study. *Medicine, 100*, Article e27073. https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.0000000000027073
36. Pan, S., Li, S., Shi, Y., Kang, Q., Jiang, S., Liu, G. G., et al. (2025). Polypharmacy and healthcare expenditures among older adults in the United States: A propensity score-matched study. *BMC Geriatrics*, Article 76. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-025-06545-w
37. Kwak, M. J., Chang, M., Chiadika, S., Aguilar, D., Avritscher, E., Deshmukh, A., et al. (2022). Healthcare expenditure associated with polypharmacy in older adults with cardiovascular diseases. *The American Journal of Cardiology, 169*, 156–158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjcard.2022.01.012
38. Almodóvar, A. S., & Nahata, M. C. (2019). Associations between chronic disease, polypharmacy, and medication-related problems among Medicare beneficiaries. *Journal of Managed Care & Specialty Pharmacy, 25*, 573–577. https://doi.org/10.18553/jmcp.2019.25.5.573
39. Zhu, S., Zheng, X., Fan, M., Jin, Y., Chen, C., & Cheng, M. (2025). Comparative effectiveness of the Beers Criteria (2023) versus the STOPP (v3) in detecting potentially inappropriate medications in older adults with heart failure: A retrospective cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Clinical Pharmacy, 47*, 1485–1492. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11096-025-01964-6
40. Jandu, J. S., Mohanaselvan, A., Dahal, R., & Bista, S. (2024). Strategies to reduce polypharmacy in older adults. In *StatPearls*. StatPearls Publishing.
41. Thomas, R. E., & Thomas, B. C. (2019). A systematic review of studies of the STOPP/START 2015 and American Geriatrics Society Beers 2015 criteria in patients ≥ 65 years. *Current Aging Science, 12*, 121–154. https://doi.org/10.2174/1874609812666190516093742
42. Ubeda, A., Ferrándiz, M. L., Maicas, N., Gomez, C., Bonet, M., & Peris, J. E. (2012). Potentially inappropriate prescribing in institutionalised older patients in Spain: The STOPP-START criteria compared with the Beers criteria. *Pharmacy Practice, 10*, 83–91. https://doi.org/10.4321/s1886-36552012000200004
43. Chang, C. T., Chan, H. K., Tan, A. Y., Kamis, S. F., Yeo, Y. L., Azman, M. A., et al. (2024). Comparing Beers, STOPP and MALPIP criteria in detecting potentially inappropriate medications, clinical outcomes, and cost impacts among older Malaysians: A cohort study. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Policy and Practice, 17*, Article 2436896. https://doi.org/10.1080/20523211.2024.2436896
44. M. R. S., Amarnath, R., Avanti, S., & Dhareshwar, B. (2026). Comparison of Beers Criteria and STOPP/START (Screening Tool of Older Persons' Prescriptions/Screening Tool to Alert to Right Treatment) criteria for assessing inappropriate drug use among elderly patients. *Cureus*, Article e102621. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.102621
45. Thompson, W., & McDonald, E. G. (2024). Polypharmacy and deprescribing in older adults. *Annual Review of Medicine, 75*, 113–127. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-med-070822-101947
46. Linsky, A. M., Motala, A., Lawson, E., & Shekelle, P. (2023). *Deprescribing to reduce medication harms in older adults: Rapid response*. In *Making healthcare safer IV: A continuous updating of patient safety harms and practices*. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Retrieved April 18, 2026, from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK600387/
47. Zhou, D., Chen, Z., & Tian, F. (2023). Deprescribing interventions for older patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association, 24*, 1718–1725. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2023.07.016
48. McGrory, F., & Elnaem, M. H. (2025). Pharmacist-led interventions for polypharmacy management in older adults: A systematic review of strategies and outcomes in the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland. *Pharmacy, 13*, Article 109. https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmacy13040109
49. Gonçalves, J. R., Magalhães, N., Machado, S., Ramalhinho, I., & Cavaco, A. M. (2025). Pharmacist-mediated deprescribing in long-term care facilities: A systematic review. *Pharmacy, 13*, Article 3. https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmacy13010003
50. Jończyk, J., Szadkowska, E., & Michalska-Falkowska, A. (2022). *Wielolekowość seniorów w Polsce: Aspekty prawno-społeczne i medyczne*.
51. Peat, G., Fylan, B., Marques, I., Raynor, D. K., Breen, L., Olaniyan, J., et al. (2022). Barriers and facilitators of successful deprescribing as described by older patients living with frailty, their informal carers and clinicians: A qualitative interview study. *BMJ Open, 12*, Article e054279. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-054279
52. Crutzen, S., Baas, G., Abou, J., van den Born-Bondt, T., Hugtenburg, J. G., Bouvy, M. L., et al. (2020). Barriers and enablers of older patients to deprescribing of cardiometabolic medication: A focus group study. *Frontiers in Pharmacology, 11*, Article 1268. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2020.01268
53. Kim, J. L., Lewallen, K. M., Hollingsworth, E. K., Shah, A. S., Simmons, S. F., & Vasilevskis, E. E. (2023). Patient-reported barriers and enablers to deprescribing recommendations during a clinical trial (Shed-MEDS). *The Gerontologist, 63*. https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnac100

54. Robinson, M., Mokrzecki, S., & Mallett, A. J. (2024). Attitudes and barriers towards deprescribing in older patients experiencing polypharmacy: A narrative review. *npj Aging, 10*, Article 6. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41514-023-00132-2
55. Goyal, P., Requijo, T., Siceloff, B., Shen, M. J., Masterson Creber, R., Hilmer, S. N., et al. (2020). Patient-reported barriers and facilitators to deprescribing cardiovascular medications. *Drugs & Aging, 37*, 125–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40266-019-00729-x
56. Doherty, A. J., Boland, P., Reed, J., Clegg, A. J., Stephani, A. M., Williams, N. H., et al. (2020). Barriers and facilitators to deprescribing in primary care: A systematic review. *BJGP Open, 4*, Article bjgpopen20X101096. https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgpopen20X101096
57. Pickering, A. N., Hamm, M. E., Dawdani, A., Hanlon, J. T., Thorpe, C. T., Gellad, W. F., et al. (2020). Older patient and caregiver perspectives on medication value and deprescribing: A qualitative study. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 68*. https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.16370
58. Ramsdale, E., Malhotra, A., Holmes, H. M., Zubkoff, L., Wang, J., Mohile, S., et al. (2023). Emotional barriers and facilitators of deprescribing for older adults with cancer and polypharmacy: A qualitative study. *Supportive Care in Cancer, 31*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-023-08084-9