

1 **Dynamic analysis of the individual patterns of intakes, voids, and bladder sensations**  
2 **reported in bladder diaries collected in the LURN study**

3 Victor P. Andreev<sup>1\*</sup>, Margaret E. Helmuth<sup>1</sup>, Abigail R. Smith<sup>1</sup>, Anna Zisman<sup>2</sup>, Anne P.  
4 Cameron<sup>3</sup>, John O. L. DeLancey<sup>4</sup>, Wade A. Bushman<sup>5</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup> Arbor Research Collaborative for Health, Ann Arbor MI, US

6 <sup>2</sup> Section of Nephrology, University of Chicago, Chicago IL, US

7 <sup>3</sup> Department of Urology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI, US

8 <sup>4</sup> Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI, US

9 <sup>5</sup> Department of Urology, School of Medicine and Public Health, University of Wisconsin,  
10 Madison WI, US

11 **\*Corresponding Author**

12 Email: [victor.andreev@arborresearch.org](mailto:victor.andreev@arborresearch.org)

13 **Short Title:** Dynamic analysis of bladder diaries

14

15

16 **Abstract**

17           The goal of this study was to perform an in-depth dynamic analysis of individual bladder  
18 diaries to inform which behavioral modifications would best reduce lower urinary tract  
19 symptoms, such as frequency and urgency. Three-day bladder diaries containing data on  
20 timing, volumes, and types of fluid intake, as well as timing, volumes, and bladder sensation at  
21 voids were analyzed for 197 participants with lower urinary tract symptoms. A novel dynamic  
22 analytic approach to bladder diary time series data was proposed and developed, including  
23 intra-subject correlations between time-varying variables: rates of intake, bladder filling rate, and  
24 urge growth rate. Grey-box models of bladder filling rate and multivariable linear regression  
25 models of urge growth rate were developed for individual diaries. These models revealed that  
26 bladder filling rate, rather than urine volume, was the primary determinant of urinary frequency  
27 and urgency growth rate in the majority of participants. Simulations performed with the  
28 developed models predicted that the most beneficial behavioral modifications to reduce the  
29 number of urgency episodes are those that smooth profiles of bladder filling rate, which might  
30 include behaviors such as exclusion of caffeine and alcohol and/or other measures, e.g.,  
31 increasing number and decreasing volumes of intakes.

32

## 33 **Introduction**

34           Bladder diaries (BDs) are a useful tool for diagnosis and treatment of patients with lower  
35 urinary tract symptoms (LUTS). Studies have shown that BDs provide accurate data on  
36 functional bladder capacity [1], incontinence episodes, frequency, nocturia, and daily urgency  
37 [2-6], and correlate well with symptom scores and urodynamics [7-8]. BDs can also provide  
38 timing and volumes of fluid intake, which is the primary driver of urinary output. The time lapse  
39 between intake and output is not straightforward. Although intake and output ultimately  
40 equilibrate over time, there is significant variability between individuals in the timing of output.  
41 Commonly used metrics from BDs ignore the timing of voids and tend to focus on summary  
42 statistics of voided volume (VV) and void frequency; however, inopportune timing of the urgent  
43 need to void can be bothersome to patients.

44           Mathematical modeling can be used to leverage the rich time series data available in  
45 BDs. There are several mathematical models analyzing renal physiology and urine production,  
46 including neural control of kidney function [9-16]. These models provide helpful insights for  
47 understanding physiology of urination; however, they do not allow for the prediction of adverse  
48 urinary events or identification of behavioral modifications to avoid such events.

49           The goal of this paper is to fill this gap by introducing a dynamic approach to the analysis  
50 of BDs, complementary to existing approaches that average dynamics of fluid intake and  
51 voiding over time. We investigate how drinking patterns and types of fluid intake affect the rate  
52 at which urine is produced by the kidneys. We also investigate how bladder filling rate (BFR)  
53 affects bladder sensations. Unlike the time-averaged approach, we are interested not only in the  
54 number of voids per day and how it correlates with the total volume of the intake, but also in  
55 how the time interval between voids and the bladder sensations at voids change during the day  
56 and how they associate with timing, volumes, and composition of fluid consumed. Since one of  
57 the goals of the paper is to introduce and justify the new analytic approach, the Methods section

58 is rather detailed and includes not only the description of, but also the thought process for  
59 selection of proposed methods.

## 60 **Materials and Methods**

### 61 **Data**

62 Data were obtained from the Symptoms of Lower Urinary Tract Dysfunction Research  
63 Network (LURN) Observational Cohort study, which collected self-reported urinary symptoms,  
64 BDs, and physical examination data on 1064 care-seeking female and male participants across  
65 six tertiary care centers [17-18]. Three-day BDs were collected using a modified International  
66 Consultation on Incontinence Questionnaire (ICIQ) bladder diary [19]. Details of the study and  
67 quality of the data have been reported [20]. Diaries included information on the timing and  
68 volumes of fluid intake and voids, as well as bladder sensations during voiding and types of  
69 fluids consumed, across 3 consecutive days.

70 Briefly, 448 participants returned BDs that had data on 3 days, had no missing intake  
71 and void volumes, and had a physiologically plausible fluid imbalance ( $<3$  L across all 3 days).  
72 The dynamic analysis approach of this paper requires detailed data; therefore, we additionally  
73 excluded BDs that had missing voiding, drinking, waking, and sleeping times, types of fluid  
74 consumed, and bladder sensations. We did not attempt to impute these missing data, but  
75 limited ourselves to the analysis of complete BDs, since imputations inherently add variability,  
76 and since we had enough complete cases. We also excluded participants with post-void  
77 residual (PVR)  $>50$  mL. This resulted in 197 BDs suitable for dynamic analysis belonging to 99  
78 male and 98 female participants. Of these, 74 had at least one incontinence episode in 3 days,  
79 165 consumed caffeinated drinks, and 65 consumed drinks containing alcohol.

80 Reported information on the types of fluid consumed was used to estimate osmolality,  
81 caffeine, and alcohol content of the fluid based on literature review [21-22]. Estimates for

82 durations of fluid intake (time taken to drink the fluid) were based on expert opinion of the  
83 authors who independently reviewed a representative list of beverages and produced estimates  
84 of time for consumption for each type of beverage. Estimated durations varied from 1 minute to  
85 20 minutes (hot beverages and alcoholic beverages are usually consumed slower than water,  
86 for example). Bladder sensations were reported on a rating scale from 0 to 4, with 0 meaning  
87 “no sensation of needing to pass urine, but passed urine for social reasons; 1=“normal desire to  
88 pass urine and no urgency”; 2=“had urgency, but it had passed before patient went to the toilet”;  
89 3=“had urgency but managed to get to the toilet, still with urgency, but did not leak urine”,  
90 4=“had urgency and could not get to the toilet in time so leaked urine” [19]. The 197 3-day BD  
91 reported a total of 5124 voids. Of these, 342 were with urge level=0; 2341 with urge level=1;  
92 732 with urge level=2; 1287 with urge level=3; and 422 with urge level=4, i.e., participants  
93 experienced sensation of urgency during 47.6% of voids, normal desire to pass urine in 45.7%  
94 of voids, and in 6.7% cases voided for social reasons.

### 95 **Ethical guidelines and consent**

96 As described in the Data section above, this is a secondary data analysis of LURN  
97 bladder diaries. The authors confirm all relevant ethical guidelines have been followed, and all  
98 research has been conducted according to the principles expressed in the Declaration of  
99 Helsinki. Written informed consent was obtained from participants enrolled in the LURN study  
100 from 2015 to 2017, with each participant signing a confidential consent form witnessed and  
101 signed by the site research coordinator. This paper’s authors did not have access to information  
102 that could identify individual participants during or after data collection. Institutional Review  
103 Board (IRB) approval was obtained from: Ethical and Independent Review Services (E&I) IRB,  
104 an Association for the Accreditation of Human Research Protection Programs (AAHRPP)  
105 Accredited Board, Registration #IRB 00007807.

## 106 **Methods**

### 107 ***Overview of the multistep analysis of BDs***

108 First, we performed a traditional time-averaged analysis of the BDs. We examined the  
109 distributions and inter-subject correlations of demographic and time-averaged BD variables  
110 across the cohort of 197 participants with LUTS. Then, we introduced a dynamic approach to  
111 the analysis of BDs by examining intra-subject correlations between BD variables across the 3-  
112 day duration of the diaries, investigated cross-correlation functions and delays between these  
113 variables, and finally developed and evaluated dynamic models for individual BDs (Figure 1).

114 **Figure1. Flowchart of the multistep analysis of BDs.** Analysis steps are in rectangles, data  
115 and results are in the hexagons. Steps 1-2 constitute time-averaged analysis; steps 3-8  
116 constitute a dynamic approach. First, we examined the distributions of BD variables across 197  
117 participants. Second, we performed the time-averaged analysis of BDs by examining the matrix  
118 of inter-subject correlation coefficients of intake and voiding variables across 197 BDs. Third, we  
119 visualized individual BD by presenting graphs of drinking and voiding events and introduced  
120 dynamic variables describing drinking and voiding patterns. Fourth, we examined the intra-  
121 subject correlations between the introduced dynamic variables. Fifth, we calculated cross-  
122 correlation functions between the introduced dynamic variables to estimate both their similarities  
123 and time lags. Sixth, we developed and evaluated the individuals' grey-box models predicting  
124 BFR using data on intake profiles and composition of the drinks. Seventh, we developed  
125 multivariable linear regression models for each individual urge growth rate (UrgR). Finally, we  
126 proposed behavioral modifications, i.e., restrictions of intake volume, caffeine, and alcohol  
127 consumption and simulated the effect of these modifications on UrgR and urge levels at voids.

128

### 129 ***Justification of dynamic approach***

130 A dynamic approach to understanding reality, i.e., description of relationships between  
131 changes in variables in time rather than relationships between the values of the variables,  
132 proves to be productive in quantitative sciences, starting with Newton's laws of motion, where  
133 acceleration, i.e., change in velocity of the object, was shown to be proportional to the force  
134 acting on the object. We propose to use a dynamic approach to the analysis of BDs, by  
135 exploring how changes in blood volume, osmolality, and concentrations of caffeine and alcohol,  
136 caused by fluid consumption affect (change) the rate of urine production by the kidneys. We  
137 propose to investigate how the sensation of urinary urge changes in time and how it is affected

138 by the bladder filling rate and urine volume. Using this dynamic approach, we introduce urge  
139 growth rate (UrgR) as defined in the next section. We believe that UrgR often (with the  
140 exception of social or convenience voids) drives voiding behavior. For example, time interval  
141 between voids is determined by the time required to reach certain urge levels, and therefore is  
142 proportional to the reciprocal of the UrgR. In a sense, UrgR is more important than urge level at  
143 void. Any healthy person deprived of the opportunity to void will eventually get to a high level of  
144 urge, e.g.,  $urge=3$ ; however, it will likely take a healthy person much longer to get to this level  
145 than a person with overactive bladder (OAB). This makes UrgR a useful metric to evaluate the  
146 severity of OAB.

147 While implementing this dynamic approach to the analysis and modeling of BDs and to  
148 the simulation of potential behavioral modifications, we kept in mind that information available  
149 for modeling, as well as our understanding of the involved physiological processes, are  
150 incomplete. For instance, we have no information on physical activities or changes in heart  
151 rate that might affect the urine production rate by the kidney. We do not have food diaries and  
152 therefore do not have information on the fluids consumed in food (e.g., watermelon or soup).  
153 We do not know how much salt is consumed with food and when, which influences water  
154 retention. We do not know about the presence of psychological distractions and triggers that  
155 might influence the sensation of urge. All this incompleteness of information makes our task of  
156 predicting urgency episodes less like Newtonian mechanics calculation of the position of planets  
157 and more like the task of the captain determining the course of the ship having an approximate  
158 knowledge of the strength of the winds and currents, and therefore regularly measuring the  
159 position of the ship relative to the sun and the stars or using global positioning system (GPS)  
160 signals. Similarly, we try to minimize the propagation of the errors along the modeling process  
161 and, whenever possible, use the measured values of variables recorded in the BDs.

162 **Dynamic variables**

163 BDs report the values of intake variables (volumes and types of drinks) at times of  
164 intakes and voiding variables (volumes and urge levels) at times of voids, which do not coincide.  
165 Dynamic analysis requires the knowledge of intake variables and voiding variables at the same  
166 and preferably equidistant time points. To meet this requirement and to analyze dynamics of  
167 drinking and voiding patterns and bladder sensations, we defined several dynamic (time-  
168 dependent) variables across the whole duration of the 3-day BDs. We calculated rate of intake,  
169 bladder filling rate (BFR), urge growth rate (UrgR), and time-dependent frequency of voiding (F),  
170 as shown below. Stepwise approximations were used to derive these variables from the BD  
171 data. They were considered constant during the time intervals (durations of fluid intake and time  
172 intervals between voids), with changes occurring only at the boundaries of these intervals.

173 Fluid intake rate ( $IR(t)$ ) was approximated as  $i^{\text{th}}$  intake volume ( $IV_i$ ) divided by the  
174 estimated duration of  $i^{\text{th}}$  intake ( $D_i$ ) and assumed zero everywhere except during reported  
175 intake, where  $i=1,\dots,M$ ,  $M$ -number of reported intakes. No fluid intake was assumed or attributed  
176 to the food the participant ate; only fluids recorded on the BD were included in the analysis.

177 Frequency of voiding ( $F(t)$ ) was defined as:

178 
$$F(t) = 24 \times 60 / \Delta T_j \quad (1)$$

179 where  $\Delta T_j = T_j - T_{j-1}$ , time interval from previous void in minutes,  $T_j$ ,  $j=1,\dots,N$  – time of each of  $N$   
180 voids reported by an individual. For easier interpretation, the  $24 \times 60$  multiplier was introduced  
181 to make frequency defined by eq. 1 comparable with the averaged daily frequency, i.e., number  
182 of voids per day. Note that  $F$  defined by eq. 1 depends on time, unlike the frequency of voiding  
183 averaged across the day or several days typically used in the urologic literature [23,24]. For  
184 example, consider an individual who voided at 8:00 am, 9:00 am, 9:20 am, 9:40 am, 12:00  
185 noon, 2:00 pm, 5:00 pm, 7:00 pm, 8:00 pm, and 11:00 pm. They would typically be described as



186 voiding 10 times a day, or voiding every 90 minutes; however, there was a time during the day  
187 when they voided every 20 minutes, which is not reflected by the time-averaged definition of  
188 frequency, but is reflected by the peak ( $F(t=9:20\text{ am})=72$ ) of the time-dependent frequency (eq.  
189 1). Note that the presence of such high-frequency voids at inopportune times could be much  
190 more bothersome for the individual than voiding 11 versus 10 times a day; therefore, it is  
191 desirable to have tools to predict such high-frequency episodes, as well as high-urgency  
192 episodes.

193 Urge was assumed to be zero immediately after each void, so  $UrgR(t)$  was defined as  
194 urge ( $U_j$ ) reported at the  $j^{\text{th}}$  void divided by  $\Delta T_j$ , assuming a linear growth of urge with time,  
195 which may not always be correct but is close to sigmoidal growth observed in several studies  
196 measuring real-time bladder sensations in individuals with and without OAB [25,26]. Even when  
197 the assumption of linear growth of urge is not valid, the variable  $UrgR(t)$  defined as  $U_j / \Delta T_j$  is of  
198 importance since it reflects how much time it takes to reach the certain level of urge. The time  
199 required to reach urgency is even more important than level of urge. For instance, an individual  
200 without OAB driving on the highway (with limited access to a toilet) might get a sensation of  
201 urge  $U_j = 3$  and need to exit the highway. However, an individual with OAB will get to urge  $U_j = 3$   
202 much faster and would need to exit more often. Variable  $U_j / \Delta T_j$  is different from frequency  
203 defined by eq. 1, since some of the voids could be social or convenience ones and occur at the  
204 low level of  $U_j$ .

205 The BFR, sometimes referred to as the rate of diuresis [27,28], was defined as:  
206  $BFR(t) = VV_j / \Delta T_j$ , where  $VV_j$  is the  $j^{\text{th}}$  voided volume (VV). Here, we assumed that the variation  
207 of PVR from void to void is small relative to the VV (justified in participants with PVR < 50 mL  
208 selected for this analysis); therefore, the VV can approximate the change of the urine stored in  
209 the bladder between voids.

210 Figure 2 illustrates the 3-day BD data (intake and VVs, and urge levels reported at voids)  
211 and its relationship with the dynamic variables derived from these data (BFR, time-dependent  
212 (F), and UrgR) for a typical study participant A. Supplemental Figures S1-S9 provide similar  
213 information for nine other representative participants (B-J). More detailed discussion of the  
214 figures is provided in the Results section; however, we think it is beneficial to introduce these  
215 figures here for better illustration of our dynamic approach to the BD analysis.

216 **Figure 2. Intake and voiding profiles recorded in the 3-day BD of patient A and dynamic**  
217 **variables derived from the profiles.** Figure 2A: fluid intake volumes. Figure 2B: voided  
218 volumes (VV). Figure 2C: urge levels reported at voids. Data in Figures 2A-2C are presented in  
219 the form of stems instead of dots to illustrate the discrete nature of drinking and voiding events  
220 and to emphasize the impossibility of connecting the dots, e.g., intake volumes are equal to zero  
221 between intakes, and void volumes are equal to zero between voids. Figure 2D: bladder filling  
222 rate (BFR(t)). Figure 2E: time-dependent frequency of voiding (F(t)). Figure 2F: urge growth rate  
223 (UrgR(t)). Caffeine containing intakes are shown in Figure 2A in red. Note that peaks of BFR(t),  
224 F(t), and UrgR(t) are collocated with intakes of caffeine and with frequent and/or high-volume  
225 drinks. Some of these peaks are labeled to emphasize their collocation (X=time in hours from  
226 midnight of the first day of the diary; Y=values of the plotted variables). Note high (several fold)  
227 time variability of BFR.

228  
229 ***Inter-subject and intra-subject correlations***

230 Both inter-subject and intra-subject correlation coefficients of BD variables were  
231 calculated. The inter-subject correlations analysis was included in the time-averaged approach  
232 (step 2 in Figure 1). It was performed by first averaging the dynamic BD variables over time (3  
233 days of the BD) and then calculating the matrix of the Pearson correlation coefficients of the  
234 time-averaged variables across 197 BDs. The intra-subject correlation analysis was part of  
235 dynamic approach (step 4 of Figure 1). It was performed by calculating matrices of Pearson  
236 correlation coefficients of dynamic variables for each of the individuals and then averaging the  
237 individual correlation matrices across all 197 individuals. Matrices of Pearson correlation  
238 coefficients were calculated using the MATLAB function `corrcoef.m` (MathWorks, MA).

239 Both for inter-subject and intra-subject correlations, we also calculated matrices of partial  
240 correlation coefficients, while controlling for certain variables. This type of analysis helps when

241 there are three or more codependent variables (e.g., A, B, C), and we want to know how  
242 variable A responds to the changes in variable B, which are not caused by the changes in  
243 variable C. It is similar to controlling for variables in linear regression models [29] and was  
244 implemented using the MATLAB function `partialcorr.m`.

### 245 ***Cross-correlation function***

246 Reactions of organisms to changes in external factors are not instantaneous but take  
247 time, which may be short or long depending on the physiological processes involved and may  
248 differ across individuals. For instance, it may take different time in different individuals for the  
249 BFR to react to the increase in the intake due to consumed fluid. Intra-subject correlations do  
250 not allow for capturing similarities in the presence of unknown time delays between the  
251 variables. To evaluate similarities and time lags between the functions representing the dynamic  
252 variables, we used cross-correlation function, which is routinely used to compare signals in  
253 signal processing [30] and is defined as:

$$254 \quad X(\tau) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t) \cdot g(t + \tau) dt / \left( \sqrt{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t)^2 dt} \cdot \sqrt{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(t)^2 dt} \right) \quad (2),$$

255 where  $f(t)$  and  $g(t)$  are two dynamic variables under comparison. The maximum possible  
256 value of cross-correlation function is  $X(\tau_{max}) = 1$ , which happens when  $g(t + \tau_{max}) = f(t)$ .  
257 Therefore, the value of  $X(\tau_{max})$  represents the level of similarity, while  $\tau_{max}$  represents the time  
258 lag between the two functions. We used cross-correlation function to compare the dynamic  
259 variables derived from the BD data. We also used cross-correlation function to compare BFR  
260 profiles predicted by the developed models and derived from the BDs. Cross-correlation  
261 function was implemented as MATLAB function `xcorr.m`.

### 262 ***Grey-box model of the urine formation rate***

263 We created mathematical models for each individual participant, describing the  
264 dynamics of the BFR, which is equal to the rate of urine formation by the kidneys. In doing so,

265 we followed a nonlinear grey-box modeling approach. Grey-box model is a type of model where  
266 the equations describing the processes are assumed known, while the parameters/coefficients  
267 of the equations have physical or physiological meaning and are determined by minimizing  
268 differences between observed and modeled processes. We described the model by a set of  
269 nonlinear ordinary differential equations (ODEs), with free parameters determined through  
270 minimization of the difference between urine formation rate profile predicted by the model and  
271 BFR profile derived from the BD. We assumed that the structure of the model was the same for  
272 all participants, while the parameters of the models were participant-specific. The core of our  
273 model is the modified model of Bighamian et al [31] describing the dynamics of the distribution  
274 of added water between blood and interstitial fluid, which is essential for determination of time  
275 lags between intakes and voids. We generalized this model by adding two more compartments  
276 (stomach and intestine) and by describing transport, kinetics, and redistribution of electrolytes,  
277 caffeine, and alcohol between blood and interstitial fluid. We also allowed for urine formation  
278 rate dependency on blood plasma volume, osmolality, and caffeine and alcohol concentrations.  
279 The model was implemented with System Identification Toolbox (MATLAB 2021a), using  
280 function `idnlgrey.m`. Details on the assumptions, equations, and implementation of the grey-box  
281 models of urine formation rate are presented in the Supplemental Material.

### 282 ***Comparing modeled and observed dynamic variables by evaluating locations and*** 283 ***amplitudes of the peaks***

284 The traditional metric to compare modeled and observed variables is called “fit percent”  
285 and is calculated as:

$$286 \quad \text{Fit Percent} = 100 \cdot \left\{ 1 - \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N (y_{obs}(t_i) - y_{mod}(t_i))^2}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N \left( y_{obs}(t_i) - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N y_{obs}(t_i)}{N} \right)^2}} \right\} \quad (3),$$

287 where  $y_{obs}(t_i)$  and  $y_{mod}(t_i)$  are the values of observed and modeled dynamic variable  $y$  at all  
288 points  $t_i$ , where this variable was observed and modeled. Note that this metric compares

289 differences in the observed and modeled values of the variable (numerator) with the overall  
 290 time-variability of the observed variable (denominator), which makes it, in general, suitable for  
 291 evaluating dynamic models. However, given the presence of high and narrow peaks in the  
 292 variables of interest in the BDs (see BFR(t), F(t) and UrgR(t) in Figure 2 and Supplemental  
 293 Figures S1-S9), which could be caused by high-volume or/and high caffeine content intakes,  
 294 this metric might be unsatisfactory. For instance, it could happen that narrow peaks in  
 295  $y_{obs}(t_{i_{obs}})$  and  $y_{mod}(t_{i_{mod}})$  are closely collocated but not overlapping. In this case, the *Fit*  
 296 *Percent* value would be lower than if the peak of interest was completely absent in the modeled  
 297 function, which would misrepresent properties of the model. To avoid this situation, we  
 298 introduced a new metric named *Peak Fit*, similar to *Fit Percent*, but allowing for some lags in the  
 299 peaks of the modeled function; i.e., we identified ten highest observed and modeled peaks and  
 300 searched for the modeled and observed maxima in the specified vicinity (30 minutes) of these  
 301 peaks. The below equation for *Peak Fit* is similar to equation for *Fit Percent* but uses only the  
 302 peak apex points compared with the maxima in the vicinity of the peaks. This way, it allows for  
 303 limited lags in the modeled function relative to the observed function and punishes both the  
 304 cases of missing peaks and of false modeled peaks, which are absent in the observed function.

305  $Peak\ Fit =$

$$306 \quad 1 - \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{10} (y_{obs}(t_{j\ obs\ peak}) - y_{mod}(t_{j\ mod\ max}))^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{10} (y_{mod}(t_{k\ mod\ peak}) - y_{obs}(t_{k\ obs\ max}))^2}}{\sqrt{2 \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{10} \left( y_{obs}(t_{j\ obs\ peak}) - \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{10} y_{obs}(t_{j\ obs\ peak})}{N} \right)^2}}$$

307 (4),

308 where  $t_{j\ obs\ peak}$  and  $t_{k\ mod\ peak}$  are positions of the apexes of the peaks in the observed and  
 309 modeled functions, while  $t_{j\ mod\ max}$  and  $t_{k\ obs\ max}$  are the maximum values of modeled and  
 310 observed functions in the vicinity of the above peaks.

311 To evaluate the average lag between observed and modeled peaks, we introduced  
312 another metric:

$$313 \text{ Peak Lag} = \sqrt{\left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{10} (t_{j \text{ obs peak}} - t_{j \text{ max mod}})^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{10} (t_{k \text{ mod peak}} - t_{k \text{ max obs}})^2 \right\} / 20} \quad (5).$$

314 Note that this metric is similar to the  $\tau_{max}$  -lag provided by the cross-correlation function;  
315 however, the latter is dominated by the lag of the highest peak, while the former provides lag  
316 averaged across multiple peaks.

### 317 ***Evaluation and selection of grey-box models***

318 An important quality of any model is its ability to describe/predict observations in the time  
319 range outside of the time range used for parameter fitting. To estimate this ability, we derived  
320 not only the models using 3 days of BD data (3-day model), but also the models using only first  
321 2 days of BD data (2-day model). Then, we used the parameters of the 2-day models and 3-day  
322 intake data to predict BFR(t) during all 3 days. Details of the comparison of 2-day and 3-day  
323 models are provided in the Results section and are briefly summarized below. We evaluated the  
324 developed 197 individuals' grey-box models of urine production rate by using the *Peak Fit*  
325 metric defined by eq. 4. We selected for further analysis and use only the individuals with *Peak*  
326 *Fit* > 0.9 both for 3-day and 2-day grey box models of urine production rate. Models for 145  
327 individuals satisfied these criteria. The mean value of Peak Fit for these models of BFR(t) was  
328 0.94, and the mean value of Peak Lag was 6 minutes. We also compared the “full models”,  
329 including information on caffeine and alcohol content of the intakes, with the “no caffeine no  
330 alcohol” models ignoring this information. It was shown that “full models” provide substantially  
331 better fit.

### 332 ***Regression models of UrgR***

333 Physiology of bladder sensations is less clear than that of urine formation by the  
334 kidneys; therefore, creation of the grey-box model of UrgR does not seem feasible. It is known,

335 however, that feeling of urinary urge is initiated by stretching of the bladder wall [32]. We  
336 assumed that the reaction of the nervous system to wall stretching was nearly instantaneous, or  
337 at least happened at a much shorter time scale (seconds) than the time scale of the BD records  
338 (time intervals between drinks and voids – minutes) and the typical time required to establish  
339 equilibrium distribution of water between blood and interstitial fluid (minutes or hours). Given the  
340 assumption of the nearly instantaneous reaction of the nervous system to the input variables,  
341 we used the multiple linear regression approach to create personalized models of urinary UrgR  
342 for each participant. Analysis of the intra-subject correlations performed as described in the  
343 “Inter-subject and intra-subject correlations” subsection above and in the Results section below  
344 provided evidence of different levels of correlations of UrgR with BFR and with VV, which  
345 correspond to sensitivity, not only to the level of bladder wall stretch, but also to the velocity of  
346 stretching.

347 Given these observations, the inputs of the model included BFR ( $x_1=BFR(t)$ ) and volume  
348 ( $x_2=V(t)$ ) of the urine in the bladder (calculated as integral of the BFR from the time of previous  
349 void to the given moment plus PVR volume  $x_2=\int_{t_n}^t BFR(\tau)d\tau +PVR$ ). The last input ( $x_3$ ) was  
350 binary and contained information on whether the participant was awake or asleep at the given  
351 moment, which allowed for possible bladder sensation differences in these two states. The  
352 formula for model specification can be presented as:

$$353 \quad y = \text{intercept} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \beta_i X_i + \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{j=1}^3 \beta_{ij} X_i X_j \quad (6),$$

354 where  $y = UrgR(t)$ , while  $X_i = \frac{x_i - \text{median}(x_i)}{\text{median}(x_i)}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ ;  $X_3 = x_3$ . Scaling of the variables is not  
355 necessary in multivariable linear regression but was implemented for further comparison of the  
356 relative role of different input variables in predicting UrgR. For instance, intercept in this  
357 formulation represents the value of UrgR in the hypothetical case when all the input variables  
358 are kept constant during the 3-day BD and equal to the median values of these variables during

359 these 3 days. The values of coefficients  $\beta_1, \beta_2$  represent the increase in the UrgR in response to  
360 the change in the values of input variables equal to their medians. The above specification (eq  
361 6) means that the model allows not only for linear dependence of UrgR(t) on the input terms, but  
362 also on their interactions. The values of UrgR(t) and BFR(t) were determined from the BDs and  
363 assumed constant during the time intervals between voids; asleep/awake data was also taken  
364 directly from the BDs. This method was chosen to describe the inputs of the model as  
365 accurately as possible. BFR (t) can be determined from the grey-box model, however, less  
366 accurately than from the BDs since the model does not take into account the changes in heart  
367 rate or the consumption of salted food or diuretics, which could contribute to changes in BFR  
368 observed from BDs.

369 Multivariable linear regression was performed using MATLAB function `stepwiseglm.m`,  
370 which uses forward and backward stepwise regression to determine the values of coefficients  $\beta_i$   
371 and  $\beta_{ij}$ . At each step, the function adds or removes terms to the model, based on the value of  
372 the 'criterion' chosen. In this situation, the default value of 'criterion' was used, i.e., the p-value  
373 for an F-test of the change in the deviance that results from adding or removing the term. The  
374 quality of the individual final models was evaluated by their adjusted R squared value (Adj.  $R^2$ ).  
375 Only the models with Adj.  $R^2 > 0.3$  were selected for further analysis and simulation.

### 376 ***Calculating urge level using the predicted UrgR: Predicting urgency episodes***

377 Timings of voids are not completely determined by the intake information, since some of  
378 the voids are “social” or “convenience” voids, which occur without urge or at the low level of  
379 urge and cannot be predicted by renal physiology-based models. Urge sensation is supposed to  
380 be zero at the moments right after voids; therefore, timings of voids are necessary as  
381 independent data to determine the level of urge with UrgR predicted by the developed  
382 regression models. Therefore, we used BD data on the timings of voids ( $t_i$ ) together with the



383 predicted by the regression models UrgR ( $pUrgR(t)$ ) to predict the values of urge levels at the  
384 times of voids:

$$385 \quad pU(t) = \int_{t_i}^t pUrgR(t)dt \quad (7).$$

386 Note that  $pUrgR(t)$  predicted by the model (unlike UrgR estimated from the BD) is not a  
387 necessary constant in the interval between the adjacent voids; therefore, integration rather than  
388 multiplication by the time interval is warranted. We then used eq. 7 to calculate urge levels at  
389 the time of each void and evaluated percentage of true positive and false positive predictions of  
390 urge episodes by comparing with urge levels reported in BD. Note that, while observed/reported  
391 values of urge at the moments of void have discrete integer values 0,1,2,3,4, the predicted  
392 values of urge  $pU(t_i)$  can have any positive value. Given the previously-outlined definitions of  
393 urge levels [19], we counted all voids where  $U(t_i)=2,3$ , or 4 as urgency episodes. In comparison,  
394 for the predicted urgency episodes, we implemented a “personalized urgency threshold”  
395 approach by allowing the threshold level for each patient to change from 1.05 to 2 and selecting  
396 for each patient the threshold that minimized the sum of percentages of false negatives and  
397 false positives. This is equivalent to adding one more parameter to the individual’s model of  
398 sensation of urge.

### 399 ***Simulation of “what if” scenarios and personalized behavioral modifications***

400 We used the developed models to simulate personalized behavioral modifications  
401 aimed to avoid or minimize urgency episodes. Simulation is different from model development  
402 since it does not involve parameter fitting. Parameters of each individual model were already  
403 determined at the stage of model development. In simulation, parameters of the models are  
404 fixed, inputs of the models are modified, and the changes of the outputs caused by the  
405 modifications of the inputs are reported. Simulating modifications of intake patterns involve  
406 running with the modified intake data the developed individual grey-box models of urine  
407 production and the regression models of UrgR. In particular, some of the simulated

408 modifications excluded use of alcohol and/or caffeinated drinks, substituting them with the  
409 alcohol-free and decaffeinated drinks with the same osmolality and volume. The BFR(t) profiles  
410 with proposed modified inputs and with the initial true inputs are calculated using the grey-box  
411 models; the difference in two profiles is determined and added to the BFR(t) profile determined  
412 from the BD. The result constitutes our best guess of the BFR(t) profile and serves as the first  
413 input variable for the developed multivariable linear regression model of UrgR(t), while the  
414 second input variable is determined by the time integral of the first one. Note that these  
415 simulations are different from “no caffeine no alcohol” models discussed above. While the  
416 comparison of “no caffeine no alcohol models” with “full models” served to demonstrate the  
417 importance of considering the effect of caffeine and alcohol on BFR for achieving adequate fit of  
418 modeled and observed profiles, the simulations with excluded caffeine and alcohol containing  
419 beverages served to examine if abstinence of these beverages could help to avoid urgency  
420 episodes.

## 421 **Results**

### 422 **Time-averaged analysis of BD data**

#### 423 ***Distributions of the BD variables across 197 participants***

424 Our cohort of 197 participants with BDs suitable for dynamic analysis is quite  
425 heterogeneous. There is substantial variability across the cohort by age, body mass index  
426 (BMI), 3-day intake volumes, mean intake volumes, types of drinks (osmolality, caffeine and  
427 alcohol content), voided volumes (VVs), bladder capacity (estimated as maximum VV), urge  
428 levels, and numbers of leaks, as illustrated by Table 1 and histograms in Figure 3.

429 **Table 1. Distribution of age, PVR, BMI, and time-averaged BD variables across 197**  
430 **participants**

	cohort minimum	cohort 25 percentile	cohort median	cohort 75 percentile	cohort maximum
Age, years	20	49	61	70	84

PVR, mL	0	0	13	27	50
BMI	19.2	25.5	29.1	33.5	55.6
3-day intake volume, mL	1567.4	4081.2	5205	6688.9	13722.3
mean intake volume, mL	109.2	242.3	291.2	351.7	597.4
max hourly intake volume / total intake volume	0.07	0.11	0.14	0.17	0.3
mean osmolality, mOsm	0	72.5	142.9	253.4	1049.2
3-day caffeine, mg	0	100	300	542.5	1450
3-day alcohol, mL	0	0	0	27.7	1632.5
3-day void volume, mL	828.1	3672.7	5027.6	6458.2	14195.5
mean void volume, mL	48.7	142.5	198.1	276.5	563.6
maximum void volume, mL	103.5	295.7	414	591.5	1419.6
mean/max void volume	0.18	0.38	0.48	0.58	0.88
mean frequency, 1/day	3	7.6	9.4	11.2	18.9
max/median of BFR	1.6	3.8	6	10.1	128
mean urge rating	0	1.1	1.7	2.4	3.9
max urge rating	0	3	3	4	4
number of leaks	0	0	0	2.3	33

431

432

433 **Figure 3. Distributions of the BD data and the derived dynamic variables across the 197**  
 434 **participants.** Rows 1-2: intake properties. First row: 3-day intake volume (mL), mean intake  
 435 volume (mL), standard deviation of intake volume (mL), ratio of maximum hourly intake volume,  
 436 and total intake volume. Second row: mean osmolality of consumed drinks (mOsm), standard  
 437 deviation of osmolality of the drinks, total consumed caffeine (mg), total consumed alcohol (mL).  
 438 Rows 3-4: voids properties. Third row: 3-day void volume (mL), mean void volume (mL),  
 439 maximum void volume, i.e., bladder capacity (mL), number of voids per day. Fourth row: log2  
 440 (max BFR(t)/median (BFR(t))) – measure of BFR versus time variability, mean urge, maximum  
 441 urge, 3-day number of leaks. Note that our cohort is quite heterogeneous, with 3-day intake  
 442 volume as low as 2L for some patients and as high as 14L for others, osmolality of the drinks  
 443 varying from 0 to 1200 mOsm, both within the BD for a given participant and across participants.  
 444 Bladder capacity varied from 200mL to 1400 mL, number of voids per day from 3 to 19, ratio of  
 445 maximum to median BFR(t) from 1.6 to 128, mean urge from 0 to 4, and number of leaks during  
 446 3 days from zero to 33.

447

448 Intake volume variability during the day differed substantially across participants, with  
 449 the ratio of maximum hourly intake volume to total 3-day intake volume ranging from 7% to  
 450 30%. Time-variability of void volumes during the day, measured as the ratio of mean to  
 451 maximum void volume ranges from 0.18 to 0.88, with cohort median equal 0.48 and 75  
 452 percentile equal 0.58, supporting the observation [33] that the majority of people void when their

453 bladder is at most 50% full. The ratio of maximum to median BFR for a given participant varies  
454 from a rather low 1.6 to extremely high value 128. Specifically, max/median BFR >4 in 70% of  
455 participants and >8 in 36% of participants, demonstrating that the high variability of BFR  
456 observed in Figure 2 and Supplemental Figures S1-S9 is a general feature of the cohort.

457 Table 2 provides values of significant correlation coefficients between the variables from  
458 Table1, sorted from stronger to weaker, and their partial correlation coefficients calculated with  
459 the rest of the variables kept constant.

460

461 **Table 2. Inter-subject correlation coefficients between variables of Table 1.**

Variables	Pearson		Partial	
	Correlation	p-value	Correlation	p-value
3-day void volume, mL ,3-day intake volume, mL	0.65	<0.001	0.22	0.003
number of leaks, mean urge	0.62	<0.001	0.46	<0.001
number of leaks, max urge	0.45	<0.001	0.09	0.233
mean frequency, 1/day ,3-day void volume, mL	0.25	<0.001	0.79	<0.001
mean intake volume, mL, BMI	0.23	0.001	0.22	0.003
3-day caffeine, mg, age	0.22	0.002	0.24	0.001
mean urge, BMI	0.21	0.003	0.09	0.25
mean frequency, 1/day ,3-day intake volume, mL	0.2	0.005	0.06	0.422
mean void volume, mL, BMI	0.17	0.018	0.18	0.016
mean frequency, 1/day ,3-day caffeine, mg	0.17	0.02	0.16	0.037
number of leaks, mean frequency, 1/day	0.16	0.029	0.04	0.574
max/median of BFR, PVR	0.15	0.032	0.18	0.016
mean urge, mean/max void volume	0.14	0.047	0.11	0.14
3-day void volume, mL, mean osmolality, mOsm	-0.16	0.022	0	0.974
mean frequency, 1/day, BMI	-0.16	0.028	0.01	0.866
mean urge, mOsm	-0.17	0.018	-0.05	0.473

462

463 Most of the inter-subject correlations are either trivial (e.g., correlations between 3-day  
 464 intake and void volumes, number of leaks and mean urgency during 3 days, or mean daily  
 465 frequency and 3-day void volume), or weak, or become weak when controlled for other  
 466 variables, therefore not allowing for identification of definitive predictors of frequency, urgency,  
 467 and incontinence episodes in our heterogeneous cohort and demonstrating the need for a  
 468 dynamic approach to the analysis of individual BDs.

469 More interesting information is provided by the analysis of the distribution of VVs divided  
 470 by the individual bladder capacity (estimated as the maximum VV during the 3-day BD). First,  
 471 we performed analysis similar to [33] by creating histograms of the number of voids with the  
 472 given ratio of VV to the individual bladder capacity. Then, we focused the analysis by looking  
 473 only at the “very urgent” voids, i.e., voids with  $U_j \geq 3$ . Finally, we investigated how many  
 474 individuals had low-volume voids ( $\frac{VV_j}{VV_{max}} \leq 0.2$ ), and low-volume “very urgent” voids. Results of

475 this analysis are presented in Figure 4. Low-volume voids appeared to be quite prevalent: 134  
476 of 197 (68%) individuals had low-volume voids, while 52 of 197 (26%) individuals had low-  
477 volume “very urgent” voids, i.e., voided with urge  $U_j \geq 3$ , when only 20% or less of their  
478 bladder volume were filled with urine. While for the majority of individuals, low-volume “very  
479 urgent” voids were infrequent (20% or less of their voids), for some individuals, such voids  
480 happened as often as in 50% of cases. This analysis indicates that, at least for some of the  
481 individuals, the fraction of bladder volume filled with urine is not the only or even the main  
482 determinant of urinary urge. Next, we performed dynamic analysis of individual BDs in search of  
483 such determinants.

484 **Figure 4. Distributions of the ratio of the voided volumes (VVs) to individual bladder**  
485 **capacity.** Figure 4A: number of voids with the given ratio of VV to the individual bladder  
486 capacity in the cohort of 197 individuals. Figure 4B: number of individuals with low-volume voids  
487 (ratio $\leq$ 20%) versus the number of such voids in the 3-day BD. Figure 4C: number of  
488 individuals with low-volume voids (ratio $\leq$ 20%) versus the fraction of such voids in the 3-day  
489 BD. Figure 4D: number of “very urgent” voids ( $U_j \geq 3$ ) with the given ratio of VV to individual  
490 bladder capacity in the cohort of 197 individuals. Figure 4E: number of individuals with low-  
491 volume “very urgent” voids (ratio $\leq$ 20%) versus the number of such voids in the 3-day BD.  
492 Figure 4F: number of individuals with low-volume “very urgent” voids (ratio $\leq$ 20%) versus the  
493 fraction of such voids in the 3-day BD.

#### 494 **Dynamic analysis of BD data**

496 In this section, we concentrate on dynamic analysis of individual BDs by visualizing  
497 individual intake and voiding patterns, calculating intra-subject correlations between dynamic  
498 BD variables, investigating similarities and time delays in the dynamics of these variables, and  
499 creating mathematical models of the individual BDs.

#### 500 ***Intake and voiding profiles***

501 Three main observations can be made from visualization of the individual intake and  
502 voiding profiles and dynamic variables derived from the BDs. Here, we demonstrate it for a  
503 typical participant A (Figure 2) and for nine other representative participants B to J  
504 (Supplemental Figures S1-S9). First, dynamic variables, i.e., bladder-filling rate (BFR),

505 instantaneous time-dependent frequency of voiding (F), and urge growth rate (UrgR) can vary  
506 several-fold (e.g., 12-fold [Figure 2], 16-fold [Supplemental Figures S2, S3, S5, S7, S9]) during  
507 the day. Second, peaks of these functions occur at time points collocated with fluid intakes. The  
508 highest peaks of BFR(t), F(t), and UrgR(t) are closely following consumption of caffeine and/or  
509 alcohol, e.g., in participant A (Figure 2), and in participants B, C, D, and I (Supplemental Figures  
510 S2, S3, S4, S9). Other peaks are collocated with frequent and/or high-volume drinks. Third,  
511 periods of low BFR(t), F(t), and UrgR(t) are collocated with time intervals with no fluid  
512 consumption, usually at nighttime.

513 Next steps serve to formalize and quantify these observations by examining intra-subject  
514 correlations and cross-correlation functions of the above dynamic BD variables, and by  
515 developing personalized models of BDs.

### 516 ***Intra-subject correlations of dynamic BD variables***

517 In this section, we will show how correlation analysis of time-dependent (dynamic)  
518 variables reveals a powerful correlation of BFR with UrgR and F. We will also show, in contrast,  
519 a lack of significant correlation of urge level at void with either BFR or VV. BD data for a typical  
520 participant A (Figure 2) can be presented in a different way by plotting UrgR versus BFR (Figure  
521 5A) and versus VV (Figure 5B). Similarly, F can be plotted versus BFR (Figure 5C) and versus  
522 VV (Figure 5D). In this presentation, information regarding the sequence of events is lost;  
523 however, presence or absence of correlations between variables becomes more visible. For  
524 instance, for participant A, BFR is strongly and significantly correlated with UrgR ( $R=0.88$ ,  
525  $p=3 \cdot 10^{-11}$ ) and with F ( $R=0.85$ ,  $p=2 \cdot 10^{-10}$ ), while correlation of these variables with VV is  
526 weak and insignificant ( $R=-0.19$ ,  $p=0.29$ ;  $R=-0.30$ ,  $p=0.08$ ). Correlations of urge level at the  
527 time of void (URG) is weak and insignificant with VV ( $R=0.32$ ,  $p=0.06$ ) and BFR ( $R=0.31$ ,  
528  $p=0.08$ ) (Figures 5E-5F). As shown in Figure 6, these observations hold for the majority of 197  
529 patients. While correlations of UrgR and F with BFR are almost always positive and are above

530 0.5 for the majority of participants, correlations of these variables with VV can be both positive  
531 and negative and are almost all weak ( $|R| < 0.5$ ). Figure 6C presents the correlations of URG with  
532 VV and BFR. Unlike UrgR and F, where correlation with BFR was a strong positive for almost all  
533 participants, there are participants with positive, zero, and negative correlations of URG with  
534 BFR. Similarly, there are participants with positive, zero, and negative correlations of URG with  
535 VV. Four extreme cases with the strongest positive and negative correlations are presented in  
536 Table 3. Note that the strongest negative correlation of URG with VV is observed for participant  
537 Y, consuming high osmolality drinks as well as caffeinated and alcohol-containing drinks.  
538 Negative correlations with BFR and VV are observed in participant Z, consuming the highest  
539 amount of caffeine. Likely, for these participants, urge level is determined not by the urine  
540 volume but by the composition of the drinks. The strongest positive correlation of URG with VV  
541 is observed for participant W, who consumed low osmolality drinks without caffeine and alcohol.  
542 The strongest positive correlation of URG with BFR was observed for participant X, with the  
543 highest time variability of BFR (max/median BFR=95.8). Observed differences in the  
544 correlations of URG with BFR and VV across participants suggest the differences in mechanism  
545 of urge, which could be potentially used for subtyping of patients with LUTS.

546



547 **Table 3. Four participants with the strongest positive and negative correlations of URG**  
 548 **with VV and BFR**

ID	W	X	Y	Z
Sex	Female	Female	Female	Male
Number of voids	15	30	22	36
Number of leaks	2	0	1	6
Total VV, mL	7097.8	3645.1	5352.9	6713.3
Mean URG	2.4	1.21	2.86	1.53
Max URG	4	3	4	4
Number of intakes	15	9	19	21
Total intake volume, mL	4864.9	3312.3	4199.5	5648.6
Total caffeine, mg	0	150	200	700
Total alcohol, mL	0	0	45	0
Mean osmolality, mOsm	133.3	240	404.2	130
Max/median BFR	3.12	95.83	6.36	5.69
Correlation of URG with VV	0.91	0.48	-0.63	-0.24
Correlation of URG with BFR	0.05	0.76	0.09	-0.32

549

550 **Figure 5. Example for a typical participant A of the correlations between the dynamic BD**  
 551 **variables.** Figure 5A: UrgR versus BFR ( $R=0.88$ ,  $p= 3 \cdot 10^{-11}$ ). Figure 5B: UrgR versus VV  
 552 ( $R=-0.19$ ,  $p=0.29$ ). Figure 5C: F versus BFR ( $R=0.85$ ,  $p= 2 \cdot 10^{-10}$ ). Figure 5D: F versus VV  
 553 ( $R=-0.30$ ,  $p=0.08$ ). Figure 5E: URG versus BFR ( $R=0.31$ ,  $p=0.08$ ). Figure 5F: URG versus VV  
 554 ( $R=0.32$ ,  $p=0.06$ ).

555  
 556 **Figure 6. Scatter plots representing the values of correlation coefficients between**  
 557 **dynamic variables for 197 participants.** Figure 6A: correlation of UrgR with BFR (mean  
 558  $R=0.73$ ) versus correlation of UrgR with VV (mean  $R=-0.07$ ). Figure 6B: correlation of F with  
 559 BFR (mean  $R=0.75$ ) versus correlation of F with VV (mean  $R=-0.17$ ). Figure 6C: correlation of  
 560 URG with BFR (mean  $R=0.12$ ) versus correlation of URG with VV (mean  $R=0.36$ ). Four cases  
 561 (W, X, Y, and Z with the highest and lowest values of R) are labeled and described in Table 3.

562  
 563 Table 4 presents the values of intra-subject correlation coefficients between dynamic BD  
 564 variables calculated for each participant and then averaged across 197 participants. As seen,  
 565 BFR, F, and UrgR are strongly and significantly correlated (correlations are preserved when  
 566 controlled for other variables; see values of partial correlation coefficients); correlations of these  
 567 variables with VV are weak, indicating that BFR rather than VV is the main determinant of  
 568 urinary frequency and UrgR. This conclusion corroborates the observation of numerous low-

569 volume “urgent” voids illustrated by Figure 4. There are two aspects of the correlation of UrgR  
 570 with BFR. The first is obvious: A higher BFR results in faster bladder-filling to a level that  
 571 produces a sensation of urge and a greater frequency of urination. The second aspect is  
 572 revealed when we compare the full correlation coefficients with the partial correlation  
 573 coefficients calculated when certain variables are fixed. For instance, partial correlation of BFR  
 574 with UrgR (R=0.758) with fixed VV is even higher than full correlation of BFR with UrgR  
 575 (R=0.733), while partial correlation of BFR with UrgR with fixed urinary frequency is relatively  
 576 weak (R=0.3, p-value<0.001), indicating that the role of high BFR cannot be reduced to the time  
 577 necessary to fill the bladder to a certain level. We further investigate the role of BFR and urine  
 578 volume in the regression models of UrgR.

579 **Table 4. Intra-subject correlations between dynamic BD variables averaged across 197**  
 580 **participants.**

Variables	Pearson Correlation	p-value	Partial Corr, VV fixed	p-value	Partial Corr, BFR fixed	p- value	Partial Corr, IR fixed	p-value	Partial Corr, F fixed	p-value
F, UrgR	0.807	<0.001	0.807	<0.001	0.597	<0.001	0.803	<0.001		
BFR, F	0.752	<0.001	0.797	<0.001			0.753	<0.001		
BFR, UrgR	0.733	<0.001	0.758	<0.001			0.728	<0.001	0.3	<0.001
BFR, VV	0.151	<0.001					0.16	<0.001	0.395	<0.001
VV, UrgR	-0.07	<0.001			-0.231	<0.001	-0.061	<0.001	0.103	<0.001
VV, F	-0.167	<0.001			-0.395	<0.001	-0.159	<0.001		

582 ***Investigating similarities between BD variables using cross-correlation functions***

583 Intra-subject correlation analysis in the previous section helped to reveal important  
 584 relationships between variables in individual BDs; however, in such analysis, information about  
 585 the sequence of intake and voiding events is lost. To preserve this information and analyze

586 similarities in profiles of the variables, including co-occurrence of events, we used cross-  
587 correlation functions, calculated as explained in the Methods section.

588 Cross-correlation functions of dynamic BD variables for a typical participant A are  
589 presented in Figure 7 and for nine other typical participants (B-J) in Supplemental Figure S10.  
590 The maxima of the cross-correlation functions of BFR(t), F(t), and UrgR(t) for participant A  
591 occurred at zero lag and have high values of over 0.96 (highest possible value of cross-  
592 correlation function is 1), demonstrating the high level of similarity of the profiles and absence of  
593 time delay between these functions. This result corroborates the observation from Figure 2 that  
594 peaks of BFR(t), F(t), and UrgR(t) are co-occurring (e.g., labeled peaks at X=30, Figure 2). It  
595 also corroborates the result of the previous section that urinary frequency and UrgR are highly  
596 correlated with the BFR. The presence of two smaller maxima of these correlation functions at  
597  $\pm 24$  hours indicate the similarity of voiding patterns in days 1,2,3 of the BD, i.e., stability of the  
598 daily voiding pattern for this participant. Note that peaks of cross-correlation function at  $\pm 24$   
599 hours occur for some (B, D, G, H, I, J) but not for all participants in Supplemental Figure S10,  
600 indicating that similarity of voiding patterns of days 1,2,3 of the BD is not a universal, but a  
601 patient-specific property.

602 **Figure 7. Cross-correlation functions between dynamic BD variables of typical**  
603 **participant A.** Cross-correlation functions of BFR(t), UrgR(t), and F(t) have high maxima  
604 ( $X_{\text{corrmax}}=0.96$ ) at zero lag ( $X=0$ ), indicating high similarity and absence of time delay between  
605 these functions. Two more maxima of these cross-correlation functions ( $X=\pm 24$  hour) indicate  
606 similarity of voiding patterns in days 1,2,3 of BD. Lower values of maxima of cross-correlation  
607 functions of frequency and UrgR with intake rate IR(t) ( $X=-0.05$ ,  $X_{\text{corrmax}}=0.34$ ) indicate that  
608 peaks in intake volumes alone cannot predict peaks in voiding variables.

609  
610 Cross-correlation functions of urinary frequency and UrgR with IR(t) demonstrate much  
611 lower values with maxima of about 0.34, indicating that peaks in intake volume alone cannot  
612 predict peaks in voiding variables. This corroborates with observations in Figure 2, where the  
613 highest peak (at X=30) co-occurred not with the highest intake volume but with the intake

614 containing caffeine. Similar cross-correlation functions can be observed in Supplemental Figure  
615 S10 for the nine representative participants (B-J). For all of these participants, the maxima of  
616 cross-correlations of F and UrgR with BFR are in the range of [0.88, 0.98], which is three- to  
617 four-fold higher than their correlations with the IR(t). This observation makes sense, since IR(t)  
618 captures information only of the volumes and durations of the drinks, while urine production rate  
619 and therefore BFR may be affected by the composition of the drinks, e.g., osmolality, caffeine,  
620 and alcohol content. Also, importantly, BFR is affected not only by the volume of fluid consumed  
621 at the most recent intake but at the previous intakes as well, as seen for the peak of BFR (at  
622  $X=68.3$ ) following several peaks of intake (around  $X=66.8$ ) in Figure 2, or similarly, for the peaks  
623 of BFR and UrgR (at  $X=14.23$ ) following a series of intakes (at  $X=13.5$ ) in Supplemental Figure  
624 S2. Therefore, analysis with cross-correlation functions confirmed conclusions of the analysis of  
625 intra-subject correlations on high correlations and co-occurrence of peaks of urinary frequency  
626 and UrgR with the BFR, but also demonstrated that more sophisticated methods of analysis are  
627 necessary to predict these peaks from the intake profiles.

### 628 ***Predicting BFR profile with the grey-box model of urine formation rate***

629 As described in the Methods section and in Supplemental Material, we developed renal  
630 physiology-based grey-box models of urine formation rate for 197 individuals by fitting  
631 parameters of the model equations to minimize the difference of the urine formation rate  
632 predicted by the models and BFR calculated from the BDs of these individuals.

633 Figure 8 presents the comparison of BFR profiles derived from the BD with results of the  
634 grey-box models of urine formation rate for participants A (Figure 8A), B (Figure 8B), D (Figure  
635 8C), and J (Figure 8D). Two versions of the model are presented, i.e., the “full model” and the  
636 model ignoring caffeine and alcohol contents of drinks (“no caf no alc”). As seen, the “full model”  
637 is capable of better describing the peaks of BFR especially collocated with intakes containing  
638 caffeine. The “no caf no alc” model predicts peaks collocated with intakes; however, these

639 peaks are lower and broader than observed and predicted by the full model, as seen for  
640 participants A and C (Figures 8A, 8C). Figures 8B and 8D demonstrate that models ignoring  
641 caffeine and alcohol content of the drinks not only have problems in accurately predicting high  
642 peaks collocated with caffeine and alcohol consumption, but also sometimes create high false  
643 peaks collocated with drinks without caffeine and alcohol (e.g., around 7 pm on the first and  
644 third days in Figure 8B and on multiple locations in Figure 8D). This is the consequence of “no  
645 caf no alc” models not differentiating between different types of drinks and therefore attributing  
646 higher effects to the volume of the drinks. Although not ideal, “full models” are capable of better  
647 prediction of BFR profiles, with fewer peaks missed and fewer false peaks created. When  
648 comparing predicted and derived (from the BD) BFR profiles, it is important to remember that  
649 the later profiles are approximations as well, based on the assumption of BFR being constant  
650 during the interval between the voids, which is not necessarily correct and might be affected by  
651 multiple factors not recorded in the BD, e.g., heart rate, level of physical activity, consumption of  
652 salted food and/or diuretics.

653 **Figure 8. Comparison of BFR profiles derived from the BDs with the profiles predicted by**  
654 **the grey-box models of urine formation rate.** Figure 8A: participant A. Figure 8B: participant  
655 B. Figure 8C: participant D. Figure 8D: participant J. Both “full models” (in red) and models  
656 ignoring caffeine and alcohol content of the drinks (in green) are presented.

### 657 ***Evaluation and selection of the BFR models***

658 We evaluated the developed grey-box models by comparing BFR profiles predicted by  
659 the models and derived from the BD. We performed not only visual comparison (Figure 8) but  
660 also quantified similarities by using cross-correlation function (eq 1) and functions Peak Fit and  
661 Peak Lag (eqs. 3-4). As noted in the Methods section, an important quality of any model is its  
662 ability to describe/predict observations in the time range outside of the time range used for  
663 parameter fitting. To estimate this ability, we developed models using 3 days of BD data (3-day  
664 model), as well as models using only the first 2 days of BD data (2-day model). Then we used  
665 the parameters of the 2-day model and 3-day intake data to predict BFR(t) during all 3 days.

666 The two rows in Figure 9 serve to compare the similarity of the observed BFR(t) and the 3-days  
667 (Figure 9A-9C) versus 2-day models (Figure 9D-9F). As seen, the histograms are rather similar,  
668 indicating that 2-day model predictions are only slightly less accurate than 3-day models. For  
669 the majority of the 3-day and 2-day models, maximum of the cross-correlation function (max  
670  $X_{corr}$ ) is above 0.8 (Figures 9A, 9D). For the majority of the models, Peak Fit > 0.9 (Figures 9B,  
671 9E) and Peak Lag < 6.5 minutes (Figures 9C, 9F). We used the Peak Fit metric to select  
672 satisfactory models for further analysis. Specifically, we selected BDs for whom both 3-day and  
673 2-day models have similar accuracy, i.e., Peak Fit > 0.9 for 3-day and 2-day models. We found  
674 145 such BDs. Table 5 provides the comparison of the 3-day and 2-day models for these  
675 selected BDs by showing mean values of maximum and lag of cross-correlation function, as  
676 well as mean values of Peak Fit and Peak Lag metrics. As seen, both 3-day and 2-day models  
677 provide satisfactory prediction of peak heights and positions, and the 2-day models are only  
678 slightly less accurate than the 3-day models.

679 **Figure 9. Distributions of metrics of similarity between modeled and observed (derived**  
680 **from BD) profiles of BFR for 197 participants.** Figures 9A-9C: 3-day models. Figures 9D-9F:  
681 2-day models. Figures 9A, 9D: distribution of maximum values of cross-correlation function.  
682 Figures 9B, 9E: distribution of Peak Fit values. Figures 9C, 9F: distribution of Peak Lag values.

683 **Table 5. Metrics for comparison of 3-day and 2-day BFR full models with BFR derived**  
684 **from selected 145 BDs. Mean (std) values**

	Peak Fit	Peak Lag, in minutes	max $X_{corr}$	$\tau_{max}$ , in minutes
BFR full 3-day	0.947 (0.017)	5.91 (0.38)	0.877 (0.07)	-2.32 (16)
BFR full 2-day	0.943 (0.018)	5.99 (0.39)	0.844 (0.08)	2.88 (60)

686  
687 ***Predictions of linear regression models of urinary UrgR***

688 As described in the Methods section, we developed multivariable linear regression  
689 models of UrgR for each individual with the following three inputs: BFR, volume of urine in the  
690 bladder, and awake (yes/no or 1/0). Figure 10 provides the comparison of profiles of UrgR(t)

691 derived from the BDs with those predicted by the developed multivariable linear regression  
692 models for four typical participants (A, B, E, and F).

693 **Figure 10. Comparison of profiles of UrgR predicted by the models and derived from the**  
694 **BDs for four typical participants.** Figure 10A: participant A (Adj.R<sup>2</sup>=0.88). Figure 10B:  
695 participant B (Adj.R<sup>2</sup>=0.87). Figure 10C: participant E (Adj.R<sup>2</sup>=0.86). Figure 10 D: participant F  
696 (Adj.R<sup>2</sup>=0.77). Note that intake and voiding profiles for these participants are presented in  
697 Figure 2 and Supplemental Figures S1, S5, and S6.

698  
699 The quality of the multivariable linear regression models (the proportion of variance  
700 explained by the model) is estimated by Adj.R<sup>2</sup>. The distribution of Adj.R<sup>2</sup> for 145 participants is  
701 presented in Figure 11A (0.1 < Adj.R<sup>2</sup> < 0.95). There is no universal rule to judge the quality of the  
702 model by the value of Adj.R<sup>2</sup>. It is recognized that higher values of Adj.R<sup>2</sup> are expected in  
703 physics and chemistry and lower in biology, medicine, and sociology. Typically, models of the  
704 processes involving human behavior are considered “good enough” if Adj.R<sup>2</sup> > 0.3 [34]. We  
705 applied this threshold and selected for further analysis the 124 participants for whom Adj.R<sup>2</sup> > 0.3  
706 in the multivariable linear regression model of UrgR. These 124 participants are a subset of 145  
707 participants for whom the satisfactory grey-box models (Peak Fit > 0.9) of urine production rate  
708 were created. We used the predicted profiles of UrgR(t) to calculate predicted urge scores at the  
709 times of void by using eq. 7 and compared the urge scores predicted by the models and  
710 reported in BD, as described in Methods, to determine percentages of true positive and false  
711 positive predictions of urgency episodes during individual 3-day BDs. The distributions of true  
712 positives and false positives are presented in Figures 11B and 11C. For 87 (70%) of individuals,  
713 models correctly predicted more than 90% of urgency episodes. Similarly, models predicted less  
714 than 10% false positive episodes in 82 (66%) individuals. The mean percentage of true positive  
715 predictions across 124 participants is 84.6%, while the mean false positive is 10.9%.

716 **Figure 11. Quality measures of the multivariable linear regression model of UrgR and**  
717 **urge scores at voids.** Figure 11A: Distribution of adjusted R squared values for 145 individuals’  
718 UrgR model (mean Adj.R<sup>2</sup>=0.67). Figure 11B: Distribution of percentage of true positive  
719 predictions of urgency episodes in subset of 124 participants with Adj.R<sup>2</sup> > 0.3. Figure 11C:

720 Distribution of percentage of false positive predictions of urgency episodes in the same subset  
 721 of 124 participants. There is a rather weak positive correlation between  $\text{Adj.R}^2$  of the model and  
 722 percentage of true positive predictions of urgency episodes ( $R=0.3$ ,  $p=0.006$ ), and very weak  
 723 negative correlation between  $\text{Adj.R}^2$  and false positive predictions ( $R=-0.17$ ,  $p=0.054$ ).

724  
 725 One goal of creating multivariable linear regression models was to investigate how BFR  
 726 and urine volume affect the UrgR in various individuals. We compared the group of participants  
 727 ( $n=106$ ) experiencing at least one episode of urgency ( $\text{URG} \geq 2$ ) with those without urgency  
 728 ( $n=18$ ). Table 6 provides the mean and standard deviation values of the linear model  
 729 coefficients for these two groups.

730 **Table 6. Comparison of coefficients of the linear model of UrgR for patients with and**  
 731 **without urinary urgency**  
 732 (Model:  $\text{UrgR} = \beta_1 \text{BFR}^0 + \beta_2 V^0 + \beta_3 \text{Awake} + \beta_{12} \text{BFR}^0 * V^0 + \beta_{13} \text{BFR}^0 * \text{Awake} + \beta_{23} V^0 * \text{Awake} +$   
 733  $\epsilon$ ), where  $\text{BFR}^0 = (\text{BFR} - \text{median BFR}) / \text{median BFR}$ ,  $V^0 = (V - \text{median } V) / \text{median } V$ .)  
 734

	mean with urgency	std with urgency	mean without urgency	std without urgency	p-values
Intercept	0.0124	0.0064	0.0061	0.0013	5.8E-05
$\beta_1$ ( $\text{BFR}^0$ )	0.0098	0.0054	0.0042	0.0021	3.6E-05
$\beta_2$ ( $V^0$ )	-0.0022	0.0020	-0.0010	0.0004	2.0E-02
$\beta_3$ (awake)	-0.0014	0.0037	-0.0005	0.0012	3.9E-01
$\beta_{12}$ ( $\text{BFR}^0 * V^0$ )	-0.0003	0.0016	-0.0003	0.0005	9.5E-01
$\beta_{13}$ ( $\text{BFR}^0 * \text{awake}$ )	-0.0008	0.0065	-0.0004	0.0022	8.1E-01
$\beta_{23}$ ( $V^0 * \text{awake}$ )	0.0008	0.0023	0.0001	0.0007	2.9E-01
$\text{Adj.R}^2$	0.591	0.162	0.660	0.143	9.1E-02

735  
 736 Intercept is significantly higher in the group with urgency. Similarly,  $\beta_1$  is positive in both  
 737 groups but is significantly higher in the group with urgency, indicating that BFR is a strong driver  
 738 of urgency. Mean of  $\beta_2$  is negative in both groups but has two-fold larger absolute value in the  
 739 group with urgency. Mean negative value of the coefficient for  $\beta_2$  is in agreement with the  
 740 negative mean intra-subject correlation of UrgR with urine volume (Table 4). The negative value  
 741 of  $\beta_2$  might seem counterintuitive; one would expect urge to be higher with the higher urine  
 742 volume when everything else is kept equal. However, it is important to remember that our model



743 (eq 6) predicts urge growth rate not urge level, meaning that with negative  $\beta_2$ , urge is growing  
744 with the increase of urine volume but slower than linearly, suggesting possible saturation of the  
745 signal produced by the stretched bladder wall. Mean of  $\beta_3$  is negative in both groups but has  
746 nearly three-fold larger absolute value in the group with urgency, indicating that, when  
747 everything else is kept equal (i.e., BFR and urine volume), on average, UrgR is higher when  
748 participants are asleep than when they are awake in both groups, but to a larger extent in  
749 participants with urgency.

750 Distributions of the intercept and model coefficients for participants with and without  
751 urgency in Figure 12 corroborates this observation. It also demonstrates that distributions of  
752 intercept and all coefficients are broader for participants with urgency relative to those without  
753 urgency. Rephrasing Leo Tolstoy, one can say that all people without urgency are “non-urgent  
754 alike”, while each person with urgency has urgency in their own way. Note that, while intercept  
755 and  $\beta_1$  are positive for all 124 participants (both with and without urgency), the values of  
756 intercept and  $\beta_1$  are higher for participants with urgency;  $\beta_2$  is negative for all participants  
757 without urgency and for the majority (107, or 92%) of participants with urgency. Coefficient  $\beta_3$  is  
758 negative for the majority of participants (85 with urgency and 12 without urgency), but is positive  
759 for some participants (31 with urgency and 6 without urgency), indicating that being awake  
760 could increase or decrease urgency growth rate in participants from both groups.

761 **Figure 12. Distributions of the intercept and 6 coefficients of multi linear regression**  
762 **models of UrgR across 124 participants.** Blue: participants with urgency (n=106). Red:  
763 participants without urgency (n=18). Bottom-right panel compares the distributions of Adj.R<sup>2</sup>  
764 values for participants with and without urgency (no significant difference).

765  
766 There are several metrics to estimate the severity of urgency in a patient; one possibility  
767 is to count the number of urgent voids. Table 7 provides correlations between the number of  
768 urgent voids with coefficients of the linear regression models across 124 participants.

769 **Table 7. Inter-subject Pearson correlation coefficients between the number of urgent**  
770 **voids and coefficients of linear regression models of UrgR**

Coefficient of variable	Correlation with number of urgent voids	p-771 values
Intercept	0.83	<0.001
$\beta_1$	0.54	<0.001
$\beta_2$	-0.41	<0.001
$\beta_3$	-0.32	0.002
$\beta_{12}$	-0.10	0.34
$\beta_{13}$	0.09	0.39
$\beta_{23}$	0.16	0.17

772

773 Number of urgent voids is strongly, significantly, and positively correlated with the  
774 intercept and coefficient  $\beta_1$ . Correlation with the intercept is obvious and trivial (it just means that  
775 participants with higher UrgR have higher number of urgent voids). Positive correlation with the  
776 coefficient  $\beta_1$  is more interesting and indicates that, not only the BFR is driving urge, but the  
777 participants with more frequent urgent voids are more sensitive to the increased BFR. Number  
778 of urgent voids is also significantly negatively correlated with  $\beta_2$ , suggesting that participants  
779 with a high number of urgent voids are less sensitive to the increased volume of urine in the  
780 bladder relative to the increased BFR.

781 It is of interest to examine if the slopes (sensitivities to different factors) are correlated,  
782 e.g., are people more sensitive to the increase of BFR also more sensitive to the increase of  
783 urine volume or to being awake. Scatter plots of intercept and coefficients  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  in Figure 13  
784 demonstrate that intercept and  $\beta_1$  are positively correlated ( $R=0.47$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), meaning that the  
785 larger the mean UrgR for the participant, the higher their sensitivity to the increase in BFR. On  
786 the contrary, correlation between  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  is negative ( $R=-0.33$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), indicating that  
787 participants more sensitive to increased BFR are less sensitive to increased urine volume. Note  
788 that correlation between  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  is different from the interaction term  $\beta_{12}$ , which deals with  
789 interactions of BFR and urine volume within a model for each individual. Negative  $\beta_{12}$  indicates

790 slower than linear growth of UrgR with BFR. Correlation between  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  are across the  
791 individuals. Negative correlation indicates that participants more sensitive to increased BFR are  
792 less sensitive to increased urine volume.

793 **Figure 13. Scatter plots of intercept and two model coefficients for 124 multivariable**  
794 **linear regression models of UrgR.** Figure 13A: intercept versus  $\beta_1$  ( $R=0.47$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). Figure  
795 13B:  $\beta_2$  versus  $\beta_1$  ( $R=-0.33$ ,  $p<0.001$ ).

796  
797 Of 21 correlations between 7 coefficients of the models, 12 are significant (Table 8) but  
798 the majority of them are weak to moderate. Of main interest are positive correlations between  
799 intercept and sensitivity to BFR ( $\beta_1$ ), and negative correlation between intercept and  $\beta_2$  and  $\beta_3$ ,  
800 indicating that participants with higher UrgR are more sensitive to BFR, less sensitive to urine  
801 volume, and have larger difference between day and night UrgRs. Correlations between  $\beta_1$  and  
802  $\beta_{ik}$ , and  $\beta_{ij}$  and  $\beta_{ki}$  are stronger; for instance, strong negative correlation of  $\beta_2$  and  $\beta_{23}$  indicates  
803 that people more sensitive to urine volume are also more sensitive to it during the night than  
804 during the day. Overall, the complex structure of correlations between coefficients of the  
805 multivariable linear regression models of UrgR indicates the possibility of different mechanisms  
806 of urge in different people. It is not clear (due to a limited sample size,  $n=124$ ) if it is possible to  
807 identify distinct subtypes of patients with urgency based on these data, or if it is a continuum of  
808 different levels of sensitivities to various factors. Subtyping of patients with urgency would  
809 benefit from inclusion of data outside of BDs (patient-reported symptoms, physical examination,  
810 etc.) and would require consideration of the correlations across these variables [35]. Such study  
811 is of interest but is beyond the scope of the current paper.

812 **Table 8. Significant inter-subject correlations between coefficients of UrgR models for**  
813 **124 participants**

First coefficient	Second coefficient	Correlation R	p-value
intercept	$\beta_1$	0.47	<0.001
intercept	$\beta_2$	-0.53	<0.001

intercept	$\beta_3$	-0.56	<0.001
intercept	$\beta_{23}$	0.21	0.014
$\beta_1$	$\beta_2$	-0.33	<0.001
$\beta_1$	$\beta_{12}$	-0.22	0.013
$\beta_1$	$\beta_{13}$	-0.57	<0.001
$\beta_1$	$\beta_{23}$	0.25	0.015
$\beta_2$	$\beta_3$	0.48	<0.001
$\beta_2$	$\beta_{23}$	-0.79	<0.001
$\beta_3$	$\beta_{23}$	-0.48	<0.001

814

815 ***Comparison of participants with satisfactory and unsatisfactory models***

816 As described above, models of urine production rate and UrgR for 124 (63% of 197  
817 participants) satisfied the selection criteria and were used for further analysis and simulation. It  
818 is of interest to evaluate how these 124 participants differ from 73 participants for whom  
819 satisfactory models were not created. Table 9 presents the comparison of the mean values and  
820 ranges of the BD variables for these two groups of participants. Variables are sorted starting  
821 with those with the most significant differences between the groups. Participants for whom  
822 satisfactory models were not created demonstrated significantly higher maximum across 3-day  
823 values of time-dependent instantaneous urinary frequency  $F(t)$  (Max F). They consumed more  
824 alcohol and high osmolality drinks. This demonstrates that our models have some difficulties in  
825 predicting extremely high peaks of F and in predicting the effects of alcohol and high-osmolality  
826 drink consumption. On the other hand, there are no differences in total intake and void volumes,  
827 maximum urge, number of voids and leaks, and sex of the participants. Differences between the  
828 groups in caffeine content of the drinks and mean urge levels are borderline significant.

**Table 9. Comparison of the groups of participants with satisfactory (selected) versus unsatisfactory (filtered) models**

Variables	Mean Selected	Std Selected	Min Selected	Max Selected	Mean Filtered	Std Filtered	Min Filtered	Max Filtered	p-value	Adjusted p-value
Max F, 1/day	62.4	64.0	7.0	480.0	114.8	127.9	12.1	720.0	<0.001	0.003
ALC, mL	19.1	44.9	0.0	215.2	75.7	212.2	0.0	1632.5	0.005	0.022
OSM, mOsm	175.4	165.6	0.0	934.1	252.7	220.2	1.2	895.4	0.006	0.022
Mean URG	1.9	0.8	0.8	3.9	1.7	0.7	0.0	3.8	0.026	0.083
CAF, mg	318.5	278.6	0.0	1300.0	410.7	311.4	0.0	1450.0	0.032	0.086
Sum intake, mL	5529.2	2246.1	1567.4	13722.3	6084.2	2437.0	2410.3	13101.3	0.105	0.240
BFR ratio	2.6	1.4	1.0	11.8	2.5	1.1	1.1	7.4	0.594	0.849
Sum void, mL	5299.3	2311.1	828.1	14195.5	5471.6	2261.5	1160.8	11740.9	0.609	0.849
PVR, mL	15.4	15.0	0.0	50.0	16.2	15.5	0.0	50.0	0.711	0.849
Max void, mL	462.9	212.8	103.5	1360.4	475.0	234.9	118.3	1419.6	0.712	0.849
Max URG	3.0	1.0	1.0	4.0	3.1	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.719	0.849
LEAK	2.0	4.3	0.0	26.0	2.2	4.8	0.0	33.0	0.743	0.849
N voids	25.9	8.9	8.0	51.0	26.2	7.8	12.0	50.0	0.861	0.918
male, %	47.6				55.4				0.999	0.999

### Simulation of behavioral modifications by using the developed models

We used the developed 124 satisfactory models of UrgR to simulate the effects of behavioral modifications. Of these participants with satisfactory models, 20 did not consume caffeine or alcohol (noCA), 29 consumed caffeine but not alcohol (yCnoA), 3 consumed alcohol but not caffeine (AnoC), and 72 consumed both caffeine and alcohol (yCA). Of these 124 participants, 106 had at least one urgency episode; distribution of these participants “with urgency” across “consumer groups” was the following: noCA=17, yCnoA=23, yAnoC=3, yCA=63. Since the goal of behavioral modifications is to minimize urgency episodes, we investigated the effects of behavioral modifications only on 106 participants with urgency. Two metrics of the effects of the modifications are of interest: first, the reduction of the mean (across the 3 days of the diary) UrgR for each individual, and second, reduction of the number of urgency episodes for each individual. The first metric translates into the expected reduction in urinary frequency (assuming that voids occur at the same levels of urge as without modification). The second assumes that timing of voids is the same as without modifications, but urgency is not reached due to the reduced UrgR. Table 10 provides the values of both metrics (separated by semicolon) averaged within the above groups of consumers.

**Table 10. Improvements in mean UrgR and number of urgency episodes due to behavioral modifications**

Simulated modification	Caffeine & alcohol consumers (n=23)	Only caffeine consumers (n=63)	Only alcohol consumers (n=3)	No caffeine no alcohol consumers (n=17)	All relevant participants*
Exclude caffeine	14.8%; 15.0%	14.5%; 14.9%	N/A	N/A	14.7%; 15.0%
Exclude alcohol	17.6%; 19.0%	N/A	23.5%; 13.3%	N/A	18.3%; 18.4%
Exclude caffeine & alcohol	26.9%; 27.6%	N/A	N/A	N/A	26.9%; 27.6%
Reduce intake	0.8%; 5.1%	0.7%; 0.8%	3.2%; 0.0%	0.1%; 1.2%	0.7%; 1.7%

volume by 10%					
Reduce intake volume by 30%	2.0%; 9.6%	1.1%; 3.2%	7.2%; 0.0%	0.9%; 1.2%	1.4%; 4.2%
Reduce intake volume by 50%	9.2%; 14.1%	7.2%; 7.1%	10.2%; 0.0%	2.3%; 3.1%	6.9%; 7.8%
Keep BFR constant	6.3%; 36.6%	8.5%; 27.9%	0.0%; 13.3%	10.9%; 17.3%	7.9%; 27.3%

\* "All relevant participants" means participants capable of performing simulated modification, e.g., yCnoA group and yCA group can exclude caffeine, while group yAnoC and noCA cannot since they are not consuming it. Two metrics of improvement defined above are separated by semicolon. First metric describes reduction in averaged urinary frequency, while the second metric describes average reduction in the number of urgent voids if the total number of voids is kept constant for the given individual.

Simulated exclusion of caffeine and alcohol predicted much higher effect in reduction of mean UrgR and reduction in the number of urgency episodes than reduction of intake volume. Exclusion of both caffeine and alcohol is more effective than exclusion of one of them. The most effective (in terms of reduction in the number of urgency episodes) simulated modification is presented in the last row of Table 10. It is the hypothetical case where BFR and urine volume in the bladder are somehow kept constant and equal to the median values of BFR and urine volume during the 3 days of the BD. Note that, in this case, the total intake volume is not reduced; however, the timings of intakes should be modified. Especially high is the reduction of the number of urgency episodes in all four groups of participants. The mean reduction in the number of urgency episodes is as high as 36.6% for participants consuming caffeine and alcohol and is 27.3% for all four groups on average. This result is consistent with our observation that peaks of UrgR are collocated with peaks of BFR (Figure 2 and Supplemental Figures S1-S9). It is also consistent with the strong intra-subject correlation of UrgR with BFR ( $R > 0.7$ ) in Table 4, and with the high level of similarity of the UrgR(t) and BFR(t) profiles demonstrated with cross-correlation functions (Figure 7 and Supplemental Figure S10).

Reactions of participants to the simulated modifications vary across individuals. For

some participants, modifications resulted in more than 50% improvement in the number of urgency episodes, while for others, they resulted in no improvement at all. Histograms in Figure 14 present the distributions of relative improvement in the number of urgency episodes across participants capable of simulated modifications (see Table 10 footnote and Figure 14 caption). Simulated cases of excluded caffeine (Figure 14A), excluded alcohol (Figure 14B), intake volume reduced by 50% (Figure 14C), and a hypothetical case of constant BFR (Figure 14D) are presented. Keeping BFR constant appears to be the most effective simulated modification at the individual level as well; i.e., 23 (21.7%) of participants are predicted to experience more than 50% reduction in the number of urgency episodes, while for other modifications, 50% reduction was achieved for a much lower number and percentage of relevant participants: caffeine exclusion 8 (9.3%), alcohol exclusion 3 (11.5%), and 50% intake volume reduction 3 (2.8%).

**Figure 14. Relative improvement in the number of urgent voids due to simulated behavioral modifications.** Figure 14A: caffeine excluded in groups of participants with urgency consuming caffeine without alcohol (n=63) and caffeine and alcohol (n=23). Figure 14B: alcohol excluded in groups of participants with urgency consuming caffeine and alcohol (n=23) and alcohol without caffeine (n=3). Figure 14C: intake volumes reduced by 50% without changing the timing of voids in all patients with urgency (n=106). Figure 14D: simulated BFR and urine volume are kept constant and equal to the median values of BFR and urine volume during 3 days (n=106).

To determine what kinds of participants benefit more from the simulated modifications, we calculated inter-subject correlations of the above two metrics of improvement with the following characteristics of the individual participants: total intake volume, total void volume, total caffeine consumed, total alcohol consumed, mean osmolality of drinks, number of voids, number of leaks, ratio of maximum BFR to median BFR, mean level of urge at voids, mean UrgR, maximum UrgR. We calculated the above correlations for each modification and group of participants separately. The decrease in percentage of urgency episodes due to excluding caffeine (in the group consuming caffeine and both caffeine and alcohol n=23+63) was found to be correlated with total amount consumed caffeine ( $R=0.21$ ,  $p=0.06$ ) and with urge level at voids



( $R=-0.36$ ,  $p=0.0008$ ), indicating that patients with moderate urgency and high caffeine consumption would benefit from caffeine exclusion. The decrease in percentage of urgency episodes due to excluding alcohol (in the group consuming alcohol and both alcohol and caffeine  $n=3+63$ ) was found to be correlated with the ratio of maximum BFR to median BFR ( $R=0.48$ ,  $p=0.014$ ), confirming the role of alcohol in creating peaks of BFR and UrgR, which can be avoided by excluding alcohol. The decrease in the percentage of urgency episodes due to decreasing the intake volume by 50% (in all patients with urgency  $n=106$ ) was found to be correlated with the total void volume ( $R=0.24$ ,  $p=0.015$ ), mean osmolality of drinks ( $R=0.24$ ,  $p=0.014$ ), and negatively correlated with the mean urge level ( $R=-0.26$ ,  $p=0.007$ ). The decrease in the mean UrgR due to 50% intake reduction was correlated with the total void volume ( $R=0.30$ ,  $p=0.002$ ), maximum voided volume ( $R=0.24$ ,  $p=0.014$ ), and negatively correlated with consumed alcohol ( $R=-0.16$ ,  $p=0.09$ ). The reduction in the number of urgency episodes was negatively correlated with mean urge level at voids ( $R=-0.38$ ,  $p=0.0001$ ) and with the number of leaks ( $R=-0.27$ ,  $p=0.057$ ), indicating that this modification is more beneficial for patients with moderate level of urge and not too frequent episodes of incontinence. The above hypothetical case is likely not easy to implement for the majority of patients, it rather serves as an asymptotic solution demonstrating what is the maximum potential improvement in the percentage of urgency episodes that could be accomplished without decreasing the volume of drinks and without changing timings of the voids. It also provides some insights for selection of patients for whom such approach might be helpful, i.e., patients with moderate mean urge at void level and with rare incontinence episodes. One consistent observation can be made for all the above simulations, i.e., intake modifications seem to be beneficial for patients with moderate urgency. For these patients, the most beneficial medication could be the exclusion of caffeine and alcohol and/or modification of timings of the drinks to avoid peaks in BFR. Additionally, for participants with higher-level urinary urgency, multiple episodes of urgency, and incontinence, none of the simulated behavioral modifications was helpful.

## Discussion

The main premise of this paper is that BDs allow much more than just verification or more accurate presentation of the data similar to that available through the relevant self-reported responses on questionnaires. We believe that important additional information and insights could be extracted through the analysis of voiding and drinking patterns, where not only volumes of the voids and intakes and voiding sensations are recorded, but importantly, accurate timings of these events. To implement this program of pattern analysis, we proposed and developed a dynamic approach to the analysis of BDs, including seven steps or levels: 1) graphical representation and visual inspection of the patterns of intakes, voids, and sensations; 2) introduction of dynamic variables, such as BFR, UrgR, and instantaneous time-dependent frequency (reciprocal of time intervals between voids); 3) intra-subject correlations between the dynamic variables; 4) analysis of similarities and delays between patterns of dynamic variables using cross-correlation function; 5) grey-box models allowing for prediction of the BFR in an individual, given the types, volumes, and timings of intakes; 6) multivariable linear regression models predicting individual's UrgR from their BFR and urine volume; 7) simulation of the effects of intake modifications on sensation of urge. Each next level provides deeper understanding of the relationship between patterns of intakes, sensations, and voids; however, each level requires more detailed and accurate data; therefore, the number of individuals to whom the proposed levels of analysis are applicable progressively reduced from 197 (levels 1-4) to 145 (level 5) to 124 (levels 6-7). Consistency of the results established across the levels of analysis increases our confidence. There are two lines of inquiry and findings across all seven levels; the first is about the role of BFR as a driver of urge and frequency, while the second is about the role of caffeine and alcohol in stimulating BFR and therefore urinary urge and frequency.

Visual inspection of dynamic variables patterns, in particular BFR(t) (Figure 2, Supplemental Figures S1-S9) demonstrated that BFR could change dramatically during the day, and that peaks of BFR could be 10-12-fold higher than median BFR value for the given individual. Analysis of the distributions of max BFR/median BFR values confirmed this conclusion for the whole cohort (Figure 3). Furthermore, the patterns of instantaneous frequency (F(t)) and UrgR(t) demonstrated high peaks, which were collocated with peaks of BFR(t) (Figure 2, Supplemental Figures S1-S9). Analysis with cross-correlation function (Figure 7, Supplemental Figure S10) demonstrated a high level of similarity and absence of delay between BFR(t), UrgR(t), and F(t). Strong association of these patterns is corroborated by the high values of mean intra-subject correlation coefficients between BFR, UrgR, and F (Table 4) for full correlations and partial correlations calculated with fixed urine volume and IR(t). Strong positive correlations of UrgR and F with BFR were observed for the majority of individuals in the cohort, while correlations of UrgR and F with urine volume were mostly weak to moderate, with positive and negative correlations being almost equally prevalent (Figure 6). Consistent strong positive correlation of UrgR and F with BFR indicates that BFR rather than urine volume was the main determinant of urgency. The hypothetical mechanism is that BFR drives the urge growth rate and makes a person void when urge reaches certain level. One can argue that increased BFR increases the volume of urine in the bladder, and a person voids as soon as the certain fraction of the bladder volume is filled. This reasoning, however, contradicts the observation that multiple “very urgent” voids ( $URG \geq 3$ ) occur when only a small fraction of the bladder is filled with urine (Figure 4D-4E) and the observation that the same level of urge in an individual could occur at different levels of bladder fullness (Figure 4F). Multivariable linear regression models of UrgR corroborated the conclusion of BFR being the dominant driver of UrgR and urge level; it also revealed that UrgR for most of the participants decreases with urine volume, meaning that urge is growing slower than linearly with urine volume. This result is in agreement with the observations of [27], where the reported urge during the natural bladder-filling experiments

demonstrated sigmoidal dependence on urine volume. Further analysis of the models showed that participants with more frequent urgency episodes are more sensitive to the increased BFR. Simulation of the hypothetical behavioral modification of keeping BFR as constant as possible showed that it resulted in the more effective reduction of the number of urgency episodes than reduction of intake volume or just exclusion of caffeine and/or alcohol. Thus, results of the analysis at multiple levels consistently demonstrated the role of the peaks of BFR as drivers of urge and the benefit of the measures leading to avoidance of such peaks.

The results of our analyses are in concert with conclusions of the study by Redmond et al [36] of BDs of 24 women with OAB compared with 40 controls, where BFR was an independent predictor of the percentage of urgent voids in patients with OAB, but not in the control group. In that study, VVs and BFRs were stratified into three levels: low, medium, and high. All voids within the groups of women were combined together, ignoring possible heterogeneity of the individuals, of which the groups consist, including different bladder capacities. Our dynamic analysis was performed separately for each individual and is free of these limitations. Another study in concert with our observations reports on the bladder sensations in normal (n=12) and OAB (n=17) participants during the oral hydration by rapid consumption of 2L of Gatorade [37]. One conclusion was “this study showed fast filling can lead normal individuals to experience OAB sensations because sensation event patterns in normal participants during fast filling were similar to OAB participants during slow filling.” Although tempting to view this conclusion as a confirmation of our observations, it is worth noting that mean BFR was about 6.5 mL/min during “slow filling” and over 12 mL/min during “fast filling”. While “fast filling” BFR is similar to observed during the peaks of BFR in our BDs, the “slow filling” BFR was about 6-fold higher than mean BFR (~1 mL/min) across the 3-day BDs in our study. It would be of interest to see the results of oral hydration study with slower “slow filling”; in

this case, differences in bladder sensations during “slow” and “fast” filling might be even higher than observed in [37].

Caffeine- and alcohol-containing drinks were reported as drivers of diuresis and urge [38,39]. Our second line of inquiry is about the role of caffeine and alcohol. Visual inspection (Figure 2, Supplemental Figures S1-S9) demonstrated that peaks of BFR are often collocated with intakes of caffeine- and alcohol-containing drinks. The assumption that certain peaks of BFR are caused not just by the intake volume but by the caffeine and alcohol content of the drinks was corroborated by the better fit to the data of the grey-box models of urine production rate, taking composition of the drinks into account relative to the models ignoring caffeine and alcohol content (Figure 8). Simulated exclusion of both caffeine and alcohol in a group of participants consuming them predicted to reduce by nearly 30% both the mean UrgR and the number of urgent voids. The effect of caffeine and alcohol exclusion is predicted to be much more substantial than that of intake volume reduction.

In summary, simulation predicted that the most beneficial modifications are those resulting in smooth profiles of BFR, which can be accomplished by exclusion of caffeine and alcohol and/or other measures (e.g., increasing number and decreasing volumes of intakes), which is consistent with some published recommendations [40]. It also demonstrated that, for some participants with severe and frequent urgency episodes, none of the simulated modifications was helpful. Such participants are likely beyond the behavioral modifications stage and require more radical medical treatment.

The above distinction – together with observed differences in the dependence of UrgR on urine volume, i.e., positive and negative intra-subject correlations of UrgR and F with VV (Figure 6), and both positive and negative values of coefficient  $\beta_2 (V^0)$  of the linear regression model (Figure 13) – indicate that urinary urge might have different mechanisms in different

participants. It is in line with the observation of urge dynamics in the natural-filling study, where some participants demonstrated sigmoidal and some linear dependencies of urge on the urine volume [27]. Recently, an expert panel [41] recommended to include some BD variables together with the results of physiological tests (e.g., maximum uroflow and PVR) into the classification of OAB patients. We believe that adding variables derived from the BDs using a dynamic approach, such as coefficients  $\beta_1(\text{BFR}^0)$  and  $\beta_2(V^0)$  might improve classification and provide additional insights into the mechanism of urge in various phenotypes.

Our paper is not free of limitations. The first group of limitations is related to the collected, or rather to the non-collected data; the second to the methodology and model assumptions. BDs are not perfect, there is always a chance of some intakes or voids being missed or recorded incorrectly [42]. We do not have data on the physical activity and heart rate that affects glomerular filtration rate. We do not have data on salt consumption with food that affects osmolality of the blood and, therefore, water reabsorption rate. We do not have data about fluids consumed with food (e.g., soup, watermelon). Participants reported the types of drinks, while information on alcohol and caffeine content is based on the literature data that is not necessarily accurate for all individual drinks. The absence or inaccuracy of these data negatively affects the accuracy of our models of urine production rate. We minimized the effects of these inaccuracies in the linear regression model of UrgR by using BFR(t) extracted from the BDs. The simulated changes in BFR(t) due to behavioral modifications were estimated as the difference in urine production rates predicted by the grey-box models with and without the above modifications, thus cancelling out some of the above inaccuracies.

The main assumption in defining the dynamic variables (BFR(t), F(t), and UrgR(t)) was that they are constant during the time intervals between voids and change abruptly at the time of voids. This is accurate for F(t), defined as reciprocal of time interval between voids, but it is an approximation for BFR(t) and UrgR(t), which is the best estimation, given the data available

in the BDs. Better approximation for BFR(t) may be derived from future studies where an observed rate growth of urine volume during natural bladder-filling (e.g., through ultrasound or fMRI measurements [43,44]) would be combined with BDs for the same participants. Similarly, accurate reporting of the level of urge during natural bladder-filling experiments [25] combined with BDs for the same patients could lead to better approximations of UrgR(t) profiles and more accurate predictions.

Despite the above limitations and approximations, our findings at different levels do corroborate each other. Deeper levels of analysis require more assumptions and approximations to provide more details on the codependence of the patterns of intakes, sensations, and voids, but are, in general, in concert with the visual observations at the first-level analysis, therefore increasing confidence in the obtained results. Obviously, our results should not be overgeneralized. They need to be validated in an independent cohort and require clinical verification. One possible way to evaluate clinical significance of dynamic approach to BD data is to start with implementing just the first step, i.e., graphically represent patterns of intakes, sensations, and voids, together with BFR and UrgR (Figure 2, Supplemental Figures S1-S9). This visual representation is useful since it clearly demonstrates the presence of peaks of BFR and urge growth and their collocation with certain intakes, which would enable both clinician and patient to generate and test hypotheses on the causes of urgency episodes, and propose and test behavioral modifications. Realized as a mobile application, it could be a useful educational and self-improvement tool for the patients.

Advancement and the growth of popularity of wearable devices measuring physical activity, together with the development of numerous apps for recording bladder and food diaries, generate optimism with regard to improvement of the quality of data required for dynamic analysis. Another potential way to advance the accuracy of model predictions is to collect data on urine composition. Studies have shown that urine osmolality can be reliably estimated by

comparing the color of the urine with color charts [45]. Availability of such data would allow for fitting the model of urine production rate, not only by comparing model predictions with the BFR, but also with the osmolality profiles. Similarly advantageous would be at least occasional measurements of caffeine and alcohol concentrations in urine. Having both measured and simulated urine composition profiles would advance the accuracy of the UrgR models and could generate more insights potentially useful for clinical practice.

## **Conclusion**

A dynamic approach to the analysis of bladder diaries was proposed and developed, including visual representation of the patterns of intakes, bladder sensations, and voids, as well as analyzing intra-subject correlations of the introduced dynamic variables (bladder filling rate and urgency growth rate), and predictive modeling of these variables. The main results of the dynamic analysis performed on the 3-day BDs from 197 participants with LUTS include observations of the collocation of the BFR and UrgR peaks with the timings of intakes containing caffeine and alcohol and with the high-volume intakes. For a majority of participants, urgent voids were observed when only a small portion of their bladder was filled with urine. UrgR was strongly positively correlated with the BFR in the majority of participants, indicating that BFR, rather than urine volume, was the main determinant of their urge sensations. A dynamic approach to analysis of BDs and its results should be validated in an independent cohort. Although the results of the analysis should not be generalized prior to validation, the dynamic approach itself might be applied to the analysis of other physiological processes of interest where continuous measurements of the variables are available, as in continuous glucose or continuous heart rate monitoring and where the rate of change of the variables in response to the stimuli might be as important or even more important than their absolute values.



## Acknowledgements

Heather Van Doren, Senior Medical Editor with Arbor Research Collaborative for Health, provided editorial assistance on this manuscript.

Authors are grateful to Drs. Ziya Kirkali, Jerry G. Blaivas, Jeffrey P. Weiss, Claire C. Yang, Robert M. Merion, Bruce M. Robinson, and Brenda W. Gillespie for interesting discussions.

The authors acknowledge the LURN study group for BD data. This LURN Ancillary Study is funded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH), grant number R21DK121065. LURN Data Coordinating Center (Arbor Research Collaborative for Health) and a clinical site at the University of Michigan are associated with this LURN Ancillary study.

The LURN study is supported by the National Institute of Diabetes & Digestive & Kidney Diseases through cooperative agreements (grants DK097780, DK097772, DK097779, DK099932, DK100011, DK100017, DK099879).

The following individuals were instrumental in the planning and conduct of LURN study at each of the participating institutions:

Duke University, Durham, North Carolina (DK097780): PIs: Cindy Amundsen, MD, J. Eric Jelovsek, MD; Co-Is: Kathryn Flynn, PhD, Jim Hokanson, PhD, Aaron Lentz, MD, David Page, PhD, Nazema Siddiqui, MD, Lisa Wruck, PhD, Todd Harshbarger, PhD; Study Coordinators: Paige Green, MSc, Magaly Guerrero, BSc, Stephanie Yu, Summer Granger

University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA (DK097772): PIs: Catherine S Bradley, MD, MSCE, Karl Kreder, MD, MBA; Co-Is: Bradley A. Erickson, MD, MS, Daniel Fick, MD, Vince Magnotta, PhD, Philip Polgreen, MD, MPH; Study Coordinators: Jean Walshire, AAS, Rachel Setting, BA

Northwestern University, Chicago, IL (DK097779): PIs: James W Griffith, PhD, Kimberly Kenton, MD, MS, Brian Helfand, MD, PhD; Co-Is: Carol Bretschneider, MD, David Cella, PhD, Sarah Collins, MD, Julia Geynisman-Tan, MD, Alex Glaser, MD, Christina Lewicky-Gaup, MD, Margaret Mueller, MD, Francesca Farina, PhD, Richard Fantus, MD, Devin Boehm, BS; Study Coordinators: Hosanna An, Andrea Villegas, Melissa Marquez, MBA, Malgorzata Antoniak, PhD, Pooja Talaty, MS, Sophia Kallas, Jessica Thomas, Amelia Joblin. Dr. Helfand and Ms. Talaty are at NorthShore University HealthSystem.

University of Michigan Health System, Ann Arbor, MI (DK099932): PI: J Quentin Clemens, MD, FACS, MSCI; Co-Is: John DeLancey, MD, Dee Fenner, MD, Rick Harris, MD, Steve Harte, PhD, Anne P. Cameron, MD, Aruna Sarma, PhD, Giulia Lane, MD, Priyanka Gupta, MD, Whitney Horner, MD; Jannah Thompson, MD; Payton Schmidt, MD; Study Coordinators: Greg Mowatt, BA, Sarah Richardson, BS, Lydia Duong, Nailah Henry, BA.

University of Washington, Seattle Washington (DK100011): PI: Claire Yang, MD; Co-I: Anna Kirby, MD; Study Coordinators: Brenda Vicars, RN; Sreya Gutta.

Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis Missouri (DK100017): PI: H. Henry Lai, MD; Co-Is: Joshua Shimony, MD, PhD, Fuhai Li, PhD; Study Coordinators: Linda Black, RN, Vivien Gardner, BSN, Patricia Hayden, BSN, Diana Wolff, Aleksandra Klim, RN, MHS, CCRC

Arbor Research Collaborative for Health, Data Coordinating Center (DK099879): PI: Robert Merion, MD, FACS; Co-Is: Victor Andreev, PhD, DSc, Brenda Gillespie, PhD, Abigail Smith, PhD; Project Manager: Jessica Durkin, M.Ed, MBA; Clinical Monitor: Melissa Sexton, BA, CCRP; Research Analysts: Margaret Helmuth, MA, Sarah Mansfield, MS. Project Associate: Julia Nashif, BA

National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, Division of Kidney, Urology, and Hematology, Bethesda, MD; Project Scientist: Ziya Kirkali MD; Project Officer: Christopher Mullins PhD; Project Advisor: Julie Barthold, MD

## References

1. Hofmeester I. Moderate agreement between bladder capacity assessed by frequency volume charts and uroflowmetry, in adolescent and adult enuresis patients. *Neurourol Urodyn* 2017;36:745-747.
2. Brown J. Measurement characteristics of a voiding diary for use by men and women with overactive bladder. *Urol* 2003;61(4):802-809.
3. Blaivas JG, Tsui JF, Amirian M, Ranasinghe B, Weiss JP, Haukka J, et al. Relationship between voided volume and the urge to void among patients with lower urinary tract symptoms, *Scandinavian J Urol* 2014;48(6):554-558.
4. Jimenez-Cidre MA. The 3-day bladder diary is a feasible, reliable and valid tool to evaluate the lower urinary tract symptoms in women. *Neurourol Urodyn* 2015;34:128-132.
5. Groutz A. Noninvasive outcome measures of urinary incontinence and lower urinary tract symptoms: a multicenter study of micturition diary and pad tests. *J Urol* 2000;164:698-701.
6. Ku J. Voiding diary for the evaluation of urinary incontinence and lower urinary tract symptoms: Prospective assessment of patient compliance and burden. *Neurourol Urodyn* 2004;23:331-335.
7. Homma Y. Assessment of overactive bladder symptoms: Comparison of 3-day bladder diary and the overactive bladder symptoms score. *Urol* 2011;77: 60-64.

8. Song M. Correlation of the overactive bladder symptom score, and the voiding diary and urodynamic parameters in patients with overactive bladder syndrome. *LUTS* 2014;6:180-184.
9. Brummen HJ. The association between overactive bladder symptoms and objective parameters from bladder diary and filling cystometry. *Neurourol Urodyn* 2004;23:38-42.
10. DiBona GF. Physiology in perspective: The wisdom of the body. Neural control of the kidney. The Walter B. Cannon Memorial Award Lecture. *Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol* 2005;289: R633-R641.
11. Fontecave-Jallon J, Randall Thomas S. Implementation of a model of bodily fluids regulation. *Acta Biotheoretica* 2015;63(3):269-282.
12. Karaaslan F, Denizhan Y, Kayserilioglu A, Ozcan Gulcur H. Long-term mathematical model involving renal sympathetic nerve activity, arterial pressure, and sodium excretion. *Ann Biomed Engineer* 2005;33(11):1607-1630.
13. Thomas SR, Layton AT, Layton HE, Moore LC. Kidney modeling: Status and perspectives. *Proceedings of the IEEE* April 2006;94(4).
14. Guyton AC, Taylor AE, Granger HJ. Dynamics and control of body fluid. Philadelphia, PA: WB Saunders Company; 1975.
15. Layton AT, Edwards A. Mathematical modeling in renal physiology. NY: Springer; 2014.
16. Weinstein AM. Mathematical models of renal fluid and electrolyte transport: Acknowledging our uncertainty. *Am J Physiol Renal Physiol* 2003;284:F871-F884.

17. Yang CC, Weinfurt KP, Merion RM, Kirkali Z; LURN Study Group. Symptoms of lower urinary tract dysfunction research network. *J Urol* 2016;196:146.
18. Cameron AP, Lewicky-Gaupp C, Smith AR, Helfand BT, Gore JL, Clemens JQ, et al. Baseline lower urinary tract symptoms in patients enrolled in LURN: a prospective, observational cohort study. *J Urol* 2018;199:1023.
19. Bright E, Cotterill N, Drake M, Abrams P. Developing and validating the international consultation on incontinence questionnaire bladder diary. *Eur Urol* 2014:1-7.
20. Cameron AP, Wiseman JB, Smith AR, Merion RM, Gillespie BW, Bradley CS, et al. Are three-day voiding diaries feasible and reliable? Results from the Symptoms of Lower Urinary Tract Dysfunction Network (LURN) cohort. *Neurourol Urodyn* 2019;38(8):2185-2193.
21. McCusker RR, Goldberger BA, Cone EJ. Caffeine content of energy drinks, carbonated sodas, and other beverages. *J Analytical Toxicology* 2006;30:112-114.
22. Mettler S, Rusch C, Colombani PC. Osmolality and pH of sport and other drinks available in Switzerland. *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Sportmedizin und Sporttraumatologie* 2006;54(3):92-95.
23. Coyne KS, Payne C, Bhattacharyya SK, Revicki DA, Thompson C, Corey R, et al. The impact of urinary urgency and frequency on health-related quality of life in overactive bladder: results from a national community survey. *Value Health* 2004;7(4):455-463.
24. FitzGerald MP, Butler N, Shott S, Brubaker L. Bother arising from urinary frequency in women. *Neurourol Urodyn* 2002;21(1):36-41.

25. Nagle AS, Speich JE, De Wachter SG, Ghamarian PP, Le DM, Colhoun AF, et al. Non-invasive characterization of real-time bladder sensation using accelerated hydration and a novel sensation meter: An initial experience. *Neurourol Urodyn* 2017;36(5):1417-1426.
26. Naimi HA, Nagle AS, Vinod NN, Kolli H, Sheen D, De Wachter SG, et al. An innovative, non-invasive sensation meter allows for a more comprehensive understanding of bladder sensation events: A prospective study in participants with normal bladder function. *Neurourol Urodyn* 2019;38(1):208-214.
27. De Wachter SG, Heeringa R, Van Koeveringe GA, Winkens B, Van Kerrebroeck PE, Gillespie JI. "Focused introspection" during naturally increased diuresis: description and repeatability of a method to study bladder sensation non-invasively. *Neurourol Urodyn* 2014;33(5):502-506.
28. Cow D. Diuresis. *J Physiol* 1914;48(1):1-17.
29. McCullagh P. Generalized linear models (2nd ed). UK: Routledge; 1983.
30. Peebles PZ. Probability, random variables, and random signal principles. NY: McGraw-Hill; 2001.
31. Bighamian R, Reisner AT, Hahn JO. A lumped-parameter subject-specific model of blood volume response to fluid infusion. *Front Physiol* 2016;7:390.
32. Janssen DAW, Schalken JA, Heesakkers JPFA. Urothelium update: how the bladder mucosa measures bladder filling. *Acta Physiol* 2017;220:201-217.

33. Bushman W, Blaivas J, Weiss J, Andreev VP. Physiologic determinants of urinary frequency and urgency in overactive bladder. Society for Biologic Research (SBUR) 2022 Annual Meeting; November 10-13, 2022; Orlando FL.
34. Linear regression models. Available at: <https://people.duke.edu/~rnau/rsquared.htm>. Accessed 2/2/23.
35. Andreev VP, Helmuth ME, Liu G, Smith AR, Merion RM, Yang CC, et al. Subtyping of common complex diseases and disorders by integrating heterogeneous data. Identifying clusters among women with lower urinary tract symptoms in the LURN study. *PLOS ONE* 2022;17(6):e0268547.
36. Redmond EJ, O'Kelly T, Flood HD. The effect of bladder filling rate on the voiding behavior of patients with overactive bladder. *J Urol* 2019;202(2):326-332.
37. Sebastian B, Swavely NR, Sethi D, Nagle AS, Thapa D, Vinod NN, et al. Comparison of sensation event descriptors in participants with overactive and normal bladders during non-invasive hydration studies. *Arch Nephrol Urol Stud* 2021;1(1):03.
38. Lohsiriwat S, Hirunsai M, Chaiyaprasithi B. Effect of caffeine on bladder function in patients with overactive bladder symptoms. *Urol Ann* 2011;3:14.
39. Eggleton MG. The diuretic action of alcohol in man. *J Physiol* 1942;101:172.
40. WebMD Editorial Contributors. Food and drink to tame an overactive bladder. Available at: <http://www.webmd.com/urinary-incontinence-oab/food-drink>. Accessed 12/21/22.



41. Blaivas JG, Li ESW, Dayan L, Edeson ME, Mathew J, O'Boyle AL, et al. Overactive bladder phenotypes: development and preliminary data. *Can J Urol* 2021;28(3):10699-10704.
42. Flynn KE, Wiseman JB, Helmuth ME, Smith AR, Bradley CS, Cameron AP, et al. Comparing clinical bladder diaries and recalled patient reports for measuring lower urinary tract symptoms in the symptoms of Lower Urinary Tract Dysfunction Research Network (LURN). *Neurourol Urodyn* 2022;41(8):1711-1721.
43. Pewowaruk R, Rutkowski D, Hernando D, Kumapayi BB, Bushman W, Rolda'n-Alzate A. A pilot study of bladder voiding with realtime MRI and computational fluid dynamics. *PLOS ONE* 2020;15(11):e0238404.
44. Nagle AS, Klausner AP, Varghese J, Bernardo RJ, Colhoun AF, Barbee RW, et al. Quantification of bladder wall biomechanics during urodynamics: A methodologic investigation using ultrasound. *J Biomech* 2017;61:232-241.
45. Kavouras SA, Johnson EC, Bougatsas D, Arnaoutis G, Panagiotakos DB, Perrier E, et al. Validation of a urine color scale for assessment of urine osmolality in healthy children. *Eur J Nutr* 2016;55(3):907-915.

## **Supporting Information**

See separate Supplemental Materials document.

### **Supplemental Material Text (Section Headings)**

Urine Formation Rate Model

Supplemental References

### **Supplemental Figures (Captions)**

**Supplemental Figure S1.** Intake and voiding profiles recorded in the 3-day BD of participant B and dynamic variables derived from the profiles.

**Supplemental Figure S2.** Intake and voiding profiles recorded in the 3-day BD of participant C and dynamic variables derived from the profiles.

**Supplemental Figure S3.** Intake and voiding profiles recorded in the 3-day BD of participant D and dynamic variables derived from the profiles.

**Supplemental Figure S4.** Intake and voiding profiles recorded in the 3-day BD of participant E and dynamic variables derived from the profiles.

**Supplemental Figure S5.** Intake and voiding profiles recorded in the 3-day BD of participant F and dynamic variables derived from the profiles.

**Supplemental Figure S6.** Intake and voiding profiles recorded in the 3-day BD of participant G and dynamic variables derived from the profiles.


**Supplemental Figure S7.** Intake and voiding profiles recorded in the 3-day BD of participant H and dynamic variables derived from the profiles.







**Supplemental Figure S8.** Intake and voiding profiles recorded in the 3-day BD of participant I and dynamic variables derived from the profiles.

















**Supplemental Figure S9.** Intake and voiding profiles recorded in the 3-day BD of participant J and dynamic variables derived from the profiles.







**Supplemental Figure S10.** Cross-correlation functions between dynamic BD variables of participants B-J.







**Supplemental Figure S11.** Box plots for the parameters of the urine formation rate models for 145 participants.















A



B



C

