Genome-wide association meta-analyses over one million individuals identify 54 loci associated with urinary incontinence and its subtypes

Elisa Moreno[1], Nikhil Arora[1,2], Emily Bertucci-Richter[3], Reyhane Eghtedarian[4], Aristomo Andries[1], Laurent F. Thomas[1,5,6,7], Julie Horn[8,9], Signe N. Stafne[5,10], Sweta Pathak[1], FinnGen, Snehal Patil[3], Dagny Gulla[11], Hanna M. Ollila[4,12,13,14], David M. Evans[15,16,17], Giulia M. Ippolito[18], Wei Zhou[19,20,21,22], Eivind Coward[1], Kristian Hveem[1,23], Ida Surakka[24], Marta R. Moksnes[1,8,25], Brooke N. Wolford[1], Ben M. Brumpton[1,23,26]

HUNT Center for Molecular and Clinical Epidemiology, Department of Public Health and Nursing, NTNU, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway

Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

Department of Biostatistics and Center for Statistical Genetics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48103, USA

Institute for Molecular Medicine Finland, FIMM, HiLIFE, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

Department of Clinical and Molecular Medicine, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway

BioCore - Bioinformatics Core Facility, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway

Clinic of Laboratory Medicine, St.Olavs Hospital, Trondheim University Hospital, Trondheim, Norway

HUNT Research Centre, Department of Public Health and Nursing, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Levanger Hospital, Nord-Trøndelag Hospital Trust, Levanger, Norway

10 Clinic of Rehabilitation, St.Olavs Hospital, Trondheim University Hospital, Trondheim,
Norway

11 Nordlandet legesenter, Kristiansund, Norway

12 Broad Institute of Harvard and MIT; Cambridge, MA, USA

13 Department of Anesthesia, Critical Care and Pain Medicine, Massachusetts General
Hospital; Boston, MA, USA

14 Centre for Genomic Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School;
Boston, MA, USA

15 Institute for Molecular Bioscience, The University of Queensland, St. Lucia, Queensland,
Australia

16 MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit at the University of Bristol, UK

17 University of Queensland Frazer Institute, University of Queensland, Woolloongabba,
Australia

18 Department of Urology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

19 Psychiatric and Neurodevelopmental Genetics Unit, Center for Genomic Medicine,
Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

20 Stanley Center for Psychiatric Research, Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge,
MA, USA

21 Program in Medical and Population Genetics, Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard,
Cambridge, MA, USA

22 Institute for Molecular Medicine Finland, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

23 HUNT Research Centre, Department of Public Health and Nursing, NTNU, Norwegian
University of Science and Technology, Levanger, Norway

24 Department of Internal Medicine, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, US

25 Levanger Hospital, Nord-Trøndelag Hospital Trust, Levanger, Norway

26 Clinic of Medicine, St. Olavs Hospital, Trondheim University Hospital, Trondheim 7030,

Norway

Abstract

Urinary incontinence (UI) markedly reduces quality of life, and its genetic basis remains to be

elucidated. Here, we performed GWAS meta-analyses of four UI phenotypes, using hospital-

based data from 1,045,436 individuals from the Trøndelag Health Study (HUNT), UK Biobank,

FinnGen, and the Michigan Genomics Initiative, and self-reported UI from 56,957 females

from HUNT and the Nurses' Health Study.

We identified 54 (52 novels) genetic loci associated with at least one UI phenotype. Analyses

revealed tissue-specific involvement, with connective and muscular tissues for stress UI, and

neural tissues for urge UI, and supported key roles of SUI-prioritized genes in the extracellular

matrix organization and muscle function. Further, genetic variations contributes to UI through

inflammation, immune, and aging pathways. We identified smoking, higher BMI, higher parity,

and pelvic organ prolapse as causal risk factors for UI in females, and benign prostatic

hyperplasia in males. Our findings identify key genetic factors, tissues, pathways, and causal

underlying UI.

Introduction

Urinary incontinence (UI) is the involuntary leakage of urine and is strongly associated with

poor quality of life (1). Most population studies report UI prevalence ranging from 25-45% in

adult women (considering occasional leakage) and 1%-39% in males, with prevalences

increasing with age (2). However, its burden tends to be underestimated at the population

level due to stigma and lack of recognition as a medical condition (3). Two main subtypes of

UI are 1) stress urinary incontinence (SUI) defined as urine leakage upon coughing, sneezing,

laughing or during physical exertion and 2) urge urinary incontinence (UUI) defined as a urine

leakage associated with a sudden need to void that is difficult to defer (4,5). Both subtypes

can co-exist, in which case the condition is referred to as mixed urinary incontinence (MUI).

Symptoms can be ameliorated by treatment and diverse clinical trials are ongoing (3).

Urinary continence is regulated and maintained through a complex coordination of smooth and skeletal muscles, nerves, bladder mucosa, connective tissues, the pelvic floor, and both the central and peripheral nervous systems (3,6). SUI primarily occurs when bladder pressure exceeds urethral pressure, often from increased intra-abdominal pressure, insufficient urethral support or sphincter dysfunction (3). In contrast, UUI is mainly characterized by detrusor muscle overactivity, with proposed mechanisms including muscle hyperexcitability, denervation, poor detrusor compliance and bladder hypersensitivity (3). However, UI etiology is far from fully understood. Despite heritability estimates of 39-63% from twin studies for SUI and 42-51% for UUI (7), genome-wide association studies (GWASs) have only identified 12 loci at the genome-wide significance threshold (p-value < 5×10^{-8}) (8–10) and replicated two (9). In addition, the six GWASs of UI are limited by small sample sizes (n=1,507 to 25,685), few results replicated, and only one GWAS included males (8–13). Additionally, these studies did not include downstream analyses such as phenome-wide association studies (PheWASs) to explore pleiotropy and comorbidities, and Mendelian randomization (MR) analyses to assess causal risk factors and guide prevention. Observational studies suggest smoking status (14) and body mass index (BMI) (15,16) as common risk factors for UI, in addition to parity (14,17) and pelvic organ prolapse (PoP) for females, and benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH) for males (15). However, it is unclear the extent to which these observational associations represent causal effects of the risk factors or the influence of confounding variables.

Here, we performed GWAS meta-analyses of four UI phenotypes (any type of UI (AUI), SUI, UUI and MUI) first using International Classification of Diseases (ICD) codes in up to 1,045,494 individuals from the Trøndelag Health Study (HUNT), UK Biobank, FinnGen and the Michigan Genomic Initiative (MGI), and secondly using self-reported data from up to 56,957 females participants in HUNT and the Nurses' Health Study (NHS). Due to potential sex differences in pathological mechanisms, we also conducted sex-specific analyses. We performed PheWAS using summary statistics from UK Biobank, and calculated genetic correlations between UI and other publicly available phenotypes. Furthermore, we created a polygenic risk score (PRS) and assessed the variance explained in HUNT. Finally, we performed MR to test the causal effect of six suggested risk factors on UI. Identifying novel UI loci, validating previous findings and conducting additional downstream analyses can unravel

111 biological pathways underlying the conditions, suggest drug targets for clinical trials and
112 potentially improve prevention.

Results

GWAS genetic discovery

We performed GWAS meta-analyses of ICD code-based definitions (UI-ICD: AUI-ICD, SUI-ICD,
UUI-ICD, MUI-ICD) across four population-based cohorts linked with hospital-based data,
encompassing up to 1,045,436 individuals (58,918 cases, 986,518 controls) (**Figure 1;**
Supplementary Table 1; Supplementary Table 2) and GWAS meta-analyses of self-reported
questionnaire (UI-srq: AUI-srq, SUI-srq, UUI-srq, MUI-srq) including up to 56,957 females
(23,392 cases, 33,565 controls) (**Supplementary Table 1; Supplementary Table 3**). The
inflation factor (λ) at MAF>0.01 ranged between 0.987 and 1.13 (**Supplementary Table 4**), and
the linkage disequilibrium score (LDSC) regression intercepts were below 1 (**Supplementary**
Table 5), indicating well-controlled genomic inflation. Using the UI-ICD definitions, the liability-
scale single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) heritability, estimated using LDSC regression,
ranged between 7.26% (UUI) and 11.85% (SUI) in females (assuming population prevalences
of 5.36% and 4.40%, respectively) and between 2.88% (AUI) and 12.37% (MUI) in males (given
population prevalences of 2.56% and 0.08%, respectively (**Supplementary Table 5;**
Supplementary Table 6). Using UI-srq definitions, heritability was of 16.55% for SUI and of
14.16% (given a population prevalence of 29.86% and 27.85%, respectively (**Supplementary**
Table 5; Supplementary Text)).

The meta-analyses identified 54 independent significant loci (p-value < 5×10^{-8}) associated
with at least one UI phenotype, among 52 were novel (**Table 1; Supplementary Table 7-9;**
Supplementary Figure 1; Supplementary Figure 2). We replicated two loci previously
associated with SUI-srq in females, rs2270016 in our study in *INO80B:WBP1* (rs7607995[(8)])
and rs1448813496 near *MARCO* (rs138724718[(9)]). In total, 49 loci were exclusively found
for UI-ICD definitions and four for UI-srq; the locus in *PCOLCE2* was highlighted on both. For
UI-ICD definitions, we identified 37 loci in females and eight in males (**Figure 2**). No loci
identified in males overlapped with those found in females or in sex-combined analyses. At

each locus, the top lead variant had consistent direction across all studies, except for
rs1155027 in AUI-ICD females.

To test the robustness of our results, we performed sensitivity analyses using different ICD
codes combinations and accounting for potential UI risk factors (**Supplementary text;**
Supplementary Table 10-13). The beta estimates for the top lead variants obtained for AUI-
ICD and UUI-ICD using alternative definitions showed consistent direction with those obtained
in the main analyses (**Supplementary Table 12**). After adjustment with sex-specific risk factors
of UI-ICD definitions in HUNT, beta estimates had consistent direction with those obtained in
the main analyses (**Supplementary Table 13**).

Protein-altering variants in meta-analysis loci

We identified one protein-altering top lead variant (rs138213197, non-synonymous variant in
HOXB13) associated with AUI-ICD and SUI-ICD in males (**Supplementary Table 7**). In addition,
three top lead variants were in high linkage disequilibrium (LD) (correlation $r^2 > 0.80$) with 25
protein-altering variants: 1) rs2814985 (AUI-ICD in females) with one non-synonymous variant
in *UHRF1BP1*, 2) rs9468 (MUI-ICD in females) with a stop-gain variant in *MAPT* and with 18
non-synonymous variants in *MAPT, CRHR1*, *SPPL2C, STH, KANSL1* and *LRRC37A2,* and 3)
rs2270016 (SUI-srq) with five non-synonymous variants located in *MOGS*, *MRPL53, TTC31* and
LBX2. The protein-altering variants mapped to genes associated with diverse traits in the
GWAS catalog, spanning many biological areas (**Supplementary Table 14**).

Prioritization of genes, pathways and tissues

To identify tissues involved in UI, we used MAGMA tissue specificity analysis to test
associations between tissue specific gene expression profiles and UI-genes (identified by the
MAGMA gene-based analysis). Here, we identified 11 tissues (from the Genotype-Tissue
Expression [GTEx] Project version 8) in which genes with strong GWAS associations were
significantly overexpressed (p-value < 9.43×10^{-4}, Bonferroni correction for 53 tissue types
tested) (**Supplementary Table 15**). For females, we identified uterus, tibial artery, sigmoid
colon, cervix endocervix and esophagus gastroesophageal junction tissues for SUI-ICD, and
cerebellar hemisphere, cerebellum, frontal cortex, hippocampus and anterior cingulate cortex

tissues for UUI-ICD. In sex-combined analyses, we identified cortex and hypothalamus for UUI-
ICD, in addition to the brain tissues identified in the female-specific analyses. No tissues were
identified for males or for UI-srq definitions. We found seven significantly enriched gene
ontology (GO) biological processes through the MAGMA gene-set analysis (p-value < $2.94{\times}10^{-6}$,
Bonferroni correction for the 17,023 curated gene sets and GO terms tested)
(**Supplementary Table 16**).

Cell-type analysis

To identify cell types that may play a role in SUI and UUI subtypes, we used FUMA cell type
analysis to test associations between cell specific gene expression profiles and SUI/UUI-genes
(identified by the MAGMA gene-based analysis). Prior to the analysis, we selected relevant
cell-type datasets: bladder and muscle cell-type datasets for SUI, and hippocampus, frontal
cortex and cerebellum cell-type datasets for UUI. We identified skeletal muscle satellites (from
limb muscle in mouse) as the only cell type significant for SUI across all single cell RNA
sequencing datasets included (p-value < $2.53{\times}10^{-4}$, Bonferroni correction for the 149 cell types
across all the datasets) (**Supplementary Table 17**). At dataset-level, stromal, smooth muscle
and leukocyte cell types were associated with the SUI-genes in bladder tissues, additionally to
mural cell type (from abdomen skeletal muscle) and tendon cell type (from pelvic diaphragm
skeletal muscle). For UUI, no significant enrichment was found across all datasets (p-value <
$4.31{\times}10^{-5}$, Bonferroni correction for the 1159 cell types across all the datasets). However, we
observed dataset-level enrichment for neurons in the hippocampus and for neuroblast in the
cerebellum (uniquely in the dataset with first trimester of developmental cells).

Colocalization

To identify shared causal variants for UI and the expression of genes nearby, and therefore
strengthen the identification of candidate genes, we performed Bayesian colocalization
analyses of 13 unique GWAS loci for UI and cis-expression quantitative trait loci (cis-eQTLs) in
relevant tissues (**Supplementary Table 18**). We found strong evidence (posterior probability
for shared causal variant (PP4) > 75%) for a shared causal variant (colocalization) of GWAS loci
for UI-ICD definitions in females and eQTLs for *HSPA4* (muscle)*, MET* (tibial artery, esophagus

muscularis, sigmoid colon), *DEPTOR* (brain spinal cord, esophagus mucosa, sigmoid colon),

CHRDL2 (putamen), *PCOLCE2* (fibroblast), *NCAM1* (tibial artery). For males we found *PTK2*

(several brain tissues) and for sex-combined *EEFSEC* (tibial nerve). We also identified strong

evidence for colocalization of GWAS loci for UI-srq in females and eQTLs for *STAM2* (muscle).

Colocalization in bladder was weak using ±500 kb around the lead variant but increased

markedly when restricted to a conservative ±50 kb window and the PP4 was close from 75%,

suggesting the shared signal is localized near the lead variant for *LRRC37A*, *LRRC37A*2 and

KANSL1-AS1.

Genetic correlation of UI phenotypes

To quantify the extent of shared heritable influences between SUI and UUI subtypes, we used

LDSC regression and estimated pair-wise genetic correlations (r_g) of 0.86 in females (p-value=

5.70×10^{-166}) and 0.58 in males (p=3.60×10^{-3}) using UI-ICD definitions, and of 0.60 in females

(p-value= 3.80×10^{-32}) using UI-srq (**Supplementary table 19**). The pair-wise genetic

correlations for SUI-ICD between females and males was of 0.17 (p-value=0.1275), and of 0.44

for UUI-ICD between females and males (p-value=7.56×10^{-6}).

We also conducted pair-wise genetic correlations of UI-ICD definitions with 2,871 phenotypes

from different studies publicly available (18). This revealed up to 644 phenotypes with

significant genetic overlaps with the four UI types in females and 25 in males (p-value <

1.74×10^{-5}, Bonferroni correction for the 2,871 phenotypes) (**Supplementary Table 20; Figure**

3). After excluding phenotypes using ICD codes related to UI or bladder disorders and for

females, SUI was most strongly genetically correlated with genital prolapse (r_g=0.58, p-

value=1.20×10^{-19}), UUI with weight gain in worst depression episode (r_g=0.65, p-

value=2.42×10^{-8}) and MUI with reason of smoking cessation due to illness or ill health (r_g=0.64,

p-value=1.36×10^{-5}). UI subtypes were also positively correlated ($r_g > 0.3$) with muscle related

disorders, joint diseases, digestive related disorders, skin and subcutaneous diseases (for UUI

only), circulatory system diseases (for UUI and MUI) and teeth related disorders (higher

genetic correlations with UUI and MUI subtypes than with SUI). Female reproductive traits

showed negative correlation with SUI and UUI. In males, UUI was most strongly correlated

with hyperplasia of prostate ($r_g = 0.78$, p-value=1.80×10^{-13}) and positive correlations ($r_g > 0.29$)

were found also with urine retention and prostate cancer. For both sexes, UUI was positively correlated with frequency of urination and polyuria, and urinary tract infection (UTI).

Phenome-wide associations studies

To investigate potential pleiotropy of the top lead variants for UI with other phenotypes, we performed PheWAS using 1523 publicly available phenotypes (biomarkers, phecodes and continuous traits) from the UK Biobank. We identified 61 UI-variants as significantly associated (p-value < 4.50×10^{-7}, Bonferroni correction for 1523 phenotypes and 73 variants) with at least one trait in UK Biobank (**Supplementary Table 21-23, Figure 4**). For females, we identified 18 biomarkers, 19 phecodes and 157 continuous traits associated with 26 variants. Most notably, these associations spanned the genitourinary system (mainly prolapses), the circulatory system, kidney function, metabolic traits (BMI, LDL- and HDL-cholesterol), reproductive traits (age at hysterectomy, lifetime number of sexual partners, age at first sexual intercourse, age at menarche, birth weight of first child), chronic pain, socio-economic status, smoking status and alcohol consumption. For males, we identified three biomarkers, five phecodes and 15 continuous traits associated with four variants, mainly prostate related traits (prostate cancer, hyperplasia), diabetes, kidney function, BMI related traits, circulatory system and chronic pain.

UI drugs and gene target

We queried DrugBank to determine whether genes identified in our study are known targets of existing drugs for UI. Among the 13 drugs identified in DrugBank (one for SUI and 12 for UUI or overactive bladder syndrome), none were targeting a protein that is coded by a gene we identified through our meta-analysis (**Supplementary table 24**).

Polygenic risk scores for urinary incontinence

To evaluate the potential predictive effect of PRSs in UI, we constructed PRSs using pruning and thresholding (P+T) and PRS-CS (continuous shrinkage) methods and GWAS meta-analysis summary statistics from UI-ICD definitions. The PRS explained up to 2.0% of the variation in

UI in females (SUI, PRS from PRS-CS). The variance explained for males was 0.2% (SUI, PRS from PRS-CS) (**Supplementary Table 25, Supplementary Table 26**). Using PRS-CS, the prevalence in the first decile was 5.45% for SUI and 5.60% for UUI compared to 15.49% and 11.38%, respectively, in the tenth decile (**Figure 5**). In females, one standard deviation (SD) increase of the PRS was associated with an increased SUI risk of 23% (P+T) and 40% (PRS-CS), while in males it was of 7% (P+T) and 16% (PRS-CS).

Mendelian Randomization

We performed two-sample MR to investigate the causal effect of six risk factors on UI: smoking status, BMI, alcohol consumption and specifically for females, PoP and parity, and for males, BPH. In the sex-combined analysis we found evidence of a positive effect of smoking status and BMI on UI. We estimated an increased risk for UI in smokers compared to non-smokers (increased risk of 7-19% depending on UI phenotype) and per SD increase in BMI (14-36%), with consistent direction across UI phenotypes (**Supplementary Table 27**). For females, we found strong evidence for a causal effect of higher parity and PoP on UI. We estimated an increased risk for UI for each additional child ever born (82-128%) and among women experiencing PoP (12-24%), with consistent direction across UI phenotypes. For males, we found strong evidence of a causal effect of BPH on UI (2-34%), with effect size estimates consistent direction across UI phenotypes. However, the analyses for alcohol consumption showed less consistent results across UI phenotypes. Estimates from sensitivity analyses generally aligned with the inverse-variance weighted (IVW) results, although MR-Egger showed some attenuation for smoking status and BMI. Sex-stratified analyses results were consistent with sex-combined analysis results for females but not for males (IVW results) and, MR-Egger intercepts for BMI in females were close to 1 (p-value < 0.5) (**Supplementary Table 28**). Using Steiger filtering, rs4944936 explained more variance in AUI and SUI than in PoP. However, estimates remained in the same direction after excluding this SNP (**Supplementary Table 29**). All instruments had an F-statistic >10, indicating sufficient strength to minimize weak instrument bias. The genetic instruments explained between 0.2% (parity) and 5.8% (BPH) of the variance in the exposures (**Supplementary Table 30**). Except smoking status in males, all exposures showed instrument heterogeneity (Q-statistic test p-value < 0.05).

Discussion

We performed the largest GWAS meta-analysis of UI to date and identified 54 genetic loci (52 novel) associated with at least one UI type. This replicated two previously identified loci (*INO80B:WBP1; MARCO*) for SUI in females. Analyses revealed tissue-specific involvement for subtypes of UI, with enrichment of SUI-associated genes in muscle and connective tissues, and enrichment of UUI-associated genes in neural tissues. These results were supported by key roles of SUI-prioritized genes in the extracellular matrix (ECM) structure (*PCOLCE2* and *NCAM1*) and proper muscle function (*HSPA4* and *DEPTOR*). Findings from the PheWAS and genetic correlation analyses aligned with each other, supporting the involvement of genetics in UI pathology through diverse tissue structures including connective tissues, and pathways including inflammation, immune system, and aging. Further, we confirmed the causal effects of smoking status, higher BMI, higher parity, PoP on UI in females and BPH on UI in males.

We replicated two loci out of the 12 previously reported (p-value<$5×10^{-8}$) (8–10). The *INO80B:WBP1* locus was previously associated with SUI in models adjusting for BMI, parity, and diabetes, whereas we identified it in our main analysis (models non-adjusted for clinical factors) (8). Among the six GWAS of UI previously published, only three reported loci at the genome-wide significance threshold of p-value<$5×10^{-8}$. This could be explained by 1) heterogeneous phenotype definitions from self-reported questionnaires and ICD codes, which may not be comparable, 2) a focus of females-specific GWAS and, 3) the limited sample size (n<26,000) of previous studies. We did not replicate genes from candidate gene studies (7,19).

We identified three top lead variants in high LD with protein-altering variants: 1) rs2814985/rs9469860 were mapped to *UHRF1BP1* and *SNRPC*. Individuals with mixed connective tissue disease frequently produce autoantibodies against a protein encoded by *SNRPC* (20). Given that connective tissue integrity is essential for bladder support, its dysfunction may contribute to UI. 2) rs9468 was in high LD with protein-altering variants in genes involved in tauopathy, dementia and Alzheimer's disease (*MAPT* and *STH*). 3) rs2270016 was in high LD with a protein-altering variant in *LBX2, MOGS, MRPL53;* these genes have been suggested to influence SUI with unclear described roles (13). As replicated in our PheWAS, the protein-altering variant rs138213197 in *HOXB13* is known to be associated with prostate cancer (21,22); a likely comorbidity causing UI.

In females, our findings suggest sex-specific tissues to be involved in UI subtypes: smooth muscles, connective tissues and mucosa tissues for SUI, and brain related tissues for UUI. Smooth muscle constitutes the detrusor muscle of the bladder, allowing the bladder to relax during filling phase and to contract during the voiding phase. The smooth muscles also constitute urethral sphincter which regulates its opening to prevent urine leakage. This is done in coordination with connective tissues and pelvic floor muscles. Connective tissues maintain the structural integrity of organs and, in the context of urinary continence, provide structural support to the urethra and bladder through the ECM. Within the ECM, fibroblasts produce collagen and other structural proteins, providing tissue elasticity and strength and the bladder mucosa is composed of ECM. Disruption of any of these components may contribute to UI.

These findings are supported by the role of the SUI-prioritized genes in the ECM (colocalization in fibroblasts and tibial arteries, a tissue composed of connective tissues)): *PCOLCE2* by playing a role in collagen formation (23,24) and *NCAM1* by encoding a cell surface glycoprotein that mediates cell-cell and cell-ECM matrix interactions (25,26). Secondly, SUI-prioritized genes are known to play a role in muscle cell structure, support and contraction: *HSPA4* (colocalization in muscles) is known to support protein cellular homeostasis maintenance and was upregulated during muscle regeneration (27), while *DEPTOR* (colocalization in gastrointestinal tissues) regulates myocyte protein metabolism, and its reduced expression can improve muscle atrophy (28). Thirdly, smooth muscle cells, satellite cells, and tendon cells were cell types associated with SUI-genes. While the smooth muscle cells form the detrusor muscle and enable the bladder to relax (filling phase) and to contract (voiding phase) (29), the satellite cells contribute to tissue regeneration (30) and the tendon cells form the tendinous arch, a dense fibrous connective tissue anchoring muscles to the pelvic bone, supporting continence (3,31).

The findings for UUI tissues in females are firstly supported by the role in neurological disorders of UUI-prioritized genes, that suggest neural pathways: *PTK2* (colocalization in diverse brain tissues) has been associated with tau-induced neurotoxicity regulation in neurodegenerative diseases and *EEFSEC* (colocalization in tibial nerve) with neurodevelopmental disorders with progressive neurodegeneration. Although these findings could suggest potential comorbidities, the absence of associations with neurodegenerative diseases in genetic correlations and PheWAS analyses reinforces that the prioritization of these genes may not be due to such comorbidities. Secondly, brain tissues involvement may

reflect neurogenic detrusor overactivity and can lead to UUI due to a disrupted bladder-
central nervous system coordination after surgery, injury or disease. Our findings align with
neuromodulation, current therapies for UUI which target bladder, nerves, brain signaling
pathways. The main enrichment analysis included the *NFIA* locus, previously associated with
UI (32); however excluding this locus yielded similar tissue associations, thereby indicating
that brain enrichment was not only driven by this locus. Thirdly, the cell-type analysis
identified neuroblast cells from the cerebellum and neurons from the hippocampus
associated with UUI-genes. The cerebellum coordinate the detrusor contraction, control the
pelvic floor in the micturition reflex and activate during the filling phase (33,34).

The findings from the genetic correlations and the PheWAS aligned with each other,
supporting the involvement of genetics in UI through ECM and connective tissues structures.
In females, we found genetic correlations of UI with ECM-related and connective-related
disorders such as PoP, chronic periodontitis, osteoarthritis (involve ECM but not connective
tissues) and myositis. Similarly, seven of nine prolapse-associated SNPs had same directions
with UI, and rs9306894-G was associated with esophagus disorders, suggesting the
involvement of connective tissues. We also observed the association of rs9468-C with UI and
osteoarthrosis with concordant effect directions. Additionally, the genetic correlations of PoP
with UI could reflect the involvement of smooth muscles and the correlation of
musculoskeletal disorders (e.g. myalgia, myositis and muscle weakness) with UI could reflect
the involvement of skeletal tissues. Our findings also support the involvement of genetics in
UI through several pathways, mainly those related to inflammation and immune system. We
found correlations of UI with many inflammatory conditions such as gingival and periodontal
diseases, chronic periodontitis and rheumatoid arthritis. Our findings suggest that the
previous reported association between overactive bladder and tooth loss due to chronic
periodontitis (35) may be driven by shared genetic factors, indicating common shared
biological pathways. We also highlighted moderate correlations between UTI and UUI. Finally,
the association of rs9468-C with UI and osteoarthrosis supports an age-related pathway, given
that osteoarthrosis has a higher prevalence in older adults.

Current pharmacotherapeutics for UI target subtype-specific mechanisms which align
with our findings, particularly for UUI. Medications for UUI target neural signaling by acting as
antagonists of muscarinic receptors or β3-adrenergic receptor agonists. Antagonists of
muscarinic receptors reduce parasympathetic cholinergic activity and therefore involuntary

detrusor contractions, while β3-adrenergic receptor agonists enhance sympathetic signaling

and promote smooth muscle detrusor relaxation during the filling phase to reduce urgency. In

contrast, the only listed medication for SUI in the DrugBank (Duloxetine) acts by enhancing

urethral sphincter contraction via central and peripheral neural mechanisms. While this

improves functional sphincter deficit observed during intra-abdominal pressure, it does not

directly target urethral muscle structure, connective tissues or ECM, which our analyses

identified as central in SUI pathophysiology. Further, none of the approved drugs target

proteins encoded by genes identified in our meta-analysis, highlighting a potential for

genetically informed therapeutic development and repurposing.

Despite the convincing roles of the associated genes in UI pathology, the PRSs we

constructed had limited predictive power. Given the range of PheWAS traits identified, other

clinical comorbidities may serve as stronger predictors for UI risk.

Two-sample MR confirmed the causal effect of smoking status, higher BMI, higher

parity, PoP and BPH on UI, aligning with previous observational studies (14–17). Sex-specific

analysis suggested that smoking status and BMI were clear risk factors for UI in females but

not in males. Our results for alcohol consumption were not consistent across all phenotypes.

However, we observed a protective effect on UUI in males, as previously reported in an

observational study including men (36). Through MR we highlighted causal associations

between parity and UI, and through PheWAS we find genetic variation for UI to also be

associated with birth weight of the first child. These findings highlight that childbirth is a

critical period for women to develop UI and reinforces the importance of raising awareness to

empower women to recognize symptoms, report them without stigma and seek appropriate

care. It also emphasizes the need for clinicians to proactively initiate discussions about UI pre-

and post-partum and manage the symptoms accordingly.

This study had several advantages and clear limitations. To date, this is the largest

meta-analysis of ICD code-based definitions (>1M individuals) of UI and of self-reported UI

(>56,000 individuals). The large sample size, and consistent effect directions support the

generalization of our findings. However, the study was limited to individuals of European

ancestry. Future replication in populations with diverse genetic ancestries is needed. UI is a

broad term encompassing multiple ICD codes. Due to country-specific usage of the ICD code

system, we collaborated with clinicians in Norway and the US to define the phenotypes

variables. Because ICD codes may only capture severe cases of UI or patients with

comorbidities; we also used self-reported data to identify moderate cases. Given these
differences, we estimated the genetic correlation between self-reported and ICD code-based
definitions and analyzed them separately. Population-based self-reported data was used to
represent the general population while hospital-based data increased sample size and variant
detection. However, this may have introduced selection bias, as hospital participants are more
likely to present with severe UI, comorbidities or potentially have higher health literacy
promoting health-seeking behavior. Further, our sensitivity analyses using all World Health
Organization ICD codes for UUI and AUI definitions, and adjusted for potential confounders,
did not show material differences to our main analyses, supporting the robustness of our
results. Finally, no overlapping loci were found between sexes, suggesting distinct genetics for
UI. However, this could result from limited sample size and lower prevalence in males. This
was supported by the female-derived PRSs being associated with an increase of UI in males
(**Supplementary Table 25; Supplementary Table 26**).

In conclusion, our study increased the number of loci associated with UI through the
largest GWAS meta-analyses of hospital-based and self-reported data to date. We identified
sex- and subtype- specific genetic mechanisms underlying UI and highlighted tissue-specific
involvement in the two main subtypes of UI. We confirmed the causal effect of smoking,
higher BMI, parity and PoP on UI in females and BPH on UI in males. Our findings enhance our
understanding of UI genetics, underlying tissues, and causal factors. Finally, these results
highlight the need of genetically informed therapeutic development and repurposing.

Methods

Cohort descriptions

HUNT

The Trøndelag Health Study (HUNT) is a large Norwegian longitudinal population-based study
(37–39). Self-reported data, clinical measurements and biological samples have been
collected over forty years: HUNT1 [1984-1986], HUNT2 [1995-1997], HUNT3 [2006-2008] and
HUNT4 [2017-2019]. In total, ~229,000 adults (≥20 years) have participated in at least one
HUNT study and ~88,000 have been genotyped (40). Participants were linked to electronic
health records allowing for a longitudinal follow-up using ICD codes available at the local
hospitals starting from 1987. Sample and genetic variant quality control (QC) have been
reported elsewhere (40).

UK Biobank

The UK Biobank is a population-based database gathering self-reported health information, clinical measurements and biological samples for ~500,000 adults living in the UK (aged 40-69 years) (41). At baseline, participants consented to link their data to electronic health-related records (National statistics, hospital information and primary care data) for follow-up. In total, 488,377 participants were genotyped (41).

FinnGen

FinnGen is a Finnish public-private collaborative study combining data from digital health record from Finnish health registries with genotyping data (42). The data freeze 12 includes 520,210 participants. Sample and genetic variant QC are described elsewhere (42,43).

MGI

The MGI is a biobank including patients receiving care at the Michigan Medicine medical center from 2012 onwards. Approximately 95,000 participants (aged ≥ 18 years) consented to link their genetic data to their electronic health records (44); therefore, in the Data Freeze 6 > 80,000 participants had genotyping data. Sample and genetic variant QC are described elsewhere (44).

NHS

The NHS cohort was initiated in 1976 and included >121,700 nurses (aged 30-55 years) in the NHSI. Participants answered biennial questionnaires about their health and lifestyle and provided blood and cheek cell samples (45). Similarly, the NHSII recruited 116,430 additional nurses (aged 25-42 years in 1989). Sample and genetic variant QC are described elsewhere (8,46). We used summary statistics from Penney and al. 2019 using NHS data and publicly available in the GWAS Catalog (8).

For each cohort, the details of the genome-wide genotyping, imputation and quality control methods are provided in (**Supplementary Table 31**).

Phenotype definitions

Self-reported phenotype definition

HUNT

Answers about UI were collected in the baseline questionnaires in HUNT 2-4. The questions differed between the self-reported questionnaire, sexes and age (**Supplementary Table 32**). We combined the questions from the HUNT self-reported and constructed four phenotype definitions: any type of UI (AUI-srq), SUI (SUI-srq), UUI (UUI-srq) and MUI (MUI-srq) (Phenotype definitions and number of individuals included are presented in **Supplementary Text; Supplementary Table 3**).

NHS

Four definitions have previously been used: SUI, UUI, MUI and all UI. In brief, UI cases reported at least weekly UI at most questionnaires (≥4 from the 7 questionnaires in NHSI, ≥3 from the five questionnaires in NHSII). Definitions are reported elsewhere (8) and the number of individuals included in our analysis is presented in **Supplementary Table 3**.

ICD-code based phenotype definitions

We constructed four ICD code-based UI definitions: any UI (AUI-ICD), SUI (SUI-ICD), UUI (UUI-ICD) and MUI (MUI-ICD) by combining ICD Ninth Revision (ICD-9) and tenth Revision (ICD-10) codes. We used definitions from the WHO dictionary for ICD-10 (version 2019; https://icd.who.int/browse10/2019/en#) for HUNT, UK Biobank and FinnGen and ICD-10-CM for MGI from the National Center for Health Statistics (version October 1st, 2023; https://ftp.cdc.gov/pub/Health_Statistics/NCHS/Publications/ICD10CM/2024/). The phenotype definitions were constructed in collaboration with local physicians to ensure that they correctly represented the coding systems used in Norway and in the US (**Supplementary Table 33, Supplementary Text**). The number included for each definition are presented **Supplementary Table 2**.

Genome-wide association analyses

We performed GWAS using a generalized mixed model as implemented in SAIGE (47) version 1.03 for GWAS using HUNT data and version 0.35.8.3 for GWAS using UK Biobank data. We adjusted the analyses for age, sex, the first ten genetic principal components (PCs) and genotyping batch. We excluded variants with minor allele count (MAC) < 10 or imputation

505 INFO score < 0.3. We inspected QQ plots, estimated the genomic inflation factor (lambda) and
506 intercepts using LD score regression (48,49).

508 Meta-analyses

We used METAL to conduct 16 fixed-effect inverse variance weighted GWAS meta-analyses of
the effect size estimates and standard errors of 1) the HUNT questionnaire-based and NHS
summary statistics including up to 56,957 individuals of European ancestry (50) and 2) ICD
code-based definitions from HUNT, UKBB, FinnGen and MGI including up to 1,045,436
individuals of European ancestry. Prior to the meta-analysis, we converted the genomic
positions in HUNT and UKBB from GRCh37 to GRCh38 using LiftOver from UCSC (51). In
addition, we applied genomic control correction based on the estimated inflation factor
(lambda) for each cohort. Prior to meta-analyses, we assessed the genetic correlations
between ICD code-based definitions and self-reported definitions from HUNT; the genetic
correlation was low to moderate ($0.53 < r_g < 0.65$) and we decided to treat the phenotype
definitions separately (**Supplementary Table 34**). We checked for heterogeneity using the I^2
from METAL (acknowledging heterogeneity if p-value < 0.05/(number of top lead SNPs for the
phenotype)) (**Supplementary Table 7**). Using the summary statistics from the meta-analyses,
we calculated the lambda (minor allele frequency > 0.01) (**Supplementary Table 4**) using all
the variants available and estimated the intercept (**Supplementary Table 5**) using the LD Score
regression (48,49), restricting to the variants present in the HapMap3 SNP-list.

525 Sensitivity analysis

526 To check whether the identified loci were reflected by known risk factors more than UI, we
527 performed GWAS using HUNT adjusted for known UI risk factors (**Supplementary Text**).
528 Additionally, we performed GWASs using alternative combinations of ICD codes to investigate
529 robustness of main analysis definitions as described in the **Supplementary Text**.

531 Genomic risk locus definition

We used FUMA v1.6.1-1.6.5 (52) (https://fuma.ctglab.nl/) to annotate and positionally map
variants from the meta-analyses after converting genomic positions to build GRCh37 using the
UCSC LiftOver (51). This was done because the FUMA versions used did not handle data of

build GRCh38. Genomic risk loci were defined by FUMA using default parameters (maximum

lead SNP p-value < 5×10^{-8}, r^2 threshold for independent significant SNPs ≥0.6; 2nd r^2 threshold

for lead SNPs ≥0.1, maximum distance of LD blocks to merge ≤ 250kb (kilobases)). The SNP

with the smallest p-value in each locus is termed 'top lead SNP' in FUMA, a term we kept here

for clarity. We used LD correlation coefficients from the 1000G European reference panel (53)

and regional plots were generated by FUMA using LocusZoom (54) (**Supplementary Figure 2**).

We verified that no variants were excluded due to the filtering on the 1000G reference panel;

if a variant was filtered out and was within -/+ 250 kb of the top lead variant identified by

FUMA, we considered it in this locus. However, if the variant was outside the -/+ 250 kb range,

we considered it a new locus; these results are marked of * in the genomic locus tables (five

in total). For the five loci we identified by manual search, we generated the LocusZoom plots

for four (variant from the locus with the smallest p-value: rs1448813496, rs765377367,

rs10993994 and rs201998020) using the reference panel generated from HUNT2-3

(**Supplementary Figure 2**). For rs191824624, we could not generate LocusZoom plot as the

variant was not available in HUNT.

Overlapping loci between definitions were counted once and considered novel if not

previously associated with UI.

We conducted the following downstream analyses using the top lead variants/loci identified

by FUMA.

Gene-based, gene-set and tissue expression analyses

We performed MAGMA gene-based, gene-set and tissue expression analyses using FUMA.

The genome-wide gene association analysis (gene-based analysis) was performed using

MAGMA (v1.6) (55) and all variants located within protein-coding genes from Ensembl. The

significance threshold was corrected for the number of protein-coding genes for which the

input SNPs were mapped.

Further, we used MAGMA to perform gene-set analyses on the genes identified in the gene-

based analysis, testing them with 17,023 genes set (Curated gene sets and Gene Ontology

terms) from the MSigDB v7.0 database. The gene-set p-values were corrected for the 17,023

curated gene sets and GO terms tested (p-value < 2.94×10^{-6} after Bonferroni correction)

To identify expression patterns of the prioritized genes across different tissues we performed

MAGMA tissue specificity analysis using gene expression data from 53 specific tissue types in

the Genotype Tissue Expression (GTEx) Project v8 (https://www.gtexportal.org/). The genes

were prioritized using the results of the gene-based analysis. Tissues were identified as

significant if their p-value $< 9.43 \times 10^{-4}$, Bonferroni correction for the 53 tissue types tested.

Cell-type analysis

571 We used cell-type specificity analysis as implemented in FUMA to identify cell types

572 potentially involved in UI and its subtypes. Details about dataset selection are presented in

573 the **Supplementary Text**.

Colocalization analysis

To test if UI loci may influence gene expression in relevant tissues, thereby suggesting a

potential role of these genes in UI, we performed Bayesian colocalization using the R 'coloc'

package (56) with summary statistics from the UI GWAS loci and publicly available eQTL data.

We used Open Targets Genetics (https://genetics.opentargets.org/) to identify top lead

variants with available eQTL data in relevant tissues within a gene mapped by FUMA, and

selected these eQTLs and the corresponding GWAS loci for the analyses. Selection of the

relevant tissues was done using the results of the MAGMA gene property analysis for tissue

specificity and literature (**Supplementary Text**). We retrieved European ancestry eQTL data

from the eQTL catalog (57) (GTEx v8, CommonMind, ROSMAP, FUSION and Alasoo 2018) using

a publicly available API (function 'request_association_from_api') and adjusting parameters

to obtain eQTL -/+ 500kb regions around the variant of interest (https://github.com/eQTL-

Catalogue/eQTL-Catalogue-resources/blob/master/tutorials/API_v2/eQTL_API_tutorial.md).

When eQTLs evidence for the same tissue but from two different datasets, we prioritized data

from the Gtex v8. For some SNPs, eQTL evidence was identified in Open Targets Genetics but

was not retrieved through the API. This may be due to the API accesses data from the eQTL

Catalogue, whereas the eQTL evidence displayed in Open Targets Genetics may originate from

the original datasets. The eQTL Catalogue reprocesses these datasets using standardized

pipelines and additional quality control and filtering criteria, which may result in some

associations not being included. In cases where the eQTL evidence was not available from

eQTL Catalog but Open Targets showed evidence in a GTEx v8 dataset, we retrieved the

corresponding data from GTEx v8 and performed colocalization. Overall, we tested 13 of the

14 unique GWAS loci for UI identified by Open Targets Genetics.

We conducted separate analyses for bladder tissue using GTEx v10; bladder tissue was not

available in the eQTLCatalog (https://www.gtexportal.org/home/downloads/adult-gtex/qtl).

We selected variants with eQTL evidence for the top lead variant of the GWAS in genes

prioritized by FUMA (using significant variant-gene associations based on GTEx permutations).

We identified one locus (chromosome 17) and considered the locus region and eQTL ±500 kb

around the variant of interest. We considered *KANSL1-AS1* (not prioritized by FUMA) which is

an antisense transcript of *KANSL1* (prioritized by FUMA). Given that bladder tissue is most

relevant to UI, we conducted a sensitivity analysis restricting cis-eQTLs to ±50 kb around the

lead variants to focus on local regulatory effects.

We set prior probabilities at 10^{-4} for phenotype or gene expression alone, and 10^{-6} for both

(58). We considered posterior probabilities (PP4) > 75% as strong evidence of a shared causal

variant for UI and gene expression. We used case-control ('cc') when formatting the data from

the GWAS in coloc and reported the proportion of cases accordingly ('s').

Heritability and genetic correlation

We estimated SNP heritability at the liability scale using LD score regression

(https://github.com/bulik/ldsc) (48,49) and estimated sample and population prevalences

(**Supplementary Text**). Additionally, we estimated SUI-ICD and UUI-ICD pairwise genetic

correlation. We restricted these analyses to SNP from HapMap3 and used LD scores derived

from the 1000G European reference panel

(https://alkesgroup.broadinstitute.org/LDSCORE/README_new_data_location.txt).

Additionally, we estimated genetic correlations between UI ICD code-based phenotypes and

2871 traits publicly available from the Complex Traits Genetics Virtual Lab server (18) using LD

score regression from European reference panels (48,49). We reported genetically correlated

phenotypes (p-value < 1.74×10^{-5}, Bonferroni correction for 2,871 phenotypes). The

phenotypes in genetic correlations with UI at r_g> 0.4 were plotted by relevant categories; for

clarity, we limited the plot at the 50 largest associations.

Phenome-wide association studies

We tested pleiotropic associations of the top lead variants identified in the meta-analyses (70 unique variants for ICD code-based definitions and three for self-reported definitions) with 1523 outcomes: 1326 'phecodes' (ICD codes groupings representing clinically concepts for research (59)), 30 biomarkers and 167 continuous traits. We used publicly available GWAS summary statistics of European ancestry individuals (https://pan.ukbb.broadinstitute.org/). Results were considered significant if p-value < 4.50×10^{-7}, Bonferroni correction for the 1523 phenotypes and the 73 variants.

UI drugs and gene target

To prioritize genes identified, we used DRUGBANK (https://go.drugbank.com/) to verify whether drugs currently used for UI (or in clinical trials) targeted the genes identified in our meta-analyze. We searched using the "Indications" option for 'stress urinary incontinence', 'urge urinary incontinence', 'urinary incontinence' and 'mixed urinary incontinence'. We selected the categories reported in the **Supplementary Table 24** in the column Indication (search ID).

PRS

We performed PRS-CS auto (60) for ICD code-based phenotypes leaving out HUNT. We used the UK Biobank European LD reference panel and computed the score using Plink2 (https://github.com/lcstoshio/tutorial_PRSCS_PRSCSx/blob/main/tutorial_PRScs.md and https://github.com/globalbiobankmeta/PRS/blob/main/run_prscsx_pipe.md) (60). We used the P+T method to generate the PRS for phenotypes with minimum five loci identified to avoid non-normality. We ran a meta-analysis excluding HUNT and extracted effect size estimates for each top lead variant. PRSs in HUNT were the sum of the number of risk alleles (from dosage), weighted by its regression coefficient (β) as implemented in Plink2 linear scoring. For both methods, we standardized the score to a normal distribution and estimated the associations between the PRS and UI in HUNT using logistic regression. Further, we estimated the variance explained by the PRS using the difference of Nagelkerke R^2 estimates between a full model

655   (PRS and covariates [age, sex, PCs and genotyping batch]) and a null model (covariates). We

656   plotted UI prevalence by PRS deciles using the PRS-CS results.

Mendelian Randomization

We conducted two-sample MR to investigate the causal effects of six previously reported risk

factors for UI: smoking status (14), alcohol consumption (36), BMI (15,16), parity (14,17) and

pelvic organ prolapse for females, and benign prostatic hyperplasia for males (15). SNP-

exposure association estimates were obtained from GWAS summary statistics of European

ancestry populations from publicly available data (17,61–64). For sex-specific analyses and

when available, we used sex-specific SNP-exposure association estimates.

Genetic instruments were derived by clumping ($r^2 < 0.001$) the lead SNPs for each risk factor

(reported in the tables of the included studies), except for BMI, where we used genome-wide

summary statistics and selected independent SNPs ($r^2 < 0.001$) passing the genome-wide

significance threshold ($p < 5 \times 10^{-8}$). SNP–outcome associations for the selected genetic

instruments were extracted from the GWAS meta-analyses of AUI-ICD, SUI-ICD, UUI-ICD and

MUI-ICD. After harmonizing the risk alleles, we performed IVW two-sample MR to estimate

associations, reporting odds ratios with 95% confident intervals, F-statistics, R^2, and Cochran's

Q for heterogeneity. We performed sensitivity analyses including simple median, weighted

median, MR-Egger methods. For binary exposures, estimates were scaled to represent the risk

increase in UI per doubling (2-fold increase) in the prevalence of exposure, by multiplying the

beta estimates by 0.693 (65). Steiger filtering was applied to verify whether each SNP

explained more variance in the exposure than in the outcome; when SNPs explained more

variance in UI, we re-ran the IVW MR and sensitivity analyses excluding those instruments.

Statistics and reproducibility

680   Statistical analysis has been performed using R v.4.2.3-4.5.2 and FUMA v1.6.1-1.6.5. The

681   definitions used are provided in **Supplementary Table 33** for ICD-based definitions and

682   **Supplementary Text** for self-reported definitions. The descriptive characteristics of the

683   individuals included per study are available **Supplementary Table 1**.

Ethics

Study participants in HUNT have given written consent for the use of their data for research. The Regional Ethics Committee (REC) for Medical and Health Research Ethics in Central Norway have approved the study (REC reference number: 2018/1622). The UK Biobank received written consent from all the participants. UK Biobank was approved by the National Health Service (NHS) Research Ethics Service (reference number 11/NW/0382). The analyses in MGI have been approved by the Institutional review Board of the University of Michigan Medical School (IRB IDs HUM00071298, HUM00148297, HUM00099197, HUM00097962, and HUM00106315). Study subjects in FinnGen provided informed consent for biobank research, based on the Finnish Biobank Act. Alternatively, separate research cohorts, collected prior the Finnish Biobank Act came into effect (in September 2013) and start of FinnGen (August 2017), were collected based on study-specific consents and later transferred to the Finnish biobanks after approval by Fimea (Finnish Medicines Agency), the National Supervisory Authority for Welfare and Health. Recruitment protocols followed the biobank protocols approved by Fimea. The Coordinating Ethics Committee of the Hospital District of Helsinki and Uusimaa (HUS) statement number for the FinnGen study is Nr HUS/990/2017. The FinnGen study is approved by Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare (permit numbers: THL/2031/6.02.00/2017, THL/1101/5.05.00/2017, THL/341/6.02.00/2018, THL/2222/6.02.00/2018, THL/283/6.02.00/2019, THL/1721/5.05.00/2019 and THL/1524/5.05.00/2020), Digital and population data service agency (permit numbers: VRK43431/2017-3, VRK/6909/2018-3, VRK/4415/2019-3), the Social Insurance Institution (permit numbers: KELA 58/522/2017, KELA 131/522/2018, KELA 70/522/2019, KELA 98/522/2019, KELA 134/522/2019, KELA 138/522/2019, KELA 2/522/2020, KELA 16/522/2020), Findata permit numbers THL/2364/14.02/2020, THL/4055/14.06.00/2020, THL/3433/14.06.00/2020, THL/4432/14.06/2020, THL/5189/14.06/2020, THL/5894/14.06.00/2020, THL/6619/14.06.00/2020, THL/209/14.06.00/2021, THL/688/14.06.00/2021, THL/1284/14.06.00/2021, THL/1965/14.06.00/2021, THL/5546/14.02.00/2020, THL/2658/14.06.00/2021, THL/4235/14.06.00/2021, Statistics Finland (permit numbers: TK-53-1041-17 and TK/143/07.03.00/2020 (earlier TK-53-90-20) TK/1735/07.03.00/2021, TK/3112/07.03.00/2021) and Finnish Registry for Kidney Diseases permission/extract from the meeting minutes on 4th July 2019. The Biobank Access Decisions

Data availability

The data are available in the supplementary and upon request. The summary statistics for the meta-analyses are available at NTNU Open Research Data

(https://dataverse.no/dataverse/ntnu DOI: *will be added*) and in the GWAS catalog (accession

number: *will be added*). The data used from the UK Biobank can be obtained by application

(https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk). The summary level data should be requested directly to

FinnGen and MGI (for MGI, by emailing AIDHI-Data-Solutions@umich.edu). The summary

level data from NHS are available at https://www.ebi.ac.uk/gwas/efotraits/HP_0000020

(study accession numbers: GCST009926, GCST009927, GCST009928, GCST0010205). The eQTL

data used are available at https://www.ebi.ac.uk/eqtl/ and

https://www.gtexportal.org/home/downloads/adult-gtex/qtl (for the bladder only). The

summary statistics used to perform the PheWas (biomarkers, continuous and phecode traits)

are available at https://pan-dev.ukbb.broadinstitute.org/, we used the manifest and

corresponding data from the 11 April 2022. The summary statistics used for the genetic

correlation section are available in the Complex Traits Genetics Virtual Lab server

(https://vl.genoma.io/).

Code availability

The following publicly available tools have been used in this project:

R v.4.2.3-4.5.2, FUMA v1.6.1-1.6.5 (https://fuma.ctglab.nl/), SAIGE version 1.03 for GWAS

using HUNT data and version 0.35.8.3 for GWAS using UK Biobank data

(https://saigegit.github.io/SAIGE-doc/), METAL

(https://genome.sph.umich.edu/wiki/METAL_Documentation), UCSC LiftOver command line

tool (https://genome.ucsc.edu/cgi-bin/hgLiftOver), plink v2 (https://www.cog-

genomics.org/plink/2.0/), Coloc (https://github.com/chr1swallace/coloc) as implemented

following the tutorial eQTL Catalog resource tutorial (https://github.com/eQTL-

Catalogue/eQTL-Catalogue-resources/blob/master/tutorials/API_v2/eQTL_API_tutorial.md),

LDSC Score Regression (https://github.com/bulik/ldsc). The code we used will be made

available on GitHub: *link*.

Acknowledgement

We want to thank the participants and staff of The Trøndelag Health Study (HUNT), the UK

Biobank, FinnGen and MGI.

The HUNT study is a collaboration between HUNT Research Center (Faculty of Medicine and

Health Sciences, Norwegian University of Science and Technology [NTNU]), Trøndelag County

Council, Central Norway Regional Health Authority, and the Norwegian Institute of Public

Health. The genotyping in HUNT was financed by the National Institutes of Health; University

of Michigan; the Research Council of Norway; the Liaison Committee for Education, Research

and Innovation in Central Norway; and the Joint Research Committee between St. Olavs

Hospital and the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Norwegian University of Science

and Technology (NTNU). Analyses were performed in digital laboratories at HUNT Cloud,

Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) (Trondheim, Norway).

This research has been conducted using the UK Biobank Resource under Application Number

40135.

We want to acknowledge the participants and investigators of the FinnGen study. The FinnGen

project is funded by two grants from Business Finland (HUS 4685/31/2016 and UH

4386/31/2016) and the following industry partners: AbbVie Inc., AstraZeneca UK Ltd, Biogen

MA Inc., Bristol Myers Squibb Inc. (and Celgene Corporation & Celgene International II Sàrl),

Genentech Inc., Merck Sharp & Dohme LCC, Pfizer Inc., GlaxoSmithKline Intellectual Property

Development Ltd., Sanofi US Services Inc., Maze Therapeutics Inc., Johnson&Johnson

Innovative Medicine Inc., Novartis AG, Boehringer Ingelheim International GmbH and Bayer

AG. Following biobanks are acknowledged for delivering biobank samples to FinnGen: Auria

Biobank (www.auria.fi/biopankki), THL Biobank (www.thl.fi/biobank), Helsinki Biobank

(www.helsinginbiopankki.fi), Biobank Borealis of Northern Finland

(https://www.ppshp.fi/Tutkimus-ja-opetus/Biopankki/Pages/Biobank-Borealis-briefly-in-

English.aspx), Finnish Clinical Biobank Tampere (www.tays.fi/en-

US/Research_and_development/Finnish_Clinical_Biobank_Tampere), Biobank of Eastern

Finland (www.ita-suomenbiopankki.fi/en), Central Finland Biobank (www.ksshp.fi/fi-

FI/Potilaalle/Biopankki), Finnish Red Cross Blood Service Biobank

(www.veripalvelu.fi/verenluovutus/biopankkitoiminta), Terveystalo Biobank

(www.terveystalo.com/fi/Yritystietoa/Terveystalo-Biopankki/Biopankki/) and Arctic Biobank

(https://www.oulu.fi/en/university/faculties-and-units/faculty-medicine/northern-finland-

birth-cohorts-and-arctic-biobank). All Finnish Biobanks are members of BBMRI.fi

infrastructure (https://www.bbmri-eric.eu/national-nodes/finland/). Finnish Biobank

Cooperative -FINBB (https://finbb.fi/) is the coordinator of BBMRI-ERIC operations in Finland.

The Finnish biobank data can be accessed through the Fingenious® services

(https://site.fingenious.fi/en/) managed by FINBB.

The authors acknowledge the Michigan Genomics Initiative participants, AI & Digital Health

Innovation at the University of Michigan, and the University of Michigan Medical School Data

Office for Clinical and Translational Research for providing data storage, management,

processing, and distribution services. The authors acknowledge the Michigan Genomics

Initiative participants, AI & Digital Health Innovation at the University of Michigan, the

University of Michigan Medical School Central Biorepository, and the University of Michigan

Advanced Genomics Core for providing data and specimen storage, management, processing,

and distribution services, and the Center for Statistical Genetics in the Department of

Biostatistics at the School of Public Health for genotype data curation, imputation, and

management in support of the research reported in this publication.

BMB is supported by grants from the Liaison Committee for Education, Research and

Innovation in Central Norway and the Joint Research Committee between St. Olavs Hospital

and the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Norwegian University of Science and

Technology (NTNU).

BNW is supported from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation

programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 101110878 and from the

European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement

No 101016775. N.M.

WZ was supported by the National Human Genome Research Institute of the National

Institutes of Health under Award Number R01HG014518. The content is solely the

responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the

National Institutes of Health.

References

1.   Pizzol D, Demurtas J, Celotto S, Maggi S, Smith L, Angiolelli G, et al. Urinary incontinence and
quality of life: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Aging Clin Exp Res. 2021 Jan;33(1):25–35.
doi:10.1007/s40520-020-01712-y PubMed PMID: 32964401; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMC7897623.

2.   Milsom I, Altman D, Cartwright R, Lapitan MC, Nelson R, Sillén U, et al. Epidemiology of Urinary
Incontinence (UI) and other Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms (LUTS), Pelvic Organ Prolapse (POP)
and Anal Incontinence (AI). In: Abrams P, Cardozo L, Khoury S, Wein AJ, editors. Incontinence.
Paris: ICUD-EAU; 2013. p. 15–107.

3.   Aoki Y, Brown HW, Brubaker L, Cornu JN, Daly JO, Cartwright R. Urinary incontinence in women.
Nat Rev Dis Primer. 2017 Jul 6;3(1):1–20. doi:10.1038/nrdp.2017.42

4.   Abrams P, Cardozo L, Fall M, Griffiths D, Rosier P, Ulmsten U, et al. The standardisation of
terminology of lower urinary tract function: Report from the standardisation sub-committee of
the International Continence Society. Neurourol Urodyn. 2002;21(2):167–78.
doi:10.1002/nau.10052

5.   Haylen BT, de Ridder D, Freeman RM, Swift SE, Berghmans B, Lee J, et al. An international
urogynecological association (IUGA)/international continence society (ICS) joint report on the
terminology for female pelvic floor dysfunction. Neurourol Urodyn. 2010;29(1):4–20.
doi:10.1002/nau.20798

6.   Falah-Hassani K, Reeves J, Shiri R, Hickling D, McLean L. The pathophysiology of stress urinary
incontinence: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Int Urogynecology J. 2021;32(3):501–52.
doi:10.1007/s00192-020-04622-9 PubMed PMID: 33416968; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMC8053188.

7.   Breinbjerg A, Jørgensen CS, Borg B, Rittig S, Kamperis K, Christensen JH. The genetics of
incontinence: A scoping review. Clin Genet. 2023;104(1):22–62. doi:10.1111/cge.14331

8.   Penney KL, Townsend MK, Turman C, Glass K, Staller K, Kraft P, et al. Genome-Wide Association
Study for Urinary and Fecal Incontinence in Women. J Urol. 2019 Nov 15;203(5):978.
doi:10.1097/JU.0000000000000655 PubMed PMID: 31729902.

9.   Cartwright R, Franklin L, Tikkinen KAO, Kalliala I, Miotla P, Rechberger T, et al. Genome-Wide
Association Study Identifies Two Novel Loci Associated with Female Stress and Urgency Urinary
Incontinence. J Urol. 2021 Sep;206(3):679–87. doi:10.1097/JU.0000000000001822 PubMed
PMID: 33904754.

10.   Minassian VA, Ghandour R, Hao L, Gabriel I. Genome-Wide Associations with Urinary
Incontinence in Women: Case-Control Study. Int Urogynecology J. 2025 Jul 24.
doi:10.1007/s00192-025-06180-4 PubMed PMID: 40705065.

11.   Funada S, Kawaguchi T, Terada N, Negoro H, Tabara Y, Kosugi S, et al. Cross-Sectional
Epidemiological Analysis of the Nagahama Study for Correlates of Overactive Bladder: Genetic
and Environmental Considerations. J Urol. 2018 Mar;199(3):774–8.
doi:10.1016/j.juro.2017.09.146 PubMed PMID: 29066362.

12.   Richter HE, Whitehead N, Arya L, Ridgeway B, Allen-Brady K, Norton P, et al. Genetic
Contributions to Urgency Urinary Incontinence in Women. J Urol. 2015 Jun. Located at:
Philadelphia, PA. doi:10.1016/j.juro.2014.12.023

13.   Post WM, Widomska J, Oosterwijk E, De Witte W, Coenen MJH, Janssen DAW, et al. A Molecular
Landscape of Stress Urinary Incontinence in Women Suggests an Important Role of Beta-Catenin
Signaling in Disease Etiology. JU Open Plus. 2023 Apr;1(4):e00017.
doi:10.1097/JU9.0000000000000019

14. Batmani S, Jalali R, Mohammadi M, Bokaee S. Prevalence and factors related to urinary
incontinence in older adults women worldwide: a comprehensive systematic review and meta-
analysis of observational studies. BMC Geriatr. 2021 Mar 29;21(1):212. doi:10.1186/s12877-021-
02135-8 PubMed PMID: 33781236; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC8008630.

15. Olagundoye O, Odusanya B, Kung JY, Gibson W, Wagg A. A scoping review of risk factors for
urinary incontinence in older men. BMC Geriatr. 2023 Sep 2;23(1):534. doi:10.1186/s12877-023-
04249-7 PubMed PMID: 37660036; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC10474661.

16. Patel UJ, Godecker AL, Giles DL, Brown HW. Updated Prevalence of Urinary Incontinence in
Women: 2015-2018 National Population-Based Survey Data. Female Pelvic Med Reconstr Surg.
2022 Apr 1;28(4):181–7. doi:10.1097/SPV.0000000000001127 PubMed PMID: 35030139.

17. Liu W, Qian L. Risk factors for postpartum stress urinary incontinence: a prospective study. BMC
Urol. 2024 Feb 16;24(1):42. doi:10.1186/s12894-024-01430-x

18. Cuéllar-Partida G, Lundberg M, Kho PF, D'Urso S, Gutiérrez-Mondragón LF, Ngo TT, et al.
Complex-Traits Genetics Virtual Lab: A community-driven web platform for post-GWAS analyses
[Internet]. bioRxiv; 2019 [cited 2025 Sep 5]. p. 518027. Available from:
https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/518027v4 doi:10.1101/518027

19. Cartwright R, Kirby AC, Tikkinen KAO, Mangera A, Thiagamoorthy G, Rajan P, et al. Systematic
review and metaanalysis of genetic association studies of urinary symptoms and prolapse in
women. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2015 Feb;212(2):199.e1-24. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2014.08.005
PubMed PMID: 25111588; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4342521.

20. Kattah NH, Kattah MG, Utz PJ. The U1-snRNP complex: structural properties relating to
autoimmune pathogenesis in rheumatic diseases. Immunol Rev. 2010 Jan;233(1):126–45.
doi:10.1111/j.0105-2896.2009.00863.x PubMed PMID: 20192997; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMC3074261.

21. Ewing CM, Ray AM, Lange EM, Zuhlke KA, Robbins CM, Tembe WD, et al. Germline Mutations in
HOXB13 and Prostate-Cancer Risk. N Engl J Med. 2012 Jan 12;366(2):141–9.
doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1110000

22. Schumacher FR, Al Olama AA, Berndt SI, Benlloch S, Ahmed M, Saunders EJ, et al. Association
analyses of more than 140,000 men identify 63 new prostate cancer susceptibility loci. Nat
Genet. 2018 Jul;50(7):928–36. doi:10.1038/s41588-018-0142-8 PubMed PMID: 29892016;
PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6568012.

23. Steiglitz BM, Keene DR, Greenspan DS. PCOLCE2 encodes a functional procollagen C-proteinase
enhancer (PCPE2) that is a collagen-binding protein differing in distribution of expression and
post-translational modification from the previously described PCPE1. J Biol Chem. 2002 Dec
20;277(51):49820–30. doi:10.1074/jbc.M209891200 PubMed PMID: 12393877.

24. PB | Collagen formation [Internet]. [cited 2025 Sep 5]. Available from:
https://reactome.org/PathwayBrowser/#/R-HSA-1474290

25. Weledji EP, Assob JC. The ubiquitous neural cell adhesion molecule (N-CAM). Ann Med Surg.
2014 Sep 1;3(3):77–81. doi:10.1016/j.amsu.2014.06.014

26. PB | ECM proteoglycans [Internet]. [cited 2025 Sep 5]. Available from:
https://reactome.org/PathwayBrowser/#/R-HSA-1474244&SEL=R-HSA-3000178

27. Elkenani M, Barakat AZ, Held T, Rodrigues DM, Mobarak S, Swarnka S, et al. Heat shock protein
A4 ablation leads to skeletal muscle myopathy associated with dysregulated autophagy and
induced apoptosis. J Transl Med. 2022 May 14;20(1):229. doi:10.1186/s12967-022-03418-3
PubMed PMID: 35568953; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC9107738.

28. Kazi AA, Hong-Brown L, Lang SM, Lang CH. Deptor Knockdown Enhances mTOR Activity and
Protein Synthesis in Myocytes and Ameliorates Disuse Muscle Atrophy. Mol Med. 2011;17(9–
10):925–36. doi:10.2119/molmed.2011.00070 PubMed PMID: 21607293; PubMed Central
PMCID: PMC3188866.

29. Tasian G, Cunha G, Baskin L. Smooth Muscle Differentiation and Patterning in the Urinary
Bladder. Differ Res Biol Divers. 2010;80(0):106–17. doi:10.1016/j.diff.2010.05.004 PubMed
PMID: 20541860; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3712869.

30. Kaczmarek A, Kaczmarek M, Ciałowicz M, Clemente FM, Wolański P, Badicu G, et al. The Role of
Satellite Cells in Skeletal Muscle Regeneration—The Effect of Exercise and Age. Biology. 2021 Oct
18;10(10):1056. doi:10.3390/biology10101056 PubMed PMID: 34681155; PubMed Central
PMCID: PMC8533525.

31. Ashton-Miller JA, Howard D, DeLancey JOL. The Functional Anatomy of the Female Pelvic Floor
and Stress Continence Control System. Scand J Urol Nephrol Suppl. 2001;(207):1–125.
doi:10.1080/003655901750174773 PubMed PMID: 11409608; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMC1192576.

32. Brain Malformations with or Without Urinary Tract Defects - MalaCards [Internet]. [cited 2026
Feb 18]. Available from:
https://www.malacards.org/card/brain_malformations_with_or_without_urinary_tract_defects
#RelatedDisorders

33. Bastide L, Herbaut AG. Cerebellum and micturition: what do we know? A systematic review.
Cerebellum Ataxias. 2020 Jul 18;7(1):9. doi:10.1186/s40673-020-00119-9

34. Seseke S, Baudewig J, Kallenberg K, Ringert RH, Seseke F, Dechent P. Gender differences in
voluntary micturition control — An fMRI study. NeuroImage. 2008 Nov 1;43(2):183–91.
doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.07.044

35. Matsuo T, Kakita S, Honda H, Mori S, Araki K, Mitsunari K, et al. Relationship Between Tooth Loss
Due to Chronic Periodontitis and Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms. Medicina (Mex). 2024 Nov
7;60(11):1829. doi:10.3390/medicina60111829 PubMed PMID: 39597014; PubMed Central
PMCID: PMC11596325.

36. Lee AH, Hirayama F. Is Alcohol Consumption Associated with Male Urinary Incontinence? Low
Urin Tract Symptoms. 2011 Apr;3(1):19–24. doi:10.1111/j.1757-5672.2010.00078.x PubMed
PMID: 26676347.

37. Krokstad S, Langhammer A, Hveem K, Holmen TL, Midthjell K, Stene TR, et al. Cohort Profile: the
HUNT Study, Norway. Int J Epidemiol. 2013 Aug;42(4):968–77. doi:10.1093/ije/dys095 PubMed
PMID: 22879362.

38. Åsvold BO, Langhammer A, Rehn TA, Kjelvik G, Grøntvedt TV, Sørgjerd EP, et al. Cohort Profile
Update: The HUNT Study, Norway. Int J Epidemiol. 2023 Feb 8;52(1):e80–91.
doi:10.1093/ije/dyac095 PubMed PMID: 35578897; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC9908054.

39. Næss M, Kvaløy K, Sørgjerd EP, Sætermo KS, Norøy L, Røstad AH, et al. Data Resource Profile: The
HUNT Biobank. Int J Epidemiol. 2024 Apr 11;53(3):dyae073. doi:10.1093/ije/dyae073

40. Brumpton BM, Graham S, Surakka I, Skogholt AH, Løset M, Fritsche LG, et al. The HUNT study: A
population-based cohort for genetic research. Cell Genomics. 2022 Oct 12;2(10):100193.
doi:10.1016/j.xgen.2022.100193 PubMed PMID: 36777998; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMC9903730.

41. Bycroft C, Freeman C, Petkova D, Band G, Elliott LT, Sharp K, et al. The UK Biobank resource with
deep phenotyping and genomic data. Nature. 2018 Oct;562(7726):203–9. doi:10.1038/s41586-
018-0579-z

42. Kurki MI, Karjalainen J, Palta P, Sipilä TP, Kristiansson K, Donner KM, et al. FinnGen provides
genetic insights from a well-phenotyped isolated population. Nature. 2023 Jan;613(7944):508–
18. doi:10.1038/s41586-022-05473-8

43. Pärn K, Isokallio MA, Fontarnau JN, Palotie A, Ripatti S, Palta P. Genotype imputation workflow
v3.0 [Internet]. 2018 May 10 [cited 2024 Dec 30]. Available from:
https://www.protocols.io/view/genotype-imputation-workflow-v3-0-nmndc5e

44. Zawistowski M, Fritsche LG, Pandit A, Vanderwerff B, Patil S, Schmidt EM, et al. The Michigan
Genomics Initiative: A biobank linking genotypes and electronic clinical records in Michigan
Medicine patients. Cell Genomics. 2023 Jan 31;3(2):100257. doi:10.1016/j.xgen.2023.100257
PubMed PMID: 36819667; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC9932985.

45. Colditz GA, Hankinson SE. The Nurses' Health Study: lifestyle and health among women. Nat Rev
Cancer. 2005 May;5(5):388–96. doi:10.1038/nrc1608

46. Lindström S, Loomis S, Turman C, Huang H, Huang J, Aschard H, et al. A comprehensive survey of
genetic variation in 20,691 subjects from four large cohorts. PLoS ONE. 2017 Mar
16;12(3):e0173997. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0173997 PubMed PMID: 28301549; PubMed
Central PMCID: PMC5354293.

47. Zhou W, Zhao Z, Nielsen JB, Fritsche LG, LeFaive J, Gagliano Taliun SA, et al. Scalable generalized
linear mixed model for region-based association tests in large biobanks and cohorts. Nat Genet.
2020 Jun;52(6):634–9. doi:10.1038/s41588-020-0621-6

48. Bulik-Sullivan BK, Loh PR, Finucane HK, Ripke S, Yang J, Patterson N, et al. LD Score regression
distinguishes confounding from polygenicity in genome-wide association studies. Nat Genet.
2015 Mar;47(3):291–5. doi:10.1038/ng.3211

49. Bulik-Sullivan B, Finucane HK, Anttila V, Gusev A, Day FR, Loh PR, et al. An atlas of genetic
correlations across human diseases and traits. Nat Genet. 2015 Nov;47(11):1236–41.
doi:10.1038/ng.3406

50. Willer CJ, Li Y, Abecasis GR. METAL: fast and efficient meta-analysis of genomewide association
scans. Bioinformatics. 2010 Sep 1;26(17):2190–1. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btq340

51. Hinrichs AS, Karolchik D, Baertsch R, Barber GP, Bejerano G, Clawson H, et al. The UCSC Genome
Browser Database: update 2006. Nucleic Acids Res. 2006 Jan 1;34(Database issue):D590–8.
doi:10.1093/nar/gkj144 PubMed PMID: 16381938; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC1347506.

52. Watanabe K, Taskesen E, van Bochoven A, Posthuma D. Functional mapping and annotation of
genetic associations with FUMA. Nat Commun. 2017 Nov 28;8(1):1826. doi:10.1038/s41467-017-
01261-5 PubMed PMID: 29184056; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5705698.

53. Auton A, Abecasis GR, Altshuler DM, Durbin RM, Abecasis GR, Bentley DR, et al. A global
reference for human genetic variation. Nature. 2015 Oct;526(7571):68–74.
doi:10.1038/nature15393

54. Pruim RJ, Welch RP, Sanna S, Teslovich TM, Chines PS, Gliedt TP, et al. LocusZoom: regional
visualization of genome-wide association scan results. Bioinformatics. 2010 Sep 15;26(18):2336–
7. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btq419

55. De Leeuw CA, Mooij JM, Heskes T, Posthuma D. MAGMA: Generalized Gene-Set Analysis of
GWAS Data. Tang H, editor. PLOS Comput Biol. 2015 Apr 17;11(4):e1004219.
doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004219

56. Giambartolomei C, Vukcevic D, Schadt EE, Franke L, Hingorani AD, Wallace C, et al. Bayesian test
for colocalisation between pairs of genetic association studies using summary statistics. PLoS
Genet. 2014 May;10(5):e1004383. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1004383 PubMed PMID:
24830394; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4022491.

57. Kerimov N, Hayhurst JD, Peikova K, Manning JR, Walter P, Kolberg L, et al. A compendium of
uniformly processed human gene expression and splicing quantitative trait loci. Nat Genet. 2021
Sep;53(9):1290–9. doi:10.1038/s41588-021-00924-w

58. Wallace C. Eliciting priors and relaxing the single causal variant assumption in colocalisation
analyses. PLOS Genet. 2020 Apr 20;16(4):e1008720. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1008720

59. Bastarache L. Using Phecodes for Research with the Electronic Health Record: From PheWAS to
PheRS. Annu Rev Biomed Data Sci. 2021 Jul 20;4:1–19. doi:10.1146/annurev-biodatasci-122320-
112352 PubMed PMID: 34465180; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC9307256.

60. Ge T, Chen CY, Ni Y, Feng YCA, Smoller JW. Polygenic prediction via Bayesian regression and
continuous shrinkage priors. Nat Commun. 2019 Apr 16;10(1):1776. doi:10.1038/s41467-019-
09718-5

61. Mathieson I, Day FR, Barban N, Tropf FC, Brazel DM, van Heemst D, et al. Genome-wide analysis
identifies genetic effects on reproductive success and ongoing natural selection at the FADS
locus. Nat Hum Behav. 2023 May;7(5):790–801. doi:10.1038/s41562-023-01528-6

62. Pujol-Gualdo N, Läll K, Lepamets M, Rossi HR, Arffman RK, Piltonen TT, et al. Advancing our
understanding of genetic risk factors and potential personalized strategies for pelvic organ
prolapse. Nat Commun. 2022 Jun 23;13(1):3584. doi:10.1038/s41467-022-31188-5

63. Yengo L, Sidorenko J, Kemper KE, Zheng Z, Wood AR, Weedon MN, et al. Meta-analysis of
genome-wide association studies for height and body mass index in ~700000 individuals of
European ancestry. Hum Mol Genet. 2018 Oct 15;27(20):3641–9. doi:10.1093/hmg/ddy271

64. Gudmundsson J, Sigurdsson JK, Stefansdottir L, Agnarsson BA, Isaksson HJ, Stefansson OA, et al.
Genome-wide associations for benign prostatic hyperplasia reveal a genetic correlation with
serum levels of PSA. Nat Commun. 2018 Nov 8;9(1):4568. doi:10.1038/s41467-018-06920-9

65. Burgess S, Labrecque JA. Mendelian randomization with a binary exposure variable:
interpretation and presentation of causal estimates. Eur J Epidemiol. 2018;33(10):947–52.
doi:10.1007/s10654-018-0424-6 PubMed PMID: 30039250; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMC6153517.

1039

Figure 1: Study design and key findings. Flowchart summarizing the analytical workflow and main results. AUI; Any type of urinary incontinence. SUI; stress urinary incontinence. UUI; urge urinary incontinence. MUI; mixed urinary incontinence. ICD; International Classification of Diseases. srq; self-reported questionnaire. HUNT; Trøndelag Health Study. MGI; Michigan Genomics Initiative. MR; Mendelian Randomization. PRS; polygenic risk scores. PheWAS; phenome-wide association studies.

Table 1. Summary of the top lead variants identified in the meta-analyses of UI phenotype.

We present results for males and females for sake of clarity, results for sex-combined analyses are available in Supplementary Table 3.

The loci are presented for each phenotypes: any type of urinary incontinence (AUI), stress urinary incontinence (SUI), urge urinary incontinence (UUI) and mixed urinary incontinence (MUI) for surveys and ICD phenotypes definitions (International Classification of Diseases). The variants are given with position in GRCH37. Allele frequency (AF) and effects size with standard error (SE) are given for the effect allele. Heterogeneity estimates are presented with the heterogeneity I squared (HetISq)and the heterogeneity p-value (HetPVal). N=sample size; Studies: F=FinnGen, H=HUNT, M=MGI, N=NHS, U=UK Biobank. Asterisks represents loci identified manually, filtered out by FUMA with the use of the 1000G European reference panel. For those, the Position SNP and the nearest gene were searched in VEP.

Definition	Sex	Novelty	Trait	rsID	Chrom:Pos	EA	AF	Effect	SE	P-value	N	Studies	Nearest gene
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs11807521	1:61844272	a	0,1041	0,0839	0,0125	1,69E-11	572696	H,U,F,M	*NFIA*
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs10200533	2:144183002	a	0,507	-0,0485	0,0076	1,57E-10	572696	H,U,F,M	*ARHGAP15:AC096558.1:RP11-570L15.2*
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs34125679	2:9304212	a	0,3105	0,0484	0,0088	3,21E-08	526672	U,F,M	*RP11-734K21.4*
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs533589387	2:205377594	t	0,0001	4,5619	0,8052	1,47E-08	220559	U	*AC016903.2*
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs35783198	3:142607767	t	0,1725	-0,064	0,0102	2,86E-10	572696	H,U,F,M	*PCOLCE2*
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs191824624*	4:105628607	t	0,0002	3,7488	0,6744	2,72E-08	220559	U	*RP11-556I14.2*
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs6817714	4:126914437	a	0,1953	0,0579	0,0095	1,10E-09	572696	H,U,F,M	*RP11-318I4.1*

ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs251387	5:127547180	t	0,2367	-0,0512	0,009	1,17E-08	572696	H,U,F,M	*SLC12A2*
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs4705880	5:132433618	a	0,2688	-0,0531	0,0093	1,36E-08	540027	H,U,F	*HSPA4*
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs2814985	6:34548296	t	0,17	0,0592	0,0102	6,35E-09	572696	H,U,F,M	*RP3-391O22.3*
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs9295224	6:163948935	c	0,2974	0,0455	0,0083	4,68E-08	572696	H,U,F,M	*QKI*
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs11770163	7:116417848	c	0,3443	0,049	0,008	7,50E-10	572696	H,U,F,M	*MET*
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs201423153	7:27285729	t	0,007	0,2923	0,0454	1,25E-10	572696	H,U,F,M	*EVX1-AS:EVX1*
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs13257316	8:120903734	a	0,5245	0,0426	0,0076	2,01E-08	572696	H,U,F,M	*DEPTOR*
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs11188337	10:97266574	a	0,2088	-0,0585	0,0095	6,39E-10	572696	H,U,F,M	*SORBS1*
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs1155027	11:112815088	t	0,3489	-0,049	0,008	7,82E-10	572696	H,U,F,M	*RP11-629G13.1*
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs2625291	11:19913145	a	0,1224	0,0775	0,0124	4,17E-10	572696	H,U,F,M	*NAV2*
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs4584608	11:74325648	a	0,2326	0,0759	0,009	4,27E-17	572696	H,U,F,M	*POLD3*
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs10774740	12:114666202	t	0,4089	-0,073	0,0078	5,25E-21	572696	H,U,F,M	*RP11-139B1.1*

ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs2806936	13:53749752	t	0,4425	0,0434	0,0076	1,12E-08	572696	H,U,F,M	*LINC01065*
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs55908306	15:96692572	a	0,1821	0,0661	0,01	3,02E-11	572696	H,U,F,M	*NR2F2-AS1*
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs11658346	17:12321794	t	0,3216	-0,0666	0,0085	4,33E-15	572696	H,U,F,M	*LINC00670*
ICD	Females	Novel	AUI	rs78261338	17:56396836	a	0,0132	0,2055	0,0365	1,88E-08	572696	H,U,F,M	*BZRAP1*
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs3820282	1:22468215	t	0,158	0,0761	0,0135	1,74E-08	553275	H,U,F,M	*WNT4*
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs189905208	2:5789613	a	0,9671	-0,1587	0,0288	3,49E-08	553275	H,U,F,M	*AC107057.2:AC108025.2*
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs4662329	2:144164134	a	0,5557	-0,0625	0,01	3,54E-10	553275	H,U,F,M	*ARHGAP15:AC096558.1:RP11-570L15.2*
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs7255	2:20878820	t	0,4763	0,057	0,01	1,15E-08	553275	H,U,F,M	*AC012065.7*
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs7600398	2:100460695	a	0,7109	0,0721	0,0121	2,43E-09	508549	U,F,M	*AFF3*
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs78579538	3:142615990	a	0,8272	0,1149	0,0133	5,03E-18	553275	H,U,F,M	*PCOLCE2*
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs12647708	4:126921277	t	0,8029	-0,0932	0,0123	4,01E-14	553275	H,U,F,M	*RP11-318I4.1*
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs138541831	4:70529893	t	0,0597	0,1152	0,0206	2,29E-08	553275	H,U,F,M	*UGT2A1*

ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs6856764	4:76278309	a	0,2945	-0,0636	0,0109	5,72E-09	553275	H,U,F,M	RP11-542G1.1: RP11-542G1.2
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs251387	5:127547180	t	0,2367	-0,0816	0,0118	3,88E-12	553275	H,U,F,M	SLC12A2
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs4895902	6:131329259	a	0,7735	0,0659	0,0121	4,48E-08	553275	H,U,F,M	EPB41L2
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs41741	7:116438511	t	0,6563	-0,0802	0,0104	1,08E-14	553275	H,U,F,M	MET
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs570853750	7:26951709	a	0,0068	0,355	0,06	3,23E-09	553275	H,U,F,M	SKAP2
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs10505131	8:110667078	t	0,7976	-0,0693	0,0122	1,31E-08	553275	H,U,F,M	SYBU
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs1409714	10:97263791	a	0,2092	-0,0851	0,0124	6,09E-12	553275	H,U,F,M	SORBS1
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs10765541	11:91941510	t	0,4386	0,0561	0,01	2,28E-08	553275	H,U,F,M	RPL7AP57
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs10891477	11:112813307	a	0,3436	-0,0821	0,0105	4,89E-15	553275	H,U,F,M	RP11-629G13.1
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs2067666	11:32498355	t	0,8543	-0,1	0,0139	7,11E-13	553275	H,U,F,M	WT1-AS
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs2625291	11:19913145	a	0,1221	0,1137	0,0162	2,54E-12	553275	H,U,F,M	NAV2
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs72979233	11:74355523	a	0,7649	0,0901	0,0118	2,33E-14	553275	H,U,F,M	POLD3
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs10774740	12:114666202	t	0,4076	-0,0901	0,0102	7,71E-1	553275	H,U,F,M	RP11-139B1.1

											9		
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs11658346	17:12321794	t	0,3207	-0,0881	0,0111	2,25E-15	553275	H,U,F,M	*LINC00670*
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs2229989	17:70118935	t	0,2489	0,0637	0,0116	4,02E-08	553275	H,U,F,M	*SOX9-AS1:SOX9*
ICD	Females	Novel	SUI	rs7291533	22:19737610	t	0,6231	0,0628	0,0105	2,21E-09	553275	H,U,F,M	*TBX1*
ICD	Females	Novel	UUI	rs12064509	1:61845270	c	0,8967	-0,0993	0,0172	7,51E-09	550826	H,U,F,M	*NFIA*
ICD	Females	Novel	UUI	rs10774740	12:114666202	t	0,4096	-0,0699	0,0107	5,28E-11	550826	H,U,F,M	*RP11-139B1.1*
ICD	Females	Novel	UUI	rs77292069	20:56366577	a	0,0012	1,3097	0,2325	1,77E-08	286515	H,U,M	*PMEPA1*
ICD	Females	Novel	MUI	rs55692570	3:142631347	t	0,1719	-0,1214	0,0213	1,22E-08	538329	H,U,F,M	*RP11-372E1.4*
ICD	Females	Novel	MUI	rs10774740	12:114666202	t	0,4044	-0,0959	0,0163	3,90E-09	538329	H,U,F,M	*RP11-139B1.1*
ICD	Females	Novel	MUI	rs9468	17:44101563	t	0,8145	-0,1156	0,0212	4,92E-08	538329	H,U,F,M	*MAPT*
ICD	Males	Novel	AUI	rs138213197	17:46805705	t	0,0049	0,5817	0,0991	4,42E-09	472740	H,U,F,M	*HOXB13*
ICD	Males	Novel	SUI	rs77541621	8:128077146	a	0,027	0,5835	0,0833	2,48E-12	459515	H,U,F,M	*PCAT2*
ICD	Males	Novel	SUI	rs10993994*	10:51549496	a	0,3786	0,1917	0,035	4,15E-08	240257	F,M	*MSMB*

ICD	Males	Novel	SUI	rs538936557	11:55455982	a	0,0564	1,2006	0,218	3,65E-08	179109	U	*RP11-674C21.9*
ICD	Males	Novel	SUI	rs138213197	17:46805705	t	0,006	1,2284	0,1787	6,32E-12	459515	H,F,M	*HOXB13*
ICD	Males	Novel	SUI	rs4430796	17:36098040	a	0,5533	0,188	0,0306	8,50E-10	459515	H,U,F,M	*HNF1B*
ICD	Males	Novel	UUI	rs13266066	8:141700117	t	0,4771	0,0815	0,0146	2,45E-08	467379	H,U,F,M	*PTK2*
ICD	Males	Novel	UUI	rs201998020*	9:132394938	a	0,0003	5,1863	0,9441	3,94E-08	225828	H,U	*ASB6, NTMT1*
ICD	Males	Novel	MUI	rs765377367*	8:115038254	a	0,0007	116,031	18,7513	6,10E-10	40476	H	.
Surveys	Females	Novel	AUI	rs7600346	2:153130367	t	0,2122	0,0936	0,0163	9,09E-09	56955	N,H	*Y_RNA*
Surveys	Females	Novel	AUI	rs78579538	3:142615990	a	0,8436	0,1062	0,0184	7,68E-09	56955	N,H	*PCOLCE2*
Surveys	Females	Novel	AUI	rs554550612	12:23441817	t	0,0028	0,8146	0,1485	4,13E-08	46024	H	*RP11-153K16.2*
Surveys	Females	Known [Penney et al.]	SUI	rs2270016	2:74686329	t	0,1616	0,1329	0,0206	1,09E-10	51346	N,H	*INO80B:WBP1*
Surveys	Females	Known [Cartwright et al.]	SUI	rs1448813496*	2:119807995	a	0,0005	2,6354	0,4623	1,20E-08	44726	H	.

Surveys	Females	Novel	SUI	rs78579538	3:142615990	a	0,8429	0,1211	0,0208	5,54E-09	51346	N,H	*PCOLCE2*
Surveys	Females	Novel	UUI	rs554550612	12:23441817	t	0,0027	0,9891	0,1736	1,22E-08	43825	H	*RP11-153K16.2*
Surveys	Females	Novel	MUI	rs554550612	12:23441817	t	0,0026	1,2101	0,2011	1,76E-09	42616	H	*RP11-153K16.2*

Figure 2: Summary of the associations for the UI phenotypes for the females (ICD based definitions). Venn diagram illustrating the small amount of genetic overlap between the main subtypes (SUI in orange, UUI in pink and MUI in yellow). The locus close to RP11-139B1.1 was shared between all the UI phenotypes. AUI; any type of urinary incontinence. SUI; stress urinary incontinence. UUI; urge urinary incontinence. MUI; mixed urinary incontinence. ICD; International Classification of Diseases.

a)

b)

c)

d)

e)

f)

Figure 3: Genetic correlation analyses. Genome-wide genetic correlation of UI GWAS meta-analysis summary statistics (ICD codes) with 2,871 phenotypes. We used a Bonferroni correction for the number of tests (0.05/ 2871=1.74 × 10^{-5}) and derived genetic correlation estimates (circles). Summary statistics of the phenotypes are available on the Complex Traits Genetics Virtual Lab server and come from many sources. Significant genetic correlations (rg>0.4) are plotted; we selected the first 50 largest associations if over 50 phenotypes were identified, we grouped those phenotypes by categories, corresponding to a color (under classification); a) genetic correlation associations for any type of urinary incontinence in females, b) genetic correlation associations for stress urinary incontinence in females, c) genetic correlation associations for urge urinary incontinence in females, d) genetic correlation associations for mixed urinary incontinence in females, e) genetic correlation associations for any type of urinary incontinence in males, f) genetic correlation associations for urge urinary incontinence in males

a)

b)

Figure 4: Phenome-wide associations between meta-analysis top lead variants with a) phecodes and b) biomarkers from the UK Biobank. Triangles represent statistically significant (p-value<4.5x10^-7) associations between a UI top lead variant identified by FUMA (x-axis, grouped by UI findings (females, males, sex-combined)) and a) phecode outcome from the UK Biobank (y-axis, groups by categories and colors) and b) biomarkers. Larger triangles represent strongest associations (lower p-values). The direction indicates if effect estimates (beta) directions were the same (up) or opposite (down) as the association with UI.

a)

b)

c)

d)

Figure 5: Prevalence of UI by PRS groups for females using ICD code-based definitions. a) Prevalence of any type of urinary incontinence (AUI) is presented by PRS groups using PRS-cs tested in HUNT, b) Prevalence of stress urinary incontinence (SUI) is presented by PRS groups using PRS-cs tested in HUNT, c) Prevalence of urge urinary incontinence (UUI) is presented by PRS groups using PRS-cs tested in HUNT, d) Prevalence of mixed urinary incontinence (MUI) is presented by PRS groups using PRS-cs tested in HUNT.