Using Cellular Communication Sensing to Support Early Recovery from Alcohol Use Disorder

Kendra Wyant   Coco Yu   John J. Curtin

2025-10-03

Introduction

One of the biggest challenges in Alcohol Use Disorders (AUD) treatment stems from the chronic relapsing nature of this disease (Scott et al., 2005). People can relapse days, weeks, and even years after obtaining the goal of abstinence. At least 60% of AUD patients relapse to heavy drinking within 6 months following treatment (Kirshenbaum et al., 2009; Nguyen et al., 2020; Witkiewitz, 2011). At most 50% of people with an AUD achieve remission after several years (Fleury et al., 2016; Heyman, 2013).

Identifying initial lapses in early recovery is critical. Lapses – single episodes of alcohol use – are easy to define, have a clear onset, and are also clinically meaningful. They serve as an early warning sign of returning back to previous drinking behavior inconsistent with desired goals (Chung & Maisto, 2006; Marlatt & Donovan, 2005; Witkiewitz & Marlatt, 2004). Lapse predicts future lapses, with more frequent ones resulting in increased risks of relapse (Högström Brandt et al., 1999; Witkiewitz & Marlatt, 2004).

Current predictions of alcohol lapses rely heavily on self reports, which can be burdensome to measure in long run. Machine learning models leveraging ecological momentary assessment (EMA) measures have performed relatively well to predict goal-inconsistent alcohol use (Wyant et al., 2024). The surveys were collected up to four times daily for three months. However, constantly completing surveys makes it burdensome for AUD patients. Although most EMA relevant mental health research demonstrated modest compliance rates, their time windows last from two weeks to three months (Czyz et al., 2018; Hung et al., 2016; Mackesy-Amiti & Boodram, 2018; Porras-Segovia et al., 2020; van Genugten et al., 2020). The study length is insufficient because AUD is a chronic disease that requires constant risk monitoring. As extended period of time is anticipated, users' perceived burden of answering surveys is presumably larger (Mogk et al., 2023). Although minimizing the number of items in the surveys

and the frequency of prompting users to complete the surveys might help mitigate the associated burden, it can inevitably reduce the prediction precision and temporal precision of predictions.

Passive cellular communication sensing represents new opportunities due to its feasibility, relatively low burden on individuals and continuous data collection. In a smartphone-based sensing platform the primary expense on the individual is the smartphone. Smartphone usage is already widespread. Eighty-five percent of US adults have a smartphone and this number is consistent across all sociodemographic groups, including those in recovery programs for substance use (Center, 2021; Masson et al., 2019). Studies collecting passive data have demonstrated high acceptability from participants and higher compliance rates compared to active measures (Beukenhorst et al., 2022; Wyant et al., 2023). Further, risk monitoring using cellular sensing is temporally sensitive to fluctuating risks. Analyzing communication patterns can detect potential triggers in time without actively prompting users to reflect on their feelings at the moment or report their environment.

Cellular communications, with minimal contextual information, is embedded with potentially rich information that align with relapse antecedents. For example, social interactions can have important influences on drinking behavior (Alvarez et al., 2021; Hunter-Reel et al., 2009). We may be able to capture immediate risk based on who someone is calling or what time of day it is. Decreased interactions may signify isolation common with depressive symptoms, reaching out to people in one's social network could signify a positive coping strategy, or changes in patterns between a single person in one's social network could indicate conflict (Chih et al., 2014; Hufford et al., 2003; Miller et al., 2001).

This study aims at building machine learning models from cellular communications that identify *who* are at heightened risk for alcohol lapses, *when* they will lapse, and *why* they are at increased risk.

Methods

Participants and Procedure

We recruited adults in early recovery from AUD in Madison, Wisconsin, via print and digital advertisements and treatment center partnerships. We required participants: were age 18 or older, could write and read in English, had moderate to severe AUD [1], were abstinent from alcohol for 1-8 weeks, were willing to use a single smartphone, and were not exhibiting severe symptoms of psychosis or paranoia.[2]

---

[1] (>= 4 self-reported DSM-5 symptoms)

[2] Defined as scores >2.2 or 2.8, respectively, on the psychosis or paranoia scales of the Symptom Checklist–90 (Derogatis, L.R., 2000)

Participants completed up to 5 study visits over approximately 3 months: a screening visit, intake visit, and 3 monthly follow-up visits. At screening we collected self-report information about demographics (age, sex at birth, race, ethnicity, education, marital status, employment, and income) and clinical characteristics (DSM-5 AUD symptom count, alcohol problems (Hurlbut & Sher, 1992), and presence of psychological symptoms (Derogatis, L.R., 2000)). At intake we collected self-report information about abstinence self-efficacy (McKiernan et al., 2011), craving (Flannery et al., 1999), and recent alcohol recovery efforts. At each monthly follow-up visit, we downloaded participants' cellular communications (voice call and SMS text message metadata logs) from their smartphone devices. Participants were asked 7 contextual questions about important contacts (i.e., people whom the partcipant communicated with at least twice by voice call or SMS text message in a one month period). While enrolled, participants were expected to complete 4 brief (7-10 questions) daily ecological momentary assessments (EMA). The first item asked participants to report dates and times of any recent alcohol use. We verified lapse reports at follow-up visits with a timeline follow-back interview. Additional sensing data streams and self-report measures were collected as part of the parent grant's aims (R01 AA024391). Our full study protocol and all measures are publicly available (https://osf.io/wgpz9/).

We screened 192 participants. Of these, 169 enrolled and 154 completed the first follow-up visit. We excluded data from 8 participants for no longer having a goal of abstinence, evidence of careless responding, and unusually low compliance. Our final sample included 146 participants.

Data Analysis Plan

Our models predicted probability of a lapse (i.e., alcohol use) in a 24-hour prediction window. Predictions were made at 4 am each day for up to 3 months. This produced a total of 11,619 labeled prediction timepoints across all participants. Features were engineered using all available data up until the prediction timepoint[3]. **?@tbl-1** presents the raw predictors and engineered features included in each model. The full model uses all available features derived from baseline self-report measures (24 features) and cellular communication data (324 features). The baseline model uses only features collected via self-report at baseline.

Candidate model configurations differed by statistical algorithm (elastic net, random forest, XGBoost), outcome resampling method, and hyperparemter values. The best model configuration for the full model and baseline model were selected and evaluated using 6 repeats of participant-grouped 5-fold cross-validation. Folds were stratified on a between-subject measure of our outcome (low lapsers/0-9 lapses vs. and high lapsers/10+ lapses).

We used a Bayesian hierarchical generalized linear model to estimate the posterior probability distributions and 95% Bayesian credible intervals (CIs) from the 30 held-out test sets for our

---

[3]We filtered down the data to only include communications with important contacts (i.e., communications we had contextual information about) prior to feature engineering.

two best models. We used weakly informative, data-dependent priors that take into account the order of magnitude of the variables to provide some regularization to stabilize computation and avoid over-fitting.[4] We set two random intercepts to account for our resampling method: one for the repeat, and another for the fold nested within repeat. auROCs were transformed using the logit function and regressed as a function of model to determine the probability that the models' performances differed systematically from each other.

- Feature Importance

Our annotated analysis scripts are publicly available on our study website (https://jjcurtin.github.io/study_messages/).

Ethical Considerations

All procedures were approved by the University of Wisconsin-Madison Institutional Review Board (Study #2015-0780). All participants provided written informed consent.

Results

Participants

Table 1 provides the demographics of our sample. We obtained a total of 417,853 contextualized communications across participants. Participants had, on average, 2,862 communications (range = 113-14,952). 57% of participants reported at least one lapse.

	N	%	M	SD	Range
Age			40.5	11.8	21-72
Sex at Birth					
Female	74	50.7			
Male	72	49.3			
Race					
American Indian/Alaska Native	3	2.1			
Asian	2	1.4			
Black/African American	8	5.5			
White/Caucasian	127	87.0			

---

[4]Priors were set as follows: residual standard deviation ~ normal(location=0, scale=exp(2)), intercept (after centering predictors) ~ normal(location=2.3, scale=1.3), the two coefficients for window width contrasts ~ normal (location=0, scale=2.69), and covariance ~ decov(regularization=1, concentration=1, shape=1, scale=1).

	N	%	M	SD	Range
Other/Multiracial	6	4.1			
Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin					
Yes	3	2.1			
No	143	97.9			
Education					
Less than high school or GED degree	1	0.7			
High school or GED	14	9.6			
Some college	40	27.4			
2-Year degree	13	8.9			
College degree	56	38.4			
Advanced degree	22	15.1			
Employment					
Employed full-time	71	48.6			
Employed part-time	25	17.1			
Full-time student	7	4.8			
Homemaker	1	0.7			
Disabled	7	4.8			
Retired	8	5.5			
Unemployed	15	10.3			
Temporarily laid off, sick leave, or maternity leave	3	2.1			
Other, not otherwise specified	9	6.2			
Personal Income			$34,726	$31,978	$0-200,000
Marital Status					
Never married	64	43.8			
Married	32	21.9			
Divorced	43	29.5			
Separated	5	3.4			
Widowed	2	1.4			

Table 1: Demographics

Note:

N = 146

**Model Evaluation**

Feature Importance

Figure 1: Global feature importance (glmnet coefficient) for the full model. Features are ordered by absolute coefficient value. Rate counts of communications with friends, non-drinkers, and drinkers were calculated across varying scoring epochs. Standardized coefficients were averaged across retained epochs to produce single aggregate feature importance score. Blue bars indicate higher feature values on average lower lapse risk. Red bars indicate higher feature values on average increase risk.

Discussion

Alvarez, M. J., Richards, D. K., Oviedo Ramirez, S., & Field, C. A. (2021). Social network heavy drinking moderates the effects of a brief motivational intervention for alcohol use among injured patients. *Addictive Behaviors*, *112*, 106594. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2020.106594

Beukenhorst, A. L., Burke, K. M., Scheier, Z., Miller, T. M., Paganoni, S., Keegan, M., Collins, E., Connaghan, K. P., Tay, A., Chan, J., Berry, J. D., & Onnela, J.-P. (2022). Using smartphones to reduce research burden in a neurodegenerative population and assessing participant adherence: A randomized clinical trial and two observational studies. *JMIR Mhealth and Uhealth*, *10*(2), e31877. https://doi.org/10.2196/31877

Center, P. R. (2021). *Mobile Fact Sheet*. Pew Research Center.

Chih, M.-Y., Patton, T., McTavish, F. M., Isham, A. J., Judkins-Fisher, C. L., Atwood, A. K., & Gustafson, D. H. (2014). Predictive modeling of addiction lapses in a mobile health application. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, *46*(1), 29–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2013.08.004

Chung, T., & Maisto, S. A. (2006). Relapse to alcohol and other drug use in treated adolescents: Review and reconsideration of relapse as a change point in clinical course. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *26*(2), 149–161. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2005.11.004

Czyz, E. K., King, C. A., & Nahum-Shani, I. (2018). Ecological assessment of daily suicidal thoughts and attempts among suicidal teens after psychiatric hospitalization: Lessons about feasibility and acceptability. *Psychiatry Research*, *267*, 566–574. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2018.06.031

Derogatis, L.R. (2000). *Brief Symptom Inventory 18 - Administration, scoring, and procedures manual*. NCS Pearson.

Flannery, B. A., Volpicelli, J. R., & Pettinati, H. M. (1999). Psychometric properties of the Penn Alcohol Craving Scale. *Alcoholism, Clinical and Experimental Research*, *23*(8), 1289–1295.

Fleury, M.-J., Djouini, A., Huỳnh, C., Tremblay, J., Ferland, F., Ménard, J.-M., & Belleville, G. (2016). Remission from substance use disorders: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *168*, 293–306. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2016.08.625

Heyman, G. M. (2013). Quitting Drugs: Quantitative and Qualitative Features. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *9*(Volume 9, 2013), 29–59. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032511-143041

Högström Brandt, A. M., Thorburn, D., Hiltunen, A. J., & Borg, S. (1999). Prediction of single episodes of drinking during the treatment of alcohol-dependent patients. *Alcohol (Fayetteville, N.Y.)*, *18*(1), 35–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0741-8329(98)00065-2

Hufford, M. R., Witkiewitz, K., Shields, A. L., Kodya, S., & Caruso, J. C. (2003). Relapse as a nonlinear dynamic system: Application to patients with alcohol use disorders. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *112*(2), 219–227. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.112.2.219

Hung, S., Li, M.-S., Chen, Y.-L., Chiang, J.-H., Chen, Y.-Y., & Hung, G. C.-L. (2016). Smartphone-based ecological momentary assessment for Chinese patients with depression: An exploratory study in Taiwan. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*, *23*, 131–136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajp.2016.08.003

Hunter-Reel, D., McCrady, B., & Hildebrandt, T. (2009). Emphasizing interpersonal factors: An extension of the Witkiewitz and Marlatt relapse model. *Addiction (Abingdon, England)*, *104*(8), 1281–1290. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2009.02611.x

Hurlbut, S. C., & Sher, K. J. (1992). Assessing alcohol problems in college students. *Journal of American College Health.*, *41*(2), 49–58.

Kirshenbaum, A. P., Olsen, D. M., & Bickel, W. K. (2009). A quantitative review of the ubiquitous relapse curve. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, *36*(1), 8–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2008.04.001

Mackesy-Amiti, M. E., & Boodram, B. (2018). Feasibility of ecological momentary assessment to study mood and risk behavior among young people who inject drugs. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *187*, 227–235. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2018.03.016

Marlatt, G. A., & Donovan, D. M. (Eds.). (2005). *Relapse prevention: Maintenance strategies in the treatment of addictive behaviors, 2nd ed* (pp. xiv, 416). The Guilford Press.

Masson, C. L., Chen, I. Q., Levine, J. A., Shopshire, M. S., & Sorensen, J. L. (2019). Health-related internet use among opioid treatment patients. *Addictive Behaviors Reports*, *9*, 100157. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.abrep.2018.100157

McKiernan, P., Cloud, R., Patterson, D. A., Wolf, S., Golder, S., & Besel, K. (2011). Development of a Brief Abstinence Self-Efficacy Measure. *Journal of Social Work Practice in the Addictions*, *11*(3), 245–253. https://doi.org/10.1080/1533256X.2011.593445

Miller, W. R., Walters, S. T., & Bennett, M. E. (2001). How effective is alcoholism treatment in the United States? *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, *62*(2), 211–220. https://doi.org/10.15288/jsa.2001.62.211

Mogk, J. M., Matson, T. E., Caldeiro, R. M., Garza Mcwethy, A. M., Beatty, T., Sevey, B. C., Hsu, C. W., & Glass, J. E. (2023). Implementation and workflow strategies for integrating digital therapeutics for alcohol use disorders into primary care: A qualitative study. *Addiction Science & Clinical Practice*, *18*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13722-023-00387-w

Nguyen, L.-C., Durazzo, T. C., Dwyer, C. L., Rauch, A. A., Humphreys, K., Williams, L. M., & Padula, C. B. (2020). Predicting Relapse After Alcohol Use Disorder Treatment in a High-Risk Cohort: The Roles of Anhedonia and Smoking. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, *126*, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2020.04.003

Porras-Segovia, A., Molina-Madueño, R. M., Berrouiguet, S., López-Castroman, J., Barrigón, M. L., Pérez-Rodríguez, M. S., Marco, J. H., Díaz-Oliván, I., de León, S., Courtet, P., Artés-Rodríguez, A., & Baca-García, E. (2020). Smartphone-based ecological momentary assessment (EMA) in psychiatric patients and student controls: A real-world feasibility study. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *274*, 733–741. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.05.067

Scott, C. K., Foss, M. A., & Dennis, M. L. (2005). Pathways in the relapse–treatment–recovery cycle over 3 years. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, *28 Suppl 1*, S63–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2004.09.006

van Genugten, C. R., Schuurmans, J., Lamers, F., Riese, H., Penninx, B. W. J. H., Schoevers, R. A., Riper, H. M., & Smit, J. H. (2020). Experienced Burden of and Adherence to Smartphone-Based Ecological Momentary Assessment in Persons with Affective Disorders.

Journal of Clinical Medicine, *9*(2), 322. https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm9020322

Witkiewitz, K. (2011). Predictors of Heavy Drinking During and Following Treatment. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors : Journal of the Society of Psychologists in Addictive Behaviors*, *25*(3), 426–438. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022889

Witkiewitz, K., & Marlatt, G. A. (2004). Relapse prevention for alcohol and drug problems: That was Zen, this is Tao. *The American Psychologist*, *59*(4), 224–235. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.4.224

Wyant, K., Moshontz, H., Ward, S. B., Fronk, G. E., & Curtin, J. J. (2023). Acceptability of Personal Sensing Among People With Alcohol Use Disorder: Observational Study. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, *11*, e41833. https://doi.org/10.2196/41833

Wyant, K., Sant'Ana, S. J., Fronk, G. E., & Curtin, J. J. (2024). Machine learning models for temporally precise lapse prediction in alcohol use disorder. *Journal of Psychopathology and Clinical Science*, *133*(7), 527–540. https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000901