



Shared micromobility in Zurich, Switzerland

Analysing usage, competition and mode choice

Conference Paper

Author(s):

[Reck, Daniel Jan](#) ; [Guidon, Sergio](#); [Haitao, He](#); [Axhausen, Kay W.](#) 

Publication date:

2020-05

Permanent link:

<https://doi.org/10.3929/ethz-b-000414863>

Rights / license:

[In Copyright - Non-Commercial Use Permitted](#)

1 Shared micromobility in Zurich, Switzerland: Analysing usage, competition and 2 mode choice

3
4
5 Daniel J. Reck^{a*}, Sergio Guidon^{ab}, He Haitao^c, Kay W. Axhausen^a

6
7 ^a *Institute for Transport Planning and Systems, ETH Zürich, CH.*

8 ^b *Institute of Science, Technology and Policy, ETH Zürich, CH.*

9 ^c *School of Architecture, Building and Civil Engineering, Loughborough University, UK.*

10 ^{*} *Corresponding author (reckd@ethz.ch).*

13 Abstract

14
15 Shared micromobility services (e-scooters, bicycles, e-bikes) have rapidly gained popularity in the
16 past few years, yet little is known about their use. While most previous studies have analysed datasets
17 from single providers, only few comparative studies between two or more modes exist and none so-
18 far have analysed competition and mode choice at a high spatiotemporal resolution. To this end, we
19 analysed a large and dense dataset containing ~56M vehicle locations and ~46K trips of 5 different
20 shared micromobility providers for two weeks in January 2020 in Zurich, Switzerland. Bivariate
21 relationships and a MNL mode choice model exhibit 3 main results: (1) docked modes (bike and e-
22 bike) exhibit a clear commuting pattern (morning and evening peak), while dockless e-scooters
23 exhibit the opposite pattern (i.e., morning and evening trough and night peak); (2) dockless e-scooters
24 are preferred for very short trips, docked bikes for medium trips in even terrain or downhill, and e-
25 bikes for longer uphill trips; (3) choice probability increases with vehicle density and battery charge
26 particularly for dockless modes, however there is first evidence of a plateau (i.e., decreasing marginal
27 utility gains up to a level of indifference in choice behaviour).

28
29
30 *Keywords:* micromobility, competition, mode choice

31
32 *Cite as:* Reck, D.J., S. Guidon, H. Haitao and K.W. Axhausen (2020) Shared micromobility in Zurich,
33 Switzerland: Analysing usage, competition and mode choice, Paper presented at the *20th Swiss*
34 *Transport Research Conference (STRC)*, Ascona, May.

1. Introduction

Shared micromobility services (dockless e-scooters, dockless and docked bikes and e-bikes) have rapidly gained popularity in the past few years. Their appearance has been welcomed by many as novel, fun, spatially efficient and sustainable new additions to the transport landscape. Others take a more critical stance questioning sustainability, safety and equity (particularly in the case of e-scooters).

While many speculate about their impact, research to guide policymaking is still in its infancy (cf. recent Call for Papers, Transportation Research Part D): How are different shared micromobility services being used? How does usage compare between different micromobility services across space and time? How do users choose between different (competing) micromobility services, and between them and other more established means of transport such as public transport and walking? Providing rigorous answers to these questions can support transport planning and regulation in various ways, such as clarifying their potential to substitute car trips, alleviate roads during the commute and reduce the footprint of the transport sector.

The existing body of knowledge strongly varies by mode. While shared docked bikes have a relatively long (research) history (at least in comparison with other shared micromobility modes) (e.g., Bachand-Marleau et al., 2012; Fishman et al., 2013; Shaheen et al., 2011), the literature on dockless (e-)bikes is much younger and already limited in scope (e.g., Campbell et al., 2016; Guidon et al., 2019; He et al., 2019; Shen et al., 2018). Dockless e-scooters are the latest addition to the micromobility mix and only recently have seen first peer-reviewed publications (e.g., Bai and Jiao, 2020; Mathew et al., 2019; McKenzie, 2019; Noland, 2019; Younes et al., 2020). Most previous studies employ datasets of a single shared micromobility service and only few comparative studies exist (e.g., Campbell et al., 2016; Lazarus et al., 2020; McKenzie, 2019; Younes et al., 2020). In particular, competition and mode choice *between* shared micromobility services has not been studied yet, however this is an increasingly relevant topic with the steady rise of new providers.

We address this gap by analysing a scraped dataset containing over 56M vehicle locations and over 46K micromobility trips of 5 micromobility providers of docked and dockless e-bikes, bikes and e-scooters for two weeks in January 2020 in Zurich, Switzerland. We describe in detail how to extract trips from scraped vehicle locations and validate scraped trips against real booking data obtained for 3 of the 5 providers. We proceed by analysing usage and identifying similarities and differences between the different providers and modes. Finally, we define competition situations by identifying all available micromobility alternatives for each trip using real-time spatiotemporal vehicle location information and estimate a multinomial logit model to investigate mode choice.

Our contributions are twofold. First, we compare micromobility usage patterns using a single large and dense dataset of quality near to real booking data for five different micromobility providers and modes. This allows to detect subtle differences in usage that allows comprehensive lessons and might otherwise be attributed to location biases. Second, we estimate a first mode choice model for micromobility. To our knowledge, this has not been done before and offers relevant lessons for policy, research and practice. Policymakers can learn about mode choice at different times of day to adjust regulation on vehicle licensing and parking in critical infrastructure zones. Researchers can use our results to update micromobility mode choice in simulations to forecast system effects in cities where micromobility (at scale) has not been introduced yet. Prospective providers can employ our results to optimize their repositioning (e.g., by time of day, elevation, battery charge) and evaluate their competitive position in new micromobility markets.

83 The remainder of this article is organized in 5 sections. We first review the literature on micromobility
84 with a particular focus on usage and mode choice. We then introduce our dataset both conceptually and
85 descriptively, and introduce the methods used to subsequently analyse bivariate and multivariate
86 relationships between mode choice and trip / provider attributes. We present and discuss our results,
87 and close with a summary and discussion of the implications for research, practice and policy.

88 89 **2. Literature Review**

90
91 The number and variety of shared micromobility services has steadily increased in recent years and now
92 includes many different modes such as docked bikes / e-bikes, dockless bikes / e-bikes and dockless e-
93 scooters. Research on shared micromobility can be categorized mainly into supply- and demand-side
94 matters, of which the latter is more relevant to the topic of this paper. Demand-side research on shared
95 micromobility is usually focused on questions such as how and why specific services are used. Demand-
96 side research can be further categorized by types of factors that influence demand such as internal (i.e.,
97 user socio-demographics), external (e.g., built environment, geography, weather) and trip-related
98 (destinations, distance, time of day). Again, the latter two are most relevant to the topic of this paper
99 and thus focus of this literature review.

100
101 Research analysing external and trip-related factors that influence demand for shared micromobility
102 services began with studies on station-based bikesharing (which we refer to as “docked” in this paper
103 to contrast the “dockless” alternatives) (e.g., Shaheen et al., 2011). A number of factors have since been
104 identified to influence demand for shared bikes, such as population density, workplace density, social
105 and leisure centre density, public transport density, elevation difference and weather (Bachand-Marleau
106 et al., 2012; Campbell and Brakewood, 2017; Fishman et al., 2013; Fishman et al., 2014; Murphy and
107 Usher, 2015; Noland et al., 2016; Ricci, 2015; Shaheen et al., 2011). The magnitude of these factors
108 generally varies with time (time of day, day of week, and month of the year). For example, while the
109 effect of workplaces is usually found to be positive on weekdays, it is found to be negative during
110 weekends. In conjunction with often observed morning and evening demand peaks, this suggests that
111 important driver of demand is the commute (e.g., McKenzie, 2019). Adverse weather (precipitation,
112 wind) usually has a negative influence on use, while agreeable weather conditions are associated with
113 higher levels of usage. Finally, while several positive factors have been associated with docked bikes
114 (e.g., generally more cycling and active travel, health-related benefits, low emissions), they have been
115 found to primarily substitute walking and public transport trips instead of the private car (Bachand-
116 Marleau et al., 2012; Campbell and Brakewood, 2017; Fishman et al., 2013; Fishman et al., 2014;
117 Murphy and Usher, 2015; Shaheen et al., 2011). Recently, dockless (e-)bikesharing systems have
118 gained substantial scholastic attention. While external factors have generally been found to be similar
119 to docked bikesharing, trips tend to be longer (i.e., between 2 and 3 km) and elevation naturally does
120 not appear to influence systems with electric support (Campbell et al., 2016; Guidon et al., 2019; Guidon
121 et al., 2020; He et al., 2019; MacArthur et al., 2014; Shen et al., 2018).

122
123 Shared e-scooters are a relatively recent addition to the shared micromobility mix, thus only few peer-
124 reviewed academic studies have analysed external factors influencing demand yet. Most studies have
125 been conducted using the publicly available booking datasets from Louisville (KY) (Noland, 2019;
126 Reck et al., 2020), Austin (TX) (Bai and Jiao, 2020; Caspi et al., 2020; Noland, 2020) or by scraping
127 the operators’ openly accessible APIs (e.g., Espinoza et al., 2020; Hawa et al., 2020; McKenzie, 2019).
128 Usual findings include that e-scooters are most frequent near universities, in central business districts
129 and where the bikeways are available (Bai and Jiao, 2020; Caspi et al., 2020; Hawa et al., 2020; Reck
130 et al., 2020; Zuniga-Garcia and Machemehl, 2020), trips are relatively short (i.e. for Louisville, the

131 median distance is 1.3 km, Reck et al., 2020) thus mostly substitute active modes, and precipitation,
132 cold temperatures and wind negatively influence usage (Noland, 2020). There seems to be some
133 uncertainty with regards to usage peaks during the day with some studies finding hints of commuting
134 peaks (Caspi et al., 2020; McKenzie, 2019), while others find single afternoon peaks (Bai and Jiao,
135 2020; Mathew et al., 2019; Reck et al., 2020). Most studies seem to follow the latter findings and
136 conclude that e-scooters are predominantly used for recreational use instead of commuting, though
137 evidence is slim (McKenzie, 2019; Noland, 2019; Reck et al., 2020).

138

139 While most previous studies employ datasets of a single shared micromobility service, only few
140 comparative studies exist (e.g., Campbell et al., 2016; Lazarus et al., 2020; McKenzie, 2019; Younes
141 et al., 2020). Campbell et al. (2016) analysed factors influencing the choice of shared bicycles and
142 shared e-bikes in Beijing employing a stated preference survey. Demand for shared bikes was strongly
143 negatively impacted by trip distance, temperature, precipitation and poor air quality. Demand for shared
144 e-bikes was found to be less sensitive to trip distance, high temperatures and poor air quality, however
145 user socio-demographics had a substantial impact, indicating that only some members of the society
146 were leaning towards this scheme. The authors conclude that while both modes are attractive
147 replacements for other active modes, e-bikes are also an attractive bus replacement while their use for
148 the first/last mile remains unclear. McKenzie (2019) later compared the spatiotemporal usage
149 patterns of dockless e-scooters with docked bikes in Washington, D.C. Using 3½ months of trip data
150 accessed at a 5-min temporal resolution from the openly accessible API, he found that e-scooter trips
151 exhibit a mid-day peak and a (slight) morning peak and thus are more similar to casual docked bike
152 trips than member trips, which exhibit a clearer commuting pattern with morning and evening peaks.
153 He further analysed trip starts by land use type finding that e-scooter trips mostly originated and
154 terminated in public/recreation areas, whereas bike trips were predominantly home-based commutes.
155 Lazarus et al. (2020) compared docked bike and dockless e-bike usage in San Francisco (CA), using
156 datasets from 02/2018 for one provider each (Ford GoBike and JUMP, respectively). They found that
157 dockless e-bike trips were ~1/3 longer in distance and ~2x longer in duration than docked bike trips. E-
158 Bike trips were further far less sensitive to total elevation gain. Estimating a destination choice model,
159 the authors further found that dockless e-bike trips tended to end in low density areas (suggesting usage
160 for leisure purposes) while docked bike trips tended to end in dense employment areas (suggesting
161 usage for the commute). Finally, Younes et al. (2020) compared the determinants of shared dockless e-
162 scooter and shared docked bike trips (both member and non-member) in Washington, D.C. Using data
163 from the providers' publicly accessible APIs between 12/2018 and 06/2019, they estimate and
164 compared hourly number of trips and hourly median duration of trips. While members of the analysed
165 docked bike scheme showed clear weekday morning and evening commute peaks, casual users of
166 docked bikes and e-scooter users only showed a weekday evening peak. Docked bike trips were ~0.5
167 km longer than e-scooter trips and weather was less of a disutility for dockless e-scooter users than for
168 docked bike users, which the authors hypothesize to be due to the egress walk often necessary from a
169 docking station. The authors further conducted an initial investigation into the interaction between the
170 two modes by measuring the impact of docked bike trips on dockless e-scooter trips. As expected, the
171 authors found that casual usage had a negative and significant coefficient (implying some possible
172 competition) while membership usage had a positive and significant coefficient (implying some
173 possible complementarity). This analysis, however, is spatially and temporally aggregated and thus it
174 remains uncertain how users decided when facing the choice between two different micromobility
175 providers and modes.

176

177 This gap precisely motivates our study. By employing a dataset that comprises trip-level data for
178 multiple shared micromobility providers, we can analyse competition and mode choice between

179 multiple shared micromobility providers at the highest possible spatiotemporal granularity. This has not
180 been studied yet, however becomes an increasingly relevant topic with the steady rise of new providers.

181

182 **3. Data**

183

184 *3.1. Preparation*

185

186 We collect our data in Zurich, Switzerland. Zurich is the largest Swiss city with 434K inhabitants (1.5M
187 in the metropolitan area). Zurich is one of Switzerland’s economic centres and situated near the Alps.
188 It exhibits elevation differences of up to 480m within the municipal area. Public transport service quality
189 can be considered very high with a stop every 300m in the city by regulation. Thus, it comes as no
190 surprise that the overall modal split of public transport was 41% (walk: 26%, car: 25%, (e-)bike: 8%)
191 in the last Swiss mobility census (2015).

192

193 Several micromobility providers operate in Zurich. The most established one is Publibike, which offers
194 docked bikes and e-bikes at ~160 stations. Bond (formerly Smide) offer high quality dockless e-bikes
195 that can travel up to a speed of 45 km/h. Several dockless e-scooter providers have appeared in 2019,
196 among them Lime, Bird, Tier, Voi and Circ.

197

198 Our raw dataset consists of scraped vehicle location data from 8 shared micromobility providers¹ in
199 Zurich, Switzerland. Between 8 January and 23 January, we queried each micromobility providers’ API
200 every ~60s for all available vehicles, thus collecting over 56M observations. Each observation contains
201 information on a vehicle’s location (GPS lon/lat), its type and model, an ID, a timestamp, the provider
202 and, for most providers, the battery level.

203

204 Naturally, a vehicle only appears as an observation in our dataset when available to be booked.
205 Conversely, we define a “disappearance” as a trip when, additionally, the following circumstances are
206 given: the time gap has to be at least 2 min long and the (haversine) distance between the origin and the
207 destination has to be at least 200 m (these filters are necessary to prevent GPS inaccuracies falsely being
208 identified as trips). We further filter trips by duration (max 60 min), distance (max 15 km) and speed
209 (max 45 km/h) as faster trips are likely due to GPS inaccuracies and thus non-informative, and longer
210 trips likely to be round trips, thus non-informative as well. As a result, we obtain a total of 48’231
211 micromobility trips during our 15 days (~3’200 trips per day).

212

213 *3.2. Validation*

214

215 We validate the scraped trip data against real booking data which we obtained for 3 of the 8 providers
216 (docked e-bikes, docked bikes, dockless e-bikes) with satisfactory results (see Figure 1). Overall, we
217 correctly identified ~95% of all trips in terms of weekday, time of day and duration. The only bias in
218 our scraped data we were able to detect is fewer short rides for docked e-bikes and bikes (5-12 min)
219 and slightly more longer trips (17+ min), which may be due to “trip chaining” (i.e., if a bike is both
220 returned and rented out again between two queries, the successive rides are identified as one). This
221 hypothesis is confirmed by the observation that the scraped data contains ~5% less trips than the
222 booking data for these two modes.

223

¹ The 8 shared micromobility providers divide into 5 dockless e-scooter providers, 1 dockless e-bike provider, 1 docked e-bike provider and 1 docked bike provider.

224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256




Fig. 1. Validation of scraped trip data vs. real booking data.

257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269

3.3. Descriptive analysis

The 48'231 scraped micromobility trips are split between the 8 operators and modes as follows: 17'751 docked e-bike trips, 7'295 docked bike trips, 4'766 dockless e-bike trips and 18'419 dockless e-scooter trips. The dockless e-scooter trips are split into 4 providers: 9'399 provider #1, 8'251 provider #2, 609 provider #3, 160 provider #4. For the subsequent analyses, we exclude dockless e-scooter providers #3 and #4 as they exhibit too few observations.

Figure 2 plots descriptive statistics for all remaining 5 providers (all curves are plotted relative to total number of trips per provider). The plot by time of day shows that shared bikes in general (i.e., dockless e-bike, docked e-bike, docked bike) are used most during the morning and evening peaks. E-scooters

270 on the other hand do not exhibit the morning peak but show a peak at mid-day, in the evening and at
271 night (i.e., between 8 p.m. and 5 a.m.).

272
273 The plot by distance shows that e-scooters are mostly used for very short trips (median: 721m) while
274 bikes (median: 1'312m) and e-bikes (median: 1'574m) are used for substantially longer trips. The plot
275 by elevation difference further reveals that docked bikes and e-scooters are mostly used in even terrain
276 (median difference in elevation for bikes: -.46m, sd: 19.7; median difference in elevation for e-scooters:
277 0.20m, sd:16.7), while e-bikes show a much larger spread in both directions (up-hill and down-hill)
278 (median: -0.16m, sd: 38.8).

279
280 The plot by duration is similar to the plot by distance (i.e., shorter durations for e-scooters, longer
281 durations for bikes). The plot by battery level reveals that very few e-scooters and dockless e-bikes
282 show low battery levels (i.e., below 20%) while e-scooters seem to be recharged more often, leading to
283 higher general battery levels and expected "peaks" at 100%. E-Scooter provider #2 exhibits further
284 peaks at 60% and 80%, which we assume to be due to programming of e-scooters' battery information
285 or charging cycles.

286




Fig. 2. Exemplary descriptive statistics for shared micromobility providers in Zurich.

293 **4. Methods**

294

295 We identify “competition situations” as follows. For each trip, we consider the departure location
 296 (“origin”) and identify all vehicles available within a 5 min walking distance (417 m at 5 km/h walking
 297 speed) and within 5 min to departure time. Figure 3 visualizes this approach.
 298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307


308

309

310

311

312



313 **Fig. 3.** Identifying competing vehicles.

314

315 Using this method, we were able to identify *competing available* providers for 46’436 trips (~97.8%).
 316 Each of those trips can thus be interpreted as a choice situation, where one provider was chosen while
 317 others were available. Each choice set is composed of a number of available providers and attributes
 318 that differentiate each provider, such as the number of available vehicles per provider (“vehicle
 319 density”) within 5 min walking distance of the origin of the recorded trip, the battery level of the closest
 320 vehicle and whether the provider was chosen to conduct the trip, and of attributes that characterize the
 321 trip (time of day, elevation difference between origin and destination, distance). Table 1 summarizes
 322 all attributes used to define the choice set.

323

324 **Table 1**

325 Attributes used to define choice sets (excluding time of day).

326

Attribute	Unit	Provider	Min.	1 st Qu.	Med.	Mean	3 rd Qu.	Max.
Vehicle density	Count	Dockless E-Scooter #1	0.0	4.0	9.0	13.1	20.0	61.0
		Dockless E-Scooter #2	0.0	4.0	8.0	9.3	13.0	40.0
		Dockless E-Bike	0.0	1.0	2.0	2.9	4.0	21.0
		Docked Bike	0.0	0.0	5.0	13.1	20.0	140.0
		Docked E-Bike	0.0	3.0	9.0	14.7	21.0	111.0
Battery level	%	Dockless E-Scooter #1	0.0	59.0	75.0	73.4	88.0	100.0
		Dockless E-Scooter #2	16.0	52.0	71.0	69.2	89.0	100.0
		Dockless E-Bike	10.0	44.0	67.0	65.1	89.0	100.0
Elevation	Metres		-213.9	-8.2	0.1	0.4	8.6	214.1
Distance	Kilometres		0.2	0.7	1.1	1.4	1.9	9.8

327 When analysing the resulting competition situations, striking differences in availabilities and choice
328 probability appear (Table 2) which motivate the remainder of this paper. While dockless e-scooter
329 providers are available in 43-44% of all choice situations, they are only chosen in 18-21% of all cases
330 when available (i.e., they are *not* chosen in 79-82% of all cases when available). This rate is even lower
331 for dockless e-bikes, which are only chosen in 11% of all cases when available, while it is substantially
332 higher for docked bikes (27%) and highest for docked e-bikes (47%). What are the causes behind these
333 differences in choice probability?
334

335 **Table 2**

336 Availabilities and choice probabilities for each provider.
337

Provider	Available	Chosen	
		Yes	No
Dockless E-Scooter #1	44 %	21 %	79 %
Dockless E-Scooter #2	43 %	18 %	82 %
Dockless E-Bike	34 %	11 %	89 %
Docked Bike	29 %	27 %	73 %
Docked E-Bike	51 %	47 %	53 %

338
339 In the following, we analyse the causes behind the different choice probabilities. We begin by exploring
340 bivariate relationships between our choice attributes (cf. Table 1) and the choice probabilities (cf. Table
341 2) for each provider and mode. Subsequently, we estimate a multinomial logit model (McFadden, 1974)
342 to explore their joint effect on mode choice using the R package “mixl” (Molloy et al., 2019). We
343 specify the utility functions using the attributes presented above and the following abbreviations:
344

345 Modes

346 ES1 Dockless E-Scooter Provider #1
347 ES2 Dockless E-Scooter Provider #2
348 ES Dockless E-Scooter Providers (both)
349 DLEB Dockless E-Bike
350 DEB Docked E-Bike
351 DBB Docked Bike

Attributes

EL Elevation difference (Destination – Origin)
MO Morning peak (binary)
NI Night (binary)
DE Vehicle density
DI Distance
BA Battery level

352
353 Utility functions

354
$$U_{ES1} = ASC_{ES1} + \beta_{EL_{ES1}} * EL + \beta_{MO_{ES1}} * MO + \beta_{NI_{ES1}} * NI + \beta_{DE_{ES1}} * \log(DE_{ES1}) + \beta_{DI_{ES1}} * DI$$

355
$$+ \beta_{BA_{ES1}} * BA$$

356
$$U_{ES2} = ASC_{ES2} + \beta_{EL_{ES2}} * EL + \beta_{MO_{ES2}} * MO + \beta_{NI_{ES2}} * NI + \beta_{DE_{ES2}} * DE_{ES2} + \beta_{DI_{ES2}} * DI + \beta_{BA_{ES2}}$$

357
$$* \log(BA)$$

358
$$U_{DLEB} = ASC_{DLEB} + \beta_{EL_{DLEB}} * \text{abs}(EL) + \beta_{DE_{DLEB}} * DE_{DLEB} + \beta_{DI_{DLEB}} * DI + \beta_{BA_{DLEB}} * \log(BA)$$

359
$$U_{DEB} = \beta_{EL_{DEB}} * \text{abs}(EL) + \beta_{MO_{DEB}} * MO + \beta_{NI_{DEB}} * NI + \beta_{DE_{DEB}} * \log(DE_{DEB}) + \beta_{DI_{DEB}}$$

360
$$* \log(DI)$$

361
$$U_{DBB} = ASC_{DBB} + \beta_{EL_{DBB}} * EL + \beta_{MO_{DBB}} * MO + \beta_{NI_{DBB}} * NI + \beta_{DE_{DBB}} * DE_{DBB} + \beta_{DI_{DBB}}$$

362
$$* \log(DI)$$

363
364
365

366 5. Results

367

368 5.1. Bivariate relationships

369

370 Figure 4 shows plots of bivariate relationships between the choice probability for each provider and
371 mode, and time of day, distance, elevation, vehicle density and battery level. The plot by time of day
372 shows a particularly strong pattern. While docked e-bikes and docked bikes are chosen most during the
373 morning and evening commuting peaks (i.e., between 6 and 9 a.m. and 4 and 7 p.m.), e-scooters show
374 the opposite pattern. They are chosen *least* during these times and most at night (i.e., between 9 p.m.
375 and 5 a.m.). Dockless e-bikes are chosen most during the morning commuting peak while their choice
376 probability remains fairly stable for the rest of the day with a slight dip at night.

377

378 The plot by distance shows that as trips get longer, the probability of choosing an e-bike (docked /
379 dockless) sharply rises while simultaneously the probability of choosing an e-scooter drops. Docked
380 bikes show a bell curve with choice probability peaking at ~2'100m and then falling with further
381 distance. The e-scooter and docked e-bike curves cross at a distance of ~650m, which can be interpreted
382 as a competitive advantage of / general preference for docked e-bikes for distances greater than 650m
383 when compared to e-scooters (without considering further factors or interaction effects). Dockless e-
384 bikes and e-scooters cross at a greater distance of ~1'500m.

385


386 The plot by elevation shows that the choice probability for e-bikes (docked and dockless) is greater
387 with increasing absolute elevation difference, while the choice probability for docked bikes peaks at the
388 highest possible negative elevation difference (i.e., down-hill) and gradually decreases as elevation rises
389 (up-hill). E-scooters choice probability is highest in flat terrain (i.e., 0 elevation difference).

390

391 Vehicle density is measured by number of available vehicles of each provider within 5 min walking
392 distance of observed trip origin. The plot shows an increasing choice probability with increasing vehicle
393 density for all providers as one would expect. Interestingly, however, both the rate (i.e., marginal utility
394 gain) and the intercept differ by mode. Particularly dockless providers (both e-scooters and e-bikes)
395 seem to gain most choice probability from a higher vehicle density. Interestingly, there appears to be a
396 “plateau”, where the maximal choice probability is reached (i.e., where more vehicles on the road do
397 not increase choice probability). For dockless e-scooters, this plateau appears to begin between 15 and
398 30 e-scooters within 5 min walking distance (i.e., a circle of 417m radius at 5 km/h walking speed). For
399 dockless e-bikes, this plateau seems to begin already at ~10 e-bikes within 5 min walking distance.
400 Docked e-bikes and bikes show higher choice probabilities at lower density levels as well as lower
401 marginal gains from additional vehicles. This could indicate differences in the choice process for
402 docked and dockless micromobility variants. Potential users might decide to take a dockless e-scooter
403 / e-bike only as they see it, while the decision to take a docked bike / e-bike might be decoupled from
404 visual stimuli.

405

406 Finally, we explore the impact of the battery level on choice probability. As expected, a higher battery
407 level at departure is related to a higher choice probability. As for vehicle density, there seems to be a
408 plateau at which users are (almost) indifferent to a higher battery charge. For dockless e-bikes, this
409 plateau appears to begin at ~40% battery charge, while for one dockless e-scooter provider it appears
410 to begin at ~50% battery charge. For the other, we observe a stronger, almost linear effect with outliers
411 of much increased choice probability at ~60%, ~80% and 100%. While there is no behavioural
412 explanation for different effects between two e-scooter companies offering the same product, we
413 speculate the effect to be due to rebalancing in high frequency areas after recharging.



417 **Fig. 4.** Bivariate relationships between variables and choice probability.

421 5.2. Multinomial logit model

422

423 We proceed by reporting the results of our mode choice analysis using a multinomial logit model. The
424 overall model has a high McFadden pseudo ρ^2 value of 0.24 using variations of just five trip- and
425 alternative-specific attributes (vehicle density, elevation, time of day, distance and battery level) and no
426 person-specific attributes. We combined the two e-scooter providers where sensible given the bivariate
427 relationships to create the most parsimonious model possible. We further applied transformations where
428 sensible (i.e., where the bivariate plots suggest a logarithmic or absolute-value relationship).

429

430 Table 3 displays the results. All coefficients are highly significant and show the expected signs. The
431 Alternative Specific Constants suggest that docked e-bikes have the highest *default* utility (competitive
432 advantage), followed by docked bikes (-0.259), dockless e-scooters (-1.885 and -2.350) and dockless
433 e-bikes (-3.526).

434

435 Dockless e-bikes seem to have the highest marginal gain in vehicle density which could be due to the
436 fact that the operator only has few dockless e-bikes deployed (250 for all of Zurich) in comparison to
437 other operators and modes. Docked alternatives gain least from increased vehicle density, which again
438 suggests differences in the decision process (see above).

439

440 Both elevation and distance have the strongest and most positive effect for e-bikes. Elevation has a
441 negative effect for docked bikes, which is intuitive as cycling up-hill takes time and energy, and only
442 seems to have a slight effect on e-scooters. Distance, in turn, has a strong and negative influence on e-
443 scooter mode choice.

444

445 The morning peak strongly and *positively* influences mode choice for docked micromobility (e-bikes
446 and bikes) and equally strongly but *negatively* for dockless e-scooters. At night, this effect reverses
447 itself (i.e., strong and positive effect on dockless e-scooters and strong and negative effect on docked
448 (e-)bikes. Finally, battery charge positively influences mode choice for all alternatives.

449

450 **Table 3**
 451 Estimation results for the multinomial logit model.
 452

Parameter	Provider	Transformation	Coef.	Std.
ASC	Dockless E-Scooter #1		-2.350	***
	Dockless E-Scooter #2		-1.885	***
	Dockless E-Bike		-3.526	***
	Docked Bike		-0.259	***
Vehicle density	Dockless E-Scooter #1	log	0.035	***
	Dockless E-Scooter #2		0.058	***
	Dockless E-Bike		0.167	***
	Docked Bike		0.017	***
	Docked E-Bike	log	0.025	***
Elevation	Dockless E-Scooter		-0.002	**
	Dockless E-Bike	abs	0.026	***
	Docked Bike		-0.010	***
	Docked E-Bike	abs	0.014	***
Morning peak (6 a.m. – 9 a.m.)	Dockless E-Scooter #1		-0.377	***
	Dockless E-Scooter #2		-0.212	***
	Docked Bike		0.170	***
	Docked E-Bike		0.131	***
Night (9 p.m. – 5 a.m.)	Dockless E-Scooter #1		0.829	***
	Dockless E-Scooter #2		0.517	***
	Docked Bike		-0.293	***
	Docked E-Bike		-0.284	***
Distance	Dockless E-Scooter		-0.304	***
	Dockless E-Bike		0.774	***
	Docked Bike	log	1.331	***
	Docked E-Bike	log	1.344	***
Battery level	Dockless E-Scooter #1		0.026	***
	Dockless E-Scooter #2	log	0.309	***
	Dockless E-Bike	log	0.134	***
McFadden pseudo ρ^2			0.24	
AIC			99'552	
n			46'436	

*** : $p < 0.01$, ** : $p < 0.05$, * : $p < 0.1$

453
 454
 455
 456

457 6. Concluding discussion

458

459 As the number of micromobility services continues to grow, an increasing number of users in many
460 cities can choose between several micromobility modes and providers. This raises a number of
461 questions: How does the usage between different modes and providers differ? Which factors influence
462 the choice of a specific mode and provider over others, and how?

463

464 Most previous studies have analysed datasets from single providers, thus drawing lessons on the
465 *isolated* usage of each mode. Only few comparative studies between two modes exist and none so-far
466 have analysed competition and mode choice at a high spatiotemporal resolution. To this end, we
467 analysed a large dataset containing trips of 5 different shared micromobility providers and observations
468 for all available vehicles at high spatiotemporal resolution over several weeks, both descriptively and
469 by estimating a mode choice model.

470

471 Our results show that users choose docked e-bikes and docked bikes mostly during peak hours while e-
472 scooters peak during off-peak hours. This indicates that docked modes are preferred for commuting, as
473 commuting trips are a major contributor to traffic in peak hours. A primary reason for this tendency
474 may be the fact that for docked services, uncertainty about the spatiotemporal availability of bikes at
475 the trip origin is lower. This may reinforce habit formation with respect to mode choice for the
476 commute.

477

478 The choice probability for e-bikes (docked and dockless) tends to increase with distance, while the
479 probability of choosing an e-scooter decreases. This can be readily explained by the advantage of e-
480 bikes in terms of comfort and lower physical exertion for longer trips. Bicycles generally tend to be
481 more comfortable for longer trips than e-scooters, but e-bikes keep this advantage also for very long
482 trips, as aerobic endurance is less important due to the electric motorization. Elevation patterns support
483 this explanation: e-bikes tend to be preferred for uphill trips.

484

485 The bivariate relationships show a pronounced effect of vehicle density on the choice of dockless e-
486 bikes and e-scooters. This is an indication that availability tends to be a limiting factor for these modes.
487 Interestingly, there appears to be a “plateau”, where the maximal choice probability is reached (i.e.,
488 where more vehicles on the road do not increase choice probability, or the “marginal utility gain” is
489 close to 0). For dockless e-scooters, this plateau appears to begin between 15 and 30 e-scooters within
490 5 min walking distance, while for dockless e-bikes, this plateau seems to begin already at ~10 e-bikes.
491 Docked e-bikes and bikes show higher choice probabilities at lower density levels as well as lower
492 marginal gains from additional vehicles. These findings could indicate differences in the choice process
493 for docked and dockless micromobility variants. Potential users might decide to take a dockless e-
494 scooter / e-bike only as they see it, while the decision to take a docked bike / e-bike might be decoupled
495 from visual stimuli.

496

497 The battery level has a strong effect on the choice of e-scooters, while it does not seem to strongly affect
498 the choice of e-bikes. A potential explanation may be that a low battery level of e-scooters has a more
499 immediate effect on the potential range and speed, and that batteries of e-bikes used in Zurich’s high-
500 end e-bikes have a much higher maximum charge than batteries of e-scooters. As for vehicle density,
501 there seems to be a plateau at which users are (almost) indifferent to a higher battery charge. For
502 dockless e-bikes, this plateau appears to begin at ~40% battery charge, while for one dockless e-scooter
503 provider it appears to begin at ~50% battery charge.

504

505 We plan several next steps to expand this research. First, we plan to include other factors such as price,
506 weather and interaction effects between our current factors (e.g., elevation and distance). Second, we
507 plan to explore different functional forms for our variables and estimated a nested logit model to test
508 different, multi-level structures of potential decision-making processes (e.g., docked vs dockless choice
509 before mode and provider choice; mode choice before provider choice). Third, we plan to expand the
510 scope of our analysis temporally by including several more weeks of Zurich data, and geographically,
511 by adding Basel as a second Swiss city to contextualize results.

512

513 **Acknowledgements**

514

515 The authors are very thankful to Lukas Ballo for providing the main data used for our analysis.

516

517 **References**

518

519 Bachand-Marleau, J., B.H.Y. Lee, and A.M. El-Geneidy (2012) Better Understanding of Factors
520 Influencing Likelihood of Using Shared Bicycle Systems and Frequency of Use. *Transportation*
521 *Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, **2314**, 66-71.

522

523 Bai, S., and J. Jiao (2020) Dockless E-scooter usage patterns and urban built Environments: A
524 comparison study of Austin, TX, and Minneapolis, MN. *Travel Behaviour and Society*, **20**, 264-272.

525

526 Campbell, K.B., and C. Brakewood (2017) Sharing riders: How bikesharing impacts bus ridership in
527 New York City. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, **100**, 264-282.

528

529 Campbell, A.A., C.R. Cherry, M.S. Ryerson, and X. Yang (2016) Factors influencing the choice of
530 shared bicycles and shared electric bikes in Beijing. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging*
531 *Technologies*, **67**, 399-414.

532

533 Caspi, O., M.J. Smart, and R.B. Noland (2020) Spatial Associations in Dockless Shared e-Scooter
534 Usage. Paper presented at the *99th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board*,
535 Washington, January.

536

537 Espinoza, W., M. Howard, J. Lane, and P. van Hentenryck (2020) Shared E-Scooters: Business,
538 Pleasure, or Transit. Paper presented at the *99th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research*
539 *Board*, Washington, January.

540

541 Fishman, E., S. Washington, and N. Haworth (2013) Bike Share: A Synthesis of the Literature.
542 *Transport Reviews*, **33** (2) 148-165.

543

544 Fishman, E., S. Washington, and N. Haworth (2014) Bike share's impact on car use: Evidence from
545 the United States, Great Britain, and Australia. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and*
546 *Environment*, **31**, 13-20.

547

548 Guidon, S., H. Becker, H. Dediu, and K.W. Axhausen (2019) Electric bicycle-sharing: a new
549 competitor in the urban transportation market? An empirical analysis of transaction data.

550 *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, **2673** (4) 15-26.

551

552 Guidon, S., D.J. Reck, and K.W. Axhausen (2020) Expanding a(n) (electric) bicycle-sharing system to
553 a new city: Prediction of demand with spatial regression and random forests. *Journal of Transport*
554 *Geography*, **84**, 102692.

555
556 Hawa, L., B. Cui, L. Sun, and A. El-Geneidy (2020) Scoot over: Determinants of shared electric
557 scooter use in Washington D.C. Paper presented at the *99th Annual Meeting of the Transportation*
558 *Research Board*, Washington, January.

559
560 He, Y., Z. Song, Z. Liu, and N.N. Sze (2019) Factors Influencing Electric Bike Share Ridership:
561 Analysis of Park City, Utah. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation*
562 *Research Board*, **2673**, 12-22.

563
564 Lazarus, J., J.C. Pourquier, F. Feng, H. Hammel, S. Shaheen (2020) Micromobility evolution and
565 expansion: Understanding how docked and dockless bikesharing models complement and compete -
566 A case study of San Francisco. *Journal of Transport Geography*, **84**, 102620.

567
568 MacArthur, J., J. Dill, and M. Person (2014) E-bikes in North America: results of an online survey.
569 *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, **2468**, 123-130.

570
571 Mathew, J.K., M. Liu, S. Seeder, and H. Li, and D.M. Bullock (2019) Analysis of E-Scooter trips and
572 their temporal usage patterns. Institute of Transportation Engineers, *ITE Journal*, **89** (6) 44-49.

573
574 McFadden, D. (1974) Conditional logit analysis of qualitative choice behaviour. In P. Zarembka (Ed.)
575 *Frontiers in Econometrics*, 105-142, Academic Press, New York.

576
577 McKenzie, G. (2019) Spatiotemporal comparative analysis of scooter-share and bike-share usage
578 patterns in Washington, D.C. *Journal of Transport Geography*, **78**, 19-28.

579
580 Molloy, J., F. Becker, B. Schmid, and K.W. Axhausen (2019) mixl: An open-source R package for
581 estimating complex choice models on large datasets. Paper presented at the *19th Swiss Transport*
582 *Research Conference*, Ascona, May.

583
584 Murphy, E., and J. Usher (2015) The role of bicycle-sharing in the city: Analysis of the Irish
585 experience. *International Journal of Sustainable Transportation*, **9** (2) 116-125.

586
587 Noland, R.B. (2019) Trip patterns and revenue of shared e-scooters in Louisville, Kentucky.
588 *Transport Findings*, 2019, April.

589
590 Noland, R.B. (2020) Scootin' in the Rain: Does Weather affect Micro-mobility? *Working Paper*, Alan
591 M. Voorhees Transportation Center, Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy,
592 Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, January.

593
594 Noland, R.B., M.J. Smart, and Z. Guo (2016) Bikeshare trip generation in New York City.
595 *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, **94**, 164-181.

596
597 Reck, D.J., S. Guidon, and Kay W. Axhausen (2020) Modelling shared e-scooters: A spatial
598 regression approach. Paper presented at the *99th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research*
599 *Board*, Washington, January.

600
601 Ricci, M. (2015) Bike sharing: A review of evidence on impacts and processes of implementation and
602 operation. *Research in Transportation Business & Management*, **15**, 28-38.
603
604 Shaheen, S., H. Zhang, E. Martin, and S. Guzman (2011) Hangzhou public bicycle: Understanding
605 early adoption and behavioural response to bike sharing in Hangzhou, China. Paper presented at
606 the *90th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board*, Washington, January.
607
608 Shen, Y., X. Zhang and J. Zhao (2018) Understanding the usage of dockless bike sharing in
609 Singapore. *International Journal of Sustainable Transportation*, **12** (9) 686-700.
610
611 Younes, H., Z. Zou, J. Wu, and G. Baiocchi (2020) Comparing the Temporal Determinants of Dockless
612 Scooter-share and Station-based Bike-share in Washington, D.C., *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 134 (August 2019) 308–320.
613
614
615 Zuniga-Garcia, N., and R. Machemehl (2020) Dockless Electric Scooters and Transit Use in an
616 Urban/University Environment. Paper presented at the *99th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board*, Washington, January.
617