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Abstract
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1. INTRODUCTION

The restaurant business is among the industries most acutely impacted by the COVID crisis. As cities and states initiated shelter-in-place orders and consumers pulled back their presence in public spaces, restaurants that rely exclusively or primarily on dine-in (serving consumers face-to-face) have been especially affected. Numbers from the Advance Monthly Retail Trade Survey by the U.S. Census Bureau indicate a 48.7% year-over-year decline for food services and drinking places (NAICS 722) in April 2020, reflecting revenue losses of over $30 billion that month alone, and of over $50 billion in March and April 2020 (US Census Bureau Monthly and Annual Retail Trade, 2020). According to the National Restaurant Association, the average establishment saw a 78% decline in its revenues in the first 10 days of April 2020 compared to the same period in April 2019, and revenue losses over the month are projected to exceed $50 billion (Grindy, 2020).

Within the restaurant industry, small businesses have been especially vulnerable to this crisis. While larger restaurant chains may have the resources to weather a prolonged economic downturn, independent establishments and mom-and-pop restaurants may struggle to stay alive as revenues fall, and it is believed that up to 75% of independent restaurants closed during the pandemic may not survive the crisis (Severson and Yaffé-Bellany, 2020). Further, independent restaurants are more heavily impacted by recessions and economic shocks than the larger national chains as they have limited access to credit and alternative financing options during such crises (Dietrich, Schneider, and Stocks, 2020). The unfavorable economic environment will thus further exacerbate the credit constraints (Evans and Jovanovic, 1989) that typically disadvantage small businesses.

Faced with the current crisis, restaurants have been forced to utilize alternative channels to reach customers, maintain revenue, and stay alive. A bright spot for some restaurants has been the growth of access to alternative digital channels over the last few years. For an independent restaurant, food delivery platforms like Uber Eats and Doordash can now make the difference between survival and shutdown. Our study takes a close look at the economic effects of access to this platform-enabled channel during the COVID-19 shutdown in March and April 2020.
Prior research has explored the challenges and opportunities that such alternative distribution channels pose to incumbent firms that have traditionally operated in different markets (e.g., Chen, Hu, and Smith, 2019a; Danaher et al., 2010; Smith and Telang, 2009). For example, Airbnb is now an increasingly important channel, not just for sharing one’s spare bedroom or apartment, but also for bed-and-breakfasts and full-time vacation rental properties (Guttentag, 2015). Similarly, e-commerce platforms such as eBay and Amazon.com are increasingly important for small businesses and individual sellers (Bailey et al., 2008).

These digital distribution channels that have ended up being a source of small business resilience exhibit different characteristics than traditional markets, altering the nature of competition in markets (Farronato and Fradkin, 2018; Hall and Krueger, 2018; Zervas, Proserpio, and Byers, 2017). Such changes provide opportunities for businesses that may struggle in other market settings. On the supply side, platforms and digital distribution channels lower the costs of entry for small providers, enabling smaller providers to reach buyers more easily and providing them with flexibility (Chen et al., 2019b; Einav, Farronato, and Levin, 2016). Digital markets greatly reduce the costs of consumer search and discovery using recommendation tools that leverage large data on consumer behavior with a wide inventory of products (Brynjolfsson, Hu, and Simester, 2011; Oestreicher-Singer and Sundararajan, 2012). In conjunction with the decreased
costs of maintaining inventory and the ability to aggregate demand across a wider consumer base, such recommendation and search tools create a market in which “niche” offerings can find an audience and thrive (e.g., Brynjolfsson et al., 2006, 2011; Oestreicher-Singer and Sundararajan, 2012; Zhang, 2018).

Building on such work, we analyze and document the stabilizing and sustaining effects of food delivery platforms in the weeks following the shutdown in the United States due to the COVID-19 pandemic in mid-March 2020. We use order-level data from the Uber Eats food delivery platform for five major US cities (New York City, San Francisco, Atlanta, Miami, and Dallas) from February 1st 2020 through May 1st 2020 to examine changes in restaurant demand and performance on the Uber Eats platform following the shutdown. We find evidence that small restaurants take advantage of the online on-demand channel to partially offset the revenue losses from shuttering their dine-in channel. Across our five sample cities, we see a sharp increase in the rate at which new restaurants join the Uber Eats platform. In addition, we see that restaurants that remain open for delivery appear to experience significant and economically meaningful increases in the count of orders that they receive.

This increase in orders exists despite the fact that many restaurants have cut the number of hours that they supply on the platform. Probing deeper, our analysis reveals that the impact of the COVID-induced economic shock has many facets which collectively influence observed changes in restaurant demand and performance. There is a demand-side shock comprised of many parts with countervailing effects: the absence of dine-in options may shift demand towards the online channel; variability in the availability of groceries and fears of going to a grocery store may induce consumers to order in rather than cook themselves; an increase in the hours people have been spending at home coupled with health concerns associated with food prepared and delivered by people outside their homes could induce an increased propensity and ability to prepare one’s own meals. More saliently, there is also a supply-side shock induced by the shuttering of many restaurants, the cutting back of operating hours for those that remain open, and the greater availability of resources to dedicate to the delivery side of operations as dine-in dries up.

Our analysis of the competitive effects of this supply-side shock reveals that the intensity of competitive effects (as measured by the percent of restaurants within a cuisine categorization that
remain open on a given day) have grown following the shock. As one might expect, the performance of an individual restaurant on the Uber Eats platform is better when a larger fraction of its competitors (defined as those in the same city offering the same cuisine) are closed. However, overall demand on the platform is larger when more restaurants are open. These dual effects of market expansion and substitution suggest an interesting tension between what is optimal for the platform and what is optimal for the complementors hosted on the platform.

Our work contributes to multiple streams of literature. Over the last decade, the emergence of platforms has spawned a growing body of literature that focuses on the strategy and performance of the firms that create and organize the platforms (e.g., Boudreau, 2010; Cennamo and Santalo, 2013; Eisenmann, Parker, and Alstyne, 2011; Tucker and Zhang, 2010; Zhu and Iansiti, 2012). However, much less attention has been paid to understanding the performance and strategy of providers on digital markets, despite the fact that such providers are critical to value creation and represent the vast majority of firms within a platform ecosystem (Kapoor and Agarwal, 2017). Our work aims to fill that gap by showing how digital channels can stabilize firm performance when other distribution channels are limited.

By showing that digital channels can serve as a substitute when traditional brick-and-mortar settings are disrupted, we contribute to the body of research that examines cannibalization and opportunities from alternative digital distribution channels (Chen et al., 2019a; Danaher et al., 2010; Deleersnyder et al., 2002; Smith and Telang, 2009). Further, by exploring the moderating effect of competition on performance on the digital platform, we add to a body of literature that explores substitution and spillovers in the sharing economy (Sundararajan, 2016) and on digital platform markets (Haviv, Huang, and Li, 2020; Reshef, 2019). Lastly, by highlighting the dual effects of market expansion and business stealing, we contribute to literature that discusses the tension between strategies that are optimal for the platform and strategies that are optimal for complementors hosted on the platform (e.g., Filippas, Jagabathula, and Sundararajan, 2019; Venkatraman and Lee, 2004; Zhu and Liu, 2018).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes our empirical setting. Section 3 outlines our data and provides some preliminary model-free results. Section 4 provides our models, their results, and discusses their implications. Section 5 concludes and outlines directions for additional inquiry.
2. **EMPIRICAL SETTING**

The focus of our study is on how digital channels can substitute for brick-and-mortar sales when traditional channels are disrupted. We take advantage of the worldwide COVID-19 pandemic, also known as the coronavirus pandemic, that began at the end of 2019. The pandemic has involved the outbreak of a viral infection that can cause acute respiratory issues in affected individuals (Liu, Kuo, and Shih, 2020). The virus was first identified in December 2019 in Wuhan, China, and has since then spread across the world, resulting in a global pandemic (Hui *et al.*, 2020). The virus is primarily transmitted through close contact and is highly contagious (Liu *et al.*, 2020).

As of June 11, 2020, more than 7.4 million cases have been reported resulting in greater than 420,000 deaths (COVID-19 Map, 2020), and there are no vaccines, drugs, or medicines that demonstrably prevent or cure the disease (WHO Q&A on Coronavirus, 2020). Accordingly, countries across the world have adopted dramatic non-pharmaceutical interventions to prevent the spread and transmission of the virus. Across the United States, states and cities have requested or required that residents avoid any non-essential travel or activity (Mervosh, Lu, and Swales, 2020). Such “stay-at-home” or “shelter-in-place” orders have devastated economies, leading to rising unemployment rates, falling consumer activity, and stifled growth (Lee, 2020).

As discussed earlier, the restaurant industry is among the most acutely impacted, and we see dramatic changes in consumer and supplier behavior on alternative distribution channels in response to these interventions, as illustrated in Figure 2. Panel A shows how consumer sessions with demand intent have increased post-shutdown across our five sample cities, with an increase in average daily consumer activity that ranges from 25% in Miami to nearly 75% in San Francisco.

In Figure 2, Panel B, we show the monthly average number of SMB restaurants that joined the Uber Eats platform in the months prior to and following the onset of the pandemic. Relative to February 2020, across the five cities, signups increased by 128% in March 2020 and by 51% in April 2020. Among our five cities, in March 2020 compared to February 2020, Atlanta displayed the largest single-city increase — by 492% or a 5.92x increase, while San Francisco displayed the largest within-city increase — by 107% or a 2.07x increase in April 2020 relative to February 2020. Signups slowed in April 2020 relative to March 2020, except in San Francisco, which saw a 1.91x increase in March 2020 and a 1.09x increase in April 2020 relative to March.
Figure 2: Consumer and Supplier Activity in Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic on the Uber Eats Platform

A. Consumer Sessions with Demand Intent

B. Monthly Rate of SMB Restaurants joining the Uber Eats platform

Note: In Panel A, the dotted curves plot the daily number of consumer sessions with demand intent between February 1 and May 1 across our five cities, normalized in a way that makes the average pre-lockdown value equal to 1. The dashed vertical line represents the day on which the shelter-in-place guidance was issued. The solid horizontal lines depict the average daily number of consumer sessions with demand intent in the pre-lockdown and post-lockdown time windows. The differences in averages pre- and post- are statistically significant in each of our cities. In Panel B, the first four bars depict the monthly average number of restaurants that joined Uber Eats in 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019. The next four bars depict the actual number of restaurants that joined Uber Eats in the first four months of 2020.
3. DATA AND MODEL-FREE ANALYSIS

We rely on data from the Uber Eats platform, a digital food service delivery platform offered by the ridesharing company Uber. Consumers can review menus and order food for delivery or takeout from participating restaurants using an application provided by the platform or through a web browser. In exchange for hosting the transaction and connecting consumers to restaurants, Uber Eats collects a commission on the orders placed on the platform from restaurants and collects delivery charges from customers.

We use order-level data to examine how restaurant demand and performance on the Uber Eats platform changes following the shutdown. Our sample consists of activity on all “Small or Medium Business” (SMB) restaurants, defined as restaurant chains with 50 or fewer locations on the Uber Eats platform, across five major US cities (New York City, San Francisco, Atlanta, Miami, and Dallas) from February 1st 2020 through May 1st 2020. A vast majority of these restaurants (90% of the SMBs in our sample) have just a single location. We measure restaurant demand and performance using the daily count of orders a restaurant receives.¹

To identify the effect of the closure of dine-in restaurants on restaurant performance on the Uber Eats platform, we take advantage of the enactment of shelter-in-place guidance in each of our five sample cities. For each city, we define a “pre-lockdown” and “post-lockdown” period depending on the date the city enacted shelter-in-place guidance (for all cities, this occurred in mid-March 2020). For example, for New York City, the pre-shutdown period comprises the days February 1 through March 16, and the post-lockdown period comprises the days March 17 through May 1. Table 1 summarizes.²

¹ Because of the proprietary nature of the Uber Eats data, we are limited in the outcome measures we can consider as part of this research study, and do not have access to restaurant revenues or order sizes.
² Dallas and Miami prohibited in-restaurant dining a week before instating shelter-in-place guidance. We use the shelter-in-place guidance for pre- and post-dates in these cities for consistency. Results are robust to using the date of restaurant closure as well.
Table 1: Pre- and Post-Lockdown Periods by Sample City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Pre-Lockdown Period</th>
<th>Post-Lockdown Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta³</td>
<td>February 1 – March 23</td>
<td>March 24 – May 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas⁴</td>
<td>February 1 – March 23</td>
<td>March 24 – May 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami⁵</td>
<td>February 1 – March 23</td>
<td>March 24 – May 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City⁶</td>
<td>February 1 – March 16</td>
<td>March 17 – May 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco⁷</td>
<td>February 1 – March 16</td>
<td>March 17 – May 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Date ranges are inclusive. Pre- and post-lockdown dates are defined by the date that the city announced “shelter-in-place” or “stay-at-home” guidance.

For data anonymity purposes as well as to ease interpretation of coefficients, order counts at the restaurant-day level are scaled by the pre-period mean count of daily orders across all restaurants within the city. This scaling will later allow us to interpret our coefficients as percentage changes in daily orders relative to pre-period activity levels within the city.

In an ideal natural experiment, we would have a set of control cities that were unaffected by the pandemic.⁸ Unfortunately, the pandemic has affected nearly all major cities across the globe, and we do not have an appropriate sample of control cities. Nevertheless, even though limited to just comparing within-city changes pre-lockdown vs. post-lockdown, we believe that the exogenous nature of the global pandemic provide clear insights into how a change in the availability of a traditional channels affects supply and demand through alternative digital channels. In general, all our analysis compares outcomes post-lockdown with outcomes pre-lockdown. We provide each model specification at the appropriate point in the following section.

---

⁴ https://static.texastribune.org/media/files/ed4763065cc11702a343bbaa3e67570b/Dallas%20County%20Shelter%20In%20Place.pdf?ga=2.204951833.80763332.1590860856-1233562438.1590098631
⁵ https://www.miamigov.com/Notices/News-Media/City-of-Miami-Orders-Residents-to-Shelter-in-Place
⁸ For example, if such a set of control cities existed, we could use a difference-in-differences identification strategy to evaluate the causal impact of restaurant closure by comparing trends from the pre-period to the post-period for treatment vs. control cities.
Before proceedings to our main results, we first provide model-free evidence aligned with the demand-side and supply-side shocks discussed in the introductory section. First, as illustrated in Figure 3, following the lockdown, all five cities experienced an increase in the total number of Uber Eats orders placed across all restaurants. The average total number of orders per day was significantly higher in the post-lockdown period across all cities except New York City, with the highest difference in San Francisco (51.2%, $p < 0.01$) and the lowest difference in New York City (3.1%, $p = 0.27$).

What is especially interesting is that these increases in total daily orders have occurred despite widespread restaurant shutdowns and cutbacks on operating hours. Many restaurants have shuttered entirely, either temporarily or permanently. Of those that remain, many have cut back on the number of hours they operate because of the dramatic decrease in on-site dining activity. As illustrated by Figure 4, following the lockdown, all five cities witnessed a substantial reduction in both the number of restaurants open for business on the platform (Panel A) and the average number of supply hours (Panel B).
When we say that a restaurant “offers supply hours,” we mean that the restaurant indicated to the Uber Eats platform at some point during the day that it was available to take orders. Restaurants have the ability to mark themselves as available or unavailable to order from on the Uber Eats platform; the platform then logs data on the windows of available time. We quantify the windows of time that a restaurant indicates availability in this manner by measuring, for each restaurant on each day, its number of *supply hours*. For example, on a given day, if a restaurant indicates availability between 12:00pm and 4:30pm and then again between 6:30pm and 10:00pm, this corresponds to the restaurant having eight supply hours on that day.

The decrease in the number of restaurants open for delivery was greatest in New York City (38%, p<0.01) and most modest in San Francisco (7%, t-stat = 6.25, p < 0.01). The decrease in the number of supply hours from restaurants that remained open was fairly consistent across all cities (ranging from -6.2% to –9.0%). Thus, the net drop in supply is quite profound across cities, and perhaps most dramatic in New York City, where the total daily supply hours post-shutdown is, on average, at barely half the pre-shutdown level. There are many factors that could be causing this precipitous drop, including restaurants ceasing operations (either temporarily or permanently), and those that remain open for take-out and delivery cutting back on operating hours because of the loss of dine-in customers. A comparison between Figure 4, Panel A and Figure 4, Panel B indicates that both these factors are at play. In NYC, it appears that the supply squeeze is driven largely by restaurants closing down, while in SF, it appears that cutbacks in operating hours accounts for most of the decline in supply.

In combination, these supply-side effects indicate a very substantial decrease in the effective total daily number of supply hours in a city. As illustrated in Figure 5, with the sustained increase in ordering through the platform, this has resulted in a dramatic increase in order velocity (number of orders fulfilled per available supply hour) across all five cities.
Figure 4: Supply-Side Response to COVID-19 Pandemic on the Uber Eats Platform

A. Number of Open Restaurants.

B. Average Daily Supply Hours for Open Restaurants.

Note: In Panel A, the dotted curves plot the average number of restaurants that offer at least one hour of supply on the Uber Eats platform on any given day. In Panel B, the dotted curves plot the average number of daily supply hours per restaurant, only counting restaurants that offer supply on the Uber Eats platform on any given day. In both charts, the solid horizontal lines depict the average in the pre-lockdown and post-lockdown windows. The differences in pre-lockdown and post-lockdown averages are statistically significant in each of our cities.
Figure 5: Changes in Order Velocity on the Uber Eats Platform in Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic

Note: The dotted curves plot the daily number of orders/supply hour (normalized velocity) fulfilled by restaurants between February 1 and May 1 across our five cities, normalized in a way that makes the average pre-lockdown value equal to 1. The solid horizontal lines depict the average normalized velocity in the pre-lockdown and post-lockdown time windows. The differences in averages pre-lockdown and post-lockdown values are statistically significant in each of our cities.

Put differently, the simultaneous increases in demand and decreases in supply have dramatically raised the rate at which active restaurants are receiving and fulfilling orders post-pandemic. The velocity increases are most dramatic in New York City and Dallas, where on average, restaurants that were still operating post-lockdown have more than doubled the number of orders they are fulfilling per available hour, but are by no means small in other cities: close to double in San Francisco, 71% higher in Miami and 69% higher in Atlanta.

Finally, we investigate the overall relationship between supply and demand, that is, the number of restaurants offering supply in a city on any given day, and the total number of order placed in that city on that day. This is summarized in Figure 6. Not surprisingly, an increase in supply is correlated with a net expansion in demand. While this is clearly positive for the platform, the impacts of supply expansion on the providers is not immediately clear, and we explore its competitive effects towards the end of Section 4.
4. MODEL AND RESULTS

Our model-free analysis reveals significant increases in total transaction activity coupled with a fairly dramatic change in the supply landscape. The analysis that follows aims to better understand restaurant-level impacts, towards unpacking the effects that the availability of the digital channel has on SMB restaurants. We quantify this impact by focusing on one key dependent variable—*the daily number of orders received by a restaurant*. While acknowledging that daily revenue would have been an informative metric, confidentiality concerns precluded the analysis of this measure.

4.1 Baseline model: Impact of lockdown on digital orders

Our first model assumes the following form:

\[ Y_{it} = \beta_1 Post_{it} + Restaurant \ FE_{i} + Day \ of \ Week \ FE_{t} + \epsilon \]  
(1)

In this equation, \(i\) indexes the restaurant and \(t\) indexes the date. \(Y\) is the count of orders a restaurant receives in a day, our dependent variable, and \(Post\) is the main independent variable which indicates whether or not the city has enacted a shelter-in-place order on a given day. \(Post\) is equal to zero on all pre-lockdown days and is equal to one in all post-lockdown days.
Table 2: Regression Estimate of the Change in Daily Restaurant Orders on the Uber Eats Platform in Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily orders (1)</th>
<th>Daily orders (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0.115***</td>
<td>0.429***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day of Week FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>2,741,977</td>
<td>1,874,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Std. Error</td>
<td>1.195</td>
<td>1.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table presents regression results that assess the impact of shutdown orders on daily order counts on the Uber Eats platform. The variable Post takes the value 0 for all observations February 1 through the declaration of shelter-in-place guidance in a given city, and the value 1 for all observations following the declaration of shelter-in-place guidance through May 1. The data set in Column 1 is a balanced panel consisting of all restaurants that offered supply on at least one day between February 1 through May 1. The data set in Column 2 is an unbalanced panel consisting of only those restaurant-days for which the restaurant offered positive supply on that day. The dependent variable is scaled by the within-city pre-period mean. Both regressions use fixed effects to control for unobserved heterogeneity by restaurant and by day-of-week.

To account for restaurant-specific heterogeneity that may drive our result (including restaurant popularity, cuisine, and the choice of whether or not to remain open for delivery following the shelter-in-place order) we include restaurant fixed effects. We also include day-of-week fixed effects to account for any cyclical variation in order density.

In Table 2, we present results from the regression analysis examining the effect of the shelter-in-place orders and subsequent dine-in restaurant shutdown on orders on the Uber Eats platform. In Column 1, the sample includes all restaurants that offered some positive level of supply (availability to take orders) on Uber Eats platform in the pre-lockdown or post-lockdown period. In Column 2, we focus on days on which a restaurant remains active on Uber Eats and display results for a sample of all restaurant-days for which a restaurant offers supply on the Uber Eats platform.

In both samples, we find that restaurants receive significantly more orders in the post-period than in the pre-period, even controlling for restaurant and day-of-week fixed effects. In Column 1, in
the sample of all restaurants that offered supply in either the pre- or post-period, we find that restaurants on average received 11.4 percent more orders a day in the post-period relative to the pre-period ($p<0.01$). In Column 2, using the sample that only contains restaurant-days for which a restaurant offers supply, this effect is much larger, and we find that restaurants that offer supply on a given day receive 42.9 percent more orders a day in the post-period ($p<0.01$).

The difference in effect size across the two samples is because the sample used in Column 1 continues to include, post-lockdown, restaurants that were active prior to the declaration of shelter-in-place guidance but may have shut down online ordering (or shut down entirely) after following the shutdown. Thus, a number of restaurants in this sample have zero daily orders for all or most of the post-lockdown time window. We explore the competitive implications of these supply-side changes later in the paper, and in what follows, focus exclusively on the latter sample, since our primary interest is in restaurant-level impacts.

We next consider heterogeneity in this effect across our five cities. We interact the post-shutdown indicator with a binary variable for each city to calculate a city-specific effect. For this analysis, we focus purely on restaurants offering supply on a given day, and use the sample comprising only restaurant-days for which a restaurant offers supply on the Uber Eats platform (the same data used in Table 2, Column 2). The results of this analysis are presented in Table 3.

Combining the baseline post-effect with the interaction effect for each city in Table 3 allows us to separately identify how the average count of orders per restaurant changes across cities in the post-period. Figure 7 illustrates these results of Table 3 further, depicting the city-specific marginal effects within each city during the pre-period.

As illustrated, restaurants in San Francisco have seen the highest percentage increase in average daily orders. A restaurant in San Francisco that continues to offer supply on the Uber Eats platform following shelter-in-place guidance and was getting 10 orders a day on average prior to March 16 would be, on average, receiving 16 orders a day post-shelter-in-place guidance (the marginal effect is a 59.6 percent increase, significant at $p<0.01$). Similarly, Dallas restaurants that remained open and available on the platform have seen average increases of 52.0 percent and NYC restaurants see an effect of about 45.5 percent. Restaurants in Miami have seen the smallest increase (21.2 percent), however, the measured effect is statistically and economically significant (at $p<0.01$) across all cities.
Table 3: Regression Estimate of the City-Specific Change in Daily Restaurant Orders on the Uber Eats Platform in Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dependent variable: Daily orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0.109***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post X Dallas</td>
<td>0.092***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post X Miami</td>
<td>−0.072***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post X New York City</td>
<td>−0.141***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post X San Francisco</td>
<td>0.258***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day of Week FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>2,741,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Std. Error</td>
<td>1.193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table presents regression results that assess the variation across cities in the impact of shutdown orders on daily order counts on the Uber Eats platform. The variable Post takes the value 0 for all observations February 1 through the declaration of shelter-in-place guidance in a given city, and the value 1 for all observations following the declaration of shelter-in-place guidance through May 1. The Post variable is interacted with an indicator variable for each city to construct a city-specific effect. The data set is an unbalanced panel consisting of only those restaurant-days for which the restaurant offered positive supply on that day. The dependent variable is scaled by the within-city pre-period mean. Both regressions use fixed effects to control for unobserved heterogeneity by restaurant and by day-of-week.
The changes we document in Uber Eats ordering activity may be due to a number of reasons. The absence of dine-in options may shift demand towards the online channel; variability in the availability of groceries and fears of going to a grocery store may induce consumers to order in rather than cook themselves. In contrast, an increase in the hours people have been spending at home coupled with health concerns associated with food prepared and delivered by people outside their homes could induce an increased propensity and ability to prepare one’s own meals; the lack of availability from one’s favorite restaurants on the platform could add to this negative demand effect. Our evidence indicates that, in the aggregate, these and other negative demand effects are significantly outweighed by the positive.

4.2 Supply Squeeze and Competitive Effects

The changes in restaurant supply on the platform is likely to influence whether and how a restaurant experiences the demand shock caused by the current pandemic. Restaurants may see
particularly large increases in demand and orders if their direct competitors are unable to stay open or provide less supply.

In traditional markets, entry or expansion by new firms is generally associated with an increase in competition and profit erosion of incumbent firms (e.g., Porter, 1979). However, digital platform markets, such as the Uber Eats platform, are characterized by indirect network effects as a higher number of providers increase platform activity (Katz and Shapiro, 1985; Rochet and Tirole, 2003; Weyl, 2010), which may benefit providers in the market even as competition on the platform increases. A small but growing body of literature has attempted to identify competitive dynamics in digital channels by examining the effects of competitor entry or expansion on incumbent performance. Considering competition between providers on the Yelp! Transactions Platform, Reshef (2019) finds that entry of new firms increases incumbent performance, especially for high-quality incumbents. Similarly, in the video game industry, Haviv et al. (2019) find evidence that an increase in sales of platform-exclusive games increases the performance of games in other genres on the platform. However, different business models across platforms may shape these effects extant research has yet to explore how a contraction in competitor supply, such as the one witnessed in our empirical setting, may affect demand.

We next analyze how restaurant supply hours and competitive conditions influence the effect of the COVID-19 induced demand shock. To assess the potential moderating effect of competition in determining whether and how the closure of dine-in restaurants affects restaurant performance on the Uber Eats platform, we first must create a measure of competition. We define each restaurant’s competitive set as the other restaurants within the same primary cuisine categorization within the city that also provide supply on the Uber Eats platform at some time between February 1, 2020 and May 1, 2020. Our measure of competition is the percent of restaurants within a category that are open on a given day. A higher value in this measure suggests that a consumer would have more options on the Uber Eats platform to choose from within that cuisine category. Figure 8 displays the distribution of the city-cuisine-day-level competition index pooled across all sample cities. We see the highest density of the index above 75%.
We use a model of the following form to estimate the role of competition in determining the effect of the COVID shock on restaurant performance:

\[ Y_{it} = \beta_1 \text{Post}_{it} + \beta_2 \text{Competition Index}_{it} + \beta_3 \text{Post}_{it} \times \text{Competition Index}_{it} + \text{Restaurant FE}_i + \text{Day of Week FE}_t + \epsilon \]  

(2)

By interacting the measure of competition with the post indicator variable, we can identify how the level of competition on a given day moderates the effect of dine-in restaurant closure on restaurant performance on the Uber Eats. By comparing the effect of our competition indicator in the pre- vs. post-period, we can identify whether and how the relative supply of peer restaurants and competitors affects the increase in restaurant demand. Our results are presented in Table 4 below.
Table 4: Regression Estimate of the Effect of Competition on Daily Orders on the Uber Eats Platform in Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily orders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0.288***</td>
<td>0.372***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet Index</td>
<td>-0.594***</td>
<td>-0.524***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.056)</td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post X Pet Index</td>
<td>-0.114**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.058)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>1,874,748</td>
<td>1,874,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>0.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Std. Error</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table presents regression results that assess the effect of competition on order counts on the Uber Eats platform pre- and post-shelter-in-place guidance due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The variable Post takes the value 0 for all observations February 1 through the declaration of shelter-in-place guidance in a given city, and the value 1 for all observations following the declaration of shelter-in-place guidance through May 1. The Percent Index variable measures the percent of sample restaurants within a given restaurant’s cuisine category that are open on a given day. The Post variable and the Percent Index variable are interacted to construct a pre- and post-period effect of competition. The data set is an unbalanced panel consisting of only those restaurant-days for which the restaurant offered positive supply on that day. The dependent variable is scaled by the within-city pre-period mean. Both regressions use fixed effects to control for unobserved heterogeneity by restaurant and by day-of-week.

The results indicate that predictably, competition has a negative effect in both the pre- and post-period. However, the effects of competition are stronger in the post-period. In Column 2, our results suggest that a ten percent increase in the number of restaurants open within a cuisine category decreases the orders a restaurant receives by 5.14% in the pre-period (at \( p<0.01 \)), while the equivalent increase in the number of restaurants open within a cuisine category would decrease the count of orders a restaurant receives by 6.35% (at \( p<0.01 \)). To illustrate this difference, in Figure 9, we chart the effects of competition in the pre- and post-period.
Figure 9: Effect of Competition on Daily Orders on the Uber Eats Platform in Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic

Note: The figure displays the effect of competition on daily restaurant orders pre- and post-shelter-in-place guidance. Competition as measured as the percent of sample restaurants within a cuisine category that are offer supply on the Uber Eats platform on a given day. The y-axis measures the percent change in daily orders, and the zero value of the y-axis represents the count of orders that a restaurant would receive in the pre-period with no competition. Estimates are derived from the regression results presented in Table 4.

Figure 9 illustrates that the increase in orders associated with the post-period differs depending on the level of competition within a cuisine category. For example, if twenty-five percent of restaurants are open within a cuisine category in both the pre- and post-period, per-restaurant daily order levels grow by 34.88% post-shelter-in-place guidance compared to pre-shelter-in-place guidance. On the other hand, if seventy-five percent of restaurants are open within a cuisine category in both the pre- and post-period, per-restaurant daily order levels grow by 28.82% in the post- vs. pre-period. The increase in orders received thus reflects changes both to restaurant supply (i.e., competition) as well as consumer demand for delivery.

These results suggest an interesting contrast between what is best for the platform and what is best for providers on the platform. As shown in Figure 6, the more restaurants that are on the platform, the greater total consumer activity on the platform is. However, as demonstrated in Table 4, it is clear that more competition on the platform appear to decrease the count of orders each restaurant can expect to receive. An open question regards whether this substitution across competition may be offset over longer periods of time by indirect network effects if a greater number of providers brings more consumers to the platform. Nevertheless, digital platforms must
navigate this tension in attempting to manage both the consumer and supplier-side of the platform, and this represents a promising area for future work.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS
As the COVID-induced lockdown of Spring 2020 winds down, “business-as-usual” has been transformed. In particular, there is likely to be a significant and permanent shift away from in-person commerce and towards digital interaction. The impacts have been across sectors---the apparel and accessories stores experienced a year-over-year decline of 89.3% in April 2020, which while understandable given shelter-in-place and people working from home, is still staggering, perhaps the biggest YoY decline in any sector ever, and an inflection point that signals the future dominance of ecommerce in this sector.

While numerous restaurants have already closed their doors for good, those that emerge from the shutdown will be the ones which were able to best leverage digital channels. The connection between platform-sourced demand and survival will be indelible, likely leading the survivors to double down on digital, seeing it as a critical source of resilience. Because of social distancing, enhanced cleaning protocols, and consumer hesitancy, the costs of dine-in will increase significantly, making a digital channel all but essential for restaurant survival.

All of these factors point to the heightened importance of platforms like Uber Eats in the economy of the future. Our findings provide insight into the details and dynamics of the role that such platforms play in mitigating the adverse effects of negative economic shocks, underscoring the risks associated with policy that may curtail their growth or reach, while also shedding new light on the different economic factors at play when a business sells through a platform.

We are currently analyzing heterogeneity in restaurant impacts following the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic---how performance on the platform prior to the onset of the pandemic moderates the shock, and whether there is a “long tail” effect that amplifies benefits to niche or less popular restaurants. Longer term, unpacking the relative impacts of the supply-side and demand-side shocks that we have documented, perhaps as part of a more detailed modeling exercise, represents an interesting direction for deeper analysis.
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