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Abstract
On-demand ridepooling (ODRP) can become a powerful alternative to reduce congestion and emissions, if it attracts private car users rather than from public transport. Therefore, it is crucial to identify the strategic phenomena that determine when ODRP systems can run efficiently, and understand when they could be integrated into a public transport network. In this paper, we analyze the performance of an ODRP system operated in a zone covered by a single public transport line. The fleet of low-capacity vehicles is endogenously adapted to the demand. Considering both users’ and operators’ costs, we identify two sources of scale economies: when demand grows, average cost is reduced due to an equivalent of the Mohring Effect (that is present in public transport), and due to matching the users in more compatible groups when they are assigned to the vehicles, which we call Better-matching Effect. A counter-balance force, called Flex-route Effect, is observed when the vehicle loads increase and users face longer detours. We find a specific demand range in which this last effect dominates the others, imposing diseconomies of scale when only users’ costs are considered. Such a phenomenon is not observed in public transport systems based on fixed routes. However, when considering both users’ and operators’ costs, scale economies prevail.

We compare the ODRP results against public transport, for a feeder line and a circular line with homogeneous demand. We show that ODRP is more competitive when users share a common destination (the feeder line) and when the demand is low, although scale effects suggest that ODRP can also play a role when the demand is high. Relaxing door-to-door vehicle requirements to allow short walks, is shown to be crucial for ODRP to become a viable alternative for both human-driven and automated vehicles, if the ODRP must serve all requests.
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1. Introduction
Transport systems are facing profound transformations worldwide thanks to the ability to connect vehicles and large numbers of passengers on-demand. After some five years of their arrival, several studies have shown that transportation network companies (TNCs) have increased traffic and congestion without reducing vehicle ownership (Diao et al., 2021; Henao & Marshall, 2019; Roy et al., 2020; Tirachini & Gomez-Lobo, 2020; Ward et al., 2021; Wu & MacKenzie, 2021). This
situation has fostered the study and implementation of on-demand ridepooling (ODRP) services, in which different users simultaneously share a vehicle when their routes are compatible.

ODRP systems have the potential of facing congestion because they might reduce the required fleet significantly when compared to the non-pooled versions, as shown by several previous studies (Alonso-Mora et al., 2017; Fagnant & Kockelman, 2018; Santi et al., 2014). However, the respective analyses are based on comparing the number of vehicles needed to serve a fixed demand, which might be troublesome as it might not be that both systems attract the same users. In fact, recent papers suggest that the ability of ODRP to reduce congestion depends on reaching some advantageous scenarios (Ke et al., 2020; Tirachini et al., 2020): combining an efficient fleet operation with an ability to attract passengers from private modes rather than from public transport. This last issue can be addressed by integrating the ODRP system into the city’s public transport network, an idea that has recently begun to be studied by scholars, as we explain in Section 2.3 when revising related works. Further, previous simulation-based studies have shown that traditional mass transit is irreplaceable in the struggle against congestion (Basu et al., 2018, Leich & Bischoff, 2019).

If one aims at finding efficient ways to integrate ODRP with traditional public transport, some strategic decisions arise. Relevant examples are if the ODRP services should replace some specific lines or operate all over the system, if they should serve only the first-and-last-miles or full trips as well, and if it is better to use them in low-demand or high-demand areas. These strategic questions require a deeper understanding of the operation and the virtues of ODRP systems, as well as sound ways to compare their performance with traditional public transport.

However, this is not an easy task, because the operation of such systems is usually quite complex due to the enormous amount of feasible combinations to match travelers and vehicles. Moreover, two NP-Hard problems are involved: Dial-A-Ride and Vehicle-Routing-Problem. Operating on-demand implies that decisions must be made with partial information, meaning that an assignment that seems efficient when making a decision might become sub-optimal when new requests appear. Such a challenge needs to be faced with specific algorithms that may yield different strategic results. For instance, a relevant difference is the one between event-based and batch-based methods: the former (followed by Bischoff et al., 2017, d’Orey et al., 2012, Fagnant & Kockelman, 2018, Hosni et al., 2014, Ma et al., 2013, Ota et al., 2016, van Engelen et al., 2018, among others) decides how to assign a request as soon as it appears, whereas the latter (followed by Alonso-Mora et al., 2017, Chen et al., 2017, Lotfi et al., 2019, Riley et al., 2019, Shen et al., 2019, Simonetto et al., 2019, among others) accumulates requests (either for a given period or until enough requests appear) of time and then decides how to assign them all at once.

The mentioned difference can affect scale effects, as accumulating several requests might enable finding better combinations. It is also important how to deal with such batches of requests. For instance, Li & Quadrifoglio (2010) study a last-mile service that dispatches vehicles one after another as soon as they get enough users. When doing so, scale effects are not triggered at all, because users are not grouped according to their destinations.
In this paper, we use an extended version of the so-called “single-line model” to study sources of economies and diseconomies of scale when operating ODRP, and we use the same model to determine which contexts favor the utilization of ODRP systems rather than traditional public transport. The traditional single-line model, that analyzes one transit line as if it was isolated from the rest of the system, has been extensively used by researchers across decades to analyze structural aspects of public transport design. Its usefulness resides in being simple, as it permits studying the impact of the demand conditions (or other parameters) over the mobility system under scrutiny, excluding the spatial distribution. By this means, the demand can be represented by a single variable (or a few of them), which makes this model quite precise for scale analysis.

The single-line model has a relevant limitation when studying on-demand systems, which require that the vehicles’ routes are not defined a priori but adapted to the emerging users. Such a feature cannot be captured in a single-line model in which there is only one possible route. This limitation might influence scale analysis, as one aspect to study is the evolution of the routes with scale. This is why we extend the single-line model, so that we keep most of its simplifying aspects, but yet enabling different routes to be followed depending on the passengers.

In our setting we have another issue that arises when analysing scale for on-demand systems: which fleet to use. Most models that simulate ODRP assume a given fleet (as we describe further in Section 2.1). However, a proper scale analysis requires that the fleet is actually optimized, which is troublesome because the total fleet cannot be changed on-demand (although the operative fleet can be optimized). Here we propose a method that permits computing the fleet together with the assignment decisions, which is interpreted as a posteriori, i.e., which fleet should have been used to serve the demand?

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 revises relevant previous studies and states the main contributions of this paper. Section 3 explains the methodology that we use to compute the ODRP system’s fleet, to expand the single-line model and to compare ODRP against public transport. Section 4 shows the results of the numerical simulations. The most relevant qualitative conclusions regarding scale effects and the circumstances that favor the use of ODRP are described in Section 5. Finally, Section 6 concludes and proposes some directions for further research.

2. Related works

2.1 Fleet sizing in on-demand ridepooling systems

Deciding which fleet to use in an ODRP system is not an easy task. Contrary to public transport, the routes cannot be known in advance, so the usual techniques dealing with cycle times and desired frequencies cannot be applied here. Such difficulties have been faced with different approaches that we now describe.
The most usual approach is to work with fleets of fixed size. In order to determine which one is optimal, or at least gain some intuition about that, it is habitual to repeat the same numerical experiments with different fleet sizes to analyze which size responds better to a given demand (Alonso-Mora et al., 2017, Levin et al., 2017, Lokhandwala & Cai, 2018, Wang et al., 2018). Other studies seek the minimal fleet able to meet some exogenous conditions on the quality of service. Daganzo & Ouyang (2019) and Martinez & Viegas (2017) require to serve all the demand, although the latter also compare the results obtained with larger fleets. Spieser et al. (2014) consider bounds on the number of passengers waiting to be served, and Fagnant & Kockelman (2018) aim at fulfilling some predefined waiting times.

Alternative rules to analyze fleet size in ONRP include the proposals of Santos & Xavier (2015), who assume that the number of vehicles has to be proportional to the number of requests; Pinto et al. (2020), who assume the availability of a budget, shared with public transport, that has to be respected; and Fielbaum (2020), who makes a weighted optimization between users’ and operators’ costs under simplifying assumptions that lead to the prediction of exact fleet sizes.

It is worth mentioning that our techniques for fleet sizing are inspired by Cap et al. (2021), who optimize the fleet together with the assignment decisions between vehicles and batches of users. The main difference is that once a group is created, they assume that it has to be wholly served before updating the vehicle’s route, so that the main question is how to chain different groups to reduce the number of required vehicles. Such an approach extends the study by Vazifeh et al. (2018), who optimizes the fleet for a non-shared on-demand system. In both studies the fleet is computed as if the demand was known, an approach that we also follow here.

2.2 The single-line model for public transport analysis

The single-line model refers to analyzing public transport systems by considering a line as isolated from the rest of the system. We now describe the scale effects that have been identified using this model. Most of such effects have been shown to remain valid for each line when a network is considered (Fielbaum et al., 2020a).

The stream of studies based on the single-line model was pioneered by Mohring (1972), who identified one of the main sources of scale economies in public transport (now known as the “Mohring Effect”): more passengers require more buses, which increases the service frequency and diminishes waiting times for everybody. His model was later extended by Jansson (1980) to consider optimal bus capacities and time at stops, where a source of diseconomies of scale emerges, namely that an increase in the number of users yields the utilization of larger buses, making users to spend more time waiting for other passengers to board and alight (an effect that can be compensated by changing the number of doors per vehicle as explained in the next paragraph). Evans & Morrison (1997) discovered yet another source of scale economies with an extension of this model: an increase in the number of users allows to spend more resources in preventing accidents and disruptions in the service. These consecutive advances have been surveyed and expanded by Jara-Díaz & Gschwender (2003).
The single-line model has been used with other purposes (different than scale analysis) as well. Jara-Díaz et al. (2017, 2020) have studied the impact of accounting for two different periods in the optimal design of the frequencies and fleets for a single line; Hörcher & Graham (2018) have focused on a spatially unbalanced line; Basso et al. (2020) have studied the evolution of the urban structure surrounding a single line; Oldfield & Bly (1988) analyzed the optimal bus size; Jara-Díaz & Tirachini (2013) studied the optimal payment technology and number of doors per vehicle; and Tirachini & Antoniou (2020) analyzed the impact of utilizing automated vehicles in a public transport line. Finally, on a similar note, a sort-of single-model has also been used to study optimal spacing between parallel lines, by replicating the single line several times in space (Fielbaum et al., 2020b, Kocur & Hendrickson, 1982, Chang & Schonfeld, 1991). These topics are discussed at length by Hörcher & Tirachini (2021). As such, variations of the single-line model have been used for decades and are still used nowadays to improve our understanding of the structural aspects of public transport design.

2.3 Integrating ridepooling and public transport

The potential of a system that integrates ODRP services with traditional public transport lines has been acknowledged by several researchers in the past few years, although there is still no systematic way to model such an integrated system. Several authors assume an integration that is achieved by a feeder-trunk structure, in which the ODRP systems serve as the feeder (Banerjee et al., 2021, Chen & Nie, 2017, Chen et al., 2020, Fielbaum, 2020, Wen et al., 2018) or replacing traditional public transport lines in low-demand areas (Basciftci & Van Hentenryck, 2021, Kim & Schonfeld, 2014, Mahéo et al., 2017, Pinto et al., 2020, Shen et al., 2018). Also studying feeder systems, Mo et al. (2021) study what happens when ODRP and public transport compete rather than collaborate, while Fielbaum (2020) argues that if users do not share a common destination, the system design becomes inefficient due to the difficulty of finding passengers whose routes are compatible.

The intuition of utilizing flexible services when demand is low seems correct, as studied by some authors that compare fixed and flexible lines. Badia & Jenelius (2020), as well as Papanikolaou & Basbas (2020), have rested on specific functional forms that approximate the ODRP systems, finding that they should be preferred not only when the demand is low but also when the areas to be served are small, and trips are short. Li & Quadrifoglio (2010) and Quadrifoglio & Li (2009) use continuous approximation models and identify the discomfort of walking as another relevant parameter that determines which type of system should be preferred. Finally, Calabrò et al. (2021) use microsimulation to find that flexible services are better in rural areas.

It should be noted that all these models assume that the flexible systems provide door-to-door service (or station-to-door, when it is solving the last-mile problem), which is a common assumption as most real-life on-demand systems operate in that way. However, operating door-to-door is not mandatory for this type of system. Actually, previous research has consistently shown that requesting some users to walk either to personalized pick-up and drop-off points (Fielbaum, 2021, Fielbaum et al., 2021) or to group meeting points (Li et al., 2016, Li et al., 2018, Stiglic et al., 2015) can enhance ODRP services significantly. Such ideas are already applied in real
life: the shared-mobility platform Jetty in Mexico City asks passengers to be at specific pick-up points to be able to board a shared car or van; and users can monitor the location of the vehicle in real time before boarding (Tirachini et al., 2020).

2.4 Contributions of this paper

The contributions of this paper are threefold:

1. We identify new sources of scale economies and diseconomies in ODRP systems that enlighten the potential and obstacles that need to be overcome for ODRP to succeed. This is our main contribution.
2. We distinguish which circumstances favor the use of ODRP to replace traditional public transport lines.
3. We propose how the fleet size in ODRP can be computed together with the assignment decisions, which can be utilized for other types of analysis beyond the objectives of this paper.

3. Methodology

3.1 On-demand computation of the fleet of the ODRP system

In this paper, we build upon the ODRP model proposed by Fielbaum et al. (2021), which in turn extends the model by Alonso-Mora et al. (2017) by optimizing the pick-up and drop-off points, which might differ from the actual origins and destinations of the users when asking them to walk increases overall efficiency. Both models determine how to operate a fixed fleet of vehicles to serve the emerging requests. We extend these works by computing the fleet endogenously. We first explain briefly how the original methods work, and then describe this extension.

The ODRP system operates over a directed graph $G = (N,A)$. Each request $r = (o_r,d_r,t_r)$ is a triplet, representing the origin, the destination, and the time in which the trip is requested. Both the origins and the destinations are assumed to be placed over the nodes of the graph. The assignment model works using a *receding horizon* approach, meaning that it accumulates the requests that emerge during a fixed amount of time $\delta$ (i.e., they are batch-based) and assigns them all at once, which updates each vehicle’s route. When such an assignment is decided, the vehicles follow their updated routes, and the system begins to accumulate requests for a time $\delta$ again, starting a new iteration.

Let us focus now on a single iteration, denoting by $R$ the set of requests to be assigned, and by $V$ the current state of the fleet of vehicles. Each vehicle is characterized by its position $P_v$ and the set of requests assigned to it $S_v$ (either in the vehicle or waiting for it). The assignment between $R$ and $V$ takes place following these three steps:

- Determine which are the feasible trips. A trip $T$ is defined by a group of requests $req(T) \subseteq R$ and a vehicle $veh(T)$, so that $T$ is feasible if the requests in $req(T)$ can be
transported together by \( \text{veh}(T) \), respecting some bounds on waiting and walking times, and on total delay (denoted, respectively, \( \Omega_w, \Omega_o \), and \( \Omega_d \)). Such bounds affect users in \( \text{req}(T) \) and in \( \text{veh}(T) \). The delay is defined as the extra time faced by a user compared to beginning her trip immediately, with no walking and following the shortest path between her origin and destination. Each trip \( T \) might be served by more than one route so that taking the route \( \pi \) imposes a cost to the system given by Eq. (1):

\[
\text{cost}(T, \pi) = \sum_{r \in \text{req}(T)} c_U(r, T, \pi) + \sum_{r \in \text{veh}(T)} \Delta c_U(r, T, \pi) + \Delta c_O(\pi)
\]

(1)

Where the first term represents the users’ costs for passengers in trip \( T \), defined as a weighted sum between waiting, walking, and in-vehicle times; the second term represents the extra costs induced to the users that were being served by the vehicle prior to this assignment (because their waiting and in-vehicle times can increase); and the third term expresses the increase in operational costs, that are assumed to be proportional to the route length. The route that offers the minimum cost is selected, so that the trip \( T \) is characterized by a single figure \( \text{cost}(T) \).

It is worth commenting that computing all the feasible trips can be computationally expensive, because their amount can increase exponentially with the number of requests. Such an issue is faced first by making a smart search of the feasible trips (using that if vehicle \( w \) is able to serve group \( G \), then it must be true that \( w \) can serve every subset of \( G \) as well), and also by using a number of heuristics, explained in detail by Fielbaum et al. (2021), to compute the sequence in which the users are served and the pick-up and drop-off points.

- Once the set \( \Gamma \) of potential trips is known with their respective costs, some of them are selected and constitute the actual assignment. To do this, an Integer Linear Programing (ILP) problem defined by Eqs. (2)-(4) is solved:

\[
\min_{x, z \in \{0,1\}} \sum_{T \in \Gamma} x_T \text{cost}(T) + \sum_{r \in R} p_{KO} z_r
\]

(2)

s.t. \( z_r + \sum_{T: r \in \text{req}(T)} x_T = 1 \ \forall r \in R \)

(3)

\[
\sum_{T: \text{veh}(T) = v} x_T \leq 1 \ \forall v \in V
\]

(4)

Binary variables \( x_T \) represent the trips that are going to be executed (marked by \( x_T = 1 \)). It is not always possible to serve all the trips (the number of vehicles might not be enough), so rejected requests are marked by \( z_r = 1 \). Each rejected request imposes a penalty \( p_{KO} \) to the system, so Eq. (2) is the objective function to be minimized when deciding the assignment.
Eq. (3) ensures that each request is either rejected or belongs to a trip that is going to be executed, while Eq. (4) ensures that each vehicle is assigned to no more than one trip.

- Finally, a rebalancing step instructs idle vehicles (i.e., those with no requests before the assignment and did not receive anyone here) to move to certain areas where more vehicles are needed. We do not explain the details here because we do not use such a procedure in this paper. We do execute a simple rebalancing step when modeling a feeder model, which we explain in Section 3.2.

In this paper, we extend this model to decide which fleet to use together with the vehicle and user assignments. To do so, we assume that the system begins with no vehicles, and that there are some spots in the city (which is a set of nodes \( M \subset N \)) where potential vehicles are placed. At each iteration (i.e., each time a batch of requests is assigned), the fleet of vehicles is composed of two sets: the one inherited from the previous iteration, plus a set containing one non-activated vehicle per request \( r \in R \), that is located in the node in \( M \) that is closest to its origin \( o_r \). If a non-activated vehicle is assigned to a group of requests, an activation cost \( c_A \) has to be paid, and the vehicle becomes available for the rest of the period of operation without paying \( c_A \) again. This is formalized by altering the cost of the trips. Denoting by \( A(v) = 1 \) if vehicle \( v \) is activated (i.e., inherited from a past iteration) and \( A(v) = 0 \) if not, Eq. (1) is modified to build the new cost function \( cost_A(T) \), given by

\[
    cost_A(T) = cost(T) + c_A \cdot [1 - A(veh(T))]
\]

These potential vehicles are interpreted as optimizing \textit{a posteriori}, and \( c_A \) should include all the costs that do not depend on the distance driven by the vehicle, such as capital costs. The fleet optimization cannot be done online, so optimizing \textit{a posteriori} (i.e., as we knew all the requests) is appropriate. In this case, the receding horizon approach is not meant to represent the online optimization, but a way to manage the impossibility (due to its enormous complexity) of assigning the whole set of requests optimally at once. An alternative interpretation is that the fleet of vehicles is actually available, and the activation costs refer to hiring a driver for that day, which would require that \( c_A \) captures only her daily wage.

As we aim at comparing with public transport, we must have zero rejections. As we now have one non-activated vehicle per request, it is always feasible to serve everybody. Therefore, we do not longer include variables \( z_r \) in the ILP to be solved, and we modify Eq. (3) accordingly to ensure that each request belongs to exactly one assigned trip, i.e.

\[
    \sum_{T: r \in req(T)} x_T = 1 \quad \forall r \in R
\]

Finally, we include yet another extension to the base model: we assume that a fixed time \( \tau \) is spent each time the vehicle stops to pick-up or drop-off one or more passengers. We include this fact
because it is relevant when analyzing scale economies, as sometimes the vehicle might use a single stop for more than one pick-up/drop-off, saving some time.

3.2 Extending the single-line model

The traditional single-line model studies the operational characteristics of a public transport vehicle that follows a predefined path, so everything is one-dimensional. Specific versions are:

- The circular model, in which the line tours a circuit that presents the same average number of users at every point. This model represents a line that carries a similar load all along its way.
- The linear model, in which vehicles travel in both directions along a linear corridor between two terminals. A particular case of the linear model is the feeder model, in which users board the vehicle across its path, and they all alight at the end. This model represents a line that goes to some relevant final destination, typically a transit station, to board a high-capacity public transport mode (e.g., rail, Bus Rapid Transit).

In any of these alternatives, the vehicle route is fixed beforehand and always the same. We aim to extend this model, keeping most of its simplifying assumptions that make it a powerful tool, but allowing for online decisions regarding the routes. To do that, we deploy a grid surrounding each bus stop, where exact origins and destinations are situated. In the traditional model, such a grid can be seen as an underlying street pattern, that does not need to be explicit because users need to walk towards the (fixed) bus stops anyhow. In such a case, walking times and distances are assumed exogenous, meaning that the operation and optimization of the public transport line are not affected.

To be precise, we assume that each bus stop belongs to a zone, which is an $a \times b$ grid, with $a, b$ odd numbers, so that the bus stop is located at the center of the grid. The potential vehicles for the ODRP system are also located at the center of the grid (the set $M$ defined above). The central streets of the grid are bidirectional, and vehicles tour them at velocity $v_1$, whereas the rest of the streets are unidirectional\(^1\), with alternate directions and velocity $v_2$, with $v_2 < v_1$. Having streets of different velocities and directions help to capture that not all routes are equally good for the vehicle to follow. The whole network is formed by chaining consecutive zones. If there are $Z$ zones, this makes a $Z \cdot a \times b$ grid in the feeder-trunk model; in the circular model, the same happens, but the last zone is chained with the first one, forming a circular grid. Both networks are depicted in Figure 3.1.

Regarding the demand, we want to keep the homogeneity assumptions from the single-line model but enabling for more complex routes. A constant number of users $Y$ emerge per time unit, and the exact origin is random: we first choose the zone with uniform probability; within that zone, the central node is chosen with probability $p$, the rest of the nodes located in the central streets with probability $p_Y$, and the nodes out of the central streets with probability $p_Y^2$. The parameter $p$ is adjusted to make the sum of the probabilities within every zone equal to 1, and the parameter

\(^1\) In the feeder-trunk model, the first and last transversal streets are also bidirectional so that there are no isolated nodes.
\( \gamma \in (0, 1) \) controls how dispersed the demand is within a zone (the lower the \( \gamma \), the more concentrated the demand in the vicinity of the bus stop). The destination is computed differently depending on the model: in the feeder-trunk, everybody goes to the center of the final zone, whereas in the circular model, the destination zone is located \( l \) zones ahead, plus a random variable that is obtained rounding a normal distribution with mean zero and variance \( \sigma^2 \); the exact destination is found within that zone using the same rules involving \( p \) and \( \gamma \) as for the origin.

\[ T = \frac{Z \cdot a \cdot L}{v_1} \]  

Figure 3.1 Extensions of the single-line model to recreate the network in which the ODRP system operates, replacing either a feeder line (a) or a circular line (b). Origins can be placed in any intersection, and the same happens with destinations in the circular model. In both cases, there are 8 zones, each formed by a 3x5 grid. Red dots represent the stations in which the ODRP vehicles begin their journeys, and also the location of the public transport stops. Dark black streets are bidirectional and can be toured with a higher speed. The traditional single-line model is recovered by considering only the long avenue that connects all the red dots.

We now explain the rebalancing step executed after deciding each assignment in the feeder-trunk model: Each idle vehicle is sent towards the station of the first zone, the one located at the largest distance from the shared destination. Such vehicles will not necessarily arrive there because they will be considered available in the following iterations, meaning that they might receive new passengers before reaching the first zone.

3.3 Public transport model

In order to compare the performance of the ODRP and the public transport systems, we now describe the public transport model we assume, following the classical model by Jansson (1980) and the posterior adaptations by Jara-Díaz & Gschwender (2009). We will describe in detail the circular model only, as the feeder-trunk model can be derived directly. Let us begin introducing some notation: \( T \) refers to the time required by a bus to tour the whole circuit, i.e.
Where \( L \) stands for the length of each arc. We assume that each user requires an average time \( t \) to board and alight the bus. Denoting by \( f \) the line frequency (to be optimized) and by \( Y \) the number of passengers per time unit, then the bus cycle time is:

\[
t_c = T + \frac{NL}{f}
\]  

(8)

To use Eq. (8) to express the operators’ costs, we follow Tirachini & Hensher (2011) and Jara-Díaz et al. (2017) to express both \( c_O \) and \( c_A \) (now read as operating costs per time-unit and capital costs, respectively) as values that grow linearly with the vehicles’ capacity \( K \), i.e.

\[
c_O = c_{O1} + c_{O2}K, \quad c_A = c_{A1} + c_{A2}K
\]

(9)

As the operating time is fixed in the public transport case (buses are operating all the time), Eq. (9) means that each bus cost can be expressed as \( c_1 + c_2K \) (mind that this linear growth with respect to \( K \) is also assumed for ODRP), with \( c_1 = c_{A1} + Ec_{O1}, \ c_2 = c_{A2} + Ec_{O2} \), where \( E \) is the total operation time. Operators’ costs can then be written as:

\[
f(T + \frac{NL}{f})(c_1 + c_2K)
\]

(10)

Users’ costs encompass waiting, in-vehicle, and walking times, as in Eq. (11). They are valued differently by the users, with the respective parameters \( p_w, p_v \), and \( p_a \). Therefore, the public transport costs are calculated by solving the following optimization problem:

\[
\min_{f,K} f(T + \frac{NL}{f})(c_1 + c_2K) + Y(p_w\overline{t_w} + p_v\overline{t_v} + p_a\overline{t_a})
\]

s.t. \( K \geq \frac{Y}{f} \alpha \)

(11)  

(12)

Eq. (11) represents the sum of operators’ and users’ costs. We assume homogeneous headway, vehicles do not run full (passengers can board the first vehicle that arrives) and random user arrivals at constant rates, which imply that the average waiting time is \( \overline{t_w} = f/2 \). Average in-vehicle time \( \overline{t_v} \) can be calculated as we know the average distance traveled by the users; it includes running time plus time spent at stops where other users board and alight. Average walking distance can be computed directly when the random demand is created, by calculating the distances between the real origins and the bus stations of the respective zones, and doing the same for the destinations. Dividing such distances by the walking speed \( v_a \) results in the average walking time \( \overline{t_a} \). Eq. (12) ensures that all users will fit on the bus. As the objective function in Eq. (11) increases with \( K \), this constraint will always be active. Factor \( \alpha \) represents the ratio between the most loaded and the average arc, which can also be computed directly once the random demand is known.
3.4 Comparison

As explained above, the assignment procedure in ODRP imposes predefined bounds on the quality of service, namely maximum waiting ($\Omega_w$) and walking ($\Omega_a$) times, as well as maximum total delay ($\Omega_d$). Defining such bounds is a relevant issue, as it has relevant impacts on the performance of the ODRP system. For instance, if the bounds are too tight and users are too spread, then the system might require to allocate almost one different vehicle per request, leading to a huge fleet; on the other hand, if the bounds are too large (or inexistent), one single vehicle might be able to serve all the requests, but offering an awful (and unrealistic) quality of service.

To make a fair comparison, we adapt the bounds depending on the total number of users. Note that this mimics what passengers usually face: when they want to make a trip on a high-demand corridor, they can rapidly find a bus (or any alternative mode they are using), and the contrary happens in low-demand areas. Thus, we define the bounds to replicate this behaviour, as follows:

- **Waiting**: The maximum waiting time that can be faced in the public transport system occurs when a passenger arrives at the station just after a bus leaves, waiting for $1/f$ (a quantity that decreases with $Y$). Recalling that when a vehicle is activated, it goes from the bus station to the pick-up point, we need to ensure that there is always enough time to wait for such a movement. Denoting by $t_1$ the vehicle-time from the station to the corner of the zone’s grid, we use $\Omega_w = \max\{\frac{1}{f}, t_1\}$.

- **Walking**: The maximum amount of walking in the public transport systems is $t_2$, defined as the walking time between the station and a corner of the zone’s grid, so we use $\Omega_a = t_2$. When we simulate the case in which ODRP offers a door-to-door service, this bound is reduced to zero.

- **Delay**: There are two sources of delay in public transport with respect to the time in vehicle: walking and waiting. The first one should be accounted for twice, at the origin and destination. Therefore, we use $\Omega_d = \max\{\frac{1}{f}, t_1\} + 2t_2$.

All the comparisons shall be made for the circular and the feeder-trunk models. Moreover, we will not impose a door-to-door scheme in the ODRP system, but we will consider that scheme for a sensitivity analysis. Finally, as the impact of automated vehicles might be very different depending on the system (the smaller the vehicles, the more relevant the savings in drivers’ wages), we will also consider both traditional and automated vehicles for the comparisons.

4. Results

We simulate one hour of operation of the ODRP system, for increasing demand levels, in order to identify scale effects. The numeric value of the parameters are shown in Table A.1 in the Appendix. All figures in this section use a logarithmic scale in the x-axis, because the phenomena that we study

---

2 Such bounds ensure that users will indeed accept the assignment proposed by the system rather than searching for an alternative mode. Moreover, without them the algorithmic burden of the problem would be unmanageable, as every possible group of users could be feasibly served by any vehicle.
tend to stabilize when the number of passengers is high, so zooming in the lower values helps the analysis. The simulations are run for different sizes of the ODRP’s vehicles, including vehicles with capacity for 2, 3, 4 and 5 passengers.

4.1 Circular model

Results of the circular model are exhibited in Figures 4.1 to 4.5. We first study the base case in which we assume the availability of automated vehicles (AV) and walks are allowed. Figure 4.1 shows a condensed way to describe the quality of service of the ODRP system from the users’ point of view: total delay, i.e., the extra time faced by them when they use this system instead of traveling in a private vehicle. This total delay includes walking time, waiting time and detour once on the vehicle. The relationship between total delay per passenger and demand, which influences the existence of scale economies, is clear. Scale effects are remarkable At the very beginning of the curve, as up to around 300 passengers/h, there is a reduction of total delay. However, when the number of passengers continues to grow, diseconomies of scale appear as average delay increases to 5 min/passenger for demands up to 1000 passenger/h. Then, average delay is once again reduced, to reach around 2 min/passenger for 3000 passenger/h.

![Figure 4.1](image)

**Figure 4.1** Average total delay faced by the users of the ODRP system in the circular model, as the number of hourly passengers grows. Different curves represent different vehicles’ sizes.

To understand the curves from Figure 4.1, we disentangle the total delay per passenger in its three components in Figure 4.2: Waiting (a), walking (b) and detour (c). Waiting times evolve similar to total delay. Let us begin our analysis after the strong drop at the beginning of the graph. The remaining of the curves reflect that average delay first increases and then slowly decreases.

Diseconomies of scale emerge when $Y$ reaches about 300 passenger/h. Until that point, the system operates almost as a private service, i.e., there is little sharing because it is difficult to find compatible users, therefore most users travel alone. When vehicles begin to be shared with more
people, one of its consequences is that vehicles do not go directly to pick-up the users but deviate to serve some co-travelers, hence increasing waiting times. This effect dominates for demands larger than 300 passenger/h. The same phenomenon can be seen related to walking and the detour, which also start to increase when crossing the same threshold, and is verified in Figure 4.3, where we show the average load of the vehicles at the end of the simulation, revealing that the load begins to grow at the exact same threshold. Actually, there is almost no walking at all when the demand is very little. Noteworthy is that the smaller the vehicle, the lower the detour, and that detours can be negative when there is some walking because the distance between the pick-up and drop-off points might be lower than between the corresponding origins and destinations. Therefore, we have identified a relevant source of diseconomies of scale in ODRP systems: an increase in the number of users implies that the vehicles will be shared by more passengers, which increases average traveling times.

As discussed by Fielbaum & Alonso-Mora (2020), the fact that routes are not known beforehand, but depend on the travelers, is specific to models that are both shared (otherwise vehicles follow shortest paths) and on-demand (otherwise vehicles follow fixed routes). Therefore, this source of scale diseconomies is specific to ODRP mobility systems. We denote this source as the “Flex-route Effect”.

In this model, the Flex-route Effect increases waiting, walking, and in-vehicle times as vehicles increase their load. It is noteworthy that there are other negative externalities that the model does not directly capture:

- Fielbaum & Alonso-Mora (2020) identify two types of unreliability: The “one-time unreliability”, defined as changes that take place while a trip is executed due to emerging requests, and the “daily unreliability”, that refers to facing different conditions each time a trip is repeated. Both types of unreliability worsen when vehicles are more loaded, i.e., the Flex-route Effect increases unreliability. It is worth mentioning that this is not a minor issue: for instance, Alonso-González et al. (2020) have estimated the value of reliability (that deals with the daily unreliability discussed above) to be approximately a half of the value of time.
- Sharing the vehicle with more users can be uncomfortable by itself, as studied by Ho et al. (2018), König & Gripenkoven (2020), and Lavieri & Bhat (2019), who propose the so-called “willingness to share” to study the difference in comfort between traveling alone or with other users. Note that this effect only occurs when vehicles start to increase their load (namely, when they pass from one to two passengers). However, it is complemented afterward with the increase in crowding, i.e., the discomfort because there is less space in the vehicle, which has been thoroughly studied in traditional public transport systems and surveyed by Tirachini et al. (2013).

The Flex-route Effect eventually gets exhausted. At some point, the vehicles no longer increase their load (when they are running at capacity, considering their current passengers and the ones that are waiting to be picked up). When this happens, Figures 4.2a and 4.2b reveal that waiting and walking times begin to diminish. Regarding waiting times, this is the analogous version of the Mohring Effect for this type of mobility system: an increase in the number of requests is satisfied with an increase
in the fleet size; therefore, it is more likely that an available vehicle is nearby. The explanation for the reduction in walking times is similar, and it has also been recognized as a “spatial counterpart of the Mohring Effect” by Fielbaum et al. (2020b): more vehicles also means that they are denser in space.

Additionally, more users imply that it is possible to find better matching among them, which also reduces waiting and walking times. When the demand is greater, origins and destinations are also denser in space, meaning that vehicles require shorter detours to combine compatible passengers. We can synthesize these scale effects by stating that two relevant sources of scale economies in ODRP are that the increase in the number of users leads 1) to a larger fleet, which reduces waiting and walking times, similar to the Mohring Effect in fixed-route public transport, and 2) to match users whose routes are more compatible. For the sake of simplicity, let us denote the first phenomenon again as “Mohring effect”. The second source will be referred to as "Better-matching Effect", and is the ODRP analogous to the fact that more direct lines that can be offered in public transport as the demand grows (a source of scale economies identified by Fielbaum et al., 2020a).

The quick drop at the beginning of the curve is explained by the Mohring Effect, but only regarding waiting times. As vehicles’ load do not increase yet (and actually might decrease slightly, due to the decrease in $\Omega_w$ and $\Omega_d$), neither the Flex-route nor the Better-matching Effects operate significantly yet. Moreover, the Mohring Effect is usually more important at low demands because when the number of vehicles is already large, the marginal impact of an additional vehicle is low in reducing waiting times.

It is worth noting that the three phenomena identified so far act on top of each other, counterbalancing their impacts. That is to say, the positive scale effects (Mohring and Better-matching) operate even when the total delay presents global diseconomies of scale, but the other effect (more people sharing the vehicle) prevails, and vice-versa.
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**Figure 4.2** Average waiting time (a), walking time (b) and detour (c), faced by the users of the ODRP system in the circular model, as the number of hourly passengers grows. Different curves represent different vehicles’ sizes.
Figure 4.3 Average number of users in the vehicles at the end of the simulation of the ODRP system in the circular model, as the number of hourly passengers grows. Different curves represent different vehicles’ sizes.

The comparison among different vehicle sizes is also informative. The smaller the vehicle, the lower the load and thus the detour. Walking times are not affected significantly by the vehicle capacity adopted. On the other hand, waiting times are slightly larger for smaller vehicles when the demand lies in the range of 300-1000 passenger/h. As the fleet size is mostly unaffected by the vehicle capacity within that range (see Figure 4.4), it is more likely that the assigned vehicle is not immediately available when vehicles are small.

The evolution of operators’ costs (depicted in Figure 4.4) is mostly characterized by scale economies when exceeding the threshold in which vehicles start to be shared more intensively (before the threshold, it exhibits an irregular pattern in which the randomness of the requests play the most relevant role). This is reflected in the fleet size (Figure 4.4 left), which also exhibits scale economies in public transport, but also in operating costs (vehicle hours traveled VHT, Figure 4.4 right). It is noteworthy that using smaller vehicles requires a larger fleet when used at capacity, which also increases VHT. Both curves eventually stabilize, meaning that this source of scale economies gets exhausted.

Figure 4.4 Fleet size (a) and Vehicle-Hours-Traveled (b), normalized by the number of passengers, as this last quantity grows. Different curves represent different vehicles’ sizes.
So far, we have exhibited results for a range of vehicle capacities, from 2 to 5 passenger/veh. However, the system should utilize vehicle sizes that minimize total costs. Our results indicate that the smallest vehicles (capacity 2) should be used if \(Y \leq 550\), and capacity 3 thereafter. Figure 4.5 synthesizes scale effects for users and operators when the capacity is optimized. The delay curve (Figure 4.5a) looks almost exactly as Figure 4.1, meaning that all the scale phenomena discussed above remain valid. Figure 4.4 implies that both the number of vehicles and VHT still exhibit scale economies when the capacity is optimized, but there remains one aspect to be analyzed: the number of seats \(S\), defined as the product of the number of vehicles and its capacities. Recall that, according to Eq. (9), operators’ capital and operating costs depend both on the total number of vehicles and on \(S\). The evolution of \(S\) when the capacity is optimized is shown in Figure 4.5b: it is similar to what we observed regarding fleet size (first erratic and then scale economies), but with a small jump when the optimal capacity switches from 2 to 3 (around 600 passenger/h in Figure 4.5b).

![Figure 4.5](image-url)  
**Figure 4.5** Average delay (a) and Seats per passenger (b), yielded by the ODRP system in the circular model, as the number of hourly passengers grows, when the optimal capacity is selected.

In Figure 4.6, we synthesize the results and compare them against public transport, including two alternative scenarios: forbidding walks (i.e., providing door-to-door service), and utilizing human-driven vehicles instead of AV, which diminishes capital costs but includes the drivers’ wages. Figure 4.6a shows the average cost per user: in all three scenarios, we observe the same situation, namely no clear trends for very low demands and economies of scale after a certain demand threshold is reached. This implies that the sources of scale diseconomies that we identified for the users, get outweighed by the sources of scale economies for the operators, leading to a global situation of scale economies that eventually get exhausted. The comparison between the different scenarios and vehicle technologies also implies relevant conclusions:
Using AV reduces the total cost to a considerable extent. This fits intuition, as having drivers for each small vehicle can increase global costs significantly (Bösch et al., 2018).

However, when the number of users is large, enabling walks can be as important as changing the technology: both non-solid curves exhibit similar values of average total cost in Figure 4.6a. In fact, a ODRP system with human-driven vehicles that enables walking has a lower total cost than a system with AVs without walks, for some demand levels. This is a remarkable finding regarding the value of designing a ODRP system with short walks.

On the other hand, as there is little walking when the number of users is low (the system works similar to a private door-to-door service), for demands below 300 passenger/h the corresponding impact of enabling walks is negligible.

Figure 4.6b shows the comparison against public transport by depicting the ratio between the total costs (including operators and users) of both systems. ODRP is in the numerator, so that a value lower than 1 implies that ODRP provides the lowest total cost. When utilizing human-driven vehicles, the parameters are updated for public transport as well. The most relevant conclusions of this comparison are the following:

- ODRP should only be preferred if the demand is very low, in line with the findings of previous research efforts, as described in Section 2. This result is driven by the small size of the ODRP vehicles.
- ODRP is more competitive when using AVs than when using human-driven vehicles. In other words, the impact of the technology of vehicle automation is larger for ODRP than for traditional public transport, which happens because the required fleet is larger when vehicles are smaller. It is noteworthy that the range in which ODRP is more cost-effective (for demands up to about 130 passenger/h) remains mostly unaffected by the vehicle technology that is used.
- For large demand levels, curves tend to stabilize, and the difference between AV and human-driven vehicles is large. For AVs, the average total cost of ODRP is around 1.5-2.0 times larger than that of public transport, depending on whether walking is allowed or not.

**Figure 4.6** ODRP’s average costs (a) and comparison with public transport’s average costs (b) in the circular model, as the number of hourly passengers grows, when the optimal capacity is selected. Different curves represent different types of vehicles and whether walks are enabled in ODRP.
In all, if one has to choose between using only ODRP (with small vehicles) or only traditional public transport, the former should be chosen only for low-demand zones. However, our results regarding the presence of scale economies when the demand is large, suggest that other types of integration could yield even better results, utilizing both systems in some complementary way to take advantage of the good quality of service that can be offered to the users. How to design such an integrated system is a broad question that goes beyond the scope of this paper, but recognizing that there might be room for improving public transport provision in high-demand zones by means of smart utilization of ODRP systems is a promising venue of further enquiry.

4.2 Feeder model

As discussed in Section 2, much of the previous research has assumed that the ODRP services can help to solve the so-called “last-mile problem”, i.e., as a feeder that connects the main transit stations with the specific origins (or destinations) of the users. For the ODRP system, the main difference is that everybody shares one extreme of the trip. In our simulations, all users are traveling to the same destination to take a second vehicle that does not affect the ODRP operation. Therefore, compatible routes are much easier to be found. The only requirement is that when a vehicle is following a route, new passengers have to be located close to that route. This demand pattern has a significant effect in the simulations: for the same number of users, the number of feasible trips is multiplied by about twenty compared to the circular model. This increases the computational burden significantly, which is why here we simulate only up to capacities equal to four.

There is yet another relevant difference related to the idle capacity. As users move all in the same direction, and the network is no longer circular, the vehicles must actively return in order to find some new passengers. Recall that this is executed through a rebalancing step: idle vehicles are sent towards the other extreme of the network, but they might not arrive there because they are still considered available for the emerging users.

Both characteristics affect public transport as well. Having a single destination implies that users board the system along the line, so that the vehicles’ load increases towards the destination, presenting relevant idle capacity before that. Vehicles also need to “rebalance”, i.e., to return empty to the other extreme of the network. In this case, all vehicles have to arrive there, as their route is fixed³.

The results of the simulation are depicted in Figures 4.7 and 4.8, considering the base model (AVs and enabling walks). Figure 4.7a condenses the information regarding users’ costs by displaying the average delay, which shows the same trends as observed in the circular model, verifying the presence of the three sources of scale economies discussed above. Figure 4.7b shows the average load per vehicle (excluding vehicles being rebalanced), confirming that vehicles start to increase their load when some threshold in the number of passengers is exceeded. Moreover, the usage of

³ Both problems might be faced with ad-hoc techniques like having some vehicles serving only the last portion of the line, i.e., a “short-turning” strategy, potentially combined with deadheading, as studied by Cortés et al. (2011).
the vehicles is much higher than in the circular model, and it is also higher than half the capacity, which is the expected load in public transport (because vehicles begin empty and get full along the way). When looking into total costs (Figure 4.7c), the same conclusions obtained for the circular model remain valid: average costs do not show a clear trend at the beginning, and scale economies prevail afterward until they eventually get exhausted.

Figure 4.8 exhibits the comparison against public transport when using the optimal capacity. In this case, vehicles of size 2 are optimal when the number of hourly passengers is lower than 380, and size 4 is optimal when this quantity is larger than 650; i.e., larger vehicles can be used (compared to the circular model) thanks to the common destination of the users. Figure 4.8 shows the sector in which ODRP is convenient, which is similar to the circular model’s results. Moreover, the cost ratio also converges when the number of passengers increases, to a value around 1.3 when demand exceeds 1000 passenger/h, which is a lower value than in the case of the circular setting (a cost ratio of around 1.5 for AVs with walking in Figure 4.6). That is, the ODRP system is more competitive when it is meant to replace a feeder transit line. As discussed above, this can be explained by two reasons: 1) Users can be matched in more efficient ways in the ODRP system when compared to the circular model, and 2) Public transport presents much idle capacity in this case, which is partially prevented thanks to the flexibility of the ODRP system.

It is noteworthy that these conclusions do not need to be exclusive for a feeder line. The relevant characteristic that yields such results is that passengers share a common destination. Therefore, lines that go to relevant destinations within a city (such as its center) might also be replaced or complemented efficiently with ODRP services, as long as congestion is not exacerbated by a larger fleet of smaller vehicles.
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**Figure 4.7** Average delay (a), active vehicle’s load at the end of the operation (b) and costs (c), faced by the users of the ODRP system in the feeder model, as the number of hourly passengers grows. Different curves represent different vehicles’ sizes.
5. Synthesis and description of qualitative findings

ODRP services present sources of scale economies and diseconomies. The former ones prevail when all costs are accounted for. However, when looking into users’ costs only, there might be situations in which the negative externalities govern the system. To be more precise, we have identified three sources for scale analysis (equivalently, three types of externalities caused by new users). They all emerge from the analysis of users’ delay (Figures 4.1 and 4.7a), how this is composed by waiting, walking, and detour (Figure 4.2), and the increase in vehicles’ load when the demand grows (Figures 4.3 and 4.7b).

- **The Mohring Effect**, operating exactly as in public transport: new users induce the utilization of a larger fleet, which reduces average waiting and walking times.

- **The Flex-route Effect**: This phenomenon is defined as the degradation in the perceived quality of service due to the increased vehicle load as a response to a larger demand. Intuitively, as the vehicle routes are not defined a priori but adapted to the specific users being served, the quality of service perceived by the users is sensitive to the route choice. When the demand grows, it is more likely to find users who can share the vehicles, eventually increasing their load. This increases the detours required by the system, which in turn increments waiting times. Moreover, the chance of walking instead of having a door-to-door service increases as well, because the time savings from walking are larger when more other passengers are affected. This effect is illustrated in Figure 5.1, where we show how the blue passenger increases all the components of her travel time when the vehicle serves a new user. The Flex-route Effect gets exhausted when vehicles run at capacity (or almost). It can be interpreted as similar to a well-known fact in public transport, namely that new users increase vehicle load, which in turn increases the time spent at stops waiting for boarding and alighting passengers. However, as in ODRP the route itself gets affected, the effect can be much more significant.
Figure 5.1 Example of the Flex-route Effect. The number of passengers is low in the top row, so users do not share the vehicle, and the blue passenger faces little waiting time and no detour. When the demand grows (bottom row), a new red co-traveler appears close to her, which increases her waiting time, requires her to walk (marked with a dotted arrow), and implies a detour, degrading her perceived quality of service.

- **The Better-matching Effect:** It is defined as the ability to create groups whose routes are more compatible with each other when the demand grows, thanks to a larger pool of requests to choose from. Intuitively, as new users enter the system, it is more likely to find users whose origins and destinations can be matched without long detours. This can be seen mathematically by noting that the optimization problem described by Eqs. (2)-(4) (or the equivalent step in the corresponding assignment algorithm) exhibits a larger feasible set with larger demands, which always leads to better results. This effect manifests in a clearer way when vehicles load does not increase, as then the systems aim for groups of the same size but with more candidates. The Better-matching Effect is illustrated in Figure 5.2, where users 1 and 2 are first grouped together; when new passengers emerge, they are separated and matched with other users such that the resulting routes get more efficient. This effect is similar to the increase in “directness” in public transport systems reported by Fielbaum et al. (2020a), who argue that an increased number of passenger permits defining lines that require fewer detours because more passengers share the origins and destinations; however, there are relevant differences with ODRP as vehicles here do not follow fixed routes but adapt them online.
Figure 5.2 Example of the Better-matching Effect. Both in the top row (low demand) and in the bottom row (high demand) we exhibit groups of size two. In the top row, the red vehicle is instructed to serve passengers 1 and 2, which are also marked with a red color. When the demand grows (bottom row), new passengers 3 and 4 appear, allowing the system to form more efficient groups. User 1 is now grouped with user 3 and served with the same previous red vehicle. Users 2 and 4 are grouped together to be served by the new blue vehicle. The color of the passengers in the bottom row marks which vehicle serves them. Total delay decreases for the two users that remain from the top row, improving their perceived quality of service.

The presence of users-related scale phenomena is described in Figure 5.3, where we show the evolution of all the three sources discussed above as the demand grows. It is a stylized schematic figure that divides the analysis into three sectors, representing the respective zones (as seen in Figures 4.1 and 4.7a) in which the average delay first decreases, then increases, and then steadily decreases again. Figure 5.3 shows the so-called Degree of scale economies, which is formally defined for any production function as the average costs divided by the marginal costs: this means that there is a threshold in $DSE = 1$ determining whether scale economies or diseconomies prevails. The mentioned three sectors are:

- When the number of passengers is low (first sector of the curve), users hardly share a vehicle, so that the Flex-route and the Better-matching Effects are almost non-existent. This means that the Mohring Effect (which is more prominent when the demand is low) prevails, and there are economies of scale.
- Eventually, users begin to share the vehicle, and the system enters into the second zone. The Flex-route Effect begins to operate, and diseconomies of scale prevail. The Mohring Effect is still present. The Better-matching Effect also starts to operate but mildly due to the increased load (this effect operates directly when the number of users per vehicle is constant). Therefore, they are outweighed by the Flex-route Effect. The minimum of the curve represents the point at which vehicles’ load increases at the fastest pace.
- Finally, when the vehicles cannot carry more passengers (they are full), the Flex-route Effect disappears, and the Mohring Effect has little impact. The Better-matching Effect, on the other hand, is fully operative, leading to $DSE > 1$. Eventually, $DSE$ converges to 1 as all these sources get exhausted.
Figure 5.3 Synthesis of the three sources of users-related scale effects for ODRP systems. The y-axis represents the degree of scale economies (DSE), so that scale economies prevail when DSE > 1 and the contrary happens when DSE < 1 (constant returns to scale if DSE = 1); the x-axis represents the number of users, and we do not include concrete numbers because this is a schematic representation. The direction of each arrow represents if it pushes DSE upwards (i.e., scale economies) or downwards (i.e., scale diseconomies), while its length represents its magnitude.

Such scale effects can be utilized to write mathematical relationships that define the users’ cost function in ODRP. Their costs depend on the number of passengers $Y$, the average load of the vehicles $q$, and the fleet size $B$. The system can decide the last two, and if we denote by $B(Y)$, $q(Y)$ the optimal value for these variables as a function of $Y$, it naturally happens that $B' > 0$, $q' > 0$ (note that as $q$ increases, larger vehicles are required). Users’ costs are defined by average waiting $t_w$, walking $t_a$, and in-vehicle time $t_v$, all of them depending on $Y$, $B$, and $q$. The Mohring Effect states that:

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial B} \leq 0 \text{ for } h = w, a$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

The Flex-route Effect implies that:

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial q} \geq 0 \text{ for } h = w, a, v$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

And the Better-matching Effect states that:

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial Y} \leq 0 \text{ for } h = w, a, v$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)
As $B$ and $\phi$ increase with $Y$, the combined effect of all the three sources of scale can be positive or negative (due to the chain rule). Figure 5.3 synthesizes when each of these effects prevails, mainly depending on the varying rate at which $\phi$ grows.

Regarding the comparison with public transport, our findings suggest that ODRP systems can play a better role when the demand is low because otherwise, the required fleet becomes too large due to the small capacity of the vehicles. However, the presence of scale economies suggests that for larger demand levels, they might also improve the public transport system, but not by replacing the whole line. In any case, such a comparison between only ODRP or only traditional fixed lines also depends on the demand structure, in such a way that when the destinations (or the origins) are more concentrated, it favors the flexible system.

6. Conclusions and future research

In this paper, we have used the single-line model to understand the sources of scale economies and diseconomies in on-demand ridepooling (ODRP) systems, and to identify under which conditions it is convenient to replace a traditional (fixed) public transport line with such a flexible system. To do this, we have extended a state-of-the-art assignment method for ODRP, in order to optimize the fleet size together with the decisions of how to group the users and which vehicle carries them.

Our simulations revealed that ODRP users induce both positive and negative externalities to the other passengers. Positive externalities are the Mohring Effect and the “Better-matching Effect”, i.e., that it is possible to form more efficient groups when the demand grows; the negative externalities relate with increasing the number of users per vehicle, which induces longer detours, which we call the “Flex-routes Effect”. There are only positive externalities on the operators’ side, namely that vehicles can be used more intensely so that the fleet size grows less than linearly.

We have found that for the efficient operation of ODRP in a setting without request rejections, the possibility of asking the passengers to perform short walks to pick up points is crucial to keep total costs down, both for users and operators. In particular, we have found that an ODRP system with human-driven vehicles and walks allowed has a total cost at a similar level to that of a door-to-door ODRP system with automated (fully driverless case) vehicles. This finding has significant implications for the current and future design of mobility systems based on shared vehicles and shared rides, either with human-driven or automated vehicles.

If the system designer has to choose between a traditional transit line or an ODRP system, the latter should be mostly preferred for low-demand zones or for feeder-type services, where most of the users share a common destination (or origin). However, the scale effects in ODRP suggest that there could be other ways of integrating both systems to enhance public transport and attract users from private modes. Understanding how this could be done is the most relevant future research question that emerges from this paper. Moreover, introducing the spatial components, i.e., looking at the whole transit network rather than at a single line, might reveal other sources of scale that do not show up here.
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Appendix

**Glossary and numerical value of the parameters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\delta$</td>
<td>Time elapsed between two consecutive assignments in ODRP.</td>
<td>1 [min]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau$</td>
<td>Time spent by the ODRP vehicle at each stop.</td>
<td>10.5 [sec]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>Number of longitudinal streets in a zone.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>Number of transversal streets in a zone.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_1$</td>
<td>Vehicles’ speed in fast streets.</td>
<td>25 [km/h]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_2$</td>
<td>Vehicles’ speed in low streets.</td>
<td>12.5 [km/h]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z$</td>
<td>Number of zones</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>Level of dispersion of the origins and destinations within a zone.</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l$</td>
<td>Average number of zones toured by the users in the circular model.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma^2$</td>
<td>Variance of the number of zones toured by the users in the circular model.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>Arcs’ length.</td>
<td>50 [m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>Time required to board and alight a public transport vehicle.</td>
<td>5 [sec]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E$</td>
<td>Total operation time</td>
<td>10 [h]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_{O1}$</td>
<td>Fixed operating cost per vehicle.</td>
<td>1.13 [US$/min]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_{O2}$</td>
<td>Capacity-dependant operating cost per vehicle.</td>
<td>0.074 [US$/min-seat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_{A1}$</td>
<td>Fixed capital cost per vehicle (AV/Human-Driven).</td>
<td>24.6/78.1 [US$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_{A2}$</td>
<td>Capacity-dependant capital cost per vehicle (AV/Human-Driven).</td>
<td>2.1/1.2 [US$/seat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_a$</td>
<td>Walking speed.</td>
<td>5 [km/h]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_v$</td>
<td>Monetary equivalent cost of one time unit spent by a user in-vehicle.</td>
<td>2.32 [US$/h]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_w$</td>
<td>Monetary equivalent cost of one time unit spent by a user waiting.</td>
<td>4.64 [US$/h]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_a$</td>
<td>Monetary equivalent cost of one time unit spent by a user walking.</td>
<td>4.64 [US$/h]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A1:** Glossary of the parameters used throughout the paper. Stopping time $\tau$ is computed following Roess et al. (2004). Operators’ cost parameters $c_{O1}, c_{O2}, c_{A1}, c_{A2}$ for human-driven and automated vehicles are calculated for Santiago, Chile, based on Tirachini & Antoniou (2020). Time required to board and alight the vehicles $t$ is taken from Jara-Díaz et al. (2017). Walking speed $v_a$, as well as users’ costs parameters $p_w, p_v$ and $p_a$ are obtained from Fielbaum et al. (2021). The rest of the parameters are ours.