Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

**Point 1:** The authors have still not addressed my concerns about this article.

**Response 1:** We are disappointed that we are unable to do more to address the reviewer’s concerns. We eagerly await the opportunity to conduct a more robust analysis on a deeper dataset when UTA resumes full transit service at some future point, likely in 2022.

**Point 2:** The authors' statement about the multiple imputation method and results is correct in that it states that multiple imputation may not be appropriate in this case. I've added a reference for Jacobsen et al. (2017) as a guide. Several of the variables in this study have missingness near or over 40% and are likely not missing at random. I don't feel it is appropriate to include this section based on the data limitations.

Jakobsen, J.C., Gluud, C., Wetterslev, J. *et al.* When and how should multiple imputation be used for handling missing data in randomised clinical trials – a practical guide with flowcharts. *BMC Med Res Methodol* **17,**162 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-017-0442-1

**Response 2:** We agree that the multiple imputation analysis is likely inappropriate. We have removed this section and added a brief discussion and reference to the Jakobsen work. Some other sentences in the manuscript required reframing to incorporate this change.

**Point 3:** The authors do a lot of speculating about the results of this study because of the lack of solid evidence from the data. The speculation leads to some interesting paths for future research, but I do not feel the paper makes a contribution as it is.

**Response 3:** We understand and appreciate the reviewer’s perspective. We believe that the paper makes a valuable – though admittedly incremental – contribution to understanding who is using an important and novel transportation service. Identifying these paths for future research is itself a contribution that merits consideration.