Response to Reviewer 3 Comments

**Point 1:** An interesting paper on a little studied subject.

**Response 1:** We are glad the reviewer found the paper interesting.

**Point 2:** In the methodology section, would it be possible to add a paragraph on the analyses you conducted. For example, the section on imputation should be presented in the methodology section before and not in the results section.

**Response 2:** Thank you for this important suggestion. At the suggestion of another reviewer, we removed the multiple imputation analysis from our manuscript. But we have included a description of the Fisher exact test and an applicable reference at the end of the methodology section, and we moved some statistical background information on this test from the results to the methodology.

To determine the relationship between the descriptive variables presented in Table 1 and expressed willingness to use the on-demand microtransit service, we employ the Fisher "exact" test of independence in contingency tables (Fisher, 1922).

Fisher, R. (1922). On the Interpretation of χ2 from Contingency Tables, and the Calculation of P. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society,* *85*(1), 87-94. doi:10.2307/2340521

**Point 3:** You discuss a lot about the limitations, but not much about the strengths?

*Line 36*, you say the objective of the survey used it would be more interesting to rewrite this section to say what the objective of your paper is and not the survey.

**Response 3:** This is a valuable point, and we thank the reviewer for bringing it up. We have strengthened the language in the introduction to emphasize the contributions rather than the survey directly. We also rearranged the order of paragraphs in the Discussion section to rhetorically underline our findings rather than the weaknesses.

**Point 4:** I see a major problem, did you receive an ethics certificate for conducting this survey and how did you obtain the consent of the participants.

**Response 4:** Thank you for raising this concern. The survey was originally conceived as part of a class project rather than a research activity, precluding it from IRB review at our institution (https://irb.byu.edu/guidance-for-researchers). Nevertheless, we informed study participants as to the purpose of the survey and its voluntary nature and followed all standard protocols when dealing with the collected information. We felt the research community would value our findings, preliminary though they may be. We have included the following sentence in the revised manuscript:

The interviewers approached subjects on the platform, identified themselves as conducting an informational survey on behalf of UTA, and informed the subjects that participation in the survey was anonymous and voluntary.

**Minor points:**

*Line 21* I think there is a problem with the references.

*Response***:** We apologize that we are unable to find the problem referred to. In our version of the document submitted to and returned by the journal, the references on this line read “[3 – 5]”, referring to Shaheen and Chan (2016), Oostendorp and Gebhardt (2018), and Shiv (2018). The references appear to print correctly in the bibliography as well. We look to the editorial staff to help with appropriately typesetting the manuscript upon publication.

*Line 46* I know this is not the purpose of your article, but isn't the use of microtransit related to environmental issues?

*Response***:** It certainly could be. In the Utah context, UTA is hoping to improve access to transit services in low-density suburban areas, and hopefully increase system ridership. This would have secondary environmental effects. The environmental costs of accessing transit via park-and-ride might also be fairly high, and we have added the following sentence and reference to the introduction:

This may lead to reduced dependence on automobiles and associated environmental benefits (Hoene and Chester, 2017).

Hoehne, C. G., & Chester, M. V. (2017). Greenhouse gas and air quality effects of auto first-last mile use with transit. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, *53*, 306-320.

*Line 46* and following, interesting your mini review, would it be possible to add some lines on how you found the articles.

*Response***:** We are glad the reviewer found the review interesting. We have added the following sentence to the relevant paragraph:

These articles were identified through a search of academic databases focusing on transportation research studies.