



Research



Cite this article: Lonardi A, Szell M, De Bacco C. 2025 Cohesive urban bicycle infrastructure design through optimal transport routing in multilayer networks. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **22**: 20240532. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2024.0532>

Received: 3 August 2024
Accepted: 11 December 2024

Subject Category:
Life Sciences—Physics interface

Subject Areas:
environmental science

Keywords:
complex systems, network science, urban systems, transportation networks

Author for correspondence:
Alessandro Lonardi
e-mail: alessandro.lonardi@tuebingen.mpg.de

Electronic supplementary material is available online at <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.c.7618817>.

Cohesive urban bicycle infrastructure design through optimal transport routing in multilayer networks

Alessandro Lonardi¹, Michael Szell^{2,3,4} and Caterina De Bacco¹

¹Max Planck Institute for Intelligent Systems, Cyber Valley, Tübingen 72076, Germany

²IT University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen 2300, Denmark

³ISI Foundation, Turin 10126, Italy

⁴Complexity Science Hub Vienna, Vienna 1080, Austria

AL, 0000-0003-4866-8088; CDB, 0000-0002-8634-0211

Bicycle infrastructure networks must meet the needs of cyclists to position cycling as a viable transportation choice in cities. In particular, protected infrastructure should be planned cohesively for the whole city and spacious enough to accommodate all cyclists safely and prevent cyclist congestion—a common problem in cycling cities like Copenhagen. Here, we devise an adaptive method for optimal bicycle network design and for evaluating congestion criticalities on bicycle paths. The method goes beyond static network measures, using computationally efficient adaptation rules inspired by optimal transport on the dynamically updating multilayer network of roads and protected bicycle lanes. Street capacities and cyclist flows reciprocally control each other to optimally accommodate cyclists on streets with one control parameter that dictates the preference of bicycle infrastructure over roads. Applying our method to Copenhagen confirms that the city's bicycle network is generally well-developed. However, we are able to identify the network's bottlenecks, and we find, at a finer scale, disparities in network accessibility and criticalities between different neighbourhoods. Our model and results are generalizable beyond this particular case study to serve as a scalable and versatile tool for aiding urban planners in designing cycling-friendly cities.

1. Introduction

Building cohesive urban networks of protected bicycle infrastructure is a contemporary challenge towards improving urban livability and transport, as cycling is a sustainable alternative to car-centric urban transport with massive economic and societal benefits [1,2]. Most cities on the planet have negligible cycling infrastructure that needs to be built from scratch [3]. Nevertheless, certain cities do have a transport infrastructure that accommodates cycling well, which we can study to understand how close to an 'optimum' they are in terms of serving the flow of cyclists or how much room there is for improvements. In particular, the Municipality of Copenhagen is known for its cohesive network of protected bicycle tracks and its corresponding cycling culture [3–5], which has developed steadily over many decades [6] and today provides well-quantified economic and health benefits to the city and its population [7]. Szell *et al.* [3] use the Dutch CROW manual [8] to define what a cohesive network is: a well-connected network that covers a large fraction of the city area.

Despite these benefits, Copenhagen's bicycle network has mostly grown organically, and apart from aggregate projections [9] little is known about whether the existing infrastructure and its planned extensions [10,11] fit the concrete local demands of cyclists. Furthermore, cyclist congestion has

become a notorious phenomenon in the city because many of the permanent, physically separated bicycle tracks cannot accommodate all the cyclists using them. In fact, while the physical separation between raised bicycle tracks and roads provides safety to cyclists, this also makes the tracks difficult to widen [5,12,13]. In Copenhagen, high bicycle flows reportedly increase travel times. Since inadequate cycling lanes to accommodate traffic demands are a primary source of dissatisfaction for cyclists and fast travel times are the main motivator for cycling, the Municipality of Copenhagen aimed to reduce travel times by 15% between 2016 and 2025 with policies such as ‘overtaking lanes’ to make the cyclists’ traffic flow smoother and electronic signals to update cyclists on congestion of roads [14,15]. While possibly less relevant in cities with fewer cyclists, this underscores the critical congestion issue in Copenhagen, where high cyclists flow can lead to overtrafficking bicycle paths.

Identifying bottlenecks in the network, together with potential improvements, requires high-quality data [9,16]. In particular, cyclist flow data can be helpful in gauging the current levels of cyclist traffic in a city. However, flow data are often not collected systematically or at high enough resolution [7,17,18]. In practice, the availability of current flow data is also of little relevance, as infrastructure network planning frameworks tend to be static and do not take into account the co-evolution of flows and infrastructure [19,20]. Furthermore, flow data can be interpreted as a reflection of currently available infrastructure, which does not paint an accurate picture of latent demand [21,22].

From a traffic flow perspective, when many cyclists are likely to use a specific street, such a street should be equipped with more cycling infrastructure. Conversely, streets with low expected cyclist demand require little to no additional infrastructure. Here, we account for these temporal dynamics of supply versus demand in terms of infrastructure, using an approach inspired by optimal transport theory [23], in line with recent data-driven approaches of bicycle network analysis to assess how ‘bikeable’ a city’s transportation network is [4,7,24,25]. We apply our framework to the case study of Copenhagen. It allows us to ask (1) *given a certain preference for protected infrastructure over unprotected roads, where would cyclists travel* and (2) *what are the implications for the protected infrastructure? Specifically, where should Copenhagen widen it?*

Previously, such questions involving cyclist flow have been tackled from different perspectives, for example from demand modelling [11,26], empirical measurements [7,27] or from a network science approach where flows on the whole city are approximated via betweenness centrality [3,28]. Here, instead, we combine the focus on the whole city with the treatment of bicycle paths as a *dynamic* network that can respond to flows and that accounts for the travel priorities of cyclists. To do so, we first evaluate global metrics to assess bikeability. Specifically, we calculate two metrics for the whole network, the Detour (how much do I have to reroute my original path if I prefer to travel on bicycle tracks?) and the Overlap (how much can I stay on bicycle tracks to reach my destination?). Unsurprisingly, this evaluation shows good results since Copenhagen’s bicycle network is well-developed. We then refine our investigation at the district level and find inequalities in the service provided by the city’s neighbourhoods, demonstrating that our flow-based method allows us to unveil results that are difficult to assess with static topological quantities only. Finally, we also identify infrastructure criticalities, i.e. bottlenecks where cyclist congestion can be expected. As our study accounts for the dynamics between flows and infrastructure, it thus complements research efforts where the network’s infrastructure is studied only statically [28,29].

1.1. Methods

The method we develop to predict cyclist routes is based on optimal transport theory [23]. This powerful mathematical framework formalizes the problem of finding the cheapest trajectories connecting two distributions, which in our set-up are paths taken by cyclists entering and exiting the city’s streets. In the last decade, optimal transport garnered significant popularity thanks to its computational efficiency [30,31] and its flexibility to model tasks across several fields of science, such as genomics [32], computer vision [33–36] or protein folding [37], among others. In this work, we formulate a set of adaptation equations that connect cyclist travel paths with time-dependent capacities. The latter variables represent bicycle track widths that evolve in time to allocate cyclists optimally, i.e. along their cheapest routes. The connection between dynamical systems and optimal transport has been extensively studied in the literature [38–46]. Here, we leverage such results to formulate principled adaptation equations that, at convergence, return exactly the shortest paths of cyclists. There are several advantages of employing optimal transport-based dynamical systems. First, convergence is achieved fast [41,47], giving an edge over traditional schemes such as Dijkstra’s algorithms [48] (see also Methods in the electronic supplementary material). Furthermore, such methods offer significant flexibility across various modelling scenarios. For example, dynamical systems have been employed in multicommodity problems where different types of users interact when moving along the network edges [49–53], or in set-ups where entry and exit inflows vary in time, or stochastically [54–57]. Recent extensions of such models include bilevel optimization [58] and integrate engineering constraints into the optimization set-up [59].

1.2. Results

Putting the model into practice by simulating cyclist routes on Copenhagen’s transportation network [60], we explore a series of promising results for improving the city’s accessibility to cycling infrastructure. We systematically study a series of computational experiments where cyclists are encouraged to prioritize varying degrees of safety over trip convenience (the latter being measured as their total path length). To compare our findings from Copenhagen with less developed networks, we extract optimal cyclist routes not only on the whole Copenhagen network but also on synthetic underdeveloped bicycle networks subsampled from the full Copenhagen network. A further comparison is Zürich, a city of similar size and population but with a much less developed bicycle network (7% of Copenhagen’s length, see table 1) serving as an example of a typical European city that largely neglects bicycle infrastructure despite its benefits [3].

Table 1. Parameters of the networks used in the numerical simulations. Coverage is the fraction between the length of the bicycle tracks (resp. of the roads) and the total length of all the network's streets. The parameter Δ is the fraction between the underdeveloped networks' bicycle tracks' length and the length of the tracks of the full network of Copenhagen. Mean values and standard deviations are computed for each λ , over 10 random seeds used to build the underdeveloped networks.

network	length roads (km)	length bicycle tracks (km)	coverage roads (%)	coverage bicycle tracks (%)	Δ (%)
Copenhagen full network	1103	420	72.4	27.6	100
Copenhagen, $\lambda = 0.9$	1103	311 \pm 5	78.0 \pm 0.3	22.0 \pm 0.4	74 \pm 5
Copenhagen, $\lambda = 0.75$	1103	254 \pm 5	81.3 \pm 0.3	18.7 \pm 0.4	60 \pm 5
Copenhagen, $\lambda = 0.5$	1103	162 \pm 5	87.2 \pm 0.4	12.8 \pm 0.4	39 \pm 5
Zürich full network	726	29	96.2	3.8	7

Our experiments focus on Copenhagen's efforts to build a cohesive bicycle network that can accommodate the needs of cyclists both in terms of safety and efficiency. Specifically, cyclists should be able to cycle without having to take lengthy detours while also having access to protected bicycle infrastructure over roads that would otherwise be unsafe due to mixing with vehicular traffic. We observe, in line with previous studies [4,7], that the Municipality of Copenhagen strongly benefits from its cohesive network of bicycle paths. Nevertheless, a fine-grained analysis of the city's accessibility to cycling infrastructure reveals potential concerns. Particularly, Copenhagen's districts exhibit substantial disparities in the quality of service provided to citizens. Established districts such as Bispebjerg, Indre By, Østerbro and Brønshøj-Husum allow cyclists to travel safely (larger usage of protected bicycle lanes) and conveniently (short travel times), as opposed to currently developing or less established areas such as Amager or Nordhavn, or districts like Frederiksberg that historically lag behind in network development [6].

Furthermore, we observe that traffic bottlenecks, assumed to arise from high cyclists' flow, critically affect the bridges connecting the island of Amager with the rest of the city. Such a result sheds light on a critical issue of the city's infrastructure, which is often neglected in urban planning, especially in organic bicycle network growth [3]: connecting two largely populated hubs with few links can drastically amplify congestion. A solution to alleviate such congestion can be installing more links between hubs, such as Copenhagen's bicycle bridge 'Cykelslangen' between Vesterbro and Amager which typically carries 19 100 cyclists on a weekday [15].

2. Methods

Before we introduce the mathematical formalism, we summarize our approach in words. Our starting point is the multilayer network of Copenhagen composed of (i) the road network and (ii) the network of protected bicycle tracks. On this multilayer network, we simulate cyclist flows between uniformly distributed origins and destinations, figure 1a, by dynamically updating edge capacities following optimal transport-inspired adaptation rules.

The rationale behind and the functioning mechanism of such adaptation rules is that if many cyclists were expected to cycle on a street, then an adaptive city would build or widen bicycle tracks along that street. Conversely, if no cyclists were expected there, bicycle tracks of an adaptive city would be narrowed or removed. In our model, this feedback mechanism between cyclist demand and infrastructure adaptation is implemented automatically. The cyclist flux, i.e. the number of cyclists moving between the network nodes, controls the infrastructure adaptation, i.e. the narrowing/widening bicycle tracks. This automatic update converges step by step to a weighted multilayer network of roads and bicycle tracks with an optimal design for accommodating cyclists, yielding capacities that allocate flows of cyclists along their most convenient paths.

The adaptation equations extract cyclist routes starting from their entry and exit inflows in nodes. Then, they allocate flows and capacities using one preference parameter $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, which controls the appeal of bicycle tracks versus roads, where $\alpha = 1$ means equal appeal and $\alpha < 1$ means more appeal for bicycle lanes. Following the literature, which reports detour factors between 1 and 2 for protected bicycle infrastructure [25], we systematically explore variations of α in the corresponding range $0.5 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. Although previous studies in Copenhagen have used proxy data for estimating empirical cyclist flows [7], here we assume no cyclist flow data are available as this is generally the case in most cities and makes our approach generally applicable.

2.1. Optimal transport dynamics for routing on networks

In order to find the origin–destination (OD) shortest paths on a multilayer network, we develop a set of adaptation rules controlling cyclist flows along edges to minimize their travel costs. We consider a multilayer network $G = (V_0 = \bigcup_k V_k, E_0 = \{\bigcup_k E_k\} \cup \{\bigcup_{kk'} E_{kk'}\})$, where V_k and E_k are nodes and intra-layer edges of layers $k = 1, \dots, L$, and $E_{kk'}$ are inter-layer edges between k and k' . We suppose that each edge has length $\ell_e > 0$ and cost $w_e > 0$. In principle, ℓ and w are not related; for example, in highways where passengers pay tolls w to travel, prices of roads may be independent of their lengths and only determined by exogenous variables. However, for our case study, we suppose that w depends on ℓ (we discuss our modelling assumption and its interpretation in §3.1).

Groups of cyclists $i = 1, \dots, M$ that enter and exit ODs are stored in a mass matrix S . Its entries are positive if $v = O^i$, i.e. the node v is an entry node for the group i , and negative if $v \in D^i$, that is, if v is one of the possible exit nodes for i . When v is neither an entry nor an exit node for any group, the mass matrix equals zero. We also assume that the system is isolated, which




Figure 1. Copenhagen's multilayer network of streets and protected bicycle tracks, the experimental set-up and simulation. (a) Copenhagen's existing multilayer network of roads (red) and the full bicycle network (blue) with origins–destinations (ODs) distributed uniformly over the roads' junctions; Frederiksberg is included. (b) Synthetic underdeveloped networks are built by iteratively adding bicycle nodes randomly, together with their inter-layer and bicycle links, to the city's roads. In blue, we draw the bicycle tracks that are present in the displayed underdeveloped network; in grey, we draw edges that belong to the full city's network but not to the underdeveloped synthetic one. (c) Routing on the underdeveloped network ($\lambda = 0.5$) with $\alpha = 0.5$. The removal of 50% of the bicycle node (approximately corresponding to a reduction of 61% of the tracks' length, see table 1) leads to a strong concentration of cyclists on the road network. Fluxes $\sum_i |F_e^i|$ of cyclists that travel on roads (red) and bicycle tracks (blue) are visualized thicker and darker for more populated edges. Because of the choice of $\alpha < 1$, cyclists tolerate slight detours in exchange for the safety of the protected tracks and thus populate the bicycle network preferentially. (d) Routing on the full network ($\lambda = 1$) with $\alpha = 0.5$. Since the bicycle network is entirely developed, fluxes are predominantly allocated on bicycle tracks instead of roads. Highlighted areas are those discussed in §3.2.

translates to the condition $\sum_v S_v^i = 0$ for all i , namely, that cyclists entering the network must also exit. The flow of cyclists of a group i between two nodes u, v is indicated by the flux F_{uv}^i with $e = (u, v)$.

The idea behind our model is that edges are endowed with adaptive capacities $\mu_e^i \geq 0$ that evolve in time to optimally allocate cyclists on their most convenient paths by means of a feedback mechanism. Such capacities admit a physical interpretation and can be thought of as road share used by cyclists of group i . This means that if a high flux F_e^i of cyclists moves along edge e , its μ_e^i increases to meet travel demands, i.e. to enable them to move on e . Conversely, if there are no cyclists, the edge capacity decays to zero. By appropriately designing adaptation equations that connect fluxes and capacities, we are able to control μ in such a way that fluxes converge to the cyclists' weighted w -shortest paths. In addition, this formalism automatically accounts for a global constraint that bounds the capacities based on a total budget (for a detailed mathematical description of the adaptation equations, see Methods in the electronic supplementary material).

One advantage of our method is the efficient calculation of the minimizer of $J(w) = \sum_{i,e} w_e |F_e^i|$, i.e. the total weighted shortest path distance travelled by the cyclists [41,47] (for details, see Methods in the electronic supplementary material). Moreover, dynamical systems can be generalized for modelling several complex routing tasks such as multicommodity problems [49–53], set-ups with time-varying or stochastic loads [54–56], and bilevel optimization [58]. They also enable the natural integration of infrastructure constraints, e.g. limiting the maximum road capacity, into the optimization setup [59].

Other methods have been employed to extract cyclist paths and to model the optimal design of Copenhagen's bicycle tracks with their impact on the city's livability. Examples are reinforcement learning algorithms [11] to maximize a 'net present

value' defined as a combination of objectives, including the infrastructure's construction and maintenance costs or the health benefits to the network's users. Additionally, nonlinear optimization routines [7,61,62] efficiently simulate realistic traffic flows on potential bicycle tracks that may be incorporated into the city's network in the future. Such models largely differ from ours based on adaptation equations. However, they offer an opportunity to enhance dynamical systems by integrating additional constraints into their formulation, thereby enabling the prediction of cyclist behaviours in a wide set of case studies. We do not address these nuances here.

3. Results

3.1. Copenhagen's transportation network

We consider the transportation network of Copenhagen with two layers extracted from [60]. The first contains $|E_1| = 11313$ roads that cover approximately 1100 km (72% of the total infrastructure), and the second is made of $|E_2| = 2554$ protected bicycle tracks that are 420 km long (the remaining 28%). The two infrastructures are joined by $|E_{12}| = 960$ inter-layer edges that connect nodes in layers $k = 1$ and $k = 2$ with the same coordinates. Such links are assigned negligible lengths and costs compared to any intra-layer edge. The network is made of $|V_0| = 9974$ nodes that represent junctions between streets, $|V_1| = 7825$ of them are road intersections (approximately 78% of the total) and $|V_2| = 2149$ are junctions between bicycle tracks (approximately 22%).

Shortest path routing is performed between $M = 397$ groups of cyclists distributed uniformly in road junctions extracted from a rectangular tessellation of the city (see Methods in the electronic supplementary material). Each group i enters one of the origin nodes, O^i , and exits uniformly from $M - 1$ destination nodes (being the origin nodes of all other groups j , i.e. $D^i = \{O^j\}^{j \neq i}$). The OD set-up is modelled by a mass matrix with entries $S_v^i = +1$ for $v = O^i$, and $S_v^i = -1/(M - 1)$ for all $v \in D^i$. Each entry represents the density of cyclists wanting to move from O^i to all nodes of D^i . For a visualization of Copenhagen's multilayer network, see figure 1a.

As anticipated in §2.1, while links are assigned physical lengths ℓ , we seek to optimize a different objective, the w -weighted total travel cost $J(w)$. This quantity corresponds to the geographical path length if $w = \ell$. However, its interpretation varies in accordance with the meaning of w . In our case study, we consider w to represent the effective length of streets. For roads, we take $w = \ell$, whereas for bicycle tracks, we set $w = \alpha \ell$, with $0.5 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ being a dimensionless coefficient. This allows modelling scenarios where cyclists find travelling on bicycle tracks more appealing than on roads, ideally when safety is prioritized ($\alpha < 1$) over travelled length.

Besides simulating cyclist routing on Copenhagen's existing transportation network itself, we synthetically create a series of reduced networks that emulate less developed infrastructures than the existing one. We create these underdeveloped networks by iteratively adding randomly extracted bicycle nodes and all their links to a network with Copenhagen's roads and no bike lanes, while making sure that the network stays fully connected. Here, we use a control parameter λ to interpolate between $\lambda = 0$, the network of roads without any bicycle infrastructure, and $\lambda = 1$, the network of roads and all bicycle infrastructure. Values of λ in between correspond to an addition of a fraction λ of randomly selected bicycle nodes. For each value of $\lambda = \{0.5, 0.75, 0.9\}$, we generate 10 networks. One such underdeveloped network for $\lambda = 0.5$ is visualized in figure 1b. In addition to the City of Copenhagen, we perform our simulation on the multilayer network of bicycle tracks and roads of Zürich, to show the decline in performance for a city where the bicycle network is strongly underdeveloped. It also serves as a validation for the proxy we chose to build underdeveloped synthetic networks. We list the network properties of all the different scenarios in table 1.

Fluxes $\sum_i |F_v^i|$ on one of Copenhagen's underdeveloped synthetic networks ($\lambda = 0.5$) and on the city's full network ($\lambda = 1$) are shown in figure 1c,d. The impact of the effective lengths on routing due to $\alpha < 1$ is visibly reflected by the larger concentration of cyclists on bicycle tracks. High fluxes occupy most of the cycling infrastructure, with scarcely populated roads. Furthermore, since on the underdeveloped network, bicycle tracks are fewer than those of the full network, congestion of both bicycle paths and roads is starker for $\lambda = 0.5$. This happens because cyclists, with fewer bicycle tracks to travel on, concentrate on critical arteries of the cycling infrastructure while also cycling on roads when the network does not provide sufficient coverage (see the electronic supplementary material for additional network visualizations with different values of λ and α and for Zürich). For the full network, figure 1d, the biggest traffic bottlenecks are the three main bridges Bryggebroen, Knippelsbro and Langebro; the roads with the highest flux are in Ågade–H.C. Andersens Blvd. In contrast, since Bryggebroen is pruned from the bicycle network of figure 1c, with $\lambda = 0.5$, the Ågade–H.C. Andersens Blvd. shows increased flow, which now extends to Amager's Ørestads Blvd.

3.2. Global metrics for bikeability

We develop and study a series of global metrics for fluxes with the goal of quantifying and shedding light on cyclist routing on Copenhagen's transport network.

First, we observe the profiles of total travelled length $J(w = \ell)$ on bicycle tracks and roads for different values of α and λ , see figure 2a. The total travelled distance on roads decreases as α reduces (solid lines), and conversely the total travelled distance on bicycle tracks grows as α decreases (dashed lines). This trend is in accordance with the fact that a lower α corresponds to lower travel cost $w = \alpha \ell$ for bicycle tracks and, therefore, to cyclists willing to travel on longer cycle paths instead of shorter roads in order to maximize their safety (expressed by $J(w)$ with $\alpha < 1$). The effect of higher λ (green to blue) is to increase the travelled distance on bicycle tracks and to lower it on roads for all values of α . This results from cyclists rerouting onto roads due to




Figure 2. Travelled distance, Overlap, Detour. Results for $\lambda = 0.5, 0.75, 0.9$ are averaged over 10 random network topologies, and shaded areas are their standard deviations. (a) $J(w = \ell)$ is solid for roads and dashed for bicycle lanes. Vertical dashed lines highlight points α_{λ} of crossing between two regimes where cyclists prefer to travel on bicycle tracks or on roads. (b,c) Overlap and Detour are computed over the whole multilayer network made of bicycle tracks and roads as defined in Methods in electronic supplementary material.

having fewer safe bicycle paths to travel on. In this respect, we observe that for $\lambda = 0.75, 0.9, 1$, bicycle lanes' and roads' travelled lengths cross at $\alpha = \alpha_{\lambda}$. This is a critical value separating two regimes where cyclists find it globally more convenient to cycle on bicycle tracks ($\alpha < \alpha_{\lambda}$) and on roads ($\alpha > \alpha_{\lambda}$). As λ decreases, the crossing value α_{λ} gets lower. In fact, for underdeveloped bicycle networks, cyclists need to have higher incentives (lower α) to favour bicycle tracks over roads. If the network is largely underdeveloped ($\lambda = 0.5$) and in Zürich, where bike lanes make only 3.8% of the streets (see table 1), the travelled lengths do not cross at any α in the chosen range, showing that even with a large incentive for safety (a very low α) cyclists have no other choice than to travel on roads. In a network where bicycle tracks have larger coverage than roads, i.e. where cycling on protected tracks is more convenient than travelling on roads without any incentive for safety ($\alpha = 1$), one should observe no crossing of the travelled lengths and the cost $J(w = \ell)$ for roads should always be below that of bicycle tracks.

In order to gain a deeper knowledge of cyclists' path trajectories, we calculate two additional metrics. The first is the Overlap, i.e. the percentage of the total length cycled on bicycle lanes. The second metric is the Detour, which is the relative change in travelled length between shortest-length fluxes (at $\alpha = 1$) and the fluxes of cyclists who incentivize safety (at $\alpha < 1$). For the mathematical definitions of Overlap and Detour, see Methods in electronic supplementary material.

Results for Overlap and Detour are reported in figure 2b,c, respectively. All Overlaps monotonically increase as α gets smaller, reflecting a progressively larger usage of the bicycle network. Since Copenhagen's bicycle tracks are well-developed, when $\alpha = 0.5$, the Overlap surpasses 80%, showing that most cyclists travel on bicycle tracks. The opposite happens in Zürich, where the Overlap is always below 10%.

Detours have a less straightforward profile. Like the Overlap, they always increase as α decreases since cyclists reroute more when prioritizing safety. However, they are not monotone for λ . As one could expect, the Detour is higher for $\lambda = 0.9$ than for the full network of Copenhagen because cyclists have to reroute on longer paths when fewer protected tracks are available. However, for lower values of $\lambda = 0.75, 0.5$ and for Zürich, the Detour becomes progressively lower, falling below the full network for $\lambda = 0.5$ and Zürich. This decrease in Detour happens due to the bicycle infrastructure becoming *too scarce*, where even high incentives to travel on bicycle tracks (low α) are not sufficient for cyclists to travel on longer protected paths rather than on roads. See the electronic supplementary material for detailed visualizations of the cyclists' flows on all networks of Copenhagen and Zürich.

In summary, a city with a well-developed bicycle network should display both high Overlap and low Detour, allowing cyclists to safely ride their bicycles and arrive at their destinations conveniently. As demonstrated by Zürich, drawing conclusions using the Detour alone could be misleading since a low Detour with a low Overlap is symptomatic of a largely underdeveloped bicycle network.

3.3. Bikeability of Copenhagen's districts

In §3.2, we studied cycling patterns using global measures for the whole transportation network. Here, we aim to analyse the city at a finer scale, evaluating the contributions of individual districts to creating a safe and efficient bicycle network.

We split the Municipality of Copenhagen into 11 parts, its 10 official districts [63], and the Municipality of Frederiksberg, which is an independent enclave entirely surrounded by Copenhagen. In figure 3b, we show a map of the city with nodes coloured according to the district they belong to.

First, we compute Detours and Overlaps for each street junction (for their mathematical definitions, see Methods in the electronic supplementary material). This allows us to get an estimate of which areas of the city provide the best service for cyclists, i.e. high Overlap and low Detour, or the worst, i.e. low Overlap and low Detour. Our analysis is performed with $\lambda = 1$ and $\alpha = 0.5$, thus simulating a scenario where cyclists are strongly encouraged to bike on cycling tracks over roads. Overall, the quality of service for cyclists in Copenhagen tends to be relatively high. In fact, on average, we get Overlap $\approx 82\%$ and Detour $\approx 6\%$ (see table 2). However, we find significant inequalities between districts.

Overlap and Detour distribute highly non-uniformly over the city's map, see figure 3a, and vary within districts, see table 2 and figure 3c. The KDE plots (with a Gaussian kernel) in figure 3c show the distribution of Overlaps and Detours for the nodes of each district. Here, points in the bottom-right quadrant are those where the metrics are above the city's average values, i.e.

Table 2. Overlap and Detour at districts' level and details on districts' infrastructure. Districts are sorted with descending R , the fraction of points in a given district with both Overlap and Detour better than average. Districts' length of roads and bicycle lanes are computed by extracting all nodes of each district, taking the union of the edges to which they are connected, and computing their total length. This way, we tend to slightly overestimate the infrastructure length since we consider edges with only one link belonging to the chosen district. We denote with an asterisk the length of the Copenhagen infrastructure computed by summing the length of all districts, and without an asterisk, that calculated directly from the city's network. Decimal digits are cut off to an arbitrary precision.

district	R (↓)	avg. overlap	avg. detour	length roads (km)	length bicycle tracks (km)	coverage roads (%)	coverage bicycle tracks (%)
Bispebjerg	69.76	83.39	4.85	93.45	36.86	71.71	28.29
Indre By	49.21	82.16	5.37	108.04	45.43	70.40	29.60
Østerbro	47.37	84.21	5.99	109.66	39.74	73.40	26.60
Brønshøj-Husum	44.81	83.82	6.03	107.18	30.38	77.92	22.08
Valby	44.31	84.86	5.88	108.59	46.32	70.10	29.90
Nørrebro	24.69	81.97	5.73	66.54	30.00	68.92	31.08
Vanløse	17.06	83.75	6.20	102.07	33.03	75.55	24.45
Vest-Kong. E.	15.59	82.21	6.77	89.93	51.26	63.69	36.31
Frederiksberg	8.88	81.07	6.35	113.35	46.15	71.06	28.94
Amager Vest	8.47	81.34	5.63	146.96	71.11	67.39	32.61
Amager Øst	6.83	77.96	6.27	98.80	24.14	80.37	19.63
Copenhagen	—	82.46	5.91	1102.62 (1144.59*)	419.70 (454.43*)	72.43 (71.58*)	27.57 (28.42*)

those where cyclists can travel (more than on average) safely on protected bicycle lanes without having to bike on long paths. To quantify this idea of superior infrastructure, we label with R the fraction between the bottom-right points and each district's total number of points, see [table 2](#).

We first focus on currently developing or less established areas. For instance, in Amager (green and purple), a large portion of data points have small Overlaps and small Detours compared to the city's average (R is below 9%, i.e. worst overall performance). This low R value signals that, under our model's assumptions, cyclists departing from Amager would rather travel on roads than protected tracks to avoid excessively long trips. Also, in Amager, cyclists leaving the southern area of the district use more bicycle tracks but have to take lengthy diversions. Detours and Overlaps in the geographically isolated port of Nordhavn, within Østerbro (pink), have a similar profile to Amager's, with cyclists travelling mostly on roads rerouting away from their shortest path.

More established areas, such as Bispebjerg (brown), Indre By (yellow), Østerbro (pink), and Brønshøj-Husum (orange) have high Overlaps. Remarkably, in Bispebjerg, all nodes are tightly concentrated around low Detour values, signifying a high and homogeneous quality of service in the district. This is also the district with the highest R value. A notable exception is Frederiksberg. This district is one of the most affluent and well-established, so at first glance, it is surprising why it has a similarly low R value ($R = 8.88$) as Amager. However, Frederiksberg is a different municipality than Copenhagen and therefore underlies a different policymaking process. It is known from historical records that Frederiksberg has been lagging behind Copenhagen regarding development of its bicycle network [6], which could explain why it is also lagging behind in terms of Detour and Overlap.

These analyses are harder to quantify using infrastructural quantities only. We support this claim by plotting and listing the length of bicycle paths and roads for each district and their share in Coverage, i.e. how many streets correspond to one or the other type of infrastructure. These metrics are plotted in [figure 3d](#) and in [table 2](#) for decreasing R and show no clear monotonicity trend. Examining the service of cycling infrastructure using only these infrastructural metrics would lead to potentially different conclusions than what was observed above using the estimated fluxes of passengers. For example, Amager Vest has better bicycle Coverage than Indre By, but the latter district has higher Overlaps and lower Detours. Thus, in principle, assessing which district is more bike-friendly is harder. For this specific example, one could argue that the reason that cyclists travel more on roads in Amager can be traced back to its extensive absolute length. However, a robust evaluation can only be made using metrics that consider various facets of the network's topology rather than a global metric only. We find that Detours and Overlap enable such an in-depth analysis at a fine scale.

3.4. Traffic congestion

To conclude our analysis of Copenhagen's transportation network, we study cyclist congestion on its streets. Particularly, we evaluate the Gini coefficient of fluxes distribution ($\sum_i |F_{el}^i|$) on bicycle tracks and roads (for its mathematical definition, see Methods in the electronic supplementary material). A lower Gini coefficient signals uniformly distributed fluxes over the edges, whereas a high Gini coefficient is symptomatic of an uneven distribution. The coefficient is normalized so that Gini=0 corresponds to uniform fluxes, and Gini=1 to maximum inequality, i.e. all flux is concentrated on one edge. In the context of congestion, a low Gini index is preferable. We evaluate its profile against α , for all λ values and for Zürich in [figure 4a](#).




Figure 3. Overlap and Detour for Copenhagen's districts. (a) Distribution of Overlap and Detour on the nodes of the city. (b) Division of Copenhagen in districts. (c) Gaussian KDE plots for each district, colours correspond to the colour scheme in (b), grey lines are averages of Overlap and Detour over the whole dataset. Contour lines are drawn to enclose $N = 200$ points at each level. (d) Absolute length in kilometres and Coverage of the infrastructure of each district, markers are coloured as in (b).




Figure 4. Gini coefficient and transport networks at different congestion levels. (a) The Gini coefficient is computed separately over the bicycle tracks and roads. Results for $\lambda = 0.5, 0.75, 0.9$ are averaged over 10 random networks, and shaded areas are their standard deviations. (b) Networks with the flux of cyclists that travel on roads (red) and bicycle tracks (blue). Edges are thicker and darker when edges are more populated. Networks correspond to the three values of α denoted by markers (circle, square, triangle) in (a) and are shown for the full Copenhagen network ($\lambda = 1$).

The Gini coefficient of the road and bicycle networks drastically differ. The former has a monotonically increasing profile as α decreases. This signals that traffic on roads becomes unbalanced when cyclists progressively reroute onto bicycle tracks. Bicycle tracks show different trends. For all synthetic underdeveloped networks with $\lambda = 0.5, 0.75, 0.9$ and for Zürich, we get an opposite pattern to those of the roads, i.e. the Gini coefficient monotonically *decreases* with decreasing α . However, the behaviour is not monotonic in the full Copenhagen network. The Gini initially drops from its maximum value at $\alpha = 0.5$ until a minimum at $\alpha = 0.85$; then the Gini increases until reaching again its maximum value at $\alpha = 1.0$, as shown in figure 4a.

This valley suggests that in a well-developed bicycle network at $\alpha = 1$, as cyclists are indifferent to choosing bicycle tracks over roads, bicycle tracks are largely unused by cyclists. This seeming preference could be explained by the phenomenon of *parallel paths* where routing on bicycle tracks that go in parallel with a road is often slightly longer than a corresponding route on the road itself [28]. Subsequently, with lower α , bicycle tracks get more uniformly populated as cyclists are encouraged to travel on them. This holds until a critical value ($\alpha = 0.85$ for Copenhagen), after which an increasing number of cyclists travel on bicycle tracks, also causing more traffic congestion.

In figure 4b, we show how the bicycle network switches from being only lightly used to congested as we decrease α (right to left). This congestion negatively impacts the quality and usability of the transportation infrastructure. In particular, we notice how the bridges connecting the larger portion of the city and the Amager island are the main traffic bottlenecks.

Finally, in figure 4a, we observe how congestion is further enhanced by the development status of the network. Underdeveloped infrastructures (lower λ) display significantly higher Gini than what is observed in the full Copenhagen network.

4. Discussion

While our analysis of Copenhagen's bicycle infrastructure revealed chokepoints and non-trivial local variations, it was a first step in applying optimal transport to bicycle network planning with potential open refinements. It also focused only on a short-term, flow-based approach that needs to be incorporated into a wider perspective of livable, sustainable, and just urban transport planning.

On a technical level, our model does not consider modal shares between bicycles and cars or between bicycles and other modes of transport. It could be that instead of rerouting onto longer paths, cyclists decide to start travelling via car—a hypothesis that is not far-fetched, given recent developments of rising car use and stagnation of bicycle modal share in Copenhagen [64]. An option to model this scenario could consider multicommodity adaptation rules [49,50,59], or statistical physics approaches, such as belief propagation [65–67]. Another open question is the effect of enriching the route choice model with more data: further auxiliary datasets in this context are objective or subjective infrastructure quality and safety [16,68] or personal routing preferences [25,27,69]. Furthermore, we do not compare our simulated traffic flows with empirical data collected via tracking devices [7,27]. While empirical flow data could make the discussion even more insightful, it comes with the potential bias of reflecting currently available infrastructure more than actual latent demand [21,22]. One limitation of our uniform OD-matrix assumption could be surpassed via non-uniform mass inflows as in [24,50,59,70] where inflows are extended, for instance, by assuming profiles based on node centralities. An alternative to building the OD matrix could be to add a distance decay term to the node inflows, which reduces the amount of cyclists travelling between distant ODs [71]. Additionally, we note that while Overlap and Detour enable us to draw several quantitative insights about Copenhagen's cyclist flows and infrastructure, there are several other metrics that can be adopted, each potentially offering valuable insights [72,73].

In this work, we focused on simulating underdeveloped networks to assess the impact of less developed infrastructures than Copenhagen's on bikeability. However, a similar analysis could be performed by considering alternative scenarios, for instance by modelling future developments where additional bicycle tracks are included to improve bikeability. This would require thinking about how to strategically add additional network edges with growing strategies [3]. Finally, our analysis focuses on the optimal cyclists' fluxes under stationary entry/exit inflows. One could potentially include time-dependent demands that would enable differentiation between short-term peak congestion and consistent bottlenecks. This could enable a broader picture to be drawn of traffic congestion on Copenhagen's streets, at the cost of higher model complexity [54].

Apart from advancing the field of flow modelling, on a higher level our study can pinpoint potential relations between bicycle infrastructure and socio-economic or policy factors. For a statistically reasonable regression analysis of our flow-based metrics with socioeconomic factors like income, education or level of urban development, we unfortunately do not have enough spatial units available ($N = 11$ districts). Nevertheless, we have reason to believe that the low R values for Amager and Frederiksberg are not a coincidence. If the low R value for Frederiksberg is indeed a remnant of the municipality's historical neglect of its bicycle network [6], it could provide a valuable lesson to the cumulative effects of policymaking. This potential effect remains open to be tested rigorously, as does the low performance in Amager and Nordhavn. It is yet unclear to which extent this performance is due to these districts' development status or their geographical remoteness. For example, should the city focus more on new connecting bicycle bridges like 'Cykelslangen' or on extending Amager's own bicycle network to improve its situation?

Besides the theoretical research, our study has potential applications in urban planning. However, a notable caveat regarding technical feasibility needs to be discussed. In Copenhagen, it might not be realistic to dynamically widen protected bicycle tracks because the city is locked into a model of raised bicycle tracks [5,12,13,74]. This track infrastructure is safe, but it does not allow the flexibility of easy widening as in, e.g. bollard-based approaches [75]. Therefore, the feasibility of the approach can depend on local contexts like the microscopic design principle of bicycle tracks. Nevertheless, our research highlights successfully the potential chokepoints in the system.

Additionally, we emphasize that while our model assumes cyclists choose OT-optimal paths, route preferences can be more nuanced and influenced by network, individual and exogenous factors [76]. Integrating data-driven behavioural studies [76,77] into network models such as the one we considered here could provide valuable insights and help translate scientific findings into actionable strategies for making cities more bikeable. A possible step in this direction is the use of bilevel approaches [58], where travellers' individual trajectories are taken into account by network managers.

In a wider perspective beyond a short-term flow-based study, long-term dynamics must be considered. Most importantly, it cannot be assumed that the total flow in the system is constant or independent of existing infrastructure. In the most extreme case of no existing protected bicycle infrastructure, cyclist flow can be assumed near zero because most people do not feel safe cycling [78], as is the case in most cities worldwide [3,79]. Going with the 'build it and they will come' principle [21], an increase in infrastructure then would lead to more flow in the system. Therefore, it is important to account not only for existing cyclists, because their numbers are strongly influenced by the existing (lack of) infrastructure. Instead, a network design is necessary that accounts for such future flow changes related to induced demand [22].

Ultimately, bicycle network analysis should also ask whether and why a bicycle network is even needed, or whether the goal of more livable, sustainable and just cities [80] can also be achieved via simpler means such as an overall reduction of speed limits and car parking, reallocation of street space from cars to sustainable transport, or introduction of congestion charges—all particularly relevant for Copenhagen [64]. These interventions also come with the benefit of reducing the many dimensions of car harm [81]. However, as such measures impose restrictions on motorized traffic and thus can imply a perceived unsettling change in the status quo and existing privileges, they depend on political choice. For cases where political leadership is not capable or willing to implement ‘big bang’ interventions (sudden sweeping changes) [74], our research can help to fine-tune existing bicycle networks effectively via incremental interventions and plan new networks or their extensions to account for cyclist congestion, to facilitate positioning cycling as a viable transportation choice in cities.

Ethics. This work did not require ethical approval from a human subject or animal welfare committee.

Data accessibility. All data used for the experiments are publicly available at [60].

An open-source Python code implementation is available: MultiOT [82].

Supplementary material is available online [83].

Declaration of AI use. We have not used AI-assisted technologies in creating this article.

Authors' contributions. A.L.: conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, software, validation, visualization, writing—original draft, writing—review and editing; M.S.: conceptualization, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, supervision, validation, visualization, writing—original draft, writing—review and editing; C.D.B.: conceptualization, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, supervision, validation, visualization, writing—original draft, writing—review and editing.

All authors gave final approval for publication and agreed to be held accountable for the work performed therein.

Conflict of interest declaration. We declare we have no competing interests.

Funding. The authors thank the International Max Planck Research School for Intelligent Systems (IMPRS-IS) for supporting A.L. M.S. acknowledges funding from EU Horizon Project JUST STREETS (Grant ID: 101104240) and from The Danish Ministry of Transport (Grant ID: CP21-033). All map data from OpenStreetMap.

References

- Buehler R, Dill J. 2016 Bikeway Networks: A Review of Effects on Cycling. *Transp. Rev.* **36**, 9–27. (doi:10.1080/01441647.2015.1069908)
- Gössling S, Choi A, Dekker K, Metzler D. 2019 The Social Cost of Automobility, Cycling and Walking in the European Union. *Ecol. Econ.* **158**, 65–74. (doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2018.12.016)
- Szell M, Mimar S, Perlman T, Ghoshal G, Sinatra R. 2022 Growing urban bicycle networks. *Sci. Rep.* **12**. (doi:10.1038/s41598-022-10783-y)
- Nielsen TAS, Skov-Petersen H, Agervig Carstensen T. 2013 Urban planning practices for bikeable cities—the case of Copenhagen. *Urban Res. Pract.* **6**, 110–115. (doi:10.1080/17535069.2013.765108)
- Haustein S, Koglin T, Nielsen TAS, Svensson Å. 2020 A comparison of cycling cultures in Stockholm and Copenhagen. *Int. J. Sustain. Transp.* **14**, 280–293. (doi:10.1080/15568318.2018.1547463)
- Carstensen TA, Olafsson AS, Bech NM, Poulsen TS, Zhao C. 2015 The spatio-temporal development of Copenhagen's bicycle infrastructure 1912–2013. *Geogr. Tidsskr. Dan. J. Geogr.* **115**, 142–156. (doi:10.1080/00167223.2015.1034151)
- Fosgerau M, Łukawska M, Paulsen M, Rasmussen TK. 2023 Bikeability and the induced demand for cycling. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **120**, e2220515120. (doi:10.1073/pnas.2220515120)
- CROW. 2016 Design Manual for Bicycle Traffic. <https://crowplatform.com/product/design-manual-for-bicycle-traffic/>
- Rambøll. 2022 *Walking and cycling data. Practice, challenges, needs and gaps*. See https://7520151.fs1.hubspotusercontent-na1.net/hubfs/7520151/Walking%20and%20cycling%20data_Ramboll_2022.pdf.
- Teknik- og Miljøforvaltningen. 2017 *Cykkelsti-prioriteringsplan 2017–2025*. Københavns Kommune: Teknik- og Miljøforvaltningen.
- Paulsen M, Rich J. 2023 Societally optimal expansion of bicycle networks. *Transp. Res. Part B* **174**, 102778. (doi:10.1016/j.trb.2023.06.002)
- Vedel SE, Jacobsen JB, Skov-Petersen H. 2017 Bicyclists' preferences for route characteristics and crowding in Copenhagen—a choice experiment study of commuters. *Transp. Res. Part* **100**, 53–64. (doi:10.1016/j.trb.2017.04.006)
- Koubeck AM, Hunt A, Bickham SC, Stuart SA. 2017 Breaking the Cycle of Congestion: An Examination of Bicycle Traffic in Copenhagen. https://digital.wpi.edu/concern/student_works/zp38wc97m?locale=zh
- City of Copenhagen, The Technical and Environmental Administration. 2016 *The bicycle account 2016*. Copenhagen City of Cyclists. See <https://bicycleinfrastructuremanuals.com/manuals4/CPH%20bicycle-account-2016.pdf>.
- City of Copenhagen, The Technical and Environmental Administration. 2019 *The bicycle account 2018*. Copenhagen City of Cyclists. See https://kk.sites.itera.dk/apps/kk_pub2/pdf/1382_fvvntrbslz.pdf.
- Vierø AR, Vyborno A, Szell M. 2024 How Good Is Open Bicycle Network Data? A Countrywide Case Study of Denmark. *Geogr. Anal.* **57**, 52–87. (doi:10.1111/gean.12400)
- Bhowmick D *et al.* 2023 A systematic scoping review of methods for estimating link-level bicycling volumes. *Transp. Rev.* **43**, 622–651. (doi:10.1080/01441647.2022.2147240)
- Lovelace R, Félix R, Carlino D. 2022 Jittering: A Computationally Efficient Method for Generating Realistic Route Networks from Origin-Destination Data. *Findings*, April. (doi:10.32866/001c.33873)
- Gerike R, Weikl S, Koszowski C, Bogenberger K. 2022 Network level design for cycling. In *Advances in transport policy and planning cycling*, pp. 77–109, vol. **10**. Cambridge, MA: Elsevier Inc. (doi:10.1016/bs.atpp.2022.04.005)
- de Groot R. 2016 *Design manual for bicycle traffic*. Ede, NL: CROW.
- Cervero R, Caldwell B, Cuellar J. 2013 Bike-and-Ride: Build It and They Will Come. *J. Public Transp.* **16**, 83–105. (doi:10.5038/2375-0901.16.4.5)
- OECD. 2021 Transport strategies for net-zero systems by design. See https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/environment/transport-strategies-for-net-zero-systems-by-design_0a20f779-en.

23. Villani C. 2009 Stability of optimal transport. In *Grundlehren der mathematischen wissenschaften optimal transport*, pp. 773–793. Berlin, Germany: Springer. (doi:10.1007/978-3-540-71050-9_28)
24. Steinacker C, Storch DM, Timme M, Schröder M. 2022 Demand-driven design of bicycle infrastructure networks for improved urban bikeability. *Nat. Comput. Sci.* **2**, 655–664. (doi:10.1038/s43588-022-00318-w)
25. Reggiani G, van Oijen T, Hamedmoghadam H, Daamen W, Vu HL, Hoogendoorn S. 2022 Understanding bikeability: a methodology to assess urban networks. *Transportation* **49**, 897–925. (doi:10.1007/s11116-021-10198-0)
26. Mahfouz H, Lovelace R, Arcaute E. 2023 A road segment prioritization approach for cycling infrastructure. *J. Transp. Geogr.* **113**, 103715. (doi:10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2023.103715)
27. Skov-Petersen H, Barkow B, Lundhede T, Jacobsen JB. 2018 How do cyclists make their way?—A GPS-based revealed preference study in Copenhagen. *Int. J. Geogr. Inf. Sci.* **32**, 1469–1484. (doi:10.1080/13658816.2018.1436713)
28. Vybornova A, Cunha T, Gühnemann A, Szell M. 2023 Automated Detection of Missing Links in Bicycle Networks. *Geogr. Anal.* **55**, 239–267. (doi:10.1111/gean.12324)
29. Rahbek Viørø A. 2020 Connectivity for Cyclists? A Network Analysis of Copenhagen's Bike Lanes. MSc thesis, Lund University, Lund, Sweden.
30. Peyré G, Cuturi M. 2019 Computational Optimal Transport: With Applications to Data Science. *Found. Trends® Mach. Learn.* **11**, 355–607. (doi:10.1561/22000000073)
31. Cuturi M. Sinkhorn distances: Lightspeed computation of optimal transport. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26 (NIPS 2013)*. vol. **26**. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2013/file/af21d0c97db2e27e13572cbf59eb343d-Paper.pdf.
32. Demetci P, Santorella R, Sandstedt B, Noble WS, Singh R. Gromov–Wasserstein optimal transport to align single-cell multi-omics data. *bioRxiv* 2020.04.28.066787 (doi:10.1101/2020.04.28.066787)
33. Werman M, Peleg S, Rosenfeld A. 1985 A distance metric for multidimensional histograms. *Comput. Vis. Graph. Image Process.* **32**, 328–336. (doi:10.1016/0734-189x(85)90055-6)
34. Peleg S, Werman M, Rom H. 1989 A unified approach to the change of resolution: space and gray-level. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.* **11**, 739–742. (doi:10.1109/34.192468)
35. Rubner Y, Tomasi C, Guibas LJ. A metric for distributions with applications to image databases. In *Sixth Int. Conf. on Computer Vision, 7 January, Bombay, India*, pp. 59–66. (doi:10.1109/iccv.1998.710701)
36. Rubner Y, Tomasi C, Guibas LJ. 2000 The Earth Mover's Distance as a Metric for Image Retrieval. *Int. J. Comput. Vis.* **40**, 99–121. (doi:10.1023/A:1026543900054)
37. Koehl P, Delarue M, Orland H. 2019 Optimal transport at finite temperature. *Phys. Rev. E* **100**, 013310. (doi:10.1103/physreve.100.013310)
38. Facca E, Daneri S, Cardin F, Putti M. 2020 Numerical Solution of Monge–Kantorovich Equations via a Dynamic Formulation. *J. Sci. Comput.* **82**, 68. (doi:10.1007/s10915-020-01170-8)
39. Facca E, Cardin F, Putti M. 2018 Towards a Stationary Monge–Kantorovich Dynamics: The *Physarum polycephalum* Experience. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **78**, 651–676. (doi:10.1137/16m1098383)
40. Facca E, Cardin F, Putti M. 2021 Branching structures emerging from a continuous optimal transport model. *J. Comput. Phys.* **447**, 110700. (doi:10.1016/j.jcp.2021.110700)
41. Facca E, Benzi M. 2021 Fast Iterative Solution of the Optimal Transport Problem on Graphs. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* **43**, A2295–A2319. (doi:10.1137/20m137015x)
42. Bonifaci V, Mehlhorn K, Varma G. 2012 *Physarum* can compute shortest paths. *J. Theor. Biol.* **309**, 121–133. (doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2012.06.017)
43. Bonifaci V. 2013 *Physarum* can compute shortest paths: A short proof. *Inf. Process. Lett.* **113**, 4–7. (doi:10.1016/j.ipl.2012.09.005)
44. Baptista D, De Bacco C. 2022 Convergence Properties of Optimal Transport-Based Temporal Networks. In *Complex networks & their applications x* (ed. RM Benito), pp. 578–592. Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing. (doi:10.1007/978-3-030-93409-5_48)
45. Baptista D, Leite D, Facca E, Putti M, De Bacco C. 2020 Network extraction by routing optimization. *Sci. Rep.* **10**, 088702. (doi:10.1038/s41598-020-77064-4)
46. Leite D, De Bacco C. 2024 Similarity and economy of scale in urban transportation networks and optimal transport-based infrastructures. *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 7981. (doi:10.1038/s41467-024-52313-6)
47. Lonardi A, Baptista D, De Bacco C. 2023 Immiscible color flows in optimal transport networks for image classification. *Front. Phys.* **11**. (doi:10.3389/fphy.2023.1089114)
48. Dijkstra EW. 1959 A note on two problems in connexion with graphs. *Numer. Math.* **1**, 269–271. (doi:10.1007/bf01386390)
49. Lonardi A, Facca E, Putti M, De Bacco C. 2021 Designing optimal networks for multicommodity transport problem. *Phys. Rev. Res.* **3**, 043010. (doi:10.1103/physrevresearch.3.043010)
50. Lonardi A, Putti M, De Bacco C. 2022 Multicommodity routing optimization for engineering networks. *Sci. Rep.* **12**, 7474. (doi:10.1038/s41598-022-11348-9)
51. Bonifaci V, Facca E, Folz F, Karrenbauer A, Kolev P, Mehlhorn K, Morigi G, Shahkarami G, Vermande Q. 2022 *Physarum*-inspired multi-commodity flow dynamics. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **920**, 1–20. (doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2022.02.001)
52. Ibrahim AA, Lonardi A, De Bacco CD. 2021 Optimal Transport in Multilayer Networks for Traffic Flow Optimization. *Algorithms* **14**, 189. (doi:10.3390/a14070189)
53. Ibrahim AA, Leite D, De Bacco C. 2022 Sustainable optimal transport in multilayer networks. *Phys. Rev. E* **105**, 064302. (doi:10.1103/physreve.105.064302)
54. Lonardi A, Facca E, Putti M, De Bacco C. 2023 Infrastructure adaptation and emergence of loops in network routing with time-dependent loads. *Phys. Rev. E* **107**, 024302. (doi:10.1103/physreve.107.024302)
55. Hu D, Cai D. 2013 Adaptation and Optimization of Biological Transport Networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 138701. (doi:10.1103/physrevlett.111.138701)
56. Katifori E, Szöllösi GJ, Magnasco MO. 2010 Damage and Fluctuations Induce Loops in Optimal Transport Networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 048704. (doi:10.1103/physrevlett.104.048704)
57. Corson F. 2010 Fluctuations and Redundancy in Optimal Transport Networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 048703. (doi:10.1103/physrevlett.104.048703)
58. Lonardi A, De Bacco C. 2023 Bilevel Optimization for Traffic Mitigation in Optimal Transport Networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 267401. (doi:10.1103/physrevlett.131.267401)
59. Ibrahim AA, Muehlebach M, De Bacco C. 2024 Optimal Transport with Constraints: From Mirror Descent to Classical Mechanics. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133**, 057401. (doi:10.1103/physrevlett.133.057401)
60. Szell M. 2021 Urban bicycle networks, existing and synthetically grown. Zenodo. (doi:10.5281/zenodo.5083049)
61. Yao R, Fosgerau M, Paulsen M, Rasmussen TK. 2024 Perturbed Utility Stochastic Traffic Assignment. *Transp. Sci.* **58**, 876–895. (doi:10.1287/trsc.2023.0449)
62. Fosgerau M, Paulsen M, Rasmussen TK. 2022 A perturbed utility route choice model. *Transp. Res. Part C* **136**, 103514. (doi:10.1016/j.trc.2021.103514)
63. Københavns Kommune. Districts. See <https://www.opendata.dk/city-of-copenhagen/bydele>.
64. Koglin T, te Brömmelstroet M, van Wee B. 2021 Cycling in Copenhagen and Amsterdam. In *Cycling for sustainable cities*, pp. 347–370. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. (doi:10.7551/mitpress/11963.003.0022)
65. Yeung CH, Saad D, Wong KYM. 2013 From the physics of interacting polymers to optimizing routes on the London Underground. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **110**, 13717–13722. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1301111110)
66. Yeung CH, Saad D. 2013 Networking—a statistical physics perspective. *J. Phys.* **46**, 103001. (doi:10.1088/1751-8113/46/10/103001)
67. Xu YZ, Po HF, Yeung CH, Saad D. 2022 Scalable node-disjoint and edge-disjoint multiwavelength routing. *Phys. Rev. E* **105**, 044316. (doi:10.1103/physreve.105.044316)

68. Gössling S, McRae S. 2022 Subjectively safe cycling infrastructure: new insights for urban designs. *J. Transp. Geogr.* **101**, 103340. (doi:10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2022.103340)
69. Łukawska M, Paulsen M, Rasmussen TK, Jensen AF, Nielsen OA. 2023 A joint bicycle route choice model for various cycling frequencies and trip distances based on a large crowdsourced GPS dataset. *Transp. Res. Part B* **176**, 103834. (doi:10.1016/j.trb.2023.103834)
70. Morris RG, Barthelemy M. 2012 Transport on Coupled Spatial Networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 128703. (doi:10.1103/physrevlett.109.128703)
71. Lovelace R, Goodman A, Aldred R, Berkoff N, Abbas A, Woodcock J. 2017 The Propensity to Cycle Tool: An open source online system for sustainable transport planning. *J. Transp. Land Use* **10**. (doi:10.5198/jtlu.2016.862)
72. Ahmed T, Pirdavani A, Wets G, Janssens D. 2024 Bicycle Infrastructure Design Principles in Urban Bikeability Indices: A Systematic Review. *Sustainability* **16**, 2545. (doi:10.3390/su16062545)
73. Arellana J, Saltarín M, Larrañaga AM, González VI, Henao CA. 2020 Developing an urban bikeability index for different types of cyclists as a tool to prioritise bicycle infrastructure investments. *Transp. Res. Part B* **139**, 310–334. (doi:10.1016/j.trb.2020.07.010)
74. Nieuwenhuijsen M, Bastiaansen J, Sersli S, Waygood EOD, Khreis H. 2019 Implementing Car-Free Cities: Rationale, Requirements, Barriers and Facilitators. In *Integrating human health into urban and transport planning* (eds M Nieuwenhuijsen, H Khreis), pp. 199–219. Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing. (doi:10.1007/978-3-319-74983-9_11)
75. National Association of City Transportation Officials. 2014 *Urban bikeway design guide*, 1st edn. Washington, DC: Island Press. (doi:10.5822/978-1-61091-582-3). See <http://link.springer.com/10.5822/978-1-61091-582-3>.
76. Łukawska M. 2024 Quantitative modelling of cyclists' route choice behaviour on utilitarian trips based on GPS data: associated factors and behavioural implications. *Transp. Rev.* **44**, 1–32. (doi:10.1080/01441647.2024.2355468)
77. Chou KY, Paulsen M, Nielsen OA, Jensen AF. 2023 Analysis of cycling accessibility using detour ratios—a large-scale study based on crowdsourced GPS data. *Sustain. Cities Soc.* **93**, 104500. (doi:10.1016/j.scs.2023.104500)
78. Hull A, O'Holleran C. 2014 Bicycle infrastructure: can good design encourage cycling? *Urban Plan. Transp. Res.* **2**, 369–406. (doi:10.1080/21650020.2014.955210)
79. Prieto-Curiel R, Ospina JP. 2024 The ABC of mobility. *Environ. Int.* **185**, 108541. (doi:10.1016/j.envint.2024.108541)
80. Gössling S. 2016 Urban transport justice. *J. Transp. Geogr.* **54**, 1–9. (doi:10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2016.05.002)
81. Miner P, Smith BM, Jani A, McNeill G, Gathorne-Hardy A. 2024 Car harm: a global review of automobility's harm to people and the environment. *J. Transp. Geogr.* **115**, 103817. (doi:10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2024.103817)
82. De Bacco C, Ibrahim AA, Leite de Souza MD, Lonardi A. 2024 MultiOT. Zenodo. (doi:10.5281/zenodo.14288856)
83. Lonardi A, Szell M, De Bacco C. 2025 Supplementary material from: Cohesive urban bicycle infrastructure design through optimal transport routing in multilayer networks. Figshare. (doi:10.6084/m9.figshare.c.7618817)