Dear David,

We would like to thank the reviewers for their very helpful comments. The major changes we have made are: a) revised literature review, b) model re-estimation with constants and adding Table 5 (marginal effects) and c) we rewrote the conclusions. We further clarified several issues raised by the reviewers. Please find attached our revised paper and below a summary of how we responded to the comments.

**Literature Review**

- *Lit. review:* Add some references on land-use and mode choice (e.g. presence of sidewalks, compactness of developments, extent of land use mix, and street connectivity.) Further add some comments on other factors such as crime, safety influencing transit choice (Reviewer B)
  
  Agreed. We have revised our literature review (in particular on page 4) and added some discussion on land-use and neighbourhood factors influencing mode choice.

- Site Mokhtarian’s work on the positive utility of commute (Reviewer C).
  
  We refer now to Mokhtarian’s work during the data analysis as well as in the conclusion.

**Figures**

- Units should be provided for table 3, 4 (time in minutes?, cost in pounds? Add scale, units to graphs (Reviewer A+ C)
  
  We clarified the units and added a comment on the scale of the figures.

- Can you calculate and graph bus stop density per older person figures 1-1/1-3. I am not clear on the scale of figure 1-3, is that just persons?
  
  We calculated an additional graph on bus stop density/older person but did not feel it provides new information and therefore did not include it.

- End of page 5, revise sentence with “suggests some (weak) correlation. Do correlation analysis bus stop density + areas with higher proportion of older people (Reviewer A + B)
  
  We dropped our sentence on correlation between bus stop density and population density as it is indeed not statistically significant.

**Model**

- I don’t believe section 5 is necessary, logit and nested logit have been described extensively in the literature and their rationale and methodology can simply be cited. (Reviewer A + C)
  
  Agreed: We dropped this section.

- Clarify why “strange mode choices” like car+walk (Reviewer C)
  
  We felt it is fairly clear but clarified at the end of Section 4 as well as in Section 5.2

- I am confused by Model 2 and its explanation in the text. The top level should still be mode choice, not "Same mode". At any rate, the discussion and results can probably be dropped if they don’t tell us anything new. (Reviewer C)
  
  Agreed: 2nd nested logit model dropped

- Explain how travel time and travel cost for the unchosen alternatives are calculated and why they are needed (Reviewer A)
  
  We added some comments in Section 5.2

- Clarify why we don’t use mode specific constants (Reviewer A + B)
  
  We agree that including the constants is better and re-estimated the model with constants

- Reviewer B suggests using marginal effects instead of parameters for interpretation.
  
  We added Table 5 but still felt reporting the parameters is important.
• Add comment that car is reference variable where possible, but e.g. for car availability it makes more sense to estimate specifically to drive (Reviewer A)
  Added comment in 3rd sentence of Section 5.2

• Use the term "statistically significant" rather than significant when doing interpretations of the models as in page 9 and maybe revise statistically not significant to “didn't find a statistically significant relationship in the model”. (Reviewer A)

Done.

Conclusions

• Revise conclusions to focus on new findings! (Reviewer B)
  The conclusions are significantly re-written. In particular we put now more emphasis the implications of our findings on tour complexity and positive travel time coefficient.

• Comment on self-selection theory in conclusions. I.e. choice of residence because of limited mobility! – careful interpretation of cause and effect (Reviewer A comment)
• Revise sentence on DaR recommendation in conclusion: acknowledge that DaR is expensive and only for a specific group attractive (Reviewer A comment)
  For both points, in light of the comments and by reviewing our paper, we felt our conclusions are too weak and we dropped these points.

• Revise interpretation of service frequency not being significant – clarify it might be because of variable definition (Reviewer A + B comment)
  Agreed.

• Add discussion on shortcomings, e.g. data not specifically collected for mode choice analysis (Reviewer A)
  Agreed.