

Erratum to: Ridership drivers of bus rapid transit systems

David A. Hensher · Zheng Li

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC. 2012

Erratum to: Transportation DOI 10.1007/s11116-012-9392-y

The model in the paper had a variable called ‘At-level boarding and alighting’ which had a controversial sign. We have re-estimated the model. The substantive findings remain, but we have removed this variable and added in two additional variables that have now proven to be informative.

The revised table and associated revised text is set out below. Most of the previous text associated with Table 2 is still applicable.

We have removed the text “*At-level boarding and alighting* is negative to the passenger-trip numbers. Although at-level boarding/alighting improves the service level, it reduces seating capacity of a vehicle. Manufacture manuals suggest that up to three seats are often lost in low floor buses compared to higher floor buses, in large part due to the design to accommodate special needs such as wheel chair access, parents with buggies, those with wheeled luggage, and people faced with difficulty in climbing steps.” And added in the text “We also find that buses with one or more doorways at both the median and curbside relative to other configurations such as one or two doors on one side only, has

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:[10.1007/s11116-012-9392-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-012-9392-y).

D. A. Hensher (✉) · Z. Li
Institute of Transport and Logistics Studies, The University of Sydney Business School,
The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia
e-mail: David.Hensher@sydney.edu.au

Z. Li
e-mail: Zheng.Li@sydney.edu.au

Table 2 Random effects regression model (dependent variable: natural logarithm of daily passengers-trips)

Explanatory variable	Parameter	<i>t</i> -ratio	VIF
Continuous variables			
Nature logarithm of fare (US\$2006)	-0.3656	-2.11	3.20
Nature logarithm of headway (min)	-0.243	-2.57	1.86
Number of existing trunk corridors	0.2229	4.18	3.17
Total length of BRT network (km)	0.5582	3.40	3.36
Average distance between stations/population density (m)	-0.17358	-2.08	1.52
Years difference relative to 2011	0.1669	2.22	3.2
Dummy variables			
Existence of an integrated network of routes and corridors (Yes)	0.4143	2.22	1.42
Modal integration at stations (Yes)	0.4529	2.04	2.01
Pre-board fare collection and fare verification (Yes)	0.6276	2.89	2.92
Doorways located on median and curbside (Yes)	2.0989	4.03	3.21
Quality control oversight from an independent entity/agency (Yes)	0.7608	4.45	1.33
Latin America (Location of BRT)	0.6249	2.09	1.81
Constant	7.2437	11.69	-
Disturbance term effects			
Country-specific disturbance (u_i)	0.1334		
Random error term (ε_{it})	0.1557		
Sample size	46		
Adjusted R^2	0.875		

a positive influence on patronage, since it enables a more efficient flow in and out from either one side or both sides of a bus. Finally we found a positive relationship between ridership and the number of years a BRT system has been in operation.”

We thank Pilo Willumson for drawing this point to our attention.