

Contents

Table of Figures	<u>XI</u>
Table of Tables	<u>XIII</u>
Foreword	<u>XV</u>
Preface	<u>XIX</u>
Author's Note Regarding Abbreviations, Keywords, and Phrases	<u>XXI</u>
Acknowledgments	<u>XXIII</u>

Introduction	<u>1</u>
---------------------	-----------------

CHAPTER 1

Methods	<u>5</u>
1.1. IRR Estimation Method	<u>5</u>
1.2. IRR Confidence Limit Estimation Method	<u>6</u>
1.3. Heterogeneity Best Practice Violation	<u>7</u>
1.4. Matching AV Crashes to Police Records	<u>8</u>
1.5. Reason for Not Using Statistical Significance Tests	<u>9</u>
References	<u>10</u>

CHAPTER 2

The First Major AV Safety Study: Schoettle and Sivak (2015)	<u>13</u>
2.1. Summary of Schoettle and Sivak (2015)	<u>14</u>
2.2. Critical Analysis of Schoettle and Sivak (2015) Study	<u>17</u>
2.3. Reanalysis of Corrected Schoettle and Sivak (2015) Data	<u>20</u>
2.4. New Methods to Remove Unrecorded Crash Selection Bias and Site Selection Bias	<u>22</u>
2.5. Summary of Reanalysis of Schoettle and Sivak (2015) Data	<u>29</u>
References	<u>30</u>

CHAPTER 3

Google AV Crash Data versus Naturalistic Crash Data: Blanco et al. (2016)	<u>33</u>
3.1. Summary of Blanco et al. (2016): Google AV versus SHRP2 CV	<u>34</u>
3.2. Epidemiologic Analysis: Blanco et al. (2016) Google AV versus SHRP2	<u>36</u>
3.3. Critical Analysis of Blanco et al. (2016): Site Selection Bias	<u>38</u>
3.4. Standardizing the AV Crash Data Adjusts for Site Selection Bias	<u>43</u>
3.5. Blanco et al. (2016): Google AV versus U.S. National CV Comparison is Confounded by Unrecorded Crashes	<u>49</u>
References	<u>51</u>

CHAPTER 4

Crash Selection Bias and Site Selection Bias: Dixit et al. (2016)	<u>53</u>
4.1. Summary of Dixit et al. (2016)	<u>53</u>
4.2. Critical Analysis of Dixit et al. (2016)	<u>54</u>
References and Endnotes	<u>60</u>

CHAPTER 5

Crash Selection Biases and Site Selection Biases: Teoh and Kidd (2017)	<u>63</u>
5.1. Phase 1 “Mountain View”: 2009–December 31, 2015	<u>64</u>
5.2. Phase 2 “All States”: January 1, 2016, to August 31, 2016	<u>79</u>
5.3. Trends in Teoh and Kidd’s (2017) Data	<u>81</u>
5.4. Discussion of Reanalyzed Teoh and Kidd (2017) Data	<u>86</u>
References and Endnotes	<u>87</u>

CHAPTER 6

Heterogeneity and Crash Selection Bias: Favarò et al. (2017)	<u>91</u>
6.1. Summary of Favarò et al. (2017) Original Data	<u>92</u>
6.2. Critical Analysis of Favarò et al. (2017)	<u>94</u>
6.3. Discussion of Favarò et al. (2017)	<u>95</u>
References and Endnotes	<u>96</u>

CHAPTER 7

Crash Selection Bias and Site Selection Bias: Banerjee et al. (2018)	<u>99</u>
7.1. Summary of Banerjee et al. (2018)	<u>100</u>
7.2. Critical Analysis of Banerjee et al. (2018)	<u>102</u>
References	<u>108</u>

CHAPTER 8

Overall Summary of AV IRR Estimates and Issues	<u>111</u>
8.1. Overview	<u>112</u>
8.2. Overall Summary of AV IRR Estimates	<u>112</u>
8.3. Overall Summary of Identified Issues	<u>118</u>
References	<u>121</u>

CHAPTER 9

Overall Discussion	<u>123</u>
9.1. Final AV IRR Estimates	<u>123</u>
9.2. Final AV IRR Issues	<u>125</u>
9.3. New Findings	<u>125</u>
9.4. Limitations of the Reanalyses	<u>126</u>
9.5. Crash Rate Reduction: AVs versus Crash Avoidance Technologies	<u>127</u>
9.6. Did Lower AV Speeds Reduce the AV Severe Crash Rate?	<u>128</u>
9.7. Other Hypotheses to Explain the Upward Trend in AV Cumulative Crash Rates	<u>129</u>
References	<u>131</u>

CHAPTER 10

Overall Conclusions	<u>135</u>
References	<u>136</u>