

Title: Prices and preferences in the electric vehicle market

Authors: Chung Yi See¹, Vasco Rato Santos², Lucas Woodley³, Megan Yeo¹, Daniel Palmer⁴, Shuheng Zhang^{1,5}, and Ashley Nunes^{1,6,7}

¹ Department of Economics
Harvard College
Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

² Department of Economics
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

³ Department of Psychology
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

⁴ Groton School
Groton, MA 01450

⁵ Department of Mathematics
Harvard College
Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

⁶ Breakthrough Institute
Berkeley, CA 94720

⁷ Center for Labor and a Just Economy
Harvard Law School
Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

Corresponding Author: Ashley Nunes, anunes@law.harvard.edu

Abstract: Although electric vehicles (EVs) are climate-friendly alternative to gasoline powered vehicles, adoption is challenged, in large measure, by higher up-front procurement prices. Existing discourse emphasizes EV battery costs as being principally responsible for this price differential and EV affordability – and consequently, widespread adoption - is routinely conditioned upon battery costs declining. Is such reasoning supported by existing data? What factors beyond battery cost may impact EV procurement prices? And what is relative influence each of these factors levy on price? Sourcing data on EV attributes and auto market conditions between 2011 and 2023, we estimate a model that addresses these questions. Our findings are fourfold. First, we find that contrary to existing discourse, EV prices are influenced principally by the number of amenities, additional features, and dealer-installed accessories sold as standard on an EV, and to a lesser extent, by the EV's horsepower. Second, we observe that EV range is negatively correlated with EV price implying that range anxiety concerns may be less consequential than existing discourse suggests. Third, we show that battery capacity is positively correlated with EV price, due to more capacity being synonymous with an EV's ability to deliver more horsepower. Collectively, this suggests that higher up-front procurement prices for EVs reflects consumer preference for vehicles that are feature dense and more powerful. Fourth and finally, we show that accommodating these preferences have – since 2018 – produced vehicles with lower fuel economy, a shift we estimate reduces an EV's envisioned lifecycle emissions benefits by at least 3.26 percent, subject to the battery pack chemistry leveraged and the carbon intensity of the electrical grid. These findings warrant attention as decarbonization efforts increasingly emphasize EVs as a pathway for complying with domestic and international climate agreements.

Introduction

What predicts electric vehicle (EV) prices? Over the last decade, EV market share has steadily risen across the world. In 2022, more than 10 million EVs were sold globally, up from 130,000 in 2012 (1-3). This trend – which shifts energy usage away from gasoline towards electricity – reflects growing environmental concerns surrounding the use of fossil fuels (4). Vehicles powered by these fuels constitute one of the largest emitters of CO₂, a contribution that accelerates the national greenhouse effect, causing global temperature to rise (5,6). In 2021, CO₂ emissions alone were responsible for approximately two-thirds of the total warming influence of all human-produced greenhouse gases (7).

Given the far-ranging environmental and health effects of these emissions, many countries have implemented policies that incentivize EV adoption. EVs present numerous advantages over their fossil fuel-powered counterparts, the most relevant – from a carbon emissions perspective – being reduced dependence on fossil fuels, which results in a more favorable emissions profile (8). This profile persists even when emissions associated with EV production, extraction, processing, transportation, and fuel distribution are accounted for (9). However, widespread adoption of EVs is challenged, in part, by on-average higher up-front procurement prices. In 2022, the average manufacturer suggested retail price (MSRP) of an EV in the United States – a key auto market – was over \$65,000, compared to \$48,000 for vehicles powered by internal combustion engines (ICEVs) (10).

What explains this price difference? A common explanation is mineral-intensity-related differences in the manufacture of EVs versus ICEVs (11). ICEVs only require five of the eight minerals used in the manufacturing of EVs, and by some estimates, two additional minerals – copper and manganese – despite being leveraged by both ICEVs and EVs, are used in far lower quantities for the former versus the latter (12). Higher mineral requirements for EVs – which are used largely to produce the batteries that propel these vehicles – contribute to higher battery manufacturing costs, and by consequence, higher EV prices (relative to ICEVs) (13,14). Projections of price parity between EVs and ICEVs reflect this sentiment, emphasizing declining battery costs – realized via increased battery production volume, and new and/or optimized battery chemistries – as crucial to EV affordability and mass-market adoption (14-16).

Is this sentiment supported by existing data? Do lower EV battery costs lower up-front EV procurement prices for consumers? If so, is the magnitude of price reductions proportional to the reduction in battery costs? What other factors might influence up-front procurement prices for consumers? An answer is – from the vantage point of effective public policy – timely, given increasing emphasis on EVs as a decarbonization pathway. This is particularly true in the United States which, owing to its high motorization rate, is a significant CO₂ emitter. In recent years, efforts to lower these emissions have accelerated. Crucial to the success of these efforts is the presumption (or expectation) of a favorable up-front cost proposition for EVs (relative to ICEVs).

Surprisingly, few studies – to our knowledge – enumerate EV cost predictors. Some studies estimate EV adoption rates based on macro-economic factors (e.g., oil prices, regulatory environment, currency fluctuations, and broad geopolitical risk) (17,18). Others leverage specific per-kWh battery pack cost targets to predict when price parity between EVs and ICEVs will occur (13,19,20). Further efforts scrutinize limited cost breakdowns based on teardown information of components universal to autos at

large (versus specific powertrains) (21,22). Moreover, all known efforts to date scrutinize cost information for a specified year which limits an appreciation of how the EV market has evolved. Efforts to enumerate long-run predictors of EV prices are – given the technology’s importance for decarbonization – surprisingly scarce.

When predictors of EV prices are investigated; these efforts often explore consumer willingness to pay for an EV *given* a certain set of attributes (e.g., extended range battery, bi-directional charging, and auto-safety features) rather than scrutinizing the extent to which these attributes predict the price set by automakers (23-25). This distinction is a subtle but important one as the equilibrium quantity of EVs sold is determined by the interaction between consumers’ demand for EVs *and* the price point set by EV manufacturers. Given the dearth of literature enumerating factors that influence the latter, we argue that an exploration of supply-side, rather than demand-side, outcomes is increasingly timely.

We do so here. Sourcing publicly available data on vehicle attributes and market conditions between 2011 and 2023, our model enumerates predictors of the EV price (26-28). We focus our efforts on the light-duty vehicle market in the United States, a sector that – owing to annual sales volume and overall miles travelled – is major contributor to nationwide greenhouse gas emissions. In recent years, efforts have emphasized EV adoption as the crucial pathway for reducing emissions contributions from light duty vehicles. The most notable of these efforts are the 2022 Inflation Reduction Act (IRA), passed by the United States Congress, and the Multi-Pollutant Emissions Standards proposed by the Environmental Protection Agency in 2023 (29-31). Our work can help inform the efficacy of these and similar EV adoption efforts by enumerating factors likely to impact EV pricing, and by consequence, adoption.

Results and Discussion

To enumerate predictors of EV prices, we scrutinize electrified light duty vehicles sold in the US between 2011 and 2023. We defined a light duty vehicle as sedan, crossover and sport utility vehicles (SUVs) powered by battery electricity that can seat three or more passengers. EVs that can only seat two passengers are excluded, as are electrified trucks and vans. This approach allows emphasis on vehicle types that are responsible for most vehicle miles travelled by households in the US. We identify 501 unique EVs that meet these criteria, 467 of which are included in our model (see method and Supplementary Information for details). Each EV is subject to a teardown whereby specific vehicle attributes are scrutinized and where applicable, enumerated (see Table 1 for a detailed description of these attributes).

Our results and discussion are structured as follows. First, we present and discuss results from our primary ordinary least-squares (OLS) regression model, which we used to estimate the predictive power of EV attributes on EV price. Second, we assess and refine the results of the primary OLS model using a secondary two-stage least-squares (2SLS) regression model. Doing so allows for an assessment of the relative impact of statistically significant attributes. Finally, we discuss the implications of these results, elucidating which factors are most responsible for historical changes in EV prices. We subsequently assess the public policy implications of our findings.

OLS Regression Results

Controlling for all other attributes, feature density (i.e., the total number of amenities, additional features, and dealer-installed accessories sold as standard for a vehicle model/trim) followed by vehicle horsepower, are the most significant influencers of EV price ($p < 0.001$) (Table 2). Our model suggests that a one percent increase in the feature density leads to a 0.745 percent increase in price, while a one percent increase in horsepower is associated with a 0.529 percent increase in price.

What are the specific feature categories that levy the most influence on EV price? To address this question, we re-execute the OLS regression, this time excluding the feature density attribute in favor of individual feature categories. In doing so, we find that compared to convenience, prevention, and security features, survivability, entertainment, navigation, and mechanical features levy the greatest influence on EV price ($p < 0.001$) (Table 3). Our model estimates that a one percent increase in survivability, entertainment, navigation, and mechanical features increases an EV's price by 0.477, 0.434, -0.164 and 0.109 percent respectively (compared to 0.225, 0.286, and 0.078 percent for convenience, prevention, and security features respectively).

Beyond feature density and horsepower, we scrutinize the influence of range on EV price, given range also emerges as being a significant cost predictor (albeit not to the same extent as feature density and horsepower). Our model estimates that a one percent increase in range leads to a 0.444 percent *decrease* in price. That range is negatively correlated with price may appear counterintuitive. Range anxiety is a well-documented phenomenon that arises from the longstanding inability of EVs – on average – to provide comparable range to ICEVs. This effect persists despite recent improvements in EV range (32,33). Hence, consumers may be willing to pay more for a higher-range EV to alleviate range

anxiety concerns. Prior literature has also observed a positive correlation between purchase price and driving range of EVs (34). EVs that offer greater range should – conventional reasoning suggests - levy a higher up-front procurement cost for consumers.

However, existing literature also demonstrates that consumers are willing to sacrifice range and fuel economy for vehicles that offer more features and more horsepower (35). Were vehicle size and horsepower to remain unchanged (and further indexed to 1980 levels), average ICEV fuel economy would – by some estimates – be nearly 60 percent higher in 2006 (36). Thus, our findings suggest that EV purchasers – like their ICEV-purchasing counterparts – favor vehicles with more features and more horsepower, even at the cost of lower range and fuel economy.

Given this finding, how might automobile manufacturers respond? Our model suggests that – to the extent that manufacturers aim to maximize EV sales – offering vehicles with more features and horsepower will have a larger effect on vehicle sales compared to improving fuel economy (37). Put simply, our results corroborate prior literature that consumer demands for more features and horsepower have a greater and more pronounced impact on vehicle prices (regardless of powertrain type) than range and fuel economy (35,36).

We further refine the results of the OLS regression by running our model using the sales figures for every EV model in our dataset as probability weights. Sales volume trends are indicative of fluctuations in demand, which likely influences EV price. The result of weighting price by sales volume aligns with the initial conclusions drawn from the original OLS regressions. Here, we find that both feature density and horsepower levy a significant influence on EV price. Specifically, a one percent increase in the feature density leads to a 0.684 percent increase in price and a one percent increase in horsepower is associated with a 0.468 percent increase in price (Table 2). Battery capacity and lagged aggregate battery cost (LABC) also emerge as significant predictors of EV prices when weighting price by sales volume ($p < 0.001$). Here, we find that a one percent increase in battery capacity decreases price by 0.544 percent while a one percent increase in LABC increases price by 0.296 percent.

These findings illuminate several interdependencies between vehicle attributes and vehicle price. Larger batteries are generally more reliable due to slower rates of natural degradation via charge-discharge cycles, thereby prolonging battery lifespan (38). Larger batteries also offer greater range, thereby mitigating range anxiety related concerns (39,40). Yet, as previously noted, our model suggests that range is negatively correlated with price. Moreover, although per-kilowatt hour battery costs have fallen over time (14), LABC has increased. LABC is the product of nominal battery capacity of an EV in the current year, and the average inflation-adjusted per-kilowatt hour battery cost for the preceding year. Thus, LABC increasing while EV prices have declined likely represents marked increases in battery capacity exceeding the observed decline in per-kilowatt hour battery costs, thus resulting in the product of battery capacity and cost rising (38,41). Collectively, this result highlights multiple potential pathways through which battery capacity might impact EV prices.

Which pathway – reliability, range, or LABC – best explains battery capacity's relationship with EV prices? To answer this question, we re-execute the OLS regression model, this time omitting battery capacity and LABC in a stepwise manner (Table 4), thereby isolating the impact of each pathway. Absent controlling

for LABC, a one percent increase in battery capacity is associated with a 0.336 percent increase in EV price. When LABC is controlled for, the impact that battery capacity has on EV price increases by 23.214 percent, from 0.336 to 0.414, though battery capacity's influence on price becomes statistically less profound. Conversely, absent controlling for battery capacity in the model, a one percent increase in LABC leads to a 0.336 percent increase in EV price. When battery capacity is controlled for, LABC's impact on EV price decreases by 76.786 percent, from 0.336 to -0.078, though the statistical significance of LABC's impact on price becomes less profound.

Collectively, this suggests that LABC is not the primary pathway through which battery capacity affects EV price, as battery capacity's impact is less sensitive to the inclusion of LABC than LABC's impact is on battery capacity. Absent both battery capacity and LABC, the magnitude of range's impact on price decreases by 63.964 percent, from -0.444 to -0.160. Instead, under these conditions, fuel economy emerges as a statistically significant factor ($p = 0.054$). This suggests that the pathway that explains battery capacity's impact on EV prices is that higher battery capacity is a signal for greater reliability.

In leveraging sales figures data, we also find that range no longer has a statistically significant impact on EV price. This suggests that range anxiety concerns may not be a significant influencer of EV price. Furthermore, even though battery costs have a statistically significant impact on price, its effect remains small in magnitude relative to feature density and horsepower. This suggests that feature density and horsepower are the primary supply-side factors affecting EV price.

2SLS Regression Results

What is the relative influence of fuel economy, range or horsepower on price? By understanding the relative impact of these three attributes, we can determine the primary mechanism through which EVs could be made more affordable. To answer this question, we perform a 2SLS regression using curb weight and internal volume as instrumental variables, and fuel economy, range, and horsepower as the treatment variables. All other attributes from the OLS regression model serve as controls. Curb weight and internal volume are chosen as instruments as they are theoretically exogenous and relevant, affecting EV prices through their impact on range and horsepower, without either instrument directly impacting prices. We note that neither of our instrumental variables are – as evidenced by the results from our OLS regression model - statistically significantly correlated with price.

In executing the 2SLS regression, we find that when using fuel economy as the treatment variable, range's impact on price becomes statistically insignificant, while the impact of horsepower on price remains statistically significant ($p < 0.001$) (Table 5). The local area treatment effect of range becoming statistically insignificant with every 2SLS regression suggests that range's impact on price reflects the curb weight and internal volume of the car, and not range itself.

The OLS analysis demonstrates that curb weight and internal volume are positively correlated with price. Greater curb weight and internal volume implies that a car becomes heavier and/or larger, which reduces range. Curb weight and internal volume are positively correlated with the number of features present on an EV, and thus, it follows that heavier, larger cars would be more expensive. This is consistent with our conclusions from the OLS regressions regarding feature density and horsepower's

impact on price. Consequently, we conclude that feature density and horsepower levy far more influence on EV prices compared to fuel economy and range.

Long-run changes in EV design and consumer preferences

The analysis executed thus far enumerates the influence of specific attributes on EV price. This approach, however, provides little insight on how the EV market has evolved. Such insight is timely as climate change mitigation efforts increasingly emphasize electrification as a decarbonization pathway.

Maximizing the decarbonization potential of this technology necessitates – from the vantage point of effective public policy – an understanding of, 1) how the EV market has evolved and, 2) how this evolution impacts the emissions reduction potential of EVs.

To achieve this, we first scrutinize long-run changes to the up-front procurement price of EVs, this given that procurement price remains – for many consumers – a significant influencer, and barrier, to EV adoption (10,13,14). Declines in battery pack costs coupled with increased production (as evidenced by sales volume) will – existing discourse consistently emphasizes– facilitate procurement price declines over time that ultimately accelerate EV adoption (1,22,42,43). Such reasoning features prominently in emissions reductions projections offered by both, the public and private sector, as declining procurement prices motivate widespread EV uptake, and by consequence, help lower emissions.

Our analysis suggests that a more nuanced perspective may be warranted. While battery pack costs have declined significantly (from \$1059 per kWh in 2011 to \$245 per kWh in 2017 to \$153 per kWh in 2022) and sales volume has increased (from 9,754 to 101,836 to 708,159 units during the same period), these trends have not been accompanied by corresponding declines in average procurement prices. Instead, we observe that the average inflation-adjusted price of an EV has steadily increased over time, from \$43,871 in 2011, to \$62,760 in 2017, to \$74,460 in 2022 (Fig. 1).

This increase does not imply the absence of more affordable EVs on the market. Such vehicles could – between 2011 and 2023 - be purchased for, on average, \$35,913 lower than what EVs would typically cost (\$67,888)(Fig. 2a). Moreover, we observe that the least expensive EVs have declined in price from \$43,251 in 2011 to \$27,842 in 2017 to \$27,787 in 2022 (Fig. 2a). However, these vehicles constitute – with rare exception – a small proportion of overall sales in the EV market. In 2017, the cheapest EV – the Mitsubishi i-MiEV – cost \$27,842, well below the \$62,760 average for that year. Yet, this vehicle accounted for 0.005 percent of overall EV sales. In 2022, the cheapest EV – the Nissan Leaf - cost \$27,787, well below the \$74,460 average for the year but accounted for 1.69 percent of overall EV sales.

Weak demand for these vehicles may be explained by scrutinizing the attributes that set them apart from their averagely priced counterparts: principally, lower feature density and lower horsepower (Fig. 2b, 2c). The average number of features and horsepower offered across all 467 EVs in our dataset is 73 and 317.48 respectively. Comparatively, the average number of features and horsepower for the cheapest EV available yearly is 48 and 123.46 respectively, differences our model suggests – and sales volume implies – helps explain weak demand for this vehicle profile (35,36,44,45). We acknowledge that the cheapest EVs also offer less range than their moderately priced counterparts (111 miles versus 227 miles), an attribute that may concurrently contribute to limited uptake (Fig. 2d). However, as previously

noted, existing literature suggests that range is – where vehicle selection is concerned – less influential than feature density and horsepower (35,36).

Having assessed the long-run price trajectory of EVs, we subsequently examine fuel economy (Fig. 2e). Although studies show clear, consistent and compelling evidence of a superior emissions profile for EVs compared to ICEVs, the magnitude of superiority depending upon – among other factors – an EV's fuel economy. Given the interdependencies between fuel economy and lifecycle emissions (8), a vehicle with higher fuel economy will – *ceteris paribus* – have a smaller emissions footprint than a vehicle with lower fuel economy. Consequently, scrutinizing long-run changes in EV fuel economy is timely if the decarbonization benefits of the technology are to be maximally realized. Doing so reveals that the average fuel economy of EVs has in recent years, decreased. Specifically, we observe that fuel economy has steadily decreased from 112.79 mpg-e in 2018 to 100.12 mpg-e in 2023.

What explains this decrease? Our model identifies battery capacity, and to a lesser extent, horsepower and curb weight, as being most responsible for declining fuel economy ($p < 0.001$) (Fig. 2f, 2c, 2g). Both average battery capacity and average horsepower of EVs have seen marked increases since 2015 coupled with a corresponding increase in average curb weight. The confluence and interdependencies between these attributes – namely manufacturing vehicles that have more battery capacity (favored by consumers as a pathway towards realizing more horsepower) increases the curb weight of the vehicle, which subsequently reduces its overall fuel economy (46)¹.

Fuel economy is also influenced by range. We observe an increase in the average EV fuel economy from 2011 to 2018, an increase predicted by increasing EV range during the same period. However, since 2018, increases in battery capacity, horsepower, and curb weight are found to levy greater influence on fuel economy (albeit in the opposite direction) compared to range. From a behavioral perspective, this implies that range anxiety has – within the existing pool of prospective EV buyers - become less of a salient factor in EV procurement decisions. One reason why is that EVs utilized thus far may serve as secondary vehicles in many households and/or be driven less, in which case, range concerns pose less of an impediment to use (47,48). Furthermore, many EVs increasingly offer range that meets the average (but not extreme) daily travel needs (49).

What are the emissions consequences of declining fuel economy? Leveraging the 2022 Greenhouse Gases, Regulated Emissions, and Energy Use in Transportation (GREET) model, we find that this decline risks reducing the envisioned lifecycle emissions benefits of EVs (50). In 2023, the average fuel economy of new EVs was 100.12 mpg-e, 7.03 percent lower than it was in 2020 (107.69 mpg-e), and 11.23 percent lower than it was in 2018 (112.79 mpg-e). Using representative values for EV manufacturing and fuel production (8,51,52), we estimate this decline alone would – for vehicles manufactured in 2023 - reduce the envisioned lifecycle emissions benefits of EVs by at least 3.26 percent (or 0.58 tons of CO_{2e} per vehicle), subject to the battery pack chemistry leveraged by the EV and the carbon intensity of the

¹ We note that internal volume and lagged aggregate battery cost (Fig 2h and 2i) levy little influence on long run price trajectory changes for EVs).

electrical grid². Were the fuel economy trajectory of the future to follow that observed since 2018, our model estimates this decline would – for vehicles manufactured in 2028 - reduce the envisioned lifecycle emissions benefits of EVs by at least 6.66 percent (or 1.23 tons of CO₂e per vehicle)³.

² This figure assumes the use of an EV that covers 179,200 miles over a 15-year lifespan. The vehicle is powered by a Nickel Manganese Cobalt 811 battery, can deliver 300 miles of range on a single charge, and is recharged from an electrical grid that has a carbon intensity of 205.79 gCO₂e/kWh in 2023 (the year of the vehicle's introduction). This figure – assuming carbon emissions associated with electricity generation declines at an annual rate of 16.42 percent, which is commensurate with a target of 90 percent fewer carbon emissions by 2030 (relative to 2005 levels) - falls to 16.70 gCO₂e/kWh in 2037 (the year the vehicle is phased out of the fleet) (8,51,52). Using an LFP battery at slower rates of grid decarbonization increase the envisioned lifecycle emissions benefits that are lost.

³ This figure assumes the use of an EV has a fuel economy of 88.87 mpg-e and covers 179,200 miles over a 15-year lifespan. The vehicle is powered by a Nickel Manganese Cobalt 811 battery, can deliver 300 miles of range on a single charge, and is recharged from an electrical grid that has a carbon intensity of 83.92 gCO₂e/kWh in 2028 (the year of the vehicle's introduction). This figure – assuming carbon emissions associated with electricity generation declines at an annual rate of 16.42 percent, which is commensurate with a target of 90% fewer carbon emissions by 2030 (relative to 2005 levels) - falls to 6.81 gCO₂e/kWh in 2042 (the year the vehicle is phased out of the fleet) (8,51,52). Using an LFP battery at slower rates of grid decarbonization increase the envisioned lifecycle emissions benefits that are lost.

Limitations and Conclusion

To enumerate predictors of EV prices, we have scrutinized 467 unique EV models/trims available for sale in the United States between 2011 and 2023. Doing so – we argue – offers reassurance that our results and ensuing interpretations are robust. Nevertheless, limitations of our approach warrant discussion.

Firstly, 34 vehicle trims had to be excluded from our analysis owing to insufficient data. This exclusion raises potential concerns regarding the robustness of our dataset. To assuage these concerns, we note that price data -aggregated across EVs for a given year in our dataset aligns with historical trends documented in prior literature and is consistent with publicly available automotive inventory data (44,53-58). Furthermore, to ensure our dataset is robust, attribute and price data leveraged by our model has been substantiated for completeness with Edmunds and Cox Automotive, authoritative sources for automotive inventory and information. We also emphasize the vehicles excluded owing to insufficient data constitute a small percentage (6.7 percent) of the complete data set.

Secondly, while the statistical significance of the relationships found from the OLS and 2SLS regressions help illuminate the influence of individual predictors of EV prices, we caution that these factors may nevertheless work in combination to influence prices. The conclusions we draw from the results regarding the importance of feature density and horsepower, and the declining prevalence of range anxiety as a salient concern when consumers are choosing a vehicle, warrant further scrutiny as the EV market continues to evolve. Further research should also assess whether these predictors retain their importance when behavioral characteristics of consumers are considered, the most notable being heterogeneity in driving patterns in multi-vehicle households (47,49).

Limitations notwithstanding, our findings challenge long-standing assertions that high battery costs are principally responsible for high procurement prices and that price declines principally necessitate declines in battery costs. We demonstrate that while battery costs have fallen over time, EV prices have risen, a rise that reflects the entry of – and consumer preference for – vehicles that are more feature dense and more powerful (59-61).

The climate implications these findings are profound. On the one hand, rising prices risks impeding electrification efforts, particularly among middle and low-income households. EV adoption within these households is particularly timely given vehicles in these households tend to be more polluting owing to vehicular age (62-64). We acknowledge that the IRA specifically incentivizes the production of less expensive EVs. If this production does not forfeit aesthetic and performance features valued by these households, EV adoption is – when considering procurement price alone - unlikely to be impeded (29). However, we caution that declining fuel economy – a trend since 2018 – risks tempering the emissions reductions benefits EVs offer. We advocate for action as EV adoption increasingly serves not only as a pathway towards emissions reduction but also a means of realizing precise emissions-reductions targets specified at the domestic and international climate agreements (30,65,66).

References

1. Needell, Zachary A., et al. "Potential for Widespread Electrification of Personal Vehicle Travel in the United States." *Nature Energy*, vol. 1, no. 9, 2016, pp. 1-7, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nenergy.2016.112>. Accessed 5 Jan. 2024.
2. Paoli, Leonardo, and Timur, Gül. "Electric cars fend off supply challenges to more than double global sales." *IEA*, 30 Jan. 2022, www.iea.org/commentaries/electric-cars-fend-off-supply-challenges-to-more-than-double-global-sales.
3. "Demand for electric cars is booming, with sales expected to leap 35% this year after a record-breaking 2022." *IEA*, 26 Apr. 2023, www.iea.org/news/demand-for-electric-cars-is-booming-with-sales-expected-to-leap-35-this-year-after-a-record-breaking-2022.
4. Jenn, Alan, et al. "An in-depth examination of electric vehicle incentives: Consumer heterogeneity and changing response over time." *Elsevier*, Transportation Research Part A, 8 Nov. 2019, www.alanjenn.com/_files/ugd/4145f9_920312aec8744ca6a28705f57a0de07b.pdf.
5. "Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Energy Data Explorer." *IEA*, Nov. 2021, <https://www.iea.org/reports/greenhouse-gas-emissions-from-energy-overview>.
6. Wolfram, Paul, et al. "Pricing of indirect emissions accelerates low-carbon transition of US Light Vehicle Sector." *Nature Communications*, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-334331/v1>.
7. Lindsey, Rebecca. "Climate Change: Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide." *Climate.gov*, 12 May 2023, www.climate.gov/news-features/understanding-climate/climate-change-atmospheric-carbon-dioxide.
8. "Mobility of the Future." *MIT Energy Initiative*, 30 May 2022, energy.mit.edu/insightsintofuturemobility.
9. Koengkan, Matheus, et al. "The Impact of Battery-Electric Vehicles on Energy Consumption: A Macroeconomic Evidence from 29 European Countries." *World Electric Vehicle Journal*, vol. 13, no. 2, Feb. 2022, p. 36, <https://doi.org/10.3390/wevj13020036>.
10. "Evaluating EV Facts over EV Hype." *Kelley Blue Book*, 16 Mar. 2021, www.kbb.com/car-advice/ev-facts-over-ev-hype/.
11. Nykvist, Björn, and Måns, Nilsson. "Rapidly falling costs of battery packs for electric vehicles." *Nature Climate Change*, 23 Mar. 2015, www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2564.
12. Tracy, Brandon S. "Critical Minerals in Electric Vehicle Batteries." *Congressional Research Service*, 29 Aug. 2022, crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R47227.
13. Slowik, Peter, et al. "Assessment of Light-Duty Electric Vehicle Costs and Consumer Benefits in the United States in the 2022–2035 Time Frame." *International Council on Clean Transportation*, Oct. 2022, theicct.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/ev-cost-benefits-2035-oct22.pdf

14. "FOTW #1272, January 9, 2023: Electric Vehicle Battery Pack Costs in 2022 Are Nearly 90% Lower than in 2008, according to DOE Estimates." *Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy*, 9 Jan. 2023, www.energy.gov/eere/vehicles/articles/fotw-1272-january-9-2023-electric-vehicle-battery-pack-costs-2022-are-nearly. Accessed 15 June 2023.
15. Randall, Tom. "Here's How Electric Cars Will Cause the next Oil Crisis." *Bloomberg*, 25 Feb. 2016, www.bloomberg.com/features/2016-ev-oil-crisis/.
16. Austin, David. "Modeling the Demand for Electric Vehicles and the Supply of Charging Stations in the United States," Congressional Budget Office, Sept. 2023, www.cbo.gov/system/files/2023-09/58964-EV.pdf.
17. Wang, Fu-Kwun, et al. "Using adaptive network-based fuzzy inference system to forecast automobile sales." *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 38, no. 8, 2011, pp. 10587–10593, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2011.02.100>.
18. Hülsmann, Marco, et al. "General sales forecast models for automobile markets based on time series analysis and data mining techniques." *Advances in Data Mining. Applications and Theoretical Aspects*, 2011, pp. 255–269, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-23184-1_20.
19. Leader, Alexandra, et al. "The effect of critical material prices on the competitiveness of Clean Energy Technologies." *Materials for Renewable and Sustainable Energy*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40243-019-0146-z>.
20. Ziegler, Micah S., and Trancik, Jessika E. "Re-Examining Rates of Lithium-Ion Battery Technology Improvement and Cost Decline." *Energy & Environmental Science*, 23 Mar. 2021, pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlelanding/2021/ee/d0ee02681f#!
21. Hummel, Patrick, et al. "UBS Evidence Lab Electric Car Teardown – Disruption Ahead?" *UBS*, 18 May 2017, <https://neo.ubs.com/shared/d1wkuDIEbYPjF/>
22. Lutsey, Nic, and Nicholas, Michael. "Update on electric vehicle costs in the United States through 2030." 2019. *The International Council on Clean Transportation*, https://theicct.org/sites/default/files/publications/EV_cost_2020_2030_20190401.pdf. Accessed 17 June 2023.
23. Beggs, Steven D., et al. "Assessing the potential demand for electric cars." *Journal of Econometrics*, vol. 17, no. 1, 1981, pp. 1–19, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076\(81\)90056-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076(81)90056-7).
24. Calfee, John E. "Estimating the demand for electric automobiles using fully disaggregated Probabilistic Choice Analysis." *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, vol. 19, no. 4, 1985, pp. 287–301, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-2615\(85\)90037-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-2615(85)90037-2).
25. Forsythe, Connor R., et al. "Technology advancement is driving electric vehicle adoption." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* vol. 120,23 (2023): e2219396120. doi:10.1073/pnas.2219396120

26. McLain, Sean. "EV Makers Turn to Discounts to Combat Waning Demand." *The Wall Street Journal*, Dow Jones & Company, 7 Nov. 2023, www.wsj.com/business/autos/ev-makers-turn-to-discounts-to-combat-waning-demand-3aa77535?mod=hp_lead_pos3.
27. Feuer, Will, and Eckert, Nora. "Ford Cuts Prices of EV Mustang Mach-E." *The Wall Street Journal*, Dow Jones & Company, 30 Jan. 2023, www.wsj.com/articles/ford-cuts-prices-of-ev-mustang-mach-e-11675090387.
28. Buckberg, Elaine. "Clean Vehicle Tax Credit: The New Industrial Policy and Its Impact." *Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research (SIEPR)*, Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research (SIEPR), Aug. 2023, siepr.stanford.edu/publications/policy-brief/clean-vehicle-tax-credit-new-industrial-policy-and-its-impact.
29. "H.R.5376 - 117th Congress (2021-2022): Inflation Reduction Act." *Congress.Gov*, 16 Aug. 2022, www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/5376/text.
30. "Proposed Rule: Multi-Pollutant Emissions Standards for Model Years 2027 and Later Light-Duty and Medium-Duty Vehicles." *EPA*, www.epa.gov/regulations-emissions-vehicles-and-engines/proposed-rule-multi-pollutant-emissions-standards-model. Accessed 24 July 2023.
31. Langan, Colin M., et al. "BEV Teardowns Revisited: Better Doesn't Mean Good", *Equity Research: Autos and Auto Parts*, Wells Fargo, 10 May 2023.
32. Nilsson, Maria. *Electric Vehicle: The Phenomenon of Range Anxiety*, 21 June 2011, e-mobility-nsr.eu/fileadmin/user_upload/downloads/info-pool/the_phenomenon_of_range_anxiety_elvire.pdf.
33. Herberz, Mario, et al. "Counteracting Electric Vehicle Range concern with a scalable behavioural intervention." *Nature Energy*, vol. 7, no. 6, 2022, pp. 503–510, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41560-022-01028-3>.
34. Burkert, Amelie, et al. "Interdisciplinary Analysis of social acceptance regarding electric vehicles with a focus on charging infrastructure and driving range in Germany." *World Electric Vehicle Journal*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2021, p. 25, <https://doi.org/10.3390/wevj12010025>.
35. Leard, Benjamin, et al. "How much do consumers value fuel economy and performance? evidence from technology adoption." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, vol. 105, no. 1, 2023, pp. 158–174, https://doi.org/10.1162/rest_a_01045.
36. Knittel, Christopher R. "Automobiles on steroids: Product attribute trade-offs and technological progress in the automobile sector." *American Economic Review*, vol. 101, no. 7, 2011, pp. 3368–3399, <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.101.7.3368>.
37. Klier, Thomas, et al. "The effects of fuel prices and vehicle sales on fuel-saving technology adoption in passenger vehicles." *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, vol. 29, no. 3, 2020, pp. 543–578, <https://doi.org/10.1111/jems.12384>.

38. Canals Casals, Lluç, et al. "Electric Vehicle Battery Health expected at end of life in the upcoming years based on UK Data." *Batteries*, vol. 8, no. 10, 2022, p. 164, <https://doi.org/10.3390/batteries8100164>.
39. Chakraborty, Prabuddha et al. "Addressing the range anxiety of battery electric vehicles with charging en route." *Scientific reports* vol. 12,1 5588. 4 Apr. 2022, doi:10.1038/s41598-022-08942-2
40. IEA (2022), Global EV Outlook 2022, IEA, Paris <https://www.iea.org/reports/global-ev-outlook-2022>, License: CC BY 4.0
41. Sanguesa, Julio A., et al. "A Review on Electric Vehicles: Technologies and Challenges." *Smart Cities*, vol. 4, no. 1, Mar. 2021, pp. 372–404. Crossref, <https://doi.org/10.3390/smartcities4010022>.
42. Davenport, Coral, and Boudette, Neal E. "Biden Plans an Electric Vehicle Revolution. Now, the Hard Part." *The New York Times*, The New York Times, 13 Apr. 2023, www.nytimes.com/2023/04/13/climate/electric-vehicles-biden-epa.html.
43. Slowik, Peter, et al. "Assessment of Light-Duty Electric Vehicle Costs and Consumer Benefits in the United States in the 2022-2035 Time Frame", The International Council on Clean Transportation, Oct. 2022, theicct.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/ev-cost-benefits-2035-oct22.pdf.
44. Youngs, Jeff. "Why Are Modern Cars So Heavy." *J.D. Power*, 19 Apr. 2019, www.jdpower.com/cars/shopping-guides/why-are-modern-cars-so-heavy.
45. Etxandi-Santolaya, Maite, et al. "Estimation of Electric Vehicle Battery Capacity Requirements Based on Synthetic Cycles." *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, vol. 114, Jan. 2023, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2022.103545>.
46. Tolouei, Reza, and Titheridge, Helena. "Vehicle Mass as a Determinant of Fuel Consumption and Secondary Safety Performance." *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, vol. 14, no. 6, 2009, pp. 385–99, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2009.01.005>.
47. Liao, Fanchao, et al. "Consumer Preferences for Electric Vehicles: A Literature Review." *Transport Reviews*, vol. 37, no. 3, 2017, pp. 252–75, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2016.1230794>.
48. Nunes, Ashley, et al. "Re-thinking procurement incentives for electric vehicles to achieve net-zero emissions." *Nature Sustainability*, vol. 5, no. 6, 2022, pp. 527–532, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-022-00862-3>.
49. Needell, Zachary A., et al. "Potential for Widespread Electrification of Personal Vehicle Travel in the United States." *Nature Energy*, vol. 1, no. 9, Aug. 2016, p. 16112, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nenergy.2016.112>.
50. "Argonne GREET Model." *Argonne National Laboratory*, Argonne National Laboratory, greet.es.anl.gov/. Accessed 27 July 2023.
51. Woodley, Lucas, et al. "Enumerating the Climate Impact of Disequilibrium in Critical Mineral Supply." [arXiv.org](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.15368), 27 Sept. 2023, arxiv.org/abs/2309.15368.

52. Woodley, Lucas, et al. "Targeted electric vehicle procurement incentives facilitate efficient abatement cost outcomes." *Sustainable Cities and Society*, vol. 96, Sept. 2023, p. 104627, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2023.104627>.
53. Rivero, Nicolás. "Why Electric Cars Are Getting Pricier Even as Batteries Get Cheaper." *Quartz*, 4 May 2022, qz.com/2161731/why-electric-cars-are-getting-pricier-while-batteries-get-cheaper.
54. Ulrich, Lawrence. "When One Car Has More Horsepower than Churchill Downs." *The New York Times*, 29 Oct. 2020, www.nytimes.com/2020/10/29/business/electric-cars-horsepower-lucid-air-rimac.html.
55. Bui, Anh, et al. "Evaluating Electric Vehicle Market Growth across U.S. Cities." International Council on Clean Transportation, Sept. 2021, theicct.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/ev-us-market-growth-cities-sept21_0.pdf.
56. "The EPA Automotive 2022 Trends Report." Environmental Protection Agency, 2022, www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2022-12/420s22001.pdf.
57. Themsche, S. Van. *The Advent of Unmanned Electric Vehicles the Choices between E-Mobility and Immobility*. Springer, 2016.
58. "Gas-Powered Cars Cheaper to Fuel than Electric in Late 2022." *Anderson Economic Group, LLC*, 24 Jan. 2023, www.andersoneconomicgroup.com/cars-gas-powered-cheaper-to-fuel-than-electric-in-late-2022/.
59. McCartt, Anne T., and Wells, JoAnn K. "Consumer Survey About Vehicle Choice", *Insurance Institute for Highway Safety*, June 2010, www.iihs.org/api/datastoredocument/bibliography/1661.
60. Salomon, Sanjay. "Why Americans Buy Bigger Cars than the Rest of the World." *boston.com*, The Boston Globe, 25 June 2015, www.boston.com/cars/news-and-reviews/2015/06/25/why-americans-buy-bigger-cars-than-the-rest-of-the-world/.
61. "Highlights of the Automotive Trends Report", *United States Environmental Protection Agency*, 31 Oct. 2023, www.epa.gov/automotive-trends/highlights-automotive-trends-report.
62. Young, Rebekah. "A Luxury We Cannot Afford to Squander: North America Needs to Back Radically Cheaper Electric Vehicles." *Scotiabank Global Site*, 11 October 2023, <https://www.scotiabank.com/ca/en/about/economics/economics-publications/post.other-publications.insights-views.electric-vehicle-demand--october-11--2023-.html>. Accessed 30 December 2023.
63. Jianwei Xing, Benjamin Leard, Shanjun Li. "What does an electric vehicle replace?" *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, vol 107, May 2021, 102432, doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2021.102432.

64. Beyer, Matthew, et al. "Cleaner Cars, Cleaner Air." *Union of Concerned Scientists*, June 2023, https://www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/2023-06/cleaner-cars-cleaner-air-report_0.pdf. Accessed 4 January 2024.

65. "The Long-Term Strategy of the United States, Pathways to Net-Zero Greenhouse Gas Emissions by 2050." *The White House*, United States Department of State, United States Executive Office of the President, November 2021, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/US-Long-Term-Strategy.pdf>. Accessed 30 December 2023.

66. "The Paris Agreement | United Nations." *the United Nations*, <https://www.un.org/en/climatechange/paris-agreement>. Accessed 30 December 2023.

Attributes	Description of Attributes
Curb weight (pounds)	The weight of an EV with standard equipment and a full tank of fuel. Figure excludes passengers, cargo, or optional equipment.
Feature density	The total number of amenities, additional features, and dealer-installed accessories sold as standard for a vehicle model/trim. Features are broken down into 7 categories: Convenience, Entertainment, Mechanical, Navigation, Prevention, Security and Survivability.
Fuel economy [combined] (miles per gallon-equivalent)	The distance travelled by the EV using the energy equivalent of one gallon of gasoline. This estimate assumes 55% city driving and 45% highway driving.
Horsepower	The power produced by an EV's engine.
Inflation-adjusted MSRP (USD)	The price suggested by manufacturers to retailers prior to the vehicle's release. MSRP is inflation-adjusted to 2023 levels.
Internal volume (cubic feet)	The total space in the interior of an EV.
Lagged aggregate battery cost (USD)	The product of the nominal battery capacity of an EV in the current year multiplied by the average inflation-adjusted dollar-per-kilowatt hour battery cost in the preceding year.
Nominal battery capacity (kWh)	A measure of how much energy the battery can deliver from a fully charged state.
Range (miles)	The total distance travelled by the EV on a single, full charge.
Sales volume	The total sales volume of a particular model, year-on-year.
Yearly number of Manufacturers	The total number of manufacturers selling EVs, year-on-year.
Yearly number of models	The total number of EV models sold by all manufacturers, year-on-year.

Table 1: Description of EV attributes

ATTRIBUTES	(1) MSRP	(2) Sales-Weighted MSRP
Curb Weight (lbs)	0.260 (0.209)	0.588** (0.244)
Feature Density	0.745*** (0.167)	0.684*** (0.180)
Fuel Economy (mpg-e)	-0.0450 (0.218)	-0.568*** (0.182)
Horsepower	0.529*** (0.0612)	0.468*** (0.0540)
Internal Volume (ft ³)	-0.153 (0.142)	-0.550** (0.252)
Lagged aggregate battery cost (\$)	-0.0780 (0.505)	0.296*** (0.0784)
Nominal Battery Capacity (kWh)	0.414 (0.535)	-0.544*** (0.179)
Range (miles)	-0.444*** (0.153)	0.0689 (0.147)
Yearly Number of Manufacturers	-1.056 (1.827)	0.364 (0.284)
Yearly Number of Models	0.356 (0.696)	-0.145 (0.132)
Constant	6.763 (5.197)	4.422** (2.212)
Observations	392	298
R-squared	0.816	0.843

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 2: OLS regression model of the effect of all attributes on MSRP, with and without weighting MSRP by the year-on-year sales volume of each EV model

Note: All attributes are natural log-transformed, so results must be interpreted as percentage changes. Lagged aggregate battery cost is the product of the average \$/kWh value of an EV battery for the previous year multiplied by the capacity (kWh) for that EV in the current year. Time fixed effects are controlled for, as our dataset tracks changes in attributes associated with specific car models across time. The MSRP of each EV is inflation-adjusted. Year-on-year sales volumes for each EV model are used as a probability weight.

ATTRIBUTES	MSRP
Curb Weight (lbs)	0.338 (0.207)
Fuel Economy (mpg-e)	0.134 (0.200)
Horsepower	0.570*** (0.0557)
Internal Volume (ft ³)	-0.419*** (0.140)
Lagged aggregate battery cost (\$)	-0.0183 (0.439)
Nominal Battery Capacity (kWh)	0.373 (0.469)
Range (miles)	-0.454*** (0.152)
Yearly Number of Manufacturers	-0.845 (1.594)
Yearly Number of Models	0.261 (0.609)
<u>Feature Categories</u>	
Convenience	0.225** (0.0916)
Entertainment	0.434*** (0.0653)
Mechanical	0.109*** (0.0322)
Navigation	-0.164*** (0.0434)
Prevention	0.286** (0.113)
Security	0.078* (0.0426)
Survivability	0.477*** (0.113)
Constant	5.323 (4.740)
Observations	384
R-squared	0.846

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 3: OLS regression model of the effect of all attributes except feature density on MSRP, with the addition of all feature categories

Note: All attributes are natural log-transformed, so results must be interpreted as percentage changes. Lagged aggregate battery cost is the product of the average \$/kWh value of an EV battery for the previous year multiplied by the capacity (kWh) for that EV in the current year. Time fixed effects are controlled for, as our dataset tracks changes in attributes associated with specific car models across time. The MSRP of each EV is inflation-adjusted.

ATTRIBUTES	(1) MSRP	(2) MSRP	(3) MSRP	(4) MSRP
Curb Weight (lbs)	0.260 (0.209)	0.260 (0.210)	0.260 (0.209)	0.313 (0.209)
Feature Density	0.745*** (0.167)	0.745*** (0.167)	0.745*** (0.167)	0.812*** (0.169)
Fuel Economy (mpg-e)	-0.0450 (0.218)	-0.0450 (0.218)	-0.0450 (0.218)	-0.320* (0.165)
Horsepower	0.529*** (0.0612)	0.529*** (0.0613)	0.529*** (0.0612)	0.523*** (0.0606)
Internal Volume (ft ³)	-0.153 (0.142)	-0.153 (0.143)	-0.153 (0.142)	-0.125 (0.145)
Lagged aggregate battery cost (\$)	-0.078 (0.505)	-	0.336** (0.159)	-
Nominal Battery Capacity (kWh)	0.414 (0.535)	0.336** (0.160)	-	-
Range (miles)	-0.444*** (0.153)	-0.444*** (0.154)	-0.444*** (0.153)	-0.160*** (0.0586)
Yearly Number of Manufacturers	-1.056 (1.827)	-0.123 (0.356)	0.886 (0.947)	-0.117 (0.360)
Yearly Number of Models	0.356 (0.696)	-0.0234 (0.283)	-0.496 (0.495)	-0.0269 (0.285)
Constant	6.763 (5.197)	5.029*** (1.852)	2.128 (2.861)	5.339*** (1.824)
Observations	392	394	392	394
R-squared	0.816	0.816	0.816	0.814

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 4: OLS regression model of the effect of all attributes on price, removing battery capacity and lagged aggregate battery cost in a stepwise manner

Note: All attributes are natural log-transformed, so results must be interpreted as percentage changes. Lagged aggregate battery cost is the product of the average \$/kWh value of an EV battery for the previous year multiplied by the capacity (kWh) for that EV in the current year. Time fixed effects are controlled for, as our dataset tracks changes in attributes associated with specific car models across time. The MSRP of each EV is inflation-adjusted.

ATTRIBUTES	(1) MSRP	(2) MSRP	(3) MSRP	(4) MSRP
Curb Weight (lbs)	0.260 (0.209)	-	-	-
Feature Density	0.745*** (0.167)	0.836*** (0.148)	1.373** (0.643)	0.637*** (0.196)
Fuel Economy (mpg-e)	-0.0450 (0.218)	-0.698 (0.450)	-3.387 (3.703)	0.0589 (0.262)
Horsepower	0.529*** (0.0612)	0.501*** (0.0649)	0.290 (0.296)	0.683*** (0.124)
Internal Volume (ft ³)	-0.153 (0.142)	-	-	-
Lagged aggregate battery cost (\$)	-0.0780 (0.505)	-0.0333 (0.539)	-0.00613 (0.692)	-0.00312 (0.511)
Nominal Battery Capacity (kWh)	0.414 (0.535)	-0.0308 (0.602)	-2.753 (3.645)	0.398 (0.549)
Range (miles)	-0.444*** (0.153)	-0.0123 (0.362)	2.705 (3.611)	-0.577*** (0.203)
Yearly Number of Manufacturers	-1.056 (1.827)	-0.317 (0.395)	0.0551 (0.675)	-0.283 (0.382)
Yearly Number of Models	0.356 (0.696)	0.0862 (0.169)	-0.0670 (0.280)	0.0758 (0.163)
Constant	6.763 (5.197)	8.950** (3.887)	16.34 (11.79)	6.166** (3.134)
Observations	392	392	392	392
R-squared	0.816	0.810	0.602	0.810
Method	OLS	2SLS, with Fuel Economy as treatment variable	2SLS, with Range as treatment variable	2SLS, with Horsepower as treatment variable
Instruments	none	Curb Weight Internal Volume	Curb Weight Internal Volume	Curb Weight Internal Volume
First stage F-statistic	-	23.29	0.746	20.68
Critical value	-	11.04	9.865	10.34

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 5: OLS and 2SLS regression models showing the price impact of various attributes, treatment variables and control variables

Note: All attributes are natural log-transformed, so results must be interpreted as percentage changes. Lagged aggregate battery cost is the product of the average \$/kWh value of an EV battery for the previous year multiplied by the capacity (kWh) for that EV in the current year. Time fixed effects are controlled for since our dataset tracks changes in attributes associated with specific car models across time. EV MSRP is inflation-adjusted. For the 2SLS regression model, curb weight and internal volume are instruments, range and horsepower are treatment variables, and all other attributes serve as controls.





Figure 1: Historical Trends (2011-2023) of Attributes. Solid colored lines denote statistically significant attributes. Dotted colored lines denote insignificant attributes. Solid black lines denote price.


Figure 2 (a-i) depicted below: Caption listed at the end.




2a: Inflation Adjusted MSRP




2b: Number of features




2c: Horsepower




2d: Range




2e: Fuel economy



2f: Nominal battery capacity



2g: Curb weight



2h: Internal volume



2i: Lagged aggregate battery cost

Figure 2: *Detailed timeseries breakdown of attributes offered by EVs sold between 2011 and 2023. Blue dots denote specific vehicle model/trim available for sale each year. Red diamond denotes attribute average for a given year. Black circles denote attribute value for the least expensive EV available for sale during that year.*

Acknowledgements

We thank Colin Langan (Wells Fargo), Talia James-Armand (Edmunds) and Mark Schirmer (Cox Automotive) for facilitating data aggregation.

Funding

A.N. was partially supported by The Alfred P. Sloan Foundation (Award #2020-14048). L.W. was supported by a National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship under grant 2140743.

Method

To begin, we clarify our terminology, specify our market focus, and highlight key parameters of our model.

In enumerating predictors of EV prices, the term ‘price’ – in our study - refers to the MSRP. The MSRP reflects a manufacturer’s price recommendation given, 1) the aesthetic and performance profile of the vehicle, and 2) how this profile compares to similar models (if any) on the market. This recommendation accounts for the costs incurred to manufacture the vehicle, applicable overhead, and a profit margin for both the manufacturer and where applicable, the dealer. The MSRP is set prior to the model release for a given year and remains – with rare exception – unaltered as changes, particularly decreases, lower the residual value of the vehicle⁴. By using a consistent price determined at the start of each sales year by supply-side factors, our work eliminates heterogeneity that arises from the usage of (and fluctuations in) dealer/transaction prices, which reflective of demand-side forces (26-28).

In scrutinizing the EV market, we focus our analysis on light-duty EVs – which we define as passenger cars and SUVs that can seat three or more passengers and are powered exclusively by an electrified powertrain. Electric trucks and vans are excluded from consideration in our analysis as are EVs that can only seat two occupants. This approach allows us to focus solely on vehicles that account for most of the vehicle miles travelled in the United States. Furthermore, we limit our analysis to vehicles that are, 1) available for sale in the US domestic market alone, 2) not considered demonstration vehicles, and 3) represent trim types available to consumers.

A vehicle’s trim is a collection of features packaged together in various ways to create vehicular profiles that differ from one another despite these vehicles sharing similar underlying characteristics. Specific trim levels denote the aesthetic and performance profile of the vehicle, associated packages, options, additional features and amenities, all of which are included in the MSRP. Heterogeneity in vehicle trims can produce - for a single model of vehicle - numerous derivatives (hereafter referred to as ‘unique vehicles’). For example, in 2022, the Tesla Model Y, was available in two different trims, the Long Range and the Performance. Despite sharing the same underlying vehicle chassis, these trims differ in the range, horsepower and stability control drivers can expect. These differences explain heterogeneity in MSRP across each trim. For every model in each year, we consider every trim available for sale in the US domestic market.

Our approach yields 533 unique EVs that were available for sale between 2011 and 2023. From this list, 32 vehicles are excluded as these vehicles are two-seater vehicles, trucks or vans, and 34 vehicles are excluded from our model owing to missing or incomplete aesthetic and/or performance profile data (see Supplementary Information: Tables S2a and S2b for a detailed list of excluded vehicles). This leaves us with 467 unique vehicles that are leveraged by our model (see Supplementary Information: Tables S1a and S1b for a complete list of included vehicles). For each of these vehicles, we consider – in addition to price – the aesthetic and performance features of the vehicle (see Table 1 for details). These include curb weight, feature density, fuel economy, horsepower, internal volume, lagged aggregate battery cost,

⁴ 2023 has been an exception in this regard as lagging demand for EVs at prespecified price points has prompted OEMs to repeatedly reduce prices over the course of the year.

nominal battery capacity, and range. We further also consider for inclusion in our model, the number of manufacturers and models available each year.

Two regression models are subsequently employed – an OLS regression model, and a 2SLS regression model, to analyze the relationship between the selected attributes, and EV price. The model controls for time fixed effects, given that there are car models in our dataset that remain in production over the span of a few years. Thus, our dataset tracks the changes in attributes associated with these car models across time, so controlling for time fixed effects is necessary.

Supplementary Information

The supplementary information section is organized into the following two sections: first, we describe how the data set leveraged by our model was compiled, and the rationale behind the attributes chosen. Second, we detail our OLS and 2SLS regressions used to analyze relationships among EV features and price.

Constructing the Dataset

Our model considers EVs available for sale between 2011 and 2023. We focus our analysis on light-duty EVs – defined as passenger cars and SUVs that are exclusively powered by battery electricity and can seat three or more passengers. We exclude demonstration vehicles that were not sold to the public. Our analysis is furthermore limited to vehicles sold by US retailers. For every model and specific trim in each year, we collected data on a series of attributes.

Out of the 533 possible models/trim combinations available for sale between 2011 and 2023, a total of 467 unique vehicles are identified for inclusion in our model. This figure reflects 34 EVs excluded due to missing or incomplete data, and 32 EVs excluded as they do not fit our desired vehicle profile (i.e., these vehicles were either two seaters, vans, or trucks). The total number of models and trims analysed can be found in Table S1a, and specific details on the 467 unique vehicles from each manufacturer can be found in Table S1b. The total number of models and trims excluded can be found in Table S2a, while details on the 66 excluded vehicles can be found in Table S2b.

With every model and specific trim in each year, we collect data on a series of attributes. These include the range, horsepower, and battery capacity, among others, as well as the features of the EV, which refers to pieces of equipment or utility that the vehicle contains. A feature density attribute that tracks the total number of features present in the vehicle is constructed and included in the dataset. Data on most attributes was collected from the official websites of manufacturers and retailers, as well as third-party sources such as car magazines. Fuel economy and range data in specific were collected from the official EPA website. Data on features was collected from autoblog.com and organised into broad categories. Finally, data on the year-on-year sales volume was also collected for every vehicle model in our dataset. Sales data on all models was collected from IHS Markit, Wards Automotive and Cox Automotive. Details on the attributes used in our statistical analysis can be found in Table S3. Details on all the individual features recorded can be found in Table S4.

Statistical Analyses

We use two regression models – an OLS regression model, and a 2SLS regression model, to analyze the relationship between the selected attributes, and EV price.

The OLS regression model is as follows:

$$MSRP_{it} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 FE_{it} + \alpha_2 R_{it} + \alpha_3 HP_{it} + \alpha_4 CW_{it} + \alpha_5 IV_{it} + \alpha_6 FD_{it} + \alpha_7 BC_{it} + \alpha_8 LABC_{it} + \alpha_9 MDL_t + \alpha_{10} MNF_t + \varepsilon_{it} + \delta_t$$

Model S1: OLS Regression Equation

where $MSRP_{it}$ is the inflation-adjusted manufacturer-suggested retail price for EV i in year t , and α_0 is a constant. FE_{it} is the combined fuel economy (in miles per gallon-equivalent), R_{it} is the range (in miles), HP_{it} is the horsepower, CW_{it} is the curb weight (in pounds), IV_{it} is the internal volume (in cubic feet), FD_{it} is the composite indicator for feature density, BC_{it} is the nominal battery capacity (in kWh), and $LABC_{it}$ is the lagged aggregate battery cost (in USD), which is calculated by multiplying nominal battery capacity with average annual inflation-adjusted battery prices (in \$/kWh), for EV i in year t . MDL_t is the total number of EV models, and MNF_t is the total number of EV manufacturers in year t . α_1 to α_{10} are the coefficients of interest, ε_{it} is the error term, and δ_t is time fixed effects.

The statistical significance and magnitude of the coefficients of interest determine the relative impact of the different selected attributes on EV prices. The model controls for time fixed effects, given that there are car models in our dataset that remain in production over the span of a few years. Thus, our dataset tracks the changes in attributes associated with these car models across time, so controlling for time fixed effects is necessary. With longitudinal panel data, we also plot the historical changes in the various attributes. Finally, we use a composite indicator for all features, as using an indicator for every individual category of features creates a lot of noise in the regression, and places undue significance on individual features that would not realistically drive up the price of an EV (such as accident survivability features, which come standard on cars according to federal regulations).

The 2SLS regression model is as follows:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 CW_{it} + \alpha_2 IV_{it} + \alpha_3 X_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} + \delta_t \quad [1]$$

$$MSRP_{it} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \hat{Y}_{it} + \alpha_2 X_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} + \delta_t \quad [2]$$

Model S2: 2SLS Regression Equation

where equation [1] of the model shows the first stage of the regression, and equation [2] shows the second stage. In equation [1], Y_{it} is the treatment variable of interest (either Range or Horsepower) for model i in year t , α_0 is a constant, CW_{it} and IV_{it} are the instrumental variables, and represent the curb weight (in pounds) and internal volume (in cubic feet) respectively of model i in year t , X_{it} is the vector for various controls (all the other attributes in the OLS regression), ε_{it} is the error term, and δ_t is time fixed effects. In equation [2], $MSRP_{it}$ is the inflation-adjusted manufacturer-suggested retail price for EV i in year t , \hat{Y}_{it} is the predicted value of treatment variable of interest (either Range or Horsepower) from the first stage regression for EV i in year t , X_{it} is the vector for various controls (all the other attributes in the OLS regression), ε_{it} is the error term, and δ_t is time fixed effects.

Year	Number of Manufacturers	Number of Models	Number of Trims
2011	1	1	2
2012	5	5	10
2013	5	5	9
2014	10	10	16
2015	9	9	18
2016	9	10	29
2017	10	12	30
2018	9	11	26
2019	11	15	46
2020	10	14	34
2021	14	18	51
2022	18	35	82
2023	20	46	114
Total Number of Unique Vehicles (2011-2023)			467

Table S1a: The total number of manufacturers and models analyzed year-on-year, broken down by trim level

Year	Manufacturer	Model	Trims
2011	Nissan	Leaf	SV
			SL
2012	Ford	Focus Electric	Base 4dr Hatchback
	Mitsubishi	i-MiEV	ES
			SE
	Nissan	Leaf	SV
			SL
	Tesla	Model S	-
			Performance
Signature			
		Signature Performance	
Toyota	RAV4	EV	
2013	Fiat	500e	Battery Electric 2dr Hatchback
	Ford	Focus Electric	Base 4dr Hatchback
	Honda	Fit EV	-
	Nissan	Leaf	SV
			S
			SL
	Tesla	Model S	-
Performance			
Toyota	RAV4	EV	
2014	BMW	i3	Base 4dr Rear-wheel Drive Hatchback
	Chevrolet	Spark EV	1LT
			2LT
	Fiat	500e	Battery Electric 2dr Hatchback
	Ford	Focus Electric	Base 4dr Hatchback
	Honda	Fit EV	-
	Mercedes-Benz	B-Class Electric Drive	4dr Hatchback
	Mitsubishi	i-MiEV	ES
Nissan	Leaf	SV	

			S
			SL
	Tesla	Model S	60
			-
			P85
			P85D
Toyota	RAV4	EV	
2015	BMW	i3	Base 4dr Rear-wheel Drive Hatchback
	Chevrolet	Spark EV	1LT
			2LT
	Fiat	500e	Battery Electric 2dr Hatchback
	Ford	Focus Electric	Base 4dr Hatchback
	Kia	Soul EV	Base 4dr Hatchback
			+ 4dr Hatchback
	Mercedes-Benz	B-Class Electric Drive	4dr Hatchback
	Nissan	Leaf	SV
			S
			SL
	Tesla	Model S	70D
			85
			85D
60			
P85D			
Volkswagen	e-Golf	Limited Edition 4dr Front-wheel Drive Hatchback	
		SEL Premium 4dr Front-wheel Drive Hatchback	
2016	BMW	i3	Base 4dr Rear-wheel Drive Hatchback
	Chevrolet	Spark EV	1LT
			2LT
	Fiat	500e	Battery Electric 2dr Hatchback
	Ford	Focus Electric	Base 4dr Hatchback
	Kia	Soul EV	EVe 4dr Hatchback

			Base 4dr Hatchback
			EVe 4dr Hatchback
	Mitsubishi	i-MiEV	ES
	Nissan	Leaf	SV
			S
			SL
	Tesla	Model S	70
			60D
			75
			70D
			75D
			60
		Model X	90D
			P90D
			P100D
			70D
			75D
			60D
	Volkswagen	e-Golf	90D
			P90D
		P100D	
		SE 4dr Front-wheel Drive Hatchback	
		SEL Premium 4dr Front-wheel Drive Hatchback	
2017	BMW	i3	4dr Hatchback
			60 Ah 4dr Rear-wheel Drive Hatchback
	Chevrolet	Bolt EV	LT
			Premier
	Fiat	500e	Battery Electric 2dr Hatchback
	Ford	Focus Electric	Base 4dr Hatchback
	Hyundai	Ioniq Electric	Electric 4dr Hatchback
			Limited 4dr Hatchback

	Kia	Soul EV	EVe 4dr Hatchback
			Base 4dr Hatchback
			+ 4dr Hatchback
	Mitsubishi	i-MiEV	ES
	Nissan	Leaf	SV
			S
			SL
	Tesla	Model 3	-
			Long Range
		Model S	75
			60D
			75D
			60
			90D
			100D
			P100D
			Model X
100D			
75D			
P100D			
Volkswagen	e-Golf	SE 4dr Front-wheel Drive Hatchback	
		SEL Premium 4dr Front-wheel Drive Hatchback	
2018	BMW	i3	s 4dr Hatchback
			94AH 4dr Rear-wheel Drive Hatchback
	Chevrolet	Bolt EV	LT
			Premier
	Fiat	500e	Battery Electric 2dr Hatchback
	Ford	Focus Electric	Base 4dr Hatchback
	Hyundai	Ioniq Electric	Electric 4dr Hatchback
Limited 4dr Hatchback			
Kia	Soul EV	EVe 4dr Hatchback	

			Base 4dr Hatchback
			+ 4dr Hatchback
	Nissan	Leaf	SV
			S
			SL
	Tesla	Model 3	Long Range
			Mid-Range
			Long Range AWD
			Performance
		Model S	75D
			100D
			P100D
		Model X	100D
	75D		
P100D			
Volkswagen	e-Golf	SE 4dr Front-wheel Drive Hatchback	
		SEL Premium 4dr Front-wheel Drive Hatchback	
2019	Audi	e-tron	Premium Plus
	BMW	i3	120Ah 4dr Rear-Wheel Drive Hatchback
			120Ah s 4dr Rear-Wheel Drive Hatchback
	Chevrolet	Bolt EV	LT
			Premier
	Fiat	500e	Battery Electric 2dr Hatchback
	Honda	Clarity Electric	Base 4dr Sedan
	Hyundai	Ioniq Electric	Electric 4dr Hatchback
			Limited 4dr Hatchback
		Kona Electric	Limited
			SEL 4dr Front-Wheel Drive
	Jaguar	I-Pace	S
			HSE
	Kia	Niro EV	EX 4dr Front-Wheel Drive Sport Utility

			EX Premium 4dr Front-Wheel Drive Sport Utility	
		Soul EV	Base 4dr Hatchback + 4dr Hatchback	
	Nissan	Leaf		SV
				S
				SL
				S Plus
				SV Plus
				SL Plus
	Tesla	Model 3		Standard Range Plus
				Standard Range
				Long Range RWD
				Mid Range
				Long Range
				Performance
		Model S		75D
				Long Range
				Sedan
				Standard Range
				100D
				Performance
				P100D
		Model X		75D
				Long Range
				Standard Range
				100D
				-
	Performance			
	P100D			
Volkswagen	e-Golf		SE 4dr Front-wheel Drive Hatchback	
			SEL Premium 4dr Front-wheel Drive Hatchback	
2020	Audi	e-tron	Premium Plus Sportback	

	BMW	i3	120Ah 4dr Rear-Wheel Drive Hatchback
			120Ah s 4dr Rear-Wheel Drive Hatchback
	Chevrolet	Bolt EV	LT
			Premier
	Hyundai	Ioniq Electric	SE 4dr Hatchback
			Limited 4dr Hatchback
		Kona Electric	Limited
			SEL 4dr Front-Wheel Drive
			Ultimate 4dr Front-Wheel Drive
	Jaguar	I-Pace	S
			HSE
	Kia	Niro EV	EX 4dr Front-Wheel Drive Sport Utility
			EX Premium 4dr Front-Wheel Drive Sport Utility
	Mini	Cooper Hardtop	SE
	Nissan	Leaf	SV
			S
			S Plus
			SV Plus
			SL Plus
	Porsche	Taycan	4S
			Turbo
			Turbo S
	Tesla	Model 3	Standard Range
			Long Range
Performance			
Model S		Long Range Plus	
		Long Range	
		Performance	
Model X		Long Range	
		Long Range Plus	
		Performance	
Model Y		Long Range 4dr Sport Utility	

			Performance 4dr Sport Utility
2021	Audi	e-tron	Premium SUV
	BMW	i3	120Ah 4dr Rear-Wheel Drive Hatchback
			120Ah s 4dr Rear-Wheel Drive Hatchback
	Chevrolet	Bolt EV	LT
			Premier
	Ford	Mustang Mach-E	Select AWD
			Select 4dr 4x2
			Premium
			Premium AWD
			California Route 1
			First Edition AWD
			GT 4dr All-Wheel Drive
	Hyundai	Ioniq Electric	SE 4dr Hatchback
			Limited 4dr Hatchback
		Kona Electric	SEL 4dr Front-Wheel Drive
			Limited
	Kia	Niro EV	EX 4dr Front-Wheel Drive Sport Utility
			EX Premium 4dr Front-Wheel Drive Sport Utility
	Mini	Cooper Hardtop	SE
	Nissan	Leaf	S
			SV
			S Plus
			SV Plus
			SL Plus
	Polestar	2	Launch Edition 4dr Fastback
	Porsche	Taycan	4S
-			
Turbo			
Turbo S			
		4	

		Taycan Cross Turismo	4S	
			Turbo	
			Turbo S	
	Tesla	Model 3		Base
				Standard Range Plus
				Long Range
				Performance
		Model S		Long Range Plus
				Sedan AWD
				Plaid+
		Model X		Long Range Plus
				Plaid
		Model Y		Standard Range 4dr Rear-Wheel Drive Sport Utility
	Performance 4dr All-Wheel Drive Sport Utility			
	Volkswagen	ID.4		AWD Pro 4dr AWD
				Pro 4dr 4x2
				1st Edition 4dr
				Pro S 4dr
				Pro S 4dr All-Wheel Drive
	Volvo	XC40 Recharge		Pure Electric P8
2022	Audi	e-tron	Premium SUV	
		e-tron GT	Premium Plus	
			RS	
		e-tron S	Premium Plus SUV	
			Premium Plus Sportback	
		Q4 e-tron	Premium SUV	
	Premium Sportback			
	BMW	i4	eDrive40 4dr Rear-Wheel Drive Gran Coupe	
			M50 4dr All-Wheel Drive Gran Coupe	
		iX	xDrive50 4dr All-Wheel Drive Sports Activity Vehicle	
	Chevrolet	Bolt EUV		LT
			Premier	

		Bolt EV	1LT
			2LT
	Ford	Mustang Mach-E	Select 4dr 4x2
			Premium
			California Route 1
			GT 4dr All-Wheel Drive
	Hyundai	Kona Electric	SEL 4dr Front-Wheel Drive
			Limited 4dr Front-Wheel Drive
		Ioniq 5	SE Standard Range 4x2
			SE
			SEL
			SE AWD
			SEL AWD
			Limited
			Limited All-Wheel Drive
	Jaguar	I-Pace	HSE
	Kia	EV6	Light 4dr 4x2
			Wind
			GT-Line 4dr All-Wheel Drive
		Niro EV	S 4dr Front-Wheel Drive Sport Utility
			EX
			EX Premium 4dr Front-Wheel Drive Sport Utility
	Lucid	Air	Pure 4dr Rear-Wheel Drive Sedan
			Grand Touring
			Dream Edition 4dr All-Wheel Drive Sedan
			Dream Edition Performance
	Mazda	MX-30	Base Front-Wheel Drive Sport Utility
Premium Plus Package Front-Wheel Drive Sport Utility			
Mercedes-Benz	AMG EQS	4MATIC+ Sedan	
	EQB 300	4dr All-Wheel Drive 4MATIC	
	EQB 350	4dr All-Wheel Drive 4MATIC	

		EQS 450+	4dr Rear-Wheel Drive Sedan
		EQS 580	4dr All-Wheel Drive 4MATIC Sedan
	Mini	Cooper Hardtop	SE
	Nissan	Leaf	S
			SV
			S Plus
			SV Plus
			SL Plus
	Polestar	2	Long Range Single Motor 4dr Front-Wheel Drive Fastback
			Long Range Dual Motor 4dr All-Wheel Drive Fastback
	Porsche	Taycan	-
			4S
			GTS
			Turbo
			Turbo S
		Taycan Cross Turismo	4
			4S
			Turbo
			Turbo S
	Taycan Sport Turismo	GTS	
	Rivian	R1S	Explore All-Wheel Drive Sport Utility
			Launch Edition All-Wheel Drive Sport Utility
	Tesla	Model 3	-
			Long Range
Performance			
Model S		-	
		Plaid	
Model X		-	
		Plaid	
Model Y	Long Range 4dr All-Wheel Drive Sport Utility		

	Volkswagen	ID.4	Performance 4dr All-Wheel Drive Sport Utility	
			Pro 4dr 4x2	
			AWD Pro	
			Pro S	
	Volvo	C40 Recharge	Pure Electric P8 Ultimate	
			Pure Electric P8 Twin	
		XC40 Recharge	Plus AWD	
			Pure Electric P8 Ultimate	
	2023	Audi	e-tron	Premium SUV
			e-tron GT	Premium Plus
RS				
e-tron S			Premium Plus SUV	
			Premium Plus Sportback	
Q4 e-tron			Premium SUV	
		Premium Sportback		
BMW		i4	eDrive35 4dr Rear-Wheel Drive Gran Coupe	
			eDrive40	
			M50 4dr All-Wheel Drive Gran Coupe	
		i7	xDrive60 4dr All-Wheel Drive Sedan	
		iX	xDrive50 4dr All-Wheel Drive Sports Activity Vehicle	
			M60 4dr All-Wheel Drive Sports Activity Vehicle	
Cadillac		Lyriq	Luxury 4x2	
			Luxury AWD	
Chevrolet		Bolt EUV	LT	
			Premier	
		Bolt EV	1LT	
			2LT	
Ford		Mustang Mach-E	Select 4dr 4x2	
	Premium			
	GT 4dr All-Wheel Drive			
	California Route 1			

	Genesis	GV60	Advanced 4dr All-Wheel Drive
			Performance 4dr All-Wheel Drive
		Electrified G80	-
	Hyundai	Ioniq 5	SE Standard Range 4x2
			SE
			SEL
			Limited All-Wheel Drive
		Ioniq 6	SE Standard Range
			SEL
		Kona Electric	SE 4dr Front-Wheel Drive
			SEL
			Limited 4dr Front-Wheel Drive
	Jaguar	I-Pace	HSE
	Kia	Niro EV	Wind 4dr Front-Wheel Drive Sport Utility
			Wave 4dr Front-Wheel Drive Sport Utility
		EV6	Light
			Wind 4dr 4x2
			GT-Line
			GT 4dr All-Wheel Drive
	Lucid	Air	4dr Rear Wheel Drive Sedan Pure
			Touring
			Grand Touring
			4dr All Wheel Drive Sedan Grand Touring Performance
	Mercedes-Benz	AMG EQE	4dr All-Wheel Drive 4MATIC+ Sedan
		EQB 250	4dr Front-Wheel Drive
		EQB 300	4dr All-Wheel Drive 4MATIC
		EQB 350	4dr All-Wheel Drive 4MATIC
EQE 350		Base 4dr Rear-Wheel Drive Sedan	
		Base 4dr All-Wheel Drive 4MATIC+ Sedan	
EQE 500		Base 4dr All-Wheel Drive 4MATIC+ Sedan	
EQS 450		4dr All-Wheel Drive 4MATIC Sedan	
		4dr All-Wheel Drive 4MATIC Sport Utility	
EQS 450+	4dr Rear Wheel Drive Sedan		

			4dr All Wheel Drive 4MATIC Sport Utility
		EQS 580	4dr All-Wheel Drive 4MATIC Sedan
			4dr All-Wheel Drive 4MATIC Sport Utility
	Mini	Cooper Hardtop	SE Signature
			SE
	Nissan	Ariya	ENGAGE 4dr Front-Wheel Drive
			Venture+
			Engage e-4ORCE
			Evolve +
			Engage + e-4ORCE
			Empower +
			Evolve + 3-4ORCE
			Platinum+ e-4ORCE
			PREMIERE 4dr Front-Wheel Drive
		Leaf	S
		SV Plus	
	Polestar	2	Long Range Single Motor 4dr Front-Wheel Drive Fastback
			Long Range Dual Motor Performance Plus 4dr AWD Fastback
	Porsche	Taycan	-
			4S
			GTS
			Turbo
			Turbo S
		Taycan Cross Turismo	4
			4S
			Turbo
			Turbo S
Taycan Sport Turismo		GTS	
Rivian	R1S	Launch	
Subaru	Solterra	(premium)	
		Limited	
		(touring)	

	Tesla	Model 3	-
			Long Range
			Performance
		Model S	-
			Plaid
		Model X	-
			Plaid
		Model Y	Performance 4dr All-Wheel Drive Sport Utility
			Base
	Long Range 4dr All-Wheel Drive Sport Utility		
	Toyota	bZ4X	XLE 4dr Front-Wheel Drive
			Limited 4dr All-Wheel Drive
	Volkswagen	ID.4	Standard 4dr 4x2
			S
			Pro
			AWD Pro
			Pro S
			Pro S Plus
			AWD Pro S
			Pro S Plus 4dr All-Wheel Drive
	Volvo	C40 Recharge	Pure Electric Twin Core
			Plus
			Pure Electric Twin Ultimate
		XC40 Recharge	Pure Electric Twin Core
			Plus
			Pure Electric Twin Ultimate

Trims that are not denoted using a specific label are denoted by a -

Table S1b: Specific models from each manufacturer analyzed year-on-year, broken down by trim level.

Year	Number of Manufacturers	Number of Models	Number of Trims
2011	3	3	5
2013	2	2	3
2014	1	1	3
2015	1	1	2
2016	2	2	2
2017	2	2	3
2018	2	2	4
2019	1	1	4
2020	1	1	2
2021	2	2	2
2022	4	5	11
2023	10	12	25
Total Number of Unique Vehicles (2011-2023)			66

Table S2a: The total number of manufacturers and models excluded from analysis, broken down by trim level

Year	Manufacturer	Model	Trims
2011	Smart	Fortwo Electric Drive	-
			Cabriolet
	Tesla	Roadster	2.5
			2.5 Sport
Th!nk	City	Base 2dr Front-wheel Drive Coupe	
2013	Coda Automotive	Coda	_*
	Smart	Fortwo Electric Drive	Passion Convertible
			Passion Coupe
2014	Smart	Fortwo Electric Drive	Passion Cabriolet
			Passion Coupe
	Tesla	Model S	85*
2015	Smart	Fortwo Electric Drive	Passion Cabriolet
			Passion Coupe
2016	Mercedes-Benz	B-Class Electric Drive	_*
	Smart	Fortwo Electric Drive	Passion
2017	Mercedes-Benz	B-Class Electric Drive	_*
	Smart	Fortwo Electric Drive	Pure Coupe
			Pure Coupe
2018	Honda	Clarity Electric	Base 4dr Sedan*
	Smart	Fortwo Electric Drive	Prime Cabriolet
			Pure Coupe
Volkswagen	e-Golf	SEL Fleet*	
2019	Smart	EQ Fortwo	Prime Cabriolet
			Pure Coupe
	Jaguar	I-PACE EV	First Edition*
			SE*
2020	Audi	e-tron	Prestige Sportback*
	Jaguar	I-PACE EV	SE*
2021	Audi	e-tron	Sportback Prestige*

	Polestar	2	Performance Package*
2022	Audi	e-tron	Chronos Edition SUV*
		e-tron GT	Prestige*
		e-tron S	Prestige*
	Ford	E-Transit Cargo Van	-
			-
		F-150 Lightning	Platinum All-Wheel Drive SuperCrew Cab 5.5 ft. box 145 in. WB Pro All-Wheel Drive SuperCrew Cab 5.5 ft. box 145 in. WB
	GMC	Hummer EV	Pickup 4x4 (X3)
	Lucid	Air	Touring*
	Rivian	R1T	Explore All-Wheel Drive Crew Cab
			Launch Edition All-Wheel Drive Crew Cab
2023	Audi	e-tron	Chronos*
			Premium Plus*
			Sportback Prestige*
		e-tron GT	Prestige*
		e-tron S	Prestige*
		Q4 Sportback e-tron	Premium*
	Prestige*		
	Fisker	Ocean	Extreme*
			One*
			Sport*
	Ford	F-150 Lightning	Platinum All-Wheel Drive SuperCrew Cab 5.5 ft. box 145 in. WB
			Pro All-Wheel Drive SuperCrew Cab 5.5 ft. box 145 in. WB
		E-Transit Cargo Van	-
			-
	GMC	Hummer EV	Pickup 4x4 Edition 1
Hyundai	Ioniq 6	Limited*	
		SE*	

	Lexus	RZ	RZ450e F Sport*
			RZ450e*
	Lordstown	Endurance	Work 4x4 Crew Cab
	Mazda	MX-30	Base*
			Premium Plus*
	Mercedes-Benz	AMG EQS	4MATIC+ Sedan*
	Rivian	R1T	Adventure All-Wheel Drive Crew Cab
		R1S	Adventure All-Wheel Drive Sport Utility*

Trims that are not denoted using a specific label are denoted by a -

Table S2b: Specific models excluded from analysis

Note: Trims marked with an asterisk are excluded from further analysis due to missing or incomplete data. Trims not denoted by an asterisk are excluded from further analysis because they do not meet our vehicle profile criteria (i.e., these vehicles are trucks, vans, or two-seater sedans). 34 models are excluded from further analysis due to missing or incomplete data, and 32 models are excluded because they do not meet our vehicle profile criteria.

Attributes	Description of Attributes
Curb weight (pounds)	The weight of an EV with standard equipment and a full tank of fuel. Figure excludes passengers, cargo, or optional equipment.
Feature Density	The total number of amenities, additional features, and dealer-installed accessories sold as standard for a vehicle model/trim. Features are broken down into 7 categories: Convenience, Entertainment, Mechanical, Navigation, Prevention, Security and Survivability.
Fuel economy [combined] (miles per gallon-equivalent)	The distance travelled by the EV using the energy equivalent of one gallon of gasoline. This estimate assumes 55% city driving and 45% highway driving.
Horsepower	The power produced by an EV's engine.
Inflation-Adjusted MSRP (USD)	The price suggested by manufacturers to retailers prior to the vehicle's release. MSRP is inflation-adjusted to 2023 levels.
Internal volume (cubic feet)	The total space in the interior of an EV.
Lagged aggregate battery cost (USD)	The product of the nominal battery capacity of an EV in the current year multiplied by the average inflation-adjusted dollar-per-kilowatt hour battery cost in the preceding year.
Nominal Battery Capacity (kWh)	A measure of how much energy the battery can deliver from a fully charged state.
Range (miles)	The total distance travelled by the EV on a single, full charge.
Sales Volume	The total sales volume of a particular model, year-on-year.
Yearly Number of Manufacturers	The total number of manufacturers selling EVs, year-on-year.
Yearly Number of Models	The total number of EV models sold by all manufacturers, year-on-year.

Table S3: Description of various attributes for which data was collected

Feature Category	Specific Features
Convenience	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. air filter 2. cooled front seats 3. cooled rear seats 4. cupholders 5. dual zone automatic air conditioning 6. heated front seats 7. heated rear seats 8. illuminated vanity mirrors 9. lumbar support, driver 10. lumbar support, passenger 11. overhead console 12. power door locks 13. power mirrors 14. power seat direction controls, driver 15. power seat direction controls, passenger 16. power windows, front 17. power windows, rear 18. programmable garage door opener 19. remote keyless entry 20. retained accessory power 21. sunroof
Entertainment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AM radio 2. aux input jack 3. Bluetooth compatibility 4. FM radio 5. HD radio 6. LCD screen, 1st row 7. LCD screen, 2nd row 8. satellite radio 9. speed-sensitive volume 10. voice recognition
Mechanical	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. adaptive suspension 2. all-wheel drive 3. automatic level control 4. height adjustable suspension 5. locking/limited slip differential 6. ride control 7. speed-sensitive steering 8. suspension tuning 9. tilt-wheel adjustable steering column
Navigation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. compass 2. driver information center 3. head-up display 4. navigation system 5. trip computer

Prevention	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. adaptive headlights 2. auto-dimming mirrors, driver 3. auto-dimming mirrors, passenger 4. auto-dimming rear-view mirror 5. blind spot sensor 6. brake assist 7. cornering lights 8. cruise control 9. day-night rear-view mirror 10. daytime running lamp 11. delay off headlights 12. electronic stability system 13. headlight washers 14. heated door mirrors 15. illuminated entry 16. lane departure warning 17. lane keep assist 18. LED brakelights 19. LED headlights 20. low tire pressure warning 21. parking assist 22. rear child safety locks 23. rear window defogger 24. traction control, ABS 25. traction control, driveline
Security	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. content theft-deterrent alarm system 2. ignition disable 3. panic alarm 4. stolen-vehicle tracking
Survivability	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. airbags, frontal, driver 2. airbags, frontal, passenger 3. airbags, knee protection, driver 4. airbags, knee protection, passenger 5. airbags, side curtain, 1st row 6. airbags, side curtain, 2nd row 7. airbags, side impact, seat mounted, driver 8. airbags, side impact, seat mounted, pass 9. height-adjustable safety belts, front 10. occupancy sensor 11. seatbelt pre-tensioners, front, 12. seatbelt pre-tensioners, rear

Table S4: The various feature categories, and specific features selected for inclusion into the dataset