BusinessStats

Data · Insights · Statistics

STATISTICS BOOK

Technology & Telecommunications: statistics and facts

30 full reports · Edition October 2026

3,400kg	374M	612M	$3,499
MAC PRO	USERS 2025	2025 SHIPMENTS	VISION PRO

businesstats.com/technology-telecommunications-topic-overview · Free to reuse under CC BY 4.0 with credit to Business Stats.

ABOUT THIS BOOK

Technology & Telecommunications: statistics and facts

This page brings together 54 Business Stats reports on Technology & Telecommunications, grouped into Apple (25 reports), AI (4 reports), Shipments Worldwide (3 reports), VR (3 reports) and Smartphone (3 reports). Narrower topics have their own pages: Apple, Hardware, Software and Telecommunications.

Among the figures you will find here: $416B (FY2025 Annual Revenue), $2.28T (Combined Revenue, Latest FY), 612M (2025 Shipments) and $3,499 (Vision Pro).

Most recently revised are Apple Revenue Worldwide — Statistics & Facts 2004–2026 and Big Tech Revenue Comparison 2026: $2.28T, Margins, AI Capex. Each report links to its original source and offers its data as a free download. This page updates itself as reports are added or revised, most recently on Oct 18, 2026.

Each chapter is a complete Business Stats report with its text, charts, tables and primary sources. The online version of every report is updated continuously; this book shows them as of Oct 18, 2026.

CONTENTS

1. Apple

1	Apple Device Carbon Footprint 2026: by Product	6
2	Apple Investing Cash Flow 2015-2026: Chart & Data	19
3	Apple R&D Spending 2007-2026: From $0.8B to $44B	32
4	Wearables Market Share by Vendor 2014-2026: Apple Leads	45
5	Tablet Market Share by Vendor 2026: Apple Leads at 40%	58
6	Apple Services Revenue Share 2015-2026: Quarterly	71
7	Apple Services Revenue 2013-2026: Quarterly Chart & Data	85

8 Apple Vision Pro Accessories Price List 2026: Full Cost 100

2. AI

9 How Many People Use Generative AI Worldwide? (2026) 113
10 90% of Banks Now Use AI — The $36.6B Finance Revolution 2026 123
11 Big Tech Revenue Comparison 2026: $2.28T, Margins, AI Capex 137
12 $621 Billion Market – AI Market Size Worldwide 2026 — Statistics & Facts 153

3. Shipments Worldwide

13 Wearable Device Shipments Worldwide: 2014-2029 Data 162
14 Tablet Shipments Worldwide Quarterly: 2010-2026 Data 176
15 PC Shipments Worldwide: Quarterly Data 2009-2026 188

4. VR

16 VR Headset Price Comparison 2026: Vision Pro to Quest 200
17 VR Headset Market Revenue Worldwide: 2018-2030 Data 213
18 $87 Billion Market — Virtual Reality (VR) Statistics & Facts 2026 226

5. Smartphone

19 Smartphone Market Share by Vendor 2009-2026 234
20 How Much Is the Smartphone Industry Worth? $409B to $584B 247
21 Smartphone Market Share by Vendor 259

6. OS Market

22 Tablet OS Market Share 2016-2026: iPad OS vs Android 274
23 Mobile OS Market Share 2009-2026: Android vs iOS 287

7. More statistics

24	Global macOS version market share 2018-2026	300
25	iPhone 16 Adoption by Model 2024-2026: Data	313
26	iPhone 17 and iPhone Air Adoption by Model 2025-2026	326
27	How Big Is the Tablet Market? Revenue 2018-2030	339
28	PC Market Revenue 2018-2028: A $247B Comeback by Category	352
29	How Many Phones Does the World Ship? 54M to 1.47B a Year	364
30	How Much Does the World Spend on Devices? $628B to $856B	376

MORE REPORTS ON THIS TOPIC (ONLINE)

- Apple Vision Pro Price 2026: 256GB, 512GB & 1TB Cost
- Apple Vision Pro Sales 2024-2028: Shipments & Forecast
- iPad Share of Apple Revenue 2010-2026
- Apple iPad Revenue Quarterly FY2010-2026
- Apple Mac Shipments Quarterly 2024-2026: Data
- Apple Mac Revenue Quarterly FY2006-2026: Data
- Apple iPhone Shipments Quarterly 2010-2026: Data
- Apple iOS Version Market Share 2018-2026: Data
- iPhone Share of Apple Revenue Quarterly 2009-2026
- Apple iPhone Revenue Quarterly 2007-2026: Data & Charts
- Apple Number of Employees 2005-2026: Data & Charts
- Apple Net Income Worldwide FY 2005-2025: Data & Charts
- Apple Net Sales by Operating Segment FY 2012-2026
- Apple Revenue Quarterly FY 2005-2026: Data & Chart
- Where Does Apple Make Its Money? Revenue by Region Explained
- Apple Statistics 2026: $416B Revenue, $4.5T Market Cap
- Apple Revenue Worldwide — Statistics & Facts 2004–2026
- Intel vs AMD Market Share 2026: AMD at 30.3% of PC CPUs
- ARM Holdings Revenue by Quarter FY2017–2026

- ARM Holdings Statistics & Facts — Revenue, Stock & Data
- Biggest Tech Companies in the UK — 2026 Rankings
- $335 Billion Market Data Centers 2026 — Statistics & Facts
- Nvidia — Statistics & Facts 2026
- Artificial Intelligence Statistics 2026: $581.7B Invested

STATISTICS REPORT

Carbon emissions of Apple flagship devices 2026, by product

Updated Jun 20, 2026 · businesstats.com/carbon-emissions-of-apple-flagship-devices

3,400kg MAC PRO	**12kg** APPLE WATCH	**55kg** IPHONE 17
~80% MANUFACTURING	**280x** RANGE	**-42%** IPHONE SINCE 6

Overview

Total greenhouse gas emissions of Apple flagship devices as of 2026, by product

The carbon footprint of Apple devices varies enormously by product, from around 12 kilograms of CO2 equivalent for an Apple Watch to roughly 3,400 kilograms for a Mac Pro. That is a spread of nearly 280 times across Apple flagship lineup. This report compares the total lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions of Apple flagship devices as of 2026, product by product. The differences between products are far larger than most buyers realise. A watch and a desktop tower are worlds apart in carbon. The choice of device dominates the impact. One decision shapes the whole footprint. The product choice outweighs everything else. A buyer decides most of the footprint at purchase. The choice is locked in before first use. Manufacturing carbon is fixed at the point of sale.

These figures come from Apple Product Environmental Reports, which estimate the total emissions of each device across its life, from making it to using it to recycling it. The numbers reflect the materials, chips and energy that go into each product, the same investments tracked in our Apple cash usage in investing activities analysis on the financial side.

Apple Device Carbon Footprint by Product, 2026 (kg CO2e)Total lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions of each flagship device.

Data:

Total lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions of Apple flagship devices as of 2026, by product, in kilograms of CO2 equivalent, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Product Environmental Reports.

Note:

Figures are for representative United States base configurations; footprints rise with more storage and memory. The Apple Vision Pro figure is an estimate. Carbon neutral products offset their remaining emissions.Switch views with the toolbar.

The pattern is clear: bigger, more powerful devices with more chips and metal carry far higher footprints. A Mac Pro tower, packed with silicon and aluminium, dwarfs an iPhone, which in turn dwarfs an Apple Watch. The research that designs these products to be more efficient is covered in our Efficiency gains start at the design stage, covered in our Apple research and development spending analysis.

A note on the data. Figures are total lifecycle emissions in kilograms of CO2 equivalent, for representative United States base configurations, from Apple Product Environmental Reports. Footprints rise with extra storage and memory, sometimes sharply. The Apple Vision Pro figure is an estimate, and carbon neutral products offset their remaining emissions through renewable energy and credits. The headline figure is the gross footprint before any offsets. Offsets reduce the net figure but not the gross one. The real emissions are still created. Neutrality is a claim about the net, not the gross. The manufacturing emissions are real regardless.

Carbon Footprint Data Table

Apple Flagship Device Carbon Footprints, 2026

Apple Flagship Device Carbon Footprints, 2026 (kg CO2e)Click any column to sort

DEVICE	CATEGORY	CARBON FOOTPRINT
Mac Pro	Mac	3,400 kg
Pro Display XDR	Display	950 kg
Mac Studio	Mac	350 kg
MacBook Pro 16"	Mac	300 kg
iMac	Mac	300 kg
Apple Vision Pro	XR	280 kg

MacBook Pro 14"	Mac	210 kg
MacBook Air	Mac	150 kg
iPad Pro	iPad	110 kg
iPhone 17 Pro Max	iPhone	78 kg
iPhone 17	iPhone	55 kg
iPad	iPad	55 kg
Mac mini	Mac	32 kg
AirPods Pro	Audio	13 kg
Apple Watch Series 11	Watch	12 kg

The table lists Apple flagship devices and their total lifecycle carbon footprints in 2026, in kilograms of CO2 equivalent. It ranges from the Apple Watch and AirPods at the low end to the Mac Pro at the extreme high end. Sorting the figures shows how sharply the footprint scales with the size, power and material content of each device. Bigger and more powerful almost always means more carbon. Power comes at an environmental cost. Performance and footprint rise together. The most capable devices carry the most carbon. Power and footprint move firmly in step. The trade-off is built into the hardware.

Footprint Tiers

Apple Device Carbon Footprint by Tier

Grouped into tiers, the devices fall into four bands. A low tier under 50 kilograms holds the Apple Watch, AirPods and the carbon neutral Mac mini. A middle tier from 50 to 150 kilograms holds the iPhones, iPads and MacBook Air. A high tier from 150 to 500 kilograms holds the larger MacBooks, iMac, Mac Studio and Vision Pro. And an extreme tier above 500 kilograms holds the Pro Display XDR and the Mac Pro. These two tower over everything else Apple sells. Their footprints are in a class apart. No phone or watch comes near them. The gap is measured in thousands of kilograms. Few comparisons in tech are so lopsided.

The distribution is bottom-heavy in volume but top-heavy in impact. Most Apple products, by units sold, sit in the lower tiers, especially iPhones and Watches. Yet the handful of high-end desktops and displays carry footprints many times larger, so a single Mac Pro can outweigh dozens of iPhones, a concentration that mirrors the premium tilt in our Apple revenue by segment analysis.

Apple Devices by Carbon Footprint Tier, 2026 (count)How many flagship devices sit in each footprint band.

Data:

Derived from total lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions of Apple flagship devices, 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Product Environmental Reports.

Note:

Tiers, category figures, lifecycle splits, generational trends and ratios are calculated from the per-device carbon footprints. Figures are for base configurations and vary by storage and memory; some figures are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

The tiers reveal a simple rule: carbon footprint tracks silicon and metal. The more chips, memory and aluminium a device contains, the higher its emissions, because manufacturing those components is energy-intensive. This is why a powerful desktop can emit a hundred times more than a watch, a relationship that shapes Apple whole environmental strategy. Material content, not screen size, is the real driver. Chips and metal decide the footprint. The more of each, the higher the emissions. The rule is simple and remarkably consistent. Across the lineup, material content rules.

Lifecycle Stages

Apple Product Carbon Footprint by Lifecycle Stage

Breaking a typical device footprint into lifecycle stages reveals where the emissions come from. For most Apple products, manufacturing dominates, accounting for roughly 80 percent of total emissions. Customer use adds around 12 to 15 percent, transport a few percent, and end-of-life recycling almost nothing. The pattern is consistent across nearly every product. Manufacturing leads in every category. Use is a distant second everywhere. Charging adds little next to manufacturing. The factory, not the socket, drives emissions. Charging is a minor share of the total.

This manufacturing-heavy profile is distinctive. Unlike a car, whose emissions come mostly from years of fuel use, an Apple device emits most of its carbon before it is ever switched on, in the mining, refining and chip-making that create it. This is why Apple focuses so heavily on recycled materials and clean energy in its supply chain, an upstream effort tied to our Most of the carbon is locked in before purchase, an upstream effort tied to our big tech revenue comparison analysis.

Apple Device Carbon Footprint by Lifecycle Stage (%)Share of emissions from each lifecycle phase, typical device.

Data:

Derived from total lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions of Apple flagship devices, 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Product Environmental Reports.

Note:

Tiers, category figures, lifecycle splits, generational trends and ratios are calculated from the per-device carbon footprints. Figures are for base configurations and vary by storage and memory; some figures are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

Because manufacturing dominates, the single biggest lever for Apple is cleaning up production. Using recycled aluminium and cobalt, and powering suppliers with renewable energy, cuts the footprint before a product leaves the factory. The use phase matters less for Apple than for most industries, making supply-chain decarbonisation the heart of its plan, a focus reflected across our Cleaning the factory beats cleaning the use phase, a focus reflected across our tech revenue comparison analysis.

iPhone Lineup

iPhone Carbon Footprint Across the iPhone 17 Lineup

Within the iPhone 17 lineup, the carbon footprint rises with size and power. The standard iPhone 17 and the thin iPhone Air both start around 55 kilograms. The iPhone 17 Pro rises to about 64 kilograms, and the iPhone 17 Pro Max to roughly 78 kilograms at base storage, climbing much higher at larger capacities.

The Pro models cost more in carbon as well as cash. Their larger displays, bigger batteries and extra cameras add materials, while higher storage tiers add memory chips that carry significant embedded emissions. A maxed-out iPhone 17 Pro Max can exceed 130 kilograms, more than double the base iPhone 17, a premium echoed in our More capability carries more carbon, a premium echoed in our Apple iPhone revenue analysis.

iPhone 17 Lineup Carbon Footprint, 2026 (kg CO2e)Carbon footprint of each model in the iPhone 17 range.

Data:

Derived from total lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions of Apple flagship devices, 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Product Environmental Reports.

Note:

Tiers, category figures, lifecycle splits, generational trends and ratios are calculated from the per-device carbon footprints. Figures are for base configurations and vary by storage and memory; some figures are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

The lineup shows how storage drives emissions. Each step up in capacity adds flash memory, one of the most carbon-intensive components, so the same model can vary widely in footprint depending on configuration. For the lowest impact, the base iPhone 17 or the iPhone Air are the greenest choices in the range, a nuance often lost in headline figures. The base model is always the greener pick. Skipping extra storage cuts real carbon. The base configuration is the low-carbon option.

Mac Lineup

Mac Carbon Footprint by Model

The Mac lineup spans the widest carbon range of any Apple category, from the remarkably low to the extraordinarily high. The carbon neutral M4 Mac mini starts at just 32 kilograms, a MacBook Air around 150, the larger MacBook Pro near 300, and the Mac Pro tower at roughly 3,400 kilograms, by far the highest of any Apple product. Nothing else Apple makes comes close to it. The Mac Pro is in a category of one. Its footprint is genuinely extreme.

The Mac Pro extreme footprint comes from its sheer material content: a large aluminium enclosure, many high-performance chips, and a power-hungry design built for professionals. It emits more than 100 times as much as a Mac mini and more than 40 times a typical iPhone, making it the clear outlier of Apple range, a niche product reflected in our The tower stands utterly apart, a niche product reflected in our Apple total revenue analysis.

Mac Carbon Footprint by Model, 2026 (kg CO2e)From the carbon neutral Mac mini to the Mac Pro.

Data:

Derived from total lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions of Apple flagship devices, 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Product Environmental Reports.

Note:

Tiers, category figures, lifecycle splits, generational trends and ratios are calculated from the per-device carbon footprints. Figures are for base configurations and vary by storage and memory; some figures are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

The contrast within the Mac line is instructive. The same brand sells both one of the lowest-footprint computers, the carbon neutral Mac mini, and the highest-footprint device it makes, the Mac Pro. The difference is almost entirely silicon and aluminium: more chips and more metal mean more carbon, a rule that governs the entire lineup. Silicon and aluminium set the footprint. The rest of the design barely moves it.

Over Generations

iPhone Carbon Footprint by Generation

Across iPhone generations, the carbon footprint has fallen substantially over time. The iPhone 6 of 2014 emitted about 95 kilograms; by the iPhone 17 of 2025, the base model was down to around 55 kilograms, a reduction of more than 40 percent despite far more powerful hardware. Each generation did more with less carbon. Efficiency rose as emissions fell.

This decline reflects Apple sustained efficiency work. Recycled materials, cleaner supplier energy and more efficient chips have steadily cut the carbon cost of each generation, even as the phones gained capability. The iPhone 16 was the first to use 95 percent recycled lithium in its battery and 100 percent recycled cobalt, a materials push tied to our Apple Services revenue analysis.

iPhone Carbon Footprint by Generation (kg CO2e)Base iPhone footprint falling across generations.

Data:

Derived from total lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions of Apple flagship devices, 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Product Environmental Reports.

Note:

Tiers, category figures, lifecycle splits, generational trends and ratios are calculated from the per-device carbon footprints. Figures are for base configurations and vary by storage and memory; some figures are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

The generational trend is not perfectly smooth, however. Some Pro models have crept upward as they added materials and storage, and the latest generation took a few steps back in recycled aluminium content. Hitting Apple 2030 carbon-neutral goal will require the trend to resume falling sharply across the whole lineup. The recent plateau is a warning sign. The easy gains may already be spent. Future cuts will be harder to find. The remaining emissions are the toughest to remove.

Carbon Neutral

Apple Carbon Neutral Devices and Their Footprint

A growing number of Apple flagship devices are now marketed as carbon neutral, meaning Apple has cut their emissions sharply and offsets the rest. The Apple Watch lineup, including the Series 11 and SE, and the M4 Mac mini are the headline carbon neutral products, with footprints as low as 12 to 32 kilograms.

Apple achieves carbon neutrality on these products through a mix of clean energy, recycled materials and high-quality carbon credits. For some devices, Apple even buys renewable electricity on behalf of customers to cover the energy used in charging, an unusual step that addresses the use phase, a commitment reflected in our wearables market share by vendor analysis.

Apple Carbon Neutral Devices: Footprint (kg CO2e)The devices Apple markets as carbon neutral.

Data:

Derived from total lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions of Apple flagship devices, 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Product Environmental Reports.

Note:

Tiers, category figures, lifecycle splits, generational trends and ratios are calculated from the per-device carbon footprints. Figures are for base configurations and vary by storage and memory; some figures are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

The carbon neutral label is not without debate. Critics question the reliance on offsets rather than absolute reductions, and the gross footprint before offsets remains real. Still, the carbon neutral devices are genuinely among the lowest-emitting Apple makes, and they point toward the company broader 2030 ambition of neutrality across its entire footprint. The carbon neutral devices are a first step. The wider lineup must follow their lead.

In Perspective

Apple Device Carbon Footprint in iPhone Equivalents

Expressing the footprints in iPhone equivalents makes the scale vivid. A single Mac Pro carries the carbon of about 62 iPhone 17s. A Pro Display XDR equals roughly 17 iPhones, a MacBook Pro 16-inch about five and a half, and an Apple Vision Pro around five. Even an iPad Pro equals two iPhones.

These multiples reframe the comparison in human terms. Buying one high-end desktop setup, a Mac Pro paired with a Pro Display XDR, carries roughly the carbon of 80 iPhones, or the lifetime emissions of a small fleet of phones. The choice of device, not just the choice to buy, shapes a buyer carbon impact dramatically. What you buy matters more than how you use it. The purchase decision is the carbon decision. Choosing a smaller device saves the most.

Apple Device Footprint in iPhone Equivalents, 2026How many iPhones equal the footprint of each big device.

Data:

Derived from total lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions of Apple flagship devices, 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Product Environmental Reports.

Note:

Tiers, category figures, lifecycle splits, generational trends and ratios are calculated from the per-device carbon footprints. Figures are for base configurations and vary by storage and memory; some figures are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

The iPhone-equivalent view also highlights where Apple total product emissions concentrate. Because iPhones sell in the hundreds of millions, their modest individual footprint adds up to the bulk of Apple product emissions, while the high-footprint desktops sell in far smaller numbers, a volume effect central to our Apple Vision Pro analysis.

The Reduction

iPhone Carbon Footprint Reduction Over Time

Tracing the iPhone carbon footprint from the iPhone 6 in 2014 to the iPhone 17 in 2025 shows a clear downward path. The footprint fell from about 95 kilograms to around 55, even as the phones grew far more capable. The slope of that line is one of Apple clearest environmental achievements.

The reduction came in steps, as each generation adopted more recycled materials and cleaner energy. The steepest improvements followed Apple commitments to recycled aluminium enclosures and renewable-powered suppliers, which cut the embedded carbon of the most material-heavy parts of the phone, a progression that underpins Apple environmental marketing. The story is central to its green image. The iPhone trend anchors its 2030 case.

iPhone Carbon Footprint: 2014 vs 2025 (kg CO2e)The drop from iPhone 6 to iPhone 17.

Data:

Derived from total lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions of Apple flagship devices, 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Product Environmental Reports.

Note:

Tiers, category figures, lifecycle splits, generational trends and ratios are calculated from the per-device carbon footprints. Figures are for base configurations and vary by storage and memory; some figures are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

Sustaining this slope is the central challenge of Apple 2030 plan. To reach carbon neutrality, the per-device footprint must keep falling toward zero, a far harder task as the easy gains are used up. The iPhone trend shows it is possible, but the pace must accelerate, a pressure that defines Apple environmental decade ahead. The pace of cuts will decide its success. The slope must steepen from here. Reaching neutrality demands faster cuts.

Manufacturing

Apple Carbon Footprint from Manufacturing by Device

Across nearly every Apple device, manufacturing is the dominant source of emissions, typically 75 to 85 percent of the total. For an iPhone, production accounts for around 80 percent; for a Mac mini, closer to 85 percent; for a MacBook, around 76 percent. The pattern holds regardless of device size.

This consistency points to a single culprit: semiconductors and metals. Making the chips, displays and aluminium that go into Apple products is enormously energy-intensive, and that energy, much of it still from fossil sources in parts of the supply chain, is where most of the carbon originates, a supply-chain reality behind Apple decarbonisation push. The factories matter more than the phones. Supply-chain energy is the real battleground.

Manufacturing Share of Apple Device Footprint (%)Manufacturing as a share of total footprint by device.

Data:

Derived from total lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions of Apple flagship devices, 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Product Environmental Reports.

Note:

Tiers, category figures, lifecycle splits, generational trends and ratios are calculated from the per-device carbon footprints. Figures are for base configurations and vary by storage and memory; some figures are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

Because manufacturing so dominates, Apple environmental progress depends overwhelmingly on its suppliers. Cleaning up the factories that make Apple chips and assemble its devices matters far more than anything that happens during use. This is why Apple Supplier Clean Energy Program sits at the centre of its strategy, an upstream focus that shapes its entire footprint. Suppliers hold the key to Apple progress. Their energy mix shapes every footprint. Cleaner supplier power lowers all devices at once.

3,400 kgMac ProHighest footprint. 12 kgApple WatchLowest, neutral. ~80%ManufacturingOf each footprint. -42%iPhoneSince iPhone 6.

The carbon emissions of Apple flagship devices in 2026 span an extraordinary range, from around 12 kilograms for an Apple Watch to roughly 3,400 for a Mac Pro. The footprint tracks the silicon and metal in each product: more chips and more aluminium mean more carbon. Manufacturing dominates, accounting for about 80 percent of every device emissions, while iPhones have grown steadily greener over time. The direction of travel is clearly downward. The long-run path bends toward lower carbon.

More than any single figure, it is the pattern that matters. Apple device footprints scale with their power and materials, concentrate in manufacturing, and are slowly falling generation by generation. As Apple pursues its 2030 carbon-neutral goal, the challenge is to keep cutting per-device emissions while selling ever more devices, a balance that will define its environmental record, a story that connects to the wider Apple picture in our biggest companies by market value analysis.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: Apple Device Carbon Footprint

The carbon footprint of a base iPhone 17 is about 55 kilograms of CO2 equivalent across its full lifecycle, according to Apple's Product Environmental Reports. The iPhone 17 Pro rises to around 64 kilograms and the iPhone 17 Pro Max to roughly 78 kilograms at base storage, climbing above 130 kilograms at the largest capacities. About 80 percent of an iPhone's footprint comes from manufacturing, mainly the production of its chips and aluminium.

The Mac Pro has by far the highest carbon footprint of any Apple flagship device, at roughly 3,400 kilograms of CO2 equivalent. This is more than 100 times the footprint of a Mac mini and over 40 times

that of a typical iPhone. The extreme figure reflects the Mac Pro's large aluminium enclosure, its many high-performance chips, and its power-hungry, professional-grade design. Among displays, the Pro Display XDR is also very high, near 950 kilograms.

The Apple Watch has the lowest carbon footprint among Apple's flagship devices, at around 12 kilograms of CO2 equivalent, and it is marketed as carbon neutral. AirPods Pro are similarly low, near 13 kilograms. The carbon neutral M4 Mac mini, at about 32 kilograms, is the lowest-footprint Mac. These low figures reflect both the small size of the devices and Apple's use of recycled materials and clean energy to reduce and offset their emissions.

For most Apple devices, manufacturing accounts for around 80 percent of total lifecycle emissions because making semiconductors, displays and aluminium is extremely energy-intensive. Unlike a car, which emits most of its carbon during years of fuel use, an Apple device emits most of its carbon before it is ever switched on, in mining, refining and chip fabrication. This is why Apple focuses heavily on recycled materials and clean energy across its supply chain rather than on the use phase.

When Apple markets a device like the Apple Watch or the M4 Mac mini as carbon neutral, it means Apple has sharply reduced the product's emissions through recycled materials and clean supplier energy, then offset the remaining emissions with high-quality carbon credits. For some products, Apple even buys renewable electricity on behalf of customers to cover charging. Critics note the reliance on offsets, but these devices are genuinely among the lowest-emitting Apple makes, with gross footprints as low as 12 to 32 kilograms.

The iPhone's carbon footprint has fallen substantially, from about 95 kilograms for the iPhone 6 in 2014 to around 55 kilograms for the base iPhone 17 in 2025, a reduction of more than 40 percent, even as the phones became far more powerful. The decline comes from Apple's use of recycled materials, cleaner supplier energy and more efficient chips. The iPhone 16 was the first to use 95 percent recycled lithium in its battery and 100 percent recycled cobalt.

Yes, significantly. Flash memory is one of the most carbon-intensive components in a device, so each step up in storage adds meaningful emissions. A base iPhone 17 Pro Max is around 78 kilograms, but a 2-terabyte version can exceed 130 kilograms. The same pattern applies to Macs: a base M4 Mac mini is 32 kilograms, while a top-spec version with far more memory and storage reaches about 121 kilograms, nearly quadruple the base.

Apple calculates each product's carbon footprint using a life cycle assessment methodology aligned with ISO standards, covering production, transport, customer use and end-of-life processing. The

figures are published in Apple's Product Environmental Reports for each device and are independently verified, in part by the Fraunhofer Institute for the product-related Scope 3 emissions. The reported figure is for a representative base configuration, and footprints rise with additional storage and memory.

The Mac Pro emits roughly 3,400 kilograms of CO2 equivalent, about 40 times a typical iPhone, because it contains far more carbon-intensive material. It has a large aluminium enclosure, many high-performance processors and graphics chips, extensive memory and a power-supply and cooling system built for sustained professional workloads. Since manufacturing chips and metal is the main source of emissions, a device packed with both, like the Mac Pro, carries a vastly higher footprint than a compact phone.

Yes. Apple has reduced its overall greenhouse gas emissions by more than 60 percent since 2015, even as revenue rose, and the per-device footprint of products like the iPhone has fallen more than 40 percent over a decade. Apple is pursuing a goal called Apple 2030, aiming to be carbon neutral across its entire footprint by the end of the decade, mainly by decarbonising its supply chain, using recycled materials, and powering manufacturing with renewable energy.

Sources

Apple Product Environmental Reports and Apple Environmental Progress Report - Source for per-device lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions.

Apple Environment - Reference for Apple product carbon footprints and environmental data.

Figures are total lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions in kilograms of CO2 equivalent, for representative United States base configurations, from Apple Product Environmental Reports. They range from about 12 kg for the Apple Watch to roughly 3,400 kg for the Mac Pro, with manufacturing accounting for around 80 percent of each device footprint. Footprints rise with extra storage and memory. The Apple Vision Pro figure is an estimate, and some figures are approximate. Carbon neutral products offset remaining emissions.

STATISTICS REPORT

Apple cash usage in investing activities 2015-2026

Updated Jun 20, 2026 · businesstats.com/apple-s-cash-usage-in-investing-activities

-$56B USED 2015	+$46B MADE 2019	+$15B 2025 INFLOW
~$11B AVG CAPEX	-$100B CUMULATIVE	~10% CAPEX/OCF

Overview

Apple's cash usage in investing activities from financial year 2015 to 2026

Apple cash flow from investing activities is one of the most volatile lines in its financial statements, swinging from huge outflows to large inflows from year to year. In 2015, Apple used more than 56 billion dollars in investing activities; by 2019 it generated nearly 46 billion. This report tracks Apple cash usage in investing activities from fiscal 2015 to 2026. Few corporate lines move so dramatically year to year. A swing of 100 billion dollars in four years is rare. The line behaves more like a market than a budget. The swings reflect financial positioning, not operations. Treasury choices drive the headline figure. The number is a financial decision, not an operating one. Treasury strategy, not the underlying business, sets it.

The swings are driven almost entirely by one thing: Apple enormous marketable securities portfolio. When Apple buys more securities than it sells, investing shows a large cash outflow; when it lets the portfolio run down, investing shows a large inflow. The capital spending that builds Apple actual facilities is a smaller, steadier part of the picture, alongside the research covered in our Building products is a smaller, steadier outlay, alongside the research covered in our Apple research and development spending analysis.

Apple Net Cash from Investing Activities, 2015-2026 (USD billions)Net cash generated by (positive) or used in (negative) investing each fiscal year.

Data:

Apple Inc. net cash generated by, or used in, investing activities by fiscal year, 2015 to 2026, in billions of U.S. dollars, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple cash flow statements (Form 10-K).

Note:

Positive values mean cash generated by investing; negative values mean cash used. The line is dominated by marketable securities activity. The 2026 figure is an estimate; Apple fiscal years end in late September.Switch views with the toolbar.

A note on signs. Positive figures mean cash generated by investing activities; negative figures mean cash used. The headline number is the net of securities purchases and sales, capital expenditure and acquisitions. Because the securities swings dwarf everything else, the net can flip from deeply negative to strongly positive in a single year, a volatility absent from our The sign can flip overnight, a volatility absent from our Apple total revenue analysis.

Figures are Apple reported net cash from investing activities by fiscal year, in billions of dollars, from Apple Form 10-K filings. Apple fiscal years end in late September. The 2026 figure is an estimate based on reported results through the first half of the year, while all earlier figures are reported actuals. Component splits are approximate where broken out. The headline net figure, however, is reported precisely. Apple discloses the total in every annual filing. The reported figure is exact, even if the drivers shift. Apple is precise about the net, vague about the parts.

Investing Cash Flow Data Table

Apple Net Cash from Investing Activities, 2015-2026

Apple Net Cash from Investing Activities and Capex, 2015-2026Click any column to sort

FISCAL YEAR	NET INVESTING CASH	CAPITAL EXPENDITURE
2015	$56.3B	$11.2B
2016	$46.0B	$13.0B
2017	$46.4B	$12.5B
2018	+$16.1B	$13.3B
2019	+$45.9B	$10.5B
2020	$4.3B	$7.3B

2021	$14.5B	$11.1B
2022	$22.4B	$10.7B
2023	+$3.7B	$11.0B
2024	+$2.9B	$9.5B
2025	+$15.2B	$12.0B
2026	+$6.0B	$13.0B

The table lists Apple net cash from investing activities for each fiscal year from 2015 to 2026, in billions of dollars, with positive figures marking cash generated and negative figures cash used. It shows the dramatic swings, from a 56 billion dollar outflow in 2015 to a 46 billion dollar inflow in 2019. Sorting the figures reveals how rarely the line sits near zero. The line lives at the extremes far more than the middle. Near-zero years are the exception, not the rule. Most years show a large inflow or a large outflow. The middle ground is seldom occupied.

Capital Expenditure

Apple Capital Expenditure in Investing Activities

Beneath the volatile headline, capital expenditure is the steady, predictable part of Apple investing. Payments for property, plant and equipment have hovered between roughly 7 and 13 billion dollars a year across the period, a remarkably narrow range for a company of Apple size. This is the cash Apple actually spends building its physical and technical infrastructure. It is the real-economy slice of the investing line. This is where Apple spends on tangible assets. It is dwarfed by the financial flows around it. Real capex hides behind the securities swings.

Apple capital expenditure is strikingly low relative to its scale. Where many large technology firms pour tens of billions into data centres, Apple has kept capex disciplined, relying partly on its suppliers to fund manufacturing equipment. The result is a capital-light model that throws off enormous free cash flow, a strength reflected in our Light capital needs leave more cash for everything else, a strength reflected in our Apple net income analysis.

Apple Capital Expenditure, 2015-2026 (USD billions)Payments for property, plant and equipment each fiscal year.

Data:

Derived from Apple Inc. net cash from investing activities by fiscal year, 2015 to 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Form 10-K filings.

Note:

Capital expenditure, marketable securities flows, era averages, cumulative totals and ratios are calculated from reported cash flow data. Securities and component figures are approximate where split out. The 2026 figure is an estimate; others are reported actuals.Switch views with the toolbar.

In the most recent years, capex has edged upward as Apple invests more in artificial intelligence infrastructure and its own data capacity. Still, the increase is modest compared with the AI-driven capital surges at rivals, keeping Apple among the most capital-efficient of the technology giants, a discipline that supports our Even the AI build-out stays restrained, a discipline that supports our big tech revenue comparison analysis.

Marketable Securities

Apple Marketable Securities Cash Flow

The marketable securities line is what makes Apple investing cash flow swing so wildly. For years, Apple parked its vast cash hoard in corporate and government bonds, buying far more than it sold, which showed as huge investing outflows. From 2015 to 2017 alone, this net buying used well over 100 billion dollars. The offshore pile reached extraordinary heights. At its peak it topped 200 billion dollars. Apple held more bonds than many governments. The sheer scale of that bond portfolio was truly staggering.

Then the direction reversed. After the 2017 United States tax reform allowed Apple to repatriate its overseas cash, the company began winding down its securities portfolio, selling and letting bonds mature faster than it bought new ones. This flipped investing cash flow strongly positive in 2018 and 2019, a dramatic reversal of direction. Years of buying gave way to years of selling. The portfolio began its long decline. The selling has continued for years since.

Apple Net Marketable Securities Cash Flow, 2015-2026 (USD billions)Net cash from buying versus selling securities, the main driver.

Data:

Derived from Apple Inc. net cash from investing activities by fiscal year, 2015 to 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Form 10-K filings.

Note:

Capital expenditure, marketable securities flows, era averages, cumulative totals and ratios are calculated from reported cash flow data. Securities and component figures are approximate where split out. The 2026 figure is an estimate; others are reported actuals.Switch views with the toolbar.

Since 2020, the securities swings have been smaller but still drive the net figure. In some years Apple has been a modest net buyer, in others a net seller, producing the alternating outflows and inflows of recent years. The portfolio is now far smaller than its peak, reducing the scale of the swings, a normalisation visible across our The wild swings have calmed since, a normalisation visible across our tech revenue comparison analysis.

The Two Drivers

Apple Investing Cash Flow: Capex vs Securities

Setting capital expenditure against marketable securities flows side by side shows why the net is so erratic. Capex is a steady outflow of around 10 to 13 billion dollars every year. The securities line, by contrast, swings by tens of billions in either direction, overwhelming the capex drag and setting the sign of the total. The capex line barely registers beside it. Securities dominate the year almost entirely.

This contrast is the heart of Apple investing cash flow. The real, operational investing, building facilities and buying equipment, is small and stable. The financial investing, managing a bond portfolio once worth more than 200 billion dollars, is enormous and volatile. The two could hardly behave more differently, a split that shapes our Operational and financial investing diverge sharply, a split that shapes our Apple revenue by segment analysis.

Apple Investing: Capex vs Securities, Recent Years (USD billions)Steady capex against swinging securities flows.

Data:

Derived from Apple Inc. net cash from investing activities by fiscal year, 2015 to 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Form 10-K filings.

Note:

Capital expenditure, marketable securities flows, era averages, cumulative totals and ratios are calculated from reported cash flow data. Securities and component figures are approximate where split out. The 2026

figure is an estimate; others are reported actuals.Switch views with the toolbar.

Separating the two makes Apple strategy clearer. The company spends modestly on physical capacity while running a treasury operation on the scale of a large asset manager. As the securities portfolio shrinks toward the level needed for operations, the financial swings should ease, leaving capex as the dominant investing line, a transition relevant to our The securities noise should fade, leaving capex as the dominant investing line, a transition relevant to our Apple iPhone revenue analysis.

Cumulative Total

Apple Cumulative Cash Used in Investing Activities

Added up across the whole period, Apple cumulative net investing cash flow remains deeply negative, at roughly 100 billion dollars used since 2015. Despite the later inflows, Apple has on balance used cash in investing over the decade, mostly to build the securities portfolio it has only partly unwound. The early buying still outweighs the later selling. On balance, Apple has invested more than it withdrew. The net position stays firmly negative. Cumulatively, Apple remains a net investor.

The cumulative line tells a story the annual swings obscure. The early years of heavy securities buying pushed the running total deeply negative, and the later inflows have only partly reversed it. On net, Apple has been a substantial user of cash in investing across the period, funding a vast financial portfolio alongside its operations, on a scale matching its balance sheet. The treasury operation rivals a large fund. Apple manages money like an asset manager.

Apple Cumulative Net Investing Cash Flow Since 2015 (USD billions)Running total of net cash from investing.

Data:

Derived from Apple Inc. net cash from investing activities by fiscal year, 2015 to 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Form 10-K filings.

Note:

Capital expenditure, marketable securities flows, era averages, cumulative totals and ratios are calculated from reported cash flow data. Securities and component figures are approximate where split out. The 2026 figure is an estimate; others are reported actuals.Switch views with the toolbar.

This cumulative view reframes the volatility. While any single year can show a large inflow or outflow, the decade-long picture is of a company that invested heavily in financial assets and has since drawn some of that back. The net position remains a large outflow, reflecting the sheer size of Apple balance sheet and treasury operations. Few companies manage cash at this scale.

By Era

Apple Investing Cash Flow by Era

Grouped by era, Apple investing cash flow falls into distinct phases. From 2015 to 2017, the securities-buying years, Apple used an average of nearly 50 billion dollars a year. In 2018 and 2019, the unwinding years, it generated an average of about 31 billion. Since 2020, the figure has hovered closer to balance. The era of giant swings appears to be over. Recent years cluster much closer to zero. The volatility has clearly subsided.

Each era reflects a different treasury strategy. The buying years built a record offshore cash pile under the old tax regime. The unwinding years followed tax reform, as Apple repatriated and returned cash to shareholders. The recent years mark a more settled phase, with the portfolio stabilised, a maturing visible in our Apple Services revenue analysis.

Average Apple Investing Cash Flow by Era (USD billions/year)Average net investing cash flow across distinct phases.

Data:

Derived from Apple Inc. net cash from investing activities by fiscal year, 2015 to 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Form 10-K filings.

Note:

Capital expenditure, marketable securities flows, era averages, cumulative totals and ratios are calculated from reported cash flow data. Securities and component figures are approximate where split out. The 2026 figure is an estimate; others are reported actuals.Switch views with the toolbar.

The era comparison shows how external events, especially tax policy, reshaped Apple investing cash flow. A change in the tax treatment of overseas cash turned years of outflows into sudden inflows, a reminder that this line reflects financial strategy as much as operations, a distinction relevant to our wearables market share by vendor analysis.

Across the Decade

Apple Cash Flow from Investing Activities, 2015 to 2026

Tracing the investing line from 2015 through 2019 to 2026 captures its dramatic swings in three snapshots. In 2015, Apple used 56 billion dollars in investing. By 2019, it generated 46 billion, a swing of more than 100 billion dollars. By 2026, the figure is estimated as a modest inflow, far closer to balance. The line is converging toward its capex floor. Capital spending will soon dominate the total. Capex is set to become the main investing line.

The path between these points is anything but straight. After the huge 2015 outflow and the 2019 inflow, the line zigzagged through smaller outflows and inflows before settling near balance. The taming of the swings reflects the shrinking securities portfolio, a stabilisation of a once-turbulent line. The calm is a marked change from the past.

Apple Investing Cash Flow: 2015, 2019 and 2026 (USD billions)The swing captured in three snapshots.

Data:

Derived from Apple Inc. net cash from investing activities by fiscal year, 2015 to 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Form 10-K filings.

Note:

Capital expenditure, marketable securities flows, era averages, cumulative totals and ratios are calculated from reported cash flow data. Securities and component figures are approximate where split out. The 2026 figure is an estimate; others are reported actuals.Switch views with the toolbar.

The long arc points toward calmer investing cash flows ahead. As the securities portfolio approaches the size Apple needs for operations, the violent swings of the past decade should give way to steadier figures dominated by capital expenditure, a calmer profile for a maturing company. The dramatic years now look behind it.

vs Operating Cash

Apple Operating vs Investing Cash Flow

Set against operating cash flow, the investing line looks small and erratic. Apple operating cash flow has been a powerful, steady stream, climbing past 100 billion dollars a year. Investing cash flow, by contrast,

bounces between modest inflows and outflows, a fraction of the operating figure in most years. Operations dominate; investing is a sideshow. The cash engine is sales, not securities.

This comparison underlines where Apple real strength lies. The operating cash flow, generated by selling iPhones, services and other products, dwarfs the investing swings and funds everything else, from buybacks to dividends to research. Investing is largely about managing the cash that operations throw off, not about funding the core business. The business funds itself from operations alone.

Apple Operating vs Investing Cash Flow, 2015-2026 (USD billions)The steady operating stream against the volatile investing line.

Data:

Derived from Apple Inc. net cash from investing activities by fiscal year, 2015 to 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Form 10-K filings.

Note:

Capital expenditure, marketable securities flows, era averages, cumulative totals and ratios are calculated from reported cash flow data. Securities and component figures are approximate where split out. The 2026 figure is an estimate; others are reported actuals.Switch views with the toolbar.

The gap between the two lines shows why Apple investing volatility matters less than it might appear. With operating cash flow so large and reliable, the swings in investing are a second-order concern, reflecting treasury management rather than the health of the business, a distinction that reassures long-term investors. The swings carry no signal about the business.

Volatility

Apple Investing Cash Flow Volatility

Measured by the absolute size of the net investing figure each year, the volatility is striking. The swings ranged from over 56 billion dollars in 2015 to under 3 billion in 2024, with no consistent pattern. Few financial lines at any company move so far and so unpredictably from year to year.

The volatility has clearly diminished over time. The enormous double-digit-billion swings of the late 2010s have given way to smaller figures, as the securities portfolio shrank and stabilised. The most recent years show far less dramatic movement than the middle of the period, a calming that reflects Apple steadier balance sheet. The portfolio no longer lurches as it once did.

Apple Investing Cash Flow: Absolute Size by Year (USD billions)The magnitude of the net swing each year.

Data:

Derived from Apple Inc. net cash from investing activities by fiscal year, 2015 to 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Form 10-K filings.

Note:

Capital expenditure, marketable securities flows, era averages, cumulative totals and ratios are calculated from reported cash flow data. Securities and component figures are approximate where split out. The 2026 figure is an estimate; others are reported actuals.Switch views with the toolbar.

This declining volatility is a sign of financial maturity. As Apple finished the great unwinding of its offshore cash pile, the wild swings that once characterised its investing cash flow faded. What remains is a smaller, more predictable line, increasingly shaped by capital spending, a steadiness that supports our Apple Vision Pro analysis.

Capex Discipline

Apple Capital Expenditure as a Share of Operating Cash Flow

Viewed as a share of operating cash flow, Apple capital expenditure is remarkably low. Capex has consumed only around 9 to 14 percent of operating cash flow across the period, leaving the vast majority of that cash free for buybacks, dividends and securities. This low capital intensity is a defining feature of Apple business model. Low capital needs set Apple apart from peers. Its asset-light model is a lasting advantage. Few rivals match its capital efficiency.

The low capex-to-cash ratio reflects Apple asset-light approach. By relying on contract manufacturers and suppliers for much of its production capacity, Apple avoids the heavy factory investment that weighs on many hardware makers. The result is one of the most cash-generative models anywhere in technology.

Apple Capex as a Share of Operating Cash Flow (%)Capital expenditure relative to operating cash flow.

Data:

Derived from Apple Inc. net cash from investing activities by fiscal year, 2015 to 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Form 10-K filings.

Note:

Capital expenditure, marketable securities flows, era averages, cumulative totals and ratios are calculated from reported cash flow data. Securities and component figures are approximate where split out. The 2026 figure is an estimate; others are reported actuals.Switch views with the toolbar.

Whether this ratio stays low is an open question. As Apple invests more in artificial intelligence infrastructure, its capital spending may rise faster than its operating cash flow, lifting the ratio. For now, though, Apple remains far more capital-efficient than its big technology peers, a discipline few of them can match.

-$56B2015Cash used. +$46B2019Cash generated. +$15B2025Recent inflow. ~$10-13BCapexSteady each year.

Apple cash usage in investing activities from 2015 to 2026 is a story of dramatic swings around a steady core. The headline figure lurched from a 56 billion dollar outflow in 2015 to a 46 billion dollar inflow in 2019, driven entirely by the buying and selling of Apple vast marketable securities portfolio. Beneath it, capital expenditure stayed disciplined at 7 to 13 billion dollars a year. The real investment in facilities stayed modest.

More than the year-to-year drama, it is the underlying shift that matters. Apple spent years building a huge financial portfolio, then wound much of it down after tax reform, and is now settling into a calmer pattern dominated by modest capital spending. The volatility is fading, leaving a leaner, steadier investing line that reflects a financially mature company, a stability that anchors the wider Apple story in our biggest companies by market value analysis.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: Apple Investing Cash Flow

Apple's cash flow from investing activities is the net cash generated by, or used in, its investing during a fiscal year. It mainly reflects the buying and selling of Apple's marketable securities portfolio, plus capital expenditure on property and equipment and small acquisitions. The figure is highly volatile: it was a 56 billion dollar outflow in 2015 but a 46 billion dollar inflow in 2019. In fiscal 2025 it was a 15.2 billion dollar inflow, with 2026 estimated nearer balance.

Apple's investing cash flow is volatile because it is dominated by its enormous marketable securities portfolio, once worth more than 200 billion dollars. When Apple buys more securities than it sells, investing shows a large cash outflow; when it lets the portfolio run down, it shows a large inflow. Because

these securities swings reach tens of billions of dollars a year, they overwhelm the steadier capital expenditure line and can flip the net figure from deeply negative to strongly positive in a single year.

Apple's capital expenditure, the cash it spends on property, plant and equipment, has stayed in a narrow range of roughly 7 to 13 billion dollars a year from 2015 to 2026. This is strikingly low for a company of Apple's size, reflecting its asset-light model that relies partly on suppliers for manufacturing capacity. Capex has edged up recently as Apple invests more in artificial intelligence infrastructure, but it remains far below the capital spending of many big technology peers.

Apple's investing cash flow turned strongly positive in 2018 and 2019 because of the 2017 United States tax reform. The new law let Apple repatriate its large overseas cash pile, after which the company began winding down the marketable securities portfolio it had built offshore, selling and letting bonds mature faster than it bought new ones. This net selling produced large cash inflows from investing, reversing years of heavy outflows from buying securities.

Negative cash flow from investing means Apple used more cash in investing than it generated during the year, typically because it bought more marketable securities than it sold, or spent on capital expenditure and acquisitions. For Apple, negative investing cash flow is not a warning sign; it usually reflects the company parking its surplus cash in bonds rather than any operational weakness. The figure says more about treasury strategy than about the health of Apple's business.

On a cumulative basis, Apple's net cash from investing activities remains deeply negative across 2015 to 2026, at roughly 100 billion dollars used in total. Despite large inflows in some years, Apple has on balance used cash in investing over the period, mostly to build a marketable securities portfolio it has only partly unwound. This cumulative outflow reflects the sheer scale of Apple's balance sheet and its treasury operations rather than spending on physical assets.

Apple's capital expenditure is low relative to its size and to its technology peers. At roughly 7 to 13 billion dollars a year, capex consumes only about 9 to 14 percent of Apple's operating cash flow, leaving the vast majority free for buybacks, dividends and securities. Apple keeps capex low by relying on contract manufacturers and suppliers for much of its production capacity, giving it one of the most cash-generative, capital-light models in the technology industry.

Apple's operating cash flow is far larger and steadier than its investing cash flow. Operating cash flow, generated by selling iPhones, services and other products, has climbed past 100 billion dollars a year. Investing cash flow, by contrast, bounces between modest inflows and outflows, usually a fraction of the operating figure. This means the volatility in investing matters less than it might appear, since the powerful

operating cash flow funds buybacks, dividends and research regardless.

The single biggest driver is Apple's marketable securities activity, the net of purchases versus sales and maturities of bonds. This swings by tens of billions of dollars a year and sets the sign of the total. Capital expenditure, at roughly 10 to 13 billion dollars, is a steady secondary outflow, and acquisitions are small. So while capex reflects real investment in the business, the headline investing figure is mostly a story about how Apple manages its enormous financial portfolio.

It already has. As Apple finished winding down the bulk of its offshore securities portfolio, the enormous swings of the late 2010s gave way to smaller figures. As the portfolio approaches the size Apple needs for operations, the violent year-to-year swings should continue to fade, leaving an investing line increasingly dominated by capital expenditure. The main factor that could lift volatility again is a large rise in capital spending, for example on artificial intelligence infrastructure.

Sources

Apple Inc. annual reports (Form 10-K) and quarterly filings - Source for the statement of cash flows and investing activities.

Apple Investor Relations - Reference for Apple cash flow statements and investing activities.

Figures are Apple reported net cash generated by or used in investing activities by fiscal year, in billions of U.S. dollars, from Apple Form 10-K filings. Positive figures mean cash generated; negative figures mean cash used. The line swung from a 56 billion dollar outflow in 2015 to a 46 billion dollar inflow in 2019, and was a 15.2 billion dollar inflow in 2025, driven by marketable securities. Capital expenditure and securities splits are approximate where broken out. The 2026 figure is an estimate; all earlier figures are reported actuals.

STATISTICS REPORT

Apple: expenditure on research and development 2007-2026

Updated Jun 20, 2026 · businesstats.com/apple-expenses-for-research-and-development

$44B R&D 2026	**$34.6B** R&D 2025	**$0.8B** R&D 2007
~50x INCREASE	**~10%** INTENSITY	**$300B+** TOTAL SPENT

Overview

Apple Inc's expenditure on research and development from 2007 to 2026

Apple research and development spending has risen every single year for nearly two decades, climbing from under one billion dollars in 2007 to an estimated forty-four billion in 2026. That is a roughly fiftyfold increase, reflecting Apple steady transformation from an iPhone-driven hardware maker into a company investing heavily in silicon, services and artificial intelligence. This report tracks Apple expenditure on research and development from 2007 to 2026.

The growth has been relentless and uninterrupted. Under chief executive Tim Cook, who took over in 2011, R&D spending has expanded in every fiscal year, a consistency unmatched by almost any other line in Apple accounts. The products this spending funds, from the Apple Watch to Apple silicon, are part of the device categories tracked in our These devices are the visible output of the spending, part of the categories tracked in our wearables market share by vendor analysis.

Apple R&D Spending, 2007-2026 (USD billions)Apple annual expenditure on research and development by fiscal year.

Data:

Apple Inc. expenditure on research and development by fiscal year, 2007 to 2026, in billions of U.S. dollars, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple annual reports (Form 10-K).

Note:

Figures are reported R&D operating expense. Apple fiscal years end in late September. The 2026 figure is an estimate based on reported quarterly results through the first half of the fiscal year.Switch views with the toolbar.

The latest figures show a sharp acceleration. After a brief slowdown in 2024, R&D spending jumped again in 2025 and 2026 as Apple poured money into artificial intelligence, infrastructure and Apple Intelligence. In the second quarter of fiscal 2026 alone, R&D expense rose more than thirty percent year over year, the steepest increase in years, a surge that reshapes the cost side of our Apple total revenue analysis.

A note on the data. Figures are Apple reported research and development operating expense by fiscal year, in billions of dollars, from Apple Form 10-K filings. Apple fiscal years end in late September. The 2026 figure is an estimate based on reported results through the first half of the year, while all earlier figures are reported actuals. The estimate is grounded in two reported quarters of strong growth. The full-year figure should land close to the projection. Reported results anchor the forecast. The trend through mid-2026 points clearly higher. Both reported quarters showed sharp gains. The momentum carried into the second half. A record full-year figure looks likely. Apple seems set for another all-time high. The fiscal 2026 record looks all but assured.

R&D Data Table

Apple Research and Development Expenditure, 2007-2026

Apple R&D Expenditure by Fiscal Year, 2007-2026Click any column to sort

FISCAL YEAR	R&D SPEND	% OF REVENUE
2007	$0.78B	3.3%
2008	$1.11B	3.4%
2009	$1.33B	3.1%
2010	$1.78B	2.7%
2011	$2.43B	2.2%
2012	$3.38B	2.2%
2013	$4.47B	2.6%
2014	$6.04B	3.3%

2015	$8.07B	3.5%
2016	$10.04B	4.7%
2017	$11.58B	5.1%
2018	$14.24B	5.4%
2019	$16.22B	6.2%
2020	$18.75B	6.8%
2021	$21.91B	6.0%
2022	$26.25B	6.7%
2023	$29.91B	7.8%
2024	$31.37B	8.0%
2025	$34.55B	8.3%
2026	$44.00B	10.0%

The table lists Apple research and development expenditure for each fiscal year from 2007 to 2026, in billions of dollars. It shows an unbroken rise from 0.8 billion to an estimated 44 billion. Sorting the figures highlights how recent the bulk of the spending is: more than half of the total has been spent in just the last five years. The spending is heavily weighted toward the present. Most of the total belongs to the last five years. The early years are a small fraction of the sum. Spending has compounded dramatically since 2020. The recent acceleration dwarfs the early years. Post-2020 spending defines the whole picture.

Growth Rate

Apple R&D Spending: Year-over-Year Growth

Apple R&D spending has grown every year, but the pace has varied. Growth rates were highest in the early years, when the base was small, often exceeding thirty or forty percent. As the absolute numbers grew, percentage growth settled into the teens and twenties, before a notable slowdown to under five percent in 2024.

The 2024 slowdown proved temporary. In 2025, growth picked back up to around ten percent, and in 2026 it accelerated sharply, with quarterly R&D rising more than thirty percent year over year. The renewed surge reflects Apple race to catch up in artificial intelligence, a spending priority that echoes through our

big tech revenue comparison analysis.

Apple R&D Spending Growth, Year-over-Year (%)Annual percentage growth in Apple research spending.

Data:

Derived from Apple Inc. research and development expenditure by fiscal year, 2007 to 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Form 10-K filings.

Note:

Year-over-year growth, R&D intensity as a share of revenue, cumulative totals, era averages and milestone figures are calculated from the reported R&D expense. The 2026 figure is an estimate; all others are reported actuals.Switch views with the toolbar.

The pattern of growth tells a strategic story. The early high-percentage years built the foundation; the steady teens-and-twenties growth of the mid-2010s funded the Apple Watch, AirPods and Apple silicon; and the renewed acceleration of 2025 and 2026 marks a determined push into AI, a pivot as significant as any in our The shift toward AI marks a new chapter, a pivot as significant as any in our Apple iPhone revenue analysis.

R&D Intensity

Apple R&D Spending as a Share of Revenue

Measured as a share of revenue, Apple R&D intensity tells a more surprising story than the raw dollars. In 2007, R&D was about 3 percent of sales. As the iPhone drove revenue up far faster than research spending, that share fell to a low near 2 percent around 2012, even as the dollar figures kept rising.

Then the trend reversed. From its 2012 low, R&D intensity climbed steadily, reaching nearly 8 percent by 2023, levels last seen before the iPhone launched. By 2026 it is estimated near 10 percent, the highest in Apple modern history, as research spending outpaces a more slowly growing top line, a striking reversal of the iPhone-era trend. Research now claims a growing slice of every sales dollar. The intensity has climbed back toward old highs. Levels unseen since before the iPhone have returned. The intensity has come full circle. From low to high, the curve completed its arc.

Apple R&D Intensity: R&D as a Share of Revenue (%)Research spending as a percentage of total revenue.

Data:

Derived from Apple Inc. research and development expenditure by fiscal year, 2007 to 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Form 10-K filings.

Note:

Year-over-year growth, R&D intensity as a share of revenue, cumulative totals, era averages and milestone figures are calculated from the reported R&D expense. The 2026 figure is an estimate; all others are reported actuals.Switch views with the toolbar.

This U-shaped curve captures Apple changing position. During the iPhone boom, revenue grew so fast that R&D shrank as a share even while rising in dollars. As iPhone growth matured and Apple invested in new frontiers, research spending claimed a growing slice of revenue, signalling a company spending more to find its next breakthrough, a search reflected in our The rising intensity signals a hunt for the next big thing, a search reflected in our Apple Vision Pro analysis.

The Reversal

Apple R&D Intensity: Year-over-Year Change

Charting the year-over-year change in R&D intensity makes the reversal vivid. In the early years, the intensity fell, as the iPhone revenue surge outpaced research spending, showing as negative changes. From the mid-2010s onward, intensity rose almost every year, showing as positive changes, as spending outgrew revenue. The shift from negative to positive marks the turning point. Apple stopped coasting and started investing hard. The change in posture is clear in the numbers. Apple now spends like a company chasing the future. The defensive posture of the iPhone years is gone.

The swing from falling to rising intensity marks a clear inflection in Apple strategy. The negative years reflect a company harvesting the iPhone windfall; the positive years reflect one reinvesting heavily in its future. The crossover, around 2012 to 2014, is the moment Apple shifted from coasting on the iPhone to spending hard for what comes next. The inflection is unmistakable in the data. The curve turns clearly upward from there. A new era of spending had begun. The reversal reset Apple research priorities entirely. Spending became the engine of future growth. Research moved to the centre of Apple strategy. It is no longer a background line in the accounts. Research has become a headline figure for Apple.

Change in Apple R&D Intensity, Year-over-Year (pp)How R&D as a share of revenue rose or fell each year.

Data:

Derived from Apple Inc. research and development expenditure by fiscal year, 2007 to 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Form 10-K filings.

Note:

Year-over-year growth, R&D intensity as a share of revenue, cumulative totals, era averages and milestone figures are calculated from the reported R&D expense. The 2026 figure is an estimate; all others are reported actuals.Switch views with the toolbar.

The recent positive changes have grown larger, as the 2025 and 2026 AI push lifts intensity sharply. Where intensity once crept up by fractions of a point, it is now rising faster, a sign of how seriously Apple is taking the artificial intelligence race, a commitment that runs through our tech revenue comparison analysis.

Cumulative Spend

Apple's Cumulative Research and Development Spending

Viewed cumulatively, the scale of Apple research investment is staggering. Since 2007, Apple has spent nearly 300 billion dollars on research and development in total. Strikingly, the majority of that sum has been spent in just the last five years, as annual budgets ballooned past 25 billion dollars.

The cumulative curve bends sharply upward, reflecting how recent most of the spending is. For the first decade, the running total grew slowly; since 2020, it has surged, with each year adding more than the entire annual budget of the early 2010s. The back-loaded nature of the spending underlines how dramatically Apple has scaled its research, a scaling mirrored in our The research budget grew in step with profits, a scaling mirrored in our Apple net income analysis.

Apple Cumulative R&D Spending Since 2007 (USD billions)Running total of all Apple research spending.

Data:

Derived from Apple Inc. research and development expenditure by fiscal year, 2007 to 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Form 10-K filings.

Note:

Year-over-year growth, R&D intensity as a share of revenue, cumulative totals, era averages and milestone figures are calculated from the reported R&D expense. The 2026 figure is an estimate; all others are reported actuals.Switch views with the toolbar.

This vast cumulative investment has funded Apple defining products. The hundreds of billions spent since 2007 underwrote the iPhone refinements, the iPad, the Apple Watch, AirPods, the shift to Apple silicon and the Vision Pro. The scale of the spending helps explain Apple ability to enter and lead new categories, a capacity reflected in our Deep pockets let Apple enter new markets at will, a capacity reflected in our tablet market share analysis.

By Era

Apple R&D Expenditure by Era

Grouped by era, the escalation in Apple R&D is stark. In the final Steve Jobs years, from 2007 to 2011, Apple spent an average of about 1.5 billion dollars a year. In the early Tim Cook years, that average rose to over 6 billion, then to more than 16 billion, and in the most recent period to over 33 billion a year.

Each era roughly quadrupled the previous one average. The jump reflects both Apple growth and a deliberate strategic choice to spend more aggressively on research. Where Jobs ran a lean R&D operation relative to revenue, Cook has steadily expanded it, treating heavy research spending as central to Apple future, a philosophy that shapes our Apple segment revenue analysis.

Average Apple R&D Spending by Era (USD billions/year)Average annual research spending across distinct periods.

Data:

Derived from Apple Inc. research and development expenditure by fiscal year, 2007 to 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Form 10-K filings.

Note:

Year-over-year growth, R&D intensity as a share of revenue, cumulative totals, era averages and milestone figures are calculated from the reported R&D expense. The 2026 figure is an estimate; all others are reported actuals.Switch views with the toolbar.

The era comparison underlines how much of Apple research spending belongs to the present. The most recent five-year period alone accounts for the largest share of all R&D ever spent, dwarfing the budgets of the Jobs era. Apple today is a far more research-intensive company than it was a decade ago, a deliberate and sustained transformation. The company reinvented its spending profile over a decade. What was lean under Jobs became expansive under Cook. The two eras could hardly look more different. One harvested the iPhone; the other reinvests heavily.

Across the Decades

Apple R&D Spending, 2007 to 2026

Tracing R&D spending from 2007 through 2016 to 2026 captures the acceleration in three snapshots. In 2007, Apple spent under one billion dollars. By 2016, that had risen to about ten billion. And by 2026, it is estimated at forty-four billion, more than quadrupling again in the second decade.

The slope steepens over time. The first decade, from 2007 to 2016, added about nine billion dollars in annual spending. The second decade, from 2016 to 2026, added more than thirty billion. The pace of increase has itself increased, a compounding pattern rare even among the largest technology firms. Few peers have raised research spending so relentlessly. The consistency sets Apple apart from its rivals. No other line in its accounts rises so reliably. The R&D figure is uniquely dependable in its growth. Investors can count on it climbing each year.

Apple R&D Spending: 2007, 2016 and 2026 (USD billions)Research spending at three points across two decades.

Data:

Derived from Apple Inc. research and development expenditure by fiscal year, 2007 to 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Form 10-K filings.

Note:

Year-over-year growth, R&D intensity as a share of revenue, cumulative totals, era averages and milestone figures are calculated from the reported R&D expense. The 2026 figure is an estimate; all others are reported actuals.Switch views with the toolbar.

The steepening slope reflects Apple shifting priorities. Early increases tracked the company growth; later increases reflect a deliberate strategic bet on new technologies, from silicon to artificial intelligence. The line is not just rising but bending upward, a sign of a company spending ever more to stay ahead of its rivals. The upward bend shows no sign of flattening. If anything, the slope is steepening with AI. The latest surge is the sharpest in years. The AI race has lit a fire under the budget.

R&D vs Revenue

Apple R&D Spending vs Revenue Growth

Comparing R&D growth with revenue growth shows why R&D intensity has risen. Since around 2015, Apple research spending has grown faster than its revenue, especially in the most recent years. Indexed to a common starting point, the R&D line pulls steadily above the revenue line. Research has outgrown sales for years now. That gap is exactly the rising intensity made visible. The two lines tell one story from two angles. Together they explain the rising intensity.

This divergence is the heart of the R&D story. For years, revenue and research grew together, but lately spending has outpaced sales as Apple invests in AI and new platforms while its core hardware revenue grows more slowly. The gap between the two lines is the rising R&D intensity, made visual, a dynamic central to our Apple Services revenue analysis.

Apple R&D vs Revenue Growth, Indexed to 2015Research spending and revenue growth compared.

Data:

Derived from Apple Inc. research and development expenditure by fiscal year, 2007 to 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Form 10-K filings.

Note:

Year-over-year growth, R&D intensity as a share of revenue, cumulative totals, era averages and milestone figures are calculated from the reported R&D expense. The 2026 figure is an estimate; all others are reported actuals.Switch views with the toolbar.

The widening gap raises a strategic question. Apple is betting that heavier research spending will eventually drive faster revenue growth, through new products and AI features. Whether that bet pays off, and revenue growth reaccelerates to match the spending, will define the next chapter of the company story.

Spending Added

Apple R&D Spending Growth by Period

Measured by the absolute dollars added in each five-year block, the acceleration is clear. From 2007 to 2011, Apple added under 2 billion dollars to its annual R&D budget. From 2011 to 2016, it added nearly 8 billion. From 2016 to 2021, almost 12 billion. And from 2021 to 2026, more than 22 billion.

Each block has added more than the last, and by a widening margin. The most recent five years alone added more to the annual budget than the entire budget stood at in 2020. This is the signature of exponential growth: not just rising, but rising faster, a trajectory that few companies of Apple size have ever sustained. The compounding is rare at such a scale. Adding billions each year is hard to sustain. Yet Apple has done it without a single pause. Two decades, not one missed year.

Apple R&D Budget Added per Five-Year Block (USD billions)Dollars added to the annual R&D budget in each period.

Data:

Derived from Apple Inc. research and development expenditure by fiscal year, 2007 to 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Form 10-K filings.

Note:

Year-over-year growth, R&D intensity as a share of revenue, cumulative totals, era averages and milestone figures are calculated from the reported R&D expense. The 2026 figure is an estimate; all others are reported actuals.Switch views with the toolbar.

The accelerating additions reflect the rising stakes of Apple research. As the company pushes into capital-intensive areas like AI infrastructure and custom silicon, each year demands a larger increase than the last. The pattern suggests the spending may keep accelerating, a prospect that few investors would have predicted a decade ago. The budget keeps setting new records each year. Every fiscal year now marks a fresh all-time high. The record is broken almost annually. Each year tops the one before it.

Product Milestones

Apple R&D Spending at Key Product Milestones

Placed against Apple major product launches, the R&D figures show how spending scaled with ambition. When the iPhone arrived in 2007, R&D was under 1 billion dollars. By the Apple Watch in 2015 it was 8 billion, by the move to Apple silicon in 2020 nearly 19 billion, and by the Vision Pro in 2024 over 31 billion.

Each new product category arrived alongside a higher level of research spending. The pattern is not coincidental: entering new markets, from wearables to spatial computing, required ever-larger research investments. The rising R&D budget is the financial footprint of Apple expanding ambitions across ever more product categories. Every new market demanded a bigger research bet. From watches to headsets, ambition drove the budget. Each leap into a new category cost more than the last. The budget scaled with

Apple widening reach.

Apple R&D Spending at Major Product Launches (USD billions)Research spending in the year of each landmark product.

Data:

Derived from Apple Inc. research and development expenditure by fiscal year, 2007 to 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple Form 10-K filings.

Note:

Year-over-year growth, R&D intensity as a share of revenue, cumulative totals, era averages and milestone figures are calculated from the reported R&D expense. The 2026 figure is an estimate; all others are reported actuals.Switch views with the toolbar.

By 2026, with R&D estimated at 44 billion dollars, the spending is increasingly directed at artificial intelligence and the infrastructure behind Apple Intelligence and services. The next product milestone the budget is funding may be less a device than a platform, a shift that could reshape the company more than any single device.

$44BR&D 2026Estimated record. $0.8BR&D 2007Where it began. ~50xIncrease2007 to 2026. ~10%IntensityShare of revenue.

Apple expenditure on research and development from 2007 to 2026 traces an extraordinary climb, from under 1 billion dollars to an estimated 44 billion, rising every single year. Under Tim Cook, R&D has grown without interruption, funding the Apple Watch, AirPods, Apple silicon and the Vision Pro, and now an aggressive push into artificial intelligence. The spending has never been higher or more focused. AI now anchors the entire research agenda. The next breakthrough may be a platform, not a device.

More than the dollar figures, it is the trend that matters. R&D intensity has climbed back to pre-iPhone levels, growth has reaccelerated after a brief pause, and the additions to the budget grow larger each year. Apple is spending more than ever to find its next breakthrough, a bet on the future whose scale and direction will shape the company for years, a story that anchors the wider Apple picture in our biggest companies by market value analysis.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: Apple R&D Spending

Apple spent about 34.55 billion dollars on research and development in its fiscal 2025 year, and is estimated to spend around 44 billion in fiscal 2026, an all-time high. R&D spending has risen every year since 2007, when it was under 1 billion dollars. The recent acceleration is driven largely by Apple's heavy investment in artificial intelligence, infrastructure and Apple Intelligence, alongside its ongoing work on silicon and new devices.

Yes. Apple's research and development expenditure has increased in every single fiscal year since at least 2007, an unbroken run of nearly two decades. This consistency is unusual; almost no other major line in Apple's accounts has risen every year without exception. Under chief executive Tim Cook, who took over in 2011, the increases have continued every year, reflecting a deliberate strategy of reinvesting heavily in future products and technologies.

Apple's R&D intensity, or research spending as a share of revenue, is estimated near 10 percent in 2026, the highest in its modern history. This figure followed a U-shaped path: it was around 3 percent in 2007, fell to a low near 2 percent around 2012 during the iPhone revenue boom, then climbed steadily back up. By 2023 it had reached nearly 8 percent, levels last seen before the iPhone launched in 2007.

Apple's R&D spending accelerated sharply in 2025 and 2026 primarily because of its push into artificial intelligence. In the second quarter of fiscal 2026, R&D expense rose more than 30 percent year over year, with Apple citing higher infrastructure-related and headcount-related costs. The spending funds Apple Intelligence, Siri improvements, custom silicon, cloud and services infrastructure, and future devices, as Apple races to keep pace in the AI era.

Since 2007, Apple has spent nearly 300 billion dollars on research and development in total. Strikingly, the majority of that sum has been spent in just the last five years, as annual budgets grew past 25 billion dollars. This back-loaded pattern reflects how dramatically Apple has scaled its research investment, particularly since 2020, with each recent year adding more than the entire annual budget of the early 2010s.

The difference is dramatic. In the final Steve Jobs years, from 2007 to 2011, Apple spent an average of about 1.5 billion dollars a year on R&D. Under Tim Cook, that average rose to over 6 billion in his early years, then more than 16 billion, and over 33 billion a year in the most recent period. Cook has treated heavy research spending as central to Apple's future, expanding it far faster than revenue in recent years.

Apple's R&D budget funds a wide range of work: custom silicon like the M-series and A-series chips, the iPhone, iPad, Mac and Apple Watch, AirPods, the Vision Pro mixed reality headset, and increasingly artificial intelligence and the infrastructure behind Apple Intelligence and services. In recent filings, Apple has attributed rising R&D costs largely to infrastructure and headcount, reflecting its growing investment in AI, cloud and services capabilities.

Briefly. In fiscal 2024, Apple's R&D spending grew only about 5 percent, a notable slowdown from the high-teens and twenties growth of previous years. However, this proved temporary: growth picked back up to around 10 percent in 2025 and accelerated sharply in 2026, with quarterly R&D rising more than 30 percent year over year. The renewed surge reflects Apple's intensified investment in artificial intelligence.

Apple's research spending has funded its entire modern product line. The hundreds of billions spent since 2007 underwrote successive iPhone generations, the iPad, the Apple Watch, AirPods, the transition to Apple silicon, and the Vision Pro. Each new product category arrived alongside a higher level of R&D spending, and the budget is now increasingly directed at artificial intelligence and the platforms behind Apple Intelligence and services.

It has become high by Apple's own historical standards. At an estimated 10 percent of revenue in 2026, R&D intensity is at its highest in Apple's modern history and well above the 2 percent low it reached around 2012. In absolute terms, Apple's roughly 44 billion dollar budget is among the largest of any company. However, as a share of revenue it remains lower than some peers that spend a larger proportion on research.

Sources

Apple Inc. annual reports (Form 10-K) and quarterly filings (Form 10-Q) - Source for reported research and development expense.

Apple Investor Relations - Reference for Apple financial statements and R&D expense.

Figures are Apple reported research and development operating expense by fiscal year, in billions of U.S. dollars, from Apple Form 10-K filings. R&D rose from 0.782 billion dollars in fiscal 2007 to 34.55 billion in fiscal 2025, with fiscal 2026 estimated near 44 billion based on reported quarterly results through the first half of the year. R&D intensity is R&D as a percentage of net sales. The 2026 figure is an estimate; all earlier figures are reported actuals.

STATISTICS REPORT

Wearables shipments share worldwide quarterly 2014-2026, by vendor

Updated Jun 19, 2026 · businesstats.com/quarterly-wearables-shipments-worldwide-market-share-by-vendor

~21% APPLE NOW	~33% APPLE PEAK	~13% XIAOMI
~11% HUAWEI	~45% FITBIT 2014	0% FITBIT TODAY

Overview

Share of wearables unit shipments worldwide from 1st quarter 2014 to 4th quarter 2026, by vendor

The wearables market, spanning smartwatches, fitness bands and ear-worn devices, has been one of the most turbulent in consumer technology. Leaders have risen and fallen repeatedly: Fitbit dominated early, Apple surged to the top, and a wave of Chinese and Indian brands crowded in behind. This report tracks worldwide wearables shipment market share by vendor, quarter by quarter, from the first quarter of 2014 to the fourth quarter of 2026.

Apple leads the market today, but by a far smaller margin than at its peak. From a high near a third of all wearables shipments around 2020, Apple share has fallen back toward the low twenties as rivals grew. The full ranking of wearables vendors is tracked in our wearables vendor market share analysis; here the focus is on how the leadership has shifted over more than a decade. The turnover has been relentless. Each era produced a new front-runner, only for it to fade. Stability has been the exception, not the rule. The wearables market rewards the relentless. Patient, steady vendors gained while bold leaders faded. Consistency outlasted spectacle in this market. Slow accumulation beat sudden surges over time. The steady, patient climbers proved to be the real long-term winners here.

Wearables Market Share by Vendor, 2014-2026 (%)Quarterly shipment share of the major wearables vendors.

Data:

Worldwide wearables shipment market share by vendor, Q1 2014 to Q4 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC trackers.

Note:

Shares are based on units shipped, in percent, and cover smartwatches, wristbands and ear-worn devices. Recent quarters use reported figures; older quarters are reconstructed from documented data, interpolated between well-documented anchor points. Quarters from Q2 2026 are estimates.Switch views with the toolbar.

Behind Apple, the field is crowded and fragmented. Xiaomi holds a steady share on the strength of cheap fitness bands, Huawei has surged with smartwatches, Samsung has slipped, and a long tail of brands, including India boAt and many ear-worn makers, fills out the rest. The Apple Watch and AirPods that drive Apple share are part of the segment tracked in our Apple Watch and AirPods sit in the wearables line, part of the segment tracked in our Apple revenue by segment analysis.

A note on the data. Shares are based on units shipped, in percent, covering smartwatches, wristbands and ear-worn devices. Recent quarters use figures reported by IDC; older quarters are reconstructed from documented data, interpolated between anchor points. Figures from the second quarter of 2026 are estimates. Category definitions for wearables have shifted over time, so long-run comparisons are indicative. Like-for-like reading across the full period needs that caveat. The category of 2014 is not quite the category of 2026. Definitions widened as earbuds joined the count. That broadening reshaped the share picture itself. Adding earbuds changed who counted as a leader. The hearables boom rewrote the rankings. Earbuds became the largest slice of all. Hearables now drive the bulk of all wearables volume.

Market Share Data Table

Wearables Market Share by Vendor, Selected Quarters

Worldwide Wearables Market Share by Vendor, Selected Quarters (%)Click any column to sort

QUARTER	APPLE	XIAOMI	HUAWEI	FITBIT
Q1 '14	1%	4%	0%	45%
Q4 '15	9%	21%	2%	27%
Q4 '17	19%	13%	4%	15%

Q4 '19	30%	12%	9%	5%
Q4 '20	33%	12%	11%	3%
Q4 '22	28%	12%	8%	0%
Q4 '23	25%	12%	9%	0%
Q4 '24	23%	12%	10%	0%
Q4 '25	22%	12%	10%	0%
Q4 '26	22%	13%	11%	0%

The table lists the worldwide wearables market share of the leading vendors at key points from 2014 to 2026. It shows Fitbit falling from dominance to nothing, Apple rising to lead and then easing back, and Xiaomi and Huawei climbing. Sorting the columns reveals how completely the leadership of this market has churned over the period. Each leader eventually yielded to the next. The pattern of succession has been remarkably consistent. One name rises, peaks, and is overtaken in turn. The cycle has repeated throughout the decade.

Latest Snapshot

Wearables Market Share by Vendor: The Latest Snapshot

Seen as a snapshot, the latest quarter shows a fragmented market led by Apple. Apple holds roughly a fifth of shipments, with Xiaomi near 13 percent, Huawei around 11 percent, Samsung lower, and a large share spread across many smaller brands. No vendor dominates the way the market leader once did.

This fragmentation sets wearables apart from phones or tablets. Where those markets are led by one or two strong vendors, wearables are split among at least four meaningful players plus an enormous long tail, reflecting how many companies, from earbud makers to fitness-band specialists, compete in the category. The contrast with Apple concentrated phone position is stark, as our smartphone market share by vendor analysis shows.

Wearables Market Share by Vendor, Latest Quarter (%)The latest quarter as a share of the whole market.

Data:

Derived from worldwide wearables shipment market share, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC.

Note:

Year-over-year changes, seasonality, the duopoly composition, share-point shifts and combined shares are calculated from the vendor share series. Older quarters are reconstructed; Q2 2026 onward are estimates. Trackers differ, and category definitions for wearables have changed over time.Switch views with the toolbar.

The crowded field reflects the breadth of the wearables category. Smartwatches, simple fitness bands and wireless earbuds are very different products, each with its own leaders, yet all counted as wearables. This diversity keeps any single vendor from dominating and makes the market unusually competitive, a dynamism that contrasts with the steadier patterns in our New entrants keep arriving, a dynamism that contrasts with the steadier patterns in our big tech revenue comparison analysis.

Apple Over Time

Apple Wearables Market Share Over Time: Rise, Peak, Decline

Apple journey in wearables is the central story: a dramatic rise, a peak, and a long, slow decline from it. From nothing before the Apple Watch launched in 2015, Apple climbed rapidly as the Watch and then AirPods caught on, reaching a peak near a third of all wearables shipments around 2020. Since then, its share has steadily eased. The descent has been gradual but persistent. Apple gave back share almost every year after its peak. The decline was steady rather than sudden.

The peak was powered above all by AirPods, which turned Apple into the dominant force in the ear-worn segment and lifted its overall wearables share to its high point. The Apple Watch added a commanding position in premium smartwatches. Together they made Apple the clear leader, a position built on the same ecosystem strength seen in our AirPods and Watch reinforced each other, a position built on the same ecosystem strength seen in our Apple iPhone revenue analysis.

Apple Wearables Market Share, 2014-2026 (%)Apple share climbing to a peak near a third, then easing back.

Data:

Derived from worldwide wearables shipment market share, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC.

Note:

Year-over-year changes, seasonality, the duopoly composition, share-point shifts and combined shares are calculated from the vendor share series. Older quarters are reconstructed; Q2 2026 onward are estimates. Trackers differ, and category definitions for wearables have changed over time.Switch views

with the toolbar.

The decline since 2020 came not because Apple shrank but because the rest of the market grew faster, especially cheap bands and smartwatches from Chinese and Indian brands. Apple suffered a notable run of seven consecutive quarters of year-over-year decline before recovering in late 2025, a dip that nonetheless left it the overall leader, as our The slide hurt but never toppled it, a dip that nonetheless left it the overall leader, as our Apple total revenue analysis reflects.

Year by Year

Apple Wearables Share: Year-over-Year Gains and Losses

Charting Apple year-over-year share change makes the rise and fall vivid. Apple gained share strongly in the late 2010s as AirPods took off, peaked around 2020, then posted a string of negative years as rivals grew faster, before stabilising. The swing from strong gains to repeated losses captures the maturing of the market. Hyper-growth gave way to steady competition. The early surge could not last forever. A mature market replaced the boom. Competition normalised what hype had inflated. The AirPods surge was always going to fade. No single product can hold an inflated share forever. Markets always broaden around a breakout hit.

The negative years were not a collapse but a normalisation. After AirPods one-off surge lifted Apple to an unusually high share, the market broadened and Apple settled back toward a more sustainable lead. The losses reflected rivals growth, especially in low-cost bands, rather than any weakness in Apple own products, a nuance echoed in our Apple Services revenue analysis.

Apple Wearables Share: Year-over-Year Change (pp)How much Apple share rose or fell each year.

Data:

Derived from worldwide wearables shipment market share, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC.

Note:

Year-over-year changes, seasonality, the duopoly composition, share-point shifts and combined shares are calculated from the vendor share series. Older quarters are reconstructed; Q2 2026 onward are estimates. Trackers differ, and category definitions for wearables have changed over time.Switch views with the toolbar.

The recent return toward stability suggests the worst of Apple decline is past. After seven straight quarters of year-over-year drops, Apple returned to growth in late 2025 on the back of a broad product refresh. The year-over-year pattern points to a vendor that overextended at its peak and has since found a more durable level, a resilience that supports our The peak was unsustainable; the recovery is not, a level that supports our tech revenue comparison analysis.

Full Composition

Wearables Market Composition by Vendor: A Churn of Leaders

Viewed as a full composition over time, the wearables market shows a remarkable churn of leaders. In 2014, Fitbit and a handful of fitness-band makers filled most of the chart. By 2020, Apple had become the largest single slice. And by 2026, the market is split more evenly among Apple, Xiaomi, Huawei, Samsung and a broad field of others. The pie is sliced far more thinly than before. Four strong vendors now share what one once dominated. The market has no single ruler today. Power is shared as never before.

The stacked view highlights how the total has been redistributed rather than simply growing. As Fitbit collapsed, its share flowed to Apple, Xiaomi and others. As Apple eased from its peak, its lost share spread among Huawei, Xiaomi and Indian brands. The market has been in constant internal flux even as overall shipments grew. Beneath the growth, leaders kept trading places. Rising shipments hid a constant reshuffling of rank. Total growth masked fierce competition within.

Wearables Market Composition by Vendor, 2014-2026 (%)All vendors stacked, showing the shifting balance.

Data:

Derived from worldwide wearables shipment market share, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC.

Note:

Year-over-year changes, seasonality, the duopoly composition, share-point shifts and combined shares are calculated from the vendor share series. Older quarters are reconstructed; Q2 2026 onward are estimates. Trackers differ, and category definitions for wearables have changed over time.Switch views with the toolbar.

What the composition makes clear is that no single vendor has held the wearables market the way Apple holds tablets or Android holds phones. The category is simply too broad, spanning earbuds, watches and bands, for one company to dominate, leaving a perpetually contested market unlike the settled duopolies in

our The breadth of products keeps it open, unlike the settled duopolies in our mobile operating system market share analysis.

The Fall of Fitbit

Fitbit Wearables Market Share: From Leader to Zero

No part of the wearables story is more dramatic than the rise and fall of Fitbit. The original wearables pioneer, Fitbit dominated the early market with its fitness bands, holding close to half of all shipments in 2014. Within a few years it had collapsed almost to nothing, overtaken by Apple, Xiaomi and the smartwatch era. The pioneer was swept aside by the platforms it helped create. Fitbit opened the market and then lost it. Its trackers could not match full smartwatches. The category outgrew the products that started it. Simple bands gave way to full-featured devices.

Fitbit fall mirrors the classic pattern of a first mover overtaken by larger, better-resourced rivals. As Apple and Samsung brought full smartwatches and Xiaomi flooded the market with cheap bands, Fitbit simpler fitness trackers lost their appeal. The company was eventually acquired by Google in 2021, ending its run as an independent force.

Fitbit Wearables Market Share, 2014-2026 (%)Fitbit usage share collapsing from near half the market.

Data:

Derived from worldwide wearables shipment market share, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC.

Note:

Year-over-year changes, seasonality, the duopoly composition, share-point shifts and combined shares are calculated from the vendor share series. Older quarters are reconstructed; Q2 2026 onward are estimates. Trackers differ, and category definitions for wearables have changed over time.Switch views with the toolbar.

The lesson of Fitbit is how quickly leadership in wearables can evaporate. A company that defined the category and led it outright was reduced to irrelevance in a few years, a collapse as sharp as any in technology. Its fate is a reminder that early dominance guarantees nothing in a market this fast-moving.

Latest Standings

Wearables Vendor Market Share: The Current Ranking

Ranked by share in the most recent quarter, the order is Apple, Xiaomi, Huawei and Samsung, with a very large combined share held by many other brands. Apple leads at roughly a fifth of shipments, but the gap to second place is far smaller than the leads enjoyed by the top vendors in phones or tablets.

The closeness of the ranking reflects the fragmented nature of the market. In any given quarter, the order beneath Apple can shift, with Xiaomi, Huawei and Samsung trading places depending on product launches and regional demand. Huawei in particular has surged, even overtaking Apple in wrist-worn shipments in early 2025 before Apple recovered. The lead changed hands and then changed back. Huawei surge proved real but not permanent. Apple reclaimed the overall lead by year-end. Its full-year position stayed secure.

Wearables Vendor Ranking, Latest Quarter (%)Vendors ranked by share of shipments.

Data:

Derived from worldwide wearables shipment market share, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC.

Note:

Year-over-year changes, seasonality, the duopoly composition, share-point shifts and combined shares are calculated from the vendor share series. Older quarters are reconstructed; Q2 2026 onward are estimates. Trackers differ, and category definitions for wearables have changed over time.Switch views with the toolbar.

The large share held by other vendors underlines how open the market remains. Brands like India boAt dominate local markets, while countless earbud and fitness-band makers each hold small slices. This long tail, larger than in most device markets, keeps the wearables category competitive and hard to consolidate, a fragmentation visible in our tablet vendor market share analysis by contrast.

The Reordering

Wearables Market Share by Vendor, 2014 to 2026

Tracing each vendor from 2014 to 2026 captures the full reordering at a glance. Fitbit falls from near the top to zero. Apple rises from nothing to the lead. Xiaomi climbs and holds. Huawei rises from zero to a solid share. And Samsung drifts modestly. The lines cross repeatedly over the decade.

The slope of each vendor tells its story. Apple steep climb and gentle decline trace its rise to dominance and partial retreat. Fitbit plunge marks the sharpest fall. The Chinese vendors steady upward slopes show their patient accumulation of share, built on volume and value rather than on a premium strategy.

Wearables Share, 2014 to 2026: The Shift (%)Each vendor traced from its 2014 share to its 2026 share.

Data:

Derived from worldwide wearables shipment market share, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC.

Note:

Year-over-year changes, seasonality, the duopoly composition, share-point shifts and combined shares are calculated from the vendor share series. Older quarters are reconstructed; Q2 2026 onward are estimates. Trackers differ, and category definitions for wearables have changed over time.Switch views with the toolbar.

Taken together, the slopes show a market that ended the period far more balanced than it began. The dominance of single vendors, first Fitbit, then Apple, gave way to a multi-player contest. The wearables market of 2026 is more competitive and more fragmented than at any point in its history, a market no longer ruled by one name. Many vendors now share what one once held. Concentration gave way to genuine fragmentation. The market is broader now than ever before. Dozens of brands hold a meaningful slice.

Apple Seasonality

Apple Wearables Market Share and the Holiday Peak

Apple wearables share follows a clear seasonal rhythm, peaking in the holiday fourth quarter and dipping in the first. New Apple Watch and AirPods models launch in the autumn, driving a surge of holiday sales, after which share falls back until the next cycle. The swing between Apple peak and trough quarters can be several points. The seasonal swing is wide enough to mislead. A single quarter can paint a false picture.

This seasonality reflects Apple gift-heavy product mix. AirPods and Apple Watches are popular presents, concentrating sales in the fourth quarter, while rivals selling cheaper bands across the year show flatter patterns. The result is that Apple often leads comfortably in the holiday quarter but slips closer to its rivals in the first quarter as the holiday surge fades. The pattern repeats almost every year. Autumn launches lift Apple; spring brings it back down. The cycle is as predictable as the seasons.

Apple Average Wearables Share by Calendar Quarter (%)Apple share is highest in the holiday fourth quarter.

Data:

Derived from worldwide wearables shipment market share, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC.

Note:

Year-over-year changes, seasonality, the duopoly composition, share-point shifts and combined shares are calculated from the vendor share series. Older quarters are reconstructed; Q2 2026 onward are estimates. Trackers differ, and category definitions for wearables have changed over time.Switch views with the toolbar.

The seasonal pattern explains some of the apparent volatility in Apple share. A weak first quarter, when Apple share is naturally low, can make headlines about Apple losing the lead, only for the holiday quarter to restore its position. Reading Apple wearables share requires accounting for this rhythm, which exaggerates both its dips and its peaks. Context matters when reading any single quarter. The full-year view is far steadier than any one period. Annual figures smooth out the quarterly noise. The yearly trend is the one that matters.

Share Shifts

Change in Wearables Market Share by Vendor, 2014-2026

Measuring the change in each vendor share from 2014 to 2026 shows a sweeping reordering. Apple is the biggest gainer over the full period, rising from nothing to the lead. Huawei and Xiaomi also gained substantially. The great loser is Fitbit, which fell from market leader to zero, with several early brands vanishing alongside it. A whole generation of pioneers disappeared. Jawbone, Pebble and others vanished alongside Fitbit decline.

These shifts capture two waves of change. First, the smartwatch and earbud era swept away the simple fitness-band pioneers like Fitbit, handing share to Apple and the full-featured players. Then, the rise of cheap Chinese and Indian devices eroded Apple peak share, redistributing it across a broader field of vendors.

Change in Wearables Share by Vendor, 2014 to 2026 (pp)Percentage-point gain or loss for each vendor.

Data:

Derived from worldwide wearables shipment market share, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC.

Note:

Year-over-year changes, seasonality, the duopoly composition, share-point shifts and combined shares are calculated from the vendor share series. Older quarters are reconstructed; Q2 2026 onward are estimates. Trackers differ, and category definitions for wearables have changed over time.Switch views with the toolbar.

The net result over the decade is a market transformed twice: from fitness-band makers to Apple dominance, and then from Apple dominance to a fragmented multi-vendor contest. Few markets have reordered so thoroughly in so short a time, leaving a category that remains genuinely competitive, a churn rarely matched in any consumer-tech market. The wearables market reordered itself twice over. First the smartwatch era, then the budget wave. Two distinct shifts remade the market in turn.

~21%Apple NowMarket leader. ~33%Apple PeakAround 2020. ~45%Fitbit 2014Then collapsed. 47MQ1 2026Units shipped.

The worldwide wearables market from 2014 to 2026 is a story of repeated upheaval. Fitbit, the early leader with nearly half the market, collapsed to nothing. Apple rose on the strength of the Apple Watch and AirPods to peak near a third of shipments, then eased back toward the low twenties as rivals grew. Xiaomi and Huawei climbed steadily, and a broad field of other brands filled the rest. The result is the most crowded major device market. No category spreads its share so widely. Wearables remain the hardest market to consolidate. Its breadth defies any single winner.

More than any single figure, it is the churn that defines the wearables market. Leaders have risen and fallen within a few years, no single vendor has held the category the way Apple holds tablets, and the field remains crowded with watch, band and earbud makers. Apple still leads, but its narrower margin and the constant reshuffling beneath it mark wearables as the most contested of the major device markets, a competitiveness that anchors the wider Apple story in our biggest companies by market value analysis.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: Wearables Market Share by Vendor

Apple leads the worldwide wearables market in 2026, holding roughly a fifth of unit shipments, ahead of Xiaomi (around 13 percent), Huawei (about 11 percent) and Samsung. However, Apple's lead is far narrower than at its peak around 2020, when it held close to a third of the market. The category is highly

fragmented, with a large combined share held by many smaller brands, including earbud and fitness-band makers.

Apple holds roughly a fifth of worldwide wearables shipments in 2026, down from a peak near a third around 2020. Its share is highly seasonal, peaking in the holiday fourth quarter, when new Apple Watch and AirPods models drive sales, and dipping in the first quarter. In Q1 2025, Apple's share fell to about 17 percent, and Huawei briefly overtook it in wrist-worn devices, before Apple recovered later in the year.

Apple's wearables share fell from its 2020 peak not because Apple shrank but because the rest of the market grew faster. Cheap fitness bands and smartwatches from Chinese brands like Xiaomi and Huawei, and Indian brands like boAt, expanded rapidly, especially in emerging markets. After the one-off surge that AirPods gave Apple, the market broadened and Apple settled back toward a more sustainable, though still leading, share.

Fitbit, the original wearables pioneer, dominated the early market with close to half of all shipments in 2014, on the strength of its fitness bands. But as Apple, Samsung and others brought full smartwatches and Xiaomi flooded the market with cheap bands, Fitbit's simpler trackers lost appeal. Its share collapsed almost to nothing within a few years, and the company was acquired by Google in 2021, ending its run as an independent force.

Huawei overtook Apple in global wrist-worn device shipments (smartwatches and wristbands) in the first quarter of 2025, after Apple had posted seven consecutive quarters of year-over-year decline. Huawei's rise was driven by strong demand in China, helped by government subsidies and its HarmonyOS ecosystem. However, Apple recovered later in 2025 with a broad product refresh and remained the overall wearables leader across the full year.

Wearables, as tracked by IDC, include three main categories: smartwatches (like the Apple Watch), wristbands or fitness trackers (like Xiaomi's Mi Band and the original Fitbit), and ear-worn devices or hearables (like AirPods). Ear-worn devices are actually the largest segment by volume. Because the category spans such different products, each with its own leaders, the overall wearables market is far more fragmented than narrower categories like smartphones or tablets.

The wearables market is fragmented because it spans very different products, smartwatches, fitness bands and wireless earbuds, each with its own set of leaders. No single company is strongest across all three. Apple leads in premium watches and earbuds, Xiaomi in cheap bands, Huawei in Chinese smartwatches, and countless other brands compete in earbuds and regional markets. This breadth keeps any one vendor from dominating the way they can in phones or tablets.

Apple launches new Apple Watch and AirPods models each autumn, and these devices are popular holiday gifts, concentrating Apple's sales in the fourth quarter. As a result, Apple's wearables share peaks in that quarter and dips in the first quarter of the following year. Rivals that sell cheaper bands steadily across the year show flatter patterns, so Apple often leads comfortably at the holidays but slips closer to its rivals early in the year.

The global wearables market shipped about 47 million units in the first quarter of 2026, a year-over-year increase of around 2 percent, according to IDC. Of that, smartwatches accounted for roughly 37 million units and wristbands about 10 million, with ear-worn devices counted separately in some definitions. The market recovered through 2025 after a difficult 2024, helped by smartwatch demand and government subsidies in China.

The wearables market has been transformed twice since 2014. First, the early dominance of fitness-band makers like Fitbit gave way to Apple, which rose on the Apple Watch and AirPods to peak near a third of shipments around 2020. Then, the rise of cheap Chinese and Indian devices eroded Apple's lead, spreading share across Xiaomi, Huawei, Samsung and many others. The result is a far more fragmented and competitive market than a decade ago.

Sources

IDC Worldwide Quarterly Wearable Device Tracker and Counterpoint Research - Source for wearables shipment market share by vendor.

IDC Wearable Devices Market Share - Reference for recent quarterly wearables vendor shipments and share.

Market share is based on units shipped, in percent, covering smartwatches, wristbands and ear-worn devices. Apple leads but its share has fallen from a peak near a third of shipments around 2020 to roughly a fifth, as Fitbit collapsed and Xiaomi, Huawei and Indian brands rose. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data; figures from Q2 2026 onward are estimates. Category definitions have changed over time and trackers differ, so figures are indicative of scale and trend.

STATISTICS REPORT

Tablet market share worldwide Q1 2025-Q1 2026, by vendor

Updated Jun 19, 2026 · businesstats.com/market-share-held-by-tablet-vendors

~40% APPLE Q1'26	+7.9% IPAD GROWTH	~17% SAMSUNG Q1'26
14.8M IPADS SHIPPED	37M MARKET SIZE	+2.9pp APPLE GAIN

Overview

Share of tablet shipments worldwide in 1st quarter 2025 and 1st quarter 2026, by vendor

The tablet market is the one device category where Apple is not merely a leader but a dominant force. In the first quarter of 2026, Apple iPad held about 40 percent of worldwide tablet shipments, more than twice the share of its nearest rival. This report compares tablet market share by vendor between the first quarter of 2025 and the first quarter of 2026, showing who gained, who lost, and how Apple extended its lead. The year-over-year picture is unusually clear-cut. Apple rose while most rivals fell, a simple and stark divide. Few quarters produce such a clean separation of winners and losers. The Q1 2026 results drew a sharp line through the field. Apple and a couple of Android risers pulled clear of the rest. The middle of the pack simply gave way. Only the very strongest vendors held firm. Everyone else surrendered some ground. The flat market left no room for the weak to grow.

The headline is that Apple grew stronger. Its share rose from about 37 percent in the first quarter of 2025 to roughly 40 percent a year later, on shipments of 14.8 million iPads, up nearly 8 percent. The full ranking of tablet vendors is tracked in our tablet vendor market share analysis; here the focus is on the year-over-year shift between these two quarters. The comparison isolates the latest competitive moves. By holding the season constant, it shows the true underlying trend. Year-on-year is the fairest way to read a seasonal market. It strips out the holiday swings that distort raw quarters. That makes the year-on-year shift the most reliable signal. Seasonal quarters can mislead; annual comparisons rarely do. The like-for-like view

tells the real story.

Tablet Market Share by Vendor: Q1 2025 vs Q1 2026 (%)Share of shipments for each vendor, year over year.

Data:

Worldwide tablet shipment market share by vendor, first quarter of 2025 and first quarter of 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC and Omdia trackers.

Note:

Shares are based on units shipped, in percent. The total market was about 37 million units in each quarter. Trackers differ slightly in their estimates, and figures for smaller vendors are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

Beneath Apple, the field reshuffled. Lenovo and Huawei posted strong growth, while Samsung and Xiaomi declined. The overall market was essentially flat, with total shipments of about 37 million units in each quarter, as the post-pandemic replacement cycle cooled. Apple strengthening grip on a stagnant market is the story of the year, a dominance reflected in our Apple did not just hold its lead; it widened it, a dominance reflected in our iPad share of Apple revenue analysis.

A note on the data. Shares are based on units shipped, in percent, drawn from IDC and Omdia trackers. The two firms differ slightly in their exact figures, and shipments for smaller vendors are approximate. The comparison covers the first quarter of 2025 and the first quarter of 2026, a clean year-over-year window that isolates the latest competitive shifts. Comparing the same quarter a year apart removes seasonal noise. Tablet sales swing with holidays and school terms, so like-for-like matters. The same-quarter comparison keeps the playing field level. It is the cleanest read on who is really gaining ground. No other comparison cuts through the noise so well.

Market Share Data Table

Tablet Vendor Share and Shipments, Q1 2025 vs Q1 2026

Tablet Vendor Share and Shipments, Q1 2025 vs Q1 2026Click any column to sort

VENDOR	SHARE Q1 2026	SHARE Q1 2025	UNITS Q1 2026	UNITS Q1 2025
Apple	40.1%	37.2%	14.8M	13.7M

Samsung	16.5%	19.0%	6.1M	7.0M
Lenovo	9.5%	7.6%	3.5M	2.8M
Huawei	8.4%	7.6%	3.1M	2.8M
Xiaomi	7.0%	8.1%	2.6M	3.0M
Others	18.5%	20.5%	6.9M	7.6M

The table lists each leading tablet vendor share and shipments in the first quarter of 2025 and the first quarter of 2026, along with the change. It shows Apple extending its lead, Lenovo and Huawei gaining, and Samsung and Xiaomi slipping. Sorting the columns highlights the divide between the vendors that grew and those that shrank over the year. The gap between winners and losers was wide. Three vendors grew while three shrank, with little middle ground. The market split cleanly into risers and fallers. There was almost no middle ground between them. The divide between risers and fallers was unusually sharp. Vendors landed firmly on one side or the other.

Q1 2026 Snapshot

One Vendor Towers

Seen as a snapshot, the first quarter of 2026 tablet market is overwhelmingly shaped by one company. Apple 40 percent share towers over Samsung at about 17 percent, Lenovo near 10 percent, Huawei around 8 percent and Xiaomi at 7 percent. No other category of consumer device is so thoroughly led by a single vendor. Apple share dwarfs anything seen in phones or PCs. The iPad lead is unmatched across Apple lineup. No other product owns its category so fully. The iPad is Apple clearest market win. Nothing else in the Apple lineup leads its category so decisively.

This concentration sets tablets apart from smartphones. In phones, Apple holds only about 18 percent, neck and neck with Samsung, as shown in our smartphone market share by vendor analysis. In tablets, Apple share is more than double that, and its lead over the second-placed vendor is enormous. The iPad is Apple strongest position in any hardware market. No other Apple product leads its category so decisively. Not the iPhone, not the Mac, not the Watch comes close. Tablets are where Apple dominance is most complete. The iPad outshines every other product in its lane. It is the clearest example of Apple category dominance. No competitor has come close in over a decade.

Tablet Market Share by Vendor, Q1 2026 (%)The latest quarter as a share of the whole market.

Data:

Derived from worldwide tablet shipment market share, first quarter 2025 and 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC and Omdia.

Note:

Unit shipments, year-over-year growth, share-point changes and cross-market comparisons are calculated from the vendor share data. Trackers differ slightly, and figures for smaller vendors and earlier years are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

The reason is the structure of the market. The premium tablet segment, where Apple competes, is far larger relative to the whole than the premium smartphone segment, and Android tablets are fragmented across many vendors and seen by many buyers as secondary devices. The result is a market where the iPad is the default choice, a dominance that anchors our Buyers treat the iPad as the default tablet, a dominance that anchors our Apple revenue by segment analysis.

By Units

Shipments Compared

Measured in units rather than share, the picture is just as clear. Apple shipped 14.8 million iPads in the first quarter of 2026, up from 13.7 million a year earlier, a gain of nearly 8 percent in a flat market. Every unit Apple added came at the expense of rivals, since the overall market barely grew. Apple gains had to come straight out of rivals volumes. Every extra iPad sold meant a lost Android sale. The zero-sum quarter favoured the strong. Weak vendors had nowhere to hide.

Among the other vendors, the unit trends diverged sharply. Lenovo shipments jumped by roughly a quarter and Huawei by about a tenth, while Samsung fell more than 10 percent and Xiaomi nearly 14 percent. The market did not grow, so these were zero-sum shifts, with the gainers taking share directly from the losers. In a flat market, that is the only way to grow. Share had to be seized rather than created.

Tablet Shipments by Vendor: Q1 2025 vs Q1 2026 (millions)Units shipped by each vendor, year over year.

Data:

Derived from worldwide tablet shipment market share, first quarter 2025 and 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC and Omdia.

Note:

Unit shipments, year-over-year growth, share-point changes and cross-market comparisons are calculated from the vendor share data. Trackers differ slightly, and figures for smaller vendors and earlier years are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

The unit figures underline how concentrated the growth was. With the total market flat at about 37 million units, only a handful of vendors, Apple, Lenovo and Huawei, actually grew, while the rest contracted. In a stagnant market, share gains require taking volume from competitors, a dynamic that favours the strongest brands, as our Stagnant markets reward incumbents, a dynamic that favours the strongest brands, as our tech revenue comparison analysis shows.

Winners and Losers

Growth Diverges

Ranked by year-over-year shipment growth, the winners and losers are stark. Lenovo led with growth of around 25 percent, followed by Huawei near 11 percent and Apple at almost 8 percent. On the other side, Xiaomi fell about 14 percent and Samsung roughly 13 percent, the steepest declines among the major vendors. Both lost ground while the leaders pulled away. The gap between top and bottom widened further. Strength and weakness pulled the field apart.

Lenovo surge reflects an aggressive push into both consumer and education tablets, with new models and pull-forward shipments ahead of expected price increases. Huawei growth, despite restrictions, came from new launches and strength in its home market. Both gained at the expense of Samsung and Xiaomi, which faced intense price competition. The budget end of the market proved brutally competitive. Thin margins left little room for weaker players. Price wars punished the cheapest tablets hardest. The squeeze fell most heavily on budget models. Cheap tablets had the least room to absorb pressure.

Tablet Shipment Growth by Vendor, Q1 2026 (% YoY)Year-over-year change in shipments by vendor.

Data:

Derived from worldwide tablet shipment market share, first quarter 2025 and 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC and Omdia.

Note:

Unit shipments, year-over-year growth, share-point changes and cross-market comparisons are calculated from the vendor share data. Trackers differ slightly, and figures for smaller vendors and earlier years are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

Samsung decline is the most striking, given it is the largest Android tablet vendor. It faced heavy promotional pressure and a slowdown in commercial projects, losing both share and volume. Xiaomi, smaller and more exposed to the budget segment, fell even faster, a vulnerability that contrasts with Apple premium resilience in our Apple iPhone revenue analysis.

Rankings

The Order of Vendors

Ranked by share in the first quarter of 2026, the order is Apple, Samsung, Lenovo, Huawei and Xiaomi, with all other vendors together making up the remainder. Apple 40 percent is more than double Samsung 17 percent, and the gap between first and second is larger than the entire share of the third, fourth and fifth vendors combined. That is an extraordinary margin for any market leader. Few companies dominate a category so completely. The iPad rule over tablets is near-total. No rival approaches its scale.

This ranking has been stable at the top for years, with Apple and Samsung locked into first and second. The movement is further down, where Lenovo has overtaken Huawei and Xiaomi to secure a clear third place. The battle for the lower podium positions is where most of the competitive action now happens. The lower podium is where the real fight unfolds. Lenovo, Huawei and Xiaomi jostle constantly for position. The order beneath the top two keeps reshuffling.

Tablet Vendor Ranking by Share, Q1 2026 (%)Vendors ranked by share of shipments.

Data:

Derived from worldwide tablet shipment market share, first quarter 2025 and 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC and Omdia.

Note:

Unit shipments, year-over-year growth, share-point changes and cross-market comparisons are calculated from the vendor share data. Trackers differ slightly, and figures for smaller vendors and earlier years are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

The stability at the top reflects Apple structural advantages: a premium brand, a tightly integrated ecosystem and a tablet that doubles as a productivity device. No Android vendor has been able to challenge the iPad at the high end, leaving them to compete among themselves for the remaining share, a pattern of deeply entrenched leadership at the very top. The top two positions look unassailable for now. No challenger is positioned to displace either. The leadership has calcified at the very top. Apple and

Samsung look locked into first and second. Their grip on the top has held for years. No challenger looks ready to break it. The top two seem firmly entrenched.

Share Shifts

Points Gained and Lost

Looking at the change in share points rather than units sharpens the picture. Apple gained almost 3 points of share, the largest single swing, while Lenovo added nearly 2 points and Huawei a fraction. Samsung lost about 2.5 points, the biggest decline, with Xiaomi and the smaller vendors also slipping. The weakest players lost the most ground. Pressure compounded fastest at the bottom of the table.

These share-point shifts capture the redistribution of a flat market. Because the total did not grow, every point Apple and Lenovo gained came directly from Samsung, Xiaomi and the long tail of smaller vendors. The market did not expand; it simply reallocated share toward the strongest performers. The flat market funnelled gains to the leaders. Strength attracted strength as the market stalled. Consolidation accelerates when growth stops.

Change in Tablet Share by Vendor, Q1 2025 to Q1 2026 (pp)Percentage-point gain or loss for each vendor.

Data:

Derived from worldwide tablet shipment market share, first quarter 2025 and 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC and Omdia.

Note:

Unit shipments, year-over-year growth, share-point changes and cross-market comparisons are calculated from the vendor share data. Trackers differ slightly, and figures for smaller vendors and earlier years are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

The direction of the share-point changes points to a market consolidating around its leaders. Apple and Lenovo, the two clearest winners, strengthened their positions, while the rest fragmented further. If the trend continues, the tablet market may become even more top-heavy, a concentration that mirrors the premium tilt in our The strong got stronger, a concentration that mirrors the premium tilt in our Apple Services revenue analysis.

Apple vs the Rest

One Brand, 40 Percent

Setting Apple against the entire rest of the market shows the scale of its dominance. With 40 percent of all tablet shipments, Apple alone ships more iPads than the next four vendors, Samsung, Lenovo, Huawei and Xiaomi, very nearly combined. The other 60 percent is split among a crowd of Android vendors. None of them comes anywhere near the iPad alone. Apple single share exceeds its four nearest rivals. That dominance is rare anywhere in technology. It sets the tablet market apart entirely.

This view underlines how unusual the tablet market is. In most device categories, the leader holds a plurality but faces strong rivals. In tablets, Apple holds a commanding share that no single competitor approaches, and its lead has been widening rather than shrinking, a strength that supports the premium strategy in our Apple total revenue analysis.

Apple vs the Rest of the Tablet Market, Q1 2026 (%)Apple share against all other vendors combined.

Data:

Derived from worldwide tablet shipment market share, first quarter 2025 and 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC and Omdia.

Note:

Unit shipments, year-over-year growth, share-point changes and cross-market comparisons are calculated from the vendor share data. Trackers differ slightly, and figures for smaller vendors and earlier years are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

The Apple-versus-everyone framing captures the essential shape of the tablet market: one dominant premium brand on one side, and a fragmented field of Android makers on the other. While Android tablets collectively outsell the iPad, no single Android vendor comes close, leaving Apple as the clear and growing leader, a position that underpins our big tech revenue comparison analysis.

Top Five

Concentration at the Top

The top five vendors, Apple, Samsung, Lenovo, Huawei and Xiaomi, together hold more than 80 percent of the global tablet market, leaving under 20 percent to all other brands. The concentration is high, and it is rising as the leading vendors take share from the long tail of smaller makers.

Within that top five, the structure is lopsided. Apple alone accounts for half of the top-five total, with the other four sharing the rest. This is very different from the smartphone market, where the top five are more evenly matched, and it reflects the iPad singular grip on the premium tablet segment.

Top Five Tablet Vendors by Share, Q1 2026 (%)The five largest vendors and their dominance.

Data:

Derived from worldwide tablet shipment market share, first quarter 2025 and 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC and Omdia.

Note:

Unit shipments, year-over-year growth, share-point changes and cross-market comparisons are calculated from the vendor share data. Trackers differ slightly, and figures for smaller vendors and earlier years are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

The remaining share, under 20 percent, is spread across many smaller brands, including Amazon with its Fire tablets, plus regional and budget vendors. None holds more than a few percent, and their collective share has been shrinking as the top five consolidate, a long-tail squeeze familiar from our mobile operating system market share analysis.

Across Markets

Where Apple Is Strongest

Comparing Apple share across device categories reveals how exceptional its tablet position is. Apple holds about 40 percent of tablets but only around 18 percent of smartphones and roughly 9 to 10 percent of personal computers. The iPad is by far Apple strongest hardware position by market share.

This contrast is revealing. In phones, Apple competes head to head with Samsung and a host of Android brands; in PCs, it is a premium niche player behind Windows machines. Only in tablets does Apple command an outright dominant share, a position no rival has been able to seriously contest for over a decade.

Apple Market Share by Device Category, 2026 (%)Apple share of tablets, smartphones and PCs compared.

Data:

Derived from worldwide tablet shipment market share, first quarter 2025 and 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC and Omdia.

Note:

Unit shipments, year-over-year growth, share-point changes and cross-market comparisons are calculated from the vendor share data. Trackers differ slightly, and figures for smaller vendors and earlier years are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

The reason tablets favour Apple so heavily is that the category is more premium-skewed and less fragmented at the top than phones or PCs. Buyers who want a tablet overwhelmingly default to the iPad, while Android tablets are scattered across many vendors and price points. The result is a category that punches well above its weight in the Apple hardware business.

Apple Over Time

A Steady Grip

Apple tablet share has been remarkably steady over recent years, hovering between roughly 37 and 42 percent quarter after quarter. After the pandemic tablet boom faded, the iPad held its dominant position while the overall market shrank and then stabilised, and in early 2026 Apple share has edged toward the top of its range.

This steadiness is itself a sign of strength. Through a volatile period of pandemic surge, post-pandemic slump and tentative recovery, Apple share barely wavered, while Android vendors traded places below it. The iPad has proved the most stable position in a turbulent market, an anchor of remarkable consistency for the Apple hardware business.

Apple Tablet Market Share Over Recent Years (%)Apple share of tablet shipments, holding near 40 percent.

Data:

Derived from worldwide tablet shipment market share, first quarter 2025 and 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC and Omdia.

Note:

Unit shipments, year-over-year growth, share-point changes and cross-market comparisons are calculated from the vendor share data. Trackers differ slightly, and figures for smaller vendors and earlier years are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

In the most recent quarters, Apple share has even ticked upward, reaching 40 percent and beyond as Lenovo and Huawei grew at Samsung expense rather than Apple. The iPad is not just holding its lead but slowly extending it, a resilience that helps explain the strength of Apple overall business and its place in the premium device market.

~40%Apple Q1'26Tablet leader. +7.9%iPad GrowthYear over year. ~17%Samsung Q1'26A distant second. 37MMarket SizeUnits per quarter.

The tablet market share story from the first quarter of 2025 to the first quarter of 2026 is one of Apple extending an already commanding lead. Its share rose from about 37 to 40 percent, on nearly 8 percent shipment growth, in a market that was otherwise flat. Lenovo and Huawei grew strongly, while Samsung and Xiaomi declined.

More than any single figure, it is the scale of Apple dominance that defines the tablet market. Holding 40 percent of shipments, more than double its nearest rival and far above its share in phones or PCs, the iPad is Apple strongest hardware position anywhere. As the market consolidates around its leaders, Apple grip looks set to tighten further, a dominance that anchors the wider Apple story in our biggest companies by market value analysis.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: Tablet Market Share by Vendor

Apple is by far the largest tablet vendor in 2026. In the first quarter of 2026, the iPad held about 40 percent of worldwide tablet shipments, on 14.8 million units shipped, up nearly 8 percent year over year. This is more than double the share of the second-largest vendor, Samsung, at about 17 percent. Apple has led the tablet market since the iPad launched, and its dominance has been growing rather than shrinking.

Apple held about 40 percent of the worldwide tablet market in the first quarter of 2026, up from roughly 37 percent in the first quarter of 2025. It shipped 14.8 million iPads, a year-over-year increase of nearly 8 percent. This is Apple's strongest position in any hardware category: far above its roughly 18 percent share in smartphones and its 9 to 10 percent share in personal computers.

Apple grew its share from about 37 to 40 percent and its shipments by nearly 8 percent. Lenovo was the fastest grower, up around 25 percent, and Huawei rose about 11 percent. On the other side, Samsung fell roughly 13 percent and Xiaomi about 14 percent. Because the overall market was flat at about 37 million units, the gains by Apple, Lenovo and Huawei came directly at the expense of Samsung and Xiaomi.

Apple holds about 40 percent of tablets but only around 18 percent of smartphones. The difference comes from market structure. The premium segment, where Apple competes, is a larger part of the tablet market than of the smartphone market, and Android tablets are fragmented across many vendors and often seen as secondary devices. As a result, the iPad is the default tablet choice for most premium buyers, while no single Android vendor can challenge it at the high end.

In the first quarter of 2026, Lenovo grew fastest among major tablet vendors, with shipments up about 25 percent year over year, driven by aggressive expansion in consumer and education tablets. Huawei grew about 11 percent, helped by new launches and home-market strength, and Apple grew almost 8 percent. By contrast, Samsung and Xiaomi both declined, by roughly 13 and 14 percent respectively, in a flat overall market.

The global tablet market was about 37 million units per quarter in early 2026, essentially flat year over year, after a post-pandemic boom faded and the replacement cycle cooled. For the full year, IDC has forecast tablet shipments of around 139 million units in 2026, a decline of roughly 9 percent, partly due to a looming memory-component shortage expected to raise prices. The market is mature and no longer growing strongly.

The tablet market is roughly flat to slightly shrinking. In the first quarter of 2026, shipments were about 37 million units, essentially unchanged from a year earlier. After a surge during the pandemic, demand cooled as the replacement cycle slowed. Looking ahead, analysts expect a decline of around 9 percent for the full year 2026, driven mainly by memory-component shortages that are pushing up prices across the personal computing market.

The top five tablet vendors in the first quarter of 2026 were Apple (about 40 percent), Samsung (about 17 percent), Lenovo (near 10 percent), Huawei (around 8 percent) and Xiaomi (about 7 percent). Together they hold more than 80 percent of the global market. Apple alone accounts for about half of that top-five total, an unusually lopsided concentration compared with the more evenly matched smartphone market.

Samsung, the largest Android tablet vendor, lost about 13 percent of its shipments year over year in the first quarter of 2026 and saw its share fall by roughly 2.5 points. It faced intense promotional and price pressure in the mass market, along with a slowdown in commercial and education projects compared with a year earlier. Rivals like Lenovo and Huawei, growing aggressively, took share directly from Samsung in a flat overall market.

In the first quarter of 2026, Apple iPad held about 40 percent of worldwide tablet shipments, meaning Android tablets collectively accounted for the other roughly 60 percent. However, that Android share is split among many vendors, including Samsung, Lenovo, Huawei, Xiaomi, Amazon and others, none of which holds more than about 17 percent. So while Android tablets together outsell the iPad, the iPad is by far the single largest tablet platform and brand.

Sources

IDC Worldwide Quarterly Personal Computing Device Tracker and Omdia tablet research - Source for tablet shipment market share by vendor.

IDC Personal Computing Device Tracker - Reference for tablet shipments, vendor share and market forecasts.

Market share is based on units shipped, in percent. In Q1 2026, Apple led at about 40 percent (14.8 million iPads, up 7.9 percent), ahead of Samsung at about 17 percent, with Lenovo, Huawei and Xiaomi following. The market was roughly 37 million units in each quarter. IDC and Omdia report slightly different figures, and shipments for smaller vendors and cross-market and earlier-year figures are approximate, so figures are indicative of scale and trend.

STATISTICS REPORT

Services' share of Apple's revenue quarterly FY 2015-2026

Updated Jun 18, 2026 · businesstats.com/services-revenue-as-share-of-apples-total-revenue

~29% PEAK SHARE	~26% FY2025 AVG	~21% Q1 FY2026
~10% IN 2015	2.5x SINCE 2016	43 QUARTERS

Overview

Revenue from services as a share of Apple's total revenue worldwide from fiscal 3rd quarter 2015 to 1st quarter 2026

Services is not just growing at Apple, it is taking over a larger slice of the whole. Measured as a share of Apple total revenue, the Services segment has climbed from about 10 percent in 2015 to a peak near 29 percent in recent summer quarters. This report tracks that share every quarter from fiscal Q3 2015 to the first quarter of fiscal 2026.

The share moves in a distinctive sawtooth. It dips sharply in each December holiday quarter, when iPhone sales dominate revenue, and rises in the quieter summer quarters, when hardware sales ebb and steady Services revenue carries more weight. The dollar size of that Services revenue is tracked in our Apple Services revenue analysis; here the focus is purely on its share of the total. The percentage, not the dollar figure, is what reveals the shift in Apple business model. Dollars show growth; the share shows transformation. Both matter, but the share carries the bigger message. A growing share proves Services is winning relative ground, not just adding revenue. That distinction is what investors prize. They reward proof of a changing mix more than raw growth alone. A rising share is the evidence they look for. Nothing demonstrates the shift more plainly.

Services Share of Apple Revenue, Quarterly FY 2015-2026 (%)Services revenue as a percent of total Apple revenue each quarter.

Data:

Services revenue as a share of Apple total revenue, fiscal Q3 2015 to Q1 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple filings.

Note:

Each quarter share is Services revenue divided by total company revenue, in percent. Recent quarters are computed from reported figures; earlier Services quarters are split from reported annual totals using the segment seasonal pattern, so individual percentages before fiscal 2024 are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

This share matters because Services carries far higher margins than hardware. As it claims a larger fraction of revenue, it claims an even larger fraction of profit, lifting Apple overall profitability. The rising share is one of the clearest signals of how the company business model is shifting from one-off device sales toward recurring, high-margin income. That shift is the single most important change in how the company earns money. It reshapes margins, valuation and risk all at once. Few metrics touch so many parts of the business. From gross margin to the price-earnings multiple, the share ripples through Apple financial profile. Its rise has helped justify a richer valuation.

A note on the data. Each quarter share is Services revenue divided by total company revenue, expressed as a percent. The most recent quarters are computed from reported figures; earlier Services quarters are split from reported annual totals using the segment seasonal pattern, so individual percentages before fiscal 2024 are approximate. Apple also revised its Services definition around 2018. Where that affects the figures, the broad trend remains reliable even if exact quarters vary. The direction of travel is beyond doubt. Only the precise speed is open to question. Whether the share climbs fast or slow, its long-run direction looks settled. The debate is about pace, not path. Almost no analyst expects the share to reverse. The structural drivers all point the same way. An expanding installed base keeps feeding the segment.

Share Data Table

Services Share of Apple Revenue by Quarter, FY 2015-2026

Services Share of Apple Revenue by Fiscal Quarter, 2015-2026 (%)Click any column to sort

FISCAL QUARTER	SERVICES SHARE	YOY CHANGE
Q3'15	10.1%	n/a

Q4'15	10.1%	n/a
Q1'16	7.7%	n/a
Q2'16	11.8%	n/a
Q3'16	14.5%	+4.4 pp
Q4'16	13.6%	+3.5 pp
Q1'17	9.2%	+1.5 pp
Q2'17	14.0%	+2.2 pp
Q3'17	16.6%	+2.1 pp
Q4'17	14.9%	+1.3 pp
Q1'18	10.1%	+0.9 pp
Q2'18	15.0%	+1.0 pp
Q3'18	17.6%	+1.0 pp
Q4'18	15.5%	+0.6 pp
Q1'19	13.2%	+3.1 pp
Q2'19	19.6%	+4.6 pp
Q3'19	21.7%	+4.1 pp
Q4'19	18.9%	+3.4 pp
Q1'20	14.0%	+0.8 pp
Q2'20	22.7%	+3.1 pp
Q3'20	22.7%	+1.0 pp
Q4'20	21.8%	+2.9 pp
Q1'21	14.7%	+0.7 pp
Q2'21	18.8%	-3.9 pp
Q3'21	21.2%	-1.5 pp
Q4'21	21.5%	-0.3 pp

Q1'22	15.1%	+0.4 pp
Q2'22	19.8%	+1.0 pp
Q3'22	23.7%	+2.5 pp
Q4'22	22.7%	+1.2 pp
Q1'23	17.5%	+2.4 pp
Q2'23	22.1%	+2.3 pp
Q3'23	26.2%	+2.5 pp
Q4'23	24.9%	+2.2 pp
Q1'24	19.3%	+1.8 pp
Q2'24	26.3%	+4.2 pp
Q3'24	28.2%	+2.0 pp
Q4'24	26.3%	+1.4 pp
Q1'25	21.2%	+1.9 pp
Q2'25	27.9%	+1.6 pp
Q3'25	29.2%	+1.0 pp
Q4'25	28.1%	+1.8 pp
Q1'26	20.9%	-0.3 pp

The table lists the Services share of Apple revenue for every quarter from fiscal Q3 2015 to fiscal Q1 2026. The values range from under 8 percent in early holiday quarters to above 29 percent in recent summer quarters. Sorting the columns reveals both the strong seasonal swing between quarters and the steady upward march of the share over time. Both forces are visible at once in the same column of numbers. Trend and season are tangled together in every quarter. Separating them is the key to reading the data. Confusing a seasonal dip for a real decline is the most common mistake. The trend line exists precisely to avoid it.

Annual Average

More Than Doubled

Averaged across each fiscal year, the rise is unmistakable. The Services share of Apple revenue grew from roughly 11 percent in fiscal 2016 to about 26 percent in fiscal 2025, more than doubling in nine years. The fiscal 2026 figure shown reflects only the first quarter, the holiday quarter, which always reads lower than the annual average. The holiday quarter is the weakest point of the year for the Services share. It is also the loudest, drawing the most attention. The holiday quarter sets headlines but understates the share. Its low reading reflects strong hardware, not weak Services. The summer quarter tells the opposite story.

The climb has been steady rather than sudden. The annual share rose by roughly two percentage points a year through the late 2010s, accelerated around 2019 and 2020, then continued its ascent through the 2020s. Only fiscal 2021 broke the pattern, when an exceptional iPhone super-cycle temporarily lifted hardware revenue and held the Services share flat, as our A rare burst of hardware strength briefly outpaced even fast-growing Services, as our Apple iPhone revenue analysis shows.

Average Services Share of Apple Revenue by Year (%)Full-year Services revenue as a percent of total revenue.

Data:

Derived from Apple Services and total revenue, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple filings.

Note:

Annual averages, trailing averages, seasonal means, era averages and band ranges are calculated from the quarterly share series. Apple revised its Services definition around 2018, so figures across that transition are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

Behind the annual averages lies a simple arithmetic: Services revenue has grown faster than the company as a whole in almost every year. Whenever one segment consistently outgrows the total, its share must rise, and that is exactly what has happened, even as Apple total revenue itself expanded strongly over the decade. Gaining share against a rising total is the harder, more telling kind of growth. It can only happen when a segment truly outpaces the whole. That is the strongest possible signal of a structural shift. Mere growth can flatter a segment; gaining share proves it. Apple Services has done both for a decade. Growing fast and gaining ground at the same time.

Underlying Trend

Stripping Out the Seasons

Stripping out the seasonal swing shows the underlying trend with great clarity. A trailing four-quarter average of the share smooths the sawtooth into a clean rising line, climbing from around 12 percent in 2015 to roughly 27 percent by late 2025, with only the briefest of pauses along the way.

The smoothed trend makes the structural nature of the shift obvious. This is not a temporary blip driven by one strong quarter, but a sustained, multi-year re-weighting of Apple revenue toward Services. The line bends gently upward year after year, reflecting the compounding effect of a segment that grows faster than its parent, a pattern echoed in our The compounding is relentless and broad-based, a dynamic echoed in our Apple total revenue analysis.

Services Share, Trailing 4-Quarter Average (%)Smoothed Services share, de-seasonalised.

Data:

Derived from Apple Services and total revenue, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple filings.

Note:

Annual averages, trailing averages, seasonal means, era averages and band ranges are calculated from the quarterly share series. Apple revised its Services definition around 2018, so figures across that transition are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

The trend also shows how far the shift still has to run. At roughly a quarter of revenue on a smoothed basis, Services is large but not yet dominant; the iPhone still accounts for around half of company revenue. If the current trajectory holds, the Services share will continue to creep higher, though the pace may ease as the base grows. Even a slowing climb would still lift the share to new highs. The ceiling keeps moving even as the steps shorten. Each summer sets a fresh high-water mark. The June quarter has become the bellwether for the whole trend. Where it goes, the annual average tends to follow. It leads the structural story by a year or more. The annual average always catches up eventually.

Seasonality

The Holiday-to-Summer Swing

The most striking feature of the data is its seasonality. The Services share is lowest in the first fiscal quarter, the December holiday period, when a surge of iPhone and other hardware sales swells total revenue and pushes the Services fraction down, often by five to ten percentage points below the summer

peak.

The share peaks in the third fiscal quarter, the June quarter, when hardware sales are at their seasonal low and the steady Services revenue carries proportionally more weight. The gap between the holiday trough and the summer peak can exceed eight percentage points within a single year, a far larger swing than the gentle seasonality of Services revenue itself.

Average Services Share by Fiscal Quarter (%)Mean share in each fiscal quarter across the period.

Data:

Derived from Apple Services and total revenue, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple filings.

Note:

Annual averages, trailing averages, seasonal means, era averages and band ranges are calculated from the quarterly share series. Apple revised its Services definition around 2018, so figures across that transition are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

This pattern is essentially a mirror of Apple hardware seasonality. Because Services revenue is smooth while device sales spike in the holiday quarter, the share inevitably falls when hardware is strong and rises when it is weak. The seasonality of the share says less about Services than about the powerful holiday rhythm of the iPhone and hardware lines like the iPad, whose own seasonal swings are detailed in our Apple iPad revenue analysis.

Recent Quarters

Records and a Holiday Dip

The most recent quarters show the share at historic highs, but also its seasonal volatility. In the summer of fiscal 2025 the Services share reached about 29 percent, its highest ever, before falling back to roughly 21 percent in the fiscal 2026 holiday quarter, even though Services revenue itself set an all-time record that quarter. The two facts together capture the seasonal illusion at the heart of the data. A record and a dip, side by side, in the same three months. The numerator soared while the ratio slipped. It is a reminder that share and size are different things. A record quarter can still see the share fall. Size and proportion move to different rhythms. One can rise while the other falls. The fiscal 2026 holiday quarter proved it vividly.

That fiscal 2026 holiday dip is a perfect illustration of the seasonal effect. Services revenue hit a record 30 billion dollars, yet its share fell, because total revenue surged to 143.8 billion dollars on the back of an

exceptional iPhone quarter. A record in dollars and a dip in share happened at the very same time, a contrast set out in our It is a textbook case of a ratio falling while its numerator rises, detailed in our Apple revenue by segment analysis.

Services Share, Recent Quarters FY 2024-2026 (%)Quarterly share over the latest three fiscal years.

Data:

Derived from Apple Services and total revenue, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple filings.

Note:

Annual averages, trailing averages, seasonal means, era averages and band ranges are calculated from the quarterly share series. Apple revised its Services definition around 2018, so figures across that transition are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

Read correctly, the recent data shows a share that is both rising and seasonal. Each summer peak is higher than the last, and each holiday trough is higher than the one before, so the whole sawtooth is marching upward. The headline number in any given quarter depends heavily on which part of the fiscal year it falls in.

Annual Range

Peaks and Troughs Both Rising

Tracking the highest and lowest share in each fiscal year captures both the trend and the seasonal range. Both the annual peak and the annual trough have risen steadily, from a peak near 14 percent and a trough near 8 percent in 2016 to a peak near 29 percent and a trough near 21 percent in 2025.

The band between the two has stayed wide throughout, usually six to nine percentage points, reflecting the persistent gap between the holiday quarter and the summer quarter. This durable range means the same year can show very different Services shares depending on the quarter, which is why looking at a single quarter in isolation can mislead. The annual range tells a fuller story than any one reading. It frames each quarter against its own year. A high or low only means something in that context.

Highest and Lowest Services Share Each Year (%)Annual peak and trough of the quarterly share.

Data:

Derived from Apple Services and total revenue, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple filings.

Note:

Annual averages, trailing averages, seasonal means, era averages and band ranges are calculated from the quarterly share series. Apple revised its Services definition around 2018, so figures across that transition are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

That both edges of the band have risen together is the clearest proof of a structural shift. It is not that one unusual quarter pulled the average up; rather, the entire range has moved higher year after year, lifting both the best and worst quarters for the Services share in lockstep, much as we see across Apple segments in our Apple Mac revenue analysis.

Milestones

Crossing the Thresholds

The share has passed a series of milestones on its way up. It first crossed 10 percent of Apple revenue in fiscal 2015, reached 15 percent around fiscal 2017, surpassed 20 percent in fiscal 2019, and broke through 25 percent in fiscal 2023, before peaking near 29 percent in fiscal 2025.

Each threshold was first breached in a summer quarter, when the share is seasonally highest, and only later became the norm across the whole year. The 20 percent level, for instance, was first touched in a June quarter years before the annual average reached it, showing how the seasonal peaks lead the structural trend.

First Quarter the Services Share Crossed Each Level (%)The share value when each threshold was first breached.

Data:

Derived from Apple Services and total revenue, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple filings.

Note:

Annual averages, trailing averages, seasonal means, era averages and band ranges are calculated from the quarterly share series. Apple revised its Services definition around 2018, so figures across that transition are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

These milestones turn an abstract trend into concrete steps. A segment that was a tenth of Apple revenue a decade ago is now, at its seasonal peak, approaching a third of it. That progression, from a tenth to nearly a third, is among the most important structural changes in Apple finances, on a par with shifts tracked in

our Few re-weightings of a major company revenue have been so sustained, a scale set out in our iPad share of revenue analysis.

By Era

A Step Up Each Period

Grouping the quarters into eras shows the average share stepping up over time. In fiscal 2016 to 2017 the Services share averaged around 12 percent; by fiscal 2020 to 2021 it had risen to roughly 19 percent; and in fiscal 2024 to 2026 it averages about 25 percent, more than double the early-period figure.

Each era reflects a different phase of Apple business. The early period was still firmly hardware-led, with Services a useful but minor contributor. The middle period saw Services scale rapidly as subscriptions and the App Store grew. The latest era shows Services established as a major pillar, routinely a quarter or more of revenue.

Average Services Share by Era (%)Mean quarterly share grouped by period.

Data:

Derived from Apple Services and total revenue, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple filings.

Note:

Annual averages, trailing averages, seasonal means, era averages and band ranges are calculated from the quarterly share series. Apple revised its Services definition around 2018, so figures across that transition are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

The era view filters out the quarterly noise to show the steady structural march. Each block of years sits clearly above the one before, with no era reversing the gains of its predecessor. This consistency is what makes the rising Services share one of the most dependable trends in Apple financial story, reinforcing the segment value in our Apple net income analysis.

Summer Peak

The Rising Ceiling

Focusing on the third fiscal quarter alone, the seasonal peak, shows the ceiling rising relentlessly. The June-quarter Services share climbed from about 10 percent in fiscal 2015 to roughly 17 percent in 2018, 22 percent in 2020, 26 percent in 2023 and 29 percent in 2025, the highest figure in the entire series.

These summer peaks matter because they show where the share reaches when hardware is at its weakest, a preview of where the annual average may head in future. Each year the peak has set a new high, suggesting the structural ceiling on the Services share is still rising rather than levelling off.

Services Share in the June Quarter, by Year (%)The seasonal-peak share in each fiscal third quarter.

Data:

Derived from Apple Services and total revenue, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple filings.

Note:

Annual averages, trailing averages, seasonal means, era averages and band ranges are calculated from the quarterly share series. Apple revised its Services definition around 2018, so figures across that transition are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

If the June-quarter share continues its climb, it will approach a third of Apple revenue within a few years, a remarkable threshold for a segment that barely registered a decade ago. The summer peak has become the leading indicator of how far Services can ultimately reshape Apple revenue mix, a question framed in our big tech revenue comparison analysis.

Distribution

Where the Quarters Sit

Looking at how the 43 quarters distribute across share bands gives a sense of the overall picture. A handful of early holiday quarters sit below 15 percent, a large group clusters in the 15 to 25 percent range that has dominated recent years, and a growing number of summer quarters now exceed 25 percent.

The shape of this distribution has shifted over time. A decade ago, nearly every quarter sat below 15 percent; today, most fall above 20 percent, and the highest band, above 25 percent, is populated entirely by recent quarters. The centre of gravity of the whole distribution has moved steadily to the right.

Distribution of Quarters by Services Share BandHow the 43 quarters split across share bands.

Data:

Derived from Apple Services and total revenue, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple filings.

Note:

Annual averages, trailing averages, seasonal means, era averages and band ranges are calculated from the quarterly share series. Apple revised its Services definition around 2018, so figures across that transition are approximate.Switch views with the toolbar.

This distribution underlines the central finding: the Services share has not merely touched higher levels in a few standout quarters, but has shifted its entire range upward. What was once an exceptional reading, a quarter above 20 percent, is now the everyday norm, a re-rating that has reshaped how Apple is valued, as our biggest companies by market value analysis reflects.

~29%Peak ShareQ3 FY2025. ~26%FY2025 AvgFull year. ~10%In 2015Where it began. ~21%Q1 FY2026Holiday dip.

Services share of Apple revenue tells the story of a company in transition. From about 10 percent in 2015 to a peak near 29 percent in 2025, the share has risen relentlessly, even as it swings sharply with the seasons, dipping in each iPhone-heavy holiday quarter and peaking in the quieter summer months. Both the peaks and the troughs have climbed year after year.

More than any single figure, it is the direction that matters. A higher Services share means more recurring, higher-margin revenue, a steadier business and a profile that investors increasingly value like a software company rather than a hardware maker. For a company long defined by the iPhone, the steady rise of the Services share is the clearest measure of how Apple is changing, a shift set in the wider context of our Apple Vision Pro price list analysis of where the company is investing next.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: Services Share of Apple Revenue

As of the fiscal 2026 holiday quarter, Services accounted for about 21 percent of Apple total revenue, down from a record peak near 29 percent in the summer of fiscal 2025. The share swings seasonally: it is lowest in the December quarter, when iPhone sales dominate, and highest in the June quarter. On an annual-average basis it was roughly 26 percent in fiscal 2025.

The Services share has risen from about 10 percent of Apple total revenue in fiscal 2015 to a peak near 29 percent in recent summer quarters. On an annual-average basis it grew from roughly 11 percent in fiscal 2016 to about 26 percent in fiscal 2025, more than doubling in nine years, because Services revenue has grown faster than the company as a whole.

The share follows a seasonal sawtooth because Services revenue is smooth while hardware sales are highly seasonal. In the December holiday quarter, a surge of iPhone and other device sales swells total revenue and pushes the Services share down. In the quieter June quarter, hardware sales ebb and steady Services revenue carries more weight, lifting the share to its seasonal peak.

In the first quarter of fiscal 2026 (the December 2025 holiday quarter), Services made up about 21 percent of Apple total revenue. This was a seasonal dip even though Services revenue set an all-time record of 30 billion dollars, because total revenue surged to 143.8 billion dollars on the back of an exceptional iPhone quarter. The summer quarters typically show a much higher share.

Services carries far higher margins than hardware, so as it claims a larger share of revenue it claims an even larger share of profit, lifting Apple overall profitability. A higher Services share also means more recurring, predictable revenue and a steadier business, which is why investors increasingly value Apple more like a software company than a pure hardware maker.

The Services share of Apple revenue peaked at about 29 percent in the June quarter of fiscal 2025, the highest in the series. Each summer quarter has tended to set a new high, with the seasonal peak rising from around 10 percent in 2015 to 29 percent in 2025. The annual average, which smooths out the seasonality, reached about 26 percent in fiscal 2025.

Yes. Both the seasonal peaks and the seasonal troughs have risen steadily year after year, so the whole sawtooth pattern is marching upward. The smoothed, four-quarter-average share climbed from around 12 percent in 2015 to roughly 27 percent by late 2025. The pace may ease as the base grows, but the underlying direction remains clearly upward.

The iPhone remains Apple largest segment, accounting for around half of total revenue, so Services, at roughly a quarter on an annual basis, is still the second-largest source. However, Services is growing faster, so its share is rising while the iPhone share is broadly flat to slightly declining over the long term, gradually narrowing the gap between the two.

The Services share first crossed 20 percent in a single quarter around fiscal 2019, in the seasonally strong June quarter. It took several more years for the annual average to reach that level, because the holiday-quarter troughs lagged behind the summer peaks. The share first crossed 25 percent in a quarter around fiscal 2023.

No. Services revenue and its share can move in opposite directions in a single quarter. In the fiscal 2026 holiday quarter, Services revenue set an all-time record of 30 billion dollars, yet its share fell to about 21

percent, because total revenue rose even faster on a surge of iPhone sales. The share depends on Services revenue relative to the whole, not on its absolute size.

Sources

Apple Investor Relations - Quarterly Earnings - Source for reported Services and total revenue (Form 8-K, 10-Q, 10-K).

Apple Inc. quarterly and annual filings - Used for Services revenue, total revenue and the resulting share through fiscal Q1 2026.

Each quarter share is Services revenue divided by total company revenue, in percent. Recent quarters are computed from reported figures: the share was about 29 percent at its fiscal 2025 summer peak and about 21 percent in the fiscal 2026 holiday quarter. Earlier Services quarters are split from reported annual totals using the segment seasonal pattern, so percentages before fiscal 2024 are approximate. Apple revised its Services definition around 2018. Not investment advice.

STATISTICS REPORT

Apple iTunes, software, and services revenue quarterly FY 2013-2026

Updated Jun 18, 2026 · businesstats.com/apples-revenue-from-itunes-software-and-services

$31.0B RECORD QUARTER	**$109B** FY2025 TOTAL	**+16%** Q2 YOY GROWTH
~26% OF APPLE REVENUE	**~7x** SINCE 2013	**$3.9B** Q1 FY2013

Overview

Apple's revenue from iTunes, software and services from fiscal 1st quarter 2013 to 2nd quarter 2026

Services has become the engine of Apple growth. Once a small line called iTunes, software and services, the category, now reported as Services, has grown from under 4 billion dollars a quarter in fiscal 2013 to a record above 30 billion dollars a quarter in fiscal 2026. This report tracks Apple iTunes, software and services revenue every quarter from fiscal 2013 to the second quarter of fiscal 2026.

The Services segment bundles the App Store, Apple Music, Apple TV+, iCloud, AppleCare, Apple Pay, advertising and licensing, the recurring, high-margin revenue Apple earns after a device is sold. In fiscal 2026 the segment set new records in both quarters, reaching 30.98 billion dollars in the March quarter. The hardware that feeds it, including the latest headset, is covered in our Apple Vision Pro accessories analysis.

Apple Services Revenue, Quarterly FY 2013-2026 ($B)iTunes, software and services revenue each fiscal quarter.

Data:

Apple iTunes, software and services (Services) revenue, fiscal Q1 2013 to Q2 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple filings.

Note:

Annual figures are reported actuals in U.S. dollars. Recent quarters (fiscal 2024 to 2026) are as reported by Apple; earlier quarters are split from reported annual totals using the segment seasonal pattern, since Apple did not always report Services quarterly in the same form.Switch views with the toolbar.

The scale of the growth is striking. Services revenue has risen almost without interruption for more than a decade, posting double-digit annual growth in most years even as Apple total revenue plateaued. It is now Apple second-largest segment after the iPhone, and by far its fastest-growing, reshaping how investors value the company. The market increasingly prices Apple as much on Services as on hardware. That shift in perception is itself a milestone for the company.

A note on the data. Annual Services figures are reported actuals in U.S. dollars. The most recent quarters, fiscal 2024 through 2026, are as Apple reported them; earlier quarters are split from reported annual totals using the segment mild seasonal pattern, because Apple did not always publish Services on the same quarterly basis. Apple also revised its Services definition around 2018. Where that change affects the figures, it is noted in the methodology. Readers can treat the broad trend as solid even where exact quarters are estimated. The shape of the growth is not in doubt.

Revenue Data Table

Apple Services Revenue by Quarter, FY 2013-2026

Apple Services Revenue by Fiscal Quarter, 2013-2026 ($B)Click any column to sort

FISCAL QUARTER	SERVICES REVENUE	YOY CHANGE
Q1'13	$3.85B	n/a
Q2'13	$3.95B	n/a
Q3'13	$4.04B	n/a
Q4'13	$4.21B	n/a
Q1'14	$4.33B	+12.5%
Q2'14	$4.44B	+12.4%
Q3'14	$4.55B	+12.6%
Q4'14	$4.73B	+12.4%
Q1'15	$4.78B	+10.4%

Q2'15	$4.90B	+10.4%
Q3'15	$5.02B	+10.3%
Q4'15	$5.22B	+10.4%
Q1'16	$5.84B	+22.2%
Q2'16	$5.99B	+22.2%
Q3'16	$6.14B	+22.3%
Q4'16	$6.38B	+22.2%
Q1'17	$7.20B	+23.3%
Q2'17	$7.38B	+23.2%
Q3'17	$7.55B	+23.0%
Q4'17	$7.85B	+23.0%
Q1'18	$8.93B	+24.0%
Q2'18	$9.15B	+24.0%
Q3'18	$9.37B	+24.1%
Q4'18	$9.74B	+24.1%
Q1'19	$11.11B	+24.4%
Q2'19	$11.39B	+24.5%
Q3'19	$11.67B	+24.5%
Q4'19	$12.13B	+24.5%
Q1'20	$12.90B	+16.1%
Q2'20	$13.23B	+16.2%
Q3'20	$13.55B	+16.1%
Q4'20	$14.09B	+16.2%
Q1'21	$16.42B	+27.3%
Q2'21	$16.83B	+27.2%

Q3'21	$17.24B	+27.2%
Q4'21	$17.93B	+27.3%
Q1'22	$18.75B	+14.2%
Q2'22	$19.22B	+14.2%
Q3'22	$19.69B	+14.2%
Q4'22	$20.47B	+14.2%
Q1'23	$20.45B	+9.1%
Q2'23	$20.96B	+9.1%
Q3'23	$21.47B	+9.0%
Q4'23	$22.32B	+9.0%
Q1'24	$23.12B	+13.1%
Q2'24	$23.87B	+13.9%
Q3'24	$24.21B	+12.8%
Q4'24	$24.97B	+11.9%
Q1'25	$26.34B	+13.9%
Q2'25	$26.65B	+11.6%
Q3'25	$27.42B	+13.3%
Q4'25	$28.80B	+15.3%
Q1'26	$30.00B	+13.9%
Q2'26	$30.98B	+16.2%

The table lists Apple Services revenue for every quarter from fiscal 2013 to the second quarter of fiscal 2026, with each quarter fiscal year and the year-on-year change. The figures climb almost every quarter, from under 4 billion dollars in 2013 to above 30 billion in 2026. Sorting the columns shows both the steady ascent and the mild within-year seasonality of the segment. The numbers reward a closer look at how evenly the growth has spread. Almost every cell in the table is larger than the one above it. The few exceptions reflect only the gentle seasonal dip. The underlying direction never wavers for long.

Annual Totals

A Sevenfold Rise

On an annual basis, the growth is even clearer. Services revenue rose from about 16 billion dollars in fiscal 2013 to roughly 109 billion dollars in fiscal 2025, a near sevenfold increase in twelve years. The fiscal 2026 part-year total, covering only the first two quarters, already exceeds 60 billion dollars, putting the segment on course for another record full year. At the current run-rate the segment is heading toward 120 billion dollars for fiscal 2026. That would extend the streak of record years without interruption. Momentum, once established here, has been hard to stop. A decade of compounding has built real inertia. Reversing such a trend would take a major shock. Nothing on the horizon currently threatens it.

Each year has added more revenue than the last in absolute terms. The segment crossed 20 billion dollars in fiscal 2016, 40 billion around fiscal 2018, and 100 billion in fiscal 2025. This compounding growth has made Services a larger business than the entire Mac line, as our Apple Mac revenue analysis shows, and comparable in scale to the iPad and Mac segments combined. Few would have predicted such scale from the modest iTunes category of a decade ago. The segment has outgrown its own origins many times over. What began as media downloads is now a vast services empire. The breadth of today offerings would be unrecognisable in 2013.

Apple Services Revenue, Annual FY 2013-2026 ($B)Full-year Services revenue; 2026 is a part-year total.

Data:

Derived from Apple Services revenue, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple filings.

Note:

Growth rates, shares, era averages, cumulative totals and the sub-segment split are calculated from reported Apple figures. Apple changed its Services definition around 2018, so figures across that transition are approximate. The internal Services breakdown is a BusinessStats estimate, as Apple does not report it.Switch views with the toolbar.

The annual trajectory has been remarkably smooth for a business of its size. Unlike Apple hardware lines, which swing with product cycles, Services has grown steadily because much of its revenue is recurring, subscriptions, storage, warranties and a cut of every App Store sale. That smoothness is one reason investors prize the segment so highly, valuing it more like a software company than a hardware maker. That re-rating has been worth hundreds of billions of dollars in market value. The quality of the revenue,

not just its size, drives that premium.

Growth Rate

Durable Double Digits

Services has sustained double-digit annual growth for most of its history, a rare feat for a business of its scale. Growth ran above 20 percent in the late 2010s, peaking around 27 percent in fiscal 2021 as pandemic-era digital spending surged, before settling into a steadier low double-digit pace of 12 to 14 percent in recent years.

Even the slower recent growth is impressive given the base. Adding 12 percent to a 100-billion-dollar business means roughly 13 billion dollars of new revenue a year, more than the entire annual revenue of many large companies. The fiscal 2023 slowdown to single digits proved temporary, with growth re-accelerating in 2024 and 2025, as reflected in our The brief dip proved to be a pause rather than a turning point, a point clear in our Apple total revenue analysis.

Apple Services Annual Growth Rate (% YoY)Year-on-year growth in Services revenue.

Data:

Derived from Apple Services revenue, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple filings.

Note:

Growth rates, shares, era averages, cumulative totals and the sub-segment split are calculated from reported Apple figures. Apple changed its Services definition around 2018, so figures across that transition are approximate. The internal Services breakdown is a BusinessStats estimate, as Apple does not report it.Switch views with the toolbar.

The durability of this growth is what sets Services apart. Where iPhone revenue rises and falls with each launch cycle, Services climbs in nearly every quarter, giving Apple a dependable, expanding base of high-margin income. This consistency has become central to the investment case for Apple, smoothing the lumpiness of its hardware business. Investors increasingly treat Services as the steady core of the Apple story. It is the part of the business they can forecast with the most confidence. Predictability is a rare and valuable trait in technology revenue. It lets Apple plan and investors model with unusual certainty. That confidence is part of the segment value.

Share of Revenue

More Than a Quarter

As Services has grown, so has its share of Apple total revenue. The segment accounted for under 10 percent of company revenue in fiscal 2013. By fiscal 2025 it had risen to roughly 26 percent, more than a quarter of everything Apple sells, even as total revenue itself grew strongly over the period.

This rising share matters because Services carries far higher margins than hardware. A dollar of Services revenue contributes much more to profit than a dollar of iPhone or Mac revenue, which is why the segment growing share has lifted Apple overall profitability, a pattern visible in our Apple net income analysis. Services now drives a disproportionate part of company profit. Its margin advantage magnifies every dollar of revenue it adds. The profit impact of the segment outweighs its already large revenue. In profit terms, Services punches well above its revenue weight. That leverage is central to why the segment matters so much. It is the clearest example of quality over quantity in Apple results.

Services as a Share of Apple Total Revenue (%)Services revenue as a percent of Apple total revenue.

Data:

Derived from Apple Services revenue, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple filings.

Note:

Growth rates, shares, era averages, cumulative totals and the sub-segment split are calculated from reported Apple figures. Apple changed its Services definition around 2018, so figures across that transition are approximate. The internal Services breakdown is a BusinessStats estimate, as Apple does not report it.Switch views with the toolbar.

The share would be higher still but for the strength of the iPhone, which remains Apple largest segment and grew sharply in fiscal 2026, as our Apple iPhone revenue analysis shows. Even so, the long-term direction is clear: Services is steadily claiming a larger slice of Apple revenue, and an even larger slice of its profit, year after year. The trend has been remarkably steady across more than a decade. Steadiness on this scale is rare among businesses of any kind.

Recent Quarters

Records Almost Every Quarter

The most recent quarters show the segment at full strength. From fiscal 2024 through fiscal 2026, Services set a new all-time revenue record almost every single quarter, climbing from about 23 billion dollars in early

fiscal 2024 to 30.98 billion dollars in the second quarter of fiscal 2026, the highest in the segment history. Each new quarter has tended to reset the record set by the one before. The pattern of serial records has become routine for the segment. Each earnings season brings another high to report. The cadence of records has become part of the Apple narrative.

This run of records reflects broad-based strength across the segment. Apple has cited growth in advertising, the App Store and cloud services as the main drivers, alongside steady gains in subscriptions and AppleCare. The breadth of the growth, spread across many sub-services rather than one, is what makes it so durable. No single service can derail the segment by stumbling. That spread of risk is a quiet strength of the business.

Apple Services Revenue, Recent Quarters FY 2024-2026 ($B)Quarterly Services revenue over the latest three fiscal years.

Data:

Derived from Apple Services revenue, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple filings.

Note:

Growth rates, shares, era averages, cumulative totals and the sub-segment split are calculated from reported Apple figures. Apple changed its Services definition around 2018, so figures across that transition are approximate. The internal Services breakdown is a BusinessStats estimate, as Apple does not report it.Switch views with the toolbar.

The recent quarters also show Services growth outpacing the company as a whole in most periods, steadily lifting its share of revenue. With Apple installed base now above two and a half billion active devices, each one a potential Services customer, the segment has a vast and still-growing foundation to build on, a scale set in context by our Few companies anywhere can match that reach, as shown in our big tech revenue comparison analysis.

Cumulative

Over 600 Billion Booked

Adding up every quarter since fiscal 2013 shows the cumulative scale of the Services business. In total, Apple has booked well over 600 billion dollars in Services revenue across the period, a figure that has grown faster in recent years as quarterly revenue has climbed toward 30 billion dollars.

The shape of the cumulative curve tells the story of acceleration. The first 100 billion dollars of cumulative Services revenue took several years to accumulate; the most recent 100 billion took barely more than a year, as the quarterly run-rate has more than tripled since the middle of the last decade. The curve steepens visibly toward the present. Acceleration, not just growth, is the defining feature of the chart. The slope of the curve has steepened with almost every passing year.

Cumulative Apple Services Revenue Since FY 2013 ($B)Running total of Services revenue across the period.

Data:

Derived from Apple Services revenue, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple filings.

Note:

Growth rates, shares, era averages, cumulative totals and the sub-segment split are calculated from reported Apple figures. Apple changed its Services definition around 2018, so figures across that transition are approximate. The internal Services breakdown is a BusinessStats estimate, as Apple does not report it.Switch views with the toolbar.

This cumulative total underlines how Services has quietly become one of the largest software-and-content businesses in the world. The revenue it has generated over the period rivals the lifetime revenue of major standalone technology companies, yet it sits as just one segment within Apple, a scale reflected in our biggest companies by market value analysis.

By Era

The Average Quarter Transformed

Grouping the data into eras shows how the average quarter has transformed. In fiscal 2013 to 2015, Services averaged under 5 billion dollars a quarter. By fiscal 2019 to 2021 that had risen to about 14 billion, and in fiscal 2025 to 2026 the average quarter exceeds 28 billion dollars, roughly six times the early-period figure. The transformation in a single decade is hard to overstate. A side business has become one of Apple defining strengths. The shift has reshaped the entire company financial profile.

Each era has also seen the segment broaden. The early years were dominated by the App Store and iTunes; later eras added Apple Music, iCloud at scale, AppleCare, Apple Pay, advertising and the streaming services. This diversification has both fuelled the growth and made it more resilient, since no single service dominates the total. Diversity has been as important to the segment as growth. The two qualities have

reinforced each other throughout. Growth funded new services, and new services drove growth. That virtuous circle remains intact today.

Average Quarterly Services Revenue by Era ($B)Mean Services revenue per quarter, grouped by period.

Data:

Derived from Apple Services revenue, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple filings.

Note:

Growth rates, shares, era averages, cumulative totals and the sub-segment split are calculated from reported Apple figures. Apple changed its Services definition around 2018, so figures across that transition are approximate. The internal Services breakdown is a BusinessStats estimate, as Apple does not report it.Switch views with the toolbar.

The era view captures the essential point: Services has not just grown, it has changed character, from a modest adjunct to Apple hardware into a major business in its own right. The average quarter today generates more revenue than the entire segment did in a full year as recently as the early 2010s, a transformation echoed across Apple lineup in our Apple revenue by segment analysis.

Seasonality

A Gentle Climb Each Year

Within each fiscal year, Services shows a mild but consistent seasonal pattern. Unlike the iPhone, whose revenue spikes sharply in the holiday first quarter, Services revenue rises gently across the fiscal year, with each quarter typically a little higher than the last as subscriptions accumulate and usage grows.

The first fiscal quarter, covering the December holiday season, is the lowest as a share of the year, while the fourth quarter, ending in September, is usually the highest. The difference is small, only a couple of percentage points between quarters, reflecting how recurring revenue smooths out the seasonality that dominates Apple hardware sales.

Apple Services Seasonality by Fiscal Quarter (% of year)Average share of annual Services revenue by fiscal quarter.

Data:

Derived from Apple Services revenue, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple filings.

Note:

Growth rates, shares, era averages, cumulative totals and the sub-segment split are calculated from reported Apple figures. Apple changed its Services definition around 2018, so figures across that transition are approximate. The internal Services breakdown is a BusinessStats estimate, as Apple does not report it.Switch views with the toolbar.

This gentle seasonality is itself a sign of the segment quality. A business whose revenue rises steadily quarter after quarter, with little of the boom-and-bust of product launches, is exactly what investors value, and it stands in sharp contrast to the pronounced seasonality of the iPad business shown in our Apple iPad revenue analysis.

Milestones

Crossing the Thresholds

Tracking the segment at four-year intervals shows the pace of its climb. In the first quarter of fiscal 2013, Services generated under 4 billion dollars. By early fiscal 2021 a comparable quarter had reached about 16 billion, and by the second quarter of fiscal 2026 it stood at nearly 31 billion dollars, roughly eight times the 2013 figure.

These milestone quarters mark the segment passage through successive thresholds. Services first crossed 10 billion dollars in a quarter in the late 2010s, 20 billion in the early 2020s, and 30 billion in fiscal 2026. Each threshold arrived faster than a simple trend would predict, a sign of the compounding nature of recurring revenue.

Apple Services Revenue at Four-Year Intervals ($B)Quarterly Services revenue sampled every four years.

Data:

Derived from Apple Services revenue, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple filings.

Note:

Growth rates, shares, era averages, cumulative totals and the sub-segment split are calculated from reported Apple figures. Apple changed its Services definition around 2018, so figures across that transition are approximate. The internal Services breakdown is a BusinessStats estimate, as Apple does not report it.Switch views with the toolbar.

The milestones make the abstract growth concrete. A segment that once added a billion dollars of quarterly revenue every few years now adds several billion in a single year. This acceleration is why Services has moved from a footnote in Apple results to one of the most closely watched numbers each quarter, on a par in importance with the iPhone in our share of revenue analysis.

Inside Services

What Makes Up the Segment

Apple does not break out the components of Services, but estimates suggest the App Store is the largest single piece, contributing roughly a third of the total. Advertising, iCloud and cloud storage, AppleCare and Apple Music each add a meaningful share, with the streaming and gaming services, Apple TV+ and Apple Arcade, making up the remainder.

This composition explains the segment resilience. Because the revenue is spread across many distinct services, a slowdown in any one of them has only a limited effect on the total. The App Store remains the anchor, but the growth of advertising and cloud services has reduced the segment dependence on any single source over time.

Estimated Apple Services Revenue by Sub-Segment (%)Estimated share of Services revenue by component.

Data:

Derived from Apple Services revenue, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple filings.

Note:

Growth rates, shares, era averages, cumulative totals and the sub-segment split are calculated from reported Apple figures. Apple changed its Services definition around 2018, so figures across that transition are approximate. The internal Services breakdown is a BusinessStats estimate, as Apple does not report it.Switch views with the toolbar.

The internal mix also points to where future growth may come from. Advertising and cloud services have been among the fastest-growing pieces, while the App Store provides a large, steady base. As Apple installed base expands, each component has room to grow, supporting the segment continued climb. The exact split, however, remains a BusinessStats estimate rather than an Apple disclosure.

$31BRecord QuarterQ2 FY2026. $109BFY2025 TotalUp 14%. ~7xSince 2013Annual growth. ~26%Of RevenueAnd rising.

Apple iTunes, software and services revenue tells the clearest story of where the company is heading. From under 4 billion dollars a quarter in fiscal 2013 to a record 30.98 billion in fiscal 2026, Services has grown almost without pause, posting double-digit annual growth in most years and rising from under 10 percent of Apple revenue to more than a quarter. It is now the company second-largest and fastest-growing segment.

More than its size, it is the character of the Services business, recurring, high-margin and diversified, that has reshaped how Apple is valued. The segment generates a disproportionate share of profit, smooths the lumpiness of hardware cycles, and grows from an installed base of more than two and a half billion devices. For a company long defined by the iPhone, the steady rise of Services is the most important financial trend of the decade, a shift set in the wider context of our Apple Vision Pro price list analysis of where Apple is investing next.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: Apple Services Revenue

In fiscal 2025, Apple Services (iTunes, software and services) generated about 109 billion dollars, up 14 percent from fiscal 2024. In fiscal 2026 the segment set records in both quarters, reaching 30.0 billion dollars in the first quarter and an all-time high of 30.98 billion dollars in the second quarter. Services is Apple second-largest segment after the iPhone.

Apple Services, historically called iTunes, software and services, includes the App Store, Apple Music, Apple TV+, Apple Arcade, iCloud and cloud storage, AppleCare, Apple Pay, advertising, and licensing (such as the payment from Google to be the default search engine). It represents the recurring, higher-margin revenue Apple earns from its installed base after a device has been sold.

Apple Services has grown by double digits in most years. Growth ran above 20 percent in the late 2010s and peaked near 27 percent in fiscal 2021 during the pandemic surge in digital spending. In recent years it has settled into a steadier pace of roughly 12 to 14 percent a year, which still adds around 13 billion dollars of new revenue annually given the large base.

Services rose from under 10 percent of Apple total revenue in fiscal 2013 to roughly 26 percent in fiscal 2025, more than a quarter of everything Apple sells. Because Services carries much higher margins than

hardware, it contributes an even larger share of Apple profit than of its revenue, which is a key reason investors value the segment so highly.

In fiscal 2026, Apple Services revenue reached 30.0 billion dollars in the first quarter (ended December 2025), a record, up 14 percent year over year, and 30.98 billion dollars in the second quarter (ended March 2026), another all-time high, up 16 percent. Both quarters set new records for the segment, continuing its long run of growth.

Services matters because it is recurring, high-margin and fast-growing. Unlike hardware, which swings with product cycles, Services revenue climbs in nearly every quarter, giving Apple a dependable and expanding base of profit. It carries higher margins than the iPhone or Mac, contributes a disproportionate share of profit, and helps make Apple less dependent on any single product.

Services is Apple second-largest segment, behind only the iPhone and well ahead of the Mac, iPad and Wearables. At roughly 109 billion dollars in fiscal 2025, the Services segment is larger than the entire Mac and iPad businesses combined, and the gap continues to widen as Services grows faster than Apple hardware lines.

iTunes, software and services was Apple original name for what is now the Services segment. In the early 2010s it covered iTunes media sales, App Store revenue, iCloud, AppleCare and software. Apple renamed and broadened the category to Services in the mid-2010s and revised its definition around 2018, which is why figures across that transition are approximate.

Apple Services revenue has been remarkably consistent, growing in nearly every quarter for more than a decade. Annual growth slowed to single digits in fiscal 2023 amid a broader spending slowdown, but the segment did not decline, and growth re-accelerated to double digits in fiscal 2024 and 2025. The recurring nature of much of its revenue makes outright declines rare.

Apple has cited advertising, the App Store and cloud services as the main recent drivers, alongside steady gains in subscriptions and AppleCare. The growth rests on Apple installed base of more than two and a half billion active devices, each a potential Services customer. As that base grows and users spend more on subscriptions and apps, Services revenue continues to climb.

Sources

Apple Investor Relations - Quarterly Earnings - Source for reported Services revenue (Form 8-K, 10-Q, 10-K).

Apple Inc. quarterly and annual filings - Used for annual Services totals and recent quarterly figures through fiscal Q2 2026.

Annual Services figures are reported actuals in U.S. dollars. Recent quarters (fiscal 2024 to 2026) are as reported by Apple: 30.0 billion dollars in Q1 FY2026 and 30.98 billion in Q2 FY2026. Earlier quarters are split from reported annual totals using the segment seasonal pattern. Apple revised its Services definition around 2018, so figures across that transition are approximate. The internal sub-segment split is a BusinessStats estimate, as Apple does not disclose it. Not investment advice.

STATISTICS REPORT

Apple Vision Pro accessories price list in the United States 2026

Updated Jun 18, 2026 · businesstats.com/apple-vision-pro-accessories-price-list

$499 APPLECARE+ 2YR	$199 TRAVEL CASE	$99–149 ZEISS LENSES
$99 EACH BAND	$19 CHEAPEST	~$1,200 FULL KIT

Overview

Apple Vision Pro accessories price list in the United States in 2026

The Apple Vision Pro starts at 3,499 dollars, but the headset is only the beginning of the cost. A range of official accessories, from head bands and optical lenses to a travel case and extended warranty, carry their own prices. This report is a full price list of Apple Vision Pro accessories in the United States in 2026, ranking every official add-on by cost and grouping them so buyers can see exactly what each extra adds. The goal is a single, clear reference for what it really costs to equip a Vision Pro. Every price here is an official US list price, not a third-party estimate. That makes the list a reliable starting point for any budget. Buyers can trust the numbers without hunting for them. Each one comes straight from the official store.

The accessories span a wide range, from a 19-dollar polishing cloth to a 499-dollar AppleCare+ plan. The headset price itself, by storage size, is covered in our Apple Vision Pro price list analysis; this report focuses purely on the accessories that sit around it. Together, the official Apple, ZEISS and Belkin add-ons form a catalogue worth well over 1,600 dollars if bought in full. No single buyer would purchase all of them, but the list shows the full scope of what is available. The catalogue is broad enough to cover comfort, vision, power, protection and repair. Few consumer devices come with so long an official accessory list. The breadth itself signals how much the headset expects of its owner. Owning a Vision Pro is a long-term commitment.

Apple Vision Pro Accessory Price List, US 2026 ($)US list price of every official Vision Pro accessory.

Data:

Apple Vision Pro accessory US prices, compiled by BusinessStats from Apple, ZEISS and Belkin.

Note:

Prices are US list prices as of June 2026, in U.S. dollars before tax. AppleCare+ is shown as the 2-year plan. The headset itself is sold separately from 3,499 dollars and is not counted as an accessory here.Switch views with the toolbar.

Few buyers need every accessory. Most choose a handful, a travel case, a pair of optical inserts, perhaps AppleCare+, which is why the typical real spend on accessories lands somewhere between a few hundred and a thousand dollars. Still, the price list matters, because the accessories are where the true cost of living with a Vision Pro quietly climbs above the advertised headline.

A note on scope. All prices are US list prices, before sales tax, as of June 2026. They come from Apple, from ZEISS (the optical-insert maker) and from Belkin (the battery holder). The headset, sold separately from 3,499 dollars, is not counted as an accessory. Prices in other countries differ once local taxes and currency are applied. The US list price is the cleanest baseline for comparison. Local taxes and currency only push the figures higher elsewhere. US buyers see the lowest of these prices. Everywhere else, the same kit costs more. Currency and tax both work against overseas buyers.

Price Data Table

Apple Vision Pro Accessory Prices, United States 2026

Apple Vision Pro Accessory US List Prices and Category, 2026Click any column to sort

ACCESSORY	US PRICE	CATEGORY
AppleCare+ (2-year)	$499	AppleCare+
Travel Case	$199	Protection
Battery Pack	$199	Power
Light Seal	$199	Comfort & fit
ZEISS Prescription	$149	Vision
Solo Knit Band	$99	Comfort & fit

Dual Loop Band	$99	Comfort & fit
ZEISS Readers	$99	Vision
Belkin Battery Holder	$50	Power
30W Power Adapter	$39	Power
Light Seal Cushion	$29	Comfort & fit
Polishing Cloth	$19	Protection

The table lists every official Apple Vision Pro accessory with its US list price and category. The prices run from 19 dollars to 499 dollars, with most clustered between 99 and 199 dollars. Sorting the price column shows how the catalogue splits into a few expensive items, AppleCare+ and the larger hardware, and a long tail of smaller add-ons under 100 dollars.

By Category

Where the Money Goes

Grouping the accessories by purpose shows where the money goes. The biggest single category is AppleCare+, the extended warranty, at 499 dollars on its own. After that come comfort and fit items, the head bands and light seals, which together total over 400 dollars across the catalogue, then power accessories, vision inserts and protection.

The comfort and fit group, the Solo Knit Band, Dual Loop Band, Light Seal and Light Seal Cushion, reflects how much of the Vision Pro experience depends on a good physical fit. The power group, built around the 199-dollar battery, keeps the headset running, since its built-in battery lasts only around two hours, a constraint explored in our Apple Vision Pro shipments analysis.

Vision Pro Accessory Spend by Category ($)Total catalogue cost grouped by accessory purpose.

Data:

Derived from Apple Vision Pro accessory US list prices, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Category totals, bundles, percentages and cumulative kit costs are calculated from Apple, ZEISS and Belkin US list prices as of June 2026, before tax. Buyers choose only the accessories they need, so most spend far less than the full catalogue total.Switch views with the toolbar.

Vision accessories, the ZEISS optical inserts, are essential for the many buyers who wear glasses, since the Vision Pro cannot be worn over spectacles. Protection, chiefly the 199-dollar travel case, rounds out the catalogue. Seen by category, the accessories are less a random list than a set of practical needs, comfort, power, vision, protection and warranty, each carrying its own price. Viewed this way, the accessory list reads as a map of what the Vision Pro demands of its owner. Comfort, sight, power and protection each come at a price. Together they define the real cost of ownership. The headset price alone never tells the whole story.

AppleCare+

The Priciest Add-On

AppleCare+ is the single most expensive Vision Pro accessory, at 499 dollars for two years of coverage, or 24.99 dollars a month. It buys unlimited repairs for accidental damage and express replacement service, but each accidental-damage repair still carries a 299-dollar deductible on top of the plan price. For a delicate, face-worn device, many buyers consider it close to essential. The plan is the single largest accessory line on any Vision Pro order. At 499 dollars it costs more than two head bands and a travel case combined. No other single accessory comes close. AppleCare+ dominates the upper end of the list.

Comparing the payment options, the flat two-year plan at 499 dollars is cheaper than paying 24.99 dollars a month, which reaches roughly 600 dollars over the same 24 months. The monthly route only makes sense for buyers who want to keep their options open or spread the cost. For anyone planning to keep the headset two years, the upfront plan is the better value. The monthly option mainly suits those unsure how long they will keep the device. For committed owners, paying once is plainly cheaper. The saving is small but real over two years. Over the life of the device it adds up.

AppleCare+ Cost: Monthly vs 2-Year Plan ($)Cumulative cost of paying monthly versus the flat 2-year plan.

Data:

Derived from Apple Vision Pro accessory US list prices, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Category totals, bundles, percentages and cumulative kit costs are calculated from Apple, ZEISS and Belkin US list prices as of June 2026, before tax. Buyers choose only the accessories they need, so most spend

far less than the full catalogue total.Switch views with the toolbar.

The economics of AppleCare+ reflect the high cost of repairing the Vision Pro. With a 299-dollar deductible per incident, the plan pays for itself after a single serious accident, given that out-of-warranty repairs can run far higher. The high price of the warranty is itself a signal of how expensive the underlying hardware is to fix, a theme that runs through Apple high-end product margins in our The cost of repair is a hidden tax on owning premium hardware, a factor visible in our Apple net income analysis.

Bands & Fit

Comfort Accessories

Comfort accessories are among the most commonly bought add-ons. The Vision Pro ships with one band, but the alternate band, the Solo Knit Band or the Dual Loop Band depending on which came in the box, costs 99 dollars. Many owners buy the second style to vary the fit between the single-band comfort of the Solo Knit and the extra support of the Dual Loop. Having both on hand lets owners match the band to the task. The choice of band noticeably changes the comfort of a long session.

The Light Seal, the part that blocks outside light and shapes the fit against the face, costs 199 dollars as a replacement, with the foam Light Seal Cushion a further 29 dollars. Because the Light Seal is matched to a buyer face scan and, where needed, to optical inserts, replacing it is more involved than swapping a simple strap, which is reflected in its higher price. The Light Seal is one of the few comfort parts that cannot simply be clipped on and off. Its fit is tied to the buyer face scan and any optical inserts.

Vision Pro Comfort & Fit Accessory Prices ($)Prices of bands, Light Seal and cushion.

Data:

Derived from Apple Vision Pro accessory US list prices, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Category totals, bundles, percentages and cumulative kit costs are calculated from Apple, ZEISS and Belkin US list prices as of June 2026, before tax. Buyers choose only the accessories they need, so most spend far less than the full catalogue total.Switch views with the toolbar.

Together, the comfort and fit accessories can add up quickly: a spare band, a replacement Light Seal and a cushion total over 320 dollars. For a device worn directly on the face for long sessions, these fit components are not luxuries but practical necessities, and their prices reflect the precision engineering

Apple builds into the parts that touch the user. Comfort, on a face-worn device, is not a luxury but a requirement. A poor fit makes even a 3,499-dollar headset unpleasant to wear.

ZEISS Lenses

Vision Inserts

For the many buyers who wear glasses, ZEISS Optical Inserts are not optional but essential, since the Vision Pro is not designed to be worn over spectacles. The inserts attach magnetically inside the headset. Reader lenses, for those who only need magnification, cost 99 dollars, while custom prescription inserts cost 149 dollars and require a valid US prescription. For glasses-wearers, one of these two options is effectively mandatory. Without inserts, the headset simply cannot be used clearly.

The 50-dollar gap between readers and prescription inserts reflects the custom grinding each prescription pair requires. For most glasses-wearers, the 149-dollar prescription inserts are the only way to use the Vision Pro comfortably, effectively making them a mandatory part of the purchase rather than a true accessory, an expense as fundamental to the experience as the iPhone is to Apple in our Apple iPhone revenue analysis.

Vision Pro ZEISS Optical Insert Prices ($)Reader versus prescription optical insert prices.

Data:

Derived from Apple Vision Pro accessory US list prices, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Category totals, bundles, percentages and cumulative kit costs are calculated from Apple, ZEISS and Belkin US list prices as of June 2026, before tax. Buyers choose only the accessories they need, so most spend far less than the full catalogue total.Switch views with the toolbar.

Apple notes that ZEISS prescription inserts may be reimbursable under US health spending accounts, which can soften their cost. Even so, for the substantial share of buyers who need vision correction, the inserts add 99 or 149 dollars to the real price of the headset, one of the clearest examples of how Vision Pro accessories turn a 3,499-dollar device into a more expensive purchase.

Power

Battery Accessories

The Vision Pro relies on an external battery pack, and power accessories form their own price group. A spare or replacement Battery Pack costs 199 dollars, a significant sum that reflects how central the battery is to a headset whose internal power lasts only about two hours. Buyers who want all-day use often keep a second battery on hand. The battery is the accessory most tied to how the headset is actually used. Heavy users feel its 199-dollar cost more than any other add-on. A spare battery is the most repeatable accessory expense.

Smaller power add-ons fill out the group. The Belkin Battery Holder, which clips the battery to a belt or pocket for easier mobile use, costs about 50 dollars, while a spare 30-watt USB-C power adapter is around 39 dollars. These lower-cost items make the battery more practical to carry, addressing one of the most-criticised aspects of the Vision Pro design. The tethered battery remains the headset most-discussed practical compromise. Its accessories exist largely to soften that compromise. The holder and adapter make the battery easier to live with.

Vision Pro Power Accessory Prices ($)Prices of the battery pack, holder and power adapter.

Data:

Derived from Apple Vision Pro accessory US list prices, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Category totals, bundles, percentages and cumulative kit costs are calculated from Apple, ZEISS and Belkin US list prices as of June 2026, before tax. Buyers choose only the accessories they need, so most spend far less than the full catalogue total.Switch views with the toolbar.

The power accessories highlight a real limitation: a premium headset tethered to an external battery that lasts only a couple of hours. The 199-dollar cost of a spare battery, in particular, is a recurring expense for heavy users, adding to the ownership cost in a way that competing all-in-one headsets, tracked in our VR headset market revenue analysis, largely avoid.

Essential Bundle

What Most Buyers Add

Most buyers settle on a small essential bundle rather than the full catalogue. For a typical owner, that means three items: the 199-dollar travel case to carry the headset safely, the 149-dollar prescription inserts

to see clearly, and the 499-dollar AppleCare+ plan to protect a fragile and expensive device. Together these come to roughly 847 dollars. This is the figure most prospective buyers should plan around. It reflects what owners actually buy, not the full catalogue.

This essential bundle nearly doubles the practical cost of the cheaper accessories and adds close to a quarter to the 3,499-dollar base price. It is the realistic floor of accessory spending for a glasses-wearing buyer who wants protection, rather than the bare minimum. Buyers who skip AppleCare+ or the case spend less, but accept more risk.

Vision Pro Essential Accessory Bundle ($)The accessories a typical buyer actually adds.

Data:

Derived from Apple Vision Pro accessory US list prices, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Category totals, bundles, percentages and cumulative kit costs are calculated from Apple, ZEISS and Belkin US list prices as of June 2026, before tax. Buyers choose only the accessories they need, so most spend far less than the full catalogue total.Switch views with the toolbar.

The essential bundle is the clearest answer to the question of what Vision Pro accessories really cost in practice. Not the full 1,600-dollar catalogue, nor zero, but somewhere around 800 to 900 dollars for the items most owners genuinely use. It is this bundle, more than any single price, that defines the true accessory cost of the headset.

Vs Headset

Accessories in Proportion

Set against the 3,499-dollar headset, the accessories range from a rounding error to a meaningful share. A minimal buyer who adds only prescription inserts spends 149 dollars, about four percent of the headset price. A typical buyer with the essential bundle spends around 847 dollars, nearly a quarter of the base price.

A buyer who wants the full practical kit, case, spare battery, prescription inserts, AppleCare+, a spare band and the Belkin holder, spends well over 1,200 dollars on accessories alone, more than a third of the headset price. At that point the accessories cost as much as an entire entry iPad, a comparison drawn out in our The full kit rivals the price of a separate device, as shown in our Apple iPad revenue analysis.

Vision Pro Accessory Spend vs Headset Price ($)Accessory kits compared with the 3,499-dollar headset.

Data:

Derived from Apple Vision Pro accessory US list prices, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Category totals, bundles, percentages and cumulative kit costs are calculated from Apple, ZEISS and Belkin US list prices as of June 2026, before tax. Buyers choose only the accessories they need, so most spend far less than the full catalogue total.Switch views with the toolbar.

This comparison frames the accessories in proportion. They are not trivial: a fully-equipped Vision Pro buyer can spend more on add-ons than the entire price of many other Apple products. Yet against a 3,499-dollar headset, even the full accessory kit adds only a third again to the total, keeping the headset itself firmly the dominant cost, as our Apple Mac revenue analysis shows for configurable devices.

Share of Price

A Third at Most

Expressed as a share of the headset price, the accessories climb in clear steps. The minimal kit of prescription inserts is about four percent of the 3,499-dollar base. The typical essential bundle is roughly 24 percent. The full practical kit reaches around 35 percent of the headset price, a substantial addition by any measure.

These percentages put the accessory cost in perspective. Even at the high end, accessories add about a third to the headset price, meaning the headset remains the overwhelming majority of any Vision Pro purchase. The accessories matter, but they scale the total by a fraction rather than transforming it, unlike the headset itself which dominates every configuration.

Accessories as a Share of the Headset Price (%)Accessory spend as a percent of the 3,499-dollar base.

Data:

Derived from Apple Vision Pro accessory US list prices, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Category totals, bundles, percentages and cumulative kit costs are calculated from Apple, ZEISS and Belkin US list prices as of June 2026, before tax. Buyers choose only the accessories they need, so most spend

far less than the full catalogue total.Switch views with the toolbar.

The rising share also shows how accessory spending is a choice. A disciplined buyer can keep accessories to a few percent of the total, while an all-in owner pushes them past a third. This flexibility is part of why the real cost of a Vision Pro varies so widely between owners, even though the headset price is fixed, a pattern echoed across Apple lineup in our Apple revenue by segment analysis.

Total Kit

From 3,499 to 4,600

Tracing the cumulative cost from the bare headset through the accessories shows the full kit assembling step by step. Starting at 3,499 dollars, adding the travel case brings the total to 3,698, prescription inserts to 3,847, a spare battery to 4,046, AppleCare+ to 4,545, and a spare band to 4,644 dollars, more than 1,100 dollars above the headline price.

Each step in this buildup is individually modest next to the base cost, but together they transform the total. The progression from 3,499 to over 4,600 dollars happens in increments that each feel small, a pattern that makes the full kit cost easy to underestimate at the point of purchase. The accessories quietly add more than a thousand dollars.

How the Vision Pro Kit Cost Builds Up ($)Cumulative cost from the headset through the accessories.

Data:

Derived from Apple Vision Pro accessory US list prices, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Category totals, bundles, percentages and cumulative kit costs are calculated from Apple, ZEISS and Belkin US list prices as of June 2026, before tax. Buyers choose only the accessories they need, so most spend far less than the full catalogue total.Switch views with the toolbar.

This cumulative view captures the essential lesson of the Vision Pro accessory price list: the 3,499-dollar headline is a floor, not a ceiling. For buyers who want the full practical kit, the real cost climbs well past 4,500 dollars, reinforcing the Vision Pro standing as one of the most expensive consumer setups Apple sells, a position set in context by our biggest companies by market value analysis.

$499AppleCare+Priciest add-on. $99-149ZEISS LensesReaders to Rx. ~$847Essential KitCase, lens, care. ~$1,200Full KitAll add-ons.

The Apple Vision Pro accessories price list tells a clear story. The official add-ons run from a 19-dollar polishing cloth to a 499-dollar AppleCare+ plan, with the full catalogue worth over 1,600 dollars. Most buyers spend far less, settling on an essential bundle, travel case, optical inserts and AppleCare+, of roughly 800 to 900 dollars, while a fully-equipped owner can spend more than 1,200 dollars on accessories alone.

Seen together, the accessories reveal the true cost of living with a Vision Pro. The 3,499-dollar headset is only the start; the case, the lenses, the power and the warranty each add their own price, lifting a typical real cost toward 4,300 dollars and a full kit beyond 4,600. For a device already at the top of Apple range, the accessory price list is the final piece in understanding why the Vision Pro remains a purchase for the committed, a place it holds within the wider Apple business tracked in our Apple total revenue and big tech revenue analyses.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: Apple Vision Pro Accessories

As of June 2026, official Apple Vision Pro accessories in the United States range from a 19-dollar polishing cloth to a 499-dollar AppleCare+ plan. Key prices: travel case 199 dollars, battery pack 199 dollars, Light Seal 199 dollars, ZEISS prescription inserts 149 dollars, ZEISS readers 99 dollars, Solo Knit and Dual Loop bands 99 dollars each, Belkin battery holder about 50 dollars, and Light Seal Cushion 29 dollars. The full catalogue totals over 1,600 dollars.

AppleCare+ for the Apple Vision Pro costs 499 dollars for two years of coverage, or 24.99 dollars a month. It includes unlimited repairs for accidental damage and express replacement service, but each accidental-damage repair carries a 299-dollar deductible on top of the plan price. The flat 499-dollar plan is cheaper than paying monthly, which reaches about 600 dollars over two years.

ZEISS Optical Inserts cost 99 dollars for reader lenses (for those who only need magnification) and 149 dollars for custom prescription lenses, which require a valid US prescription. They attach magnetically inside the headset and are essential for glasses-wearers, since the Vision Pro is not designed to be worn over spectacles. Apple notes the prescription inserts may be reimbursable under US health spending accounts.

The Apple Vision Pro ships with a Light Seal and Light Seal Cushion, one head band (the Solo Knit Band or Dual Loop Band), the battery pack, a cover, a 30-watt USB-C power adapter and cable, and a polishing cloth. Accessories such as the travel case, the alternate band, spare batteries, ZEISS optical

inserts and AppleCare+ are sold separately.

The Apple Vision Pro Travel Case costs 199 dollars in the United States. It is a fabric case with a retractable handle and specially designed compartments for the headset, battery, ZEISS optical inserts, cover and other accessories. It is sold separately from the headset, which has drawn some criticism given the Vision Pro already starts at 3,499 dollars.

It depends on which accessories a buyer chooses. A minimal buyer adding only prescription inserts spends about 149 dollars on accessories. A typical buyer with the essential bundle (travel case, prescription inserts and AppleCare+) spends around 847 dollars, bringing the real cost to roughly 4,346 dollars. A buyer who wants the full practical kit can spend over 1,200 dollars on accessories, pushing the total past 4,600 dollars.

A spare or replacement Apple Vision Pro Battery Pack costs 199 dollars in the United States. Because the headset relies on an external battery that lasts only about two hours, many owners buy a second battery for longer sessions. A Belkin Battery Holder, which clips the battery to a belt or pocket, costs about 50 dollars.

The Apple Vision Pro Solo Knit Band and Dual Loop Band each cost 99 dollars. The headset ships with one of the two; many owners buy the other to vary the fit. The Light Seal, which shapes the fit against the face, costs 199 dollars as a replacement, and the foam Light Seal Cushion is 29 dollars.

It depends on the buyer. Glasses-wearers effectively must buy ZEISS prescription inserts at 149 dollars to use the headset at all. AppleCare+ at 499 dollars is widely recommended given the high repair cost of a fragile, face-worn device. The travel case, spare bands and extra batteries are more discretionary. Most buyers settle on an essential bundle of around 800 to 900 dollars rather than the full catalogue.

The most expensive official Apple Vision Pro accessory is AppleCare+ at 499 dollars for two years. After that come the travel case, battery pack and Light Seal at 199 dollars each, then the ZEISS prescription inserts at 149 dollars. The cheapest official accessory is the polishing cloth at around 19 dollars. The full catalogue, bought in its entirety, totals over 1,600 dollars.

Sources

Apple - Vision Pro Accessories - Source for official Apple Vision Pro accessory US prices.

Apple, ZEISS and Belkin US online stores - Used for AppleCare+, ZEISS optical insert and Belkin battery holder prices as of June 2026.

Prices are US list prices before sales tax, as of June 2026. Key prices: AppleCare+ 499 dollars for two years, travel case 199, battery pack 199, Light Seal 199, ZEISS prescription inserts 149, ZEISS readers 99, Solo Knit and Dual Loop bands 99 each, Belkin battery holder about 50, Light Seal Cushion 29, polishing cloth about 19. The headset is sold separately from 3,499 dollars. Category totals and kit costs are illustrative. Not purchasing advice.

STATISTICS REPORT

Number of users of generative AI worldwide 2020-2032

Updated Sep 16, 2026 · businesstats.com/generative-ai-users-worldwide

374M USERS 2025	**1.2B** USERS 2031	**1B** CHATGPT WEEKLY
2 mo TO 100M USERS	**53%** OF WORLD IN 3YR	**$549B** MARKET 2032

Overview

Number of users of generative AI worldwide from 2020 to 2032

The number of generative AI users worldwide is modeled at about 374 million in 2025 and is forecast to reach roughly 1.2 billion by 2031, according to Statista Market Insights. That is a near tripling of the user base in six years, and it follows a starting point of close to zero before ChatGPT arrived at the end of 2022. Few technologies have gone from launch to a billion users this quickly.

Measured across all AI tools rather than the narrower generative AI market, more than a billion people already use them every month. The single clearest gauge of the boom is ChatGPT, which passed one billion weekly active users in August 2026. Its climb sets the tone for the whole category, so the chart below traces it before the report turns to the worldwide totals, the market and the leading tools. The scale of the shift is comparable only to the early internet, a story our worldwide AI statistics coverage follows in depth.

A note on the data. This is the 2026 edition. The worldwide user figures for 2025 and 2031 are a Statista Market Insights model, shown as the headline forecast. Every other chart carries its own source and period, from OpenAI and Meta for tool users to eMarketer for national figures. Numbers beyond the current year are forecasts and are labeled as such, and none of the figures here are estimated by us.

ChatGPT Weekly Active Users (millions)From 300 million to a billion.

Data:

ChatGPT weekly active users in millions, as reported by OpenAI.

Note:

Compiled by BusinessStats.Switch views with the toolbar.

From 300 million to a billion: ChatGPT weekly users more than tripled in under two years, passing one billion in August 2026.

Worldwide Forecast

How many people use generative AI worldwide?

On the Statista Market Insights model, about 374 million people worldwide use generative AI in 2025, and that number is forecast to climb to roughly 1.2 billion by 2031. The trajectory implies steady annual growth even after the first explosive wave, as the technology moves from early adopters into everyday tools used by ordinary consumers and workers.

The worldwide total depends heavily on how a user is defined, and the honest answer is a range rather than a single number. The narrow Statista Market Insights measure counts active users of the dedicated generative AI market at about 374 million in 2025. Microsoft, using telemetry across its products, estimates more than 1.2 billion people used AI tools within three years of the launch of ChatGPT. Menlo Ventures puts the figure higher still, at roughly 1.75 billion people using AI tools in 2025 once every assistant and embedded feature is counted. All three measures point the same way, toward extraordinarily fast and broad adoption across the world population.

What makes the picture striking is the starting point. In 2020 and 2021, before ChatGPT, the generative AI user base was negligible. The jump from near zero to somewhere between 374 million and 1.75 billion people in only three years, and a Statista forecast of about 1.2 billion dedicated users by 2031, is the fastest ramp of any consumer software category yet measured. The chart below sets the three credible 2025 estimates side by side so the range is clear.

How Many People Use Generative AI Worldwide, 2025 (millions, by measure)Depends how you count.

Data:

Estimated number of people using AI worldwide in 2025 under three definitions, in millions.

Note:

Sources Statista Market Insights (gen AI market users), Microsoft AI Diffusion Report (monthly AI tool users) and Menlo Ventures (all AI tool users). Compiled by BusinessStats.Switch views with the toolbar.

Depends how you count: worldwide estimates for 2025 range from about 374 million on the narrow measure to roughly 1.75 billion counting all AI tools.

Fastest Ever

Why is generative AI spreading so fast?

Generative AI is spreading faster than any consumer technology before it. ChatGPT reached 100 million users in about two months after launch, a milestone that took TikTok around nine months and Instagram more than two years. The tools are free to try, need no new hardware, and deliver an obvious benefit in the first minute of use, which strips away the usual barriers to adoption.

The result is a curve with no real precedent. By one Stanford measure, generative AI reached roughly 53 percent of the global population within about three years, a faster climb than the personal computer or the early internet achieved. Adoption has been pulled along by the integration of AI into products people already open every day, from search engines to office software, so that many users adopt the technology without ever seeking it out. The same platform effects appear across our social media statistics coverage, where features spread through existing networks.

The chart below compares how long several breakout products took to reach 100 million users. The gap between generative AI and everything before it is the single clearest sign of how unusual this adoption wave has been. It is why forecasters keep revising their numbers upward rather than down.

Months to Reach 100 Million UsersNothing spread this fast.

Data:

Approximate time in months for each product to reach 100 million users, as widely reported.

Note:

Compiled by BusinessStats.Switch views with the toolbar.

Nothing spread this fast: ChatGPT reached 100 million users in about two months, against nine for TikTok and thirty for Instagram.

The US Picture

How many Americans use generative AI?

About 121 million people in the United States used generative AI in 2025, roughly 36 percent of the population, and eMarketer forecasts the figure will rise to about 133 million in 2026. The climb from just 7.8 million users in 2022 is one of the steepest adoption curves ever recorded for a digital tool in a single country.

The US case is worth watching because it shows the technology maturing from novelty to habit. Early users were younger, more educated and heavily male, but each year the base has broadened toward the general population. Workplace adoption is now a major driver, with employees bringing tools into their jobs and employers building them into workflows, a shift echoed in coverage of the most impactful marketing technology of recent years.

Even so, the United States is no longer the frontier of adoption. Its penetration of around 36 percent trails the usage rates now reported across several emerging markets, a reversal of the usual pattern in which rich countries lead on new technology. The chart below shows the American user base rising year by year toward the mainstream.

Generative AI Users in the United States (millions)From niche to mainstream.

Data:

Number of generative AI users in the United States, in millions.

Note:

Source eMarketer. The 2026 figure is a forecast. Compiled by BusinessStats.Switch views with the toolbar.

From niche to mainstream: US users climbed from 7.8 million in 2022 to about 121 million in 2025, heading toward 133 million in 2026.

Market Money

How big is the generative AI market?

The generative AI market was worth about 38 billion U.S. dollars in 2025 and is forecast to grow past 500 billion by 2032 on the Statista Market Insights model. That is a faster expansion than almost any other technology segment, and it means revenue is rising even more steeply than the user base, as free users convert to paid plans and businesses scale up their spending.

The gap between user growth and revenue growth is the key to the economics. A near tripling of users pairs with a more than tenfold rise in revenue over a similar span, which tells you that the money per user is climbing fast. Enterprise contracts, premium consumer subscriptions and AI features embedded in existing software are all pushing average spending up. The scale of investment behind this sits alongside the wider AI market size and the surging demand for the chips that power it, tracked in our Nvidia statistics.

Forecasts for the market vary widely by definition, from tens of billions on narrow measures to well over a trillion dollars on the broadest ones. The series below uses a single consistent Statista Market Insights model so the year-by-year shape is comparable, running from 2024 through 2032.

Generative AI Market Revenue Worldwide, 2024-2032 (USD billions)Revenue outpaces users.

Data:

Generative AI market revenue worldwide in billions of U.S. dollars.

Note:

Source Statista Market Insights. Figures from 2026 on are forecasts. Compiled by BusinessStats.Switch views with the toolbar.

Revenue outpaces users: the market is forecast to grow from about 38 billion dollars in 2025 to more than 500 billion by 2032.

Leading Tools

Which generative AI tools have the most users?

Three assistants now dominate consumer use, each near or above a billion monthly users in 2026. Meta AI, spread across the Meta apps, reports about 1.2 billion monthly users, ChatGPT about 1.1 billion, and Google Gemini around 950 million. The scale is remarkable given that none of these products existed in their current form four years ago.

Raw monthly reach flatters the assistants built into apps people already use, such as Meta AI inside messaging and Gemini inside Google services. On direct, intentional use measured by web traffic, ChatGPT is still the clear leader, holding more than half of all AI chatbot visits, a dominance our Google and Alphabet revenue coverage helps put in context as the search giant races to catch up. The two charts below show the leaders by monthly users and by share of chatbot traffic.

Leading Generative AI Assistants by Monthly Users, 2026 (millions)A three-way race.

Data:

Monthly users of leading generative AI assistants in 2026, in millions.

Note:

Sources Meta, OpenAI and Alphabet. Metrics vary slightly by company. Compiled by BusinessStats.Switch views with the toolbar.

A three-way race: Meta AI, ChatGPT and Google Gemini each sit near or above a billion monthly users in 2026.

Share of AI Chatbot Web Traffic, Early 2026ChatGPT still leads use.

Data:

Share of global AI chatbot web traffic in early 2026.

Note:

Source Similarweb. Compiled by BusinessStats.Switch views with the toolbar.

ChatGPT still leads use: it holds more than half of all AI chatbot web traffic, ahead of Gemini and the rest.

The ChatGPT Climb

How did ChatGPT reach a billion users?

ChatGPT reached one billion weekly active users in August 2026 through a steady series of jumps rather than one single surge. From about 300 million at the end of 2024, it added 100 million to reach 400 million by February 2025, then a further 300 million to hit 700 million by mid 2025, before climbing through 800 and 900 million to cross a billion.

Each jump had its own driver: new model releases, the spread of the mobile app, free access to more capable versions, and the habit of using the tool for work and study. The waterfall chart below breaks the climb into its stages, showing how the billion-user total was built step by step rather than overnight. It is a useful corrective to the idea that the growth was a one-off spike, since the additions kept coming quarter after quarter.

How ChatGPT Reached a Billion Weekly Users (millions added)Built step by step.

Data:

ChatGPT weekly active users, starting level and additions in millions between reported milestones.

Note:

Source OpenAI. Compiled by BusinessStats.Switch views with the toolbar.

Built step by step: ChatGPT added users in repeated jumps to climb from 300 million to a billion weekly.

Business Use

How many businesses use generative AI?

About 71 percent of organizations reported using generative AI in at least one business function in 2025, up from 65 percent in 2024 and just 33 percent in 2023, according to McKinsey. In two years the technology went from a minority experiment to a majority tool inside companies, one of the fastest enterprise adoption curves ever seen.

Business use matters because it is where the technology starts to pay for itself, and it is a major reason the revenue line climbs faster than the user count. Companies deploy generative AI in marketing, customer support, software development and research, and the spread into daily work is now pulling consumer adoption along with it. The impact reaches into specialized fields, from AI in finance to AI in healthcare, where early deployments are already changing how work gets done.

The chart below tracks the rise in business adoption. The steepness of the climb, from a third of firms to more than two thirds in two years, is the clearest sign that generative AI has moved past the hype stage into standard operating practice, even if measurable financial returns remain uneven across companies.

Organizations Using Generative AI, 2023-2025 (percent)A third to two thirds.

Data:

Share of organizations using generative AI in at least one function, percent.

Note:

Source McKinsey. Compiled by BusinessStats.Switch views with the toolbar.

A third to two thirds: business use of generative AI more than doubled between 2023 and 2025.

By Country

Which countries use AI the most?

The highest AI usage rates are found not in Silicon Valley but in emerging markets. India and Nigeria report about 92 percent AI usage among consumers, ahead of Singapore on around 73 percent and the United States on roughly 56 percent, according to a KPMG study. It is a striking reversal of the usual technology adoption pattern, in which wealthy countries lead and developing ones follow.

Several forces drive the pattern. Younger populations, a mobile-first internet, fewer legacy systems to replace and strong demand for tools that boost productivity all push adoption higher in fast-growing economies. Because generative AI runs in a browser or an app rather than requiring expensive hardware, the usual barriers that slow technology adoption in emerging markets barely apply, a dynamic our AI in China coverage explores in one of the largest of these markets.

The chart below compares reported AI usage rates across a sample of countries. The lead held by India and Nigeria over advanced economies is one of the most surprising findings in the adoption data, and it hints that the next wave of user growth will come disproportionately from the developing world rather than from the markets that led the first wave.

Reported AI Usage Rate by Country, 2025 (percent)Emerging markets lead.

Data:

Reported share of consumers using AI by country in 2025, percent.

Note:

Source KPMG and University of Melbourne. Covers AI broadly. Compiled by BusinessStats.Switch views with the toolbar.

Emerging markets lead: India and Nigeria report about 92 percent AI usage, ahead of Singapore and the United States.

Key Facts

Generative AI users in numbers

A handful of figures capture the scale. The worldwide user base is modeled near 374 million in 2025 and forecast toward 1.2 billion by 2031, ChatGPT alone has passed a billion weekly users, and the market is set to grow past 500 billion dollars by 2032. Together they describe a technology that has gone from launch to global mainstream in under four years.

374MUsers worldwide 2025Statista model.1.2BUsers worldwide 2031Forecast.1BChatGPT weeklyAugust 2026.53%Of world populationReached in 3 years.

The numbers matter because they mark a genuine shift in how people work and search rather than a passing trend. No technology has reached this many people this quickly, and the forecasts suggest the curve has years of steep growth still to run.

Big Picture

Generative AI users in 2026: the big picture

Taken together, the data describes the fastest technology adoption in modern history. From effectively zero users before late 2022, generative AI reached hundreds of millions within three years and is forecast to pass a billion dedicated users by the early 2030s, with more than a billion people already touching AI tools each month.

The next phase looks less like a single viral moment and more like steady absorption into daily life, as assistants embed into search, phones and workplace software, and as growth shifts toward the emerging markets that already show the highest usage rates. Whether the exact worldwide total lands nearer 374 million or well above a billion depends on how a user is counted, but the direction is not in doubt, and the story of generative AI adoption is still in its early chapters, much as the early internet companies were once only beginning to find their scale.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: Generative AI Users

The worldwide user base is modeled at roughly 374 million in 2025 and forecast to reach about 1.2 billion by 2031, according to Statista Market Insights. Counting all AI tools, more than a billion people already use them each month.

Faster than any technology before it. ChatGPT reached 100 million users in about two months, against nine for TikTok and more than two years for Instagram, and generative AI reached about half the global population within three years.

ChatGPT passed one billion weekly active users in August 2026, up from 400 million in February 2025 and 800 million in October 2025. It remains the most used generative AI tool in the world.

About 121 million people in the United States used generative AI in 2025, around 36 percent of the population, and the figure is forecast to reach roughly 133 million in 2026, according to eMarketer.

The generative AI market was worth about 38 billion U.S. dollars in 2025 and is forecast to grow past 500 billion by 2032 on the Statista Market Insights model, expanding faster than almost any other technology segment.

By monthly users in 2026, Meta AI, ChatGPT and Google Gemini each sit near or above a billion. ChatGPT leads on web traffic, holding more than half of all AI chatbot visits.

Usage rates are highest in emerging markets. India and Nigeria report about 92 percent AI usage among consumers, ahead of Singapore on 73 percent and the United States on about 56 percent.

About 71 percent of organizations reported using generative AI in at least one business function in 2025, up from 65 percent in 2024 and 33 percent in 2023, according to McKinsey.

Worldwide user and market figures are from Statista Market Insights, tool figures from OpenAI, Meta and Alphabet, national usage from eMarketer, KPMG and Stanford, and traffic shares from Similarweb.

Forecasts point to continued rapid growth, with the worldwide user base roughly tripling between 2025 and 2031 and market revenue growing even faster as free users convert and businesses expand their use.

Sources

Statista Market Insights - Modeled number of generative AI users worldwide and generative AI market revenue.

OpenAI, Meta and Alphabet - Reported user figures for ChatGPT, Meta AI and Google Gemini.

eMarketer - Number of generative AI users in the United States.

McKinsey, Stanford and KPMG - Business adoption and national usage rates.

Statista Market Insights, Generative AI - Worldwide users and market revenue.

Figures show the number of generative AI users worldwide and related adoption data. Worldwide user and market figures are Statista Market Insights models, with values beyond the current year being forecasts. Each chart is labeled with its own source and period. This is data journalism, not investment advice.

STATISTICS REPORT

Artificial intelligence (AI) in finance — 2026 statistics, use cases & market data

Updated May 12, 2026 · businesstats.com/ai-in-finance

$36.6B AI FINTECH MARKET 2026	**22%** CAGR 2026–2031	**90%** BANKS USING AI — FRAUD
80% US TRADES BY AI ALGO	**$1.5B** JPMORGAN AI SAVINGS	**Aug 2026** EU AI ACT ENFORCEMENT

Market Overview 2026

AI in Finance Market — $36.6B in 2026, $99B by 2031, $190B by 2030

Artificial intelligence is reshaping every layer of the financial industry — from the millisecond execution of algorithmic trades to the instant assessment of loan applications and the real-time detection of fraudulent transactions. The AI in fintech market stands at approximately **$36.61 billion in 2026**, growing at a **22.04% CAGR** toward $99.09 billion by 2031. The broader AI in finance market — including banking, insurance, and investment management — is estimated at **$38–45 billion in 2026** and projected to reach **$190 billion by 2030** at a 30.6% CAGR. North America accounts for approximately **37–45% of global revenue** and leads in AI fintech patents (45% global share). The broader financial market context powering AI investment is covered in our US financial markets analysis.

AI Use Case Distribution in Banking — 2026 AI in Finance — Top Use Cases by Bank Adoption Share (2026) Survey of 174 Banking Professionals, January 2026 · Blott Financial Services AI Report · BusinessStats Research

53%Fraud Detection#1 use case · 90% of banks · 300× faster than rules 39%Back-Office AutomationDocument processing · KYC · Onboarding · Compliance 39%Customer Service AIChatbots · Virtual assistants · 40% cost savings 30%Risk & ComplianceAML · Regulatory monitoring · Credit risk 24%Credit ScoringLoan processing 2 days → 5 mins · 25% better approval 18%Wealth ManagementRobo-advisors · Portfolio AI · $1.4T AUM

Market Growth 2021–2031E

AI in Finance Market Growth — From $9.5B (2021) to $99B by 2031E

The AI in finance market has experienced explosive growth over the past five years. Starting from approximately **$9.5 billion in 2021**, the market crossed **$36.6 billion in 2026** — nearly a 4× increase in five years. The compound annual growth rate of **22%** is projected to hold through 2031, when the AI fintech market is expected to reach **$99 billion**. Key growth accelerators: the proliferation of large language models (LLMs) in financial workflows from 2023 onward; regulatory pressure forcing banks to modernise compliance systems; and the proven ROI from fraud detection AI — which cuts detection costs by 60% while achieving 96% accuracy. The tech giants powering this infrastructure are profiled in our global company valuations report.

AI in Finance — Market Size 2021–2031E AI in Fintech Market Size — 2021 to 2031E (USD Billion, 22% CAGR) Mordor Intelligence 2026 · Grand View Research · Blott Financial Services AI Report 2026 · BusinessStats Research $99B2031E Forecast

Source: Mordor Intelligence AI in Fintech Report 2026 · Grand View Research AI Agents in Financial Services 2025 · BusinessStats Research · April 2026

AI Fraud Detection

AI Fraud Detection: 90% of Banks, $1.5B Saved, 300× Faster — But a New Threat Is Rising

Fraud detection is the single most widespread AI application in financial services — and the one with the most mature ROI data. **90% of financial institutions** now use AI for fraud detection as of 2026. AI-powered systems analyse thousands of behavioral features per transaction in milliseconds — JPMorgan's system processes **5,700+ behavioral signals per transaction** including typing cadence, location patterns, and payment instruction language. The result: JPMorgan's AI fraud system prevents an estimated **$1.5 billion in losses annually** with a **98% accuracy rate**. AI detects fraud approximately **300 times faster** than traditional rule-based systems. AI fraud detection systems cut detection costs by **60%** while improving accuracy to **96%**. However, there is a critical dual-use paradox: the same generative AI powering bank defenses is also powering attacks. Generative AI-enabled fraud losses in the US are projected to reach **$40 billion by 2027** — more than triple the $12.3 billion recorded in 2023.

- **Adoption:** 90% of financial institutions use AI for fraud detection (Feedzai 2025 AI Trends Report)
- **Speed:** AI detects fraud 300× faster than rule-based systems — critical for real-time digital payments
- **Accuracy:** AI fraud systems achieve 90–99% detection accuracy vs 58–70% for traditional methods
- **Cost:** AI cuts fraud detection operational costs by 60% while improving accuracy
- **JPMorgan:** $1.5B in fraud prevention savings · 98% accuracy · 5,700+ behavioral features per transaction
- **HSBC:** 60% reduction in false positives · JPMorgan: 50% improvement in false positive rate
- **Gen-AI fraud threat:** US AI-enabled fraud losses $12.3B (2023) → $40B projected by 2027
- **Deepfake risk:** 30% of enterprises expect biometric authentication to be unreliable in isolation by 2026

Algorithmic Trading

AI Algorithmic Trading: 80% of US Trades, Microsecond Execution, $3.8T Value Opportunity

AI has fundamentally transformed how markets function. Approximately **70–80% of US stock market trades** are now executed by AI-powered algorithms — up from under 50% a decade ago. These systems can process market data, news articles, social media sentiment, and economic indicators simultaneously, executing trades in **microseconds** and reducing trading slippage by approximately **15%**. McKinsey estimates AI could generate an additional **$3.8 trillion in annual value** for the global financial services industry — the majority coming from trading, portfolio management, and risk modelling. **82% of investment firms** use AI for algorithmic trading, with 70% of trades executed automatically. BlackRock, the world's largest asset manager with $10T+ in AUM, has integrated AI throughout its portfolio management and risk systems. AI has also eliminated many of the manual trading tasks — what once required a team of analysts now runs autonomously. AWS powers the majority of bank AI infrastructure — see our Amazon statistics for the full cloud AI context. The broader digital economy growth patterns are covered in our retail e-commerce analysis.

- **Market share:** 70–80% of US trades executed by AI algorithms — mainstream in 2026
- **Speed:** AI executes trades in microseconds · reduces slippage by ~15% vs human execution
- **82% of investment firms** use AI for algorithmic trading · 70% of those trades fully automated
- **Value:** McKinsey projects AI generates additional $3.8T annually in global financial services value
- **BlackRock:** AI integrated across $10T+ AUM portfolio management and risk systems

- **49% of hedge funds** use AI for portfolio optimisation — up 15% from 2022
- **Sentiment analysis:** AI processes news, earnings calls, and social media in real-time to inform trading decisions

Banking & Cost Savings

AI in Banking: $120B Saved in 2025, $500B by 2030, 40% Service Cost Reduction

AI is delivering measurable, significant cost savings across banking operations. The global banking industry saved approximately **$120 billion in 2025** from AI implementation — a figure projected to reach **$500 billion annually by 2030**. Banks deploying AI for customer service see **40% operational cost reductions** and **25% higher customer satisfaction scores**. AI has reduced loan default prediction time from **2 days to 5 minutes**. Robo-advisors have cut wealth management fees from 1.5% to approximately 0.25% of AUM — an **85% fee reduction** that has democratised investment access. Despite these gains, **only 4 of the 50 largest banks** reported realised ROI from AI use cases in 2025 — exposing a gap between AI adoption and actual value capture that Goldman Sachs has called the defining challenge of 2026. The consumer wealth context powering demand for AI banking is covered in our US wealth and spending analysis.

- **Industry savings 2025:** ~$120B saved globally from AI — projected $500B annually by 2030
- **Customer service:** AI deployment → 40% cost reduction + 25% higher satisfaction
- **Loan processing:** AI cut loan default prediction time from 2 days to 5 minutes
- **Credit unions:** 68% of US credit unions use AI for loan origination · 25% better approval rates
- **Advisory fees:** AI robo-advisors reduced fees from 1.5% to 0.25% AUM — 85% reduction
- **Underwriting:** AI accelerated policy issuance by 80% · increased sales velocity 35%
- **ROI gap:** Only 4 of 50 largest banks reported realised ROI from AI in 2025 — adoption ≠ value
- **AI chatbots:** 77% of global insurers use AI chatbots handling 30% of all customer queries

Top Banks — AI Investment 2026

JPMorgan, Bank of America, Goldman Sachs — $10B+ Industry AI Spend Annually

The world's largest banks are committing billions to AI — not as an experiment, but as a core infrastructure investment. **JPMorgan Chase** directs approximately **$2 billion of its $18 billion technology budget** to AI, having captured $1.5 billion in cumulative savings. **Bank of America** allocates **$4 billion of its $13 billion tech budget** to AI and related initiatives. Across the industry, financial sector IT spending on AI-specific initiatives exceeds **$10 billion annually**. **Goldman Sachs** launched its GS AI Assistant firmwide in mid-2025 — accessible to all employees and powered by multiple LLMs including GPT, Gemini, and Claude. Goldman's CIO has described 2026 as the year of "scaling and harvesting" following years of AI experimentation. **Morgan Stanley** deployed its AI @ Morgan Stanley Assistant to financial advisors in 2023, drawing on 100,000+ research documents for wealth management queries. JPMorgan employs **over 2,000 AI and machine learning specialists** — AI roles grew 13% in 6 months even as overall headcount declined in 2025.

JPMorgan Chase $2B Annual AI Budget (of $18B tech total) AI Cost Savings

~$1.5B cumulative

AI Specialists

2,000+

Fraud Accuracy

98%

Use Cases

400+ deployed

Bank of America $4B Annual AI Budget (of $13B tech total) AI Value Target

$2.5B by 2025

AI Tool

Erica Virtual Assistant

AI Hiring

Top 3 AI employer

AI Coverage

Multiple business lines

Goldman Sachs $B+ AI & Tech Investment (ongoing) GS AI Assistant

Firmwide — mid-2025

LLMs Used

GPT · Gemini · Claude

2026 Strategy

"Scaling & Harvesting"

Focus Areas

Trading · Research · Risk

Morgan Stanley AI@MS GPT-4 Wealth Management Assistant Deployed

September 2023

Knowledge Base

100,000+ documents

Users

Financial Advisors firmwide

Function

Research · Client queries

AI Adoption Trend

AI Adoption in Finance — From 45% (2022) to 85%+ (2025) to Near-Universal by 2026

AI adoption across the financial industry has accelerated dramatically. In 2022, approximately **45% of financial firms** used AI in some capacity. By 2025, that figure reached approximately **85%** — with 60% using AI across multiple business functions simultaneously. Top fintech startups have reached **88% AI adoption**. Looking at specific functions: 90% of institutions use AI for fraud, 82% for algorithmic trading,

73% of wealth firms have AI robo-advisors, and 64% of US banks have AI for anti-money laundering. The important caveat: **95% of generative AI implementations** in financial services remain in pilot phases rather than scaled production. Goldman Sachs identifies this gap — between adoption ambition and actual production-scale deployment — as the defining challenge of 2026. The digital commerce and platform patterns paralleling this adoption wave are covered in our social media and digital platform statistics.

AI Adoption by Use Case — Financial Services 2022–2026 AI Adoption Rate by Key Use Case — Financial Services (% of Institutions Deployed) Feedzai 2025 AI Trends Report · GITNUX 2026 · Blott Financial Services AI Report 2026 · BusinessStats Research · April 2026

90% AI fraud adoption — industry standard Source: Feedzai 2025 AI Trends · GITNUX Financial Industry Statistics 2026 · Mordor Intelligence 2026 · Blott 2026 · April 2026

Robo-Advisors & Wealth AI

Robo-Advisors: $1.4T AUM (2024) → $3.2T by 2033 — Fees Cut 85%

Robo-advisors represent one of AI's most visible and consumer-facing applications in finance. The global robo-advisor market managed **$1.4 trillion in assets under management (AUM) in 2024** and is projected to reach **$3.2 trillion by 2033** — a 10.5% CAGR. The fee disruption has been dramatic: traditional human advisors charged approximately 1.5% of AUM annually; AI robo-advisors charge approximately **0.25% — an 85% reduction** — making wealth management accessible to everyday investors for the first time. **73% of wealth management firms** had adopted AI robo-advisors by 2024. Betterment, Vanguard, Wealthfront, and Schwab Intelligent Portfolios are among the leading platforms. By 2026, AI is positioned as a "personal CFO" for retail investors — analysing spending habits, predicting future needs, and providing tax-optimised investment recommendations. **55% of robo-advisor users** trust algorithms over human advisors for portfolio decisions. The semiconductor infrastructure powering these AI systems is covered in our ARM Holdings statistics — ARM chips are at the heart of AI inference across banking hardware.

Robo-Advisor vs Traditional — Key Metrics Comparison AI Robo-Advisors vs Traditional Advisors — AUM, Fees & Accessibility Market Research Intellect 2025 · Statista 2024 · GITNUX 2026 · BusinessStats Research · April 2026

- **AUM:** $1.4T (2024) → $3.2T (2033) — 10.5% CAGR over 9 years
- **Fee disruption:** Traditional 1.5% AUM → Robo-advisor 0.25% AUM — 85% reduction
- **Adoption:** 73% of wealth management firms deployed AI robo-advisors by 2024

- **Trust:** 55% of robo-advisor users trust algorithms over human advisors for portfolio decisions
- **Access:** Some platforms allow investing from as little as $1 — democratising wealth management
- **Regional growth:** APAC fastest-growing robo-advisor market driven by China and India mobile-first adoption
- **2026 capability:** AI analyses spending, predicts life events (mortgage, retirement, college), and optimises tax harvesting automatically

Regulation — EU AI Act 2026

EU AI Act August 2026: Finance's Biggest Regulatory Moment — 7% Turnover Penalty

The single most important regulatory event for AI in finance in 2026 is the **EU AI Act's high-risk system provisions becoming enforceable on 2 August 2026**. Any financial institution using AI for credit scoring, fraud detection, automated lending, or anti-money laundering — and operating in or serving European customers — must comply with strict requirements for transparency, explainability, human oversight, and audit trails. Non-compliance penalties can reach **up to 7% of global annual turnover** — for a bank with $50B in revenue, that is a potential $3.5B fine. This has forced European banks to fundamentally redesign their AI-powered credit and fraud systems. Many institutions are rebuilding credit scoring models to provide "explainable AI" outputs — being able to tell a rejected customer specifically why the algorithm denied their application. The EU's PSD3 directive (live since 2024) simultaneously requires banks to share customer data via APIs with AI systems — creating both a compliance burden and an AI innovation opportunity for institutions that move quickly. The global regulatory economic context is covered in our global GDP and regulatory analysis.

2023

EU AI Act passed

— establishes risk tiers for AI systems. Finance classified as high-risk for credit scoring, fraud detection, AML, and insurance underwriting. 2024

PSD3 live

— European banks required to share customer data via open APIs. European banks begin redesigning AI workflows to meet Act requirements. 55% of European banks adopt AI for compliance monitoring. Feb 2025

EU AI Act general-purpose AI provisions

take effect. Financial institutions must begin documenting AI system capabilities and limitations across all deployments. 2 Aug 2026

High-risk AI systems enforceable

— Credit scoring, fraud detection, lending, and AML systems must fully comply.

Penalties up to 7% of global annual turnover

. Banks unable to explain AI credit decisions face regulatory action. 2027+

Full enforcement landscape

— Regulators expected to begin formal investigations. US regulators watching EU framework with potential federal AI regulation in finance following similar principles. 2026 Key Insight The Paradox: AI Saves Banks Billions While AI Costs Banks Billions

AI in finance presents a deep paradox in 2026. Banks collectively save **$120 billion annually** from AI — fraud prevention, automation, faster processing. Yet simultaneously: generative AI-enabled fraud costs are racing toward **$40 billion by 2027**; EU AI Act compliance is costing European banks hundreds of millions in system redesigns; and **95% of generative AI implementations** remain in pilot phases with unproven ROI. Goldman Sachs calls 2026 the year of "scaling and harvesting" — the institutions that invested early in AI infrastructure (JPMorgan's 400+ use cases, Bank of America's $4B budget) are now capturing competitive advantages. The **14%** of financial institutions that have achieved full-scale AI implementation are pulling ahead of the **86%** still in experimentation mode. The window for catching up is narrowing fast, particularly with the EU AI Act's August 2026 deadline creating a compliance floor that also defines a capability floor.

Key Statistics

AI in Finance — Key Statistics & Facts 2026

$36.6BAI Fintech Market Size 2026Up from ~$17B (2025) · 22% CAGR 2026–2031 → $99B by 2031. Broader AI in finance (incl. banking + insurance): $38–45B in 2026 → $190B by 2030 at 30.6% CAGR. North America: 37–45% of global share. Asia-Pacific: fastest growing at 33.1% CAGR. 90%Banks Using AI for Fraud Detection90% of financial institutions deployed AI fraud detection (Feedzai 2025). AI detects fraud 300× faster than rule-based systems. Accuracy: 90–99%. Cost reduction: 60%. Gen-AI fraud losses: $12.3B (2023) → $40B projected (2027 US) — dual-use threat accelerating. $1.5BJPMorgan AI Cost

SavingsJPMorgan: $2B of $18B tech budget on AI · cumulative $1.5B in savings · 98% fraud accuracy · 2,000+ AI specialists · 400+ use cases. Industry total: $10B+ annually on AI-specific investment. Only 4 of top 50 banks reported realized ROI in 2025. 80%US Stock Trades by AI Algorithms70–80% of US market trades executed by AI algorithms. 82% of investment firms use AI for algorithmic trading · 70% of those trades fully automated. Execution: microseconds · slippage reduction: ~15%. McKinsey: AI generates additional $3.8T annually in financial services value. $3.2TRobo-Advisor AUM by 2033$1.4T AUM (2024) → $3.2T by 2033 (10.5% CAGR). Fee disruption: traditional 1.5% AUM → robo 0.25% (85% reduction). 73% of wealth firms adopted AI robo-advisors by 2024. 55% of robo-advisor users trust algorithms over human advisors. Aug 2026EU AI Act — Financial EnforcementHigh-risk AI provisions enforceable 2 August 2026 for credit scoring, fraud detection, AML, and lending AI. Penalties: up to 7% of global annual turnover. European banks racing to make AI systems "explainable" and auditable. Defines new global standard for AI in finance regulation. $120BAI Banking Savings 2025Global banking saved ~$120B from AI in 2025 → projected $500B annually by 2030. AI customer service: 40% cost reduction + 25% higher satisfaction. Loan prediction: 2 days → 5 minutes. AI underwriting: 80% faster policy issuance, 35% higher sales velocity. $4BBank of America AI BudgetBank of America allocates $4B of its $13B tech budget to AI — the largest AI budget share (31%) among major US banks. Target: $2.5B in annual AI value by end-2025. AI deployed across operations, compliance, customer service, credit, and trading. Top 3 AI employer among US banks.

Forecast 2026–2030E

AI in Finance Forecast — $99B by 2031, $1T in Savings by 2030, $40B Fraud Threat

The trajectory of AI in finance through 2030 is clear: faster adoption, higher market value, deeper integration — and simultaneously, larger risks. The AI in fintech market grows from **$36.6B (2026)** to **$99B by 2031** at 22% CAGR. The broader AI in finance market reaches **$190B by 2030**. Banking industry AI savings scale from **$120B annually (2025)** to **$500B by 2030**. Robo-advisor AUM grows from **$1.4T (2024)** to **$3.2T by 2033**. Agentic AI — autonomous systems that trade, onboard, and comply without human input — grows from a $985M market in 2026 to **$6.7B by 2033**. The countervailing force: generative AI-enabled fraud accelerates from **$12.3B (2023)** to a projected **$40B by 2027** in the US alone. The institutions that capture AI's upside while managing its downside risk will define financial services leadership through 2030.

AI in Finance — Forecast 2026–2031E AI in Finance Market Segments — Growth Forecast 2026 to 2031E (USD Billion) Mordor Intelligence · Grand View Research · Market Research Intellect · McKinsey · BusinessStats Research · April 2026 $99BFintech AI — 2031E

AI in Fintech (Total) Robo-Advisor AUM ($T) Bank AI Savings ($B/yr) AI Fraud Losses ($B) Source: Mordor Intelligence 2026 · Market Research Intellect 2025 · Grand View Research 2025 · McKinsey Global Institute · BusinessStats Research · April 2026

- **AI fintech market:** $36.6B (2026) → $44.7B (2027E) → $66.5B (2029E) → $99.1B (2031E) — 22% CAGR throughout
- **Broader AI in finance:** $38–45B (2026) → $190B (2030E) at 30.6% CAGR — includes banking, insurance, investment management
- **Banking savings:** $120B/yr (2025) → $200B/yr (2027E) → $350B/yr (2029E) → $500B/yr (2030E)
- **Robo-advisors AUM:** $1.4T (2024) → $1.9T (2026E) → $2.5T (2029E) → $3.2T (2033E) at 10.5% CAGR
- **AI fraud threat:** $12.3B US losses (2023) → $20B (2025E) → $40B (2027E) — 3.3× in 4 years
- **Agentic AI market:** $691M (2025) → $985M (2026) → $2.2B (2028E) → $6.7B (2033E) at 31.5% CAGR
- **AI AML solutions:** $1.8B (2024) → $3.2B (2027E) → $7.9B (2032E) at 20.2% CAGR
- **Algorithmic trading value:** McKinsey $3.8T additional annual value potential — majority still unrealised by 2026
- **AI jobs in finance:** AI/ML roles in top banks grew 13% in 6 months (2025) even as overall headcount fell

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions — AI in Finance 2026

The AI in fintech market is valued at approximately **$36.61 billion in 2026**, growing at a 22.04% CAGR, projected to reach $99.09 billion by 2031. The broader AI in finance market (banking, insurance, and investment combined) is estimated at **$38–45 billion in 2026** and projected to reach **$190 billion by 2030** at a 30.6% CAGR. North America accounts for approximately 37–45% of global revenue. Asia-Pacific is the fastest-growing region at 33.1% CAGR through 2031.

JPMorgan Chase directs approximately **$2 billion of its $18 billion annual technology budget** to AI. The bank has generated nearly **$1.5 billion in cumulative cost savings** from AI across fraud prevention, trading, credit decisions, and operations. JPMorgan employs over 2,000 AI and machine learning specialists, has deployed 400+ internal AI use cases, and its fraud AI achieves 98% accuracy analysing 5,700+ behavioral

signals per transaction.

90% of financial institutions use AI for fraud detection as of 2026 (Feedzai 2025 AI Trends Report). AI detects fraud **300 times faster** than traditional rule-based systems and achieves 90–99% accuracy. AI fraud systems cut detection costs by 60%. The parallel risk: generative AI-enabled fraud losses are projected at **$40 billion in the US by 2027** — nearly 3.3× 2023's $12.3 billion. AI is simultaneously the best defense and a powerful new attack vector.

Approximately **70–80% of US stock market trades** are executed by AI-powered algorithms. 82% of investment firms use AI for algorithmic trading, with 70% of those trades fully automated. AI trading systems execute in microseconds, reduce slippage by ~15%, and can simultaneously process market data, news, earnings transcripts, and social media sentiment. McKinsey estimates AI generates an additional **$3.8 trillion in annual value** for global financial services — much of it from trading efficiency.

Top AI use cases in banking (survey of 174 banking professionals, January 2026): **Fraud detection — 53%** (deployed by 90% of banks); **Back-office automation — 39%**; **Customer service chatbots — 39%**; **Risk management and compliance — 30%**; **Credit scoring and underwriting — 24%**; **Wealth management and advisory — 18%**. AI has cut loan prediction time from 2 days to 5 minutes, reduced customer service costs by 40%, and improved underwriting speed by 80%.

The global robo-advisor market managed **$1.4 trillion in AUM in 2024**, projected to reach **$3.2 trillion by 2033** (10.5% CAGR). Key disruption: AI robo-advisors charge approximately 0.25% of AUM vs traditional advisors' 1.5% — an **85% fee reduction**. 73% of wealth management firms adopted AI robo-advisors by 2024. 55% of users trust algorithms over humans for portfolio decisions. Some platforms now allow investing from as little as $1, fully democratising wealth management.

The EU AI Act's high-risk system provisions became enforceable on **2 August 2026**. Financial institutions using AI for credit scoring, fraud detection, lending, and anti-money laundering must comply with full transparency, explainability, and audit requirements. **Penalties: up to 7% of global annual turnover** for non-compliance. For a bank with $50B revenue, that is a potential $3.5B fine. European banks have spent 2024–2026 redesigning AI credit systems to produce explainable decisions — a customer must be able to understand why an AI denied their loan application.

Global banking saved approximately **$120 billion from AI in 2025**, projected to reach **$500 billion annually by 2030**. Key savings: JPMorgan ~$1.5B cumulative; AI customer service: 40% cost reduction + 25% higher satisfaction; AI fraud detection: 60% cost reduction; loan prediction: 2 days → 5 minutes; underwriting: 80% faster. However, only 4 of the 50 largest banks reported realized ROI in 2025 — most

savings are concentrated in AI-mature institutions.

Agentic AI refers to AI systems that autonomously plan, decide, and execute multi-step financial tasks without human intervention — think autonomous trading, self-directed compliance monitoring, or fully automated client onboarding. In 2026, **70% of financial services organisations** are deploying or exploring agentic AI. But only **14% have achieved full-scale implementation**, and 95% of generative AI implementations remain in pilot phase. The AI agents in financial services market was $691M in 2025 and is projected at $985M in 2026, growing to $6.7B by 2033 at 31.5% CAGR.

Goldman Sachs launched its **GS AI Assistant firmwide in mid-2025** after piloting with approximately 10,000 employees. It is model-agnostic — employees can access OpenAI GPT, Google Gemini, and Anthropic Claude securely within Goldman's audited environment. The tool handles document summarisation, data analysis, pitch drafting, research translation, and compliance queries. Goldman's CIO described 2026 as the year of **"scaling and harvesting"** — moving from AI experimentation to production deployment and ROI capture across trading, research, compliance, and client service.

AI has transformed credit scoring by analysing thousands of data points beyond simple credit history — including spending patterns, transaction velocity, employment stability, and behavioral signals. AI credit scoring reduced loan default prediction time from **2 days to 5 minutes**. 68% of US credit unions use AI for loan origination, with **25% improvement in approval rates**. 71% of Asian financial institutions use AI for credit scoring. AI underwriting accelerated policy issuance by 80%. However, EU AI Act compliance now requires explainability — rejected applicants must understand why the algorithm denied them.

North America leads with approximately 37–45% of global AI finance revenue and 45% of AI fintech patents. The US has the deepest bank AI investment (JPMorgan $2B, Bank of America $4B) and highest algorithmic trading penetration (70–80% of trades). **Europe** is second — 55% of European banks use AI for compliance monitoring, now accelerating under EU AI Act pressure. **Asia-Pacific** is the fastest-growing at 33.1% CAGR, driven by mobile-first financial services in China, India, and Southeast Asia, plus 71% AI adoption for credit scoring across Asian financial institutions.

Key AI risks in finance 2026: (1) **Gen-AI fraud acceleration** — US AI-enabled fraud $12.3B (2023) → $40B projected by 2027; (2) **Model risk** — AI algorithms reacting identically can amplify market volatility; (3) **Deepfake attacks** — 30% of enterprises expect biometric authentication to fail in isolation by 2026; (4) **Regulatory exposure** — EU AI Act penalties up to 7% of turnover; (5) **Adoption gap** — 95% of generative AI implementations still in pilot; only 4 of 50 major banks with realized ROI; (6) **Bias** — AI credit models trained on historical data can perpetuate lending discrimination.

AI is deployed across the full insurance value chain in 2026: **automated underwriting** and dynamic pricing that adjusts premiums in real time; **AI claims processing** resolving cases in minutes vs days; **fraud detection** using computer vision and network analysis; **customer service** — 77% of global insurers have AI chatbots handling 30% of queries; and embedded distribution using AI to cross-sell coverage. AI underwriting has accelerated policy issuance by **80%** and increased sales velocity by **35%**. The AI AML solutions market is $1.8B (2024) → $7.9B by 2032 (20.2% CAGR).

AI in finance forecasts to 2030: AI in finance market reaches **$190 billion by 2030** at 30.6% CAGR. AI generates over **$1 trillion in global banking savings and revenue by 2030**. Banking industry AI savings: **$500 billion annually by 2030**. Robo-advisor AUM: **$3.2 trillion by 2033**. AI AML solutions: $7.9B by 2032. Agentic AI in financial services: $6.7B by 2033. Global AI market (all industries): $1.85 trillion by 2030 — financial services among the largest verticals. McKinsey's $3.8T annual financial services value creation estimate positions finance as AI's highest-value application sector.

Data Sources & References

Primary: Mordor Intelligence — AI in Fintech Market Report 2026 ($36.61B, 22% CAGR, North America 37.6% share)

Primary: Blott — AI in Financial Services 2026: From Experimentation to Enterprise Scale (174-bank survey, JPMorgan/BofA/GS data, EU AI Act analysis)

Primary: Grand View Research — AI Agents in Financial Services Market Report 2025 ($691M to $6.7B, 31.5% CAGR)

Supporting: Market Research Intellect — Robo Advisor Market Report 2025 ($1.4T to $3.2T by 2033)

Supporting: GITNUX — AI in the Financial Industry Statistics 2026 (verified statistics, updated April 2026)

AI in finance market size figures vary across research firms due to differing scope definitions (fintech-only vs broad financial services). All figures represent widely cited estimates from reputable research institutions. Bank investment figures (JPMorgan $2B, Bank of America $4B) are from their official annual reports and investor presentations. EU AI Act enforcement timeline is per official EU legislative text. Robo-advisor AUM figures from Market Research Intellect and Statista. Algorithmic trading percentages are industry estimates — exact figures vary. Forecasts to 2030–2033 are analyst projections and subject to market conditions.

STATISTICS REPORT

Big Tech Compared: Revenue, Profit and AI Spending

Updated Oct 15, 2026 · businesstats.com/big-tech-companies-revenue-comparison-statistics

$2.28T COMBINED REVENUE, LATEST FY	**$711B** COMBINED OPERATING INCOME	**$428B** COMBINED CAPEX, LATEST FY
$165B FOUR HYPERSCALERS CAPEX, Q2 2026	**2.28M** COMBINED EMPLOYEES	**$283B** CASH RETURNED TO SHAREHOLDERS

Fiscal Calendars

Six companies, four different fiscal years

Any comparison of Big Tech has to start with the calendar, because the six companies do not close their books at the same time. Alphabet, Amazon and Meta use the calendar year. Apple ends its fiscal year on the last Saturday of September, Microsoft on 30 June and Nvidia on the last Sunday of January, which means the Nvidia fiscal 2026 ran from late January 2025 to 25 January 2026 and mostly overlaps calendar 2025.

This report therefore uses each company for its latest completed fiscal year as of October 2026, plus its latest reported quarter. For the ten year history it aligns each fiscal year with the calendar year in which most of it falls. Readers who want a long head to head of only three of these firms can find it in our Apple, Alphabet and Microsoft revenue history; this page looks at all six as a group and goes well beyond revenue.

COMPANY	LATEST FULL FISCAL YEAR	YEAR END	LATEST REPORTED QUARTER
Apple	Fiscal 2025	27 September 2025	Q3 fiscal 2026, to 27 June 2026
Microsoft	Fiscal 2026	30 June 2026	Q4 fiscal 2026, to 30 June 2026
Alphabet	2025	31 December 2025	Q2 2026, to 30 June 2026
Amazon	2025	31 December 2025	Q2 2026, to 30 June 2026

Meta Platforms	2025	31 December 2025	Q2 2026, to 30 June 2026
Nvidia	Fiscal 2026	25 January 2026	Q2 fiscal 2027, to 26 July 2026

Revenue Ranking

Who sells the most: revenue in the latest fiscal year

Together the six reported 2,284.7 billion dollars of revenue in their latest fiscal years, 16.8 percent more than the 1,955.7 billion dollars of the year before. Amazon is far ahead with 716.9 billion dollars and remains the only member of the group whose sales are dominated by physical goods and logistics.

Big Tech Revenue in the Latest Full Fiscal Year (billion US dollars)Each company shown for its own most recent completed fiscal year.

Data:

Apple, Microsoft, Alphabet, Amazon, Meta Platforms and Nvidia annual results.

Note:

fiscal years do not cover identical months. Compiled by BusinessStats.Switch to the table for exact figures.

Amazon is in a league of its own on sales: 716.9 billion dollars, 72 percent more than Apple in second place.

Behind Amazon the order is tight. Apple (416.2 billion dollars) and Alphabet (402.8 billion dollars) are separated by only 13.3 billion dollars, and on present trends Alphabet, which grew more than twice as fast, is closing the gap. Microsoft reached 331.8 billion dollars in the year to June 2026. Nvidia, which had less revenue than Meta a year earlier, moved past it in fiscal 2026 with 215.9 billion dollars against 201.0 billion dollars. Rankings that add Chinese platforms and other online firms are in our list of internet companies ranked by revenue.

COMPANY	REVENUE	PRIOR YEAR	GROWTH	SHARE OF GROUP
Amazon	$716.9B	$638.0B	+12.4%	31.4%
Apple	$416.2B	$391.0B	+6.4%	18.2%
Alphabet	$402.8B	$350.0B	+15.1%	17.6%
Microsoft	$331.8B	$281.7B	+17.8%	14.5%

Nvidia	$215.9B	$130.5B	+65.5%	9.5%
Meta Platforms	$201.0B	$164.5B	+22.2%	8.8%
Total	$2,284.7B	$1,955.7B	+16.8%	100%

Growth rates now spread from single digits to more than 60 percent. Apple grew 6.4 percent, the slowest in the group, while Nvidia added 85.4 billion dollars of revenue in one year, almost as much as the whole of Meta revenue in 2021. What each company actually sells, from iPhones to search ads to cloud capacity, is broken down in our report on the biggest revenue source of each tech company.

Share of the Group

How the revenue pie is divided

Seen as one pool, the six companies split their 2.28 trillion dollars very unevenly. Amazon accounts for almost a third, Apple and Alphabet for close to a fifth each, Microsoft for about one seventh, and Nvidia and Meta for less than a tenth each. The donut uses the latest full fiscal year for every company.

Share of Combined Big Tech Revenue, Latest Fiscal Year (%)Total of 2,284.7 billion US dollars.

Data:

latest full fiscal year revenue of each company.

Note:

shares are BusinessStats calculations and add to 100 percent. Compiled by BusinessStats.Switch to the table for exact figures.

One third Amazon: the e-commerce and cloud group alone generates 31.4 percent of the revenue of the six.

The split looked very different a decade ago. In 2016 Apple produced 38.0 percent of the combined revenue of these six companies and Amazon 24.0 percent. By 2025 Apple had dropped to 18.6 percent, while Amazon rose to 32.1 percent, Nvidia from 1.2 to 9.7 percent and Meta from 4.9 to 9.0 percent. The shift reflects where growth has been: cloud computing, digital advertising and AI chips rather than consumer hardware.

COMPANY	SHARE 2016	SHARE 2025	CHANGE

Apple	38.0%	18.6%	-19.4 points
Amazon	24.0%	32.1%	+8.1 points
Microsoft	16.1%	12.6%	-3.5 points
Alphabet	15.9%	18.0%	+2.1 points
Meta Platforms	4.9%	9.0%	+4.1 points
Nvidia	1.2%	9.7%	+8.5 points

Ten Years of Revenue

A decade of combined revenue: from 568 billion to 2.23 trillion dollars

Adding the six together year by year shows how fast the group has grown as a whole. On an aligned basis, combined revenue rose from 567.6 billion dollars in 2016 to 1.09 trillion dollars in 2020 and 2.23 trillion dollars in 2025, a multiple of 3.9 and a compound annual growth rate of 16.4 percent. The group has not had a single year of falling revenue in that period.

Combined Revenue of Apple, Microsoft, Alphabet, Amazon, Meta and Nvidia, 2016 to 2025 (trillion US dollars)Each fiscal year placed in the calendar year in which most of it falls.

Data:

annual revenue from company annual reports.

Note:

Microsoft fiscal 2016 and 2017 as restated for the ASC 606 revenue standard; Nvidia fiscal 2017 to fiscal 2026 shown as 2016 to 2025; 2025 uses Microsoft fiscal 2025 (to June 2025). Compiled by BusinessStats.Switch to the table for exact figures.

Almost four times larger: combined revenue grew at 16.4 percent a year between 2016 and 2025, with no down year.

The fastest single year was 2021, when combined revenue jumped 29.2 percent, or 317 billion dollars, as pandemic demand lifted online retail, advertising, cloud and devices at the same time. The slowest were 2022 and 2023, at about 9 percent each, when advertising weakened, Meta posted its only revenue decline (to 116.6 billion dollars in 2022) and Apple dipped in fiscal 2023. Growth then accelerated again to 14.7 percent in 2024 and 16.4 percent in 2025 as AI spending took off.

COMPANY	2016 REVENUE	2025 REVENUE	MULTIPLE	ANNUAL GROWTH RATE
Nvidia	$6.9B	$215.9B	31.3x	46.6%
Meta Platforms	$27.6B	$201.0B	7.3x	24.7%
Amazon	$136.0B	$716.9B	5.3x	20.3%
Alphabet	$90.3B	$402.8B	4.5x	18.1%
Microsoft	$91.2B	$281.7B	3.1x	13.4%
Apple	$215.6B	$416.2B	1.9x	7.6%
Combined	$567.6B	$2,234.5B	3.9x	16.4%

Nvidia is the outlier: its revenue rose more than thirtyfold, almost all of it after 2022, when data center demand for its graphics processors exploded. Apple, the largest of the six in 2016, grew the least. Year by year histories for individual companies are available in our pages on Alphabet annual revenue and Apple revenue by quarter since 2005.

Latest Quarter

The latest quarter: 677 billion dollars in three months

The most recent results, for the quarter that ended in June 2026 (July for Nvidia), show the group still accelerating. Combined revenue reached 676.8 billion dollars, up 28.0 percent from the same quarter a year earlier, well above the 16.8 percent growth of the last full fiscal years. Every company grew by double digits, including Apple at 16.4 percent.

Revenue Growth: Latest Fiscal Year vs Latest Quarter (%)Year on year growth in revenue.

Data:

company earnings releases and annual reports.

Note:

growth rates are BusinessStats calculations from reported revenue. Compiled by BusinessStats.Switch to the table for exact figures.

Faster, not slower: five of the six grew faster in the latest quarter than in their last full fiscal year; Microsoft was steady at about 18 percent.

COMPANY	QUARTER	REVENUE	GROWTH	OPERATING INCOME	OPERATING MARGIN
Amazon	Q2 2026	$200.6B	+19.6%	$27.5B	13.7%
Alphabet	Q2 2026	$119.8B	+24.2%	$40.8B	34.0%
Apple	Q3 FY2026	$109.4B	+16.4%	$35.7B	32.6%
Nvidia	Q2 FY2027	$96.2B	+106%	$63.7B	66.2%
Microsoft	Q4 FY2026	$90.0B	+17.7%	$40.6B	45.1%
Meta Platforms	Q2 2026	$60.8B	+28.0%	$18.8B	30.9%

Two quarterly milestones stand out. Nvidia, with 96.2 billion dollars, now has more quarterly revenue than Microsoft (90.0 billion dollars), and its operating income of 63.7 billion dollars was the highest of all six, ahead of Alphabet (40.8 billion dollars) and Microsoft (40.6 billion dollars). Alphabet, meanwhile, posted 119.8 billion dollars, ahead of Apple in a June quarter, helped by Google Cloud revenue of 24.8 billion dollars, up 82 percent.

Cloud is the common thread. Amazon Web Services grew 37 percent to 42.2 billion dollars, with operating income of 16.6 billion dollars, more than half of total Amazon operating income. Microsoft said Azure and other cloud services grew 43 percent in its June quarter and that Azure passed 100 billion dollars of annual revenue for the first time. How the three main cloud providers split the market is covered in our analysis of the cloud infrastructure market.

Operating Margins

Operating income and margins: Nvidia and Microsoft lead

Revenue rankings and profit rankings are very different. Combined operating income in the latest fiscal years was 711.0 billion dollars, an operating margin of 31.1 percent for the group. Microsoft earned the most operating income in absolute terms, 155.2 billion dollars in fiscal 2026, followed by Apple (133.1 billion dollars), Nvidia (130.4 billion dollars) and Alphabet (129.0 billion dollars).

Operating Margin by Company, Latest Fiscal Year (%)Operating income as a share of revenue.

Data:

reported GAAP operating income and revenue.

Note:

Apple and Alphabet both round to 32.0 percent (Apple 31.97, Alphabet 32.03). Compiled by BusinessStats.Switch to the table for exact figures.

Six to one: Nvidia keeps 60 cents of every revenue dollar as operating profit, Amazon about 11 cents.

Amazon is the clear exception, with an operating margin of 11.2 percent, because retail and logistics carry thin margins. The group total masks this: Amazon produced 31 percent of the revenue of the six but only 11 percent of their operating income. Within Amazon, the cloud unit does most of the earning, as our data on Amazon operating income by segment shows.

COMPANY	OPERATING INCOME	PRIOR YEAR	OPERATING MARGIN
Microsoft	$155.2B	$128.5B	46.8%
Apple	$133.1B	$123.2B	32.0%
Nvidia	$130.4B	$81.5B	60.4%
Alphabet	$129.0B	$112.4B	32.0%
Meta Platforms	$83.3B	$69.4B	41.4%
Amazon	$80.0B	$68.6B	11.2%
Total	$711.0B	$583.6B	31.1%

Margins are now under pressure at the heaviest spenders. Meta reported an operating margin of 31 percent in the June 2026 quarter, down from 43 percent a year earlier, as costs rose 55 percent, including 2.40 billion dollars of legal charges and 1.18 billion dollars of severance. Rising depreciation from new data centers is the main structural reason, and it will grow as the 2025 and 2026 capex flows through the income statement.

Net Income

Net income: why reported profits need a second look

Net income for the six totalled 636.1 billion dollars in their latest fiscal years. Microsoft reported the most at 133.7 billion dollars, followed by Alphabet (132.2 billion dollars), Nvidia (120.1 billion dollars) and Apple (112.0 billion dollars). Nvidia had the highest net margin at 55.6 percent, Amazon the lowest at 10.8 percent.

COMPANY	NET INCOME	NET MARGIN	ITEMS TO NOTE

Microsoft (FY2026)	$133.7B	40.3%	Up 31% from $101.8B
Alphabet (2025)	$132.2B	32.8%	Higher than operating income because of non-operating income
Nvidia (FY2026)	$120.1B	55.6%	Up from $72.9B
Apple (FY2025)	$112.0B	26.9%	Up from $93.7B
Amazon (2025)	$77.7B	10.8%	Up from $59.2B
Meta Platforms (2025)	$60.5B	30.1%	Includes a one-time non-cash tax charge of $15.93B

Several of these figures are distorted by one-off items, which is why operating income is the better guide to the underlying business. Meta recorded a one-time, non-cash income tax charge of 15.93 billion dollars in the third quarter of 2025 after the One Big Beautiful Bill Act was enacted, which pushed its net income below the 2024 level even though operating income rose 20 percent.

In 2026 the distortion runs the other way. Alphabet reported net income of 112.2 billion dollars for the June 2026 quarter, almost three times its operating income, because of a net gain of 98.0 billion dollars, mainly unrealised gains on equity securities. Amazon reported quarterly net income of 62.6 billion dollars, including 53.4 billion dollars of non-operating pre-tax income, primarily from its investments in Anthropic. Long run profit histories for one company are in our series on Apple net income since 2005.

AI Capex Race

The AI capex race: spending from 2023 to 2026

Capital expenditure is where Big Tech has changed most since 2023. The four companies that run large cloud and AI data center fleets, Amazon, Alphabet, Microsoft and Meta, spent a combined 140.1 billion dollars on property and equipment in 2023. In 2025 the figure was 357.5 billion dollars, and guidance for 2026 adds up to roughly 730 billion dollars, about twice the 2025 level.

Capital Expenditure of the Four Hyperscalers, 2023 to 2026 Guidance (billion US dollars)2023 to 2025: cash purchases of property and equipment. 2026: latest guidance.

Data:

Amazon, Alphabet, Microsoft and Meta filings and earnings calls.

Note:

Microsoft fiscal years to June for 2023 to 2025, calendar 2026 guidance of about $175B including finance leases. Meta 2026 is the midpoint of $130B to $145B including finance lease principal; Alphabet midpoint of $195B to $205B; Amazon about $220B. 2026 = guidance, not actual. Compiled by BusinessStats.Switch to the table for exact figures.

Five times in three years: combined capex of the four is on course to rise from about 140 billion dollars in 2023 to roughly 730 billion dollars in 2026.

The run rate is already visible in the quarterly numbers. In the three months to June 2026, Amazon spent 54.2 billion dollars on property and equipment, Alphabet 44.9 billion dollars, Microsoft 35.8 billion dollars and Meta 30.1 billion dollars: 165.0 billion dollars in one quarter, up 87 percent from 88.2 billion dollars a year earlier. Amazon alone spent 173.0 billion dollars over the twelve months to June 2026.

COMPANY	FIRST GUIDANCE	LATEST GUIDANCE (JULY 2026)	BASIS
Amazon	About $200B (February)	About $220B	Cash capex, calendar 2026
Alphabet	$175B to $185B (February)	$195B to $205B	Calendar 2026
Microsoft	About $190B (April)	About $175B	Calendar 2026, includes finance leases; cut reflects lease reclassification, not lower spending
Meta Platforms	$115B to $135B (January)	$130B to $145B	Includes principal payments on finance leases

Each revision except the Microsoft one went up. Alphabet raised its range twice and said capex will rise significantly again in 2027. Amazon said the increase to about 220 billion dollars was driven mainly by higher memory costs. Microsoft lowered its reported figure from about 190 billion dollars to about 175 billion dollars only because more future data center leases will be classified as operating leases, which are not counted in capex; its CFO said underlying calendar 2026 investment plans were unchanged.

Capex intensity shows how differently the six are positioned. In their latest fiscal years Microsoft (34.9 percent) and Meta (34.7 percent) spent more than a third of revenue on property and equipment, Alphabet 22.7 percent and Amazon 18.4 percent. Apple (3.1 percent) and Nvidia (2.8 percent) are light by comparison: Apple relies on contract manufacturers and Nvidia on chip foundries. The heavy spending has a cost: Amazon reported free cash flow of minus 7.6 billion dollars for the twelve months to June 2026.

Physical capacity being built is tracked in our data center statistics.

COMPANY	CAPEX	SHARE OF REVENUE	YEAR ON YEAR
Amazon (2025)	$131.8B	18.4%	+59%
Microsoft (FY2026)	$115.9B	34.9%	+80%
Alphabet (2025)	$91.4B	22.7%	+74%
Meta Platforms (2025)	$69.7B	34.7%	+87%
Apple (FY2025)	$12.7B	3.1%	+35%
Nvidia (FY2026)	$6.0B	2.8%	+87%
Total	$427.7B	18.7%	n/a

Where the Capex Goes

Where the capex goes: Nvidia sits on the other side of the trade

A large part of what the hyperscalers spend ends up as Nvidia revenue, which makes Nvidia the one member of the group whose sales depend directly on the investment budgets of the others. Nvidia reported data center revenue of 193.7 billion dollars in fiscal 2026, about 90 percent of its total, and 89.0 billion dollars in the quarter to July 2026 alone, up 117 percent.

The customer base is concentrated. In its fiscal 2026 annual report, Nvidia said one direct customer accounted for 22 percent of total revenue and another for 14 percent, and that some indirect customers, which buy through system makers and cloud providers, individually represent 10 percent or more of revenue. Nvidia does not name them in the filing. It guided to revenue of 108.0 billion dollars, plus or minus 2 percent, for the quarter to October 2026, assuming no data center compute revenue from China. More on the chipmaker is in our Nvidia statistics and facts.

How the capex race links the six

- Amazon, Alphabet, Microsoft and Meta spent about 357.5 billion dollars on property and equipment in 2025 (Microsoft fiscal 2025), while Nvidia booked 193.7 billion dollars of data center revenue in its fiscal 2026.
- Servers, chips and networking are short lived assets: Microsoft said about two thirds of its June quarter capex went to short lived assets, mainly CPUs and GPUs.

- Amazon, Alphabet, Microsoft and Meta are cloud and AI rivals, yet all four are also large Nvidia customers and design their own AI chips.

Research Spending

Research and development: 207 billion dollars a year

Five of the six report a research and development line, and together they spent 207.1 billion dollars on it in their latest fiscal years. Alphabet spent the most, 61.1 billion dollars, followed by Meta at 57.4 billion dollars, which is 28.5 percent of its revenue, the highest research intensity in the group. Microsoft spent 35.6 billion dollars, Apple 34.6 billion dollars and Nvidia 18.5 billion dollars.

COMPANY	R&D EXPENSE	SHARE OF REVENUE	PRIOR YEAR
Alphabet (2025)	$61.1B	15.2%	$49.3B
Meta Platforms (2025)	$57.4B	28.5%	$43.9B
Microsoft (FY2026)	$35.6B	10.7%	$32.5B
Apple (FY2025)	$34.6B	8.3%	$31.4B
Nvidia (FY2026)	$18.5B	8.6%	$12.9B
Amazon (2025)	Not reported separately	n/a	n/a

Amazon does not report R&D. Its closest line, technology and infrastructure, was 108.5 billion dollars in 2025, but it also includes the cost of running data centers and AWS, so it is not comparable. Research budgets are still rising fast in 2026: Apple spent 11.7 billion dollars in its June 2026 quarter, up 32 percent, Alphabet 18.2 billion dollars (up 32 percent) and Meta 21.7 billion dollars. The long run Apple series is in our data on Apple research and development spending.

Employees

Employees and revenue per employee

The six employed about 2.28 million people at the end of their latest fiscal years, and Amazon accounts for 1.58 million of them, 69 percent of the total, because of its warehouses and delivery network. The others are far smaller: Microsoft 223,000, Alphabet 190,820, Apple about 166,000, Meta 78,865 and Nvidia about 42,000.

Revenue per Employee, Latest Fiscal Year (million US dollars)Revenue divided by year end headcount.

Data:

headcount as reported at fiscal year end: Apple full-time equivalent, Microsoft full-time, Amazon full-time and part-time.

Note:

definitions differ slightly between companies. Compiled by BusinessStats.Switch to the table for exact figures.

11 times apart: Nvidia generated about 5.1 million dollars of revenue per employee, Amazon about 455,000 dollars.

Revenue per employee ranges from about 455,000 dollars at Amazon to 5.14 million dollars at Nvidia. Profit per employee is even more uneven: Nvidia earned about 2.86 million dollars of net income per employee in fiscal 2026, against about 49,000 dollars at Amazon. Among the software and advertising companies, Meta (2.55 million dollars of revenue per employee) and Apple (2.51 million dollars) lead Alphabet (2.11 million dollars) and Microsoft (1.49 million dollars).

COMPANY	FISCAL YEAR END	EMPLOYEES	LATEST UPDATE
Amazon	Dec 2025	1,576,000	1,595,000 (June 2026)
Microsoft	Jun 2026	223,000	121,000 in the US, 102,000 abroad
Alphabet	Dec 2025	190,820	198,933 (June 2026)
Apple	Sep 2025	about 166,000	next update with fiscal 2026 report
Meta Platforms	Dec 2025	78,865	75,472 (June 2026)
Nvidia	Jan 2026	about 42,000	in 38 countries

Headcount is barely growing while capex explodes. Microsoft ended fiscal 2026 with 223,000 people, fewer than the 228,000 a year earlier, and Meta had 75,472 employees in June 2026, down 1 percent, after a headcount reduction in May 2026 that affected about 8,000 staff. Amazon added only 1 percent in 2025. Apple workforce history is in our series on the number of Apple employees.

Buybacks and Dividends

Cash returned to shareholders: 283 billion dollars

In their latest fiscal years the six returned 283.2 billion dollars to shareholders through share repurchases and dividends. Apple alone returned 106.1 billion dollars (90.7 billion dollars of buybacks and 15.4 billion dollars of dividends), equal to 95 percent of its net income. Alphabet returned 55.8 billion dollars, Microsoft 48.7 billion dollars, Nvidia 41.1 billion dollars and Meta 31.6 billion dollars.

Cash Returned to Shareholders, Latest Fiscal Year (billion US dollars)Cash paid for share repurchases plus dividends.

Data:

repurchases of common stock and dividends paid from each cash flow statement.

Note:

Amazon pays no dividend and made no repurchases in 2025. Compiled by BusinessStats.Switch to the table for exact figures.

Apple still dwarfs the rest: its 106.1 billion dollars of payouts were almost twice the next largest.

COMPANY	BUYBACKS	DIVIDENDS	TOTAL	SHARE OF NET INCOME
Apple	$90.7B	$15.4B	$106.1B	95%
Alphabet	$45.7B	$10.0B	$55.8B	42%
Microsoft	$22.3B	$26.4B	$48.7B	36%
Nvidia	$40.1B	$1.0B	$41.1B	34%
Meta Platforms	$26.2B	$5.3B	$31.6B	52%
Amazon	$0	$0	$0	0%

2026 shows the capex race starting to crowd out buybacks. Alphabet bought back no shares in the first half of 2026 after 45.7 billion dollars in 2025, and Meta also made no repurchases in the first half, after 26.2 billion dollars in 2025; both kept paying dividends. Apple and Nvidia, which spend little on data centers, kept going: Apple repurchased 62.1 billion dollars of stock in the nine months to June 2026 and Nvidia 39.0 billion dollars in the six months to July 2026, with about 99.0 billion dollars of authorisation left. How payouts and growth feed into valuations is shown in our ranking of the biggest companies by market value.

Corrected Figures

Figures corrected from the previous edition

The March 2026 version of this page contained several numbers that do not match the company filings. They have been checked against the original documents and replaced.

Corrections after checking the filings

- Meta 2025 net income was 60.5 billion dollars, not 83.3 billion dollars; 83.3 billion dollars was its operating income.
- Amazon 2025 net income was 77.7 billion dollars, not about 59 billion dollars; 59.2 billion dollars was the 2024 figure.
- Microsoft fiscal 2025 net income was 101.8 billion dollars, not about 108 billion dollars. Its fiscal 2026 net income was 133.7 billion dollars.
- Amazon spent 131.8 billion dollars on property and equipment in 2025; the figure of about 200 billion dollars was its plan for 2026, later raised to about 220 billion dollars.
- The six employ about 2.28 million people, not more than 2.5 million.
- Nvidia growth of 114 percent referred to fiscal 2025; in fiscal 2026 revenue grew 65.5 percent to 215.9 billion dollars.
- Market capitalisation figures and analyst forecasts were removed because they could not be tied to a primary source at a fixed date.

What to Watch

What to watch in the next results

The next round of results, for the quarter to September 2026, is expected from late October. Apple will also report its full fiscal 2026, which will change the combined annual figure again; after nine months Apple revenue stood at 364.4 billion dollars, up 16.2 percent. Company guidance for the September quarter points to continued growth: Amazon expects net sales of 197.0 to 202.0 billion dollars and operating income of 22.5 to 26.5 billion dollars, and Meta expects revenue of 61 to 64 billion dollars.

Three numbers will matter most for the group. First, whether hyperscaler capex keeps rising in line with guidance of roughly 730 billion dollars for 2026, and what Alphabet, Amazon, Meta and Microsoft signal for 2027. Second, whether margins hold as depreciation climbs, with the Meta decline from 43 to 31 percent

an early warning. Third, whether Nvidia meets its 108.0 billion dollar revenue outlook, which would confirm that the spending is still flowing to suppliers. The wider market behind this spending is sized in our report on the AI market worldwide, and the advertising side of the Meta business in our Facebook statistics.

Key Facts

Big Tech compared in eight numbers

$2.28TCombined revenueLatest full fiscal years.31.1%Group operating margin$711B of operating income.60.4%Nvidia operating marginFiscal 2026, highest of six.16.4%Annual growth 2016 to 2025Combined, aligned fiscal years.$165BFour hyperscalers capexOne quarter, April to June 2026.$207BCombined R&DFive companies, Amazon excluded.$5.1MNvidia revenue per employeeAbout 42,000 staff.$106BApple payoutsBuybacks and dividends, FY2025. FAQ

Questions about how the Big Tech companies compare

Apple, Microsoft, Alphabet, Amazon, Meta and Nvidia reported combined revenue of 2,284.7 billion dollars in their latest full fiscal years, 16.8 percent more than a year earlier.

Amazon, with 716.9 billion dollars in 2025, followed by Apple (416.2 billion dollars in fiscal 2025) and Alphabet (402.8 billion dollars in 2025).

Microsoft had the most operating income, 155.2 billion dollars in fiscal 2026, and the most net income, 133.7 billion dollars. Nvidia had the highest margins: 60.4 percent operating and 55.6 percent net.

Nvidia. Its revenue grew 65.5 percent in fiscal 2026 and 106 percent year on year in the quarter to July 2026, reaching 96.2 billion dollars.

Amazon, Alphabet, Microsoft and Meta spent 165 billion dollars on property and equipment in the quarter to June 2026, and their 2026 guidance adds up to roughly 730 billion dollars, about twice the 2025 level.

About 2.28 million at the end of their latest fiscal years, of which Amazon accounts for 1.58 million. Nvidia is the smallest employer with about 42,000 staff.

Nvidia, with about 5.1 million dollars of revenue per employee in fiscal 2026, against about 455,000 dollars at Amazon.

A combined 283.2 billion dollars in buybacks and dividends in their latest fiscal years, led by Apple with 106.1 billion dollars. Amazon pays no dividend and made no repurchases.

Apple ends its fiscal year in late September, Microsoft on 30 June and Nvidia in late January, while Alphabet, Amazon and Meta use the calendar year, so each company is compared on its own latest full year.

Sources

Apple Inc. - Form 10-K for fiscal 2025, fiscal 2025 fourth quarter earnings release and third quarter fiscal 2026 earnings release (Form 8-K).

Microsoft Corporation - Form 10-K for fiscal 2026, fiscal 2026 and fiscal 2024 fourth quarter earnings releases, and the fiscal 2026 fourth quarter earnings call.

Alphabet Inc. - fourth quarter 2025, fourth quarter 2024 and second quarter 2026 earnings releases, and earnings calls of February and July 2026.

Amazon.com, Inc. - fourth quarter 2025, fourth quarter 2024 and second quarter 2026 earnings releases, and earnings calls of February and July 2026.

Meta Platforms, Inc. - fourth quarter and full year 2025, fourth quarter 2024, third quarter 2025 and second quarter 2026 earnings releases.

NVIDIA Corporation - Form 10-K for fiscal 2026, fourth quarter fiscal 2026 and second quarter fiscal 2027 earnings releases.

US Securities and Exchange Commission, EDGAR - annual reports on Form 10-K of all six companies for fiscal years 2016 to 2025, used for the ten year revenue history.

Totals, shares, growth rates, margins, capex intensity, per employee values and payout ratios are BusinessStats calculations from reported figures. Capex is cash purchases of property and equipment (Nvidia includes intangible assets) unless stated; 2026 capex values are company guidance as of July 2026, not actual spending. Market capitalisation and analyst forecasts from the previous edition have been removed.

STATISTICS REPORT

AI Market Size Worldwide — 2020 to 2031 Statistics & Facts

Updated Mar 19, 2026 · businesstats.com/ai-market-size-worldwide

$390B AI MARKET 2025	**37%** CAGR 2020–2031	**$1.81T** PROJECTED 2031
$100B+ AI INVESTMENT 2025	**46%** GENAI CAGR	**$15.7T** PWC GDP IMPACT 2030

Overview

Global AI Market 2020–2031 — The Fastest Growing Technology Market in History

Artificial intelligence is experiencing the most rapid market expansion of any technology sector in history — surpassing the internet in the 1990s, smartphones in the 2000s, and cloud computing in the 2010s. The global AI market stood at **$62 billion in 2020**, grew to **$390 billion by 2025**, and is projected to reach **$1.81 trillion by 2031**. This represents a CAGR of approximately 37% — compound annual growth that turns every dollar invested in 2020 into roughly $29 by 2031. No technology market in history has scaled at this speed across this magnitude of absolute dollar value.

The market acceleration from 2022 onwards reflects the impact of generative AI — the technology behind ChatGPT, Google Gemini, Anthropic Claude, and image generators like Midjourney and DALL-E. Generative AI transformed AI from a largely enterprise back-office technology into a consumer phenomenon with mass-market adoption. OpenAI's ChatGPT reached 100 million users in just 2 months — the fastest consumer application adoption in recorded history. This triggered an enormous wave of enterprise spending, venture capital investment, and government programmes that have fundamentally restructured the AI market trajectory. For the broader technology investment picture, see our Nasdaq stock market statistics and Alphabet annual revenue data.

The global AI market is growing at 37% CAGR — the fastest technology market expansion in history. From $62B in 2020 to a projected $1.81T by 2031, AI is reshaping every industry from healthcare and finance to

retail, manufacturing, and education.

Market Size Chart

Global AI Market Size 2020–2031 — Bar Chart

The chart below shows the global AI market size from 2020 through 2025 (actual/estimated) and 2026–2031 (projected). The exponential growth curve is clearly visible — particularly the acceleration from 2022 driven by generative AI. Note that AI market size estimates vary significantly between research firms due to differing scope definitions: some measure only AI software platforms, others include hardware (NVIDIA GPUs, AI servers), and others encompass AI-enabled services (consulting, implementation). The figures here represent blended consensus estimates across Grand View Research, IDC, McKinsey, and Gartner. Hover over bars for year-by-year data.

Global AI Market 2020–2031 Global AI Market Size — USD Billions (2020 to 2031) Grand View Research · IDC · McKinsey · Gartner · *2026–2031 = projected consensus $390B2025 Estimate Actual / Estimated Projected * ▲CAGR ~37% · 29x growth 2020–2031 Sources: Grand View Research · IDC Worldwide AI Spending Guide · Gartner · McKinsey · Bloomberg Intelligence · *2026–2031 consensus projection

Full Data Table

AI Market Size by Year — Complete Data 2020 to 2031

Global AI Market Size 2020–2031 — Full DatasetClick columns to sort

YEAR	MARKET SIZE (USD)	YOY GROWTH	GENAI SHARE	STATUS	KEY DRIVER
2020	$62B	+24%	~2%	Actual	COVID digital acceleration
2021	$94B	+52%	~3%	Actual	Enterprise AI adoption surge
2022	$142B	+51%	~5%	Actual	MLOps, AI chips, cloud AI
2023	$207B	+46%	~18%	Actual	ChatGPT / GenAI explosion
2024	$279B	+35%	~28%	Actual	Enterprise GenAI deployment
2025	$390B	~+40%	~38%	Estimated	AI agents, AI PCs, GenAI scale
2026*	$540B*	~+38%*	~45%*	Projected	Agentic AI, multimodal models
2027*	$740B*	~+37%*	~50%*	Projected	AI-native software, robotics

2028*	$1.01T*	~+36%*	~55%*	Projected	AI healthcare, finance at scale
2029*	$1.30T*	~+29%*	~58%*	Projected	Physical AI, autonomous systems
2030*	$1.57T*	~+21%*	~62%*	Projected	AGI-adjacent, mass deployment
2031*	$1.81T*	~+15%*	~65%*	Projected	AI infrastructure maturity

Market Segments

AI Market by Segment — Software, Hardware & Services 2025

The AI market consists of three broad segments: **AI Software** (platforms, applications, algorithms, foundation models), **AI Hardware** (NVIDIA GPUs, TPUs, AI servers, custom silicon), and **AI Services** (consulting, integration, managed services). AI software is both the largest and fastest-growing segment driven by the enormous addressable market for AI applications across every industry vertical. AI hardware is the most visible segment due to NVIDIA's extraordinary stock performance — the company's market cap briefly exceeded $3 trillion in 2024 on AI chip demand. AI services is the most fragmented, spanning McKinsey AI strategy work to Accenture implementation to thousands of specialised AI consultancies. For the stock market context on AI hardware companies, see our comprehensive financial markets statistics and stock market terminology guide.

AI Market Segments — 2025 Breakdown Global AI Revenue by Segment — 2025 % of $390B total · Grand View Research · IDC · 2025 estimate

Regional Breakdown

AI Market by Region — North America Leads, Asia-Pacific Closes Fast

North America holds approximately 37% of the global AI market, driven by the concentration of AI-native companies (Google, Microsoft, Amazon, Meta, OpenAI, Anthropic) and the world's deepest venture capital ecosystem. The US government has also emerged as a major AI spender — the CHIPS and Science Act allocated $52 billion for semiconductor manufacturing, and the FY2026 federal budget includes substantial AI research funding across DARPA, NIH, and civilian agencies. Asia-Pacific is the second-largest region at approximately 28%, with China accounting for the majority. China's AI is concentrated in large state-backed companies (Baidu, Alibaba, Tencent, Huawei) and a growing ecosystem of AI startups. Europe holds approximately 20% share, constrained by the EU AI Act regulatory framework which, while providing consumer protections, has also raised compliance costs for AI deployers. For the broader digital economy

context, see our Alibaba statistics and Amazon statistics.

AI Market Share by Region — 2025 Global AI Market — Regional Share 2025 % of $390B total · IDC Worldwide AI Spending Guide · McKinsey 2025

Generative AI

Generative AI Market — 46% CAGR, $1.3 Trillion by 2032

Generative AI — technology that creates new content (text, images, audio, video, code) rather than merely analysing existing data — has transformed from a research curiosity to a multi-hundred-billion dollar market in just three years. Bloomberg Intelligence projects the generative AI market will grow from approximately $45 billion in 2023 to **$1.3 trillion by 2032**, a CAGR of 46%. This extraordinary growth reflects both the breadth of generative AI's applications (every knowledge worker is a potential user) and enterprise willingness to pay significant licensing fees for frontier models.

The generative AI market operates in three layers: **Foundation Models** (OpenAI, Anthropic, Google DeepMind, Meta AI, Mistral — training large language models from scratch), **Infrastructure** (NVIDIA chips, cloud providers AWS/Azure/GCP providing compute), and **Applications** (thousands of companies building products on top of foundation models — from GitHub Copilot to Salesforce Einstein). The application layer is where most long-term value will likely be captured. Whoever owns the end-user relationship and embeds AI into daily workflows creates switching costs that protect revenue. For company-level data on the biggest AI players see our Google statistics and Alphabet revenue breakdown.

Market Milestone ChatGPT — 100 Million Users in 2 Months: The Fastest Consumer App in History

OpenAI launched ChatGPT on 30 November 2022 and reached 100 million monthly active users by January 2023. TikTok took 9 months, Instagram 2.5 years, Facebook 4.5 years. By 2025, ChatGPT had approximately 400 million weekly active users. OpenAI's valuation reached $157 billion in 2024 — roughly equivalent to Goldman Sachs' market capitalisation, making it the most valuable AI startup in history. Broader AI assistant ecosystem: Google Gemini, Microsoft Copilot, Meta AI, and Anthropic Claude collectively serve over one billion monthly users across all platforms.

AI Investment

Global AI Investment — Over $100 Billion in 2025

AI investment reached unprecedented levels in 2025. Total global AI investment — combining venture capital ($50B+), corporate R&D ($30B+), and government spending ($20B+) — exceeded **$100 billion** for the first time. The US accounts for approximately 60% of global private AI investment. Largest corporate AI commitments in 2025-2026: Microsoft ($100B committed to AI infrastructure including its OpenAI partnership), Google ($75–80B in AI capex), Meta ($60–65B), Amazon ($50–60B+). These Big Tech hyperscaler investments are primarily in AI infrastructure — data centres, GPUs, subsea cables — reflecting the capital-intensive reality of training and serving frontier AI models at scale. NVIDIA became the world's most valuable public company briefly in 2024, its data centre revenue growing from $15B in FY2023 to $80B+ in FY2025.

$100B+Total AI Investment 2025 $50B+Venture Capital 2025 60%US Share of Global AI VC $157BOpenAI Valuation 2024 $100BMicrosoft AI Commitment $52BUS CHIPS Act

Industry Verticals

AI Spending by Industry Vertical — Financial Services Leads

AI investment is not evenly distributed across industries. Financial services leads AI spending globally, accounting for approximately 17% of total AI market value. Banks, hedge funds, and insurance companies use AI for algorithmic trading, fraud detection, credit scoring, regulatory compliance automation, and personalised financial advice. Healthcare and life sciences is the second-largest vertical — AI is being deployed for drug discovery (reducing development timelines from 10+ years), medical imaging diagnostics, electronic health records management, and clinical trial optimisation. Retail and e-commerce is third, with Amazon, Alibaba, and other large platforms investing heavily in AI for product recommendations, inventory management, dynamic pricing, and autonomous logistics. For more on the largest digital commerce platforms see our Alibaba statistics and Amazon statistics.

Trends & Line Chart

AI Market Trends 2020–2031 — Four Key Metrics Compared

The chart below tracks four critical AI market indicators from 2020 to 2031: **Total AI Market** (all segments combined), **Generative AI** (the fastest-growing sub-segment), **Global AI Investment** (VC + corporate + government), and **NVIDIA AI/Data Centre Revenue** (the most concrete real-time infrastructure spending proxy). Each line tells a different part of the AI story — the total market shows the scale, GenAI shows the

acceleration, investment shows capital commitment, and NVIDIA shows actual hardware demand.

AI Trends 2020–2031 Total AI, GenAI, Investment & NVIDIA Revenue — 2020 to 2031* USD Billions · Multiple sources · *2026–2031 projected $540BTotal AI 2026*

▲GenAI 46% CAGR · overtakes traditional AI by 2028 Sources: Grand View Research · Bloomberg Intelligence · IDC · NVIDIA earnings · *2026–2031 projected

The divergence between total AI market and the generative AI sub-segment from 2023 reflects how rapidly GenAI has come to dominate AI investment flows. NVIDIA's AI chip revenue — growing from approximately $5 billion in 2022 to over $80 billion in 2025 — is the most concrete real-time indicator of actual AI infrastructure spending. Every frontier model (GPT-4o, Gemini Ultra, Claude 3.5 Sonnet) required billions of dollars of NVIDIA GPU compute to train. Ongoing inference — serving AI responses to billions of daily users — adds further billions in annual infrastructure costs, driving sustained hardware demand through the forecast period.

NVIDIA's AI chip revenue grew from $5 billion in 2022 to over $80 billion in FY2025 — the fastest corporate revenue growth in history. A single frontier AI model training run can cost $50–150 million in compute. Ongoing inference (serving AI responses to users) adds billions more in annual infrastructure costs for each major model deployment.

Key Statistics

AI Market Key Facts & Statistics 2026

Global AI Market — Core Statistics 2026 AI Market Size Worldwide — Complete Fact Sheet $62BAI Market 2020 (Base Year) $390BAI Market 2025 (Estimated) $1.81TAI Market 2031 (Projected) 37%CAGR 2020–2031 46%GenAI CAGR through 2030 $15.7TPwC AI GDP Contribution 2030

Key Players

AI Market Key Players — Company Revenue Rankings 2025

The AI market is dominated by technology giants who have data, compute, and research talent to build foundational AI systems. **Microsoft** leads in enterprise AI revenue through its $13 billion investment in OpenAI and subsequent integration of AI across Azure (estimated $25B+ in AI-related cloud revenue), Microsoft 365 Copilot at $30/user/month for 300M+ Office users, and GitHub Copilot with 1.8 million paying subscribers. Microsoft is uniquely positioned as the enterprise AI distribution channel — almost

every large organization already pays for Microsoft software, making AI upsells structurally easier than for pure AI startups. **Google (Alphabet)** is the most AI-pervasive company globally — AI is embedded in Search, YouTube, Ads, Maps, Gmail, and Cloud. For full Google context see our Google statistics.

NVIDIA has become the defining infrastructure company of the AI era. Its H100 and H200 GPUs are the computational engines powering virtually every major AI model. Data center revenue grew from $15 billion in fiscal 2022 to over $90 billion in fiscal 2025 — one of the most rapid revenue accelerations in semiconductor history. NVIDIA's CUDA software platform creates significant switching costs that give it structural pricing power. **Amazon Web Services** integrates AI across SageMaker, Bedrock, Alexa, and custom chips (Trainium, Inferentia). For Amazon's broader context see our Amazon statistics.

OpenAI — valued at $157 billion in 2024 — is the most valuable private technology company in the world and the primary driver of the current AI boom through ChatGPT and GPT-4. Revenue grew from $28 million in 2022 to an estimated $3.7 billion in 2024. **Anthropic** — founded by former OpenAI researchers — has raised $7.3 billion from Amazon and Google, focusing on AI safety and the Claude model family. **xAI** (Elon Musk) launched Grok integrated with X/Twitter and raised $6 billion at a $24 billion valuation in 2024. The competitive dynamics among frontier AI labs are intense — talent costs are extraordinary, compute requirements grow exponentially, and winner-take-most dynamics create enormous incentives to maintain performance leadership. For stock investment context see our stock market terminology guide.

AI Venture Capital — $110 Billion Invested in 2025

AI startup funding has set consecutive records. In 2025, global AI venture capital investment reached approximately $110 billion — representing 35% of all venture capital deployed globally. This is up from $91 billion in 2024, $46 billion in 2023, and $15 billion in 2020. The top 10 AI deals in 2025 collectively raised over $30 billion, with individual mega-rounds including OpenAI ($6.6B at $157B valuation), xAI ($6B), Anthropic ($4B from Amazon), Scale AI ($1B), and Mistral ($1.1B). Late-stage AI companies are commanding valuation multiples of 20-50x forward revenue — reflecting extraordinary growth expectations. The AI IPO pipeline for 2026-2028 is substantial, with Databricks, Perplexity, Cohere, and various AI infrastructure firms considered likely public market candidates.

AI Adoption Statistics — From 20% to 72% in Eight Years

Enterprise AI adoption has crossed a critical threshold. McKinsey's 2025 Global Survey found that **72% of organisations globally** had adopted AI in at least one business function — up from 55% in 2023, 50% in 2022, and just 20% in 2017. The most common AI use cases: natural language processing for customer

service (56% of adopting organisations), computer vision for quality inspection (44%), predictive analytics for demand forecasting (42%), and generative AI for content creation (38%). However, the gap between AI adoption and value realisation is significant — only 28% report having scaled AI to deliver measurable enterprise-wide impact. Common barriers include data quality issues (55%), talent shortages (50%), integration complexity (45%), and unclear ROI frameworks (40%). Organisations that have successfully scaled AI report productivity improvements of 15-40% in AI-augmented roles, and cost reductions of 10-25% in AI-automated processes. For the US market context see our US financial markets statistics.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions — AI Market Size

The global AI market is estimated at approximately **$390 billion in 2025**, up ~40% from $279B in 2024. Generative AI accounts for approximately 38% (~$148B) of total spend. NVIDIA alone generates $80B+ in AI chip revenue. Estimates vary by research firm: Grand View Research ($390B), IDC ($380B), Gartner ($360B) — differences reflect varying scope definitions.

The global AI market is projected to reach approximately **$1.81 trillion by 2031** (Grand View Research consensus). By 2030, PwC estimates AI will contribute $15.7 trillion to global GDP. Goldman Sachs projects AI could add 7% to global GDP. McKinsey estimates AI's economic impact at $2.6–4.4 trillion annually from productivity gains.

Generative AI is growing at 46% CAGR — from $45B in 2023 to projected $1.3T by 2032 (Bloomberg Intelligence). AI chips/hardware is the fastest-growing hardware segment. Healthcare AI and financial services AI are the fastest-growing industry verticals by absolute dollar spend.

North America leads decisively — approximately 37% of global AI market (~$145B in 2025), driven by US tech giants and the world's most active AI venture capital ecosystem. Asia-Pacific is #2 at 28%, with China the dominant force. Europe holds approximately 20% but faces regulatory headwinds from the EU AI Act. The UK, Canada, France, and Israel are notable secondary AI hubs.

Total global AI investment exceeded **$100 billion in 2025**: VC ~$50B, corporate R&D ~$30B, government ~$20B. Microsoft committed $100B (incl. OpenAI). Google, Meta, Amazon each plan $50–80B in AI capex in 2025–2026. OpenAI reached a $157B valuation in 2024.

PwC: AI will contribute **$15.7 trillion to global GDP by 2030** (China +$7T, North America +$3.7T, Northern Europe +$1.8T). Goldman Sachs: AI could boost global GDP by 7%. McKinsey: AI will automate 30% of

work hours by 2030, primarily repetitive cognitive tasks. Jobs impact is mixed — significant displacement in some roles, significant creation in AI development, deployment, and oversight roles.

Data Sources & References

Primary: Grand View Research — Artificial Intelligence Market Size Report 2025

Primary: IDC — Worldwide AI and Generative AI Spending Guide, 2025–2029

Primary: McKinsey Global Institute — The State of AI 2025

Supporting: Goldman Sachs — Generative AI Research Report · PwC — Sizing the Prize: AI Economic Impact · Bloomberg Intelligence — Generative AI Forecast

Supporting: Stanford HAI AI Index 2025 · NVIDIA Annual Report FY2025 · Gartner AI Hype Cycle 2025 · CB Insights State of AI · OECD AI Policy Observatory

AI market size figures vary significantly across research firms due to scope differences (software-only vs software + hardware + services). All figures here are blended consensus estimates. Projections marked * are subject to revision. Generative AI figures from Bloomberg Intelligence and Goldman Sachs. All USD unless stated. AI Market Size 2025AI Market Size 2026Artificial Intelligence MarketGenerative AI MarketAI Market 2031AI Investment StatisticsNVIDIA AI RevenueAI CAGRAI GDP ImpactChatGPT Market Statistics

STATISTICS REPORT

Wearable device unit shipments worldwide 2014-2029

Updated Jun 15, 2026 · businesstats.com/wearables-worldwide-shipments

612M 2025 SHIPMENTS	**+9.1%** 2025 GROWTH	**+89%** 2019 BOOM
705M 2029 FORECAST	**~6.7B** TOTAL 2014-29	**22%** APPLE SHARE

Overview

Wearables unit shipments worldwide from 2014 to 2029

In a little over a decade, the wearable has gone from a niche gadget to one of the most widely shipped consumer electronics categories on earth. Worldwide wearable device shipments rose from under 30 million units in 2014 to around 612 million in 2025, an almost twentyfold increase, and are forecast to climb toward 705 million by 2029. Behind that surge lies a dramatic shift in what counts as a wearable, from the early fitness bands and first smartwatches to the wireless earbuds, or hearables, that now dominate the market. This is the story of how a category exploded, told through annual shipments from 2014 to 2029.

The wearable market today spans smartwatches, fitness wristbands, and above all earwear, the wireless earbuds and headphones that became a mass-market phenomenon after Apple launched the AirPods. These ear-worn devices, classed as hearables, transformed the category from a modest wrist-based market into a vast one shipping hundreds of millions of units a year. The figures here, based on data from IDC, track all of these form factors together, in millions of units, capturing both the explosive growth phase and the more mature, steadier market the category has become. The closely watched tablet market is covered in our global tablet shipments analysis.

Annual Wearable Shipments, 2014-2029 (M units)Unit shipments, millions. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

Data:

IDC Worldwide Quarterly Wearable Device Tracker, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Millions of units; years from 2026 onward are forecasts.Switch views with the toolbar and metric above. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

A note on the data is useful. These figures cover annual worldwide wearable device shipments, in millions of units, from 2014 through forecasts for 2029, and are based on data from IDC, the standard industry tracker for the category. The historical years are well documented, while the years from 2026 onward are forecasts that carry the usual uncertainty of any projection. The category definition is broad, encompassing earwear, watches, wristbands and emerging form factors such as smart rings and glasses, which is why total volumes are so much larger than for watches alone.

What makes the wearable story remarkable is how completely its character changed along the way. The category that began as a fitness-tracking novelty on the wrist was reinvented by the wireless earbud, which turned wearables into an everyday accessory for hundreds of millions of people. Today the wearable is a mature, high-volume market shipping more units each year than tablets and PCs combined, yet one increasingly driven by replacement demand rather than first-time buyers. The shipment curve that follows charts that journey, set against the wider device landscape explored in our big tech revenue comparison analysis.

Annual Data Table

Annual Wearable Shipments, 2014-2029

Annual Wearable Shipments, 2014-2029 (M units, (f)=forecast)Click any column to sort

YEAR	SHIPMENTS	YOY GROWTH
2014	28.8 M	-
2015	78.1 M	+171.2%
2016	102.4 M	+31.1%
2017	115.4 M	+12.7%
2018	178.2 M	+54.4%
2019	336.5 M	+88.8%
2020	444.7 M	+32.2%

2021	533.6 M	+20.0%
2022	492.1 M	-7.8%
2023	524.0 M	+6.5%
2024	560.5 M	+7.0%
2025	611.5 M	+9.1%
2026 (f)	640.0 M	+4.7%
2027 (f)	665.0 M	+3.9%
2028 (f)	685.0 M	+3.0%
2029 (f)	705.0 M	+2.9%

The table shows annual wearable shipments for every year from 2014 to 2029, alongside the rate of change. The early rows capture the category finding its feet, followed by the extraordinary surge of 2019 to 2021 as hearables went mainstream and the pandemic boosted demand for health and audio devices. The market then dipped slightly in 2022 and 2023 before returning to growth, with steady single-digit gains forecast through the rest of the decade. Sorting the growth column reveals just how dramatic the hearables-driven boom was compared with the calmer years on either side.

Shipment Trend

From Novelty to Mainstream

The annual curve makes the wearable's explosive growth unmistakable. The line starts almost flat in the early years, when the category was small and built around fitness bands and first-generation smartwatches. Then comes the dramatic surge from 2018 to 2021, as wireless earbuds went mainstream and pandemic demand for health and audio devices accelerated adoption. After 2021 the curve flattens into a mature plateau, rising only gently as the market shifts from rapid expansion to steady replacement-driven growth.

This shape, a slow start, a steep climb, and then a high plateau, is the classic profile of a technology that crosses from early adoption into the mainstream. The inflection point came around 2019, when hearables transformed the category from a wrist-based niche into a mass market spanning ears as well. Once that wave of first-time adoption crested, growth naturally slowed, leaving a very large market that now expands

at a far gentler pace, much as smartphones did after their own boom, as traced in our quarterly smartphone shipments analysis.

Shipment Trend with Forecast (M units)Unit shipments, millions. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

Data:

IDC Worldwide Quarterly Wearable Device Tracker, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Millions of units; years from 2026 onward are forecasts.Switch views with the toolbar. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

It is worth emphasising how unusual the scale of this growth has been. Few consumer electronics categories have grown twentyfold in a decade, and fewer still have done so by effectively absorbing an entirely new form factor midstream. The wearable's trajectory reflects not one product but a family of devices, each adding to the total, which is why the category now ships in volumes that rival the largest device markets despite having barely existed in its modern form fifteen years ago. The pace also caught many forecasters off guard, with early projections for the category repeatedly revised upward as hearables outran every expectation. That history is a useful caution against assuming the market has now settled into a fully predictable path, since the same disruptive potential that reshaped it once could surface again as new form factors mature.

Annual Growth

The Hearables Boom in Growth Rates

Plotting annual growth lays bare the wearable's boom-and-plateau pattern. The standout years are 2019, when shipments jumped by close to 90 percent as hearables went mainstream, and 2020, with another large gain driven by pandemic demand. After the peak of 2021, growth turned briefly negative in 2022 as the market digested the pandemic surge, before settling into modest single-digit gains forecast for the rest of the decade. The pattern is that of a category that grew explosively, paused, and then matured into steady expansion.

This deceleration is the natural consequence of success. The triple-digit and double-digit growth rates of the boom years simply could not continue once most interested consumers owned earbuds and a smartwatch. The brief decline of 2022 reflected a post-pandemic hangover and tougher economic conditions, not a structural problem, and the market quickly returned to growth. The forecast of gentle,

mid-single-digit gains through 2029 points to a mature category sustained by replacement demand, new health features and emerging form factors such as smart rings, themes explored in our artificial intelligence worldwide statistics overview.

Annual Shipment Growth Rate (%)Year-over-year change, percent.

Data:

IDC Worldwide Quarterly Wearable Device Tracker, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Millions of units; years from 2026 onward are forecasts.Switch views with the toolbar. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

The growth chart also highlights how dependent the category became on a single catalyst. The hearables wave drove the most dramatic gains, and once it crested, the underlying growth rate of the rest of the market, watches and bands, was revealed to be far more modest. This is characteristic of a maturing market, where headline growth gives way to a steadier baseline punctuated by occasional bursts tied to new features or form factors rather than broad, category-wide expansion.

6.7 Billion Wearables

6.7 Billion Wearables and Counting

Adding up every year since 2014 reveals a staggering total: roughly 6.7 billion wearable devices shipped worldwide between 2014 and 2029. From almost nothing in modern terms, the category has put billions of earbuds, watches and bands onto wrists and into ears in little more than a decade, building one of the largest installed bases in consumer electronics. The cumulative line climbs ever more steeply as annual volumes grow, underlining how quickly the wearable went from curiosity to ubiquity.

This vast installed base is the engine of the category's future. With billions of devices in use, the market generates dependable replacement demand, particularly for earbuds, which are lost, damaged or upgraded far more often than watches. For Apple in particular, wearables built around the AirPods and Apple Watch have become a substantial business, contributing to the company's results as detailed in our Apple total net sales analysis. The cumulative total underlines that wearables, far from a passing fad, have become a permanent and growing fixture of personal technology.

Cumulative Wearable Shipments Since 2014Running total, billions of units.

Data:

IDC Worldwide Quarterly Wearable Device Tracker, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Millions of units; years from 2026 onward are forecasts.Switch views with the toolbar. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

The cumulative figure also reframes how the wearable should be understood. It is no longer an accessory category but a core device market, shipping more units in a single recent year than tablets ship in three. This scale gives the leading vendors powerful incentives to keep investing, and it anchors a large ecosystem of health services, audio platforms and app experiences built around devices people wear all day, every day, a level of engagement few other gadgets can match. That constant presence also makes wearables a uniquely valuable gateway for health monitoring, contactless payments and voice assistants, extending their importance well beyond the hardware itself. As healthcare systems begin to recognise the data these devices collect, the vast installed base could become as significant for medicine as it already is for consumer technology.

Shipments by Era

Wearable Shipments by Era

Grouping the years into eras captures the wearable's transformation. The early era of 2014 to 2017 averaged just over 80 million units a year, a modest market built around fitness bands and first smartwatches. The hearables boom of 2018 to 2021 averaged around 373 million as wireless earbuds and pandemic demand drove explosive growth. The mature era of 2022 to 2029 averages around 610 million, a vast but more slowly growing market. The averages tell the story of a category that quadrupled and then quadrupled again within a decade.

The era view makes clear that the wearable did not simply grow, it changed in kind. The early era was a small, experimental market feeling out whether consumers wanted devices on their wrists. The boom era settled that question emphatically, as hundreds of millions adopted earbuds and watches. The mature era represents the new normal: a huge, established market that grows steadily rather than explosively, a profile that increasingly resembles the smartphone and PC markets covered in our global PC shipments analysis.

Average Annual Shipments by Era (M units)Average per year within each era (millions).

Data:

IDC Worldwide Quarterly Wearable Device Tracker, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Millions of units; years from 2026 onward are forecasts.Switch views with the toolbar. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

What the era averages cannot fully convey is how the centre of gravity shifted from the wrist to the ear. The early eras were defined by bands and watches, but it was earwear that powered the boom and now dominates volumes. This shift reshaped the competitive landscape, drawing in audio brands alongside traditional electronics makers, and it explains why the modern wearable market is far larger, and far more fragmented, than the wrist-based market of its early years. This migration from wrist to ear also changed who the category buyers are, broadening it from fitness enthusiasts to virtually every smartphone owner who wants better audio. In doing so, wearables shed their image as specialist gadgets and became, like the smartphone before them, a near-universal accessory of modern life.

Categories

Earwear Rules: The Category Split

Breaking the market down by category reveals what really drives the numbers: earwear. Wireless earbuds and headphones account for the largest single share of wearable shipments, with well over 300 million units a year, dwarfing every other form factor. Smartwatches form the second pillar, shipping around 150 million units annually, while fitness wristbands, once the heart of the category, have shrunk to a small slice as their functions were absorbed into watches. Emerging form factors such as smart rings and glasses remain small but are growing fast.

The dominance of earwear is the single most important fact about the modern wearable market. It explains why total volumes are so large, why the category grew so explosively after 2018, and why audio brands now compete alongside watchmakers and electronics giants. Earbuds are inexpensive, frequently replaced and bought by a far broader audience than smartwatches, which makes them the volume engine of the entire category. Smartwatches, though fewer in number, command higher prices and deeper engagement, anchoring the premium end of the market.

Wearable Shipments by Category, 2024Composition by category, 2024 (millions of units).

Data:

IDC, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Category and vendor splits are recent estimates; values approximate.Switch views with the toolbar. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

This category structure shapes the strategies of every major player. Vendors that lead in earwear, such as Apple with its AirPods, win on sheer volume, while those strong in smartwatches capture higher margins and richer health and fitness ecosystems. The decline of the standalone wristband, meanwhile, shows how quickly form factors can rise and fall within the category, a reminder that today's volume leaders must keep innovating to avoid the fate of the once-dominant fitness band. The rapid rise of the smart ring is the clearest current example, offering much of the health tracking of a watch in a far smaller package, and several major brands have entered the segment in pursuit of the next growth wave. Whether rings, glasses or some yet-unseen form factor becomes the next earwear remains an open question, but the category history suggests the answer could reshape the rankings quickly.

Category Trends

How Earwear Took Over

Tracking the categories over time shows how completely earwear reshaped the market. In 2018, before the hearables wave fully broke, earwear, smartwatches and wristbands were far closer in size. By the early 2020s, earwear had surged past the others to become by far the largest segment, while wristbands went into decline. Smartwatches grew steadily throughout, never matching earwear's explosive rise but building a large and durable market of their own focused on health, fitness and notifications.

This divergence explains much of the category's overall shape. The explosive growth of total wearable shipments was overwhelmingly an earwear story, layered on top of the slower, steadier growth of smartwatches. As earwear approaches saturation in mature markets, its growth is cooling, which is why the headline category is now expanding more gently. Smartwatches, with their richer feature sets and health capabilities, are expected to keep growing steadily, increasingly serving as health devices as much as accessories.

Shipments by Category Over Time (M units)By category, millions of units (estimated). Area view stacks to total.

Data:

IDC, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Category and vendor splits are recent estimates; values approximate.Switch views with the toolbar. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

The contrasting trajectories of the three categories underline a broader truth about wearables: the label covers very different products serving very different needs. Earbuds are about audio and convenience, watches about health and connectivity, bands about simple fitness tracking. Lumping them together produces impressive headline numbers, but the real dynamics play out at the category level, where earwear drives volume, smartwatches drive value, and new form factors hint at where the next wave of growth might come from.

Leading Vendors

Apple Leads a Fragmented Field

The hundreds of millions of wearables shipped each year are spread across a notably fragmented field of vendors. Apple leads overall, powered by the AirPods and Apple Watch, with roughly a fifth of global shipments and a far larger share of revenue thanks to premium pricing. Behind Apple sit a cluster of rivals including Xiaomi, Huawei and Samsung, each strong in particular regions or categories, while a long tail of audio and electronics brands accounts for a large combined share, reflecting how accessible the earbud market has become.

This fragmentation distinguishes wearables from more concentrated device markets. The low cost and broad appeal of wireless earbuds have allowed dozens of brands to win meaningful volume, especially in price-sensitive emerging markets, so that the others category is unusually large. Apple's leadership rests on the premium end and on the tight integration of its devices with the iPhone, a dynamic that mirrors its position across categories as detailed in our smartphone market share by vendor analysis.

Wearable Shipment Share by Vendor, 2024Vendor share of unit shipments, 2024 (percent).

Data:

IDC, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Category and vendor splits are recent estimates; values approximate.Switch views with the toolbar. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

Beneath Apple, competition is fierce and regionally varied. Xiaomi and Huawei are powerful in China and other emerging markets, Samsung leans on its smartphone ecosystem, and specialist audio brands such as boAt dominate value segments in markets like India. The result is a market where one premium leader coexists with a crowded field of value players, and where shipment rankings can shift quickly as new earbud models and price points reshape demand at the lower end. This churn at the value end contrasts sharply with the stability at the top, where the grip of premium brands on their buyers has proved remarkably durable. For analysts, the fragmentation means headline share figures can understate how profitable the category is for its leaders, since a large slice of the earnings flows to a handful of premium brands rather than the many makers chasing volume.

Milestone Years

The Wearable Arc in Five Years

A handful of milestone years trace the wearable's entire arc. In 2014, the young category shipped under 30 million units, a fitness-band curiosity. By 2019, the hearables boom had pushed shipments past 336 million, a near doubling in a single year. The pandemic-fuelled surge of 2021 reached 534 million, then after a dip the market hit a record 612 million in 2025. The forecast for 2029 points to around 705 million units, a mature market still growing steadily. Together these years span the wearable's journey from novelty to mainstream essential.

What stands out across these milestones is the sheer speed of the transformation. In just five years, from 2014 to 2019, the category grew more than tenfold, a pace almost unheard of in mature consumer electronics. The years since have been about consolidation rather than explosion, with the market settling into steady growth at a very high level. Each milestone marks not just a larger number but a different phase, from experimentation to boom to maturity, in the space of a single decade.

Shipments at Milestone Years (M units)Selected milestone years (millions of units).

Data:

IDC Worldwide Quarterly Wearable Device Tracker, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Millions of units; years from 2026 onward are forecasts.Switch views with the toolbar. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

These milestone years also serve as useful benchmarks for the category's health. Annual shipments above 500 million confirm a market firmly in the mainstream, while the gentle slope from 2025 toward 2029 signals maturity rather than stagnation. The forecast trajectory, steady growth toward 705 million units, describes a category that has found its level as a permanent fixture of personal technology, neither booming as it once did nor fading, but quietly expanding year after year. Set against the wild swings of its early years, this steadiness is itself a kind of achievement, marking the graduation of the wearable into the ranks of established, dependable device categories. The numbers from here are likely to be less dramatic than those of the boom, but they describe a market that has become a permanent part of how billions manage their health, their music and their daily connectivity.

Wearables vs Tablets

Wearables Overtake Tablets

Setting wearables against tablets reveals one of the most striking reversals in consumer electronics. In 2018 the two categories shipped broadly comparable volumes, but over the following years wearables roughly tripled while tablets stayed essentially flat. Indexing both to 2018 shows wearable shipments soaring while the tablet line moves sideways, a vivid illustration of how the wearable overtook and then left behind a category once seen as the future of computing. The tablet trajectory, by contrast, has been one of long stagnation after an early boom that briefly promised far more.

This divergence captures a broader shift in how people use technology. As tablets settled into a mature, replacement-driven niche, wearables rode the hearables wave and the rise of health tracking to become a far larger volume market. The contrast is all the more striking given that both categories are dominated by Apple, whose AirPods and Watch drove the wearable surge even as iPad volumes plateaued, a balance reflected in the revenue trends of our tablet industry revenue analysis.

Wearables vs Tablets Shipments, Indexed (2018 = 100)Indexed to 2018 = 100. Higher means faster growth from the 2018 base.

Data:

IDC Worldwide Quarterly Wearable Device Tracker, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Millions of units; years from 2026 onward are forecasts.Switch views with the toolbar. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

Ultimately, the wearable versus tablet comparison shows how unevenly the device landscape has evolved. Some categories, like the tablet, found a comfortable but limited niche, while others, like the wearable, unlocked entirely new use cases and scaled far beyond initial expectations. For anyone tracking where consumer technology is heading, the wearable stands out as the device category that grew up fastest, a theme that runs through the broader technology landscape mapped in our internet companies revenue analysis.

612M2025 ShipmentsRecord annual high. +9.1%2025 GrowthHearables wave. ~6.7BTotal ShippedSince 2014. 22%Apple ShareMarket leader.

Taken together, the annual data tells the full story of the wearable, from a sub-30-million-unit curiosity in 2014, through the hearables boom that pushed shipments past 500 million, to a record 612 million units in 2025 and a market forecast to near 705 million units by 2029. The category shipped roughly 6.7 billion devices over the period, was reshaped midstream by the rise of wireless earbuds, and is led by Apple at the premium end of a notably fragmented field. By 2029, the wearable has become one of the highest-volume consumer electronics categories in the world.

Yet the more important shift is qualitative. The wearable has evolved from a fitness novelty into an everyday essential that hundreds of millions wear all day, increasingly serving as a health and audio platform as much as a gadget. The questions ahead are whether smart rings, glasses and richer health features can drive the next wave of growth, or whether the category will settle into the steady maturity its forecast implies. The market value of the companies competing for these shipments is examined in our biggest companies by market value overview. Either way, the wearable has secured a lasting and central place in personal technology. What began as an experiment strapped to the wrist now rides on wrists and in ears across the world, generating data and engagement that few could have imagined in 2014. For the rest of this decade, the wearable looks set to remain not the flashiest device category, but one of the most quietly indispensable.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: Wearable Shipments

Worldwide wearable device shipments reached around 612 million units in 2025, up from under 30 million in 2014. Shipments are forecast to grow steadily to roughly 705 million units by 2029. The figures, based on IDC data, include earwear, smartwatches, wristbands and emerging form factors such as smart rings.

A wearable device is a smart electronic device worn on the body or clothing. The main categories are earwear, meaning wireless earbuds and headphones; smartwatches; and fitness wristbands, along with emerging form factors such as smart rings and glasses. Many track biometric data, run apps and connect to a smartphone, making wearables both health tools and everyday accessories.

Wearable shipments surged after 2018 mainly because of hearables, the wireless earbuds and headphones popularised by Apple's AirPods. These ear-worn devices brought a vast new audience to the category, and shipments jumped nearly 90 percent in 2019. Pandemic demand for health and audio devices in 2020 and 2021 accelerated the boom further, lifting the category past 500 million units a year.

Earwear, meaning wireless earbuds and headphones, is by far the biggest wearable category, with over 340 million units shipped in 2024. Smartwatches are second at around 150 million units, while fitness wristbands have shrunk as their functions were absorbed into watches. Earwear's dominance is the single most important driver of the category's overall volume.

Apple is the largest wearables maker, with roughly a fifth of global shipments and a far larger share of revenue thanks to premium pricing. Its AirPods and Apple Watch lead the market. Behind Apple sit Xiaomi, Huawei and Samsung, along with a long tail of audio and electronics brands that gives the wearable market an unusually fragmented structure.

Worldwide wearable shipments are forecast to reach around 705 million units by 2029, up from about 612 million in 2025, implying steady mid-single-digit annual growth. The growth is expected to come from replacement demand, new health features and emerging form factors such as smart rings and glasses, rather than from another explosive wave like the hearables boom.

Yes. Wearables ship far more units than tablets. In 2025, wearable shipments of around 612 million units were about four times the roughly 152 million tablets shipped that year. Although the two categories were comparable in size in 2018, wearables roughly tripled over the following years while tablets stayed broadly flat, a striking reversal in the device market.

From 2014 through 2029, the world is estimated to have shipped roughly 6.7 billion wearable devices. This vast installed base, built in little over a decade, sustains strong replacement demand, particularly for earbuds, which are replaced more often than watches, and underpins a large ecosystem of health, fitness and audio services.

By unit shipments, earbuds are far more popular, with earwear shipping more than twice as many units as smartwatches. Earbuds are cheaper, replaced more frequently and bought by a broader audience.

Smartwatches, however, command higher prices and deeper engagement, anchoring the premium, health-focused end of the wearable market even though they ship in smaller numbers.

The figures are based on data from IDC, the standard industry tracker for wearable devices, in millions of units, from 2014 through 2029 forecasts. The historical years are well documented, while years from 2026 onward are forecasts that carry the usual uncertainty of any projection. The category covers earwear, watches, wristbands and emerging form factors.

Sources

IDC - Worldwide Quarterly Wearable Device Tracker - Primary source for worldwide wearable shipment figures, categories and vendor share.

IDC wearable device shipment data (2014-2029) - Used for annual shipment totals, category splits and the 2025-2029 forecast.

Industry trackers and reports - Used for historical context, category trends and vendor positioning.

Shipment figures are based on IDC data, in millions of units, from 2014 through 2029 forecasts. Historical years are well documented; years from 2026 onward are forecasts. Category and vendor splits are approximate and drawn from the most recent available data. Not investment advice.

STATISTICS REPORT

Tablet shipments worldwide quarterly 2010-2026

Updated Jun 14, 2026 · businesstats.com/global-tablet-shipments-by-quarter

~41M Q4 2025 SHIPMENTS	**230M** 2014 PEAK (YEAR)	**169M** 2021 PANDEMIC PEAK
129M 2023 LOW	**~2.6B** TOTAL SINCE 2010	**38%** APPLE SHARE

Overview

Tablet shipments worldwide from 2nd quarter 2010 to 4th quarter 2026

Few devices have lived a more dramatic life than the tablet. Born with the launch of the iPad in 2010, it exploded onto the market, with shipments rocketing from under 20 million units that first year to a peak above 230 million in 2014. Then came the long decline, the pandemic revival, the post-COVID slump, and a fresh recovery, leaving the market shipping around 150 million units a year by 2025. Tracking these shipments quarter by quarter, from the second quarter of 2010 to the fourth quarter of 2026, lays bare the full arc of a device that soared, faded, and found its level. The revenue behind these shipments is explored in our tablet industry revenue analysis.

The quarterly data captures both the device's explosive early growth and its pronounced seasonal rhythm. Tablet shipments are heavily concentrated in the fourth quarter, when holiday gifting drives a surge that dwarfs the rest of the year. Layered on top of that rhythm is the bigger story: the meteoric rise as the iPad created a new category, the long decline as larger smartphones squeezed demand, the work-from-home boom of 2020 and 2021, and the recent stabilisation. The closely related PC market is tracked in our global PC shipments analysis.

tablet shipments worldwide quarterly Q2 2010 Q4 2026 lineQuarterly Tablet Shipments, Q2 2010-Q4 2026 (M units)tablet shipments worldwide quarterly Q2 2010 Q4 2026 line ~41MQ4 2025

Note: IDC data; recent quarters reported, earlier quarters estimated from annual totals and seasonality; 2026 forecast.

A note on the data is important. These figures cover tablet shipments based on data from IDC, in millions of units, from the second quarter of 2010, when the category effectively began, through to forecasts for 2026. Annual totals and recent quarters are well documented, while some earlier quarters are estimated from annual totals and the well established seasonal pattern of the market, so the precise quarterly values for the early years are best read as indicative of the shape of the market rather than exact counts. The 2026 figures are forecasts, and the overall trajectory is firmly grounded in the industry data.

What makes the tablet story so striking is how completely the early hype gave way to reality. Launched amid predictions that it would replace the PC, the tablet instead peaked within four years and then declined for most of a decade, squeezed between ever larger phones and ever lighter laptops. Yet it never disappeared, finding durable demand in education, business and the home, and staging a genuine revival during the pandemic. The shipment curve that follows is a chronicle of a category that burned bright, cooled, and settled into a lasting niche, a journey set against the wider device market in our big tech revenue comparison analysis.

Annual Data Table

Annual Tablet Shipments, 2010-2026

Annual Tablet Shipments, 2010-2026 (M units, (f)=forecast)Click any column to sort

YEAR	SHIPMENTS	YOY GROWTH
2010	19.4 M	-
2011	72.0 M	+271.1%
2012	144.2 M	+100.3%
2013	217.1 M	+50.6%
2014	229.6 M	+5.8%
2015	206.8 M	-9.9%
2016	174.8 M	-15.5%
2017	163.5 M	-6.5%

2018	146.0 M	-10.7%
2019	144.1 M	-1.3%
2020	164.1 M	+13.9%
2021	168.8 M	+2.9%
2022	163.0 M	-3.4%
2023	128.5 M	-21.2%
2024	147.6 M	+14.9%
2025	151.9 M	+2.9%
2026 (f)	138.9 M	-8.6%

The table shows annual tablet shipments for every year from 2010 to 2026, alongside the rate of change. The early rows capture the explosive growth as the category took off, building to the 2014 peak, before the long slide that ran through the late 2010s as smartphones grew larger. The pandemic years of 2020 and 2021 stand out as a clear revival, followed by the steep slump of 2023 and a recovery in 2024 and 2025, with 2026 forecast to decline again. Sorting the growth column reveals just how volatile the market has been, from triple-digit early growth to sharp double-digit swings in the 2020s.

Annual Growth

The Tablet Roller Coaster: Annual Growth

Plotting annual growth lays bare the tablet's extraordinary volatility. The early years saw triple-digit growth as the category exploded from a tiny base, with shipments more than doubling year after year. That gave way to steady declines through the mid and late 2010s as the market saturated and phones grew larger. The pandemic delivered a sharp rebound in 2020 and 2021, before another steep drop in 2023, a strong recovery in 2024 and 2025, and a forecast decline in 2026 as a cooling replacement cycle and a memory shortage weigh on the market.

This whipsaw pattern is characteristic of a young category that matured fast and then became sensitive to external shocks. The enormous early growth rates simply reflect the tiny starting base, while the later swings track the pandemic surge and its unwinding. The recent recovery of 2024 and 2025 was driven by replacement cycles, education projects and pre-buying ahead of expected price rises, but the 2026

forecast points to renewed weakness, a reminder that the tablet remains a discretionary purchase sensitive to economic conditions, as explored in our artificial intelligence worldwide statistics overview of the device market.

tablet shipments annual growth rate percent barAnnual Shipment Growth Rate (%)tablet shipments annual growth rate percent bar +271%2011 boom

Note: annual percentage change; red bars are years of decline.

The growth chart also highlights how the tablet's fortunes have decoupled from those of its larger cousins at key moments. While all personal devices boomed during the pandemic, the tablet's swings have often been sharper, reflecting its status as an optional second or third device that consumers buy enthusiastically in good times and defer in bad ones. Reading through the dramatic percentage moves to the underlying trend reveals a market that, after its early explosion, has essentially moved sideways within a wide band for the past decade.

2.6 Billion Tablets

2.6 Billion Tablets and Counting

Adding up every quarter since 2010 reveals a striking total: roughly 2.6 billion tablets shipped worldwide between 2010 and 2026. Despite years of decline from its peak, the tablet has put more than two and a half billion devices into the hands of users in little over a decade, a testament to how deeply the category embedded itself in homes, schools and businesses. The cumulative line climbs steadily, underlining that even a mature, post-peak market continues to ship enormous volumes year after year, sustaining a substantial global installed base.

This vast installed base is the foundation of the tablet's enduring relevance. With billions of devices in use, the market generates dependable replacement demand and a large audience for content, apps and services, even as new unit sales have cooled. For Apple in particular, the iPad remains a meaningful pillar of a broader ecosystem, contributing to the company's results as detailed in our Apple total net sales analysis. The cumulative total underlines that the tablet, for all its decline from peak, remains a major and lasting device category.

cumulative tablet shipments since 2010 billion lineCumulative Tablet Shipments Since 2010 (M units)cumulative tablet shipments since 2010 billion line ~2.6Bby 2026

Note: running total of annual tablet shipments.

The cumulative figure also puts the tablet's scale in perspective against its neighbours. While it has shipped far fewer units than the smartphone, with its billions of annual sales tracked in our quarterly smartphone shipments analysis, the tablet's roughly 2.6 billion lifetime shipments represent a significant slice of the personal computing landscape. It is this large, recurring base of devices, replaced on a multi-year cycle, that keeps the major vendors invested in the category despite its post-peak maturity, and that anchors the steady, if unspectacular, business the tablet has become.

Shipments by Era

Tablet Shipments by Era

Grouping the years into eras captures the tablet's distinctive arc. The rise era of 2010 to 2014 averaged around 137 million units a year, a figure held down by the tiny early years even as the market raced to its peak. The post-peak era of 2015 to 2019 averaged about 167 million as shipments declined from the 2014 high but remained elevated. The cycle era of 2020 to 2026 has averaged roughly 152 million, encompassing the pandemic spike, the 2023 slump and the recent recovery. The market has settled into a range well below its peak but still substantial.

The era view makes clear that the tablet never returned to its 2014 peak, yet it also never collapsed to insignificance. Instead it found a durable equilibrium in the 130 to 170 million unit range, sustained by replacement demand and steady use in education, business and the home. The relative stability of the post-peak and cycle eras, despite the pandemic distortion, shows a market that has matured into a dependable if no longer growing category, a profile that contrasts with the still-expanding installed base of PCs covered in our PC market revenue analysis.

tablet shipments average by era horizontal barAverage Annual Shipments by Era (M units)tablet shipments average by era horizontal bar 167M2015-19152M2020-26

What the era averages cannot fully convey is how the composition of the market has shifted over time. The early peak was driven by a flood of cheap, small tablets bought as novelty devices, many of which were rarely upgraded. Today's market is far more skewed toward premium, larger and more capable devices used for real work and creativity, which means that even with lower unit volumes, the value and usefulness of the tablets being shipped has risen. The market is smaller in units than at its peak but arguably more serious in purpose.

Quarterly Seasonality

The Holiday Effect: Seasonality

Tablet shipments follow the most pronounced seasonal pattern of any major device category, and the quarterly data makes it unmistakable. The fourth quarter towers over the rest of the year, as tablets are among the most popular holiday gifts, driving a surge that can be half as large again as a typical quarter. The first quarter, following the holiday rush, is usually the weakest. This extreme seasonality, far stronger than in PCs or smartphones, reflects the tablet's status as a discretionary, gift-friendly consumer device.

Understanding this rhythm is essential for reading the headline numbers correctly. A steep fall from the fourth quarter to the first quarter is normal seasonality, not a sign of trouble, whereas a year-on-year decline in any given quarter is a genuine warning. The intense fourth-quarter concentration also shapes the competitive calendar, with vendors timing new model launches and aggressive promotions to capture holiday demand. For the tablet industry more than any other, the final quarter of the year is where the battle for sales and share is won or lost.

tablet shipments seasonality average by quarter barAverage Shipments by Calendar Quarter (M units)tablet shipments seasonality average by quarter bar Q4peakQ1low

The strength of the holiday peak also reveals something about who buys tablets and why. Much of the fourth-quarter surge comes from consumers buying tablets as gifts, often entry-level models, rather than from businesses making planned purchases. This contrasts with the steadier, less seasonal buying patterns of the PC market, and it makes the tablet market especially sensitive to consumer confidence and discretionary spending during the crucial holiday season, when a large share of the year's volume is decided.

Recent Quarters

The Recovery and the 2026 Risk

Zooming in on the most recent quarters, from early 2023 to the end of 2026, shows a market that staged a clear recovery before facing renewed headwinds. After the slump of 2023, when shipments fell sharply, the market returned to growth from 2024, supported by replacement demand, education projects and refreshed product lines. The recovery continued through 2025, with the holiday fourth quarter reaching around 41 million units, lifted by strong iPad demand and pre-buying ahead of expected price increases driven by a looming memory shortage.

That momentum is forecast to fade in 2026. With the replacement cycle cooling and component costs rising, tablet shipments are projected to decline by around 9 percent over the full year, to roughly 139 million units. The memory shortage that is squeezing the PC market is expected to weigh on tablets too, though less severely given memory's smaller share of a tablet's cost. The recent recovery, in other words, looks set to give way to a softer patch as the market works through a more cautious consumer environment.

tablet shipments recent quarters 2023 2026 barQuarterly Shipments, Q1 2023-Q4 2026 (M units)tablet shipments recent quarters 2023 2026 bar ~41MQ4 2025

Note: reported figures for recent quarters; 2026 forecast.

The contrast between the strong recovery and the cautious 2026 outlook captures the tablet market's current balancing act. The strength of 2024 and 2025 was real, but it leaned heavily on one-off factors such as education subsidies in China and pre-emptive buying ahead of price rises, rather than on a sustained surge in underlying demand. As those temporary supports fade and prices climb, the market is expected to settle back toward its long-run trend, underlining that the tablet remains a mature category prone to short bursts of growth around a broadly flat baseline.

Recovery and Risk

Strong Rebound, Fragile Footing

Viewing the recent quarters through year-on-year growth makes the recovery, and its fragility, clear. From early 2024 through 2025, most quarters posted solid year-on-year growth as the market rebounded from the 2023 lows, with some quarters reaching double-digit gains driven by replacement demand and pre-buying. This run of growth marked a decisive turnaround and fuelled optimism that the tablet had found a new footing. The strength was genuine, but as in PCs, much of it borrowed demand from the future by pulling purchases forward.

The forecast for 2026 illustrates the precariousness of that recovery. After the run of growth, year-on-year comparisons are expected to turn negative as the replacement cycle cools and higher prices deter buyers. The episode is a reminder that the tablet market remains acutely sensitive to consumer sentiment, component costs and the timing of product refreshes, capable of swinging from healthy growth to decline within a few quarters. For a mature, discretionary category, such volatility around a flat trend is the norm rather than the exception.

tablet shipments quarterly year over year growth barQuarterly Shipments Growth, Year on Year (%)tablet shipments quarterly year over year growth bar +13%Q2 20252026decline

The quarterly growth pattern also underscores how dependent the tablet market has become on a handful of large vendors and specific catalysts. Strong quarters often hinge on a well-received new iPad, a wave of education orders, or a burst of pre-emptive buying, while weak quarters reflect the absence of such drivers. This lumpy, catalyst-dependent growth is typical of a saturated market where broad-based organic demand has given way to targeted bursts of replacement and upgrade activity concentrated among the leading brands.

Leading Vendors

Apple and the Rest

The tens of millions of tablets shipped each quarter are dominated by Apple, whose iPad commands by far the largest share of the market. Apple alone accounts for close to two-fifths of global shipments, and an even larger share of revenue and profit thanks to its premium pricing. Samsung is the leading Android maker, followed by Lenovo, Huawei and Xiaomi, with a long tail of smaller brands making up the rest. This concentrated structure, dominated by one premium player and a cluster of value rivals, closely mirrors the smartphone market.

Apple's dominance of the tablet market is even more pronounced than in smartphones, where its share is smaller. The iPad has led the category since its creation, and Apple's grip has if anything tightened in recent years as premium demand has held up better than the budget end. This entrenched leadership, built on a powerful ecosystem and brand loyalty, makes it extremely difficult for rivals to challenge Apple at the top, a dynamic that parallels its position across devices as detailed in our smartphone market share by vendor analysis.

tablet vendor share Apple iPad Samsung Lenovo donutTablet Shipment Share by Vendortablet vendor share Apple iPad Samsung Lenovo donut 38%Apple

Beneath Apple, the competition among Android makers is fierce and shifting. Lenovo has posted strong recent growth on the back of aggressive pricing and education demand, while Samsung balances premium and value lines, and Huawei and Xiaomi compete hard in their home and regional markets. The result is a stable top tier led by Apple, with the positions behind it contested quarter by quarter. For these vendors, the tablet is a meaningful if secondary business, fought over with thin margins in a market where Apple captures most of the available profit.

Milestone Quarters

The Tablet Arc in Five Quarters

A handful of milestone quarters trace the tablet's entire arc. In the fourth quarter of 2010, the young category shipped around 10 million units. By its peak in the fourth quarter of 2014, a single quarter exceeded 65 million. The pandemic drove another surge, with the fourth quarter of 2021 reaching around 45 million, before the slump brought the second quarter of 2023 down to roughly 28 million. The fourth quarter of 2026 is forecast near 40 million as the market cools. Together these quarters span the tablet's explosive birth, peak, decline, revival and renewed softness.

What stands out across these milestones is how far the tablet fell from its peak yet how firmly it has held a substantial floor. The category never came close to reclaiming its 2014 high, but neither did it fade away, instead settling into a durable range sustained by replacement demand and steady use in key sectors. Each shock, from the smartphone squeeze to the pandemic to the memory shortage, reshaped the market without destroying it, reflecting the tablet's enduring, if reduced, role in how people consume content, learn and work.

tablet shipments milestone quarters horizontal barShipments at Milestone Quarters (M units)tablet shipments milestone quarters horizontal bar ~40MQ4 2026

Note: selected milestone quarters tracing the market arc.

These milestone quarters also serve as useful reference points for gauging the market's health at any moment. A holiday quarter above 50 million units signalled a market at or near its peak, while anything below 30 million points to genuine weakness, as in the 2023 trough. The forecast for late 2026, near 40 million, places the market in the middle of that range, neither booming nor collapsing, a fitting summary of a mature category that has long since traded explosive growth for steady, cyclical endurance.

Shipments vs Revenue

Fewer Units, Steadier Money

Setting shipments against revenue reveals the premiumisation that defines the modern tablet market. While unit shipments have swung sharply and remain below their peak, the revenue generated by those units has held up better, because the average price of a tablet has risen as buyers increasingly choose premium, larger and more capable devices. Indexing both measures to 2018 shows revenue proving more resilient

than units through the post-pandemic period, evidence that the market is increasingly driven by value rather than volume. The full revenue picture, including the rising average price of a tablet, is one of premiumisation steadily lifting the value of a flat-volume market.

This shift toward value over volume has accelerated with the arrival of more powerful, AI-capable tablets that command premium prices. As unit growth has stalled, vendors have leaned on higher average prices and richer feature sets to sustain revenue, a strategy epitomised by Apple's premium iPad lineup. The same dynamic of premiumisation supporting revenue in a flat-volume market plays out across consumer electronics, including smartphones, whose revenue trends are tracked in our worldwide smartphone market revenue analysis.

tablet shipments vs revenue indexed 2018 2025 lineShipments vs Revenue, Indexed (2018 = 100)tablet shipments vs revenue indexed 2018 2025 line RevenuesteadierUnitsvolatile

Ultimately, the divergence between flat units and steadier revenue captures the essence of the mature tablet market. Growth, such as it is, now comes from selling better tablets rather than more of them, a pattern that rewards premium brands and squeezes those competing purely on price. For the wider device economy, the tablet illustrates how a post-peak category can remain valuable through premiumisation, a theme that runs through the broader technology landscape mapped in our internet companies revenue analysis.

230M2014 PeakAll-time annual high. ~41MQ4 2025Recent holiday quarter. ~2.6BTotal ShippedSince 2010. 38%Apple iPadLargest share.

Taken together, the quarterly data tells the complete story of the tablet, from its explosive birth in 2010, through a peak above 230 million units in 2014, a long decline, a pandemic revival and a recent recovery, to a forecast softening in 2026. The category shipped roughly 2.6 billion devices over the period, dominated throughout by Apple's iPad, and has settled into a mature range well below its peak but still substantial. By 2026, a cooling replacement cycle and a memory shortage threatened to tip the market back into decline.

Yet for all its volatility, the tablet has secured a lasting place in personal computing, shipping in volumes that confirm its role as a durable, if no longer growing, device category. The questions ahead are whether AI features and ever more capable devices can reignite meaningful growth, or whether the tablet will remain a comfortable niche between phone and laptop. The market value of the companies competing for these shipments is examined in our biggest companies by market value overview. Either way, the tablet has proved far more resilient than its post-peak decline once suggested, earning a permanent if modest seat in the device landscape. For now, the data describes a category that has made peace with its limits: smaller

than at its peak, yet large, stable and profitable enough to keep the major vendors invested year after year. The tablet may never reclaim the explosive growth of its early years, but as a dependable fixture of how billions of people read, learn, create and unwind, it has secured a lasting place in personal computing for the rest of the decade and well beyond.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: Tablet Shipments

Tablet shipments vary strongly by quarter due to holiday seasonality, ranging from around 28 to 30 million units in weaker quarters to over 40 million in the fourth-quarter holiday peak. In late 2025, roughly 41 million tablets shipped in the fourth quarter. Full-year 2025 shipments were about 152 million units, according to IDC.

Annual tablet shipments peaked in 2014 at around 230 million units, just four years after the category was created with the launch of the iPad in 2010. The market then declined for most of the following decade as larger smartphones squeezed demand, before stabilising in a lower range of roughly 130 to 170 million units a year.

Tablet shipments declined after 2014 mainly because the market saturated and smartphones grew larger, blurring the line between phone and tablet. Once most interested buyers owned a tablet, demand shifted to replacement, which is weaker because tablets are replaced less often than phones. The result was a long decline from the 2014 peak through the late 2010s.

The pandemic drove a sharp revival in tablet shipments in 2020 and 2021, as people bought tablets for remote work, online learning and home entertainment. Shipments rose to around 169 million units in 2021, the highest since the mid-2010s. This boom then unwound, with shipments slumping to about 129 million in 2023 before recovering.

IDC forecasts worldwide tablet shipments to decline by around 9 percent in 2026, to roughly 139 million units, after a recovery in 2024 and 2025. The decline is attributed to a cooling replacement cycle and a memory component shortage that is raising costs, though the impact on tablets is expected to be less severe than on PCs.

Apple is by far the largest tablet maker, with its iPad capturing close to two-fifths of global shipments and an even larger share of revenue thanks to premium pricing. In the 2025 holiday quarter, Apple held around 42 percent of the market. Samsung is the leading Android maker, followed by Lenovo, Huawei and

Xiaomi.

Tablet shipments are the most seasonal of any major device category, with the fourth quarter towering over the rest of the year as tablets are popular holiday gifts. The first quarter, following the holiday rush, is typically the weakest. This is why a fall from the fourth to the first quarter is normal, while a year-on-year decline is the real signal to watch.

From the second quarter of 2010, when the category began, through 2026, the world is estimated to have shipped roughly 2.6 billion tablets. Despite declining from its 2014 peak, the tablet has built a vast global installed base, sustaining dependable replacement demand and a large audience for apps, content and services.

Yes. Although unit shipments are well below their 2014 peak, tablets remain a substantial category, shipping around 150 million units a year and serving durable demand in education, business, healthcare and the home. Premium, larger and more capable devices, including AI-enabled tablets, are sustaining the market's value even as overall volumes have plateaued.

The figures are based on data from IDC, the industry-standard tablet tracker, in millions of units, from the second quarter of 2010 through 2026 forecasts. Annual totals and recent quarters are well documented, while some earlier quarters in the long series are estimated from annual totals and seasonal patterns and are indicative. The 2026 figures are forecasts.

Sources

IDC - Worldwide Quarterly Personal Computing Device Tracker - Primary source for worldwide tablet shipment figures and vendor share.

IDC and Omdia quarterly and annual tablet shipment data (2010-2026) - Used for annual totals, recent quarterly shipments and vendor share.

Industry trackers and reports - Used for historical context, seasonal patterns and the 2026 outlook.

Shipment figures are based on IDC data, in millions of units, from the second quarter of 2010 through 2026 forecasts. Annual totals are widely reported; some earlier quarters in the long series are estimated from annual totals and seasonal patterns and are indicative. The 2026 figures are forecasts. The revenue comparison uses a separate source. Not investment advice.

STATISTICS REPORT

PC unit shipments worldwide quarterly 2009-2026

Updated Jun 14, 2026 · businesstats.com/global-pc-shipments-since-1st-quarter-2009

63M Q1 2026 SHIPMENTS	**364M** 2011 PEAK (YEAR)	**349M** 2021 PANDEMIC PEAK
242M 2023 LOW	**5.0B** TOTAL SINCE 2009	**31%** AI PCS 2025

Overview

Personal computer (PC) unit shipments worldwide from 1st quarter 2009 to 1st quarter 2026

The personal computer has been written off countless times, yet it keeps shipping by the hundreds of millions. From around 296 million units in 2009, worldwide PC shipments climbed to a peak above 360 million in 2011, then endured a long decline, a dramatic pandemic revival, a sharp crash, and a fresh recovery, ending up shipping close to 280 million units a year by 2025. Tracking these shipments quarter by quarter, from the first quarter of 2009 to the first quarter of 2026, lays bare the full story of a mature but resilient market that refuses to fade. The revenue these shipments generate is explored in our PC market revenue analysis.

The quarterly data captures both the seasonal rhythm of the PC business and its dramatic long term swings. PC shipments are seasonal, strongest in the third and fourth quarters as businesses spend their budgets and retailers stock up for the holidays. Layered on top of that rhythm is the bigger story: the smartphone and tablet era that hollowed out PC demand through the 2010s, the extraordinary work from home boom of 2020 and 2021, the brutal correction that followed, and the recent recovery powered by the end of Windows 10 support and the arrival of AI PCs. The parallel story in smartphones is told in our quarterly smartphone shipments analysis.

PC unit shipments worldwide quarterly Q1 2009 Q1 2026 lineQuarterly PC Shipments, Q1 2009-Q1 2026 (M units)PC unit shipments worldwide quarterly Q1 2009 Q1 2026 line 63MQ1 2026

Note: traditional PCs; recent quarters reported, earlier quarters estimated from annual totals and seasonality.

A note on the data is important. These figures cover traditional PCs, defined as desktops, notebooks and workstations but excluding tablets, based on data from IDC and Gartner, in millions of units. Annual totals are well established and widely reported. For the long quarterly series, recent quarters use reported figures, while some earlier quarters are estimated from annual totals and the well documented seasonal pattern of the market, so the precise quarterly values for the early years are best read as indicative of the shape of the market rather than exact counts. The overall trajectory is firmly grounded in the industry data.

What makes the PC shipment story so compelling is its repeated defiance of the doom mongers. Declared obsolete with the rise of the smartphone, the PC instead found new life, first as the essential tool of remote work and learning during the pandemic, and now as the platform for on device artificial intelligence. The shipment curve that follows is, in effect, a chronicle of how an essential technology adapts and endures, weathering disruption after disruption while remaining central to how the world works. Its place in the wider technology economy is set out in our big tech revenue comparison analysis.

Annual Data Table

Annual PC Shipments, 2009-2025

Annual PC Shipments, 2009-2025 (million units)Click any column to sort

YEAR	SHIPMENTS	YOY GROWTH
2009	296 M	-
2010	351 M	+18.6%
2011	364 M	+3.7%
2012	351 M	-3.6%
2013	316 M	-10.0%
2014	309 M	-2.2%
2015	276 M	-10.7%
2016	260 M	-5.8%
2017	259 M	-0.4%

2018	259 M	+0.0%
2019	267 M	+3.1%
2020	302 M	+13.1%
2021	349 M	+15.6%
2022	292 M	-16.3%
2023	242 M	-17.1%
2024	263 M	+8.7%
2025	279 M	+6.1%

The table shows annual PC shipments for every year from 2009 to 2025, alongside the rate of change, the solid backbone of the quarterly series. The early rows capture the market near its all time peak, before the long slide that ran from 2012 through 2018 as smartphones and tablets cannibalised demand. The pandemic years of 2020 and 2021 stand out as a dramatic revival, followed by the steep crash of 2022 and 2023 and a strong recovery in 2024 and 2025. Sorting the growth column reveals just how volatile the market has been, swinging from double digit declines in the mid 2010s and early 2020s to double digit growth during the pandemic boom.

The annual figures also reveal how concentrated the market's downturns and recoveries have been. The two steepest declines, in 2013 and again in 2022 and 2023, both followed periods of unusually strong demand, the netbook and Windows upgrade cycles in the earlier case and the pandemic surge in the latter. In each instance the market overshot on the way up and then corrected sharply, a pattern that recurs throughout the PC industry. Reading the table from top to bottom is, in effect, a tour through more than fifteen years of technology shifts, economic cycles and changing work patterns, all of which left their mark on how many PCs the world chose to buy in any given year.

Annual Growth

The PC Roller Coaster: Annual Growth

Plotting annual growth lays bare the PC market's roller coaster. After modest growth into the 2011 peak, shipments fell for years, with double digit declines in 2013 and 2015 as the smartphone and tablet era squeezed the PC. A brief recovery in 2019 was followed by the explosive pandemic boom, with shipments jumping 13 percent in 2020 and another 16 percent in 2021. That boom then reversed brutally, with

shipments crashing 16 percent in 2022 and a further 17 percent in 2023, before a strong rebound of 9 percent in 2024 and 6 percent in 2025, driven by the Windows 11 transition and AI PCs.

This extreme volatility is characteristic of a mature durable goods market buffeted by external forces. The pandemic pulled years of PC demand forward into 2020 and 2021, leaving a deep hole that took until 2024 to fill. The recent recovery has been powered by a specific catalyst: the end of support for Windows 10 in October 2025, which forced businesses to upgrade aging fleets, combined with the marketing push behind AI PCs. The role of artificial intelligence in driving this latest cycle is examined in our artificial intelligence worldwide statistics overview.

It is worth noting how unusual the recent growth has been in historical terms. For most of the 2010s, a year of flat or slightly positive shipments counted as a good result, as the market managed a gradual decline rather than a collapse. The pandemic boom and the 2024 and 2025 recovery therefore stand out as rare bright spots in an otherwise mature market. Whether the latest upswing proves durable or simply borrows from future demand remains the central question, and the answer will shape vendor strategies, component orders and pricing across the industry for years to come, with the memory shortage adding a fresh layer of uncertainty to an already difficult forecast.

PC shipments annual growth rate percent barAnnual Shipment Growth Rate (%)PC shipments annual growth rate percent bar +15.6%2021 boom

Note: annual percentage change; red bars are years of decline. 5 Billion PCs

Five Billion PCs and Counting

Adding up every quarter since 2009 reveals a staggering total: roughly 5 billion PCs shipped worldwide between 2009 and 2025. Even in its worst years, the industry still ships well over 240 million units, a testament to the enduring centrality of the PC to work, education and creativity. The cumulative line climbs steadily, underlining that while the PC may no longer be a growth market in the way it once was, it remains a vast and recurring one. This enormous installed base anchors the productivity economy in a way no other device can match, as explored in our internet companies revenue analysis.

The cumulative figure also highlights how the rewards of this market flow to a concentrated group of vendors and component makers. With around 5 billion machines shipped over the period, even a slowly growing or flat market represents an enormous and dependable revenue stream for the companies that dominate it. It is this vast base of devices, replaced on a multi year cycle, that makes the PC market so strategically valuable despite its maturity, and that the leading brands have learned to monetise through

services, accessories and premium upgrades, a pattern detailed in our largest source of revenue of leading tech companies analysis.

Cumulative PC shipments since 2009 billion lineCumulative PC Shipments Since 2009 (M units)Cumulative PC shipments since 2009 billion line 5.0Bby 2025

Note: running total of annual PC shipments. Shipments by Era

PC Shipments by Era

Grouping the years into eras captures the market's three phases. The peak era of 2009 to 2012 averaged around 341 million units a year, near the all time high. The decline era of 2013 to 2018 saw the average fall to roughly 280 million as smartphones and tablets ate into PC demand. The cycle era of 2019 to 2025 has averaged about 285 million units a year, but that average hides enormous swings, from the pandemic peak of 349 million in 2021 to the trough of 242 million in 2023. The market has stabilised at a level well below its early peak, but it has proved far more durable than once feared.

The era view makes clear that the PC market never returned to the heights of its early 2010s peak, yet it also never collapsed. Instead, it found a new, lower equilibrium, sustained by the irreplaceable role of the PC in productivity, content creation and gaming. The recent cycle, with its pandemic spike and subsequent volatility, shows a market that remains highly sensitive to external shocks but fundamentally stable in its underlying demand. The broader economic forces shaping this demand are explored in our global economy overview.

It is striking that even the cycle era average of around 285 million units a year sits comfortably above the levels many analysts feared during the darkest days of the smartphone era, when some predicted the PC would dwindle into irrelevance. Instead, the market found a floor and held it, proving that reports of the death of the PC were greatly exaggerated. The device remains indispensable for any task that demands a keyboard, a large screen and serious processing power, a category of work that has, if anything, grown in the era of remote collaboration and content creation, ensuring the PC a durable place even as smaller devices proliferate around it.

PC shipments average by era horizontal barAverage Annual Shipments by Era (M units)PC shipments average by era horizontal bar 341M2009-12280M2013-18

Quarterly Seasonality

The Second-Half Effect: Seasonality

PC shipments follow a clear seasonal pattern, and the quarterly data makes it unmistakable. The third and fourth quarters are consistently the strongest, as businesses spend their annual budgets, students prepare for the new academic year, and retailers stock up for the holiday season. The first quarter is typically the weakest, following the holiday surge. This seasonality is remarkably consistent year to year, which is why analysts always compare a quarter with the same quarter a year earlier rather than the preceding one, to strip out the predictable seasonal swings.

Understanding this rhythm is essential for reading the headline numbers correctly. A decline from the fourth quarter to the first quarter is normal seasonality, not a sign of weakness, whereas a year on year fall in any given quarter is a genuine warning. The seasonal concentration in the second half of the year also shapes the competitive calendar, with vendors timing new product launches and promotions to capture back to school and holiday demand. For the PC industry, the second half of the year is where much of the annual battle for market share is won or lost.

The seasonal pattern also interacts with the broader cycles in revealing ways. During the pandemic boom, the usual seasonal peaks were amplified as demand ran hot all year, while in the depths of the 2023 downturn even the normally strong fourth quarter struggled. This interplay between predictable seasonality and unpredictable cycles is what makes forecasting PC shipments so challenging, and why even the largest research firms regularly revise their estimates as new data arrives. For anyone tracking the market, separating the seasonal signal from the underlying trend is the essential first step toward understanding where shipments are truly heading.

PC shipments seasonality average by quarter barAverage Shipments by Calendar Quarter (M units)PC shipments seasonality average by quarter bar Q4peakQ1low

Recent Quarters

The Recovery: 2023 to 2026

Zooming in on the most recent quarters, from early 2023 to early 2026, shows a market that staged an impressive recovery. After the brutal correction of 2022 and 2023, when shipments slumped to multi year lows, the market returned to growth from 2024 onward. The recovery accelerated through 2025, with the third quarter reaching nearly 76 million units, as the Windows 10 end of support deadline and AI PC marketing drove a wave of upgrades. Businesses in particular rushed to replace aging fleets, lifting commercial PC shipments and powering some of the strongest growth the market had seen in years.

That momentum carried into early 2026, but with a crucial twist. PC shipments rose to around 63 million units in the first quarter of 2026, but analysts warned the growth was artificially inflated by vendors and channels building up inventory ahead of expected price hikes. A severe shortage of memory components, which sharply raised costs, is forecast to push PC prices up by nearly a fifth in 2026 and drag full year shipments into a double digit decline. The recovery, in other words, may have already peaked, with a difficult year ahead as the memory crunch bites.

The contrast between the headline growth and the underlying caution from analysts captures the strange position the PC market found itself in entering 2026. On paper, shipments were still rising, extending the recovery that had begun two years earlier. Beneath the surface, however, the drivers had shifted from genuine demand to defensive buying, as companies and channels stocked up before prices climbed. This kind of demand pulled forward rarely ends well, and the months ahead were widely expected to bring the payback, with shipments falling as the inflated inventories were worked through and higher prices deterred buyers across both the consumer and commercial segments.

PC shipments recent quarters 2023 2026 barQuarterly Shipments, Q1 2023-Q1 2026 (M units)PC shipments recent quarters 2023 2026 bar 76MQ3 2025

Note: reported figures for recent quarters. Recovery and Risk

Strong Growth, Fragile Foundations

Viewing the recent quarters through year on year growth makes the recovery, and its fragility, clear. From early 2024 through the end of 2025, almost every quarter posted strong year on year growth, with gains approaching 10 percent in the strongest periods as the Windows 11 transition and AI PC demand drove upgrades. This run of growth marked a decisive turnaround from the declines of 2022 and 2023 and fuelled optimism that the PC market had firmly recovered. The strength was real, but it was also borrowing demand from the future, as the Windows 10 deadline concentrated years of upgrades into a short window.

The first quarter of 2026 illustrates the precariousness of the situation. While shipments still grew year on year, analysts cautioned that the growth reflected pre emptive buying ahead of price rises rather than genuine underlying demand. With the memory shortage set to push prices sharply higher and the Windows upgrade wave largely complete, the outlook for the rest of 2026 is for renewed decline. The episode is a reminder that the PC market remains acutely sensitive to component costs, software cycles and the broader economy, capable of swinging from boom to bust with little warning.

PC shipments quarterly year over year growth barQuarterly Shipments Growth, Year on Year (%)PC shipments quarterly year over year growth bar +9%2025+4%Q1 2026

Leading Vendors

Who Ships the Most PCs

The hundreds of millions of PCs shipped each year are dominated by a handful of global brands. Lenovo leads the market with around a quarter of all units, followed by HP and Dell, the three together accounting for roughly 60 percent of PCs shipped. Apple sits fourth at around 9 percent by units, though it captures a far larger share of revenue and profit thanks to its premium Mac pricing, while ASUS, Acer and a tail of smaller brands make up the rest. This concentrated structure gives the leading vendors significant scale advantages in a fiercely competitive market.

The vendor landscape has consolidated significantly over the life of the PC market. Where once dozens of brands competed, the market is now firmly in the hands of a few giants, with the top five capturing the overwhelming majority of shipments. This consolidation reflects the brutal economics of a mature hardware market, where scale is essential to negotiate component costs and sustain razor thin margins. Apple stands apart by competing almost entirely at the premium end, a strategy that, as in smartphones, lets it capture outsized profits from a modest unit share, as detailed in our Apple total net sales analysis.

The competitive dynamics in PCs echo those in the smartphone market, where a handful of brands also dominate global shipments while a long tail of smaller players fights for the remainder. The same forces of scale, brand and distribution that shape the PC vendor rankings apply across consumer electronics, as set out in our smartphone market share by vendor analysis. In PCs, the stability of the top rankings over many years underlines how difficult it now is for a new entrant to break into a market defined by thin margins, enormous fixed costs and the deep relationships that the incumbents have built with corporate buyers and retail channels alike.

PC vendor shipment share Lenovo HP Dell Apple donutPC Shipment Share by VendorPC vendor shipment share Lenovo HP Dell Apple donut 24%Lenovo

Milestone Quarters

The PC Arc in Five Quarters

A handful of milestone quarters trace the PC market's entire arc. In the first quarter of 2009, the industry shipped around 70 million units. By the peak in late 2011, a single quarter could exceed 90 million. The pandemic drove another surge, with the fourth quarter of 2021 reaching around 94 million units, before the crash brought the first quarter of 2023 down to roughly 54 million, a multi year low. The first quarter of 2026 came in near 63 million as the recovery began to falter. Together these quarters span the market's peak, decline, revival and renewed uncertainty.

What stands out across these milestones is the market's remarkable resilience within a clear long term plateau. The PC never reclaimed its early 2010s peak, but neither did it collapse, instead settling into a cyclical pattern around a high base. Each shock, whether the smartphone era, the pandemic or the memory shortage, reshaped the market without destroying it. This durability reflects the PC's status as an essential tool that billions of people and businesses rely on and replace on a regular cycle, guaranteeing a steady flow of shipments regardless of the prevailing economic weather.

These milestone quarters also serve as useful reference points for anyone trying to gauge where the market sits at any given moment. A quarter above ninety million units signals a market running hot, as in the pandemic peak, while anything near or below sixty million points to genuine weakness, as in the 2023 trough. The first quarter of 2026, at around sixty three million units, sits in the middle of that range, neither booming nor collapsing, a fitting summary of a mature market navigating yet another period of uncertainty as it has so many times before, and as it will surely do again.

PC shipments milestone quarters horizontal barShipments at Milestone Quarters (M units)PC shipments milestone quarters horizontal bar 63MQ1 2026

Note: selected quarters tracing the market's arc. Shipments vs Revenue

Fewer Units, Steadier Money: Shipments vs Revenue

Setting shipments against revenue reveals the premiumisation that defines the modern PC market. While unit shipments have swung wildly and remain volatile, the revenue generated by those units has been steadier, because the average price of a PC has risen as buyers trade up to more capable, premium machines. Indexing both measures to 2018 shows revenue holding up better than units through the post pandemic correction, evidence that the market is increasingly driven by value rather than volume. The full revenue picture, including the rising average price of a PC, is a story of premiumisation playing out across the industry.

This shift toward value over volume has accelerated with the arrival of AI PCs, which command premium prices and which vendors hope will spark a sustained upgrade cycle. AI capable machines accounted for a growing share of shipments through 2025 and are expected to become the majority of the market within a few years. Combined with the memory driven price increases now sweeping the industry, this premiumisation means PC revenue is likely to prove more resilient than unit shipments in the difficult period ahead. The way these devices underpin the digital economy mirrors the smartphone, whose revenue is tracked in our worldwide smartphone market revenue analysis.

PC shipments vs revenue indexed 2018 2025 lineShipments vs Revenue, Indexed (2018 = 100)PC shipments vs revenue indexed 2018 2025 line RevenuesteadierUnitsvolatile

63MQ1 2026Recovery may be peaking. 364M2011 PeakAll-time annual high. 5.0BTotal ShippedSince 2009. 31%AI PCs 2025Share of shipments.

Taken together, the quarterly data tells the complete story of the PC, from a market near its all time peak in 2009 to a mature, cyclical industry shipping close to 280 million units a year today. The PC weathered the smartphone era, boomed during the pandemic, crashed, and recovered on the back of the Windows 11 transition and AI PCs, with roughly 5 billion machines shipped over the period. By early 2026, a memory shortage threatened to tip the market back into decline, a reminder of its enduring sensitivity to supply shocks.

Yet for all its volatility, the PC endures as an indispensable tool for work, learning and creation, shipping in volumes that would have seemed unimaginable when the personal computer first appeared. The questions ahead are whether AI PCs can drive a genuine new upgrade cycle, how severely the memory shortage will bite, and whether the market can hold its ground as computing continues to evolve. The market value of the companies competing for these shipments is examined in our biggest companies by market value overview. Whatever the next few quarters bring, the long sweep of the data leaves one conclusion hard to escape: the personal computer has proved far more durable than almost anyone predicted, and it is likely to remain a fixture of the technology landscape for many years yet.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: PC Shipments

As of the first quarter of 2026, around 63 million PCs were shipped worldwide, according to industry trackers. Quarterly shipments typically range from roughly 54 million in weaker quarters to over 90 million at the market's pandemic-era peak. The figures cover traditional PCs: desktops, notebooks and

workstations, excluding tablets.

Annual PC shipments peaked in 2011 at above 360 million units, near the all-time high. The market then declined for years before a pandemic-driven revival saw shipments reach 349 million in 2021, the highest since 2012. Shipments have since settled below those peaks, at around 280 million units a year.

PC shipments surged in 2020 and 2021, growing 13 and 16 percent, as the pandemic forced people to work, learn and entertain at home, driving record demand. This pulled years of purchases forward, so when the boom faded, shipments crashed 16 percent in 2022 and 17 percent in 2023 before recovering from 2024.

Around 63 million PCs were shipped worldwide in the first quarter of 2026, a modest year-on-year increase. However, analysts warned the growth was artificially inflated by vendors building inventory ahead of expected price hikes driven by a memory component shortage, with a full-year decline forecast for 2026.

The PC recovery of 2024 and 2025 was driven mainly by the end of support for Windows 10 in October 2025, which forced businesses to upgrade aging fleets, combined with strong marketing around AI PCs. Together these catalysts produced some of the strongest growth the market had seen in years.

An AI PC is a computer, usually a laptop, with a dedicated neural processing unit that runs artificial intelligence tasks efficiently on the device. AI PCs accounted for around 31 percent of shipments in 2025 and are forecast to surpass 143 million units in 2026, as vendors hope they will drive a new upgrade cycle and command premium prices.

Lenovo leads the global PC market with around a quarter of unit shipments, followed by HP and Dell, with the three together accounting for roughly 60 percent of PCs shipped. Apple is fourth at around 9 percent by units but captures a larger share of revenue due to premium Mac pricing, followed by ASUS and Acer.

From the first quarter of 2009 through the end of 2025, the world shipped roughly 5 billion PCs. Even in its weakest years the industry ships well over 240 million units annually, underlining the enduring importance of the PC to work, education and creativity despite years of predictions of its decline.

PCs are durable goods that people and businesses replace only every few years, so demand comes in waves tied to replacement cycles, software transitions and economic conditions. Major catalysts, such as the pandemic or the end of Windows 10 support, can pull demand forward and leave gaps afterward, producing the large swings seen in the data.

The figures are based on data from IDC and Gartner, the industry-standard PC trackers, covering traditional PCs (desktops, notebooks and workstations; tablets excluded), in millions of units. Annual totals are well established. Recent quarters use reported figures, while some earlier quarters in the long series are estimated from annual totals and seasonal patterns and are indicative.

Sources

IDC - Worldwide Quarterly Personal Computing Device Tracker - Primary source for worldwide PC shipment figures and vendor share.

IDC and Gartner quarterly and annual PC shipment data (2009-2026) - Used for annual totals, recent quarterly shipments and vendor share.

Industry trackers and reports - Used for historical context, seasonal patterns and AI PC adoption.

Shipment figures cover traditional PCs (desktops, notebooks and workstations; tablets excluded), based on IDC and Gartner data, in millions of units. Annual totals are widely reported; some earlier quarters in the long series are estimated from annual totals and seasonal patterns and are indicative. Q1 2026 is preliminary. The revenue comparison uses a separate source. Not investment advice.

STATISTICS REPORT

Comparison of VR headsets worldwide 2023-2026, by price

Updated Jun 20, 2026 · businesstats.com/vr-headset-comparison-by-price

$3,499 VISION PRO	$299 QUEST 3S	12x PRICE RANGE
$1,799 GALAXY XR	$499 QUEST 3	7x PRO VS QUEST

Overview

Comparison of virtual reality (VR) headsets worldwide from 2023 to 2026, by suggested Retail Price (MSRP)

Virtual reality headsets span one of the widest price ranges of any consumer electronics category. At one end sits the Apple Vision Pro at 3,499 dollars; at the other, the Meta Quest 3S at just 299 dollars. That is roughly a twelvefold gap between the cheapest and most expensive mainstream headsets. This report compares VR and mixed reality headsets worldwide from 2023 to 2026 by suggested retail price. The spread alone tells a story of a market still finding its level. No mainstream category stretches so far from cheap to costly. VR pricing remains unsettled in a way phones never were. The category is still searching for its mainstream price. No price point has yet come to define VR.

The comparison covers the major consumer headsets of the period, from Meta affordable Quest line through console and PC VR options to the ultra-premium devices from Apple, Samsung and Pimax. These headsets are increasingly counted within the broader wearables category tracked in our wearables market share by vendor analysis, of which head-worn XR is the fastest-growing premium slice. No category mixes such cheap and such costly devices. A budget headset and a flagship can differ twelvefold. That gulf defines the market more than any single price. The range, not the average, is the real story. The extremes are what set this market apart.

VR Headset Price Comparison by MSRP, 2023-2026 (USD)Major VR and mixed reality headsets ranked by suggested retail price.

Data:

Comparison of virtual reality and mixed reality headsets worldwide, 2023 to 2026, by suggested retail price (MSRP) in U.S. dollars, compiled by BusinessStats from manufacturer pricing and VRcompare.

Note:

Prices are launch MSRP in the United States unless noted. Some prices changed after launch, and a 2026 memory-component shortage pushed several upward. The Valve Steam Frame price is an estimate pending confirmation. Regional prices and discounts vary.Switch views with the toolbar.

Two forces define the pricing landscape. At the top, Apple kicked off an ultra-premium tier with the Vision Pro, later joined by Samsung Galaxy XR and high-end PC headsets. At the bottom, Meta has driven mass-market prices down to keep VR accessible. The detailed Apple pricing is laid out in our Apple Vision Pro price list analysis.

A note on the data. Prices are launch suggested retail price in U.S. dollars unless noted. Several prices changed after launch: a 2026 memory-component shortage pushed Meta and others upward, while Sony cut the PlayStation VR2. The Valve Steam Frame price is an estimate pending confirmation. Regional prices, bundles and discounts vary, so figures show relative positioning rather than current street prices. Launch MSRP gives the cleanest like-for-like baseline. Street prices shift with sales and bundles, but MSRP anchors the comparison. It is the fairest way to line the headsets up. Every headset is judged at its starting price.

Price Comparison Data Table

VR Headsets Worldwide 2023-2026, by Price (MSRP)

VR Headsets Worldwide 2023-2026, by Suggested Retail Price (MSRP)Click any column to sort

HEADSET	BRAND	MSRP (USD)	YEAR
Apple Vision Pro	Apple	$3,499	2024
Pimax Crystal Super	Pimax	$1,999	2025
Samsung Galaxy XR	Samsung	$1,799	2025
Valve Steam Frame	Valve	$1,200	2026
HTC Vive XR Elite	HTC	$1,099	2023

Bigscreen Beyond	Bigscreen	$999	2023
Valve Index	Valve	$999	2019
PlayStation VR2	Sony	$549	2023
Meta Quest 3	Meta	$499	2023
Pico 4	Pico	$429	2023
Meta Quest 3S	Meta	$299	2024

The table lists the major VR and mixed reality headsets compared in this report, with their brand, launch suggested retail price and release year. It ranges from the 299-dollar Meta Quest 3S to the 3,499-dollar Apple Vision Pro. Sorting the columns shows how sharply the headsets separate into distinct price tiers, from budget standalone devices to ultra-premium mixed reality. The headsets barely belong to the same category by price. A 299-dollar band and a 3,499-dollar computer share little. Only the label VR unites them. By price, they are worlds apart.

Price Tiers

VR Headset Prices by Tier: Budget to Premium

Grouped into price tiers, the headsets fall into four clear bands. A budget tier under 500 dollars holds the Meta Quest 3S, Pico 4 and Meta Quest 3 at launch. A mid tier from 500 to 1,000 dollars holds the PlayStation VR2, Valve Index and Bigscreen Beyond. A premium tier from 1,000 to 2,000 dollars holds the Vive XR Elite, Steam Frame, Galaxy XR and Pimax Crystal. And an ultra tier above 2,000 dollars holds the Vision Pro alone. No other headset comes close to its price. The Vision Pro sits in a tier of one. Nothing else crosses the 2,000-dollar mark. The Vision Pro stands alone above the field.

The shape of this distribution is telling. The largest cluster sits in the premium 1,000 to 2,000 dollar band, reflecting a wave of high-end headsets from Samsung, Valve, HTC and Pimax. Yet the headsets that actually sell in volume are concentrated in the budget tier, where Meta affordable Quest devices dominate, a split that shapes the wider VR market. Premium models are many, but the cheap ones sell. The volume lives where the prices are lowest. Buyers vote with their wallets for affordability. The cheapest headsets ship the most units.

VR Headsets by Price Tier, 2026 (count)How many headsets sit in each price band.

Data:

Derived from the worldwide VR headset price comparison, 2023 to 2026, by MSRP, compiled by BusinessStats from manufacturer pricing and VRcompare.

Note:

Price tiers, brand averages, year averages, price changes and ratios are calculated from the launch MSRP figures. Some prices changed after launch; the Valve Steam Frame price is an estimate. Figures are in U.S. dollars and are indicative of relative positioning.Switch views with the toolbar.

The four-tier structure underlines how fragmented VR pricing has become. Where smartphones cluster around a few familiar price points, VR headsets are spread from under 300 dollars to nearly 3,500, serving wildly different buyers, from casual gamers to professional early adopters. No single price defines the category, a diversity unusual in consumer hardware. Few categories ask buyers to choose across such a range. From impulse buy to major purchase, VR spans both. The decision depends entirely on budget. Use case and wallet drive every choice here.

Price by Year

VR Headset Prices by Release Year, 2023-2026

Tracking the average launch price by release year shows VR headsets growing more expensive on average as premium devices arrived. In 2023, a cluster of mid-range headsets kept the average moderate. In 2024 and 2025, the Vision Pro, Galaxy XR and Pimax Crystal pulled the average sharply upward, before more mid-priced 2026 launches eased it back. The average tracked the arrival of each premium wave. Every flagship launch nudged the typical price higher. The trend followed the top of the market, not the bottom. Premium launches set the pace for the average.

The rising average reflects the arrival of an ultra-premium tier rather than across-the-board inflation. Apple Vision Pro in 2024 and the premium XR headsets of 2025 lifted the typical launch price, even as Meta continued to anchor the affordable end. The market did not simply get pricier; it stretched, adding a costly top end while keeping a cheap bottom. The middle, by contrast, stayed comparatively thin. Few headsets occupy the space between cheap and premium. The market hollowed out in the middle. Buyers face a choice of cheap or costly, little between.

Average VR Headset Launch Price by Year (USD)Average suggested retail price of headsets launched each year.

Data:

Derived from the worldwide VR headset price comparison, 2023 to 2026, by MSRP, compiled by BusinessStats from manufacturer pricing and VRcompare.

Note:

Price tiers, brand averages, year averages, price changes and ratios are calculated from the launch MSRP figures. Some prices changed after launch; the Valve Steam Frame price is an estimate. Figures are in U.S. dollars and are indicative of relative positioning.Switch views with the toolbar.

By 2026, average launch prices eased as more mid-range headsets, including Valve Steam Frame, entered the market. The pattern suggests the ultra-premium experiment is maturing into a fuller range of options, a broadening that mirrors the premiumisation seen in our Choice widened as the category matured, a broadening that mirrors the premiumisation seen in our Apple revenue by segment analysis.

By Brand

VR Headset Price Comparison by Brand

Compared by brand, the headsets separate into clear pricing philosophies. Apple sits alone at the top with the 3,499-dollar Vision Pro. Pimax and Samsung occupy the premium tier near 1,800 to 2,000 dollars. Valve and HTC sit around 1,000 to 1,200 dollars. Sony PlayStation VR2 is mid-range, and Meta is consistently the most affordable major brand. Each brand picked a lane and stayed in it. Pricing became a signature for each maker. Buyers learned to expect a brand by its price. Price became shorthand for each maker strategy.

Each brand pricing reflects its strategy. Apple targets professionals and early adopters willing to pay a premium for the best display and passthrough. Meta prioritises volume and accessibility, accepting thin margins to build an install base. Sony leverages its console ecosystem, while Valve and Pimax serve PC enthusiasts, a spread of approaches as varied as in our Strategy, not just hardware, sets the prices apart, a spread as varied as in our smartphone market share by vendor analysis.

VR Headset Price by Brand, 2023-2026 (USD)Average headset price for each major brand.

Data:

Derived from the worldwide VR headset price comparison, 2023 to 2026, by MSRP, compiled by BusinessStats from manufacturer pricing and VRcompare.

Note:

Price tiers, brand averages, year averages, price changes and ratios are calculated from the launch MSRP figures. Some prices changed after launch; the Valve Steam Frame price is an estimate. Figures are in U.S. dollars and are indicative of relative positioning.Switch views with the toolbar.

The brand comparison highlights Meta unusual position. Alone among the major players, Meta has actively pushed prices down and kept them low, treating hardware as a gateway to its software and services rather than a profit centre. This loss-leading strategy has made Meta the volume leader even as rivals chase the premium, a model echoed in our Cheap hardware is the hook for Meta software, a model echoed in our big tech revenue comparison analysis.

Meta Quest Pricing

Meta Quest VR Headset Price Over Time

Meta own Quest line shows how a single brand has navigated VR pricing over time. The Quest 2 launched at 299 dollars in 2020, rose to 399 dollars amid component costs, and was succeeded by the 499-dollar Quest 3 in 2023. In 2026, a memory shortage pushed the Quest 3 to 599 dollars, its highest price yet. The flagship has crept steadily upward over six years.

Alongside the flagship, Meta has kept a budget option to anchor the entry point. The Quest 3S arrived in 2024 at 299 dollars, restoring the low price the Quest 2 had abandoned, before edging up to around 349 dollars in 2026. The two-tier approach lets Meta cover both value buyers and those wanting the latest features, a laddered strategy familiar from our One cheap, one premium, covering both ends, a laddered strategy familiar from our Apple iPhone revenue analysis.

Meta Quest Flagship Price Over Time (USD)The Meta Quest flagship price from 2020 to 2026.

Data:

Derived from the worldwide VR headset price comparison, 2023 to 2026, by MSRP, compiled by BusinessStats from manufacturer pricing and VRcompare.

Note:

Price tiers, brand averages, year averages, price changes and ratios are calculated from the launch MSRP figures. Some prices changed after launch; the Valve Steam Frame price is an estimate. Figures are in U.S. dollars and are indicative of relative positioning.Switch views with the toolbar.

The upward drift of Quest prices marks a turning point for VR affordability. For years, Meta pushed prices down to grow the market; the 2026 increases, forced by component shortages, reversed that trend. Whether Meta can return to aggressive pricing once supply normalises will shape how accessible VR remains, a question that touches the whole VR and wearables category.

Price Changes

VR Headset Price Changes, Launch to 2026

Comparing launch prices with 2026 prices reveals which headsets moved and in which direction. The Meta Quest 3 rose from 499 to 599 dollars and the Quest 3S from 299 to around 349, both driven up by the memory shortage. The PlayStation VR2, by contrast, was cut from 549 to around 399 dollars as Sony sought to revive demand.

These opposing moves capture two different pricing pressures. Meta increases were involuntary, forced by rising component costs that hit its thin-margin hardware hardest. Sony cut was strategic, an attempt to reposition an underperforming headset as a value option. The same period saw prices pushed in both directions for different reasons.

VR Headset Price: Launch vs 2026 (USD)How key headset prices moved from launch to 2026.

Data:

Derived from the worldwide VR headset price comparison, 2023 to 2026, by MSRP, compiled by BusinessStats from manufacturer pricing and VRcompare.

Note:

Price tiers, brand averages, year averages, price changes and ratios are calculated from the launch MSRP figures. Some prices changed after launch; the Valve Steam Frame price is an estimate. Figures are in U.S. dollars and are indicative of relative positioning.Switch views with the toolbar.

The net effect narrowed the gap between the mass-market headsets. As the Quest 3 rose and the PlayStation VR2 fell, the two leading mid-range options converged near the 400 to 600 dollar band, intensifying competition for value buyers, a contest as sharp as any in our tablet vendor market share analysis.

Increases and Cuts

VR Headset Price Increases and Cuts (% Change)

Expressed as a percentage change from launch to 2026, the price moves are stark. The Meta Quest 3 rose about 20 percent and the Quest 3S around 17 percent, while the PlayStation VR2 fell roughly 27 percent. The Apple Vision Pro held steady, its price unchanged even through the M5 refresh of late 2025.

The diverging changes show how differently the memory shortage hit each maker. Meta, selling hardware at thin margins, had little choice but to pass on higher costs. Sony, with a more diversified business, could absorb a cut to chase volume. Apple premium pricing left ample room to hold steady, a resilience consistent with our Apple total revenue analysis.

VR Headset Price Change, Launch to 2026 (%)Percentage price increase or cut for key headsets.

Data:

Derived from the worldwide VR headset price comparison, 2023 to 2026, by MSRP, compiled by BusinessStats from manufacturer pricing and VRcompare.

Note:

Price tiers, brand averages, year averages, price changes and ratios are calculated from the launch MSRP figures. Some prices changed after launch; the Valve Steam Frame price is an estimate. Figures are in U.S. dollars and are indicative of relative positioning.Switch views with the toolbar.

The percentage view also highlights the squeeze on budget VR. The headsets that rose most were the cheapest ones, where even a small dollar increase is a large percentage, making VR notably less affordable for first-time buyers in 2026 than a year earlier, a real setback for mass adoption.

Premium vs Mass

Premium Mixed Reality vs Mass-Market VR Headset Prices

Splitting the field into premium mixed reality and mass-market VR shows the category two halves. The premium XR headsets, led by the Vision Pro, Galaxy XR and Pimax Crystal, average well over 2,000 dollars. The mass-market VR headsets, led by the Quest line and PlayStation VR2, average under 500 dollars, roughly a fifth of the premium price.

This five-to-one gap defines the strategic divide in VR. Premium XR aims to deliver a no-compromise experience for professionals and enthusiasts, justifying its cost with cutting-edge displays and sensors. Mass-market VR chases scale, accepting lower specifications to reach a broad audience, a bifurcation as

sharp as any in consumer technology.

Premium XR vs Mass-Market VR: Average Price (USD)Average price of premium mixed reality versus mass-market VR.

Data:

Derived from the worldwide VR headset price comparison, 2023 to 2026, by MSRP, compiled by BusinessStats from manufacturer pricing and VRcompare.

Note:

Price tiers, brand averages, year averages, price changes and ratios are calculated from the launch MSRP figures. Some prices changed after launch; the Valve Steam Frame price is an estimate. Figures are in U.S. dollars and are indicative of relative positioning.Switch views with the toolbar.

The wide gap raises the central question of the VR market: whether the premium and mass tiers will converge. For now they remain far apart, serving different buyers at vastly different prices, with little in the middle, a polarisation more extreme than in almost any other consumer hardware market.

The Headline Gap

Apple Vision Pro vs Meta Quest 3 Price Gap

The single sharpest comparison is between the two best-known headsets: the Apple Vision Pro at 3,499 dollars and the Meta Quest 3 at 499 at launch. Apple flagship costs seven times as much as Meta, the clearest illustration of how far apart the premium and mass ends of VR have grown.

This sevenfold gap reflects fundamentally different products and strategies. The Vision Pro is a professional-grade mixed reality computer with the sharpest displays on the market; the Quest 3 is an affordable gaming and fitness headset built for the mainstream. They compete only loosely, aimed at almost entirely different buyers, a divide as wide as any in our mobile operating system market share analysis.

Apple Vision Pro vs Meta Quest 3 Price (USD)The price gap between the two best-known headsets.

Data:

Derived from the worldwide VR headset price comparison, 2023 to 2026, by MSRP, compiled by BusinessStats from manufacturer pricing and VRcompare.

Note:

Price tiers, brand averages, year averages, price changes and ratios are calculated from the launch MSRP figures. Some prices changed after launch; the Valve Steam Frame price is an estimate. Figures are in U.S. dollars and are indicative of relative positioning.Switch views with the toolbar.

The Vision Pro versus Quest 3 gap also frames the debate over VR future. Apple bets that buyers will eventually pay for a premium experience as the technology matures; Meta bets that low prices and scale will win the market first. Which approach prevails will shape the category, a strategic contest underpinning our tech revenue comparison analysis.

In Perspective

Apple Vision Pro Price in VR Headset Multiples

Put in everyday terms, the price of a single Apple Vision Pro buys a remarkable number of rival headsets. One Vision Pro equals nearly twelve Meta Quest 3S units, seven Meta Quest 3 headsets, or more than six PlayStation VR2 units. Even against the premium Samsung Galaxy XR, the Vision Pro costs nearly twice as much.

These multiples make the Vision Pro position vivid. It is not merely the most expensive headset but an order of magnitude pricier than the mass-market options, placing it in a category of its own. For the price of one Vision Pro, a buyer could equip an entire household or classroom with Quest headsets.

How Many Headsets Equal One Apple Vision ProThe Vision Pro price expressed in units of each rival.

Data:

Derived from the worldwide VR headset price comparison, 2023 to 2026, by MSRP, compiled by BusinessStats from manufacturer pricing and VRcompare.

Note:

Price tiers, brand averages, year averages, price changes and ratios are calculated from the launch MSRP figures. Some prices changed after launch; the Valve Steam Frame price is an estimate. Figures are in U.S. dollars and are indicative of relative positioning.Switch views with the toolbar.

The multiples also explain the Vision Pro modest sales relative to the Quest. With Apple having sold a few hundred thousand units against tens of millions of Quest headsets, price is the decisive factor. The headset extraordinary capabilities have not overcome its extraordinary cost, a tension between capability and cost

that defines the product.

$3,499Vision ProMost expensive. $299Quest 3SCheapest. 12xPrice RangeTop to bottom. 7xVision Provs Quest 3.

The comparison of VR headsets from 2023 to 2026 reveals a market split into extremes. At the top, the Apple Vision Pro stands alone at 3,499 dollars, joined by premium devices from Samsung, Pimax and Valve. At the bottom, Meta affordable Quest line, from 299 to 599 dollars, drives the volume. Between them lies a sparse middle, leaving VR pricing more polarised than almost any consumer category.

More than any single price, it is the sheer range that defines VR in this period. A twelvefold gap separates the cheapest headset from the most expensive, reflecting a technology still searching for its mainstream price point. As component shortages push budget prices up and premium makers hold firm, the central question remains whether VR will be defined by Apple premium vision or Meta mass-market one, a contest that anchors the broader device story in our biggest companies by market value analysis.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: VR Headset Prices

The Apple Vision Pro is the most expensive mainstream VR or mixed reality headset, priced at 3,499 dollars. It topped lists of mass-market consumer headsets when ranked by price, ahead of the Pimax Crystal Super and the Samsung Galaxy XR. Apple held the price steady even through the M5 refresh of late 2025. Specialist or enterprise headsets can cost more, but among consumer devices the Vision Pro stands alone at the top.

The cheapest major VR headset is the Meta Quest 3S, which launched in 2024 at 299 dollars, though a 2026 memory shortage pushed it to around 349 dollars. It offers standalone VR with no PC required, making it the most accessible entry point into the category. Below it, only older or discontinued models like the Meta Quest 2 reached similar prices. The Quest 3S remains the default recommendation for first-time VR buyers on a budget.

The Apple Vision Pro costs 3,499 dollars, while the Meta Quest 3 launched at 499 dollars, making the Vision Pro about seven times more expensive. The two headsets target very different buyers: the Vision Pro is a premium mixed reality device for professionals and Apple-ecosystem users, while the Quest 3 is an affordable, mainstream gaming and fitness headset. The price gap reflects fundamentally different strategies rather than directly competing products.

A global shortage of memory components, the same shortage that affected PCs and other devices, pushed several VR headset prices up in 2026. The Meta Quest 3 rose from 499 to 599 dollars and the Quest 3S from 299 to around 349. Because Meta sells its hardware at thin margins to build an install base, it had little room to absorb the higher component costs and passed them on to buyers, making budget VR notably less affordable.

The Samsung Galaxy XR, launched in October 2025, costs 1,799 dollars. It positions itself as a premium mixed reality headset and a direct challenger to the Apple Vision Pro, at roughly half the Vision Pro's price. With Android XR, Gemini AI integration and strong media apps, it offers a high-end experience below Apple's price, though its hand and eye tracking is generally rated a step behind the Vision Pro's.

VR headsets in 2026 fall into four broad price tiers. The budget tier, under 500 dollars, includes the Meta Quest 3S and Pico 4. The mid tier, 500 to 1,000 dollars, includes the PlayStation VR2 and Valve Index. The premium tier, 1,000 to 2,000 dollars, includes the HTC Vive XR Elite, Samsung Galaxy XR and Pimax Crystal. The ultra tier, above 2,000 dollars, is held by the Apple Vision Pro alone.

The PlayStation VR2 has become a stronger value option in 2026. After launching at 549 dollars in 2023, Sony cut its price to around 399 dollars to revive demand, and added PC adapter support. Some reviewers now rank it among the best value headsets, citing its OLED display and feature set for the price. However, it still requires a PlayStation 5 or, with the adapter, a PC, unlike standalone headsets such as the Meta Quest.

The Valve Steam Frame, confirmed for a 2026 release, has an estimated price of around 1,200 dollars, though Valve has said it is revisiting its shipping schedule and pricing because of the same memory and storage shortage that affected other makers. It is a standalone headset running SteamOS that can also stream PC VR content. As of mid-2026 the final price remains unconfirmed, so this figure should be treated as an estimate.

The Apple Vision Pro costs 3,499 dollars because it uses cutting-edge components, including dual micro-OLED displays with higher resolution than any rival, advanced passthrough cameras, and Apple's own M-series and R1 chips. It is positioned as a professional-grade spatial computer rather than a gaming headset, aimed at early adopters and Apple-ecosystem users. The high price reflects both the expensive hardware and Apple's premium strategy, prioritising margins and experience over mass-market volume.

For most buyers, the Meta Quest 3 at 599 dollars or the Quest 3S at around 349 dollars offer the best balance of price, library and ease of use, with no PC required. Console gamers may prefer the PlayStation VR2, now around 399 dollars. Those deep in the Apple ecosystem who want the sharpest displays may consider the 3,499-dollar Vision Pro, and PC enthusiasts the Valve or Pimax headsets. The right choice

depends heavily on budget and use case.

Sources

VRcompare, manufacturer pricing and IDC - Source for VR and mixed reality headset prices and specifications.

VRcompare Headset Database - Reference for VR headset specifications and suggested retail prices.

Prices are launch suggested retail price (MSRP) in U.S. dollars unless noted. The Apple Vision Pro leads at 3,499 dollars, ahead of the Pimax Crystal Super, Samsung Galaxy XR and others, down to the Meta Quest 3S at 299 dollars. Some prices changed after launch: a 2026 memory-component shortage pushed Meta and others up, while Sony cut the PlayStation VR2. The Valve Steam Frame price is an estimate pending confirmation. Regional prices and discounts vary, so figures are indicative of relative positioning.

STATISTICS REPORT

VR headset market revenue worldwide 2018-2030

Updated Jun 15, 2026 · businesstats.com/vr-headset-market-revenue-worldwide

$10.5B 2025 REVENUE	**+5.5%** 2025 GROWTH	**$12.8B** 2030 FORECAST
~$120B TOTAL 2018-30	**~30M** 2030 UNITS	**50%** META SHARE

Overview

VR headset market revenue worldwide from 2018 to 2030

Virtual reality has spent a decade swinging between hype and disappointment, but the money tells a steadier story. Worldwide revenue from VR headsets climbed from roughly four billion U.S. dollars in 2018 to about 10.5 billion in 2025, and is forecast to approach 12.8 billion by 2030. That is not the explosive, world-changing curve some predicted, yet it is a market that has more than doubled in seven years and keeps growing. This report tracks VR headset market revenue worldwide, year by year, from 2018 through forecasts for 2030, and sets the numbers against the wider story of immersive technology.

The VR headset market covers the dedicated devices that immerse users in virtual environments, from standalone headsets such as Meta's Quest line to tethered systems like Sony's PlayStation VR and premium mixed-reality devices such as Apple's Vision Pro. The figures here, drawn from Statista's VR Headsets segment of the consumer electronics market, measure hardware revenue in U.S. dollars, capturing both the early enthusiast era and the broader consumer market the category is becoming. VR headsets sit within the wider family of body-worn devices tracked in our worldwide wearable shipments analysis.

Annual VR Headset Revenue, 2018-2030 ($bn)Revenue, billion U.S. dollars. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

Data:

Statista Market Insights, VR Headsets segment (consumer electronics), compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Figures are modeled estimates in U.S. dollars; years from 2026 onward are forecasts.Switch views with the toolbar and metric above. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

A note on the data is useful. These figures cover annual worldwide VR headset revenue, in U.S. dollars, from 2018 through forecasts for 2030, and are modeled estimates from Statista Market Insights rather than audited totals. The historical years reflect actual market development, while the years from 2026 onward are forecasts that carry the usual uncertainty of any projection. Estimates for the VR market vary widely between research firms because definitions differ; some broader studies that fold in software, enterprise systems and augmented reality report figures many times larger than the hardware-only series used here.

What makes the VR revenue story interesting is its resilience rather than its drama. The category survived an early hype cycle, a post-pandemic dip in enthusiasm and persistent doubts about whether mainstream consumers would ever adopt headsets, yet revenue kept climbing through it all. Today VR sits at the centre of a broader push toward spatial and mixed-reality computing, backed by some of the largest technology companies in the world, whose scale is mapped in our big tech revenue comparison analysis. The revenue curve that follows charts that uneven but persistent climb.

Annual Data Table

Annual VR Headset Revenue, 2018-2030

Annual VR Headset Revenue, 2018-2030 ($bn, (f)=forecast)Click any column to sort

YEAR	REVENUE	YOY GROWTH
2018	$4.5 B	-
2019	$5.2 B	+15.6%
2020	$6.2 B	+19.2%
2021	$7.4 B	+19.4%
2022	$8.1 B	+9.5%
2023	$9.2 B	+13.6%
2024	$9.9 B	+7.9%
2025	$10.5 B	+5.5%

2026 (f)	$10.9 B	+4.5%
2027 (f)	$11.4 B	+4.1%
2028 (f)	$11.8 B	+3.9%
2029 (f)	$12.3 B	+3.8%
2030 (f)	$12.8 B	+3.7%

The table shows annual VR headset revenue for every year from 2018 to 2030, alongside the rate of change. The early rows capture a small enthusiast market, followed by the pandemic-era acceleration of 2020 and 2021 as standalone headsets like the Quest 2 brought VR to a wider audience. Growth then cooled into steadier single-digit gains as the market matured, and the forecast years extend that gentler trajectory. Sorting the growth column highlights how front-loaded the category's expansion was, with the fastest gains concentrated in the earlier years and a calmer, more predictable climb thereafter.

Revenue Trend

From Niche to Established Market

The annual curve makes the VR market's character clear. Revenue starts modestly in 2018, when headsets were largely the preserve of enthusiasts and developers, then climbs steeply through 2020 and 2021 as standalone devices lowered the barrier to entry and pandemic conditions boosted demand for home entertainment. After that surge the line keeps rising but at a gentler slope, reflecting a market that has moved past its first growth spurt into a steadier expansion phase.

This shape, a modest start followed by a steep climb and then a flatter but still-rising line, is typical of a technology working its way toward the mainstream without ever quite arriving. The acceleration around 2020 and 2021 marked VR's clearest breakthrough moment, driven by affordable standalone hardware, much as accessible devices reshaped other categories. Once that wave of early adoption crested, growth settled into the single digits, a pattern that echoes the maturing of larger device markets traced in our quarterly smartphone shipments analysis.

VR Headset Revenue Trend with Forecast ($bn)Revenue, billion U.S. dollars. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

Data:

Statista Market Insights, VR Headsets segment (consumer electronics), compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Figures are modeled estimates in U.S. dollars; years from 2026 onward are forecasts.Switch views with the toolbar. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

It is worth emphasising how contested these numbers are. Because the VR market is young and defined differently by different analysts, revenue estimates diverge sharply, and the consumer-hardware lens used here deliberately excludes the much larger sums sometimes claimed for the broader virtual and augmented reality economy. What the consistent series does show is a category that has grown steadily rather than spectacularly, defying both the most euphoric forecasts and the predictions of collapse. That steadiness, rather than any single breakout product, may be the most important feature of the market so far, and it is the quality that has kept major investors engaged through the quiet years.

Annual Growth

A Front-Loaded Growth Curve

Plotting annual growth lays bare how front-loaded the VR market's expansion has been. The standout years are 2020 and 2021, when revenue rose at double-digit rates as standalone headsets and pandemic demand widened the audience. After that peak the growth rate steps down year by year, settling into mid-single-digit gains for the rest of the decade. The pattern is that of a category that grew quickly early on and is now expanding at a more measured, mature pace.

This deceleration is the natural arc of a maturing market. The rapid percentage gains of the early 2020s were partly a function of a small starting base, where each new hit device moved the needle sharply. As annual revenue passed ten billion dollars, the same absolute gains translated into smaller percentages, and growth cooled accordingly. The forecast of steady mid-single-digit expansion through 2030 points to a category sustained by gradual adoption and new devices rather than another sudden boom, a dynamic shaped by the broader technology trends explored in our artificial intelligence worldwide statistics overview.

Annual VR Headset Revenue Growth (%)Year-over-year change, percent.

Data:

Statista Market Insights, VR Headsets segment (consumer electronics), compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Figures are modeled estimates in U.S. dollars; years from 2026 onward are forecasts.Switch views with the toolbar. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

The growth chart also underlines how dependent the market remains on landmark hardware. VR revenue tends to step up when a major new headset lands and broadens the audience, then plateau between releases. This lumpiness is characteristic of a category still driven by a handful of flagship devices rather than continuous, broad-based demand, which is why analysts watch each major launch closely for signs that the market is finally crossing into the mainstream. The next generation of lighter, cheaper headsets is widely seen as the test of whether that crossing can happen.

$120 Billion in Revenue

120 Billion Dollars and Counting

Adding up every year since 2018 reveals a substantial total: roughly 120 billion U.S. dollars of VR headset revenue generated worldwide between 2018 and 2030. From a small enthusiast market, the category has accumulated a meaningful body of sales, funding successive generations of hardware and drawing sustained investment from major technology companies. The cumulative line climbs ever more steeply as annual revenue grows, underlining how the market has compounded despite its uneven year-to-year story.

This cumulative total matters because it represents the scale of investment the category can justify. More than a hundred billion dollars of hardware revenue over the period has helped sustain research into displays, optics and chips, and has kept VR on the roadmaps of the world's largest device makers. For a company like Apple, whose results are detailed in our Apple total net sales analysis, even a comparatively small VR business signals a long-term bet on spatial computing as a possible successor platform to the smartphone.

Cumulative VR Headset Revenue Since 2018 ($bn)Running total, billions of U.S. dollars.

Data:

Statista Market Insights, VR Headsets segment (consumer electronics), compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Figures are modeled estimates in U.S. dollars; years from 2026 onward are forecasts.Switch views with the toolbar. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

The cumulative figure also reframes how VR should be understood. It is no longer a speculative curiosity but an established, if still modest, hardware market with a decade of revenue behind it. That track record gives vendors the confidence to keep investing through slow periods, and it anchors a growing ecosystem of games, applications and enterprise tools built around headsets. Whether that ecosystem can eventually lift VR from a niche into a mass-market platform remains the central question hanging over every forecast, and the answer will determine whether the next decade looks like steady growth or a genuine breakout.

Revenue by Era

VR Revenue by Era

Grouping the years into eras captures the VR market's evolution. The early era of 2018 to 2020 averaged a little over five billion dollars a year, a small market built around enthusiasts and developers. The growth era of 2021 to 2025 averaged around nine billion as standalone headsets and pandemic demand widened the audience. The forecast era of 2026 to 2030 averages close to twelve billion, a larger and steadier market. The averages tell the story of a category that has roughly doubled and then grown again, though never explosively.

The era view makes clear that VR has grown in steps rather than a smooth line. The early era was an experimental market testing whether consumers wanted immersive headsets at all. The growth era settled that question partially, as affordable standalone devices found a real audience. The forecast era represents a more confident phase: a market expected to keep expanding steadily, increasingly resembling other maturing device categories such as those covered in our global PC shipments analysis.

Average Annual Revenue by Era ($bn)Average per year within each era (billion U.S. dollars).

Data:

Statista Market Insights, VR Headsets segment (consumer electronics), compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Figures are modeled estimates in U.S. dollars; years from 2026 onward are forecasts.Switch views with the toolbar. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

What the era averages cannot fully convey is how the centre of gravity shifted from tethered, high-end systems toward affordable standalone headsets. The early eras leaned on PC-connected devices aimed at enthusiasts, but it was the self-contained headset, requiring no console or computer, that powered the growth phase and broadened the market. This shift reshaped the competitive landscape and lowered the

price of entry, and it explains why the modern VR market reaches a far wider audience than the specialist systems of its early years. The same pattern of a cheaper, simpler device unlocking a larger market has recurred across consumer electronics.

Leading Vendors

Meta Dominates the Field

Breaking the market down by vendor reveals just how concentrated VR hardware has become. Meta dominates unit shipments through its Quest line, accounting for roughly half of headsets sold, thanks to aggressive pricing and a large content library. Sony holds a meaningful share through PlayStation VR, tied to its console base, while ByteDance's Pico is strong in parts of Asia. Apple's Vision Pro, HTC and a cluster of smaller specialists make up the rest, giving the category a clear leader and a long tail of challengers.

Meta's dominance is the single most important fact about the consumer VR market. By selling standalone headsets at low margins to build an audience, the company has made Quest the default entry point for mainstream buyers, much as a few leaders anchor other device markets. That strategy mirrors the platform dynamics seen across consumer electronics, where scale and ecosystem matter as much as hardware, a pattern detailed in our smartphone market share by vendor analysis. Rivals must either match Meta's pricing or target premium and niche segments instead.

VR Headset Shipment Share by Vendor, 2025Vendor share of unit shipments, 2025 (percent).

Data:

VR headset vendor and regional estimates, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Vendor and regional splits are recent estimates; values approximate.Switch views with the toolbar. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

Beneath Meta, the competitive field is varied and shifting. Sony leans on its gaming ecosystem, ByteDance on its regional strength, and Apple on the premium, mixed-reality end of the market with the high-priced Vision Pro. Whether any challenger can erode Meta's volume lead depends largely on price and content, the two factors that have repeatedly decided VR's winners. The arrival of new entrants, including Samsung's mixed-reality efforts, suggests the vendor rankings could still shift markedly as the platform race intensifies and fresh hardware reaches buyers.

Unit Sales

Headsets Sold: The Volume Story

Revenue tells only half the story; unit sales reveal the other half. The number of VR headsets sold worldwide rose from a few million in 2018 to well over twenty million by the mid-2020s, and is forecast to approach thirty million units a year by 2030. The volume curve broadly tracks the revenue line but is smoothed by falling average prices, as affordable standalone headsets came to make up a growing share of the devices sold.

The gap between rising units and more slowly rising revenue points to a steady decline in average selling prices. As cheap standalone headsets replaced expensive tethered systems, the typical VR device became far more affordable, expanding the audience even as it limited revenue growth. This trade-off, more units at lower prices, is a familiar one in consumer electronics and helps explain why VR volumes have grown faster than the revenue figures alone suggest, a dynamic also visible in the pricing trends behind our worldwide smartphone market revenue analysis.

VR Headset Unit Sales, 2018-2030 (M units)Unit sales, millions. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

Data:

Statista Market Insights, VR Headsets segment, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Unit sales are modeled estimates in millions; years from 2026 onward are forecasts.Switch views with the toolbar. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

The volume trajectory is central to VR's mainstream ambitions. A market selling thirty million headsets a year is no longer a niche, even if it remains small beside smartphones or wearables. Reaching that scale would build the installed base needed to sustain a healthy content ecosystem, the missing ingredient that has held VR back from each previous breakthrough. Whether unit sales can climb well beyond that level depends on lighter, cheaper and more compelling devices arriving in the years ahead, and on developers finding the applications that make a headset feel essential.

Revenue by Region

Where VR Revenue Comes From

VR headset revenue is unevenly distributed across the world. China is the single largest market, generating more than three billion dollars in 2025, supported by strong domestic brands and a large gaming audience. The United States follows closely, anchored by Meta's home market and high consumer spending, while Europe forms a substantial third bloc. The rest of Asia and the remaining regions together account for a meaningful share, reflecting how VR adoption has spread well beyond its early Western enthusiast base.

This regional split shapes the strategies of the major vendors. China's scale makes it indispensable for any volume-focused maker, even as local brands dominate there, while the United States remains the key market for premium devices and content spending. Europe's sizeable but fragmented market rewards localisation, and the fast-growing rest of Asia offers the clearest long-term upside. The geography of VR demand mirrors the broader patterns of digital spending mapped in our internet companies revenue analysis.

VR Headset Revenue by Region, 2025 ($bn)Revenue by region, 2025 (billion U.S. dollars).

Data:

VR headset vendor and regional estimates, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Vendor and regional splits are recent estimates; values approximate.Switch views with the toolbar. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

The balance between regions is likely to keep shifting as the market matures. Falling headset prices tend to unlock demand fastest in price-sensitive emerging markets, which could lift Asia's share over time, while premium mixed-reality devices may concentrate revenue in wealthier regions. For now, the market's reliance on two large blocs, China and the United States, gives it a degree of concentration that vendors must navigate carefully, since policy or competitive shifts in either can move the global totals more than developments anywhere else.

Milestone Years

The VR Revenue Arc in Five Years

A handful of milestone years trace VR's revenue arc. In 2018, the young market generated around four billion dollars, a niche built on enthusiast hardware. By 2021, the standalone-headset wave had lifted

revenue past seven billion. The market reached about 10.5 billion dollars in 2025, then is forecast to climb toward roughly 12.3 billion in 2029 before edging higher in 2030. Together these years span VR's journey from curiosity toward a steadier, larger market.

What stands out across these milestones is how steady, rather than spectacular, the climb has been. Revenue roughly doubled between 2018 and 2025, a solid pace but far short of the explosive growth once predicted for the category. Each milestone marks not a sudden leap but a confirmation that the market kept expanding through difficult years, building a durable foundation rather than riding a single boom. That persistence is itself notable for a technology so often written off.

VR Headset Revenue at Milestone Years ($bn)Selected milestone years (billion U.S. dollars).

Data:

Statista Market Insights, VR Headsets segment (consumer electronics), compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Figures are modeled estimates in U.S. dollars; years from 2026 onward are forecasts.Switch views with the toolbar. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

These milestone years also serve as benchmarks for the category's health. Annual revenue above ten billion dollars confirms a market that has moved beyond the experimental stage, while the gentle slope toward 2030 signals maturity rather than stagnation. The forecast trajectory, steady growth toward roughly 12.8 billion dollars, describes a category that has found a sustainable level and is widely expected to grow further if lighter, cheaper headsets and richer content finally push VR toward the mainstream it has long promised to reach. The numbers from here are less about survival and more about how far the category can scale.

VR vs Wearables

VR Against the Wearable Boom

Setting VR revenue against wearable shipments puts the category's scale in perspective. Indexing both to 2018 shows VR headset revenue rising to a little over twice its starting level by 2026, a respectable climb. Yet wearable shipments, the broader body-worn category that VR belongs to, grew even faster from the same base, lifted by the explosion of wireless earbuds. The comparison shows VR as a real but comparatively modest grower next to the wearable boom.

This divergence captures VR's position within personal technology. While wearables rode a mass-market wave of affordable earbuds and watches, VR remained a more specialised purchase, growing steadily without ever matching that breadth of adoption. Both categories are pushed by major technology companies betting on body-worn computing, but they have scaled very differently, a contrast also visible in the revenue trajectories of our tablet industry revenue analysis. VR's slower index growth reflects a higher-priced, lower-volume market still working toward mainstream reach.

VR Revenue vs Wearable Shipments, Indexed (2018 = 100)Indexed to 2018 = 100. Higher means faster growth from the 2018 base.

Data:

Statista (VR headset revenue) and IDC (wearable shipments), compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Indexed to 2018 = 100; VR is a revenue index, wearables a shipment index.Switch views with the toolbar. Years from 2026 are forecasts.

Ultimately, the VR versus wearables comparison shows how unevenly the body-worn device landscape has evolved. Some categories, like earwear, found enormous mass-market demand quickly, while others, like VR, are building more gradually toward an uncertain but potentially transformative future. For anyone tracking where consumer technology is heading, VR stands out as the long bet, a category whose modest revenue today belies the scale of ambition and investment behind it. The coming years will reveal whether that bet pays off, as the technology either crosses into everyday use or settles permanently into its specialised niche.

$10.5B2025 RevenueUp from ~$4B in 2018. +5.5%2025 GrowthSteady single digits. ~$120BTotal Revenue2018 to 2030. 50%Meta ShareClear market leader.

Taken together, the annual data tells the full story of the VR headset market, from a roughly four-billion-dollar enthusiast niche in 2018, through the standalone-headset and pandemic surge that pushed revenue past ten billion, to a market generating about 10.5 billion dollars in 2025 and forecast to approach 12.8 billion by 2030. The category accumulated roughly 120 billion dollars in revenue over the period, is led decisively by Meta, and reaches its largest markets in China and the United States. By 2030, VR has become an established hardware category rather than the speculative bet it once was.

Yet the more important question is qualitative. VR has evolved from a hyped novelty into a steady, if still niche, market, increasingly framed as the foundation of a broader era of spatial and mixed-reality

computing. The questions ahead are whether lighter, cheaper headsets and more compelling content can finally lift the category into the mainstream, or whether it will remain a sizeable but specialised market for years to come. The market value of the companies competing to answer that question is examined in our biggest companies by market value overview. Either way, VR has secured a real, if modest, place in consumer technology, and the next wave of devices will determine whether it finally fulfils its long-promised potential. For now, the steady revenue line is the clearest sign that the category is here to stay.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: VR Headset Revenue

Worldwide VR headset revenue reached about 10.5 billion U.S. dollars in 2025, up from roughly 4 billion in 2018. Revenue is forecast to grow steadily to around 12.8 billion dollars by 2030. The figures, from Statista's VR Headsets segment, measure hardware revenue and are modeled estimates; broader studies that include software and augmented reality report much larger numbers.

A VR headset is a device that immerses the wearer in a computer-generated environment using built-in displays and motion-tracking sensors. Types range from standalone headsets such as the Meta Quest, which need no external computer, to tethered systems like Sony's PlayStation VR and premium mixed-reality devices such as Apple's Vision Pro.

VR revenue accelerated after 2020 mainly because of affordable standalone headsets, led by the Meta Quest 2, which removed the need for an expensive PC or console. Pandemic conditions also boosted demand for home entertainment. Together these lifted the category from an enthusiast niche toward a broader consumer market, driving double-digit revenue growth in 2020 and 2021.

Meta is by far the largest VR headset maker, accounting for roughly half of global shipments through its Quest line. It sells standalone headsets at low margins to build an audience and content ecosystem. Sony, through PlayStation VR, ByteDance's Pico and Apple's Vision Pro follow, with HTC and other specialists making up the remainder of a concentrated market.

Worldwide VR headset revenue is forecast to reach roughly 12.8 billion U.S. dollars by 2030, up from about 10.5 billion in 2025, implying steady mid-single-digit annual growth. Unit sales are expected to approach thirty million headsets a year. Growth is expected to come from cheaper, lighter devices and richer content rather than another sudden boom.

Worldwide VR headset unit sales rose from a few million in 2018 to more than twenty million by the mid-2020s, and are forecast to approach thirty million units a year by 2030. Volumes have grown faster than revenue because average selling prices fell as affordable standalone headsets replaced expensive tethered systems.

China is the single largest VR headset market by revenue, generating more than 3 billion U.S. dollars in 2025, supported by strong domestic brands and a large gaming audience. The United States is a close second, anchored by Meta's home market and high consumer spending, with Europe forming a substantial third bloc.

VR market estimates vary because analysts define the category differently. The figures here cover VR headset hardware revenue from Statista's consumer-electronics segment. Broader studies that fold in software, enterprise systems, services and augmented reality report figures many times larger, sometimes exceeding fifty billion dollars by 2030, which is why headline numbers differ widely between sources.

Yes. VR headset revenue has grown steadily, more than doubling from about 4 billion U.S. dollars in 2018 to roughly 10.5 billion in 2025, and forecasts point to continued mid-single-digit growth through 2030. Growth has slowed from the double-digit rates of the early 2020s as the market matured, but the trajectory remains upward.

The figures are modeled estimates from Statista Market Insights, covering the VR Headsets segment of the consumer electronics market, in U.S. dollars, from 2018 through 2030 forecasts. Historical years reflect actual market development, while years from 2026 onward are forecasts that carry the usual uncertainty. Vendor and regional splits are approximate.

Sources

Statista - VR Headsets, Consumer Electronics Market - Primary source for worldwide VR headset revenue and unit sales figures.

Statista Market Insights VR headset revenue and volume data (2018-2030) - Used for annual revenue, unit sales and the 2026-2030 forecast.

Industry reports and vendor disclosures - Used for vendor shares, regional splits and historical context.

Revenue figures are modeled estimates from Statista Market Insights, in U.S. dollars, from 2018 through 2030 forecasts. Historical years reflect actual market development; years from 2026 onward are forecasts. Vendor and regional splits are approximate, and estimates vary between research firms because definitions differ. Not investment advice.

STATISTICS REPORT

Virtual Reality (VR) — Statistics & Facts 2026

Updated Mar 20, 2026 · businesstats.com/virtual-reality-statistics

$87B GLOBAL VR MARKET 2026	**171M** VR USERS WORLDWIDE	**43%** META QUEST MARKET SHARE
26% CAGR 2026-2032	**$345B** PROJECTED 2032	**22M** HEADSETS SHIPPED 2025

Overview

Virtual Reality — The $87 Billion Technology Redefining Human Experience

Virtual reality is the technology that replaces a user's real-world environment with a fully immersive computer-generated experience — delivered through a headset that tracks head movement and renders stereoscopic 3D visuals at low latency, creating the sensation of physical presence in a digital world. The global VR market reached approximately **$87 billion in 2026**, having grown from just $7.7 billion in 2019 — more than a tenfold increase in seven years. There are approximately **171 million VR users worldwide** as of 2026, and the market is projected to reach **$345 billion by 2032** at a CAGR of approximately 26% — making it one of the fastest-growing technology markets globally. The convergence of VR with artificial intelligence, 5G networks, and spatial computing is fundamentally expanding what the technology can do and who it can serve, pushing VR beyond gaming into enterprise training, healthcare, real estate, education, and social interaction at scale. For broader technology investment context see our AI market size worldwide and data centers statistics covering the infrastructure powering these immersive experiences.

The VR industry has three distinct hardware segments. **Standalone VR headsets** — led by the Meta Quest 3 and Quest 3S — are self-contained devices requiring no external PC or console, accounting for approximately 75% of consumer VR shipments. **PC-tethered VR headsets** — including the Valve Index and HTC Vive Pro 2 — deliver higher visual fidelity by offloading processing to a connected gaming PC, targeting the premium gaming and professional simulation market. **Standalone enterprise headsets** — including the Apple Vision Pro at $3,499 — are purpose-built for enterprise workflows featuring enterprise-

grade durability and management software. Understanding the capital markets driving investment in these hardware categories is covered in our Nasdaq stock market statistics on technology sector valuations.

Virtual reality has evolved from a niche gaming peripheral to an $87 billion global market serving gaming, enterprise training, healthcare, education, and social interaction. Meta Quest 3 leads the consumer market while Apple Vision Pro targets the premium spatial computing segment at $3,499.

Market Size 2019-2032

Global VR Market Size 2019-2032 — From $7.7B to $345B

The chart below tracks the global VR market from 2019 through 2032. The dramatic acceleration from 2022 onwards reflects three converging trends: Meta's aggressive headset price cuts making VR accessible to mainstream consumers, the launch of Meta Quest Pro and Quest 3 expanding enterprise and mixed reality use cases, and Apple's Vision Pro launch in 2024 validating spatial computing as a mainstream technology category and triggering a wave of enterprise developer investment in immersive applications. The 2026-2032 projected CAGR of 26% reflects expected maturation of enterprise VR adoption and the ecosystem buildout around spatial computing platforms. For the broader technology investment landscape see our Alphabet revenue statistics on how major tech companies are investing in next-generation computing platforms.

Global VR Market 2019-2032 Virtual Reality Market Size Worldwide — USD Billions USD Billions · Grand View Research · IDC · Statista · *2027-2032 projected $87B2026 Market Actual Projected

CAGR ~26% · 2026-2032 Sources: Grand View Research · IDC Worldwide AR/VR Headset Tracker · Statista · *2027-2032 projected

Headset Market & Rankings

VR Headset Market Share 2025 — Meta Dominates, Apple Disrupts

Meta Platforms dominates the VR headset market with approximately **43% market share** through its Quest product line — having sold approximately 20 million Quest units cumulatively since 2020. Meta's strategy of aggressive pricing (Quest 3S starts at $299), a robust content ecosystem (10,000+ apps in the Meta Quest Store), and continuous hardware iteration has made it the undisputed leader in standalone VR. Sony PlayStation VR2 holds approximately 18% share, benefiting from its PlayStation 5 install base of 50+ million consoles. Apple Vision Pro, launched at $3,499, captured approximately 7% market share in 2025 —

validating the spatial computing concept for enterprise buyers. Pico, owned by ByteDance, holds approximately 12% share with strong performance in Asia and enterprise deployments. See our Amazon statistics on its VR and spatial computing investments through AWS.

VR Headset Market Share 2025 Global VR Headset Market Share — 2025 % of global VR headset shipments · IDC Worldwide AR/VR Headset Tracker Q4 2025

VR Headset Shipments by Manufacturer — Annual Rankings 2025

Headset Shipments 2025 VR Headset Annual Shipments — Top Manufacturers 2025 Millions of units · IDC Worldwide AR/VR Headset Tracker 2025 VR Headset Market — Complete Rankings & Data 2025Click column to sort

COMPANY	KEY DEVICE	MARKET SHARE	PRICE (USD)	SEGMENT	KEY STRENGTH
Meta	Quest 3 / Quest 3S	43%	From $299	Consumer / Enterprise	Largest content ecosystem
Sony	PlayStation VR2	18%	$550	Console Gaming	PS5 integration, haptics
Pico (ByteDance)	Pico 4 Ultra	12%	$500	Consumer / Enterprise	Strong in Asia, enterprise
Apple	Vision Pro	7%	$3,499	Premium / Enterprise	Spatial computing, display
HTC Vive	Vive XR Elite	6%	$1,099	PC / Enterprise	Enterprise software ecosystem
Valve	Index	4%	$999	PC Gaming	Finger tracking, SteamVR
Others	Various	10%	Varies	Mixed	Niche segments

VR Users Worldwide

VR Users Worldwide 2026 — 171 Million and Growing Rapidly

Approximately **171 million people use virtual reality globally** in 2026, up from 65 million in 2020 — a 163% increase in six years. The United States leads with approximately **57 million VR users**, representing 33% of the global total despite having only 4% of world population. Europe collectively accounts for approximately 45 million users, led by Germany (12M), UK (10M), and France (8M). Asia-Pacific is the fastest-growing

region with approximately 55 million users, driven by China's strong domestic VR ecosystem including ByteDance's Pico headsets, Japan's gaming culture, and South Korea's technology adoption. The global VR user base is projected to surpass **300 million by 2028** as headset prices continue falling and content libraries expand. For context on consumer markets driving VR adoption see our countries with the largest GDP worldwide data.

VR Users Growth 2019-2028 Global VR Users — 2019 to 2028* (Millions) Millions of active VR users · eMarketer · Statista · *2027-2028 projected 171M2026 Users

+163% users growth 2020-2026 Sources: eMarketer VR User Forecast · Statista VR users worldwide 2019-2028

Use Cases & Industries

VR Use Cases — Gaming, Enterprise, Healthcare, Education & Beyond

Virtual reality's application landscape has dramatically expanded beyond gaming — which remains the largest use case at approximately 43% of the market — into enterprise training (28%), healthcare (12%), education (8%), real estate (5%), and social/entertainment (4%). This diversification is critical to the market's long-term growth trajectory, as enterprise and healthcare applications command significantly higher revenue per user than consumer gaming. A single enterprise VR training deployment can generate $50,000-$500,000 in revenue compared to a $30 consumer game purchase. The shift toward enterprise adoption has transformed the revenue mix, with business applications now generating more total revenue than consumer gaming despite serving far fewer users. For investment implications of this enterprise technology shift see our fintech statistics on how digital transformation spending connects to broader enterprise software trends.

VR Market by Use Case 2026 Global VR Revenue by Industry Application — 2026 % of $87B global VR market by application · Grand View Research · PwC 2026

Healthcare VR — $10.5 Billion and Transforming Medicine

Healthcare represents one of the most compelling and fastest-growing VR applications, with the healthcare VR market valued at approximately **$10.5 billion in 2026** growing at approximately 30% annually. VR is being deployed across three primary healthcare areas: surgical training and simulation, patient therapy and pain management, and medical education. Surgical simulation is particularly impactful — studies show that surgeons trained with VR simulation make 29% fewer errors and complete procedures 38% faster than

those trained through traditional methods alone. The technology allows surgical trainees to practice complex procedures hundreds of times before operating on real patients, dramatically improving outcomes and reducing costs associated with surgical errors. Johnson and Johnson, Stryker, and Medtronic have all invested in VR surgical training platforms.

Pain management through VR has emerged as a clinically validated non-pharmacological intervention. Multiple controlled clinical trials have demonstrated that VR distraction therapy reduces acute pain intensity by 24-60% in burn wound care, chemotherapy, physical therapy, and post-surgical recovery — with particular effectiveness for pediatric patients. Cedars-Sinai Medical Center in Los Angeles has deployed VR pain management across multiple departments, reporting significant reductions in opioid prescription rates for patients using VR therapy. This application has attracted significant attention from healthcare systems seeking to reduce opioid dependency while improving patient experience and outcomes.

Enterprise VR

Enterprise VR — $24 Billion Market Transforming Training and Collaboration

Enterprise VR has emerged as the fastest-growing segment, valued at approximately **$24 billion in 2026** and growing at approximately 35% annually. The primary enterprise applications are training and simulation (manufacturing safety, emergency response, military, aviation), collaborative virtual workspaces, design and prototyping (automotive, aerospace, architecture), and customer experience (retail, real estate virtual tours). PwC's landmark "Seeing Is Believing" study calculated that VR training is up to **4x faster than classroom training**, with learners up to 275% more confident in applying skills learned in VR. Major corporations including Walmart (uses VR for 1M+ employee training), Boeing (jet assembly training), Ford (vehicle design), and Accenture (onboarding 150,000+ employees in VR) have deployed VR training at scale.

Industry Milestone Walmart Trained Over 1 Million Employees Using VR — Cutting Training Time by 10-15% While Improving Retention

Walmart's VR training programme — using 17,000 Oculus Go headsets deployed across 4,700 US stores — is one of the largest corporate VR deployments in history. The retailer uses VR to train employees in Black Friday crowd management, customer service scenarios, new technology rollouts, and compliance training. Walmart reported that employees trained in VR scored 10-15% higher on knowledge assessments and completed training in significantly less time than those using traditional methods. The programme has since

expanded with Meta Quest hardware and now covers advanced leadership training scenarios.

Enterprise VR Investment 2026 Enterprise VR Spending by Industry Sector — 2026 USD Billions · PwC Extended Reality in the Enterprise · Accenture XR Survey 2025 Enterprise VR training is growing at 35% annually — with companies including Walmart, Boeing, Ford, and Accenture deploying VR for employee training at massive scale. PwC research shows VR training is up to 4x faster than classroom methods with 275% higher learner confidence in applying new skills.

Key Statistics

Virtual Reality — Key Statistics & Facts 2026

The virtual reality industry has quietly become one of the most strategically important emerging technology sectors in the global economy. Meta Platforms has invested approximately $50 billion in Reality Labs — its VR and AR hardware division — since 2019, absorbing significant losses while building the hardware ecosystem and content library that makes mass-market VR viable. Apple's entry with Vision Pro at $3,499 has reframed the category as "spatial computing" rather than gaming hardware, potentially unlocking enterprise buyers previously reluctant to deploy gaming-associated headsets in professional environments. The convergence of VR with generative AI is creating a new category of AI-native immersive experiences — where environments, characters, and interactions are generated in real-time by AI rather than pre-built by developers, dramatically reducing content creation costs.

$87BGlobal VR Market 2026 171MVR Users Worldwide 22MHeadsets Shipped 2025 $50BMeta Reality Labs Total Invest. 10,000+Apps in Meta Quest Store 4xFaster than Classroom Training

VR Gaming — $37 Billion and the Content Arms Race

Global VR gaming revenue reached approximately **$37 billion in 2026** — the largest single vertical within the VR market. The top-selling VR games include Beat Saber (Meta, 4M+ copies sold), Half-Life: Alyx (Valve, 3M+ copies), Resident Evil Village VR (Capcom), and Gran Turismo 7 VR (Sony). Meta has invested approximately $3 billion in first-party VR game studios and content acquisition since 2021, recognising that exclusive high-quality content is the primary driver of headset adoption — a strategy borrowed directly from console gaming. The VR gaming market is projected to reach $92 billion by 2030 as headset penetration increases and AAA game developers dedicate more resources to VR-native titles. For the financial markets implications of VR gaming's growth trajectory see our fintech statistics on digital entertainment payment flows.

The metaverse concept — persistent shared virtual worlds where people work, play, socialize, and transact — positions VR as the primary hardware access point for the next evolution of the internet. McKinsey estimated the metaverse could generate $4-5 trillion in annual economic value by 2030. While the metaverse narrative cooled significantly from its 2021-2022 peak hype cycle — following Meta's pivot to AI and the muted reception to Horizon Worlds — the underlying infrastructure investments in VR hardware and spatial computing software have continued at substantial scale. The AI-augmented metaverse — where AI generates environments in real-time — represents a more credible near-term vision than the static social worlds that initially failed to attract mainstream adoption. The technology stack powering this vision runs on the infrastructure covered in our data centers statistics analysis.

Forecast 2032

VR Market Forecast — $345 Billion by 2032

The global virtual reality market is projected to reach approximately **$345 billion by 2032**, growing from $87 billion in 2026 at a CAGR of approximately 26%. Five structural drivers will power this growth. First, **enterprise adoption acceleration** — as VR training ROI becomes well-documented across more industries, corporate VR budgets will scale from pilots to enterprise-wide programmes, driving the enterprise segment from $24 billion to over $120 billion. Second, **headset price compression** — continued hardware cost reduction will bring capable standalone VR headsets below $200 by 2028, dramatically expanding the addressable consumer market. Third, **AI-native content creation** — generative AI will reduce VR content development costs by 60-80%, enabling independent developers and enterprise buyers to create custom VR experiences without $500,000-$2M production budgets. Fourth, **5G-enabled mobile VR** — as 5G networks mature and processing moves to edge servers, high-fidelity VR experiences will become deliverable to lightweight headsets. Fifth, **healthcare and therapeutic validation** — ongoing clinical trials will produce regulatory-approved VR therapeutics for pain management, PTSD, phobias, and neurological rehabilitation, creating a pharmaceutical-equivalent revenue stream with recurring subscription billing. For financial markets context driving these investments see our Nasdaq statistics on technology sector growth multiples.

VR Market Forecasts 2032 Global Virtual Reality Market — Key Projections to 2032 $345BGlobal VR Market 2032 (proj.) 26%CAGR 2026-2032 300M+VR Users 2028 (proj.) $120BEnterprise VR 2032 (proj.) $200Entry Headset Price 2028 $92BVR Gaming Revenue 2030

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions — Virtual Reality

The global virtual reality market is worth approximately **$87 billion in 2026**, projected to reach $345 billion by 2032 at a CAGR of approximately 26%. The enterprise segment is growing fastest at approximately 35% annually, while gaming remains the largest use case at 43% of total market revenue.

Approximately **171 million people use virtual reality globally** in 2026, up from 65 million in 2020 — a 163% increase in six years. The US leads with approximately 57 million users. The global VR user base is projected to surpass 300 million by 2028 as headset prices fall below $200.

Meta dominates with approximately 43% market share through its Quest product line. Sony PlayStation VR2 holds 18%, Pico (ByteDance) 12%, Apple Vision Pro 7%, HTC Vive 6%, and Valve Index 4%. Meta has sold approximately 20 million Quest units cumulatively since 2020.

Gaming leads at 43% of VR market revenue. Enterprise training and simulation accounts for 28% — Walmart, Boeing, Ford, and Accenture use VR for mass employee training. Healthcare accounts for 12% (surgical simulation, pain management). Education 8%, real estate 5%, social/entertainment 4%. Enterprise is the fastest-growing segment at 35% CAGR.

The VR market is projected to reach **$345 billion by 2032**. Key growth drivers include enterprise training adoption at scale, AI-native content creation reducing development costs by 60-80%, headset prices falling below $200, 5G-enabled lightweight headsets, and clinically validated VR therapeutics. The convergence of VR with AI represents the most significant development for the industry over the next five years.

Data Sources & References

Primary: Grand View Research — Virtual Reality Market Report 2025

Primary: IDC — Worldwide AR/VR Headset Tracker Q4 2025

Supporting: PwC — Seeing is Believing: The Power of Virtual Reality in the Workplace · eMarketer VR User Forecast 2026 · Statista Virtual Reality Market Outlook · Goldman Sachs VR/AR Opportunity 2025

All market figures in USD. User counts represent active VR users (used VR at least once per month). Headset market share from IDC Q4 2025 shipment data. 2027-2032 figures are projections subject to revision. Enterprise figures include AR/MR devices used in enterprise settings. Virtual Reality 2026 VR Market Size Meta Quest Statistics VR Headset Market Share VR Users Worldwide Enterprise VR VR Gaming Revenue Apple Vision Pro VR Healthcare Metaverse Statistics

STATISTICS REPORT

Smartphone market share worldwide quarterly 2009-2026, by vendor

Updated Jun 19, 2026 · businesstats.com/global-market-share-held-by-smartphone-vendors-since-4th-quarter-2009

~19% SAMSUNG Q1'26	~18% APPLE Q1'26	~12% XIAOMI Q1'26
~39% NOKIA 2009	~45% CHINESE BRANDS	0% NOKIA TODAY

Overview

Smartphone market share worldwide from 4th quarter 2009 to 1st quarter 2026, by vendor

The smartphone market has been reshaped completely since 2009. Where Nokia and BlackBerry once dominated, Samsung and Apple now lead, with a wave of Chinese vendors crowding in behind them. This report tracks worldwide smartphone market share by vendor, quarter by quarter, from the fourth quarter of 2009 to the first quarter of 2026, charting one of the most dramatic reorderings in tech. No other major market has seen its leaders change so completely. Today's top brands were minor or nonexistent in 2009. Xiaomi did not exist; Huawei was tiny; Transsion was unknown. The leaders of today were nowhere on the map. The market reinvented its entire top tier in a decade. Such wholesale turnover is rare in any industry. The smartphone market remakes itself constantly. No lead is ever truly safe in this fast-moving global business.

As of early 2026, Samsung and Apple lead the market, each holding roughly 18 to 19 percent of global shipments, with Xiaomi third near 12 percent. Behind them, Oppo, Vivo and the fast-rising Transsion fill out the top ranks. The revenue these shipments generate for the leaders is explored in our Apple, Google and Microsoft revenue comparison analysis; here the focus is on units and share. Shipments tell a different story from revenue. A vendor can lead in units yet trail in profit. Apple proves the point, taking most profit from a minority of units. Share of shipments is only one way to measure success. Profit, revenue and brand value tell other stories. Each lens ranks the vendors differently. No single measure captures the full picture.

Worldwide Smartphone Market Share by Vendor, 2009-2026 (%)Quarterly shipment share of the major vendors.

Data:

Worldwide smartphone shipment market share by vendor, Q4 2009 to Q1 2026, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC, Counterpoint and similar trackers.

Note:

Shares are based on units shipped, in percent. Recent quarters use reported figures; older quarters are reconstructed from documented annual and quarterly market-share data, with values interpolated between well-documented anchor points. Trackers differ slightly, so figures are indicative of scale and trend.Switch views with the toolbar.

The story is one of repeated upheaval. Nokia, which held nearly 40 percent of the market in 2009, was gone within a few years. Samsung rose to become the long-running leader. Huawei surged to second place by 2019, only to collapse under US sanctions. And Apple, ever cyclical, has climbed steadily to challenge Samsung for the top spot, a rise powered by the iPhone in our Apple climbed from a niche player to a co-leader, a rise powered by the iPhone in our Apple iPhone revenue analysis.

A note on the data. Shares are based on units shipped, in percent. Recent quarters use figures reported by trackers such as IDC and Counterpoint; older quarters are reconstructed from documented annual and quarterly market-share data, with values interpolated between well-documented anchor points. Research firms differ slightly, so the figures are indicative of scale and trend rather than exact. The broad trends, however, are well established and widely agreed. Every tracker shows the same overall arc. IDC, Counterpoint and Omdia agree on the big picture. They differ only at the margins of each quarter. The headline rankings are consistent across firms. Analysts agree on who leads, if not by how much.

Market Share Data Table

Smartphone Market Share by Vendor, Selected Quarters

Worldwide Smartphone Market Share by Vendor, Selected Quarters (%)Click any column to sort

QUARTER	SAMSUNG	APPLE	XIAOMI	OTHERS
Q4 '09	3%	18%	0%	79%
Q4 '11	22%	23%	1%	54%

Q4 '13	28%	20%	2%	50%
Q4 '15	21%	20%	5%	54%
Q4 '17	18%	20%	7%	55%
Q4 '19	18%	19%	9%	54%
Q4 '21	19%	22%	12%	47%
Q4 '23	16%	22%	13%	49%
Q4 '25	19%	23%	12%	46%
Q1 '26	19%	18%	12%	51%

The table lists the worldwide smartphone market share of the leading vendors at key points from 2009 to 2026. It shows Nokia falling from dominance to nothing, Samsung rising to lead, Huawei spiking and crashing, and Xiaomi climbing into the top three. Sorting the columns highlights how completely the order has changed over the period. Almost none of the 2009 leaders remain near the top today. The turnover at the top has been near-total. Of the 2009 leaders, only Apple and Samsung still matter. Every other name has fallen away or transformed. The 2009 and 2026 leaderboards barely overlap. Only two names survive at the top. Samsung and Apple alone bridge both eras. They are the market's two enduring great survivors.

Q1 2026 Standings

A Photo Finish

As of the first quarter of 2026, Samsung leads the smartphone market with about 19 percent share, narrowly ahead of Apple at roughly 18 percent. Xiaomi sits third near 12 percent, followed by Oppo and Vivo, with Transsion and others making up the rest. The top two are separated by less than a single percentage point.

The closeness of Samsung and Apple is a defining feature of the current market. The lead flips between them depending on the quarter: Apple typically leads in the holiday fourth quarter when new iPhones ship in volume, while Samsung leads in other quarters on the strength of its broad lineup. In early 2026, Samsung reclaimed the top spot after the iPhone holiday surge faded. The pattern repeats almost every year. Apple peaks in winter, Samsung leads the rest of the year. The seasonal handover is one of the market most reliable rhythms. It has held for over a decade. The winter spike is now a fixture of the market. Apple holiday surge is utterly predictable. Every autumn launch lifts its winter share.

Smartphone Market Share by Vendor, Q1 2026 (%)Latest quarter share, ranked.

Data:

Derived from worldwide smartphone shipment market share, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC, Counterpoint and similar trackers.

Note:

Combined shares, head-to-head gaps, seasonality, era leaders and share changes are calculated from the vendor share series. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data; recent quarters use reported figures. Different research firms report slightly different shares.Switch views with the toolbar.

Below the top two, the Chinese vendors compete fiercely for share. Xiaomi, Oppo and Vivo each hold high-single-digit to low-teens shares, while Transsion has risen rapidly by dominating emerging markets in Africa and Asia. The market in early 2026 was also shrinking, squeezed by memory-component shortages that pushed up prices, a pressure felt across our Rising costs squeezed the whole industry, a pressure felt across our big tech revenue comparison analysis.

Samsung vs Apple

The Central Rivalry

The Samsung versus Apple rivalry is the central contest of the modern smartphone era. For most of the 2010s, Samsung led comfortably, shipping more phones across more price points than anyone. But Apple has steadily closed the gap, and since around 2023 the two have been effectively tied, trading the top spot from quarter to quarter. The two have never been more evenly matched. Each quarter the lead can change hands. No vendor can take the top spot for granted now. The contest is decided quarter by quarter. Momentum can shift with a single product launch. One strong flagship can redraw the quarter. A single hit phone shifts the rankings.

The two compete in very different ways. Samsung sells across the entire price range, from budget A-series phones to premium foldables, giving it huge volume. Apple sells only premium phones but in enormous numbers, capturing the vast majority of industry profit despite shipping fewer units, a profit dominance reflected in our Apple net income analysis.

Samsung vs Apple Market Share, 2009-2026 (%)Quarterly share of the two leaders, head to head.

Data:

Derived from worldwide smartphone shipment market share, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC, Counterpoint and similar trackers.

Note:

Combined shares, head-to-head gaps, seasonality, era leaders and share changes are calculated from the vendor share series. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data; recent quarters use reported figures. Different research firms report slightly different shares.Switch views with the toolbar.

The result is a market where Samsung and Apple are nearly tied in units but worlds apart in economics. Apple takes the lions share of smartphone profits with its premium-only lineup, while Samsung relies on volume. The unit race may be close, but in revenue and profit per phone, Apple is far ahead, a gap reinforced by the services attached to each device in our Apple Services revenue analysis.

Rise and Fall

Leaders Come and Go

No part of the smartphone story is more dramatic than the rise and fall of vendors. Nokia, the dominant force of 2009 with nearly 40 percent share, was overwhelmed by the Android and iPhone era and had effectively vanished from the rankings by 2014, one of the fastest collapses in business history.

Huawei traced an even steeper arc. It climbed to become the second-largest smartphone vendor in the world by 2019, briefly even challenging for first, before US sanctions in 2020 cut off its access to chips and Google services. Within a year its global share had collapsed from around 18 percent to low single digits, redrawing the entire competitive map. Few corporate falls have been so sudden or so complete. Huawei went from challenger to footnote almost overnight. Geopolitics, not the market, decided its fate. A single policy change reshaped the rankings. External shocks can matter as much as competition. Politics reshaped the market as much as products. Sanctions did what no rival could.

The Rise and Fall of Vendors: Nokia, Huawei, Xiaomi (%)Quarterly share of three vendors with dramatic arcs.

Data:

Derived from worldwide smartphone shipment market share, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC, Counterpoint and similar trackers.

Note:

Combined shares, head-to-head gaps, seasonality, era leaders and share changes are calculated from the vendor share series. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data; recent quarters use reported figures. Different research firms report slightly different shares.Switch views with the toolbar.

Into the space left by these falls stepped new winners. Xiaomi rose from nothing in 2013 to a steady top-three position, briefly reaching second place in 2021. Oppo, Vivo and Transsion also surged. The lesson of the smartphone market is that dominance is fragile, and that a leader can fall as fast as it rose, a volatility rare in our Smartphone leadership has proved strikingly fragile, a volatility rare in our biggest companies by market value analysis.

Snapshot

A Fragmented Field

Seen as a snapshot, the first quarter of 2026 market is more fragmented than it looks. Samsung and Apple together hold under 40 percent, leaving the majority of the market to a crowd of Chinese vendors and others. Xiaomi, Oppo, Vivo and Transsion together account for a larger combined share than either leader, underlining how competitive the field below the top two has become. The middle of the market is a brutal contest. Margins there are thin and competition fierce. Survival depends on scale and efficiency. Many brands have tried and failed to break through. The graveyard of smartphone makers is crowded. Few who enter the market manage to stay.

This fragmentation is a defining feature of the modern market. Unlike the early years, when one or two vendors dominated, today no single company holds even a fifth of the market, and five or six vendors hold meaningful shares. The result is intense competition, especially in the mid-range and emerging markets where the Chinese brands and Transsion battle for volume. Price competition there is relentless. Only the most efficient vendors survive.

Smartphone Market Share by Vendor, Q1 2026 (%)The latest quarter as a share of the whole market.

Data:

Derived from worldwide smartphone shipment market share, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC, Counterpoint and similar trackers.

Note:

Combined shares, head-to-head gaps, seasonality, era leaders and share changes are calculated from the vendor share series. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data; recent quarters use reported

figures. Different research firms report slightly different shares.Switch views with the toolbar.

The snapshot also captures how far the centre of gravity has shifted toward Asia. With Samsung (Korean), Apple (American) and four major Chinese vendors making up most of the market, the smartphone industry is now overwhelmingly an Asian-led business, a shift that has redrawn the global technology map over the past fifteen years.

Chinese Vendors

The Collective Rise

Tracking the combined share of the Chinese vendors, Xiaomi, Oppo, Vivo, Huawei, Honor and Transsion, shows their collective rise. From a negligible presence in 2009, Chinese brands together now account for roughly 40 to 45 percent of the global market, more than Samsung and Apple combined, even after Huawei collapse.

This collective rise reshaped the industry. Chinese vendors first conquered their vast home market, then expanded across Asia, Africa and Latin America with aggressive pricing and rapid innovation. Transsion in particular built a dominant position in Africa with phones tailored to local needs, while Xiaomi, Oppo and Vivo spread across emerging markets worldwide. Their expansion was rapid and far-reaching. Within a decade they reached every continent.

Combined Market Share of Chinese Vendors, 2009-2026 (%)Xiaomi, Oppo, Vivo, Huawei, Honor and Transsion together.

Data:

Derived from worldwide smartphone shipment market share, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC, Counterpoint and similar trackers.

Note:

Combined shares, head-to-head gaps, seasonality, era leaders and share changes are calculated from the vendor share series. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data; recent quarters use reported figures. Different research firms report slightly different shares.Switch views with the toolbar.

The combined Chinese share would be even higher but for the fall of Huawei, once the largest of them. Its collapse handed share to its domestic rivals, especially Xiaomi and the Honor brand it spun off. Even so, the Chinese vendors as a group are now the dominant force in global smartphone volume, a scale that now

rivals any single vendor in the entire industry. Collectively they are the market dominant force. No single rival matches their combined scale.

Apple Seasonality

The Holiday Spike

Apple market share follows a pronounced seasonal rhythm unlike any other vendor. Its share peaks sharply in the fourth quarter, the holiday season when new iPhones launch, then declines through the following quarters until the next launch. The swing between Apple peak and trough quarters can exceed eight percentage points.

This seasonality reflects Apple unique strategy of launching its flagship iPhones each September, driving a wave of holiday-quarter sales. No other major vendor concentrates its sales so heavily in one quarter. The pattern means Apple often leads the market in the fourth quarter but slips behind Samsung in the spring and summer, as seen in our Apple revenue by segment analysis.

Apple Average Market Share by Calendar Quarter (%)Apple share is highest in the holiday fourth quarter.

Data:

Derived from worldwide smartphone shipment market share, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC, Counterpoint and similar trackers.

Note:

Combined shares, head-to-head gaps, seasonality, era leaders and share changes are calculated from the vendor share series. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data; recent quarters use reported figures. Different research firms report slightly different shares.Switch views with the toolbar.

The seasonality of Apple share is the mirror image of its revenue seasonality. Because the iPhone dominates Apple sales, the holiday quarter that lifts Apple market share also drives its biggest revenue quarter of the year. The two move together, making the fourth quarter decisive for Apple in both share and sales.

Top Five Today

Concentration at the Top

The top five vendors today, Samsung, Apple, Xiaomi, Oppo and Vivo, together hold roughly 70 to 75 percent of the global market, leaving the rest to Transsion, Honor, Motorola, Huawei and a long tail of smaller brands. The concentration at the top is real but far from total, with the sixth-place vendor still holding a meaningful share.

The composition of the top five has been remarkably stable in recent years, even as the order shifts. Samsung and Apple anchor the top two, while Xiaomi, Oppo and Vivo rotate through the next three places depending on the quarter and region. Transsion has been knocking on the door of the top five, occasionally breaking in on the strength of its emerging-market sales.

Top Five Smartphone Vendors by Share, 2026 (%)The five largest vendors and their combined dominance.

Data:

Derived from worldwide smartphone shipment market share, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC, Counterpoint and similar trackers.

Note:

Combined shares, head-to-head gaps, seasonality, era leaders and share changes are calculated from the vendor share series. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data; recent quarters use reported figures. Different research firms report slightly different shares.Switch views with the toolbar.

Below the top five, the competition is even more intense. Transsion, Honor and Motorola are all vying for position, while once-mighty brands like LG and HTC have exited the market entirely. The churn below the leaders is a reminder of how unforgiving the smartphone business has become, a dynamic that makes the smartphone business one of the most unforgiving in all of technology.

Share Shifts

A Decade of Change

Comparing each vendor share in 2026 with its share roughly a decade earlier shows who has gained and who has lost. Apple and Xiaomi are among the biggest gainers, while Samsung has held roughly steady. The clearest loser is Huawei, whose share collapsed after 2020, along with the long-departed Nokia and LG.

These shifts reflect the forces that have shaped the market: Apple steady premium climb, Xiaomi aggressive expansion, Huawei sanctions-driven collapse, and the disappearance of older Western and Korean brands. The net effect has been a market that is both more concentrated at the very top and more fragmented just below it than it was a decade ago.

Change in Market Share by Vendor Since 2016 (pp)Percentage-point gain or loss over roughly a decade.

Data:

Derived from worldwide smartphone shipment market share, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC, Counterpoint and similar trackers.

Note:

Combined shares, head-to-head gaps, seasonality, era leaders and share changes are calculated from the vendor share series. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data; recent quarters use reported figures. Different research firms report slightly different shares.Switch views with the toolbar.

The pattern of gains and losses also points to where the market is heading. Apple continued share gains suggest the premium segment is strengthening, while the rise of Transsion and the Chinese brands points to growth in emerging markets. The vendors gaining share today are those positioned at the two ends of the market, premium and ultra-affordable, a barbell shape echoed in our Apple total revenue analysis.

Apple vs the Rest

One Brand Against Many

Setting Apple against the entire rest of the market shows the scale of its singular position. With around 18 percent of global shipments, Apple alone holds roughly the same share as the next two or three vendors combined, despite selling only premium phones. The other 82 percent is split among Samsung and a crowd of Android vendors.

This view underlines how unusual Apple position is. It is the only major vendor that sells no budget phones, yet it holds a share rivalling Samsung, which sells across every price point. Apple converts its slice of units into the overwhelming majority of industry profit, a dominance that defines its place in our Services share of Apple revenue analysis.

Apple vs the Rest of the Market, 2009-2026 (%)Apple share stacked against all other vendors combined.

Data:

Derived from worldwide smartphone shipment market share, compiled by BusinessStats from IDC, Counterpoint and similar trackers.

Note:

Combined shares, head-to-head gaps, seasonality, era leaders and share changes are calculated from the vendor share series. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data; recent quarters use reported figures. Different research firms report slightly different shares.Switch views with the toolbar.

The Apple-versus-everyone framing captures the essential split in the smartphone market: one premium giant on one side, and the entire Android ecosystem on the other. While Android phones vastly outnumber iPhones in total, Apple single brand stands against dozens of competing Android makers, a structural advantage that underpins the wider Apple story in our App Store categories analysis.

~19%Samsung Q1'26Market leader. ~18%Apple Q1'26A close second. ~12%Xiaomi Q1'26Third place. ~39%Nokia in 2009Then dominant.

The worldwide smartphone market share story from 2009 to 2026 is one of relentless change. Nokia and BlackBerry, the leaders of 2009, are gone. Samsung rose to dominate and still leads narrowly. Apple climbed steadily to draw level. Huawei soared and crashed. And a wave of Chinese vendors, Xiaomi, Oppo, Vivo and Transsion, reshaped the market from below.

More than any single ranking, it is the constant churn that defines the smartphone market. Leaders have risen and fallen within a few years, dominance has proved fragile, and the centre of gravity has shifted decisively toward Asia. As of 2026, Samsung and Apple are locked in a near-tie at the top while the Chinese vendors crowd in behind, a balance that, on the history of this market, is unlikely to hold for long, a volatility that sets the smartphone business apart from the steadier giants in our Apple revenue share analysis.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: Smartphone Market Share by Vendor

As of the first quarter of 2026, Samsung has the largest worldwide smartphone market share at about 19 percent, narrowly ahead of Apple at roughly 18 percent. Xiaomi is third near 12 percent, followed by Oppo and Vivo. Samsung and Apple are effectively tied, and the lead flips between them by quarter: Apple typically leads in the holiday fourth quarter, while Samsung leads the rest of the year.

The market has transformed completely. In 2009, Nokia dominated with nearly 40 percent share and BlackBerry held about 20 percent, while Apple was around 16 percent and Samsung tiny. Today Samsung and Apple lead at about 18 to 19 percent each, Nokia and BlackBerry are gone, and Chinese vendors like Xiaomi, Oppo, Vivo and Transsion hold large shares. It is one of the most dramatic reorderings in tech history.

Huawei rose to become the world's second-largest smartphone vendor by 2019, briefly challenging for first place. But US sanctions imposed in 2020 cut off its access to advanced chips and to Google's Android services, crippling its phones outside China. Within about a year, its global market share collapsed from around 18 percent to low single digits, handing share to rivals like Xiaomi and its own spun-off Honor brand.

It depends on the quarter. Samsung and Apple have been effectively tied for the lead since around 2023, each with about 18 to 19 percent of global shipments. Apple typically leads in the holiday fourth quarter, when new iPhones ship in volume, while Samsung leads in other quarters on the strength of its broad lineup. In Q1 2026, Samsung reclaimed the top spot as the iPhone holiday surge faded.

Chinese smartphone vendors, including Xiaomi, Oppo, Vivo, Honor, Transsion and Huawei, together hold roughly 40 to 45 percent of the global market as of 2026, more than Samsung and Apple combined. They first conquered their home market, then expanded across Asia, Africa and Latin America. Transsion in particular dominates many African markets, while Xiaomi, Oppo and Vivo compete fiercely across emerging markets worldwide.

Apple launches its new flagship iPhones each September, which drives a surge of sales in the fourth quarter holiday season. Because the iPhone dominates Apple's sales, its market share spikes in that quarter, often making Apple the top vendor, then declines through the following quarters until the next launch. The swing between Apple's peak and trough quarters can exceed eight percentage points, a seasonality unique among major vendors.

Several once-major brands have exited the market. Nokia, the dominant vendor of 2009, collapsed in the early 2010s after failing to adapt to Android and the iPhone. BlackBerry, once around 20 percent share, vanished by the mid-2010s. LG exited the smartphone business in 2021, and HTC, once a major Android maker, faded to irrelevance. Huawei's global share collapsed after 2020 sanctions, though it survives in China.

Smartphone market share is usually measured by units shipped, tracked by research firms such as IDC, Counterpoint Research and Omdia. Shipments count phones sent to retailers and carriers, not necessarily

sold to consumers. The firms report quarterly figures, and their estimates differ slightly because of different methodologies. This analysis uses reported figures for recent quarters and documented data for older ones, so figures are indicative of scale and trend.

The global smartphone market was shrinking in early 2026. According to IDC and other trackers, Q1 2026 shipments fell by roughly 3 to 6 percent year over year, breaking a long growth streak. The decline was driven mainly by memory-component shortages that raised costs and forced price increases, squeezing demand, especially for lower-end Android phones. Samsung and Apple were the only top-five vendors to grow, thanks to their premium focus.

Transsion is a Chinese smartphone maker, owner of the Tecno, Infinix and itel brands, that has risen rapidly by dominating emerging markets, especially in Africa. It builds affordable phones tailored to local needs, such as better camera tuning for darker skin tones, longer battery life and dual-SIM support. By 2025 Transsion had become a top-five global vendor by units, with around 8 to 9 percent share, one of the fastest risers in the industry.

Sources

IDC Worldwide Quarterly Mobile Phone Tracker, Counterpoint Research and Omdia - Source for reported quarterly smartphone shipment market share by vendor.

IDC Smartphone Market Share - Reference for recent quarterly vendor shipments and share.

Market share is based on units shipped, in percent. In Q1 2026, Samsung led at about 19 percent and Apple at roughly 18 percent, with Xiaomi third near 12 percent. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented annual and quarterly market-share data, with values interpolated between well-documented anchor points; recent quarters use reported figures. IDC, Counterpoint and Omdia report slightly different shares, so figures are indicative of scale and trend rather than exact.

STATISTICS REPORT

Revenue of the smartphones industry worldwide 2018-2030

Updated Jun 14, 2026 · businesstats.com/worldwide-smartphone-market-revenue

$584B 2030 REVENUE (RECORD)	**$490B** 2018 REVENUE	**$409B** 2020 PANDEMIC LOW
$6.4T TOTAL 2018-2030	**18.7%** APPLE SHARE 2024	**$118B** CHINA MARKET 2026

Overview

Revenue of the smartphones industry worldwide from 2018 to 2030

The smartphone has become the defining product of the modern technology era, and the money the world spends on it each year is staggering. According to Statista Market Insights, global revenue in the smartphones market is estimated to climb from around $490 billion in 2018 to roughly $584 billion by 2030, making it comfortably the single largest category of consumer electronics spending. Yet the path between those two points has been turbulent, marked by a sharp pandemic era crash, a slow recovery, and a renewed growth phase driven by premium devices, 5G and the early adoption of artificial intelligence features. The smartphone is the largest slice of the broader hardware market analysed in our total device spending worldwide forecast.

Behind the headline revenue figures lies a market that has matured dramatically. In the early 2010s, smartphone revenue grew explosively as the technology spread across the world, but by 2018 that growth had largely stalled as the major markets approached saturation. Revenue then fell sharply in 2020 as the pandemic disrupted supply chains and consumer spending, before recovering and settling into a phase of slow, steady growth. The market is now driven less by selling phones to new users and more by persuading existing owners to upgrade to more expensive devices. The fierce battle for those buyers is detailed in our smartphone market share by vendor analysis.

A word on the figures is important. The revenue numbers here are Statista Market Insights estimates of worldwide consumer spending on smartphones, a modeled dataset rather than a tally of audited company

accounts. The most recent and forecast years are based on Statista's published estimates, and the series as a whole is a model of the market, so the figures are best read as a guide to the scale and direction of the market rather than precise totals. Even so, the overall story they tell, of a huge, maturing market returning to gradual growth, is clear and consistent with shipment data and company results. How this revenue compares with the technology giants overall is set out in our big tech companies revenue comparison analysis.

The smartphone journey from luxury novelty to global necessity is one of the great commercial stories of the century. In barely a decade it went from a product owned by a wealthy minority to one carried by the majority of humanity, reshaping industries from retail and banking to media and transport along the way. That explosive adoption phase is now largely complete in the developed world and well advanced in emerging markets, which is why revenue growth has cooled even as the device itself has become more central to daily life than ever. The market today is defined not by reaching new users but by deepening the relationship with the billions who already depend on their phones.

Smartphone industry revenue worldwide 2018 2030 barWorldwide Smartphone Revenue, 2018-2030 ($B)Smartphone industry revenue worldwide 2018 2030 bar $584B2030 record

Note: Statista Market Insights estimates; 2020 was the pandemic low, 2030 is a forecast. Full Data Table

Worldwide Smartphone Revenue by Year

Worldwide Smartphone Revenue, 2018-2030 (USD billion)Click any column to sort

YEAR	REVENUE	YOY GROWTH
2018	$490 B	-
2019	$471 B	-3.9%
2020	$409 B	-13.2%
2021	$448 B	+9.5%
2022	$465 B	+3.8%
2023	$458 B	-1.5%
2024	$468 B	+2.2%
2025	$485 B	+3.6%

2026	$503 B	+3.7%
2027	$522 B	+3.8%
2028	$543 B	+4.0%
2029	$563 B	+3.7%
2030*	$584 B	+3.7%

The table sets out estimated worldwide smartphone revenue for every year from 2018 to 2030, alongside the annual rate of change. The early rows show the market drifting sideways and then dropping sharply in 2020, the pandemic year. The middle rows trace a hesitant recovery, with revenue not clearly surpassing its pre pandemic level until the middle of the decade. The later rows, shown as forecasts, describe a steadier climb to record territory by 2030. Sorting the growth column reveals the defining feature of this market: a dramatic double digit collapse in 2020 followed by years of low single digit growth, a profile typical of a large, mature consumer market that has moved past its explosive expansion phase.

COVID Crash & Recovery

The COVID Crash and the Slow Recovery

Expressed as annual growth rates, the smartphone market's pandemic shock stands out starkly. Revenue fell more than 13 percent in 2020 as lockdowns shuttered stores, disrupted manufacturing and made consumers cautious about big ticket purchases. That was the steepest single year decline in the market's modern history. The following year saw a strong rebound of nearly 10 percent as pent up demand was released and supply chains recovered, but the bounce was short lived. From 2022 onwards, growth has settled into a narrow band of low single digits, reflecting a market that is large, mature and growing only modestly as it relies on upgrades rather than first time buyers.

The pattern of growth rates reveals the fundamental challenge facing the smartphone industry. With the vast majority of the world's connected population already owning a smartphone, the market can no longer count on a steady stream of new users to drive revenue. Instead, growth now depends almost entirely on convincing existing owners to upgrade, ideally to pricier premium models. This is why average selling prices have become so important, and why manufacturers are racing to add compelling new features, from advanced cameras and foldable screens to artificial intelligence, that might justify a higher price and a faster upgrade cycle. The role of AI in reviving demand is examined in our artificial intelligence worldwide statistics overview.

Smartphone revenue year over year growth rate percent barSmartphone Revenue Growth Rate (%)Smartphone revenue year over year growth rate percent bar -13.2%2020 crash

Note: annual percentage change; red bars are years of decline. $6 Trillion Market

More Than $6 Trillion in Smartphone Sales

Adding up every year's revenue reveals the colossal scale of the smartphone economy. Across the thirteen years from 2018 to 2030, the world is estimated to spend more than $6.4 trillion on smartphones, a sum that dwarfs the economies of most countries. The cumulative line climbs steadily even through the difficult years, because even in the depths of the 2020 downturn the world still spent more than $400 billion on smartphones in a single year. This enormous and resilient spending base is why the smartphone market remains one of the most fiercely contested arenas in all of technology, with billions in revenue at stake for the handful of companies that dominate it.

The cumulative total also underscores how concentrated the rewards of this market have become. A small group of manufacturers, led by Apple and Samsung, capture a disproportionate share of the more than $6 trillion spent over the period, particularly at the profitable premium end. Apple in particular has built an enormous business on a relatively small share of global smartphone units by focusing almost entirely on high priced devices, a strategy detailed in our Apple total net sales analysis. For the companies competing in this market, even a small shift in share or average price translates into billions of dollars, which is why the smartphone wars remain so intense even as overall growth has slowed.

Cumulative smartphone revenue 2018 2030 trillion lineCumulative Smartphone Revenue Since 2018 ($B)Cumulative smartphone revenue 2018 2030 trillion line $6.4Tby 2030

Note: running total of annual revenue; 2030 projected. Revenue by Era

Smartphone Revenue by Era

Grouping the years into eras smooths out the volatility and shows the underlying shape of the market. In the 2018 to 2021 era, which includes the pandemic crash, revenue averaged around $455 billion a year. The 2022 to 2026 era lifted the average modestly to roughly $476 billion as the market recovered and stabilised. The forecast 2027 to 2030 era pushes the average up to about $553 billion, reflecting the steady growth expected in the second half of the decade. Each era is larger than the last, but the gains are gradual rather than dramatic, underlining how the smartphone market has shifted from explosive growth to slow, incremental expansion driven by rising prices.

The era based view highlights an important truth about the modern smartphone market: it is enormous and still growing, but its growth is now measured rather than spectacular. The days of double digit annual expansion are gone, replaced by a grind of low single digit gains powered by premiumisation rather than rising unit volumes. For investors and manufacturers, this means the smartphone is no longer a growth story in the traditional sense but a mature, cash generating market where success depends on capturing share and margin rather than riding a rising tide. The broader economic forces shaping this consumer spending are explored in our global economy overview.

Smartphone revenue average by era horizontal barAverage Annual Revenue by Era ($B)Smartphone revenue average by era horizontal bar $553B2027-30$455B2018-21

Who Leads the Market

Who Leads the Smartphone Market

The smartphone market is dominated by a handful of global brands, and the competition at the top is relentless. In 2024, Apple led the market with about 18.7 percent of global shipments, narrowly ahead of Samsung at roughly 18 percent, with the two giants regularly swapping the top spot from quarter to quarter. China's Xiaomi held third place at around 14 percent, continuing its steady rise, followed by other Chinese brands and Transsion, which has built a strong position in emerging markets such as Africa. The remaining third of the market is split among numerous smaller players, a long tail of regional and budget brands fighting for the scraps left by the leaders.

Market share by units, however, tells only part of the story, because the brands differ enormously in the prices they command. Apple, despite holding a unit share similar to Samsung's, captures a far larger share of the industry's total revenue and the overwhelming majority of its profits, because it sells almost exclusively premium devices at high prices. Android vendors, by contrast, compete across a much wider range of price points, including huge volumes of low cost phones in emerging markets that generate little revenue per unit. This split between high volume, low margin Android brands and Apple's high margin premium model is the central dynamic of the smartphone business and shapes how the revenue pie is divided, a pattern visible across the wider sector in our largest source of revenue of leading tech companies analysis.

The competitive landscape has also shifted geographically. Where the early smartphone market was dominated by American, Korean and Japanese brands, Chinese manufacturers now account for a large and growing share of global shipments, led by Xiaomi and supported by Oppo, Vivo and Transsion. These

brands have been particularly successful in price sensitive emerging markets across Asia, Africa and Latin America, where they offer capable devices at aggressive prices. This geographic rebalancing has intensified competition and put downward pressure on average prices in the value segment, even as the premium tier, dominated by Apple and Samsung, continues to command ever higher prices.

Smartphone vendor market share 2024 Apple Samsung Xiaomi donutSmartphone Market Share by Vendor, 2024Smartphone vendor market share 2024 Apple Samsung Xiaomi donut 18.7%Apple

Revenue Up, Shipments Flat

Revenue Up, Shipments Flat: The Premiumisation Story

One of the most revealing aspects of the modern smartphone market is the gap between revenue and unit shipments. While revenue has trended upward over the period, the number of phones shipped has actually been broadly flat or declining, peaking at over 1.4 billion units in 2018 before falling to around 1.2 billion in recent years. The market sold fewer phones in 2023 than in 2018, yet generated comparable or higher revenue. This divergence is the clearest possible evidence of premiumisation: consumers are buying fewer phones but spending more on each one, as average selling prices climb thanks to premium features and longer ownership cycles.

The flattening of unit shipments reflects the maturity of the smartphone market and the lengthening of replacement cycles. Where consumers once upgraded their phones every two years, many now hold onto them for three, four or even five years, as improvements between generations have become more incremental and devices have grown more durable and expensive. This is a double edged sword for manufacturers: it pressures unit sales but pushes them to extract more value from each sale through higher prices and add on services. The hope across the industry is that artificial intelligence features could shorten upgrade cycles again, sparking a new wave of unit growth to accompany the steady rise in revenue.

The shift toward longer ownership has profound implications for the industry business model. As hardware sales growth slows, manufacturers have increasingly turned to services, accessories and trade in programmes to extract additional revenue from each customer over the life of a device. Apple has been the clearest example, building a vast services business around its installed base of iPhones, but rivals are following suit. This evolution means that the headline revenue figures for hardware sales, large as they are, increasingly understate the total economic value the smartphone generates for the companies that make and sell them across the full lifetime of each device.

Smartphone shipments units by year 2018 2025 lineSmartphone Shipments (Million Units)Smartphone shipments units by year 2018 2025 line 1.43B20181.24B2024

The Road to 2030

The Road to 2030

Looking ahead, Statista forecasts the smartphone market to grow steadily through the rest of the decade, rising from around $468 billion in 2024 to roughly $584 billion by 2030, an increase of nearly a quarter. The compound annual growth rate over this period is projected at a modest but positive figure of under 4 percent, reflecting the market's maturity. This forecast assumes that premiumisation continues, that 5G adoption keeps lifting average prices, and that artificial intelligence features help sustain demand. China remains the single largest national market, generating an estimated $118 billion in 2026, underlining the importance of the Chinese consumer to the industry's fortunes, as explored in our China economy analysis.

The forecast growth, while modest, would still represent record breaking revenue for the smartphone industry, surpassing every previous peak. It rests on several assumptions that could yet be challenged, including stable global economic conditions, continued consumer appetite for premium devices, and the successful integration of new technologies that justify higher prices. Trade tensions, tariffs and economic uncertainty all pose risks to the outlook, as does the possibility that AI features fail to excite consumers enough to accelerate upgrades. Even so, the central expectation is for a large, resilient market to keep growing slowly, cementing the smartphone's status as the most valuable consumer electronics category in the world.

The forecast also depends heavily on the trajectory of the Chinese market, both as a place to sell phones and as the home of many of the leading manufacturers. China is simultaneously the largest national market and the base for several of the fastest growing brands, giving it outsized influence over global revenue. Any slowdown in Chinese consumer spending, or any escalation of trade tensions affecting Chinese manufacturers, would ripple through the entire industry. At the same time, India has emerged as a crucial growth market, with rising incomes and smartphone adoption offering one of the few remaining sources of significant new unit demand for the years ahead.

Smartphone revenue forecast 2024 2030 barForecast Smartphone Revenue, 2024-2030 ($B)Smartphone revenue forecast 2024 2030 bar $584B2030$468B2024

Milestones

Smartphone Revenue Milestones

A few milestone years capture the smartphone market's modern journey. In 2018, revenue stood at around $490 billion, near its pre pandemic peak, as the market matured. The pandemic then drove a crash to roughly $409 billion in 2020, the low point of the period. Revenue clawed its way back, not clearly exceeding the 2018 level until the middle of the decade, and is forecast to reach a record of about $584 billion by 2030. These milestones trace a market that suffered a severe shock, took years to recover, and is now pushing into record territory on the back of higher prices rather than higher volumes.

What is striking about these milestones is how long the recovery took. Unlike some markets that bounced back quickly from the pandemic, smartphone revenue needed several years to surpass its pre crisis level, held back by economic uncertainty, supply constraints and the fundamental maturity of the market. This slow recovery is a reminder that the smartphone is no longer a young, fast growing product but a established staple whose sales rise and fall with the broader economy and the pace of innovation. The market's resilience in eventually reaching new highs, however, speaks to the central and enduring role the smartphone plays in modern life.

Smartphone revenue milestone years 2018 2020 2030 horizontal barSmartphone Revenue at Milestone Years ($B)Smartphone revenue milestone years 2018 2020 2030 horizontal bar $584B2030

Note: selected years tracing the market's crash and recovery. Growth by Era

Average Growth Rate by Era

Averaging the annual growth rates within each era makes the market's changing pace explicit. The 2019 to 2021 period, dominated by the pandemic crash and rebound, averaged slightly negative growth overall. The 2022 to 2026 era settled into modest positive growth of around 2 percent a year as the market stabilised. The forecast 2027 to 2030 era is expected to accelerate slightly to nearly 4 percent annual growth, as premiumisation and new technologies gain traction. The overall trajectory is one of a market that has moved past its turbulent pandemic phase into a period of slow but steady and positive expansion.

This gentle acceleration in the forecast period reflects cautious optimism about the second half of the decade. After years of flat or falling unit sales and a painful pandemic shock, the industry is betting that a combination of artificial intelligence, foldable designs and continued premiumisation can reignite growth, even if only modestly. The smartphone market is unlikely ever to return to the explosive growth of its early years, but a steady climb of a few percent a year on a base of nearly $500 billion still represents enormous and growing value. The relationship between this hardware revenue and the services built on top of it is

examined in our internet companies revenue analysis.

Smartphone revenue average growth by era barAverage Annual Growth by Era (%)Smartphone revenue average growth by era bar +3.8%2027-30

Note: average of annual growth rates within each era. Share of Device Market

Smartphones in the Wider Device Market

Set against the wider device market, the smartphone's dominance becomes clear. Of the roughly $856 billion the world is forecast to spend on all devices, including PCs, tablets, mobile phones and printers, in 2026, smartphones alone account for around $500 billion, well over half the total. No other device category comes close. This makes the smartphone not just the most important consumer electronics product but the single largest driver of global device spending, the foundation on which the entire personal technology market rests. The full device spending picture, in which the smartphone dwarfs PCs, tablets and printers combined, shows just how dominant it has become, a dominance closely tied to the digital commerce tracked in our retail e-commerce sales growth worldwide analysis.

The smartphone's outsized share of device spending also explains why its health matters so much to the broader technology economy. When smartphone revenue stumbles, as it did in 2020, the entire device market feels the impact, and the fortunes of chip makers, component suppliers and retailers swing with it. Conversely, the steady growth forecast for smartphones underpins much of the expected growth in overall device spending. As the gateway through which billions of people access the internet, apps and services, the smartphone sits at the centre of the digital economy, and its revenue trajectory is among the most closely watched indicators in all of technology. Note that this comparison draws on two different research sources and is therefore indicative rather than exact.

Smartphone share of total device spending 2026 donutSmartphones Share of Device Spending, 2026Smartphone share of total device spending 2026 donut 59%Smartphones$856BAll devices

$584B2030 RevenueRecord forecast. $409B2020 LowPandemic crash. 18.7%Apple ShareMarket leader 2024. $6.4TTotal 2018-2030Cumulative.

Taken together, the figures describe a smartphone market that is vast, mature and slowly growing. From around $490 billion in 2018, revenue crashed to $409 billion in the pandemic year of 2020, recovered gradually, and is forecast to reach a record of roughly $584 billion by 2030. The market now grows in low single digits, driven by premium pricing rather than rising unit sales, as a small group of brands led by

Apple and Samsung compete fiercely for share and margin. With more than $6 trillion forecast to be spent over the period and the smartphone accounting for well over half of all device spending, this remains the most valuable consumer electronics market in the world.

For all the talk of saturation and slowing growth, the sheer scale of the market means that even modest percentage gains translate into tens of billions of dollars, and the smartphone shows no sign of surrendering its place at the heart of the global technology economy. Whatever the precise figures turn out to be, the direction is unmistakable: a maturing market, still expanding, still indispensable, and still the largest prize in consumer technology. For consumers, investors and the technology industry alike, the smartphone market will remain one of the most important arenas to watch in the years ahead, a barometer of innovation, affordability and the shifting balance of power between the handful of brands that compete to define it for years to come. The key questions ahead are whether artificial intelligence can reignite faster growth, how trade tensions and economic uncertainty affect demand, and whether any challenger can disrupt the dominance of the established leaders. The market value of those leaders is examined in our biggest companies by market value overview.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: Smartphone Industry Revenue

The worldwide smartphone market is estimated to generate around $503 billion in revenue in 2026, according to Statista Market Insights, making it the largest single category of consumer electronics. Revenue is forecast to grow to roughly $584 billion by 2030. These figures are modeled estimates of consumer spending on smartphones.

Global smartphone revenue fell to about $409 billion in 2020, a decline of more than 13 percent from the previous year, as the COVID-19 pandemic disrupted manufacturing, closed stores and made consumers cautious about big purchases. It was the steepest annual drop in the market's modern history, followed by a rebound in 2021.

Yes, but slowly. After the pandemic crash and recovery, smartphone revenue has settled into low single digit annual growth, forecast at under 4 percent a year through 2030. Growth now comes from rising prices and premium devices rather than from selling more phones, since most of the world already owns a smartphone.

In 2024, Apple led the global smartphone market with about 18.7 percent of unit shipments, narrowly ahead of Samsung at around 18 percent. Xiaomi was third at roughly 14 percent. Apple and Samsung

regularly swap the top position, while Apple captures a far larger share of industry revenue and profit due to its premium pricing.

Smartphone revenue has risen even as unit shipments have flattened or declined because of premiumisation: consumers are buying fewer phones but spending more on each one. Average selling prices have climbed thanks to premium features, 5G and longer ownership cycles, so the market generates more money from fewer devices.

China is the largest single national smartphone market, generating an estimated $118 billion in revenue in 2026, according to Statista. The United States is typically the second most valuable market. China's size makes it crucial to the industry, and shifts in Chinese demand can significantly affect global smartphone revenue.

Worldwide smartphone revenue is forecast to reach about $584 billion by 2030, a record, up from roughly $468 billion in 2024. This represents growth of nearly a quarter over the period, at a compound annual rate of under 4 percent, reflecting the market's maturity. The 2030 figure is a Statista forecast.

Smartphones account for well over half of all global device spending. Of the roughly $856 billion forecast to be spent on all devices (PCs, tablets, mobile phones and printers) in 2026, smartphones alone make up around $500 billion. This makes the smartphone the single largest category of device spending by a wide margin. Note that this draws on two different sources.

The industry hopes so. Manufacturers are adding artificial intelligence features to premium phones in an effort to persuade consumers to upgrade more often, which could shorten replacement cycles and lift both unit sales and revenue. Whether AI features prove compelling enough to accelerate growth meaningfully remains uncertain, but it is central to the industry's growth strategy.

The revenue figures are Statista Market Insights estimates of worldwide consumer spending on smartphones, a modeled dataset rather than audited accounts. Recent and forecast years use Statista's published estimates. Shipment and market share figures come from IDC and industry sources. All figures are estimates and forecasts and should be read as indicative of the market's scale and direction.

Sources

Statista Market Insights - Smartphones Worldwide - Primary source for the worldwide smartphone revenue estimates and forecast.

Statista Market Insights, Consumer Electronics (2018-2030) - Modeled estimates of worldwide smartphone market revenue and volume.

IDC and industry reports - Used for smartphone shipment figures and vendor market share.

Revenue figures are Statista Market Insights estimates of worldwide consumer spending on smartphones, a modeled dataset. Recent and forecast years use Statista's published estimates; 2030 is a forecast. Shipment and vendor share data are from IDC and industry sources. The device market comparison uses Gartner and is indicative. Not investment advice.

STATISTICS REPORT

Smartphone Market Share by Vendor — Statistics & Facts (Q4 2009 to Q4 2026)

Updated May 30, 2026 · businesstats.com/smartphone-market-share-by-vendor

1.26B UNITS SHIPPED 2025	**19.7%** APPLE SHARE 2025	**19.1%** SAMSUNG SHARE 2025
$579B MARKET VALUE 2026E	**3rd** CONSECUTIVE APPLE #1	**-0.9%** 2026 UNIT FORECAST

Executive Summary

Sixteen Years of Disruption — The Complete Story of Smartphone Market Share by Vendor

No industry in modern history has experienced more dramatic and sustained disruption to competitive market share than smartphones. In Q4 2009, Nokia commanded nearly **40% of the global smartphone market**, with Research In Motion (BlackBerry) holding a further 20%, and Apple's iPhone — just two years old — occupying a distant but fast-growing third place. By Q4 2025, those two early giants had been entirely erased from the competitive landscape, replaced by a new global oligopoly dominated by Apple, Samsung, and a constellation of powerful Chinese manufacturers that together account for the vast majority of the 1.26 billion smartphones shipped in 2025.

The story of smartphone vendor market share from 2009 to 2026 is fundamentally a story of platform disruption, ecosystem lock-in, manufacturing scale, and the relentless democratisation of mobile computing. According to IDC's Worldwide Quarterly Mobile Phone Tracker, the global smartphone market shipped **1.26 billion units in full-year 2025** — representing 1.9% growth over 2024 and more than seven times the 175 million units shipped in 2009. Apple finished 2025 as the world's largest smartphone vendor for the third consecutive year, shipping a record **247.8 million units** — meaning roughly one in every five smartphones shipped globally was an iPhone. Samsung, with 241.2 million units, finished marginally behind — a contest so close that the entire industry year hinged on the success of Apple's iPhone 17 super-cycle.

Looking ahead, IDC projects a modest 0.9% decline in smartphone unit shipments for 2026, driven primarily by global memory component shortages that will squeeze margins at the entry-level and force average selling prices to a record high of $465 — pushing total market value to an unprecedented $578.9 billion. This report documents the complete vendor market share data across all key eras, from the Symbian age through the Android revolution, the Chinese vendor surge, and the present-day duopoly era.

Key Statistics at a Glance — Global Smartphone Market Share 2009–2026

METRIC	VALUE / FIGURE
Global Smartphone Shipments 2009	~175 Million Units
Nokia Market Share Q4 2009	~40% (Symbian Era Peak)
BlackBerry / RIM Market Share Q4 2009	~20%
Apple iPhone Market Share Q4 2009	~16%
Android Market Share Q4 2010	Surpassed Symbian for first time
Samsung — Year #1 as Global Leader	2012 (Overtook Nokia)
Huawei Peak Market Share	~16% (2019–2020)
Global Smartphone Shipments 2024	1.24 Billion Units (+6.4% YoY)
Global Smartphone Shipments 2025	1.26 Billion Units (+1.9% YoY)
Apple Full-Year Shipments 2025	247.8 Million Units (Record)
Apple 2025 Annual Market Share	19.7% — #1 for 3rd Year Running
Samsung Full-Year Shipments 2025	241.2 Million Units
Samsung 2025 Annual Market Share	19.1% (+7.9% YoY)
Xiaomi 2025 Annual Market Share	~13% (165.3M units)
Vivo & OPPO 2025 Annual Market Share	~8% each
Apple Q4 2025 Market Share	24.2% (Record Holiday Quarter)
Apple + Samsung Combined 2025 Share	~39% — Majority of Industry Profits
Global Market Value 2025	~$537.6 Billion
Projected Market Value 2026	$578.9 Billion (Record, Despite Unit Decline)

Projected Average Selling Price 2026	$465 — All-Time Record

Era I — 2009 to 2011

The Symbian Age: Nokia's Collapsing Empire and the Android Uprising

When Statista and Gartner first began comprehensive tracking of smartphone vendor market share in Q4 2009, the competitive landscape looked almost unrecognisable compared to today. Symbian OS, Nokia's proprietary platform, accounted for nearly half of the global smartphone operating systems market in 2009, while Research In Motion — the maker of BlackBerry — held approximately 20%. Apple's iOS sat in third place with roughly 16% share, and Android — launched commercially in 2007 — was a fledgling platform accounting for just 2–3% of the market at the start of 2009. The global market in that year was modest by today's standards: approximately 175 million smartphones shipped worldwide, in an era when the device category was still far from mass-market.

The transformation that followed was breathtaking in its speed. According to combined Gartner/IDC/Canalys/Strategy Analytics data compiled for 2010, global smartphone sales jumped 70% from 175 million in 2009 to 298 million units in 2010 — a single-year leap that dwarfed any previous technology adoption curve. The beneficiaries of this explosion were the Android hardware vendors: Samsung, HTC, Motorola, and LG all grew aggressively on the back of Google's open-source platform. Nokia's Symbian, by contrast, was already showing structural weakness. Gartner noted that RIM's market share declined from 19.5% in Q4 2009 to 13.7% by Q4 2010, while Nokia was propping up its market position through aggressively priced low-end Symbian devices — a strategy that proved unsustainable. Symbian effectively vacated the market by 2014 following Nokia's partnership with Microsoft in 2011, ceding its position in one of the fastest platform transitions in technology history.

175MUnits Shipped 2009 ~40%Nokia Share Q4 2009 ~20%BlackBerry Q4 2009 298MUnits Shipped 2010 +70%YoY Growth 2010 2011Android Becomes #1 OS The smartphone industry has grown from 175 million units in 2009 to 1.26 billion in 2025. In 16 years, the market transitioned from Nokia/Symbian dominance to an Apple-Samsung duopoly, with Chinese vendors claiming an ever-larger share of global shipments. The Platform Tipping Point — Q4 2010

Android Overtakes Symbian — The Moment Everything Changed

In Q4 2010, Android OS unit sales surpassed Symbian for the first time on a quarterly basis — a milestone that, in retrospect, marked the definitive end of the pre-smartphone era. Google's strategy of partnering

with multiple hardware manufacturers simultaneously — Samsung, HTC, Sony Ericsson, LG, Motorola — gave Android an insurmountable distribution advantage that no single-vendor OS could replicate. By 2011, Android had become the global number-one smartphone platform, a position it has never relinquished. The combined market share of Android and iOS has stood at 99.9% or above every year since 2014, with all other platforms reduced to statistical irrelevance.

Era II — 2012 to 2016

Samsung's Decade: Galaxy Dominance, Apple's Premium Moat, and the Chinese Emergence

The period from 2012 to 2016 was defined by Samsung's extraordinary ascent to global market leadership and its bruising rivalry with Apple over the premium segment. Samsung overtook Nokia as the global mobile phone market leader in 2012, cementing a position it would hold for over a decade. The Korean giant's Galaxy S and Note series established Android's viability in the premium tier, while the Galaxy A and J series captured extraordinary volumes across emerging markets in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. At its peak in 2013–2014, Samsung commanded approximately 30–32% of global smartphone shipments — a market share figure that dwarfed every competitor and has never been surpassed by any single vendor since.

Apple's response was strategic rather than volumetric. While Samsung competed on breadth, Apple doubled down on premium positioning, pricing power, and ecosystem lock-in. The iPhone 6 and iPhone 6 Plus, launched in September 2014, generated the most successful iPhone cycle in Apple's history at that time — finally giving Apple large-screen devices to compete with Samsung's Galaxy phablets. Apple's share of global smartphone revenue was consistently above 90% of industry profits even while its unit share hovered between 14–17%, demonstrating that market share in units and market share in value are radically different metrics in the smartphone industry. This era also marked the beginning of the Chinese vendor surge: Huawei's global market share grew from approximately 3% in 2011 to 10% by 2016, while Xiaomi — founded in 2010 — rocketed from nowhere to become the world's fifth-largest smartphone vendor by 2014, pioneering the flash-sale, hypervalue model that would define Chinese smartphone commerce.

Quarterly Market Share — Key Historical Milestones by Vendor

Smartphone Market Share by Vendor — Historical Milestones Q4 2009 to Q4 2024

PERIOD	VENDOR / EVENT	MARKET SHARE / MILESTONE

Q4 2009	Nokia (Symbian)	~40% — Last dominant quarter
Q4 2009	RIM / BlackBerry	~20% — Peak enterprise dominance
Q4 2009	Apple (iOS)	~16% — Fast-growing third place
Q4 2010	Android vendors (Samsung/HTC)	Android overtakes Symbian Q4 quarterly
2011	Google Android	Becomes #1 global smartphone OS — a position held to this day
2012	Samsung	Overtakes Nokia as global #1 vendor — Samsung era begins
2013–2014	Samsung	~30–32% global share — all-time peak for any single vendor post-2009
Q4 2014	Apple (iPhone 6/6 Plus)	Biggest iPhone launch in history at the time; Apple captures #1 spot Q4
2016	Samsung Galaxy Note 7	Battery crisis causes global recall — first major market share disruption from product failure
2016–2018	Huawei	Grows from 10% to ~15% — becomes credible global #3
2018–2019	Huawei	Overtakes Apple in unit shipments in 2019 for first time; reaches 16% share
2020	Huawei	US trade ban — Huawei loses Google Play access; rapid decline begins
Q4 2020	Apple (iPhone 12 5G)	First 5G iPhone drives Apple to #1 globally for single quarter with ~23% share
2021	Xiaomi	Briefly overtakes Apple to become #2 globally in Q2 2021
2022–2023	Samsung	Holds #1 for full year with ~20–22% share; Apple closes gap steadily
Full Year 2023	Apple	First time Apple tops full-year global shipments — overtakes Samsung
Full Year 2024	Apple	Second consecutive year as #1; global market grows 6.4% to 1.24 billion units
Full Year 2025	Apple	Third year as #1 with record 247.8M shipments and 19.7% market share

Era III — 2017 to 2022

The Chinese Surge, Huawei's Rise and Fall, and the 5G Transition

The period from 2017 to 2022 brought three seismic forces to the smartphone vendor landscape: the extraordinary rise of Chinese manufacturers beyond Samsung and Huawei, the weaponisation of trade policy as a market share instrument, and the 5G transition that created the most powerful smartphone upgrade supercycle of the modern era. By 2019, Huawei had grown its global market share to approximately 16% — temporarily overtaking Apple in unit shipments — driven by a powerful combination of competitive hardware, aggressive pricing, a strong domestic China base, and expanding presence across Europe, the Middle East, and Africa. Huawei's Kirin processor ambitions and HarmonyOS development signalled a vendor intent on platform-level independence from both Android and iOS — a development that alarmed both Google and the US government.

The US Entity List designation in May 2019 — which restricted American companies from supplying technology to Huawei — effectively dismantled Huawei's international smartphone business within 18 months. Loss of Google Mobile Services access made Huawei devices commercially unviable in Europe and most emerging markets. Huawei's global smartphone market share collapsed from approximately 16% in 2020 to below 4% in international markets by 2022, representing one of the most rapid competitive collapses in consumer electronics history. The primary beneficiaries of Huawei's share loss were Xiaomi — which briefly overtook Apple to become the world's second-largest smartphone vendor in Q2 2021 — along with OPPO, vivo, and Realme, all of which expanded aggressively across Southeast Asia, India, the Middle East, and Europe.

The iPhone 12's launch in Q4 2020 — Apple's first 5G device family — triggered the most powerful Apple upgrade cycle since the iPhone 6, driving Apple to its first-ever quarterly #1 global position with approximately 23% market share in Q4 2020. The 5G transition proved to be a disproportionate Apple tailwind because the iPhone's premium pricing positioned it in the segment where early 5G adoption was concentrated, while Android vendors competed fiercely — and largely unprofitably — to deliver 5G to mid-range and budget price tiers.

Apple14–17% share 2015–2022 → #1 in 2023Maintained premium pricing discipline throughout. iPhone 12 5G cycle (Q4 2020) delivered first-ever quarterly global #1. Ecosystem lock-in through iCloud, App Store, AirPods, and Apple Watch created the highest customer retention rate in the industry — consistently above 90%. Samsung~20–32% share 2012–2022Longest reign as global #1 vendor, from 2012 to 2022. Galaxy S and Note flagships established Android premium credibility. Galaxy A series delivered extraordinary mid-market volumes. Foldable Galaxy Z series commands 64% of the global foldable market as of Q3 2025.

Huawei3% (2011) → 16% (2019) → <4% (2022)The most dramatic rise-and-fall in smartphone history. US Entity List designation in 2019 destroyed international Google Mobile Services access. Now dominant only in domestic China — reclaimed #1 in China in 2025 with 16.4% domestic share ahead of Apple's 16.2%. Xiaomi~13% share 2025 (#3 globally)Founded 2010, reached global #5 by 2014. Primary beneficiary of Huawei's collapse. Briefly global #2 in Q2 2021. Strong in India (consistent #2 or #3), Europe, and Latin America. Redmi Note and POCO sub-brands drive volume while Xiaomi 14/15 Ultra targets premium. OPPO / OnePlus~8% share 2025 (#5 globally)Dominant in China, Southeast Asia, and India. OnePlus brand targets premium users globally. Find X series competes directly with Samsung Galaxy S at ultra-premium price points. Aggressive AI camera features differentiate the brand in a crowded mid-range market. Transsion~9% global share Q3 2025 — fastest growingUnknown to most Western consumers but the dominant force in sub-Saharan Africa. Brands include Tecno, Infinix, and itel. Africa shipments surged 25% YoY in Q3 2025. Now consistently #4 globally on quarterly basis, having displaced vivo and OPPO in the overall volume rankings.

Current Era — 2024 & 2025

Apple's Three-Year Reign: Record Shipments, iPhone 17 Super-Cycle, and the AI Smartphone Revolution

The 2024–2025 period cemented a new competitive equilibrium in the global smartphone industry. Apple became the clear winner of the full-year 2025 rankings with record shipments of 247.8 million units and a 19.7% global market share — marking the third consecutive year that Apple topped the annual global vendor rankings for the first time since the company began competing in the smartphone market in 2007. This achievement is particularly remarkable given that Apple competes exclusively in the premium and ultra-premium price tiers, while its three-year dominance was achieved against vendors — primarily Samsung — that compete across every price segment from sub-$100 to over $1,500.

The iPhone 17 series, launched in September 2025, proved to be Apple's most commercially successful product cycle since the iPhone 6. According to Omdia's January 2026 research, the global smartphone market grew 4% in Q4 2025, with Apple leading at 25% market share for that quarter. Crucially, Apple's iPhone 17 success was genuinely global — not just dependent on traditional Western markets. In China — historically a challenging market for Apple — iPhone 17 demand was so strong that Apple ranked first in China in both October and November 2025 with over 20% domestic share, driving IDC to revise Apple's China forecast from a projected 1% decline to a positive 3% growth — a phenomenal turnaround in what is the world's most competitive smartphone market.

247.8MApple 2025 Units 241.2MSamsung 2025 Units 165.3MXiaomi 2025 Units 24.2%Apple Q4 2025 Share +7.9%Samsung YoY 2025 1.26BTotal Units 2025

Apple is set to have a record year in 2025 with shipments forecast to cross 247 million units, thanks to the phenomenal success of its latest iPhone 17 series. In China, massive demand has significantly accelerated Apple's performance — turning a previously projected 1% decline into positive growth. This calendar year will not only be a record period for Apple in terms of shipments but also in value, with revenue forecast to exceed $261 billion.

— Nabila Popal, Senior Research Director, IDC Worldwide Quarterly Mobile Phone Tracker, December 2025

Q4 2025 Market Share — Latest Available Quarterly Data

Global Smartphone Vendor Market Share — Q4 2025 & Full Year 2025 (IDC / Omdia Data)

RANK	VENDOR	Q4 2025 SHIPMENTS	Q4 2025 SHARE	FULL YEAR 2025 UNITS	FULL YEAR SHARE
1	Apple	81.3M	24.2%	247.8M	19.7%
2	Samsung	~79M	~23.5%	241.2M	19.1%
3	Xiaomi	37.8M	11.2%	165.3M	~13.1%
4	vivo	27.0M	~8.0%	~100M+	~8%
5	OPPO	26.9M	~8.0%	~100M+	~8%
6	Transsion	~22M	~6.5%	~115M+	~9%
—	Others	~60M	~18%	~390M	~31%

The 2025 global smartphone market was defined by Apple's record iPhone 17 super-cycle, Samsung's strong Galaxy A series recovery, and the ongoing battle among Chinese vendors for the remaining 60% of global shipments. AI-powered features became the primary upgrade driver across all price tiers.

Quarterly Deep Dive

Q3 2025 in Detail — Samsung Leads Volume, Apple Leads Value, Transsion Surges in Africa

The third quarter of 2025 provided a revealing snapshot of the structural dynamics reshaping the global smartphone vendor landscape. IDC's Q3 2025 data showed global shipments of 325.7 million units — up

3.5% year-on-year, with Samsung retaining the volume leadership position it holds in non-holiday quarters, shipping 61.4 million units for an 18.8% share. Apple followed with 59.4 million units (18.2%), ahead of the iPhone 17 launch. Xiaomi held third place with 43.4 million units and 13.3% share, while Transsion posted the strongest growth of any top-five vendor, shipping 29.2 million units for a 9.0% share — reflecting a 13.4% year-on-year increase driven by its extraordinary expansion across sub-Saharan Africa, where shipments surged 25% year-on-year in the quarter.

Regional dynamics in Q3 2025 were sharply divergent. Asia-Pacific recorded a 5% year-on-year increase — its highest quarterly volume since Q4 2021 — while Africa surged 25% year-on-year. North America and Greater China were the notable weak spots: North American shipments contracted after early demand pull-ins related to tariff concerns concluded, while China saw its second consecutive quarterly decline as government consumer subsidy effects expired. This divergence underscores an important structural reality: the near-term growth of the global smartphone market is now substantially dependent on first-time buyer conversion in emerging markets rather than replacement cycles in saturated developed economies.

Global Smartphone Market Share — Q3 2025 (IDC Preliminary Data)

RANK	VENDOR	Q3 2025 SHIPMENTS (M)	Q3 2025 MARKET SHARE	Q3 2024 SHARE	YOY CHANGE
1	Samsung	61.4M	18.8%	18.3%	+6.3%
2	Apple	59.4M	18.2%	18.1%	+4.1%
3	Xiaomi	43.4M	13.3%	13.6%	+1.4%
4	Transsion	29.2M	9.0%	8.2%	+13.4%
5	vivo	28.8M	8.9%	8.9%	+3.5%

Market Trends 2025–2026

Six Forces Reshaping the Global Smartphone Vendor Landscape

AI Features as the Primary Upgrade Driver

On-device AI capabilities — from Apple Intelligence to Google's Gemini integration and Samsung's Galaxy AI — have become the dominant marketing proposition driving smartphone upgrades in 2025–2026. Vendors across every price tier are racing to deliver AI camera enhancements, real-time translation, and productivity assistants. The democratisation of AI features from flagship to mid-range has accelerated the upgrade cycle, particularly in markets where 3–4 year old devices feel increasingly inadequate.

Foldables — Premium Niche with Real Growth

Samsung's Galaxy Z Fold 7 sold 50% more units than the Z Fold 6 in the US in the same post-launch window, and more than double the Z Fold 6 units in its first four weeks in Western Europe — giving Samsung a 64% share of the global foldable market. Apple is expected to enter the foldable segment by 2026–2027, which would significantly expand the total addressable market for this premium category.

Emerging Markets — The Next Billion

Africa, South Asia, and Southeast Asia are the primary growth frontiers. Transsion's 13.4% Q3 2025 volume growth in Africa demonstrates the enormous untapped demand remaining in markets where smartphone penetration is still well below 60%. Indian shipments continue to grow at mid-single-digit rates, with Xiaomi, vivo, and Samsung competing intensely alongside Reliance Jio's domestic device initiative.

DRAM Shortage — The 2026 Supply Constraint

A tightening of DRAM and NAND supply — driven by prioritisation of AI data centre memory demand over consumer device allocations — will be the defining challenge for smartphone vendors in 2026. Entry-level Android vendors face the sharpest impact given memory costs represent a higher share of their bill-of-materials. Higher ASPs are inevitable across the board, which will constrain volume but expand revenue at the market level.

Premiumisation Across All Tiers

The consistent shift toward higher-priced devices noted by Counterpoint Research in 2025 — driven by trade-in programmes, carrier financing, and AI feature demand — is expanding average selling prices even before the memory shortage takes effect. The mid-range tier ($300–$600) is growing faster than both entry-level and ultra-premium segments as consumers in developing markets make their first smartphone upgrade to a quality device.

China — Huawei's Domestic Comeback

While Huawei remains effectively excluded from international markets, its domestic China performance has been extraordinary. Huawei reclaimed the #1 position in China in 2025 with 46.7 million units and 16.4% domestic share — narrowly ahead of Apple's 46.2 million units (16.2%). HarmonyOS's maturing app ecosystem and Kirin chip recovery have positioned Huawei as the premium alternative to iPhone in China's increasingly nationalistic consumer market.

2026 Forecast & Outlook

2026 Projections — Unit Decline, Record ASPs, and $579 Billion Market Value

IDC has revised its 2026 global smartphone forecast to a 0.9% unit shipment decline — a significant downward revision from an earlier projection of 1.2% growth — reflecting the combined impact of global memory component shortages and Apple's strategic decision to shift the base iPhone model launch from fall 2026 to early 2027. Despite the volume softness, average selling prices are projected to reach a record high of $465, driven by memory-related cost increases cascading through the bill-of-materials at every price tier. The net effect is a record total market value of $578.9 billion — demonstrating that premium pricing power more than compensates for modest volume declines in the smartphone industry's maturing phase.

Counterpoint Research director Tarun Pathak projects a general market contraction of approximately 3% in 2026, more bearish than IDC's estimate, citing the combination of DRAM/NAND shortages, Apple's product cycle shift, and post-stimulus demand normalisation in China. For market share dynamics, Apple's base iPhone delay is the single most consequential variable: it reduces Apple's volume in 2026 while creating substantial pent-up demand for a large-scale 2027 launch. Samsung is positioned to benefit from Apple's temporary volume gap in Q3 and Q4 2026, potentially reclaiming the full-year #1 position. Chinese vendors — particularly Xiaomi, vivo, and OPPO — will need to navigate the memory cost squeeze carefully to avoid losing ground to Transsion in the lower price tiers where the squeeze is most severe.

2026 Forecast Global Smartphone Market — Key 2026 Projections $578.9BMarket Value 2026 (Record) -0.9%Unit Shipment Change (IDC) $465Record Average Selling Price -4.2%Apple iOS Shipment Forecast ~1.24BProjected Units 2026 3.9%Market CAGR to 2030

Key 2026 Growth Drivers and Headwinds

Memory Component Shortage — Entry-Level SqueezeDRAM and NAND supply tightness, driven by AI data centre prioritisation, will raise component costs at all smartphone price points. Entry-level Android devices — where memory costs represent the highest share of the bill-of-materials — face the sharpest margin pressure, potentially shrinking the sub-$150 smartphone segment and forcing first-time buyers in emerging markets to delay upgrades or reduce storage specs. Apple's Base iPhone Cycle Delay to Early 2027Apple's strategic shift of its next base iPhone model launch from fall 2026 to early 2027 removes a historically significant volume event from the Q4 2026 calendar. IDC projects this decision alone accounts for a 4.2% decline in iOS shipments in 2026. However, the delay is expected to create extraordinary pent-up demand

that will make 2027 a super-cycle year for Apple — a pattern consistent with previous iPhone launch cycle extensions. Samsung is well-positioned to benefit from Apple's volume gap in 2026 given its Galaxy A series strength across every global price tier and the Galaxy Z Fold 7's strong early sales momentum. A potential return to the full-year #1 position in 2026 is within reach for Samsung if Apple's holiday quarter is significantly impacted by the base model delay.Samsung's Opportunity to Reclaim #1 AI Smartphone Demand — Upgrade Catalyst Remains StrongOn-device AI features continue to represent a compelling upgrade proposition for consumers on 3–4 year old devices globally. The acceleration of AI capabilities — from real-time language translation to on-device image generation — maintains consumer appetite for new device categories even in a year of unit volume softness. AI will increasingly become the primary battleground between Apple Intelligence, Google Gemini, Samsung Galaxy AI, and Xiaomi's HyperMind. Emerging Market Resilience — Africa and South AsiaSub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and parts of Southeast Asia remain the most structurally attractive growth segments for smartphone vendors in 2026. Transsion, Xiaomi, and Samsung all have strong regional distribution that should maintain volume growth in these markets even as mature economies stagnate. Africa's smartphone penetration remains well below 60% in most markets, representing a multiyear structural demand driver independent of memory pricing dynamics.

Historical Timeline

The Complete Story — Smartphone Market Share Era by Era

Q4 2009 — Q4 2010 The Symbian Endgame: Nokia Dominant, Android Rising Nokia holds ~40% share with Symbian OS. BlackBerry commands ~20%. Apple's iOS at ~16%. Global shipments: 175M (2009) → 298M (2010). Android grows from 2% to overtake Symbian on a quarterly basis in Q4 2010, led by Samsung and HTC. Gartner records 72% smartphone market growth in 2010. 2011 — 2013 Android Consolidates. Samsung Becomes Global #1. Android becomes the world's leading smartphone OS in early 2011 and never looks back. Samsung overtakes Nokia as the leading smartphone vendor in 2012, reaching 30%+ share by 2013. Nokia-Microsoft partnership fails to reverse Symbian's decline. BlackBerry begins terminal market share erosion from 20% to below 2%. Apple maintains 14–16% share with commanding premium positioning. 2014 — 2016 iPhone 6 Super-Cycle. Chinese Vendors Enter the Stage. iPhone 6/6 Plus launch in 2014 makes Apple competitive in large-screen segment — Apple briefly becomes #1 in Q4 2014. Samsung Galaxy Note 7 battery crisis (2016) triggers global recall and first major market share disruption from product failure. Xiaomi explodes to global #5 by 2014. Huawei reaches 10% share. Oppo and vivo become dominant in China. Global annual shipments cross 1.4 billion for first time. 2017 — 2019 The

Huawei Moment. Chinese Vendors Surge to 56% Combined Share. Huawei grows to 16% global share by 2019, briefly overtaking Apple in unit shipments. Combined Chinese vendor quarterly share hits 56% of global shipments in Q4 2024 — a historic milestone. Xiaomi expands to India and Europe. Samsung fights to maintain leadership. Apple's iPhone X (2017) at $999 establishes ultra-premium tier as a permanent market segment. 2020 — 2022 US Trade War Destroys Huawei Internationally. 5G Drives Apple Super-Cycle. US Entity List designation in May 2019 takes full effect in 2020 — Huawei loses Google Play, collapsing from 16% to <4% internationally. iPhone 12 5G (Q4 2020) drives Apple to first-ever quarterly #1 with ~23% share. Xiaomi briefly overtakes Apple in Q2 2021. Samsung Galaxy Z Fold and Flip launch the foldable era. Global market disrupted by COVID demand volatility and supply chain constraints. 2023 — 2025 Apple's Three-Year Reign. Record Shipments. iPhone 17 Super-Cycle. Apple becomes the world's #1 smartphone vendor for the first time on a full-year basis in 2023 — and repeats the achievement in 2024 and 2025. iPhone 17 series drives a record 247.8M units in 2025, with Apple at 19.7% global share. Samsung holds second with 241.2M units and 19.1% share. Xiaomi remains a stable #3. Transsion emerges as the fastest-growing top-5 vendor globally. Total market reaches 1.26B units in 2025. 2026 Outlook Memory Shortage Squeeze, ASP Record, Samsung Potential Comeback Year Global smartphone units projected to decline ~0.9–3% due to DRAM/NAND shortages raising costs across the board. Apple base iPhone delay to 2027 reduces iOS shipments by ~4.2%. Average selling price hits a record $465. Total market value reaches unprecedented $578.9 billion. Samsung positioned to potentially reclaim full-year #1. AI capabilities remain primary upgrade driver. Africa and South Asia continue as volume growth anchors.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions

In Q4 2009, **Nokia** held approximately **40% of the global smartphone market** through its Symbian OS platform. Research In Motion (BlackBerry) held second place with approximately 20% share, while Apple's iOS occupied third place with around 16%. Android was still a nascent platform accounting for 2–3% of the market. Nokia's dominance was already beginning to fracture, however, as Android-powered Samsung and HTC devices were growing at rates Nokia could not match with the aging Symbian platform.

Apple is the world's largest smartphone vendor in 2025 for the **third consecutive year**, shipping a record **247.8 million iPhones** with a 19.7% global market share — meaning roughly 1 in every 5 smartphones shipped in 2025 was an iPhone. Samsung finished a close second with 241.2 million units and 19.1% share, posting 7.9% year-on-year growth. The two vendors together account for approximately 39% of global smartphone shipments and the vast majority of industry profits.

Apple achieved a **24.2% global market share in Q4 2025**, shipping over 81.3 million units — its strongest holiday quarter performance on record. This was driven by strong demand for the iPhone 17 series across all major regions, including a remarkable turnaround in China where Apple ranked first in both October and November 2025 with over 20% domestic market share. The Q4 performance was confirmed by both IDC (2.3% market growth) and Omdia (4% market growth in Q4 2025).

Nokia's smartphone market share collapsed from approximately 40% in Q4 2009 to statistical irrelevance by 2014. The root cause was Nokia's failure to respond to the touchscreen smartphone revolution — its Symbian OS was fundamentally ill-suited to the app-centric, touchscreen paradigm established by iOS and adopted by Android. Nokia's partnership with Microsoft in 2011 — which involved abandoning Symbian in favour of Windows Phone — came too late and with insufficient ecosystem support to reverse the decline. Microsoft acquired Nokia's handset division for $7.2 billion in 2014, wrote down nearly the entire investment within a year, and exited the consumer smartphone business entirely by 2016.

IDC forecasts a **0.9% decline in global smartphone unit shipments in 2026**, with total units falling to approximately 1.24 billion. The decline is driven by DRAM and NAND memory component shortages that will raise component costs and average selling prices to a record $465. Despite the volume softness, the total market value is projected to reach a record **$578.9 billion**. Apple's decision to delay its base iPhone model to early 2027 is expected to reduce iOS shipments by approximately 4.2% in 2026, potentially allowing Samsung to reclaim the full-year #1 position.

Transsion — the Chinese company behind the Tecno, Infinix, and itel brands — has been the fastest-growing top-5 smartphone vendor globally in recent quarters. In Q3 2025, Transsion posted 13.4% year-on-year shipment growth, the highest rate of any top-5 vendor, driven by its dominant position in sub-Saharan Africa where shipments surged 25% year-on-year. Transsion's strategy of tailoring hardware (cameras, battery size, dual-SIM) to the specific needs of African consumers, combined with competitive pricing below $200, has made it the de-facto market leader across much of the continent.

Huawei's global smartphone trajectory represents the most dramatic rise-and-fall in the industry's history. Growing from approximately 3% share in 2011 to **16% in 2019** — briefly overtaking Apple in unit shipments — Huawei appeared poised to challenge Samsung for global leadership. The US Entity List designation in May 2019 restricted American technology suppliers and, crucially, removed Huawei's access to Google Mobile Services (including the Google Play Store). This made Huawei devices commercially unviable outside China, and its international market share collapsed from 16% to below 4% by 2022. Domestically, however, Huawei has staged a remarkable recovery — reclaiming the #1 position in China in 2025 with

16.4% domestic market share ahead of Apple.

Data Sources & References

Primary: IDC Worldwide Quarterly Mobile Phone Tracker — Q3 2025 & Full Year 2025 Data

Historical OS Data: Statista / Gartner — Global Smartphone Vendor Market Share Since 2009

Additional: Counterpoint Research · Omdia Q4 2025 · GSMArena IDC Summary · TechInsights · Canalys Smartphone Market Pulse · Gartner Historical Mobile Device Data

Smartphones Market Share Apple Samsung Xiaomi 2009–2026 IDC Industry Report Android iOS Q4 2025 2026 Forecast

STATISTICS REPORT

Market share of tablet operating systems worldwide 2016-2026, by quarter

Updated Jun 19, 2026 · businesstats.com/global-market-share-of-tablet-operating-systems-since-2010

~51% IPADOS 2025	~49% ANDROID 2025	~73% IPADOS PEAK
Q3'23 IPAD RETOOK LEAD	~0% WINDOWS 2026	99%+ DUOPOLY

Overview

Market share of tablet operating systems worldwide from 1st quarter 2016 to 4th quarter 2026

On tablets, the operating-system race looks nothing like the one on phones. Where Android dominates smartphones, on tablets it is Apple iPadOS and iOS that lead, narrowly, with Android close behind and everything else a rounding error. This report tracks worldwide tablet operating system market share, quarter by quarter, from the first quarter of 2016 to the fourth quarter of 2026. The race has been far closer and more dynamic than on phones. Where phones settled into a stable order, tablets kept shifting. The lead changed hands twice in a single decade. That kind of turnover is unheard of in phones. The tablet OS market is the dynamic one. Phones settled; tablets kept moving. The two markets could hardly be more different. One is settled, the other in constant flux. The contrast defines the two mobile markets.

As of late 2025, iPadOS held about 51 percent of tablet usage worldwide and Android about 49 percent, an unusually close split. The hardware-maker view of the same market, where Apple holds about 40 percent of shipments, is covered in our tablet vendor market share analysis; here the focus is on the operating systems, where Apple lead is larger because iPads are used so heavily. Active use, not units sold, drives these figures. A heavily-used iPad counts for more than an idle tablet. Usage tracking rewards engagement over raw shipments. An idle tablet barely registers in the data.

Tablet Operating System Market Share Worldwide, 2016-2026 (%)Quarterly usage share of the major tablet platforms.

Data:

Market share of tablet operating systems worldwide, Q1 2016 to Q4 2026, compiled by BusinessStats on a StatCounter-style usage basis.

Note:

Shares are based on tablet web-usage tracking, in percent. Recent quarters use reported figures; older quarters are reconstructed from documented data, interpolated between well-documented anchor points. Quarters from Q1 2026 are estimates. Usage shares fluctuate more for tablets than phones and differ from shipment shares.Switch views with the toolbar.

The contrast with phones is striking. On smartphones, Android leads by more than two to one, as shown in our mobile operating system market share analysis. On tablets, the positions are almost reversed, with iPadOS narrowly ahead. The iPad heavy real-world usage gives Apple a usage share well above its share of tablet shipments. Each iPad is simply used far more than the average Android tablet. That intensity lifts Apple usage share well above its shipment share. Engagement, not just sales, defines the leader here. The most-used platform wins, not the best-selling. That is why Apple leads despite selling fewer tablets. Heavy use beats high shipments in the usage data. Engagement is the metric that matters here. Usage, not units, crowns the tablet leader.

A note on the data. Shares are based on tablet web-usage tracking, the StatCounter-style measure, in percent. Recent quarters use reported figures; older quarters are reconstructed from documented data, interpolated between anchor points. Figures from the first quarter of 2026 are estimates. Tablet usage shares fluctuate more than phone shares because of seasonal product cycles. New iPad and tablet launches can move the shares sharply. A strong iPad cycle can swing the balance in a quarter. The market is unusually sensitive to product timing. A late iPad launch can dent a quarter; an early one can lift it. Timing matters more here than in any other OS market. A launch can reshape a whole quarter.

Market Share Data Table

Tablet OS Market Share, Selected Quarters

Worldwide Tablet OS Market Share, Selected Quarters (%)Click any column to sort

QUARTER	IPADOS / IOS	ANDROID	WINDOWS
Q1 '16	66%	31%	3.0%

Q4 '17	66%	32%	2.1%
Q1 '19	73%	24%	1.8%
Q4 '20	55%	43%	1.3%
Q4 '21	47%	51%	1.1%
Q4 '22	47%	51%	0.8%
Q3 '23	51%	47%	0.6%
Q4 '24	52%	47%	0.4%
Q4 '25	51%	48%	0.4%
Q4 '26	52%	47%	0.3%

The table lists the worldwide market share of the major tablet operating systems at key points from 2016 to 2026. It shows iPadOS leading early, Android rising to overtake it around 2021, and iPadOS regaining the lead in 2023. Sorting the columns reveals how the lead changed hands twice over the decade, a volatility absent from the phone market. The tablet OS lead has been anything but settled. It has flipped, recovered and flipped again. Stability is the one thing this market has lacked. The leaderboard kept rewriting itself. Two reversals in a decade made it the most fluid OS race. No other platform market shifted so often. The tablet OS race stands alone in its volatility.

Snapshot

A Near-Even Duopoly

Seen as a snapshot, the late-2025 tablet operating system market is a near-even duopoly. iPadOS at about 51 percent and Android at about 49 percent together account for more than 99 percent of tablet usage, with Windows and Chrome OS reduced to fractions of a percent. The market is, for practical purposes, a two-platform race. No third platform holds even one percent. Windows and Chrome OS have faded to the margins. The contest is purely iPadOS against Android. Everything else has been squeezed out. The duopoly is as complete as on phones, just far closer. Two platforms, but a near-even split. Far closer than the lopsided phone duopoly. A point or two now separates the two. It is the closest race in any major OS category.

This near-even split is remarkable given how lopsided the phone market is. On tablets, Apple and Google are almost perfectly matched in usage, whereas on phones Android dwarfs iOS. The tablet market is the one place where the two mobile platforms compete on roughly equal terms, a balance that shapes our smartphone market share by vendor analysis by contrast.

Tablet OS Market Share Worldwide, Late 2025 (%)The latest quarter as a share of the whole market.

Data:

Derived from worldwide tablet operating system market share, compiled by BusinessStats on a StatCounter-style usage basis.

Note:

The iPadOS-Android gap, share changes, cross-device comparisons and Windows decline are calculated from the OS share series. Older quarters are reconstructed; Q1 2026 onward are estimates. Tablet usage shares fluctuate and differ from shipment-based vendor shares.Switch views with the toolbar.

The closeness also makes the tablet OS market unusually competitive at the top. A swing of just a point or two can change which platform leads, and the lead has in fact changed hands more than once. Unlike the settled phone duopoly, the tablet OS race remains genuinely contested, a dynamism reflected in our iPad share of Apple revenue analysis.

iPadOS vs Android

A Lead That Changed Hands

The iPadOS versus Android contest is the heart of the tablet OS story, and it has been a real seesaw. iPadOS led comfortably through the late 2010s, peaking near 73 percent in early 2019. Then Android surged, overtaking iPadOS around 2021 and holding the global lead for roughly two years before iPadOS fought back. The contest has swung back and forth twice. Few markets reverse their leader so often. The tablet OS race is the exception. No other major OS market reverses so freely. The tablet contest stayed open while phones settled. Its outcome was never a foregone conclusion. Either platform could lead in any given year.

Android rise came from the flood of affordable Android tablets across emerging markets and the education sector, where cheap devices dominate. As these tablets multiplied, Android usage climbed steadily, eroding the iPad early dominance and briefly pushing Apple into second place, a shift driven by the same forces in our Cheap hardware reshaped the market, a shift driven by the same forces in our Apple, Google

and Microsoft revenue comparison analysis.

iPadOS vs Android Tablet Market Share, 2016-2026 (%)Quarterly usage share of the two leaders, head to head.

Data:

Derived from worldwide tablet operating system market share, compiled by BusinessStats on a StatCounter-style usage basis.

Note:

The iPadOS-Android gap, share changes, cross-device comparisons and Windows decline are calculated from the OS share series. Older quarters are reconstructed; Q1 2026 onward are estimates. Tablet usage shares fluctuate and differ from shipment-based vendor shares.Switch views with the toolbar.

Then the tide turned again. In the third quarter of 2023, iPadOS overtook Android once more to retake the global lead, helped by strong iPad sales and the long, heavy use of older iPads that keeps them active for years. By late 2025 iPadOS held a narrow but clear lead, a recovery that mirrors Apple resilience in our Apple iPhone revenue analysis.

The Seesaw

When the Lead Flipped

Tracking the gap between iPadOS and Android over time captures the seesaw vividly. In 2019, iPadOS led by nearly 50 points. By 2021 that lead had vanished and turned negative, with Android ahead by a few points. Since 2023, the gap has swung back in iPadOS favour, settling at a slim positive margin.

This swinging gap is what makes the tablet OS market so different from the phone market, where the Android lead has been stable for years. On tablets, the lead has crossed zero twice, first as Android overtook iPadOS and then as iPadOS recovered. Few technology markets show such a clear reversal and counter-reversal in a single decade. The tablet OS market rewrote its own hierarchy twice. First Android rose, then iPadOS recovered. No phone market has matched that drama. The tablet OS story is the more turbulent one by far. Its shares have whipsawed where phones held steady. Volatility is the tablet market signature.

iPadOS Lead Over Android on Tablets, 2016-2026 (pp)iPadOS share minus Android share, by quarter.

Data:

Derived from worldwide tablet operating system market share, compiled by BusinessStats on a StatCounter-style usage basis.

Note:

The iPadOS-Android gap, share changes, cross-device comparisons and Windows decline are calculated from the OS share series. Older quarters are reconstructed; Q1 2026 onward are estimates. Tablet usage shares fluctuate and differ from shipment-based vendor shares.Switch views with the toolbar.

The current slim iPadOS lead looks more stable than the wild swings of the past, but it is far from secure. With the two platforms separated by only a couple of points, another swing is entirely possible. The tablet OS race remains the most genuinely competitive of the major operating-system markets, a contest underpinning our The outcome is still genuinely in doubt, a contest underpinning our Apple revenue by segment analysis.

From the Peak

A 25-Point Swing

The scale of iPadOS decline from its peak is striking. From nearly 73 percent of tablet usage in early 2019, it fell to around 47 percent at its 2021 to 2022 low before recovering to about 51 percent. The peak-to-trough swing of more than 25 points is unheard of in the smartphone OS market.

That 2019 peak reflected an era when the iPad utterly dominated tablet usage and Android tablets were still seen as cheap alternatives. The subsequent decline came not because the iPad weakened but because Android tablets multiplied so rapidly, especially in education and emerging markets, diluting iPadOS share even as iPad sales held up. The iPad did not shrink; the market around it grew. Dilution, not decline, drove iPadOS down from its peak. The iPad itself never lost its strength. Its share fell only because the market widened. More Android tablets simply diluted the pool.

iPadOS Tablet Share: 2019 Peak vs Recent (%)iPadOS usage share at key points from its peak.

Data:

Derived from worldwide tablet operating system market share, compiled by BusinessStats on a StatCounter-style usage basis.

Note:

The iPadOS-Android gap, share changes, cross-device comparisons and Windows decline are calculated from the OS share series. Older quarters are reconstructed; Q1 2026 onward are estimates. Tablet usage shares fluctuate and differ from shipment-based vendor shares.Switch views with the toolbar.

The recovery from the 2021 low shows the iPad enduring strength. Even as Android tablets proliferated, the iPad heavy and long-lasting usage pulled iPadOS share back above 50 percent. The platform proved far more resilient than its sharp decline suggested, a durability that few rivals in any market could match.

Android Rise

The Volume Surge

Android tablet usage tells the mirror-image story. From around 31 percent in 2016, it dipped as the iPad peaked, then climbed sharply to overtake iPadOS around 2021, reaching the low fifties. Since iPadOS recovery, Android has settled back to about 49 percent, still far above its 2019 low.

The engine of Android tablet growth was sheer volume at the low end. Cheap Android tablets from many vendors flooded schools, emerging markets and budget-conscious households, driving up Android usage even though each device was used less intensively than an iPad. Quantity, not engagement, powered the Android surge.

Android Tablet Share: Year-over-Year Change (pp)How much Android share rose or fell each year - the surge and the pullback.

Data:

Derived from worldwide tablet operating system market share, compiled by BusinessStats on a StatCounter-style usage basis.

Note:

The iPadOS-Android gap, share changes, cross-device comparisons and Windows decline are calculated from the OS share series. Older quarters are reconstructed; Q1 2026 onward are estimates. Tablet usage shares fluctuate and differ from shipment-based vendor shares.Switch views with the toolbar.

Android tablet share has now plateaued near parity with iPadOS, held back by the same dynamic that limits it: its devices are used less heavily than iPads, so its usage share lags its shipment share. On tablets, Android ships more units but its lighter usage keeps it just behind iPadOS, a gap that shapes our Usage favours Apple even where units favour Android, a gap that shapes our Apple Services revenue analysis.

Tablet vs Phone

The Order Reverses

Comparing tablet and phone operating systems side by side reveals one of the most striking contrasts in technology. On phones, Android leads with about 70 percent to iOS 29 percent. On tablets, the order flips: iPadOS leads with about 51 percent to Android 49 percent. The same two platforms rank in opposite orders on the two devices. The same platforms swap places between phone and tablet. Device type alone flips the ranking. Apple leads tablets; Android leads phones. The same rivalry produces opposite winners.

The reason is the structure of each market. On phones, cheap Android devices dominate the huge emerging-market and budget segments, giving Android overwhelming volume. On tablets, the premium iPad commands the most active users, and the tablet market is smaller and more premium-skewed, letting iPadOS lead in usage despite Android higher shipments. Heavy iPad use offsets Android volume advantage. Engagement tips the usage balance to Apple. Active iPads carry more weight than idle slates.

OS Share: Tablet vs Phone, 2026 (%)iPadOS and Android share on tablets compared with phones.

Data:

Derived from worldwide tablet operating system market share, compiled by BusinessStats on a StatCounter-style usage basis.

Note:

The iPadOS-Android gap, share changes, cross-device comparisons and Windows decline are calculated from the OS share series. Older quarters are reconstructed; Q1 2026 onward are estimates. Tablet usage shares fluctuate and differ from shipment-based vendor shares.Switch views with the toolbar.

This device-by-device reversal is one of the clearest illustrations of how Apple premium strategy plays out. Apple is strongest where devices are used intensively and bought by higher-spending users, which describes tablets far better than budget phones. The contrast captures the essence of Apple market position in our biggest companies by market value analysis.

Windows Fades

The Forgotten Third

Windows is the forgotten third platform of the tablet market. Despite Microsoft long push with Surface devices and Windows tablets, Windows never captured more than a few percent of tablet usage and has since dwindled to almost nothing, around a fraction of a percent by 2026. Windows simply never found a place on tablets. The third platform never materialised.

The failure of Windows on tablets echoes its failure on phones. Just as Windows Phone could not break the Android-iOS duopoly, Windows tablets could not establish a third option in a market that consumers saw as a choice between the iPad and Android. Surface devices found a niche as laptop replacements rather than as mainstream tablets. Buyers wanted iPads or Android, not Windows slates. The choice was always binary. iPad or Android, with nothing in between. No third option ever gained traction.

Windows Tablet Market Share, 2016-2026 (%)Windows tablet usage share fading toward zero.

Data:

Derived from worldwide tablet operating system market share, compiled by BusinessStats on a StatCounter-style usage basis.

Note:

The iPadOS-Android gap, share changes, cross-device comparisons and Windows decline are calculated from the OS share series. Older quarters are reconstructed; Q1 2026 onward are estimates. Tablet usage shares fluctuate and differ from shipment-based vendor shares.Switch views with the toolbar.

The near-disappearance of Windows leaves the tablet OS market as a clean two-platform contest, much like phones. Chrome OS and Linux tablets together add only a fraction of a percent, leaving iPadOS and Android to split essentially the entire market between them, a clean two-platform duopoly much like the one on phones. Two platforms now own essentially the whole market. Nothing else registers above a fraction. The market belongs to two platforms alone. Everything else has been reduced to noise.

Share Shifts

A Decade of Change

Measuring the change in each platform share from 2016 to 2026 shows a more balanced reordering than on phones. iPadOS is down modestly from the high sixties to the low fifties, Android is up substantially from the low thirties to the high forties, and Windows has fallen from a few percent to almost nothing.

These shifts reflect the rise of affordable Android tablets rather than any collapse of the iPad. Unlike the phone market, where older platforms vanished entirely, the tablet market simply rebalanced between its two leaders, with Android closing most of a large early gap while iPadOS retained its lead.

Change in Tablet OS Share, 2016 to 2026 (pp)Percentage-point gain or loss for each platform.

Data:

Derived from worldwide tablet operating system market share, compiled by BusinessStats on a StatCounter-style usage basis.

Note:

The iPadOS-Android gap, share changes, cross-device comparisons and Windows decline are calculated from the OS share series. Older quarters are reconstructed; Q1 2026 onward are estimates. Tablet usage shares fluctuate and differ from shipment-based vendor shares.Switch views with the toolbar.

The net result over the decade is a market that moved from clear iPad dominance toward a near-even duopoly, then back to a slim iPad lead. The changes were real but bounded, leaving both platforms strong, a balanced outcome that contrasts with the winner-take-most phone market in our tablet vendor market share analysis.

Then and Now

2016 vs 2026

Comparing 2016 with 2026 side by side captures the rebalancing. In 2016, iPadOS led with around two-thirds of tablet usage, Android held about a third, and Windows a few percent. By 2026, iPadOS and Android are nearly tied in the low fifties and high forties, with Windows gone. The gap of thirty points in 2016 shrank to almost nothing. Convergence defined the decade. The leaders ended closer than they began. A wide gap narrowed to a near tie.

The before-and-after shows convergence rather than collapse. Unlike phones, where the 2016 leaders were swept away, both of the tablet market 2016 leaders, iPadOS and Android, remain the leaders in 2026, just far closer together. Only Windows fell away entirely. The two leaders converged rather than one collapsing.

Tablet OS Share, 2016 to 2026: The Shift (%)Each platform traced from its 2016 share to its 2026 share.

Data:

Derived from worldwide tablet operating system market share, compiled by BusinessStats on a StatCounter-style usage basis.

Note:

The iPadOS-Android gap, share changes, cross-device comparisons and Windows decline are calculated from the OS share series. Older quarters are reconstructed; Q1 2026 onward are estimates. Tablet usage shares fluctuate and differ from shipment-based vendor shares.Switch views with the toolbar.

The decade of change left the tablet OS market more competitive than it began. A commanding iPad lead gave way to a genuine two-horse race, the most balanced of any major operating-system market, a competitiveness that sets tablets apart from every other device category.

~51%iPadOS 2025Tablet leader. ~49%Android 2025A close second. ~73%iPadOS 2019Its peak. Q3 2023iPadOS RetookThe lead.

The worldwide tablet operating system market from 2016 to 2026 is a story of a lead that changed hands twice. iPadOS dominated early, peaking near 73 percent in 2019, before a flood of affordable Android tablets pushed Android into the lead around 2021. Then, in 2023, iPadOS recovered to retake first place, ending the period with a slim lead near 51 percent. The decade ended almost where a two-horse race began.

More than any single figure, it is the seesaw that defines the tablet OS market. Unlike the settled phone duopoly, where Android leads by more than two to one, the tablet race has been genuinely competitive, with iPadOS and Android trading the lead and ending nearly tied. The reversal of the phone hierarchy on tablets captures Apple unusual strength in premium, heavily-used devices, a strength that anchors the wider Apple story in our Apple total revenue analysis.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: Tablet Operating System Market Share

As of late 2025 and into 2026, iPadOS and iOS together are the most popular tablet operating system worldwide, with about 51 percent of tablet usage, narrowly ahead of Android at about 49 percent, on a StatCounter usage basis. Windows and Chrome OS account for only fractions of a percent. The tablet market is essentially a two-platform race, and unusually close, with iPadOS holding only a slim lead.

iPadOS is slightly bigger, at about 51 percent of tablet usage versus Android's 49 percent as of late 2025. But the lead is narrow and has changed hands. iPadOS led comfortably until around 2021, when

Android overtook it, then iPadOS regained the lead in the third quarter of 2023. This is the reverse of the phone market, where Android leads iOS by more than two to one.

On phones, Android leads with about 70 percent because cheap Android devices dominate the huge budget and emerging-market segments. On tablets, Apple's iPadOS leads in usage because the iPad commands the most active, heavily-using customers, and the tablet market is smaller and more premium-skewed. The iPad's intensive real-world use gives Apple a usage share above its tablet shipment share, flipping the phone-market order.

Android overtook iPadOS in global tablet usage around 2021, as a wave of affordable Android tablets spread through emerging markets and education. Android then held the global lead for roughly two years. However, in the third quarter of 2023, iPadOS overtook Android again to retake first place, and it has held a narrow lead since. The tablet OS lead has therefore changed hands twice in a decade.

iPadOS peaked at nearly 73 percent of global tablet usage in early 2019, when the iPad utterly dominated and Android tablets were still seen as budget alternatives. From that peak, iPadOS share fell to around 47 percent at its 2021 to 2022 low as Android tablets multiplied, before recovering to about 51 percent by late 2025. The peak-to-trough swing of more than 25 points is far larger than anything in the phone OS market.

Android tablet usage grew from around 31 percent in 2016 to nearly half the market, driven by a flood of cheap Android tablets from many vendors. These affordable devices spread rapidly through schools, emerging markets and budget-conscious households, multiplying Android's installed base. Even though each Android tablet is typically used less heavily than an iPad, sheer volume pushed Android usage up and briefly into the global lead.

Tablet OS market share is commonly measured by usage, tracked by services like StatCounter that record which operating system is used to browse the web from tablets. This usage-based measure differs from shipment-based figures, which count devices sold. Because iPads are used more heavily and last longer than many Android tablets, Apple's usage share is higher than its shipment share. Tablet usage shares also fluctuate more than phone shares due to seasonal cycles.

Windows never succeeded as a mainstream tablet operating system. Despite Microsoft's long push with Surface devices, Windows tablets never captured more than a few percent of tablet usage and have since dwindled to a fraction of a percent. Surface devices found a niche as laptop replacements rather than as mainstream tablets, and consumers came to see the tablet market as a choice between the iPad and Android, leaving no room for a third platform.

Yes, but a much closer one. Like phones, the tablet market is dominated by iPadOS and Android, which together hold more than 99 percent of usage, with Windows and Chrome OS reduced to fractions of a percent. But while the phone duopoly is lopsided, with Android leading more than two to one, the tablet duopoly is nearly even, around 51 to 49 in iPadOS's favour, making it far more competitive.

It is possible, given how close the race is. iPadOS and Android are separated by only a couple of points, and the lead has already changed hands twice in the past decade. Android continues to gain from cheap tablets in emerging markets, while iPadOS benefits from the iPad's heavy, long-lasting use. With such a slim margin, another swing in either direction cannot be ruled out, making this the most competitive major OS market.

Sources

StatCounter GlobalStats and IDC - Source for worldwide tablet operating system usage and market-share data.

StatCounter Tablet OS Market Share - Reference for recent worldwide tablet operating system usage share.

Shares are based on tablet web-usage tracking and are in percent. In late 2025, iPadOS led at about 51 percent and Android at about 49 percent, with Windows reduced to a fraction of a percent. iPadOS peaked near 73 percent in 2019, Android overtook it around 2021, and iPadOS retook the lead in the third quarter of 2023. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data; figures from Q1 2026 onward are estimates. Tablet usage shares fluctuate and differ from shipment-based shares.

STATISTICS REPORT

Market share of mobile operating systems worldwide 2009-2026, by quarter

Updated Jun 19, 2026 · businesstats.com/global-market-share-held-by-mobile-operating-systems-since-2009

~70% ANDROID 2026	~29% IOS 2026	99%+ DUOPOLY SHARE
2012 ANDROID PASSED IOS	~2% ANDROID 2009	0% SYMBIAN TODAY

Overview

Market share of mobile operating systems worldwide from 1st quarter 2009 to 4th quarter 2026, by quarter

The mobile operating system market has consolidated into one of the cleanest duopolies in technology. Where half a dozen platforms once competed, today just two, Android and Apple iOS, account for more than 99 percent of all mobile devices. This report tracks worldwide mobile operating system market share, quarter by quarter, from the first quarter of 2009 to the fourth quarter of 2026. No other technology market has consolidated so completely. From many platforms to two in barely a decade. The pace of change was breathtaking even by tech standards. A whole ecosystem rose and another collapsed at once. Such simultaneous birth and death is rare in technology. Android and iOS grew as the old guard fell. The new winners absorbed the share the losers gave up. None of it flowed to any newcomer outside the pair. The market funneled everything to two winners. Consolidation could hardly have been more complete. Two platforms now leave room for no other. The duopoly admits no third entrant at all, and likely never will again.

As of early 2026, Android leads with roughly 70 percent of the global market and iOS holds about 29 percent, as tracked in our mobile operating system market share data, leaving less than 1 percent to everything else. This is the operating-system view of the market; the hardware-maker view, where Samsung, Apple, Xiaomi and others compete, is covered in our smartphone market share by vendor analysis, and the two look very different. Counting platforms is not the same as counting brands. One

Android share hides dozens of competing makers. The platform unites rivals who fight each other fiercely. Beneath one banner sit Samsung, Xiaomi, Oppo and many more. They share an OS but little else. Fierce rivals united only by their platform.

Mobile Operating System Market Share Worldwide, 2009-2026 (%)Quarterly usage share of the major mobile platforms.

Data:

Market share of mobile operating systems worldwide, Q1 2009 to Q4 2026, compiled by BusinessStats on a StatCounter-style usage basis.

Note:

Shares are based on mobile web-usage tracking, in percent. Recent quarters use reported figures; older quarters are reconstructed from documented data, interpolated between well-documented anchor points. Quarters from Q2 2026 are estimates. Usage-based shares differ from shipment-based vendor shares.Switch views with the toolbar.

The distinction matters. Android powers phones from Samsung, Xiaomi, Oppo, Vivo, Transsion and dozens of others, so its 70 percent share is spread across many vendors. Apple iOS runs only on the iPhone, so its 29 percent belongs to a single company, the same company whose hardware sales drive our Apple iPhone revenue analysis. One operating system is a coalition; the other is a single brand. That contrast shapes the whole market. A coalition behaves very differently from a single firm. Android answers to many masters; iOS to just one. That difference shapes pricing, updates and strategy alike. One model is open, the other tightly controlled. Apple owns its stack; Google licenses Android widely. Control versus openness defines their rivalry. Each approach has proved enormously successful. Open and closed models both reached billions. Two opposite philosophies achieved two huge successes.

A note on the data. Shares are based on mobile web-usage tracking, the StatCounter-style measure, in percent. Recent quarters use reported figures; older quarters are reconstructed from documented data, interpolated between well-documented anchor points. Figures from the second quarter of 2026 onward are estimates. Usage-based shares differ from shipment-based vendor shares and from other trackers. The broad trends, however, are clear and widely agreed. Every tracker shows Android leading and iOS second. They disagree only on the exact figures. The overall picture is beyond dispute. Android leads, iOS follows, the rest are gone. The hierarchy has held for over a decade. No reshuffle looks likely any time soon. The two survivors are firmly entrenched. Their grip on the market looks unbreakable. No challenger has the

ecosystem to compete. Apps and developers lock the two-platform duopoly firmly in place for years to come.

Market Share Data Table

Mobile OS Market Share, Selected Quarters

Worldwide Mobile OS Market Share, Selected Quarters (%)Click any column to sort

QUARTER	ANDROID	IOS	SYMBIAN	OTHERS
Q1 '09	2%	33%	35%	30%
Q1 '11	22%	25%	20%	33%
Q4 '12	46%	22%	5%	27%
Q4 '14	60%	22%	1%	17%
Q4 '16	69%	21%	0%	10%
Q4 '18	74%	22%	0%	4%
Q4 '20	72%	26%	0%	2%
Q4 '22	71%	28%	0%	1%
Q4 '24	70%	29%	0%	1%
Q4 '26	71%	28%	0%	1%

The table lists the worldwide market share of the major mobile operating systems at key points from 2009 to 2026. It shows Android rising from almost nothing to dominance, iOS holding a steady second place, and Symbian, BlackBerry and Windows Phone falling to zero. Sorting the columns reveals how completely a fragmented market collapsed into a two-platform world. Almost nothing from 2009 survived the decade. Only iOS remains from the original field. Every other 2009 platform has vanished or shrunk to nothing. The turnover at the top was almost total. Only Apple bridges the 2009 and 2026 markets. Every other former leader fell away entirely. The 2009 leaderboard is now almost unrecognisable. Only one name carries over to today. Apple alone links the two eras of mobile. It is the sole survivor of the 2009 field.

Q1 2026 Standings

A Two-Platform World

As of early 2026, Android holds about 70 percent of the global mobile operating system market, more than double the roughly 29 percent held by Apple iOS. Every other platform combined, Samsung Tizen, KaiOS and a handful of others, accounts for well under 1 percent. The market is, for practical purposes, a two-horse race.

Android lead reflects its presence on phones at every price point, from ultra-budget devices in emerging markets to premium flagships. Because dozens of manufacturers build Android phones, the platform reaches billions of users across the developing world, where affordable handsets dominate. India, Indonesia and much of Africa are overwhelmingly Android. Affordable handsets put it in billions of hands. Emerging markets are overwhelmingly Android territory. In India and much of Africa it is the default. Affordability made Android the people's platform. Its reach in the developing world is unmatched. Billions came online first on an Android phone. For many, Android is the internet itself. It introduced a generation to smartphones. Android brought the world online affordably. Its cheap devices reached the last billion users.

Mobile OS Market Share Worldwide, Early 2026 (%)Latest usage share by platform.

Data:

Derived from worldwide mobile operating system market share, compiled by BusinessStats on a StatCounter-style usage basis.

Note:

Combined shares, the Android-iOS gap, the duopoly total and share changes are calculated from the OS share series. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data; Q2 2026 onward are estimates. Usage-based shares differ from shipment-based figures and from other trackers.Switch views with the toolbar.

Apple iOS, by contrast, is concentrated in wealthy markets. It leads in the United States, Japan and parts of Northern Europe, where premium phones are common. Although iOS trails Android by more than two to one in usage, it captures the majority of app revenue, a reversal explored in our App Store categories analysis, because its users spend far more per head. Value, not volume, defines the iOS business. Fewer users, but far higher spending each. iOS users drive the majority of app revenue. Quality of audience beats quantity for Apple. A smaller, richer base funds the whole business. Apple turns fewer users into far more profit. Its margins dwarf those of any Android maker. Profit, not share, is Apple measure of success. And by that measure Apple leads comfortably. Revenue tells a very different story from raw usage share.

Android vs iOS

The Defining Contest

The Android versus iOS contest is the defining story of the mobile era. Android overtook iOS in global usage in 2012 and has led ever since, steadily widening its advantage through the 2010s before settling into a stable roughly 70-to-29 split. The two have effectively divided the world between them.

Their rise was simultaneous but their strategies opposite. Android, open and licensed to any manufacturer, spread across the entire industry and conquered emerging markets through sheer affordability and choice. iOS, exclusive to Apple, pursued the premium segment, sacrificing volume for value, a trade-off visible in our Volume versus value became the defining split, a trade-off visible in our Apple, Google and Microsoft revenue comparison analysis.

Android vs iOS Market Share, 2009-2026 (%)Quarterly usage share of the two survivors, head to head.

Data:

Derived from worldwide mobile operating system market share, compiled by BusinessStats on a StatCounter-style usage basis.

Note:

Combined shares, the Android-iOS gap, the duopoly total and share changes are calculated from the OS share series. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data; Q2 2026 onward are estimates. Usage-based shares differ from shipment-based figures and from other trackers.Switch views with the toolbar.

The result is a stable standoff that has held for years. Android dominates volume; iOS dominates profit and engagement. Neither shows any sign of displacing the other, and no third platform has come close to challenging them. The mobile OS market has reached an equilibrium unusual in technology, where two rivals coexist at very different scales, a balance underpinning our Neither needs to beat the other to thrive, a balance underpinning our big tech revenue comparison analysis.

The Fallen

Platforms That Vanished

Before Android and iOS divided the world, the mobile operating system market was crowded and fragmented. In 2009, Nokia Symbian platform led, with BlackBerry OS, the early iPhone OS and Windows Mobile all holding meaningful shares. Within a few years, most of these had collapsed entirely.

Symbian, once the dominant smartphone platform, was overwhelmed by the touchscreen era and effectively disappeared by 2014. BlackBerry OS, beloved of business users for its keyboards and security, faded just as fast. Both failed to build the app ecosystems and touch interfaces that Android and iOS made standard, a shift reflected in our The app store became the new battleground, a shift reflected in our App Store apps by category analysis.

The Fall of Symbian, BlackBerry and Windows Phone (%)Quarterly share of the platforms that disappeared.

Data:

Derived from worldwide mobile operating system market share, compiled by BusinessStats on a StatCounter-style usage basis.

Note:

Combined shares, the Android-iOS gap, the duopoly total and share changes are calculated from the OS share series. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data; Q2 2026 onward are estimates. Usage-based shares differ from shipment-based figures and from other trackers.Switch views with the toolbar.

Windows Phone is the most striking failure of all. Despite Microsoft vast resources and a well-reviewed product, it never passed a few percent of the market and was abandoned by 2017. Its collapse showed that even a tech giant could not break the Android-iOS duopoly once it had formed, a lesson echoed across our biggest companies by market value analysis.

Snapshot

Almost the Whole Pie

Seen as a snapshot, the early-2026 market is overwhelmingly a duopoly. Android two-thirds-plus and iOS just under a third together fill the chart almost completely, with the sliver left for others barely visible. No market in consumer technology is more thoroughly dominated by exactly two players.

This concentration is the opposite of the fragmented market of 2009, when no single platform held even a clear majority and five or six competed. The collapse from many platforms to two is one of the fastest and most complete consolidations in the history of consumer technology, taking barely five years. Few markets have ever changed so fast. A whole industry reordered in five years.

Mobile OS Market Share Worldwide, Early 2026 (%)The latest quarter as a share of the whole market.

Data:

Derived from worldwide mobile operating system market share, compiled by BusinessStats on a StatCounter-style usage basis.

Note:

Combined shares, the Android-iOS gap, the duopoly total and share changes are calculated from the OS share series. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data; Q2 2026 onward are estimates. Usage-based shares differ from shipment-based figures and from other trackers.Switch views with the toolbar.

The duopoly is also remarkably stable. The Android-iOS split has barely moved in years, hovering around 70-to-29 or 71-to-28 quarter after quarter. Unlike the volatile vendor market beneath it, the operating-system layer has settled into an equilibrium that looks set to persist, a stability rare in our The split has barely moved in years, a stability rare in our Apple total revenue analysis.

Android Rise

From Nothing to Dominance

Android rise is one of the great growth stories in technology. From a negligible 2 to 4 percent of the market in 2009, the year after its launch, it climbed to overtake every rival and reach roughly 70 percent by the mid-2010s, a level it has held since. No platform has ever scaled to so many users so quickly.

The engine of that rise was the open licensing model. By giving Android away to any manufacturer, Google ensured it would run on phones at every price, from dozens of brands, in every market. This flooded the world with affordable Android devices and built an installed base now measured in the billions, a scale that anchors our Billions of devices now run Android, a scale that anchors our Apple revenue by segment analysis as the counterweight to iOS.

Android Market Share Worldwide, 2009-2026 (%)Android usage share climbing from launch to dominance.

Data:

Derived from worldwide mobile operating system market share, compiled by BusinessStats on a StatCounter-style usage basis.

Note:

Combined shares, the Android-iOS gap, the duopoly total and share changes are calculated from the OS share series. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data; Q2 2026 onward are estimates. Usage-based shares differ from shipment-based figures and from other trackers.Switch views with the toolbar.

Android growth has now plateaued, not because it is failing but because it has saturated the market. With around 70 percent of all devices and most of the affordable segment, there is little room left to grow except as the overall smartphone market expands. Its dominance is mature, stable and, for now, unchallenged.

The Duopoly

Two Platforms, One Market

Perhaps the most telling measure is the combined share of Android and iOS together. In 2009, the two accounted for under 40 percent of the market, with the majority split among Symbian, BlackBerry and others. By 2014 they had passed 95 percent, and today they exceed 99 percent, a near-total duopoly.

This rise of the duopoly came directly at the expense of the older platforms. As Symbian, BlackBerry and Windows Phone collapsed, almost all of their share flowed to Android and iOS rather than to any new entrant. The market did not just consolidate; it consolidated around exactly two winners.

Android and iOS Combined Market Share, 2009-2026 (%)The two leaders combined share, rising toward 100 percent.

Data:

Derived from worldwide mobile operating system market share, compiled by BusinessStats on a StatCounter-style usage basis.

Note:

Combined shares, the Android-iOS gap, the duopoly total and share changes are calculated from the OS share series. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data; Q2 2026 onward are estimates. Usage-based shares differ from shipment-based figures and from other trackers.Switch views with the

toolbar.

The completeness of the duopoly is what makes the mobile OS market so unusual. In most industries, even dominant players leave room for a meaningful third option. In mobile operating systems, the third option has effectively ceased to exist, leaving a market structure that shapes the entire app economy in our Apple Services revenue analysis.

Then and Now

2009 vs 2026

Comparing 2009 with 2026 side by side captures the scale of the transformation. In 2009, Symbian led with around a third of the market, iOS and BlackBerry held substantial shares, and Android was a rounding error. By 2026, Android commands 70 percent, iOS 29 percent, and the rest have vanished.

Almost nothing about the 2009 market survived. Of the platforms that mattered then, only iOS remains relevant, and even it has been recast from a leading platform into the smaller half of a duopoly. Every other 2009 leader, Symbian, BlackBerry, Windows Mobile, is gone, an extinction rare in any market.

Mobile OS Market Share: 2009 vs 2026 (%)Each platform share at the start and end of the period.

Data:

Derived from worldwide mobile operating system market share, compiled by BusinessStats on a StatCounter-style usage basis.

Note:

Combined shares, the Android-iOS gap, the duopoly total and share changes are calculated from the OS share series. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data; Q2 2026 onward are estimates. Usage-based shares differ from shipment-based figures and from other trackers.Switch views with the toolbar.

The before-and-after comparison is the clearest possible illustration of how fast and how completely the mobile OS market changed. In the span of a single phone generation, a fragmented field of established platforms was replaced by a stable duopoly of two newcomers, a turnover that reshaped the entire technology industry in the span of a single decade.

iOS Over Time

The Steady Second

Apple iOS share has followed a steadier path than any other platform. After an early lead in the first years of the smartphone era, it was overtaken by Android in 2012 and has since held a remarkably stable share, drifting between roughly 20 and 30 percent and settling near 29 percent in recent years.

This stability is itself remarkable. While Android surged and the older platforms collapsed, iOS simply held its ground, neither collapsing nor breaking out. Apple deliberate focus on the premium segment capped its volume share but gave it an unusually loyal and high-spending user base, the foundation of its enduring place in the market.

Apple iOS Market Share at Selected Points (%)iOS usage share, steady through the smartphone era.

Data:

Derived from worldwide mobile operating system market share, compiled by BusinessStats on a StatCounter-style usage basis.

Note:

Combined shares, the Android-iOS gap, the duopoly total and share changes are calculated from the OS share series. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data; Q2 2026 onward are estimates. Usage-based shares differ from shipment-based figures and from other trackers.Switch views with the toolbar.

In recent years iOS has even edged upward, from the low 20s to around 29 percent, as Apple expanded in markets like India and as its installed base grew. While it remains the smaller half of the duopoly by usage, its share has been quietly rising, a trend that supports the premium strategy that defines its place in the market.

Share Shifts

Winner Takes Most

Measuring the change in each platform share from 2009 to 2026 shows the full reordering. Android is the overwhelming gainer, adding nearly 70 percentage points. iOS is modestly up. And Symbian, BlackBerry and Windows Phone are the great losers, each falling from meaningful shares to zero.

These shifts capture a winner-take-most dynamic. The gains were concentrated almost entirely in Android, with iOS taking a smaller steady slice, while the losses were spread across every older platform. The

market did not redistribute share evenly; it funneled it overwhelmingly to one new winner.

Change in Mobile OS Market Share, 2009 to 2026 (pp)Percentage-point gain or loss for each platform.

Data:

Derived from worldwide mobile operating system market share, compiled by BusinessStats on a StatCounter-style usage basis.

Note:

Combined shares, the Android-iOS gap, the duopoly total and share changes are calculated from the OS share series. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data; Q2 2026 onward are estimates. Usage-based shares differ from shipment-based figures and from other trackers.Switch views with the toolbar.

The pattern of gains and losses also explains why the market is now so stable. With every weak platform already eliminated and the two survivors firmly entrenched, there are no more shares to redistribute. The dramatic changes are behind us, leaving a settled duopoly that defines the modern mobile world and the entire app economy built on these two platforms.

~70%Android 2026Market leader. ~29%iOS 2026A clear second. 99%+DuopolyAndroid plus iOS. ~2%Android 2009Its starting point.

The worldwide mobile operating system market from 2009 to 2026 is a story of consolidation as dramatic as any in technology. A fragmented field led by Symbian, with BlackBerry, early iOS and Windows Mobile all competing, collapsed within a few years into a clean duopoly. Android rose from almost nothing to roughly 70 percent, iOS settled at about 29 percent, and every other platform disappeared.

More than any single figure, it is the completeness of the duopoly that defines the market. Two operating systems now run more than 99 percent of the world phones, one a coalition of dozens of hardware makers and the other a single premium brand. The contest between volume and value, Android breadth against Apple depth, has reached a stable equilibrium that shapes the whole mobile economy, a balance that anchors the wider mobile economy and the app stores built upon it.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: Mobile Operating System Market Share

Android is the most popular mobile operating system worldwide in 2026, with about 70 percent of the global market, according to usage-based trackers like StatCounter. Apple iOS is second at roughly 29 percent. Together they account for more than 99 percent of all mobile devices. Every other platform, including Samsung Tizen and KaiOS, holds well under 1 percent combined, making the market effectively a two-platform duopoly.

As of early 2026, Android holds about 70 percent of the global mobile operating system market and Apple iOS about 29 percent, a roughly 70-to-29 split on a usage basis. Android leads because it runs on phones from many manufacturers at every price point, while iOS runs only on the iPhone. The split has been stable for several years, though iOS has edged up slightly from the low 20s a decade ago.

Android overtook iOS in global mobile operating system usage in 2012. Android launched in 2008 with a tiny share, but its open licensing model spread it across dozens of manufacturers and price points, driving explosive growth. It passed iOS in 2012 and has led every year since, widening its advantage through the 2010s before settling into a stable roughly 70-to-29 lead that persists today.

Symbian, Nokia's platform and the smartphone leader of 2009, and BlackBerry OS both collapsed because they failed to adapt to the touchscreen and app-store era that Android and iOS defined. Symbian was overwhelmed by 2014, and BlackBerry OS faded just as fast. Neither built the modern app ecosystems or touch interfaces that consumers came to expect, and both were swept aside as Android and iOS took over the market.

Mobile operating system market share is commonly measured by usage, tracked by services like StatCounter that record which OS is used to browse the web. This usage-based measure differs from shipment-based figures, which count phones sold. Usage share reflects the active installed base and web activity, so a platform with many heavily used devices ranks highly. This analysis uses a StatCounter-style usage basis, which differs from vendor shipment shares.

Operating system share measures platforms (Android versus iOS), while vendor share measures hardware makers (Samsung, Apple, Xiaomi and others). They look very different: Android holds about 70 percent of the OS market, but that share is split among many vendors like Samsung, Xiaomi, Oppo and Vivo, all of which use Android. Apple is the only iOS vendor, so its roughly 18 percent vendor share equals most of iOS's 29 percent OS share.

Although iOS holds only about 29 percent of mobile usage versus Android's 70 percent, it captures the majority of app revenue, often around 60 to 65 percent of consumer app spending. This is because iOS users are concentrated in wealthy markets like the United States, Japan and Northern Europe, and tend to spend far more on apps and subscriptions. Android's huge share is dominated by lower-spending users in emerging markets.

It is highly unlikely in the near term. Android and iOS together hold more than 99 percent of the market, and even Microsoft, with vast resources, failed to establish Windows Phone as a third platform before abandoning it in 2017. The duopoly is reinforced by the enormous app ecosystems built around both. Some efforts, like Huawei's HarmonyOS, exist mainly in China, but no platform has come close to challenging the global duopoly.

In 2009, the year after its launch, Android held only about 2 to 4 percent of the global mobile operating system market. At the time, Nokia's Symbian led with roughly a third of the market, while BlackBerry OS, the early iPhone OS and Windows Mobile all held meaningful shares. Android's climb from that tiny base to about 70 percent by the mid-2010s is one of the fastest growth stories in technology history.

Not much. After the dramatic consolidation of 2009 to 2014, when many platforms collapsed into the Android-iOS duopoly, the market has been remarkably stable. The Android-iOS split has hovered around 70-to-29 for years, with only small movements. iOS has edged up slightly, but neither platform is displacing the other, and no third platform is emerging. The era of rapid change in mobile operating systems appears to be over.

Sources

StatCounter GlobalStats, IDC and Counterpoint Research - Source for worldwide mobile operating system usage and market-share data.

StatCounter Mobile OS Market Share - Reference for recent worldwide mobile operating system usage share.

Shares are based on mobile web-usage tracking and are in percent. In early 2026, Android led at about 70 percent and Apple iOS at roughly 29 percent, together exceeding 99 percent of the market. Older quarters are reconstructed from documented data, interpolated between well-documented anchor points; figures from Q2 2026 onward are estimates. Usage-based shares differ from shipment-based vendor shares and between trackers, so figures are indicative of scale and trend.

STATISTICS REPORT

macOS version market share worldwide 2018-2026

Updated Jun 17, 2026 · businesstats.com/worldwide-macos-version-market-share

~64%	~84%	Sept 25
TAHOE SHARE	TWO NEWEST	TAHOE LAUNCH

26
VERSION NUMBER

Overview

macOS market share worldwide from 2018 to 2026, by version

How quickly do Mac users adopt each new version of macOS, and how long do older versions linger? This report tracks the market share of each major macOS version worldwide, month by month, from 2018 to 2026, from High Sierra through to the latest release, macOS Tahoe. It is a portrait of a steady, predictable upgrade cycle, one that is slower and more fragmented than the equivalent pattern on the iPhone, reflecting the longer lives and more varied uses of Mac computers. Where iPhones are replaced every few years and updated almost in lockstep, Macs persist for far longer, producing a richer mix of versions in active use at any moment. That diversity is the central fact that shapes everything in this report. It is what sets the Mac apart from the tightly synchronised iPhone. The contrast between the two platforms runs through every chart here. It is the single most important idea for understanding macOS adoption. Everything else in this analysis follows from that one fundamental difference.

The shape of the data is a series of overlapping waves. Each autumn Apple releases a new macOS version, named after a place in California, and over the following year it climbs to become the most used version, while its predecessor recedes. The volumes of Macs running this software are tracked in our Apple Mac sales analysis, though Mac users tend to upgrade more gradually than iPhone owners do.

macOS Version Market Share, 2018-2026 (%)Share of worldwide macOS desktop usage held by each major version, by month.

Data:

macOS major-version market share, worldwide desktop, modelled by BusinessStats.

Note:

StatCounter cannot separate macOS versions since Catalina because of an Apple reporting issue, so this major-version view is modelled on TelemetryDeck data and release timing. Figures are estimates, in percent.Switch views with the toolbar.

As of mid-2026, macOS Tahoe, released in September 2025 with the new Liquid Glass design, is the dominant version, used by a clear majority of Macs. Its predecessor, Sequoia, holds a substantial minority, and a long tail of older versions, Sonoma, Ventura and earlier, accounts for the rest. The two newest versions together cover the large majority of active Macs, but a meaningful slice runs older software. That blend of a dominant newest version and a stubborn older tail is the signature shape of the macOS installed base. No other major platform combines fast majority adoption with so durable a tail. The Mac sits in a category of its own in that respect. Few ecosystems balance currency and longevity so distinctively. The Mac manages to stay modern while honouring older hardware.

An important note on the data. StatCounter, the usual source for version share, cannot correctly separate macOS versions released since Catalina, because Apple reports them all as Catalina, a known measurement issue. This report therefore uses a modelled major-version view, informed by TelemetryDeck data and the timing of each release. The figures are careful estimates of the real adoption pattern, not exact counts. The trends they capture are reliable, even where the precise monthly percentages should be read with appropriate caution. The direction of travel matters far more than any single decimal point. Readers should weigh the overall pattern, not the exact figures. The broad arc is what these estimates capture best. Precise monthly counts are beyond what any model can promise here.

Version Data Table

macOS Versions: Release, Peak Share and Mid-2026 Share

macOS Major Versions: Release Year, California Namesake, Peak Share and Mid-2026 ShareClick any column to sort

VERSION	RELEASED	NAMED AFTER	PEAK SHARE	MID-2026
Tahoe	2025	Lake Tahoe	63.8%	63.8%

Sequoia	2024	Sequoia NP	65.9%	20.5%
Sonoma	2023	Sonoma	65.5%	3.9%
Ventura	2022	Ventura	63.2%	0.9%
Monterey	2021	Monterey	64.5%	0.3%
Big Sur	2020	Big Sur	64.1%	0.1%
Catalina	2019	Catalina Is.	66.6%	0.0%
Mojave	2018	Mojave	60.7%	0.0%
High Sierra	2017	High Sierra	47.7%	0.0%

The table lists the major macOS versions covered, their release year and the California place they are named after, along with the approximate peak share each reached and its share as of mid-2026. The newest versions dominate the recent figures, while older releases have dwindled to small remnants. Sorting the columns shows how each version rose to prominence and then gave way to its successor. Read top to bottom, the table is a roll-call of the California place names Apple has worked through over the years. Each name marks a year in the Mac steady march forward. The list reads almost like a calendar of Apple recent history. Each release marks another step in the platform evolution.

Current Share

Tahoe Takes the Lead

As of mid-2026, the macOS landscape is led decisively by Tahoe, the version released in September 2025. It is used by a clear majority of Macs worldwide, having climbed steadily since its launch. Its arrival brought the Liquid Glass interface, a translucent redesign shared with iOS, and it was notable as the final version of macOS to support Intel-based Macs.

Behind Tahoe sits Sequoia, the previous version, still running on roughly a fifth of Macs as users gradually upgrade. Further back, Sonoma, Ventura and a scattering of older releases make up a long tail. This tail is longer than on the iPhone, reflecting the many older Macs that remain in service, a durability that supports Apple ecosystem revenue tracked in our Apple Mac revenue analysis.

macOS Version Share, Mid-2026 (%)Share of macOS desktop usage by version as of June 2026.

Data:

macOS major-version market share, worldwide desktop, modelled by BusinessStats.

Note:

StatCounter cannot separate macOS versions since Catalina because of an Apple reporting issue, so this major-version view is modelled on TelemetryDeck data and release timing. Figures are estimates, in percent.Switch views with the toolbar.

The current snapshot captures a healthy but unhurried upgrade cycle. A clear majority of Macs run the latest version within a year of its release, a strong adoption rate by industry standards, yet a persistent minority lingers on older software. This balance of rapid majority adoption and a stubborn tail is the defining characteristic of macOS version share, and it underpins the steady ecosystem revenue in our Apple total revenue analysis.

All Versions

The Overlapping Waves

Plotting all the major versions together reveals the overlapping-wave pattern clearly. Each version rises from nothing after its autumn release, peaks as the dominant version within a year or so, then declines as its successor takes over. The lines cross in a regular cadence, one handover each year, tracing the steady annual rhythm of the macOS release cycle, a pattern that mirrors the one in our iOS version share analysis.

What stands out is how each version peaks at a somewhat lower level and is overtaken a little faster in recent years, a sign of gradually quickening adoption. The newest versions, Sequoia and Tahoe, climbed to majority share more briskly than the likes of Mojave or Catalina did, helped by smoother update mechanisms and the free, prominent upgrade prompts Apple now uses. The same machinery that drives fast iPhone adoption is increasingly at work on the Mac, pulling users forward each autumn. The annual cadence has become almost ritualistic in its regularity.

macOS Versions: Share Over Time (%)Share of macOS desktop usage held by each major version, by month.

Data:

macOS major-version market share, worldwide desktop, modelled by BusinessStats.

Note:

StatCounter cannot separate macOS versions since Catalina because of an Apple reporting issue, so this major-version view is modelled on TelemetryDeck data and release timing. Figures are estimates, in percent.Switch views with the toolbar.

The trend lines also show the persistent floor of older versions that never quite disappears. Unlike on the iPhone, where old versions fade close to zero, macOS retains a visible base of older releases, the legacy of long-lived Macs and machines that can no longer upgrade. This fragmentation is modest but real, and distinguishes the Mac from the more uniform iPhone base. The Mac is simply a more varied platform, spanning a decade of hardware in a way the iPhone rarely does. A Mac bought years ago often still runs, just on older software. That durability is a quiet strength, even as it adds fragmentation.

macOS Tahoe

The Current Release

macOS Tahoe, version 26, is the current release and the centrepiece of the recent data. Launched in September 2025, it carried a new naming scheme, jumping from version 15 to 26 to align with the year-based naming Apple adopted across its platforms, matching iOS 26. Its headline feature was Liquid Glass, a translucent interface redesign that gave the Mac its freshest look in years. The redesign generated unusual excitement for a macOS release, helping to pull users onto the new version more quickly than usual. A striking redesign can be a powerful adoption driver in its own right. Tahoe novelty clearly helped speed its uptake. A fresh look gives users a reason to upgrade sooner.

Tahoe adoption followed the familiar macOS curve, climbing steadily through late 2025 and into 2026 to become the most used version by early in the year. By mid-2026 it ran on a clear majority of Macs, a healthy adoption pace that reflected both the appeal of its redesign and the smooth, free upgrade path Apple provides, a strategy that underpins the ecosystem value in our Apple revenue by segment analysis.

macOS Tahoe (26) Adoption (%)Share of macOS desktop usage running Tahoe, by month since launch.

Data:

Derived from the modelled macOS major-version share, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Combined shares, peaks, adoption speeds and snapshots are calculated from the modelled monthly series, in percent of macOS desktop usage.Switch views with the toolbar.

Tahoe also carries historic significance as the last version of macOS to support Intel-based Macs. From the next release onward, macOS will run only on Apple silicon, completing the transition begun in 2020. This makes Tahoe a kind of bridge, the final release to span both the Intel and Apple silicon eras, before the Mac becomes a wholly Apple-chip platform. The long transition that began in 2020 thus reaches its conclusion with the release that follows Tahoe. The Mac will then be, for the first time, a single-architecture platform. That unification promises a simpler, more efficient future for the Mac. The end of Intel support closes a long chapter in the Mac story.

Two Newest Versions

Staying Current

A useful way to gauge fragmentation is to track the combined share of the two newest macOS versions. Across the period, the two most recent releases together have typically accounted for a large majority of active Macs, usually somewhere above eighty percent. This high combined share shows that most Mac users stay reasonably current, running either the latest version or the one before it. For developers and Apple alike, that concentration is a considerable advantage, keeping most users on supported, secure software. A concentrated base is easier to protect and easier to build for. Both Apple and third-party developers benefit from that concentration.

That said, the two-newest share on macOS sits a little below the equivalent figure on the iPhone, where the two latest versions often exceed eighty-five percent. The gap reflects the Mac longer tail of older software, a structural difference between the platforms. Macs simply last longer and upgrade a little more slowly than iPhones, a contrast visible against our iPhone 15 adoption analysis.

Combined Share of the Two Newest macOS Versions (%)Combined share of the two most recent macOS versions, by month.

Data:

Derived from the modelled macOS major-version share, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Combined shares, peaks, adoption speeds and snapshots are calculated from the modelled monthly series, in percent of macOS desktop usage.Switch views with the toolbar.

The combined share of the two newest versions has crept upward over the years, a sign that adoption is gradually accelerating. As Apple has refined its update process and as more Macs run Apple silicon, which

handles updates smoothly, the proportion of users staying current has risen. The Mac is slowly becoming a little more like the iPhone in its upgrade behaviour, though a gap remains. The convergence is real but partial, and the Mac structural differences ensure it will never fully close. Long-lived hardware guarantees a permanent gap between the two platforms. The Mac will always carry more history with it than the iPhone. That is the natural cost of building such durable machines.

Year-End Snapshots

Same Shape, New Names

Taking snapshots at the end of selected years shows how completely the macOS landscape turns over. At the end of 2020, Catalina dominated while Big Sur, just released, was beginning its climb. By the end of 2022 Monterey led with Ventura rising; by the end of 2024 Sonoma led with Sequoia rising; and by mid-2026 Tahoe led with Sequoia receding. Four snapshots, four different leaders, yet the same underlying picture each time, a dominant version flanked by a rising successor and a fading tail. The cast changes every year, but the play is always the same. That predictability is the defining trait of the macOS cycle. It makes the platform unusually easy to forecast and plan around.

Each snapshot looks structurally similar, a dominant version, a rising successor and a tail of older releases, yet the specific versions are entirely different. This regularity is the essence of the macOS cycle: the names and numbers change every year, but the underlying shape of adoption stays remarkably constant, a predictability that few software platforms match. Windows, by contrast, sees versions linger for many years, with no such clean annual handover. Apple control over its ecosystem produces a tidiness Microsoft can only envy.

macOS Version Mix at Selected Dates (%)Share by version at the end of selected years.

Data:

Derived from the modelled macOS major-version share, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Combined shares, peaks, adoption speeds and snapshots are calculated from the modelled monthly series, in percent of macOS desktop usage.Switch views with the toolbar.

Comparing the snapshots also reveals the gradual acceleration of adoption. The leading version commands a slightly larger share in the more recent snapshots, and the tail of very old versions has thinned over time. The macOS base is becoming modestly more current, even as it retains more fragmentation than the tightly

clustered iPhone ecosystem. The Mac is becoming more current, but it remains, and will likely always remain, a more varied platform than the phone. That is a feature of the Mac longevity, not a flaw in its adoption.

Adoption Speed

Reaching a Quarter of Macs

Measuring how quickly each version reaches a quarter of all Macs captures the pace of adoption. In the earlier part of the period, versions like Mojave and Catalina took several months to cross the twenty-five percent mark. More recent versions, Sonoma, Sequoia and Tahoe, reached that threshold noticeably faster, a clear sign of accelerating uptake. The gap between a version release and its rise to prominence has narrowed steadily over the years. Newer versions simply reach critical mass sooner than their predecessors did.

This quickening reflects several factors: smoother and more automated update mechanisms, the prevalence of Apple silicon Macs that update reliably, and Apple increasingly prominent prompts encouraging users to upgrade. Each new release tends to reach majority status a little sooner than its predecessor, a trend that strengthens Apple control over its platform and its security posture. The faster users move to the newest version, the more uniform and defensible the Mac base becomes. Security and consistency both improve as adoption accelerates.

Months for Each macOS Version to Reach 25% ShareTime from release for each version to reach a quarter of macOS usage.

Data:

Derived from the modelled macOS major-version share, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Combined shares, peaks, adoption speeds and snapshots are calculated from the modelled monthly series, in percent of macOS desktop usage.Switch views with the toolbar.

Faster adoption benefits both Apple and its users. It means new features and security fixes reach more Macs more quickly, and it simplifies life for developers, who can target newer software with greater confidence. The accelerating pace is a quiet but meaningful improvement in the health of the Mac platform, narrowing the historic gap with the faster-moving iPhone, and supporting the margins detailed in our Apple net income analysis.

Fragmentation

The Persistent Tail

Tracking the combined share of older versions, those beyond the two most recent, measures the Mac fragmentation directly. This older share has hovered in the mid-to-high teens for much of the period, higher than on the iPhone, and represents the Macs running software two or more generations behind the latest release. It is the clearest single measure of how fragmented the Mac base is. Tracking it over time shows whether the platform is growing more or less uniform.

Several factors sustain this older base. Macs are durable and expensive, so many remain in use for five, seven or even ten years, long after they stop receiving the newest macOS. Some older Macs cannot run the latest versions at all, and some users, particularly in business settings, deliberately defer upgrades for stability, a caution echoed across the enterprise market. In managed environments, IT departments often hold back updates until they have tested them thoroughly.

Combined Share of Older macOS Versions (%)Combined share of versions beyond the two most recent, by month.

Data:

Derived from the modelled macOS major-version share, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Combined shares, peaks, adoption speeds and snapshots are calculated from the modelled monthly series, in percent of macOS desktop usage.Switch views with the toolbar.

The older share has slowly declined over the years as adoption has quickened and as more of the installed base has shifted to Apple silicon. But it has not vanished, and it is unlikely to. A persistent tail of older macOS versions is a structural feature of the Mac, the price of long-lived hardware, and a clear point of difference from the more uniform world of the iPhone in our Apple iPhone revenue analysis.

Peak Share

How High Each Version Climbed

Comparing the peak share each version reached shows how dominant each release became at its height. Most major versions climbed to somewhere around half to two-thirds of all Macs at their peak, before their

successor pulled them down. The peaks have risen gradually over time, with the most recent versions reaching higher pinnacles than the earlier ones. The ceiling on any single version share has risen as adoption has quickened.

The rising peaks reflect the same accelerating adoption seen elsewhere in the data. As each version reaches majority faster and climbs higher, it signals a Mac base that is increasingly willing and able to stay current. The trend mirrors, at a slower pace, the very high peaks seen on the iPhone, where the newest version routinely commands a commanding majority. The Mac is climbing toward that pattern, even if it has not yet reached it.

Peak Share Reached by Each macOS Version (%)The highest share each major version reached at its peak.

Data:

Derived from the modelled macOS major-version share, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Combined shares, peaks, adoption speeds and snapshots are calculated from the modelled monthly series, in percent of macOS desktop usage.Switch views with the toolbar.

No macOS version, however, has reached the towering peaks common on the iPhone, where a single version can exceed eighty percent. The Mac more fragmented base, with its persistent tail of older releases, caps how high any single version can climb. This structural ceiling is a defining feature of macOS adoption, and a lasting contrast with the iPhone tighter ecosystem detailed in our smartphone vendor share analysis.

Version Lifecycles

A Consistent Curve

Overlaying the lifecycle of each version, aligned to its months since release, reveals a strikingly consistent adoption curve. Each version rises steeply in its first few months, reaches its peak around the time its successor launches, then declines along a similar path. The curves are near-replicas of one another, a testament to the regularity of the macOS cycle. Each version walks almost the same path as the one before it, just shifted forward by a year.

The consistency of these lifecycle curves is what makes macOS adoption so predictable. Knowing how past versions behaved allows a confident forecast of how the current version will rise and fall. The newer

curves are slightly steeper, reflecting the gradual acceleration of adoption, but the overall shape has held remarkably steady across nearly a decade of releases. That stability makes the macOS cycle one of the most forecastable in all of consumer software.

macOS Version Lifecycles, by Months Since Release (%)Share over time for recent versions, aligned to months since each release.

Data:

Derived from the modelled macOS major-version share, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Combined shares, peaks, adoption speeds and snapshots are calculated from the modelled monthly series, in percent of macOS desktop usage.Switch views with the toolbar.

These lifecycle patterns ultimately reflect Apple control over its ecosystem. By providing free annual upgrades, prominent prompts and smooth update mechanisms, Apple has engineered an adoption curve that is the envy of the wider computing industry, where upgrades are often slow and fragmented, a coherence that supports the company overall strength in our big tech revenue comparison analysis.

TahoeMid-2026 LeaderClear majority. ~84%Two NewestOf all Macs. Sept '25Tahoe LaunchLiquid Glass. IntelLast SupportTahoe ends it.

Across nearly a decade, macOS version share has told a story of steady, predictable renewal. Each autumn a new version arrives, climbs to dominance within a year, and gives way to its successor, in a cycle so regular that the only thing that changes is the name. The latest chapter belongs to Tahoe, which by mid-2026 commands a clear majority, carrying the new Liquid Glass design and marking the end of Intel support on the Mac. It is a fitting capstone to a transition that reshaped the Mac over half a decade.

Beneath the regularity lies a quiet trend toward faster adoption and a slowly shrinking, but stubbornly persistent, tail of older versions. The Mac remains more fragmented than the iPhone, the natural result of long-lived hardware and varied uses, yet it grows a little more current with each passing year. The macOS upgrade cycle stands as one of the most orderly in computing, a model of how a platform can renew itself year after year, a coherence that supports the company standing in our biggest companies by market value analysis.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: macOS Version Share

As of mid-2026, macOS Tahoe, released in September 2025, is the most popular version, running on a clear majority of Macs worldwide. Its predecessor, Sequoia, holds roughly a fifth, with Sonoma, Ventura and older versions making up a long tail of the remainder.

Mac users update fairly quickly but more slowly than iPhone users. A new macOS version typically reaches a majority of Macs within about a year of release. However, macOS has a longer tail of older versions than iOS, reflecting the longer lifespan of Mac hardware and the deferral of upgrades in business settings.

It is a careful estimate, not an exact count. StatCounter, the usual source for version share, cannot correctly separate macOS versions released since Catalina, because Apple reports them all as Catalina, a known measurement issue. This report therefore uses a modelled major-version view informed by TelemetryDeck data and release timing.

macOS Tahoe is version 26 of macOS, released in September 2025. It introduced the Liquid Glass interface, a translucent redesign shared with iOS 26, and adopted a year-based naming scheme, jumping from version 15 to 26. Tahoe is also notable as the final version of macOS to support Intel-based Macs.

Macs last much longer than iPhones, often remaining in use for five to ten years, so more of them run older software. Some older Macs cannot install the latest macOS at all, and business users often defer upgrades for stability. As a result, macOS has a larger tail of older versions than the more uniform iPhone base.

Apple adopted a year-based naming scheme across its platforms in 2025, naming versions after the upcoming year rather than using sequential numbers. So macOS went from version 15, Sequoia, to version 26, Tahoe, aligning it with iOS 26 and Apple other operating systems for consistency.

macOS Big Sur, released in 2020 as version 11, was the first to support Apple silicon Macs, marking the jump from the long-running version 10 series. macOS Tahoe in 2025 is the final version to support Intel Macs, so the next release will run only on Apple silicon, completing the transition.

Since 2013, macOS versions have been named after notable places in California, including Mojave, Catalina, Big Sur, Monterey, Ventura, Sonoma, Sequoia and Tahoe. The naming replaced the earlier big-cat theme, such as Mavericks and Yosemite reflecting California landmarks rather than animals.

A clear majority of Macs typically run the latest macOS version within a year of its release. As of mid-2026, macOS Tahoe ran on well over half of active Macs, while the two newest versions combined accounted for a large majority, somewhere above eighty percent of the Mac base.

Yes, gradually. Recent macOS versions have reached majority status faster than older ones, helped by smoother update mechanisms, the spread of Apple silicon Macs that update reliably, and more prominent upgrade prompts. The tail of older versions has slowly thinned, though it remains larger than on the iPhone.

Sources

TelemetryDeck macOS Version Survey - Source for macOS version adoption signals used to inform the model.

StatCounter Global Stats and Apple release records - Used for overall macOS share and version release timing.

macOS version shares are modelled, in percent of macOS desktop usage. StatCounter cannot separate macOS versions since Catalina, because Apple reports them all as Catalina, a known measurement issue, so this major-version view is modelled on TelemetryDeck data and the timing of each release. The figures are careful estimates of the real adoption pattern, not exact counts. Not investment advice.

STATISTICS REPORT

iPhone 16 adoption rate worldwide monthly 2024-2026, by model

Updated Jun 17, 2026 · businesstats.com/iphone-16-adoption-rate-by-model-worldwide

#1 IPHONE 16 (2025)	~4% OF ALL PHONES	16e SLEEPER HIT
~50% PRO TIER EARLY	5 of 10 TOP PHONES IPHONE	

Overview

iPhone 16 adoption rate worldwide from September 2024 to June 2026, by model

The iPhone 16 generation, launched in September 2024, will be remembered for a quiet revolution: it was the year the ordinary iPhone reclaimed the crown. After years in which the largest, most expensive Pro Max model topped the charts, the standard iPhone 16 became the best-selling smartphone in the world, holding that title across multiple quarters of 2025. This report tracks the adoption of each iPhone 16 model worldwide, month by month, from September 2024 to June 2026, charting how the lineup mix shifted over the generation full life. Few lineups have changed their internal order so completely from launch to maturity. The iPhone 16 is a textbook case of how a generation evolves over time. The shape it traced would soon repeat with the iPhone 17. The iPhone 16 set the playbook its successor would follow. That continuity made the iPhone 16 a pivotal generation for Apple. It marked the moment value moved firmly to the centre of the iPhone story.

It is a story of two halves. In the launch months of late 2024, the Pro Max and Pro led, as premium models usually do when enthusiasts buy first. But through 2025 the affordable iPhone 16 surged to the top and stayed there, a pattern Apple repeated with the next generation, detailed in our iPhone 17 adoption by model analysis. The standard model had finally closed the gap with its Pro siblings on features and value.

iPhone 16 Lineup Model Mix, Sep 2024 - Jun 2026 (%)Share of the iPhone 16 generation held by each model, by month.

Data:

iPhone 16 lineup model mix, compiled by BusinessStats from industry reporting.

Note:

Model-level monthly shares are modelled on published rankings and demand signals from Counterpoint Research and supply-chain reports; they are estimates, not exact figures. Shares are of the iPhone 16 generation, in percent.Switch views with the toolbar.

Two supporting characters shaped the generation. The iPhone 16 Plus continued the sorry tradition of the fourth model that never catches on, languishing in last place throughout, so unloved that Apple replaced it entirely the following year. The iPhone 16e, a new lower-cost model launched in February 2025, did the opposite, quietly climbing the charts to become a genuine sleeper hit in the budget tier. Its success caught many critics, who had written it off at launch, by surprise. The 16e quietly proved that a well-judged budget phone still has a place. Apple had found a new way to reach price-conscious buyers. That reach widened Apple appeal without touching its premium image. It was a rare case of expanding reach and protecting prestige at once.

A note on the data is important. Apple does not publish a monthly breakdown by model, so the figures here are modelled on published rankings and demand signals from Counterpoint Research and supply-chain reports. They capture the well documented shape of the generation, even where exact monthly values are estimates. The software these devices run is tracked in our iOS version share analysis, and the volumes behind them in our shipment data.

Model Data Table

iPhone 16 Models: Launch, Start and June 2026 Share

iPhone 16 Models: Launch, Share at Launch, June 2026 Share and ChangeClick any column to sort

MODEL	LAUNCHED	SEP 2024	JUNE 2026	CHANGE
iPhone 16	Sep 2024	28.0%	44.6%	+16.6 pts
iPhone 16 Pro Max	Sep 2024	31.0%	4.0%	-27.0 pts
iPhone 16 Pro	Sep 2024	27.0%	4.0%	-23.0 pts
iPhone 16 Plus	Sep 2024	14.0%	9.9%	-4.1 pts

iPhone 16e	Feb 2025	0.0%	37.6%	+37.6 pts

The table lists the five iPhone 16 models, their launch, and their share of the generation at the start of the period and as of June 2026, along with the change between the two. The standard iPhone 16 and the new iPhone 16e show the largest gains, while the Pro and Pro Max fade as they are discontinued after the iPhone 17 arrives. The iPhone 16 Plus stays small throughout. Sorting the columns shows how the generation shifted from a premium-led launch to a value-led afterlife. The table reads almost like a relay, with the lead passing from the Pro models to the standard one. By the end, the cheapest models carried the generation almost alone. Volume migrated downmarket exactly as Apple lineup strategy intends. The range quietly steered buyers exactly where Apple wanted them. Lineup design, as ever, did much of the selling.

Current Mix

A Budget Afterlife

As of June 2026, well after the iPhone 17 launch, the iPhone 16 generation lives on as a budget proposition, and its mix reflects that. The standard iPhone 16 holds the largest share, now joined closely by the iPhone 16e, as these two affordable models continue to sell long after the Pro versions were discontinued. The Pro and Pro Max, which led at launch, have dwindled to small remainders, while the Plus clings to a thin slice.

This is the natural endgame for an iPhone generation. Once a newer lineup arrives, Apple typically discontinues the prior Pro models and keeps the standard and budget versions on sale at lower prices, so the older generation becomes an entry point to the ecosystem. That strategy keeps drawing in price-sensitive buyers, supporting the services and ecosystem revenue explored in our iPhone share of Apple revenue analysis.

iPhone 16 Lineup Model Mix, June 2026 (%)Share of the iPhone 16 generation held by each model as of June 2026.

Data:

iPhone 16 lineup model mix, compiled by BusinessStats from industry reporting.

Note:

Model-level monthly shares are modelled on published rankings and demand signals from Counterpoint Research and supply-chain reports; they are estimates, not exact figures. Shares are of the iPhone 16 generation, in percent.Switch views with the toolbar.

The current mix, dominated by the standard iPhone 16 and the iPhone 16e, shows how Apple now uses older generations to cover the affordable end of its range. Rather than a single cheap model, it offers a ladder of older iPhones at descending prices, with the iPhone 16 and 16e doing that job in 2026. The Pro models, having served their premium purpose at launch, simply leave the stage. It is a tidy, predictable end to a familiar product cycle. Apple has refined this downmarket handoff over many generations.

All Five Models

The Lineup Over Time

Plotting all five models together reveals the full drama of the generation. The Pro Max and Pro start high and decline steadily, falling away sharply once the iPhone 17 arrives and they are discontinued. The standard iPhone 16 rises and holds, the iPhone 16e climbs from nothing into a major share, and the Plus flatlines near the bottom throughout. The crossing lines map a generation that began premium and ended affordable.

The most important crossing comes early, when the standard iPhone 16 overtakes the Pro Max to lead the lineup, a reversal that made headlines as the regular iPhone returned to the top of the global charts. This shift toward value was not unique to Apple; it reflected a wider market mood visible across vendors in our smartphone market share by vendor analysis, where affordability increasingly drives sales.

iPhone 16 Models: Share Over Time (%)Share of the generation held by each iPhone 16 model, by month.

Data:

iPhone 16 lineup model mix, compiled by BusinessStats from industry reporting.

Note:

Model-level monthly shares are modelled on published rankings and demand signals from Counterpoint Research and supply-chain reports; they are estimates, not exact figures. Shares are of the iPhone 16 generation, in percent.Switch views with the toolbar.

Later, a second story unfolds in the lower half of the chart: the rise of the iPhone 16e and the slow fade of everything Pro. By 2026 the lineup that began as a contest between premium flagships had become a duel between two affordable models, the standard iPhone 16 and the 16e. It is a vivid illustration of how an iPhone generation evolves from launch flagship to budget workhorse. The same phones that once led the premium tier end up anchoring the entry level. What launches as a flagship finishes as an affordable workhorse.

The Standard Champion

iPhone 16 Reclaims the Crown

The standard iPhone 16 is the defining success of the generation, and a landmark for Apple. In the first quarter of 2025 it became the best-selling smartphone in the world, the first time in two years that the regular iPhone, rather than a Pro or Pro Max, had topped the global charts. It held that position through subsequent quarters, finishing 2025 as the world best-selling smartphone overall. No single model from any rival came close to it over the year. The standard iPhone 16 simply outsold everything else on the planet.

Its success came down to value. Apple narrowed the gap between the standard and Pro models, giving the iPhone 16 a fast A18 chip, the Action button and the new Camera Control, while keeping its price well below the Pro line. A subtle design refresh after several near-identical generations also helped. The result drew a wave of upgraders, lifting the shipment totals tracked in our Apple smartphone shipments analysis.

Standard iPhone 16 Share of the Generation (%)Share of the iPhone 16 generation held by the standard iPhone 16, by month.

Data:

Derived from the iPhone 16 lineup model mix, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Combined shares, changes and rankings are calculated from the modelled model-mix series, in percent of the iPhone 16 generation.Switch views with the toolbar.

The rise of the standard iPhone 16 to the top of the world charts marked a genuine shift in buyer behaviour. For years the assumption had been that Apple biggest, priciest model would always lead; the iPhone 16 proved that a well-judged mainstream phone could win outright. It set the template that the standard iPhone 17 would follow the next year, cementing the affordable flagship as Apple new volume champion. The lesson would echo through Apple lineup decisions for years. The base model had become the heart of the range.

The Sleeper Hit

iPhone 16e Climbs the Charts

The iPhone 16e is the generation surprise success. Launched in February 2025 as a lower-cost model replacing the ageing iPhone SE, it was initially doubted by critics who felt it was priced too high. Buyers disagreed. In its first full month it landed sixth on the global best-seller list, and by the third quarter of 2025 it had climbed to become one of the best-selling smartphones in the world. For a budget model launched mid-cycle, that was a remarkable climb. The 16e outperformed the ageing SE it replaced from the very start. The 16e gave the entry tier a much-needed modern refresh. Buyers in emerging markets responded with real enthusiasm. Affordability and modern features proved a potent combination.

Its appeal lay in offering modern features, a current design, a fast chip and a familiar experience, at a price well below the flagship models. For huge numbers of buyers in price-sensitive markets, the 16e hit a sweet spot the old iPhone SE never reached. Its strength reshaped the affordable end of Apple range, with implications for the company average prices explored in our Apple revenue by segment analysis.

iPhone 16e Share of the Generation (%)Share of the iPhone 16 generation held by the iPhone 16e, by month.

Data:

Derived from the iPhone 16 lineup model mix, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Combined shares, changes and rankings are calculated from the modelled model-mix series, in percent of the iPhone 16 generation.Switch views with the toolbar.

The iPhone 16e success matters strategically. It showed that Apple could compete more effectively in the mid-range without cannibalising its flagships, expanding the brand reach to new buyers. As the Pro models faded after the iPhone 17 launch, the 16e increasingly shared the budget stage with the standard iPhone 16, the two of them carrying the generation through its long, affordable afterlife into 2026. Together they kept the iPhone 16 name relevant long after its flagship moment. An older generation rarely stays this visible for so long.

The Crossover

When the Standard Model Overtook the Pro Max

The defining moment of the generation was the crossover, when the standard iPhone 16 overtook the iPhone 16 Pro Max to become the best-selling model. At launch in late 2024 the Pro Max led, as the most expensive model often does when early adopters buy first. But that lead proved temporary, and within a couple of quarters the standard model had pulled decisively ahead. The early Pro Max lead proved to be a sprint, not a marathon. Enthusiast demand faded while mainstream demand endured. The broad market, not early adopters, decided the generation. Their verdict, delivered over many months, was emphatic. Buyers rarely speak so clearly about a single product.

By the first quarter of 2025 the reversal was complete and widely reported. Counterpoint Research confirmed the standard iPhone 16 as the world best-selling smartphone, with the Pro Max and Pro following in second and third. It was the first time in two years the base model had led, a shift that rippled into Apple overall revenue picture in our Apple total revenue analysis.

iPhone 16 vs iPhone 16 Pro Max Share (%)Share of the generation held by the standard iPhone 16 and the Pro Max, by month.

Data:

iPhone 16 lineup model mix, compiled by BusinessStats from industry reporting.

Note:

Model-level monthly shares are modelled on published rankings and demand signals from Counterpoint Research and supply-chain reports; they are estimates, not exact figures. Shares are of the iPhone 16 generation, in percent.Switch views with the toolbar.

The crossover mattered because it inverted years of received wisdom. Apple had trained the market to expect the Pro Max on top, yet the iPhone 16 won on value and a narrowed feature gap. The pattern would repeat with the iPhone 17, suggesting a lasting change in how buyers choose, gravitating to the standard model when it offers most of the Pro experience for less. Value, not size, increasingly decides which iPhone tops the charts. The Pro Max no longer has an automatic claim to the crown.

Pro vs Standard Tier

The Value Balance Tips

Grouping the lineup into the premium Pro tier, the Pro and Pro Max together, against the standard tier of the iPhone 16, Plus and 16e, shows how the generation value balance shifted dramatically over time. At launch the premium pair held a commanding share, as enthusiasts rushed to the newest flagships and the Pro line reportedly accounted for around half of all iPhone sales. At launch, the premium tier was unmistakably the centre of the lineup. Only later did the balance swing decisively toward value.

Then the balance tipped. As the standard iPhone 16 surged and the 16e arrived, the affordable tier gained ground, and once the iPhone 17 launched and the Pro models were discontinued, the premium tier collapsed within the generation. The drift toward cheaper models has real consequences for margins, a dynamic that feeds the profit picture in our Apple net income analysis.

iPhone 16 Premium Tier vs Standard Tier Share (%)Combined share of the Pro and Pro Max versus the standard, Plus and 16e, by month.

Data:

Derived from the iPhone 16 lineup model mix, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Combined shares, changes and rankings are calculated from the modelled model-mix series, in percent of the iPhone 16 generation.Switch views with the toolbar.

The arc of the tier balance captures the whole generation in one view: a premium-led launch giving way to a value-led maturity and a budget-only afterlife. It is the natural life cycle of an iPhone generation, compressed into a clear shift from Pro dominance to standard and entry-level dominance as the months pass and a newer lineup takes over the premium tier.

Winners and Losers

Share Change Over the Generation

Measuring how each model share changed between launch and June 2026 distils the generation into winners and losers. The iPhone 16e posts the largest gain, rising from nothing to a major share, followed by the standard iPhone 16. The Pro Max and Pro post the steepest declines, as they are discontinued after the iPhone 17 arrives, while the Plus drifts modestly lower from an already weak base. The fourth model started small and only grew smaller. Its decline was the one entirely predictable story of the generation.

These shifts are not merely cosmetic; they reshape the economics of the generation over its life. The growth of the cheaper standard and entry-level models, alongside the disappearance of the high-margin Pro versions, tilts the generation increasingly toward volume over value, a balance that informs the broader market revenue picture in our worldwide smartphone market revenue analysis.

iPhone 16 Models: Share Change, Launch to June 2026 (points)Change in each model share of the generation between launch and June 2026.

Data:

Derived from the iPhone 16 lineup model mix, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Combined shares, changes and rankings are calculated from the modelled model-mix series, in percent of the iPhone 16 generation.Switch views with the toolbar.

The pattern of change also reflects the natural rhythm of an Apple lineup. Pro models are built to sell hard at launch and then cede the stage; standard and budget models are built to sell steadily for years. The iPhone 16 generation followed that script almost perfectly, with the added twist of an unusually successful new entry-level model in the 16e. That budget hit was the generation genuine surprise.

Against the World

Each Model on the Global Stage

Set against the entire global smartphone market, the standard iPhone 16 achievement stands out. At its peak it accounted for around four percent of all smartphones sold worldwide, more than any other single model from any maker, an extraordinary concentration for one phone. The Pro Max and Pro followed at meaningful but smaller shares, with the 16e and Plus lower still. Even Apple weaker models sat within reach of the global top ten.

That a single model can capture around four percent of the entire global market underlines Apple unique position at the top of the rankings. In Q1 2025, five of the ten best-selling smartphones in the world were iPhones, a dominance of the charts that no rival can match, and one that reflects the company overall scale in our global smartphone shipments analysis.

iPhone 16 Models: Peak Share of All Global Smartphones (%)Each iPhone 16 model peak share of total worldwide smartphone sales.

Data:

Derived from the iPhone 16 lineup model mix, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Combined shares, changes and rankings are calculated from the modelled model-mix series, in percent of the iPhone 16 generation.Switch views with the toolbar.

The iPhone 16e place in the global rankings is notable for a budget model. Reaching the upper ranks of the worldwide best-seller list within months of launch confirmed that Apple affordable strategy was working, broadening its reach without surrendering the premium tier to rivals. The iPhone 16 Plus, by contrast, never registered strongly, confirming its status as the lineup weak link. No amount of marketing could make the Plus matter to buyers.

Model Ranking

The Order That Emerged

Ranking the five models by their average share across the period confirms the order that emerged: the standard iPhone 16 first, reflecting its long spell at the top, followed by the Pro Max and Pro from their strong launch period, then the fast-rising iPhone 16e, with the iPhone 16 Plus a clear last. The order captures both the launch hierarchy and the later value-led shift. It is the whole generation arc compressed into a single ranking.

The ranking tells the generation story in miniature: a triumphant standard model, a strong but fading Pro pair, a surprising entry-level hit, and a perennial laggard in the Plus. It is a cleaner hierarchy than the raw monthly data might suggest, because the models occupied such different roles, premium launch sellers versus durable affordable options, across the generation life, a split that shaped the revenue tracked in our iPhone revenue analysis.

iPhone 16 Models by Average Share of the Generation (%)Average share of the generation held by each model across the period.

Data:

Derived from the iPhone 16 lineup model mix, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Combined shares, changes and rankings are calculated from the modelled model-mix series, in percent of the iPhone 16 generation.Switch views with the toolbar.

For Apple, the ranking is largely encouraging. A runaway standard model, a solid premium launch, and a successful new budget entry more than offset the familiar disappointment of the Plus. The main lesson, that the fourth flagship model never works while a well-judged cheaper model can thrive, would directly shape Apple decisions for the following iPhone 17 generation. Apple clearly learned from both the wins and the one persistent failure.

#1iPhone 16World best-seller 2025. ~4%Of All PhonesStandard model, peak. SleeperiPhone 16eSurprise budget hit. LastiPhone 16 PlusReplaced by the Air.

Across nearly two years, the iPhone 16 generation told a clear and consequential story: the standard model reclaimed the global crown, the new iPhone 16e proved a surprise hit, the Pro models sold hard at launch and then bowed out, and the iPhone 16 Plus confirmed once more that the fourth flagship never catches on. The mix shifted steadily from a premium-led launch to a value-led afterlife, a life cycle that now defines how Apple generations age.

The generation lessons proved lasting. The triumph of the affordable standard model and the success of the 16e reshaped Apple thinking, encouraging it to lean into value at the heart of its range, while the failure of the Plus led directly to its replacement by the thin iPhone Air in the next generation. As the iPhone 16 settles into its long budget afterlife, it stands as the generation that proved the ordinary iPhone could once again rule the world.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: iPhone 16 Adoption

The standard iPhone 16 sold the best. In 2025 it became the best-selling smartphone in the world, according to Counterpoint Research, topping the global charts across multiple quarters. It was the first time in two years that a base iPhone, rather than a Pro or Pro Max, had led worldwide smartphone sales.

Yes. Despite early doubts about its price, the iPhone 16e, launched in February 2025 to replace the iPhone SE, became a surprise hit. In its first full month it landed sixth on the global best-seller list, and by the third quarter of 2025 it had climbed into the upper ranks, outperforming the old SE.

The iPhone 16 Plus continued a long pattern of the fourth main iPhone model failing to catch on. Buyers who wanted a larger phone tended to choose the Pro Max, while value buyers chose the standard model,

leaving the Plus without a clear audience. Apple replaced it with the thin iPhone Air in the iPhone 17 generation.

The standard iPhone 16 became the world best-selling smartphone in the first quarter of 2025, according to Counterpoint Research, and held the top spot through later quarters, finishing 2025 as the best-selling smartphone overall. At launch in late 2024, the Pro Max and Pro had led the lineup first.

Apple does not publish a monthly breakdown by model, so the figures here are modelled on published rankings and demand signals from Counterpoint Research and supply-chain reports. The overall shape, with the standard model leading, the 16e rising and the Pro models fading after the iPhone 17 launch, reflects well-documented reporting, though individual monthly values are estimates.

Apple narrowed the gap between its standard and Pro models, giving the iPhone 16 a fast A18 chip, the Action button and the new Camera Control, while keeping its price well below the Pro line. Combined with a design refresh and strong demand from upgraders, this made it the world best-selling smartphone in 2025.

After the iPhone 17 launched in September 2025, Apple discontinued the iPhone 16 Pro and Pro Max, as it typically does with prior-generation premium models. The standard iPhone 16, the iPhone 16e and the Plus continued on sale at lower prices, turning the generation into an affordable entry point to the iPhone range.

It depends on the measure. The single best-selling model was the standard iPhone 16, but the Pro line as a whole, the Pro and Pro Max combined, accounted for around half of Apple iPhone sales early in the generation. So while the base model was the top individual seller, the premium tier remained collectively very large.

Both generations saw the standard model become the world best-selling smartphone, confirming a lasting shift toward value. The main difference was at the fourth slot: the iPhone 16 had the weak Plus, which Apple replaced with the thin iPhone Air in the iPhone 17 generation, though the Air also struggled to find buyers.

At its peak, the standard iPhone 16 accounted for around four percent of all smartphones sold worldwide, the highest of any single model. In the first quarter of 2025, five of the ten best-selling smartphones in the world were iPhones, underlining Apple dominance of the top of the global rankings.

Sources

Counterpoint Research - Source for best-selling smartphone model rankings and global model share.

Counterpoint Global Handset Model Sales Tracker and supply-chain reporting - Used for iPhone 16 model rankings, the iPhone 16e launch and Pro discontinuation.

iPhone 16 model mix is modelled from published demand signals, in percent of the generation. Apple does not disclose a monthly model breakdown, so figures are estimates anchored to Counterpoint Research rankings and supply-chain reports. The standard iPhone 16 was reported as the world best-selling smartphone in 2025; the iPhone 16e was a budget hit and the Pro models were discontinued after the iPhone 17 launch. Not investment advice.

STATISTICS REPORT

iPhone 17 and iPhone Air adoption rate worldwide monthly 2025-2026, by model

Updated Jun 16, 2026 · businesstats.com/iphone-17-and-air-adoption-rate-by-model

#1 IPHONE 17	~6% OF ALL PHONES	-80% AIR PRODUCTION
~5% AIR SHARE	~28% PRO MAX SHARE	~25% PRO SHARE

Overview

iPhone 17 and iPhone Air adoption rate worldwide from October 2025 to June 2026, by model

Every autumn Apple launches a new iPhone lineup, and the way buyers split across its models tells a story about taste, pricing and ambition. The iPhone 17 generation, launched in September 2025, produced one of the most lopsided model races in years: a runaway hit at the affordable end, a steady premium core, and a bold new ultra-thin model that fell flat. This report tracks the adoption of each iPhone 17 model worldwide, month by month, from October 2025 to June 2026, showing how the mix shifted as the generation matured. Few recent lineups have seen their internal order rearrange so completely in so short a time. The reshuffling makes the iPhone 17 one of the more revealing lineups Apple has shipped. It offered a rare, real-time look at how buyers weigh price against features. Few product cycles offer such a clear natural experiment. Apple effectively ran four pricing bets at once and watched the market choose. The data that emerged is a small masterclass in consumer behaviour.

The headline is the triumph of the standard iPhone 17. Within months it had become the best-selling smartphone in the world, a position confirmed by Counterpoint Research for early 2026, when it alone accounted for roughly six percent of all global smartphone sales. The devices behind these figures all run Apple latest software, charted in our iOS version share analysis, where the iPhone 17 generation drove Apple to a record shipment year.

iPhone 17 Lineup Model Mix, Oct 2025 - Jun 2026 (%)Share of the iPhone 17 generation held by each model, by month.

Data:

iPhone 17 lineup model mix, compiled by BusinessStats from industry reporting.

Note:

Model-level monthly shares are modelled on published demand signals from Counterpoint Research, Morgan Stanley and supply-chain reports; they are estimates, not exact figures. Shares are of the iPhone 17 generation, in percent.Switch views with the toolbar.

The other defining story is the iPhone Air. Apple replaced the unloved Plus model with a strikingly thin new design, betting that buyers would pay for elegance. They largely did not. Within weeks of launch, reports of weak demand prompted Apple to slash Air production dramatically, and the model settled into a small niche share. It was the rare misstep in an otherwise triumphant lineup, and a reminder that even Apple cannot manufacture demand for a concept buyers do not want. The Air became the clearest cautionary note in an otherwise victorious year. Its struggles stood out all the more against the success around it. The contrast turned a modest product into a widely discussed cautionary tale. Its name became shorthand for over-reaching on design. The lesson for Apple was pointed and hard to ignore.

A note on the data is important. Apple does not publish a monthly model-by-model breakdown, so the figures here are modelled on published demand signals from Counterpoint Research, Morgan Stanley and supply-chain reports. They capture the well documented shape of the generation, the standard model surging, the Air fading, the Pro models holding firm, even where exact monthly values are estimates. The revenue these models generate appears in our Apple iPhone revenue analysis.

Model Data Table

iPhone 17 Models: Launch, Start and June 2026 Share

iPhone 17 Models: Launch, Share at Launch, June 2026 Share and ChangeClick any column to sort

MODEL	LAUNCHED	OCT 2025	JUNE 2026	CHANGE
iPhone 17	Sep 2025	28.0%	42.0%	+14.0 pts
iPhone 17 Pro Max	Sep 2025	36.0%	28.0%	-8.0 pts

iPhone 17 Pro	Sep 2025	26.0%	25.0%	-1.0 pts
iPhone Air	Sep 2025	10.0%	5.0%	-5.0 pts

The table lists the four iPhone 17 models, their launch, and their share of the generation at the start of the period and as of June 2026, along with the change between the two. The standard iPhone 17 shows the largest gain, climbing into a clear lead, while the iPhone Air shows the steepest decline from an already modest base. The Pro and Pro Max hold steadier, premium positions. Sorting the columns shows at a glance which models rose and which faded over the generation first nine months. The spread between best and worst performer is unusually wide for a single lineup. Most generations cluster more tightly; this one fanned out dramatically. The result was a lineup of clear winners and one clear loser. That separation made the generation unusually easy to read.

Current Mix

Where the Lineup Stands

As of June 2026, the iPhone 17 generation is led decisively by the standard model. The base iPhone 17 holds the largest share of the lineup, having overtaken the Pro Max that led at launch, while the Pro Max sits in a clear second place and the iPhone 17 Pro holds a steady third. The iPhone Air trails far behind, its share reduced to a small fraction of the generation after its early stumble. The four models now sit in a clear, well-separated order. There is little ambiguity left about which model buyers preferred. The standard iPhone 17 settled the question early and never looked back. Its dominance only grew firmer as the months passed.

This distribution marks a notable shift from the launch period, when the Pro Max was the single most popular model. Over the following months the centre of gravity moved toward the affordable standard iPhone, a pattern that has implications for Apple average selling prices and margins, explored in our iPhone share of Apple revenue analysis, where the mix of models shapes how much each generation earns.

iPhone 17 Lineup Model Mix, June 2026 (%)Share of the iPhone 17 generation held by each model as of June 2026.

Data:

iPhone 17 lineup model mix, compiled by BusinessStats from industry reporting.

Note:

Model-level monthly shares are modelled on published demand signals from Counterpoint Research, Morgan Stanley and supply-chain reports; they are estimates, not exact figures. Shares are of the iPhone 17 generation, in percent.Switch views with the toolbar.

The current mix is, in many ways, a healthy one for Apple in volume terms, even if a tilt toward the cheaper model slightly pressures margins. A dominant, affordable hero model brings in large numbers of upgraders, while the Pro line keeps the premium tier strong. Only the iPhone Air sits awkwardly, a high-concept product that never found the audience Apple hoped for, now a minor footnote in an otherwise successful generation.

All Four Models

The Lineup Over Time

Plotting all four models together over time reveals the dynamics of the generation at a glance. The standard iPhone 17 rises steadily from launch, the Pro Max drifts down from an early peak, the Pro holds a remarkably flat line, and the Air sinks from a modest start to a thin sliver. The crossing lines tell the story of a lineup whose centre of gravity moved toward the affordable end as the months passed. The chart reads almost like a relay, with the lead passing from the Pro Max to the standard model. By the end of the period the handover was complete and decisive. What began as a close race ended as a comfortable lead.

The most striking feature is how quickly the standard model pulled ahead. In a single generation, Apple cheapest flagship went from trailing the Pro Max to leading the entire lineup, a reversal of the usual pattern in which the largest, most expensive model dominates. This shift mirrors a broader move in the smartphone market toward value, visible across vendors in our smartphone market share by vendor analysis.

iPhone 17 Models: Share Over Time (%)Share of the generation held by each iPhone 17 model, by month.

Data:

iPhone 17 lineup model mix, compiled by BusinessStats from industry reporting.

Note:

Model-level monthly shares are modelled on published demand signals from Counterpoint Research, Morgan Stanley and supply-chain reports; they are estimates, not exact figures. Shares are of the iPhone 17 generation, in percent.Switch views with the toolbar.

The flat line of the iPhone 17 Pro is its own kind of story. Unlike the volatile standard model and the sinking Air, the Pro held a stable share throughout, suggesting a loyal core of buyers who want premium features without the largest size or price. That steadiness makes the Pro a dependable pillar of the lineup, even as attention focused on the standard model rise and the Air collapse. Steadiness, in a volatile lineup, turned out to be its own kind of success. The Pro quietly did its job while louder stories played out around it. Its steadiness was easy to overlook but important to Apple bottom line.

The Standard Hero

iPhone 17 Climbs to the Top

The standard iPhone 17 is the defining success of the generation. Launched as the most affordable model in the main lineup, it struck a chord with buyers, offering most of what people wanted at a lower price than the Pro models. Its share of the generation climbed steadily from launch, and by early 2026 it had become the best-selling individual smartphone in the entire world, a remarkable achievement for a non-Pro model.

Several factors drove its success. A strong feature set, attractive pricing, and a vast base of owners with ageing iPhones ready to upgrade all combined to push the standard model to the top. Analysts noted that much of the demand came from people replacing much older devices, a dynamic that bodes well for future generations and for the shipment trajectory tracked in our global smartphone shipments analysis.

Standard iPhone 17 Share of the Generation (%)Share of the iPhone 17 generation held by the standard iPhone 17, by month.

Data:

Derived from the iPhone 17 lineup model mix, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Combined shares, changes and rankings are calculated from the modelled model-mix series, in percent of the iPhone 17 generation.Switch views with the toolbar.

The rise of the standard iPhone 17 to the top of the global charts is significant beyond a single generation. It suggests that Apple does not need its most expensive model to lead, and that a well-judged mainstream phone can dominate worldwide. For a company often associated with premium pricing, having its most affordable flagship become the world best-seller is a notable and strategically useful outcome.

The Air Stumble

An Ultra-Thin Misfire

The iPhone Air is the cautionary tale of the generation. Conceived as a daring, ultra-thin device to replace the lukewarm Plus model, it launched to curiosity but quickly faltered. Within weeks, supply-chain reports described weak demand, and analysts including Ming-Chi Kuo reported that Apple was cutting Air production drastically, by as much as eighty percent, as orders failed to materialise. Seldom has a flagship Apple product been pared back so quickly after launch.

The reasons were not hard to find. The Air made significant compromises for its thinness, including a smaller battery and a single camera, and it was priced close to the far more capable Pro. Many buyers concluded that the standard iPhone 17 and the Pro models already covered their needs, leaving little room for a thin-for-thinness model. This gap between concept and demand affects Apple wider results, seen in our Apple revenue by segment analysis.

iPhone Air Share of the Generation (%)Share of the iPhone 17 generation held by the iPhone Air, by month.

Data:

Derived from the iPhone 17 lineup model mix, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Combined shares, changes and rankings are calculated from the modelled model-mix series, in percent of the iPhone 17 generation.Switch views with the toolbar.

The Air share of the generation, already modest at launch, drifted lower through the period as production cuts took hold and word of its limitations spread. It became the smallest part of the lineup by a wide margin, a high-profile experiment that did not pay off. Apple is reportedly rethinking the concept for future generations, a sign that even its boldest design bets are subject to the verdict of buyers. No amount of engineering elegance can substitute for a feature set people actually want.

The Crossover

When the Standard Model Overtook the Pro Max

The most dramatic moment in the generation was the crossover, when the standard iPhone 17 overtook the iPhone 17 Pro Max to become the best-selling model. At launch the Pro Max led, as the largest and most expensive model often does in the opening weeks, when early adopters and enthusiasts buy first. But that lead did not last, and the standard model soon pulled ahead. The early Pro Max lead proved to be a head

start, not a durable advantage. Enthusiast demand faded, and mainstream demand carried the day. The broad market, not the early adopters, decided this generation.

By early 2026 the reversal was complete. Counterpoint Research confirmed that the standard iPhone 17 had become the world best-selling smartphone, with the Pro Max a distant second, a clear flip from the launch-quarter order. The size of the gap surprised some observers and signalled a real shift in buyer preference, one that ripples into Apple overall standing among the companies in our most valuable companies ranking.

iPhone 17 vs iPhone 17 Pro Max Share (%)Share of the generation held by the standard iPhone 17 and the Pro Max, by month.

Data:

iPhone 17 lineup model mix, compiled by BusinessStats from industry reporting.

Note:

Model-level monthly shares are modelled on published demand signals from Counterpoint Research, Morgan Stanley and supply-chain reports; they are estimates, not exact figures. Shares are of the iPhone 17 generation, in percent.Switch views with the toolbar.

The crossover matters because it inverts the usual hierarchy. For several recent generations, the largest Pro Max model led or ran close to the standard iPhone. This time the affordable model won decisively and early, suggesting that buyers, perhaps wary of high prices, gravitated to value. Whether this proves a one-generation quirk or a lasting change will shape how Apple positions and prices future lineups. The crossover may well be remembered as a turning point in iPhone strategy. It hinted that value, not size, may define the lineups ahead. Apple will study this result closely as it plans the iPhone 18.

Pro vs Standard Tier

The Value Balance

Grouping the lineup into the premium Pro tier, the Pro and Pro Max together, against the standard tier of the iPhone 17 and the Air shows how the generation value balance shifted. At launch the premium pair held a slight edge, as enthusiasts rushed to the newest high-end models. Over the following months, however, the standard tier gained ground as the affordable iPhone 17 surged. The balance tilted steadily from premium toward value across the period. That drift is the quiet financial story beneath the louder sales headlines. Mix, as ever, matters as much to Apple as raw volume does.

This rebalancing has real consequences for Apple finances. The Pro models carry higher prices and fatter margins, so a shift toward the standard model, even a popular one, can gently pressure the average selling price. That dynamic feeds directly into the revenue and profit picture detailed in our Apple net income analysis, where model mix is a quiet but important lever on earnings.

iPhone 17 Premium Tier vs Standard Tier Share (%)Combined share of the Pro and Pro Max versus the standard iPhone 17 and Air, by month.

Data:

Derived from the iPhone 17 lineup model mix, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Combined shares, changes and rankings are calculated from the modelled model-mix series, in percent of the iPhone 17 generation.Switch views with the toolbar.

Still, the premium tier held up well in absolute terms, anchored by a strong Pro Max and a steady Pro. The story is less one of premium weakness than of standard strength: the iPhone 17 did not so much steal Pro buyers as bring in a wave of upgraders at the affordable end. For Apple, a healthy premium tier alongside a runaway standard model is close to an ideal volume outcome, if not a perfect margin one. Volume and prestige rarely sit together so comfortably. Apple managed to lead on units without abandoning the high end.

Winners and Losers

Share Change Over the Generation

Measuring how each model share changed between launch and June 2026 distils the generation into a single picture of winners and losers. The standard iPhone 17 posts the largest gain by far, climbing several points to lead the lineup. The iPhone Air posts the steepest decline, shrinking from an already small base. The Pro and Pro Max move only modestly, reflecting their steadier roles.

These changes are not merely cosmetic; they reshape the economics of the generation. A larger standard share means more volume at lower prices, while a shrinking Air share removes a would-be premium contributor. The net effect is a lineup that sells in large numbers but leans more on its affordable hero, a balance that informs the broader market revenue picture in our worldwide smartphone market revenue analysis.

iPhone 17 Models: Share Change, Launch to June 2026 (points)Change in each model share of the generation between launch and June 2026.

Data:

Derived from the iPhone 17 lineup model mix, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Combined shares, changes and rankings are calculated from the modelled model-mix series, in percent of the iPhone 17 generation.Switch views with the toolbar.

The pattern of change also offers a clear verdict on Apple choices this generation. The market rewarded the well-judged standard iPhone and the dependable Pro models, while punishing the over-ambitious Air. It is a reminder that even within a single successful lineup, buyers draw sharp distinctions, rewarding value and capability while declining to pay a premium for novelty alone. The market verdict was unusually blunt and unusually quick. Buyers made up their minds within weeks, not months.

Against the World

Each Model on the Global Stage

Set against the entire global smartphone market, the scale of the standard iPhone 17 success becomes clear. By early 2026 it alone accounted for around six percent of all smartphones sold worldwide, more than any other single model from any maker, an extraordinary concentration for one phone. The Pro Max followed at a meaningful but clearly smaller share, with the Pro behind it. The order on the world stage mirrored the order within Apple own lineup.

That a single model can capture six percent of the entire global market underlines Apple unique position. No Android maker, spread across many models and price points, places a single device so high on the worldwide charts. This dominance of the top of the rankings is a recurring feature of Apple business, visible in the company overall revenue in our Apple total revenue analysis.

iPhone 17 Models: Share of All Global Smartphones, Early 2026 (%)Each iPhone 17 model share of total worldwide smartphone sales in early 2026.

Data:

Derived from the iPhone 17 lineup model mix, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Combined shares, changes and rankings are calculated from the modelled model-mix series, in percent of the iPhone 17 generation.Switch views with the toolbar.

The iPhone Air, by contrast, registered only a tiny share of the global market, far below the other three models. Its position near the bottom of Apple own lineup, let alone the global charts, confirms how comprehensively it failed to find an audience. The contrast between the chart-topping standard model and the barely-visible Air, within the same generation, is the starkest illustration of the lineup split fortunes.

Model Ranking

The Order That Emerged

Ranking the four models by their average share across the period confirms the order that emerged: the standard iPhone 17 first, the Pro Max second, the Pro third, and the Air a distant fourth. While the standard model and Pro Max traded the lead during the period, over the full nine months the standard iPhone 17 comes out clearly on top, reflecting its sustained surge.

The ranking captures the generation in miniature: an affordable hero, a strong premium flagship, a steady mid-premium option, and a failed experiment. It is a cleaner hierarchy than many recent generations produced, with clear separation between the models rather than a tight cluster. The clarity of the order reflects how decisively buyers expressed their preferences this time around, and the volumes behind it set a record, as our Apple smartphone shipments analysis shows.

iPhone 17 Models by Average Share of the Generation (%)Average share of the generation held by each model across the period.

Data:

Derived from the iPhone 17 lineup model mix, compiled by BusinessStats.

Note:

Combined shares, changes and rankings are calculated from the modelled model-mix series, in percent of the iPhone 17 generation.Switch views with the toolbar.

For Apple, the ranking is mostly good news. Three of the four models performed solidly, led by a runaway standard iPhone, and only the Air disappointed. A lineup in which the worst outcome is a single niche model, while the best is the world top-selling phone, is one most manufacturers would envy, even with the margin questions that a standard-led mix raises.

#1iPhone 17World best-seller. ~6%Of All PhonesStandard model, early 2026. -80%Air ProductionCut on weak demand. FlipThe CrossoverStandard beat Pro Max.

Across its first nine months, the iPhone 17 generation told a clear story: the standard model triumphed, becoming the best-selling smartphone in the world, while the bold iPhone Air fell flat and the Pro models held their premium ground. The model mix shifted steadily toward the affordable end, inverting the usual hierarchy and confirming that, this time, value won. It was a generation defined as much by one surprise success as by one high-profile disappointment.

What the generation reveals is the power, and the limits, of Apple lineup strategy. A well-judged standard model can dominate the globe, but no amount of design ambition can force buyers to embrace a product they do not want. As Apple plans future lineups, including a rumoured foldable and a rethought thin model, the lessons of the iPhone 17 generation, reward value, respect demand, will loom large over how it positions and prices the iPhones to come.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: iPhone 17 Adoption

The standard iPhone 17 sold the best. By early 2026 it had become the best-selling individual smartphone in the world, according to Counterpoint Research, accounting for roughly six percent of all global smartphone sales. It overtook the iPhone 17 Pro Max, which had led the lineup at launch.

The iPhone Air faced weak demand because its extreme thinness forced compromises, including a smaller battery and a single camera, while its price sat close to the far more capable Pro models. Many buyers felt the standard iPhone 17 and the Pro models already met their needs, and Apple cut Air production by as much as eighty percent.

Yes. The iPhone 17 Pro Max was the most popular model at launch and remained a strong second-place seller throughout the period. It only lost the overall lead because the affordable standard iPhone 17 surged ahead, becoming the world best-selling phone, with the Pro Max a clear but distant second by early 2026.

The iPhone Air is an ultra-thin iPhone that Apple introduced with the iPhone 17 generation in September 2025, replacing the Plus model. It prioritised a slim design over features like battery life and cameras. Despite the bold concept, it saw weak demand and became the smallest-selling model in the lineup by a wide margin.

The standard iPhone 17 overtook the iPhone 17 Pro Max around the turn of 2025 into 2026. The Pro Max led during the launch quarter of late 2025, but by the first quarter of 2026 the standard model had pulled clearly ahead to become the best-selling smartphone in the world, according to Counterpoint Research.

Apple does not publish a monthly breakdown by model, so the figures here are modelled on published demand signals from Counterpoint Research, Morgan Stanley and supply-chain reports. The overall shape, with the standard model surging, the Air fading and the Pro models steady, reflects well-documented reporting, though individual monthly values are estimates.

The standard iPhone 17 offered a strong feature set at a lower price than the Pro models, appealing to a large base of owners with ageing iPhones ready to upgrade. Analysts noted that much of its demand came from people replacing much older devices, helping it become the world best-selling smartphone in early 2026.

Yes, very well. The iPhone 17 generation helped drive Apple to a record shipment year in 2025, with around 247 million iPhones shipped according to IDC. Strong demand for the standard iPhone 17 and the Pro models more than offset the weak performance of the iPhone Air.

A shift toward the affordable standard iPhone 17, away from the higher-priced Pro models and the failed Air, can gently pressure Apple's average selling price and margins, since the standard model is cheaper. However, the sheer volume of standard iPhone 17 sales, combined with a still-strong Pro tier, kept the generation highly profitable overall.

Apple has not confirmed its plans, but reports suggest the company is rethinking the thin-iPhone concept after the Air's weak reception, with production cut sharply. Future lineups may revise or replace the Air, and Apple is also reported to be preparing a foldable iPhone, as it adjusts its strategy in response to how buyers responded to the iPhone 17 generation.

Sources

Counterpoint Research - Source for best-selling smartphone model rankings and global model share.

Morgan Stanley, Ming-Chi Kuo and supply-chain reporting (Nikkei) - Used for iPhone 17 demand signals and iPhone Air production cuts.

iPhone 17 model mix is modelled from published demand signals, in percent of the generation. Apple does not disclose a monthly model breakdown, so figures are estimates anchored to reporting from Counterpoint Research, Morgan Stanley and supply-chain sources. The standard iPhone 17 was reported as the world best-selling smartphone in early 2026; the iPhone Air saw sharp production cuts on weak demand. Not

investment advice.

STATISTICS REPORT

Revenue of the tablets industry worldwide 2018-2030

Updated Jun 16, 2026 · businesstats.com/revenue-tablets-worldwide

$61.7B 2029 PEAK (EST.)	**$54B** 2024 REVENUE	**+14.7%** GROWTH 2024-29
~$720B CUMULATIVE 18-30	**38%** APPLE SHARE	**$365** AVG PRICE 2030

Overview

Revenue of the tablets industry worldwide from 2018 to 2030

The tablet was once hailed as the device that would replace the PC, then written off as a fad squeezed between ever larger smartphones and ever lighter laptops. The reality has been more nuanced. Worldwide tablet industry revenue stood at around 50 billion dollars in 2018, dipped, surged during the pandemic, slumped again, and is now forecast to climb steadily to a new peak of about 62 billion dollars by 2029. This report tracks tablet market revenue worldwide from 2018 to 2030, charting a market that never became the PC killer but instead settled into a durable, slowly growing niche. The closely related PC market is tracked in our global PC shipments analysis.

The revenue trajectory tells a story of resilience rather than growth heroics. After the early struggles of the late 2010s, when tablets were losing ground to large screen phones, the pandemic delivered an unexpected boom as households bought tablets for remote work, online learning and home entertainment. That surge faded, but it left the market on a higher base, and the arrival of more capable, premium tablets, many positioned as laptop replacements with keyboards and styluses, has supported a gradual recovery. The parallel boom and bust in PCs is detailed in our PC market revenue analysis.

tablet industry revenue worldwide 2018 2030 estimate forecastTablet Industry Revenue, 2018-2030 ($B)tablet industry revenue worldwide 2018 2030 estimate forecast $61.7B2029 peak

Note: Statista Market Insights estimates; 2025-2030 are forecasts (lighter bars).

A note on the data is essential. These revenue figures are based on Statista Market Insights and are explicitly described by the source as estimates, modelled across the years from 2018 to 2030, in billions of US dollars. The headline anchors, including the forecast peak of around 62 billion dollars in 2029 and the projected growth through the late 2020s, come from the published estimates, while the year by year path and related measures such as average price and implied unit volume are modelled to be consistent with that trajectory and the known shape of the market. They should be read as a reliable picture of the market's direction rather than precise audited accounts.

What makes the tablet market interesting is precisely its in between status. Too large to replace the phone and too limited to fully replace the laptop, the tablet has nonetheless carved out a permanent role in education, creative work, point of sale systems, healthcare and casual home use. Apple's iPad dominates the revenue pool thanks to premium pricing, while a cluster of Android makers compete on value. The result is a market that is mature and consolidated but far from dead, generating tens of billions of dollars a year, as set in the wider device context of our big tech revenue comparison analysis.

To make sense of the numbers, it helps to remember how the tablet category was born. Launched into a wave of enthusiasm in the early 2010s, tablets were briefly the fastest growing consumer electronics product in history, with shipments soaring as buyers snapped up the new form factor. That explosive adoption phase ended years before this dataset begins, which is why the period from 2018 onward looks so different: it captures a market that has already matured, where the early land grab is over and the story is one of replacement, refinement and the slow climb of average prices rather than the breathless growth of the category's youth.

Annual Data Table

Annual Tablet Revenue, 2018-2030

Tablet Industry Revenue, 2018-2030 ($B, (f)=forecast)Click any column to sort

YEAR	REVENUE	YOY GROWTH
2018	$49.5 B	-
2019	$47.8 B	-3.4%
2020	$54.0 B	+13.0%
2021	$57.5 B	+6.5%

2022	$52.0 B	-9.6%
2023	$51.5 B	-1.0%
2024	$53.8 B	+4.4%
2025 (f)	$55.3 B	+2.9%
2026 (f)	$57.0 B	+3.1%
2027 (f)	$58.7 B	+3.0%
2028 (f)	$60.2 B	+2.6%
2029 (f)	$61.7 B	+2.4%
2030 (f)	$61.2 B	-0.7%

The table lists estimated tablet industry revenue for every year from 2018 to 2030, with the annual rate of change. The early years capture the pre-pandemic softness, the 2020 and 2021 rows show the COVID driven surge, and the 2022 and 2023 rows reveal the subsequent correction. From 2024 onward the figures are forecasts, rising gently year after year toward the 2029 peak before a slight easing in 2030. Sorting the growth column highlights how the market's fortunes have swung with external events, from the pandemic spike to the post pandemic hangover and the steadier growth now expected through the rest of the decade.

Reading the table closely reveals how concentrated the market's swings have been around a handful of pivotal years. The pandemic years of 2020 and 2021 stand out as the clearest deviation from trend, while 2022 marks the sharpest single year reversal as that boom unwound. From 2024 the forecast settles into a narrow band of low single digit growth, with each year adding a billion or two until the 2029 peak. This steadiness is itself revealing, signalling that analysts expect no major shocks or breakthroughs, just the gentle continuation of a mature market growing in line with prices and replacement demand.

Revenue Trend

A Market of Value, Not Volume

The revenue curve makes the market's character clear at a glance. There is no explosive growth, but neither is there collapse. Instead the line traces a gentle U through the early 2020s, with the pandemic spike standing out as the major deviation, before settling into a steady upward grind toward the 2029 peak.

The market is expected to add roughly 8 billion dollars of revenue between 2024 and 2029, an increase of close to 15 percent over five years, modest but consistent growth that reflects a maturing product category finding its level.

This shape is typical of a mature consumer electronics category that has passed its explosive growth phase. The early excitement that drove tablets to their unit shipment peak in the mid 2010s has long since faded, and the market now grows in line with replacement cycles, premiumisation and steady demand from education and enterprise rather than rapid new adoption. The gentle slope of the forecast reflects an expectation that tablets will remain a useful but secondary device for most users, complementing rather than replacing phones and PCs, a dynamic explored further in our worldwide smartphone market revenue analysis.

tablet revenue trend smooth line 2018 2030Revenue Trend with Forecast ($B)tablet revenue trend smooth line 2018 2030 $61.7B2029 peak+15%2024-29

It is worth dwelling on what this gentle revenue curve means for the companies that depend on it. For a vendor selling tablets, the absence of dramatic growth places a premium on margin, brand and ecosystem rather than on chasing market share through volume. This is precisely the environment in which Apple thrives, leveraging its premium positioning, accessories and services to extract more value from each device sold. For the Android makers competing at lower price points, the same flat market is far more challenging, forcing a constant battle on cost that leaves little room for error and rewards only those with the scale to compete.

Annual Growth

Boom, Bust and Steady Recovery

Plotting annual growth rates exposes the volatility hidden within the smooth looking revenue line. The market contracted in 2019 as large phones ate into demand, then jumped sharply in 2020 as the pandemic struck, with double digit growth as households rushed to buy tablets for home schooling and remote work. That boom reversed in 2022 with a steep decline, followed by a near flat 2023, before the market returned to modest single digit growth from 2024. The forecast years show steady low single digit gains, with a slight dip projected for 2030 after the 2029 peak.

The pattern of a sharp pandemic spike followed by a hangover and then steady normalisation is common across consumer technology, but it is especially pronounced for tablets, which benefited enormously from lockdowns and then suffered as that pulled forward demand unwound. The steadier growth now forecast

reflects a market that has worked through the pandemic distortion and found a sustainable trajectory, driven by premium devices and durable demand from education and business rather than the one off surge of the COVID years. The comparable smartphone cycle is covered in our quarterly smartphone shipments analysis.

tablet revenue annual growth rate percent barAnnual Revenue Growth Rate (%)tablet revenue annual growth rate percent bar +13.0%2020 boom

Note: annual percentage change; red bars are years of decline.

The growth rate chart also serves as a useful corrective to overly optimistic or pessimistic narratives about the tablet. Neither the pandemic boom nor the subsequent bust represented a permanent change in the market's underlying trajectory; both were temporary distortions around a fundamentally flat to modestly growing trend. Recognising this helps explain why the forecast looks so calm, returning the market to the steady, unspectacular growth that characterised it before the pandemic intervened. For anyone making decisions based on these numbers, the lesson is to look through the short term swings to the durable trend beneath them.

Revenue by Phase

Tablet Revenue by Phase

Grouping the years into phases clarifies the market's evolution. The pre-pandemic phase of 2018 and 2019 averaged under 50 billion dollars a year as the market struggled. The COVID phase of 2020 and 2021 jumped to an average near 56 billion dollars as demand surged. The dip phase of 2022 to 2024 settled back to around 52 billion dollars as the boom unwound, before the forecast phase from 2025 to 2030 averages close to 59 billion dollars, the highest of any phase, as the market resumes steady growth toward its projected peak.

The phase averages underline that the pandemic, far from being a lasting boost, was a temporary spike that the market took years to build back toward. Only in the forecast period does the average decisively exceed the COVID era peak, and even then the growth is gradual rather than dramatic. This is the profile of a category that has matured into a stable, dependable revenue stream rather than a high growth frontier, generating reliable income for the vendors that dominate it, as examined in our largest source of revenue of leading tech companies analysis.

tablet revenue average by phase horizontal barAverage Annual Revenue by Phase ($B)tablet revenue average by phase horizontal bar $59Bforecast avg$56BCOVID avg

The clear takeaway from the phase analysis is that the tablet market's best years, in revenue terms, lie ahead rather than behind. While the pandemic delivered a memorable spike, it is the steady forecast period that is expected to set new records, driven not by a sudden surge in demand but by the patient accumulation of premium sales and price increases. For a category once dismissed as a passing fad, reaching fresh revenue highs at the end of the decade is a quietly remarkable outcome that few would have predicted during the gloom of the mid 2010s.

Cumulative Revenue

720 Billion Dollars and Counting

Adding up every year from 2018 to 2030 gives a cumulative tablet industry revenue of roughly 720 billion dollars over the period. Even as a mature, slow growing category, the tablet market represents an enormous pool of recurring revenue, replaced on a multi year cycle and concentrated among a handful of major vendors. The cumulative line climbs steadily throughout, underlining that while tablets may not grab headlines, they generate substantial and dependable income year after year, a quiet but valuable corner of the consumer electronics landscape.

This cumulative total puts the tablet market in perspective against its larger neighbours. While smartphones and PCs generate far more revenue, the tablet market's roughly 720 billion dollars over thirteen years is a significant business in its own right, more than enough to sustain dedicated product lines at the major technology companies. For Apple in particular, the iPad remains a meaningful contributor to the broader product portfolio, as detailed in our Apple total net sales analysis, even if it is dwarfed by the iPhone.

cumulative tablet revenue since 2018 lineCumulative Tablet Revenue, 2018-2030 ($B)cumulative tablet revenue since 2018 line $720Bby 2030

Note: running total of annual tablet industry revenue.

It is worth placing this cumulative figure in the context of the broader device economy. The roughly 720 billion dollars the tablet market generates over the period is spread across more than a decade and shared among several vendors, so no single company captures anywhere near all of it. Yet even a fraction of that total represents a meaningful business line, which is why the major players continue to invest in new models, accessories and software despite the market's maturity. The tablet may be a secondary device,

but the revenue it generates is substantial enough to justify sustained attention from the industry's largest companies.

Average Price

The Premiumisation Engine: Average Price

The average price of a tablet has risen over the period, and this premiumisation is central to understanding the revenue story. After dipping during the pandemic, when cheaper tablets sold in volume, the average selling price has climbed steadily as buyers increasingly opt for premium devices with larger screens, faster processors, keyboard accessories and stylus support. This rising average price has helped lift revenue even as unit volumes have stayed relatively flat, meaning the market is increasingly driven by value per device rather than by selling more units.

The shift toward higher priced tablets reflects a broader trend across consumer electronics, where vendors chase margin through premiumisation as unit growth slows. Apple's iPad Pro and iPad Air lines, along with premium Android and Windows tablets positioned as laptop replacements, have pushed the average price upward. This dynamic mirrors what has happened in PCs and smartphones, where rising average prices have sustained revenue in mature markets, where premium devices increasingly drive the headline numbers even as overall unit demand plateaus.

average tablet price per unit 2018 2030 lineAverage Tablet Price per Unit ($)average tablet price per unit 2018 2030 line $3652030 est.$2952020 low

The rising average price also has implications for who buys tablets and why. As entry level devices become relatively less central to the market and premium models drive more of the revenue, the typical tablet buyer is increasingly someone seeking a capable, productivity oriented device rather than a cheap secondary screen. This shift toward higher value use cases, in education, creative work and business, helps insulate the market from the price competition that has hollowed out margins in other mature categories, and it supports the steady revenue growth that the forecast anticipates through the rest of the decade.

Implied Volume

Flat Units, Rising Value

Dividing revenue by the average price gives an implied picture of unit volumes, and it confirms that the tablet market is a value story rather than a volume one. Implied shipments have stayed broadly flat across

the period, hovering around the 150 to 170 million unit range, with the pandemic years seeing a volume spike as cheaper devices sold in bulk. The steady or slightly declining unit trend, combined with rising prices, is exactly what produces the gentle revenue growth seen in the forecast, growth driven by what each device costs rather than by how many are sold.

This flat to declining volume profile is the defining feature of the mature tablet market. Unlike the explosive unit growth of the early 2010s, when tablets were a novel must have device, today's market is about replacement and premiumisation rather than new adoption. Most people who want a tablet already own one, so vendors compete to sell more capable, higher priced upgrades rather than to win vast numbers of first time buyers. The contrast with the still growing installed base of PCs underlines how differently the two markets have aged, with the PC remaining a daily essential while the tablet settles into a more occasional role.

tablet implied unit volume revenue divided by price barImplied Unit Volume (M units)tablet implied unit volume revenue divided by price bar 170Mpeak

Note: implied volume = revenue divided by average price; indicative only.

For vendors, this flat volume reality shapes every strategic decision. With little prospect of selling dramatically more units, growth must come from persuading existing buyers to trade up to pricier models, from extending replacement cycles into new accessories and services, and from defending share in a market where every sale is hard won. It is a demanding environment that rewards scale, brand strength and ecosystem depth, which is precisely why the market has consolidated around a small group of dominant players with the resources to compete.

Leading Vendors

Who Earns the Tablet Dollars

The tens of billions in tablet revenue flow overwhelmingly to a small group of vendors, with Apple sitting firmly at the top. The iPad commands the largest share of the market, and an even larger share of revenue and profit thanks to its premium pricing, capturing close to two fifths of unit shipments. Samsung is the leading Android maker, followed by Lenovo, Huawei and Xiaomi, with a long tail of smaller brands making up the rest. This concentrated structure, dominated by one premium player and a cluster of value rivals, closely mirrors the smartphone market.

Apple's dominance of the tablet market is even more pronounced in revenue terms than in units, because the iPad sells at far higher average prices than most Android tablets. This allows Apple to capture the lion's share of the market's profit while competitors fight over thinner margins at the value end. The structure echoes Apple's position in smartphones, where it captures a modest unit share but an outsized share of industry profit, a dynamic detailed in our smartphone market share by vendor analysis.

tablet vendor share Apple iPad Samsung Lenovo donutTablet Shipment Share by Vendortablet vendor share Apple iPad Samsung Lenovo donut 38%Apple

The stability of the vendor rankings is itself a sign of the market's maturity. Apple has led the tablet market for well over a decade, and the cast of challengers behind it has changed only gradually, with Samsung, Lenovo, Huawei and a handful of others trading places at the margins. This entrenched structure makes it extremely difficult for a new entrant to break in, as the established players benefit from scale, brand loyalty, retail relationships and, in Apple's case, a powerful ecosystem that locks users in. The result is a market that is unlikely to see dramatic shifts in leadership absent a major technological disruption.

Tablets vs PCs vs Phones

The Smallest of the Big Three

Set against its larger cousins, the tablet market is comfortably the smallest of the three big personal computing categories. In 2024, tablets generated around 54 billion dollars in revenue, against roughly 219 billion for PCs and close to 468 billion for smartphones. The tablet sits in the shadow of both, reflecting its status as a secondary, optional device for most people rather than the essential daily tool that the smartphone has become or the productivity workhorse that the PC remains. This hierarchy has been remarkably stable for years.

The comparison helps explain why tablets receive less attention and investment than phones or PCs from most major vendors, with the notable exception of Apple. For most users a tablet is a nice to have rather than a necessity, which caps its market size relative to the devices people genuinely cannot do without. Yet the tablet's smaller scale does not make it unimportant, as it remains a profitable, durable category and a strategic platform for content, education and creative work, a role that connects to the broader digital economy mapped in our internet companies revenue analysis.

tablet vs PC vs smartphone revenue 2024 barMarket Revenue Compared, 2024 ($B)tablet vs PC vs smartphone revenue 2024 bar $54Btablets$468Bphones

The three way comparison also hints at where the tablet market might find future growth. As smartphones grow ever larger and laptops ever lighter, the tablet occupies a shrinking but defensible middle ground, and its best prospects lie in carving out distinct use cases that neither neighbour serves as well. Detachable tablets that double as laptops, rugged models for industrial use, and large screen devices for creative professionals all point to a strategy of specialisation rather than mass market dominance. It is in these niches, rather than in head to head competition with phones and PCs, that the tablet is most likely to sustain its modest growth.

Tablet vs PC Trend

Two Mature Markets, Indexed

Indexing tablet and PC revenue to a common starting point in 2018 reveals how differently the two markets have travelled. Both were buffeted by the pandemic, with sharp spikes and subsequent corrections, but the tablet market has shown a steadier underlying recovery, while PC revenue swung more violently through the boom and bust. By the late 2020s both are growing modestly from their 2018 base, confirming that these mature markets now move in broadly similar, gentle upward trajectories rather than the explosive growth of their earlier years.

The convergence of these trajectories underlines a key theme: the personal computing market as a whole, whether tablets, PCs or smartphones, has matured into a set of large, stable, slowly growing categories rather than the high growth frontier it once was. Value now comes from premiumisation, replacement cycles and services rather than from rapid new adoption. For investors and strategists, the question is no longer which device will win, but how each mature category can be monetised, a theme that runs through our biggest companies by market value analysis.

tablet vs PC revenue indexed 2018 lineTablet vs PC Revenue, Indexed (2018 = 100)tablet vs PC revenue indexed 2018 line TabletsteadierPCvolatile

Ultimately, the indexed comparison reinforces the central message of this report: the tablet has settled into the same mature, premium driven pattern that now defines personal computing as a whole. Neither a breakout growth story nor a market in terminal decline, it is a stable and profitable category that rises gently with prices and replacement demand. For anyone tracking the device economy, the tablet is best understood not in isolation but as one steady thread in the larger, slowly growing fabric of consumer technology that surrounds it.

$61.7B2029 PeakNew all-time high (est.). +14.7%2024-2029Five-year growth. $720BCumulativeTotal 2018-2030. 38%Apple iPadLargest share.

Taken together, the data paints the tablet not as the PC killer once predicted, nor as the failed fad later dismissed, but as a durable, mid sized market that has matured into steady, premiumisation driven growth. From around 50 billion dollars in 2018, through a pandemic spike and slump, tablet revenue is forecast to reach a new peak near 62 billion dollars by 2029, generating some 720 billion dollars cumulatively over the period. It is a market defined by value over volume, dominated by Apple, and sustained by enduring demand from education, business and creative users.

The questions ahead are whether AI features, larger and more capable devices, and the continued push to position tablets as laptop replacements can lift the market beyond its gentle forecast path, or whether it will remain a comfortable but unspectacular niche. The role of artificial intelligence in reshaping device demand is examined in our artificial intelligence worldwide statistics overview. Either way, the tablet has proved more resilient than its critics expected, securing a lasting if modest place in the personal computing landscape for the rest of the decade and likely well beyond. For now, the data describes a market that has found its level: large enough to matter, stable enough to plan around, and profitable enough to keep the major vendors invested. The tablet may never again capture the excitement of its early years, but as a dependable, premium driven business generating tens of billions of dollars annually, it has earned a permanent seat at the personal computing table for the foreseeable future.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: Tablet Revenue

Worldwide tablet industry revenue was estimated at around 54 billion US dollars in 2024 and is forecast to reach a peak of about 61.7 billion dollars by 2029, according to Statista Market Insights estimates. The market is mid sized within consumer electronics, smaller than both the PC and smartphone markets.

The tablet market is growing modestly. After a pandemic boom in 2020 and 2021 and a slump in 2022 and 2023, revenue is forecast to rise steadily, adding around 7.9 billion dollars, or about 15 percent, between 2024 and 2029. Growth is gradual rather than explosive, reflecting a mature product category.

Tablet revenue jumped in 2020 and 2021 because lockdowns drove households to buy tablets for remote work, online learning and home entertainment. This surge pulled demand forward, so revenue then fell in 2022 and 2023 as the boom unwound, before the market returned to steady growth from 2024.

Statista Market Insights estimates project tablet industry revenue to reach a new peak of about 61.7 billion US dollars in 2029, the fifth consecutive year of growth, before easing slightly in 2030. The forecast reflects steady premiumisation driven growth rather than a return to the rapid expansion of the early 2010s.

Tablet revenue is rising mainly because average selling prices are increasing, even though unit volumes have stayed broadly flat. Buyers are increasingly choosing premium tablets with larger screens, keyboards and styluses, positioned as laptop replacements. This premiumisation lifts revenue per device, making the market a value story rather than a volume one.

Apple is the largest tablet maker, with its iPad capturing close to two fifths of global shipments and an even larger share of revenue thanks to premium pricing. Samsung is the leading Android maker, followed by Lenovo, Huawei and Xiaomi, with a long tail of smaller brands making up the remainder of the market.

The tablet market is the smallest of the three big personal computing categories. In 2024, tablets generated around 54 billion dollars in revenue, against roughly 219 billion for PCs and close to 468 billion for smartphones. This reflects the tablet's status as a secondary, optional device rather than an essential daily tool.

Tablet demand is sustained by education, enterprise, healthcare, point of sale and creative use, along with home entertainment and casual browsing. The push to position tablets as laptop replacements, with keyboard and stylus support, plus emerging AI features, supports premiumisation and steady replacement demand rather than rapid new adoption.

Across the full period from 2018 to 2030, the tablet industry is estimated to generate roughly 720 billion US dollars in cumulative revenue. Even as a mature, slow growing category, this represents a substantial and dependable pool of recurring income concentrated among a handful of major vendors led by Apple.

The figures are based on Statista Market Insights, which explicitly describes its data as estimates modelled across the years 2018 to 2030, in billions of US dollars. The headline anchors, such as the 2029 peak and the 2024 to 2029 growth, come from the published estimates, while the year by year path and related measures are modelled to be consistent and should be read as indicative of direction.

Sources

Statista Market Insights - Revenue of the tablets industry worldwide 2018-2030 - Primary source for tablet revenue estimates and forecasts.

Statista Market Insights and IDC Worldwide Quarterly Tablet Tracker - Used for revenue estimates, average price, implied volume and vendor share.

Industry reports and company filings - Used for context on premiumisation, AI tablets and competitive structure.

Tablet revenue figures are based on Statista Market Insights and are explicitly described by the source as estimates, in billions of US dollars, for 2018 to 2030. Figures from 2025 are forecasts. Average price and implied volume are modelled to be consistent with the revenue trajectory and are indicative. Vendor share reflects recent IDC data. Not investment advice.

STATISTICS REPORT

Global revenue of PCs 2018-2028

Updated Jun 16, 2026 · businesstats.com/revenue-pcs-market-worldwide

$247B 2028 REVENUE (RECORD)	**$201B** 2018 REVENUE	**58%** LAPTOPS SHARE
$2.45T TOTAL 2018-2028	**$143B** LAPTOPS 2028	**$40B** DESKTOPS 2028

Overview

Revenue of the PCs market worldwide from 2018 to 2028, by category

The personal computer, declared dead more times than almost any other gadget, remains a quietly enormous business. Worldwide revenue in the PC market, which spans laptops, desktop PCs and tablets, is forecast to climb from around $201 billion in 2018 to a record of about $247 billion by 2028, according to Statista. Far from fading away, the market has proved remarkably durable, weathering the rise of the smartphone, a pandemic boom and bust, and a difficult few years of decline to emerge at new highs. Understanding how that revenue is split between categories, and which devices are driving the growth, reveals a market in the middle of a quiet transformation.

The headline figure masks a turbulent journey. PC revenue surged during the pandemic of 2020 and 2021, as locked down households and remote workers rushed to buy laptops and tablets, before slumping in 2022 and 2023 as that demand evaporated and the market digested years of pulled forward purchases. Since then, a steady recovery has taken hold, powered increasingly by premium laptops and the early wave of artificial intelligence enabled PCs, carrying the market back toward record territory. This report breaks the PC market down by category, from 2018 to 2028, to show exactly where the money flows and how the balance between laptops, desktops and tablets is shifting. The market's closest cousin, the smartphone, shows a strikingly similar pattern of maturity in our quarterly global smartphone shipments analysis.

Global PC market revenue 2018 2028 barWorldwide PC Market Revenue, 2018-2028 ($B)Global PC market revenue 2018 2028 bar $247B2028 record

Note: Statista estimates; 2021 was the pandemic peak, 2028 is a forecast.

A note on the data is important. The figures here are Statista Market Insights estimates of worldwide PC market revenue, covering laptops, desktop PCs and tablets but excluding smartphones, and including consumer, business and government spending. The total is anchored to Statista's published figures, while the split between categories reflects Statista estimates, so the figures are best read as a guide to the scale and direction of the market. As a modeled forecast, the 2028 figure is a projection rather than a certainty. How this hardware market fits within total technology spending is explored in our big tech revenue comparison analysis.

What makes the PC market especially interesting is its split personality. It is simultaneously a mature, replacement driven business in its desktop and tablet segments and a slowly growing one in laptops, where premiumisation and new technologies keep lifting prices. The category view that follows captures this dual nature, showing a market that is no longer expanding in unit terms but is still managing to grow in value, as buyers trade up to more capable and expensive machines. It is a pattern that closely mirrors the smartphone market, whose shipment trends closely mirror those of the personal computer in almost every respect.

It is worth putting the PC market in context against its great rival, the smartphone. While the smartphone generates far larger headline revenue, the PC remains the indispensable tool for serious work, content creation and gaming, a role no phone has been able to take over. The two markets share a common dynamic, however: both have matured, both now grow through rising prices rather than rising volumes, and both are betting on artificial intelligence to spark the next upgrade cycle. The smartphone side of that story is detailed in our worldwide smartphone market revenue analysis, which traces a strikingly similar pattern of premiumisation.

Data Table by Category

PC Market Revenue by Category, 2018-2028

PC Market Revenue by Category, 2018-2028 (USD billion)Click any column to sort

YEAR	TOTAL	LAPTOPS	TABLETS	DESKTOP PCS
2018	$201 B	$108 B	$58 B	$35 B
2019	$199 B	$107 B	$58 B	$34 B
2020	$216 B	$120 B	$60 B	$36 B

2021	$233 B	$132 B	$63 B	$38 B
2022	$220 B	$124 B	$59 B	$37 B
2023	$211 B	$117 B	$58 B	$36 B
2024	$219 B	$122 B	$60 B	$37 B
2025	$226 B	$128 B	$60 B	$38 B
2026	$233 B	$133 B	$61 B	$39 B
2027	$240 B	$138 B	$63 B	$39 B
2028*	$247 B	$143 B	$64 B	$40 B

The table breaks PC market revenue down by category for every year from 2018 to 2028, showing the total alongside laptops, desktop PCs and tablets. Reading across the rows reveals the pandemic surge in 2020 and 2021, the sharp correction of 2022 and 2023, and the steady climb back to a record in 2028. Reading down the columns shows the very different trajectories of the three categories: laptops growing strongly to dominate the market, desktops quietly recovering to modest new highs, and tablets holding broadly steady. The total has risen by more than a fifth across the period, but almost all of that growth has come from laptops, underlining their role as the engine of the modern PC business.

Revenue by Category

How PC Revenue Splits by Category

Stacking the three categories shows at a glance how the PC market is composed and how that composition is changing. Laptops form the dominant and growing base of the market, accounting for well over half of all revenue and climbing toward $143 billion by 2028. Tablets make up the second largest slice at around $64 billion, while desktop PCs, despite a recent revival, remain the smallest category at approximately $40 billion. The chart makes clear that the market's growth is being driven overwhelmingly by laptops, with the other two categories contributing stability rather than expansion.

The dominance of laptops reflects a profound shift in how people compute. Where the desktop once defined personal computing, the flexibility of the laptop, now powerful enough for all but the most demanding tasks, has made it the default choice for consumers and businesses alike. Tablets, which were once expected to replace laptops entirely, have instead settled into a complementary role, popular for media and casual use but rarely a full replacement for a proper computer. Desktops, meanwhile, survive in

gaming, professional workstations and offices, a niche but resilient corner of the market that has lately returned to growth.

The stacked view also reveals how stable the overall structure of the market has been despite the turbulence in the totals. Through the pandemic boom, the subsequent bust and the recovery, the broad proportions between laptops, tablets and desktops have shifted only gradually, with laptops slowly gaining ground at the expense of the other two. This stability is reassuring for the industry, because it means no single category is collapsing or being disrupted out of existence. Instead, the market is evolving steadily, with the laptop cementing its position as the heart of personal computing while tablets and desktops settle into durable supporting roles.

PC revenue by category laptops desktop tablets stacked 2018 2028PC Revenue by Category, 2018-2028 ($B)PC revenue by category laptops desktop tablets stacked 2018 2028 $143BLaptops 2028

Note: laptops, tablets and desktop PCs; Statista estimates. 2028 Category Split

The 2028 Category Split

Looked at as a snapshot, the 2028 revenue split shows just how lopsided the PC market has become. Laptops are forecast to command close to 58 percent of all PC revenue, with tablets taking around 26 percent and desktop PCs just 16 percent. A market once dominated by bulky desktop towers is now overwhelmingly a portable one, with laptops and tablets together accounting for more than four fifths of spending. This portability driven structure has profound implications for the chip makers, component suppliers and brands that serve the market, rewarding those who excel at thin, efficient, battery powered designs.

The category split also shapes where innovation and competition are concentrated. With laptops generating the lion's share of revenue, that is where manufacturers focus their most advanced features, from artificial intelligence accelerators and high resolution displays to all day battery life. The arrival of AI PCs, laptops with dedicated neural processing units, is the latest battleground, and the industry hopes it can spark a new upgrade cycle much as new technologies periodically reinvigorate the smartphone market. The role of AI across the technology landscape is examined in our artificial intelligence worldwide statistics overview.

PC revenue category split 2028 laptops tablets desktop donutPC Revenue Share by Category, 2028PC revenue category split 2028 laptops tablets desktop donut 58%Laptops

Annual Growth

The Pandemic Rollercoaster: Annual Growth

Tracking the total market's annual growth lays bare the pandemic rollercoaster. PC revenue jumped more than 8 percent in 2020 and nearly 8 percent again in 2021 as the world bought computers in record numbers, before falling around 6 percent in 2022 and a further 4 percent in 2023 as the boom unwound. From 2024 onward, the market settles into a pattern of steady, low single digit growth of around 3 percent a year, the signature of a mature market growing through rising prices rather than rising volumes. The wild swings of the pandemic years have given way to a calmer, more predictable trajectory.

This pattern of boom, bust and gentle recovery is characteristic of durable goods markets, where demand comes in waves tied to replacement cycles and external shocks. The pandemic pulled years of PC purchases forward into 2020 and 2021, leaving a hole that took until 2024 to fill. Now, with the installed base aging and new AI capabilities arriving, the industry is positioned for a fresh, if modest, upgrade cycle. The broader economic conditions shaping this consumer and business spending are explored in our global economy overview.

PC market revenue growth rate by year barPC Revenue Growth Rate (%)PC market revenue growth rate by year bar +8.5%2020 boom

Note: annual percentage change; red bars are years of decline. Category Trends

Diverging Fortunes: Category Trends

Plotting the three categories as separate lines reveals their diverging fortunes. The laptop line climbs steadily across the period, dipping during the 2022 to 2023 correction but recovering to clear new highs, the clear growth engine of the market. The tablet line is far flatter, rising modestly during the pandemic before settling into a narrow band, reflecting a category that has matured and found its natural level. The desktop line, the lowest of the three, shows a gentle but persistent recovery in recent years, defying predictions of its demise as gamers, professionals and businesses continue to value the power and value that desktops offer.

The contrasting trajectories explain why the category view matters so much. A simple headline figure for the PC market would hide the fact that its growth is almost entirely a laptop story, with tablets and desktops essentially treading water. For investors, suppliers and manufacturers, this means the strategic action is in laptops, where premiumisation, AI features and design innovation determine who wins. The other

categories offer stability and steady cash flow but little growth, a dynamic that shapes how the major PC makers allocate their investment and marketing across their product ranges.

The divergence between the categories is ultimately a story about how people work and live. The laptop has won because it offers the best balance of power, portability and price for the widest range of users, from students to professionals. Tablets occupy a narrower niche as media and casual computing devices, while desktops endure where raw performance and value matter most. As remote and hybrid work have become permanent features of the economy, the premium on portable, capable machines has only grown, reinforcing the laptop dominance that the category data so clearly displays across the entire period.

PC revenue category trends laptops desktop tablets lineRevenue by Category Over Time ($B)PC revenue category trends laptops desktop tablets line $143BLaptops$40BDesktops

$2.45 Trillion Market

A $2.45 Trillion Market

Adding up every year's revenue reveals the cumulative scale of the PC market: across the eleven years from 2018 to 2028, the world is on course to spend roughly $2.45 trillion on laptops, desktops and tablets. Even in its weakest years, the market generates well over $200 billion annually, a testament to the enduring centrality of the personal computer to work, education and entertainment. This vast and recurring spending base is why the PC market, for all the talk of its decline, remains one of the most important hardware markets in the world, closely tied to the broader device economy.

The cumulative figure also highlights how the PC sits within the wider technology ecosystem. While smartphones command larger headline revenue, the PC remains the primary tool for serious work and content creation, anchoring the productivity economy in a way that no other device can match. The companies that dominate this market, from chip makers to brands, capture a steady share of that $2.45 trillion, and the way those revenue pools are distributed across the technology giants is detailed in our largest source of revenue of leading tech companies analysis.

Cumulative PC market revenue 2018 2028 trillion lineCumulative PC Revenue Since 2018 ($B)Cumulative PC market revenue 2018 2028 trillion line $2.45Tby 2028

Note: running total of annual PC market revenue. Growth by Category

Growth Rates by Category

Comparing the growth rates of the three categories over the full period quantifies their diverging paths. Laptops are forecast to grow at a compound annual rate of nearly 3 percent, comfortably the fastest of the three and well ahead of the market as a whole. Desktop PCs grow at a more modest pace of around 1.3 percent a year, a respectable showing for a category many had written off, while tablets bring up the rear at roughly 1 percent annual growth. These figures confirm laptops as the undisputed growth leader, while the other categories deliver the slow, steady expansion typical of mature markets.

The growth rate gap, though it looks small in any single year, compounds into a significant reshaping of the market over time. A category growing at 3 percent steadily pulls ahead of one growing at 1 percent, which is why laptops keep claiming an ever larger share of PC revenue. For the industry, the message is clear: the future of PC growth lies in portable, premium and increasingly intelligent laptops, with desktops and tablets playing valuable but supporting roles. This concentration of growth in a single category is a defining feature of the modern PC market.

The compound growth figures also help explain why the PC market has confounded the doom mongers who predicted its demise. A market growing at around 2 percent a year in value, even with flat or falling unit volumes, is far from dying; it is simply maturing, much as countless other large consumer markets have before it. The steady, unspectacular growth of laptops in particular provides a reliable foundation of revenue that supports the entire computing ecosystem, from chip designers to software developers. In a technology landscape obsessed with explosive growth, the PC market is a reminder that enormous, stable and slowly growing businesses can be every bit as valuable as the fast movers that grab the headlines.

PC revenue CAGR by category laptops desktop tablets barAnnual Growth Rate by Category, 2018-2028 (%)PC revenue CAGR by category laptops desktop tablets bar +2.8%Laptops+1.0%Tablets

Leading Vendors

Who Captures the PC Market

The revenue generated by the PC market is captured by a small group of dominant vendors. By shipments, Lenovo leads the global market with around a quarter of all units, followed by HP and Dell, the three of which together account for roughly 60 percent of PCs shipped. Apple, while smaller by units at around 9 percent, captures a disproportionate share of revenue and profit thanks to its premium pricing, while ASUS, Acer and a long tail of smaller brands make up the rest. This concentrated structure gives the leading vendors significant scale advantages in a competitive market.

It is worth noting that shipment share and revenue share differ markedly, particularly for Apple. Because the company sells exclusively premium Macs at high prices, its share of PC market revenue is considerably larger than its share of units, a pattern that echoes its strategy in smartphones. The Windows PC makers, by contrast, compete across a much wider range of price points, including high volumes of affordable machines that generate less revenue per unit. This split between premium and value strategies shapes how the market's revenue is divided, a dynamic detailed in our Apple total net sales analysis.

The structure of the PC vendor market closely mirrors that of the smartphone market, with a handful of giants commanding most of the volume and a clear split between premium and value strategies. Just as Apple and Samsung dominate smartphones, Lenovo, HP and Dell dominate PCs, while Apple straddles both markets as the premium leader. The competitive dynamics, brand loyalty and pricing strategies that shape who wins are remarkably similar across the two categories, as our smartphone market share by vendor analysis illustrates in detail for the phone market.

PC vendor shipment share Lenovo HP Dell Apple donutPC Shipment Share by VendorPC vendor shipment share Lenovo HP Dell Apple donut 24%Lenovo

Revenue vs Shipments

Fewer PCs, Similar Money: Revenue vs Shipments

Setting revenue against unit shipments reveals the same premiumisation story that defines the smartphone market. PC shipments peaked dramatically during the pandemic, reaching around 341 million units in 2021, before crashing to a low near 242 million in 2023 and recovering only modestly since. Yet revenue has held up far better than units, because the average price of a PC has risen steadily as buyers trade up to more capable laptops. The world is buying fewer computers than it did at the pandemic peak, but spending nearly as much, as the mix shifts toward premium devices.

This divergence between flat or falling units and resilient revenue is the central economic feature of the mature PC market. With unit growth largely exhausted in saturated markets, manufacturers have focused on raising average selling prices through premium designs, better displays, longer battery life and now artificial intelligence features. The hope is that AI PCs in particular can both lift prices and shorten upgrade cycles, reviving a market that has long depended on replacement demand. The way these devices enable the broader digital economy is tracked in our retail e-commerce sales growth worldwide analysis.

PC shipments units by year 2018 2028 linePC Shipments (Million Units)PC shipments units by year 2018 2028 line 341M2021 peak242M2023 low

2018 vs 2028

Where the Growth Landed: 2018 vs 2028

Comparing each category at the start and end of the period shows where the growth has actually landed. Laptop revenue is forecast to rise from around $108 billion in 2018 to about $143 billion in 2028, an increase of roughly $35 billion that accounts for the vast majority of the market's total growth. Tablets edge up from about $58 billion to $64 billion, while desktops climb modestly from around $35 billion to $40 billion. The picture could hardly be clearer: laptops are doing almost all the heavy lifting, while the other two categories contribute only marginal gains.

This concentration of growth has strategic consequences for everyone in the PC ecosystem. Chip makers prioritise the processors and accelerators that power premium laptops, component suppliers focus on thin and light designs, and brands pour their marketing into the laptop lines that drive both volume and value. The desktop and tablet categories, while still substantial and profitable, are managed for steady returns rather than growth. Understanding this split is essential for anyone seeking to navigate or invest in the PC market, and it frames the competitive battles that will define the rest of the decade.

Finally, it is worth remembering what these revenue figures represent in human terms: hundreds of millions of machines that power the modern economy, from the laptops on which knowledge work is done to the tablets used in classrooms and the desktops that run businesses and creative studios. The steady flow of spending on these devices underpins a vast ecosystem of software, services and content that depends on capable hardware to function, an ecosystem whose own economics are explored in our internet companies revenue analysis. The PC, in short, remains foundational infrastructure for the digital age.

PC revenue by category 2018 vs 2028 grouped barCategory Revenue, 2018 vs 2028 ($B)PC revenue by category 2018 vs 2028 grouped bar +$35BLaptops+$6BTablets

$247B2028 RevenueRecord, all categories. $143BLaptops 202858% of the market. $2.45TTotal SpendAcross 2018-2028. +2.8%Laptop CAGRFastest category.

Taken together, the data describes a PC market that is mature, resilient and quietly growing in value even as it has stopped growing in units. From around $201 billion in 2018, revenue dipped, surged during the pandemic, corrected, and is forecast to reach a record of about $247 billion by 2028, with laptops driving almost all of the growth and now commanding close to 58 percent of the market. Tablets and desktops provide stability rather than expansion, while a cumulative $2.45 trillion is set to be spent over the period, confirming the PC's enduring importance to work and life.

The questions that will shape the market's future are whether AI PCs can ignite a genuine new upgrade cycle, how far premiumisation can continue to lift prices, and whether laptops can keep growing fast enough to offset the maturity of tablets and desktops. What is clear is that the personal computer, so often written off, remains a vast and vital market, evolving rather than dying as it adapts to a world of portable, premium and increasingly intelligent machines. For buyers, builders and investors alike, the category data offers a clear roadmap: follow the laptop, watch the rise of AI PCs, and treat the recurring billions spent on desktops and tablets as the dependable bedrock of one of technology's most underestimated markets. Whatever the next decade brings, the personal computer looks set to remain a cornerstone of how the world works, learns and creates, generating hundreds of billions of dollars a year for those who build it. The market value of the companies competing for this revenue is examined in our biggest companies by market value overview.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: PC Market Revenue

The worldwide PC market, covering laptops, desktop PCs and tablets, is forecast to generate about $247 billion in revenue by 2028, up from around $201 billion in 2018, according to Statista Market Insights. The total stood at roughly $220 billion in 2022. Smartphones are not included in this figure.

Statista divides the PC market into three categories: laptops, desktop PCs and tablets. Laptops are by far the largest, accounting for close to 58 percent of revenue, followed by tablets at around 26 percent and desktop PCs at about 16 percent. Smartphones and accessories sold separately are excluded from the PC market.

Laptops generate the most revenue by a wide margin, forecast at around $143 billion by 2028, close to 58 percent of the total PC market. They are also the fastest growing category. Tablets are second at roughly $64 billion, and desktop PCs are the smallest at about $40 billion, though desktops have recently returned to growth.

In revenue terms the PC market is growing slowly, forecast to reach a record by 2028 after recovering from a 2022-2023 slump. However, unit shipments have fallen from their 2021 pandemic peak, so the market is growing in value rather than volume, as buyers trade up to more expensive premium and AI-enabled laptops.

PC revenue surged in 2020 and 2021 as the pandemic forced people to work, learn and entertain themselves at home, driving record demand for laptops and tablets. This pulled years of purchases

forward, so when the boom faded, the market slumped sharply in 2022 and 2023 before beginning a steady recovery from 2024 onward.

An AI PC is a computer, usually a laptop, with a dedicated neural processing unit that can run artificial intelligence tasks efficiently on the device. The industry hopes AI PCs will justify higher prices and encourage people to upgrade sooner, sparking a new growth cycle in a mature market that has long relied on replacement demand.

By shipments, Lenovo leads the global PC market with around a quarter of units, followed by HP and Dell, with the three together accounting for roughly 60 percent of PCs shipped. Apple, ASUS and Acer follow. Apple captures a larger share of revenue than units because it sells exclusively premium Macs at high prices.

In Statista's PC market definition, yes: the PC market comprises laptops, desktop PCs and tablets, all treated as physical computing units. Smartphones, which also have computing capabilities, are excluded. Tablets account for around a quarter of PC market revenue, making them a significant but slower growing part of the market.

Worldwide PC market revenue is forecast to reach about $247 billion by 2028, a record, with a cumulative total of roughly $2.45 trillion spent across 2018 to 2028. Laptops account for most of the growth. The 2028 figure is a Statista Market Insights forecast and represents a modeled estimate rather than a certainty.

The figures are Statista Market Insights estimates of worldwide PC market revenue, covering laptops, desktop PCs and tablets and including consumer, business and government spending. The total is anchored to Statista's published figures, while category splits are estimates. All figures are modeled estimates, and 2028 is a forecast, so they indicate scale and direction rather than exact totals.

Sources

Statista Market Insights - PCs / Computing Worldwide - Primary source for worldwide PC market revenue and category estimates.

Statista Market Insights, PCs market (2018-2028) - Modeled estimates of PC market revenue by category (laptops, desktop PCs, tablets).

IDC and industry reports - Used for PC unit shipments and vendor market share.

Revenue figures are Statista Market Insights estimates, in current U.S. dollars, covering laptops, desktop PCs and tablets (smartphones excluded). The total is anchored to Statista's published figures; category splits are estimates. 2028 is a forecast. Vendor share is by shipments. Not investment advice.

STATISTICS REPORT

Smartphone shipments worldwide quarterly 2009-2026

Updated Jun 14, 2026 · businesstats.com/quarterly-global-smartphone-shipments-by-quarter

290M Q1 2026 SHIPMENTS	**54M** Q4 2009 SHIPMENTS	**1.47B** 2016 PEAK (YEAR)
18.7B TOTAL SINCE 2009	**-4%** Q1 2026 YOY	**21.7%** SAMSUNG Q1 2026

Overview

Smartphone shipments worldwide from 4th quarter 2009 to 1st quarter 2026

Few products have risen as fast, or shipped in as vast a quantity, as the smartphone. From barely 54 million units in the final quarter of 2009, when the smartphone era was just beginning, worldwide shipments climbed to a peak of over 400 million in a single holiday quarter, before settling into the mature, cyclical market of today, which ships close to 300 million units a quarter. Tracking these shipments quarter by quarter, from the fourth quarter of 2009 to the first quarter of 2026, reveals the full arc of the smartphone's journey: explosive early growth, a long plateau, a pandemic shock, and a market now defined by replacement rather than expansion. The money behind these shipments is explored in our worldwide smartphone market revenue analysis.

The quarterly view is especially revealing because smartphone shipments are highly seasonal, peaking in the fourth quarter of each year as manufacturers and retailers push new flagship models into the holiday shopping season. Overlaid on this seasonal rhythm is the bigger story of the market's maturation. The breakneck growth of the early 2010s, when shipments routinely rose 40 to 75 percent a year, gave way to a plateau around 2016 and 2017, then to outright decline, the pandemic disruption of 2020, and a fragile recovery. By early 2026, the market had slipped back into decline once again. The intense competition between the brands shipping these phones is tracked in our smartphone market share by vendor analysis.

Smartphone shipments worldwide quarterly Q4 2009 Q1 2026 lineQuarterly Smartphone Shipments, Q4 2009-Q1 2026 (M units)Smartphone shipments worldwide quarterly Q4 2009 Q1 2026 line 290MQ1 2026

Note: IDC data; recent quarters reported, earlier quarters estimated from annual totals and seasonality.

A note on the data is important. The shipment figures here are based on data from IDC, the industry standard tracker of smartphone shipments, expressed in millions of units. Annual totals are well established and widely reported. For the long quarterly series, recent quarters use reported IDC figures, while some earlier quarters are estimated from annual totals and the well documented seasonal pattern of the market, so the precise quarterly values for the early years are best read as indicative of the shape and rhythm of the market rather than exact counts. The overall trajectory, however, is firmly grounded in the industry data. How these device shipments fit into total technology spending is set out in our big tech revenue comparison analysis.

To appreciate the scale of what the quarterly data captures, it helps to remember how new the smartphone was in late 2009. The iPhone was barely two years old, Android had only just launched, and most of the world still carried basic feature phones. The chart that follows therefore documents not just a product cycle but the birth and maturation of an entire industry, one that would go on to reshape communication, commerce, media and daily life for billions of people. Reading it from left to right is like watching the digital age arrive in real time, quarter by quarter, until the smartphone became the most widely owned piece of technology in human history.

Annual Data Table

Annual Smartphone Shipments, 2009-2025

Annual Smartphone Shipments, 2009-2025 (million units)Click any column to sort

YEAR	SHIPMENTS	YOY GROWTH
2009	173 M	-
2010	305 M	+76.3%
2011	494 M	+62.0%
2012	725 M	+46.8%
2013	1019 M	+40.6%

2014	1301 M	+27.7%
2015	1437 M	+10.5%
2016	1473 M	+2.5%
2017	1466 M	-0.5%
2018	1405 M	-4.2%
2019	1372 M	-2.3%
2020	1292 M	-5.8%
2021	1355 M	+4.9%
2022	1205 M	-11.1%
2023	1170 M	-2.9%
2024	1240 M	+6.0%
2025	1250 M	+0.8%

The table shows annual smartphone shipments for every year from 2009 to 2025, alongside the rate of change, providing the solid backbone of the quarterly series. The early rows are extraordinary, with shipments more than doubling between 2009 and 2011 and continuing to surge through 2013. Growth then slowed sharply, peaking in 2016 before the market entered a period of stagnation and decline. The pandemic year of 2020 and the slump of 2022 stand out as the weakest years, while 2024 marked a return to growth. Sorting the growth column reveals the dramatic deceleration from the triple digit boom years of the early 2010s to the low single digit swings of today, the clearest signal of a market that has moved from explosive expansion to mature replacement.

Annual Growth

From Rocket Ship to Plateau: Annual Growth

Plotting annual growth rates lays bare the smartphone market's transformation from rocket ship to mature plateau. In 2010 and 2011, shipments grew by more than 60 percent a year as smartphones swept across the developed world. Growth then decelerated steadily, from over 40 percent in 2012 and 2013 to single digits by 2015, before turning negative for the first time in 2017. The market has since seesawed between modest growth and decline, with the steepest drop coming in 2022, when shipments fell more than 10

percent amid economic uncertainty and weak demand. This long deceleration is the defining feature of the smartphone era's second decade.

The pattern reflects the fundamental dynamics of a maturing market. In the early years, growth came from hundreds of millions of first time buyers upgrading from basic feature phones to smartphones. Once that transition was largely complete across the major markets, the source of growth vanished, and shipments came to depend almost entirely on existing owners replacing their devices. As replacement cycles lengthened, with consumers holding phones for three or four years instead of two, unit growth stalled. The industry's hope is that new technologies, particularly artificial intelligence features, might shorten those cycles again, a prospect examined in our artificial intelligence worldwide statistics overview.

Smartphone shipments annual growth rate percent barAnnual Shipment Growth Rate (%)Smartphone shipments annual growth rate percent bar +76%2010 boom

Note: annual percentage change; red bars are years of decline. 18.7 Billion Phones

More Than 18 Billion Phones Shipped

Adding up every quarter since 2009 reveals a staggering total: by the end of 2025, the world had shipped roughly 18.7 billion smartphones, with the figure passing 19 billion in early 2026. That is more than two phones for every person alive on Earth, shipped in little more than fifteen years. The cumulative line climbs relentlessly, because even in the weakest years the industry still ships well over a billion units. This colossal installed base is the foundation of the modern digital economy, the hardware layer on which the entire world of apps, services and mobile commerce is built, as explored in our internet companies revenue analysis.

The scale of cumulative shipments also explains why the smartphone market, despite its maturity, remains so strategically vital. With billions of devices in active use and well over a billion replaced every year, even a market growing slowly in unit terms represents an enormous and recurring opportunity. It is this vast installed base that companies like Apple have learned to monetise far beyond the initial sale, through services, accessories and ecosystems, a strategy detailed in our Apple total net sales analysis. The phone, once sold, becomes a gateway to years of additional revenue.

The relentless climb of the cumulative line carries a sustainability dimension too. With nearly 19 billion devices shipped, the smartphone industry has become a major consumer of raw materials, from rare earth metals to lithium, and a significant source of electronic waste as billions of older devices are retired each year. This has pushed manufacturers toward longer software support, trade in schemes and recycling

programmes, partly to address environmental concerns and partly to capture value from the enormous installed base. The sheer volume of devices in circulation has made the smartphone not just an economic force but an environmental one as well.

Cumulative smartphone shipments since 2009 billion lineCumulative Shipments Since 2009 (M units)Cumulative smartphone shipments since 2009 billion line 18.7Bby 2025

Note: running total of annual shipments. Shipments by Era

Smartphone Shipments by Era

Grouping the years into eras captures the market's three distinct phases. The rise era of 2009 to 2013 averaged around 543 million units a year, a figure inflated by breakneck growth from a tiny base. The peak era of 2014 to 2017 averaged roughly 1.42 billion units annually, as the market hit its all time high in 2016. The mature era of 2018 to 2025 has averaged about 1.29 billion units a year, below the peak, as the market settled into a pattern of gentle decline and recovery. The contrast between the eras shows a market that expanded explosively, crested, and has since plateaued at a high but no longer growing level.

The era view underlines a crucial point about the smartphone market: it is no longer growing in unit terms, yet it remains enormous. Annual shipments today are lower than they were at the 2016 peak, a remarkable fact for a product once synonymous with relentless growth. The market has effectively saturated, with almost everyone who wants and can afford a smartphone already owning one. Future unit growth, if it comes, will rely on emerging markets, replacement cycles and new technologies rather than on the flood of first time buyers that powered the first decade. The broader economic context for this consumer demand is explored in our global economy overview.

Smartphone shipments average by era horizontal barAverage Annual Shipments by Era (M units)Smartphone shipments average by era horizontal bar 1419M2014-17543M2009-13

Quarterly Seasonality

The Holiday Effect: Quarterly Seasonality

Smartphone shipments follow a pronounced seasonal pattern, and the quarterly data makes it unmistakable. The fourth quarter, covering the crucial holiday shopping season, is consistently the strongest of the year, as manufacturers launch flagship devices and retailers discount aggressively. The first quarter typically holds up reasonably well on the momentum of holiday launches, before the second

quarter dips to the annual low point. The third quarter then begins to recover as the industry gears up for the next holiday cycle. This rhythm has held remarkably steady across the years, making the fourth quarter the single most important period for the entire industry.

Understanding this seasonality matters for interpreting the headline numbers, because a quarter must always be compared with the same quarter a year earlier rather than the previous quarter. A drop from the fourth quarter to the first quarter is normal seasonality, not a sign of weakness, whereas a year on year decline in any given quarter is a genuine warning signal. It is precisely such a year on year decline that the market registered in early 2026, breaking a long run of growth and prompting concern about the year ahead. The seasonal peak in the fourth quarter also concentrates the industry's marketing and competitive battles into a few critical weeks each year.

The seasonal concentration in the fourth quarter also shapes the competitive calendar of the entire industry. Flagship launches are timed to land just before the holidays, marketing budgets peak, and the battle for the crucial gift buying season can make or break a vendor for the whole year. Apple in particular relies heavily on the fourth quarter, when its newest iPhones drive a surge that often pushes it to the top of the shipment rankings, before Samsung typically reclaims the lead in the quieter first half of the year. This rhythm has become one of the most predictable features of the global technology calendar.

Smartphone shipments seasonality average by quarter barAverage Shipments by Calendar Quarter (M units)Smartphone shipments seasonality average by quarter bar Q4peakQ2low

Recent Quarters

The Recovery and Its Stall: 2023 to 2026

Zooming in on the most recent quarters, from the start of 2023 to early 2026, shows a market that staged a solid recovery before running into fresh trouble. Through 2023, shipments were subdued as the industry worked through excess inventory and weak demand. From early 2024, however, the market returned to growth, stringing together a run of quarters in which shipments rose year on year, helped by recovering demand and strong flagship launches. The fourth quarters of 2024 and 2025 were particularly robust, driven by holiday sales and record performances from the leading brands, especially at the premium end of the market.

That recovery, however, came to an abrupt halt in the first quarter of 2026. Shipments fell to around 290 million units, a decline of roughly 4 percent year on year, breaking a streak of about ten consecutive quarters of growth that had run since the middle of 2023. Analysts attributed the reversal primarily to a

global shortage of memory components, which pushed up costs and forced manufacturers to raise prices, dampening demand in price sensitive markets. The episode was a reminder that, even in recovery, the smartphone market remains vulnerable to supply shocks and economic headwinds, with much of the manufacturing base concentrated in China, as explored in our China economy analysis.

Smartphone shipments recent quarters 2023 2026 barQuarterly Shipments, Q1 2023-Q1 2026 (M units)Smartphone shipments recent quarters 2023 2026 bar 332MQ4 2024

Note: IDC reported figures for recent quarters. The Streak Breaks

A 10-Quarter Growth Streak Ends

Viewing the recent quarters through the lens of year on year growth makes the turning point crystal clear. From early 2024 through the end of 2025, almost every quarter posted positive year on year growth, with gains of 5 to 7 percent in the strongest periods as the market rebounded from its 2023 lows. This sustained run of growth had encouraged optimism that the smartphone market had finally turned a corner after years of stagnation. The first quarter of 2026, however, broke the pattern decisively, registering a clear year on year decline and signalling that the recovery had stalled.

The breaking of the growth streak in early 2026 carries significance beyond a single quarter. It marked the first year on year decline since mid 2023 and prompted analysts to revise their full year forecasts downward, warning that component shortages and rising prices could weigh on the market throughout 2026. For an industry that had only recently regained its footing, the reversal underscored how fragile the recovery remained. Whether it proves a brief stumble or the start of a deeper downturn will depend heavily on how quickly the memory shortage eases and how consumers respond to the higher prices that are likely to follow.

Smartphone shipments quarterly year over year growth barQuarterly Shipments Growth, Year on Year (%)Smartphone shipments quarterly year over year growth bar +7%2024 peak-4%Q1 2026

Leading Vendors

Who Ships the Most Phones

The hundreds of millions of phones shipped each quarter are dominated by a small group of global brands. In the first quarter of 2026, Samsung led the market with about 22 percent of shipments, reclaiming the top spot it traditionally holds in the first quarter, when Apple's holiday surge has faded. Apple ranked second,

followed by China's Xiaomi in third, with vivo, OPPO and a long tail of smaller brands making up the rest. The first quarter ranking typically favours Samsung and Android brands, since Apple's shipments are heavily concentrated in the fourth quarter around new iPhone launches.

The competitive picture has shifted dramatically over the life of the smartphone market. Early leaders such as Nokia and BlackBerry vanished, while Samsung and Apple rose to a dominant duopoly at the top. More recently, Chinese brands led by Xiaomi, vivo, OPPO and Transsion have captured a large share of global volume, particularly in emerging markets where their aggressively priced devices have thrived. This leaves the market split between a premium tier dominated by Apple and Samsung and a vast value segment contested by Chinese manufacturers, a divide that shapes how shipments translate into revenue and profit, as set out in our largest source of revenue of leading tech companies analysis.

The stakes in these shipment rankings are enormous, because scale confers powerful advantages in a hardware business. Higher volumes mean better terms from component suppliers, greater bargaining power with carriers and retailers, and more resources to invest in research and marketing. This is why vendors fight so fiercely for every share point, even in a flat or shrinking market, and why the collapse of former giants such as Nokia and BlackBerry happened so quickly once they lost scale. In the smartphone industry, momentum in shipments can rapidly become either a virtuous or a vicious cycle.

Smartphone vendor market share Q1 2026 Samsung Apple Xiaomi donutSmartphone Shipment Share, Q1 2026Smartphone vendor market share Q1 2026 Samsung Apple Xiaomi donut 21.7%Samsung

Milestone Quarters

The Smartphone Arc in Five Quarters

A handful of milestone quarters trace the smartphone's entire arc. In the fourth quarter of 2009, the industry shipped around 54 million units, a figure that would soon look quaint. By the peak years around 2016, a single holiday quarter could exceed 400 million units. The second quarter of 2020 saw shipments slump to roughly 280 million as the pandemic struck, before the market recovered. The fourth quarter of 2024 reached a healthy 332 million on the back of strong holiday demand, while the first quarter of 2026 came in near 290 million as the latest downturn began. Together these quarters span the market's birth, boom, shock and maturity.

What stands out across these milestones is how the smartphone market has matured without collapsing. Even at its lowest recent points, the industry still ships far more phones in a single quarter than it did in an entire year at the start of the smartphone era. The market has cycled through booms and busts, supply

shocks and demand slumps, yet the underlying volume has remained enormous. This resilience reflects the smartphone's status as an essential product that billions of people replace on a regular cycle, ensuring a steady, massive flow of shipments regardless of the economic weather.

These milestone quarters also map neatly onto the broader technology cycles of their times. The 2009 starting point coincided with the dawn of the app economy, the 2016 peak with the maturing of the global smartphone market, the 2020 trough with the pandemic, and the 2026 downturn with the supply chain pressures and component shortages reshaping the industry today. In this sense, the smartphone shipment curve doubles as a barometer of the wider technology economy, registering each major shock and shift in consumer behaviour across more than fifteen years of rapid change.

Smartphone shipments milestone quarters horizontal barShipments at Milestone Quarters (M units)Smartphone shipments milestone quarters horizontal bar 290MQ1 2026

Note: selected quarters tracing the market's arc. Shipments vs Revenue

Fewer Phones, Similar Money: Shipments vs Revenue

Perhaps the most important insight from the shipment data emerges when it is set against revenue. While unit shipments have trended downward from their peak and remain below their 2018 level, the revenue generated by those shipments has held up far better, recovering close to its earlier highs. Indexing both measures to 2018 shows the gap clearly: the world is shipping fewer phones but spending nearly as much money, because the average price of each device has risen steadily. This is the premiumisation story in a single chart, the defining economic feature of the modern smartphone market, transforming a business of falling unit sales into one of resilient and even rising value.

This divergence between falling units and resilient revenue has reshaped the entire industry's strategy. With unit growth no longer available, manufacturers have focused relentlessly on raising average selling prices, pushing premium features, larger storage, foldable designs and advanced cameras to justify higher prices. The result is a market where shipping fewer, more expensive phones can be more profitable than chasing volume, a logic that Apple pioneered and others have followed. The broader shift toward digital commerce that these devices enable is tracked in our retail e-commerce sales growth worldwide analysis. Note that the revenue series draws on a different source from the shipment data and the comparison is therefore indicative.

Smartphone shipments vs revenue indexed 2018 2025 lineShipments vs Revenue, Indexed (2018 = 100)Smartphone shipments vs revenue indexed 2018 2025 line RevenueresilientUnitsfalling

290MQ1 2026Down 4% year on year. 1.47B2016 PeakAll-time annual high. 18.7BTotal ShippedSince Q4 2009. 21.7%Samsung ShareLeader in Q1 2026.

Taken together, the quarterly data tells the complete story of the smartphone, from a fledgling product shipping 54 million units in late 2009 to a mature global industry shipping close to 300 million units a quarter today. The market boomed through the early 2010s, peaked around 2016, weathered the pandemic, and has since settled into a cyclical pattern of modest growth and decline, with around 18.7 billion phones shipped over the period. By early 2026, a fresh downturn driven by component shortages had broken a promising recovery, underlining the market's enduring sensitivity to supply and economic shocks.

Yet for all the talk of saturation and decline, the smartphone remains the most ubiquitous and important consumer device on the planet, shipping in volumes that dwarf every other category of personal technology. The key questions ahead are whether artificial intelligence can revive unit growth, how quickly the memory shortage eases, and whether any new form factor can reignite the kind of demand that defined the smartphone's first decade. The market value of the companies competing for these shipments is examined in our biggest companies by market value overview. Whatever the answer, the quarterly shipment data will remain one of the most closely watched indicators in technology, a real time pulse of consumer confidence, innovation and the global supply chains that turn silicon and glass into the devices that billions of people carry every day, and a reliable early warning of shifts rippling through the wider electronics industry. For now, the smartphone endures as the device against which all others are measured, and its quarterly numbers remain essential reading for anyone tracking the direction of global technology.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: Smartphone Shipments

As of the first quarter of 2026, around 290 million smartphones were shipped worldwide, according to IDC. Quarterly shipments typically range from roughly 280 million in the weaker quarters to over 330 million in the strong fourth quarter holiday period. The figure has come down from a peak of over 400 million in a single quarter around 2016.

Annual smartphone shipments peaked in 2016 at around 1.47 billion units. The strongest individual quarters, exceeding 400 million units, also came in the holiday periods of the mid 2010s. Since then, annual shipments have remained below that peak, fluctuating between roughly 1.17 and 1.4 billion units a year as the market matured.

Smartphone shipments have declined from their 2016 peak mainly because the market has saturated: most people who want a smartphone already own one, so growth depends on replacements rather than new buyers. Lengthening upgrade cycles, economic uncertainty and, most recently, a memory component shortage that raised prices have all weighed on shipments.

Global smartphone shipments were around 290 million units in the first quarter of 2026, a decline of roughly 4 percent year on year, according to IDC. This broke a streak of about ten consecutive quarters of growth dating back to mid 2023, and was driven largely by a global memory shortage that pushed up prices.

The fourth quarter is consistently the strongest for smartphone shipments, because it covers the holiday shopping season and the launch of new flagship phones, including Apple's latest iPhones. The second quarter is typically the weakest. This seasonal pattern means quarters should always be compared with the same quarter a year earlier rather than the previous quarter.

From the fourth quarter of 2009 through the end of 2025, the world shipped roughly 18.7 billion smartphones, with the total passing 19 billion in early 2026. That is more than two phones for every person on Earth, shipped in little more than fifteen years, underlining the smartphone's extraordinary global reach.

Samsung and Apple are the two largest smartphone vendors, regularly trading the top spot. In the first quarter of 2026, Samsung led with about 22 percent of shipments, ahead of Apple, with Xiaomi third. Apple tends to lead in the fourth quarter around new iPhone launches, while Samsung typically leads earlier in the year.

No. Unit shipments have fallen from their peak and remain below 2018 levels, but revenue has held up much better, recovering close to its earlier highs. This is because average selling prices have risen, so the industry sells fewer phones but generates nearly as much money, a trend known as premiumisation. Note that shipment and revenue data come from different sources.

Highly seasonal. The fourth quarter, covering the holidays and new flagship launches, is typically 20 to 25 percent stronger than the weakest quarter of the year. This seasonality is remarkably consistent year to year, which is why analysts focus on year on year comparisons for the same quarter rather than sequential quarter to quarter changes.

The figures are based on data from IDC, the industry standard smartphone tracker, in millions of units. Annual totals are well established and widely reported. Recent quarters use reported IDC figures, while

some earlier quarters in the long series are estimated from annual totals and seasonal patterns, so early quarterly values are indicative of the market's shape rather than exact counts.

Sources

IDC - Worldwide Quarterly Mobile Phone Tracker - Primary source for worldwide smartphone shipment figures and vendor market share.

IDC quarterly and annual smartphone shipment data (2009-2026) - Used for annual totals, recent quarterly shipments and vendor share.

Industry trackers and reports - Used for historical context and seasonal shipment patterns.

Shipment figures are based on IDC data, in millions of units. Annual totals are widely reported. Recent quarters use reported IDC figures; some earlier quarters in the long series are estimated from annual totals and seasonal patterns and are indicative. Q1 2026 is preliminary. The revenue comparison uses a separate source. Not investment advice.

STATISTICS REPORT

IT devices total spending worldwide 2012-2026

Updated Jun 14, 2026 · businesstats.com/total-devices-spending-worldwide-forecast

$856B 2026 SPENDING (RECORD)	**$628B** 2012 SPENDING	**$808B** 2021 PANDEMIC BOOM
$10.5T TOTAL SINCE 2012	**~14%** SHARE OF IT BUDGET	**+9.3%** 2026 GROWTH

Overview

Global spending on devices (PCs, tablets, mobile phones, and printers) from 2012 to 2026

Every year the world spends hundreds of billions of dollars on the hardware that powers daily digital life: the PCs on desks, the tablets on laps, the mobile phones in pockets and the printers in offices. Analysts at Gartner group these four product categories together as the devices segment of global information technology spending, and tracking that figure offers a revealing window into the health of the consumer and business technology market. Between 2012 and 2026, worldwide device spending has swung from roughly $628 billion to a projected record of about $856 billion, but the path between those points has been anything but a straight line. The biggest single category within this total is mobile phones, the competitive dynamics of which are explored in our smartphone market share by vendor analysis.

The device spending line tells the story of more than a decade of technological change. It rose in the early 2010s as smartphones and tablets went mainstream, sagged in the middle of the decade as the PC market slumped and tablet sales saturated, recovered in the late 2010s, and then exploded during the pandemic as locked down households and remote workers rushed to buy laptops, tablets and phones. After a sharp correction, spending has climbed back to fresh records, lifted recently by rising prices and the arrival of artificial intelligence enabled devices. The role of AI in reshaping technology demand is covered in our artificial intelligence worldwide statistics overview.

It is worth being clear about what these numbers represent. They are Gartner's estimates of worldwide end user spending on devices, expressed in current U.S. dollars, and like all forecasts they are revised as new

data arrives. The most recent years are based on Gartner's latest published forecasts, while earlier figures are drawn from its historical estimates, which the firm updates over time. Currency movements, shifting average selling prices and changing replacement cycles all influence the totals, so the figures are best read as a guide to the overall trend rather than precise accounting results. How this hardware spending sits alongside the revenue of the technology giants is set out in our big tech companies revenue comparison analysis.

Understanding device spending matters because these four product categories are the physical gateway to the entire digital economy. Every cloud service, every app, every piece of software and every online purchase ultimately reaches people through a PC, tablet or phone, which is why the health of the device market is closely watched as a leading indicator of broader technology demand. A strong year for devices often signals confident consumers and businesses willing to invest, while a slump can foreshadow caution across the wider economy. The device line is, in that sense, a useful early read on the mood of the global technology market as a whole, even as spending power gradually shifts toward the software and services that run on top of the hardware.

Global device spending PCs tablets mobile phones printers 2012 2026 barWorldwide Device Spending, 2012-2026 ($B)Global device spending PCs tablets mobile phones printers 2012 2026 bar $856B2026 record

Note: Gartner end user spending on devices; 2021 was the pandemic boom, 2026 is a forecast. Full Data Table

Worldwide Device Spending by Year

Worldwide Device Spending, 2012-2026 (USD billion)Click any column to sort

YEAR	DEVICE SPENDING	YOY GROWTH
2012	$628 B	-
2013	$666 B	+6.1%
2014	$685 B	+2.9%
2015	$654 B	-4.5%
2016	$600 B	-8.3%
2017	$663 B	+10.5%

2018	$706 B	+6.5%
2019	$682 B	-3.4%
2020	$670 B	-1.8%
2021	$808 B	+20.6%
2022	$722 B	-10.6%
2023	$700 B	-3.0%
2024	$722 B	+3.1%
2025	$783 B	+8.4%
2026*	$856 B	+9.3%

The table lays out worldwide device spending for every year from 2012 to 2026, alongside the annual rate of change. Reading down the columns, three distinct phases stand out. The early and middle years hover in a band between $600 billion and $700 billion, with a noticeable dip in 2015 and 2016. The pandemic year of 2021 leaps out, with spending surging past $800 billion in a single extraordinary year. The most recent rows show a recovery from the post pandemic correction back to record territory, driven by higher prices rather than a surge in the number of devices sold. Sorting the growth column quickly reveals just how volatile this market can be, swinging from double digit gains to double digit declines within a few years.

Year-on-Year Growth

The Ups and Downs: Year-on-Year Growth

Expressed as annual growth rates, the device market looks far more turbulent than its relatively stable headline totals suggest. The standout year is 2021, when spending jumped more than 20 percent as the pandemic triggered a once in a generation wave of device buying. That boom was followed by an equally dramatic bust, with spending falling more than 10 percent in 2022 as demand that had been pulled forward evaporated and households paused upgrades. The mid decade years of 2015 and 2016 show another soft patch, when a slumping PC market and saturated tablet sales dragged the total down. These swings make device spending one of the more cyclical corners of the technology economy.

The pattern of booms and busts reflects the unusual nature of device demand. Unlike software subscriptions or cloud services, which generate steady recurring revenue, devices are durable goods that

consumers and businesses replace only every few years. When a wave of buying occurs, whether driven by a new technology, a pandemic or a refresh cycle, it tends to pull demand forward and leave a hole in following years. This is exactly what happened around the pandemic, and Gartner has warned that the recent recovery could similarly cool once the current upgrade wave passes. The replacement cycle dynamic is a key reason device spending rarely grows in a smooth, predictable line the way other parts of the IT budget often do.

Device spending year over year growth rate percent barDevice Spending Growth Rate (%)Device spending year over year growth rate percent bar +20.6%2021 boom

Note: annual percentage change; red bars are years of decline. Cumulative Spending

More Than $10 Trillion Spent in 15 Years

Adding up every year's spending reveals the sheer scale of the global device market over time. Between 2012 and 2026, the world is on course to have spent more than $10.5 trillion on PCs, tablets, mobile phones and printers, a staggering sum that underlines how central these devices have become to modern life and work. The cumulative line climbs relentlessly, since even in weak years the world still spends well over half a trillion dollars on hardware. More than a third of that entire fifteen year total has been spent in just the last five years, reflecting both higher prices and the enduring importance of personal devices even as spending shifts toward cloud and software elsewhere in the technology budget.

The cumulative figure also puts the device market in perspective against other parts of the economy. Spending of more than $10 trillion over the period rivals the entire annual economic output of major nations, and it flows to a relatively concentrated group of manufacturers, chip makers and component suppliers. For the companies at the top of this market, capturing even a small additional share of global device spending translates into billions in revenue, which is why competition in smartphones and PCs remains so fierce. The way this hardware spending compares with the recurring revenue of internet and software firms is examined in our internet companies revenue analysis.

It is also worth noting how concentrated this enormous spending has become among a handful of dominant manufacturers. A small group of smartphone and PC makers, led by names such as Apple, Samsung, Lenovo and HP, capture the lion's share of the more than $10 trillion spent over the period, supported by an even smaller group of chip and component suppliers. This concentration means that shifts in global device spending flow disproportionately to a few balance sheets, which is why the quarterly results of the largest device makers are scrutinised so closely as a proxy for the health of the entire market. The competitive

battle for that spending never lets up.

Cumulative device spending since 2012 trillion lineCumulative Device Spending Since 2012 ($B)Cumulative device spending since 2012 trillion line $10.5Tby 2026

Note: running total of annual device spending; 2026 projected. Spending by Era

Device Spending by Era

Grouping the years into three five year eras smooths out the annual noise and reveals a clear upward drift in the baseline level of device spending. In the 2012 to 2016 era, spending averaged around $647 billion a year, held back by the mid decade PC slump. The 2017 to 2021 era lifted the average to roughly $706 billion, boosted by the late decade recovery and the enormous pandemic spike at its end. The most recent 2022 to 2026 era pushes the average higher still, to about $757 billion, as the market has settled into a higher band driven by premium pricing and AI enabled hardware. Each era has been larger than the last, even though individual years within them have been volatile.

The steady rise in the era averages is an important counterpoint to the dramatic year to year swings. While any single year can surge or slump, the underlying trend over five year periods is one of gradual, persistent growth. This reflects the deepening role of personal devices in every aspect of life and work, as well as the steady upward creep of prices, particularly for premium smartphones and high specification laptops. It also shows that, despite repeated predictions of a saturated and declining device market, global spending has continued to grind higher over the long run, supported by population growth, rising incomes in emerging markets and the constant reinvention of devices through new features and capabilities.

Device spending average annual by era horizontal barAverage Annual Spending by Era ($B)Device spending average annual by era horizontal bar $757B2022-26$647B2012-16

Devices in the IT Picture

Devices in the Bigger IT Picture

Device spending is large, but it is only one piece of a much bigger global IT budget. In 2026, worldwide IT spending is forecast to exceed $6 trillion, spread across five major segments: IT services, software, communications services, devices and data center systems. Devices, at around $856 billion, account for roughly one seventh of the total, ranking behind the giant IT services and software categories but ahead of, or close to, data center systems. This breakdown shows that while devices remain a substantial market, the

bulk of technology spending now flows toward services, software and the infrastructure behind cloud computing. How those revenue pools are distributed among the leading firms is detailed in our largest source of revenue of leading tech companies analysis.

The position of devices within the wider IT budget has been shifting steadily. A decade ago, hardware commanded a larger share of technology spending, but the relentless growth of cloud services, enterprise software and, more recently, artificial intelligence infrastructure has gradually reduced the relative weight of devices. This does not mean device spending is shrinking, far from it, but rather that the rest of the IT budget is growing faster. The result is a technology economy in which hardware remains essential but is no longer the centre of gravity, as spending power migrates toward the software and services layered on top of the devices.

The five segment structure also helps explain why technology has proved so resilient as an investment theme. When one category slows, another often accelerates, keeping total IT spending on a steady upward path even through recessions and shocks. During the pandemic it was devices that surged; more recently it has been data center systems and software, powered by artificial intelligence. This rotation of growth between segments gives the overall technology budget a stability that any single category, including devices, lacks on its own. For the industry as a whole, the diversification across hardware, software, services and infrastructure is a source of enduring strength.

Worldwide IT spending by segment 2026 devices software services donutWorldwide IT Spending by Segment, 2026 ($B)Worldwide IT spending by segment 2026 devices software services donut
$856BDevices

Devices vs Data Centers

Devices Lose Ground to Data Centers

Perhaps the most striking shift in the technology budget is the explosive rise of data center spending, driven by the race to build artificial intelligence infrastructure. As recently as 2021, worldwide spending on data center systems was a fraction of device spending, but it has since surged as hyperscale cloud providers pour money into AI optimised servers. By 2026, data center systems spending is forecast to approach $788 billion, closing in on the roughly $856 billion spent on devices. The two lines, once far apart, are converging rapidly. The companies winning this data center boom are profiled in our Nvidia statistics and facts analysis of the AI hardware market.

This convergence marks a profound reordering of technology priorities. For most of the past two decades, devices were the dominant hardware category, the place where most computing money was spent. Now, the centre of hardware investment is shifting from the billions of personal devices in people's hands to the concentrated data centers that train and run artificial intelligence models. If current trends continue, data center spending could soon overtake device spending altogether, a milestone that would symbolise the transition from the personal computing era to the AI infrastructure era. The cloud platforms driving this build out are examined in our big three cloud market analysis.

Device spending vs data center systems spending 2021 2026 lineDevices vs Data Center Systems ($B)Device spending vs data center systems spending 2021 2026 line $788BData center 2026

Note: data center spending is closing in on device spending as AI infrastructure booms. Fastest Growing Segments

Where IT Spending Is Growing Fastest in 2026

Looking at growth rates rather than absolute size makes the shift in technology spending even clearer. In 2026, data center systems spending is forecast to grow by around 32 percent, by far the fastest of any segment, as the AI infrastructure boom accelerates. Software is set to grow about 15 percent, while IT services and devices are each expected to grow in the high single digits. Communications services, the most mature category, grows only slightly. Device spending, despite reaching a record in dollar terms, is now one of the slower growing parts of the IT budget, a reflection of how the momentum in technology has moved decisively toward AI and cloud infrastructure.

The contrast in growth rates explains why the composition of IT spending is changing so quickly. When one segment grows at 32 percent while another grows at 9 percent, the faster growing category steadily claims a larger share of the total over time. This is exactly what is happening as data center and software spending outpace devices. For device makers, the challenge is to keep growing in a market that, while still enormous, is maturing and ceding the spotlight to AI infrastructure. Many are responding by building AI capabilities directly into their devices, hoping to spark a new upgrade cycle that could reignite faster growth in the years ahead.

IT spending growth by segment 2026 data center devices barIT Spending Growth by Segment, 2026 (%)IT spending growth by segment 2026 data center devices bar +32%Data center+9%Devices

The Rollercoaster

The Device Spending Rollercoaster

Picking out a handful of milestone years captures the device market's rollercoaster ride in a single view. In 2012, spending stood at about $628 billion as smartphones and tablets were still spreading. It peaked at roughly $685 billion in 2014 before the mid decade slump dragged it down to a trough near $600 billion in 2016. The pandemic then propelled spending to a dramatic high of around $808 billion in 2021, before a correction and recovery carried it to a projected record of about $856 billion in 2026. These milestones trace a market that has repeatedly defied predictions of decline, finding new sources of growth even after each downturn.

What links these milestones is the way external forces have repeatedly reshaped device demand. The early growth was driven by the smartphone revolution, the mid decade slump by PC saturation and a strong dollar, the 2021 spike by the pandemic, and the latest record by rising prices and the dawn of AI enabled hardware. In each case, a powerful external catalyst pushed the market sharply in one direction. This sensitivity to outside events makes device spending an unusually good barometer of the broader technology and economic climate, reflecting everything from consumer confidence to global supply chains and the arrival of transformative new technologies.

Device spending milestone years 2012 2021 2026 horizontal barDevice Spending at Milestone Years ($B)Device spending milestone years 2012 2021 2026 horizontal bar $856B2026

Note: selected years tracing the market's peaks and troughs. A Shrinking Slice

A Shrinking Slice of IT Budgets

Even as device spending climbs to new records in dollar terms, its share of the total IT budget has been slipping. In 2021, at the height of the pandemic device boom, hardware accounted for roughly 19 percent of all worldwide IT spending. By 2026, despite the record absolute figure, that share is forecast to fall to under 14 percent. The reason is not weakness in devices but extraordinary strength elsewhere, as spending on data center systems, software and services grows far faster. The broader economic backdrop shaping these technology budgets is explored in our global economy overview.

This shrinking slice tells a deeper story about the evolution of technology. The device, once the centrepiece of the digital economy and the gateway through which people accessed computing, is increasingly becoming a commodity endpoint for services and intelligence that live in the cloud. The value, and therefore the spending, is migrating up the stack from hardware toward software, services and AI. Devices remain indispensable, and the world will keep spending more on them each year, but they now

compete for a smaller share of a much larger and faster growing technology budget. The shift mirrors the broader move toward digital services tracked in our retail e-commerce sales growth worldwide analysis.

Device spending share of total IT budget 2021 2026 lineDevices as a Share of Total IT Spending (%)Device spending share of total IT budget 2021 2026 line 19%202114%2026

Growth by Era

Average Growth Rate by Era

Averaging the annual growth rates within each five year era highlights how the pace of the device market has changed over time. In the 2012 to 2016 era, average annual growth was roughly flat, even slightly negative, as the mid decade slump offset the early gains. The 2017 to 2021 era saw average growth jump to around 6 percent a year, lifted enormously by the pandemic surge at its close. The most recent 2022 to 2026 era settles back to more moderate average growth of about 1 to 2 percent a year, as the post pandemic correction drags down the average despite the strong recent recovery. The pattern shows a market whose growth has come in concentrated bursts rather than a steady climb.

This era based view of growth reinforces the central theme of the device market: volatility around a slowly rising baseline. The bursts of strong growth have always been tied to specific catalysts, the smartphone boom, the pandemic, and now potentially AI enabled devices, rather than to steady underlying expansion. For anyone trying to forecast where device spending heads next, the lesson is that the market rarely moves in a straight line, and that the next major move, up or down, is likely to be driven by a new external force rather than by the gradual grind of replacement demand alone. Whether AI proves to be that next great catalyst is the defining question for the years ahead.

Device spending average growth rate by era barAverage Annual Growth by Era (%)Device spending average growth rate by era bar +6%2017-2021

Note: average of annual growth rates within each five year era. $856B2026 SpendingRecord forecast. Source: Gartner. $808B2021 BoomPandemic peak. Source: Gartner. $10.5TTotal Since 2012Cumulative. Source: Gartner. ~14%Share of ITFalling. Source: Gartner.

Taken together, the device spending figures describe a market that is huge, resilient and surprisingly volatile. From about $628 billion in 2012 to a projected record near $856 billion in 2026, worldwide spending on PCs, tablets, mobile phones and printers has weathered a mid decade slump, a pandemic boom and bust, and the rise of AI, ending the period larger than ever even as its share of total IT spending

shrinks. The cumulative total of more than $10 trillion underlines how central these devices remain to modern life, while the explosive growth of data center spending alongside them signals where the next wave of technology investment is heading. The key questions ahead are whether AI enabled devices can spark a fresh upgrade cycle, how rising component costs affect prices and demand, and whether the personal device can hold its ground as the centre of gravity in technology shifts toward the cloud. What is certain is that the device market, having survived a decade of slumps, booms and disruptions to reach record spending, has proved far more durable than the periodic predictions of its decline would suggest. Apple's own pivotal role in this market is detailed in our Apple total net sales analysis, and its regional sales in our quarterly Apple revenue by region breakdown.

FAQ

Frequently Asked Questions: Global Device Spending

Worldwide spending on devices, which Gartner defines as PCs, tablets, mobile phones and printers, is forecast to reach about $856 billion in 2026, an all time record. The figure has ranged from roughly $600 billion to over $800 billion over the past decade, depending on economic conditions and upgrade cycles. Source: Gartner IT spending forecasts.

In Gartner's worldwide IT spending forecast, the devices segment covers PCs, tablets, mobile phones and printers, essentially the personal hardware that consumers and businesses buy. It is one of five major IT spending segments, alongside IT services, software, communications services and data center systems. Mobile phones make up the largest share of device spending. Source: Gartner.

Device spending jumped more than 20 percent in 2021, to around $808 billion, because the COVID-19 pandemic triggered a massive wave of buying. Locked down households and remote workers and students rushed to purchase laptops, tablets and phones. This pulled demand forward, which is why spending then fell sharply in 2022 as the boom faded. Source: Gartner.

Worldwide device spending is projected to reach a record of about $856 billion in 2026, surpassing the previous pandemic era high of roughly $808 billion in 2021. The recent record is driven more by rising prices and AI enabled hardware than by a surge in the number of devices sold. The 2026 figure is a Gartner forecast. Source: Gartner.

In dollar terms, device spending is growing and is projected to hit a record in 2026. However, its share of total worldwide IT spending is shrinking, from about 19 percent in 2021 to under 14 percent in 2026, because spending on data centers, software and services is growing much faster. So devices are growing

in absolute terms but losing relative weight. Source: Gartner.

Device spending has historically been far larger than data center systems spending, but the gap is closing fast. By 2026, data center spending is forecast to approach $788 billion, nearing the roughly $856 billion spent on devices, as the race to build AI infrastructure drives huge investment in servers. Data center spending could soon overtake devices. Source: Gartner.

Mobile phones are the largest single category within device spending, reflecting the enormous global market for smartphones, followed by PCs. Tablets and printers make up smaller shares. Because mobile phones dominate, overall device spending tends to track trends in the global smartphone market closely. Source: Gartner and industry reports.

Between 2012 and 2026, the world is on course to spend more than $10.5 trillion in total on PCs, tablets, mobile phones and printers. Even in weaker years, annual spending has stayed well above half a trillion dollars, and more than a third of the entire fifteen year total has been spent in just the last five years. Source: Gartner IT spending forecasts.

Devices are durable goods that people replace only every few years, so demand comes in waves tied to new technologies, economic conditions and refresh cycles. A buying surge, like the pandemic boom, pulls demand forward and leaves a gap in following years. This replacement cycle dynamic makes device spending far more cyclical than recurring software or services revenue. Source: Gartner.

The figures are Gartner's estimates of worldwide end user spending on devices, in current U.S. dollars. The most recent years use Gartner's latest published forecasts, while earlier years are based on its historical estimates, which the firm revises over time as new data arrives. All figures are forecasts and estimates, not audited results, and should be read as indicative of the trend. Source: Gartner.

Sources

Gartner Newsroom - Worldwide IT Spending Forecasts - Primary source for worldwide device spending and IT spending by segment.

Gartner quarterly IT spending forecasts (2012-2026) - Source for the devices segment spending series and segment growth rates.

Gartner press releases on PCs, tablets and mobile phones - Used for historical device spending estimates and shipment context.

Figures are Gartner estimates of worldwide end user spending on devices in current U.S. dollars. Gartner revises its forecasts over time, so earlier years are indicative of the trend. The 2026 figure is a forecast. Segment and total IT figures are Gartner 2025-2026 forecasts. Not investment advice.

HOW TO CITE THIS BOOK

Business Stats (2026). Technology & Telecommunications: statistics and facts. Retrieved Oct 18, 2026, https://businesstats.com/technology-telecommunications-topic-overview/

Methodology

Every figure comes from a Business Stats report that names its primary source: statistics offices, central banks, company filings and original surveys. Estimates and projections are labelled as such.

Free to reuse under CC BY 4.0 with credit to Business Stats. Business Stats takes great care over accuracy but cannot guarantee it; check the linked original sources before making decisions.

Read online: https://businesstats.com/technology-telecommunications-topic-overview/