**The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on academic productivity**
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**‘Publish or perish’ is an expression describing the pressure on academics to consistently publish research to ensure a successful career in academia. A global pandemic has changed the world, but how has it changed academic productivity? Here we show that academics are posting more articles on the arXiv pre-print server than would be expected even if there were no pandemic: 168,630 were posted in 2020, a +12.6% change from 2019 and +1.4 deviation above the Gaussian process model prediction of 162,577 4,393. Most individual fields were not significantly affected by the pandemic; however, we do observe large declines in areas of high-energy physics where many laboratories were closed and a key annual conference was cancelled. The most significant increase occurred in quantitative biology, where a 50% increase (+8 in pre-prints was driven by research related to the COVID-19 pandemic. One third of these pre-prints are written by researchers from other fields (e.g., mathematicians, physicists), and about 13% are led by biologists or clinicians using arXiv for the first time. While quantitative biology pre-prints have returned to pre-pandemic levels, 20% of the research in this field is now focussed on the COVID-19 pandemic, demonstrating a strong shift in research focus.**

Peer-reviewed publications are the most common measure of productivity in academia. The arXiv1 (https://arxiv.org) is a service for the distribution of research publications (pre-prints) prior to their appearance in a journal. A pre-print on arXiv does not ensure that the contents have passed peer-review, but most material on arXiv eventually goes through peer-review because it is now standard in many research fields to post to arXiv either during or after the peer-review process2. For this reason, the number of pre-prints posted to arXiv approximates the number of peer-reviewed publications written in these fields.

Here we make quantitative comparisons on the number of pre-prints posted to arXiv before and during the pandemic. The pandemic has affected the general population3-5 and the scientific community6-8 in complex and unequal ways. Generational inequality, career stage, personal circumstances, carer responsibilities, work environments, places of employment, and many other factors, all significantly contribute to the unequal impact the pandemic may have had on a scientist's capacity to conduct research. Our analysis does not directly consider these factors, nor can it identify groups or individuals disproportionately affected by the pandemic. We have instead adopted a broad perspective and present new quantitative results for entire scientific fields. The aim is to provide a large-scale view of scientific productivity which will serve as a foundation for future studies on the detailed impacts of COVID-19 on academic productivity.

We retrieved metadata for 1,475,914 pre-prints posted to arXiv between 1 April 2007 and 31 May 2021. The metadata includes the creation date, research field(s), title, author name(s), abstract, and other miscellaneous information9. There is an increasing number of pre-prints posted to arXiv each year in nearly every field (Figure 1). These long-term trends are relatively predictable from year to year, allowing us to quantify any change in academic productivity due to the COVID-19 pandemic. We used the number of publications from January 2015 to December 2019 to train a predictive Gaussian process model10. The model treats the number of monthly pre-prints in a research field as a sequence of normally-distributed random variables. The expected number of pre-prints was assumed to change linearly with time, and a quasi-periodic kernel function10,11 was used to capture seasonal variations (Figure 1). The number of pre-prints posted since January 2020 agree closely with the model predictions in nearly all research fields (Table 1), indicating no collective impact on academic productivity due to the COVID-19 pandemic. In fact, the total number of arXiv pre-prints in 2020 across all fields (168,630) exceeds our model predictions (162,577 4,393; +1.4).

Border closures and travel restrictions have forced many academic conferences to be held online-only, or to be cancelled. Hosting conferences online creates a mix of effects, as forgoing in-person experiences benefits those who could not otherwise participate due to visa issues or travel costs12. The immediate impact of cancelling a conference is readily apparent in pre-print counts in lattice physics (Figure 1; arXiv subject code hep-lat, see Methods for explanation), where most pre-prints are posted around December each year as conference proceedings from the International Symposium on Lattice Field Theory. In 2020 the conference was cancelled13 and no accompanying pre-prints exist. The impact of conference cancellations and travel restrictions on academic research is likely to extend well beyond the output of a single field in a particular year, as discussions at conferences spark new research ideas and collaborations that can lead to publications many months or years later14.

Experimental research projects often require specialised laboratories, or data to be collected over many years. The pandemic has forced many laboratories to close or operate with restricted access15-17 which could lead to long-lasting delays in ongoing experiments, or immediate drops in publication due to difficulty in accessing completed (or nearly completed) experiment data. There is some evidence of this in pre-print numbers already, with 20% fewer pre-prints in high energy physics (hep-ex) in 2020 than expected by our model (observed 615; predicted 818 94). But declines are not ubiquitous across fields with large components of experimental research. The closest comparable field of phenomenology in high energy physics (hep-ph) showed no substantial decline. Neither did nuclear experimental research (nucl-ex). And throughout 2020, research in condensed matter (cond-mat) saw a 1.8 increase above our model predictions (observed 16,188; predicted 15,325 492). Segmenting condensed matter pre-prints by research topic shows that most of this increase (in cond-mat) was driven by a 30% increase in material science pre-prints (cond-mat.mtrl-sci).

The field of quantitative biology (q-bio) showed the largest increase in pre-prints in 2020 above what was expected by our model. There were 2,790 quantitative biology pre-prints in 2020, 50% above the previous year, representing a +8 deviation from our model predictions (predicted 1,914 109; 876 fewer than observed). This increase is explainable by an increase in COVID-19 related research, as there were 864 quantitative biology pre-prints in 2020 with pandemic-related terms in their title or abstract (see Methods), and just 39 in the decade prior. Indeed, in April 2020 nearly 60% of arXiv pre-prints in quantitative biology were related to the pandemic (Figure 2). Pandemic-related pre-prints also appeared in other fields (computer science, physics, statistics, and quantitative finance, all peaking around April 2020), but these pre-prints constituted fewer than 10% of the total pre-prints in these fields. As of mid-2021 the number of monthly pre-prints in quantitative biology has dropped to pre-pandemic levels. Approximately 20% of current pre-prints in quantitative biology are related to the ongoing pandemic, representing a strong shift in ongoing research focus.

An increase in quantitative biology[[1]](#footnote-1)† research during a global pandemic is unsurprising. However, the question arises if this increase was driven by existing researchers in the field, or by authors from other fields entering quantitative biology due to the pandemic. In 2020 there was a peak in the number of new authors appearing for the first time in the quantitative biology literature (Supplementary Figure 1) while the number of new authors in all other fields remained steady. The increase in pre-prints (and new authors) is driven by small (1-4) groups of authors, where many had never posted pre-prints to quantitative biology before. A close examination of a random sample of pre-prints suggests that 13% of the pandemic-related pre-prints posted in q-bio during 2020 were written by biologists or clinicians using arXiv for the first time, and 36% were written by researchers from other fields (primarily mathematicians and physicists). These pre-prints tend to focus on modelling the COVID-19 outbreak using public data sets, rather than topics that require more expert domain knowledge in quantitative biology.

The pandemic has also created distinct challenges when interpreting trends in the arXiv data. For example, there was a large spike in papers submitted to the statistics category (stat) in June 2020 which one might assume was driven by COVID-related work given what we have observed in quantitative biology. However, the number of COVID-related papers posted in this period is modest (Figure 2), and the key factor appears to be delayed paper submission deadlines for two large conferences (NeurIPS and the Joint Statistical Meetings). Both conferences have had submission deadlines in mid-May in recent years, but in 2020, their deadlines were moved to early June.

The COVID-19 pandemic appears to have had minimal impact on collective research productivity to date. In this study we have only focussed on the quantity of publications as a measure for productivity, and not their quality. While citations are the most used measure of impact of academic publications, that metric becomes a more biased statistic when many related pre-prints are all being posted nearly at the same time18. Amongst individual fields the largest decline is explainable by a cancelled conference, and the few other drops in pre-prints are statistically insignificant. It's plausible that many of the pre-prints already posted are research projects that were well underway before the pandemic. The relatively long timescales of academic research would suggest that the full impact on academic productivity due to the COVID-19 pandemic is yet to be seen. The methodology and results presented here provide a quantitative framework for future investigations on the longer-term impacts of the pandemic.
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**Table 1: The number of arXiv pre-prints per primary research field in 2020 compared to 2019, and model predictions (see Methods).**

(The Table is located at the end of this document)

**Figure Legends**

****

**Figure 1: There has been no significant change in monthly arXiv pre-prints (black) since the COVID-19 pandemic began.** The expected number of pre-prints from our Gaussian Process model is shown in red, and the red region shows the 1 uncertainty in that prediction.

****

**Figure 2:** **Pre-prints related to the COVID-19 pandemic peaked in April 2020, accounting for nearly 60% the quantitative biology (q-bio) pre-prints in that month**. Shown are five other research fields with the highest number of pandemic-related pre-prints in 2020. Monthly pre-prints are shown on the left, and the percentage of pandemic-related pre-prints in that research field is shown on the right.

**Methods**

**Grouping by research field:** Pre-prints posted to the arXiv can be listed in a single field of research, or cross-listed in multiple fields. A field is annotated by primary.SEC where the primary field of research has the prefix, and the sub-field of research is represented by a short suffix. For example, one pre-print may have a primary field of research as stellar astrophysics (astro-ph.SA) and be cross-listed in machine learning (stat.ML). These field(s) of research are supplied by the corresponding author. It is a subjective decision whether to include more than one field of research, or what those fields of research would be. For this reason, throughout this work when we segment by research field we take the primary parent research field provided and ignore any cross-listed fields of research. When we segment pre-prints by sub-field, we similarly take the primary sub-field provided and ignore any cross-listings.

A pre-print's identifier is defined by the year and month that the pre-print was posted, and the number of pre-prints already posted in that month (across all fields). Pre-prints posted prior to April 2007 use a different identifier scheme, and a different research field definition. For these reasons, we have excluded pre-prints earlier than this date.

**Long-term modelling of monthly pre-print counts:** We use monthly pre-print counts per primary research field from January 2015 until December 2019 to make predictions for the number of pre-prints expected per month from January 2020 onwards. We use a straight line to model the mean pre-prints over time, and a Gaussian process with a quasi-periodic kernel covariance function to capture seasonal periodicity10,11 and a white noise component. We fit the parameters of the mean model and the kernel hyper-parameters simultaneously, but kept the periodicity hyper-parameter fixed to one year. The predictions of the expectation and variance in the number of monthly pre-print counts are conditioned on the optimized hyper-parameters. We fit this model to monthly pre-print counts for every primary research field. These predictions are listed in Table 1. The expected total number of pre-prints, and the uncertainty in that number, are summed from the models used in individual research fields.

The Gaussian process model we have adopted has good predictive accuracy. We repeated the fitting procedure using data from January 2014 until December 2018 and made predictions for the monthly pre-prints in 2019 (Supplementary Figure 2). The predictions are in very good agreement with the 2019 counts, demonstrating that the model is suitable for making predictions for 2020 and beyond. Nevertheless, our conclusions are reasonably insensitive to the choice of model. As an alternative model we considered an autoregressive integrated moving average (ARIMA) model17 with seasonal terms ( for the non-seasonal component, and with for the seasonal component). The predictions from the ARIMA model agree excellently with the mean predictions from the Gaussian process model, and both models can capture seasonal variation in pre-print counts (Supplementary Figure 2). The largest differences between these models is in hep-lat, where the ARIMA model predicts a higher peak number of pre-prints than the Gaussian process model. This is not unexpected: the peak height of lattice physics pre-prints has been dropping for the last three years, and this gradual decline is better captured by the Gaussian process model. If we adopted the ARIMA model then the drop in hep-lat pre-prints would become more significant. Throughout this work we adopt the predictions from the Gaussian process model, unless otherwise specified.

**Uniquely identifying authors:** The arXiv team has parsed given and family names from author strings for all pre-prints. In general the author names have been appropriately parsed, even given a wide set of input formats. We made only one correction to these parsed names. When the author’s name was provided in the format of ‘Family-name First-given-name I.’, without any commas, this was interpreted by the arXiv parser such that the family name was ‘I.’ and the given names were ‘Family-name First-given-name’. We identified situations like this by checking if the parsed family name was just an initial, and if two given names were parsed. In these situations, we correctly ordered the author name.

The arXiv metadata available to us do not include institutional affiliations, or identifiers that would uniquely identify an author. There are two primary ways that name confusion could impact our inferences. In the first scenario, two people with the same name are amalgamated and treated as a single author that is on average twice as productive (or more, for very common names) as other authors. In the second scenario, an author will sometimes publish as ‘A. B. Smith’, and other times publish as ‘A. Smith’. A careful exploration of the data shows that this is a very frequent scenario, and if left uncorrected, would appear as many ‘unique’ authors with half as many publications on average.

We have taken a simple approach to address name confusion. We first define a unique author by family name and the initial of the first given name (‘Family-name, I.’), such that we intentionally group together authors that may share the same initial of their first given name. While our approach to name confusion is grossly simple, it is unlikely that these choices have any substantial impact on our inferences. In general, this errs on the side of name conflation and over-productivity, except for the relatively rare authors who change their last names over their career. Any common name is likely to appear in the literature early in the data set and will not impact the conclusions we draw about how publishing changed in 2020. Indeed, we re-produced the analysis and figures in this paper by taking all initials given and it made no change to our conclusions. This is due, in part, to most authors not providing middle initials.

**Pre-prints related to the COVID-19 pandemic:** We identified a pre-print as being related to the COVID-19 pandemic if the title or abstract contained any of the following four (case-insensitive) terms: ‘pandemic’, ‘COVID’, ‘SARS-CoV-2’, ‘lockdown’, or ‘coronavirus’. Before 2020, these terms rarely appear in the title or abstract of any pre-print on arXiv (Figure 2).

**First author research fields for pandemic-related pre-prints in quantitative biology:** There were 864 pandemic-related pre-prints posted to q-bio in 2020. Of those, 430 had a first author that had never appeared in the q-bio literature before. We downloaded a random sample of 100 of these 430 pre-prints and identified the research field of the first author. Normally this was straightforward, as the affiliation in the PDF would include the relevant university department. In ambiguous cases we used Google to find their research field from their university home page, CV, or other documents. We found that 27% of these pre-prints had a biologist or a clinician as the first author, where we used an inclusive definition for anyone who might qualify as a biologist or a clinician. The remaining pre-prints were predominantly led by mathematicians and physicists, followed by computer scientists, engineers, and economists.

We can extrapolate this random sample to the full set of 864 pandemic-related pre-prints posted to q-bio in 2020. Taking 73% of 430 yields 314 pandemic-related pre-prints that were led by researchers from other fields. This suggests 36% (314 / 864) pandemic-related pre-prints posted in q-bio during 2020 were written by researchers from other fields, and 13% (116 / 864) were written by biologists or clinicians using arXiv for the first time.
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**Supplementary Figure Legends**

****

**Supplementary Figure 1:** **The number of new authors appearing in arXiv pre-prints per month (black) and number of new authors per number of pre-prints (light blue, limits on right axis).** We show new authors since 2010, but we used data since 2007 to determine if an author was new. The slow change in new authors approximates the net number of new authors joining the field (cf. spike in new authors in quantitative biology in 2020). The variations in the number of new authors per paper reflect collaboration size differences between fields (e.g., hep-ex vs. hep-lat).

**Supplementary Figure 2: The Gaussian process model and the ARIMA model have good predictive accuracy and can capture seasonal variation in monthly pre-prints.** We used data from January 2013 to December 2018 to predict the number of pre-prints in 2019 in each research field, using a Gaussian process model and an ARIMA model (a; see Methods). There is very good agreement between the data and both models, demonstrating either model is suitable for predictions in 2020. Both models can capture seasonal variations, as demonstrated by the predicted expectation value of monthly pre-prints in hep-lat (b).

**Data Availability:** The entire dataset used in this article is from arXiv. The dataset is curated by Cornell University and hosted by Kaggle (https://www.kaggle.com/Cornell-University/arxiv). The dataset is updated weekly. We accessed this dataset on 01 June 2021.

**Code Availability:** The software developed to retrieve and analyse the data for this project is available online (https://github.com/andycasey/arxiv-covid).
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**Table 1: The number of arXiv pre-prints per primary research field in 2020 compared to 2019, and model predictions (see Methods).**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **arXiv code** | **Field of research** | **Pre-prints in 2020** | **Yearly change (%)** | **Predicted pre-prints in 2020** | **Significance ()** |
| astro-ph | Astrophysics | 14,893 | +3.4 | 14,990 653 | -0.1 |
| cond-mat | Condensed Matter | 16,188 | +7.0 | 15,325 492 | +1.8 |
| cs | Computer Science | 54,808 | +24.3 | 51,673 4,047 | +0.8 |
| gr-qc | General Relativity and Quantum Cosmology | 3,405 | +12.4 | 3,166 154 | +1.6 |
| hep-ex | High Energy Physics (Experiment) | 615 | -19.8 | 818 94 | -2.2 |
| hep-lat | High Energy Physics (Lattice) | 394 | -19.3 | 475 170 | -0.5 |
| hep-ph | High Energy Physics (Phenomenology) | 4,586 | +1.3 | 4,615 329 | -0.1 |
| hep-th | High Energy Physics (Theory) | 3,869 | +0.9 | 4,000 291 | -0.4 |
| math | Mathematics | 35,367 | +5.5 | 35,362 1,177 | +0.0 |
| math-ph | Mathematical Physics | 1,378 | -6.3 | 1,460 95 | -0.9 |
| nlin | Nonlinear Sciences | 885 | +6.1 | 822 63 | +1.0 |
| nucl-ex | Nuclear Experiment | 499 | +2.9 | 490 61 | +0.1 |
| nucl-th | Nuclear Theory | 1,212 | -3.2 | 1,234 111 | -0.2 |
| physics | Physics | 15,241 | +14.3 | 14,746 506 | +1.0 |
| q-bio | Quantitative Biology | 2,790 | +49.0 | 1,914 109 | +8.0 |
| q-fin | Quantitative Finance | 979 | +23.1 | 805 55 | +3.2 |
| quant-ph | Quantum Physics | 6,341 | +13.4 | 5,858 266 | +1.8 |
| stat | Statistics | 5,180 | +20.2 | 4,824 490 | +0.7 |
|  | **Total** | **168,630** | **+12.6** | **162,557 4,393** | **+1.4** |

1. † Quantitative biology is only a sub-field of biology, and most biology pre-prints are posted to bioRxiv (https://biorxiv.org). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)