

arXiv `math.PR` submissions

Trends, structural breaks and possible explanations

September 2016–August 2026

Analysis report — 18 September 2026

Abstract

We bring together a descriptive analysis of monthly counts of articles classified under probability on arXiv, exploratory detection of trend changes, sensitivity checks, an examination of additional breaks over 2023–2026, and a discussion of possible explanations, including the Covid-19 pandemic and the rise of artificial intelligence. The analysis covers 120 consecutive months and 41 013 articles, including both primary and secondary classifications; the complete monthly counts are reproduced in Appendix A. The main model, a continuous piecewise-linear trend with monthly seasonal effects, selects breakpoints in October 2020, March 2023 and February 2026. These dates are not invariant across models: the most stable signal is a sharp acceleration in late 2025–early 2026, preceded by a slowdown and then a recovery whose dates are harder to pinpoint. Within the 2023–2026 window, an additional inflection in mid-2023 remains possible, whereas the segmentations of 2024–2025 are less stable. The aggregate series cannot attribute these developments to a particular cause or establish the persistence of the latest regime.

Summary

The central descriptive finding is the recent acceleration: for March–August, the total rises from 2 383 articles in 2025 to 3 336 in 2026, an increase of 40.0 %. This comparison covers the same months and does not depend on any structural-break model. It is not driven by the final observation alone.

The March 2023 breakpoint in the global model corresponds to an *end to the plateau*, rather than a jump observed in that particular month. A delayed Covid effect, a return towards the earlier trajectory, a change in secondary classifications and an AI effect are distinct hypotheses that may operate simultaneously. Their respective quantitative contributions are not identified.

The dates in the tables and the vertical lines in the figures are model-conditional estimates, never dates of causal events. All numerical results specific to `math.PR` are based on the monthly observations reproduced in Appendix A and the methods described below, rather than on the studies cited for background.

Contents

Summary	1
1 Data and scope	3
1.1 Observation window and data provenance	3
1.2 Counting rule and category scope	3
1.3 Complete months and limitations	3
2 Descriptive findings	4
2.1 Evolution over ten years	4
2.2 The recent increase: comparisons over the same calendar months	5
2.3 March 2023 is not an isolated observable jump	5
3 Method for detecting trend changes	5
3.1 A continuous trend with common seasonal effects	5
3.2 Exhaustive search and segment conventions	6
3.3 Penalisation and interpretation of the result	6
3.4 Alternative models examined	6
4 Results for the full period	7
4.1 Three breakpoints in the main model	7
4.2 Sensitivity to scale and continuity	8
4.3 Dependence on the final months and the observation window	9
4.4 The final-segment length constraint is decisive	9
4.5 Breaks or smooth acceleration?	9
5 Uncertainty, bootstrap and diagnostics	10
5.1 A conditional protocol	10
5.2 Residual dependence and inferential caution	11
6 Additional breaks over 2023–2026	11
6.1 Local search with shorter segments	11
6.2 An inflection in mid-2023 remains possible	12
6.3 The steps in autumn 2024 and autumn 2025	13
6.4 Level shifts, historical seasonality and alternative windows	14
7 Interpreting the recovery around 2022–2023	14
7.1 A retrospectively estimated breakpoint is not an event	14
8 The hypothesis of a delayed Covid effect	15
8.1 New projects and completed articles do not respond at the same time	15
8.2 Extending the pre-2020 trend	15
9 Hypotheses involving artificial intelligence	16
9.1 AI as a tool and AI as a research topic	16
9.2 What the cited study of writing practices measures	17
9.3 Covid and AI are not mutually exclusive explanations	17
10 Conclusions and further analyses	17
A Complete monthly data	18
References	18

1 Data and scope

1.1 Observation window and data provenance

The analysis uses monthly counts of arXiv articles classified under `math.PR`, retrieved from arXiv metadata on 14–16 September 2026 [1, 2]. The 120 observations run from September 2016 to August 2026 without gaps or duplicate months. Every count is a strictly positive integer, and the category and counting scope are constant throughout the series. The total is 41 013. The complete monthly observations are reproduced in Appendix A.

The recorded retrieval timestamps range from 14 September 2026 at 12:52:09 UTC to 16 September 2026 at 17:25:35 UTC. The series is therefore a snapshot of metadata retrieved in September 2026, rather than a record of the index as it stood at each submission date. These aggregate counts have not been independently checked against article-level identifiers.

1.2 Counting rule and category scope

Monthly totals are obtained from the `totalResults` count returned by arXiv queries using the `submittedDate` field, with calendar-month boundaries in UTC. The documentation distinguishes the `published` date of the first submission from the `updated` date of the retrieved version; the intended grouping is by first submission, not by revision [2]. A new version should therefore not count as a new article in this series.

Both primary and secondary classifications under `math.PR` are included. Cross-listing makes the same article visible in several categories [3]. An article contributes to only one monthly observation in this series, but may contribute to several series if multiple categories are counted separately. Simply adding these series therefore does not give a count of distinct articles. A series restricted to articles whose primary category is `math.PR` would have a different scope and would need to be analysed separately.

The data do not contain the history of each classification and cannot reconstruct categories as they stood on the submission date. Nor do the aggregate observations provide the identifiers, authors, titles or abstracts needed for an article-by-article audit. We refer to *submissions classified under probability*, rather than a direct measure of the quality, originality or individual productivity of probabilists.

1.3 Complete months and limitations

Each observation covers a calendar month that had ended before the data were retrieved; none is marked as partial in the collection records. September 2026 is excluded. This avoids mistaking an incomplete month’s count for a genuine fall in submissions.

The absence of partial or missing months is not an independent audit of the completeness of the arXiv index. The analysis is conditional on the recorded counts: it does not quantify errors in the underlying metadata, subsequent corrections or changes in classification.

2 Descriptive findings

2.1 Evolution over ten years

Figure 1 shows the raw series and a purely descriptive trailing twelve-month moving average. This average is never used to detect breaks. It introduces a smoothing lag: a change should not be dated solely from its point of inflection.




Figure 1: Observed monthly counts and trailing twelve-month moving average. The vertical axis starts at zero. September–December 2026 are neither observed nor extrapolated. Source: arXiv metadata; monthly observations in Appendix A.

Table 1: Complete calendar years in the observed series. Year-on-year changes are calculated only between two complete years.

Year	Total	Monthly average	Year-on-year change
2017	3 241	270.1	—
2018	3 495	291.2	+7.84 %
2019	3 642	303.5	+4.21 %
2020	3 967	330.6	+8.92 %
2021	3 966	330.5	−0.03 %
2022	3 945	328.8	−0.53 %
2023	4 027	335.6	+2.08 %
2024	4 473	372.8	+11.08 %
2025	4 962	413.5	+10.93 %

The monthly averages are almost identical from 2020 to 2022: 330.6, 330.5 and 328.8. The average rises slightly in 2023, then more markedly in 2024 and 2025. September–December 2016 totals 1 117 articles; January–August 2026 totals 4 178, or 522.25 per month. These partial calendar years should not be compared directly with full-year totals.

2.2 The recent increase: comparisons over the same calendar months

For a set of months A , we calculate

$$100 \left(\frac{\sum_{m \in A} N_{2026,m}}{\sum_{m \in A} N_{2025,m}} - 1 \right). \quad (1)$$

This comparison removes the effect of choosing different seasonal windows, without adjusting for every calendar feature, particularly the distribution of weekdays.

Table 2: Comparisons of the same months in 2025 and 2026.

Period	2025	2026	Change
January–August	3 173	4 178	+31.7 %
March–August	2 383	3 336	+40.0 %
April–August	1 921	2 834	+47.5 %
August	368	623	+69.3 %

The contrast does not rest on August alone: the increases in April, May, June and July 2026 relative to the same months of 2025 are 31.4 %, 44.9 %, 42.5 % and 50.2 %, respectively. The March–August average rises from 397.17 to 556 articles per month.

2.3 March 2023 is not an isolated observable jump

March 2023 has 348 articles, compared with 359 in March 2022. The first quarter totals exactly 932 articles in each year. The 2023 total exceeds that of 2022 by only 2.1 %, compared with an increase of 11.1 % in 2024 and 10.9 % in 2025. The March 2023 breakpoint obtained below therefore does not mean that an instantaneous shock increased submissions that month.

3 Method for detecting trend changes

3.1 A continuous trend with common seasonal effects

For $t = 0, \dots, n - 1$, let N_t denote the number of articles and $m(t)$ the calendar month. The main model is

$$N_t = a + s_{m(t)} + bt + \sum_{j=1}^K d_j(t - \tau_j)_+ + \varepsilon_t, \quad \sum_{m=1}^{12} s_m = 0, \quad (2)$$

where $(x)_+ = \max(x, 0)$ and $\tau_1 < \dots < \tau_K$ are monthly indices. The trend

$$f(t) = a + bt + \sum_{j=1}^K d_j(t - \tau_j)_+ \quad (3)$$

is continuous, with a different slope on either side of each breakpoint. A change in slope is not a jump in level. The seasonally adjusted trend shown in the figures is $\hat{f}(t)$, whereas the fitted value of the observation is $\hat{f}(t) + \hat{s}_{m(t)}$.

The twelve calendar-month effects are assumed to remain constant throughout the period studied. They are estimated *jointly* with the slopes and breakpoints. Subtracting the raw averages for each calendar month first would be a different procedure, one that could confound growth with seasonality.

For fixed dates, the coefficients are estimated by least squares. An equivalent regression parametrisation uses twelve monthly indicators, one slope and K hinge functions. Time is expressed

in years for numerical scaling. The slopes in this report are converted back into changes in the monthly count *per elapsed month*.

3.2 Exhaustive search and segment conventions

The dates lie on the grid of observed months. For the global sample, the search imposes

$$\tau_1 \geq 12, \quad \tau_{j+1} - \tau_j \geq 12, \quad n - \tau_K \geq 6. \quad (4)$$

The final quantity counts observations *starting at and including the breakpoint*. With a series ending in August 2026, the latest admissible date is March 2026, which leaves six observations from March to August, or five elapsed months after the breakpoint. The selected date, February 2026, leaves seven observations from February to August, or six elapsed months.

All admissible combinations are examined for $K = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$. To speed up the search, the baseline regressors are eliminated by orthogonal projection; the best model is then checked again by solving the least-squares problem directly. This global search over the grid relies neither on local optimisation of the dates nor on visually chosen segments.

3.3 Penalisation and interpretation of the result

The residual sum of squares of the best model with K breakpoints is denoted by RSS_K . The score used is explicitly

$$S_K = n \log \left(\frac{\text{RSS}_K}{n} \right) + (13 + 2K) \log n. \quad (5)$$

The model contains $13 + K$ regression coefficients, to which we add K estimated dates in the penalty. Terms common to all models are omitted. We select the smallest score within the family considered.

This is a *BIC-style convention*, not a significance test, a posterior probability or an exact integration of the likelihood. Estimating unknown dates is a non-regular problem; autocorrelation and heteroskedasticity may affect the appropriateness of a penalty motivated by independent Gaussian errors. Bai and Perron [4] provide a general reference on structural changes, segment-length constraints and the distinction between estimation and selection; the present analysis does not apply all their tests or automatically inherit the guarantees of their theorems for the continuous model (2).

3.4 Alternative models examined

We also replace N_t by $\log N_t$, by

$$\frac{365.25}{12} \frac{N_t}{D_t}, \quad \text{or by} \quad \log \left(\frac{N_t}{D_t} \right), \quad (6)$$

where D_t is the number of days in the month. The first transformation expresses the volume for a fixed conventional month length. The logarithm places more emphasis on relative deviations. On this scale, the exponential of a fitted trend is a geometric trend, not automatically an expected count.

To distinguish slope changes from genuine steps, we also examine

$$N_t = a + s_{m(t)} + bt + \sum_{j=1}^K \left(c_j \mathbf{1}_{\{t \geq \tau_j\}} + d_j (t - \tau_j)_+ \right) + \varepsilon_t. \quad (7)$$

The score becomes $n \log(\text{RSS}/n) + (13 + 3K) \log n$. Another family retains a common slope and allows only level shifts. Models in this family have $13 + K$ coefficients and an additional date penalty of $K \log n$. Rank-deficient configurations are excluded from the relevant sensitivity analyses.

Scores are not compared directly across differently transformed responses or different observation windows. They can be compared across families fitted to the same response, on the same sample and with a common penalisation convention.

4 Results for the full period

4.1 Three breakpoints in the main model

Table 3: Global search, monthly counts, jointly estimated seasonal effects, constraints (4). Dates are in year-month format.

K	Optimal dates	Score S_K	Gap from minimum
0	None	947.68	148.44
1	2025-10	823.13	23.90
2	2023-12 ; 2026-02	809.42	10.18
3	2020-10 ; 2023-03 ; 2026-02	799.23	0.00
4	2019-02 ; 2020-06 ; 2023-03 ; 2026-02	805.62	6.38

The residual sum of squares of the selected model is 43 903.79. A fourth break reduces it to 42 751.94, but not enough to offset its penalty. The overall pattern is moderate growth, near-stagnation, recovery and then a recent acceleration.




Figure 2: Main global model: observed counts and continuous seasonally adjusted trend. The estimated breakpoints are October 2020, March 2023 and February 2026. The vertical axis is restricted to make slope changes visible; Figure 1 provides a view starting at zero.

Table 4: Descriptive slopes of the selected global model. The unit is the change in the monthly article count per elapsed month.

Phase	Slope
September 2016–October 2020	+1.53
October 2020–March 2023	−0.29
March 2023–February 2026	+3.27
February 2026–August 2026	+33.65

A slope of +3.27 means that the trend in the monthly count increases by approximately 3.27 articles from one month to the next. It is not an increase of 3.27 %. The final slope is estimated over a very short interval and must not be extrapolated.

4.2 Sensitivity to scale and continuity

Table 5: Dates selected in several model families. Continuous models search for up to four breakpoints; the global variants allowing both level shifts and slope changes search for up to three.

Response and model	Selected dates
Counts; continuous trend	2020-10 ; 2023-03 ; 2026-02
Counts normalised to a fixed month length; continuous trend	2020-12 ; 2023-03 ; 2026-01
Logarithms; continuous trend	2021-02 ; 2022-02 ; 2025-11
Logarithms of counts per day; continuous trend	2021-02 ; 2022-02 ; 2025-11
Counts; level shifts and slope changes	2021-07 ; 2024-10 ; 2026-02
Logarithms; level shifts and slope changes	2021-07 ; 2025-12




Figure 3: Global variant fitted to logarithms and displayed on a logarithmic axis. The exponentiated trend is geometric. The recent acceleration is recovered, but the earlier breakpoints and the final date differ from those in the count model.

The description *slowdown, recovery, recent acceleration* is more stable than the exact triplet of dates. For the latest transition, we use the wording *late 2025–early 2026*. Treating February 2026 as a universal date would not be justified.

4.3 Dependence on the final months and the observation window

Table 6: Removing the final months, using the continuous count model and searching for zero to four breakpoints.

Last month retained	Selected dates
2026-08	2020-10 ; 2023-03 ; 2026-02
2026-07	2020-10 ; 2023-03 ; 2026-01
2026-06	2020-10 ; 2023-03 ; 2026-01
2026-05	2020-12 ; 2023-02 ; 2025-11

The acceleration is not created by August alone, or by July and August together. However, moving the end of the sample back also moves the latest admissible date back; this constraint must be taken into account when interpreting shifts in the estimates.

The recovery dated to March 2023 does not depend on including 2026 either. When the global series ends in December 2024, the count model selects December 2020 and March 2023; when it ends in December 2025, it selects October 2020 and March 2023. On the logarithmic scale, both cutoffs retain February 2021 and February 2022. These checks confirm a recovery but once again underline the uncertainty in its timing.

4.4 The final-segment length constraint is decisive

If twelve observations are required from the last breakpoint onwards, no date later than September 2025 is admissible. The continuous count model then selects February 2021, February 2022 and September 2025. With initial, intermediate and final segments of at least eighteen months, it selects only one breakpoint, in March 2025; with twenty-four months, it selects only one, in September 2024.

In these cases, the final break dates coincide with the latest admissible dates. They do not demonstrate that the acceleration began earlier. As of August 2026, we do not yet have twelve observations following a regime beginning in early 2026. The constraint therefore makes confirmation based on a full year of this latest regime impossible.

4.5 Breaks or smooth acceleration?

A fourth-degree polynomial trend with the same seasonal effects gives a score of 825.67 on the counts, compared with 799.23 for the selected segmented model. On the logarithmic scale, the corresponding scores are -587.19 and -594.52 . Counts and logarithms are compared separately.

These checks favour the segmented representation among the models examined; they do not rule out every possible smooth acceleration. A parsimonious piecewise approximation can be useful even when the underlying mechanism has no instantaneous break.

5 Uncertainty, bootstrap and diagnostics

5.1 A conditional protocol

Block resampling preserves some of the temporal dependence, unlike independent resampling of residuals; Künsch [5] is a general reference for this method. The bootstrap summary is based on 999 replications of a circular residual bootstrap, with six-month blocks and seed 20260918.

Writing $\hat{\varepsilon}_t = N_t - \hat{N}_t$, the residuals are centred and then multiplied by

$$\sqrt{\frac{n}{n-p-K}}, \quad n = 120, \quad p = 16, \quad K = 3. \quad (8)$$

This finite-sample correction is a convention; it is not claimed to be exactly unbiased after date selection. Blocks are sampled circularly with replacement, concatenated and truncated to 120 residuals. The simulated series adds these residuals to the fitted signal, including seasonality.

The three dates are re-estimated jointly over the full grid at every replication. By contrast, the number of breaks, the transformation, the continuous model family and the constraints remain fixed. The bootstrap therefore does not reproduce the entire model-selection procedure.

Table 7: Empirical quantiles of the re-estimated dates, using the nearest-observed-value quantile convention. These are not unconditional confidence intervals.

Breakpoint	2.5 % quantile	Median	97.5 % quantile
First	2019-01	2020-11	2021-12
Second	2022-05	2023-03	2023-11
Last	2025-12	2026-02	2026-03




Figure 4: Conditional bootstrap distribution of the final date. The mass at the right-hand boundary, March 2026, also reflects the final-segment length constraint.

The final breakpoint is placed at the right-hand admissible boundary in 232 of the 999 replications, or 23.2 %. The December 2025–March 2026 interval should not be interpreted as precise timing independent of the model and truncation. The wide ranges for the first two breakpoints reflect their less precise localisation in this conditional exercise.

The validity of the resampling procedure requires, among other things, approximately stationary residuals and dependence compatible with six-month blocks. The protocol does not guarantee 95 % coverage, does not propagate uncertainty about the number of breaks and does not calibrate all the exploratory comparisons performed.

5.2 Residual dependence and inferential caution

Figure 5 shows the residuals of the global model. The Ljung–Box diagnostic [6] at twelve lags uses

$$Q_{12} = n(n+2) \sum_{h=1}^{12} \frac{\hat{\rho}_h^2}{n-h}, \quad \hat{\rho}_h = \frac{\sum_{t=h}^{n-1} \hat{\varepsilon}_t \hat{\varepsilon}_{t-h}}{\sum_{t=0}^{n-1} \hat{\varepsilon}_t^2}. \quad (9)$$

We obtain $Q_{12} = 22.85$. The naive χ^2_{12} reference distribution would give a p -value of approximately 0.029, but this reference is not calibrated for the present model after selection. We therefore do not present it as a formal test with controlled size. The residual dependence visible in these diagnostics motivates caution and the exploratory use of blocks.




Figure 5: Residuals from the selected global fit. The zero line is not a confidence bound; no calibrated test band is shown.

The integer counts are not modelled here using a Poisson or negative binomial distribution. Least squares is used to describe trends and does not establish constant error variance. Count models, evolving seasonality and out-of-sample temporal validation remain analyses to be carried out, rather than checks already performed.

6 Additional breaks over 2023–2026

6.1 Local search with shorter segments

We now restrict the series to the 44 months from January 2023 to August 2026. The continuous trend and monthly effects are re-estimated jointly over this window, requiring at least six observations before the first breakpoint, six months between consecutive breakpoints and six observations from the last breakpoint onwards. The search again covers $K = 0, \dots, 4$.

Table 8: Continuous models for January 2023–August 2026. The scores are not comparable with those for the global series.

K	Optimal dates	Score	Gap from minimum
0	None	369.04	80.93
1	2026-02	288.11	0.00
2	2023-07 ; 2026-02	290.36	2.24
3	2023-07 ; 2024-01 ; 2026-02	291.81	3.70
4	2023-07 ; 2024-01 ; 2024-10 ; 2026-02	296.49	8.38

The one-break model is preferred, but its score advantage of 2.24 over the two-break model remains modest. It would be excessive to infer that no additional inflection exists. Conversely, the appearance of October 2024 in the best fit *when four breaks are imposed* does not establish that this date is supported by the selection of the number of breaks.




Figure 6: Comparison of the local one-break and two-break models. The seasonally adjusted counts use the monthly effects of the one-break model. The two-break model has its own seasonality, re-estimated jointly: the two adjustments are not assumed to be identical.

The local slope rises from +3.22 to +37.13 articles in the monthly count per elapsed month. In the two-break alternative, the slopes are +7.63, +2.87 and +38.35. These values differ from the global slopes because the window and the estimated seasonality differ. None of these large final slopes should be extrapolated.

6.2 An inflection in mid-2023 remains possible

On the logarithmic scale, with minimum segment lengths of six months, the model with two breakpoints, July 2023 and February 2026, becomes preferred. Its advantage over the one-break model is 2.28 score points. This slight reversal in ranking highlights the dependence on the fitting scale.

Table 9: Local sensitivity to short segments, using the continuous model and searching for up to three breaks.

Minimum (months)	Counts	Logarithms
3	2026-02	2023-05 ; 2026-02
4	2026-02	2023-05 ; 2026-02
5	2026-02	2023-06 ; 2026-02
6	2026-02	2023-07 ; 2026-02

The movement of the first breakpoint towards May–July 2023 partly follows the initial-segment constraint. Requiring at least nine or twelve months before the first breakpoint and between subsequent breakpoints, while retaining six final observations, leaves only February 2026 selected in the local logarithmic model. With a window beginning in January 2021, the continuous model selects February 2023 and February 2026 on both counts and logarithms, with no additional breakpoint in summer 2023.

We therefore have difficulty distinguishing a gradual recovery around 2022–2023 from one that includes a brief phase of faster growth in early 2023. Starting precisely in January 2023 leaves little prior information with which to identify this first phase.

6.3 The steps in autumn 2024 and autumn 2025

In the raw counts, the increases from August to October are striking: $308 \rightarrow 384$ in 2023, $310 \rightarrow 442$ in 2024 and $368 \rightarrow 451$ in 2025. Their recurrence at the same time of year requires an examination of seasonality before concluding that they are independent regime changes.




Figure 7: Comparison of the same months over 2023–2026. Autumn increases recur before 2026. The 2026 series ends in August; no autumn continuation is assumed.

Table 10: Monthly averages compared with the same months of the previous year.

Period	Average	Previous year	Change
September–December 2024	409.50	368.00	+11.3 %
September–December 2025	447.25	409.50	+9.2 %
March–August 2026	556.00	397.17	+40.0 %

In this comparison, autumn 2025 does not show a further acceleration relative to autumn 2024. Both autumns are compatible with fairly steady underlying growth accompanied by monthly fluctuations. The contrast with 2026 is much clearer. This observation does not prove that the fluctuations in 2024–2025 are entirely seasonal.

6.4 Level shifts, historical seasonality and alternative windows

Allowing both level shifts and slope changes with locally estimated seasonality, the counts select September 2023 and February 2026. The score of 290.21 remains above the 288.11 of the local continuous one-break model. The family with a common slope and level shifts can produce more dates, but its best local score on the counts, 330.60, is substantially higher.

Another sensitivity analysis first estimates seasonality over September 2016–December 2022 using a continuous trend with at most two breakpoints, then fixes it for the local analysis. The local continuous model then selects January 2026 on the counts and November 2025 on the logarithms. The discontinuous model produces June 2024 and April 2025; on the counts, it adds February 2026. This procedure does not propagate uncertainty in the historical seasonality, and its local score does not penalise parameters estimated at the first stage: it must not be compared with scores from joint estimation.

With historical seasonality fixed in this way, the discontinuous logarithmic variant selects only June 2024 and April 2025, with no new date in early 2026. This exception rules out saying that *all* families recover a late breakpoint. Instead, it illustrates how the acceleration can be absorbed by different segmentations and jumps, and how fragile additional breaks are when seasonality is treated differently.

Finally, over January 2023–December 2025, the continuous count model selects no break; on logarithms, it selects July 2023 and January 2024. Over January 2023–June 2026, it selects January 2026 on the counts and July 2023 followed by January 2026 on the logarithms.

Each calendar month appears only three or four times in the local window. The seasonal adjustment is therefore itself uncertain. We retain several *candidate inflections*, but not an established sequence of regime changes in 2024–2025.

7 Interpreting the recovery around 2022–2023

7.1 A retrospectively estimated breakpoint is not an event

The March 2023 estimate retrospectively joins an almost horizontal segment to an increasing one, using subsequent observations. It does not necessarily locate the onset of a causal mechanism. In particular, the contrast between March 2023 on the counts and February 2022 on the logarithms precludes making a month-by-month coincidence the main argument for a historical explanation.

A break in the series may also reflect a change in its composition. Write

$$N_t = P_t + C_t, \tag{10}$$

where P_t counts submissions whose primary category is `math.PR`, and C_t counts those for which it is only a secondary category. This decomposition is exact, but its components are not observed

separately in the aggregate series. The recovery in N_t may therefore arise from growth in P_t , in C_t , or in both.

An increase in the number of active authors, their average output, their propensity to submit to arXiv, or interactions with other disciplines could also alter the series. We do not have the data needed to measure these mechanisms separately.

8 The hypothesis of a delayed Covid effect

8.1 New projects and completed articles do not respond at the same time

Disruption to research does not imply an immediate fall in submissions. Articles submitted in 2020 may have come from projects already well advanced, whereas a reduction in new projects could affect subsequent output. Casey, Mandel and Ray [7] emphasise these lags and find that total arXiv submissions in 2020 were not below their extrapolation of the earlier trend. Their study therefore does not establish an immediate general collapse, nor does it test the 2023 recovery in `math.PR` considered here.

The survey by Gao and co-authors [8], conducted in January 2021 among scientists in the United States and Europe, provides relevant evidence: among respondents not working on Covid, reported new projects fell by 36 % in 2020 relative to 2019, compared with 9 % for new publications. These are individual self-reports across disciplines, not a measure specific to probability. The study by Myers and co-authors [9] also highlights heterogeneity in reductions in research time, particularly across disciplines and family circumstances.

For our series, a scenario consistent with these studies would be the completion of earlier projects in 2020, a delayed slowdown in 2021–2022, and then a recovery in projects and submissions around 2022–2023. This is a hypothesis, not a causally identified chronology. Opposing effects across researchers could offset each other in the aggregate total.

8.2 Extending the pre-2020 trend

We fit only the 40 months from September 2016 to December 2019 using

$$N_t = a + s_{m(t)} + bt + \varepsilon_t, \quad \sum_{m=1}^{12} s_m = 0, \quad (11)$$

then mechanically extend this fit without re-estimating the coefficients. The slope is 1.2361 additional articles in the monthly count per elapsed month. Table 11 compares observed averages with averages of the extended fitted values, including seasonality.

Table 11: Pre-2020 reference: monthly averages, rounded to one decimal place. The extended values are not estimates of what would causally have occurred without the pandemic.

Year	Observed	Pre-2020 extension
2020	330.6	318.6
2021	330.5	333.4
2022	328.8	348.2
2023	335.6	363.1
2024	372.8	377.9
2025	413.5	392.7




Figure 8: Trajectory fitted before 2020 and illustrative extension through 2025. Observed counts are adjusted using only monthly effects estimated before 2020. The vertical line marks the start of the period not used for estimation. No prediction interval or causal effect is shown.

The years 2022 and 2023 fall below this extension, while 2024 comes almost back to the trajectory. The plateau can therefore be interpreted as a *growth shortfall*, rather than stability without consequences. Part of the subsequent increase is consistent with a return towards the earlier trajectory; 2025 exceeds it.

This interpretation rests on only 40 pre-2020 months, a linear form and fixed seasonal effects. We have not constructed a prediction interval for this extension. The gap from the line is not a causal estimate of the Covid effect. Recovering a monthly level does not mean that any cumulative lost output has been recovered; nor does it establish that the delayed projects are those that ultimately produced the observed articles.

9 Hypotheses involving artificial intelligence

9.1 AI as a tool and AI as a research topic

ChatGPT was introduced on 30 November 2022 and GPT-4 on 14 March 2023 [10, 11]. These milestones naturally raise questions about the recovery in 2023, but the coincidence does not overcome statistical uncertainty about its date. A tool’s public availability is not the date at which the researchers concerned adopted it.

Two mechanisms must be distinguished. First, assistance with English, writing, coding or certain mathematical tasks could alter completion times or the number of articles completed. This would require measuring usage and its associated lags, without assuming that the tools discovered the results. Second, an increase in research *on* AI and machine learning could expand interactions with probability, even without AI assistants being used to produce that research. The arXiv 2023 annual report mentions strong growth in submissions in machine learning and AI [12]; it does not quantify their contribution to `math.PR`.

9.2 What the cited study of writing practices measures

Liang and co-authors [13] analyse corpora from January 2020 to February 2024. Their estimate of the fraction of abstract sentences substantially modified by a large language model reaches 4.9 % in mathematics and 17.5 % in computer science in February 2024. The method estimates a corpus-level mixture, rather than making a certain attribution for each article. The pre-ChatGPT baseline in November 2022 is already 2.4 % in mathematics, which the authors regard as consistent with their procedure’s false-positive rate.

These proportions are neither the fraction of articles entirely written by AI nor a measure of the additional articles caused by it. They do not establish an effect on mathematical discoveries and do not cover 2025–2026. Changes in writing practices and growth in submission volumes are different objects of study.

9.3 Covid and AI are not mutually exclusive explanations

A gradual recovery from pandemic disruptions, general growth in scientific communities and their submissions, compositional changes and the diffusion of AI tools may coexist. The univariate series does not allow their respective contributions to be estimated. The acceleration observed in early 2026 is a clearer descriptive fact than the timing of the 2023 recovery, but it too provides no causal attribution on its own.

10 Conclusions and further analyses

The most stable finding is a sharp recent increase in submissions classified under `math.PR`, which persists in same-month comparisons and after the final observations are removed. The global continuous models locate it in late 2025–early 2026. They also describe a slowdown followed by a recovery, but the timing of these phases depends more strongly on the transformation and the observation window.

The local analysis allows for a candidate inflection in mid-2023. It does not establish a sequence of independent breaks in 2024 and 2025. A single straight line over those years is a descriptive simplification, not a claim that their dynamics are perfectly constant. Failure to select a break does not prove that none exists.

The first additional check should separate P_t and C_t in (10), then examine the primary categories from which cross-listed articles originate. Comparing growth in `math.PR` with that of mathematics as a whole would require consistent counting scopes and deduplication of identifiers. An author-level analysis should distinguish the number of active researchers, their output and collaboration sizes, while accounting for name ambiguity.

For the historical interpretation, it would be useful to compare several categories in terms of their pre-Covid trajectories, subsequent deviations and recoveries, without treating these categories as necessarily unaffected controls. Investigating an AI effect would require measures of adoption and an appropriate comparison strategy; a simple before/after-2023 regression would not suffice. Quantity and quality metrics should also remain distinct.

Finally, additional observations will make it possible to assess the duration of the latest regime. This report makes no forecasts beyond August 2026. Its conclusion is descriptive: *moderate growth, a slowdown, a recovery, and then a marked recent acceleration, with model-dependent timing and no causal identification.*

A Complete monthly data

The table below gives all 120 monthly observations used in the analysis. Counts include articles whose primary or secondary category is `math.PR`, grouped by first-submission month, from the September 2026 metadata snapshot described in Section 1. A dash indicates a month outside the observation window, never a zero. The totals for 2016 and 2026 are therefore partial calendar-year totals; every individual monthly count covers a complete month.

Year	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
2016	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	288	301	271	257	1 117
2017	276	237	275	250	235	279	289	268	275	290	303	264	3 241
2018	269	282	293	290	283	294	292	291	297	320	278	306	3 495
2019	259	247	329	304	324	292	331	272	316	322	321	325	3 642
2020	287	266	343	346	331	357	355	318	321	358	330	355	3 967
2021	311	335	349	335	343	354	322	284	321	337	358	317	3 966
2022	298	275	359	268	339	333	353	321	355	326	367	351	3 945
2023	291	293	348	306	333	313	363	308	358	384	362	368	4 027
2024	335	377	392	329	386	328	378	310	380	442	377	439	4 473
2025	407	383	462	382	381	386	404	368	439	451	414	485	4 962
2026	422	420	502	502	552	550	607	623	—	—	—	—	4 178

References

- [1] Data used in this report, *Monthly arXiv math.PR counts, September 2016–August 2026*. Primary and secondary classifications included; metadata retrieved on 14–16 September 2026. All observations are reproduced in Appendix A.
- [2] arXiv, *arXiv API User’s Manual*, sections on dates, categories and `totalResults`. Documentation accessed on 18 September 2026. <https://info.arxiv.org/help/api/user-manual.html>.
- [3] arXiv, *Category cross listing*. Documentation accessed on 18 September 2026. <https://info.arxiv.org/help/cross.html>.
- [4] J. Bai and P. Perron, *Computation and analysis of multiple structural change models*, Journal of Applied Econometrics **18** (2003), no. 1, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jae.659>.
- [5] H. R. Künsch, *The Jackknife and the Bootstrap for General Stationary Observations*, The Annals of Statistics **17** (1989), no. 3, 1217–1241. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176347265>.
- [6] G. M. Ljung and G. E. P. Box, *On a measure of lack of fit in time series models*, Biometrika **65** (1978), no. 2, 297–303. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/65.2.297>.
- [7] A. R. Casey, I. Mandel and P. K. Ray, *The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on academic productivity*, preprint, 2021, arXiv:2109.06591v1. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.06591v1>.
- [8] J. Gao, Y. Yin, K. R. Myers *et al.*, *Potentially long-lasting effects of the pandemic on scientists*, Nature Communications **12** (2021), article 6188. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-26428-z>.
- [9] K. R. Myers, W. Y. Tham, Y. Yin *et al.*, *Unequal effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on scientists*, Nature Human Behaviour **4** (2020), 880–883. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0921-y>.
- [10] OpenAI, *Introducing ChatGPT*, 30 November 2022. <https://openai.com/index/chatgpt/>.
- [11] OpenAI, *GPT-4*, 14 March 2023. <https://openai.com/index/gpt-4-research/>.
- [12] arXiv, *Annual Report 2023*, p. 3 (printed pagination), on growth in submissions in machine learning and artificial intelligence. https://info.arxiv.org/about/reports/2023_arXiv_annual_report.pdf.
- [13] W. Liang, Y. Zhang, Z. Wu, H. Lepp, W. Ji, X. Zhao, H. Cao, S. Liu, S. He, Z. Huang, D. Yang, C. Potts, C. D. Manning and J. Y. Zou, *Mapping the Increasing Use of LLMs in Scientific Papers*, preprint, 2024, arXiv:2404.01268v1, particularly Section 5.1. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.01268v1>.