

ALLERGY, PHILOSOPHY

MEDRXIV

24.09.2019

ArXiv is operational since 1991, bioRxiv since 2013 and since 2019 there is now also medRxiv. More details at <https://www.bmjjournals.org/content/365/bmjj.12301>

The main arguments in favour of sharing work in its preliminary form are, firstly, that science works faster if work is made available sooner after it is completed and, secondly, that articles are improved by feedback from a wider group of readers, alongside formal peer review by a few experts. Simple estimates suggest that halving the delay to sharing a research result can double the speed at which research progresses. Ambitious research funders are now embracing preprints and other measures that aim to accelerate the pace of research.

Although there was a mixed reception in the beginning, see [Science back in 2017](#)

MedArXiv will have a hard time attracting preprints if mainstream medical journal editors decide they won't publish final versions of the papers. Currently, The BMJ and The Lancet are among the few medical journals that have explicitly said that posting a preprint doesn't preclude publication; Nature and Science, which both occasionally publish medical studies, have the same policy. But at the JAMA Network, which publishes a dozen journals, the issue is hotly debated.

[@medRxiv](#) opened on June 6. So far they have only 304 followers on Twitter (and no allergy paper in the archive).

As the current "Allergy" editor and the publisher (John Wiley and Sons A/S) agreed to preprints last week, [I have submitted now my first preprint paper](#). Therefore, there are now 305 followers and 1 allergy paper :-)

