[00:00:04] Speaker 0: Thank you all so much for being here and for taking part in this discussion. You are here as experts in your experience with writing papers, publishing them, and thinking about ways in how we can present our work. And the point of this focus group discussion is to flesh out some of the problems we have in doing science, presenting our work, and finding some solutions to it. So that's a bit of a general idea today. But I thought we started maybe by you giving a short introduction to your research and why you chose to come to this workshop today. And I would say let's start the right way around.

[00:01:18] Speaker 1: So I, well my basic background is linguistics. And since January or December of the year XXX of my entire field is upside down, because ChatGPT came out. It's a completely different branch or a completely different approach to this problem than how I was trained although there are some connections. And this also explains why I'm here because now suddenly I feel like I need a different skill set because my field, well, was not really competitive and still it isn't but it's getting more competitive and now I feel like I need different skills on how to publish research. And the immediate reason why I am here is because I was working, or I am working, on two articles. And one of them got rejected, both of them got rejected within one week, although I handed them in nine months apart, but I got the feedback in one week. And one of the reviewers wants to fight my work, or wants to fight to have my article rejected. It was really...

[00:02:53] Speaker 0: Wow.

[00:02:56] Speaker 1: So now I'm thinking I need more ways to publish my research. Because either I'm doing something completely wrong, or I'm doing something completely right, or this person has issues with me, or with something else. So, I need extra skills.

[00:03:15] Speaker 0: Thank you.

[00:03:18] Speaker 2: Yes, I'm a psychologist and I do qualitative research The reason why I'm here is that I've, up until now, I've published as a co-author once. I have one publication resubmitted with minor revisions and one with major revisions resubmitted which, I don't know, a fifty percent chance of being published. And to me that whole process of publishing was really frustrating. It took so much time and almost a year in order to resubmit before you get an answer, and then reviewers who have completely different reviews sometimes, which are hard to combine. But the mere time it takes, and I'm, well, probably as you can guess, I'm an external PhD, so I've, I come from a world where you get immediate feedback of what you're doing and you can publish things much more easily in magazines or whatsoever. So I was actually looking for, is there another way to, I would say publish, but at least to do something with your output in a shorter time frame than waiting for a year for something to be published. So that was my motivation to come here and I'm just really curious to see what are the options and probably also the hurdles. So thanks for the opportunity.

[00:04:58] Speaker 1: Thank you for sharing.

[00:05:00] Speaker 3: I'm also a psychologist, but more like a meta-psychologist rather than a researcher. And for me it was already trying to improve the way we were working for a long time. One part of that was looking into pre-registration and publishing about how to do that. It makes very much sense to just be open and transparent from the beginning of things, so people can see your steps. And then therefore this platform, which I came to know about, was also making a lot of sense. And I think why even go to journals? I feel they only add some reputation, but that doesn't give us much good. In the end, we just keep looking at the rankings of the person or work behind.

[00:05:55] Speaker 4: Okay, and then I guess I have two reasons. One, and it's that my PhD project is with Open Science. And Open Science is very close to this type of publication, which makes your work more transparent. And also, you can publish even if you are rejected. Also, because I keep hearing these kind of things that we've just heard from colleagues who get frustrated in the process of publishing something. So that would be the other reason. I myself want to be a researcher who's open and transparent, and the environment where I'm being socialized as an academic, I believe, is very nice for that purpose. So I consider myself very lucky in that sense. And yeah, that would be it. So I'm interested also from a research perspective myself in this, and then to use it for my own work.

[00:06:55] Speaker 0: Thank you all for sharing. So all of you seem to have thought a little bit about, well, how we publish and the issues we have in mind if there are alternative ways to it. Can you already, well, summarize your main issues with the traditional publishing system beyond, and then maybe then react to each other. Would someone like to start or should we go the round again?

[00:07:30] Speaker 2: So you're asking our issues with the traditional way of publishing?

[00:07:35] Speaker 3: You already mentioned the time.

[00:07:37] Speaker 2: Time. My main issue is time.

[00:07:40] Speaker 3: And then for society to learn about it sooner or for you to have less lag maybe in your project? Or for what reason? Is time important? Or both?

[00:07:56] Speaker 2: Well, one thing would be that if you have to wait so long for a publication to be finalized, then in the meantime, and I think you mentioned something similar to that, you've already moved on. So it's like your thinking has developed, but there's still a publication which represents something that has already been passed in a way, or… So that is a bit of a disappointment for yourself. You say, well, I would have written it completely different if it would have been now. It's too long to represent something current sometimes.

Speaker 3: So its time but its also flexibility. Its not a fluent document, or a living document, or something you can update. So stable?

[00:08:43] Speaker 2: Maybe yes, maybe yes. Maybe you can update.

[00:08:52] Speaker 3: But does the journal system where we live in sort of allow us to do that very well? I think that's another issue that I would...

Speaker 2: Well, it's not encouraged.

[00:09:02] Speaker 3: No, right? And the editors don't really want to do any retractions or corrections because it looks bad for the journal, so it's not in their interest.

[00:09:11] Speaker 2: Well, that's an important issue as well, I guess, yeah. But time also to the outside world, because people would be interested in the field or in academics to know about the results of your work because they have participated in it and then they have to wait for at least a year in order to see something, to see something tangible. and that to me is, you have to disappoint people which is not something you would like, to share something earlier in the process and up until now I wouldn't, I wouldn't know how, I wouldn't know how to do that. But apart from time, I don't know, maybe you added flexibility as well, which is also an issue, I guess, yeah.

[00:10:04] Speaker 1: And the process is highly subjective, because if you have three reviewers, all three need to agree, and maybe if you get the right three reviewers, it will be accepted. But if you only get one who might be working on something similar or something different or has completely different, well, is from a different school, that's in my field, that's important, then they might reject it already because you are not using the right methods in their framework. And then it might be that the process takes even longer or people get discouraged, although the research might be good. Which you don't know.

[00:10:56] Speaker 4: And now maybe, because I'm at a different phase, I still don't worry much about whether I will be published or not. Or maybe I should be worried about that, but I'm not at the moment. So what I find really restrictive about the traditional publishing way is it's not inclusive. So I'm not reading all that’s out there or that could be out there. I'm at the right place in a wealthy institution, wealthy country, and still it might be hard for us. So can you imagine for others who are somewhere else in more difficult institutions, countries? So that makes us, we are missing a big part of what we could learn about the world. And that's because of the way publishing houses are structured.

[00:11:52] Speaker 0: And if you think about this, let me rephrase this, how much does your considerations and your concerns about the way you publish traditionally at the moment affect your research processes before you even submit? Like do you already, Speaker 4 for example said, you're writing now, don't worry about it yet. So does that mean that the project you start, the way you record things are not affected by your choice, future potential choices to publish a paper?

[00:12:26] Speaker 4: Yeah. I can tell you that I'm not even thinking about where I'm going to publish or if this would become a paper or chapter. I'm not worried about that, so it's not affecting the way I'm working. I'm sure it is in a subconscious way, probably. There are some things that I'm thinking about without even realizing, but I'm not actively thinking I have to do this or that or that, because my goal is to publish in a Q-one journal.

[00:13:08] Speaker 0: Does it affect any of your [addressing the room] thoughts? You [Speaker 1] said you were looking for a new skill set now?

[00:13:13] Speaker 1: Yeah, also because my field changed because suddenly it's a hot topic and it's almost, well and it felt in the past it felt like everybody was doing their own thing but nobody had something that could change the world yet. But now it's a mature field. But now I'm at the end stage of my PhD and I used to work like you are working now, and now I am trying to publish, because I felt like, well, I'm doing what I think is useful, and what I think is valuable, and now I'm trying to publish it. And then I noticed that things that might seem useful to me or my supervisors, that when you present them to people from a completely different background, they might be sensitive or they might reject it right away. And now I think, well, if I had known this, maybe I would have already, maybe for a future, if I stay in academia, maybe for a future project, I would take into account how publishable it is. So maybe I would already, in the design phase of my study, take into account, well, can I sell this to a reviewer? And not, do I think it's valuable only?

[00:14:41] Speaker 0: How is it for you two [Speaker 2 and 3]?

[00:14:47] Speaker 2: Yeah, well, for me... I was quite discouraged at one point and when I got back the major revision paper I thought I don't want to do this because there was one reviewer very negative and; I agree with you that sometimes it's a matter of being in a different stream, expecting another type of literature review that you had done, you have done, and the other was quite positive. So I thought, how can I sort of satisfy both? It's impossible. I just don't want to do it anymore. But I had worked with a co-author who was well, who was a second author, so she said, well, why not? Let's try it. And after a holiday, I sort of, well, got new energy to do it. But what it changed was that next time I would do a lot more research into what kind of journal would be interested and would probably have; where I would have a chance to be published. Because I'm kind of new to this world of publishing, I just, I used the Journal Finder, but it doesn't really give you the best options, and sometimes you think it's a good match, and you read articles that seem to be similar to yours, but then again there's other reviewers who have a different idea. So I don't know, I've never had a desk reject, but I had one major revision and then after half a year I resubmitted because I had new energy to do it and then it became a desk reject the second time and it was so much work I put into it. And then I tried another journal and then it was immediately accepted with minor revision. So I thought well it's sometimes it's so arbitrary and and then I think so for me it changed that I have to put much more effort into looking for the right journals, because there's so many of them. Yeah, and that's a skill I don't have. So in addition to what you're trying to teach us today, I would also benefit from having the skills of selecting better journals or more suitable journals for my type of papers, I guess.

[00:17:11] Speaker 0: It sounds like a lot of work that has to go, like a lot of administrative work for us personally, that has to go into your daily life, rather than just doing research, you also have to now be strategic.

[00:17:24] Speaker 2: Yeah, that's right.

Speaker 0: And plan ahead of it.

[00:17:28] Speaker 2: And right now I would say I'm in the last year of my PhD and I just, I want, it's quite some time I've had a delay because of Covid because I couldn't enter, I couldn't get participants and so for me now it's, I want to finish this and I don't want to take another year of trying to publish a paper. I first want to finish and then see whether I won't have a career in academia in the way you have at another phase in your life, but I want to continue working as a researcher. So I need to develop those skill sets in parallel with trying to finish my PhD.

[00:18:08] Speaker 0: Does your [Speaker3] perspective on publishers affect the way you work. In fact, you already said you're quite selective in what you publish.

[00:18:15] Speaker 3: Yes. Well, I don't know. But to me, this... Okay, so I consider myself also a bit of an activist, and part of being a rebel is also trying to sort of flip this, because I hear you saying, like, I need to be strategic, I need to do, like, some new skills, or how to select a journal, and all these things. So we are now letting the format decide the content. And I think that's very tricky.

Speaker 2: [agreeing noices]

[00:18:47] Speaker 3: So I'd rather create some content and then think, oh, what can I do with it? And sometimes it doesn't even look like I can pre-print this, because a pre-print already gives a format of rights, right? So what is that? Lately I was doing some summary of a hackathon that I organized, and there were three parallel hackathons, but parallel, so I couldn't, like, to make three summaries, or one, and then I make one, but I call it a proceeding, and then I thought, I'll just pre-print that. It's not a manuscript, it's breaking the mold of what the normal form is, but I don't care about that, because my goal is to get this in a package together to a reader. So it doesn't matter. Right?

[00:19:30] Speaker 2: So what did you do then? What platform did you use?

[00:19:33] Speaker 3: So for pre-printing we have for psychology SciArchive, but there is also ViyaArchive or any other archive you could do that with. And then it's just, yeah, it's version controlled and it's just your text, whatever it was. And it has a DOI and people can refer to it. So I would look up, being a PhD student… Actually, I also want to know, I'm not a PhD student, but I want to know for you guys, is it a requirement to publish in a journal for you to graduate? If not, do you want to stay in academia? Then maybe be strategic and play the game. I mean, yeah, then they need journals at some point, but maybe preprinted already now. And then we can see this evolution. And we can also credit you for making that major revision and see the versions and what changed. And maybe sometimes, because it's so subjective, the reviewers will ask you to change the wrong things. And then we can see those versions as a consumer of this work. Which for me, makes it more credible. Because it's transparent where you went.

[00:20:38] Speaker 2: Well, your messages is: don't comply too easily. Or make sense in a way.

[00:20:45] Speaker 3: I guess that is the rebel part

[00:20:46] Speaker 2: Yeah . It's thought-provoking, at least.

[00:20:49] Speaker 1: If somebody published their research and I want to read into it, probably I won't read all their versions, I will only read the last one, because of time limits, so I think the last one will be the best.

[00:21:02] Speaker 3: But if it's in your area and you're doing very similar things, then you'd be interested, then at least it is there.

[00:21:07] Speaker 01: Maybe if it's very closely related, I would.

[00:21:11] Speaker 3: And also the fact that it is there already makes it that they will be more accountable for whatever, right? So the fact that it can be checked, will probably already make it more robust. Whether we check it or not, it is another resource at our digression.

[00:21:26] Speaker 0: Maybe just a little starting point. Let's maybe reimagine science, reimagine publishing. We have the opportunity to have quite some impact on this platform now. If we would want to change science and the way we present it, what kind of things would we wish for? SO, for you [Speaker 3], a version control, it would be a non-selective way of publishing, in a way? Or more freedom?

[00:21:58] Speaker 3: Yes. More freedom, more opportunity to interact. So, yeah, it's an illusion that everybody will go and put some comments on preprints, because there's just too much out there, and it's not really going to work. Unless it's also something that could give credit to the reviewers, or commenters, or whatever you want to call them. And there are some, some platforms for that as well. But we still need to work on this reward and recognizing this verification work. So maybe you started... Anybody who wants to get a promotion will need to verify some of their own work. Whether it's providing replication or some kind of quality check that is applicable to you. And then that will go to the committee for you to get a promotion. Or maybe as a journal. There could be a call to say, well, in our journal, look at these years and then let's go and verify some of the papers we publish, because the journals should actually be accountable for stuff they have in there. But that assumes journals, and maybe I don't want to assume journals.

[00:23:04] Speaker 0: What does ‘assume journals’ means? That they exist?

[00:23:11] Speaker 3: That they exist, or that we, yeah. But come at it from all angles, right? So then we also need to assume journals, yeah.

[00:23:19] Speaker 2: It provokes a question, if you talk about version control, would it even be an option to say at one point in time, well, I wrote this three years ago, but I just think about this completely differently and I would have done it differently. I want to withdraw it.

[00:23:33] Speaker 3: Oh no, put an update, please. Because then hopefully everybody who cites you can also get the notification that there's an update or something in your system, that would be great. And then, because I know some people here...

Speaker 2: Or replacement of some sort?

[00:23:47] Speaker 3: Yeah, yeah. So Zotero now has a plugin where it says all this paper that you cite has been rejected, you know, right? So then you can stop citing things that are no longer in the scientific record. Because people keep doing that, because they have the local version on their computer and they just... Yeah, that's where was I going with this?

[00:24:09] Speaker 2: You said never withdraw, but replace it or update it.

[00:24:12] Speaker 3: Yeah, update it, because that shows that we are doing science, because we are …

[00:24:16] Speaker 2: That we're developing.

[00:24:19] Speaker 3: Yeah, and we're getting more towards the truth. And science is, I think, what sets it apart from other ways of knowing, is that it's self-correct. So then we show that it [the paper] is self-correct.

Speaker 2: Yeah.

[00:24:32] Speaker 0: I also heard for you two [Speaker 1 and 2], the review process is something that you find a bit, well, tricky at the moment, as it is set up. If we can imagine this nice world, if you stick to an idea of there's a platform and you can have version control papers on there. And, well, could we get around a review without reviews? Can we verify it that way? Is that something that would interest you? Or could you see a way of how could we shape reviews in such a way that they are useful and not create such a huge extra load of work?

[00:25:17] Speaker 1: I find it difficult because I also feel like even a negative review can be valuable because if somebody has legitimate criticism on your work after the first two weeks of condemning them then at some point, it's also good that people have an opportunity to tell you if you missed something or if you made a mistake. The problem is that you don't know what's in their head because maybe they have another issue that, they are working on something similar or something completely different and maybe there are things that are influencing their opinion that do not reflect your work. But you can never know and I wouldn't know how to avoid this because; maybe if editors would select reviewers on some ground that they should be open to accepting this article if they find it well, or if they find it good enough. So its, I think, its really, it's almost impossible to avoid it in a system where you get judged by people who are anonymous, which is what you want.

Speaker 3: Is it?

[00:26:39] Speaker 1: I've also been asked as a reviewer once and then I felt like, because I'm an early career researcher and I don't know if I want to stay in academia, but if I would like, well these were people at the other end of the world so it didn't matter, but if it would have been somebody from Amsterdam or Belgium and I would severely criticize them and they would be well, important professors, I would think, well, this is a university where I will definitely never find a job. So then I wouldn't feel...

Speaker 3: [inaudible] but the text itself could be open? Because if it is valid criticism, then other people can also take that into account when they read it.

[00:27:26] Speaker 1: But if it's not anonymous, it might come back to me.

[00:27:32] Speaker 3: So don't put your name under it? And then, but you do provide the review openly.

[00:27:41] Speaker 1: I wouldn't mind if it's, maybe that would be better, because then you also, maybe then you don't say things like, I will fight to have this rejected.

[00:27:52] Speaker 3: Exactly, right? Which is a good thing, right? So we're acountable in that sense.

[00:27:55] Speaker 1: Which is not something I would say, by the way.

Speaker 3: But then again, people do, yeah.

[00:28:01] Speaker 2: I don't know. There should be... The idea of reuse is good. And I would... Well, in my opinion, there's at least something good about it. And it's blind, which also has its pros. But couldn't there be a way to get some consistency? Because I think the lack of consistency is one of the problems. It's almost arbitrary. We feel that, okay, well, then this review was positive and this one was negative, so what do I make of it? And you can all, obviously, that's a natural process. But if you would have more, if you would have ten or twenty, then it would be completely different. So I'm just thinking out loud, if you would have a platform where things would be published and then people would spend, other researchers would, scholars would spontaneously give their feedback on this, then something can develop, you know, you can learn from that, you receive the feedback, it can be anonymous as well, but nobody is required to do it, they can do it because they think it's valuable to give this feedback, whether positive or constructive, and the person who wrote it can learn from it, And if somebody never gets feedback, never gets any response to it, then, well, that might be a sign that you're not writing anything interesting for your audience, whoever that maybe. So it would be something like the amount which would count and the type of feedback you would get, but not a requirement.

Speaker 3: I fear it would give more room for inequities, like some people would, some parts of the world, some people would not get read, not because it is not good quality, but because they don’t have a network or something like that. So it would create an imbalance. I don't think anybody would just volunteer – oh well, I know people who actually volunteer and go to preprints, but then maybe go to the ones that are in the most far corner of the archive, that nobody has given an eye yet, because they're all so busy. And that may not have to do with the quality of the preprint, right?

[00:30:23] Speaker 2: But what kind of process would make that happen? Because, there's a pre-print that's published. Why would something be read less than something else? Because you simulate your peers to do it?

[00:30:38] Speaker 3: Because the person who wrote it isn't supervised by somebody famous or something like that.

[00:30:43] Speaker 2: Oh sure, it's by name.

[00:30:44] Speaker 3: Yeah.

[00:30:44] Speaker 1: But then, okay, because it's transparent and then you get this mechanism. Yeah, okay. Yeah, sure. Yeah.

[00:30:56] Speaker 4: With Open Peer Review, I do think that for early career and for researchers in not included minority groups, it's a bit tricky if your name is there. And because of the issue that you mentioned [Speaker 1], what if someone from a university where maybe you would like to work someday, or someone who has an influence. So yeah, then you would think twice before you openly share your comments and your name. Now, when that becomes anonymus, then yeah, I do, I think that sharing at least your comments, you think twice before you write anything random and maybe cruel in there. So that's a nice way to start.

[00:31:44] Speaker 3: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Just thinking about what you [Speaker 2] were saying, like structure this. Well, some journals have not just like, oh, please write a review, but do it on these things. And then these questions could nudge the reviewer to think about the quality of the methodology instead of just saying: I want to fight this thing. But they have to justify, right? Because of these nudging’s and the forms and these things.

[00:32:07] Speaker 2: Very specific questions.

[00:32:10] Speaker 4: But yeah, that brings me to the problem that academics have to do many things for free and not being recognized. So that's also what's problematic about peer review, I believe. And so that's another side of the coin, recognition of your work.

[00:32:28] Speaker 2: As a reviewer, you mean?

[00:32:29] Speaker 4: As a reviewer, yeah.

[00:32:29] Speaker 0: Have any of you written reviews for other people?

[00:32:44] Speaker 1: I've written one review. I was making accounts for journals where I wanted to publish and suddenly they wrote me an email like, do you want to be a reviewer? And I accepted because, well, I thought it's a good practice if I get into the process myself that I know what's ahead. It was really useful because you have to get out of your comfort zone because you have to think in the way, well, you have to think about their research instead of your own. And personally I leave my own opinion, … Well, I don't use that, but I really try to follow their reasoning and not to give my opinion about the field, but see if you assume this, and I know people do, does this conclusion follow from the assumptions, and not: do I think this is the way the field should go. So I try to be honest, not what some other people do.

[00:33:53] Speaker 0: Anybody else?

Speaker 3: Sure.

[00:33:57] Speaker 0: And your experience, how you did your reviews, and how you were approached, and all the surroundings, how does that affect you as an author when you process this?

[00:34:06] Speaker 3: Well, I really like it when editors send you lots of comments on the other reviews, because than you can see whether you have similar points, basically, in their letters. So that they can see what happens to your comments. I like that. What else? What is the question? I am sorry.

[00:34:29] Speaker 0: I think where I want to get at the end is the question, if we take the modular thinking back into consideration for the review process, for example. If we think and publish a paper, let's say not in one chunk, but we have like multiple parts of a paper that are published, and then we would have to review that. That of course would be a new challenge for a reviewer. We talked about this [during the workshop], right? How much information is too much information? How do you rate this kind of thing? As someone who has reviewed or has been reviewed, how do you feel that, how does it affect these processes?

[00:35:06] Speaker 2: If only part of the [paper are published], yeah.

[00:35:09] Speaker 0: I don't know, that's the question. Would we only want part or would we want the whole thing to be, well, available, right?

[00:35:24] Speaker 2: Well, the good thing about the whole thing is that at least people can read about how one leads to another and otherwise, it would be without the context, so I'm not sure if that would work. But I also like the structured way of the questions that are really succinct, and you could, you at least know why they say what they say. So reading the whole part, but I'm not sure if you're also thinking about publishing only a part of the paper, right? That's what you're getting at?

[00:36:03] Speaker 0: That depends a bit on... I mean...

[00:36:07] Speaker 2: Not all papers are suitable for that, I would say.

[00:36:11] Speaker 3: But you could maybe publish a pre-registration, so your plan for doing the research. And in that sense, if you look at journals you read out, so the registered reports model, if you're a reviewer, you see the thing twice. And now, I sort of also, for time reasons, I only accept it to be a reviewer of the registered report because I like it so much, you can actually... Yeah, you have to... but you do see it again and you can give some feedback that people can include still in their plan before they run the plan. So it's sort of more satisfying in that way.

[00:36:43] Speaker 2: Okay, for the reviewer?

[00:36:46] Speaker 3: For the reviewer, yeah. To see that. And then I also guess at some point, if it's about conclusions and I want to comment on that, then I don't want to see the whole package because I want to know where the conclusions are based on, right? But if its about the measure they use, and I think if some items in the questionnaire are not right, then maybe I should be commenting on this module, because whoever finds that should know that, right? So its also about filtering and curating and directing people to the right thing, because it would be very wasteful, again if they have to read my whole review and then only find one part that's being linked to...

[00:37:27] Speaker 2: Relevant for them.

[00:37:28] Speaker 3: Yeah.

[00:37:33] Speaker 0: I would say we have to finish after this, but I would like to hear your two [Speaker 1 and 4] thoughts as well on that. Also thinking maybe, you are in different stages of dissertation writing. Dissertations are inherently modular because there are different chapters that might be papers or might be not, right? And someone has to assess that as well.

[00:38:00] Speaker 4: Well, yeah, I mean, it would make sense, or it would be very valuable if someone looks at your work for, as you said [Speaker 3], because they can give you feedback that you can easily incorporate. You're at the early stages, and you're still working on it. Now, is that feasible in terms of workload? I don't know. So yeah, I like the idea that someone would look at the different parts of your work, the different modules. But I am not sure how that would work, could be done. I struggle to find the right way.

[00:38:37] Speaker 0: Could it be an option to think about really specializing in a certain parts only of a paper rather than reading a whole thing? Say someone is a methodological, has a methodological focus and uses a methodology module, another one reads, say, result sections?

Speaker 4: I don't think so, because they need to read more than just one section to understand the whole work. So, I'm not sure, yeah.

[00:39:06] Speaker 1: I think in general with the dissertation, it's also difficult to, because you are working on a lot of things, but sometimes you have years where you basically, for the outside world, it seems like you're doing nothing, because you don't have any output. But there is output, it all comes down to one dissertation or one paper, and then it suddenly seems like you're doing a lot. Actually, I once saw a movie about Einstein, and I always, because they had this wonder year, and then he published four papers in one year. And I always thought he had a brilliant year. But now I'm nearing the end of my dissertation, I suddenly understand that it's not like this year was brilliant, but probably he was thinking about and working on things for years, and now in this one year everything came together. But it seems like this one year was especially productive. I don't know if this happened this way, but...

[00:40:09] Speaker 0: Thinking modular publishing, what is a way of him having... maybe share his ideas already, what he wrote this year, would have made him feel like, would make him feel for audiences, not like he published everything in one year, but rather he was thinking already?

[00:40:25] Speaker 1: Maybe he did, maybe he was so brilliant that he did, I don't know, but to me it seems like that if I managed to get my papers published somewhere, I could have multiple publications following each other, but it's not that because in these months I was so productive. It's more that in these years I was seemingly doing nothing. Although I was working hard.

[00:41:02] Speaker 0: Alright, thank you so very much for your insights.