**Marino:** Last Spring, Hans and I managed to get a paper published in a top-tier journal in work and organizational psychology. It is rare to publish a paper during your PhD program in our field (Organization Studies), so you might expect many celebratory interactions during the day that I got the news. However, some people were commenting on the fact that the paper has 33 authors and that it is ‘just’ a manifesto and not an empirical paper, which takes up limited space in an elite journal in our field. It seems problematic to some that I am collaborating with an amazing group of people from at least five different disciplines. It also seems problematic that we are taking up space in an elite journal with a rather non-conventional paper.

These remarks left me extremely confused. When I started my scientific career, I firmly believed that science was about brilliant minds collaborating, venturing into the unknown by conducting non-conventional research, and sharing their knowledge for the benefit of society. I found out that my hypothesis was seriously wrong and learned that academia is more competitive than the corporate world, conventional to its core, while sharing is the exception rather than the norm.

The world is facing numerous problems, but the current publishing system causes scientists to work individually on problems and only share their solutions when they are published – which in our field on average takes five years from the point of idea conception. That is five years of delay in which society cannot benefit from that solution, and five years in which other scientists who came up with similar solutions but did not yet publish those, find their time and effort wasted.

Most scientists are aware of these problems and some are brave enough to acknowledge them. However, in discussions on this topic the usual response that we get is that there is no alternative and that this system simply the best of the worst.

**Hans:** However, we challenge that. Why wouldn’t it be possible for all researchers who work on tackling the same issue to collaborate? Shouldn’t a 100 scientists working *together* be able to come up with much better solutions in a quicker way compared to 100 scientist who each work individually trying to outsmart one another – or at least be the first to get something published?

Last year, Marino and Chris Hartgerink, another PhD candidate from our university, published a paper in which they propose a different publication system. The “as-you-go” system they propose is digital, which obliterates the current suggestion that there is only limited space for a number of articles and takes away the competitiveness that in the current system has been artificially created. It is called “as-you-go”, because you immediately share your ideas or findings, to make sure society can immediately benefit from them and other scientists can build on them. Furthermore, instead of having to write an entire paper, the “as-you-go” system works with modules, which can be pieces of theory, results, or even data, a video, or a drawing, and even null-findings. This will help to mitigate the current replication crisis and increase a focus on knowledge building instead of only chasing ‘new’ findings. Finally, it will be open to everyone. So not just scientists, but also practitioners and other people who are interested can chip in and share their ideas and experiences.

So whereas the current system stimulates competition, leads to a lot of wasted time and resources, and holds back the dissemination of solutions to societal problems, the “as-you-go” system stimulates cooperation, focuses on addressing the problems rather than outcompeting other scientists, creates an inclusive culture, and immediately disseminates new insights and findings.

And the cool thing is: Chris recently received a $750,000 grant to realize the “as-you-go” system through his open worker cooperative Liberate Science. So in the near future we can actually start to use it and hopefully change the game.