Some people believe that it is good to share as much information as possible in scientific research, business and economic world. Others believe that some information is too important or too valuable to be shared freely.

Discuss both these views and give your own opinion.

Information sharing is always playing an important role in the process of decision making about producing and storing it, which leads to many debates, for instance, to what extent <u>should</u> information <u>should</u> be exhibited to public. This essay is going to cover some undiscovered parts of the matter.

On one hand, helping the development of science encourages a huge number of scientists to reveal what they find in they laboratories or research institutes. <u>In-from their point of view</u> all researchers and even people <u>are deserved deserve</u> to be informed. This idea comes from the attitude of "the more <u>others</u> will benefit from our results the more we can benefit from theirs". Besides, they perceive <u>that</u> although it seems that information plays an important role in attaining a competitive advantage, there are lots of other issues such as capabilities of implementing them in the real world that are important to lead to a sustainable competitive advantage and not information merely can do so.

But <u>the other group</u> believe that no researcher will unveil all of his/her information. Their strategy is "neither we nor they" which is a direct conclusion of "prisoner's dilemma" taught in "game theory". Neglecting the whole theory, it simply says that <u>the</u> reality <u>urges</u> all the players in a game not to cooperate as they believe that the other side will not do so. As a <u>results result</u>, they decide to disguise many of the results and establish preventive hedges around their outcomes. Investing in construction of an expensive research center must be accompanied <u>with by</u> capital return. If everyone has access to the results, the center may not be able to excel in its economic targets and will be definitely closed. So it is fair enough to put some restrictions on the flow of information, as I myself do significantly agree with this idea.

In conclusion, establishing a set of <u>firm enough firm</u> restrictions on information as <u>one of the most</u> <u>valuable sources</u> of power and the main asset of companies and research centers should be conceived as a must that shall be strictly obeyed.