

Fighting Uncertainty with Uncertainty: Time Value of Knowledge and the Net Present Value (NPV) of Knowledge Machines

Ravi Kashyap

SolBridge International School of Business / City University of Hong Kong

September 22, 2017

Keywords: Value Knowledge; Machine; Time; Net Present; Fight; Uncertainty; Social; Natural; Science; Randoptimization

JEL Codes: D81 Criteria for Decision-Making under Risk and Uncertainty; D8 Information, Knowledge, and Uncertainty; G12 Asset Pricing

Contents

1	Abstract	3
2	Knowledge for What Sake?	3
3	Managing Known Unknowns and their Unknown Unknown Relationships	5
4	Questions & Answers, Q&A, Definitions and Assumptions, D&A, in our DNA	8
5	Switching on Knowledge Machines	12
5.1	Notation and Terminology	12
5.2	Once On, Never Off	13
5.3	The Limits, The Physics and The Motivation for Time Travel	15
6	Unintended Consequences of Journal Submissions	16
6.1	Catch-22 Situations	20
6.2	Tolerating More Unintended Consequences	23
7	The End Game	24
7.1	Fighting Uncertainty with Uncertainty	26
8	End-notes and Acknowledgments	29
9	References	34

arXiv:1908.03233v1 [q-fin.GN] 1 Aug 2019

1 Abstract

We formulate one methodology to put a value or price on knowledge, using well accepted techniques from finance. We then apply this valuation to the decision problem of selecting papers for publication from an overall pool of submissions. Our initial analysis shows that one of the better solutions, we can accomplish with regards to the creation and dissemination of knowledge, might be described by the prescription, “Don’t Simply Optimize, Also Randomize; best described by the term - Randoptimization”. We specifically show that the best decision we can make, with regards to the selection of articles by journals, requires us to formulate a cutoff point, or, a region of optimal performance and randomly select from within that region of better results. The policy implication (for all fields) is to randomly select papers, based on publication limitations (journal space, reviewer load etc.) from an overall pool of submissions, that have a single shred of knowledge (or one unique idea) and have the editors and reviewers coach the authors to ensure a better final outcome.

2 Knowledge for What Sake?

Despite the apparent lack of consensus, as to what knowledge really is and a possibly demonstrable absence of well accepted reasons for maybe, why we even need knowledge (as the name of this section suggests, whatever knowledge might be, if it can be traded for whichever sake, the Japanese drink, that we might be able to ferret out, that might be a good exchange, or trade); most would agree that knowledge is valuable (Russell 1948 is perhaps an ideal place to start examining the relation between individual experience and the general body of scientific knowledge; see also: Kvanvig 2003; Pritchard 2009; Pritchard, Millar & Haddock 2010; Crevoisier 2016; End-note 2). (End-note 3) has a collection of quotes starting from the 1st century AD, stating the ancient belief that knowledge has worth (Boswell 1873; Toffler 1990). That the Wikipedia link, as of Oct-16-2017, about the value of knowledge, has material only from as recently as 2000 years ago, shows how limited our knowledge, regarding the value, history has placed on knowledge is. (Dancy, Sosa & Steup 2009; DeRose 2005; Figueroa 2016; Pritchard 2018; Hetherington 2018; End-note 4) are an excellent collection of articles on leading theories, thinkers, ideas, distinctions and concepts in epistemology.

A recent attempt, in the context of the time periods discussed above, (Martin 1996), acknowledges that, measuring the value of knowledge has not progressed much beyond an awareness, that traditional accounting practices are misleading and can lead to wrong business decisions. (Bozeman & Rogers 2002) admit that determining the value of scientific and technical knowledge poses a great many problems (the value of knowledge shifts dramatically over time as new uses for the knowledge emerge; a related problem is that market-based valuation of knowledge is an inadequate index of certain types of scientific knowledge). They present an alternative framework for the value

of scientific and technical knowledge, one based not on market pricing of information, but instead, on the intensity and range of uses of scientific knowledge. Their churn model of scientific knowledge value emphasizes the distinctive properties of scientific and technical knowledge and focuses on the social context of its production. They consider the value of scientific and technical knowledge in enhancing the activities of the set of individuals who interact in the demand, production, technical evaluation, and application of scientific and technical knowledge. (Barnett 1999) mentions that even universities, which are solely meant to create and spread knowledge might have lost their way and how they need a new sense of purpose. (Delanty 2001) is about the role of universities in the knowledge society.

Our contribution to the knowns and unknowns about knowledge is to formulate one methodology to put a value or price on knowledge, using well accepted techniques from finance. To the best of our knowledge (limited as it is, which follows from the present understanding and also from the definition of knowledge we use below 3), this is the first recorded attempt to value knowledge. We then apply this valuation to the decision problem of selecting papers for publication from an overall pool of submissions.

Hence, the example we develop in greater detail is with regards to the creation and dissemination of knowledge. That there is uncertainty in this process, is perhaps, not to be debated. Our initial analysis shows that one of the better solutions, we can accomplish in this space, might be described by the prescription, “Don’t Simply Optimize, Also Randomize; best described by the term - Randoptimization”. We can overcome uncertainty with uncertainty. Using randomness in our choices and in what we control, and hence in the decision making process, could potentially offset the uncertainty inherent in the environment and yield better outcomes.

We specifically show that the best decision we can make, with regards to the selection of articles by journals (and in a subsequent paper, with respect to school admissions), requires us to formulate a cutoff point, or, a region of optimal performance and randomly select from within that region of better results. The policy implication (for all fields) is to randomly select papers, based on publication limitations (journal space, reviewer load etc.) from an overall pool of submissions, that have a single shred of knowledge (or one unique idea) and have the editors and reviewers coach the authors to ensure a better final outcome.

Summary 1. In later sections, we hope to pitch in to this effort to refocus what knowledge stands for and how best to spread it, by starting with the intuition for one method to value knowledge. We then formalize this idea with a series of axioms and models. We show how this method signifies, that the best way for journals to select submissions would be randomly, once a paper meets certain basic quality criteria.

3 Managing Known Unknowns and their Unknown Unknown Relationships

As with everything else, it is slightly concerning that attempts are being made to manage something that has barely begun to be understood, but perhaps attempts at controlling something, might help reveal its true value. (Chyi Lee & Yang 2000) introduce the knowledge value chain model as a knowledge management (KM) framework. The model consists of knowledge infrastructure (knowledge worker recruitment, knowledge storage capacity, customer/supplier relationship, among other things), the process of KM (knowledge acquisition, knowledge innovation, knowledge protection, knowledge integration, and knowledge dissemination), and the interaction among those components resulting in knowledge performance. (Bhatt 2001) argues that the knowledge management process can be categorized into knowledge creation, knowledge validation, knowledge presentation, knowledge distribution, and knowledge application activities.

(Carlucci, Marr & Schiuma 2004) explore the fundamental issue of how knowledge management initiatives impact business performance. By considering works in the knowledge and performance management, they identify strategic, managerial, and operational dimensions of knowledge management and allow linking knowledge management with core competencies, strategic processes, business performance, and finally, with value creation. (Dayan, Heisig & Matos 2017) show, using around 200 interviews, that KM is a factor for the formulation and implementation of organization strategy and suggests that KM practitioners stimulate the advantages their organizations can gain from enhancing the relationship between KM and organization strategy. (Darroch 2005) presents empirical evidence to support the view that a firm with a knowledge management capability will use resources more efficiently and so will be more innovative and perform better.

(Kianto, Vanhala & Heilmann 2016) propose a theoretical model concerning the connections between five facets of KM (knowledge acquisition, knowledge sharing, knowledge creation, knowledge codification and knowledge retention) and job satisfaction, which is empirically tested based on survey data collected from the members of a Finnish municipal organization. They find that existence of KM processes in one's working environment is significantly linked with high job satisfaction. Especially intra-organisational knowledge sharing seems to be a key KM process, promoting satisfaction with one's job in most employee groups. (Reagans, Miron-Spektor & Argote 2016) show that each of the two productivity factors: 1) specialized knowledge among team members; and 2) transactive processes that promote coordination, contributed significantly more to team performance when the other factor was present. They also illustrate potential possibilities for failure if team members utilizing knowledge could not coordinate their collective efforts and if there was too much coordination without sufficient knowledge.

(Lee & Lan 2007) investigate the shift from a knowledge repository approach, the prominent method to handle

large volumes of information since the instigation of World Wide Web, to a conversational collaborative foundation of knowledge management. This shift is necessary since the knowledge residing in the repositories has not been accumulated or integrated to generate new intelligence. They demonstrate the opportunity for more effective and feasible knowledge management and propose basic applications of collaborative intelligence (defined as the measure of the collaborative ability of an entity or a group, it rests on three pillars: collaboration technology environment, including chats, Wikipedia or give and get model of information sharing; rallying the area of knowledge, also to be understood as open creation of content and storage outside the personal computer; and intellectual cooperation).

(Kogut & Zander 1992) tackle the prevailing view that firms serve to keep in check the transaction costs arising from the self-interested motivations of individuals. They develop the argument that what firms do better than markets is the sharing and transfer of the knowledge of individuals and groups within an organization, since hiring new workers is not equivalent to changing the skills of a firm, an analysis of what firms can do must understand knowledge as embedded in the organizing principles by which people cooperate within organizations. (Sakaiya, Fields & Marsh 1991) prophesies a new economic and social value system for the coming millennium built on the belief that a knowledge-value revolution will unfold, as advanced nations have to cope with an utter transformation of their moral standards. (Gittelman & Kogut 2003) analyze the publications and patents of 116 biotechnology firms during the period 1988–1995 and suggest that the role of the small, research-intensive firm is to create a repository of knowledge and to act as an organizational mechanism to combine the capabilities of versatile scientists within and outside the boundaries of the firm; and to manage the selection of scientific ideas to produce valuable technical innovations.

(Petrash 1996) is a discussion of the experiences of Dow Chemical company in developing a vision, functional systems, and tools, for the value management of its intellectual assets (IA). Such an effort could lead to the development of some competencies in the area of “measuring and valuing” IA, and in developing systems that support the leveraging of IA for maximum value. (Carlile 2004) examines the management of knowledge across boundaries in settings where innovation is desired. (Stewart & Ruckdeschel 1998) address past, present, and future economics and management, including a framework toward knowledge resources and information sharing in organizations. (Brown & Duguid 2001) suggest that often too much attention is paid to the idea of community, too little to the implications of practice, which creates epistemic differences among the communities within a firm, and the firm’s advantage over the market lies in dynamically coordinating the knowledge produced by these communities despite such differences.

(Argote, McEvily & Reagans 2003) discusses mechanisms of knowledge management and how those mechanisms affect a unit’s ability to create, retain and transfer knowledge. (Beck, Pahlke & Seebach 2014) test a multilevel model of knowledge exchange including the characteristics of knowledge seekers and knowledge contributors and find that the knowledge seeker’s characteristics and relational factors (from an activity-centered language / action point

of view) drive knowledge exchanges. (Hwang, Singh & Argote 2015) empirically examine the dynamics of knowledge sharing in an organization-hosted online knowledge forum and find that boundaries based on categorical attributes, such as location or hierarchical status, are expected to weaken, and boundaries based on expertise are expected to strengthen. (Archer-Brown & Kietzmann 2018) examine how enterprise social media (ESM, that is, social media within a firm) can be understood as a strategic knowledge management phenomenon to improve organizational performance.

(Hendriks & Vriens 1999) discuss some of the issues with, Knowledge-based systems (KBS), which provide a way of formalizing and automating knowledge. KBS are the outcome of a knowledge engineering process that may be seen as providing some of the building blocks of knowledge management. Their discussion addresses the issue of how knowledge engineering relates to a broader perspective of knowledge management, including some ways to identify the issues to be addressed when valuing KBS as potential measures for knowledge management. (Alavi & Leidner 2001) provide a review and interpretation of the knowledge management literature in different fields with an eye toward identifying the important areas for research. (Barley, Treem & Kuhn 2018) advance strategic directions for future KM scholarship, based on the notion that recognizing multiple knowledge trajectories can aid in addressing several significant lines of theorizing in management and organization studies

(Argote & Ingram 2000; Argote, Ingram, Levine & Moreland 2000; Argote & Fahrenkopf 2016) develop mechanisms of knowledge transfer and discuss factors that facilitate or impede transfer including psychological processes that underlie knowledge transfer. (Ren, Deng & Liang 2018) adopted a questionnaire survey method to collect data from construction enterprises in China, to investigate how project nature affects the effectiveness of knowledge transfer between projects, finding that similarity of projects could promote inter-project communication and improve transfer intention. (Szulanski, Ringov & Jensen 2016) find empirical support that knowledge transfer can be facilitated through the judicious timing of transfer methods. (Wang, Noe & Wang 2014) investigate how individual characteristics and organizational work practices influence knowledge sharing, finding that two accountability-inducing management practices, evaluation and evaluation plus reward, had a positive relationship with knowledge sharing.

It is heartening to know that organizations are deeply engaged in coming up with ways to enhance, share and value knowledge. (Nonaka 1994; Nonaka, Takeuchi & Umemoto 1996; Nonaka & Von Krogh 2009) are excellent sources about theories of organizational knowledge creation; (Zucker, Darby & Armstrong 2002) take up the issue of commercializing knowledge, which involves transfer from discovering scientists to those who will develop it commercially and find that a robust indicator of a firm's tacit knowledge capture (and strong predictor of its success) is the number of research articles written jointly by firm scientists and discovering, "star" scientists, nearly all working at top universities.

4 Questions & Answers, Q&A, Definitions and Assumptions, D&A, in our DNA

It would not be entirely incorrect to state that the majority of the attempts at knowledge creation, start with answering questions. In present day society, we seem to be focused on answering questions that originate in different disciplines.

Assumption 1. *As a first step, we recognize that one possible categorization of different fields can be done by the set of questions, a particular field attempts to answer. Since we are the creators of different disciplines, but we may or may not be the creators of the world in which these fields need to operate, the answers to the questions posed by any domain can come from anywhere or from phenomenon studied under a combination of many other disciplines.*

Hence, the answers to the questions posed under the realm of knowledge creation, can come from seemingly diverse subjects, such as, physics, biology, mathematics, chemistry, marketing, economics, finance and so on. This suggests that we might be better off, identifying ourselves with problems and solutions, which tacitly confers upon us the title, Problem Solvers, instead of calling ourselves physicists, biologists, psychologists, marketing experts, economists and so on. This quest for answers is bounded only by our imagination (Calaprice 2000).

As we linger on the topic of Questions & Answers, Q&A. The field that is most concerned with the valuation of assets (for lack of knowledge of a better word, or terminology, on behalf of the authors, let us categorize knowledge under the umbrella of assets) is finance. Hence, it should not come as a surprise that finance can provide a very surprising answer to the question: what is the value of knowledge in any field? Any answer we wish to seek would depend on some Definitions and Assumptions, D&A. But if we change those D&A, we might get different Q&A, even telling us that Q&A and D&A might be in our very DNA, the biological one (Alberts, Johnson, Lewis, Raff, Roberts & Walter 2002; Alberts 2017; End-note 5). Maybe, DNA hold the lessons from the lives of every ancestor we have ever had. Evolution is constantly coding the information, compressing it and passing forward, what is needed to survive better and to thrive, building what is essential right into our genes (Church, Gao & Kosuri 2012; Lutz, Ouchi, Liu & Sawamoto 2013; Kosuri & Church 2014; Roy, Meszynska, Laure, Charles, Verchin & Lutz 2015). A related question, that comes up is: what is finance? The answer is that finance is a game, where there are only three simple decisions to be made: Buy, Sell or Hold; the complication are mainly to get to these results (Kashyap 2015).

It is worth noting that goods that are not actively traded pose many valuation challenges. There are many interesting techniques used to determine the value of assets, especially non-financial ones. (Zhao & Zhou 2011)

consider status indicators that determine wine prices such as: individual wine tasting scores rated by critics and more general status indicators like classified appellation affiliation, extra designation on the label, or a winery's organizational status; (Gustafson, Lybbert & Sumner 2016) present an experimental approach to measure consumer willingness to pay for wine attributes; (Costanigro, McCluskey & Mittelhammer 2007) provide empirical evidence that the wine market is differentiated into multiple segments or wine classes based on price ranges and find evidence that consumers value the same wine attributes differently across categories.

(Ortiz, Stone & Zissu 2017) develop a valuation model, for a crowd funding initiative to finance a pipeline to transport beer, which takes into account the terms of the contract, the current and expected future price of beer, and the life expectancy of the investor; (Masset & Weisskopf 2015) examine the performance, selectivity, and market-timing abilities of wine fund managers; (Aznar & Guijarro 2007) discuss aesthetic variables in paintings; (Carmona 2015) is about jewelry appraisal; (De Groot, Wilson & Boumans 2002) present a conceptual framework and typology for describing, classifying and valuing ecosystem functions, goods and services; (Throsby 2003) is a discussion of the non-market value of cultural goods - literature, visual arts, music, theater, dance, etc.; (Lebreton, Jorge, Michel, Thirion & Pessiglione 2009) isolate brain regions that may constitute a system that automatically engages in valuating the various components of our environment so as to influence our future choices.

As we go about applying finance principles to assess the value of knowledge in all domains; we need to bear in mind that all valuations are subjective, since they are done by social beings and a hall mark of the social sciences is the lack of objectivity (Kashyap 2017). Here we assert that objectivity is with respect to comparisons done by different participants and that a comparison is a precursor to a decision.

Assumption 2. *Despite the several advances in the social sciences, we have yet to discover an objective measuring stick for comparison, a so called, True Comparison Theory, which can be an aid for arriving at objective decisions. Hence, despite all the uncertainty in the social sciences, the one thing we can be almost certain about is the subjectivity in all decision making.*

For our present purposes, the lack of such an objective measure means that the difference in comparisons, as assessed by different participants, can give rise to different valuations for the same element of knowledge (or asset). We consider two extreme individuals and their perspectives, which would influence their valuations.

Definition 1. Type A person, who has **All** the known knowledge in the universe. So if any new knowledge becomes available, he is desperate to have it, since without this new knowledge he is incomplete.

We have to mention here that a type A person would place an extremely high valuation on every element of knowledge he already has and any new knowledge that might come up.

Definition 2. Type Z person, who has no knowledge about anything in the universe. So he cares nothing about any knowledge, wants nothing and his valuation for all pieces of knowledge would be **Zero**.

It is worth noting that there might be views expressed by people, (or, people with beliefs, in this very world that we live in), who do not seek anything, not even knowledge, that once you stop looking for things, you will have everything. This would be a contradiction to our definition, since in this case, the type Z person is the one who wants nothing and would put a valuation of zero on any new knowledge, but he would actually have everything, and he becomes the type A person. Alternately, the type A person, has all the knowledge in the world because he wants nothing, or his valuation of everything, including knowledge is zero, making him the type Z person. The scope of our discussion will be restricted to someone who is between Type A and Z, so that he has a non-zero valuation of every piece of knowledge.

Assumption 3. *The assumption made in finance regarding homogeneous expectations (Levy & Levy 1996; Chiarella & He 2001), especially in the derivation of many asset pricing models, investment analysis and portfolio management principles (Bodie, Kane & Marcus 2014), is stunningly sophisticated, yet seemingly simplistic. Most people would argue that no two people are alike, so this assumption does not seem validated (Valsiner 2007; Buss 1985; Plomin & Daniels 1987). Then again, this assumption is perhaps a very futuristic one, where we are picking the best habits and characteristics, from our fellow beings (maybe not just humans?) and the environment we live in and the external stimulus we receive tends to become more similar, and at some point in the future, we might tend to have more in common with each other, fulfilling this great assumption, which seems more of a prophecy. Again, if we become too similar, then mother nature, or, evolution, will have less to work with. Since more differences, tell her, which ones are better for certain conditions; and many possibilities create stronger survival potential. Not to mention, if we all look alike, think alike and act alike the world would be a very mundane place. But with respect to finance, we might evolve enough, so that one day, we might have the same expectations with respect to our monetary concerns. This would also be the day when the Bid-Offer spread would cease to matter, or, we would be indifferent to it, making every coffee shop, theater, street corner, pub, or everywhere ... a venue for any product (Kashyap 2015). Using a related concept from economics regarding equilibriums (Dixon 1990; Varian 1992), when we continue to evolve and evolve towards similarity, both type A and type Z kind of person can be equilibriums.*

To better understand knowledge, let us first start with what is not knowledge. Anything that we don't know is not knowledge. Many times, what we don't know is scary or can cause confusion or frustration. Confusion and Frustration, though, scary and ugly to begin with, can be powerful motivators, as long as, we don't let them bother us. Because,

1. Confusion is the beginning of Understanding.
2. Necessity, is the mother of all creation / innovation / invention, but the often forgotten father, is Frustration, which is sometimes, even more necessary, than necessity herself.

What we learn from the story of, Beauty and the Beast, is that, we need to love the beasts to find beauty. Hence, if we start to love these monsters (Confusion and Frustration), we can unlock their awesomeness and find truly stunning solutions. We will further try to provide one definition, for what knowledge might be, keeping in mind that, as generic as we want to make any definition, we need to be open to the possibility that the definition might need to be altered, depending on the specifics of the situation.

Definition 3. Knowledge is a connection between different elements of this universe, the elements could be many (more than two), two or in some cases, a link from one element to the same element. This might require us to clarify what is an element here. We suggest that the element discussed here is anything that belongs to this universe and any characteristic of that element, as observable in this universe. We emphasize the word universe here, since this definition would need to be modified, once we establish (there is already speculation regarding this eventuality) the possibility of other universes (Carr 2007; Weinberg 2007; End-note 6).

This tells us that, knowledge from one time period can be useful in another time period, should there be a possibility of the same connection reoccurring or using the connection we know about to create a modified or new connection; we use existing connections discovered from another time period.

Definition 4. Knowledge machines are elements themselves, that look to create (or discover or record) connections between the various elements. They are people, research journals, books, music and everything else that fulfills the property of being part of the efforts to add to the collective pool of knowledge.

5 Switching on Knowledge Machines

In finance (Cochrane 2009), we talk about something called as a Money Machine which will get turned off, as soon as, people step in to take advantage of it. This is, also know as, Arbitrage¹ (Shleifer & Vishny 1997; Brown & Werner 1995; End-note 7) and it is possible when the law of one price² is violated³ (Isard 1977; Crouhy-Veyrac, Crouhy & Melitz 1982; Protopapadakis & Stoll 1983; Goodwin, Grennes & Wohlgenant 1990; Froot, Kim & Rogoff 1995; End-note 8). This is nothing but buying the asset that we think is cheaper than what it should be and selling the asset that we think is more expensive than what it should be. This is based on the price of the asset, or, the market assessment of the asset in an applicable market, as of today. When no price is available either due to the lack of a corresponding market or participants, we can use the expectation of discounted future cash flows.

There is a generally accepted concept in finance theory called the time value of money (Ross, Westerfield & Jaffe 2002; Bierman Jr & Smidt 2012; Brealey, Myers, Allen & Mohanty 2012; Delaney, Rich & Rose 2016; Petters & Dong 2016; Marty 2017; Olson & Bailey 1981; Becker & Mulligan 1997; Loewenstein & Prelec 1991; End-note 9, 10, Figure 1). This idea can be simply stated as the fact that most people (and perhaps even animals with non-monetary rewards: Hayden 2016) would rather have a certain sum of money now rather than the same sum of money later. This intuitively makes sense to most people, since we are not sure whether we will receive that certain sum in the future, due to the main uncertainties that the future holds. Though, it should be easily seen that for people that can travel through time, money would be the same whether now or later. As unlikely or likely the possibility of time travel might be, it is mainly being used here to illustrate further the notion of why money has different values at different periods of time.

5.1 Notation and Terminology

- PV is the value at $time = 0$ (present value).
- FV is the value at $time = n$ (future value).
- n is the number of periods (not necessarily an integer).

¹If payoff A is always at least as good as payoff B, and sometimes A is better, then the price of A must be greater than the price of B.

²If two portfolios (assets or goods) have the same payoffs (in every state of nature), then they must have the same price.

³ A few other subtleties can arise; Arbitrage is possible when one of three conditions is met:

- The same asset does not trade at the same price on all markets ("the law of one price").
- Two assets with identical cash flows do not trade at the same price.
- An asset with a known price in the future does not today trade at its future price discounted at the risk-free interest rate (or, the asset has significant costs of storage; as such, for example, this condition holds for grain but not for securities).

- i, k are the interest rate, knowledge rate at which the corresponding amount (of money or knowledge respectively) compounds each period.
- g is the growth rate of money or knowledge over each time period.

For completeness, and to act as a reference point, we summarize the formula for the time value of money (more mathematically advanced treatments can use the concept of discount functions in both discrete, or, continuous time with exponential or hyperbolic discounting, among other possibilities, including the usage of differential equations; see: Thaler 1981; Frederick, Loewenstein & O'donoghue 2002; Marzilli Ericson, White, Laibson & Cohen 2015; Cruz Rambaud & Ventre 2017; End-note 11; Figure 2). The essence of the below equations, with regard to money are that, money in the future decreases in value when it is measured in the present, or brought into the present, since the interest rate is usually non-negative, $i \geq 0$; to be precise, let us term this discounting. Likewise, money from the present, when it is to be valued in the future, or taken into the future, increases in value; again for precision sake, let us call it compounding.

$$PV = \frac{FV}{(1+i)^n} \iff FV = PV(1+i)^n$$

Expressed using discount functions, which for money is less than one, $f(i, n) = 1/(1+i)^n \leq 1$, we can write this as,

$$PV = FV f(i, n) \iff FV = \frac{PV}{f(i, n)}$$

5.2 Once On, Never Off

In contrast to money, the most wonderful thing about knowledge is that if more people know about it, the more it will be switched on. Once we become aware of a connection (either ourselves, or due to the guidance of someone else), we generally see other links, we either put a spin on the connection, by relating it to other elements, (new connections), or, we find other characteristics of the same connection, which by our definition can be viewed as new connections. Hence as more people become aware of any piece of knowledge, they add more pieces of knowledge to it, making the overall body of knowledge grow with time.

We also consider the possibility, that new knowledge could replace old knowledge making it obsolete, but then again, new knowledge only becomes more useful, by knowing the old connection, which shows how the new knowledge might be better. This means, new knowledge is only useful when used together with old knowledge. If old knowledge

is forgotten or lost, new knowledge, might need to rediscover the old connections, before its value becomes enhanced. Hence, the discount function for knowledge, would always be one or greater than one, $h(k, n) = (1 + k)^n \geq 1$, stated as the below axiom.

Axiom 1. *Knowledge never decreases in value. If it decreases in value, it was never knowledge to begin with.*

Instead of discount function, since by assumption knowledge never decreases in value (irrespective of whether it moves forward or backward in time), we will use the term weight. The weights to be used can be based on the following assumptions:

1. Past knowledge is important the older it is. That is knowledge from long ago is more valuable than knowledge yesterday. This is because the knowledge today is built on the connections we have created or discovered in the past. So the foundation for today is the knowledge from long ago, and the more knowledge from the past we have the more consistent the knowledge we have today, otherwise any alternate connections from the past could render a large body of knowledge obsolete, but then again, only by knowing this chain of connections, which though fallow, we can create better connections. So knowledge is never waster and it never loses value. We can make a related assumption that knowledge becomes more important at an increasing rate, going back from today (Rosser & Lis 2016; Courant, Robbins & Stewart 1996; Wagenaar & Sagaria 1975; Meadows, Meadows, Randers & Behrens 1972; Leike 2001; End-note 12, 13; Figure 3; when any piece of knowledge becomes most useful, its weight at that time can be captured as the position of the center of the peak of a Gaussian function, or the mean of a normal distribution and the weight at other times could taper off similar to the normal density function: (Rao 1973; Cramér 2016); End-note 14, 15; Figure 4).
2. Future knowledge is important the closer it is to us. That is knowledge that is far away from today is less valuable than knowledge about tomorrow. If future knowledge cannot be immediately connected to the knowledge we have now, or at any point in time, we fail to appreciate its value. For example, if we took the knowledge of differential equations to the past, before we had knowledge of algebra or before zero was being used, it would be very hard to see the importance of calculus. We can make a related assumption that knowledge becomes less important at an increasing rate, going forward from today (End-note 12, 13; Figure 3; similar to what we discussed in the point above, 1, for past knowledge , when any piece of knowledge becomes most useful, its weight at that time can be represented as the position of the center of the peak of a Gaussian function, or the mean of a normal distribution and the weight at other times could taper off similar to the normal density function: End-note 14, 15; Figure 4). It is, of course possible that, knowledge

from different times in the far away future, that can shed light on connections we are working with today, can become valuable, so there can be weights for future knowledge, that have multiple regions of significant value (this is expressed by the use of multi-modal probability distributions: Cramér 2016; End-note 16; Figure 5).

3. Certain knowledge could be useful at certain points in time, and then decays around a certain point of high importance. We view these as impulse response functions over certain intervals of time. That is when certain knowledge becomes extremely valuable over a certain duration of time (Nikodým 1966; Hassani 2009; End-note 17; Figure 6, 7).

Theorem 1. *From Axiom 1 and the weight functions (1, 2, 3) above, we get that the value of all knowledge, or the value of any knowledge at any point in time is growing. This means the past, present and future value of every piece of knowledge is infinity.*

$$PV = FV h(k, n) = \infty \iff FV = PV h(k, n) = \infty$$

This result provides a lower bound for the value of knowledge. The policy implications based on this lower bound for all efforts regarding knowledge creation (which is the one of the main purposes or perhaps even the sole purpose of all journals, researchers, etc.) are discussed in section 6.

The implications of this valuation exercise, which places a high premium on any piece of knowledge, are to ensure that participants in any knowledge system are better trained to notice the knowledge available from any source. When there are constraints (time and other resources) a random selection from many qualified papers with inputs from reviewers to improve the randomly selected papers will be a more fruitful outcome for everyone involved and for society as well. Section 7.1 has a discussion of how this randomizing approach is part of a bigger series of solution techniques to counter the uncertainty we encounter in our lives.

5.3 The Limits, The Physics and The Motivation for Time Travel

The concept of time value of money (or the time value of anything) arises because we (most of us?) do not have a way to travel across time. Physics, provides us with a theoretical basis for moving across time (Lewis 1976; Deutsch & Lockwood 1994; Woodward 1995; Nahin 2001; Gott 2002; Arntzenius & Maudlin 2002; Kaku 2009; Nahin 2017), which is one of the dimensions in the physical world we live in. We are four dimensional creatures: attitude,

longitude, height and time are our dimensions since we need to know these four co-ordinates to fully specify the position of any object in our universe. This is perhaps, best made clear to lay audiences, with regards to physics, such as many of us, by the movie *Interstellar* (Thorne 2014). Also (Sagan 2006) has a mesmerizing account of many physical aspects, including how objects or beings can transform between worlds that are governed by higher or lower dimensions and change their shapes or their physical form when they enter a lower dimensional world though their shape is unchanged in the higher dimensional world. As they move from the higher dimensions into the lower dimensions, they would need to obey the physical laws of the lower dimension, or take the physical shape or be limited by the properties prescribed by the lower dimensional world.

Time is our last dimension, since it is the one which, we cannot control or move around in. But we can change the other three co-ordinates (the first three co-ordinates are the co-ordinates of space, and we can change where we are in space) and hence we have three degrees of freedom. This points to a possibility that, beings from a higher dimension can travel through time and enter our three dimensional world; but they would need to be limited by the physical rules as dictated by the dimensions of our world. This also suggests that one way to enter our dimension from a higher dimensional universe (or even a lower dimension) would be to be born in our world and likewise, the way to leave our universe to go into a higher (or lower) dimension, might be to die. And while it might be hard to take physical material from one universe to another. Thoughts, or knowledge, might be mobile across dimensions (Suddendorf & Corballis 2007; Suddendorf & Busby 2003; Suddendorf & Busby 2005; Boyer 2008; Botzung, Denkova & Manning 2008; Suddendorf, Addis & Corballis 2011). And birth (or rebirth) would be one way to travel across time. We could speculate further that the reason for this cycle of births and deaths might be to collect the most precious commodity that we can think of, which is knowledge, since it is the only entity that gains in value as it moves across time.

Now getting back to knowledge, knowledge now or later would still be valuable (Theorem 1). If anything, for a time traveler that travels around time collecting knowledge instead of money, knowledge from different time periods would hold more value, in comparison to money, which would have the same value at any point in time for this time traveler (adjusting for simple things like inflation and so on).

6 Unintended Consequences of Journal Submissions

A glimpse, of what a journey towards the land of unintended consequences holds, can be seen, by reminding ourselves that all knowledge creation, is but an unintended consequence. We start with an attempt, to understand the papers written by others, (literature review of knowledge already created or experiments performed under what conditions) and end up with papers of our own (results that add what is missing or suggest improvements). Although, to be precise, as researchers, we do want to intentionally create new knowledge, but the exact new

knowledge we end up creating is unintentional; we stumble upon it, as we wander around the knowledge that is already in place. This is simply because, our intentions, or what we intend, can only be catered from what we already know, or, from existing knowledge; new knowledge, which is unknown, has to come from the realm of the unintentional.

An unwelcome but unintended consequence of all this knowledge (re?)-creation, is that perhaps, more knowledge is being lost than what is being created (Parolo, Pan, Ghosh, Huberman, Kaski, & Fortunato 2015). Perhaps, as someone has already said, everything has already been said, but not by everyone and perhaps not to everyone (since we sometimes forget, things that we ourselves might have said).

When papers such as these are being written, [the titles of these papers are quite sufficient to understand the nature of the issues they address: (Zivney & Bertin 1992, “Publish or perish: What the competition is really doing”; (Seglen 1997), “Why the impact factor of journals should not be used for evaluating research”; (Choi 2005), “How to publish in top journals”; (Lawrence 2003), “The politics of publication”; (De Rond & Miller 2005), “Publish or Perish: Bane or Boon of Academic Life?”], it is a warning sign that maximum efforts are not being spent on creating the best work, but a lot of work is spent in getting published at the top outlets. This is of course, a topic that would perhaps determine the fate of this paper and others we plan to write developing these topics about the current selection process at the top journals (part of this discussion is from Kashyap 2017).

Publishing in top journals is an unintended consequence, we wish to publish in a great journal, but the exact journal we publish in, is chosen from the realm of the unintentional. There are two ways to publish in an excellent journal:

1. Publish in an excellent journal, (but this is becoming harder and harder and some would say, an almost impossible task).
2. Publish in a good journal (and help to make it an excellent journal). Convoluting as it might seem, this might not be that bad, since someone with less to lose, has more to gain. A journal with less reputation and impact, can only gain more impact. We are waiting for reviewers to pounce on this point and suggest in their referee reports that we should send this paper to lower ranked journals. This also points to the current trend in the reviewing of knowledge created by others, where we seem to focus on nitpicking (Renard 2017; End-note 23) and the use of straw-man arguments (Anthony 2004; Talisse & Aikin 2006; Pirie 2015; End-note 22). (Boudreau, Guinan, Lakhani & Riedl 2016) focus on the evaluation of scientific research projects and argue that the “intellectual distance” between the knowledge embodied in research proposals and an evaluator’s own expertise systematically relates to the evaluations given. They find that evaluators systematically give lower scores to research proposals that are closer to their own areas of expertise and to those that are

highly novel.

3. If you give someone money, it is very likely that they will not turn it down. Forgetting about the point of whether we should be giving money to rich people or to people that need it more? These “so called” top journals that are meant to create knowledge, turn down most of the knowledge that is given to them. So should we not be sending knowledge to where it is needed more than the top journals (unless all authors realize this and act accordingly, we need to consider the alternate solution outlined in the next point).
4. One solution to the selection of papers by journals could perhaps be, to make an assessment of whether any paper has a single shred of a novel idea, or innovation, or makes some contribution to knowledge. If it does, it will grow over time and its present value will be infinity (Theorem 1). The editorial policy (for all fields) then could be to randomly select papers based on publication limitations (journal space, reviewer load etc.) from an overall pool of submissions, that have a single drop of knowledge (or one unique idea). The editors and reviewers could then spend their efforts on guiding the authors to ensure a better final outcome. This would then mean, suggesting ways to improve the manuscript instead of being too caught up on finding ways to reject a paper. The editors and reviewers specially involved in suggesting improvements or changes should have their names as contributors to the finalized manuscript.
5. This specifically tells us that the best decision we can make, with regards to the selection of articles by journals, requires us to formulate a cutoff point, or, a region of expected future impact and randomly select from within that region of better results. Here, we need to be mindful that the smartest of us are ill-equipped to deal with the uncertainty in the world around us and the decisions from the best of us usually falls short of being optimal (End-note 24). So the more conservative, we are in selecting this region, the less different the expected future impact will be between what we deem optimal and what the actual best might be (ruling out the self-fulfilling prophecies we have now due to the great attention that the top journal receive and the sub optimal papers that might end up shaping our views due to the selection bias inherent within all of us, including the editors and reviewers of papers.
6. Of course, truly outstanding and well written papers can be selected without subjecting them to this lottery. But then again, if a paper is truly outstanding and well written, it should matter less where it gets published (unless of course, we are judging a paper based on where it is published; isn't one of the goals of all education and knowledge creation to ensure that we don't judge a book by its cover?). So we can make the case, that all papers can be found a home based on this mechanism, that relies on controlled uncertainty. Needless to say, it might be less confusing for all participants in the knowledge Eco-system if the randomly selected papers fall into the various artificial categories or fields we have created to understand this world (but without

getting too perturbed about very specific specializations; assumption 1). For lack of a better option, at least at present, we advocate sticking to the various subject codes and so on, before the random selection process happens, while being open to the possibilities discussed at the outset in section 4.

7. Also, another way to ensure that the reviewers are exposed to the repercussions of their views / decisions are to make all referee reports / decision letters, including the submitted manuscripts, available publicly online, along with full details of every individual involved; this is not just for accepted papers, but for all papers that are submitted. The current process of blinded reviews is archaic and ridiculous at best. Many authors post papers on research websites and if a reviewer wants to know who the author is, it is not that hard to find out, since this is the generation of google, where nothing can stay hidden, since there are some serious engines on the prowl, searching for whatever findings that one wishes to find. A better approach would be to make everything available to everyone and time (and other people) will tell the truth. Also, in this age of (too much) information (Kashyap 2016), the one thing we need to have more of, are the lessons learnt from the errors of others (Ismail 2014; End-note 24). This will ensure that people understand, what sort of papers are getting rejected and if the decisions being made are fair. This will act as a self correcting, control mechanism to ensure that erroneous decisions do not end up causing too much trouble. The reviewers need not be anonymous and they could be named on the manuscript when it is published.

With no offense to any of the editors and reviewers who spend countless hours finding the most suitable papers for their journals. Would it not be easier and better to randomly select good papers from the overall pool of submissions and coach the authors so that the papers can develop to become excellent papers? Different journals could even collaborate to select papers from the submission pool in this way. This will perhaps also ensure that papers will not just be judged merely by where they are published but a deeper evaluation will be done by future authors to determine what previous work is helpful for them.

It can be argued that such a thorough assessment will lead to better fulfillment of one of the fundamental goals of research and the pursuit of knowledge, which is to promote better decision making, and not to let ourselves fall into the easy trap of judging a book by its cover (or being misled by appearances), a cliché that scholars teach students all over the world in classrooms but sometimes overlook when they step into their offices. No doubt, the problem here is not that severe since the best works do bubble up to the surface over time and researchers are careful in selecting the works they deem beneficial for further studying or enhancing.

This also serves to highlight the role of journal editors, who are merely the gatekeepers of certain citadels of knowledge. They need to ensure that anyone who can contribute to enriching life in their encampment should be allowed in. The reviewers are then the people who ensure that the newcomers adhere to any cultural norms and do

not cause any disruption, while being open to adapt customs and unique experiences that the immigrants might be bringing with them to their knowledge city.

The theoretical and mathematical justifications, we have provided earlier (Axiom and Theorem in section 5.2) are mostly because many journal editors seem to require complicated mathematics, [see, Kashyap 2016, for a discussion of whether mathematics is incomprehensibly difficult, or, whether it is beautifully simple and has been made tremendously convoluted, unintentionally, of course], enormous amounts of data crunching, or, abstruse phrases explaining straightforward concepts, to evaluate, and in many cases even to acknowledge, the contributions in any paper; again an unintended consequence, Kashyap 2016 has more details; though these extra measures, act as a certain filtering procedure for quality and are based on the very noble aspiration of ensuring that the best knowledge bubbles to the surface; it might be more efficient if the editors watch out for innovative, or new content and coach the authors on the steps required to create a publication in their journal; this is illustrated with a simple example: a hundred lessons on physics will surely be helpful; but if we substitute one physics lesson for a lesson in chemistry, or, astronomy, that might be more enlightening, and lead to greater productivity and impact at a later stage.

6.1 Catch-22 Situations

A more immediate concern of having experts in a field evaluate a manuscript for new knowledge is that, they might fail to find connections between how contributions from a seemingly unrelated field could be material for the advancement of ideas in their field. By definition, knowledge is something new and anything new brings with it an element of unfamiliarity. The extent of unfamiliarity is likely to be proportional to how far from the domain of expertise of the expert this new link is being made.

A simple pedagogical tool that is encouraged in classrooms (and all areas of teaching) is that when someone has doubts, or if a new concept is unclear, they should ask questions. The intention behind raising these questions is to relate the new concept to the concepts they already know. This seemingly simple mechanism is virtually absent in the present peer review process. Reviewers and editors, (the experts in a field) might be highly risk averse with either a belief (or a subconscious bias) that they would not be seen as experts, if they ask authors to explain a new paper to help them understand it better. Below we state and discuss a few catch-22 (Heller 1999) situations that are cropping up in the peer review process.

1. Only an expert can review new knowledge. But then if it is new knowledge, how can there be an expert in that. In case someone voices the argument that, the expert is in the field and not in the new knowledge per se. We would like to point out assumption 1, where the fields we have created are artificial and the solutions

can come far from away seemingly unrelated fields. So in essence, we don't know something (because it is new) and we have already put a label on it and we have "so called" experts checking it. An immediate way to counter this implication, is to be open to publishing papers in a journal that do not reference any papers from that journal or other seemingly related journals.

2. To understand something new to us, we need to ask questions. But then if we are experts in something, and we ask questions, we are no longer experts.
3. The conundrum in point 2 above is resolved once we relax the current expectation on experts (and a better understanding of what expertise really is) who are expected to be highly familiar with something that is new. Hence, one alternate criteria for paper selection should be that the more unfamiliar or unclear a paper is to an expert, the more new knowledge it might contain.
4. The current mechanism and the rules (some unwritten but many explicitly known) of knowledge creation incentivizes people to not leap far from their so called field, since it is likely to be not accepted and we need up creating minor variations of the same concepts or over complicating the same simple things to get published. The knowledge that can contribute more and becomes more important is the one that links elements that are further away (End-note 1).
5. If there is one thing we need to know in doing research, it is that knowledge does not have strict rules on how it should be. If someone is unable to see the main contributions in a paper immediately, then they should read the paper again and ask questions. Just because we do not understanding something, does not mean there is nothing worth understanding. I suppose, most of us also teach students. Don't we always tell them that if something is not clear, they should ask questions. If we forget to follow what we preach and if we somehow start to think we are experts in whatever we do and the methods of learning do not apply to us, that is when I think we are getting ahead of ourselves (this could and perhaps is leading to all sorts of issues). New knowledge by definition is new and hence unfamiliar to the ones that did not create it. So the methods of learning applies to anyone who is not familiar with it, this could be editors / reviewers of all journals.
6. Another objection to randomly select papers could be that people might not be devoted to improve the quality of their papers. But then again, later generations will be the judge of that. If someone does not want to take pride in their work, and they need to be forced (say by the incentives in a system), we need to question, how we can hope to create a better society (assuming that more knowledge is better), if people need to be forced to contribute. What different is it from a labor camp? Also, the reviewers and authors are providing suggestions to improve the paper, which of course need to be satisfactorily incorporated for final acceptance.

7. We need to always remind ourselves, there are no good or bad people. We do what we do, because of seemingly tough situations and mediocre role models. This might well be the case despite the amount of knowledge a person has accumulated. Surely, there is no fool proof solution and there could be all kinds of dishonest claims to get through the gates of knowledge; all we are suggesting here is that reviewers and editors should accept their limitations and be open to possibilities, including the one, that involves them asking authors questions to understand their work better. Making information more public, (even with rejections / revisions etc.) is the way to prevent authors / reviewers etc. from playing games where revisions might not be satisfactory or expectations for revisions could be needlessly high.

The takeaway from this is, perhaps, that a paper (or a book, movie or any idea) will be published, not only because it has become better over time, (with suggestions from reviewers, editors and after multiple revisions, which is certainly possible), but more importantly because, society (or those of us meant to receive the knowledge contained in that work) can realize the contributions of that article and and have finally become ready to acknowledge and accept it. (Ke, Ferrara, Radicchi & Flammini 2015) study how common , “sleeping beauties are in science”, papers whose relevance has not been recognized for decades, but then suddenly become highly influential and cited. (Gans & Shepherd 1994) find that journals have rejected many papers that later became classics and search for patterns and lessons about the publication process.

(Capaldo, Lavie & Messeni Petruzzelli 2017) analyze biotech patents and address how the scientific value of innovations varies with the maturity of the knowledge that underlies them. They suggest that incorporating geographically distant knowledge can enhance the value contribution of knowledge maturity, whereas incorporating technologically distant knowledge or waiting for the adoption of knowledge in the industry mitigates this value. This value mitigation needs to be understood as a piece of knowledge not yet having been connected to elements that would increase its value; the time is not yet ripe for it; so its value is perceived to be less than what it is. (Fortunato, Bergstrom & Vespignani 2018) is a discussion of the science of science (SciSci), which offers a quantitative understanding of the interactions among scientific agents across diverse geographic and temporal scales and how a deeper understanding of the factors that drive successful science, can more effectively address environmental, societal, and technological problems; (Clauset, Larremore & Sinatra 2017) is a data driven approach to the science of science, motivated by the desire among everyone involve in the pursuit of knowledge to predict what might be discovered.

In this vein, an unpublished working paper signifies that it is ahead (or behind) of its time and its contributions are beyond the comprehension of the ones that are supposed to receive it. If we currently believe that all papers cannot and should not be published, an artifact of having too many authors, writing too many papers. Then we are

espousing the belief that, we think more people doing research and finding answers (and in many cases questions) is an unwanted outcome.

6.2 Tolerating More Unintended Consequences

A further glance in the direction of unintended outcomes, might show that, in the process of creating knowledge, and trying to understand the world better or make it a better place, we might just end up understanding one another better, perhaps, becoming more tolerant in the process, an unintended yet very welcome consequence; making us wonder whether, the the true purpose of all knowledge creation might be to make us more tolerant.

As a parting thought, which acts to buttress this line of thinking, should not the ranking of a journal be based on the expected future impact (or the Net Present Value) of the publications in that journal? As we have shown earlier, every paper that has even a single shred of knowledge will have an infinite expected future impact and hence the ranking of the associated journal will be extremely high. Since thoughts can lead to dreams, the perfect journal ranking (TPR) might be envisioned as follows,

$$TPR = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (A^*)^n$$

$$TPR \approx \lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} (A^{*1} \cdots *m)^n$$

Here, $A^* \geq 1$; $A^{*1} \cdots *m \geq 1$; $A, *, *1, \dots, *m$ are mostly *Real*; but, of course, we are free to use our *Imagination*. Currently journals are ranked as A^* by many ranking service providers. Such A^* journals are known to have published papers that have produced significant historical (or based on past data) impact in terms of other papers that cite them. We need to understand that research is our contribution to society. Society needs scholars and researchers to ensure that better decisions are made and a culture that promotes thoughtful decisions is nourished. If the best decision that the role models for society can do is rush blindly where better outcomes are promised, without understanding the greater purpose behind their actions, we need to question the reason for their existence.

Let us remind ourselves that real numbers became complex (or imaginary numbers) yet extremely beneficial, only with the aid of creativity and acceptance, without which, this discussion will merely remain a dream and this present nightmare⁴ we are all in, will persist.

⁴ This is a nightmare in which, perhaps, we seem to refuse most knowledge, and in many cases even wisdom, that is handed to us, not just in journals or books, but keeps bombarding us from all directions and is present all around us, without even acknowledging it, failing to see the many forms that this mythical creature called knowledge can take, and remaining unaware that it retains its essence in whatever shape it takes, teasing and testing us maybe, to become appreciative of the collateral beauty within everything, which is meant to bring peace to our minds and joy to our souls, once we comprehend this universal truth.

Continuing this chain of thoughts, we perhaps need to sleep and many of the answers we seek, or the knowledge we need, might be provided to us in our dreams (Dreams are currently not well understood and there is significant research being done in this field: Foulkes 1996; Nofzinger, Mintun, Wiseman, Kupfer & Moore 1997; Hobson, Pace-Schott & Stickgold 2000). It is said that the Universe is but the Brahma's (Creator's) dream (Kashyap 2016). Research (Effort / Struggle) can help us understand this world; Sleep (Ease / Peace of Mind) can help us create our own world. A message from close by and down under: We need to "Do Some Yoga and Sleep Like A Koala" (Figure 8). We just need to be mindful that the most rosy and well intentioned dreams can have unintended consequences (Kashyap 2016) and turn to nightmares (as it presently has become with regards to creating and disseminating knowledge).

The other unintentional outcomes, due to having man-made furnishings, such as journal rankings labeling us, that have arisen and distracted us from properly evaluating, the true splendor of all of nature's creations, need to be recognized. We have barely stopped discriminating based on race, religion, color, other dividers; we have found new ways to differentiate, such as the ranking of the schools we have attended, the rankings of the journals we publish in, the grades we obtain, the advanced degrees we have, the titles we confer upon ourselves both within the corporate culture or outside, the neighborhoods we live in, and so on. The current set up of rankings and the best ranked institutions attracting the best minds and resources, become self fulfilling prophecies that segment society, which is one of the primary outcomes that education, and all of knowledge creation seeks to eradicate.

The belief of many authors is that publishing in a less ranked journal is bad for their careers and their reputation. So many authors give up on some of their papers, if it is not accepted by certain top ranked journals. That knowledge might never get its share of recognition and even worse, stay lost forever, all due to the subjective decisions of creatures with limited intelligence (which is all of us), who fail to see the collateral beauty of the connection that exists between everything (Tyree 2017; End-note 25). Due to the limitations our training equips us with, which is the notion of research we have been prescribed with, many times we are prevented from seeing the solutions that might be dangling right before our eyes. The issue is not that research should be done differently, maybe it should be, though we will take up this important and related topic later. But the real issue is that, because of our belief in certain set ways in which we expect to find knowledge, we have blinded ourselves to other avenues filled with wisdom.

7 The End Game

In the movie, *Ender's Game* (based on the book of the same name: Card 2010; Blackmore 1991; Beck 2015), Ender has to find a home, for the last surviving member, of the alien race he has destroyed. End Game is the

last move, (or, the final stage of some action or process) in any game, you might play (Roycroft 2016; Beasley & Whitworth 2017; End-note 26; Figure 9). In the social sciences, the end game, is perhaps, to understand the source of uncertainty, that seems to wreck havoc in our lives, but perhaps, also makes life interesting and challenging (for financial markets, it is the source of uncertainty that causes varying prices for financial instruments, which we wish to invest in). If we know the source of uncertainty, we might be able to predict the future better (assuming, we cannot stop the uncertainty and that we can moderately, but not completely, understand it, or, even influence it) and profit from it.

1. Let us illustrate with an example, say, that we are looking at the list of exam scores in the class. The scores are sorted in some order, and you are seeing only the list of student IDs and the corresponding score. So it is harder for you to understand, the order by which, the scores were sorted. It might seem quite random to you. But if I told you the answer, that they are sorted by your first names, the uncertainty vanishes for you. But since your names are not displayed in the final list, it might be hard for you to guess the source of randomness. So, in many cases, the randomness vanishes once you know what is causing the randomness, and there was never any randomness for me, since I was creating the randomness for you.
2. Another example could be: suppose I am moving my hand around in the air. Are you able to guess where my hand position will be next? It is apparently random to you. But to me there is no uncertainty here, since I can put my hand wherever I choose to. This is true, even if I myself do not know at this moment in time, where it will be in the next moment in time. But I can decide, where to put it next, as that moment unfolds. The randomness or uncertainty is only for the viewers of the hand, but not to me.
3. This tells us a lot about Life, Uncertainty and Unintended Consequences: since if uncertainty is eliminated, there are, likely to be, no unintended consequences. This raises, the most important question, of all: What is the ultimate End Game of Life? It is perhaps, to discover, the source(s) of uncertainty that unfold(s) around us. So, Life then, just becomes, a Video Game of Uncertainty, with a lot of special effects (Pain / Pleasure etc. etc.). And the Universe, is nothing but, an Out of the Box, Xbox Arcade (Takahashi 2002; Green & Bavelier 2003; Koepp, Gunn, Lawrence, Cunningham, Dagher, Jones & Grasby 1998; Egenfeldt-Nielsen, Smith & Tosca 2013) ... Phrasing this in another way: Enlightenment is the solution to the ultimate puzzle created mostly to be engaging entertainment, which is the Universe.
4. In the social sciences (and in finance), as we have discussed before, the uncertainty is simply due to the actions of everyone else participating in this business called life (and in the financial markets). This means that predictions in perhaps, all of social sciences, are valid only for a limited amount of time and we cannot be sure about the length of this time, since we need to constantly factor in the actions of everyone that can

potentially influence a prediction, making it an extremely hard task (Staddon 2017 shows how science works, fails to work, or pretends to work, by looking at examples from such diverse fields as physics, biomedicine, psychology, and economics).

5. This also means, that the more actions from other participants that we can anticipate, the lesser will be the uncertainty we need to contend with and the greater will be accuracy of our predictions, which will translate to greater future benefits (or profits in the finance space).

7.1 Fighting Uncertainty with Uncertainty

In this present paper, we have taken a step further and looked at ways in which introducing randomness in our choices and in what we control, and hence in the decision making process, could potentially offset the uncertainty inherent in the environment and yield better outcomes. In short, we try to overcome uncertainty with uncertainty. Such an approach, while seemingly absurd, is the ideal medicine for the even greater absurdity in the decision making process that has become prevalent in today's society. It takes care of the issues that crop up due to the limitations in our understanding of complex systems, and the widely acknowledged problem that most of our measurements are highly prone to errors.

Pondering on the sources of uncertainty and the tools we have to capture it, might lead us to believe that, either, the level of our mathematical knowledge is not advanced enough, or, we are using the wrong methods. Many interesting situations in life (Kashyap 2017), are caused by the uncertainty inherent in them, which we (all researchers and society) seem to be looking to solve using logic (mathematics). This paper is meant to illustrate why perhaps dealing with uncertainty, something twisted, requires an equally twisted approach and perhaps, solutions might not be obtained using straight techniques that rely on precision. The dichotomy between logic and randomness is a topic worth pursuing on many fronts. Our innovation is one possible alternative methodology, succinctly expressed as, "Fighting Uncertainty with Uncertainty".

This technique is suitable for the social sciences since the primary source of uncertainty are the members of the system themselves and presently, no methods are known to fully determine the outcomes in such an environment, which perhaps, would require being able to read the minds of everyone involved and to anticipate their actions continuously. Admittedly, we are not qualified to recommend whether such an approach is conducive for the natural sciences, unless perhaps, bounds can be established on the levels of uncertainty in a system and it is shown that a better understanding of the system and hence improved decision making will not alter the outcomes. Barring such a bound on the level of uncertainty it is advisable to understand the sources that cause arbitrary outcomes and follow more traditional methods.

The central innovation can be understood as optimizing to get an interval of satisfactory performance and randomizing over that interval. The goal is not just to optimize, but to identify a region of acceptable performance and set the parameters of a probability distribution over that region, and sample from it to provide an agreeable level of performance. Agents looking to optimize will randomize over an optimal region, hence this approach is called "Randoptimization". Due to measurement errors and other uncertainty, we can never be certain of any optimization we perform, rather it is better to randomize over acceptable states.

The example we have developed in greater detail is the submission of papers to journals with impact uncertainty. The theorem, which is a new result shows that, any paper, that has a single innovative idea should be accepted and the editors (more importantly reviewers should work with the authors to develop it further). Other areas, where such an approach might be helpful, with the common prescription, "Don't Simply Optimize, Also Randomize; perhaps best described by the term - Randoptimization" are considered in (Kashyap 2017) and repeated below for completeness.

1. News-vendor Inventory Management Problem.
2. School Admissions.
3. Journal Submissions.
4. Job Candidate Selection.
5. Stock Picking.
6. Monetary Policy

Success is, a very relative term. In the extreme case, which, we study a bit about in finance, one person's success (profit) could be someone else's failure (loss). That being said, to triumph in creating a valuation for knowledge and almost everything else, it is important to know where we are, and start the journey towards, where we want to be. An unintended consequence of taking the first step on a journey, means that the percentage of the distance left to be traveled reduces from infinity to a finite number. So once we start the trip, it becomes manageable immediately. The subjectivity in how we compare things (assumption 2) means that the benchmark for knowledge valuation might be constantly changing, though our main results demonstrate that the value knowledge will remain extremely high despite changing measuring sticks. One way to better understand something of infinite value is to spend an infinite amount of time dealing with it (finding beneficial uses or even being skeptical), which means we need to keep on learning.

The dynamic nature of any social-science system, where changes can be observed and decisions can be made by participants to influence the system, means that the limited predictive ability of any awareness will necessitate periodic reviews and the prescription of corrective programs. It would be interesting to see how participants modify their actions once randomness is introduced in the decision making process. Where there is uncertainty, there will be unintended consequences, which might be welcome or hazardous (Kashyap 2016). Of interest would be to see whether such an approach will reduce the sense of entitlement prevalent in society or whether it would lead to greater complacency.

To remind ourselves about one thing on closing: "The source of most (all) human conflict (and misunderstanding) is not because of what is said (written) and heard (read), but is partly due to how something is said and mostly because of the difference between what is said and heard and what is meant and understood ... " Part of the problem is also due to the use of a very imprecise language like English for communication. A point we need to keep in mind is that perhaps, English language (and many languages), especially its pronunciations and grammar are not the easiest to learn, due to the many nuances it has, that do not generalize easily. It would then make sense to develop a language that is more structured and free of ambiguity (Stageberg 1968 has a discussion with some examples). If the only paper written thus far in recorded history (to the best of our knowledge) to attempt to find the value of knowledge, does not find a place in every journal it is submitted to, then journals (and researchers) have lost touch with their roots which is to find and disseminate knowledge (no matter what form and shape it comes in).

Hence, despite any rough edges in the above discussion, our only hope is that this paper represents the first step towards a formal mechanism for putting the value on something, which we deem valuable, but fail to recognize it in most places we see it (as evidenced by referee reports, which are mostly filled with trivial straw-man arguments or nitpicking the weakest points of a paper; someone was asked to view a new bridge that connects two islands. The person looked at the rust (or algae) on a couple of the pillars and dismissed the entire bridge, which is the first known link between the two islands; the bridge is the new knowledge or the main result in any paper, whose main essence has been completely overlooked; surely we need to educate all people, including the so called experts in their domains, that one reason, why such unwanted outcomes creep up, is because, we live in a world that requires around 2000 IQ points, to consistently make correct decisions; but the smartest of us has only a fraction of that; Ismail 2014; End-note 24. Hence, we need to rise, above the urge to ridicule, the seemingly obvious blunders of others, since without those marvelous mistakes, the path ahead will not become clearer for us). Just because we do not see a connection, does not mean, that there is no connection (Newton discovered gravity, which has existed since time immemorial, only when an apple fell on his head. Though the truth behind this myth can be debated, the metaphor is relevant for us, since we sometimes, only notice things that hit us: McKie & De Beer 1951; Fara 1999; End-note 27). We need to try harder and be more open to acknowledging the smallest piece of new knowledge

that might have been brought to light by anyone (knowledge is synonymous to light in many cultures across the world; for someone that is able to differentiate between darkness and light, a single ray of light can be the greatest ally in keeping hope alive; MacMillan 2008; Newman 2017; End-note 28).

8 End-notes and Acknowledgments

1. A stimulating discussion with Dr. Tom Steinberger showed that many academics share the same view. In particular, Dr. Steinberger coined the term threshold theory to convey the concept regarding how many papers based on ideas that are a certain threshold away from existing ideas are likely to be rejected by most journals; though these ideas are the very ones that end up producing significant impact not just in terms of citations but in terms of how they shape the lives of people and the world around them. One specific example from finance is Bit-Coin, which is now being extensively discussed, researched and published about. Though before its inception, any paper that articulated this concept would be unlikely to have been published in the top five finance journals. The students of SolBridge International School of Business provided the inspiration for this paper since this idea originated while discussing the concept of time value of money. The faculty members of SolBridge International School of Business provided patient guidance, support and valuable suggestions. Dr. Yong Wang, Dr. Isabel Yan, Dr. Vikas Kakkar, Dr. Fred Kwan, Dr. William Case, Dr. Srikant Marakani, Dr. Qiang Zhang, Dr. Costel Andonie, Dr. Jeff Hong, Dr. Guangwu Liu, Dr. Humphrey Tung and Dr. Xu Han at the City University of Hong Kong provided advice and more importantly encouragement to explore and where possible apply cross disciplinary techniques.
2. Knowledge is a familiarity, awareness, or understanding of someone or something, such as facts, information, descriptions, or skills, which is acquired through experience or education by perceiving, discovering, or learning. Knowledge, Wikipedia Link
3. The idea that knowledge has value is ancient. In the 1st century AD, Juvenal (55-130) stated "All wish to know but none wish to pay the price" (Hight 1961; Courtney 2013). In 1775, Samuel Johnson wrote: "All knowledge is of itself of some value." The first time we checked the link was around Oct-16-2017: Knowledge Value, Wikipedia Link
4. Epistemology is the study of the nature of knowledge, justification, and the rationality of belief. It is the branch of philosophy concerned with the theory of knowledge. Epistemology, Wikipedia Link

5. Deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) is a molecule composed of two chains (made of nucleotides) that coil around each other to form a double helix carrying the genetic instructions used in the growth, development, functioning and reproduction of all known living organisms and many viruses. DNA, [Wikipedia Link](#)
6. The multiverse is a hypothetical group of multiple universes including the universe in which humans live. Multiverse, [Wikipedia Link](#)
7. In economics and finance, arbitrage is the practice of taking advantage of a price difference between two or more markets: striking a combination of matching deals that capitalize upon the imbalance, the profit being the difference between the market prices. When used by academics, an arbitrage is a (imagined, hypothetical, thought experiment) transaction that involves no negative cash flow at any probabilistic or temporal state and a positive cash flow in at least one state; in simple terms, it is the possibility of a risk-free profit after transaction costs. For example, an arbitrage opportunity is present when there is the opportunity to instantaneously buy something for a low price and sell it for a higher price. Arbitrage, [Wikipedia Link](#)
8. The law of one price (LOOP) states that in the absence of trade frictions (such as transport costs and tariffs), and under conditions of free competition and price flexibility (where no individual sellers or buyers have power to manipulate prices and prices can freely adjust), identical goods sold in different locations must sell for the same price when prices are expressed in a common currency. This law is derived from the assumption of the inevitable elimination of all arbitrage. Law of One Price, [Wikipedia Link](#)
9. The time value of money is a theory that suggests a greater benefit of receiving money now rather than later. It is founded on time preference (End-note 10). Time Value of Money, [Wikipedia Link](#)
10. In economics, time preference (or time discounting, delay discounting, temporal discounting) is the current relative valuation placed on receiving a good at an earlier date compared with receiving it at a later date. Time Preference, [Wikipedia Link](#)
11. A discount function is used in economic models to describe the weights placed on rewards received at different points in time. Discount Function, [Wikipedia Link](#)
12. Exponential growth is exhibited when the rate of change—the change per instant or unit of time—of the value of a mathematical function is proportional to the function’s current value, resulting in its value at any time being an exponential function of time, i.e., a function in which the time value is the exponent. Exponential Growth, [Wikipedia Link](#); Exponential Growth, [Mathworld Link](#). The exponential function $x(t) = x(0)e^{kt}$, $k > 0$, satisfies the linear differential equation:

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = kx \quad (1)$$

saying that the change per instant of time of x at time t is proportional to the value of $x(t)$, and $x(t)$ has the initial value $x(0)$. In the above differential equation, if $k < 0$, then the quantity experiences exponential decay (End-note 13).

13. A quantity is subject to exponential decay if it decreases at a rate proportional to its current value. Exponential Decay, Wikipedia Link; Exponential Decay, Mathworld Link. Symbolically, this process can be expressed by the following differential equation, where N is the quantity and λ (lambda) is a positive rate called the exponential decay constant:

$$\frac{dN}{dt} = -\lambda N \quad (2)$$

The solution to this equation is:

$$N(t) = N_0 e^{-\lambda t} \quad (3)$$

where $N(t)$ is the quantity at time t , and $N_0 = N(0)$ is the initial quantity, i.e. the quantity at time $t = 0$.

14. In mathematics, a Gaussian function, often simply referred to as a Gaussian, is a function of the form:

$$f(x) = a e^{-\frac{(x-b)^2}{2c^2}} \quad (4)$$

for arbitrary real constants a, b and non zero c . It is named after the mathematician Carl Friedrich Gauss. The graph of a Gaussian is a characteristic symmetric "bell curve" shape. Gaussian Function, Wikipedia Link; Gaussian Function, Mathworld Link

15. In probability theory, the normal (or Gaussian or Gauss or Laplace–Gauss) distribution is a very common continuous probability distribution. The normal distribution is sometimes informally called the bell curve. However, many other distributions are bell-shaped (such as the Cauchy, Student's t, and logistic distributions). Normal Distribution, Wikipedia Link. The probability density of the normal distribution is:

$$f(x | \mu, \sigma^2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} e^{-\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}} \quad (5)$$

where μ is the mean or expectation of the distribution (and also its median and mode), σ is the standard deviation, and σ^2 is the variance.

16. In statistics, a multi-modal distribution is a continuous probability distribution with two or more different modes. These appear as distinct peaks (local maxima) in the probability density function. Multimodal Distribution, Wikipedia Link. Bi-modal distributions are an important sub-class, an important example of a bi-modal distribution is the beta distribution. The probability density function of the beta distribution, for

$0 \leq x \leq 1$, and shape parameters $\alpha, \beta > 0$, is a power function of the variable x and of its reflection $(1 - x)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} f(x; \alpha, \beta) &= \text{constant} \cdot x^{\alpha-1}(1-x)^{\beta-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{\text{B}(\alpha, \beta)} x^{\alpha-1}(1-x)^{\beta-1} \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where the beta function, B , is a normalization constant to ensure that the total probability is 1. In the above equations x is a realization, an observed value that actually occurred, of a random process X . The beta function, also called the Euler integral of the first kind, is a special function defined by

$$\text{B}(x, y) = \int_0^1 t^{x-1}(1-t)^{y-1} dt \quad ; x, y \text{ can be complex numbers with their real part greater than zero.} \tag{7}$$

17. In mathematics, the Dirac delta function (δ function or impulse function) is a generalized function or distribution introduced by the physicist Paul Dirac. It is used to model the density of an idealized point mass or point charge as a function equal to zero everywhere except for zero and whose integral over the entire real line is equal to one. Dirac Delta or Impulse Function, Wikipedia Link; Dirac Delta or Impulse Function, Mathworld Link. The Dirac delta can be loosely thought of as a function on the real line which is zero everywhere except at the origin, where it is infinite,

$$\delta(x) = \begin{cases} +\infty, & x = 0 \\ 0, & x \neq 0 \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

and which is also constrained to satisfy the identity

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(x) dx = 1 \tag{9}$$

- (a) This is merely a heuristic characterization (End-note 18). The Dirac delta is not a function in the traditional sense as no function defined on the real numbers has these properties. The Dirac delta function can be rigorously defined either as a distribution (End-note 19) or as a measure (End-note 20).
- (b) A closer look at the impulse function should tells us that we can also consider suitable impulse response functions (End-note 21) to capture the weight we are assigning to how the value of any particular knowledge might change over time.

18. A heuristic technique (Ancient Greek: "find" or "discover"), often called simply a heuristic, is any approach

to problem solving, learning, or discovery that employs a practical method, not guaranteed to be optimal, perfect, logical, or rational, but instead sufficient for reaching an immediate goal. Heuristic, Wikipedia Link

19. Distributions (or generalized functions) are objects that generalize the classical notion of functions in mathematical analysis. Distributions make it possible to differentiate functions whose derivatives do not exist in the classical sense. Distributions or Generalized Functions, Wikipedia Link
20. In mathematical analysis, a measure on a set is a systematic way to assign a number to each suitable subset of that set, intuitively interpreted as its size. In this sense, a measure is a generalization of the concepts of length, area, and volume. Technically, a measure is a function that assigns a non-negative real number or $+\infty$ to (certain) subsets of a set X . Measure, Wikipedia Link
21. In signal processing, the impulse response, or impulse response function, of a dynamic system is its output when presented with a brief input signal, called an impulse (End-note 17). Impulse response functions describe the reaction of endogenous macroeconomic variables such as output, consumption, investment, and employment at the time of the shock and over subsequent points in time. Impulse Response, Wikipedia Link
22. A straw man is a form of argument and an informal fallacy based on giving the impression of refuting an opponent's argument, while actually refuting an argument that was not presented by that opponent. One who engages in this fallacy is said to be "attacking a straw man".Strawman Argument, Wikipedia Link
23. Hypercriticism: these people are often regarded as anal retentive or nitpickers (see nagging). Nitpickers engage in minute, trivial, and unjustified faultfinding to excess.[14] Nagging means endless scolding, complaints, and faultfinding. Nitpick or Hyper Criticism, Wikipedia Link
24. Such unwanted outcomes creep up because we live in a world that requires around 2000 IQ points, to consistently make correct decisions; but the smartest of us has only a fraction of that (Ismail 2014). Hence, we need to rise above the urge to ridicule the seemingly obvious blunders of others, since without those marvelous mistakes the path ahead will not become clearer for us. As Taleb explains, "it is trial with small errors that leads to progress". That being said, if there are big errors that might incapacitate the person trying the trial from further trials; as long as someone else has observed the attempts with huge errors, the rest of society benefits from it; assuming, of course, that the big blow up has left a non-trivial portion of society intact, or at-least not too shaken up. (Ismail 2014) mentions the following quote from Taleb, "Knowledge gives you a little bit of an edge, but tinkering (trial and error) is the equivalent of 1,000 IQ points. It is tinkering that allowed the industrial revolution". Nassim Taleb and Daniel Kahneman discuss Trial and Error / IQ Points, among other things, at the New York Public Library on Feb 5, 2013..

25. Collateral Beauty is a 2016 American drama film directed by David Frankel and written by Allan Loeb. The film stars an ensemble cast of Will Smith, Edward Norton, Keira Knightley, Michael Peña, Naomie Harris, Jacob Latimore, Kate Winslet, and Helen Mirren. It follows a man who copes with his daughter's death by writing letters to time, death, and love. Collateral Beauty, Wikipedia Link
26. In chess and chess-like games, the endgame (or end game or ending) is the stage of the game when few pieces are left on the board. The stage of a chess game after major reduction of forces. Also the final stage of some action or process. Endgame, Wikipedia Link, Endgame, Websters Dictionary Link
27. Squirreled away in the archives of London's Royal Society is a manuscript containing the truth about the apple. It is the manuscript for what would become a biography of Newton entitled Memoirs of Sir Isaac Newton's Life written by William Stukeley, an archaeologist and one of Newton's first biographers, and published in 1752 (Stukeley 1936). Newton told the apple story to Stukeley, who relayed it as such: "After dinner, the weather being warm, we went into the garden and drank tea, under the shade of some apple trees. . . he told me, he was just in the same situation, as when formerly, the notion of gravitation came into his mind. It was occasion'd by the fall of an apple, as he sat in contemplative mood. Why should that apple always descend perpendicularly to the ground, thought he to himself. . .". Newton Gravity Apple Linke
28. Knowledge is synonymous to light in many cultures across the world; for someone that is able to differentiate between darkness and light, a single ray of light can be the greatest ally in keeping hope alive; MacMillan 2008; Newman 2017; One of the most popular festivals of Hinduism, Diwali the festival of lights, symbolizes the spiritual "victory of light over darkness, good over evil and knowledge over ignorance". Deepavali, Festival of Lights, Wikipedia Link

9 References

1. Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS quarterly*, 107-136.
2. Alberts, B. (2017). *Molecular biology of the cell*. Garland science.
3. Alberts, B., Johnson, A., Lewis, J., Raff, M., Roberts, K., & Walter, P. (2002). *Molecular Biology of the Cell*, Garland Science, New York.

4. Almeida, P., & Kogut, B. (1999). Localization of knowledge and the mobility of engineers in regional networks. *Management science*, 45(7), 905-917.
5. Anthony, B. J. (2004). Argument and its uses. *Informal Logic*, 24(2), 137-151.
6. Archer-Brown, C., & Kietzmann, J. (2018). Strategic knowledge management and enterprise social media. *Journal of Knowledge Management*.
7. Argote, L., McEvily, B., & Reagans, R. (2003). Managing knowledge in organizations: An integrative framework and review of emerging themes. *Management science*, 49(4), 571-582.
8. Argote, L., & Ingram, P. (2000). Knowledge transfer: A basis for competitive advantage in firms. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 82(1), 150-169.
9. Argote, L., Ingram, P., Levine, J. M., & Moreland, R. L. (2000). Knowledge transfer in organizations: Learning from the experience of others. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 82(1), 1-8.
10. Argote, L., & Fahrenkopf, E. (2016). Knowledge transfer in organizations: The roles of members, tasks, tools, and networks. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 136, 146-159.
11. Arntzenius, F., & Maudlin, T. (2002). Time travel and modern physics. *Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplements*, 50, 169-200.
12. Aznar, J., & Guijarro, F. (2007). Modelling aesthetic variables in the valuation of paintings: an interval goal programming approach. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 58(7), 957-963.
13. Barley, W. C., Treem, J. W., & Kuhn, T. (2018). Valuing Multiple Trajectories of Knowledge: A Critical Review and Agenda for Knowledge Management Research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 12(1), 278-317.
14. Barnett, R. (1999). *Realizing the university*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
15. Beasley, J., & Whitworth, T. (2017). *Endgame Magic*. Courier Dover Publications.
16. Beck, B. (2015). War Games: Ender's Game, The Monuments Men, and Movies for Peace. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 17(1), 21-24.
17. Beck, R., Pahlke, I., & Seebach, C. (2014). Knowledge exchange and symbolic action in social media-enabled electronic networks of practice: A multilevel perspective on knowledge seekers and contributors. *MIS quarterly*, 38(4), 1245-1269.
18. Bhatt, G. D. (2001). Knowledge management in organizations: examining the interaction between technologies, techniques, and people. *Journal of knowledge management*, 5(1), 68-75.

19. Bierman Jr, H., & Smidt, S. (2012). The time value of money. In *The Capital Budgeting Decision*, Ninth Edition (pp. 29-59). Routledge.
20. Blackmore, T. (1991). Ender's Beginning: Battling the Military in Orson Scott Card's *Ender's Game*. *Extrapolation*, 32(2), 124-142.
21. Bodie, Z., Kane, A., & Marcus, A. (2014). *Investments* (10th global ed.). Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Education.
22. Boswell, J. (1873). *The Life of Samuel Johnson*. William P. Nimmo.
23. Botzung, A., Denkova, E., & Manning, L. (2008). Experiencing past and future personal events: Functional neuroimaging evidence on the neural bases of mental time travel. *Brain and cognition*, 66(2), 202-212.
24. Boudreau, K. J., Guinan, E. C., Lakhani, K. R., & Riedl, C. (2016). Looking across and looking beyond the knowledge frontier: Intellectual distance, novelty, and resource allocation in science. *Management Science*, 62(10), 2765-2783.
25. Boyer, P. (2008). Evolutionary economics of mental time travel?. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 12(6), 219-224.
26. Bozeman, B., & Rogers, J. D. (2002). A churn model of scientific knowledge value: Internet researchers as a knowledge value collective. *Research Policy*, 31(5), 769-794.
27. Brealey, R. A., Myers, S. C., Allen, F., & Mohanty, P. (2012). *Principles of corporate finance*. Tata McGraw-Hill Education.
28. Brown, D. J., & Werner, J. (1995). Arbitrage and existence of equilibrium in infinite asset markets. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 62(1), 101-114.
29. Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (2001). Knowledge and organization: A social-practice perspective. *Organization science*, 12(2), 198-213.
30. Buss, D. M. (1985). Human mate selection: Opposites are sometimes said to attract, but in fact we are likely to marry someone who is similar to us in almost every variable. *American scientist*, 73(1), 47-51.
31. Calaprice, A. (2000). *The expanded quotable Einstein*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton.
32. Capaldo, A., Lavie, D., & Messeni Petruzzelli, A. (2017). Knowledge maturity and the scientific value of innovations: The roles of knowledge distance and adoption. *Journal of Management*, 43(2), 503-533.
33. Card, O. S. (2010). *Ender's game* (Vol. 1). Macmillan.

34. Carlile, P. R. (2004). Transferring, translating, and transforming: An integrative framework for managing knowledge across boundaries. *Organization science*, 15(5), 555-568.
35. Carlucci, D., Marr, B., & Schiuma, G. (2004). The knowledge value chain: how intellectual capital impacts on business performance. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 27(6-7), 575-590.
36. Carmona, C. I. (2015). Jewelry Appraisal Handbook. *The Journal of Gemmology*, 34(7), 639-640.
37. Carr, B. (Ed.). (2007). *Universe or multiverse?.* Cambridge University Press.
38. Chiarella, C., & He, X. (2001). Asset price and wealth dynamics under heterogeneous expectations. *Quantitative Finance*, 1(5), 509-526.
39. Choi, K. (2005). How to Publish in Top Journals Part . *Pan-Pacific Management Review*, 8(1), 91-106.
40. Church, G. M., Gao, Y., & Kosuri, S. (2012). Next-generation digital information storage in DNA. *Science*, 1226355.
41. Chyi Lee, C., & Yang, J. (2000). Knowledge value chain. *Journal of management development*, 19(9), 783-794.
42. Clauset, A., Larremore, D. B., & Sinatra, R. (2017). Data-driven predictions in the science of science. *Science*, 355(6324), 477-480.
43. Cochrane, J. H. (2009). *Asset Pricing:(Revised Edition).* Princeton university press.
44. Costanigro, M., McCluskey, J. J., & Mittelhammer, R. C. (2007). Segmenting the wine market based on price: hedonic regression when different prices mean different products. *Journal of agricultural Economics*, 58(3), 454-466.
45. Courant, R., Robbins, H., & Stewart, I. (1996). *What is Mathematics?: an elementary approach to ideas and methods.* Oxford University Press, USA.
46. Crevoisier, O. (2016). The economic value of knowledge: Embodied in goods or embedded in cultures?. *Regional Studies*, 50(2), 189-201.
47. Crouhy-Veyrac, L., Crouhy, M., & Melitz, J. (1982). More about the law of one price. *European Economic Review*, 18(2), 325-344.
48. Cruz Rambaud, S., & Ventre, V. (2017). Deforming time in a nonadditive discount function. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 32(5), 467-480.
49. Dancy, J., Sosa, E., & Steup, M. (Eds.). (2009). *A companion to epistemology.* John Wiley & Sons.

50. Dayan, R., Heisig, P., & Matos, F. (2017). Knowledge management as a factor for the formulation and implementation of organization strategy. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 21(2), 308-329.
51. Darroch, J. (2005). Knowledge management, innovation and firm performance. *Journal of knowledge management*, 9(3), 101-115.
52. De Groot, R. S., Wilson, M. A., & Boumans, R. M. (2002). A typology for the classification, description and valuation of ecosystem functions, goods and services. *Ecological economics*, 41(3), 393-408.
53. Delaney, C. J., Rich, S. P., & Rose, J. T. (2016). A Paradox Within The Time Value Of Money: A Critical Thinking Exercise For Finance Students. *American Journal of Business Education (Online)*, 9(2), 83.
54. Delanty, G. (2001). The university in the knowledge society. *Organization*, 8(2), 149-153.
55. De Rond, M., & Miller, A. N. (2005). Publish or Perish: Bane or Boon of Academic Life?. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 14(4), 321-329.
56. DeRose, K. (2005). What is epistemology. A brief introduction to the topic, 20.
57. Deutsch, D., & Lockwood, M. (1994). The quantum physics of time travel. *Scientific American*, 270(3), 68-74.
58. Dixon, H. (1990). Equilibrium and explanation. Published in Creedy J. *The Foundations of Economic Thought*. Blackwells. pp. 356–394.
59. Egenfeldt-Nielsen, S., Smith, J. H., & Tosca, S. P. (2013). *Understanding video games: The essential introduction*. Routledge.
60. Fara, P. (1999). Catch a falling apple: Isaac Newton and myths of genius. *Endeavour*, 23(4), 167-170.
61. Figueroa, A. (2016). Science Is Epistemology. In *Rules for Scientific Research in Economics* (pp. 1-14). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
62. Fortunato, S., Bergstrom, C. T., Börner, K., Evans, J. A., Helbing, D., Milojević, S., ... & Vespignani, A. (2018). Science of science. *Science*, 359(6379), eaao0185.
63. Foulkes, D. (1996). Dream Research: 1953-1993. *Sleep*, 19(8), 609-624.
64. Frederick, S., Loewenstein, G., & O'donoghue, T. (2002). Time discounting and time preference: A critical review. *Journal of economic literature*, 40(2), 351-401.
65. Froot, K. A., Kim, M., & Rogoff, K. (1995). The law of one price over 700 years (No. w5132). National Bureau of Economic Research.

66. Gans, J. S., & Shepherd, G. B. (1994). How are the mighty fallen: Rejected classic articles by leading economists. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 8(1), 165-179.
67. Gibson, B., & Oberlander, E. (2008). Wanting to appear smart: Hypercriticism as an indirect impression management strategy. *Self and Identity*, 7(4), 380-392.
68. Gittelman, M., & Kogut, B. (2003). Does good science lead to valuable knowledge? Biotechnology firms and the evolutionary logic of citation patterns. *Management Science*, 49(4), 366-382.
69. Goodwin, B. K., Grennes, T., & Wohlgenant, M. K. (1990). Testing the law of one price when trade takes time. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 9(1), 21-40.
70. Gott, J. R. (2002). *Time travel in Einstein's universe: the physical possibilities of travel through time*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
71. Green, C. S., & Bavelier, D. (2003). Action video game modifies visual selective attention. *Nature*, 423(6939), 534.
72. Gustafson, C. R., Lybbert, T. J., & Sumner, D. A. (2016). Consumer sorting and hedonic valuation of wine attributes: exploiting data from a field experiment. *Agricultural economics*, 47(1), 91-103.
73. Hassani, S. (2009). Dirac delta function. In *Mathematical methods* (pp. 139-170). Springer, New York, NY.
74. Hayden, B. Y. (2016). Time discounting and time preference in animals: a critical review. *Psychonomic bulletin & review*, 23(1), 39-53.
75. Hendriks, P. H., & Vriens, D. J. (1999). Knowledge-based systems and knowledge management: Friends or foes?. *Information & Management*, 35(2), 113-125.
76. Hetherington, S. C. (2018). *Knowledge puzzles: An introduction to epistemology*. Routledge.
77. Hobson, J. A., Pace-Schott, E. F., & Stickgold, R. (2000). Dreaming and the brain: toward a cognitive neuroscience of conscious states. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 23(6), 793-842.
78. Heller, J. (1999). *Catch-22: a novel* (Vol. 4). Simon and Schuster.
79. Hwang, E. H., Singh, P. V., & Argote, L. (2015). Knowledge sharing in online communities: learning to cross geographic and hierarchical boundaries. *Organization Science*, 26(6), 1593-1611.
80. Isard, P. (1977). How far can we push the "law of one price"?. *The American Economic Review*, 67(5), 942-948.

81. Ismail, S. (2014). *Exponential Organizations: Why new organizations are ten times better, faster, and cheaper than yours (and what to do about it)*. Diversion Books.
82. Kaku, M. (2009). *Physics of the impossible: A scientific exploration into the world of phasers, force fields, teleportation, and time travel*. Anchor.
83. Kashyap, R. (2015). A Tale of Two Consequences. *The Journal of Trading*, 10(4), 51-95.
84. Kashyap, R. (2016). Notes on Uncertainty, Unintended Consequences and Everything Else. Working Paper.
85. Kashyap, R. (2017). Fighting Uncertainty with Uncertainty: A Baby Step. *Theoretical Economics Letters*, 7(5), 1431-1452.
86. Ke, Q., Ferrara, E., Radicchi, F., & Flammini, A. (2015). Defining and identifying Sleeping Beauties in science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(24), 7426-7431.
87. Kianto, A., Vanhala, M., & Heilmann, P. (2016). The impact of knowledge management on job satisfaction. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 20(4), 621-636.
88. Koeppe, M. J., Gunn, R. N., Lawrence, A. D., Cunningham, V. J., Dagher, A., Jones, T., ... & Grasby, P. M. (1998). Evidence for striatal dopamine release during a video game. *Nature*, 393(6682), 266.
89. Kogut, B., & Zander, U. (1992). Knowledge of the firm, combinative capabilities, and the replication of technology. *Organization science*, 3(3), 383-397.
90. Kosuri, S., & Church, G. M. (2014). Large-scale de novo DNA synthesis: technologies and applications. *Nature methods*, 11(5), 499.
91. Kvanvig, J. L. (2003). *The value of knowledge and the pursuit of understanding*. Cambridge University Press.
92. Lawrence, P. A. (2003). The politics of publication. *Nature*, 422(6929), 259-261.
93. Lebreton, M., Jorge, S., Michel, V., Thirion, B., & Pessiglione, M. (2009). An automatic valuation system in the human brain: evidence from functional neuroimaging. *Neuron*, 64(3), 431-439.
94. Lee, M. R., & Lan, Y. C. (2007). From Web 2.0 to conversational knowledge management: towards collaborative intelligence. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Research*, 2(2), 47-62.
95. Leike, A. (2001). Demonstration of the exponential decay law using beer froth. *European Journal of Physics*, 23(1), 21.

96. Levy, M., & Levy, H. (1996). The danger of assuming homogeneous expectations. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 52(3), 65-70.
97. Lewis, D. (1976). The paradoxes of time travel. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 13(2), 145-152.
98. Loewenstein, G., & Prelec, D. (1991). Negative time preference. *The American Economic Review*, 81(2), 347-352.
99. Lutz, J. F., Ouchi, M., Liu, D. R., & Sawamoto, M. (2013). Sequence-controlled polymers. *Science*, 341(6146), 1238149.
100. MacMillan, D. M. (2008). *Diwali: Hindu festival of lights*. Enslow Publishers, Inc..
101. Martin, J. (1996). *Cybercorp: the new business revolution*. American Management Assoc., Inc.
102. Marty, W. (2017). The Time Value of Money. In *Fixed Income Analytics* (pp. 5-16). Springer, Cham.
103. Marzilli Ericson, K. M., White, J. M., Laibson, D., & Cohen, J. D. (2015). Money earlier or later? Simple heuristics explain intertemporal choices better than delay discounting does. *Psychological science*, 26(6), 826-833.
104. Masset, P., & Weisskopf, J. P. (2015). Wine funds: an alternative turning sour?. *The Journal of Alternative Investments*, 17(4), 6-20.
105. McKie, D., & De Beer, G. R. (1951). Newton's apple. *Notes and Records of the Royal society of London*, 9(1), 46-54.
106. Meadows, D. H., Meadows, D. L., Randers, J., & Behrens, W. W. (1972). *The limits to growth*. New York, 102, 27.
107. Nahin, P. J. (2001). *Time machines: Time travel in physics, metaphysics, and science fiction*. Springer Science & Business Media.
108. Nahin, P. J. (2017). The Physics of Time Travel: II. In *Time Machine Tales* (pp. 289-337). Springer, Cham.
109. Newman, J. (2017). Diwali (Festivals in Different Cultures). *The School Librarian*, 65(2), 89.
110. Nikodým, O. M. (1966). Dirac's Delta-function. In *The Mathematical Apparatus for Quantum-Theories* (pp. 724-760). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
111. Nofzinger, E. A., Mintun, M. A., Wiseman, M., Kupfer, D. J., & Moore, R. Y. (1997). Forebrain activation in REM sleep: an FDG PET study. *Brain research*, 770(1), 192-201.

112. Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization science*, 5(1), 14-37.
113. Nonaka, L., Takeuchi, H., & Umemoto, K. (1996). A theory of organizational knowledge creation. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 11(7-8), 833-845.
114. Nonaka, I., & Von Krogh, G. (2009). Perspective—Tacit knowledge and knowledge conversion: Controversy and advancement in organizational knowledge creation theory. *Organization science*, 20(3), 635-652.
115. Olson, M., & Bailey, M. J. (1981). Positive time preference. *Journal of Political Economy*, 89(1), 1-25.
116. Ortiz, C. E., Stone, C. A., & Zissu, A. (2017). Beer Annuities: Hold the Interest and Principal. *The Journal of Derivatives*, 24(4), 108-114.
117. Parolo, P. D. B., Pan, R. K., Ghosh, R., Huberman, B. A., Kaski, K., & Fortunato, S. (2015). Attention decay in science. *Journal of Informetrics*, 9(4), 734-745.
118. Petrash, G. (1996). Dow's journey to a knowledge value management culture. *European management journal*, 14(4), 365-373.
119. Petters, A. O., & Dong, X. (2016). The Time Value of Money. In *An Introduction to Mathematical Finance with Applications* (pp. 13-82). Springer, New York, NY.
120. Pirie, M. (2015). *How to win every argument: the use and abuse of logic*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
121. Plomin, R., & Daniels, D. (1987). Why are children in the same family so different from one another?. *Behavioral and brain Sciences*, 10(1), 1-16.
122. Pritchard, D. (2009). The value of knowledge. *The Harvard Review of Philosophy*, 16(1), 86-103.
123. Pritchard, D., Millar, A., & Haddock, A. (2010). *The nature and value of knowledge: Three investigations*. OUP Oxford.
124. Pritchard, D. (2018). *What is this thing called knowledge?*. Routledge.
125. Protopapadakis, A., & Stoll, H. R. (1983). Spot and futures prices and the law of one price. *The Journal of Finance*, 38(5), 1431-1455.
126. Rao, C. R. (1973). *Linear statistical inference and its applications*. New York: Wiley.
127. Reagans, R., Miron-Spektor, E., & Argote, L. (2016). Knowledge utilization, coordination, and team performance. *Organization Science*, 27(5), 1108-1124.

128. Ren, X., Deng, X., & Liang, L. (2018). Knowledge transfer between projects within project-based organizations: the project nature perspective. *Journal of Knowledge Management*.
129. Renard, J. B. (2017). Negatory Rumors. *Rumor Mills: The Social Impact of Rumor and Legend*, 178.
130. Ross, S. A., Westerfield, R. W., & Jaffe, J. F. (2002). *Corporate Finance*.
131. Rosser, M., & Lis, P. (2016). *Basic mathematics for economists*. Routledge.
132. Roy, R. K., Meszynska, A., Laure, C., Charles, L., Verchin, C., & Lutz, J. F. (2015). Design and synthesis of digitally encoded polymers that can be decoded and erased. *Nature communications*, 6, 7237.
133. Roycroft, A. J. (2016). *The Chess Endgame Study: A Comprehensive Introduction Second Edition*. Courier Dover Publications.
134. Russell, B. (1948). *Human knowledge: its scope and value*. Routledge. Chicago.
135. Sakaiya, T., Fields, G., & Marsh, W. (1991). *The knowledge-value revolution, or, a history of the future*. Kodansha America, Inc.
136. Seglen, P. O. (1997). Why the impact factor of journals should not be used for evaluating research. *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, 314(7079), 498.
137. Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1997). The limits of arbitrage. *The Journal of Finance*, 52(1), 35-55.
138. Staddon, J. (2017). *Scientific Method: How Science Works, Fails to Work, and Pretends to Work*. Routledge.
139. Stageberg, N. C. (1968). Structural Ambiguity for English Teachers. In *Selected Addresses Delivered at the Conference on English Education* (No. 6, pp. 29-34). National Council of Teachers of English.
140. Stewart, T., & Ruckdeschel, C. (1998). *Intellectual capital: The new wealth of organizations*.
141. Suddendorf, T., & Busby, J. (2005). Making decisions with the future in mind: Developmental and comparative identification of mental time travel. *Learning and Motivation*, 36(2), 110-125.
142. Suddendorf, T., & Busby, J. (2003). Mental time travel in animals?. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 7(9), 391-396.
143. Suddendorf, T., & Corballis, M. C. (2007). The evolution of foresight: What is mental time travel, and is it unique to humans?. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 30(3), 299-313.
144. Suddendorf, T., Addis, D. R., & Corballis, M. C. (2011). Mental time travel and shaping of the human mind. *M. Bar*, 344-354.

145. Szulanski, G., Ringov, D., & Jensen, R. J. (2016). Overcoming stickiness: How the timing of knowledge transfer methods affects transfer difficulty. *Organization Science*, 27(2), 304-322.
146. Talisse, R., & Aikin, S. F. (2006). Two forms of the straw man. *Argumentation*, 20(3), 345-352.
147. Takahashi, D. (2002). *Opening the Xbox: Inside Microsoft's plan to unleash an entertainment revolution*. Prima Communications, Inc.
148. Toffler, A. (1990). *Powershift*. New York: Bantam.
149. Thaler, R. (1981). Some empirical evidence on dynamic inconsistency. *Economics letters*, 8(3), 201-207.
150. Throsby, D. (2003). Determining the value of cultural goods: How much (or how little) does contingent valuation tell us?. *Journal of cultural economics*, 27(3-4), 275-285.
151. Tyree, T. (2017). Making Movie Money: A 25-Year Analysis of Rappers' Acting Roles in Hollywood Movies. *The Journal of Hip Hop Studies*, 4(1), 118-147.
152. Valsiner, J. (2007). Culture in minds and societies: Foundations of cultural psychology. *Psychol. Stud.*(September 2009), 54, 238-239.
153. Varian, H. R. (1992). *Microeconomic analysis*.
154. Wang, S., Noe, R. A., & Wang, Z. M. (2014). Motivating knowledge sharing in knowledge management systems: A quasi-field experiment. *Journal of Management*, 40(4), 978-1009.
155. Weinberg, S. (2007). Living in the multiverse. *Universe or multiverse*, 29-42.
156. Woodward, J. F. (1995). Making the universe safe for historians: Time travel and the laws of physics. *Foundations of Physics Letters*, 8(1), 1-39.
157. Zhao, W., & Zhou, X. (2011). Status inconsistency and product valuation in the California wine market. *Organization Science*, 22(6), 1435-1448.
158. Zivney, T. L., & Bertin, W. J. (1992). Publish or perish: What the competition is really doing. *The Journal of Finance*, 47(1), 295-329.
159. Zucker, L. G., Darby, M. R., & Armstrong, J. S. (2002). Commercializing knowledge: University science, knowledge capture, and firm performance in biotechnology. *Management science*, 48(1), 138-153.





Figure 1: Time Value of Money: Discounting and Compounding





Figure 2: Discount Functions: Hyperbolic and Exponential

10 Figures




Figure 3: Exponential Growth and Decay




Figure 4: Gaussian Weight Functions




Figure 5: Multi-Modal Weight Functions





Figure 6: Impulse Functions



Impulse Function

- Derivative of $u(t)$ at $t=0$ doesn't exist
 - Discontinuous function
- Assume function varies linearly across the discontinuity
 - As $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ abrupt discontinuity occurs at origin
 - Derivative between ϵ & $-\epsilon$ is $0.5/\epsilon$
 - Derivative for $t > \epsilon$ is $-ae^{-a(t-\epsilon)}$



docsity.com

Figure 7: Impulse Function with Linear Discontinuity



Sleeping Like a Koala



© 2016 Gain Knowledge Group. All Rights Reserved.

1

Figure 8: Sleeping Like a Koala

 *Ender's End Game, in an Out of the Box, Xbox Arcade, also known as, Our Universe ...*



Figure 9: Ender's End Game, in an Out of the Box, X-Box Arcade, also known as, Our Universe