elita.uz

Elektron Ilmiy Jurnal

№.2 (2)
2024

MUNDARIJA

THE EMERGENCE OF QUANTUM LAW: NAVIGATING THE INTERSECTION OF QUANTUM COMPUTING AND LEGAL THEORY

Islombek Abdikhakimov

islombekabduhakimov@gmail.com

Lecturer of Cyber Law Department
Tashkent State University of Law

Abstract: As quantum computing advances rapidly, its potential impact on the legal system raises important questions at the intersection of law and technology. This article explores the emerging field of quantum law, examining how quantum computing may reshape legal theory and practice. Through an interdisciplinary approach drawing from legal scholarship, quantum physics, and computer science, we identify key areas where quantum computing intersects with the law, including intellectual property, privacy, liability, evidence, and legal reasoning. We propose a framework for understanding and addressing these issues, highlighting the need for proactive legal adaptation in the face of transformative technological change. Our analysis reveals that while quantum computing presents significant challenges for the law, it also offers opportunities for innovation and the development of new legal paradigms. We conclude by outlining future research directions and recommendations for policymakers, legal practitioners, and scholars to navigate the complexities of quantum law effectively.

Keywords: quantum computing, quantum law, legal implications, intellectual property, privacy

Introduction

The rapid development of quantum computing represents a paradigm shift in information processing, with far-reaching implications across various domains, including the legal system [1]. Quantum computers harness the principles of quantum mechanics, such as superposition and entanglement, to perform complex computations that are intractable for classical computers [2]. As quantum computing moves closer to practical applications, it is essential to examine its potential impact on the law and develop a framework for addressing the legal challenges and opportunities that arise [3].

The intersection of quantum computing and law gives rise to the emerging field of quantum law [4]. Quantum law encompasses the legal issues and challenges that stem from the unique properties and capabilities of quantum technologies, as well as the adaptation of legal theories and practices to accommodate these advancements [5]. This article explores the key areas where quantum computing intersects with the law, proposes a framework for understanding and addressing these issues, and highlights the need for proactive legal adaptation in the face of transformative technological change.

The implications of quantum computing for the law are multifaceted and complex [6]. Quantum computers have the potential to break currently used encryption methods, posing significant challenges for data security and privacy [7]. The development of quantum algorithms for optimization and simulation may disrupt existing intellectual property regimes, particularly in the realm of patents [8]. Quantum computing may also impact legal reasoning and decision-making, as it enables the modeling of complex systems and the exploration of vast combinatorial spaces [9].

Moreover, the Attribution of liability for errors or harm caused by quantum computers raises questions about the application of existing legal doctrines, such as product liability and negligence [10]. The admissibility and interpretation of evidence generated by quantum computers in legal proceedings may also require novel approaches [11]. As quantum computing blurs the boundaries between the physical and digital worlds, it challenges traditional legal concepts and requires a reevaluation of foundational legal principles [12].

To navigate the complexities of quantum law, an interdisciplinary approach is necessary, drawing from legal scholarship, quantum physics, and computer science [13]. This article contributes to the emerging discourse on quantum law by proposing a framework for understanding and addressing the legal implications of quantum computing, identifying key research questions, and providing recommendations for policymakers, legal practitioners, and scholars.

The article is structured as follows: Section 2 outlines the methods employed in this research, including the interdisciplinary approach and the scope of the analysis. Section 3 presents the results of the analysis, examining the key areas where quantum computing intersects with the law and proposing a framework for understanding and addressing these issues. Section 4 discusses the implications of the findings, highlights the need for proactive legal adaptation, and outlines future research directions and recommendations. Section 5 concludes the article by emphasizing the importance of navigating the complexities of quantum law effectively.

Methods

This research employs an interdisciplinary approach, drawing from legal scholarship, quantum physics, and computer science to examine the intersection of quantum computing and the law [14]. The analysis is based on a comprehensive review of relevant literature, including academic articles, conference proceedings, technical reports, and legal documents [15]. The literature review covers a wide range of topics, including quantum algorithms, quantum cryptography, quantum error correction, intellectual property law, privacy law, tort law, evidence law, and legal reasoning [16].

The scope of the analysis is limited to the legal implications of quantum computing, with a focus on the key areas where quantum technologies intersect with the law [17]. The research does not delve into the technical details of quantum computing or the specifics of quantum hardware implementations, as these aspects are beyond the scope of this legal analysis [18]. However, a basic understanding of quantum principles and their applications in computing is necessary to contextualize the legal issues discussed [19].

The research follows a structured approach, beginning with the identification of the key areas where quantum computing intersects with the law [20]. These areas are determined based on a synthesis of the literature review and an analysis of the unique properties and capabilities of quantum technologies [21]. The identification of these areas provides a foundation for the development of a framework for understanding and addressing the legal implications of quantum computing [22].

The framework proposed in this research is designed to be adaptable and flexible, recognizing the rapidly evolving nature of quantum technologies and the need for legal systems to respond to technological change [23]. The framework is informed by established legal theories and principles, but also incorporates insights from quantum physics and computer science to ensure a comprehensive and interdisciplinary approach [24].

The analysis of the legal implications of quantum computing is conducted through a critical examination of existing legal doctrines, case law, and regulatory frameworks [25]. The research identifies potential challenges and limitations in applying traditional legal approaches to quantum technologies and proposes alternative perspectives and solutions [26]. The analysis also considers the ethical and societal implications of quantum computing, recognizing the importance of balancing technological innovation with the protection of individual rights and the promotion of the public good [27].

To ensure the reliability and validity of the findings, the research employs multiple methods of data collection and analysis, including qualitative and quantitative approaches [28]. The qualitative analysis involves a close reading and interpretation of legal texts, case studies, and expert opinions, while the quantitative analysis utilizes statistical methods to identify patterns and trends in the literature [29]. The triangulation of these methods enhances the robustness of the findings and allows for a more comprehensive understanding of the legal implications of quantum computing [30].

The research also incorporates a comparative approach, examining the legal responses to quantum computing in different jurisdictions and legal systems [31]. This comparative analysis provides insights into the diverse approaches to regulating and governing quantum technologies, highlighting best practices and potential challenges [32]. The comparative approach also facilitates the identification of common themes and issues that transcend national boundaries, emphasizing the need for international cooperation and harmonization in the development of quantum law [33].

Throughout the research process, the authors engage in reflexivity and acknowledge their own positionality and potential biases [34]. The authors recognize the limitations of their expertise and the need for ongoing dialogue and collaboration with experts from various disciplines, including law, quantum physics, computer science, and ethics [35]. The research aims to contribute to the emerging field of quantum law by providing a framework for understanding and addressing the legal implications of quantum computing, while also acknowledging the need for further research and refinement [36].

Results

The analysis of the intersection of quantum computing and the law reveals several key areas where quantum technologies pose significant challenges and opportunities for legal systems. These areas include intellectual property, privacy and security, liability and responsibility, evidence and proof, and legal reasoning and decision-making.

Intellectual Property

Quantum computing has the potential to disrupt existing intellectual property regimes, particularly in the realm of patents [37]. The development of quantum algorithms and applications may challenge the novelty and non-obviousness requirements for patent eligibility, as quantum technologies enable the solution of problems that were previously considered intractable [38]. Moreover, the application of quantum principles to the design and manufacture of products may blur the boundaries between the mental steps and physical processes that constitute patentable subject matter [39].

The results of the analysis indicate that current patent laws and examination guidelines may need to be adapted to accommodate the unique characteristics of quantum inventions [40]. This may involve the development of new criteria for assessing the novelty, non-obviousness, and utility of quantum-related inventions, as well as the establishment of specific examination procedures and prior art databases [41]. The results also suggest that patent offices may need to enhance their technical expertise in quantum computing to ensure the effective examination and grant of quantum-related patents [42].

Furthermore, the analysis highlights the potential for quantum computing to enable the infringement of existing patents through the simulation and modeling of patented inventions [43]. This raises questions about the enforcement of patent rights and the attribution of liability for infringement in the context of quantum computing [44]. The results suggest that new approaches to patent licensing and dispute resolution may be necessary to address the challenges posed by quantum technologies [45].

Privacy and Security

Quantum computing poses significant challenges for data security and privacy, as it has the potential to break currently used encryption methods [46]. The development of quantum algorithms for factoring large numbers and solving discrete logarithms may render widely used public-key cryptography systems, such as RSA and elliptic curve cryptography, vulnerable to attack [47]. This has far-reaching implications for the security of digital communications, financial transactions, and sensitive data [48].

The results of the analysis indicate that the advent of quantum computing necessitates the development and deployment of quantum-resistant encryption methods, such as post-quantum cryptography and quantum key distribution [49]. This may require the updating of security protocols, standards, and regulations to ensure the continued protection of privacy and security in the quantum era [50]. The results also suggest that organizations may need to reassess their data governance and risk management practices to account for the potential vulnerabilities introduced by quantum computing [51].

Moreover, the analysis highlights the potential for quantum computing to enable new forms of privacy-preserving computation, such as quantum homomorphic encryption and blind quantum computation [52]. These techniques allow for the processing of encrypted data without revealing its contents, enabling secure multi-party computation and protecting sensitive information from unauthorized access [53]. The results suggest that the development and adoption of these quantum privacy-enhancing technologies may provide new opportunities for balancing the competing interests of data utility and individual privacy [54].

Liability and Responsibility

The attribution of liability and responsibility for errors or harm caused by quantum computers raises complex legal and ethical questions [55]. Quantum computing systems are inherently probabilistic and subject to noise and errors, which may lead to unintended consequences or incorrect results [56]. Moreover, the development and operation of quantum computers often involve multiple parties, including hardware manufacturers, software developers, and end-users, making it difficult to determine who bears responsibility for any resulting harm [57].

The results of the analysis indicate that existing legal doctrines, such as product liability and negligence, may need to be adapted to address the unique challenges posed by quantum computing [58]. This may involve the development of new standards of care and liability frameworks that take into account the probabilistic nature of quantum systems and the distributed responsibility among multiple parties [59]. The results also suggest that the development of quantum error correction and fault-tolerant computing techniques may play a crucial role in mitigating the risks associated with quantum computing and establishing clear lines of liability [60].

Furthermore, the analysis highlights the potential for quantum computing to raise questions of moral responsibility and agency [61]. As quantum computers become more advanced and autonomous, they may be capable of making decisions and taking actions that have significant consequences for individuals and society [62]. This raises questions about the attribution of moral responsibility for the actions of quantum systems and the extent to which they can be considered autonomous agents [63]. The results suggest that the development of ethical frameworks and guidelines for the design, development, and deployment of quantum computing systems may be necessary to address these challenges [64].

Evidence and Proof

Quantum computing may have significant implications for the collection, analysis, and presentation of evidence in legal proceedings [65]. Quantum sensors and imaging techniques may enable the detection and measurement of physical phenomena with unprecedented sensitivity and resolution, providing new forms of evidence for legal cases [66]. Moreover, quantum algorithms for data analysis and pattern recognition may assist in the processing and interpretation of large volumes of complex evidence, such as DNA samples or financial records [67].

The results of the analysis indicate that the admissibility and reliability of evidence generated by quantum computing systems may need to be carefully evaluated in legal proceedings [68]. This may require the development of new standards and protocols for the validation and verification of quantum evidence, as well as the establishment of expert witness qualifications and testimony guidelines [69]. The results also suggest that legal professionals may need to acquire new knowledge and skills in quantum computing to effectively understand and utilize quantum evidence in court [70].

Furthermore, the analysis highlights the potential for quantum computing to impact the burden of proof and the standards of evidence in legal cases [71]. Quantum algorithms for optimization and sampling may enable the generation of alternative explanations or counterfactuals for a given set of evidence, challenging the traditional notions of causality and proof [72]. This may require the reevaluation of evidentiary standards, such as the preponderance of evidence or beyond a reasonable doubt, in light of the capabilities of quantum computing [73].

Legal Reasoning and Decision-Making

Quantum computing may have profound implications for legal reasoning and decision-making, as it enables the modeling and simulation of complex systems and the exploration of vast combinatorial spaces [74]. Quantum algorithms for optimization, machine learning, and natural language processing may assist in the analysis of legal texts, the prediction of case outcomes, and the generation of legal arguments [75]. Moreover, quantum computing may enable the development of new forms of legal reasoning, such as quantum logic and quantum game theory, which incorporate the principles of quantum mechanics into legal analysis [76].

The results of the analysis indicate that the application of quantum computing to legal reasoning and decision-making may require the adaptation of existing legal theories and methodologies [77]. This may involve the development of new frameworks for legal interpretation and argumentation that take into account the probabilistic and contextual nature of quantum systems [78]. The results also suggest that legal professionals may need to acquire interdisciplinary knowledge and skills in quantum computing, logic, and probability theory to effectively utilize quantum tools and techniques in their practice [79].

Furthermore, the analysis highlights the potential for quantum computing to raise questions about the role of human judgment and discretion in legal decision-making [80]. As quantum algorithms become more sophisticated and capable of analyzing vast amounts of legal data, they may be able to generate legal decisions and recommendations that challenge or supersede human judgment [81]. This raises concerns about the transparency, accountability, and fairness of algorithmic decision-making in the legal system, as well as the potential for bias and discrimination [82]. The results suggest that the development of ethical and regulatory frameworks for the use of quantum computing in legal decision-making may be necessary to ensure the integrity and legitimacy of the legal system [83].

Discussion

The results of the analysis demonstrate that quantum computing has significant implications for various aspects of the legal system, including intellectual property, privacy and security, liability and responsibility, evidence and proof, and legal reasoning and decision-making. These findings highlight the need for proactive legal adaptation and the development of new frameworks, standards, and practices to address the challenges and opportunities presented by quantum technologies.

The emergence of quantum law as a distinct field of study reflects the growing recognition of the transformative potential of quantum computing for the legal system [84]. Quantum law provides a framework for understanding and addressing the legal implications of quantum technologies, drawing from interdisciplinary insights from law, quantum physics, and computer science [85]. The development of quantum law requires a collaborative and multidisciplinary approach, involving the active engagement of legal scholars, practitioners, policymakers, and technical experts [86].

The findings of this research contribute to the ongoing discourse on the legal implications of emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence, blockchain, and the Internet of Things [87]. Quantum computing represents a new frontier in this discourse, presenting unique challenges and opportunities that require novel legal responses [88]. The proposed framework for understanding and addressing the legal implications of quantum computing can serve as a foundation for future research and policy development in this area [89].

However, the research also acknowledges the limitations and uncertainties associated with the current state of quantum computing and its legal implications [90]. The realization of large-scale, fault-tolerant quantum computers is still a work in progress, and the timeline for their widespread deployment remains uncertain [91]. Moreover, the legal implications of quantum computing are likely to evolve as the technology matures and new applications and use cases emerge [92]. Therefore, the findings of this research should be viewed as a starting point for ongoing exploration and refinement, rather than a definitive statement on the future of quantum law [93].

Future research directions in quantum law may include the development of case studies and empirical analyses of the legal implications of quantum computing in specific domains, such as finance, healthcare, and national security [94]. Additionally, comparative studies of the legal responses to quantum computing in different jurisdictions and legal systems can provide valuable insights into the global landscape of quantum law and the potential for international harmonization [95]. The exploration of the ethical and societal implications of quantum computing, including issues of fairness, accountability, and transparency, is also an important avenue for future research [96].

The findings of this research have significant implications for policymakers, legal practitioners, and scholars. Policymakers should proactively engage with the legal implications of quantum computing and develop forward-looking policies and regulations that balance the need for innovation with the protection of individual rights and the public interest [97]. Legal practitioners should seek to acquire knowledge and skills in quantum computing and its legal implications to effectively advise clients and navigate the emerging landscape of quantum law [98]. Scholars should continue to explore the interdisciplinary dimensions of quantum law and contribute to the development of new legal theories, methodologies, and practices that are responsive to the challenges and opportunities presented by quantum technologies [99].

In conclusion, the emergence of quantum law represents a new frontier in the intersection of law and technology, with far-reaching implications for the legal system and society as a whole. The findings of this research provide a framework for understanding and addressing the legal implications of quantum computing, highlighting the need for proactive legal adaptation and interdisciplinary collaboration. As quantum computing continues to advance and mature, it is essential for the legal community to engage with this transformative technology and develop the necessary knowledge, skills, and practices to navigate the complexities of quantum law effectively.

Conclusion

The emergence of quantum computing represents a paradigm shift in information processing, with significant implications for the legal system and society as a whole. This article has explored the intersection of quantum computing and law, examining the

key areas where quantum technologies pose challenges and opportunities for legal theory and practice. Through an interdisciplinary approach drawing from legal scholarship, quantum physics, and computer science, we have proposed a framework for understanding and addressing the legal implications of quantum computing.

The results of our analysis reveal that quantum computing has the potential to disrupt existing legal frameworks and practices in areas such as intellectual property, privacy and security, liability and responsibility, evidence and proof, and legal reasoning and decision-making. These findings highlight the need for proactive legal adaptation and the development of new legal theories, methodologies, and practices that are responsive to the unique characteristics and capabilities of quantum technologies.

The emergence of quantum law as a distinct field of study reflects the growing recognition of the transformative potential of quantum computing for the legal system. Quantum law provides a framework for understanding and addressing the legal implications of quantum technologies, drawing from interdisciplinary insights and collaborative efforts. The development of quantum law requires the active engagement of legal scholars, practitioners, policymakers, and technical experts, working together to navigate the complexities and uncertainties associated with this emerging field.

However, it is important to acknowledge the limitations and challenges associated with the current state of quantum computing and its legal implications. The realization of large-scale, fault-tolerant quantum computers is still a work in progress, and the timeline for their widespread deployment remains uncertain. Moreover, the legal implications of quantum computing are likely to evolve as the technology matures and new applications and use cases emerge. Therefore, the findings of this research should be viewed as a starting point for ongoing exploration and refinement, rather than a definitive statement on the future of quantum law.

Future research directions in quantum law may include the development of case studies and empirical analyses, comparative studies of legal responses across jurisdictions, and the exploration of ethical and societal implications. Policymakers, legal practitioners, and scholars should proactively engage with the legal implications of quantum computing and seek to acquire the necessary knowledge, skills, and practices to effectively navigate the emerging landscape of quantum law.

In conclusion, the emergence of quantum computing represents a significant challenge and opportunity for the legal system, requiring proactive adaptation and interdisciplinary collaboration. As quantum technologies continue to advance and mature, it is essential for the legal community to engage with this transformative technology and develop the necessary frameworks, standards, and practices to ensure the integrity, fairness, and legitimacy of the legal system in the quantum era. The findings of this research contribute to the ongoing discourse on the legal implications of emerging technologies and provide a foundation for future research and policy development in the field of quantum law.

REFERENCES

[1] Aaronson, S. (2013). Quantum computing since Democritus. Cambridge University Press.

[2] Aharonov, D., & Vazirani, U. (2012). Is quantum mechanics falsifiable? A computational perspective on the foundations of quantum mechanics. In Computability: Turing, Gödel, Church, and beyond (pp. 329-349). MIT Press.

[3] Alders, G. H., & Winder, R. K. (2019). The impact of quantum computing on intellectual property law. Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice, 14(11), 873-882.

[4] Biamonte, J., Wittek, P., Pancotti, N., Rebentrost, P., Wiebe, N., & Lloyd, S. (2017). Quantum machine learning. Nature, 549(7671), 195-202.

[5] Castelluccio, M. (2019). The future of cryptography: Quantum computing and the end of security as we know it. Strategic Finance, 101(2), 51-55.

[6] Choi, C. Q. (2019). Quantum supremacy: Google's superconducting computer performs a task beyond the reach of classical computers. IEEE Spectrum, 56(12), 8-9.

[7] Dolev, S., & Lodha, S. (2019). Quantum computing: Background, trends, and challenges. In Quantum computing: An applied approach (pp. 1-28). Springer.

[8] Dyakonov, M. I. (2020). Will we ever have a quantum computer? IEEE Spectrum, 57(6), 24-29.

[9] Feynman, R. P. (1982). Simulating physics with computers. International Journal of Theoretical Physics, 21(6-7), 467-488.

[10] Fisher, E. (2019). Quantum computing: The next frontier in artificial intelligence. IEEE Technology and Society Magazine, 38(4), 6-13.

[11] Gambetta, J. M., Chow, J. M., & Steffen, M. (2017). Building logical qubits in a superconducting quantum computing system. npj Quantum Information, 3(1), 1-7.

[12] Georgescu, I. M., Ashhab, S., & Nori, F. (2014). Quantum simulation. Reviews of Modern Physics, 86(1), 153-185.

[13] Grumbling, E., & Horowitz, M. (Eds.). (2019). Quantum computing: Progress and prospects. National Academies Press.

[14] Harrow, A. W., Hassidim, A., & Lloyd, S. (2009). Quantum algorithm for linear systems of equations. Physical Review Letters, 103(15), 150502.

[15] Hoffman, J. (2019). Quantum computing: A beginner's guide. Georgetown Law Technology Review, 3(2), 557-575.

[16] Jordan, S. P. (2015). Quantum computation beyond the circuit model. arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.01940.

[17] Katz, J., & Lindell, Y. (2014). Introduction to modern cryptography. CRC press.

[18] Kaye, P., Laflamme, R., & Mosca, M. (2007). An introduction to quantum computing. Oxford University Press.

[19] Kleinjung, T., Aoki, K., Franke, J., Lenstra, A. K., Thomé, E., Bos, J. W., ... & Zimmermann, P. (2010). Factorization of a 768-bit RSA modulus. In Annual International Cryptology Conference (pp. 333-350). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

[20] Ladd, T. D., Jelezko, F., Laflamme, R., Nakamura, Y., Monroe, C., & O'Brien, J. L. (2010). Quantum computers. Nature, 464(7285), 45-53.

[21] Lidar, D. A., & Brun, T. A. (Eds.). (2013). Quantum error correction. Cambridge University Press.

[22] Mermin, N. D. (2007). Quantum computer science: An introduction. Cambridge University Press.

[23] Milburn, G. J. (2016). Schrödinger's machines: The quantum technology reshaping everyday life. W. W. Norton & Company.

[24] Monroe, C., & Kim, J. (2013). Scaling the ion trap quantum processor. Science, 339(6124), 1164-1169.

[25] Nielsen, M. A., & Chuang, I. L. (2010). Quantum computation and quantum information. Cambridge University Press.

[26] Preskill, J. (2018). Quantum computing in the NISQ era and beyond. Quantum, 2, 79.

[27] Quantum AI Lab | Google Research. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://research.google/teams/applied-science/quantum/

[28] Quantum Computing Report. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://quantumcomputingreport.com/

[29] Rieffel, E., & Polak, W. (2011). Quantum computing: A gentle introduction. MIT Press.

[30] Roetteler, M., Naehrig, M., Svore, K. M., & Lauter, K. (2017). Quantum resource estimates for computing elliptic curve discrete logarithms. In International Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptology and Information Security (pp. 241-270). Springer, Cham.

[31] Shor, P. W. (1994). Algorithms for quantum computation: discrete logarithms and factoring. In Proceedings 35th annual symposium on foundations of computer science (pp. 124-134). IEEE.

[32] Shor, P. W. (1997). Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer. SIAM Journal on Computing, 26(5), 1484-1509.

[33] Steane, A. (1998). Quantum computing. Reports on Progress in Physics, 61(2), 117-173.

[34] Svore, K. M., & Troyer, M. (2016). The quantum future of computation. Computer, 49(9), 21-30.

[35] Terhal, B. M. (2015). Quantum error correction for quantum memories. Reviews of Modern Physics, 87(2), 307-346.

[36] Van Meter, R., & Horsman, C. (2013). A blueprint for building a quantum computer. Communications of the ACM, 56(10), 84-93.

[37] Van Meter, R., & Itoh, K. M. (2005). Architecture-dependent execution time of Shor's algorithm. In Experimental Implementation of Quantum Computation (Vol. 1, pp. 183-188). International Society for Optics and Photonics.

[38] Venegas-Andraca, S. E. (2012). Quantum walks: A comprehensive review. Quantum Information Processing, 11(5), 1015-1106.

[39] Walter, M., Gross, D., & Eisert, J. (2017). Multi-partite entanglement. arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.03079.

[40] Wehner, S., Elkouss, D., & Hanson, R. (2018). Quantum internet: A vision for the road ahead. Science, 362(6412), eaam9288.

[41] Willsch, D., Willsch, M., Jin, F., De Raedt, H., & Michielsen, K. (2019). Testing quantum fault tolerance on small systems. Physical Review A, 100(5), 052301.

[42] Wootters, W. K., & Zurek, W. H. (1982). A single quantum cannot be cloned. Nature, 299(5886), 802-803.

[43] Yan, F., Iliyasu, A. M., & Venegas-Andraca, S. E. (2016). A survey of quantum image representations. Quantum Information Processing, 15(1), 1-35.

[44] Yoder, T. J., Low, G. H., & Chuang, I. L. (2014). Fixed-point quantum search with an optimal number of queries. Physical Review Letters, 113(21), 210501.

[45] Zhong, H. S., Wang, H., Deng, Y. H., Chen, M. C., Peng, L. C., Luo, Y. H., ... & Pan, J. W. (2020). Quantum computational advantage using photons. Science, 370(6523), 1460-1463.

[46] Zhu, D., Abulikemu, A., & Pfister, O. (2019). Quantum error correction for continuous-variable quantum information processing. In Quantum Information and Measurement (pp. S1B-3). Optical Society of America.

[47] Zhuang, Q., & Zhang, Z. (2019). Entanglement-assisted classical communication over quantum channels. Physical Review A, 100(3), 032312.

[48] Zoller, P., Beth, T., Binosi, D., Blatt, R., Briegel, H., Bruss, D., ... & Zeilinger, A. (2005). Quantum information processing and communication. The European Physical Journal D, 36(2), 203-228.

[49] Zurek, W. H. (2003). Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical. Reviews of Modern Physics, 75(3), 715-775.

[50] Zwierlein, M. W., Stan, C. A., Schunck, C. H., Raupach, S. M., Gupta, S., Hadzibabic, Z., & Ketterle, W. (2003). Observation of Bose-Einstein condensation of molecules. Physical Review Letters, 91(25), 250401.