

From: [Liu, Yi-Kai \(Fed\)](#)
To: [Smith-Tone, Daniel C. \(Fed\)](#); [Chen, Lily \(Fed\)](#); [Moody, Dustin \(Fed\)](#)
Subject: Re: News-level events
Date: Thursday, August 4, 2016 1:09:51 PM

Hi Daniel,

Don't worry, I'd heard about that result a few months ago. We did have a "direct line" to hear about it, since someone from Chris Monroe's group gave a talk about it at JQI. If you'd like to hear announcements about those talks, you can sign up for the JQI and QuICS mailing lists.

Also, that result is roughly in line with the overall research direction that Monroe's group has been pursuing for years... so although the technical details are very impressive, it did not come out of the blue.

Cheers,

--Yi-Kai

From: Smith-Tone, Daniel (Fed)
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2016 3:38 PM
To: Chen, Lily (Fed); Moody, Dustin (Fed); Liu, Yi-Kai (Fed)
Subject: News-level events

Hello,

I'm curious what you think about this:

<https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2016/08/160803140137.htm>

It is hard to trust science news articles very much since they don't share details, repeat every statement three times so that the average reader can recall it, and use vague terminology to convey information. On the other hand, this does seem like a step forward in the engineering of practical and scalable quantum computing tech to someone naïve like me.

My question is, whether we knew about this before a journalist outside of our organization did. I don't want for an academic result to be delayed a moment in the publication process, but I feel like information that may potentially impact our project that is performed by people affiliated with us should have a direct route to us, since we have to deal with the consequences of large scale advancement. Do the scientists at the institutes have any obligation for a WERB-like review? If so, is there a way to filter these so that relevant discoveries can be communicated directly to us in good faith? I don't think that we should be learning about results of scientist who are at least partly "ours" from external sources.

Am I out of line thinking this way?

Thanks for considering my comments.

Cheers,
Daniel