"All-versus-nothing" proof of tripartite quantum steering and genuine entanglement certification in the two-sided device-independent scenario
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We present an “all-versus-nothing” proof of EPR steering in the tripartite scenario. In particular, we demonstrate the non-existence of a local hidden state model in the two-sided device-independent (2SDI) framework by presenting a full logical contradiction of the predictions of the LHV model with quantum mechanical outcome statistics for any three-qubit generalized Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GGHZ) state. We moreover formulate a 2SDI steering inequality which is a generalization of the fine-grained steering inequality in case of the tripartite scenario, and which captures quantum correlations present in any GGHZ state. We show that the maximum quantum violation of our proposed 2SDI steering inequality can be used to certify genuine entanglement of three-qubit states.

I. INTRODUCTION

The presence of entanglement among spatially separated parties is one of the most intriguing phenomena in quantum physics. A bipartite quantum state is called entangled iff it is not separable. A multipartite quantum state is called genuinely multipartite entangled [1] iff it is not separable with respect to any bipartition. Studies on multipartite entanglement have gained a lot of attention due to their foundational significance as well as their information theoretic applications, for example, in extreme spin squeezing [2], high sensitivity metrology tasks [3, 4], quantum computing using cluster states [5], measurement-based quantum computation [6] and multiparty quantum network [7, 8].

Due to its complex structure, the detection of genuine multipartite entanglement is quite difficult to realize experimentally. Apart from the usual state tomography, various witnesses [1, 9–14] have been proposed for detecting genuine entanglement. However, these processes have experimental limitations due to the requirement of precise control over the systems. Alternatively, one may use genuine Bell-nonlocality witnesses which rely on the experimental statistics alone without any characterization of the experimental devices. Several multipartite Bell-type inequalities have been proposed to certify genuine multipartite entanglement (GME) in the device-independent (DI) scenario [15–17] which requires no trust/characterization of any observer’s devices. Naturally, the question arises whether one can certify the presence of genuine multipartite entanglement using lesser resources in a scenario where some of the observers’ devices are not characterized, i.e., when the scenario is partially device-independent.

The above-mentioned partially device-independent scenario is related to the concept of EPR steering which was initially proposed by Schrödinger [18]. Later, in 2007, Wiseman et al. [19] formulated this phenomenon in terms of an operational task. In the bipartite scenario, EPR steering (or, quantum steering) implies the possibility of producing different sets of states at one party’s (say, Alice) end by performing local quantum measurements of any two noncommuting observables on the other spatially separated party’s (say, Bob) end. EPR steering is defined as the non-existence of local hidden state (LHS) models to describe the conditional states produced at Bob’s side. Here the outcome statistics of one subsystem which is being ‘steered’ (in the present case Bob), are produced due to characterized quantum measurements on a quantum state. However, there is no such constraint for the other subsystem.

In quantum theory, several no-go theorems depict the failure of certain physical models to describe the outcome statistics produced in quantum mechanics. For instance, the well-known Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) theorem [20, 21] rules out the existence of a local hidden variable (LHV) model for the GHZ state by presenting a full contradiction of the predictions of the LHV model with the outcome statistics produced in quantum mechanics. The GHZ theorem has also been experimentally verified [22, 23]. Similarly, non-locality without inequalities was demonstrated by taking into account the contradiction of LHV ‘elements of reality’ with quantum mechanics [24–26]. Such “all-versus-nothing” proof of Bell-nonlocality rules out the possibility of local-hidden variable (LHV) models more uncompromisingly than Bell inequalities. Recently, EPR steering of any arbitrary two-qubit pure entangled state has been demonstrated without invoking any steering inequality [27]. In the present work our motivation is to extend the GHZ theorem for any three-
qubit generalized Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GGHZ) state to the tripartite steering scenario.

With the above goal, we first present an "all-versus-nothing" proof of tripartite EPR steering for any three-qubit pure generalized Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) state in the two-sided device-independent (2SDI) scenario, where one of the three parties performs characterized measurements and the other two parties perform black-box measurements. Next, to capture the quantum correlation present in GHZ states, we propose a 2SDI tripartite steering inequality which is a generalization of the fine-grained steering inequality in the bipartite scenario [28]. Fine-grained steering inequalities are derived using the fine-grained uncertainty relation [29] and provide tighter steering criteria [30, 31] over steering inequalities based on Heisenberg’s uncertainty relation [32, 33], as well as over steering inequalities based on entropic uncertainty relations [34]. Quantum violation of our proposed 2SDI tripartite fine-grained steering inequality implies tripartite steering in the 2SDI scenario. Finally, we demonstrate that the maximum quantum violation of this inequality certifies the presence of genuine entanglement of three-qubits in the 2SDI scenario.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we review the concept of tripartite steering in the 2SDI scenario. In Sec. III, we demonstrate the non-existence of the LHS model for any three-qubit pure GHZ state using logical contradiction. In Sec. IV, we derive a fine-grained steering inequality for the tripartite steering case in the 2SDI scenario. Certification of genuine entanglement of three-qubit states is shown in Sec. V, followed by the concluding remarks in Sec. VI.

II. TRIPARTITE QUANTUM STEERING IN THE TWO-SIDED DEVICE-INDEPENDENT SCENARIO

We begin by recapitulating the definitions of tripartite steering [35–37]. In this context two scenarios arise: 1) one-sided device-independent (1SDI) scenario and 2) two-sided device-independent (2SDI) scenario. For the purpose of the present study, we will restrict ourselves to the 2SDI scenario.

Consider a tripartite steering scenario where three spatially separated parties, say Alice, Bob and Charlie, share an unknown quantum system \( \rho_{ABC} \in B(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C) \) with the local Hilbert space dimension of Alice’s subsystem and that of Bob’s subsystem being arbitrary and the local Hilbert space dimension of Charlie’s subsystem being fixed. Here, \( B(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C) \) stands for the set of all density operators acting on the Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C \). Alice performs a set of positive operator-valued measurements (POVM) \( X \) with outcomes \( a \). Here \( x \in \{0, 1, 2, \cdots, n_A\} \) denotes the measurement choices of Alice and \( a \in \{0, 1, \cdots, d_A\} \). On the other hand, Bob performs a set of positive operator-valued measurements (POVM) \( Y \) with outcomes \( b \).

\( y \in \{0, 1, 2, \cdots, n_B\} \) denotes the measurement choices of Bob and \( b \in \{0, 1, \cdots, d_B\} \). These local measurements by Alice and Bob prepare the set of conditional states on Charlie’s side.

The above scenario is called 2SDI since the POVM elements \( \{M^A_{a|x} \}_{a,x} \) (where \( M^A_{a|x} \geq 0 \forall a, x \); and \( \sum_x M^A_{a|x} = 1 \forall x \)) associated with Alice’s measurements and the POVM elements \( \{M^B_{b|y} \}_{b,y} \) (where \( M^B_{b|y} \geq 0 \forall b, y \); and \( \sum_y M^B_{b|y} = 1 \forall y \)) associated with Bob’s measurements are unknown. The steering scenario is characterized by the assemblage \( \{\sigma^C_{a,b|x,y} \}_{a,x,b,y} \) which is the set of unnormalized conditional states on Charlie’s side. Each element in the assemblage is given by \( \sigma^C_{a,b|x,y} = P(a,b|x,x) \rho^C_{a,b|x,x} \), where \( P(a,b|x,y) \) is the conditional probability of getting the outcome \( a \) and \( b \) when Alice performs the measurement \( x \) and Bob performs measurement \( y \) respectively; \( \rho^C_{a,b|x,x} \) is the normalized conditional state on Charlie’s end. Quantum theory predicts that all valid assemblages should satisfy the following criterion:

\[
\sigma^C_{a,b|x,y} = \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda) \rho^C_{a,b|x,x},
\]

where \( \lambda \) denotes local hidden variable (LHV) which occurs with probability \( P(\lambda) > 0 \); \( \sum \lambda P(\lambda) = 1 \); the quantum states \( \rho^C_{a,b|x,x} \) are called local hidden states (LHS) which satisfy \( \rho^C_{a,b|x,x} \geq 0 \) and \( \text{Tr} \rho^C_{a,b|x,x} = 1 \).

Now, suppose that Charlie performs a set of characterized POVMs \( Z \) with outcomes \( c \) having the POVM elements \( \{M^C_{c|z} \}_{c,z} \) (where \( M^C_{c|z} \geq 0 \forall c, z \); and \( \sum_z M^C_{c|z} = 1 \forall z \)) on \( \{\sigma^C_{a,b|x,y} \}_{a,x,b,y} \). Here \( z \in \{0, 1, 2, \cdots, n_C\} \) denotes the measurement choices of Charlie and \( c \in \{0, 1, \cdots, d_C\} \). These measurements by Charlie on \( \{\sigma^C_{a,b|x,y} \}_{a,x,b,y} \) produces measurement correlations \( \{P(a,b,c|x,x,y,y) \}_{a,x,b,y,c,z} \), where

\[
P(a,b,c|x,x,y,y;Z) = \text{Tr} \left[ M^C_{c|z} \sigma^C_{a,b|x,y} \right].
\]

The correlation \( \{P(a,b,c|x,x,y,y;Z) \}_{a,x,b,y,c,z} \) detects tripartite steerability if it does not have the following LHV-LHV-LHS decomposition:

\[
P(a,b,c|x,x,y,y;Z) = \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda) \rho^C_{a,b|x,x},
\]

where \( \lambda \) denotes local hidden variable (LHV) which occurs with probability \( P(\lambda) > 0 \); \( \sum \lambda P(\lambda) = 1 \); the quantum states \( \rho^C_{a,b|x,x} \) are called local hidden states (LHS) which satisfy \( \rho^C_{a,b|x,x} \geq 0 \) and \( \text{Tr} \rho^C_{a,b|x,x} = 1 \).

Now, suppose that Charlie performs a set of characterized POVMs \( Z \) with outcomes \( c \) having the POVM elements \( \{M^C_{c|z} \}_{c,z} \) (where \( M^C_{c|z} \geq 0 \forall c, z \); and \( \sum_z M^C_{c|z} = 1 \forall z \)) on \( \{\sigma^C_{a,b|x,y} \}_{a,x,b,y} \). Here \( z \in \{0, 1, 2, \cdots, n_C\} \) denotes the measurement choices of Charlie and \( c \in \{0, 1, \cdots, d_C\} \). These measurements by Charlie on \( \{\sigma^C_{a,b|x,y} \}_{a,x,b,y} \) produces measurement correlations \( \{P(a,b,c|x,x,y,y) \}_{a,x,b,y,c,z} \), where

\[
P(a,b,c|x,x,y,y;Z) = \text{Tr} \left[ M^C_{c|z} \sigma^C_{a,b|x,y} \right].
\]
where $P(c|Z, \rho^C)$ denotes the quantum probability of obtaining the outcome $c$ when measurement $Z$ is performed on LHS $\rho^C$.

III. TRIPARTITE STEERING OF GGHZ STATES

The GHZ theorem that leads to "1 $=$ $-1"$, shows tripartite Bell nonlocality of the GHZ state $|\psi_{GHZ}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle + |111\rangle)$ in the simplest way. Motivated by this simple nonlocality argument, in Ref. [27], a simple demonstration of EPR steering was presented for any bipartite pure entangled state, where the LHS models lead to the logical contradiction "2 $=$ 1". Here we will demonstrate that the existence of LHS models lead to the contradiction "2 $=$ 1" in the 2SDI scenario for any pure state that belongs the generalized GHZ (Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger) class having the form,

$$|\psi(\theta)_{GHZ}\rangle = \cos \theta |000\rangle + \sin \theta |111\rangle, \quad 0 < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}$$

when the trusted party (Charlie) performs two projective measurements.

Let us consider that Alice and Bob prepare the generalized GHZ (GGHZ) state given by Eq.(5). They keep two particles at their possession and send the third particle to Charlie. Next, Alice performs her choice of either one of two projective measurements of the observables $X_z$ (where $X_0 = \hat{\sigma} \cdot n_A^0$, $X_1 = \hat{\sigma} \cdot n_A^1$) and communicates the outcome $a \in \{0, 1\}$. Similarly, Bob performs his choice of either one of two projective measurements of the observables $Y_y$ (where $Y_0 = \hat{\sigma} \cdot n_B^0$, $Y_1 = \hat{\sigma} \cdot n_B^1$) and communicates the outcome $b \in \{0, 1\}$. Here $\hat{\sigma} = (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$; $n_A^0$, $n_A^1$, $n_B^0$, $n_B^1$ are unit vectors; $n_A^0 \neq n_A^1$; $n_B^0 \neq n_B^1$. Henceforth, we shall denote $\hat{\sigma} \cdot n$ by $\sigma_n$ for any unit vector $n$.

After Alice’s and Bob’s measurements, a total of sixteen possible unnormalized conditional states $\sigma_{a|X_0, Y_0}^C$ (with $a, b, x, y \in \{0, 1\}$) are prepared at Charlie’s end. If Charlie’s conditional states have LHS description, then there exists an ensemble $\{P(\lambda) \rho^C_\lambda\}$ and stochastic maps $P(a|X_0, \lambda)$, $P(b|Y_0, \lambda)$ satisfying Eq.(2). Moreover, the above ensemble should satisfy the following relation:

$$\sum_\lambda P(\lambda) \rho^C_\lambda = \rho^C_{\text{GGHZ}}$$

$$= \text{Tr}_{AB} \left[ |\psi(\theta)_{GHZ}\rangle \langle \psi(\theta)_{GHZ}| \right].$$

Now, consider that Alice performs projective measurements of the following two observables: $X_0 = \sigma_x$, $X_1 = \sigma_y$. On the other hand, Bob performs projective measurements of the following two observables: $Y_0 = \frac{\sigma_x + \sigma_z}{\sqrt{2}}$, $Y_1 = \frac{\sigma_y + \sigma_z}{\sqrt{2}}$. In this case each of the normalized conditional states $\rho^C_{a|X_0, Y_0}$ produces at Charlie’s end is a pure state. For any fixed $x$ and fixed $y$, the four normalized conditional states $\rho^C_{0|X_0, Y_0}$, $\rho^C_{1|X_0, Y_0}$, $\rho^C_{0|X_0, Y_0}$, $\rho^C_{1|X_0, Y_0}$ are four different pure states. Moreover, the normalized conditional states $\{\rho^C_{a|X_0, Y_0}\}_{a, x, b, Y_0}$ satisfy the following,

$$\{\rho^C_{0|X_0, Y_0}, \rho^C_{1|X_0, Y_0}, \rho^C_{0|X_0, Y_0}, \rho^C_{1|X_0, Y_0}\} \neq \{\rho^C_{0|X_0, Y_1}, \rho^C_{1|X_0, Y_1}, \rho^C_{0|X_0, Y_1}, \rho^C_{1|X_0, Y_1}\}$$

which means no element of the set on LHS is equal to any element of the set on RHS of (7). On the other hand, we obtain

$$\rho^C_{0|X_0, Y_0} = \rho^C_{0|X_0, Y_0},$$

$$\rho^C_{1|X_0, Y_1} = \rho^C_{1|X_0, Y_1},$$

and

$$\rho^C_{0|X_0, Y_0} = \rho^C_{0|X_0, Y_0},$$

$$\rho^C_{1|X_0, Y_1} = \rho^C_{0|X_0, Y_0}.$$

Hence, a total of eight different conditional states are produced on Charlie’s side, each of which are pure states.

Now, let us assume that the above conditional states (which are pure states) have LHS description using the ensemble $\{P(\lambda) \rho^C_\lambda\}$ and stochastic maps $P(a|X_0, \lambda)$, $P(b|Y_0, \lambda)$ satisfying Eq.(2). It is well-known that a pure state cannot be expressed as a convex sum of other different states, i.e., a density matrix of pure state can only be expanded by itself. Therefore, we can write the following using Eqs.(2), (7), (8) and (9),

$$\rho^C_{0|X_0, Y_0} = P(1) \rho^C_1,$$

$$\rho^C_{0|X_0, Y_0} = P(2) \rho^C_2,$$

$$\rho^C_{0|X_0, Y_0} = P(3) \rho^C_3,$$

$$\rho^C_{0|X_0, Y_0} = P(4) \rho^C_4,$$

$$\rho^C_{0|X_0, Y_1} = P(5) \rho^C_5,$$

$$\rho^C_{0|X_0, Y_1} = P(6) \rho^C_6,$$

$$\rho^C_{0|X_0, Y_1} = P(7) \rho^C_7,$$

$$\rho^C_{0|X_0, Y_1} = P(8) \rho^C_8,$$

$$\rho^C_{0|X_1, Y_0} = P(5) \rho^C_5,$$

$$\rho^C_{0|X_1, Y_0} = P(6) \rho^C_6,$$

$$\rho^C_{0|X_1, Y_1} = P(7) \rho^C_7,$$

$$\rho^C_{0|X_1, Y_1} = P(8) \rho^C_8.$$
\[ \sigma_{0,0}^{C|X,Y} = P(3) \rho_{C}^{Z}, \]
\[ \sigma_{0,1}^{C|X,Y} = P(4) \rho_{C}^{Z}, \]
\[ \sigma_{1,0}^{C|X,Y} = P(1) \rho_{C}^{Z}, \]
\[ \sigma_{1,1}^{C|X,Y} = P(2) \rho_{C}^{Z}, \]

(13)

We can therefore claim, that the ensemble \( \{ p(\lambda) \rho_{C}^{\lambda} \} \) consists of eight LHS: \( \{ P(1) \rho_{C}^{Z}, P(2) \rho_{C}^{Z}, P(3) \rho_{C}^{Z}, P(4) \rho_{C}^{Z}, P(5) \rho_{C}^{Z}, P(6) \rho_{C}^{Z}, P(7) \rho_{C}^{Z}, P(8) \rho_{C}^{Z} \} \) which reproduces the conditional states \( \{ \sigma_{a,b}^{C|X,Y} \}_{a,X,Y,b,Y} \) at Charlie’s end. Now, using Eq.(6) we can write,

\[ \sum_{\lambda=1}^{8} P(\lambda) \rho_{\lambda}^{C} = \rho_{GGHZ}^{C}. \]  

(14)

Next, summing Eqs.(10), (11), (12) and (13), and then taking trace, the left-hand sides give 4 \( \text{Tr}[\rho_{GGHZ}^{C}] = 4 \). Here we have used the fact: \( \sum_{a=0}^{1} \sum_{b=0}^{1} \sigma_{a,b}^{C|X,Y} = \rho_{GGHZ}^{C} \) \( \forall \ x,y \). On the other hand, the right-hand sides give 2 \( \text{Tr}[\rho_{GGHZ}^{C}] = 2 \) following Eq.(14). Hence, this leads to a full contradiction of "2 = 1".

Note that the above sharp logical contradiction for demonstrating the non-existence of LHS models for the GGHZ states generalizes the EPR paradox to the case of pure three-qubit entangled states. Here, Alice’s and Bob’s two different local measurements on the GGHZ state prepare different pure conditional states at Charlie’s end. In Ref. [38], it has been demonstrated that perfect correlations of the EPR paradox can be detected by the algebraic maximum of the sum of two conditional probabilities. Similarly, in order to detect the correlation of the GGHZ state demonstrated by the above contradiction, one may consider the following sum of four conditional probabilities:

\[ CP := P(0_{Z_{0}}|0_{X_{0}},1_{Y_{0}}) + P(0_{Z_{0}}|1_{X_{0}},1_{Y_{0}}) + P(0_{Z_{0}}|1_{X_{0}},1_{Y_{0}}) + P(0_{Z_{0}}|0_{X_{0}},1_{Y_{0}}). \]

(15)

Here, \( P(c_{Z_{0}}|a_{X},b_{Y}) \) denotes the conditional probability of occurrence of the outcome \( c \) when Charlie performs measurement \( Z_{c} \), given that Alice and Bob get the outcome \( a \) and \( b \) by performing measurements \( X_{a} \) and \( Y_{b} \), respectively (with \( a, b, c, x, y, z \in \{0,1\} \)). It can be checked that the GGHZ state gives rise to the algebraic maximum of 4 for the above quantity for the following choice of measurements:

\[ X_{0} = \sigma_{x}; \quad Y_{0} = \sin 2\theta_{x} + \cos 2\theta_{x} \quad Z_{0} = \sigma_{x} \]
\[ X_{1} = \sigma_{y}; \quad Y_{1} = \cos 2\theta_{x} + \sin 2\theta_{x} \quad Z_{1} = \sigma_{y} \]

(16)

IV. FINE-GRAINED TRIPARTITE STEERING INEQUALITY

We now present a fine-grained steering inequality whose violation detects tripartite quantum steering in the 2SDI scenario. The task of the inequality is motivated from the above expression of \( CP \) given in Eq.(15).

Consider the following two-sided device-independent tripartite scenario: Alice performs two arbitrary black-box dichotomic measurements \( X_{a} \) with \( x \in \{0,1\} \) having outcomes \( a \in \{0,1\} \). Bob performs two arbitrary black-box dichotomic measurements \( Y_{b} \) with \( y \in \{0,1\} \) having outcomes \( b \in \{0,1\} \). Charlie performs two arbitrary mutually unbiased qubit measurements \( Z_{z} \) with \( z \in \{0,1\} \) having outcomes \( c \in \{0,1\} \). In the context of this scenario, the tripartite correlation \( P(a,b,c|X_{a},Y_{b},Z_{z}) \) does not detect tripartite steerability iff it has the following LHV-LHI-LHS decomposition:

\[ P(a,b,c|X_{a},Y_{b},Z_{z}) = \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda) P(a|X_{a},\lambda) P(b|Y_{b},\lambda) P(c|Z_{z},\rho_{\lambda}^{C}) \]

(17)

From Eq.(17), an arbitrary conditional probability distribution can be written as,

\[ P(c_{Z_{z}}|a_{X},b_{Y}) = \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda) P(a|X_{a},\lambda) P(b|Y_{b},\lambda) P(c|Z_{z},\rho_{\lambda}^{C}) \frac{P(\lambda)}{P(a|X_{a},\lambda) P(b|Y_{b},\lambda) P(c|Z_{z},\rho_{\lambda}^{C})}. \]

(18)

Now, from the inequality: \( \sum_{x,y} \leq \left( \max_{x,y} \right) \sum_{x,y} \) for \( x \geq 0 \) and \( y \geq 0 \), one can write from Eq.(7),

\[ P(c_{Z_{z}}|a_{X},b_{Y}) \leq \max_{\lambda} \left[ P(c|Z_{z},\rho_{\lambda}^{C}) \right] \left[ \sum_{\lambda} P(\lambda) P(a|X_{a},\lambda) P(b|Y_{b},\lambda) P(c|Z_{z},\rho_{\lambda}^{C}) \right] \]
\[ = P(c|Z_{z},\rho_{\lambda_{\text{max}}}^{C}), \]

(19)

where \( P(c|Z_{z},\rho_{\lambda_{\text{max}}}^{C}) = \max_{\lambda} \left[ P(c|Z_{z},\rho_{\lambda}^{C}) \right] \). The above inequality is saturated when \( \rho_{\lambda}^{C} = \rho_{\lambda_{\text{max}}}^{C} \) \( \forall \lambda \).

Now, let us consider the following sum of conditional probabilities

\[ CP = P(c_{Z_{0}}|a_{X},b_{Y}) + P(c_{Z_{1}}|a_{X},b_{Y}) \]
\[ + P(c_{Z_{0}}|a_{X},b_{Y}) + P(c_{Z_{1}}|a_{X},b_{Y}) \]

(20)

with \( a, a', a'', a', b, b', b'', c \in \{0,1\} \). Note that \( CP \) given by Eq.(15) is a specific case of \( CP \). Since, the trusted party Charlie performs two arbitrary mutually unbiased qubit measurements, following the approach adopted for deriving the fine grained bipartite steering inequality in [28], one obtains

\[ CP \leq 2 \max_{\{ \tilde{Z}_{0},\tilde{Z}_{1} \}} \left[ P(c|\tilde{Z}_{0},\rho_{\lambda_{\text{max}}}^{C}) + P(c|\tilde{Z}_{1},\rho_{\lambda_{\text{max}}}^{C}) \right], \]

(21)

where \( \{ \tilde{Z}_{0},\tilde{Z}_{1} \} \) ranges over all possible pairs of mutually unbiased qubit measurements. The right hand side of the above inequality measures the uncertainty arising from mutually unbiased qubit measurements \( \{ \tilde{Z}_{0},\tilde{Z}_{1} \} \) and is bounded by the fine grained uncertainty relation [29].

The task of tripartite quantum steering is demonstrated if Alice and Bob are able to convince Charlie that
their shared state is genuinely entangled. Let us discuss Alice-Bob’s strategy to cheat Charlie when Charlie’s particle is a qubit. Alice and Bob try to maximize the right hand side of inequality (21) using the LHS model. Here we consider two different scenarios separately [28].

In the 1st scenario, Alice and Bob get the information of \( \{ Z_0, Z_1 \} \) before preparing the tripartite state. In this case the following can be shown [28]

\[
CP \leq 2(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}) = 2 + \sqrt{2}.
\]  

(22)

The above inequality can be derived using the fine-grained uncertainty relation and its violation implies tripartite quantum steering in the 2SDI scenario.

In the 2nd scenario, Alice and Bob prepare the state without getting the information of \( \{ Z_0, Z_1 \} \). Hence, in this case Alice and Bob prepare all systems without any knowledge of Charlie’s set of observables. In this scenario, following the approach adopted in [28], it can be shown that

\[
CP \leq 3.
\]  

(23)

Quantum violation of the above inequality implies tripartite quantum steering in 2SDI scenario.

Hence, for the expression (15), when the shared state does not demonstrate tripartite steering, we can write

\[
CP = P(0_{Z_0}|1_{X_0},1_{Y_0}) + P(0_{Z_0}|0_{X_0},1_{Y_1}) + P(0_{Z_1}|0_{X_0},1_{Y_0}) + P(0_{Z_1}|0_{X_1},1_{Y_1}) \\
\leq 2 + \sqrt{2} \quad \text{(1st Scenrio)} \\
\leq 3 \quad \text{(2nd Scenario)}.
\]  

(24)

Note that any pure GGHZ state given by Eq.(5) violates the above 2SDI tripartite steering inequality to its algebraic maximum of 4 for the observables given in Eq. (16).

V. CERTIFICATION OF GENUINE ENTANGLEMENT OF THREE-QUBIT STATES

We will now show that the maximum quantum violation of the above fine-grained inequality (FGI) (24) can be used as a tool for certification of genuinely entangled three-qubit states in the 2SDI scenario. We adopt here a two-step process. At first, we prove that if the shared state is a three-qubit state, the maximum violation of the FGI given by (24) certifies that the state is genuinely entangled. We then show that if the dimension of the shared state is \( d_A \times d_B \times 2 \), the maximum violation of the FGI given by (24) certifies that the state is a direct sum of copies of three-qubit genuinely entangled states.

Lemma 1. Suppose that the trusted party, Charlie, performs projective qubit mutually unbiased measurements corresponding to the operators \( Z_0 = \sigma_x \) and \( Z_1 = \sigma_y \) and the shared state is a three-qubit state. Then, maximum violation of FGI given by (24) certifies that the three-qubit state is genuinely entangled.

Proof. Note that the conditional probabilities in this FGI can be written as \( P(c_{Z_1}|a_{X_1},b_{Y_1}) = \text{Tr} \left( \Pi_{c|Z_1} \cdot \sigma_{a,b|x,y}^C \right) \), where \( \Pi_{c|Z_1} \) is the projector associated with the \( c \) outcome of \( Z_1 \) measurement of Charlie. Now, the quantum violation of the FGI becomes 4, when each of the four conditional probabilities appearing on the left hand side of the FGI given by (24) is 1. Hence, the following conditions on the normalized conditional states \( \{ \sigma_{a,b|x,y}^C \}_{a,b,x,y} \) should be satisfied simultaneously when maximum violation (4) of FGI is obtained:

- When Alice gets outcome 1 by measuring \( X_0 \) and Bob gets outcome 1 by measuring \( Y_0 \), then the conditional state prepared at Charlie’s end must be eigenstate of the operator \( Z_0 = \sigma_x \) associated with eigenvalue +1, i.e.,

\[
\Theta_{1,1|0,0}^C = \frac{I + \sigma_x}{2}.
\]  

(25)

- When Alice gets outcome 0 by measuring \( X_1 \) and Bob gets outcome 1 by measuring \( Y_1 \), then the conditional state prepared at Charlie’s end must be the eigenstate of the operator \( Z_1 = \sigma_y \) associated with eigenvalue +1, i.e.,

\[
\Theta_{0,1|1,1}^C = \frac{I + \sigma_y}{2}.
\]  

(26)

- When Alice gets outcome 0 by measuring \( X_0 \) and Bob gets outcome 1 by measuring \( Y_1 \), then the conditional state prepared at Charlie’s end must be the eigenstate of the operator \( Z_1 = \sigma_y \) associated with eigenvalue +1, i.e.,

\[
\Theta_{0,1|0,1}^C = \frac{I + \sigma_y}{2}.
\]  

(27)

- When Alice gets outcome 0 by measuring \( X_1 \) and Bob gets outcome 1 by measuring \( Y_0 \), then the conditional state prepared at Charlie’s end must be the eigenstate of the operator \( Z_1 = \sigma_y \) associated with eigenvalue +1, i.e.,

\[
\Theta_{0,1|1,0}^C = \frac{I + \sigma_y}{2}.
\]  

(28)

Now, it will be shown that no pure three-qubit state without genuine entanglement can provide maximum quantum violation 4 of FGI (24).

Pure states: Any pure three-qubit state without entanglement can be in one of the following two categories:

i) Fully separable states: Quantum violation of the tripartite steering inequality (24) implies that the shared state is steerable and hence, entangled. Thus, the fully separable states cannot provide maximum quantum violation 4 of FGI (24).

ii) Bi-separable states: Within the biseparable states, consider a state \( |\psi\rangle \) as shown below,

\[
|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle_A \otimes |\psi\rangle_{BC},
\]  

(29)
where $|\psi\rangle_{BC}$ is an arbitrary pure two-qubit entangled state and $|\psi\rangle_A$ is an arbitrary pure qubit state. Alice and Bob perform two arbitrary projective measurements. For bi-separable states of above kind, Alice’s particle is not correlated with Bob’s and Charlie’s particle. Hence, Charlie’s measurement outcome cannot depend on Alice’s measurement settings and outcomes. Hence, the sum of conditional probabilities in Eq. (24) will take the following form: 

$$CP = P(0Z_0|1Y_0) + P(0Z_0|0Y_1) + P(0Z_1|1Y_1) + P(0Z_1|0Y_0).$$

(30)

Hence, in order to get each term of Eq. (30) equal to 1, Charlie’s conditional state should be simultaneous eigenstate of $Z_0 = \sigma_x$ and $Z_1 = \sigma_y$ when Bob obtains the outcome 1 by performing the measurement $Y_0$. Similarly, Charlie’s conditional state should be simultaneous eigenstate of $Z_0 = \sigma_x$ as $Z_1 = \sigma_y$ when Bob obtains the outcome 1 by performing measurement $Y_1$. But these are not possible. Hence, an arbitrary bi-separable state of the form (29) cannot provide maximum violation 4 of FGI (24).

Now, consider a bi-separable pure state $|\psi\rangle$ as shown below,

$$|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle_B \otimes |\psi\rangle_{AC},$$

(31)

where $|\psi\rangle_{AC}$ is an arbitrary pure two-qubit entangled state and $|\psi\rangle_B$ is an arbitrary pure qubit state. Alice and Bob perform two arbitrary projective measurements. For bi-separable states of above kind, Bob’s particle is not correlated with Alice’s and Charlie’s particle. Hence, Charlie’s measurement outcome cannot depend on Bob’s measurement settings and outcomes. Hence, the sum of conditional probabilities in Eq. (24) will take the following form:

$$CP = P(0Z_0|1X_0) + P(0Z_0|0X_1) + P(0Z_1|0X_0)$$

$$+ P(0Z_1|1X_1).$$

(32)

Hence, in order to get each term of Eq. (30) equal to 1, Charlie’s conditional state should be simultaneous eigenstate of $Z_0 = \sigma_x$ and $Z_1 = \sigma_y$ when Alice obtains the outcome 0 by performing measurement $X_0$. But this is not possible. Hence, an arbitrary bi-separable state of the form (31) cannot provide maximum violation 4 of FGI (24).

Now, consider the bi-separable states of the following type,

$$|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle_C \otimes |\psi\rangle_{AB},$$

(33)

where $|\psi\rangle_{AB}$ is an arbitrary pure two-qubit entangled state and $|\psi\rangle_C$ is an arbitrary pure qubit state. In this case Charlie’s particle is not correlated with Alice’s particle and Bob’s particle. Hence, the sum of conditional probabilities in Eq. (24) will take the following form:

$$CP = 2[P(0Z_0|\psi\rangle_C) + P(0Z_1|\psi\rangle_C)].$$

(34)

where $P(0Z_0|\psi\rangle_C)$ is the probability of occurrence of the outcome 0 when the measurement of observable $Z_0$ is performed on the state $|\psi\rangle_C$. The above expression of CP can never give quantum violation of FGI (24) due to the fine-grained uncertainty relation.

Next, we will show that no mixed three-qubit state without genuine entanglement can give maximum quantum violation 4 of the FGI given by (24).

**Mixed States:** The three-qubit mixed states without genuine entanglement can be classified as follows [9]:

i) **Fully separable states (S)**: This class of states includes those states that can be expressed as convex combination of fully separable pure states. The mixed states belonging to this class, being not entangled, never violate the FGI given by (24).

ii) **Bi-separable states (B)**: These are the states that can be expressed as convex combination of fully separable pure states and bi-separable pure states.

Let us consider an arbitrary mixed bi-separable three-qubit state $\rho_3$. Since any bi-separable mixed state can be expressed as convex combination of fully separable pure states and bi-separable pure states, we can write the following general decomposition of $\rho_3$,

$$\rho_3 = \sum_i p_i \rho_{bs}^i + \sum_j q_j \rho_{fs}^j,$$

(35)

where $0 \leq p_i \leq 1$, $0 \leq q_j \leq 1$, $\sum_i p_i + \sum_j q_j = 1$, $\rho_{bs}^i$ is a pure bi-separable three-qubit state for all $i$, $\rho_{fs}^j$ is a pure fully separable three-qubit state for all $j$.

Now, suppose that Alice obtains the outcome 1 by performing measurement of the observable $X_0$ and Bob obtains the outcome 1 by performing measurement of the observable $Y_0$ on the above mixed bi-separable three-qubit state $\rho_3$. Hence, the normalized conditional state prepared at Charlie’s side is given by,

$$\rho_{C|1,1|0,0}^{T} = \frac{\text{Tr}_{AB} \left[ \rho_3 (\Pi_{1|X_0} \otimes \Pi_{1|Y_0} \otimes I) \right]}{\text{Tr} \left[ \rho_3 (\Pi_{1|X_0} \otimes \Pi_{1|Y_0} \otimes I) \right]} = \frac{\text{Tr}_{AB} \left[ \left( \sum_i p_i \rho_{bs}^i + \sum_j q_j \rho_{fs}^j \right) (\Pi_{1|X_0} \otimes \Pi_{1|Y_0} \otimes I) \right]}{P(1,1|0,0)},$$

(36)

where $P(1,1|0,0) = \text{Tr} \left[ \rho_3 (\Pi_{1|X_0} \otimes \Pi_{1|Y_0} \otimes I) \right]$ is the probability that Alice gets the outcome 1 by performing measurement of $X_0$ and Bob gets the outcome 1 by performing the measurement of $Y_0$ on the state $\rho_3$. Next,
we have,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Tr}_{AB} \left[ \left( \sum_i p_i \rho_{bs}^i + \sum_j q_j \rho_{fs}^j \right) \left( \Pi_{1|X_0} \otimes \Pi_{1|Y_0} \otimes I \right) \right] \\
= \sum_i p_i \text{Tr}_{AB} \left[ \rho_{bs}^i \left( \Pi_{1|X_0} \otimes \Pi_{1|Y_0} \otimes I \right) \right] \\
+ \sum_j q_j \text{Tr}_{AB} \left[ \rho_{fs}^j \left( \Pi_{1|X_0} \otimes \Pi_{1|Y_0} \otimes I \right) \right] \\
= \sum_i p_i P_{bs}^i (1,1|0,0) \varrho_{bs1,1|0,0}^{C} \\
+ \sum_j q_j P_{fs}^j (1,1|0,0) \varrho_{fs1,1|0,0}^{C},
\end{align*}
\]

(37)

where \( P_{bs}^i (1,1|0,0) \) is the probability that Alice gets the outcome 1 by performing measurement of \( X_0 \) and Bob gets the outcome 1 by performing the measurement of \( Y_0 \) on the state \( \rho_{bs}^i \); \( \varrho_{bs1,1|0,0}^{C} \) is the normalized conditional state prepared at Charlie’s side in this case; \( P_{fs}^j (1,1|0,0) \) and \( \varrho_{fs1,1|0,0}^{C} \) are defined similarly. Hence, from Eqs.(36) and (37), we get

\[
\begin{align*}
\varrho_{C1,1|0,0}^{C} \\
= \sum_i p_i \tilde{P}_{bs}^i \varrho_{bs1,1|0,0}^{C} + \sum_j q_j \tilde{P}_{fs}^j \varrho_{fs1,1|0,0}^{C},
\end{align*}
\]

(38)

where

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{P}_{bs}^i &= \frac{P_{bs}^i (1,1|0,0)}{P(1,1|0,0)} \\
&= \frac{\text{Tr} \left[ \rho_{bs}^i \left( \Pi_{1|X_0} \otimes \Pi_{1|Y_0} \otimes I \right) \right]}{\text{Tr} \left[ \rho_B \left( \Pi_{1|X_0} \otimes \Pi_{1|Y_0} \otimes I \right) \right]} \\
&\leq 1,
\end{align*}
\]

(39)

and similarly,

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{P}_{fs}^j &= \frac{P_{fs}^j (1,1|0,0)}{P(1,1|0,0)} \\
&= \frac{\text{Tr} \left[ \rho_{fs}^j \left( \Pi_{1|X_0} \otimes \Pi_{1|Y_0} \otimes I \right) \right]}{\text{Tr} \left[ \rho_B \left( \Pi_{1|X_0} \otimes \Pi_{1|Y_0} \otimes I \right) \right]} \\
&\leq 1.
\end{align*}
\]

(40)

Hence, Eq.(38) represents convex combination of \( \varrho_{C1,1|0,0}^{C} \) in terms of different normalized states.

When the FGI given by (24) is maximally violated by the state \( \rho_B \) given by Eq.(35), the condition given by Eq.(25) should be satisfied. In other words, \( \varrho_{C1,1|0,0}^{C} \) should be a pure state and eigenstate of \( \sigma_x \). Now, any pure state cannot be obtained by a convex sum of other different states. Hence, the FGI given by (24) is maximally violated by the state \( \rho_B \) (35) only if each of the states \( \varrho_{bs1,1|0,0}^{C} \) and \( \varrho_{fs1,1|0,0}^{C} \) is the eigenstate of \( \sigma_x \), i.e., the normalized conditional state prepared from each of the states \( \rho_{bs}^i \) and \( \rho_{fs}^j \) satisfies the condition (25).

Considering the other three terms appearing on the left-hand side of FGI (24), it can be shown that the state \( \rho_B \) (35) gives maximum quantum violation of FGI (24) only if each of the states \( \rho_{bs}^i \) and \( \rho_{fs}^j \) satisfies the conditions (25), (26), (27) and (28) simultaneously, i.e., each of the states \( \rho_{bs}^i \) and \( \rho_{fs}^j \) gives maximum quantum violation of FGI (24). However, we have already shown that no pure separable and no pure bi-separable three-qubit state can maximally violate FGI (24). Hence, no mixed bi-separable three-qubit state can maximally violate FGI (24).

Hence, when the shared state is a three-qubit state, then the maximum violation of the FGI (24) certifies that the state is genuinely entangled.

Next, we will present the following Lemma to complete our proof that the maximum quantum violation of tripartite steering inequality (24) certifies genuine entanglement of three-qubit states in 2SDI scenario.

**Lemma 2.** If the maximal violation (4) of FGI given by (24) is obtained in our 2SDI scenario from a tripartite state of dimension \( d_A \times d_B \times 2 \), then the state of the system can be expressed as a direct sum of copies of three-qubit genuinely entangled states.

**Proof.** Here we use a result [39] which states that given two Hermitian operators \( A_0 \) and \( A_1 \) with eigenvalues \( \pm 1 \) acting on a Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H} \), there is a decomposition of \( \mathcal{H} \) as a direct sum of subspaces \( \mathcal{H}_i \) of dimension \( d \leq 2 \) each, such that both \( A_0 \) and \( A_1 \) act within each \( \mathcal{H}_i \), that is, they can be written as \( A_0 = \oplus_i A_i^0 \) and \( A_1 = \oplus_i A_i^1 \), where \( A_i^0 \) and \( A_i^1 \) act on \( \mathcal{H}_i \).

In general, in our steering scenario any shared tripartite state lies in \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C) \) where the dimension of \( \mathcal{H}_A \) and \( \mathcal{H}_B \) (the untrusted sides) are \( d_A \) and \( d_B \) (where \( d_A \) and \( d_B \) are arbitrary) respectively, and the dimension of \( \mathcal{H}_C \) (the trusted side) is 2. From the above-mentioned result [39] it follows that \( \mathcal{H}_A \) can be expressed as a direct sum of subspaces \( \mathcal{H}_A^a \) of dimension \( d \leq 2 \) each. Similarly, \( \mathcal{H}_B \) can be expressed as a direct sum of subspaces \( \mathcal{H}_B^b \) of dimension \( d \leq 2 \) each, hence,

\[
\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C = (\oplus_a \mathcal{H}_A^a \otimes \mathcal{H}_B^b) \otimes \mathcal{H}_C \\
\simeq (\oplus_{a,b} \mathcal{H}_A^a \otimes \mathcal{H}_B^b \otimes \mathcal{H}_C).
\]

(41)

Let us consider that \( X_x = \Pi_{0|X} - \Pi_{1|X}, \) with \( x \in \{0,1\} \), where \( \Pi_{a|X} \) (\( a \in \{0,1\} \)) denotes the projector. Hence, one can write \( \Pi_{a|X} = \oplus_u \Pi_{a|X}^u \), where each \( \Pi_{a|X}^u \) acts on \( \mathcal{H}_A^a \) for all \( a \) and \( x \). We also denote \( \Pi^u = \Pi_{0|X}^u - \Pi_{1|X}^u \) the projector on \( \mathcal{H}_A^a \). Similarly, consider that \( Y_y = \Pi_{0|Y} - \Pi_{1|Y} \) with \( y \in \{0,1\} \). One can write \( \Pi_{0|Y} = \oplus_u \Pi_{0|Y}^u \), where each \( \Pi_{0|Y}^u \) acts on \( \mathcal{H}_B^b \) for all \( b \) and \( y \). We denote \( \Pi^u = \Pi_{0|Y}^u - \Pi_{1|Y}^u \) the projector on \( \mathcal{H}_B^b \). On the other hand, \( Z_z = \Pi_{0|Z} - \Pi_{1|Z} \), with \( z \in \{0,1\} \), where \( \Pi_{c|Z} \) (\( c \in \{0,1\} \)) denotes the projector acting on \( \mathcal{H}_C \) of dimension 2.
Hence, for any state $\rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C)$, we have,
\[
P(c_{Z_u}|a_X, b_{Y_v}) = \frac{P(a, b, c|x, y, z)}{P(a, b|x, y)} = \frac{\text{Tr} \left[ \rho (\Pi_{q_1x} \otimes \Pi_{b}y) \otimes \Pi_{c}Z_u \right]}{\text{Tr} \left[ \rho (\Pi_{q_1x} \otimes \Pi_{b}y) \right]} = \frac{\sum_{u,v} q_{uv} \text{Tr} \left[ \rho_{uv} (\Pi_{u}^{\text{out}} \otimes \Pi_{v}^{\text{in}}) \otimes \Pi_{c}Z_u \right]}{\sum_{u,v} q_{uv} \text{Tr} \left[ \rho_{uv} (\Pi_{u}^{\text{out}} \otimes \Pi_{v}^{\text{in}}) \right]} = \frac{\sum_{u,v} q_{uv} P_{uv}(a, b, c|x, y, z)}{\sum_{u,v} q_{uv} P_{uv}(a, b|x, y)}, \tag{42}
\]
where $q_{uv} = \text{Tr} \left[ \rho (\Pi_{u}^{\text{out}} \otimes \Pi_{v}^{\text{in}} \otimes \mathbb{I}) \right] ; \sum_{u,v} q_{uv} = 1$ and $\rho_{uv} = (\Pi_{u}^{\text{out}} \otimes \Pi_{v}^{\text{in}} \otimes \mathbb{I}) \rho (\Pi_{u}^{\text{out}} \otimes \Pi_{v}^{\text{in}} \otimes \mathbb{I}) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A^{u} \otimes \mathcal{H}_B^{u} \otimes \mathcal{H}_C)$ is, at most, a three-qubit state.

Now, $P(c_{Z_u}|a_X, b_{Y_v})$ will be equal to 1 if and only if
\[
\sum_{u,v} q_{uv} (P_{uv}(a, b|x, y) - P_{uv}(a, b, c|x, y, z)) = 0. \tag{43}
\]
Since for all $\rho_{uv}$, the conditional probability
\[
P_{uv}(c_{Z_u}|a_X, b_{Y_v}) = P_{uv}(a, b, c|x, y, z) / P_{uv}(a, b|x, y) \leq 1, \quad \text{we have} \quad P_{uv}(a, b|x, y) - P_{uv}(a, b, c|x, y, z) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } u, v. \quad \text{On the other hand}, \quad q_{uv} \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } u, v. \quad \text{Hence}, \quad \text{the above condition (43) is satisfied if and only if} \quad q_{uv} = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad P_{uv}(c_{Z_u}|a_X, b_{Y_v}) = 1 \quad \forall \ u, v. \tag{44}
\]
Next, let us define the following,
\[
CP_{uv} = P_{uv}(0|Z_u|X_u, 1_{Y_v}) + P_{uv}(0|Z_u|X_u, 1_{Y_v}) + P_{uv}(0|Z_u|X_u, 1_{Y_v}) + P_{uv}(0|Z_u|X_u, 1_{Y_v}). \tag{45}
\]
Now, from the above argument it can be concluded that the maximal violation (4) of FGI given by (24) is obtained if and only if $CP_{uv} = 4$ for all $u, v$ unless $q_{uv} = 0$. Now, from Lemma 1, it is observed that $CP_{uv} = 4$ certifies genuine entanglement when the shared state is a three-qubit state. Hence, if a state $\rho$ of dimension $d_A \times d_B \times 2$ leads to maximum quantum violation (4) of FGI given by (24), then it is given by,
\[
\rho = \sum_{u,v} q_{uv} \rho_{uv}^{GE}, \tag{46}
\]
where $\rho_{uv}^{GE}$ are genuinely entangled three-qubit states, $\sum_{u,v} q_{uv} = 1$, $q_{uv} \geq 0 \quad \forall \ u, v$. Note that when $q_{uv} = 0$, then according to condition (44) the corresponding $CP_{uv}$ may not be equal to 4. But such $q_{uv}$ does not contribute to $\rho$.

Therefore, we can state our result below:

**Result 1.** The maximal violation of FGI certifies genuine entanglement of three-qubit states in our 2SDI scenario.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In the present work we have demonstrated tripartite EPR steering of arbitrary three-qubit pure GGHZ states in the 2SDI scenario using a logical argument. In particular, we have shown that the existence of the LHS model for any three-qubit pure GGHZ state leads to the sharp contradiction: "2 = 1". This method rules out the possibility of the LHS model in the tripartite 2SDI scenario more uncompromisingly than the usual steering inequalities. This logical argument has been presented following the well-known GHZ theorem [20, 21] which has recently been generalized to the bipartite steering scenario. Our logical contradiction may be regarded as a generalization of the "steering paradox" [27] to more than two parties.

We have further derived a tripartite 2SDI steering inequality based on the fine-grained uncertainty relation [29]. This inequality serves as a generalization of the fine-grained bipartite steering inequality [28]. We have shown that the maximum quantum violation of our tripartite steering inequality certifies genuine entanglement of three-qubit states in the 2SDI scenario. Maximum violation of FGI is associated with genuine tripartite steering since it certifies the presence of genuine entanglement. It may be noted that genuine entanglement certification in the 2SDI scenario may have certain practical advantages over the fully device independent methods based on Bell nonlocality, as well as the methods based on entanglement witnesses.

Before concluding, it may worth highlighting some possible off-shoots of our present study. First, practical demonstration of this simple logical contradiction aimed towards showing tripartite steering by photon entanglement based experiments should not be difficult to implement. Note that the quantum violation of the bipartite steering inequality has been demonstrated experimentally using two-photon polarization-entangled states [40]. This opens up the possibility of experimental demonstration of quantum violation of our proposed steering inequality in the near future. Secondly, it would be interesting to explore whether the tripartite correlations certified by the maximal violation of our FGI can be used for self-testing [38]. For this purpose the robustness of our entanglement certification against experimental noise needs to be further investigated. Finally, our analysis brings into focus the question as to whether multipartite quantum steering for more than three parties having arbitrary local dimensions can be demonstrated using sharp logical contradiction.
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