

Generalized Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Steering Paradox

Zhi-Jie Liu,¹ Jie Zhou,² Xing-Yan Fan,¹ Mi Xie,³ and Jing-Ling Chen^{1,*}

¹*Theoretical Physics Division, Chern Institute of Mathematics and LPMC,
Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, People's Republic of China*

²*College of Physics and Materials Science, Tianjin Normal University, Tianjin 300382, People's Republic of China*

³*Department of Physics, School of Science, Tianjin University, Tianjin 300072, People's Republic of China*

(Dated: May 7, 2024)

Quantum paradoxes are essential means to reveal the incompatibility between quantum and classical theories, among which the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) steering paradox offers a sharper criterion for the contradiction between local-hidden-state model and quantum mechanics than the usual inequality-based method. In this work, we present a generalized EPR steering paradox, which predicts a contradictory equality “ $2_Q = (1 + \delta)_C$ ” ($0 \leq \delta < 1$) given by the quantum (Q) and classical (C) theories. For any N -qubit state in which the conditional state of the steered party is pure, we test the paradox through a two-setting steering protocol, and find that the state is steerable if some specific measurement requirements are satisfied. Moreover, our construction also enlightens the building of EPR steering inequality, which may contribute to some schemes for typical quantum teleportation and quantum key distributions.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of quantum nonlocality araised from the seminal paper of Einstein, Podolsky, and Rosen (EPR) [1], which questioned the completeness of quantum mechanical description for physical reality under the assumptions of locality and reality. As a peculiar nonlocality, EPR steering, also known as “the spooky action at a distance” [2, 3], was initially imported by Schrödinger in his reply to EPR’s paper [1]. After that, the notion of steering remained undiscussed for a long time, until Vujicic and Herbut extended Schrödinger’s results to the system of continuous variable [4]. Subsequently, Reid proved the possibility of the EPR paradox by performing orthogonal phase measurements on the two output beams of a non-simplex parametric amplifier, which led to an EPR-type argument [5]. In addition, Verstraete pointed out the connection of Schrödinger’s idea with quantum teleportation and entanglement transformation [6].

Mathematically, quantum nonlocality [7] is defined by the corresponding classical model. For example, entanglement [8] is defined by the separable state model [9, 10]; the classical model corresponding to Bell nonlocality [11] is the local-hidden-variable (LHV) model [12–14]. In order to depict EPR steering rigorously, Wiseman *et al.* proposed the local-hidden-state (LHS) model and thus gave an operational definition of steering using a task with two parties (say Alice and Bob) sharing a quantum state [15, 16]; the immediate effect of this nonlocality is that Alice can steer the particles of Bob, according to the measurement postulation of quantum mechanics. However, the LHS model assumes that the particles in Bob’s hand is specific, though Bob does not know it. Therefore, Alice’s ability to steer Bob’s state is an illusion that cannot be observed experimentally. If Alice convince Bob that the two particles in their hands are entangled and the LHS model cannot describe the particles in Bob’s

hand, then Alice is capable of (EPR) steering Bob. These works [15, 16] have stimulated interest in the research of EPR steering, for examples, how to

- (i). determine the steerability of a given state [17–24];
- (ii). characterize the border of quantum steering with the other two types of nonlocality [25, 26];
- (iii). apply steering to realistic quantum information tasks [27–32].

For the research type-(i) mentioned above, there are generally two effective methods to determine whether a quantum state is steerable. The first one is based on the EPR steering inequality, for instance, the linear EPR steering inequality [17], and the chained EPR steering inequalities [18, 19], which were constructed compared to the Bell chain inequality [33], optimizing the visibility of the Werner state [34]. The other is the approach without inequalities, also dubbed the all-versus-nothing (AVN) proof, which reveals the contradiction between classical theory and quantum mechanics more intuitively than the inequality approach. The AVN proof [35] was first built as an elegant argument for the nonexistence of the LHV model. Analogous to the AVN argument for Bell nonlocality without inequalities, Chen *et al.* presented the AVN proof of EPR steering for any two-qubit entangled state based on a two-setting steering protocol [20]. They then extracted the method for EPR steering paradox as the contradictory equality “ $2_Q = 1_C$ ” (“ 2_Q ” is the quantum prediction, and “ 1_C ” is the result of the LHS model) for any two-qubit pure state in the two-setting steering protocol [21]. Subsequently, the EPR steering paradox approach has been further investigated, e.g., “ $2_Q = 1_C$ ” for a particular four-qubit mixed state [23], “ $k_Q = 1_C$ ” for an arbitrary two-qubit pure state in the k -setting steering protocol [22], and “ $2_Q = 1_C$ ” for an arbitrary N -qubit entangled state [24].

In this work, we propose a general EPR steering paradox, expressed as “ $2_Q = (1 + \delta)_C$ ” ($0 \leq \delta < 1$), for an arbitrary N -qubit entangled state, both pure and mixed. Considering that the conditional states of the steered party (Bob) are all pure, we propose a theorem for any N -qubit quantum steerable states in the two-setting protocol. We analyze all possible four cases of Bob’s conditional states, corresponding to $\delta = 0$ and $0 < \delta < 1$ respectively. It is noteworthy to mention that we find all the steerable states when Bob’s conditional states are pure.

RESULTS

A theorem on the EPR steering paradox

In order to investigate the existence of steering trait for a quantum state, we propose the generalized EPR steering paradox; the contradiction between the LHS model and EPR steering is used to determine whether one side, Alice, can steer the other side, Bob. The main result is summarized into a theorem:

Theorem 1.—In the two-setting steering protocol $\{\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2\}$, Alice and Bob share an N -qubit state ρ_{AB} . Assume that Alice measures along $\hat{n}_1$ and $\hat{n}_2$, corresponding to the results a , and a' ; then Bob obtains the conditional states $\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2}$, respectively. Considering the scenario where both sets of Bob’s conditional states $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\}$ and $\{\tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2}\}$ are all pure, there will be a contradiction of “ $2_Q = (1 + \delta)_C$ ” (with $0 \leq \delta < 1$) if ρ_{AB} satisfies “the measurement requirement”, viz.,

- Bob obtains two sets of results $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\}$ and $\{\tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2}\}$ that are not exactly the same, i.e., $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\} \neq \{\tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2}\}$.

The complete proof of the theorem is given in the Methods section. Notice that the EPR steering paradox “ $2_Q = (1 + \delta)_C$ ” mentioned in the theorem can be categorized into $\delta = 0$ and $\delta \neq 0$, based on which some analysis and examples of the theorem are given below.

Some cases of the theorem

Case. 1—The sets of Bob’s conditional states $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\}$ and $\{\tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2}\}$ are all different.

Example 1.—We consider the example of an arbitrary two-qubit pure state presented by Chen *et al.* [21]. Alice prepares an arbitrary two-qubit pure state $\rho_{AB} = |\Psi(\theta)\rangle\langle\Psi(\theta)|$, where

$$|\Psi(\theta)\rangle = \cos\theta|0\rangle|0\rangle + \sin\theta|1\rangle|1\rangle, \quad (1)$$

with $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$; she keeps one of the particle in Eq. (1), and sent the other to Bob. In the two-setting steering protocol $\{\hat{z}, \hat{x}\}$, Alice performs four possible projective measurements

$$\begin{aligned} P_0^{\hat{z}} &= |0\rangle\langle 0|, \quad P_0^{\hat{x}} = |+\rangle\langle +|, \\ P_1^{\hat{z}} &= |1\rangle\langle 1|, \quad P_1^{\hat{x}} = |-\rangle\langle -|, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $|\pm\rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}(|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)$. After Alice’s measurements, the four unnormalized conditional states corresponding to Bob are

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_0^{\hat{z}} &= \cos^2\theta|0\rangle\langle 0|, \quad \tilde{\rho}_0^{\hat{x}} = \frac{1}{2}|\lambda_+\rangle\langle\lambda_+|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_1^{\hat{z}} &= \sin^2\theta|1\rangle\langle 1|, \quad \tilde{\rho}_1^{\hat{x}} = \frac{1}{2}|\lambda_-\rangle\langle\lambda_-|, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $|\lambda_{\pm}\rangle = \cos\theta|0\rangle \pm \sin\theta|1\rangle$. It is worth noting that Bob’s conditional states are all pure states and none of them are identical, which relate to the measurement requirement mentioned in Theorem 1.

The mathematical definition of the LHS model is given by Wiseman *et al.* [15]. If the LHS model can describe the state assemblage of Bob’s unnormalized conditional states, then Bob’s state can be described by

$$\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}} = \sum_{\xi} \wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \quad (4)$$

and

$$\sum_{\xi} \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi} = \rho_B. \quad (5)$$

Here $\wp_{\xi}$ and $\wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi)$ are probabilities satisfying $\sum_{\xi} \wp_{\xi} = 1$, and $\sum_a \wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 1$, for a fixed ξ , and $\rho_B = \text{tr}_A(\rho_{AB})$ is Bob’s reduced density matrix. Because Bob’s unnormalized conditional states in Eq. (3) are four different pure states, the state ensemble can be taken as $\{\wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}\} = \{\wp_1 \rho_1, \wp_2 \rho_2, \wp_3 \rho_3, \wp_4 \rho_4\}$. And it is a well-established tenet that a pure state cannot be obtained as a convex combination of other distinct states, which suggests

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\rho}_0^{\hat{z}} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_1^{\hat{z}} = \wp_2 \rho_2, \\ \tilde{\rho}_0^{\hat{x}} = \wp_3 \rho_3, \\ \tilde{\rho}_1^{\hat{x}} = \wp_4 \rho_4. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Here $\wp(0|\hat{z}, 1) = \wp(1|\hat{z}, 2) = \wp(0|\hat{x}, 3) = \wp(1|\hat{x}, 4) = 1$, and other $\wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 0$. Summing and taking the trace of Eq. (6) gives

$$\text{tr}(\tilde{\rho}^{\hat{z}} + \tilde{\rho}^{\hat{x}}) = 2\text{tr}(\rho_B) = 2_Q \quad (7)$$

on the left, and

$$\text{tr}(\wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp_4 \rho_4) = \text{tr}(\rho_B) = 1_C \quad (8)$$

on the right. Then the contradiction “ $2_Q = 1_C$ ” is obtained. In this case EPR steering paradox is formulated as “ $2_Q = 1_C$ ” with $\delta = 0$.

Case. 2—Bob has the same conditional states in the same set of measurements.

Example 2.—We consider the example of a four-qubit mixed entangled state presented by Liu *et al.* [23].

Alice prepares the state $\rho_{AB} = \cos^2 \theta |LC_4\rangle \langle LC_4| + \sin^2 \theta |LC'_4\rangle \langle LC'_4|$, where

$$\begin{aligned} |LC_4\rangle &= \frac{1}{2} (|0000\rangle + |1100\rangle + |0011\rangle - |1111\rangle), \\ |LC'_4\rangle &= \frac{1}{2} (|0100\rangle + |1000\rangle + |0111\rangle - |1011\rangle), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

are the linear cluster states [36]. She keeps the particles 1, 2 and sends the particles 3, 4 to Bob. In the two-setting steering protocol $\{\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2\}$ ($\hat{n}_1 \neq \hat{n}_2$),

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{n}_1 &= \sigma_z \sigma_z \equiv zz, \\ \hat{n}_2 &= \sigma_y \sigma_x \equiv yx. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

After Alice's measurements, Bob's unnormalized conditional states are

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \frac{1}{4} \cos^2 \theta (|00\rangle + |11\rangle) (\langle 00| + \langle 11|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \frac{1}{4} \sin^2 \theta (|00\rangle + |11\rangle) (\langle 00| + \langle 11|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \frac{1}{4} \sin^2 \theta (|00\rangle - |11\rangle) (\langle 00| - \langle 11|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \frac{1}{4} \cos^2 \theta (|00\rangle - |11\rangle) (\langle 00| - \langle 11|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \frac{1}{8} (|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) (\langle 00| - i\langle 11|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \frac{1}{8} (|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) (\langle 00| + i\langle 11|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \frac{1}{8} (|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) (\langle 00| + i\langle 11|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \frac{1}{8} (|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) (\langle 00| - i\langle 11|), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

which are not all the same, and satisfy the requirement in Theorem 1.

If Bob's states have a LHS description, they must satisfy Eqs. (4) and (5). Because the eight states in the set of Bob's conditional states (11) are pure states, and there are only four different states therein; it is sufficient to take ξ from 1 to 4. Similarly, a pure state cannot be obtained by the convex combination of other pure states, and thus one has

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \wp(00|\hat{n}_1, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1, \quad \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(00|\hat{n}_2, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \wp(01|\hat{n}_1, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1, \quad \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(01|\hat{n}_2, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \wp(10|\hat{n}_1, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2, \quad \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(10|\hat{n}_2, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \wp(11|\hat{n}_1, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2, \quad \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(11|\hat{n}_2, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Since in the set Eq. (11), $\tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} = \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_1}$, $\tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} = \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_1}$, $\tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} = \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_2}$, and $\tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} = \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_2}$, in the LHS description we describe the identical terms by the same hidden state. And $\sum_a \wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 1$, so we have $\wp(00|\hat{n}_1, 1) + \wp(01|\hat{n}_1, 1) = 1$, $\wp(10|\hat{n}_1, 2) + \wp(11|\hat{n}_1, 2) = 1$, $\wp(00|\hat{n}_2, 3) + \wp(11|\hat{n}_2, 3) = 1$, $\wp(01|\hat{n}_2, 4) + \wp(10|\hat{n}_2, 4) = 1$, and other $\wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 0$. After taking the sum of Eq. (12) and taking the trace subsequently, we get

" $2_Q = 1_C$ ". In the same way, we get the EPR steering paradox " $2_Q = 1_C$ " and $\delta = 0$.

Case. 3—Bob has the same conditional states in different sets of measurements.

Example 3.—We consider the example of a 3-qubit pure entangled state $\rho_{AB} = |\Psi'\rangle \langle \Psi'|$, where

$$|\Psi'\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \left[|001\rangle + |01\rangle (|0\rangle + |1\rangle) + |10\rangle (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) - |110\rangle \right]. \quad (13)$$

Alice prepares the state ρ_{AB} as in Eq. (13). She keeps the particles 1, 2 and sends the particle 3 to Bob. In the two-setting steering protocol $\{\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2\}$ ($\hat{n}_1 \neq \hat{n}_2$), with

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{n}_1 &= \sigma_z \sigma_z \equiv zz, \\ \hat{n}_2 &= \sigma_x \sigma_x \equiv xx, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

after Alice's measurements, Bob's unnormalized conditional states are

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \frac{1}{6} |1\rangle \langle 1|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \frac{1}{6} (|0\rangle + |1\rangle) (\langle 0| + \langle 1|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \frac{1}{6} (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) (\langle 0| - \langle 1|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \frac{1}{6} |0\rangle \langle 0|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \frac{1}{24} (|0\rangle + |1\rangle) (\langle 0| + \langle 1|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \frac{1}{24} (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) (\langle 0| - \langle 1|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \frac{1}{24} (|0\rangle + 3|1\rangle) (\langle 0| + 3\langle 1|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \frac{1}{24} (3|0\rangle - |1\rangle) (3\langle 0| - \langle 1|). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Notice that all of Bob's states are pure, while there are identical results in $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\}$ and $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_2}\}$, which implies that Bob's two sets of results are not identical, satisfying the requirement of Theorem 1.

Suppose Bob's states have a LHS description, and then they must satisfy Eqs. (4) and (5). Because the eight states of Eq. (15) are pure states, and there are only six different states in the measurement result Eq. (15), it is sufficient to take ξ from 1 to 6. Analogously, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \wp_1 \rho_1, \quad \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_2 \rho_2, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \wp_2 \rho_2, \quad \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_3 \rho_3, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \wp_3 \rho_3, \quad \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_5 \rho_5, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \wp_4 \rho_4, \quad \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_6 \rho_6. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Here we describe the identical terms by the same hidden states. $\wp(00|\hat{n}_1, 1) = \wp(01|\hat{n}_1, 2) = \wp(10|\hat{n}_1, 3) = \wp(11|\hat{n}_1, 4) = \wp(00|\hat{n}_2, 2) = \wp(01|\hat{n}_2, 3) = \wp(10|\hat{n}_2, 5) = \wp(11|\hat{n}_2, 6) = 1$, and other $\wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 0$. Summing Eq.

(16), the quantum result is $2\rho_B$, while the classical result is $\rho_B + \wp_2\rho_2 + \wp_3\rho_3$. Then taking the trace, we obtain “ $2_Q = (1 + \wp_2 + \wp_3)_C$ ”. And $\sum_{\xi=1}^6 \wp_\xi = 1$, $\wp_1, \wp_2, \wp_3, \wp_4, \wp_5$, together with $\wp_6$ are non-zero, thus $0 < \wp_2 + \wp_3 < 1$. In this case, we get the EPR steering paradox “ $2_Q = (1 + \delta)_C$ ” and $\delta = \wp_2 + \wp_3$, with $0 < \delta < 1$.

Case. 4—Bob has the same conditional states in the sets corresponding to both the same and different directions of Alice’s measurements.

Example 4.—We consider the W state [37] shared by Alice and Bob. Suppose Alice prepares the W state $\rho_{AB} = |W\rangle\langle W|$, where

$$|W\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} [|100\rangle + |010\rangle + |001\rangle].$$

She keeps the particles 1, 2, and sends the other to Bob. In the two-setting steering protocol $\{\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2\}$, where $\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2$ are shown in Eq. (14), after Alice’s measurements, Bob’s unnormalized conditional states are

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{zz} &= \frac{1}{3} |1\rangle\langle 1|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{zz} &= \frac{1}{3} |0\rangle\langle 0|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{zz} &= \frac{1}{3} |0\rangle\langle 0|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{zz} &= 0, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{xx} &= \frac{1}{12} (2|0\rangle + |1\rangle)(2\langle 0| + \langle 1|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{xx} &= \frac{1}{12} |1\rangle\langle 1|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{xx} &= \frac{1}{12} |1\rangle\langle 1|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{xx} &= \frac{1}{12} (2|0\rangle - |1\rangle)(2\langle 0| - \langle 1|), \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

namely, Bob obtains seven pure states. This satisfies the requirement in Theorem 1. Summing all the equations in Eq. (17) together, and then taking the trace, we get $\text{tr}(2\rho_B) = 2_Q$.

If Bob’s states have a LHS description, they satisfy Eqs. (4) and (5). In Eq. (17), there are four pure states, which means that it is sufficient to take ξ from 1 to 4. Because the conditional states obtained by Bob are all pure states, and a pure state can only be expanded by itself, and then one selects

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{zz} &= \wp_1\rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{zz} &= \wp(01|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 2)\wp_2\rho_2, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{zz} &= \wp(10|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 2)\wp_2\rho_2, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{zz} &= 0, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{xx} &= \wp_3\rho_3, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{xx} &= \wp(01|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 1)\wp_1\rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{xx} &= \wp(10|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 1)\wp_1\rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{xx} &= \wp_4\rho_4. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Perceive that in Eq. (17), $\tilde{\rho}_{00}^{zz} = \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{zz} = \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{zz}$, so we take the same hidden state $\wp_1\rho_1$ to describe $\tilde{\rho}_{00}^{zz}, \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{zz}$, and $\tilde{\rho}_{10}^{zz}$. Similarly, $\tilde{\rho}_{01}^{xx} = \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{xx}$, and we take $\wp_2\rho_2$ to describe them. Because $\sum_a \wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 1$, we have $\wp(00|zz, 1) = \wp(00|xx, 3) = \wp(11|xx, 4) = 1$,

$\wp(01|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 2) + \wp(10|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 2) = 1$, $\wp(01|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 1) + \wp(10|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 1) = 1$, and other $\wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 0$. We sum up Eq. (18) and take the trace, which leads the right-hand side to $(1 + \wp_1)_C$. Since $\tilde{\rho}_{00}^{zz}, \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{zz}, \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{zz}, \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{xx}, \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{xx}, \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{xx}$, and $\tilde{\rho}_{11}^{xx}$ are nonzero in Eq. (17), $\wp_1, \wp_2, \wp_3$, and $\wp_4$ are all nonzero, as well as $\sum_\xi \wp_\xi = 1$, which imply that $0 < \wp_1 < 1$. However, the result of the left-hand side is 2. Consequently, we obtain the paradox “ $2_Q = (1 + \wp_1)_C$ ”. In the case of W state, we get the contradiction “ $2_Q = (1 + \delta)_C$ ”, where $0 < \delta < 1$.

In Cases. 1 and 2, Bob’s two sets of results are completely different, with the contradiction “ $2_Q = 1_C$ ”, where $\delta = 0$, consistent with the results in [24]. Notwithstanding, in Cases. 3 and 4, Bob’s two sets of results are not exactly the same, with the contradiction “ $2_Q = (1 + \delta)_C$ ”, where $0 < \delta < 1$. Generalized proof of each case and detailed analysis of the examples are provided in the Supplementary Information (SI) (See Supplementary Information for detail analyses of the theorem.).

DISCUSSION

This work advances the study of the EPR steering paradox. In Theorem 1, we present the generalized EPR steering paradox “ $2_Q = (1 + \delta)_C$ ”, where $0 \leq \delta < 1$. The argument holds for any N -qubit entangled state, either pure or mixed. We show that some quantum states do not satisfy the previous EPR steering paradox “ $2_Q = 1_C$ ” [21], but the quantum results contradict the LHS model as well, expressed as “ $2_Q = (1 + \delta)_C$ ”. We find a universal EPR steering paradox and show that our result contains the previous EPR steering paradox “ $2_Q = 1_C$ ” as special cases [21, 23]. It is worth noting that we have found all the steerable states when Bob’s conditional states are pure.

Moreover, if one considers the k -setting EPR steering scenario, then a contradiction “ $k_Q = (1 + \delta_k)_C$ ”, where $0 \leq \delta_k < k - 1$, can be derived from a similar procedure. Of course, our conclusion applies to any N -qudit state naturally. Besides, as there exists a close connection between steering paradox and inequality [35], our conclusion also provides a new way to structure the N -qubit EPR steering inequality from the perspective of the generalized steering paradox. However, for any quantum state, if the result “ $2_Q = 2_C$ ” happens, i.e., there is no contradiction between the quantum result and the LHS model, in such a case one cannot judge whether the quantum state is steerable based on the paradox approach. Finally, if Bob’s conditional states are all mixed, is it possible to find a sufficient and necessary condition for steering? We shall investigate this problem subsequently.

METHODS

Proof of the theorem

We consider that Alice and Bob share an N -qubit en-

tangled state

$$\rho_{AB} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle \left\langle \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right|, \quad (19)$$

with

$$\left| \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle = \sum_i \left(s_i^{(\alpha)} |\phi_i\rangle \left| \eta_i^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle \right), \quad (20)$$

or

$$\left| \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle = \sum_j \left(t_j^{(\alpha)} |\varphi_j\rangle \left| \varepsilon_j^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle \right). \quad (21)$$

Eqs. (20) and (21) are the expressions of $|\psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)}\rangle$ under different representations $|\phi_i\rangle \otimes |\eta_i\rangle$ and $|\varphi_j\rangle \otimes |\varepsilon_j\rangle$, where $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, 2^M$. Alice keeps $M (M < N)$ particles, and Bob keeps $(N - M)$ particles.

In the two-setting steering protocol $\{\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2\}$, Alice performs 2^{M+1} projective measurements, and then Bob obtains the according unnormalized conditional states $\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell} = \text{tr}_A [(P_a^{\hat{n}_\ell} \otimes \mathbf{1}) \rho_{AB}]$, where $\hat{n}_\ell$ ($\ell = 1, 2$) is the measurement direction, a is the result of Alice, and $\mathbf{1}$ is a $2^{N-M} \times 2^{N-M}$ identity matrix. Set $P_{ai}^{\hat{n}_1} = |\phi_i\rangle \langle \phi_i|$ and $P_{aj'}^{\hat{n}_2} = |\varphi_j\rangle \langle \varphi_j|$. After Alice's measurement, Bob obtains

$$\tilde{\rho}_{a_i}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} |s_i^{(\alpha)}|^2 |\eta_i^{(\alpha)}\rangle \langle \eta_i^{(\alpha)}|, \quad (22)$$

or

$$\tilde{\rho}_{a'_j}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} |t_j^{(\alpha)}|^2 |\varepsilon_j^{(\alpha)}\rangle \langle \varepsilon_j^{(\alpha)}|. \quad (23)$$

If Bob's states have a LHS description, they satisfy Eqs. (4) and (5), which lead to 2^{M+1} equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1} &= \sum_{\xi} \wp(a|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \sum_{\xi} \wp(a'|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

The quantum value 2 can be attained through summing Eq. (22) and Eq. (23) and then taking the trace. However the maximum value of the LHS result is 2 if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_a \sum_{\xi} \wp(a|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi} &= \sum_{a'} \sum_{\xi} \wp(a'|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi} \\ &= \sum_{\xi} \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}. \end{aligned}$$

But the equation “ $2_Q = 2_C$ ” is not contradictory, and under this circumstance we cannot determine whether Alice can steer Bob, since there may exist other measurement strategies for Alice to steer Bob, or produce the contradiction “ $2_Q = (1 + \delta)_C$ ”, with $\delta \in [0, 1)$.

Considering that the conditional states of Bob are all pure, which implies that $|\eta_i\rangle$ and $|\varepsilon_j\rangle$ are independent of α , i.e.,

$$\left| \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle = \sum_i s_i^{(\alpha)} |\phi_i\rangle |\eta_i\rangle, \quad (25)$$

or

$$\left| \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle = \sum_j t_j^{(\alpha)} |\varphi_j\rangle |\varepsilon_j\rangle. \quad (26)$$

Then the conditional states of Bob are

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} |s_1^{(\alpha)}|^2 |\eta_1\rangle \langle \eta_1|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} |s_{2M}^{(\alpha)}|^2 |\eta_{2M}\rangle \langle \eta_{2M}|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} |t_1^{(\alpha)}|^2 |\varepsilon_1\rangle \langle \varepsilon_1|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} |t_{2M}^{(\alpha)}|^2 |\varepsilon_{2M}\rangle \langle \varepsilon_{2M}|. \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

Sufficiency—“ $2_Q = 2_C$ ” $\implies \{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\} = \{\tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2}\}$. To prove the proposition $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\} \neq \{\tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2}\} \implies “2_Q = (1 + \delta)_C”$, we simplify the process by demonstrating the accuracy of the contrapositive.

Since the density matrix of a pure state can only be expanded by itself, that is each $\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2}$ in Eq. (24) can only be described by a definite hidden state. Without loss of generality, suppose that Bob's conditional states are completely different in the set involving the same measurement direction $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\}$ or $\{\tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2}\}$. Further Eq. (24) can be written as

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_2}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_2 \rho_2, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_{2M} \rho_{2M}, \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp'_1 \rho'_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_2}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp'_2 \rho'_2, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp'_{2M} \rho'_{2M}. \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

Summing the Eq. (28), we have

$$\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1} + \tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{i=1}^{2^M} \wp_i \rho_i + \sum_{i=1}^{2^M} \wp'_i \rho'_i.$$

The equation “ $2_Q = 2_C$ ” requests

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2^M} \wp'_i \rho'_i = \sum_{i=1}^{2^M} \wp_i \rho_i = \sum_{\xi} \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}. \quad (29)$$

It means that $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\} = \{\tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2}\}$, i.e., the measurement requirement is not satisfied. Note that there is also no contradiction appearing if Bob has the same conditional state in the same direction measurement result $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\}$ or $\{\tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2}\}$. As a result, if the measurement requirement

is met, the paradoxical equality “ $2_Q = (1 + \delta)_C$ ”, with $\delta \in [0, 1)$, can be achieved.

Necessity— $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\} = \{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_2}\} \implies “2_Q = 2_C”$. Similarly, the proposition “ $2_Q = (1 + \delta)_C \implies \{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\} \neq \{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_2}\}$ ” can be proven by showing the accuracy of its contrapositive.

Suppose that there are 2^M distinct states in $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\}$ and that they are the same as the corresponding 2^M elements in $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_2}\}$. Bob’s conditional states are

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_1^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_1\rangle \langle \eta_1|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_{2^M}^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_{2^M}\rangle \langle \eta_{2^M}|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| t_1^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_1\rangle \langle \eta_1|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| t_{2^M}^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_{2^M}\rangle \langle \eta_{2^M}|. \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

There are only 2^M different pure states in the quantum result Eq. (30). It is sufficient to take ξ from 1 to 2^M in the LHS description, e.g.,

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a'|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}. \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

Since Bob’s states are all pure, each $\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell}$ in Eq. (31) contains only one term. Eq. (31) can be written as

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_{2^M} \rho_{2^M}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_{2^M} \rho_{2^M}. \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

Here we describe the same term with the same hidden state. And $\sum_a \wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 1$, so we have $\wp(a_1|\hat{n}_1, 1) = \dots = \wp(a_{2^M}|\hat{n}_1, 2^M) = \wp(a'_1|\hat{n}_2, 1) = \dots = \wp(a'_{2^M}|\hat{n}_2, 2^M) = 1$, and the others $\wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 0$. Then we take the sum of Eq. (32) and take the trace, and get “ $2_Q = 2_C$ ”. That means that there is no contradiction if $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\} = \{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_2}\}$, i.e., the measurement requirement is not satisfied, and we cannot conclude whether Alice can steer Bob. Consequently, if there is a contradiction “ $2_Q = (1 + \delta)_C$ ”, then the measurement condition must be satisfied.

In summary, we demonstrate that the measurement requirement is both a sufficient and necessary condition for the contradiction “ $2_Q = (1 + \delta)_C$ ”, on the premise that Bob’s conditional states are pure.

REFERENCES

- * chenjl@nankai.edu.cn
- [1] Einstein, A., Podolsky, B. & Rosen, N. Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete? *Phys. Rev.* **47**, 777 (1935).
 - [2] Schrödinger, E. Discussion of probability relations between separated systems. *Proc. Cambridge Philo. Soc.* **31**, 555 (1935).
 - [3] Schrödinger, E. Probability relations between separated Systems. *Proc. Cambridge Philo. Soc.* **32**, 446 (1936).
 - [4] Vujicic, M. & Herbut, F. Distant steering: Schrodinger’s version of quantum non-separability. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **21**, 2931 (1988).
 - [5] Reid, M. D. Demonstration of the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox using nondegenerate parametric amplification. *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 913 (1989).
 - [6] Verstraete, F. Quantum entanglement and quantum information. Ph.D. thesis, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (2002).
 - [7] Popescu, S., & Rohrlich, D. Quantum nonlocality as an axiom. *Found. Phys.* **24**, 397 (1994).
 - [8] Horodecki, R., Horodecki, P., Horodecki, M. & Horodecki, K. Quantum entanglement. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865 (2009).
 - [9] Doherty, A. C., Parrilo, P. A. & Spedalieri, F. M. Distinguishing separable and entangled states. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 187904 (2002).
 - [10] Li, N. & Luo, S. Classical states versus separable states. *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 024303 (2008).
 - [11] Brunner, N., Cavalcanti, D., Pironio, S., Scarani, V. & Wehner, S. Bell nonlocality. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **86**, 419 (2014).
 - [12] Fry, E. S. & Thompson, R. C. Experimental test of local hidden-variable theories. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **37**, 465 (1976).
 - [13] Augusiak, R., Demianowicz, M. & Acín, A. Local hidden-variable models for entangled quantum states. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **47**, 42 (2014).
 - [14] Barukčić, I. Local hidden variable theorem. *Causation* **1**, 11 (2006).
 - [15] Wiseman, H. M., Jones, S. J. & Doherty, A. C. Steering, entanglement, nonlocality, and the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 140402 (2007).
 - [16] Jones, S. J., Wiseman, H. M. & Doherty, A. C. Entanglement, Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen correlations, Bell nonlocality, and steering. *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 052116 (2007).
 - [17] Saunders, D. J., Jones, S. J., Wiseman, H. M. & Pryde, G. J. Experimental EPR-steering using Bell-local states. *Nat. Phys.* **6**, 845-849 (2010).
 - [18] Meng, H. X., Zhou, J., Jiang, S. H., Xu, Z. P., Ren, C. L., Su, H. Y. & Chen, J. L. Comparing Bell nonlocality and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering based on the chained inequalities. *Optics Communications* **425**, 101 (2018).
 - [19] Meng, H. X., Zhou, J., Ren, C. L., Su, H. Y. & Chen, J. L. Chained Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering inequalities with improved visibility. *Inter. J. Quant. Inform.* **16**, 1850034 (2018).
 - [20] Chen, J. L., Ye, X. J., Wu, C. F., Su, H. Y., Cabello, A., Kwek, L. C. & Oh, C. H. All-Versus-Nothing proof of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering. *Sci. Rep.* **3**, 2143 (2013).
 - [21] Chen, J. L., Su, H. Y., Xu, Z. P. & Pati, A. K. Sharp con-

- tradiction for local-hidden-state model in quantum steering. *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 32075 (2016).
- [22] Feng, T. F., Ren, C. L., Feng, Q., Luo, M. L., Qiang, X. G., Chen, J. L. & Zhou, X. Q. Steering paradox for Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen argument and its extended inequality. *Photonics Res.* **9**, 6 (2021).
 - [23] Liu, Z. H., Zhou, J., Meng, H. X., Yang, M., Li, Q., Meng, Y., Su, H. Y., Chen, J. L., Sun, K., Xu, J. S., Li, C. F. & Guo, G. C. Experimental test of the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger-type paradoxes in and beyond graph states. *npj Quantum Inf.* **7**, 66 (2021).
 - [24] Liu, Z. J., Zhou, J., Meng, H. X., Fan, X. Y., Xie, M., Zhang, F. L. & Chen, J. L. Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering paradox $2 = 1$ for N qubits. *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **39**, 2450030 (2024).
 - [25] Cavalcanti, D., Almeida, M. L., Scarani, V. & Acín, A. Quantum networks reveal quantum nonlocality. *Nat. Commun.* **2**, 184 (2011).
 - [26] Acín, A., Gisin, N. & Toner, B. Grothendieck's constant and local models for noisy entangled quantum states. *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 062105 (2006).
 - [27] Gehring, T., Händchen, V., Duhme, J., Furrer, F., Franz, T., Pacher, C., Werner, R. F. & Schnabel, R. Implementation of continuous-variable quantum key distribution with composable and one-sided-device-independent security against coherent attacks. *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 8795 (2015).
 - [28] Armstrong, S., Wang, M., Teh, R. Y., Gong, Q. H., He, Q. Y., Janousek, J., Bachor, H. A., Reid, M. D. & Lam, P. K. Multipartite Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering and genuine tripartite entanglement with optical networks. *Nat. Phys.* **11**, 167 (2015).
 - [29] He, Q. Y., Rosales-Zárate, L., Adesso, G. & Reid, M. D. Secure Continuous Variable Teleportation and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Steering. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 180502 (2015).
 - [30] Skrzypczyk, P. & Cavalcanti, D. Maximal Randomness Generation from Steering Inequality Violations Using Qudits. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 260401 (2018).
 - [31] Piani, M. & Watrous, J. Necessary and Sufficient Quantum Information Characterization of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Steering. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 060404 (2015).
 - [32] Yadin, B., Fadel, M. & Gessner, M. Metrological complementarity reveals the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 2410 (2021).
 - [33] Braunstein, S. L. & Caves, C. M. Wringing out better Bell inequalities. *Ann. Phys.* **202**, 22 (1990).
 - [34] Werner, R. F. Quantum states with Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen correlations admitting a hidden-variable model. *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 4277 (1989).
 - [35] Mermin, N. D. Extreme quantum entanglement in a superposition of macroscopically distinct states. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 1838 (1990).
 - [36] Scarani, V., Acín, A., Schenck, E. & Aspelmeyer, M. Nonlocality of cluster states of qubits. *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 042325 (2005).
 - [37] Dür, W., Vidal, G. & Cirac, J. I. Three qubits can be entangled in two inequivalent ways. *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 062314 (2000).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Z.J.L. thanks Wei-Min Shang and Hao-Nan Qiang for insightful discussion. J.L.C. is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants No. 12275136 and 12075001) and the 111 Project of B23045. Z.J.L. is supported by the Nankai Zhide Foundation.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

J.L.C. supervised the project. Z.J.L., J.Z., X.Y.F. and M.X. contributed to the theoretical analysis. All authors read the paper and discussed the results. Z.J.L., J.Z. and X.Y.F. contributed equally to this work.

DATA AVAILABILITY

All data that support the findings of this study are included within the article (and any supplementary files).

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare no competing interests.

Supplemental Information for “Generalized Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Steering Paradox”

Zhi-Jie Liu,¹ Jie Zhou,² Xing-Yan Fan,¹ Mi Xie,³ and Jing-Ling Chen¹

¹*Theoretical Physics Division, Chern Institute of Mathematics and LPMC,
Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, People’s Republic of China*

²*College of Physics and Materials Science, Tianjin Normal University, Tianjin 300382, People’s Republic of China*

³*Department of Physics, School of Science, Tianjin University, Tianjin 300072, People’s Republic of China*

(Dated: May 7, 2024)

CONTENTS

S1. Detail analyses of the theorem	1
A. The sets of Bob’s conditional states are all different	3
1. Example 1	3
B. There are identical states in the same set of measurements	5
1. Example 2	7
C. There are identical states in different sets of measurements	12
1. Example 3	14
D. The same states appear in both identical and distinct sets of measurements	19
1. Example 4	21
E. Bob’s two sets of results are identical	26
1. Example 5	27
S2. $k = 1 + \delta_k$ for N -qubit state	28
S3. $k = 1 + \delta_k$ for N -qudit state	32
References	35

S1. DETAIL ANALYSES OF THE THEOREM

We consider Alice and Bob share an N -qubit entangled state

$$\rho_{AB} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle \left\langle \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right|. \quad (\text{S1})$$

$\left| \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle$ can be written as

$$\left| \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle = \sum_i \left(s_i^{(\alpha)} \left| \phi_i \right\rangle \left| \eta_i^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle \right), \quad (\text{S2})$$

or

$$\left| \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle = \sum_j \left(t_j^{(\alpha)} \left| \varphi_j \right\rangle \left| \varepsilon_j^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle \right), \quad (\text{S3})$$

Eqs. (S2) and (S3) are representations of $\left| \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle$ under different representations of $\left| \phi_i \right\rangle \otimes \left| \eta_i \right\rangle$ and $\left| \varphi_j \right\rangle \otimes \left| \varepsilon_j \right\rangle$, where $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, 2^M$. Alice keeps M ($M < N$) particles, and Bob keeps $(N - M)$.

In the 2-setting steering protocol $\{\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2\}$, Alice performs 2^{M+1} projective measurements, then Bob obtains unnormalized conditional states $\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell} = \text{tr}_A [(P_a^{\hat{n}_\ell} \otimes \mathbb{1}) \rho_{AB}]$, where $\hat{n}_\ell$ ($\ell = 1, 2$) is the measurement direction, a is the

result of Alice, and $\mathbf{1}$ is a $2^{N-M} \times 2^{N-M}$ identity matrix. We consider Alice's measurements $P_{a_i}^{\hat{n}_1} = |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|$ and $P_{a'_j}^{\hat{n}_2} = |\varphi_j\rangle\langle\varphi_j|$. After Alice's measurement, Bob obtains

$$\tilde{\rho}_{a_i}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_i^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 \left| \eta_i^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle \left\langle \eta_i^{(\alpha)} \right|,$$

and

$$\tilde{\rho}_{a'_j}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| t_j^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 \left| \varepsilon_j^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle \left\langle \varepsilon_j^{(\alpha)} \right|.$$

The pure state requirement requests the conditional states of Bob are all pure states. It means that $|\eta_i\rangle$ and $|\varepsilon_j\rangle$ are independent of α . So the state function can be reexpressed as

$$\left| \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle = \sum_i \left(s_i^{(\alpha)} |\phi_i\rangle |\eta_i\rangle \right), \quad (\text{S4})$$

or

$$\left| \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle = \sum_j \left(t_j^{(\alpha)} |\varphi_j\rangle |\varepsilon_j\rangle \right), \quad (\text{S5})$$

and the conditional states of Bob can be rewritten as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_1^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_1\rangle \langle \eta_1|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_{2M}^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_{2M}\rangle \langle \eta_{2M}|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| t_1^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\varepsilon_1\rangle \langle \varepsilon_1|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| t_{2M}^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\varepsilon_{2M}\rangle \langle \varepsilon_{2M}|. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S6})$$

If Bob's states have a LHS discription, they satisfy

$$\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}} = \sum_{\xi} \wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \quad (\text{S7})$$

and

$$\sum_{\xi} \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi} = \rho_B. \quad (\text{S8})$$

Here $\wp_{\xi}$ and $\wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi)$ are probabilities satisfying

$$\sum_{\xi} \wp_{\xi} = 1, \quad (\text{S9})$$

and

$$\sum_a \wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 1, \quad (\text{S10})$$

for a fixed ξ , and $\rho_B = \text{tr}_A(\rho_{AB})$ is Bob's reduced density matrix. Then there are 2^{M+1} equations:

$$\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_{\ell}} = \sum_{\xi} \wp(a|\hat{n}_{\ell}, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}. \quad (\text{S11})$$

Since Bob's conditional states are all pure states, and the density matrix of a pure state cannot be obtained by superposition of other states, each $\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_{\ell}}$ can only be described by one hidden state $\wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}$.

A. The sets of Bob's conditional states are all different

Firstly, we consider Bob's 2^{M+1} conditional states are all different in the quantum result. So it is enough to take ξ from 1 to 2^{M+1} in the LHS discription. Then we have

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^{M+1}} \wp(a_1|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^{M+1}} \wp(a_{2^M}|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^{M+1}} \wp(a'_1|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^{M+1}} \wp(a'_{2^M}|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S12})$$

Each $\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell}$ in Eq. (S12) contains only one term since Bob's conditional states are all pure, and the density matrix of a pure state can only be expanded by itself. And they're all different from each other. Eq. (S12) can be written as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_{2^M} \rho_{2^M}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_{2^M+1} \rho_{2^M+1}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_{2^{M+1}} \rho_{2^{M+1}}. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S13})$$

Because $\sum_a \wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 1$, $\wp(a_1|\hat{n}_1, 1) = \wp(a_2|\hat{n}_1, 2) = \dots = \wp(a_{2^M}|\hat{n}_1, 2^M) = \wp(a'_1|\hat{n}_2, 2^M + 1) \dots = \wp(a'_{2^M}|\hat{n}_2, 2^{M+1}) = 1$ and all other $\wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 0$. Summing the Eq. (S13) and taking the trace, we get the paradox “ $2_Q = 1_C$ ”. “ 2_Q ” is the quantum result, and “ 1_C ” is the classical result. This also means that in this case we can obtain the EPR steering paradox “ $2_Q = 1_C$ ”, and at this point $\delta = 0$.

1. Example 1

We consider the example of an arbitrary 2-qubit pure state presented by Chen *et al.* (2016) [1]. For arbitrary 2-qubit pure state $\rho_{AB} = |\Psi(\theta)\rangle\langle\Psi(\theta)|$, where

$$|\Psi(\theta)\rangle = \cos\theta |0\rangle|0\rangle + \sin\theta |1\rangle|1\rangle, \quad (\text{S14})$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(\theta)\rangle &= \frac{\cos\theta}{\sqrt{2}} (|+\rangle + |-\rangle) |0\rangle + \frac{\sin\theta}{\sqrt{2}} (|+\rangle - |-\rangle) |1\rangle \\ &= \frac{|+\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} (\cos\theta |0\rangle + \sin\theta |1\rangle) + \frac{|-\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} (\cos\theta |0\rangle - \sin\theta |1\rangle), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S15})$$

with $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$. Eqs. (S14) and (S15) are representations of $|\Psi(\theta)\rangle$ under different representations. Alice prepares this 2-qubit pure state, one of which she keeps, and the other is sent to Bob. In the two-setting steering protocol $\{\hat{z}, \hat{x}\}$, Alice has four possible projective measurements

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} P_0^{\hat{z}} = |0\rangle\langle 0|, \\ P_1^{\hat{z}} = |1\rangle\langle 1|, \\ P_0^{\hat{x}} = |+\rangle\langle +|, \\ P_1^{\hat{x}} = |-\rangle\langle -|, \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S16})$$

where $|\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)$. After Alice's measurement, the four non-normalized conditional states corresponding to Bob are

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_0^{\hat{z}} = \cos^2 \theta |0\rangle\langle 0|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_1^{\hat{z}} = \sin^2 \theta |1\rangle\langle 1|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_0^{\hat{x}} = \frac{1}{2} |\lambda_+\rangle\langle \lambda_+|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_1^{\hat{x}} = \frac{1}{2} |\lambda_-\rangle\langle \lambda_-|, \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S17})$$

where $|\lambda_{\pm}\rangle = \cos \theta |0\rangle \pm \sin \theta |1\rangle$. This is the quantum result. And it is worth noting that Bob's conditional states are all pure states and that none of the four conditional states are identical. This satisfies the pure state requirement and the measurement requirement mentioned in the theorem.

If Bob's states have a LHS description, they must satisfy Eqs. (S7) and (S8). Then Bob's four unnormalized conditional states can be written as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_0^{\hat{z}} = \sum_{\xi} \wp(0|\hat{z}, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_1^{\hat{z}} = \sum_{\xi} \wp(1|\hat{z}, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_0^{\hat{x}} = \sum_{\xi} \wp(0|\hat{x}, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_1^{\hat{x}} = \sum_{\xi} \wp(1|\hat{x}, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S18})$$

Because the four states of Eq. (S17) are pure states, it is sufficient to take ξ from 1 to 4. Eq. (S18) can be write as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_0^{\hat{z}} = \wp(0|\hat{z}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(0|\hat{z}, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(0|\hat{z}, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(0|\hat{z}, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\ \tilde{\rho}_1^{\hat{z}} = \wp(1|\hat{z}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(1|\hat{z}, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(1|\hat{z}, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(1|\hat{z}, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\ \tilde{\rho}_0^{\hat{x}} = \wp(0|\hat{x}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(0|\hat{x}, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(0|\hat{x}, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(0|\hat{x}, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\ \tilde{\rho}_1^{\hat{x}} = \wp(1|\hat{x}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(1|\hat{x}, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(1|\hat{x}, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(1|\hat{x}, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S19})$$

And owing to the fact that a pure state cannot be obtained by convex combination of other pure states, one has

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_0^{\hat{z}} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_1^{\hat{z}} = \wp_2 \rho_2, \\ \tilde{\rho}_0^{\hat{x}} = \wp_3 \rho_3, \\ \tilde{\rho}_1^{\hat{x}} = \wp_4 \rho_4. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S20})$$

Here

$$\wp(0|\hat{z}, 1) = \wp(1|\hat{z}, 2) = \wp(0|\hat{x}, 3) = \wp(1|\hat{x}, 4) = 1,$$

and other $\wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 0$. Summing and taking the trace of Eq. (S20) gives $\text{tr}(\tilde{\rho}^{\hat{z}} + \tilde{\rho}^{\hat{x}}) = 2\text{tr}(\rho_B) = 2$ on the left and $\text{tr}(\wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp_4 \rho_4) = \text{tr}(\rho_B) = 1$ on the right. Then the contradiction “ $2_Q = 1_C$ ” is obtained. In this case EPR steering paradox is formulated as “ $2_Q = 1_C$ ” with $\delta = 0$.

B. There are identical states in the same set of measurements

Suppose two elements in $\{|\eta_i\rangle\}$ (or $\{|\varepsilon_j\rangle\}$) are identical, for example, $|\eta_m\rangle = |\eta_n\rangle$, (where $m \neq n$, $m, n = 1, 2, \dots, 2^M$), and the others are different. In this case, Bob’s conditional states are

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_1^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_1\rangle \langle \eta_1|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_m}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_m^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_m\rangle \langle \eta_m|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_n}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_n^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_m\rangle \langle \eta_m|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_{2^M}^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_{2^M}\rangle \langle \eta_{2^M}|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| t_1^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\varepsilon_1\rangle \langle \varepsilon_1|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| t_{2^M}^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\varepsilon_{2^M}\rangle \langle \varepsilon_{2^M}|. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S21})$$

In this case, there are $2^{M+1} - 1$ different pure states in the quantum result Eq. (S21). For the LHS description, it is sufficient to take ξ from 1 to $2^{M+1} - 1$, e.g.,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^{M+1}-1} \wp(a_1|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_m}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^{M+1}-1} \wp(a_m|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_n}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^{M+1}-1} \wp(a_n|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^{M+1}-1} \wp(a_{2M}|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^{M+1}-1} \wp(a'_1|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^{M+1}-1} \wp(a'_{2M}|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S22})$$

Similarly, because Bob's states are all pure, each $\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_i}$ in Eq. (S22) contains only one term. Eq. (S22) can be written as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_m}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(a_m|\hat{n}_1, m) \wp_m \rho_m, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_n}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(a_n|\hat{n}_1, m) \wp_m \rho_m, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_{2^M-1} \rho_{2^M-1}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_{2^M} \rho_{2^M}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_{2^{M+1}-1} \rho_{2^{M+1}-1}. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S23})$$

Since in quantum result we assume that $|\eta_m\rangle = |\eta_n\rangle$, in the LHS description we describe $\tilde{\rho}_{a_m}^{\hat{n}_1}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{a_n}^{\hat{n}_1}$ by the same hidden state $\wp_m \rho_m$. And $\sum_a \wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 1$, so we have $\wp(a_1|\hat{n}_1, 1) = \dots = \wp(a_{m-1}|\hat{n}_1, m-1) = \wp(a_{m+1}|\hat{n}_1, m+1) = \dots = \wp(a_{n-1}|\hat{n}_1, n-1) = \wp(a_{n+1}|\hat{n}_1, n) = \dots = \wp(a_{2M}|\hat{n}_1, 2^M - 1) = \wp(a'_1|\hat{n}_2, 2^M) \dots = \wp(a'_{2M}|\hat{n}_2, 2^{M+1} - 1) =$

1, $\wp(a_m|\hat{n}_1, m) + \wp(a_n|\hat{n}_1, m) = 1$, and the others $\wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 0$. Then we take the sum of Eq. (S23) and take the trace, and we get “ $2_Q = 1_C$ ”. In the same way, in this case we get the EPR steering paradox “ $2_Q = 1_C$ ” and at this moment $\delta = 0$.

1. Example 2

We consider the example of a 4-qubit mixed entangled state presented by Liu *et al.* (2021) [2]. Here $\rho_{AB} = \cos^2 \theta |LC_4\rangle \langle LC_4| + \sin^2 \theta |LC'_4\rangle \langle LC'_4|$, where

$$\begin{aligned} |LC_4\rangle &= \frac{1}{2} (|0000\rangle + |1100\rangle + |0011\rangle - |1111\rangle), \\ |LC'_4\rangle &= \frac{1}{2} (|0100\rangle + |1000\rangle + |0111\rangle - |1011\rangle), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S24})$$

are the linear cluster states. They can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} |LC_4\rangle &= \frac{1}{4} (|\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle) (|+\rangle + |-\rangle) |00\rangle - \frac{i}{4} (|\uparrow\rangle - |\downarrow\rangle) (|+\rangle - |-\rangle) |00\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} (|\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle) (|+\rangle + |-\rangle) |11\rangle + \frac{i}{4} (|\uparrow\rangle - |\downarrow\rangle) (|+\rangle - |-\rangle) |11\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{4} [|\uparrow+\rangle (|00\rangle - i|00\rangle + |11\rangle + i|11\rangle) + |\uparrow-\rangle (|00\rangle + i|00\rangle + |11\rangle - i|11\rangle) \\ &\quad + |\downarrow+\rangle (|00\rangle + i|00\rangle + |11\rangle - i|11\rangle) + |\downarrow-\rangle (|00\rangle - i|00\rangle + |11\rangle + i|11\rangle)] \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \{ (|\uparrow+\rangle + |\downarrow-\rangle) [(1-i)|00\rangle + (1+i)|11\rangle] + (|\uparrow-\rangle + |\downarrow+\rangle) [(1+i)|00\rangle + (1-i)|11\rangle] \} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \{ (|\uparrow+\rangle + |\downarrow-\rangle) (1-i) (|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) + (|\uparrow-\rangle + |\downarrow+\rangle) (1+i) (|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) \}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} |LC'_4\rangle &= \frac{1}{4} (|\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle) (|+\rangle - |-\rangle) |00\rangle - \frac{i}{4} (|\uparrow\rangle - |\downarrow\rangle) (|+\rangle + |-\rangle) |00\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} (|\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle) (|+\rangle - |-\rangle) |11\rangle + \frac{i}{4} (|\uparrow\rangle - |\downarrow\rangle) (|+\rangle + |-\rangle) |11\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{4} [|\uparrow+\rangle (|00\rangle - i|00\rangle + |11\rangle + i|11\rangle) + |\uparrow-\rangle (-|00\rangle - i|00\rangle - |11\rangle + i|11\rangle) \\ &\quad + |\downarrow+\rangle (|00\rangle + i|00\rangle + |11\rangle - i|11\rangle) + |\downarrow-\rangle (-|00\rangle + i|00\rangle - |11\rangle - i|11\rangle)] \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \{ (|\uparrow+\rangle - |\downarrow-\rangle) [(1-i)|00\rangle + (1+i)|11\rangle] + (-|\uparrow-\rangle + |\downarrow+\rangle) [(1+i)|00\rangle + (1-i)|11\rangle] \} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \{ (|\uparrow+\rangle - |\downarrow-\rangle) (1-i) (|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) + (-|\uparrow-\rangle + |\downarrow+\rangle) (1+i) (|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) \}, \end{aligned}$$

where $|\pm\rangle = (1/\sqrt{2})(|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)$, $|\uparrow\rangle = (1/\sqrt{2})(|0\rangle \pm i|1\rangle)$. Alice prepares the state ρ_{AB} . She keeps particles 1, 2, and sends particles 3, 4 to Bob. In the 2-setting steering protocol $\{\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2\}$ ($\hat{n}_1 \neq \hat{n}_2$), with

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{n}_1 &= \sigma_z \sigma_z \equiv zz, \\ \hat{n}_2 &= \sigma_y \sigma_x \equiv yx. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S25})$$

In the protocol, Bob asks Alice to carry out either one of two possible projective measurements on her qubits, i.e.,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} P_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} = |00\rangle \langle 00|, \\ P_{01}^{\hat{n}_1} = |01\rangle \langle 01|, \\ P_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} = |10\rangle \langle 10|, \\ P_{11}^{\hat{n}_1} = |11\rangle \langle 11|, \\ P_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} = |\uparrow +\rangle \langle \uparrow +|, \\ P_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} = |\uparrow -\rangle \langle \uparrow -|, \\ P_{10}^{\hat{n}_2} = |\downarrow +\rangle \langle \downarrow +|, \\ P_{11}^{\hat{n}_2} = |\downarrow -\rangle \langle \downarrow -|. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S26})$$

After Alice's measurement, Bob's unnormalized conditional states are

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} = \frac{1}{4} \cos^2 \theta (|00\rangle + |11\rangle) (\langle 00| + \langle 11|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_1} = \frac{1}{4} \sin^2 \theta (|00\rangle + |11\rangle) (\langle 00| + \langle 11|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} = \frac{1}{4} \sin^2 \theta (|00\rangle - |11\rangle) (\langle 00| - \langle 11|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_1} = \frac{1}{4} \cos^2 \theta (|00\rangle - |11\rangle) (\langle 00| - \langle 11|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} = \frac{1}{8} (|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) (\langle 00| - i\langle 11|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} = \frac{1}{8} (|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) (\langle 00| + i\langle 11|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_2} = \frac{1}{8} (|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) (\langle 00| + i\langle 11|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_2} = \frac{1}{8} (|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) (\langle 00| - i\langle 11|), \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S27})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\ &= \text{tr}_A \left[(|00\rangle \langle 00| \otimes \mathbb{1}) (\cos^2 \theta |LC_4\rangle \langle LC_4| + \sin^2 \theta |LC'_4\rangle \langle LC'_4|) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \text{tr}_A \left[(|00\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (\cos^2 \theta (|00\rangle + |11\rangle)) (\langle 0000| + \langle 1100| + \langle 0011| - \langle 1111|) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{4} (\langle 00|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|00\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (\cos^2 \theta (|00\rangle + |11\rangle)) [\langle 00|_A (\langle 00| + \langle 11|) + \langle 11|_A (\langle 00| - \langle 11|)] (|00\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \cos^2 \theta (|00\rangle + |11\rangle) (\langle 00| + \langle 11|), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{01}^{\hat{n}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[(|01\rangle\langle 01| \otimes \mathbb{1}) (\cos^2 \theta |LC_4\rangle\langle LC_4| + \sin^2 \theta |LC'_4\rangle\langle LC'_4|) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \text{tr}_A \left[|01\rangle_A (\sin^2 \theta (|00\rangle + |11\rangle)) (\langle 0100| + \langle 1000| + \langle 0111| - \langle 1011|) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{4} (\langle 01|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|01\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (\sin^2 \theta (|00\rangle + |11\rangle)) [\langle 01|_A (\langle 00| + \langle 11|) + \langle 10|_A (\langle 00| - \langle 11|)] (|01\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \sin^2 \theta (|00\rangle + |11\rangle) (\langle 00| + \langle 11|),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[(|10\rangle\langle 10| \otimes \mathbb{1}) (\cos^2 \theta |LC_4\rangle\langle LC_4| + \sin^2 \theta |LC'_4\rangle\langle LC'_4|) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \text{tr}_A \left[|10\rangle_A (\sin^2 \theta (|00\rangle - |11\rangle)) (\langle 0100| + \langle 1000| + \langle 0111| - \langle 1011|) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{4} (\langle 10|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|10\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (\sin^2 \theta (|00\rangle - |11\rangle)) [\langle 01|_A (\langle 00| + \langle 11|) + \langle 10|_A (\langle 00| - \langle 11|)] (|10\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \sin^2 \theta (|00\rangle - |11\rangle) (\langle 00| - \langle 11|),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{11}^{\hat{n}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[(|11\rangle\langle 11| \otimes \mathbb{1}) (\cos^2 \theta |LC_4\rangle\langle LC_4| + \sin^2 \theta |LC'_4\rangle\langle LC'_4|) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \text{tr}_A \left[|11\rangle_A (\cos^2 \theta (|00\rangle - |11\rangle)) (\langle 0000| + \langle 1100| + \langle 0011| - \langle 1111|) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{4} (\langle 11|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|11\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (\cos^2 \theta (|00\rangle - |11\rangle)) [\langle 00|_A (\langle 00| + \langle 11|) + \langle 11|_A (\langle 00| - \langle 11|)] (|11\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \cos^2 \theta (|00\rangle - |11\rangle) (\langle 00| - \langle 11|),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} \otimes \mathbb{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[(|\uparrow+\rangle\langle \uparrow+| \otimes \mathbb{1}) (\cos^2 \theta |LC_4\rangle\langle LC_4| + \sin^2 \theta |LC'_4\rangle\langle LC'_4|) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \text{tr}_A \left\{ (|\uparrow+\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) [\cos^2 \theta (1-i)(|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) \langle LC_4| + \sin^2 \theta (1-i)(|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) \langle LC'_4|] \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{4} (\langle \uparrow+|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|\uparrow+\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) [\cos^2 \theta (1-i)(|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) \langle LC_4| + \sin^2 \theta (1-i)(|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) \langle LC'_4|] (|\uparrow+\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{16} (\langle \uparrow+|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|\uparrow+\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \cos^2 \theta (1-i)(|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) [(\langle \uparrow+| + \langle \downarrow-|)(1+i)(\langle 00| - i\langle 11|) \\
&\quad + (\langle \uparrow-| + \langle \downarrow+|)(1-i)(\langle 00| + i\langle 11|)] (|\uparrow+\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&\quad + (\langle \uparrow+|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|\uparrow+\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \sin^2 \theta (1-i)(|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) [(\langle \uparrow+| - \langle \downarrow-|)(1+i)(\langle 00| - i\langle 11|) \\
&\quad + (-\langle \uparrow-| + \langle \downarrow+|)(1-i)(\langle 00| + i\langle 11|)] (|\uparrow+\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{16} (1-i)(|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) \langle \uparrow+|_A \{|\uparrow+\rangle (1+i)(\langle 00| - i\langle 11|)\} \\
&= \frac{1}{16} (1-i)(|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) (1+i)(\langle 00| - i\langle 11|) \\
&= \frac{1}{8} (|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) (\langle 00| - i\langle 11|),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} \otimes \mathbb{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[(|\uparrow - \rangle \langle \uparrow -| \otimes \mathbb{1}) (\cos^2 \theta |LC_4\rangle \langle LC_4| + \sin^2 \theta |LC'_4\rangle \langle LC'_4|) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \text{tr}_A \left\{ (|\uparrow - \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) [\cos^2 \theta (1+i)(|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) \langle LC_4| - \sin^2 \theta (1+i)(|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) \langle LC'_4|] \right\}, \\
&= \frac{1}{4} (\langle \uparrow - |_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|\uparrow - \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) [\cos^2 \theta (1+i)(|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) \langle LC_4| - \sin^2 \theta (1+i)(|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) \langle LC'_4|] (|\uparrow - \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}), \\
&= \frac{1}{16} (\langle \uparrow - |_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|\uparrow - \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \cos^2 \theta (1+i)(|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) [(\langle \uparrow + | + \langle \downarrow - |)(1+i)(\langle 00| - i\langle 11|) \\
&\quad + (\langle \uparrow - | + \langle \downarrow + |)(1-i)(\langle 00| + i\langle 11|)] (|\uparrow - \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&\quad - (\langle \uparrow - |_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|\uparrow - \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \sin^2 \theta (1+i)(|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) [(\langle \uparrow + | - \langle \downarrow - |)(1+i)(\langle 00| - i\langle 11|) \\
&\quad + (-\langle \uparrow - | + \langle \downarrow + |)(1-i)(\langle 00| + i\langle 11|)] (|\uparrow - \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}), \\
&= \frac{1}{16} \cos^2 \theta (1+i)(|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) (1-i)(\langle 00| + i\langle 11|) + \sin^2 \theta (1+i)(|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) (1-i)(\langle 00| + i\langle 11|), \\
&= \frac{1}{16} (1+i)(1-i)(|00\rangle - i|11\rangle)(\langle 00| + i\langle 11|), \\
&= \frac{1}{8} (|00\rangle - i|11\rangle)(\langle 00| + i\langle 11|),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{10}^{\hat{n}_2} \otimes \mathbb{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right], \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[(|\downarrow + \rangle \langle \downarrow +| \otimes \mathbb{1}) (\cos^2 \theta |LC_4\rangle \langle LC_4| + \sin^2 \theta |LC'_4\rangle \langle LC'_4|) \right], \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \text{tr}_A \left\{ (|\downarrow + \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) [\cos^2 \theta (1+i)(|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) \langle LC_4| + \sin^2 \theta (1+i)(|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) \langle LC'_4|] \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{4} (\langle \downarrow + |_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|\downarrow + \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) [\cos^2 \theta (1+i)(|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) \langle LC_4| + \sin^2 \theta (1+i)(|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) \langle LC'_4|] (|\downarrow + \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}), \\
&= \frac{1}{16} (\langle \downarrow + |_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|\downarrow + \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \cos^2 \theta (1+i)(|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) [(\langle \uparrow + | + \langle \downarrow - |)(1+i)(\langle 00| - i\langle 11|) \\
&\quad + (\langle \uparrow - | + \langle \downarrow + |)(1-i)(\langle 00| + i\langle 11|)] (|\downarrow + \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&\quad + (\langle \downarrow + |_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|\downarrow + \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \sin^2 \theta (1+i)(|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) [(\langle \uparrow + | - \langle \downarrow - |)(1+i)(\langle 00| - i\langle 11|) \\
&\quad + (-\langle \uparrow - | + \langle \downarrow + |)(1-i)(\langle 00| + i\langle 11|)] (|\downarrow + \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}), \\
&= \frac{1}{16} \cos^2 \theta (1+i)(|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) (1-i)(\langle 00| + i\langle 11|) + \sin^2 \theta (1+i)(|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) (1-i)(\langle 00| + i\langle 11|), \\
&= \frac{1}{16} (1+i)(|00\rangle - i|11\rangle) (1-i)(\langle 00| + i\langle 11|), \\
&= \frac{1}{8} (|00\rangle - i|11\rangle)(\langle 00| + i\langle 11|),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{11}^{\hat{n}_2} \otimes \mathbb{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right], \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[(|\downarrow - \rangle \langle \downarrow -| \otimes \mathbb{1}) (\cos^2 \theta |LC_4\rangle \langle LC_4| + \sin^2 \theta |LC'_4\rangle \langle LC'_4|) \right], \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \text{tr}_A \left\{ (|\downarrow - \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) [\cos^2 \theta (1-i)(|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) \langle LC_4| - \sin^2 \theta (1-i)(|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) \langle LC'_4|] \right\}, \\
&= \frac{1}{4} (\langle \downarrow - |_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|\downarrow - \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) [\cos^2 \theta (1-i)(|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) \langle LC_4| - \sin^2 \theta (1-i)(|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) \langle LC'_4|] (|\downarrow - \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{16} (\langle \downarrow - |_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|\downarrow - \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \cos^2 \theta (1-i)(|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) [(\langle \uparrow + | + \langle \downarrow - |)(1+i)(\langle 00| - i\langle 11|) \\
&\quad + (\langle \uparrow - | + \langle \downarrow + |)(1-i)(\langle 00| + i\langle 11|)] (|\downarrow - \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&\quad - (\langle \downarrow - |_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|\downarrow - \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \sin^2 \theta (1-i)(|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) [(\langle \uparrow + | - \langle \downarrow - |)(1+i)(\langle 00| - i\langle 11|) \\
&\quad + (-\langle \uparrow - | + \langle \downarrow + |)(1-i)(\langle 00| + i\langle 11|)] (|\downarrow - \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{16} \cos^2 \theta (1-i)(|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) (1+i)(\langle 00| - i\langle 11|) + \sin^2 \theta (1-i)(|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) (1+i)(\langle 00| - i\langle 11|) \\
&= \frac{1}{16} (1-i)(|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) (1+i)(\langle 00| - i\langle 11|) \\
&= \frac{1}{8} (|00\rangle + i|11\rangle) (\langle 00| - i\langle 11|).
\end{aligned}$$

In the quantum result, Bob's states are all pure. Although there are identical results in the same set of measurements, Bob's two sets of results are completely different, which satisfies the requirements in the theorem.

If Bob's states have a LHS description, they must satisfy Eqs. (S7) and (S8). Because there are only 4 different states in the quantum result, it is sufficient to take ξ from 1 to 4, one has

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(00|\hat{n}_1, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(00|\hat{n}_1, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(00|\hat{n}_1, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(00|\hat{n}_1, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\
\tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(01|\hat{n}_1, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(01|\hat{n}_1, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(01|\hat{n}_1, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(01|\hat{n}_1, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\
\tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(10|\hat{n}_1, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(10|\hat{n}_1, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(10|\hat{n}_1, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(10|\hat{n}_1, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\
\tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(11|\hat{n}_1, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(11|\hat{n}_1, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(11|\hat{n}_1, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(11|\hat{n}_1, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\
\tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(00|\hat{n}_2, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(00|\hat{n}_2, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(00|\hat{n}_2, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(00|\hat{n}_2, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\
\tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(01|\hat{n}_2, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(01|\hat{n}_2, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(01|\hat{n}_2, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(01|\hat{n}_2, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\
\tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(10|\hat{n}_2, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(10|\hat{n}_2, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(10|\hat{n}_2, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(10|\hat{n}_2, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\
\tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(11|\hat{n}_2, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(11|\hat{n}_2, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(11|\hat{n}_2, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(11|\hat{n}_2, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4.
\end{array} \right.$$

Since the eight states of Eq. (S27) are pure states, and a pure state cannot be obtained by convex combination of

other pure states, one has

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(00|\hat{n}_1, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(01|\hat{n}_1, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(10|\hat{n}_1, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(11|\hat{n}_1, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(00|\hat{n}_2, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(01|\hat{n}_2, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(10|\hat{n}_2, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(11|\hat{n}_2, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S28})$$

Since in quantum result $\tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} = \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_1}$, $\tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} = \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_1}$, $\tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} = \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_2}$, and $\tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} = \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_2}$, in the LHS description we describe the identical terms by the same hidden state. And $\sum_a \wp(a|\hat{n}_1, \xi) = 1$ and $\sum_a \wp(a|\hat{n}_2, \xi) = 1$, so we have $\wp(00|\hat{n}_1, 1) + \wp(01|\hat{n}_1, 1) = 1$, $\wp(10|\hat{n}_1, 2) + \wp(11|\hat{n}_1, 2) = 1$, $\wp(00|\hat{n}_2, 3) + \wp(11|\hat{n}_2, 3) = 1$, and $\wp(01|\hat{n}_2, 4) + \wp(10|\hat{n}_2, 4) = 1$. Then we take the sum of Eq. (S28) and take the trace, and we get “ $2_Q = 1_C$ ”. In the same way, in this case we get the EPR steering paradox “ $2_Q = 1_C$ ” and at this moment $\delta = 0$.

C. There are identical states in different sets of measurements

Suppose that none of the elements in $\{|\eta_i\rangle\}$ are the same, and that none of the elements in $\{|\varepsilon_j\rangle\}$ are the same, but that an element $|\eta_m\rangle$ in $\{|\eta_i\rangle\}$ is the same as an element $|\varepsilon_n\rangle$ in $\{|\varepsilon_j\rangle\}$, i.e., $|\eta_m\rangle = |\varepsilon_n\rangle$, where $m, n = 1, 2, \dots, 2^M$. In this case, Bob's conditional states are

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_1^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_1\rangle \langle \eta_1|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_m}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_m^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_m\rangle \langle \eta_m|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_{2^M}^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_{2^M}\rangle \langle \eta_{2^M}|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| t_1^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\varepsilon_1\rangle \langle \varepsilon_1|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_n}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| t_n^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_m\rangle \langle \eta_m|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| t_{2^M}^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\varepsilon_{2^M}\rangle \langle \varepsilon_{2^M}|. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S29})$$

there are $2^{M+1} - 1$ different pure states in the quantum result Eq. (S29). We can take ξ from 1 to $2^{M+1} - 1$ in the LHS description, e.g.,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^{M+1}-1} \wp(a_1|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_m}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^{M+1}-1} \wp(a_m|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^{M+1}-1} \wp(a_{2^M}|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^{M+1}-1} \wp(a'_1|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_n}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^{M+1}-1} \wp(a'_n|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^{M+1}-1} \wp(a'_{2^M}|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S30})$$

Each $\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell}$ in Eq. (S30) contains only one term because Bob's states are all pure. Hence, Eq. (S30) can be expressed as:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_m}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(a_m|\hat{n}_1, m) \wp_m \rho_m, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_{2^M-1} \rho_{2^M-1}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_{2^M} \rho_{2^M}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_n}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(a'_n|\hat{n}_2, n) \wp_n \rho_n, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_{2^{M+1}-1} \rho_{2^{M+1}-1}. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S31})$$

Since we assume that $|\eta_m\rangle = |\varepsilon_n\rangle$, we describe $\tilde{\rho}_{a_m}^{\hat{n}_1}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{a'_n}^{\hat{n}_2}$ by the same hidden state $\wp_m \rho_m$. And $\sum_a \wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 1$, so we have $\wp(a_1|\hat{n}_1, 1) = \dots = \wp(a_{m-1}|\hat{n}_1, m-1) = \wp(a_{m+1}|\hat{n}_1, m+1) = \dots = \wp(a_{2^M}|\hat{n}_1, 2^M-1) = \wp(a'_1|\hat{n}_2, 2^M) \dots = \wp(a'_{n-1}|\hat{n}_2, n-1) = \wp(a'_{n+1}|\hat{n}_2, n) = \dots = \wp(a'_{2^M}|\hat{n}_2, 2^{M+1}-1) = 1$, and the others

$\wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 0$, with the peculiarity that in this case $\wp(a_m|\hat{n}_1, m) = \wp(a'_m|\hat{n}_2, m) = 1$, e.g., Eq. (S30) should be written as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_m}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_m \rho_m, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_{2M-1} \rho_{2M-1}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_{2M} \rho_{2M}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_n}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_m \rho_m, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_{2M+1-1} \rho_{2M+1-1}. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S32})$$

We take the sum of Eq. (S32), the quantum result on the left gives $\tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} + \tilde{\rho}_{a_2}^{\hat{n}_1} + \dots + \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2M}}^{\hat{n}_1} + \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2} + \tilde{\rho}_{a'_2}^{\hat{n}_2} + \dots + \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = 2\rho_B$, and the classical result on the right gives $\wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp_2 \rho_2 + \dots + \wp_m \rho_m + \dots + \wp_m \rho_m + \dots + \wp_{2M+1-1} \rho_{2M+1-1} = \rho_B + \wp_m \rho_m$, since $\sum_{\xi=1}^{2M} \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi} = \rho_B$. We then take the trace to get the result “ $2_Q = (1 + \wp_m)_C$ ”. Since $\sum_{\xi} \wp_{\xi} = 1$, and $\wp_1, \dots, \wp_{m-1}, \wp_{m+1}, \dots, \wp_{2M+1-1} \neq 0, 0 < \wp_m < 1$. In this case, we get the EPR steering paradox “ $2_Q = (1 + \delta)_C$ ” and $\delta = \wp_m$, with $0 < \delta < 1$.

1. Example 3

We consider the example of a 3-qubit pure entangled state $\rho_{AB} = |\Psi'\rangle \langle \Psi'|$, where

$$|\Psi'\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} [|001\rangle + |01\rangle (|0\rangle + |1\rangle) + |10\rangle (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) - |110\rangle], \quad (\text{S33})$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi'\rangle &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}} (|++\rangle + |+-\rangle + |-+\rangle + |--\rangle) |1\rangle \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}} (|++\rangle - |+-\rangle + |-+\rangle - |--\rangle) (|0\rangle + |1\rangle) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}} (|++\rangle + |+-\rangle - |-+\rangle - |--\rangle) (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) \\ &- \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}} (|++\rangle - |+-\rangle - |-+\rangle + |--\rangle) |0\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}} [|++\rangle (|0\rangle + |1\rangle) + |+-\rangle (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) + |-+\rangle (|0\rangle + 3|1\rangle) - |--\rangle (3|0\rangle - |1\rangle)]. \end{aligned}$$

Alice prepares the state ρ_{AB} as in Eq. (S33). She keeps particles 1, 2, and sends particle 3 to Bob. In the 2-setting steering protocol $\{\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2\}$ ($\hat{n}_1 \neq \hat{n}_2$), with

$$\hat{n}_1 = \sigma_z \sigma_z \equiv zz, \quad (\text{S34})$$

$$\hat{n}_2 = \sigma_x \sigma_x \equiv xx,$$

i.e.,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} P_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} = |00\rangle \langle 00|, \\ P_{01}^{\hat{n}_1} = |01\rangle \langle 01|, \\ P_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} = |10\rangle \langle 10|, \\ P_{11}^{\hat{n}_1} = |11\rangle \langle 11|, \\ P_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} = |++\rangle \langle ++|, \\ P_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} = |+-\rangle \langle +-|, \\ P_{10}^{\hat{n}_2} = |-+\rangle \langle -+|, \\ P_{11}^{\hat{n}_2} = |--\rangle \langle --|, \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S35})$$

After Alice's measurement, Bob's unnormalized conditional states are

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} = \frac{1}{6} |1\rangle \langle 1|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_1} = \frac{1}{6} (|0\rangle + |1\rangle) (\langle 0| + \langle 1|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} = \frac{1}{6} (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) (\langle 0| - \langle 1|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_1} = \frac{1}{6} |0\rangle \langle 0|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} = \frac{1}{24} (|0\rangle + |1\rangle) (\langle 0| + \langle 1|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} = \frac{1}{24} (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) (\langle 0| - \langle 1|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_2} = \frac{1}{24} (|0\rangle + 3|1\rangle) (\langle 0| + 3\langle 1|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_2} = \frac{1}{24} (3|0\rangle - |1\rangle) (3\langle 0| - \langle 1|), \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S36})$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} \otimes \mathbf{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\ &= \text{tr}_A \left[(|00\rangle \langle 00| \otimes \mathbf{1}) |\Psi'\rangle \langle \Psi'| \right] \\ &= \text{tr}_A \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (|00\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) |1\rangle \langle \Psi'| \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \langle 00|_A \otimes \mathbf{1} (|00\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) |1\rangle \langle \Psi'| (|00\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{6} \langle 00|_A \otimes \mathbf{1} (|00\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) |1\rangle [\langle 00| \langle 1| + \langle 01| (\langle 0| + \langle 1|) + \langle 10| (\langle 0| - \langle 1|) - \langle 11| \langle 0|] (|00\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{6} |1\rangle \langle 1|, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{01}^{\hat{n}_1} \otimes \mathbf{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[(|01\rangle \langle 01| \otimes \mathbf{1}) |\Psi'\rangle \langle \Psi'| \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (|01\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) (|0\rangle + |1\rangle) \langle \Psi'| \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (\langle 01|_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) (|01\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) (|0\rangle + |1\rangle) \langle \Psi'| (|01\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{6} (\langle 01|_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) (|01\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) (|0\rangle + |1\rangle) [\langle 00| \langle 1| + \langle 01| (\langle 0| + \langle 1|) \\
&\quad + \langle 10| (\langle 0| - \langle 1|) - \langle 11| \langle 0|] (|01\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{6} (|0\rangle + |1\rangle) (\langle 0| + \langle 1|),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} \otimes \mathbf{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[(|10\rangle \langle 10| \otimes \mathbf{1}) |\Psi'\rangle \langle \Psi'| \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (|10\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) \langle \Psi'| \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (\langle 10|_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) (|10\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) (\langle \Psi'| |10\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{6} (\langle 10|_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) (|10\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) [\langle 00| \langle 1| + \langle 01| (\langle 0| + \langle 1|) \\
&\quad + \langle 10| (\langle 0| - \langle 1|) - \langle 11| \langle 0|] (|10\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{6} (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) (\langle 0| - \langle 1|),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{11}^{\hat{n}_1} \otimes \mathbf{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[(|11\rangle \langle 11| \otimes \mathbf{1}) |\Psi'\rangle \langle \Psi'| \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[-\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (|11\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) |0\rangle \langle \Psi'| \right] \\
&= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (\langle 11|_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) (|11\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) |0\rangle \langle \Psi'| (|11\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) \\
&= -\frac{1}{6} (\langle 11|_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) (|11\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) |0\rangle [\langle 00| \langle 1| + \langle 01| (\langle 0| + \langle 1|) + \langle 10| (\langle 0| - \langle 1|) - \langle 11| \langle 0|] (|11\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{6} |0\rangle \langle 0|,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} \otimes \mathbf{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[(|++\rangle \langle ++| \otimes \mathbf{1}) |\Psi'\rangle \langle \Psi'| \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[\frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}} (|++\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) (|0\rangle + |1\rangle) \langle \Psi'| \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}} (\langle ++|_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) (|++\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) (|0\rangle + |1\rangle) \langle \Psi'| (|++\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{24} (\langle ++|_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) (|++\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) (|0\rangle + |1\rangle) [\langle ++| (\langle 0| + \langle 1|) + \langle +-| (\langle 0| - \langle 1|) \\
&\quad + \langle -+| (\langle 0| + 3 \langle 1|) - \langle --| (3 \langle 0| - \langle 1|)] (|++\rangle_A \otimes \mathbf{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{24} (|0\rangle + |1\rangle) (\langle 0| + \langle 1|),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} \otimes \mathbb{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[(|+-\rangle \langle +-| \otimes \mathbb{1}) |\Psi'\rangle \langle \Psi'| \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[\frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}} (|+-\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) \langle \Psi'| \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}} (\langle +-|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|+-\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) \langle \Psi'| (|+-\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{24} (\langle +-|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|+-\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) [\langle ++| (\langle 0| + \langle 1|) + \langle +-| (\langle 0| - \langle 1|) \\
&\quad + \langle -+| (\langle 0| + 3\langle 1|) - \langle --| (3\langle 0| - \langle 1|))] (|+-\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{24} (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) (\langle 0| - \langle 1|),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{10}^{\hat{n}_2} \otimes \mathbb{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[(|-+\rangle \langle -+| \otimes \mathbb{1}) |\Psi'\rangle \langle \Psi'| \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[\frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}} (|-+\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|0\rangle + 3|1\rangle) \langle \Psi'| \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}} (\langle -+|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|-+\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|0\rangle + 3|1\rangle) \langle \Psi'| (|-+\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{24} (\langle -+|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|-+\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|0\rangle + 3|1\rangle) [\langle ++| (\langle 0| + \langle 1|) + \langle +-| (\langle 0| - \langle 1|) \\
&\quad + \langle -+| (\langle 0| + 3\langle 1|) - \langle --| (3\langle 0| - \langle 1|))] (|-+\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{24} (|0\rangle + 3|1\rangle) (\langle 0| + 3\langle 1|),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{11}^{\hat{n}_2} \otimes \mathbb{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[(|--\rangle \langle --| \otimes \mathbb{1}) |\Psi'\rangle \langle \Psi'| \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}} (|--\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (3|0\rangle - |1\rangle) \langle \Psi'| \right] \\
&= -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}} (\langle --|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|--\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (3|0\rangle - |1\rangle) \langle \Psi'| (|--\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= -\frac{1}{24} (\langle --|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|--\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (3|0\rangle - |1\rangle) [\langle ++| (\langle 0| + \langle 1|) + \langle +-| (\langle 0| - \langle 1|) \\
&\quad - \langle -+| (\langle 0| - 3\langle 1|) - \langle --| (3\langle 0| - \langle 1|))] (|--\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{24} (3|0\rangle - |1\rangle) (3\langle 0| - \langle 1|).
\end{aligned}$$

In the quantum result, all of Bob's states are pure. While there are identical results in different sets of measurements, Bob's two sets of results are not identical, satisfying the theorem's requirements.

Suppose Bob's states have a LHS description, they must satisfy Eqs. (S7) and (S8). Because there are only 6

different states in the quantum result, it is sufficient to take ξ from 1 to 6, one has

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(00|\hat{n}_1, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(00|\hat{n}_1, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(00|\hat{n}_1, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(00|\hat{n}_1, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4 + \wp(00|\hat{n}_1, 5) \wp_5 \rho_5 + \wp(00|\hat{n}_1, 6) \wp_6 \rho_6, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(01|\hat{n}_1, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(01|\hat{n}_1, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(01|\hat{n}_1, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(01|\hat{n}_1, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4 + \wp(01|\hat{n}_1, 5) \wp_5 \rho_5 + \wp(01|\hat{n}_1, 6) \wp_6 \rho_6, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(10|\hat{n}_1, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(10|\hat{n}_1, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(10|\hat{n}_1, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(10|\hat{n}_1, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4 + \wp(10|\hat{n}_1, 5) \wp_5 \rho_5 + \wp(10|\hat{n}_1, 6) \wp_6 \rho_6, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(11|\hat{n}_1, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(11|\hat{n}_1, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(11|\hat{n}_1, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(11|\hat{n}_1, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4 + \wp(11|\hat{n}_1, 5) \wp_5 \rho_5 + \wp(11|\hat{n}_1, 6) \wp_6 \rho_6, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(00|\hat{n}_2, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(00|\hat{n}_2, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(00|\hat{n}_2, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(00|\hat{n}_2, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4 + \wp(00|\hat{n}_2, 5) \wp_5 \rho_5 + \wp(00|\hat{n}_2, 6) \wp_6 \rho_6, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(01|\hat{n}_2, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(01|\hat{n}_2, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(01|\hat{n}_2, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(01|\hat{n}_2, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4 + \wp(01|\hat{n}_2, 5) \wp_5 \rho_5 + \wp(01|\hat{n}_2, 6) \wp_6 \rho_6, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(10|\hat{n}_2, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(10|\hat{n}_2, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(10|\hat{n}_2, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(10|\hat{n}_2, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4 + \wp(10|\hat{n}_2, 5) \wp_5 \rho_5 + \wp(10|\hat{n}_2, 6) \wp_6 \rho_6, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(11|\hat{n}_2, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(11|\hat{n}_2, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(11|\hat{n}_2, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(11|\hat{n}_2, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4 + \wp(11|\hat{n}_2, 5) \wp_5 \rho_5 + \wp(11|\hat{n}_2, 6) \wp_6 \rho_6. \end{array} \right.$$

Since the 8 states of Eq. (S36) are pure states, and a pure state cannot be obtained by convex combination of other pure states, one has

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(00|\hat{n}_1, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(01|\hat{n}_1, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(10|\hat{n}_1, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(11|\hat{n}_1, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(00|\hat{n}_2, 5) \wp_5 \rho_5, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(01|\hat{n}_2, 6) \wp_6 \rho_6, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(10|\hat{n}_2, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp(11|\hat{n}_2, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2, \end{array} \right.$$

where the others $\wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 0$, and we describe the identical terms by the same hidden state. Because, for $\hat{n}_1$ and $\hat{n}_2$, $\sum_a \wp(a|\hat{n}_1, \xi) = 1$ and $\sum_a \wp(a|\hat{n}_2, \xi) = 1$, we have $\wp(00|\hat{n}_1, 1) = \wp(01|\hat{n}_1, 2) = \wp(10|\hat{n}_1, 3) = \wp(11|\hat{n}_1, 4) = \wp(00|\hat{n}_2, 5) = \wp(01|\hat{n}_2, 6) = \wp(10|\hat{n}_2, 1) = \wp(11|\hat{n}_2, 2) = 1$. Then we have

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_2 \rho_2, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_3 \rho_3, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_4 \rho_4, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_2 \rho_2, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_3 \rho_3, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_5 \rho_5, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_6 \rho_6. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S37})$$

Summing Eq. (S37), the left quantum result is $2\rho_B$, and the right classical result is $\rho_B + \wp_2\rho_2 + \wp_3\rho_3$. Then taking the trace, we obtain “ $2_Q = (1 + \wp_2 + \wp_3)_C$ ”. Because $\sum_{\xi=1}^6 \wp_\xi = 1$ and $\wp_1, \wp_2, \wp_3, \wp_4, \wp_5$, and $\wp_6$ are non-zero, $0 < \wp_2 + \wp_3 < 1$. In this case, we get the EPR steering paradox “ $2_Q = (1 + \delta)_C$ ” and $\delta = \wp_2 + \wp_3$, with $0 < \delta < 1$.

D. The same states appear in both identical and distinct sets of measurements

Here, we consider the case where $\{|\eta_i\rangle\}$ is a subset of $\{|\varepsilon_j\rangle\}$, but $\{|\eta_i\rangle\}$ and $\{|\varepsilon_j\rangle\}$ are nonidentical, i.e., combining cases 2 and 3. We consider the more extreme case by assuming that the first h terms in $\{|\eta_i\rangle\}$ correspond equally to the first h terms in $\{|\varepsilon_j\rangle\}$ and that the remaining $2^M - h$ terms in $\{|\eta_i\rangle\}$ are all the same and equal to the $(h+1)$ st term in $\{|\varepsilon_j\rangle\}$, but that none of the remaining $2^M - h$ terms in $\{|\varepsilon_j\rangle\}$ are the same. In this scenario, Bob’s conditional states are

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_1^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_1\rangle \langle \eta_1|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_2}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_2^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_2\rangle \langle \eta_2|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_h}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_h^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_h\rangle \langle \eta_h|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{h+1}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_{h+1}^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_{h+1}\rangle \langle \eta_{h+1}|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{h+2}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_{h+2}^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_{h+1}\rangle \langle \eta_{h+1}|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_{2^M}^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_{h+1}\rangle \langle \eta_{h+1}|, \end{array} \right. \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| t_1^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_1\rangle \langle \eta_1|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_2}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| t_2^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_2\rangle \langle \eta_2|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_h}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| t_h^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_h\rangle \langle \eta_h|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{h+1}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| t_{h+1}^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_{h+1}\rangle \langle \eta_{h+1}|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{h+2}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| t_{h+2}^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\varepsilon_{h+2}\rangle \langle \varepsilon_{h+2}|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| t_{2^M}^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\varepsilon_{2^M}\rangle \langle \varepsilon_{2^M}|. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S38})$$

In equation Eq. (S38), there are 2^M different pure states in the quantum result. For the LHS description, values of ξ from 1 to 2^M are sufficient. That is, the LHS model describes Bob's state as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a_1|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_2}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a_2|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_h}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a_h|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{h+1}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a_{h+1}|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{h+2}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a_{h+2}|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a_{2^M}|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \end{array} \right. \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a'_1|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_2}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a'_2|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_h}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a'_h|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{h+1}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a'_{h+1}|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{h+2}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a'_{h+2}|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a'_{2^M}|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S39})$$

Eq. (S39) can be expressed as each $\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell}$ containing only one term due to Bob's states being pure, i.e.,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_2}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_2 \rho_2, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_h}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_h \rho_h, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{h+1}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(a_{h+1}|\hat{n}_1, h+1) \wp_{h+1} \rho_{h+1}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{h+2}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(a_{h+2}|\hat{n}_1, h+1) \wp_{h+1} \rho_{h+1}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp(a_{2^M}|\hat{n}_1, h+1) \wp_{h+1} \rho_{h+1}, \end{array} \right. \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_2}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_2 \rho_2, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_h}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_h \rho_h, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{h+1}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_{h+1} \rho_{h+1}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{h+2}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_{h+2} \rho_{h+2}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_{2^M} \rho_{2^M}. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S40})$$

We assume that the first h terms in $\{|\eta_i\rangle\}$ correspond equally to the first h terms in $\{|\varepsilon_j\rangle\}$, therefore we describe the identical terms in $\{|\eta_i\rangle\}$ and $\{|\varepsilon_j\rangle\}$ by the same hidden state. The remaining $2^M - h$ terms in $\{|\eta_i\rangle\}$ are all the same and equal to the $(h+1)$ st term in $\{|\varepsilon_j\rangle\}$, hence describe them with $\wp_{h+1} \rho_{h+1}$. And $\sum_a \wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 1$, so we have $\wp(a_1|\hat{n}_1, 1) = \wp(a_2|\hat{n}_2, 2) = \dots = \wp(a_h|\hat{n}_2, h) = \wp(a'_1|\hat{n}_2, 1) = \wp(a'_2|\hat{n}_2, 2) = \dots = \wp(a'_h|\hat{n}_2, h) = \wp(a'_{h+1}|\hat{n}_2, h+1) = \wp(a'_{h+2}|\hat{n}_2, h+2) = \dots = \wp(a'_{2^M}|\hat{n}_2, 2^M) = 1$, $\wp(a_{h+1}|\hat{n}_1, h+1) + \wp(a_{h+2}|\hat{n}_1, h+1) + \dots + \wp(a_{2^M}|\hat{n}_1, h+1) = 1$ and the others $\wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 0$. Summing Eq. (S40), the left quantum result is $2\rho_B$, and the right classical result is $\rho_B + \sum_{\xi=1}^{h+1} \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}$, here $\sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi} = \rho_B$. Then taking the trace, we obtain “ $2_Q = \left(1 + \sum_{\xi=1}^{h+1} \wp_{\xi}\right)_C$ ”.

Because $\sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp_{\xi} = 1$ and there are $(2^M - h)$ $\wp_{\xi}$ non-zero, $0 < \sum_{\xi=1}^{h+1} \wp_{\xi} < 1$. In this case, we get the EPR steering paradox

“ $2_Q = (1 + \delta)_C$ ” and $\delta = \sum_{\xi=1}^{h+1} \wp_{\xi}$, with $0 < \delta < 1$.

1. Example 4

We consider the W state shared by Alice and Bob. Suppose Alice prepares the W state $\rho_{AB} = |W\rangle\langle W|$, where

$$|W\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} [|100\rangle + |010\rangle + |001\rangle],$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} |W\rangle &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} (|++\rangle + |+-\rangle - |-+\rangle - |--\rangle) |0\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} (|++\rangle - |+-\rangle + |-+\rangle - |--\rangle) |0\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} (|++\rangle + |+-\rangle + |-+\rangle + |--\rangle) |1\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} [|++\rangle (2|0\rangle + |1\rangle) + |+-\rangle |1\rangle + |-+\rangle |1\rangle - |--\rangle (2|0\rangle - |1\rangle)]. \end{aligned}$$

She keeps particles 1, 2, and sends the other to Bob. In the two-setting steering protocol $\{\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2\}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{n}_1 &= \sigma_z \sigma_z \equiv zz, \\ \hat{n}_2 &= \sigma_x \sigma_x \equiv xx. \end{aligned} \tag{S41}$$

In the protocol, Bob asks Alice to carry out either one of two possible projective measurements on her qubits, i.e.,

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \hat{P}_{00}^{zz} &= |00\rangle\langle 00|, \\ \hat{P}_{01}^{zz} &= |01\rangle\langle 01|, \\ \hat{P}_{10}^{zz} &= |10\rangle\langle 10|, \\ \hat{P}_{11}^{zz} &= |11\rangle\langle 11|, \\ \hat{P}_{00}^{xx} &= |++\rangle\langle ++|, \\ \hat{P}_{01}^{xx} &= |+-\rangle\langle +-|, \\ \hat{P}_{10}^{xx} &= |-+\rangle\langle -+|, \\ \hat{P}_{11}^{xx} &= |--\rangle\langle --|, \end{aligned} \right. \tag{S42}$$

where $|\pm\rangle = (1/\sqrt{2})(|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)$. After Alice's measurement, Bob's unnormalized conditional states are

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{zz} = \frac{1}{3} |1\rangle \langle 1|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{zz} = \frac{1}{3} |0\rangle \langle 0|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{zz} = \frac{1}{3} |0\rangle \langle 0|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{zz} = 0, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{xx} = \frac{1}{12} (2|0\rangle + |1\rangle)(2\langle 0| + \langle 1|), \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{xx} = \frac{1}{12} |1\rangle \langle 1|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{xx} = \frac{1}{12} |1\rangle \langle 1|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{xx} = \frac{1}{12} (2|0\rangle - |1\rangle)(2\langle 0| - \langle 1|), \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S43})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{00}^{\hat{n}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\ &= \text{tr}_A [(|00\rangle \langle 00| \otimes \mathbb{1}) |W\rangle \langle W|] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \text{tr}_A [(|00\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) |1\rangle \langle W|] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} (\langle 00|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|00\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) |1\rangle \langle W| (|00\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{3} (\langle 00|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|00\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) |1\rangle [\langle 100| + \langle 010| + \langle 001|] (|00\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{3} |1\rangle \langle 1|, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{01}^{\hat{n}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\ &= \text{tr}_A [(|01\rangle \langle 01| \otimes \mathbb{1}) |W\rangle \langle W|] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \text{tr}_A [(|01\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) |0\rangle \langle W|] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} (\langle 01|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|01\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) |0\rangle \langle W| (|01\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{3} (\langle 01|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|01\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) |0\rangle [\langle 100| + \langle 010| + \langle 001|] (|01\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{3} |0\rangle \langle 0|, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{10}^{\hat{n}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[(|10\rangle \langle 10| \otimes \mathbb{1}) |W\rangle \langle W| \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \text{tr}_A \left[(|10\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) |0\rangle \langle W| \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} (\langle 10|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|10\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) |0\rangle \langle W| (|10\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{3} (\langle 10|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|10\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) |0\rangle [\langle 100| + \langle 010| + \langle 001|] (|10\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{3} |0\rangle \langle 0|,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_1} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{11}^{\hat{n}_1} \otimes \mathbb{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[(|11\rangle \langle 11| \otimes \mathbb{1}) |W\rangle \langle W| \right] \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{00}^{\hat{n}_2} \otimes \mathbb{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[(|++\rangle \langle ++| \otimes \mathbb{1}) |W\rangle \langle W| \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} \text{tr}_A \left[(|++\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (2|0\rangle + |1\rangle) \langle W| \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} (\langle ++|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|++\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (2|0\rangle + |1\rangle) \langle W| (|++\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{12} (\langle ++|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|++\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (2|0\rangle + |1\rangle) [\langle ++| (2\langle 0| + \langle 1|) + \langle +-| \langle 1| \\
&\quad + \langle -+| \langle 1| - \langle --| (2\langle 0| - \langle 1|)] (|++\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{12} (2|0\rangle + |1\rangle) (2\langle 0| + \langle 1|),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{01}^{\hat{n}_2} \otimes \mathbb{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A \left[(|+-\rangle \langle +-| \otimes \mathbb{1}) |W\rangle \langle W| \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} \text{tr}_A \left[(|+-\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) |1\rangle \langle W| \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} (\langle +-|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|+-\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) |1\rangle \langle W| (|+-\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{12} (\langle +-|_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (|+-\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) |1\rangle [\langle ++| (2\langle 0| + \langle 1|) + \langle +-| \langle 1| \\
&\quad + \langle -+| \langle 1| - \langle --| (2\langle 0| - \langle 1|)] (|+-\rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{12} |1\rangle \langle 1|,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{10}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{10}^{\hat{n}_2} \otimes \mathbb{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A [(| - + \rangle \langle - + | \otimes \mathbb{1}) | W \rangle \langle W |] \\
&= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} \text{tr}_A [(| - + \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) | 1 \rangle \langle W |] \\
&= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} (\langle - + |_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (| - + \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) | 1 \rangle \langle W | (| - + \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{12} (\langle - + |_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (| - + \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) | 1 \rangle [\langle + + | (2 \langle 0 | + \langle 1 |) + \langle + - | \langle 1 | \\
&\quad + \langle - + | \langle 1 | - \langle - - | (2 \langle 0 | - \langle 1 |)] (| - + \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{12} | 1 \rangle \langle 1 |,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{11}^{\hat{n}_2} &= \text{tr}_A \left[\left(P_{11}^{\hat{n}_2} \otimes \mathbb{1} \right) \rho_{AB} \right] \\
&= \text{tr}_A [(| - - \rangle \langle - - | \otimes \mathbb{1}) | W \rangle \langle W |] \\
&= -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} \text{tr}_A [(| - - \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (2 | 0 \rangle - | 1 \rangle) \langle W |] \\
&= -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} (\langle - - |_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (| - - \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (2 | 0 \rangle - | 1 \rangle) \langle W | (| - - \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= -\frac{1}{12} (\langle - - |_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (| - - \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) (2 | 0 \rangle - | 1 \rangle) [\langle + + | (2 \langle 0 | + \langle 1 |) + \langle + - | \langle 1 | \\
&\quad + \langle - + | \langle 1 | - \langle - - | (2 \langle 0 | - \langle 1 |)] (| - - \rangle_A \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{12} (2 | 0 \rangle - | 1 \rangle) (2 \langle 0 | - \langle 1 |).
\end{aligned}$$

In the quantum result, Bob obtains seven pure states. Summing the Eq. (S43) and taking the trace, we get $\text{tr}(2\rho_B) = 2$.

If Bob's states have a LHS description, they satisfy Eqs. (S7) and (S8). In the quantum result, there are 4 pure states in Eq. (S43). It is sufficient to take ξ from 1 to 4. Bob's states can be write as

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned}
&\tilde{\rho}_{00}^{zz} = \wp(00|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(00|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(00|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(00|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\
&\tilde{\rho}_{01}^{zz} = \wp(01|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(01|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(01|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(01|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\
&\tilde{\rho}_{10}^{zz} = \wp(10|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(10|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(10|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(10|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\
&\tilde{\rho}_{11}^{zz} = 0, \\
&\tilde{\rho}_{00}^{xx} = \wp(00|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(00|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(00|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(00|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\
&\tilde{\rho}_{01}^{xx} = \wp(01|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(01|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(01|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(01|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\
&\tilde{\rho}_{10}^{xx} = \wp(10|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(10|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(10|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(10|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4, \\
&\tilde{\rho}_{11}^{xx} = \wp(11|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp(11|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp(11|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp(11|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4.
\end{aligned} \right. \quad (\text{S44})$$

Because the eight states on the left-hand side of Eq. (S44) are all pure states, and a pure state can only be expanded

by itself, then each $\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell}$ in Eq. (S44) contains only one term, e.g.,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{zz} = \wp(00|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{zz} = \wp(01|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{zz} = \wp(10|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{zz} = 0, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{xx} = \wp(00|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 3) \wp_3 \rho_3, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{xx} = \wp(01|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{xx} = \wp(10|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{xx} = \wp(11|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 4) \wp_4 \rho_4. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S45})$$

The other $\wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi)$ are 0. Because in the quantum result Eq. (S43), $\tilde{\rho}_{00}^{zz} = \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{zz} = \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{zz}$, we take the same hidden state $\wp_1 \rho_1$ to describe $\tilde{\rho}_{00}^{zz}$, $\tilde{\rho}_{01}^{zz}$, and $\tilde{\rho}_{10}^{zz}$. Similarly, $\tilde{\rho}_{01}^{xx} = \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{xx}$, we take $\wp_2 \rho_2$ to describe them. Then because $\sum_a \wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 1$, for example, for $\tilde{\rho}_{01}^{zz}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{10}^{zz}$, $\wp(00|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 2) = 0$, we have $\wp(01|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 2) + \wp(10|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 2) = 1$. Similarly, we can get $\wp(01|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 1) + \wp(10|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 1) = 1$, and $\wp(00|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 1) = \wp(00|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 3) = \wp(11|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 4) = 1$. Then Eq. (S45) can be written as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{zz} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{zz} = \wp(01|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{zz} = \wp(10|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 2) \wp_2 \rho_2, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{zz} = 0, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{xx} = \wp_3 \rho_3, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{xx} = \wp(01|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{xx} = \wp(10|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{xx} = \wp_4 \rho_4. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S46})$$

Because of $\sum_\xi \wp_\xi \rho_\xi = \rho_B$, we sum up Eq. (S46) and take the trace, and the right-hand side gives

$$\text{tr} [2\wp_1 \rho_1 + \wp_2 \rho_2 + \wp_3 \rho_3 + \wp_4 \rho_4] = \text{tr} [\rho_B + \wp_1 \rho_1] = 1 + \wp_1. \quad (\text{S47})$$

Since $\tilde{\rho}_{00}^{zz}$, $\tilde{\rho}_{01}^{zz}$, $\tilde{\rho}_{10}^{zz}$, $\tilde{\rho}_{00}^{xx}$, $\tilde{\rho}_{01}^{xx}$, $\tilde{\rho}_{10}^{xx}$, and $\tilde{\rho}_{11}^{xx}$ are nonzero in the quantum result Eq. (S43), $\wp_1$, $\wp_2$, $\wp_3$, and $\wp_4$ are all nonzero. And because $\sum_\xi \wp_\xi = 1$, $0 < \wp_1 < 1$. However, the result of the left-hand side is 2. We obtain the paradox “ $2_Q = (1 + \wp_1)_C$ ”. In the case of the W state, we get the contradiction “ $2_Q = (1 + \delta)_C$ ”, where $0 < \delta < 1$.

E. Bob's two sets of results are identical

Finally, we consider what the result would be if $\{|\eta_i\rangle\} = \{|\varepsilon_j\rangle\}$. Suppose that there are 2^M distinct elements in $\{|\eta_i\rangle\}$ and that they are the same as the corresponding 2^M elements in $\{|\varepsilon_j\rangle\}$. Bob's conditional states are

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_1^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_1\rangle \langle \eta_1|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_{2^M}^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_{2^M}\rangle \langle \eta_{2^M}|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_1'}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| t_1^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_1\rangle \langle \eta_1|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2^M}'}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| t_{2^M}^{(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_{2^M}\rangle \langle \eta_{2^M}|. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S48})$$

In this case, there are only 2^M different pure states in the quantum result Eq. (S48). It is sufficient to take ξ from 1 to 2^M , e.g.,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a_1|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a_{2^M}|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_1'}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a_1'|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2^M}'}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a_{2^M}'|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S49})$$

Since Bob's states are all pure, each $\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell}$ in Eq. (S49) contains only one term. Eq. (S49) can be written as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_{2^M} \rho_{2^M}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_1'}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2^M}'}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_{2^M} \rho_{2^M}. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S50})$$

Since in quantum result we assume that $\{|\eta_i\rangle\} = \{|\varepsilon_j\rangle\}$, in the LHS description we describe the same term with the same hidden state. And $\sum_a \wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 1$, so we have $\wp(a_1|\hat{n}_1, 1) = \dots = \wp(a_{2^M}|\hat{n}_1, 2^M) = \wp(a_1'|\hat{n}_2, 1) \dots = \wp(a_{2^M}'|\hat{n}_2, 2^M) = 1$, and the others $\wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 0$. Then we take the sum of Eq. (S50) and take the trace, and we get “ $2_Q = 2_C$ ”. That means that, in this case, there is no contradiction, and we cannot conclude whether Alice can steer Bob.

1. Example 5

Suppose Alice prepares a 3-qubit state $\rho_{AB} = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, where

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2} [|00\rangle + |01\rangle + |10\rangle + |11\rangle] \otimes |0\rangle.$$

She keeps particles 1, 2, and sends the other to Bob. In the two-setting steering protocol $\{\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2\}$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{n}_1 &= \sigma_z \sigma_z \equiv zz, \\ \hat{n}_2 &= \sigma_x \sigma_x \equiv xx.\end{aligned}\tag{S51}$$

In the protocol, Bob asks Alice to carry out either one of two possible projective measurements on her qubits, i.e.,

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \hat{P}_{00}^{zz} &= |00\rangle\langle 00|, \\ \hat{P}_{01}^{zz} &= |01\rangle\langle 01|, \\ \hat{P}_{10}^{zz} &= |10\rangle\langle 10|, \\ \hat{P}_{11}^{zz} &= |11\rangle\langle 11|, \\ \hat{P}_{00}^{xx} &= |++\rangle\langle ++|, \\ \hat{P}_{01}^{xx} &= |+-\rangle\langle +-|, \\ \hat{P}_{10}^{xx} &= |-+\rangle\langle -+|, \\ \hat{P}_{11}^{xx} &= |--\rangle\langle --|, \end{aligned} \right.\tag{S52}$$

where $|\pm\rangle = (1/\sqrt{2})(|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)$. After Alice's measurement, Bob's unnormalized conditional states are

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{zz} &= \frac{1}{4} |0\rangle\langle 0|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{zz} &= \frac{1}{4} |0\rangle\langle 0|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{zz} &= \frac{1}{4} |0\rangle\langle 0|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{zz} &= \frac{1}{4} |0\rangle\langle 0|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{xx} &= |0\rangle\langle 0|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{xx} &= 0, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{xx} &= 0, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{xx} &= 0. \end{aligned} \right.\tag{S53}$$

In the quantum result, Bob obtains 5 pure states. Summing the Eq. (S53) and taking the trace, we get $\text{tr}(2\rho_B) = 2$.

If Bob's states have a LHS description, they satisfy Eqs. (S7) and (S8). In the quantum result, there are 1 pure

state in Eq. (S53). It is sufficient to take $\xi = 1$. Bob's states can be write as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{zz} = \wp(00|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{zz} = \wp(01|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{zz} = \wp(10|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{zz} = \wp(11|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{xx} = \wp(00|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{xx} = 0, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{xx} = 0, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{xx} = 0. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S54})$$

Because in the quantum result Eq. (S53), $\tilde{\rho}_{00}^{zz} = \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{zz} = \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{zz} = \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{xx} = \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{xx}$, we take the same hide state $\wp_1 \rho_1$ to describe them. Then because $\sum_a \wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 1$, we have $\wp(00|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 1) + \wp(01|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 1) + \wp(10|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 1) + \wp(11|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 1) = 1$, and $\wp(00|\hat{x}\hat{x}, 1) = 1$. Then Eq. (S54) can be written as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{zz} = \wp(00|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{zz} = \wp(01|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{zz} = \wp(10|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{zz} = \wp(11|\hat{z}\hat{z}, 1) \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{00}^{xx} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{01}^{xx} = 0, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{10}^{xx} = 0, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{11}^{xx} = 0. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S55})$$

Because of $\sum_{\xi} \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi} = \rho_B$, e.g., $\wp_1 \rho_1 = \rho_B$, we sum up Eq. (S55) and take the trace, and the right hand side gives

$$\text{tr}[2\wp_1 \rho_1] = \text{tr}[2\rho_B] = 2. \quad (\text{S56})$$

We obtain “ $2_Q = 2_C$ ”. There is no contradiction in this case, so we cannot conclude whether Alice can steer Bob.

S2. $k = 1 + \delta_k$ FOR N -QUBIT STATE

In the 2-setting protocol, we propose that the EPR steering paradox “ $2_Q = (1 + \delta)_C$ ” is obtained when the N -qubit entangled state ρ_{AB} shared by Alice and Bob satisfies the measurement requirement. Here we show a more general steering paradox “ $k_Q = (1 + \delta_k)_C$ ”. In a k -setting steering protocol $\{\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2, \dots, \hat{n}_k\}$, consider Alice and Bob share an N -qubit entangled state

$$\rho_{AB} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle \left\langle \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right|, \quad (\text{S57})$$

where Alice retains M ($M < N$) particles and sends the remaining $(N - M)$ particles to Bob, and

$$\left| \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle = \sum_i \left(s_i^{\hat{n}_\ell(\alpha)} \left| \phi_i^{\hat{n}_\ell} \right\rangle \left| \eta_i^{\hat{n}_\ell(\alpha)} \right\rangle \right), \quad (\text{S58})$$

in which $i = 1, 2, \dots, 2^M$ and $\hat{n}_\ell$ ($\ell = 1, 2, \dots, k$) the measurement direction. In the k -setting steering protocol $\{\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2, \dots, \hat{n}_k\}$, Alice performs $k \cdot 2^M$ projective measurements $\hat{P}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell}$, where a is the measurement result. For each $\hat{P}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell}$, Bob obtains the corresponding unnormalized state $\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell} = \text{tr}_A \left[\left(\hat{P}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{2^{N-M} \times 2^{N-M}} \right) \rho_{AB} \right]$, where $\mathbb{1}_{2^{N-M} \times 2^{N-M}}$ is the $2^{N-M} \times 2^{N-M}$ identity matrix.

We propose a lemma for N -qubit in the k -setting steering protocol $\{\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2, \dots, \hat{n}_k\}$.

Lemma 1. *In the k -setting steering protocol $\{\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2, \dots, \hat{n}_k\}$, Alice and Bob share an N -qubit entangled state. Assume that Alice performs $k \cdot 2^M$ projective measurements $\hat{P}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell}$ and Bob obtains the corresponding conditional state $\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell}$. Considering the scenario where Bob's conditional states $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell}\}$ are all pure, there will be a contradiction of “ $k_Q = (1 + \delta_k)_C$ ” (with $0 \leq \delta_k < k - 1$) if Bob obtains k sets of results $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell}\}$ that are not exactly the same, i.e., there exists at least one set of $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_p}\}$, with $p \in [1, k]$, different from the others.*

Proof. The sets of projectors for Alice are as follows

$$P_{a_i}^{\hat{n}_\ell} = \left| \phi_i^{\hat{n}_\ell} \right\rangle \left\langle \phi_i^{\hat{n}_\ell} \right|, i = 1, 2, \dots, 2^M.$$

After Alice's measurement, Bob obtains

$$\tilde{\rho}_{a_i}^{\hat{n}_\ell} = \sum_\alpha p_\alpha |s_i^{\hat{n}_\ell(\alpha)}|^2 |\eta_i^{\hat{n}_\ell(\alpha)}\rangle \langle \eta_i^{\hat{n}_\ell(\alpha)}|, \quad (\text{S59})$$

If Bob's states have a LHS description, they satisfy Eqs. (S7) and (S8), which lead to $k \cdot 2^M$ equations:

$$\tilde{\rho}_{a_i}^{\hat{n}_\ell} = \sum_\xi \wp(a_i | \hat{n}_\ell, \xi) \wp_\xi \rho_\xi. \quad (\text{S60})$$

The quantum value k can be attained through summing Eq. (S59) and then taking the trace. However the maximum value of the LHS result is k if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i \sum_\xi \wp(a_i | \hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_\xi \rho_\xi &= \sum_i \sum_\xi \wp(a'_i | \hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_\xi \rho_\xi \\ &= \dots = \sum_i \sum_\xi \wp(a''_i | \hat{n}_k, \xi) \wp_\xi \rho_\xi \\ &= \sum_\xi \wp_\xi \rho_\xi. \end{aligned}$$

Considering that the conditional states of Bob are all pure, which implies that all $|\eta_i^{\hat{n}_\ell}\rangle$ are independent of α , i.e.,

$$\left| \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle = \sum_i \left(s_i^{\hat{n}_\ell(\alpha)} \left| \phi_i^{\hat{n}_\ell} \right\rangle \left| \eta_i^{\hat{n}_\ell} \right\rangle \right), \quad (\text{S61})$$

Then the conditional states of Bob are

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_1^{\hat{n}_1(\alpha)} \right|^2 \left| \eta_1^{\hat{n}_1} \right\rangle \left\langle \eta_1^{\hat{n}_1} \right|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_{2M}^{\hat{n}_1(\alpha)} \right|^2 \left| \eta_{2M}^{\hat{n}_1} \right\rangle \left\langle \eta_{2M}^{\hat{n}_1} \right|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_1^{\hat{n}_2(\alpha)} \right|^2 \left| \eta_1^{\hat{n}_2} \right\rangle \left\langle \eta_1^{\hat{n}_2} \right|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_{2M}^{\hat{n}_2(\alpha)} \right|^2 \left| \eta_{2M}^{\hat{n}_2} \right\rangle \left\langle \eta_{2M}^{\hat{n}_2} \right|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a''_1}^{\hat{n}_k} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_1^{\hat{n}_k(\alpha)} \right|^2 \left| \eta_1^{\hat{n}_k} \right\rangle \left\langle \eta_1^{\hat{n}_k} \right|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a''_{2M}}^{\hat{n}_k} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_{2M}^{\hat{n}_k(\alpha)} \right|^2 \left| \eta_{2M}^{\hat{n}_k} \right\rangle \left\langle \eta_{2M}^{\hat{n}_k} \right|. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S62})$$

Sufficiency—“ $k_Q = k_C$ ” $\implies \{\tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1}\} = \{\tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2}\} = \dots = \{\tilde{\rho}_{a''_1}^{\hat{n}_k}\}$.

Since the density matrix of a pure state can only be expanded by itself, that is each $\tilde{\rho}_{a_i}^{\hat{n}_\ell}$ in Eq. (S60) can only be described by a definite hidden state. Without loss of generality, suppose that Bob’s conditional states are completely different in the set involving the same measurement direction $\tilde{\rho}_{a_i}^{\hat{n}_\ell}$. Further Eq. (S60) can be written as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_{2M} \rho_{2M}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp'_1 \rho'_1, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp'_{2M} \rho'_{2M}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a''_1}^{\hat{n}_k} = \wp''_1 \rho''_1, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a''_{2M}}^{\hat{n}_k} = \wp''_{2M} \rho''_{2M}. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S63})$$

Summing the Eq. (S63), we have

$$\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1} + \tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2} + \dots + \tilde{\rho}_{a''}^{\hat{n}_k} = \sum_{i=1}^{2^M} \wp_i \rho_i + \sum_{i=1}^{2^M} \wp'_i \rho'_i + \dots + \sum_{i=1}^{2^M} \wp''_i \rho''_i.$$

The equation “ $k_Q = k_C$ ” requests

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2^M} \wp_i \rho_i = \sum_{i=1}^{2^M} \wp'_i \rho'_i = \dots = \sum_{i=1}^{2^M} \wp''_i \rho''_i = \sum_{\xi} \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}. \quad (\text{S64})$$

It means that $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\} = \{\tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2}\} = \dots = \{\tilde{\rho}_{a''}^{\hat{n}_k}\}$, i.e., Bob's k sets of results are identical. Note that there is also no contradiction appearing if Bob has k sets of identical results. Therefore, its contrapositive also holds, and if at least one set of results $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_p}\}$, with $p \in [1, k]$ is not identical to the others, the paradoxical equality " $k_Q = (1 + \delta_k)_C$ " can be obtained.

$$\text{Necessity}—\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\} = \{\tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2}\} = \dots = \{\tilde{\rho}_{a''}^{\hat{n}_k}\} \implies "k_Q = k_C".$$

Suppose that there are 2^M distinct states in $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\}$ and that they are the same as the corresponding $(k-1) \cdot 2^M$ elements in $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_h}\}$, with $h = 2, 3, \dots, k$. Bob's conditional states are

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_1^{\hat{n}_1(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_1\rangle \langle \eta_1|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_{2^M}^{\hat{n}_1(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_{2^M}\rangle \langle \eta_{2^M}|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_1^{\hat{n}_2(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_1\rangle \langle \eta_1|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_{2^M}^{\hat{n}_2(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_{2^M}\rangle \langle \eta_{2^M}|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a''_1}^{\hat{n}_k} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_1^{\hat{n}_k(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_1\rangle \langle \eta_1|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a''_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_k} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_{2^M}^{\hat{n}_k(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_{2^M}\rangle \langle \eta_{2^M}|. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S65})$$

There are only 2^M different pure states in the quantum result Eq. (S65). It is sufficient to take ξ from 1 to 2^M in the LHS description, e.g.,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a'|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a''}^{\hat{n}_k} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{2^M} \wp(a''|\hat{n}_k, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S66})$$

Since Bob's states are all pure, each $\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell}$ in Eq. (S66) contains only one term. Eq. (S66) can be written as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_{2^M} \rho_{2^M}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_{2^M} \rho_{2^M}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a''_1}^{\hat{n}_k} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a''_{2^M}}^{\hat{n}_k} = \wp_{2^M} \rho_{2^M}. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S67})$$

Here we describe the same term with the same hidden state. And $\sum_a \wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 1$, so we have $\wp(a_1|\hat{n}_1, 1) = \dots = \wp(a_{2^M}|\hat{n}_1, 2^M) = \wp(a'_1|\hat{n}_2, 1) \dots = \wp(a'_{2^M}|\hat{n}_2, 2^M) = \dots = \wp(a''_1|\hat{n}_k, 1) \dots = \wp(a''_{2^M}|\hat{n}_k, 2^M) = 1$, and the others $\wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 0$. Then we take the sum of Eq. (S67) and take the trace, and get " $k_Q = k_C$ ". That means that there is no contradiction if $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\} = \{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_2}\} = \dots = \{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_k}\}$, and we cannot conclude whether Alice can steer Bob. Consequently, its contrapositive also holds, and if there is a contradiction " $k_Q = (1 + \delta_k)_C$ ", then it requests that at least one set of results $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_p}\}$, with $p \in [1, k]$ is not identical to the others. $\square$

S3. $k = 1 + \delta_k$ FOR N -QUDIT STATE

We now generalize the result to the most general case. In the k -setting steering protocol, assume that Alice and Bob share a mixed entangled state of N d -dimensional systems (N -qudit). Then, we can obtain a similar simple result for " $k_Q = (1 + \delta_k)_C$ " (with $0 \leq \delta_k < k - 1$).

We propose a lemma for N -qudit in the k -setting steering protocol $\{\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2, \dots, \hat{n}_k\}$.

Lemma 2. *In the k -setting steering protocol $\{\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2, \dots, \hat{n}_k\}$, Alice and Bob share an N -qudit entangled state. Assume that Alice performs $k \cdot d^M$ projective measurements $\hat{P}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell}$ and Bob obtains the corresponding conditional state $\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell}$. Considering the scenario where Bob's conditional states $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell}\}$ are all pure, there will be a contradiction of " $k_Q = (1 + \delta_k)_C$ " (with $0 \leq \delta_k < k - 1$) if Bob obtains k sets of results $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell}\}$ that are not exactly the same i.e., there exists at least one set of $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_p}\}$, with $p \in [1, k]$, different from the others.*

Proof. Let us consider that Alice prepared an N -qudit state

$$\rho_{AB} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle \left\langle \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right|. \quad (\text{S68})$$

Similarly, Alice keeps M ($M < N$) particles and sends the remaining $(N - M)$ particles to Bob. In the k -setting steering protocol $\{\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2, \dots, \hat{n}_k\}$, Alice performs $k \cdot d^M$ projective measurements $\hat{P}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell}$ ($\ell = 1, 2, \dots, k$). Bob obtains the corresponding unnormalized states are $\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell} = \text{tr}_A [(P_a^{\hat{n}_\ell} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{d^{N-M} \times d^{N-M}}) \rho_{AB}]$. The difference is that $\mathbb{1}_{d^{N-M} \times d^{N-M}}$ is the $d^{N-M} \times d^{N-M}$ identity matrix. $\left| \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle$ can be written as

$$\left| \psi_{AB}^{(\alpha)} \right\rangle = \sum_i \left(s_i^{\hat{n}_\ell(\alpha)} \left| \phi_i^{\hat{n}_\ell} \right\rangle \left| \eta_i^{\hat{n}_\ell(\alpha)} \right\rangle \right), \quad (\text{S69})$$

here $i = 1, 2, \dots, d^M$. We require Bob's conditional states are all pure, then $|\eta_i^{\hat{n}_\ell(\alpha)}\rangle$ independent of α .

Suppose the sets of projectors for Alice are as follows

$$P_a^{\hat{n}_\ell} = |\phi_i^{\hat{n}_\ell}\rangle\langle\phi_i^{\hat{n}_\ell}|, i = 1, 2, \dots, d^M.$$

After Alice's measurement, Bob obtains

$$\tilde{\rho}_{a_i}^{\hat{n}_\ell} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} |s_i^{\hat{n}_\ell(\alpha)}|^2 |\eta_i^{\hat{n}_\ell}\rangle\langle\eta_i^{\hat{n}_\ell}|. \quad (\text{S70})$$

If Bob's states have a LHS description, they satisfy Eqs. (S7) and (S8), which lead to $k \cdot d^M$ equations:

$$\tilde{\rho}_{a_i}^{\hat{n}_\ell} = \sum_{\xi} \wp(a_i|\hat{n}_\ell, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}. \quad (\text{S71})$$

The quantum value k can be attained through summing Eq. (S71) and then taking the trace. However the maximum value of the LHS result is k if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i \sum_{\xi} \wp(a_i|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi} &= \sum_i \sum_{\xi} \wp(a'_i|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi} \\ &= \dots = \sum_i \sum_{\xi} \wp(a''_i|\hat{n}_k, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi} \\ &= \sum_{\xi} \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}. \end{aligned}$$

Sufficiency—“ $k_Q = k_C$ ” $\implies \{\tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1}\} = \{\tilde{\rho}_{a_2}^{\hat{n}_2}\} = \dots = \{\tilde{\rho}_{a_k}^{\hat{n}_k}\}$.

Since the density matrix of a pure state can only be expanded by itself, that is each $\tilde{\rho}_{a_i}^{\hat{n}_\ell}$ in Eq. (S70) can only be described by a definite hidden state. Without loss of generality, suppose that Bob's conditional states are completely different in the set involving the same measurement direction $\tilde{\rho}_{a_i}^{\hat{n}_\ell}$. Further Eq. (S70) can be written as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{d^M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_{d^M} \rho_{d^M}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp'_1 \rho'_1, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{d^M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp'_{d^M} \rho'_{d^M}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_k} = \wp''_1 \rho''_1, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{d^M}}^{\hat{n}_k} = \wp''_{d^M} \rho''_{d^M}. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S72})$$

Summing the Eq. (S72), we have

$$\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1} + \tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2} + \dots + \tilde{\rho}_{a''}^{\hat{n}_k} = \sum_{i=1}^{d^M} \wp_i \rho_i + \sum_{i=1}^{d^M} \wp'_i \rho'_i + \dots + \sum_{i=1}^{d^M} \wp''_i \rho''_i.$$

The equation “ $k_Q = k_C$ ” requests

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d^M} \wp'_i \rho'_i = \sum_{i=1}^{d^M} \wp_i \rho_i = \cdots = \sum_{i=1}^{d^M} \wp''_i \rho''_i = \sum_{\xi} \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}. \quad (\text{S73})$$

It means that $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\} = \{\tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2}\} = \cdots = \{\tilde{\rho}_{a''}^{\hat{n}_k}\}$, i.e., Bob’s k sets of results are identical. Note that there is also no contradiction appearing if Bob has Bob has k sets of identical results. Therefore, its contrapositive also holds, and if at least one set of results $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_p}\}$, with $p \in [1, k]$ is not identical to the others, the paradoxical equality “ $k_Q = (1 + \delta_k)_C$ ” can be obtained.

Necessity— $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\} = \{\tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2}\} = \cdots = \{\tilde{\rho}_{a''}^{\hat{n}_k}\} \implies “k_Q = k_C”$.

Suppose that there are 2^M distinct states in $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\}$ and that they are the same as the corresponding $(k-1) \cdot d^M$ elements in $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_h}\}$, with $h = 2, 3, \dots, k$. Bob’s conditional states are

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_1^{\hat{n}_1(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_1\rangle \langle \eta_1|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{d^M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_{d^M}^{\hat{n}_1(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_{d^M}\rangle \langle \eta_{d^M}|, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_1^{\hat{n}_2(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_1\rangle \langle \eta_1|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{d^M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_{d^M}^{\hat{n}_2(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_{d^M}\rangle \langle \eta_{d^M}|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_k} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_1^{\hat{n}_k(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_1\rangle \langle \eta_1|, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{d^M}}^{\hat{n}_k} = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \left| s_{d^M}^{\hat{n}_k(\alpha)} \right|^2 |\eta_{d^M}\rangle \langle \eta_{d^M}|. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S74})$$

There are only d^M different pure states in the quantum result Eq. (S74). It is sufficient to take ξ from 1 to d^M in the LHS description, e.g.,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{d^M} \wp(a|\hat{n}_1, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{d^M} \wp(a'|\hat{n}_2, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a''}^{\hat{n}_k} = \sum_{\xi=1}^{d^M} \wp(a''|\hat{n}_k, \xi) \wp_{\xi} \rho_{\xi}. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S75})$$

Since Bob's states are all pure, each $\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_\ell}$ in Eq. (S75) contains only one term. Eq. (S75) can be written as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\rho}_{a_1}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a_{d^M}}^{\hat{n}_1} = \wp_{d^M} \rho_{d^M}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_1}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a'_{d^M}}^{\hat{n}_2} = \wp_{d^M} \rho_{d^M}, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a''_1}^{\hat{n}_k} = \wp_1 \rho_1, \\ \dots \\ \tilde{\rho}_{a''_{d^M}}^{\hat{n}_k} = \wp_{d^M} \rho_{d^M}. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{S76})$$

Here we describe the same term with the same hidden state. And $\sum_a \wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 1$, so we have $\wp(a_1|\hat{n}_1, 1) = \dots = \wp(a_{d^M}|\hat{n}_1, d^M) = \wp(a'_1|\hat{n}_2, 1) \dots = \wp(a'_{d^M}|\hat{n}_2, d^M) = \dots = \wp(a''_1|\hat{n}_k, 1) \dots = \wp(a''_{d^M}|\hat{n}_k, d^M) = 1$, and the others $\wp(a|\hat{n}, \xi) = 0$. Then we take the sum of Eq. (S76) and take the trace, and get " $k_Q = k_C$ ". That means that there is no contradiction if $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_1}\} = \{\tilde{\rho}_{a'}^{\hat{n}_2}\} = \dots = \{\tilde{\rho}_{a''}^{\hat{n}_k}\}$, and we cannot conclude whether Alice can steer Bob. Consequently, its contrapositive also holds, and if there is a contradiction " $k_Q = (1 + \delta_k)_C$ ", then it requests that at least one set of results $\{\tilde{\rho}_a^{\hat{n}_p}\}$, with $p \in [1, k]$ is not identical to the others. $\square$

-
- [1] Chen, J. L., Su, H. Y., Xu, Z. P., & Pati, A. K. Sharp contradiction for local-hidden-state model in quantum steering *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 32075 (2016).
[2] Liu, Z. H., Zhou, J., Meng, H. X., Yang, M., Li, Q., Meng, Y., Su, H. Y., Chen, J. L., Sun, K., Xu, J. S., Li, C. F. & Guo, G. C. Experimental test of the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger-type paradoxes in and beyond graph states *npj Quantum Inf.* **7**, 66 (2021).