

# Sharing tripartite nonlocality sequentially using only projective measurements

Yiyang Xu<sup>1,2</sup>, Hao Sun<sup>1,2</sup>, Fenzhuo Guo<sup>\*1,2</sup>, Haifeng Dong<sup>3</sup>, and Qiaoyan Wen<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Science, Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Beijing, 100876, China

<sup>2</sup>Henan Key Laboratory of Network Cryptography Technology, Zhengzhou, 450001, China

<sup>3</sup>School of Instrumentation Science and Opto-Electronics Engineering, Beihang University, Beijing, 100191, China

<sup>4</sup>State Key Laboratory of Networking and Switching Technology, Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Beijing, 100876, China

June 27, 2024

## Abstract

Bell nonlocality is a valuable resource in quantum information processing tasks. Scientists are interested in whether a single entangled state can generate a long sequence of nonlocal correlations. Previous work has accomplished sequential tripartite nonlocality sharing through unsharp measurements. In this paper, we investigate the sharing of tripartite nonlocality using only projective measurements and sharing classical randomness. For the generalized GHZ state, we have demonstrated that using unbiased measurement choices, two Charlies can share the standard tripartite nonlocality with a single Alice and a single Bob, while at most one Charlie can share the genuine tripartite nonlocality with a single Alice and a single Bob. However, with biased measurement choices, the number of Charlies sharing the genuine tripartite nonlocality can be increased to two. Nonetheless, we find that using biased measurements does not increase the number of sequential observers sharing the standard tripartite nonlocality. Moreover, we provide the feasible range of double violation for the parameters of the measurement combination probability with respect to the state.

## 1 Introduction

Quantum nonlocality is one of the most important properties of quantum mechanics. It was first pointed out by Einstein, Podolsky, and Rosen [1], highlighting conflicts between quantum mechanics and local realism. Later, Bell derived a statistical inequality, known as the Bell inequality, using it to certify nonlocality [2]. Subsequently, various Bell inequalities have been derived and extensively studied for nonlocality [3–10], with experimental verifications conducted in many different scenarios [11–14]. Moreover, Bell nonlocality [15] serves as a valuable resource in quantum information processing tasks such as device independent randomness generation [16–19], quantum key distribution [20], and reductions of communication complexity [21].

The study of nonlocality sharing among multiple observers has been a hot topic. In 2015, Silva et al. [22] demonstrated through unsharp measurements that two Bobs could share the nonlocality with a single Alice. This opened up extensive research into the nonlocality sharing among multiple observers. In 2020, Brown and Colbeck considered the scenario where each Bob in the sequence performed unsharp measurements with unequal sharpness parameters [23]. They found that an arbitrary number of Bobs could share the nonlocality of a maximally entangled two-qubit state with a single Alice, and they

---

\*Corresponding author: gfenzhuo@bupt.edu.cn

extended this conclusion to all pure entangled two-qubit states. Zhang and Fei investigated sharing the nonlocality of arbitrary dimensional bipartite entangled [24]. In three-qubit system, Saha et. al. [25] studied sharing the nonlocality with multiple observers in one side and found that up to six Charlies could share the standard tripartite nonlocality with a single Alice and a single Bob, and up to two Charlies could share the genuine tripartite nonlocality. In Ref. [26], the author found that an arbitrary number of Charlies could share the standard tripartite nonlocality with a single Alice and a single Bob. Furthermore, the bilateral sharing of nonlocality for two-qubit entangled states [27, 28] and the trilateral nonlocality sharing for three-qubit entangled states [29] have also been studied. So far, significant progress has been made in the study of nonlocality sharing along this line of research[30–36].

Most of the studies on nonlocality sharing mentioned above have used unsharp measurements. Although projective measurement is the simplest form of measurement and is easily implemented in experiments, it is also the most destructive to quantum states. Entangled states become separable after projective measurements, thus limiting its application in nonlocality sharing. However, in recent work [37], the authors demonstrated that if the Bobs choose to combine three projective measurement strategies with different probabilities, then two Bobs can share the nonlocality of the two-qubit entangled state with a single Alice. This opens up the study of nonlocality sharing using projective measurements. In Ref. [38] Zhang et al. investigated the scenario of bipartite high-dimensional pure states. Inspired by [37, 38], this paper investigates the application of projective measurements in nonlocality sharing with a three-qubit entangled system.

For the generalized GHZ state, we propose projective measurements and combine different measurement strategies to investigate nonlocality sharing. When considering unbiased measurement choices, where all possible measurement settings for each Charlie are uniformly distributed, two Charlies can share standard tripartite nonlocality with a single Alice and a single Bob. For different state parameters  $\varphi$ , we provide the feasible range for the double violation with respect to the combination probability  $p$ . However, unbiased measurement choices permit at most one Charlie to share genuine tripartite nonlocality with a single Alice and a single Bob. To overcome this limitation, we introduce the parameter  $v$  to modify the unbiased measurement choices into biased measurement choices. This modification allows two Charlies to share genuine tripartite nonlocality with a single Alice and a single Bob. However, biased measurement choices do not increase the number of sequential observers sharing standard nonlocality. We also provide the feasible ranges for realizing nonlocality sharing with respect to the biased parameter  $v$  and state parameter  $\varphi$ . Additionally, for two specific values of  $v$ , we present the feasible range of double violation concerning the combination probability  $p$  and the state parameter  $\varphi$ .

## 2 Defining tripartite nonlocality

In a Bell scenario involving a three-qubit entangled state, there are three spatially separated parties, named Alice, Bob, and Charlie. They share a three-qubit entangled state, and perform the measurements  $A_x$ ,  $B_y$ , and  $C_z$  on their subsystems, respectively, with outcomes  $a$ ,  $b$ , and  $c$  where  $x, y, z \in \{0, 1\}$ ,  $a, b, c \in \{+1, -1\}$ . In this setup, the quantum correlations are described by the conditional probability  $P(a, b, c|A_x, B_y, C_z)$ . For all combinations of  $x, y, z, a, b, c$ , if the correlations  $P(a, b, c|A_x, B_y, C_z)$  can be represented by a local hidden variable model,

$$P(a, b, c|A_x, B_y, C_z) = \sum_{\xi} q(\xi) P_{\xi}(a|A_x) P_{\xi}(b|B_y) P_{\xi}(c|C_z), \quad (1)$$

where  $q(\xi)$  is the probability distribution on the local hidden variable  $\xi$ ,  $0 \leq q(\xi) \leq 1$  and  $\sum_{\xi} q(\xi) = 1$ , then  $\{P(a, b, c|A_x, B_y, C_z)\}$  is said to be fully local. If  $\{P(a, b, c|A_x, B_y, C_z)\}$  is not fully local, it indicates standard tripartite nonlocality, which can be certified through the violation of the Mermin inequality [5]. This inequality takes the following form.

$$M = \langle A_1 B_0 C_0 \rangle + \langle A_0 B_1 C_0 \rangle + \langle A_0 B_0 C_1 \rangle - \langle A_1 B_1 C_1 \rangle \leq 2, \quad (2)$$

where  $\langle A_x B_y C_z \rangle = \sum_{abc} (abc) P(a, b, c|A_x, B_y, C_z)$ .

In 1987, Svetlichny [4] introduced genuine tripartite nonlocality, which means that when the corre-




Fig. 1: The relations among standard nonlocality and genuine nonlocality.

lations cannot be described by the following local hidden variable model,

$$\begin{aligned}
 P(a, b, c|A_x, B_y, C_z) = & \sum_{\xi} q(\xi) P_{\xi}(b, c|B_y, C_z) P_{\xi}(a|A_x) \\
 & + \sum_{\mu} q(\mu) P_{\mu}(a, c|A_x, C_z) P_{\mu}(b|B_y) \\
 & + \sum_{\nu} q(\nu) P_{\nu}(a, b|A_x, B_y) P_{\nu}(c|C_z),
 \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where  $0 \leq q(\xi), q(\mu), q(\nu) \leq 1$ , and  $\sum_{\xi} q(\xi) + \sum_{\mu} q(\mu) + \sum_{\nu} q(\nu) = 1$ , it indicates genuine tripartite nonlocality. If a quantum correlation violates the Mermin inequality, it does not necessarily imply that the correlation exhibits genuine tripartite nonlocality. However, genuine tripartite nonlocality can be certified through the violation of the Svetlichny inequality [4], which takes the following form

$$\begin{aligned}
 S = & \langle A_0 B_0 C_1 \rangle + \langle A_0 B_1 C_0 \rangle + \langle A_1 B_0 C_0 \rangle - \langle A_1 B_1 C_1 \rangle \\
 & + \langle A_0 B_1 C_1 \rangle + \langle A_1 B_0 C_1 \rangle + \langle A_1 B_1 C_0 \rangle - \langle A_0 B_0 C_0 \rangle \leq 4.
 \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

According to the above definition, the relationship between standard tripartite nonlocality and genuine tripartite nonlocality can be described by Fig. 1.

### 3 Sharing of standard tripartite nonlocality

Previous studies have achieved sequential sharing of standard tripartite nonlocality using unsharp measurements [25, 26]. In this section, we will explore whether projective measurements can enable multiple Charlies to share standard tripartite nonlocality with a single Alice and a single Bob.

As shown in Fig. 2, three particles are prepared in the entangled source  $\rho_{ABC} = |\text{GHZ}_{\varphi}\rangle\langle\text{GHZ}_{\varphi}|$ , where  $|\text{GHZ}_{\varphi}\rangle$  is the generalized three-qubit GHZ state.

$$|\text{GHZ}_{\varphi}\rangle = \cos \varphi |000\rangle + \sin \varphi |111\rangle, \quad 0 \leq \varphi \leq \pi/4. \tag{5}$$

These three particles are spatially separated and shared between Alice, Bob, and multiple Charlies. Alice performs binary measurements on the first particle according to the input  $x \in \{0, 1\}$  and obtains the outcome  $a \in \{+1, -1\}$ . Bob performs binary measurements on the second particle according to the input  $y \in \{0, 1\}$  and obtains the outcome  $b \in \{+1, -1\}$ . Charlie <sub>$k$</sub>  ( $k = 1, \dots, n$ ) performs binary measurements on the third particle according to the input  $z_k \in \{0, 1\}$ , obtains the outcome  $c_k \in \{+1, -1\}$ , and sends the postmeasurement state to the next Charlie, i.e., Charlie <sub>$k+1$</sub> . Each Charlie can implement two different projective measurement strategies: **PM(1)** ( $\lambda = 1$ ): Both measurements are projective measurements. **PM(2)** ( $\lambda = 2$ ): One measurement is a projective measurement and the other measurement is an identity measurement.

It is crucial to determine the shared state  $\rho_{ABC}^{(k+1)}$  among Alice, Bob, and Charlie<sub>k+1</sub> after Charlie<sub>k</sub> performs measurements. Here, it is required that each Charlie performs measurements independent of the measurement choices and results of the preceding Charlies in the sequence, and we consider each observer's input is equally probable. The postmeasurement states are determined by generalized von Neumann-Lüders transformation rule [39]:

$$\rho_{ABC}^{(k+1,\lambda)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{c_k, z_k} \left( \mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \sqrt{C_{c_k|z_k}^{(k,\lambda)}} \right) \rho_{ABC}^{(k,\lambda)} \left( \mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \sqrt{C_{c_k|z_k}^{(k,\lambda)}} \right), \quad (6)$$

where  $C_{c_k|z_k}^{(k,\lambda)}$  is the projective measurement, thus satisfying  $(C_{c_k|z_k}^{(k,\lambda)})^2 = C_{c_k|z_k}^{(k,\lambda)}$ .




Fig. 2: A quantum state  $\rho_{ABC}$  is initially distributed between Alice, Bob, and Charlie<sub>1</sub>. After Charlie<sub>1</sub> performs some kind of quantum measurements(QM) on his part and records the outcomes, he passes the postmeasurement quantum state to Charlie<sub>2</sub>, who then repeats the process. Where QM given by a random combination of several projective measurements (PMs) with different probabilities  $p$ . Before the experiment begins, all parties agree to share classical randomness  $p = \{p_\lambda\}$  satisfying  $\sum_\lambda p_\lambda = 1$ .

From the previous section, we know that standard tripartite nonlocality can be certified through the violation of the Mermin inequality. Each pair Alice-Bob-Charlie<sub>k</sub> tests the Mermin inequality,

$$M_k \equiv \sum_{\lambda=1}^2 p_\lambda M_k^\lambda \leq 2, \quad (7)$$

where

$$M_k^\lambda = \langle A_1 B_0 C_0^{(k,\lambda)} \rangle + \langle A_0 B_1 C_0^{(k,\lambda)} \rangle + \langle A_0 B_0 C_1^{(k,\lambda)} \rangle - \langle A_1 B_1 C_1^{(k,\lambda)} \rangle, \quad (8)$$

$\langle A_x B_y C_z^{(k,\lambda)} \rangle = \text{Tr}[\rho_{ABC}^{(k,\lambda)} (A_x \otimes B_y \otimes C_z^{(k,\lambda)})]$  and  $\{A_x, B_y, C_z^{(k,\lambda)}\}_{k=1,2,\dots,n}$  denote the observables of the respective parties conditioned on  $\lambda$ . Here, we consider the simplest scenario, namely,  $n = 2$ . For the generalized GHZ state (5), we give the following measurement strategy for Alice, Bob, and Charlie<sub>k</sub>. Alice's observables are defined by:

$$A_0 = \sigma_x, \quad A_1 = \sigma_y, \quad (9)$$

Bob's observables are defined by:

$$B_0 = -\sigma_y, \quad B_1 = \sigma_x. \quad (10)$$

For Charlie<sub>k</sub>, we separately analyze the two types of projective measurement strategies: Case(i)-(ii). **Case(i):**( $\lambda = 1$ ) Both measurements of Charlie<sub>1</sub> are projective. The measurement settings are given by the following observables:

$$C_{0|0}^{(1,1)} = \frac{\mathbb{I} + \sigma_x}{2}, \quad C_{0|1}^{(1,1)} = \frac{\mathbb{I} + \sigma_y}{2}. \quad (11)$$

Using normalization and spectral decomposition theorem, we can obtain  $C_{1|z}^{(1,1)} = \mathbb{I} - C_{0|z}^{(1,1)}$  and  $C_z^{(1,1)} = C_{0|z}^{(1,1)} - C_{1|z}^{(1,1)}$  for  $z = 0, 1$ . Under this measurement strategy and the initial state  $|\text{GHZ}_\varphi\rangle\langle\text{GHZ}_\varphi|$ , we can calculate the Mermin inequality value for Alice, Bob, and Charlie<sub>1</sub> as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} M_1^{\lambda=1} &= \text{Tr}[\rho_{ABC}^{(1,1)}(A_1 B_0 C_0^{(1,1)} + A_0 B_1 C_0^{(1,1)} + A_0 B_0 C_1^{(1,1)} - A_1 B_1 C_1^{(1,1)})] \\ &= \text{Tr}[\rho_{ABC}^{(1,1)}(-\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x + \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x - \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y - \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_y)] \\ &= 4 \sin 2\varphi. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

According to Eq. (6), the state shared among Alice, Bob, and Charlie<sub>2</sub> is given by

$$\rho_{ABC}^{(2,1)} = \frac{1}{2}\rho_{ABC}^{(1,1)} + \frac{1}{4}(\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \sigma_x)\rho_{ABC}^{(1,1)}(\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \sigma_x) + \frac{1}{4}(\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \sigma_y)\rho_{ABC}^{(1,1)}(\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \sigma_y). \quad (13)$$

Then taking  $C_z^{(2,1)} = C_z^{(1,1)}$  for  $z = 0, 1$ , we can get

$$\begin{aligned} M_2^{\lambda=1} &= \text{Tr}[\rho_{ABC}^{(2,1)}(A_1 B_0 C_0^{(2,1)} + A_0 B_1 C_0^{(2,1)} + A_0 B_0 C_1^{(2,1)} - A_1 B_1 C_1^{(2,1)})] \\ &= 2 \sin 2\varphi. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

**Case(ii):**( $\lambda = 2$ ) One measurement of Charlie<sub>1</sub> is projective and the other is an identity measurement,

$$C_{0|0}^{(1,2)} = \frac{\mathbb{I} + \sigma_x}{2}, \quad C_{0|1}^{(1,2)} = \mathbb{I}. \quad (15)$$

Similarly, we can obtain  $C_{1|z}^{(1,2)} = \mathbb{I} - C_{0|z}^{(1,2)}$ ,  $C_z^{(1,2)} = C_{0|z}^{(1,2)} - C_{1|z}^{(1,2)}$  for  $z = 0, 1$ , and we can calculate the Mermin inequality value for Alice, Bob, and Charlie<sub>1</sub> as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} M_1^{\lambda=2} &= \text{Tr}[\rho_{ABC}^{(1,2)}(A_1 B_0 C_0^{(1,2)} + A_0 B_1 C_0^{(1,2)} + A_0 B_0 C_1^{(1,2)} - A_1 B_1 C_1^{(1,2)})] \\ &= \text{Tr}[\rho_{ABC}^{(1,2)}(-\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x + \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x - \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_y \otimes \mathbb{I} - \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x \otimes \mathbb{I})] \\ &= 2 \sin 2\varphi. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The state shared among Alice, Bob, and Charlie<sub>2</sub> is given by

$$\rho_{ABC}^{(2,2)} = \frac{3}{4}\rho_{ABC}^{(1,2)} + \frac{1}{4}(\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \sigma_x)\rho_{ABC}^{(1,2)}(\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \sigma_x). \quad (17)$$

Then taking  $C_0^{(2,2)} = \sigma_x$ ,  $C_1^{(2,2)} = \sigma_y$ , we can get

$$\begin{aligned} M_2^{\lambda=2} &= \text{Tr}[\rho_{ABC}^{(2,2)}(A_1 B_0 C_0^{(2,2)} + A_0 B_1 C_0^{(2,2)} + A_0 B_0 C_1^{(2,2)} - A_1 B_1 C_1^{(2,2)})] \\ &= 3 \sin 2\varphi. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Now we consider standard tripartite nonlocality based on the mixture of case(i) and case(ii). Let's assume the probability of choosing the first measurement is  $p$ , and the probability of choosing the second measurement is  $1 - p$ . Then, from Eq. (7), we have

$$M_1 \equiv p \cdot M_1^{\lambda=1} + (1 - p) \cdot M_1^{\lambda=2} = p \cdot 4 \sin 2\varphi + (1 - p) \cdot 2 \sin 2\varphi = (2p + 2) \sin 2\varphi, \quad (19)$$

and

$$M_2 \equiv p \cdot M_2^{\lambda=1} + (1 - p) \cdot M_2^{\lambda=2} = p \cdot 2 \sin 2\varphi + (1 - p) \cdot 3 \sin 2\varphi = (3 - p) \sin 2\varphi. \quad (20)$$

Thus, the problem of nonlocality sharing can be transformed into determining whether we can find parameters  $p$  and  $\varphi$  such that both  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are simultaneously greater than 2. In other words, the conditions  $(2p + 2) \sin 2\varphi > 2$  and  $(3 - p) \sin 2\varphi > 2$  must be satisfied. In Fig. 3, we plot the violations of the Mermin inequality  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  with respect to the parameters  $p$  and  $\phi$ , and we can observe that there exist values of  $p$  and  $\varphi$  that satisfy the above two inequalities. And it can be observed that, as long as  $\varphi \in (0.424, \pi/4]$ , there exists a mixed strategy that allows two Charlies to share the standard nonlocality. For each fixed value of  $\varphi$  within this range, the range of the parameter  $p$  can be easily calculated,  $\frac{1}{\sin 2\varphi} - 1 < p < 3 - \frac{2}{\sin 2\varphi}$ .




Fig. 3: (a)  $M_1$  (orange) and  $M_2$  (blue) are violation surfaces parameterized by  $p$  and  $\varphi$ , and the contour surface  $M = 2$  (green) represents the local bound of the Mermin inequality. (b) The feasible range of parameters  $p$  and  $\varphi$  that satisfy the conditions.

## 4 Sharing of genuine tripartite nonlocality

In Ref. [25], sequential sharing of the genuine tripartite nonlocality has been achieved using unsharp measurements. In this section, we will explore whether, for the generalized GHZ state, using only projective measurements can enable multiple Charlies to share the genuine tripartite nonlocality with a single Alice and a single Bob. The measurement scenario is similar to that described in the Sect. 3 and can be illustrated in Fig. 2.

From Sect. 2, we know that the genuine tripartite nonlocality can be certified through the violation of the Svetlichny inequality. Each pair Alice-Bob-Charlie<sub>k</sub> tests the Svetlichny inequality,

$$S_k \equiv \sum_{\lambda=1}^2 p_\lambda S_k^\lambda \leq 4, \quad (21)$$

where

$$S_k^\lambda = \langle A_0 B_0 C_1^{(k,\lambda)} \rangle + \langle A_0 B_1 C_0^{(k,\lambda)} \rangle + \langle A_1 B_0 C_0^{(k,\lambda)} \rangle - \langle A_1 B_1 C_1^{(k,\lambda)} \rangle \\ + \langle A_0 B_1 C_1^{(k,\lambda)} \rangle + \langle A_1 B_0 C_1^{(k,\lambda)} \rangle + \langle A_1 B_1 C_0^{(k,\lambda)} \rangle - \langle A_0 B_0 C_0^{(k,\lambda)} \rangle. \quad (22)$$

Here, we also consider the simplest scenario, and give the following measurement strategy for Alice, Bob, and Charlie<sub>k</sub>.

Alice's observables as follows:

$$A_0 = \sigma_x, \quad A_1 = \sigma_y, \quad (23)$$

Bob's observables as follows:

$$B_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\sigma_x - \sigma_y), \quad B_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\sigma_x + \sigma_y). \quad (24)$$

Next, the measurement strategies of Charlie<sub>k</sub> are divided into Case(i) and Case(ii).

**Case(i):**( $\lambda = 1$ ) Both measurements of Charlie<sub>1</sub> are projective,

$$C_{0|0}^{(1,1)} = \frac{\mathbb{I} - \sigma_y}{2}, \quad C_{0|1}^{(1,1)} = \frac{\mathbb{I} + \sigma_x}{2}. \quad (25)$$

We can obtain  $C_{1|z}^{(1,1)} = \mathbb{I} - C_{0|z}^{(1,1)}$ ,  $C_z^{(1,1)} = C_{0|z}^{(1,1)} - C_{1|z}^{(1,1)}$  for  $z = 0, 1$ , and it is not difficult to calculate that the Svetlichny inequality value for Alice, Bob, and Charlie<sub>1</sub> is  $S_1^{\lambda=1} = 4\sqrt{2} \sin 2\varphi$ . Using Eq. (6) we obtain

$$\rho_{ABC}^{(2,1)} = \frac{1}{2}\rho_{ABC}^{(1,1)} + \frac{1}{4}(\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \sigma_x)\rho_{ABC}^{(1,1)}(\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \sigma_x) + \frac{1}{4}(\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \sigma_y)\rho_{ABC}^{(1,1)}(\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \sigma_y). \quad (26)$$

Then taking  $C_z^{(2,1)} = C_z^{(1,1)}$  for  $z = 0, 1$ , we can get  $S_2^{\lambda=1} = 2\sqrt{2} \sin 2\varphi$ .

**Case(ii):**( $\lambda = 2$ ) One measurement of Charlie<sub>1</sub> is projective and the other is an identity measurement, and their measurement settings are given by the following observables:

$$C_{0|0}^{(1,2)} = \mathbb{I}, \quad C_{0|1}^{(1,2)} = \frac{\mathbb{I} + \sigma_x}{2}. \quad (27)$$

We can obtain  $C_{1|z}^{(1,2)} = \mathbb{I} - C_{0|z}^{(1,2)}$ ,  $C_z^{(1,2)} = C_{0|z}^{(1,2)} - C_{1|z}^{(1,2)}$  for  $z = 0, 1$ . If, similar to Sect. 3, we select the two measurements in Eq. (27) with equal probability, we find that at most one Charlie can share the genuine tripartite nonlocality with a single Alice and a single Bob. Therefore, we will use biased measurement choices here. Let's assume Charlie<sub>1</sub> selects measurement  $C_0^{(1,2)}$  with the probability of  $v$ , and measurement  $C_1^{(1,2)}$  with the probability of  $1 - v$ , where  $v \in (0, 1)$ . We can calculate that the Svetlichny inequality value for Alice, Bob, and Charlie<sub>1</sub> is  $S_1^{\lambda=2} = 2\sqrt{2} \sin 2\varphi$ . The state shared among Alice, Bob, and Charlie<sub>2</sub> is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{ABC}^{(2,2)} &= (1 - v) \left( \mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \frac{\mathbb{I} + \sigma_x}{2} \rho_{ABC}^{(1,2)} \mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \frac{\mathbb{I} + \sigma_x}{2} + \mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \frac{\mathbb{I} - \sigma_x}{2} \rho_{ABC}^{(1,2)} \mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \frac{\mathbb{I} - \sigma_x}{2} \right) \\ &\quad + v \cdot \mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \rho_{ABC}^{(1,2)} \mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \\ &= \frac{1 + v}{2} \rho_{ABC}^{(1,2)} + \frac{1 - v}{2} (\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \sigma_x) \rho_{ABC}^{(1,2)} (\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \sigma_x). \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Then taking  $C_0^{(2,2)} = -\sigma_y$ ,  $C_1^{(2,2)} = \sigma_x$ , we can get  $S_2^{\lambda=2} = 2\sqrt{2}(1 + v) \sin 2\varphi$ .

Similar to the Sect. 3, we now consider the mixture of case(i) and case(ii). Let's assume the probability of choosing the first measurement is  $p$ , and the probability of choosing the second measurement is  $1 - p$ . From Eq. (21), we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &\equiv p \cdot S_1^{\lambda=1} + (1 - p) \cdot S_1^{\lambda=2} = p \cdot 4\sqrt{2} \sin 2\varphi + (1 - p) \cdot 2\sqrt{2} \sin 2\varphi \\ &= 2\sqrt{2}(p + 1) \sin 2\varphi, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 &\equiv p \cdot S_2^{\lambda=1} + (1 - p) \cdot S_2^{\lambda=2} = p \cdot 2\sqrt{2} \sin 2\varphi + (1 - p) \cdot 2\sqrt{2}(1 + v) \sin 2\varphi \\ &= 2\sqrt{2}[1 + v(1 - p)] \sin 2\varphi. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Now, we need to investigate whether we can find parameters  $v$ ,  $p$ , and  $\varphi$  such that both  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are simultaneously greater than 4. In other words, it needs to satisfy

$$2\sqrt{2}(p + 1) \sin 2\varphi > 4, \quad \text{and} \quad 2\sqrt{2}[1 + v(1 - p)] \sin 2\varphi > 4, \quad (31)$$

which implies

$$0 \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sin 2\varphi} - 1 < p < 1 + \frac{1}{v} - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{v \sin 2\varphi} \leq 1. \quad (32)$$

In Fig. 4, we can observe that there exist  $v$  and  $\varphi$  such that both inequalities in Eq. (31) hold. It is found that when the range of  $v$  is  $(0.7071, 1)$ , with some state parameters  $\varphi$  there exists a combination of measurements such that both  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are simultaneously greater than 4. This indicates that unbiased measurements cannot achieve double violations. For example, when selecting  $v = 0.8$  and  $v = 0.9$ , we obtain Fig. 5. It can be observed that as  $v$  increases, the feasible range for double violation with respect to  $\varphi$  and  $p$  also expands. In Fig. 5(a), we observe that as long as  $\varphi \in (0.683, \pi/4]$ , there exists a mixed strategy such that  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are both greater than 4. Specifically, when  $\varphi = \pi/4$ ,  $p \in (\sqrt{2} - 1, \frac{9-5\sqrt{2}}{4}) \approx (0.4143, 0.4822)$ , where  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are simultaneously greater than 4. Similarly,




Fig. 4: When the parameters  $v$  and  $\varphi$  are within the blue region, there exists a mixed strategy such that both  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are greater than 4.




Fig. 5: (a) and (b) show the feasible ranges of  $\varphi$  and  $p$  for the double violation when  $v = 0.8$  and  $v = 0.9$ , respectively.



in Fig. 5(b), we find that when  $\varphi \in (0.643, \pi/4]$ , there exists a mixed strategy, and when  $\varphi = \pi/4$ , the feasible range for  $p$  is  $(\sqrt{2} - 1, \frac{19-10\sqrt{2}}{9}) \approx (0.4143, 0.5397)$ .

Finally, it can be seen that using biased measurement choices can increase the number of sequential observers sharing the genuine tripartite nonlocality. However, through calculations, we find that even with biased measurement choices, at most two Charlies can share the standard nonlocality with a single Alice and a single Bob.

## 5 Conclusion

We have demonstrated that three-qubit nonlocality sharing can be achieved solely through projective measurements when the parties share classical randomness. Specifically, we found that unbiased measurement choices enable two Charlies to share the standard tripartite nonlocality with a single Alice and a single Bob. Furthermore, biased measurement choices allow two Charlies to share the genuine tripartite nonlocality with a single Alice and a single Bob. Additionally, we investigated the sharing of tripartite nonlocality among bilateral and trilateral scenarios. However, we found that with the measurement settings in this paper, it is not possible to achieve the sharing of standard tripartite nonlocality and genuine nonlocality among more than one sequential observer. Our results suggest that many other sequential quantum information protocols, such as steering [22], entanglement witnessing [40, 41], and contextuality [42], can also be implemented based on projective measurements.

The current work raises some interesting questions: (1) In [26], it was proven that using unsharp measurements, any number of Charlies can share standard nonlocality by violating the Mermin inequality with a single Alice and a single Bob. It is still unknown whether more than two sequential violations can be achieved using projective measurements. (2) Whether there exist some state and measurement strategies such that tripartite nonlocal correlations can be shared among a single Alice—multiple Bobs—multiple Charlies, and multiple Alices—multiple Bobs—multiple Charlies.

## 6 Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants No. 62171056, and No. 62220106012), and the Henan Key Laboratory of Network Cryptography Technology (Grants No. LNCT2022-A03).

## References

- [1] Albert Einstein, Boris Podolsky, and Nathan Rosen. Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete? *Physical review*, 47(10):777, 1935.
- [2] John S Bell. On the einstein podolsky rosen paradox. *Physics Physique Fizika*, 1(3):195, 1964.
- [3] John F Clauser, Michael A Horne, Abner Shimony, and Richard A Holt. Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories. *Physical Review Letters*, 23(15):880, 1969.
- [4] George Svetlichny. Distinguishing three-body from two-body nonseparability by a bell-type inequality. *Physical Review D*, 35(10):3066, 1987.
- [5] N David Mermin. Extreme quantum entanglement in a superposition of macroscopically distinct states. *Physical Review Letters*, 65(15):1838, 1990.
- [6] Mohammad Ardehali. Bell inequalities with a magnitude of violation that grows exponentially with the number of particles. *Physical Review A*, 46(9):5375, 1992.
- [7] Daniel Collins, Nicolas Gisin, Noah Linden, Serge Massar, and Sandu Popescu. Bell inequalities for arbitrarily high-dimensional systems. *Physical Review Letters*, 88(4):040404, 2002.
- [8] Časlav Brukner, Marek Żukowski, and Anton Zeilinger. Quantum communication complexity protocol with two entangled qutrits. *Physical Review Letters*, 89(19):197901, 2002.

- [9] AV Belinskiĭ and David Nikolaevich Klyshko. Interference of light and bell's theorem. *Physics-Uspekhi*, 36(8):653, 1993.
- [10] Marek Żukowski and Časlav Brukner. Bell's theorem for general n-qubit states. *Physical Review Letters*, 88(21):210401, 2002.
- [11] Alain Aspect, Jean Dalibard, and Gérard Roger. Experimental test of bell's inequalities using time-varying analyzers. *Physical Review Letters*, 49(25):1804, 1982.
- [12] Marissa Giustina, Alexandra Mech, Sven Ramelow, Bernhard Wittmann, Johannes Kofler, Jörn Beyer, Adriana Lita, Brice Calkins, Thomas Gerrits, Sae Woo Nam, et al. Bell violation using entangled photons without the fair-sampling assumption. *Nature*, 497(7448):227–230, 2013.
- [13] Marissa Giustina, Marijn AM Versteegh, Sören Wengerowsky, Johannes Handsteiner, Armin Hochrainer, Kevin Phelan, Fabian Steinlechner, Johannes Kofler, Jan-Åke Larsson, Carlos Abellán, et al. Significant-loophole-free test of bell's theorem with entangled photons. *Physical Review Letters*, 115(25):250401, 2015.
- [14] Giulio Foletto, Matteo Padovan, Marco Avesani, Hamid Tebyanian, Paolo Villoresi, and Giuseppe Vallone. Experimental test of sequential weak measurements for certified quantum randomness extraction. *Physical Review A*, 103(6):062206, 2021.
- [15] Nicolas Brunner, Daniel Cavalcanti, Stefano Pironio, Valerio Scarani, and Stephanie Wehner. Bell nonlocality. *Reviews of modern physics*, 86(2):419, 2014.
- [16] Stefano Pironio, Antonio Acín, Serge Massar, A Boyer de La Giroday, Dzmitry N Matsukevich, Peter Maunz, Steven Olmschenk, David Hayes, Le Luo, T Andrew Manning, et al. Random numbers certified by bell's theorem. *Nature*, 464(7291):1021–1024, 2010.
- [17] Antonio Acín, Serge Massar, and Stefano Pironio. Randomness versus nonlocality and entanglement. *Physical Review Letters*, 108(10):100402, 2012.
- [18] Antonio Acín and Lluís Masanes. Certified randomness in quantum physics. *Nature*, 540(7632):213–219, 2016.
- [19] Erik Woodhead, Boris Bourdoncle, and Antonio Acín. Randomness versus nonlocality in the mermin-bell experiment with three parties. *Quantum*, 2:82, 2018.
- [20] Antonio Acín, Nicolas Brunner, Nicolas Gisin, Serge Massar, Stefano Pironio, and Valerio Scarani. Device-independent security of quantum cryptography against collective attacks. *Physical Review Letters*, 98(23):230501, 2007.
- [21] Harry Buhrman, Richard Cleve, Serge Massar, and Ronald De Wolf. Nonlocality and communication complexity. *Reviews of modern physics*, 82(1):665, 2010.
- [22] Ralph Silva, Nicolas Gisin, Yelena Guryanova, and Sandu Popescu. Multiple observers can share the nonlocality of half of an entangled pair by using optimal weak measurements. *Physical Review Letters*, 114(25):250401, 2015.
- [23] Peter J Brown and Roger Colbeck. Arbitrarily many independent observers can share the nonlocality of a single maximally entangled qubit pair. *Physical Review Letters*, 125(9):090401, 2020.
- [24] Tinggui Zhang and Shao-Ming Fei. Sharing quantum nonlocality and genuine nonlocality with independent observables. *Physical Review A*, 103(3):032216, 2021.
- [25] Sutapa Saha, Debarshi Das, Souradeep Sasmal, Debasis Sarkar, Kaushiki Mukherjee, Arup Roy, and Some Sankar Bhattacharya. Sharing of tripartite nonlocality by multiple observers measuring sequentially at one side. *Quantum Information Processing*, 18:1–15, 2019.
- [26] Ya Xi, Mao-Sheng Li, Libin Fu, and Zhu-Jun Zheng. Sharing tripartite nonlocality sequentially by arbitrarily many independent observers. *Physical Review A*, 107(6):062419, 2023.

- [27] Shuming Cheng, Lijun Liu, Travis J Baker, and Michael JW Hall. Limitations on sharing bell nonlocality between sequential pairs of observers. *Physical Review A*, 104(6):L060201, 2021.
- [28] Jie Zhu, Meng-Jun Hu, Chuan-Feng Li, Guang-Can Guo, and Yong-Sheng Zhang. Einstein-podolsky-rosen steering in two-sided sequential measurements with one entangled pair. *Physical Review A*, 105(3):032211, 2022.
- [29] Changliang Ren, Xiaowei Liu, Wenlin Hou, Tianfeng Feng, and Xiaoqi Zhou. Nonlocality sharing for a three-qubit system via multilateral sequential measurements. *Physical Review A*, 105(5):052221, 2022.
- [30] Meng-Jun Hu, Zhi-Yuan Zhou, Xiao-Min Hu, Chuan-Feng Li, Guang-Can Guo, and Yong-Sheng Zhang. Observation of non-locality sharing among three observers with one entangled pair via optimal weak measurement. *npj Quantum Information*, 4(1):63, 2018.
- [31] Debarshi Das, Arkaprabha Ghosal, Souradeep Sasmal, Shiladitya Mal, and AS Majumdar. Facets of bipartite nonlocality sharing by multiple observers via sequential measurements. *Physical Review A*, 99(2):022305, 2019.
- [32] Asmita Kumari and AK Pan. Sharing nonlocality and nontrivial preparation contextuality using the same family of bell expressions. *Physical Review A*, 100(6):062130, 2019.
- [33] Giulio Foletto, Luca Calderaro, Armin Tavakoli, Matteo Schiavon, Francesco Picciariello, Adán Cabello, Paolo Villoresi, and Giuseppe Vallone. Experimental certification of sustained entanglement and nonlocality after sequential measurements. *Physical Review Applied*, 13(4):044008, 2020.
- [34] Tianfeng Feng, Changliang Ren, Yuling Tian, Maolin Luo, Haofei Shi, Jingling Chen, and Xiaoqi Zhou. Observation of nonlocality sharing via not-so-weak measurements. *Physical Review A*, 102(3):032220, 2020.
- [35] Tinggui Zhang, Qiming Luo, and Xiaofen Huang. Quantum bell nonlocality cannot be shared under a special kind of bilateral measurements for high-dimensional quantum states. *Quantum Information Processing*, 21(10):350, 2022.
- [36] Shyam Sundar Mahato and AK Pan. Sharing nonlocality in a quantum network by unbounded sequential observers. *Physical Review A*, 106(4):042218, 2022.
- [37] Anna Steffnlongo and Armin Tavakoli. Projective measurements are sufficient for recycling nonlocality. *Physical Review Letters*, 129(23):230402, 2022.
- [38] Tinggui Zhang, Hong Yang, and Shao-Ming Fei. Sharing bell nonlocality of bipartite high-dimensional pure states using only projective measurements. *Physical Review A*, 109(2):022419, 2024.
- [39] Paul Busch. Unsharp reality and joint measurements for spin observables. *Physical Review D*, 33(8):2253, 1986.
- [40] Anindita Bera, Shiladitya Mal, Aditi Sen, Ujjwal Sen, et al. Witnessing bipartite entanglement sequentially by multiple observers. *Physical Review A*, 98(6):062304, 2018.
- [41] Mahasweta Pandit, Chirag Srivastava, and Ujjwal Sen. Recycled entanglement detection by arbitrarily many sequential and independent pairs of observers. *Physical Review A*, 106(3):032419, 2022.
- [42] Hammad Anwer, Natalie Wilson, Ralph Silva, Sadiq Muhammad, Armin Tavakoli, and Mohamed Bourennane. Noise-robust preparation contextuality shared between any number of observers via unsharp measurements. *Quantum*, 5:551, 2021.