

Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen correlations and Bell correlations in the simplest scenario

Quan Quan^{1,2}, Huangjun Zhu^{3,4,*}, Heng Fan^{5,6,2}, and Wen-Li Yang^{2,7}

¹*State Key Laboratory of Low-Dimensional Quantum Physics and
Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China*

²*Institute of Modern Physics, Northwest University, Xi'an 710069, China*

³*Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Cologne, Cologne 50937, Germany*

⁴*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 2Y5, Canada*

⁵*Institute of Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*

⁶*Collaborative Innovation Center of Quantum Matter, Beijing 100190, China*

⁷*Shaanxi Key Laboratory for Theoretical Physics Frontiers, Xi'an 710069, China*

(Dated: May 29, 2022)

Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) steering is an intermediate type of quantum nonlocality which sits between entanglement and Bell nonlocality. A set of correlations is Bell nonlocal if it does not admit a local hidden variable (LHV) model, while it is EPR nonlocal if it does not admit a local hidden variable-local hidden state (LHV-LHS) model. It is interesting to know what states can generate EPR-nonlocal correlations in the simplest nontrivial scenario, that is, two projective measurements for each party sharing a two-qubit state. Here we show that a two-qubit state can generate EPR-nonlocal full correlations (excluding marginal statistics) in this scenario if and only if it can generate Bell-nonlocal correlations. If full statistics (including marginal statistics) is taken into account, surprisingly, the same scenario can manifest the simplest one-way steering and the strongest hierarchy between steering and Bell nonlocality. To illustrate these intriguing phenomena in simple setups, several concrete examples are discussed in detail, which facilitates experimental demonstration. In the course of study, we introduce the concept of restricted LHS models and thereby derive a necessary and sufficient semidefinite-programming criterion to determine the steerability of any bipartite state under given measurements. Analytical criteria are further derived in several scenarios of strong theoretical and experimental interest.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.65.Ud, 03.65.Ta

I. INTRODUCTION

Local measurements on entangled states can generate nonlocal correlations that cannot be reproduced by any classical mechanism [1–4]. This counterintuitive phenomenon is a subject of continuous debate and inspiration for various new ideas [5–7]. It also plays a key role in many quantum information processing protocols, especially quantum key distribution (QKD) and secure quantum communication [8–10]. The strongest nonlocal correlations can be detected by violation of Bell inequalities, which indicates one's inability to construct a local-hidden-variable (LHV) model of the correlations [3, 7]. Such correlations are known as Bell nonlocal.

Recently, Wiseman *et al.* [4, 11] formalized the concept of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) steering [1, 2] and showed that it is an intermediate type of nonlocality that sits between entanglement and Bell nonlocality. EPR steering can be detected by violation of steering inequalities [12–15], which indicates one's inability to construct a hybrid local hidden variable-local hidden state (LHV-LHS) model [4, 11, 16]. The asymmetry in the model reflects the asymmetry in the roles played by the two parties [4, 17, 18]. Correlations that do not admit an LHV-LHS model are referred to as EPR nonlocal, which

are weaker than Bell-nonlocal correlations and easier to generate [4]. They have received increasing attentions recently because of their intriguing connections with Bell-nonlocal correlations [19–22] and potential applications in quantum information processing, such as quantum key distribution and secure teleportation [6, 10, 23, 24].

The simplest Bell scenario consists of two parties, Alice and Bob, and two binary measurements for each party [3, 25, 26]. The set of correlations is Bell nonlocal if and only if (iff) it violates the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) inequality [25], which is a full-correlation inequality. In addition, there is a simple criterion on which two-qubit states can generate such correlations [27, 28]. The simplest steering scenario also consists of two binary measurements for each party, assuming that Bob (the steered party) can only perform projective measurements. Recently, Cavalcanti *et al.* introduced an analog CHSH inequality and showed that the set of full correlations (excluding marginal statistics) is EPR nonlocal iff this inequality is violated, assuming mutually unbiased measurements for Bob [29]. However, little is known about which two-qubit states are EPR nonlocal in the simplest steering scenario.

Here we show that a two-qubit state can generate EPR-nonlocal full correlations (excluding marginal statistics) in the simplest steering scenario iff it can generate Bell-nonlocal correlations (note that, in the simplest scenario, Bell nonlocality depends on full correlations, but not on marginal statistics [28]). When full statistics (including

* hzhu1@uni-koeln.de, zhu Huangjun@gmail.com

marginal statistics) is taken into account, surprisingly, the same scenario can demonstrate the simplest one-way steering and the strongest hierarchy between steering and Bell nonlocality. In particular, we show that certain two-qubit states are steerable one way in the simplest scenario, but are not steerable the other way (and thus necessarily Bell local) even if one can perform the most sophisticated measurements allowed by quantum mechanics. To illustrate these intriguing phenomena, several concrete examples are discussed in detail, which are amenable to demonstration in simple experiments.

In the course of study, we introduce restricted LHS models, and thereby derive a semidefinite program (SDP) for determining the steerability of any bipartite state under given measurements. Furthermore, we derive necessary and sufficient analytical criteria in several cases of strong theoretical and experimental interest, for example, when Alice and Bob share a two-qubit state and Alice performs two binary measurements.

Our study settles a fundamental question on steering in the simplest nontrivial scenario, which may serve as a starting point for exploring steering in more complicated scenarios. Meanwhile, it provides valuable insight on the relations between entanglement, steering, and Bell nonlocality. It also helps explain the relation between steering and incompatibility of observables, which complements several recent studies [15, 21, 30, 31].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we introduce the concept of restricted LHS models and thereby propose a SDP for determining the steerability of bipartite states under given measurements of the two parties. In Sec. III, we derive a necessary and sufficient steering criterion in the simplest nontrivial scenario. In Sec. IV, we show that a two-qubit state can generate EPR-nonlocal full correlations in this scenario iff it can generate Bell-nonlocal (full) correlations. The relations between entanglement, EPR steering, and Bell nonlocality are then discussed briefly. In Sec. V, we provide a concrete example to show that violation of full-correlation inequalities is sufficient, but not necessary, for demonstrating steering even in the simplest steering scenario, in sharp contrast with the simplest Bell scenario. This example also manifests a strict hierarchy between steering and Bell nonlocality. In Sec. VI, we show that the above steering scenario can demonstrate one-way steering and the hierarchy between steering and Bell nonlocality in the simplest and strongest form. Section VII summarizes this paper.

II. STEERING CRITERIA BASED ON RESTRICTED LHS MODELS

A. Restricted LHS models

Suppose Alice and Bob share a bipartite state ρ and they can perform measurements in the sets M_A and M_B , respectively, which are referred to as *measurement as-*

semblages henceforth. Let $p(a, b|A, B)$ be the probability of obtaining the outcomes a and b when Alice and Bob perform measurements $A \in M_A$ and $B \in M_B$. Then the state ρ is *steerable* if the set of probability distributions $p(a, b|A, B)$ does not admit an LHV-LHS model [4, 11],

$$p(a, b|A, B) = \sum_{\lambda} p_{\lambda} p(a|A, \lambda) p(b|B, \rho_{\lambda}). \quad (1)$$

Here, $p(a|A, \lambda)$ for each A and λ denotes an arbitrary probability distribution as does p_{λ} , while $p(b|B, \rho_{\lambda}) = \text{tr}(\rho_{\lambda} B_b)$ denotes the quantum probability of outcome b when Bob performs the measurement B on the state ρ_{λ} , where B_b is the effect [element in a positive-operator-valued measure (POVM)] corresponding to outcome b .

If Alice performs the measurement $A \in M_A$ on the bipartite state ρ and obtains the outcome a , then Bob's subnormalized reduced state is $\rho_{a|A} = \text{tr}_A[(A_a \otimes I)\rho]$, which satisfies $\sum_a \rho_{a|A} = \rho_B := \text{tr}_A(\rho)$. The set of states $\{\rho_{a|A}\}_a$ for a given measurement A is an *ensemble* for ρ_B , and the whole collection of ensembles $\{\rho_{a|A}\}_{a,A}$ is a *state assemblage* [32]. The state assemblage $\{\rho_{a|A}\}_{a,A}$ is *unsteerable* if there exists an LHS model [4, 11, 15, 21, 30, 31],

$$\rho_{a|A} = \sum_{\lambda} p_{\lambda} p(a|A, \lambda) \rho_{\lambda}, \quad (2)$$

where $p(a|A, \lambda) \geq 0$, $\sum_a p(a|A, \lambda) = 1$, and $p_{\lambda} \rho_{\lambda}$ form an ensemble for ρ_B . The steerability of the assemblage $\{\rho_{a|A}\}_{a,A}$ can be determined by SDP [32, 33].

To elucidate the connection between the LHS model in Eq. (2) and the LHV-LHS model in Eq. (1), here we introduce the concept of restricted LHS models. Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be the space of all operators acting on Bob's Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{V} \leq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ a subspace. The assemblage $\{\rho_{a|A}\}_{a,A}$ admits a $\mathcal{V}$ -restricted LHS model if

$$\text{tr}(\Pi \rho_{a|A}) = \sum_{\lambda} p_{\lambda} p(a|A, \lambda) \text{tr}(\Pi \rho_{\lambda}) \quad \forall \Pi \in \mathcal{V}, \quad (3)$$

where $p(a|A, \lambda) \geq 0$, $\sum_a p(a|A, \lambda) = 1$, and $p_{\lambda} \rho_{\lambda}$ form an ensemble for a quantum state. In that case, the state assemblage $\{\rho_{a|A}\}_{a,A}$ is called $\mathcal{V}$ -unsteerable. The assemblage is unsteerable iff it is $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ -unsteerable. Any $\mathcal{V}$ -unsteerable assemblage is also $\mathcal{W}$ -unsteerable if $\mathcal{W} \leq \mathcal{V}$.

Suppose $\mathcal{R}$ is the space spanned by all the effects B_b in Bob's measurement assemblage. Then the set of probability distributions $p(a, b|A, B)$ admits an LHV-LHS model iff the state assemblage $\{\rho_{a|A}\}_{a,A}$ is $\mathcal{R}$ -unsteerable in view of the relation

$$p(a, b|A, B) = \text{tr}(\rho_{a|A} B_b). \quad (4)$$

The existence of such a model does not depend on any detail of Bob's measurement assemblage except for the span $\mathcal{R}$.

B. Semidefinite programming for determining steerability

The $\mathcal{V}$ -steerability of the assemblage $\{\rho_{a|A}\}_{a,A}$ can be resolved by a similar SDP used for determining the steerability of $\{\rho_{a|A}\}_{a,A}$. To start with, let us first review the SDP for determining the steerability of the assemblage $\{\rho_{a|A}\}_{a,A}$. Recall that $\{\rho_{a|A}\}_{a,A}$ is steerable iff it does not admit an LHS model as

$$\rho_{a|A} = \sum_{\lambda} p_{\lambda} p(a|A, \lambda) \rho_{\lambda} = \sum_{\lambda} p(a|A, \lambda) \sigma_{\lambda}, \quad (5)$$

where $\sigma_{\lambda} = p_{\lambda} \rho_{\lambda}$ form an ensemble of ρ_B . Here the conditional probability distributions $p(a|A, \lambda)$ can be replaced by deterministic conditional probability distributions $D(a|A, \lambda)$, which are extremal. Then the steerability of the assemblage can be determined by the following SDP [32, 33],

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{find } \{\sigma_{\lambda}\} \text{ subjected to} \\ & \sum_{\lambda} D(a|A, \lambda) \sigma_{\lambda} = \rho_{a|A} \quad \forall A, a, \\ & \text{tr}\left(\sum_{\lambda} \sigma_{\lambda}\right) = 1, \quad \sigma_{\lambda} \geq 0 \quad \forall \lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The assemblage $\{\rho_{a|A}\}_{a,A}$ is $\mathcal{R}$ -steerable iff it cannot be written as follows,

$$\text{tr}(\Pi \rho_{a|A}) = \sum_{\lambda} D(a|A, \lambda) \text{tr}(\Pi \sigma_{\lambda}) \quad \forall A, a; \quad \forall \Pi \in \mathcal{R}. \quad (7)$$

Let $\{\Pi_j\}$ be a basis of $\mathcal{R}$. Then the $\mathcal{R}$ -steerability can be determined by the following SDP,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{find } \{\sigma_{\lambda}\} \text{ subjected to} \\ & \sum_{\lambda} D(a|A, \lambda) \text{tr}(\Pi_j \sigma_{\lambda}) = \text{tr}(\Pi_j \rho_{a|A}) \quad \forall A, a, j, \\ & \text{tr}\left(\sum_{\lambda} \sigma_{\lambda}\right) = 1, \quad \sigma_{\lambda} \geq 0 \quad \forall \lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

In this way, the steerability of any bipartite state under given measurements can be determined by SDP.

III. EPR-NONLOCAL CORRELATIONS IN THE SIMPLEST SCENARIO

A. The simplest steering scenario

What is the simplest steering scenario? This question has attracted a lot of attention recently [26, 29, 34–36]. To demonstrate steering, Alice and Bob need to share an entangled state, and the simplest candidate is a two-qubit state. Alice also needs a choice over her measurements, and the simplest measurement assemblage consists of two projective measurements. It is not necessary for Bob

to have a choice over different measurements, but the effects in his measurement assemblage cannot commute with each other pairwise, so the span of these effects has dimension at least 3; the simplest measurement assemblage satisfying this property consists of either two projective measurements or one trine measurement [26]. To summarize, in the simplest steering scenario, Alice and Bob share a two-qubit state, and there are two choices for the measurement setting:

1. Two projective measurements for Alice and Bob, respectively.
2. Two projective measurements for Alice and one trine measurement for Bob.

Here, scenario 2 is singled out by the least complexity cost of 12, where the complexity cost is the number of possible patterns of joint detection outcomes that can occur [26]; see Appendix A. In practice, however, it is usually easier to perform two projective measurements than one trine measurement, so we shall focus on scenario 1 in the following discussions. Note that the span of effects of any trine measurement on a qubit can be realized by two projective measurements, and vice versa. In view of the restricted LHS models discussed above, the two scenarios are actually equivalent as far as determining steerability is concerned, although one scenario may be easier than the other for experimental implementation. Therefore, many of our conclusions on scenario 1 are also applicable to scenario 2. In addition, similar analysis is applicable when the projective measurements of Alice and Bob are replaced by general binary measurements.

B. Necessary and sufficient steering criterion

The steerability of any two-qubit state under arbitrary given measurements can be determined using the SDP presented in Sec. II B. In the simplest steering scenario, we can even derive an analytical criterion.

Consider the two-qubit state

$$\rho = \frac{1}{4} \left(I \otimes I + \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} \otimes I + I \otimes \boldsymbol{\beta} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} + \sum_{i,j=1}^3 t_{ij} \sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j \right), \quad (9)$$

where σ_j for $j = 1, 2, 3$ are three Pauli matrices, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is the vector composed of them, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ are the Bloch vectors for Alice and Bob, respectively, and $T = (t_{ij})$ is the correlation matrix. Both Alice and Bob can choose two projective measurements as described by $\{A_1, A_2\} = \{\mathbf{a}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{a}_2 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}\}$ and $\{B_1, B_2\} = \{\mathbf{b}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{b}_2 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}\}$, respectively, where $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2$ are unit vectors in dimension 3, referred to as measurement vectors henceforth. The two outcomes of each measurement are denoted by $\pm$.

If Alice obtains outcomes $\pm$ given measurements $m = 1, 2$, then the unnormalized reduced states of Bob are

given by

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{\pm|m} &= \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}_A \{ [(I \pm \mathbf{a}_m \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}) \otimes I] \rho \} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} [(1 \pm \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{a}_m)I + \boldsymbol{\beta} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} \pm \gamma_m \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}],\end{aligned}\quad (10)$$

where $\gamma_{mj} = \sum_{i=1}^3 a_{mitij}$. The span of effects of Bob's measurements is $\mathcal{R} = \text{Span}\{I, \mathbf{b}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{b}_2 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}\}$, which is three dimensional except in the trivial case in which $\mathbf{b}_1$ and $\mathbf{b}_2$ are parallel or antiparallel. The state ρ is steerable under given measurements iff the assemblage $\{\rho_{\pm|m}\}_{m=1,2}$ is $\mathcal{R}$ -steerable.

Let $\tilde{\rho}_B$ be the orthogonal projection of ρ_B onto $\mathcal{R}$. Then, $\tilde{\rho}_B$ is a density matrix whose Bloch vector is the projection of the Bloch vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ of ρ_B onto the plane spanned by $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2$. Let $\tilde{\rho}_{\pm|m}$ be the orthogonal projection of $\rho_{\pm|m}$ onto $\mathcal{R}$; then $\{\tilde{\rho}_{\pm|m}\}_{m=1,2}$ is an assemblage for $\tilde{\rho}_B$. To be concrete, we have

$$\tilde{\rho}_B = \frac{1}{2}(I + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}), \quad \tilde{\rho}_{\pm|m} = \frac{1}{4}[(1 \pm \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{a}_m)I + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} \pm \tilde{\gamma}_m \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}],\quad (11)$$

where

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \sum_{m=1}^2 (\boldsymbol{\beta} \cdot \mathbf{b}_m) \mathbf{b}'_m, \quad \tilde{\gamma}_m = \sum_{n=1}^2 (\gamma_m \cdot \mathbf{b}_n) \mathbf{b}'_n, \quad (12)$$

and $\mathbf{b}'_1, \mathbf{b}'_2$ form the dual basis of $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2$ in their span, as characterized by the equation $\mathbf{b}'_m \cdot \mathbf{b}_n = \delta_{mn}$, assuming $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2$ are linearly independent. Note that $\mathbf{b}'_m = \mathbf{b}_m$ when $\mathbf{b}_1$ and $\mathbf{b}_2$ are orthogonal, that is, when Bob's measurements are mutually unbiased. To appreciate the significance of the $\mathcal{R}$ -restricted assemblage $\{\tilde{\rho}_{\pm|m}\}_{m=1,2}$, note that it is steerable iff $\{\rho_{\pm|m}\}_{m=1,2}$ is $\mathcal{R}$ -steerable, that is, iff ρ is steerable under given measurements.

If $\tilde{\rho}_B$ is not invertible, then it is pure, so the assemblage $\{\tilde{\rho}_{\pm|m}\}_{m=1,2}$ cannot be steerable. Otherwise, the steerability of $\{\tilde{\rho}_{\pm|m}\}_{m=1,2}$ is equivalent to the incompatibility of the set of steering-equivalent observables $\{O_{\pm|m}\}_{m=1,2}$ [31] with

$$O_{\pm|m} = \tilde{\rho}_B^{-1/2} \tilde{\rho}_{\pm|m} \tilde{\rho}_B^{-1/2}. \quad (13)$$

The latter statement is equivalent to the noncoexistence of the two qubit effects $O_{+|1}$ and $O_{+|2}$, which can be determined analytically [31, 37–39]. To be specific, express $O_{\pm|m}$ as follows:

$$O_{\pm|m} = \frac{1}{2}[(1 \pm \eta_m)I \pm \mathbf{r}_m \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}], \quad (14)$$

where η_m is a real constant, and $\mathbf{r}_m$ is a real vector in dimension 3, which satisfies $|\eta_m| + |\mathbf{r}_m| \leq 1$. Then, $O_{+|1}$ and $O_{+|2}$ are coexistent iff [39]

$$(1 - F_1^2 - F_2^2) \left(1 - \frac{\eta_1^2}{F_1^2} - \frac{\eta_2^2}{F_2^2}\right) \leq (\mathbf{r}_1 \cdot \mathbf{r}_2 - \eta_1 \eta_2)^2, \quad (15)$$

where

$$F_m = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{(1 + \eta_m)^2 - r_m^2} + \sqrt{(1 - \eta_m)^2 - r_m^2} \right). \quad (16)$$

In this way, we can determine analytically the steerability of any two-qubit state under two given projective measurements on each side.

We emphasize that all the parameters entering the inequality in Eq. (15) are determined by measurement vectors of Bob and measurement statistics. So it is straightforward to test this inequality in experiments. To see this, note that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle A_m \rangle &= \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{a}_m, \\ \langle B_n \rangle &= \boldsymbol{\beta} \cdot \mathbf{b}_n, \\ \langle A_m B_n \rangle &= \mathbf{a}_m^T T \mathbf{b}_n = \gamma_m \cdot \mathbf{b}_n.\end{aligned}\quad (17)$$

Therefore, $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{a}_m$ is determined by measurement statistics; $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_m$ are determined by measurement statistics and Bob's measurement vectors according to Eqs. (12) and (17) (note that $\mathbf{b}'_1, \mathbf{b}'_2$ are determined by $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2$). Consequently, $\tilde{\rho}_B$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{\pm|m}$ are completely determined by measurement vectors of Bob and measurement statistics, from which our claim follows. In practice, we may also use other tomographic methods for reconstructing $\tilde{\rho}_B$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{\pm|m}$, which may offer some advantage. For example, the maximum-likelihood method [40, 41] can ensure the positivity of the operators reconstructed. This topic has received little attention in the study of steering, but deserves further study in its own right.

The above analysis is still applicable even if Alice performs two general binary measurements and Bob performs arbitrary measurements. In addition, the dimension of Alice's Hilbert space can be larger than 2. To see this, note that the span $\mathcal{R}$ of effects in Bob's measurement assemblage has dimension 1 to 4. In addition, Bob's state assemblage $\{\rho_{\pm|m}\}_{m=1,2}$ has two ensembles, each of which consists of two subnormalized qubit states as in the above discussion, and the same holds for the $\mathcal{R}$ -restricted assemblage $\{\tilde{\rho}_{\pm|m}\}_{m=1,2}$. The bipartite state shared by Alice and Bob is steerable by the given measurements iff $\{\tilde{\rho}_{\pm|m}\}_{m=1,2}$ is steerable. When $\dim(\mathcal{R}) = 4$, we have $\tilde{\rho}_{\pm|m} = \rho_{\pm|m}$; when $\dim(\mathcal{R}) \leq 3$, $\tilde{\rho}_{\pm|m}$ can be computed in a similar way as in the above discussion. In addition, the state cannot be steerable when $\dim(\mathcal{R}) \leq 2$, in which case all effects in Bob's measurement assemblage commute with each other and thus can be diagonalized simultaneously.

IV. COINCIDENCE OF EPR-NONLOCAL FULL CORRELATIONS AND BELL-NONLOCAL CORRELATIONS IN THE SIMPLEST SCENARIO

Although the steering scenario discussed in Sec. III looks simple, it is nontrivial to determine the steerability of a generic two-qubit state under optimal measurements. It is instructive to note that in the simplest Bell scenario,

the CHSH inequality, a full-correlation inequality, is the only nontrivial Bell inequality [25, 28]. To address a similar problem in the steering scenario, an analog CHSH inequality was recently proposed by Cavalcanti *et al.* in the case Bob performs two mutually unbiased projective measurements [29], which was extended to a more general setting later [42]. In this section, we propose a simpler analog CHSH inequality whose violation is both necessary and sufficient for demonstrating EPR-nonlocal full correlations (excluding marginal statistics). Furthermore, we determine the maximum violation of the analog CHSH inequality for any two-qubit state and thereby show that a two-qubit state can generate EPR-nonlocal full correlations in the simplest steering scenario iff it can generate Bell-nonlocal correlations.

A. Analog CHSH inequality for EPR-nonlocal full correlations

The full correlations between A_m and B_n for $m, n = 1, 2$ are given by the third line in Eq. (17). The set of full correlations is Bell nonlocal if it does not admit an LHV model [3, 7, 28],

$$\langle A_m B_n \rangle = \sum_{\lambda} p_{\lambda} E(A_m, \lambda) E(B_n, \lambda), \quad m, n = 1, 2. \quad (18)$$

Here,

$$\begin{aligned} E(A_m, \lambda) &= p(+|A_m, \lambda) - p(-|A_m, \lambda), \\ E(B_n, \lambda) &= p(+|B_n, \lambda) - p(-|B_n, \lambda), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where p_{λ} is an arbitrary probability distribution, while $p(\pm|A_m, \lambda)$ and $p(\pm|B_n, \lambda)$ are arbitrary conditional probability distributions. It turns out that such a model cannot exist iff these correlations violate the celebrated CHSH inequality [25, 28],

$$\langle A_1 B_1 \rangle + \langle A_2 B_1 \rangle + \langle A_1 B_2 \rangle - \langle A_2 B_2 \rangle \leq 2, \quad (20)$$

up to relabeling of the measurements and outcomes.

The set of full correlations is EPR nonlocal if it does not admit an LHV-LHS model [29],

$$\langle A_m B_n \rangle = \sum_{\lambda} p_{\lambda} E(A_m, \lambda) E(B_n, \rho_{\lambda}), \quad m, n = 1, 2, \quad (21)$$

where

$$E(B_n, \rho_{\lambda}) = p(+|B_n, \rho_{\lambda}) - p(-|B_n, \rho_{\lambda}). \quad (22)$$

Compared with the LHV model in Eq. (18), here the only difference is that $p(\pm|B_n, \rho_{\lambda})$ are quantum probabilities determined by the Born rule.

Recently, an analog CHSH inequality was derived in Ref. [42] based on the earlier work in Ref. [29], which yields a necessary and sufficient criterion on demonstrating EPR-nonlocal full correlations in the simplest steering scenario. Here we propose a simpler criterion.

Theorem 1. In the simplest steering scenario, the set of full correlations is EPR nonlocal iff the analog CHSH inequality

$$\begin{aligned} &|\langle (A_1 + A_2) B_1 \rangle \mathbf{b}'_1 + \langle (A_1 + A_2) B_2 \rangle \mathbf{b}'_2| \\ &+ |\langle (A_1 - A_2) B_1 \rangle \mathbf{b}'_1 + \langle (A_1 - A_2) B_2 \rangle \mathbf{b}'_2| \leq 2 \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

is violated, where $\mathbf{b}'_1, \mathbf{b}'_2$ form the dual basis of the basis composed of Bob's measurement vectors $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2$ within their span, assuming $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2$ are linearly independent.

Unlike the CHSH inequality, the analog CHSH inequality in Eq. (23) is not linear in the correlation functions. Accordingly, the set of EPR local correlations (those correlations that admit LHV-LHS models) does not form a polytope. In addition, EPR-nonlocal full correlations do not necessarily violate the CHSH inequality and can be Bell local (that is, admit LHV models) in certain scenarios. This conclusion is in contrast with the fact that EPR-local correlations can attain the same upper bound 2 of the CHSH inequality as Bell-local correlations [34]. The criterion in Theorem 1 bears a strong resemblance to the criterion on the noncoexistence of two unbiased qubit effects [43, 44]; this is not a coincidence, as reflected in the following proof.

Proof. According to the discussion in Sec. III, the two-qubit state ρ in Eq. (9) is steerable under the measurements A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 iff the assemblage $\{\tilde{\rho}_{\pm|m}\}_{m=1,2}$ in Eq. (11) is steerable. If ρ is a Bell-diagonal state, then $\tilde{\rho}_{\pm|m} = (1 \pm \tilde{\gamma}_m \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma})/4$ given that $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \boldsymbol{\beta} = 0$. According to Lemma 1 below, $\{\tilde{\rho}_{\pm|m}\}_{m=1,2}$ is unsteerable iff

$$|\tilde{\gamma}_1 + \tilde{\gamma}_2| + |\tilde{\gamma}_1 - \tilde{\gamma}_2| \leq 2. \quad (24)$$

Alternatively, this equation also follows from Eq. (15). According to Eqs. (12) and (17), Eq. (24) is equivalent to the analog CHSH inequality in Eq. (23). For Bell-diagonal states, the marginal statistics are completely random, so the existence of an LHV-LHS model for full correlations is equivalent to the existence of an LHV-LHS model for full statistics. Therefore, the set of full correlations is EPR local iff the analog CHSH inequality is satisfied.

When ρ is not a Bell-diagonal state, let ϱ be the Bell diagonal state with the same correlation matrix as ρ . Then, ϱ and ρ generate the same full correlations. In particular, the set of full correlations generated by ρ is EPR local iff that generated by ϱ is EPR local. Now Theorem 1 follows from the above conclusion on Bell-diagonal states. $\square$

In general, violation of Eq. (24) is sufficient, but not necessary, for witnessing steering of the assemblage $\{\tilde{\rho}_{\pm|m}\}_{m=1,2}$ (cf. Secs. V and VI). Accordingly, violation of the analog CHSH inequality is sufficient, but not necessary, for demonstrating steering even in the simplest steering scenario.

Lemma 1. Let $\{\rho_{\pm|m}\}_{m=1,2}$ be a qubit assemblage with

$$\rho_{\pm|m} = \frac{1}{4}[(1 \pm \nu_m)I + \beta \cdot \sigma \pm \gamma_m \cdot \sigma]. \quad (25)$$

If $\{\rho_{\pm|m}\}_{m=1,2}$ is unsteerable, then

$$|\gamma_1 + \gamma_2| + |\gamma_1 - \gamma_2| \leq 2. \quad (26)$$

If $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = 0$ and $\beta = 0$, then $\{\rho_{\pm|m}\}_{m=1,2}$ is unsteerable iff Eq. (26) is satisfied.

Remark 1. When $\beta = 0$, the lemma follows from the result on the coexistence of two qubit effects [43, 44].

Proof. If $\{\rho_{\pm|m}\}_{m=1,2}$ is unsteerable, then any assemblage obtained from $\{\rho_{\pm|m}\}_{m=1,2}$ by applying a unitary transformation is also unsteerable. In addition, permuting the elements in each ensemble in the assemblage does not change steerability. Therefore, the assemblage $\{[(1 \pm \nu_m)I - (\beta \cdot \sigma \pm \gamma_m \cdot \sigma)]/4\}_{m=1,2}$ is unsteerable, and so is the assemblage $\{\rho'_{\pm|m}\}_{m=1,2}$ with $\rho'_{\pm|m} = [(1 \mp \nu_m)I - \beta \cdot \sigma \pm \gamma_m \cdot \sigma]/4$. Consequently, the assemblage $\{(\rho_{\pm|m} + \rho'_{\pm|m})/2\}_{m=1,2} = \{(I \pm \gamma_m \cdot \sigma)/4\}_{m=1,2}$ is unsteerable. In view of the relation between steerability and joint measurability [15, 31], this means that the measurement assemblage $\{(I \pm \gamma_m \cdot \sigma)/2\}_{m=1,2}$ is compatible, which is the case iff Eq. (26) is satisfied according to Ref. [43].

If $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = 0$ and $\beta = 0$, then $\{\rho_{\pm|m}\}_{m=1,2}$ is unsteerable iff the measurement assemblage $\{(I \pm \gamma_m \cdot \sigma)/2\}_{m=1,2}$ is compatible, which is the case iff Eq. (26) is satisfied [43]. $\square$

If Bob's measurements are mutually unbiased, that is, $\mathbf{b}_1 \perp \mathbf{b}_2$, then $\mathbf{b}'_1 = \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}'_2 = \mathbf{b}_2$, so that Eq. (23) reduces to the special analog CHSH inequality

$$\sqrt{\langle (A_1 + A_2)B_1 \rangle^2 + \langle (A_1 + A_2)B_2 \rangle^2} + \sqrt{\langle (A_1 - A_2)B_1 \rangle^2 + \langle (A_1 - A_2)B_2 \rangle^2} \leq 2, \quad (27)$$

which was first derived by Cavalcanti *et al.* [29] (and called the analog CHSH inequality in their paper). Comparison of Eqs. (20) and (27) may give the impression that it is easier to generate EPR-nonlocal full correlations than Bell-nonlocal (full) correlations.

B. A surprising coincidence

Theorem 2. A two-qubit state can generate Bell-nonlocal correlations in the simplest nontrivial scenario iff it can generate EPR-nonlocal full correlations.

This theorem follows from Theorem 3 below. An alternative proof is presented in Appendix B. Shortly after our original draft was posted (arXiv:1601.00962v1), Girdhar and Cavalcanti derived a similar result independently (arXiv:1601.01703), which has been published by now [42].

Theorem 3. The maximal violation S of the analog CHSH inequality by any two-qubit state with correlation matrix T is equal to the maximal violation of the CHSH inequality, namely, $S = 2\sqrt{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}$, where λ_1, λ_2 are the two largest eigenvalues of TT^T . Both inequalities are violated iff $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 > 1$.

Here the maximal violation S is defined as the maximum of the left hand side of Eq. (23) over A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 . Alternatively, S may be defined as the maximum of the left hand side of Eq. (27), since the maximum in the former case can be attained by mutually unbiased measurements for Bob, as shown in the following proof. Strictly speaking, S represents the maximal violation only when it is larger than 2. To avoid verbosity, we shall not mention this subtlety again in the rest of this paper.

Proof. According to Horodecki *et al.* [27] (see also Ref. [28]), the violation of the CHSH inequality satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle A_1 B_1 \rangle + \langle A_2 B_1 \rangle + \langle A_1 B_2 \rangle - \langle A_2 B_2 \rangle \\ &= (\mathbf{a}_1^T + \mathbf{a}_2^T)T\mathbf{b}_1 + (\mathbf{a}_1^T - \mathbf{a}_2^T)T\mathbf{b}_2 \\ &\leq |T^T(\mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{a}_2)| + |T^T(\mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{a}_2)| \leq 2\sqrt{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where the first inequality is saturated when $\mathbf{b}_1$ and $\mathbf{b}_2$ align with $T^T(\mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{a}_2)$ and $T^T(\mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{a}_2)$, respectively, and the second one is saturated when $\mathbf{a}_1$ and $\mathbf{a}_2$ are eigenvectors of TT^T with the two largest eigenvalues [36].

The violation of the analog CHSH inequality reads

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle (A_1 + A_2)B_1 \rangle \mathbf{b}'_1 + \langle (A_1 + A_2)B_2 \rangle \mathbf{b}'_2| \\ &+ |\langle (A_1 - A_2)B_1 \rangle \mathbf{b}'_1 + \langle (A_1 - A_2)B_2 \rangle \mathbf{b}'_2| \\ &= |[(\mathbf{a}_1^T + \mathbf{a}_2^T)T\mathbf{b}_1] \mathbf{b}'_1 + [(\mathbf{a}_1^T + \mathbf{a}_2^T)T\mathbf{b}_2] \mathbf{b}'_2| \\ &+ |[(\mathbf{a}_1^T - \mathbf{a}_2^T)T\mathbf{b}_1] \mathbf{b}'_1 + [(\mathbf{a}_1^T - \mathbf{a}_2^T)T\mathbf{b}_2] \mathbf{b}'_2| \\ &\leq |T^T(\mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{a}_2)| + |T^T(\mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{a}_2)| \leq 2\sqrt{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Here the first inequality is saturated when $\mathbf{b}_1$ and $\mathbf{b}_2$ form a basis in the span of $T^T\mathbf{a}_1$ and $T^T\mathbf{a}_2$; it suffices to consider mutually unbiased measurements for Bob, in agreement with the discussion on restricted LHS models. The second one is saturated under the same condition as that in Eq. (28). Therefore, the CHSH and analog CHSH inequalities can be violated iff $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 > 1$. $\square$

What we have demonstrated in the above proof is actually stronger than stated in Theorem 3: the maximal violations of the CHSH and analog CHSH inequalities for fixed measurements of Alice are also equal. However, there is a crucial difference in Bob's measurements required to saturate the CHSH and analog CHSH inequalities, as reflected in Theorem 4 below. It should also be pointed out that Theorem 3 does not imply the equivalence of Bell-local (full) correlations and EPR-local full correlations under given measurements in the simplest scenario.

Theorem 4. Suppose both Alice and Bob can only perform mutually unbiased measurements. The maximal

violation of the analog CHSH inequality by any two-qubit state with correlation matrix T is still equal to $S = 2\sqrt{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}$, where λ_1, λ_2 are the two largest eigenvalues of TT^T . The maximal violation of the CHSH inequality is equal to $S_M = \sqrt{2}(\sqrt{\lambda_1} + \sqrt{\lambda_2})$.

Remark 2. In the steering scenario, the measurements of Alice (the steering party) are usually not characterized; in the Bell scenario, the measurements of both Alice and Bob are not characterized. However, to demonstrate nonlocality in experiments, precise characterization and implementation of these measurements are essential. Therefore, Theorem 4 is instructive to experimental demonstration of the two forms of nonlocality.

Proof. The conclusion on the analog CHSH inequality is clear from the proof of Theorem 3. Concerning the CHSH inequality, since A_1 and A_2 are mutually unbiased and so are B_1 and B_2 , we have $\mathbf{a}_1 \perp \mathbf{a}_2$ and $\mathbf{b}_1 \perp \mathbf{b}_2$. Consequently, Eq. (28) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle A_1 B_1 \rangle + \langle A_2 B_1 \rangle + \langle A_1 B_2 \rangle - \langle A_2 B_2 \rangle \\ &= \sqrt{2}(\mathbf{c}_1^T T \mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbf{c}_2^T T \mathbf{b}_2) \leq \sqrt{2}(\sqrt{\lambda_1} + \sqrt{\lambda_2}), \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where $\mathbf{c}_1 = (\mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{a}_2)/\sqrt{2}$ and $\mathbf{c}_2 = (\mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{a}_2)/\sqrt{2}$ are orthonormal. The inequality follows from the variational characterization of singular values [45]; it is saturated when $\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2$ ($\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2$) are the left (right) singular vectors corresponding to the two largest singular values of T . $\square$

Remark 3. Note that $\sqrt{2}(\sqrt{\lambda_1} + \sqrt{\lambda_2}) \leq 2\sqrt{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}$ and that the inequality is saturated iff $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$. Therefore, the maximal violation of the CHSH inequality is reduced under the restriction to mutually unbiased measurements whenever $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$.

Theorems 3 and 4 reflect a crucial difference between the optimal measurements in the simplest steering scenario and that in the simplest Bell scenario. In the former case, it is not necessary to align Bob's measurements as long as the span of his measurement vectors is the same as that of $T^T \mathbf{a}_1$ and $T^T \mathbf{a}_2$; it suffices to consider mutually unbiased measurements for both Alice and Bob to attain the maximal violation of the analog CHSH inequality. In the latter case, by contrast, the optimal measurements are much more restricted, and it is usually impossible to attain the maximal violation of the CHSH inequality if their measurements are both mutually unbiased.

C. Relations between entanglement, steering and Bell nonlocality

The relation between the maximal violation of the CHSH inequality and the concurrence C for two-qubit states [46] was determined in Ref. [47]. By Theorem 3, the same result applies to the analog CHSH inequality:

$$2\sqrt{2}C \leq S \leq 2\sqrt{1 + C^2}. \quad (31)$$




FIG. 1. (color online). Ranges of values of the steering measure S (the common maximal violation of the CHSH and analog CHSH inequalities) for given concurrence. Left: General two-qubit states by Eq. (31); Right: Entangled Bell-diagonal states by Eq. (33). For comparison, the ranges of values of S_M are rendered in dark orange (dark gray), where S_M is the maximal violation of the CHSH inequality when both parties can only perform mutually unbiased measurements; cf. Eqs. (32) and (34). In each plot, the lower boundaries (solid lines) of S_M and S coincide, but the upper boundaries (dashed lines) are different.

The relation between S_M and C can be derived similarly,

$$2\sqrt{2}C \leq S_M \leq \sqrt{2}(1 + C). \quad (32)$$

Both upper bounds are saturated by pure states and rank-2 Bell-diagonal states, while lower bounds are saturated by convex combinations of the singlet and a suitable product state (cf. Sec. V). By contrast, for entangled Bell-diagonal states, we have

$$\frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3}(1 + 2C) \leq S \leq 2\sqrt{1 + C^2}, \quad (33)$$

$$\frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3}(1 + 2C) \leq S_M \leq \sqrt{2}(1 + C). \quad (34)$$

Here Eq. (33) is derived in Ref. [36]; Eq. (34) follows from a similar recipe. Both lower bounds are saturated by Werner states, while upper bounds by rank-2 Bell-diagonal states. The relations between S, S_M and C are illustrated in Fig. 1.

As an implication of Eqs. (31) and (32), any two-qubit state with $C > 1/\sqrt{2}$ can violate the analog CHSH inequality and is thus steerable. To violate the CHSH inequality under mutually unbiased measurements, it must have concurrence at least $C > \sqrt{2} - 1$. So not all entangled pure states can violate the CHSH inequality in this scenario, although they can under optimal measurements. The restriction to mutually unbiased measurements severely limits the capability of two-qubit states in generating Bell-nonlocal full correlations, in sharp contrast with the steering scenario, in which this is not a limitation. This observation is instructive for clarifying the distinction between the two forms of nonlocality, which is quite relevant to experimental demonstration. It is also of intrinsic interest to understanding the relation between nonlocality and incompatibility of observables.

V. STRICT HIERARCHY BETWEEN STEERING AND BELL NONLOCALITY IN THE SIMPLEST SCENARIO

In this section, we provide a concrete example of two-qubit states that do not violate the analog CHSH inequality but are nevertheless steerable in the simplest steering scenario, that is, two projective measurements for both Alice and Bob. Our example shows that violation of full-correlation inequalities is not necessary for demonstrating steering, even in the simplest steering scenario, once full statistics is taken into account. This conclusion is in sharp contrast with the simplest Bell scenario, in which case violation of the CHSH inequality, a full-correlation inequality, is necessary for demonstrating Bell nonlocality [25, 28]. In this way, our example demonstrates a strict hierarchy between steering and Bell nonlocality in the simplest scenario.

Consider the two-qubit state ρ in Eq. (9) with

$$\alpha = (0, 0, 1 - s), \quad \beta = 0, \quad T = -\text{diag}(s, s, s), \quad (35)$$

where $0 \leq s \leq 1$. More explicitly, ρ has the form

$$\rho = \frac{1}{4}[I \otimes I + (1-s)\sigma_3 \otimes I - s(\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_1 + \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2 + \sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_3)]. \quad (36)$$

The state is a convex combination of the singlet and a product state,

$$\rho = s(|\Psi_-\rangle\langle\Psi_-|) + (1-s)(|0\rangle\langle 0|) \otimes \frac{I}{2}, \quad (37)$$

where $|\Psi_-\rangle = (|01\rangle - |10\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. The reduced states of Alice and Bob are given by $\rho_A = [I + (1-s)\sigma_3]/2$ and $\rho_B = I/2$. The eigenvalues of ρ are

$$0, \quad \frac{1-s}{2}, \quad \frac{1+s \pm \sqrt{1-2s+5s^2}}{4}. \quad (38)$$

The partial transpose of ρ reads

$$\frac{1}{4}[I \otimes I + (1-s)\sigma_3 \otimes I - s(\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_1 - \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2 + \sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_3)], \quad (39)$$

whose eigenvalues are

$$\frac{1}{2}, \quad \frac{s}{2}, \quad \frac{1-s \pm \sqrt{1-2s+5s^2}}{4}. \quad (40)$$

The negativity and concurrence of ρ read

$$N(\rho) = \frac{-1+s+\sqrt{1-2s+5s^2}}{2}, \quad C(\rho) = s. \quad (41)$$

Therefore, ρ is entangled iff $0 < s \leq 1$.

According to Theorem 3, the maximum violation of the (analog) CHSH inequality by ρ reads

$$S(\rho) = 2\sqrt{2}s = 2\sqrt{2}C(\rho). \quad (42)$$

So, ρ can generate EPR-nonlocal full correlations in the simplest steering scenario iff $\sqrt{2}/2 < s \leq 1$. According




FIG. 2. (color online). Hierarchy between entanglement, EPR steering, and Bell nonlocality demonstrated by the family of states in Eq. (36), which is parametrized by s . The oblique line depicts the relation between concurrence C (equal to the parameter s) and the maximum violation S of the (analog) CHSH inequality. The black region (dot-dashed line) corresponds to states that can generate Bell-nonlocal correlations or EPR-nonlocal full correlations in the simplest scenario. States corresponding to the blue region sandwiched between the two thin dashed lines are steerable in the same scenario, but cannot generate Bell-nonlocal correlations or EPR-nonlocal full correlations.

to Theorem 4, the same formula still applies under the restriction to mutually unbiased measurements, that is,

$$S_M(\rho) = 2\sqrt{2}s = 2\sqrt{2}C(\rho). \quad (43)$$

The coincidence $S_M(\rho) = S(\rho)$ follows from the fact that all singular values of the correlation matrix T are equal. It is worth pointing out that $S(\rho)$ and $S_M(\rho)$ saturate the lower bounds in Eqs. (31) and (32), respectively.

Suppose Alice can perform two projective measurements $\mathbf{a}_m \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ for $m = 1, 2$. Then the assemblage $\{\rho_{\pm|m}\}$ of Bob induced by Alice has the form

$$\rho_{\pm|m} = \frac{1}{4}\{[1 \pm (1-s)a_{m3}]I \mp s\mathbf{a}_m \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}\}. \quad (44)$$

If Bob's measurement vectors are parallel to that of Alice's, that is, $\mathbf{b}_m = \mathbf{a}_m$ for $m = 1, 2$, then ρ_B and $\rho_{\pm|m}$ belong to $\mathcal{R} = \text{Span}\{I, \mathbf{b}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{b}_2 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}\}$, so we have $\tilde{\rho}_B = \rho_B$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{\pm|m} = \rho_{\pm|m}$. The steering-equivalent observables of $\tilde{\rho}_{\pm|m}$ take on the form

$$O_{\pm|m} = \frac{1}{2}\{[1 \pm (1-s)a_{m3}]I \mp s\mathbf{a}_m \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}\}. \quad (45)$$

Therefore, ρ is steerable by the given measurements iff the inequality in Eq. (15) is violated, where $\mathbf{r}_m = -s\mathbf{a}_m$ and $\eta_m = (1-s)a_{m3}$ for $m = 1, 2$.

Choose $\mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{b}_1 = (1, 0, 0)^T$ and $\mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{b}_2 = (0, 0, 1)^T$; then $\eta_1 = 0$, $\eta_2 = 1-s$, $r_1 = r_2 = s$, $\mathbf{r}_1 \cdot \mathbf{r}_2 = 0$, $F_1 = \sqrt{1-s^2}$, and $F_2 = \sqrt{1-s}$. According to Eq. (15),

the state ρ is steerable whenever $s(s + s^2 - 1) > 0$, that is, $s > (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2$. If

$$\frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{5} - 1) < s \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \quad (46)$$

then the state ρ is steerable in the simplest steering scenario, but cannot violate the CHSH or analog CHSH inequality, as illustrated in Fig. 2. In this way, the state demonstrates a strict hierarchy between steering and Bell nonlocality in the simplest scenario.

As a side remark, our example disproves the claim in Ref. [29] that violation of the analog CHSH inequality (when Bob's measurements are mutually unbiased) is both necessary and sufficient for demonstrating steering in the simplest steering scenario. The lapse in Ref. [29] appears in the paragraph above Eq. (10) there, where they claimed that the number of free parameters in the set of probability distributions $\mathbf{P}_{AB}$ is 4 instead of 8; cf. similar result on the Bell scenario [28]. Note that the constraints on the probability distributions considered in Ref. [29] are not independent. By contrast, the number of free parameters characterizing full correlations is only 4. Therefore, an LHV-LHS model for full correlations is not *a priori* sufficient for guaranteeing an LHV-LHS model for full statistics.

VI. SIMPLEST AND STRONGEST ONE-WAY STEERING

In this section, we reveal one-way steering in the simplest and strongest form. Building on the previous work in Ref. [48], we show that certain two-qubit states are steerable one way in the simplest steering scenario, but are not steerable the other way even under the most sophisticated measurements allowed by quantum mechanics. The following example also demonstrates the strongest hierarchy between steering and Bell nonlocality.

Consider the two-qubit state [48],

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(p, \theta) &= p(|\psi(\theta)\rangle\langle\psi(\theta)|) + (1 - p) \left[\frac{I}{2} \otimes \rho_B(\theta) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \left\{ I \otimes I + p \cos(2\theta) \sigma_3 \otimes I + \cos(2\theta) I \otimes \sigma_3 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + p [\sin(2\theta) \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_1 - \sin(2\theta) \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2 + \sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_3] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where $|\psi(\theta)\rangle = \cos\theta|00\rangle + \sin\theta|11\rangle$ with $\sin(2\theta) \neq 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_B(\theta) &= \text{tr}_A(|\psi(\theta)\rangle\langle\psi(\theta)|) = \frac{1}{2} [I + \cos(2\theta) \sigma_3] \\ &= \cos^2\theta |0\rangle\langle 0| + \sin^2\theta |1\rangle\langle 1|. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

The two-qubit state $\rho(p, \theta)$ has correlation matrix

$$T = \text{diag}(p \sin(2\theta), -p \sin(2\theta), p), \quad (49)$$

so it can violate the analog CHSH inequality iff

$$p^2 [1 + \sin^2(2\theta)] > 1. \quad (50)$$

According to Ref. [48], the state $\rho(p, \theta)$ is unsteerable from Bob to Alice by arbitrary projective measurements and hence cannot violate any Bell inequality when

$$\cos^2(2\theta) \geq \frac{2p - 1}{(2 - p)p^3}. \quad (51)$$

In addition, the state is steerable from Alice to Bob by two projective measurements whenever $p > 1/\sqrt{2}$. However, the steerability was not inferred directly from steering criteria, instead it is inferred from violation of the CHSH inequality after applying a suitable local filtering operation. Also, the result presented in Ref. [48] does not *a priori* imply that the state with $p > 1/\sqrt{2}$ is steerable in the simplest steering scenario under consideration here. Nevertheless, we show that our steering criterion derived in Sec. III can certify the simplest one-way steering, which is easy to verify in experiments.

Suppose the projective measurements of Alice and Bob are determined by the measurement vectors

$$\mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{b}_1 = (1, 0, 0)^T, \quad \mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{b}_2 = (0, 0, 1)^T. \quad (52)$$

Then, the $\mathcal{R}$ -restricted state assemblage of Bob is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{\pm|1} &= \rho_{\pm|1} = \frac{1}{4} [I + \cos(2\theta) \sigma_3 \pm 2p \sin\theta \cos\theta \sigma_1] \\ &\cong \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \cos^2\theta & \pm p \sin\theta \cos\theta \\ \pm p \sin\theta \cos\theta & \sin^2\theta \end{pmatrix}, \\ \tilde{\rho}_{\pm|2} &= \rho_{\pm|2} = \frac{1}{4} \{ [1 \pm p \cos(2\theta)] I + [\cos(2\theta) \pm p] \sigma_3 \} \\ &\cong \frac{1}{2} \text{diag}((1 \pm p) \cos^2\theta, (1 \mp p) \sin^2\theta). \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

The corresponding steering-equivalent observables read

$$O_{\pm|1} = \frac{1}{2} (I \pm p \sigma_1), \quad O_{\pm|2} = \frac{1}{2} (I \pm p \sigma_3). \quad (54)$$

So, ρ is steerable from Alice to Bob in the simplest steering scenario whenever $p > 1/\sqrt{2}$ according to the steering criterion in Eq. (15) or (26) (cf. Ref. [43]). This condition turns out to be also necessary. To see this, note that $\rho(p, \theta)$ is obtained from the Bell-diagonal state $\rho(p, \pi/4)$ (equivalent to a Werner state under a local unitary transformation) by applying local filtering operation on Bob's side. In addition $\rho(p, \pi/4)$ is steerable by two projective measurements iff $p > 1/\sqrt{2}$ [36]. Therefore, $\rho(p, \theta)$ is steerable from Alice to Bob in the simplest steering scenario iff

$$p > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad (55)$$

which is usually much easier to satisfy than the condition in Eq. (50) required for violating the analog CHSH




FIG. 3. (color online). States that can demonstrate the simplest and strongest one-way steering. Each parameter point coordinated by p and θ defines a two-qubit state according to Eq. (47). The orange (intermediate gray) region corresponds to states that can violate the (analog) CHSH inequality. The red (dark gray) region corresponds to states that are steerable from Alice to Bob in the simplest steering scenario, but that cannot violate the (analog) CHSH inequality. States in the yellow (light gray) region are not steerable from Bob to Alice by arbitrary projective measurements. States in the intersection of the red region and the yellow region (including the black dot corresponding to $p = 0.8$ and $\theta = 0.05$) are the most peculiar because they can demonstrate the simplest and strongest one-way steering.

inequality. If, in addition, Eq. (51) is satisfied ($p = 0.8$ and $\theta = 0.05$, for example), then the state $\rho(p, \theta)$ demonstrates the simplest one-way steering and the strongest hierarchy between steering and Bell nonlocality under projective measurements; see Fig. 3.

Next, we strengthen the above result by considering POVMs. Consider the state [48]

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2}[\rho(p, \theta) + \rho_A(p, \theta) \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0|)] \\ &= \frac{1}{4}[I \otimes I + p \cos(2\theta) \sigma_3 \otimes I + \cos^2 \theta I \otimes \sigma_3 \\ & \quad + p \cos \theta (\sin \theta \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_1 - \sin \theta \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2 + \cos \theta \sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_3)], \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where

$$\rho_A(p, \theta) = \text{tr}_B[\rho(p, \theta)] = \frac{1}{2}[I + p \cos(2\theta) \sigma_3]. \quad (57)$$

It has correlation matrix

$$T = \text{diag}(p \sin \theta \cos \theta, -p \sin \theta \cos \theta, p \cos^2 \theta), \quad (58)$$

so it can never violate the analog CHSH inequality. In addition, it is not steerable from Bob to Alice by arbitrary POVMs when Eq. (51) is satisfied, while it is steerable from Alice to Bob by two projective measurements for a certain parameter range satisfying Eq. (51) [48]. Again,

this conclusion does not *a priori* imply that the state is steerable from Alice to Bob in the simplest steering scenario. Fortunately, our steering criteria can certify the simplest one-way steering as in the previous case. For example, when $p = 0.825$ and $\theta = 0.020$, the state in Eq. (56) is not steerable from Bob to Alice by arbitrary POVMs. However, it is steerable from Alice to Bob under the same measurement setting as specified in Eq. (52), in which case the inequality in Eq. (15) is violated by 0.021.

In view of the discussion in Sec. III A, to demonstrate one-way steering proposed above, Bob may also perform a trine measurement instead of two projective measurements. One particular trine measurement takes on the form $\{(I + \mathbf{c}_j \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma})/3\}_{j=1,2,3}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c}_1 &= (0, 0, 1)^T, \\ \mathbf{c}_2 &= \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{3}, 0, -1)^T, \\ \mathbf{c}_3 &= \frac{1}{2}(-\sqrt{3}, 0, -1)^T. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

The resulting protocol has the least complexity cost of 12 that is inevitable [26]. Therefore, to demonstrate one-way steering, it suffices to employ the simplest setting that is able to demonstrate steering.

VII. SUMMARY

In summary, we studied steering systematically in the simplest nontrivial scenario. We showed that a two-qubit state can generate EPR-nonlocal full correlations in this scenario iff it can generate Bell-nonlocal correlations. When full statistics is taken into account, surprisingly, the same scenario can demonstrate one-way steering and the hierarchy between steering and Bell nonlocality in the simplest and strongest form. To illustrate these intriguing phenomena, we provided several fiducial examples, which can be realized in real experiments with current technology. In the course of study, we introduced the concept of restricted LHS models and thereby derived a simple SDP criterion to determine the steerability of any bipartite state under given measurements. Analytical criteria are further derived in several important scenarios.

Our work prompts several interesting questions, which deserve further study. For example, what is the explicit analytical necessary and sufficient criterion on steerability in the simplest steering scenario (two dichotomic measurements for both Alice and Bob)? Does there exist a two-qubit state that is not steerable in the simplest scenario, but is steerable in the second simplest scenario in which Alice performs two dichotomic measurements and Bob performs full tomography (by either three dichotomic measurements or a single four-outcome informationally complete POVM)? We hope that these questions will stimulate further progress in the study of steering.

Note added: Recently, we noticed that our work had some overlap with Ref. [49].

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We are grateful to one referee for suggesting an alternative proof of Theorem 2. Q.Q. and W.L.Y. acknowledge supports from The National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC), Grants No. 11375141, No. 11425522, and No. 11434013. H.Z. acknowledges financial supports from the Excellence Initiative of the German Federal and State Governments (ZUK81) and the DFG as well as the Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics. Research at the Perimeter Institute is supported by the Government of Canada through Industry Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Research and Innovation. H.F. is supported by Ministry of Science and Technology of China (Grants No. 2016YFA0302104 and No. 2016YFA0300600), NSFC (Grant No. 91536108), and CAS (Grants No. XDB01010000 and No. XDB21030300).

Appendix A: The hierarchy between entanglement, EPR steering, and Bell nonlocality

In this appendix, we briefly review the hierarchy between entanglement, EPR steering, and Bell nonlocality for the convenience of the reader. The concepts of entanglement, EPR steering, and Bell nonlocality all originated from the EPR paradox [1, 2]. For a long time, the three concepts were thought to be equivalent to each other since researchers only considered pure states. Starting with the work of Werner in 1989 [16], researchers gradually realized that the three concepts are, in general, very different for mixed states. There exists a logical hierarchy between them: Bell nonlocality is stronger than steering, while steering is stronger than entanglement.

In 2007, Wiseman *et al.* clarified the operational as well as mathematical distinctions between entanglement, EPR steering, and Bell nonlocality [4, 11]. In addition, they proved that, when restricted to projective measurements, steerability is strictly stronger than nonseparability, and strictly weaker than Bell nonlocality. In other words, every violation of a Bell inequality demonstrates EPR steering, and every violation of an EPR-steering inequality demonstrates entanglement (but the converses do not hold in general). Two-qubit Werner states provide a concrete demonstration of this hierarchy. Furthermore, recently the strict hierarchy was shown to hold even under generalized measurements, as represented by positive-operator-valued measures (POVMs) [22].

The strict hierarchy between entanglement, EPR steering, and Bell nonlocality is also reflected in the complexity costs for demonstrating them experimentally, as pointed out by Saunders *et al.* [26]. Here the complexity cost is defined as

$$W = \prod_{p=1}^P \sum_{s=1}^{S_p} O_p^s, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $P \geq 2$ represents the number of distinct parties in the experimental demonstration, $S_p \geq 1$ represents the number of different measurement settings employed by party p , $O_p^s \geq 2$ represents the number of potential measurement outcomes for party p when setting s is chosen, and W represents the total number of potential joint measurement outcomes that may appear. The authors of Ref. [26] showed that the least complexity costs for demonstrating entanglement, EPR steering, and Bell nonlocality are $W_E = 9$, $W_S = 12$, and $W_B = 16$, respectively.

In certain special cases, the hierarchy mentioned above may not always be strict. In the case of pure states, for example, it is well known that entanglement is both necessary and sufficient for demonstrating steering and Bell nonlocality. If the steering party can only perform two projective measurements, then a two-qubit Bell-diagonal state can demonstrate steering iff it can demonstrate Bell nonlocality [36]. In addition, the least complexity costs for demonstrating entanglement, EPR steering, and Bell nonlocality under projective measurements are all equal to 16. In general, it is highly nontrivial to determine the precise relations between entanglement, EPR steering, and Bell nonlocality for a given scenario.

All three concepts, i.e., entanglement, EPR steering, and Bell nonlocality, are useful in certain contexts. For example, all of them are useful to QKD. To be specific, Bell nonlocality is necessary for realizing device-independent QKD, while EPR steering is necessary for realizing one-sided device-independent QKD [10, 50]. In practice, it is usually much more difficult to demonstrate Bell nonlocality than EPR steering. Therefore, understanding the hierarchy between the three forms of nonlocality is of fundamental interest not only to foundational studies but also to practical applications. Our work is a contribution along this direction.

Appendix B: Alternative proof of Theorem 2

In this appendix, we provide an alternative proof of Theorem 2 in the main text, which offers a complementary perspective on the relation between steering and Bell nonlocality.

To start with, we clarify the relations between steering and Bell nonlocality for Bell-diagonal states in the simplest scenario based on an earlier work [36].

Lemma 2. The following five statements concerning a Bell-diagonal state ρ are equivalent.

1. ρ is steerable by two projective measurements.
2. ρ is steerable in the simplest steering scenario.
3. ρ can generate EPR-nonlocal full correlations in the simplest steering scenario.
4. ρ is Bell nonlocal in the simplest Bell scenario.

5. ρ can generate Bell-nonlocal full correlations in the simplest Bell scenario.

Remark 4. Here the simplest steering scenario and Bell scenario mean two projective measurements for each party. Statements 4 and 5 are equivalent since the CHSH inequality, a full-correlation inequality, is the only Bell inequality in the simplest Bell scenario [28]. However, we are not aware of any simple and intuitive proof of this latter fact. For Bell-diagonal states, the equivalence also follows from the fact that the marginal statistics are completely random. Remarkably, the following proof of the lemma does not rely on this equivalence.

Proof. EPR-nonlocal full correlations imply steerability, and Bell-nonlocal full correlations imply Bell nonlocality. Thanks to the hierarchy between steering and Bell nonlocality, any of statements 2 to 5 implies statement 1; statement 5 implies statements 1 to 4. According to our early work in Ref. [36], a Bell-diagonal state is steerable by two projective measurements iff it can violate the CHSH inequality, that is, iff it can generate Bell-nonlocal full correlations in the simplest Bell scenario. Therefore, statements 1 and 5 are equivalent, which implies the equivalence of all five statements in view of the above observation. $\square$

Alternative proof of Theorem 2. Let ρ be a two-qubit

state and ϱ the Bell-diagonal state with the same correlation matrix as ρ . Then, ϱ and ρ generate the same full correlations in the simplest steering and Bell scenarios. In particular, ρ can generate EPR-nonlocal full correlations iff ϱ can, which is the case iff ϱ can generate Bell-nonlocal (full) correlations according to Lemma 2. Therefore, ρ can generate EPR-nonlocal full correlations in the simplest steering scenario iff it can generate Bell-nonlocal (full) correlations in the simplest Bell scenario. $\square$

Remark 5. The alternative proof does not yield a criterion on generating EPR-nonlocal full correlations directly. Interestingly, the theorem is established based on the hierarchy between steering and Bell nonlocality as well as the known criterion on the violation of the CHSH inequality. In sharp contrast, the proof in the main text establishes the relation between steering and Bell nonlocality by first deriving the maximal violation of the analog CHSH inequality. It yields a necessary and sufficient criterion on generating EPR-nonlocal full correlations directly and also provides a natural measure of the correlation strength. Both approaches are instructive and interesting in their own rights; together they offer complementary perspectives on steering and Bell nonlocality in the simplest scenario.

-
- [1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, “Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?” *Phys. Rev.* **47**, 777–780 (1935).
 - [2] E. Schrödinger, “Discussion of probability relations between separated systems,” *Math. Proc. Cambr. Philos. Soc.* **31**, 555–563 (1935).
 - [3] J. S. Bell, “On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox,” *Phys.* **1**, 195–200 (1964).
 - [4] H. M. Wiseman, S. J. Jones, and A. C. Doherty, “Steering, entanglement, nonlocality, and the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 140402 (2007).
 - [5] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, “Quantum entanglement,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865 (2009).
 - [6] M. D. Reid, P. D. Drummond, W. P. Bowen, E. G. Cavalcanti, P. K. Lam, H. A. Bachor, U. L. Andersen, and G. Leuchs, “Colloquium: The Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox: From concepts to applications,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 1727 (2009).
 - [7] N. Brunner, D. Cavalcanti, S. Pironio, V. Scarani, and S. Wehner, “Bell nonlocality,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **86**, 419 (2014).
 - [8] A. K. Ekert, “Quantum cryptography based on Bell’s theorem,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 661 (1991).
 - [9] N. Gisin, G. Ribordy, W. Tittel, and H. Zbinden, “Quantum cryptography,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 145–195 (2002).
 - [10] C. Branciard, E. G. Cavalcanti, S. P. Walborn, V. Scarani, and H. M. Wiseman, “One-sided device-independent quantum key distribution: Security, feasibility, and the connection with steering,” *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 010301(R) (2012).
 - [11] S. J. Jones, H. M. Wiseman, and A. C. Doherty, “Entanglement, Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen correlations, Bell nonlocality, and steering,” *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 052116 (2007).
 - [12] M. D. Reid, “Demonstration of the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox using nondegenerate parametric amplification,” *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 913 (1989).
 - [13] E. G. Cavalcanti, S. J. Jones, H. M. Wiseman, and M. D. Reid, “Experimental criteria for steering and the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox,” *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 032112 (2009).
 - [14] I. Kogias, P. Skrzypczyk, D. Cavalcanti, A. Acín, and G. Adesso, “Hierarchy of steering criteria based on moments for all bipartite quantum systems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 210401 (2015).
 - [15] H. Zhu, M. Hayashi, and L. Chen, “Universal steering criteria,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 070403 (2016).
 - [16] R. F. Werner, “Quantum states with Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen correlations admitting a hidden-variable model,” *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 4277 (1989).
 - [17] J. Bowles, T. Vértesi, M. T. Quintino, and N. Brunner, “One-way Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 200402 (2014).
 - [18] V. Händchen, T. Eberle, S. Steinlechner, A. Samblowski, T. Franz, R. F. Werner, and R. Schnabel, “Observation of one-way Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering,” *Nat. Photon.* **6**, 596–599 (2012).
 - [19] J.-L. Chen, C. Ren, C. Chen, X.-J. Ye, and A. K. Pati, “Bell’s nonlocality can be detected by the violation of

- Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering inequality.” *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 39063 (2016).
- [20] N. Stevens and P. Busch, “Steering, incompatibility, and Bell-inequality violations in a class of probabilistic theories,” *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 022123 (2014).
 - [21] M. T. Quintino, T. Vértesi, and N. Brunner, “Joint measurability, Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering, and Bell nonlocality,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 160402 (2014).
 - [22] M. T. Quintino, T. Vértesi, D. Cavalcanti, R. Augusiak, M. Demianowicz, A. Acín, and N. Brunner, “Inequivalence of entanglement, steering, and Bell nonlocality for general measurements,” *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 032107 (2015).
 - [23] M. D. Reid, “Signifying quantum benchmarks for qubit teleportation and secure quantum communication using Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering inequalities,” *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 062338 (2013).
 - [24] Q. He, L. Rosales-Zárate, G. Adesso, and M. D. Reid, “Secure continuous variable teleportation and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 180502 (2015).
 - [25] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, “Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880 (1969).
 - [26] D. J. Saunders, M. S. Palsson, G. J. Pryde, A. J. Scott, S. M. Barnett, and H. M. Wiseman, “The simplest demonstrations of quantum nonlocality,” *New J. Phys.* **14**, 113020 (2012).
 - [27] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and M. Horodecki, “Violating Bell inequality by mixed spin-1/2 states: necessary and sufficient condition,” *Phys. Lett. A* **200**, 340–344 (1995).
 - [28] V. Scarani, “The device-independent outlook on quantum physics (lecture notes on the power of Bell’s theorem),” *Acta Physica Slovaca* **62**, 347 (2012), arXiv:1303.3081.
 - [29] E. G. Cavalcanti, C. J. Foster, M. Fuwa, and H. M. Wiseman, “Analog of the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt inequality for steering,” *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B* **32**, A74–A81 (2015).
 - [30] R. Uola, T. Moroder, and O. Gühne, “Joint measurability of generalized measurements implies classicality,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 160403 (2014).
 - [31] R. Uola, C. Budroni, O. Gühne, and J.-P. Pellonpää, “One-to-one mapping between steering and joint measurability problems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 230402 (2015).
 - [32] M. F. Pusey, “Negativity and steering: A stronger Peres conjecture,” *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 032313 (2013).
 - [33] P. Skrzypczyk, M. Navascués, and D. Cavalcanti, “Quantifying Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 180404 (2014).
 - [34] M. Żukowski, A. Dutta, and Z. Yin, “Geometric Bell-like inequalities for steering,” *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 032107 (2015).
 - [35] A. Roy, S. S. Bhattacharya, A. Mukherjee, and M. Banik, “Optimal quantum violation of Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt like steering inequality,” *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **48**, 415302 (2015).
 - [36] Q. Quan, H. Zhu, S.-Y. Liu, S.-M. Fei, H. Fan, and W.-L. Yang, “Steering Bell-diagonal states,” *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 22025 (2016).
 - [37] P. Stano, D. Reitzner, and T. Heinosaari, “Coexistence of qubit effects,” *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 012315 (2008).
 - [38] P. Busch and H.-J. Schmidt, “Coexistence of qubit effects,” *Quantum Inf. Process.* **9**, 143–169 (2009).
 - [39] S. Yu, N.-L. Liu, L. Li, and C. H. Oh, “Joint measurement of two unsharp observables of a qubit,” *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 062116 (2010).
 - [40] Z. Hradil, “Quantum-state estimation,” *Phys. Rev. A* **55**, R1561 (1997).
 - [41] Y. S. Teo, H. Zhu, B.-G. Englert, J. Řeháček, and Z. Hradil, “Quantum-state reconstruction by maximizing likelihood and entropy,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 020404 (2011).
 - [42] P. Girdhar and E. G. Cavalcanti, “All two-qubit states that are steerable via Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt-type correlations are Bell nonlocal,” *Phys. Rev. A* **94**, 032317 (2016).
 - [43] P. Busch, “Unsharp reality and joint measurements for spin observables,” *Phys. Rev. D* **33**, 2253 (1986).
 - [44] H. Zhu, “Information complementarity: A new paradigm for decoding quantum incompatibility,” *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 14317 (2015).
 - [45] R. Bhatia, *Matrix Analysis* (Springer, New York, 1997).
 - [46] W. K. Wootters, “Entanglement of formation of an arbitrary state of two qubits,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 2245–2248 (1998).
 - [47] F. Verstraete and M. M. Wolf, “Entanglement versus Bell violations and their behavior under local filtering operations,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 170401 (2002).
 - [48] J. Bowles, F. Hirsch, M. T. Quintino, and N. Brunner, “Sufficient criterion for guaranteeing that a two-qubit state is unsteerable,” *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 022121 (2016).
 - [49] A. C. S. Costa and R. M. Angelo, “Quantification of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering for two-qubit states,” *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 020103 (2016).
 - [50] M. Tomamichel and R. Renner, “Uncertainty relation for smooth entropies,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 110506 (2011).