

Resolving game theoretical dilemmas with quantum states

Azhar Iqbal[†], James M. Chappell[‡], Claudia Szabo[†], Derek Abbott[‡]

[†]*School of Computer and Mathematical Sciences,
University of Adelaide, South Australia 5005, Australia*

[‡]*School of Electrical & Electronic Engineering,
University of Adelaide, South Australia 5005, Australia.*

Abstract

We present a new framework for creating a quantum version of a classical game, based on Fine's theorem. This theorem shows that for a given set of marginals, a system of Bell's inequalities constitutes both necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of the corresponding joint probability distribution. Using Fine's theorem, we reexpress both the player payoffs and their strategies in terms of a set of marginals, thus paving the way for the consideration of sets of marginals—corresponding to entangled quantum states—for which no corresponding joint probability distribution may exist. By harnessing quantum states and employing Positive Operator-Valued Measures (POVMs), we then consider particular quantum states that can potentially resolve dilemmas inherent in classical games.

I. INTRODUCTION

In conventional approaches [1–6] to quantizing non-cooperative games [7–9] each player conducts local unitary transformations (strategies) on an entangled quantum state. Following this, a quantum measurement [10] determines each player’s payoff. The goal is to identify sets of local unitary operations that meet the set of Nash inequalities associated with the player payoffs. Various methodologies and perspectives have emerged [5, 11–14] to develop quantum versions of games. Bleiler [15] formalized a set-theoretic approach to game quantization, introducing concepts of proper, improper, and complete quantizations, and exploring the potential of broader notion of randomization through the lens of quantum superposition for quantization of games.

An entangled quantum state [10], when examined closely, reveals to offer inherently quantum, non-classical probability distributions that can breach Bell’s inequalities [16–19]. This understanding inspired us to devise a framework wherein game-theoretical challenges are articulated using the distinct attributes of quantum states, specifically their ability to generate non-classical probability distributions.

Fine’s theorem [21–23] asserts that a system of Bell’s inequalities, given a set of marginals, provides both necessary and sufficient conditions to ensure the existence of a joint probability distribution for those marginals. Building on this foundation, our paper introduces a fresh methodology for quantum games, derived straight from the classical game’s mixed-strategy version. Harnessing Fine’s theorem, we recast each player’s payoffs as well as their strategies in terms of the marginals of a joint probability distribution. Through game-theoretical scrutiny, we can pinpoint sets of marginals that can potentially resolve the game, subsequently enabling the identification of corresponding quantum states. To extrapolate marginal probability distributions from these quantum states, we delve into positive operator-valued measures (POVMs) [10]—a concept previously explored in quantum game studies [5, 26].

Our innovative approach, anchored in Fine’s theorem, reframes quantum games by focusing on Fine’s theorem for a system of Bell’s inequalities. By scrutinizing the marginals of a probability distribution, our methodology facilitates a seamless transition from a game’s classical mixed-strategy version to its quantum counterpart linked to the entangled states. This framework offers a renewed perspective on harnessing non-classical probability distributions, derived from entangled quantum states, to illuminate and resolve the game-theoretical

conundrums.

II. FINE'S THEOREM FOR THREE BIVALENT OBSERVABLES

We consider Fine's theorem [21–23] for three bivalent observables that is described as follows. If a, b, c are bivalent observables (each mapping into $\{+1, -1\}$ with given joint distributions $P_{a,b}$, $P_{a,c}$, and $P_{b,c}$, then necessary and sufficient for the existence of a joint distribution $P_{a,b,c}$, compatible with the given joints for the pairs, is the satisfaction of the following system of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
P(a) + P(b) + P(c) &\leq 1 + P(ab) + P(ac) + P(bc), \\
P(ab) + P(ac) &\leq P(a) + P(bc), \\
P(ab) + P(bc) &\leq P(b) + P(ac), \\
P(ac) + P(bc) &\leq P(c) + P(ab),
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $P(\bullet)$ is the probability that each enclosed observable takes the value $+1$.

In Fine's proof, when an observable O , for instance, takes the value -1 it is denoted by \bar{O} iff the observable O takes value $+1$, and we also denote $\xi = P(abc)$. Then the terms in a distribution $P_{a,b,c}$, if there were one compatible with the given joint distributions for pairs, would have to satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
P(ab\bar{c}) &= P(ab) - \xi, \\
P(a\bar{b}c) &= P(ac) - \xi, \\
P(a\bar{b}\bar{c}) &= P(a) - P(ab) - P(ac) + \xi, \\
P(\bar{a}bc) &= P(bc) - \xi, \\
P(\bar{a}b\bar{c}) &= P(b) - P(ab) - P(bc) + \xi, \\
P(\bar{a}\bar{b}c) &= P(c) - P(ac) - P(bc) + \xi, \\
P(\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}) &= 1 - P(a) - P(b) - P(c) + P(ab) + P(ac) + P(bc) - \xi.
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Using $0 \leq \xi \leq \min(P(ab), P(ac), P(bc))$, the condition that each term in (2) be non-negative produces the system (1). Conversely, if the system (1) is satisfied then choosing ξ as above insures that Eqs. (2) define the required distribution $P_{a,b,c}$.

III. APPLYING FINE'S THEOREM TO THREE-PLAYER GAMES

Let $\mathfrak{R} = \{A, B, C\}$ be the set of players. A classical three-person normal form game is given by a) Three non-empty sets Σ_A , Σ_B , and Σ_C representing the strategy sets of the players A, B, and C; b) Three real valued functions P_A , P_B , and P_C defined on $\Sigma_A \times \Sigma_B \times \Sigma_C$. The *product space* $\Sigma_A \times \Sigma_B \times \Sigma_C$ is the set of all tuples $(\sigma_A, \sigma_B, \sigma_C)$ with $\sigma_A \in \Sigma_A$, $\sigma_B \in \Sigma_B$ and $\sigma_C \in \Sigma_C$. A strategy is understood as such a tuple $(\sigma_A, \sigma_B, \sigma_C)$ and P_A , P_B , P_C are payoff functions of the three players. The game is denoted as $\Gamma = \{\Sigma_A, \Sigma_B, \Sigma_C; P_A, P_B, P_C\}$.

To apply Fine's theorem to three-player games, we use the above notation and consider the game for players A, B, and C and in which the player payoffs are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_A(\lambda, \mu, \nu) = & \alpha_1 P(abc) + \beta_1 P(ab\bar{c}) + \gamma_1 P(\bar{a}bc) + \delta_1 P(\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}) + \\ & \epsilon_1 P(\bar{a}bc) + \epsilon_1 P(\bar{a}b\bar{c}) + \zeta_1 P(\bar{a}\bar{b}c) + \eta_1 P(\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}); \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_B(\lambda, \mu, \nu) = & \alpha_2 P(abc) + \beta_2 P(ab\bar{c}) + \gamma_2 P(\bar{a}bc) + \delta_2 P(\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}) + \\ & \epsilon_2 P(\bar{a}bc) + \epsilon_2 P(\bar{a}b\bar{c}) + \zeta_2 P(\bar{a}\bar{b}c) + \eta_2 P(\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}); \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_C(\lambda, \mu, \nu) = & \alpha_3 P(abc) + \beta_3 P(ab\bar{c}) + \gamma_3 P(\bar{a}bc) + \delta_3 P(\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}) + \\ & \epsilon_3 P(\bar{a}bc) + \epsilon_3 P(\bar{a}b\bar{c}) + \zeta_3 P(\bar{a}\bar{b}c) + \eta_3 P(\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\alpha_{1,2,3}, \beta_{1,2,3}, \dots, \eta_{1,2,3}$ are real numbers, $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in [0, 1]$ and

$$\lambda = P(a), \quad \mu = P(b), \quad \nu = P(c), \quad (6)$$

are defined as the (mixed) strategies of the players A, B, and C, respectively. Eqs. (3,4,5) define the player payoffs for the three players for a general game such that it paves the way to applying Fine's theorem to the game. Note that the observable b , for instance, takes the value -1 it is denoted by \bar{b} iff the observable b takes value $+1$. For the factorizable case, the players' payoffs (3,4,5) are expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{A,B,C}(\lambda, \mu, \nu) = & (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)\lambda\mu\nu + (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3)\lambda\mu(1-\nu) + \\ & (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3)\lambda(1-\mu)\nu + (\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3)\lambda(1-\mu)(1-\nu) + \\ & (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3)(1-\lambda)\mu\nu + (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3)(1-\lambda)\mu(1-\nu) + \\ & (\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3)(1-\lambda)(1-\mu)\nu + (\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3)(1-\lambda)(1-\mu)(1-\nu), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

giving a mixed-strategy version of a three-player game.

A strategy profile is a Nash equilibrium if every strategy in that profile is a best response to every other strategy in the profile; i.e., there is no strategy that a player could play that would yield a higher payoff, given all the strategies played by the other players. The Nash equilibria described by the triple $(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)$ for this game, are then obtained from the inequalities

$$\frac{\partial \Pi_A}{\partial \lambda} |_{(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)} (\lambda^* - \lambda) \geq 0, \quad \frac{\partial \Pi_B}{\partial \mu} |_{(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)} (\mu^* - \mu) \geq 0, \quad \frac{\partial \Pi_C}{\partial \nu} |_{(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)} (\nu^* - \nu) \geq 0, \quad (8)$$

for all $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in [0, 1]$. The inequalities (8) are not sufficient as all derivatives can be zero. In that case we would also require the second derivatives $\frac{\partial^2 \Pi_A}{\partial \lambda^2} |_{(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)}$, $\frac{\partial^2 \Pi_B}{\partial \mu^2} |_{(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)}$, and $\frac{\partial^2 \Pi_C}{\partial \nu^2} |_{(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)}$ to be positive, in order to represent that the triple $(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)$ is a maxima with respect to λ, μ , and ν .

IV. THE CASE OF THREE-PLAYER PRISONERS' DILEMMA

Consider the three-player Prisoners' Dilemma game [24, 25] for which we write the player payoffs as

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{A,B,C}(\lambda, \mu, \nu) = & (\varkappa, \varkappa, \varkappa)P(abc) + (\kappa, \kappa, \vartheta)P(ab\bar{c}) + (\kappa, \vartheta, \kappa)P(\bar{a}bc) \\ & + (\tau, \theta, \theta)P(\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}) + (\vartheta, \kappa, \kappa)P(\bar{a}bc) + (\theta, \tau, \theta)P(\bar{a}b\bar{c}) \\ & + (\theta, \theta, \tau)P(\bar{a}\bar{b}c) + (\omega, \omega, \omega)P(\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{a) } & \vartheta > \varkappa, \quad \omega > \tau, \quad \theta > \kappa, \\ \text{b) } & \vartheta > \theta > \omega, \quad \varkappa > \kappa > \tau, \\ \text{c) } & \kappa > \omega, \quad \varkappa > \theta, \quad \kappa > (1/2)(\tau + \theta), \quad \varkappa > (1/2)(\kappa + \vartheta). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

An example satisfying these requirements is the case when

$$\varkappa = 7, \quad \vartheta = 9, \quad \kappa = 3, \quad \tau = 0, \quad \omega = 1, \quad \theta = 5, \quad (11)$$

for which the player payoffs (3,4,5) are expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{A,B,C}(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= (7, 7, 7)P(abc) + (3, 3, 9)P(ab\bar{c}) + (3, 9, 3)P(\bar{a}bc) \\
&\quad + (0, 5, 5)P(\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}) + (9, 3, 3)P(\bar{a}bc) + (5, 0, 5)P(\bar{a}b\bar{c}) \\
&\quad + (5, 5, 0)P(\bar{a}\bar{b}c) + (1, 1, 1)P(\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}).
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
P(ab) &= P(abc) + P(ab\bar{c}) = \lambda\mu\nu + \lambda\mu(1 - \nu) = \lambda\mu, \\
P(ac) &= \lambda\nu, \quad P(bc) = \mu\nu,
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

and for factorizable case, Bell's inequalities (BIs) (1) then take the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda + \mu + \nu &\leq (1 + \lambda\mu + \lambda\nu + \mu\nu), \\
\lambda\mu + \lambda\nu &\leq \lambda + \mu\nu, \quad \lambda\mu + \mu\nu \leq \mu + \lambda\nu, \quad \lambda\nu + \mu\nu \leq \nu + \lambda\mu,
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

i.e. the sum of last three inequalities take the form

$$\begin{aligned}
2(\lambda\mu + \lambda\nu + \mu\nu) &\leq (\lambda + \mu + \nu) + (\lambda\mu + \lambda\nu + \mu\nu), \\
(\lambda\mu + \lambda\nu + \mu\nu) &\leq (\lambda + \mu + \nu), \\
(\lambda\mu + \lambda\nu + \mu\nu) &\leq (\lambda + \mu + \nu) \leq (1 + \lambda\mu + \lambda\nu + \mu\nu),
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

i.e. for factorizable case, these form a consistent set as the last three BIs are consistent with the first BI.

With (11) and for the factorizable case, the players' payoffs are expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{A,B,C}(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= (7, 7, 7)\lambda\mu\nu + (3, 3, 9)\lambda\mu(1 - \nu) + \\
&\quad (3, 9, 3)\lambda(1 - \mu)\nu + (0, 5, 5)\lambda(1 - \mu)(1 - \nu) + \\
&\quad (9, 3, 3)(1 - \lambda)\mu\nu + (5, 0, 5)(1 - \lambda)\mu(1 - \nu) + \\
&\quad (5, 5, 0)(1 - \lambda)(1 - \mu)\nu + (1, 1, 1)(1 - \lambda)(1 - \mu)(1 - \nu),
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

that is

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_A(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= \lambda(\mu\nu - \mu - \nu - 1) + 4\mu + 4\nu + 1, \\
\Pi_B(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= \mu(\lambda\nu - \lambda - \nu - 1) + 4\nu + 4\lambda + 1, \\
\Pi_C(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= \nu(\lambda\mu - \mu - \lambda - 1) + 4\mu + 4\lambda + 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

For Nash equilibrium, as a triple $(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)$ for three-player PD game, we consider the inequalities (8) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \Pi_A}{\partial \lambda} \Big|_{(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)} (\lambda^* - \lambda) &= (\mu^* \nu^* - \mu^* - \nu^* - 1)(\lambda^* - \lambda) \geq 0, \\
\frac{\partial \Pi_B}{\partial \mu} \Big|_{(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)} (\mu^* - \mu) &= (\lambda^* \nu^* - \lambda^* - \nu^* - 1)(\mu^* - \mu) \geq 0, \\
\frac{\partial \Pi_C}{\partial \nu} \Big|_{(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)} (\nu^* - \nu) &= (\lambda^* \mu^* - \mu^* - \lambda^* - 1)(\nu^* - \nu) \geq 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

that gives the NE of $(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*) = (0, 0, 0)$ i.e. each of the three players play the strategy of Defection. At this NE, the player payoffs are then obtained as $\Pi_A(0, 0, 0) = \Pi_B(0, 0, 0) = \Pi_C(0, 0, 0) = 1$. Note that for strategy triple $(1, 1, 1)$ each of the three players play the strategy of Cooperation. An approach to a quantum game from the perspective of non-factorizable probability distributions is discussed in Ref. [27] and the difference between W state and GHZ state [10] from the perspective of three-player PD is also discussed in Ref. [28].

A. The player payoffs expressed in terms of the marginals

We now substitute from Eqs. (2,6) and the player payoffs $\Pi_{A,B,C}$ are obtained as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{A,B,C}(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= \alpha_{1,2,3}\xi + \beta_{1,2,3}(P(ab) - \xi) + \gamma_{1,2,3}(P(ac) - \xi) \\
&\quad + \delta_{1,2,3}(\lambda - P(ab) - P(ac) + \xi) \\
&\quad + \epsilon_{1,2,3}(P(bc) - \xi) + \varepsilon_{1,2,3}(\mu - P(ab) - P(bc) + \xi) \\
&\quad + \zeta_{1,2,3}(\nu - P(ac) - P(bc) + \xi) \\
&\quad + \eta_{1,2,3}(1 - \lambda - \mu - \nu + P(ab) + P(ac) + P(bc) - \xi).
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Eqs. (19) re-express the player payoffs in terms of the probabilities λ, μ, ν , representing the player strategies and defined in (6). With $\xi = P(abc)$ these payoffs are expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{A,B,C}(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= (\alpha_{1,2,3} - \beta_{1,2,3} - \gamma_{1,2,3} + \delta_{1,2,3} - \epsilon_{1,2,3} + \varepsilon_{1,2,3} + \zeta_{1,2,3} - \eta_{1,2,3})P(abc) \\
&\quad + (\beta_{1,2,3} - \delta_{1,2,3} - \varepsilon_{1,2,3} + \eta_{1,2,3})P(ab) + (\epsilon_{1,2,3} - \varepsilon_{1,2,3} - \zeta_{1,2,3} + \eta_{1,2,3})P(bc) \\
&\quad + (\gamma_{1,2,3} - \delta_{1,2,3} - \zeta_{1,2,3} + \eta_{1,2,3})P(ac) + (\delta_{1,2,3} - \eta_{1,2,3})\lambda \\
&\quad + (\varepsilon_{1,2,3} - \eta_{1,2,3})\mu + (\zeta_{1,2,3} - \eta_{1,2,3})\nu + \eta_{1,2,3}.
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

We consider Eqs. (20) as the defining payoff relations for the corresponding quantum game, as these payoffs also allow us to consider the case when Bell's inequalities (1) are violated. This will be the case when the distribution $P_{a,b,c}$ as defined in (2) does not hold.

We emphasize here that when Bell's inequalities hold, the steps in obtaining Eqs. (20) from (3,4,5) can be reversed. This is because Bell's inequalities (1) are necessary and sufficient for the existence of a joint distribution ξ . That is, from the given payoff relations (20), one can obtain the payoff relations (3,4,5) from which the classical mixed-strategy game can then be obtained for the case of factorizable probabilities as considered in Eq. (7).

B. Expressing the players' payoffs in three-player Prisoners' Dilemma in terms of the marginals

After substituting from Eqs. (11,2, 6), the player payoffs $\Pi_{A,B,C}$ above are obtained as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_A(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= \xi - P(ab) - P(ac) - \lambda + 4\mu + 4\nu + 1, \\
\Pi_B(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= \xi - P(ab) - P(bc) + 4\lambda - \mu + 4\nu + 1, \\
\Pi_C(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= \xi - P(bc) - P(ac) + 4\lambda + 4\mu - \nu + 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Now, if Bell's inequalities hold then the joint distribution (2) exists and the player payoffs (21) take the form of those in the classical mixed-strategy game.

V. USING QUANTUM STATES

We now use a quantum state $|\Psi\rangle$ and assume that the bivalent observables a, b , and c are the eigenvalues of Pauli spin-flip operator σ_z . The diagonal representation of σ_z is

$\sigma_z = |0\rangle\langle 0| - |1\rangle\langle 1|$ and with $|0\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $|1\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ the eigenstates of σ_z are $|\psi\rangle_{+1} = |0\rangle$ and $|\psi\rangle_{-1} = |1\rangle$ with the eigenvalues $+1$ and -1 , respectively. Let ρ_Ψ be the density matrix of the quantum state $|\Psi\rangle$.

A. Evaluating the marginals in Bell's inequalities using POVMs

A positive operator-valued measure (POVM) [10] is a measure whose values are positive semi-definite operators on a Hilbert space and the quantum measurements described by POVMs are a generalization of quantum measurement. To measure Alice's system in the standard basis, we consider the POVM given by

$$M_A^0 = |0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes \mathcal{I}_C, \quad M_A^1 = |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes \mathcal{I}_C, \quad (22)$$

for which we have

$$M_A^0 + M_A^1 = (|0\rangle\langle 0|_A + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A) \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes \mathcal{I}_C = \mathcal{I}_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes \mathcal{I}_C = \mathcal{I}, \quad (23)$$

and similarly

$$M_B^0 + M_B^1 = M_C^0 + M_C^1 = \mathcal{I}. \quad (24)$$

The probability of Alice, Bob, and Chris obtaining the outcome $+1$, respectively, is then obtained as

$$\lambda = P(a) = \text{Tr}(M_A^0 \rho), \quad \mu = P(b) = \text{Tr}(M_B^0 \rho), \quad \nu = P(c) = \text{Tr}(M_C^0 \rho). \quad (25)$$

For the probability $P(ab)$ we consider the POVM given by

$$\begin{aligned} M_{AB}^{00} &= |0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes \mathcal{I}_C, & M_{AB}^{11} &= |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes \mathcal{I}_C, \\ M_{AB}^{10} &= |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes \mathcal{I}_C, & M_{AB}^{01} &= |0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes \mathcal{I}_C. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{AB}^{00} + M_{AB}^{01} &= (|0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B + |0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_B) \otimes \mathcal{I}_C \\
&= |0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0|_B + |1\rangle\langle 1|_B) \otimes \mathcal{I}_C \\
&= |0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes \mathcal{I}_C, \text{ and} \\
M_{AB}^{11} + M_{AB}^{10} &= (|1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_B + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B) \otimes \mathcal{I}_C \\
&= |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes (|1\rangle\langle 1|_B + |0\rangle\langle 0|_B) \otimes \mathcal{I}_C \\
&= |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes \mathcal{I}_C, \text{ and, therefore} \\
M_{AB}^{00} + M_{AB}^{01} + M_{AB}^{11} + M_{AB}^{10} &= (|0\rangle\langle 0|_A + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A) \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes \mathcal{I}_C \\
&= \mathcal{I}_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes \mathcal{I}_C = \mathcal{I}
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

We can define another POVM given by

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{AB}^{+1} &= M_{AB}^{00} + M_{AB}^{11} \\
&= (|0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_B) \otimes \mathcal{I}_C,
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{AB}^{-1} &= M_{AB}^{10} + M_{AB}^{01} \\
&= (|1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B + |0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_B) \otimes \mathcal{I}_C,
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

and we obtain $P(ab) = \text{Tr}(M_{AB}^{+1}\rho)$.

Similarly, for $P(bc)$ we consider the POVM given by

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{BC}^{00} &= \mathcal{I}_A \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C), \quad M_{BC}^{11} = \mathcal{I}_A \otimes (|1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C), \\
M_{BC}^{10} &= \mathcal{I}_A \otimes (|1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C), \quad M_{BC}^{01} = \mathcal{I}_A \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C).
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{BC}^{+1} &= M_{BC}^{00} + M_{BC}^{11} \\
&= \mathcal{I}_A \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C + |1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C),
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{BC}^{-1} &= M_{BC}^{10} + M_{BC}^{01} \\
&= \mathcal{I}_A \otimes (|1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C + |0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C),
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

and we obtain $P(bc) = \text{Tr}(M_{BC}^{+1}\rho)$.

Similarly, for $P(ac)$ we consider the POVM given by

$$\begin{aligned} M_{AC}^{00} &= |0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C, \quad M_{AC}^{11} = |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C, \\ M_{AC}^{10} &= |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C, \quad M_{AC}^{01} = |0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C, \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

and we note that

$$\begin{aligned} M_{AC}^{+1} &= M_{AC}^{00} + M_{AC}^{11} \\ &= |0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

$$\begin{aligned} M_{AC}^{-1} &= M_{AC}^{10} + M_{AC}^{01} \\ &= |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C + |0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

and we obtain $P(ac) = \text{Tr}(M_{AC}^{+1}\rho)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} M_{BC}^{00} &= (|0\rangle\langle 0|_A + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A) \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C) \\ &= |0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

$$\begin{aligned} M_{BC}^{11} &= (|0\rangle\langle 0|_A + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A) \otimes (|1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C) \\ &= |0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

$$\begin{aligned} M_{BC}^{10} &= (|0\rangle\langle 0|_A + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A) \otimes (|1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C) \\ &= |0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

$$\begin{aligned} M_{BC}^{01} &= (|0\rangle\langle 0|_A + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A) \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C) \\ &= |0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Now consider

$$\begin{aligned} M_{ABC}^{+1} &= |0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C + \\ &\quad |0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C, \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

$$\begin{aligned} M_{ABC}^{-1} &= |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C + \\ &\quad |0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C + |0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C, \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

for which

$$M_{ABC}^{+1} + M_{ABC}^{-1} = (|0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_A) \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes \mathcal{I}_C = \mathcal{I}_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes \mathcal{I}_C = \mathcal{I} \quad (42)$$

That is, $M_{ABC}^{+1}, M_{ABC}^{-1}$ form a POVM.

B. Obtaining the marginals using POVMs

We consider GHZ type pure state i.e. $|\Psi\rangle = a|000\rangle + b|111\rangle$ where $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ and $|a|^2 + |b|^2 = 1$. This gives $\langle\Psi| = a^*\langle 000| + b^*\langle 111|$ and we have

$$\rho_\Psi = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| = |a|^2|000\rangle\langle 000| + ab^*|000\rangle\langle 111| + a^*b|111\rangle\langle 000| + |b|^2|111\rangle\langle 111|, \quad (43)$$

and from (25) we therefore have

$$\lambda = P(a) = \text{Tr}(M_A^0\rho_\Psi), \mu = P(b) = \text{Tr}(M_B^0\rho_\Psi), \nu = P(c) = \text{Tr}(M_C^0\rho_\Psi). \quad (44)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= \text{Tr}(M_A^0\rho_\Psi) = \text{Tr}[(|0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes \mathcal{I}_C)\rho_\Psi] \\ &= \text{Tr}[|a|^2(|000\rangle\langle 000| + ab^*|000\rangle\langle 111|) = |a|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= \text{Tr}(M_B^0\rho_\Psi) = \text{Tr}[(\mathcal{I}_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes \mathcal{I}_C)\rho_\Psi] \\ &= \text{Tr}[|a|^2(|000\rangle\langle 000| + ab^*|000\rangle\langle 111|) = |a|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \nu &= \text{Tr}(M_C^0\rho_\Psi) = \text{Tr}[(\mathcal{I}_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C)\rho_\Psi] \\ &= \text{Tr}[|a|^2(|000\rangle\langle 000| + ab^*|000\rangle\langle 111|) = |a|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Also, as $P(ab) = \text{Tr}(M_{AB}^{+1}\rho_\Psi)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
P(ab) &= \text{Tr}[(|0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_B) \otimes \mathcal{I}_C] \rho_\Psi \\
&= \text{Tr}(|a|^2 |000\rangle\langle 000| + ab^* |000\rangle\langle 111| + a^*b |111\rangle\langle 000| + |b|^2 |111\rangle\langle 111|) \\
&= |a|^2 + |b|^2 = 1
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

and we obtain $P(ab) = 1$.

Similarly, as $P(bc) = \text{Tr}(M_{BC}^{+1} \rho_\Psi)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Tr}(M_{BC}^{+1} \rho_\Psi) &= \text{Tr}[\mathcal{I}_A \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C + |1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C)] \rho_\Psi \\
&= \text{Tr}(|a|^2 |000\rangle\langle 000| + ab^* |000\rangle\langle 111| + a^*b |111\rangle\langle 000| + |b|^2 |111\rangle\langle 111|) \\
&= |a|^2 + |b|^2 = 1,
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

and, as $P(ac) = \text{Tr}(M_{AC}^{+1} \rho_\Psi)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Tr}(M_{AC}^{+1} \rho_\Psi) &= \text{Tr}[|0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C] \rho_\Psi \\
&= \text{Tr}(|a|^2 |000\rangle\langle 000| + ab^* |000\rangle\langle 111| + a^*b |111\rangle\langle 000| + |b|^2 |111\rangle\langle 111|) \\
&= |a|^2 + |b|^2 = 1
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

and we obtain $P(ac) = 1$. Similarly, as $P(abc) = \text{Tr}(M_{ABC}^{+1} \rho_\Psi)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Tr}(M_{ABC}^{+1} \rho_\Psi) &= \text{Tr}[|0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C + \\
&\quad |0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C] \rho_\Psi \\
&= \text{Tr}(|a|^2 |000\rangle\langle 000| + ab^* |000\rangle\langle 111|) = |a|^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

and we obtain $P(abc) = |a|^2$ and Bell's inequalities (1) take the form

$$3|a|^2 \leq 4, \quad 2 \leq |a|^2 + 1, \quad 2 \leq |a|^2 + 1, \quad 2 \leq |a|^2 + 1 \tag{52}$$

or $1 \leq |a|^2 \leq 4/3$ that are violated, for instance, when $a = 1/\sqrt{2}$.

VI. THREE-PLAYER PD GAME WITH THE GHZ STATE

Now, also consider the case when we have the correlation form of players' payoff relations (21) for the considered PD game and for the GHZ state, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\xi &= P(abc) = 1/2, \\ \lambda &= P(a) = 1/2, \quad \mu = P(b) = 1/2, \quad \nu = P(c) = 1/2, \\ P(ab) &= 1, \quad P(bc) = 1, \quad P(ac) = 1, \quad P(abc) = 1/2,\end{aligned}\tag{53}$$

which gives us

$$\Pi_A(1/2, 1/2, 1/2) = \Pi_B(1/2, 1/2, 1/2) = \Pi_C(\lambda, \mu, \nu) = 3.\tag{54}$$

VII. THE CASE OF THREE-QUBIT PURE STATE

Consider the state

$$\begin{aligned}|\Psi\rangle &= c_1 |000\rangle + c_2 |001\rangle + c_3 |010\rangle + c_4 |011\rangle \\ &\quad + c_5 |100\rangle + c_6 |101\rangle + c_7 |110\rangle + c_8 |111\rangle,\end{aligned}\tag{55}$$

with $\sum_i^8 |c_i|^2 = 1$. For this state, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}P(ac) &= \text{Tr}(M_{AC}^{+1} \rho_\Psi) = \text{Tr}[|0\rangle \langle 0|_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_C + |1\rangle \langle 1|_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes |1\rangle \langle 1|_C] \rho_\Psi \\ &= \text{Tr}(|000\rangle \langle 000| + |010\rangle \langle 010| + |101\rangle \langle 101| + |111\rangle \langle 111|) |\Psi\rangle \langle \Psi| \\ &= |c_1|^2 + |c_3|^2 + |c_6|^2 + |c_8|^2.\end{aligned}\tag{56}$$

In analogy with the calculations above, we also obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda &= |c_1|^2 + |c_2|^2 + |c_3|^2 + |c_4|^2, \\
\mu &= |c_1|^2 + |c_2|^2 + |c_5|^2 + |c_6|^2, \\
\nu &= |c_1|^2 + |c_3|^2 + |c_5|^2 + |c_7|^2, \\
P(ab) &= |c_1|^2 + |c_2|^2 + |c_7|^2 + |c_8|^2, \\
P(bc) &= |c_1|^2 + |c_4|^2 + |c_5|^2 + |c_8|^2, \\
P(ac) &= |c_1|^2 + |c_3|^2 + |c_6|^2 + |c_8|^2, \\
\xi = P(abc) &= |c_1|^2 + |c_4|^2 + |c_6|^2 + |c_7|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

For PD, substituting from Eqs. (57) to Eqs. (21) we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_A(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= 2 [3 |c_1|^2 + |c_2|^2 + |c_3|^2 + 4 |c_5|^2 + 2 |c_6|^2 + 2 |c_7|^2 - |c_8|^2] + 1, \\
\Pi_B(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= 2 [3 |c_1|^2 + |c_2|^2 + 4 |c_3|^2 + 2 |c_4|^2 + |c_5|^2 + 2 |c_7|^2 - |c_8|^2] + 1, \\
\Pi_C(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= 2 [3 |c_1|^2 + 4 |c_2|^2 + |c_3|^2 + 2 |c_4|^2 + |c_5|^2 + 2 |c_6|^2 - |c_8|^2] + 1,
\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

expressing the player payoffs in terms of the coefficients of the considered pure state.

VIII. THE CASE OF MIXED THREE-QUBIT STATES

We consider the mixed state ρ_Φ given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_\Phi &= p_1 |000\rangle \langle 000| + p_2 |001\rangle \langle 001| + p_3 |010\rangle \langle 010| + p_4 |011\rangle \langle 011| + \\
&\quad p_5 |100\rangle \langle 100| + p_6 |101\rangle \langle 101| + p_7 |110\rangle \langle 110| + p_8 |111\rangle \langle 111|,
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

where $0 \leq p_i \leq 1$ and $\sum_i^8 p_i = 1$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda &= \text{Tr}(M_A^0 \rho_\Phi) = \text{Tr} [(|0\rangle \langle 0|_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes \mathcal{I}_C) \rho_\Phi] \\
&= \text{Tr} [(|000\rangle \langle 000| + |001\rangle \langle 001| + |010\rangle \langle 010| + |011\rangle \langle 011|) \rho_\Phi] \\
&= p_1 + p_2 + p_3 + p_4
\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu &= \text{Tr}(M_B^0 \rho_\Psi) = \text{Tr}[(\mathcal{I}_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes \mathcal{I}_C) \rho_\Phi] \\
&= \text{Tr}[p_1 |000\rangle\langle 000| + p_2 |001\rangle\langle 001| + p_5 |100\rangle\langle 100| + p_6 |101\rangle\langle 101|] \\
&= p_1 + p_2 + p_5 + p_6
\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu &= \text{Tr}(M_C^0 \rho_\Phi) = \text{Tr}[(\mathcal{I}_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C) \rho_\Phi] \\
&= \text{Tr}[(|0\rangle\langle 0|_A + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A) \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0|_B + |1\rangle\langle 1|_B) \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C] \rho_\Phi \\
&= p_1 + p_3 + p_5 + p_7
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

IX. THE PRODUCT STATE

Consider a one-qubit pure quantum states

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi_1\rangle &= e^{i\delta_1} \left(\cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} |0\rangle + e^{i\phi_1} \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} |1\rangle \right), \\
|\psi_2\rangle &= e^{i\delta_2} \left(\cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} |0\rangle + e^{i\phi_2} \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} |1\rangle \right), \\
|\psi_3\rangle &= e^{i\delta_3} \left(\cos \frac{\theta_3}{2} |0\rangle + e^{i\phi_3} \sin \frac{\theta_3}{2} |1\rangle \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

A product state of these is

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi_{1,2,3}\rangle &= e^{i(\delta_1+\delta_2+\delta_3)} \left[\left(\cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} \cos \frac{\theta_3}{2} |000\rangle + e^{i\phi_3} \cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_3}{2} |001\rangle + \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. e^{i\phi_2} \cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} \cos \frac{\theta_3}{2} |010\rangle + e^{i(\phi_2+\phi_3)} \cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_3}{2} |011\rangle \right) + \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left(e^{i\phi_1} \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} \cos \frac{\theta_3}{2} |100\rangle + e^{i(\phi_1+\phi_3)} \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_3}{2} |101\rangle + \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. e^{i(\phi_1+\phi_2)} \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} \cos \frac{\theta_3}{2} |110\rangle + e^{i(\phi_2+\phi_3)} e^{i\phi_1} \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_3}{2} |111\rangle \right) \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

and for the pure state $|\Psi\rangle = c_1 |000\rangle + c_2 |001\rangle + c_3 |010\rangle + c_4 |011\rangle + c_5 |100\rangle + c_6 |101\rangle + c_7 |110\rangle + c_8 |111\rangle$ we have $\lambda = |c_1|^2 + |c_2|^2 + |c_3|^2 + |c_4|^2$. For the product state (64) we therefore obtain

$$\lambda = \cos^2 \frac{\theta_1}{2}, \quad \mu = \cos^2 \frac{\theta_2}{2}, \quad \nu = \cos^2 \frac{\theta_3}{2}. \quad (65)$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} P(ab) &= |c_1|^2 + |c_2|^2 + |c_7|^2 + |c_8|^2 \\ &= \cos^2 \frac{\theta_1}{2} \cos^2 \frac{\theta_2}{2} + \sin^2 \frac{\theta_1}{2} \sin^2 \frac{\theta_2}{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

and that can be expressed as $P(ab) = \lambda\mu + (1 - \lambda)(1 - \mu)$. Also,

$$\begin{aligned} P(bc) &= |c_1|^2 + |c_4|^2 + |c_5|^2 + |c_8|^2 \\ &= \cos^2 \frac{\theta_2}{2} \cos^2 \frac{\theta_3}{2} + \sin^2 \frac{\theta_2}{2} \sin^2 \frac{\theta_3}{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

and for the state (64) this can be expressed as $P(bc) = \mu\nu + (1 - \mu)(1 - \nu)$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} P(ac) &= |c_1|^2 + |c_3|^2 + |c_6|^2 + |c_8|^2 \\ &= \cos^2 \frac{\theta_1}{2} \cos^2 \frac{\theta_3}{2} + \sin^2 \frac{\theta_1}{2} \sin^2 \frac{\theta_3}{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

that can be expressed as $P(ac) = \lambda\nu + (1 - \lambda)(1 - \nu)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} P(abc) &= |c_1|^2 + |c_4|^2 + |c_6|^2 + |c_7|^2 \\ &= \lambda\mu\nu + \lambda(1 - \mu)(1 - \nu) + (1 - \lambda)\mu(1 - \nu) + (1 - \lambda)(1 - \mu)\nu, \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

for the state (64).

X. BELL'S INEQUALITIES VIOLATION

The above case shows that a set of non-factorizable probabilities, understood as above, can emerge from a factorizable quantum state of three qubits. This is because $\lambda = P(a)$, $\mu = P(b)$, $\nu = P(c)$ and for the product state (64) we find, for instance, $P(abc) \neq P(a)P(b)P(c)$. This set, however, should satisfy Bell's inequalities. Below, we show that this is the case. Considering BIs (1), we note that for the state (64) BIs take the form

$$\begin{aligned}
3[\lambda + \mu + \nu] &\leq 4 + 2[\lambda\mu + \mu\nu + \lambda\nu], \\
1 + 2\lambda(\mu + \nu) &\leq 3\lambda + 2\mu\nu, \\
1 + 2\mu(\lambda + \nu) &\leq 3\mu + 2\lambda\nu, \\
1 + 2\nu(\lambda + \mu) &\leq 3\nu + 2\lambda\mu.
\end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

The last three inequalities added give us

$$\begin{aligned}
3 + 2[\lambda(\mu + \nu) + \mu(\lambda + \nu) + \nu(\lambda + \mu)] &\leq 3(\lambda + \mu + \nu) + 2(\lambda\mu + \lambda\nu + \mu\nu), \\
3 + 4[\lambda\mu + \lambda\nu + \mu\nu] &\leq 3(\lambda + \mu + \nu) + 2(\lambda\mu + \lambda\nu + \mu\nu), \\
3 + 2[\lambda\mu + \lambda\nu + \mu\nu] &\leq 3(\lambda + \mu + \nu), \\
4 + 2[\lambda\mu + \lambda\nu + \mu\nu] &\leq 1 + 3(\lambda + \mu + \nu),
\end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

the last inequality above combined with the last inequality in the previous set give

$$3[\lambda + \mu + \nu] \leq 4 + 2[\lambda\mu + \mu\nu + \lambda\nu] \leq 1 + 3(\lambda + \mu + \nu), \tag{72}$$

that is, the set of inequalities are self consistent. In contrast, for an entangled state, a similar set of BIs would not be self-consistent i.e. holding of three inequalities would lead to contradicting with the fourth one. Note that even for an entangled state, Bell's inequalities are violated only in some directions and not in every direction.

In contrast, consider the GHZ state for which we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi = P(abc) &= 1/2, \\
\lambda = P(a) = 1/2, \mu = P(b) = 1/2, \nu = P(c) &= 1/2, \\
P(ab) = 1, P(bc) = 1, P(ac) = 1, P(abc) &= 1/2.
\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

and the BIs

$$\begin{aligned}
P(a) + P(b) + P(c) &\leq 1 + P(ab) + P(ac) + P(bc), \\
P(ab) + P(ac) &\leq P(a) + P(bc), \\
P(ab) + P(bc) &\leq P(b) + P(ac), \\
P(ac) + P(bc) &\leq P(c) + P(ab),
\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

take the form $3/2 \leq 4$, $2 \leq 3/2$, $2 \leq 3/2$, $2 \leq 3/2$, $3/2 \leq 4$, $2 \leq 3/2$, $2 \leq 3/2$, $2 \leq 3/2$, and BIs are, therefore, violated.

XI. QUANTUM SOLUTION OF THREE-PLAYER PD

We consider the mixed-strategy players' payoffs in the three-player PD as given by (21)

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_A(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= \xi - P(ab) - P(ac) - \lambda + 4\mu + 4\nu + 1, \\
\Pi_B(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= \xi - P(ab) - P(bc) + 4\lambda - \mu + 4\nu + 1, \\
\Pi_C(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= \xi - P(bc) - P(ac) + 4\lambda + 4\mu - \nu + 1,
\end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

and analyze these for various quantum states.

A. The factorizable state

For the factorizable state (64), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
P(a) &= \lambda, \quad P(b) = \mu, \quad P(c) = \nu, \quad P(ab) = \lambda\mu + (1 - \lambda)(1 - \mu), \\
P(bc) &= \mu\nu + (1 - \mu)(1 - \nu), \quad P(ac) = \lambda\nu + (1 - \lambda)(1 - \nu), \\
P(abc) &= \lambda\mu\nu + \lambda(1 - \mu)(1 - \nu) + (1 - \lambda)\mu(1 - \nu) + (1 - \lambda)(1 - \mu)\nu,
\end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

with which the payoffs (75) can be re-expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_A(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= 2(2\lambda\mu\nu - 2\lambda\mu - 2\lambda\nu - \mu\nu + \lambda + 3\mu + 3\nu) - 1, \\
\Pi_B(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= 2(2\lambda\mu\nu - 2\lambda\mu - \lambda\nu - 2\mu\nu + 3\lambda + \mu + 3\nu) - 1, \\
\Pi_C(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= 2(2\lambda\mu\nu - \lambda\mu - 2\lambda\nu - 2\mu\nu + 3\lambda + 3\mu + \nu) - 1,
\end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

and Nash inequalities then take the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \Pi_A}{\partial \lambda} \Big|_{(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)} (\lambda^* - \lambda) &= 2(2\mu^* \nu^* - 2\mu^* - 2\nu^* + 1)(\lambda^* - \lambda) \geq 0, \\
\frac{\partial \Pi_B}{\partial \mu} \Big|_{(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)} (\mu^* - \mu) &= 2(2\lambda^* \nu^* - 2\lambda^* - 2\nu^* + 1)(\mu^* - \mu) \geq 0, \\
\frac{\partial \Pi_C}{\partial \nu} \Big|_{(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)} (\nu^* - \nu) &= 2(2\lambda^* \mu^* - 2\lambda^* - 2\mu^* + 1)(\nu^* - \nu) \geq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

that can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mu^* \nu^* - \mu^* - \nu^* + 1/2)(\lambda^* - \lambda) &\geq 0, \\
(\lambda^* \nu^* - \lambda^* - \nu^* + 1/2)(\mu^* - \mu) &\geq 0, \\
(\lambda^* \mu^* - \lambda^* - \mu^* + 1/2)(\nu^* - \nu) &\geq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

From (79) neither $(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*) = (1, 1, 1)$ nor $(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*) = (0, 0, 0)$ emerge as a solution. For the case of non-edge triples $(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)$, we have

$$\mu^* \nu^* - \mu^* - \nu^* + 1/2 = 0, \tag{80}$$

$$\lambda^* \nu^* - \lambda^* - \nu^* + 1/2 = 0, \tag{81}$$

$$\lambda^* \mu^* - \lambda^* - \mu^* + 1/2 = 0. \tag{82}$$

Now, subtracting (81) from (80), subtracting (82) from (81), and subtracting (82) from (80) gives

$$(\nu^* - 1)(\mu^* - \lambda^*) = 0, \quad (\lambda^* - 1)(\nu^* - \mu^*) = 0, \quad (\mu^* - 1)(\nu^* - \lambda^*) = 0, \tag{83}$$

and it follows from (83) that $\lambda^* = \mu^* = \nu^*$ holds for the solution. Also, Eqs (80,81,82) can be expressed as

$$\mu^* + \nu^* - \mu^* \nu^* = 1/2, \quad \lambda^* + \nu^* - \lambda^* \nu^* = 1/2, \quad \lambda^* + \mu^* - \lambda^* \mu^* = 1/2. \tag{84}$$

From $\lambda^* = \mu^* = \nu^*$, we obtain $2\lambda^* - (\lambda^*)^2 = 1/2$ or $(\lambda^*)^2 - 2\lambda^* + 1/2 = 0$ or $\lambda^* = \frac{2 \pm \sqrt{2}}{2}$ and as $0 \leq \lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^* \leq 1$, we have $\lambda^* = \mu^* = \nu^* = \frac{2 - \sqrt{2}}{2}$ and then

$$\begin{aligned}
P(ab) &= \lambda^* \mu^* + (1 - \lambda^*)(1 - \mu^*) = 2 - \sqrt{2}, \\
P(bc) &= \mu^* \nu^* + (1 - \mu^*)(1 - \nu^*) = 2 - \sqrt{2}, \\
P(ac) &= \lambda^* \nu^* + (1 - \lambda^*)(1 - \nu^*) = 2 - \sqrt{2}, \\
P(abc) &= \lambda^* [\mu^* \nu^* + (1 - \mu^*)(1 - \nu^*)] + \mu^*(1 - \lambda^*)(1 - \nu^*) + \nu^*(1 - \lambda^*)(1 - \mu^*), \\
&= (2 - \sqrt{2})(3 - \sqrt{2})/2.
\end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

To find the quantum states corresponding to these marginals, we use the state (55) for which, the mixed-strategy solution $\lambda^* = \mu^* = \nu^* = \frac{2-\sqrt{2}}{2}$ results in negative value for the probability p_4 . This solution is to be discarded and the factorizable state (64) therefore generates no solution. We now consider GHZ and W-type states.

B. GHZ-type state

For GHZ type state i.e. $|\Psi\rangle = a|000\rangle + b|111\rangle$ where $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ and $|a|^2 + |b|^2 = 1$. This gives $\langle\Psi| = a^*\langle 000| + b^*\langle 111|$ and we have

$$\rho_\Psi = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| = |a|^2|000\rangle\langle 000| + ab^*|000\rangle\langle 111| + a^*b|111\rangle\langle 000| + |b|^2|111\rangle\langle 111|, \tag{86}$$

and from (25) we as considered above, therefore, have

$$\lambda = P(a) = \text{Tr}(M_A^0 \rho), \mu = P(b) = \text{Tr}(M_B^0 \rho), \nu = P(c) = \text{Tr}(M_C^0 \rho). \tag{87}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda &= \text{Tr}(M_A^0 \rho_\Psi) = \text{Tr}[(|0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes \mathcal{I}_C) \rho_\Psi] = |a|^2, \\
\mu &= \text{Tr}(M_B^0 \rho_\Psi) = \text{Tr}[(\mathcal{I}_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes \mathcal{I}_C) \rho_\Psi] = |a|^2, \\
\nu &= \text{Tr}(M_C^0 \rho_\Psi) = \text{Tr}[(\mathcal{I}_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C) \rho_\Psi] = |a|^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
P(ab) &= \text{Tr}(M_{AB}^{+1} \rho_\Psi) = \text{Tr}[(|0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_B) \otimes \mathcal{I}_C] \rho_\Psi = 1, \\
P(bc) &= \text{Tr}(M_{BC}^{+1} \rho_\Psi) = \text{Tr}[\mathcal{I}_A \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_C + |1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_C)] \rho_\Psi = 1, \\
P(ac) &= \text{Tr}(M_{AC}^{+1} \rho_\Psi) = \text{Tr}[|0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes \mathcal{I}_B \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0|_C + |1\rangle\langle 1|_C) \otimes \mathcal{I}_B] \rho_\Psi = 1, \\
\xi &= P(abc) = \text{Tr}(M_{ABC}^{+1} \rho_\Psi) = |a|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

As the above probabilities are over determined, the GHZ state does not permit players making choices within the considered scheme.

C. W-type state

For the W-type state $|\Psi_W\rangle = c_2|001\rangle + c_3|010\rangle + c_5|100\rangle$, with $|c_2|^2 + |c_3|^2 + |c_5|^2 = 1$, we obtain

$$\lambda = |c_2|^2 + |c_3|^2, \mu = |c_2|^2 + |c_5|^2, \nu = |c_3|^2 + |c_5|^2, \quad (90)$$

and

$$P(ab) = |c_2|^2, P(bc) = |c_5|^2, P(ac) = |c_3|^2, \xi = P(abc) = 0. \quad (91)$$

We note that

$$\lambda + \mu + \nu = 2(|c_2|^2 + |c_3|^2 + |c_5|^2) = 2, \quad (92)$$

$$P(ab) = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda - \nu + \mu), P(bc) = \frac{1}{2}(\mu + \nu - \lambda), P(ac) = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + \nu - \mu), \quad (93)$$

and the mixed-strategy players' payoffs (21) in three-player PD take the form

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_A(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= -2\lambda + 4\mu + 4\nu + 1, \\ \Pi_B(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= 4\lambda - 2\mu + 4\nu + 1, \\ \Pi_C(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= 4\lambda + 4\mu - 2\nu + 1. \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

Nash inequalities then become

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \Pi_A}{\partial \lambda} \Big|_{(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)} (\lambda^* - \lambda) &= -2(\lambda^* - \lambda) \geq 0, \\ \frac{\partial \Pi_B}{\partial \mu} \Big|_{(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)} (\mu^* - \mu) &= -2(\mu^* - \mu) \geq 0, \\ \frac{\partial \Pi_C}{\partial \nu} \Big|_{(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)} (\nu^* - \nu) &= -2(\nu^* - \nu) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

giving the outcome as $(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*) = (0, 0, 0)$ which contradicts Eq. (92). The W-type state, therefore, does not offer a resolution or representation of three-player PD.

D. The state $|\Psi\rangle = c_4 |011\rangle + c_6 |101\rangle + c_7 |110\rangle$

For the state

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi\rangle &= c_4 |011\rangle + c_6 |101\rangle + c_7 |110\rangle, \\ |c_4|^2 + |c_6|^2 + |c_7|^2 &= 1, \end{aligned} \tag{96}$$

we obtain from Eqs. (57, 58)

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= |c_4|^2, \quad \mu = |c_6|^2, \quad \nu = |c_7|^2, \\ \Pi_A(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= 4(\mu + \nu) + 1, \\ \Pi_B(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= 4(\lambda + \nu) + 1, \\ \Pi_C(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= 4(\lambda + \mu) + 1, \end{aligned} \tag{97}$$

and thus

$$\frac{\partial \Pi_A}{\partial \lambda} |_{(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)} = \frac{\partial \Pi_B}{\partial \mu} |_{(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)} = \frac{\partial \Pi_C}{\partial \nu} |_{(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)} = 0, \tag{98}$$

resulting in the strategy triple $(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*)$ becoming a NE, with the players' payoffs obtained from Eq. (97) as

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_A(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*) &= 4(\mu^* + \nu^*) + 1, \\ \Pi_B(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*) &= 4(\lambda^* + \nu^*) + 1, \\ \Pi_C(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*) &= 4(\lambda^* + \mu^*) + 1, \\ &\text{with } \lambda^* + \mu^* + \nu^* = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{99}$$

That is, this state allows surpassing the strong domination of pure strategy triple $(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*) = (0, 0, 0)$ in three-player PD but with the unattractive outcome that no unique but a continuum of NE that emerge. For instance, at $(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \nu^*) = (1/3, 1/3, 1/3)$ with $\Pi_{A,B,C}(1/3, 1/3, 1/3) = 11/3$.

XII. THE CASE OF A THREE-PLAYER SYMMETRIC COOPERATIVE GAME

Note that a, b, c are bivalent observable, each mapping into $\{+1, -1\}$. Let φ be an arbitrary subset of \mathfrak{R} . The players in φ may form a coalition so that, for all practical purposes, the coalition φ appears as a single player. It is expected that players in $(\mathfrak{R} - \varphi)$ will form an opposing coalition and the game has two opposing coalition players i.e. φ and $(\mathfrak{R} - \varphi)$. Each of the three players A, B, and C chooses one of the two strategies $+1, -1$. If the three players choose the same strategy there is no payoff; otherwise, the two players who have chosen the same strategy receive one unit of money each from the ‘odd man.’ Payoff functions Π_A, Π_B and Π_C for players A, B and C, respectively, are given as [29]

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_A(+1, +1, +1) &= \Pi_A(-1, -1, -1) = 0, \\ \Pi_A(+1, +1, -1) &= \Pi_A(-1, -1, +1) = \Pi_A(+1, -1, +1) = \Pi_A(-1, +1, -1) = 1, \\ \Pi_A(+1, -1, -1) &= \Pi_A(-1, +1, +1) = -2,\end{aligned}\tag{100}$$

with similar expressions for Π_B and Π_C .

Suppose $\varphi = \{B, C\}$, hence $\mathfrak{R} - \varphi = \{A\}$. The coalition game represented by Γ_φ is given by the payoff matrix

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathfrak{R} - \varphi \\ \begin{array}{cc} [+1] & [-1] \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \varphi \\ [+1, +1] \\ [+1, -1] \\ [-1, +1] \\ [-1, -1] \end{array} \end{array} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 \\ 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.\tag{101}$$

Here the strategies $[+1, -1]$ and $[-1, +1]$ are dominated by $[+1, +1]$ and $[-1, -1]$. After eliminating these dominated strategies the payoff matrix becomes

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathfrak{R} - \varphi \\ \begin{array}{cc} [+1] & [-1] \end{array} \\ \varphi \\ \begin{array}{c} [+1, +1] \\ [-1, -1] \end{array} \end{array} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.\tag{102}$$

It is seen that the mixed strategies:

$$\wp : \frac{1}{2} [+1, +1] + \frac{1}{2} [-1, -1], \quad (103)$$

$$\Re - \wp : \frac{1}{2} [+1] + \frac{1}{2} [-1]. \quad (104)$$

are optimal for \wp and $(\Re - \wp)$ respectively. In coalition games the notion of a strategy disappears; the main features are those of a coalition and the value or worth of the coalition. The underlying assumption is that each coalition can guarantee its members a certain amount called the *value of a coalition* which measures the worth the coalition possesses. It is characterized as the payoff which the coalition can assure for itself by selecting an appropriate strategy, whereas the ‘odd man’ can prevent the coalition from getting more than this amount. With the strategies (103,104) a payoff 1 for players \wp is assured for all strategies of the opponent; hence, the value of the coalition $v(\Gamma_\wp)$ is 1 i.e. $v(\{B, C\}) = 1$. Since Γ is a zero-sum game, $v(\Gamma_\wp)$ can also be used to find $v(\Gamma_{\Re-\wp})$ as $v(\{A\}) = -1$. The game is symmetric and one can write

$$\begin{aligned} v(\Gamma_\wp) &= 1, \quad \text{and} \quad v(\Gamma_{\Re-\wp}) = -1, \quad \text{or} \\ v(\{A\}) &= v(\{B\}) = v(\{C\}) = -1, \\ v(\{A, B\}) &= v(\{B, C\}) = v(\{C, A\}) = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

The mixed-strategy payoff relations for the players A,B, and C then are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{A,B,C}(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= \Pi_{A,B,C}(+1, +1, +1)P(abc) + \Pi_{A,B,C}(+1, +1, -1)P(ab\bar{c}) + \\ &\quad \Pi_{A,B,C}(+1, -1, +1)P(a\bar{b}c) + \Pi_{A,B,C}(+1, -1, -1)P(a\bar{b}\bar{c}) + \\ &\quad \Pi_{A,B,C}(-1, +1, +1)P(\bar{a}bc) + \Pi_{A,B,C}(-1, +1, -1)P(\bar{a}b\bar{c}) + \\ &\quad \Pi_{A,B,C}(-1, -1, +1)P(\bar{a}\bar{b}c) + \Pi_{A,B,C}(-1, -1, -1)P(\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}), \end{aligned} \quad (106)$$

where $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in [0, 1]$ and $P(\bullet)$ is the probability that each enclosed observable takes the value +1. In view of (100), the above payoffs can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_A(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= P(ab\bar{c}) + P(a\bar{b}c) - 2P(a\bar{b}\bar{c}) - 2P(\bar{a}bc) + P(\bar{a}b\bar{c}) + P(\bar{a}\bar{b}c), \\ \Pi_B(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= P(ab\bar{c}) - 2P(a\bar{b}c) + P(a\bar{b}\bar{c}) + P(\bar{a}bc) - 2P(\bar{a}b\bar{c}) + P(\bar{a}\bar{b}c), \\ \Pi_C(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= -2P(ab\bar{c}) + P(a\bar{b}c) + P(a\bar{b}\bar{c}) + P(\bar{a}bc) + P(\bar{a}b\bar{c}) - 2P(\bar{a}\bar{b}c). \end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

A. Factorizable case

For factorizable probabilities, the payoffs (107) take the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_A(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= 2\lambda(\mu + \nu - 1) + \mu + \nu - 4\mu\nu, \\
\Pi_B(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= 2\mu(\nu + \lambda - 1) + \lambda + \nu - 4\lambda\nu, \\
\Pi_C(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= 2\nu(\lambda + \mu - 1) + \lambda + \mu - 4\lambda\mu.
\end{aligned} \tag{108}$$

For the case when $\mu = \nu$ i.e. the players B and C make a coalition and play the same strategy, whereas the player A is left out, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_A(\lambda, \mu, \mu) &= 2(\lambda - \mu)(2\mu - 1), \\
\Pi_B(\lambda, \mu, \mu) &= \Pi_C(\lambda, \mu, \mu) = (\lambda - \mu)(1 - 2\mu).
\end{aligned} \tag{109}$$

For the case when $\lambda = \nu$ i.e. the players A and C make a coalition and play the same strategy, whereas the player B is left out, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_A(\lambda, \mu, \lambda) &= (\lambda - \mu)(2\lambda - 1) = \Pi_C(\lambda, \mu, \lambda), \\
\Pi_B(\lambda, \mu, \lambda) &= 2(\mu - \lambda)(2\lambda - 1).
\end{aligned} \tag{110}$$

For the case when $\lambda = \mu$ i.e. the players A and B make a coalition and play the same strategy whereas the player C is left out, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_A(\lambda, \lambda, \nu) &= (\lambda - \nu)(2\lambda - 1) = \Pi_B(\lambda, \lambda, \nu), \\
\Pi_C(\lambda, \lambda, \nu) &= 2(\nu - \lambda)(2\lambda - 1).
\end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

In view of these payoff relations, let $\mu = \nu = c$, i.e. the players B and C make a coalition and play the strategy c , whereas the player A is left out and plays $\lambda = l \neq c$, resulting in

$$\Pi_B(l, c, c) = (l - c)(1 - 2c) = \Pi_C(l, c, c), \tag{112}$$

$$\Pi_A(l, c, c) = -2(l - c)(1 - 2c) = -2\Pi_B(l, c, c), \tag{113}$$

i.e. when $l = c$ we get $\Pi_A(l, c, c) = 0$, as expected. Also when $l = 1 - c$ we obtain

$$\Pi_A(l, c, c) = -2(2c - 1)^2 = \Pi_B(c, l, c) = \Pi_C(c, c, l), \quad (114)$$

That is, the coalition can be considered as a single player. Noticing $\Pi_B(l, c, c) = l - 2cl - c + 2c^2$ we now consider

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_A(l^*, c^*, c^*) - \Pi_A(l, c^*, c^*) &= \frac{\partial \Pi_A}{\partial l} \Big|_{(l^*, c^*)} (l^* - l) = -2(1 - 2c^*)(l^* - l) \geq 0, \\ \Pi_B(l^*, c^*, c^*) - \Pi_B(l^*, c, c) &= \frac{\partial \Pi_B}{\partial c} \Big|_{(l^*, c^*)} (c^* - c) = (-2l^* - 1 + 4c^*)(c^* - c) \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

that gives $c^* = l^* = 1/2$.

B. Quantum solution

Using (2), the players' mixed-strategy payoff relations (107) can be re-expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_A(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= 2[P(ab) - 2P(bc) + P(ac) - P(a)] + P(b) + P(c), \\ \Pi_B(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= 2[P(ab) + P(bc) - 2P(ac) - P(b)] + P(a) + P(c), \\ \Pi_C(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= 2[-2P(ab) + P(bc) + P(ac) - P(c)] + P(a) + P(b). \end{aligned} \quad (116)$$

Now, with the pure state (55) these payoffs (116) take the form

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_A(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= 2[|c_2|^2 + |c_3|^2 - 2|c_4|^2 - 2|c_5|^2 + |c_6|^2 + |c_7|^2] - 2\lambda + \mu + \nu, \\ \Pi_B(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= 2[|c_2|^2 - 2|c_3|^2 + |c_4|^2 + |c_5|^2 - 2|c_6|^2 + |c_7|^2] + \lambda - 2\mu + \nu, \\ \Pi_C(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= 2[-2|c_2|^2 + |c_3|^2 + |c_4|^2 + |c_5|^2 + |c_6|^2 - 2|c_7|^2] + \lambda + \mu - 2\nu. \end{aligned} \quad (117)$$

Consider now the following constraints on the three-qubit pure quantum state

$$|c_4|^2 = |c_6|^2 = |c_7|^2, \quad |c_2|^2 = |c_3|^2 = |c_5|^2, \quad (118)$$

which reduce the above payoffs to

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_A(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= -2\lambda + \mu + \nu, \\
\Pi_B(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= \lambda - 2\mu + \nu, \\
\Pi_C(\lambda, \mu, \nu) &= \lambda + \mu - 2\nu.
\end{aligned}
\tag{119}$$

Now the definitions (57) makes the players' strategic variables λ , μ , and ν to become identical and also that each player's payoff then become identically zero i.e. $\Pi_A(\varkappa) = \Pi_B(\varkappa) = \Pi_C(\varkappa) = 0$. This results in the players left with no motivation to make a coalition.

XIII. DISCUSSION

Fine's theorem establishes a connection between the existence of a joint probability distribution for specified marginals and the satisfaction of system of Bell's inequalities, linked through the *if and only if* conditions. Using Fine's theorem, our analysis rephrases the mixed-strategy payoff relations of a game in the context of the marginals of a joint probability distribution. If such a joint distribution exists for the marginals, its depiction in terms of these marginals can be further simplified to an expression involving the joint distribution itself. Crucially, if this joint distribution is factorizable, the game can be distilled down to its classical mixed-strategy counterpart, thus making the mixed-strategy classical game to remain embedded within the presented framework. That is, the mere existence of a joint distribution corresponding to a set of marginals does not necessarily yield the classical mixed-strategy game. Factorizability of this distribution, in the sense described, remains a key requisite. That is, a factorizable probability distribution—as outlined—leads to the classical mixed-strategy game, ensuring that the set of Bell's inequalities is met. However, it's worth noting that a probability distribution satisfying Bell's inequalities doesn't necessarily guarantee its factorizability in the described manner.

Furthermore, through the lens of Fine's theorem, we demonstrate that player payoffs and strategies—when re-expressed in terms of a set of marginals—set the stage for analyzing what quantum probabilities can offer in potentially resolving the dilemmas that the games can represent. Via Fine's theorem, along with the considered or given quantum state(s) and the mixed-strategy version of the classical game, the presented framework allows a direct consideration of what quantum probabilities can offer to the game. In order to obtain

required marginal from the quantum states, the framework uses POVMs.

When applied to three-player PD, a three-qubit pure state (96) is determined for which the presented framework gives an unattractive outcome, with a continuum of NE that emerge. When applied to a three-player symmetric cooperative game, sets of three-qubit pure states, as given by (118), are determined for which the players are left with no motivation to make a coalition. The framework paves the way for the analysis of a range of games from the perspective of what quantum states have to offer and that can resolve their inherent dilemmas.

The presented approach to quantization is *complete* in the sense defined in Ref. [15], as the mixed-strategy version of the classical game remains embedded within its quantized version. Ref. [5] describes how POVMs generalize quantization schemes based on EWL [2, 3] and MW [4] schemes. The present manuscript, however, uses POVMs more directly in view of applying Fine's theorem in order to re-express the player payoffs and strategies in term of a set of marginals.

XIV. CONCLUSIONS

In essence, the introduced methodology paves the way for obtaining a game's quantum version directly from its classical mixed-strategy iteration, keeping in perspective the existence and/or non-existence of a joint probability distribution corresponding to a set of marginals, corresponding system of Bell's inequalities, and Fine's theorem that links them. The proposed framework is not confined to Nashian game theory. Instead, it offers the versatility to incorporate non-Nashian game-theoretic solution concepts. This encompasses a range of concepts such as perfect prediction equilibrium, translucent equilibrium, perfectly transparent equilibrium, superrationality, and minimax-rationalizability, among others. Furthermore, an intuitive progression of this research would be to apply Fine's theorem to four bivalent observables [21–23], paving the way for the quantization of four-player games.

[1] D. A. Meyer, Quantum strategies, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1052 (1999).

[2] J. Eisert, M. Wilkens, M. Lewenstein, Quantum games and quantum strategies, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3077 (1999).

- [3] J. Eisert, M. Wilkens, Quantum games. *J. Mod. Opt.* **47**, 2543 (2000).
- [4] L. Marinatto, T. Weber, A quantum approach to static games of complete information, *Phy.Lett. A.* **272**/5-6 (2000).
- [5] Chapter 13 (Quantum Games: a survey for mathematicians) Section 13.10 in V. N. Kolokoltsov and O. A. Malafeyev, *Understanding Game Theory: Introduction To The Analysis Of Many Agent Systems With Competition And Cooperation*, World Scientific; 2nd edition (2020), and the references within, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.04466>
- [6] The URL at <https://scholar.google.com.au/citations?user=wkfPcaQAAAAJ&hl=en> contains an extensive list of publications on the subject of quantum games.
- [7] K. Binmore, *Game Theory: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford University Press, Oxford (2007).
- [8] M. J. Osborne, *An Introduction to Game Theory*, Oxford University Press, Oxford (2003).
- [9] E. Rasmusen, *Games and Information: An Introduction to Game Theory*, 3rd ed., Blackwell Publishers Ltd., Oxford (2001).
- [10] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht (1995).
- [11] Ramón Alonso-Sanz, *Quantum Game Simulation*, Springer (2019) and the references within. ISBN 978-3-030-19633-2.
- [12] F. S. Khan, N. Solmeyer, R. Balu, et al., Quantum games: a review of the history, current state, and interpretation. *Quantum Inf Process.* **17**, 309 (2018), and the references within, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11128-018-2082-8>
- [13] P. Frackiewicz, *Application of quantum computing to game theory*, LAP Lambert Academic Publishing (2014), ISBN-13: 978-3659608834.
- [14] David Schneider, Geometrical Exploration of Quantum Games, in *Game Theory Relaunched*, Edited by Hardy Hanappi, DOI: 10.5772/53931 (2013).
- [15] Steven A. Bleiler, A Formalism for Quantum Games and an Application, <https://arxiv.org/abs/0808.1389>
- [16] J. Bell, On the Einstein–Podolsky–Rosen paradox, *Physics* **1**, 195–200 (1964).
- [17] J. Bell, *Speakable and Unsayable in Quantum Mechanics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1987).
- [18] A. Aspect, J. Dalibard, G. Roger, Experimental test of Bell’s inequalities using time-varying

- analyzers, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 1804–1807 (1982).
- [19] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, R. A. Holt, Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 880–884 (1969).
- [20] A. Iqbal, S. Weigert, Quantum correlation games. J. Phys. A Math. Gen. **37**, 5873–5885 (2004).
- [21] A. Fine, Joint distributions, quantum correlations, and commuting observables, J. Math. Phys. **23**, 1306 (1982).
- [22] A. Fine, Hidden variables, joint probability, and the Bell Inequalities, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 291(1982).
- [23] J.J. Halliwell, Two proofs of Fine’s theorem, Phys. Lett. A. **378**, Issue 40, 2945-2950 (2014).
- [24] M.J. O’Donnell, The three-player Prisoner’s Dilemma, Available from the URL: <http://www.classes.cs.uchicago.edu/archive/1998/fall/CS105/Project/node6.html>, Department of Computer Science, University of Chicago (1998).
- [25] A. Iqbal, T. Cheon, and D. Abbott, Probabilistic analysis of three-player symmetric quantum games played using the Einstein–Podolsky–Rosen–Bohm setting, Phys. Lett. A **372**, 6564–6577 (2008).
- [26] C.F. Lee and N. F. Johnson, Efficiency and formalism of quantum games, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 022311 (2003).
- [27] A. Iqbal, J. M. Chappell and D. Abbott, On the equivalence between non-factorizable mixed-strategy classical games and quantum games, R. Soc. Open Sci., Vol. **3**, Art. 150477 (2016).
- [28] Y-J. Han, Y-S. Zhang, G-C. Guo, W state and Greenberger–Horne–Zeilinger state in quantum three-person prisoner’s dilemma, Phys. Lett. A **295**, 61–64 (2002).
- [29] E. Burger, J.E. Freund, *Introduction to the Theory of Games*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1963.