Observing geometry of quantum states in a three-level system
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Geometric characters of physical objects greatly facilitate our understanding of the world. Along with the founding of quantum mechanics, of particular interest is the geometry of quantum systems from which many non-classical behaviors arise and exotic properties of the system can be inferred. However, there is always the difficulty to illustrate geometry of quantum systems beyond the simplest quantum bit model. One approach is to project the state space of quantum systems to the familiar Euclidean space via measurements of observables on the system. Here we report the first experiment measuring the geometry of such projections beyond one quantum bit. Specifically, we observe the joint numerical ranges of a triple of observables in a three-level photonic system, providing complete classification of the geometric objects. We further show that the geometry of different classes reveals ground-state degeneracies of corresponding Hamiltonians, which is related to quantum phases in the thermodynamic limit. Our results offer a versatile geometric approach for exploring and utilizing the higher dimensional quantum systems.

Arising from Euclid’s first attempt of establishing its axiomatic form, geometry has become an essential method for understanding the physical world [1–6]. An exemplary use of geometric method is in the creation of statistical mechanics in 1870s, when Gibbs introduced a geometric means to infer thermodynamic properties (e.g. energy or entropy) of a system by considering a convex body constituted by all possible values of physical quantities [7]. Shifting to quantum systems where the behaviors are governed by quantum physics, the possible expectation values of physical quantities are instead acquired by observing the entire space of quantum states, mathematically the set of all semi-definite matrices of trace one $\mathcal{M}_d = \{\rho : \rho \geq 0, \text{Tr}(\rho) = 1\}$ in a $d$-dimensional Hilbert space. As the state space of a single qubit has a successful geometric representation known as Bloch sphere [8, 9], there is no satisfactory geometric way to represent a higher dimensional state space. Here we investigate the geometry of quantum states by considering the convex body formed by expectation values of different observables on all quantum states. This geometric construction is equivalent to projecting the state space $\mathcal{M}_d$ to $n$-dimensional Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$ via measurements of $n$ observables on the system and allows exploration of physical properties of high-dimensional quantum systems through their lower-dimensional projections.

Behind the geometric construction is the concept of numerical range in mathematical terminology. Back in 1918, Toeplitz [10] introduced the numerical range of a $d \times d$ complex matrix $F$, which is defined as $W(F) = \{ z = \langle \psi | F | \psi \rangle : | \psi \rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d, \langle \psi | \psi \rangle = 1 \}$. Here $F = F_1 + i F_2$ involves two Hermitian matrices $F_1, F_2$. The conjecture by Toeplitz that $W(F)$ is convex was later proved by Hausdorff in 1919 [10, 11]. This result, named as Toeplitz-Hausdorff theorem, initiated the topic in the field of linear algebra and convex analysis. A natural extension is termed as joint numerical range (JNR) [12] involving a collection of Hermitian matrices $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, \ldots, F_n\}$

$$W(\mathcal{F}) = \{ \langle \psi | F_1 | \psi \rangle, \ldots, \langle \psi | F_n | \psi \rangle : | \psi \rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d, \langle \psi | \psi \rangle = 1 \}.$$

The range $W(\mathcal{F})$, as a subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, naturally forms a geometric object in Euclidean space. Then the state space projection via these matrices, which allows statistical mixture of pure states $| \psi \rangle$, is simply the convex hull of the JNR

$$L(\mathcal{F}) = \{ \text{Tr}(\rho F_1), \ldots, \text{Tr}(\rho F_n) : \rho \in \mathcal{M}_d \}.$$

In the following, we are mainly concerned with the set $L(\mathcal{F})$ and do not distinguish the two definitions.

In recent years, the topic of numerical range has been reviewed in the study of quantum phase transition [13–16], quantum control [17] and error correcting codes in quantum computing [18, 19]. Yet many characteristics of JNR are still unknown for dimension as low as 3. Recently, Szymański, Weis and Życzkowski made a crucial...
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FIG. 1. Quantum state space projection and the joint numerical range (JNR). a, The state space of a qubit system \( \mathcal{M}_2 \) can be represented as a Bloch sphere, which is actually the JNR formed by the expectation values of the three Pauli matrices \( \{\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z\} \). Undergoing a linear transformation \( \text{GL}(2) \), the Bloch sphere becomes an ellipsoid that is the JNR of other three linearly independent matrices. b, The state space of a higher-dimensional quantum system (\( d \geq 3 \)) is a convex set with a more complicated structure. Following the qubit case, these structures can be revealed by projecting the state space \( \mathcal{M}_d \) to \( \mathbb{R}^n \) through a set of \( n \) Hermitian observables. This constitute the convex hull of the JNR, whose surface can be generated by the ground states of a sequence of supporting Hamiltonians \( H(\vec{h}) \), geometrically the supporting hyperplanes \( \Pi \) (grey, solid lines). In general, ground-state degeneracy happens when flat portions appear on the surface.

step towards this problem by proving complete classification of the JNR in the case \( d = n = 3 \) [20]. However, experimentally recovering the geometry of JNR, together with its classification, demands sampling adequate data, which is a non-trivial issue requiring the ability to implement universal quantum computation on a qudit system [21–23]. To date there is no experimental observation of such a geometric set, and the lack of experimental realization in turn limits further understanding and exploiting of such geometry. To bridge this gap, we performed the measurement of JNRs by a triple of Hermitian operators in a three-state photonic system (a qutrit). Our experiment reveals the possible ground-state degeneracies of Hamiltonians in certain bases of \( \mathcal{F} \) and relates the degeneracies to quantum phases of the corresponding system. To our knowledge this is the first experiment allowing a complete observation of geometric projections for system beyond a qubit.

A simple example of JNR is the well-known Bloch sphere of a qubit system [8, 9] formed by the JNR of Pauli operators \( \{\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z\} \), whereas the JNR of other Hermitian matrices is equivalent to a transformation of the Bloch sphere, as shown in Fig. 1a. Extended to the general case, the JNR for \( n \) linearly independent Hermitian observables \( \mathcal{F} \) is also an \( n \)-dimensional projection of the \( d \)-dimensional state space \( \mathcal{M}_d \). The geometry of JNR is associated with a class of supporting Hamiltonians \( H(\vec{h}) = \sum h_i F_i \) on the basis \( \mathcal{F} \), i.e., an observable corresponding to the total energy of the system. Here \( \vec{h} = (h_1, ..., h_n) \) is an inward-pointing unit vector in \( \mathbb{R}^n \). The surface of the JNR can be generated by the ground states of the supporting Hamiltonians \( H(\vec{h}) \), having the least energy within possible states under \( H \). Geometrically, each vector \( \vec{h} \) determines a supporting hyperplane \( \Pi \) that is tangent to the surface of JNR, as depicted in Fig. 1b. The tangent point is acquired by the ground-state of the supporting Hamiltonian \( H(\vec{h}) \), while the corresponding ground-state energy \( E \) can be obtained by projecting the vector \( \langle \psi | F_1 | \psi \rangle, ..., \langle \psi | F_n | \psi \rangle \) onto the \( \vec{h} \) direction (see Supplemental Materials). If there exists a flat portion on the surface of JNR at a particular \( \vec{h} \), the supporting hyperplane will be tangent to the whole portion instead of a single point. This indicates a ground-state degeneracy in the sense that different ground-states are associated with one supporting Hamiltonian \( H(\vec{h}) \) [16].

In the case \( d = n = 3 \), the image of the JNR forms a three-dimensional oval that can be classified in terms of its one- or two-dimensional faces, that is, segments or filled ellipses. These faces are invariant under linear transformation and translation. According to the number of segments \( (s) \) and filled ellipses \( (e) \), all the JNRs can be divided into ten possible categories [20], among which eight categories are unitarily irreducible [24]:

\[
s = 0; e = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 \quad \text{and} \quad s = 1; e = 0, 1, 2.
\]

The flat portion appears as ellipse when the linear span of \( \{F'_1, F'_2, F'_3, I_2\} \) is 3-dimensional, where \( \{F'_1, F'_2, F'_3\} \) is the projection of operators \( \{F_1, F_2, F_3\} \) onto the degenerate subspace and \( I_2 \) is the \( 2 \times 2 \) identity operator. When the dimension of the linear span is reduced to 2, the flat portion degenerates to a segment (see Supplemental Materials for details).

To measure the JNR, one can prepare identical copies of quantum states and then the expectation values of \( \mathcal{F} \) can be obtained by separately measuring the collection of observables on the same states. To this end, we prepare single photons propagating in three modes which can be mathematically described as spin-one particles with three levels (denoted as \( |0\rangle, |1\rangle, |2\rangle \) respectively). The single photon is initially injected into one of the three modes. By applying two sequential unitary operations on two modes of the single photon (Fig. 2a), the system can be prepared in any pure superposition of the three levels, of the form \( |\psi\rangle = \cos \theta_1 e^{i\phi_1} |0\rangle + \sin \theta_1 \sin \theta_2 e^{i\phi_2} |1\rangle + \sin \theta_1 \cos \theta_2 |2\rangle \). The measurement of any Hermitian observable (Fig. 2b) is realized by a three-outcome quantum measurement collapsing the state onto one of the
three eigenstates of the observable $F_i$. The state firstly undergoes a unitary evolution consisting of three sequential two-mode unitaries, so that the input state is transformed in the eigen-basis of the observable $F_i$ [21]. At the end we monitor the three output modes by photon detectors. Expectation values of the observable can be obtained by the statistics of the outcomes.

To realize the above scheme, we implement photonic setups depicted in Fig. 2c. Heralded single photons are generated via a spontaneous parametric downconversion (SPDC) pumped by a pulsed laser. The state preparation module involves waveplates and a calcite beam displacer (BD) to distribute the single photons among three modes, encoded in the horizontal and vertical polarizations of a single path mode and another path mode. Two variable phase retarders are also included in this module to manipulate phases between different modes. As a result an arbitrary pure qutrit state among the three modes is prepared. The two-mode unitary evolutions in the measurement part are accomplished by a set of waveplates along with mode transformations combining waveplates and BDs. After the evolution, we use three single photon counting modules (SPCMs) to detect the single photon and register the coincidence counts between the three detectors and the heralding detectors with a coincidence logic. Then the clicks of the three detectors indicate measuring the corresponding eigenvalues $\lambda_{ij}^{(i)}$ of $F_i$. The waveplates in the measurement stage can be configured in different settings (see Supplemental Materials), thus enabling measurements of different observables with the same set of states.

For each class of JNR we provide an example of the 3-tuple of observables $\mathcal{F}$ (see Supplemental Materials) being measured in our experiment. Given the set of JNR for $n = 3$ is convex [25] and any interior point can be obtained by the mixture of boundary states, we randomly sample 300 ground-states $|\psi_i(\theta, \phi)\rangle$ of supporting Hamiltonian $H(\theta, \phi) = \sin \theta \cos \phi F_1 + \sin \theta \sin \phi F_2 + \cos \theta F_3$ according to the parameters $\theta, \phi$ for each class, here $(\theta, \phi)$ defines the unit vector $\hat{h} = (\sin \theta \cos \phi, \sin \theta \sin \phi, \cos \theta)$. Then we measure the expectation values of the three observables with respect to these ground-states. Figure 3 illustrates the experimental results for the exemplary JNRs of eight classes. The theoretical JNR for each class is plotted by sampling adequate ground-states (more than 3000) and generating the convex hull of the corresponding theoretical expectation values. The experimental results are all located near the boundary of the theoretical predictions. The average similarity $S$ between experimentally measured probability distributions $\{p_j\}$ and the theoretical values $\{p_j^{th}\}$ is above 0.994, with $S = (\sqrt{p_0^{th}} + \sqrt{p_1^{th}} + \sqrt{p_2^{th}})^2$. The convex hulls of
FIG. 3. Complete observation of joint numerical range (JNR). a-h, Experimentally measured data (red dots) and the theoretical predictions of JNR (chromatic convex bodies) for the examples of the eight possible classes. Each class is specified by the number of segments ($s$) and filled ellipses ($e$) on the surface (plotted with gray lines) of the convex body. We sample 300 Hamiltonians involving the three operators for each class and measure the three observables on corresponding ground states. The experimental results are in line with the theoretical predictions as they are near the boundary surfaces of these plots. The classes (distinguished by segments and ellipses) are apparent according to the geometric characters in the plots.

The experimental data also show the same geometry features (the number of $s$ and $e$) and manifest high similarity with the theoretical convex hulls of JNRs. Deviations between the observed data and the theoretical values are mainly attributed to systematic errors in the settings of experimental parameters (see Supplemental Materials for a detailed analysis).

Following the complete observation of the unitarily irreducible geometric bodies, we now show how the geometry of JNRs in Fig. 3 determines the ground-state energies and degeneracies of supporting Hamiltonians. In Fig. 4, by combining the measurement results of $F_1, F_2, F_3$ with the corresponding unit vector $(\theta, \phi)$ in $H(\theta, \phi)$, we give the corresponding energy $E$ (red dots), the expectation values of $H(\theta, \phi)$, of the measured states versus $\theta$ and $\phi$. The resulting energies are in line with theoretical prediction of ground state energies within experimental errors. In particular, there is a clear correspondence between the segments and ellipses in Fig. 3 and the degeneracy points in Fig. 4. For example, the first class (Fig. 4a) corresponds to a gaped Hamiltonian and cannot see any flat portions from the surface of its JNR. As for the case $s = 1, e = 1$, there are two degeneracy points in the band structure diagram, one is cone-shaped which is non-analytic in all directions and corresponds to the ellipse on the JNR and the other is $\Lambda$-shaped which is non-analytic only in one direction and corresponds to the segment.

For quantum matters at zero temperature, the ground states associated to a class of Hamiltonians are realized as “quantum phases” of the matter. The degeneracy of ground states, usually indicating a gap closing in the system, is an important indicator of different quantum phases, for example, in symmetry breaking, topological ordered [26] and gapless phases. As demonstrated in our experiment, the flat surfaces (ellipses and segments in the case $d = n = 3$) on an image of JNR indicate ground-state degeneracies under the class of Hamiltonians $H(\vec{h})$, which represent different phases of the system. Therefore, the geometry of JNRs can be viewed as an intuitive geometric representation of quantum phases, with different regions on the surface representing different phases. Two states are in the same phase if they can adiabatically evolve into each other without closing gap, equivalently they can be changed into each other smoothly without any singularity on the surface of the JNR (the values of physical observables). This provides a geometric method to investigate quantum phases [14], topological orders [15] etc. by separately measuring (local) components in the basis of Hamiltonians $H$, instead of studying the global $H$ [27]. The present scheme can be readily extended to more general Hamiltonians and more complex systems. Restricted by imagination for higher dimensional objects, we are here only illustrating the class of Hamiltonians containing three observables.

Determining the ground state wavefunctions, together with their degeneracies, is proven to be intractable according to the theory of quantum computational complexity. Theories of numerical ranges have been adopted
in one of the basic problems in quantum chemistry, the N-representability problem [28, 29], and the quantum marginal problem in quantum information theory [30]. In this sense our work also foreshadows a new path for addressing relevant problems with experimental measurements of observables and geometric analysis.

Geometry of quantum systems is definitely essential for understanding physical concepts from quantum matters to quantum information. We have identified the geometry of a three-level quantum system by conclusively observing the complete classification of joint numerical ranges (JNRs) by three observables. This yields the first experimental illustration of quantum systems beyond a qubit system. By separately measuring physical quantities and constituting the convex bodies, we reveal the deep relation between the geometric characters of JNR and the ground-state degeneracy, and thereby quantum phases of the system, governed by the supporting Hamiltonians. Our work opens the avenue for experimental study of fascinating phenomena and intractable problems for quantum systems via geometric ways. This geometric method is applicable to high-spin and many-body systems, where the set of observables are happened to be local Hamiltonians of subsystems which may be easier to conduct and investigate than the global one [27]. This versatile approach therefore enables further investigations to understand the complexity of quantum systems, to infer intriguing phases and properties of quantum matters, as well as to utilize and harness quantum information covering entanglement certification [31], characterization of quantum measurements [32], and precision metrology [33].

The authors thank Y. Zhao, H. Zhang for enlightening discussions. This work was supported by the National Key Research and Development Program of China (grant no. 2017YFA0303703) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant nos. 11690032, 61490711, 11474159 and 11574145).

FIG. 4. Determining ground state energy and degeneracy. a–h, The band structures of the lowest two bands for the eight classes of Hamiltonians. Colored surfaces represent the energy of the ground state and the first excited state of the Hamiltonian $H(\theta, \phi)$ as a function of $\theta, \phi$. The experimental results (red dots) are computed by the experimental data of each class of JNR, as indirectly measured expectation values of $H(\theta, \phi)$. The number and feature of degeneracy points shown in the bands have a correspondence with the number of segments and ellipses revealed on the JNR bodies.
[24] The other two categories, $s = \infty, e = 0$ or $1$, correspond to linearly dependent operator sets, whose JNRs can be obtained by lower dimensional JNRs, as shown in the Supplemental Materials.
SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS FOR "OBSERVING GEOMETRY OF QUANTUM STATES IN A THREE-LEVEL SYSTEM"

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Numerical Range and its extensions

Mathematically, Numerical Range (NR) $W(F)$ of a $d \times d$ matrix $F$ is $\{\langle x | A | x \rangle, |x\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d, \langle x | x \rangle = 1\}$. Physicists are generally more interested in the case of $F$ being a Hermitian matrix, i.e. $F = F^\dagger$. It is straightforward to observe that $W(F)$ is the set of expected outcomes by measuring the observable $F$ with pure quantum states. The first important result of NR is called Toeplitz-Hausdorff theorem which states NRs are convex and compact\[^{[10, 11]}\].

A natural generalization of Numerical Range is that, instead of measuring one observable, one may measure a set of linearly independent operators $F = \{F_1, \cdots, F_n\}$. This is so called Joint Numerical Range (JNR)

$$W(F) = \{(\langle x | F_1 | x \rangle, \langle x | F_2 | x \rangle, \cdots, \langle x | F_n | x \rangle), |x\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d, \langle x | x \rangle = 1\}. \tag{1}$$

The JNR of $\{F_1, F_2\}$ can be merged into NR since it equals to the NR of $A = F_1 + iF_2$. Therefore, people usually consider $n \geq 3$ while studying JNR. In contrast with Numerical Range, JNR is usually not convex \[^{[25, 34]}\]. In other words, the measurement outcome set that using only pure states to measure a set of observables may not be convex. The next problem is how to characterize measurements according to mixed states.

In 1979, Au-Yeung and Poon \[^{[25]}\] studied a generalized JNR

$$W^{(r)}(F) = \left\{\left(\sum_{i=1}^r \langle x_i | F_1 | x_i \rangle, \sum_{i=1}^r \langle x_i | F_2 | x_i \rangle, \cdots, \sum_{i=1}^r \langle x_i | F_n | x_i \rangle\right) \mid \sum_{i=1}^r \langle x_i | x_i \rangle = 1, |x_i\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d\right\}. \tag{2}$$

When $r = 1$, it reduces to standard JNR where $r$ denotes the largest degree of quantum states used to measure the operator set $F$. Notice that $|x_i\rangle$ in Eq. (2) is not normalized. The probability $p_i$ of each component pure state absorbed in $|x_i\rangle$. Rewrite $|x_i\rangle$ as $\sqrt{p_i} |x'_i\rangle$, where $\langle x_i | x_i \rangle = 1$ and $\sum p_i = 1$. We can reformulate $W^{(r)}(F)$ as

$$W^{(r)}(F) = \left\{(\text{Tr}(F_1 \rho), \text{Tr}(F_2 \rho), \cdots, \text{Tr}(F_n \rho)) \left| \sum_{i=1}^r p_i |x'_i\rangle \langle x'_i | = \rho, \sum_{i=1}^r p_i = 1, \langle x'_i | x'_i \rangle = 1, |x'_i\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d, p_i \in [0, 1]\right.\right\}. \tag{3}$$

In \[^{[25]}\], a lower bound for $W^{(r)}(F)$ to be convex has been provided. For the scenario considered in this paper, which is qutrit systems ($d = 3$) with three linear independent observables ($n = 3$), the measurement results of pure states (JNR of $F$, $W(F)$) is convex. Moreover, in qutrit systems, if we allow the use of mixed states up to degree 2, then $W^{(r)}(F)$ is convex whenever $|F| < 8$.

Another concept introduced in \[^{[35]}\] is the Joint Algebraic Numerical Range (JANR)

$$L(F) = \left\{(\text{Tr}(F_1 \rho), \text{Tr}(F_2 \rho), \cdots, \text{Tr}(F_n \rho)) \mid \rho \text{ is a quantum state}\right\}. \tag{4}$$

Clearly, $L(F) = \text{Cov}(W(F))$. Since $W(F)$ is convex for the case discussed in this paper ($d = n = 3$), we do not distinguish the difference between the JANR and JNR in the following sections.

Supporting Hamiltonian and JNR

The surface of JNR is determined by the ground states of the class of Hamiltonians associated to $F$, which can be written as

$$H(\vec{h}) = \sum_i h_i F_i$$

with $\vec{h} = (h_1, \ldots, h_n)$ as the inward pointing unit vector in the $n$ dimensional Euclidean space. This can be easily understand as follows. First, it is obvious that the point $(\langle F_1 \rangle, \ldots, \langle F_n \rangle)$ with minimum value of $\langle F_1 \rangle$ can be obtained by the eigen-state with minimum eigen-value of $F_1$, which is equivalent to making a tangent plane of $W(F)$ in the direction $(1, \ldots, 0)$ to get the tangent point as this extreme point. This tangent point also corresponds to the point
obtained by the ground-state of \( H((1,...,0)) \). In order to get other surface points, we only need to rotate the plane with inward pointing normal vector \((1,...,0)\) to other direction \( \vec{h} \) and tangent to \( W(\mathcal{F}) \). This new tangent point can be obtained by the minimum eigen-state of a rotated operator \( F' = \vec{h} \cdot (F_1,...,F_n) \), that is the ground-state of supporting Hamiltonian \( H(\vec{h}) \). And we call the tangent plane in the \( \vec{h} \) direction as supporting hyperplane, denoted as \( \Pi \). Moreover, it can be seen that the ground-state energy \( E \) can be written as

\[
E = \sum_i h_i \langle F_i \rangle,
\]

which is equivalent to projecting \( (\langle F_1 \rangle,...,\langle F_n \rangle) \) onto the \( \vec{h} \) direction.

**Physical Interpretation of Joint Algebraic Numerical Range**

In this section, we discuss the structure of Joint Algebraic Numerical Range (or the convex hull of JNR). We show that the boundary of JANR of a linearly independent set \( \mathcal{F} \) of operators can be reached by ground states of Hamiltonians \( H = \sum_{i=1}^n h_i F_i \), where \( \{h_1,\cdots,h_n\} \in \mathbb{R}^n \). For example, Fig. 5 is the structure of the first three energy levels of a qudit system for which \( d = 9 \) and the set \( \{F_1,F_2\} \) was random generated.

The expected value of \( H \) according to a state \( |\psi\rangle \) is

\[
\langle H \rangle_\psi = \langle \psi | H | \psi \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n h_i \langle \psi | F_i | \psi \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n h_i \langle F_i \rangle_\psi
\]

It is easy to see that the minimum of \( \langle H \rangle_\psi \) is achieved when \( |\psi\rangle \) is the ground state of \( H \). Notice that \( \{h_1,\cdots,h_n\} \) is a representation of \( H \) in terms of the operator set \( \mathcal{F} \). We denote the representation by \( \vec{h} = (h_1,\cdots,h_n) \).

Observe that \( \vec{h} = (h_1,\cdots,h_n) \) has the same eigenspaces with \( -\vec{h} \) and the eigenvalues differ from one another with a constant \(-1\). In other words, the ground state of \( \vec{h} \) becomes the highest excited states of \(-\vec{h} \). Since \( \vec{h} \) and \(-\vec{h} \) are all in \( \mathbb{R}^n \), the image of ground states of such class of \( H \) \( (H = \sum_{i=1}^n h_i F_i) \) is the same as the image of highest excited states of \( H \). The same discussion could be extended to the second excited states and the second highest excited states etc. Therefore, one only need to study \( \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil \) levels of the eigenspaces.

In terms of geometry of JNR, people are more interested in ground states which form the boundary. If the ground state of \( H \) is not degenerate, there is only one point \( (\langle F_1 \rangle_\psi,\langle F_2 \rangle_\psi,\cdots,\langle F_n \rangle_\psi) \) on the boundary of JANR corresponding to the ground state.

**Observation 1.** Suppose \( \mathcal{F} = \{F_1,F_2,\cdots,F_n\} \) and \( \{F_1,F_2,\cdots,F_n,I_d\} \) is linearly independent. Let \( p \) be an extreme point of JANR. Denote the inward pointing normal vector of the supporting plane (or tangent plane) at a point \( p \) by \( \vec{h}_p \). If the ground state of Hamiltonian \( H = \vec{h}_p \cdot \mathcal{F} \) is not degenerate, then there is only one state \( |\psi\rangle \) with \( p = (\langle F_1 \rangle_\psi,\langle F_2 \rangle_\psi,\cdots,\langle F_n \rangle_\psi) \). Further, \( |\psi\rangle \) is the ground state of \( H \).

**Physical Interpretation of JNR surface**

The surface of joint numerical range \( W(\mathcal{F}) \) is determined by the ground states of the class of Hamiltonians associated with \( \mathcal{F} \). We considered the geometry of JNRs of three by 3 Hermitian matrices in this paper. Suppose \( \mathcal{F} = \{F_1,F_2,F_3\} \) where \( \{F_1,F_2,F_3,I_d\} \) is linearly independent. The analysis of the influence of ground state degeneracy of such JNRs is given as follows:

Consider a supporting plane \( \Pi \) of \( W(\mathcal{F}) \) with inward pointing normal vector \( \vec{h} = (h_1,h_2,h_3) \). Suppose \( H = \sum_{i=1}^3 h_i F_i \) has degenerate ground states. Then the degeneracy is 2-dimensional. Choose two ground states, \(|x_1\rangle\) and \(|x_2\rangle\), orthogonal to each other. Let \( X \) be the \( 3 \times 2 \) matrix with columns \(|x_1\rangle\) and \(|x_2\rangle\). Let \( \mathcal{S} \) be the linear span of the \( 2 \times 2 \) matrices \( X F_i X : 1 \leq i \leq 3 \). Let \( \mathcal{S} \) be the linear span of the \( 3 \times 2 \) matrices \( X F_i X : 1 \leq i \leq 3 \). Then \( 1 \leq \dim \mathcal{S} \leq 3 \). We have

1. If \( \dim \mathcal{S} = 1 \), then \( \Pi \) touches \( W(\mathcal{F}) \) at a point.
2. If \( \dim \mathcal{S} = 2 \), then \( \Pi \cap W(\mathcal{F}) \) is a non-degenerate line segment.
3. If \( \dim \mathcal{S} = 3 \), then \( \Pi \cap W(\mathcal{F}) \) is a non-degenerate ellipse.
FIG. 5. The Joint numerical range of two 9 by 9 random generated hermitian operators \( \{ F_1, F_2 \} \). \( (d = 9 \text{ and } n = 2) \) The colored area is the JNR \( W(\mathcal{F}) \) of \( \mathcal{F} = \{ F_1, F_2 \} \). The blue dots are the measurements according to ground states of \( H = h_1 F_1 + h_2 F_2 \), which \( h_1 \) and \( h_2 \) are random generated. The cyan dots is formed by the first excited states of \( H \). The green dots correspond to the second excited states.

\[
\begin{array}{c|ccc}
A & A_1 & A_2 & A_3 \\
\hline
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c|ccc}
B & B_1 & B_2 & B_3 \\
\hline
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
\end{array}
\]

TABLE I. Two sets of hermitian matrices of Class 1.

For the first scenario, notice that, the two sets of operators in Table I are both belong to the first JNR class - there are no lines and ellipses on the surfaces of their JNR. The class of Hamiltonians \( H = \sum_i h_i A_i \) attached to the set \( A \) (the set of operators we use in the paper) does not have degenerated ground states. The Hamiltonian class attached to the operator set \( B \) is truly the first scenario. That is, \( H = \sum_i h_i B_i \)'s ground-state degeneracy appears as a point on the JNR surface when \( \vec{h} = (1, 0, 0) \).

The established JNR examples of Class 4 and Class 8 used in this paper, which has 3 ellipses and 2 ellipses plus 1 segment respectively, are appropriate examples for the second and third scenarios. Fig. 6 depicts their JNRs and 2-D projections. For Class 4, we have

\[
F_{41} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad F_{42} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad F_{43} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.
\]

The projection of \( W(\mathcal{F}) \) to the \( x-y \) plane (Fig. 6(a), \( W(F_{41}, F_{42}) \)) is a triangle with inward pointing normal vectors \((1, 0), (-1, -1)\) and \((-1, 1)\) showing the degeneracy for \( \vec{h} = (1, 0, 0), (-1, -1, 0) \) and \((-1, 1, 0)\). The corresponding \( X \) is given by

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 \\
\end{pmatrix}, \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}
\]

respectively. Direct calculation shows that \( \dim S = 3 \) in all three cases. Therefore, \( W(\mathcal{F}_4) \) has three ellipses on its surface.

The same discussion holds for \( W(\mathcal{F}_8) \). For Class 8, we have

\[
F_{81} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad F_{82} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad F_{83} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}
\]
FIG. 6. The Joint Numerical Ranges of Class 4 and Class 8 and their projections to three coordinate planes.

The projection of \( W(\mathcal{F}) \) to the \( x-zy \) plane (Fig. 6(g), \( W(F_{81}, F_{83}) \)) is a triangle with inward pointing normal vectors \((1, 0), (-1, -1)\) and \((-1, 1)\) showing the degeneracy for \( \vec{h} = (1, 0, 0), (-1, 0, -1) \) and \((-1, 0, 1)\). The corresponding \( X \) is given by

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\
0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
-1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

respectively. Direct calculation shows that \( \dim S = 2 \) in the first case and \( \dim S = 3 \) in last two cases. Therefore, \( W(F_{8}) \) has one line segment and two ellipses on its surface.

**EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS**

**State Preparation**

Light pulses with 830nm central wavelength from a ultrafast Ti:Sapphire laser (76MHz repetition rate; Coherent Mira-HP) are firstly frequency doubled in a beta barium borate (\( \beta \)-BBO) crystal. The second harmonic laser then pump a 10 mm bulk potassium dihydrogen phosphate (KDP) crystal phase-matched for type-II collinear degenerate downconversion to produce photon pairs denoted as signal and idler. After the PBS, the idler mode is detected by a SPCM (Excilitas Technologies, SPCM-AQRH-FC with a detection efficiency about 49%) as the trigger of the heralded single photon source, whereas the signal mode is directed towards the following set-up (shown in Fig. 2c).

We use BD, wave plates and two phase retarders (PRs) to prepare arbitrary pure qutrit states encoded in the polarization and spatial optical modes, depicted in the state preparation module in Fig. 2c in the main text. Single photons with horizontal polarization \( |H\rangle \) firstly been scrambled in the superposition of horizontal and vertical
polarization by HWP\(_A\) with setting angle \(\theta_A\).

\[
|\psi_1\rangle = \cos \theta_A \, |H\rangle + \sin \theta_A \, |V\rangle.
\]

Then followed by a PR, a relative phase between horizontal and vertical polarization is included and the state can be written as

\[
|\psi_2\rangle = e^{i\phi_1} \cos \theta_A \, |H\rangle + \sin \theta_A \, |V\rangle.
\]

After BD1, the state is in the superposition of two spatial mode \(|s1\) (top) and \(|s2\) (lower),

\[
|\psi_3\rangle = e^{i\phi_1} \cos \theta_A \, |H\rangle \otimes |s1\rangle + \sin \theta_A \, |V\rangle \otimes |s2\rangle.
\]

In the spatial mode \(|s1\), a HWP with angle 45° flip the polarization into \(|V\), while in spatial mode \(|s2\), HWP\(_B\) is set to \(\theta_B\), therefore, the state after HWP\(_B\) is

\[
|\psi_4\rangle = e^{i\phi_1} \cos \theta_A \, |V\rangle \otimes |s1\rangle + \sin \theta_A (\sin \theta_B \, |H\rangle - \cos \theta_B \, |V\rangle) \otimes |s2\rangle.
\]

To generate arbitrary pure qutrit state, another relative phase still needed. Here we use the second PR simultaneously manipulating the two spatial mode, introduce another phase factor \(\phi_2\) between horizontal and vertical polarization modes, thus in the end, when the photon pass through BD2, we have prepared an arbitrary qutrit state in the form of

\[
|\psi_5\rangle = e^{i\phi_1} \cos \theta_A \, |V\rangle \otimes |s1\rangle + e^{i\phi_2} \sin \theta_A \sin \theta_B \, |H\rangle \otimes |s1\rangle - \sin \theta_A \cos \theta_B \, |V\rangle \otimes |s2\rangle.
\]

By defining the three eigen-modes of the qutrit state as

\[
|0\rangle \equiv |H\rangle \otimes |s1\rangle, \quad |1\rangle \equiv |V\rangle \otimes |s1\rangle, \quad |2\rangle \equiv |V\rangle \otimes |s2\rangle,
\]

the state of single photons go through the state preparation module can be written as

\[
|\psi\rangle = e^{i\phi_2} \sin \theta_A \sin \theta_B \, |0\rangle + e^{i\phi_1} \cos \theta_A \, |1\rangle - \sin \theta_A \cos \theta_B \, |2\rangle.
\]

For realistic implementation of the two PRs, we use different set-ups. LR1 is implemented by a liquid crystal phase retarder (Thorlabs, LCC1113-B) with its optical axis parallel to the horizontal polarization. Different phase \(\phi_1\) can be realized by applying different voltage to this retarder. However, due to the tiny separating distance (4mm) of the two spatial modes and limited retardance uniformity of the liquid crystal phase retarder, the second PR is realized by applying different voltage to this retarder. However, due to the tiny separating distance (4mm) of the two spatial modes and limited retardance uniformity of the liquid crystal phase retarder, the second PR is realized by applying different voltage to this retarder. However, due to the tiny separating distance (4mm) of the two spatial modes and limited retardance uniformity of the liquid crystal phase retarder, the second PR is realized by applying different voltage to this retarder. However, due to the tiny separating distance (4mm) of the two spatial modes and limited retardance uniformity of the liquid crystal phase retarder, the second PR is realized by applying different voltage to this retarder. However, due to the tiny separating distance (4mm) of the two spatial modes and limited retardance uniformity of the liquid crystal phase retarder, the second PR is realized by applying different voltage to this retarder.

By defining the three eigen-modes of the qutrit state as

\[
|0\rangle \equiv |H\rangle \otimes |s1\rangle, \quad |1\rangle \equiv |V\rangle \otimes |s1\rangle, \quad |2\rangle \equiv |V\rangle \otimes |s2\rangle,
\]

the state of single photons go through the state preparation module can be written as

\[
|\psi\rangle = e^{i\phi_2} \sin \theta_A \sin \theta_B \, |0\rangle + e^{i\phi_1} \cos \theta_A \, |1\rangle - \sin \theta_A \cos \theta_B \, |2\rangle.
\]

For the experimental observation of the classification of qutrit JNR, we experimentally measured the expectation values of 8 classes of triple Hermitian observables \(F = (F_1, F_2, F_3)\). For each classes, 300 boundary points were measured by sampling 300 boundary states. The exemplary 8 classes of Hermitian observables we have measured is shown in Table II.

To measure the expectation value \(\langle F_i \rangle\) of a Hermitian observable \(F_i\) with respect to an arbitrary state \(|\psi\rangle\), we first rewrite \(|\psi\rangle\) in the eigen-basis of \(F_i\),

\[
|\psi\rangle = \alpha |\lambda_0^{(i)}\rangle + \beta |\lambda_1^{(i)}\rangle + \gamma |\lambda_2^{(i)}\rangle,
\]

where \(|\lambda_j^{(i)}\rangle (j = 0, 1, 2)\) is the corresponding eigen-vector of the eigen-value \(\lambda_j^{(i)}\) of \(F_i\). In order to measure the probability that \(|\psi\rangle\) been projected into each eigen-mode of \(F_i\), we can first apply a unitary transformation

\[
U_{F_i} = |0\rangle \langle \lambda_0^{(i)}| + |1\rangle \langle \lambda_1^{(i)}| + |2\rangle \langle \lambda_2^{(i)}|.
\]
TABLE II. 8 classes of $F$ measured in our experiment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>$F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$s = 0, e = 0$</td>
<td>$F_{11} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 1 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $F_{12} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; i \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ i &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $F_{13} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 1 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 1 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$s = 0, e = 1$</td>
<td>$F_{21} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 1 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $F_{22} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 1 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 1 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $F_{23} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; i &amp; 0 \ i &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$s = 0, e = 2$</td>
<td>$F_{31} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $F_{32} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 1 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $F_{33} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; i &amp; 0 \ i &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$s = 0, e = 3$</td>
<td>$F_{41} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 1 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $F_{42} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 1 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $F_{43} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; i &amp; 0 \ i &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$s = 0, e = 4$</td>
<td>$F_{51} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $F_{52} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 1 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $F_{53} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; i &amp; 0 \ i &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$s = 1, e = 0$</td>
<td>$F_{61} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; i &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 1 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $F_{62} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; i &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $F_{63} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; i &amp; 0 \ i &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$s = 1, e = 1$</td>
<td>$F_{71} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 1 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $F_{72} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 1 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $F_{73} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$s = 1, e = 2$</td>
<td>$F_{81} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 1 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $F_{82} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $F_{83} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III. Wave plate setting angles for different non-diagonal observables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observable</th>
<th>HWP1</th>
<th>QWP</th>
<th>HWP2</th>
<th>HWP3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$F_{11}, F_{63}, F_{82}$</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>112.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{12}$</td>
<td>90 (before HWP1)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{13}$</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{22}, F_{73}$</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>112.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{23}, F_{43}$</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0 (after HWP1)</td>
<td>-67.5</td>
<td>-67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{32}$</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{33}$</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>60.86</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{42}, F_{53}, F_{62}, F_{83}$</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{52}$</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>60.86</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{61}$</td>
<td>-67.5</td>
<td>0 (before HWP1)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{72}$</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

to $|\psi\rangle$, which transforms any state from the eigen-basis of $F_i$ into computational or experimental basis, thus the probability $|\alpha|^2, |\beta|^2$ and $|\gamma|^2$ can be directly read out by projecting state $U_F |\psi\rangle$ into the three experimental basis. By defining detecting events in the experimental basis $|j\rangle (j = 0, 1, 2)$ as measuring the outcome $\lambda_j$, then $\langle F_i \rangle$ can be derived by using $\langle F_i \rangle = |\alpha|^2 \lambda_0 + |\beta|^2 \lambda_1 + |\gamma|^2 \lambda_2$. To realize this unitary operation $U_F$, we implemented a three stage interferometer formed by BDs and wave plates, as shown in Fig. In each stage, BDs and HWPs permute two of the qutrit eigen-modes into the same spatial mode with different polarization, then the two modes were interfered by HWP and QWP, which equivalently performing a $2 \times 2$ unitary on the two modes and leaving the third mode unchanged. It has been shown that any $3 \times 3$ unitary operation $U$ can be written as $U = U_3 U_2 U_1$, where $U_1, U_2, U_3$ are of the form

$$U_1 = \begin{pmatrix} m_1 & n_1 & 0 \\ p_1 & q_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, U_2 = \begin{pmatrix} m_2 & 0 & n_2 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ p_2 & q_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, U_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_3 & n_3 \\ 0 & p_3 & q_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

and $m_k, n_k, p_k, q_k (k = 1, 2, 3)$ form a $2 \times 2$ unitary block. Therefore, by using the QWP-HWP-QWP configuration, arbitrary $2 \times 2$ unitary block in $U_k$ can be realized in each interference stage, and in principle, this three stage interferometer can realize any $3 \times 3$ unitary $U$. In our experiments, the three stage interferometer from left to right
perform unitary operations in the form of $U_1, U_2$ and $U_3$ sequentially. For most of the observables in Table II, only HWP is needed for the realization of $U_{F_i}$, and for some observables, QWP is needed, the wave plate setting angles of all the non-diagonal observables listed in Table II are show in Table III. As for diagonal observables, $U_{F_i}$ become the identity operator, and all the wave plates set to zero.

**Experimental Error Analysis**

As mentioned in the main text, deviations between the observed data and the theoretical values are mainly attributed to two kinds of systematic errors in the settings of experimental parameters. The first is the imperfection of the two PRs. The QWP-HWP-QWP configuration involves three wave plates which suffering misalignments of the optics axis (typically $\sim 0.1$ degree), retardation errors (typically $\sim \lambda/300$ where $\lambda = 830$nm) and inaccuracies of setting angles (typically $\sim 0.2$ degree) while the liquid crystal phase retarder was pre-calibrated by a co-linear interferometer formed by four wave plates which may transfer the experimental errors. Both cause inaccuracy in manipulating relative phase between horizontal and vertical polarizations and also cause inaccuracy in calibrating the interferometers. The second kind of systematic errors come from the slowly drift and slight vibrating of the interferometers in the measurement progress, which cause a decreasing of interference visibility. Overall, all the experimental data were obtained with interference visibility above $98.7\%$. The average similarity $S$ of experimentally measured probability distributions of all the operators are shown in Table IV. All the average similarities are above 0.994, which indicates well overall performances of the experimental settings and high similarities between the experimental datas and theoretical JNRs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$S(F_1)$</td>
<td>0.9997</td>
<td>0.9998</td>
<td>0.9998</td>
<td>0.9997</td>
<td>0.9999</td>
<td>0.9979</td>
<td>0.9999</td>
<td>0.9997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S(F_2)$</td>
<td>0.9990</td>
<td>0.9985</td>
<td>0.9988</td>
<td>0.9986</td>
<td>0.9992</td>
<td>0.9986</td>
<td>0.9964</td>
<td>0.9948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S(F_3)$</td>
<td>0.9998</td>
<td>0.9992</td>
<td>0.9998</td>
<td>0.9991</td>
<td>0.9988</td>
<td>0.9996</td>
<td>0.9977</td>
<td>0.9955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Experimental Observations of Joint Numerical Ranges in the Case $d = 3, n = 2$**

By projecting the three dimensional JNR in the main text into two dimensional plane, our experimental results also show an complete observation of the four classes of $L(F)$ in the case $d = 3, n = 2$ [37]. Four exemplary results are shown in Fig. 7. From left to right, the four classes are: an oval (the convex hull of a sextic curve), the convex hull of a quartic curve with a flat portion on the boundary, the convex hull of an ellipse and a point outside the ellipse, a triangle. As the boundary states of $L(F)$ with $d = 3, n = 2$ no longer being the boundary states in the case $n = 2$, most of the experimental points are inside the range, but still show well agreements with the theoretically predicted ranges.

![FIG. 7. Experimentally observed four classes of JNR of two $3 \times 3$ observables. Theoretical boundary curves of these two dimensional plane sets are plotted with black lines while blue points (300 for each class) represent the experiment results.](image-url)
Two classes of unitarily reducible JNRs in the case $d = n = 3$

As mentioned in the main text, in the case $d = n = 3$, there are ten possible categories of JNRs according to the number of ellipse $e$ and segment $s$. The experimental results of the eight unitarily irreducible classes are shown in the main text. The another two classes with $s = \infty, e = 1$ and $s = \infty, e = 0$ can be obtained by the experimental data of the former eight classes, as we will show below.

Unitarily reducible means that the set of Hermitian matrices $\mathcal{F}$ is linearly dependent, thus the unitarily reducible JNRs can be derived by lower dimensional JNRs. For example, the JNR with $s = \infty, e = 1$ can be generate by rotating the triangle $L(F_{51}, F_{53})$ in Fig. 7(d) about its axis of symmetry. It is obviously that the resulting JNR have infinite number of segments and a ellipse on its surface and can be represented as $L(F_{51}, F_{53}, F_{53})$, which is available from our experimental data. Similarly, for the case $s = \infty, e = 0$, it can also be derived by a scaling and rotating of $L(F_{51}, F_{52})$ in Fig. 7(c).