

# The dc-Josephson effect with more than four superconducting leads

Régis Mélin<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Univ. Grenoble-Alpes, CNRS, Grenoble INP, Institut NEEL, 38000 Grenoble, France

By definition, the  $p$ -terminal dc-Josephson current is sensitive to the superconducting phase variables of  $p$  terminals. In the paper, we establish protocol for direct detection of the  $p$ -terminal dc-Josephson effect with  $p \geq 3$  in a device containing  $N$  superconducting leads  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_N$  having the phase variables  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_N$ . The calculated signal  $\chi^{(N)}$  can be probed in microwave experiments, and it corresponds to the higher-order nonlocal inverse inductance obtained from differentiating the current  $I_1$  through  $S_1$  with respect to the remaining  $N-2$  independent phase differences  $\varphi_2 - \varphi_N, \varphi_3 - \varphi_N, \dots, \varphi_{N-1} - \varphi_N$ . We find that the values  $p \leq N-2$  do not contribute to  $\chi^{(N)}$ , and that  $\chi^{(N)} \neq 0$  implies evidence for the  $p = N-1$  or the  $p = N$ -terminal dc-Josephson currents. For  $N = 4$  superconducting leads, we demonstrate that  $\chi^{(4)} \neq 0$  implies evidence for the  $p = 3$  or  $p = 4$  dc-Josephson effect, irrespective of the  $p = 2$ -terminal dc-Josephson current. Thus, we provide a way to demonstrate the dc-Josephson effect with more than three terminals (*i.e.* with  $p \geq 3$ ) in a device containing more than four superconducting leads (*i.e.* with  $N \geq 4$ ). The predicted  $\chi^{(4)}$  is “yes or no” answer to the  $p \geq 3$  dc-Josephson effect, *i.e.* for  $N = 4$ , nonvanishingly small  $\chi^{(4)} \neq 0$  implies the  $p = 3$  or  $p = 4$ -terminal dc-Josephson effect and vanishingly small  $\chi^{(4)} = 0$  implies absence of the  $p = 3$  and  $p = 4$ -terminal dc-Josephson effect. The paper can be viewed as generalizing the recently considered  $\varphi$ -junctions in Andreev molecules to arbitrary number  $N$  of the superconducting leads, and it relies on basic properties of the dc-Josephson effect that are not directly related to nontrivial topology and Weyl point singularities.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The two-terminal Josephson junction<sup>1</sup> formed with the BCS superconductors  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  reveals physical relevance of the gauge-invariant difference  $\varphi_1 - \varphi_2$  between their macroscopic phase variables (see figure 1a). Equilibrium dissipationless supercurrent

$$I_S^{(2)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2) = I_c^{(2)} \sin(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2) \quad (1)$$

flows across the  $S_1$ - $S_2$  Josephson weak link<sup>2</sup>, where the superscript “(2)” in Eq. (1) refers to the number  $N = 2$  of the superconducting leads. Anderson and Rowell<sup>3</sup> experimentally confirmed the prediction<sup>1</sup> of the dc-Josephson effect.

Eq. (1) is valid for tunnel junctions and the current-phase relation

$$I_S^{(2)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2) = \sum_n I_{c,n}^{(2)} \sin[n(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)] \quad (2)$$

with  $n$ -Cooper pair tunneling holds more generally at arbitrary interface transparency, see figure 1b for example of the higher-order two-Cooper pair tunneling with  $n = 2$  in Eq. (2).

Current flows by Andreev reflection at a normal metal-superconductor (NS) interface biased at the voltage  $V$  smaller than the superconducting gap  $\Delta$ , *i.e.*  $|eV| < \Delta$ . Spin-up electron from  $N$  is Andreev reflected as a spin-down hole while a Cooper pair is transmitted into  $S$ .

Nonlocality of Andreev reflection at the scale  $R_0 \approx \xi_0$  of the BCS coherence length  $\xi_0$  was predicted and experimentally probed<sup>4–20</sup> in a  $N_1$ - $S_2$ - $N_3$  three-terminal device since the early 2000’s, see figures 1c and 1d. The normal leads  $N_1$  and  $N_3$  are laterally connected to the grounded  $S_2$  and the voltages  $V_1$  and  $V_3$  are applied on  $N_1$  and  $N_3$ , the superconducting  $S_2$  being grounded at  $V_2 = 0$ .

Elastic cotunneling (EC)<sup>9,10,12</sup> over  $R_0 \approx \xi_0$  transfers electrons from  $N_1$  to  $N_3$  across  $S_2$ , or from  $N_3$  to  $N_1$ , see figure 1c. Crossed Andreev reflection (CAR)<sup>8–10,12</sup> over  $R_0 \approx \xi_0$

scatters spin-up electron from  $N_1$  as spin-down hole into  $N_2$ , leaving a Cooper pair in  $S_2$ , see figure 1d. Said differently, two opposite-spin electrons from  $N_1$  and  $N_3$  are cooperatively transmitted into the central  $S_2$  and eventually join the condensate.

EC and CAR in the above mentioned  $N_1$ - $S_2$ - $N_3$  three-terminal device were generalized to dEC<sup>21</sup> (see figure 1e) and dCAR<sup>21</sup> (see figure 1f) in a laterally-connected  $S_1$ - $S_2$ - $S_3$  three-terminal Josephson junction with separation  $R_0 \approx \xi_0$  between the  $S_1$ - $S_2$  and  $S_2$ - $S_3$  interfaces. Namely, double elastic cotunneling (dEC)<sup>21</sup> on figure 1e transfers a Cooper pair from  $S_1$  to  $S_3$  across  $S_2$ , or from  $S_3$  to  $S_1$ . Double crossed Andreev reflection (dCAR)<sup>21</sup> on figure 1f takes a Cooper pair from  $S_1$  and another one from  $S_2$ . The two pairs from  $S_1$  and  $S_3$  exchange partners, yielding four-fermion state, *i.e.* the so-called quartet of electrons<sup>21–30</sup>. The quartet eventually dissociates as two “outgoing” Cooper pairs joining the condensate of  $S_2$ .

Voltage biasing the  $S_1$ - $S_2$ - $S_3$  three-terminal Josephson junction<sup>21,22</sup> on figures 1e and 1f at the voltage differences  $V_1 - V_2$  and  $V_3 - V_2$  is a possibility to reveal<sup>31–33</sup> dCAR and the quartets as emergence of the  $V_1 + V_3 = 0$  dc-Josephson resonance line, if one of the elements of the differential conductance matrix is plotted in the  $(V_1, V_3)$  voltage plane while the “central”  $S_2$  is grounded at the reference voltage  $V_2 = 0$ . Other dc-Josephson resonance lines were predicted<sup>21,22</sup> and observed<sup>31–33</sup>, such as  $V_1 = V_3$  due to dEC. Other experiments<sup>34–38</sup> did not report the quartet dc-Josephson anomaly, which is maybe a matter of the materials and configurations of the devices. In addition, the recent Ref. 39 reports progress in the fabrication of four-terminal devices.

Considering more generally  $p_1$  Cooper pairs from  $S_1$  and  $p_3$  from  $S_3$  yields the energy  $E_{initial} = 2p_1V_1 + 2p_3V_3$  of the “initial state”, and  $E_{final} = 2(p_1 + p_3)V_2$  for the final state, with  $E_{final} \equiv 0$  because  $V_2 = 0$  for the grounded  $S_2$ . Energy conservation  $E_{initial} = E_{final}$  implies the dc-Josephson resonance




FIG. 1. Panels a and b show the two-terminal dc-Josephson effect, with single Cooper pair tunneling [see Eq. (1)] and two-Cooper pair tunneling [see Eq. (2) with  $n = 2$ ] respectively. Panels c and d show double elastic cotunneling (dEC) and double crossed Andreev reflection (dCAR) respectively, in a three-terminal Josephson junction. Panels e and f show elastic cotunneling (EC) and crossed Andreev reflection (CAR) respectively, in a normal metal-superconductor-normal metal beam splitter.

line at

$$p_1 V_1 + p_3 V_3 = 0 \quad (3)$$

which is sustained by the static dc-phase variable

$$\varphi_{p_1, q_1} = p_1 [\varphi_1(t) - \varphi_2(t)] + p_3 [\varphi_3(t) - \varphi_2(t)] \quad (4)$$

$$= p_1 [\varphi_1 - \varphi_2] + p_3 [\varphi_3 - \varphi_2]. \quad (5)$$

The following Josephson relations<sup>1</sup>

$$\varphi_1(t) = \varphi_1 + \frac{2eV_1}{\hbar} t \quad (6)$$

$$\varphi_2(t) = \varphi_2 \quad (7)$$

$$\varphi_3(t) = \varphi_3 + \frac{2eV_3}{\hbar} t \quad (8)$$

for the superconducting phase variables  $\varphi_1(t)$ ,  $\varphi_2(t)$  and  $\varphi_3(t)$  as a function of the time  $t$  were combined to Eq. (3) in order to deduce Eq. (5) from Eq. (4). Then, the multipair supercurrent generalizing the quartets<sup>21,22</sup> takes the form

$$I_{p_1, p_3}^{(3)} = I_{c, p_1, p_3} \sin [p_1 (\varphi_1 - \varphi_2) + p_3 (\varphi_3 - \varphi_2)]. \quad (9)$$

However, Eq. (9) also holds at equilibrium, *i.e.* if all superconducting leads  $S_1$ ,  $S_2$  and  $S_3$  are grounded at  $V_1 - V_2 = V_3 - V_2 = 0$ , and biased at the phase differences  $\varphi_1 - \varphi_2$  and  $\varphi_3 - \varphi_2$ . The present paper focuses on the equilibrium multi-terminal dc-Josephson effect where all leads are grounded.

Nonlocality of the dc-Josephson effect can be understood in different ways:

(i) Subgap propagation over the zero-energy BCS coherence length  $R_0 \approx \xi_0$  across the “central”  $S_2$  in a  $S_1$ - $S_2$ - $S_3$  three-terminal Josephson junction made with the  $S_1$ - $S_2$  and  $S_2$ - $S_3$  lateral contacts separated by  $R_0$ , see the above discussion.

(ii) Emergence of dc-Josephson current controlled by the phase of three or more superconducting leads, see Eq. (9) with  $p_1 \neq 0$  and  $p_3 \neq 0$ .

The considered devices involve  $N$  superconductors connected by single-channel weak links to the nonsuperconducting “central” region, see figure 2a. The above item (i) for

nonlocality over  $R_0 \approx \xi_0$  is thus not directly relevant to the present work. According to the above item (ii), we evaluate the contribution of the  $p$ -terminal Josephson effect in a device containing  $N$  superconducting leads. Namely, we evaluate the sensitivity of the current  $I_1$  through lead  $S_1$  on the  $p$  superconducting phase variables  $\varphi_{a_1}, \varphi_{a_2}, \dots, \varphi_{a_p}$  where  $1 \leq a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_p \leq N$ . Then, we define  $\chi^{(N)}$  as the partial derivative of  $I_1$  with respect to the  $N - 2$  phase differences  $\varphi_2 - \varphi_N, \varphi_3 - \varphi_N, \dots, \varphi_{N-1} - \varphi_N$ . We show that the  $p$ -terminal dc-Josephson effect with  $p \leq N - 2$  does not contribute to  $\chi^{(N)}$  while  $p = N$  and  $p = N - 1$  yield nonvanishingly small contribution to  $\chi^{(N)}$ . Thus, microwave experiments can reveal experimental evidence for  $\chi^{(4)} \neq 0$  with  $N = 4$ , which implies the  $p = 3$  or the  $p = 4$  three or four-terminal dc-Josephson effects, whatever the value of the  $p = 2$  dc-Josephson supercurrent. Thus, the following paper demonstrates the possibility of directly testing the multiterminal dc-Josephson effect with  $p \geq 3$  in microwave experiments.

The paper is organized as follows. Section II establishes connection to known results. Section III presents the model and the  $p$ -terminal Josephson current in a device containing  $N$  superconducting leads. Section IV provides examples with  $N = 3$  and  $N = 4$  superconducting leads. Section V generalizes the theory to arbitrary number  $N$  of the superconducting leads. Numerical results for  $N = 4$  superconducting leads are presented in section VI. Summary and final remarks are provided in section VII.

## II. CONNECTION WITH RECENT RESULTS

We first note that the field of multiterminal Josephson junctions<sup>21–30</sup> has recently been enriched with the proposal of nontrivial topology<sup>40–50</sup> and topology in the time-periodic Floquet dynamics<sup>51–53</sup>. The present paper is not directly related to those works on topology, in the sense that we consider basic properties of the dc-Josephson, which generally hold in the absence of Weyl-point singularities.




FIG. 2. The highlighted panel a shows the  $N$ -terminal Josephson junction considered in the paper, where the  $N$  grounded superconducting leads  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_N$  with superconducting phase variables  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N$  are connected to a small nonsuperconducting region. The supercurrents through the leads  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_N$  are denoted by  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_N$ , with  $\sum_{\alpha=1}^N I_{\alpha} = 0$ . Panels b-d show the devices with  $N = 3$  (b),  $N = 4$  (c), and  $N = 5$  (d).

This section provides connection to known results on the multiterminal dc-Josephson interferometers discussed in Refs. 24, 54–56.

The recent Refs. 54–56 considered an “Andreev molecule” in the laterally-connected  $S_1$ - $S_2$ - $S_3$  three-terminal Josephson junction under equilibrium voltage biasing conditions, *i.e.* the three superconducting leads  $S_1, S_2$  and  $S_3$  are grounded at  $V_1 - V_2 = V_3 - V_2 = 0$ . Refs. 54–56 characterize the supercurrent  $I_1(\varphi_3)$  through lead  $S_1$  as a function of the phase  $\varphi_3 \neq 0$  on  $S_3$  which is not directly connected to  $S_1$ , while  $\varphi_2 = 0$  is the reference, and it is assumed in addition that  $\varphi_1 = 0$ .

This nonlocal response<sup>54–56</sup> of the supercurrent  $I_1$  through  $S_1$  to the phase  $\varphi_3$  on  $S_3$  originates from the above mentioned dEC and dCAR<sup>21</sup>. In the limit of tunnel contacts, the dEC and dCAR Josephson currents are given by<sup>21</sup>

$$I_{dEC}^{(3)} = I_{c,dEC}^{(3)} \sin(\varphi_1 - \varphi_3), \quad (10)$$

$$I_{dCAR}^{(3)} = I_{c,dCAR}^{(3)} \sin(\varphi_1 + \varphi_3 - 2\varphi_2), \quad (11)$$

where “(3)” in the superscript refers to the number  $N = 3$  of the superconducting leads. Considering  $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2 = 0$  and  $\varphi_3 \neq 0$  yields the dc-Josephson current  $I_1$  through  $S_1$ :

$$I_1^{(3)}(0) = I_{dEC}^{(3)} + I_{dCAR}^{(3)} = \left( -I_{c,dEC}^{(3)} + I_{c,dCAR}^{(3)} \right) \sin \varphi_3. \quad (12)$$

In an intuitive two-terminal picture, a  $\varphi$ -junction is obtained<sup>54–56</sup>: the supercurrent  $I_1^{(3)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)$  plotted as a function of  $\varphi_1 - \varphi_2$  is shifted by arbitrary phase which is controlled by  $\varphi_3 - \varphi_2 \neq 0$ . Two limiting cases are considered:

(a) *In the tunnel limit*, the dEC and dCAR current-phase relations are 0- and  $\pi$ -shifted respectively<sup>21,22</sup>. Then,  $I_{c,dCAR}^{(3)} < 0$  and  $-I_{c,dEC}^{(3)} < 0$  are both negative, yielding the same negative sign  $-I_{c,dEC}^{(3)} + I_{c,dCAR}^{(3)} < 0$  as if  $-I_{c,dEC}^{(3)}$  was alone. In this item (a), we assume that the contacts have linear dimension which is large compared to the Fermi wave-length  $\lambda_F$  and small compared to the superconducting coherence length  $\xi_0$ .

(b) *The limit  $R_0 \ll \xi_0$  of small separation between the contacts necessarily produces  $I_{c,dCAR}^{(3)} \simeq 0$* , because the assumption  $R_0 \ll \xi_0$  implies equivalence to the two-terminal  $S_1$ - $S_3$ . Then, the sign of  $-I_{c,dEC}^{(3)} + I_{c,dCAR}^{(3)} \simeq -I_{c,dEC}^{(3)} < 0$  is necessarily negative in the absence of dCAR.

The conditions for deducing “evidence for dCAR” from positive

$$-I_{c,dEC}^{(3)} + I_{c,dCAR}^{(3)} > 0 \quad (13)$$

have thus not been elucidated at present time: The above arguments show that Eq. (13) is parameter-dependent. In the following paper, we propose another possibility for directly probing the  $p$ -terminal dc-Josephson effect with  $p \geq 3$ .

Considering now the  $(S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4)$  four-terminal Josephson junction with  $N = 4$ , we recently proposed<sup>24</sup> a superconducting quantum interference device (SQUID<sup>57</sup>) containing two loops making four contacts on a double quantum dot defined in a semiconducting nanowire or a carbon nanotube. It was shown in Ref. 24 that dEC and dCAR can be distinguished as different peaks in the Fourier transform of the critical current with respect to the magnetic field. Thus, this double SQUID<sup>24</sup> successfully proposes a way to provide evidence for dCAR and for “the three-terminal dc-Josephson effect”.

The device on figure 2c contains the four superconducting leads  $S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4$  which are biased at the three independent phases differences  $\varphi_1 - \varphi_4, \varphi_2 - \varphi_4$  and  $\varphi_3 - \varphi_4$ . As it is mentioned above, the superconducting leads are grounded at  $V_1 - V_4 = 0, V_2 - V_4 = 0$  and  $V_3 - V_4 = 0$ . In addition, the two loops are pierced by the magnetic field fluxes  $\Phi_A$  and  $\Phi_B$ . Compared to Ref. 24, we complementary propose microwave detection of the second-order nonlocal inverse inductance

$$\chi^{(4)} \equiv \chi^{(4)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4, \varphi_2 - \varphi_4, \varphi_3 - \varphi_4) \quad (14)$$

$$= \frac{\partial^2 I_1^{(4)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4, \varphi_2 - \varphi_4, \varphi_3 - \varphi_4)}{\partial(\varphi_2 - \varphi_4) \partial(\varphi_3 - \varphi_4)}, \quad (15)$$

which is also evaluated as a function of  $\varphi_1 - \varphi_4$  for  $\varphi_2 - \varphi_4 = 0$  and  $\varphi_3 - \varphi_4 = 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \chi^{(4)(0)} &\equiv \chi^{(4)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4) \\ &= \frac{\partial^2 I_1^{(4)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4, \varphi_2 - \varphi_4, \varphi_3 - \varphi_4)}{\partial(\varphi_2 - \varphi_4) \partial(\varphi_3 - \varphi_4)} \Bigg|_{\substack{\varphi_2 - \varphi_4 = 0 \\ \varphi_3 - \varphi_4 = 0}}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The superscript “(4)” in Eqs. (14)-(15) and Eqs. (16)-(17) refers to the number  $N = 4$  of the superconducting leads, see the device on figure 2c. In experiments, Eqs. (14)-(17) can be detected with microwaves.

In the paper, we demonstrate that

$$“\chi^{(4)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4, \Phi_A, \Phi_B) = 0 \text{ or } \chi^{(4)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4) = 0”$$

generically implies

“Absence of the three- and four-terminal dc-Josephson effect, i.e.  $I_{c,p_1,p_3}^{(3)} = 0$  in Eq. (9) for all  $p_1, p_3$ , and  $I_{c,p_1,p_2,p_3}^{(4)} = 0$  for all  $p_1, p_2, p_3$ ”.

The above mentioned four-terminal critical current<sup>29,33</sup>  $I_{c,p_1,p_2,p_3}^{(4)}$  corresponds to

$$\begin{aligned} I_{p_1,p_2,p_3}^{(4)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4, \varphi_2 - \varphi_4, \varphi_3 - \varphi_4) \\ = I_{c,p_1,p_2,p_3}^{(4)} \sin[p_1(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4) + p_2(\varphi_2 - \varphi_4) \\ + p_3(\varphi_3 - \varphi_4)]. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Conversely, we deduce a second logical link:

$$“\text{Nonvanishingly small signal } \chi^{(4)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4, \Phi_A, \Phi_B) \neq 0 \text{ or } \chi^{(4)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4) \neq 0”$$

generically implies

“Evidence for the three- or four-terminal dc-Josephson effect, i.e.  $I_{c,p_1,p_3}^{(3)} \neq 0$  for some  $p_1, p_3$  or  $I_{c,p_1,p_2,p_3}^{(4)} \neq 0$  for some  $p_1, p_2, p_3$ ”.

The two logical links are independent on the value of the two-terminal dc-Josephson current, i.e.  $I_{c,n}^{(2)}$  in Eq. (2) can take the arbitrary values  $I_{c,n}^{(2)} \neq 0$ . In addition, we generalize the theory to an arbitrary number  $N$  of the superconducting leads.

### III. $p$ -TERMINAL JOSEPHSON CURRENT WITH $N$ SUPERCONDUCTING LEADS

In this section, we establish an expression for the  $p$ -terminal dc-Josephson current with  $N \geq p$  superconducting leads. The Table summarizes the different values of  $p$  and  $N$  that are considered in the paper. Subsection III A presents the expression of the Andreev Bound States (ABS) energies. Subsection III B provides the general expression of the  $p$ -terminal Josephson current. Subsection III C presents the example of a single-level quantum dot in the infinite-gap limit.

#### A. Expression of the supercurrent carried by the Andreev Bound States

In this subsection, we evaluate the Fourier transform of the ABS energies with respect to all superconducting phase variables  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N$  of the  $N$  superconducting leads  $S_1, \dots, S_N$  connected to small nonsuperconducting region.

The ABS energies  $E_{ABS,\lambda}^{\{\varphi\}}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N)$  depend on all values of the  $\varphi_n - \varphi_N$  (where  $n = 1, \dots, N - 1$  labels the superconducting leads and  $\lambda = 1, \dots, N_{ABS}$  is used for the negative-energy ABS). Taking the Fourier transform leads to

$$\begin{aligned} E_{ABS,\lambda}^{\{\varphi\}}(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_N) = \sum_{m_1} \sum_{m_2} \dots \sum_{m_N} E_{ABS,\lambda}^{\{m\}} [m_1, m_2, \dots, m_N] \times \\ \exp(i(m_1 \varphi_1 + m_2 \varphi_2 + \dots + m_N \varphi_N)) \delta(m_1 + m_2 + \dots + m_N), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where the constraint

$$m_1 + m_2 + \dots + m_N = 0 \quad (20)$$

originates from gauge invariance, i.e. any of the superconducting phases  $\varphi_{n_{ref}}$  can be chosen as the reference, leaving  $N - 1$  independent gauge-invariant phase differences  $\varphi_n - \varphi_{n_{ref}}$  with  $n \neq n_{ref}$ . For instance, choosing  $n_{ref} = N$  leads to

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 \varphi_1 + m_2 \varphi_2 + \dots + m_N \varphi_N \\ = m_1 (\varphi_1 - \varphi_N) + m_2 (\varphi_2 - \varphi_N) + \dots \\ + m_{N-1} (\varphi_{N-1} - \varphi_N), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where Eq. (20) and Eq. (21) are equivalently used. The variables  $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_N$  are conjugate to the superconducting phases  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_N$ , i.e. they are interpreted as the algebraic number of Cooper pairs transmitted into  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_N$ .

The zero-temperature dc-Josephson current through the lead  $S_{N_0}$  is given by

$N$	Figure number	$p = 2$	$p = 3$	$p = 4$	...	$p = N - 1$	$p = N$
2		Eqs. (1)-(2)			...		
3	Fig. 2b	Eqs. (32)-(33)	Eq. (34)		...		
4	Fig. 2c	Eqs. (40)-(40)	Eqs. (41)-(43)	Eq. (44)	...		
	Fig. 3	Fig. 3-a1	Eq. (47)	Eq. (48)	...		
	Fig. 4	Fig. 3-a1	Eq. (50)	Eq. (50)	...		
		Fig. 4-a1	Fig. 3-a2	Fig. 3-a3	...		
		Fig. 4-a1	Fig. 4-a2		...		
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
$N = 2q$	Fig. 2a				...	Eq. (57)	Eq. (54)
$N = 2q' + 1$	Fig. 2a				...	Eq. (62)	Eq. (61)

TABLE I. The table summarizes the values of  $p$  and  $N$  that are considered in the paper.

$$I_{N_0}^{S,(N)}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N) = -\frac{e}{\hbar} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi_{N_0}} \sum_{\lambda} E_{ABS,\lambda}^{\{\varphi\}}(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_N) \quad (22)$$

$$= \sum_{m_1} \sum_{m_2} \dots \sum_{m_N} I_{c,n_0}^{(N)}[m_1, \dots, m_N] \sin(m_1 \varphi_1 + m_2 \varphi_2 + \dots + m_N \varphi_N) \delta(m_1 + m_2 + \dots + m_N), \quad (23)$$

where

$$I_{c,n_0}^{(N)}[m_1, \dots, m_N] = -\frac{e}{\hbar} m_{N_0} E_{ABS,\lambda}^{\{m\}}[m_1, m_2, \dots, m_N]. \quad (24)$$

### B. $p$ -terminal dc-Josephson current with $N$ superconducting leads

In this subsection, we provide expression for the  $p$ -terminal dc-Josephson current in a device containing  $N$  superconducting leads, with  $p \leq N$ .

We consider the  $p$  integers  $a_1, \dots, a_p$  such that  $1 \leq a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_p \leq N$ . They encode supercurrent flowing through the superconducting leads  $S_{a_1}, S_{a_2}, \dots, S_{a_p}$ , and absence of supercurrent through  $S_{b_1}, S_{b_2}, \dots, S_{b_{N-p}}$ , where  $a_\alpha \neq b_\beta$  for all  $\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, p$  and  $\beta = 1, 2, \dots, n-p$ . Then,  $m_{a_\alpha} \neq 0$  if  $a_\alpha$

belong to  $\{a_1, \dots, a_p\}$ , and  $m_{b_\beta} = 0$  if  $b_\beta$  is not in  $\{a_1, \dots, a_p\}$ , see Eqs. (22)-(23).

These statements are illustrated on figure 3 for the  $N = 4$  superconducting leads  $S_1, S_2, S_3$  and  $S_4$ . Figure 3-a1, 3-b1 and 3-c1 show the balance in the number of ‘‘outgoing’’ and ‘‘incoming’’ Cooper pairs, for the  $p = 2, 3, 4$ -terminal dc-Josephson currents respectively, in a device containing  $N = 4$  superconducting leads. Figures 3-a2, 3-b2 and 3-c2 show the values of the variables  $a_\alpha$  and  $m_{a_\alpha}$  for the processes on figures 3-a1, 3-b1 and 3-c1 with  $(m_{a_1}, m_{a_2}) = (1, -1)$ ,  $(m_{a_1}, m_{a_2}, m_{a_3}) = (3, -1, -2)$  and  $(m_{a_1}, m_{a_2}, m_{a_3}, m_{a_4}) = (1, -1, 1, -1)$  respectively. We also note that dressing the processes on figures 3-a1 and 3-a2 according to figures 4-a1 and 4-a2 leaves unchanged the values of  $a_\alpha$  and  $m_{a_\alpha}$ .

Now, Eqs. (22)-(23) are decomposed as the following:

$$I_{N_0}^{S,(N)}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N) = \sum_{p=2}^N I_{N_0}^{S,(p)}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N), \quad (25)$$

where

$$I_{N_0}^{S,(N)(p)}(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N) = \sum_{a_1=1}^N \sum_{a_2=a_1+1}^N \dots \sum_{a_p=a_{p-1}+1}^N \delta\left(\prod_{\alpha=1}^N (1 - \delta(a_\alpha, n_0))\right) \sum_{m_{a_1} \neq 0} \sum_{m_{a_2} \neq 0} \dots \sum_{m_{a_p} \neq 0} \times \quad (26)$$

$$I_{c,n_0}^{(N)(p)}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p) [m_{a_1}, \dots, m_{a_p}] \sin(m_{a_1} \varphi_{a_1} + m_{a_2} \varphi_{a_2} + \dots + m_{a_p} \varphi_{a_p}) \delta(m_{a_1} + m_{a_2} + \dots + m_{a_p}).$$

The  $\delta$ -function  $\delta\left(\prod_{\alpha=1}^N (1 - \delta_{a_\alpha, n_0})\right)$  in Eq. (26) is used to indicate that the lead  $S_{N_0}$  (through which the supercurrent is evaluated) is among  $S_{a_1}, \dots, S_{a_p}$  (which sustain the considered  $p$ -terminal dc-Josephson process). Namely,  $a_{\alpha_0} = N_0$  for one of the  $\alpha = \alpha_0$  implies  $\prod_{\alpha=1}^N (1 - \delta_{a_\alpha, n_0}) = 0$  and  $a_\alpha \neq N_0$  for all  $\alpha = 1, \dots, p$  implies  $\prod_{\alpha=1}^N (1 - \delta_{a_\alpha, n_0}) = 1$ .

Eqs. (22)-(23) were calculated from the contribution of the ABS to the dc-Josephson supercurrent. The present paper is based on the general current-phase relation given by Eq. (26), which also captures the contribution of the continua<sup>54-56</sup>.




FIG. 3. Panels a1, b1 and c1 show the “incoming” and “outgoing” Cooper pairs for the  $p = 2, 3, 4$ -terminal dc-Josephson processes respectively, with a total of  $N = 4$  superconducting leads. The corresponding values of  $a_\alpha$  and  $m_{a_\alpha}$  are shown on panels a2, b2 and c2. The integer  $a_\alpha \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  is shown on the  $x$ -axis of panels a2, b2 and c2 corresponding to the parameters of panels a1, b1 and c1 respectively. The variable  $m \equiv m_\alpha$  on the  $y$ -axis of panels a2, b2 and c2 is the algebraic number of Cooper pairs transmitted in each superconducting lead.




FIG. 4. Panels a1 and a2 are obtained by “dressing” the  $p = 2$  and  $p = 3$ -terminal dc-Josephson current processes on figures 3-a1 and 3-a2 by an “excursion” in and out from one of the superconducting leads. Thus, the  $p = 2$  and  $p = 3$ -terminal dc-Josephson processes on panel a1 and b1 involve three and four terminal respectively. They receive the same  $a_\alpha$  and  $m_{a_\alpha}$  values as the “bare” diagrams on figures 3-a1 and 3-a2.

### C. Single-level quantum dot

In this subsection, we illustrate Eqs. (22)-(23) for a quantum dot connected to three or four superconducting leads. We denote by  $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \dots, \Gamma_N$  the line-width broadening associated to hopping between the dot and each of the superconducting leads  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_N$  in the normal-state. We take the infinite-gap limit, see for instance Refs. 53, 58, and 59. The  $2 \times 2$  Nambu Hamiltonian takes the form

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \Gamma_\alpha \exp(i\varphi_\alpha) \\ \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \Gamma_\alpha \exp(-i\varphi_\alpha) & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (27)$$

The ABS energies

$$E_{ABS,\pm}(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_N) = \pm \left| \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \Gamma_\alpha \exp(i\varphi_\alpha) \right|. \quad (28)$$

imply nonvanishingly small Fourier coefficients  $E_{ABS,\pm}^{(m)}[m_1, m_2, \dots, m_N]$  in Eq. (19). This yields the  $p$ -terminal Josephson effect, *i.e.* components of the supercurrent which are sensitive to the superconducting phase variables of  $p$  superconducting leads:

$$\Psi_p[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p] = m_{a_1} \varphi_{a_1} + m_{a_2} \varphi_{a_2} + \dots + m_{a_p} \varphi_{a_p}, \quad (29)$$

where  $\{a_\alpha\}$  is a set of  $p$  integers such that  $1 \leq a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_p \leq N$  and  $m_{a_\alpha} \neq 0$  for all  $\alpha = 1, \dots, p$ .

Figures 5 and 6 show the distributions  $P(H_{n_1, n_2, n_3})$  and  $P(H_{n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4})$  for the Fourier harmonics of the three and four-terminal dc-Josephson currents

$$H_{n_{a_1}, n_{a_2}, \dots, n_{a_p}} = \int \frac{d\varphi_{a_1}}{2\pi} \int \frac{d\varphi_{a_2}}{2\pi} \dots \int \frac{d\varphi_{a_p}}{2\pi} \times \quad (30)$$

$$I_1^{S(N)(p)}(\varphi_{a_1}, \varphi_{a_2}, \dots, \varphi_{a_p}) \times \quad (31)$$

$$\sin(m_{a_1} \varphi_{a_1} + m_{a_2} \varphi_{a_2} + \dots + m_{a_p} \varphi_{a_p}),$$




FIG. 5. The figure shows the distribution  $P(H_{n_1, n_2, n_3})$  for a quantum dot connected to  $N = 3$  superconducting leads, where  $H_{n_1, n_2, n_3}$  is given by Eq. (30) with  $N = p = 3$ . Panels a, b, c and d correspond to  $(n_1, n_2, n_3) = (1, 0, -1), (2, 0, -2), (1, 1, -2)$  and  $(2, 1, -3)$  respectively. The coupling parameters  $\Gamma$ s entering Eqs. (27)-(28) are chosen at random in a Gaussian distribution centered at  $\bar{\Gamma} = 1$  and with root-mean-square  $\delta\Gamma = 0.5$ . The negative values of the  $\Gamma$ s are rejected.

where  $a_\alpha \equiv \alpha$  on the examples of figures 5 and 6 where  $p = N$ .

The distribution of the  $\Gamma$ s in Eqs. (27)-(28) is taken as a Gaussian centered at  $\bar{\Gamma} = 1$ , with root-mean-square  $\delta\Gamma = 0.5$ . The negative values of the  $\Gamma$ s are rejected in the numerical calculation. These parameter values imply that  $H_{n_1, n_2, n_3}$  and  $H_{n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4}$  are roughly of order unity on figures 5 and 6. Figure 5a shows the  $(1, 0, -1)$  harmonics with  $N = 3$ , with the expected positive sign. Figure 5b shows the expected negative sign of the  $(2, 0, -2)$  harmonics. Figure 5c shows the  $(1, 1, -2)$  quartets with negative sign corresponding to the negative  $I_{c, dCAR} < 0$  mentioned in section II. Figure 5d shows the  $(2, 1, -3)$  harmonics. Figures 6a-6d further illustrate the multiterminal dc-Josephson effect on the example of  $N = 4$  superconducting leads, with  $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4) = (1, -1, 1, -1), (3, 1, -2, -2), (2, 3, -3, -1)$  and  $(1, 3, -3, -1)$  respectively.

It is concluded that the multiterminal dc-Josephson effect naturally emerges if a quantum dot is connected to  $N$  superconducting leads, in the form of the higher-order harmonics of the dc-Josephson current-phase relation, see the selected values of  $(n_1, n_2, n_3)$  and  $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4)$  for  $N = 3$  and  $N = 4$  superconducting leads on figures 5 and 6 respectively.

#### IV. EXAMPLES WITH $N = 3, 4$ SUPERCONDUCTING LEADS

In this section, we present the specific examples of  $N = 3$  and  $N = 4$  superconducting leads, see the devices on figures 2b and 2c respectively. The cases  $N = 3$  and  $N = 4$  are

treated in sections IV A and IV B respectively. We show that  $\chi^{(3)}$  for  $N = 3$  yields the  $p = 2$  and the  $p = 3$ -terminal dc-Josephson effect, and that  $\chi^{(4)}$  for  $N = 4$  yields the  $p = 3$  and the  $p = 4$ -terminal dc-Josephson effect, whatever the value of the  $p = 2$ -terminal dc-Josephson current. Thus, our proposal has the potential for directly probing the  $p = 3$  or  $p = 4$ -terminal dc-Josephson effect with  $N = 4$  superconducting leads in microwave experiments.

##### A. Device with $N = 3$ superconducting leads on figure 2b

In this subsection, we consider the device with  $N = 3$  superconducting leads on figure 2b. We specifically evaluate the flux- $\Phi$  sensitivity of the supercurrent through the lead  $S_1$ :

$$I_1^{(3)}(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3) = \sum_{n \neq 0} I_c'^{(3)(2)(1,2)}[n] \sin[n(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)] \quad (32)$$

$$+ \sum_{n \neq 0} I_c'^{(3)(2)(1,3)}[n] \sin[n(\varphi_1 - \varphi_3)] \quad (33)$$

$$+ \sum_{n_1 \neq 0, n_2 \neq 0} I_c'^{(3)(3)(1,2,3)}[n_1, n_2] \times \sin[n_1(\varphi_1 - \varphi_3) + n_2(\varphi_2 - \varphi_3)]. \quad (34)$$

Taking into account that  $\varphi_3 = \varphi_2 - \Phi$ , we obtain  $\varphi_1 - \varphi_3 = \varphi_1 - \varphi_2 + \Phi$ . The considered signal for  $N = 3$  is defined as




FIG. 6. The figure shows the distribution  $P(H_{n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4})$  for a quantum dot connected to  $N = 4$  superconducting leads, where  $H_{n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4}$  is given by Eq. (30) with  $N = p = 4$ . Panels a, b, c and d correspond to  $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4) = (1, -1, 1, -1)$ ,  $(3, 1, -2, -2)$ ,  $(2, 3, -3, -1)$  and  $(1, 3, -3, -1)$  respectively. The coupling parameters  $\Gamma$ 's entering Eqs. (27)-(28) are chosen at random in a Gaussian distribution centered at  $\bar{\Gamma} = 1$  and with root-mean-square  $\delta\Gamma = 0.5$ .

the following:

$$\chi^{(3)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2, \Phi) = \frac{\partial I_1^{(3)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_3, \varphi_2 - \varphi_3)}{\partial (\varphi_2 - \varphi_3)}, \quad (35)$$

which is analogous to  $\chi^{(4)}$  in the above Eqs. (14)-(15) with  $N = 4$  superconducting leads. Again,  $\chi^{(3)}$  in Eq. (35) can be detected in microwave experiments.

The following is deduced from Eqs. (32)-(35):

$$\begin{aligned} & \chi^{(3)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2, \Phi) \\ &= \sum_{n \neq 0} n I_c'^{(3)(2)(1,3)}[n] \cos[n(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2 + \Phi)] \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & + \sum_{n_1, n_2} n_2 I_c'^{(3)(3)(1,2,3)}[n_1, n_2] \times \\ & \cos[n_1(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2 + \Phi) + n_2\Phi]. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

The zero-flux limit  $\Phi = 0$  of Eqs. (36)-(37) is the following:

$$\chi^{(3)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2) \equiv \chi^{(3)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2, 0) \quad (38)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{n \neq 0} n \left[ I_c'^{(3)(2)(1,3)}[n] + \sum_{n_2 \neq 0} I_c'^{(3)(3)(1,2,3)}[n, n_2] \right] \times \\ & \cos[n(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)]. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Both  $p = 2$  and  $p = 3$  contribute to  $\chi^{(3)}$  in Eqs. (36)-(37) and  $\chi^{(3)(0)}$  in Eqs. (38)-(39). Thus,  $\chi^{(3)}$  or  $\chi^{(3)(0)}$  with  $N = 3$  superconducting leads cannot be used to probe the  $p = 3$ -terminal dc-Josephson effect independently on the contribution of the  $p = 2$ -terminal Josephson effect, see the discussion in section II.

#### B. Device with $N = 4$ superconducting leads on figure 2c

In this subsection, we now consider the device with  $N = 4$  superconducting leads, see figure 2c. We evaluate the sensitivity of the supercurrent  $I_1^{(4)}$  through the lead  $S_1$  on the three superconducting phase differences  $\varphi_1 - \varphi_4$ ,  $\varphi_2 - \varphi_4$  and  $\varphi_3 - \varphi_4$ .



The supercurrent through the superconducting lead  $S_1$  takes the form

$$I_1^{(4)} = \sum_{n \neq 0} I_c'^{(4)(2)(1,2)}[n] \sin[n(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)] + \sum_{n \neq 0} I_c'^{(4)(2)(1,3)}[n] \sin[n(\varphi_1 - \varphi_3)] + \sum_{n \neq 0} I_c'^{(4)(2)(1,4)}[n] \sin[n(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4)] \quad (40)$$

$$+ \sum_{n_1 \neq 0, n_2 \neq 0} I_c'^{(4)(3)(1,2,3)}[n_1, n_2] \sin[n_1(\varphi_1 - \varphi_3) + n_2(\varphi_2 - \varphi_3)] \quad (41)$$

$$+ \sum_{n_1 \neq 0, n_2 \neq 0} I_c'^{(4)(3)(1,2,4)}[n_1, n_2] \sin[n_1(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4) + n_2(\varphi_2 - \varphi_4)] \quad (42)$$

$$+ \sum_{n_1 \neq 0, n_3 \neq 0} I_c'^{(4)(3)(1,3,4)}[n_1, n_3] \sin[n_1(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4) + n_3(\varphi_3 - \varphi_4)] \quad (43)$$

$$+ \sum_{n_1 \neq 0, n_2 \neq 0, n_3 \neq 0} I_c'^{(4)(4)(1,2,3,4)}[n_1, n_2, n_3] \sin[n_1(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4) + n_2(\varphi_2 - \varphi_4) + n_3(\varphi_3 - \varphi_4)]. \quad (44)$$

The fluxes  $\Phi_A$  and  $\Phi_B$  are taken into account with  $\varphi_3 = \varphi_2 - \Phi_A$  and  $\varphi_4 = \varphi_3 - \Phi_B$ , which leads to

$$\varphi_3 - \varphi_4 = \Phi_B \quad (45)$$

$$\varphi_2 - \varphi_4 = \Phi_A + \Phi_B. \quad (46)$$

Eq. (41) and Eq. (44) contribute for finite values to  $\chi^{(4)} \neq 0$  in Eqs. (14)-(15) and  $\chi^{(4)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4) \neq 0$  in Eqs. (16)-(17). The other terms in Eqs. (40)-(44) do not contribute to  $\chi^{(4)}$  and  $\chi^{(4)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_N)$  after the partial derivatives with respect to  $\varphi_2 - \varphi_4$  and  $\varphi_3 - \varphi_4$  have been taken:

$$\chi^{(4)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4, \Phi_A, \Phi_B) = \sum_{n_1 \neq 0, n_2 \neq 0} n_2(n_1 + n_2) I_c'^{(4)(3)(1,2,3)}[n_1, n_2] \times \quad (47)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sin[n_1(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4) + n_2(\Phi_A + \Phi_B) - (n_1 + n_2)\Phi_B] \\ & - \sum_{n_1 \neq 0, n_2 \neq 0, n_3 \neq 0} n_2 n_3 I_c'^{(4)(4)(1,2,3,4)}[n_1, n_2, n_3] \sin[n_1(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4) + n_2(\Phi_A + \Phi_B) + n_3\Phi_B], \quad (48) \end{aligned}$$

where we used Eqs. (40)-(46).

Assuming zero flux  $\Phi_A = \Phi_B = 0$  (or, equivalently,  $\varphi_2 - \varphi_4 = 0$  and  $\varphi_3 - \varphi_4 = 0$ ), Eqs. (47)-(48) simplify as

$$\chi^{(4)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4) \equiv \chi^{(4)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4, 0, 0) \quad (49)$$

$$= \sum_{n_1 \neq 0, n_2 \neq 0} n_2 \left[ (n_1 + n_2) I_c'^{(4)(3)(1,2,3)}[n_1, n_2] - \sum_{n_3 \neq 0} n_3 I_c'^{(4)(4)(1,2,3,4)}[n_1, n_2, n_3] \right] \sin[n_1(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4)]. \quad (50)$$

Eqs. (47)-(50) contain the  $p = 3$  and the  $p = 4$ -terminal contributions  $I_c'^{(4)(3)(1,2,3)}$  and  $I_c'^{(4)(4)(1,2,3,4)}$ . The  $p = 2$  two-terminal  $I_c'^{(4)(2)(1,2)}$ ,  $I_c'^{(4)(2)(1,3)}$ ,  $I_c'^{(4)(2)(1,4)}$  do not appear in Eqs. (47)-(50). Thus, experimental detection of  $\chi^{(4)} \neq 0$  or  $\chi^{(4)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4) \neq 0$  implies evidence for the  $p = 3$  or  $p = 4$  dc-Josephson effects. Specifically, we demonstrated the following for  $N = 4$  superconducting leads (see figure 2c):

“Nonvanishingly small  $\chi^{(4)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4, \Phi_A, \Phi_B) \neq 0$  or  $\chi^{(4)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4) \neq 0$  with  $N = 4$  superconducting leads”

generically implies

“Evidence for the  $p = 3$  or  $p = 4$ -terminal Josephson effect”.

Now, we generalize this statement to a device containing an arbitrary number  $N$  of the superconducting leads, see figures 2b, 2c and 2d for  $N = 3, 4, 5$  respectively, and figure 7 for  $N = 6$ .

## V. $N$ SUPERCONDUCTING LEADS

We demonstrated in the previous section IV that  $\chi^{(3)} \neq 0$  or  $\chi^{(3)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_3) \neq 0$  for  $N = 3$ , and that  $\chi^{(4)} \neq 0$  or  $\chi^{(4)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4) \neq 0$  for  $N = 4$  imply evidence for the  $p = 2, 3$  and the  $p = 3, 4$  dc-Josephson effects respectively.

Now, we generalize this statement to arbitrary values of the number  $N$  of the superconducting leads. Subsection V A provides expression of the higher-order nonlocal inverse inductance  $\chi^{(N)}$  at arbitrary  $N$ . Subsections V B and V C present the calculations for even and odd values of  $N$  respectively.

### A. Higher-order nonlocal inverse inductance

In this subsection, we discuss how  $N = 3, 4$  in the previous sections IV A and IV B respectively can be generalized to arbitrary number  $N$  of superconducting leads.

Eqs. (25)-(26) for the dc-Josephson current are written as

$$I_1^{S(N)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_N, \varphi_2 - \varphi_N, \dots, \varphi_{N-1} - \varphi_N) = \sum_{p=2}^{N-1} \sum_{a_1=1}^{N-1} \sum_{a_2=a_1+1}^{N-1} \dots \sum_{a_p=a_{p-1}+1}^{N-1} \quad (51)$$

$$\delta \left( \prod_{\alpha=1}^{N-1} (1 - \delta(a'_\alpha, 1)) \right) \sum_{m'_{a_1} \neq 0} \sum_{m'_{a_2} \neq 0} \dots \sum_{m'_{a_p} \neq 0} I_c^{(N)(1)(p)}(a'_1, a'_2, \dots, a'_p) [m'_{a_1}, \dots, m'_{a_p}] \sin \left( \sum_{\alpha=1}^p m'_{a_\alpha} (\varphi_{a_\alpha} - \varphi_N) \right),$$

where we evaluated the supercurrent through the lead labeled by  $N_0 = 1$ , and used the phase  $\varphi_N$  of the superconducting lead  $S_N$  as a reference. The variable  $a'_\alpha$  in Eq. (51) is defined in the interval  $1 \leq a'_\alpha \leq N-1$  while  $a_\alpha$  in Eq. (26) is such that  $1 \leq a_\alpha \leq N$ .

We define the order- $(N-2)$  nonlocal inductance as the signal which is proposed to be detected in microwave experiments:

$$\chi^{(N)} \equiv [L_{N-2}^{-1}]'(\varphi_1 - \varphi_N, \varphi_2 - \varphi_N, \dots, \varphi_{N-1} - \varphi_N)$$

$$= \frac{\partial^{N-2}}{\partial(\varphi_2 - \varphi_N) \partial(\varphi_3 - \varphi_N) \dots \partial(\varphi_{N-1} - \varphi_N)} \times I_1^S(\varphi_1 - \varphi_N, \varphi_2 - \varphi_N, \dots, \varphi_{N-1} - \varphi_N). \quad (52)$$

We note that the lead  $S_N$  is singled out in Eq. (52): the superconducting phase variable  $\varphi_N$  is the reference for evaluating the partial derivatives of  $I_1^S$  with respect to all of the  $\varphi_n - \varphi_N$ , with  $n = 2, \dots, n-1$ . Now, we provide a calculation of Eq. (52).




FIG. 7. The figure shows a  $N = 6$  dc-Josephson junction (a). Panels b, c and d, e show the  $p = 3, 6, 5, 5$ -terminal dc-Josephson processes in a device containing  $N = 6$  superconducting leads respectively. The processes on the green-highlighted panels c and e contribute for a nonvanishingly small  $[L_{N-2}^{-1}]^{(N)} \neq 0$  in Eq. (52), on the condition of nonvanishingly small corresponding critical currents.

### B. Even number $N = 2q$ of superconducting leads

In this subsection, we assume that  $N = 2q$  is even. In addition, we assume in subsection VB 1 that  $\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2q-1} m'_{b'_\alpha} \neq 0$  (with  $m'_{b'_\beta} \neq 0$  for all  $\beta = 1, \dots, 2q-1$ ). Conversely, subsection VB 2 deals with  $\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2q-1} m'_{b'_\alpha} = 0$ .

1.  $p = 2q$ -terminal Josephson processes with  $N = 2q$  superconducting leads

In this subsection, we assume that  $N = 2q$  is even and  $\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2q-1} m'_{b'_\alpha} \neq 0$  (with  $m'_{b'_\beta} \neq 0$  for all  $\beta = 1, \dots, 2q-1$ ).

This results in the  $p = 2q$ -terminal dc-Josephson contribution  $\left[ L_{2q-2}^{-1} \right]^{(2q)}$  to  $\chi^{(2q)} = \left[ L_{2q-2}^{-1} \right]'$  in Eq. (52). Taking into account that  $b'_\alpha = \alpha$  for a  $p = 2q = N$ -terminal dc-Josephson process, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ L_{2q-2}^{-1} \right]^{(2q)} &= (-)^{q+1} \sum_{m'_1 \neq 0} \sum_{m'_2 \neq 0} \dots \sum_{m'_{2q-1} \neq 0} I'_{c,1}{}^{(2q)(2q)(1,2,\dots,2q-1)} [m'_1, \dots, m'_{2q-1}] \times \\ &\quad \left( \prod_{\alpha=2}^{2q-1} m'_\alpha \right) \sin \left( \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2q-1} m'_\alpha (\varphi_\alpha - \varphi_{2q}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Specializing to  $\varphi_2 - \varphi_{2q} = \dots = \varphi_{2q-1} - \varphi_{2q} = 0$  and  $\varphi_1 - \varphi_{2q} \neq 0$  leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ \tilde{L}_{2q-2}^{-1} \right]^{(2q)(0)} &= (-)^{q+1} \sum_{m'_1 \neq 0} \sum_{m'_2 \neq 0} \dots \sum_{m'_{2q-1} \neq 0} I'_{c,1}{}^{(1)(2q)(1,2,\dots,2q-1)} [m'_1, \dots, m'_{2q-1}] \times \\ &\quad \left( \prod_{\alpha=2}^{2q-1} m'_\alpha \right) \sin (m'_1 (\varphi_1 - \varphi_{2q})). \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

2.  $p = (2q-1)$ -terminal Josephson processes with  $N = 2q$  superconducting leads

Now, we assume in this subsection that  $N = 2q$  is even and

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2q-1} m'_{c'_\alpha} = 0, \quad (55)$$

with  $c'_\alpha = \alpha$  for all  $\alpha = 1, \dots, 2q-1$ . Then, we make use of the identities

$$\begin{aligned} \sin \left( \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2q-1} m'_\alpha (\varphi_\alpha - \varphi_{2q}) \right) &= \sin \left( \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2q-1} m'_\alpha \varphi_\alpha \right) = \sin \left( \sum_{\alpha=2}^{2q-1} m'_\alpha (\varphi_\alpha - \varphi_1) \right) \\ &= \sin \left( \sum_{\alpha=2}^{2q-1} m'_\alpha (\varphi_\alpha - \varphi_{2q}) - \sum_{\alpha=2}^{2q-1} m'_\alpha (\varphi_{2q} - \varphi_1) \right) = \sin \left( \sum_{\alpha=2}^{2q-1} m'_\alpha (\varphi_\alpha - \varphi_{2q}) + m'_1 (\varphi_{2q} - \varphi_1) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Specializing to  $\varphi_1 - \varphi_{2q} \neq 0$  and  $\varphi_2 - \varphi_{2q} = \dots = \varphi_{2q-1} - \varphi_{2q} = 0$ , we deduce the contribution  $\left[ \tilde{L}_{2q-2}^{-1} \right]^{(2q-1)}$  of the  $p = 2q-1$ -terminal dc-Josephson processes to  $\left[ \tilde{L}_{2q-2}^{-1} \right]'$  in the presence of  $N = 2q$  superconducting leads:

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ \tilde{L}_{2q-2}^{-1} \right]^{(2q-1)(0)} &= (-)^q \sum_{m'_2 \neq 0} \sum_{m'_3 \neq 0} \dots \sum_{m'_{2q-2} \neq 0} I'_{c,1}{}^{(2q)(1)(2q-1)(1,2,\dots,2q-1)} \left[ - \left( \sum_{\alpha=2}^{2q-1} m'_\alpha \right), m'_2, \dots, m'_{2q-1} \right] \times \\ &\quad \left( \prod_{\alpha=2}^{2q-1} m'_\alpha \right) \sin \left( \left( \sum_{\alpha=2}^{2q-1} m'_\alpha \right) (\varphi_1 - \varphi_{2q}) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where we used  $m'_{2q-1} = -\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2q-2} m'_\alpha$  deduced from Eq. (55).

3. Summary

The zero-flux limit of the predicted experimental signal with  $N = 2q$  generalizes the above Eq. (50) with  $q = 2$ :

$$\chi^{(2q)(0)} (\varphi_1 - \varphi_{2q}) = (54) + (57). \quad (58)$$

### C. Odd number $N = 2q' + 1$ of superconducting leads

In this subsection, we assume now that  $N = 2q' + 1$  is odd. We assume in subsection V C 1 that  $\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2q-1} m'_{b'_\alpha} \neq 0$  (with  $m'_{b'_\beta} \neq 0$  for all  $\beta = 1, \dots, 2q-1$ ) and we assume in subsection V C 2 that  $\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2q-1} m'_{b'_\alpha} = 0$ .

#### 1. $p = (2q' + 1)$ -terminal Josephson processes with $N = 2q' + 1$ superconducting leads

In this subsection, we assume that  $N = 2q' + 1$  is odd and  $\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2q'} m'_{b'_\alpha} \neq 0$  (with  $m'_{b'_\beta} \neq 0$  for all  $\beta = 1, \dots, 2q'$ ).

We find

$$\left[ L_{2q'-1}^{-1} \right]'^{(2q'+1)} = (-)^{q'+1} \sum_{m'_1 \neq 0} \sum_{m'_2 \neq 0} \dots \sum_{m'_{2q'} \neq 0} I'_{c,1}{}^{(2q'+1)}(2q')(1,2,\dots,2q') [m'_1, \dots, m'_{2q'}] \times \quad (59)$$

$$\left( \prod_{\alpha=2}^{2q'} m'_\alpha \right) \cos \left( \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2q'} m'_\alpha (\varphi_\alpha - \varphi_{2q'+1}) \right). \quad (60)$$

Specializing Eq. (59) to  $\varphi_2 - \varphi_{2q'+1} = \dots = \varphi_{2q'} - \varphi_{2q'+1} = 0$  and  $\varphi_1 - \varphi_{2q'+1} \neq 0$  leads to

$$\left[ \tilde{L}_{2q'-1}^{-1} \right]'^{(2q'+1)(0)} = (-)^{q'+1} \sum_{m'_1 \neq 0} \sum_{m'_2 \neq 0} \dots \sum_{m'_{2q'} \neq 0} I'_{c,1}{}^{(2q'+1)}(2q')(1,2,\dots,2q') [m'_1, \dots, m'_{2q'}] \times \quad (61)$$

$$\left( \prod_{\alpha=2}^{2q'} m'_\alpha \right) \cos (m'_1 (\varphi_1 - \varphi_{2q'+1})).$$

#### 2. $p = 2q'$ -terminal Josephson processes with $N = 2q' + 1$ superconducting leads

In this subsection, we assume that  $N = 2q' + 1$  is odd and  $\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2q'} m'_{b'_\alpha} = 0$  (with  $m'_{b'_\beta} \neq 0$  for all  $\beta = 1, \dots, 2q'$ ).

We specialize to  $\varphi_2 - \varphi_{2q'+1} = \dots = \varphi_{2q'} - \varphi_{2q'+1} = 0$  and  $\varphi_1 - \varphi_{2q'+1} \neq 0$ , we deduce

$$\left[ \tilde{L}_{2q'-1}^{-1} \right]'^{(2q')(0)} = (-)^{q'+1} \sum_{m'_2 \neq 0} \sum_{m'_3 \neq 0} \dots \sum_{m'_{2q'} \neq 0} I'_{c,1}{}^{(2q'+1)}(2q')(1,2,\dots,2q') \left[ - \left( \sum_{\alpha=2}^{2q'} m'_\alpha \right), m'_2, \dots, m'_{2q'} \right] \times \quad (62)$$

$$\left( \prod_{\alpha=2}^{2q'} m'_\alpha \right) \cos \left( \left( \sum_{\alpha=2}^{2q'} m'_\alpha \right) (\varphi_1 - \varphi_{2q'+1}) \right).$$

#### 3. Summary

The zero-flux limit of the predicted experimental signal with  $N = 2q' + 1$  generalizes the above Eqs. (38)-(39):

$$\chi^{(2q'+1)(0)} (\varphi_1 - \varphi_{2q'}) = (61) + (62). \quad (63)$$

#### D. Discussion

To summarize, the  $p = N$ -terminal and some of the  $p = N - 1$ -terminal dc-Josephson processes contribute for finite values to  $\chi^{(N)} \equiv [L_{N-2}^{-1}]'$  given by Eq. (52):

$$\chi^{(N)} = [L_{N-2}^{-1}]' = [L_{N-2}^{-1}]'^{(N)} + [L_{N-2}^{-1}]'^{(N-1)}. \quad (64)$$

In general,

$$[L_{N-2}^{-1}]'^{(N)} \neq 0 \quad (65)$$

$$[L_{N-2}^{-1}]'^{(N-1)} \neq 0 \quad (66)$$

if the corresponding critical currents are nonvanishingly small. We find:

$$[L_{N-2}^{-1}]'^{(p)} = 0 \text{ if } p \leq N - 2. \quad (67)$$

In addition, the  $(N - 2)$ -th order derivative of  $\sin (m_{a'_1} \varphi_{a'_1} + m_{a'_2} \varphi_{a'_2} + \dots + m_{a'_p} \varphi_{a'_p})$  in Eq. (52) produces sin or cos according to the parity of  $N$ .

The Appendix details examples with  $N = 6$  superconducting leads, see figure 7.




FIG. 8. The figure shows  $\chi^{(4)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4)$  as a function of  $\varphi_1 - \varphi_4$ , for  $\alpha_{2T} = 1$ ,  $\alpha_{4T} = 0$ . The values of  $\alpha_{3T}$  between 0 and 1 are shown on the figure.

## VI. NUMERICAL RESULTS

Now, we present a numerical illustration that  $\chi^{(4)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4)$  defined in Eq. (16) is vanishingly small if the  $p = 3$  and the  $p = 4$ -terminal critical currents are also vanishingly small i.e.  $I_c^{(4)(3)(1,3,4)} = 0$  and  $I_c^{(4)(4)(1,2,3,4)} = 0$  in Eqs. (40)-(44).

This implies that “measurement of  $\chi^{(4)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4) \neq 0$ ” is evidence for the  $p = 3$  or  $p = 4$ -terminal dc-Josephson critical currents  $I_c^{(4)(3)(1,3,4)} \neq 0$  or  $I_c^{(4)(4)(1,2,3,4)} \neq 0$ .

We use the following phenomenological modeling of the ABS energies:

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_{ABS}(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3, \varphi_4) = & \alpha_0 \\
 & + \alpha_{2T} \{ \cos(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2) + \cos(\varphi_1 - \varphi_3) + \cos(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4) + \cos(\varphi_2 - \varphi_3) + \cos(\varphi_2 - \varphi_4) + \cos(\varphi_3 - \varphi_4) \} \\
 & + \alpha_{3T} \{ \cos(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2 - 2\varphi_3) + \cos(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2 - 2\varphi_4) + \cos(\varphi_2 + \varphi_3 - 2\varphi_1) + \cos(\varphi_2 + \varphi_3 - 2\varphi_4) \\
 & + \cos(\varphi_1 + \varphi_3 - 2\varphi_2) + \cos(\varphi_1 + \varphi_3 - 2\varphi_4) + \cos(\varphi_1 + \varphi_4 - 2\varphi_2) + \cos(\varphi_1 + \varphi_4 - 2\varphi_3) \\
 & + \cos(\varphi_2 + \varphi_3 - 2\varphi_1) + \cos(\varphi_2 + \varphi_3 - 2\varphi_4) + \cos(\varphi_2 + \varphi_4 - 2\varphi_1) + \cos(\varphi_2 + \varphi_4 - 2\varphi_3) \\
 & + \cos(\varphi_3 + \varphi_4 - 2\varphi_1) + \cos(\varphi_3 + \varphi_4 - 2\varphi_2) \\
 & + \alpha_{4T} \{ \cos(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2 - \varphi_3 + \varphi_4) + \cos(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2 + \varphi_3 - \varphi_4) + \cos(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2 - \varphi_3 - \varphi_4) \}, \tag{69}
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha_0$  is a constant energy shift, and  $\alpha_{2T}$ ,  $\alpha_{3T}$  and  $\alpha_{4T}$  parameterize the  $p = 2, 3, 4$  dc-Josephson effect.

The current  $I_1$  through the lead  $S_1$  is deduced from Eq. (22), and  $\chi^{(4)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4)$  is obtained from Eqs. (16)-(17).

Figure 8 shows  $\chi^{(4)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4)$  for  $\alpha_{2T} = 1$ ,  $\alpha_{4T} = 0$  and  $\alpha_{3T}$  between 0 and 1. It is concluded that  $\alpha_{3T} = \alpha_{4T} = 0$  implies  $\chi^{(4)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4) = 0$ . Conversely,  $\alpha_{3T} \neq 0$  with  $\alpha_{4T} = 0$  implies nonvanishingly small  $\chi^{(4)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4) \neq 0$ , whatever  $\alpha_{2T}$ . Thus, Figure 8 confirms that  $\chi^{(4)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4) \neq 0$  is evidence for the  $p = 3$  or  $p = 4$  dc-Josephson effect in a device with  $N = 4$  superconducting leads. The effect is “yes or no” answer to the  $p \geq 3$  multiterminal dc-Josephson effect.

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

Now, we present summary of the main results and final remarks.

We considered multiterminal dc-Josephson interferometers that were investigated in devices containing  $N = 4$  (or with  $N \geq 4$ ) superconducting leads, in a way which is different from the previous Refs. 24, 54–56.

Specifically, we proposed to detect the  $p \geq 3$ -terminal Josephson effect in a device containing  $N = 4$  superconducting leads, see figure 2c. The experimental signal  $\chi^{(4)}$  or  $\chi^{(4)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4)$  is given by Eqs. (14)-(15) or Eqs. (16)-(17) respectively. We obtained the following result:

“Nonvanishingly small second-order nonlocal inverse inductance  $\chi^{(4)}$  or  $\chi^{(4)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_4)$ ”

generically implies

“Evidence for the three or four-terminal dc-Josephson effect”.

We generalized this statement to a device containing arbitrary number  $N \geq 4$  of the superconducting leads, thus with  $N - 1$  independent phase differences. One of those phase differences (e.g.  $\varphi_1 - \varphi_N$ ) is reserved for controlling the current-phase relation of the overall two-terminal device. The remaining  $N - 2$  independent superconducting phase differences are used in the definition Eq. (52) of the higher-order nonlocal inverse inductance  $\chi^{(N)}$  and they are related to the  $N - 2$  dependent fluxes.

Practically, the partial derivative of the supercurrent  $I_1$  through the superconducting lead  $S_1$  with respect to  $\varphi_2 - \varphi_N$ ,  $\varphi_3 - \varphi_N$ , ...,  $\varphi_{N-1} - \varphi_N$  [see Eqs. (14)-(15), (16)-(17) and Eq. (52)] can be evaluated by changing variables from the  $N - 1$  independent phase differences  $\varphi_1 - \varphi_N$ ,  $\varphi_2 - \varphi_N$ , ...,  $\varphi_{N-1} - \varphi_N$  to  $\varphi_1 - \varphi_N$  and the  $N - 2$  fluxes  $\Phi_{A_1}$ ,  $\Phi_{A_2}$ , ...,  $\Phi_{A_{N-2}}$ .

We demonstrated that finite values for  $\chi^{(N)} \neq 0$  or  $\chi^{(N)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_N) \neq 0$  necessarily originate from the  $p = N - 1$  and  $p = N$ -terminal dc-Josephson effects: the  $p$ -terminal dc-Josephson effect does not contribute to  $\chi^{(N)}$  or  $\chi^{(N)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_N)$  if  $p \leq N - 2$ .

Finally, a device with number  $N = 4$  of the superconducting leads and two loops seems to be already quite interesting from the point of view of possible experiments, see figure 2c. Microwave detection of  $\chi^{(N)} \neq 0$  or  $\chi^{(N)(0)}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_N) \neq 0$  is promising, see also the recent Refs. 51–53.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The idea of the paper came from reading the manuscript of V. Bezoni’s PhD thesis<sup>56</sup>. The author wishes to thank Ç.Ö. Girit for useful discussions and J.D. Pillet for sharing their results<sup>54,55</sup> prior to making their preprints public. The author wishes to thank Romain Danneau for useful comments on a previous version of the manuscript. The author thanks the Infrastructure de Calcul Intensif et de Données (GRI-

CAD) for use of the resources of the Mésocentre de Calcul Intensif de l’Université Grenoble-Alpes (CIMENT). The author acknowledges support from the French National Research Agency (ANR) in the framework of the Graphmon project (ANR-19-CE47-0007).

## APPENDIX: EXAMPLES WITH $N = 6$ SUPERCONDUCTING LEADS

In this Appendix, we detail the examples shown on figure 7 with  $N = 6$  superconducting leads.

Figure 7b shows example of a  $p = 3$ -terminal dc-Josephson process with  $N = 6$ . Figure 7c shows a  $p = 6$ -terminal process with  $N = 6$ . Figures 7d and 7e show  $p = 5$  with  $N = 6$ . Not all values of  $p$  contribute to  $\chi^{(N)} = [L_{N-2}^{-1}]'$  in Eq. (52):

(i) The  $p = 3$ -terminal dc-Josephson current  $i_1(\varphi_3 - \varphi_1, \varphi_5 - \varphi_1)$  shown on figure 7b depends on the two independent phase differences  $\varphi_3 - \varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_5 - \varphi_1$ , thus it cannot contribute to  $\chi^{(6)} = [L_4^{-1}]'$  in Eq. (52) where nonvanishingly small value for  $\chi^{(6)} = [L_4^{-1}]' \neq 0$  requires additional sensitivity of the supercurrent through the lead  $S_1$  on both the superconducting phase variables  $\varphi_2$  and  $\varphi_4$ .

(ii) The  $p = 6$ -terminal dc-Josephson current  $i_2$  shown on figure 7c is sensitive to all phase differences between  $S_n$  and  $S_m$  with  $n, m = 1, \dots, 6$ , thus it contributes for a finite value to  $\chi^{(N)} = [L_{N-2}^{-1}]'$  in Eq. (52), see below.

(iii) The  $p = 5$ -terminal dc-Josephson current  $i_3(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1, \varphi_4 - \varphi_1, \varphi_5 - \varphi_1, \varphi_6 - \varphi_1)$  shown on figure 7d depends on  $N - 2 = 4$  phase differences. However, this dc-Josephson process produces  $\chi^{(6)} = [L_4^{-1}]' = 0$  because  $i_3$  on figure 7d is independent on  $\varphi_3$ .

(iv) The  $p = 5$ -terminal dc-Josephson current  $i_4(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1, \varphi_3 - \varphi_1, \varphi_4 - \varphi_1, \varphi_5 - \varphi_1)$  shown on figure 7e is sensitive on all the phase variables  $\{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3, \varphi_4, \varphi_5\}$ . Then,  $i_4 \equiv i_4'(\varphi_1 - \varphi_6, \varphi_2 - \varphi_6, \varphi_3 - \varphi_6, \varphi_4 - \varphi_6, \varphi_5 - \varphi_6)$  contributes for a finite value to  $\chi^{(6)} = [L_4^{-1}]'$ , see below.

Now, we detail the above items (ii) and (iv) corresponding to figures 7c and 7e.

First, concerning item (ii) and figure 7c, the lowest-order supercurrent  $i_2$  through the lead  $S_1$  is given by

$$i_2(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3, \varphi_4, \varphi_5, \varphi_6) = j_2^{(0)} \sin[(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1) + (\varphi_3 - \varphi_1) + (\varphi_4 - \varphi_1) + (\varphi_5 - \varphi_1) + (\varphi_6 - \varphi_1)] \quad (70)$$

$$= j_2^{(0)} \sin[-5\varphi_1 + \varphi_2 + \varphi_3 + \varphi_4 + \varphi_5 + \varphi_6] \quad (71)$$

$$= j_2^{(0)} \sin[-5(\varphi_1 - \varphi_6) + (\varphi_2 - \varphi_6) + (\varphi_3 - \varphi_6) + (\varphi_4 - \varphi_6) + (\varphi_5 - \varphi_6)]. \quad (72)$$

Thus,

$$\frac{\partial^4 i_2(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3, \varphi_4, \varphi_5, \varphi_6)}{\partial(\varphi_2 - \varphi_6) \partial(\varphi_3 - \varphi_6) \partial(\varphi_4 - \varphi_6) \partial(\varphi_5 - \varphi_6)} = i_2(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3, \varphi_4, \varphi_5, \varphi_6) \quad (73)$$

and we find:

$$\left. \frac{\partial^4 i_2(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3, \varphi_4, \varphi_5, \varphi_6)}{\partial(\varphi_2 - \varphi_6) \partial(\varphi_3 - \varphi_6) \partial(\varphi_4 - \varphi_6) \partial(\varphi_5 - \varphi_6)} \right|_{\substack{\varphi_2 - \varphi_6 = 0, \varphi_3 - \varphi_6 = 0 \\ \varphi_4 - \varphi_6 = 0, \varphi_5 - \varphi_6 = 0}} = -j_2^{(0)} \sin[5(\varphi_1 - \varphi_6)]. \quad (74)$$

Second, we consider item (iv) and figure 7d:

$$i_4(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3, \varphi_4, \varphi_5, \varphi_6) = j_4^{(0)} \sin[(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1) + (\varphi_4 - \varphi_1) + (\varphi_5 - \varphi_1) + (\varphi_6 - \varphi_1)] \quad (75)$$

$$= j_4^{(0)} \sin[-4\varphi_1 + \varphi_2 + \varphi_4 + \varphi_5 + \varphi_6] \quad (76)$$

$$= j_4^{(0)} \sin[-4(\varphi_1 - \varphi_6) + (\varphi_2 - \varphi_6) + (\varphi_4 - \varphi_6) + (\varphi_5 - \varphi_6)], \quad (77)$$

which implies that the following is vanishingly small:

$$\frac{\partial^4 i_4(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3, \varphi_4, \varphi_5, \varphi_6)}{\partial(\varphi_2 - \varphi_6) \partial(\varphi_3 - \varphi_6) \partial(\varphi_4 - \varphi_6) \partial(\varphi_5 - \varphi_6)} = 0. \quad (78)$$

The above Eqs. (73) and (78) confirm the general theory presented in the paper.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> B.D. Josephson, *Possible new effects in superconductive tunnelling*, Physics Letters **1**, 251 (1962).
  - <sup>2</sup> K.K. Likharev, *Superconducting weak links*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **51**, 101 (1979).
  - <sup>3</sup> P.W. Anderson and J.M. Rowell, *Probable Observation of the Josephson Superconducting Tunneling Effect*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 230 (1963).
  - <sup>4</sup> J.M. Byers and M.E. Flatté, *Probing Spatial Correlations with Nanoscale Two-Contact Tunneling*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 306 (1995).
  - <sup>5</sup> N.K. Allsopp, V.C. Hui, C.J. Lambert, and S.J. Robinson, *Theory of the sign of multi-probe conductances for normal and superconducting materials*, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **6**, 10475 (1994).
  - <sup>6</sup> J. Torrès and T. Martin, *Positive and negative Hanbury-Brown and Twiss correlations in normal metal-superconducting devices*, Eur. Phys. J. B **12**, 319 (1999).
  - <sup>7</sup> M.S. Choi, C. Bruder, and D. Loss, *Spin-dependent Josephson current through double quantum dots and measurement of entangled electron states*, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 13569 (2000).
  - <sup>8</sup> G. Deutscher and D. Feinberg, *Coupling superconducting-ferromagnetic point contacts by Andreev reflections*, Appl. Phys. Lett. **76**, 487 (2000).
  - <sup>9</sup> G. Falci, D. Feinberg, and F.W.J. Hekking, *Correlated tunneling into a superconductor in a multiprobe hybrid structure*, Europhys. Lett. **54**, 255 (2001).
  - <sup>10</sup> R. Mélin and D. Feinberg, *Transport theory of multiterminal hybrid structures*, Eur. Phys. J. B **26**, 101 (2002).
  - <sup>11</sup> N.M. Chtchelkatchev, G. Blatter, G.B. Lesovik, and T. Martin, *Bell inequalities and entanglement in solid-state devices*, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 161320 (2002).
  - <sup>12</sup> R. Mélin and D. Feinberg, *Sign of the crossed conductances at a ferromagnet/superconductor/ferromagnet double interface*, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 174509 (2004).
  - <sup>13</sup> D. Beckmann, H.B. Weber, and H.v. Löhneysen, *Evidence for crossed Andreev reflection in Superconductor-Ferromagnet hybrid structures*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 197003 (2004).
  - <sup>14</sup> S. Russo, M. Kroug, T.M. Klapwijk, and A.F. Morpurgo, *Experimental observation of bias-dependent nonlocal Andreev reflection*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 027002 (2005).
  - <sup>15</sup> P. Cadden-Zimansky and V. Chandrasekhar, *Nonlocal correlations in normal-metal superconducting systems*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 237003 (2006).
  - <sup>16</sup> P. Cadden-Zimansky, Z. Jiang, and V. Chandrasekhar, *Charge imbalance, crossed Andreev reflection and elastic co-tunnelling in ferromagnet/superconductor/normal-metal structures*, New J. Phys. **9**, 116 (2007).
  - <sup>17</sup> L.G. Herrmann, F. Portier, P. Roche, A. Levy Yeyati, T. Kontos, and C. Strunk, *Carbon nanotubes as Cooper pair beam splitters*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 026801 (2010).
  - <sup>18</sup> L. Hofstetter, S. Csonka, J. Nygaard, and C. Schönenberger, *Cooper pair splitter realized in a two-quantum-dot Y-junction*, Nature (London) **461**, 960 (2009).
  - <sup>19</sup> J. Wei and V. Chandrasekhar, *Positive noise cross-correlation in hybrid superconducting and normal-metal three-terminal devices*, Nat. Phys. **6**, 494 (2010).
  - <sup>20</sup> A. Das, Y. Ronen, M. Heiblum, D. Mahalu, A.V. Kretinin, and H. Shtrikman, *High-efficiency Cooper pair splitting demonstrated by two-particle conductance resonance and positive noise cross-correlation*, Nat. Commun. **3**, 1165 (2012).
  - <sup>21</sup> A. Freyn, B. Douçot, D. Feinberg and R. Mélin, *Production of non-local quartets and phase-sensitive entanglement in a superconducting beam splitter*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 257005 (2011).
  - <sup>22</sup> R. Mélin, D. Feinberg and B. Douçot, *Partially resummed perturbation theory for multiple Andreev reflections in a short three-terminal Josephson junction*, Eur. Phys. J. B **89**, 67 (2016).
  - <sup>23</sup> T. Jonckheere, J. Rech, T. Martin, B. Douçot, D. Feinberg, and R. Mélin, *Multipair DC Josephson resonances in a biased allsuperconducting bijunction*, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 214501 (2013).
  - <sup>24</sup> J. Rech, T. Jonckheere, T. Martin, B. Douçot, D. Feinberg, and R. Mélin, *Proposal for the observation of nonlocal multipair production*, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 075419 (2014).
  - <sup>25</sup> R. Mélin, M. Sotto, D. Feinberg, J.-G. Caputo and B. Douçot, *Gate-tunable zero-frequency current cross-correlations of the quartet mode in a voltage-biased three-terminal Josephson junction*, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 115436 (2016).
  - <sup>26</sup> R. Mélin, J.-G. Caputo, K. Yang and B. Douçot, *Simple Floquet-Wannier-Stark-Andreev viewpoint and emergence of low-energy scales in a voltage-biased three-terminal Josephson junction*, Phys. Rev. B **95**, 085415 (2017).
  - <sup>27</sup> R. Mélin, R. Danneau, K. Yang, J.-G. Caputo, and B. Douçot, *Engineering the Floquet spectrum of superconducting multiterminal quantum dots*, Phys. Rev. B **100**, 035450 (2019).
  - <sup>28</sup> B. Douçot, R. Danneau, K. Yang, J.-G. Caputo and R. Mélin, *Berry phase in superconducting multiterminal quantum dots*, Phys. Rev. B **101**, 035411 (2020).
  - <sup>29</sup> R. Mélin, *Inversion in a four-terminal superconducting device on the quartet line: I. Two-dimensional metal and the quartet beam splitter*, Phys. Rev. B **102**, 245435 (2020).

- <sup>30</sup> R. Mélin and B. Douçot, *Inversion in a four terminal superconducting device on the quartet line: II. Quantum dot and Floquet theory*, Phys. Rev. B **102**, 245436 (2020).
- <sup>31</sup> A.H. Pfeffer, J.E. Duvauchelle, H. Courtois, R. Mélin, D. Feinberg, and F. Lefloch, *Subgap structure in the conductance of a three-terminal Josephson junction*, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 075401 (2014).
- <sup>32</sup> Y. Cohen, Y. Ronen, J.H. Kang, M. Heiblum, D. Feinberg, R. Mélin and H. Strikman, *Non-local supercurrent of quartets in a three-terminal Josephson junction*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. **115**, 6991 (2018).
- <sup>33</sup> K.F. Huang, Y. Ronen, R. Mélin, D. Feinberg, K. Watanabe, T. Taniguchi and P. Kim, *Quartet supercurrent in a multi-terminal Graphene-based Josephson Junction*, cond-mat preprint (2020).
- <sup>34</sup> E. Strambini, S. D'Ambrosio, F. Vischi, F.S. Bergeret, Yu.V. Nazarov, and F. Giazotto, *The  $\omega$ -SQUIPT as a tool to phase-engineer Josephson topological materials*, Nat. Nanotechnol. **11**, 1055 (2016).
- <sup>35</sup> A.W. Draelos, M.-T. Wei, A. Seredinski, H. Li, Y. Mehta, K. Watanabe, T. Taniguchi, I.V. Borzenets, F. Amet, and G. Finkelstein, *Supercurrent flow in multiterminal graphene Josephson junctions*, Nano Lett. **19**, 1039 (2019).
- <sup>36</sup> N. Pankratova, H. Lee, R. Kuzmin, K. Wickramasinghe, I. W. Mayer, J. Yuan, M. Vavilov, J. Shabani and V. Manucharyan, *The multi-terminal Josephson effect*, Phys. Rev. X **10**, 031051 (2020).
- <sup>37</sup> G.V. Graziano, J.S. Lee, M. Pendharkar, C. Palmstrom and V.S. Pribiag, *Transport Studies in a Gate-Tunable Three-Terminal Josephson Junction*, arXiv:1905.11730v2 (2020).
- <sup>38</sup> E.G. Arnault, T. Larson, A. Seredinski, L. Zhao, H. Li, K. Watanabe, T. Taniguchi, I. Borzenets, F. Amet and G. Finkelstein, *The multiterminal inverse AC Josephson effect*, arXiv:2012.15253v1 (2020).
- <sup>39</sup> S.A. Khan, L. Stampfer, T. Mutas, J.-H. Kang, P. Krogstrup and T.S. Jespersen, *Multiterminal Quantized Conductance in InSb Nanocrosses*, arXiv:2101.02529 (2021).
- <sup>40</sup> R.-P. Riwar, M. Houzet, J.S. Meyer, and Y.V. Nazarov, *Multiterminal Josephson junctions as topological materials*, Nat. Commun. **7**, 11167 (2016).
- <sup>41</sup> E. Eriksson, R.-P. Riwar, M. Houzet, J. S. Meyer, and Y. V. Nazarov, *Topological transconductance quantization in a four-terminal Josephson junction*, Phys. Rev. B **95**, 075417 (2017).
- <sup>42</sup> O. Deb, K. Sengupta and D. Sen, *Josephson junctions of multiple superconducting wires*, Phys. Rev. B **97**, 174518 (2018).
- <sup>43</sup> H. Weisbrich, R.L. Klees, G. Rastelli and W. Belzig, *Second Chern Number and Non-Abelian Berry Phase in Topological Superconducting Systems*, PRX Quantum **2**, 010310 (2021).
- <sup>44</sup> V. Fatem, A.R. Akhmerov and L. Bretheau, *Weyl Josephson circuits*, arXiv:2008.13758v1 (2020).
- <sup>45</sup> L. Peyruchat, J. Griesmar, J.-D. Pillet and Ç.Ö. Girit, *Transconductance quantization in a topological Josephson tunnel junction circuit*, arXiv:2009.03291v1 (2020).
- <sup>46</sup> Y. Chen and Y.V. Nazarov, *Weyl point immersed in a continuous spectrum: an example from superconducting nanostructures*, arXiv:2102.03947v1 (2021).
- <sup>47</sup> E.V. Repin and Y.V. Nazarov, *Weyl points in the multi-terminal Hybrid Superconductor-Semiconductor Nanowire devices*, arXiv:2010.11494v1 (2020).
- <sup>48</sup> H.-Y. Xie, M.G. Vavilov and A. Levchenko, *Topological Andreev bands in three-terminal Josephson junctions*, Phys. Rev. B **96**, 161406 (2017).
- <sup>49</sup> H.-Y. Xie, M.G. Vavilov and A. Levchenko, *Weyl nodes in Andreev spectra of multiterminal Josephson junctions: Chern numbers, conductances and supercurrents*, Phys. Rev. B **97**, 035443 (2018).
- <sup>50</sup> B. Douçot, R. Danneau, K. Yang, J.-G. Caputo and R. Mélin, *Berry phase in superconducting multiterminal quantum dots*, Phys. Rev. B **101**, 035411 (2020).
- <sup>51</sup> B. Venitucci, D. Feinberg, R. Mélin, B. Douçot, *Nonadiabatic Josephson current pumping by microwave irradiation*, Phys. Rev. B **97**, 195423 (2018).
- <sup>52</sup> L.P. Gavensky, G. Usaj, D. Feinberg and C.A. Balseiro, *Berry curvature tomography and realization of topological Haldane model in driven three-terminal Josephson junctions*, Phys. Rev. B **97**, 220505 (2018).
- <sup>53</sup> R. L. Klees, G. Rastelli, J. C. Cuevas, and W. Belzig, *Microwave Spectroscopy Reveals the Quantum Geometric Tensor of Topological Josephson Matter*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **124**, 197002 (2020).
- <sup>54</sup> J.D. Pillet, V. Benzoni, J. Griesmar, J.-L. Smirr and Ç. Ö. Girit, *Nonlocal Josephson Effect in Andreev Molecules* Nano Lett. **19**, 7138 (2019).
- <sup>55</sup> J.-D. Pillet, V. Benzoni, J. Griesmar, J.-L. Smirr and Ç. Ö. Girit, *Scattering description of Andreev molecules*, SciPost Phys. Core **2**, 009 (2020).
- <sup>56</sup> V. Benzoni, *Hybridization of Andreev bound states in closely spaced Josephson junctions*, PhD thesis, Thèse de Doctorat de l'Université PSL (2021).
- <sup>57</sup> J.E. Zimmerman and A.H. Silver, *Macroscopic Quantum Interference Effects through Superconducting Point Contacts*, Phys. Rev. **141**, 367 (1966).
- <sup>58</sup> A. Zazunov, V.S. Shumeiko, E.N. Bratus', J. Lantz, and G. Wendin, *Andreev Level Qubit*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 087003 (2003).
- <sup>59</sup> T. Meng, S. Florens and P. Simon, *Self-consistent description of Andreev bound states in Josephson quantum dot devices*, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 224521 (2009).