

# Strong-coupling theory of quantum dot Josephson junctions: the role of a residual quasiparticle

Luka Pavešić,<sup>1,2,\*</sup> Ramón Aguado,<sup>3,†</sup> and Rok Žitko<sup>1,2,‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Jožef Stefan Institute, Jamova 39, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia*

<sup>2</sup>*Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, University of Ljubljana, Jadranska 19, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia*

<sup>3</sup>*Instituto de Ciencia de Materiales de Madrid (ICMM),*

*Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC), Sor Juana Ines de la Cruz 3, 28049 Madrid, Spain*

We consider an interacting quantum dot strongly coupled to two superconducting leads in a Josephson junction geometry. By defining symmetry-adapted superpositions of states from the leads, we formulate an effective Hamiltonian with a single orbital directly coupled to the dot and three additional indirectly coupled orbitals. This minimal basis set allows to account for the quasiparticles in the vicinity of the dot as well as those further away in the leads, and to describe how their role evolves as a function of the phase bias  $\phi$ . This formulation also reveals the changing nature of the spin-doublet state for experimentally relevant coupling strength. The binding of a nearly decoupled quasiparticle in the vicinity of the QD explains the "doublet chimney" in the phase diagram for  $\phi \sim \pi$ , in contrast to  $\phi \sim 0$  where the residual quasiparticle escapes to infinity and plays no active role.

Josephson junctions (JJs) are key constituents in modern platforms for quantum state engineering using superconductors (SCs)<sup>1</sup> and they are continuously enhanced with novel functionalities such as gate tunability, compatibility with magnetic fields<sup>2</sup>, and unconventional Josephson potentials for building parity-protected qubits<sup>3</sup>. Another target is fully exploiting the microscopic degrees of freedom in the JJ, namely its subgap levels in the few-channel regime. A recent example are Andreev spin qubits (ASQ)<sup>4–6</sup>, where quantum information is stored in the spin degree of freedom of a trapped quasiparticle. The first experimental realisation of this idea<sup>7</sup> relied on non-interacting Andreev levels, but required a complex scheme involving higher energy levels for qubit manipulation. A promising alternative makes use of interacting subgap states in JJs with an embedded semiconducting quantum dot (QD) tuned into a spinful doublet ground state (GS)<sup>8–10</sup>. The QD needs sufficiently strong coupling to the SC leads for efficient control and read-out, but at very large coupling the doublet is no longer the GS, leading to increased leakage out of the computational subspace. The competition between singlet and doublet GSs is governed by the coupling strength, charging energy, QD filling, and phase difference across the junction,  $\phi$ <sup>11,12</sup>. Experimentally relevant intermediate coupling regimes will need to be fully understood for building optimized ASQs.

We approach this problem starting from the strong-coupling limit by reformulating the superconducting Anderson model (SAM) in the basis of symmetry-adapted orbitals, using a minimal set of states that permits to account for the finite bandwidth in the leads. We properly account for the screening of the QD spin, the main mechanism responsible for lowering the energy of the subgap states below the continuum of elementary quasiparticle (Bogoliubov) excitations. It has long been believed that the QD spin is fully screened in the singlet and "unscreened" in the doublet GS<sup>13</sup>. For very strong coupling, the QD spin is however completely screened in all states at all  $\phi$ : in this limit the doublet is, in fact, the same as the well-understood singlet state, but with an overall doublet character owing to one residual spin resulting from the broken Cooper pair. We show that the wavefunction of this spin (its orbital character) depends on the value of  $\phi$ . For  $\phi \sim 0$  it is far away




Figure 1. (a) Sketch of the quantum dot Josephson junction. (b, d) Phase diagrams for  $\phi = 0$  and  $\phi = \pi$ .  $V$  is the coupling strength,  $\nu = 1/2 - \epsilon/U$  is the dot filling in units of charge. The "doublet chimney" for  $\phi = \pi$  is given by  $|\nu - 1| = \Delta^2/4V^2$ , Eq. (6). (c) Sketch of the model expressed in terms of a symmetric and an antisymmetric superconductor orbital at  $\phi = \pi$ . Only the symmetric orbital couples directly to the dot. Superconducting pairing materializes as a  $\phi$ -dependent anomalous hopping that mixes the two types of orbitals.

from the QD in a symmetric orbital, while for  $\phi \sim \pi$  it is located closer to the QD in an antisymmetric orbital. Importantly, while the free magnetic moment exists in the doublet state at large coupling, it is no longer localized on the QD itself, but rather smeared across the superconducting leads. The exact spatial location and extent depend on the model parameters, especially the phase bias  $\phi$ . This puts constraints on the coupling strength in JJs intended to be used as ASQs: if the coupling is too strong, the moment is less responsive to modulation and readout schemes that locally address the dot. Furthermore, the qubit encoded in the spin degree of freedom of the ASQ is expected to have different decoherence rate depending on the distribution in space of the spin doublet wave-

function because the QD and the superconducting leads are made of materials representing different noise environments.

The notion of unscreened QD spin in the doublet states is also challenged by the existence of the ‘‘doublet chimney’’. This extended doublet phase at  $\phi = \pi$  that persists even for large coupling strengths where a singlet GS is generally expected [see Fig. 1(d)] has been predicted theoretically<sup>16–20</sup> long ago and recently directly observed in experiment<sup>8</sup>. Expansion in the inverse coupling strength gives analytical insight into the regime of intermediate QD-SC coupling and explains the role of the residual spin as well as the shape of the phase boundary.

*Model.*—The system, sketched in Fig. 1(a), is modelled by SAM,  $H = H_{\text{SC}}^{(L)} + H_{\text{SC}}^{(R)} + H_{\text{QD}} + H_{\text{hop}}$ , with

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\text{SC}}^{(\beta)} &= \sum_{k\sigma} \epsilon_k c_{\beta k\sigma}^\dagger c_{\beta k\sigma} - \Delta \sum_k e^{i\phi_\beta} c_{\beta k\downarrow}^\dagger c_{\beta k\uparrow}^\dagger + \text{H.c.}, \\ H_{\text{QD}} &= \epsilon \sum_\sigma \hat{n}_{d\sigma} + U \hat{n}_{d\uparrow} \hat{n}_{d\downarrow}, \\ H_{\text{hop}} &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}}} \sum_{\beta=L,R} V_\beta \sum_{k\sigma} d_\sigma^\dagger c_{\beta k\sigma} + \text{H.c.} \end{aligned}$$

$c_{\beta k\sigma}$  is the operator for an electron in the superconductor  $\beta \in \{L, R\}$  with energy  $\epsilon_k$  and spin  $\sigma$ .  $d_\sigma$  is the operator for the QD level,  $\hat{n}_{d\sigma} = d_\sigma^\dagger d_\sigma$  the corresponding number operator,  $\epsilon$  the impurity level,  $U$  the on-site interaction, and  $V_\beta$  the hopping to lead  $\beta$ . We parameterize the hoppings as  $V_L = V(1 - \eta)$ ,  $V_R = V(1 + \eta)$ , so that  $\eta$  quantifies the left-right asymmetry.  $\mathcal{N}$  is the number of  $k$ -states in a SC lead. We set  $\phi_L = -\phi/2$  and  $\phi_R = \phi/2$ .

We simplify the Hamiltonian in several steps. First, we apply the gauge transformation  $c_{\beta k\sigma} \rightarrow e^{\phi_\beta/2} c_{\beta k\sigma}$ ,<sup>21,22</sup> and then reduce the infinite basis set by retaining two states for each superconductor, one representing states in the immediate vicinity of the QD, another representing states far away from the QD:  $c_{\beta\sigma}(r) = (1/\sqrt{\mathcal{N}}) \sum_k e^{ikr} c_{\beta k\sigma}$  with  $r = 0$  and  $r = l$ , respectively. The two orbitals are coupled by a hopping term obtained by Fourier transforming the dispersion,  $t = (1/\mathcal{N}) \sum_k e^{ikl} \epsilon_k$ ; this quantifies the mobility of quasi-particles (QPs) in the truncated model. For an orbital far from the QD (large  $l$ ) the sum rapidly oscillates and  $t$  is small. Next, we define the orthogonal symmetric  $b$  and antisymmetric  $a$  orbitals:

$$\begin{aligned} b_\sigma(r) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_L^2 + V_R^2}} \left[ V_L e^{-i\frac{\phi}{4}} c_{L\sigma}(r) + V_R e^{i\frac{\phi}{4}} c_{R\sigma}(r) \right], \\ a_\sigma(r) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_L^2 + V_R^2}} \left[ -V_R e^{-i\frac{\phi}{4}} c_{L\sigma}(r) + V_L e^{i\frac{\phi}{4}} c_{R\sigma}(r) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Our minimal model is  $H = H_{\text{SC}} + H_{\text{QD}} + H_{\text{hop}}$  with

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\text{SC}} &= -\Delta \cos \frac{\phi}{2} \sum_{r=0,l} [a_\downarrow(r) a_\uparrow(r) + b_\downarrow(r) b_\uparrow(r) + \text{H.c.}] \\ &\quad -i\Delta \frac{1-\eta^2}{1+\eta^2} \sin \frac{\phi}{2} \sum_{r=0,l} [a_\uparrow(r) b_\downarrow(r) - a_\downarrow(r) b_\uparrow(r) + \text{H.c.}] \\ &\quad -i\Delta \frac{2\eta}{1+\eta^2} \sin \frac{\phi}{2} \sum_{r=0,l} [b_\downarrow(r) b_\uparrow(r) - a_\downarrow(r) a_\uparrow(r) + \text{H.c.}] \\ &\quad -t \sum_\sigma [a_\sigma^\dagger(0) a_\sigma(l) + b_\sigma^\dagger(0) b_\sigma(l) + \text{H.c.}], \\ H_{\text{hop}} &= -V \sqrt{2(1+\eta^2)} \sum_\sigma [d_\sigma^\dagger b_\sigma(0) + \text{H.c.}]. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Only the symmetric proximal orbital  $b(0)$  is directly coupled to the QD, simplifying the hopping term at the price of additional  $\phi$ -dependent terms in  $H_{\text{SC}}$ .

*Eigenstates.*—The strong-coupling theory is based on expanding in  $1/V$ , with  $H_{\text{hop}}$  as the non-perturbed part, and  $H' = H_{\text{QD}} + H_{\text{SC}}$  as the perturbation. We use projector-based perturbation theory (PT) to deal with the large degeneracy<sup>23</sup>. Low-energy eigenstates of  $H_{\text{hop}}$  have two electrons occupying the  $d - b(0)$  bonding orbital,

$$|B\rangle = \frac{d_\uparrow^\dagger + b_\uparrow^\dagger(0)}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{d_\downarrow^\dagger + b_\downarrow^\dagger(0)}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle, \tag{2}$$

with a bonding energy of  $E_B = -2V \sqrt{2(1+\eta^2)}$ . The configuration of electrons in the remaining SC orbitals is arbitrary and does not affect the energy of unperturbed states. It does determine their total spin, with the doublets having a free spin in one of the orbitals.

For non-zero  $1/V$  the GS degeneracy is lifted. The first-order energy corrections are

$$\begin{aligned} \delta E_S^{(1)} &= \frac{U}{4} + \epsilon \pm \Delta \frac{\sqrt{[(1+\eta^2) \cos \frac{\phi}{2}]^2 + [2\eta \sin \frac{\phi}{2}]^2}}{1+\eta^2}, \\ \delta E_D^{(1)} &= \frac{U}{4} + \epsilon, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

for the lowest singlet (S) and the lowest doublet (D). The  $\Delta$ -term simplifies to  $\delta E_S^{(1)} = \frac{U}{4} + \epsilon \pm \Delta \cos(\phi/2)$  for  $\eta = 0$ , the cosine factors originating from the interference processes between the two leads; this is the same cosine factor that arises in the anomalous part of the hybridisation function of SAM<sup>24</sup>. Unless  $\eta = 0$  and  $\phi = \pi$ , the two S states are split, with D exactly midway between them. Finite bandwidth effects ( $t$  term) favor states where the  $a$  orbitals form an  $a(0) - a(l)$  bond. In the doublet state this leaves the  $b(l)$  orbital occupied by a free spin, while in the singlet states two types of a local singlet are formed in the  $b(l)$  orbital, namely  $\mathbb{1}_{b(l)} \pm b_\downarrow^\dagger(l) b_\uparrow^\dagger(l)$ . The sum with equal phase (+ sign) for the lower-energy state can be interpreted as a Cooper pair, while the sum with the




Figure 2. Low-energy spectra, singlet (red,  $S = 0$ ) and doublet (blue,  $S = 1/2$ ) states. (a)  $\phi = 0$  and (b)  $\phi = \pi$  eigenenergies vs coupling strength  $V$ . (c)  $\phi$ -dependence at large  $V/\Delta$ . Labels indicate the degeneracy of excited states. Full lines: exact diagonalisation, dashed lines: first-order expansion for large  $V$ , Eq. (3). (d) Energy difference between the lowest doublet and singlet at  $\phi = \pi$  in log-log scale. Dashed line: fifth-order correction, Eq. (5). Parameters are  $\eta = 0$ ,  $U = 5\Delta$ ,  $\epsilon = -U/2$ ,  $t = 0.01\Delta$ . The energies are shifted by  $U/2 + 4\Delta$ .

opposite phase (-) for the higher-energy state corresponds to a broken Cooper pair, i.e., two QPs.

The spectrum splits into several manifolds depending on the occupancy of the bonding and antibonding orbitals between  $d$  and  $b(0)$ , with all states within the same manifold having the same  $V$ -dependence for large  $V$ , see Fig. 2(a,b). Fig. 2(c) shows the  $\phi$ -dependence in the lowest manifold at large  $V$ . In the singlet subspace (red), the GS contains a Cooper pair, gaining  $\Delta \cos(\phi/2)$  condensation energy, while the first excited singlet has one broken Cooper pair, costing an additional  $\Delta \cos(\phi/2)$ . The lowest-energy doublet (blue) contains a single QP. This pattern repeats with higher excitations containing increasing numbers of broken Cooper pairs and QPs<sup>25</sup>.

*Spin screening.*—At  $V = 0$ , the GS is a doublet  $D_0$ , a product state composed of a free spin on the QD and decoupled SC leads. At  $V = \infty$ , the GS is a doublet  $D_b$ , where the QD spin is bound into a singlet with the quasiparticle in orbital  $b(0)$  in the same way as in the singlet state, and a residual quasiparticle in orbital  $b(l)$ . The mixing of  $D_0$  and  $D_b$  with increasing  $V$  can be quantified using spin compensation  $\kappa = 1 - 2\langle S_{\text{QD}}^z \rangle$ , ranging from  $\kappa = 0$  for a free spin to  $\kappa = 1$  for a completely screened QD<sup>14</sup>. Fig. 3(a) shows that  $\kappa(V)$  is indeed monotonously increasing from 0 to 1. It weakly depends on  $\phi$  due to anomalous hopping terms in  $H_{\text{SC}}$  from Eq. (1).

The relation between the lowest singlet and doublet states is revealed through matrix elements  $\chi_\alpha = |\langle D | \alpha_\uparrow^\dagger | S \rangle|$  with  $\alpha \in \{a(0), a(l), b(0), b(l)\}$ . Fig. 3(b) shows the  $\phi$  dependence of  $\chi$  at large  $V = 2.5\Delta$ . Because the QD spin is always completely screened in the singlet,  $\chi_{b(0)}$  is small when the  $(d, b(0))$  configuration in both states is similar, i.e., when the QD spin is screened in the doublet as well. The remaining  $\chi$




Figure 3. Local moment screening in the doublet ground state. (a) Spin compensation  $\kappa$  vs  $V$  for  $\phi = 0, \pi/2, \pi$ . (b) Addition amplitudes  $\chi$  vs  $\phi$  for  $V = 2.5\Delta$ . (c) Addition amplitudes  $\chi$  vs  $V$  for  $\phi = 0$ . (d) Addition amplitudes  $\chi$  vs  $V$  for  $\phi = \pi$ . Parameters are  $\eta = 0$ ,  $U = 10\Delta$ ,  $\epsilon = -U/2$ ,  $t = 0.2\Delta$ .  $\chi_{a(l)}$  is negligibly small in all cases.

quantify the position of the spin-carrying residual QP in the doublet. For  $\phi \sim 0$ , it clearly resides in the orbital  $b(l)$ . The maximum value  $1/\sqrt{2}$  is explained by the fact that the state of  $b(l)$  in the singlet is  $(\mathbb{1}_{b(l)} + b_\uparrow^\dagger(l)b_\downarrow^\dagger(l))/\sqrt{2}$ . For  $\phi \sim \pi$ , the residual spin resides mostly in  $a(0)$ , with some weak admixture of  $b(l)$ ; the ratio depends on  $t/\Delta$ , i.e., on the mobility of the quasiparticles. Fig. 3(c) shows the  $V$  dependence at  $\phi = 0$ . It directly confirms the interpretation of  $\kappa$  variation in terms of the changing nature of the doublet from  $D_0$  to  $D_b$ . Fig. 3(d) shows the  $V$  dependence at  $\phi = \pi$ . At  $V = 0$ , the singlet is a linear combination of singlet states involving  $a(0)$  and  $b(0)$ , explaining equal values of the corresponding  $\chi$ . With increasing  $V$ , the singlet and doublet evolve into a similar screened state, except for the residual quasiparticle in orbital  $a(0)$ .

*Doublet chimney at  $\nu = 1$ .*—The lowest-lying singlet and doublet states are degenerate at  $\phi = \pi$  to lowest order, see Eq. (3), yet the exact solution gives slightly lower energy for the doublet. It is possible to analytically calculate high-order corrections at  $\phi = \pi$  because the “nearly free” quasiparticle occupies a proximal orbital  $a(0)$ , see Fig. 3(b,d), thus it is admissible to set  $t = 0$  without qualitatively changing the low-energy states. For  $\eta = 0$  the lowest two singlet states are exactly degenerate at  $\phi = \pi$  as  $H'$  does not mix them in any order<sup>26</sup>. We thus use the non-degenerate Rayleigh-Schrödinger PT. In third order, we find

$$\delta E_S^{(3)} - \delta E_D^{(3)} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{U\Delta^2}{V^2} |\nu - 1|, \quad (4)$$

with  $\nu = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{U}$  the QD filling in units of particle number. For  $\nu = 1$ , a difference is found only in the fifth order and it

has a surprisingly simple form:

$$\delta E_S^{(5)} - \delta E_D^{(5)} = \frac{1}{8} \frac{U\Delta^4}{V^4}. \quad (5)$$

The energy corrections at all lower orders are exactly the same in both spin sectors. At fifth order, there are  $U^5$ ,  $U^3\Delta^2$  and  $U\Delta^4$  contributions, with only the terms of the last kind not cancelling out. Fig. 2(d) shows that Eq. (5) becomes a good approximation for  $V \gtrsim \Delta$ . Combining the third and fifth order equations gives the shape of the transition line (the chimney) as

$$|\nu - 1| = \Delta^2/4V^2. \quad (6)$$

*Residual interaction.*—At large  $V$ , the  $d$  and  $b(0)$  orbitals are equally strongly coupled in S and D states and, counter-intuitively, it is the state of the antisymmetric orbital  $a(0)$  (the number of quasiparticles it contains) that differentiates them via higher order processes. This residual interaction is a kind of blocking effect<sup>27</sup>: pairing processes are ineffective for orbitals occupied by a single quasiparticle, leading to different combinatorial prefactors that result in the non-zero fifth order energy difference.<sup>28</sup> Note that the energy difference only appears for  $U \neq 0$ , see Eq. (5). This confirms that the doublet is stabilized by an effective interaction between the QP screening the QD local moment and the free QP. In the non-interacting resonant limit ( $U = 0$ ,  $\epsilon = 0$ ) the completely proximitized QD level is occupied by a Cooper pair (Andreev bound state) and there is only one free QP in the doublet state. At  $\phi = \pi$  the singlet and doublet states are then exactly degenerate. An experimental observation of a doublet chimney thus directly implies an interacting QD level.

We note that an analogous phenomenon of persistent doublet GSs is also found in the hard-gap Anderson impurity model<sup>29–35</sup>, to which the QD JJ problem maps for  $\phi = \pi$ <sup>34,35</sup>. Such states have been interpreted in terms of a fixed-point effective Hamiltonian obtained in a NRG analysis of finite-size spectra<sup>30</sup> and through the analytical structure of the impurity self-energy which features a  $\delta$ -peak pinned at the Fermi level<sup>31,32</sup>. Interestingly, the fixed-point analysis in Ref. 30 was also based on a two-orbital description<sup>36</sup>. This clearly indicates that for this class of Hamiltonians, the strong-coupling limit cannot be reproduced with a single-orbital (ZBA) description of the bands. Our work explains this requirement in the context of superconducting systems from the perspective of the two electrons following the break-up of the Cooper pair due to exchange coupling to the QD: one electron forms the singlet state with the QD local moment, while the other either experiences residual interaction (to produce a doublet ground

state at  $\phi \sim \pi$ ) or goes away to infinity (to produce a singlet ground state at  $\phi \sim 0$ ).

*Discussion.*—The proposed model, Eq. (1), should be compared with the zero-bandwidth approximation (ZBA), obtained by setting  $t = 0$  and discarding  $a(l)$  and  $b(l)$ . ZBA is commonly used to explore the subgap spectrum<sup>37–44</sup>, as it is widely believed to reproduce all qualitative features correctly. This is, however, not the case in the strong-coupling limit for  $\phi \neq \pi$ . For the mirror-symmetric  $\eta = 0$ ,  $\phi = 0$  case, ZBA predicts a level crossing between two doublet states having different mirror symmetry as  $V$  is increased, which is at odds with numerical calculations for the full model<sup>45</sup> that clearly show that at  $\phi = 0$  the symmetry of the doublet state (which is a mixture of  $D_0$  and  $D_b$ ) does not change. In ZBA, the second QP is constrained to always sit in the proximal antisymmetric orbital  $a(0)$ , while in our model the finite hopping  $t$  allows it to tunnel to a distal symmetric orbital  $b(l)$ , while  $a(0)$  and  $a(l)$  form an inter-site singlet, thereby reducing the energy of  $D_b$  and restoring the expected symmetry as well as the correct order of states at  $\phi = 0$ . ZBA is only adequate for the  $\eta = 0$ ,  $\phi = \pi$  case.

*Conclusion.*—The multi-orbital approximation used in this work is a minimal model that makes it possible to correctly describe the effects of quasiparticles away from the QD. It provides insights into the spin-screening mechanisms and the nature of the doublet state for all coupling strengths and all values of phase bias  $\phi$ . That will be instrumental in the design of complex hybrid devices based on coupled spins and SC degrees of freedom, such as ASQs. For example, our results imply that the doublet spin can be partially redistributed into the SCs, and thus cannot be manipulated by experimental methods addressing the QD. We also explained the curious doublet chimney as a kind of blocking effect arising from the presence of a residual quasiparticle, located close to the QD at  $\phi = \pi$ .

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

LP thanks G3rman Blesio and Szczepan Gł3dzik for discussions and ideas. We acknowledge the support of the Slovenian Research Agency (ARRS) under P1-0416 and J1-3008 and of the Spanish Ministry of Science through Grants PID2021-125343NB-I00 and TED2021-130292B-C43 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033, "ERDF A way of making Europe" and European Union NextGenerationEU/PRTR. Support by the CSIC Interdisciplinary Thematic Platform (PTI+) on Quantum Technologies (PTI-QTEP+) is also acknowledged.

\* luka.pavesic@ijs.si

† ramon.aguado@csic.es

‡ rok.zitko@ijs.si

<sup>1</sup> M. H. Devoret and R. J. Schoelkopf, "Superconducting circuits for quantum information: An outlook," *Science* **339**, 1169–1174 (2013).

<sup>2</sup> Ram3n Aguado, "A perspective on semiconductor-based superconducting qubits," *Applied Physics Letters* **117**, 240501 (2020).

<sup>3</sup> T. W. Larsen, M. E. Gershenson, L. Casparis, A. Kringh3j, N. J. Pearson, R. P. G. McNeil, F. Kueemeth, P. Krogstrup, K. D. Petersson, and C. M. Marcus, "Parity-protected superconductor-semiconductor qubit," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 056801 (2020).

- <sup>4</sup> A. Zazunov, V. S. Shumeiko, E. N. Bratus', J. Lantz, and G. Wendin, "Andreev level qubit," *Physical Review Letters* **90** (2003), 10.1103/physrevlett.90.087003.
- <sup>5</sup> Nikolai M. Chtchelkatchev and Yu. V. Nazarov, "Andreev quantum dots for spin manipulation," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 226806 (2003).
- <sup>6</sup> C. Padurariu and Yu. V. Nazarov, "Theoretical proposal for superconducting spin qubits," *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 144519 (2010).
- <sup>7</sup> M. Hays, V. Fatemi, D. Bouman, J. Cerrillo, S. Diamond, K. Sereniak, T. Connolly, P. Krogstrup, J. Nygård, A. Levy Yeyati, A. Geresdi, and M. H. Devoret, "Coherent manipulation of an Andreev spin qubit," *Science* **373**, 430–433 (2021).
- <sup>8</sup> Arno Bargerbos, Marta Pita-Vidal, Rok Žitko, Jesús Ávila, Lukas J. Splitthoff, Lukas Grünhaupt, Jaap J. Westdorp, Christian K. Andersen, Yu Liu, Leo P. Kouwenhoven, Ramón Aguado, Angela Kou, and Bernard van Heck, "Singlet-Doublet Transitions of a Quantum Dot Josephson Junction Detected in a Transmon Circuit," *PRX Quantum* **3** (2022), 10.1103/prxquantum.3.030311.
- <sup>9</sup> Arno Bargerbos, Marta Pita-Vidal, Rok Žitko, Lukas J. Splitthoff, Lukas Grünhaupt, Jaap J. Westdorp, Yu Liu, Leo P. Kouwenhoven, Ramón Aguado, Christian Kraglund Andersen, Angela Kou, and Bernard van Heck, "Spectroscopy of spin-split Andreev levels in a quantum dot with superconducting leads," (2022), 10.48550/arxiv.2208.09314.
- <sup>10</sup> Marta Pita-Vidal, Arno Bargerbos, Rok Žitko, Lukas J. Splitthoff, Lukas Grünhaupt, Jaap J. Westdorp, Yu Liu, Leo P. Kouwenhoven, Ramón Aguado, Bernard van Heck, Angela Kou, and Christian Kraglund Andersen, "Direct manipulation of a superconducting spin qubit strongly coupled to a transmon qubit," *Nature Physics* (2023), 10.1038/s41567-023-02071-x.
- <sup>11</sup> Gediminas Kiršanskas, Moshe Goldstein, Karsten Flensberg, Leonid I. Glazman, and Jens Paaske, "Yu-Shiba-Rusinov states in phase-biased superconductor-quantum dot-superconductor junctions," *Physical Review B* **92**, 235422 (2015).
- <sup>12</sup> V Meden, "The anderson-josephson quantum dot—a theory perspective," *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **31**, 163001 (2019).
- <sup>13</sup> See Refs. 14 and 15 for a discussion on the quantification of the degree of screening in doublet states.
- <sup>14</sup> Cătălin Pașcu Moca, Ireneusz Weymann, Miklós Antal Werner, and Gergely Zaránd, "Kondo Cloud in a Superconductor," *Physical Review Letters* **127** (2021), 10.1103/physrevlett.127.186804.
- <sup>15</sup> Luka Pavešić, Marta Pita-Vidal, Arno Bargerbos, and Rok Žitko, "Impurity Knight shift in quantum dot Josephson junctions," arXiv:2212.07185 (2022).
- <sup>16</sup> Hiroyuki Shiba and Toshio Soda, "Superconducting tunneling through the barrier with paramagnetic impurities," *Progress of Theoretical Physics* **41**, 25–44 (1969).
- <sup>17</sup> K. A. Matveev, M. Gisselält, L. I. Glazman, M. Jonson, and R. I. Shekhter, "Parity-induced suppression of the Coulomb blockade of Josephson tunneling," *Physical Review Letters* **70**, 2940–2943 (1993).
- <sup>18</sup> A. V. Rozhkov and Daniel P. Arovas, "Josephson coupling through a magnetic impurity," *Physical Review Letters* **82**, 2788–2791 (1999).
- <sup>19</sup> Aashish A. Clerk and Vinay Ambegaokar, "Loss of  $\pi$ -junction behavior in an interacting impurity Josephson junction," *Physical Review B* **61**, 9109–9112 (2000).
- <sup>20</sup> F. Siano and R. Egger, "Josephson current through a nanoscale magnetic quantum dot," *Physical Review Letters* **93** (2004), 10.1103/physrevlett.93.047002.
- <sup>21</sup> Akira Oguri, Yoshihide Tanaka, and A. C. Hewson, "Quantum phase transition in a minimal model for the Kondo effect in a Josephson junction," *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan* **73**, 2494–2504 (2004).
- <sup>22</sup> Mahn-Soo Choi, Minchul Lee, Kicheon Kang, and W. Belzig, "Kondo effect and Josephson current through a quantum dot between two superconductors," *Physical Review B* **70** (2004), 10.1103/physrevb.70.020502.
- <sup>23</sup> Demin Yao and Jicong Shi, "Projection operator approach to time-independent perturbation theory in quantum mechanics," *American Journal of Physics* **68**, 278–281 (2000).
- <sup>24</sup> A. Kadlecová, M. Žonda, and T. Novotný, "Quantum dot attached to superconducting leads: Relation between symmetric and asymmetric coupling," *Physical Review B* **95** (2017), 10.1103/physrevb.95.195114.
- <sup>25</sup> R. Combescot, *Superconductivity: An introduction* (Cambridge University Press, 2022).
- <sup>26</sup> This is because of the enhanced symmetry at  $\phi = \pi$ : the system is symmetric under  $d_{\uparrow} \rightarrow d_{\downarrow}$ ,  $d_{\downarrow} \rightarrow d_{\uparrow}$  (without any sign change!) followed by complex conjugation. This operation reflects spin across the  $(xy)$  plane in the spin space. It is an antiunitary symmetry different from the time-reversal symmetry at  $\phi = 0$ , with  $d_{\uparrow} \rightarrow -d_{\downarrow}$ ,  $d_{\downarrow} \rightarrow d_{\uparrow}$ , which inverts spin.
- <sup>27</sup> Jan von Delft and D.C. Ralph, "Spectroscopy of discrete energy levels in ultrasmall metallic grains," *Physics Reports* **345**, 61–173 (2001).
- <sup>28</sup> All perturbation calculations as well as an extended collection of exact numerical results is available in the form of Wolfram Mathematica notebooks in the Supplemental material.
- <sup>29</sup> Katsuhiko Takegahara, Yukihiro Shimizu, and Osamu Sakai, "Quantum monte carlo and numerical renormalization group studies of magnetic impurities in nonmetallic systems," *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan* **61**, 3443–3446 (1992).
- <sup>30</sup> Kan Chen and C. Jayaprakash, "Kondo effect in fermi systems with a gap: A renormalization-group study," *Physical Review B* **57**, 5225–5234 (1998).
- <sup>31</sup> Martin R. Galpin and David E. Logan, "Anderson impurity model in a semiconductor," *Physical Review B* **77** (2008), 10.1103/physrevb.77.195108.
- <sup>32</sup> M. R. Galpin and D. E. Logan, "A local moment approach to the gapped anderson model," *The European Physical Journal B* **62**, 129–145 (2008).
- <sup>33</sup> C. P. Moca and A. Roman, "Quantum phase transition in a gapped Anderson model: A numerical renormalization group study," *Physical Review B* **81**, 235106 (2010).
- <sup>34</sup> Peter Zalom, Vladislav Pokorný, and Tomáš Novotný, "Spectral and transport properties of a half-filled Anderson impurity coupled to phase-biased superconducting and metallic leads," *Physical Review B* **103**, 035419 (2021).
- <sup>35</sup> Peter Zalom and Martin Žonda, "Subgap states spectroscopy in a quantum dot coupled to gapped hosts: Unified picture for superconductor and semiconductor bands," *Physical Review B* **105**, 205412 (2022).
- <sup>36</sup> Eq. (8) in Ref. 30, involving operators  $f$  and  $g$ .
- <sup>37</sup> Ian Affleck, Jean-Sébastien Caux, and Alexandre M. Zagoskin, "Andreev scattering and josephson current in a one-dimensional electron liquid," *Physical Review B* **62**, 1433–1445 (2000).
- <sup>38</sup> E. Vecino, A. Martín-Rodero, and A. Levy Yeyati, "Josephson current through a correlated quantum level: Andreev states and  $\pi$  junction behavior," *Physical Review B* **68** (2003), 10.1103/physrevb.68.035105.
- <sup>39</sup> F. S. Bergeret, A. Levy Yeyati, and A. Martín-Rodero, "Josephson effect through a quantum dot array," *Physical Review B* **76** (2007), 10.1103/physrevb.76.174510.
- <sup>40</sup> K. Grove-Rasmussen, G. Steffensen, A. Jellinggaard, M. H. Madsen, R. Žitko, J. Paaske, and J. Nygård, "Yu-Shiba-Rusinov screening of spins in double quantum dots," *Nature Communi-*

- cations **9** (2018), 10.1038/s41467-018-04683-x.
- <sup>41</sup> Juan Carlos Estrada Saldaña, Alexandros Vekris, Luka Pavešič, Rok Žitko, Kasper Grove-Rasmussen, and Jesper Nygård, “Two Bogoliubov quasiparticles entangled by a spin,” (2022), 10.48550/ARXIV.2203.00104.
- <sup>42</sup> Martin Žonda, Peter Zalom, Tomáš Novotný, Georgios Loukeris, Jakob Bätge, and Vladislav Pokorný, “Generalized atomic limit of a double quantum dot coupled to superconducting leads,” (2022).
- <sup>43</sup> C. Hermansen, A. Levy Yeyati, and J. Paaske, “Inductive microwave response of Yu-Shiba-Rusinov states,” *Physical Review B* **105** (2022), 10.1103/physrevb.105.054503.
- <sup>44</sup> Harald Schmid, Jacob F. Steiner, Katharina J. Franke, and Felix von Oppen, “Quantum Yu-Shiba-Rusinov dimers,” *Physical Review B* **105** (2022), 10.1103/physrevb.105.235406.
- <sup>45</sup> Rok Žitko, “Josephson potentials for single impurity Anderson impurity in a junction between two superconductors,” Zenodo dataset, 10.5281/zenodo.5874832 (2022).