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#### Abstract

We study the Josephson effect in a superconductor/altermagnet/superconductor (S/AM/S) junction. We find anomalous phenomena including $0-\pi$ transition as well as multi-nodal current-phase relations. Similar to $d$-wave superconductor, $d$-wave altermagnet can support $\varphi$ junction where free energy minima locate neither $\varphi=0$ nor $\pm \pi$ with double degeneracy. These properties can be tunable by parameters, e.g., the exchange energy, the orientation of crystal axis, the length, and the applied gate voltage of altermagnet. These rich features lead to accessible functionality of S/AM/S junction.


Introduction. - Recently, altermagnet (AM) [1-8] has emerged as a new class of magnetic materials distinct from ferro- and antiferromagnet. AM material exhibits spin-polarized Fermi surface resembling ferromagnet but with a collinear compensated magnetic ordering like antiferromagnet. AM has been found in various types of materials like metallic $\mathrm{RuO}_{2}[2,9], \mathrm{Mn}_{5} \mathrm{Si}_{3}$ [10], semiconducting/insulating $\mathrm{La}_{2} \mathrm{CuO}_{4}$ [11] and MnTe [12-14], and many more.

Due to the vanishing net macroscopic magnetization, AM provides a new benefit in combing with superconductors and may have intriguing implications. Now, research on the transport properties in junctions consisting of AM and superconductors become a hot topic [15-20]. In an $\mathrm{AM} / s$-wave superconductor (S) junction, studies show that Andreev reflection is sensitive to both the crystal orientation and the strength of the spin-splitting field $[15,16]$, as compared to ferromagnetic materials which are orientation independent. Another remarkable finding is that the Josephson currents through AM also display $0-\pi$ oscillations even without any net magnetization [18, 19]. Such phenomena are also explained by a phaseshift that depends on the crystalline axis of AM [17]. Furthermore, in S/AM/spin-triplet superconductor junctions, the $\phi_{0}$ phase as well as the $0-\pi$ transition can be realized as the unique interplay between altermagnetism and spin-triplet Cooper pairs [21].

It can be shown that in a $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{AM} / \mathrm{S}$ junction, the current-phase relation (CPR) has symmetry $I(\varphi)=$ $-I(-\varphi)$, which excludes the possibility of $\varphi_{0}$ junction. However, to the best of our knowledge, studies so far reveal only two types of $C P R$ in the $S / A M / S$ junction: 0 - and $\pi$ - junctions. Whether the altermagnetic ordering can generate more exotic CPR, like $\varphi$ junction [22], where the free-energy minimum of the $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{AM} / \mathrm{S}$ junction locates neither 0 nor $\pi$, can exist or not, remains an open question. It is noted that a $\varphi$ junction has a doubly degenerate ground state, which was experimentally observed in the Josephson junction with a current injector [23]. It has been shown that $\varphi$ junctions exhibit interesting physical properties such as non-Fraunhofer interference pattern under an external magnetic field [24, 25], half-integer


FIG. 1. (a) Schematic of planar S/AM/S Josephson junction. (b) The Josephson current for $\alpha=0, \alpha=\pi / 8$ and $\alpha=\pi / 4$. (c) and (d) are angle-resolved current for $\alpha=0$ and $\alpha=\pi / 4$, respectively. $\theta$ is the injection angle $\theta=\arcsin \left(k_{y} / k_{F}\right)$. We set $J / \mu=0.2, U_{G}=0, Z=0$ and $k_{F} L=20$ for all panels. Temperature is at $T=0.025 T_{c}$.

Shapiro steps [24], and fractional vortex [24, 26]. One important route to form $\varphi$ junction is the superposition of multiple 0 - and $\pi$-segments, such as ferromagnetic junctions [27-29] or d-wave Josephson junctions [24, 30-36]. For example, in the Josephson effect with $d$-wave pairings, the current component becomes either positive or negative depending on the injection angle of the quasiparticle [30, 31, 33, 37, 38]. Thus the total Josephson current as a superposition displays exotic CPR and temperature dependence of maximum Josephson current [30, 31, 38]. It is quite natural to anticipate that Josephson junction with $d$-wave AM has similar physical properties.

In this letter, we study the Josephson effect of a twodimensinal S/AM/S junction, as depicted in Fig.1(a). We find that the angle-resolved component of the Josephson current sensitively depends on the momentum parallel to the interface because of the alternating sign change
of magnetic ordering in the Brillouin zone. These components display a $0-\pi$ transition as the transport orientation varies, similar to the system with layered multiple 0 - and $\pi$-segments [39]. Therefore, the superposition of channels can result in anomalous CPR with multiple nodal points, as well as $\varphi$ junction. When we apply a gate voltage in AM to change the transmissivity of transport channels, the resulting CPR shows different types including $0, \pi$, and $\varphi$ junctions by changing the gate voltage. We can generate $\varphi$ junction in a simple way accessible by experiments in S/AM/S junction.

Model and Formalism. - Our model consists of a $d$ wave altermagnet between two semi-infinite superconductors as shown in Fig.1(a). We take the junction in $x$-direction where AM is located at $0<x<L$ with the length of AM $L$. In terms of the Nambu spinors $\hat{c}_{\boldsymbol{k}}=\left(c_{\boldsymbol{k} \uparrow}, c_{\boldsymbol{k} \downarrow}, c_{-\boldsymbol{k} \uparrow}^{\dagger}, c_{-\boldsymbol{k} \downarrow}^{\dagger}\right)^{T}$ with $\mathbf{k}=\left(k_{x}, k_{y}\right)$, the Hamiltonian of the system is written as $\mathcal{H}=\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}} \hat{c}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{\dagger} \mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \hat{c}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{k}}=\left(\frac{\hbar^{2} \mathbf{k}^{2}}{2 m}-\mu+U\right) \hat{\tau}_{z}+M_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{s}_{z} \hat{\tau}_{z}-\Delta \hat{s}_{y} \hat{\tau}_{y} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here, $\mu$ is the chemical potential and $\hat{s}_{i}\left(\hat{\tau}_{i}\right)$ is the Pauli matrix in spin (Nambu) space. $M_{\mathbf{k}}$ denotes the altermagnetism and without loss of generality, the Neel vector of AM is along $z$-axis,

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{\mathbf{k}}=J k_{F}^{-2}\left[\left(k_{x}^{2}-k_{y}^{2}\right) \cos 2 \alpha+2 k_{x} k_{y} \sin 2 \alpha\right] \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $J$ denotes the strength of the exchange energy of AM and $\alpha$ is the angle between the lobe of the direction of AM and normal to the interface, see Fig. 1 (a). We assume that $0<J<\mu / 2$ to have a well-defined Fermi surface [15]. $k_{F}$ is the wavevector $k_{F}=\sqrt{2 m \mu / \hbar^{2}}$. For $\alpha=0$, the magnetization has pure $d_{x^{2}-y^{2}}$-wave symmetry and for $\alpha=\pi / 4$, it has pure $d_{x y}$-wave symmetry. We assume the conventional spin-singlet $s$-wave pair potential, the spatial dependence of which is given by $\Delta(x)=$ $\Delta\left[e^{i \varphi} \Theta(-x)+\Theta(x-L)\right]$ where $\varphi$ is the macroscopic superconducting phase difference. We further adopt the BCS relation for its temperature dependence: $\Delta(T)=$ $\Delta_{0} \tanh \left(1.74 \sqrt{T_{c} / T-1}\right)$ with $\Delta_{0}=1.76 k_{B} T_{c}, T_{c}$ the critical temperature, and temperature $T=k_{B}{ }^{-1} \beta^{-1}$. $U=U_{G} \Theta(x) \Theta(L-x)+U_{I}[\delta(x)+\delta(x-L)]$, where $U_{G}$ is the gate voltage applied in the middle of the junction and $U_{I}$ is the barrier strength at the interface between S and AM.

The equilibrium Josephson current can be calculated by Furusaki-Tsukada formula [33, 40]. Due to the translational invarince along $y$-axis, the $y$-component of the wave vector $k_{y}=\sqrt{2 m \mu / \hbar^{2}} \sin \theta=k_{F} \sin \theta$ is preserved, where $\theta$ is the injection angle from $-\pi / 2$ to $\pi / 2$. For a fixed $\theta$, we consider the four types of local Andreev reflection coefficients by quasiparticle injections from the left S: a spin- $\uparrow(\downarrow)$ electron to a spin- $\downarrow(\uparrow)$ hole: $a_{e, \uparrow(\downarrow)}$ and a spin- $\uparrow(\downarrow)$ hole to a spin- $\downarrow(\uparrow)$ electron: $a_{h, \uparrow(\downarrow)}$. The


FIG. 2. Josephson currents and their free energies of $\varphi$ junction with a $d_{x y}$-AM: (a) Josephson current and (b) the corresponding free energy without gate voltage. $Z=0$ and the lengths are $k_{F} L=28.6$ (black) and 35.8 (red). (c) and (d) are Josephson current and free energy for fixed $k_{F} L=20$. The applied gate voltage is $U_{G}=0.2 \mu$ when $Z=0$ (blue) and $0.1 \mu$ when $Z=1$ (green). Other parameters are $\alpha=\pi / 4$, $J / \mu=0.2$ and $T=0.025 T_{c}$ for all panels.
detailed derivation of $a_{e, \uparrow(\downarrow)}$ and $a_{h, \uparrow(\downarrow)}$ is shown in Supplementary Materials. Then, the Josephson current is calculated by $I=\int_{-\pi / 2}^{\pi / 2} I(\theta) d \theta$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
I(\theta)=\frac{e \Delta \cos \theta}{2 \hbar \beta} \sum_{\omega_{n}, s} \frac{k_{n x}^{+}+k_{n x}^{-}}{\sqrt{\omega_{n}^{2}+\Delta^{2}}}\left[\frac{a_{e, s}}{k_{n x}^{+}}-\frac{a_{h, s}}{k_{n x}^{-}}\right] \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here, $\quad k_{n x}^{ \pm}=\sqrt{\frac{2 m}{\hbar^{2}}\left(\mu \pm i \sqrt{\omega_{n}^{2}+\Delta^{2}}\right)-k_{y}^{2}}$ are the wavevectors of S and $\omega_{n}$ is the Matsubara frequency $\omega_{n}=\pi k_{B} T(2 n+1),(n=0, \pm 1, \pm 2 \ldots)$. In this paper, we consider the short junction $L \ll \xi$ where $\xi=\hbar v_{F} / \Delta_{0}$ is the coherence length and choose $\Delta_{0} / \mu=0.01$. We finally normalize $I$ to $2 e R_{N} I /\left(\pi \Delta_{0}\right)$ where $R_{N}$ is the resistance of the junction in normal state, i.e., of the normal metal (N)/AM/N junction.

Symmetry analysis - Before showing the numerical results, we analyze the general characteristic of CPR from the symmetry point of view. We can decompose the Josephson current into a series of different orders of Josephson coupling

$$
\begin{equation*}
I(\varphi)=\sum_{n} I_{n} \sin (n \varphi)+J_{n} \cos (n \varphi) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

We consider the fourfold rotation operator $C_{4}$ corresponding to a rotation angle $\pi / 2$ with respect to $z$-axis which makes $k_{x} \rightarrow k_{y}, k_{y} \rightarrow-k_{x}, \hat{s}_{z} \rightarrow \hat{s}_{z}$. The altermagnetism flip its sign under $C_{4}$. Using the time reversal operation $\mathcal{T}=-i \hat{s}_{y} \mathcal{K}$ with $\mathcal{K}$ the complex conjugation operator, we can make $k_{x} \rightarrow-k_{x}, k_{y} \rightarrow-k_{y}, \hat{s}_{z} \rightarrow-\hat{s}_{z}$


FIG. 3. The length dependence of Josephson current for different crystallographic orientation of AM. Upper panels: current phase relation $I(\varphi)$ as a function of the junction length for (a) $\alpha=0$, (c) $\pi / 8$ and (e) $\pi / 4$. For a specific $L$, the current is normalized to the maximum value $I_{c}(L)=\max (I(\varphi, L))$. Lower panels: the maximum Josephson current corresponding to the upper ones: (b) $\alpha=0$, (d) $\pi / 8$ and (f) $\pi / 4$. Other parameters are $J / \mu=0.2, U_{G}=0, Z=0$. Temperature is at $T=0.025 T_{c}$.
and $\varphi \rightarrow-\varphi$. Thus a combined operation with $\mathcal{T}$ i.e., $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}=\mathcal{T} C_{4}$ will give rise to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{H}(\varphi) \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{-1}=\mathcal{H}(-\varphi) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, the energy spectrum $E$ and the free energy $F$ is an even function of $\varphi: F(\varphi)=F(-\varphi)$ while the Josephson current $I(\varphi) \propto \partial_{\varphi} F(\varphi)$ has the property $I(\varphi)=-I(-\varphi)$ for arbitrary $\alpha$. It prohibits the term $J_{n} \cos (n \varphi)$ in the CPR of our system in the absence of spin-orbit couplings [41]. We will point out that although the characteristic of CPR is conventional but high-harmonic term $I_{n} \sin (n \varphi)(n>1)$ can become dominant in the presence of altermangetism.

Anomalous $C P R$ - We calculate the current-phase relation of the Josephson junction in Fig. 1(b), with $k_{F} L=20(L=0.1 \xi)$, the temperature $T=0.025 T_{c}$ and without gate voltage $U_{g}=0$. Fig. 1(b) shows the orientation-dependent CPRs for a fixed altermagnetic strength $J=0.2 \mu$. It is seen that the CPRs strongly depend on the crystallographic orientation of AM. For $d_{x^{2}-y^{2}-\mathrm{AM}}(\alpha=0)$, the CPR exhibits 4 nodes in one period $\varphi \in[0,2 \pi)$ while the number of nodes becomes 8 for $d_{x y}$-AM $(\alpha=\pi / 4)$. When the orientation angle $\alpha$ is $\pi / 8$, quite standard sinusoidal CPR is reproduced.

To elucidate the origin of exotic CPRs in Fig. 1, we plot the angle-resolved Josephson current shown in Fig. 1(c) and (d) which corresponds to $d_{x^{2}-y^{2-}}$ and $d_{x y}$-AM, respectively. Clearly, for a fixed $\theta$, the direction of the current becomes either positive or negative depending on the angle. Except the nodal points at $\varphi=0$ or $\pi$ due to $I(\varphi)=-I(-\varphi)$ with $2 \pi$ periodicity, the angularaveraged current as a function of $\theta$ can also have nodes
when positive and negative contributions happen to cancel each other. The present multi-nodal CPR is a specific feature of the $d$-wave altermagnetism, where both the magnitude and the sign of the exchange field vary by changing $\theta$. The system corresponds to the multilayered 0 and $\pi \mathrm{S} /$ ferromagnet/S junction in the momentum space, while each layer can develop the CPR independently. In this sense, the $\theta$ dependence of CPRs can generate Josephson current with multiple nodes for $d$-wave altermagnetism.

Tunable $\varphi$ Josephson junction - Thus far we have shown that $0-\pi$ oscillation in the momentum space. Next, we explore the existence of $\varphi$ junction. We focus on the $d_{x y}$-AM since the angle-resolved CPR has the most drastic oscillations. We choose the same magnitude of $J$ as shown in Fig. 1 but change the junction length $L$. We find that the CPR is sensitive to the variation of $L$ and the $\varphi$ junction emerges. As an example, we plot the obtained $\varphi$ junctions for different values of $L$ in Fig. 2(a). We show the corresponding free energy $F(\varphi)$ in Fig. 2(b), where $F$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
I=\frac{2 e}{\hbar} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \varphi} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

We normalized the value of $F$ by $F_{0}=4 e^{2} R_{N} /\left(\pi \hbar \Delta_{0}\right)$. We have verified that the minimum value of free energy is located at two degenerate $\varphi \neq 0$ or $\pi$.

To see the feasibility that $\varphi$ junction can be widely formed in this junction, we consider the effect of gate voltage applied on AM. It is shown that the gate voltage changes the 0 junction, see the red curve in Fig. 1, to a $\varphi$ junction, see the blue curves in Figs. 2(c)(d).


FIG. 4. The altermagnetic field dependence of Josephson current. Upper panels show the current phase relation as a function of the AM strength $J$ while the lower ones are the corresponding maximum supercurrent. $J$ yields $0-\pi$ transitions and decaying maximum current $I_{c}$. The crystallographic orientations of AM are $\alpha=0$ in (a)(b), $\pi / 8$ in (c)(d) and $\pi / 4$ in (e)(f). We set $k_{F} L=20, U_{G}=0, Z=0$ and temperature $T=0.025 T_{c}$.

This approach is possible to generate $\varphi$ junction even in the presence of the interface barrier $Z=m U_{I} / \hbar^{2} k_{F}$, e.g., the green lines in Figs. 2 (c) (d). Our result can be explained intuitively that the wavevector of AM for each $k_{y}$ varies by tuning the gate voltage, due to the nature of momentum-dependent polarization of AM where $M_{\mathbf{k}}$ has both the magnitude and sign change. Since the momentum-resolved CPRs rely sensitively on $M_{\mathbf{k}}$, which produces 0- $\pi$ transition, the configuration of momentumresolved CPRs as well as the total Josephson current by summing all channels can easily be tunable by applying gate voltage. The merit of this tunability is a realization of control of the CPR in a simple geometry like S/AM/S junction with applying gate voltage on AM. The tunability of the $\varphi$ junction is also useful for the theoretical design of the quantum two-level systems available for future qubits [42].
$0-\pi$ oscillation - We have given several examples of $\varphi$ junction for some certain parameters. Thus the S/AM/S system can yield all three types of CPR, $0, \pi$, and $\varphi$. Next, we will explore the condition for the transition of CPR by changing junction parameters and discuss the condition for the emergence of $\varphi$ junction.

In Fig. 3, we show the critical current $I_{c}$ as a function of $L$ while keeping other parameters the same as Fig. 1. In upper panels, the current $I(\varphi, L)$ has been normalized to the critical current with the same length $I_{c}(L)$. It is shown that $0-\pi$ transition is induced by changing $L$. The $\operatorname{dip}$ of $I_{c}$ is generated by the $0-\pi$ transition. Compared to the lattice model [18] where the width along the $y$ axis is limited, our model incorporates more channels in the large width limit along the $y$-axis. Thus, we obtain
the smooth periodic behavior of $I_{c}$. Moreover, the period of this oscillation is longer for $d_{x^{2}-y^{2}}-\mathrm{AM}$ junction, see Fig. 3(b), and shorter for $d_{x y}$ - AM one, see Fig. 3(f). From the CPR, we find that the high-harmonic components appear more frequently in $d_{x y}-\mathrm{AM}$ junction for most values of $L$, as seen in Fig. 3(e). The existence of many high-harmonic components reduces the magnitude of $I_{c}$ but produces exotic CPRs. It can be explained that the positive and negative values of angle-resolved Josephson current likely cancel each other near the $0-\pi$ transition point. Since the momentum-resolved CPR varies asynchronously, the slight change of various parameters in the model can generate neither 0 nor $\pi$ junction. On the other hand, in S/ferromagnet/S junctions where momentum-resolved CPR behaves almost synchronously close to the $0-\pi$ transition point for varying parameters, the system becomes either 0 or $\pi$ junction. We thus conclude that the anomalous $\varphi$ dependence of the Josephson current can occur in an AM junction near the $0-\pi$ transition point due to the alternating magnetic orders in momentum space.

In Fig. 4, we show the critical current as a function of $J$ while keeping other parameters the same as Fig. 1. We find that not only the junction length but also the strength of AM $J$ can induce $0-\pi$ transition. We see a clear dip as a sign of the $0-\pi$ transition. It is also found that as $J$ becomes larger, $0-\pi$ transition occurs more frequently. For $d_{x y}$-AM junction, the CPR becomes very far from the conventional sinusoidal one near the $0-\pi$ transition driven by $J$. From this result, we can conclude that the CPR depends sensitively on the magnitude of the exchange coupling of AM.

Conclusions. - To summarize, we have studied the Josephson effect in a superconductor/altermagnet/superconductor junction. It is found that anomalous phenomena including $0-\pi$ transition as well as multi-nodal current-phase relations appear. We can design $\varphi$ junction by tuning the exchange coupling, the orientation of crystal axis, the length, and the applied gate voltage of altermagnet. These rich features serve as a guide to designing quantum two-level systems with large tunability in Josephson systems.

In this letter, we focus on conventional spin-singlet $s$ wave superconductor. It is much more interesting to consider topological superconductor like $d$-wave or $p$-wave superconductor junctions since zero energy surface Andreev bound states can generate a zero bias conductance peak (ZBCP) [33, 43]. Actually, the non-monotonic temperature dependence of Josephson current [30, 31, 38] was observed in experiments [35, 36, 44]. Since the ZBCP has been also predicted in $d$-wave altermagnet junctions, it is interesting to study $d$-wave superconductor / altermagnet / $d$-wave superconductor junctions. Recently, altermagnetism is shown to produce topological superconductors [45-49] and it is of interest to study the topological Josephson effect with altermagnet in the future.
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## S1. Details of the model

Here we provide details concerning the method which we used in the calculations of Josephson current in the main text.

On the left S region $x<0$, we solve all eigenvectors of $\mathcal{H}: A_{1 \sigma} e^{i k_{x}^{+} x+i k_{y} y}, A_{2 \sigma} e^{-i k_{x}^{-} x+i k_{y} y}, A_{3 \sigma} e^{-i k_{x}^{+} x+i k_{y} y}$ and $A_{4 \sigma} e^{i k_{x}^{-} x+i k_{y} y}$, where the spinors $A_{i=1-4, \sigma}$ are give by

$$
\begin{align*}
& A_{1 \uparrow}=A_{3 \uparrow}=\left[e^{i \varphi / 2}, 0,0, \gamma e^{-i \varphi / 2}\right]^{T},  \tag{S1}\\
& A_{2 \uparrow}=A_{4 \uparrow}=\left[\gamma e^{i \varphi / 2}, 0,0, e^{-i \varphi / 2}\right]^{T} \text {, }  \tag{S2}\\
& A_{1 \downarrow}=A_{3 \downarrow}=\left[0, e^{i \varphi / 2},-\gamma e^{-i \varphi / 2}, 0\right]^{T} \text {, }  \tag{S3}\\
& A_{2 \downarrow}=A_{4 \downarrow}=\left[0, \gamma e^{i \varphi / 2},-e^{-i \varphi / 2}, 0\right]^{T} \text {. } \tag{S4}
\end{align*}
$$

$\gamma$ is defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma=\frac{\Delta}{E+\sqrt{E^{2}-\Delta^{2}}} \tag{S5}
\end{equation*}
$$

The scattering processes $\Psi=\left[\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}, \psi_{3}, \psi_{4}\right]^{T}$ are described by

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Psi_{1}(x<0)=\left[A_{1 \uparrow} e^{i k_{x}^{+} x}+a_{e, \uparrow} A_{4 \uparrow} e^{i k_{x}^{-} x}+b_{e, \uparrow} A_{3 \uparrow} e^{-i k_{x}^{+} x}\right] e^{i k_{y} y},  \tag{S6}\\
& \Psi_{2}(x<0)=\left[A_{2 \uparrow} e^{-i k_{x}^{-} x}+a_{h, \uparrow} A_{3 \uparrow} e^{-i k_{x}^{+} x}+b_{h, \uparrow} A_{4 \uparrow} e^{i k_{x}^{-} x}\right] e^{i k_{y} y},  \tag{S7}\\
& \Psi_{3}(x<0)=\left[A_{1 \downarrow} e^{i k_{x}^{+} x}+a_{e, \downarrow} A_{4 \downarrow} e^{i k_{x}^{-} x}+b_{e, \downarrow} A_{3 \downarrow} e^{-i k_{x}^{+} x}\right] e^{i k_{y} y},  \tag{S8}\\
& \Psi_{4}(x<0)=\left[A_{2 \downarrow} e^{-i k_{x}^{-} x}+a_{h, \downarrow} A_{3 \downarrow} e^{-i k_{x}^{+} x}+b_{h, \downarrow} A_{4 \downarrow} e^{i k_{x}^{-} x}\right] e^{i k_{y} y} . \tag{S9}
\end{align*}
$$

In the AM region $0<x<L$, we seek the wavefunctions of electrons: $B_{1 \uparrow} e^{i k_{e, \uparrow}^{+} x+i k_{y} y}, B_{2 \uparrow} e^{i k_{e, \uparrow}^{-} x+i k_{y} y}, B_{3 \downarrow} e^{i k_{e, \downarrow}^{+} x+i k_{y} y}$, $B_{4 \downarrow} e^{i k_{e, \downarrow}^{-} x+i k_{y} y}$, with

$$
\begin{align*}
& B_{1 \uparrow}=B_{2 \uparrow}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
1, & 0, & 0,
\end{array}\right]^{T}  \tag{S10}\\
& B_{3 \uparrow}=B_{4 \uparrow}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
0, & 1, & 0,
\end{array}\right]^{T} \tag{S11}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
k_{e, \uparrow}^{+} & =\frac{1}{\hbar+m \alpha_{2} / \hbar} \sqrt{2 m\left(\mu+U_{G}+E\right)\left(1+\frac{m \alpha_{2}}{\hbar^{2}}\right)-\hbar^{2} k_{y}^{2}+\frac{m^{2}\left(\alpha_{2}^{2}+\alpha_{1}^{2}\right) k_{y}^{2}}{\hbar^{2}}}-\frac{m \alpha_{1} k_{y}}{\hbar^{2}+m \alpha_{2}}  \tag{S12}\\
k_{e, \uparrow}^{-} & =-\frac{1}{\hbar+m \alpha_{2} / \hbar} \sqrt{2 m\left(\mu+U_{G}+E\right)\left(1+\frac{m \alpha_{2}}{\hbar^{2}}\right)-\hbar^{2} k_{y}^{2}+\frac{m^{2}\left(\alpha_{2}^{2}+\alpha_{1}^{2}\right) k_{y}^{2}}{\hbar^{2}}-\frac{m \alpha_{1} k_{y}}{\hbar^{2}+m \alpha_{2}}}  \tag{S13}\\
k_{e, \downarrow}^{+} & =\frac{1}{\hbar-m \alpha_{2} / \hbar} \sqrt{2 m\left(\mu+U_{G}+E\right)\left(1-\frac{m \alpha_{2}}{\hbar^{2}}\right)-\hbar^{2} k_{y}^{2}+\frac{m^{2}\left(\alpha_{2}^{2}+\alpha_{1}^{2}\right) k_{y}^{2}}{\hbar^{2}}}+\frac{m \alpha_{1} k_{y}}{\hbar^{2}-m \alpha_{2}}  \tag{S14}\\
k_{e, \downarrow}^{-} & =-\frac{1}{\hbar-m \alpha_{2} / \hbar} \sqrt{2 m\left(\mu+U_{G}+E\right)\left(1-\frac{m \alpha_{2}}{\hbar^{2}}\right)-\hbar^{2} k_{y}^{2}+\frac{m^{2}\left(\alpha_{2}^{2}+\alpha_{1}^{2}\right) k_{y}^{2}}{\hbar^{2}}}+\frac{m \alpha_{1} k_{y}}{\hbar^{2}-m \alpha_{2}} \tag{S15}
\end{align*}
$$

The wavefunctions of holes in AM are given by $C_{1 \uparrow} e^{i k_{h, \uparrow}^{+} x+i k_{y} y}, C_{2 \uparrow} e^{i k_{h, \uparrow}^{-} x+i k_{y} y}, C_{3 \downarrow} e^{i k_{h, \downarrow}^{+} x+i k_{y} y}, C_{4 \downarrow} e^{i k_{h, \downarrow}^{-} x+i k_{y} y}$, with

$$
\begin{align*}
& C_{1 \uparrow}=C_{2 \uparrow}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
0, & 0, & 1,
\end{array}\right]^{T},  \tag{S16}\\
& C_{3 \downarrow}=C_{4 \downarrow}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
0, & 0 & 0,
\end{array}\right]^{T}, \tag{S17}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
& k_{h, \uparrow}^{+}=\frac{1}{\hbar+m \alpha_{2} / \hbar} \sqrt{2 m\left(\mu+U_{G}-E\right)\left(1+\frac{m \alpha_{2}}{\hbar^{2}}\right)-\hbar^{2} k_{y}^{2}+\frac{m^{2}\left(\alpha_{2}^{2}+\alpha_{1}^{2}\right) k_{y}^{2}}{\hbar^{2}}-\frac{m \alpha_{1} k_{y}}{\hbar^{2}+m \alpha_{2}},}  \tag{S18}\\
& k_{h, \uparrow}^{-}=-\frac{1}{\hbar+m \alpha_{2} / \hbar} \sqrt{2 m\left(\mu+U_{G}-E\right)\left(1+\frac{m \alpha_{2}}{\hbar^{2}}\right)-\hbar^{2} k_{y}^{2}+\frac{m^{2}\left(\alpha_{2}^{2}+\alpha_{1}^{2}\right) k_{y}^{2}}{\hbar^{2}}-\frac{m \alpha_{1} k_{y}}{\hbar^{2}+m \alpha_{2}},}  \tag{S19}\\
& k_{h, \downarrow}^{+}=\frac{1}{\hbar-m \alpha_{2} / \hbar} \sqrt{2 m\left(\mu+U_{G}-E\right)\left(1-\frac{m \alpha_{2}}{\hbar^{2}}\right)-\hbar^{2} k_{y}^{2}+\frac{m^{2}\left(\alpha_{2}^{2}+\alpha_{1}^{2}\right) k_{y}^{2}}{\hbar^{2}}}+\frac{m \alpha_{1} k_{y}}{\hbar^{2}-\alpha_{2} m},  \tag{S20}\\
& k_{h, \downarrow}^{-}=-\frac{1}{\hbar-m \alpha_{2} / \hbar} \sqrt{2 m\left(\mu+U_{G}-E\right)\left(1-\frac{m \alpha_{2}}{\hbar^{2}}\right)-\hbar^{2} k_{y}^{2}+\frac{m^{2}\left(\alpha_{2}^{2}+\alpha_{1}^{2}\right) k_{y}^{2}}{\hbar^{2}}}+\frac{m \alpha_{1} k_{y}}{\hbar^{2}-\alpha_{2} m} . \tag{S21}
\end{align*}
$$

Here, we denote $\alpha_{1}$ and $\alpha_{2}$ as

$$
\begin{align*}
& k_{F}^{2} \alpha_{1}=2 J \sin 2 \alpha,  \tag{S22}\\
& k_{F}^{2} \alpha_{2}=2 J \cos 2 \alpha . \tag{S23}
\end{align*}
$$

Thus, the scattering waves in AM are

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Psi_{1}(0<x<L)=\left[s_{1,1} B_{1 \uparrow} e^{i k_{e, \uparrow}^{+} x}+s_{1,2} B_{2 \uparrow} e^{i k_{e, \uparrow}^{-} x}+s_{1,3} C_{3 \downarrow} e^{i k_{h, \downarrow}^{+} x}+s_{1,4} C_{4 \downarrow} e^{i k_{h, \downarrow}^{-} x}\right] e^{i k_{y} y},  \tag{S24}\\
& \Psi_{2}(0<x<L)=\left[s_{2,1} B_{1 \uparrow} e^{i k_{e, \uparrow}^{+} x}+s_{2,2} B_{2 \uparrow} e^{i k_{e, \uparrow}^{-} x}+s_{2,3} C_{3 \downarrow} e^{i k_{h, \downarrow}^{+} x}+s_{2,4} C_{4 \downarrow} e^{i k_{h, \downarrow}^{-} x}\right] e^{i k_{y} y},  \tag{S25}\\
& \Psi_{3}(0<x<L)=\left[s_{3,1} B_{3 \downarrow} e^{i k_{e, \downarrow}^{+} x}+s_{3,2} B_{4 \downarrow} e^{i k_{e, \downarrow}^{-} x}+s_{3,3} C_{1 \uparrow} e^{i k_{h, \uparrow}^{+} x}+s_{3,4} C_{2 \uparrow} e^{i k_{h, \uparrow}^{-} x}\right] e^{i k_{y} y},  \tag{S26}\\
& \Psi_{4}(0<x<L)=\left[s_{4,1} B_{3 \downarrow} e^{i k_{e, \downarrow}^{+} x}+s_{4,2} B_{4 \downarrow} e^{i k_{e, \downarrow}^{-} x}+s_{4,3} C_{1 \uparrow} e^{i k_{h, \uparrow}^{+} x}+s_{4,4} C_{2 \uparrow} e^{i k_{h, \uparrow}^{-} x}\right] e^{i k_{y} y} . \tag{S27}
\end{align*}
$$

In the right S region $(x>L)$, the eigenvectors of $\mathcal{H}$ are $D_{1 \sigma} e^{i k_{x}^{+} x+i k_{y} y}, D_{2 \sigma} e^{-i k_{x}^{-} x+i k_{y} y}, D_{3 \sigma} e^{-i k_{x}^{+} x+i k_{y} y}$ and $D_{4 \sigma} e^{i k_{x}^{-} x+i k_{y} y}$, where $D_{i=1-4, \sigma}$ are given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& D_{1 \uparrow}=D_{3 \uparrow}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
1, & 0 & 0, \gamma
\end{array}\right]^{T},  \tag{S28}\\
& D_{2 \uparrow}=D_{4 \uparrow}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
\gamma, & 0 & 0, \\
1
\end{array}\right]^{T} \text {, }  \tag{S29}\\
& D_{1 \downarrow}=D_{3 \downarrow}=\left[\begin{array}{llll}
0, & 1, & -\gamma, & 0
\end{array}\right]^{T} \text {, }  \tag{S30}\\
& D_{2 \downarrow}=D_{4 \downarrow}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
0, \gamma, & -1, & 0
\end{array}\right]^{T} \text {. } \tag{S31}
\end{align*}
$$

The scattering waves in this region are

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Psi_{1}(x<0)=\left[c_{1} D_{1 \uparrow} e^{i k_{x}^{+} x}+d_{1} D_{2 \uparrow} e^{-i k_{x}^{-} x}\right] e^{i k_{y} y},  \tag{S32}\\
& \Psi_{2}(x<0)=\left[c_{2} D_{1 \uparrow} e^{i k_{x}^{+} x}+d_{2} D_{2 \uparrow} e^{-i k_{x}^{-} x}\right] e^{i k_{y} y},  \tag{S33}\\
& \Psi_{3}(x<0)=\left[c_{3} D_{1 \downarrow} e^{i k_{x}^{+} x}+d_{3} D_{2 \downarrow} e^{-i k_{x}^{-} x}\right] e^{i k_{y} y},  \tag{S34}\\
& \Psi_{4}(x<0)=\left[c_{4} D_{1 \downarrow} e^{i k_{x}^{+} x}+d_{4} D_{2 \downarrow} e^{-i k_{x}^{-x}}\right] e^{i k_{y} y .} . \tag{S35}
\end{align*}
$$



FIG. S1. Gate-tuned Josephson current (a) and the corresponding free energy (b). We set $J=0.2 \mu, \alpha=0, k_{F} L=20, Z=0$ and $T=0.025 T_{c}$.


FIG. S2. Gate-tuned Josephson current (a) and the corresponding free energy (b). We set $J=0.2 \mu, \alpha=\pi / 4, k_{F} L=20$, $Z=0$ and $T=0.025 T_{c}$.

The scattering coefficients $a_{e, \sigma}, a_{h, \sigma}, b_{e, \sigma}, b_{h, \sigma}, s_{i, j}, c_{i}$ and $d_{i}$ are solved by the following boundary conditions

$$
\begin{align*}
\Psi_{x=0^{+}} & =\Psi_{x=0^{-}}  \tag{S36}\\
\left(\frac{\hbar^{2}}{m}+\alpha_{2} \hat{s}_{z}\right)\left(-i \partial_{x} \Psi\right)_{x=0^{+}}-\frac{\hbar^{2}}{m}\left(-i \partial_{x} \Psi\right)_{x=0^{-}} & =\left(-\alpha_{1} k_{y} \hat{s}_{z}-2 i U_{I}\right) \Psi_{x=0}  \tag{S37}\\
\Psi_{x=L^{+}} & =\Psi_{x=L^{-}}  \tag{S38}\\
\frac{\hbar^{2}}{m}\left(-i \partial_{x} \Psi\right)_{x=L^{+}}-\left(\frac{\hbar^{2}}{m}+\alpha_{2} \hat{s}_{z}\right)\left(-i \partial_{x} \Psi\right)_{x=L^{-}} & =\left(\alpha_{1} k_{y} \hat{s}_{z}-2 i U_{I}\right) \Psi_{x=L} \tag{S39}
\end{align*}
$$

## S2. Additional results for gate tunable CPRs

In the main text, we have obtained the gate-tunable $\varphi$-junction for specific parameters. Here, we present more results. By gradually changing the gate voltage, we find that the $S / A M / S$ junction can evolve among 0 -, $\pi$ - and $\varphi$-junction. The applied gate voltage can alter the altermagnetic field experienced by quasiparticles with a fixed transverse momentum $k_{y}$. Therefore, the angle-resolved CPR can be greatly changed by a the variation of a gate voltage. It has been known from the main text that the angle-resolved Josephson current is a rapid oscillatory function of $k_{y}$. Thus it is expected that this system provides multiple gate-tunable 0 and $\pi$ channels and is a promising platform to realize a $\phi$-junction.


FIG. S3. Gate-tuned Josephson current (a) and the corresponding free energy (b). We set $J=0.2 \mu, \alpha=\pi / 4, k_{F} L=30$, $Z=0$ and $T=0.025 T_{c}$.


FIG. S4. Gate-tuned Josephson current (a) and the corresponding free energy (b). We set $J=0.08 \mu, \alpha=\pi / 4, k_{F} L=20$, $Z=1$ and $T=0.025 T_{c}$.

In Fig. S1, we show the current phase relation and the corresponding free energy by changing the gate voltage $U_{G}$ with a $d_{x^{2}-y^{2}-A M . ~ I t ~ c a n ~ b e ~ s e e n ~ i n ~ F i g . ~ S 1(a) ~ t h a t ~ n o t ~ o n l y ~ t h e ~ m a g n i t u d e ~ b u t ~ t h e ~ c h a r a c t e r i s t i c ~ o f ~ J o s e p h s o n ~}^{\text {a }}$ current varies sensitively by increasing the gate voltage. As clearly seen from the free energy in Fig. S1(b), the system is $\pi$-junction for $U_{G}$ ranges from 0 to 0.7 and becomes 0 -junction for $U_{G} / \mu=0.8$ to 1.0 . Thus the gate voltage provides a convenient way to obtain the $0-\pi$ transition in our system.

Next, we show that the $\varphi$-junction can emerge for the $d_{x y}$ - AM case by changing the gate voltage. In Fig. S2, we plot the current phase relation and the corresponding free energy. It is seen that although the junction is 0 -junction without a gate voltage, it evolves to $\varphi$-junction for $U_{G} / \mu=0.2,0.4,0.5$, and 0.7 . The gate can also drive the system to a $\pi$ junction, e.g., $U_{G} / \mu=0.9$.

We also obtain $\varphi$-junction for various combination of parameters in our system. In Fig. S3, we choose junction length $k_{F} L=30$ with a $d_{x y}$-AM while keep other parameters the same as those in Fig. S2. We can still observe the generation of $\varphi$-junction for finite gate voltages: $U_{G} / \mu=0.4,0.6$ and 0.8 . As $Z$ is finite, we provide an example as shown in Fig. S4. It can be seen that $\varphi$-junction is produced at a finite gate voltage $U_{G}=0.8 \mu$.

