

Non-reciprocal frustrations: time crystalline order-by-disorder phenomenon and a spin-glass-like state

Ryo Hanai

*Asia Pacific Center for Theoretical Physics, Pohang 37673, Korea and
Department of Physics, Pohang University of Science and Technology, Pohang 37673, Korea*

(Dated: August 19, 2022)

Having conflicting goals often leads to frustrations. The conflict occurs, for example, in systems that cannot minimize simultaneously all interactions between the objects, a situation known as geometrical frustration. A typical feature of these systems is the presence of accidental ground state degeneracy that gives rise to a rich variety of unusual phenomena such as order-by-disorder phenomena and spin glasses. In this article, we show that a *dynamical* counterpart of these phenomena may arise from a fundamentally different, *non-equilibrium* source of conflict: non-reciprocal interactions. We show that non-reciprocal systems with anti-symmetric coupling generically generate marginal orbits that can be regarded as a dynamical counterpart of accidental degeneracy, due to the emerging Liouville-type theorem. These “accidental degeneracy” of orbits are shown to often get “lifted” by stochastic noise or weak random disorder to give rise to order-by-disorder phenomena with the peculiarity that the emerging state usually has a time crystalline order. We further report numerical evidence of a state analogous to a spin glass induced by non-reciprocal frustrations that exhibit aging and a power-law temporal relaxation associated with a short-ranged spatial correlation. Our work provides an unexpected link between a seemingly unrelated field of complex magnetic materials and non-reciprocal matter.

The concept of geometrical frustration was formulated by Gerard Toulouse [1] to describe magnetic systems that cannot satisfy the spins’ “desire” to minimize all interactions [2]. This means that at least part of the spins is forced to compromise for global optimization. As there can be many ways to achieve this, geometrical frustrations often lead to the generation of accidentally degenerate ground states (Figs. 1(a),(b)). Not only that this makes the system extremely sensitive to external perturbations but also gives rise to various exotic phenomena, such as order-by-disorder phenomena (OBDP) [3–7], spin glass [8–14], spin ice [15], and quantum [16] and classical [5, 6] spin liquids.

In this article, we argue that non-reciprocal interactions — interactions that break the action-reaction symmetry, which arises ubiquitously in a wide range of science [17–30] — provide a *non-equilibrium* source of frustrations that gives rise to a *dynamical* counterpart of phenomena occurring in geometrically frustrated systems (Fig. 1(c)). It becomes intuitively clear that non-reciprocal interactions can cause frustrations, by considering the following example: agent A attracts agent B but B repulses A. In this situation, there are no configurations that can make both the agents ‘happy’, in an analogous situation to a geometrically frustrated case. There is a crucial difference, however, that these agents typically start a “chase-and-runaway” motion that cannot be described in terms of an energy minimization problem [28], instead of settling down to a compromised configuration as in the geometrical frustration case. As such, the two types of frustrations seem to have no direct connection in their phenomenology beyond the vague resemblance mentioned above.

We claim in this article that, surprisingly, there is actually a *direct* analogy between the two types of frustra-

tions, despite their fundamental differences. Our claim is based on the observation that non-reciprocal interactions with asymmetric coupling generically give rise to marginal orbits (Fig. 1(c)) due to the emerging Liouville-type theorem, which can be regarded as a dynamical counterpart of accidentally degenerate ground states. We show that these “accidentally degenerate” marginal orbits generically get lifted by stochastic noise or weak random disorder, giving rise to a dynamical counterpart of the OBDP usually associated with time-crystalline order. We finally study a randomly coupled spin chain with non-reciprocal frustrations but with *no* geometrical frustration, to find numerical evidence that a state reminiscent of spin glass emerges.

I. THE EMERGENCE OF “ACCIDENTAL DEGENERACY” OF ORBITS

In this article, for concreteness, we consider dissipatively coupled classical XY spin systems with their spin angle $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N)$ dynamics governed by

$$\dot{\theta}_i = - \sum_{j=1}^N J_{ij} \sin(\theta_i - \theta_j), \quad (1)$$

which generically has a non-reciprocal coupling $J_{ij} \neq J_{ji}$. The effect of stochastic noise will be addressed later.

Let us first briefly review the reciprocal coupling case $J_{ij} = J_{ji}$ with and without geometrical frustrations. In such systems, Eq. (1) can be described using a derivative of a potential $V(\theta)$ as $\dot{\theta}_i = -\partial V(\theta)/\partial \theta_i$, where

$$V(\theta) = - \sum_{i,j} J_{ij} \cos(\theta_i - \theta_j). \quad (2)$$

arXiv:2208.08577v1 [cond-mat.dis-nn] 18 Aug 2022




Figure 1. **Geometrical and non-reciprocal frustration and the emergence of “accidental degeneracy” of orbits.** The top panel exemplifies systems with (a) no frustrations, (b) geometrical frustrations, and (c) non-reciprocal frustrations. The bottom panel schematically describes their typical orbits in phase space. Here, for clarity of the figure, we have regarded the orbits that are identical up to global rotation (which trivially exist due to global rotation symmetry) as the same orbit. (a) In frustration-free systems, since fixing the angle of one spin would determine all other spin configurations to minimize the energy of the system, the ground state is unique up to global symmetry. As a result, the system converges into a unique fixed point (red point). (b) Geometrically frustrated systems, on the other hand, often exhibit accidentally degenerate ground states because of the existence of underconstrained degrees of freedom. These degenerate ground states correspond to marginal fixed points in the language of dynamical systems (blue line). (c) In non-reciprocally frustrated systems with perfect non-reciprocity $J_{ij} = -J_{ji}$, the spins start a chase-and-runaway motion that corresponds to marginal orbits arising due to Liouville’s theorem (Eq. (3)). These can be regarded as the dynamical counterpart of the ground state accidental degeneracy of geometrically frustrated systems.

As a result, the system is driven towards the (local) minimum of the potential V .

Frustration-free systems are systems that have ground states that minimize the potential V of Eq. (2) *term by term* [1] (Fig. 1(a)). Since fixing one spin angle determines all other configurations, these systems only have a ground state (or a fixed point, in the language of dynamical systems) degeneracy that is trivially due to the rotation symmetry of the dynamical system. In contrast, in geometrically frustrated systems (Fig. 1(b)), there are no configurations that simultaneously minimize all the interaction terms [1]. This situation often yields accidental degeneracy of ground states that do not stem from their underlying symmetry [2]. Which ground state (or marginal fixed point) the system ultimately converges to depends on its initial condition.

We show below that a dynamical counterpart of these accidental degeneracy arises generically in non-reciprocally coupled systems $J_{ij} \neq J_{ji}$, or more specifically, in systems with anti-symmetric coupling $J_{ij} = -J_{ji}$ (which we refer to below as ‘*perfectly non-reciprocal*’). In this situation, the distribution function $\rho(\theta)$ is found to stay constant along any trajectory (See Methods for the proof and generalizations to more general models.),

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t} + \sum_i \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial\theta_i} \dot{\theta}_i = 0, \quad (3)$$

in a similar manner to Liouville’s theorem of Hamilto-

nian systems. (See Ref. [31] for a similar relation known in the context of game theories.) The conservation of phase volume $dV = \rho \prod_i d\theta_i$ of Eq. (3) means that the dynamics are dissipationless and the sum of all Lyapunov exponents is zero $\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i = 0$. In the absence of chaos $\lambda_i \leq 0$, this makes all Lyapunov exponents vanish $\lambda_i = 0$, which, generically, implies the emergence of marginal orbits described schematically in Fig. 1(c). Which orbit the system actually takes depends on the initial condition, in an identical situation to the geometrically frustrated case with accidental degeneracy.

We interpret these as the emergence of “accidental degeneracy” caused by non-reciprocal frustrations. This degeneracy is accidental, in the sense that it is not originated from the global symmetry or topology of the dynamical system (Eq. (1)), in direct analogy to that of geometrical frustrations. The difference lies both in its physical origin and the consequence: in the non-reciprocal (geometrical) frustration case, the degeneracy comes from Liouville’s theorem (underconstrained degrees of freedom [2, 5, 6]) and the resulting marginal orbits are typically time-dependent (marginal fixed points).

Take an $N = 2$ perfectly non-reciprocal system $J_{12} = -J_{21} = J_-$ as the simplest example [28, 32]. One can readily find an analytical solution to the center-of-mass angle $\Theta = (\theta_1 + \theta_2)/2$ and the difference $\Delta\theta = \theta_1 - \theta_2$




Figure 2. **Marginal orbits in perfectly non-reciprocal three spin system.** We set $J_{12} = -J_{21} = 3$, $J_{23} = -J_{32} = -1$, $J_{31} = -J_{13} = 2$.

for a given initial condition $\theta_{i=1,2}(t=0)$ as

$$\Theta(t) = -J_- t \sin[\Delta\theta(0)], \quad \Delta\theta(t) = \Delta\theta(0). \quad (4)$$

As expected, the system exhibits marginal periodic orbits, where the speed and direction of the drift of the center-of-mass angle Θ are determined by the initial condition. The numerical solution for $N = 3$ is depicted in Fig. 2 as another example, where we similarly find marginal periodic orbits.

Accidental degeneracy is usually associated with fine-tuning of parameters. Here, in the non-reciprocal frustration case, the emergence of marginal orbits relies on the fine-tuning of the coupling to be perfectly non-reciprocal $J_{ij} = -J_{ji}$. Once the coupling strength deviates from this limit, the marginal orbits would generically turn into (un)stable orbits, corresponding to the ‘lifting’ of degeneracy. This situation is in parallel to the geometrical frustration case where the degeneracy is contingent on the coupling strength being identical $J_{ij} = J$ [2].

II. TIME CRYSTALLINE ORDER-BY-DISORDER PHENOMENA

Having established that non-reciprocal interaction gives an alternative route from geometrical frustrations to generate ‘accidental degeneracy’ (marginal orbits), we ask below how they affect the many-body properties of the system. In geometrically frustrated systems, a paradigmatic example of a phenomenon emerging from such accidental degeneracy is the OBDP [3–7]. As the degeneracy generated by frustration is not protected by symmetry nor topology, it is fragile, not only against external perturbations but also against disorders such as thermal noise or weak random potential. As a result, the degeneracy often gets lifted and ends up, perhaps counter-intuitively, in a more ordered state than that of the clean system. This is known as the OBDP.

We show below that an analogous phenomenon arises in the non-reciprocally frustrated many-body systems as well, with the peculiarity that the emerging ordered state

is typically time-periodic, a.k.a. the time crystals [33, 34]. To set up the stage, consider a system where the spins are grouped into a few communities (labeled by $a, b = A, B, C, \dots$) that each consist of N_a spins and are now subject to stochastic noise η_i^a ,

$$\dot{\theta}_i^a = - \sum_b \frac{j_{ab}}{N_b} \sum_{j=1}^{N_b} \sin(\theta_i^a - \theta_j^b) + \eta_i^a, \quad (5)$$

where $\langle \eta_i^a(t) \rangle = 0$, $\langle \eta_i^a(t) \eta_j^b(t') \rangle = \sigma \delta_{ab} \delta_{ij} \delta(t - t')$. For simplicity, we have restricted ourselves to the case with all-to-all coupling but this assumption should not be crucial. We consider the case where the intra-community couplings are ferromagnetic $j_{aa} > 0$, while the inter-community couplings may be non-reciprocal $j_{ab} \neq j_{ba} (a \neq b)$. The former causes the intra-community spins to order ferromagnetically at sufficiently weak noise strength, which is characterized by the order parameter $\psi_a(t) = (1/N_a) \sum_{i=1}^{N_a} e^{i\theta_i^a(t)} = r_a(t) e^{i\phi_a(t)}$ [35].

In the absence of noise $\sigma = 0$, all spins in the same community would eventually align ($\theta_i^a = \phi_a$) to give perfect magnetization $r_a = 1$. As a result, the spins in the same community will collectively behave as a macroscopic object that follows the same dynamics as Eq. (1),

$$\dot{\phi}_a(t) = - \sum_b j_{ab} \sin(\phi_a(t) - \phi_b(t)). \quad (6)$$

Therefore, as shown in the previous section, these macroscopic angles $\phi_a(t)$ exhibit marginal, ‘accidentally degenerate’ orbits when the inter-community couplings j_{ab} are chosen to have geometrical or non-reciprocal frustration. For example, in a geometrically frustrated system consisting of four communities ($a, b = A, B, C, D$) that interacts antiferromagnetically $j_{ab} < 0 (a \neq b)$ (Fig. 3(a)), the system relaxes to the accidentally degenerate ground states parameterized by a relative angle α illustrated in the inset of Fig. 3(a) (See Ref. [5, 6] and Methods). Similarly, systems with non-reciprocal frustrations with $j_{ab} = -j_{ba}$ exhibit time-dependent, marginal orbits $\phi(t) = (\phi_A(t), \phi_B(t), \dots)$. (See Fig. 3(b).)

Below, we show that this ‘accidental degeneracy’ generically gets ‘lifted’ by the stochastic noise, irrespective of whether it originated from geometrical or non-reciprocal frustrations. In the presence of noise, θ_i^a fluctuates around the macroscopic spin angle ϕ_a . At sufficiently weak noise strength, the distribution of $\delta\theta_i^a = \theta_i^a - \phi_a$ takes a Gaussian distribution (See Methods)

$$\rho_i^a(t, \delta\theta_i^a; \phi(t)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi} w_a(t; \phi(t))} e^{-(\delta\theta_i^a)^2 / w_a^2(t; \phi(t))} \quad (7)$$

with its width w_a given by,

$$w_a^2(t; \phi(t)) = \sigma \int_0^t d\tau e^{-2 \int_\tau^t d\tau' \sum_b j_{ab} \cos(\phi_a(\tau') - \phi_b(\tau'))}$$

for an initial condition with a perfectly magnetized state $\delta\theta_i^a(t=0) = 0$. Crucially, the width $w_a(\phi)$ of the fluctuations depends on which orbit $\phi(t)$ (among the ‘accidentally degenerate’ orbits) the system happened to take, in




Figure 3. Time crystalline order-by-disorder phenomena induced by non-reciprocal frustration. (a),(b) “Accidental degeneracy” of orbits in (a) geometrically and (b) non-reciprocally frustrated multi-community many-body systems. The large arrows represent the macroscopic angles ϕ_a that are composed of a macroscopic number of spins represented by smaller solid arrows. A geometrically frustrated four-community system illustrated in (a) exhibits an accidental degeneracy parameterized by a relative angle α . Similarly, a non-reciprocally frustrated two-community system illustrated in (b) exhibits marginal orbits parameterized by a relative angle $\Delta\phi$. These degeneracies are shown to get lifted by introducing disorder to the system. (c)-(e) Order-by-disorder phenomena in a non-reciprocally interacting two-community stochastic XY-model (Eq. (5)). (c) The phase difference $\Delta\phi$ dynamics. The solid (thin) line represents the dynamics in the presence (absence) of noise. (d) The time dependence of effective coupling strength $j_{ab}^*(\phi)$ (Eq. (9)). (e) Time evolution of ϕ_A, ϕ_B . In (c)-(e), we set $j_{AA} = j_{BB} = 3, j_{AB} = -j_{BA} = 1$, the noise strength $\sigma = 1.5$, and the number of spins $N_A = N_B = 2000$. The system “selects” $\Delta\phi_* = \pm\pi/2$ that satisfies $j_{AB}^*(\Delta\phi_*) = -j_{BA}^*(\Delta\phi_*)$ to give rise to the chiral phase, all in agreement with our analytical analysis in the main text. (f) Order-by-disorder phenomena in a non-reciprocally coupled three community system with random torque (Eq. (13)). The phase difference $\phi_a - \phi_b$ dynamics are computed using the Ott-Antonsen ansatz [36, 37] (Eq. (44) in Methods). Solid (thin) lines represent the trajectories for different initial conditions in the presence (absence) of random torque, where one can see that certain orbits are “selected” by disorder. We set the coupling $j_{AA} = j_{BB} = j_{CC} = 4, j_{AB} = -j_{BA} = 3, j_{BC} = -j_{CB} = -1, j_{CA} = -j_{AC} = 2$, the torque distribution width $\Delta = 0.1$.

stark contrast to degeneracy arising from global symmetry. As a result, macroscopic angle dynamics (Methods),

$$\dot{\phi}_a(t) = - \sum_b j_{ab}^*(\phi(t)) \sin(\phi_a(t) - \phi_b(t)) + \bar{\eta}_a(t), \quad (8)$$

are now governed by ϕ -dependent, renormalized coupling

$$j_{ab}^*(\phi(t)) = j_{ab} \frac{r_b(\phi(t))}{r_a(\phi(t))} \langle \cos^2 \delta\theta_i^a \rangle_{\phi(t)}, \quad (9)$$

where $\langle h(\delta\theta_i^a) \rangle_{\phi(t)} = \int d\theta_i^a \rho_i^a(t, \delta\theta_i^a; \phi(t)) h(\delta\theta_i^a)$. Here, we have assumed that the system self-averages, $\langle h(\delta\theta_i^a) \rangle_{\phi(t)} = (1/N_a) \sum_{i=1}^{N_a} h(\delta\theta_i^a(t))$. In Eq. (9), $\bar{\eta}_a \approx (1/N_a) \sum_{i=1}^{N_a} \eta_i^a$ is the effective noise for the macroscopic angle that obeys $\langle \bar{\eta}_a \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \bar{\eta}_a(t) \bar{\eta}_b(t') \rangle \approx (\sigma/N_a) \delta_{ab} \delta(t - t')$. As a result of $\phi_a(t)$ being a macroscopic quantity, the noise strength vanishes as one takes the thermodynamic limit $N_a \rightarrow \infty$.

First consider the geometrically frustrated system introduced above that has an accidentally degenerate ground state manifold parameterized by an angle α (Fig. 3(a)). In this situation, the effective coupling turns out to be ϕ -independent $j_{ab}^*(\phi(\alpha)) = j^* < 0$ on this manifold (Methods). Therefore, this many-body problem maps to that of a four-spin system on a tetrahedron lattice, but importantly, at a very low but *finite* temperature $T \sim \sigma/N_a \rightarrow 0^+ > 0$. As pointed out in Ref. [6], under such stochasticity, the probability to realize the angle α is found to be overwhelmingly concentrated to the collinear configuration $\alpha_* = 0, \pi$, giving rise to an OBDP.

A similar “orbit selection” takes place in non-reciprocally frustrated systems as well (Fig. 3(b)). In this regard, recall that the marginal orbits in these systems are contingent on the perfect non-reciprocity, $j_{ab} = -j_{ba}$. As the distribution of fluctuations $\rho_i^a(\delta\theta_i^a; \phi)$ typically differs from community to community, Eq. (9) tells us that the perfect non-reciprocity condition is generi-

cally no longer satisfied for the effective couplings (i.e. $j_{ab}^*(\phi) \neq j_{ba}^*(\phi)$) and therefore, the degeneracy of the marginal orbits would get “lifted”.

To be explicit, let us consider the case of two communities $a = A, B$ that are non-reciprocally coupled ($j_{AB} \neq j_{BA}$). This model was studied in Ref. [28] and was shown to exhibit a non-reciprocal phase transition [28, 38–41] from a static phase to a chiral phase, i.e. a phase where ϕ_a drifts at a constant speed, by spontaneously breaking parity. Interestingly, increasing the noise strength was found to *enhance* the parameter regime of the chiral phase despite being a more ordered state than a static phase, which is reminiscent of OBDP. (See Figs. 2(b) and (c) in Ref. [28] and Figs. S11 and S13 in their Supplementary Information.)

Here we argue that those properties can indeed be naturally understood from the perspective of OBDP. From Eq. (8), the phase difference $\Delta\phi = \phi_A - \phi_B$ and the center-of-mass phase $\Phi = (\phi_A + \phi_B)/2$ follows,

$$\Delta\dot{\phi} = -(j_{AB}^*(\Delta\phi) + j_{BA}^*(\Delta\phi)) \sin \Delta\phi \quad (10)$$

$$\dot{\Phi} = -\frac{j_{AB}^*(\Delta\phi) - j_{BA}^*(\Delta\phi)}{2} \sin \Delta\phi. \quad (11)$$

In contrast to the deterministic case (Eq. (6)) where $\Delta\phi(t) = \Delta\phi(0)$ is initial state-dependent in the perfectly non-reciprocal case $j_{AB} = -j_{BA} = j_-$, in the presence of noise $\sigma > 0$, Eq. (10) exhibits *stable* fixed points due to the ϕ -dependent renormalized couplings $j_{ab}^*(\phi)$; the “orbit selection” occurs. For example, when we set $j_{AA} = j_{BB} = j_0$ (taken to be $j_0 > |j_-|$ to ensure stability $\omega_a^2 > 0$), Eq. (10) reads (Methods)

$$\Delta\dot{\phi} \simeq \frac{j_0 j_-^2 \sigma^2}{2} \frac{\cos \Delta\phi}{(j_0^2 - j_-^2 \cos^2 \Delta\phi)^2} \sin \Delta\phi, \quad (12)$$

which has stable fixed points at $\Delta\phi_* \simeq \pm\pi/2$ (Fig. 3(c)) corresponding to the state satisfying $j_{AB}^*(\Delta\phi_*) = -j_{BA}^*(\Delta\phi_*)$ (See Eq. (10) and Fig. 3(d)). The resulting phase is a time-dependent chiral phase [28], where the center-of-mass phase Φ drifts according to $\dot{\Phi}_*(t) \simeq \mp j_- t$, indicating a chiral motion of the phases ϕ_a (Fig. 3(e)). This phenomenon can be regarded as an instance of OBDP associated with a time-crystalline order. (Note that there are cases where the system converges to a state without time-crystalline order; in Methods, we show both analytically and numerically that systems with $j_{AA} \gg j_{BB}$ or $j_{AA} \ll j_{BB}$ “select” a static state.)

So far, we have been restricting ourselves to systems with two communities under stochastic noise. However, the underlying mechanism of OBDP is not restricted to such a specific case. In Fig. 3(f), we show the macroscopic angle dynamics of a non-reciprocal *three*-community system with a random torque ω_i^a ($a, b = A, B, C$) distributed in a Lorentz distribution function $p_a(\omega_i^a) = (\Delta/\pi)/[(\omega_i^a)^2 + \Delta^2]$ as a source of disorder (similarly to the Kuramoto model [28, 35, 42], see Methods and




Figure 4. **One-dimensional spin chain with random asymmetric nearest-neighbor coupling.**

Refs. [36, 37].),

$$\dot{\theta}_i^a = \omega_i^a - \sum_b \frac{j_{ab}}{N_b} \sum_{j=1}^{N_b} \sin(\theta_i^a - \theta_j^b). \quad (13)$$

As seen, among the marginal orbits in the absence of disorder $\Delta = 0$ of Fig. 2 (and the thin line of Fig. 3(f)), certain orbits are “selected” to be stable (solid lines in Fig. 3(f)), signaling the occurrence of OBDP.

III. NON-RECIPROCALITY INDUCED GLASSY DYNAMICS

Another striking phenomenon arising from frustration is the emergence of spin glasses [8–14], which occurs ubiquitously in geometrically frustrated systems with random interactions. In such a situation, a macroscopic number of fixed points and saddle points are generated to make the potential energy landscape V bumpy. This makes it extremely difficult for the system to find its global minimum, resulting in slow dynamics characterized by a power law decay (or slower [14]) of time correlation functions and the aging phenomena [11, 12, 14] associated with no long-ranged spatial order.

A natural question is whether such glassy state are generated by non-reciprocal frustrations. It is tempting to expect the negative, as they induce the chase-and-runaway dynamics that may cause the glass to melt. Indeed, there are a number of works that support this view [20, 23, 43–45] including the works in the context of neural [23, 44, 45] and ecological systems [20]. However, the above studies analyzed (mostly all-to-all coupled) models that already contain geometrical frustrations in the reciprocal limit, making it unclear what the exact role of non-reciprocal frustrations was.

To unambiguously study the effect of non-reciprocal frustrations alone, it is important for us to consider models that have *no* geometrical frustrations in the reciprocal limit. For this purpose, we consider a one-dimensional XY spin chain that follows Eq. (1) that consists of N spins with nearest-neighbor interaction $J_{ij} = J_i^R \delta_{i+1,j} + J_i^L \delta_{i,j+1}$ in an open boundary condition (Fig. 4), with $J_i^{L/R}$ being randomly distributed according to

$$p(J_i^{L/R}) \propto \begin{cases} e^{-(J_i^{L/R})^2/(2\sigma^2)} & |J_i^{L/R}| \geq J_c \\ 0 & |J_i^{L/R}| < J_c \end{cases} \quad (14)$$




Figure 5. **Domain wall annihilation dynamics in reciprocal one-dimensional random spin chain.** The reciprocal coupling $J_i^R = J_i^L$ ($J_{ij} = J_{ji}$) case. As shown in the bottom-left panel, the ground state configuration of the reciprocally coupled spin chain (where the signs represent the sign of the reciprocal coupling at each bond) exhibits nematic order that is unique up to global rotation, implying the absence of geometrical frustrations. (a) Typical trajectory of (nematic) angles $\varphi_i = \theta_i \pmod{\pi}$. We set $N = 2^9 = 512$ and the initial condition were taken randomly from a uniform distribution $\theta_i = [0, 2\pi)$. (b) Spatial correlation function $C_x(x, t)$. (c) Time correlation function $C_t(t_w + t, t_w)$. In panels (b) and (c), we have averaged over 400 trajectories of random initial conditions and configurations of coupling strengths and have set $N = 2^{10} = 1024$. The domain wall annihilation dynamics of this one-dimensional chain give rise to slow relaxation (that shows aging phenomena) towards a long-ranged nematically ordered state.

Here, we have introduced a cutoff J_c (which we set $J_c = 0.1\sigma_J$ throughout) to avoid the coupling from completely vanishing.

This model has a crucial advantage in that no geometrical frustrations exist in the reciprocal limit $J_i^R = J_i^L$, and therefore, frustration can only arise through non-reciprocal interactions. This can be seen from the fact that the ground state configuration of the reciprocal system is uniquely determined once one fixes one of the spins (Fig. 5 bottom-left panel). Since reciprocal coupling favors either alignment or anti-alignment of spins, the ground state in the reciprocal limit exhibit a nematic order characterized by a complex order parameter $\psi_2 = (1/N) \sum_{i=1}^N e^{2i\theta_i}$.

Figure 5(a) shows a typical trajectory of $\varphi_i = \theta_i \pmod{\pi}$ [which regards the angles of the arrow pointing to opposite directions as being identical, thus making it useful to measure nematicity] in the reciprocal case, $J_i^R = J_i^L$ (which gives $J_{ij} = J_{ji}$). As seen, the dynamics are governed by the annihilation dynamics of the initially created (nematic) domain walls (Figs. 5(b)) towards the nematic long-range ordered state. This is captured in the spatial correlation function $C_x(x, t) =$

$|(1/(N-x)) \sum_{j=1}^{N-x} \overline{\psi_{2,j+x}(t)\psi_{2,j}^*(t)}|$ that is converging towards the long-ranged ordered state $C_x(x, t \rightarrow \infty) \rightarrow 1$ (Fig. 5(c)). Here, $\psi_{2,i}(t) = e^{2i\theta_i(t)}$ is a complex representation of nematic direction at site i , and $\overline{(\dots)}$ represents the average over random initial conditions, with a different configuration of J_{ij} taken for each run. Since this process occurs very slowly, the time correlation function $C_t(t_w + t, t_w) = |(1/N) \sum_{i=1}^N \overline{\delta\psi_{2,i}(t_w + t)\delta\psi_{2,i}^*(t_w)}|$ (where $\delta\psi_{2,i}(t) = \psi_{2,i}(t) - \psi_{2,i}(t_w)$) exhibits an aging behavior, i.e., the feature that the system takes more time to decorrelate as the waiting time proceeds (Fig. 5(d)).

Now let us turn to the non-reciprocal case $J_{ij} \neq J_{ji}$, where the couplings J_i^R and J_i^L are being sampled independently. In this case, as seen in Fig. 6(a), we observe the formation of domains that are *locally* nematically ordered, in which many of them are almost time periodic (see e.g., $i = 230$ in Fig. 6(b)) but others seem to be interrupted ($i = 233$) by the nearby chaotic domain ($i = 236$). These behaviors are vastly different from the reciprocal case of Fig. 5(a) dominated by domain wall annihilation dynamics.

Figures 6(c) and (d) show the spatial and time correlation function of this asymmetric spin chain, respec-




Figure 6. **Non-reciprocal frustration induced spin-glass-like state in an asymmetric random spin chain.** The asymmetric coupling case ($J_{ij} \neq J_{ji}$), where the coupling to the left J_i^L and the right J_i^R are sampled independently. (a),(b) Typical trajectory of (nematic) angles $\varphi_i = \theta_i \pmod{\pi}$ of a one-dimensional random non-reciprocal spin chain. Here, we have set $N = 2^9 = 512$ and the initial condition were taken randomly from a uniform distribution $\theta_i = [0, 2\pi)$. (c) Line-cut data of the trajectory at site $i = 230, 233, 236$ of (b). (c) Spatial correlation function $C_x(x, t)$. (d) Time correlation function $C_t(t_w + t, t_w)$. Note that both axes are plotted on a logarithmic scale. In panels (c) and (d), we have averaged over 500 and 400 trajectories, respectively (400 trajectories for $t = 3.2 \times 10^4, 6.4 \times 10^4, 10^5$ in (c)) and have set $N = 2^{10} = 1024$. This system exhibits slow dynamics characterized by power-law decay and aging phenomena associated with a short-ranged correlation. This is reminiscent of a spin glass, where the latter property is in stark contrast to the nematically ordered state seen in the reciprocal case.

tively. Strikingly, the time correlation function exhibits a power-law decay $C_t(t_w + t, t_w) \sim t^{-\alpha}$ at large t with a clear sign of aging, while the state is converging towards a short-ranged correlated state $C_x(x, t) \sim e^{-|x|/\xi}$, in stark contrast to the reciprocal case. These features are reminiscent of a spin glass, except that the time correlation function does not seem to converge to a finite value at $t \rightarrow \infty$ [8] (at least up to $\sigma_j t = 10^6$), implying that the state does not seem to freeze to a static state.

We remark that a similar slow decay has been observed in one-dimensional coupled logistic maps in their discrete-time evolution, as pioneered by Kaneko [46, 47]. In his model, each site is itself a logistic map that exhibits bifurcations to limit cycles or chaos, and these sites are coupled with their neighboring sites. At a phenomenological level, we observe interesting similarities between our model and Kaneko's model: in the former, by regarding each domain seen in Fig. 6(a) as a chaotic or periodic element, each element seems to be attempting to align with the nearby domains, somewhat analogous to the latter situation. However, there are also clear differences, e.g., the randomness is explicitly encoded in

the former from random coupling (similarly to the original spin glass problem) while they are generated spontaneously from chaos in the latter. The connection between the two models deserves further investigation.

We have shown that non-reciprocal interaction induce frustration that gives rise to similar phenomena to those occurring in geometrically frustrated systems, offering an unexpected bridge between complex magnetic materials and non-reciprocal systems. Future works will explore systems with macroscopic number of degeneracy [48] analogous to classical spin liquids [2, 5, 6] and possible extension to open quantum many-body systems [30, 49].

Methods

LIIOUVILLE-TYPE THEOREM FOR PERFECTLY NON-RECIPROCAL SYSTEMS

Here we provide the proof for the Liouville-type theorem, Eq. (3) in the main text for the XY-model

$$\dot{\theta}_i = - \sum_j J_{ij} \sin(\theta_i - \theta_j). \quad (15)$$

We also provide its generalization to more general non-reciprocal models. The continuity equation of the distribution function ρ for the XY-model (Eq. (15)) is given by

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = - \sum_i \frac{\partial(\rho \dot{\theta}_i)}{\partial \theta_i} = - \sum_i \left[\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \theta_i} \dot{\theta}_i + \rho \frac{\partial \dot{\theta}_i}{\partial \theta_i} \right]. \quad (16)$$

In a perfectly non-reciprocal case $J_{ij} = -J_{ji}$, the second term of Eq. (16) can be shown to vanish as,

$$\rho \sum_i \frac{\partial \dot{\theta}_i}{\partial \theta_i} = \rho \sum_{ij} [J_{ij} \cos(\theta_i - \theta_j)] = 0, \quad (17)$$

where in the last equality, we have used the property that J_{ij} is anti-symmetric and $\cos(\theta_i - \theta_j)$ is symmetric. This gives

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \sum_i \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \theta_i} \dot{\theta}_i = 0, \quad (18)$$

proving the Liouville-type theorem.

In the above proof, note how we have only used the property that the derivative of the right-hand side of the dynamical system Eq. (15) is anti-symmetric. This suggests that the Liouville-type theorem

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \sum_i \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_i} \dot{x}_i, \quad (19)$$

holds whenever the dynamical system composed of two-body interactions is given by the form

$$\dot{x}_i = \sum_j \phi_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \quad (20)$$

with $\partial \phi_{ij}/\partial x_i$ being odd under the exchange of the label i and j . For example, the Heisenberg spin systems $\mathbf{S}_i = (S_i^x, S_i^y, S_i^z)$ (with $|\mathbf{S}_i|^2 = 1$) that is described by the Landau-Lifshitz equation [50],

$$\dot{\mathbf{S}}_i = - \sum_{j=1}^N J_{ij} [\mathbf{S}_i \times \mathbf{S}_j + \alpha \mathbf{S}_i \times (\mathbf{S}_i \times \mathbf{S}_j)] \quad (21)$$

obeys the Liouville-type theorem

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{\mu=x,y,z} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial S_i^\mu} \dot{S}_i^\mu \quad (22)$$

when the coupling is anti-symmetric $J_{ij} = -J_{ji}$.

ORDER-BY-DISORDER PHENOMENA IN ALL-TO-ALL COUPLED XY-MODEL

We provide here the details of the analysis of order-by-disorder phenomena (OBDP) occurring in both geometrically and non-reciprocally frustrated systems. For concreteness, we consider the dynamics of the all-to-all coupled XY-model grouped into a few communities $a = A, B, C, \dots$, following the Langevin equation,

$$\dot{\theta}_i^a = - \sum_b \frac{j_{ab}}{N_b} \sum_{j=1}^{N_b} \sin(\theta_i^a - \theta_j^b) + \eta_i^a, \quad (23)$$

where $\langle \eta_i^a(t) \rangle = 0$, $\langle \eta_i^a(t) \eta_j^b(t') \rangle = \sigma \delta_{ab} \delta_{ij} \delta(t - t')$. The all-to-all coupled nature allows us to rewrite Eq. (23) in a single spin picture,

$$\dot{\theta}_i^a = - \sum_b j_{ab} r_b \sin(\theta_i^a - \phi_b) + \eta_i^a, \quad (24)$$

by introducing the order parameter $\psi_a = (1/N_a) \sum_i e^{i\theta_i^a} = r_a e^{i\phi_a}$.

As emphasized in the main text, when the inter-community coupling is taken to be geometrically/non-reciprocally frustrated, the order parameter dynamics can take different orbits $\phi(t) = (\phi_A(t), \phi_B(t), \dots)$ depending on their initial condition in the absence of stochasticity. We will show below that this ‘‘accidental degeneracy’’ of orbits is generically lifted by the presence of noise.

To proceed, we consider the dynamics of fluctuations $\delta\theta_i^a = \theta_i^a - \phi_a$ caused by noise. Assuming weak noise strength, we linearize the stochastic equation of motion as

$$\delta\dot{\theta}_i^a \approx - \sum_b j_{ab} \cos(\phi_a(t) - \phi_b(t)) \delta\theta_i^a + \eta_i^a. \quad (25)$$

As Eq. (25) is linear, the probability distribution function $\rho_i^a(\delta\theta_i^a)$ can be computed analytically as [51, 52],

$$\rho_i^a(t, \delta\theta_i^a; \phi(t)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi} w_a(t; \phi(t))} e^{-(\delta\theta_i^a)^2 / w_a^2(t; \phi(t))} \quad (26)$$

with its width w_a given by,

$$w_a^2(t; \phi(t)) = \sigma \int_0^t d\tau e^{-2 \int_\tau^t d\tau' \sum_b j_{ab} \cos(\phi_a(\tau') - \phi_b(\tau'))}$$

when an initial condition is a perfectly magnetized state, $\delta\theta_i^a(t=0) = 0$. Especially in the case where $\Delta\phi_{ab} = \phi_a - \phi_b$ converges to a constant value, which occurs, e.g., in a geometrically frustrated system and two-community perfectly non-reciprocal system, the steady-state distribution has the width [53]

$$w_a^2(t \rightarrow \infty, \phi) = \frac{\sigma}{\sum_b j_{ab} \cos \Delta\phi_{ab}}. \quad (27)$$

Let us now write down the order parameter dynamics that are affected by the above fluctuations induced by noise. From

$$\dot{\psi}_a = (\dot{r}_a + r_a i \dot{\phi}_a) e^{i\phi_a} = \frac{i}{N_a} \sum_{i=1}^{N_a} \dot{\theta}_i^a e^{i\theta_i^a}, \quad (28)$$

one obtains,

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\phi}_a &= -\sum_b \frac{j_{ab}}{N_b} \sum_{i=1}^{N_b} \frac{r_b}{r_a} \sin(\theta_i^a - \phi_b) \cos(\theta_i^a - \phi_a) + \bar{\eta}_a \\ &= -\sum_b j_{ab}^*(\phi(t)) \sin(\phi_a - \phi_b) + \bar{\eta}_a\end{aligned}\quad (29)$$

that is governed by the renormalized couplings,

$$j_{ab}^*(\phi(t)) = j_{ab} \frac{r_b(\phi(t))}{r_a(\phi(t))} \langle \cos^2 \delta\theta_i^a \rangle_{\phi(t)}, \quad (30)$$

which are, crucially, ϕ -dependent. Here, the effective noise for the macroscopic angle ϕ_a is given by $\bar{\eta}_a = 1/(r_a N_a) \sum_{i=1}^{N_a} \eta_i^a \cos \delta\theta_i^a \approx (1/N_a) \sum_{i=1}^{N_a} \eta_i^a$ that follows $\langle \bar{\eta}_a \rangle \approx 0$, $\langle \bar{\eta}_a(t) \bar{\eta}_b(t') \rangle \approx (\sigma/N_a) \delta_{ab} \delta(t-t')$, and $\langle h(\delta\theta_i^a) \rangle_{\phi(t)} = \int d\theta_i^a \rho_i^a(t, \delta\theta_i^a; \phi(t)) h(\delta\theta_i^a)$ is the noise average. In the second line, we have assumed that the system self-averages, i.e., $\langle h(\delta\theta_i^a) \rangle_{\phi(t)} = (1/N_a) \sum_{i=1}^{N_a} h(\delta\theta_i^a(t))$ and used the property $\rho_i^a(\delta\theta_i^a) = \rho_i^a(-\delta\theta_i^a)$. As one sees by comparing with the deterministic case (Eq. (6) in the main text), we find that the bare couplings j_{ab} has been replaced by the renormalized, ϕ -dependent coupling $j_{ab}^*(\phi)$. We further proceed for latter use by expanding Eq. (29) in terms of $\delta\theta_i^a$, giving

$$\begin{aligned}j_{ab}^*(\phi(t)) &= j_{ab} \frac{\langle \cos \delta\theta_i^b \rangle_{\phi(t)}}{\langle \cos \delta\theta_i^a \rangle_{\phi(t)}} \langle \cos^2 \delta\theta_i^a \rangle_{\phi(t)} \\ &\simeq j_{ab} \frac{1 - \frac{1}{2!} \langle (\delta\theta_i^b)^2 \rangle_{\phi} + \frac{1}{4!} \langle (\delta\theta_i^b)^4 \rangle_{\phi}}{1 - \frac{1}{2!} \langle (\delta\theta_i^a)^2 \rangle_{\phi} + \frac{1}{4!} \langle (\delta\theta_i^a)^4 \rangle_{\phi}} \\ &\times \left[1 - \langle (\delta\theta_i^a)^2 \rangle_{\phi} + \frac{1}{3} \langle (\delta\theta_i^a)^4 \rangle_{\phi} \right] \\ &\simeq j_{ab} \left[1 - \frac{1}{4} (w_a^2(\phi) + w_b^2(\phi)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{32} (5w_a^4(\phi) + 2w_a^2(\phi)w_b^2(\phi) + w_b^4(\phi)) \right].\end{aligned}\quad (31)$$

Here, we have used the relation $r_a(\phi) = \langle \cos \delta\theta_i^a \rangle_{\phi}$ in the first line, expanded in terms of $\delta\theta_i^a$ in the second, and the Gaussian integral

$$\langle (\delta\theta_a)^2 \rangle_{\phi} = \frac{w_a^2(\phi)}{2}, \quad \langle (\delta\theta_a)^4 \rangle_{\phi} = \frac{3w_a^4(\phi)}{4}, \quad (32)$$

in the third.

Below, we will show that Eq. (29) generically exhibit an OBDP in both geometrically and non-reciprocally frustrated frustrations.

A. Geometrically frustrated case: communities on a tetrahedron lattice

Consider first a geometrically frustrated system that is composed of four communities, which is all-to-all antiferromagnetically coupled $j_{ab} = j < 0$ (Fig. 3(a) in the main text). We set the intra-community ferromagnetic coupling strength to be identical $j_{aa} = j_0 > 0$ with

$a, b = A, B, C, D$, for simplicity. In the absence of noise, the system is driven towards its potential energy minimum that are accidentally degenerate because of the geometrical frustrations. To see this, define $\mathbf{S}_a = (S_a^x, S_a^y) = (\cos \phi_a, \sin \phi_a)$ and observe that [2, 5, 6]

$$V(\phi) = -j \sum_{ab} \mathbf{S}_a \cdot \mathbf{S}_b = -j \left(\sum_a \mathbf{S}_a \right)^2 + \text{const.} \quad (33)$$

The ground state is given by the configuration that makes $\sum_a \mathbf{S}_a$ vanish (Note that $j < 0$). As illustrated in Fig. 3(a) in the main text, for the case considered here, the (accidentally degenerate) ground states are parameterized by an angle α and β as

$$\phi_A = \beta, \quad \phi_B = \pi + \beta, \quad \phi_C = \alpha + \beta, \quad \phi_D = \alpha + \pi + \beta, \quad (34)$$

where the angle β parameterize the degeneracy trivially arising from the rotation symmetry, while α parameterize the accidental degeneracy arising from geometrical frustration. The labels of the communities can be permuted.

Now, in the presence of noise ($\sigma > 0$), the width is given by (see Eq. (27)),

$$\begin{aligned}w_a^2(\phi) &= \frac{\sigma}{j_0 - j(\cos \pi + \cos \alpha + \cos(\alpha + \pi))} \\ &= \frac{\sigma}{j_0 + |j|}\end{aligned}\quad (35)$$


which is independent of the configuration α and are identical for all communities. As a result, from Eq. (31), one finds that $j_{ab}^*(\phi) = j^* = \text{const.}$ on the ground state manifold, giving the macroscopic angle dynamics, ($a, b = A, B, C, D$)

$$\dot{\phi}_a = j^* \sum_{b(\neq a)} \sin(\phi_b - \phi_a) + \bar{\eta}_a. \quad (36)$$

Since this system obeys the fluctuation-dissipation theorem [53], the system is mapped to a problem of four spins at very low but *finite* temperature $T \sim \sigma/N_a$. As done in Ref. [6] Sec. IV, the distribution function for realizing the angle α in such systems can be computed as,

$$\rho(\alpha) \propto \frac{1}{|\sin \alpha|}, \quad (37)$$

in the regime $\sin^2 \alpha \ll \sigma/(N_a j^*) \rightarrow 0$. This shows that the probability distribution is overwhelmingly concentrated to a collinear configuration $\alpha_* = 0$ or $\alpha_* = \pi$. This occurs because, while the energy in generic configuration varies quadratically in displacement from the ground state configuration, there exists a special direction of displacement around the collinear configuration $\alpha = 0, \pi$ that the energy varies quartically [6]. This is nothing but an OBDP.



Extended Data Fig. 1. **Time-crystalline order by disorder phenomena with different intra-community coupling strength.** The intra-community coupling strength is set to (a)-(c) $j_{AA} = j_{BB} = 3$, (d)-(f) $j_{AA} = 5, j_{BB} = 2$, (g)-(i) $j_{AA} = 2, j_{BB} = 5$. (a),(d),(g) Phase difference $\Delta\phi$ dynamics, where solid (thin) line represents the dynamics in the presence (absence) of noise. (b),(e),(h) Effective coupling $j_{ab}^*(\phi)$. (c),(f),(i) Phase ϕ_a dynamics. While in (a)-(c), the chiral phase with $\Delta\phi_* = \pm\pi/2$ that satisfies $j_{AB}^*(\Delta\phi_*) = -j_{BA}^*(\Delta\phi_*)$ is “selected”, in (d)-(f) [(g)-(i)], as the effective coupling $j_{BA}^*(\Delta\phi)[j_{AB}^*(\Delta\phi)]$ is more strongly renormalized than $j_{AB}^*(\Delta\phi)[j_{BA}^*(\Delta\phi)]$, one always finds $j_{AB}^*(\Delta\phi) < -j_{BA}^*(\Delta\phi)$ [$j_{AB}^*(\Delta\phi) > -j_{BA}^*(\Delta\phi)$] that stabilizes the anti-aligned [aligned] phase characterized by the phase difference $\Delta\phi_* = \pi$ [$\Delta\phi_* = 0$]. These results are all consistent with our analytical analysis (Eq. (38)). We set the noise strength $\sigma = 1.5$, the number of spins $N_A = N_B = 2000$, and the inter-community coupling strength $j_{AB} = -j_{BA} = 1$.

B. Non-reciprocally frustrated case I: two-community stochastic XY-model

We now turn to the non-reciprocally frustrated case. We will focus here on a system consisting of two communities that are coupled perfectly non-reciprocally $j_{AB} = -j_{BA} = j_-$. From Eq. (29), the phase difference $\Delta\phi$ and the center-of-mass phase $\Phi = (\phi_A + \phi_B)/2$ dynamics are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Delta\phi} &= -(j_{AB}^*(\Delta\phi) + j_{BA}^*(\Delta\phi)) \sin \Delta\phi \\ &\simeq -\frac{j_-}{8} [w_A^4(\Delta\phi) - w_B^4(\Delta\phi)] \sin \Delta\phi, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Phi} &= -\frac{j_{AB}^*(\Delta\phi) - j_{BA}^*(\Delta\phi)}{2} \sin \Delta\phi \\ &\simeq -j_- \sin \Delta\phi, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

with the width given by

$$w_A^2(\Delta\phi) = \frac{\sigma}{j_{AA} + j_- \cos \Delta\phi}, \quad (40)$$

$$w_B^2(\Delta\phi) = \frac{\sigma}{j_{BB} - j_- \cos \Delta\phi}, \quad (41)$$

where we have used Eq. (30) in the second line of both Eqs. (38) and (39).

In the deterministic case $\sigma = 0$ (that has vanishing width $w_A(\Delta\phi) = w_B(\Delta\phi) = 0$), one has $\dot{\Delta\phi} = 0$ for arbitrary $\Delta\phi$ and hence the orbit $\Delta\phi(t) = \Delta\phi(0)$ depend on their initial condition, corresponding to the dynamical counterpart of accidentally degenerate ground states. In contrast, in the presence of noise, the $\Delta\phi$ -dependence of the effective coupling now makes the $\Delta\phi$ dynamics of Eq. (38) to exhibit *stable* fixed points. This “orbit selection” is the dynamical counterpart of the OBDP that

arises in non-reciprocally frustrated systems.

In particular, there are two candidates for stable fixed points: one is the phase difference satisfying $\sin \Delta\phi = 0$, or $\Delta\phi = 0, \pi$. This corresponds to the static phase, as the center-of-mass phase Φ would be time independent. The other is the phase difference that satisfies $w_A(\Delta\phi) = w_B(\Delta\phi)$, which is equivalent to $j_{AB}^*(\Delta\phi) = -j_{BA}(\Delta\phi)$. This corresponds to the chiral phase [28] with a finite drift speed $\dot{\Phi} \neq 0$.

In the case with identical intra-community coupling $j_{AA} = j_{BB} = j_0$, the $\Delta\phi$ -dynamics reads

$$\Delta\dot{\phi} \simeq \frac{j_0 j_-^2 \sigma^2}{2} \frac{\cos \Delta\phi}{(j_0^2 - j_-^2 \cos^2 \Delta\phi)^2} \sin \Delta\phi, \quad (42)$$

which has stable fixed points at $\Delta\phi_* = \pm\pi/2$ satisfying $w_A(\Delta\phi_*) = w_B(\Delta\phi_*) \cos \Delta\phi_* = 0$ or $j_{AB}^*(\Delta\phi) = -j_{BA}(\Delta\phi)$; the chiral phase is stabilized. See Extended Data Fig. 1(a) for numerical verification. (In this case, $\Delta\phi = 0, \pi$ are unstable fixed points.)

On the other hand, when the the intra-community coupling of community A(B) become large compared to B(A), i.e., $j_{AA} \gg j_{BB}$ ($j_{AA} \ll j_{BB}$), fluctuations of the community A(B) get strongly suppressed to always give $w_A^2 < w_B^2$ ($w_A^2 > w_B^2$) for *arbitrary* ϕ (See Eqs. (40) and (41)). As a result, the effective couplings cannot satisfy the perfectly non-reciprocal condition necessary for the emergence of the chiral phase anymore, where one always has $|j_{AB}^*(\phi)| < |j_{BA}^*(\phi)|$ ($|j_{AB}^*(\phi)| > |j_{BA}^*(\phi)|$) for arbitrary $\Delta\phi$. This leads the system to select $\Delta\phi_* = \pi(0)$

for $j_- > 0$, corresponding to a static phase $\dot{\Phi}_*(t) = 0$. All these features are demonstrated numerically in Extended Data Figs. 1(b),(c).

C. Non-reciprocal frustration case II: three-component non-reciprocal Kuramoto model

Adding stochastic noise is not the only way to introduce disorder to the system: a random torque (or random natural frequencies, in the context of synchronization) can play a similar role. Known as the Kuramoto model [35, 42] generalized to multiple species [28], such systems are governed by

$$\dot{\theta}_i^a = \omega_i^a - \sum_b \frac{j_{ab}}{N_b} \sum_{j=1}^{N_b} \sin(\theta_i^a - \theta_j^b), \quad (43)$$

where the distribution of natural frequency ω_i^a of community a is given by the Lorentz distribution $p_a(\omega) = (\Delta/\pi)/(\omega^2 + \Delta^2)$. Fortunately, the order parameter dynamics of this system can be evaluated *exactly* by the Ott-Antonsen ansatz [36, 37]

$$\dot{\psi}_a = -\Delta\psi_a + \frac{1}{2} \sum_b j_{ab}(\psi_b - \psi_a^* \psi_b^*). \quad (44)$$

Figures 3(d),(e) in the main text are generated by simulating Eq. (44), giving rise to the OBDP.

-
- [1] G. Toulouse, "Theory of the frustration effect in spin glasses. i." *Communications on Physics* **2**, 115–119 (1977).
 - [2] Roderich Moessner and Arthur P. Ramirez, "Geometrical frustration," *Physics Today* **59**, 24–29 (2006).
 - [3] J. Villain, R. Bidaux, J.-P. Carton, and R. Conte, "Order as an effect of disorder," *Journal de Physique* **41**, 1263–1272 (1980).
 - [4] Christopher L. Henley, "Ordering due to disorder in a frustrated vector antiferromagnet," *Physical Review Letters* **62**, 2056–2059 (1989).
 - [5] R. Moessner and J. T. Chalker, "Properties of a classical spin liquid: The heisenberg pyrochlore antiferromagnet," *Physical Review Letters* **80**, 2929–2932 (1998).
 - [6] R. Moessner and J. T. Chalker, "Low-temperature properties of classical geometrically frustrated antiferromagnets," *Physical Review B* **58**, 12049–12062 (1998).
 - [7] Doron Bergman, Jason Alicea, Emanuel Gull, Simon Trebst, and Leon Balents, "Order-by-disorder and spiral spin-liquid in frustrated diamond-lattice antiferromagnets," *Nature Physics* **3**, 487–491 (2007).
 - [8] S. F. Edwards, "Theory of spin glasses," *J. Phys. F: Met. Phys.* **5**, 965 (1975).
 - [9] David Sherrington and Scott Kirkpatrick, "Solvable model of a spin-glass," *Physical Review Letters* **35**, 1792 (1975).
 - [10] G. Parisi, "Infinite number of order parameters for spin-glasses," *Physical Review Letters* **43**, 1754–1756 (1979).
 - [11] H. Sompolinsky and Annette Zippelius, "Relaxational dynamics of the edwards-anderson model and the mean-field theory of spin-glasses," *Physical Review B* **25**, 6860–6875 (1982).
 - [12] L. F. Cugliandolo and J. Kurchan, "Analytical solution of the off-equilibrium dynamics of a long-range spin-glass model," *Physical Review Letters* **71**, 173 (1993).
 - [13] Daniel S. Fisher and David A. Huse, "Equilibrium behavior of the spin-glass ordered phase," *Physical Review B* **38**, 386–411 (1988).
 - [14] Daniel S. Fisher and David A. Huse, "Nonequilibrium dynamics of spin glasses," *Physical Review B* **38**, 373–385 (1988).
 - [15] C. Castellano, C. Castellano, and S.L. Sondhi, "Spin Ice, Fractionalization, and Topological Order," *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.* **3**, 35–55 (2012).
 - [16] Lucile Savary and Leon Balents, "Quantum spin liquids: a review," *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **80**, 016502 (2016).
 - [17] Michael G. Neubert and Hal Caswell, "Alternatives to resilience for measuring the responses of ecological systems to perturbations," *Ecology* **78**, 653–665 (1997).
 - [18] Tobias Reichenbach, Mauro Mobilia, and Erwin Frey, "Mobility promotes and jeopardizes biodiversity in rock-paper-scissors games," *Nature* **448**, 1046–1049 (2007).

- [19] Stefano Allesina and Si Tang, “Stability criteria for complex ecosystems,” *Nature* **205**, 483 (2012).
- [20] Guy Bunin, “Ecological communities with lotka-volterra dynamics,” *Phys. Rev. E* **95**, 042414 (2017).
- [21] Hyunsuk Hong and Steven H. Strogatz, “Kuramoto Model of Coupled Oscillators with Positive and Negative Coupling Parameters: An Example of Conformist and Contrarian Oscillators,” *Physical Review Letters* **106**, 054102 (2011).
- [22] J. Cowan H. Wilson, “Excitatory and inhibitory interactions in localized populations of model neurons,” *Biophysical Journal* **12**, 1–24 (1972).
- [23] H. Sompolinsky and I. Kanter, “Temporal Association in Asymmetric Neural Networks,” *Physical Review Letters* **57**, 2861–2864 (1986).
- [24] A. V. Ivlev, J. Bartnick, M. Heinen, C.-R. Du, V. Nosenko, and H. Löwen, “Statistical mechanics where Newton’s third law is broken,” *Physical Review X* **5**, 011035 (2015).
- [25] Nariya Uchida and Ramin Golestanian, “Synchronization and Collective Dynamics in a Carpet of Microfluidic Rotors,” *Physical Review Letters* **104**, 178103 (2010).
- [26] Suropriya Saha, Sriram Ramaswamy, and Ramin Golestanian, “Pairing, waltzing and scattering of chemotactic active colloids,” *New Journal of Physics* **21**, 063006 (2019).
- [27] Yuval Yifat, Delphine Coursault, Curtis W. Peterson, John Parker, Ying Bao, Stephen K. Gray, Stuart A. Rice, and Norbert F. Scherer, “Reactive optical matter: light-induced motility in electrostatically asymmetric nanoscale scatterers,” *Light: Science & Applications* **7** (2018), 10.1038/s41377-018-0105-y.
- [28] Michel Fruchart, Ryo Hanai, Peter B. Littlewood, and Vincenzo Vitelli, “Non-reciprocal phase transitions,” *Nature* **592**, 363–369 (2021).
- [29] Yuto Ashida, Zongping Gong, and Masahito Ueda, “Non-Hermitian Physics,” *Advances in Physics* **69**, 249–435 (2021).
- [30] A. Metelmann and A. A. Clerk, “Nonreciprocal photon transmission and amplification via reservoir engineering,” *Phys. Rev. X* **5**, 021025 (2015).
- [31] Josef Hofbauer, “Evolutionary dynamics for bimatrix games: a hamiltonian system?” *J. Math. Biol.* **34**, 675–688 (1996).
- [32] Yongjoo Baek, Alexandre P. Solon, Xinpeng Xu, Nikolai Nikola, and Yarif Kafri, “Generic long-range interactions between passive bodies in an active fluid,” *Physical Review Letters* **120**, 058002 (2018).
- [33] Krzysztof Sacha and Jakub Zakrzewski, “Time crystals: a review,” *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **81**, 016401 (2018).
- [34] Vedika Khemani, Roderich Moessner, and S. L. Sondhi, “A Brief History of Time Crystals,” (2019), arXiv:1910.10745.
- [35] Yoshiki Kuramoto, *Chemical Oscillations, Waves, and Turbulence* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1984).
- [36] Edward Ott and Thomas M. Antonsen, “Low dimensional behavior of large systems of globally coupled oscillators,” *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* **18**, 037113 (2008).
- [37] Edward Ott and Thomas M. Antonsen, “Long time evolution of phase oscillator systems,” *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* **19**, 023117 (2009).
- [38] Suropriya Saha, Jaime Agudo-Canalejo, and Ramin Golestanian, “Scalar active mixtures: The nonreciprocal cahn-hilliard model,” *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 041009 (2020).
- [39] Zhihong You, Aparna Baskaran, and M. Cristina Marchetti, “Nonreciprocity as a generic route to traveling states,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **117**, 19767–19772 (2020).
- [40] Ryo Hanai, Alexander Edelman, Yoji Ohashi, and Peter B. Littlewood, “Non-Hermitian Phase Transition from a Polariton Bose-Einstein Condensate to a Photon Laser,” *Physical Review Letters* **122**, 185301 (2019).
- [41] Ryo Hanai and Peter B. Littlewood, “Critical fluctuations at a many-body exceptional point,” *Physical Review Research* **2**, 033018 (2020).
- [42] Juan A. Acebrón, L. L. Bonilla, Conrad J. Pérez Vicente, Félix Ritort, and Renato Spigler, “The Kuramoto model: A simple paradigm for synchronization phenomena,” *Reviews of Modern Physics* **77**, 137–185 (2005).
- [43] A. Crisanti and H. Sompolinsky, “Dynamics of spin systems with randomly asymmetric bonds: Ising spins and glauher dynamics,” *Physical Review A* **37**, 4864 (1988).
- [44] G. Parisi, “Asymmetric neural networks and the process of learning,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **19**, L675 (1986).
- [45] J. A. Hertz, G. Grinstein, and S. A. Solla, *Irreversible spin glasses and neural networks* (Springer, 1987).
- [46] Kunihiko Kaneko, “Pattern dynamics in spatiotemporal chaos,” *Physica D* **34**, 1–41 (1989).
- [47] Kunihiko Kaneko, “Overview of coupled map lattices,” *Chaos* **2**, 279–282 (1992).
- [48] Kurt Wiesenfeld and Peter Hadley, “Attractor crowding in oscillator arrays,” *Physical Review Letters* **62**, 1335 (1989).
- [49] Tony E. Lee and Ching-Kit Chan, “Heralded Magnetism in Non-Hermitian Atomic Systems,” *Physical Review X* **4**, 041001 (2014).
- [50] Amikam Aharoni, *Introduction to the theory of ferromagnetism* (Oxford University Press, 1996).
- [51] Fabrizio Lillo and Rosario N. Mantegna, “Drift-controlled anomalous diffusion: A solvable gaussian model,” *Physical Review E* **61**, R4675(R) (2000).
- [52] Kwok Sau Fa, “Fokker-planck equation with linear and time dependent load forces,” *Eur. J. Phys.* **37**, 065101 (2016).
- [53] N. G. van Kampen, *Stochastic Processes in Physics and Chemistry* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2003).