

Photoinduced non-reciprocal magnetism

Ryo Hanai,^{1,*} Daiki Ootsuki,^{2,†} and Rina Tazai^{1,‡}

¹*Center for Gravitational Physics and Quantum Information,
Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan*

²*Graduate School of Human and Environmental Studies,
Kyoto University, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan*

(Dated: July 23, 2024)

Out of equilibrium, the action-reaction symmetry of the interactions is often broken, leading to the emergence of various collective phenomena with no equilibrium counterparts. Although ubiquitous in classical active systems, implementing such non-reciprocal interactions in solid-state systems has remained challenging, as the known quantum schemes require precise control over the system on a single-site level. Here, we propose a novel dissipation-engineering protocol to induce non-reciprocal interactions in solid-state platforms with light, which we expect to be achievable with state-of-the-art experimental techniques. Focusing on magnetic metals for concreteness, we show microscopically that a light injection that introduces the decay channel to a virtually excited state gives rise to non-reciprocal interactions between localized spins. One can even realize a situation where spin A tries to align with spin B but the B tries the opposite, resulting in a chase-and-runaway dynamics. Applying our scheme to layered ferromagnets, we show that a non-reciprocal phase transition from a static to a many-body time-dependent chiral phase emerges. Our work paves the way to bring solid-state systems to the realm of non-reciprocal science, providing yet another possibility to control quantum matter with light.

In equilibrium, the free energy minimization principle states that all interactions between constituents must have action-reaction symmetry. However, this constraint is no longer present once the system is out of equilibrium [1, 2]. In fact, non-reciprocal interactions are ubiquitous in Nature: the brain is composed of inhibitory and excitatory neurons that non-reciprocally interact [3–6]; the predator chases the prey and the prey runs away because their interaction is asymmetric; colloids immersed in a chemically/optically active media exhibit non-reciprocal interactions [7–10]. Recent studies revealed that such non-reciprocal interactions fundamentally affect the collective properties of many-body systems [11–26]. A prominent example is the emergence of non-reciprocal phase transitions [15–25, 27, 28], where a time-dependent phase that exhibits a collective and persistent chase-and-runaway motion between macroscopic quantities arises. Its critical point is characterized by the *coalescence* of a collective mode to the Nambu-Goldstone mode [15, 17, 20–23, 25] (instead of merely being degenerate as in the conventional cases), which is strictly forbidden in equilibrium.

Non-reciprocal interactions are not restricted to the classical systems mentioned above. Quantum systems may also exhibit non-reciprocity [28–30] by carefully tailoring dissipation microscopically [31, 32]. Indeed, such non-reciprocity has been implemented in synthetic quantum systems such as cold atoms [33], optomechanics [34], and circuit QED [35]. However, these schemes require fine control of dissipation and gauge flux *at a single-*

site/plaquette level, imposing a challenge to realize non-reciprocal interactions in solid-state systems.

In this work, we propose a novel dissipation-engineering scheme to realize non-reciprocal interactions in solid-state systems with light (Fig. 1(a),(b)), which we expect to be achievable with state-of-the-art experimental techniques. We show that interactions between localized spins in magnetic metals mediated by conduction electrons, known as the Ruderman-Kittel-Kasuya-Yosida (RKKY) interaction [36–38], can be engineered to switch from ferromagnetic to antiferromagnetic (or vice versa) with light. This is achieved by injecting light at an appropriately tuned frequency that introduces the decay to a virtually excited state, which *selectively* destroys the energetically favored state (Fig. 2). By tuning the light frequency to activate only some fraction of the spins [where the other spins are off-resonant from the radiated light], one can engineer non-reciprocal interactions where spin A tries to align with spin B but spin B tries the opposite, resulting in chase and runaway dynamics, see Fig. 1(b). We estimate the injection power needed for their emergence is within reach of the current techniques and the heating effect should be minimal. These results are derived microscopically by combining the projection method generalized to open quantum systems [39–44] and Keldysh theory [45–47]. By applying this scheme to a layered ferromagnet, we show that the light-induced interlayer non-reciprocal interaction triggers a non-reciprocal phase transition [15] to a time-dependent chiral phase where the magnetization of the two layers exhibit a collective chase and runaway motion (Fig. 1(c)).

We expect our scheme to be applicable to a wide class of quantum materials such as Mott insulating phases in strongly correlated electrons [48, 49], multi-band superconductivity [50, 51], and optical phonon-mediated su-

* ryo.hanai@yukawa.kyoto-u.ac.jp

† ootsuki.daiki.4z@kyoto-u.ac.jp

‡ tazai.rina.2y@kyoto-u.ac.jp




FIG. 1. **Light control of magnetic interactions and magnetism via dissipation.** (a) In the absence of light, the interaction between the local spins (thick blue arrow) is reciprocal. The spins are driven towards the equilibrium configuration [alignment in the ferromagnetic case illustrated here] through a magnetic friction called the Gilbert damping (green arrows). (b) When the light is tuned to a frequency $h\nu$ that selectively activates the red spin [in the way illustrated in Fig. 2], the light-induced torque (pink arrows) acts on the activated spin. As a result, the two spins effectively interact non-reciprocally, where the active (quiescent) spin tries to anti-align (align) with the opponent's spin. (c) Phase diagram of a layered ferromagnet under light injection, determined by our meanfield description (Eq. (8)). Here, the two ferromagnetic layers (A and B) are separated by a non-magnetic metal and the laser is injected to introduce active dissipation to the B layer at rate γ_B , making the interlayer magnetic interactions non-reciprocal. When the light is off ($\gamma_B = 0$), the magnetization of the two layers aligns for ferromagnetic interlayer interaction $j_{AB}(=j_{BA}) > 0$ (blue region). As the light-induced dissipation is turned on $\gamma_B > 0$, the system exhibits a phase transition to an antialigned configuration (red) at $\gamma_B \simeq \alpha_B |g_B|$ and a non-reciprocal phase transition to a time-dependent chiral phase [where the two magnetizations exhibit many-body chase-and-runaway dynamics](cyan). [See text and Fig. 4 for further details.] We set the intralayer interaction and Gilbert damping of the layer A (B) as $j_{AA} = 10\text{meV}$ ($j_{BB} = 5\text{meV}$) and $\alpha_A = 0.1$ ($\alpha_B = 2 \times 10^{-3}$), respectively. The sd coupling strength for B is $g_B = -10\text{meV}$, the filling $n = 1$, and the temperature is $k_B T = 9\text{meV}$. The dashed lines are the phase boundary at a lower temperature $k_B T = 5\text{meV}$.

perconductivity that arises e.g. in SrTiO_3 [52, 53]. This broad applicability is anticipated because our proposal does not rely on any properties specific to magnetic metals as long as the interaction is mediated via a virtual high-energy state. The origin of the non-reciprocity of our proposal is the imbalance in the amount of energy injected into each spin, conceptually similar to those arising in soft active matter [8–10, 54] but is different from known quantum schemes that control the interference effects with gauge flux [31, 32].

The effect of non-reciprocal interactions on the collective properties of many-body systems is currently under heavy investigation in many different disciplines of science, ranging from active matter [8–10, 15, 55–60], photonics [7], robotics [61], living matter [54, 62], open quantum systems [27–31, 63], ecology [64–69], and neuroscience [3–6], to sociology [70]. Our work serves as a starting point to study quantum non-reciprocal science in solid-state platforms, offering an alternative route to control quantum matter with light [20, 71–80].

I. THE DISSIPATION ENGINEERING SCHEME

To illustrate our idea to create non-reciprocal interactions with light, let us briefly review the spin-spin interactions in magnetic metals [81], which is the focus of this work. [See Fig. 2(a).] These materials comprise localized spins (responsible for magnetic properties) and conduction electrons that are free to move (responsible for metallic properties), which couple through the spin-exchange coupling called the sd coupling [41, 82]. The sd coupling arises through the exchange of electrons, where the conduction electrons tunnel to the localized orbital to virtually excite the localized electron to a double-occupied state (see the “speech bubble” in Fig. 2(a)). The localized spins interact indirectly through this sd coupling using the conduction electrons as the mediating field, giving rise to magnetic interactions known as the RKKY interactions [36–38].

We propose to dissipation engineer the RKKY interaction with light. Our idea is to inject light that has its energy $h\nu$ tuned to selectively turn on the tunneling from the double-occupied state to a higher-energy state that quickly dissipates (Fig. 2(b)). This introduces a finite lifetime to the virtual state, directly affecting the




FIG. 2. **Dissipation engineering RKKY interactions in magnetic metals.** (a) Schematic description of magnetic metals. It is composed of localized spins (thick blue arrows) and conduction electrons (yellow spheres with arrows attached). The conduction electrons form a Fermi sea up to the Fermi energy ε_F . The localized electrons are modeled as a two-level system with energy ε_d with an on-site Coulomb interaction U . The two types of electrons couple through a spin exchange coupling called the sd coupling. Here, the sd spin exchange coupling arises through the second-order process where the conduction electron tunnels into the localized orbital to virtually excite to a double-occupied state and back, which involves spin-flip (the bottom panel). Using the conduction electrons as a medium, a magnetic interaction between the localized spins arises (the so-called RKKY interaction). [Note: there is another process where the localized electron first tunnels to the conduction band and back.] As these perturbative processes lower the energy, the ground state configuration is the state that activates these processes the most. (b) Our dissipation-engineering scheme is to inject light at a frequency $h\nu$ resonant with the double-occupied state and a higher-level state (say, an unoccupied higher-level f-orbital state at the energy $\varepsilon_{f,B}$) that quickly dissipates with rate $\Gamma_{f,B}$ in the figure. Since the decay occurs only when the localized-conduction electron exchange process activates (which lowers the energy), this process *selectively* destroys the energetically favored states, giving rise to a light-induced torque (pink arrow in Fig. 1(b)) that applies opposite to Gilbert damping (green arrows in Fig. 1(a),(b)). When this decay is turned on only to spin B but not A, the light-induced torque is applied only to B spins and hence a non-reciprocal interaction emerges. The lost electron is immediately resupplied from the surrounding environment.

properties of the sd coupling and hence the RKKY interaction. The lost electron is immediately resupplied such that localized electrons are always singly occupied.

We show below from explicit microscopic calculations that this light-induced dissipation gives rise to a torque (pink arrows in Fig. 1(b)), which interestingly applies in

the direction *opposite* to the energetically favored configuration. This light-induced torque competes with the magnetic friction called the Gilbert damping [83, 84] (green arrows) that relaxes the system to the ground state. When we choose the frequency of the light $h\nu$ in a way that it only resonates with a portion of the spins (red

spins in Fig. 1(b)), this light-induced torque only applies to those activated spins, giving rise to non-reciprocal interactions.

Why does our dissipation scheme give rise to torque that applies in the opposite direction from the Gilbert damping? This can be understood from the general picture we provide below. Our light-injection scheme only dissipates the virtual state of the second-order process illustrated in Fig. 2(b). Hence, the decay channel is turned on *only* when this process is activated; the configuration that activates the process more is the one that is likely to decay faster. Note crucially that these second-order processes always lower the energy in equilibrium because, according to the second-order perturbation theory, the energy change due to this process is given by $\Delta E = \sum_m |v_{i,m}|^2 / (E_i - E_m) < 0$, where $E_{i(m)}$ is the energy of the initial (intermediate) state of the unperturbed system and $v_{i,m}$ is the matrix element between these states. (Note that $E_i < E_m$.) For example, the *sd* exchange coupling is antiferromagnetic because the above process can only be activated when conduction and localized spins are antialigned due to the Pauli-blocking effect. Similarly, the sign of RKKY interactions is determined by which configuration the perturbative processes activate the most frequently. Therefore, the energetically favorable state is the state that experiences the strongest decay. This results in dissipative interaction in the direction *opposite* from the friction towards the ground state arising due to the coupling with the surrounding environment such as the substrate, bulk phonons, etc. We remark that similar physics was discussed in Refs. [85, 86] in the context of cold atomic systems, where they also dissipation-engineered sign-reversal of (reciprocal) interactions; but see also Methods for their crucial differences arising from the absence of the surrounding environment.

As the above scenario does not rely on features specific to magnetic systems, we expect our scheme to be equally relevant to a wide class of quantum materials [48–53].

II. QUANTUM MASTER EQUATION

Our goal from here on is to develop a formalism that allows us to describe the effective spin dynamics of the open quantum system with dissipation induced by continuous light injection. In this work, we consider magnetic metals modeled by the Anderson impurity model [81, 87] (Fig 2(a)), described by the Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + \hat{H}_{cd}$,

$$\hat{H}_0 = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma=\uparrow, \downarrow} \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \quad (1)$$

$$+ \sum_a \left[\sum_{\sigma=\uparrow, \downarrow} \varepsilon_{d,a} \hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma,a} + U_a \hat{d}_{\uparrow,a}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\uparrow,a} \hat{d}_{\downarrow,a}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\downarrow,a} \right],$$

$$\hat{H}_{cd} = \sum_{a,\sigma} [v_a \hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a\sigma} + \text{h.c.}] \quad (2)$$

Here, conduction electrons are modeled as free electrons, where $\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}$ is the fermionic annihilation operator of the

conduction electrons with spin $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$ and momentum \mathbf{k} and $\hat{c}_{\mathbf{r},\sigma} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}$ is its Fourier transform. $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ is the kinetic energy. The conduction electrons are assumed to be large enough to be always in thermal equilibrium, where its distribution is given by the Fermi distribution function $f(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) = [e^{(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_F)/(k_B T)} + 1]^{-1}$ (ε_F is the Fermi energy and k_B is the Boltzmann constant) at low temperature $k_B T \ll \varepsilon_F$. The localized electrons at site a are modeled as a two-level system that has energy $\varepsilon_{d,a}$ and an on-site Coulomb repulsion $U_a (> 0)$, where $\hat{d}_{\sigma,a}$ is a fermionic annihilation operator at site a . v_a is the conduction-localized electron mixing (c-d mixing), and \mathbf{R}_a is the position of the localized electron. The energy level of localized electrons $\varepsilon_{d,a}$ sit below the Fermi energy ε_F but the double-occupied state $\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a$ is above it. The resultant localized electrons are always singly occupied. Below, we consider systems with strong enough Coulomb repulsion $U_a \gg v_a$ that justifies the perturbative treatment of the c-d mixing v_a (See Supplemental Information (SI) Sec. III.C for a more precise condition).

As mentioned previously, we introduce a decay channel to localized electrons in the double-occupied state by injecting a laser that couples this state to a higher-energy state that quickly relaxes (see Fig. 2(b)). This dissipative process can be safely regarded as a Markov process as long as the higher-energy state decays fast enough compared to its re-population rate, which is true in the range of interest (see Methods for details). Such Markovian open quantum systems are generally described by the Gorini-Kossakowski-Sudarshan-Lindblad (GKSL) master equation [39, 40] (also called the Lindblad master equation; see e.g. Ref. [88] and SI Sec. I for a brief review), given by (where $\hat{\rho}$ is the reduced system density operator),

$$\partial_t \hat{\rho} = -i[\hat{H}, \hat{\rho}] + \sum_{a,\sigma} \kappa_a \mathcal{D}[\hat{d}_{\sigma,a} \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a] \hat{\rho}, \quad (3)$$

for our system. The dissipator $\mathcal{D}[\hat{L}] \hat{\rho} = \hat{L} \hat{\rho} \hat{L}^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{ \hat{L}^\dagger \hat{L}, \hat{\rho} \}$ makes the time evolution non-unitary. Here, $\hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a$ is a projection operator onto the double-occupied state at site a , turning on a decay channel at the rate κ_a only when site a is double-occupied.

We wish to derive the localized spin dynamics in the presence of light-induced dissipation $\kappa_a > 0$. In the equilibrium limit $\kappa_a \rightarrow 0$, a standard procedure to analyze the Anderson impurity model (Eq. (1) and (2)) is to map the localized electrons in the fermionic picture to localized spins, which is performed by projecting out the virtual excited states that have fast oscillations [41, 81]. This incorporates the second-order process in terms of v_a illustrated in Fig. 2(a). Here, we perform the same procedure in spirit but employ it to the GKSL master equation (3) [42–44, 89–91], see Methods and SI Sec. I–III for details. It yields,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \hat{\rho} = & -i[\hat{H}_{sd}, \hat{\rho}] \quad (4) \\ & + \sum_a \left[\gamma_a \mathcal{D} \left[\sum_{\sigma} \hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a,\sigma} \hat{P}_s^a \right] + \sum_{\sigma} \kappa_a \mathcal{D}[\hat{d}_{\sigma,a} \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a] \right] \hat{\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

The first term on the right-hand side describes the coherent dynamics that have an identical form to those found in equilibrium and the second and the third are the light-induced dissipative terms. The sd Hamiltonian [82] $\hat{H}_{sd} = -(1/2) \sum_a g_a \hat{P}_s^a [\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\mathbf{R}_a) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}}_a] \hat{P}_s^a$ describes the spin exchange coupling between the conduction and localized spins, where \hat{P}_s^a is the projection operator to singly-occupied localized electron states at site a . Here, $(\hat{\mathbf{S}}_a)_i = \sum_{\sigma, \sigma'} \hat{d}_{\sigma, a}^\dagger (\sigma_i)_{\sigma \sigma'} \hat{d}_{\sigma', a}$ is the localized spins, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$ are the Pauli matrices, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\mathbf{R}_a) = \sum_{\sigma, \sigma'} (\hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a, \sigma'}^\dagger \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\sigma' \sigma} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a, \sigma})$ is the conduction spin at position \mathbf{R}_a , and $g_a \simeq -|v_a|^2 [(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_F)^{-1} + (\varepsilon_F - \varepsilon_{d,a})^{-1}] < 0$ (where $\kappa_a \ll U_a$ is assumed) is the sd coupling strength that is antiferromagnetic. (Note that $\varepsilon_{d,a} < \varepsilon_F < \varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a$.) As usual, we have assumed that only the excitations near the Fermi surface are responsible. We have also ignored the impurity potential of conduction electrons, as they play a minor role.

The second term is the emergent correlated dissipation with the rate $\gamma_a \simeq \kappa_a |v_a|^2 / (\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_F)^2$ that arises from the interplay between the strong correlation effect and the light-induced decay (see Fig. 5 in Methods). This term induces dissipative tunneling of electrons from the conduction band to the localized orbital when the electron a is singly occupied. The third term describes the decay of electrons from the double-occupied state at a much faster rate than the correlated tunneling ($\kappa_a \gg \gamma_a$), driving the system immediately back to the singly occupied state.

The emergent correlated dissipation (the second term in Eq. (4)) already captures the underlying mechanism of sign inversion of interactions described in the previous section. This can be seen from the localized spin dynamics that are derived from the master equation (4),

$$\dot{\mathbf{S}}_a = g_a \langle \hat{\mathbf{S}}_a \times \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\mathbf{R}_a) \rangle - \gamma_a n \mathbf{S}_a + \gamma_a \boldsymbol{\tau}(\mathbf{R}_a), \quad (5)$$

where $\langle \hat{O} \rangle = \text{tr}[\hat{\rho} \hat{O}]$ represents the expectation value, $\mathbf{S}_a = \langle \hat{\mathbf{S}}_a \rangle$, $\boldsymbol{\tau}(\mathbf{R}_a) = \langle \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\mathbf{R}_a) \rangle$, and n is the filling of the conduction electron. The first and second terms describe the coherent dynamics arising from sd interaction and the light-induced decay of the dipole moment of the localized spin, respectively. The third term is the emergent dissipative torque, which drives the localized spin toward alignment with the conduction spins. This is the opposite of what is expected from energetics, where the sd coupling is antiferromagnetic $g_a < 0$. We note that it was crucial for this light-induced dissipator in Eq. (4) to have the form $\mathcal{D}[\sum_\sigma \hat{o}_\sigma]$ instead of $\sum_\sigma \mathcal{D}[\hat{o}_\sigma]$ for the dissipative torque to appear, see SI Sec. III.C for details.

III. LANDAU-LIFSHITZ-GILBERT EQUATION WITH LIGHT-INDUCED INTERACTIONS

The remaining task to obtain the effective interaction between the localized spins [36–38] (i.e. the dissipation-engineered RKKY interaction) is to integrate out the

conduction electron degrees of freedom that we regard as a (non-Markovian) bath. We perform this by mapping the master equation (4) to a Keldysh action [46] that allows us to utilize field-theoretic approaches, taking into account non-adiabatic effects from the Fermi statistics of the conduction electrons. Once the Keldysh action is obtained, we integrate out the conduction electrons' degrees of freedom within the second-order perturbation in terms of sd coupling g_a and light-induced correlated decay rate γ_a under the gradient approximation (i.e., Markov approximation plus a first-order non-Markovian correction). We extract the localized spin dynamics in the saddle-point approximation from the obtained reduced Keldysh action consisting only of localized electrons' degrees of freedom. We detail the procedure in Methods and SI Sec. IV.

The obtained semiclassical localized spin dynamics are

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{S}}_a = & \sum_{b(\neq a)} J_{ab} \mathbf{S}_a \times \mathbf{S}_b - \alpha_a \mathbf{S}_a \times \dot{\mathbf{S}}_a \\ & - \gamma_a n \mathbf{S}_a - \sum_{b(\neq a)} \Omega_{ab} \mathbf{S}_b, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

which is one of the main results of this work. We emphasize that all terms, including the Gilbert damping term, are obtained microscopically.

The first two terms on the right-hand side are the Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert equation [83, 84], while the last two terms are terms generated through our controlled dissipation. The first term gives rise to the coherent precession motion around the effective magnetic field $\mathbf{B}_{\text{eff}} = \sum_{b(\neq a)} J_{ab}(\mathbf{R}_{ab}) \mathbf{S}_b$, where $J_{ab}(= J_{ba})$ is the RKKY interaction strength given by $J_{ab}(\mathbf{R}_{ab}) = -9\pi [(g_a g_b) / \varepsilon_F] n^2 F(2k_F \mathbf{R}_{ab})$ in the case of parabolic dispersion $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = \hbar^2 \mathbf{k}^2 / (2m)$ in three spatial dimensions, where m is the conduction electron mass, $k_F = \sqrt{2m\varepsilon_F} / \hbar$ is the Fermi momentum, $\mathbf{R}_{ab} = |\mathbf{R}_a - \mathbf{R}_b|$ is the inter-spin distance, and $F(x) = [-x \cos x + \sin x] / x^4$, and \hbar is the Dirac constant. The second term, obtained as the first-order correction to the Markov approximation [92], is the Gilbert damping term describing the spins' magnetic friction [83, 84]. This drives the system toward the ground state configuration when combined with the first term (green arrows in Fig. 1). Here, α_a is the Gilbert damping rate, which in the parabolic dispersion case reads $\alpha_a = (9\pi^2 / 2) n^2 (g_a / \varepsilon_F)^2$. The relaxation rate for such a process is $\gamma_{\text{Gil}}^{ab} \sim \alpha_a |J_{ab}|$.

The light-induced dissipative interactions $\Omega_{ab}(\mathbf{R}_{ab}) = (\gamma_a / |g_a|) J_{ab}(\mathbf{R}_{ab}) (\simeq (\kappa_a / U_a) J_{ab}(\mathbf{R}_{ab}))$ compete with this equilibration dynamics (pink arrows in Fig. 1(b)). In addition to the unavoidable decay with rate γ_a of the dipole moment described by the third term, our light induces effective interactions that cannot be written as the derivative of the energy function. (We briefly note that we have ignored the contribution from self-dissipative interaction Ω_{aa} , which merely renormalizes the decay rate γ_a .) This dissipative interaction drives the system towards a configuration *opposite* from the ground state




FIG. 3. **Typical energy scales in different physical pictures.** The energy scales in (left panel) localized electrons immersed in conduction electrons picture described by Eq. (3), (middle panel) localized spins immersed in conduction electrons picture described by Eq. (4), and (right panel) in the interacting localized spin picture (where the conduction electrons are integrated out) described by Eq. (6). These pictures map from one to the other via the projection method (SI Sec. III) and Keldysh theory (SI Sec. IV). Each panel lists the energy scales in the coherent (Hamiltonian) and dissipative dynamics. The equilibration occurs at the timescale set by the energy scale in the Hamiltonian multiplied by the Gilbert damping rate α_a . This competes with the light-induced dissipation and the sign reversal of interaction occurs when the latter exceeds the former.

configuration. When $\kappa_a \gtrsim \alpha_a U_a$, this light-induced contribution ($\Omega_{ab} = \kappa_a/U_a \cdot J_{ab}$) exceeds the Gilbert damping ($\gamma_{\text{Gil}}^{ab} \sim \alpha_a J_{ab}$), causing the effective interaction to change its sign. When this sign flip occurs to one of the spins but not the other, non-reciprocal interactions with effective opposite signs emerge, resulting in chase-and-runaway dynamics, the situation illustrated in Fig. 1(b).

In Methods, we estimate the pumping power P required to achieve this regime as

$$P \gtrsim \alpha_a \frac{2\pi U_a \nu m_0 \epsilon_0 c}{e^2} \Gamma_{f,a} \quad (7)$$

using a Lorentz oscillator model, where e is the electron charge, m_0 is the electron mass, ϵ_0 is the vacuum dielectric constant, and c is the speed of light. Setting the

typical values $U_a \sim 1\text{eV}$, $\alpha_a \sim 10^{-2}$, $\Gamma_{f,a} \sim 10\text{meV}$, $h\nu \sim 1\text{eV}$, the required pump power is $P \gtrsim 10^8\text{W/cm}^2$. Not only is this pump power achievable, e.g. with Raman lasers with pulse duration of $O(10\text{ns})$ [93] or even with a steady-state resource [94], but the heating effect should be minimal for magnetic metals. For instance, in Ref. [78], it was reported that the sample did not demagnetize until the pump power exceeded $P \sim 10^{10}\text{W/cm}^2$. For convenience for the readers, we have summarized the typical energy scales in Fig. 3.




FIG. 4. **Non-reciprocal phase transitions in light-activated layered ferromagnets.** (a) Layered ferromagnet composed of A and B layers separated by a non-magnetic metal exposed of light injection that activates the B layer. The interlayer RKKY interaction is mediated by the itinerant electrons in the non-magnetic metal layer, which is modified by light. In particular, the magnetization in the A layer aligns with the rate $\alpha_A j_{AB}$ for ferromagnetic interlayer interactions $j_{AB} > 0$, while the B layer may align or antialign with layer A depending on the sign of the modified effective interaction $\alpha_B j_{AB} - \Omega_{BA}$. $\varphi_{A(B)}$ is the orientation direction of the magnetization $\mathbf{m}_{A(B)}$ of A(B)-layer ferromagnet. (b)-(d) Different phases arising in this system. (b) Aligned phase ($\Delta\varphi = \varphi_A - \varphi_B = 0$) realized in the equilibrium limit $\gamma_B = 0$. (c) Antialigned phase ($\Delta\varphi = \pi$) at $\gamma_B = 0.022\text{meV}$. (d) Chiral phase ($\Delta\varphi \neq 0, \pi$) at $\gamma_B = 0.03\text{meV}$. (e) The orientation angle difference $\Delta\varphi$ and (f) the magnitude of the magnetization $|\mathbf{m}_{A,B}|$ as a function of γ_B . We set $j_{AB} = 5\text{meV}$ and the other parameters are the same as those used in Fig. 1(c). The simulations were run from random initial conditions.

IV. NON-RECIPROCAL PHASE TRANSITIONS

So far, we have shown from microscopic calculations that one can generate non-reciprocal interactions with light. An intriguing question is how such non-reciprocal interaction affects the collective properties of many-body systems. In this work, at the outset, we consider a simple setup illustrated in Fig. 4(a), where light is exposed to two layers of ferromagnets (that we label A and B) sandwich a non-magnetic metal. The light is tuned to activate only layer B spins. In the absence of light, this is a type of MRAM device. The itinerant electrons in the non-magnetic metal layer mediate the interlayer RKKY interaction [79, 95–97]. The light injection induces additional torque to the B layer applying oppositely from conventional RKKY interaction, giving rise to non-reciprocal interlayer interaction (Fig. 4(a)).

We wish to predict the magnetization dynamics of this system. Unfortunately, deriving the governing equation

of the collective magnetization dynamics from a microscopic model is a highly non-trivial task that requires a beyond-saddle-point approximation we employed above [98]. Although deriving such a coarse-grained description from microscopics is an important challenge, here, we take a phenomenological approach below.

We make the following observations: (a) In the absence of light, the magnetism $\mathbf{m}_{a=A,B}$ should converge to the known equilibrium value. (b) Since the relaxation towards this state occurs through the Gilbert damping, their relaxation time for the a -layer is expected to be $\tau_{\text{Gil}}^a = O([\alpha_a \sum_b j_{ab}]^{-1})$, where $j_{ab}(= j_{ba})$ is the interaction strength J_{ab} multiplied by the number of spins a given spin couples to. (c) When light is injected into the B layer, the light-induced torque Ω_{BA} and a decay with the rate γ_B is introduced to B layer magnetization \mathbf{m}_B . This brings us to propose the following phenomenological

meanfield description:

$$\dot{\mathbf{m}}_A = \alpha_A \left[-k_B T \mathbf{m}_A + \left[1 - \frac{(\mathbf{h}_{\text{eff}}^A)^2}{3(k_B T)^2} \right] \mathbf{h}_{\text{eff}}^A \right], \quad (8a)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{m}}_B = \alpha_B \left[-k_B T \mathbf{m}_B + \left[1 - \frac{(\mathbf{h}_{\text{eff}}^B)^2}{3(k_B T)^2} \right] \mathbf{h}_{\text{eff}}^B \right] - \gamma_B n \mathbf{m}_B - \Omega_{BA} \mathbf{m}_A, \quad (8b)$$

where $\mathbf{h}_{\text{eff}}^a = \sum_{b=A,B} j_{ab} \mathbf{m}_b$ is the effective field applied to \mathbf{m}_a and $\Omega_{BA} = (\gamma_B/|g_B|)j_{AB}$ is the light-induced torque. For simplicity, we have assumed that the system is close enough to the disordered-ordered transition point that the Ginzburg-Landau expansion is justified and the anisotropy is strong enough that z -component of the magnetization vanishes $m_a^z = 0$. In the absence of light $\gamma_B = 0$, the steady state $\dot{\mathbf{m}}_a = 0$ reproduces the known result from the Weiss theory. This is of the general form introduced in Ref. [15].

Figure 1(c) shows the phase diagram obtained by simulating Eq. (8). In the absence of the light injection $\gamma_B = 0$, unsurprisingly, the magnetization orientation of the two layers aligns $\Delta\varphi = \varphi_A - \varphi_B = 0$ (Fig. 4(b)), where the orientation of the magnetism is defined by $\mathbf{m}_a = |\mathbf{m}_a|(\cos \varphi_a, \sin \varphi_a)$. As one increases the laser power that increases γ_B , the light-induced torque Ω_{BA} weakens the ferromagnetic interaction, until it swaps the sign at $\Omega_{BA} \gtrsim \alpha_B j_{AB}$ or $\gamma_B \gtrsim \alpha_B |g_B|$ (see Fig. 4(e)). This causes a transition from aligned $\Delta\varphi = 0$ to antialigned configuration $\Delta\varphi = \pi$ (blue thin line in Fig. 1(c) and Fig. 4(c)). Remarkably, the B layer completely demagnetizes at the transition point $|\mathbf{m}_B| = 0$, while the A layer is still ferromagnetic $\mathbf{m}_A \neq 0$ (Fig. 4(f)) even though the interlayer coupling is still present.

As γ_B is further increased, the system exhibits a non-reciprocal phase transition [15, 26] to a time-dependent chiral phase (see Fig. 1(c)) exhibiting a many-body chase-and-runaway motion (Fig. 4(d)). The parity spontaneously breaks in this chiral phase, where the relative orientation angle converges to a state $\Delta\varphi = (\neq 0, \pi)$ that is not invariant under the parity operation $\Delta\varphi \rightarrow -\Delta\varphi$. This cannot be understood from the Landau theory [15], where the critical point is characterized by the coalescence of the collective modes to the Nambu-Goldstone mode [17, 20]. Interestingly, there are regions where this symmetry-broken phase *expands* when increasing the temperature, which is opposite from what is conventionally expected (see the dashed lines in Fig. 1(c) that show the phase boundary at a lower temperature). This is a signature of order-by-disorder phenomena discussed in Ref. [26], where a direct analogy between the geometrically frustrated systems and non-reciprocal matter was drawn.

V. DISCUSSION

In summary, we have proposed a scheme to dissipation-engineer non-reciprocal interactions with light. We

showed microscopically that the light injection to magnetic metals that introduces decay of a virtually excited state induces non-reciprocal interaction between localized spins. Applying this method to layered ferromagnets, we showed that a non-reciprocal phase transition to a time-dependent chiral phase emerges [15, 26]. The pump intensity required to achieve this is estimated to be within reach of the current experimental techniques.

Recent works showed that non-reciprocal phase transitions exhibit unconventional critical phenomena associated with anomalously giant fluctuations [17], fluctuation-induced first-order transition [20], and diverging entropy production [21–23], due to the unique feature that the criticality is driven by the coalescence of the modes to the Nambu-Goldstone mode. Furthermore, non-reciprocal interactions have been shown to give rise to emergent features such as odd elasticity [11, 12] (anti-symmetric part of the static elastic modulus tensor), long-ranged order in two spatial dimensions [13, 14] (in an apparent violation of the Hohenberg-Mermin-Wagner theorem), and phenomena analogous to those occurring in geometrically frustrated systems [26]. Our dissipation-engineering scheme may allow exploring these non-reciprocal physics in solid-state platforms.

Methods

OUTLINE OF THE DERIVATION OF EQ. (4) AND EQ. (6)

We provide here a brief outline of the derivation of Eq. (4) and Eq. (6) in the main text. The full detail is provided in the SI Sec. III and IV, respectively.

1. Derivation of Eq. (4)

Our starting point to derive Eq. (4) is the quantum master equation (3), which, for convenience, we write it as

$$\partial_t \hat{\rho} = \mathcal{L} \hat{\rho}, \quad (9)$$

where we have expressed the right-hand side of Eq. (3) using a superoperator (an operator that acts on a matrix) called the Lindbladian \mathcal{L} . We split the Lindbladian into two contributions $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{L}_1$:

$$\mathcal{L}_1 \rho = -i[\hat{H}_{cd}, \hat{\rho}] \quad (10)$$

is the contribution from the c-d mixing $\hat{H}_{cd} = \sum_{a,\sigma} [v_a \hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a \sigma} + \text{h.c.}] = \sum_a \sum_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} [v_a e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} \hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} + \text{h.c.}]$ that we treat as a perturbation. The rest $\mathcal{L}_0 =$

$\mathcal{L}_{c0} + \sum_a \mathcal{L}_{d0,a}$ is the non-perturbative part, given by,

$$\mathcal{L}_{c0}\hat{\rho} = -i\left[\sum_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^\dagger\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma},\hat{\rho}\right], \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{d0,a}\hat{\rho} = & -i\left[\left(\sum_{\sigma}\varepsilon_{d,a}\hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger\hat{d}_{\sigma,a} + U_a\hat{d}_{\uparrow,a}^\dagger\hat{d}_{\uparrow,a}\hat{d}_{\downarrow,a}^\dagger\hat{d}_{\downarrow,a}\right),\hat{\rho}\right] \\ & + \sum_{\sigma}\kappa_a\mathcal{D}[\hat{d}_{\sigma,a}\hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a]\hat{\rho}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

In the following, we take advantage of the property that our system has a separation of timescales by dividing the double Hilbert space (where the density operator $\hat{\rho}$ lives in) into slow and fast degrees of freedom. By perturbatively projecting out the latter [41], we obtain an effective low-energy description. Specifically, we first divide the right (left) eigenstates $\hat{r}_n^{(0)}$ ($\hat{l}_n^{(0)}$) with the eigenvalue $\lambda_n^{(0)}$ of the non-perturbative Lindbladian, defined as $\mathcal{L}_0\hat{r}_n^{(0)} = \lambda_n^{(0)}\hat{r}_n^{(0)}$ ($\hat{l}_n^{(0)\dagger}\mathcal{L}_0 = \hat{l}_n^{(0)\dagger}\lambda_n^{(0)}$), to slow ($n \in \mathfrak{s}$) and fast ($n \in \mathfrak{f}$) degrees of freedom ($|\lambda_{n \in \mathfrak{s}}^{(0)}| \ll |\lambda_{n \in \mathfrak{f}}^{(0)}|$). The perturbative Lindbladian \mathcal{L}_1 couples the slow and fast modes. Then, as derived in SI Sec. I.A.2, we perturbatively project out the fast degrees of freedom to yield the effective low-energy Lindbladian,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}})_{n_l, n_r} & \equiv (\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)}, \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}\hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)}) = \text{tr}[\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger}\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}\hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)}] \\ & = \text{tr}[\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger}\mathcal{L}_0\hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)}] + \text{tr}[\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger}\mathcal{L}_1\hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)}] \\ & - \sum_{m \in \mathfrak{f}} \frac{\text{tr}[\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger}\mathcal{L}_1\hat{r}_m^{(0)}]\text{tr}[\hat{l}_m^{(0)\dagger}\mathcal{L}_1\hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)}]}{\lambda_m^{(0)}} + O((\mathcal{L}_1)^3). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Here, $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}) = \text{tr}[\hat{A}^\dagger\hat{B}]$ is the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product and $\hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)}$ ($\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)}$) is the right (left) eigenstates that form the basis of the slow degrees of freedom ($n_r, n_l \in \mathfrak{s}$). The first, second, and third terms on the rightmost side are the zeroth, first, and second-order contribution in terms of \mathcal{L}_1 , respectively. In the third term, the sum is taken over the fast degrees of freedom. Note how the third term has a similar form to the familiar second-order Rayleigh-Schrödinger perturbation theory, which is given by the matrix element $\text{tr}[\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger}\mathcal{L}_1\hat{r}_m^{(0)}]\text{tr}[\hat{l}_m^{(0)\dagger}\mathcal{L}_1\hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)}]$ divided by the eigenvalue of the intermediate state $\lambda_m^{(0)}$. Equation (13) is consistent with the so-called Lindblad perturbation theory [42–44].

In our problem, first note that the localized and conduction electrons are decoupled in the non-perturbative Lindbladian $\mathcal{L}_0 = \mathcal{L}_{c0} + \sum_a \mathcal{L}_{d0,a}$ and therefore the right eigenstate is expressed as a direct product $\hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)} = (\prod_a \hat{r}_{a, n_r}^{d(0)}) \otimes \hat{r}_{n_r}^{c(0)}$ of the right eigenstates of $\mathcal{L}_{d0,a}$ and \mathcal{L}_{c0} described by $\hat{r}_{a, n_r}^{d(0)}$ and $\hat{r}_{n_r}^{c(0)}$, respectively. For the conduction electrons, we will always be considering low-temperature states that have their conduction electrons in their ground state that forms a Fermi sea $\hat{r}_{n_r}^{c(0)} = |F\rangle\langle F|$, where $|F\rangle = \prod_{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} < \varepsilon_F} \prod_{\sigma=\uparrow, \downarrow} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^\dagger |0\rangle$. For the localized electrons, we regard the eigenstates with singly occupied state as slow degrees of freedom, i.e., $\{|\uparrow\rangle_a \langle \uparrow|$

$|\downarrow\rangle_a \langle \downarrow|, |\downarrow\rangle_a \langle \uparrow|, |\uparrow\rangle_a \langle \downarrow|, |\uparrow\rangle_a \langle \uparrow|, \}$ where $|\sigma\rangle_a = \hat{d}_{a, \sigma}^\dagger |\emptyset\rangle_a$ is a singly occupied state and $|\emptyset\rangle_a$ is a vacant state. We also regard eigenstates that are diagonal in the Fock basis as slow modes for the localized electrons (which includes states like $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_a \langle \uparrow\downarrow|$, where $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_a$ is a double-occupied state) as they do not involve fast coherent dynamics. The rest, such as $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_a \langle \uparrow|$ and $|\emptyset\rangle_a \langle \downarrow|$, are fast degrees of freedom.

Among these slow degrees of freedom, we are mainly interested in the states where the localized electron is singly occupied, i.e., $\hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)} = \prod_a |\sigma_a\rangle_a \langle \sigma'_a|_a \otimes |F\rangle\langle F|$ ($\sigma_a, \sigma'_a = \uparrow, \downarrow$). In this case, the first-order contribution (the second term in Eq. (13)) is absent. For the second-order contribution (the third term in Eq. (13)), the c-d mixing \mathcal{L}_1 transfers the state into a state where (a) the localized electron is double-occupied and a hole is excited in the conduction band [the process illustrated in Fig. 2] or (b) the localized electron is vacant and a particle is excited in the conduction band. As a result, the intermediate state involves states with eigenvalues $\lambda_{(a)\pm}^{(0)} = \pm i(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_{d,a} - U_a) - \kappa_a/2$ for the process (a) and $\lambda_{(b)\pm}^{(0)} = \pm i(\varepsilon_{d,a} - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}})$ for the process (b). The real part of the process (a) $\text{Re}\lambda_{(a)\pm} = -\kappa_a/2$ reflects the light-induced decay that turns on in the double-occupied state. Assuming further that only excitation near the Fermi surface contributes $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \approx \varepsilon_F$, this yields, as detailed in SI Sec. III,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}^{\text{sd}}(\hat{P}_s^a \hat{\rho} \hat{P}_s^a) & = -i[\hat{H}_{\text{sd}}, \hat{\rho}] \\ & + \sum_a \gamma_a \mathcal{D}\left[\sum_{\sigma} \hat{d}_{\sigma, a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a, \sigma} \hat{P}_s^a\right] \hat{\rho}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Here, the sd coupling

$$g_a = -|v_a|^2 \left[\frac{\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_F}{(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_F)^2 + \frac{\kappa_a^2}{4}} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon_F - \varepsilon_{d,a}} \right] \quad (15)$$

in the sd Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{\text{sd}} = -(1/2) \sum_a g_a \hat{P}_s^a [\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\mathbf{R}_a) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}}_a] \hat{P}_s^a$ and the correlated dissipation

$$\gamma_a = \frac{|v_a|^2 \kappa_a}{(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_F)^2 + \frac{\kappa_a^2}{4}}, \quad (16)$$

are given by the imaginary and real part, respectively, of $|v_a|^2 [\lambda_{(a)+}^{-1} + \lambda_{(b)+}^{-1}]$ that arise from the two processes (a) and (b). The expression valid at regimes $\kappa_a \ll \varepsilon_F, \varepsilon_{d,a}, U_a$ is reported in the main text.

The correlated dissipation (the second term in Eq. (14)) adds an electron to the localized orbital such that the state transfers to a double-occupied state. This is quickly returned to a singly-occupied state via the light-induced decay with rate κ_a , which can readily be seen from the effective Lindbladian applied to $\hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)} = |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_a \langle \uparrow\downarrow|_a \otimes |F\rangle\langle F|$ as,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}^{\text{sd}}(\hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a \hat{\rho} \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a) = \sum_{a, \sigma} \kappa_a \mathcal{D}[\hat{d}_{\sigma, a} \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a] \hat{\rho}, \quad (17)$$

where we have ignored the contribution to the coherent dynamics since we are not interested in the details of the double-occupied state. When applied to a vacant state $\hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)} = \prod_a |\emptyset\rangle_a \langle \emptyset|_a \otimes |F\rangle \langle F|$, we find $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}^{\text{sd}}(\hat{P}_{\emptyset}^a \hat{\rho} \hat{P}_{\emptyset}^a) = 0$ (\hat{P}_{\emptyset}^a is a projection operator to a vacant state), where again, we have ignored the contribution to the coherent dynamics. Summing up these results gives the desired Eq. (4) in the main text.

2. Derivation of Eq. (6)

We next integrate out the conduction electron degrees of freedom to derive the RKKY interactions between the localized spins modified by light. As emphasized in the main text, it is crucial to consider the non-adiabatic (non-Markovian) effect arising from the Fermi distribution function of the conduction electrons. A useful approach to take such effect into account is to analyze a generating function called the Keldysh partition function, defined as [45–47] (See SI Sec. I for a brief review.),

$$Z \equiv \text{tr}[\hat{\rho}(t_f)] = \text{tr}[e^{\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}^{\text{sd}}(t_f-t_0)} \hat{\rho}(t_0)], \quad (18)$$

for the master equation (4). We expand the time evolution operator $e^{\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}(t_f-t_0)}$ in terms of fermionic coherent states into a product of infinitesimally short time interval, similarly to the path integral formalism in quantum mechanics. Unlike in quantum mechanics (that deals with wave functions $|\psi\rangle$) that involves one Grassmann field $\psi(t)$ per degree of freedom, however, as we are dealing with the dynamics of the density matrix $\hat{\rho}$ that lives in the double Hilbert space, each degree of freedom is assigned with two fields $\psi_+(t)$ and $\psi_-(t)$ that loosely describes the time evolution of the ket and bra space, respectively. For our system (Eq. (4)), the Keldysh partition function is given by,

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}(d_+, \bar{d}_+, d_-, \bar{d}_-) \mathcal{D}(c_+, \bar{c}_+, c_-, \bar{c}_-) e^{iS} \quad (19)$$

where $S[d_+, \bar{d}_+, d_-, \bar{d}_-, c_+, \bar{c}_+, c_-, \bar{c}_-] = S_d^0[d, \bar{d}] + S_c^0[c, \bar{c}] + S_{\text{sd}}^{\text{coh}}[c, \bar{c}, d, \bar{d}] + S_{\text{sd}}^{\text{dis}}[c, \bar{c}, d, \bar{d}]$ is the so-called

Keldysh action, given by

$$S_d^0[d, \bar{d}] = \int dt \sum_{s=\pm} \sum_{a,\sigma} s \bar{d}_{a,\sigma}^s(t) i \partial_t d_{a,\sigma}^s(t) \quad (20)$$

$$S_c^0[c, \bar{c}] = \int dt \sum_{s=\pm} \sum_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} s \times \left[\bar{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^s(t) i \partial_t c_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^s(t) - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \bar{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^s(t) c_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^s(t) \right], \quad (21)$$

$$S_{\text{sd}}^{\text{coh}}[c, \bar{c}, d, \bar{d}] = - \int dt \sum_{s=\pm} s \sum_a \sum_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}} (-g_a) e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{R}_a} \times \sum_{\sigma,\sigma'} \bar{d}_{\sigma,a}^s(t) \bar{c}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},\sigma'}^s(t) c_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^s(t) d_{\sigma',a}^s(t), \quad (22)$$

$$S_{\text{sd}}^{\text{dis}}[c, \bar{c}, d, \bar{d}] = -i \int dt \sum_a \sum_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}} \gamma_a e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{R}_a} \times \sum_{\sigma,\sigma'} \left[\bar{c}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},\sigma'}^-(t) d_{\sigma',a}^-(t) \bar{d}_{\sigma,a}^+(t) c_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^+(t) - \frac{1}{2} \bar{c}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},\sigma'}^+(t+\delta) d_{\sigma',a}^+(t+\delta) \bar{d}_{\sigma,a}^+(t-\delta) c_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^+(t-\delta) - \frac{1}{2} \bar{c}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},\sigma'}^-(t-\delta) d_{\sigma',a}^-(t-\delta) \bar{d}_{\sigma,a}^-(t+\delta) c_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^-(t+\delta) \right], \quad (23)$$

Here, $c_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^{\pm}$ and $d_{a,\sigma}^{\pm}$ are the Grassmann variables of conduction and localized electrons, respectively, and $t_{\pm\delta} = t \pm 0^+$.

Since the Keldysh action S is quadratic in terms of (c, \bar{c}) , one can analytically integrate out the conduction electron degrees of freedom to obtain the effective action $S_{\text{eff}}[d, \bar{d}]$ defined as $Z \equiv \int \mathcal{D}(d, \bar{d}) e^{iS_{\text{eff}}[d, \bar{d}]}$. As detailed in SI Sec IV, the effective action within the second-order perturbation in terms of g_a and γ_a (with several additional assumptions detailed in SI Sec. IV) reads $S_{\text{eff}}[d, \bar{d}] = S_d^0[d, \bar{d}] + S_{\gamma}[d, \bar{d}] + S_M[d, \bar{d}]$, where

$$S_{\gamma}[d, \bar{d}] = i \int dt \sum_{a,\sigma} \gamma_a n [d_{\sigma,a}^-(t) \bar{d}_{\sigma,a}^+(t) - \frac{1}{2} d_{\sigma,a}^+(t+\delta) \bar{d}_{\sigma,a}^+(t-\delta) - \frac{1}{2} d_{\sigma,a}^-(t-\delta) \bar{d}_{\sigma,a}^-(t+\delta)], \quad (24)$$

is the first-order contribution and $S_M[d, \bar{d}] = S_{\text{RKKY}}^{\text{coh}}[d, \bar{d}] + S_{\text{Gilbert}}[d, \bar{d}] + S_{\text{RKKY}}^{\text{neq}}[d, \bar{d}]$ is the second-

order contribution, with

$$S_{\text{RKKY}}^{\text{coh}}[d, \bar{d}] = \int dt \sum_{a,b} \frac{J_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b})}{2} \sum_{j=0}^3 \sum_{s=\pm} s \hat{m}_{a,j}^{s,s} \hat{m}_{b,j}^{s,s}, \quad (25)$$

$$S_{\text{Gilbert}}[d, \bar{d}] = - \sum_a \frac{\alpha_a}{4} \int dt \sum_{j=0}^3 \hat{m}_{a,j}^{+,+}(t) \partial_t \hat{m}_{a,j}^{-,-}(t), \quad (26)$$

$$S_{\text{RKKY}}^{\text{neq}}[d, \bar{d}] = i \int dt \sum_{a,b} \frac{\Omega_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b})}{2} \times \sum_{j=0}^3 \left[\hat{m}_{a,j}^{+,+} \hat{m}_{b,j}^{+,+} + \hat{m}_{a,j}^{-,-} \hat{m}_{b,j}^{-,-} - \hat{m}_{a,j}^{+,-} \hat{m}_{b,j}^{+,+} - \hat{m}_{a,j}^{-,-} \hat{m}_{b,j}^{+,-} \right]. \quad (27)$$

Here, $\hat{m}_{a,j}^{l_1, l_2}[d, \bar{d}] = \sum_{\mu, \nu = \uparrow, \downarrow} \bar{d}_{\mu, a}^{\dagger} \hat{\sigma}_j^{\mu\nu} d_{\nu, a}^{l_2}$ ($l_1, l_2 = +, -$) is a localized spin written in terms of Grassmann variables, and

$$J_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}) = - \frac{|g_a| |g_b|}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} \cos(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_{a,b}) \frac{f_+ - f_-}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_-} \quad (28)$$

$$\Omega_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}) = - \frac{\gamma_a |g_b|}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} \cos(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_{a,b}) \frac{f_+ - f_-}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_-}, \quad (29)$$

$$\alpha_a = -4\pi g_a^2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} \frac{f_+ - f_-}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_-} \delta(\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_-), \quad (30)$$

with $\varepsilon_{\pm} = \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}/2}$ and $f_{\pm} = f(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}/2})$. $J_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b})$ is identical to the well-known form of the RKKY interaction strength [81]. In calculating S_M , we have employed a gradient approximation, i.e. a Markovian approximation ($S_{\text{RKKY}}^{\text{coh}}$ and $S_{\text{RKKY}}^{\text{neq}}$) plus the first-order correction to it (S_{Gilbert}).

The physical meaning of each term becomes clear by deriving the equation of motion of the spins. To do this, we introduce a set of auxiliary fields m and Lagrange multipliers λ as

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int \mathcal{D}[m] e^{iS_M[m]} \\ &\times \int \mathcal{D}[\lambda] \int \mathcal{D}[d, \bar{d}] e^{iS_d^0[d, \bar{d}] + iS_{\gamma}[d, \bar{d}] + iS_{\lambda}[\lambda, m, \hat{m}[d, \bar{d}]]} \\ &\equiv \int \mathcal{D}[m] \int \mathcal{D}[\lambda] e^{iS_M[m]} e^{iS_B^{\lambda}[\lambda, m]} \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

with

$$S_{\lambda}[\lambda, m, \hat{m}[d, \bar{d}]] = \int dt \sum_a \sum_{l_1, l_2 = q, c} \sum_{j=0}^3 \lambda_{a,j}^{l_1, l_2}(t) \times [m_{a,j}^{l_1, l_2}(t) - \hat{m}_{a,j}^{l_1, l_2}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)]]. \quad (32)$$

As detailed in see SI Sec. IV.C, taking the saddle-point approximation of Eq. (31) as $\frac{\delta S_M^{\text{eff}}[\lambda, m]}{\delta \lambda_{a,j}^{l_1, l_2}} = \frac{\delta S_M^{\text{eff}}[\lambda, m]}{\delta m_{a,j}^{l_1, l_2}} = 0$

(where $S_M^{\text{eff}}[\lambda, m] = S_M[m] + S_B^{\lambda}[\lambda, m]$) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \mathbf{S}_a &= -\gamma_a n \mathbf{S}_a - \sum_{b(\neq a)} \Omega_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}) \mathbf{S}_b(t) \\ &- \left[\sum_b J_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}) \mathbf{S}_b(t) - \alpha_a \dot{\mathbf{S}}_a(t) \right] \times \mathbf{S}_a(t), \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where $S_{a,j} = m_{a,j}^{++}(t) = m_{a,j}^{--}(t) = \langle \sum_{\sigma, \sigma' = \uparrow, \downarrow} \hat{d}_{a,\sigma}^{\dagger}(t) \sigma_j^{\sigma, \sigma'} \hat{d}_{a,\sigma'}(t) \rangle$ and $m_{a,j}^{+-}(t) = m_{a,j}^{-+}(t) = 0$, which is the desired Eq. (6) in the main text. The first, second, third, and fourth terms on the right-hand side arise from S_{γ} , $S_{\text{RKKY}}^{\text{neq}}$, $S_{\text{RKKY}}^{\text{coh}}$, and S_{Gilbert} , respectively.

ESTIMATION OF THE REQUIRED POWER

Below, we estimate the required laser power P to realize the sign-inversion of the interactions, which occurs when the decay rate of the double-occupied state κ_a exceeds $\alpha_a U_a$ (see main text and Fig. 3). Our scheme considers the situation where the double-occupied (at energy $\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a$) and higher-level states (at energy $\varepsilon_{f,a}$) are coupled through the injected laser. We assume that the higher-level state is localized and dissipates with the rate $\Gamma_{f,a}$, so one can model it with a Lorentz oscillator model [99].

When a laser with the pump power P is injected into the material, the dissipation causes the energy loss of the laser intensity if the system is in a double-occupied state. The lost energy density per unit time and volume W is given by

$$W = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_0 \omega \chi''(\omega) |E|^2 = \frac{\omega \chi''(\omega)}{c} P, \quad (34)$$

where $\omega = 2\pi\nu$ is the laser frequency. Here, we have expressed the pump power $P = \frac{1}{2} c \epsilon_0 |E|^2$ in terms of speed of light c , vacuum dielectric constant ϵ_0 , and electric field E . The absorption susceptibility $\chi''(\omega)$ is computed according to the Lorentz oscillator model as

$$\chi''(\omega) = \frac{n e^2}{\epsilon_0 m_0} \frac{\omega \Gamma_{f,a}}{(\omega_0^2 - \omega^2)^2 + \omega^2 \Gamma_{f,a}^2} \simeq \frac{n e^2}{\epsilon_0 m_0} \frac{1}{\omega_0 \Gamma_{f,a}}. \quad (35)$$

Here, ω_0 is the resonant frequency (which, in our case, corresponds to $\hbar\omega_0 = \varepsilon_{f,a} - (\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a)$), n is the number of electrons per unit volume, and m_0 is the electron mass. In the second equality, we have set the laser frequency to be on resonance $h\nu = \hbar\omega = \hbar\omega_0$.

The decay rate of the double-occupied state κ_a per electron is estimated as

$$\kappa_a = \frac{W}{n \cdot \omega_0}. \quad (36)$$

This needs to be larger than $\alpha_a U_a$ to achieve the regime for showing laser-induced switching of interactions. This condition is given by,

$$\kappa_a = \frac{\chi''(\omega_0) P}{n \cdot c} \gtrsim \alpha_a U_a. \quad (37)$$




FIG. 5. **Light-injection induced dissipation and their energy scales.** (a) The double-occupied (at the energy $\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a$) and the higher energy states (at the energy $\varepsilon_{f,a}$) are coupled by the injection of a resonant laser $h\nu = \varepsilon_{f,a} - (\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a)$. The higher-energy state dissipates with the rate $\Gamma_{f,a}$. The localized electrons are typically in a single-occupied state but may virtually excite once in a while to a double-occupied state via the c-d mixing v_a . Note that no electrons decay in the absence of c-d mixing $v_a = 0$ because they are always in the single-occupied state. (b) Localized spin picture obtained after projecting out the double-occupied states (see Eq. (5)). In this picture, one finds that the effective transfer rate from the localized electron to the higher-energy state is given by $\gamma_a \approx \kappa_a |v_a|^2 / U_a^2$. We require $\gamma_a \ll \Gamma_{f,a}$ to justify the Markov approximation.

This yields the condition,

$$P \gtrsim \frac{\alpha_a U_a n \cdot c}{\chi''(\omega_0)} = \alpha_a \frac{U_a \omega_0 m_0 c \epsilon_0}{e^2} \Gamma_{f,a}, \quad (38)$$

shown in Eq. (7).

JUSTIFICATION OF MARKOV APPROXIMATION

For the Markov approximation to be valid, the relaxation rate of the bath must be much faster than the timescale of the system dynamics. We argue here that this is likely to be justified in the range of interest at realistic parameters for magnetic metals.

In our setup, the double-occupied state couples to the higher-level state with the decay rate $\Gamma_{f,a}$ via a laser injection tuned to be resonant with the two states. The higher-level state can be regarded as our “external bath” in the context of open quantum systems. As explained above, this process gives rise to the decay rate κ_a *once the site a is double occupied* (see Fig. 5(a)). Note crucially that, as illustrated in Fig. 5(b), this is different from *the rate at which the relevant system pumps an electron to this high-energy state* because the relevant system transfers into a double-occupied state only once in a while when the conduction electron tunnels to the localized orbital. For example, when the c-d mixing is absent $v_a = 0$, there would be no electron transfer from the relevant system to the higher-energy state. The relevant transfer rate of a localized electron from the relevant system to the higher-energy state is estimated to be $\gamma_a \simeq \kappa_a |v_a|^2 / U_a^2$, which we have derived in Eq. (4).

For the Markov approximation to be valid, the dissipation rate of this higher energy state (i.e. the “external bath”) $\Gamma_{f,a}$ must be much faster than the supply rate to this state $\gamma_a \ll \Gamma_{f,a}$. This is because when the higher-level state is occupied, the Pauli blocking effect would suppress the decay. A slow relaxation of the occupancy of the state would lead to a non-Markovian effect.

It should be relatively easy to satisfy this Markov condition at the regime of interest. We are interested in the regime where we see the sign-reversal of the RKKY interactions, which happens when the dissipation rate exceeds $\kappa_a \gtrsim \alpha_a U_a$ or $\gamma_a \gtrsim \alpha_a |g_a|$ (see the discussion above Eq. (7)). In the case $\alpha_a = 10^{-2}$ and $|g_a| = 10\text{meV}$, this sets the condition, $\gamma_a \gtrsim 0.1\text{meV}$. This required dissipation rate is less than the typical value of linewidth $\Gamma_{f,a}$, satisfying the justification condition for the Markov approximation, $\gamma_a \ll \Gamma_{f,a}$.

It is worth summarizing the requirements for our scheme to work. Putting the conditions in one line,

$$\alpha_a U_a \frac{|v_a|^2}{U_a^2} \lesssim \frac{P e^2}{\epsilon_0 m_0 c \omega_0 \Gamma_{f,a}} \frac{1}{U_a^2} \frac{|v_a|^2}{U_a^2} = \gamma_a \ll \Gamma_{f,a}. \quad (39)$$

This shows that the required pump power P to achieve sign inversion becomes less by choosing the higher-energy state that has a longer lifetime (i.e. smaller $\Gamma_{f,a}$) as shown in Eq. (7) but small $\Gamma_{f,a}$ makes it more difficult to satisfy the Markovian condition $\gamma_a \ll \Gamma_{f,a}$. We remark that a smaller c-d mixing $|v_a|/U_a$ helps satisfy the Markovian condition $\gamma_a \ll \Gamma_{f,a}$ without modifying the condition for the sign inversion, which physically makes sense because small v_a makes the double-occupied state rarer and hence rarer for the electrons to escape from the relevant system.

COMPARISON TO COLD ATOM EXPERIMENTS

It is interesting to compare our proposal relevant to solid-state systems to the recent cold atom experiment of dissipative Fermi Hubbard model [85, 86], where they demonstrated a dynamic sign reversal of interactions. In their experiment, similar to our situation, they introduced a controlled decay channel that is activated only when the sites are double occupied, causing both atoms to decay whenever they are on the same site. They demonstrated that this engineered dissipation decreases the anti-ferromagnetic correlation (present in the ground state) and increases the ferromagnetic correlation, again analogous to our sign reversal of effective interactions. We briefly note, however, that the possibility of implementing non-reciprocal interactions was not explored in their work.

In contrast to our solid-state case, where the coupling to the environment is unavoidable, their cold atomic systems are almost perfectly isolated from the environment other than the decay to the vacuum they purposely introduced. This fundamental difference critically impacts the resulting dynamics. First, in our proposal, the surrounding environment (i.e. the conduction band) immediately compensates for the lost electrons such that localized or-

bitals are always singly occupied, while their atomic system only has a loss channel. As a result, their dissipation stops activating when the atoms stop colliding, resulting in a strong initial state dependence on the final configuration. This is in stark contrast to ours, where no initial-state dependence is present and even exhibits persistent time-dependent to a collective chase and runaway phase due to non-reciprocal interaction. Second, the Gilbert damping (present in our system) is absent in the cold atomic systems, as there is no environment where the atoms can dissipate their spin angular momentum. The competition between the friction (that drives the system toward equilibrium) and the light-induced dissipative interaction is hence a unique feature of our proposal for solid-state systems.

Acknowledgement

RH was supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Research Activity Start-up from JSPS in Japan (No. 23K19034) and the National Research Foundation (NRF) funded by the Ministry of Science of Korea (Grant No. RS-2023-00249900). DO was supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Early-Career Scientists from JSPS in Japan (No. 21K13882). RT was supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Early-Career Scientists (No. 22K14003) and for Research Activity Start-up (No. 20K22328) from JSPS in Japan.

-
- [1] M. J. Bowick, N. Fakhri, M. C. Marchetti, and S. Ramaswamy, *Phys. Rev. X* **12**, 010501 (2022).
 - [2] S. Shankar, A. Souslov, M. J. Bowick, M. C. Marchetti, and V. Vitelli, *Nature Review Physics* **4**, 380–398 (2022).
 - [3] H. Wilson and J. Cowan, *Biophysical Journal* **12**, 1 (1972).
 - [4] H. Sompolinsky and I. Kanter, *Physical Review Letters* **57**, 2861 (1986).
 - [5] C. van Vreeswijk and H. Sompolinsky, *Science* **274**, 1724 (1996).
 - [6] H. Rieger, M. Schreckenberg, and J. Zittartz, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **21**, L263 (1988).
 - [7] M. Wimmer, A. Regensburger, C. Bersch, M.-A. Miri, S. Batz, G. Onishchukov, D. N. Christodoulides, and U. Peschel, *Nature Physics* **9**, 780–784 (2013).
 - [8] R. Soto and R. Golestanian, *Physical Review Letters* **112**, 068301 (2014).
 - [9] Y. Yifat, D. Coursault, C. W. Peterson, J. Parker, Y. Bao, S. K. Gray, S. A. Rice, and N. F. Scherer, *Light: Science & Applications* **7**, 105 (2018).
 - [10] J. Parker, C. W. Peterson, Y. Yifat, S. A. Rice, Z. Yan, S. K. Gray, and N. F. Scherer, *Optica* **7**, 1341 (2020).
 - [11] C. Scheibner, A. Souslov, D. Banerjee, P. Surówka, W. T. M. Irvine, and V. Vitelli, *Nature Physics* **16**, 475 (2020).
 - [12] M. Fruchart, C. Scheibner, and V. Vitelli, *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.* **14**, 471 (2023).
 - [13] L. P. Dadhichi, J. Kethapelli, R. Chajwa, S. Ramaswamy, and A. Maitra, *Phys. Rev. E* **101**, 052601 (2020).
 - [14] S. A. M. Loos, S. H. L. Klapp, and T. Martynek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 198301 (2023).
 - [15] M. Fruchart, R. Hanai, P. B. Littlewood, and V. Vitelli, *Nature* **592**, 363 (2021).
 - [16] R. Hanai, A. Edelman, Y. Ohashi, and P. B. Littlewood, *Physical Review Letters* **122**, 185301 (2019).
 - [17] R. Hanai and P. B. Littlewood, *Physical Review Research* **2**, 033018 (2020).
 - [18] Z. You, A. Baskaran, and M. C. Marchetti, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **117**, 19767 (2020).
 - [19] S. Saha, J. Agudo-Canalejo, and R. Golestanian, *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 041009 (2020).
 - [20] C. P. Zelle, R. Daviet, A. Rosch, and S. Diehl, *arXiv:2304.09207* (2023).
 - [21] T. Suchanek, K. Kroy, and S. A. M. Loos, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 258302 (2023).
 - [22] T. Suchanek, K. Kroy, and S. A. M. Loos, *Phys. Rev. E* **108**, 064123 (2023).
 - [23] T. Suchanek, K. Kroy, and S. A. M. Loos, *Phys. Rev. E* **108**, 064610 (2023).
 - [24] F. Brauns and M. C. Marchetti, *Phys. Rev. X* **14**, 021014 (2024).
 - [25] C. Weis, M. Fruchart, R. Hanai, K. Kawagoe, P. B. Littlewood, and V. Vitelli, *arXiv:2207.11667* (2022), *arXiv:2207.11667*.
 - [26] R. Hanai, *Phys. Rev. X* **14**, 011029 (2024).
 - [27] E. I. R. Chiacchio, A. Nunnenkamp, and M. Brunelli, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 113602 (2023).
 - [28] T. Nadolny, C. Bruder, and M. Brunelli,

- arXiv:2406.03357 (2024).
- [29] Y. Ashida, Z. Gong, and M. Ueda, *Advances in Physics* **69**, 249 (2021).
- [30] X. Zhang, T. Zhang, M.-H. Lu, and Y.-F. Chen, *Advances in Physics: X* **7**, 1 (2022).
- [31] A. Metelmann and A. A. Clerk, *Phys. Rev. X* **5**, 021025 (2015).
- [32] Y.-X. Wang, C. Wang, and A. A. Clerk, *PRX Quantum* **4**, 010306 (2023).
- [33] Q. Liang, D. Xie, Z. Dong, H. Li, H. Li, B. Gadway, W. Yi, and B. Yan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 070401 (2022).
- [34] K. Fang, J. Luo, A. Metelmann, M. H. Matheny, F. Marquardt, A. A. Clerk, and O. Painter, *Nature Physics* **13**, 465 (2017).
- [35] Y. Wang, X. Wang, Connolly, A. A. T., Clerk, and C. Wang, *Science Advances* **10**, eadj8796 (2024).
- [36] M. A. Ruderman and C. Kittel, *Phys. Rev.* **96**, 99 (1954).
- [37] T. Kasuya, *Progress of Theoretical Physics* **16**, 45 (1956).
- [38] K. Yosida, *Phys. Rev.* **106**, 893 (1957).
- [39] V. Gorini, A. Kossakowski, and E. Sudarshan, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **17**, 821 (1976).
- [40] G. Lindblad, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **48**, 119 (1976).
- [41] J. R. Schrieffer and P. A. Wolff, *Phys. Rev.* **149**, 491 (1966).
- [42] A. C. Y. Li, F. Petruccione, and J. Koch, *Scientific Reports* **4**, 48879 (2014).
- [43] A. C. Y. Li, F. Petruccione, and J. Koch, *Phys. Rev. X* **6**, 021037 (2016).
- [44] R. Hanai, A. McDonald, and A. Clerk, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **3**, 043228 (2021).
- [45] A. Kamenev, *Field theory of non-equilibrium systems* (Cambridge University Press, 2023).
- [46] L. M. Sieberer, M. Buchhold, and S. Diehl, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **79**, 096001 (2016).
- [47] L. M. Sieberer, M. Buchhold, J. Marino, and S. Diehl, arXiv:2312.03073 (2023), arXiv:2312.03073.
- [48] N. F. MOTT, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **40**, 677 (1968).
- [49] M. Imada, A. Fujimori, and Y. Tokura, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **70**, 1039 (1998).
- [50] J. Kondo, *Progress of Theoretical Physics* **29**, 1 (1963).
- [51] H. Suhl, B. T. Matthias, and L. R. Walker, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **3**, 552 (1959).
- [52] L. P. Gor'kov, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **113**, 4646 (2016).
- [53] J. F. Schooley, W. R. Hosler, and M. L. Cohen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **12**, 474 (1964).
- [54] T. H. Tan, A. Mietke, J. Li, Y. Chen, H. Higinbotham, P. J. Foster, S. Gokhale, J. Dunkel, and N. Fakhri, *Nature* **607**, 287 (2022).
- [55] A. V. Ivlev, J. Bartnick, M. Heinen, C.-R. Du, V. Nosenko, and H. Löwen, *Phys. Rev. X* **5**, 011035 (2015).
- [56] N. Uchida and R. Golestanian, *Physical Review Letters* **104**, 178103 (2010).
- [57] C. H. Meredith, P. G. Moerman, J. Groenewold, Y.-J. Chiu, W. K. Kegel, A. van Blaaderen, and L. D. Zarzar, *Nature Chemistry* **12**, 1136 (2020).
- [58] S. Saha, S. Ramaswamy, and R. Golestanian, *New Journal of Physics* **21**, 063006 (2019).
- [59] J. Zhang, R. Alert, J. Yan, N. S. Wingreen, and S. Granick, *Nature Physics* **17**, 961 (2021).
- [60] T. Liu, V. Raskatla, J. Li, K. F. MacDonald, and N. I. Zheludev, arXiv:2404.10525 (2024), arXiv:2404.10525.
- [61] M. Brandenbourger, X. Locsin, E. Lerner, and C. Coulais, *Nature Communications* **10** (2019), 10.1038/s41467-019-12599-3.
- [62] A. Kocabas, S. Ozdemir, M. Basaran, T. Yüce, A. Kecebas, B. Altın, Y. Yaman, E. Demir, and C. Kocabas, “Non-reciprocal phase transition enables swarming motility in biological active matter,” (2024).
- [63] N. Hatano and D. R. Nelson, *Physical Review Letters* **77**, 570 (1996).
- [64] M. G. Neubert and H. Caswell, *Ecology* **78**, 653 (1997).
- [65] B. Kerr, M. A. Riley, M. W. Feldman, and B. J. M. Bohannan, *Nature* **418**, 171 (2002).
- [66] T. Reichenbach, M. Mobilia, and E. Frey, *Nature* **448**, 1046 (2007).
- [67] H. Rieger, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **22**, 3447 (1989).
- [68] S. Allesina and S. Tang, *Nature* **205**, 483 (2012).
- [69] G. Bunin, *Phys. Rev. E* **95**, 042414 (2017).
- [70] H. Hong and S. H. Strogatz, *Physical Review Letters* **106**, 054102 (2011).
- [71] T. Oka and S. Kitamura, *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.* **10**, 387 (2019).
- [72] M. S. Rudner and N. H. Lindner, *Nature Reviews Physics* **2**, 229 (2020).
- [73] Y. Tokura and N. Nagaosa, *Nature Communications* **9**, 3740 (2018).
- [74] R. D. Dennis Hardt, S. Diehl, N. del Ser, and A. Rosch, arXiv:2405.14320 (2024).
- [75] I. Carusotto and C. Ciuti, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **85**, 299 (2013).
- [76] K. Yonemitsu and K. Nasu, *Physics Reports* **465**, 1 (2008).
- [77] S. Koshihara, T. Ishikawa, Y. Okimoto, K. Onda, R. Fukaya, M. Hada, Y. Hayashi, S. Ishihara, and T. Luty, *Physics Reports* **942**, 1 (2022).
- [78] C. D. Stanciu, F. Hansteen, A. V. Kimel, A. Kirilyuk, A. Tsukamoto, A. Itoh, and T. Rasing, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 047601 (2007).
- [79] T. Ostler, J. Barker, R. Evans, R. Chantrell, U. Atxitia, O. Chubykalo-Fesenko, S. El Moussaoui, L. Le Guyader, E. Mengotti, L. Heyderman, F. Nolting, A. Tsukamoto, A. Itoh, D. Afanasiev, B. Ivanov, A. Kalashnikova, K. Vahaplar, J. Mentink, A. Kirilyuk, T. Rasing, and A. Kimel, *Nature Communications* **3**, 666 (2012).
- [80] C.-H. Lambert, S. Mangin, B. S. D. C. S. Varaprasad, Y. K. Takahashi, M. Hehn, M. Cinchetti, G. Malinowski, K. Hono, Y. Fainman, M. Aeschlimann, and E. E. Fullerton, *Science* **345**, 1337 (2014).
- [81] K. Yosida, *Theory of Magnetism (Springer Series in Solid-State Sciences, 122)* (Springer, 1996) p. 177.
- [82] J. Kondo, *Progress of Theoretical Physics* **32**, 37 (1964).
- [83] L. Landau and E. Lifshitz, *Physik. Zeits. Sowjetunion* **8**, 153 (1935).
- [84] T. Gilbert, *IEEE Transactions on Magnetism* **40**, 3443 (2004).
- [85] M. Nakagawa, N. Tsuji, N. Kawakami, and M. Ueda, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 147203 (2020).
- [86] K. Honda, S. Taie, Y. Takasu, N. Nishizawa, M. Nakagawa, and Y. Takahashi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 063001 (2023).
- [87] P. W. Anderson, *Phys. Rev.* **124**, 41 (1961).

- [88] C. Gardiner and P. Zoller, *Quantum noise* (Springer, Heidelberg, 2000).
- [89] S. Nakajima, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **20**, 948 (1958).
- [90] R. Zwanzig, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **33**, 1338 (1960).
- [91] M. Vanhoecke and M. Schirò, arXiv:2405.17348 (2024).
- [92] F. Reyes-Osorio and B. K. Nikolić, *Phys. Rev. B* **109**, 024413 (2024).
- [93] M. A. Ferrara and L. Sirleto, *Micromachines* **11**, 3 (2020).
- [94] K. D. Stenning, X. Xiao, H. H. Holder, J. C. Gartside, A. Vanstone, O. W. Kennedy, R. F. Oulton, and W. R. Branford, *Cell Reports Physical Science* **4**, 101291 (2023).
- [95] Y. Yafet, *J. Appl. Phys. B* **61**, 4058 (1987).
- [96] P. Bruno and C. Chappert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 1602 (1991).
- [97] M. D. Stiles, *Journal of Magnetism and Magnetic Materials* **100**, 322 (1999).
- [98] D. A. Garanin, *Phys. Rev. B* **55**, 3050 (1997).
- [99] M. Dressel and G. Grüner, “Semiconductors,” in *Electrodynamics of Solids: Optical Properties of Electrons in Matter* (Cambridge University Press, 2002) p. 136–172.
- [100] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, USA, 2007).
- [101] J. M. Luttinger and W. Kohn, *Phys. Rev.* **97**, 869 (1955).
- [102] E. Manousakis, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **63**, 1 (1991).
- [103] J. I. Cirac, R. Blatt, P. Zoller, and W. D. Phillips, *Phys. Rev. A* **46**, 2668 (1992).
- [104] F. Reiter and A. S. Sørensen, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 032111 (2012).
- [105] E. M. Kessler, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 012126 (2012).
- [106] R. Kubo, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **29**, 255 (1966).
- [107] L. M. Sieberer, A. Chiocchetta, A. Gambassi, U. C. Täuber, and S. Diehl, *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 134307 (2015).
- [108] L. M. Sieberer, S. D. Huber, E. Altman, and S. Diehl, *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, 134310 (2014).
- [109] Y. Rikitake and H. Imamura, *Phys. Rev. B* **72**, 033308 (2005).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

This Supplemental Information (SI) provides full details of our formalism.

In Sec. **I**, we give a brief review of the formalism of open quantum systems, focusing on those used in this work. We provide theoretical methods to treat Markovian (Sec. **IA**) and non-Markovian (Sec. **IB**) baths.

In Sec. **II**, we introduce our model.

In Sec. **III**, we derive Eq. (4) in the main text, which describes the effective localized spin dynamics immersed in conduction electrons with light-induced decay. In the derivation, we use the results from the projection method introduced in Sec. **IA 2**.

In Sec. **IV**, we derive the Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert equation with light-induced interactions (Eq. (6) in the main text), which is our main result of this work. We use the Keldysh formalism introduced in Sec. **IB** in the derivation.

I. MINI-REVIEW: THEORETICAL DESCRIPTION OF OPEN QUANTUM SYSTEMS

This section briefly reviews the theoretical description of open quantum systems. Open quantum systems are systems where the relevant system is coupled to baths that model the effect of the surrounding environment. When the relevant system is (weakly) attached to a single thermal bath, the system reaches a thermal equilibrium with the bath. In contrast, when the relevant system is attached to two (or more) baths, an energy current may constantly flow from one bath to the system that dissipates to the other baths, driving the state into a nonequilibrium steady state. The latter is the situation we will be interested in in this work.

The full microscopic information of the total system composed of the relevant system plus the baths, described by the total Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{\text{tot}} = \hat{H}_s + \hat{H}_b + \hat{H}_{sb}$, is encoded in the density operator of the full system $\hat{\rho}_{\text{tot}}$. Here, $\hat{H}_{s(b)}$ is the relevant system (bath) Hamiltonian that is composed of operators acting on the relevant system (bath), and \hat{H}_{sb} is the system-bath coupling. The bath Hamiltonian \hat{H}_b may contain multiple baths, in which case drives the system into a nonequilibrium steady state. The dynamics are governed by Liouville's equation,

$$\partial_t \hat{\rho}_{\text{tot}} = -i[\hat{H}_{\text{tot}}, \hat{\rho}_{\text{tot}}]. \quad (\text{S1})$$

We will be interested in the properties of the reduced-density matrix $\hat{\rho} = \text{Tr}_B \hat{\rho}_{\text{tot}}$, where the baths' degrees of freedom are traced out. When the relevant system is weakly attached to a single thermal bath, the system generically reaches an equilibrium state, which is fully characterized by eigenenergy E_n and eigenstates $|\phi_n\rangle$ of the system Hamiltonian \hat{H}_s ($\hat{H}_s |\phi_n\rangle = E_n |\phi_n\rangle$), thanks to the equilibrium statistical mechanics that tells us that the reduced density operator $\hat{\rho}$ reaches the canonical ensemble (when attached to a thermal bath at the temperature T),

$$\hat{\rho}_{\text{eq}} = \frac{1}{Z} e^{-\hat{H}_s / (k_B T)} = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_n e^{-E_n / (k_B T)} |\phi_n\rangle \langle \phi_n|. \quad (\text{S2})$$

Here, $Z = \text{tr}[e^{-\hat{H}_s / (k_B T)}]$ is the partition function, where $\text{tr}[\dots]$ is the trace over the relevant system degrees of freedom, and k_B is the Boltzmann constant. Therefore, once we compute the eigenenergy and the eigenstates, the density operator $\hat{\rho}$ is fully determined and it is not necessary to compute Liouville's equation (S1) directly.

However, for systems attached to multiple baths, the system converges to non-equilibrium systems, where such a general relation is unknown. Therefore, one is required to directly analyze the dynamics of the density operator $\hat{\rho} = \text{Tr}_B \hat{\rho}_{\text{tot}}$. This is indeed what we will do in the following.

Roughly speaking, there are two types of baths, i.e. Markovian and non-Markovian baths. Markovian baths are baths where they relax fast enough such that the evolution of the relevant system is determined solely by the state of at the instantaneous time; memory effects are absent. Non-Markovian baths are the baths where such memory effects cannot be ignored. As we explain in Secs. **III** and **IV**, our dissipation-engineering scheme requires treating both types of baths and therefore, we give a short review of their theoretical description of both cases.

This section is organized as follows. In Sec. **IA**, we review the theoretical treatment of the quantum master equation relevant to systems attached to Markovian baths. After introducing the Gorini-Kossakowski-Sudarshan-Lindblad (GKSL) master equation [39, 40], which is the most general description of Markov dynamics of the reduced density operator $\hat{\rho}$, we describe the general properties of the GKSL master equation in Sec. **IA**. We then introduce a projection method we use to derive Eq. (4) in the main text. In Sec. **IB**, we introduce the so-called Keldysh formalism, which allows us to treat non-Markovian open systems on a field-theoretical basis. This will be used to derive Eq. (6) in the main text.

A. Markov environment: the GKSL master equation

In this section, we will be concerned with situations where the system is weakly attached to a bath that relaxes fast enough such that the relevant system dynamics can be regarded as Markovian. One strategy to treat this system is to start from Liouville's equation (S1) and trace out the bath degrees of freedom. One can microscopically derive the governing equation for reduced density matrix $\hat{\rho}(t)$ dynamics, e.g., by employing a second-order Born-Markov approximation in terms of system-bath coupling strength (see e.g., [100]). Here, we take a more phenomenological approach, where we take advantage of the property that in Markovian dynamics, by definition, the density matrix $\hat{\rho}(t + \Delta t)$ is determined solely by transforming the density matrix $\hat{\rho}(t)$ [i.e., $\hat{\rho}(t + \Delta t)$ does not depend on the density matrix before the time t] and that the density operator must fulfill certain mathematical properties [88, 100].

Let us denote such a transformation as $\hat{\rho}(t + \Delta t) = \mathcal{V}\hat{\rho}(t)$, where \mathcal{V} operates on the density matrix $\hat{\rho}$. [Operators that act on operators are called *superoperators*.] There are several properties that this operation must satisfy, arising from demanding that the reduced operator $\hat{\rho}(t + \Delta t)$ retains all the properties density operators must satisfy. The first property is the trace-preservation, i.e., $\text{tr}[\hat{\rho}(t + \Delta t)] = \text{tr}[\mathcal{V}\hat{\rho}(t)] = \text{tr}[\hat{\rho}(t)] (= 1)$, which is required because the eigenvalues p_n of the density operator $\hat{\rho} = \sum_n p_n |n\rangle\langle n|$ describes the probability of being in the state $|n\rangle$, which must sum to unity $\sum_n p_n = 1$.

The second property is a property called complete positivity. Positivity is the property that all the eigenvalues p_n are positive, which is again required because p_n is the probability and must be positive. The operation \mathcal{V} is required to satisfy a stronger condition called complete positivity, where not only the reduced density operator $\hat{\rho}$ but the total system $\hat{\rho}_{\text{tot}}$ stays positive after the operation $[\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{I}]\hat{\rho}_{\text{tot}}$, where \mathcal{V} operates on the relevant system and \mathcal{I} , the identity superoperator, acts on the bath degrees of freedom. See e.g., [100] for details. The map that satisfies both these properties is called the CPTP map.

Under this condition, it has been shown [39, 40] that this operation must have the form (see e.g. Ref. [100] for the proof),

$$\hat{\rho}(t + \Delta t) = \mathcal{V}\hat{\rho}(t) = \hat{\rho}(t) - i[\hat{H}, \hat{\rho}(t)]\Delta t + \sum_{\ell} \left[\hat{L}_{\ell}\hat{\rho}(t)\hat{L}_{\ell}^{\dagger} - \frac{1}{2}\{\hat{L}_{\ell}^{\dagger}\hat{L}_{\ell}, \hat{\rho}(t)\} \right] \Delta t + O((\Delta t)^2) \quad (\text{S3})$$

or in the $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ limit,

$$\partial_t \hat{\rho} = \mathcal{L}\hat{\rho} = -i[\hat{H}, \hat{\rho}] + \sum_{\ell} \kappa_{\ell} \mathcal{D}[\hat{L}_{\ell}]\hat{\rho}. \quad (\text{S4})$$

This is called the GKSL or Lindblad master equation [39, 40]. Here, the superoperator \mathcal{L} is called the Lindbladian. \hat{H} is the Hamiltonian of the system which determines the coherent dynamics. The dissipator, $\mathcal{D}[\hat{L}]\hat{\rho} = \hat{L}\hat{\rho}\hat{L}^{\dagger} - \frac{1}{2}\{\hat{L}^{\dagger}\hat{L}, \hat{\rho}\}$, is the term that makes the time evolution non-unitary. The so-called jump operator \hat{L}_{ℓ} consists of operators acting on the system, which describes how the environment interacts with the system with the dissipation rate κ_{ℓ} in channel ℓ . For instance, suppose the system consists of bosonic/fermionic particles and one takes $\hat{L}_{\ell} = \hat{a}$ (where \hat{a} is an annihilation operator of a particle in the system) and $\kappa_{\ell} = \kappa$. This corresponds to the case where the environment induces one-body loss from the system with the loss rate κ . When one takes $\hat{L} = \hat{a}^{\dagger}$, on the other hand, it describes the situation where the particles are pumped into the system. Taking $\hat{L} = \hat{a}^2$ means two-body loss, etc.

1. General properties of the GKSL master equation

Here we review some general properties of the GKSL master equation (S4) relevant to our study. To formulate them, it is useful to express the GKSL master equation in terms of the vectorized form to make explicit connections to the more familiar Schrödinger equation. The vectorization (Choi-Jamiolkowski isomorphism) is chosen to be performed by the replacement [88],

$$|i\rangle\langle j| \rightarrow |j\rangle \otimes |i\rangle. \quad (\text{S5})$$

For example, an operator $\hat{A} = \sum_{i,j} a_{i,j} |i\rangle\langle j|$ is vectorized as

$$\text{vec}(\hat{\rho}) = \sum_{i,j} a_{i,j} |j\rangle \otimes |i\rangle. \quad (\text{S6})$$

Their dual $\hat{A}^\dagger = \sum_{i,j} a_{i,j}^* |j\rangle\langle i|$ is vectorized as

$$[\text{vec}(\hat{A})]^\dagger = \sum_{i,j} a_{i,j}^* |j\rangle \otimes \langle i|. \quad (\text{S7})$$

This choice of vectorization is useful, thanks to the following properties. First, the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}) = \text{tr}[\hat{A}^\dagger \hat{B}]$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{A}, \hat{B}) &= \text{tr}[\hat{A}^\dagger \hat{B}] = \sum_{i,j,i',j'} a_{i,j}^* b_{i',j'} \text{tr}[(|i\rangle\langle j|)^\dagger (|i'\rangle\langle j'|)] = \sum_{i,j} a_{i,j}^* b_{i,j} \\ &= \sum_{i,j,i',j'} (a_{j,i}^* \langle i| \otimes \langle j|) (b_{i',j'} |j'\rangle \otimes |i'\rangle) = [\text{vec}(\hat{A})]^\dagger \text{vec}(\hat{B}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S8})$$

which is just the inner product of the two vectors. Another useful property is the relation

$$\text{vec}(\hat{A}\hat{B}\hat{C}) = (\hat{C}^\text{T} \otimes \hat{A}) \text{vec}(\hat{B}), \quad (\text{S9})$$

which can be shown similarly by decomposing the matrix in terms of the chosen eigenbasis. This relation implies (where $\hat{I} = \sum_i |i\rangle \otimes \langle i|$ is the identity operator)

$$\text{vec}(\hat{A}\hat{\rho}\hat{B}) = (\hat{B}^\text{T} \otimes \hat{A}) \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}) \quad (\text{S10})$$

$$\text{vec}(\hat{A}\hat{\rho}) = \text{vec}(\hat{A}\hat{\rho}\hat{I}) = (\hat{I} \otimes \hat{A}) \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}) \quad (\text{S11})$$

$$\text{vec}(\hat{\rho}\hat{A}) = \text{vec}(\hat{I}\hat{\rho}\hat{A}) = (\hat{A}^\text{T} \otimes \hat{I}) \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}), \quad (\text{S12})$$

allowing us to express the GKSL master equation (S4) in the vectorized form,

$$\partial_t \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}) = \check{\mathcal{L}} \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}), \quad (\text{S13})$$

where

$$\check{\mathcal{L}} = -i(\hat{I} \otimes \hat{H} - \hat{H}^\text{T} \otimes \hat{I}) + \sum_\ell \kappa_\ell \left[\hat{L}_\ell^* \otimes \hat{L}_\ell - \frac{1}{2} \hat{I} \otimes \hat{L}_\ell^\dagger \hat{L}_\ell - \frac{1}{2} (\hat{L}_\ell^\dagger \hat{L}_\ell)^\text{T} \otimes \hat{I} \right]. \quad (\text{S14})$$

Equation (S13) formally has a similar form to the Schrödinger equation of quantum mechanics. However, unlike in the Schrödinger equation, the operator $\check{\mathcal{L}}$ that governs the dynamics is non-Hermitian. In those cases, it is useful to characterize the $\check{\mathcal{L}}$ with *both* the right and left eigenvectors (\hat{r}_n and \hat{l}_n , respectively),

$$\check{\mathcal{L}} \text{vec}(\hat{r}_n) = \lambda_n \text{vec}(\hat{r}_n), \quad \check{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger \text{vec}(\hat{l}_n) = \lambda_n^* \text{vec}(\hat{l}_n), \quad (\text{S15})$$

where the eigenvalues λ_n are sorted as $\lambda_{N-1} \leq \lambda_{N-2} \leq \dots \leq \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_0$. Note that in Hermitian cases, $\hat{r}_n = \hat{l}_n$ but this does not generally hold otherwise. In the operator form, these read

$$\mathcal{L} \hat{r}_n = \lambda_n \hat{r}_n, \quad \hat{l}_n^\dagger \mathcal{L} = \hat{l}_n^\dagger \lambda_n, \quad (\text{S16})$$

which form a biorthogonal and complete basis,

$$\text{vec}(\hat{l}_n)^\dagger \text{vec}(\hat{r}_m) = \delta_{nm}, \quad \sum_n \text{vec}(\hat{r}_n) \text{vec}(\hat{l}_n)^\dagger = \hat{I}. \quad (\text{S17})$$

Here, we used the property that an inner product is properly defined (Eq. (S8)). One can then decompose the density operator into eigenmodes of $\check{\mathcal{L}}$:

$$\text{vec}(\hat{\rho}(t)) = e^{\check{\mathcal{L}}t} \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}(0)) = \sum_n e^{\lambda_n t} \text{vec}(\hat{r}_n) \text{vec}(\hat{l}_n)^\dagger \hat{\rho}(0), \quad (\text{S18})$$

which is equivalent to

$$\hat{\rho}(t) = e^{\mathcal{L}t} \hat{\rho}(0) = \sum_n e^{\lambda_n t} \hat{r}_n \text{tr}[\hat{l}_n^\dagger \hat{\rho}(0)]. \quad (\text{S19})$$

As one sees from here, $-\text{Re}\lambda_n$ characterizes the decay rate of the mode n and $\text{Im}\lambda_n$ characterizes its oscillation frequency.

We remark that the GKSL master equation (S4) is guaranteed to have at least one eigenstate with a vanishing eigenvalue $\lambda_0 = 0$, corresponding to the steady state $\partial_t \hat{\rho}_{ss} = 0$. This can be shown from the trace-preserving property of the GKSL master equation that the dynamics assure $\text{tr}\hat{\rho}(t) = 1$ at arbitrary times,

$$\partial_t \text{tr}\hat{\rho} = \text{tr}[\mathcal{L}\hat{\rho}] = 0. \quad (\text{S20})$$

In the vectorized GKSL master equation, this reads

$$0 = \text{vec}(\hat{I})^\dagger \check{\mathcal{L}} \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}). \quad (\text{S21})$$

Here, we have used the relation $\text{tr}(\hat{A}) = \text{vec}(\hat{I})^\dagger \text{vec}(\hat{A})$ where $\text{vec}(\hat{I}) = \sum_i |i\rangle \otimes |i\rangle$. For this to be true for arbitrary $\hat{\rho}$,

$$0 = \text{vec}(\hat{I})^\dagger \check{\mathcal{L}} \quad (\text{S22})$$

must be satisfied. This assures the presence of a left eigenstate given by

$$\hat{l}_0 = \hat{I}, \quad (\text{S23})$$

with zero eigenvalue $\lambda_0 = 0$. The right eigenstate is the state satisfying

$$\mathcal{L}(\hat{r}_0) = 0, \quad (\text{S24})$$

which is nothing but a steady state $\hat{r}_0 = \hat{\rho}_{ss}$. Using this property, we find

$$\hat{\rho}(t) = \hat{\rho}_{ss} + \sum_{n \neq 0} e^{\lambda_n t} \hat{r}_n \text{tr}[\hat{l}_n^\dagger \hat{\rho}(0)]. \quad (\text{S25})$$

Here, the coefficient in front of $\hat{\rho}_{ss}$ is unity $\text{tr}[\hat{l}_0^\dagger \hat{\rho}(0)] = 1$, which can be shown from orthogonality relation (S17) that implies $\text{tr}[\hat{l}_m \hat{r}_n] = \delta_{n,m}$ and $\hat{l}_0 = \hat{I}$. One also finds that the $n \neq 0$ right eigenstates are traceless, from $\text{tr}[\hat{r}_n] = \text{tr}[\hat{l}_0^\dagger \hat{r}_n] = 0$ ($n \neq 0$).

2. Projection method

There are many situations in condensed matter physics and quantum optics where there is a separation of timescales in the problem. In such cases, it is often useful to project out the higher-energy degrees of freedom to obtain an effective low-energy description [41, 89, 90]. These approaches have been proven useful in describing, e.g., electrons in a potential perturbed by impurities can be described by an effective $k \cdot p$ theory [101]; the Fermi-Hubbard model at the half-filling can be mapped to an anti-ferromagnetically interacting spin model [102]; the Anderson impurity model can be mapped to an sd exchange coupling model [41] that has successfully described the Kondo effect [82].

Here, we extend this concept to an open quantum system, which will be used in Sec. III. We develop here a projection method that is consistent with the so-called Lindblad perturbation theory [42–44], which is similar to the generalized Schrieffer-Wolff transformation technique [103–105] in spirit. We consider a Lindbladian that can be split into the non-perturbative and perturbative part $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \epsilon \mathcal{L}_1$ (where $\epsilon = 1$ is a book-keeping constant). The non-perturbative Lindbladian master equation,

$$\partial_t \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}^{(0)}) = \check{\mathcal{L}}_0 \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}^{(0)}) \quad (\text{S26})$$

is assumed to have a separation of timescales. We label a set of eigenvectors $\hat{r}_n^{(0)}$ [$n \in \mathfrak{s}(\mathfrak{f})$] with small [in magnitude] eigenvalues $|\lambda_{n \in \mathfrak{s}}^{(0)}| (< |\lambda_{n \in \mathfrak{f}}^{(0)}|)$ as slow (fast) modes, where $\hat{r}_n^{(0)}$ ($\hat{l}_n^{(0)}$) is the right (left) eigenstate of the non-perturbative Lindbladian defined as $\mathcal{L}_0 \hat{r}_n^{(0)} = \lambda_n^{(0)} \hat{r}_n^{(0)}$ ($\hat{l}_n^{(0)\dagger} \mathcal{L}_0 = \hat{l}_n^{(0)\dagger} \lambda_n^{(0)}$) with the eigenvalue $\lambda_n^{(0)}$. We split the density operator into slow and fast part $\hat{\rho}^{(0)} = \hat{\rho}_s^{(0)} + \hat{\rho}_f^{(0)}$. Here, $\hat{\rho}_s^{(0)} = \mathcal{P} \hat{\rho}^{(0)} = \sum_{n \in \mathfrak{s}} c_n \hat{r}_n^{(0)}$ is the density operator spanned projected to the slow variable space (where $\mathcal{P} \hat{\rho} = \sum_{n \in \mathfrak{s}} \hat{r}_n^{(0)} \text{tr}[\hat{l}_n^{(0)\dagger} \hat{\rho}]$ is a projection operator onto the slow space) and $\hat{\rho}_f^{(0)} = \mathcal{Q} \hat{\rho}^{(0)} = (\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{P}) \hat{\rho}^{(0)} = \sum_{n \in \mathfrak{f}} c_n \hat{r}_n^{(0)}$ is the fast variable space (where $\mathcal{Q} \hat{\rho} = \sum_{n \in \mathfrak{f}} \hat{r}_n^{(0)} \text{tr}[\hat{l}_n^{(0)\dagger} \hat{\rho}]$ is a projection

operator onto the fast variable space and \mathcal{I} is an identity superoperator). The non-perturbative GKSL master equation $\partial_t \hat{\rho}_s^{(0)} + \partial_t \hat{\rho}_f^{(0)} = \mathcal{L}_0 \hat{\rho}_s^{(0)} + \mathcal{L}_0 \hat{\rho}_f^{(0)}$ reads

$$\partial_t \begin{pmatrix} \check{\mathcal{P}} \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}^{(0)}) \\ \check{\mathcal{Q}} \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}^{(0)}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \check{\mathcal{P}} \check{\mathcal{L}}_0 & 0 \\ 0 & \check{\mathcal{Q}} \check{\mathcal{L}}_0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \check{\mathcal{P}} \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}^{(0)}) \\ \check{\mathcal{Q}} \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}^{(0)}) \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{S27})$$

in the vectorized representation, where we used the property that these two spaces do not talk to each other via \mathcal{L}_0 . Here, we have introduced a projection operator in the vectorized representation, $\text{vec}(\mathcal{P}\hat{\rho}) \equiv \check{\mathcal{P}} \text{vec}(\hat{\rho})$ and similarly for $\check{\mathcal{Q}}$.

Let us now add back the perturbation \mathcal{L}_1 . In such a case, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \begin{pmatrix} \check{\mathcal{P}} \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}) \\ \check{\mathcal{Q}} \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}) \end{pmatrix} &\approx \begin{pmatrix} \partial_t \check{\mathcal{P}} \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \check{\mathcal{L}}_{ss} & \check{\mathcal{L}}_{sf} \\ \check{\mathcal{L}}_{fs} & \check{\mathcal{L}}_{ff} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \check{\mathcal{P}} \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}) \\ \check{\mathcal{Q}} \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \check{\mathcal{P}} \check{\mathcal{L}} & \epsilon \check{\mathcal{P}} \check{\mathcal{L}}_1 \\ \epsilon \check{\mathcal{Q}} \check{\mathcal{L}}_1 & \check{\mathcal{Q}} \check{\mathcal{L}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \check{\mathcal{P}} \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}) \\ \check{\mathcal{Q}} \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}) \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S28})$$

where in the second equality, we have done an adiabatic approximation for the fast modes (i.e., the fast modes relax fast enough such that the fast variables adiabatically follow the slow variables). This leads to

$$\check{\mathcal{Q}} \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}) \approx -(\check{\mathcal{L}}_{ff})^{-1} \check{\mathcal{L}}_{fs} \check{\mathcal{P}} \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}), \quad (\text{S29})$$

therefore,

$$\partial_t \check{\mathcal{P}} \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}) = \check{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{eff}} \check{\mathcal{P}} \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}) = [\check{\mathcal{L}}_{ss} - \check{\mathcal{L}}_{sf} (\check{\mathcal{L}}_{ff})^{-1} \check{\mathcal{L}}_{fs}] \check{\mathcal{P}} \text{vec}(\hat{\rho}) \quad (\text{S30})$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{eff}} &= \check{\mathcal{P}} \check{\mathcal{L}} \check{\mathcal{P}} - \epsilon^2 \check{\mathcal{P}} \check{\mathcal{L}}_1 \check{\mathcal{Q}} (\check{\mathcal{L}})^{-1} \check{\mathcal{Q}} \check{\mathcal{L}}_1 \check{\mathcal{P}} \\ &= \check{\mathcal{P}} \left[\check{\mathcal{L}}_0 + \epsilon \check{\mathcal{L}}_1 - \epsilon^2 \sum_{m \in \text{f}} \frac{\check{\mathcal{L}}_1 \text{vec}(\hat{r}_m^{(0)}) \text{vec}(\hat{l}_m^{(0)})^\dagger \check{\mathcal{L}}_1}{\lambda_m^{(0)}} \right] \check{\mathcal{P}} + O(\epsilon^3) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S31})$$

The matrix element of the effective Lindbladian $(\check{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{eff}})_{n_l \in \text{s}, n_r \in \text{s}} \equiv (\hat{l}_{n_l \in \text{s}}^{(0)}, \check{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{eff}} \hat{r}_{n_r \in \text{s}}^{(0)})$, which contains all the information about the system in the slow dynamics of interest, reads

$$\begin{aligned} (\check{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{eff}})_{n_l, n_r} &\equiv (\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)}, \check{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{eff}} \hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)}) = \text{vec}(\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)})^\dagger \check{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{eff}} \text{vec}(\hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)}) \\ &= (\mathcal{L}_0)_{n_l, n_r} + \epsilon (\mathcal{L}_1)_{n_l, n_r} - \epsilon^2 \sum_{m \in \text{f}} \frac{\text{tr}[\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger} \mathcal{L}_1 \hat{r}_m^{(0)}] \text{tr}[\hat{l}_m^{(0)\dagger} \mathcal{L}_1 \hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)}]}{\lambda_m^{(0)}} + O(\epsilon^3). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S32})$$

Equation (S32) is the central relation that will be used below to derive the effective spin-exchange dynamics between the localized and conduction electrons (Eq. (4) in the main text).

B. Non-Markov environment: Keldysh theory

The previous section discussed open quantum systems whose dynamics are assumed to be Markovian. However, there are situations where such assumptions are inappropriate, where the baths do not relax fast enough compared to the relevant system and the dynamics of the baths play a role as a result. A prominent example is a many-body system attached to a thermal bath. In this case, the relevant system generically approaches an equilibrium state, where general properties such as the fluctuation-dissipation theorem [106] should be satisfied. However, these relations cannot be satisfied when we neglect the non-Markovianity arising from Fermi/Bose distribution functions [107]. As we will be interested in situations where we continuously tune from equilibrium to non-equilibrium, a formalism that includes such effects is desired.

This subsection briefly reviews the Keldysh approach that can incorporate such effects. (For further details, we refer to e.g., Refs. [45–47].) In this approach, we describe the dynamics of the density matrix $\hat{\rho}$ in terms of a path integral, which enables us to use field-theoretical techniques such as perturbative diagrammatic calculations, renormalization group methods, and makes the connection to the semi-classical limit explicit. This will prove useful for obtaining the equation of motion of observables and will be used in the analysis performed in Sec. IV.

1. Keldysh formalism for closed systems

Let us start by formulating the Keldysh theory for closed systems described by the Hamiltonian \hat{H} . The Liouville equation reads,

$$i\partial_t \hat{\rho} = [\hat{H}, \hat{\rho}], \quad (\text{S33})$$

which has a formal solution,

$$\hat{\rho}(t) = \hat{U}(t, t_0) \hat{\rho}(t_0) \hat{U}^{-1}(t, t_0), \quad (\text{S34})$$

with the time evolution operator given by,

$$\hat{U}(t, t_0) = e^{-i\hat{H}(t-t_0)}. \quad (\text{S35})$$

We set the initial state to be a thermal state at temperature T ,

$$\hat{\rho}(t = t_0) = \frac{1}{Z_0} \sum_n e^{-E_n/(k_B T)} |n\rangle \langle n|. \quad (\text{S36})$$

Here, E_n is an eigenenergy, $|n\rangle$ is the eigenstate, and $Z_0 = \sum_n e^{-E_n/(k_B T)}$. We define the Keldysh partition function as,

$$Z \equiv \text{tr} \hat{\rho}(t_f) = \text{tr} [\hat{U}(t_f, t_0) \hat{\rho}(t_0) \hat{U}^{-1}(t_f, t_0)]. \quad (\text{S37})$$

Although this quantity itself is trivially computed as unity $Z = 1$, the functional integral form of this quantity serves as a generating function that gives us useful macroscopic information we will be interested in.

To illustrate how this formalism works, we will focus on a simple, single-mode fermion system $\hat{H} = \varepsilon_0 \hat{\psi}^\dagger \hat{\psi}$, where $\hat{\psi}$ is a fermionic annihilation operator. Similarly to the path integral formalism in quantum mechanics, we expand the time evolution operator into a product of infinitesimally short time interval $\delta_t = (t_f - t_0)/N$ (with $N \rightarrow \infty$) and replace the annihilation operators $\hat{\psi}_j$ (j labels discretized time $t_j = j\delta_t$) to a Grassmann variable in the fermionic case ψ_i with coherent states

$$\hat{\psi}_j |\psi_j\rangle = \psi_j |\psi_j\rangle, \quad \langle \psi_j | \hat{\psi}_j^\dagger = \langle \psi_j | \psi_j^*. \quad (\text{S38})$$

by inserting the completeness relation

$$\hat{1} = \int d\psi_j d\psi_j^* e^{-\psi_j^* \psi_j} |\psi_j\rangle \langle \psi_j|. \quad (\text{S39})$$

We obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= Z_0^{-1} \int \prod_n d\bar{\psi}_{+,n} d\psi_{+,n} d\bar{\psi}_{-,n} d\psi_{-,n} \\ &\times e^{\sum_j [\bar{\psi}_{j,+} (\psi_{j-1,+} - \psi_{j,+} - i\delta_t \varepsilon_0 \psi_{j-1,+}) + \bar{\psi}_{j,-} (\psi_{j-1,-} - \psi_{j,-} + i\delta_t \varepsilon_0 \psi_{j-1,-})]} e^{-\bar{\psi}_{1,+} \psi_{1,+} - \bar{\psi}_{1,-} \psi_{1,-} + \zeta \bar{\psi}_{1,+} \psi_{N,-} + \bar{\psi}_{1,-} \psi_{N,+}} \\ &\equiv \int \mathcal{D}[\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-] e^{iS[\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-]}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S40})$$

where we have used

$$\langle \psi_{+,n+1} | \psi_{+,n} \rangle = e^{\bar{\psi}_{+,n+1} \psi_{+,n}}, \quad \langle -\psi_{-,n} | -\psi_{-,n+1} \rangle = e^{\bar{\psi}_{-,n} \psi_{-,n+1}} \quad (\text{S41})$$

and $Z_0^{-1} = \langle \psi_+(t_0) | \hat{\rho}(t_0) | -\psi_-(t_0) \rangle$. Here, the action has the form $S = \bar{\psi} G^{-1} \psi$, where we have introduced a set of coherent states for both the time evolution of ket (+) and bra (-), collectively denoted as

$$\psi = (\psi_{1,+} \cdots \psi_{N,+} \psi_{1,-} \cdots \psi_{N,-})^T, \quad \bar{\psi} = (\psi_{1,+} \cdots \psi_{N,+} \psi_{1,-} \cdots \psi_{N,-}) \quad (\text{S42})$$

with $\zeta = -e^{-\varepsilon_0/(k_B T)}$ and the kernel is given by,

$$G^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} (G^{-1})_{++} & (G^{-1})_{+-} \\ (G^{-1})_{-+} & (G^{-1})_{--} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{S43})$$

with

$$(G^{-1})_{++} = i \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -a_+ & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & -a_+ & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -a_+ & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (G^{-1})_{--} = i \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -a_- & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & -a_- & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -a_- & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{S44})$$

$$(G^{-1})_{+-} = i \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & -\zeta \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (G^{-1})_{-+} = i \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{S45})$$

where $a_{\pm} = 1 \mp i\varepsilon_0\delta_t$. The action in the continuous-time limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ reads,

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \int dt dt' (\bar{\psi}_+(t) \ \bar{\psi}_-(t)) \begin{pmatrix} G_{++}(t, t') & G_{+-}(t, t') \\ G_{-+}(t, t') & G_{--}(t, t') \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_+(t') \\ \psi_-(t') \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \int dt (\bar{\psi}_+(t) \ \bar{\psi}_-(t)) \begin{pmatrix} i\partial_t - \varepsilon_0 & 0 \\ 0 & -(i\partial_t - \varepsilon_0) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_+(t) \\ \psi_-(t) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S46})$$

Taking the inverse of G^{-1} , one obtains in the continuous-time limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ (see e.g. Ref. [45] for derivation),

$$G_{+-}(t, t') = if(\varepsilon_0)e^{-i\varepsilon_0(t-t')}, \quad (\text{S47a})$$

$$G_{-+}(t, t') = i(1 + f(\varepsilon_0))e^{-i\varepsilon_0(t-t')}, \quad (\text{S47b})$$

$$G_{++}(t, t') = \theta(-t)G_{+-}(t, t') + \theta(t)G_{-+}(t, t'), \quad (\text{S47c})$$

$$G_{--}(t, t') = \theta(t)G_{+-}(t, t') + \theta(-t)G_{-+}(t, t'). \quad (\text{S47d})$$

where $f(\omega) = 1/(e^{\omega/(k_B T)} + 1)$ is the Fermi distribution function and $\theta(t)$ is a step function. Their Fourier transformation is given by,

$$G_{+-}(\omega) = 2\pi i\delta(\omega - \varepsilon_0)f(\varepsilon_0), \quad (\text{S48a})$$

$$G_{-+}(\omega) = -2\pi i\delta(\omega - \varepsilon_0)(1 - f(\varepsilon_0)), \quad (\text{S48b})$$

$$G_{++}(\omega) = \frac{1 - f(\varepsilon_0)}{\omega - \varepsilon_0 + i\delta} + \frac{f(\varepsilon_0)}{\omega - \varepsilon_0 - i\delta}, \quad (\text{S48c})$$

$$G_{--}(\omega) = -\frac{f(\varepsilon_0)}{\omega - \varepsilon_0 + i\delta} - \frac{1 - f(\varepsilon_0)}{\omega - \varepsilon_0 - i\delta}. \quad (\text{S48d})$$

These are related to the various two-point functions as [45–47],

$$G_{+-}(t, t') = -i \langle \psi_+(t) \bar{\psi}_-(t') \rangle = -i \int \mathcal{D}(\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-) \psi_+(t) \bar{\psi}_-(t') e^{iS} = i \langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(t') \hat{\psi}(t) \rangle \quad (\text{S49})$$

$$G_{-+}(t, t') = -i \langle \psi_-(t) \bar{\psi}_+(t') \rangle = -i \int \mathcal{D}(\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-) \psi_-(t) \bar{\psi}_+(t') e^{iS} = -i \langle \hat{\psi}(t) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(t') \rangle \quad (\text{S50})$$

$$G_{++}(t, t') = -i \langle \psi_+(t) \bar{\psi}_+(t') \rangle = -i \int \mathcal{D}(\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-) \psi_+(t) \bar{\psi}_+(t') e^{iS} = -i \langle \mathcal{T} \hat{\psi}(t) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(t') \rangle \quad (\text{S51})$$

$$G_{--}(t, t') = -i \langle \psi_-(t) \bar{\psi}_-(t') \rangle = -i \int \mathcal{D}(\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-) \psi_-(t) \bar{\psi}_-(t') e^{iS} = -i \langle \bar{\mathcal{T}} \hat{\psi}(t) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(t') \rangle \quad (\text{S52})$$

where \mathcal{T} and $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$ are the time-ordered and anti-time-ordered operators, respectively.

It is often useful to change the variables via a ‘‘Wick rotation’’,

$$\psi_c = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\psi_+ + \psi_-), \quad \psi_q = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\psi_+ - \psi_-), \quad (\text{S53})$$

to transform the action into,

$$S = \int dt dt' (\bar{\psi}_q(t) \ \bar{\psi}_c(t)) \begin{pmatrix} G_{qq}(t, t') & G_{qc}(t, t') \\ G_{cq}(t, t') & G_{cc}(t, t') \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_q(t') \\ \psi_c(t') \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{S54})$$

where the kernel in this representation is related to the correlation functions and response functions as,

$$G^K(t, t') \equiv G_{cc}(t, t') = -i \langle \psi_c(t) \bar{\psi}_c(t') \rangle = -i \int \mathcal{D}(\psi_q, \bar{\psi}_q, \psi_c, \bar{\psi}_c) \psi_c(t) \bar{\psi}_c(t') e^{iS} = -i \langle [\hat{\psi}(t), \hat{\psi}^\dagger(t')] \rangle \quad (\text{S55a})$$

$$G^R(t, t') \equiv G_{cq}(t, t') = -i \langle \psi_c(t) \bar{\psi}_q(t') \rangle = -i \int \mathcal{D}(\psi_q, \bar{\psi}_q, \psi_c, \bar{\psi}_c) \psi_c(t) \bar{\psi}_q(t') e^{iS} = -i\theta(t - t') \langle \{\hat{\psi}(t), \hat{\psi}^\dagger(t')\} \rangle \quad (\text{S55b})$$

$$G^A(t, t') \equiv G_{qc}(t, t') = -i \langle \psi_q(t) \bar{\psi}_c(t') \rangle = -i \int \mathcal{D}(\psi_q, \bar{\psi}_q, \psi_c, \bar{\psi}_c) \psi_q(t) \bar{\psi}_c(t') e^{iS} = i\theta(t' - t) \langle \{\hat{\psi}(t), \hat{\psi}^\dagger(t')\} \rangle \quad (\text{S55c})$$

$$0 = G_{qq}(t, t') = -i \langle \psi_q(t) \bar{\psi}_q(t') \rangle = -i \int \mathcal{D}(\psi_q, \bar{\psi}_q, \psi_c, \bar{\psi}_c) \psi_q(t) \bar{\psi}_q(t') e^{iS}. \quad (\text{S55d})$$

Here, G^R , G^A , and G^K are called the retarded, advanced, and Keldysh Green's functions, respectively. Their Fourier transform is given by,

$$G^R(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega - \varepsilon_0 + i\delta}, \quad (\text{S56a})$$

$$G^A(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega - \varepsilon_0 - i\delta}, \quad (\text{S56b})$$

$$G^K(\omega) = -\pi i(1 - 2f(\omega))\delta(\omega - \varepsilon_0). \quad (\text{S56c})$$

Physically, $G^R(\omega)[= G^{A*}(\omega)]$ describes the response to an external field, while $G^K(\omega)$ describes the correlation function. One can check that the fluctuation-dissipation relation for fermions [106]

$$G^K(\omega) = (1 - 2f(\omega))[G^R(\omega) - G^A(\omega)] \quad (\text{S57})$$

is satisfied as should in general closed equilibrium systems.

It is worth pointing out that the action Eq. (S46) (or Eq. (S54)) vanishes when one puts $\psi_+ = \psi_-$ (or equivalently, $\psi_q = 0$). This so-called causality structure originates from the trace-preserving property of the governing dynamics [45–47]. This can be seen by noting that, replacing ψ_+ to ψ_- implies moving the time evolution operator $\hat{U}(t_f, t_0)$ that time-evolves the ket in the Keldysh partition function (S37) to the bra-dynamics, using the cyclic property of the trace.

It is straightforward to generalize this result to many-body systems. An example relevant to our study is a free electron gas described by the Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}}$. The action is given by,

$$S = \int dt dt' \sum_{\mathbf{k}} (\bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{k}}^+(t) \quad \bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{k}}^-(t)) \begin{pmatrix} G_{\mathbf{k}}^{++}(t, t') & G_{\mathbf{k}}^{+-}(t, t') \\ G_{\mathbf{k}}^{-+}(t, t') & G_{\mathbf{k}}^{--}(t, t') \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_{\mathbf{k}}^+(t') \\ \psi_{\mathbf{k}}^-(t') \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{S58})$$

where

$$\begin{pmatrix} G_0^{++}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) & G_0^{+-}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \\ G_0^{-+}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) & G_0^{--}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \left[\frac{1-f_{\mathbf{k}}}{\omega - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} + i\delta} + \frac{f_{\mathbf{k}}}{\omega - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - i\delta} \right] & 2\pi i \delta(\omega - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) f_{\mathbf{k}} \\ -2\pi i \delta(\omega - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) (1 - f_{\mathbf{k}}) & \left[-\frac{f_{\mathbf{k}}}{\omega - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} + i\delta} - \frac{1-f_{\mathbf{k}}}{\omega - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - i\delta} \right] \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{S59})$$

2. Open quantum system attached to a thermal bath

Keldysh formalism is useful for formulating open quantum systems. To illustrate this, we will show an example of a single-mode fermion attached to a thermal bath modeled by a collection of free fermions. The Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = \hat{H}_s + \hat{H}_b + \hat{H}_{sb}$ is given by,

$$\hat{H}_s = \varepsilon_0 \hat{\psi}^\dagger \psi, \quad \hat{H}_b = \sum_{\mu} \omega_{\mu} \hat{\phi}_{\mu}^\dagger \phi_{\mu}, \quad \hat{H}_{sb} = \sum_{\mu} [v_{\mu} \hat{\phi}_{\mu}^\dagger \hat{\psi} + \text{h.c.}], \quad (\text{S60})$$

where $\hat{\phi}_{\mu}$ and ω_{μ} are the fermionic annihilation operator and the energy of bath fermions at mode μ , respectively. The Keldysh partition function can be obtained for this system as,

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}[\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-, \phi_+, \bar{\phi}_+, \phi_-, \bar{\phi}_-] e^{iS_{\text{tot}}[\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-, \phi_+, \bar{\phi}_+, \phi_-, \bar{\phi}_-]}, \quad (\text{S61})$$

where the total action is composed of three parts $S_{\text{tot}} = S_0 + S_b + S_{sb}$, which are given by,

$$S_0 = \int dt dt' (\bar{\psi}_+(t) \quad \bar{\psi}_-(t)) \begin{pmatrix} G_{++}(t, t') & G_{+-}(t, t') \\ G_{-+}(t, t') & G_{--}(t, t') \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_+(t') \\ \psi_-(t') \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{S62})$$

$$S_b = \sum_{\mu} \int dt dt' (\bar{\phi}_+^{\mu}(t) \quad \bar{\phi}_-^{\mu}(t)) \begin{pmatrix} B_{++}^{\mu}(t, t') & B_{+-}^{\mu}(t, t') \\ B_{-+}^{\mu}(t, t') & B_{--}^{\mu}(t, t') \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_+^{\mu}(t') \\ \phi_-^{\mu}(t') \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{S63})$$

$$S_{sb} = \sum_{\mu} \int dt [(v_{\mu} \bar{\phi}_+(t) \psi_+(t) + \text{c.c.}) - (v_{\mu} \bar{\phi}_-(t) \psi_-(t) + \text{c.c.})]. \quad (\text{S64})$$

Here, $\phi_{\pm}, \bar{\phi}_{\pm}$ are the Grassmann variables of the baths, $G_{s,s'}(s, s' = +, -)$ is given by Eq. (S47), and

$$\begin{pmatrix} B_{++}^{\mu}(t, t') & B_{+-}^{\mu}(t, t') \\ B_{-+}^{\mu}(t, t') & B_{--}^{\mu}(t, t') \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} i\theta(-t)f(\omega_{\mu})e^{-i\varepsilon_0(t-t')} + i\theta(t)(1+f(\omega_{\mu}))e^{-i\omega_{\mu}(t-t')} & if(\omega_{\mu})e^{-i\omega_{\mu}(t-t')} \\ i(1+f(\omega_{\mu}))e^{-i\omega_{\mu}(t-t')} & i\theta(t)f(\omega_{\mu})e^{-i\omega_{\mu}(t-t')} + i\theta(-t)(1+f(\omega_{\mu}))e^{-i\omega_{\mu}(t-t')} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{S65})$$

are the various two-point correlation functions of the baths.

Since the total action S_{tot} is quadratic in terms of the bath Grassmann variables ϕ_{\pm} , one can analytically integrate out the bath degrees of freedom as,

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}[\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-] e^{iS_{\text{eff}}[\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-]}, \quad (\text{S66})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} e^{iS_{\text{eff}}[\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-]} &= e^{iS_0[\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-]} \int \mathcal{D}[\phi_+, \bar{\phi}_+, \phi_-, \bar{\phi}_-] e^{iS_b[\phi_+, \bar{\phi}_+, \phi_-, \bar{\phi}_-] + S_{sb}[\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-, \phi_+, \bar{\phi}_+, \phi_-, \bar{\phi}_-]} \\ &= e^{iS_0[\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-]} e^{i\Delta S[\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-]}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S67})$$

The contribution arising from the attachment of the bath ΔS is computed as,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta S[\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-] &= \sum_{\mu} |v_{\mu}|^2 \int dt dt' (\bar{\psi}_+(t) \quad \bar{\psi}_-(t)) \begin{pmatrix} B_{++}^{\mu}(t, t') & B_{+-}^{\mu}(t, t') \\ B_{-+}^{\mu}(t, t') & B_{--}^{\mu}(t, t') \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_+(t') \\ \psi_-(t') \end{pmatrix}, \\ &= \sum_{\mu} |v_{\mu}|^2 \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} (\bar{\psi}_q(\omega) \quad \bar{\psi}_c(\omega)) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{\omega - \omega_{\mu} - i\delta} \\ \frac{1}{\omega - \omega_{\mu} + i\delta} & -\pi i(1 - 2f(\omega))\delta(\omega - \omega_{\mu}) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_q(\omega) \\ \psi_c(\omega) \end{pmatrix}, \\ &\simeq \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} (\bar{\psi}_q(\omega) \quad \bar{\psi}_c(\omega)) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i\frac{\gamma(\omega)}{2} \\ -i\frac{\gamma(\omega)}{2} & i\frac{\gamma(\omega)}{2}(1 - 2f(\omega)) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_q(\omega) \\ \psi_c(\omega) \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S68})$$

Here, in the second equality, we have moved to the quantum-classical representation Eq. (S53). In the third, we have ignored the contribution from the real part of the propagators (the ‘‘Lamb shift’’) and have introduced a dissipation rate $\gamma(\omega) = \pi \sum_{\mu} |v_{\mu}|^2 \delta(\omega - \omega_{\mu})$, where we have taken the spectrum of the bath fermions to be a continuum.

The effective action $S_{\text{eff}} = S_0 + \Delta S$ is therefore summarized as,

$$S = \int dt dt' (\bar{\psi}_q(\omega) \quad \bar{\psi}_c(\omega)) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & G^A(\omega) \\ G^R(\omega) & G^K(\omega) \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_q(\omega) \\ \psi_c(\omega) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{S69})$$

where the correlation functions and response functions are given by,

$$G^R(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega - \varepsilon_0 + i\gamma(\omega)}, \quad (\text{S70})$$

$$G^A(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega - \varepsilon_0 - i\gamma(\omega)}, \quad (\text{S71})$$

$$G^K(\omega) = -i\pi(1 - 2f(\omega)) \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\gamma(\omega)}{(\omega - \varepsilon_0)^2 + \gamma^2(\omega)}. \quad (\text{S72})$$

Compared with the closed system counterpart (Eq. (S56)), the delta-functions of the spectrum in Eq. (S56) is replaced by a Lorentzian. This shows that the coupling to the bath gives rise to dissipation in the relevant system.

Remarkably, the fluctuation-dissipation theorem (Eq. (S57)) is still satisfied with this attachment to the thermal bath. This illustrates how the Keldysh theory rightly describes how an attachment to a thermal bath thermalizes the relevant system. (In fact, this can be understood as a result of a certain symmetry of the Keldysh action that is respected in the thermal equilibrium, see Ref. [107].) We remark that this could not have been captured in the GKSL formalism discussed in Sec. IA [107], where the Markovian approximation ignores the dynamical effects arising from the Fermi distribution function.

3. Keldysh technique applied to the GKSL master equation

So far, we have considered the case where the relevant system is attached to a single bath, reproducing the results known from the equilibrium statistical mechanics. The real advantage of using the Keldysh approach is that it can treat nonequilibrium systems arising from attaching to multiple baths.

In our study, we will be concerned with a system (localized electrons) attached to two baths. One of the baths is Markovian (the higher-energy state) and the other is non-Markovian (conduction electrons). As we have reviewed in Sec. IA, once we integrated out the Markovian bath, the reduced density operator $\hat{\rho}$ is governed by the GKSL equation (S4), reproduced below for convenience:

$$\partial_t \hat{\rho} = \mathcal{L} \hat{\rho} = -i[\hat{H}, \hat{\rho}] + \sum_{\ell} \kappa_{\ell} \mathcal{D}[\hat{L}_{\ell}] \hat{\rho}, \quad (\text{S73})$$

with $\mathcal{D}[\hat{L}] \hat{\rho} = \hat{L} \hat{\rho} \hat{L}^{\dagger} - \frac{1}{2} \{ \hat{L}^{\dagger} \hat{L}, \hat{\rho} \}$. Therefore, we will have in mind the situation where the Hamiltonian \hat{H} is composed of the relevant system and the non-Markovian bath (but the formalism below is general).

Following Refs. [46, 47], we formulate a Keldysh path integral formalism for the GKSL equation to treat this type of open system. As done in the previous subsections, we define the Keldysh action

$$Z = \text{tr}[\hat{\rho}(t_f)] = \text{tr}[e^{\mathcal{L}(t_f - t_0)} \hat{\rho}(t_0)] = \text{tr} \left[\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{n=0}^N \hat{\rho}_n \right] \quad (\text{S74})$$

where we have discretized the GKSL equation (S73) as

$$\hat{\rho}_{n+1} = (\hat{1} + \delta_t \mathcal{L})[\hat{\rho}_n] + O(\delta_t^2). \quad (\text{S75})$$

with $\delta_t = (t_f - t_0)/N$ and defined $\hat{\rho}_0 \equiv \hat{\rho}(t_0)$.

Let us restrict ourselves, for simplicity, to a single-mode fermion system. As before, we expand the Keldysh partition function into coherent states. This can be computed once $\langle \psi_{+,n+1} | \hat{\rho}_{n+1} | -\psi_{-,n+1} \rangle = \langle \psi_{+,n+1} | (\hat{1} + \delta_t \mathcal{L})[\hat{\rho}_n] | -\psi_{-,n+1} \rangle$ is calculated. Using

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \psi_{+,n+1} | \mathcal{L} \hat{\rho}_n | -\psi_{-,n+1} \rangle \\ &= \int d\bar{\psi}_{+,n} d\psi_{+,n} d\bar{\psi}_{-,n} d\psi_{-,n} e^{-\bar{\psi}_{+,n} \psi_{+,n} - \bar{\psi}_{-,n} \psi_{-,n}} \langle \psi_{+,n} | \hat{\rho}_n | -\psi_{-,n+1} \rangle \langle \psi_{+,n+1} | \mathcal{L} [| \psi_{+,n} \rangle \langle -\psi_{-,n} |] | -\psi_{-,n+1} \rangle \\ &= \int d\bar{\psi}_{+,n} d\psi_{+,n} d\bar{\psi}_{-,n} d\psi_{-,n} e^{-\bar{\psi}_{+,n} \psi_{+,n} - \bar{\psi}_{-,n} \psi_{-,n}} \langle \psi_{+,n} | \hat{\rho}_n | -\psi_{-,n} \rangle \\ & \times \left[(-i) \left[\langle \psi_{+,n+1} | \hat{H} | \psi_{+,n} \rangle \langle -\psi_{-,n} | -\psi_{-,n+1} \rangle - \langle \psi_{+,n+1} | \psi_{+,n} \rangle \langle -\psi_{-,n} | \hat{H} | -\psi_{-,n+1} \rangle \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sum_{\ell} \kappa_{\ell} \left[\langle \psi_{+,n+1} | \hat{L}_{\ell} | \psi_{+,n} \rangle \langle -\psi_{-,n} | \hat{L}_{\ell}^{\dagger} | -\psi_{-,n+1} \rangle \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - \frac{1}{2} \left[\langle \psi_{+,n+1} | \hat{L}_{\ell}^{\dagger} \hat{L}_{\ell} | \psi_{+,n} \rangle \langle -\psi_{-,n} | -\psi_{-,n+1} \rangle + \langle \psi_{+,n+1} | \psi_{+,n} \rangle \langle -\psi_{-,n} | \hat{L}_{\ell}^{\dagger} \hat{L}_{\ell} | -\psi_{-,n+1} \rangle \right] \right] \\ &= \int d\bar{\psi}_{+,n} d\psi_{+,n} d\bar{\psi}_{-,n} d\psi_{-,n} e^{-(\bar{\psi}_{+,n} - \bar{\psi}_{+,n+1}) \psi_{+,n} - \bar{\psi}_{-,n} (\psi_{-,n} - \psi_{-,n+1})} \langle \psi_{+,n} | \hat{\rho}_n | -\psi_{-,n} \rangle \\ & \times \left[(-i) \left[H_+(\psi_{+,n}, \bar{\psi}_{+,n}) - H_-(\psi_{-,n}, \bar{\psi}_{-,n}) \right] + \sum_{\ell} \kappa_{\ell} \left[L_{+,n,\ell}(-\bar{L}_{-,n,\ell}) - \frac{1}{2} (\bar{L}_{+,n,\ell} L_{+,n,\ell} + \bar{L}_{-,n,\ell} L_{-,n,\ell}) \right] \right] \quad (\text{S76}) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$H_+(\psi_{+,n}, \bar{\psi}_{+,n}) = \langle \psi_{+,n} | \hat{H} | \psi_{+,n} \rangle, \quad H_-(\psi_{-,n}, \bar{\psi}_{-,n}) = \langle -\psi_{-,n} | \hat{H} | -\psi_{-,n} \rangle, \quad (\text{S77})$$

$$L_{+,n,\ell} = \langle \psi_{+,n} | \hat{L}_\ell | \psi_{+,n} \rangle, \quad L_{-,n,\ell} = \langle -\psi_{-,n} | \hat{L}_\ell | -\psi_{-,n} \rangle, \quad (\text{S78})$$

This yields,

$$\langle \psi_{+,n+1} | \hat{\rho}_{n+1} | -\psi_{-,n+1} \rangle = \int d\bar{\psi}_{+,n} d\psi_{+,n} d\bar{\psi}_{-,n} d\psi_{-,n} e^{-(\bar{\psi}_{+,n} - \bar{\psi}_{+,n+1})\psi_{+,n} - \bar{\psi}_{-,n}(\psi_{-,n} - \psi_{-,n+1})} e^{\delta_t \mathcal{L}[\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-]} \quad (\text{S79})$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}[\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-] &= (-i) \left[H_+(\psi_{+,n}, \bar{\psi}_{+,n}) - H_-(\psi_{-,n}, \bar{\psi}_{-,n}) \right] \\ &+ \sum_\ell \kappa_\ell \left[L_{+,n,\ell}(-\bar{L}_{-,n,\ell}) - \frac{1}{2} (\bar{L}_{+,n,\ell} L_{+,n,\ell} + \bar{L}_{-,n,\ell} L_{-,n,\ell}) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S80})$$

Here, we have assumed that the Hamiltonian \hat{H} , the dissipators \hat{L}_ℓ , and $\hat{L}_\ell^\dagger \hat{L}_\ell$ are normal ordered. We note that there are subtleties in this normal ordering procedure, where the causality structure may be broken [108]. This can be mitigated by introducing an infinitesimal time difference that enforces the ordering of the operators, see e.g. Appendix A in Ref. [47] for details. Taking the continuous limit, the Keldysh partition function can be computed as

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}[\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-] e^{iS[\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-]}, \quad (\text{S81})$$

with the Keldysh action S given by,

$$\begin{aligned} S[\psi_+, \bar{\psi}_+, \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_-] &= \int dt \left[\bar{\psi}_+(t)(i\partial_t - H_+(t))\psi_+(t) - \bar{\psi}_-(t)(i\partial_t - H_-(t))\psi_-(t) \right. \\ &+ \left. \sum_\ell \kappa_\ell \left[L_{+, \ell}(t) \bar{L}_{-, \ell}(t) - \frac{1}{2} (\bar{L}_{+, \ell}(t+\delta) L_{+, \ell}(t-\delta) + \bar{L}_{-, \ell}(t-\delta) L_{-, \ell}(t+\delta)) \right] \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S82})$$

Here, we have introduced $t_{\pm\delta} = t \pm 0^+$ to ensure the causality structure of the action, i.e., $S[\psi_+ = \psi_-, \bar{\psi}_+ = \bar{\psi}_-] = 0$. Equation (S82) that gives the relation between the GKSL equation (S73) and the Keldysh action S is the central relation used in Sec. IV.

II. THE MODEL

Equipped with the theoretical tools introduced in Sec. I, we formulate below our dissipation-engineering scheme to control local spin-spin interactions in magnetic metals. This section summarizes our model.

As illustrated schematically in Fig. 2(a) in the main text, this system is composed of localized electrons immersed in a Fermi sea of conduction electrons. The localized electrons are responsible for magnetic properties, while the conduction electrons are responsible for metallic properties. To manipulate the effective spin-spin interactions between the localized sites (Fig. 2(b) in the main text), we inject a laser light that gives rise to dissipation to the double-occupied state at site a at the rate κ_a . By tuning the frequency of the laser to be resonant with a higher-level state (say, upper-level f -orbital state) that has a linewidth $\Gamma_{f,a}$, (Fig. 2(c) in the main text), we turn on tunneling from the double-occupied state to the higher-level state (a labels the localized electron sites). This process can be regarded as a Markov process, as long as the dissipation rate of the higher-level state $\Gamma_{f,a}$ (which is the timescale of the memory of the bath) is larger than its supply rate. A detailed discussion on this point is provided in Methods. As explained in Sec. IA, the time evolution of reduced system density operator $\hat{\rho}$ of such Markov system is generally governed by the GKSL master equation. In our system, it reads

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \hat{\rho} &= \mathcal{L} \hat{\rho} \\ &= -i[\hat{H}, \hat{\rho}] + \sum_{a,\sigma} \kappa_a \mathcal{D}[\hat{d}_{\sigma,a} \hat{P}_{\uparrow}^a] \hat{\rho} + \sum_{a,\sigma} \delta_a \mathcal{D}[\hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger \hat{P}_{\emptyset}^a] \hat{\rho}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S83})$$

The first term describes the coherent dynamics of the magnetic metals and the second term is the light-induced dissipation. We have added the third term phenomenologically to ensure the steady state of localized electrons is

singly occupied at each site. (We have omitted the third term in the main text, as they only play a role in ensuring the state is in the singly occupied state.)

The magnetic metal is modeled by the Anderson impurity model $\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + \hat{H}_{cd}$ consisting of two parts. The unperturbed part $\hat{H}_0 = \hat{H}_{c0} + \hat{H}_{d0}$ describes the conduction electrons and the localized electrons, given respectively by,

$$\hat{H}_{c0} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma=\uparrow, \downarrow} \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}, \quad (\text{S84})$$

$$\hat{H}_{d0} = \sum_a \left[\sum_{\sigma=\uparrow, \downarrow} \varepsilon_{d,a} \hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma,a} + U_a \hat{d}_{\uparrow,a}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\uparrow,a} \hat{d}_{\downarrow,a}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\downarrow,a} \right]. \quad (\text{S85})$$

Here, the conduction electrons are modeled as free electrons, where $\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}$ is a fermionic annihilation operator of conduction electrons with momentum \mathbf{k} and spin $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$ and $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ is the kinetic energy. We assume that the conduction electrons' system size is large enough to ensure they are always in thermal equilibrium. Its distribution obeys the Fermi distribution function $f(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) = [e^{(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_F)/(k_B T)} + 1]^{-1}$ that is characterized by temperature T and the Fermi energy ε_F . We will focus on low-temperature regime $k_B T \ll \varepsilon_F$. The localized electrons are modeled as a two-level system with energy $\varepsilon_{d,a}$ and an on-site Coulomb repulsion $U_a > 0$ at site a . Here, $\hat{d}_{a,\sigma}$ is a fermionic annihilation operator of localized electrons at site a . These two types of electrons couple through the second part of the Hamiltonian \hat{H} , namely the c-d mixing \hat{H}_{cd} , where the electrons in the conduction band tunnel at rate v_a to the localized orbital and vice versa, described by

$$\hat{H}_{cd} = \sum_{a,\sigma} [v_a \hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a\sigma} + \text{h.c.}] = \sum_a \sum_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} [v_a e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_a} \hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} + \text{h.c.}], \quad (\text{S86})$$

Here, $\hat{c}_{\mathbf{r},\sigma} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}$ is the Fourier transform of $\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}$ and \mathbf{R}_a is the position of the local electron at site a . In what follows, we restrict our interest to systems where the Coulomb repulsion is strong enough ($U_a \gg v_a$) to treat \hat{H}_{cd} as a perturbation.

The second term in the GKSL master equation (S83) describes the light-induced loss of an electron in the double-occupied state. The localized electron at site a can take four states: it can be vacant $|\emptyset\rangle_a$, singly occupied with \uparrow (\downarrow)-spin $|\uparrow\rangle_a$ ($|\downarrow\rangle_a = \hat{d}_{a,\uparrow(\downarrow)}^\dagger |\emptyset\rangle_a$), or double-occupied occupied $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_a = \hat{d}_{a,\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{d}_{a,\downarrow}^\dagger |\emptyset\rangle_a$. $\hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a$ at site a projects the state to the double-occupied state $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_a$, enforcing the loss to activate only when site a is double-occupied. It will become clear in the following that this selective decay of localized electrons effectively modifies the interactions between the localized spins.

The third term ($\delta_a \rightarrow 0^+$) is phenomenologically added to drive the system towards a singly occupied state ($|\uparrow\rangle_a$ or $|\downarrow\rangle_a$), where \hat{P}_{\emptyset}^a is the projection operator to the vacant state $|\emptyset\rangle_a$ at site a .

III. EFFECTIVE LOCALIZED SPIN DYNAMICS IMMERSSED IN CONDUCTION ELECTRONS WITH LIGHT-INDUCED CORRELATED DISSIPATION

To proceed, we resort to the projection method introduced in Sec. IA2 to perturbatively derive the effective low-energy dynamics given by Eq. (4) in the main text. We split the Lindbladian $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{L}_1$ in Eq. (S83) to non-perturbative (\mathcal{L}_0) and perturbative part (\mathcal{L}_1) as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_0 \hat{\rho} = -i[\hat{H}_{c0} + \hat{H}_{d0}, \hat{\rho}] + \sum_{a,\sigma} \kappa_a \mathcal{D}[\hat{d}_{\sigma,a} \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a] \hat{\rho} + \sum_{a,\sigma} \delta_a \mathcal{D}[\hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger \hat{P}_{\emptyset}^a] \hat{\rho}, \quad (\text{S87})$$

$$\mathcal{L}_1 \hat{\rho} = -i[\hat{H}_{cd}, \hat{\rho}]. \quad (\text{S88})$$

The perturbative part \mathcal{L}_1 , i.e. the c-d mixing, gives a contribution at most $O(v_a/U_a)$, which is assumed to be small. In this section, we will use the relation Eq. (S32) to derive the low-energy effective Lindbladian of our system (Eq. (S83)) within the second-order perturbation in \mathcal{L}_1 , which we reproduce below for convenience:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}})_{n_l, n_r} &\equiv (\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)}, \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} \hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)}) = \text{tr}[\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger} \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} \hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)}] \\ &= \text{tr}[\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger} \mathcal{L}_0 \hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)}] + \text{tr}[\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger} \mathcal{L}_1 \hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)}] - \sum_{m \in \mathfrak{f}} \frac{\text{tr}[\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger} \mathcal{L}_1 \hat{r}_m^{(0)}] \text{tr}[\hat{l}_m^{(0)\dagger} \mathcal{L}_1 \hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)}]}{\lambda_m^{(0)}} + O((\mathcal{L}_1)^3). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S89})$$

Here, $\hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)}$ and $\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)}$ are the right and left eigenstates, respectively, that form a basis of the slow variable space we define below. $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}) = \text{tr}[\hat{A}^\dagger \hat{B}]$ is the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product (see Eq. (S8)). In the third term, the sum is taken over the fast degrees of freedom, also defined below.

A. Characterization of non-perturbative Lindbladian $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_0$

As is clear from the expression of Eq. (S89), the first step to derive the effective low-energy Lindbladian is to characterize the (left) right eigenstates $\hat{r}_n^{(0)}$ ($\hat{l}_n^{(0)}$) and eigenvalues of the unperturbed Lindbladian \mathcal{L}_0 (Eq. (S87)). This can be done exactly since the nonperturbative Lindbladian $\mathcal{L}_0 = \mathcal{L}_{c0} + \sum_a \mathcal{L}_{d0,a}$ is composed of free conduction electrons and localized electrons that are completely decoupled, where

$$\mathcal{L}_{c0}\hat{\rho} = -i\left[\sum_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^\dagger\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma},\hat{\rho}\right], \quad (\text{S90})$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{d0,a}\hat{\rho} = -i\left[\left(\sum_{\sigma}\varepsilon_{d,a}\hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger\hat{d}_{\sigma,a} + U_a\hat{d}_{\uparrow,a}^\dagger\hat{d}_{\uparrow,a}\hat{d}_{\downarrow,a}^\dagger\hat{d}_{\downarrow,a}\right),\hat{\rho}\right] + \sum_{\sigma}\kappa_a\mathcal{D}[\hat{d}_{\sigma,a}\hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a]\hat{\rho} + \sum_{\sigma}\delta_a\mathcal{D}[\hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger\hat{P}_{\emptyset}^a]\hat{\rho}. \quad (\text{S91})$$

The eigenvectors can be expressed as a direct product, i.e. $\hat{r}_n^{(0)} = \hat{r}_n^{c(0)} \otimes \prod_a \hat{r}_{a,n}^{d(0)}$ and $\hat{l}_n^{(0)} = \hat{l}_n^{c(0)} \otimes \prod_a \hat{l}_{a,n}^{d(0)}$. Here, $\hat{r}_n^{c(0)}$ and $\hat{l}_n^{c(0)}$ are the right and left eigenstates, respectively, of the (non-perturbative) conduction electron Lindbladian \mathcal{L}_{c0} that satisfies,

$$\mathcal{L}_{c0}\hat{r}_n^{c(0)} = \lambda_n^{c(0)}\hat{r}_n^{c(0)}, \quad \mathcal{L}_{c0}^\dagger\hat{l}_n^{c(0)} = \lambda_n^{c(0)*}\hat{l}_n^{c(0)}, \quad (\text{S92})$$

with an eigenvalue $\lambda_n^{c(0)}$. Similarly, $\hat{r}_{a,n}^{d(0)}$ and $\hat{l}_{a,n}^{d(0)}$ are the right and left eigenstates, respectively, with an eigenvalue $\lambda_{a,n}^{d(0)}$ for the localized electron part $\mathcal{L}_{d0,a}$

$$\mathcal{L}_{d0,a}\hat{r}_{a,n}^{d(0)} = \lambda_{a,n}^{d(0)}\hat{r}_{a,n}^{d(0)}, \quad \mathcal{L}_{d0,a}^\dagger\hat{l}_{a,n}^{d(0)} = \lambda_{a,n}^{d(0)*}\hat{l}_{a,n}^{d(0)}. \quad (\text{S93})$$

The total eigenvalue $\lambda_n^{(0)}$ is given by their sum $\lambda_n^{(0)} = \lambda_n^{c(0)} + \sum_a \lambda_{a,n}^{d(0)}$.

1. Characterization of $\mathcal{L}_{d0,a}$

Let us first characterize $\mathcal{L}_{d0,a}$. It is helpful to point out that the superoperator $\mathcal{N}_{a,\sigma}^d\hat{\rho} = [\hat{d}_{a,\sigma}^\dagger\hat{d}_{a,\sigma},\hat{\rho}]$ commutes with $\mathcal{L}_{d0,a}$, implying that the two superoperators share a set of eigenvectors. The eigenvector of the superoperator $\mathcal{N}_{a,\sigma}^d$ is the outer product of Fock states with corresponding eigenvalue $m_\uparrow(m_\downarrow) = 0, \pm 1$. Here, the eigenvalue $m_\uparrow(m_\downarrow) = 0, \pm 1$ is given by the number of $\sigma = \uparrow(\downarrow)$ -spin electrons in ket minus those in bra. Therefore, the right and left eigenvectors of $\mathcal{L}_{d0,a}$ can be cast into a block-diagonal form $\mathcal{L}_{d0,a} = \otimes_{m_\uparrow,m_\downarrow} \mathcal{L}_{d0,a,(m_\uparrow,m_\downarrow)}$, where m_σ is the eigenvalue of $\mathcal{N}_{a,\sigma}^d$. The simultaneous right and left eigenstates of $\mathcal{L}_{d0,a}$ and $\mathcal{N}_{a,\sigma}^d$ are given respectively by

$$\mathcal{L}_{d0,a,(m_\uparrow,m_\downarrow)}\hat{r}_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow,m_\downarrow)}^{d(0)} = \lambda_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow,m_\downarrow)}^{d(0)}\hat{r}_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow,m_\downarrow)}^{d(0)}, \quad \mathcal{L}_{d0,a,(m_\uparrow,m_\downarrow)}^\dagger\hat{l}_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow,m_\downarrow)}^{d(0)} = \lambda_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow,m_\downarrow)}^{d(0)*}\hat{l}_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow,m_\downarrow)}^{d(0)}. \quad (\text{S94})$$

For example, $(m_\uparrow, m_\downarrow) = (0, 0)$ sector has the right and left eigenmode of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{r}_{a,\ell,m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0}^{d(0)} &= r_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0),\emptyset}^{(0)}|\emptyset\rangle\langle\emptyset| + r_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0),\uparrow}^{(0)}|\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow| \\ &\quad + r_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0),\downarrow}^{(0)}|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow| + r_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0),\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S95})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{l}_{a,\ell,m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0}^{d(0)} &= l_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0),\emptyset}^{(0)}|\emptyset\rangle\langle\emptyset| + l_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0),\uparrow}^{(0)}|\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow| \\ &\quad + l_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0),\downarrow}^{(0)}|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow| + l_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0),\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S96})$$

Similarly, the right and left eigenvectors have the form

$$\hat{r}_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=1,m_\downarrow=0)}^{d(0)} = r_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=1,m_\downarrow=0),\emptyset}^{(0)}|\uparrow\rangle\langle\emptyset| + r_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=1,m_\downarrow=0),\downarrow}^{(0)}|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|, \quad (\text{S97})$$

$$\hat{l}_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=1,m_\downarrow=0)}^{d(0)} = l_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=1,m_\downarrow=0),\emptyset}^{(0)}|\uparrow\rangle\langle\emptyset| + l_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=1,m_\downarrow=0),\downarrow}^{(0)}|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|, \quad (\text{S98})$$

for $(m_\uparrow, m_\downarrow) = (1, 0)$,

$$\hat{r}_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=-1,m_\downarrow=0)}^{d(0)} = r_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=-1,m_\downarrow=0),\uparrow}^{(0)}|\emptyset\rangle\langle\uparrow| + r_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=-1,m_\downarrow=0),\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}|\downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow|, \quad (\text{S99})$$

$$\hat{l}_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=-1,m_\downarrow=0)}^{d(0)} = l_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=-1,m_\downarrow=0),\uparrow}^{(0)}|\emptyset\rangle\langle\uparrow| + l_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=-1,m_\downarrow=0),\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)}|\downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow|, \quad (\text{S100})$$

for $(m_\uparrow, m_\downarrow) = (-1, 0)$, and so on.

Let us start with the analysis of the eigenvectors of $(m_\uparrow, m_\downarrow) = (0, 0)$ -sector, which is often called the T_1 -modes that physically correspond to the population dynamics of the states. In this sector, one finds by plugging the form Eqs. (S95) and (S96) into Eqs. (S94),

$$\mathbf{M}_a \mathbf{r}_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0)}^{(0)} = \lambda_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0)}^{(0)} \mathbf{r}_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0)}^{(0)}, \quad \mathbf{r}_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0)}^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} r_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0),\emptyset}^{(0)} \\ r_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0),\uparrow}^{(0)} \\ r_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0),\downarrow}^{(0)} \\ r_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0),\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{S101})$$

$$(\mathbf{l}_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0)}^{(0)})^\top \mathbf{M}_a = \lambda_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0)}^{(0)} (\mathbf{l}_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0)}^{(0)})^\top, \quad \mathbf{l}_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0)}^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} l_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0),\emptyset}^{(0)} \\ l_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0),\uparrow}^{(0)} \\ l_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0),\downarrow}^{(0)} \\ l_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=0,m_\downarrow=0),\uparrow\downarrow}^{(0)} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{S102})$$

with

$$\mathbf{M}_a = \begin{pmatrix} -2\delta_a & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \delta_a & 0 & 0 & \kappa_a \\ \delta_a & 0 & 0 & \kappa_a \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -2\kappa_a \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{S103})$$

Note that the Hamiltonian \hat{H} gives no contribution to this Fock-space diagonal subspace, where the dynamical matrix \mathbf{M}_a contains no contribution from \hat{H} . This is due to the property that \hat{H} is diagonal in the Fock space.

The first four rows of Table I report the eigenvalues and the right and left eigenvectors in the $(m_\uparrow, m_\downarrow) = (0, 0)$ sector, computed by diagonalizing \mathbf{M}_a . Note that the first two eigenvectors are degenerate with zero eigenvalues. This is because both spin configurations of singly occupied state ($|\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\rangle$) do not experience any dissipation in $\mathcal{L}_{d0,a}$. We also note that this zero-eigenvalue degenerate space of the left eigenvectors contains the identity operator \hat{I} , as is expected from the general result (Eq. (S23)).

We now move on to the analysis of other sectors $(m_\uparrow, m_\downarrow) \neq (0, 0)$ (often called the T_2 -modes). Noting that the jump term $\hat{d}_{\sigma,a} \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow} \hat{r}_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow,m_\downarrow)} \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow} \hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger = 0$ ($(m_\uparrow, m_\downarrow) \neq (0, 0)$) does not contribute in this sector because of the presence of the projection operator $\hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}$, the eigenvalues and eigenstates are given as a simple beamsplitter operator, see Table I. This can be readily checked. For example, for the $(m_\uparrow, m_\downarrow) = (1, 0)$ sector, $\mathcal{L}_{d0} \hat{r}_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=1,m_\downarrow=0)}$ can be compute as,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}_{d0} (r_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=1,m_\downarrow=0),\emptyset}^{(0)} |\uparrow\rangle \langle \emptyset| + r_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=1,m_\downarrow=0),\downarrow}^{(0)} |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle \langle \downarrow|) \\ &= \left(-i\varepsilon_{d,a} + \frac{\delta_a}{2} \right) r_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=1,m_\downarrow=0),\emptyset}^{(0)} |\uparrow\rangle \langle \emptyset| + \left(-i(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a) - \frac{\kappa_a}{2} \right) r_{a,\ell,(m_\uparrow=1,m_\downarrow=0),\downarrow}^{(0)} |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle \langle \downarrow| \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S104})$$

which is diagonal, giving the eigenvalues and eigenstates listed in the seventh and ninth row of Table I.

As mentioned earlier, while the T_1 -modes (the $(m_\uparrow, m_\downarrow) = (0, 0)$ sector) only involve dissipation, the T_2 -modes (the $(m_\uparrow, m_\downarrow) \neq (0, 0)$ sector) involves coherence between the two different states. The oscillation frequencies of the T_2 -modes are the difference between the energies of two states, which are of order $O(\varepsilon_{d,a}, U_a)$. We regard the first six (the last six) eigenvalues on Table I as the slow (fast) modes. We will perturbatively project out the fast modes to obtain the effective dynamics including the effect of the c-d mixing \mathcal{L}_1 .

2. Characterization of \mathcal{L}_{c0}

Let us next analyze \mathcal{L}_{c0} . As noted earlier, we assume that the system size of the conduction electrons is large enough such that they are always in the equilibrium state. Assuming further that the system is at low temperature $k_B T \ll \varepsilon_F$, the steady state ($\mathcal{L}_{c0} \hat{\rho}_{c,ss}^{(0)} = 0$) is approximately given by a Fermi sphere $\hat{\rho}_{c,ss}^{(0)} = |F\rangle \langle F|$, where

$$|F\rangle = \prod_{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} < \varepsilon_F} \prod_{\sigma=\uparrow,\downarrow} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^\dagger |0\rangle, \quad (\text{S105})$$

TABLE I. Eigenvalues and eigenstates of $\mathcal{L}_{d0,a}$

	Eigenvalue $\lambda_{a,n}^{d(0)}$	Right eigenstate $r_{a,n}^{d(0)}$	Left eigenstate $\hat{l}_{a,n}^{d(0)}$
slow	0	$\frac{1}{2}[\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow + \downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow]$	\hat{I}
	0	$\frac{1}{2}[\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow - \downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow]$	$\frac{1}{2}[\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow - \downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow]$
	$-2\delta_a$	$ \uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow + \downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow - 2 \emptyset\rangle\langle\emptyset $	$-\frac{1}{2} \emptyset\rangle\langle\emptyset $
	$-2\kappa_a$	$ \uparrow\downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow - \frac{1}{2} \uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow - \frac{1}{2} \downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow $	$ \uparrow\downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow $
	0	$ \uparrow\rangle\langle\downarrow $	$ \uparrow\rangle\langle\downarrow $
	0	$ \downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow $	$ \downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow $
fast	$-i\varepsilon_{d,a} - \frac{\delta_a}{2}$	$ \sigma\rangle\langle\emptyset $	$ \sigma\rangle\langle\emptyset $
	$i\varepsilon_{d,a} - \frac{\delta_a}{2}$	$ \emptyset\rangle\langle\sigma $	$ \emptyset\rangle\langle\sigma $
	$-i(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a) - \frac{\kappa_a}{2}$	$ \uparrow\downarrow\rangle\langle\sigma $	$ \uparrow\downarrow\rangle\langle\sigma $
	$i(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a) - \frac{\kappa_a}{2}$	$ \sigma\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow $	$ \sigma\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow $
	$-i(2\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a) - \frac{\kappa_a}{2}$	$ \uparrow\downarrow\rangle\langle\emptyset $	$ \uparrow\downarrow\rangle\langle\emptyset $
	$i(2\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a) - \frac{\kappa_a}{2}$	$ \emptyset\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow $	$ \emptyset\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow $

and $|0\rangle$ is a vacuum state. Since \mathcal{L}_{c0} is composed of free electrons, one can obtain all the eigenvalues and eigenstates by adding or subtracting electrons from this state to both ket and bra space. For example, by creating or annihilating an electron above or below the Fermi sphere, given respectively by,

$$|\mathbf{k}\sigma\rangle \equiv \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^\dagger |F\rangle \quad (\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} > \varepsilon_F), \quad |\overline{\mathbf{k}\sigma}\rangle \equiv \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} |F\rangle \quad (\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} < \varepsilon_F) \quad (\text{S106})$$

then

$$\mathcal{L}_{c0}(|\mathbf{k}, \sigma\rangle\langle F|) = -i\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}(|\mathbf{k}\sigma\rangle\langle F|), \quad (\text{S107a})$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{c0}(|F\rangle\langle \mathbf{k}, \sigma|) = +i\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}(|F\rangle\langle \mathbf{k}, \sigma|), \quad (\text{S107b})$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{c0}(|\overline{\mathbf{k}\sigma}\rangle\langle F|) = +i\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}(|\overline{\mathbf{k}\sigma}\rangle\langle F|), \quad (\text{S107c})$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{c0}(|F\rangle\langle \overline{\mathbf{k}\sigma}|) = -i\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}(|F\rangle\langle \overline{\mathbf{k}\sigma}|), \quad (\text{S107d})$$

gives a set of eigenvalues and right eigenstates of \mathcal{L}_{c0} . The left eigenstate is identical to the right eigenstate, which is immediate from the property $\mathcal{L}_{c0}^\dagger = \mathcal{L}_{c0}^*$. Similarly, by further adding one more particle or a hole to these states, one obtains further sets of eigenvalues and right eigenstates of \mathcal{L}_{c0} ,

$$\mathcal{L}_{c0}(|\mathbf{k}\sigma, \overline{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'}\rangle\langle F|) = -i(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}'}) (|\mathbf{k}\sigma, \overline{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'}\rangle\langle F|), \quad (\text{S108a})$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{c0}(|F\rangle\langle \mathbf{k}, \sigma, \overline{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'}|) = +i(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}'}) (|F\rangle\langle \mathbf{k}, \sigma, \overline{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'}|), \quad (\text{S108b})$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{c0}(|\mathbf{k}\sigma\rangle\langle \mathbf{k}'\sigma'|) = -i(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}'}) (|\mathbf{k}\sigma\rangle\langle \mathbf{k}'\sigma'|), \quad (\text{S108c})$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{c0}(|\overline{\mathbf{k}\sigma}\rangle\langle \overline{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'}|) = +i(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}'}) (|\overline{\mathbf{k}\sigma}\rangle\langle \overline{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'}|), \quad (\text{S108d})$$

etc., where

$$|\mathbf{k}\sigma, \overline{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'}\rangle \equiv \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'} |F\rangle \quad (\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} > \varepsilon_F, \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}'} < \varepsilon_F). \quad (\text{S109})$$

One can continue the same procedure to obtain all sets of eigenvalues and eigenstates.

Note crucially that, at the low-temperature regime we are interested in, the energy of the created/removed electrons from the Fermi sphere are generically near the Fermi surface, i.e., $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}, \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}'} \sim \varepsilon_F$. Therefore, the eigenvalues of the eigenstates with different total charges of excitation in the ket and bra space (such as those in Eq. (S107)) are at least $O(\varepsilon_F)$, while those with the same charge in ket and bra space (such as those in Eq. (S108)) are generically small. We will regard the latter (former) as the slow (fast) modes in the next subsection.

B. Derivation of Eq. (4) in the main text

Having derived the right and left eigenstates of the nonperturbative Lindbladian \mathcal{L}_0 , we are now in the position to derive the effective low-energy master equation (Eq. (4) in the main text) that incorporates the effect of c-d mixing \mathcal{L}_1

within the second-order perturbation. In what follows, we will explicitly compute the matrix element of the low-energy effective Lindbladian $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}})_{n_l, n_r} = (\hat{l}_{n_l}, \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}} \hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)}) = \text{tr}[\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger} \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}} \hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)}]$ (see Eq. (S89)).

We will mainly be interested in the singly-occupied case, where we take the right eigenstate $\hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)}$ as a singly occupied state for the localized electrons and a Fermi sphere for the conduction electron, given by $(\sigma_+, \sigma_- = \uparrow, \downarrow)$

$$\hat{r}_{n_r}^{(0)} = \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+; F), (\sigma_-; F)}^{(0)} = |\sigma_+\rangle|F\rangle\langle\sigma_-|\langle F|. \quad (\text{S110})$$

This state has a zero eigenvalue in the unperturbed Lindbladian, i.e., $\mathcal{L}_0 \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+; F), (\sigma_-; F)}^{(0)} = 0$. For simplicity, we have temporarily dropped the localized electron label a and will focus on a single impurity problem (as the extension to the multiple impurity case is straightforward). We will discuss the matrix elements that involves T_1 modes with vacant $|\emptyset\rangle\langle\emptyset|$ and double occupied state $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow|$ later. The left eigenstate $\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)}$ is taken from the slow variable space defined in the previous section, see Table I and the final paragraph of Sec. III A 2. One can readily check that the zeroth order contribution in Eq. (S89) vanishes, i.e., $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}})_{n_l, [(\sigma_+; F), (\sigma_-; F)]}^{(0)} = \text{tr}[\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger} \mathcal{L}_0 \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+; F), (\sigma_-; F)}^{(0)}] = 0$.

For later convenience, we find it useful to introduce the c-d mixing operators,

$$\hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak\sigma} = v_a e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_a} \hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}, \quad \hat{V}_{c\leftarrow d}^{ak\sigma} = v_a^* e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_a} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma,a} (= (\hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak\sigma})^\dagger), \quad (\text{S111})$$

that simplifies the notation of perturbative Lindbladian to

$$\mathcal{L}^{(1)}\rho = -i[\hat{H}_{cd}, \hat{\rho}] = -i \sum_a \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} [\hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak\sigma} + \hat{V}_{c\leftarrow d}^{ak\sigma}, \hat{\rho}]. \quad (\text{S112})$$

The state $\hat{r}_{\sigma_+, \sigma_-; F}^{(0)}$ is perturbed with $\mathcal{L}^{(1)}$ as,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{(1)}\hat{r}_{(\sigma_+; F), (\sigma_-; F)}^{(0)} &= -i \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} [(\hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak\sigma} + \hat{V}_{c\leftarrow d}^{ak\sigma})(|\sigma_+\rangle|F\rangle\langle\sigma_-|\langle F|) - (|\sigma_+\rangle|F\rangle\langle\sigma_-|\langle F|)(\hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak\sigma\dagger} + \hat{V}_{c\leftarrow d}^{ak\sigma\dagger})] \\ &= -i \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \left[v_a e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_a} \delta_{\sigma_+, -\sigma} \delta_{\mathbf{k}\in F} (|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle|\overline{\mathbf{k}\sigma}\rangle\langle\sigma_-|\langle F|) + v_a^* e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_a} \delta_{\sigma_+, \sigma} \delta_{\mathbf{k}\in\bar{F}} (|\emptyset\rangle|\mathbf{k}\sigma\rangle\langle\sigma_-|\langle F|) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - [(|\sigma_+\rangle|F\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow|\langle\overline{\mathbf{k}\sigma}|) v_a^* e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_a} \delta_{\sigma_-, -\sigma} \delta_{\mathbf{k}\in F} + (|\sigma_+\rangle|F\rangle\langle\emptyset|\langle\mathbf{k}\sigma|) v_a e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_a} \delta_{\sigma_-, \sigma} \delta_{\mathbf{k}\in\bar{F}}] \right] \quad (\text{S113}) \end{aligned}$$

where we have introduced $\delta_{\mathbf{k}\in F} = 1(0)$ when $\mathbf{k} \in F$ is an (un)occupied state, for simplicity of notation. We have also introduced the notation $\uparrow \equiv -\downarrow$ and $\downarrow \equiv -\uparrow$, again for simplicity of notation. Notice how the c-d mixing \mathcal{L}_1 transfers the state in the slow variable space to the fast variable state. The localized electron state is transferred from a singly occupied state in the $(m_\uparrow, m_\downarrow) = (0, 0)$, $(m_\uparrow, m_\downarrow) = (1, -1)$ or $(m_\uparrow, m_\downarrow) = (-1, 1)$ sector to a different sector, i.e., $(m_\uparrow, m_\downarrow) = (\pm 1, 0)$, $(m_\uparrow, m_\downarrow) = (0, \pm 1)$ sector. This property immediately tells us that the first-order contribution in Eq. (S89) vanishes, i.e., $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}})_{n_l, [(\sigma_+; F), (\sigma_-; F)]}^{(1)} = \text{tr}[\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger} \mathcal{L}_1 \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+; F), (\sigma_-; F)}^{(0)}] = 0$.

We, therefore, concentrate below on the second-order contribution in Eq. (S89),

$$(\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}})_{n_l, [(\sigma_+; F), (\sigma_-; F)]}^{(2)} = - \sum_{m \in \mathfrak{f}} [\lambda_m^{(0)}]^{-1} (\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)}, \mathcal{L}^{(1)} \hat{r}_m^{(0)}) (\hat{l}_m^{(0)}, \mathcal{L}^{(1)} \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+; F), (\sigma_-; F)}^{(0)}), \quad (\text{S114})$$

where the sum is taken over the fast modes defined in Secs. III A 1 and III A 2. A straightforward calculation using the results derived in Sec. III A 1 and III A 2 yields,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}})_{n_l, [(\sigma_+; F), (\sigma_-; F)]}^{(2)} &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}', \sigma, \sigma'} \\ &\times \left[\frac{(\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)}, \hat{V}_{c\leftarrow d}^{ak'\sigma'} \hat{r}_{(\uparrow\downarrow; (\mathbf{k}, -\sigma_+)), (\sigma_-; F)}^{(0)}) - \hat{r}_{(\uparrow\downarrow; (\mathbf{k}, -\sigma_+)), (\sigma_-; F)}^{(0)} \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak'\sigma'\dagger} (\hat{l}_{(\uparrow\downarrow; (\mathbf{k}, -\sigma_+)), (\sigma_-; F)}^{(0)}, \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak\sigma} \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+; F), (\sigma_-; F)}^{(0)})}{-i(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) - \frac{\kappa_a}{2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{(\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)}, \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak'\sigma'} \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+; F), (\uparrow\downarrow; (\mathbf{k}, -\sigma_-))}^{(0)}) - \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+; F), (\uparrow\downarrow; (\mathbf{k}, -\sigma_-))}^{(0)} \hat{V}_{c\leftarrow d}^{ak'\sigma'\dagger} (\hat{l}_{(\sigma_+; F), (\uparrow\downarrow; (\mathbf{k}, -\sigma_-))}^{(0)}, \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+; F), (\sigma_-; F)}^{(0)} \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak\sigma\dagger})}{i(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) - \frac{\kappa_a}{2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{(\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)}, \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak'\sigma'} \hat{r}_{(\emptyset; (\mathbf{k}, \sigma_+)), (\sigma_-; F)}^{(0)}) - \hat{r}_{(\emptyset; (\mathbf{k}, \sigma_+)), (\sigma_-; F)}^{(0)} \hat{V}_{c\leftarrow d}^{ak'\sigma'\dagger} (\hat{l}_{(\emptyset; (\mathbf{k}, \sigma_+)), (\sigma_-; F)}^{(0)}, \hat{V}_{c\leftarrow d}^{ak\sigma} \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+; F), (\sigma_-; F)}^{(0)})}{-i(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_{d,a}) - \frac{\delta_a}{2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{(\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)}, \hat{V}_{c\leftarrow d}^{ak'\sigma'} \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+; F), (\emptyset; (\mathbf{k}, \sigma_-))}^{(0)}) - \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+; F), (\emptyset; (\mathbf{k}, \sigma_-))}^{(0)} \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak'\sigma'\dagger} (\hat{l}_{(\sigma_+; F), (\emptyset; (\mathbf{k}, \sigma_-))}^{(0)}, \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+; F), (\sigma_-; F)}^{(0)} \hat{V}_{c\leftarrow d}^{ak\sigma\dagger})}{i(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_{d,a}) - \frac{\delta_a}{2}} \right]. \quad (\text{S115}) \end{aligned}$$

Here, we have introduced the notation for the intermediate states,

$$\hat{r}_{(\uparrow\downarrow;(\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_+)),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)} = \hat{l}_{(\uparrow\downarrow;(\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_+)),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)} = |\uparrow\downarrow|\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_+\rangle\langle\sigma_-|F\rangle, \quad (\text{S116a})$$

$$\hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\uparrow\downarrow;(\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_-))}^{(0)} = \hat{l}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\uparrow\downarrow;(\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_-))}^{(0)} = |\sigma_+\rangle|F\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow|\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_-\rangle, \quad (\text{S116b})$$

$$\hat{r}_{(\emptyset;(\mathbf{k},\sigma_+)),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)} = \hat{l}_{(\emptyset;(\mathbf{k},\sigma_+)),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)} = |\emptyset\rangle|\mathbf{k},\sigma_+\rangle\langle\sigma_-|F\rangle, \quad (\text{S116c})$$

$$\hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\emptyset;(\mathbf{k},-\sigma_-))}^{(0)} = \hat{l}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\emptyset;(\mathbf{k},-\sigma_-))}^{(0)} = |\sigma_+\rangle|F\rangle\langle\emptyset|\mathbf{k},-\sigma_-\rangle. \quad (\text{S116d})$$

Let us focus first on the first two terms that involve a double-occupied state as their intermediate state, which we denote $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}})^{(2A)}_{n_l,[(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)]}$:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}})^{(2A)}_{n_l,[(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)]} &= \sum_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}',\sigma,\sigma'} \\ &\times \left[\frac{(\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)}, \hat{V}_{c\leftarrow d}^{ak'\sigma'} \hat{r}_{(\uparrow\downarrow;(\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_+)),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)}) - \hat{r}_{(\uparrow\downarrow;(\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_+)),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)} \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak'\sigma'\dagger} (\hat{l}_{(\uparrow\downarrow;(\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_+)),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)}, \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak\sigma} \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\uparrow\downarrow;(\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_-))}^{(0)})}{-i(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) - \frac{\kappa_a}{2}} \right. \\ &\left. - \frac{(\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)}, \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak'\sigma'} \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\uparrow\downarrow;(\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_-))}^{(0)}) - \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\uparrow\downarrow;(\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_-))}^{(0)} \hat{V}_{c\leftarrow d}^{ak'\sigma'\dagger} (\hat{l}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\uparrow\downarrow;(\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_-))}^{(0)}, \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)} \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak\sigma\uparrow})}{i(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) - \frac{\kappa_a}{2}} \right] \quad (\text{S117}) \end{aligned}$$

One can proceed with the calculation as,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}})^{(2A)}_{n_l,[(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)]} &= \sum_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}',\sigma,\sigma'} \\ &\times \left[\frac{1}{-i(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) - \frac{\kappa_a}{2}} \text{tr} \left[\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger} \left\{ \hat{V}_{c\leftarrow d}^{ak'\sigma'} |\uparrow\downarrow|\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_+;F\rangle\langle\sigma_-|F\rangle - |\uparrow\downarrow|\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_+;F\rangle\langle\sigma_-|F\rangle \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak'\sigma'\dagger} \right\} \right] \right. \\ &\quad \times \text{tr} \left[|\sigma_-\rangle|F\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow|\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_+;F| \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak\sigma} \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)} \right] \\ &- \frac{1}{i(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) - \frac{\kappa_a}{2}} \text{tr} \left[\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger} \left\{ \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak'\sigma'} |\sigma_+\rangle|F\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow|\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_-;F| - |\sigma_+\rangle|F\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow|\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_-;F| \hat{V}_{c\leftarrow d}^{ak'\sigma'\dagger} \right\} \right] \\ &\quad \times \text{tr} \left[|\uparrow\downarrow|\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_-;F\rangle\langle\sigma_+|F\rangle \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)} \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak\sigma\uparrow} \right] \Big] \\ &= - \sum_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}',\sigma,\sigma'} \\ &\times \left[\frac{\langle\sigma_-|F\rangle \left[\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger} \hat{V}_{c\leftarrow d}^{ak'\sigma'} - \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak'\sigma'\dagger} \hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger} \right] |\uparrow\downarrow|\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_+;F\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow|\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_+;F| \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak\sigma} \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)} |\sigma_-\rangle|F\rangle}{i(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) + \frac{\kappa_a}{2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\langle\uparrow\downarrow|\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_-;F| \left[\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger} \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak'\sigma'} - \hat{V}_{c\leftarrow d}^{ak'\sigma'\dagger} \hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger} \right] |\sigma_+\rangle|F\rangle\langle\sigma_+|F\rangle \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)} \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak\sigma\uparrow} |\uparrow\downarrow|\overline{\mathbf{k}},-\sigma_-;F\rangle}{-i(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) + \frac{\kappa_a}{2}} \right] \\ &= - \sum_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}',\sigma,\sigma'} \left[\frac{\text{tr} \left[\left[\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger} \hat{V}_{c\leftarrow d}^{ak'\sigma'} - \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak'\sigma'\dagger} \hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger} \right] \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak\sigma} \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)} \right]}{i(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) + \frac{\kappa_a}{2}} - \frac{\text{tr} \left[\left[\hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger} \hat{V}_{d\leftarrow c}^{ak'\sigma'} - \hat{V}_{c\leftarrow d}^{ak'\sigma'\dagger} \hat{l}_{n_l}^{(0)\dagger} \right] \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)} \hat{V}_{c\leftarrow d}^{ak\sigma\uparrow} \right]}{-i(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) + \frac{\kappa_a}{2}} \right] \quad (\text{S118}) \end{aligned}$$

where we have substituted the definition of the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product (Eq. (S8)) and the right and left eigenstates of the intermediate states (Eq. (S116)) in the first equality, took the traces in the second, and rewrote the expression in terms of the trace over the integrand in the third. The advantage of writing $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}})^{(2A)}_{n_l,[(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)]}$ in

this form becomes clear by separating the coefficients to the real and imaginary part as,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}}^{\text{(2A)}})_{n_i,[(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)]} &= - \sum_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}',\sigma,\sigma'} \\
&\times \left[\frac{-i(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}})}{(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}})^2 + \frac{\kappa_a^2}{4}} \text{tr} \left[\hat{l}_{n_i}^{(0)\dagger} \left(\hat{V}_{c \leftarrow d}^{a\mathbf{k}\sigma'} \hat{V}_{d \leftarrow c}^{a,\mathbf{k},\sigma} \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)} - \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)} \hat{V}_{d \leftarrow c}^{a,\mathbf{k},\sigma} \hat{V}_{c \leftarrow d}^{a\mathbf{k}\sigma'} \right) \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\kappa_a}{(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}})^2 + \frac{\kappa_a^2}{4}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \text{tr} \left[\hat{l}_{n_i}^{(0)\dagger} \left(\frac{1}{2} \hat{V}_{c \leftarrow d}^{a\mathbf{k}\sigma'} \hat{V}_{d \leftarrow c}^{a,\mathbf{k},\sigma} \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)} + \frac{1}{2} \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)} \hat{V}_{d \leftarrow c}^{a,\mathbf{k},\sigma} \hat{V}_{c \leftarrow d}^{a\mathbf{k}\sigma'} - \hat{V}_{d \leftarrow c}^{a,\mathbf{k},\sigma} \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)} \hat{V}_{d \leftarrow c}^{a\mathbf{k}\sigma'} \right) \right] \right] \\
&\equiv (\hat{l}_{n_i}^{(0)}, \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}}^{\text{(2A)}} \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)})
\end{aligned} \tag{S119}$$

where we have used the cyclic property of the trace $\text{tr}[\hat{A}\hat{B}] = \text{tr}[\hat{B}\hat{A}]$. By further employing an approximation that the excitation of the conduction electrons occurs near the Fermi surface $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \simeq \varepsilon_{\text{F}}$, the effective Lindbladian $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}}^{\text{(2A)}}$ is simplified to a GKSL form (Eq. (S4)),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}}^{\text{(2A)}} \hat{\rho} &= -i[\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(A)}, \hat{\rho}] + \frac{\kappa_a}{(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_{\text{F}})^2 + \frac{\kappa_a^2}{4}} \mathcal{D} \left[\sum_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} \hat{V}_{d \leftarrow c}^{a\mathbf{k}\sigma} \hat{P}_s \right] \hat{\rho} \\
&= -i[\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(A)}, \hat{\rho}] + \gamma_a \mathcal{D} \left[\sum_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} \hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} \hat{P}_s e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} \right] \hat{\rho} \\
&= -i[\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(A)}, \hat{\rho}] + \gamma_a \mathcal{D} \left[\sum_{\sigma} \hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a,\sigma} \hat{P}_s \right] \hat{\rho}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S120}$$

Here, \hat{P}_s^a is a projection operator to a singly-occupied state,

$$\gamma_a = \frac{|v_a|^2 \kappa_a}{(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_{\text{F}})^2 + \frac{\kappa_a^2}{4}}, \tag{S121}$$

is the light-induced dissipation rate, and the Hamiltonian part $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(A)}$ is given by,

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(A)} &= \sum_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}',\sigma,\sigma'} \frac{-(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}})}{(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}})^2 + \frac{\kappa_a^2}{4}} \hat{P}_s^a \hat{V}_{c \leftarrow d}^{a\mathbf{k}\sigma'} \hat{V}_{d \leftarrow c}^{a,\mathbf{k},\sigma} \hat{P}_s^a \\
&\approx \frac{-(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_{\text{F}})}{(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_{\text{F}})^2 + \frac{\kappa_a^2}{4}} |v_a|^2 \sum_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}',\sigma,\sigma'} e^{i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}') \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} \hat{P}_s^a \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}',\sigma'}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma',a} \hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} \hat{P}_s^a.
\end{aligned} \tag{S122}$$

The remaining two terms of $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}}^{\text{(2)}})_{n_i,[(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)]}$ in Eq. (S115), given by,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}}^{\text{(2B)}})_{n_i,[(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)]} &= \sum_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}',\sigma,\sigma'} \\
&\times \left[\frac{(\hat{l}_{n_i}^{(0)}, \hat{V}_{d \leftarrow c}^{a\mathbf{k}\sigma'} \hat{r}_{(\emptyset;(\mathbf{k},\sigma_+),(\sigma_-;F))}^{(0)} - \hat{r}_{(\emptyset;(\mathbf{k},\sigma_+),(\sigma_-;F))}^{(0)} \hat{V}_{c \leftarrow d}^{a\mathbf{k}\sigma'} \hat{r}_{(\emptyset;(\mathbf{k},\sigma_+),(\sigma_-;F))}^{(0)})}{-i(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_{d,a}) - \frac{\delta_a}{2}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{(\hat{l}_{n_i}^{(0)}, \hat{V}_{c \leftarrow d}^{a\mathbf{k}\sigma'} \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\emptyset;(\mathbf{k},\sigma_-))}^{(0)} - \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\emptyset;(\mathbf{k},\sigma_-))}^{(0)} \hat{V}_{d \leftarrow c}^{a\mathbf{k}\sigma'} \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\emptyset;(\mathbf{k},\sigma_-))}^{(0)})}{i(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_{d,a}) - \frac{\delta_a}{2}} \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{S123}$$

can be similarly computed. We report the result as follows:

$$(\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}}^{\text{(2B)}})_{n_i,[(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)]} = \left(\hat{l}_{n_i}^{(0)}, \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}}^{\text{(2B)}} \hat{r}_{(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)}^{(0)} \right) = (\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}}^{\text{(2B)}})_{n_i,[(\sigma_+;F),(\sigma_-;F)]} \tag{S124}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}}^{\text{(2B)}} \hat{\rho} &= -i[\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(B)}, \hat{\rho}] \\
&\quad + \sum_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}',\sigma,\sigma'} \sum \pi |v_a|^2 \delta(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_{d,a}) e^{i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}') \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} \left[\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma,a} \hat{P}_s^a \hat{\rho} \hat{P}_s^a \hat{d}_{\sigma',a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}',\sigma'} - \frac{1}{2} \{ \hat{P}_s^a \hat{d}_{\sigma',a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}',\sigma}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma,a} \hat{P}_s^a, \hat{\rho} \} \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{S125}$$

and

$$\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(B)} = - \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}', \sigma, \sigma'} \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_{d,a}} \hat{P}_s^a \hat{V}_{d \leftarrow c}^{a, \mathbf{k}'} \hat{V}_{c \leftarrow d}^{a, \mathbf{k}, \sigma} \hat{P}_s^a \approx - \frac{|v_a|^2}{\varepsilon_F - \varepsilon_{d,a}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}', \sigma, \sigma'} e^{-i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}') \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} \hat{P}_s^a \hat{d}_{\sigma', a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}' \sigma'} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k} \sigma}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma, a} \hat{P}_s^a. \quad (\text{S126})$$

The second term in Eq. (S125) vanishes for the following reasons. The term contains a delta function, which enforces the created conduction electron to have energy at $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = \varepsilon_{d,a}$. This lies below the Fermi surface ε_F , which is forbidden due to the Pauli blocking effect.

Adding the two contributions up and reintroducing the sum over the localized electron sites a , we obtain $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}, \text{sd}}^{(2)})_{n_l, [(\sigma_+; F), (\sigma_-; F)]}$, with

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}, \text{sd}}^{(2)} \hat{\rho} = -i[\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}, \hat{\rho}] + \sum_a \gamma_a \mathcal{D} \left[\sum_{\sigma} \hat{d}_{\sigma, a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a, \sigma} \hat{P}_s^a \right] \hat{\rho}. \quad (\text{S127})$$

Here, the total Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}} = \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(A)} + \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(B)}$. The Hamiltonian can be rewritten into a sum of two contributions $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}} = \hat{H}_{\text{sd}} + \hat{H}_{\text{imp}}$. The sd Hamiltonian describes the exchange coupling between the conduction electrons and localized spins,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_{\text{sd}} &= \sum_a |v_a|^2 \left[\frac{\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_F}{(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_F)^2 + \frac{\kappa_a^2}{4}} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon_F - \varepsilon_{d,a}} \right] \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'} e^{i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}') \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} \sum_{\sigma, \sigma'} \hat{P}_s^a \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}' \sigma'}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k} \sigma} \hat{d}_{\sigma, a}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma', a} \hat{P}_s^a \\ &= - \sum_a \frac{g_a}{2} \sum_{\sigma, \sigma'} \sum_{i=0}^3 \hat{P}_s^a (\hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a, \sigma'}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a, \sigma}^{\sigma, \sigma'}) (\hat{d}_{\sigma, a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a, \sigma}^{\sigma, \sigma'} \hat{d}_{\sigma', a}) \hat{P}_s^a \\ &= - \sum_a \frac{g_a}{2} \sum_{\sigma, \sigma'} \hat{P}_s^a [\boldsymbol{\tau}(\mathbf{R}_a) \cdot \mathbf{S}_a] \hat{P}_s^a + \text{const.}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S128})$$

where

$$g_a = -|v_a|^2 \left[\frac{\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_F}{(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_F)^2 + \frac{\kappa_a^2}{4}} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon_F - \varepsilon_{d,a}} \right] (< 0) \quad (\text{S129})$$

is an antiferromagnetic sd coupling,

$$\mathbf{S}_a = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{d}_{\uparrow, a}^\dagger & \hat{d}_{\downarrow, a}^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{d}_{\uparrow, a} \\ \hat{d}_{\downarrow, a} \end{pmatrix} = (S_a^1, S_a^2, S_a^3) \quad (\text{S130})$$

is the localized spins (with $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$ being the Pauli matrices), and

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}(\mathbf{R}_a) = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a, \uparrow}^\dagger & \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a, \downarrow}^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a, \uparrow} \\ \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a, \downarrow} \end{pmatrix} = (\tau_1(\mathbf{R}_a), \tau_2(\mathbf{R}_a), \tau_3(\mathbf{R}_a)) \quad (\text{S131})$$

is the conduction spin at position \mathbf{R}_a . The impurity Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{imp} is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_{\text{imp}} &= - \sum_a \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'} |v_a|^2 \frac{\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_F}{(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_F)^2 + \frac{\kappa_a^2}{4}} \sum_{\sigma} e^{i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}') \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} \hat{P}_s^a \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}' \sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k} \sigma} \hat{P}_s^a - \sum_a \sum_{\mathbf{k}} |v_a|^2 \frac{1}{\varepsilon_F - \varepsilon_{d,a}} \sum_{\sigma} \hat{P}_s^a \hat{d}_{\sigma, a}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma, a} \hat{P}_s^a \\ &= \sum_a \sum_{\sigma} \left[g_{\text{imp}}^{c,a} \hat{P}_s^a \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a, \sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a, \sigma} \hat{P}_s^a + g_{\text{imp}}^{d,a} \hat{P}_s^a \hat{d}_{\sigma, a}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma, a} \hat{P}_s^a \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S132})$$

with

$$g_{\text{imp}}^{c,a} = -|v_a|^2 \frac{\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_F}{(\varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a - \varepsilon_F)^2 + \frac{\kappa_a^2}{4}}, \quad (\text{S133})$$

$$g_{\text{imp}}^{d,a} = -|v_a|^2 \frac{1}{\varepsilon_F - \varepsilon_{d,a}}. \quad (\text{S134})$$

In the equilibrium limit $\kappa_a \rightarrow 0$, these reproduce the conventional sd Hamiltonian.

A similar calculation can be performed for the contribution for the vacant $|\emptyset\rangle\langle\emptyset|$ and double-occupied $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow|$ states. The effective Lindbladian reads, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}}^{(2)}(\hat{P}_\emptyset^a \hat{\rho} \hat{P}_\emptyset^a) &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'} \sum_{\sigma, \sigma'} \pi |v_a|^2 \delta(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_{d,a}) e^{i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}') \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} \left[\hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} \hat{P}_\emptyset^a \hat{\rho} \hat{P}_\emptyset^a \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}',\sigma'}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma',a} - \frac{1}{2} \{ \hat{P}_\emptyset^a \hat{d}_{\sigma',a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma'} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}',\sigma}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma,a} \hat{P}_\emptyset^a, \hat{\rho} \} \right] \\ &= \sum_{\sigma, \sigma'} \gamma_{\text{dis},a,\emptyset} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} \left[\hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}_{d,a},\sigma} \hat{P}_\emptyset^a \hat{\rho} \hat{P}_\emptyset^a \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}_{d,a}-\mathbf{q},\sigma'}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma',a} - \frac{1}{2} \{ \hat{P}_\emptyset^a \hat{d}_{\sigma',a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}_{d,a},\sigma'} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}_{d,a}-\mathbf{q},\sigma}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma,a} \hat{P}_\emptyset^a, \hat{\rho} \} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S135})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff,sd}}^{(2)}(\hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a \hat{\rho} \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a) &= \kappa_a \sum_{\sigma} \mathcal{D}[\hat{d}_{\sigma,a} \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a] \hat{\rho} \\ &+ \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'} \sum_{\sigma, \sigma'} \pi |v_a|^2 \delta(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_{d,a} - U_a) e^{i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}') \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} \left[\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma,a} \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a \hat{\rho} \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a \hat{d}_{\sigma',a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}',\sigma'} - \frac{1}{2} \{ \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a \hat{d}_{\sigma',a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma'} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}',\sigma}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma,a} \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a, \hat{\rho} \} \right] \\ &= \kappa_a \sum_{\sigma} \mathcal{D}[\hat{d}_{\sigma,a} \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a] \hat{\rho} \\ &+ \sum_{\sigma, \sigma'} \gamma_{\text{dis},a,\uparrow\downarrow} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} \left[\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}_{d,a},\sigma}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma,a} \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a \hat{\rho} \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a \hat{d}_{\sigma',a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}_{d,a}-\mathbf{q},\sigma'} - \frac{1}{2} \{ \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a \hat{d}_{\sigma',a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}_{d,a},\sigma'} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}_{d,a}-\mathbf{q},\sigma}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma,a} \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a, \hat{\rho} \} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S136})$$

Here, as we are only interested in the dynamics of singly occupied states, we omitted the contribution to the coherent dynamics in the vacant or double-occupied state.

$$\gamma_{\text{dis},a,\emptyset} = \pi |v_a|^2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \delta(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_{d,a}), \quad \gamma_{\text{dis},a,\uparrow\downarrow} = \pi |v_a|^2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \delta(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_{d,a} - U_a). \quad (\text{S137})$$

are the dissipation rate of the vacant and double-occupied states, and \mathbf{k}_d and $\mathbf{k}_{d,a}^U$ are momenta that satisfies, respectively,

$$\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}_{d,a}} = \varepsilon_{d,a}, \quad \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}_{d,a}^U} = \varepsilon_{d,a} + U_a. \quad (\text{S138})$$

In contrast to the singly occupied state counterparts, (the second term of Eq. (S125)), the Pauli blocking effect does not play a role in these terms and therefore they do not vanish.

Summing up all the contributions (Eqs. (S127), (S135), (S136)), we finally obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \hat{\rho} &= -i[\hat{H}_{\text{sd}} + \hat{H}_{\text{imp}}, \hat{\rho}] + \sum_a \left[\gamma_a \mathcal{D} \left[\sum_{\sigma} \hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a,\sigma} \hat{P}_s^a \right] + \sum_{\sigma} \kappa_a \mathcal{D}[\hat{d}_{\sigma,a} \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a] \right] \hat{\rho} \\ &+ \sum_{\sigma, \sigma'} \gamma_{\text{dis},a,\emptyset} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} \left[\hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}_{d,a},\sigma} \hat{P}_s^a \hat{\rho} \hat{P}_s^a \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}_{d,a}-\mathbf{q},\sigma'}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma',a} - \frac{1}{2} \{ \hat{P}_s^a \hat{d}_{\sigma',a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}_{d,a},\sigma'} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}_{d,a}-\mathbf{q},\sigma}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma,a} \hat{P}_s^a, \hat{\rho} \} \right] \\ &+ \sum_{\sigma, \sigma'} \gamma_{\text{dis},a,\uparrow\downarrow} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} \left[\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}_{d,a},\sigma}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma,a} \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a \hat{\rho} \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a \hat{d}_{\sigma',a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}_{d,a}-\mathbf{q},\sigma'} - \frac{1}{2} \{ \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a \hat{d}_{\sigma',a}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}_{d,a},\sigma'} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}_{d,a}-\mathbf{q},\sigma}^\dagger \hat{d}_{\sigma,a} \hat{P}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^a, \hat{\rho} \} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S139})$$

In the main text in Eq. (4), we have reported the description without the final two terms, as their role is merely to retain the state in a singly occupied state and they do not play any role in the singly occupied sector we are interested in (but see the remarks below). We have also dropped the impurity Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{imp} . This completes the derivation of Eq. (4) in the main text.

C. Remarks on Eq. (4) in the main text and Eq. (S139)

Two remarks are in order.

The first remark is on the condition for justifying the second-order perturbation we employed to derive Eq. (4) in the main text. The second-order perturbation is justified when its contribution, roughly given by $\sum_{\mathbf{k}} |v|^2 / (\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_d + U + i\delta) \sim -|v|^2 / U - i\gamma_{\text{dis}}$ in the typical case $\varepsilon_d \sim \varepsilon_{\text{F}} \sim U$ (where we have omitted the site index a and $\gamma_{\text{dis}} \sim \gamma_{\text{dis},\emptyset}, \gamma_{\text{dis},\uparrow\downarrow}$), is dominant over the higher-order terms. The fourth-order contribution (note that the third-order contribution is absent for a similar reason to why the first-order contribution is absent) is roughly estimated as $|v|^4 (\sum_{\mathbf{k}} 1 / (\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_d + U + i\delta))^3$ which has the magnitude of the real part $O(|v|^4 / U^3, \gamma_{\text{dis}}^3 / |v|^2)$ and the imaginary part $O((|v|^2 / U^2) \gamma_{\text{dis}}, \gamma_{\text{dis}}^2 / U)$. By comparing with the second-order contribution, one finds that the second-order

perturbation is justified when $|v|/U, \gamma_{\text{dis}}/U, \gamma_{\text{dis}}/|v| \ll 1$. Noting that $\gamma_{\text{dis}} \sim |v|^2/W$ (where W is the bandwidth), the final condition reads $|v|/W \ll 1$.

This situation for the dissipation rate γ_{dis} (where it must be small compared to U), is in stark contrast to the situation for κ , where the second-order perturbation is better for larger κ . This is because the timescale of the intermediate state becomes faster for larger κ .

Secondly, in the light-induced dissipator in Eq. (S139), the sum over the spin configuration $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$ is taken *within* the jump operator, $\mathcal{D}[\sum_{\sigma} \hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a, \sigma}] \hat{\rho}$, instead of having a form $\sum_{\sigma} \mathcal{D}[\hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a, \sigma}] \hat{\rho}$. This form is quite crucial to induce tunneling between different spin configurations in a *correlated* manner, giving rise to dissipative coupling between different spin configurations between the conduction and localized spins (the last term in Eq. (5) in the main text). This can be seen explicitly by operating the dissipator to a singly occupied state. For example, when the dissipator of this form is applied to the down-spin state, i.e., $|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|$, (where we omit the site index a for simplicity)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}[(\hat{d}_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\uparrow} + \hat{d}_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\downarrow})](|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|F)\langle\downarrow|F\rangle &= (\hat{d}_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\uparrow} + \hat{d}_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\downarrow})(|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|F)\langle\downarrow|F\rangle(\hat{c}_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} \hat{d}_{\uparrow} + \hat{c}_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} \hat{d}_{\downarrow}) \\ &- \frac{1}{2}(\hat{c}_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} \hat{d}_{\uparrow} + \hat{c}_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} \hat{d}_{\downarrow})(\hat{d}_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\uparrow} + \hat{d}_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\downarrow})(|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|F)\langle\downarrow|F\rangle - \frac{1}{2}(|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|F)\langle\downarrow|F\rangle(\hat{c}_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} \hat{d}_{\uparrow} + \hat{c}_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} \hat{d}_{\downarrow})(\hat{d}_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\uparrow} + \hat{d}_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\downarrow}) \\ &= |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle\langle\overline{c, \uparrow}| \langle\uparrow\downarrow|\overline{c, \uparrow}\rangle - \hat{c}_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\uparrow}(|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|F)\langle\downarrow|F\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \hat{c}_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\uparrow}(|\uparrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|F)\langle\downarrow|F\rangle + \frac{1}{2}(|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|F)\langle\uparrow|F\rangle \hat{c}_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\downarrow} \\ &= |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle\langle\overline{c, \uparrow}| \langle\uparrow\downarrow|\overline{c, \uparrow}\rangle - n(|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|F)\langle\downarrow|F\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \hat{c}_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\uparrow}(|\uparrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|F)\langle\downarrow|F\rangle + \frac{1}{2}(|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|F)\langle\uparrow|F\rangle \hat{c}_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\downarrow} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S140})$$

where $n = (1/2)\langle F | \sum_{\sigma} \hat{c}_{\sigma}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\sigma} | F \rangle$ and $|\overline{c, \uparrow}\rangle = \hat{c}_{\uparrow} | F \rangle$. As is clear from the last two terms, this dissipation involves a spin-flip

$$|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow| \rightarrow |\uparrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|, |\downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow|. \quad (\text{S141})$$

This is in stark different to the case where the sum over the spins σ is outside the jump operator, $\sum_{\sigma} \mathcal{D}[\hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}_a, \sigma}] \hat{\rho}$, in which the \uparrow and \downarrow spins would decay independently. Starting again with the down spin configuration, one finds

$$\sum_{\sigma} \mathcal{D}[\hat{d}_{\sigma}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\sigma}](|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|F)\langle\downarrow|F\rangle = \mathcal{D}[\hat{d}_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\uparrow}](|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|F)\langle\downarrow|F\rangle \quad (\text{S142})$$

where it is clear that no spin flips are involved.

IV. LANDAU-LIFSHITZ-GILBERT EQUATION WITH LIGHT-INDUCED INTERACTIONS

In the previous section, we have derived an effective low-energy description of the localized electron coupled to conduction electrons (Eq. (4) in the main text or Eq. (S139)). In this section, we derive the equation of motion of the localized spins [Eq. (6) in the main text] interacting through the RKKY interaction [36–38]) modified by the light injection, by integrating out the conduction electrons, treating them as a non-Markovian bath.

To incorporate the non-Markovian effect arising from the Fermi distribution function of conduction electrons, we employ the Keldysh theory introduced in Sec. IB. Using Eq. (S82), the Keldysh partition function of Eq. (4) in the main text is given by,

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}(d, \bar{d}) \mathcal{D}(c, \bar{c}) e^{iS[c, \bar{c}, d, \bar{d}]} \quad (\text{S143})$$

where the effective action is the sum of three parts:

$$S[c, \bar{c}, d, \bar{d}] = S_d^0[d, \bar{d}] + S_c^0[c, \bar{c}] + S_{\text{sd}}[c, \bar{c}, d, \bar{d}] \quad (\text{S144})$$

Here, d, \bar{d} and c, \bar{c} are Grassmann variables and

$$S_d^0[d, \bar{d}] = \int dt \sum_{s=\pm} \sum_{a, \sigma} s \bar{d}_{a, \sigma}^s(t) i \partial_t d_{a, \sigma}^s(t) \quad (\text{S145})$$

$$S_c^0[c, \bar{c}] = \int dt \sum_{s=\pm} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} s \left[\bar{c}_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^s(t) i \partial_t c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^s(t) - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \bar{c}_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^s(t) c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^s(t) \right], \quad (\text{S146})$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{sd}}^{\text{coh}}[c, \bar{c}, d, \bar{d}] &= - \int dt \sum_{s=\pm} s \sum_a \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} (-g_a) e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} \sum_{\sigma, \sigma'} \bar{d}_{\sigma, a}^s(t) \bar{c}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \sigma'}^s(t) c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^s(t) d_{\sigma', a}^s(t) \\ &= \int dt \sum_{s=\pm} s \sum_a \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} g_a e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} \sum_{\sigma, \sigma'} \bar{c}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \sigma'}^s(t) c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^s(t) [\delta_{\sigma\sigma'} - d_{\sigma', a}^s(t, s\delta) \bar{d}_{\sigma, a}^s(t-s\delta)] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S147})$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{sd}}^{\text{dis}}[c, \bar{c}, d, \bar{d}] &= -i \int dt \sum_a \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} \gamma_a e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} \sum_{\sigma, \sigma'} \left[\bar{c}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \sigma'}^-(t) d_{\sigma', a}^-(t) \bar{d}_{\sigma, a}^+(t) c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^+(t) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \bar{c}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \sigma'}^+(t+\delta) d_{\sigma', a}^+(t+\delta) \bar{d}_{\sigma, a}^+(t-\delta) c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^+(t-\delta) - \frac{1}{2} \bar{c}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \sigma'}^-(t-\delta) d_{\sigma', a}^-(t-\delta) \bar{d}_{\sigma, a}^-(t+\delta) c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^-(t+\delta) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S148})$$

with $S_{\text{sd}} = S_{\text{sd}}^{\text{coh}} + S_{\text{sd}}^{\text{dis}}$. $s = \pm$ labels the forward and backward contours. We have added or subtracted an infinitesimal $t_{\pm\delta} = t \pm 0^+$ to avoid subtleties in normal ordering, see, e.g. Refs. [46, 47, 108] for details. For the simplicity of notation, we have omitted the projection operator to the singly occupied state and omitted the contribution from the double-occupied state.

The actions involving conduction electrons can be rewritten in a compact form,

$$S_c[d, \bar{d}, c, \bar{c}] \equiv S_c^0[c, \bar{c}] + S_{\text{sd}}[d, \bar{d}, c, \bar{c}] = \int dt \sum_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}} \bar{\Psi}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}^T(t) \hat{\mathbb{M}}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] \Psi_{\mathbf{k}}(t) \quad (\text{S149})$$

by introducing a spinor-Keldysh representation,

$$\hat{\mathbb{M}}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}(t) = (\hat{\mathbb{G}}_0^{-1}(t))_{\mathbf{k}} \delta_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{0}} - \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)], \quad \Psi_{\mathbf{k}}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} c_{\mathbf{k}, \uparrow}^+(t) \\ c_{\mathbf{k}, \downarrow}^+(t) \\ c_{\mathbf{k}, \uparrow}^-(t) \\ c_{\mathbf{k}, \downarrow}^-(t) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{S150})$$

Here, $\hat{\mathbb{G}}_0^{-1}(t)_{\mathbf{k}}$ is a free Green function in the Keldysh formalism, where its Fourier transform is given by (see Eq. (S48)) [45],

$$\mathbb{G}_0(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \begin{pmatrix} G_0^{++}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \mathbf{1}_{2 \times 2} & G_0^{+-}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \mathbf{1}_{2 \times 2} \\ G_0^{-+}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \mathbf{1}_{2 \times 2} & G_0^{--}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \mathbf{1}_{2 \times 2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \left[\frac{1-f_{\mathbf{k}}}{\omega - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} + i\delta} + \frac{f_{\mathbf{k}}}{\omega - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - i\delta} \right] \mathbf{1}_{2 \times 2} & 2\pi i \delta(\omega - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) f_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{1}_{2 \times 2} \\ -2\pi i \delta(\omega - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) (1 - f_{\mathbf{k}}) \mathbf{1}_{2 \times 2} & \left[-\frac{f_{\mathbf{k}}}{\omega - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} + i\delta} - \frac{1-f_{\mathbf{k}}}{\omega - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - i\delta} \right] \mathbf{1}_{2 \times 2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{S151})$$

where $f_{\mathbf{k}} = [e^{(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \varepsilon_{\text{F}})/(k_{\text{B}}T)} + 1]^{-1}$ is the Fermi distribution function and $\mathbf{1}_{2 \times 2}$ is a 2-by-2 identity operator. The self-energy is given by,

$$\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] & \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{+-}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] \\ \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{-+}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] & \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{S152})$$

with

$$(\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)])_{\sigma', \sigma} = - \sum_a \left[g_a e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} \delta_{\sigma\sigma'} - \tilde{g}_a e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} d_{\sigma', a}^+(t+\delta) \bar{d}_{\sigma, a}^+(t-\delta) \right], \quad (\text{S153})$$

$$(\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)])_{\sigma', \sigma} = \sum_a \left[g_a e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} \delta_{\sigma\sigma'} - \tilde{g}_a^* e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} d_{\sigma', a}^-(t-\delta) \bar{d}_{\sigma, a}^-(t+\delta) \right], \quad (\text{S154})$$

$$(\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{-+}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)])_{\sigma', \sigma} = i \sum_a \gamma_a e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} d_{\sigma', a}^-(t) \bar{d}_{\sigma, a}^+(t), \quad (\text{S155})$$

$$(\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{+-}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)])_{\sigma', \sigma} = 0 \quad (\text{S156})$$

where

$$\tilde{g}_a = g_a - i\frac{\gamma_a}{2}. \quad (\text{S157})$$

Below, for simplicity, we omit the first term in Eqs. (S153) and (S154) (which should only quantitatively shift the magnitude of dephasing).

$$\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}}^{++}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] = \sum_a e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{R}_a} \tilde{g}_a \mathbb{D}_a^{++}(t), \quad (\text{S158})$$

$$\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}}^{--}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] = -\sum_a e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{R}_a} \tilde{g}_a^* \mathbb{D}_a^{--}(t), \quad (\text{S159})$$

$$\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}}^{-+}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] = i\sum_a e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{R}_a} \gamma_a \mathbb{D}_a^{-+}(t), \quad (\text{S160})$$

$$\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}}^{+-}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] = 0, \quad (\text{S161})$$

where

$$\mathbb{D}_a^{++}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} d_{\uparrow,a}^+(t+\delta) \bar{d}_{\uparrow,a}^+(t-\delta) & d_{\uparrow,a}^+(t+\delta) \bar{d}_{\downarrow,a}^+(t-\delta) \\ d_{\downarrow,a}^+(t+\delta) \bar{d}_{\uparrow,a}^+(t-\delta) & d_{\downarrow,a}^+(t+\delta) \bar{d}_{\downarrow,a}^+(t-\delta) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{S162})$$

$$\mathbb{D}_a^{--}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} d_{\uparrow,a}^-(t-\delta) \bar{d}_{\uparrow,a}^-(t+\delta) & d_{\uparrow,a}^-(t-\delta) \bar{d}_{\downarrow,a}^-(t+\delta) \\ d_{\downarrow,a}^-(t-\delta) \bar{d}_{\uparrow,a}^-(t+\delta) & d_{\downarrow,a}^-(t-\delta) \bar{d}_{\downarrow,a}^-(t+\delta) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{S163})$$

$$\mathbb{D}_a^{-+}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} d_{\uparrow,a}^-(t) \bar{d}_{\uparrow,a}^+(t) & d_{\uparrow,a}^-(t) \bar{d}_{\downarrow,a}^+(t) \\ d_{\downarrow,a}^-(t) \bar{d}_{\uparrow,a}^+(t) & d_{\downarrow,a}^-(t) \bar{d}_{\downarrow,a}^+(t) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{S164})$$

For later use, we Fourier transform these self-energies as,

$$\Sigma^{++}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] = \sum_a \delta((\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_2)/2 - \mathbf{R}_a) \tilde{g}_a \mathbb{D}_a^{++}(t) \quad (\text{S165})$$

$$\Sigma^{--}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] = \sum_a \delta((\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_2)/2 - \mathbf{R}_a) (-\tilde{g}_a) \mathbb{D}_a^{--}(t), \quad (\text{S166})$$

$$\Sigma^{-+}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] = i\sum_a \gamma_a \delta((\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_2)/2 - \mathbf{R}_a) \mathbb{D}_a^{-+}(t), \quad (\text{S167})$$

$$\Sigma^{+-}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] = 0, \quad (\text{S168})$$

where

$$\Sigma(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, t) = \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot(\mathbf{r}_1+\mathbf{r}_2)/2} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{r}_1-\mathbf{r}_2)} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}}(t). \quad (\text{S169})$$

We now perform the Grassmann integral over the conduction electrons, regarding them as the (non-Markovian) environment for localized electrons, to obtain the effective dynamics of the localized spin dynamics:

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}(d, \bar{d}) e^{iS_d[d, \bar{d}]} \int \mathcal{D}(c, \bar{c}) e^{iS_c[d, \bar{d}, c, \bar{c}]} \equiv \int \mathcal{D}(d, \bar{d}) e^{iS_{\text{eff}}[d, \bar{d}]} \quad (\text{S170})$$

where the effective action $S_{\text{eff}}[d, \bar{d}] = S_d^0[d, \bar{d}] + \Delta S_{\text{eff}}[d, \bar{d}]$ reads

$$\begin{aligned} e^{i\Delta S_{\text{eff}}[d, \bar{d}]} &= \det \left[(-i)(\mathbb{G}_0^{-1} - \Sigma[d, \bar{d}]) \right] \\ &\simeq \exp \left[-\text{Tr}[\Sigma[d, \bar{d}]\mathbb{G}_0] - \frac{1}{2}\text{Tr}[\Sigma[d, \bar{d}]\mathbb{G}_0\Sigma[d, \bar{d}]\mathbb{G}_0] \right] + \text{const.} \\ &\equiv \exp \left[i\Delta S_{\text{eff}}^{(1)}[d, \bar{d}] + i\Delta S_{\text{eff}}^{(2)}[d, \bar{d}] \right] + \text{const.} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S171})$$

Here, the first-order contribution is $\Delta S_{\text{eff}}^{(1)}[d, \bar{d}] = i\text{Tr}[\Sigma\mathbb{G}_0]$ and the second-order contribution is given by, $\Delta S_{\text{eff}}^{(2)}[d, \bar{d}] = \frac{i}{2}\text{Tr}[\Sigma[d, \bar{d}]\mathbb{G}_0\Sigma[d, \bar{d}]\mathbb{G}_0]$, where $\text{Tr}[\mathbf{A}] = \int d\mathbf{r}_1 \int d\mathbf{r}_2 \int dt_1 \int dt_2 \text{tr}_\sigma \text{tr}_s [A(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1; \mathbf{r}_2, t_2)] \delta(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2) \delta(t_1 - t_2)$ and $\text{tr}_{\sigma(s)}[\dots]$ describes the trace in the spin (Keldysh) space.

A. First-order correction: Decay of dipole moment

The first-order correction reads

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta S_{\text{eff}}^{(1)}[d, \bar{d}] &= i\text{Tr}[\Sigma \mathbb{G}_0] = i\text{tr}_{\sigma,s} \int dt_1 \int d\mathbf{r}_1 \int dt_2 \int d\mathbf{r}_2 [\Sigma(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, t_1) \delta(t_1 - t_2) \mathbb{G}_0(\mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_1, t_2 - t_1 + \delta)] \\
&= i \int dt' \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \text{tr}_{\sigma,s} [\Sigma_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}}(t') \mathbb{G}_0(-\mathbf{k}, t = \delta)] = i \int dt \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} e^{i\omega s \delta} \text{tr}_{\sigma,s} [\Sigma_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}}(t) \mathbb{G}_0(\mathbf{k}, \omega)] \\
&= i \int dt \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} e^{i\omega s \delta} \text{tr}_{\sigma} [\Sigma_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}}^{++}(t) \mathbb{G}_0^{++}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) + \Sigma_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}}^{--}(t) \mathbb{G}_0^{--}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) + \Sigma_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}}^{+-}(t) \mathbb{G}_0^{+-}(\mathbf{k}, \omega)] \\
&= \int dt \sum_a \sum_{\sigma} \left[-g_a [d_{\sigma,a}^+(t+\delta) \bar{d}_{\sigma,a}^+(t-\delta) - d_{\sigma,a}^-(t-\delta) \bar{d}_{\sigma,a}^-(t+\delta)] \right. \\
&\quad \left. -i\gamma_a n \left[d_{\sigma,a}^-(t) \bar{d}_{\sigma,a}^+(t) - \frac{1}{2} d_{\sigma,a}^+(t+\delta) \bar{d}_{\sigma,a}^+(t-\delta) - \frac{1}{2} d_{\sigma,a}^-(t-\delta) \bar{d}_{\sigma,a}^-(t+\delta) \right] \right] \tag{S172}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega e^{i\omega \delta} \mathbb{G}_0^{++}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = 2\pi i f_{\mathbf{k}}, \tag{S173}$$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega e^{-i\omega \delta} \mathbb{G}_0^{--}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = 2\pi i f_{\mathbf{k}}, \tag{S174}$$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \mathbb{G}_0^{+-}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = 2\pi i f_{\mathbf{k}}, \tag{S175}$$

and $\sum_{\mathbf{k}} f_{\mathbf{k}} = n$, where n is the filling. Comparing this action with Eq. (S82), we find that this corresponds to the equation of motion $\partial_t \hat{\rho} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}^{(1)} \hat{\rho}$ governed by a superoperator,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}^{(1)} \hat{\rho} = -i \sum_a \sum_{\sigma} [\hat{P}_s g_a \hat{d}_{\sigma,a} \hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^{\dagger} \hat{P}_s, \hat{\rho}] + \sum_a \sum_{\sigma} \gamma_a n \mathcal{D}[\hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^{\dagger} \hat{P}_s] \hat{\rho}, \tag{S176}$$

which are the Hartree energy shift (which we ignore below) and an onsite pumping of localized electrons. The latter gives rise to a decay of magnetic dipole moment, which can be seen from the equation of motion for the averaged magnetic dipole $\langle \hat{S}_a \rangle = \text{tr}[\hat{\rho} \hat{S}_a]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \dot{S}_a^i \rangle &= \text{tr}[(\partial_t \hat{\rho}) \hat{S}_a^i] \\
&= \gamma_a \text{tr} \left[-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\nu} \hat{d}_{\nu,a} \hat{d}_{\nu,a}^{\dagger} \hat{\rho} \hat{S}_a^i - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\rho} \sum_{\nu} \hat{d}_{\nu,a} \hat{d}_{\nu,a}^{\dagger} \hat{S}_a^i + \sum_{\nu} \hat{d}_{\nu,a}^{\dagger} \hat{\rho} \hat{d}_{\nu,a} \hat{S}_a^i \right] \\
&= \gamma_a \left[-\frac{1}{2} \left\langle \hat{S}_a^i \sum_{\nu} \hat{d}_{\nu,a} \hat{d}_{\nu,a}^{\dagger} \right\rangle - \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \sum_{\nu} \hat{d}_{\nu,a} \hat{d}_{\nu,a}^{\dagger} \hat{S}_a^i \right\rangle + \left\langle \sum_{\nu} \hat{d}_{\nu,a} \hat{S}_a^i \hat{d}_{\nu,a}^{\dagger} \right\rangle \right] \\
&= \gamma_a \left[-\frac{1}{2} \langle \hat{S}_a^i \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \hat{S}_a^i \rangle + \left\langle \sum_{\nu} \sum_{\mu'\nu'} \sigma_i^{\mu'\nu'} (\delta_{\mu'\nu} - \hat{d}_{\mu',a}^{\dagger} \hat{d}_{\nu,a}) (\delta_{\nu'\nu} - \hat{d}_{\nu',a}^{\dagger} \hat{d}_{\nu',a}) \right\rangle \right] \\
&= \gamma_a \left[-\langle \hat{S}_a^i \rangle + \sum_{\mu'\nu'} \left\langle -(\hat{d}_{\mu',a}^{\dagger} \sigma_i^{\mu'\nu'} \hat{d}_{\nu',a}) - (\hat{d}_{\mu',a}^{\dagger} \sigma_i^{\mu'\nu'} \hat{d}_{\nu',a}) + 2(\hat{d}_{\mu',a}^{\dagger} \sigma_i^{\mu'\nu'} \hat{d}_{\nu',a}) \right\rangle \right] \\
&= -\gamma_a \langle S_a^i \rangle. \tag{S177}
\end{aligned}$$

B. Second-order correction: RKKY interactions and Gilbert damping

We now move on to the analysis of the second-order perturbation contribution $S_{\text{eff}}^{(2)}$, our central interest, which gives rise to the light-modified RKKY interaction and the Gilbert damping:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta S_{\text{eff}}^{(2)}[d, \bar{d}] &= \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr}[\boldsymbol{\Sigma}[d, \bar{d}] \mathbb{G}_0 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}[d, \bar{d}] \mathbb{G}_0] \\ &= \frac{i}{2} \int dt dt' \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 d\mathbf{r}_3 d\mathbf{r}_4 \text{tr}_{\sigma, s} \left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2; t) \mathbb{G}_0(\mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_3, t - t') \boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\mathbf{r}_3, \mathbf{r}_4, t') \mathbb{G}_0(\mathbf{r}_4 - \mathbf{r}_1; t' - t) \right] \\ &= \frac{i}{2} \int dt dt' \sum_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}} \text{tr}_{\sigma, s} \left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}(t) \mathbb{G}_0(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, t - t') \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}(t') \mathbb{G}_0(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; t' - t) \right].\end{aligned}\quad (\text{S178})$$

Recall that the self-energy $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)]$ (the Green's function \mathbb{G}_0) is composed of (conduction) localized electrons. The timescale of the dynamics of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is therefore much slower than those of \mathbb{G}_0 . Taking advantage of this property, we perform a gradient expansion as

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta S_{\text{eff}}^{(2)}[d, \bar{d}] &= \frac{i}{2} \int dt_g d\tau \sum_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}} \text{tr}_{\sigma, s} \left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}(t_g + \tau/2) \mathbb{G}_0(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}(t_g - \tau/2) \mathbb{G}_0(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \right] \\ &\approx S_{\text{eff}}^{\text{RKKY}}[d, \bar{d}] + S_{\text{Gilbert}}[d, \bar{d}].\end{aligned}\quad (\text{S179})$$

Here, ($\delta \rightarrow 0^+$)

$$S_{\text{eff}}^{\text{RKKY}}[d, \bar{d}] = \frac{i}{2} \int dt_g d\tau \sum_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}} \text{tr}_{\sigma, s} \left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}(t_g + \delta) \mathbb{G}_0(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}(t_g - \delta) \mathbb{G}_0(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \right] \quad (\text{S180})$$

is the Markovian limit contribution that, as we will show below, gives rise to the RKKY interaction and its correction from the light-induced dissipation. The first-order non-Markovian correction is given by,

$$\begin{aligned}S_{\text{Gilbert}}[d, \bar{d}] &= \frac{i}{2} \int dt_g d\tau \frac{\tau}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}} \left[\text{tr}_{\sigma, s} \left[[\partial_{t_g} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}(t_g + \delta)] \mathbb{G}_0(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}(t_g - \delta) \mathbb{G}_0(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \text{tr}_{\sigma, s} \left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}(t_g + \delta) \mathbb{G}_0(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) [\partial_{t_g} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}(t_g - \delta)] \mathbb{G}_0(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \right] \right]\end{aligned}\quad (\text{S181})$$

which will be shown below to give rise to the Gilbert damping.

1. Markovian contribution: RKKY interaction

First, consider the Markovian contribution. Taking the trace in the Keldysh space and using the property that $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{+-} = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}S_{\text{eff}}^{\text{RKKY}}[d, \bar{d}] &= \frac{i}{2} \int dt_g \int d\tau \sum_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}} \text{tr}_{\sigma} \left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t_g + \delta) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t_g - \delta) G_0^{++}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) G_0^{++}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \right. \\ &\quad + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t_g + \delta) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{-+}(t_g - \delta) G_0^{+-}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) G_0^{++}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \\ &\quad + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t_g + \delta) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t_g - \delta) G_0^{--}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) G_0^{++}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \\ &\quad + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{-+}(t_g + \delta) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t_g - \delta) G_0^{++}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) G_0^{+-}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \\ &\quad + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{-+}(t_g + \delta) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{-+}(t_g - \delta) G_0^{+-}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) G_0^{+-}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \\ &\quad + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{-+}(t_g + \delta) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t_g - \delta) G_0^{--}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) G_0^{--}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \\ &\quad + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t_g + \delta) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t_g - \delta) G_0^{++}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) G_0^{--}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \\ &\quad + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t_g + \delta) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{-+}(t_g - \delta) G_0^{+-}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) G_0^{--}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \\ &\quad \left. + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t_g + \delta) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t_g - \delta) G_0^{--}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) G_0^{--}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \right].\end{aligned}\quad (\text{S182})$$

The conduction electron Green's functions can be written as [45],

$$G_0^{++}(\mathbf{k}, t-t') = \theta(t-t')G_0^>(\mathbf{k}, t-t') + \theta(t'-t)G_0^<(\mathbf{k}, t-t'), \quad (\text{S183a})$$

$$G_0^{--}(\mathbf{k}, t-t') = \theta(t'-t)G_0^>(\mathbf{k}, t-t') + \theta(t-t')G_0^<(\mathbf{k}, t-t'), \quad (\text{S183b})$$

$$G_0^{+-}(\mathbf{k}, t-t') = G_0^<(\mathbf{k}, t-t'), \quad (\text{S183c})$$

$$G_0^{-+}(\mathbf{k}, t-t') = G_0^>(\mathbf{k}, t-t'), \quad (\text{S183d})$$

where the lesser ($s=<$) and greater ($s=>$) Green's function are collectively expressed as (in Fourier space),

$$G_0^s(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = F_{\mathbf{k}}^s[G_0^R(\mathbf{k}, \omega) - G_0^A(\mathbf{k}, \omega)] \quad (\text{S184})$$

with

$$G_0^R(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{1}{\omega - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} + i\delta}, \quad G_0^A(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{1}{\omega - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - i\delta}, \quad (\text{S185})$$

$$F^<(\mathbf{k}) = -f_{\mathbf{k}}, \quad F^>(\mathbf{k}) = 1 - f_{\mathbf{k}}. \quad (\text{S186})$$

Substituting this expression into Eq. (S182), we encounter integrals of the form ($s_1, \dots, s_4 = +, -$ and $s_a, s_b = <, >$),

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\tau \theta(\tau) G_0^{s_a}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) G_0^{s_b}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) = i \frac{F_+^{s_a} F_-^{s_b}}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- - i\delta}, \quad (\text{S187})$$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\tau \theta(-\tau) G_0^{s_a}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) G_0^{s_b}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) = -i \frac{F_+^{s_a} F_-^{s_b}}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- + i\delta}, \quad (\text{S188})$$

where

$$\varepsilon_{\pm} \equiv \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}/2}, \quad F_{\pm}^s \equiv F_{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}/2}^s. \quad (\text{S189})$$

Using these relations, one obtains,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{eff}}^{\text{RKKY}}[d, \bar{d}] &\approx -\frac{1}{2} \int dt \\ &\times \sum_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}} \text{tr}_{\sigma} \left[\frac{F_+^> F_-^<}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- - i\delta} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t+\delta) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t-\delta) - \frac{F_+^< F_-^>}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- + i\delta} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t-\delta) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t+\delta) \right. \\ &+ \frac{F_+^< F_-^<}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- - i\delta} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t+\delta) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{-+}(t-\delta) - \frac{F_+^< F_-^>}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- + i\delta} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t-\delta) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{-+}(t+\delta) \\ &+ \frac{F_+^< F_-^>}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- - i\delta} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t+\delta) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t-\delta) - \frac{F_+^< F_-^>}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- + i\delta} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t-\delta) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t+\delta) \\ &+ \frac{F_+^> F_-^<}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- - i\delta} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{-+}(t+\delta) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t-\delta) - \frac{F_+^< F_-^<}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- + i\delta} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{-+}(t-\delta) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t+\delta) \\ &+ \frac{F_+^< F_-^>}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- - i\delta} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{-+}(t+\delta) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t-\delta) - \frac{F_+^< F_-^<}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- + i\delta} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{-+}(t-\delta) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t+\delta) \\ &+ \frac{F_+^< F_-^<}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- - i\delta} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t+\delta) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{-+}(t-\delta) - \frac{F_+^> F_-^<}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- + i\delta} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t-\delta) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{-+}(t+\delta) \\ &+ \frac{F_+^< F_-^>}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- - i\delta} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t+\delta) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t-\delta) - \frac{F_+^> F_-^<}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- + i\delta} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t-\delta) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t+\delta) \\ &+ \frac{F_+^< F_-^<}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- - i\delta} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{-+}(t+\delta) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{-+}(t-\delta) - \frac{F_+^< F_-^<}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- + i\delta} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{-+}(t-\delta) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{-+}(t+\delta) \\ &+ \left. \frac{F_+^> F_-^<}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- - i\delta} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t+\delta) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t-\delta) - \frac{F_+^> F_-^<}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- + i\delta} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t-\delta) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t+\delta) \right] \quad (\text{S190}) \end{aligned}$$

We proceed by plugging in the explicit form of Σ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} \frac{F_+^{s_a} F_-^{s_b}}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- \mp i\delta} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{s_1 s_2}(t \pm \delta) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{s_3 s_4}(t \mp \delta) \\
&= \sum_{a, b} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} \frac{F_+^{s_a} F_-^{s_b}}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- \mp i\delta} e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot (\mathbf{R}_a - \mathbf{R}_b)} \Sigma_a^{s_1, s_2}(t \pm \delta) \Sigma_b^{s_3, s_4}(t \mp \delta) \\
&= \sum_{a, b} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} \frac{F_+^{s_a} F_-^{s_b}}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- \mp i\delta} \cos(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_{a, b}) \Sigma_a^{s_1, s_2}(t \pm \delta) \Sigma_b^{s_3, s_4}(t \mp \delta)
\end{aligned} \tag{S191}$$

where $\mathbf{R}_{a, b} = \mathbf{R}_a - \mathbf{R}_b$ and

$$\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{s_1, s_2}(t) = \sum_a e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_a} \Sigma_a^{s_1, s_2}(t) \tag{S192}$$

with

$$\Sigma_a^{++}(t) = \left(g_a - i\frac{\gamma_a}{2}\right) \mathbb{D}_a^{++}(t), \tag{S193}$$

$$\Sigma_a^{--}(t) = -\left(g_a + i\frac{\gamma_a}{2}\right) \mathbb{D}_a^{--}(t), \tag{S194}$$

$$\Sigma_a^{-+}(t) = i\gamma_a \mathbb{D}_a^{-+}(t), \tag{S195}$$

$$\Sigma_a^{+-}(t) = 0. \tag{S196}$$

In the final equality of Eq. (S191), we have used the property that $\varepsilon_{\pm} \equiv \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}/2}$, $F_{\pm}^s \equiv F_{\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}/2}^s$, and $\Sigma_a^{s, s'}$ are symmetric under the transformation $(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}) \rightarrow (-\mathbf{k}, -\mathbf{q})$.

After a lengthy but straightforward calculation, we arrive at,

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\text{eff}}^{\text{RKKY}}[d, \bar{d}] &= \int dt \sum_{a, b} \left[J_{a, b}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) \left(\text{tr}_{\sigma} [\mathbb{D}_a^{++}(t + \delta) \mathbb{D}_b^{++}(t - \delta)] - \text{tr}_{\sigma} [\mathbb{D}_a^{--}(t - \delta) \mathbb{D}_b^{--}(t + \delta)] \right) \right. \\
&+ i\Lambda_{a, b}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) \left(\text{tr}_{\sigma} [\mathbb{D}_a^{++}(t + \delta) \mathbb{D}_b^{++}(t - \delta)] + \text{tr}_{\sigma} [\mathbb{D}_a^{--}(t - \delta) \mathbb{D}_b^{--}(t + \delta)] \right) \\
&+ [H_{a, b}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) - i\Gamma_{a, b}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b})] \text{tr}_{\sigma} [\mathbb{D}_a^{--}(t) \mathbb{D}_b^{++}(t)] \\
&+ P_{a, b}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) \left(\text{tr}_{\sigma} [\mathbb{D}_a^{-+}(t + \delta) \mathbb{D}_b^{++}(t - \delta)] - \text{tr}_{\sigma} [\mathbb{D}_b^{--}(t - \delta) \mathbb{D}_a^{++}(t + \delta)] \right) \\
&- i\Omega_{a, b}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) \left(\text{tr}_{\sigma} [\mathbb{D}_a^{-+}(t + \delta) \mathbb{D}_b^{++}(t - \delta)] + \text{tr}_{\sigma} [\mathbb{D}_b^{--}(t - \delta) \mathbb{D}_a^{++}(t + \delta)] \right) \\
&- W_{a, b}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) \left(\text{tr}_{\sigma} [\mathbb{D}_a^{++}(t + \delta) \mathbb{D}_b^{-+}(t - \delta)] - \text{tr}_{\sigma} [\mathbb{D}_b^{-+}(t - \delta) \mathbb{D}_a^{--}(t + \delta)] \right) \\
&\left. - i\Phi_{a, b}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) \left(\text{tr}_{\sigma} [\mathbb{D}_a^{++}(t + \delta) \mathbb{D}_b^{-+}(t - \delta)] + \text{tr}_{\sigma} [\mathbb{D}_b^{-+}(t - \delta) \mathbb{D}_a^{--}(t + \delta)] - 2\text{tr}_{\sigma} [\mathbb{D}_a^{-+}(t + \delta) \mathbb{D}_b^{-+}(t - \delta)] \right) \right] \tag{S197}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$J_{a, b}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) = f_{\text{RKKY}}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) \left(g_a g_b - \frac{\gamma_a \gamma_b}{4} \right) - \frac{1}{2} m_{\text{dis}}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) [(-g_a) \gamma_b + (-g_b) \gamma_a], \tag{S198}$$

$$\Lambda_{a, b}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) = m_{\text{dis}}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) \left(g_a g_b - \frac{\gamma_a \gamma_b}{4} \right) + \frac{1}{2} f_{\text{RKKY}}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) [(-g_a) \gamma_b + (-g_b) \gamma_a], \tag{S199}$$

$$H_{a, b}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) - i\Gamma_{a, b}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) = m_{\text{dis}}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) \left[[(-g_a) \gamma_b - (-g_b) \gamma_a] - 2i \left(g_a g_b + \frac{\gamma_a \gamma_b}{4} \right) \right], \tag{S200}$$

$$P_{a, b}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) = f_{\text{RKKY}}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) \frac{\gamma_a \gamma_b}{2} + m_{\text{dis}}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) \gamma_a (-g_b), \tag{S201}$$

$$\Omega_{a, b}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) = f_{\text{RKKY}}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) \gamma_a (-g_b) - m_{\text{dis}}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) \frac{\gamma_a \gamma_b}{2}, \tag{S202}$$

$$W_{a, b}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) = h_{\text{dis}}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) (-g_a) \gamma_b, \tag{S203}$$

$$\Phi_{a, b}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) = h_{\text{dis}}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b}) \frac{\gamma_a \gamma_b}{2}. \tag{S204}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\text{RKKY}}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}) &\equiv -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} \cos(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_{a,b}) \frac{F_+^> F_-^< - F_+^< F_-^>}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_-} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \cos(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_{a,b}) \frac{(1-f_+)(-f_-) - (-f_+)(1-f_-)}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_-} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} \cos(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_{a,b}) \frac{f_+ - f_-}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_-}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S205})$$

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\text{dis}}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}) &\equiv -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} \cos(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_{a,b}) \pi \delta(\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_-) (F_+^> F_-^< + F_+^< F_-^>) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} \cos(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_{a,b}) \pi \delta(\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_-) ((1-f_+)f_- + f_+(1-f_-)), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S206})$$

$$h_{\text{dis}}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} \cos(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_{a,b}) 2\pi \delta(\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_-) F_+^< F_-^< = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} \cos(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R}_{a,b}) 2\pi \delta(\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_-) f_+ f_- \quad (\text{S207})$$

Here, $J_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b})$ is identical to the well-known form of the RKKY interaction in the equilibrium limit $\gamma_a = 0$. We note the $m_{\text{dis}}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b})$ vanishes at $T = 0$.

One can check that this action has the causality structure $S_{\text{eff}}^{\text{RKKY}}[d, \bar{d}]|_{d_+ = d_-, \bar{d}_+ = \bar{d}_-} = 0$ [45], implying the trace conserving property $\partial_t \text{tr}[\hat{\rho}] = 0$ [46].

Let us first show that the conventional RKKY interaction [36–38] recovers in the equilibrium limit $\gamma_a = 0$. In this limit, the effective action reads,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{eq}}^{\text{RKKY}}[d, \bar{d}] &= \int dt \sum_{a,b} \left[J_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}) \left(\text{tr}_\sigma [\mathbb{D}_a^{++}(t+\delta) \mathbb{D}_b^{++}(t-\delta)] - \text{tr}_\sigma [\mathbb{D}_a^{--}(t-\delta) \mathbb{D}_b^{--}(t+\delta)] \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + i g_a g_b m_{\text{dis}}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}) \left(\text{tr}_\sigma [\mathbb{D}_a^{++}(t+\delta) \mathbb{D}_b^{++}(t-\delta)] + \text{tr}_\sigma [\mathbb{D}_a^{--}(t-\delta) \mathbb{D}_b^{--}(t+\delta)] \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 2i g_a g_b m_{\text{dis}}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}) \text{tr}_\sigma [\mathbb{D}_a^{--}(t) \mathbb{D}_b^{++}(t)] \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S208})$$

Using the relation,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}_\sigma [\mathbb{D}_a^{s_1, s_2}(t) \mathbb{D}_b^{s_3, s_4}(t)] &= \text{tr}_\sigma \left[\begin{pmatrix} d_{\uparrow, a}^{s_1} \bar{d}_{\uparrow, a}^{s_2} & d_{\uparrow, a}^{s_1} \bar{d}_{\downarrow, a}^{s_2} \\ d_{\downarrow, a}^{s_1} \bar{d}_{\uparrow, a}^{s_2} & d_{\downarrow, a}^{s_1} \bar{d}_{\downarrow, a}^{s_2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d_{\uparrow, b}^{s_3} \bar{d}_{\uparrow, b}^{s_4} & d_{\uparrow, b}^{s_3} \bar{d}_{\downarrow, b}^{s_4} \\ d_{\downarrow, b}^{s_3} \bar{d}_{\uparrow, b}^{s_4} & d_{\downarrow, b}^{s_3} \bar{d}_{\downarrow, b}^{s_4} \end{pmatrix} \right] \\ &= d_{\uparrow, a}^{s_1} \bar{d}_{\uparrow, a}^{s_2} d_{\uparrow, b}^{s_3} \bar{d}_{\uparrow, b}^{s_4} + d_{\downarrow, a}^{s_1} \bar{d}_{\downarrow, a}^{s_2} d_{\downarrow, b}^{s_3} \bar{d}_{\downarrow, b}^{s_4} + d_{\uparrow, a}^{s_1} \bar{d}_{\downarrow, a}^{s_2} d_{\downarrow, b}^{s_3} \bar{d}_{\uparrow, b}^{s_4} + d_{\downarrow, a}^{s_1} \bar{d}_{\uparrow, a}^{s_2} d_{\uparrow, b}^{s_3} \bar{d}_{\downarrow, b}^{s_4} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^3 \sum_{\mu, \nu = \uparrow, \downarrow} \sum_{\mu', \nu' = \uparrow, \downarrow} (d_{\nu', a}^{s_1} \sigma_i^{\mu\nu} \bar{d}_{\mu, a}^{s_2}) (d_{\nu', b}^{s_3} \sigma_i^{\mu'\nu'} \bar{d}_{\mu', b}^{s_4}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S209})$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{eq}}^{\text{RKKY}}[d, \bar{d}] &= \int dt \sum_{a,b} \sum_{j=0}^3 \left[\frac{J_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b})}{2} \sum_{s=\pm} s \hat{m}_{a,j}^{s,s} \hat{m}_{b,j}^{s,s} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{i}{2} g_a g_b m_{\text{dis}}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}) \left[\hat{m}_{a,j}^{+,+} \hat{m}_{b,j}^{+,+} + \hat{m}_{a,j}^{-,-} \hat{m}_{b,j}^{-,-} - 2\hat{m}_{a,j}^{-,-} \hat{m}_{b,j}^{+,+} \right] \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S210})$$

where $(l_1, l_2 = +, -)$

$$\hat{m}_{a,j}^{l_1, l_2}[d, \bar{d}] = \sum_{\mu, \nu = \uparrow, \downarrow} \bar{d}_{\mu, a}^{l_1} \hat{\sigma}_j^{\mu\nu} d_{\nu, a}^{l_2}. \quad (\text{S211})$$

We find by comparing with Eq. (S82) that the corresponding Liouville equation is,

$$\partial_t \hat{\rho} = -i[\hat{H}_{\text{RKKY}}, \hat{\rho}] + \sum_{j=1}^3 \mathcal{D} \left[\sum_a g_a \sqrt{m_{\text{dis}}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b})} \hat{S}_{a,j} \right] \hat{\rho} \quad (\text{S212})$$

with $\hat{H}_{\text{RKKY}} = \sum_{a,b} (J_{a,b}/2) \hat{\mathbf{S}}_a \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}}_b$ and $(\hat{\mathbf{S}}_a)_j = \sum_{\sigma,\sigma'} \hat{d}_{\sigma,a}^\dagger (\sigma_j)_{\sigma\sigma'} \hat{d}_{\sigma',a}$ is the localized spin operator. This is identical to those found in Ref. [109], where the dissipator describes the decoherence effect on the spins that become non-zero at finite temperature $T > 0$.

Having checked that our formalism reproduces the known results in the equilibrium limit, we now add back the light-induced terms. For simplicity, we restrict ourselves to $T = 0$ and the case $\gamma_a \ll |g_a|$, corresponding to the case where $\kappa_a \ll U_a$. Noting that $m_{\text{dis}}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b})$ vanishes at the zero temperature limit, the effective Keldysh action simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\text{eff}}^{\text{RKKY}}[d, \bar{d}] &= \int dt \sum_{a,b} \left[J_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}) \left(\text{tr}_\sigma [\mathbb{D}_a^{++}(t+\delta) \mathbb{D}_b^{++}(t-\delta)] - \text{tr}_\sigma [\mathbb{D}_a^{--}(t-\delta) \mathbb{D}_b^{--}(t+\delta)] \right) \right. \\
&+ i \frac{\Omega_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}) + \Omega_{ba}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b})}{2} \left(\text{tr}_\sigma [\mathbb{D}_a^{++}(t+\delta) \mathbb{D}_b^{++}(t-\delta)] + \text{tr}_\sigma [\mathbb{D}_a^{--}(t-\delta) \mathbb{D}_b^{--}(t+\delta)] \right) \\
&- i \Omega_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}) \left(\text{tr}_\sigma [\mathbb{D}_a^{-+}(t+\delta) \mathbb{D}_b^{++}(t-\delta)] + \text{tr}_\sigma [\mathbb{D}_b^{--}(t-\delta) \mathbb{D}_a^{-+}(t+\delta)] \right) \\
&\left. - W_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}) \left(\text{tr}_\sigma [\mathbb{D}_a^{++}(t+\delta) \mathbb{D}_b^{-+}(t-\delta)] - \text{tr}_\sigma [\mathbb{D}_b^{-+}(t-\delta) \mathbb{D}_a^{--}(t+\delta)] \right) \right] \\
&= \int dt \sum_{a,b} \frac{J_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b})}{2} \sum_{j=0}^3 \sum_{s=\pm} \hat{m}_{a,j}^{s,s} \hat{m}_{b,j}^{s,s} \\
&+ i \int dt \sum_{a,b} \frac{\Omega_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b})}{2} \sum_{j=0}^3 \left[\hat{m}_{a,j}^{+,+} m_{b,j}^{+,+} + \hat{m}_{a,j}^{-,-} m_{b,j}^{-,-} - \hat{m}_{a,j}^{+,-} m_{b,j}^{+,+} - \hat{m}_{a,j}^{-,-} m_{b,j}^{+,-} \right] \tag{S213}
\end{aligned}$$

where (note that $g_a < 0$)

$$J_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}) = g_a g_b f_{\text{RKKY}}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}), \tag{S214}$$

$$\Omega_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}) = \gamma_a |g_b| f_{\text{RKKY}}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}). \tag{S215}$$

In the final equality, we have ignored the contribution arising from the term proportional to $W_{a,b}$ since they only contribute to the coherent motion, which is subdominant $o(J_{a,b})$ in the regime of interest $\kappa_a \ll U_a$ (or $\gamma_a \ll |g_a|$).

2. Non-Markovian correction: Gilbert damping

We next analyze the non-Markovian correction $S_{\text{eff}}^{\text{Gilbert}}[d, \bar{d}]$. Taking the trace over the Keldysh space,

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\text{Gilbert}}[d, \bar{d}] &= \frac{i}{2} \int dt_g d\tau \frac{\tau}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}} \left[\text{tr}_{\sigma,s} \left[[\partial_{t_g} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t_g + \delta)] \mathbb{G}_0^{++}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t_g - \delta) \mathbb{G}_0^{++}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \right] \right. \\
&- \text{tr}_{\sigma,s} \left[\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t_g + \delta) \mathbb{G}_0^{++}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) [\partial_{t_g} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t_g - \delta)] \mathbb{G}_0^{++}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \right] \\
&+ \text{tr}_{\sigma,s} \left[[\partial_{t_g} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t_g + \delta)] \mathbb{G}_0^{+-}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t_g - \delta) \mathbb{G}_0^{-+}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \right] \\
&- \text{tr}_{\sigma,s} \left[\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t_g + \delta) \mathbb{G}_0^{+-}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) [\partial_{t_g} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t_g - \delta)] \mathbb{G}_0^{-+}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \right] \\
&+ \text{tr}_{\sigma,s} \left[[\partial_{t_g} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t_g + \delta)] \mathbb{G}_0^{-+}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t_g - \delta) \mathbb{G}_0^{+-}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \right] \\
&- \text{tr}_{\sigma,s} \left[\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t_g + \delta) \mathbb{G}_0^{-+}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) [\partial_{t_g} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t_g - \delta)] \mathbb{G}_0^{+-}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \right] \\
&+ \text{tr}_{\sigma,s} \left[[\partial_{t_g} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t_g + \delta)] \mathbb{G}_0^{--}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t_g - \delta) \mathbb{G}_0^{--}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \right] \\
&- \text{tr}_{\sigma,s} \left[\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t_g + \delta) \mathbb{G}_0^{--}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) [\partial_{t_g} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t_g - \delta)] \mathbb{G}_0^{--}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) \right] \left. \right] \tag{S216}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we have omitted the contribution from the light-induced dissipation by setting $\Sigma^{-+} = 0$, assuming that they are small compared to those already present in their absence. Similarly to the case of Markovian contribution $S_{\text{eff}}^{\text{RKKY}}[d, \bar{d}]$, since the conduction electron Green's functions can be split into a sum over lesser and greater Green's function (Eq. (S183)), we encounter forms like

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\tau \tau \theta(\tau) G_0^{s_a}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) G_0^{s_b}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{F_+^{s_a} F_-^{s_b}}{(\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- - i\delta)^2}, \quad (\text{S217})$$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\tau \tau \theta(-\tau) G_0^{s_a}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2, \tau) G_0^{s_b}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}/2; -\tau) = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{F_+^{s_a} F_-^{s_b}}{(\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- + i\delta)^2}. \quad (\text{S218})$$

Using these relations, we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{eff}}^{\text{Gilbert}}[d, \bar{d}] &= \frac{i}{2} \int dt \\ &\times \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} \text{tr}_{\sigma} \left[\frac{F_+^< F_-^<}{(\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- - i\delta)^2} [\partial_t \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t+\delta)] \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t-\delta) + \frac{F_+^< F_-^>}{(\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- + i\delta)^2} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t-\delta) [\partial_t \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t+\delta)] \right. \\ &+ \frac{F_+^< F_-^>}{(\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- - i\delta)^2} [\partial_t \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t+\delta)] \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t-\delta) + \frac{F_+^> F_-^<}{(\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- + i\delta)^2} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t-\delta) [\partial_t \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t+\delta)] \\ &+ \frac{F_+^< F_-^>}{(\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- - i\delta)^2} [\partial_t \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t+\delta)] \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t-\delta) + \frac{F_+^< F_-^>}{(\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- + i\delta)^2} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t-\delta) [\partial_t \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t+\delta)] \\ &\left. + \frac{F_+^> F_-^<}{(\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- - i\delta)^2} [\partial_t \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t+\delta)] \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t-\delta) + \frac{F_+^> F_-^<}{(\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- + i\delta)^2} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t-\delta) [\partial_t \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t+\delta)] \right]. \quad (\text{S219}) \end{aligned}$$

Let us further ignore the non-local contribution [92] for simplicity, by taking into account contribution only from $\mathbf{q} = 0$ in the self-energy, i.e., $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{q}} \approx \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}}$. In this case, using $\int dt \text{tr}_{\sigma} [\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t+\delta) [\partial_t \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t-\delta)]] = \int dt \text{tr}_{\sigma} [\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t-\delta) [\partial_t \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t+\delta)]] = 0$, the effective action simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{eff}}^{\text{Gilbert}}[d, \bar{d}] &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} [F_+^< F_-^> - F_+^> F_-^<] \text{Im} \left[\frac{1}{(\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- - i\delta)^2} \right] \int dt \left[\text{tr}_{\sigma} [\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}}^{++}(t) [\partial_t \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}}^{--}(t)]] \right] \\ &= -\sum_a \frac{\alpha_a}{2} \int dt \left[\text{tr}_{\sigma} [\mathbb{D}_a^{++}(t) [\partial_t \mathbb{D}_a^{--}(t)]] \right] \\ &= -\sum_a \frac{\alpha_a}{4} \int dt \sum_{j=0}^3 (\bar{d}_{\mu, a}^+ \sigma_j^{\mu\nu} d_{\nu, a}^+) [\partial_t (\bar{d}_{\mu', a}^- \sigma_j^{\mu'\nu'} d_{\nu', a}^-)] \quad (\text{S220}) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\alpha_a = 2g_a^2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} [F_+^< F_-^> - F_+^> F_-^<] \text{Im} \left[\frac{1}{(\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_- - i\delta)^2} \right] = -4\pi g_a^2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} \frac{f_+ - f_-}{\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_-} \delta(\varepsilon_+ - \varepsilon_-) \quad (\text{S221})$$

For parabolic dispersion $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = \mathbf{k}^2/(2m)$ at three spatial dimensions, one obtains the form,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_a &= -4\pi g_a^2 \frac{2\pi(V/N)^2}{(4\pi^2)^2} \int_0^{\infty} dk k^2 \int_0^{\infty} dq q^2 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} d\theta \cos \theta \frac{f_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - f_{\mathbf{k}}}{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}} \delta(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) \\ &= \frac{9\pi^2}{2} \frac{n_e^2}{(N/V)^2} \frac{g_a^2}{\varepsilon_{\text{F}}^2} = \frac{9\pi^2}{2} n^2 \frac{g_a^2}{\varepsilon_{\text{F}}^2} \quad (\text{S222}) \end{aligned}$$

where $n_e = k_{\text{F}}^3/(3\pi^2)$ is the electron density (where k_{F} is the Fermi momentum), N is the number of sites, V is the volume, and $n = n_e/(N/V)$ is the filling of the conduction electrons.

C. Semiclassical approximation: Derivation of Eq. (6) in the main text

Summarizing all terms derived above, the Keldysh action $Z = \int \mathcal{D}[d, \bar{d}] e^{iS_{\text{eff}}[d, \bar{d}]}$ reads,

$$S_{\text{eff}}[d, \bar{d}] = S_d^0[d, \bar{d}] + S_{\gamma}[d, \bar{d}] + S_M[d, \bar{d}] \quad (\text{S223})$$

with

$$S_M[d, \bar{d}] = S_{\text{RKKY}}^{\text{coh}}[d, \bar{d}] + S_{\text{Gilbert}}[d, \bar{d}] + S_{\text{RKKY}}^{\text{neq}}[d, \bar{d}]. \quad (\text{S224})$$

Here,

$$\begin{aligned} S_d^0[d, \bar{d}] + S_\gamma[d, \bar{d}] &= \int dt \sum_{a, \sigma} \left[\left[\sum_{s=\pm} s \bar{d}_{a, \sigma}^s i \partial_t d_{a, \sigma}^s \right] + i \gamma_a n [d_{\sigma, a}^-(t) \bar{d}_{\sigma, a}^+(t) - \frac{1}{2} d_{\sigma, a}^+(t+\delta) \bar{d}_{\sigma, a}^+(t-\delta) - \frac{1}{2} d_{\sigma, a}^-(t-\delta) \bar{d}_{\sigma, a}^-(t+\delta)] \right] \\ &= \int dt \sum_{a, \sigma} \left[[\bar{d}_{a, \sigma}^q i \partial_t d_{a, \sigma}^c + \bar{d}_{a, \sigma}^c i \partial_t d_{a, \sigma}^q] - i \gamma_a n [\bar{d}_{\sigma, a}^q d_{\sigma, a}^q + \frac{1}{2} \bar{d}_{\sigma, a}^q d_{\sigma, a}^c - \frac{1}{2} \bar{d}_{\sigma, a}^c d_{\sigma, a}^q] \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S225})$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{RKKY}}^{\text{coh}}[d, \bar{d}] &= \int dt \sum_{a, b} \frac{J_{a, b}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b})}{2} \sum_{j=0}^3 \sum_{s=\pm} s \hat{m}_{a, j}^{s, s} \hat{m}_{b, j}^{s, s} \\ &= \int dt \sum_{a, b} \frac{J_{a, b}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b})}{4} \sum_{j=0}^3 \left[(\hat{m}_{a, j}^{c, q} + \hat{m}_{a, j}^{q, c}) (\hat{m}_{b, j}^{c, c} + \hat{m}_{b, j}^{q, q}) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S226})$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{Gilbert}}[d, \bar{d}] &= - \sum_a \frac{\alpha_a}{4} \int dt \sum_{j=0}^3 \hat{m}_{a, j}^{+, +}(t) \partial_t \hat{m}_{a, j}^{-, -}(t) \\ &= - \sum_a \frac{\alpha_a}{4} \int dt \sum_{j=0}^3 [\hat{m}_{a, j}^{c, q}(t) + \hat{m}_{a, j}^{q, c}(t)] \partial_t [\hat{m}_{a, j}^{c, c}(t) + \hat{m}_{a, j}^{q, q}(t)] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S227})$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{RKKY}}^{\text{neq}}[d, \bar{d}] &= i \int dt \sum_{a, b} \frac{\Omega_{a, b}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b})}{2} \sum_{j=0}^3 \left[\hat{m}_{a, j}^{+, +} \hat{m}_{b, j}^{+, +} + \hat{m}_{a, j}^{-, -} \hat{m}_{b, j}^{-, -} - \hat{m}_{a, j}^{+, -} \hat{m}_{b, j}^{+, +} - \hat{m}_{a, j}^{-, -} \hat{m}_{b, j}^{+, -} \right] \\ &= i \int dt \sum_{a, b} \frac{\Omega_{a, b}(\mathbf{R}_{a, b})}{4} \sum_{j=0}^3 \left[(\hat{m}_{a, j}^{q, c} - \hat{m}_{a, j}^{c, q} + 2 \hat{m}_{a, j}^{q, q}) (\hat{m}_{b, j}^{c, c} + \hat{m}_{b, j}^{q, q}) + (\hat{m}_{a, j}^{c, q} + \hat{m}_{a, j}^{q, c}) (\hat{m}_{b, j}^{c, q} + \hat{m}_{b, j}^{q, c}) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S228})$$

where we have introduced the classical-quantum representation,

$$d_{\mu, a}^c(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (d_{\mu, a}^+(t) + d_{\mu, a}^-(t)), \quad d_{\mu, a}^q(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (d_{\mu, a}^+(t) - d_{\mu, a}^-(t)), \quad (\text{S229})$$

and $(l_1, l_2 = +, - \text{ or } c, q)$

$$\hat{m}_{a, j}^{l_1, l_2}[d, \bar{d}] = \sum_{\mu, \nu=\uparrow, \downarrow} \bar{d}_{\mu, a}^{l_1} \hat{\sigma}_j^{\mu\nu} d_{\nu, a}^{l_2}. \quad (\text{S230})$$

In the following, we will perform a saddle point approximation to obtain a semiclassical description of spins, namely the Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert (LLG) equation modified to exhibit non-reciprocal interactions (Eq. (6) in the main text). For this purpose, we introduce a set of auxiliary fields m and Lagrange multipliers λ as

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int \mathcal{D}[d, \bar{d}] e^{i S_{\text{eff}}[d, \bar{d}]} = \int \mathcal{D}[d, \bar{d}] e^{i (S_d^0[d, \bar{d}] + S_\gamma[d, \bar{d}] + S_M[\hat{m}[d, \bar{d}]])} \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}[m] \int \mathcal{D}[d, \bar{d}] \delta(\hat{m}[d, \bar{d}] - m) e^{i (S_d^0[d, \bar{d}] + S_\gamma[d, \bar{d}] + S_M[m])} \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}[m] e^{i S_M[m]} \int \mathcal{D}[\lambda] \int \mathcal{D}[d, \bar{d}] e^{i (S_d^0[d, \bar{d}] + i S_\gamma[d, \bar{d}] + i S_\lambda[\lambda, m, \hat{m}[d, \bar{d}]])} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S231})$$

$$\equiv \int \mathcal{D}[m] e^{i S_M[m]} e^{i S_B[m]} \quad (\text{S232})$$

where

$$S_\lambda[\lambda, m, \hat{m}[d, \bar{d}]] = \int dt \sum_a \sum_{l_1, l_2=q, c} \sum_{j=0}^3 \lambda_{a, j}^{l_1, l_2}(t) [m_{a, j}^{l_1, l_2}(t) - \hat{m}_{a, j}^{l_1, l_2}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)]] \quad (\text{S233})$$

with

$$\lambda_a(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_{a,j}^{q,q}(t) & \lambda_{a,j}^{q,c}(t) \\ \lambda_{a,j}^{c,q}(t) & \lambda_{a,j}^{c,c}(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{m}_a(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{m}_{a,j}^{q,q}(t) & \mathbf{m}_{a,j}^{q,c}(t) \\ \mathbf{m}_{a,j}^{c,q}(t) & \mathbf{m}_{a,j}^{c,c}(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{m}}_a(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{m}}_{a,j}^{q,q}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] & \hat{\mathbf{m}}_{a,j}^{q,c}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] \\ \hat{\mathbf{m}}_{a,j}^{c,q}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] & \hat{\mathbf{m}}_{a,j}^{c,c}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{S234})$$

Note that $\mathbf{m}_a^{c,q}(t) = [\mathbf{m}_a^{q,c}(t)]^*$ and $\lambda_a^{c,q}(t) = [\lambda_a^{q,c}(t)]^*$, where $\mathbf{m}_a^{l_1, l_2} = (m_{a,1}^{l_1, l_2}, m_{a,2}^{l_1, l_2}, m_{a,3}^{l_1, l_2})$ and $\lambda_a^{l_1, l_2} = (\lambda_{a,1}^{l_1, l_2}, \lambda_{a,2}^{l_1, l_2}, \lambda_{a,3}^{l_1, l_2})$. Here, the idea is to replace all \hat{m} 's composed of a product of Grassmann variables with real numbers m .

The physical meaning of $\mathbf{m}_a^{l_1, l_2}(t)$ become clear by taking the saddle point of Eq. (S231) in terms of λ as $0 = \delta S_\lambda[\lambda, m, \hat{m}[d, \bar{d}]]/\delta \lambda_{a,j}^{l_1, l_2}$, or

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} m_{a,j}^{q,q}(t) & m_{a,j}^{q,c}(t) \\ m_{a,j}^{c,q}(t) & m_{a,j}^{c,c}(t) \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \langle \hat{\mathbf{m}}_{a,j}^{q,q}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] \rangle & \langle \hat{\mathbf{m}}_{a,j}^{q,c}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] \rangle \\ \langle \hat{\mathbf{m}}_{a,j}^{c,q}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] \rangle & \langle \hat{\mathbf{m}}_{a,j}^{c,c}[d(t), \bar{d}(t)] \rangle \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \left\langle \sum_{\mu, \nu} \bar{d}_{\mu,a}^q(t) \sigma_j^{\mu, \nu} d_{\nu,a}^q(t) \right\rangle & \left\langle \sum_{\mu, \nu} \bar{d}_{\mu,a}^q(t) \sigma_j^{\mu, \nu} d_{\nu,a}^c(t) \right\rangle \\ \left\langle \sum_{\mu, \nu} \bar{d}_{\mu,a}^c(t) \sigma_j^{\mu, \nu} d_{\nu,a}^q(t) \right\rangle & \left\langle \sum_{\mu, \nu} \bar{d}_{\mu,a}^c(t) \sigma_j^{\mu, \nu} d_{\nu,a}^c(t) \right\rangle \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta(t-t') \left\langle \sum_{\mu, \nu} \sigma_j^{\mu, \nu} \{ \hat{d}_{\mu,a}^\dagger(t), \hat{d}_{\nu,a}(t') \} \right\rangle \Big|_{t' \rightarrow t+\delta} \\ -\theta(t'-t) \left\langle \sum_{\mu, \nu} \sigma_j^{\mu, \nu} \{ \hat{d}_{\mu,a}^\dagger(t), \hat{d}_{\nu,a}(t') \} \right\rangle \Big|_{t' \rightarrow t-\delta} & 2 \left\langle \sum_{\mu, \nu} \hat{d}_{\mu,a}^\dagger(t) \sigma_j^{\mu, \nu} \hat{d}_{\nu,a}(t) \right\rangle \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2m_{a,j} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S235})$$

Here, $\mathbf{m}_a = (m_{a,1}, m_{a,2}, m_{a,3}) = \left\langle \sum_{\mu, \nu} \hat{d}_{\mu,a}^\dagger(t) \sigma^{\mu, \nu} \hat{d}_{\nu,a}(t) \right\rangle$ is the average magnetization of a -site. The off-diagonal component vanishes because the equal-time response function vanishes.

The Berry phase contribution is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{iS_B[m]} &\equiv \int \mathcal{D}[\lambda] \int \mathcal{D}[d, \bar{d}] e^{iS_d^0[d, \bar{d}] + iS_\gamma[d, \bar{d}]} e^{iS_\lambda[\lambda, m, \hat{m}[d, \bar{d}]]} \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}[\lambda] e^{i \int dt \sum_a \sum_{j=0}^3 \sum_{l_1, l_2} \lambda_{a,j}^{l_1, l_2} m_{a,j}^{l_1, l_2}} \int \mathcal{D}[d, \bar{d}] \exp \left[i \int dt \sum_a \Psi_{d,a}^\dagger(t) (\mathbf{G}_{0a}^{-1} - \Sigma_a^\lambda[\lambda_a(t)]) \Psi_{d,a}(t) \right] \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}[\lambda] e^{i \int dt \sum_{l_1, l_2} \lambda_{a,j}^{l_1, l_2} m_{a,j}^{l_1, l_2}} \exp \left[i \cdot (-i) \sum_a \ln \det \left[(-i) (\mathbf{G}_{0a}^{-1} - \Sigma_a^\lambda[\lambda_a(t)]) \right] \right] \\ &\equiv \int \mathcal{D}[\lambda] e^{iS_B^\lambda[\lambda, m]}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S236})$$

where

$$\Psi_{d,a}(t) = (d_{a,\uparrow}^q, d_{a,\downarrow}^q, d_{a,\uparrow}^c, d_{a,\downarrow}^c)^\text{T}, \quad \Psi_{d,a}^\dagger(t) = (\bar{d}_{a,\uparrow}^q, \bar{d}_{a,\downarrow}^q, \bar{d}_{a,\uparrow}^c, \bar{d}_{a,\downarrow}^c). \quad (\text{S237})$$

and

$$\mathbf{G}_{0a}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} -i\gamma_a \hat{n} & (i\partial_t + i\gamma_a n/2) \hat{1} \\ (i\partial_t - i\gamma_a n/2) \hat{1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Sigma_a^\lambda[\lambda_a(t)] = \sum_{j=0}^3 \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_{a,j}^{qq} \hat{\sigma}_j & \lambda_{a,j}^{qc} \hat{\sigma}_j \\ \lambda_{a,j}^{cq} \hat{\sigma}_j & \lambda_{a,j}^{cc} \hat{\sigma}_j \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{S238})$$

and $\mathbf{G}_a^{-1} = \mathbf{G}_{0,a}^{-1} - \Sigma_a$.

We perform a saddle point approximation to the λ integral, i.e.,

$$e^{iS_B[m]} \approx e^{iS_B^\lambda[\lambda=\lambda_0, m]} \quad (\text{S239})$$

where λ_0 is determined from the saddle point condition,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \left. \frac{\delta S_B^\lambda[\lambda, m]}{\delta \lambda_{a,j}^{l_1, l_2}(t)} \right|_{\lambda=\lambda_0} = m_{a,j}^{l_1, l_2}(t) - i \text{Tr} \left[\mathbf{G}_a \frac{\delta \mathbf{G}_a^{-1}}{\delta \lambda_{a,j}^{l_1, l_2}(t)} \right] \Big|_{\lambda=\lambda_0} \\
&= \text{tr}_{\text{sp}}[\hat{\sigma}_j(\mathbf{m}_a^{l_1, l_2}(t) \cdot \hat{\sigma})] \\
&\quad - i \int dt_1 dt_2 \text{tr}_{s, \sigma} \left[\begin{pmatrix} G_a^{q,q}(t_1, t_2) & G_a^{q,c}(t_1, t_2) \\ G_a^{c,q}(t_1, t_2) & G_a^{c,c}(t_1, t_2) \end{pmatrix} \frac{\delta \begin{pmatrix} (G^{-1})_a^{q,q}(t_2, t_1 + 0^+) & (G^{-1})_a^{q,c}(t_2, t_1 + 0^+) \\ (G^{-1})_a^{c,q}(t_2, t_1 + 0^+) & (G^{-1})_a^{c,c}(t_2, t_1 + 0^+) \end{pmatrix}}{\delta \lambda_{a,j}^{l_1, l_2}(t)} \right] \Big|_{\lambda=\lambda_0} \quad (\text{S240})
\end{aligned}$$

Explicit components are computed as follows. For $(l_1, l_2) = (q, q)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \left. \frac{\delta S_B^\lambda[\lambda, m]}{\delta \lambda_{a,j}^{q,q}(t)} \right|_{\lambda=\lambda_0} = \text{tr}_{\text{sp}}[\hat{\sigma}_j(\mathbf{m}_a^{q,q}(t) \cdot \hat{\sigma})] \\
&\quad - i \int dt_1 dt_2 \text{tr}_{s, \sigma} \left[\begin{pmatrix} G_a^{q,q}(t_1, t_2) & G_a^{q,c}(t_1, t_2) \\ G_a^{c,q}(t_1, t_2) & G_a^{c,c}(t_1, t_2) \end{pmatrix} \frac{\delta \begin{pmatrix} (G^{-1})_a^{q,q}(t_2, t_1 + 0^+) & (G^{-1})_a^{q,c}(t_2, t_1 + 0^+) \\ (G^{-1})_a^{c,q}(t_2, t_1 + 0^+) & (G^{-1})_a^{c,c}(t_2, t_1 + 0^+) \end{pmatrix}}{\delta \lambda_{a,j}^{q,q}(t)} \right] \Big|_{\lambda=\lambda_0} \\
&= \text{tr}_{\text{sp}} \left[\left[(\mathbf{m}_a^{q,q}(t) \cdot \hat{\sigma}) + i \int dt_1 \hat{G}_a^{q,q}(t_1, t) \delta(t - t_1 + 0^+) \right] \hat{\sigma}_j \right] \quad (\text{S241})
\end{aligned}$$

As this holds for all $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$, this implies,

$$(\mathbf{m}_a^{q,q}(t) \cdot \hat{\sigma}) + i \int dt_1 \hat{G}_a^{q,q}(t_1, t) \delta(t - t_1 + 0^+) = 0. \quad (\text{S242})$$

For $(l_1, l_2) = (q, c)$,

$$0 = \left. \frac{\delta S_B^\lambda[\lambda, m]}{\delta \lambda_{a,j}^{q,c}(t)} \right|_{\lambda=\lambda_0} = \text{tr}_{\text{sp}} \left[\left[(\mathbf{m}_a^{q,c}(t) \cdot \hat{\sigma}) + i \int dt_1 \hat{G}_a^{q,c}(t_1, t; \lambda) \delta(t - t_1 + 0^+) \right] \hat{\sigma}_j \right] \quad (\text{S243})$$

and so on. Therefore,

$$(\mathbf{m}_a^{q,q}(t) \cdot \hat{\sigma}) + i \int dt_1 \hat{G}_a^{q,q}(t_1, t; \lambda) \delta(t - t_1 + 0^+) = 0, \quad (\text{S244})$$

$$(\mathbf{m}_a^{q,c}(t) \cdot \hat{\sigma}) + i \int dt_1 \hat{G}_a^{q,c}(t_1, t; \lambda) \delta(t - t_1 + 0^+) = 0, \quad (\text{S245})$$

$$(\mathbf{m}_a^{c,q}(t) \cdot \hat{\sigma}) + i \int dt_1 \hat{G}_a^{c,q}(t_1, t; \lambda) \delta(t - t_1 + 0^+) = 0, \quad (\text{S246})$$

$$(\mathbf{m}_a^{c,c}(t) \cdot \hat{\sigma}) + i \int dt_1 \hat{G}_a^{c,c}(t_1, t; \lambda) \delta(t - t_1 + 0^+) = 0, \quad (\text{S247})$$

or

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{m}_a^{q,q}(t) \cdot \hat{\sigma} & \mathbf{m}_a^{c,q}(t) \cdot \hat{\sigma} \\ \mathbf{m}_a^{q,c}(t) \cdot \hat{\sigma} & \mathbf{m}_a^{c,c}(t) \cdot \hat{\sigma} \end{pmatrix} = -i \int dt_1 \begin{pmatrix} \hat{G}_a^{q,q}(t_1, t; \lambda) & \hat{G}_a^{q,c}(t_1, t; \lambda) \\ \hat{G}_a^{c,q}(t_1, t; \lambda) & \hat{G}_a^{c,c}(t_1, t; \lambda) \end{pmatrix} \delta(t - t_1 + 0^+). \quad (\text{S248})$$

We will use Eq. (S235), i.e., $\mathbf{m}_a^{c,c} = 2\mathbf{m}_a$ and $\mathbf{m}_a^{q,q} = \mathbf{m}_a^{c,q} = \mathbf{m}_a^{q,c} = 0$ from below. Applying \hat{G}^{-1} to both sides from the left, one obtains,

$$\left[\begin{pmatrix} -i\gamma_a \hat{1} & (i\partial_t/2 + i\gamma_a n/2) \hat{1} \\ (i\partial_t/2 - i\gamma_a n/2) \hat{1} & 0 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{qq} \cdot \hat{\sigma} & \boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{qc} \cdot \hat{\sigma} \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{cq} \cdot \hat{\sigma} & \boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{cc} \cdot \hat{\sigma} \end{pmatrix} \right] \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{m}_a(t) \cdot \hat{\sigma} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} (-i) \delta(t_1 - t) |_{t_1 \rightarrow t+0^+} \quad (\text{S249})$$

where the left-hand side can be computed as,

$$\text{LHS} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (i\partial_t/2 + i\gamma_a n/2)(\mathbf{m}_a \cdot \hat{\sigma}) \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (\boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{qc} \cdot \hat{\sigma})(\mathbf{m}_a \cdot \hat{\sigma}) \\ 0 & (\boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{cc} \cdot \hat{\sigma})(\mathbf{m}_a \cdot \hat{\sigma}) \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{S250})$$

Similarly, when applying \hat{G}^{-1} from the right, one obtains

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{m}_a(t) \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \end{pmatrix} \left[\begin{pmatrix} -i\gamma_a n \hat{1} & (-i\overleftarrow{\partial}_t/2 + i\gamma_a n/2)\hat{1} \\ (-i\overleftarrow{\partial}_t/2 - i\gamma_a n/2)\hat{1} & 0 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{q,q} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} & \boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{q,c} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{c,q} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} & \boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{c,c} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \end{pmatrix} \right] = \frac{1}{2}(-i)\delta(t_1 - t)|_{t_1 \rightarrow t+0^+} \quad (\text{S251})$$

with

$$\text{LHS} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ (-i\partial_t/2 - i\gamma_a n/2)(\mathbf{m}_a(t) \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) & 0 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ (\mathbf{m}_a(t) \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{c,q} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) & (\mathbf{m}_a(t) \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{c,c} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{S252})$$

Subtracting the two relations yields,

$$\frac{i}{2}(\partial_t + \gamma_a n)(\mathbf{m}_a \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) = (\boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{q,c} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})(\mathbf{m}_a \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) \quad (\text{S253})$$

$$\frac{i}{2}(\partial_t + \gamma_a n)(\mathbf{m}_a \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) = -(\mathbf{m}_a(t) \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{c,q} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) \quad (\text{S254})$$

Note that Eq. (S253) is the complex conjugate of Eq. (S254) (because $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{q,c}(t) = [\boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{c,q}(t)]^*$) and is therefore equivalent. From these two equations, one obtains,

$$i(\partial_t + \gamma_a n)(\mathbf{m}_a \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) = (\boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{q,c} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})(\mathbf{m}_a \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) - (\mathbf{m}_a(t) \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})([\boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{q,c}]^* \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}). \quad (\text{S255})$$

Using

$$\sum_{j=0}^3 f_j \text{tr}_\sigma[\hat{\sigma}_j \hat{\sigma}_i] = 2f_i, \quad (\text{S256})$$

$$i \sum_{l,j,k=1}^3 a_l b_j \epsilon_{ljk} \text{tr}_\sigma[\hat{\sigma}_k \hat{\sigma}_i] = 2i \sum_{l,j,k} a_l b_j \epsilon_{ljk} \delta_{ik} = 2i \sum_{l,j,k} a_l b_j \epsilon_{lji} = 2i(\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b})_i, \quad (\text{S257})$$

we find

$$i(\partial_t + \gamma_a n)\mathbf{m}_a = (\boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{q,c} - [\boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{q,c}]^*) + (\lambda_{a,0}^{q,c} - [\lambda_{a,0}^{q,c}]^*)\mathbf{m}_a + i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{q,c} + [\boldsymbol{\lambda}_a^{q,c}]^*) \times \mathbf{m}_a. \quad (\text{S258})$$

Let us now determine $\lambda_{a,j}^{q,c} (= [\lambda_{a,j}^{c,q}]^*)$ by finding the saddle point of $S_{\text{eff}}[\lambda, m] \equiv S_B^\lambda[\lambda, m] + S_M[m]$ as

$$0 = \frac{\delta S_{\text{eff}}[\lambda, m]}{\delta m_{a,j}^{q,c}(t)} = \lambda_{a,j}^{q,c}(t) + \sum_b \frac{J_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b})}{2} m_{b,j}(t) - \frac{\alpha_a}{2} \frac{dm_{a,j}^{c,c}(t)}{dt} + i \sum_b \frac{\Omega_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b})}{2} m_{b,j}(t), \quad (\text{S259})$$

which gives,

$$\lambda_{a,j}^{q,c}(t) + [\lambda_{a,j}^{q,c}(t)]^* = -\sum_b J_{a,b} m_{b,j}(t) + \alpha_a \frac{dm_{a,j}(t)}{dt} \quad (\text{S260})$$

$$\lambda_{a,j}^{q,c}(t) - [\lambda_{a,j}^{q,c}(t)]^* = -i \sum_b \Omega_{a,b} m_{b,j}(t). \quad (\text{S261})$$

This yields the desired LLG equation modified by the light-induced dissipation

$$\partial_t \mathbf{m}_a = -\gamma_a n \mathbf{m}_a - \sum_{b(\neq a)} \Omega_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}) \mathbf{m}_b(t) - \left[\sum_b J_{a,b}(\mathbf{R}_{a,b}) \mathbf{m}_b(t) - \alpha_a \dot{\mathbf{m}}_a(t) \right] \times \mathbf{m}_a(t), \quad (\text{S262})$$

where we have ignored the dissipative self-interaction $\Omega_{a,a}$. This completes the derivation of Eq. (6) in the main text.