

Reciprocal Reservoir Induced Non-Hermitian Skin Effect

Xin Li,¹ Mohamed Al Begaowe,¹ Shu Zhang,² and Benedetta Flebus¹

¹*Department of Physics, Boston College, 140 Commonwealth Avenue Chestnut Hill, MA 02467, USA*

²*Max Planck Institute for the Physics of Complex Systems, 01187 Dresden, Germany*

(Dated: August 1, 2023)

The non-Hermitian skin effect (NHSE), which describes the localization of macroscopic fraction of eigenstates at a specific boundary, is inherently tied to nonreciprocity. Here, we show that the NHSE can be engineered in an open magnetic system interacting with a reciprocal reservoir, through the interplay between the reservoir-induced coherent and dissipative couplings. Based on a Lindbladian time evolution, we investigate the transient nonreciprocal dynamics along a spin chain and its unidirectional limit, which allow us to reveal both consistency with and limitation of the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian approach. We comment on the connection to the semiclassical dissipative magnetization dynamics, and identify the key ingredients underlying the NHSE in magnetic systems as Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction (DMI) and dissipative coupling, analogous to those in multi-layered magnet-metal heterostructures. Our work suggests the generality of nonreciprocal dynamics in magnetic systems and may inspire new schemes for engineering nonreciprocity in other quantum platforms.

The advent of non-Hermitian notions has drastically extended our understanding of dynamical open systems [1–4]. Non-Hermitian approaches have shown that dissipation, perceived for a long time solely as a foe, can induce far richer and more significant phenomena than finite quasiparticle lifetimes. One of particular interest is the NHSE—a nonreciprocal accumulation of the eigenmodes at open boundaries, which contradicts Bloch band theory and the conventional bulk-boundary correspondence [4, 5]. Heretofore, the NSHE has been proposed and studied in various platforms, including electrical [6] and topoelectrical circuits [7], mechanical metamaterials [8], cold-atom [9], photonic [10, 11], acoustic [12], and magnonic [13] systems, with promising applications in quantum sensing and signal amplification [14–19].

The essence of the NHSE lies in nonreciprocity. On a model level, it is intuitive that a directionally biased particle hopping rate can lead to state accumulation at the preferred boundary. In practice, nonreciprocity typically needs to be engineered in an open system. Taking, e.g., cavity-based photonic systems, this can be achieved using synthetic gauge fields, structured external drives, or chiral damping [20–22]. The growing interest in non-Hermitian physics in magnetic systems makes it highly desirable to develop a clear framework for reservoir engineering of the magnetic NHSE that would shed light on its generality and feasibility [23–33]. The questions are twofold: Further clarification is needed on the minimal physical ingredients required for a magnetic system to exhibit the NHSE and whether it persists in the full Liouvillian dynamics including quantum jumps [22, 34]. Since dissipative magnetization dynamics are often discussed in spintronic platforms, it is worth exploring the connection between the nonreciprocal dynamics therein and the NHSE.

In this work, we show that the magnetic NHSE stems from the interplay between coherent chiral interactions

and dissipative couplings, which can be induced by a reciprocal reservoir [35–37]. The mechanism is then examined in the Lindbladian description of magnon dynamics, where the quantum jumps are included to correctly describe the time evolution of two-point correlation functions. The nonreciprocal dynamics stay valid, though we show that the non-Hermitian approach hinders the timescales reflecting causality and locality [4, 38–40]. We also investigate the connection to the generalized Landau–Lifshitz–Gilbert (LLG) equation, a phenomenological classical equation widely used to study dissipative magnetization dynamics, for example, in a magnetic|metallic heterostructure, and discuss the absence of the unidirectional limit of nonreciprocity in this system.

In an interacting spin system, the coherent chiral interaction can be an effective DMI resulting from inversion-symmetry breaking, and the dissipative coupling naturally arises between spins coupled to a shared reservoir. This suggests that nonreciprocity and the associated NHSE can be statically engineered and commonly exist in open spin systems. Our study also sheds light on the correspondence between quantum and classical modeling of dissipative magnetic dynamics.

Model. The model under consideration is a one-dimensional ($1d$) array of N spins weakly coupled with a common reservoir, as sketched in Fig. 1(a). The reservoir induces a local dissipation for the dynamics of each spin, and it mediates coherent and dissipative couplings between the spins [41]. We capture these effects using a Lindblad master equation for the density matrix ρ of the spin array, which results from perturbatively treating the exchange interactions between the spin system and the reservoir under the Born-Markov approximation, i.e.,

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = -i[\mathcal{H}, \rho] - \mathcal{L}[\rho]. \quad (1)$$

Here the Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} and the Lindblad dissipator $\mathcal{L}[\rho]$




FIG. 1. (a) A 1d array of spins interacting with a shared reservoir. \mathbf{s}_α denotes the spin at the α -th site and a is the lattice constant. (b) The probability density distribution of the first right eigenmode $\psi_{1,\alpha}^R$ (5) with open boundary conditions, and, (c) under periodic conditions, the corresponding eigenenergy loops of the full spectrum in the complex energy plane. We have taken the dissipative coupling as real-valued, $\Gamma = \Gamma^*$. (d) Schematic illustration of the effective coherent coupling $\propto \tilde{J}e^{i\phi} = J + iD$ and the reciprocal dissipative coupling $\propto \Gamma$ mediated by the reservoir.

respectively describe the coherent and dissipative time evolution, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \omega_\alpha \hat{s}_\alpha^z + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\substack{\alpha \neq \beta: \\ \alpha, \beta=1}}^N \left(\hat{s}_\alpha^+ J_{\alpha\beta} \hat{s}_\beta^- + \text{h.c.} \right), \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{L}[\rho] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha, \beta=1}^N \Gamma_{\alpha\beta} \left(\{ \hat{s}_\alpha^- \hat{s}_\beta^+, \rho \} - 2 \hat{s}_\beta^+ \rho \hat{s}_\alpha^- \right). \quad (3)$$

The N spins are originally isolated, with a Zeeman splitting of frequency ω_α at site α . The dimensionless spin operators are defined as $\hat{s}_\alpha^\pm \equiv \hat{s}_\alpha^x \pm i \hat{s}_\alpha^y$. Individually, each spin interacting with the reservoir causes an energy shift, which is absorbed into ω_α , and a local spin relaxation rate $\Gamma_{\alpha\alpha}$. Collectively, for a pair of spins at sites $\alpha \neq \beta$, the shared reservoir mediates a coherent coupling $J_{\alpha\beta}$ and a cooperative decay of rate $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta}$. These parameters are determined by the correlation functions of the degrees of freedom in the reservoir. Since the induced Ising-type interactions $\propto s_\alpha^z s_\beta^z$, giving rising to pure dephasing effects, are dominated by reservoir fluctuations at much lower frequencies [41], we have neglected them assuming a gapped reservoir. In this study, we focus on the zero-temperature limit, where all thermal excitation processes in the reservoir are fully suppressed. However, our results are generally applicable to the finite-temperature regime with the parameters modified accordingly [42].

To clarify the essential features in later discussions, we make the following simplifications. We set the Zeeman frequencies and local relaxation rates to be uniform, $\omega_\alpha = \omega_0$ and $\Gamma_{\alpha\alpha} = \Gamma_0$, and consider the induced couplings between nearest-neighbor sites only: for $\beta = \alpha + 1$, $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta} = \Gamma$ and $J_{\alpha\beta} = J + iD$; for $\beta = \alpha - 1$, $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta} = \Gamma^*$ and $J_{\alpha\beta} = J - iD$. Here, J , D , ω_0 and Γ_0 are purely real and Γ is assumed complex. It is natural to identify J and

D , respectively, as an isotropic XY interaction, assuming an axial symmetry around the z axis in the spin space, and a DMI allowed by a broken inversion symmetry.

Generally, the dissipative coupling Γ is complex. To ensure the stability of the system, the evolution generated by Eq. (3) should be positive semidefinite, implying $\Gamma_0 \geq 2|\Gamma|$ [42, 43]. Physically, this means that the local decay of a spin is sufficiently rapid to dissipate the energy transferred from its neighboring spins [42]. Assuming reciprocity of the correlation functions in the reservoir would impose a vanishing $\text{Im} \Gamma$ [41, 44]. Interestingly, as we will demonstrate below, a real-valued Γ alone is sufficient to induce a non-Hermitian skin effect.

Effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian. We first examine the spin-chain dynamics under an approximated non-Hermitian quadratic Hamiltonian. It is convenient to take a boson (magnon) description by performing the Holstein-Primakoff transformation and approximate the master equation (1) into a quadratic form using $\hat{s}_\alpha^+ \approx \sqrt{2s} \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger$ and $\hat{s}_\alpha^- = -s + \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger \hat{a}_\alpha$, which applies to macrospins with small excitation numbers, i.e. $s \gg 1$ and $n_\alpha \equiv \langle \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger \hat{a}_\alpha \rangle \ll s$. A further approximation of neglecting the quantum jumps ($\sim \hat{a}_\beta^\dagger \rho \hat{a}_\alpha^-$) leads to dynamics governed by a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian of a tight-binding form [42]

$$\mathcal{H}_{nh} = \mathcal{H}_{nh}^0 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N-1} \left(\gamma_L \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger \hat{a}_{\alpha+1} + \gamma_R \hat{a}_{\alpha+1}^\dagger \hat{a}_\alpha \right), \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{nh}^0 = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N (\omega_0 - is\Gamma_0) \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger \hat{a}_\alpha$ captures the effective on-site potential, $\gamma_L \equiv s(J + iD - i\Gamma)$ and $\gamma_R \equiv s(J - iD - i\Gamma^*)$ are the left- and right-hopping amplitudes, respectively. The non-Hermitian Hamiltonian (4) takes a tridiagonal Toeplitz matrix form and the eigenvectors can be solved analytically [42]. For an array of N

macrospins with open boundary conditions, the probability density distribution of the right and left eigenvectors is, respectively,

$$|\psi_{n,\alpha}^R|^2 = \left| \frac{\gamma_R}{\gamma_L} \right|^\alpha \left(\sin \frac{n\alpha\pi}{N+1} \right)^2, \quad (5)$$

$$|\psi_{n,\alpha}^L|^2 = \left| \frac{\gamma_L}{\gamma_R} \right|^\alpha \left(\sin \frac{n\alpha\pi}{N+1} \right)^2, \quad (6)$$

where n labels the eigenmodes. Clearly, when $|\gamma_R/\gamma_L| \neq 1$, the eigenmodes tend to accumulate towards one of the two edges of the array, which is known as the NHSE. The effect is maximized at $J = \pm \text{Im} \Gamma$ and $D = \mp \text{Re} \Gamma$, where the hopping becomes unidirectional and the wavefunctions show a perfect localization at the edge. For $\text{Re} \Gamma = 0$, we have the typical Hatano-Nelson model (without randomness), where the $\text{Im} \Gamma$ provides the nonreciprocal hopping component. In this work, we highlight the (nonreciprocal) skin effect induced by a reciprocal reservoir, and, from now on, impose a real-valued $\Gamma = \Gamma^*$.

The NHSE can be associated with a topological winding number of the complex energy dispersion under the periodic boundary condition [38, 39, 45]. Diagonalizing Eq. (4) in the Fourier space yields $\mathcal{H}_{\text{nh}}(k) = \sum_k \epsilon_k \hat{a}_k^\dagger \hat{a}_k$ [42], with

$$\epsilon_k = 2s [(J - i\Gamma) \cos k - D \sin k], \quad (7)$$

where we have set the equidistance between two nearest spins as $a = 1$ and the on-site potential term as the reference point. Here, we observe a direct correlation between the degree of the edge localization of the bulk states and the circularity of the winding number loop, as shown in Figs. 1(b) and (c), as both are controlled by Γ . The unidirectional limit corresponds to a circular loop (orange curve).

Origin of the NHSE. The NHSE is commonly reported in systems with directional coherent or incoherent interactions, e.g., models with an asymmetry in the left and right coherent hoppings, or with chiral damping [22, 34, 46, 47]. In our model (4), the coherent, $\propto J \pm iD$, and the nonlocal dissipative, $\propto \Gamma$ (real-valued), couplings allow hopping in both directions between two nearest neighbors. It is the balancing between them that yields nonreciprocity, as it can be easily visualized by redefining $J + iD = \tilde{J}e^{i\phi}$ and rewriting Eq. (4) for $\alpha = 1, 2$ as

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_0 & \tilde{J}e^{i\phi} - i\Gamma \\ \tilde{J}e^{-i\phi} - i\Gamma & \epsilon_0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

For $\phi \neq 0$, i.e., $D \neq 0$, the propagation between the two sites is non-reciprocal, while for $\phi = \pm\pi/2$ (i.e., $J = 0$) and $\Gamma = \pm\tilde{J}$ the hopping becomes purely unidirectional.

Our results show that the key ingredients for the emergence of the NHSE in magnetic systems are the nonlocal dissipation and the complex coherent hoppings. At

the level of the magnon Hamiltonian that is expanded with respect to a time-reversal-broken ground state, the DMI breaks time-reversal symmetry (TRS), leading to a nontrivial phase in the coherent hopping that cannot be gauged out [48, 49]. This mechanism underlying nonreciprocity is intimately connected with the reservoir engineering approaches proposed by Refs. [35, 36] for constructing nonreciprocal photonic devices. In these setups, synthetic gauge fields are introduced by using nonlinearities and external drives. In our model and in Ref. [29], effective DMI emerges as a result of an inversion symmetry breaking, suggesting that nonreciprocity can be statically engineered. Furthermore, our finding has the important implication that the NHSE can exist very generally in open magnonic systems: Firstly, DMI commonly exists as part of the exchange interactions either in noncentrosymmetric magnetic systems or at magnetic surfaces. Second, the reservoir can be reciprocal and essentially featureless. Therefore, our discussion here generally applies to an inversion-breaking dissipative magnetic system.

Magnon dynamics. In order to investigate the magnon dynamics through the spin array beyond the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian approach, we derive the equations of motion for magnon operators directly from the master equation (1), retaining the quantum jumps [42]. Under the quadratic approximation of the master equation, the following set of equations are closed, including those of the magnon number operator $n_\alpha \equiv \langle \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger \hat{a}_\alpha \rangle$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \langle \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger \hat{a}_\beta \rangle &= \gamma_0 \langle \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger \hat{a}_\beta \rangle - i\gamma_L \langle \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger \hat{a}_{\beta+1} \rangle - i\gamma_R \langle \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger \hat{a}_{\beta-1} \rangle \\ &\quad + i\gamma_L^* \langle \hat{a}_{\alpha+1}^\dagger \hat{a}_\beta \rangle + i\gamma_R^* \langle \hat{a}_{\alpha-1}^\dagger \hat{a}_\beta \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

with $\gamma_0 = -2s\Gamma_0$. We simulate the time evolution of the magnon number distribution by solving Eq. (9) numerically with an initial state of one magnon excitation at the center of a $N = 9$ spin array and $\langle \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger \hat{a}_\beta \rangle = 0$ for any $\alpha, \beta \neq 5$. The overall dynamics, as shown in Fig. 2(a)-(c) for unidirectional, nonreciprocal, and reciprocal propagation, respectively, is largely consistent with the understanding from the non-Hermitian description. In particular, the unidirectional limit remains, as can be seen directly from the Eq. (9): When $\gamma_R(\gamma_L) = 0$, two-point correlators can only build up to the left (right) during the entire time evolution.

However, an important caveat is revealed in the transient dynamics: a large local dissipation can fully suppress the state accumulation at the system boundary, as depicted by Fig. 2(d). The time and length scales on which the NHSE is observable cannot be captured by the topological properties of the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian, but rather strongly depends on the local dissipation, which can be adjusted by pumping. Moreover, the quantum jumps are necessary for the time-evolution equations of the two-point correlators (9) to




FIG. 2. (a)-(d) The dynamical evolution of the magnon number n_α as a function of time. At time $t = 0$, a magnon resides at the site $\alpha = 5$. (a) For $J = 0$ and $D, \Gamma = 1$ the magnonic excitation propagates only towards the right of the array. (b) Nonreciprocal magnon propagation towards the left and right sides of the array for $J, D, \Gamma = 1$. (c) For $D = 0$ and $\Gamma, J = 1$, the propagation is reciprocal. In (a)-(c), the local dissipation is set to $\Gamma_0 = 2\Gamma$. (d) For a local dissipation $\Gamma_0 \gg D, \Gamma \neq 0$, magnon decay can suppress the spreading, such that no NHSE is observable.

be closed [42], which maintains the inner consistency of the single-quasiparticle dynamics. These results highlight the limitation of an analysis based on non-Hermitian eigenenergies and eigenmodes. [40].

Connection to the classical magnetization dynamics. An analogy can be drawn between our model (1) and the magnetic multilayer sketched in Fig. 3(a), where each magnetic layer interacts with its nearest neighbors via a metallic spacer. In addition to the intrinsic Gilbert damping α_l of the magnetic dynamics, the metallic spacer mediates a nonlocal spin pumping α_{nl} between the long-wavelength magnetization dynamics of adjacent layers [50–53]. The electric Fermi surface in metallic spacer can also mediate an effective coherent RKKY coupling J , with a DMI component D due to interfacial inversion-symmetry breaking [54–59].

A minimal model for the magnetic Hamiltonian of the multilayer can be written as [60]

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{H}} = & - \sum_{\langle \alpha\beta \rangle} [J\mathbf{m}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{m}_\beta + D\hat{\mathbf{z}} \cdot (\mathbf{m}_\alpha \times \mathbf{m}_\beta)] \\ & - \sum_{\alpha} \mu_0 M_s \mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{m}_\alpha, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $\mathbf{H} = H\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ is an externally applied magnetic field oriented along the $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ direction, M_s the saturation magnetization and μ_0 the vacuum permeability. The macrospin dynamics of the magnetization direction \mathbf{m}_α of the α th layer read as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathbf{m}_\alpha}{\partial t} = & - \frac{\gamma}{M_s} \mathbf{m}_\alpha \times \mathbf{H}_{\text{eff},\alpha} + \alpha_l \mathbf{m}_\alpha \times \frac{\partial \mathbf{m}_\alpha}{\partial t} \\ & + \alpha_{nl} \mathbf{m}_\alpha \times \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{m}_{\alpha-1}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{m}_{\alpha+1}}{\partial t} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

with $\mathbf{H}_{\text{eff},\alpha} = -\partial\tilde{\mathcal{H}}/\partial\mathbf{m}_\alpha$ and γ the gyromagnetic ratio. Transformation into a bosonic hopping model reveals an energy spectrum under periodic boundary condition that




FIG. 3. (a) Schematic of a multilayer magnetic array. The metallic spacers can mediate an interlayer DM interaction $\propto D$ and a damping-like spin pumping $\propto \alpha_{nl}$ between nearest neighbor magnetic layers. (b) Elliptical eigenenergy loop in the complex plane [42]. Small effective next nearest neighbor interactions $\propto \alpha_{nl}D, \alpha_{nl}J$ are induced dynamically and preclude fully circular energy loop, even when the nearest neighbor hoppings become unidirectional. We plot the elliptical eigenenergy loop by choosing the local dissipation as $\alpha_l = 0.002$ and the nonlocal dissipation as $\alpha_{nl} = 0.001$.

also forms a closed loop in the complex plane, as shown in Fig. 3(b). The nonzero winding number of the loop reveals a similar nonreciprocity as the NHSE [42].

For a bilayer, a balance between DMI and nonlocal damping, i.e., $D = \pm\alpha_{nl}\mu_0 M_s H$ [42] can yield unidirectional transport [60]. However, a key difference between the non-Hermitian model (4) and Eq. (11) arises for more than two layers: the latter cannot exhibit exact unidirectionality [42]. The nonlocal damping in Eq. (11) is determined for a given layer by the instantaneous dynamic state of the adjacent layers. This effectively establishes a next nearest neighbor and even further interactions [42], which stay active as the nearest-neighbor hopping in one direction can be turned off. Therefore, the dynamics can be nonreciprocal but not unidirectional, as reflected by

the nonvanishing ellipticity of the eigenenergy loop.

Discussion. In this work, we uncover the origin of the NHSE in magnetic systems, which lies in the interplay between nonlocal dissipation and any coherent interaction that breaks the TRS of the magnon Hamiltonian. We develop a master equation framework for coupled magnetization dynamics induced by the reservoir. Finite-temperature and spin pumping effects can be easily integrated into our model by adjusting the relevant parameters accordingly [41, 61]. Our approach highlights the limitations of the winding number in predicting whether a macroscopic accumulation of bulk states at a boundary can physically take place [38, 39, 45]. The mechanism that we uncover is intimately connected with approaches to quantum nonreciprocity at light-matter interfaces [35, 36], for which engineering a nontrivial phase in the nonlocal quantum many-body dynamics requires a combination of external drives. Our results suggests that quantum nonreciprocity in spin ensembles can be engineered at equilibrium via their mutual interactions with a magnetic bath lacking, e.g., inversion or mirror symmetries.

We also establish a link between the NHSE and the classical magnetization dynamics, showing that nonreciprocity (*albeit* not unidirectionality) can be realized by virtue of the same ingredients underlying the NHSE. Our findings, together with the growing interest in non-Hermitian engineering of magnetic systems, call for the development of a more precise connection between the dissipative coupling in the Lindbladian and the nonlocal damping in the classical equations of dissipative magnetic dynamics needs to be established. Finally, non-Markovian effects may also arise in dynamical magnetic systems [62], which go beyond the Lindblad formalism, making this an important topic for further exploration.

Acknowledgments. The authors thank R. A. Duine and J. Marino for helpful discussions. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. NSF DMR-2144086.

-
- [1] Y. Ashida, Z. Gong, and M. Ueda, *Advances in Physics* **69**, 249 (2020).
- [2] C. M. Bender, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **70**, 947 (2007).
- [3] R. El-Ganainy, K. G. Makris, M. Khajavikhan, Z. H. Musslimani, S. Rotter, and D. N. Christodoulides, *Nature Physics* **14**, 11 (2018).
- [4] E. J. Bergholtz, J. C. Budich, and F. K. Kunst, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **93**, 015005 (2021).
- [5] X. Zhang, T. Zhang, M.-H. Lu, and Y.-F. Chen, *Advances in Physics: X* **7**, 2109431 (2022).
- [6] S. Liu, R. Shao, S. Ma, L. Zhang, O. You, H. Wu, Y. J. Xiang, T. J. Cui, and S. Zhang, *Research* (2021).
- [7] T. Hofmann, T. Helbig, F. Schindler, N. Salgo, M. Brzezińska, M. Greiter, T. Kiessling, D. Wolf, A. Vollhardt, A. Kabaši, *et al.*, *Physical Review Research* **2**, 023265 (2020).
- [8] A. Ghatak, M. Brandenbourger, J. Van Wezel, and C. Coullais, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **117**, 29561 (2020).
- [9] Q. Liang, D. Xie, Z. Dong, H. Li, H. Li, B. Gadway, W. Yi, and B. Yan, *Physical review letters* **129**, 070401 (2022).
- [10] L. Xiao, T. Deng, K. Wang, G. Zhu, Z. Wang, W. Yi, and P. Xue, *Nature Physics* **16**, 761 (2020).
- [11] S. Weidemann, M. Kremer, T. Helbig, T. Hofmann, A. Stegmaier, M. Greiter, R. Thomale, and A. Szameit, *Science* **368**, 311 (2020).
- [12] L. Zhang, Y. Yang, Y. Ge, Y.-J. Guan, Q. Chen, Q. Yan, F. Chen, R. Xi, Y. Li, D. Jia, *et al.*, *Nature communications* **12**, 6297 (2021).
- [13] T. Yu, J. Zou, B. Zeng, J. Rao, and K. Xia, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04348* (2023).
- [14] L. Bao, B. Qi, and D. Dong, *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **17**, 014034 (2022).
- [15] J. C. Budich and E. J. Bergholtz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 180403 (2020).
- [16] F. Koch and J. C. Budich, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **4**, 013113 (2022).
- [17] R. El-Ganainy, J. I. Dadap, and R. M. Osgood, *Optics letters* **40**, 5086 (2015).
- [18] T. T. Koutserimpas and R. Fleury, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 087401 (2018).
- [19] Q. Wang, C. Zhu, Y. Wang, B. Zhang, and Y. D. Chong, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 024301 (2022).
- [20] K. Fang, Z. Yu, and S. Fan, *Nature photonics* **6**, 782 (2012).
- [21] L. Ranzani and J. Aumentado, *New Journal of Physics* **17**, 023024 (2015).
- [22] F. Song, S. Yao, and Z. Wang, *Physical review letters* **123**, 170401 (2019).
- [23] X. Li, K. Deng, and B. Flebus, *Physical Review B* **106**, 214432 (2022).
- [24] P. M. Gunnink, B. Flebus, H. M. Hurst, and R. A. Duine, *Phys. Rev. B* **105**, 104433 (2022).
- [25] P. A. McClarty and J. G. Rau, *Physical Review B* **100**, 100405 (2019).
- [26] B. Flebus, R. A. Duine, and H. M. Hurst, *Physical Review B* **102**, 180408 (2020).
- [27] T. Yu and B. Zeng, *Phys. Rev. B* **105**, L180401 (2022).
- [28] H. Yuan, W. Sterk, A. Kamra, and R. A. Duine, *Physical Review B* **106**, 224422 (2022).
- [29] K. Deng and B. Flebus, *Physical Review B* **105**, L180406 (2022).
- [30] H. M. Hurst and B. Flebus, *Journal of Applied Physics* **132**, 220902 (2022).
- [31] K. Deng, X. Li, and B. Flebus, *Physical Review B* **107**, L100402 (2023).
- [32] M. Lu, X.-X. Zhang, and M. Franz, *Physical review letters* **127**, 256402 (2021).
- [33] X. Zhang, L. Jin, and Z. Song, *Physical Review B* **101**, 224301 (2020).
- [34] S. Longhi, *Physical Review B* **102**, 201103 (2020).
- [35] A. Metelmann and A. A. Clerk, *Physical Review X* **5**, 021025 (2015).
- [36] K. Fang, J. Luo, A. Metelmann, M. H. Matheny, F. Marquardt, A. A. Clerk, and O. Painter, *Nature Physics* **13**, 465 (2017).
- [37] A. Clerk, *SciPost Physics Lecture Notes* , 044 (2022).

- [38] D. S. Borgnia, A. J. Kruchkov, and R.-J. Slager, Physical review letters **124**, 056802 (2020).
- [39] N. Okuma, K. Kawabata, K. Shiozaki, and M. Sato, Physical review letters **124**, 086801 (2020).
- [40] G. Lee, A. McDonald, and A. Clerk, arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.14212 (2022).
- [41] J. Zou, S. Zhang, and Y. Tserkovnyak, Physical Review B **106**, L180406 (2022).
- [42] *See Supplementary material.*
- [43] H.-P. Breuer, F. Petruccione, *et al.*, *The theory of open quantum systems* (Oxford University Press on Demand, 2002).
- [44] A. Seif, Y.-X. Wang, and A. A. Clerk, Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 070402 (2022).
- [45] K. Zhang, Z. Yang, and C. Fang, Physical Review Letters **125**, 126402 (2020).
- [46] Y. Yi and Z. Yang, Physical Review Letters **125**, 186802 (2020).
- [47] C.-H. Liu, K. Zhang, Z. Yang, and S. Chen, arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.02617 (2020).
- [48] S. K. Kim, H. Ochoa, R. Zarzuela, and Y. Tserkovnyak, Physical review letters **117**, 227201 (2016).
- [49] J. Koch, A. A. Houck, K. Le Hur, and S. Girvin, Physical Review A **82**, 043811 (2010).
- [50] M. M. Subedi, K. Deng, Y. Xiong, J. Mongeon, M. T. Hossain, P. Meisenheimer, E. Zhou, J. Heron, M. B. Jungfleisch, W. Zhang, B. Flebus, and J. Sklenar, Magnon-magnon interactions induced by spin pumping-driven symmetry breaking in synthetic antiferromagnets (2023).
- [51] Y. Tserkovnyak, A. Brataas, and G. E. W. Bauer, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 224403 (2002).
- [52] Y. Tserkovnyak, A. Brataas, G. E. W. Bauer, and B. I. Halperin, Rev. Mod. Phys. **77**, 1375 (2005).
- [53] Y. Tserkovnyak, A. Brataas, and G. E. W. Bauer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 117601 (2002).
- [54] Y.-H. Huang, C.-C. Huang, W.-B. Liao, T.-Y. Chen, and C.-F. Pai, Physical Review Applied **18**, 034046 (2022).
- [55] K. Di, V. L. Zhang, H. S. Lim, S. C. Ng, M. H. Kuok, J. Yu, J. Yoon, X. Qiu, and H. Yang, Physical review letters **114**, 047201 (2015).
- [56] B. Ma, B. Flebus, and G. A. Fiete, Physical Review B **101**, 035104 (2020).
- [57] D.-S. Han, K. Lee, J.-P. Hanke, Y. Mokrousov, K.-W. Kim, W. Yoo, Y. L. Van Hees, T.-W. Kim, R. Lavrijsen, C.-Y. You, *et al.*, Nature materials **18**, 703 (2019).
- [58] A. Fernández-Pacheco, E. Vedmedenko, F. Ummelen, R. Mansell, D. Petit, and R. P. Cowburn, Nature materials **18**, 679 (2019).
- [59] C. O. Avci, C.-H. Lambert, G. Sala, and P. Gambardella, Physical review letters **127**, 167202 (2021).
- [60] H. Yuan, R. Lavrijsen, and R. Duine, Physical Review B **107**, 024418 (2023).
- [61] O. Chelpanova, A. Leroise, S. Zhang, I. Carusotto, Y. Tserkovnyak, and J. Marino, arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.04509 (2021).
- [62] S. K. Kim, O. Tchernyshyov, V. Galitski, and Y. Tserkovnyak, Phys. Rev. B **97**, 174433 (2018).
-

Supplemental material: “Reciprocal Reservoir Induced Non-Hermitian Skin Effect”

X. Li, M. Al Begaowe, S. Zhang and B. Flebus

S1. MASTER EQUATION FRAMEWORK

The complete Lindbladian

In the main text, we have neglected the influence of thermal and dephasing effects in the Lindblad dissipator (3). Here, we present the complete Lindblad dissipator as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}[\rho] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha, \beta=1}^N \Gamma_{\alpha\beta} \left[\left(\{\hat{s}_\alpha^- \hat{s}_\beta^+, \rho\} - 2\hat{s}_\beta^+ \rho \hat{s}_\alpha^- \right) + \tilde{\Gamma}_{\alpha\beta} \left(\{\hat{s}_\alpha^+ \hat{s}_\beta^-, \rho\} - 2\hat{s}_\beta^- \rho \hat{s}_\alpha^+ \right) + \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^z \left(\{\hat{s}_\alpha^z \hat{s}_\beta^z, \rho\} - 2\hat{s}_\beta^z \rho \hat{s}_\alpha^z \right) \right], \quad (\text{S1})$$

where the Hermiticity of the density matrix ρ implies $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta} = \Gamma_{\beta\alpha}^*$, $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\alpha\beta} = \tilde{\Gamma}_{\beta\alpha}^*$ and $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^z = \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^z$. While generally the coefficients $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta}$, $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^z$ in (S1) can be complex, for $\alpha = \beta$ they are real. At thermal equilibrium, the fluctuation-dissipation theorem dictates $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\alpha\beta} = e^{-\beta\hbar\omega_0} \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}$ and, thus, one has $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow 0$ for $T \rightarrow 0$. The terms $\propto \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^z$ capture dephasing effects, which are dominated by low-frequency (dc-like) response of the reservoir and can be neglected for a gapped reservoir.

Positive semidefiniteness of the decoherence matrix

The positive semidefinite decoherence matrix $\mathbf{\Gamma}$, whose entries correspond to the coefficients $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta}$ in Eq. (3), encodes the effect of the reservoir on the spin system. It takes the form of a tridiagonal Toeplitz matrix, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{\Gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_0 & \Gamma & & & & & \\ \Gamma^* & \Gamma_0 & \Gamma & & & & \\ & \Gamma^* & \ddots & \ddots & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \Gamma & & \\ & & & \Gamma^* & \Gamma_0 & \Gamma & \\ & & & & \Gamma^* & \Gamma_0 & \end{pmatrix}_{N \times N}, \quad (\text{S2})$$

which can be diagonalized to obtain the eigenvalues:

$$\gamma_n = \Gamma_0 + 2|\Gamma| \cos \frac{n\pi}{N+1}, \quad (\text{S3})$$

with $n = 1, \dots, N$. For an infinitely-long spin chain, i.e., $N \rightarrow \infty$, the requirement of positive semidefiniteness $\gamma_n \geq 0$ implies $\Gamma_0 \geq 2|\Gamma|$.

Derivation of the effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian

For macrospins with small excitation numbers, i.e., $s = |\mathbf{s}|/\hbar \gg 1$ and $n_\alpha \equiv \langle \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger \hat{a}_\alpha \rangle \ll s$, we can invoke the Holstein Primakoff (HP) transformation, i.e.,

$$\hat{s}_\alpha^z = -s + \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger \hat{a}_\alpha, \quad \hat{s}_\alpha^+ \approx \sqrt{2s} \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger, \quad \hat{s}_\alpha^- \approx \sqrt{2s} \hat{a}_\alpha, \quad (\text{S4})$$

where \hat{a}_α^\dagger and \hat{a}_α are, respectively, the magnon creation and annihilation operators satisfying the following commuting relations:

$$[\hat{a}_\alpha, \hat{a}_\beta] = \hat{a}_\alpha \hat{a}_\beta - \hat{a}_\beta \hat{a}_\alpha = 0, \quad [\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger, \hat{a}_\beta^\dagger] = \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger \hat{a}_\beta^\dagger - \hat{a}_\beta^\dagger \hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger = 0, \quad [\hat{a}_\alpha, \hat{a}_\beta^\dagger] = \hat{a}_\alpha \hat{a}_\beta^\dagger - \hat{a}_\beta^\dagger \hat{a}_\alpha = \delta_{\alpha\beta}. \quad (\text{S5})$$

Focusing only on nearest-neighbor (NN) interactions, we can rewrite the coherent coupling Hamiltonian (2) in terms of magnon operators as

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \omega_0 \hat{a}_{\alpha}^{\dagger} \hat{a}_{\alpha} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N-1} \left[s(J - iD) \hat{a}_{\alpha+1}^{\dagger} \hat{a}_{\alpha} + h.c. \right], \quad (\text{S6})$$

where $h.c.$ stands for the corresponding Hermitian conjugate terms. Similarly, the Lindblad dissipator $\mathcal{L}[\rho]$ given in Eq. (3) can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{L}[\rho] = i[\mathcal{H}', \rho] - \sum_{\alpha=1}^N s\Gamma_0 \hat{a}_{\alpha}^{\dagger} \rho \hat{a}_{\alpha} - \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N-1} (2s\Gamma \hat{a}_{\alpha+1}^{\dagger} \rho \hat{a}_{\alpha} + h.c.), \quad (\text{S7})$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}' = - \sum_{\alpha=1}^N is\Gamma_0 \hat{a}_{\alpha}^{\dagger} \hat{a}_{\alpha} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N-1} \left(-is\Gamma \hat{a}_{\alpha+1}^{\dagger} \hat{a}_{\alpha} - h.c. \right), \quad (\text{S8})$$

and $[\mathcal{H}', \rho] = \mathcal{H}'\rho - \rho\mathcal{H}'^{\dagger}$. The first term on the right-hand-side of Eq. (S7) introduces an effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}' and the remaining terms are the quantum jump operators. Plugging Eq. (S7) into Eq. (1) while neglecting the quantum jump terms, we obtain

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = -i[\mathcal{H}_{nh}, \rho], \quad (\text{S9})$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{nh} = \mathcal{H} + \mathcal{H}'$ is the effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian (4) in the main text.

Diagonalization of the effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian

In the non-unidirectional case, $\gamma_L\gamma_R \neq 0$, the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian (4) is a tridiagonal Toeplitz form matrix,

$$\mathcal{H}_{nh} = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_0 & \gamma_L & & & & \\ \gamma_R & \epsilon_0 & \gamma_L & & & \\ & \gamma_R & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \gamma_L & \\ & & & \gamma_R & \epsilon_0 & \gamma_L \\ & & & & \gamma_R & \epsilon_0 \end{pmatrix}_{N \times N}. \quad (\text{S10})$$

Diagonalizing Eq. (S10), we obtain a series of eigenvalues:

$$\lambda_n = \epsilon_0 + 2\sqrt{\gamma_L\gamma_R} \cos \frac{n\pi}{N+1}, \quad n = 1, \dots, N, \quad (\text{S11})$$

and the corresponding right and left eigenvectors

$$|\Psi_n^R\rangle = (\psi_{n,1}^R, \dots, \psi_{n,\alpha}^R, \dots, \psi_{n,N}^R)^T, \quad |\Psi_n^L\rangle = (\psi_{n,1}^L, \dots, \psi_{n,\alpha}^L, \dots, \psi_{n,N}^L)^T, \quad (\text{S12})$$

with

$$\psi_{n,\alpha}^R = \left(\frac{\gamma_R}{\gamma_L} \right)^{\alpha/2} \sin \frac{n\alpha\pi}{N+1}, \quad \psi_{n,\alpha}^L = \left(\frac{\gamma_L^*}{\gamma_R^*} \right)^{\alpha/2} \sin \frac{n\alpha\pi}{N+1}, \quad n, \alpha = 1, \dots, N, \quad (\text{S13})$$

from which it is straightforward to derive Eqs. (5) and (6). On the other hand, if the system satisfies the unidirectional condition, i.e., $\gamma_L = 0$ or $\gamma_R = 0$, the Hamiltonian (4) reduces to a Jordan block of size N ,

$$\mathcal{H}_{nh}^L = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_0 & \gamma_L & & & & \\ 0 & \epsilon_0 & \gamma_L & & & \\ & 0 & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \gamma_L & \\ & & & 0 & \epsilon_0 & \gamma_L \\ & & & & 0 & \epsilon_0 \end{pmatrix}_{N \times N}, \quad \mathcal{H}_{nh}^R = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_0 & 0 & & & & \\ \gamma_R & \epsilon_0 & 0 & & & \\ & \gamma_R & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & 0 & \\ & & & \gamma_R & \epsilon_0 & 0 \\ & & & & \gamma_R & \epsilon_0 \end{pmatrix}_{N \times N}. \quad (\text{S14})$$

The Jordan block form Hamiltonians (S14) are non-diagonalizable, but we can directly read off the only eigenvalue with N multiplicity for both \mathcal{H}_{nh}^L and \mathcal{H}_{nh}^R , i.e., $\lambda = \epsilon_0$, and the corresponding right and left eigenvectors as

$$|\Psi_L^R\rangle = (1, 0, \dots, 0)^T, \quad |\Psi_L^L\rangle = (0, \dots, 0, 1)^T, \quad (\text{S15})$$

for \mathcal{H}_{nh}^L , and

$$|\Psi_R^R\rangle = (0, \dots, 0, 1)^T, \quad |\Psi_R^L\rangle = (1, 0, \dots, 0)^T, \quad (\text{S16})$$

for \mathcal{H}_{nh}^R . Equations (S15) and (S16) show that, under the unidirectional condition, the eigenmodes will exactly only reside at one of boundaries.

Winding number loops for the macrospin array

In Eq. (7), we have obtained the spectrum $\epsilon_k = \text{Re}[\epsilon_k] + i\text{Im}[\epsilon_k]$, where $\text{Re}[\epsilon_k] = 2s(J \cos k - D \sin k)$ and $\text{Im}[\epsilon_k] = -2s\Gamma \cos k$ denote the real and imaginary parts, respectively. For vanishing DMI and finite symmetric exchange interactions and nonlocal dissipation, i.e., $D = 0$ and $J, \Gamma \neq 0$, the real and imaginary energies satisfy a linear relationship, i.e.,

$$\text{Re}[\epsilon_k] = -\frac{J}{\Gamma} \text{Im}[\epsilon_k], \quad (\text{S17})$$

pointing to the absence of the non-Hermitian skin effect. In the general case, i.e., $D, J, \Gamma \neq 0$, the winding number loop obeys the equation of an elliptical curve:

$$\frac{1}{4D^2} (\text{Re}[\epsilon_k])^2 + \frac{J}{2D^2\Gamma} \text{Re}[\epsilon_k] \text{Im}[\epsilon_k] + \frac{J^2 + D^2}{4D^2\Gamma^2} (\text{Im}[\epsilon_k])^2 = 1. \quad (\text{S18})$$

When the system satisfies the unidirectionality condition, i.e., $J = 0$ and $D = \pm\Gamma$, the ellipse (S18) simplifies to a circle, i.e.,

$$(\text{Re}[\epsilon_k])^2 + (\text{Im}[\epsilon_k])^2 = 4D^2. \quad (\text{S19})$$

Derivation of the dynamical equations

In the Schrödinger picture, the dynamical behaviours of the expectation value of a general operator $\langle \hat{\mathcal{O}} \rangle \equiv \text{Tr}(\hat{\mathcal{O}}\rho)$ are governed by the following equation:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \text{Tr} \left(\hat{\mathcal{O}} \frac{d}{dt} \rho \right) = -i \langle [\hat{\mathcal{O}}, \mathcal{H}] \rangle - \text{Tr} \left(\hat{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{L}[\rho] \right). \quad (\text{S20})$$

We first investigate the dynamical evolution of the one-body magnon operators by replacing $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ with \hat{a}_α in Eq. (S20), i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} -i \langle [\hat{a}_\alpha, \mathcal{H}] \rangle &= -i \sum_{\alpha'} \omega_0 \langle \hat{a}_\alpha \hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\alpha'} \rangle - is \sum_{\alpha'} (J + iD) \langle \hat{a}_\alpha \hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\alpha'+1} \rangle - is \sum_{\alpha'} (J - iD) \langle \hat{a}_\alpha \hat{a}_{\alpha'+1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\alpha'} \rangle \\ &\quad + i \sum_{\alpha'} \omega_0 \langle \hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\alpha'} \hat{a}_\alpha \rangle + is \sum_{\alpha'} (J + iD) \langle \hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\alpha'+1} \hat{a}_\alpha \rangle + is \sum_{\alpha'} (J - iD) \langle \hat{a}_{\alpha'+1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\alpha'} \hat{a}_\alpha \rangle, \\ &= -i\omega_0 \langle \hat{a}_\alpha \rangle - is(J + iD) \langle \hat{a}_{\alpha+1} \rangle - is(J - iD) \langle \hat{a}_{\alpha-1} \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S21})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} -\text{Tr}(\hat{a}_\alpha \mathcal{L}[\rho]) &= -s \sum_{\alpha'} \Gamma_0 \left(\langle \hat{a}_\alpha \hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\alpha'} \rangle + \langle \hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\alpha'} \hat{a}_\alpha \rangle - 2 \langle \hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger \hat{a}_\alpha \hat{a}_{\alpha'} \rangle \right) \\ &\quad -s \sum_{\alpha'} \Gamma \left(\langle \hat{a}_\alpha \hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\alpha'+1} \rangle + \langle \hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\alpha'+1} \hat{a}_\alpha \rangle - 2 \langle \hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger \hat{a}_\alpha \hat{a}_{\alpha'+1} \rangle \right) \\ &\quad -s \sum_{\alpha'} \Gamma \left(\langle \hat{a}_\alpha \hat{a}_{\alpha'+1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\alpha'} \rangle + \langle \hat{a}_{\alpha'+1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\alpha'} \hat{a}_\alpha \rangle - 2 \langle \hat{a}_{\alpha'+1}^\dagger \hat{a}_\alpha \hat{a}_{\alpha'} \rangle \right), \\ &= -s\Gamma_0 \langle \hat{a}_\alpha \rangle - s\Gamma \langle \hat{a}_{\alpha+1} \rangle - s\Gamma \langle \hat{a}_{\alpha-1} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S22})$$

Combing Eqs. (S21) and (S22), we find

$$\frac{d}{dt}\langle\hat{a}_\alpha\rangle = -(i\omega_0 + s\Gamma_0)\langle\hat{a}_\alpha\rangle - i\gamma_L\langle\hat{a}_{\alpha+1}\rangle - i\gamma_R\langle\hat{a}_{\alpha-1}\rangle, \quad (\text{S23})$$

with $\gamma_L \equiv s(J + iD - i\Gamma)$ and $\gamma_R \equiv s(J - iD - i\Gamma^*)$. Here, we focus on the scenario where, initially, only one magnon at the center of the macrospin array is excited, and all the expectation values of the single magnon operators are vanishing, i.e., $\langle\hat{a}_\alpha\rangle_{t=0} = 0$. Accordingly, the linear Eqs. (S23) do not possess nontrivial solutions.

We can derive the equation governing the dynamical evolution of the expectation values of the two-body magnon operators, i.e., $\langle\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\rangle$, as

$$\frac{d}{dt}\langle\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\rangle = -i\langle[\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta, \mathcal{H}]\rangle - \text{Tr}(\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\mathcal{L}[\rho]). \quad (\text{S24})$$

The first term on the right-hand-side of Eq. (S24) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} -i\langle[\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta, \mathcal{H}]\rangle &= i\sum_{\alpha'}\omega_0\langle\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger\hat{a}_{\alpha'}\rangle - is\sum_{\alpha'}(J+iD)\langle\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger\hat{a}_{\alpha'+1}\rangle - is\sum_{\alpha'}(J-iD)\langle\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\hat{a}_{\alpha'+1}^\dagger\hat{a}_{\alpha'}\rangle \\ &\quad -i\sum_{\alpha'}\omega_0\langle\hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger\hat{a}_{\alpha'}\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\rangle + is\sum_{\alpha'}(J+iD)\langle\hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger\hat{a}_{\alpha'+1}\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\rangle + is\sum_{\alpha'}(J-iD)\langle\hat{a}_{\alpha'+1}^\dagger\hat{a}_{\alpha'}\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\rangle, \\ &= is(J-iD)\left[\langle\hat{a}_{\alpha+1}^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\rangle - \langle\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_{\beta-1}\rangle\right] + is(J+iD)\left[\langle\hat{a}_{\alpha-1}^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\rangle - \langle\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_{\beta+1}\rangle\right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S25})$$

In order to determine how the quantum jump terms, $\propto \hat{a}_\beta^\dagger\rho\hat{a}_\alpha^-$, affect the dynamical evolution of the two-point correlations $\langle\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\rangle$, we expand the second term on the right-hand-side of Eq. (S24) as

$$\begin{aligned} -\text{Tr}(\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\mathcal{L}[\rho]) &= -s\sum_{\alpha'}\Gamma_0\left(\langle\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger\hat{a}_{\alpha'}\rangle + \langle\hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger\hat{a}_{\alpha'}\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\rangle - 2\langle\hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\hat{a}_{\alpha'}\rangle\right) \\ &\quad -s\sum_{\alpha'}\Gamma\left(\langle\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger\hat{a}_{\alpha'+1}\rangle + \langle\hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger\hat{a}_{\alpha'+1}\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\rangle - 2\langle\hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\hat{a}_{\alpha'+1}\rangle\right) \\ &\quad -s\sum_{\alpha'}\Gamma\left(\langle\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger\hat{a}_{\alpha'-1}\rangle + \langle\hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger\hat{a}_{\alpha'-1}\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\rangle - 2\langle\hat{a}_{\alpha'}^\dagger\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\hat{a}_{\alpha'-1}\rangle\right) \\ &= -2s\Gamma_0\langle\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\rangle - s\Gamma\langle\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_{\beta+1}\rangle - s\Gamma^*\langle\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_{\beta-1}\rangle - s\Gamma^*\langle\hat{a}_{\alpha+1}^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\rangle - s\Gamma\langle\hat{a}_{\alpha-1}^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S26})$$

Combining Eq. (S25) and Eq. (S26) we obtain the dynamical equation given in Eq. (9), i.e.,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\langle\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\rangle = \gamma_0\langle\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\rangle - i\gamma_L\langle\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_{\beta+1}\rangle - i\gamma_R\langle\hat{a}_\alpha^\dagger\hat{a}_{\beta-1}\rangle + i\gamma_L^*\langle\hat{a}_{\alpha+1}^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\rangle + i\gamma_R^*\langle\hat{a}_{\alpha-1}^\dagger\hat{a}_\beta\rangle. \quad (\text{S27})$$

Note that the quantum jump terms are necessary to cancel the four-point correlators and obtain a closed set of equations of motion on the quadratic level. To go beyond single-quasiparticle dynamics and study nonlinear effects, one should keep the $\mathcal{O}(1/s)$ or higher orders in the Holstein-Primakoff expansion of the master equation, which generates a cumulant hierarchy in the equations of motion of the correlators.

S2. CLASSICAL MAGNETIZATION DYNAMICS

Equation (11) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial\mathbf{m}_\alpha}{\partial t} &= -\frac{\gamma J}{M_s}\mathbf{m}_\alpha \times (\mathbf{m}_{\alpha-1} + \mathbf{m}_{\alpha+1}) + \frac{\gamma}{M_s}\mathbf{m}_\alpha \times [(\mathbf{m}_{\alpha+1} \times \mathbf{D}) - (\mathbf{m}_{\alpha-1} \times \mathbf{D})] - \gamma\mu_0\mathbf{m}_\alpha \times \mathbf{H} \\ &\quad + \alpha_l\mathbf{m}_\alpha \times \frac{\partial\mathbf{m}_\alpha}{\partial t} + \alpha_{nl}\mathbf{m}_\alpha \times \frac{\partial\mathbf{m}_{\alpha-1}}{\partial t} + \alpha_{nl}\mathbf{m}_\alpha \times \frac{\partial\mathbf{m}_{\alpha+1}}{\partial t}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S28})$$

For small fluctuations of the magnetic order parameter around the equilibrium direction, i.e., $\mathbf{m}_\alpha = (m_\alpha^x, m_\alpha^y, 1)$ with $|m_\alpha^{x(y)}| \ll 1$, we can simplify Eq. (S28) by only retaining terms linear in m_α^x and m_α^y . Similarly, for $\alpha_l, \alpha_{nl} \ll 1$, terms

of second or higher order in these parameters can be neglected. Then, invoking the Holstein-Primakoff transformation, i.e., $\langle \hat{a}_\alpha \rangle \equiv m_\alpha^x + im_\alpha^y$, Eq. (S28) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \hat{a}_\alpha}{\partial t} \approx & + \frac{\gamma}{M_s} \left\{ \left[(i - \alpha_l) (2J + \mu_0 M_s H) + 2J \alpha_{nl} \right] \hat{a}_\alpha + \left[(-i + \alpha_l) (J - iD) - \alpha_{nl} (2J + \mu_0 M_s H) \right] \hat{a}_{\alpha-1} \right. \\ & \left. + \left[(-i + \alpha_l) (J + iD) - \alpha_{nl} (2J + \mu_0 M_s H) \right] \hat{a}_{\alpha+1} + \alpha_{nl} (J - iD) \hat{a}_{\alpha-2} + \alpha_{nl} (J + iD) \hat{a}_{\alpha+2} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S29})$$

As shown by the last two terms on the right-hand-side of Eq. (S29), the nonlocal dissipation terms, i.e., $\alpha_{nl} \mathbf{m}_\alpha \times \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{m}_{\alpha-1}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{m}_{\alpha+1}}{\partial t} \right)$, gives rise to effective next nearest neighbor (NNN) interactions. For a bilayer, i.e., $N = 2$, Eq. (S29) simplifies to

$$\frac{\partial \hat{a}_1}{\partial t} = \frac{\gamma}{M_s} \left\{ \left[(i - \alpha_l) (2J + \mu_0 M_s H) + 2J \alpha_{nl} \right] \hat{a}_1 + \left[(-i + \alpha_l) (J + iD) - \alpha_{nl} (2J + \mu_0 M_s H) \right] \hat{a}_2 \right\}, \quad (\text{S30})$$

$$\frac{\partial \hat{a}_2}{\partial t} = \frac{\gamma}{M_s} \left\{ \left[(i - \alpha_l) (2J + \mu_0 M_s H) + 2J \alpha_{nl} \right] \hat{a}_2 + \left[(-i + \alpha_l) (J - iD) - \alpha_{nl} (2J + \mu_0 M_s H) \right] \hat{a}_1 \right\}. \quad (\text{S31})$$

To achieve unidirectional transport, the second terms on the right-hand-side of Eqs. (S30) or (S31) must vanish, i.e.,

$$J = \pm \alpha_l D, \quad D = \pm \alpha_{nl} \mu_0 M_s H (1 + \alpha_l^2 - 2\alpha_{nl} \alpha_l)^{-1}, \quad (\text{S32})$$

where the positive and negative signs correspond to the unidirectionality of Eqs. (S30) and (S31), respectively. Recalling the condition $\alpha_{nl}, \alpha_l \ll 1$, Eqs. (S32) can be simplified to

$$J = 0, \quad D = \pm \alpha_{nl} \mu_0 M_s H. \quad (\text{S33})$$

However, for magnetic multilayers with $N \geq 3$, unidirectionality cannot be achieved due to the emergence of effective NNN couplings. This can be shown explicitly by considering Eq. (S29) in the limit of an infinitely-long spin chain, i.e., $N \rightarrow \infty$. Invoking the Heisenberg equation of motion, i.e., $d\hat{a}/dt = -i[\hat{a}, \mathcal{H}]$, and performing a Fourier transform, one can derive an effective Hamiltonian in momentum space, whose spectrum $\tilde{\varepsilon}_k$ reads as

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_k = -\frac{\gamma}{M_s} \left[1 + i(\alpha_l + 2\alpha_{nl} \cos k) \right] \left[J(1 - \cos k) + \mu_0 H M_s + D \sin k \right]. \quad (\text{S34})$$

Plugging the unidirectionality condition (S33) into Eq. (S34) yields

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_k = -\gamma \mu_0 H \left[(1 \pm \alpha_{nl} \sin k) + i(\alpha_l + 2\alpha_{nl} \cos k) \right]. \quad (\text{S35})$$

For simplicity, we normalize Eq. (S35) by dividing $-\gamma \mu_0 H$ on both sides, i.e., $\varepsilon = \tilde{\varepsilon}_k / (-\gamma \mu_0 H)$. It is then straightforward to determine the relationship between the real and imaginary parts as

$$\frac{(\text{Re}[\varepsilon_k] - 1)^2}{\alpha_{nl}^2} + \frac{(\text{Im}[\varepsilon_k] - \alpha_l)^2}{4\alpha_{nl}^2} = 1. \quad (\text{S36})$$

One can readily recognize Eq. (S36) as describing an ellipse rather than a circle, indicating the absence of unidirectionality but the presence of nonreciprocity.