

On the Direct Construction of MDS and Near-MDS Matrices

Kishan Chand Gupta¹, Sumit Kumar Pandey², and Susanta Samanta³

¹ Applied Statistics Unit, Indian Statistical Institute,
203, B.T. Road, Kolkata-700108, INDIA.
kishan@isical.ac.in

² Computer Science and Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Jammu,
Jagti, PO Nagrota, Jammu-181221, INDIA.
emailpandey@gmail.com

³ Applied Statistics Unit, Indian Statistical Institute,
203, B.T. Road, Kolkata-700108, INDIA.
susantas_r@isical.ac.in

Abstract. The optimal branch number of MDS matrices makes them a preferred choice for designing diffusion layers in many block ciphers and hash functions. Consequently, various methods have been proposed for designing MDS matrices, including search and direct methods. While exhaustive search is suitable for small order MDS matrices, direct constructions are preferred for larger orders due to the vast search space involved. In the literature, there has been extensive research on the direct construction of MDS matrices using both recursive and nonrecursive methods. On the other hand, in lightweight cryptography, Near-MDS (NMDS) matrices with sub-optimal branch numbers offer a better balance between security and efficiency as a diffusion layer compared to MDS matrices. However, no direct construction method is available in the literature for constructing recursive NMDS matrices. This paper introduces some direct constructions of NMDS matrices in both nonrecursive and recursive settings. Additionally, it presents some direct constructions of nonrecursive MDS matrices from the generalized Vandermonde matrices. We propose a method for constructing involutory MDS and NMDS matrices using generalized Vandermonde matrices. Furthermore, we prove some folklore results that are used in the literature related to the NMDS code.

Keywords: Diffusion Layer · MDS matrix · Near-MDS matrix · Companion matrix · Vandermonde matrix.

1 Introduction

The concept of confusion and diffusion, introduced by Shannon [29], is commonly employed in the design of symmetric key cryptographic primitives. Typically, the round function of such designs uses both non-linear and linear layers to achieve confusion and diffusion, respectively. The focus of this paper is on the

construction of linear diffusion layers that maximize the spreading of internal dependencies. One way to formalize the concept of perfect diffusion is through the use of multipermutations, which are introduced in [28,34]. Another way to define it is using *Maximum Distance Separable* (MDS) matrices [3]. Due to the optimal branch number of MDS matrices, many block ciphers and hash functions use them in their diffusion layers. In the literature, there has been extensive study of constructing MDS matrices, and we can categorize the approaches of constructing MDS matrices mainly in two ways: nonrecursive and recursive. In nonrecursive constructions, the constructed matrices are themselves MDS. Whereas in recursive constructions, we generally start with a sparse matrix A of order n , with a proper choice of elements such that A^n is an MDS matrix.

The advantage of *recursive MDS* matrices is that they are particularly well suited for lightweight implementations: the diffusion layer can be implemented by recursively executing the implementation of the sparse matrices, requiring some clock cycles. Recursive MDS matrices based on the companion matrices were used in the PHOTON [8] family of hash functions and LED block cipher [9] because companion matrices can be implemented by a simple LFSR.

One can again classify the techniques used to construct MDS matrices based on whether the matrix is constructed directly or a search method by enumerating some search space. While an exhaustive search may be appropriate for finding small order MDS matrices, direct constructions are favored for higher orders, owing to the enormous search space.

In the literature, there has been extensive research on the direct construction of MDS matrices using both recursive and nonrecursive methods. Nonrecursive direct constructions mainly rely on Cauchy and Vandermonde based constructions [10,16,19,20,24,27], while recursive direct constructions are obtained through certain coding-theoretic methods. Augot et al. [1] employed shortened BCH codes, and Berger [2] used Gabidulin codes in their method. Then, in a series of works [13,14,15], the authors proposed many approaches for the construction of recursive MDS matrices from the companion matrices over finite fields.

Near-MDS (NMDS) matrices have sub-optimal branch numbers, leading to a slower diffusion speed compared to MDS matrices. However, NMDS matrices can provide a more favorable trade-off between security and efficiency as a diffusion layer, when compared to MDS matrices. Despite their potential benefits, research on NMDS matrices has been limited in the literature, and there is currently no direct construction method available for them in a recursive approach. In 2017, Li et al. [21] explored the construction of NMDS matrices from circulant and Hadamard matrices. In [22], the focus is on studying the recursive NMDS matrices with the goal of achieving the lowest possible hardware cost. Additionally, recent studies such as [17,31,32] have presented direct constructions of NMDS codes, which can be utilized to derive nonrecursive NMDS matrices. In a more recent study [11], Gupta et al. explored the construction of NMDS matrices in both recursive and nonrecursive settings and delved into the hardware efficiency of these construction techniques.

This paper aims to address the absence of direct constructions for recursive NMDS matrices by presenting some direct constructions of NMDS matrices in a recursive setting. It also includes a novel direct construction of recursive MDS matrices. Additionally, the paper introduces generalized Vandermonde matrices for direct constructions of nonrecursive MDS and NMDS matrices. We also propose a method for constructing involutory MDS and NMDS matrices. Furthermore, the paper provides formal proof for some commonly referenced folklore results in the literature of NMDS codes.

This paper is structured as follows: Section 2 provides the necessary notations and presents some fundamental results, including useful results on NMDS codes. Section 3 describes several direct construction methods for nonrecursive MDS and NMDS matrices, while Section 4 presents direct construction methods for recursive MDS and NMDS matrices. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper.

2 Definition and Preliminaries

Let \mathbb{F}_q be the finite field containing q elements, where $q = p^r$ for some prime p and a positive integer r . The set of vectors of length n with entries from the finite field \mathbb{F}_q is denoted by \mathbb{F}_q^n . Let $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ denote the polynomial ring over \mathbb{F}_q in the indeterminate x . We denote the algebraic closure of \mathbb{F}_q by $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_q$ and the multiplicative group by \mathbb{F}_q^* . It is a well-established fact that elements of a finite field with characteristic p can be represented as vectors with coefficients in \mathbb{F}_p . In other words, there exists a vector space isomorphism from \mathbb{F}_{p^r} to \mathbb{F}_p^r defined by $x = (x_1\alpha_1 + x_2\alpha_2 + \cdots + x_r\alpha_r) \rightarrow (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_r)$, where $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_r\}$ is a basis of \mathbb{F}_{p^r} . If α is a primitive element of \mathbb{F}_{p^r} , every nonzero element of \mathbb{F}_{p^r} can be expressed as a power of α , i.e., $\mathbb{F}_{p^r}^* = \{1, \alpha, \alpha^2, \alpha^3, \dots, \alpha^{p^r-2}\}$.

Let $M_{k \times n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ denote the set of all matrices of size $k \times n$ over \mathbb{F}_q . For simplicity, we use $M_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ to denote the ring of all $n \times n$ matrices (square matrices of order n) over \mathbb{F}_q . Let I_n denote the identity matrix of $M_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$. The determinant of a matrix $A \in M_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is denoted by $\det(A)$. A square matrix A is said to be nonsingular if $\det(A) \neq 0$ or equivalently, if the rows (columns) of A are linearly independent over \mathbb{F}_q . We now recall some concepts from coding theory.

A *linear code* \mathcal{C} of length n and dimension k over \mathbb{F}_q is denoted as an $[n, k]$ code. If the minimum distance of \mathcal{C} is equal to d then we denote it as an $[n, k, d]$ code. The *dual code* \mathcal{C}^\perp of a code \mathcal{C} can be defined as the subspace of dimension $(n - k)$ that is orthogonal to \mathcal{C} .

A *generator matrix* of \mathcal{C} over \mathbb{F}_q is defined as a $k \times n$ matrix G whose rows form a basis for \mathcal{C} . On the other hand, a *parity check matrix* of \mathcal{C} over \mathbb{F}_q is a $(n - k) \times n$ matrix H such that for every $c \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$, $c \in \mathcal{C} \iff Hc^T = \mathbf{0}$. In other words, the code \mathcal{C} is the kernel of H in \mathbb{F}_q^n . A generator matrix G is said to be in standard form if it has the form $G = [I_k \mid A]$, where A is a $k \times (n - k)$ matrix. If $G = [I_k \mid A]$ is a generator matrix, then $H = [-A^T \mid I_{n-k}]$ is a parity check matrix for \mathcal{C} .

The following lemma establishes a connection between the properties of a parity check matrix and the minimum distance d of a linear code \mathcal{C} .

Lemma 1. [23, page 33] *Let H be a parity check matrix of a code \mathcal{C} . Then the code has minimum distance d if and only if*

- (i) every $d - 1$ columns of H are linearly independent,
- (ii) some d columns are linearly dependent.

Constructing a linear code with large values of k/n and d is desirable in coding theory. However, there is a trade-off between the parameters n, k , and d . For instance, the well-known Singleton bound gives an upper bound on the minimum distance for a code.

Theorem 1. (The Singleton bound)[23, page 33] *Let \mathcal{C} be an $[n, k, d]$ code. Then $d \leq n - k + 1$.*

Definition 1. (MDS code) *A code with $d = n - k + 1$ is called maximum distance separable code or MDS code in short.*

Remark 1. An $[n, k]$ MDS code is defined as having minimum distance of $n - k + 1$. Thus, every set of $n - k$ columns of the parity check matrix are linearly independent.

Remark 2. Since the dual of an MDS code is again an MDS code [23, page 318], every k columns of the generator matrix are linearly independent.

Now, we will briefly discuss another important class of linear code which found many applications in cryptography. In [5], the concept of Near-MDS codes is introduced as a relaxation of some constraints of the MDS code. The widely used approach to defining Near-MDS codes is through generalized Hamming weights [35].

Definition 2. [35] *Let \mathcal{C} be an $[n, k]$ code with $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{C}$ as a subcode of \mathcal{C} . The support of \mathcal{D} , denoted by $\chi(\mathcal{D})$, is the set of coordinate positions, where not all codewords of \mathcal{D} have zero, i.e.,*

$$\chi(\mathcal{D}) = \{i : \exists (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{D} \text{ and } x_i \neq 0\}.$$

Using the terminology, an $[n, k]$ code is a linear code of dimension k and support size at most n . The rank of a vector space is its dimension, and we may use the terms rank and dimension interchangeably.

Example 1. Let \mathcal{C} be the linear code with a generator matrix

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then $\chi(\mathcal{C}) = \{1, 2, 3, 5, 6\}$ and $\chi(\mathcal{D}) = \{2, 3, 5, 6\}$ for the subcode \mathcal{D} generated by the second and third rows of G .

Definition 3. [35] For a linear code \mathcal{C} , the r -th generalized Hamming weight, denoted as $d_r(\mathcal{C})$, is defined as the cardinality of the minimal support of an r -dimensional subcode of \mathcal{C} , where $1 \leq r \leq k$, i.e.,

$$d_r(\mathcal{C}) = \min\{|\chi(\mathcal{D})| : \mathcal{D} \text{ is a subcode of } \mathcal{C} \text{ with rank } r\}.$$

Note that $d_1(\mathcal{C}) = d$ is the minimum distance of \mathcal{C} .

Example 2. Consider the linear code \mathcal{C} in Example 1. It is easy to check that $d_1(\mathcal{C}) = 2$. By determining the minimal support of all two-dimensional subspaces $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{C}$, we get $d_2(\mathcal{C}) = 4$. Also, there is at least one codeword in \mathcal{C} with a 1 in each position except the fourth position, which implies that $d_3(\mathcal{C}) = 5$.

Theorem 2. (Monotonicity) [35] For every $[n, k, d]$ code, we have

$$1 \leq d_1(\mathcal{C}) = d < d_2(\mathcal{C}) < d_3(\mathcal{C}) \cdots < d_k(\mathcal{C}) \leq n.$$

Corollary 1. (Generalized Singleton bound) [35] For an $[n, k]$ code \mathcal{C} , $d_r(\mathcal{C}) \leq n - k + r$. (When $r = 1$, this is the Singleton bound.)

Theorem 3 provides another method to compute the generalized Hamming weight of linear code. Let H be a parity check matrix of \mathcal{C} and let H_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, be its i -th column vector. Let $\langle H_i : i \in I \rangle$ be the space generated by the column vectors H_i for $i \in I$.

Theorem 3. [35] For all $r \leq k$,

$$d_r(\mathcal{C}) = \min\{|I| : |I| - \text{rank}(\langle H_i : i \in I \rangle) \geq r\}.$$

The following Theorem establishes a connection between the properties of a parity check matrix and the generalized Hamming weight of a linear code \mathcal{C} . Although this theorem is well-known, we have not found its proof, so we are providing it below.

Theorem 4. [5,35] Let H be a parity check matrix for a linear code \mathcal{C} . Then $d_r(\mathcal{C}) = \delta$ if and only if the following conditions hold:

- (i) any $\delta - 1$ columns of H have rank greater or equal to $\delta - r$,
- (ii) there exist δ columns in H of rank $\delta - r$.

Proof. For any $I \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, let $S(I) = \langle H_i : i \in I \rangle$ be the space spanned by the vectors H_i for $i \in I$, where H_i denotes the i -th column of the parity check matrix H of \mathcal{C} . Let

$$S^\perp(I) = \left\{ x \in \mathcal{C} : x_i = 0 \text{ for } i \notin I \text{ and } \sum_{i \in I} x_i H_i = 0 \right\}.$$

Then $\text{rank}(S(I)) + \text{rank}(S^\perp(I)) = |I|$.

Let $d_r(\mathcal{C}) = \delta$, and we will prove that both conditions hold. To do so, let us assume for the sake of contradiction that there exist some $\delta - 1$ columns of H , say $H_{i_1}, H_{i_2}, \dots, H_{i_{\delta-1}}$, with $\text{rank} \leq \delta - r - 1$.

Now, let $I = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{\delta-1}\} \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Then $\text{rank}(S(I)) \leq \delta - r - 1$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rank}(S^\perp(I)) &= |I| - \text{rank}(S(I)) \\ &\geq \delta - 1 - (\delta - r - 1) = r. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have $\text{rank}(S^\perp(I)) \geq r$. Also, by the construction, $S^\perp(I)$ is a subcode of \mathcal{C} and $|\chi(S^\perp(I))| \leq \delta - 1$. This leads to a contradiction since $d_r(\mathcal{C}) = \delta$. Therefore, we can conclude that any $\delta - 1$ columns of H have rank greater or equal to $\delta - r$.

Since $d_r(\mathcal{C}) = \delta$, there exists a subcode \mathcal{D} of \mathcal{C} with $\text{rank}(\mathcal{D}) = r$ and $|\chi(\mathcal{D})| = d_r(\mathcal{C})$. Let $I = \chi(\mathcal{D})$. Now, we will show that $\mathcal{D} = S^\perp(I)$.

Let $c = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n) \in \mathcal{D}$ be a codeword. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^n c_i H_i = \mathbf{0} \\ \implies &\sum_{i \in I} c_i H_i + \sum_{i \notin I} c_i H_i = \mathbf{0} \\ \implies &\sum_{i \in I} c_i H_i = \mathbf{0} \quad [\text{Since } c_i = 0 \ \forall i \notin I = \chi(\mathcal{D})] \\ \implies &c \in S^\perp(I) \\ \implies &\mathcal{D} \subset S^\perp(I). \end{aligned}$$

If possible, let $\text{rank}(S^\perp(I)) = r' > r$. Now, since $\text{rank}(S(I)) + \text{rank}(S^\perp(I)) = |I|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I| - \text{rank}(S(I)) &= r' > r \\ \implies d_{r'}(\mathcal{C}) &\leq |I| = \delta \quad [\text{By Theorem 3}]. \end{aligned}$$

But by the monotonicity of generalized Hamming weights we must have

$$\delta = d_r(\mathcal{C}) < d_{r'}(\mathcal{C}) \leq \delta,$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, we must have $\text{rank}(\mathcal{D}) = \text{rank}(S^\perp(I))$ and $\mathcal{D} = S^\perp(I)$. Thus,

$$\text{rank}(S(I)) = |I| - r = \delta - r.$$

Therefore, there exist δ columns in H of rank $\delta - r$.

For the converse part, assume that both conditions hold. From Condition (ii), we know that there exist some $I \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with $|I| = \delta$ such that $\text{rank}(S(I)) = \delta - r$. This implies that

$$\text{rank}(S^\perp(I)) = |I| - \text{rank}(S(I)) = r.$$

Since $|I| - \text{rank}(S(I)) = r$, by Theorem 3, we have $d_r(\mathcal{C}) \leq \delta$.

If possible, let $d_r(\mathcal{C}) = \delta - t$ for some $t \geq 1$. Now, by Theorem 3, there exist some $I' \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with $|I'| = \delta - t$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |I'| - \text{rank}(S(I')) &\geq r \\ \implies \text{rank}(S(I')) &\leq |I'| - r \\ \implies \text{rank}(S(I')) &\leq \delta - t - r. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there exist $|I'| = \delta - t$ many columns, say $H_{i_1}, H_{i_2}, \dots, H_{i_{\delta-t}}$, of H of rank $\leq \delta - t - r$. Now, by adding any other $t - 1$ columns of H to that $\delta - t$ columns we have $\delta - 1$ columns, say $H_{i_1}, H_{i_2}, \dots, H_{i_{\delta-t}}, H_{i_{\delta-t+1}}, \dots, H_{i_{\delta-1}}$, of H of rank $\leq (\delta - t - r) + (t - 1) = \delta - r - 1 < \delta - r$. This leads to a contradiction to condition (i). Hence, we must have $d_r(\mathcal{C}) = \delta$. \square

Definition 4. (NMDS code)[5] An $[n, k]$ code \mathcal{C} is said to be Near-MDS or NMDS if

$$d_1(\mathcal{C}) = n - k \quad \text{and} \quad d_i(\mathcal{C}) = n - k + i, \quad \text{for } i = 2, 3, \dots, k.$$

Remark 3. From the monotonicity of generalized Hamming weights, we can say that an $[n, k]$ code is NMDS if and only if $d_1(\mathcal{C}) = n - k$ and $d_2(\mathcal{C}) = n - k + 2$.

Remark 4. For an $[n, k, d]$ code \mathcal{C} , if $d = n - k$, then \mathcal{C} is called an Almost-MDS or AMDS code. However, it is worth noting that not all AMDS codes are necessarily NMDS codes. For example, consider the linear code \mathcal{C} with a generator matrix

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \alpha^2 & \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \alpha & \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \alpha & 0 & \alpha \end{bmatrix}$$

over the finite field \mathbb{F}_{2^2} constructed by the polynomial $x^2 + x + 1$ and α is a root of $x^2 + x + 1$. Then it can be checked that \mathcal{C} is a $[6, 3, 3]$ code. Also, by determining the minimal support of all two-dimensional subspaces $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{C}$, we get $d_2(\mathcal{C}) = 4 < 5$. This value is achieved by the subspace spanned by the first two rows of the generator matrix G . Hence, \mathcal{C} is not an NMDS code.

However, when both \mathcal{C} and its dual \mathcal{C}^\perp meet the criteria of being AMDS codes, then \mathcal{C} is classified as an NMDS code [4].

Theorem 4 provides the following useful result on NMDS code.

Lemma 2. [5] Let H be a parity check matrix of an $[n, k]$ code \mathcal{C} . Then the code \mathcal{C} is NMDS if and only if H satisfies the conditions

- (i) every $n - k - 1$ columns of H are linearly independent,
- (ii) there exist some $n - k$ columns that are linearly dependent,
- (iii) any $n - k + 1$ columns of H are of full rank.

Proof. Let \mathcal{C} be an NMDS code. Therefore, we have $d_1 = n - k$ and $d_2 = n - k + 2$. Since d_1 is the minimum distance of \mathcal{C} , from Lemma 1, we can say that $d_1 = n - k$ if and only if any $n - k - 1$ columns of H are linearly independent and there exist some $n - k$ columns that are linearly dependent. Moreover, Theorem 4 implies that $d_2 = n - k + 2$ if and only if any $n - k + 1$ columns of H have rank greater or equal to $(n - k + 2) - 2 = n - k$ and there exist $n - k + 2$ columns of H of rank $(n - k + 2) - 2 = n - k$. Since H is a parity check matrix of \mathcal{C} , we have $\text{rank}(H) = n - k$. Therefore, we can conclude that $d_2 = n - k + 2$ if and only if any $n - k + 1$ columns of H are of full rank. It completes the proof. \square

It can be deduced from the properties of the generalized Hamming weights that the dual of an NMDS code is also an NMDS code.

Lemma 3. [5] *If an $[n, k]$ code is NMDS, then its dual code is also NMDS.*

One can infer from Lemma 3 that a generator matrix of an $[n, k]$ NMDS code must satisfy conditions similar to those in Lemma 2.

Lemma 4. [5] *Let G be a generator matrix of an $[n, k]$ code \mathcal{C} . Then the code \mathcal{C} is NMDS if and only if G satisfies the conditions*

- (i) every $k - 1$ columns of G are linearly independent,
- (ii) there exist some k columns that are linearly dependent,
- (iii) any $k + 1$ columns of G are of full rank.

We will now explore MDS and NMDS matrices, which have notable cryptographic applications. The concept of MDS and NMDS matrices is derived from the MDS and NMDS codes, respectively. Generally, the matrix A in the generator matrix $G = [I \mid A]$ of an $[n, k]$ code \mathcal{C} is considered to be an MDS or NMDS matrix depending on whether the code \mathcal{C} is MDS or NMDS. Since square matrices are typically used in practice, for the sake of simplicity, we will consider the $[2n, n]$ code instead of the generic form of the $[n, k]$ code throughout the rest of this paper.

Definition 5. *A matrix A of order n is said to be an MDS (NMDS) matrix if $[I \mid A]$ is a generator matrix of a $[2n, n]$ MDS (NMDS) code.*

Since the dual of an MDS code is also an MDS code, and Lemma 3 demonstrates that the dual of an NMDS code is an NMDS code, we can consequently deduce the following results regarding MDS and NMDS matrices.

Corollary 2. *If A is an MDS (NMDS) matrix, then A^T is also an MDS (NMDS) matrix.*

The goal of lightweight cryptography is to design ciphers that require minimal hardware resources, consume low energy, exhibit low latency, and optimize their combinations. One proposed method for reducing chip area is the use of recursive MDS (NMDS) matrices.

Definition 6. Let q be a positive integer. A matrix B is said to be recursive MDS (NMDS) or q -MDS (q -NMDS) if the matrix $A = B^q$ is MDS (NMDS). If B is q -MDS (q -NMDS) then we say B yields an MDS (NMDS) matrix.

Example 3. For example, the matrix

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & \alpha & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

is 22-MDS and 10-NMDS, where α is a primitive element of the field \mathbb{F}_{2^4} and a root of $x^4 + x + 1$.

Vandermonde matrices have gained significant attention in the literature of constructing MDS codes. However, Vandermonde matrices defined over a finite field may contain singular square submatrices [23, Page 323]. Consequently, these matrices by itself need not be MDS. To address this issue, Lacan and Fimes [19,20] employed two Vandermonde matrices to construct an MDS matrix. Later, Sajadieh et al. [27] used a similar approach to obtain an MDS matrix that is also involutory.

Definition 7. (*Vandermonde matrix*) The matrix

$$A = \text{vand}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ x_1 & x_2 & \dots & x_n \\ x_1^2 & x_2^2 & \dots & x_n^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ x_1^{n-1} & x_2^{n-1} & \dots & x_n^{n-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

is called a Vandermonde matrix, where x_i 's are elements of a finite or infinite field.

We sometimes use the notation $\text{vand}(\mathbf{x})$ to represent the Vandermonde matrix $\text{vand}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$, where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$.

It is known that

$$\det(\text{vand}(\mathbf{x})) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (x_j - x_i),$$

which is nonzero if and only if the x_i 's are distinct.

There are several generalizations of the Vandermonde matrices in the literature, as documented in [6,7,18,25,30,33] and the references therein. Our focus is on the variant presented in [18], due to its applications in cryptography and error correcting codes. The definition of this variant is as follows.

Definition 8. (*Generalized Vandermonde matrix*) Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ and $T = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n\} \subset \mathbb{Z}$ with $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_n$. Then the matrix

$$V(\mathbf{x}; T) = \begin{bmatrix} x_1^{t_1} & x_2^{t_1} & \dots & x_n^{t_1} \\ x_1^{t_2} & x_2^{t_2} & \dots & x_n^{t_2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_1^{t_n} & x_2^{t_n} & \dots & x_n^{t_n} \end{bmatrix}$$

is said to be a *generalized Vandermonde matrix with respect to T* .

Remark 5. Observe that the matrix $V(\mathbf{x}; T)$ is the Vandermonde matrix $vand(\mathbf{x})$ if $T = \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$.

Let I denote the set of discontinuities in T , i.e., $I = \{0, 1, \dots, t_n\} \setminus T$. Clearly, $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_n = n + |I| - 1$. Throughout the rest of the paper, the notation $V_\perp(\mathbf{x}; I)$ is used interchangeably with $V(\mathbf{x}; T)$.

Now, we will see how the determinant of $V(\mathbf{x}; T)$ can be computed with the help of the determinant of a Vandermonde matrix when T has discontinuities. To do so, we require the following definition.

Definition 9. The *elementary symmetric polynomial of degree d* is defined as

$$\sigma_d(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{w(e)=d} x_1^{e_1} x_2^{e_2} \cdots x_n^{e_n},$$

where $e = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n) \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$.

Theorem 5. [18, Theorem 1] If $I = \{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_s\}$, we have

$$\det(V_\perp(\mathbf{x}; I)) = \det(vand(\mathbf{x})) \det(S(\mathbf{x})),$$

where $S(\mathbf{x}) = (\sigma_{n-l_i+j-1}(\mathbf{x}))_{i,j=1}^s$.

Lemma 5. [18, Lemma 1] If $I = \{l\}$, we have

$$\det(V_\perp(\mathbf{x}; I)) = \det(vand(\mathbf{x})) \sigma_{n-l}(\mathbf{x}).$$

By substituting $I = \{n-1\}$ and $I = \{1\}$ into Lemma 5, we can derive Corollaries 3 and 4, respectively.

Corollary 3. Let $I = \{n-1\}$, then $\det(V_\perp(\mathbf{x}; I)) = \det(vand(\mathbf{x})) (\sum_{i=1}^n x_i)$.

Corollary 4. Let $I = \{1\}$ and each x_i be a nonzero element of a field. Then we can express the determinant of $V_\perp(\mathbf{x}; I)$ as

$$\det(V_\perp(\mathbf{x}; I)) = (\prod_{i=1}^n x_i) \det(vand(\mathbf{x})) (\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^{-1}).$$

Now, we will consider the case when T has more than one discontinuity, specifically, we will explore how to compute the determinant of $V_\perp(\mathbf{x}; I)$ when $I = \{1, n\}$.

Corollary 5. *Let $I = \{1, n\}$ and each x_i be a nonzero element of a field. Then we can express the determinant of $V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$ as*

$$\det(V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)) = \det(\text{vand}(\mathbf{x})) \left(\prod_{i=1}^n x_i \right) \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^{-1} \right) - 1 \right].$$

Proof. From Theorem 5, we know that

$$\det(V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)) = \det(\text{vand}(\mathbf{x})) \det(S(\mathbf{x})),$$

where $S(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{n-1}(\mathbf{x}) & \sigma_n(\mathbf{x}) \\ \sigma_0(\mathbf{x}) & \sigma_1(\mathbf{x}) \end{bmatrix}$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \det(S(\mathbf{x})) &= \sigma_{n-1}(\mathbf{x})\sigma_1(\mathbf{x}) - \sigma_n(\mathbf{x})\sigma_0(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^n x_i \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^{-1} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right) \right] - \prod_{i=1}^n x_i \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n x_i \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^{-1} \right) - 1 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\det(V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)) = \det(\text{vand}(\mathbf{x})) \left(\prod_{i=1}^n x_i \right) \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^{-1} \right) - 1 \right]$. \square

Now, let us recall the companion matrix structures which are used for the construction of recursive MDS matrices.

Definition 10. (*Companion matrix*) Let $g(x) = a_1 + a_2x + \dots + a_nx^{n-1} + x^n \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ be a monic polynomial of degree n . The companion matrix $C_g \in M_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ associated with the polynomial $g(x)$ is given by

$$C_g = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \dots & 1 \\ -a_1 & -a_2 & \dots & \dots & -a_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Definition 11. A square matrix $M \in M_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is said to be diagonalizable if M is similar to a diagonal matrix. This means $M = PDP^{-1}$ for some diagonal matrix D and a nonsingular matrix P .

Now, we will consider some results related to diagonalizable companion matrices.

Lemma 6. [12] Let $C_g \in M_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ be a nonsingular companion matrix which is diagonalizable, say $C_g = PDP^{-1}$ where P is a nonsingular matrix of order n and $D = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$. Then all entries of P will be nonzero. Moreover, C_g can be expressed as $C_g = VDV^{-1}$, where $V = \text{vand}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$.

Corollary 6. [12] *A companion matrix C_g is nonsingular and diagonalizable if and only if all eigenvalues of C_g are distinct and nonzero.*

Lemma 7. [26] *If M is an $n \times n$ matrix with n distinct eigenvalues, then M is diagonalizable.*

Theorem 6. [26] *The characteristic polynomial of C_g , as defined in Definition 10, is the polynomial $g(x) = a_1 + a_2x + \dots + a_nx^{n-1} + x^n$.*

Since the roots of a characteristic polynomial are the eigenvalues, based on Lemma 6, Lemma 7 and Theorem 6, we can conclude the following result for a companion matrix.

Theorem 7. *If the monic polynomial $g(x) = a_1 + a_2x + \dots + a_nx^{n-1} + x^n$ has n distinct nonzero roots $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n$, then C_g can be expressed as $C_g = VDV^{-1}$, where $V = \text{vand}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$ and $D = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$.*

We close this section by providing Lemma 8, which will be beneficial in this paper. To prove this lemma, we need the following result from linear algebra.

Theorem 8. *Let A be an $n \times n$ matrix and B be an $n \times l$ matrix. If A is nonsingular, then the rank of AB is equal to the rank of B .*

Lemma 8. *Let A be an $n \times n$ nonsingular matrix and G be a generator matrix of a $[l, n]$ code \mathcal{C} . Then AG is also a generator matrix of the code \mathcal{C} .*

Proof. We know that the rows of the generator matrix G form a basis for the linear code \mathcal{C} and $\text{rank}(G) = n$. Also, since A is nonsingular, according to Theorem 8, we have $\text{rank}(AG) = \text{rank}(G) = n$. Therefore, all n rows of AG are linearly independent.

Note that each row of AG is a linear combination of the rows of G . Therefore, each row of AG represents a codeword of \mathcal{C} , and these rows are linearly independent. Consequently, the rows of AG form a basis for \mathcal{C} . Therefore, AG is also a generator matrix of the code \mathcal{C} . \square

3 Direct Construction of Nonrecursive MDS and NMDS Matrices

The application of Vandermonde matrices for constructing MDS codes is well documented in the literature [10,16,19,20,24,27]. In this section, we explore the use of generalized Vandermonde matrices for the construction of both MDS and NMDS matrices. Specifically, we focus on the generalized Vandermonde matrices $V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$, where I is a subset of $\{1, n-1, n\}$.

Generalized Vandermonde matrices, with these parameters, defined over a finite field can contain singular submatrices (see Example 4). Consequently, these matrices by itself need not be MDS over a finite field. However, like Vandermonde based constructions, we can use two generalized Vandermonde matrices for constructing MDS matrices.

Example 4. Consider the generalized Vandermonde matrix $V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$ with $\mathbf{x} = (1, \alpha, \alpha^2, \alpha^5)$ and $I = \{3\}$

$$V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \alpha & \alpha^2 & \alpha^5 \\ 1 & \alpha^2 & \alpha^4 & \alpha^{10} \\ 1 & \alpha^4 & \alpha^8 & \alpha^{20} \end{bmatrix},$$

where α is a primitive element of the finite field \mathbb{F}_{2^4} constructed by the polynomial $x^4 + x + 1$. Consider the 2×2 submatrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \alpha^5 \\ 1 & \alpha^{20} \end{bmatrix}$$

which is singular as $\alpha^{20} = \alpha^5$.

Theorem 9. Let $V_1 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$ and $V_2 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{y}; I)$ be two generalized Vandermonde matrices with $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$, $\mathbf{y} = (x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}, \dots, x_{2n})$ and $I = \{n-1\}$. The elements x_i are $2n$ distinct elements from \mathbb{F}_q , and $\sum_{i=1}^n x_{r_i} \neq 0$ for all $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\} \subset E$, where $E = \{1, 2, \dots, 2n\}$. Then the matrices $V_1^{-1}V_2$ and $V_2^{-1}V_1$ are such that any square submatrix of them is nonsingular and hence MDS matrices.

Proof. Let U be the $n \times 2n$ matrix $[V_1 \mid V_2]$. By Corollary 3, we can conclude that both V_1 and V_2 are nonsingular matrices. Consider the product $G = V_1^{-1}U = [I \mid A]$, where $A = V_1^{-1}V_2$. We will now prove that A does not contain any singular submatrix.

Now, since $U = V_1G$, from Lemma 8, we can say that U is also a generator matrix for the linear code \mathcal{C} generated by matrix $G = [I \mid A]$. From Remark 2, we know that a generator matrix U generates a $[2n, n, n+1]$ MDS code if and only if any n column of U is linearly independent.

Now, we can observe that any n column of U forms a generalized Vandermonde matrix of the same form as V_1 and V_2 . Since each x_i are distinct and $\sum_{i=1}^n x_{r_i} \neq 0$ for all $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\} \subset E$, from Corollary 3, we can say that every n column of U are linearly independent. Hence, we can say that the code \mathcal{C} is an MDS code.

Therefore, G generates a $[2n, n, n+1]$ MDS code and hence $A = V_1^{-1}V_2$ is an MDS matrix. For $V_2^{-1}V_1$, the proof is identical. \square

Remark 6. We know that the inverse of an MDS matrix is again MDS [10], therefore, if $V_1^{-1}V_2$ is MDS, then $V_2^{-1}V_1$ is also MDS and vice versa.

Example 5. Consider the generalized Vandermonde matrices $V_1 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$ and $V_2 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{y}; I)$ with $\mathbf{x} = (1, \alpha, \alpha^2, \alpha^3)$, $\mathbf{y} = (\alpha^4, \alpha^5, \alpha^6, \alpha^7)$ and $I = \{3\}$, where α is a primitive element of \mathbb{F}_{2^8} and a root of $x^8 + x^7 + x^6 + x + 1$. It can be verified that V_1 and V_2 satisfy the conditions in Theorem 9. Therefore, the matrices

$$V_1^{-1}V_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^7 & \alpha^{234} & \alpha^{57} & \alpha^{156} \\ \alpha^{37} & \alpha^{66} & \alpha^{55} & \alpha^{211} \\ \alpha^{205} & \alpha^{100} & \alpha^{30} & \alpha^{86} \\ \alpha^{227} & \alpha^{50} & \alpha^{149} & \alpha^{40} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad V_2^{-1}V_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^{136} & \alpha^{49} & \alpha^{235} & \alpha^{30} \\ \alpha^{210} & \alpha^{77} & \alpha^{201} & \alpha^{198} \\ \alpha^{144} & \alpha^{72} & \alpha^{52} & \alpha^{220} \\ \alpha^{42} & \alpha^{228} & \alpha^{23} & \alpha^{248} \end{bmatrix}$$

are MDS matrices.

Cauchy matrices are always MDS, meaning that it is not possible to obtain NMDS matrices directly from them. Furthermore, there is currently no known construction method for NMDS matrices using Vandermonde matrices. In Theorem 10, we demonstrate the possibility of constructing NMDS matrices using generalized Vandermonde matrices. However, similar to MDS matrices, generalized Vandermonde matrices with $I = \{n - 1\}$ themselves may not be NMDS over a finite field (see Example 6). As a consequence, we use two generalized Vandermonde matrices for constructing NMDS matrices.

Example 6. Consider the generalized Vandermonde matrix $A = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$ with $\mathbf{x} = (1, \alpha, \alpha^3, \alpha^7)$ and $I = \{3\}$, where α is a primitive element of the finite field \mathbb{F}_{2^4} constructed by the polynomial $x^4 + x + 1$ and α is a root of it. Let us consider the linear code \mathcal{C} with a generator matrix

$$G = [I \mid A] \\ = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \alpha & \alpha^3 & \alpha^7 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & \alpha^2 & \alpha^6 & \alpha^{14} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & \alpha^4 & \alpha^{12} & \alpha^{28} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now, consider matrix

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & \alpha & \alpha^3 & \alpha^7 \\ 1 & 1 & \alpha^2 & \alpha^6 & \alpha^{14} \\ 0 & 1 & \alpha^4 & \alpha^{12} & \alpha^{28} \end{bmatrix},$$

which is constructed by the five columns: the third, fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth columns of G . It can be observed that $\text{rank}(M) = 3 < 4$, which violates the condition (iii) in Lemma 4. Therefore, \mathcal{C} is not an NMDS code and hence A is not an NMDS matrix.

Theorem 10. *Let $V_1 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$ and $V_2 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{y}; I)$ be two generalized Vandermonde matrices with $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$, $\mathbf{y} = (x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}, \dots, x_{2n})$ and $I = \{n - 1\}$. The elements x_i are $2n$ distinct elements from \mathbb{F}_q such that $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \neq 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^n x_{n+i} \neq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n x_{r_i} = 0$ for some other $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\} \subset E$, where $E = \{1, 2, \dots, 2n\}$. Then the matrices $V_1^{-1}V_2$ and $V_2^{-1}V_1$ are NMDS matrices.*

Proof. Let U be the $n \times 2n$ matrix $[V_1 \mid V_2]$. By Corollary 3, we can conclude that both V_1 and V_2 are nonsingular matrices. Consider the product $G = V_1^{-1}U = [I \mid A]$, where $A = V_1^{-1}V_2$. To show, $A = V_1^{-1}V_2$ is an NMDS matrix, we need to prove that the $[2n, n]$ code \mathcal{C} generated by $G = [I \mid A]$ is an NMDS code.

Now, since $U = V_1G$, from Lemma 8, we can say that U is also a generator matrix for the linear code \mathcal{C} . Thus, we can conclude that $A = V_1^{-1}V_2$ is an NMDS matrix if and only if U meets the three conditions mentioned in Lemma 4.

A submatrix $U[R]$, constructed from any t columns of U , is given by

$$U[R] = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ x_{r_1} & x_{r_2} & \dots & x_{r_t} \\ x_{r_1}^2 & x_{r_2}^2 & \dots & x_{r_t}^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{r_1}^{n-2} & x_{r_2}^{n-2} & \dots & x_{r_t}^{n-2} \\ x_{r_1}^n & x_{r_2}^n & \dots & x_{r_t}^n \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where R denotes a set $\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_t\} \subset E = \{1, 2, \dots, 2n\}$ of t elements.

So for $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_{n-1}\} \subset E$ we have

$$U[R] = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ x_{r_1} & x_{r_2} & \dots & x_{r_{n-1}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{r_1}^{n-2} & x_{r_2}^{n-2} & \dots & x_{r_{n-1}}^{n-2} \\ x_{r_1}^n & x_{r_2}^n & \dots & x_{r_{n-1}}^n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now, we consider the $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ submatrix $U'[R]$ of $U[R]$, which is constructed from the first $n-1$ rows of $U[R]$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} U'[R] &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ x_{r_1} & x_{r_2} & \dots & x_{r_{n-1}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{r_1}^{n-3} & x_{r_2}^{n-3} & \dots & x_{r_{n-1}}^{n-3} \\ x_{r_1}^{n-2} & x_{r_2}^{n-2} & \dots & x_{r_{n-1}}^{n-2} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \text{vand}(x_{r_1}, x_{r_2}, \dots, x_{r_{n-1}}), \end{aligned}$$

which is nonsingular since each x_i is a distinct element. Therefore, any submatrix of U constructed from any $n-1$ columns has a nonsingular $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ submatrix, implying that any $n-1$ columns of U are linearly independent.

Now, suppose $\sum_{i=1}^n x_{r'_i} = 0$ for some $R' = \{r'_1, r'_2, \dots, r'_n\} \subset E$. Then for R' , we have

$$U[R'] = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ x_{r'_1} & x_{r'_2} & \dots & x_{r'_n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{r'_1}^{n-2} & x_{r'_2}^{n-2} & \dots & x_{r'_n}^{n-2} \\ x_{r'_1}^n & x_{r'_2}^n & \dots & x_{r'_n}^n \end{bmatrix},$$

which is a generalized Vandermonde matrix $V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$ with $\mathbf{x} = (x_{r'_1}, x_{r'_2}, \dots, x_{r'_n})$ and $I = \{n-1\}$. Thus, from Corollary 3, we have

$$\det(U[R']) = \left[\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (x_{r'_j} - x_{r'_i}) \right] \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_{r'_i} \right).$$

Since $\sum_{i=1}^n x_{r'_i} = 0$, we have $\det(U[R']) = 0$, i.e., the columns of $U[R']$ are linearly dependent. Hence, there exist n columns (depends upon R') that are linearly dependent.

Now, we need to show that the third condition of Lemma 4 is also satisfied by U . To prove this, we will use a contradiction argument. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that each set of $n + 1$ columns of U is not of full rank. Let $R'' = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n, r_{n+1}\} \subset E$ be a set of $n + 1$ elements such that the corresponding submatrix $U[R'']$ of U is not of full rank, i.e., $\text{rank}(U[R'']) < n$. Now, by our assumption, each $n \times n$ submatrix of $U[R'']$ is singular. Since each $x_r \neq x_{r'}$ for $r, r' \in E$, from Corollary 3, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} x_{r_2} + x_{r_3} + x_{r_4} + x_{r_5} + \cdots + x_{r_{n+1}} &= 0, \\ x_{r_1} + x_{r_3} + x_{r_4} + x_{r_5} + \cdots + x_{r_{n+1}} &= 0, \\ x_{r_1} + x_{r_2} + x_{r_4} + x_{r_5} + \cdots + x_{r_{n+1}} &= 0, \\ &\vdots \\ x_{r_1} + x_{r_2} + x_{r_3} + x_{r_4} + \cdots + x_{r_n} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

This system of equations can be written as $MX = 0$, where M is a $(n + 1) \times (n + 1)$ matrix given by

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad X = [x_{r_1}, x_{r_2}, x_{r_3}, x_{r_4}, \dots, x_{r_{n+1}}]^T.$$

Note that $\det(M) = (-1)^n n$. Suppose p is the characteristic of the field \mathbb{F}_q . We will now examine two scenarios: first, when p does not divide n ; and second, when p divides n .

Case 1: $p \nmid n$.

In this case, we have $\det(M) \neq 0$. Therefore, $MX = 0$ has a unique solution $X = [0, 0, \dots, 0]^T$. This means $x_{r_i} = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n + 1$ which is a contradiction because each x_i is distinct.

Case 2: $p|n$.

If $p|n$, M is a singular matrix. Let M' be the $n \times n$ submatrix obtained by deleting the 1st row and 1st column of M . The determinant of M' is given by $\det(M') = (-1)^{n-1}(n-1)$. Since p is a prime and $p|n$, we must have $p \nmid (n-1)$. Therefore, $\det(M') \neq 0$. From this, we conclude that the rank of M is n and so the solution space of $MX = 0$ has dimension 1.

Since $p|n$, it is easy to verify that $[1, 1, \dots, 1]^T$ is a solution of $MX = 0$. As this vector is nonzero, we deduce that the solution space of $MX = 0$ is given by

$$X = \{c \cdot [1, 1, \dots, 1]^T : c \in \mathbb{F}_q\}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$[x_{r_1}, x_{r_2}, x_{r_3}, \dots, x_{r_{n+1}}]^T = c \cdot [1, 1, \dots, 1]^T$$

for some $c \in \mathbb{F}_q$, which contradicts the fact that each $x_r \neq x_{r'}$ for $r, r' \in E$.

Thus, we can conclude that U , and hence $G = [I \mid A]$, generates a $[2n, n]$ NMDS code. Therefore, according to Definition 5, $A = V_1^{-1}V_2$ is an NMDS matrix. For $V_2^{-1}V_1$, the proof is identical. \square

Remark 7. In Theorem 10, it is assumed that $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \neq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n x_{n+i} \neq 0$. This assumption is made based on Corollary 3, which states that $\det(V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)) = \det(\text{vand}(\mathbf{x}))(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i)$ and $\det(V_{\perp}(\mathbf{y}; I)) = \det(\text{vand}(\mathbf{y}))(\sum_{i=1}^n x_{n+i})$. If either of these sums is zero, it would result in the determinant of either V_1 or V_2 being zero, making them singular. Hence, the assumption is necessary to ensure the nonsingularity of V_1 and V_2 .

Example 7. Consider the generalized Vandermonde matrices $V_1 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$ and $V_2 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{y}; I)$ with $\mathbf{x} = (1, \alpha, \alpha^2, \alpha^3)$, $\mathbf{y} = (\alpha^4, \alpha^5, \alpha^6, \alpha^7)$ and $I = \{3\}$, where α is a primitive element of \mathbb{F}_{2^4} and a root of $x^4 + x + 1$. It is easy to check that each x_i are distinct and $1 + \alpha + \alpha^3 + \alpha^7 = 0$. Therefore, the matrices

$$V_1^{-1}V_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^7 & \alpha^9 & \alpha^9 & 1 \\ \alpha^{14} & \alpha^{14} & \alpha^3 & 1 \\ \alpha^{10} & \alpha^5 & \alpha^5 & 0 \\ \alpha^2 & \alpha^2 & \alpha^8 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad V_2^{-1}V_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \alpha^7 & 1 & \alpha^7 \\ 1 & \alpha^{14} & 0 & \alpha^3 \\ 1 & \alpha^5 & 1 & \alpha^{10} \\ 1 & \alpha^8 & 1 & \alpha^8 \end{bmatrix}$$

are NMDS matrices.

In the context of implementing block ciphers, we know that if an efficient matrix M used in encryption is involutory, then its inverse $M^{-1} = M$ applied for decryption will also be efficient. Hence, it is important to find MDS or NMDS matrices that are also involutory.

In the following theorem, we present a method for obtaining involutory matrices from generalized Vandermonde matrices with $I = \{n - 1\}$. The proof of this theorem can be approached similarly to the proof provided in [10, Theorem 4.3] for Vandermonde matrices. However, it is important to note that in the proof of the following theorem, we rely on the conditions $\binom{n}{1} = \binom{n}{n-1} = 0$ for even values of n over \mathbb{F}_{2^r} . For brevity, we state the result without presenting a detailed proof.

Theorem 11. *Let $V_1 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$ and $V_2 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{y}; I)$ be two generalized Vandermonde matrices of even order over \mathbb{F}_{2^r} with $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$, $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$ and $I = \{n - 1\}$. If $y_i = l + x_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, for some $l \in \mathbb{F}_{2^r}^*$ then $V_2V_1^{-1}$ is a lower triangular matrix whose nonzero elements are determined by powers of l . Also, $V_1^{-1}V_2 (= V_2^{-1}V_1)$ is an involutory matrix.*

Remark 8. $V_1^{-1}V_2$ is involutory if and only if $V_1^{-1}V_2 = V_2^{-1}V_1$

Now, by applying Theorem 9 and Theorem 11, we can find involutory MDS matrices over \mathbb{F}_{2^r} , as follows.

Corollary 7. Let $V_1 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$ and $V_2 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{y}; I)$ be two generalized Vandermonde matrices of even order over \mathbb{F}_{2^r} with $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$, $\mathbf{y} = (x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}, \dots, x_{2n})$ and $I = \{n-1\}$. If V_1 and V_2 satisfying the three properties:

- (i) $x_{n+i} = l + x_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, for some $l \in \mathbb{F}_{2^r}^*$,
- (ii) $x_i \neq x_j$ for $i \neq j$ where $1 \leq i, j \leq 2n$, and
- (iii) $\sum_{i=1}^n x_{r_i} \neq 0$ for all $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\} \subset E$, where $E = \{1, 2, \dots, 2n\}$,

then $V_1^{-1}V_2$ is an involutory MDS matrix.

Example 8. Let α be a primitive element of \mathbb{F}_{2^8} and a root of $x^8 + x^7 + x^6 + x + 1$. Let $l = \alpha$, $\mathbf{x} = (1, \alpha, \alpha^2, \alpha^3, \alpha^4, \alpha^5)$, and $\mathbf{y} = (\alpha + 1, 0, \alpha^2 + \alpha, \alpha^3 + \alpha, \alpha^4 + \alpha, \alpha^5 + \alpha)$. Consider the generalized Vandermonde matrices $V_1 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$ and $V_2 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{y}; I)$ with $I = \{5\}$. Then it can be checked that both matrices V_1 and V_2 satisfy the conditions of Corollary 7. Therefore, the matrix

$$V_1^{-1}V_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^{113} & \alpha^{33} & \alpha^{227} & \alpha^{93} & \alpha^{16} & \alpha^{174} \\ \alpha^{63} & \alpha^{107} & \alpha^{186} & \alpha^{149} & \alpha^{175} & \alpha^{10} \\ \alpha^{105} & \alpha^{34} & \alpha^{116} & \alpha^{97} & \alpha^{198} & \alpha^{197} \\ \alpha^{40} & \alpha^{66} & \alpha^{166} & \alpha^{43} & \alpha^{213} & \alpha^{52} \\ \alpha^{136} & \alpha^{10} & \alpha^{185} & \alpha^{131} & \alpha^5 & \alpha^{136} \\ \alpha^{211} & \alpha^{17} & \alpha^{101} & \alpha^{142} & \alpha^{53} & \alpha^{56} \end{bmatrix}$$

is an involutory MDS matrix.

Remark 9. It is worth mentioning that the above result is not true for odd order matrices. For example, consider the 3×3 generalized Vandermonde matrices $V_1 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$ and $V_2 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{y}; I)$ with $I = \{2\}$, $\mathbf{x} = (1, \alpha, \alpha^2)$ and $\mathbf{y} = (1 + \alpha^3, \alpha + \alpha^3, \alpha^2 + \alpha^3)$, where α is a primitive element of \mathbb{F}_{2^4} and a root of $x^4 + x + 1$. Then it can be checked that the matrices V_1 and V_2 satisfy the conditions in Corollary 7. However, the matrix

$$V_1^{-1}V_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^{10} & \alpha^{13} & \alpha^1 \\ \alpha^3 & \alpha^{11} & \alpha^{11} \\ \alpha^{11} & \alpha^1 & \alpha^{13} \end{bmatrix}$$

is not an involutory matrix.

Also, by using Theorem 10 and Theorem 11, we can obtain involutory NMDS matrices over \mathbb{F}_{2^r} with the following approach.

Corollary 8. Let $V_1 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$ and $V_2 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{y}; I)$ be two generalized Vandermonde matrices of even order over \mathbb{F}_{2^r} with $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$, $\mathbf{y} = (x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}, \dots, x_{2n})$ and $I = \{n-1\}$. If V_1 and V_2 satisfying the three properties:

- (i) $x_{n+i} = l + x_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, for some $l \in \mathbb{F}_{2^r}^*$,

- (ii) $x_i \neq x_j$ for $i \neq j$ where $1 \leq i, j \leq 2n$, and
- (iii) $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \neq 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^n x_{n+i} \neq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n x_{r_i} = 0$ for some other $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\} \subset E$, where $E = \{1, 2, \dots, 2n\}$,

then $V_1^{-1}V_2$ is an involutory NMDS matrix.

Example 9. Let α be a primitive element of \mathbb{F}_{2^4} and a root of x^4+x+1 . Let $l = 1$, $\mathbf{x} = (1, \alpha, \alpha^2, \alpha^3)$, and $\mathbf{y} = (0, 1 + \alpha, 1 + \alpha^2, 1 + \alpha^3)$. Consider the generalized Vandermonde matrices $V_1 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$ and $V_2 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{y}; I)$ with $I = \{3\}$. Then it can be checked that both matrices V_1 and V_2 satisfy the conditions of Corollary 8. Therefore, the matrix

$$V_1^{-1}V_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^9 & \alpha^7 & \alpha^7 & \alpha^7 \\ \alpha^3 & \alpha^{14} & \alpha^3 & \alpha^3 \\ \alpha^{10} & \alpha^{10} & \alpha^5 & \alpha^{10} \\ \alpha^2 & \alpha^2 & \alpha^2 & \alpha^8 \end{bmatrix}$$

is an involutory NMDS matrix.

We will now focus on using the generalized Vandermonde matrices $V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$ with $I = \{1\}$ for constructing MDS and NMDS matrices. Similar to the case of generalized Vandermonde matrices with $I = \{n - 1\}$, these matrices alone may not be MDS or NMDS (as shown in Example 10). Therefore, we will consider two generalized Vandermonde matrices for the construction of MDS and NMDS matrices.

Example 10. Consider the generalized Vandermonde matrix $V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$ with $\mathbf{x} = (1, \alpha, \alpha^5, \alpha^{10})$ and $I = \{1\}$

$$V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \alpha^2 & \alpha^{10} & \alpha^{20} \\ 1 & \alpha^3 & \alpha^{15} & \alpha^{30} \\ 1 & \alpha^4 & \alpha^{20} & \alpha^{40} \end{bmatrix},$$

where α is a primitive element of the finite field \mathbb{F}_{2^4} constructed by the polynomial $x^4 + x + 1$. But it contains a singular 2×2 submatrix $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ \alpha^{15} & \alpha^{30} \end{bmatrix}$. Hence, $V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$ is not an MDS matrix. Also, it can be checked that $V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$ is not an NMDS matrix.

We can prove the following theorem using Corollary 4 which is similar to the proof of Theorem 9. For brevity, we state the result without presenting a proof.

Theorem 12. *Let $V_1 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$ and $V_2 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{y}; I)$ be two generalized Vandermonde matrices with $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$, $\mathbf{y} = (x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}, \dots, x_{2n})$ and $I = \{1\}$. Suppose that the elements x_i are $2n$ distinct nonzero elements from \mathbb{F}_q , and $\sum_{i=1}^n x_{r_i}^{-1} \neq 0$ for all $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\} \subset E$, where $E = \{1, 2, \dots, 2n\}$. Then the matrices $V_1^{-1}V_2$ and $V_2^{-1}V_1$ are such that any square submatrix of them is nonsingular and hence MDS matrices.*

Example 11. Consider the generalized Vandermonde matrices $V_1 = V_\perp(\mathbf{x}; I)$ and $V_2 = V_\perp(\mathbf{y}; I)$ with $\mathbf{x} = (1, \alpha, \alpha^2, \alpha^3)$, $\mathbf{y} = (\alpha^4, \alpha^5, \alpha^6, \alpha^7)$ and $I = \{1\}$, where α is a primitive element of \mathbb{F}_{2^8} and a root of $x^8 + x^7 + x^6 + x + 1$. It can be verified that V_1 and V_2 satisfy the conditions in Theorem 12. Therefore, the matrices

$$V_1^{-1}V_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^9 & \alpha^{43} & \alpha^{252} & \alpha^{70} \\ \alpha^{232} & \alpha^{68} & \alpha^{92} & \alpha^{168} \\ \alpha^{206} & \alpha^{213} & \alpha^{93} & \alpha^{230} \\ \alpha^{34} & \alpha^{243} & \alpha^{61} & \alpha^{152} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad V_2^{-1}V_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^{24} & \alpha^{137} & \alpha^{42} & \alpha^{223} \\ \alpha^{66} & \alpha^{14} & \alpha^{88} & \alpha^{197} \\ \alpha^{187} & \alpha^{35} & \alpha^{50} & \alpha^{25} \\ \alpha^{128} & \alpha^{33} & \alpha^{214} & \alpha^{246} \end{bmatrix}$$

are MDS matrices.

In the following theorem we discuss a new construction of NMDS matrices from the generalized Vandermonde matrices with $I = \{1\}$. The proof can be derived using Corollary 4, following a similar approach to that of Theorem 10. We state the result without providing a proof.

Theorem 13. *Let $V_1 = V_\perp(\mathbf{x}; I)$ and $V_2 = V_\perp(\mathbf{y}; I)$ be two generalized Vandermonde matrices with $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$, $\mathbf{y} = (x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}, \dots, x_{2n})$ and $I = \{1\}$. Assume that the elements x_i are $2n$ distinct nonzero elements from \mathbb{F}_q such that $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^{-1} \neq 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^n x_{n+i}^{-1} \neq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n x_{r_i}^{-1} = 0$ for some other $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\} \subset E$, where $E = \{1, 2, \dots, 2n\}$. Then the matrices $V_1^{-1}V_2$ and $V_2^{-1}V_1$ are NMDS matrices.*

Remark 10. Similar to Theorem 10, according to the Corollary 4, the assumption $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^{-1} \neq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n x_{n+i}^{-1} \neq 0$ in Theorem 13 is necessary to ensure the nonsingularity of V_1 and V_2 .

Example 12. Consider the generalized Vandermonde matrices $V_1 = V_\perp(\mathbf{x}; I)$ and $V_2 = V_\perp(\mathbf{y}; I)$ with $\mathbf{x} = (1, \alpha, \alpha^2, \alpha^3)$, $\mathbf{y} = (\alpha^4, \alpha^5, \alpha^6, \alpha^7)$ and $I = \{1\}$, where α is a primitive element of \mathbb{F}_{2^4} and a root of $x^4 + x + 1$. It is easy to check that each x_i are distinct and $1 + \alpha^{-1} + \alpha^{-2} + \alpha^{-7} = 0$. Therefore, the matrices

$$V_1^{-1}V_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^9 & \alpha^5 & \alpha^2 & \alpha^{13} \\ \alpha^7 & \alpha & \alpha^{10} & \alpha^9 \\ \alpha^{11} & 0 & 1 & \alpha^5 \\ \alpha^{11} & \alpha^8 & \alpha^4 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad V_2^{-1}V_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^{14} & \alpha^{11} & \alpha^9 & \alpha^{13} \\ 0 & \alpha^4 & \alpha^8 & \alpha^2 \\ \alpha^6 & \alpha^{13} & \alpha^{13} & \alpha^2 \\ \alpha^2 & 1 & \alpha^4 & \alpha^6 \end{bmatrix}$$

are NMDS matrices.

Now, we consider generalized Vandermonde matrices $V(\mathbf{x}; T)$, where T has more than one discontinuity, specifically, we consider $V_\perp(\mathbf{x}; I)$ with $I = \{1, n\}$ for providing a new direct construction for MDS matrices. The proof follows a similar approach to that of Theorem 9 and can be derived using Corollary 5. For brevity, we state the result without presenting a proof.

Theorem 14. *Let $V_1 = V_\perp(\mathbf{x}; I)$ and $V_2 = V_\perp(\mathbf{y}; I)$ be two generalized Vandermonde matrices with $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$, $\mathbf{y} = (x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}, \dots, x_{2n})$*

and $I = \{1, n\}$. The elements x_i are $2n$ distinct nonzero elements from \mathbb{F}_q , and $(\sum_{i=1}^n x_{r_i})(\sum_{i=1}^n x_{r_i}^{-1}) - 1 \neq 0$ for all $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\} \subset E$, where $E = \{1, 2, \dots, 2n\}$. Then the matrices $V_1^{-1}V_2$ and $V_2^{-1}V_1$ are such that any square submatrix of them is nonsingular and hence MDS matrices.

Example 13. Consider the generalized Vandermonde matrices $V_1 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{x}; I)$ and $V_2 = V_{\perp}(\mathbf{y}; I)$ with $\mathbf{x} = (1, \alpha, \alpha^2, \alpha^3)$, $\mathbf{y} = (\alpha^4, \alpha^5, \alpha^6, \alpha^7)$ and $I = \{1, 4\}$, where α is a primitive element of \mathbb{F}_{2^4} and a root of $x^4 + x + 1$. It can be verified that V_1 and V_2 satisfy the conditions in Theorem 14. Therefore, the matrices

$$V_1^{-1}V_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^{10} & \alpha^2 & \alpha^2 & \alpha^{14} \\ \alpha^{12} & \alpha^2 & \alpha^{10} & \alpha^5 \\ \alpha & \alpha^9 & 1 & 1 \\ \alpha^7 & \alpha^7 & \alpha^4 & \alpha^{12} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad V_2^{-1}V_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^7 & \alpha^4 & \alpha^{12} & \alpha^2 \\ \alpha^5 & \alpha^{10} & \alpha^9 & \alpha^6 \\ \alpha^5 & 1 & \alpha^{12} & \alpha^{12} \\ \alpha^9 & \alpha^2 & \alpha^7 & \alpha^5 \end{bmatrix}$$

are MDS matrices.

Remark 11. It is important to note that in Theorem 9 and Theorem 10, at most one x_i may be zero for $V_1^{-1}V_2$ and $V_2^{-1}V_1$ to be MDS or NMDS. However, in Theorem 12, Theorem 13, and Theorem 14, each x_i needs to be nonzero; otherwise, the term x_i^{-1} in the conditions will not be defined.

Remark 12. We have presented a method for constructing involutory MDS and NMDS matrices using generalized Vandermonde matrices $V_{\perp}(x; I)$ with $I = \{n-1\}$. However, we have not been able to determine the conditions for constructing involutory MDS and NMDS matrices from generalized Vandermonde matrices with $I = \{1\}$ and $I = \{1, n\}$.

Remark 13. This paper does not consider the generalized Vandermonde matrices $V(\mathbf{x}; T)$ with discontinuities other than $\{1\}$, $\{n-1\}$, or $\{1, n\}$, or those with more than two discontinuities. This is because the conditions for being MDS or NMDS matrices become more complicated. However, it is possible to find additional direct constructions of MDS and NMDS matrices by using Theorem 5.

Till now, we have discussed nonrecursive constructions of MDS and NMDS matrices. In the next section, we will explore the recursive constructions of MDS and NMDS matrices using the direct method.

4 Direct Construction of Recursive MDS and NMDS Matrices

In this section, we present various techniques for direct construction of MDS and NMDS matrices over finite fields, in recursive approach. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to provide a direct construction method for recursive NMDS matrices. We begin by establishing a condition for the similarity between a companion matrix and a diagonal matrix. Using this condition, we can represent the companion matrix as a combination of a Vandermonde

matrix and a diagonal matrix. We utilize determinant expressions for generalized Vandermonde matrices to present several techniques for constructing recursive NMDS matrices that are derived from companion matrices. Furthermore, a new direct construction for recursive MDS matrices is introduced.

Lemma 9. *Let $g(x) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ be a monic polynomial of degree n with n distinct roots, say $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}_q$. Then the matrix*

$$G' = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \lambda_1 & \dots & \lambda_1^{n-1} & \lambda_1^m & \lambda_1^{m+1} & \dots & \lambda_1^{m+n-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \lambda_n & \dots & \lambda_n^{n-1} & \lambda_n^m & \lambda_n^{m+1} & \dots & \lambda_n^{m+n-1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (2)$$

is also a generator matrix for the $[2n, n]$ code \mathcal{C} with generator matrix $G = [I \mid (C_g^T)^m]$.

Proof. From Theorem 7, we know that if a polynomial $g(x)$ has n distinct roots $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$, then the companion matrix C_g associated to $g(x)$ can be written as $C_g = VDV^{-1}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \text{vand}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_n \\ \lambda_1^2 & \lambda_2^2 & \dots & \lambda_n^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \lambda_1^{n-1} & \lambda_2^{n-1} & \dots & \lambda_n^{n-1} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

and $D = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$.

Let \mathcal{C} be a $[2n, n]$ code with generator matrix $G = [I \mid (C_g^T)^m]$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} G &= [I \mid (C_g^T)^m] = [I \mid ((V^T)^{-1}DV^T)^m] \\ &= [I \mid (V^T)^{-1}D^mV^T] \\ &= (V^T)^{-1}[V^T \mid D^mV^T] \\ &= (V^T)^{-1}G', \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $G' = [V^T \mid D^mV^T]$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G' &= [V^T \mid D^mV^T] \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \lambda_1 & \dots & \lambda_1^{n-1} & \lambda_1^m & \lambda_1^{m+1} & \dots & \lambda_1^{m+n-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \lambda_n & \dots & \lambda_n^{n-1} & \lambda_n^m & \lambda_n^{m+1} & \dots & \lambda_n^{m+n-1} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Also, from (3), we have $G' = V^T G$. Hence, according to Lemma 8, we can conclude that G' is also a generator matrix for the linear code \mathcal{C} . \square

Let C_g be the companion matrix associated with a monic polynomial $g(x)$ of degree $n \geq 3$. Then for $m < n$, it can be observed that the first row of C_g^m is a unit vector. Hence, the linear code generated by $[I \mid C_g^m]$ has minimum distance $< n$. Therefore, for $m < n$, C_g^m cannot be an MDS or NMDS matrix.

Theorem 15. *Let $g(x) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ be a monic polynomial of degree n . Suppose that $g(x)$ has n distinct roots, say $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \overline{\mathbb{F}_q}$. Let m be an integer with $m \geq n$. Then the matrix $M = C_g^m$ is MDS if and only if any n columns of the matrix G' given in (2) are linearly independent.*

Proof. From Corollary 2, we know that C_g^m is an MDS matrix if and only if its transpose $(C_g^m)^T = (C_g^T)^m$ is also an MDS matrix. Also, according to Definition 5, $(C_g^T)^m$ is MDS if and only if the $[2n, n]$ code \mathcal{C} , with generator matrix $G = [I \mid (C_g^T)^m]$, is an MDS code.

Now, since $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ are n distinct roots of $g(x)$, from Lemma 9, we can say that the matrix G' in (2) is also a generator matrix for the code \mathcal{C} . Therefore, by Remark 2, we can establish that $(C_g^m)^T$ is MDS, and hence C_g^m , if and only if any n columns of G' are linearly independent. \square

Theorem 16. *Let $g(x) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ be a monic polynomial of degree n . Suppose that $g(x)$ has n distinct roots, say $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \overline{\mathbb{F}_q}$. Let m be an integer with $m \geq n$. Then the matrix $M = C_g^m$ is NMDS if and only if the matrix G' given in (2) satisfy the three conditions outlined in Lemma 4.*

Proof. From Corollary 2, we know that C_g^m is an NMDS matrix if and only if its transpose $(C_g^m)^T = (C_g^T)^m$ is also an NMDS matrix. Also, by Definition 5, $(C_g^T)^m$ is an NMDS matrix if and only if the $[2n, n]$ code \mathcal{C} , with generator matrix $G = [I \mid (C_g^T)^m]$, is an NMDS code.

As $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ are n distinct roots of $g(x)$, we can infer from Lemma 9 that the matrix G' defined in (2) is also a generator matrix for the code \mathcal{C} . Consequently, we can conclude that $(C_g^m)^T$ is NMDS, and therefore C_g^m is NMDS, if and only if the matrix G' satisfy the three conditions outlined in Lemma 4. \square

Lemma 10. *If $g(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n (x - \lambda_i) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ yields a recursive MDS (NMDS) matrix then for any $c \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$ the polynomial $c^n g\left(\frac{x}{c}\right) = \prod_{i=1}^n (x - c\lambda_i)$ also yields a recursive MDS (NMDS) matrix.*

Proof. Let $g^*(x) = c^n g\left(\frac{x}{c}\right)$. Then the matrix $C_{g^*} = cEC_gE^{-1}$ where

$$E = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & c^2 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ & & & \dots & & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & c^{n-2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & c^{n-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The matrix $C_g^m = c^m E C_g^m E^{-1}$ is MDS (NMDS) if and only if C_g^m is MDS (NMDS). \square

Using the above lemma, it is possible to obtain more polynomials that produce recursive MDS or NMDS matrices from an initial polynomial.

Now, we present two methods for the construction of polynomials that yields recursive NMDS matrices. The polynomials constructed using these methods have distinct roots. The main idea behind these methods is Theorem 16: we suitably choose $\lambda_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$, and verify that the polynomial $g(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n (x - \lambda_i) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ satisfies the condition of Theorem 16. To do so, we must examine the rank of the submatrices of G' constructed from any t columns (here we examine $t = n - 1, n, n + 1$) of G' corresponding to λ_i 's as given in (2). A submatrix $G'[R]$, constructed from any t columns of G' , is given by

$$G'[R] = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1^{r_1} & \lambda_1^{r_2} & \dots & \lambda_1^{r_t} \\ \lambda_2^{r_1} & \lambda_2^{r_2} & \dots & \lambda_2^{r_t} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \lambda_n^{r_1} & \lambda_n^{r_2} & \dots & \lambda_n^{r_t} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

where R denotes a set $\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_t\} \subset E = \{0, 1, \dots, n-1, m, m+1, \dots, m+n-1\}$ of t elements.

Theorem 17. *Let $\lambda_i = \theta^{i-1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $\lambda_n = \theta^n$ for some $\theta \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$. Let $g(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n (x - \lambda_i)$. Then for an integer $m \geq n$, the matrix C_g^m is NMDS if and only if $\theta^r \neq \theta^{r'}$ for $r, r' \in E$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \theta^{r_i} = 0$ for some $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\} \subset E$, where $E = \{0, 1, \dots, n-1, m, m+1, \dots, m+n-1\}$.*

Proof. We have $\lambda_i = \theta^{i-1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $\lambda_n = \theta^n$. So for $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_t\} \subset E$ we have

$$G'[R] = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ \theta^{r_1} & \theta^{r_2} & \dots & \theta^{r_t} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (\theta^{n-2})^{r_1} & (\theta^{n-2})^{r_2} & \dots & (\theta^{n-2})^{r_t} \\ (\theta^n)^{r_1} & (\theta^n)^{r_2} & \dots & (\theta^n)^{r_t} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ \theta^{r_1} & \theta^{r_2} & \dots & \theta^{r_t} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (\theta^{r_1})^{n-2} & (\theta^{r_2})^{n-2} & \dots & (\theta^{r_t})^{n-2} \\ (\theta^{r_1})^n & (\theta^{r_2})^n & \dots & (\theta^{r_t})^n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now, to prove the theorem, we can assume $x_{r_i} = \theta^{r_i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$ and apply Theorem 10. \square

Example 14. Consider the field \mathbb{F}_{2^4} with the constructing polynomial $x^4 + x + 1$ and let α be a root of it. Let $\theta = \alpha$. We can verify that $\theta^0 + \theta^1 + \theta^3 + \theta^7 = 0$. Now, let us consider the polynomial $g(x) = (x-1)(x-\alpha)(x-\alpha^2)(x-\alpha^4)$. It can be verified that C_g^m is an NMDS matrix for $4 \leq m \leq 11$.

Remark 14. The above theorem assumes that $\sum_{i=1}^n \theta^{r_i} = 0$ for some $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\} \subset E$. However, to ensure MDS property, the condition needs to be changed to $\sum_{i=1}^n \theta^{r_i} \neq 0$ for all $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\} \subset E$ [15, Theorem 3].

Remark 15. We can see that the condition on θ in Theorem 17 is applicable even if we take $\lambda_i = \theta^{i-1}c, 1 \leq i \leq n-1$, and $\lambda_n = \theta^n c$ for some $c \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$. By considering the roots in this way the polynomials that we get are the same as those obtained by applying Lemma 10.

Lemma 11. *Let $\lambda_1 = 1$, and $\lambda_i = \theta^i, 2 \leq i \leq n$, for some $\theta \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$. Let $g(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n (x - \lambda_i)$. Then for an integer $m \geq n$, the matrix C_g^m is NMDS if and only if $\theta^r \neq \theta^{r'}$ for $r, r' \in E$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \theta^{-r_i} = 0$ for some $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\} \subset E$, where $E = \{0, 1, \dots, n-1, m, m+1, \dots, m+n-1\}$.*

Proof. Consider $\gamma_i = \lambda_{n-i+1} = (\theta^{-1})^{i-1}c, 1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $\gamma_n = \lambda_1 = (\theta^{-1})^n c$ for $c = \theta^n$. Then by Theorem 17 and the above remark, the matrix C_g^m is NMDS if and only if $\theta^{-r_i}, 1 \leq i \leq n$, are distinct and $\sum_{i=1}^n \theta^{-r_i} = 0$ for some $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\} \subset E$. It completes the proof. \square

Example 15. Consider the field \mathbb{F}_{2^4} with the constructing polynomial $x^4 + x + 1$ and let α be a root of it. Let $\theta = \alpha$. We can verify that $\theta^0 + \theta^{-1} + \theta^{-2} + \theta^{-7} = 0$. Now, let us consider the polynomial $g(x) = (x-1)(x-\alpha^2)(x-\alpha^3)(x-\alpha^4)$. It can be verified that C_g^m is an NMDS matrix for $4 \leq m \leq 11$.

Remark 16. The proof of the above lemma can also be seen similarly as in the proof of Theorem 17 by using Corollary 4.

Remark 17. The above lemma assumes that $\sum_{i=1}^n \theta^{-r_i} = 0$ for some $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\} \subset E$. However, to ensure MDS property, the condition needs to be changed to $\sum_{i=1}^n \theta^{-r_i} \neq 0$ for all $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\} \subset E$ [15, Corollary 1].

Now, we will present a direct construction of polynomial that yields recursive MDS matrix.

Theorem 18. *Let $\lambda_1 = 1$, and $\lambda_i = \theta^i$ for $2 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $\lambda_n = \theta^{n+1}$ for some $\theta \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$. Let $g(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n (x - \lambda_i)$. Then for an integer $m \geq n$, the matrix C_g^m is MDS if and only if $\theta^r \neq \theta^{r'}$ for $r, r' \in E$ and $(\sum_{i=1}^n \theta^{r_i})(\sum_{i=1}^n \theta^{-r_i}) - 1 \neq 0$ for all $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\} \subset E$, where $E = \{0, 1, \dots, n-1, m, m+1, \dots, m+n-1\}$.*

Proof. We have $\lambda_1 = 1$, and $\lambda_i = \theta^i$ for $2 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $\lambda_n = \theta^{n+1}$. From Theorem 15, we know that the matrix C_g^m is MDS if and only if any n columns of G' are linearly independent. So for any $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\} \subset E$ we have

$$G'[R] = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ (\theta^2)^{r_1} & (\theta^2)^{r_2} & \dots & (\theta^2)^{r_n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (\theta^{n-1})^{r_1} & (\theta^{n-1})^{r_2} & \dots & (\theta^{n-1})^{r_n} \\ (\theta^{n+1})^{r_1} & (\theta^{n+1})^{r_2} & \dots & (\theta^{n+1})^{r_n} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ (\theta^{r_1})^2 & (\theta^{r_2})^2 & \dots & (\theta^{r_n})^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (\theta^{r_1})^{n-1} & (\theta^{r_2})^{n-2} & \dots & (\theta^{r_{n-1}})^{n-2} \\ (\theta^{r_1})^{n+1} & (\theta^{r_2})^{n+1} & \dots & (\theta^{r_n})^{n+1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $y_{r_i} = \theta^{r_i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Therefore, we have

$$G'[R] = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ y_{r_1}^2 & y_{r_2}^2 & \dots & y_{r_n}^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ y_{r_1}^{n-1} & y_{r_2}^{n-1} & \dots & y_{r_n}^{n-1} \\ y_{r_1}^{n+1} & y_{r_2}^{n+1} & \dots & y_{r_n}^{n+1} \end{bmatrix},$$

which is a generalized Vandermonde matrix of the form $V_{\perp}(\mathbf{y}; I)$ with $I = \{1, n\}$. Therefore, from Corollary 5 $\det(G'[R]) \neq 0$ if and only if y_{r_i} are distinct and $(\sum_{i=1}^n y_{r_i})(\sum_{i=1}^n y_{r_i}^{-1}) - 1 \neq 0$. It completes the proof. \square

Example 16. Consider the field \mathbb{F}_{2^4} with the constructing polynomial $x^4 + x + 1$ and let α be a root of it. Let $\theta = \alpha$ and consider the polynomial $g(x) = (x - 1)(x - \alpha^2)(x - \alpha^3)(x - \alpha^5)$. It can be checked that the polynomial $g(x)$ satisfies the condition in Theorem 18, so it yields a recursive MDS matrix of order 4. It can be verified that C_g^4 is an MDS matrix.

5 Conclusion

There has been significant research in the literature on the direct construction of MDS matrices using both recursive and nonrecursive methods. However, research on NMDS matrices has been limited in the literature, and there is currently no direct construction method available for them in a recursive approach. This paper addresses this gap by presenting novel direct construction techniques for NMDS matrices in the recursive setting. By employing generalized Vandermonde matrices, we provide a new approach for constructing MDS and NMDS matrices. We also propose a method for constructing involutory MDS and NMDS matrices using generalized Vandermonde matrices. These direct constructions offer an efficient way of designing MDS and NMDS matrices, particularly for larger orders. Moreover, the paper provides proof for some commonly referenced results related to the NMDS code. Overall, this work provides valuable tools for constructing MDS and NMDS matrices and advances the current state of research in this area.

References

1. Daniel Augot and Matthieu Finiasz. Direct Construction of Recursive MDS Diffusion Layers Using Shortened BCH Codes. In Carlos Cid and Christian Rechberger, editors, *Fast Software Encryption*, pages 3–17, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2015. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
2. Thierry P. Berger. Construction of Recursive MDS Diffusion Layers from Gabidulin codes. In Goutam Paul and Serge Vaudenay, editors, *Progress in Cryptology – INDOCRYPT 2013*, pages 274–285, Cham, 2013. Springer International Publishing.

3. Joan Daemen and Vincent Rijmen. *The Design of Rijndael: AES - The Advanced Encryption Standard*. Information Security and Cryptography. Springer, 2002.
4. Mario A. De Boer. Almost MDS codes. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 9(2):143–155, Oct 1996.
5. Stefan Dodunekov and Ivan Landgev. On near-MDS codes. *Journal of Geometry*, 54(1):30–43, 1995.
6. Moawwad E.A. El-Mikkawy. Explicit inverse of a generalized Vandermonde matrix. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 146(2):643–651, 2003.
7. I Gohberg, M.A Kaashoek, and L Rodman. Spectral analysis of families of operator polynomials and a generalized Vandermonde matrix ii: The infinite dimensional case. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 30(3):358–389, 1978.
8. Jian Guo, Thomas Peyrin, and Axel Poschmann. The PHOTON Family of Lightweight Hash Functions. In Phillip Rogaway, editor, *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2011*, pages 222–239, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
9. Jian Guo, Thomas Peyrin, Axel Poschmann, and Matt Robshaw. The LED Block Cipher. In Bart Preneel and Tsuyoshi Takagi, editors, *Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems – CHES 2011*, pages 326–341, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
10. Kishan Chand Gupta, Sumit Kumar Pandey, Indranil Ghosh Ray, and Susanta Samanta. Cryptographically significant MDS matrices over finite fields: A brief survey and some generalized results. *Advances in Mathematics of Communications*, 13(4):779–843, 2019.
11. Kishan Chand Gupta, Sumit Kumar Pandey, and Susanta Samanta. On the construction of near-MDS matrices. *Cryptography and Communications*, Aug 2023.
12. Kishan Chand Gupta, Sumit Kumar Pandey, and Ayineedi Venkateswarlu. Towards a General Construction of Recursive MDS Diffusion Layers. In Pascale Charpin, Nicolas Sendrier, and Jean-Pierre Tillich, editors, *The 9th International Workshop on Coding and Cryptography 2015 WCC2015*, Proceedings of the 9th International Workshop on Coding and Cryptography 2015 WCC2015, Paris, France, April 2015.
13. Kishan Chand Gupta, Sumit Kumar Pandey, and Ayineedi Venkateswarlu. On the direct construction of recursive MDS matrices. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 82(1-2):77–94, 2017.
14. Kishan Chand Gupta, Sumit Kumar Pandey, and Ayineedi Venkateswarlu. Towards a general construction of recursive MDS diffusion layers. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 82(1-2):179–195, 2017.
15. Kishan Chand Gupta, Sumit Kumar Pandey, and Ayineedi Venkateswarlu. Almost involutory recursive MDS diffusion layers. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 87(2-3):609–626, 2019.
16. Kishan Chand Gupta and Indranil Ghosh Ray. On Constructions of Involutory MDS Matrices. In Amr Youssef, Abderrahmane Nitaj, and Aboul Ella Hassanien, editors, *Progress in Cryptology – AFRICACRYPT 2013*, pages 43–60, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
17. Daitao Huang, Qin Yue, Yongfeng Niu, and Xia Li. MDS or NMDS self-dual codes from twisted generalized Reed-Solomon codes. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 89(9):2195–2209, Sep 2021.
18. Nicholas Kolokotronis, Konstantinos Limniotis, and Nicholas Kalouptsidis. Factorization of determinants over finite fields and application in stream ciphers. *Cryptography and Communications*, 1:175–205, 2009.

19. Jérôme Lacan and Jérôme Fimes. A Construction of Matrices with No Singular Square Submatrices. In Gary L. Mullen, Alain Poli, and Henning Stichtenoth, editors, *Finite Fields and Applications*, pages 145–147, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
20. Jérôme Lacan and Jérôme Fimes. Systematic MDS erasure codes based on Vandermonde matrices. *IEEE Communications Letters*, 8(9):570–572, 2004.
21. Chaoyun Li and Qingju Wang. Design of lightweight linear diffusion layers from near-mds matrices. *IACR Transactions on Symmetric Cryptology*, 2017(1):129–155, Mar. 2017.
22. Xiaodan Li and Wenling Wu. Constructions of Iterative Near-MDS Matrices with the Lowest XOR Count. In Joonsang Baek and Sushmita Ruj, editors, *Information Security and Privacy*, pages 132–150, Cham, 2021. Springer International Publishing.
23. F.J. MacWilliams and N.J.A. Sloane. *The Theory of Error Correcting Codes*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York-Oxford, 1977.
24. Ferdaouss Mattoussi, Vincent Roca, and Bessem Sayadi. Complexity comparison of the use of Vandermonde versus Hankel matrices to build systematic MDS Reed-Solomon codes. In *2012 IEEE 13th International Workshop on Signal Processing Advances in Wireless Communications (SPAWC)*, pages 344–348, 2012.
25. Henry M. Power. The companion matrix and Liapunov functions for linear multivariable time-invariant systems. *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, 283(3):214–234, 1967.
26. A. Ramachandra Rao and P. Bhimasankaram. *Linear Algebra*. Hindustan Book Agency, 2000.
27. Mahdi Sajadieh, Mohammad Dakhilalian, Hamid Mala, and Behnaz Omoomi. On construction of Involutionary MDS Matrices from Vandermonde Matrices in $GF(2^q)$. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 64(3):287–308, sep 2012.
28. C. P. Schnorr and S. Vaudenay. Black box cryptanalysis of hash networks based on multipermutations. In Alfredo De Santis, editor, *Advances in Cryptology — EUROCRYPT’94*, pages 47–57, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1995. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
29. C. E. Shannon. Communication theory of secrecy systems. *The Bell System Technical Journal*, 28(4):656–715, 1949.
30. Igor E. Shparlinski. On the singularity of generalised Vandermonde matrices over finite fields. *Finite Fields and Their Applications*, 11(2):193–199, 2005.
31. Junzhen Sui, Qin Yue, Xia Li, and Daitao Huang. MDS, Near-MDS or 2-MDS Self-Dual Codes via Twisted Generalized Reed-Solomon Codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(12):7832–7841, 2022.
32. Junzhen Sui, Xiaomeng Zhu, and Xueying Shi. MDS and near-MDS codes via twisted Reed-Solomon codes. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 90(8):1937–1958, Aug 2022.
33. H. Van de Vel. Numerical treatment of a generalized Vandermonde system of equations. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 17(2):149–179, 1977.
34. Serge Vaudenay. On the need for multipermutations: Cryptanalysis of MD4 and SAFER. In Bart Preneel, editor, *Fast Software Encryption*, pages 286–297, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1995. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
35. V.K. Wei. Generalized hamming weights for linear codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 37(5):1412–1418, 1991.