

On σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes associated with Toeplitz matrices

Yang Li*, Shixin Zhu† Edgar Martínez-Moro‡

May 13, 2024

Abstract

In this paper, we present four general constructions of σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes associated with Toeplitz matrices. The first one relies on the σ' dual of a known σ' dual-containing matrix-product code; the second one is founded on quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrices, where we provide an efficient algorithm for generating them on the basic of Toeplitz matrices; and the last two ones are based on the utilization of certain special Toeplitz matrices. Concrete examples and detailed comparisons are provided. As a byproduct, we also find an application of Toeplitz matrices in $\tilde{\tau}$ -optimal defining matrices.

Keywords: σ self-orthogonal code, Matrix-product code, Toeplitz matrix, Quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrix

MSC(2010): Primary 94B05 15B05 12E10

1 Introduction

Let \mathbb{F}_q denote the finite field with q elements, where $q = p^h$ is a prime power and let \mathbb{F}_q^n denote the n -dimensional vector space over \mathbb{F}_q . Then an $[n, k, d]_q$ linear code \mathcal{C} is a k -dimensional subspace of \mathbb{F}_q^n with minimum Hamming distance d and we call \mathcal{C} a *maximum distance separable (MDS)* code if $d = n - k + 1$. For a given linear code \mathcal{C} over \mathbb{F}_q , we will use \mathcal{C}^\perp to denote its *dual code* with respect to a certain inner product (namely the Euclidean, Hermitian, Galois, symplectic or σ inner product). A linear code \mathcal{C} is said to be *self-orthogonal* if $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^\perp$; *dual-containing* if $\mathcal{C}^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, and *self-dual* if $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^\perp$.

Since the very beginning of coding theory, the exploration of self-orthogonal codes has garnered significant interest and emerged as a focal point. Extensive research on this topic has revealed robust connections between self-orthogonal codes and diverse mathematical domains,

*School of Mathematics, Hefei University of Technology, Hefei, 230601, Anhui, China. Email: yangli-math@163.com

†School of Mathematics, Hefei University of Technology, Hefei, 230601, Anhui, China. Email: zhushixin-math@hfut.edu.cn (*Corresponding author*).

‡Institute of Mathematics, University of Valladolid, Spain. Email: Edgar.Martinez@uva.es.

including combinatorial t -design theory [2], group theory [15], lattice theory [4, 15, 18], modular forms [47], and quantum coding theory [8, 26]. Specifically speaking, finite groups such as the Mathieu groups were linked to certain self-orthogonal codes, and the extended binary self-orthogonal Golay code was associated with the Conway group. Additionally, self-orthogonal codes have been used to produce many 5-designs [1]. For more details on self-orthogonal codes, one can refer to the recent papers [3, 14, 20, 27, 30, 31, 35, 48, 50, 52, 55] and the references therein. All these distinguished works have also stimulated the interest in the study of self-orthogonal codes under various inner products.

On the other hand, matrix-product codes were introduced by Blackmore and Norton as a generalization of many combinatorial constructions in [6] and hence, they provide efficient ways to obtain new codes of larger lengths from known codes of short lengths. Note also that efficient decoding algorithms for matrix-product codes were developed in [21–23]. Nowadays, matrix-product codes have been widely studied and applied in various fields, such as locally recoverable codes [37], symbol-pair codes [38], linear complementary pairs of codes [35], and digital nets [42]. These results have also motivated us to further investigate the topic of matrix-product codes in order to develop our constructions.

Combining the above two aspects, we had as a broad line of interest to study self-orthogonal matrix-product codes. Moreover, we have in mind for this research the following two basic observations.

- (1) Since the Euclidean and Hermitian duals of matrix-product codes were determined in [6, 54], many constructions of Euclidean and Hermitian self-orthogonal matrix-product codes have been proposed in [9, 16, 24, 39, 53] and the references therein. Note that Cao *et al.* recently characterized the σ duals of matrix-product codes in [12]. On this basis, in the same paper, the authors obtained several constructions of σ dual-containing matrix-product codes, but none of σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes. Note also that when considering the σ self-orthogonality, it seems that only constacyclic codes over rings were studied in [34, 55]. Motivated by this, it is of particular interest to study σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes.
- (2) On the other hand, the constructions of Hermitian self-orthogonal matrix-product codes are closely related to the non-singular by columns (NSC) quasi-unitary matrices as it was stated by Zhang in [53]. The authors have tried to find such matrices by employing Vandermonde matrices [10] and reverse NSC matrices [11]. Note that Toeplitz matrices have recently gained substantial prominence in coding theory as a generalization of circulant matrices and negacirculant matrices [28, 29, 32, 49] and that these matrices are conveniently storable and computationally efficient [19, 40, 41, 44]. This leads us to study the matrix-product codes related to Toeplitz matrices.

Combining the above two observations, we aim to study σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes associated with Toeplitz matrices in this paper. Four general constructions of σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes are presented, with many explicit examples. The following are the main results of this paper.

- (1) The first general construction of σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes, presented in Theorem 3.1, relies on the σ' dual of a known σ' dual-containing matrix-product code. From it, one can state the relationship between a linear code and its dual code with respect to a certain inner product, see Remark 3.3.
- (2) We introduce NSC quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrices in Definition 3.4 and present a concrete construction for them in Theorem 3.5. An algorithm for generating NSC quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrices is further provided in Algorithm 1 by employing Toeplitz matrices. Some sampling results given in Table 2 also illustrate that Algorithm 1 is efficient. With the help of these NSC quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrices, we obtain the second general construction of σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes in Theorem 3.10.
- (3) The last two general constructions of σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes are presented in Theorems 3.12 and 3.14 using certain special Toeplitz matrices. As a byproduct, we also find an interesting connection between those Toeplitz matrices and $\tilde{\tau}$ -optimal defining matrices in Remark 3.17.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews some useful notions and results. Section 3 presents the four general constructions of σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes as well as many specific examples and provides detailed comparisons among them. Finally, Section 4 concludes this paper.

2 Preliminaries

In this paper, we will denote by $q = p^h$ a prime power and e will be an integer with $0 \leq e \leq h - 1$. \mathbb{F}_q^n will denote the n -dimensional vector space over \mathbb{F}_q and $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ will denote the \mathbb{F}_q -linear space of $n \times n$ matrices over \mathbb{F}_q . For two vectors $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)$ and $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$ in \mathbb{F}_q^n , we denote by $d_H(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \#\{i \mid u_i \neq v_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ their *Hamming distance*. $\mathbf{0}$ and O will denote the zero vector and the zero matrix, respectively, whose sizes are unspecified here and will depend on the context. In the following, we review and give some useful results on σ inner products, σ duals, Toeplitz matrices, non-singular by columns matrices, and matrix-product codes.

2.1 σ inner products and σ duals

Let σ be a mapping from \mathbb{F}_q^n to \mathbb{F}_q^n . The mapping σ is said to be an *isometry* if $d_H(\sigma(\mathbf{u}), \sigma(\mathbf{v})) = d_H(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ for any $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$. Moreover, if σ is linear, we call it a *linear isometry*. The group of all isometries on \mathbb{F}_q^n will be denoted by $\mathbf{Aut}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$. Two linear codes \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 are called *isometric* if $\mathcal{C}_2 = \sigma(\mathcal{C}_1)$ for some $\sigma \in \mathbf{Aut}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$. Let $\mathbf{MAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$ be the *monomial group* consisted of the set of linear maps given by monomial matrices in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$. It can be easily checked that $\mathbf{MAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$ corresponds to the group of all linear isometries of \mathbb{F}_q^n .

As the authors proved in [5, 46], when $n \geq 3$, isometries that map subspaces onto subspaces are exactly the *semilinear mappings* of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma = (\tau, \pi) : \mathbb{F}_q^n &\rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^n \\ \mathbf{u} &\mapsto \tau(\pi(\mathbf{u})),\end{aligned}$$

where τ is a linear isometry and π is an automorphism of the finite field \mathbb{F}_q , abusing the notation $\pi(\mathbf{u}) = (\pi(u_1), \pi(u_2), \dots, \pi(u_n))$. We will denote by $\mathbf{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$ the group of all semilinear isometries on \mathbb{F}_q^n . Under above definitions, for any $\sigma = (\tau, \pi) \in \mathbf{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$, there is a monomial matrix $M_\tau \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ corresponding to τ such that

$$\sigma(\mathbf{u}) = \tau(\pi(\mathbf{u})) = \pi(\mathbf{u})M_\tau. \quad (1)$$

Note that each monomial matrix $M_\tau \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ can be decomposed as $M_\tau = D_\tau P_\tau$, where $D_\tau \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ is a diagonal matrix and $P_\tau \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ is a permutation matrix for the permutation $\tau = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & \cdots & n \\ \tau_1 & \tau_2 & \cdots & \tau_n \end{pmatrix}$. Furthermore, Equation (1) can be expressed as $\sigma(\mathbf{u}) = \pi(\mathbf{u})D_\tau P_\tau$. Note also that monomial and permutation matrices are non-singular matrices.

For $\sigma = (\tau, \pi) \in \mathbf{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$ with τ corresponding to a monomial matrix $M_\tau \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$, Carlet *et al.* in [13] introduced the σ inner product of \mathbf{u} and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ as

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i v'_i,$$

where $\sigma(\mathbf{v}) = (v'_1, v'_2, \dots, v'_n)$. Then the σ dual of an $[n, k]_q$ linear code \mathcal{C} is defined by

$$\mathcal{C}^{\perp_\sigma} = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n \mid \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{c} \rangle_\sigma = 0, \forall \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}\}. \quad (2)$$

As usually, \mathcal{C} is called σ self-orthogonal if $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\perp_\sigma}$; σ dual-containing if $\mathcal{C}^{\perp_\sigma} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$; and σ self-dual if $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^{\perp_\sigma}$.

For $0 \leq e \leq h-1$, let π_e denote the *Frobenius automorphism* over \mathbb{F}_q such that $\pi_e(\mathbf{u}) = (u_1^{p^e}, u_2^{p^e}, \dots, u_n^{p^e})$ and $\pi_e(A) = (a_{ij}^{p^e})$ for any $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n) \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ and $A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$. Let $\tau_{id} \in \mathbf{MAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$ be the *identity transformation* and $\tau_{sym} \in \mathbf{MAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^{2n})$ be the *symplectic transformation*, that is, τ_{id} corresponds to an identity matrix I_n and τ_{sym} corresponds to a symplectic matrix $\Omega_{2n} = \begin{pmatrix} O & I_n \\ -I_n & O \end{pmatrix}$. Then it is clear that the σ inner product is a generalization of the Galois (containing the Euclidean and Hermitian) inner product [13, 17] and the symplectic inner product [51]. Specifically speaking, we have the following.

- (1) If $\tau = \tau_{id}$ and $\pi = \pi_e$, the (τ_{id}, π_e) inner product coincides with the *e-Galois inner product*. Moreover, if $e = 0$, the (τ_{id}, π_0) inner product is the *Euclidean inner product*; and if $e = h/2$ with even h , the $(\tau_{id}, \pi_{h/2})$ inner product is the *Hermitian inner product*.
- (2) If $\tau = \tau_{sym}$ and $\pi = \pi_0$, the (τ_{sym}, π_0) inner product becomes the *symplectic inner product*.

Note that relationships as above also exist for the *Euclidean dual code* \mathcal{C}^{\perp_E} , the *Hermitian dual code* \mathcal{C}^{\perp_H} , the *e-Galois dual code* \mathcal{C}^{\perp_e} , and the *symplectic dual code* \mathcal{C}^{\perp_S} . In addition, we also have $\mathcal{C}^{\perp_\sigma} = \sigma(\mathcal{C})^{\perp_E}$ from [13], where $\sigma(\mathcal{C}) = \pi_e(\mathcal{C})M_\tau = \{\pi_e(\mathbf{c})M_\tau \mid \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}\}$. According to the following lemma, $\sigma(\mathcal{C})^{\perp_E}$ can be further determined.

Lemma 2.1. ([12, Lemma 3.2]) Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power and e be an integer with $0 \leq e \leq h - 1$. Let \mathcal{C} be an $[n, k]_q$ linear code. If $\sigma = (\tau, \pi_e) \in \text{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$, where τ corresponds to a monomial matrix $M_\tau \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$, then $\sigma(\mathcal{C})^{\perp_E} = \sigma(\mathcal{C}^{\perp_E})(M_\tau^T M_\tau)^{-1}$.

2.2 Toeplitz matrices and non-singular by columns matrices

In this subsection, we review some basic results on Toeplitz matrices and non-singular by columns (NSC) matrices, and then we prove that many NSC matrices can be obtained by known NSC matrices.

Definition 2.2. Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power and $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$. We say that A is a *Toeplitz matrix* if it has constant entries on all diagonals parallel to the main diagonal.

Definition 2.3. ([6, Definition 3.1]) Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power and $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$. Let A_ℓ be the $\ell \times n$ matrix consisting of the first ℓ rows of A and $A_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_\ell}$ be the $\ell \times \ell$ matrix consisting of columns j_1, j_2, \dots, j_ℓ of A_ℓ . We call A a *non-singular by columns (NSC) matrix* if $A_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_\ell}$ is non-singular for any $1 \leq \ell \leq n$ and $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_\ell \leq n$.

The following two lemmas are known.

Lemma 2.4. ([49, Theorem 1]) Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power and $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ be any Toeplitz matrix. Then $A = QA^T Q$, where $Q = \text{adiag}(1, 1, \dots, 1) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ is an anti-diagonal matrix.

Lemma 2.5. ([6, Lemma 4.3]) Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power and $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ be NSC. Then $Q(A^{-1})^T \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ is NSC.

Theorem 2.6. Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power and $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ be NSC. Then for any diagonal matrix $D = \text{diag}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ with $d_i \neq 0$ for any $1 \leq i \leq n$, both DA and AD are NSC.

Proof. Since A is NSC and $d_i \neq 0$ for any $1 \leq i \leq n$, it holds that

$$\det((DA)_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_\ell}) = \det((AD)_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_\ell}) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} d_{j_i} \right) \det(A_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_\ell}) \neq 0$$

for any $1 \leq \ell \leq n$ and $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_\ell \leq n$. By Definition 2.3, we complete the proof. \square

With above definitions, it is also easy to check that $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ must be non-singular if A is NSC, and $\pi_e(Q) = Q^{-1} = Q^T = Q^n = Q$ for any $0 \leq e \leq h - 1$ and any positive integer n . Based on Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5, we then deduce that $\pi_e(A)^{-1}Q$ is also NSC for any $0 \leq e \leq h - 1$ if A is an NSC Toeplitz matrix as follows.

Theorem 2.7. Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power and $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ be an NSC Toeplitz matrix. Then for any $0 \leq e \leq h - 1$, $\pi_e(A)^{-1}Q \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ is NSC.

Proof. Since A is NSC, then

$$\det(\pi_e(A)_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_\ell}) = \pi_e(\det(A_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_\ell})) = (\det(A_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_\ell}))^{p^e} \neq 0$$

for any $1 \leq \ell \leq n$, $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_\ell \leq n$ and $0 \leq e \leq h - 1$, which implies that $\pi_e(A)$ is NSC. Since A is a Toeplitz matrix, it follows from Lemma 2.4 that

$$\pi_e(A)^T = \pi_e(QAQ) = Q\pi_e(A)Q.$$

By Lemma 2.5, we immediately get that

$$Q(\pi_e(A)^{-1})^T = Q(\pi_e(A)^T)^{-1} = Q(Q\pi_e(A)Q)^{-1} = \pi_e(A)^{-1}Q \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$$

is NSC. This completes the proof. \square

2.3 Matrix-product codes and their σ duals

In this subsection, we recall some basic concepts and results on matrix-product codes, involving their definition, parameters, and dual codes under both the Euclidean and σ inner products.

Definition 2.8. ([6, Definition 2.1]) Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power and $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$. Let C_i be an $[n, k_i, d_i]_q$ linear code for $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$. A *matrix-product code* $\mathcal{C}(A) = [C_1, C_2, \dots, C_s] \cdot A$ is defined as the set of all matrix-products $[\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2, \dots, \mathbf{c}_s] \cdot A$, where $\mathbf{c}_i = (c_{1i}, c_{2i}, \dots, c_{ni})^T \in C_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$, A is called the *defining matrix* of $\mathcal{C}(A)$, and C_1, C_2, \dots, C_s are called the *input codes* of $\mathcal{C}(A)$. A classical codeword $\mathbf{c} = [\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2, \dots, \mathbf{c}_s] \cdot A \in \mathcal{C}(A)$ can be expressed as the $n \times s$ matrix

$$\mathbf{c} = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^s c_{1i}a_{i1} & \sum_{i=1}^s c_{1i}a_{i2} & \cdots & \sum_{i=1}^s c_{1i}a_{is} \\ \sum_{i=1}^s c_{2i}a_{i1} & \sum_{i=1}^s c_{2i}a_{i2} & \cdots & \sum_{i=1}^s c_{2i}a_{is} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sum_{i=1}^s c_{ni}a_{i1} & \sum_{i=1}^s c_{ni}a_{i2} & \cdots & \sum_{i=1}^s c_{ni}a_{is} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover, if we regard $\mathbf{c}_i = (c_{1i}, c_{2i}, \dots, c_{ni}) \in C_i$ as a row vector of length n for $1 \leq i \leq s$, then any codeword of $\mathcal{C}(A)$ can also be viewed as a row vector of length sn , that is,

$$\mathbf{c} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^s a_{i1}\mathbf{c}_i, \sum_{i=1}^s a_{i2}\mathbf{c}_i, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^s a_{is}\mathbf{c}_i \right).$$

Note that Definition 2.8 is indeed valid for any $s \times t$ matrix A over \mathbb{F}_q . However, we only consider the case $s = t$ in this paper. The reason for this convention arises from the following series of lemmas.

Lemma 2.9. ([22,43]) Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power and $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ be non-singular. Let C_i be an $[n, k_i, d_i]_q$ linear code for $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$. Then $\mathcal{C}(A)$ is an $[sn, \sum_{i=1}^s k_i, \geq d]_q$ linear code, where $d = \min\{D_i(A)d_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq s\}$ and $D_i(A)$ denotes the minimum distance of the $[s, i]_q$ linear code generated by the first i rows of A .

Lemma 2.10. ([6, Proposition 6.2]) Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power and $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ be non-singular. Let C_i be an $[n, k_i, d_i]_q$ linear code for $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$. Then the Euclidean dual of $\mathcal{C}(A)$ is

$$\mathcal{C}(A)^{\perp_E} = [C_1^{\perp_E}, C_2^{\perp_E}, \dots, C_s^{\perp_E}] \cdot (A^{-1})^T.$$

Remark 2.11. From [6], the minimum distance of a matrix-product code shown in Lemma 2.9 may be sharper when the defining matrix is NSC, and in this case one can also obtain a lower bound on the minimum distance of its Euclidean dual code.

Lemma 2.12. ([6, Theorems 3.7 and 6.6]) Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power and $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ be NSC. Let C_i be an $[n, k_i, d_i]_q$ linear code with Euclidean dual distance $d_i^{\perp_E}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$. Then $\mathcal{C}(A)$ and its Euclidean dual code have respective parameters $[sn, \sum_{i=1}^s k_i, \geq d]_q$ and $[sn, sn - \sum_{i=1}^s k_i, \geq d^{\perp_E}]_q$, where $d = \min\{(s+1-i)d_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq s\}$ and $d^{\perp_E} = \min\{id_i^{\perp_E} \mid 1 \leq i \leq s\}$.

Next, we recall some basic results on σ duals of matrix-product codes. To this end, we need to introduce the Kronecker product of two matrices.

Definition 2.13. ([25, Section 11.4]) Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power, $A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$, and $B \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, t)$. The Kronecker product of A and B is defined by

$$A \otimes B = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}B & a_{12}B & \cdots & a_{1s}B \\ a_{21}B & a_{22}B & \cdots & a_{2s}B \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{s1}B & a_{s2}B & \cdots & a_{ss}B \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, st).$$

Lemma 2.14. ([12, Theorem 4.4 and Remark 4.5 (2)]) Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power and e be an integer with $0 \leq e \leq h-1$. Let C_i be an $[n, k_i, d_i]_q$ linear code for $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ and $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ be non-singular. Set $\sigma = (\tau, \pi_e) \in \text{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^{sn})$ and $\sigma' = (\tau', \pi_e) \in \text{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$, where τ corresponds to a monomial matrix $M_\tau = D_\tau P_\tau \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, sn)$ and τ' corresponds to a monomial matrix $M_{\tau'} = D_{\tau'} P_{\tau'} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$. If there is a monomial matrix $M_{\tilde{\tau}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ such that $M_\tau = M_{\tilde{\tau}} \otimes M_{\tau'}$, then the σ dual of $\mathcal{C}(A)$ is

$$\mathcal{C}(A)^{\perp_\sigma} = [C_1^{\perp_{\sigma'}}, C_2^{\perp_{\sigma'}}, \dots, C_s^{\perp_{\sigma'}}] \cdot (M_{\tilde{\tau}}^T \pi_e(A)^T)^{-1}.$$

Lemma 2.15. ([12, Theorem 4.6 and Remark 4.7 (2)]) Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power and e be an integer with $0 \leq e \leq h-1$. Let C_i be an $[n, k_i, d_i]_q$ linear code for $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ and $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$. Set $\sigma = (\tau, \pi_e) \in \text{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^{sn})$ and $\sigma' = (\tau', \pi_e) \in \text{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$, where τ corresponds to a monomial matrix $M_\tau = D_\tau P_\tau \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, sn)$ and τ' corresponds to a monomial matrix $M_{\tau'} =$

$D_{\tau'} P_{\tau'} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$. If there is a monomial matrix $M_{\tilde{\tau}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ such that $M_{\tau} = M_{\tilde{\tau}} \otimes M_{\tau'}$ and $AM_{\tilde{\tau}}^T \pi_e(A)^T = \text{diag}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_s) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$, then the intersection of $\mathcal{C}(A)$ and $\mathcal{C}(A)^{\perp\sigma}$ is

$$\mathcal{C}(A) \cap \mathcal{C}(A)^{\perp\sigma} = [\mathcal{C}'_1, \mathcal{C}'_2, \dots, \mathcal{C}'_s] \cdot A \text{ with } \mathcal{C}'_i = \begin{cases} \mathcal{C}_i, & \text{if } d_i = 0, \\ \mathcal{C}_i \cap \mathcal{C}_i^{\perp\sigma}, & \text{if } d_i \neq 0. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Theorem 2.16. With the notations and conditions as in Lemma 2.15. If $d_i = 0$ or \mathcal{C}_i is σ' self-orthogonal for $1 \leq i \leq s$, then $\mathcal{C}(A)$ is σ self-orthogonal.

Proof. Note that \mathcal{C}_i is σ' self-orthogonal if and only if $\mathcal{C}_i = \mathcal{C}_i \cap \mathcal{C}_i^{\perp\sigma'}$. Then combining the given conditions and Equation (3), we have $\mathcal{C}'_i = \mathcal{C}_i$ for any $1 \leq i \leq s$. It follows from Lemma 2.15 that $\mathcal{C}(A) \cap \mathcal{C}(A)^{\perp\sigma} = [\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2, \dots, \mathcal{C}_s] \cdot A = \mathcal{C}(A)$, which implies that $\mathcal{C}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{C}(A)^{\perp\sigma}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{C}(A)$ is σ self-orthogonal under the described conditions. \square

Remark 2.17. Since $\det(M_{\tilde{\tau}}) \neq 0$ for any monomial matrix $M_{\tilde{\tau}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$, it follows from the condition $AM_{\tilde{\tau}}^T \pi_e(A)^T = \text{diag}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_s)$ that

$$\det(A) \det(\pi_e(A)) = (\det(A))^{p^e+1} = \left(\prod_{i=1}^s d_i \right) \det(M_{\tilde{\tau}})^{-1} \neq 0$$

if and only if $d_i \neq 0$ for any $1 \leq i \leq s$. In other words, if $d_i = 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq s$, then $\det(A) = 0$, and hence, A is not NSC. Combining Remark 2.11, the case $d_i = 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq s$, feasible in Theorem 2.16, may not be interesting in practice. As a result, we will expect to find NSC matrices A , monomial matrices $M_{\tilde{\tau}}$, and σ' self-orthogonal codes $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2, \dots, \mathcal{C}_s$ that satisfy the conditions in Theorem 2.16 to derive σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes.

3 Four general constructions of σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes associated with Toeplitz matrices

In this section, we provide four general constructions of σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes. The first one relies on the σ' dual of a known σ' dual-containing matrix-product code; the second one is founded on the so-called quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrix (see Definition 3.4); and the last two ones are based on the utilization of certain special Toeplitz matrices. As a byproduct, we also provide a connection between these special Toeplitz matrices and the $\tilde{\tau}$ -optimal defining matrices recently introduced in [9].

3.1 The first general construction via σ' duals of known σ' dual-containing matrix-product codes

We will begin with two important observations.

- (1) On one hand, we notice that several families of q -ary σ' dual-containing matrix-product codes have been constructed in [12, Section 5] for some special $\sigma' \in \mathbf{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^{sn})$ with $q \in \{4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13\}$.

- (2) On the other hand, it is well-known that for any linear code \mathcal{C} , \mathcal{C}^{\perp_E} (resp. \mathcal{C}^{\perp_H} , \mathcal{C}^{\perp_e} , and \mathcal{C}^{\perp_S}) is Euclidean (resp. Hermitian, e -Galois, and symplectic) self-orthogonal if and only if \mathcal{C} is Euclidean (resp. Hermitian, $(h-e)$ -Galois, and symplectic) dual-containing.

Motivated by the facts above, the following natural question arises: whether it is possible to construct σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes by considering the σ' dual of a known σ' -dual containing matrix-product code. The following theorem gives an affirmative answer to this question.

Theorem 3.1. (Construction I) *Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power and e, e' be two integers with $0 \leq e, e' \leq h-1$. Let C_i be an $[n, k_i, d_i]_q$ linear code with Euclidean dual distance $d_i^{\perp_E}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ and $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ be non-singular. Let $\sigma = (\tau, \pi_e) \in \text{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^{sn})$ and $\sigma' = (\tau', \pi_{e'}) \in \text{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^{sn})$, where τ corresponds to a monomial matrix $M_\tau \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, sn)$ and τ' corresponds to a monomial matrix $M_{\tau'} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, sn)$. Then the following statements hold.*

- (1) *If $e' \equiv h - e \pmod{h}$ and $\pi_e(M_{\tau'}) = tM_{\tau}^T$ for some $t \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$, then $\mathcal{C}(A)$ is a σ' dual-containing matrix-product code if and only if $\mathcal{C}(A)^{\perp_{\sigma'}}$ is a σ self-orthogonal matrix-product code.*
- (2) *If A is NSC, then $\mathcal{C}(A)$ has parameters $[sn, \sum_{i=1}^s k_i, \geq d]_q$ and $\mathcal{C}(A)^{\perp_{\sigma'}}$ has parameters $[sn, sn - \sum_{i=1}^s k_i, \geq d^{\perp_{\sigma'}}]_q$, where $d = \min\{(s+1-i)d_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq s\}$ and $d^{\perp_{\sigma'}} = \min\{id_i^{\perp_E} \mid 1 \leq i \leq s\}$.*

Proof. (1) Recall that $\mathcal{C}^{\perp_{\tilde{\sigma}}} = \tilde{\sigma}(\mathcal{C})^{\perp_E}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}(\mathcal{C}) = \pi_e(\mathcal{C})M_{\tilde{\tau}}$ for any $[n, k]_q$ linear code \mathcal{C} and any $\tilde{\sigma} = (\tilde{\tau}, \pi_e) \in \text{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$, where $\tilde{\tau}$ corresponds to a monomial matrix $M_{\tilde{\tau}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$. It then follows from the given conditions, Lemma 2.1, and the linearity of $\mathcal{C}(A)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{C}(A)^{\perp_{\sigma'}})^{\perp_{\sigma}} &= \sigma \left(\left(\mathcal{C}(A)^{\perp_{\sigma'}} \right)^{\perp_E} \right) (M_{\tau}^T M_{\tau})^{-1} \\
&= \sigma \left(\left(\sigma'(\mathcal{C}(A))^{\perp_E} \right)^{\perp_E} \right) M_{\tau}^{-1} (M_{\tau}^T)^{-1} \\
&= \pi_e(\pi_{h-e}(\mathcal{C}(A))M_{\tau'}) M_{\tau} M_{\tau}^{-1} (M_{\tau}^T)^{-1} \\
&= \mathcal{C}(A) \pi_e(M_{\tau'}) (M_{\tau}^T)^{-1} \\
&= \mathcal{C}(A).
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Hence, $\mathcal{C}(A)^{\perp_{\sigma'}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}(A)$ if and only if $\mathcal{C}(A)^{\perp_{\sigma'}} \subseteq (\mathcal{C}(A)^{\perp_{\sigma'}})^{\perp_{\sigma}}$, that is, $\mathcal{C}(A)$ is σ' dual-containing if and only if $\mathcal{C}(A)^{\perp_{\sigma'}}$ is σ self-orthogonal. On the other hand, from [12, Theorem 4.4], $\mathcal{C}(A)^{\perp_{\sigma'}}$ is still a matrix-product code. Combining these two aspects, we complete the proof of the result (1).

(2) Using similar calculations as in the proof of the result (1) above, we deduce that $\mathcal{C}(A)^{\perp_{\sigma'}} = \pi_{e'}(\mathcal{C}(A)^{\perp_E})(M_{\tau'}^T)^{-1}$. Hence, $\mathcal{C}(A)^{\perp_{\sigma'}}$ has the same parameters as $\mathcal{C}(A)^{\perp_E}$. Since $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ is NSC, the parameters of $\mathcal{C}(A)$ and $\mathcal{C}(A)^{\perp_E}$ can be immediately obtained from Lemma 2.12. This completes the proof the result (2). \square

Example 3.2. Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power and $t \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$ be any element. Recall that several families of q -ary σ' dual-containing matrix-product codes were constructed in [12, Section 5] based on Lemma 2.14. Assume that $\sigma' = (\tau', \pi_{e'}) \in \text{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^{sn})$. One can further note that in [12, Section 5], τ' always corresponds to a monomial matrix $M_{\tau'} = M_{\tilde{\tau}} \otimes I_n$ with $M_{\tilde{\tau}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ being a monomial matrix. From Theorem 3.1, to derive σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes from these σ' dual-containing matrix-product codes, it suffices to take $\sigma = (\tau, \pi_{h-e'}) \in \text{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^{sn})$ such that τ corresponds to the monomial matrix

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\tau} &= t^{-1} \pi_{h-e'}(M_{\tau'})^T \\ &= (t^{-1} I_s \otimes I_n) (\pi_{h-e'}(M_{\tilde{\tau}}^T) \otimes I_n^T) \\ &= \left(t^{-1} \pi_{h-e'}(M_{\tilde{\tau}})^T \right) \otimes I_n. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Specifically speaking, we have the following results.

- (1) In Theorems 5.5, 5.8, 5.11, 5.14, 5.17 and 5.20 of [12], $e' = 0$ and $M_{\tilde{\tau}}$ being symmetric are restricted. Following Equation (5), we can take $\sigma = (\tau, \pi_h) = (\tau, \pi_0)$, where τ corresponds to the monomial matrix

$$M_{\tau} = (t^{-1} \pi_h(M_{\tilde{\tau}}^T)) \otimes I_n = (t^{-1} \pi_0(M_{\tilde{\tau}})) \otimes I_n = t^{-1} M_{\tau'}.$$

Then we immediately get several classes of q -ary σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes by taking σ' duals of these existing σ' dual-containing matrix-product codes.

- (2) Let ω be a primitive element of \mathbb{F}_4 . In Theorem 5.2 of [12], two classes of quaternary σ' dual-containing matrix-product codes were constructed, where $\sigma' = (\tau', \pi_1)$ and τ' corresponds to a monomial matrix $M_{\tau'} = M_{\tilde{\tau}} \otimes I_n$ with $M_{\tilde{\tau}}$ listed in the second column of Table 1. Following Equation (5), we can take $\sigma = (\tau, \pi_1)$, where τ corresponds to a monomial matrix M_{τ} listed in the third column of Table 1. Again, we directly obtain two classes of quaternary σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes by taking σ' duals of the σ' dual-containing matrix-product codes constructed in [12, Theorems 5.2].

Table 1: The monomial matrices $M_{\tilde{\tau}}$ and M_{τ} in Example 3.2 (2)

Finite field \mathbb{F}_q	$M_{\tilde{\tau}}$	M_{τ}	Reference
$q = 4$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega+1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} t^{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & t^{-1}\omega^2 \\ 0 & 0 & t^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & t^{-1}\omega & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \otimes I_n$	[12, Theorem 5.2 1)]
$q = 4$	$\begin{pmatrix} \omega+1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega+1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} t^{-1}\omega & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & t^{-1}\omega^2 & 0 \\ 0 & t^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & t^{-1}\omega \end{pmatrix} \otimes I_n$	[12, Theorem 5.2 2)]

We end this subsection with the following remark.

Remark 3.3. Taking into account Equation (4), it is easy to conclude that $(\mathcal{C}^{\perp_{\sigma'}})^{\perp_{\sigma}} = \mathcal{C}$ for any $[n, k]_q$ linear code \mathcal{C} provided that $\sigma = (\tau, \pi_e) \in \text{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$ and $\sigma' = (\tau', \pi_{e'}) \in \text{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$, where τ corresponds to a monomial matrix $M_\tau \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ and τ' corresponds to a monomial matrix $M_{\tau'} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ satisfying $e' \equiv h - e \pmod{h}$ and $\pi_{e'}(M_{\tau'}) = tM_\tau^T$ for some $t \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$. In particular, we have the following subcases.

- (1) $\tau = \tau' = \tau_{id}$. In this case, $M_\tau = M_{\tau'} = I_n$, then we have $\pi_e(I_n) = tI_n^T$ with $t = 1$ for any $0 \leq e \leq h - 1$. It implies that $(\mathcal{C}^{\perp_{h-e}})^{\perp_e} = \mathcal{C}$. Moreover, we get that $(\mathcal{C}^{\perp_E})^{\perp_E} = \mathcal{C}$ and $(\mathcal{C}^{\perp_H})^{\perp_H} = \mathcal{C}$.
- (2) $\tau = \tau' = \tau_{sym}$ and n is even. In this case, $M_\tau = M_{\tau'} = \Omega_n$, then we have $\pi_0(\Omega_n) = t\Omega_n^T$ with $t = -1$. It deduces that $(\mathcal{C}^{\perp_S})^{\perp_S} = \mathcal{C}$.

Therefore, one has a unified framework for the relationship between a linear code and its dual code with respect to a certain inner product that follows from the proof of Theorem 3.1. Note also that this framework can not be obtained from the results in [34, 55].

3.2 The second general construction via quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrices obtained from general Toeplitz matrices

In this subsection, we present the second general construction of σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes. We first introduce the concept of quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrices, which generalizes the well-known quasi-orthogonal matrices and quasi-unitary matrices.

Definition 3.4. Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power and e be an integer with $0 \leq e \leq h - 1$. Set $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ and $\widehat{\sigma} = (\widehat{\tau}, \pi_e) \in \text{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^s)$, where $\widehat{\tau}$ corresponds to a monomial matrix $M_{\widehat{\tau}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$. If $AM_{\widehat{\tau}}^T \pi_e(A)^T \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ is a diagonal matrix with all nonzero diagonal elements, then we call A a *quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrix*. In particular, a quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrix coincides with a *quasi-orthogonal matrix* if $\widehat{\sigma} = (\tau_{id}, \pi_0)$; and a *quasi-unitary matrix* if $\widehat{\sigma} = (\tau_{id}, \pi_{h/2})$ and h is even.

According to Lemma 2.15 and Theorem 2.16, the construction of quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrices is closely related to the existence of σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes. This motivates us to give an explicit way for obtaining NSC quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrices as follows.

Theorem 3.5. Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power, $r = 2e$ if $0 \leq e \leq \frac{h}{2}$ and $r = 2e - h$ if $\frac{h}{2} < e \leq h - 1$. Let $g = \gcd(r, h)$ and \mathbb{F}_{p^g} be the subfield of \mathbb{F}_q with p^g elements. Suppose that $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ is an NSC matrix and $M_{\widetilde{\tau}} = D_{\widetilde{\tau}} P_{\widetilde{\tau}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ is a monomial matrix such that $AM_{\widetilde{\tau}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{p^g}, s)$. If all leading principal minors of $AM_{\widetilde{\tau}} \pi_e(AM_{\widetilde{\tau}})^T$ are nonzero, then there is a unit lower triangular matrix $L \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ such that $LA \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ is an NSC quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrix, where $\widehat{\sigma} = (\widehat{\tau}, \pi_e) \in \text{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^s)$ and $\widehat{\tau}$ corresponds to the diagonal matrix $M_{\widehat{\tau}} = D_{\widetilde{\tau}} \pi_e(D_{\widetilde{\tau}}) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$.

Proof. Under the given conditions, for any $a \in \mathbb{F}_{p^g} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q$, we have $\pi_{2e}(a) = \pi_r(a) = a$ if $0 \leq e \leq \frac{h}{2}$; and $\pi_{2e}(a) = \pi_{r+h}(a) = \pi_r(\pi_h(a)) = a$ if $\frac{h}{2} < e \leq h - 1$. Since $AM_{\widetilde{\tau}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{p^g}, s)$, we get that

$$\pi_e(AM_{\widetilde{\tau}} \pi_e(AM_{\widetilde{\tau}})^T)^T = \pi_{2e}(AM_{\widetilde{\tau}}) \pi_e(AM_{\widetilde{\tau}})^T = AM_{\widetilde{\tau}} \pi_e(AM_{\widetilde{\tau}})^T.$$

It implies that

$$AM_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_e(AM_{\tilde{\tau}})^T = \begin{pmatrix} B_{s-1} & \mathbf{b}_{s-1} \\ \pi_e(\mathbf{b}_{s-1})^T & b_s \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

where $B_{s-1} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s-1)$ satisfies $\pi_e(B_{s-1})^T = B_{s-1}$ and $\det(B_{s-1}) \neq 0$, \mathbf{b}_{s-1} is a column vector of length $s-1$ over \mathbb{F}_{p^g} and $\pi_e(b_s) = b_s$. Since B_{s-1} is non-singular, we are able to take

$$L_{s-1} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{s-1} & \mathbf{0}_{(s-1) \times 1} \\ -\pi_e(\mathbf{b}_{s-1})^T B_{s-1}^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

Then it can be checked that L_{s-1} is a unit lower triangular matrix and

$$\begin{aligned} & L_{s-1} AM_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_e(M_{\tilde{\tau}})^T \pi_e(A)^T \pi_e(L_{s-1})^T \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} I_{s-1} & \mathbf{0}_{(s-1) \times 1} \\ -\pi_e(\mathbf{b}_{s-1})^T B_{s-1}^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B_{s-1} & \mathbf{b}_{s-1} \\ \pi_e(\mathbf{b}_{s-1})^T & b_s \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_{s-1} & -\pi_e(B_{s-1}^{-1})^T \pi_{2e}(\mathbf{b}_{s-1}) \\ \mathbf{0}_{1 \times (s-1)} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} B_{s-1} & \mathbf{b}_{s-1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{1 \times (s-1)} & -\pi_e(\mathbf{b}_{s-1})^T B_{s-1}^{-1} \mathbf{b}_{s-1} + b_s \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_{s-1} & -\pi_e((B_{s-1}^T)^{-1}) \mathbf{b}_{s-1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{1 \times (s-1)} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} B_{s-1} & \mathbf{0}_{(s-1) \times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{1 \times (s-1)} & -\pi_e(\mathbf{b}_{s-1})^T B_{s-1}^{-1} \mathbf{b}_{s-1} + b_s \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $-\pi_e(\mathbf{b}_{s-1})^T B_{s-1}^{-1} \mathbf{b}_{s-1} + b_s \neq 0$ since

$$\det(L_{s-1} AM_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_e(M_{\tilde{\tau}})^T \pi_e(A)^T \pi_e(L_{s-1})^T) = \det(AM_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_e(AM_{\tilde{\tau}})^T) \neq 0.$$

Note that all leading principal minors of B_{s-1} are still nonzero and $\pi_e(B_{s-1})^T = B_{s-1}$, then the above processes shown in Equations (6), (7), and (8) can be repeated for B_{s-1} . Note also that they can be iterated $s-2$ times. Take $L'_{s-i-1} = \begin{pmatrix} L_{s-i-1} & \mathbf{0}_{(s-i) \times i} \\ \mathbf{0}_{i \times (s-i)} & I_i \end{pmatrix}$ for $1 \leq i \leq s-2$ and $L = L'_1 L'_2 \cdots L'_{s-2} L_{s-1}$. Then it is clear that L is a unit lower triangular matrix such that

$$LAM_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_e(M_{\tilde{\tau}})^T \pi_e(A)^T \pi_e(L)^T = (LA)(M_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_e(M_{\tilde{\tau}})^T) \pi_e(LA)^T = (LA)M_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_e(LA)^T$$

is a diagonal matrix with all nonzero diagonal elements, where $M_{\tilde{\tau}} = M_{\tilde{\tau}}^T = M_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_e(M_{\tilde{\tau}})^T = D_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_e(D_{\tilde{\tau}})$. Let $\widehat{\sigma} = (\widehat{\tau}, \pi_e)$ and $\widehat{\tau}$ corresponds to the diagonal matrix $M_{\tilde{\tau}}$. By Definition 3.4, LA is just a quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrix. Since the matrix A is NSC and L is a unit lower triangular matrix, it can be verified that

$$\det((LA)_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_\ell}) = \det(A_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_\ell}) \neq 0$$

for any $1 \leq \ell \leq s$ and $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_\ell \leq s$. By Definition 2.3, LA is also a NSC matrix. We have completed the whole proof. \square

Remark 3.6. With the notations and conditions as in Theorem 3.5. On one hand, if we take A and $M_{\tilde{\tau}}$ from $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{p^g}, s)$, then $AM_{\tilde{\tau}}$ must be in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{p^g}, s)$. On the other hand, if we take $M_{\tilde{\tau}} = I_s$ and $e = h/2$ with even h in Theorem 3.5, then $M_{\tilde{\tau}} = I_s$, which implies that $\widehat{\sigma} = (\widehat{\tau}, \pi_e) = (\tau_{id}, \pi_{h/2})$ coincides with the Hermitian inner product. It means that LA is just an NSC quasi-unitary matrix in this case, which is the same as [10, Theorem 5]. Consequently, Theorem 3.5 can also be regarded as a generalization of [10, Theorem 5].

It should be emphasized that Theorem 3.5 is important and easy to use. Its importance will be shown in Theorem 3.10 below for constructing σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes. Combining Theorem 3.5 with Theorems 2.6, 2.7, and Remark 3.6, we provide an algorithm for constructing NSC quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrices in Algorithm 1. In addition, we point out that Algorithm 1 is more efficient compared to the case where the matrix T is taken to be other types of matrices in Line 5 of this algorithm. This assertion arises from, at least, the following two facts.

- (1) Toeplitz matrices are easy to store and compute (see [19, 40, 41, 44] for more details), and many of the submatrices of a Toeplitz matrix are also Toeplitz matrices with smaller sizes.
- (2) From Theorems 2.6 and 2.7, an NSC Toeplitz matrix is accompanied by three other NSC matrices.

One has also the following open problem on NSC quasi-unitary matrices.

Problem 3.7. ([10, Question 14]) Let $q = p^h \neq 2$ be a prime power. For $s = q$ and $q + 2 \leq s \leq q^2$, do $s \times s$ NSC quasi-unitary matrices exist over \mathbb{F}_{q^2} ?

An affirmative answer to Problem 3.7 was given in [10, Remark 16] only for the values $s = q = 3$. Very recently, Cao *et al.* in [11] proposed an algorithm for searching NSC quasi-unitary matrices over \mathbb{F}_{q^2} by employing the so-called reversely non-singular by columns (RNSC) matrices of type $(V^{-1})^T D$, where $V = (x_j^{i-1})_{1 \leq i, j \leq s} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{q^2}, s)$ is a non-singular Vandermonde matrix and $D \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{q^2}, s)$ is a diagonal matrix. For more details on RNSC matrices, we refer to [16, 33]. Clearly, $(V^{-1})^T D$ is not a Toeplitz matrix in general. Hence, even if we restrict Algorithm 1 to the case of constructing NSC quasi-unitary matrices over \mathbb{F}_{q^2} , it is different from that given in [11]. The following remark gives a further comparison between them.

Remark 3.8. Similar to [11, Remark 3.7], we perform a sampling manner, with the help of the Magma software package [7], to count the number of NSC quasi-unitary matrices in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{q^2}, s)$ based on NSC Toeplitz matrices by using Algorithm 1 for $(q, s) \in \{(3, 3), (3, 5), (3, 6), (4, 4), (4, 6), (4, 7), (5, 5), (5, 7), (5, 8), (7, 7), (7, 9), (8, 8)\}$ and the chosen random seed 2024. Our sampling results and those of Cao *et al.* are listed in the second (resp. third) and fifth (resp. sixth) columns of Table 2, respectively, where the symbol “ $a/10000$ ” denotes the number of the NSC quasi-unitary matrices obtained from Algorithm 1 (resp. [11, Algorithm 1]) after sampling 10000 times and the symbol “ $-$ ” denotes that no sampling results are documented in [11]. From Table 2, it is easy to conclude that our sampling results are more than those presented in [11, Remark 3.7]. As we stated before, this advantage stems from the use of Toeplitz matrices.

An explicit example on general NSC quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrix is also given below and will be used in the following.

Example 3.9. Take $p = 3$, $h = 4$, $e = 1$, then $r = 2e = 2$ and $g = \gcd(r, h) = 2$. Note that $\mathbb{F}_{3^2} = \{0, 1, \omega^{10}, \omega^{20}, \omega^{30}, 2, \omega^{50}, \omega^{60}, \omega^{70}\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{3^4}$, where ω is a primitive element of \mathbb{F}_{3^4} . Let A

Algorithm 1: An algorithm for constructing NSC quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrices

Input: A finite field size $q = p^h$, a matrix size s , integers e, r , and $g = \gcd(r, h)$, a monomial matrix $M_{\tilde{\tau}} = D_{\tilde{\tau}} P_{\tilde{\tau}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{p^g}, s)$, and a matrix $Q = \text{adiag}(1, 1, \dots, 1) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{p^g}, s)$.

Output: An NSC quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrix in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$.

// $M_{i,i}$ is the $i \times i$ leading principal submatrix of the matrix M .

```

1 begin
2   SetSeed(2024);
3    $A \leftarrow O_{s \times s}$ .
4   while  $A = O_{s \times s}$  do
5     Sample randomly an NSC Toeplitz matrix  $T \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{p^g}, s)$  and a diagonal matrix
        $D \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{p^g}, s)$  with all nonzero diagonal elements;
6      $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_i \leftarrow (TDM_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_e(TDM_{\tilde{\tau}})^T)_{i,i};$ 
7      $\mathcal{D}\mathcal{P}_i \leftarrow (DTM_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_e(DTM_{\tilde{\tau}})^T)_{i,i};$ 
8      $\mathcal{R}\mathcal{D}_i \leftarrow \left( \pi_e(T)^{-1} QDM_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_e(\pi_e(T)^{-1} QDM_{\tilde{\tau}})^T \right)_{i,i};$ 
9      $\mathcal{D}\mathcal{R}_i \leftarrow \left( D\pi_e(T)^{-1} QM_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_e(D\pi_e(T)^{-1} QM_{\tilde{\tau}})^T \right)_{i,i};$ 
10    if  $\det(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_i) \neq 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq s-1$  then
11       $A \leftarrow TD;$ 
12    else if  $\det(\mathcal{D}\mathcal{P}_i) \neq 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq s-1$  then
13       $A \leftarrow DT;$ 
14    else if  $\det(\mathcal{D}\mathcal{R}_i) \neq 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq s-1$  then
15       $A \leftarrow \pi_e(T)^{-1} QD;$ 
16    else if  $\det(\mathcal{R}\mathcal{D}_i) \neq 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq s-1$  then
17       $A \leftarrow D\pi_e(T)^{-1} Q;$ 
18    end
19  end
20   $S \leftarrow AM_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_e(AM_{\tilde{\tau}})^T = \begin{pmatrix} B_{s-1} & \mathbf{b}_{s-1} \\ \pi_e(\mathbf{b}_{s-1})^T & b_s \end{pmatrix}$ , where  $\pi_e(B_{s-1})^T = B_{s-1}$  is invertible,
      $\mathbf{b}_{s-1} \in \mathbb{F}_{p^g}^{s-1}$ , and  $\pi_e(b_s) = b_s$ ;
21   $L_{s-1} \leftarrow \begin{pmatrix} I_{s-1} & \mathbf{0}_{(s-1) \times 1} \\ -\pi_e(\mathbf{b}_{s-1})^T B_{s-1}^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix};$ 
22  for  $1 \leq i \leq s-2$  do
23     $B_{s-i} \leftarrow \begin{pmatrix} B_{s-i-1} & \mathbf{b}_{s-i-1} \\ \pi_e(\mathbf{b}_{s-i-1})^T & b_{s-i} \end{pmatrix}$ , where  $\pi_e(B_{s-i-1})^T = B_{s-i-1}$  is invertible,
      $\mathbf{b}_{s-i-1} \in \mathbb{F}_{p^g}^{s-i-1}$ , and  $\pi_e(b_{s-i}) = b_{s-i}$ ;
24     $L_{s-i-1} \leftarrow \begin{pmatrix} I_{s-i-1} & \mathbf{0}_{(s-i-1) \times 1} \\ -\pi_e(\mathbf{b}_{s-i-1})^T B_{s-i-1}^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix};$ 
25     $L'_{s-i-1} \leftarrow \begin{pmatrix} L_{s-i-1} & \mathbf{0}_{(s-i) \times i} \\ \mathbf{0}_{i \times (s-i)} & I_i \end{pmatrix};$ 
26  end
27   $L \leftarrow L'_1 L'_2 \cdots L'_{s-2} L_{s-1};$ 
28   $M_{\tilde{\tau}} \leftarrow D_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_e(D_{\tilde{\tau}});$ 
29   $\widehat{\sigma} \leftarrow (\tilde{\tau}, \pi_e)$ , where  $\tilde{\tau}$  corresponds to the matrix  $M_{\tilde{\tau}}$ ;
30  return  $LA \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$  is an NSC quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$  matrix;
31 end

```

Table 2: Comparison of sampling results between Algorithm 1 and [11, Algorithm 1]

(q, s)	Algorithm 1	[11, Algorithm 1]	(q, s)	Algorithm 1	[11, Algorithm 1]
(3, 3)	8294/10000	5384/10000	(3, 5)	6622/10000	3449/10000
(3, 6)	1117/10000	—	(4, 4)	7327/10000	3736/10000
(4, 6)	4614/10000	2047/10000	(4, 7)	5673/10000	—
(5, 5)	7454/10000	4061/10000	(5, 7)	5668/10000	2619/10000
(5, 8)	4501/10000	—	(7, 7)	7633/10000	3897/10000
(7, 9)	6235/10000	2913/10000	(8, 8)	7595/10000	3844/10000

be a 3×3 NSC Toeplitz matrix over $\mathbb{F}_{3^2} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{3^4}$ given by

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \omega^{10} & \omega^{50} & \omega^{20} \\ \omega^{30} & \omega^{10} & \omega^{50} \\ 1 & \omega^{30} & \omega^{10} \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } M_{\tilde{\tau}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \omega^{10} & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega^{60} \end{pmatrix}.$$

One can compute that

$$AM_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_1(AM_{\tilde{\tau}})^T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 2 & \omega^{30} \\ 2 & \omega^{10} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and all leading principal minors of $AM_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_1(AM_{\tilde{\tau}})^T$ are 1, 2, 2. Then from the proof of Theorem 3.5 (resp. Algorithm 1), we can take

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & \omega^{10} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and hence, } LA = \begin{pmatrix} \omega^{10} & \omega^{50} & \omega^{20} \\ \omega^{30} & \omega^{10} & \omega^{50} \\ 1 & \omega^{30} & \omega^{10} \end{pmatrix}$$

is a 3×3 NSC quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrix over \mathbb{F}_{3^4} , where $\widehat{\sigma} = (\tilde{\tau}, \pi_1)$ and $\tilde{\tau}$ corresponds to the diagonal matrix $M_{\tilde{\tau}} = D_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_1(D_{\tilde{\tau}}) = \text{diag}(2, 1, 1)$. Moreover, one can indeed check that $(LA)M_{\tilde{\tau}}^T\pi_1(LA)^T = \text{diag}(1, 2, 1)$. Similarly, more examples can be obtained by applying Theorem 3.5 (resp. Algorithm 1).

The following result provides our second general construction of σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes.

Theorem 3.10. (Construction II) Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power, $r = 2e$ if $0 \leq e \leq \frac{h}{2}$, and $r = 2e - h$ if $\frac{h}{2} < e \leq h - 1$. Let $g = \gcd(r, h)$ and \mathbb{F}_{p^g} be the subfield field of \mathbb{F}_q . Let C_i be an $[n, k_i, d_i]_q$ linear code with Euclidean dual distance $d_i^{\perp_E}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ and $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ be NSC. Set $\sigma = (\tau, \pi_e) \in \mathbf{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^{sn})$ and $\sigma' = (\tau', \pi_e) \in \mathbf{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$, where τ corresponds to a monomial matrix $M_\tau = D_\tau P_\tau \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, sn)$ and τ' corresponds to a monomial matrix $M_{\tau'} = D_{\tau'} P_{\tau'} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$. If both of the following conditions hold:

- (1) there is a monomial matrix $M_{\tilde{\tau}} = D_{\tilde{\tau}} P_{\tilde{\tau}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ such that $AM_{\tilde{\tau}}^T \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{p^g}, s)$ and all principal minors of $AM_{\tilde{\tau}}^T \pi_e(AM_{\tilde{\tau}})^T$ are nonzero;

(2) $M_\tau = (D_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_e(D_{\tilde{\tau}})) \otimes M_{\tau'}$ and C_i is σ' self-orthogonal for any $1 \leq i \leq s$,

then there is a unit lower triangular matrix $L \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ such that $\mathcal{C}(LA)$ is an $[sn, \sum_{i=1}^s k_i, \geq d]_q$ σ self-orthogonal matrix-product code, where $d = \min\{(s+1-i)d_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq s\}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{C}(LA)^{\perp\sigma}$ has parameters $[sn, sn - \sum_{i=1}^s k_i, \geq d^{\perp\sigma}]_q$, where $d^{\perp\sigma} = \min\{id_i^E \mid 1 \leq i \leq s\}$.

Proof. Denote $M_{\tilde{\tau}} = D_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_e(D_{\tilde{\tau}})$, then $M_{\tilde{\tau}}^T = M_{\tilde{\tau}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ is a monomial matrix. It follows from the condition (1) and Theorem 3.5 that there is a unit lower triangular matrix $L \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ such that LA is NSC and

$$(LA)M_{\tilde{\tau}}^T\pi_e(LA)^T = (LA)(D_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_e(D_{\tilde{\tau}}))\pi_e(LA)^T = \text{diag}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_s) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$$

with $d_i \neq 0$ for any $1 \leq i \leq s$. Combining the condition (2) and Theorem 2.16, we directly conclude that $\mathcal{C}(LA)$ is a σ self-orthogonal matrix-product code. By an argument similar to that in the proof of Theorem 3.1 (2), $\mathcal{C}(LA)$ and $\mathcal{C}(LA)^{\perp\sigma}$ have the described parameters. \square

Example 3.11. According to [45, Theorem 4.5], there exist (τ_{id}, π_1) (i.e., 1-Galois) self-orthogonal $[81, k, 82-k]_{3^4}$ MDS codes for any $1 \leq k \leq 20$. Take $\sigma = (\tau, \pi_1)$ and $\sigma' = (\tau_{id}, \pi_1)$, where τ corresponds to the monomial matrix $M_\tau = M_{\tilde{\tau}} \otimes I_{81}$ with $M_{\tilde{\tau}} = \text{diag}(2, 1, 1)$ as in Example 3.9. Put $C_i = [81, k_i, 82-k_i]_{3^4}$ for $1 \leq k_i \leq 20$ and $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Combining Example 3.9 with Theorem 3.10, we immediately get σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes with parameters

$$[243, k_1 + k_2 + k_3, \geq \min\{(4-i)(82-k_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq 3\}]_{3^4}.$$

We list some explicit parameters of them in Table 3, where $C_1 = C_2 = [81, 20, 62]_{3^4}$ is taken.

Table 3: Some σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes derived from Theorem 3.10

C_3	σ self-orthogonal matrix-product code	C_3	σ self-orthogonal matrix-product code
$[81, 1, 81]_{3^4}$	$[243, 41, \geq 81]_{3^4}$	$[81, 2, 80]_{3^4}$	$[243, 42, \geq 80]_{3^4}$
$[81, 3, 79]_{3^4}$	$[243, 43, \geq 79]_{3^4}$	$[81, 4, 78]_{3^4}$	$[243, 44, \geq 76]_{3^4}$
$[81, 5, 77]_{3^4}$	$[243, 45, \geq 77]_{3^4}$	$[81, 6, 76]_{3^4}$	$[243, 46, \geq 76]_{3^4}$
$[81, 7, 75]_{3^4}$	$[243, 47, \geq 75]_{3^4}$	$[81, 8, 74]_{3^4}$	$[243, 48, \geq 74]_{3^4}$
$[81, 9, 73]_{3^4}$	$[243, 49, \geq 73]_{3^4}$	$[81, 10, 72]_{3^4}$	$[243, 50, \geq 72]_{3^4}$
$[81, 11, 71]_{3^4}$	$[243, 51, \geq 71]_{3^4}$	$[81, 12, 70]_{3^4}$	$[243, 52, \geq 70]_{3^4}$
$[81, 13, 69]_{3^4}$	$[243, 53, \geq 69]_{3^4}$	$[81, 14, 68]_{3^4}$	$[243, 54, \geq 68]_{3^4}$
$[81, 15, 67]_{3^4}$	$[243, 55, \geq 67]_{3^4}$	$[81, 16, 66]_{3^4}$	$[243, 56, \geq 66]_{3^4}$
$[81, 17, 65]_{3^4}$	$[243, 57, \geq 65]_{3^4}$	$[81, 18, 64]_{3^4}$	$[243, 58, \geq 64]_{3^4}$
$[81, 19, 63]_{3^4}$	$[243, 59, \geq 63]_{3^4}$	$[81, 20, 62]_{3^4}$	$[243, 60, \geq 62]_{3^4}$

3.3 The third and fourth general constructions via special Toeplitz matrices

In this subsection, we give our last two general constructions of σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes such that their defining matrices are Toeplitz matrices. As a byproduct of these two constructions, we also find an interesting application of these Toeplitz matrices in the so-called $\tilde{\tau}$ -optimal defining matrices. The following result provides the third general construction.

Theorem 3.12. (Construction III) Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power and e be an integer with $0 \leq e \leq h - 1$. Let C_i be an $[n, k_i, d_i]_q$ linear code with Euclidean dual distance $d_i^{\perp_E}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ and $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ be an NSC Toeplitz matrix. Set $\sigma = (\tau, \pi_e) \in \text{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^{sn})$ and $\sigma' = (\tau', \pi_e) \in \text{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$, where τ corresponds to a monomial matrix $M_\tau = D_\tau P_\tau \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, sn)$ and τ' corresponds to a monomial matrix $M_{\tau'} = D_{\tau'} P_{\tau'} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$. If both of the following conditions hold:

- (1) there is a monomial matrix $M \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ such that $\pi_e(A)MA = DQ$ for some diagonal matrix $D \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$;
- (2) $M_\tau = (MQ) \otimes M_{\tau'}$ and C_i is σ' self-orthogonal for any $1 \leq i \leq s$,

then $C(A)$ is an $[sn, \sum_{i=1}^s k_i, \geq d]_q$ σ self-orthogonal matrix-product code, where $d = \min\{(s+1-i)d_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq s\}$. Moreover, $C(A)^{\perp_\sigma}$ has parameters $[sn, sn - \sum_{i=1}^s k_i, \geq d^{\perp_\sigma}]_q$, where $d^{\perp_\sigma} = \min\{id_i^{\perp_E} \mid 1 \leq i \leq s\}$.

Proof. Denote $M_{\tilde{\tau}} = MQ$. Since $M \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ is a monomial matrix and $Q = \text{adiag}(1, 1, \dots, 1) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$, it is easy to see that $M_{\tilde{\tau}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ is still a monomial matrix. Noting that $\pi_e(A)MA = DQ$ and A is NSC, we further get that all diagonal elements of D are nonzero since

$$\det(D) = \det(\pi_e(A)) \det(M) \det(A) \det(Q)^{-1} \neq 0.$$

It then follows from the condition (1) and Lemma 2.4 that

$$AM_{\tilde{\tau}}^T \pi_e(A)^T = (\pi_e(A)M_{\tilde{\tau}} A^T)^T = (\pi_e(A)M(QA^T))^T = (\pi_e(A)M(AQ))^T = D.$$

Combining the condition (2) and Theorem 2.16, it is straightforward to deduce that $C(A)$ is a σ self-orthogonal matrix-product code. Again, the parameters of $C(A)$ and $C(A)^{\perp_\sigma}$ can be obtained by a similar argument as the one in the proof of Theorem 3.1 (2). \square

Example 3.13. Let $q = 2^6$ and $e = 0$. Let $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{2^6}, 3)$ be an NSC Toeplitz matrix, $M \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{2^6}, 3)$ be a monomial matrix, and $D = \text{diag}(\omega^{36}, \omega^{54}, 1) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{2^6}, 3)$ be a diagonal matrix given by

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \omega^{54} & \omega^{27} \\ \omega^{36} & 1 & \omega^{54} \\ \omega^{54} & \omega^{36} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } M = \begin{pmatrix} \omega^{27} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega^{54} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega^{27} \end{pmatrix},$$

where ω is a primitive element of \mathbb{F}_{2^6} . It can be checked that $\pi_0(A)MA = DQ$. According to [36, Theorem 3], there exist (τ_{id}, π_0) (*i.e.*, Euclidean) self-orthogonal $[64, k, 65-k]_{2^6}$ MDS codes for any $1 \leq k \leq 32$. Take $\sigma = (\tau, \pi_0)$ and $\sigma' = (\tau_{id}, \pi_0)$, where τ corresponds to the monomial matrix $M_\tau = (MQ) \otimes I_{64} = \text{adiag}(\omega^{27}, \omega^{54}, \omega^{27}) \otimes I_{64}$. Let the codes $C_i = [64, k_i, 65-k_i]_{2^6}$ for $1 \leq k_i \leq 32$ and $1 \leq i \leq 3$. With Theorem 3.12, we immediately get σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes with parameters

$$[192, k_1 + k_2 + k_3, \geq \min\{(4-i)(65-k_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq 3\}]_{2^6}.$$

For more clarity, we list some explicit parameters of them in Table 4, where $C_1 = C_2 = [64, 32, 33]_{2^6}$ is taken.

Table 4: Some σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes derived from Theorem 3.12

C_3	σ self-orthogonal matrix-product code	C_3	σ self-orthogonal matrix-product code
$[64, 1, 64]_{2^6}$	$[192, 65, \geq 64]_{2^6}$	$[64, 2, 63]_{2^6}$	$[192, 66, \geq 63]_{2^6}$
$[64, 3, 62]_{2^6}$	$[192, 67, \geq 62]_{2^6}$	$[64, 4, 61]_{2^6}$	$[192, 68, \geq 61]_{2^6}$
$[64, 5, 60]_{2^6}$	$[192, 69, \geq 60]_{2^6}$	$[64, 6, 59]_{2^6}$	$[192, 70, \geq 59]_{2^6}$
$[64, 7, 58]_{2^6}$	$[192, 71, \geq 58]_{2^6}$	$[64, 8, 57]_{2^6}$	$[192, 72, \geq 57]_{2^6}$
$[64, 9, 56]_{2^6}$	$[192, 73, \geq 56]_{2^6}$	$[64, 10, 55]_{2^6}$	$[192, 74, \geq 55]_{2^6}$
$[64, 11, 54]_{2^6}$	$[192, 75, \geq 54]_{2^6}$	$[64, 12, 53]_{2^6}$	$[192, 76, \geq 53]_{2^6}$
$[64, 13, 52]_{2^6}$	$[192, 77, \geq 52]_{2^6}$	$[64, 14, 51]_{2^6}$	$[192, 78, \geq 51]_{2^6}$
$[64, 15, 50]_{2^6}$	$[192, 79, \geq 50]_{2^6}$	$[64, 16, 49]_{2^6}$	$[192, 80, \geq 49]_{2^6}$
$[64, 17, 48]_{2^6}$	$[192, 81, \geq 48]_{2^6}$	$[64, 18, 47]_{2^6}$	$[192, 82, \geq 47]_{2^6}$
$[64, 19, 46]_{2^6}$	$[192, 83, \geq 46]_{2^6}$	$[64, 20, 45]_{2^6}$	$[192, 84, \geq 45]_{2^6}$
$[64, 21, 44]_{2^6}$	$[192, 85, \geq 44]_{2^6}$	$[64, 22, 43]_{2^6}$	$[192, 86, \geq 43]_{2^6}$
$[64, 23, 42]_{2^6}$	$[192, 87, \geq 42]_{2^6}$	$[64, 24, 41]_{2^6}$	$[192, 88, \geq 41]_{2^6}$
$[64, 25, 40]_{2^6}$	$[192, 89, \geq 40]_{2^6}$	$[64, 26, 39]_{2^6}$	$[192, 90, \geq 39]_{2^6}$
$[64, 27, 38]_{2^6}$	$[192, 91, \geq 38]_{2^6}$	$[64, 28, 37]_{2^6}$	$[192, 92, \geq 37]_{2^6}$
$[64, 29, 36]_{2^6}$	$[192, 93, \geq 36]_{2^6}$	$[64, 30, 35]_{2^6}$	$[192, 94, \geq 35]_{2^6}$
$[64, 31, 34]_{2^6}$	$[192, 95, \geq 34]_{2^6}$	$[64, 32, 33]_{2^6}$	$[192, 96, \geq 33]_{2^6}$

If we add some extra restrictions to the Toeplitz matrices A used in Theorem 3.12 (**Construction III**), we can obtain the fourth general construction of σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes as follows, in which C_1, C_2, \dots, C_s are no longer required to be σ' self-orthogonal.

Theorem 3.14. (Construction IV) Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power and e be an integer with $0 \leq e \leq h - 1$. Let C_i be an $[n, k_i, d_i]_q$ linear code with Euclidean dual distance $d_i^{\perp_E}$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ and $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$. Set $\sigma = (\tau, \pi_e) \in \text{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^{sn})$ and $\sigma' = (\tau', \pi_e) \in \text{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$, where τ corresponds to a monomial matrix $M_\tau \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, sn)$ and τ' corresponds to a monomial matrix $M_{\tau'} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ such that $M_\tau = D \otimes M_{\tau'}$ for some diagonal matrix $D \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$. Then the following statements hold.

- (1) If A is a non-singular Toeplitz matrix, then $C(A)^{\perp_\sigma} = [C_s^{\perp_{\sigma'}}, C_{s-1}^{\perp_{\sigma'}}, \dots, C_1^{\perp_{\sigma'}}] \cdot \pi_e(A)^{-1} Q D^{-1}$
- (2) If A is a non-singular Toeplitz matrix and $C_i \subseteq C_{s+1-i}^{\perp_{\sigma'}}$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$, then $C(\pi_e(A)^{-1} Q D^{-1}) \subseteq C(A)^{\perp_\sigma}$. Moreover, if $\pi_e(A)A = Q D^{-1}$, then $C(A)$ is a σ self-orthogonal matrix-product code.
- (3) If A is an NSC Toeplitz matrix, then $C(\pi_e(A)^{-1} Q D^{-1})$ has parameters $[sn, \sum_{i=1}^s k_i, \geq d]_q$ and $C(A)^{\perp_\sigma}$ has parameters $[sn, sn - \sum_{i=1}^s k_i, \geq d^{\perp_\sigma}]_q$, where $d = \min \{(s+1-i)d_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq s\}$ and $d^{\perp_\sigma} = \min \{id_i^{\perp_E} \mid 1 \leq i \leq s\}$.

Proof. (1) Recall that $\pi_e(Q) = Q^T = Q^{-1} = Q$ for $0 \leq e \leq h - 1$. Regard Q as the permutation matrix corresponding to the reverse permutation $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & \cdots & s \\ s & s-1 & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Since $M_\tau = D \otimes M_{\tau'}$ and both M_τ and $M_{\tau'}$ are monomial matrices, we easily know that each diagonal element of D is

nonzero. It then follows from Lemma 2.14 that

$$\begin{aligned}
C(A)^{\perp\sigma} &= [C_1^{\perp\sigma}, C_2^{\perp\sigma}, \dots, C_s^{\perp\sigma}] \cdot (D^T \pi_e(A)^T)^{-1} \\
&= [C_1^{\perp\sigma}, C_2^{\perp\sigma}, \dots, C_s^{\perp\sigma}] \cdot (Q \pi_e(A) Q)^{-1} D^{-1} \\
&= [C_1^{\perp\sigma}, C_2^{\perp\sigma}, \dots, C_s^{\perp\sigma}] \cdot Q \pi_e(A)^{-1} Q D^{-1} \\
&= [C_s^{\perp\sigma}, C_{s-1}^{\perp\sigma}, \dots, C_1^{\perp\sigma}] \cdot \pi_e(A)^{-1} Q D^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the result (1).

(2) Note that $C(\pi_e(A)^{-1} Q D^{-1}) = [C_1, C_2, \dots, C_s] \cdot \pi_e(A)^{-1} Q D^{-1}$. Combining the result (1) above and the given conditions, the result (2) clearly holds.

(3) Since A is an NSC Toeplitz matrix and $D \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ is a diagonal matrix, it deduces from Theorems 2.6 and 2.7 that $\pi_e(A)^{-1} Q D^{-1} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ is also an NSC matrix. With an argument similar to that in the proof of Theorem 3.1 (2), the result (3) follows directly. \square

Example 3.15. Let $q = 3^4$ and $e = 1$. Let $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{3^4}, 2)$ be an NSC Toeplitz matrix and $D = \text{diag}(\omega^8, \omega^8) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{3^4}, 2)$ be a diagonal matrix given by $A = \begin{pmatrix} \omega^{38} & \omega^{68} \\ \omega^{68} & \omega^{38} \end{pmatrix}$, where ω is a primitive element of \mathbb{F}_{3^4} . It can be checked that $\pi_1(A)A = Q D^{-1} = \text{adiag}(\omega^{72}, \omega^{72})$. According to Example 3.11, there exist (τ', π_1) self-orthogonal matrix-product codes C' with parameters $[243, k_1 + k_2 + k_3, \geq \min\{(4-i)(82-k_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq 3\}]_{3^4}$ for any $1 \leq k_i \leq 20$ and $1 \leq i \leq 3$, where τ' corresponds to the monomial matrix $M_{\tau'} = \text{diag}(2, 1, 1) \otimes I_{81} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{3^4}, 243)$. Take $\sigma = (\tau, \pi_1)$ and $\sigma' = (\tau', \pi_1)$, where τ corresponds to the monomial matrix $M_\tau = D \otimes M_{\tau'}$. Let $C_2 = C'$. We can further deduce from Theorem 3.10 that $C_2^{\perp\sigma}$ has parameters $[243, 243 - k_1 - k_2 - k_3, \min\{i(k_i + 1) \mid 1 \leq i \leq 3\}]_{3^4}$. Taking C_1 as a subcode of $C_2^{\perp\sigma}$, we immediately get σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes with parameters

$$[486, k_1 + k_2 + k_3 + s, \geq \min\{2i(k_i + 1), (4-i)(82-k_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq 3\}]_{3^4}$$

for any $1 \leq s \leq 243 - k_1 - k_2 - k_3$ and $1 \leq k_i \leq 20$ with $1 \leq i \leq 3$ from Theorems 3.14 (2) and (3). In particular, these σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes coincide with σ self-dual codes if $s = 243 - k_1 - k_2 - k_3$ is fixed.

As a byproduct, we get a connection between Toeplitz matrices and the so-called $\tilde{\tau}$ -optimal defining ($\tilde{\tau}$ -OD) matrices introduced by Cao in [9] when $D = I_s$ and $e = 0$ are fixed in the condition (1) of Theorem 3.12 (resp. Theorem 3.14 (2)). To this end, we first recall the definition of $\tilde{\tau}$ -OD matrices, and from it one realizes that $\tilde{\tau}$ -OD matrices are indeed a generalization of NSC quasi-orthogonal matrices mentioned in Definition 3.4.

Definition 3.16. ([9, Definition 5.3]) Let $q = p^h$ be a prime power and $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ be NSC. We call A a $\tilde{\tau}$ -optimal defining ($\tilde{\tau}$ -OD) matrix if $AA^T = DP_{\tilde{\tau}}$ for some diagonal matrix $D \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ and permutation matrix $P_{\tilde{\tau}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ corresponding to the permutation $\tilde{\tau}$.

Remark 3.17. (A connection between Toeplitz matrices and $\tilde{\tau}$ -OD matrices) Suppose that $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ is an NSC Toeplitz matrix satisfying $\pi_e(A)MA = Q$ for some monomial matrix $M \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$. We have the following facts.

(1) From Lemma 2.4, we conclude that

$$A\pi_e(A)^T = A\pi_e(QAQ) = AQ(QA^{-1}M^{-1})Q = M^{-1}Q \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$$

is a monomial matrix. Since $M^{-1} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ is also monomial, then we can fix that $M^{-1} = D_{\tau'}P_{\tau'}$, where $D_{\tau'} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ is a diagonal matrix and $P_{\tau'} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ is a permutation matrix corresponding to the permutation $\tau' = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & \cdots & s \\ \tau'_1 & \tau'_2 & \cdots & \tau'_s \end{pmatrix}$. It follows that $P_{\tau'}Q \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_q, s)$ is a permutation matrix corresponding to the permutation

$$\tilde{\tau} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & \cdots & s \\ s+1-\tau'_1 & s+1-\tau'_2 & \cdots & s+1-\tau'_s \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Definition 3.16, A is just a $\tilde{\tau}$ -OD matrix in the case of $e = 0$.

(2) On the other hand, we note that the matrices of the types VD , LV , and LDV have been used to find $\tilde{\tau}$ -OD matrices in [9, Section 5], where $V = (x_j^{i-1})_{1 \leq i, j \leq s}$ is a non-singular Vandermonde matrix, D is a diagonal matrix and L is a lower triangular matrix. It is also easily checked that VD , LV and LDV are not Toeplitz matrices in general. For some specific examples, one can see [9, Section 5].

Combining the facts (1) and (2) above, we conclude that the Toeplitz matrices A used in Theorem 3.12 (**Construction III**) (resp. Theorem 3.14 (**Construction IV**) (2)) are able to provide a new way to find $\tilde{\tau}$ -OD matrices.

Furthermore, since we restrict to $e = 0$ and $D = I_s$ when considering $\tilde{\tau}$ -OD matrices, then we can also regard the Toeplitz matrices A used in Theorem 3.12 (**Construction III**) (resp. Theorem 3.14 (**Construction IV**) (2)) as generalizations of $\tilde{\tau}$ -OD matrices. In other words, if the restrictions $e = 0$ and $D = I_s$ are relaxed, the Toeplitz matrices A used in Theorem 3.12 (**Construction III**) (resp. Theorem 3.14 (**Construction IV**) (2)) may not be $\tilde{\tau}$ -OD matrices for any $\tilde{\tau}$.

To illustrate the facts in Remark 3.17 we provide the following two examples.

Example 3.18. Let $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{2^3}, 3)$ be an NSC Toeplitz matrix and $M \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{2^3}, 3)$ be a monomial matrix given by

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \omega^2 & \omega^3 \\ \omega^3 & 1 & \omega^2 \\ \omega^2 & \omega^3 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \omega^6 \\ 0 & \omega^6 & 0 \\ \omega^6 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where ω is a primitive element of \mathbb{F}_{2^3} . It can be easily checked that

$$\pi_0(A)MA = Q \text{ and } M^{-1} = \text{diag}(\omega, \omega, \omega)Q$$

is a monomial matrix. From Remark 3.17 (1), we immediately get that A is a τ_{id} -OD matrix.

Example 3.19. Let $A \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{F}_{2^6}, 3)$ be the NSC Toeplitz matrix shown in Example 3.13. It is easy to check that

$$AA^T = \begin{pmatrix} \omega^{27} & \omega^{45} & \omega^{54} \\ \omega^{45} & \omega^{18} & 0 \\ \omega^{54} & 0 & \omega^{18} \end{pmatrix}$$

is not a $\tilde{\tau}$ -OD matrix for any permutation $\tilde{\tau}$, where ω is a primitive element of \mathbb{F}_{2^6} . Combining Example 3.13, we conclude that A is indeed a candidate for Theorem 3.12 (**Construction III**) but not for [9].

3.4 Comparisons of the four general constructions

In this subsection, we give comparisons among the four general constructions of σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes proposed in above subsections.

First of all, it is clear that Theorem 3.1 (**Construction I**) is not the same as Theorems 3.10, 3.12, and 3.14 (**Constructions II, III, and IV**). We further indicate that **Constructions II, III, and IV** respectively provided in Theorems 3.10, 3.12 and 3.14 are also different from each other in at least the following three regards.

- (1) According to Theorem 3.5 (resp. Algorithm 1), the defining matrix LA used in **Construction II** is usually not a Toeplitz matrix, even if A is chosen to be a Toeplitz matrix. However, the defining matrix A used in **Constructions III** and **IV** must be a Toeplitz matrix. This suggests that **Construction II** is different from **Constructions III** and **IV**.
- (2) $M_\tau = (D_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_e(D_{\tilde{\tau}})) \otimes M_{\tau'}$, $M_\tau = (MQ) \otimes M_{\tau'}$ and $M_\tau = D \otimes M_{\tau'}$ are required in **Constructions II, III, and IV**, accordingly. Note that $D_{\tilde{\tau}}\pi_e(D_{\tilde{\tau}})$ and D must be diagonal matrices, but MQ may not be. For instance, in Example 3.13, $MQ = \text{adiag}(\omega^{27}, \omega^{54}, \omega^{27})$ is not diagonal, where ω is a primitive element of \mathbb{F}_{2^6} . This shows that **Construction III** is different from **Constructions II and IV**.
- (3) If one lets $\sigma' = (\tau', \pi_e) \in \text{SLAut}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$ be the same in **Constructions II, III, and IV**, then the input codes C_1, C_2, \dots, C_s used in **Constructions II** and **III** are limited to be σ' self-orthogonal, but the σ' self-orthogonality is not a necessary condition for **Construction IV**. This shows that **Construction IV** is different from **Constructions II and III**.

In summary, the last three general constructions of σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes, and hence, all these four general constructions, differ from each other.

4 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we focused on the study of σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes associated with Toeplitz matrices and presented four general constructions, which were based on the σ' dual of a known σ' dual-containing matrix-product code, the newly introduced NSC quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrices, and the utilization of certain special Toeplitz matrices, respectively. We also proposed a concrete

construction for the NSC quasi- $\widehat{\sigma}$ matrices and provided an efficient algorithm to obtain such matrices by employing NSC Toeplitz matrices. As a byproduct, we also found an interesting connection between those special Toeplitz matrices and $\widetilde{\tau}$ -optimal defining matrices.

For future research, it would be interesting to construct more σ self-orthogonal matrix-product codes for various σ inner products over finite fields or finite rings and explore their possible applications in other areas.

Acknowledgments

The research of Yang Li and Shixin Zhu is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant Nos. 12171134 and U21A20428. The research of Edgar Martínez-Moro is supported by the Spanish Research Agency MCIU/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and the European Union NextGenerationEU/PRTR under Grant TED2021-130358B-I00. All the examples in this paper were computed or verified with the Magma software package.

Declarations

Data availability No data are generated or analyzed during this study.

Conflict of Interest The authors declare that there is no possible conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Assmus Jr., E.F., Mattson Jr., H.F.: New 5-designs. *J. Comb. Theory* **6**(2), 122-151 (1969).
- [2] Bachoc, C., Gaborit, P.: Designs and self-dual codes with long shadows. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A* **105**(1), 15-34 (2004).
- [3] Ball, S., Vilar, R.: Determining when a truncated generalised Reed-Solomon code is Hermitian self-orthogonal. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **68**(6), 3796-3805 (2022).
- [4] Bannai, E., Dougherty, S.T., Harada, M., Oura, M.: Type II codes, even unimodular lattices, and invariant rings. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **45**(4), 1194-1205 (1999).
- [5] Betten, A., Braun, M., Fripertinger, H., Kerber, A., Kohnert, A., Wassermann, A.: Error-correcting linear codes: Classification by isometry and applications. Springer Science and Business Media **18**, (2006).
- [6] Blackmore, T., Norton, G.H.: Matrix-product codes over \mathbb{F}_q . *Appl. Algebra Eng. Commun. Comput.* **12**(6), 477-500 (2001)
- [7] Bosma, W., Cannon, J., Playoust, C.: The Magma algebra system I: The user language. *J. Symb. Comput.* **24**(3-4), 235-265 (1997).

- [8] Calderbank, A.R., Rains, E.M., Shor, P.W., Sloane, N.J.A.: Quantum error correction via codes over GF(4). *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **44**(4), 1369-1387 (1998).
- [9] Cao, M.: On dual-containing, almost dual-containing matrix-product codes and related quantum codes. *Finite Fields Appl.* **96**, 102400 (2024).
- [10] Cao, M., Wang, H., Cui, J.: Construction of quantum codes from matrix-product codes. *IEEE Commun. Lett.* **24**(4), 706-710 (2020)
- [11] Cao, M., Wei, F.: Construction of some new entanglement-assisted quantum error-correcting codes of large lengths. *Discrete Math.* **347**(6), 113969 (2024).
- [12] Cao, M., Yang, J., Wei, F.: On the σ duals and σ hulls of linear codes. *Cryptogr. Commun.* **16**, 507-530 (2024).
- [13] Carlet, C., Mesnager, S., Tang, C., Qi, Y.: On σ -LCD codes. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **65**(3), 1694-1704 (2019).
- [14] Chen, H.: New MDS entanglement-assisted quantum codes from MDS Hermitian self-orthogonal codes. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **91**(8), 2665-2676 (2023).
- [15] Conway, J.H., Sloane, N.J.A.: *Sphere Packings, Lattices and Groups*. Springer, New York, (1998).
- [16] Fan, Y., Ling, S., Liu, H.: Matrix product codes over finite commutative Frobenius rings. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **71**(2), 201-227 (2014).
- [17] Fan, Y., Zhang, L.: Galois self-dual constacyclic codes. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **84**(11), 473-492 (2017).
- [18] Harada, M.: On the existence of frames of the Niemeier lattices and self-dual codes over \mathbb{F}_p . *J. Algebra* **321**(8), 2345-2352 (2009).
- [19] Hayes, M.H.: *Statistical digital signal processing and modeling*. John Wiley and Sons, (1996).
- [20] Heng, Z., Li, D., Liu, F.: Ternary self-orthogonal codes from weakly regular bent functions and their application in LCD Codes. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **91**(12), 3953-3976 (2023).
- [21] Hernando, F., Høholdt, T., Ruano, D.: List decoding of matrix-product codes from nested codes: an application to quasi-cyclic codes. *Adv. Math. Commun.* **6**(3), 259-272 (2012).
- [22] Hernando, F., Lally, k., Ruano, D.: Construction and decoding of matrix-product codes from nested codes. *Appl. Algebra Eng. Commun. Comput.* **20**, 497-507 (2009).
- [23] Hernando, F., Ruano, D.: Decoding of matrix-product codes. *J. Algebra Appl.* **12**(4), 1250185 (2013).
- [24] Jitman, S., Mankean, T.: Matrix-product constructions for Hermitian self-orthogonal codes. arXiv:1710.04999 (2017).

- [25] Kenneth, R.H.: *Handbook of Linear Algebra* (Second Edition). CRC Press, Boca Raton (2014).
- [26] Ketkar, A., Klappenecker, A., Kumar, S., Sarvepalli, P.K.: Nonbinary stabilizer codes over finite fields. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **52**(11), 4892-4914 (2006).
- [27] Kim, J.-L., Kim, Y.H., Lee, N.: Embedding linear codes into self-orthogonal codes and their optimal minimum distances. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **67**(6), 3701-3707 (2021).
- [28] Li, S., Shi, M., Liu, H.: On Toeplitz codes of index t and isometry codes. *Discrete Math.* **346**(9), 113484 (2023).
- [29] Li, S., Shi, M. Wang, J. An improved method for constructing formally self-dual codes with small hulls. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **91**, 2563-2583 (2023).
- [30] Li, Y., Su, Y., Zhu, S., Li, S., Shi, M.: Several classes of Galois self-orthogonal MDS codes and related applications. *Finite Fields Appl.* **91**, 102267 (2023).
- [31] Li, Y., Zhu, S.: Linear codes of larger lengths with Galois hulls of arbitrary dimensions and related entanglement-assisted quantum error-correcting codes. *Discrete Math.* **347**(2), 113760 (2024).
- [32] Li, Y., Zhu, S., Martínez-Moro, E.: The hull of two classical propagation rules and their applications. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **69**(10), 6500-6511 (2023).
- [33] Liu, H., Liu, J.: Homogeneous metric and matrix product codes over finite commutative principal ideal rings. *Finite Fields Appl.* **64**, 101666 (2020).
- [34] Liu, H., Liu, J.: On σ -self-orthogonal constacyclic codes over $\mathbb{F}_{p^m} + u\mathbb{F}_{p^m}$. *Adv. Math. Commun.* **16**, 643-665 (2022).
- [35] Liu, H., Liu, X.: LCP of matrix product codes. *Linear Multilinear Algebra* **70**(22), 7611-7622 (2022).
- [36] Luo, G., Cao, X., Chen, X.: MDS codes with hulls of arbitrary dimensions and their quantum error correction. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **65**(5), 2944-2952 (2018).
- [37] Luo, G., Ezerman, M.F., Ling, S.: Three new constructions of optimal locally repairable codes from matrix-product codes. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **69**(1), 75-85 (2023).
- [38] Luo, G., Ezerman, M.F., Ling, S., Pan, X.: New families of MDS symbol-pair codes from matrix-product codes. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **69**(3), 1567-1587 (2023).
- [39] Mankean, T., Jitman, S.: Matrix-product constructions for self-orthogonal linear codes. In: 2016 12th International Conference on Mathematics, Statistics, and Their Applications (ICMSA). IEEE, pp. 6-10 (2016).
- [40] Monahan, J.F.: *Numerical methods of statistics*. Cambridge University Press, (2011).
- [41] Mukherjee, B.N., Maiti, S.S.: On some properties of positive definite Toeplitz matrices and their possible applications. *Linear Algebra Appl.* **102**, 211-240 (1988).

- [42] Niederreiter, H., Özbudak, F.: Matrix-product constructions of digital nets. *Finite Fields Appl.* **10**(3), 464-479 (2004).
- [43] Özbudak, F., Stichtenoth, H.: Note on Niederreiter-Xing's propagation rule for linear codes. *Appl. Algebra Eng. Commun. Comput.* **13**(1), 53-56 (2002).
- [44] Press, W. H.: *Numerical recipes 3rd edition: The art of scientific computing*. Cambridge University Press, (2007).
- [45] Qian, L., Cao, X., Wu, X., Lu, W.: MDS codes with l -Galois hulls of arbitrary dimensions. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10623-024-01371-4> (2024).
- [46] Sendrier, N., Simos, D.E.: The hardness of code equivalence over \mathbb{F}_q and its application to code-based cryptography. In: Int. Workshop Post-Quantum Cryptogr. pp. 203-216 (2013).
- [47] Shi, M., Choie, Y.J., Sharma, A., Solé, P.: *Codes and Modular Forms: A Dictionary*. World Scientific, (2020).
- [48] Shi, M., Li, S., Kim, J.-L.: Two conjectures on the largest minimum distances of binary self-orthogonal codes with dimension 5, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **69**(7), 4507-4512 (2023).
- [49] Shi, M., Xu, L., Solé, P.: On isodual double Toeplitz codes. *J. Syst. Sci. Complex*. Accepted (2023).
- [50] Wu, Y., Lee, Y.: Binary LCD codes and self-orthogonal codes via simplicial complexes. *IEEE Commun. Lett.* **24**(6), 1159-1162 (2020).
- [51] Xu, H., Du, W.: Constructions of symplectic LCD MDS codes. *Bull. Malaysian Math. Sci. Soc.* **44**, 3377-3390 (2021).
- [52] Xu, H., Du, W.: On some binary symplectic self-orthogonal codes. *Appl. Algebra Eng. Commun. Comput.* **33**(3), 321-337 (2022).
- [53] Zhang, X.: Hermitian self-orthogonal matrix product codes and their applications to quantum codes. *Quantum Inf. Process.* **23**, 108 (2024).
- [54] Zhang, T., Ge, G.: Quantum codes from generalized Reed-Solomon codes and matrix-product codes. arXiv:1508.00978 (2015).
- [55] Zheng, X., Kong, B., Yu, Y.: Quantum codes from σ -dual-containing constacyclic codes over $\mathfrak{R}_{l,k}$. *AIMS Mathematics* **8**(10), 24075-24086 (2023).