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ABSTRACT

If a small fraction of Fast Radio Bursts (FRBs) are associated with Gamma-Ray Bursts (GRBs), as recently suggested by Zhang, the combination of redshift measurements of GRBs and dispersion measure (DM) measurements of FRBs opens a new window to study cosmology. At $z < 2$ where the universe is essentially fully ionized, detections of FRB/GRB pairs can give an independent measurement of the intergalactic medium portion of the baryon mass fraction, $\Omega_{b,IGM}$, of the universe. If a good sample of FRB/GRB associations are discovered at higher redshifts, the free electron column density history can be mapped, which can be used to probe the reionization history of both hydrogen and helium in the universe. We apply our formulation to GRBs 101011A and 100704A by Bannister et al. (2012). If such have an associated FRB, and constrained $\Omega_{b,IGM}$ to be consistent with the value derived from other methods. The methodology developed here is also applicable, if the redshifts of FRBs not associated with GRBs can be measured by other means.

Subject headings: gamma-rays: bursts - cosmology: cosmological parameters, reionization - radio: bursts

1. INTRODUCTION

The physical origin of newly discovered fast radio bursts (FRBs) is debated (Thornton et al. 2013; Falcke & Rezzolla 2013, Totani 2013, Popov & Postnov 2007, 2013, Kashiyama et al. 2013, Loeb et al. 2013, Zhang 2014, Kulkarni et al. 2014). One attractive proposal is delayed collapses of supra-massive neutron stars after loosing centrifugal support due to spin down (Falcke & Rezzolla 2013). Zhang (2014) recently suggested that within such a scenario, a small fraction of FRBs can be physically associated with some gamma-ray bursts (GRBs), whose central engine is a supra-massive millisecond magnetar, which collapses into a black hole after the GRB prompt emission is over ($10^2 - 10^4$ s). Such a FRB/GRB association might have been detected in GRB 101011A and GRB 100704A by Bannister et al. (2012). If such FRB/GRB associations are confirmed to be common, it opens a new window to study cosmology. This Letter discusses the cosmological implications of such associations.

2. DISPERSION MEASURE OF FRB/GRB SYSTEMS

For an FRB/GRB association system, one can in principle get two precise measurements. One is the redshift of the system, which can be measured from the emission lines of the GRB host galaxies or absorption lines of the GRB afterglows. The second is the dispersion measure (DM) of the system measured from the FRB. In general, the DM is defined as the delayed arrival time of a radio wave with respect to the arrival time in vacuum, i.e. (Rybicki & Lightman 1979)

$$\Delta t \simeq \int \frac{dl}{c} \frac{\nu_p^2}{2v_s^2} \simeq 4.2 \, s \left( \frac{\nu}{1 \, \text{GHz}} \right)^{-2} \frac{\text{DM}}{10^3 \, \text{pc cm}^{-3}} \times 3 \, \text{s}.$$ (1)

In the following, we discuss the use of DM for studying FRB/GRB associations. Using the DM as a cosmological tool is, however, limited because of the lack of a clear impulsive radio emission signal. Nevertheless, the DM is rewritten as

$$\Delta t = \int \frac{dl}{c} \frac{\nu_p^2}{2v_s^2} \simeq 4.2 \, s \left( \frac{\nu}{1 \, \text{GHz}} \right)^{-2} \frac{\text{DM}}{10^3 \, \text{pc cm}^{-3}}.$$ (1)

where $\nu_p = (ne^2/\pi m_e)^{1/2} = 8.98 \times 10^3 n_e^{1/2}$ Hz is the plasma frequency, and DM is normalized to a typical plasma frequency, and DM is normalized to a typical value $10^3$ pc cm$^{-3}$ for the intergalactic medium (IGM) to a source at a cosmological distance. Practically it is measured from the time delay between two frequencies. For a plasma at redshift $z$, the rest-frame delay time ($\Delta t_z$) between two rest-frame frequencies ($\nu_{1,z} < \nu_{2,z}$) is

$$\Delta t_z = \int \frac{dl}{c} \frac{\nu_p^2}{2v_s^2} \left( \frac{1}{\nu_{1,z}} - \frac{1}{\nu_{2,z}} \right) = \frac{c^2}{2\pi m_e c} \left( \frac{1}{\nu_{1,z}} - \frac{1}{\nu_{2,z}} \right) \int n_e dz,$$ (2)

where $\int n_e dz = \text{DM}_z$ is the rest-frame dispersion measure, which is just the column density of free electrons at the source. In the observer frame, the observed delay time is $\Delta t = \Delta t_z (1 + z)$ and the observed frequency is $\nu = \nu_z/(1 + z)$. So Eq. (2) can be modified as

$$\Delta t = \frac{c^2}{2\pi m_e c} \left( \frac{1}{\nu_{1}^2} - \frac{1}{\nu_{2}^2} \right) \int \frac{n_e}{1 + z} dz,$$ (3)

where the measured DM by an earth observer is

$$\text{DM} = \int \frac{n_e}{1 + z} dz.$$ (4)

For an FRB/GRB system, the measured DM should include four terms:

$$\text{DM}_{\text{tot}} = \text{DM}_{\text{MW}} + \text{DM}_{\text{IGM}} + \text{DM}_{\text{host}} + \text{DM}_{\text{GRB}}.$$ (5)

They denote dispersion measure contributions from the Milky Way, intergalactic medium, GRB host galaxy, and the GRB blastwave itself, respectively. The observed $\text{DM}_{\text{tot}}$ of FRBs are around several hundreds pc cm$^{-3}$ (Lorimer et al. 2007, Thornton et al. 2013), and the two putative FRBs associated with two GRBs also have similar values of DMs (Bannister et al. 2012). In the follow-
ing we discuss the relative importance of the four terms in turn.

2.1. DM_{MW} and DM_{host}

DM_{MW} is well constrained with the pulsar data (Taylor & Cordes 1993), and is a strong decreasing function of Galactic latitude |b|, from DM_{MW}^\text{max} \sim 10^3 \text{pc cm}^{-3} when |b| \sim 0^\circ to < 100 \text{ pc cm}^{-3} at |b| > 10^\circ (Thornton et al. 2013). The observed FRBs all have relatively large |b|, so DM_{MW} is a relatively small term.

DM_{host} is poorly known. If GRBs are born in giant molecular clouds, DM_{host} may be very large (Ioka 2003). Afterglow studies of GRBs seem to suggest that the GRB circumburst density is relatively low, with a typical value of n_{ISM} \sim 1 \text{ cm}^{-3} (e.g. Panaitescu & Kumar 2002; Yost et al. 2003). Considering that the GRB host galaxies are typically smaller than Milky Way (Fruchter et al. 2000) and the additional (1 + z) deduction factor (Eq. (3)), it would be reasonable to assume that on average DM_{host} \lesssim DM_{MW}.

2.2. DM_{GRB}

A GRB-associated FRB would happen at the end of the X-ray plateau phase (or somewhat later), which could be the time when the supramassive neutron star collapses into a black hole (Zhang 2014). As the FRB is ejected at an inner radius r_1 \sim 10^7 \text{ cm}, the blastwave is already at a large radius r_2 \sim c \delta t = 3 \times 10^{13} \text{ cm}(\frac{\delta t}{100}) where \delta t is the delay time between the FRB and the GRB. The FRB, traveling essentially at the speed of light, would catch up with the blastwave at a radius r_3 \sim 2(\Gamma(r_3)^2/r_2) \gg r_2. At this radius, the plasma frequency is much lower than the FRB frequency, so that the FRB can go through the blastwave (Zhang 2014). In any case, the blastwave would contribute to the frequency dispersion, which we calculate below.

One important parameter is the baryon loading parameter of the GRB, which may be characterized as \Gamma_0 = E_{iso}/M_0c^2, where M_0 is the initial mass loading in the GRB outflow, and E_{iso} = E_{\gamma,iso} + E_{K,iso} + E_{K,iso} is the isotropic energy of the GRB, which is the sum of the isotropic energy released in \gamma-rays (prompt phase), in X-rays as internal emission (during the internal plateau), and the isotropic kinetic energy that powers the afterglow emission (the normal plateau) (Liu & Zhang 2014). For FRB-associated GRBs, there should be energy injection in the early afterglow phase (Zhang 2014), so the kinetic energy E_{K,iso} should be calculated after energy injection is over. The parameter \Gamma_0 is therefore the final “effective” initial Lorentz factor of the outflow. It reflects the average baryon-loading parameter \eta(1 + \sigma_0) (\eta is the dimensionless entropy, and \sigma_0 is the initial magnetization parameter at the central engine) (Lei et al. 2013). The radius at which the FRB catches up the blastwave also depends on the density profile of the circumburst medium, which could be either a constant density medium with \rho = n m_p (n is the number density of protons/electrons) or a stellar wind with \rho = Ar^{-2} (A = 5 \times 10^{11} A_{\star} \text{ g cm}^{-1} is the wind parameter).

At late phase of blastwave propagation (much later than the energy injection phase), which is relevant for FRB catching up with the blastwave, the energy conservation equation can be written as

\Gamma_0 M_0 + m(r) = \Gamma(r)[M_0 + \Gamma(r)m(r)],

where m(r) is the mass accumulated from the circumburst medium, which is m(r) = (4/3)\pi r^3 - \frac{1}{2} \eta m_p for ISM, and m(r) = \int_0^r \rho \pi r^2 df = \pi A(r - r_1) for wind.

The catching up condition can be more rigorously written as

\frac{r_1 - r}{c} = \int_{r_2}^{r_3} \frac{dr}{\beta(r)c}.

Using Eqs. (6) and (7), one can solve for r_3 for different initial parameters. Since the thickness \Delta of the FRB-associated GRBs, there should be energy injection equation can be written as

DM_{GRB} = \frac{DM_{GRB}\times}{1 + z} = \int n_\text{d}dl

\simeq \frac{|M_0 + m(r_3)|/n_\text{d}}{(1 + z)\pi r_3^2/\Delta} \Delta = \frac{M_0 + m(r_3)}{(1 + z)m_p \pi r_3^2}.

Based on the above equations, we calculate the rest frame GRB DM value, DM_{GRB}\times for a set of typical values of GRB parameters (Panaitescu & Kumar 2002; Yost et al. 2003; Zhang & Meszaros 2004): r_1 = 10^7 \text{ cm}, \ E_{iso} = 10^{53} \text{ erg}, \Gamma_0 = 300 (so that M_0 = 3.7 \times 10^{29} \text{ g}), \delta t = 500 s, n = 1 \text{ cm}^{-3} (ISM) and A_{\star} = 1 (wind). For the ISM case, we get r_3 = 2.0 \times 10^{17} \text{ cm}, \Gamma(r_3) = 42.7, m(r_3) = 5.2 \times 10^{28} \text{ g}, and DM_{GRB}\times = 0.68 \text{ pc cm}^{-3}. For the wind case, we get r_3 = 6.0 \times 10^{16} \text{ cm}, \Gamma(r_3) = 32.4, m(r_3) = 9.5 \times 10^{28} \text{ g}, and DM_{GRB}\times = 7.9 \text{ pc cm}^{-3}. These are summarized in the first row of Table 1. In the following rows in Table 1 we vary each input parameter (E_{iso}, \Gamma_0, \delta t, and n/A_{\star}) to a wider range and recalculate the DM_{GRB}\times values. In particular, we incorporate more extreme parameters (Zhang & Meszaros 2004) in favor of large DM_{GRB} values. The general result is that DM_{GRB}\times is much less than DM_{tot} detected from FRBs, and in most cases even smaller than DM_{MW} and DM_{host}.

For a quick estimate, one can also use an approximated treatment to derive r_3 and DM_{GRB}\times. Since the catch-up radius is still in the relativistic phase of the blastwave, one can simplify Eq. (6) to \Gamma_0 M_0 = \Gamma(r)^2 m(r), or E_{iso} = }
The units of the parameters: DM_{GRB,a} in pc cm^{-3}, E_{iso} in erg; δt in s; n in cm^{-3}. DM_{GRB,a} (typical) is the value of DM_{GRB,a} with typical parameters introduced in section 3.2.4. The following four rows present the calculated values of DM_{GRB,a} by changing one parameter (in parenthesis) with other parameters kept at the typical values.

| Parameter | ISM | wind |
|-----------|-----|------|
| DM_{GRB,a} (typical) | 0.23 (10^{-2}) | 2.1 (10^{-2}) | 10.7 (10^{-2}) | 7.7 (10^{-3}) |
| DM_{GRB,a} (E_{iso}) | 2.9 (10^{-2}) | 0.36 (600) | 28.7 (100) | 4.4 (600) |
| DM_{GRB,a} (δt) | 1.6 (100) | 0.77 (10) | 0.57 (100) | 4.3 (1000) |
| DM_{GRB,a} (n/A_{e}) | 0.21 (0.1) | 2.3 (10) | 0.77 (0.1) | 107 (10) |

There are some equations of DM_{IGM} for an IGM with a fully ionized, pure hydrogen plasma. Here we derive a more general expression. We consider an IGM with hydrogen (H) mass fraction \( Y_H = (3/4) y_1 \) and helium (He) mass fraction \( Y_{He} = (1/4) y_2 \), where \( y_1 \sim 1 \) and \( y_2 \sim 4 - 3 y_1 \sim 1 \) are the hydrogen and helium mass fractions normalized to the typical values 3/4 and 1/4, respectively. We also introduce the ionization fractions for each species as a function of redshift, i.e. \( \chi_{e,He}(z) \) and \( \chi_{e,He}(z) \). The number density of free electrons at redshift \( z \) can be expressed as

\[
n_e = n_{H,0} (1 + z)^3 \chi_{e,H}(z) + 2 n_{He,0} (1 + z)^3 \chi_{e,He}(z)
\]

\[
= \left[ Y_H \rho_{e,0} \Omega_{H,0} f_{IGM} \right] \chi_{e,H}(z) + 2 Y_{He} \rho_{e,0} \Omega_{H,0} f_{IGM} \chi_{e,He}(z)
\]

\[
\times (1 + z)^3
\]

\[
= 3 \rho_{e,0} \Omega_{H,0} f_{IGM}
\]

\[
\left[ 4 \chi_{e,H}(z) + \frac{1}{8} y_2 \chi_{e,He}(z) \right] (1 + z)^3.
\]

Here \( n_{H,0} \) and \( n_{He,0} \) are the number density of H and He at \( z = 0 \), \( \rho_{e,0} \) is the critical mass density at \( z = 0 \), \( \Omega_{e} \) is the current baryon mass fraction of the universe, and \( f_{IGM} \) is the fraction of baryon mass in the intergalactic medium. Noticing that these two FRBs may be real.

The baryon mass fraction \( \Omega_{b} \) is an important parameter in FRB/GRB systems. The baryon mass fraction \( \Omega_{b} \) is measured through Big Bang nucleosynthesis (Walker et al. 1991) or anisotropy data of cosmic microwave background (Hinshaw et al. 2013, Ade et al. 2013). The derived results vary from 0.02 to 0.05. The latest Planck + WMAP results (Ade et al. 2013) give \( \Omega_{b} = (0.0458, 0.0517) \) within 2σ.

The FRB/GRB systems provide an independent method to directly measure the IGM portion of baryon mass fraction, \( \Omega_{IGM} \). Re-writing Eq. (13), one gets

\[
\Omega_{b,IGM} = \frac{8 \pi G m_p D_{IGM}}{3 c H_0}
\]

\[
\times \int_0^{z} \left[ \frac{4}{3} \chi_{e,H}(z) + \frac{1}{8} y_2 \chi_{e,He}(z) \right] (1 + z) dz
\]

(13)

Studies suggest that H is essentially fully ionized at \( z < 6 \) (Fan et al. 2006), and He is essentially fully ionized at \( z < 2 \) (McQuinn et al. 2009). For nearby GRBs (\( z < 2 \)), one can take \( \chi_{e,H} = \chi_{e,He} = 1 \). When taking \( y_1 \sim y_2 \sim 1 \), one has

\[
\Omega_{b,IGM} \simeq \frac{64 \pi G m_p D_{IGM}}{21 c H_0} / \int_0^z \left[ \frac{1}{\Omega_{m}(1 + z)^3 + \Omega_{\Lambda}} \right]^{1/2}
\]

(15)

Since \( H_0, \Omega_{m} \) and \( \Omega_{\Lambda} \) can be well measured by other methods, by measuring \( z \) and DM_{IGM} of FRB/GRB systems at \( z < 2 \), one can directly measure \( \Omega_{b,IGM} \).

Two GRBs, 101011A and 100704A, might each have an associated FRB (Bannister et al. 2012) with properties similar to other FRBs (Lorimer et al. 2007, Thornton et al. 2013). Unfortunately, neither GRB had a measured redshift, so that our method cannot be applied directly. Nonetheless, we can apply some empirical relations to estimate the redshift range of the two GRBs, and hence, pose a constraint on \( \Omega_{b,IGM} \).

We apply the so-called Amati relation (Amati et al. 2002, 2008, Capozziello & Izzo 2010)

\[
\log \frac{E_{\gamma,iso}}{\text{erg}} = A + \gamma \log \frac{E_{p,x}}{\text{keV}}
\]

(16)

to estimate the redshifts of the two GRBs. Here \( E_{\gamma,iso} \) is the normalized isotropic \( \gamma \)-ray energy of the GRB, \( E_{p,x} \) is the intrinsic peak energy with redshift correction.

The significance of the signals was low, and Bannister et al. (2012) were not certain about whether the associations are real. On the other hand, the epochs of FRBs are consistent with the theoretically motivated epochs discussed in Zhang (2011), which suggests that these two FRBs may be real.
and the fitting parameters are $A = 49.17 \pm 0.40$, $\gamma = 1.46 \pm 0.29$, with a standard deviation $\sigma_{\text{ext}} = 0.37$ (Capozziello & Izzo 2010). In Fig.1 we draw $2 \sigma$ and $3 \sigma$ zones of the correlation, and use the observed fluence and $E_p$ of the two bursts (GRB 100111A (Burgess 2010): 8-1000 keV fluence $(5.24 \pm 0.39) \times 10^{-6}$ erg cm$^{-2}$ and $E_p = 296.6 \pm 49.4$ keV; GRB 100704A (McBreen 2010): 10-1000 keV fluence $(5.8 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-6}$ erg cm$^{-2}$ and $E_p = 178.30^{+16.30}_{-15.50}$ keV) to calculate the intrinsic $E_{\text{isc}}$ and $E_p$ for different redshifts. For each burst, we draw two curves to reflect the errors of the observables. By requiring that the bursts enter the $3 \sigma$ region of the correlation, we derive $z > 0.246$ for GRB 100111A and $z \geq 0.166$ for GRB 100704A.

With the constrained redshift range, we can then constrain the range of $\Omega_{b,\text{fGM}}$ using Eq. (15). The standard cosmological parameters derived by the latest Planck team (Ade et al. 2013) are adopted ($\Omega_m, \Omega_{\Lambda, h} = (0.315, 0.685, 0.673)$: The measured $\Delta M_{\text{tot}}$ values are $569.98$ pc cm$^{-3}$ for GRB 100111A, and $194.57$ pc cm$^{-3}$ for GRB 100704A (Bannister et al. 2012). These are the upper limits of $\Omega_{b,\text{fGM}}$. According to Taylor & Cordes (1993) and Thornton et al. (2013), $\Omega_{b,\text{fGM}}$ of the two GRBs would be about $30$ pc cm$^{-3}$ for GRB 100111A ($|b| = 45.4^\circ$) and $40$ pc cm$^{-3}$ for GRB 100704A ($|b| = 13.2^\circ$). For simplicity we assume $\Delta M_{\text{tot}} = \Delta M_{\text{MW}}$, and neglect $\Delta M_{\text{GRB}}$. We then get possible values of $\Omega_{b,\text{fGM}}$: about $510$ pc cm$^{-3}$ for GRB 100111A and $115$ pc cm$^{-3}$ for GRB 100704A.

In Fig. 2 we present the constraints on $\Omega_{b,\text{fGM}}$ for the two FRB/GRB systems. For each case, we plot two lines: a solid line using $\Delta M_{\text{tot}}$ and a dashed line using estimated $\Delta M_{\text{fGM}}$. The lower limit on $z$ derived from the Amati relation requirement imposes an upper limit on $\Omega_{b,\text{fGM}}$. This upper limit is $0.101/0.114$ for GRB 100111A, and $0.034/0.058$ for GRB 100704A. Even though not tight, it is generally consistent with other measurements (Walker et al. 1991; Fukugita et al. 1998; Hinshaw et al. 2013; Ade et al. 2013), and suggest that the matter component of the universe is dominated by dark matter. Such a consistency also supports that the two putative FRB-GRB associations reported by Bannister et al. (2012) are likely real.

One can also reverse the procedure to estimate $z$ of the two FRB/GRB systems using the available $\Omega_{b,\text{fGM}}$ constraints. Based on the $2 \sigma$ best fit value of $\Omega_b = (0.046, 0.052)$ from Planck+WMAP results (Ade et al. 2013) and the constraint on $f_{\text{GRB}}$ $\approx 0.83$ from baryon mass summation (Fukugita et al. 1998), one gets the $2 \sigma$ range of $\Omega_{b,\text{fGM}}$: $0.038, 0.043$ (horizontal lines in Fig. 2). This gives estimated redshifts of the two FRB/GRB systems: $z = (0.554, 0.687)$ for GRB 100111A, and $z = (0.130, 0.246)$ for GRB 100704A.

In the future, if $z$ is measured, one may also use the value of $\Omega_{b,\text{fGM}}$ derived from our method along with the $\Omega_b$ value derived from the standard method (CMB) to constrain $f_{\text{GRB}}$.
are available for GRB 101011A and GRB 100704A, we demonstrated that the method is applicable, and the derived loose constraints on $\Omega_b f_{\text{IGM}}$ are consistent with results of other methods. This raises the prospects of mapping reionization history of the universe using FRB/GRB systems at higher redshifts.

The uncertainties of the method lie in precise determinations of other terms in $\Delta M_{\text{tot}}$ (Eq. (5)). While $\Delta M_{\text{MW}}$ can be more reliably constrained, $\Delta M_{\text{host}}$ and $\Delta M_{\text{GRB}}$ cannot. One can make an argument that both are relatively small values. If occasionally abnormally large $\Delta M_{\text{tot}}$ is measured, the system can be excluded for cosmological studies, but could be used to study host galaxy properties (e.g. whether there exists a dense electronic disk or the host galaxy is near edge on) or the circum-burst medium of the GRB (e.g. an over-dense wind environment).

Another issue is that the $\Omega_b f_{\text{IGM}}$ measured for different lines of sight may fluctuate, and the scattering effect would introduce biases in FRB-GRB sample selection (McQuinn 2014). Studying a large sample of FRB/GRB systems over a wide redshift range can give a more reliable averaged value of $\Omega_b f_{\text{IGM}}$.

Within the FRB/GRB association picture, most FRBs are not supposed to be associated with GRBs, and their counterparts in other wavelengths may be faint (Zhang 2014). If, on the other hand, the redshifts of these FRBs can be determined by other means, the methodology developed here can be also applied to those systems.

We thank Zheng Zheng for helpful discussion and a referee for helpful comments. This work is partially supported by NASA under grant NNX10AD48G.

REFERENCES

Ade, P. A. R., Aghanim, N., Armitage-Caplan, C., et al. 2013, arXiv:1303.5076
Amati, L., Guidorzi, C., Frontera, F., et al. 2008, MNRAS, 391, 577
Amati, L., Frontera, F., Tavani, M., et al. 2002, A&A, 390, 81
Bannister, K. W., Murphy, T., Gaensler, B. M., & Reynolds, J. E. 2012, ApJ, 757, 38
Burgess, J. M. 2010, GCN Circular # 11344
Capozziello, S., & Izzo, L. 2010, A&A, 519, A73
Falcke, H., & Rezzolla, L. 2013, arXiv:1307.4099
Fan, X., Carilli, C. L., & Keating, B. 2006, ARA&A, 44, 415
Fruchter, A. S., Levan, A. J., Strolger, L., et al. 2006, Nature, 441, 463
Fukugita, M., Hogan, C. J., & Peebles, P. J. E. 1998, ApJ, 503, 518
Hinshaw, G., Larson, D., Komatsu, E., et al. 2013, ApJS, 208, 19
Inoue, S. 2004, MNRAS, 348, 999
Ioka, K. 2003, ApJ, 598, L79
Kashiyama, K., Ioka, K., & Mészáros, P. 2013, ApJ, 776, L39
Kulkarni, S., Ofek, E. O., Neill, J. D., Juric, C. & Zheng, Z. 2014, ApJ, submitted
Léi, W.-H., Zhang, B., & Liang, E.-W. 2013, ApJ, 765, 125
Loeb, A., Shvartzvald, Y., & Maoz, D. 2014, MNRAS, in press (arXiv:1310.2419)
Lorimer, D. R., Bailes, M., McLaughlin, M. A., Narkevic, D. J., & Crawford, F. 2007, Science, 318, 777
Lü, H.-J., & Zhang, B. 2014, ApJ, submitted (arXiv:1401.1562)
McBreen, S. 2010, GCN Circular # 10933
McQuinn, M. 2014, ApJ, 780, L33
McQuinn, M., Lidz, A., Zaldarriaga, M., et al. 2009, ApJ, 694, 842
Panaitescu, A., & Kumar, P. 2002, ApJ, 571, 779
Popov, S. B., & Postnov, K. A. 2007, arXiv:0710.2006
—. 2013, arXiv:1307.4924
Rybicki, G. B., & Lightman, A. P. 1979, Radiative processes in astrophysics (New York, Wiley-Interscience, 1979. 393 p.)
Taylor, J. H., & Cordes, J. M. 1993, ApJ, 411, 674
Thornton, D., Stappers, B., Bailes, M., et al. 2013, Science, 341, 53
Totani, T. 2013, PASJ, 65, L12
Walker, T. P., Steigman, G., Kang, H.-S., Schramm, D. M., & Olive, K. A. 1991, ApJ, 376, 51
Yost, S. A., Harrison, F. A., Sari, R., & Frail, D. A. 2003, ApJ, 597, 459
Zhang, B. & Mészáros, P. 2004, International Journal of Modern Physics A, 19, 2385
Zhang, B. 2014, ApJ, 780, L21

FRB/GRB cosmology