

Padé Approximants for Fast Radio Bursts Diffuse Dispersion Measure

Marios Kalomenopoulos^{a,b}  and Jiaming Zhuge (诸葛佳明)^{a,b} 

^aNevada Center for Astrophysics, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, NV 89154, USA

^bDepartment of Physics and Astronomy, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, NV 89154, USA

E-mail: marios.kalomenopoulos@gmail.com, jiaming.zhuge@unlv.edu

Abstract. Fast Radio Bursts (FRBs) have become an indispensable tool for studying the Universe’s ionisation properties, as well as its cosmological parameters. This is achieved by analysing their diffuse dispersion measure (DM_{diff}) as a function of redshift. However, this requires an integration along the line-of-sight, which is time-consuming. In this work, we derive an analytical approximation formula for DM_{diff} for flat, Λ CDM and w CDM universes. We show that our approximation works well for the ranges $0.01 \leq z \leq 2$, $0.2 \leq \Omega_m \leq 1.0$ and $-3.0 \leq w \leq -0.5$, with relative fractional error to a numerically evaluated DM_{diff} always smaller than 3.5 %, in the worst case scenario, and in most cases smaller than 0.5 %. Moreover, the approximation is more than 15 (2) times faster than the numerical solution of Λ CDM (w CDM). Therefore, we hope that it could be a useful tool for the FRB community.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	FRBs Dispersion Measure	2
3	Padé Approximant for DM_{diff} - Flat ΛCDM	3
4	Padé Approximant for DM_{diff} - Flat $w\text{CDM}$	4
5	Accuracy and Timing Performance	7
6	Conclusions	9
A	Comparison to the hypergeometric function	9

1 Introduction

Almost twenty years from their discovery [1], FRBs have become a unique probe to study the Universe and its constituents [e.g. 2–6]. At the same time, they offer multiple opportunities for multimessenger astrophysics if they can be associated with other high-energy astrophysical phenomena [7]. In all cases, a fast and accurate calculation of the theoretical dispersion measure of the diffuse component is needed to compare with observed data.

In this work, we derive a useful approximation for the diffuse DM of FRBs, in a **flat**, ΛCDM universe, given by

$$\text{DM}_{\text{diff}} = \frac{3cH_0\Omega_b f_{\text{diff}}}{8\pi Gm_p\sqrt{\Omega_m}}\chi_{7/8}\left(\Phi[x(0, \Omega_m)] - \sqrt{1+z} \cdot \Phi[x(z, \Omega_m)]\right), \quad (1.1)$$

where

$$x(z, \Omega_m) = \frac{1 - \Omega_m}{\Omega_m} \cdot \frac{1}{(1+z)^3}, \quad (1.2)$$

and

$$\Phi(x) = -\frac{2.0 + 2.856x + 1.095x^2 + 0.0913x^3}{1.0 + 1.3280x + 0.4486x^2 + 0.0277x^3}. \quad (1.3)$$

The different parameters correspond to: H_0 the Hubble parameter, c the speed of light, Ω_b the density of baryons in the Universe, G Newton’s gravitational constant, m_p the mass of the proton, Ω_m the density of matter in the Universe, and we have assumed $1 = \Omega_m + \Omega_\Lambda$, with Ω_Λ the density due to a cosmological constant. f_{diff} and $\chi_{7/8}$ refer, respectively, to the portion of diffuse baryons and ionised electrons in the Universe and will be explained in more detail in section 2. z denotes the redshift and Φ the Padé approximant derived in detail in section 3, with the coefficients of eq. (1.3) rounded to the fourth significant digit.

A similar approximation for the diffuse DM of FRBs, in a **flat**, $w\text{CDM}$ universe is given in section 4.

2 FRBs Dispersion Measure

FRBs are bursts of radio emission that last for the order of milliseconds. As they travel through the Universe the different frequencies of the signal travel with different speeds and arrive at different times. These time delays are quantified by the dispersion measure of the pulse. During its propagation through the Universe, the FRB pulse passes through various environments, whose dispersion measures is usually analysed separately [e.g. 8–10]. In this work, we are focusing on one such contribution, DM_{diff} .

The DM_{diff} measures the contributions of diffused electrons along the line-of-sight, drawn from the intergalactic medium (IGM) and intervening cosmic halos. This has the clearest connection to cosmology, since a mean diffuse DM can be derived theoretically and depends on the various cosmological parameters. Assuming a homogeneous distribution and ionization of baryons, with ionized fraction $\chi(z)$ [9, 11, 12] one has, for a flat, Λ CDM universe:

$$\langle \text{DM}_{\text{diff}} \rangle(z) = \frac{3cH_0\Omega_b}{8\pi Gm_p} \int_0^z \frac{f_{\text{diff}}(z)\chi(z)(1+z)}{\sqrt{\Omega_m(1+z)^3 + (1-\Omega_m)}} dz, \quad (2.1)$$

with

$$\chi(z) = Y_{\text{H}}X_{e,\text{H}}(z) + \frac{1}{2}Y_{\text{He}}X_{e,\text{He}}(z). \quad (2.2)$$

f_{diff} introduces astrophysical effects, quantifying the fraction of diffuse baryons in both the intergalactic medium and halos, and can in principle depend on redshift. Following, observational studies that have constrained $f_{\text{diff}} \sim 0.84$ with no evidence of redshift dependence [13], we take it here as a constant and take it out of the integral. $\chi(z)$ represents the fraction of ionized electrons over the baryons in the Universe. Its components correspond to the mass fraction of hydrogen H , Y_{H} or helium He , Y_{He} and to the ionization fraction of each element. For low redshifts ($z < 3$), the Universe is ionized, and $\chi(z)$ tends to a constant value $\chi(z) = \chi_{7/8} \sim 7/8$ [9, 14]. As a result DM_{diff} becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{DM}_{\text{diff}} \rangle(z) &= \frac{3cH_0\Omega_b f_{\text{diff}}}{8\pi Gm_p} \chi_{7/8} \int_0^z \frac{(1+z)}{\sqrt{\Omega_m(1+z)^3 + (1-\Omega_m)}} dz \\ &= \text{DM}_{\text{diff}}^c \int_0^z \frac{(1+z)}{\sqrt{\Omega_m(1+z)^3 + (1-\Omega_m)}} dz, \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

where in $\text{DM}_{\text{diff}}^c$ we have collected all the cosmological and astrophysical parameters that do not affect the z integral.

3 Padé Approximant for DM_{diff} - Flat ΛCDM

We obtain our approximation, following closely the equivalent derivation of [15] for the luminosity distance in flat ΛCDM cosmologies. We start from eq. (2.3):

$$\begin{aligned}\text{DM}_{\text{diff}} &= \text{DM}_{\text{diff}}^c \int_0^z \frac{(1+z)dz}{\sqrt{\Omega_m(1+z)^3 + (1-\Omega_m)}} \\ &= \text{DM}_{\text{diff}}^c \int_a^1 \frac{da}{\sqrt{\Omega_m a^3 + (1-\Omega_m)a^6}}, \quad \text{with } a = 1/(1+z).\end{aligned}\quad (3.1)$$

We define a new function $F(a)$:

$$F(a) = \int_0^a \sqrt{\frac{\Omega_m}{\Omega_m a^3 + (1-\Omega_m)a^6}} da. \quad (3.2)$$

Note that we have introduced an extra $\sqrt{\Omega_m}$ term, which helps simplify the expansion below. This would re-write eq. (3.1) as

$$\text{DM}_{\text{diff}} = \frac{\text{DM}_{\text{diff}}^c}{\sqrt{\Omega_m}} \left(F(1) - F(a) \right). \quad (3.3)$$

For the next steps, we are going to expand $F(a)$ with respect to a , where $a \rightarrow 0$ (large z regime). This expansion results in

$$F(a) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}} \left(-2 - 0.2x + 0.068x^2 - 0.037x^4 + \dots \right), \quad (3.4)$$

with $x = x(a, \Omega_m) = x(z, \Omega_m)$ defined in eq. (1.2). We expand F until $\mathcal{O}(x^6)$ inclusive, and calculate the Padé approximant [16] to order $(N, M) = (3, 3)$:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{a(x)}} \Phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{a(x)}} \frac{b_0 + b_1x + b_2x^2 + b_3x^3}{1.0 + c_1x + c_2x^2 + c_3x^3}. \quad (3.5)$$

The coefficients are

$$b_0 = -2.0, \quad (3.6)$$

$$b_1 = -2.85592665, \quad (3.7)$$

$$b_2 = -1.0945641, \quad (3.8)$$

$$b_3 = -0.0913347, \quad (3.9)$$

$$c_1 = 1.32796333, \quad (3.10)$$

$$c_2 = 0.44857662, \quad (3.11)$$

$$c_3 = 0.02769881. \quad (3.12)$$

Bringing everything together and returning to (z, Ω_m) notation, we have the analytical formula:

$$\text{DM}_{\text{diff}} = \frac{\text{DM}_{\text{diff}}^c}{\sqrt{\Omega_m}} \left(\Phi[x(0, \Omega_m)] - \sqrt{1+z} \cdot \Phi[x(z, \Omega_m)] \right). \quad (3.13)$$

4 Padé Approximant for $\text{DM}_{\text{diff}}^w$ - Flat $w\text{CDM}$

We obtain our approximation, following closely the equivalent derivation of [17] for the luminosity distance in flat $w\text{CDM}$ cosmologies. Here w is the general factor in the equation of state parameterization for dark energy (DE) connecting its pressure p and density ρ as $p = w\rho c^2$ [18]. This modifies the denominator in the different distance elements [19, 20], hence the diffuse DM is now written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DM}_{\text{diff}}^{w\text{CDM}} &= \text{DM}_{\text{diff}}^c \int_0^z \frac{(1+z)dz}{\sqrt{\Omega_m(1+z)^3 + (1-\Omega_m)(1+z)^{3(1+w)}}} \\ &= \text{DM}_{\text{diff}}^c \int_a^1 \frac{da}{\sqrt{\Omega_m a^3 + (1-\Omega_m)a^{3(1-w)}}}, \quad \text{with } a = 1/(1+z). \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

For the following analysis, we consider w negative, and specifically $w < -1/6$, to avoid divergences in the denominator. This range is consistent with most standard DE models [21]. We define a new function $\tilde{F}(a)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}(a) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Omega_m}} \int_0^a \frac{1}{\sqrt{a^3 + \frac{1-\Omega_m}{\Omega_m} a^3 a^{-3w}}} da \Rightarrow \\ \tilde{F}(\tilde{x}) &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Omega_m}} \cdot \frac{1}{3w} \int_0^{\tilde{x}} \left(\frac{s}{\tilde{x}}\right)^{-1/6w} \cdot \frac{1}{\tilde{x}} \cdot \frac{d\tilde{x}}{\sqrt{1+\tilde{x}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

where we have introduced $s = (1-\Omega_m)/\Omega_m$ and $\tilde{x} = sa^{-3w}$. Note that setting $w = -1$ correctly returns to eq. (3.2). Using \tilde{F} would re-write eq. (4.1) as:

$$\text{DM}_{\text{diff}}^{w\text{CDM}} = \text{DM}_{\text{diff}}^c \left(\tilde{F}(1) - \tilde{F}(a) \right). \quad (4.3)$$

Similarly with section 3, we expand $\tilde{F}(a)$ with respect to a , where $a \rightarrow 0$ (large z regime) and then calculate the Padé approximant to order $(N, M) = (3, 3)$:

$$\Phi^{w\text{CDM}}(\tilde{x}) = \frac{b_0 + b_1\tilde{x} + b_2\tilde{x}^2 + b_3\tilde{x}^3}{1.0 + c_1\tilde{x} + c_2\tilde{x}^2 + c_3\tilde{x}^3}, \quad (4.4)$$

with coefficients:

$$c_1^{\text{num}} = 7 (13554501120w^7 + 2144869632w^6 + 186662880w^5 + 11424240w^4 + 447552w^3 + 10512w^2 + 138w + 1) \quad (4.5)$$

$$c_1^{\text{den}} = 4 (17420977152w^7 + 2348289792w^6 + 206452800w^5 + 12398832w^4 + 473904w^3 + 10800w^2 + 144w + 1) \quad (4.6)$$

$$c_2^{\text{num}} = 7 (287698065408w^8 + 67349242368w^7 + 7092738432w^6 + 484856928w^5 + 23238576w^4 + 732672w^3 + 14328w^2 + 162w + 1) \quad (4.7)$$

$$c_2^{\text{den}} = 8 (522629314560w^8 + 87869670912w^7 + 8541873792w^6 + 578417760w^5 + 26615952w^4 + 797904w^3 + 15120w^2 + 174w + 1) \quad (4.8)$$

$$c_3^{\text{num}} = 7 (3862337458176w^9 + 1485633788928w^8 + 219003450624w^7 + 17781674688w^6 + 976307904w^5 + 38712816w^4 + 1042416w^3 + 17892w^2 + 180w + 1) \quad (4.9)$$

$$c_3^{\text{den}} = 64 (12543103549440w^9 + 2631501416448w^8 + 292874641920w^7 + 22423900032w^6 + 1217200608w^5 + 45765648w^4 + 1160784w^3 + 19296w^2 + 198w + 1) \quad (4.10)$$

$$b_0 = 6w \quad (4.11)$$

$$b_1^{\text{num}} = 15w (113857809408w^8 + 30024815616w^7 + 3631469760w^6 + 274710528w^5 + 14793840w^4 + 525312w^3 + 11556w^2 + 144w + 1) \quad (4.12)$$

$$b_1^{\text{den}} = 2 (104525862912w^8 + 31510715904w^7 + 3587006592w^6 + 280845792w^5 + 15242256w^4 + 538704w^3 + 11664w^2 + 150w + 1) \quad (4.13)$$

$$b_2^{\text{num}} = 9w (48333274988544w^{10} + 15147986411520w^9 + 2611359461376w^8 + 276998911488w^7 + 19936155456w^6 + 1037489472w^5 + 39459312w^4 + 1036800w^3 + 17676w^2 + 180w + 1) \quad (4.14)$$

$$b_2^{\text{den}} = 4 (37629310648320w^{10} + 15733943967744w^9 + 2719298304000w^8 + 283269477888w^7 + 20869742016w^6 + 1114953984w^5 + 42066864w^4 + 1082592w^3 + 18324w^2 + 192w + 1) \quad (4.15)$$

$$b_3^{\text{num}} = 3w (35039125420572672w^{12} + 8629966763753472w^{11} + 1619918846263296w^{10} + 221082842105856w^9 + 21477950191872w^8 + 1497341832192w^7 + 77109117696w^6 + 3001784832w^5 + 87399648w^4 + 1812672w^3 + 25200w^2 + 216w + 1) \quad (4.16)$$

$$b_3^{\text{den}} = 32 (16255862200074240w^{12} + 8377494841294848w^{11} + 1873191824621568w^{10} + 252316887183360w^9 + 23632344926208w^8 + 1641458763648w^7 + 85870694592w^6 + 3349442016w^5 + 95451696w^4 + 1935144w^3 + 26820w^2 + 234w + 1) \quad (4.17)$$

As expected the coefficients are more complex this time, and to allow for better visibility they have been broken, where needed, in their numerator and denominator. In those cases, $b_i = b_i^{\text{num}}/b_i^{\text{den}}$ for example. Returning to (z, Ω_m) notation, we get the analytical formula:

$$\text{DM}_{\text{diff}}^{w\text{CDM}} = -\frac{\text{DM}_{\text{diff}}^c}{3w\sqrt{\Omega_m}} \left(\Phi^{w\text{CDM}}[x(0, \Omega_m, w)] - \sqrt{1+z} \cdot \Phi^{w\text{CDM}}[x(z, \Omega_m, w)] \right). \quad (4.18)$$

5 Accuracy and Timing Performance

To calculate the accuracy of our approximants, we compare the relative error between the numerical and the approximate calculation of the integrals. We define the fractional percentage error as

$$\Delta E [\%] = \frac{|\text{DM}^{\text{num}} - \text{DM}^{\text{Padé}}|}{\text{DM}^{\text{num}}} \cdot 100 \quad (5.1)$$

Wherever we use values of the cosmological parameters from Λ CDM, we base ourselves on Planck18 [22]. For example, when testing the w CDM approximant for different w values, the matter density parameter is fixed $\Omega_m = \Omega_m^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$, unless stated otherwise.

In Figure 1, we show the accuracy performance of the Padé approximants for the Λ CDM and w CDM cases. The redshift range is the same for both, $0.01 \leq z \leq 2$. We observe, as expected, that the approximate solutions improve for higher redshifts, and that Ω_m has a bigger impact on the accuracy, compared to w . In general, smaller Ω_m and more positive w lead to worse results, with $\Omega_m = 0.2$ in the flat, Λ CDM case yielding the worst performance $\Delta E \sim 3.5\%$ ¹. Table 1 gives example values for ΔE for pairs of (z, Ω_m) .




Figure 1. (Left) Fractional error ΔE for the DM Padé Approximant in a flat, Λ CDM universe, for the redshift range $0.01 \leq z \leq 2$, and for two values of Ω_m : ($\Omega_m = 0.2$ - blue, crosses) and ($\Omega_m = \Omega_m^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$ - red, dots). Increasing z and Ω_m reduces the fractional error. (Right) Fractional error ΔE for the DM Padé Approximant in a flat, w CDM universe, for the redshift range $0.01 \leq z \leq 2$, and for two values of w : ($w = -0.5$ - blue, crosses) and ($w = -3.0$ - red, dots). Increasing z and decreasing w reduces the fractional error. Here $\Omega_m = \Omega_m^{\Lambda\text{CDM}}$.

Ω_m	$z = 0.01$	$z = 0.05$	$z = 0.1$	$z = 0.5$	$z = 1.0$
0.2	3.51	2.89	2.31	0.68	0.32
0.3	0.47	0.38	0.29	0.08	0.04
0.4	0.07	0.05	0.04	0.01	0.01

Table 1. ΔE [%] values for different redshift and Ω_m values for the flat, Λ CDM case.

In Figure 2, we fix the redshift to the most pessimistic value $z = 0.01$, i.e. to the redshift limit where the approximation is anticipated to achieve the worst accuracy. We then compare the accuracy ΔE for different combinations of (w, Ω_m) . Some example choices are

¹However, this is still smaller than observational uncertainties of current FRBs' DM_{diff} (for example, see [23]).

shown in Table 2. The 2D result supplements the 1D analysis of Figure 1, showing that for the whole parameter space we studied, the influence of Ω_m is much more important than w .




Figure 2. Fractional error ΔE for the DM Padé Approximant in a flat, w CDM universe, for a fixed redshift $z = 0.01$, i.e. the most conservative choice. The other cosmological parameters vary in the ranges: $-3 \leq w \leq -0.5$ and $0.1 \leq \Omega_m \leq 1$. We also denote with a red, dashed line the limit where the fractional error is $\Delta E = 1\%$, while the white, dotted line corresponds to the cases where the parameters take their Λ CDM values. We observe that the value of Ω_m plays the more crucial role in our Padé approximants, compared to w .

w	$\Omega_m = 0.2$	$\Omega_m = 0.3$	$\Omega_m = 0.4$
-3.0	2.62	0.36	0.05
-1.5	3.1	0.42	0.06
-1.0	3.5	0.47	0.07
-0.5	4.93	0.64	0.09

Table 2. ΔE [%] values for different w and Ω_m values for the flat, w CDM case, at redshift $z = 0.01$.

Finally, in Table 3 we compare the timing performance of the approximants versus the numerical integration in Python’s `quad` function. The biggest improvement is seen in the Λ CDM case, with around 17 times faster evaluations. The w CDM approximate result still evaluates faster, but with less significant difference. The reason for this lies in the complicated nature of the Padé coefficients in this case. However, if one considers that a DM needs to be calculated multiple times for most parameter inference analyses, like in MCMC, the timing improvement will eventually be remarkable.

Model	Λ CDM (Num)	w CDM (Num)
Λ CDM (Padé)	~ 17	—
w CDM (Padé)	—	~ 2.5

Table 3. Timing improvement $\Delta t = t_{\text{Num}}/t_{\text{App}}$ values between the numerical solutions and the Padé approximants.

6 Conclusions

In this short note, we have derived a Padé approximant for the diffuse DM of FRBs, assuming a flat, Λ CDM or w CDM universe. We show that our approximation works well for a range of cosmological density parameters and redshifts. More specifically, for $0.01 \leq z \leq 2$, $0.2 \leq \Omega_m \leq 1.0$ and $-3.0 \leq w \leq -0.5$ the relative error in DM_{diff} is always below 3.5%. The relative error decreases as one probes larger redshifts $z > 0.01$, larger matter density $\Omega_m > 0.2$ and more negative DE EoS $w < -0.5$. Moreover, if one assumes the fiducial values for the pair $(\Omega_m, w) \simeq (0.31, -1)$, in order to constrain astrophysical and cosmological parameters in the factor outside the redshift integral $\text{DM}_{\text{diff}}^c$, the relative error is below 0.5% for the whole redshift range we considered. Compared to direct numerical evaluation, we find that our solution is more than 10 times faster for Λ CDM and more than 2 times faster for w CDM. As a result, we consider it a useful tool for cosmological and astrophysical studies involving FRBs.

Software: Astropy [24, 25], Numpy [26], Scipy [27], Matplotlib [28], Sympy [29]. The code that reproduces our analysis will become available together with our upcoming work [30], and will appear in https://github.com/MariosNT/FRB_GW_association_cosmo. Feel free to contact us for earlier access.

A Comparison to the hypergeometric function

[31] cite an analytical solution of the DM_{diff} integral, for flat Λ CDM cosmologies with $\Omega_m < 1$ given by

$$\int_0^z \frac{(1+z)dz}{\sqrt{\Omega_m(1+z)^3 + (1-\Omega_m)}} = \left[\frac{(z+1)^2}{2\sqrt{1-\Omega_m}} \cdot {}_2F_1\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{2}{3}; \frac{5}{3}; -\frac{\Omega_m(1+z)^3}{\Omega_\Lambda}\right) \right] \Big|_0^z, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

with ${}_2F_1$ the hypergeometric function [32]. This function is available in modern Python packages, like Scipy [27]. Of course, our approximant is less precise in its range of validity compared to the analytic solution, however it is about $\times 3$ faster. This will give it an efficiency advantage when many DM calculations are needed, e.g. in the case of MCMC analyses.

References

- [1] D.R. Lorimer, M. Bailes, M.A. McLaughlin, D.J. Narkevic and F. Crawford, *A Bright Millisecond Radio Burst of Extragalactic Origin*, *Science* **318** (2007) 777 [[0709.4301](#)].
- [2] J.M. Cordes and S. Chatterjee, *Fast Radio Bursts: An Extragalactic Enigma*, *ARA&A* **57** (2019) 417 [[1906.05878](#)].
- [3] E. Petroff, J.W.T. Hessels and D.R. Lorimer, *Fast radio bursts*, *A&A Rev.* **27** (2019) 4 [[1904.07947](#)].
- [4] E. Petroff, J.W.T. Hessels and D.R. Lorimer, *Fast radio bursts at the dawn of the 2020s*, *A&A Rev.* **30** (2022) 2 [[2107.10113](#)].
- [5] Q. Wu and F.-Y. Wang, *Statistical Properties and Cosmological Applications of Fast Radio Bursts*, *Chinese Physics Letters* **41** (2024) 119801 [[2409.13247](#)].
- [6] M. Glowacki and K.-G. Lee, *Cosmology with Fast Radio Bursts*, *arXiv e-prints* (2024) [arXiv:2410.24072](#) [[2410.24072](#)].
- [7] B. Zhang, *Multiwavelength and Multimessenger Counterparts of Fast Radio Bursts*, *Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science* **74** (2024) 89 [[2410.02216](#)].
- [8] D. Thornton, B. Stappers, M. Bailes, B. Barsdell, S. Bates, N.D.R. Bhat et al., *A Population of Fast Radio Bursts at Cosmological Distances*, *Science* **341** (2013) 53 [[1307.1628](#)].
- [9] W. Deng and B. Zhang, *Cosmological Implications of Fast Radio Burst/Gamma-Ray Burst Associations*, *ApJ* **783** (2014) L35 [[1401.0059](#)].
- [10] J.X. Prochaska and Y. Zheng, *Probing Galactic haloes with fast radio bursts*, *MNRAS* **485** (2019) 648 [[1901.11051](#)].
- [11] K. Ioka, *The Cosmic Dispersion Measure from Gamma-Ray Burst Afterglows: Probing the Reionization History and the Burst Environment*, *ApJ* **598** (2003) L79 [[astro-ph/0309200](#)].
- [12] S. Inoue, *Probing the cosmic reionization history and local environment of gamma-ray bursts through radio dispersion*, *MNRAS* **348** (2004) 999 [[astro-ph/0309364](#)].
- [13] Z. Li, H. Gao, J.J. Wei, Y.P. Yang, B. Zhang and Z.H. Zhu, *Cosmology-insensitive estimate of IGM baryon mass fraction from five localized fast radio bursts*, *MNRAS* **496** (2020) L28 [[2004.08393](#)].
- [14] M. Fukugita, C.J. Hogan and P.J.E. Peebles, *The Cosmic Baryon Budget*, *ApJ* **503** (1998) 518 [[astro-ph/9712020](#)].
- [15] M. Adachi and M. Kasai, *An Analytical Approximation of the Luminosity Distance in Flat Cosmologies with a Cosmological Constant*, *Progress of Theoretical Physics* **127** (2012) 145 [[1111.6396](#)].
- [16] M.C. Bender and A.S. Orszag, *Advanced mathematical methods for scientists and engineers I: asymptotic methods and perturbation theory.*, Springer-Verlag (1999).
- [17] H. Wei, X.-P. Yan and Y.-N. Zhou, *Cosmological applications of Padé approximant*, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2014** (2014) 045 [[1312.1117](#)].
- [18] M.P. Hobson, G.P. Efstathiou and A.N. Lasenby, *General Relativity*, Cambridge University Press (2006), [10.2277/0521829518](#).
- [19] E.V. Linder, *Exploring the Expansion History of the Universe*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90** (2003) 091301 [[astro-ph/0208512](#)].
- [20] J.A. Frieman, M.S. Turner and D. Huterer, *Dark energy and the accelerating universe.*, *ARA&A* **46** (2008) 385 [[0803.0982](#)].

- [21] L.A. Escamilla, W. Giarè, E.D. Valentino, R.C. Nunes and S. Vagnozzi, *The state of the dark energy equation of state circa 2023*, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2024** (2024) 091 [[2307.14802](#)].
- [22] N. Aghanim, Y. Akrami, M. Ashdown, J. Aumont, C. Baccigalupi, M. Ballardini et al., *Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters*, *A&A* **641** (2020) A6.
- [23] J.-P. Macquart, J.X. Prochaska, M. McQuinn, K.W. Bannister, S. Bhandari, C.K. Day et al., *A census of baryons in the Universe from localized fast radio bursts*, *Nature* **581** (2020) 391 [[2005.13161](#)].
- [24] Astropy Collaboration, T.P. Robitaille, E.J. Tollerud, P. Greenfield, M. Droettboom, E. Bray et al., *Astropy: A community Python package for astronomy*, *A&A* **558** (2013) A33 [[1307.6212](#)].
- [25] Astropy Collaboration, A.M. Price-Whelan, B.M. Sipőcz, H.M. Günther, P.L. Lim, S.M. Crawford et al., *The Astropy Project: Building an Open-science Project and Status of the v2.0 Core Package*, *AJ* **156** (2018) 123 [[1801.02634](#)].
- [26] C.R. Harris, K.J. Millman, S.J. van der Walt, R. Gommers, P. Virtanen, D. Cournapeau et al., *Array programming with NumPy*, *Nature* **585** (2020) 357.
- [27] P. Virtanen, R. Gommers, T.E. Oliphant, M. Haberland, T. Reddy, D. Cournapeau et al., *SciPy 1.0: Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python*, *Nature Methods* **17** (2020) 261.
- [28] J.D. Hunter, *Matplotlib: A 2d graphics environment*, *Computing in Science & Engineering* **9** (2007) 90.
- [29] A. Meurer, C.P. Smith, M. Paprocki, O. Čertík, S.B. Kirpichev, M. Rocklin et al., *Sympy: symbolic computing in python*, *PeerJ Computer Science* **3** (2017) e103.
- [30] J. Zhuge, M. Kalomenopoulos, C.J. Haster and B. Zhang, *Cosmology with FRBs and GWs associations without redshift information*, *The Astrophysical Journal (To be submitted)* (2025) .
- [31] J.N. Jahns-Schindler and L.G. Spitler, *Breaking the Baryon Density-Hubble Constant Degeneracy in Fast Radio Burst Applications with Associated Gravitational Waves*, *arXiv e-prints* (2025) [arXiv:2508.14434](#) [[2508.14434](#)].
- [32] M. Abramowitz and I.A. Stegun, *Handbook of mathematical functions with formulas, graphs, and mathematical tables*, Dover (1965).