

# Searching for Galactic Micro-FRB with Lunar Scattering

J. I. Katz,<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics and McDonnell Center for the Space Sciences, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 63130 USA*

9 April 2024

## ABSTRACT

Does the Galaxy contain sources of micro-FRB, lower energy events resembling the known FRB but detectable only at Galactic distances? The answer to this question is essential to determining the nature of FRB sources. At typical (10 kpc) Galactic distances a burst would be about 117 dB brighter than at a “cosmological” ( $z = 1$ ) distance. The radiation of Galactic micro-FRB, if they exist, could be detected after Lunar reflection, or an upper bound on their rate set, by a modest (20 m at 1.4 GHz) radio telescope staring at the Moon. It would have all-sky sensitivity. The delay between detection of direct (by STARE2 or dipoles) and Lunar-scattered radiation would restrict a burst’s position to a narrow arc.

**Key words:** radio continuum: transients, Galaxy: general, instrumentation: miscellaneous

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The sources of Fast Radio Bursts (FRB) remain a mystery. Many different astronomical objects and processes have been proposed (Platts *et al.* 2018). If associated with stars or their remnants (neutron stars, stellar mass black holes, supernova remnants *etc.*), the distribution of FRB fluence on the sky would be expected to resemble that of Galactic stars, concentrated in the Galactic plane, as is the distribution of other radiation associated with stars and their remnants (Katz 2019a)<sup>1</sup>. This is a consequence of the domination of the distribution of stellar mass in the Universe, weighted by the  $-2$  power of its distance, by the Galactic disc.

Yet FRB are isotropically distributed (Bhandari *et al.* 2018). Are FRB associated with stars or with some unrelated class of objects? If the former, concentration of micro-FRB, such as might be produced by repeating FRB, in the Galactic plane would be expected. Empirical confirmation or contradiction of that prediction would help decide the question of the origin of FRB.

Some FRB repeat, requiring a non-catastrophic origin, but it is not known if apparently non-repeating FRB actually repeat at long intervals or are the results of catastrophic non-repeating processes. Phenomenological arguments for the distinct nature of the sources of repeating and apparently non-repeating FRB have been recently presented by

Katz (2019a); Li *et al.* (2019), while Ravi (2019) has argued on statistical grounds that apparent non-repeaters must actually repeat because the rates of known catastrophic events are insufficient.

Here I consider the possibility of detecting micro-FRB, events intermediate in energy between giant pulsar pulses and FRB observed at  $z \sim 1$ . Even if micro-FRE were 12 orders of magnitude less energetic than “cosmological” FRB they would be observable at Galactic ( $\sim 10$  kpc) distances. There may be two contributors to a population of Galactic micro-FRB: Repeaters that, like FRB 121102, have large numbers of weak bursts but that are much weaker or less active than FRB 121102 (which, if at Galactic distances, would have been detected in side-lobes of unrelated radio observations), and possible weak non-repeaters.

It is known (Kumar *et al.* 2019) that individual FRB sources produce bursts with a wide range of strengths, suggesting that even weak or comparatively inactive sources may produce bursts detectable at Galactic distances. If FRB are produced by comparatively common objects like neutron stars, of which there are many in the Galaxy with a broad range of parameters, then a minority with optimal parameters (such as very young neutron stars) may be detectable at cosmological distances while the much greater number with less favorable parameters might produce micro-FRB detectable only at Galactic distances.

Most natural events that leave their sources fundamentally unchanged repeat, with a spectrum of outburst sizes that increases rapidly towards weaker outbursts. Examples include earthquakes, Solar and stellar flares, giant pulsar pulses, lightning and SGR (soft gamma repeater) outbursts. Most of these processes appear to have no natural size scale, but rather a power law distribution of event sizes. In con-

\* E-mail katz@wuphys.wustl.edu

<sup>1</sup> Observed gamma-ray bursts (GRB) are isotropically distributed, but, integrated long enough ( $\gg 10^6$  y) to include expected infrequent Galactic GRB, the distribution of GRB fluence is expected also to be concentrated in the Galactic plane.

trast, the largest SGR outbursts and recurrent novæ appear to be exceptions, with characteristic sizes. Catastrophic events that destroy their sources, such as supernovæ and gamma-ray bursts, generally also have characteristic sizes.


FRB energetic enough to be observed by Parkes at cosmological distances occur at a rate  $\sim 10^6/\text{sky-y}$  (Cordes & Chatterjee 2019). With  $\sim 10^9 L^*$  galaxies with  $z \leq 1$  (Conselice *et al.* 2016) their rate is  $\sim 10^{-3}/\text{galaxy-y}$ . Less energetic bursts of repeating FRB, detectable at Galactic distances, may be frequent enough to occur in feasible observing times (Bochenek *et al.* 2020). Some constraints on those FRB, with energies between those detectable only at Galactic distances and those detectable at cosmological distances, were set by observations of the Virgo cluster (Agarwal *et al.* 2019). Detection of Galactic micro-FRB would establish that the Galaxy contains many sources, consistent with the popular hypotheses (Keane *et al.* 2012; Cordes & Wasserman 2016; Katz 2018; Cordes & Chatterjee 2019) that these sources are neutron stars. The absence of Galactic micro-FRB would point to sources rare enough that there are *none* in the Galaxy (Katz 2019a,b), likely excluding neutron star origin.

In this paper I suggest a method of monitoring the entire Galaxy for micro-FRB. Its sensitivity would be about 73 dB less than that of pointed observations with a Parkes-class telescope, but this is more than compensated by the  $\approx 117$  dB inverse-square law ratio of intensity of Galactic sources in comparison to those at “cosmological” distances ( $z = 1$ ; luminosity distance 7 Gpc). The FRB K-correction is unknown but the redshift also tends to make Galactic counterparts brighter than distant FRB. The survey would probe the FRB luminosity function about 44 dB deeper than is possible at cosmological distances. The proposed observations would be sensitive to bursts over almost the entire sky, and the hypothesis of a numerous population of Galactic micro-FRB could be confirmed or excluded.

The Moon reflects, mostly as a specular glint but partly diffusely, radio radiation that illuminates it. Radiation from a FRB in any direction (except for the narrow cone eclipsed by the Earth) is reflected in every direction and can be detected at the Earth (except for sources in the narrow cone eclipsed at the Earth by the Moon). The intensity at the Earth is much less than the incident intensity at the Moon, but the great brightness of a Galactic FRB, in comparison to the same event at cosmological distances, more than compensates for this.

For a radio telescope beam matched to the angular size of the Moon the loss in sensitivity, aside from a contribution  $\sim 13$  dB attributable to the Lunar reflectivity and a trigonometric factor, equals the gain in acceptance solid angle ( $4\pi$  sterad *vs.* the beam solid angle). In addition, the required telescope would be modest ( $\approx 20$  m in L band) and perhaps possible to dedicate to these observations whenever the Moon is above the horizon, thousands of hours per year. A larger telescope (or one observing at higher frequency) would have greater sensitivity, at the price of requiring multiple beams to cover the Moon.

The proposed observations might be combined with other radio astronomy programs (McKinley *et al.* 2018; James *et al.* 2019) that involve staring at the Moon.



**Figure 1.** Specular reflection of radiation from a source at infinity towards the Earth, also approximated as at infinity, by a spherical Moon.

## 2 LUNAR SCATTERING


Scattered radiation can be detected by a radio telescope starting at the Moon. The glint of a spherical Moon is not significantly spread in time (diffraction broadens it very slightly from a geometrical glint).

Most direct measurements (Thompson & Dyce 1966) of Lunar radio-wave reflection have been monostatic and are not directly applicable to the bistatic problem of scattering towards the Earth from general directions of incidence. The measured electromagnetic properties (Olhoeft & Strangway 1975) of the Lunar surface can be used to estimate the bistatic scattering. At the L-band frequencies of most FRB observations the properties in the upper  $c/n\omega = 1/k = \lambda/2\pi \sim 1\text{--}3$  cm of soil are applicable: the density is about  $1.55 \text{ g/cm}^3$  and the empirical relation of Olhoeft & Strangway (1975) indicates a dielectric constant  $K' \approx 2.77$  and refractive index  $n = \sqrt{K'} \approx 1.66$ .

Here we treat the Moon as a specularly reflecting sphere of radius  $R$  at a distance  $D \gg R$  from the observer. For an observer on the Earth  $D/R \approx 220$  and  $D/R_E \approx 60$  so that both source and observer may be considered to be at infinity. The geometry is shown in Fig. 1.

On scales  $\gtrsim 20$  m median lunar slopes are  $\sim 5\text{--}10^\circ$  (Shepard, Brackett & Arvidson 1995; Rosenberg *et al.* 2011). The light travel time across a Lunar radius is 6 ms. Smooth slopes contributing glints will be separated by a small fraction of the Lunar radius, possibly contributing to a temporal width of the glint  $\sim 1$  ms. Diffusely scattered radiation may arrive with delays of up to  $12 \cos \theta$  ms, contributing a weak tail to the specularly scattered pulse (Fermat’s Principle ensures that the specular glint arrives first).

If the FRB signal is  $F$  per unit area on a surface perpendicular to its direction, it delivers  $F \cos \theta$  per unit area of the surface of the Moon at the specular point, where  $\theta$  is the angle between the specular point and the direction to the Earth (Fig. 1). The signal may be the flux, the fluence or the inte-



**Figure 2.** The angle-dependent factors in Eq. 2 of the two polarization states for a Lunar dielectric constant  $K' = 2.77$  ( $n = 1.66$ ). Lower  $x$ -axis gives angle of incidence  $\theta$  in radians, upper in degrees.

gral of the product of flux with an arbitrary function of time. The signal illuminating the portion of the Lunar surface in an interval  $d\theta$  about the angle of incidence  $\theta$  and  $d\phi$  from the plane of incidence ( $\phi$  is the azimuthal angle around the direction to the Earth)  $dF = F \cos \theta R^2 \sin \theta d\theta d\phi$ . A square patch is defined by  $d\phi = \csc \theta d\theta$ . This is reflected into a solid angle  $d\Omega = \sin \theta 2d\theta 2d\phi = 4(d\theta)^2$  because the change in direction on reflection is twice the angle of incidence.

The reflected signal per unit solid angle

$$\frac{dF}{d\Omega} = \frac{1}{4} F R^2 \cos \theta. \quad (1)$$

At a distance  $D$  the observed signal is

$$F_{\text{obs}} = F \frac{\mathcal{R}(\theta)}{4} \frac{R^2}{D^2} \cos \theta, \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{R}$  is the reflection coefficient. For polarizations perpendicular and parallel to the plane of incidence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{\perp}(\theta) &= \left( \frac{\cos \theta - \sqrt{n^2 - \sin^2 \theta}}{\cos \theta + \sqrt{n^2 - \sin^2 \theta}} \right)^2; \\ \mathcal{R}_{\parallel}(\theta) &= \left( \frac{n^2 \cos \theta - \sqrt{n^2 - \sin^2 \theta}}{n^2 \cos \theta + \sqrt{n^2 - \sin^2 \theta}} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The products  $\mathcal{R}(\theta) \cos \theta$  are shown in Fig. 2.

There are two important consequences of Eqs. 2 and 3 and Fig. 2:

(i) As a rough approximation

$$\frac{F_{\text{obs}}}{F} \sim 0.02 \frac{R^2}{D^2} \sim 4 \times 10^{-7}; \quad (4)$$

the scattered signal is about 64 dB weaker than the direct signal<sup>2</sup>.

(ii) Scattering is strongly polarizing.

The optimal diameter of a single-beam telescope is  $d_{\text{tel}} \approx \lambda D / (2R) \approx 22$  m at 1400 MHz. Many such telescopes exist, and would provide nearly  $4\pi$  sky coverage for FRB during the 0.5 duty factor of the Moon above the horizon. The telescope gain near the center of its beam

$$g_{\text{tel}} \approx 10 \log_{10} \left( \frac{\pi d_{\text{tel}}}{\lambda} \right)^2 \approx 10 \log_{10} \left( \frac{\pi D}{2R} \right)^2 \approx 51 \text{ dB}. \quad (5)$$

Combining Eqs. 4 and 5 leads to a system gain

$$g_{\text{sys}} \approx 10 \log_{10} \left[ 0.02 \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \right)^2 \right] \approx -13 \text{ dB}, \quad (6)$$

independent of  $D/R$ ; the weakness of Lunar-scattered radiation is cancelled, except for the reflectivity and a geometric factor, by the gain of a telescope beam matched to the angular size of the Moon.

The gain of the proposed system should be compared to that of a single dipole, which is near 0 dB (except in its narrow nulls), and to that of the Parkes telescope ( $d_{\text{tel}} = 64$  m) in the center of one of its beams, which is about 60 dB. The proposed system would be about 13 dB less sensitive than a single dipole and 73 dB less sensitive than Parkes, corresponding to a detection threshold  $\sim 20$  MJy for a  $\sim 1$  ms burst. In a search for Galactic micro-FRB this lesser sensitivity, in comparison to Parkes, would be compensated by the  $4\pi$  acceptance angle and by the fact that at Galactic distances (10 kpc) a given burst would be about 117 dB brighter than at luminosity distance 6.7 Gpc ( $z = 1$ ) and about 100 dB brighter than at luminosity distance 1.0 Gpc ( $z = 0.193$ , the distance of FRB 121102). The proposed system would probe the FRB luminosity function to energies  $117 - 73 = 44$  dB less than Parkes at  $z = 1$  and to energies  $100 - 73 = 27$  dB less than Parkes at  $z = 0.193$ .

### 3 LOCALIZATION

If a burst were detected by the proposed system, localization would be necessary to confirm the burst's Galactic nature and to permit further investigation. There are two methods of localization, both of which require simultaneous detection with another instrument.

One such instrument could be a dipole or array of dipoles. Even a single dipole would be more sensitive than the proposed system, but would suffer from a high rate of electromagnetic interference because of a dipole's roughly isotropic sensitivity. A dipole would detect a Galactic FRB with the same energy as the Parkes FRB at  $z \sim 1$  with signal-to-noise ratio roughly 50 dB higher than the detections of the cosmological FRB (Katz 2014; Maoz & Loeb 2017). A phased array of dipoles would provide higher sensitivity over the entire visible hemisphere, and also directional information to discriminate against interference, whether through the antenna or “back-door” into the electronics.

<sup>2</sup> There is a selection bias towards detection at angles at which this factor is larger, so we take a factor somewhat larger than the mean of Fig. 2.

STARE2 (Bochenek *et al.* 2020) has somewhat lower angular acceptance (3.6 sterad) than dipoles and a sensitivity of 300 kJy for 1 ms bursts, roughly 55 dB less than that of Parkes but about 5 dB better than that of a dipole.

### 3.1 Temporal

Comparing the arrival times of a burst at a Lunar-staring telescope and at another receiver, such as a dipole or an array of dipoles, would constrain the position of the burst. Radiation reflected by the Moon arrives later than that observed directly by

$$\Delta t = \frac{D}{c} (1 - \cos(\pi - 2\theta)) = \frac{D}{c} (1 + \cos(2\theta)) \sim 1 \text{ s}, \quad (7)$$

where  $D$  is the distance to the Moon. Bursts are typically 1–10 ms long but contain temporal structure as fine as  $\delta t \sim 30 \mu\text{s}$  (Cordes & Chatterjee 2019). On the basis of the time difference of arrival between the Lunar-reflected signal and the direct signal detected by a dipole array or STARE2, a burst could be localized to an arc of width

$$\Delta\theta \sim \frac{\delta t}{|d\Delta t/d\theta|} \sim 5'', \quad (8)$$

where  $\delta t \sim 30 \mu\text{s}$  is the uncertainty in the time difference. If phase coherence were maintained between the detectors,  $\delta t$  in Eq. 8 would be replaced by  $\lambda/(2\pi c)$ . This narrow, albeit one-dimensional, localization of bursts from anywhere on the sky is the chief advantage of observation of Lunar-scattered burst radiation.

Less sharp localization  $\delta\theta \sim c\delta t/L \sim 5(6000 \text{ km}/L)'$  transverse to the narrow arc can be provided by comparing arrival times at two dipole arrays separated by a distance  $L$ . Very large separations reduce the probability that a burst is above the horizon at both locations, so  $\sim 6000 \text{ km}$  may be a practical upper limit on useful values of  $L$ .

### 3.2 Polarization

Fig. 2 shows that the polarization of reflected radiation depends on its angle of incidence. Combining the measured polarization of a Lunar-reflected burst with that measured directly by a dipole or dipole array would constrain the direction of origin of the burst. Because of the limited accuracy of polarization measurements this could not be a tight constraint, probably no narrower than  $\sim 0.2 \text{ rad}$ , but its intersection with a temporal arc of localization would be sufficient to establish whether a burst originated within, or outside, the Galactic plane.

### 3.3 No Solar Reflection

If reflection from the Sun could be observed, it would provide an independent and precise second temporal localization arc intersecting that of Lunar reflection. Unfortunately, the Solar reflectivity at frequencies at which FRB are observed is extremely small.

The free-free absorption coefficient of plasma (Spitzer

1962)

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa &= \frac{4}{3} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{3}} \frac{Z^2 e^6 n_e n_i}{cm_e^{3/2} \nu^2 (k_B T)^{3/2}} g_{ff} \\ &= \kappa_0 \left( \frac{1400 \text{ MHz}}{\nu} \right)^2 \left( \frac{T}{25000 \text{ K}} \right)^{-3/2} n^2 \text{ cm}^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where  $\kappa_0 \approx 9.3 \times 10^{-27} \text{ cm}^5$  and we have taken a singly ionized plasma with  $n = n_e = n_i$  and  $T = 25000 \text{ K}$  (the temperature at the turning point where the plasma frequency  $\nu_p = 1400 \text{ MHz}$ ). The critical electron density

$$n_c = \frac{\pi m_e \nu^2}{e^2} = 2.4 \times 10^{10} \left( \frac{\nu}{1400 \text{ MHz}} \right)^2 \text{ cm}^{-3}. \quad (10)$$

At  $1/2$  scale height above the turning point the Gaunt factor  $g_{ff} \approx 4.1$  (the wave group velocity is  $0.63 c$ ). The density distribution

$$n(z) = n_c \exp(-z/h), \quad (11)$$

where the scale height

$$h = \frac{k_B T R_\odot^2}{G M_\odot \mu} \approx 1.17 \times 10^7 \left( \frac{T}{25000 \text{ K}} \right) \text{ cm}, \quad (12)$$

taking the mean molecular weight  $\mu = 1.29 m_p/2$  of singly ionized Solar plasma. The integrated round trip optical depth on a radial ray from infinity to the critical density at which the wave reflects

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &= 2\kappa_0 n_c^2 \int_0^\infty dz \exp(-2z/h) \\ &\approx 640 \left( \frac{\nu}{1400 \text{ MHz}} \right)^2 \left( \frac{T}{25000 \text{ K}} \right)^{-1/2}; \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

the absorption on non-radial rays requires a numerical integral but is also large.

Lower frequencies are reflected higher in the Solar atmosphere where temperatures are higher, but the dependence on temperature is not steep. Solar reflection is likely not observable for  $\nu \gtrsim 100 \text{ MHz}$ , several times lower than the lowest frequencies at which FRB have been observed.

## 4 RATES

If FRB-like sources are distributed in all galaxies, including our own, the detectable event rate is related to the distribution of FRB energies. Extrapolation of the rate of FRB observed at  $z \lesssim 1$  by a power law with exponent  $-\alpha$  would predict an all-sky detection rate of Galactic micro-FRB  $\sim 10^{-3} \times (F_{\text{cosmo}}/F_{\text{Lunar}})^\alpha/\text{y}$ , where  $F_{\text{cosmo}}/F_{\text{Lunar}} \approx 2.5 \times 10^4$  ( $117 - 73 = 44 \text{ dB}$ ) is the ratio of detectable emitted powers or energies and  $10^{-3}/\text{y}$  is the FRB rate per galaxy estimated from Parkes observations (Sec. 1). The rate of detectable Galactic micro-FRB is  $> 1/\text{y}$  if  $\alpha > 0.7$ .

The proposed system would be about 73 dB less sensitive than Parkes, implying an equivalent detection threshold (the flux density impinging on the Moon, not on the receiver) of about 20 MJy for a 1 ms burst, about 70 times less sensitive than STARE2 (Bochenek *et al.* 2020). For STARE2 the extrapolated burst detection rate is  $\sim 10^{-3} (F_{\text{cosmo}}/F_{\text{STARE2}})^\alpha/\text{y}$ , where  $F_{\text{cosmo}}/F_{\text{STARE2}} \approx 1.7 \times 10^6$  ( $117 - 55 = 62 \text{ dB}$ ). The observed upper bound of  $40/\text{y}$



implies  $\alpha < \log_{10}(40/10^{-3})/6.2 \approx 0.7$ , suggesting a detection rate for the Lunar reflection system  $\lesssim 1/\text{y}$ , but the validity of assuming and extrapolating a power law over several orders of magnitude is questionable.

Direct comparison, depending only on the assumed power law slope between the detection thresholds of the Lunar and STARE2 systems indicates that the Lunar system would have a detection rate  $\sim (4\pi/3.6)70^{-\alpha}$  times that of STARE2, where the first factor is the ratio of their acceptance solid angles when the Moon is above the horizon and the second factor is the ratio of their sensitivities. For  $\alpha = 0.7$  this is about 0.2 if the Moon is continuously observed, requiring at least two widely separated telescopes; with only one the Moon is below the horizon half the time and the factor becomes about 0.1.

## 5 DISCUSSION

Do micro-FRB exist in our Galaxy at all? The answer has implications for the nature of FRB sources (Keane *et al.* 2012; Katz 2019a,b). Proposed non-catastrophic FRB models (Platts *et al.* 2018) do not make quantitative predictions of the numbers of possible micro-FRB. Detection of even one would establish that their sources are comparatively common in the stellar population. Non-detection would tend to exclude sources, like neutron stars, that are present in the Galaxy, but this conclusion would depend on the extrapolation of the observed FRB rate to low energy bursts. In the extreme limit (inconsistent with observations of repeating FRB) that bursts are standard candles, no inference could be drawn unless no bursts were observed for a time several times the mean recurrence time per galaxy of known cosmological FRB,  $\gg 10^3 \text{y}$ .

Non-repeating FRB may be produced with catastrophic events with a natural scale (so that at low energy  $\alpha < 0$ ). Recurring phenomena generally have more weak events than strong ones, typically with a power law distribution that grows rapidly towards small amplitude ( $\alpha > 0$ ). This appears to be true for FRB 121102, the only well-studied repeater, although this has not been well quantified and extrapolation to weaker bursts detectable only at Galactic distances is speculative. Despite this, the existence of repeating FRB with a broad distribution of intrinsic strengths suggests that if any such sources are present in the Galaxy their weaker bursts might be observable.

Observation of FRB radiation reflected by the Moon:

- (i) simultaneously observes nearly the entire sky when the Moon is above the horizon;
- (ii) requires the use of only a single radio telescope, of  $\sim 22 \text{ m}$  diameter for observations at  $\sim 1 \text{ GHz}$ ;
- (iii) in combination with an array of dipoles or STARE2 observing the direct radiation, can localize sources to a narrow arc on the sky. Approximate localization by two or more STARE2 receivers or arrays of dipoles can restrict the location to a small portion of that arc.

The proposed method is not intrinsically more sensitive to the direct radiation of a FRB than the far sidelobes of a large telescope, which Tendulkar, Kaspi & Patel (2016) used to demonstrate the absence of a FRB associated with the giant December 27, 2004 outburst of SGR 1806–20, but lunar scattering makes localization possible.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I thank C. D. Bochenek and L. Cowie for useful discussions.

## REFERENCES

- Agarwal, D., Lorimer, D. R., Fialkov, A. *et al.* 2019 MNRAS 490, 1 (arXiv:1909.05779).
- Bhandari, S., Keane, E. F., Barr, E. D. *et al.* 2018 MNRAS 475, 1427.
- Bochenek, C. D., Belov, K. V., Kocz, J., Kulkarni, S. R., Lamb, J., Ravi, V. & Woody, D. 2020 PASP 132, 4202 (arXiv:2001.05077).
- Conselice, C. J., Wilkinson, A., Duncan, K. & Mortlock, A. 2016 ApJ 830, 83.
- Cordes, J. M. & Chatterjee, S. 2019 ARA&A 57, 417.
- Cordes, J. M. & Wasserman, I. 2016 MNRAS 457, 232.
- James, C. W., Bray, J. D. & Ekers, R. D. 2019 Res. Astron. Ap. 19, 19.
- Katz, J. I. 2014 Phys. Rev. D 89, 103009.
- Katz, J. I. 2018 Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 103, 1 (arXiv:1804.09092).
- Katz, J. I. 2019a MNRAS 487, 491 (arXiv:1811.10755).
- Katz, J. I. 2019b MNRAS in press (arXiv:1912.00526).
- Keane, E. F., Stappers, B. W., Kramer, M. & Lyne, A. G. MNRAS 425, L71.
- Kumar, P., Shannon, R. M., Osłowski, S., Qiu, H., Bhandari, S., Farah, W., Flynn, C., Kerr, M. *et al.* 2019 ApJ 887, L30.
- Li, Y., Zhang, B., Nagamine, K. & Shi, J. 2019 ApJ 884, L26 (arXiv:1906.08749).
- Maoz, D. & Loeb, A. 2017 MNRAS 467, 3920.
- McKinley, B., Bernardi, G., Trott, C. M. *et al.* 2018 MNRAS 481, 5034.
- Olheoft, G. R. & Strangway, D. W. 1975 Earth Plan. Sci. Lett. 24, 394.
- Platts, E., Wellman, A., Walters, A., Tendulkar, S. P., Gordin, J. E. B. & Kandhai, S. 2018 arXiv:1810.05836.
- Ravi, V. 2019 Nature Astronomy 3, 928 (arXiv:1907.06619).
- Rosenburg, M. A., Aharonson, O., Head, J. W. *et al.* 2011 J. Geophys. Res. 116, E02001.
- Shepard, M. K., Brackets, R. A. & Arvidson, R. E. 1995 J. Geophys. Res. 100, 11709.
- Spitzer, L. 1962 *Physics of Fully Ionized Gases* 2nd ed. (Interscience, New York).
- Tendulkar, S. P., Kaspi, V. M. & Patel, C. 2016 ApJ 827, 59.
- Thompson, T. W. & Dyce, R. B. 1966 J. Geophys. Res. 71, 4843.

This paper has been typeset from a  $\text{\LaTeX}$  file prepared by the author.