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## 1. Introduction

Estimation of uncertainties in $k_{\text {eff }}$ and power density calculations is important in nuclear design and safety analyses, code validation, data evaluation, etc. There are two main sources of uncertainties; the cross section data and the modeling. If one eliminates the modeling uncertainty by using a detailed geometrical input and precise material data, the cross section data present the most significant source of the uncertainties.

The prediction uncertainty of a nuclear parameter can be estimated in terms of its sensitivities to cross sections [1]. The objectives of this paper are to realize a sensitivity and uncertainty ( $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{U}$ ) analysis module in McCARD (Monte Carlo Code for Advanced Reactor Design and analysis) [2] and to examine its performance in comparison with other codes: TSUNAMI [3] and SUSD3D [4]. This work will provide a useful basis of continuous energy Monte Carlo (MC) calculations aimed at conducting the $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{U}$ analysis.

## 2. Uncertainty Quantification

### 2.1 Propagated Uncertainty

A nuclear parameter $Q$ can be viewed as a function of various input parameters such as system geometry, material composition, cross section data, etc. Then $Q$ can be expressed as
$x_{r, g}^{i}$ is the $g$-th group microscopic cross-section of reaction type $r$ of isotope $i . I, \Gamma$, and $G$ represents the total number of isotopes, reaction types, and energy groups, respectively.

Because of the data uncertainties, there can be an infinitely different set of cross section inputs to $Q$. This may result in different Q's as many as the number of input sets. Let's designate the $k$-th cross section input set which may be sampled from the cross section distribution by $\left(x_{r, g}^{i}\right)_{k}(k=1,2, \ldots)$. The value of $Q$ from this set can be expressed as

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(x_{r, g}^{i}\right)_{k}(i \in I, r \in \Gamma, g \in G) \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

The mean of $Q, \bar{Q}$, and its variance about $\bar{Q}$, $\sigma^{2}[Q]$, can then be given by

$$
\begin{gather*}
\bar{Q}=\lim _{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k}^{N} Q_{k}  \tag{3}\\
\sigma^{2}[Q]=\lim _{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{k}^{N}\left(Q_{k}-\bar{Q}\right)^{2} . \tag{4}
\end{gather*}
$$

Let's assume that $\bar{Q}$ is determined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{Q} \equiv Q(6, \underbrace{6, \overline{x_{i}^{i}}, 6}_{\overline{x_{r, g}^{i}}(i \in I, r, r, \bar{\Gamma}, g \in G)}, 6) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $\overline{x_{r, g}^{i}}$ denoting the mean of the cross section which is defined in the same way as $\bar{Q}$ in Eq. (3). The Taylor series expansion of Eq. (2) to the first order of the cross section variations about their mean values, $\left(Q_{k}-\bar{Q}\right)$ in Eq. (4) leads to

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{k}-\bar{Q} \cong \sum_{i, r, g}\left(\left(x_{r, g}^{i}\right)_{k}-\overline{x_{r, g}^{i}}\right)\left(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x_{r, g}^{i}}\right) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

The substitution of Eq. (6) into Eq. (4) results in

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sigma^{2}[Q] \cong \lim _{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{k}^{N}\{ \\
& \left.\sum_{i, r, g, i^{\prime}, r^{\prime}, g^{\prime}}\left(\left(x_{r, g}^{i}\right)_{k}-\overline{x_{r, g}^{i}}\right)\left(\left(x_{r^{\prime}, g^{\prime}}^{i^{\prime}}\right)_{k}-\overline{x_{r^{\prime}, g^{\prime}}^{i^{\prime}}}\right)\left(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x_{r, g}^{i}}\right)\left(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x_{r^{\prime}, g^{\prime}}^{i^{\prime}}}\right)\right\} \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

Equation (7) can be rewritten as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma^{2}[Q] \cong \sum_{i, r, g} \sum_{i^{\prime}, r^{\prime}, g^{\prime}} \operatorname{cov}\left[x_{r, g}^{i}, x_{r^{\prime}, g^{\prime}}^{i^{\prime}}\right]\left(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x_{r, g}^{i}}\right)\left(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x_{r^{\prime}, g^{\prime}}^{i^{\prime}}}\right) \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& \operatorname{cov}\left[x_{r, g}^{i}, x_{r^{\prime}, g^{\prime}}^{i^{\prime}}\right]= \\
& \quad \lim _{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{k}^{N}\left(\left(x_{r, g}^{i}\right)_{k}-\overline{x_{r, g}^{i}}\right)\left(\left(x_{r^{\prime}, g^{\prime}}^{i^{\prime}}\right)_{k}-\overline{x_{r^{\prime}, g^{\prime}}^{i^{\prime}}}\right) \tag{9}
\end{align*}
$$

From Eq. (8), the relative variance of $Q$ is obtained by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\frac{\sigma[Q]}{\bar{Q}}\right)^{2} \cong \sum_{i, r, g} \sum_{i^{\prime}, r^{\prime}, g^{\prime}} \frac{\operatorname{cov}\left[x_{r, g}^{i}, x_{r^{\prime}, g^{\prime}}^{i^{\prime}}\right]}{\overline{x_{r, g}^{i}} \cdot \overline{x_{r^{\prime}, g^{\prime}}^{i^{\prime}}}} S_{Q}\left[x_{r, g}^{i}\right] S_{Q}\left[x_{r^{\prime}, g^{\prime}}^{i^{\prime}}\right], \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $S_{Q}\left[x_{r, g}^{i}\right]$ is the sensitivity coefficient of $Q$ to $x_{r, g}^{i}$ defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{Q}\left[x_{r, g}^{i}\right] \equiv \overline{\overline{x_{r, g}^{i}}} \overline{\bar{Q}} \cdot \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x_{r, g}^{i}} . \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

### 2.2 Calculation of Sensitivity Coefficient

The derivative, $\partial Q / \partial x_{r, g}^{i}$, in Eq. (11), can be approximated by

$$
\begin{gather*}
\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x_{r, g}^{i}} \cong \frac{Q\left(\overline{x_{r, g}^{i}}+\sigma\left[x_{r, g}^{i}\right]\right)-Q\left(\overline{x_{r, g}^{i}}\right)}{\sigma\left[x_{r, g}^{i}\right]}=\frac{\delta Q\left[x_{r, g}^{i}\right]}{\sigma\left[x_{r, g}^{i}\right]} ;  \tag{12}\\
\delta Q\left[x_{r, g}^{i}\right] \equiv Q\left(\overline{x_{r, g}^{i}}+\sigma\left[x_{r, g}^{i}\right]\right)-Q\left(\overline{x_{r, g}^{i}}\right) . \tag{13}
\end{gather*}
$$

$\delta Q\left[x_{r, g}^{i}\right]$ can be estimated in the MC forward calculations by the MC perturbation techniques [5, 6].

## 3. Numerical Results

The uncertainty of $k_{\text {eff }}$ for the GODIVA problem [7] was investigated using the McCARD code and the covariance data of JENDL-3.3. The ERRORJ code [8] was used to produce the 30 -group covariance matrices based on the JENDL-3.3.

Table I shows a comparison of the results from other S/U analysis code systems, TSUNAMI and SUSD3D, which were reported in Ref. [9]. From the table, we can see that the uncertainties by the McCARD code agree well with those from other code systems.

## 3. Conclusions

We augmented the McCARD capability with the cross section $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{U}$ analysis module. This work will enable users to conduct a satisfactory $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{U}$ analysis using continuous cross-section libraries.
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Table I. Comparison of $k_{\text {eff }}$ and uncertainties due to the covariance in U-235 JENDL-3.3 for the GODIVA problem

| Code | Spectrum/ Eigenvalue | KENO-V.a | ANISN | McCARD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sensitivity/ Uncertainty | TSUNAMI | SUSD3D |  |
| XS Library |  | JENDL 3.3 |  |  |
| Energy Group |  | 238 | 44 | Cont. |
| keff (SD) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1.00322 \\ & (0.0002) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.01108 \\ \text { (NA) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1.00398 \\ & (0.0006) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Covariance Data |  | 238 grp | 44 grp | 30 grp |
| Unc. due to U-235 (\%) | $v, \nu$ | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 |
|  | $(\mathrm{n}, \gamma),(\mathrm{n}, \gamma)$ | 0.15 | 0.17 | 0.16 |
|  | $(\mathrm{n}, \gamma),(\mathrm{n}, \mathrm{n})$ | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
|  | (n,2n), (n,2n) | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
|  | ( $\mathrm{n}, 2 \mathrm{n}$ ), ( $\mathrm{n}, \mathrm{n}$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  | (n,fis.), (n,fis.) | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.17 |
|  | (n,fis.), (n,n) | -0.05 | -0.03 | -0.03 |
|  | $(\mathrm{n}, \mathrm{n}),(\mathrm{n}, \mathrm{n})$ | 0.33 | 0.32 | 0.36 |
|  | total ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.45 |
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