

Validation of Kinetics Parameter Calculation Capability of McCARD

Hyung Jin Shim^{a*}, Yonghee Kim^a, Chang Hyo Kim^b

^a Korea Atomic Energy Research Institute, 1045 Daedeokdaero, Yuseoung-gu, Daejeon, Korea, 305-353

^b Seoul National University, 599 Gwanakro, Gwanak-gu, Seoul, Korea, 151-742

*Corresponding author: shimhj@kaeri.re.kr

1. Introduction

Reactor kinetics parameters like the effective delayed neutron fraction, β_{eff} , and the prompt neutron generation time, Λ , in the point kinetics equation [1, 2] are weighted quantities. The adjoint angular flux from the solution to a relevant adjoint eigenvalue equation is preferred as the weighting function in order to improve the accuracy of the eigenvalue perturbation calculations [2]. There have been several studies [3-5] on how to calculate the adjoint-weighted kinetics parameters by the continuous-energy Monte Carlo (MC) forward eigenvalue calculations. They can be grouped into two categories according to the adopted adjoint solution: the constant source adjoint function and the self-consistent adjoint function. The constant source adjoint function, ϕ_s^* , is the solution of

$$\mathbf{M}^* \phi_s^* = \Sigma_d, \quad (1)$$

while the self-consistent adjoint function, ϕ_0^* is the fundamental-mode solution of the following adjoint eigenvalue equation.

$$\mathbf{M}^* \phi_0^* = \frac{1}{k_0} \mathbf{F}^* \phi_0^* \quad (2)$$

Σ_d is the cross-section characterizing a fictitious detector placed in the reactor core and k_0 is the fundamental-mode eigenvalue. \mathbf{M}^* and \mathbf{F}^* are the adjoint operators corresponding to the direct operators for the destruction \mathbf{M} and the fission \mathbf{F} , respectively.

The kinetics parameter calculation capability has been implemented into McCARD [6] with both the constant source adjoint function and the self-consistent adjoint function. The purpose of this paper is to present a comparison of McCARD results of both methods with measurements for several critical facility problems.

2. Adjoint-Weighted Kinetics Parameters

β_{eff} and Λ in the point kinetics equation are defined with the adjoint flux by

$$\beta_{eff} = \frac{1}{F} \int d\mathbf{r} \int dE \int d\Omega \int dE' \int d\Omega' \phi^*(\mathbf{r}, E, \Omega) \times (1/4\pi) \chi_d(E, E') \nu_d(E') \Sigma_f(\mathbf{r}, E') \phi(\mathbf{r}, E', \Omega'), \quad (3)$$

$$\Lambda = \frac{1}{F} \int d\mathbf{r} \int dE \int d\Omega \phi^*(\mathbf{r}, E, \Omega) \frac{1}{v(E)} \phi(\mathbf{r}, E, \Omega); \quad (4)$$

$$F = \int d\mathbf{r} \int dE \int d\Omega \int dE' \int d\Omega' \phi^*(\mathbf{r}, E, \Omega) \times (1/4\pi) \chi(E, E') \nu(E') \Sigma_f(\mathbf{r}, E') \phi(\mathbf{r}, E', \Omega'), \quad (5)$$

where χ and χ_d are the fission spectrum of a neutron and a delayed neutron, respectively. ν and ν_d are the mean number of neutrons and delayed neutrons, respectively, produced in a fission. Σ_f is the fission cross section. v is the neutron velocity.

2.1 Constant Source Adjoint Function

In terms of the Green's function G , ϕ_s^* in Eq. (1) can be expressed as [7]

$$\phi_s^*(\mathbf{r}, E, \Omega) = \int d\mathbf{r}' \int dE' \int d\Omega' G(\mathbf{r}, E, \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{r}', E', \Omega') \Sigma_d(\mathbf{r}', E', \Omega'), \quad (6)$$

where $G(\mathbf{r}', E', \Omega' \rightarrow \mathbf{r}, E, \Omega)$ is defined by

$$\mathbf{M}G(\mathbf{r}', E', \Omega' \rightarrow \mathbf{r}, E, \Omega) = \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \delta(E - E') \delta(\Omega - \Omega'), \quad (7)$$

and means the angular flux at \mathbf{r}, E, Ω produced from a unit point source located at \mathbf{r}', E', Ω' .

Let us choose $\nu \Sigma_f$ as Σ_d . Because of the physical meaning of G in Eq. (6), $\phi_s^*(\mathbf{r}, E, \Omega)$ then is interpreted as the number of fission neutrons produced at the next generation due to the source at \mathbf{r}, E, Ω .

From this meaning of $\phi_s^*(\mathbf{r}, E, \Omega)$, kinetics parameters at cycle i , $\beta_{eff,i}$ and Λ_i can be calculated by the collision estimator as

$$\beta_{eff,i} = \frac{1}{M_i} \sum_{j \in D_i} \sum_{k=1}^{K_j} w_{ijk} \frac{\nu \Sigma_{f,ijk}}{\Sigma_{t,ijk}} \bigg/ \frac{1}{M_i} \sum_{j=1}^{M_i} \sum_{k=1}^{K_j} w_{ijk} \frac{\nu \Sigma_{f,ijk}}{\Sigma_{t,ijk}}, \quad (8)$$

$$\Lambda_i = \frac{\frac{1}{M_i} \sum_{j=1}^{M_i} \sum_{k=1}^{K_j} w_{ijk} \frac{\nu \Sigma_{f,ijk}}{\Sigma_{t,ijk}} \sum_{k'=1}^k \Delta t_{ijk}}{\frac{1}{M_i} \sum_{j=1}^{M_i} \sum_{k=1}^{K_j} w_{ijk} \frac{\nu \Sigma_{f,ijk}}{\Sigma_{t,ijk}} \sum_{k'=1}^k \nu \Sigma_{f,ijk} \Delta l_{ijk}}. \quad (9)$$

i, j , and k are cycle, history, and collision indices, respectively. M_i is the number of histories of i -th cycle and K_j is the total number of collisions experienced by j -th history of cycle i . D_i is the domain of delayed fission neutron sources among all the sources of cycle i . w_{ijk} is the neutron weight for k -th collision of history j at cycle i . Δl_{ijk} is the track length between $(k-1)$ -th and k -th collision of history j at cycle i . v_{ijk} is the velocity of incident neutron for collision k of history j at cycle i . The flight time, Δt_{ijk} is defined by $\Delta l_{ijk}/v_{ijk}$.

In another way, the denominator of the right hand side (RHS) of Eq. (9) can be calculated using the cycle-wise eigenvalues as

$$F_i = k_i k_{i-1}, \quad (10)$$

where k_i denotes the eigenvalue estimated at cycle i .

From the cycle-wise results, β_{eff} , Λ and their statistical uncertainties can be readily calculated.

2.2 Self-Consistent Adjoint Function

The adjoint eigenvalue equation of Eq. (2) can be expressed as

$$\phi_0^* = \frac{1}{k_0} (\mathbf{M}^*)^{-1} \mathbf{F}^* \phi_0^* = \frac{1}{k_0} (\mathbf{F} \mathbf{M}^{-1})^* \phi_0^* = \frac{1}{k_0} \mathbf{H}^* \phi_0^*, \quad (11)$$

where the fission operator \mathbf{H} is defined by [8]

$$\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{F} \mathbf{M}^{-1}. \quad (12)$$

By the power method for Eq. (11), an unnormalized fundamental-mode eigenfunction can be calculated as

$$\phi_0^* = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi_{0,n}^*; \phi_{0,n}^* = \frac{1}{k_0^n} (\mathbf{H}^n)^* \phi_{0,init}^*, \quad (13)$$

n is the iteration or generation index. $\phi_{0,n}^*$ denotes the n -th iterated solution and $\phi_{0,init}^*$ can be an arbitrary non-zero function as a starting distribution.

Then when $\phi_{0,init}^*(\mathbf{r}, E, \Omega) = 1$, $\phi_0^*(\mathbf{r}, E, \Omega)$ of Eq. (13) can be interpreted as the number of fission neutrons produced in the n -th generation due to a unit source neutron located at (\mathbf{r}, E, Ω) as n approaches infinity. This physical interpretation is well-known as the iterated fission probability [9]. When n is large enough to converge the iterative solution, ϕ_0^* can be approximated by $\phi_{0,n}^*$. In the conventional MC forward calculations, $\phi_{0,n}^*$ required at cycle i can be estimated by tallying the number of fission neutrons generated at $(i+n-1)$ -th cycle, which means that the kinetics parameters calculated at cycle i requires the flux or fission source data of $(i+n-1)$ -th cycle. Then from the physical meaning of $\phi_{0,n}^*$, $\beta_{eff,i}$ and Λ_i can be calculated by the collision estimator as

$$\beta_{eff,i} = \frac{1}{M_i} \sum_{j \in D_{i-n+1}} \sum_{k=1}^{K_{ij}} w_{ijk} \frac{v \Sigma_{f,ijk}}{\Sigma_{t,ijk}} \bigg/ \frac{1}{M_i} \sum_{j=1}^{M_i} \sum_{k=1}^{K_{ij}} w_{ijk} \frac{v \Sigma_{f,ijk}}{\Sigma_{t,ijk}}, \quad (14)$$

$$\Lambda_i = \frac{\frac{1}{M_i} \sum_{j=1}^{M_i} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K_{ij}} w_{ijk} \frac{v \Sigma_{f,ijk}}{\Sigma_{t,ijk}} \right) \left(w_{(i-n+1)j'1} \frac{\Delta_{(i-n+1)j'k'}}{v_{i(i-n+1)j'k'}} \right)}{\frac{1}{M_i} \sum_{j=1}^{M_i} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K_{ij}} w_{ijk} \frac{v \Sigma_{f,ijk}}{\Sigma_{t,ijk}} \right) \left(w_{(i-n+1)j'1} v \Sigma_{f,(i-n+1)j'k'} \Delta_{(i-n+1)j'k'} \right)}, \quad (15)$$

where j' and k' is the history and collision indices of $(i+n-1)$ -th cycle from which the progenitor of j -th fission source of cycle i is generated.

The denominator of the RHS of Eq. (15) can be also calculated by

$$F_i = k_i k_{i-n}. \quad (16)$$

3. Numerical Results

The MC forward eigenvalue calculations with continuous-energy cross-section libraries produced from ENDF/B-VII were conducted for two kinds of critical facilities: Godiva [10], the Tank-type Critical

Assembly (TCA) [11]. In the MC calculations, the self-consistent adjoint functions are assumed to be converged after 10 power iterations. Table III shows a comparison of β_{eff} estimated from McCARD with measurements. From the table, it is noted that β_{eff} 's from the use of either ϕ_s^* or ϕ_0^* agree well with the measurements within 2% error. Table IV shows the comparisons of β_{eff}/Λ estimated from McCARD with experimental outputs. From the table, it is noted that the β_{eff}/Λ values from the use of ϕ_0^* agree well with the measurements within 3% error, while the maximum error of β_{eff}/Λ from the use of ϕ_s^* is 13%.

Acknowledgement

This work is supported by "Development of the Reactor Core Design Codes for a Nuclear Power Plant" project sponsored by Korea Ministry of Knowledge Economy.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. F. Henry, "Nuclear-Reactor Analysis," MIT Press, 1975.
- [2] K. O. Ott and R. J. Neuhold, "Introductory Nuclear Reactor Dynamics," American Nuclear Society, 1985.
- [3] Y. Nauchi and T. Kameyama, "Proposal of Direct Calculation of Kinetic Parameters β_{eff} and Λ Based on Continuous Energy Monte Carlo Method," *J. Nucl. Sci. Technol.*, **42**[6], 503, 2005.
- [4] R. K. Meulekamp and S. C. van der Marck, "Calculating the Effective Delayed Neutron Fraction with Monte Carlo," *Nucl. Sci. Eng.*, **152**, 142, 2006.
- [5] B. C. Kiedrowski and F. Brown, "Adjoint-Weighted Kinetics Parameters with Continuous Energy Monte Carlo," *Trans. Am. Nucl. Soc.*, v. 100, p. 297, 2009.
- [6] H. J. Shim and C. H. Kim, "Error Propagation Module Implemented in the MC-CARD Monte Carlo Code," *Trans. Am. Nucl. Soc.*, v. 86, p. 325, 2002.
- [7] K. Kobayashi and K. Nishihara, "Definition of subcriticality using the importance function for the production of fission neutrons," *Nucl. Sci. Eng.*, **136**, 272, 2000.
- [8] H. J. Shim and C. H. Kim, "Real Variance Estimation in Monte Carlo Wielandt Calculations," PHYSOR 2008, Interlaken, Switzerland, September 14-19, 2008.
- [9] H. Hurwitz, "Physical Interpretation of the Adjoint Flux: Iterated Fission Probability," *Naval Reactor Physics Handbook*, Vol. I, A. Radkowsky, Ed., U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, 1964.
- [10] J. Blair Briggs (ed.), "International Handbook of Evaluated Criticality Safety Benchmark Experiments," NEA/NSC/DOC(95)03/I, Nuclear Energy Agency, Paris, 2004.
- [11] H. Tsuruta, I. Kobayashi, T. Suzuki, et al., "Critical Sizes of Light Water Moderated UO₂ and PuO₂-UO₂ Lattices," JAERI 1254, JAERI, 1978.

Table III: Comparison of β_{eff} for Critical Facilities

| Facility | Core Name | $(\beta_{eff})_{exp}$ | $(\beta_{eff})_{MC}$ weighted by ϕ_s^* | | | $(\beta_{eff})_{MC}$ weighted by ϕ_0^* | | |
|----------|-----------|-----------------------|---|---------|---------------|---|---------|---------------|
| | | | Mean | RSD (%) | Ratio to Exp. | Mean | RSD (%) | Ratio to Exp. |
| Godiva | - | 0.00640 | 0.00646 | 0.17 | 1.01 | 0.00649 | 0.42 | 1.01 |
| | 1.50U | 0.00771 | 0.00767 | 0.49 | 0.99 | 0.00774 | 1.32 | 1.00 |
| TCA | 1.83U | 0.00760 | 0.00758 | 0.53 | 1.00 | 0.00762 | 1.38 | 1.00 |
| | 2.48U | 0.00765 | 0.00750 | 0.47 | 0.98 | 0.00748 | 1.31 | 0.98 |

Table IV: Comparison of β_{eff}/Λ for Critical Facilities

| Facility | Core Name | $(\beta_{eff}/\Lambda)_{exp}$ | $(\beta_{eff}/\Lambda)_{MC}$ weighted by ϕ_s^* | | | $(\beta_{eff}/\Lambda)_{MC}$ weighted by ϕ_0^* | | |
|----------|-----------|-------------------------------|---|---------|---------------|---|---------|---------------|
| | | | Mean | RSD (%) | Ratio to Exp. | Mean | RSD (%) | Ratio to Exp. |
| Godiva | - | 1.11×10^6 | 1.13×10^6 | 0.17 | 1.02 | 1.14×10^6 | 0.42 | 1.03 |
| TCA | 1.50U | 219 | 191 | 0.49 | 0.87 | 220 | 1.34 | 1.01 |
| | 1.83U | 201 | 175 | 0.53 | 0.87 | 197 | 1.39 | 0.98 |
| | 2.48U | 175 | 154 | 0.47 | 0.88 | 170 | 1.32 | 0.97 |