PAUL SCHERRER INSTITUT





D. Rochman and E. Bauge

Fission yields and cross sections: correlated or not?

CSEWG meeting, BNL, online, 30 November 2020





- Motivation/examples
- Considered system and results
- Conclusion





BFMC + integral data

- Motivation 1: integral data are already used during adjustment
- Motivation 2: This should be done at the evaluation level
- Motivation 3: It leads to uncertainty reduction and cross-isotope correlations
- Motivation 4: nothing new: already done with GLLS by SG... at the OECD
- <u>BFMC</u>:
 - Generate n=5000 random FY and XS libraries based on ENDF/B-VIII.0 covariance
 - Calculate n times the benchmark
 - Assign weights to all realizations *i* with a chi2 and update the parameter distributions



- Update the cross sections with the weights.
- <u>System</u>: PIE sample called GU1, simulated with CASMO (18 actinides, 32 fission products measured)





- <u>PIE data</u>: isotopic concentrations from irradiated samples in a specific reactor
- Measured actinides and fission products (e.g. in mg/gU)
- Used for transport and depletion code validation





• Production of some measured fission products depends on both FY and XS



Fig. 4. Case of correlations between 147 Pm(n, γ) and fission yields from 235 U and 239 Pu. Left: prior correlation matrix without PIE data; Right: posterior correlation matrix using the PIE measurement from 147 Sm.





Production of some measured fission products depends on FY from a few actinides



Fig. 3. Case of correlations between fission yields from ²³⁵U, ²³⁹Pu and ²⁴¹Pu. Left: prior correlation matrix without PIE data; Right: posterior correlation matrix using the PIE measurement from ¹³³Cs.





- Last example of correlations between nuclear data, after XS-XS, XS-nu, XS-nu-PFNS,
- Such correlations can improve calculations of integral quantities and answer requests from a number of users
- Because such correlations are constructed with specific measurements, and are case dependent, it is advocated that such correlations (and adjusted nuclear data) find their place in dedicated adjusted libraries
- This possibility can improve the user's satisfaction, but also emphasizes the fact that current nuclear data evaluations do not lead to a unique set of cross sections, nubar or fission yields.





References on correlations

- E. Bauge, P. Dossantos-Uzarralde, "Evaluation of the Covariance Matrix of 239Pu Neutronic Cross Sections in the Continuum Using the Backward-Forward Monte-Carlo Method", J. Kor. Phys. Soc. 59 (2011) 1218.
- D. Rochman, E. Bauge, A. Vasiliev and H. Ferroukhi, "Correlation nu-sigma-chi in the fast neutron range via integral information", <u>EPJ/N 3 (2017) 14</u>.
- D. Rochman, E. Bauge, A. Vasiliev, H. Ferroukhi and G. Perret, "Nuclear data correlation between different isotopes via integral information", <u>EPJ/N 4 (2018) 7</u>.
- E. Bauge and D. Rochman, "Cross-observables and cross-isotopes correlations in nuclear data from integral constraints", EPJ/ N 4 (2018) 35.
- D. Rochman, E. Bauge, A. Vasiliev, H. Ferroukhi, S. Pelloni, A.J. Koning and J.Ch. Sublet, "Monte Carlo nuclear data adjustment via integral information", EPJ Plus 133 (2018) 537.
- D. Rochman, A. Vasiliev, H. Ferroukhi, S. Pelloni, E. Bauge and A.J. Koning, "Correlation nu-sigma for U-Pu in the thermal and resonance neutron range via integral information", <u>EPJ Plus 133 (2019)</u> <u>453</u>.
- J.-Ch. Sublet et al., "Neutron-induced damage simulations: Beyond defect production crosssection, displacement per atom and iron-based metrics", <u>EPJ Plus 134 (2019) 350</u>.
- D. Rochman and E. Bauge, *"Fission yields and cross sections: correlated or not ?"*, submitted to <u>EPJ/N</u>, July 2020.





Wir schaffen Wissen – heute für morgen

