


ISSN: 2161-6795

Volume 13, Number 2, April 2023



World Journal of Nuclear Science and Technology



ISSN: 2161-6795



<https://www.scirp.org/journal/wjnst>

Journal Editorial Board

ISSN 2161-6795 (Print) ISSN 2161-6809 (Online)

<https://www.scirp.org/journal/wjnst>

Editor-in-Chief

Prof. Andrzej Grzegorz Chmielewski

Institute of Nuclear Chemistry and
Technology, Poland

Editorial Board

Dr. Khaled Salahel Din Ibraheem Ahmed

South Valley University, Egypt

Dr. Abdullah Aydin

Kirikkale University, Türkiye

Prof. Jiejun Cai

Sun Yat-sen University, China

Prof. Ahmet Cengiz

Uluda University, Türkiye

Prof. Abdelmajid Choukri

University of Ibn Tofail, Morocco

Prof. Snezana Dragovic

University of Belgrade, Serbia

Prof. Hardy Christian Ekberg

Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden

Prof. Juan-Luis François

National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico

Prof. Shaban Ramadan Mohamed Harb

South Valley University, Egypt

Prof. Xiaolin Hou

Technical University of Denmark, Denmark

Prof. Ning Liu

Sichuan University, China

Prof. Man Gyun Na

Chosun University, South Korea

Prof. Dragoslav Nikezic

University of Kragujevac, Serbia

Dr. Rafael Rodríguez Pérez

University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain

Prof. K. Indira Priyadarsini

Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, India

Dr. Mohammad Mizanur Rahman

Bangladesh Atomic Energy Commission, Bangladesh

Prof. Massimo Rogante

Studio d'Ingegneria Rogante, Italy

Prof. Vitalii D. Rusov

Odessa National Polytechnic University, Ukraine

Dr. Chhanda Samanta

Virginia Military Institute, USA

Prof. Kune Y. Suh

Seoul National University, South Korea

Prof. Wenxi Tian

Xi'an Jiaotong University, China

Dr. Heiko Timmers

The University of New South Wales, Australia

Prof. Marco Túllio Menna Barreto de Vilhena

Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil

Dr. Jun Wang

University of Wisconsin Madison, USA

Dr. Leopoldo A. Pando Zayas

University of Michigan, USA

Table of Contents

Volume 13 Number 2

April 2023

**Feasibility to Convert the NuScale SMR from UO₂ to a Mixed (U, Th)O₂ Core:
A Parametric Study of Fuel Element—Seed-Blanket Concept**

G. L. Stefani, D. M. E. Gonçalves, C. Raitz, M. V. da Silva, C. J. C. M. R. da Cunha.....11

System Variables Design of Safety Analysis for Fast Reactors

M. H. Saad, A. M. Ibrahim.....29

World Journal of Nuclear Science and Technology (WJNST)

Journal Information

SUBSCRIPTIONS

The *World Journal of Nuclear Science and Technology* (Online at Scientific Research Publishing, <https://www.scirp.org/>) is published quarterly by Scientific Research Publishing, Inc., USA.

Subscription rates:

Print: \$79 per issue.

To subscribe, please contact Journals Subscriptions Department, E-mail: sub@scirp.org

SERVICES

Advertisements

Advertisement Sales Department, E-mail: service@scirp.org

Reprints (minimum quantity 100 copies)

Reprints Co-ordinator, Scientific Research Publishing, Inc., USA.

E-mail: sub@scirp.org

COPYRIGHT

Copyright and reuse rights for the front matter of the journal:

Copyright © 2023 by Scientific Research Publishing Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Copyright for individual papers of the journal:

Copyright © 2023 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.

Reuse rights for individual papers:

Note: At SCIRP authors can choose between CC BY and CC BY-NC. Please consult each paper for its reuse rights.

Disclaimer of liability

Statements and opinions expressed in the articles and communications are those of the individual contributors and not the statements and opinion of Scientific Research Publishing, Inc. We assume no responsibility or liability for any damage or injury to persons or property arising out of the use of any materials, instructions, methods or ideas contained herein. We expressly disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. If expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional person should be sought.

PRODUCTION INFORMATION

For manuscripts that have been accepted for publication, please contact:

E-mail: wjnst@scirp.org

Feasibility to Convert the NuScale SMR from UO_2 to a Mixed (U, Th) O_2 Core: A Parametric Study of Fuel Element—Seed-Blanket Concept

Giovani Laranjo de Stefani¹, Diego Manoel Enedino Gonçalves¹, Cesar Raitz², Marcelo V. da Silva², Caio Július César Miranda Rodrigues da Cunha³

¹Departamento de Engenharia Nuclear, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

²Instituto de Engenharia Nuclear, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

³Departamento de Energia Nuclear, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Recife, Brazil

Email: giovanni.laranjo@coppe.ufrj.br

How to cite this paper: Stefani, G.L., Gonçalves, D.M.E., Raitz, C., da Silva, M.V. and da Cunha, C.J.C.M.R. (2023) Feasibility to Convert the NuScale SMR from UO_2 to a Mixed (U, Th) O_2 Core: A Parametric Study of Fuel Element—Seed-Blanket Concept. *World Journal of Nuclear Science and Technology*, 13, 11-28.

<https://doi.org/10.4236/wjnst.2023.132002>

Received: January 11, 2023

Accepted: April 4, 2023

Published: April 7, 2023

Copyright © 2023 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract

Delays in the construction of nuclear reactors due to licensing issues have been a problem across the world, affecting projects in Finland, France, and the United States. Small Modular Reactors (SMRs) emerge as a transition between Generations III+ and IV in order to make nuclear energy more competitive with other energy sources, including renewables. In this study, the SMR NuScale, one of the most promising projects today, is investigated for its conversion into a U-233-producing reactor through the Radkowsky seed-blanket fuel element concept, applied in the Shippingport reactor, in a parametric study. Initially, a validation of the reference reactor (NuScale) was carried out with data from technical documents and papers, thus demonstrating the agreement of the computational model carried out with the SERPENT code. Then, a parametric study is carried out to define the area of the seed and blanket region, proportions of enrichment and pitch length. Finally, a comparison is made between the production of U-233, TRU reduction, burn-up extension and neutronic and thermohydraulic safety parameters. This study demonstrates an improvement in the conversion factor and a considerable reduction in the production of TRU, in addition to the production of U-233 with a low proportion of other uranium isotopes that can lead to the beginning of the thorium cycle with already consolidated technologies.

Keywords

Thorium, SMR, Seed-Blanket, NuScale

1. Introduction

The nuclear industry has been in constant evolution since its emergence during World War II. In addition, nuclear energy plays an important role in the development of electric energy generation in Brazil and in the world, since the great world powers use this energy, not just to produce electricity, but also to move ships, submarines, applications in the medical field, etc. Generation I reactors were early power reactor designs, developed in the 1950s and built in the 1960s. Thus, Generation II reactors were developed with safety improvements and greater fuel economy. Generation II reactors represent 90% of current reactors in operation and were built before 2000. Generation III reactors were developed as advanced Light Water Reactors (LWRs) with several design enhancements. The Generation III+ reactors, in turn, incorporate evolutionary improvements to the Generation III reactors, such as passive cooling, in some projects, and some units have already been built around the world, as is the case with the reactors at the Lufeng site in China.

Generation IV reactors are the promise of revolutionary projects with greater use of natural resources, greater passive security and lower capital costs. The speculation of the first Generation IV reactors was for 2030 [1] as shown in **Figure 1**, but with the appearance of Small Modular Reactors (SMRs), it is estimated that this deadline will be postponed, as explained below.

Generation III+ reactors around the world have experienced construction delays due to licensing issues. We can cite the case of Olkiluoto 3, in Finland, whose initial cost estimate was €\$3 billion, with construction starting in 2005 and forecast for completion in 2010, which ended up costing €\$11 billion [2] and had its first maximum power reached in September 2022, with regular operation scheduled for December 2022.

Finland's case is no exception and has been repeated all over the world, as in the US where Westinghouse filed for bankruptcy after the cost of Vogtle 3 and Vogtle 4 increased to US\$30 billion [3], due to regulatory problems with the NRC. In France, the Flamanville 3, whose commercial operation was expected for 2013




Figure 1. Nuclear energy generations: time intervals correspond to the design and first deployments of different generations of reactors [1].

and with an initial cost of €3 billion, had its commercial operation postponed to mid-2023 and the cost increased to €12.7 billion [4]. Licensing problems, schedule delays and rising costs led to the development of Small Modular Reactors (SMRs) as a response to the problems of economic competitiveness of nuclear energy with other sources, with respect to costs and construction time [5] [6] [7].

SMR projects leverage five factors to be more economically competitive than large reactors: 1) Their reduced size implies a lower capital cost for construction, when compared to a large unit; 2) The Components of an SMR can be manufactured on an assembly line and shipped to site, thereby reducing the cost of construction. Since in some projects, they arrive on the site as ready-made packages (project simplification); 3) Its reduced size makes passive features easy to implement; 4) Some SMRs are designed to operate without refueling for their entire operational life. In this way, they do not need to plan for refueling or storing fuel. The seller undertakes to remove the entire plant, exempting the concessionaire from decommissioning plans; 5) Reduced construction schedule. The cost of an SMR is in the order of US\$1.5 billion [8] [9]. In the US, the SMR with the most advanced project is the NuScale, already with licensing well advanced with the NRC and with its first unit will be operational in mid-2029, with the remaining modules coming into operation for full operation of the plant by 2030 [10].

Thorium has a high melting point, around 3300°C, and is naturally found in the form of oxides, phosphates and silicates. The element in question still has a higher melting point than that of UO₂, which has a melting point of 2800°C, in addition to releasing fewer gases from fission than UO₂. All these characteristics make thorium a great attraction to be used in the nuclear industry. These properties tend to improve the thermo-hydraulic characteristics of Mixed Oxide (MOX) fuels, with thorium and uranium, compared to current uranium oxide fuels. Thorium available in the Earth's crust probably has more available energy than all uranium and fossil fuel sources combined. There is no standard classification for thorium resources, as there is for uranium resources, as it is not a targeted exploration resource for the mineral industry. Its availability is normally estimated in relation to uranium and rare Earth resources and their application in the fuel cycle has implications for the reduction of long-lived actinides and Transuranic (TRU) elements [11] [12] [13].

The motivation for using thorium also has an economic character, due to the increase in the cost of uranium extraction in this century. Maintaining the current consumption rate, it is estimated that extractions costing less than US\$80 per kilogram of uranium should last for the next 40 years, for costs of US\$130 per kilogram of uranium with a durability of 60 years and for costs below US\$260 per kilogram of uranium about 100 years [14]. The mentioned costs limit uranium as a primary source of energy to this century, if no recycling process is used and only with the use of thermal reactors, without taking advantage of the remaining plutonium in the material used or from other sources [15].

Given these concerns, there are already studies on the use of thorium in large PWR reactors, such as the AP1000 reactor [16] [17]. In these studies, the authors show that the use of the thorium cycle in LWR reactors using Radkowsky's seed-blanket concept [13] is advantageous, since its use as a homogeneous MOX with a high amount of uranium implies the accumulation of isotopes such as U-236, which end up making the process uneconomical and increasing the need for enrichment with each new cycle with reprocessing. However, the use of the seed-blanket concept implies a reduction of heat production areas and consequently higher heat fluxes in the seed region when compared to the original reactor. Thus, as SMR reactors have lower power, the use of the seed-blanket fuel element concept becomes viable, without the need for power reduction.

The objective of this work is, taking the NuScale as a reference reactor, to carry out a parametric study to design a Radkowsky's seed-blanket concept fuel element for this reactor, reducing the amount of plutonium produced and producing U-233 for later use, increasing the sustainability of the cycle of fuel.

Some recent studies have advanced in the investigation of Small Modular Reactors (SMRs) of Pressurized Water (PWR) with the use of thorium, but there are still few in the literature. From the manuscripts found, we can mention the use of TRISO particles applied to mixed oxide fuels [18], the conversion with minimal alterations of the SMART reactor with the reduction of the amount of burnable poisons necessary for reactivity control [19], the development of reactors for marine propulsion [20] [21] [22] [23], experiments to validate codes used to simulate reactors [24] and thermo-hydraulic analysis with advanced fuels [25]. These studies are the only ones found in the Web of Science base with the keywords thorium, SMR and PWR, demonstrating that there is still much to be explored in this field, especially in new designs in fuel elements, which is the case of this study and which in its vast majority are carried out by the same research groups, being little disseminated.

The originality of this article lies in the application of the seed-blanket concept proposed by Radkowsky to the NuScale reactor with different fuel rod pitches, without changing the core heat removal system, thus being a way of starting the thorium cycle in PWR reactor technologies already well-consolidated in the nuclear industry, producing 1 kg of U-233 per cycle.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. The NuScale Reference Model

The NuScale is a small modular reactor moderated by light water, currently in the licensing stage, with a capacity to generate 77 MWe. Each core module is approximately one-third the size of a large-scale reactor core. Its design includes modern Generation III+ security systems like passive cooling. The core module is composed of 37 assemblies. Each assembly has a grid of 17×17 rods, 264 for fuel, 24 guide tubes and a central tube for instrumentation. The used fuel is UO_2 with U-235 enriched between 2.60 and 4.55 w/o, depending on the assembly lo-

cation. In 12 assemblies, the fuel contains homogeneously mixed gadolinium oxide, to control its burning.

To have a reference model against which to compare the converted core, we created a computational model of a NuScale reactor, using the parameters found in the NuScale specifications [26]. The relevant geometric parameters of a NuScale assembly are presented in **Table 1** and **Figure 2**.

The reactor core has a total of 37 fuel assembly in which 12 of these has a mixture of uranium-gadolinium oxide and the remaining 25 fuel assembly are built with pure UO_2 . In this way, there are two types of fuel rods as shown in **Figure 2**.

The two types of fuel assembly described are shown in **Figure 3** with the arrangement of the UO_2 and $(\text{Gd}, \text{U})\text{O}_2$ rods.

In the reactor core, there are 12 fuel assemblies with a concentration of 2 w/o of Gd_2O_3 and an average enrichment of 4.32 w/o (**Figure 4** in dark blue); 12 fuel assemblies with a concentration of Gd_2O_3 of 6w/o and an average enrichment of

Table 1. Design parameters for the NuScale assembly.

Description	Value
Fuel pellet diameter	0.81153 cm
Gap outer diameter	0.82804 cm
Rod diameter	0.94996 cm
Rod pitch	1.25984 cm
Rod height	215.9 cm
Active height	200.0 cm




Figure 2. The axial schemes of two types of fuel rods are shown [26].




Figure 3. Cross view of two types of fuel assembly including Gd_2O_3 pins (right) and pure UO_2 pins (left) are shown [26].




Figure 4. NuScale full core (1/4 symmetry) [26].

4.30 w/o (Figure 4 in light blue); and one fuel assembly with a Gd_2O_3 concentration of 8 w/o and an average enrichment of 4.29 w/o (Figure 4 in red). The rest are built with pure UO_2 (Figure 4 in green). Fuel enrichment without Gd_2O_3 is 4.55 w/o, with gadolinium oxide is 4.11 w/o.

The operating states of the reactor used in the simulations are shown in Table 2.

The SERPENT code was used to simulate the full core model using the Monte Carlo method. To validate the model, we compared the results with those from Sadegh-Noedoost *et al.* [26], which were obtained using the MCNPX code. Subsequently, simulations of a single NuScale assembly were used as a reference to compare the results obtained with the MOX fuel element.

Table 2. Operation states.

Operation state	Temperature	
	Fuel	Moderator
Cold Zero Power (CZP)	300 K	300 K
Hot Zero Power (HZP)	492 K	492 K
Hot Full Power (HFP)	700 K	557 K

2.2. Homogeneous Model

To increase the nuclear fuel cycle, Radkowsky (Galperin *et al.* [13]) proposed the Seed-Blanket Unit (SBU) concept, where the nucleus is divided into two regions, one with fissile elements (the seed) surrounded by another with fertile elements (the blanket). Besides exploring the vast amount of thorium natural reserves, a seed-blanket reactor has other advantages, such as the reduction of transuranic waste, which prevents their reuse for the construction of nuclear weapons.

The first step in converting a reactor to mixed fuel is to look for the proportion of seed and blanket volumes that provides an infinite multiplication factor (k_∞) above one and maximizes the Conversion Rate (CR).

A first approach to this problem is to use a *homogeneous model*, which is a simplified reactor model with a single fuel assembly, where the geometry of the rods is removed and two parallelepipeds delimit the seed and blanket regions, each containing a homogeneous mixture of the materials that compose them (Figure 5). Then, the blanket volume is varied until the desired condition is found.

Initially, following the results of Galperin *et al.* [13], we used a moderator to fuel volume ratio of $z_s = (V_m/V_f)_s = 3.1$ in the seed region and $z_b = (V_m/V_f)_b = 2.0$ in the blanket region. From these values, one can calculate the molecular fractions for water in each mixture, x_s and x_b , then the material compositions can be written as

- $x_s\text{H}_2\text{O} + (1 - x_s)\text{UO}_2$ for the seed and
- $x_b\text{H}_2\text{O} + (1 - x_b)\text{Th}_{0.9}\text{U}_{0.1}\text{O}_2$ for the blanket,

both with 20 w/o U-235 enrichment.

The assembly has an active volume of $21.26 \times 21.26 \times 200 \text{ cm}^3$. The analysis of the homogeneous reactor proceeded as follows, 13 simulations were carried out so that the ratio between the blanket and total volumes (V_b/V_t) comprised the range between 11.50% and 94.73%. Then, the values of k_∞ and CR obtained from the simulations were analyzed to choose (V_b/V_t) such as to obtain a slightly supercritical reactor $k_\infty > 1$ and maximize the conversion rate. The optimal value, $V_b/V_t = 0.72$, was used to build a detailed reactor model, as described in the next section.

2.3. Heterogenous Model

In the heterogeneous model, the geometry of the rods is included (pellet, gap, clad). The dynamics of a seed-blanket reactor is different from that of a reactor




Figure 5. The homogeneous model cross-section.

that uses only UO_2 as fuel. To accommodate the volumes found in the previous analysis, we need to make allowances for the pitch and diameter of the rods. Let X and L be the sides of the cross section of the seed and blanket regions, respectively. It is possible to calculate $X^2 = L^2(1 - V_b/V_t)$. Remembering that the moderator to fuel volume ratio is $z = V_m/V_f = A_m/A_f$, where A_m and A_f are the moderator and fuel areas, respectively, we can write the following relationships,

$$A_f^{(s)} = \frac{X^2}{z_s + 1} = (m^2 - M) \frac{\pi}{4} D_s^2, \quad (1)$$

$$A_f^{(b)} = \frac{L^2}{z_b + 1} \times \frac{V_b}{V_t} = (17^2 - n^2 - N) \frac{\pi}{4} D_b^2, \quad (2)$$

where m and n are the number of grid steps in the seed and empty grid steps in the blanket, $M(N)$ is the number of guide tubes, $D_s(D_b)$ is the fuel diameter for the seed (blanket). Equations (1) and (2) can be used to make an initial estimate of the fuel diameters. We have, of course, the condition $D_{s/b} < P_{s/b}$, where $P_s = X/m$ and $P_b = L/17$ are the pitch of the rods. A choice of initial parameters, using $V_b/V_t = 0.72$, is presented in **Table 3**.

With these parameters, we have the same amount of guide and instrument tubes, but 304 fuel rods instead of 264 in the original NuScale design. This configuration is shown in **Figure 6**.

As in the previous study, using this detailed model, we performed a parametric study varying the diameters D_s and D_b of the rods, to find the best conversion factor without exceeding the power limit. Finally, the values of average power, effective multiplication factor and fraction of delayed neutrons in the BOC and EOC were calculated to compare against those of the original NuScale.


3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Reference Model Validation

The study consists of converting the NuScale reactor core from a UO_2 core to

Table 3. Initial parameters for the heterogenous model.

	Parameter				
	Steps	Guide tubes	Fuel rods	Pitch (cm)	Diameter (cm)
Seed	$m = 11$	$M = 9$	112	1.023	0.592
Blanket	$n = 9$	$N = 16$	192	1.251	0.848

**Figure 6.** NuScale-Th fuel element configuration.

a (Th, U)O₂ MOX, so we need to ensure that we are modeling the desired reactor. To validate the model, we took the reference [1] and modeled the reactor core in 3 different states: Cold Zero Power (CZP), Hot Zero Power (HZP) and Hot Full Power (HFP). The description of these states can be found in Section 2, and the results obtained are shown in Table 4.


In Table 4, we note a good compatibility between the reference and modeling values, with a maximum difference of the order of 200 pcm for k_{eff} . This is an acceptable value given that the data were generated using different cross-section libraries, being ENDF/B-VII for our study and ENDF/B-VI for the reference [26]; and different Monte Carlo codes, SERPENT for this study and MCNP for the reference.

3.2. Parametric Study of Seed and Blanket Areas

In the second part of this study, we searched for the optimal ratio of blanket volume to total volume which maximizes the conversion factor and that provides an infinite multiplication factor so that the reactor maintains an excess of reactivity for operation. In this first study, the model was simplified to two homogeneous regions for the seed and blanket, constituted by a weighted mixture with the material proportions of fuel and moderator, so it would be possible to study the model in a simplified way. The proportions taken from the ratio volume of the moderator by the volume of fuel were 3.1 and 1.9 in the seed and in the blanket respectively, these values are the same used by Galperin *et al.* (as cited in Kasten [27]). The values of k_{∞} and CR as a function of the ratio of blanket volume to total volume are shown in Figure 7.

Table 4. Parameters for validation of the reference reactor modeling.

State	NuScale—Full Core (BOC)	
	Reference [26]	Calculation
CZP (k_{eff})	1.21151 ± 0.00007	1.21045 ± 0.00010
HZP (k_{eff})	1.16658 ± 0.00008	1.16988 ± 0.00011
HFP (k_{eff})	1.13926 ± 0.00009	1.13701 ± 0.00010
β_{eff}	0.00700 ± 0.00020	0.00695 ± 0.00050

**Figure 7.** Conversion ratio and infinite multiplication factor as a function of the ratio between blanket volume and total volume.

In **Figure 7**, we note that values (V_b/V_T) greater than 0.8 can be discarded from the study as they result in a subcritical reactor ($k_\infty < 1$). Therefore, the construction of the heterogeneous model should have a ratio slightly less than 0.8, as it is also necessary to maximize the conversion rate at the BOC stage. The chosen value, 0.72, provides a good margin for parameter variation in the heterogeneous model. Results for the chosen model are presented in **Table 5**.

3.3. Modeling of the Seed-Blanket Fuel Element

From the choice of the best ratio between blanket and total volumes, with a k_∞ that remains greater than zero until the end of the cycle, in the third part of this study, we set up the seed-blanket fuel assembly as shown in **Figure 6**.

We note, in **Figure 6**, that the configuration for the blanket is of the type 17×17 , while for the seed it is 11×11 . For a better evaluation of the performance of this fuel element, we took the average power per fuel assembly in the NuScale core and modeled a reflected fuel element obtaining the parameters in **Table 6**, along with the equivalent for the reference reactor for comparison.

If we compare the value of k_∞ obtained by the homogeneous reactor in **Table 5** with the value obtained in **Table 6**, we notice that the heterogeneous reactor model has a value greater than what is expected. This can be explained by the formula of the 4 factors [28], given by

Table 5. Results for the homogeneous model (BOC).

Parameter	Homogeneous fuel assembly calculations	
	Value	
V_b/V_T	0.7235	
k_∞	1.030720 ± 0.00008	
β_{eff}	0.00686 ± 0.00050	
CR	0.88 ± 0.00	

Table 6. Reflected fuel element performance in 24 months of burnup.

Table head	Heterogeneous fuel assembly calculations	
	NuScale	SBU
V_m/V_f seed	-	1.70
V_m/V_f blanket	-	2.71
Power (W)	4.32×10^6	4.32×10^6
CR (BOC)	0.35 ± 0.00	0.48 ± 0.00
CR (EOC)	0.44 ± 0.00	0.52 ± 0.00
U-235 cycle consumption (kg)	3.13	3.22
k_∞ (BOC)	1.42334 ± 0.00009	1.26341 ± 0.00010
k_∞ (EOC)	1.21322 ± 0.00011	1.16182 ± 0.00011
β_{eff} (BOC)	0.00682 ± 0.00017	0.00675 ± 0.00017
β_{eff} (EOC)	0.00583 ± 0.00019	0.00573 ± 0.00020
U-233 production (kg)	**	1.00

**Negligible.

$$k_\infty = f\eta p\varepsilon, \quad (3)$$

where f is the thermal utilization, p is the resonance escape probability, ε is the rapid fission factor, and η is the average of neutrons emitted in fission per neutrons absorbed in the fuel. For the heterogeneous reactor, the thermal utilization will drop due to the depression of the neutron flux within the fuel. However, the resonance escape probability and the fast fission factor will increase, making the value of k_∞ considerably higher, this fact is well known within reactor physics [28].

Analyzing the conversion ratio, we noticed that there was a reduction in the value of the heterogeneous model when compared to the homogeneous model (Table 5) due to the self-shielding effect [28] that reduces the magnitude of the neutron flux in the fuel rods.

Analyzing Table 6, we note that there was a considerable increase in the conversion factor when the seed-blanket concept is used, despite the k_∞ at the beginning and end of cycle being lower in relation to the reference reactor, we note that the drop in reactivity is considerable (about 50% smaller). Thus, it is expected

that the core of this reactor will achieve an extension of the cycle lifetime or even that the fuel element will be able to remain in the core for more cycles, before its removal is necessary. We noticed a slightly lower consumption of U-235 (~3%) and that the value of the effective fraction of delayed neutrons remains approximately the same. Although, numerically, the value of U-233 seems small, the blanket can be maintained for an irradiation time of several cycles, not needing to be removed together with the seed, in this way it may imply a greater accumulation of U-233 before its removal of the core until its quantity becomes adequate for use. The higher EOC CR value demonstrates that the reactor becomes a better converter as the neutron spectrum becomes harder.

Figure 8 and **Figure 9** below demonstrate the production of Pu-239 and Pu-241 in the fuel element during the operating cycle.

In **Figure 8** and **Figure 9**, it is possible to notice that the seed-blanket concept reduces TRU production by more than 50% compared to the standard NuScale fuel element. This is also valid for long-lived actinides, thus representing a considerable reduction in tailings destined for geological deposits and reduction of decommissioning costs.




Figure 8. Production of Pu-239 in kg/THM.




Figure 9. Production of Pu-241 in kg/THM.

Figure 8 demonstrates that Pu-239 is approaching a state of equilibrium, where the amount of material produced is equal to that consumed, while in **Figure 9**, we can see that Pu-241 is far from reaching this state. However, as the UO₂ fuel (seed) will stay in the core for less time than the blanket composed of (Th, U)O₂, where the amount of plutonium produced is much lower due to the low amount of UO₂ present, this will not affect the reactor at long term. This analysis is important because the blanket can remain in the core for a time many times longer than the seed, for a better use of thorium in the production of U-233.

3.4. Safety Parameters

In previous sections, the viability of the concept was verified and in the last part of this study, the operational safety for the new seed-blanket fuel element should be verified. **Table 7** and **Table 8** present the data for the temperature reactivity coefficients in BOC for the NuScale reference and the seed-blanket unit fuel elements.

We note that, in **Table 7**, there was a safety reduction for the temperature reactivity coefficient. This is due to the reduction in the fraction of water in the moderator volume in the seed and consequently in the hydrogen available for moderation, so its reduction ends up having a greater impact on core reactivity.

In the case of **Table 8**, we notice an increase in the safety of the temperature reactivity coefficient. This increase is due to the resonance integral of thorium being greater than that of uranium, thus increasing neutron capture with temperature [29].

A proprietary Matlab code was developed to verify the thermohydraulic operating limits of the proposed core. We validated the maximum temperature reached in the fuel and the Minimum Departure from Nucleate Boiling Ratio (MDNBR) as reported by the NRC and described in Ref. [30].

Table 7. Moderator temperature reactivity coefficient.

T_{fuel} (K)	T_{mod} (K)	Heterogeneous fuel assembly calculations	
		NuScale	SBU
		α_M (pcm/°C)	α_M (pcm/°C)
700	410 - 494	-7.54 ± 0.31	-5.69 ± 0.18
700	494 - 505	-10.79 ± 0.31	-7.34 ± 0.18
700	505 - 516	-12.28 ± 0.31	-10.13 ± 0.18
700	516 - 527	-13.69 ± 0.30	-9.11 ± 0.18
700	527 - 538	-15.47 ± 0.30	-10.13 ± 0.17
700	538 - 549	-15.90 ± 0.30	-13.84 ± 0.18
700	549 - 560	-20.36 ± 0.30	-14.76 ± 0.18
700	560 - 571	-23.06 ± 0.30	-18.41 ± 0.17
700	571 - 582	-28.81 ± 0.30	-21.92 ± 0.18
700	582 - 593	-34.25 ± 0.30	-26.06 ± 0.18

Table 8. Fuel temperature reactivity coefficient.

T_{fuel} (K)	T_{mod} (K)	Heterogeneous fuel assembly calculations			
		Nuscale		SBU	
		(BOC)	(EOC)	(BOC)	(EOC)
		α_F (pcm/°C)	α_F (pcm/°C)	α_F (pcm/°C)	α_F (pcm/°C)
700 - 800	531	-1.48 ± 0.01	-1.59 ± 0.01	-2.92 ± 0.01	-3.23 ± 0.02
800 - 900	531	-1.25 ± 0.01	-1.78 ± 0.01	-2.55 ± 0.01	-2.65 ± 0.02
900 - 1000	531	-1.51 ± 0.02	-1.60 ± 0.02	-2.77 ± 0.01	-3.16 ± 0.02
1000 - 1100	531	-1.11 ± 0.02	-1.20 ± 0.02	-2.14 ± 0.02	-2.28 ± 0.04
1100 - 1200	531	-1.25 ± 0.01	-1.46 ± 0.01	-2.29 ± 0.02	-2.11 ± 0.03
1200 - 1300	531	-1.35 ± 0.02	-1.60 ± 0.02	-2.17 ± 0.01	-2.70 ± 0.02
1300 - 1400	531	-0.92 ± 0.02	-1.24 ± 0.02	-2.15 ± 0.00	-2.01 ± 0.03
1400 - 1500	531	-1.09 ± 0.01	-1.14 ± 0.01	-1.75 ± 0.02	-2.00 ± 0.03
1500 - 1600	531	-1.23 ± 0.02	-1.48 ± 0.02	-2.13 ± 0.02	-1.95 ± 0.00
1600 - 1700	531	-1.03 ± 0.01	-1.12 ± 0.01	-1.63 ± 0.03	-1.97 ± 0.00
1700 - 1800	531	-0.92 ± 0.01	-1.25 ± 0.01	-1.61 ± 0.02	-1.71 ± 0.02

Table 9. NuScale and SBU thermohydraulic parameters.

Table head	Reactor			
	NuScale (BOC)	NuScale (EOC)	SBU (BOC)	SBU (EOC)
Fuel center line temperature	1110 K	997 K	1579 K	1340 K
Clad maximum temperature	817 K	762 K	1138 K	999 K
MDNBR	2.72	3.37	1.25	1.59

We found a maximum fuel temperature slightly higher than that reported by the NRC for the standard NuScale. This is due to the use of a conservative sub-channel analysis model. For the SBU model, we also obtained an extrapolated maximum temperature value, however, under the thermal limit stipulated for UO_2 , which is 2800°C.

One of the main parameters in evaluating the safety of the reactor is the Minimum Departure from Nucleate Boiling Ratio (MDNBR), which describes the relationship between the critical heat flux and the local heat flux. This is a critical analysis in reactor engineering, as it is essential to ensure that nucleated boiling does not occur in PWR-type reactors. We used the Westinghouse non-uniform W-3 correlation [31] to calculate the critical heat flux. After validating the code used with the standard NuScale core, as shown in **Table 9**, we obtained 1.26 and 1.59 as minimum values for DNBR in BOC and EOC, respectively. According to Todreas and Kazimi [32], the DNBR values are considered safe.

4. Conclusions

The study demonstrated the viability of the seed-blanket concept applied to a

PWR-type SMR reactor, without the need for power reduction, since the lower power of a small reactor ensures that the thermal safety requirements are guaranteed.

In the validation of the reference reactor, a very close value of the effective fraction of delayed neutrons and effective multiplication factor was found, with a maximum difference of the order of 250 pcm. The value is acceptable considering that different cross-section libraries and codes were used.

In the parametric study carried out for the homogeneous seed-blanket reactor, a model with a conversion ratio of 0.87 and $k_{\infty} = 1.030720 \pm 0.00008$ was chosen, which, when transformed into a heterogeneous reactor, had its k_{∞} value increased to 1.26186 ± 0.00009 and the conversion factor reduced to 0.48 in BOC. These effects are expected due to changes in the 4-factor formula with increased resonance escape and fast fission factor, as well as the self-shielding effect.

The produced value of the U-233 isotope (1 kg) represents 1/3 of the mass burned of U-235, as each cycle is expected to remove approximately 1/3 of the reactor mass expected for the reactor model complete to be developed in the next phase of the study represents an almost sustainable production of fissile material. The use of devices such as neutron reflectors or even redistribution of flux by increasing the fissile material in the blanket can make the concept even more efficient. A possible way to increase the amount of fissile material in the blanket would be to change the MOX from (U, Th)O₂ to (Pu, Th)O₂. This would also contribute to the improvement of DNBR, which turned out to be the main safety factor affected in this analysis. The temperature reactivity coefficients and the fraction of delayed neutrons had little change from those for the model used as a reference.

Finally, the amount of TRU produced by the reactor had a reduction of ~50% of its mass value, when compared to the reference model. In the next stage of this study, this suggested fuel element concept will be examined and the complete reactor core will be modeled and studied throughout the first cycle. A more detailed analysis of the safety parameters will be carried out at the beginning, middle and end of the cycle.

Thus, we can list the main results of this study as the increase in the conversion value, reduction of TRU produced, production of fissile uranium and extension of the fuel cycle.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful for funding and support provided by funding agencies CNPq and FAPERJ.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- [1] GIF (2014) Technology Roadmap Update for Generation IV Nuclear Energy Systems.

- Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA).
- [2] Deutsche Welle (2022) Finland's Much-Delayed Nuclear Plant Launches. <https://www.dw.com/en/finlands-much-delayed-nuclear-plant-launches/a-61108015>
 - [3] ANS (2022) Vogtle Project Update: Cost likely to Top \$30 Billion. <https://www.ans.org/news/article-3949/vogtle-project-update-cost-likely-to-top-30-billion/>
 - [4] ANS (2022) Another Delay, Cost Bump, for Flamanville-3. <https://www.ans.org/news/article-3573/another-delay-cost-bump-for-flamanville3/>
 - [5] Kröger, W., Sornette, D. and Ayoub, A. (2020) Towards Safer and More Sustainable Ways for Exploiting Nuclear Power. *World Journal of Nuclear Science and Technology*, **10**, 91-115. <https://doi.org/10.4236/wjnst.2020.103010>
 - [6] Boarin, S. and Ricotti, M.E. (2014) An Evaluation of SMR Economic Attractiveness. *Science and Technology of Nuclear Installations*, **2014**, Article ID: 803698. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/803698>
 - [7] Freire, L.O. and Andrade, D.A. (2021) Novel Technological Developments with Impacts on Perspectives for Mobile Nuclear Power Plants. *World Journal of Nuclear Science and Technology*, **11**, 141-158. <https://doi.org/10.4236/wjnst.2021.114011>
 - [8] Stewart, W.R. and Shirvan, K. (2022) Capital Cost Estimation for Advanced Nuclear Power Plants. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **155**, Article ID: 111880. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2021.111880>
 - [9] Lloyd, C.A., Roulstone, T. and Lyrons, R.E. (2021) Transport, Constructability, and Economic Advantages of SMR Modularization. *Progress in Nuclear Energy*, **134**, Article ID: 103672. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnucene.2021.103672>
 - [10] NuScale Power. A Cost Competitive Nuclear Power Solution. <https://www.nuscalepower.com/benefits/cost-competitive>
 - [11] Lung, M. and Gremm, O. (1998) Perspectives of the Thorium Fuel Cycle. *Nuclear Engineering and Design*, **180**, 133-146. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0029-5493\(97\)00296-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0029-5493(97)00296-3)
 - [12] Humphrey, U.E. and Khandaker, M.U. (2018) Viability of Thorium-Based Nuclear Fuel Cycle for the Next Generation Nuclear Reactor: Issues and Prospects. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **97**, 259-275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2018.08.019>
 - [13] Galperin, A., Reichert, P. and Radkowsky, A. (1997) Thorium Fuel for Light Water reactors—Reducing Proliferation Potential of Nuclear Power Fuel Cycle. *Science & Global Security*, **6**, 265-290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08929889708426440>
 - [14] Maiorino, J.R., Moreira, J.M.L., Stefani, G.L., Busse, A. and Santos, T.A. (2014) Thorium as a New Primary Source of Nuclear Energy. In: *Proceedings of IX Congresso Brasileiro de Planejamento Energético (CBPE)*, Florianópolis, 25-27 August 2014, 1-11.
 - [15] IAEA (2014) Technology Roadmap Update for Generation IV Nuclear Energy Systems.
 - [16] Maiorino, J.R., Stefani, G.L., Moreira, J.M.L., Rossi, P.C.R. and Santos, T.A. (2017) Feasibility to Convert an Advanced PWR from UO₂ to a Mixed U/ThO₂ Core—Part I: Parametric Studies. *Annals of Nuclear Energy*, **102**, 47-55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2016.12.010>
 - [17] De Stefani, G.L., Maiorino, J.R. and de Losada Moreira, J.M. (2020) The AP-Th 1000—An Advanced Concept to Use MOX of Thorium in a Closed Fuel Cycle. *In-*

- ternational Journal of Energy Research*, **45**, 11642-11655.
- [18] Rosales, J., Francois, J.L. and Garcia, C. (2022) Neutronic Assessment of a PWR-Type SMR Core with TRISO Particles Using Mixed-Oxide Fuel Strategies. *Progress in Nuclear Energy*, **154**, Article ID: 104470. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnucene.2022.104470>
- [19] Akbari-Jeyhouni, R., Ochbelagh, D.R., Maiorino, J.R., D'Auria, F. and Stefani, G.L. (2018) The Utilization of Thorium in Small Modular Reactors—Part I: Neutronic Assessment. *Annals of Nuclear Energy*, **120**, 422-430. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2018.06.013>
- [20] Alam, S.B., de Oliveira, R.G.G., Goodwin, C.S. and Parks, G.T. (2019) Coupled Neutronic/Thermal-Hydraulic Hot Channel Analysis of High Power Density Civil Marine SMR Cores. *Annals of Nuclear Energy*, **127**, 400-411. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2018.12.031>
- [21] Peakman, A., Owen, H. and Abram, T. (2021) Core Design and Fuel Behaviour of a Small Modular Pressurised Water Reactor Using (Th,U)O₂ Fuel for Commercial Marine Propulsion. *Progress in Nuclear Energy*, **141**, Article ID: 103966. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnucene.2021.103966>
- [22] Alam, S.B., Goodwin, C.S. and Parks, G.T. (2019) Parametric Neutronics Analyses of Lattice Geometry and Coolant Candidates for a Soluble-Boron-Free Civil Marine SMR Core Using Micro-Heterogeneous Duplex Fuel. *Annals of Nuclear Energy*, **129**, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2019.01.037>
- [23] Alam, S.B., Ridwan, T., Kumar, D., Almutairi, B., Goodwin, C. and Parks, G.T. (2019) Small Modular Reactor Core Design for Civil Marine Propulsion Using Micro-Heterogeneous Duplex Fuel. Part II: Whole-Core Analysis. *Nuclear Engineering and Design*, **346**, 176-191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2019.03.004>
- [24] Watts, D.G., Adams, F.P., Masala, E., Blomeley, L. and Bromeley, B.P. (2022) Physics Modeling for Conceptual Designs of Proposed Experiments in the Zero Energy Deuterium-2 Critical Facility for Testing Small Modular Reactor-Type Fuels. *Journal of Nuclear Engineering and Radiation Science*, **8**, Article ID: 031501. <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4054079>
- [25] Bayomy, A.M., Bromley, B.P., Dominguez, A.N. and Kelly, S. (2022) Steady-State Subchannel Thermalhydraulic Assessment of a Full-Scale Pressurized Water Reactor-Small Modular Reactor Fuel Assembly with Conventional and Advanced Fuels. *Journal of Nuclear Engineering and Radiation Science*, **8**, Article ID: 031601. <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4053829>
- [26] Sadegh-Noedoost, A., Faghihi, F., Fakhraei, A. and Amin-Mozafari, M. (2020) Investigations of the Fresh-Core Cycle-Length and the Average Fuel Depletion Analysis of the NuScale Core. *Annals of Nuclear Energy*, **136**, Article ID: 106995. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2019.106995>
- [27] Kasten, P.R. (1998) Review of the Radkowsky Thorium Reactor Concept. *Science & Global Security*, **7**, 237-269. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08929889808426462>
- [28] Lamarsh, J.R. (1966) Introduction to Nuclear Reactor Theory. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Boston.
- [29] Frick, K. and Bragg-Sitton, S. (2021) Development of the NuScale Power Module in the INL Modelica Ecosystem. *Nuclear Technology*, **207**, 521-542. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00295450.2020.1781497>
- [30] NuScale Power LLC (2020) NuScale Standard Plant Design Certification Application. Chapter 4: Reactor. Rev. 5.
- [31] Tong, L.S. (1972) Boiling Crisis and Critical Heat Flux. Technical Report, TID-25887.

<https://doi.org/10.2172/4629988>

- [32] Todreas, N.E. and Kazimi, M.S. (2021) Nuclear Systems Volume I: Thermal Hydraulic Fundamentals. CRC Press, Boca Raton. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781351030502>

System Variables Design of Safety Analysis for Fast Reactors

Magdi Hassan Saad^{1,2}, Abdallah M. Ibrahim³

¹Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, Taibah University, Al Madinah Al Munawwarah, KSA

²Department of Physics, Sudan University of Science & Technology, Khartoum, Sudan

³Department of Nuclear Engineering, Sudan University of Science & Technology, Khartoum, Sudan

Email: mh Mohammed@taibahu.edu.sa

How to cite this paper: Saad, M.H. and Ibrahim, A.M. (2023) System Variables Design of Safety Analysis for Fast Reactors. *World Journal of Nuclear Science and Technology*, 13, 29-39.

<https://doi.org/10.4236/wjnst.2023.132003>

Received: January 28, 2023

Accepted: April 9, 2023

Published: April 12, 2023

Copyright © 2023 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative

Commons Attribution International

License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract

This research aims to examine the risk in the technology design of fast breeder reactors while the development depends on safety considerations. The project explored the variables, which could affect positively the expected average fuel burn-up, breeding ratio, and decay heat removal. That is accomplished using features such as guard vessels and elevated pipe routing to prevent the cracked state of both core components and fuel cladding interface conditions. So, the cracked region of fuel was detected by thermal-hydraulic analysis. We used ZrFeCr alloys to estimating of the rise in fuel cladding and coolant that can be incorporated in the design ZrFeCr alloys to uniform corrosion in temperature and 10.3 Mpa pressure. Fast creep of the reactor vessel during the coolant heat-up transient is another issue to be considered corrosion resistance of structural material can be achieved by controlling oxygen content in steel alloy. In this trend, S4337 S5140 steels are wide and can be used in future fossil power plants because of their excellent high-temperature strength.

Keywords

Reactor, Safety, Crack, Temperature, Safety Management System

1. Introduction

Nuclear power plants must always ensure the highest level of safety that can reasonably be achieved to protect workers at these plants, the public, and the environment from any harmful effects of ionizing radiation or other hazards present at the installation. This statement is valid for all existing nuclear power plants and serves as a guide for developing Generation IV nuclear reactors [1] [2].

There is a large gap between the high-level safety fundamentals and the detailed codes and standards, which can be summarized in **Figure 1**.

Because risk cannot be eliminated, it must ideally be optimized. This means a cost/benefit analysis, although such analysis often looks only at the risk of technology, without factoring in benefits. At a risk optimum, the additional resources used to provide additional risk reduction would come at a disproportionate cost, and any resources removed from risk reduction would cause a disproportionate increase in risk. This situation is shown in **Figure 2**. This optimum is never achieved in practice. This is partly because the risk from nuclear power is perceived to be greater than that of other technologies, even if the numerical risk is the same, due to social factors such as unfamiliarity with the technology and its association with atomic [3] [4].

One of the most important safety considerations is relative to the motion of the reactor core and control rods within the containment affected by the site-specific ground motion to the seismic response. This approach may present the opportunity for refinement of the reactor design by revealing components that are unnecessary or possibly overdesigned components imposed according to current deterministic licensing requirements.

The objective is not only to design a sodium-cooled fast reactor (**Figure 3**), but also to develop a systematic process to be used in the design, the challenge of this project is obtaining reliable cost estimates in sufficient detail to test to methodology. To avoid absolutes, this project will focus on comparative assessments of design and cost estimates completed in the past. The advanced metal reactor is well-documented since it has detailed costs at the component level and a probabilistic risk assessment [5].




Figure 1. Hierarchy of safety standards.




Figure 2. Risk optimization.




Figure 3. Pool-type Sodium-cooled Fast Reactor (SFR).

The pressure control system refers to that of a BWR the same as in the two-pass cooling SCW fast reactor as shown in Equations (1)-(2) where $V(t)$ is the open-

ing of the turbine control valve with the control's parameter of K [6]:

$$V_r(t) = 1 - \frac{P_{set} - P(t)}{K} \quad (1)$$

$$V(t) = V_r(t) + 2 \frac{dV_r}{dt} - 5 \frac{dV}{dt} \quad (2)$$

The early outlet temperature control system was designed by considering only one signal of steam temperature deviation, as the feedback is shown in Equation (3) which u is the control signal, and K_P is the control parameter [7].

$$\frac{du}{dt} = K_P \frac{T - T_{set}}{T_{set}} \quad (3)$$

The goal is to show meaningful fuel reductions in cost and safety which will be compared to a thermal reactor once a reasonable model has been developed areas for reduction in cost with safety aspects of the design will be determined and specific items can be addressed expected that the methodology could be used in the design of any future reactor since the methodology will be generic. Sustainability: Concerning sustainability, the main concern was the management of the environment through clean air restrictions, waste management restrictions, and conservation of resources.

Fast reactors use Lead-Bismuth Eutectic (LBE) and lead as coolants and possess a very high level of inherent self-protection and passive safety against severe accidents. That type of reactor can be simultaneously more safely and more cheaply. As all other coolants, LBE and Lead Coolant (LC) possess particular virtues and shortcomings. The conclusion is made about the promising usage of FRs with these coolants in future NP after the experience in operating the prototypes of such reactors has been obtained [8].

There a study has shown a relationship between safety management system implementation and safety performance, where the analyses indicated a significant difference between compliance with the safety management system and safety performance. Therefore, it is concluded that a safety management system is critical to improving safety performance, and the safety management system is. There is a need for ongoing commitment and determination from all parties concerned for the improved safety performance to be sustained [9].

1.1. System Thermal-Fluids Modeling

SAM is being developed as a system-level modeling and simulation tool with higher fidelity yet computationally efficient. As a new code development, the initial effort has been focused on the modeling and simulation capabilities of the heat transfer and single-phase fluid dynamics responses in reactor systems. The transient simulation capabilities of typical reactor accidents have been demonstrated in the transient simulations of various advanced reactor types and validated against the EBR-II, FFTF, and MSRE (Figure 4), and many integral effects test results. The key features include [10] [11] [12]:




Figure 4. Temperature distributions in the simulation of Advanced Burner Test Reactor (ABTR).

- Robust and high-order FEM model of single-phase fluid flow and heat transfer;
- Component-based system modeling;
- Flexible coupling between fluid and solid components enables a wide range of engineering applications;
- Enhanced built-in closure models and flexible modeling of fluid properties, friction, and convective heat transfer.

1.2. Reduced-Order Multi-Dimensional Flow Model

A computationally efficient multi-dimensional flow model is under development for thermal mixing and stratification phenomena in large enclosures for safety analysis. An advanced and efficient thermal mixing and stratification modeling capability embedded in a system analysis code is desirable to improve reactor safety analyses' accuracy and reduce modeling uncertainties [13] [14] [15] (**Figure 5**).

1.3. Flexible Core Modeling

A pseudo-3-D full-core conjugate heat transfer modeling capability has been developed in SAM for efficient and accurate temperature predictions of SFR structures. A multi-channel rod bundle model is developed to account for the temperature differences between the center region and the edge region of the coolant channel in a fuel assembly [16] [17] [18] [19]. The hexagon lattice core can be modeled with automatically-generated 1-D parallel channels representing the subassembly flow, and 2-D duct walls and inter-assembly gaps (**Figure 6**).

1.4. Multi-Physics Multi-Scale Integration

Flexible coupling interfaces have been developed to allow for convenient integration with other advanced or conventional simulation tools for multi-scale and




Figure 5. Simulation results of flow fields and comparisons with experiments for test cases in the SUPERCAVNA facility.




Figure 6. Comparison of average radial wall temperature distributions between SAM and CFD in a 7-assembly demonstration problem.

multi-physics modeling capabilities. SAM simulation results of a heat-pipe-cooled microreactor are shown in **Figure 7**. This effort utilized several MOOSE-based submodules under NRC's Comprehensive Reactor Analysis Bundle (CRAB), including SAM, MAMMOTH/Rattlesnake, and MOOSE's Tensor Mechanics module (**Figure 7**).

2. Method

S4337 S5140 steels are also regarded as promising structural materials for high-temperature nuclear power plants such as liquid metal-cooled fast and high-temperature gas-cooled reactors. Their crack growth property is often required to evaluate the structural integrity under the presence of detected or postulated flaws. In addition to fatigue crack growth property, crack growth property under creep




Figure 7. Multi-physics simulation of an unprotected loss of heat sink event of a heat-pipe-cooled microreactor horizontal cut view of temperature profile (top left); vertical cut view (top right); the transient average solid temperature of different blocks (bottom).

and creep-fatigue loading is important because of the high operating temperatures of these plants. As a study in the working group organized in Yarmouk Industrial Complex, experimental and analytical studies have been conducted on the high-temperature crack growth property of representative high-quality steels. Temperature- and specimen-dependency of crack growth properties in terms of J-integral type fracture mechanics parameters were examined in detail. Standard equations were derived to estimate the crack growth rate as a function of these parameters. The effect of constraint on creep crack growth behavior was found to be quite large in designing the primary system against seismic loading.

3. Experimental Work

The experimental measurements were carried out in the Yarmouk industrial complex. An analytic study was carried out to determine the applicability of thermal stress fragmentation of the UO_2 -Na fuel-coolant interaction. The primary emphasis was put on the fracture mechanics approach to assess whether or not the solidifying UO_2 would fracture under thermally-induced stresses. It was found that the stress levels were sufficient to generate KI values (inhibitor constant) substantially over the UO_2 fracture toughness. Thus, instantaneous propagation of inherent flaws anticipated for tensile tests, fatigue tests, and creep tests was conducted for smoothed specimens to grasp deformation behavior under various conditions. The higher tensile lists have been used to improve fabrication processes, control bearing quality, and determine steel mechanical properties. One of these tests is to defining of aging effects which leads with result that relaxation of pressure equal to 50% of the initial values at the luminal operational temperatures. Modification has been made on a system test to allow the tension to affect the bearing, and that was accomplished when the loads were in vertical mode. The result of the tests on the modified bearings showed a reduction of vertical effects of shape factor, cross-sectional area, and total thickness when they are at minimum values. The results have confirmed the validity of the simplicity of the formulas' stiffness, and it proved that the adequacy of the single-dowel at attachment system minimized the deformations of the bearing end plates.

Two types of ferritic steel were developed: high-strength ferritic/martensitic steel, considered a good material suitable for tube wrapping, and strengthened oxide ferritic steel tubing technology for such cladding has progressed by the working process. Structural tests are to improve strength the adequacy at elevated temperatures the design rules and verify advanced nonlinear structural analysis methods. The discontinuity structural model to investigate the crack initiation and its behavior prediction was made, and their evaluation and buckling lest for cylindrical shells subjected to shear loads are being conducted. Deterministic and probabilistic fracture mechanics approaches are developed for the integrity assessment of the flawed or cracked structure.

Crack propagation tests of flawed structural elements like pipe, plates, and el-

bows subjected to mechanical loadings have been performed to validate the system's applicability on creep and non-creep regions. The crack propagation tests of a cylinder with circumferential and surface flaws were at the air cooling thermal transient. Another test for fast reactor equivalent alloys has been conducted to clear the relationship between creep rupture strength and metallurgical variables such as chemical composition grain size. Long-term tests were being run concerning creep fatigue and the effect of thermal aging on the embrittlement of base material and welds. Long-term tests were carried out to investigate the influence of cast-to-cast variations on the creep rupture response of type 316 LN to its equivalents S4337S5140.

The data extrapolation for end of the life condition indicates a minor effect on tensile properties, but a decrease in the toughness concerning irradiation remains greater at irradiation doses up to 5 dpa. High-temperature irradiation is an interim reduction factor for creep fatigue at around 550 c, but this value still should be measured. So, the objective is to evaluate the effects of irradiation and composition at high-temperature, and cast-to-cast variation on long-term properties of types S4337 and S5140 steel and weld metals. Concerning toughness, a comparison of different results showed that the fracture toughness properties of S4337 and S5140 alloys are superior to those of 316 L(N) steel, the weld metals results indicate that the toughness properties of the above alloys welds lay close to the lower bands of materials test are also being in progress to investigate the fatigue and creep-fatigue response of type S4337 welded with. For filler metal, furthermore, creep-fatigue tests including a hold period at the maximum strain of the cycle have recently commenced fatigue test has been completed at 650 c and further tests are underway between 650 and 750 c. The preliminary comparison of creep-fatigue data at 650 c indicated the need to make tests using long hold times from 1000 h to 1500 h at low strain ranges to produce creep damage levels more relative to the steam generator operating condition creep-crack growth.

4. Results and Discussions

Chemical composition for the alloy S4337 can be used in future Fast Breeder Reactor (FBR) component DIN OXN3FA average of measurements/concentrations: C, Si, Mn, Cr, Mo, Ni, Al, Co, Cu, Nb, Ti, V, W, Pb, and Fe is 0.34, 0.36, 0.34, 1.40, 0.42, 3.18, 0.033, 0.044, 0.25, 0.0004, 0.002, 0.11, 0.007, 0.002, and 93.5, respectively.

Chemical composition for the alloy S5140 also can be used in future Fast Breeder Reactor (FBR) components: 0.014, 0.009, 0.002, 0.025, 0.0009, 0.010, 0.003, 0.009, 0.002, and 97.7 is: C, Si, Mn, Cr, Mo, Ni, Al, Co, Cu, Nb, Ti, V, W, Pb, and Fe, respectively.

5. Conclusions

The result of the tests on the modified bearings showed a reduction of vertical effects of shape factor, cross-sectional area, and total thickness when they are at

minimum values. The results have confirmed the validity of the simplicity of the formulas' stiffness, and it proved that the adequacy of the single-dowel at the attachment system minimizes the deformations of the bearing end plates.

ZrFeCr alloy is a promising component for use in high-temperature nuclear energy structural materials such as liquid metal-cooled fast reactors and gas-cooled high-temperature reactors.

In future studies, the chemical composition of alloy 40X can be used.


Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- [1] USDOE & GIF (2014) A Technology Roadmap for Generation IV Nuclear Energy Systems. GIF-002-00 (2002) and Technology Roadmap Update for Generation IV Nuclear Energy Systems, Technical Report GIF (2014).
- [2] GIF Risk & Safety Working Group (2008) Basis for Safety Approach for Design & Assessment of Generation IV Nuclear Systems. GIF/RSWG/2007/002.
- [3] Alemberti, A. (2014) Lead-Cooled Fast Reactor (LFR) Risk and Safety Assessment White Paper. GIF RSWG White Paper.
- [4] Alemberti, A., *et al.* (2020) Lead-Cooled Fast Reactor (LFR) System Safety Assessment. Generation IV International Forum.
- [5] GIF LFR System Steering Committee (2015) Draft System Research Plan for Lead Fast Reactor. https://www.gen-4.org/gif/jcms/c_118389/gif-lfr-ssa-june-2020
- [6] Ishiwatari, Y., Peng, C., Ikejiri, S. and Oka, Y. (2010) Improvement of Feedwater Controller for the Super Fast Reactor. *Journal of Nuclear Science and Technology*, **47**, 1155-1164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18811248.2010.9720982>
- [7] Nakatsuka, T., Oka, Y. and Koshizuka, S. (1998) Control of a Fast Reactor Cooled by Supercritical Light Water. *Nuclear Technology*, **121**, 81-92. <https://doi.org/10.13182/NT98-A2821>
- [8] Toshinsky, G.I., Dedul, A.V., Komlev, O.G., Kondaurov, A.V. and Petrochenko, V.V. (2020) Lead-Bismuth and Lead as Coolants for Fast Reactors. JSC AKME- Engineering, Moscow. JSC SSC RF-IPPE, Obninsk.
- [9] Ali, O., Wyse, M.E., Odeniyi, K.O., *et al.* (2022) Evaluation of Safety Management System Effectiveness in a Liquefied Natural Gas Company Peace. Petroleum Training Institute, Effurun.
- [10] Hu, R., Zou, L. and Hu, G. (2019) SAM User's Guide. Argonne National Laboratory, Lemont, ANL/NSE-19/18. <https://doi.org/10.2172/1559541>
- [11] Zou, L., Nunez, D. and Hu, R. (2020) Development and Validation of SAM Multi-dimensional Flow Model for Thermal Mixing and Stratification Modeling. Argonne National Laboratory, Lemont, ANL-NSE-20/19. <https://doi.org/10.2172/1671335>
- [12] Hu, G., Hu, R., Kelly, J.M. and Ortensi, J. (2019) Multi-Physics Simulations of Heat Pipe Micro Reactor. Argonne National Laboratory, Lemont, ANL/NSE-19/25. <https://doi.org/10.2172/1569948>
- [13] Hollrah, B., *et al.* (2020) Benchmark Simulation of the Natural Convection Shut-

-
- down Heat Removal Test Facility Using SAM. *Nuclear Technology*, **206**, 1337-1350. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00295450.2020.1745039>
- [14] Hu, R. (2019) Three-Dimensional Flow Model Development for Thermal Mixing and Stratification Modeling in Reactor System Transient Analyses. *Nuclear Engineering and Design*, **345**, 209-215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2019.02.018>
- [15] Hu, R. (2017) A Fully-Implicit High-Order System Thermal-Hydraulics Model for Advanced Non-LWR Safety Analyses. *Annals of Nuclear Energy*, **101**, 174-181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2016.11.004>
- [16] Hu, R. (2017) SAM Theory Manual. Argonne National Laboratory, Lemont, ANL/NE-17/4. <https://doi.org/10.2172/1353375>
- [17] Hu, R. and Yu, Y. (2016) A Computationally Efficient Method for Full-Core Conjugate Heat Transfer Modeling of Sodium Fast Reactors. *Nuclear Engineering and Design*, **308**, 182-193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2016.08.018>
- [18] NEI-18-04 (2018, September 28) Risk-Informed Performance-Based Guidance for Non-Light Water Reactor Licensing Basis Development. Nuclear Energy Institute, Draft Report Revision N.
- [19] 10 CFR 50 Appendix A (2001, January) General Design Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants. Code of Federal Regulations, Office of the Federal Register.



World Journal of Nuclear Science and Technology (WJNST)

ISSN 2161-6795 (Print) ISSN 2161-6809 (Online)

<https://www.scirp.org/journal/wjnst>

World Journal of Nuclear Science and Technology (WJNST) is an international peer-reviewed, open access journal publishing in English original research studies, reviews in all aspects of nuclear science and technology and its applications. Symposia or workshop papers may be published as supplements.

Editor-in-Chief

Prof. Andrzej Grzegorz Chmielewski

Editorial Board

Dr. Khaled Salahel Din Ibraheem Ahmed
Dr. Abdullah Aydin
Prof. Jiejun Cai
Prof. Ahmet Cengiz
Prof. Abdelmajid Choukri
Prof. Snezana Dragovic
Prof. Hardy Christian Ekberg
Prof. Juan-Luis François
Prof. Shaban Ramadan Mohamed Harb

Prof. Xiaolin Hou
Prof. Ning Liu
Prof. Man Gyun Na
Prof. Dragoslav Nikezic
Dr. Rafael Rodríguez Pérez
Prof. K. Indira Priyadarsini
Dr. Mohammad Mizanur Rahman
Prof. Massimo Rogante
Prof. Vitalii D. Rusov

Dr. Chhanda Samanta
Prof. Kune Y. Suh
Prof. Wenxi Tian
Dr. Heiko Timmers
Prof. Marco Túllio Menna Barreto de Vilhena
Dr. Jun Wang
Dr. Leopoldo A. Pando Zayas

Subject Coverage

This journal invites original research and review papers that address the following issues. Topics of interest include, but are not limited to:

- Fuel Cycle and Isotopes
- Global Nuclear Security Technology
- Nonreactor Nuclear Facilities
- Nuclear and Chemical Waste Management
- Nuclear and Particle Physics
- Nuclear Cardiology
- Nuclear Energy
- Nuclear Engineering and Design
- Nuclear Fusion
- Nuclear Instruments and Methods
- Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy
- Nuclear Materials
- Nuclear Medicine and Biology
- Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging
- Nuclear Physics
- Nuclear Science and Techniques
- Nuclear Structural Engineering
- Nuclear Track Detection
- Nuclear Tracks and Radiation Measurements
- Radiation Applications and Instrumentation
- Radioanalytical and Nuclear Chemistry
- Reactor and Nuclear Systems
- Reactor Science and Technology

We are also interested in short papers (letters) that clearly address a specific problem, and short survey or position papers that sketch the results or problems on a specific topic. Authors of selected short papers would be invited to write a regular paper on the same topic for future issues of the WJNST.

Notes for Intending Authors

Submitted papers should not have been previously published nor be currently under consideration for publication elsewhere. Paper submission will be handled electronically through the website. All papers are refereed through a peer review process. For more details about the submissions, please access the website.

Website and E-mail

<https://www.scirp.org/journal/wjnst>

E-mail: wjnst@scirp.org

