

31st International Seminar on Interaction of Neutrons with Nuclei: Fundamental Interactions & Neutrons, Nuclear Structure, Ultracold Neutrons, Related Topics (ISINN-31)



Analysis of Physical Parameters of the New High-Flux Pulse Reactor

Presenter:

Chereshkov, Dimitar Georgiev

25-30 May 2025, Dongguan, China

Outline



- Aim and objectives
- Pulse reactor NEPTUNE
- Fuel composition
- Benchmark for determining the critical mass of neptunium
- Comparison of benchmark models with experiment
- Comparison of different fuel-loaded reactors
- Key characteristics of the reactor
- Optimization of research reactor parameters
- Conclusions
- References

Aim and objectives

Aim:

Justification of NEPTUNE relevance for neutron studies.



Objectives:

Evaluation of the parameters of the neptunium reactor.
Analysis of different types of fuels.
Optimization of the parameters of the reactor.



Pulse reactor NEPTUNE



Main aims of NEPTUNE development:

 \oplus

Successful continuation of the neutron research program following the end of the operational life of the IBR-2M.

 \oplus

Adhering to the new standards set by the homeland and the global legislation.



Fuel composition

Advantages



The effective threshold of ²³⁷Np (0,4 MeV) is noticeably lower than the fission threshold of ²³⁸U

The lifetime of the fast neutron generation (τ) in the neptunium zone is significantly lower than in the plutonium one

The effective delayed neutron fraction $\beta_{9\phi}$ is noticeably lower than the same value for ²³⁹Pu

Disadvantages

(-)

Little-studied properties of nitride fuel in reactor conditions

Insignificant experience of the neptunium as a fuel fraction

Lack of infrastructure for the production of fuel compositions

Benchmark for determining the critical mass of neptunium





Fig. 1: Experiment scheme



Fig. 2: Neptunium sphere

The neptunium sphere weight – 6,0704 kg.

This experiment was performed in an effort to decrease the uncertainty in the critical mass of ²³⁷Np.

Comparison of benchmark models with experiment





Fig. 3: Benchmark model

Table 2: Comparison of effective multiplication factors

Parameter	Los Alamos	JINR	Experiment
k _{eff}	$0,9978 \pm 0,0002$	$0,99612 \pm 0,0001$	$1,0026 \pm 0,0001$
Δk, pcm	480	648	_

We can assume that our calculations are close to the calculations at Los Alamos and the result of the experiment.

Comparison of different fuel-loaded reactor models





Table 3: Comparison of parameters of different fuelloaded reactors

Parameter	NpN	UO ₂	PuO ₂
Prompt neutron lifetime, s	1,0.10-8	4,9.10-7	1,7.10-7
Effective delayed neutron fraction, %	0,140	0,730	0,220
Max. neutron flux, n/cm ² .s	1,22.10 ¹⁴	1,1.10 ¹³	2,5.10 ¹³

Fig. 4: Reactor model of NEPTUNE

Key characteristics of the reactor



Pulse length:

 $\theta_{eff} \cong (\frac{\tau}{\alpha V^2})^{\frac{1}{3}}$

Pulse delayed neutron fraction:

$$\beta_p \cong 0.5 \; (\alpha \; V^2 \; \tau^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}$$

where: τ – average neutron lifetime; V – linear velocity of the reactivity modulator; α – reactivity modulator parabola coefficient.

Pulse energy Q:

Power spread of pulse energy Q:

$$Q \cong S\pi B \frac{\tau}{\varepsilon_m} \exp\left(\frac{4B}{3}\right) \qquad 0$$

$$Q \cong Q_{nom} \exp\left(\frac{\Delta\rho}{\beta_p}\right)$$

Optimization of research reactor parameters

Further possible changes:

- ① Reactor and fuel element designs
- ② Fuel composition by adding other isotopes



With a change in the isotopic composition of the fuel in the core, it is possible to achieve an increase in the average neutron lifetime by 2-3 times.

Conclusions



: The possibility of obtaining shorter bursts while maintaining the neutron flux.

[·] Reduction of background power in the intervals between pulses in comparison with other options.

: Lack of infrastructure for the production of fuel compositions.

: Reactor parameter optimization work is performed for criticality safety and nonproliferation issues.

References



- 1. E. P. Shabalin. Fast pulsed reactors. Moscow: Atomizdat, 1976. 248 p.
- V.L. Aksenov, M.V. Rzyanin & E.P. Shabalin. Research Reactors at JINR: Looking into the Future. Phys. Part. Nuclei 52, 1019–1032 (2021).
- E. P. Shabalin, V. L. Aksenov. Conception of Dubna Neutron Source of the Fourth Generation. Poverhnost`. Rengenovskie, sinhotronnyie i neytronnyie issledovaniya 7, 13— 19 (2018).
- 4. E. P. Shabalin, V. L. Aksenov, G. G. Komyshev, A. D. Rogov. Neptunium-Based High-Flux Pulsed Research Reactor. Atomic Energy 124 (6), 364-370 (2018).





Thank you for your attention!

Chereshkov, Dimitar Georgiev Engineer, New Neutron Source Department

e-mail: dimchereshkov@nf.jinr.ru



