Comparison Between Continuous and Batchwise Online Reprocessing in Serpent2

Luke Seifert, Madicken Munk

University of Illinios at Urbana-Champaign, Department of Nuclear, Plasma, and Radiological Engineering, Urbana, IL 61801

Introduction

Molten Salt Reactor Online Reprocessing

- Depletion of Molten Salt Reactors requires accounting for reprocessing
- Batchwise modeling of Molten Salt Reactors is common [3, 2]
- Continuous modeling offers unique advantages over batchwise modeling

Comparison of Methods

- An identical toy model is implemented for both methods
- Continuous model uses varying number of steps
- Multiple approaches are implemented for the continuous model



Figure: Geometry of toy model used in Serpent2 for continuous and batchwise reprocessing models.

Objectives

- Capture the precise differences in continuous and batchwise models
- Determine effective depletion step sizes for continuous reprocessing
- Investigate validity of using average feed rates during depletion

Future Work

- Mass balancing of continuous reprocessing for full reactor
- Comparison of models for full reactor
- Depletion step size development over reactor lifetime

Reprocessing Models

Batchwise Reprocessing

- Iteratively perform depletion with external adjustments
- Small removals each depletion step is Steady Batch
- Full removal after set number of steps is Bulk Batch
- SaltProc used to run batchwise reprocessing for Serpent2

Continuous Reprocessing

- Adds "decay-like" term to Bateman equation, less iterative [1]

$$\frac{dN_j}{dt}_{base} = \sum_{i \neq j} \left[\left(\gamma_{i \to j} \sigma_{f,i} \Phi + \lambda_{i \to j} + \sigma_{i \to j} \Phi \right) N_i \right] - \left(\lambda_j + \sigma_j \Phi \right) N_j$$

$$\frac{dN_j}{dt}_{net} = \frac{dN_j}{dt}_{base} - \lambda_{r,j} N_j + \sum_{mat} \lambda_{r,i \to j} N_i$$

- Cycle Time Decay model treats reprocessing as decay

$$\lambda_r = \frac{ln(2)}{\tau_{1/2}}$$

- Cycle Rate treats as linear fractional removal, same as Steady Batch

$$\lambda_r = ln\left(\frac{1}{1 - X}\right)$$

- SaltProc Cycle Rate mimics batchwise reprocessing with continuous model

Model Overview

Table: Different Reprocessing Approaches

Approach	Cycle Time	$\tau_{1/2}$	X [s^{-1}]	λ_r [s^{-1}]
Bulk Batch [3d]	20 s	-	-	-
Bulk Batch [3d]	30 d	-	-	-
Steady Batch [3d]	20 s	-	3.86E-6	-
Steady Batch [3d]	3 d	-	3.86E-6	-
Steady Batch [3d]	30 d	-	3.86E-7	-
Cycle Time Decay	20 s	10 s	-	6.93E-2
Cycle Time Decay	3 d	1.5 d	-	5.35E-6
Cycle Rate	20 s	-	0.05	5.13E-2
Cycle Rate	3 d	-	3.86E-6	3.86E-6
SaltProc Cycle Rate	20 s	-	3.86E-6	3.86E-6
SaltProc Cycle Rate	3 d	-	3.86E-6	3.86E-6
SaltProc Cycle Rate	30 d	-	3.86E-7	3.86E-7

Results

Comparison Results



Figure: Continuous and batch models k_{eff} over time when using the matching depletion steps and feed rates and when continuous uses a single step and average feed rates.

Table: k_{eff} at 30 Days for 3 and 30 Day Steps

Approach	3d Step k_{eff}	30d Step k_{eff}	Diff [pcm]
CR	0.622815	0.622043	77
SPCR	0.612871	0.611481	140
CTD	0.62241	0.623246	84
CTRL	0.594924	0.595784	86

Acknowledgements

This material is based upon work supported under an Integrated University Program Graduate Fellowship. The authors are grateful for this generous support.

The authors thank Kathryn Huff for her contribution and support of this work in its early stages.

Contact Information

- Email: seifert5@illinois.edu
- Phone: +1 865 279 0603

References

[1] M. Aufiero, A. Cammi, C. Fiorina, J. LeppÃdnen, L. Luzzi, and M. Ricotti.
An extended version of the SERPENT-2 code to investigate fuel burn-up and core material evolution of the Molten Salt Fast Reactor.
Journal of Nuclear Materials, 441(1-3):473–486, Oct. 2013.

[2] B. R. Betzler, J. J. Powers, and A. Worrall.
Molten salt reactor neutronics and fuel cycle modeling and simulation with SCALE.
Annals of Nuclear Energy, 101:489–503, Mar. 2017.

[3] A. Rykhlevskii, J. W. Bae, and K. D. Huff.
Modeling and simulation of online reprocessing in the thorium-fueled molten salt breeder reactor.
Annals of Nuclear Energy, 128:366–379, June 2019.