

**Identifying MSR Multiphysics Modeling Challenges**

*Principal Investigator*  
Kathryn D. Huff

**UIUC-ARFC-2019-01**

Advanced Reactors and Fuel Cycles  
Dept. of Nuclear, Plasma, & Radiological Engineering  
University of Illiois at Urbana-Champaign  
image  
*This research was performed using funding received from Battelle Energy Alliance LLC, Idaho National Laboratory Standard Research Contract 214196.*

# Introduction

Solid fueled nuclear reactors differ from liquid fueled reactors with respect to many physical domains including neutronics, thermal hydraulics, and materials performance. Accordingly, liquid fueled reactors challenge the capabilities of conventional computational tools designed for modeling and simulating the physics of solid fueled reactors.

These challenges compound one another in numerical simulations that model the coupling between physics, particularly in liquid fueled reactors in which the fuel *circulates*. In such reactors, neutron kinetics, fuel depletion, heat transport, and fluid flow couple together much more tightly, stiffening the interdependent system of PDEs driving reactor behavior. While solid fueled reactor simulation can accurately couple neutronics and thermal hydraulics through operator splitting techniques and loose coupling, such approaches cannot capture the tightly coupled multiphysics of reactors with circulating liquid fuel.

# Liquid vs. Solid Fuel

Differences between liquid and solid fueled designs arise primarily from the mobility of the dissolved fuel. This feature impacts neutronics, thermal hydraulics, and the relationship between them. In particular, modeling and simulating time dependent reactor dynamics can require new methods when coupling neutron kinetics, feedbacks, and depletion dynamics with fuel expansion, flow dynamics, heat removal, and system safety.

## Neutronic Differences

In all liquid fueled molten salt reactors, salt movement directly impacts neutron kinetics and control through delayed neutron precursor movement. Since the fissionable material is dissolved in the fuel salt, isotopes produced by fission also move congruously with the salt. Reactor controllability hinges upon delayed neutron precursors, which contribute to , the delayed neutron precursor fraction.

Circulating fuels can additionally be reprocessed during reactor operation. Thus, fuel composition in liquid fueled reactors not only varies with in-core transmutation, but also through out-of-core chemical extraction, gas sparging, mechanical filtering, and other methods. For example, several fission products selectively precipitate onto nickel surfaces in fluoride salt, as documented in (Engel et al. 1980), allowing those to be removed when the fuel salt is circulated out of the core, reducing unwanted neutron absorption. These dynamics occur on fast timescales (minutes) if the fuel is reprocessed “online” or on slower, discrete timescales if the design involves processing in batches.

Very long fuel residence times in circulating, liquid fueled reactors also presents a challenge regarding depletion dynamics. In contrast to legacy reactors, material damage to the fuel does not limit burnup. Instead, corrosion and fast neutron damage to other structures (e.g. graphite moderation structures) limit burnup. If those structures are protected (as in (Engel et al. 1980)) reactor operation can continue without opening the vessel for thirty or more years. The buildup and transmutation of fission products in the vessel during that time impacts reaction rates over the course of years or decades. Computational tools to accurately characterise this depletion evolution must incorporate chemical processing logistics as well.

Additionally, fuel temperature reactivity feedback related to salt density is very strong in liquid fueled MSRs. Though the fuel salt remains single phase, density variation with temperature impacts fuel isotope number densities, , and corresponding reaction rates , resulting in very strong fuel temperature feedbacks. For example, in fast-spectrum fluoride MSRs, salt expansion contributes approximately half of the total temperature reactivity coefficient (M. Aufiero, Fratoni, and Rubiolo 2017).

## Thermal Hydraulic Differences

In MSR concepts, the fuel salt remains in a single, liquid phase throughout normal operation. And, in contrast to conventional reactors, MSRs operate at near atmospheric pressures and very high temperatures, frequently with very high Prandtl number flow. Natural circulation in these fluids plays a strong role in reactor performance, and although many designs incorporate pumps to drive fuel circulation, some designs may rely on natural circulation driven flow instead.

Such single-phase flows can typically be modeled with the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations or a weakly compressible lattice-Boltzmann equation. However, in startup, shutdown, off-normal operation, and accident scenarios, simulations may need to capture the solid and gaseous phases as well.

The gaseous phase must be considered because gaseous fission product isotopes appear in the liquid fuel during operation. As gaseous fission product inventory evolves, microbubbles may form when these gases coalesce. Aufiero et al. (M. Aufiero, Fratoni, and Rubiolo 2017) recently showed significant impact to reactor neutronics from compressibility in the salt potentially introduced by such microbubbles. Since these microbubbles cannot be neglected in safety assessment, mass transport must be incorporated into any multiphysics assessment of liquid-fueled MSRs.

In certain designs stationary flow vortices may develop as well, potentially causing the fuel salt in that location to overheat and evaporate. Such voiding can be avoided at the design stage if computational tools can accurately capture such vortical stagnation points in the flow.

Finally, the solid phase may need to be considered when simulating “freeze plugs,” solidified salt which may block a channel. Some designs incorporate freeze as an intentional safety valve which melts at a high core temperature, allowing the core salt to drop into a dump tank or other safe configuration (Q. Li et al. 2014). Transition into solid phase (freezing) is most likely to occur in small out-of-core fuel piping under off-normal scenarios.

Toward validation of this software, new experimental flow loops (e.g. (Britsch et al. 2019)), promise to correct a dearth of experimental data regarding thermophysical properties for these salts and their natural circulation behavior.

## Coupling Differences

While loose coupling (e.g. operator splitting) can be sufficient for solid fueld reactors, tight interdependencies among neutronics and thermal hydraulics must be modeled as tightly or fully coupled. A fully coupled approach demands methods which are stable, parallelizable, and multi-scale. Common approximations in both thermal hydraulics and neutronics may need to be used with care. Specifically, methods which neglect density variation (e.g. Boussinesq), rapidly changing isotopics (e.g. cross sections generated a single isotopic composition), or compressibility (Navier-Stokes), may fail to capture important coupled phenomena.

Additionally, simulation of time dependent multiphysics phenomena in MSRs must handle neutronics concerns at many time scales such as density-driven temperature feedbacks, delayed neutron precursor drift, and composition changes due to online reprocessing. Multiphysics modeling must similarly handle thermal hydraulics concerns such as thermal expansion, compressibility due to fission gases, natural circulation, and evaporation or solidification of the fuel salt.

# Coupled Multiphysics Modeling

Forward looking needs and challenges for modeling and simulation of any molten salt reactor will address separate neutronic and thermal hydraulic modeling challenges as well as unique issues with respect to coupling them.

## Current Tools


With the inclusion of the MSR among the Generation-IV reactor designs (GIF 2008; GIF 2015) and many new nuclear companies proposing both liquid-fueled and solid-fueled commercial MSR concepts (Hyde and McWhirter 2015; Leblanc 2015; ThorCon 2017; Scarlat et al. 2014; Transatomic Power Corporation 2016), corresponding tools for modeling and simulation of the coupled physics are in development internationally.

Standard Monte Carlo (Leppanen et al. 2015; Werner 2017) and deterministic (Rearden and Jessee 2016) transport solvers capably handle static neutronic analysis of MSRs However, time dependent kinetics and dynamics analysis cannot be achieved with conventional software. Toward this end, various efforts have extended or created custom tools which incorporate delayed neutron precursor drift. Some solutions have coupled CFD with Monte Carlo, while others are built on software packages such as COMSOL (AB 2018) or MOOSE (D. R. Gaston et al. 2015; D. Gaston et al. 2009) fundamentally designed for multiphysics coupling.

In 2007, Krepel et al. extended the LWR diffusion code DYN3D to incorporate delayed neutron precursor drift and fission energy release directly into the mobile coolant. Krepel et al. demonstrated the resulting tool, DYN3D-MSR, via simulation of the MSRE (Krepel et al. 2007). Soon thereafter, Kophazi et al. used iterative coupling between in-house three-dimensional neutronic and one-dimensional heat conduction models DALTON and THERM to analyze normal MSRE operation as well as channel-blocking-incident transients (Kophazi, Lathouwers, and Kloosterman 2009). The Kophazi model added entrance effects of heat transfer coefficients as well as thermal coupling between fuel channels through moderator heat conduction.


More recently, Cammi et al. performed a 2D-axisymmetric single-channel analysis of the MSBR using the commercial finite element package COMSOL Multiphysics (A. Cammi et al. 2011). That work directly solved for the fuel salt velocity field, used heterogeneous group constants in fuel and moderator regions, and employed the COMSOL software package intrinsically designed for coupled multiphysics simulation. Fiorina, Lathouwers, and their colleagues conducted a benchmarking exercise (Fiorina et al. 2014) in which this Politecnico di Milano approach was expanded to a multi-channel model of the MSFR and compared to code from the University of Delft (De Zwaan et al. 2007; Linden 2012) based on the 2009 DALTON/THERM iterative coupling approach in (Kophazi, Lathouwers, and Kloosterman 2009). These models showed good agreement for multiple accident transients. Meanwhile, leveraging lessons learned from these efforts resulted in a multiscale approach from Zanetti et al. in 2015 (Zanetti et al. 2015) successfully combines high and low geometric fidelity for graphite-moderated MSRs.

The most recent developments in this area leverage open frameworks such as the multiphysics MOOSE framework (D. R. Gaston et al. 2015; D. Gaston et al. 2009) or the CFD framework OpenFOAM(Weller et al. 1998). In concert with the INL MOOSE framework, Lindsay et al. (Lindsay et al. 2018; Lindsay and Huff 2018) developed and demonstrated a finite element based application, Moltres, with full coupling between multi-group diffusion neutronics with delayed neutron precursor drift and the Navier Stokes equations. Moltres is in continued active development (K. D. Huff 2018) at the University of Illinois alongside the helper utility SaltProc (Rykhlevskii, Bae, and Huff 2018; Rykhlevskii, Lindsay, and Huff 2017) which simulates online fuel reprocessing via depletion with SERPENT2(Leppanen et al. 2015). The processing flow chart for SaltProc v.1.0 appears in Figure [fig:saltproc].



SaltProc couples to Serpent to add and remove specific isotopes from the core at the appropriate reprocessing intervals, mass rate, removal efficiency to simulate fuel management. Figure reproduced from (Rykhlevskii, Bae, and Huff 2018; Rykhlevskii, Lindsay, and Huff 2017).

Very recently, Aufiero et al. (M. Aufiero et al. 2014) have begun to approach transient simulations in the MSFR within the finite volume OpenFOAM CFD toolkit (Weller et al. 1998). This approach benefits from pre-implemented turbulence models available in the OpenFOAM library and captures the full-core three-dimensional geometry of the reactor primary circuit. OpenFOAM CFD has additionally been shown by Laureau et al. (Laureau et al. 2017) to couple well with Transient Fission Matrix neutronics within the MSFR. This OpenFOAM coupling approach also enabled the first analysis of compressibility effects in the MSFR by Aufiero et al. (M. Aufiero, Fratoni, and Rubiolo 2017). That work has been extended this year by Cervi et al., who incorporated modeling of a helium bubbling system envisioned for fission product removal in the MSFR and assessed the impacts of that system on coupled thermal hydraulics and neutronics with respect to compressibility (Cervi et al. 2019). As shown in Figure [fig:cervi], reproduced from (Cervi et al. 2019), this simulation approach uses tight, but not full coupling, in order to incorporate the fidelity awarded by Monte Carlo neutronics.



In this figure reproduced from (Cervi et al. 2019), the structure of the coupling between Serpent and OpenFOAM is shown. Picard iterations seek convergence of the thermal hydraulic solution, then proceeds to solve the neutronics iterations.

Regarding thermal hydraulics, Leandro et al. (Leandro et al. 2019) demonstrated MSRE systems analysis with the NEAMS SAM module. Pressure drop predictions compared well to results from the MSRE as well as RELAP5-3D simulation comparisons. Meanwhile, the existing MSR multiphysics simulation tools mentioned in the previous section each capture some, but not all thermal hydraulic phenomena of importance in these reactors. With regard to thermal hydraulic modeling challenges, none of the current multiphysics tools capture one key operational safety challenge for these reactor types. Preliminary analysis indicates that serious local power density concerns may arise from *stagnation points* in liquid fueled MSRs. When flow vortices arise in the core, fuel may become trapped in the vortical stagnation points, driving temperature increase which could damage reactor components or initiate boiling. Quantifying the likelihood of stagnation points for the many operational states expected in these designs (e.g. load-following transients) is currently beyond the capability of existing molten salt multiphysics tools.

## Multiphysics Coupling Needs

For stability, modeling multiphysics modeling and simulation approaches in MSR regimes should use stable, fully coupled PDE solver methods such as JFNK. To capture the multi-scale nature of these systems simulations should incorporate adaptive meshing in both time and space. For parallelizability, mesh handling methods such as domain decomposition must be available in the multiphysics framework or if the mesh is not domain decomposed, then the framework must scale well in memory. Applications built on the MOOSE and COMSOL frameworks both satisfy all of these requirements.

## Conclusion

To summarize, the main modeling and simulation needs for successful coupled multiphysics MSR simulation stem from neutronic and thermal hydraulic behaviors unique to circulating molten salt fuels. While state-of-the-art MSR simulation approaches now handle treatment of delayed neutron precursor drift, many tools lack treatment of salt compressibility, potential formation of vortical stagnation points, fuel composition variability due to online reprocessing, and treatment of natural circulation flow for mildly compressible high temperature high Prandtl number flows. Furthermore, some high fidelity methods (e.g. Monte Carlo transport) challenge implementation within multiphysics simulation frameworks enabling full coupling. Finally, a dearth of experimental data limits validation of all of these tools, though new natural circulation flow loops, corrosion studies, and fission product removal experiments promise to improve validation capabilities.

# Opportunities

Tools such as Moltres (Lindsay et al. 2018) can be improved by incorporating compressibility into their thermal hydraulic models and by introducing higher fidelity methods for neutron transport into MOOSE applications.

All existing tools could benefit from composition modeling that incorporates isotopic changes on the minute-to-minute, and hour-to-hour timescales inherent to online reprocessing systems.

And, all existing multiphysics tools are lacking stagnation point modeling and simulation. One option is to leverage high fidelity thermal hydraulic and neutronics tools to improve coupled neutronics-and-thermal-hydraulics multiphysics capabilities, predictively simulate vortices and similar thermal hydraulic phenomena, identify experimental data needs, and clarify the licensing pathway for these designs. High order fluid dynamics simulations of these vortices could rely on methods in a spectral element code such as Nek5000 (Fischer et al. 2008). Reduced order models, informed by such simulations could be implemented in the MOOSE (D. Gaston et al. 2009) application, Moltres (Lindsay et al. 2018) which captures coupled multi-group neutronics, simplified thermal hydraulics, and delayed neutron precursor drift in liquid fueled MSRs. Additionally, geometrically detailed power distributions (needed by Nek5000) and few-group cross sections (needed by Moltres) can be generated with the high fidelity Monte Carlo neutron transport software, Serpent (Leppanen et al. 2015).

AB, COMSOL. 2018. “COMSOL Multiphysics.” Stokholm, Sweden: COMSOL AB. <www.comsol.com>.

Aufiero, Manuele, Antonio Cammi, Olivier Geoffroy, Mario Losa, Lelio Luzzi, Marco E. Ricotti, and Hervé Rouch. 2014. “Development of an OpenFOAM Model for the Molten Salt Fast Reactor Transient Analysis.” *Chemical Engineering Science* 111 (May): 390–401. doi:[10.1016/j.ces.2014.03.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ces.2014.03.003).

Aufiero, Manuele, Massimiliano Fratoni, and Pablo Rubiolo. 2017. “Monte Carlo/CFD Coupling for Accurate Modeling of the Delayed Neutron Precursors and Compressibility Effects in Molten Salt Reactors.” In *Transactions of the American Nuclear Society Annual Meeting*. Vol. 116. San Francisco, CA: ANS.

Britsch, Karl, Mark Anderson, Paul Brooks, and Kumar Sridharan. 2019. “Natural Circulation FLiBe Loop Overview.” *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer* 134 (May): 970–83. doi:[10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2018.12.180](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2018.12.180).

Cammi, Antonio, Valentino Di Marcello, Lelio Luzzi, Vito Memoli, and Marco Enrico Ricotti. 2011. “A Multi-Physics Modelling Approach to the Dynamics of Molten Salt Reactors.” *Annals of Nuclear Energy* 38 (6): 1356–72. doi:[10.1016/j.anucene.2011.01.037](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2011.01.037).

Cervi, E., S. Lorenzi, A. Cammi, and L. Luzzi. 2019. “Development of a Multiphysics Model for the Study of Fuel Compressibility Effects in the Molten Salt Fast Reactor.” *Chemical Engineering Science* 193 (January): 379–93. doi:[10.1016/j.ces.2018.09.025](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ces.2018.09.025).

De Zwaan, S. J., B. Boer, D. Lathouwers, and J. L. Kloosterman. 2007. “Static Design of a Liquid-Salt-Cooled Pebble Bed Reactor (LSPBR).” *Annals of Nuclear Energy* 34 (1): 83–92.

Engel, J.R., H.F. Bauman, J.F. Dearing, W.R. Grimes, H.E. McCoy, and W.A. Rhoades. 1980. “Conceptual Design Characteristics of a Denatured Molten-Salt Reactor with Once-Through Fueling.” Department of Energy ORNL/TM-7207, 5352526. Oak Ridge, TN, United States: Oak Ridge National Laboratory. <http://www.osti.gov/scitech/biblio/5352526>.

Fiorina, Carlo, Danny Lathouwers, Manuele Aufiero, Antonio Cammi, Claudia Guerrieri, Jan Leen Kloosterman, Lelio Luzzi, and Marco Enrico Ricotti. 2014. “Modelling and Analysis of the MSFR Transient Behaviour.” *Annals of Nuclear Energy* 64 (Supplement C): 485–98. doi:[10.1016/j.anucene.2013.08.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2013.08.003).

Fischer, P, J Lottes, D Pointer, and A Siegel. 2008. “Petascale Algorithms for Reactor Hydrodynamics.” *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* 125 (1): 012076. doi:[10.1088/1742-6596/125/1/012076](https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/125/1/012076).

Gaston, D., G. Hansen, S. Kadioglu, D. A. Knoll, C. Newman, H. Park, C. Permann, and W. Taitano. 2009. “Parallel Multiphysics Algorithms and Software for Computational Nuclear Engineering.” *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* 180 (1): 012012. doi:[10.1088/1742-6596/180/1/012012](https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/180/1/012012).

Gaston, Derek R., Cody J. Permann, John W. Peterson, Andrew E. Slaughter, David Andrš, Yaqi Wang, Michael P. Short, et al. 2015. “Physics-Based Multiscale Coupling for Full Core Nuclear Reactor Simulation.” *Annals of Nuclear Energy*, Multi-Physics Modelling of LWR Static and Transient Behaviour, 84 (October): 45–54. doi:[10.1016/j.anucene.2014.09.060](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2014.09.060).

GIF. 2008. “Generation IV International Forum 2008 Annual Report.” Generation IV International Forum.

———. 2015. “Generation IV International Forum 2015 Annual Report.” Generation IV International Forum.

Huff, Kathryn D. 2018. “Neutron Kinetics in Liquid-Fueled Nuclear Reactors.” Invited Talk. Mumbai, India. <https://katyhuff.github.io/2018-12-18-mumbai>.

Hyde, Roderick A., and Jon D. McWhirter. 2015. Liquid fuel nuclear fission reactor. US9183953 B2, issued November 2015. <http://www.google.com/patents/US9183953>.

Kophazi, J., D. Lathouwers, and J.L. Kloosterman. 2009. “Development of a Three-Dimensional Time-Dependent Calculation Scheme for Molten Salt Reactors and Validation of the Measurement Data of the Molten Salt Reactor Experiment.” *Nuclear Science and Engineering* 163 (2): 118–31.

Krepel, Jiří, Ulrich Rohde, Ulrich Grundmann, and Frank-Peter Weiss. 2007. “DYN3D-MSR Spatial Dynamics Code for Molten Salt Reactors.” *Annals of Nuclear Energy* 34 (6): 449–62. doi:[10.1016/j.anucene.2006.12.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2006.12.011).

Laureau, A., D. Heuer, E. Merle-Lucotte, P. R. Rubiolo, M. Allibert, and M. Aufiero. 2017. “Transient Coupled Calculations of the Molten Salt Fast Reactor Using the Transient Fission Matrix Approach.” *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 316 (Supplement C): 112–24. doi:[10.1016/j.nucengdes.2017.02.022](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2017.02.022).

Leandro, Adrian M., Florent Heidet, Rui Hu, and Nicholas R. Brown. 2019. “Thermal Hydraulic Model of the Molten Salt Reactor Experiment with the NEAMS System Analysis Module.” *Annals of Nuclear Energy* 126 (April): 59–67. doi:[10.1016/j.anucene.2018.10.060](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2018.10.060).

Leblanc, David. 2015. Integral molten salt reactor. WO2015017928 A1, issued February 2015. <http://www.google.com/patents/WO2015017928A1>.

Leppanen, Jaakko, Maria Pusa, Tuomas Viitanen, Ville Valtavirta, and Toni Kaltiaisenaho. 2015. “The Serpent Monte Carlo Code: Status, Development and Applications in 2013.” *Annals of Nuclear Energy*, Joint International Conference on Supercomputing in Nuclear Applications and Monte Carlo 2013, SNA + MC 2013. Pluri- and Trans-disciplinarity, Towards New Modeling and Numerical Simulation Paradigms, 82 (August): 142–50. doi:[10.1016/j.anucene.2014.08.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2014.08.024).

Li, Qiming, Zhongfeng Tang, Yuan Fu, Zhong Li, and Naxiu Wang. 2014. “Preliminary Study of the Use of Freeze-Valves for a Passive Shutdown System in Molten Salt Reactors.” In, 325–41. American Society of Mechanical Engineers. doi:[10.1115/NRC2014-5025](https://doi.org/10.1115/NRC2014-5025).

Linden, Erik van der. 2012. “Coupled Neutronics and Computational Fluid Dynamics for the Molten Salt Fast Reactor.” *Delft University of Technology*.

Lindsay, Alexander, and Kathryn Huff. 2018. “Moltres: Finite Element Based Simulation of Molten Salt Reactors.” *The Journal of Open Source Software* 3 (21): 1–2. doi:[10.21105/joss.00298](https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.00298).

Lindsay, Alexander, Gavin Ridley, Andrei Rykhlevskii, and Kathryn Huff. 2018. “Introduction to Moltres: An Application for Simulation of Molten Salt Reactors.” *Annals of Nuclear Energy* 114 (April): 530–40. doi:[10.1016/j.anucene.2017.12.025](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2017.12.025).

Rearden, Bradley T., and Matthew A. Jessee. 2016. “SCALE: A Comprehensive Modeling and Simulation Suite for Nuclear Safety Analysis and Design.” Technology Manual ORNL/TM-2005/39, Version 6.2. Oak Ridge, TN, United States: Oak Ridge National Laboratory. <https://www.ornl.gov/sites/default/files/SCALE%20Code%20System.pdf>.

Rykhlevskii, Andrei, Jin Whan Bae, and Kathryn Huff. 2018. “Modeling and Simulation of Online Reprocessing in the Molten Salt Breeder Reactor.” *Submitted*, September.

Rykhlevskii, Andrei, Alexander Lindsay, and Kathryn D. Huff. 2017. “Online Reprocessing Simulation for Thorium-Fueled Molten Salt Breeder Reactor.” In *Transactions of the American Nuclear Society*. Washington, DC, United States: American Nuclear Society.

Scarlat, Raluca O., Michael R. Laufer, Edward D. Blandford, Nicolas Zweibaum, David L. Krumwiede, Anselmo T. Cisneros, Charalampos Andreades, et al. 2014. “Design and Licensing Strategies for the Fluoride-Salt-Cooled, High-Temperature Reactor (FHR) Technology.” *Progress in Nuclear Energy* 77 (November): 406–20. doi:[10.1016/j.pnucene.2014.07.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnucene.2014.07.002).

ThorCon. 2017. “The Do-Able Molten Salt Reactor.” Stevenson, WA: ThorCon USA Inc.

Transatomic Power Corporation. 2016. “Neutronics Overview.” White Paper 1.1. Cambridge, MA, United States: Transatomic Power Corporation. <http://www.transatomicpower.com/new-neutronics-white-paper-2/>.

Weller, Henry G., G. Tabor, Hrvoje Jasak, and C. Fureby. 1998. “A Tensorial Approach to Computational Continuum Mechanics Using Object-Oriented Techniques.” *Computers in Physics* 12 (6): 620–31. <http://scitation.aip.org/content/aip/journal/cip/12/6/10.1063/1.168744>.

Werner, Christopher J. 2017. “MCNP USERS MANUAL Code Version 6.2.” User Manual la-ur-17-29981. Los Alamos, NM, United States: Los Alamos National Lab. (LANL), Los Alamos, NM (United States). <https://laws.lanl.gov/vhosts/mcnp.lanl.gov/pdf_files/la-ur-17-29981.pdf>.

Zanetti, Matteo, Antonio Cammi, Carlo Fiorina, and Lelio Luzzi. 2015. “A Geometric Multiscale Modelling Approach to the Analysis of MSR Plant Dynamics.” *Progress in Nuclear Energy* 83 (Supplement C): 82–98. doi:[10.1016/j.pnucene.2015.02.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnucene.2015.02.014).