



Building bridges between nuclear reactions and statistical models

D. Rochman

CNR*24 conference, Eric Bauge session, IAEA, Vienna, July 11th, 2024





Two examples of Eric's work

Two of his achievements linking physics and statistics:

BFMC + TMC

correlations due to integral constraints

DE LA RECHERCHE À L'INDUSTRIE

Correlations in nuclear data from integral constraints: cross-observables and cross-isotopes

Eric Bauge : CEA DAM DIF, France Dimitri Rochman : PSI, Swizerland

Fig. 1. (Color online) Schematic view of the "all model" evaluation method.

The Backward-Forward Monte-Carlo (BFMC)







- First applications of BFMC:
 - on ⁸⁹Y, Chadwick et al., <u>Nucl.Data Sheets 108 (2007) 2742</u>
 - on ²³⁹Pu, E. Bauge et al., <u>J. Korean Phys. Soc. 59 (2011) 1218</u>
 - on covariance + TMC, E. Bauge, <u>Nucl.Data Sheets 123 (2015) 201</u>
 - Followed by others
- BFMC: "inspired from Bayesian methods"
- Select the calculation with the smallest weight: this is the new evaluation

$$\chi_I^2 = \sum_{l,l'=1,..,m} (e_i^l - s_l) (\nu^{-1})_{ll'} (e_j^{l'} - s_{l'}).$$

$$w_I = C \ e^{-\left(\frac{\chi_I^2}{\chi_{\min}^2}\right)^2}$$

Example 1: BFMC + TMC







Based on pmf1 : ²³⁹Pu (EPJ/N 3 (2017) 14)



Summary

• A first attempt at the rigorous quantification of the $\sigma - \chi - \nu$ correlations existing in all the present evaluated nuclear data files

These correlation allow nuclear data files to reach target integral performance. (Evaluators have known that for a long time, but never advertised it).

A first demonstration is limited to a few PMFs (Eur. Phys. J. N 3, 14 (2017))

 Cross isotopes correlations (IMF7: BIGTEN known to strongly depend on both) ²³⁵U and ²³⁸U) can be guantified (submitted to EPJ N).

The posterior (weighted) distributions are not inconsistent with the best differential experiments.

 Adjusting for one integral exp. seems to improve agreement with other integral expt. (including with different neutronic spectra).

- Do we learn anything about the fission process ? NO !
- The ENDF6 format does not allow for storage or processing of such correlations







• Based on imf7 : ²³⁵U-²³⁸U (EPJ/N 4 (2018) 7)



• Based on 14 fast benchmarks : ²³⁵U- ²³⁸U-²³⁹Pu (EPJ Plus 133 (2018) 537)



Prior

Posterior





• Based on PWR cycles with boron concentration: (EPJ Plus 133 (2019) 453)





Posterior

PSI



- Based on PWR nuclide concentration measurements:
- Production of some measured fission products depends on both FY and XS
 Prior
 Posterior



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



- TENDL as a supporting library for JEFF
 - Formal and informal help of Eric since 2015
 - How to combine in-depth evaluations and broad approaches (and motivate people) ?
 - Adept of the "soft power": let's convinced people and not force a solution

- Varying models
 - Produce libraries purely on model variations since 2019
 - Only recently applied to TENDL-Astro



- Acknowledging the adjustment
 - From Eric's email (2018)

[...] One truth has to be hammered into shead :

benchmark data are already being used in the evaluation process of released libraries!

If the proposed file does not agree with the chosen benchmark suite (Mosteler for example) then the file in not accepted and evaluators go back to work. This part of the evaluation process is, at the time, not reflected in a mathematical way and barely acknowledged, but it doesn't mean it doesn't exist. There are two solutions : going on with denial (Roberto's) or try to model that existing process in a reproducible mathematical way (ours). [...]



Many thanks



• Questions?

