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A method for determining the effective delayed neutron fraction $\beta_{\text{eff}}$ using in-pile reactivity oscillations and Fourier analysis is presented. This method is based on measurements of the reactor's power response to small periodic in-pile reactivity perturbations and utilizes Fourier analysis for reconstruction of the reactor zero power transfer function. This approach enables the estimation of $\beta_{\text{eff}}$ using multi-parameter nonlinear weighted least-squares fit. The method extends previous works by accounting for higher harmonics excitation in the frequency domain by the trapezoidal reactivity signal, both in the reactivity perturbation and in the reactor power response. We show that by using this new approach it is possible to obtain the reactor transfer function in a wide range of frequencies, using only a single oscillation frequency. This method is applied to a set of measurements of the MAESTRO core configuration in the MINERVE zero power reactor (ZPR) located at the Cadarache Research Center. The derived value of $\beta_{\text{eff}}$, using this method, is $711 \pm 17$ pcm.
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1. Introduction

Delayed neutrons are of fundamental importance in the field of nuclear reactor dynamics and control. Although only a small fraction of the neutrons emitted by fission are not prompt, the knowledge of the delayed neutron parameters is essential for transient analysis, such as startup or shutdown of the reactor, as well as for accident analysis and control system design [1].

A well-known model frequently implemented in the study of nuclear reactor dynamics is the point reactor model. In the context of this model, the delayed neutron characteristics are lumped in several representative groups of constant parameters which adequately describe the time dependence of the delayed neutron precursors [2]. One of the main delayed neutron parameters used in the point reactor model equations is the effective delayed neutron fraction $\beta_{\text{eff}}$, which incorporates both delayed neutron spectral properties and core geometrical configuration [1,2]. Additional delayed neutron parameters include the fraction of fission neutrons emitted in each delayed group $\beta_j$ and the delayed neutron precursors decay constants $\lambda_j$.

Experimental efforts aimed at determining the value of $\beta_{\text{eff}}$, which provide experimental support for the evaluation of delayed neutron parameters, are extremely valuable. This is due to the fact that unlike other fields in reactor physics, e.g. criticality safety or shielding, the availability of experimental data and benchmark problems for validating delayed neutron parameters and its implementation in different models is highly limited [3,4]. Furthermore, the existing experimental data exhibit significant discrepancies between the different sets of parameters [5], which lead to substantial disparity in the analysis of kinetic experiments and reactor dynamic behavior [4,6–8].

The small number of experiments dedicated to the evaluation of $\beta_{\text{eff}}$, along with the significant discrepancies between the delayed neutron parameter sets, strongly emphasize the need for novel and more accurate experiments aimed at measuring this value in thermal
reactors [4,9]. According to the WPEC Subgroup 6 report [9], the utilization of critical facilities for in-pile measurements designed for validating the calculations of thermal reactors is recommended. In addition, the WPEC Subgroup 6 report recommends a target accuracy of 3% for \( \beta_{\text{eff}} \) calculations, which imposes an upper limit on the uncertainty associated with experiments in order for them to be useful for nuclear data validation [4,9]. The analysis of the MISTRAL experiments on the effective delayed fraction \([4,9]\). The analysis of the MISTRAL experiments on the effective delayed fraction \( \beta_{\text{eff}} \) in the EOLE zero power reactor (ZPR) [10], for UO2 and MOX LWR cores, performed using noise techniques and the European nuclear data file JEFF-3.1.1, led to very satisfactory results with C/E within uncertainty limits of 1.6% (1\( \sigma \)).

In this work, a method for determining the effective delayed neutron fraction \( \beta_{\text{eff}} \) using in-pile reactivity oscillation and Fourier analysis is presented. The method is based on measurements of the reactor's power response to small periodic in-pile reactivity perturbations and utilizes Fourier analysis for reconstruction of the reactor zero power transfer function. Knowledge of the reactor transfer function enables the estimation of \( \beta_{\text{eff}} \) using a fitting procedure.

The method presented here extends a previous work by Yedvab et al. [4] in which the delayed neutron normalized emission rate (NER) is evaluated in the frequency domain using in-pile reactivity oscillations. While Yedvab et al. [4] observed excitation of higher odd harmonics in the frequency domain triggered by the trapezoidal reactivity signal; they did not account for it in their analysis. In this work, we account for these higher harmonics, both in the reactivity perturbation and in the power response, showing that it is possible to reconstruct the reactor transfer function (or the delayed neutrons emission rate) over a wide range of frequencies using only a single oscillation at a low frequency.

2. Theoretical background

2.1. Derivation of the transfer function

Study of the reactor power level response to small reactivity perturbations is of great importance regarding the stability and control of the reactor. The reactor power level response is described by a transfer function, which summarizes the main physical parameters controlling the reactor’s dynamics [1,2,10,11]. For a critical reactor operating at low power (such that the reactivity is not affected by the reactor’s power level), the relation between small reactivity perturbation and the consequent small power response is derived by linearization of the point reactor dynamic equations [1,2,10,11] expressed by

\[
\delta P(s) = \delta \rho(s) P_0 R(s),
\]

where \( \delta \rho(s) \) is the Laplace transform of small reactivity perturbation \( \delta \rho(t) \), \( \delta P(s) \) is the Laplace transform of the consequent small power response \( \delta P(t) \), \( P_0 \) stands for the mean power, \( s \) is a complex variable, and \( R(s) \) is the zero power transfer function given by

\[
R(s) = \frac{1}{P_0} \frac{\delta P(s)}{\delta \rho(s)} = \left( s \Lambda + \sum_{j} \frac{s \beta_j}{s + \lambda_j} \right)^{-1}.
\]

Thus, the transfer function formula encapsulates the point reactor model dynamic parameters: \( \Lambda, \beta_j, \) and \( \lambda_j \).

Note that the transfer function \( R(s) \) is complex and its explicit representation in the frequency domain \( R(\omega) \) is obtained by substituting \( j \omega \) for \( s \) [1,10,11]. For \( \omega \sim \lambda_j \) and \( \omega \sim 10^{-5} \) seconds, the \( s \Lambda \) term can be neglected since \( \Lambda \ll \beta_j / (\lambda_j + s) \) and Equation (2) becomes

\[
R(s) \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow j \omega} \left( \sum_{j} \frac{s \beta_j}{s + \lambda_j} \right)^{-1}.
\]

Once the transfer function \( R(\omega) \) is measured over a range of frequencies it is possible to apply a fit procedure to determine the required delayed neutron parameters. For example, it is customary to assume that the delayed precursors group decay constants \( \lambda_j \) are known and determine the \( \beta_j \) through the fit procedure. Actually, it is enough to measure the transfer function amplitude \( |R(\omega)| \) for the fit procedure, disregarding its phase.

2.2. Measurement of the transfer function

A simple procedure for measuring the reactor transfer function is to periodically perturb a low power critical reactor by in-pile oscillations of a small reactivity sample and monitor both the position of the sample and the power level as a function of time. The reactivity perturbation may be applied using a control rod or a mechanical piston able to insert small samples into the core. The appropriate transforms should then be applied to both signals and the transfer function can be obtained.

This procedure requires fine tuning of the reactivity perturbation amplitude \( \delta \rho \). On one hand, the perturbation should be large enough in order to overcome the inherent stochastic fluctuations characterizing the neutron flux and the acquisition system in the reactor. On the other hand, the perturbation should be small enough such that the linearization of the point reactor model equations is not invalidated. More specifically, the method for determining the transfer function values is as follows. For a pure sinusoidal perturbation with a distinct frequency \( \omega_0 \), e.g.,

\[
\delta \rho(t) = \delta \rho_0 \sin(\omega_0 t),
\]

where \( \delta \rho_0 \) is a constant reactivity worth of the perturbation, the reactor power response as a function of time is [1,11]

\[
\delta P(t) = P_0 \delta \rho_0 |R(i \omega_0)| \sin(\omega_0 t + \phi),
\]

where \( P_0 \delta \rho_0 \) is the Laplace transform of \( \delta \rho_0 \sin(\omega_0 t) \).
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where \( \phi \) is the transfer function phase angle. Since \( \delta P(t) \) is periodic it can be represented by a sum of its Fourier modes,

\[
\delta P(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \delta \hat{P}(\omega) \sin(\omega t) d\omega. \tag{6}
\]

In this case, the only non-zero Fourier component of \( \delta P(t) \) is

\[
\delta \hat{P}(\omega_0) = P_0 \delta \rho_0 |R(i\omega_0)|. \tag{7}
\]

In order to determine the transfer function amplitude \(|R(i\omega_0)|\) and discard the phase contribution, the modulus is taken for both sides of Equation (7) to obtain

\[
P_0 |R(i\omega_0)| = \frac{|\delta \hat{P}(\omega_0)|}{|\delta \rho_0|}. \tag{8}
\]

Generalizing the above result, any arbitrary periodic perturbation waveform \( \delta \rho(t) \) can be decomposed into its Fourier components:

\[
\delta \rho(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \delta \hat{\rho}(\omega) e^{i\omega t} d\omega. \tag{9}
\]

Each Fourier component of the reactivity perturbation is transformed independently into a corresponding component in the power response of the reactor [11]:

\[
\delta P(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \delta \hat{P}(\omega) e^{i\omega t} d\omega \nonumber
\]

\[
= P_0 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \delta \hat{\rho}(\omega) |R(i\omega)| e^{i\omega t + \phi} d\omega. \tag{10}
\]

Hence, an expression for the transfer function amplitude is obtained in the frequency domain

\[
P_0 |R(i\omega)| = \frac{|\delta \hat{P}(\omega)|}{|\delta \hat{\rho}(\omega)|}. \tag{11}
\]

Note that for the method of in-pile oscillations, the waveform of the power response signal in the time domain \( \delta P(t) \) can be rather complicated, making the analysis extremely non-trivial; whereas the power response signal in frequency domain \( \delta \hat{P}(\omega) \) will show distinct maxima at the resonant frequencies \( \omega_n \) making the analysis simpler.

2.3. Pseudo-square waveform for the reactivity perturbation

In the measurements performed in the MINERVE ZPR, the reactivity perturbation was induced by a periodic insertion of a small reactivity worth water sample using a dedicated high accuracy mechanical piston [12]. The movement of the piston was chosen to be trapezoidal, i.e. the reactivity sample position toggled between two stationary states – inside and outside the core, with a short (~1 s) transition between them.

Unlike pure sinusoidal signal, which excites a single Fourier mode, the quasi-square signal excites a series of higher modes (harmonics) in addition to the fundamental one. For oscillations with period \( T \gg 1 \) second, the piston waveform signal quickly approaches the shape of a square waveform, in which case the excited higher harmonics are given by the Fourier series of a square signal:

\[
\delta \rho(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \rho_n \sin(\omega_n t) \cong \rho_0 \sum_{n=1, 3, 5, \ldots}^{\infty} \frac{\sin(\omega_n t)}{n}, \tag{12}
\]

where \( f \) is the oscillation frequency of the piston and \( \rho_0 \) is the reactivity worth of the sample. An important feature of the square signal is that the energy stored in its higher harmonics decays like \( n^{-1} \). This slow decay with \( n \) facilitates a proper signal to noise ratio of the higher harmonics excited by the reactivity perturbation. The general formula for the transfer function amplitude for each frequency \( \omega_n \) is

\[
P_0 |R(i\omega_n)| = \frac{|\delta \hat{P}(\omega_n)|}{|\delta \hat{\rho}(\omega_n)|}, \tag{13}
\]

where \( |\delta \hat{P}(\omega_n)| \) and \( |\delta \hat{\rho}(\omega_n)| \) are the amplitude of the Fourier components at \( \omega_n \) of the power response and the reactivity perturbation, respectively.

3. Experimental setup

The oscillation experiments were performed at the MINERVE ZPR located at the CEA Cadarache Research Center. MINERVE is a pool-type (~120 m³) reactor operating at a maximum power of 100 W with a corresponding thermal flux of \( 10^9 \text{n cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1} \) [13]. The core is submerged under 3 meters of water and is cooled through natural convection. The core is composed of a driver zone, which includes 40 standard highly enriched MTR-type metallic uranium alloy plate assemblies surrounded by a graphite reflector. An experimental cavity (70 × 70 cm), in which various UO₂ or MOX cladded fuel pins can be loaded in different lattices, reproducing various neutron spectra [13, 14], is located in the center of the driver zone. An oscillator piston, capable of moving periodically and vertically between two positions located inside and outside of the core is located inside the experimental zone. A general view of the MINERVE reactor is shown in Figure 1, together with schematic drawings of the reactor geometrical configuration and the MAESTRO core configuration [15].
Our measurements at MINERVE lasted 6 days using the MAESTRO core configuration [14,15]. The experiment was performed using 16 different oscillation frequencies in the range 0.005 to 0.25 Hz, with 100 full period cycles obtained for most frequencies. The average power level during the measurements was approximately 10 W, with maximal power oscillation of ±2% and an average power level drift of less than 1% per minute. The reactivity oscillations were introduced into the reactor using a dedicated mechanical piston, mounted with a light water sample. The water sample acted as an additional moderator, which introduced an additional reactivity of \(3.79 ± 0.02\) pcm into the core [16].

The neutron count rate was measured using three thermal neutron detectors: \(^{10}\text{B}\) based ionization chamber (IC), high sensitivity (CF8R, 8 mm diameter, 1.6 mg fissile material deposit) fission chamber (FC) and a low sensitivity (CF3R, 3 mm diameter, 20 \(\mu\)g fissile material deposit) FC [17]. The IC was operated in current mode, avoiding dead time corrections that originated from the detector’s high neutron sensitivity, whereas both FCs operated in pulse mode. The typical count rate in the CF8R detector was 2000 cps, and hence no dead time correction was required with an average dead time constant of \(\sim 0.5\) \(\mu\)s. The detectors location is marked in Figure 1(b) by red (IC) and blue (FC) circles (next to the north side of the core).

The detectors outputs, along with a trigger signal used for synchronizing the piston position and the detectors acquisition, were recorded using two PC-based Fast Comtec acquisition cards (model MCA-3FADC), with a counting time per channel (time resolution \(\Delta t\) of 0.1 s. This \(\Delta t\) was chosen such that it offered an appropriate number of channels for the entire frequency range sampled in the experiment (4000 channels for the highest oscillation frequency of 0.25 Hz and 256,000 channels for the lowest frequency 0.005 Hz).

4. Results and data analysis

An example of the reactivity perturbation worth (proportional to the piston’s position) and the corresponding IC and the more sensitive FC signals (total neutron count) for a 60 s oscillation period is shown in Figure 2.

The temporal dynamics of the external reactivity perturbation, introduced by the oscillating piston (a) and the corresponding IC and FC counts (b and c, respectively), obtained for a 60 s oscillation period.

Figure 2. The prompt response of the neutron flux to the piston movement, as well as the delayed neutron dynamics, can be clearly observed. The sharp trapezoidal (nearly square) waveform of the reactivity perturbation is also evident (Figure 2(a)). The statistical precision of the IC is significantly higher than that of the FC (Figure 2(b) and 2(c)). Hence, the power oscillations observed by the FC are obscured by statistical fluctuations, which limit the derived number of higher harmonics (see Section 4.2). The sharp upward “spikes” visible in the IC signal (Figure 2(b)) originate from the voltage to frequency converter. Although these “spikes” add positive counts, they are sharp, their occurrence is infrequent and their effect on the power spectrum is negligible.

4.1. Experimental error estimation

There are three main independent contributions for the experimental error associated with the transfer function amplitude measurements. The first contribution, marked by \(\sigma_{\text{drift}}\), is due to the drift in the reactor power level during the oscillations. The second one, marked by \(\sigma_{\text{stat}}\), is due to statistical fluctuations characterizing the neutron flux, the detectors response, and the electronic acquisition system. The last one, marked by \(\sigma_{\text{react}}\), stems from the uncertainty in the reactivity worth of the induced perturbation. These errors are estimated for each value of the transfer function, i.e. for each harmonic value for each oscillation period. Assuming the errors are independent, the total uncertainty (1\(\sigma\)) for each value is estimated according to

\[
\sigma_{\text{total}} = \sqrt{\sigma_{\text{stat}}^2 + \sigma_{\text{drift}}^2 + \sigma_{\text{react}}^2}.
\]  (14)

During the measurements campaign, the MINERVE automatic pilot rod, which is usually used to compensate for reactivity changes due to samples oscillations, was disconnected and the power level was regulated.
4.2. Determine the transfer function amplitude

In order to determine the transfer function amplitude we apply Fourier transform to both the reactivity perturbation and the power response signals according to Equation (11). An example of the 60 s period analysis is shown in Figure 3, where the reactivity perturbation (Figure 3(a)), the power spectrum harmonics, obtained by the IC and FC detectors (Figure 3(b) and 3(c)) and the derived transfer function amplitude (Figure 3(d)) are plotted in the frequency domain. The fundamental mode and the higher harmonics are obtained at $\omega_n = 2\pi n/60$ rad/s for odd $n$.

The ratio between the harmonics height and the noise decreases and the uncertainty in the derived harmonic heights increases with the harmonic’s order $n$. Hence, the number of harmonics used in each oscillation period is chosen according to a threshold based on the harmonics height to noise ratio. The transfer function amplitude values of the 60 s period measurement, corresponding to the first 9 harmonics with the threshold set at $n = 17$, are shown in Figure 3(d), along with curves obtained by substituting the delayed group constants from ENDF/B-VII.1 [19] and JEFF-3.1.2 [20] neutron data libraries into Equation (3), using $\beta_{\text{eff}} = 650$ and 665 pcm, respectively. In all measurements, the number of harmonics obtained from the FC count is significantly smaller than that obtained using the IC count, due to the large statistical uncertainty in the former (see Section 4.1).

The obtained values of $|R(\omega)|$ using all oscillation periods with their respective harmonics are presented in Figure 4. Also presented are calculated curves (according to Equation (3)) using available neutron data library. In addition, the calculated curve based on the neutron data derived in the present work is plotted (see Section 4.3). This curve exhibits good qualitative agreement with those of the literature (Figure 4).

4.3. Estimation of the delayed neutron fraction $\beta_{\text{eff}}$

The data points of the transfer function amplitude, obtained using both the IC and FC, were used to fit
Figure 4. The obtained values of \(|R(i\omega)|\) using the IC (open) and the FC (closed), including all oscillation periods and their higher harmonics, as a function of angular frequency. Also presented are theoretical curves (Equation (3)) of the transfer functions, using the neutron data libraries ENDF/B-VII.1 (blue), JEFF-3.1.2 (red), and JENDL-4.0 (orange). In addition, the calculated curve based on the neutron data derived in the present work is presented (black). The error bars correspond to 1\(\sigma\).

curves of the theoretical form described in Equation (3). The fitting procedure was applied using multi-parameter nonlinear weighted least-squares fit, where for each library, the delayed neutron precursors decay constants \(\lambda_j\) were fixed, \(s\) was an independent variable, the data points were the dependent variables, the delayed neutron group yield \(\beta_j\) were the fitted parameters, the \(\beta_j\) from the library were used as an initial point, and the inverse of the errors were used as weights. The available neutron data libraries used for the fitting procedure are specified in Table 1. The differences between the obtained transfer functions were negligible, indicating small sensitivity of the fitting procedure to a specific choice of the neutron data library. Note that in the case of the JEFF-3.1 and ROSFOND libraries, eight groups of delayed neutron decay constants were used, whereas six groups were used for the other libraries. The decay constants used were of \(^{235}\text{U}\) thermal fission.

The effective delayed neutron fraction is calculated according to \(\beta_{\text{eff}} = \sum \beta_j \) for each library. The uncertainty in \(\beta_{\text{eff}}\) results from (1) the propagation of the statistical errors \(\Delta \beta_{\text{stat}}\), (2) the propagation of uncertainty in the induced reactivity perturbation \(\Delta \beta_{\text{react}}\), and (3) the propagation of uncertainty in the \(\lambda_j\) sets taken from different libraries.

The statistical errors in the transfer function values are propagated to \(\Delta \beta_{\text{stat}}\) by applying a Monte Carlo re-sampling technique (see Section 4.1). Each value of the obtained transfer function (Figure 4) is varied by adding normally distributed random noise with standard deviation of \(\sigma = \sqrt{\sigma_{\text{stat}}^2 + \sigma_{\text{drift}}^2}\).

The uncertainty in the induced reactivity perturbation \(\Delta \beta_{\text{react}}\) results from uncertainty in the sample reactivity worth and the reactivity contribution of the piston itself. In principle, the reactivity contribution of the piston itself (without a water sample) should be negligible, since the inside and outside piston states should induce similar reactivity perturbations. However, power oscillations were detected in response to “piston-only” oscillation experiments. Analysis of these experiments yields a piston’s reactivity worth of 0.23 \(\pm\) 0.05 pcm. Detailed description will be published elsewhere. Thus, the total reactivity worth of the induced perturbation is 4.02 \(\pm\) 0.06 pcm. Finally, the uncertainty in the induced reactivity perturbation is propagated to \(\Delta \beta_{\text{react}} = 11\) pcm.

A value of \(\beta_{\text{eff}}\) is obtained for each \(\lambda_j\) set (taken from different neutron data libraries). The uncertainty in the \(\lambda_j\) sets is propagated to an uncertainty in \(\beta_{\text{eff}}\) by evaluating the standard deviation of the different \(\beta_{\text{eff}}\) values (Table 1). Although underestimated due to the existence of correlations between the different \(\lambda_j\) sets, this uncertainty (\(\sim 0.5\%\)) is negligible compared to both \(\Delta \beta_{\text{stat}}\) and \(\Delta \beta_{\text{react}}\).

Table 1. Values of the effective delayed neutron fraction \(\beta_{\text{eff}}\) obtained for the measured transfer function data points using multi-parameter nonlinear weighted least-squares fit and delayed neutron precursors decay constants from different neutron cross section data libraries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>(\beta_{\text{eff}}) (pcm)</th>
<th>(\Delta \beta_{\text{stat}}) (pcm)</th>
<th>(\Delta \beta_{\text{react}}) (pcm)</th>
<th>(\Delta \beta_{\text{eff}}) (%)</th>
<th>C/E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keepin [2]</td>
<td>710 (\pm) 22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.00857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDF/B-VI [22]</td>
<td>711 (\pm) 22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.00647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDF/B-VII [19]</td>
<td>711 (\pm) 23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.00468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF-2.2 [23]</td>
<td>713 (\pm) 23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.00468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF-3.1.2 [20]</td>
<td>708 (\pm) 25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.01169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENDL-3.1 [24]</td>
<td>711 (\pm) 20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.00707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENDL-4.0 [25]</td>
<td>711 (\pm) 25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.00708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSFOND [26]</td>
<td>709 (\pm) 24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.01003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady [27]</td>
<td>712 (\pm) 22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.00528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuttle [28]</td>
<td>713 (\pm) 28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.00380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>711 (\pm) 17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.00715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assuming these uncertainties are uncorrelated, the total uncertainty in the derived value of $\beta_{\text{eff}}$ is $\Delta \beta = \sqrt{\Delta \beta_{\text{stat}}^2 + \Delta \beta_{\text{react}}^2} = 17\text{pcm}$, where $\Delta \beta_{\text{stat}}$ and $\Delta \beta_{\text{react}}$ are averaged over the different libraries (see Table 1). Hence, the obtained value of $\beta_{\text{eff}}$ is $711 \pm 17 \text{pcm}$ ($\sigma$). Recent calculations performed by CEA using TRIPOLI4.9 and JEFF-3.1.1 suggest a value of $748.8 \pm 0.4 \text{pcm}$ (without full uncertainty analysis) and will be reported elsewhere [21].

5. Conclusions

A method for determining the effective delayed neutron fraction $\beta_{\text{eff}}$ using in-pile oscillations and Fourier analysis is presented. The method developed in this work extends previous works by accounting for the higher harmonics excitation by the non-sinusoidal reactivity perturbation waveform. This work demonstrates that although previously overlooked, these higher harmonics store valuable information regarding the reactor transfer function. Furthermore, it is shown that the transfer function can be reconstructed with satisfactory precision over a wide range of frequencies using non-sinusoidal perturbation and a single oscillation frequency. The method is applied to a set of in-pile measurements performed at the MINERVE ZPR in order to determine the value of $\beta_{\text{eff}}$ for the MAESTRO core configuration. This goal is achieved by applying multi-parameter nonlinear weighted least-squares fit to the measured reactor transfer function using precursors decay constants from several neutron cross section data libraries [2,19,20,22–28].

The obtained value of $\beta_{\text{eff}}$ is $711 \pm 17 \text{pcm}$ ($\sigma$) and the uncertainties associated with this result and with results obtained for each specific neutron data library (see Table 1) are small enough so that the method presented in this work can be regarded as a qualified technique for this kind of measurements [3]. Moreover, since the uncertainty, $\Delta \beta_{\text{eff}} = 2.3\%$, is small enough to meet the target accuracy of 3% for $\beta_{\text{eff}}$ calculations [9], the obtained values of $\beta_{\text{eff}}$ can be considered as benchmarks to validate calculation methods and related nuclear data libraries used for $\beta_{\text{eff}}$ determination. In this respect, the uncertainty in the applied reactivity perturbation plays a significant role and is propagated directly to an uncertainty in the value of $\beta_{\text{eff}}$. Reducing this uncertainty (which is 1.5% in this work) in this kind of experiments is of utmost importance.

A major concern in in-pile kinetic measurements is the accuracy estimation and reduction of the associated uncertainties. More specifically, the uncertainties in the present work, e.g. reactivity perturbation worth, can be reduced by performing additional measurements and by comparison to independent in-pile methods (e.g. noise techniques). These uncertainties can also be better quantified by further development of the experimental technique described in this work. Further work should, therefore, include the use of additional samples for reactivity perturbation, suppression of the power drift during the oscillations, and comparison with independent static techniques (e.g. CPSD).
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