


WONDER 2026



Impact of nuclear data on decay heat calculations



Francesco Esposito
esposito@subatech.in2p3.fr

PhD director: **Lydie Giot**

02 / 07 / 2026

*International Workshop On Nuclear
Data Evaluation for Reactor
Applications*


Aix-en-Provence, France

June 29th – July 3rd, 2026

Decay heat importance

Decay heat can be defined as the *recoverable energy released from the decay of radionuclides after the reactor shutdown*. It constitutes an **important source of power** over a wide time scale.

Decay heat is a fundamental safety function for the fuel cycle back-end.



E. Merle-Lucotte et al. (2016)

Innovative reactor concepts

GenIV → MSR



Unique operational conditions and geometries



Need to expand research on decay heat calculation and uncertainty propagation

Classical methods for decay heat calculation cannot be used

Lack of return of experience


Different back-end fuel cycle with respect to solid fuel

Uncertainty propagation

Safety authorities require not only the decay heat value, but also the associated **uncertainty**.

$$\frac{dN_i(t)}{dt} = \sum_{j \neq i}^M \left[N_j(t) \left(b_{j \rightarrow i} \lambda_j + \sum_p \phi_p(t) \langle \sigma_{p,j \rightarrow i} \rangle \right) - N_i(t) \left(\lambda_i + \sum_p \phi_p(t) \langle \sigma_{p,i \rightarrow j} \rangle \right) \right]$$











Studies of Subatech (Nantes) and LPSC (Grenoble): develop **flexible** codes for MSR simulation with uncertainty propagation from nuclear data.



¹A. Laureau et al. Uncertainty propagation for the design study of the PETALE experimental programme in the CROCUS reactor (2020)

²J. Halwani, Decay Heat Calculations and Application of the Lines of Defence Method to Chloride Molten Salt Reactor ARAMIS-A (2025)

Monte Carlo method for uncertainty propagation



$$\bar{y}_1, \bar{y}_2, \dots, \bar{y}_m$$

$$\sigma_{y_1}^2, \sigma_{y_2}^2, \dots, \sigma_{y_m}^2$$

Code-to-code comparisons



Results using CEA's random fission yields

Influence of the sampling distribution

Results with other libraries and impact of TAGS measurements

Results with JEFF-4.0

More complex cases



Fission pulse decay heat


- Large availability of experimental data for thermal cases
- Disentangle fission yields and decay data contribution from that of cross sections

Fission yields sampling

- Study the effect of only one type of nuclear data on decay heat
- JEFF-4.0 covariance matrices available from CEA

Belfiore¹: Monte Carlo approach (SANDY code)


Fission Pulse from $^{235}\text{U}_{\text{th}}$ – JEFF-3.3. 200 samples with Normal sampling, symmetric cut-off. **Differences may be explained by the small number of samples.**



¹E. Belfiore. "Sensitivity and Uncertainty Analysis for Nuclear Data of Relevance in Spent Nuclear Fuel Characterization", Master Thesis, (2023)

Tsilanizara²: S/U approach

Fission Pulse from $^{235}\text{U}_{\text{th}}$ – JEFF-3.1.1. **Differences may be explained by the different approach for uncertainties propagation.**



²A. Tsilanizara and T. Huynh. "New feature of DARWIN/PEPIN2 inventory code: Propagation of nuclear data uncertainties to decay heat and nuclide density". In: Annals of Nuclear Energy 164 (2021)













Influence of the sampling distribution


Different choices are possible on the sampling distribution and on the treatment of negative values. Example with 2000 samples, $^{235}\text{U}_{\text{th}}$, JEFF-4.0


^{95}Nb
 $\sigma/\mu = 0.34$


^{144}Pr
 $\sigma/\mu = 0.58$


^{70}Cu
 $\sigma/\mu = 1.59$





Purple bins
 Samples distribution


Purple solid line
 Mean of the samples


Yellow background
 1 standard deviation
 of the samples



Black solid line
 Reference mean


Black dashed line
 Reference standard
 deviation

Does the choice have an impact on the final decay heat uncertainty?


Test case: $^{235}\text{U}_{\text{th}}$ – JEFF-4.0 fission yields – 2000 samples

Without covariance matrix for fission yields







Max difference: <0.3%

With covariance matrix for fission yields



Max difference: <0.15%



μ = mean value
 σ = standard deviation



Results obtained with:

- Cocodrilo code
- Uncertainties from fission yields only
- 2000 samples
- Sampling method: Normal distribution, symmetric cut-off
- Fission Yields and covariance matrices: JEFF-4.0

+ Light particles and electromagnetic components of decay heat → back-up slides

Results using CEA's Fission Yields files

Results directly using samples generated by CEA¹: JEFF-4.0 files made available in April 2026 within APRENDE for Independent Fission Yields on 4 thermal systems. They are 10'000 samples with restrain on Cumulative Fission Yields.








Max difference: ~0.35% for both cases

¹G. Kessedjian et al., "Monte Carlo Fission Yield files for the 4 major fissile nuclei", Nuclear Data Week - JEFF meeting / APRENDE, 13-17 April 2026

Impact of new TAGS Data in JEFF-4.0 decay data library

JEFF-4.0 new mean decay energies : ^{93}Rb , $^{96\text{gs,m},99}\text{Y}$, $^{103,108}\text{Tc}$, ^{99}Y , ^{138}I , ^{142}Cs



APRENDE

Total = total decay heat

ELP = Light particles component of decay heat


EEM = Electromagnetic component of decay heat

More complex cases

Longer irradiation cases: Friesenhahn et al. decay heat experiments^{1,2} (1976-1979)

Experimental data available for ^{235}U (1'000s, 20'000s, 24h, 35d) and ^{239}Pu (1'000s, 24h) samples.

Results obtained sampling all FYs of JEFF-3.3 at all energies, with Normal, symmetric cut-off, no covariance matrix, 100 samples.



Possibilities to explore: influence of sampling only one or more specific **nuclides**, at one or more specific **energies**.

¹S. J Friesenhahn et al., ^{235}U Fission Product Decay Heat from 1 to 105 seconds, EPRI report (1976).


²S. J Friesenhahn et al., Measurement of ^{239}Pu and ^{235}U Fission Product Decay Power From 1 to 105 Seconds, EPRI report (1979).

- Development of **Cocodrilo code** with studies on FY samplings
- **Agreement** with both MC and S/U approaches for Fission Pulses
- First application to the new **JEFF-4.0** library release and covariance matrices
- **Very small impact** of the chosen sampling distribution on fission pulse calculations

Outlooks:

- Separate systematic uncertainty from **statistical uncertainty**
- **Decay data** sampling
- Effect of **sampling distributions** in more **complex** cases than fission pulses
- Extension of the code to **more complex cases** (assemblies and core concepts)

*Thank you for your
attention!*



WONDER 2026

Aix-en-Provence, France

02 / 07 / 2026


Francesco Esposito

esposito@subatech.in2p3.fr


- **CNRS-IN2P3 MSR team (LPSC-Grenoble, Subatech):** Michel Allibert, Lydie Giot, Daniel Heuer, Axel Laureau, Elsa Merle
on this topic :
PhD students: Jad Halwani, Yohannes Molla
and interns: Florent Hervy, David Laks
- Support of **Master Project/DONEE** (CNRS)
- **Aprende European project** (Addressing PRiorities of Evaluated Nuclear Data in Europe), European Union's HORIZON-EURATOM under grant agreement No. 101164596
Collaboration with Sofia Portolan (PSI, EPFL), Dimitri Rochman (NAGRA)
Collaboration with Fanny Farget (GANIL), Diego Ramos (GANIL)
- **ENDURANCE European project** (EU kNowleDge hUb foR enabling MolteN Salt ReaCtor safety development and DEployment), European Union's HORIZON-EURATOM under grant agreement No. 101164596, mobility grants.
- **TAS collaboration** (IFIC Valencia, SEN team@Subatech, Univ. of Surrey) for providing TAGS data and scientific discussions

Backup – Effect of the number of samples

Convergence of mean value and of relative uncertainty at fixed cooling times




1% (not 100%)



Backup – Effect of the number of samples


Correspondence of converged relative uncertainty on the full profile






$^{235}\text{U}_{\text{th}}$
Thermal fission pulse
JEFF-4.0, no CovMat

Backup – Effect of the number of samples

Evolution of relative uncertainty curve at different number of samples



Backup – Effect of the number of samples




With covariance matrix, results seem to converge faster

Backup – Distribution of output values


After 2000 samples:

$^{235}\text{U}_{\text{th}}$
Thermal fission pulse
JEFF-4.0, no CovMat




Backup – Distribution of output values – KS statistic


20 samples – Mean: **0.15**



2000 samples – Mean: **0.014**



200 samples – Mean: **0.042**



Kolmogorov-Smirnov
statistic

$^{235}\text{U}_{\text{th}}$

Thermal fission pulse

JEFF-4.0, no CovMat

SetZero

$$G(\mathbf{Y}; \bar{\mathbf{y}}; \Sigma) \text{ and } \sigma_i^2 = \Sigma_{ii}$$

- spectral decomposition

$$\Sigma = \mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{D} \cdot \mathbf{P}^T$$

- Sampling

$$\mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)$$

$$\mathbf{y}_s = \bar{\mathbf{y}} + \mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{D}^{1/2} \cdot \mathbf{S}$$

- Regularization

$$\text{if } y_{s,i} < 0; y_{s,i} = 0$$

LogNormal

$$\bar{y}_i^{LN} = \log \left(\frac{\bar{y}_i^2}{\sqrt{\sigma_i^2 + \bar{y}_i^2}} \right) \quad (\sigma_i^{LN})^2 = \log \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\bar{y}_i^2} \right)$$

$$\Sigma_{ij}^{LN} = \log \left(1 + \frac{\Sigma_{ij}}{\bar{y}_i \cdot \bar{y}_j} \right)$$

- Regularization

$$\text{Arg} > 0$$

$$\text{Arg} < 0$$

$$\Sigma_{ij}^{\log} \approx \frac{\Sigma_{ij}}{\sigma_i \cdot \sigma_j} \cdot \sigma_i^{LN} \cdot \sigma_j^{LN}$$

Corr_{ij}

- Sampling

$$\Sigma^{LN} = \mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{D} \cdot \mathbf{P}^T$$

$$\mathbf{y}_s^{LN} = \bar{\mathbf{y}}^{LN} + \mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{D}^{1/2} \cdot \mathbf{S}$$

$$\mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)$$

$$y_{s,i} = \exp(y_{s,i}^{LN})$$

iterative adjustment

- Cholesky decomposition

$$\text{Find } \mathbf{L} : \text{Cov}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{L}^T$$

- Sampling

$$\mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)$$


$$\mathbf{y}_s = \bar{\mathbf{y}} + \mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{S}$$

- Regularization

$$\mathbf{y}_s = |\mathbf{y}_s|$$

- k Iterative process





$$\mathbf{y}_{s,i}^k = \left| \left(\mathbf{y}_{s,i}^{k-1} - \overline{\mathbf{y}_{s,i}^{k-1}} \right) \cdot \frac{\sigma_i}{\sigma_{\mathbf{y}_{s,i}^{k-1}}} + \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i \right|$$




- Friesenhahn setup
- ²³⁹Pu_{th}, 24h irradiation
- Cocodrilo code
- Uncertainties from fission yields only
- 100 samples
- Sampling method: normal with symmetric cut-off, no covariance matrix
- JEFF-3.1.1
- Statistical uncertainty calculated with 100 fixed samples (“virtual samples”)

$$\sigma_{sys} = \sqrt{\sigma_{tot}^2 - \sigma_{stat}^2}$$


Backup – Contribution of nuclides to uncertainty







Total decay heat



Light particles component




Electromagnetic component




With more samples, the effect of the sampling distribution is even smaller

Test case: $^{235}\text{U}_{\text{th}}$ – JEFF-4.0 fission yields – 10'000 samples

Without covariance matrix for fission yields



With covariance matrix for fission yields



To be compared with slide 7

Backup – Indicators for samples quality

How many nuclides are affected by such distorted distributions?


- Application of indicators found in literature
- Development of new indicators to have a clearer view

$$AME(N) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M ME_i(N) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \left| \frac{m_i(N)}{\mu_i} - 1 \right|$$


$$AVE(N) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M VE_i(N) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \left| \frac{s_i^2(N)}{\sigma_i^2} - 1 \right|$$

Example with 2000 samples from JEFF-4.0, fission yields of $^{239}\text{Pu}_{\text{th}}$, Normal symmetric cut-off:

AME and contributions of selected nuclides





AVE and contributions of selected nuclides



Backup – Pandemonium effect

Efficiency of Ge detectors decreases as the energy of gamma ray increases
 → underestimation of mean gamma energy and overestimation of mean beta energy



M. Fleming and J.-C. Sublet. "Validation of FISPACT-II Decay Heat and Inventory Predictions for Fission Events". June 2015. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.1003.8168

A. Algora et al. "Reactor Decay Heat in ^{239}Pu : Solving the γ Discrepancy in the 4–3000-s Cooling Period". In: Phys. Rev. Lett. 105 (20 Nov. 2010)