



²³⁸PuO₂ AS A HEAT SOURCE FUEL

Because of the present and potential use of ²³⁸PuO₂ as a heat source fuel, I wish to point out that the neutron radiation levels for fuel currently being produced are considerably lower than those given in the recent article by Taherzadeh and Gingo, "Neutron Radiation Characteristics of Plutonium Dioxide Fuel," *Nucl. Technol.*, **15**, 396 (1972). One reason for this is that when it is important to minimize neutron levels, PuO₂ which has been depleted in ¹⁷O and ¹⁸O is used for the fuel, whereas in this article the PuO₂ is assumed to contain oxygen of natural isotopic abundance. Oxygen-17 and ¹⁸O are the naturally occurring isotopes of oxygen which can undergo (α, n) reactions with alpha particles from ²³⁸Pu. The specific neutron yield from the O(α, n) reaction, only, for fuel produced at Mound Laboratory which has been depleted in these two isotopes has been between 3×10^2 and 3×10^3 n/(sec g) ²³⁸Pu, depending on the degree of depletion. This compares with a measured yield of 1.4 to 1.5×10^4 n/(sec g) ²³⁸Pu from the O(α, n) reaction for undepleted PuO₂. The authors have calculated a yield of $1.99 \pm 0.45 \times 10^4$ n/(sec g) ²³⁸Pu [or $(1.42 \pm 0.32) \times 10^4$ n/(sec g) (PuO₂-80% ²³⁸Pu)] from the O(α, n) reaction for undepleted PuO₂.

Another reason for the neutron levels in the article being higher than current practice is the relatively high concentrations of low *Z* impurities assumed by the authors. Based on these concentrations, they have calculated a yield of 1.3×10^4 n/(sec g) ²³⁸Pu for (α, n) reactions with impurities. For fuel produced recently at our laboratory, the neutron levels from (α, n) reactions with impurities have been $\leq 2 \times 10^3$ n/(sec g) ²³⁸Pu.

The authors have calculated the total specific yield for a particular 2200-W(th) source fueled with undepleted PuO₂. Their value, which includes neutron-induced multiplication, is 6.42×10^4 n/(sec g) ²³⁸Pu [or 4.59×10^4 n/(sec g) PuO₂]. Using the same source design but assuming the PuO₂ is depleted in ¹⁷O and ¹⁸O, as is currently being produced for large size heat sources, the expected total specific yield, including multiplication, would be only about 7 to 8×10^3 n/(sec g) ²³⁸Pu.

Unfortunately, the article contains some errors. Two which might result in confusion for some readers are

1. *Section IIIA*. "The gamma-ray energy emitted from the excited states of the daughter nucleus (²³⁴*U) has a maximum energy of 43.5 keV, and thus will be absorbed by the source or the shield surrounding it." Gamma rays as high as 1085 keV from the daughter nucleus have been observed, and these will not all be absorbed.

2. *Section IV*. There is the suggestion that 5.11×10^{11} might be the alpha yield per second per gram of ²³⁸Pu. In the reference this value came from, 5.11×10^{11} is stated as being the yield per gram of ²³⁸Pu product, which most likely means per gram of total plutonium of which 81% is ²³⁸Pu.

M. Edward Anderson

Monsanto Research Corporation
Mound Laboratory
Miamisburg, Ohio 45342

October 16, 1972

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Mound Laboratory is operated by Monsanto Research Corporation for the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission under Contract No. AT-33-1-GEN-53.

REPLY TO: ²³⁸PuO₂ AS A HEAT SOURCE FUEL

The author of the letter has stated that the experimental value of the neutron yield of the *current* Mound Laboratory plutonium dioxide fuel heat source is considerably lower than the reported value¹ in *Nuclear Technology*.

1. The neutron emission characteristics of plutonium dioxide fuel were estimated in Ref. 1 for a typical fuel source available at the time the report was being prepared. The difference between the heat sources selected by Ref. 1 and by Mound Laboratory is in the quantity of the low-*Z* impurities and ¹⁶O enrichment. Obviously, if a low impurity and ¹⁷O-¹⁸O depleted source is used, a lower neutron yield would be expected.

In general, one can estimate the neutron emission yield of any plutonium dioxide fuel, including the current Mound Laboratory fuel, by using the *Nuclear Technology* report, provided the characteristics of the fuel are made available. Disregarding the difference between the two heat sources under question, there is good agreement between the theoretical calculation $(1.99 \pm 0.45) \times 10^4$ n/(sec g) ²³⁸Pu (Ref. 1) and experimental estimated value of $(1.54 \pm 0.07) \times 10^4$ n/(sec g) ²³⁸Pu (Mound Laboratory, Letter to the Editor). These numbers are in good agreement. An analytical calculation is based on the integration of the O(α, n) reaction rate, and the parameters involved had to be gathered from various publications. The magnitude of the reaction cross section, the