Simulating the DESCANT Neutron Detection Array with the Geant4 Monte Carlo Toolkit

WNPPC 2017

Joseph Turko University of Guelph February 17th, 2017



CHANGING LIVES IMPROVING LIFE



Motivation

Rapid neutron capture processes predicted to be responsible for the production of ~ half the elements heavier than ⁵⁶Fe

Competition between (n,γ), photodisintegration, and β-decay processes

 $t_{1/2}$ influences the speed of the r-process $P_{\beta n}$ influences the post

r-process nuclear abundances



DESCANT

DEuterated SCintillator Array for Neutron Tagging

Located at TRIUMF, in Vancouver, BC

70 close-packed hexagonal deuterated benzene scintillators form array to replace downstream lampshade of either GRIFFIN or TIGRESS

New ancillary detector to GRIFFIN / TIGRESS γ -ray spectrometers for neutron tagging





DESCANT

DEuterated SCintillator Array for Neutron Tagging



V Bildstein. *et al,* Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research A 729 (2013) 118





Geant4 Simulation of DESCANT

Geant4 Neutron Physics

To validate the use of the Geant4 code, a simple cylindrical detector was simulated to verify the fast-neutron cross sections of ¹H, ²H, and ¹²C

The total and differential cross-sections were calculated in Geant4 and compared to experimental results from ENDF Validation of G4NeutronHP data-driven models



¹H Total Cross Section



7

²H Total Cross Section



8

¹²C Total Cross Section



9

Differential Cross Sections

Differential cross sections were calculated by comparing the incoming and outgoing momenta of the first elastic scattering interaction of mono-energetic neutrons

Very important quantity to verify -Geant4 will be used to develop data-rejection algorithms for multiple scattering interactions between detectors

1 MeV



0

Scattering Angle [deg

1 MeV



5.5 MeV



Differential Crosssections of ²H

9.7 MeV



with G4NeutronHP

Experiment

0.1 MeV



Experiment

Differential Crosssections of ¹²C

5.35 MeV



Scintillation Physics

New release Geant4.10 contains optical physics packages to handle scintillation processes

Many input parameters required to accurately handle scintillation light emission:

- Resolution scale for the scintillating material
- Reflection and refraction coefficients of all materials
- Absorption lengths of all materials
- Fast and slow scintillation light emission components
- Light yield of various recoiling nuclei
- Etc...

Many of these parameters are not available for the DESCANT scintillator!

Scintillation Physics

New release Geant4.10 contains optical physics packages to handle scintillation processes

Many input parameters required to accurately handle scintillation light emission:

- Resolution scale for the scintillating material
- Reflection and refraction coefficients of all materials
- Absorption lengths of all materials
- Fast and slow scintillation light emission components
- Light yield of various recoiling nuclei
- Etc....

Many of these parameters are not available for the DESCANT scintillator!

Light Production Model

The simulated energy deposition can be then "smeared out" to replicate the experimental spectra

The light yield *L* for each particle in the scintillator can modelled by the function: $L(E) = a_1 E - a_2 (1 - e^{-a_3 E^{a_4}})$

This is followed by a Gaussian smearing with centred at *L* with a full-width half maximum given by:

$$FWHM = \sqrt{\alpha^2 + \frac{\beta^2}{L} + \frac{\gamma^2}{L^2}} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \dots \dots \quad FWHM$$

This is not so easy! All scintillating particles have a separate set of a_i coefficients: protons, deuterons, carbon, alphas, ⁹Be, and ¹⁰B

Simulated Annealing

Searching for the best fit over many energies can be very challenging There are many possible sets of parameters that provide a good fit which is the best global fit for a large energy range? Traditional gradient search methods can easily get trapped at local minima near the initial search location - but is this the best global fit? Simulated annealing is a method to avoid getting trapped at local

minima



Light Production Model

Before determining the best coefficients for the deuterated DESCANT detectors, the validity of the model on a simple proton scintillator must be verified

Proof-of-concept experiments comparing a C₆H₆ detector to its C₆D₆ deuterated counterpart were conducted at the University of Kentucky - this data will be analyzed for this component

	Proton-recoil						Deuteron-recoil						
	e⁻	p +	α	¹² C	⁹ Be	¹⁰ B		e-	d+	α	¹² C	⁹ Be	¹⁰ B
a 1	1	0.642	0.41	<0.001	0.0821	0.0375	a ₁	1	0.537	0.41	<0.001	0.0821	0.0375
a 2	0	1.459	0.59	0	0	0	a ₂	0	1.387	0.59	0	0	0
a ₃	0	0.373	0.065	0	0	0	a3	0	0.338	0.065	0	0	0
a 4	0	0.969	1.01	0	0	0	a 4	0	1.010	1.01	0	0	0

Proton-Recoil Scintillator Pulse-Height Spectra



Deuteron-Recoil Scintillator Pulse-Height Spectra



Summary

- Total and differential cross sections in Geant4 were verified for the main isotopic components of BC501A and BC537
- Preliminary pulse height spectra simulated for a simple cylindrical geometry

Next Steps

- Verify light yield parametrization for all energies
- Expand light yield simulation to the DESCANT prototype detectors
- Simulate the entire DESCANT array investigations of multiple scattering interactions, response with coupling to GRIFFIN, etc...

Acknowledgements

University of Guelph

Vinzenz Bildstein, Paul Garrett, Ryan Dunlop, Andrew MacLean, Evan Rand

Funding from The Canadian Foundation for Innovation, The National Research Council of Canada and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada



But at what cost?

- Optical physics simulations are extremely computationally expensive!
- Assuming a constant event rate, a simulation with 1000 keV neutrons is slowed down by a factor of ~ 500x !

Simulation Time vs. Number of Events



BC501A Pulse-Height Spectra



BC501A Pulse-Height Spectra

4.16 MeV

2.96 MeV

