



HAL
open science

Simulation of flow redistribution in 7 x 7 ballooned fuel bundle experiments using DRACCAR code

J.E. Luna Valencia, A.V.S. Oliveira, Tony Glantz, Alexandre Labergue, S. Leclerc, Michel Gradeck

► To cite this version:

J.E. Luna Valencia, A.V.S. Oliveira, Tony Glantz, Alexandre Labergue, S. Leclerc, et al.. Simulation of flow redistribution in 7 x 7 ballooned fuel bundle experiments using DRACCAR code. Nuclear Engineering and Design, 2022, 396, pp.111888. 10.1016/j.nucengdes.2022.111888 . hal-03921718

HAL Id: hal-03921718

<https://hal.univ-lorraine.fr/hal-03921718v1>

Submitted on 4 Jan 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Simulation of flow redistribution in 7x7 ballooned fuel bundle experiments using DRACCAR code

J.E. Luna Valencia^{a,b}, A.V.S. Oliveira^b, T. Glantz^a, S. Leclerc^b, A. Labergue^b, M. Gradeck^{b,*}

^aIRSN, PSN, B.P. 3, 13115 Saint Paul-Lez-Durance, France

^bUniversité de Lorraine, CNRS, LEMTA, F-54000 Nancy, France

Abstract

IRSN has developed the DRACCAR code in order to model loss of coolant accidents (LOCA) in a light water nuclear reactor. The physics during a hypothetical loss of coolant accident involves several phenomena such as heat and mass transfers, fluid dynamics, mechanics and chemistry. Even if the modeling requires these conjugated processes, it is important to validate them separately first. Clad ballooning can occur during a LOCA, leading to flow redistribution between sub-channels. In this paper, we present DRACCAR simulations of the fluid dynamics in two 7 x 7 ballooned bundles with different blockage ratios and ballooned lengths and with two different flow rates, one laminar and the other turbulent. DRACCAR results for the axial velocities in specific sub-channels are compared to experimental data obtained by MRI techniques on the MASCARA facility. The present results show that DRACCAR is capable of predicting correctly the velocity profiles for both bundles and flow rates. The axial velocity is, in general, well estimated by DRACCAR, especially for the intact and less-blocked sub-channels. DRACCAR also performed well for the most blocked sub-channel for both bundles, performing better for the most blocked one, which ensures DRACCAR fluid dynamics calculations in the most critical regions in LOCA conditions.

Keywords:

LOCA, Nuclear reactor, Clad ballooning, Thermal-hydraulics, Reflooding, Magnetic Resonance Imaging

1. Introduction

One hypothetical accident that is considered for the design of the safety systems of pressurized-water reactors (PWR) is the Loss of Coolant Accident, commonly referred to as LOCA. During the course of such an accident, the fuel rods heat dissipation can be highly degraded and the fuel assemblies' temperature rapidly increases. In some cases, it leads to the ballooning or burst of some of the pressurized fuel rods and the formation of blocked sub-channels (Fig. 1) [1]. The emergency core cooling system (ECCS) is designed to inject fresh water into the nuclear reactor's core to impede the fuel assemblies to reach prohibitive temperatures. This step is known as the reflooding phase. Because of the high temperature of the fuel rods, the injected water partially evaporates and a steam-droplet two-phase flow is created downstream of the water level. This phenomenon plays a very important role in the coolability of the regions not yet immersed in water.

Different thermal-hydraulic studies have been carried out to characterize this two-phase flow and its cooling capacity: the droplets' size across spacer grids under reflood conditions [2, 3], the modeling of droplets breakup and

*Corresponding author

Email address: michel.gradeck@univ-lorraine.fr (M. Gradeck)




Figure 1: Picture after PHEBUS in-pile LOCA experiment showing the clad ballooning and the formation of blocked sub-channels ([1]).

entrainment during the reflooding phase [4, 5] and the droplets dynamics and heat transfer between the flow and the nuclear rods at sub-channel scale [6, 7]. Furthermore, the steam flow rate entering the blocked sub-channels is decreased due to its preferential deviation to less deformed sub-channels [8]. Ruyer et al. [9] observed in a CFD analysis that with this steam deviation, the large droplets tend to continue their path toward the blocked sub-channel because of their high inertia. Nevertheless, this is still particularly critical because wall-to-steam convection is highly decreased, as this is the most important heat dissipation process during a LOCA [10, 11]. For this reason, the thermal-hydraulics in blocked sub-channels raises concerns on the core coolability to guarantee nuclear safety [12].

In order to increase the knowledge on the cooling of a reactor's core during a LOCA, the French Institut de Radioprotection et de Sûreté Nucléaire (IRSN) launched the PERFROI project intending to perform high-quality experiments for better understanding the thermal-hydraulics and thermomechanics during a LOCA. In the thermal-hydraulics axis, the main experiment (named COAL¹ [13, 14]) consists of a bundle of electrically heated rods, with the blockage region simulating clad ballooning and fuel relocation (balloons filling up with fuel pellets, associated with a possible power profile modification [15–17]), using a 7 x 7 bundle geometry at full-length scale. The test section instrumentation counts with many thermocouples placed on the sheaths, on the housing and in the flow. Although COAL experiments allow the thermal-hydraulics characterization during the reflooding phase, information on the heat transfer and fluid dynamics processes is hidden in this large-scale experiment. For this reason, additional experimental campaigns were carried out to complement COAL with information on the two-phase flow heat transfer and hydraulics. On the one hand, experiments with COLIBRI² experimental apparatus [6, 7] resulted in a precise characterization of the heat transfer phenomena by analyzing a steam-droplets flow within a vertical tube in LOCA conditions at the sub-channel scale. On the other hand, using MRI techniques, the experimental campaign MASCARA³ [18, 19] provided valuable information on the flow redistribution in the presence of ballooned zone within several 7 x 7 bundles. The geometries tested in MASCARA were very similar to the test sections to be used in COAL experiments. Therefore, while COLIBRI contributed to the analysis of the thermal phenomena and the droplets dynamics, MASCARA campaign isolated the hydraulics from thermal effects and analyzed the flow behavior when passing through spacer grids and ballooned fuel rods.

All the effort spent in experimental campaigns is justified because they serve to acquire knowledge of the involved

¹COAL: **CO**olability of a fuel **A**ssembly during **LO**CA

²COLIBRI: **CO**o**LI**ng of **B**lockage **R**egion **I**nside a PWR Reactor

³MASCARA: **M**RI of **A**ssembly **S**ub-**C**hannels for the **A**nalysis of **R**eactor **A**ccidents.

1
2
3 physical phenomena and integrate it into computer codes such as DRACCAR⁴, an IRSN's code that describes the
4 3D thermomechanical behavior and reflooding of a fuel assembly including its coolability as well as its embrittlement
5 during a LOCA. The code evaluates the blockage ratio associated with deformed fuel rods and their impact on core
6 cooling. Also, DRACCAR simulates the uncovering (dewatering) phase of cooling accidents affecting spent fuel pools.
7 This calculation implies complex computations involving multi-phase flow, coupled with heat transfers, chemical
8 reactions, mechanical strain, and fuel relocation. In thermal-hydraulics simulations, DRACCAR is coupled to two
9 different codes, CESAR [20] and CATHARE-3 [21].

10
11
12 DRACCAR simulations of COLIBRI experiments have already been performed [10] and very good agreement has
13 been observed, even though the heat transfer by impact of the droplets has been neglected. The next step, before
14 the simulation of COAL experiments with DRACCAR, is the simulation of the MASCARA hydraulics experiments,
15 object of the present paper. Although Oliveira et al. tested several geometries and flow rates [18, 19], we compare
16 herein calculations and experimental results for two flow rates and two bundles: one bundle with 90% of blockage
17 ratio and 240 mm of blockage length and one with 61% of blockage ratio and 100 mm of blockage length, both
18 with flow rates of 50 and 245 lpm. In this study, the DRACCAR/CATHARE-3 coupling is used in the different
19 simulations.

20 2. MASCARA: experimental apparatus and procedure

21
22
23 MASCARA device has been developed to measure three-component velocity fields in fuel rods bundles having
24 ballooned zones using magnetic resonance velocimetry (MRV). More than 1,000 velocity fields were obtained with
25 seven different bundles and four different flow rates, some results presented in detail in previous studies, like comparing
26 the flow in an intact bundle and a ballooned one [19] and analyzing parametric effects on the flow redistribution
27 because of clad ballooning [18]. Detailed information regarding the measurement techniques, the MRV sequence
28 and parameters, data reduction and uncertainties are available in these previous works. In this paper, we present
29 only the main aspects concerning the test section that are important when comparing the experimental results with
30 DRACCAR simulations.

31
32
33 MASCARA's experimental bench is schematically represented in Fig. 2, consisting of a regular single-phase
34 hydraulic circuit with a screw pump connected to a damper in order to assure a stable flow in all the circuit,
35 pressures transducers for safety purposes, an electromagnetic flowmeter to measure the water flow rate, which is
36 later used for validating the MRV measurements, and the test section. This one consists of a 7 x 7 representative test
37 bundle, which is inserted into a radiofrequency (RF) coil and this assembly is, in turn, inserted into the MRI scanner.
38 The intact rods were made of polycarbonate tubes, while the ballooned rods were constructed by 3D printing (FDM
39 - fused deposition modeling) using PLA as the base polymer. Furthermore, the four spacer grids were made of
40 Inconel and they had the same material and geometry used in COAL experiments [1]. These grids were not made
41 of a ferromagnetic material; however, they still disturbed the magnetic field and impeded accurate velocity field
42 measurements by 4 cm close to them.

43
44
45 All the bundles tested by Oliveira et al. [18] had 49 elements arranged in a 7 × 7 structure, having thirty tubes

46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62 ⁴DRACCAR: **D**éformation et **R**enoyage d'un **A**ssemblage de **C**rayons **C**ombustibles pendant un **A**cident de **R**efroidissement




Figure 2: Hydraulic circuit of MASCARA: 1) water tank, 2) eccentric screw pump, 3) damper, 4) absolute pressure transducer, 5) electromagnetic flowmeter, 6) differential pressure transducer, 7) test section, 8) MRI scanner, 9) radio- frequency (RF) coil. ([19]).

with 9.5 mm diameter to represent intact fuel rods, sixteen ballooned tubes, and three tubes with a 12.45 mm diameter to represent guide tubes. In this study, we chose two bundles having two different blockage ratios and two different blockage lengths, named G61%/100mm and G90%/240mm, to compare with DRACCAR simulations. The blockage ratio τ_b describes the reduction in the cross-sectional area because of the cladding ballooning and is defined by:

$$\tau_b = 1 - \frac{S_b}{S_0} \quad (1)$$

where S_b and S_0 are the flow passage areas of a blocked and an intact sub-channel, respectively. The first bundle, G61%/100mm, represents the case where the blocked sub-channels are formed by four ballooned rods that touch their neighboring rods without losing the circular shape ($\tau_b = 61\%$ in Fig. 4), with a blockage length of 100 mm. The second bundle, G90%/240mm, represents a severe blockage ratio and length, as mentioned by Grandjean [22]. In this case, the blocked sub-channels are formed by ballooned fuel rods with a squared shape and rounded corners, due to joint deformation with neighboring rods ($\tau_b = 90\%$ in Fig. 4). Therefore, in the ballooned zone (for τ_b equal to both 61% and 90%), the flow within blocked sub-channels is isolated from neighborhood sub-channels with both bundles.

Figure 3 shows the side view of these two test section configurations and the position of the spacer grids and the ballooned zone, with their values given in Table 1. The first and the last spacer grids do not have mixing vanes, while the two in the middle have them with remarkable performance to homogenize the flow, as described in previous studies [19]. The distance of 522 mm between the two mixing spacer grids in the middle (E - A) was fixed because it is approximately the same distance found in typical French PWR's. Figure 4, in turn, shows the bundles

cross-sectional views in the intact and ballooned zones, the first only having intact sub-channels (no ballooning) and the second having the balloon whose shape corresponds to the bundles blockage ratios (61% and 90%).

Table 1: Dimensions of the tested bundles as shown in Fig. 3 (in mm).

Bundle	τ_b	L_b	A	B	C	D	E	F	E-A
G61%/100mm	61%	100	252	444 ^a	479	614 ^a	774	1073	522
G90%/240mm	90%	240	282	370	435	740	803	1072	521

^a In our previous study [18], these dimensions were incorrectly presented (difference of 10 mm). These are the correct values.




Figure 3: Axial positions of the grids and the balloon in the bundles.

Between the intact and the ballooned regions, there is a transition zone (Fig. 5). For the G61%/100mm bundle with a blockage ratio of 61%, the fuel rods cross-section increases keeping the circular shape and the transition finishes where they are in contact. The length of this transition is 35 mm. For the case of the G90%/240mm bundle with a 90% blockage ratio, there is a first transition like the one in the G61%/100mm bundle and a second transition zone, which is 30 mm long, where the fuel rods shape continues deforming progressively until reaching the final cross-section shown in Fig. 4. For both bundles, there is another transition zone downstream of the balloon, exactly like the first but mirrored.

As mentioned at the beginning of this section, MRV was the technique we used to measure the velocity fields in these bundles. We used a typical gradient-echo pulse sequence with an additional flow encoding sequence. The pixel resolution was $0.47 \times 0.47 \text{ mm}^2$ and the experimental procedure ensured the velocity uncertainty in one pixel to be about 20% of the bulk mean velocity [19]. However, to compare the experimental results with DRACCAR simulations, we must take the mean axial velocity within a sub-channel. In this case, the uncertainty of this mean velocity is reduced to 10% of the flow mean velocity, as discussed by Oliveira et al. [18].




Figure 4: Section view in the intact and ballooned zones, with evidence on the ballooned fuel rods' shapes for 61% and 90% blockage ratios ([19]).




Figure 5: Transition from regular to ballooned zone for both bundles: a) G61%/100 mm; b) G90%/240mm.

3. DRACCAR: details of the simulation

3.1. Modeling concept


DRACCAR is a code from the FUEL+ software platform developed by IRSN since 2008 to simulate the 3D thermo-mechanical deformation and the reflooding of fuel rods during a LOCA (among other phenomena). DRACCAR allows

1
2
3 modeling problems with different scales, from a single fuel rod or fuel assembly to the entire reactor's core or spent
4 fuel pool. Moreover, this code can perform calculations including fuel assembly components like control rods, fuel
5 rods (modeling both the stack of fuel pellets and the cladding), instrumentation tubes, guide tubes, and spacer
6 grids. To achieve this, DRACCAR couples two codes: a thermo-mechanical code ICARE3D and one of the two
7 different thermal-hydraulic codes, CESAR and CATHARE-3 [16]. In the present study, we coupled DRACCAR with
8
9
10
11

12 For the thermal-hydraulics calculations, DRACCAR relies on a 3D structured mesh with hexahedral elements.
13 In the transverse direction, each element contains one sub-channel, which means that DRACCAR does not calculate
14 velocity profiles within the sub-channel. On the other hand, the sub-channels are meshed in the axial direction.
15 Hence, the mass and momentum balance equations are solved for each element. Although the simulation in this
16
17
18
19
20

21 3.2. Simulation domain and conditions

22
23 The main objective of simulating MASCARA experiments using DRACCAR is to validate the fluid dynamics
24 models implemented in the code by comparing the calculated and measured fluid velocities upstream, within, and
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32 downstream of the ballooned zone. Thus, the simulation domain is restricted to the bundle part downstream of the
33 first mixing spacer grid until the top grid of the test section (Fig. 6). The inlet boundary condition was set for each
34 sub-channel as the velocity measured experimentally in MASCARA and the outlet pressure value was set to the
35 atmospheric pressure (relative pressure equal to zero).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42



43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
Figure 6: Simulation domain of the present study.

66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000




Figure 7: Example of balloon modeling with DRACCAR.

automatically by DRACCAR using a modified Idel'cick equation [23]:

$$k = 0.228 \left(\frac{p}{d} - 1 \right)^{-0.5} \quad (2)$$

where p and d are the pitch and the external rod diameter respectively. Finally, some number of the domain discretization are: for the G61%100mm bundle, we used 24 axial elements, of which 8 correspond to the transition and ballooned zones; and for the bungle G90%/240mm we used 41 axial elements, 14 of them being in the transition and ballooned zones.

3.3. DRACCAR/MASCARA comparison

Oliveira et al. [19] presented velocity fields like the example in Fig. 8a (without transverse velocities), the colored bar referring to the magnitude of the axial velocity V_z (z -direction, Fig. 6) normalized with the bulk mean velocity \tilde{V}_{ref} . Nevertheless, DRACCAR simulations only provide mean velocities for each sub-channel, i.e. without detailing the velocity field within the sub-channels. For this reason, MASCARA results of velocity fields were re-processed to obtain the mean axial velocity for each sub-channel. Fig. 8b presents the same velocity field shown in Fig. 8a but now with the normalized mean axial velocity for each sub-channel, which can be compared with DRACCAR simulations. In addition, we used two flow rates for the DRACCAR validation: 50 lpm and 240 lpm, corresponding to a Reynolds number of 1936 and 9599 respectively (laminar and turbulent flow).

Comparing visually the velocity fields as in Fig. 8 or presenting velocity profiles for all the 64 sub-channels would not be practical nor simple to validate the DRACCAR simulations. Therefore, we chose specific sub-channels to compare MASCARA and DRACCAR results (Fig. 9), each one with specific blockage and location characteristics as listed below:

- **A:** a sub-channel with the highest blockage ratio, in the center of the ballooned zone;
- **B:** a moderately blocked sub-channel between two intact rods and two ballooned rods;
- **C:** a moderately blocked sub-channel between one guide tube, one intact rod, and two ballooned rod;
- **D:** an intact sub-channel.




Figure 8: Example for G90%/240mm bundle at 50 lpm of: (a) a normalized axial velocity field obtained by MRI techniques (MASCARA result), and (b) its corresponding normalized mean axial field for each sub-channel for comparison with DRACCAR simulation.

These sub-channels present axial velocity profiles with different behaviors that worth the discussion in this paper. Other sub-channels could also be used in the results presentation, like those partially blocked in the corners of the ballooned zone (for example, the one between D and D' or the one at two sub-channels above C) or those neighboring the housing. They were not used because the first is less critical than the chosen partially blocked sub-channels and the latter presented practically the same velocity profile of an intact sub-channel.




Figure 9: Sub-channels chosen for this study and the bundle symmetry axis, showing an example of symmetric sub-channels (D and D').

The tested geometry was designed to be symmetric to an inclined axis (Fig. 9), which should result in a velocity field as well symmetric to the same axis. However, the bundles used in MASCARA could be slightly misaligned inside the housing [19] and this would favor the axial flow in one sub-channel compared to its symmetric one, although the difference is negligible most of the times. We present examples of this result with the G90%/240mm bundle at the beginning of the results presentation. To reduce experimental biases because of the bundle misalignment and to better validate DRACCAR simulations, we used the mean velocity of the two symmetric sub-channels of MASCARA results. Moreover, averaging the sub-channel velocities reduces the experimental uncertainty because considering more pixels in the averaging population reduces the measurement noise. Figure 9 presents an example of symmetric sub-channels (D and D'), so the experimental results presented in the next section for this sub-channel are actually

the average of these two sub-channels.

4. Results and discussion

We present herein the results as axial velocity profiles for the chosen sub-channels shown in Fig. 9 and for both bundles (G61%/100mm and G90%/240mm) and flow rates (50 and 245 lpm). For a better comparison of MASCARA and DRACCAR results, we normalized both axial positions according to the zone in the bundle and the sub-channels' axial velocities. The first normalization was done by taking the position within a given zone (intact, transition or balloon) and dividing it by the length of this zone. Meanwhile, the axial velocity normalization was performed according to the following equation:

$$V_{z,n} = \frac{V_z - V_{min}}{V_{max} - V_{min}} \quad (3)$$

where V_{min} and V_{max} are, respectively, the minimum and maximum axial velocities either simulated in DRACCAR or obtained in MASCARA, resulting in $V_{z,n}$ always between 0 and 1.

As mentioned in the previous section, we present in Fig. 10 results for symmetric sub-channels with the G90%/240mm bundle for the two tested flow rates. Because DRACCAR simulations result in perfectly matched axial velocity profiles for symmetric sub-channels, only one of its curves is presented in the figure. For MASCARA results, the axial velocities of symmetric sub-channels are very similar for both flow rates but do not match perfectly, which is natural in experiments. Hence, using average values for MASCARA axial velocities to compare with DRACCAR simulations is reasonable to reduce experimental imperfections, even if they are very small.





Figure 10: Comparison of axial profiles in symmetric sub-channels for the G90%/240mm bundle: (a) 50 lpm, and (b) 245 lpm.

Starting with the G61%/100mm bundle, Fig. 11a and b present the simulated and experimental velocity profiles for this bundle with 50 and 245 lpm, respectively. The velocity profiles in less blocked sub-channels, i.e. B and D, are very similar: the axial velocity increased upstream of the balloon because of the flow redistribution from blocked sub-channels (like A), the axial velocity was almost stable in the ballooned zone, and there was a slight decrease downstream of the balloon. DRACCAR succeeded to estimate their velocity profiles within the experimental uncertainty ($V_{z,n} = \pm 0.1$). For the most blocked sub-channel (A), the axial velocity decreased up- and downstream of

1
 2
 3 the ballooned zone because of the flow redistribution in the first transition zone and the flow passage area expansion
 4 in the second transition zone, as described in detail by Oliveira et al. [18]. In this case, DRACCAR calculated
 5 the same velocity profile observed in the experiments but the quantitative results were only accurate in the first
 6 transition for 50 lpm and the ballooned zone for both flow rates. Especially downstream of the balloon, DRACCAR
 7 overestimated the axial velocity within the blocked sub-channel. This is clearly observed in Fig. 12 where we present
 8 the difference between the calculated and experimental $V_{z,n}$ with black horizontal dashed lines to represent the
 9 range where DRACCAR calculations are within the experimental uncertainty. We find that DRACCAR results
 10 for sub-channel A were fairly accurate except in the second transition zone. Last, for both flow rates, DRACCAR
 11 could predict neither qualitatively nor quantitatively the axial velocity profile for sub-channel C, the one neighboring
 12 ballooned rods and a guide tube. Although the increase in the first transition zone was well calculated, the decrease
 13 in the ballooned zone was not predicted in the simulations, while the decrease in the second transition zone was
 14 not as steep as observed in the experimental results (Fig. 11). This difference between simulation and experimental
 15 results for sub-channel C is clearer in Fig. 12, especially with 50 lpm since DRACCAR largely overestimated the
 16 velocity in these regions.
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24



25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43 Figure 11: Normalized velocities (lines are DRACCAR simulations, markers are MASCARA results) in different sub-channels for the
 44 G61%/100mm bundle: (a) 50 lpm, and (b) 245 lpm.

45
 46
 47 Figure 13 presents the DRACCAR and MASCARA results for the axial velocity along the G90%/240mm bundle,
 48 while Fig. 14 shows the difference between simulated and experimental axial velocities, both figures for 50 and 245
 49 lpm. As in the previous case, the velocity in the less blocked sub-channels (B and D) increased in the first transition
 50 zone, remained stable in the blocked zone and progressively decreased after the balloon. Likewise, DRACCAR
 51 adequately estimated the velocity in these sub-channels within the experimental uncertainty, except in the first
 52 transition zone for the sub-channel B with 50 lpm. The fluid velocity in the most blocked sub-channel (A) followed
 53 a similar behavior to that described for the G61%/100mm bundle. The only difference is the existence of a local
 54 minimum in the transition zone upstream of the balloon where the ballooned rods are in touch (as shown in Fig. 5),
 55 as discussed in detail by Oliveira et al. [18]. For this sub-channel, DRACCAR estimated quite precisely the axial
 56 velocity, being more accurate in the first transition for the two studied flow rates and less accurate at the end of the
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

second transition zone, underestimating the axial velocity and finding the minimum slightly earlier than MASCARA results. Finally, DRACCAR overestimated the axial velocity for the sub-channel C with the G90%/240mm bundle as we observed with G61%/100mm. Nevertheless, most of the points are within the experimental uncertainty of $V_{z,n} = \pm 0.1$ (Fig. 14).




Figure 12: Difference between simulated (DRACCAR) and experimental (MASCARA) normalized axial velocity for the G61%/100mm bundle




Figure 13: Normalized velocities (lines are DRACCAR simulations, markers are MASCARA results) in different sub-channels for the G90%/240mm bundle: (a) 50 lpm, and (b) 245 lpm.

Although MASCARA experiments may appear relatively simple for a computational fluid dynamics simulation, we should remind that DRACCAR calculations rely on models with one element containing a whole sub-channel, without detailing the fluid dynamics within. Therefore, modeling the Navier-Stokes equation becomes more complicated, especially the convective term ($V \cdot \nabla V$) in the Lagrangian derivative. This term is significant in the transition zones, where, in fact, DRACCAR was less accurate (see Figs.12 and Figs. 14). Although the axial velocity estimates for sub-channel C all along with the bundle and sub-channel A in the second transition zone were less accurate, with deviations higher than the experimental uncertainty, DRACCAR succeeded to calculate precisely most of the




Figure 14: Difference between simulated (DRACCAR) and experimental (MASCARA) normalized axial velocity for the G90%/240mm bundle

velocity points. Table 2 presents the percentage of axial velocity points that DRACCAR could estimate within the experimental uncertainty for each bundle, flow rate and sub-channel. As we discussed, the calculations for the sub-channel A, the one in the center of the balloon, were in general quite accurate. While DRACCAR was less accurate for this sub-channel with the G61%/100mm bundle and 245 lpm flow rate, it presented a remarkable performance for the G90%/240mm, which is considered one of the most critical scenarios [22]. For less blocked sub-channels, namely B and D, DRACCAR estimated more than 85% of the local axial velocities correctly. As already mentioned, the calculations for sub-channel C (partially blocked by the neighboring balloon and a guide tube) were not accurate enough, which deserves more attention to improve the model in this case, even though this sub-channel is not considered critical as the axial velocity is not much reduced because of the flow redistribution. A more precise analysis of the transverse velocities may help to explain this difference between calculation and experimental data.

Table 2: Percentage of points estimated by DRACCAR within the experimental uncertainty ($V_{z,n} = \pm 0.1$).

	G61%/100mm		G90%/240mm	
Flow (lpm)	50	245	50	245
Sub-channel A	78%	56%	72%	92%
Sub-channel B	97%	89%	88%	100%
Sub-channel C	50%	58%	56%	56%
Sub-channel D	86%	92%	100%	100%
Total points	78%	74%	79%	87%

With the present results, the fluid dynamics model implemented in DRACCAR was validated, especially because of its accurate results for the most blocked sub-channel. Since its heat transfer models were separately validated in a previous study [10], the final step in the thermal-hydraulics axis in project PERFROI will be comparing DRACCAR

1
2
3 245 simulations with the test results from COAL experiments.
4
5

6 5. Conclusions

7
8 In this study, we validated the IRSN DRACCAR LOCA code by comparing the simulations with test results from
9 the MASCARA experimental campaign for two ballooned 7 x 7 bundles with different blockage ratios and lengths
10 (bundles G61%/100mm G90%/240mm) and with different flow rates, one in laminar regime (50 lpm) and the other
11 in turbulent regime (245 lpm). The results showed that DRACCAR succeeded to estimate the axial flow velocity in
12 intact and less blocked sub-channels for both configurations and flow rates. For the blocked sub-channel in the center
13 250 of the balloon, DRACCAR performed better with the more blocked bundle (G90%/240mm), which is considered
14 one of the worst-case scenarios of clad ballooning during a LOCA. However, for this bundle, the axial flow velocity
15 within this sub-channel was underestimated at the end of the transition zone downstream of the balloon. For the
16 G61%/100mm bundle, DRACCAR succeeds to correctly estimate the velocity profile for this blocked sub-channel
17 and most of the points were estimated within the experimental uncertainty; however, the axial velocity was largely
18 overestimated at the end of the second transition zone. Finally, for the partially-blocked sub-channel neighboring
19 the balloon and a guide tube, the axial velocity estimate deserves more attention to improve its calculation, even
20 though this is not considered a critical sub-channel during a LOCA.
21 255

22
23
24
25
26
27
28 260 Once COAL experimental campaign will be finished, simulations of the experiments will be performed with
29 DRACCAR including all the involved thermal-hydraulics phenomena during the reflooding phase, which will be
30 an important step for the validation of code. Furthermore, DRACCAR simulations of MASCARA experiments
31 with non-coplanar balloons are also expected, in which balloons are located in different axial positions so the flow
32 redistribution behaves differently from those presented in this study.
33
34
35
36
37

38 265 6. Acknowledgement

39
40 The authors would like to thank Didier Stemmelen, Research Fellow at CNRS and LEMTA (Université de
41 Lorraine), for reviewing this paper and giving valuable suggestions to improve its quality, especially concerning the
42 method and result presentations.
43
44
45

46 7. Funding

47
48
49 270 This work is completed within the framework of RSNR Project PERFROI from a French State aid managed by
50 the French National Research Agency under the program of Investments for the Future carrying the reference n°
51 ANR-11-RSNR-0017.
52
53
54

55 References

- 56
57 [1] G. Repetto, C. Dominguez, B. Durville, S. Carnemolla, D. Campello, C. Tardif, M. Gradeck, The R&D PER-
58 FROI project on thermal mechanical and thermal hydraulics behaviors of a fuel rod assembly during a loss of
59 275 coolant accident, 16th International Topical Meeting on Nuclear Reactor Thermal Hydraulics (NURETH-16) 1
60 (2015) 1–14.
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3 [2] Y. Jin, F. R. Beck, B. R. Lowery, D. J. Miller, F. B. Cheung, S. M. Bajorek, K. Tien, C. L. Hoxie, Experimental
4 study of droplet sizes across a spacer grid location under various reflood conditions, *Experimental Thermal and*
5 *Fluid Science* 94 (February 2017) (2018) 246–257. doi:[10.1016/j.expthermflusci.2018.02.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.expthermflusci.2018.02.017).
6 280
- 7
8 [3] H. K. Cho, K. Y. Choi, S. Cho, C.-H. Song, Experimental observation of the droplet size change across a wet grid
9 spacer in a 6x6 rod bundle, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 241 (12) (2011) 4649 – 4656, the18th International
10 Conference on Nuclear Engineering (ICONE-18). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2011.03.042>.
11
- 12
13 [4] Y. Jin, F.-B. Cheung, K. Shirvan, S. M. Bajorek, K. Tien, C. L. Hoxie, Development of a droplet breakup model
14 for dry spacer grid in the dispersed flow film boiling regime during reflood transients, *International Journal of*
15 *Heat and Mass Transfer* 143 (2019) 118544. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2019.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2019.118544)
16 285 [118544](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2019.118544).
17
18
19
20 [5] J. M. Yoo, B. J. Yun, H. Y. Yoon, J. J. Jeong, Modeling of the droplet entrainment rate in the post-dryout
21 regime for the analysis of a reflood phase, *Annals of Nuclear Energy* 148 (2020) 107757. doi:[https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2020.107757)
22 [org/10.1016/j.anucene.2020.107757](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2020.107757).
23 290
24
25
26 [6] J. Peña Carrillo, A. V. S. Oliveira, A. Labergue, T. Glantz, M. Gradeck, Experimental thermal hydraulics
27 study of the blockage ratio effect during the cooling of a vertical tube with an internal steam-droplets flow,
28 *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer* 140 (2019) 648 – 659. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2019.06.012)
29 [ijheatmasstransfer.2019.06.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2019.06.012).
30
31
32
33 295 [7] A. V. S. Oliveira, J. D. Peña Carrillo, A. Labergue, T. Glantz, M. Gradeck, Experimental study of dispersed
34 flow film boiling at sub-channel scale in LOCA conditions: Influence of the steam flow rate and residual power,
35 *Applied Thermal Engineering* 172 (2020) 115143. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2020.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2020.115143)
36 [115143](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2020.115143).
37
38
39
40 [8] N. H. Nguyen, J. Kim, S.-H. Hong, S.-K. Moon, C.-H. Song, Improvements of cobra-4k on the effect of flow
41 blockage during a lb loca with consideration of fuel relocation phenomenon, *Nuclear Engineering and Design*
42 300 *325* (2017) 218 – 231. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2017.08.015>.
43
44
45
46 [9] P. Ruyer, N. Seiler, B. Biton, F. Lelong, F. Secondi, D. Baalbaki, M. Gradeck, Two-phase flow across a partially
47 damaged core during the reflood phase of a LOCA, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 264 (2013) 187 – 194,
48 SI:NURETH-14. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2013.02.026>.
49
50
51 305 [10] A. V. S. Oliveira, J. D. Peña Carrillo, A. Labergue, T. Glantz, M. Gradeck, Mechanistic modeling of the thermal-
52 hydraulics in polydispersed flow film boiling in LOCA conditions, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 357 (2020)
53 110388. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2019.110388>.
54
55
56
57 [11] Y. Guo, K. Mishima, A non-equilibrium mechanistic heat transfer model for post-dryout dispersed flow regime,
58 *Experimental Thermal and Fluid Science* 26 (6-7) (2002) 861–869. doi:[10.1016/S0894-1777\(02\)00195-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0894-1777(02)00195-4).
59
60
61 310 [12] C.-H. Song, Some issues and challenges in advanced thermal-hydraulic safety research, *Nuclear Technology*
62 196 (3) (2016) 421–445. doi:<https://doi.org/10.13182/NT16-91>.
63
64
65

- 1
2
3 [13] G. Repetto, T. Glantz, G. Guillard, B. Bruyère, Q. Grando, Core coolability in loss of coolant accident: the
4 COAL experiments investigating the thermal hydraulics of a rod bundle with blocked area during the reflooding,
5 17th International Topical Meeting on Nuclear Reactor Thermal Hydraulics (NURETH-17) 1 (2017) 359–372.
6
7
8 315 [14] G. Repetto, C. Marquié, B. Bruyère, T. Glantz, Core coolability in loss of coolant accident: the COAL exper-
9 iments, 16th International Topical Meeting on Nuclear Reactor Thermal Hydraulics (NURETH-16) 1 (2015)
10 24–37.
11
12
13 [15] S. Bascou, O. De Luze, S. Ederli, G. Guillard, Development and validation of the multi-physics DRACCAR
14 code, *Annals of Nuclear Energy* 84 (2015) 1–18. doi:10.1016/j.anucene.2014.09.040.
15
16
17 320 [16] T. Glantz, T. Taurines, O. De Luze, S. Belon, G. Guillard, F. Jacq, DRACCAR: A multi-physics code for
18 computational analysis of multi-rod ballooning, coolability and fuel relocation during LOCA transients Part
19 one: General modeling description, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 339 (June) (2018) 269–285. doi:10.1016/
20 j.nucengdes.2018.06.022.
21
22
23
24 [17] T. Glantz, T. Taurines, S. Belon, O. De Luze, G. Guillard, F. Jacq, DRACCAR: A multi-physics code for
25 computational analysis of multi-rod ballooning, coolability and fuel relocation during LOCA transients. Part
26 325 Two: Overview of modeling capabilities for LOCA, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 339 (August) (2018) 202–
27 214. doi:10.1016/j.nucengdes.2018.08.031.
28
29
30
31 [18] A. V. S. Oliveira, D. Stemmelen, S. Leclerc, T. Glantz, A. Labergue, G. Repetto, M. Gradeck, Parametric effects
32 on the flow redistribution in ballooned bundles evaluated by magnetic resonance velocimetry, *Experimental*
33 *Thermal and Fluid Science* 125 (2021) 110383. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.expthermflusci.2021.
34 330 110383.
35
36
37
38 [19] A. V. S. Oliveira, D. Stemmelen, S. Leclerc, T. Glantz, A. Labergue, G. Repetto, M. Gradeck, Velocity field
39 and flow redistribution in a ballooned 7×7 fuel bundle measured by magnetic resonance velocimetry, *Nuclear*
40 *Engineering and Design* 369 (2020) 110828. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2020.110828.
41
42
43 335 [20] P. Chatelard, S. Belon, L. Bosland, L. Carénini, O. Coindreau, F. Cousin, C. Marchetto, H. Nowack, L. Piar,
44 L. Chailan, Main modelling features of the astec v2.1 major version, *Annals of Nuclear Energy* 93 (2016)
45 83–93, eRMSAR-2015 conference of SARNET in the frame of the NUGENIA Technical Area 2. doi:https:
46 //doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2015.12.026.
47
48
49
50 [21] P. Emonot, A. Souyri, J. Gandrille, F. Barré, Cathare-3: A new system code for thermal-hydraulics in the
51 context of the neptune project, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 241 (11) (2011) 4476–4481, 13th International
52 340 Topical Meeting on Nuclear Reactor Thermal Hydraulics (NURETH-13). doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.
53 nucengdes.2011.04.049.
54
55
56
57 [22] C. Grandjean, Coolability of blocked regions in a rod bundle after ballooning under LOCA conditions: Main
58 findings from a review of past experimental programmes, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 237 (15) (2007) 1872
59 – 1886, NURETH-11. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2007.02.022.
60 345
61
62 [23] I. Idel’cik, *Mémento des pertes de charges*, 3rd Edition, Eyrolles, EDF, Paris, 1986.
63
64
65

Simulation of flow redistribution in 7x7 ballooned fuel bundle experiments using DRACCAR code

J.E. Luna Valencia^{a,b}, A.V.S. Oliveira^b, T. Glantz^a, A. Labergue^b, S. Leclerc^b, M. Gradeck^{b,*}

^aIRSN, PSN, B.P. 3, 13115 Saint Paul-Lez-Durance, France

^bUniversité de Lorraine, CNRS, LEMTA, F-54000 Nancy, France

Abstract

IRSN has developed DRACCAR code in order to model loss of coolant accidents (LOCA) in a light water nuclear reactor. The physics during a hypothetical loss of coolant accident involves several phenomena such as heat and mass transfers, fluid dynamics, mechanics, and chemistry. Even if the modeling requires these conjugated processes, it is important to validate them separately first. Clad ballooning can occur during a LOCA, leading to flow redistribution between sub-channels. In this paper, we present DRACCAR simulations of the fluid dynamics in two 7 x 7 ballooned bundles with different blockage ratios and ballooned lengths and with two different flow rates, one laminar and the other turbulent. DRACCAR results for the axial velocities in specific sub-channels are compared to experimental data obtained by MRI techniques on the MASCARA facility. The present results show that **in most of the sub-channels studied**, DRACCAR is capable of predicting correctly the velocity profiles for both bundles and flow rates. The axial velocity is, in general, well estimated by DRACCAR, especially for the intact and less-blocked sub-channels. **For the most blocked subchannel, DRACCAR is able to estimate the majority of the axial velocity in a margin of $\pm 15\%$ with respect to the MASCARA values, except for the most blocked subchannel in laminar flow.**

Keywords:

LOCA, Nuclear reactor, Clad ballooning, Thermal-hydraulics, Reflooding, Magnetic Resonance Imaging

1. Nomenclature

Latin letters		V_{min}	MASCARA's minimum axial velocity
d	Nuclear rod diameter	V_{max}	MASCARA's maximum axial velocity
L_b	Blocked length	\tilde{V}_{ref}	Bulk mean velocity
k	Pressure drop coefficient	V_z	Axial velocity
p	Nuclear rod pitch	$V_{z,n}$	Normalized axial velocity
S_b	Blocked sub-channel flow passage area	z	Axial distance
S_0	Intact sub-channel flow passage area	Greek letters	
V	Velocity	τ_b	Dimensionless blockage ratio

*Corresponding author

Email address: michel.gradeck@univ-lorraine.fr (M. Gradeck)

2. Introduction

One hypothetical accident that is considered for the design of the safety systems of pressurized-water reactors (PWR) is the Loss of Coolant Accident, commonly referred to as LOCA. During the course of such an accident, the fuel rods heat dissipation can be highly degraded and the fuel assemblies' temperature rapidly increases. In some cases, it leads to the ballooning or burst of some of the pressurized fuel rods and the formation of blocked sub-channels (Fig. 1) [1]. The emergency core cooling system (ECCS) is designed to inject fresh water into the nuclear reactor's core to impede the fuel assemblies to reach prohibitive temperatures. This step is known as the reflooding phase. Because of the high temperature of the fuel rods, the injected water partially evaporates and a steam-droplet two-phase flow is created downstream of the water level. This phenomenon plays a very important role in the coolability of the regions not yet immersed in water.




Figure 1: Picture after PHEBUS in-pile LOCA experiment showing the clad ballooning and the formation of blocked sub-channels [1].

Different thermal-hydraulic studies have been carried out to characterize this two-phase flow and its cooling capacity: the droplets' size across spacer grids under reflood conditions [2, 3], the modeling of droplets breakup and entrainment during the reflooding phase [4, 5] and the droplets dynamics and heat transfer between the flow and the nuclear rods at sub-channel scale [6, 7]. Furthermore, the steam flow rate entering the blocked sub-channels is decreased due to its preferential deviation to less deformed sub-channels [8]. Ruyer et al. [9] observed in a CFD analysis that with this steam deviation, the large droplets tend to continue their path toward the blocked sub-channel because of their high inertia. Nevertheless, this is still particularly critical because [heat transfer due to wall-to-steam convection](#) is highly decreased [in blocked sub-channels](#), as this is the most important heat dissipation process during a LOCA [10, 11]. For this reason, the thermal-hydraulics in blocked sub-channels raises concerns on the core coolability to guarantee nuclear safety [12].

In order to increase the knowledge on the cooling of a reactor's core during a LOCA, the French Institut de Radioprotection et de Sûreté Nucléaire (IRSN) launched the PERFROI project intending to perform high-quality experiments for better understanding the [thermal-hydraulic and thermomechanic behaviors of the damaged core](#) during a LOCA. In the thermal-hydraulics axis, the main experiment (named COAL¹ [13, 14]) consists of a bundle of electrically heated rods, with the blockage region simulating clad ballooning and fuel relocation (balloons filling up with fuel pellets, associated with a possible power profile modification [15–17]), using a 7 x 7 bundle geometry at full-length scale. The test section instrumentation counts with many thermocouples placed on the sheaths, on the housing

¹COAL: **CO**olability of a fuel **A**ssembly during **LO**CA

1
2
3 and in the flow. Although COAL experiments allow the thermal-hydraulics characterization during the reflooding
4 phase, information on the heat transfer and fluid dynamics processes is hidden in this large-scale experiment. For
5 this reason, additional experimental campaigns were carried out to complement COAL with information on the
6 two-phase flow heat transfer and hydraulics. On the one hand, experiments with COLIBRI² experimental apparatus
7 [6, 7] resulted in a precise characterization of the heat transfer phenomena by analyzing a steam-droplets flow
8 within a vertical tube in LOCA conditions at the sub-channel scale. On the other hand, using MRI techniques,
9 the experimental campaign MASCARA³ [18, 19] provided valuable information on the flow redistribution in the
10 presence of ballooned zone within several 7 x 7 bundles. The geometries tested in MASCARA were very similar to
11 the test sections that will be used in COAL experiments. Therefore, while COLIBRI contributed to the analysis
12 of the thermal phenomena and the droplets dynamics, MASCARA campaign isolated the hydraulics from thermal
13 effects and analyzed the flow behavior when passing through spacer grids and ballooned fuel rods.
14
15

16
17
18
19
20 All the effort spent in experimental campaigns is justified because they serve to acquire knowledge of the involved
21 physical phenomena and integrate it into computer codes such as DRACCAR⁴, an IRSN's code that describes the
22 3D thermomechanical behavior and reflooding of a fuel assembly including its coolability as well as its embrittlement
23 during a LOCA. The code evaluates the blockage ratio associated with deformed fuel rods and their impact on core
24 cooling. Also, DRACCAR simulates the uncovering (dewatering) phase of cooling accidents affecting spent fuel pools.
25 This calculation implies complex computations involving multi-phase flow, coupled with heat transfers, chemical
26 reactions, mechanical strain, and fuel relocation. To accomplish this, DRACCAR combines two codes, one for the
27 thermomechanical and chemical behavior calculation of the fuel assemblies and the second one, for the thermal-
28 hydraulics behavior calculation for the flow that passes through these assemblies [16, 17]. In thermal-hydraulics
29 simulations, DRACCAR is coupled to two different thermal-hydraulic codes, CESAR [20] and CATHARE-3 [21].
30
31

32
33
34
35
36 DRACCAR simulations of COLIBRI experiments have already been performed [10] and very good agreement
37 has been observed, even though the heat transfer by droplets impact onto the heated wall has been neglected –
38 this heat transfer phenomenon can contribute up to 10% to the internal heat dissipation (for an intact tube and
39 a droplet volume fraction of about 10^{-4}), as evaluated by Peña Carrillo et al. [22]. The next step, before the
40 simulation of COAL experiments with DRACCAR, is the simulation of the MASCARA hydraulics experiments,
41 object of the present paper. Although Oliveira et al. tested several geometries and flow rates [18, 19], we compare
42 herein calculations and experimental results for two flow rates and two bundles: one bundle with 90% of blockage
43 ratio and 240 mm of blockage length and one with 61% of blockage ratio and 100 mm of blockage length, both with
44 flow rates of 50 and 245 lpm. In this study, the DRACCAR/CATHARE-3 coupling is used in the simulations.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 3. MASCARA: experimental apparatus and procedure

53
54 MASCARA device has been developed to measure three-component velocity fields in fuel rods bundles having
55 ballooned zones using magnetic resonance velocimetry (MRV). More than 1,000 velocity fields were obtained with
56 seven different bundles and four different flow rates, some results were presented in detail in previous studies, like
57
58
59


60 ²COLIBRI: COoLIing of Blockage Region Inside a PWR Reactor

61 ³MASCARA: MRI of Assembly Sub-Channels for the Analysis of Reactor Accidents.

62 ⁴DRACCAR: Déformation et Renoyage d'un Assemblage de Crayons Combustibles pendant un Accident de Refroidissement

1
2
3 comparing the flow in an intact bundle and a ballooned one [19] and analyzing parametric effects on the flow
4 redistribution because of clad ballooning [18]. Detailed information regarding the measurement techniques, the MRV
5 sequence and parameters, data reduction and uncertainties are available in these previous works. In this paper,
6 65 we present only the main aspects concerning the test section that are important when comparing the experimental
7 results with DRACCAR simulations.
8
9

10 MASCARA's experimental bench is schematically represented in Fig. 2, consisting of a regular single-phase
11 hydraulic circuit with a screw pump connected to a damper in order to assure a stable flow in all the circuit,
12 pressures transducers for safety purposes, an electromagnetic flowmeter to measure the water flow rate, which is
13 70 later used for validating the MRV measurements (comparing the flowmeter value with the calculated flow rate using
14 MRV results), and the test section, which is placed horizontally. This one consists of a 7 x 7 representative test
15 bundle, which is inserted into a radiofrequency (RF) coil and this assembly is, in turn, inserted into the MRI scanner.
16 The intact rods were made of polycarbonate tubes, while the ballooned rods were constructed by 3D printing (FDM -
17 fused deposition modeling) using PLA as the base polymer. Furthermore, the four spacer grids were made of Inconel
18 and they had the same material and geometry used in COAL experiments (Fig. 3)[1]. These grids were not made
19 of a ferromagnetic material; however, they still disturbed the magnetic field and impeded accurate velocity field
20 measurements by 4 cm close to them.
21
22 75
23
24
25
26
27



28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52 Figure 2: Hydraulic circuit of MASCARA: 1) water tank, 2) eccentric screw pump, 3) damper, 4) absolute pressure transducer, 5)
53 electromagnetic flowmeter, 6) differential pressure transducer, 7) test section, 8) MRI scanner, 9) radio- frequency (RF) coil. ([19]).
54
55

56 All the bundles tested by Oliveira et al. [18] had 49 elements arranged in a 7×7 structure, having thirty tubes
57 with 9.5 mm diameter to represent intact fuel rods, sixteen ballooned tubes, and three tubes with a 12.45 mm
58 80 diameter to represent guide tubes. In this study, we chose two bundles having two different blockage ratios and two
59 different blockage lengths, named G61%/100mm and G90%/240mm, to compare with DRACCAR simulations. The
60
61
62
63
64
65

blockage ratio τ_b describes the reduction in the cross-sectional area because of the cladding ballooning and is defined by:

$$\tau_b = 1 - \frac{S_b}{S_0} \quad (1)$$

where S_b and S_0 are the flow passage areas of a blocked and an intact sub-channel, respectively. The first bundle, G61%/100mm, represents the case where the blocked sub-channels are formed by four ballooned rods that touch their neighboring rods without losing the circular shape ($\tau_b = 61\%$ in Fig. 4), with a blockage length of 100 mm. The second bundle, G90%/240mm, represents a severe blockage ratio and length, as mentioned by Grandjean [23]. In this case, the blocked sub-channels are formed by ballooned fuel rods with a squared shape and rounded corners, due to joint deformation with neighboring rods ($\tau_b = 90\%$ in Fig. 4). Therefore, in the ballooned zone (for τ_b equal to both 61% and 90%), the flow within blocked sub-channels is isolated from neighborhood sub-channels.

Figure 3 shows the side view of these two test section configurations and the position of the spacer grids and the ballooned zone, with their values given in Table 1. The first and the last spacer grids do not have mixing vanes, while the two in the middle have **mixing vanes** with remarkable performance to homogenize the flow, as described in previous studies [19]. The distance of 522 mm between the two mixing spacer grids in the middle (E – A) was fixed because it is approximately the same distance found in typical French PWR's. Figure 4, in turn, shows the bundles cross-sectional views in the intact and ballooned zones, the first only having intact sub-channels (no ballooning) and the second having the **balloons** whose shape corresponds to the bundles blockage ratios (61% and 90%).

Table 1: Dimensions of the tested bundles as shown in Fig. 3 (in mm).

Bundle	τ_b	L_b	A	B	C	D	E	F	E-A
G61%/100mm	61%	100	252	444 ^a	479	614 ^a	774	1073	522
G90%/240mm	90%	240	282	370	435	740	803	1072	521

^aIn our previous study [18], these dimensions were incorrectly presented (difference of 10 mm). These are the correct values.




Figure 3: Axial positions of the grids and the balloon in the bundles.




Figure 4: Section view in the intact and ballooned zones, with evidence on the ballooned fuel rods' shapes for 61% and 90% blockage ratios ([19]).

Between the intact and the ballooned regions, there is a transition zone (Fig. 5). For the G61%/100mm bundle with a blockage ratio of 61%, the fuel rods cross-section increases keeping the circular shape and the transition finishes where they are in contact. The length of this transition is 35 mm. For the case of the G90%/240mm bundle with a 90% blockage ratio, there is a first transition like the one in the G61%/100mm bundle and a second transition zone, which is 30 mm long, where the fuel rods shape continues deforming progressively until reaching the final cross-section shown in Fig. 4. For both bundles, there is another transition zone downstream of the balloon, exactly like the first but mirrored.

As mentioned at the beginning of this section, MRV was the technique we used to measure the velocity fields in these bundles. We used a typical gradient-echo pulse sequence with an additional flow encoding sequence, as explained by Oliveira et al. [19]. The pixel resolution was $0.47 \times 0.47 \text{ mm}^2$ and the experimental procedure ensured the velocity uncertainty in one pixel to be about $\pm 20\%$ of the bulk mean velocity [19]. However, to compare the experimental results with DRACCAR simulations, we must take the mean axial velocity within a sub-channel. In this case, the uncertainty of this mean velocity is reduced to $\pm 10\%$ of the flow mean velocity, as discussed by Oliveira et al. [18].




Figure 5: Transition from regular to ballooned zone for both bundles: a) G61%/100 mm; b) G90%/240mm.

4. DRACCAR: details of the simulation

4.1. Modeling concept

DRACCAR is a code from the FUEL+ software platform developed by IRSN since 2008 to simulate the 3D thermo-mechanical deformation and the reflooding of fuel rods during a LOCA (among other phenomena). DRACCAR allows modeling problems with different scales, from a single fuel rod or fuel assembly to the entire reactor's core or spent fuel pool. Moreover, this code can perform calculations including fuel assembly components like control rods, fuel rods (modeling both the stack of fuel pellets and the cladding), instrumentation tubes, guide tubes, and spacer grids. To achieve this, DRACCAR couples two codes: a thermo-mechanical code ICARE3D and one of the two different thermal-hydraulic codes, CESAR and CATHARE-3 [16]. In the present study, we coupled DRACCAR with CATHARE-3 and disabled the thermo-mechanical package as it was unnecessary to simulate MASCARA experiments.

The CATHARE code is the result of a joint project of CEA (Research and Development institute), EDF (operator and electricity supplier), FRAMATOME (Power plant designer), and IRSN (technical support of French Safety Authority) aiming to develop and provide a thermal-hydraulics system code in support of the French nuclear fleet. CATHARE has been intensively used for the French nuclear fleet (plant or component design, safety studies, normal and emergency procedures validation, uncertainties analysis, etc.), and largely and internationally distributed among research institutes. The code is developed and maintained at CEA, by the CATHARE team.

CATHARE is modular code where several modules can be connected to represent any hydraulic circuit. The three main hydraulic modules are:

- the 1-D module to describe pipes,
- the 0-D module to describe large capacities,
- the 3-D module to describe multidimensional effects in specific components.

All these modules use by default a 2-phase model to describe steam-liquid flows and four non-condensable gases can be transported. Both thermal and mechanical non-equilibrium of the two phases is described thanks to the 3 balance equations solved for each phase: mass, momentum, and energy. All kinds of two-phase flow patterns are modeled, in laminar and turbulent regimes.

The numerical method in CATHARE code uses a first-order finite volume - finite difference scheme with a staggered mesh and the donor cell principle. The time discretization varies from the fully implicit discretization used in the 0-D and 1-D modules to the semi-implicit scheme used in the 3-D module [24].

4.2. Simulation domain and conditions

The DRACCAR calculations of MASCARA experiments aim reproducing the fluid dynamic upstream, within and downstream of the ballooned zone; that is why the modeling domain is restricted to the bundle part downstream the first mixing grid. Moreover, the DRACCAR models associated to grids are not detailed enough to precisely reproduce the impact of the mixing vanes on the fluid as observed in the experiments, leading to a calculated fluid flow distribution slightly different from the experimental one. In order to overcome this problem, it has been chosen to match the inlet of the domain to the first position after the mixing grid where MRV measurements were performed and to impose the experimental results as inlet boundary conditions (that is to say the axial fluid velocity at the inlet of each sub-channel). The end of the modeling domain corresponds to the end of the MASCARA bundle. The second grid is only simulated through the use of a singular pressure drop coefficient. At the outlet of each sub-channel, a pressure boundary condition is defined, and the outlet pressure value is set to the atmospheric pressure (Fig. 6).




Figure 6: Simulation domain of the present study.

As transverse flow is expected in MASCARA, the 3D module of CATHARE is used for the simulation, so a 3D structured mesh with hexahedral elements is considered. Considering a transverse plane (i.e. a cross-sectional cut), each element contains only one sub-channel, which means that DRACCAR does not calculate velocity within the sub-channel. Figure 7 presents an axial cut at $z = 142mm$ with the G90%/240mm bundle, showing the mesh used in MASCARA simulation, which contains 64 sub-channels to model a whole MASCARA bundle. The sub-channels are

as well meshed in the axial direction. The axial discretization is the same for all the sub-channels and depends on the bundle considered: for the G61%/100mm bundle, we used 24 axial elements, of which 8 correspond to the transition and ballooned zones (in total $64 \times 24 = 1536$ fluid meshes are used for this bundle). For the G90%/240mm bundle, we used 41 axial elements, 14 of them being in the transition and ballooned zones (in total 2624 fluid meshes are considered).




Figure 7: Example of meshing used for MASCARA (the meshing is in blue – the structures are in red) with the G90%/240mm bundle at $z = 142$ mm.

The exact geometries and positions of the 30 intact fuel rods, 3 guide tubes and housing used in MASCARA experiments were simulated with DRACCAR, which means the fluid passage section areas (in all the three directions) and the friction perimeter were as well correctly represented. The axial ballooned rods shape could not be simulated continuously over the axial DRACCAR meshing. Thus, their complex geometry was modeled to preserve the exact fluid passage area and friction perimeter at all the mesh faces (where the momentum balances equations are solved), as shown in Fig. 8. This modeling was performed following several steps. First, we calculated the volume of each ballooned rod forming a given sub-channel. Then, this rod volume was divided by the element dimension in each direction to obtain the wall section area. Finally, this section area was subtracted to the total element section area to obtain the precise fluid section area for the concerned face. With this choice, in the axial direction, the diameter of the tube was precisely equal to 12.6 mm between the two transitions (Fig. 8).

For the axial singular pressure losses, a coefficient equal to 1.38 (k , classical coefficient used for this type of grid) is imposed at the modeled grid elevation. For the radial singular pressure drop, k is calculated using modified Idel'cick equation [25]:

$$k = 0.228 \left(\frac{p}{d} - 1 \right)^{-0.5} \quad (2)$$

where p and d are respectively the pitch and the external rod diameter.




Figure 8: Example of balloon modeling with DRACCAR.

4.3. DRACCAR/MASCARA comparison

Oliveira et al. [19] presented velocity fields like the example in Fig. 9a (without transverse velocities), the colored bar referring to the magnitude of the axial velocity V_z (z -direction, Fig. 6) normalized with the bulk mean velocity \tilde{V}_{ref} . Nevertheless, DRACCAR simulations only provide mean velocities for each sub-channel, i.e. without detailing the velocity field within the sub-channels. Even though DRACCAR calculates transverse velocities, we did not compare these calculations with experimental data because there is a deterministic error in MASCARA measurements of transverse velocities by MRV that could not be corrected [18]. Therefore, only axial velocity results were compared, which is the most important velocity vector in thermal calculations. In addition, MASCARA results of velocity fields were re-processed to obtain the mean axial velocity for each sub-channel. Fig. 9b presents the same velocity field shown in Fig. 9a but now with the normalized mean axial velocity for each sub-channel, which can be compared with DRACCAR simulations. Furthermore, we used two flow rates for the DRACCAR simulation: 50 lpm and 240 lpm, corresponding to a Reynolds number of 1936 and 9599 respectively (laminar and turbulent flow). The flow behavior of these two flow regimes is described by Oliveira et al.[19].




Figure 9: Example for G90%/240mm bundle at 50 lpm of: (a) a normalized axial velocity field obtained by MRI techniques (MASCARA result), and (b) its corresponding normalized mean axial field for each sub-channel for comparison with DRACCAR simulation, both at $z = 386mm$.

Comparing visually the velocity fields as in Fig. 9 or presenting velocity profiles for all the 64 sub-channels would not be practical nor simple to validate the DRACCAR simulations. Therefore, we chose specific sub-channels to

compare MASCARA and DRACCAR results (Fig. 10), each one with specific blockage and location characteristics as listed below:

- **A**: a sub-channel with the highest blockage ratio, in the center of the ballooned zone ($\tau_{b,A} = \tau_b$ of each bundle);
- **B**: a moderately blocked sub-channel between two intact rods and two ballooned rods ($\tau_{b,B} = 30.6\%$ for G61% and $\tau_{b,B} = 45\%$ for G90%);
- **C**: a moderately blocked sub-channel between one guide tube, one intact rod, and two ballooned rod ($\tau_{b,C} = 45\%$ for G61% and $\tau_{b,C} = 59.5\%$ for G90%);
- **D**: an intact sub-channel ($\tau_{b,D} = 0\%$ for both bundles).

These sub-channels present axial velocity profiles with different behaviors that worth the discussion in this paper. Other sub-channels could also be used in the results presentation, like those partially blocked in the corners of the ballooned zone (for example, the one between D and D' or the sub-channel at two sub-channels above C) or those neighboring the housing. They were not used because the first is less critical than the chosen partially blocked sub-channels and the latter presented practically the same velocity profile of an intact sub-channel.




Figure 10: Sub-channels chosen for this study and the bundle symmetry axis, showing an example of symmetric sub-channels (D and D').

The tested geometry was designed to be symmetric to an inclined axis (Fig. 10), which should result in a velocity field as well symmetric to the same axis. However, the bundles used in MASCARA could be slightly misaligned inside the housing [19] and this would favor the axial flow in one sub-channel compared to its symmetric one, although the difference is negligible most of the times. We present examples of this result with the G90%/240mm bundle at the beginning of the results presentation. To reduce experimental biases because of the bundle misalignment and to better validate DRACCAR simulations, we used the mean velocity of the two symmetric sub-channels of MASCARA results. Moreover, averaging the sub-channel velocities reduces the experimental uncertainty because considering more pixels in the averaging population reduces the measurement noise. Figure 10 presents an example of symmetric sub-channels (D and D'), so the experimental results presented in the next section for this sub-channel are actually the average of two symmetrical sub-channels.

5. Results and discussion

We present herein the results as axial velocity profiles for the chosen sub-channels shown in Fig. 10 and for both bundles (G61%/100mm and G90%/240mm) and flow rates (50 and 245 lpm). For a better comparison of MASCARA and DRACCAR results, we normalized both axial positions according to the zone in the bundle and the sub-channels' axial velocities. The first normalization was done by taking the position within a given zone (intact, transition or balloon) and dividing it by the length of this zone. Meanwhile, the axial velocity normalization was performed according to the following equation:

$$V_{z,n} = \frac{V_z - V_{min}}{V_{max} - V_{min}} \quad (3)$$

where V_{min} and V_{max} are, respectively, the minimal and maximal mean axial velocities obtained in MASCARA. We remind that V_z is the mean velocity at each axial position of each sub-channel, either measured in MASCARA or calculated by DRACCAR.

As mentioned in the previous section, we present in Fig. 11 results for symmetric sub-channels with the G90%/240mm bundle for the two tested flow rates. Because DRACCAR simulations result in perfectly matched axial velocity profiles for symmetric sub-channels, only one of its curves is presented in the figure. For MASCARA results, the axial velocities of symmetric sub-channels are very similar for both flow rates but do not match perfectly, which is natural in experiments. Hence, using average values for MASCARA axial velocities to compare with DRACCAR simulations is reasonable to reduce experimental imperfections, even if they are very small.




Figure 11: Comparison of axial profiles in symmetric sub-channels for the G90%/240mm bundle: (a) 50 lpm, and (b) 245 lpm.

Starting with the G61%/100mm bundle, Fig. 12a and b present the simulated and experimental velocity profiles for this bundle with 50 and 245 lpm, respectively. The velocity profiles in less blocked sub-channels, i.e. B and D, are very similar: the axial velocity increased upstream of the balloon because of the flow redistribution from blocked sub-channels (like A), the axial velocity was almost stable in the ballooned zone, and there was a slight decrease downstream of the balloon. DRACCAR succeeded to estimate their velocity profiles within the experimental uncertainty ($\Delta V_{z,n} = \pm 0.09$ for G61%/100mm, 50lpm and $\Delta V_{z,n} = \pm 0.1$ for G61%/100mm, 245lpm). For the most blocked sub-channel (A), the axial velocity decreased up- and downstream of the ballooned zone because of the

flow redistribution in the first transition zone and the flow passage area expansion in the second transition zone, as described in detail by Oliveira et al. [18]. In this case, DRACCAR calculated the same velocity profile observed in the experiments but the quantitative results were only accurate in the first transition for 50 lpm and the ballooned zone for both flow rates. Especially downstream of the balloon, DRACCAR overestimated the axial velocity within the blocked sub-channel. Hence, we find that DRACCAR results for sub-channel A were fairly accurate except in the second transition zone. Last, for both flow rates, DRACCAR could predict neither qualitatively nor quantitatively the axial velocity profile for sub-channel C, the one neighboring ballooned rods and a guide tube. Although the increase in the first transition zone was well calculated, the decrease in the ballooned zone was not predicted in the simulations, while the decrease in the second transition zone was not as steep as observed in the experimental results (Fig. 12).




Figure 12: Normalized velocities (lines are DRACCAR simulations, markers are MASCARA results) in different sub-channels for the G61%/100mm bundle: (a) 50 lpm, and (b) 245 lpm.

Figure 13 presents the DRACCAR and MASCARA results for the axial velocity along the G90%/240mm bundle for 50 and 245 lpm. As in the previous case, the velocity in the less blocked sub-channels (B and D) increased in the first transition zone, remained stable in the blocked zone and progressively decreased after the balloon. Likewise, DRACCAR adequately estimated the velocity in these sub-channels within the experimental uncertainty ($\Delta V_{z,n} = \pm 0.06$ for G90%/240mm, 50lpm and $\Delta V_{z,n} = \pm 0.07$ for G90%/240mm, 245lpm), except in the first transition zone for the sub-channel B with 50 lpm. The fluid velocity in the most blocked sub-channel (A) followed a similar behavior to that described for the G61%/100mm bundle. The only difference is the existence of a local minimum in the transition zone upstream of the balloon where the ballooned rods are in touch (as shown in Fig. 5), as discussed in detail by Oliveira et al. [18]. For this sub-channel and for the higher flow rate, DRACCAR estimated quite precisely the axial velocity, being more accurate in the first transition and less accurate at the end of the second transition zone, underestimating the axial velocity and finding the minimum slightly earlier than MASCARA results. For the 50lpm flow rate, DRACCAR calculated the same velocity profile observed in the experiments, but it underestimated the axial velocity in the balloon and the second transition zone, finding the minimum earlier. Finally, DRACCAR overestimated the axial velocity for the sub-channel C with the G90%/240mm bundle as we observed

with G61%/100mm.




Figure 13: Normalized velocities (lines are DRACCAR simulations, markers are MASCARA results) in different sub-channels for the G90%/240mm bundle: (a) 50 lpm, and (b) 245 lpm.

Although MASCARA experiments may appear relatively simple for a computational fluid dynamics simulation, we should remind that DRACCAR calculations rely on models describing the fluid behavior inside the entire sub-channel at a given axial position, so the velocity field inside this sub-channel is not calculated. This lack of resolution within the sub-channel makes the calculation of the Navier-Stokes equation becomes more complicated, especially because of the convective term ($V \cdot \nabla V$) in the Lagrangian derivative. This term is significant in-between and within the sub-channels in the transition zones, where, in fact, DRACCAR was less accurate (see Figs. 12 and 13). Although the axial velocity estimates for sub-channel C all along with the bundle and sub-channel A in the second transition zone were less accurate, with deviations higher than the experimental uncertainty, DRACCAR succeeded to calculate precisely most of the velocity points. Table 2 presents the percentage of axial velocity points that DRACCAR could estimate within a range of $\pm 15\%$ of MASCARA's axial velocities values for each bundle, flow rate and sub-channel. For this table, the real MASCARA and DRACCAR velocities were used (not normalized velocities). As we discussed, the calculations for the sub-channel A, the one in the center of the balloon, were in general quite accurate (except for G90%/240mm with 50 lpm). For less blocked sub-channels, namely B and D, DRACCAR estimated more than 80% of the local axial velocities within a range of $\pm 15\%$ with respect to the MASCARA value. As already mentioned, the calculations for sub-channel C (partially blocked by the neighboring balloon and a guide tube) were not accurate enough, which deserves more attention to improve the model in this case, even though this sub-channel is not considered critical as the axial velocity is not much reduced because of the flow redistribution. A more precise analysis of the transverse velocities may help to explain this difference between calculation and experimental data.

With the present results, it was found that the fluid dynamics model implemented in DRACCAR was capable of predicting most of the axial velocity of the sub-channels in both blocked assemblies. However, there are still aspects of DRACCAR to improve, especially in the calculation of the sub-channels' axial velocity near the guide tubes (as sub-channel C).

Table 2: Percentage of points estimated by DRACCAR between a range of $\pm 15\%$ of the MASCARA results.

	G61%/100mm		G90%/240mm	
Flow (lpm)	50	245	50	245
Sub-channel A	83%	69%	20%	68%
Sub-channel B	100%	100%	80%	100%
Sub-channel C	58%	72%	40%	56%
Sub-channel D	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	85%	85%	60%	81%

6. Conclusions

In this study, we compared the IRSN DRACCAR LOCA code simulations with test results from the MASCARA experimental campaign for two ballooned 7 x 7 bundles with different blockage ratios and lengths (bundles G61%/100mm G90%/240mm) and with different flow rates, one in laminar regime (50 lpm) and the other in turbulent regime (245 lpm). The results showed that DRACCAR succeeded to estimate the axial flow velocity in intact and less blocked sub-channels for both configurations and flow rates. For the blocked sub-channel in the center of the balloon, DRACCAR performed better for the less blocked bundle (G61%/100mm). In this case, DRACCAR succeeds to correctly estimate the velocity profile for this blocked sub-channel and most of the points were estimated within the experimental uncertainty; however, the axial velocity was largely overestimated at the end of the second transition zone. For the more blocked bundle (G90%/240mm), which is considered one of the worst-case scenarios of clad ballooning during a LOCA, DRACCAR correctly estimates the velocity behavior in this sub-channel, however it underestimate MASCARA's velocity from the blocked zone. Nonetheless, this would results in a conservative heat transfer estimation. Finally, for the partially-blocked sub-channel neighboring the balloon and a guide tube, the axial velocity estimate deserves more attention to improve its calculation, even though this is not considered a critical sub-channel during a LOCA.

Once COAL experimental campaign will be finished, simulations of the experiments will be performed with DRACCAR including all the involved thermal-hydraulics phenomena during the reflooding phase, which will be an important step for the validation of code. Furthermore, DRACCAR simulations of MASCARA experiments with non-coplanar balloons are also expected, in which balloons are located in different axial positions so the flow redistribution behaves differently from those presented in this study.

7. Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank Didier Stemmelen, Research Fellow at CNRS and LEMTA (Université de Lorraine), for reviewing this paper and giving valuable suggestions to improve its quality, especially concerning the method and result presentations.

8. Funding

This work is completed within the framework of RSNR Project PERFROI from a French State aid managed by the French National Research Agency under the program of Investments for the Future carrying the reference n° ANR-11-RSNR-0017.

References

- [1] G. Repetto, C. Dominguez, B. Durville, S. Carnemolla, D. Campello, C. Tardif, M. Gradeck, The R&D PERFROI project on thermal mechanical and thermal hydraulics behaviors of a fuel rod assembly during a loss of coolant accident, 16th International Topical Meeting on Nuclear Reactor Thermal Hydraulics (NURETH-16) 1 (2015) 1–14.
- [2] Y. Jin, F. R. Beck, B. R. Lowery, D. J. Miller, F. B. Cheung, S. M. Bajorek, K. Tien, C. L. Hoxie, Experimental study of droplet sizes across a spacer grid location under various reflood conditions, *Experimental Thermal and Fluid Science* 94 (February 2017) (2018) 246–257. doi:10.1016/j.expthermflusci.2018.02.017.
- [3] H. K. Cho, K. Y. Choi, S. Cho, C.-H. Song, Experimental observation of the droplet size change across a wet grid spacer in a 6×6 rod bundle, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 241 (12) (2011) 4649–4656. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2011.03.042.
- [4] Y. Jin, F.-B. Cheung, K. Shirvan, S. M. Bajorek, K. Tien, C. L. Hoxie, Development of a droplet breakup model for dry spacer grid in the dispersed flow film boiling regime during reflood transients, *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer* 143 (2019) 118544. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2019.118544.
- [5] J. M. Yoo, B. J. Yun, H. Y. Yoon, J. J. Jeong, Modeling of the droplet entrainment rate in the post-dryout regime for the analysis of a reflood phase, *Annals of Nuclear Energy* 148 (2020) 107757. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2020.107757.
- [6] J. Peña Carrillo, A. V. S. Oliveira, A. Labergue, T. Glantz, M. Gradeck, Experimental thermal hydraulics study of the blockage ratio effect during the cooling of a vertical tube with an internal steam-droplets flow, *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer* 140 (2019) 648 – 659. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2019.06.012.
- [7] A. V. S. Oliveira, J. D. Peña Carrillo, A. Labergue, T. Glantz, M. Gradeck, Experimental study of dispersed flow film boiling at sub-channel scale in LOCA conditions: Influence of the steam flow rate and residual power, *Applied Thermal Engineering* 172 (2020) 115143. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2020.115143.
- [8] N. H. Nguyen, J. Kim, S.-H. Hong, S.-K. Moon, C.-H. Song, Improvements of cobra-tf on the effect of flow blockage during a lb loca with consideration of fuel relocation phenomenon, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 325 (2017) 218 – 231. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2017.08.015.
- [9] P. Ruyer, N. Seiler, B. Biton, F. Lelong, F. Secondi, D. Baalbaki, M. Gradeck, Two-phase flow across a partially damaged core during the reflood phase of a LOCA, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 264 (2013) 187 – 194, SI:NURETH-14. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2013.02.026.

- 1
2
3 [10] A. V. S. Oliveira, J. D. Peña Carrillo, A. Labergue, T. Glantz, M. Gradeck, Mechanistic modeling of the thermal-
4 hydraulics in polydispersed flow film boiling in LOCA conditions, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 357 (2020)
5 110388. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2019.110388>.
6
7
8 345 [11] Y. Guo, K. Mishima, A non-equilibrium mechanistic heat transfer model for post-dryout dispersed flow regime,
9 *Experimental Thermal and Fluid Science* 26 (6-7) (2002) 861–869. doi:10.1016/S0894-1777(02)00195-4.
10
11
12 [12] C.-H. Song, Some issues and challenges in advanced thermal-hydraulic safety research, *Nuclear Technology*
13 196 (3) (2016) 421–445. doi:<https://doi.org/10.13182/NT16-91>.
14
15
16 [13] G. Repetto, T. Glantz, G. Guillard, B. Bruyère, Q. Grando, Core coolability in loss of coolant accident: the
17 COAL experiments investigating the thermal hydraulics of a rod bundle with blocked area during the reflooding,
18 17th International Topical Meeting on Nuclear Reactor Thermal Hydraulics (NURETH-17) 1 (2017) 359–372.
19
20
21 [14] G. Repetto, C. Marquié, B. Bruyère, T. Glantz, Core coolability in loss of coolant accident: the COAL exper-
22 iments, 16th International Topical Meeting on Nuclear Reactor Thermal Hydraulics (NURETH-16) 1 (2015)
23 24–37.
24
25
26 355 [15] S. Bascou, O. De Luze, S. Ederli, G. Guillard, Development and validation of the multi-physics DRACCAR
27 code, *Annals of Nuclear Energy* 84 (2015) 1–18. doi:10.1016/j.anucene.2014.09.040.
28
29
30 [16] T. Glantz, T. Taurines, O. De Luze, S. Belon, G. Guillard, F. Jacq, DRACCAR: A multi-physics code
31 for computational analysis of multi-rod ballooning, coolability and fuel relocation during LOCA transients
32 Part one: General modeling description, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 339 (June) (2018) 269–285.
33
34
35 360 [17] T. Glantz, T. Taurines, S. Belon, O. De Luze, G. Guillard, F. Jacq, DRACCAR: A multi-physics code for
36 computational analysis of multi-rod ballooning, coolability and fuel relocation during LOCA transients. Part
37 Two: Overview of modeling capabilities for LOCA, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 339 (August) (2018) 202–
38 214. doi:10.1016/j.nucengdes.2018.08.031.
39
40
41 [18] A. V. S. Oliveira, D. Stemmelen, S. Leclerc, T. Glantz, A. Labergue, G. Repetto, M. Gradeck, Parametric effects
42 on the flow redistribution in ballooned bundles evaluated by magnetic resonance velocimetry, *Experimental*
43 *Thermal and Fluid Science* 125 (2021) 110383. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.expthermflusci.2021.110383>.
44
45 365 [19] A. V. S. Oliveira, D. Stemmelen, S. Leclerc, T. Glantz, A. Labergue, G. Repetto, M. Gradeck, Velocity field
46 and flow redistribution in a ballooned 7×7 fuel bundle measured by magnetic resonance velocimetry, *Nuclear*
47 *Engineering and Design* 369 (2020) 110828. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2020.110828>.
48
49
50 [20] P. Chatelard, S. Belon, L. Bosland, L. Carénini, O. Coindreau, F. Cousin, C. Marchetto, H. Nowack,
51 L. Piar, L. Chailan, Main modelling features of the astec v2.1 major version, *Annals of Nuclear Energy*
52 93 (2016) 83–93, eRMSAR-2015 conference of SARNET in the frame of the NUGENIA Technical Area 2.
53
54 370 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2015.12.026>.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

375 [21] P. Emonot, A. Souyri, J. Gandrille, F. Barré, Cathare-3: A new system code for thermal-
hydraulics in the context of the neptune project, Nuclear Engineering and Design 241 (11) (2011)
4476–4481, 13th International Topical Meeting on Nuclear Reactor Thermal Hydraulics (NURETH-13).
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2011.04.049>.

[22] J. D. Peña Carrillo, A. V. S. Oliveira, T. Glantz, G. Repetto, M. Gradeck, Analyse des transferts thermiques d'un
380 écoulement vertical vapeur/gouttes dans une géométrie tubulaire, in: Congrès français de thermique, Société
Française de Thermique, Nantes, 2019.

[23] C. Grandjean, Coolability of blocked regions in a rod bundle after ballooning under LOCA conditions: Main
findings from a review of past experimental programmes, Nuclear Engineering and Design 237 (15) (2007) 1872–
1886. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2007.02.022>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0029549307002038>

[24] R. Prea, V. Figerou, A. Mekkas, A. Ruby, Cathare-3: A first computation of a 3-inch-break loss-of-coolant
accident using both Cartesian and cylindrical 3D-meshes modeling of a PWR vessel, in: 17th International
Topical Meeting on Nuclear Reactor Thermal Hydraulics, NURETH 2017, Vol. 2017-Septe, 2017.

[25] I. Idel'cik, Mémento des pertes de charges, 3rd Edition, Eyrolles, EDF, Paris, 1986.

Declaration of interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

Credit Author Statement

J.E. Luna Valencia: Data Curation, Investigation, Writing - Original draft preparation

Arthur V. S. Oliveira: Methodology, Data Curation, Investigation, Writing - Original draft preparation

T. Glantz: Data Curation, Conceptualization, Software, Supervision, Writing - Review & Editing

A. Labergue: Supervision, Writing - Review & Editing

S. Leclerc: Methodology, Software, Investigation, Writing - Review & Editing

M. Gradeck: Conceptualization, Supervision, Project administration, Writing - Review & Editing

References

- [1] G. Repetto, C. Dominguez, B. Durville, S. Carnemolla, D. Campello, C. Tardif, M. Gradeck, The R&D PER- FROI project on thermal mechanical and thermal hydraulics behaviors of a fuel rod assembly during a loss of coolant accident, 16th International Topical Meeting on Nuclear Reactor Thermal Hydraulics (NURETH-16) 1 (2015) 1–14.
- [2] Y. Jin, F. R. Beck, B. R. Lowery, D. J. Miller, F. B. Cheung, S. M. Bajorek, K. Tien, C. L. Hoxie, Experimental study of droplet sizes across a spacer grid location under various reflood conditions, *Experimental Thermal and Fluid Science* 94 (February 2017) (2018) 246–257. doi:10.1016/j.expthermflusci.2018.02.017.
- [3] H. K. Cho, K. Y. Choi, S. Cho, C.-H. Song, Experimental observation of the droplet size change across a wet grid spacer in a 6x6 rod bundle, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 241 (12) (2011) 4649 – 4656, the 18th International Conference on Nuclear Engineering (ICONE-18). doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2011.03.042.
- [4] Y. Jin, F.-B. Cheung, K. Shirvan, S. M. Bajorek, K. Tien, C. L. Hoxie, Development of a droplet breakup model for dry spacer grid in the dispersed flow film boiling regime during reflood transients, *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer* 143 (2019) 118544. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2019.118544.
- [5] J. M. Yoo, B. J. Yun, H. Y. Yoon, J. J. Jeong, Modeling of the droplet entrainment rate in the post-dryout regime for the analysis of a reflood phase, *Annals of Nuclear Energy* 148 (2020) 107757. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2020.107757.
- [6] J. Peña Carrillo, A. V. S. Oliveira, A. Labergue, T. Glantz, M. Gradeck, Experimental thermal hydraulics study of the blockage ratio effect during the cooling of a vertical tube with an internal steam-droplets flow, *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer* 140 (2019) 648 – 659. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2019.06.012.
- [7] A. V. S. Oliveira, J. D. Peña Carrillo, A. Labergue, T. Glantz, M. Gradeck, Experimental study of dispersed flow film boiling at sub-channel scale in LOCA conditions: Influence of the steam flow rate and residual power, *Applied Thermal Engineering* 172 (2020) 115143. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2020.115143.
- [8] N. H. Nguyen, J. Kim, S.-H. Hong, S.-K. Moon, C.-H. Song, Improvements of cobra-tf on the effect of flow blockage during a lb loca with consideration of fuel relocation phenomenon, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 325 (2017) 218 – 231. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2017.08.015.
- [9] P. Ruyer, N. Seiler, B. Biton, F. Lelong, F. Secondi, D. Baalbaki, M. Gradeck, Two-phase flow across a partially damaged core during the reflood phase of a LOCA, *Nuclear Engineering and Design*

264 (2013) 187 – 194, SI:NURETH-14. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2013.02.026>.

[10] A. V. S. Oliveira, J. D. Peña Carrillo, A. Labergue, T. Glantz, M. Gradeck, Mechanistic modeling of the thermal- hydraulics in polydispersed flow film boiling in LOCA conditions, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 357 (2020) 110388. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2019.110388>.

[11] Y. Guo, K. Mishima, A non-equilibrium mechanistic heat transfer model for post-dryout dispersed flow regime, *Experimental Thermal and Fluid Science* 26 (6-7) (2002) 861–869. doi:10.1016/S0894-1777(02)00195-4.

[12] C.-H. Song, Some issues and challenges in advanced thermal-hydraulic safety research, *Nuclear Technology* 196 (3) (2016) 421–445. doi:<https://doi.org/10.13182/NT16-91>.

[13] G. Repetto, T. Glantz, G. Guillard, B. Bruyère, Q. Grando, Core coolability in loss of coolant accident: the COAL experiments investigating the thermal hydraulics of a rod bundle with blocked area during the reflooding, 17th International Topical Meeting on Nuclear Reactor Thermal Hydraulics (NURETH-17) 1 (2017) 359–372.

[14] G. Repetto, C. Marquié, B. Bruyère, T. Glantz, Core coolability in loss of coolant accident: the COAL experiments, 16th International Topical Meeting on Nuclear Reactor Thermal Hydraulics (NURETH-16) 1 (2015) 24–37.

[15] S. Bascou, O. De Luze, S. Ederli, G. Guillard, Development and validation of the multi-physics DRACCAR code, *Annals of Nuclear Energy* 84 (2015) 1–18. doi:10.1016/j.anucene.2014.09.040.

[16] T. Glantz, T. Taurines, O. De Luze, S. Belon, G. Guillard, F. Jacq, DRACCAR: A multi-physics code for computational analysis of multi-rod ballooning, coolability and fuel relocation during LOCA transients Part one: General modeling description, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 339 (June) (2018) 269–285. doi:10.1016/j.nucengdes.2018.06.022.

[17] T. Glantz, T. Taurines, S. Belon, O. De Luze, G. Guillard, F. Jacq, DRACCAR: A multi-physics code for computational analysis of multi-rod ballooning, coolability and fuel relocation during LOCA transients. Part Two: Overview of modeling capabilities for LOCA, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 339 (August) (2018) 202–214. doi:10.1016/j.nucengdes.2018.08.031.

[18] A. V. S. Oliveira, D. Stemmelen, S. Leclerc, T. Glantz, A. Labergue, G. Repetto, M. Gradeck, Parametric effects on the flow redistribution in ballooned bundles evaluated by magnetic resonance velocimetry, *Experimental Thermal and Fluid Science* 125 (2021) 110383. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.expthermflusci.2021.110383>.

[19] A. V. S. Oliveira, D. Stemmelen, S. Leclerc, T. Glantz, A. Labergue, G. Repetto, M. Gradeck, Velocity field and flow redistribution in a ballooned 7×7 fuel bundle measured by magnetic resonance velocimetry, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 369 (2020) 110828.

doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2020.110828>.

[20] P. Chatelard, S. Belon, L. Bosland, L. Carénini, O. Coindreau, F. Cousin, C. Marchetto, H. Nowack, L. Piar, L. Chailan, Main modelling features of the astec v2.1 major version, *Annals of Nuclear Energy* 93 (2016)83–93, eRMSAR-2015 conference of SARNET in the frame of the NUGENIA Technical Area 2. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2015.12.026>.

[21] P. Emonot, A. Souyri, J. Gandrille, F. Barré, Cathare-3: A new system code for thermal-hydraulics in the context of the neptune project, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 241 (11) (2011) 4476–4481, 13th International Topical Meeting on Nuclear Reactor Thermal Hydraulics (NURETH-13). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2011.04.049>.

[22] J. D. Peña Carrillo, A. V. S. Oliveira, T. Glantz, G. Repetto, M. Gradeck, Analyse des transferts thermiques d'un écoulement vertical vapeur/gouttes dans une géométrie tubulaire, in: *Congrès français de thermique*, Société Française de Thermique, Nantes, 2019.

[23] C. Grandjean, Coolability of blocked regions in a rod bundle after ballooning under LOCA conditions: Main findings from a review of past experimental programmes, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 237 (15) (2007) 1872 – 1886, NURETH-11. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2007.02.022>.

[24] R. Prea, V. Figerou, A. Mekkas, A. Ruby, Cathare-3: A first computation of a 3-inch-break loss-of-coolant accident using both Cartesian and cylindrical 3D-meshes modeling of a PWR vessel, in: *17th International Topical Meeting on Nuclear Reactor Thermal Hydraulics*, NURETH 2017, Vol. 2017-Septe, 2017.

[25] Idel'cik, *Mémento des pertes de charges*, 3rd Edition, Eyrolles, EDF, Paris, 1986.