Neutron energy spectrum measurement using an NE213 scintillator at CHARM
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ABSTRACT

To establish a methodology for neutron spectrum measurement at the CERN High energy AcceleRator Mixed field facility (CHARM), neutron spectra were measured using an NE213 scintillator on top of the CHARM roof shielding where is the CERN Shielding Benchmark Facility (CSBF). The spectra were derived as fluences into the scintillator by the unfolding method using an iterative Bayesian algorithm. The methodology was verified based on the agreement of two spectra measured for different positions and directions of incident neutrons by changing the detector orientation. Since the spectra on the roof-top were obtained within a reasonable beam-time, this methodology is suitable for measuring the spectrum when there is less shielding material. Thus, experimental data for neutron transition can be obtained as a function of shielding thickness using this facility.

1. Introduction

The energy spectra and attenuation lengths of secondary neutrons, which are generated through hadronic cascade reactions in a target, in a beam line tunnel, and shielding structure are of primary importance for the shielding design of high-energy and high-power hadron accelerators. These quantities have recently been estimated using Monte Carlo codes such as FLUKA [1,2], GEANT4 [3], MARS [4], and PHITS [5], which are based on theoretical models and parameters for not only a simple bulk geometry but also complex maze structures. For verification and validation of these codes, results of the codes should be examined through the comparison with experimental data obtained for an actual, well-defined geometry as well as models and parameters.

To date, several experiments have been performed to obtain the energy spectra and attenuation of secondary neutrons at high-energy accelerator facilities. Neutron energy spectra from several target materials have been measured for a 40 GeV/c mixed beams of protons and pions at the CERN European Union High-Energy Reference Field (CERF) using Bonner spheres [6] and for 120 GeV protons at the MTest of the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory (FNAL) using time-of-flight method with an NE213 scintillator [7–9]. Neutron energy spectra behind shielding have been measured at the CERF using Bonner spheres [10,11] and an NE213 scintillator [12] with the unfolding technique, and at the FNAL pbar using 120 GeV protons with Bonner spheres [13]. According to these experiments, there are notable differences between calculation and experimental results. To explore the reasons for these differences experimentally, a facility is needed to measure neutron energy spectra and attenuation under various-conditions, such as different target and shielding materials, and its thicknesses, with various types of neutron detectors.

The CERN High energy AcceleRator Mixed field facility (CHARM) has been constructed to evaluate the radiation hardness of devices and equipment subjected to secondary-particle fields from high-energy hadron cascade reactions [14,15]. It receives a proton beam with momentum of 24 GeV/c and adjustable intensity. The facility, consists of a large irradiation space inside its shielding enclosure, a remote-controlled target holder, four movable shielding walls, a maze structure for access to the irradiation space, and replaceable roof shielding blocks.
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that are more than 3 m thick. Thus, this facility is suitable to obtain systematic data for neutron energy spectra and attenuation under various conditions.

In this study, we measured neutron spectra using an NE213 scintillator on top of the CHARM roof shielding where was the CERN Shielding Benchmark Facility (CSBF), to establish a methodology for neutron energy spectrum measurement at this facility. The top of the roof is located 6.75 m laterally above the target with a shielding structure. This corresponds to the maximum shielding condition for 90 degrees vertically to the beam axis. If neutron spectrum can be obtained under this condition within a reasonable beam-time, then the spectrum can be obtained when there is less shielding material, owing to sufficient beam intensity. The thickness of removable shield was estimated to be 170 cm for concrete under the same detector position and beam intensity of this measurement. This would mean that experimental data for neutron transition could be obtained as a function of the shielding thickness using this facility.

We chose an NE213 scintillator as the neutron detector since it provides a neutron spectrum in the energy range from several to a few hundred MeV. The unfolding technique was applied to deduce the neutron energy spectrum behind a shielding wall, where the time-of-flight technique was not applicable. Bonner spheres are another type of detector that could be used, as it covers the energy range from eV to MeV. There are overlaps in the energy range of both spectra. However, the spectrum obtained with an NE213 scintillator provides a more detailed shape in the energy range in which the physical models treat nuclear reactions in the calculation codes. Furthermore, higher energy neutrons are sources of lower energy neutrons, so the detailed spectrum in the higher energy range is important for validating the calculation results given by the codes.

### 2. Structure of CHARM from the viewpoint of a shielding experiment

CHARM was constructed in the Proton Synchrotron (PS) East Area hall. Fig. 1 shows a plan view of CHARM at beam line height, 125 cm above the floor. The target is located in the irradiation room, which has an approximately $5 \times 7 \times 3.6$ m$^3$ (L x W x H) area enclosed by shielding walls made of marble, concrete, and iron. The 24 GeV/c proton beam bombards the target to produce a radiation field of secondary particles. The space around the target is used for irradiation of devices and equipment that are to be tested for radiation hardness. To control the intensity of the radiation field, the target holder with three targets and four plates of movable shield walls are installed in the irradiation space. A beam dump consisting of 8-m-thick iron is located 7.2 m downstream from the target. A wall of concrete and iron with a beam hole is placed in front of the beam dump to avoid particle reflections. This arrangement enables measurement of the secondary particles directly from the target at an angle perpendicular to the primary beam.

The access corridor to the irradiation space has the maze structure to reduce the radiation leakage dose. The structure is suitable for collecting experimental data on the propagation of low-energy neutrons. These data should be useful as a reference for benchmarking Monte Carlo codes, since the radiation field at the entrance of the maze should be well known because of the simple target, the simple room structure, and less reflection from the beam dump.

Fig. 2 shows a sectional view of CHARM on vertical plane along the beam-line. The CSBF is integrated into the roof shielding of CHARM [15]. The roof shielding above the target consists of a 40-cm-thick iron block, an additional 40-cm-thick iron block, and concrete blocks. By removing or replacing the additional iron and concrete blocks, neutron attenuation data can be obtained for quite simple shielding structures consisting of 40-cm-thick iron and material with a thickness between 0 and 3.6 m.

The 24 GeV/c primary proton beam from the PS is transported through the air to the target. The intensity of the beam is $5 \times 10^{11}$ protons per spill. Each spill has typically a duration of 350 ms. The spills belong to a super-cycle of the PS, and are supplied to not only CHARM but also other facilities. Protons are injected into CHARM at a rate of up to $6.7 \times 10^{10}$ protons/s. The number of protons in a spill can be reduced down to 10% or less to mitigate the count rate of a secondary particle detector for an experiment.

The beam parameters are monitored using several devices installed along the beam-line. The beam intensity is recorded spill by spill using a secondary emission chamber (SEC) [16]. The SEC is installed right after the extraction port from the PS. The number of protons incident on the target, can be deduced by multiplying the count of the SEC by a calibration factor of $1.87 \times 10^7$ (protons/count) [17]. The beam position and size are monitored in real time by four beam profile monitors (BPMs) consisting of 40-channel metal foil detectors. The BPMs are placed on the beam-line more than 8 m upstream of the target.

In summary, the facility has the potential to allow us to measure the experimental data of secondary particles originating from 24 GeV/c protons for both direct exposure and attenuation by concrete with thickness of up to 3.6 m.

### 3. Experiment

#### 3.1. Experimental setup

The neutron detector, a $\Phi 12.7 \times 12.7$ cm$^3$ NE213 scintillator...
coupled with a photomultiplier tube (R1250, Hamamatsu), was set on top of the concrete shielding. The thickness and material of the shields from the target to the top were 10-cm-thick marble, 80-cm-thick iron and 360-cm-thick concrete (80-cm-thick barite concrete and 280-cm-thick normal concrete). Fig. 3 shows the two different detector setups that were used: a “vertical setup” with the detector facing the concrete surface toward the target and a “horizontal setup” with the detector parallel to the primary proton beam, facing the upstream direction. These two setups were used to confirm the effect of detector orientation on the measured neutron spectrum because the detector sensitivity depends on the position and direction of incident neutrons. For both setups, the detector was set 40 cm away from the position just above the target center as shown in Fig. 3. The vertical distances between the target center and the center of the NE213 scintillator were 694 and 688 cm for the vertical and horizontal setups, respectively. As veto detectors, two NE102A plastic scintillators were set at the bottom of the detector (Veto 1) and beam upstream to the detector (Veto 2). The Veto 1 and 2 detectors had dimensions of \(15 \times 15 \times 0.6 \text{ cm}^3\) and \(15 \times 15 \times 0.3 \text{ cm}^3\), respectively.

The 24 GeV/c protons were bombarded onto a \(68 \times 50 \text{ cm}^2\) copper target (density: 8.96 g/cm³). For every super-cycle containing 30–47 spills, 1–5 spills were assigned to CHARM. The number of protons monitored by the SEC was \(3 \times 10^{11}\) protons/spill during this experiment. The beam was centered with diameters of 1.6 cm (horizontal) and 1.4 cm (vertical) full width at half maximum, measured by using the BPM placed near the target. The energy deposition of protons penetrating the target was calculated with SPAR\[18\] to be \(7.9 \times 10^4\) MeV. The transmission rate for protons impinging on the target was estimated with SPAR\[18\] to be 7.9 \times 10^4 counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(1.4 \times 10^2\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(4 \times 10^2\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(5 \times 10^2\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(6 \times 10^2\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(7 \times 10^2\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(8 \times 10^2\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(9 \times 10^2\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(10^2\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(110\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(120\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(130\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(140\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(150\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(160\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(170\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(180\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(190\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(200\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(210\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(220\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(230\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(240\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(250\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(260\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(270\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(280\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(290\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(300\) counts/spill.

To discriminate neutrons from \(\gamma\)-rays, two integrated values of the signal from the NE213 detector were acquired with two gates covering the total and slow parts of the signal. The integrated values of the veto detector signals were obtained by using the total gate to distinguish charged particles from uncharged particles. The integrated values were recorded with analog-to-digital converters (ADCs; A3200, Nikiglass Co., Ltd.). In summary, the event-by-event data consists of the time between the pre-trigger and the NE213 detector signal, the ADC values for the total and slow parts of the signal from the NE213 detector, and the ADC values for the signals of each veto detector.

Fig. 4 shows a time chart of signals from the detectors and the accelerator, together with elements of event-by-event data.

Fig. 4 shows a time chart of signals from the detectors and the accelerator, together with elements of event-by-event data. The transmission rate for protons impinging on the target was estimated with SPAR\[18\] to be 7.9 \times 10^4 counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(1.4 \times 10^2\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(3 \times 10^2\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(4 \times 10^2\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(5 \times 10^2\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(6 \times 10^2\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(7 \times 10^2\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(8 \times 10^2\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(9 \times 10^2\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(10^2\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(110\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(120\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(130\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(140\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(150\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(160\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(170\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(180\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(190\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(200\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(210\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(220\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(230\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(240\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(250\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(260\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(270\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(280\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(290\) counts/spill. The numbers of spills were \(300\) counts/spill.

Fig. 4 shows a time chart of signals from the detectors and the accelerator, together with elements of event-by-event data.
of the total and slow parts of the signal from the NE213 detector were set to be 150 and 125 ns, respectively. The gate of the total part was earlier than that of the slow part by 25 ns. The signals from each veto detector were directly connected to the inputs of the ADCs.

4. Data analysis

4.1. Spectrum unfolding

The neutron energy spectra were obtained as energy-dependent neutron fluences into the scintillator. The neutron fluence \( \frac{dY(E)}{dE} \) was derived from

\[
dY(E) = \frac{S(E)}{BA \Delta E},
\]

(1)

where \( \Delta E \) is the energy bin width of the spectrum, \( B \) is the number of protons derived from the measured counts of the SEC, and \( A \) is the effective detector surface area derived from track length estimation. Finally, \( S(E) \) is the incident neutron spectrum on the NE213 scintillator with energy \( E \), and was derived using the unfolding method.

In the unfolding process, we used the iterative Bayesian algorithm [20] in the RooUnfold package [21]. The relation between the incident neutron spectrum with the energy \( E \), \( S(E) \) at \( i \)th energy bin, and neutron light output spectrum with the light output \( L \), \( N(L_i) \) at \( j \)th light output bin, is expressed as

\[
S(E_i) = \sum_{j} N(L_{ij}) P(E_i|L_{ij}),
\]

(2)

where \( N(L_{ij}) \) was obtained by analyzing event-by-event data. The conditional probability \( P(E_i|L_{ij}) \) is expressed as

\[
P(E_i|L_{ij}) = \frac{P(L_{ij}|E_i)P(E_i)}{\sum_{n} P(L_{ij}|E_n)P(E_n)},
\]

(3)

where \( P(E_i) \) is the probability of the incident neutron number in \( i \)th energy bin to that in all energy bins, and \( n \) is the number of energy bins. The detector response is indicated as the conditional probability \( P(L_i|E_i) \) in cases to obtain a light output \( L_i \) from the NE213 detector when neutrons with mono energy \( E_i \) enter in the NE213 detector, and was obtained by simulation. In the unfolding method, \( S(E) \) was derived by giving an initial distribution to \( P(E) \).

4.2. Neutron light output spectrum

The neutron light output spectrum was deduced by event selection and light output calibration. Events originating in the beam and identified neutrons were extracted from the event-by-event data.

Events originating in the beam were discriminated with a scatter plot showing the counts for each spill as a function of the time difference between the pre-trigger and the NE213 detector signal, as shown in Fig. 6. Beam on and off target periods distinguished by the count difference. The events between 180 and 640 ms shown in Fig. 6 were selected as beam events.

Neutron events were obtained by selection of uncharged particle events and pulse shape discrimination (PSD). Charged and uncharged particle events were distinguished using the scatter plots of total ADC versus Veto 1 and total ADC versus Veto 2, as shown in Fig. 7. The band corresponding to proton events can be observed in the scatter plots of total ADC versus Veto 1. PSD was performed with a scatter plot of total versus slow ADCs as shown in Fig. 8. Because the neutron and \( \gamma \)-ray events overlap with one another in the low total ADC region, the discrimination threshold of the total ADC was chosen as 227 ch, which corresponds to 3.1 MeVee (MeV electron equivalent) in the vertical setup and 3.0 MeVee in the horizontal setup. The loss of neutron events due to the overlap was less than 5% at the threshold.

4.3. Detector response and effective detector surface area

The detector responses and the effective detector surface area were calculated using the SCINFUL-QMD code [23,24], taking into account the position and direction of the incident neutrons. Fig. 10 shows the geometries used for the calculations. Source neutrons with uniform energy distribution up to 300 MeV were isotropically and uniformly generated inside a circle with a diameter of 10 m. A scoring region with the same shape and size as the NE213 scintillator used in this experiment was set above the center of this circle.

The light output and straight-line length from the incident point to the detector wall were calculated when the neutron entered the scoring region. The light output was smeared with its resolution. The resolution was determined using the experimental data for the Compton edges of \( \gamma \)-rays for \(^{137}\)Cs, \(^{60}\)Co, \(^{22}\)Na, and \(^{241}\)AmBe. The light output resolution above 5 MeVee was determined to be about 3.5%.
The detector responses were calculated by scoring the incident neutron energy and the light output. The effective detector surface area $A$ was derived from the following equation [25]:

$$A = \frac{V}{l_{\text{av}}} \quad (4)$$

where $V$ is the volume of the NE213 scintillator and $l_{\text{av}}$ is the track length, which is the average of the straight-line lengths from the incident point to the detector wall. The track length corresponds to an index of the dependence on the position and direction distributions, and is estimated to be 7.42 and 5.80 cm for the vertical and horizontal setups, respectively.

5. Results and discussion

Fig. 11 shows the neutron energy spectra for the vertical and horizontal setups, as well as the ratio of the spectra for horizontal setup to vertical setup. The edge of the lowest energy bin of the measured spectra was determined by the threshold of the PSD. The measured spectra have only uncertainty originating in the unfolding [21]. The uncertainties of each bin are less than 8%. A broad peak in the energy range between 20 and 30 MeV is significantly observed in both spectra. The broad peak component was formed during neutron transport in the iron shield placed above the target due to a depression of the total cross section, and remained during the neutron transmission through the concrete.
In spite of the difference for the setups for the NE213 scintillator, the spectra are in good agreement with each other within the ratio difference less than 19%. The agreement is especially good in the energy range between 20 and 80 MeV. The integral values of the spectra in the energy range between 6.7 and 300 MeV were $2.11 \times 10^{-10}$ and $2.15 \times 10^{-10}$ (n/cm$^2$/proton) for the vertical and horizontal setups, respectively. These integral values are in good agreement with each other within the ratio difference less than 2%. The difference of integral values is consistent with the difference of the ratio of the inverse square of the distances between the target and the NE213 detector for the vertical and horizontal setups. These agreements indicate that the methodology of the calculations worked properly for detector responses and effective area. However, calculating the detector responses and the effective area with a three-dimensional particle transport Monte Carlo code will be required for more complex conditions, such as a detector surrounded by concrete walls.

The feasibility of the measurement using this facility with the NE213 detector is discussed for less shielding materials and using different targets. In this experiment, the count rate was less than $3 \times 10^3$ cps. The NE213 detector accepts count rates up to $10^5$ cps. The transmission rate $T$ is estimated as

$$T = \exp \left( -\frac{\rho}{\lambda} t \right).$$  

(5)

where $\rho$ is the density of the shielding material (2.4 g/cm$^3$ for normal concrete and 3.35 g/cm$^3$ for barite concrete) [17], $\lambda$ is the attenuation length (120 g/cm$^2$ for normal concrete and 124 g/cm$^2$ for barite concrete) [26], and $t$ is the thickness of the shielding material. The half-value thickness and tenth-value thickness of normal concrete are 35 and 115 cm, respectively. With the same beam intensity as in this experiment, a measurement with current apparatus is feasible for the removal of 170 cm normal concrete, i.e. down to 80 cm thickness of iron and 115 cm thickness of concrete, respectively. Since the yield for the aluminum target is about 2.5 times less than for the copper target [15], the count rate of the aluminum target is estimated to be $10^3$ cps. Removing 220 cm thickness of normal concrete is thus acceptable for the aluminum target. A reduction of the beam intensity would be necessary to remove more shields. In order to remove the concrete shield entirely, the beam intensity would be reduced to about 1% of the current beam intensity for the copper target, and to about 4% for the aluminum target.

6. Summary

The neutron energy spectra were measured by using an NE213 detector on the roof top of CHARM. The NE213 detector was set in vertical and horizontal setups. The neutron energy spectra were derived from the unfolding method using an iterative Bayesian algorithm. The detector responses were calculated with the SCINFUL-QMD code, by taking into account the positions and directions of the incident neutrons. The neutron energy spectra were obtained as the fluences into the scintillator by dividing the energy spectra by the effective detector surface area, which was derived via track length estimation in the detector response calculation. Since the shapes of neutron energy spectra were in good agreement with each other, the measurement method was experimentally confirmed to be reasonable. It was also found that the measured spectrum had a broad peak at 20–30 MeV.

In future research, the detector response and the effective detector surface area should be investigated under more complex geometry, for various position and direction distributions of incident neutrons impinging on the detector. When the detector is placed on a flat open surface, the contribution due to the neutron distributions is expected to be small. However, this contribution may become more significant for measurements at a location surrounded with shielding or in a maze structure. Although there is a difficulty to determine the distributions, experimentally, the distributions could be obtained by the calculation by three dimensional Monte Carlo simulation codes. This will be the next step of this study.

The present method with the NE213 detector at CHARM is quite effective for measuring the neutron energy spectrum and attenuation in shielding. Further shielding experiments are desired to obtain the systematic data set and shielding properly. Comparisons between measured and calculated values will be useful for improvement and validation of empirical formulas and simulation codes.
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