





ICRM-GSWG

Benchmark for Monte Carlo simulation - part II - Coincidence summing corrections

Anagnostakis M.^a, Karfopoulos K.^b, **Mitsios I.**^a, Potiriadis C.^b, Salpadimos N.^b, Savva M.I.^c

^aNuclear Engineering Department, National Technical University of Athens ^bGreek Atomic Energy Commission (EEAE) ^cInstitute of Nuclear & Radiological Sciences &Technology, Energy & Safety, National Centre for Scientific Research "DEMOKRITOS"

PENELOPE Codes – Methodology

>PENELOPE 2018 (performed by all participants)

Two kinds of simulations were performed:

- For specific energies full energy peak efficiency (FEPE) calculation
- For the whole isotope decay scheme (subroutine pennuc) full energy peak efficiency calculation for energies of interest with the use of emission intensity for each energy – subtraction of continuum background was performed

TCC factor calculation

FEPE from whole isotope decay scheme simulation

FEPE from specific energy simulation

PENELOPE Codes – Methodology

PENELOPE 2005 (performed by Savva M.I.)

The code was modified to simulate the cascade emission of Co-57, Co-60, Cs-137 and Y-88 and a Compton Suppression system (Savva & Anagnostakis, 2016)

Specific γ-rays and decay schemes were simulated only for Cs-134 and Co-60

TCC was calculated using the aforementioned formula

Challenges

- Amount of simulations required (240) and number of required showers (2*10⁶ to 10⁷) to achieve uncertainty<1%</p>
 - Simulations lasted from several hours to a few days

Continuum Background Subtraction (use of channels left and right of the photopeak of interest)

>X-ray peak formation from whole isotope decay scheme simulations

Example – Detector B Soil ¹³³Ba











Indicative Results – Detector A Water ⁶⁰Co



Indicative Results – Detector A Soil ¹³⁴Cs



Indicative Results – Detector B Soil ¹³⁴Cs



Indicative Results – Detector A Point Source ²²Na



