	EET	
	PER	• •
ORIGINAL AND THREE COPIES REQUIRE	ED .	STED
TITLE: Computation of Analytical Bounds for Cross Section	on Self-Shielding Factors	
AUTHOR(S): (List authors in the proper order and exactly as they are to be p AFTER EACH AUTHOR WHO IS AN ANS MEMBER; AN "S" AFTER S		
J. Barhen *		
2. D. G. Cacuci * Martin Charles and States and Sta		
AFFILIATION(S): (List corresponding author's affiliation and complete mailing	•	
l. Bldg. 6002, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, P.O. Box X,		
2. Bldg. 6002, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, P.O. Box X, 5.	Oak Ridge, TN 37830	• •
ndicate number of author to whom correspondence should be addressed	1 and complete page /	
o whom should the page charge be billed?		ц
Preferred: Attach purchase order with appropriate purchase order number to	original copy of the summary	
FOR CONTRIBUTED SUMMARY: Identify ANS Division or Technical Group having cognizance of your subject		
in which subject category (from page 3) do you feel this summary belongs?	14.1	
Mernative Category: Mathematics and Computation: 7.2.4		
Has the substance of this summary been presented or published previously (including U.S. DOE or equivalent	•
YES (NO) Give details		
Ias the paper been submitted for publication in a technical journal?	•	
VES (NO) Give details		
YES NO Give details		
lave you presented related papers?	· · ·	
lave you presented related papers? YES NO Give details		
Have you presented related papers? YES NO Give details Has this summary been approved for publication by your institution or compa	-	
Have you presented related papers? YES NO Give details Has this summary been approved for publication by your institution or compa YES NO Give details	-	•
lave you presented related papers? YES NO Give details las this summary been approved for publication by your institution or compa	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•
lave you presented related papers? YES NO Give details las this summary been approved for publication by your institution or compa YES NO Give details OR INVITED SUMMARY: /hich ANS Division or Technical Group invited you?		•
lave you presented related papers? YES NO Give details las this summary been approved for publication by your institution or compa YES NO Give details OR INVITED SUMMARY: Which ANS Division or Technical Group invited you? erson who invited you OR CONTRIBUTED OR INVITED SUMMARY:	Session No	
Iave you presented related papers? YES NO Give details	Session No Figures0	•
Iave you presented related papers? YES NO Give details	Session No Figures0 lines of equations × 10) 70	•
Iave you presented related papers? YES NO Give details	Session No Figures0 lines of equations × 10) 70 al837	

.

	FILING AND MAIL	LING INFOR	MATI	ON		
Name and full mailing to whom corresponder				LOG	#	·
(Type or print legibly	- form used for maning.)					
L Parban		7	•			
J. Barhen Bldg. 6025	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•••••				
	onal Laboratory					
p. 0. Box X				elephone:		
Oak Ridge, TN	37380			Commercial: TS:	615-574-52	
· · ·			Ľ		624-52	204
The off strength of f	omputation of Analy	vtical Bound	is for	Cross Sec	tion Self-S	hielding
	Factors	, crear bound				
· · ·		• • • • • •	F		• • • • • • •	
	a a an Arra an Arra an Arra an		eset a co	· · ·.		
		· · .				
	considered for inclusion o, California, Nov. 11 - 1	in the program	n of the	American N		
This summary will be Meeting, San Francisco	considered for inclusion o, California, Nov. 11 - 1	in the program	n of the	American N		
This summary will be Meeting, San Francisco July 23, 1979. Your paper has been r 1. Accepted Winter M	considered for inclusion o, California, Nov. 11 - 1 reviewed and: for presentation at the Meeting. (See Attached	in the program 16, 1979. Anoth 	n of the	American N y of this for 	m will be sent	to you abo r summary mmary ref
This summary will be Meeting, San Francisco July 23, 1979. Your paper has been r 1. Accepted Winter N structions	considered for inclusion o, California, Nov. 11 - 1 reviewed and: for presentation at the Meeting. (See Attached	in the program 16, 1979. Anoth 1979 1979 1 In-	n of the	American N y of this for 3. It is sugg combine enced as	m will be sent	to you abo r summary mmary ref
This summary will be Meeting, San Francisco July 23, 1979. Your paper has been r 1. Accepted Winter I structions 2. It is sugg	considered for inclusion o, California, Nov. 11 - 1 reviewed and: for presentation at the Meeting. (See Attached	in the program 16, 1979. Anoth 1979 1979 1 In-	a of the her cop	American N y of this for 3. It is sugg combine enced as tachraent	m will be sent	r summary mmary ref
This summary will be Meeting, San Francisco July 23, 1979. Your paper has been r 1. Accepted Winter I structions 2. It is sugg	considered for inclusion o, California, Nov. 11 - 1 reviewed and: for presentation at the Meeting. (See Attached i) gested that your summar	in the program 16, 1979. Anoth 1979 1979 1 In-	a of the her cop	American N y of this for 3. It is sugg combine enced as tachraent	m will be sent gested that you d with the su Log #	r summary mmary ref
This summary will be Meeting, San Francisco July 23, 1979. Your paper has been r 1. Accepted Winter M structions 2. It is sugg revised. (Your paper is being r	considered for inclusion o, California, Nov. 11 - 1 reviewed and: for presentation at the Meeting. (See Attached s) gested that your summar See Attachment)	in the program 16, 1979. Anoth 1979 1979 1 In-	a of the her cop	American N y of this for 3. It is sugg combine enced as tachraent	m will be sent gested that you d with the su Log #	r summary mmary ref
This summary will be Meeting, San Francisco July 23, 1979. Your paper has been r 1. Accepted Winter I structions 2. It is sugg revised. (Your paper is being r view because:	considered for inclusion o, California, Nov. 11 - 1 reviewed and: for presentation at the Meeting. (See Attached a) gested that your summar See Attachment) returned without re-	in the program 16, 1979. Anoth 1979 d In- ry be	a of the her cop	American N y of this for 3. It is sugg combine enced as tachrnent 4. Rejected.	m will be sent	to you abo r summary mmary ref (See Comments
This summary will be Meeting, San Francisco July 23, 1979. Your paper has been r 1. Accepted Winter I structions 2. It is sugg revised. (Your paper is being r view because:	considered for inclusion o, California, Nov. 11 - 1 reviewed and: for presentation at the Meeting. (See Attached s) gested that your summar See Attachment)	in the program 16, 1979. Anoth 1979 d In- ry be	a of the her cop	American N y of this for 3. It is sugg combine enced as tachrnent 4. Rejected. 2. It signific	m will be sent gested that you d with the su Log #	to you abo r summary mmary ref (See Comments
This summary will be Meeting, San Francisco July 23, 1979. Your paper has been r 1. Accepted Winter M structions 2. It is sugg revised. (Your paper is being r view because: 1. It was reco	considered for inclusion o, California, Nov. 11 - 1 reviewed and: for presentation at the Meeting. (See Attached a) gested that your summar See Attachment) returned without re-	in the program 16, 1979. Anoth 1979 d In- ry be date.	a of the her cop	American N y of this for 3. It is sugg combine enced as tachrient 4. Rejected. 2. It signific of 900 we	m will be sent	to you abo r summary mmary ref (See Comments
This summary will be Meeting, San Francisco July 23, 1979. Your paper has been r 1. Accepted Winter M structions 2. It is sugg revised. (Your paper is being r view because: 1. It was reco In all correspondence	considered for inclusion o, California, Nov. 11 - 1 reviewed and: for presentation at the Meeting. (See Attached s) gested that your summar See Attachment) returned without re- ceived after the deadline regarding your summary,	in the program 16, 1979. Anoth 1979 d In- ry be date.	a of the her cop	American N y of this for 3. It is sugg combine enced as tachrient 4. Rejected. 2. It signific of 900 we	m will be sent	to you abo r summary mmary ref (See Comments
This summary will be Meeting, San Francisco July 23, 1979. Your paper has been r 1. Accepted Winter M structions 2. It is sugg revised. (Your paper is being r view because: 1. It was rec In all correspondence Thank you for submitt	considered for inclusion o, California, Nov. 11 - 1 reviewed and: for presentation at the Meeting. (See Attached s) gested that your summar See Attachment) returned without re- ceived after the deadline regarding your summary,	in the program 16, 1979. Anoth 1979 d In- ry be date.	a of the her cop	American N y of this for 3. It is sugg combine enced as tachrient 4. Rejected. 2. It signific of 900 we	m will be sent	to you abo r summary mmary ref (See Comments
This summary will be Meeting, San Francisco July 23, 1979. Your paper has been r 1. Accepted Winter M structions 2. It is sugg revised. (Your paper is being r view because: 1. It was reco In all correspondence	considered for inclusion o, California, Nov. 11 - 1 reviewed and: for presentation at the Meeting. (See Attached s) gested that your summar See Attachment) returned without re- ceived after the deadline regarding your summary,	in the program 16, 1979. Anoth 1979 d In- ry be date.	a of the her cop	American N y of this for 3. It is sugg combine enced as tachrient 4. Rejected. 2. It signific of 900 we	m will be sent	to you abo r summary mmary ref (See Comments
This summary will be Meeting, San Francisco July 23, 1979. Your paper has been r 1. Accepted Winter M structions 2. It is sugg revised. (Your paper is being r view because: 1. It was rec In all correspondence Thank you for submitt Sincerely,	considered for inclusion o, California, Nov. 11 - 1 reviewed and: for presentation at the Meeting. (See Attached s) gested that your summar See Attachment) returned without re- ceived after the deadline regarding your summary,	in the program 16, 1979. Anoth 1979 d In- ry be date.	a of the her cop	American N y of this for 3. It is sugg combine enced as tachrient 4. Rejected. 2. It signific of 900 we	m will be sent	to you abo r summary mmary ref (See Comments
This summary will be Meeting, San Francisco July 23, 1979. Your paper has been r 1. Accepted Winter M structions 2. It is sugg revised. (Your paper is being r view because: 1. It was rec In all correspondence Thank you for submitt Sincerely, Neil Norman ANS Technical Progra	considered for inclusion o, California, Nov. 11 - 1 reviewed and: for presentation at the Meeting. (See Attached i) gested that your summar See Attachment) returned without re- ceived after the deadline regarding your summary, ting this summary.	in the program 16, 1979. Anoth 1979 d In- ry be date.	a of the her cop	American N y of this for 3. It is sugg combine enced as tachrient 4. Rejected. 2. It signific of 900 we	m will be sent	to you abo r summary mmary ref (See Comments
This summary will be Meeting, San Francisco July 23, 1979. Your paper has been r 1. Accepted Winter M structions 2. It is sugg revised. (Your paper is being r view because: 1. It was rec In all correspondence Thank you for submitt Sincerely, Neil Norman	considered for inclusion o, California, Nov. 11 - 1 reviewed and: for presentation at the Meeting. (See Attached i) gested that your summar See Attachment) returned without re- ceived after the deadline regarding your summary, ting this summary.	in the program 16, 1979. Anoth 1979 d In- ry be date.	a of the her cop	American N y of this for 3. It is sugg combine enced as tachrient 4. Rejected. 2. It signific of 900 we	m will be sent	to you abo r summary mmary ref (See Comments

COMPUTATION OF ANALYTICAL BOUNDS FOR CROSS SECTION SELF-SHIELDING FACTORS*

J. Barhen Engineering Physics Division Oak Ridge National Laboratory Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

D. G. Cacúci Engineering Physics Division Oak Ridge National Laboratory Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

DISCLAIMER

This book was preserved as an account of vice's sponteethed by an agincy of the United States Government. Nexteen the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of ther employees, makes any warrathy, espends or implied, or assumer any legal fability or responsibility for the accurdy, completeness or usefulness of any information a patiantals, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would incl. If now privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial chocks, upposs, or viewed by total ensite tables, and indicated the accurdy, a state Government or any agency thereof. The vecks and coming of accurds even and coming the united states Government or any agency thereof. The vecks and comings on autors expressed hereind a not necessarily state or reflers those of the United States Government or any specific there is a state of the United States Government or any specific thereof.

Submitted for Presentation to the American Nuclear Society

San Francisco, California, November 11-16, 1979

By acceptance of this article, the publisher or recipient acknowledges the U.S. Government's right to retain a nonexclusive, royalty-free license in and to any copyright covering the article.

^{*}Research sponsored by the Reactor Research and Technology Division, U. S. Department of Energy under contract W-7405-eng-26 with the Union Carbide Corporation.

COMPUTATION OF ANALYTICAL BOUNDS FOR CROSS SECTION SELF-SHIELDING FACTORS

The shielding factor method (SFM) is a frequently used economical procedure for computing the effective multigroup cross sections needed in reactor analysis. While initially developed and employed in codes used by the fast reactor community,¹⁻⁴ the method has been receiving increased attention in recent years from the electric utility industry, for applications to power reactors.⁴⁻⁶ A fundamental problem regarding the method's applicability is to determine the limits of the range of values within which a cross section shielding factor is restricted, and whether these limits are physically meaningful. In a previous paper⁷ strict upper and lower bounds for the transport f-factor and for the sum of reaction f-factors were derived and discussed. The purpose of the present work is to present extensions of the methodology of Ref. (7).

Strict upper and lower bounds for individual reaction f-factors have now been derived, allowing for cross section discontinuities (e.g. between the resolved and unresolved regions). The resulting expressions were coded in BRINE, a stand alone module easily incorporable into existing SFM cross section processors. BRINE will be used to check the shielding factors in the multipurpose ENDF/B-V based VITAMIN-E library,⁸ now under production at ORNL.

The computation of analytical bounds for the self-shielding factors involves separate treatments of the resolved and unresolved regions, since the corresponding cross-section representations differ. Moreover, particular care is required in handling those groups where cross section discontinuities, allowed by the ENDF specifications,⁹ occur. For illustrative purposes, the methodology for deriving a strict upper bound for a flux-weighted reaction f-factor in the resolved resonance region will now be presented. Complete results covering all possible cases are summarized in Table I. The reaction self-shielding factor $f_G^{X,r}(\sigma_B,T)$ is defined¹⁻³ as

$$f_{G}^{x,r}(\sigma_{B},T) = \frac{I_{G}[c(E)]}{I_{G}[c(E)\sigma_{x}^{r}(E,0)]} \cdot I_{G}\left[\frac{c(E)\sigma_{x}^{r}(E,T)}{\sigma_{B} + \sigma_{t}^{r}(E,T)}\right] / I_{G}\left[\frac{c(E)}{\sigma_{B} + \sigma_{t}^{r}(E,T)}\right].$$
(1)

C(E) represents the slowly varying broad energy behavior of the flux. The symbol I_G denotes integration over energy, in group G. The various definite integrals involved are clearly finite. The Diaz-Goldmann-Metcalf inequality¹⁰ applied to a pair of positive real valued functions g and h defined on G, gives:

$$I_{G}[g^{2}] \cdot I_{G}[h^{2}] \leq \{I_{G}[g \cdot h]\}^{2} \cdot [\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4}(B^{2} + \frac{1}{B^{2}})]$$
(2)

where $B^2 = (M_g M_h/m_g M_h)$, and M_g , m_g , M_h and m_h denote Sup g, Inf g, Sup h and Inf h over group G, respectively; M_g and m_g can be taken to be the maximum and minimum values, respectively, attained by the function g in the energy interval (group) G. M_h and m_h can be taken similarly for the function h. Consider now two additional functions \overline{g} and \overline{h} , defined on G such that:

$$g(E)h(E) = \overline{g}(E)\overline{h}(E)$$
 for $E \in G$. (3)

1

Then the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality¹⁰ gives:

$$\{I_{g}[g\cdot h]\}^{2} = \{I_{g}[\overline{g}\cdot\overline{h}]\}^{2} \leq I_{g}[\overline{g}^{2}] \cdot I_{g}[\overline{h}^{2}]$$
(4)

Choosing now

$$h^{2}(E) \equiv \frac{C(E)\sigma_{x}^{r}(E,T)}{\sigma_{B} + \sigma_{t}^{r}(E,T)} , \quad \overline{h}^{2} \equiv \left| \frac{C(E)}{\sigma_{B} + \sigma_{t}^{r}(E,T)} , \text{ and } g^{2}(E) \equiv C(E) \right|$$
(5)

forces $\overline{g}^2(E)$ to be equal to $C(E)\sigma_x^r(E,T)$, and yields the following strict upper bound for $f_G^{x,r}(\sigma_B,T)$:

$$f_{G}^{x,r}(\sigma_{B},T) \leq \frac{I_{G}[C(E)\sigma_{x}^{r}(E,T)]}{I_{G}[C(E)\sigma_{x}^{r}(E,0)]} \cdot \left[\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4}(B^{2} + \frac{1}{B^{2}})\right] .$$
(6)

The strict lower bound for $f_{G}^{x,r}(\sigma_{B},T)$ is derived similarly, leading to

$$f_{G}^{x,r}(\sigma_{B},T) \geq \frac{I_{G}[C(E)\sigma_{x}^{r}(E,T)]}{I_{G}[C(E)\sigma_{x}^{r}(E,0)]} \cdot \left[\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4}(B^{2} + \frac{1}{B^{2}})\right]^{-1}$$
(7)

Discontinuities in cross sections at a finite number of points E_b^k in a given group G may occur, as specified by the ENDF procedures.⁹ In this case Lebesgue-Stieltjes integrable extensions of the functions g, h, \overline{g} , and \overline{h} can readily be constructed. The methodology outlined in Eqs. (2-7) is then directly applicable to the "extended" g and h functions. However extra care needs be excercised when evaluating M_g, m_g, M_h, and m_h since cross section discontinuities may introduce additional "jump" constants. This is shown in Table 1.

Important conclusions from this study include:

- A general methodology for computing strict upper and lower bounds for self-shielding factors has been developed.
- (2) The complete range of self-shielding factors computed by cross section processing codes was addressed, and ENDF/B specified cross section discontinuities were taken into account.

- (3) Initial results obtained with data from a preliminary ENDF/B-V file confirm the necessity of replacing any arbitrarily imposed bounds on the shielding factors (e.g. $f_x \leq 1$ forced within some older generation codes²) by analytically derived bounds.
- (4) The stand alone module BRINE will provide SFM users with a practical tool to check the f-factors.

Shielding Factor Type	Resolved Region or Smooth Cross Sections	Unresolved Region Cross Sections	Group Containing A Cross Section Discontinuity e.g. the Resolved/Unresolved Boundary
Reaction Flux-Weighted	$U.B. = [N_{G}^{x,r}]^{2} A_{G}^{x,r}$ $L.B. = \frac{1}{[N_{G}^{x,r}]^{2}} A_{G}^{x,r}$ $A_{G}^{x,r} = \frac{I_{G}[C(E)\sigma_{x}^{r}(E,T)]}{I_{G}[C(E)\sigma_{x}^{r}(E,0)]}$ $g_{+}^{2} \equiv C(E) \qquad g_{-}^{2} \equiv C(E)\sigma_{x}^{r}(E,T)$ $C(E)\sigma_{-}^{r}(E,T) \qquad \Gamma(E)$	$U.B. = \left[N_{G}^{x,u}\right]^{2} \cdot A_{G}^{x,u}$ $L.B. = \frac{1}{\left[N_{G}^{x,u}\right]^{2}} \cdot A_{G}^{x,u}$ $A_{G}^{x,u} = \frac{I_{G}\left[C(E) \ \overline{\sigma}_{x}(E,\sigma_{B},T)\right]}{I_{G}\left[C(E) \ \overline{\sigma}_{x}^{\infty}(E)\right]}$ $g_{+}^{2} \equiv C(E) \qquad g_{-}^{2} \equiv C(E) \ \overline{\sigma}_{x}^{(E,\sigma_{B},T)}$ $L.B. = \frac{C(E)\overline{\sigma}_{x}(E,\sigma_{B},T)}{C(E)\overline{\sigma}_{x}(E,\sigma_{B},T)}$	$U.8. = [N_{\tilde{w}}^{X}]^{2} A_{\tilde{w}}^{X}$ $L.8. = \frac{1}{[N_{\tilde{w}}^{X}]^{2}} A_{\tilde{w}}^{X}$ $A_{\tilde{w}}^{X} = \frac{1}{[r_{g}^{\Gamma}(\varepsilon)\sigma_{x}^{\Gamma}(\varepsilon,\tau)] + I_{u}[\varepsilon(\varepsilon)\overline{\sigma}_{x}(\varepsilon,\sigma_{g},\tau)]}{I_{r}[\varepsilon(\varepsilon)\sigma_{x}^{\Gamma}(\varepsilon,0)] + I_{u}[\varepsilon(\varepsilon)\sigma_{x}^{\overline{\omega}}(\varepsilon)]}$ $\tilde{B}_{\tilde{w}}^{X} = \frac{\tilde{H}_{g}}{\tilde{m}_{g}} \frac{\tilde{H}_{h}}{\tilde{m}_{g}} \tilde{H}_{h} \qquad \tilde{H}_{g} = \sup[\tilde{H}_{g}^{\Gamma}, \tilde{H}_{g}^{U}, H_{g}^{Ump}], \text{ etc. }$ $\tilde{H}_{g}^{r} = [\Phi_{H}^{r}T_{H}^{X,r}]^{\frac{1}{2}}$
e-	$h_{+}^{2} \equiv \frac{\sigma(\sigma_{T,\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{r}))}{\sigma_{B} + \sigma_{t}^{r}(\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{T})} \qquad h_{-}^{2} \equiv \frac{U(E)}{\sigma_{B} + \sigma_{t}^{r}(\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{T})}$ $\begin{bmatrix} B_{0}^{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r}} \end{bmatrix}^{2} = \frac{\Phi_{H}}{\Phi_{m}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\Sigma_{H}^{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r}}}{\Sigma_{m}^{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r}}} \end{bmatrix}^{\frac{1}{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{B} + \Sigma_{H}^{t} \\ \sigma_{B} + \Sigma_{H}^{t} \end{bmatrix}^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$h_{+}^{2} \equiv \frac{x}{\sigma_{B} + \overline{\sigma}_{t,0}^{(E,\sigma_{B},T)}} h_{-}^{2} \equiv \frac{\sigma_{E} + \overline{\sigma}_{t,0}^{(E,\sigma_{B},T)}}{\sigma_{B} + \overline{\sigma}_{t,0}^{(E,\sigma_{B},T)}}$ $\begin{bmatrix} \gamma_{H}^{x,u} \\ \beta_{H}^{x,u} \end{bmatrix}^{2} - \frac{\phi_{H}}{\phi_{H}} \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{H}^{x,u} \\ \Sigma_{m}^{x,u} \end{bmatrix}^{\frac{1}{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{B} + \Sigma_{H}^{t,0} \\ \sigma_{B} + \Sigma_{H}^{x,0} \end{bmatrix}^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\begin{split} \mathbf{W}_{g} &= \left[\boldsymbol{\phi}_{M}^{\Gamma} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{M}^{\mathbf{x}}, \Gamma \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \boldsymbol{\phi}_{M}^{\Gamma} &= \operatorname{Sup} \left[\sqrt{C(E)} \right] \\ \boldsymbol{\phi}_{M}^{\Gamma} &= \operatorname{Sup} \left[\sqrt{C(E)} \right] \\ \boldsymbol{H}_{g}^{jump} &= \left[\boldsymbol{\phi}_{b} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{M}^{\mathbf{x}, b} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{M}^{\mathbf{x}, b} &\approx \operatorname{Sup} \left\{ \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{X}^{\Gamma} (\boldsymbol{E}_{b} - 0, T), \ \boldsymbol{\overline{\sigma}}_{X} (\boldsymbol{E}_{b} + 0, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{B}, T) \right\} \\ &= \operatorname{tc} \end{split}$
Total Current-Weighted ,	Derived in Ref. 7	Derived in Ref. 7	$U.B. = A_{\nu}^{t} I$ $L.B. = \frac{1}{\left[N_{U}^{t}\right]_{i}^{T}} A_{\nu}^{t}$ G
			$ \begin{bmatrix} t_1 \\ A_{\omega} \\ G \end{bmatrix} = \frac{I_r[C(E)\sigma_t^r(E,T)] + I_u[C(E)\widetilde{\sigma}_{t,1}(E,\sigma_B,T)]}{I_r[C(E)\sigma_t^r(E,0)] + I_u[C(E)\widetilde{\sigma}_{u,1}^{\infty}(E)]} $ $ \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{B}_{C}^{t} \\ \widetilde{B}_{C}^{t} \end{bmatrix}^2 $ derived as above.
		•.	Note that: $h_{+}^{2} \equiv \frac{C(E)\overline{\sigma}_{t,1}(E,\sigma_{B},T)}{[\sigma_{B} + \overline{\sigma}_{t,0}(E,\sigma_{B},T)][\sigma_{B} + \overline{\sigma}_{t,1}(E,\sigma_{B},T)]}$

Notes: 1. For computational efficiency BRINE allows optional use of \tilde{B}^2 (see table) instead of B^2 , $[N^2 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4}(B^2 + \frac{1}{B^2})]$, 2. Notations are self-explanatory: $\Sigma_H^{X_c\Gamma} = \sup_E [\sigma_X^{\Gamma}(E,T)]$ for $E \in \Delta_{\Gamma} \cap G$, etc. $(g_{\frac{1}{2}}^2, h_{\frac{1}{2}}^2) \cong$ functions used in deriving the upper bound.

3. U.B. = upper bound; L.B. = lower bound.

REFERENCES

- R. E. Schenter et al., BNWL-1002 (1969); R. W. Hardie et. al., BNWL-954 (1969).
- 2. B. A. Hutchins et al., GEAP-13703, GEAP-13740 (1971).
- 3. C. R. Weisbin et al., LA-6486-MS (1976).
- 4. R. E. MacFarlane et al., LA-7584-MS (1976).
- 5. W. R. Cobb et al., ARMP System documentation, 11.5, EPRI-RP-118 (1977).
- 6. A. Ahlin et al., ARMP System, II.6, EPRI-RP-118-1 (1977).
- 7. D. G. Cacuci, ORNL-RSIC-41, 227, (1978).
- 8. C. R. Weisbin et al., ORNL-5505 (1979).
- 9. D. Garber et al., ENDF-102, BNL-NCS-50486 (1975).
- 10. D. S. Mitrinovic, "Analytical Inequalities," Springer Verlog, New York (1970).