A next-generation inverse-geometry spallation-driven ultracold neutron source
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The concept of a next-generation spallation-driven ultracold neutron (UCN) source capable of delivering an integrated flux of \( \sim 10^9 \) UCN s\(^{-1} \) is presented. A novel “inverse geometry” design is used with 40 liters of superfluid \(^4\)He (He-II) as converter cooled with state-of-the-art sub-cooled cryogenic technology to \( \sim 1.6 \) K. Our source design is optimized for a 100 W maximum thermal heat load constraint on the He-II and its vessel. In this paper, we first explore a modified Lujan-Center Mark-3 target for UCN production as a benchmark. We then present the baseline concept of our inverse geometry source design that gives a total UCN production rate in the converter of \( P_{\text{UCN}} = 2.4 \times 10^8 \) s\(^{-1} \).

In our inverse geometry, the spallation target is wrapped symmetrically around the cryogenic UCN converter to permit raster scanning the proton beam over a relatively large volume of tungsten spallation target to reduce the demand on the cooling requirements, which makes it reasonable to assume that water edge-cooling only is sufficient. Our design is refined in several steps to reach \( P_{\text{UCN}} = 2.1 \times 10^8 \) s\(^{-1} \) under our other restriction of 1 MW maximum available proton beam power. We then study effects of the He-II scattering kernel used as well as reductions in \( P_{\text{UCN}} \) due to pressurization to reach a estimate of \( P_{\text{UCN}} = 1.8 \times 10^8 \) s\(^{-1} \). Finally, we provide an estimate for the UCN extraction efficiency to show that the total extracted UCN rate out of the converter can be as large as \( R_{\text{ex}} \approx 6 \times 10^8 \) s\(^{-1} \) for the He-II at 1.6 K out of a 18 cm diameter guide. The UCN extraction loss is dominated by upscattering in the He-II so that if the He-II can be cooled further to \( 1.4 \) K, \( R_{\text{ex}} \approx 8 \times 10^8 \) s\(^{-1} \) can be attained. These extracted UCN rates are around an order of magnitude higher than the strongest proposed sources so far, and is around three orders of magnitude stronger than existing sources.

I. INTRODUCTION

Ultracold neutrons (UCNs) are an important tool in experiments with impact in nuclear physics, particle physics, astrophysics, cosmology,13 as well as condensed matter physics.2 Some experiments include high-precision measurements of the neutron lifetime and β-decay correlation parameters searches for a beyond standard model neutron permanent electric dipole moment, short range forces, and Lorentz violation.4 However, existing UCN experiments are primarily limited by the UCN fluxes or densities available. A dramatic increase would create new opportunities for next-generation experiments.

There is a range of UCN sources currently in operation or in development world-wide. They use either solid deuterium \((sD_2)\) or superfluid \(^4\)He (He-II) as the cold neutron (CN) to UCN converter material (except for Ref. 15). These sources are located either in-pile or at the end of a cold neutron guide at a reactor or spallation based neutron source. \(sD_2\) has a larger UCN conversion cross-section than He-II and also converts CNs of higher energies where the incident flux is also higher. Furthermore, from a cryogenic perspective, \(sD_2\) sources can be operated \(\sim 4\) K, where ample cooling power is available to ensure the thermal properties of \(sD_2\) are compatible with the requirements of heat removal for practical sources. However, after UCNs are created in the \(sD_2\) they become lost quickly (\(\sim 30 – 60\) ms) via upscattering or nuclear absorption. The scattering mean free path for UCN in \(sD_2\) can be as small as \(1 – 2\) cm, reducing the UCN extraction efficiency from thick \(sD_2\) converters. \(sD_2\) sources have been constructed at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL),16,17 at the Paul Scherrer Institute18 and at the University of Mainz.19 There are also several others under construction at North Carolina State University,20 and at the Technical University of Munich.21 The latter, which is mostly constructed, is the most ambitious of these \(sD_2\) sources. It has a predicted usable UCN rate of \(R_{\text{ex}} \approx 5 \times 10^7\) s\(^{-1} \) and a density in the source delivery system of \(5,000\) cm\(^{-3} \). In this paper, we denote the produced UCN rate by \(P_{\text{UCN}}\) and the extracted UCN rate out of the source by \(R_{\text{ex}}\).

He-II offers much higher thermal conductivities and a UCN upscattering time constant given by \(t_{\text{up}} \approx (100 \text{ s K}^2)/T^7\) (see Sec. VI), resulting in UCN loss times \(\gtrsim 3\) s for a He-II bath at a temperature \(T = 1.6\) K. At these temperatures, the total scattering mean-free-path for 8.9 Å (1 meV) neutrons, the primary UCN producing CN component, is \(\approx 18\) m.22 This permits the design of a simple, large volume source where the converter material also serves as the coolant.

There are two “in-pile” He-II sources currently under construction. One is at TRIUMF, Canada, where the source is coupled to a 500 MeV proton beam with 20 kW incident beam power.23–25 The next generation version of this source will have an expected \(R_{\text{ex}} \sim 10^8\) s\(^{-1} \) and UCN density deliverable to an experimental volume of \(6,000\) cm\(^{-3} \) (both polarized).
The other He-II UCN source is situated in the thermal column of the WWNR reactor at Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute with a predicted \( R_{\text{ex}} = (6 - 8) \times 10^7 \text{ s}^{-1} \) and a UCN density delivered to an experiment of 13,000 cm\(^{-3}\). The former will use evaporative \(^3\)He refrigeration to cool the He-II converter to 0.8 K, while the latter will directly evaporate the He-II converter to reach 1.2 K. There are also He-II sources coupled to the end of cold neutron beams to profit from the long 8.9 Å neutron mean-free-path and reduced heat loads, which allows temperatures of \( \sim 0.5 \) K to be reached. Using a valve on the He-II converter volume, these sources are optimized for accumulating high UCN densities inside the source. These sources are in operation\(^{34,35}\) with UCN densities of \( \sim 120 \text{ cm}^{-3} \) observed inside \( \sim 4 \text{ L} \) volumes of He-II.\(^{32}\) Future versions under construction have expected UCN densities of \( \sim 2000 \text{ cm}^{-3} \) in larger \( (\sim 20 \text{ L}) \) volumes.\(^{35}\)

In the present work, we investigate a concept for a next-generation He-II UCN source located at a spallation target. The geometry, which was briefly outlined in Ref.\(^{39}\), is based on using a 40 L cylindrical volume of He-II for UCN production. Our design philosophy is to optimize the UCN production rate with the following constraints: (1) allow up to 1 MW spallation proton beam power with \( \sim 800 \text{ MeV} \) proton energy, (2) use state-of-the-art sub-cooled He-II systems at the temperature range \( T \approx 1 - 2 \) K, and (3) operate with edge-cooling of a tungsten spallation target with water.

In order to achieve the goal of edge water cooling for this proton beam power, the beam is rastered so the heating is distributed. This leads to a design of having the pre-moderator, moderator, and spallation target wrapped axial-symmetrically around the He-II UCN converter in order to have symmetric heat loads and UCN production as the proton beam is scanned. By distributing the heat load in the spallation target, as pointed out in Ref.\(^{40}\), the design constraints will be limited by the heating on the cryogenic components. In our design, the heat load on the He-II converter and its vessel is dominated by fast neutrons. In order for maximal UCN production, the CN flux spectrum in the He-II needs to have strong overlap with the UCN production function in He-II, which has a large peak for 1 meV \( (\sim 10 \text{ K}) \) cold neutrons.

The most applicable cooling technology for high heat loads in our converter temperature range is a sub-cooled He-II system. These have been developed for the Large Hadron Collider’s magnet systems at CERN\(^{41,42}\) and is now common place at facilities like Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility and the Spallation Neutron Source. By using a series of five cold compressors, a nominal 100 W of cooling power can be provided at \( \sim 1.6 \) K. We are also investigating the possibility of cooling to \( \sim 1.4 \) K for the same heat load by the addition of cold compression stages. A heat exchanger can be used to transfer cooling from the circulating sub-cooled He-II line to the pressurized, isotopically pure, 40 L He-II UCN converter. To avoid UCN absorption losses, the \(^3\)He concentration must be restricted to below 1 part in \( \lesssim 10^9 \), a level that is routinely achieved with superleak technology. By pressurizing the He-II, formation of localized helium bubbles that can upscatter UCNs will be suppressed.\(^{43}\)

We will use a 800 MeV proton beam for our analysis, similar to the high-current medium-energy accelerator at LANSE of LANL.\(^{44}\) This will permit us to compare our expected cold neutron flux to LANSE’s Lujan Center Mark III target, for which a detailed performance assessment exists. The LANSE accelerator has recently been refurbished and is capable of delivering up to 1 MW of proton beam power at 800 MeV.\(^{45}\) Our upper limit of 1 MW is thus consistent with available accelerator technology. There are also other powerful proton beams available for spallation targets world-wide including: 1.4 MW at the Spallation Neutron Source (with a planned 2.8 MW upgrade\(^{46}\)), 5 MW at the European Spallation Source, 1 MW at the Japan Proton Accelerator Research Complex, and 1.3 MW at the Paul Scherrer Institute.

For the 1 MW proton power and 100 W He-II heat load design restrictions, in Ref.\(^{39}\) \( P_{\text{UCN}} = 7 \times 10^8 \text{ s}^{-1} \) was estimated for our initial inverse geometry design. In this paper, we describe optimizations with individual improvements of \( \gtrsim 10\% \) from this design. This allowed us to reach \( P_{\text{UCN}} = 1.8 \times 10^9 \text{ s}^{-1} \). In the final section, we also perform UCN extraction simulations to give an estimate for \( R_{\text{ex}} \approx (6 - 8) \times 10^8 \text{ s}^{-1} \). The calculations in this paper assume a \(^{58}\)Ni coating for UCN reflection, which has a neutron optical potential \( U_{\text{Ni}} = 335 \text{ neV} \). Because of the potential of He-II of \( U_{\text{He-II}} = 18.5 \text{ neV} \), the UCN energy that can be reflected when they are inside the He-II is reduced to 316.5 neV. For reference, the total UCN production rate scales with the cut-off energy \( E_c \) as \( R_{\text{ex}} \propto E_c^{3/2} \). Therefore, a Be-coated vessel will have a maximum reflected energy of \( E_c = 233.5 \text{ neV} \), and the total UCN production scales as \( 0.64 R_{\text{ex}} \) compared to \(^{58}\)Ni (after taking into account \( U_{\text{He-II}} \)).

II. LUJAN CENTER TARGET REFERENCE

The production of UCN in He-II is strongly peaked for incoming neutrons with a wavelength of 8.9 Å or 1 meV energy due to the kinematics of single-phonon scattering. This means that in the case of a spallation driven UCN source, the high energy neutrons, which are produced through spallation with \( \sim \) MeV energies, need to be cooled significantly to be useful for UCN production. In addition, the He-II bath needs to be shielded from \( \gamma \)-photon and charged particle heating.

First, it is useful to include the well bench-marked Lujan Center Mark-3 target geometry\(^{41}\) as a reference point for our design. The Lujan target configuration, shown in Fig.\(^{1}\), has been optimized for long wavelength cold neutrons using the cold beryllium reflector filter concept for small angle neutron scattering and reflectometry. Such a geometry is useful for UCN production in He-II due to the need for long wavelengths cold neutrons. For discussion, to convert the Lujan Center beam conditions of 100 \( \mu \)A and 800 MeV proton beam...
current and energy (equivalent to 80 kW beam power). The heat deposited in the He-II and its vessel was \( \sim 67 \) W, with \( \sim 67\% \) generated by neutrons (cold and fast), \( \sim 28\% \) by photons and \( \sim 5\% \) by protons. Based on the assumption of 100 W cooling power at 1.6 K available, this calculation predicted that using a proton power of 120 kW is possible, resulting in \( P_{UCN} = 1.4 \times 10^6 \) s\(^{-1}\). This design does not utilize a full 1 MW beam power. On the other hand, the Lujan geometry neutron production efficiency has been exhaustively optimized, benchmarked, and established, providing us with a reasonable point of reference moving forward.

If one further considers that a possible production target will have to accommodate additional engineering details, this \( P_{UCN} \) must be viewed as an upper limit. While we did not perform a full-fledged optimization study for the Lujan Center target geometry, it is safe to assume that it will not yield significantly more long wavelength cold neutron flux since this geometry has already been optimized for cold neutron production during the development of the Mark III target. Next we describe our novel “inverse geometry” target design.

### III. BASELINE INVERSE GEOMETRY DESIGN

One of the key ideas for our inverse geometry approach is based on the backscattering concept that was first proposed and implemented by Russe [50]. The idea is that, in the free gas model, if a neutron scatters inelastically the energy loss increases with increasing scattering angle. To avoid ambiguity, “inelastic scattering” used in this paper refers to a loss of neutron kinetic energy in the laboratory frame. This means that the spectrum observed in the backscattering direction is colder [51, 52] and can lead to a so-called “over moderated spectrum” [53]. This is advantageous due to the long 8.9 Å wavelength of the UCN production peak in He-II.

Fig. 2 shows our baseline inverse geometry design. The spallation target is a cylindrical shell made from tungsten with an outer radius of 58 cm and a wall thickness of 5 cm. The target is 30 cm long to the proton beam, which is longer than the 22 cm stopping length for 800 MeV protons in tungsten [54]. The impinging proton beam is rastered to distribute the heat load to different regions of the target. With these dimensions, and even with an expected maximum beam power of 1 MW, the maximum deposited energy per volume is similar to the one at the lower target of the Lujan Mark-3 target (\( \sim 35 \text{ W/cm}^3 \)) [55]. This should allow for water cooling the edge of the tungsten target.

At the core of the model is a cylindrical 40 liter He-II bath with a 18 cm radius and 40 cm length. The He-II bath is surrounded by 5 cm thick LH\(_2\) \((T = 20 \text{ K})\) moderator. Both are encased by 5 mm wall thickness aluminum canisters. The thickness of the LH\(_2\) moderator is chosen to be the same as the Lujan Center target system in our baseline design. The reflector between the target and the cold source is chosen to be bismuth, which is a good attenuator of \(\gamma\)-photons and protons, and ensures minimal neutron absorption between the target and the LH\(_2\) moderator.

In our baseline inverse geometry design, for a beam power of 80 kW (100 \(\mu\)A) the He-II heat load is \( \sim 27 \text{ W} \). Therefore, we can operate the target with almost 300 kW beam power to reach our 100 W He-II heat load specification. For this baseline design \( P_{UCN} = 2.4 \times 10^8 \) s\(^{-1}\) is attained, which is already 1.7 times larger than for the Lujan Center geometry. This increase is primarily due to the lower heat deposited in the He-II per incident neutron.

### IV. INVERSE GEOMETRY DESIGN MODIFICATIONS

In this section we describe key modifications of the material choice in our baseline inverse geometry design that will improve \( P_{UCN} \) further.

#### A. Beryllium canister

Even though the neutron absorption cross-section of aluminum is fairly low at the thermal energy (25.8 meV), \( \sigma_{abs} = 0.23\)b, this increases to 1.17 b for 1 meV neutrons, which would cause a \( \sim 30\% \) reduction of 1 meV neutrons through a 5 mm aluminum wall. On the other hand, \( \sigma_{abs} \) of beryllium at 1 meV is 40.6 mb only. The reduction of 1 meV neutrons through the same wall thickness would only be 2\%. We therefore replace the aluminum canisters with beryllium canisters. This not only increased the cold neutron flux efficiency of the system per proton but also slightly reduced the heat load. The CN spectrum temperature in the He-II was also reduced to 24 K. Both effects combine to give a \( P_{UCN} = 4 \times 10^8 \) s\(^{-1}\) for the 100 W He-II heat load.
FIG. 2. MCNP model of the baseline design of our “Inverse Geometry” source. The axis of the 40 L cylindrical superfluid $^4\text{He}$ (He-II) converter volume is parallel to direction of the rastered proton beam. (Left) Cross-section at a plane coincident with the He-II volume’s axis. (Right) Cross-section of the plane perpendicular to the He-II volume’s axis and passing through its center.

B. Heavy water ($\text{D}_2\text{O}$) pre-moderator

Many of the designs that use liquid hydrogen moderators also use thermal pre-moderators. The most commonly used materials for pre-moderation are light and heavy water. As mentioned above, we chose bismuth as the reflector material to minimize the absorption between the tungsten target and the He-II. The neutron absorption by the deuteron is significantly lower than by protons. Based on this consideration, we add a heavy water ($\text{D}_2\text{O}$) pre-moderator. The thickness of the pre-moderator is chosen to be 5 cm in our baseline design. While this modification did not significantly increase the efficiency of the target system, even though the spectral temperature was reduced to 23 K, it did reduce the He-II heat load per proton by more than 20%. This leads to $P_{\text{UCN}} = 5.4 \times 10^8 \text{ s}^{-1}$ for 100 W He-II load with 425 kW proton beam power.

C. Liquid deuterium ($\text{LD}_2$) moderator

Even though liquid hydrogen ($\text{LH}_2$) is more effective in moderating neutrons compared to liquid deuterium ($\text{LD}_2$), its thermal absorption cross section is $\sim 640$ times higher. This causes the $(n, \gamma)$ production rate in LH$_2$ to be significantly higher than in LD$_2$. This means that the expected particle heating in the He-II bath should be lower if the bath is surrounded by a deuterated material compared to a protonated material. In a final step of modifying the baseline concept, we replace the LH$_2$ moderator with a LD$_2$ moderator of the same size. While this led to a small reduction in the efficiency of the system, because the CN spectrum temperature increased to 26 K, the reduction in the He-II heat load per proton by more than 25% leads to $P_{\text{UCN}} = 7.1 \times 10^8 \text{ s}^{-1}$ for 100 W He-II heat load with a 580 kW proton beam power.

V. OPTIMIZING THE INVERSE GEOMETRY DESIGN

In this section we optimize the dimensions of the inverse geometry design including the modifications described in the previous section. The optimized geometry is shown in Fig. 3. While scanning parameters in the model, the neutron flux in the He-II volume per 100 $\mu$A beam current (80 kW beam power) for selected parameters are calculated. The maximum total UCN production rate is then calculated by folding the neutron flux with the UCN production curve and then scaled linearly to the maximum beam power for the 100 W in He-II condition.

The CN-energy dependent UCN production function is calculated following Ref. 49 using the measured dynamic structure factor from neutron time-of-flight inelastic scattering from Refs. 56 and 57 that covers 0.2 meV to 4 meV. This technique has become the standard for calculating UCN production rates in He-II.$^{27,36,58}$ The width of the UCN production peak from single-phonon scattering, which is at $\sim 1$ meV, calculated from this data has a width of $\sim 0.4$ meV due to the resolution of the time-of-flight spectrometer used (see Fig. 9). The “true” single-phonon linewidth has been measured to be $\sim 20 - 50 \mu$eV (FWHM) at 1 meV and in our temperature range.$^{59}$ However, the use of the broadened single-phonon peak width in the UCN production function is valid so long as the CN spectrum is broad, as is the case here. The UCN production curve used is for He-II at 1.5 K (e.g. see Ref. 36). The UCN production curve in Ref. 49 used previously in Ref. 39, which is for He-II at 1.2 K, contains an error in the binning and is thus avoided here. The temperature-dependence and the shape of the differential UCN production function are described in Sec. V F.

The simulations in this section were performed using MCNP 6.$^{60}$ whereas those in the previous sections and previous publications$^{19}$ were done using MCNPX. The neutron energy bin sizes were reduced from 0.04 – 0.10 meV in the
earlier simulations (the smaller size was used over the single-phonon UCN production peak) to a constant 0.02 meV. Furthermore, the lowest CN energy used is reduced from 0.9 meV to 0.03 meV. This allows the full-width of the single-phonon UCN production peak to be covered and increases the number of points over the peak. For the neutron spectrum plots shown, these smaller bins are averaged over six bins.

The MCNP scattering kernel used for bismuth at ambient temperature was generated using NJOY. In order to do so, the released version of NJOY was modified to include the crystal structure of bismuth (as shown in Ref. 62) in the LEAPR subroutine. The He-II in our MCNP calculations is treated as a free-gas scatterer at 1.6 K with an approximately constant cross-section of 0.76–0.78 b per atom for 1–5 meV cold neutrons, our energy range of interest. This does not fully describe neutron inelastic scattering in He-II. The effects of this is studied and described in Sec. V E.

For the other materials used, we have restricted ourselves to those with known and vetted characteristics. For further improvements of our source design we are also exploring novel moderators, such as triphenylmethane and high albedo cold neutron reflectors, such as diamond nanoparticles.

Next we describe the parameters of our source that we systematically optimize: the LD$_2$ moderator thickness, the D$_2$O pre-moderator thickness, and the tungsten target location relative to the He-II volume. Then an interpretation on how the parameters optimize the UCN production rate is given. Finally, we discuss the impacts of the He-II scattering kernel used, and the He-II temperature and pressure on the UCN production.

A. LD$_2$ moderator thickness

The LD$_2$ moderator thickness was scanned between 1 cm to 25 cm. The $P_{UCN}$ for 100 W He-II heat load has a peak value of $1.7 \times 10^9$ s$^{-1}$ when the LD$_2$ moderator thickness is 18 cm with a full-width half maximum of $\sim$ 20 cm. This peak is caused by the beam power per 100 W He-II decreasing with LD$_2$ thickness, while the CN flux per beam current increasing and essentially flattening off at $\sim$ 16 cm. We choose the LD$_2$ thickness of 18 cm as the starting point of our further optimizations. At this LD$_2$ thickness, a maximum proton beam power of 650 kW can be used.

B. D$_2$O pre-moderator thickness

The D$_2$O pre-moderator thickness was scanned between 1 cm to 9 cm. The initial guess for the thickness of 5 cm was very close to the optimum of 7 cm, which gives the highest $P_{UCN} = 1.75 \times 10^9$ s$^{-1}$ for 100 W He-II heat load. $P_{UCN}$ decreases to around a half only when the D$_2$O thickness is decreased to $\sim$ 2.5 cm.

This peak in $P_{UCN}$ is due to the monotonically decreasing beam power per He-II heat load with D$_2$O thickness, while the CN flux per beam power increases at small thicknesses but flattens off after $\sim$ 6 cm. At the optimized D$_2$O thickness, a maximum proton beam power of 670 kW can be used.

C. Tungsten target location

The final step is optimizing the location of the spallation tungsten target. The original position of 0 cm is defined for when the downstream (relative to the proton beam) end of the tungsten target is coincident with the back wall (also relative to the proton beam) of the cylindrical He-II vessel. An positive target location is defined as moving the target towards the proton beam downstream direction.

Plots of $P_{UCN}$ for 100 W He-II heat load with the target location scanned are shown in Fig. 4 for: the baseline parameters, alternately optimizing the D$_2$O and LD$_2$ thicknesses described previously, and having both optimized. There is no peak in $P_{UCN}$ per 100 W He-II heat load, rather it continually increases when the tungsten target location is increased. This
is because the beam power per He-II heat load increases with target location to approximately the 2nd to 3rd power (see Fig. 5), while the CN flux incident on the He-II is roughly constant from −5 cm to 20 cm, and then starts decreasing approximately linearly. This behavior is consistent with that seen in Ref. [64].

A tungsten target location of 32 cm provides the optimal \( P_{UCN} \) for our constraint of 100 W He-II cooling power and 1 MW proton beam power for the 18 cm optimized LD2 thickness and 7 cm optimized D2O thickness. With these parameters, \( P_{UCN} = 2.1 \times 10^9 \) s\(^{-1}\) is reached. This study also shows that if more proton beam power were to be available, the UCN production can increase further even under the 100 W He-II heat load restriction.

**D. Summary and interpretation of improvements**

To understand how the inverse geometry along with its modifications and optimizations produce an increased \( P_{UCN} \) for 100 W He-II heat load, it is useful to look at the different differential CN flux in the He-II per proton in Fig. 6. Table 1 summarizes the proton beam current and power that can be used under the 100 W He-II heat load constraint. Combining these with Figs. 4 and 5, the overall picture of the optimization process can be deduced.

The neutron flux in the He-II used are from the so-called track-length (“F4”) tallies from MCNP, where the distance neutrons travel in the He-II volume are summed up and then normalized by the cell volume and number of protons (i.e., its raw units are: cm/cm\(^3\)/proton). The proton number is then converted to 100 \( \mu \)A-s and the differential energy flux calculated by dividing by the energy bin width to give the units of cm\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) meV\(^{-1}\) (100 \( \mu \)A\(^{-1}\)) in the plots.

In general, relative to our baseline inverse geometry after the modifications described in Sec. LV, the optimized final source featured a reduction in the effective CN temperature (with the peak in the CN distribution now at \( \sim 1.8 \) meV) and an improved CN flux per proton (e.g., 1.9 times larger at 1 meV). This combined with 1.5 times higher proton beam power per He-II heat load to lead to an increase \( P_{UCN} \) at 1 MW proton power and 100 W He-II heat load by a factor of 2.8, or to \( P_{UCN} = 2.1 \times 10^9 \) UCN s\(^{-1}\).

For reference, this CN flux per proton is around a factor of 2.5 better than our reference source based on the Lujan Mark-3 target. The \( P_{UCN} \) for the same 100 W He-II heat load is normalized by the cell volume and number of protons (i.e., its raw units are: cm/cm\(^3\)/proton). The proton number is then converted to 100 \( \mu \)A-s and the differential energy flux calculated by dividing by the energy bin width to give the units of cm\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) meV\(^{-1}\) (100 \( \mu \)A\(^{-1}\)) in the plots.
now 15 times higher in our optimized inverse geometry design. Next we describe the incremental improvements coming from each step.

The transition from the original Lujan Center geometry to the baseline inverse geometry (before the modifications described in Sec. [IV]) produced a colder CN spectrum, with the peak shifting from ~3 meV to ~2 meV. This corresponded to a shift of an effective Maxwellian spectrum from 32 K to 26.5 K. Recall that this transition increased $P_{\text{UCN}}$ from $1.4 \times 10^8$ s$^{-1}$ to $2.4 \times 10^8$ s$^{-1}$. This gain came from an increase in the maximum proton beam power that can be used. The CN flux per proton was actually reduced to 0.7 times at 1 meV. The He-II heat load per 100 µA proton beam was 67 W for the Lujan Center UCN source geometry, whereas for the baseline inverse geometry (before modifications) it is only 27 W.

The modifications described in Sec. [IV] replaced the aluminum canisters with beryllium, added a D$_2$O pre-moderator, and changed the LH$_2$ moderator to LD$_2$. These modifications increased the CN flux per proton by 1.7 times as well as decreased the He-II heat load per beam current to 13 W per 100 µA$^{-1}$. This combined to give the ~3.5 times gain in $P_{\text{UCN}}$ to $8 \times 10^8$ s$^{-1}$.

The final optimization of the D$_2$O thickness, LD$_2$ thickness, and tungsten target location gave a further factor of ~3 times gain to reach $P_{\text{UCN}} = 2.1 \times 10^9$ s$^{-1}$. To understand the effect, it is useful to look at the various contributions to the He-II heat load, which are shown in Fig. 7 for different cases of optimization. For reference, the Lujan center geometry’s heat load per 100 µA beam current was 66.7 W total (44.7 W from neutrons, 18.7 W from $\gamma$ and 3.3 W from protons), essentially an order of magnitude greater than the optimized geometry.

When the LD$_2$ thickness was increased from 5 cm to 18 cm, the 1 meV CN flux per proton increased by 2.5 times (keeping the D$_2$O thickness and target location optimized). This can be attributed to better matching of the moderator thickness before neutron loss kicks in. The increase in the CN flux overwhelmed the improvement in He-II heat load per proton, which only increased by 1.2 times. This gave the total 2 times increase in $P_{\text{UCN}}$. The He-II heat load per proton decrease came from a combination of reduced neutrons, $\gamma$ and protons. The heat load due to neutrons is dominated by fast neutrons (> 80 meV). The contribution from cold neutrons (defined between 0 – 12 meV) is $\sim 10^{-3}$ W per 100 µA beam and from thermal neutrons (defined between 12 – 80 meV) it is $\sim 10^{-4}$ W per 100 µA beam.

When the D$_2$O thickness was increased from 5 cm to 7 cm (keeping LD$_2$ and target location optimized), the increase in the CN flux at 1 meV of 1.5 times can be attributed to a better optimized pre-moderator. The He-II heat load per proton increased by 1.2 times so overall there was a slight increase in $P_{\text{UCN}}$ by a factor ~ 1.3. The increase in the heat load was due to an increase in fast neutrons, whereas the $\gamma$ and proton heating went down.

The optimal thicknesses of the D$_2$O pre-moderator and LD$_2$...
moderator are correlated. This can be seen in Fig. 4 for the case of D$_2$O optimized and LD$_2$ at baseline, where the $P_{UCN}$ is actually reduced to a factor 0.9 compared with D$_2$O baseline and LD$_2$ baseline, regardless of the target location. The suggests that alternately optimizing these two parameters is needed. This was done for one iteration here but we should be close to the final optimum values.

The optimization from shifting the tungsten target location from 0 cm to 32 cm (at D$_2$O and LD$_2$ optimized) was interesting as the neutron flux per proton was reduced to 0.8 times. However, the He-II heat load per proton was reduced to a factor of 0.6, which permitted our design goal of applying the full 1 MW beam power on the target.

This results in an increase of $P_{UCN}$ per He-II heat load by 1.3 times. Since the He-II heat load is dominated by fast neutrons, the effect of moving the He-II volume further upstream towards the proton beam away from the tungsten target is a suppression of the fast neutrons more quickly relative to the loss of cold neutrons.

The trend of increasing $P_{UCN}$ per 100 W He-II with tungsten target location appears to continue beyond the largest 37 cm studied. This indicates that if more powerful proton beams beyond the 1 MW considered here were to be available, it could be utilized to increase $P_{UCN}$ further while still satisfying the 100 W He-II heat load constraint. But since the UCN production per proton falls as this distance is increased, 32 cm is the optimal position for the 1 MW proton beam power and 100 W of He-II cooling constraints considered here.

### E. Effects of incorrect He-II scattering in MCNP

As mentioned earlier the He-II was treated as a free gas scatterer in MCNP with the correct density for 1.6 K He-II (0.145 g/cm$^3$) and with an approximately constant cross-section of 0.78 – 0.76 b per atom for 1 – 5 meV cold neutrons. This corresponds to a neutron scattering mean-free-path of ~ 60 cm.

Liquid helium cooled below $T_3 = 2.17$ K starts exhibiting properties of a quantum fluid with unique phonon and roton quasi-particle excitations. Neutrons inelastically scatter off these excitations and thus both the cross-sections and energy loss in the free gas scatterer model are incorrect. The total scattering cross-section, which is predominantly inelastic scattering, decreases with temperature with the drop being largest for lower CN energies. At 2.2 meV, approximately the peak of the CN spectrum incident on the He-II, this cross-section has been measured to be 0.24 barns per atom at 1.6 K (1.9 m mean-free-path) At 1 meV the measured cross-section is 25 nb (18 m mean-free-path).

The cross-sections used in the MCNP simulations are larger than the measured values. This will affect the UCN production in the following ways. Firstly, in the simulations more 1 meV neutrons entering the He-II volume undergo inelastic scattering. Since any scattering of these neutrons will take them out of the single phonon UCN production peak, the UCN production in our simulations from these neutrons is underestimated. Secondly, in the simulations a large fraction of the incoming 1.3 – 8 meV neutrons undergo scattering (or multiple scattering) in the 40 L He-II volume. This scattering increases their path lengths in the He-II (e.g. an albedo effect) and results in an overestimate of UCN production for neutrons in this energy class. Thirdly, in the simulations the additional inelastic scattering in the He-II moderates the neutron spectrum to lower energies where the UCN production cross-sections are larger. This effect causes an overestimate of the UCN production.

MCNP scattering kernels for He-II do not exist to our knowledge. Nevertheless, we study the impact of the incorrect kernel. First, the He-II density is reduced to 10% for a simulation run for the optimized parameters case. This causes the track-length weighted cold neutron flux at 1 meV to decrease by ~ 20% and the peak of the cold neutron spectrum shifts from 1.8 meV to 2.2 meV. This is shown in Fig. 8. The He-II heating per proton from the full He-II density simulations is used since the heating is dominated by fast neutrons and gammas, which are not affected by the He-II quantum liquid behavior. The $P_{UCN}$ is reduced to $1.9 \times 10^9$ s$^{-1}$ (i.e. a ~ 15% reduction).

The He-II scattering cross-section reduction due to the quantum collective excitations occurs only for neutrons with energies $\lesssim$ 10 meV. The global He-II density reduction of the previous study affected all neutrons. To check that the $P_{UCN}$ decrease was not caused by the lack of moderation of thermal and fast neutrons in the He-II, a MCNP with perturbation capability (i.e. a “PERT card”) simulation at the optimized parameters was performed. The He-II density was reduced only for neutrons with energy < 10 meV. The spectrum and $P_{UCN}$ were the same to < 5% compared to the global He-II density.
reduction study. This is within the statistics of the simulations.

With these studies, we have shown that the impact of having the incorrect He-II scattering kernel in our simulations is smaller than about 15%. This is not a large effect at this stage of our physics design for the source.

F. Effects of He-II temperature and pressure

The He-II operating temperature of this UCN source design is higher than the \(< 1.2 \text{ K}\) typically used. In this section, we study the effects on \(P_{\text{UCN}}\) by the warmer He-II temperature. The amplitude of the single-phonon peak in the dynamic structure of He-II decreases with increasing temperature, therefore so does the differential UCN production at 1 meV. This will cause a reduction in \(P_{\text{UCN}}\) if the CN spectrum is strongly peaked at 1 meV. However, for a broad spectrum, because of the conservation of the second moment sum rule of the dynamic structure factor, \(P_{\text{UCN}}\) should remain relatively constant.

To verify the total UCN production rate does not decrease significantly at 1.6 K for our CN spectrum, the differential UCN production is folded with the CN spectrum in He-II for the optimized geometry. Experimental studies of UCN production have been performed between 1.1 – 2.4 K in Ref. [56]. The calculation here follows the appendix of Ref. [56] which used neutron inelastic scattering data between 1.2 K to 2.5 K from Ref. [56] and [57]. \(P_{\text{UCN}}\) is then calculated by integrating the differential production. As shown in Fig. 9 it can be seen that \(P_{\text{UCN}}\) is approximately constant until \(\sim 2 \text{ K}\) after which it drops, though only by \(\sim 6\%\). The largest effect of increasing the temperature is the increase of the upsampling of UCNs and thus reduces the extraction efficiency. This is described in the next section.

We also note that experimental studies of UCN production in pressurized He-II from SVP to 20 bars have been performed [55]. From these results, if we pressurize the He-II converter to \(\sim 1 \text{ bar}\), which should be sufficient for suppressing bubble formation that can cause UCN loss, we expect a reduction in \(P_{\text{UCN}}\) by \(\sim 5\%\). Including this pressurization loss and the effect of the incorrect He-II scattering kernel, \(P_{\text{UCN}} = 1.8 \times 10^9 \text{ UCN s}^{-1}\) is expected from our optimized source design.

VI. UCN EXTRACTION GEOMETRY

The ability to extract the large \(P_{\text{UCN}}\) out the source is critical for an experiment. Once UCNs are produced they can be lost due to upscattering in the He-II or upscattering or absorption losses at the walls of the volumes and guides. In this section we discuss UCN extraction geometries and make estimates of the extraction efficiency. Fig. 10 shows the extraction geometries we have considered. So far, it has been more convenient to show the inverse geometry source’s axis in a vertical orientation, however, due to the technical simplifications of having a horizontal proton beam, the engineering will be easier to orient the source’s axis horizontally.

In horizontal and vertical UCN extraction geometries that are studied, a guide with diameter \(D_{\text{guide}}\) is connected to the He-II volume. A straight guide section with length \(\gtrsim 52 \text{ cm}\) is required to reach outside the bismuth filter. This section of the UCN guide will be filled with He-II, which will also act as the heat removal conduit. A foil, which is “transparent” to UCNs, will be needed to contain the He-II.

First we describe the heat removal properties needed for the UCN extraction guide, then we give an overview of the UCN extraction system, such as the foil material and locations, and then we summarize the results from UCN trajectory tracking simulations.
A. Heat removal with UCN extraction guide

A heat exchanger from the flowing sub-cooled He-II line of the refrigeration system is required to remove the heat from the He-II converter. As a pessimistic assumption in our UCN transport calculations, we assume that any UCN that reach the heat exchanger will be lost immediately. This is due to the large surface area of the heat exchanger and typically UCN lossy materials used. To reduce this UCN loss, we can place the heat exchanger on the end of a He-II filled conduit split off from the main UCN extraction path. If this conduit is vertically above the main UCN extraction guide, gravity will aid in reducing the UCNs that can reach the heat exchanger. Optimizing a UCN source design to allow sufficient heat removal from the UCN converter, or to allow optical or pumping access, while maintaining low UCN transport loss is a common problem, in particular for He-II based sources under high heat loads.\textsuperscript{29,31,32}

The heat exchanger (also due to materials typically used) will need to be in a low radiation area so unwanted heating due to activation is reduced. Sufficient space between the heat exchanger and the tungsten target will be required for shielding. The vertical T-shaped geometry shown in Fig. 10 is a simplified layout used for UCN extraction simulations.

When the engineering details of the shielding is needed, UCN transport calculations can be on an angle so that the distance between the heat exchanger and tungsten target is greatly increased. This would not affect the thermal transport properties.

The heat flux in the He-II conduit considered falls in the Gorter-Mellink regime, where the temperature gradient is dominated by the mutual friction between the normal and superfluid components. Following Refs.\textsuperscript{42} and \textsuperscript{65} for a tubular He-II conduit of length $L$, diameter $D$, with end temperatures of $T_C$ and $T_W$, the steady-state heat flow $Q$ is given by:

$$\left(\frac{4Q}{\pi D^2}\right)^n L = X(T_C) - X(T_W),$$

where $n \approx 3.4$ is found experimentally, $X(T)$ is a parameter that is a function of temperature (physically analogous to a conductivity integral), and $T_C = 1.60$ K (at the heat exchanger). A reasonable maximum tolerable temperature increase is 50 mK at the 40 L He-II converter volume to not significantly affect the UCN upscattering loss which increases with $T$ (see next). For $L = 1.5$ m (combining the horizontal and vertical distances to the heat exchanger), the smallest $D_{\text{guide}}$ is 15 cm for sufficient heat removal (with a weak dependence on $L$). As shall be seen later, it is advantageous to have $D_{\text{guide}} \gtrsim 18$ cm for UCN extraction.

To further reduce UCN loss we also consider a combination of the following: (1) placing an aperture or orifice with opening diameter $D_{\text{ap}}$ just before the heat exchanger; (2) inducing non-specular UCN reflections on the side walls of the heat exchanger guide section with roughened surfaces or by adding appropriate geometric features (e.g. ribbing); and (3) increasing the length of the vertical heat exchanger conduit (denoted by $L_{\text{ex}}$). The effects of these on UCN transport are summarized in Sec. VIF with simulations.

A detailed cryogenic engineering simulation of the source design will be completed in future work. Experimental He-II temperature rise across thin apertures for different heat fluxes can be performed and used as input to optimize $D_{\text{ap}}$, balancing UCN transport and thermal transport. We note that a Venturi design, which we have not studied in detail, would produce a smaller temperature rise for the same opening diameter, however this would increase $L_{\text{ex}}$.

B. UCN up-scattering loss with He-II temperature

Three different processes were included in Ref.\textsuperscript{66} that contribute to the temperature-dependent UCN upscattering time constant in He-II, $\tau_{\text{up}}^{-1}(T)$: one-phonon absorption, two-phonon scattering, and roton-phonon scattering. However, several experiments have shown that only the second mechanism appears to be present\textsuperscript{35,36,67}. We will use the 95% C.I limits set on the one-phonon absorption and roton-phonon scattering mechanisms of $< 47\%$ and $< 29\%$, respectively, that were measured at our temperatures.\textsuperscript{35} Thus, for our up-
scattering rate estimate, we use:

\[ \tau_{up}^{-1}(T) = (0.47)(130 \text{ s}^{-1}) (e^{-(12 K)/T}) + (7.6 \times 10^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1} K^{-7})(T^7) + (0.29)(18 \text{ s}^{-1} K^{-3/2})(T^{3/2} e^{-(8.6 K)/T}). \]  

Note that the up-scattering time constant does not depend on the UCN velocity, but faster moving UCNs will generally spend less time in the He-II so that the up-scattering loss is reduced.

We will pressurize our 1.6 K He-II bath to ~ 1 bar. The up-scattering rate does not increase significantly for such a low pressure.\(^{22}\) The pressurization moves the state of He-II far from the liquid/vapor line in the phase diagram such that the He-II needs to be locally heated to > 4.2 K before a bubble can be formed. Therefore, we can neglect UCN upscattering caused by helium gas bubbles.\(^{23}\)

C. Extraction orientation and He-II containment foil location

We consider having the UCN extraction guide coming out of the 40 L He-II converter volume horizontally or vertically downwards (see Fig. 10). A foil with good UCN transmission properties is required for containing the He-II. This foil has to be located after the T-section of the heat exchanger. The extraction orientation does not affect the thermal properties of the system.

A common foil material to use for UCN transmission is aluminum, which has \( U_{Al} = 54 \text{ neV} \). If we define the “transverse kinetic energy” by \( E_\perp \equiv mv_\perp^2/2 \), where \( m \) is the neutron mass and \( v_\perp \) is the velocity component perpendicular to the surface of the foil, then only UCNs with \( E_\perp > U_{Al} - U_{He-II} \) at the foil can be transmitted (recall \( U_{He-II} = 18.5 \text{ neV} \)). If \( E_\perp < U_{Al} - U_{He-II} \) then the UCN will be reflected back towards the production region and likely to be lost. When using aluminum a vertical drop is advantageous to ensure low energy UCN are accelerated by gravity so they over come the \( U_{Al} - U_{He-II} \) potential.

Primarily driven by the UCN transmission properties of the He-II containment foil, the following UCN extraction geometries (see Fig. 10) are studied:

1. “horizontal near foil”: a straight horizontal UCN extraction guide coming out of the He-II converter volume, followed by a polypropylene foil immediately after the T-section to the heat exchanger, and then a final elbow piece to avoid direct view of radiation and fast neutrons coming from the source

2. “horizontal far foil”: a straight horizontal guide followed by a downward-pointing 90° elbow, an aluminum foil, and then an upward-pointing 90° elbow to have the outgoing guide horizontal

3. “vertical downward”: a vertical downward extraction guide followed by an aluminum foil after the T-section to the heat exchanger, then a 90° elbow to have the outgoing guide horizontal

The idea behind geometries (2) and (3) is to use gravity to accelerate UCNs so they can more easily overcome the aluminum foil’s potential. Acceleration could allow UCNs to spend less time in the He-II where they can get up-scattered if their path length is not increased. However, acceleration will cause a fraction of UCNs to have too high kinetic energy to be reflected by the guide potential.

During transmission through a material, UCN loss can also occur due to absorption or up-scattering. The loss rate constant is given by \( \tau_{up}^{-1} = \nu \sum n_i (\sigma_{abs} + \sigma_{up})_i \), where \( n_i \) is the number density of the \( i \)th element in the material, with the summation over the different elements. \( \sigma_{abs} \) and \( \sigma_{up} \) are the nuclear absorption and up-scattering cross-sections at the UCN velocity \( \nu \), respectively. UCN up-scattering is dominated by incoherent scattering producing phonons (or other excitations) in a material. \( \sigma_{up} \) generally reduces as a material is cooled; at our low temperatures \( \sigma_{up} \) is expected to be negligible. In this case, the neutron loss time constant in aluminum is \( \tau_1 = 3 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s} \).

Another possible UCN window material for our application is polypropylene. Polypropylene has a negative neutron optical potential \( U_{pp} \approx -8 \text{ neV} \), therefore essentially all UCNs incident on the window will be transmitted. Polypropylene windows 2" in diameter and 30 \( \mu \)m thick have been shown to be superfluid helium leak tight (at 1.9 K) and shown to withstand a ~ 2 bar pressure difference (at 77 K). For our larger diameter UCN window, a support grid can be used. Usually polymer-based UCN windows are not used at room temperature due to the large up-scattering cross-section; the incoherent scattering length of hydrogen is 25 barns compared to aluminum’s 0.26 barns. However, at our low temperatures we can ignore up-scattering losses to get a neutron loss time constant in polypropylene of \( \tau_2 = 2 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s} \), around the same as for aluminum but with a lower optical potential.

Experimentally observed UCN losses are generally higher than those predicted from idealized material properties. For instance, for a 30 \( \mu \)m thick foil with \( \tau_1 = 2 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s} \), the UCN transmission is expected to be 97% for UCNs \( E_\perp = 100 \text{ neV} \). A better transmission value to use was experimentally measured in Ref. 68. The combined transmission of two 25 \( \mu \)m thick polypropylene foils was observed to be 85% at 17 K, and for slower moving UCNs than expected in our source. For polypropylene foils with a thin aluminum coating, the transmission dropped by more than a factor of two in the same geometry.

As observed in the studies of Ref. 68, the limiting factor on the UCN transmission through cryogenic foils will most likely be the build-up of frozen contaminants on its surface. We envision exposing our foil to UV light emitted from behind a UCN-reflecting UV-transmitting window to desorb frozen contamination. The heat load from this will be small compared to the 100 W load already on the He-II. We can also consider winding a superconducting coil around the foil to produce a magnetic field gradient that accelerates high-field seeking UCN, via the Stern-Gerlach force, during UCN transmission through the foil to further reduce losses.
D. Shielding of the extraction guide

One aspect of the extraction design not fully explored is the heat load in the He-II that is inside the extraction guide. The source of heating on the He-II converter comes predominantly from fast neutrons (described in Sec. 1D). We do not require UCN production in the guide, therefore a combination of borated-polyethylene and lead shielding can surround the guide to reduce the heat load there. To reduce fast neutrons by an order of magnitude, around 10 cm thickness of shielding is required. In the UCN extraction geometries discussed so far, such neutron absorbing shielding could significantly affect the cold neutron flux in the 40 L He-II converter volume as well. Designing shielding of the heat exchanger should be fairly straightforward since it is outside the bismuth.

To reduce the guide shielding’s impact on the cold neutron flux on the 40 L He-II converter, there is the possibility of having the horizontal extraction guide on the opposite side of the tungsten target (i.e. it comes out towards the proton upstream direction). In this geometry, the UCN extraction properties are the same since when UCNs are produced from down-scattered CN, their initial velocity are essentially isotropic in space. Bends in the UCN guide after the He-II containment foil will be needed to bring the UCNs out of the proton beam’s path. Such bends are needed in the other geometries as well in order to facilitate shielding of direct sight fast neutrons and gammas. The rastered proton beam will need to be controlled so that it does not strike the heat exchanger and bent guide. This will slightly reduce heat distribution of the proton beam on the tungsten target from the full $2\pi$ azimuthal angle. These details will be considered as our design moves towards an engineered design.

E. Kinetic theory estimate of UCN extraction

To first guide our design of the UCN extraction system, we make use of the UCN kinetic theory approximation: the rate of UCNs incident on a surface of area $A$ is given by $\bar{\rho}\bar{v}A/4$, where $\bar{\rho}$ and $\bar{v}$ are the average UCN density and velocity just outside the surface. Neglecting the effects of gravity and using the kinetic theory approximation, the UCN density $\bar{\rho} = N/V$ is constant, where $N$ is the number of UCNs in a volume $V$.

Under the kinetic theory approximation the loss rate constants from: reflection losses from the material walls of the He-II volume and guides up to the foil is given by $\tau_{\text{walls}}^{-1} = \bar{\rho}\bar{v}A_{\text{walls}}/(4V)$, and UCNs escaping into the heat exchanger volume by $\tau_{\text{exchanger}}^{-1} = \bar{\rho}A_{\text{exchanger}}/(4V)$, where $V$ is the volume of the He-II vessel plus the guides up to the foil. The value of $\bar{v} \approx 7$ ms$^{-1}$ is used, which is equivalent to 260 neV; recall we’re assuming a critical UCN cut-off energy of 316 neV ($U_{\text{SNi}} - U_{\text{He-II}}$). $\bar{\rho}$ is the average loss per reflection from the material walls, with typical values being $\bar{\rho} \approx 5 \times 10^{-4}$. Thus, the expression to estimate the extracted rate of UCNs $R_{\text{ex}}$ is given by:

$$R_{\text{ex}} \approx P_{\text{UCN}} \frac{\bar{\rho}A_{\text{guide}}}{4V} \left( \frac{\tau_{\text{up}}^{-1}(T)}{4} + \frac{\bar{v}}{4V} (\bar{\mu}A_{\text{walls}} + A_{\text{guide}} + A_{\text{exchanger}}) \right)^{-1}. \quad (3)$$

Using this kinetic theory approach we find that $D_{\text{guide}} \gtrsim 18$ cm is required and obtain $R_{\text{ex}}/P_{\text{UCN}} \gtrsim 50\%$, which shows promise for the UCN extraction process. Next we use a UCN trajectory tracking Monte-Carlo simulation to obtain a more detailed analysis of the UCN extraction system to provide a better estimate of the process.

F. UCN trajectory simulations

A UCN trajectory tracking Monte-Carlo package developed in Ref. [69] is used on the geometries discussed above to estimate the UCN extraction efficiency. UCNs are generated uniformly in the 40 L He-II converter volume with velocity $v < 7.8$ ms$^{-1}$ (equivalent to kinetic energy $E < U_{\text{SNi}} - U_{\text{He-II}} = 316.5$ neV). When UCNs are produced they are expected to fill phase space with constant density so that they have isotropic initial velocity and have a spectrum $dn/dv \sim v^2$ (or $dn/dE \sim \sqrt{E}$). The initial direction and velocity of UCNs are generated according to these distributions and have their individual trajectories tracked in the presence of gravity. Losses due to upscattering and absorption are included, as well as neutron $\beta$-decay. Upon incidence on a material wall, the transverse energy of the UCN is calculated to determine if the UCN is reflected, transmitted, or lost, following the standard expressions in Refs. [70] and [71]. If reflection occurs, a Lambertian reflection kernel with a diffuse reflection probability is applied. UCNs that exit the final horizontal guide of the different geometries and have kinetic energies less than $U_{\text{SNi}}$ are counted as being successfully extracted.

For the surfaces inside the 40 L converter volume and in the guides, the reflection loss factor used is $f = W/U = 5 \times 10^{-4}$, where $W$ is the imaginary part of the neutron optical potential. Parameters in the simulations are: 3% diffuse reflection probability for the guides (the probability inside the 40 L volume is scanned), 18 cm diameter for the main UCN extraction guide, and 14 cm diameter heat exchanger conduit. The temperature rise using these two diameters and approximate lengths in Eq. (1) is $\sim 50$ mK. For each simulation run 10,000 UCNs were generated and tracked. The loss probability of a geometry is calculated by counting the total number of lost UCNs divided by the 10,000 generated.

In the simulations, we separate the contributions to the total loss probability $\Lambda_{\text{tot}}$ into losses from: (1) He-II upscattering $\Lambda_{\text{He-II}}$; (2) walls of the guiding system $\Lambda_{\text{walls}}$; and (3) due to UCNs that reach the heat exchanger $\Lambda_{\text{ex}}$. There also exists some “unphysical” losses in the simulations, which are 0.7% or less, due to, for example, small gaps at where the software smoothly joins surfaces of different shapes. The total extracted UCN rate is calculated by $R_{\text{ex}} = P_{\text{UCN}}(1 - \Lambda_{\text{tot}})$.
For typical horizontal near foil and far foil geometries \( A_{\text{He-II}}/A_{\text{tot}} \sim 55\% \). For the vertically downward extraction the He-II loss becomes \( A_{\text{He-II}}/A_{\text{tot}} \sim 35\% \). However, the gain in kinetic energy of \( \sim 160 \text{ neV} \) from the vertical drop causes many more UCNs to be lost at the guides at the bottom so that the total extraction efficiency of the downward extraction compared to the horizontal geometries is \( R_{\text{ex}}(\text{downward})/R_{\text{ex}}(\text{horizontal}) \sim 25\% - 40\% \). Due to this low extraction probability, and the difficulty of shielding the guide, we do not see the downward extraction being a viable choice.

Diffuse reflections in the 40 L converter volume can help break-up otherwise long-lived glancing-reflection orbits in the cylindrical volume, allowing them to escape more quickly and not be lost in the He-II, which is the main loss mechanism. Implementing diffuse reflections can be done by increasing the surface roughness of the volume walls or by having macroscopic ridges or ribs, which would serve the same purpose. Increasing the diffuse reflection probability in the 40 L converter volume from 3\% to 50\% increases \( R_{\text{ex}} \) by \( \sim 30\% \) for the near foil and far foil geometries. Increasing the diffuse probability beyond 50\% does not produce much further improvement.

Another source of loss is the heat exchanger (see Sec. [VTA]). We study two ways to try to reduce this loss. First, by placing an aperture with diameter \( D_{\text{ap}} \) just in front of the heat exchanger. Decreasing \( D_{\text{ap}} \) from 14 cm (i.e., no aperture) to 5 cm only decreases \( R_{\text{ex}} \) from 5\% to 4\% while \( A_{\text{He-II}} \) increases from 54\% to 55\%. Therefore, there is essentially no gain from this technique. This is because UCNs that reflect off this aperture have long path lengths in the He-II and will be lost anyway. The second way is to increase the diffuse reflection probability on the walls of the heat exchanger conduit section. This allows some UCNs that enter this section to reflect off the side walls and away from the heat exchanger. However, some of these UCNs will also travel backwards and forwards in this section and thus become lost due to the long path lengths in the He-II. When the diffuse reflection probability increases from 0\% to 100\%, \( A_{\text{ex}} \) decreases from 9\% to 2\%, but the corresponding increase in \( A_{\text{He-II}} \) is from 52\% to 55\%. The net improvement in \( R_{\text{ex}} \) is therefore \( \sim 4\% \).

The final total UCN extraction efficiencies \( R_{\text{ex}}/P_{\text{UCN}} \) for using the aluminum foil and with the implementations of the diffuse reflections described previously is \( \sim 30\% \) for the near foil geometry and \( \sim 19\% \) for the far foil geometry. The UCN loss at the walls due to the drop in the far foil geometry is large and does not compensate the reduction in aluminum foil losses. For the near foil geometry, if the aluminum foil is replaced with a polypropylene foil (see Sec. [VTC]) then \( R_{\text{ex}}/P_{\text{UCN}} \sim 41\% \) is reached. This improvement primarily comes from the reduced reflection at the foil.

Losses at the foils due to frozen contamination and support grid are not included so far. As discussed in Sec. [VTC] a UCN transmission of 85\% has been observed with through 50 \( \mu \text{m} \) of polypropylene at 17 K for UCNs with a lower velocity than what we expect here. If we apply this loss along with a 90\% transmission support grid (required for mechanically supporting our larger foil size), then we reach \( R_{\text{ex}}/P_{\text{UCN}} \sim 31\% \).

The contributions to the UCN loss in this configuration at 1.6 K He-II temperature are: \( A_{\text{He-II}} \sim 48\% \), which includes UCNs that go up and down the heat exchanger guide-section; \( A_{\text{ex}} \sim 5\% \), \( A_{\text{wall}} \sim 6\% \), and \( A_{\text{foil}} \sim 10\% \), which are losses upon transmission at the polypropylene foil due to frozen contamination and the support grid.

Due to the size of \( A_{\text{He-II}} \), it is interesting to explore how this improves if the He-II can be cooled further. If lower temperatures can be reached, then \( R_{\text{ex}}/P_{\text{UCN}} \) becomes 38\% for 1.5 K and 45\% for 1.4 K, with \( A_{\text{He-II}} \) being 37\% and 26\%, respectively. As mentioned earlier, in order to reach the same 100 W cooling power at 1.5 K and 1.4 K, additional cold compression stages on the cooling system would be required.

### G. UCN densities

We can provide UCN density figures relevant to our design. Due to differences in source geometries, operational modes, and experimental volumes needed to be filled, these densities only provide an approximate comparison between different sources.

We first estimate the maximum UCN density which can be produced inside the source, and then attempt to assess the “useful” density in an experimental cell attached relatively near the source. The density produced inside the source sets the maximum UCN density that can be extracted from the source. This density is given by \( \rho_{\text{source}} = P_{\text{UCN}} \tau_{\text{source}}/V_{\text{source}} \), where \( \tau_{\text{source}} \) is the effective lifetime of UCNs inside the source and \( V_{\text{source}} \) is the volume of the source. From Eq. (2), the up-scattering rate in He-II is 0.29 \( \text{s}^{-1} \) at 1.6 K. This can be scaled by \( A_{\text{He-II}}/A_{\text{tot}} \approx 70\% \) to give \( \tau_{\text{source}} \approx 2.4 \text{ s} \). Then we arrive at \( \rho_{\text{source}} \approx 8 \times 10^{4} \text{ UCN cm}^{-3} \), where we take the source volume to be the 40 L of He-II plus the guides up to the containment foil.

The “useful” UCN density is what might be achievable inside a UCN bottle located at the exit of the source applying some conservative assumptions. This density depends on the volume of the bottle. The rate of UCNs leaving the source (after exiting the He-II containment foil) from the simulations for 1.6 K is \( R_{\text{ex}} = 6 \times 10^{8} \text{ UCN s}^{-1} \) for the 18 cm diameter guide. If the bottle’s opening diameter \( D_{\text{open}} \) is matched to this, then we can assume that the rate of UCNs entering the bottle \( R_{\text{in}} = R_{\text{ex}} \). This assumes that once a UCN leaves the bottle, it has negligible probability of returning again, which we call the “no return” assumption. This assumption underestimates the UCN density by \( \sim 10\% \) since the UCN extraction efficiency is \( \sim 31\% \) for a UCN from the He-II converter volume to reach the source exit.

Once UCNs are inside the bottle, they can be lost via: (1) UCNs leaving the bottle through the opening again, (2) losses at the walls, or (3) neutron \( \beta \)-decay. At equilibrium, \( R_{\text{in}} \) is equal to the total rate of UCN loss in the bottle. If kinetic theory is assumed (see Sec. [VTE]), which can be established quickly if the bottle walls have rough surfaces or geometric features that make UCN trajectories chaotic quickly, then this
The equilibrium condition becomes:

\[ R_{\text{in}} = \rho_{\text{bottle}} \left( \frac{\pi \bar{v} D_{\text{open}}}{16} + \frac{\bar{\mu} A_{\text{bottle}}}{4} + 4 \frac{V_{\text{bottle}}}{\tau_{\text{bottle}}} \right) \tag{4} \]

where \( \rho_{\text{bottle}} \) is the equilibrium UCN density inside the bottle, \( \bar{v} \) is the average UCN velocity, \( A_{\text{bottle}} \) and \( V_{\text{bottle}} \) are the volume and wall surface area of the bottle, and \( \bar{\mu} \) is the average loss probability per reflection on the walls.

To illustrate how the filling from our source scales with the bottle size, Table II shows calculations for a spherical bottle. The values used are \( \bar{v} = 7 \, \text{m/s} \), which corresponds to an average kinetic energy of 260 neV, and \( \bar{\mu} = 5 \times 10^{-4} \). Also shown in the table are the UCN storage time constant in the bottle, \( \tau_{\text{bottle}} \), including time for UCNs to exit the bottle. Therefore, \( \tau_{\text{bottle}} \) is also the build-up time constant of UCN density during filling. We note that these results will be the same for any source design that satisfies the “no return” assumption made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( V_{\text{bottle}} ) [L]</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>( 5 \times 10^3 )</th>
<th>( 5 \times 10^6 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \rho_{\text{bottle}} ) ( \times 10^3 ) cm(^{-3})</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tau_{\text{bottle}} ) [s]</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSIONS

In this paper we have presented our inverse geometry spallation-target He-II UCN source. We proposed to scan the proton beam around a cylindrical tungsten spallation to reduce the time-averaged power density on the target to allow water edge-cooling. Our cylindrical pre-moderator, moderator and He-II converter volumes are then nested radially inwards at smaller diameters. The overall design goal was to maximize the time-averaged 1 MeV cold neutron flux (the primary UCN production energy) in the 40 L He-II converter per He-II heat load and per proton. The boundary conditions we set for this optimization were 100 W He-II heat load, achievable with sub-cooled He-II technology at the 1.6 K temperature range we’re considering, and 1 MW proton beam power (at 800 MeV proton energy), consistent with existing neutron spallation sources, in particular at LANSE.

In Sec. III we presented our baseline design that yielded a total UCN production rate of \( P_{\text{UCN}} = 2.4 \times 10^8 \) UCNs s\(^{-1}\). This is already 1.7 times higher than our benchmark, which is a modification of the highly optimized Lujan Center Mark-3 target to produce UCNs (described in Sec. II).

In Sec. IV we modified our baseline inverse geometry design by changing the canister material from aluminum to beryllium, adding a D\(_2\)O pre-moderator, and changing the moderator from LH\(_2\) to LD\(_2\), to obtain \( P_{\text{UCN}} = 7 \times 10^8 \) UCNs s\(^{-1}\).

In Sec. [VI] we performed MCNP6.1 simulations to lower neutron energies and with finer energy bin sizes and optimized the LD\(_2\) thickness, D\(_2\)O thickness and tungsten target location. After our optimization, we obtained a geometry that provided a factor of 1.8 gain in the cold neutron flux in the He-II converter per proton and a factor of 8.3 reduction in the He-II heat load per proton when compared with the Lujan Center geometry. These gains are impressive as the latter is already a well-optimized source of low energy cold neutrons.

We also explored the impacts on the UCN production rate associated with the He-II temperature than in typical UCN sources, as well as from pressurizing the He-II scattering kernel, using a warmer He-II temperature than existing sources, and with finer energy resolution and energy bin sizes and optimized the LD\(_2\) thickness, D\(_2\)O thickness and tungsten target location. After our optimization, we obtained a geometry that provided a factor of 1.8 gain in the cold neutron flux in the He-II converter per proton and a factor of 8.3 reduction in the He-II heat load per proton when compared with the Lujan Center geometry. These gains are impressive as the latter is already a well-optimized source of low energy cold neutrons.

In Sec. [VII] we studied the UCN extraction for different geometries from our source design, taking into account cryogenic considerations. With the aid of UCN tracking simulations we showed that a total extraction efficiency of \( \approx 31\% \) is attainable using a horizontal, 18-cm-diameter, UCN guide coming straight out from the source, which also serves as the heat removal conduit, and with a supported polypropylene He-II containment foil at the end. We include the transmission loss through the foil in our efficiency estimates by using the experimentally attained value of 85% from Ref. 68 and assuming a 90% transmission through the support structure. To sustain high transmission through the cryogenic foil, we will research techniques for periodic removal of frozen contaminants. UCN wall reflection losses and He-II up-scattering losses are also included in the UCN transport simulations. Since the losses are dominated by the latter, we find that an extraction efficiency of \( \approx 45\% \) can be reached if the He-II can be cooled to 1.4 K.

Combining the above UCN extraction efficiency with \( P_{\text{UCN}} \), the integrated extracted UCN rate of \( R_{\text{ex}} = 6 \times 10^8 \) UCNs s\(^{-1}\) can be reached at 1.6 K and \( R_{\text{ex}} = 8 \times 10^8 \) UCNs s\(^{-1}\) at 1.4 K out of a 18cm diameter guide. This extracted rate is roughly an order of magnitude higher than the best proposed UCN sources so far, and is at least three orders of magnitude higher than existing sources. Such a rate would open a window to new exciting experiments with UCN that were not possible previously. We will continue to explore the cryogenic refrigeration required for reaching 1.4 K and the possibility of using advanced neutron moderators, such as triphenylmethane\(^{69}\) and high albedo cold neutron reflectors, such as diamond nanoparticles\(^{63}\) to boost \( P_{\text{UCN}} \).

In Sec. [VIII] we provided UCN density figures for our source design. Firstly, the UCN density inside the source was estimated to be approximately \( \approx 8 \times 10^4 \) cm\(^{-3}\), with a survival time of UCNs in the source \( \tau_{\text{source}} \approx 2 \) s. This density is the
upper limit of that can be extracted from the source. Secondly, kinetic theory was used to describe the filling of a bottle at the exit of the source after the He-II containment foil, which allows the use of $R_{ex}$ from simulations of UCN transport out of the source. The accumulated equilibrium UCN density in a bottle with volume $\lesssim 500 \text{ L}$ and under the conservative “no return” assumption was found to be $\sim 1.3 \times 10^4 \text{ cm}^{-3}$.

For context, the He-II source of Refs. 30–33 provides an interesting comparison to our source design. Our design has approximately 10 times higher integrated UCN flux, however, the lifetime in our source is around 10 times shorter due to our warmer He-II temperature. Therefore, the UCN densities deliverable to small experimental volumes end up being approximately the same. However, the decrease in the UCN density for larger volume sizes will be weaker in our source. Therefore, our design is particularly advantageous for experiments that can use large experimental volumes as it enables a very large total number of UCNs to be obtained. Furthermore, as noted earlier, our source can produce higher integrated flux and thus higher extracted UCN densities for $> 1 \text{ MW}$ proton beam power.

Another interesting comparison to provide further context of our source design is to consider placing a thin layer of $\text{sD}_2$, $2 \text{ L}$ in total, in the converter volume instead of He-II. A rough estimate of the total UCN production rate $P_{UCN}$ for the same $1 \text{ MW}$ proton beam power gives a decrease by approximately a factor of 20. The heating of the $\text{sD}_2$ is not considered here. While the UCN production cross-section in $\text{sD}_2$ averaged over the $< 10 \text{ meV}$ CN energy range is larger than for He-II, our source design is optimized to produce a high flux of low energy CN in the converter volume, which is better suited for He-II. With $\text{sD}_2$, the cooling requirements of the crystal under high heat loads will need to be studied, and the UCN extraction efficiency will decrease due to the high losses when UCNs exit or re-enter the $\text{sD}_2$ in the converter volume. An optimized $\text{sD}_2$ source for high proton beam powers should be the topic of a future paper.

We point out that our current design is a so-called “physics model”. For the MCNPX simulations, it was shown in Ref. 72 for the case of the Lujan Center target, the fluxes calculated using a so-called “engineering model”, which is based on the actual engineering design, predicts up to $30\%$ less flux than the original physics model. The accuracy of the engineering model was later shown to be reasonable. Conventional knowledge suggests that the flux reduction between a physics model and an engineering model can actually be up to $50\%$. However, this is still significantly higher than what is achievable with a Lujan-like geometry and other current and proposed UCN sources world-wide. This should motivate further work towards an engineering design and the incorporation of state-of-the-art moderator and reflector materials.
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