Sintering of a UO_2 - PuO_2 freeze-granulated powder under reducing conditions

Julie Simeon, Florent Lebreton, Laure Ramond, Florian La Lumia, Nicolas Clavier, Guillaume Bernard-Granger

► To cite this version:

Julie Simeon, Florent Lebreton, Laure Ramond, Florian La Lumia, Nicolas Clavier, et al.. Sintering of a UO_2 - PuO_2 freeze-granulated powder under reducing conditions. Journal of the European Ceramic Society, 2020, 40 (15), pp.5900-5908. 10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2020.07.022 . hal-02927353

HAL Id: hal-02927353

<https://hal.science/hal-02927353>

Submitted on 1 Sep 2020

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

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

Sintering of a $\text{UO}_2\text{-PuO}_2$ freeze-granulated powder under reducing conditions

Julie Simeon, Florent Lebreton, Laure Ramond, Florian La Lumia, N. Clavier[†]
& Guillaume Bernard-Granger

CEA, DES, ISEC, DMRC, Univ Montpellier, Marcoule, France

[†]ICSM, Univ Montpellier, CEA, CNRS, ENSCM, Bagnols-sur-Cèze, France

Abstract

A freeze-granulated powder made of UO_2 and PuO_2 , containing 15 mol% of $\text{Pu}/(\text{U}+\text{Pu})$, was sintered under reducing conditions (oxygen potential of -468 kJ/mol at 1700 °C). Constructing the “grain size versus relative density” trajectory, using the constant rates of heating and the master sintering curves approaches and calculating the diffusion coefficients by exploiting the results of the sintering runs enabled to propose that densification was probably controlled by grain boundary diffusion and grain growth by the grain boundaries. An activation energy around 525 kJ/mol was obtained for densification, which was close to what was reported for grain boundary diffusion of plutonium cations in $\text{U}_{0.55}\text{Pu}_{0.45}\text{O}_{2-x}$ polycrystalline materials. The sintered microstructure appeared homogeneous regarding the plutonium and uranium cations spatial distribution. By combining the master sintering curve approach for anisothermal and isothermal conditions, it was possible to predict the evolution of the relative density over time for any type of thermal path.

Keywords: Sintering; oxides; microstructure; MOX

The submitted paper is original and has not been or is not being submitted to the peer review process to any other journal

*Corresponding author: guillaume.bernard-granger@cea.fr

1. Introduction

Mixed OXides (MOX, $\text{UO}_2\text{-PuO}_2$) nuclear fuels are used in light water reactors and are also candidates for fast neutron ones. The advantage of such fuels is that it allows the use of plutonium oxide recovered from the recycling of spent UOX (Uranium OXide) fuels, as well as depleted uranium oxide resulting from the UOX fuel enrichment protocol.

The MOX fuel takes usually the shape of cylindrical pellets (typically 10 mm of diameter and height) that are industrially manufactured using a powder metallurgy dry-route process. In a first step, the UO_2 and PuO_2 raw powders are dry ground/milled together. Then the pellets are shaped using automatic uniaxial pressing and sintered at high temperature under a specific atmosphere by controlling the oxygen partial pressure. Depending on the application, the sintered pellets may also encounter an additional rectification step of their lateral surface by dry centerless-grinding. Then, they are introduced into tubes made from an appropriate material, referred to as the cladding. These tubes are sealed and loaded onto an assembly, with specific configurations, that will be positioned in the core of a given nuclear reactor.

The Pu content incorporated in a MOX fuel formulation depends on the type of reactor where it will be **burned**. For light water nuclear reactors, the Pu/(U+Pu) ratio typically ranges between 3 and 11 mol%. For fast neutron nuclear reactors it is not clearly specified **up to now**, but it should **range** between 15 and 35 mol% **[1-2]**. If the “oxygen over metal” ratio, named O/M, is 2.00 for MOX fuels devoted to light water nuclear reactors, it should be strictly comprised between 2.00 and 1.94 for the ones dedicated to fast neutron nuclear reactors mainly to avoid pellets/cladding interaction and to be able to control the thermal conductivity of the fuel at high temperature. Therefore, MOX fuels dedicated to fast neutron nuclear reactors are sintered under more reducing conditions than those for light water nuclear reactors.

Sintering at high temperatures of MOX fuels has been investigated in the past regarding the plutonium oxide content incorporated and in different kinds of atmospheres (oxidizing, inert and reducing) [1-5]. Despite experiments perfectly well conducted, the results were not conclusive in identifying the mechanisms controlling densification and development of the microstructure.

In comparison to the traditional powder-metallurgy process, the freeze-granulation route has been shown to be an advantageous approach to manufacture MOX fuel pellets [6]. Highly flowable, dustless and easy-to-press MOX granules were elaborated using such a process [6]. Then, the purpose of this paper is to rigorously investigate the sintering behavior in reducing conditions of powder compacts made of such granules.

2. Experimental procedure

2.1. Freeze granulated powder

A UO_2 - PuO_2 powder, containing 15 mol% Pu/(U+Pu), was prepared using the freeze-granulation protocol defined by La Lumia [6]. The UO_2 powder used was synthesized through a dry route by reduction of UF_6 in gas phase. It contains also 8.5 wt% of the U_3O_8 phase and has an overall O/M ratio of 2.20. The PuO_2 powder was obtained by oxalic precipitation of plutonium (IV) nitrate and calcination in air. Its O/M ratio is 2.00. More details about both powders are available in the literature [7]. Fig. 1 shows the morphology of some individual granules observed using scanning electron microscopy (SEM, Supra 55 VP, Zeiss). They have a spherical shape and are devoid of any central cavity. Laser particle size distribution measured in dry mode (Mastersizer 3000, Malvern Panalytical, Mie configuration, compressed air pressure in the venturi fixed to 0.1 bar) is also shown in Fig. 1. The most important point is that the median diameter for the number distribution ($[D_n(50)]$) is around 100 μm and that there are no granules smaller than 30 μm . The Pu/(U+Pu) content in the freeze-granulated powder was determined to be 14.4($\pm$ 0.4) mol% using

thermal ionization mass spectrometry (TIMS, VG-54 magnetic sector mass spectrometer, Isotopx).

2.2. Calculation of the theoretical density for sintering

The target O/M ratio after sintering is around 1.96 which is representative of MOX fuel for fast neutron reactors. Philipponneau proposed a relationship linking the lattice parameter, a , to the Pu/(U+Pu) molar content, y , and the deviation from stoichiometry, x , for $U_{1-y}Pu_yO_{2-x}$ solid solutions [8]:

$$a(pm) = 547 - 7.4y + 32x \quad (1)$$

Assuming that the Pu content will not vary during sintering and neglecting the americium content present in the freeze-granulated powder (the β decay of the small content of ^{241}Pu present in the PuO_2 raw powder gives rise to an amount of ^{241}Am estimated to be 1.84 mol% $Am/(Pu+Am)$), a lattice parameter of 547.21 pm is then calculated for the $U_{0.856}Pu_{0.144}O_{1.960}$ composition. Because $U_{1-y}Pu_yO_{2-x}$ solid solutions have a fluorite structure (Fm $\bar{3}m$, space group 225), the theoretical density at room temperature is then given by:

$$\rho_0^{th} = \frac{4(M_{U/Pu} + 1.96M_O)}{N_A a^3} \quad (2)$$

where $M_{U/Pu}$ is the molar mass of U/Pu, M_O is the molar mass of O, N_A is the number of Avogadro and a is the lattice parameter. The UO_2 and PuO_2 raw powders used are mainly constituted by ^{238}U and ^{239}Pu isotopes, respectively. Assuming a molar mass of 238 g for U/Pu, a value around 11.0 g/cm³ is then calculated for ρ_0^{th} .

We are aware that the starting UO_2 powder contains 8.5 wt% of U_3O_8 that transforms into $UO_{2.00}$ in a reducing atmosphere above 600 °C [9]. This contribution was not taken into account in the calculation of the theoretical

density at room temperature as U_3O_8 reduction occurs before any significant sintering. The O/M ratio of the sample is also supposed to change continuously during the sintering experiments under reducing conditions [10]: i) between 300 and 900 °C the reduction of UO_{2+x} into $UO_{2.00}$ proceeds, ii) in the range 900-1700 °C the reduction of PuO_2 or $U_{1-y}Pu_yO_2$ solid solution formed at high temperature into PuO_{2-x} or $U_{1-y}Pu_yO_{2-x}$ takes place. However, we decided to keep 11.0 g/cm³ as the theoretical density for the duration of each experiment (temperature between 20 and 1700 °C) because the impact on the theoretical density value would be marginal.

2.3. Green compacts

Cylindrical samples (diameter of 5.4 mm and a height around 7 mm) were obtained by uniaxial pressing the freeze-granulated powder with a compaction pressure of 450 MPa (manual hydraulic press, Atlas 25, Specac). The geometric relative green density was around 57(± 0.4)% for all the different compacts prepared.

It has to be emphasized that all samples underwent a debinding thermal treatment before sintering to remove the organic compounds (dispersant and binder) which were incorporated during the preparation of the freeze-granulated powder [6]. Thus, samples were exposed at 600 °C for 2h in an Ar/4 vol% H_2 atmosphere humidified with 1200 vpm of water (oxygen partial pressure and oxygen potential set to 1.3×10^{-27} bar and -450 kJ/mol at 600 °C, respectively).

2.4. Sintering

Kato proposed the following expression for the O/M ratio of $U_{1-y}Pu_yO_{2\pm x}$ MOX formulations taking into account the thermal and atmosphere conditions they are submitted to [11]:

$$\frac{O}{M}$$

$$= 2$$

$$\begin{aligned} & - \left[e^{\frac{44.0+55.8y}{R}} \times e^{-\frac{376000}{RT}} \times p_{O_2}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right]^{-5} \\ & + \left[\left(e^{\frac{68.8+131.3y}{R}} \times e^{-\frac{515000}{RT}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \times p_{O_2}^{-\frac{1}{4}} \right]^{-5} \\ & + \left[\left(2 \times e^{\frac{153.5-96.5y+331.0y^2}{R}} \times e^{-\frac{891000}{RT}} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \times p_{O_2}^{-\frac{1}{3}} \right]^{-5} \\ & + \left(\frac{1}{2}y \right)^{-5} \left\{ e^{\frac{-22.8-84.5y}{R}} \times e^{\frac{105000}{RT}} \times p_{O_2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \quad (3) \end{aligned}$$

where y is, as before, the Pu/(U+Pu) molar content, p_{O_2} is the oxygen partial pressure of the atmosphere, R is the universal gas constant and T the absolute temperature. The oxygen partial pressure is related to the oxygen potential $\overline{\Delta G_{O_2}}$ by the well-known expression:

$$\overline{\Delta G_{O_2}} = RT \ln \left(\frac{p_{O_2}}{p_{O_2}^*} \right) \quad (4)$$

where $p_{O_2}^*$ is the unit of the oxygen partial pressure (1 bar).

The green pellets were sintered from room temperature to 1700 °C in a high temperature dilatometer (DIL402C, Setaram) under Ar/4 vol% H₂. According to Kato, the oxygen partial pressure required to obtain a O/M ratio around 1.96 for a MOX **composition** containing 14.4 mol% Pu/(U+Pu), at 1700 °C, is around 4.1×10^{-13} bar, which gives an oxygen potential of -468 kJ/mol. Accordingly, the atmosphere was monitored and controlled with an oxygen pump (Gen'air, Setnag) in order to have a constant water concentration of 100 vpm (calculated using the Wheeler approach [12] to obtain the target oxygen partial pressure and oxygen potential at 1700 °C) during the sintering runs.

Heating rates fixed to 2, 3 and 4 °C/min were used for the sintering runs. The isothermal duration was ranging from 0 to 4h and the target temperature from 1600 to 1700 °C (for the only test completed at 1600 °C, the oxygen partial pressure and the oxygen potential were adjusted regarding equations (3) and (4) to obtain a O/M ratio around 1.96). The equipment contribution was subtracted based on a blank measurement made with an Al₂O₃ reference sample for each experiment.

Because the mass of the samples does not change significantly between the debinded and fired states (maximum weight loss of 1% resulting from reduction of the oxide-based material), the following relation is obtained [13-14]:

$$D_{(T)}(\%) = D_0 \frac{1}{\xi^2 \left[1 + \frac{\Delta L_{(T)}}{L_0} \right]^3} e^{3\alpha(T-T_0)} \quad (5)$$

where: $D_{(T)}$ is defined as the sample instantaneous relative density, D_0 is the relative green density, ξ is representative of the shrinkage anisotropy of the sample and is given by $\xi = \frac{\phi_f L_0}{\phi_0 L_f} = \frac{\phi_{(T)} L_0}{\phi_0 L_{(T)}}$ with ϕ_f the final diameter, L_f the final height, ϕ_0 the initial diameter, L_0 the initial height, $\phi_{(T)}$ the instantaneous diameter and $L_{(T)}$ the instantaneous height, $\Delta L_{(T)} = L_{(T)} - L_0$ (<0) is the sample height variation, α is the linear thermal expansion coefficient, T is the instantaneous absolute temperature and T_0 the absolute room temperature. From a practical point of view, α is determined from the cooling steps of the dilatometer runs. An average value of $11.6(\pm 0.6) \times 10^{-6}$ is retained. All the sintering tests carried out have shown that the parameter ξ is very close to 1.

The density of the sintered samples was measured using the Archimedes method with bromobenzene (dry, immersed and humid weights, three series of measurements were carried out for each sample).

2.4. Grain size measurement

For green compacts, the grain size is determined from a fracture surface observed using SEM (Supra 55 VP, Zeiss) in secondary electron mode. For sintered samples, each complete sample is embedded in a resin and a mirror longitudinal polished cross section is prepared including a final mechanical-polishing step using 250 and 40 nm colloidal silica suspensions that reveals sufficiently the grain boundaries of the polycrystal using the backscattered electron mode during SEM (Mira 3, Tescan) observations. Then, for both kinds of samples, it is easy to determine the average grain size by the intercept method (at least 300 grains are taken into account, correction factor set to 1.56) from SEM images [15].

2.4. Plutonium distribution in the sintered samples

The longitudinal polished cross sections of some sintered samples were characterized using electron probe microanalysis (EPMA, SX100, Cameca). Measurements performed at 20 kV at the U-M α and Pu-M β lines allowed the U-Pu distribution to be assessed. The Pu content in the mappings was estimated based on quantitative measurements along 500 μ m lines obtained by applying the ZAF method and using UO $_2$ and PuO $_2$ samples as standards for U, Pu and O.

3. Results and discussion

Fig. 2a shows the variation of the relative density as a function of temperature for the different heating rates. Whatever the heating rate, samples start to densify around 600 °C. The lower the heating rate, the higher the relative density for a given temperature. Such a behavior is not new and was

previously reported for numerous non-radioactive oxides [13-14, 16-17]. Sato argued that the lower the heating rate, the longer the exposure time and the higher the shrinkage and relative density reached at a given temperature [16].

Fig. 2b shows how the instantaneous densification rate is changing as a function of temperature for the three heating rates retained. The higher the heating rate, the higher the instantaneous densification rate whatever the temperature. This trend was also previously reported for non-radioactive oxides [13-14, 18]. More interesting is the fact that the curves do not exhibit the traditional bell-shape with a clear maximum densification rate. If it might seem that a maximum densification rate around $5.7 \times 10^{-5} \text{ s}^{-1}$ is positioned at 1680 °C when the heating rate is fixed to 2 °C/min, no maximum of the densification rate does appear for the two other heating rate values. This type of sample requires a significant residence time at high temperature to reach high densities under the atmospheric conditions applied. The temperature rise phase alone does not allow materials with closed porosity to be obtained (Fig. 2a). Similar trends have been reported by Kutty [3] in the past and more recently by Nakamichi [5].

Fig. 2c is a zoom of Fig. 2b in the 600-1200 °C temperature range. Whatever the heating rate, the densification rate exhibits a maximum value around 775 °C. It signifies that densification starts around 600 °C and slows-down from 775 °C. Similar results were reported by several authors investigating the sintering behavior in different kinds of atmospheres of UO_2 -20 wt% PuO_2 [3], UO_2 -30 wt% PuO_2 [19] fuels and UO_2 -30 wt% CeO_2 surrogates [20]. According to them, the densification slow-down is correlated with the onset of a UO_2 - PuO_2 or UO_2 - CeO_2 solid solution formation. Even if additional experiments are required (X-ray diffraction experiments at high temperature will be completed in the future), we postulate that a solid solution forms in the densifying samples around 775 °C, whatever the heating rate used. Because

the solid solution is formed by the interdiffusion of Pu^{4+} cations into the UO_2 lattice and U^{4+} cations into the PuO_2 lattice it decreases the densification rate until completion and then densification restarts with a polycrystalline sample made of $\text{U}_{1-y}\text{Pu}_y\text{O}_{2-x}$ grains. Accordingly, when densification resumes around 1000°C , the samples are more homogeneous and can be described as a polycrystalline body constituted by pores and grains of $\text{U}_{1-y}\text{Pu}_y\text{O}_{2-x}$ solid solutions, rather than UO_2 and PuO_2 grains alone.

Fig. 2d shows the variation of the absolute instantaneous densification rate in function of $D(T)$ for the different heating rates retained. The three curves overlap meaning that the densification mechanism is independent of the heating rate used.

Fig. 3 shows examples of the green and sintered microstructures observed using SEM (sample relative density increases from left to right for each row of micrographs). When observed in two dimensions and as soon as densification proceeds, the residual pores becomes isolated, switching from a vermicular morphology to a more rounded shape. For all sintered samples, the elemental grains constituting the polycrystalline material are well faceted with an equilibrium shape.

Fig. 4 shows results from EPMA observations concerning the plutonium spatial distribution and its quantification in sintered samples having relative densities between 84.2 and 97.9%. The Pu repartition inside all pellets is homogenous, notably compared to samples manufactured by conventional powder metallurgy processes [21-22]. However, small and local enrichments, with Pu contents between 40-60 mol%, are still visible. MOX fuels with a very homogeneous U/Pu distribution are thought to have a better behavior under irradiation in reactors by limiting/preventing the formation of the typical high burnup structure [23-24].

Knowing the relative density and the grain size of each sample (green and sintered ones), it is possible to construct the “grain size versus relative density” trajectory named the “sintering path”, as shown on Fig. 5. The experimental points seem to belong to a single trajectory (dashed curve, first level fitting using the Lab Fit Curve Fitting Software) that is independent of sintering temperature, soak time and heating rate. Accordingly, the grain size can be described as a monotonous function of the relative density. A multitude of sintering experimental conditions led to the same microstructure, as was previously reported for other non-radioactive oxides [13-14, 18].

The experimental points constituting the sintering path shown on Fig. 5 were fitted with theoretical expressions linking the grain size to the relative density [25]. The best agreement coefficient value amongst these fits, almost 1, is obtained when grain growth is controlled by the grain boundaries and densification is controlled by grain boundary diffusion (see the fit on Fig. 6a). Nonetheless, other mechanism combinations are leading to determination coefficient values above 0.99. At this point, we must remain careful regarding the mechanisms controlling densification and grain growth.

Let us now focus on the determination of the apparent activation energy for the mechanism controlling densification. The equation for the densification rate can be separated into temperature-dependent, grain size-dependent and density-dependent quantities as follows [14, 17, 26]:

$$\frac{dD}{dt} = A \frac{F[D]}{G^n} e^{-\frac{Q_d}{RT}} \quad (6)$$

where A is a constant, $F[D]$ is a function only of density, Q_d is the apparent activation energy for the mechanism controlling densification, R is the universal gas constant, T is the instantaneous absolute temperature, G is the

grain size, n is the grain size exponent whose value depends on whether the densification rate is controlled by lattice diffusion ($n = 3$) or grain-boundary diffusion ($n = 4$).

The instantaneous densification rate may be also written as:

$$\frac{dD}{dt} = \frac{dD}{dT} \frac{dT}{dt} \quad (7)$$

where dT/dt , the heating rate, is held constant during anisothermal sintering experiments and is named ζ . By combining relations (6), (7) and rearranging, the following expression is obtained:

$$\ln \left[T \frac{dD}{dT} \frac{dT}{dt} \right] = -\frac{Q_d}{RT} + \ln\{F[D]\} + \ln(A) - n\ln(G) \quad (8)$$

A plot of the left-hand side of relation (8) versus $1/T$ would give a value for Q_d provided that the data points are taken at a constant value of D and G . Fig. 5 shows that each value of relative density corresponds to a single value of grain size, whatever the sintering conditions. Points for a constant value of D are then generated by changing the heating rate. The measurements led to values of Q_d at different values of D . This formalism is known as the CRH method (Constant Rates of Heating). Using this approach leads to an almost constant apparent activation energy of 528 ± 7 kJ/mol for the mechanism controlling densification, as shown on Fig. 6b.

A second method to determine the apparent activation energy for the mechanism controlling densification is to construct the Master Sintering Curve (MSC). By extending the analysis of sintering beyond the confined segments described by the individual stage models, it was shown for an isotropic shrinkage (true for the freeze-granulated powder investigated here because the

value of ξ in relation (1) is very close to 1) and if there exists only one dominant diffusion mechanism (either volume or grain boundary diffusion), that the densification rate may be expressed as [27-29]:

$$\frac{dD}{Ddt} = \frac{3\gamma_{sv}\Omega\Gamma[D]\Phi_0}{RT(G[D])^n} e^{-\frac{Q_d}{RT}} \quad (9)$$

where γ_{sv} is the solid/vapor surface tension, $\Phi_0 = \Phi_{v0}$ and $n = 3$ for volume diffusion, $\Phi_0 = \delta_b\Phi_{b0}$ with δ_b the grain boundary thickness and $n = 4$ for grain boundary diffusion (Φ_0 is the pre-exponential factor of the diffusion coefficient), $\Gamma[D]$ and $G[D]$ (the grain size) are functions only of the relative density, T_0 is the temperature at which densification is effectively starting (assumed to be 1000 °C, at the end of solid solution formation) and the other parameters were described previously. Equation (9) is similar to Equation (6) and also to densification rate expressions established in the past for a control by volume or grain boundary diffusion when sintering fine-grained ceramics [25]. Su obtained the well-known relationship after rearranging and integrating expression (9) [28-29]:

$$\frac{R}{3\gamma_{sv}\Omega\Phi_0} \int_{D_0}^D \frac{(G[D])^n}{D\Gamma[D]} dD = \int_0^t \frac{e^{-\frac{Q_d}{RT}}}{T} dt \quad (10)$$

Stating $\Theta_d(h/K) = \int_0^t \frac{e^{-\frac{Q_d}{RT}}}{T} dt$ gives:

$$\frac{R}{3\gamma_{sv}\Omega\Phi_0} \int_{D_0}^D \frac{(G[D])^n}{D\Gamma[D]} dD = \int_0^t \frac{e^{-\frac{Q_d}{RT}}}{T} dt = \Theta_d(h/K) = \frac{1}{\zeta} \int_{T_0}^T \frac{e^{-\frac{Q_d}{RT}}}{T} dT \quad (11)$$

Because the left-hand site of Equation (11) is a function only of relative density, the MSC is defined as the relationship between relative density D and Θ_d [28-29]. To construct the MSC curve under anisothermal sintering

1 conditions, we used the results from the dilatometer runs, the trapezoidal
2 approximation and a curve-fitting procedure to determine the value of Q_d by
3 minimizing the residual sum of squares (RSS) between the experimental and
4 calculated values, assuming that all points must line up to form a single curve.
5 Such an analysis leads to the results shown in Figs. 6c and 6d. The apparent
6 activation energy for the mechanism controlling densification is then
7 calculated to be around 510 ± 10 kJ/mol (the uncertainty is only estimated).
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 Thereby, an apparent average activation energy of 525 ± 9 kJ/mol, associated
17 with the densification mechanism, is determined from the CRH and MSC
18 methods (average value and standard deviation calculated by taking into
19 account the four values obtained from the CRH method and the single value
20 calculated from the MSC analysis).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 By expanding the concept of the MSC approach to isothermal sintering
29 conditions (use of the same value of activation energy as that previously
30 determined under anisothermal conditions), it is possible to predict the
31 evolution of the instantaneous relative density as a function of temperature for
32 any thermal cycle including anisothermal and isothermal steps. The results
33 obtained are visible in Figure 7 where calculated (Calc) cycles are compared to
34 experimental (Exp) ones. The agreement between the calculated and
35 experimental values is very good. The use of such an approach makes it
36 possible to design an ideal sintering cycle from the point of view of its speed
37 (the cooling step is not taken into account because it depends on the type of
38 furnace used) and its consumption of resources while making it possible to
39 achieve a final relative density greater than 95% (MOX fuel criterion for the
40 fast neutron reactors).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Now let's try to specify in more detail what could be the densification
55 mechanism involved. Noyau measured the volume and grain boundary
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

diffusion coefficients of plutonium cations in an $U_{0.55}Pu_{0.45}O_{2-x}$ polycrystalline material, for an oxygen potential set to -395 kJ/mol [30]. He obtained:

$$D_v^{Pu} = 11.02 \times 10^{-4} e^{-\frac{625000}{RT}} m^2/s \quad (12)$$

$$D_b^{Pu} = 4.51 \times 10^{-2} e^{-\frac{506000}{RT}} m^2/s \quad (13)$$

where D_v^{Pu} and D_b^{Pu} are the volume and grain boundary diffusion coefficients.

The activation energy for the grain boundary diffusion of plutonium cations obtained by Noyau (around 506 kJ/mol), is very close to the one (525 kJ/mol) that was determined from the CRH and MSC methods for densification of the freeze-granulated powder investigated in the study reported in this paper.

Let us now calculate the grain boundary diffusion coefficient involved in densification by exploiting the sintering experiments completed on the freeze-granulated powder and by considering the theoretical expression for the densification rate.

When densification is controlled by grain boundary diffusion, the densification rate in the secondary and tertiary stages of sintering is given by [25]:

$$\frac{dD}{dt} = \frac{400\Omega\gamma_{sv}\delta_b D_b}{RTG^4} \quad (14)$$

which turns to:

$$D_b = \frac{RTG^4}{400\Omega\gamma_{sv}\delta_b} \frac{dD}{dt} \quad (15)$$

By using a typical value of 1 nm for δ_b and 1 J/m² for γ_{sv} , the grain boundary diffusion coefficient variation in function of temperature was calculated from the sintering experiment conducted on the freeze-granulated powder with a

heating rate fixed to 2 °C/min, between 1100 and 1680 °C (at 1100 °C, the sample relative density is 57.4% against 84.6% at 1680 °C). Then it was compared to the experimental values obtained by Noyau. The results are summarized on Fig. 8. As implicitly introduced into relation (9), the grain boundary diffusion coefficient can also be expressed as:

$$D_b = \Phi_{0b} e^{-\frac{Q}{RT}} \quad (16)$$

with Φ_{0b} the pre-exponential factor and Q the activation energy of the grain boundary diffusion mechanism. For each data series, Φ_{0b} and Q values are also given in Fig. 8.

For temperatures higher than 1525 °C, corresponding to a relative density above 69.2%, the experimental values of the grain boundary diffusion coefficient of plutonium cations in a polycrystalline $U_{0.55}Pu_{0.45}O_{2-x}$ material are very close to the ones calculated from the sintering run completed on the freeze-granulated powder. In the same time, the activation energy calculated from the sintering experiment is 494 kJ/mol, which is similar to 506 kJ/mol obtained by Noyau. For temperatures below 1525 °C and for relative density values below 69.2%, the calculated values of the grain boundary diffusion coefficient from the sintering experiment are now much higher than the experimental values obtained by Noyau. More than that, the activation energy values differ a lot: 506 kJ/mol for Noyau against 180 kJ/mol from the sintering run completed on the freeze-granulated powder.

Accordingly, for temperatures above 1525 °C (relative density above 69.2%), densification of the freeze granulated powder is most probably controlled by the grain boundary diffusion of plutonium cations. In the same time, it is also likely that grain growth is controlled by grain boundaries (best fit of theoretical expressions, result shown on Fig. 6a). For temperatures lower than 1525 °C

(relative density below 69.2%) another mechanism may control densification. Such a possible change was not identified using the CRH and MSC approaches. More experimental results are then needed to conclude regarding this point.

In the future, transmission electron microscopy observations will be completed on some of the sintered samples. Particular attention will be paid to the analysis of grain boundaries (nature, defects, chemical segregation...), to the identification of a possible space charge zone in their vicinity and to the potential variation of chemical composition when moving from a grain boundary to the core of the surrounding grains.

Additional sintering runs will be also completed on freeze-granulated powders incorporating 25 and 33 mol% Pu/(U+Pu) and the results will be compared to the ones reported in this paper.

4. Conclusions

Sintering investigations on a $\text{UO}_2\text{-PuO}_2$ freeze-granulated powder containing 15 mol% Pu/(U+Pu) were completed under reducing conditions (oxygen potential set to -468 kJ/mol at 1700 °C) for a target O/M ratio of 1.96. After formation of a $\text{U}_{1-y}\text{Pu}_y\text{O}_{2\pm x}$ solid solution that ended around 1000 °C, the sintered microstructure appeared homogeneous regarding the plutonium and uranium cations spatial distribution. Depending on the sintering parameters, the final sintered relative density achieved was well above 95%.

By constructing the “grain size versus relative density” trajectory named the “sintering path”, using the CRH and MSC approaches and calculating the grain boundary diffusion coefficient from the sintering runs, it appeared that densification was most probably controlled by the grain boundary diffusion of plutonium cations and grain growth by the grain boundaries at temperatures

1 above 1525 °C. For temperatures below 1525 °C, different mechanisms may
2 be possibly involved.
3
4

5 By combining the master sintering curve approach for anisothermal and
6 isothermal conditions, it was possible to predict the evolution of the relative
7 density over time for any type of thermal path (heating rate, sintering soak
8 temperature and holding time).
9
10
11
12
13

14 **Acknowledgements:** The authors warmly thank Gauthier Jouan, Romain
15 Lauwerier, Jean-Robert Sevilla, Romain Vauchy and Patrice Signorel for their
16 precious help during the experiments carried out within the framework of this
17 study.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- [1] S. Noyau, F. Audubert, P.M. Martin, A. Maitre. Influence of the oxygen potential on the sintering of UO_2 -45% PuO_2 . J. Eur. Ceram. Soc. 35 (2011) 3651-3663. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2015.05.006>

- [2] S. Berzati, S. Vaudez, R.C. Belin, J. Lchelle, Y. Marc, J.C. Richaud, J.M. Heintz. Controlling the oxygen potential to improve the densification and the solid solution formation of uranium–plutonium mixed oxides. J. Nucl. Mater. 447 (2014) 115-124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnucmat.2013.12.014>

- [3] T.R.G. Kutty, P.V. Hegde, K.B. Khan, S. Majumdar, D.S.C. Purushotham. Sintering studies on UO_2 - PuO_2 pellets with varying PuO_2 content using dilatometry. J. Nucl. Mater. 282 (2000) 54-65. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-3115\(00\)00394-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-3115(00)00394-9)

- [4] T.R.G. Kutty, P.V. Hegde, R. Keswani, K.B. Khan, S. Majumdar, D.S.C. Purushotham. Densification behaviour of UO_2 -50% PuO_2 pellets by dilatometry. J. Nucl. Mater 264 (1999) 10-19. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-3115\(98\)00490-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-3115(98)00490-5)

- [5] S. Nakamichi, S. Hirooka, M. Kato, T. Sunaoshi, A. T. Nelson, K. J. McClellan. Effect of O/M ratio on sintering behavior of $(\text{Pu}_{0.3}\text{U}_{0.7})\text{O}_{2-x}$. J. Nucl. Mater. 535 (2020) 152188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnucmat.2020.152188>

- [6] F. La Lumia, L. Ramond, C. Pagnoux, P. Coste, F. Lebreton, J.R. Sevilla, G. Bernard-Granger. Dense and homogeneous MOX fuel pellets manufactured using the freeze granulation route. J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 103 (2020) 3020-3029. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jace.17005>

- [7] F. La Lumia, L. Ramond, C. Pagnoux, G. Bernard-Granger. Preparation and co-dispersion of TiO₂-Y₂O₃ suspensions through the study of their rheological and electrokinetic properties. *Ceram. Int.* 45 (2019) 3023-3032. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ceramint.2018.10.123>
- [8] R. Vauchy, A.C. Robisson, R.C. Belin, P.M. Martin, A.C. Scheinost, F. Hodaj. Room temperature oxidation of hypostoichiometric uranium-plutonium mixed oxides U_{1-y}Pu_yO_{2-x}. A depth-selective approach. *J. Nucl. Mater.* 465 (2015) 349-357. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnucmat.2015.05.033>
- [9] F. Valdivieso, M. Pijolat, M. Soustelle, J. Jourde. Reduction of uranium oxide U₃O₈ into uranium dioxide UO₂ by ammonia. *Proceedings of the XIVth International Symposium on the Reactivity of Solids, Budapest, pp. 117-122, 2000*
- [10] S. Vaudez, J. Lchelle, S. Berzati, J.M. Heintz. Assessing the oxygen stoichiometry during the sintering of (U, Pu)O₂ fuel. *J. Nucl. Mater.* 460 (2015) 221-225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnucmat.2015.02.005>
- [11] M. Kato, M. Watanabe, T. Matsumoto, S. Hirooka, M. Akashi. Oxygen potentials, oxygen diffusion coefficients and defect equilibria of nonstoichiometric of (U, Pu)O_{2±x}. *J. Nucl. Mater.* 487 (2017) 424-432. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnucmat.2017.01.056>
- [12] V. J. Wheeler, I.G. Jones. Thermodynamic and composition changes in UO_{2±x} (x < 0.005) at 1950 K. *J. Nucl. Mater.* 42 (1972) 117-121. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3115\(72\)90018-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3115(72)90018-9)

- [13] G. Bernard-Granger, C. Guizard. Apparent activation energy for the densification of a commercially available granulated zirconia powder. J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 90 (2007) 1246-1250. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1551-2916.2006.01415.x>
- [14] N. Benameur, G. Bernard-Granger, A. Addad, S. Raffy, C. Guizard. Sintering analysis of a fine-grained alumina – magnesia spinel powder. J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 94 (2011) 1388-1396. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1551-2916.2010.04271.x>
- [15] M.I. Mendleson. Average grain size in polycrystalline ceramics. J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 52 (1969) 443-446. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1151-2916.1969.tb11975.x>
- [16] E. Sato, C.P. Carry. Yttria doping and sintering of submicrometer-grained α -alumina. J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 79 (1996) 2156-2160. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1151-2916.1996.tb08950.x>
- [17] J. Wang, R. Raj. Estimate of the activation energies for boundary diffusion from rate-controlled sintering of pure alumina and alumina doped with zirconia or titania. J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 73 (1990) 1172-75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1151-2916.1990.tb05175.x>
- [18] G. Bernard-Granger, C. Guizard, A. Addad. Sintering of an ultra pure α -alumina powder: I. Densification, grain growth and sintering path. J. Mater. Sci. 42 (2007) 6316-6324. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10853-006-1206-1>
- [19] R. Manzel, W.D. Dorr. Fabrication of $\text{UO}_2\text{-Gd}_2\text{O}_3$ fuel pellets. Ceram. Bull. 59 (1980) 601-616

[20] W. Dorr, S. Hellmann, G. Mages. Study of the formation of $\text{UO}_2\text{-PuO}_2$ solid solution by means of $\text{UO}_2\text{-CeO}_2$ simulate. J. Nucl. Mater. 140 (1986) 7-10. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3115\(86\)90190-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3115(86)90190-X)

[21] T. Gervais, D. Favet, L. Paret, S. Vaudez. (U, Pu) O_{2-x} MOX pellet for Astrid reactor project. Proceedings of the International Conference on Fast Reactors and Related Fuel Cycles: Next Generation Nuclear Systems for Sustainable Developments, Yekaterinburg, 2017

[22] G. Oudinet, I. Munoz-Viallard, L. Aufore, M.J. Gotta, J.M. Becker, G. Chiarelli, R.Castelli. Characterization of plutonium distribution in MIMAS MOX by image analysis. J. Nucl. Mat. 375 (2008) 86-94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnucmat.2007.10.013>

[23] J. Noirot, L. Desgranges, J. Lamontagne. Detailed characterizations of high-burnup structures in oxide fuels. J. Nucl. Mater. 372 (2008) 318-339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnucmat.2007.04.037>

[24]. J. Noirot, Y. Pontillon, J. Lamontagne, I. Zacharie-Aubrun, K. Hanifi, P. Bienvenu, L. Desgranges. High burn-up structure in nuclear fuel: impact on fuel behavior. EPJ Web of Conferences 115 (2016) 04005

[25] G. Bernard-Granger, C. Guizard. New relationships between relative density and grain size during solid-state sintering of ceramic powders. Acta Mater. 56 (2008) 6273–6282. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actamat.2008.08.054>

[26] J. Wang, R. Raj. Activation energy for the sintering of two-phase alumina-zirconia ceramics. J. Am. Ceram. Soc.74 (1991) 1959–63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1151-2916.1991.tb07815.x>

[27] J.D. Hansen, R.P. Rusin, M.H. Teng, D.L. Johnson. Combined-stage sintering model. J. Am. Ceram. Soc. 75 (1992) 1129–35.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1151-2916.1992.tb05549.x>

[28] H. Su, D.L. Johnson. Master sintering curve: a practical approach to sintering. J. Am. Ceram. Soc. 79 (1996) 3211–7.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1151-2916.1996.tb08097.x>

[29] D.L. Johnson. Finding and utilizing the master sintering curve. Proceedings of Sintering 03: International conference on the science, technology and application of sintering, Penn State University, 2003

[30] S. Noyau. Etude des phénomènes d'autodiffusion et d'interdiffusion du plutonium dans les céramiques de type $U_{1-y}Pu_yO_{2\pm x}$. PhD Thesis, University of Limoges, 2012

Figure captions

Fig. 1: a) SEM micrograph of granules constituting the freeze-granulated powder; b) and c) SEM micrographs of the inside of an individual granule; d) and e) U and Pu EDS mapping (arbitrary color scale) of the inside of an individual granule (same area as that shown on c); f) Volume/number distributions from laser granulometer tests in dry mode on the freeze-granulated powder.

Fig. 2: a) Relative density in function of temperature; b) Densification rate in function of temperature; c) Zoom of b) in the 600-1200 °C temperature range; d) Absolute densification rate in function of temperature. Three different heating rates values have been used: 2 °C/min (solid blue line), 3 °C/min (dashed red line) and 4 °C/min (dashed green line).

Fig. 3: Microstructure of a green sample and different sintered samples. For each sintered microstructure are given in order of appearance the heating rate value, the sintering temperature, the time spend at the sintering temperature, the relative density D and the grain size G of the sintered sample.

Fig. 4: Sintering path. Plot of the grain size as a function of relative density. For each experimental point, the values given are the heating rate, the sintering temperature and the time spent at the sintering temperature.

Fig. 5: Colored pseudo-quantified Pu mapping by EPMA on different sintered samples having a relative density ranging from 84.2 to 97.9%. For each map are given in order of appearance the heating rate value, the sintering temperature, the time spend at the sintering temperature, the relative density D and the grain size G of the sintered sample.

Fig. 6: a) Fitting of the experimental points for a scenario based on densification being controlled by grain boundary diffusion and grain growth by the grain boundaries; b) Determination of the apparent activation energy for densification using the anisothermal CRH method. Different relative density values have been fixed for the three heating rates applied during the sintering tests; c) Determination of the apparent activation energy for densification using the anisothermal MSC method – Residual sum of squares (RSS), d) Determination of the apparent activation energy for densification using the anisothermal MSC method – MSC curve.

Fig. 7: Extension of the concept of the MSC approach to predict the evolution of the instantaneous relative density as a function of temperature for any thermal cycle including anisothermal and isothermal steps. Calculated values are compared to experimental ones.

Fig. 8: Calculation of the grain boundary diffusion coefficient from sintering experiments. Comparison to the experimental values obtained by Noyau for a $U_{0.55}Pu_{0.45}O_{2-x}$ polycrystalline material [30]. The pre-exponential Φ_{0b} and activation energy Q values are indicated

Fig2

Fig3

Fig4

Fig5

Fig6

Fig7

Fig8