



HAL
open science

Validation of a multimodal set-up for the study of zirconium alloys claddings' behaviour under simulated LOCA conditions

Damien Campello, Nicolas Tardif, Jean Desquines, Marie-Christine Baietto, Michel Coret, Anne Maynadier, Philippe Chaudet

► To cite this version:

Damien Campello, Nicolas Tardif, Jean Desquines, Marie-Christine Baietto, Michel Coret, et al.. Validation of a multimodal set-up for the study of zirconium alloys claddings' behaviour under simulated LOCA conditions. *Strain*, 2018, 54 (5), 10.1111/str.12279 . hal-01862731v1

HAL Id: hal-01862731

<https://hal.science/hal-01862731v1>

Submitted on 27 Aug 2018 (v1), last revised 12 Jul 2022 (v2)

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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License



**VALIDATION OF A MULTI-MODAL SETUP FOR THE STUDY OF
ZIRCONIUM ALLOYS CLADDINGS' BEHAVIOR UNDER
SIMULATED LOCA CONDITIONS**

Journal:	<i>Strain</i>
Manuscript ID	STRAIN-1339.R2
Manuscript Type:	Full Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	07-May-2018
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Campello, Damien; Univ Lyon, INSA-Lyon, CNRS UMR5259, LaMCoS, F-69621, France Tardif, Nicolas; Univ Lyon, INSA-Lyon, CNRS UMR5259, LaMCoS, F-69621, France Desquines, Jean; Institut de Radioprotection et de Surete Nucleaire Cadarache, PSN-RES/SEREX/LE2M Baietto, Marie-Christine; Univ Lyon, INSA-Lyon, CNRS UMR5259, LaMCoS, F-69621, France Coret, Michel; GeM (UMR6183), Ecole Centrale de Nantes Maynadier, Anne; DFEMTO-ST, UMR CNRS 6174, Applied Mechanics Department Chaudet, Philippe; Univ Lyon, INSA-Lyon, CNRS UMR5259, LaMCoS, F-69621, France</p>
Keywords:	Digital Image Correlation, Near Infra-Red Thermography, uncertainties, measurement errors

1
2
3
4 VALIDATION OF A MULTI-MODAL SETUP FOR THE STUDY OF
5 ZIRCONIUM ALLOYS CLADDINGS' BEHAVIOR UNDER SIMULATED
6
7 LOCA CONDITIONS
8
9

10
11 D. CAMPELLO^A, N. TARDIF^A, J. DESQUINES^B, M.-C. BAIETTO^A, M. CORET^C, A.
12 MAYNADIER^D, P. CHAUDET^A
13

14 ^A Univ Lyon, INSA-Lyon, CNRS UMR5259, LaMCoS, F-69621, France

15 ^B IRSN/PSN-RES/SEREX/LE2M, Saint Paul lez Durance, France

16 ^C GeM (UMR6183), Ecole Centrale de Nantes, 1 rue de la Noë 44321 Nantes, France

17 ^D FEMTO-ST, UMR CNRS 6174, Applied Mechanics Department, 24 rue de l'Épitaphe, 25000
18
19 Besançon, France
20
21
22
23

24 **Corresponding author:**

25 Nicolas Tardif

26 Laboratoire de Mécanique des Contacts et des Structures

27 Université de Lyon, CNRS, INSA-Lyon UMR5259

28 27 bis avenue Jean Capelle - F69621 Villeurbanne Cedex France

29 T. +33 (0)4 72 43 84 52

30 F. +33 (0)4 72 43 09 80

31 nicolas.tardif@insa-lyon.fr
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

ABSTRACT

In [2], the authors used a combined experimental / numerical approach to identify the creep behavior of as-fabricated Zircaloy-4 claddings under simulated LOCA conditions. The current paper deals with the uncertainties and errors estimation of the two key methods used to measure the thermal and kinematic full fields during the creep tests: Near Infra-Red Thermography (NIRT) and 2 Dimensional Digital Image Correlation (2D-DIC).

The NIRT uncertainties are evaluated as 0.7% of the actual temperature. They are mainly due to the thermocouple measurements used to calibrate the radiometric model of the NIRT.

A combined 2D-DIC / edge detection approach is proposed to quantify the error related to 2D-DIC when measuring the ballooning of the tubular specimen. The 2D-DIC error is evaluated as 0.1% of the actual equivalent strain even for ballooning inducing a radius increase of 20%.

Keywords: Digital Image Correlation, Near Infra-Red Thermography, uncertainties, measurement error

1 INTRODUCTION

During its operating life, the water in the primary loop of a Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) is pressurized at 155 bar and heated by fuel pellet stacks up to 320 °C. The fuel pellets are inserted in claddings assembled in a 27x27 bundle. They are made of zirconium alloys. The claddings are designed to be the first safety barrier in French PWR. In operating lifecycle, filling gas and fission gas release also internally pressurizes the fuel claddings. A Loss of Coolant Accident scenario (LOCA) postulates a breach in the primary loop system. The water is depressurized limiting the coolant efficiency. Both the water and the fuel rods are then heated and the claddings are loaded with internal pressure. It can lead to rod ballooning and, potentially, to rod bursting. Re-flooding the nuclear core reactor interrupts this accidental sequence. The fuel rod ballooning can impede the core cooling capacity by flow blockage. The PERFROI project, detailed in [1], aims to study this complex scenario.

In [2], the authors presented the global picture of the coupled experimental/numerical approach to identify the steady-state creep behavior of as-fabricated Zircaloy-4 claddings under simulated LOCA conditions. The study targeted thermal-mechanical conditions corresponding to the lower bound of phase transformation from α towards $\alpha + \beta$ where several creep mechanisms are potentially activated (i.e. temperatures between 750 and 850 °C, stress

1
2
3 between 7 and 45 MPa). Fig. 1 summarizes the methodology. The experimental setup enabled
4 the internal pressurization of an unirradiated Zircaloy-4 cladding by stage. An induction
5 heating system induced an axisymmetric but axially heterogeneous thermal loading. Thermal
6 and kinematic surface fields were monitored by optical full-field measurement methods
7 during the ballooning. Hence, several thermal-mechanical conditions were studied during
8 each experiment. The parameters of local Norton power laws were identified by Finite
9 Element Model Updating by minimizing the difference between experimentally measured and
10 calculated secondary creep strain rates. The approach enables a substantial reduction of the
11 test matrix and associated discrepancies compared to other traditional setup [3-9].

12
13
14
15
16
17 Since the nineties, non-contact techniques in both kinematic and thermal fields
18 measurements have been improved. Digital Image Correlation [10, 11] and edge detection [12]
19 are frequently used for strain measurements in experimental mechanics. Recent improvements
20 in algorithms (global approaches with finite element basis [13], multi-grid solver [14],
21 Integrated-DIC [15], FEMU [16]...) allow for material behavior identification as proposed by
22 Réthoré et al. in [17].

23
24
25
26
27 Infra-Red (IR) cameras are now commonly used in the field of experimental mechanics
28 for computing thermal fields as demonstrated in [18] with Infra-Red Image Correlation or in
29 [19] to explore the energy balance associated with high-cycle fatigue. The IR cameras remain
30 very expensive compared to standard cameras, and do not allow for high spatial resolution. In
31 order to avoid these drawbacks the Near Infra-Red (NIR) measurement methods have also
32 been developed [20, 21, 22]. Their use (for the steel industry [23] for example, or a hot
33 specimen in an aggressive environment [24]) has been greatly improved in the recent years.
34 This paper focuses on the validation of the experimental setup detailed in [2] and more
35 specifically on uncertainties and error quantification of the 2 key optical full-field
36 measurement methods applied in the test configuration: NIR Thermography (NIRT) and 2D
37 Digital Image Correlation (2D-DIC).

38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45 First, the experimental setup is recalled. The Post-processing of NIRT and 2D-DIC are
46 detailed. The NIRT protocol is then assessed. Finally, error made by the use of 2D-DIC to
47 analyze the ballooning of the tubular specimen is then quantified by the comparison with a
48 more accurate combined edge detection / 2D-DIC method.
49
50

51 52 53 2 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 The homemade experimental setup is depicted in Fig. 2. The setup enabled a combined
4 biaxial compression/internal pressurization loading of the tubular Zircaloy-4 sample. A local
5 thermal loading was applied by induction heating. The specimen was surrounded by an
6 enclosure to maintain an inert environment during the test. Windows were distributed over the
7 circumference in order to enable the thermal and kinematic optical full-field measurements.
8
9
10
11 Details on the setup are given in the following.

12 13 14 2.1 MATERIAL

15
16 The material was Stress Relieved Annealed (SRA) Zr-4 manufactured by CEZUS. The
17 claddings in service have a 9.5 mm outer diameter, a 0.57 mm thickness and are 4 m long.
18 The claddings were cut by an electro discharge machining into 90 mm long samples.
19
20
21
22

23 2.2 SPECIMEN PREPARATION

24
25 High temperature image correlation measurement requires meticulous preparation. A
26 black undercoating (ULFALUX thermo-coating 1200 °C) was sprayed on the outer specimen
27 surface. A white speckle was then applied using BND painting. The speckle size ranged from
28 10 to 120 μm (usual pixel size of the optical measurement was 9 μm). A degreaser was used
29 for removing the painting along the z direction at two circumferential positions separated by a
30 180 °C angle. Three type K thermocouples (Ⓔ) were spot-welded in each of the painting free
31 azimuth. The two wires of each thermocouple were separated using a single hole round
32 ceramic insulator (SH-1-24). The diameter of the wires (CAB KX 04) was 0.078 mm to lower
33 the intrusive effect of the thermocouples.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 2.3 SETUP

43
44 The test specimen was connected (Ⓕ in Fig. 1) onto a Schenck 10kN servo-hydraulic
45 tensile machine (Ⓐ, Ⓑ) using custom grips (Ⓒ) designed by Tardif et al. [24]. An enclosure
46
47 (Ⓓ) was fitted to the machine for working in an inert environment. Argon flushing (Ⓔ, Ⓕ)
48
49 was kept during the entire test with a constant flow.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 A 6 kW induction generator (CELES) control the tube heating. The regulation was enclosed
4 in a K-type thermocouple (⑭) measurement loop. The coils (⑨, ⑫) let a visual access to the
5 warmest part of the specimen. The height of the region of interest (ROI, ⑬) is $z_0 = 20 \text{ mm}$.
6
7 A proportional pressure regulator (IMF) linked to an argon cylinder controlled the
8 pressurization (⑧) of the specimen. Two pressure gages (P8AP from HBM, ④) mounted
9
10 onto the upper and lower grips measured the internal pressure. The pressure induced bottom-
11 end effect was mechanically compensated by an axial compressive force F inducing a
12 uniaxial hoop loading.
13
14
15
16
17

18 Five sapphire glasses were distributed over the enclosure to enable optical monitoring of
19 the ROI by 4 digital cameras (⑩) equipped with 200 mm macro optics (NIK AF MICRO-
20 NIKKOR 200MM F/4 D IF-ED).
21
22

23 Two 12MPx CMOS cameras (VC-12MC-M65E0-FM) performed the 2D-DIC on the tubular
24 specimen surface at temperatures ranging from 750 to 850°C. At such temperatures, the
25 cladding surface emits radiation in the Near Infra-Red (NIR) spectral range. To get rid of
26 incandescence, blue LED rings (CCS LDR2-70-BL2, 470nm, ⑪) were set up above and
27 below the induction coils. The LED rings were pulsing blue light. Band-pass filters (MIDOPT
28 FIL BP470/62) centered on 470 nm (useful range: 425-495nm) were fitted to the 12
29 MegaPixels cameras used for DIC as proposed by Pan et al. in [25, 26].
30
31

32 Additionally, two 16MPx CCD cameras (Prosilica GE4900) shot images without any filtering
33 when the blue lights were put off for NIRT. This way, only the light emitted by the specimen
34 surface radiation was captured.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 3 DEDICATED TEST PROCEDURES FOR ERRORS AND UNCERTAINTIES ASSESSMENT 43 OF THE FULL FIELD MEASUREMENTS 44

45 3.1 TEST PROCEDURE TEST A FOR NIRT ASSESSMENT 46 47

48 A thermal cycling test was performed on a cladding at three different temperature
49 levels. The thermal loading history is plotted versus time in Fig. 3. The cladding was first
50 heated then three thermal cycles were successively performed and had actual both heating and
51 cooling rates of $2.2^\circ\text{C} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$. Argon flushing was kept during the whole test. The force was also
52 set to zero. Note that the dedicated test conditions were aggravating compared to those in [2]
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (isothermal creep). Radiometric models were calibrated for each cycle during its own heating
4 part. A Prosilica GE4900 camera shot pictures at a 1 Hz frequency, with a $f/11$ aperture.
5

6 The test procedure will be referred as Test A in the following.
7
8

9 3.2 TEST PROCEDURE TEST B FOR 2D DIC ASSESSMENT 10

11 The same test procedure as in [2] was chosen to assess the 2D-DIC. The test procedure
12 is shown in Fig. 4. At the beginning of the test, the enclosure was filled with argon gas and
13 flushing was kept on during the whole test. A controlled axial force of 0 N was set during the
14 $3^{\circ}\text{C} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ thermal ramp up to a first plateau. The first plateau enabled the evacuation of the
15 smoke induced by the heating of the paint. Then the thermal ramp was started again up to the
16 set point (795°C). Then, the mechanical loading was applied by the combination of the
17 compressive force and the internal pressure. Three mechanical plateaus were set so that the J2
18 equivalent strain reaches at least 4% at each plateau.
19

20 The cameras configuration is shown in Fig. 5a. Images shot by Cam 1 and Cam 2 (see
21 5b and 5c) were respectively dedicated to 2D-DIC and edge detection. This additional digital
22 image analysis provided the out-of-plane displacement due to the tube ballooning.
23
24

25 The test procedure will be referred as Test B in the following.
26
27
28
29

30 4 POST-PROCESSING METHODS 31 32 33

34 4.1 NEAR INFRA-RED THERMOGRAPHY 35 36 37

38 The design of the setup was chosen to apply a 20°C heterogeneous thermal axial
39 distribution in the ROI. This temperature distribution had a strong impact on the creep strain
40 rates as can be seen in Fig. 1. Hence Full field thermal measurement must be preferred to
41 local measurements such as type K thermocouples. Near-Infrared thermography is well
42 suitable to the thermal measurement of metal at temperature higher than 750°C as it can be set
43 up with a cheap CCD or CMOS camera. These cameras types have a higher spatial resolution
44 than usual infrared cameras. The calibration of the radiometric model requires a reference
45 temperature measurement provided by type K thermocouples.
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 4.1.1 PRINCIPLE OF RADIOMETRIC MEASUREMENTS 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

Any surface emits radiation (with a wavelength λ) at a given temperature T . The surface is characterized by an emissivity ($0 \leq \varepsilon(\lambda) \leq 1$) depending on the radiation wavelength. The total emittance $\phi_{\lambda,T}^e$ of this surface is estimated using its emissivity and the Planck law according to equation (1). The Planck law provides the total emittance of a black-body $\phi_{\lambda,T}^0$ in a hemisphere using the Planck constant h , the speed of light c and the Boltzman constant k . Note that the emissivity of a black-body is equal to 1.

$$\phi_{\lambda,T}^e = \varepsilon(\lambda) \cdot \phi_{\lambda,T}^0 = \varepsilon(\lambda) \cdot \frac{2h \cdot c^2 \cdot \lambda^{-5}}{\exp\left(\frac{h \cdot c}{k \cdot \lambda \cdot T}\right) - 1} \quad (1)$$

Meriaudeau et al. detailed the concept of a radiation thermometer (RT) in [20]. A radiometer senses the radiant flux of a target. This flux is the sum of the emitted flux $\phi_{\lambda,T}^e$ and a reflected flux $\phi_{\lambda,T}^{ref}$ as detailed in equation (2).

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{\lambda,T}^{tot} &= \phi_{\lambda,T}^e + \phi_{\lambda,T}^{ref} \\ &= \varepsilon(\lambda) \cdot L^0(\lambda, T) + [1 - \varepsilon(\lambda)] \cdot \phi_{rec} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

$\phi_{\lambda,T}^{ref}$ comes from the flux $\phi_{\lambda,T}^{rec}$ that the surface receives from the surroundings. A single detector (gain K and exposure time t_i) of a digital radiometer is now considered. Its digital level output I is written in equation (3) using the spectral response of the optical system $W(\lambda)$ and the total radiant flux of the target $\phi_{\lambda,T}^{tot}$. Finally, the radiometric model gives the relation between the Temperature and the digital level recorded by the camera.

$$I = t_i \cdot \int W(\lambda) \cdot \phi_{\lambda,T}^{tot} d\lambda \quad (3)$$

4.1.2 CALIBRATION OF THE RADIOMETRIC MODEL DURING THE HEATING STEP

In the proposed setup, induction heating induces negligible environmental heating (enclosure, argon,...). There was no other hot object in the surroundings. Moreover, the tubular geometry cannot lead to the reflection of the specimen itself. The calculation of $\phi_{\lambda,T}^{tot}$ was simplified to the emitted flux assuming that $\phi_{\lambda,T}^{rec} = 0$.

The spectral response $W(\lambda)$ of the optical image acquisition chain combined the argon's, the sapphire's and the objectives' transmittances (respectively $\tau_{ar}(\lambda)$, $\tau_{sap}(\lambda)$, $\tau_{obj}(\lambda)$), and the detector's quantum efficiency $\eta_{det}(\lambda)$, as written in equation (4).

$$W(\lambda) = \tau_{ar}(\lambda) \cdot \tau_{sap}(\lambda) \cdot \tau_{obj}(\lambda) \cdot \eta_{det}(\lambda) \quad (4)$$

A review of several calibration methods can be found in Rotrou et al. [28]. The radiometric model was calibrated using the thermocouples local measurements during the heating phase of each test. This method is particularly well adapted since the spectral response $W(\lambda)$ is not known. Note that the thermocouples and the NIRT acquisition were triggered at exactly the same time.

Fig. 6 shows five pictures shot during the end of the heating. The thermocouples are located on the left side of the digital images. Three digital thermocouples were numerically built, close to actual Tc. They are depicted by the blue, red and green boxes in Fig. 6. An averaged gray level intensity I_{eq} was calculated into these boxes to be correlated to the associated thermocouple measurements.

Inside the digital thermocouples, the emissivity of the surface is heterogeneous because of the speckle applied onto the specimen. In order to achieve a good sensitivity to the radiation emitted by the surface, only the brightest 30% pixel intensities were averaged for computing I_{eq} .

As detailed by Rotrou in [29], the concept of equivalent wavelength λ_{eq} is useful to analytically assess a measured temperature T_{mes} based on a digital level intensity I_{eq} . The chosen radiometric model is detailed in equation (5). The parameters K_1 and K_2 of equation (6) were calibrated using the correlation between digital and real thermocouple measurements.

$$T_{mes} = \frac{K_1}{\ln\left(\frac{K_2}{I_{eq}} + 1\right)} \quad (5)$$

$$K_1 = \frac{h \cdot c}{k \cdot \lambda_e} \quad K_2 = 2 \cdot \varepsilon(\lambda_e) \cdot c \cdot \lambda_e^{-4} \cdot W(\lambda_e) \cdot t_i \quad (6)$$

The calibration was performed using a least squares minimization between temperature T_{mes} and averaged grey level intensity I_{eq} data.

4.2 KINEMATIC FULL FIELD MEASUREMENTS

In [2], 2D-DIC measured the creep rate distribution along the yellow line in front of the cameras as depicted in Fig 5b. The ROI (white box in Fig. 5b) was discretized by isotropic linear Q4 finite elements. Their size was $30 \times 30 \text{ px}^2$. The ill-defined problem of the optical flow conservation was solved using a non linear least squares method relying on a finite element basis. Axial and hoop displacements were extracted from 2D-DIC results at the mesh nodes. From the gradient tensors, logarithmic strains were computed. True Von Mises equivalent creep strain was calculated over the sample surface assuming material incompressibility (equation (7)) during high temperature creep.

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{zz}^{vp} + \varepsilon_{\theta\theta}^{vp} + \varepsilon_{rr}^{vp} &= 0 \\ \varepsilon_{eq}^{vp} &= \left[\frac{2}{3} (\varepsilon_{zz}^2 + \varepsilon_{\theta\theta}^2 + \varepsilon_{rr}^2) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

In Test B, a coupled edge detection / 2D-DIC approach was used to quantify the error made by the 2D-DIC during the ballooning of the specimen. The edge detection method is based on the analysis of the gray level gradient of an image. Recent improvements allow for a sub-pixel definition of a curvilinear shape position and low CPU time calculations [12]. The reference line (*i.e.* edge before loading) was defined between -8mm and +8mm of the eulerian variable Z (see Fig 5c). It was discretized by 30 elements associated to a B-spline shape functions basis.

The software used to perform 2D-DIC [30] and Edge detection [12] is called Ufreckles. It has been developed by Réthoré.

The coupled edge detection / 2D-DIC approach needs two steps. The first step allows for calibrating the intrinsic parameters of the optical system used for 2D-DIC. Then the displacements and strain measured by 2D-DIC are corrected by the out-of-plane displacements measured by the edge detection measurement.

4.2.1 CALIBRATION OF THE OPTICAL MODEL

Several authors [31, 32] reported the effect of out-of-plane motion on in-plane displacements. These displacements can be corrected as proposed by Felipe-Sesé et al. in [33] using the dedicated experiment detailed in Fig. 7. The test aimed to calibrate the initial distance between the object and the optical system d_0 , and the position of the intersection between the optical axis (OA) and the detector plane $O(-d_i, x_c, y_c)$.

1
2
3 Cam 1 (i.e. Fig. 5a) was mounted onto a sliding caliper and was translated in order to
4 induce in-plane displacements u_r . When sliding the caliper, the 2D-DIC measures the virtual
5 displacement of the measured point M in the detector plane $((x_2 - x_1)\vec{x} + (y_2 - y_1)\vec{y})$. This
6 virtual displacement depends on three parameters d_0 , x_c and y_c . Considering a linearized
7 optical system model, the virtual displacement can be deduced from system equations (8).
8
9
10

$$\begin{aligned} d_0 \cdot (x_1 - x_c) &= (d_0 - u_r) \cdot (x_2 - x_c) \\ d_0 \cdot (y_1 - y_c) &= (d_0 - u_r) \cdot (y_2 - y_c) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

11
12
13
14
15
16
17 The optical system was translated up to a maximum amplitude $u_r = 1 \text{ mm}$ then
18 moved back to the initial position with 0.1 mm displacement steps. Parameters are determined
19 using a least squares minimization between the displacements calculated with the optical
20 model and the 2D-DIC. Resulting parameters d_0 , x_c and y_c were respectively identified as
21 613 mm, -122 px and -62 px.
22
23
24

25 The virtual strain associated to the virtual displacement is depicted as a function of the
26 normalized in-plane displacement u_r in Fig. 8. The linearization of the optical system model
27 is validated at least for an in-plane displacement u_r of 1mm. Note that the optical system used
28 in these experiments is not strongly affected by the out-of-plane displacement.
29
30
31
32

33 4.2.2 CORRECTION OF THE CLADDING BALLOONING

34
35 Fig. 9 illustrates the description of the combined edge detection / 2D-DIC approach.

36 2D-DIC was performed on the Region of Interest (white box in Fig. 5b) of the pictures
37 shot during Test B. Displacements and strains in both x and y directions of the detector plane
38 were extracted along the yellow line.
39
40
41

42 The edge detection provided the radial displacement u_r of every point of the deformed
43 edge (Fig. 10) in the eulerian coordinate system (Fig 5c). The resulting point Q' in the
44 detector plane corresponding to point M' can be calculated using equation (9) where $M =$
45 d_i/d_0 is the magnification of the optical system.
46
47
48
49
50
51

$$y' - y_c = \frac{M \cdot d_0}{d_0 - u_r} \cdot (Z - Z_c). \quad (9)$$

The initial position Q_0 of the deformed point Q' was determined in the detector plane using the 2D-DIC results as follows:

$$y_0 - y_c = y' - y_c - u_y(Q'), \quad (10)$$

with $u_y(Q')$, the displacement of Q measured by the 2D-DIC in the y direction of the detector plane.

The initial axial position $Z_0 - Z_c$ of the deformed point M' was finally calculated using equation (11):

$$Z_0 - Z_c = \frac{y_0 - y_c}{M} \quad (11)$$

The axial and radial displacements of each point of the yellow line during the transformation from the initial to the deformed configurations were thus determined. The logarithmic strains were calculated using deformed curvilinear positions and their associated initial positions.

5 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 NIRT ASSESSMENT

5.1.1 UNCERTAINTIES RELATED TO THE THERMOCOUPLES MEASUREMENT

Five components were involved in the acquisition chain: a thermocouple wire, a LEMO connector, a compensation wire, a converter TEPI (BEP304 model) and a FlexTest SE controller. Each of the components is a source of error affecting the temperature uncertainties. Table 1 summarizes the manufacturers data.

TC wire	Compensation	BEP304	MTS FlexTest recorder
$0.004 T $	$\pm 2.5^\circ C$	$\pm 6^\circ C$	$< 3 \cdot 10^{-5} T $

Tab. 1: Acquisition chain uncertainties

The uncertainties induced by the BEP304 take into account the internal cold junction measurement. It has the highest influence on the temperature measurement uncertainties. This manufacturer data accounts for the heating time of the cold junction. Performing measurement once the converter behavior is stabilized can reduce the uncertainties.

A calibrator (Fluke 725 Multifunction Process Calibrator) was placed before the compensation wire for assessing errors due to the compensation wire combined with the converter. It simulated the temperature of a K-type thermocouple. Five tracks of the converter were tested. The measurements were performed after 1.5 operating hour of the converter. Temperature were imposed in a range of 720 to 880 °C temperature steps. The maximal error was 0.4% of the setting temperature, and the averaged error was 0.18%. The calibration of the NIRT relied on the thermocouple measurements. The errors related to the thermocouples acquisition chain were thus passed on the final temperature estimation.

5.1.2 TEST A : NIRT UNCERTAINTIES

The temperatures calculated using the calibrated radiometric model were compared to the thermocouples measurements during Test A (Fig. 3).

The parameters determined using the calibration process and the silicon sensor time exposure t_i are reported in Tab. 4 for each cycle.

	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3
t_i (ms)	70	30	14.2
K_1 (K)	$1.60 \cdot 10^4$	$1.66 \cdot 10^4$	$1.67 \cdot 10^4$
K_2 (GL)	$5.96 \cdot 10^8$	$4.34 \cdot 10^8$	$2.4 \cdot 10^8$
λ_e (nm)	897	869	862

Tab. 2: Radiometric model parameters calibrated during each heating

The effective wavelength λ_e was calculated using equation (6). Note that λ_e is decreasing with increasing temperature level as expected. The Digital Thermocouple (DT) and thermocouples (TC) measurements are plotted for the second temperature level cycle in Fig. 11a. The comparison between the NIRT and the thermocouple measurements are reported in Table 3 for each cycle.

Cycle	$ \Delta T/T _{mean}$ (%)	$ \Delta T/T _{max}$ (%)
1	0.25	0.7
2	0.14	0.54
3	0.12	0.6

Tab. 3: Comparison between thermocouples and NIRT for each cycle

Temperatures were calculated using the three radiometric models and grey level intensities ranging from 120 to 200. Results are plotted in Fig. 11b versus the grey levels normalized by their respective time exposure. The radiometric model continuity from one calibration to another is highlighted. It was expected because of the linearity between the pixel intensity and the time exposure.

The maximal difference on the temperature prediction compared to thermocouples measurements remained lower than 0.7% when considering the entire test data.

Finally, the uncertainties estimation of the NIRT method was inherent to the thermocouples measurements and remains lower than 0.7% of the true temperature and the averaged error was 0.32% of the true temperature.

5.2 TEST B : 2D-DIC ASSESSMENT

Several aspects of the 2D-DIC measurements will be discussed in the following. First, the influence of the setup on the 2D-DIC noise will be studied at room temperature and at high temperature (respectively at markers t_A and t_B in Fig. 4). Then, the error induced by the out-of-plane displacement will be regarded at different ballooning levels (markers t_1 to t_4 in Fig. 4) by using the combined 2D-DIC/edge detection approach.

5.2.1 ANALYSIS OF THE INFLUENCE OF NOISE IN 2D DIC MEASURE

At markers t_A and t_B , (respectively at room and high temperature), Cam 1 shot 30 pictures, under a constant thermal mechanical loading, for a noise analysis purpose. A stationary spatial thermal distribution was reached at t_B .

Fig. 12a shows the Grey level histogram of the ROI (red box, 1851×301 px²). The histogram is plotted considering all the data (i.e. the pixels grey level of all pictures associated to each marker). The first pictures of the sets t_A and t_B are also shown as an example of the effect of the heating on the speckle pattern. The heating results in a decrease of the contrast

between black and white speckles. The white speckles Grey levels diminished and were smoothed. It is worth mentioning that the test constraints induce a poor speckle pattern quality either at high or room temperature as the highest quality being a wide and uniform histogram.

2D-DIC was performed with these data sets. Fig. 12b shows the displacement histogram over the whole data sets t_A and t_B (i.e. the displacement of all the nodes of each pictures). Fig 12c and Fig. 12d depict the histograms of the strains respectively at room temperature and at high temperature. The mean values and the standard deviations of each histogram are summarized in Table 4. Note that the histograms include the DIC noise but also the physical displacements induced by the thermal mechanical loading noise (see Fig. 4). The increase of noise between room and high temperature can be explained by several reasons. The dynamic of the pictures are narrower at high temperature. Little residual smoke induced by the heating of the paint could affect the measurement. However, no mirage effect was observed presumably because of the combined effect of the induction volume heating and the argon sweeping.

	Room temperature t_A			High temperature t_B		
	Displacement [mm]	Axial strain	Hoop strain	Displacement [mm]	Axial strain	Hoop strain
Mean Value	$-1.36 \cdot 10^{-20}$	$-3.65 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$-3.14 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$5.46 \cdot 10^{-20}$	$7.15 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$9.37 \cdot 10^{-5}$
Standard Deviation	$1.85 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$2.05 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$3.49 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$4.03 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$4.50 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$6.71 \cdot 10^{-4}$

Tab. 4: 2D-DIC noises at room and high temperature

Hence, the strain uncertainty at high temperature is less than $1.0 \cdot 10^{-4}$. The strain noise is less than $1.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$. The identification process shown in Fig. 1 used the stationary strain rates profile along the axial position of the ROI at each mechanical loading plateau. These stationary strain rates are calculated over a Von Mises equivalent strain range that is typically higher than 0.01 and over more than 20 pictures. The strain range is far higher than the strain uncertainty. The 20 pictures are enough to smooth the noise effect.

5.2.2 CORRECTION OF THE CLADDING BALLOONING

The error of the 2D DIC measurements induced by the out-of-plane displacement is quantified in the following at different ballooning levels (markers t_1 to t_4 in Fig. 4) by using the combined 2D-DIC / edge detection approach. The marker t_4 is picked because of its extremely large ballooning state

The axial strain, calculated by 2D-DIC, and the curvilinear strain, calculated by the combined edge detection / 2D DIC approach, are plotted in Fig. 13a.

The correction effect is negligible for times $t_1 \rightarrow t_3$ but it becomes significant for time t_4 when the balloon is pronounced. After correction, the axial deformation is lowered in the middle of the specimen because of the out-of-plane displacement combined to a low curvature. The opposite phenomenon is observed at the sample regions that were no longer perpendicular to the optical axis. The in-plane projection induced an artefacted contribution to ε_{yy} .

The hoop strain levels were higher than those of axial strains. The tube curvature was not accounted for considering the low chord error induced by the Finite Element discretization of the circumference of the tube at the generator location. The hoop strains calculated using 2D-DIC were thus only corrected by subtracting the virtual strain related to the out-of-plane displacement (see Fig. 8). The 2D-DIC hoop strain and the corrected one are plotted versus the position Z in Fig. 13b. The correction is not significant in the hoop direction.

In [2], the equivalent Von Mises plastic strain was used for the FEMU based identification. The equivalent true strains were computed with and without the out-of-plane displacement correction. The error er defined in equation (12) is plotted in Fig. 13c at the 4 markers.

$$er^2 = \frac{(\varepsilon_{eq}^{2D} - \varepsilon_{eq}^{cor})^2}{(\varepsilon_{eq}^{cor})^2} \quad (12)$$

The error associated to the 2D-DIC was lower than 1% of the equivalent strains accounting for the out-of-plane displacement even when the balloon was pronounced.

6 CONCLUDING REMARKS

The combined experimental/numerical approach detailed in [2] for identifying the creep behavior of Fresh zirconium alloys under simulated LOCA conditions was assessed.

1
2
3 The paper focused on uncertainties and error quantification of the two key optical full field
4 measurement method: NIRT and 2D-DIC.
5

6 The NIRT uncertainties mainly results from the thermocouples acquisition chain used
7 for the calibration of the radiometric model. The physically based radiometric model tends to
8 lower these uncertainties during the calibration by correcting the discrepancies between
9 thermocouples. An uncertainty of 0.7% of the actual temperature was quantified.
10
11

12 2D-DIC measured the ballooning of the tube. A correction method is proposed to take
13 into account the out-of plane displacement of the tube during the ballooning. The method
14 relies on a combined 2D-DIC / edge detection approach.
15
16

17 Applied to the used optical system, the correction is lower than 1% of the equivalent plastic
18 strain even for a 20% increase of radius during the ballooning, value far higher than the ones
19 used in [2] for the identification process. However, in the test configuration, axial strains are
20 unaccurately estimated at this strain level and must be corrected from a radius increase of
21 10%. The proposed approach would have been particularly necessary for anisotropy
22 identification in multiple biaxial stress states as enables the setup.
23
24
25
26

27 The combined 2D-DIC / edge detection approach can be used with a single camera for
28 axisymmetric ballooning as during the above discussed testing conditions. It simplifies the
29 setup and test procedure compared to 3D DIC.
30
31
32
33
34

35 7 ACKNOWLEDGMENT

36
37
38 The study was performed in the framework of the PERFROI ANR project (n° ANR-11-
39 RSNR-0017-01). The authors would like to acknowledge all the participants of the project:
40 EDF, IRSN-SEREX, LEMTA, Ecole Centrale of Paris. The authors would also like to thank J.
41 Réthoré for the open access to the Ufreckles software and his caring help, and S. Comas-
42 Cardona for his kind assistance in the improvement of this paper.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Repetto, et al., *16th International Topical Meeting on Nuclear Reactor Thermalhydraulics*, **2015**.
- [2] D. Campello, et al., *IJSS*, **2017**, 115-116,190.
- [3] F. Nagase, T. Fuketa, *J NUCL SCI TECHNOL*, **2004**, 41 (7), 723
- [4] C. Bushy, K. Marsh, *Tech. Rep., Colorado Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit*, **1974**.
- [5] D. Kaddour, et al., *Scripta Mater*, **2004**, 51 (6), 515.
- [6] H. E. Rosinger, et al., *Tech Rep, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited*, **1978**.
- [7] M. Réocreux, E. S. de Martinville, *NED*, **1990**, 124 (3), 363.
- [8] E. Ho, S. Mac Ewen, *JOM*, **1983**, 35 (2), 25.
- [9] J. H. Kim, et al., *NED*, **2004**, 234, 157.
- [10] M. Sutton, et al., *IMAGE VISION COMPUT*, **1983**, 1 (3), 133. □
- [11] T. C. Chu, et al., *EXP MECH*, **1985**, 25 (3), 232. □
- [12] J. Réthoré, M. François, *OPT LASER ENG*, **2014**, 52, 145. □
- [13] G. Besnard, et al., *EXP MECH*, **2006**, 46 (6), 789. □
- [14] J. Réthoré, et al., *COMPUT METHOD APPL M*, **2007**, 196 (49), 5016. □
- [15] F. Hild, S. Roux, *Comptes Rendus Mécanique*, **2006**, 334 (1), 8. □
- [16] K. T. Kavanagh, R. W. Clough, *IJSS*, **1971**, 7 (1), 11. □
- [17] J. Réthoré, et al., *IJSS*, **2013**, 50 (1), 73. □
- [18] A. Maynadier, et al., *EXP MECH*, **2012**, 52 (3), 241. □
- [19] A. Chrysochoos, et al., *JSA*, **2008**, 43 (6), 411. □
- [20] F. Meriaudeau, et al., *OPT ENG*, **1996**, 35 (12), 3470. □
- [21] P. Saunders, T. Ricolfi, *TEMPMEKO*, 37, 329–334. □
- [22] T. Sentenac, et al., *IEEE T INSTRUM MEAS*, **2003**, 52 (1), 46. □
- [23] F. Meriaudeau, *IMAGE VISION COMPUT*, **2007**, 25 (7), 1124. □
- [24] P. Saunders, S. Bonsey, D. White, *HThP*, **1989**, 31 (1), 83. □
- [25] N. Tardif, et al., *NED*, **2011**, 241 (3), 755. □
- [26] B. Pan, et al., *MEAS SCI TECHNOL*, **2011**, 22 (1). □
- [27] B. Pan, et al., *OPT LASER TECHNOL*, **2012**, 44 (1), 204. □□
- [28] Y. Rotrou et al., *Quantitative Infra-Red Thermography Journal*, **2006**, 3 (1), 93. □
- [29] Y. Rotrou, *Ph.D. thesis*, Ecole nationale supérieure de l'aéronautique et de l'espace, **2006**. □□
- [30] J. Réthoré, *INT J NUMER METH ENG*, **2010**, 84 (6), 631. □
- [31] J. Réthoré et al., *OPT LASER ENG*, **2014**, 57, 20. □
- [32] M. Sutton et al., *OPT LASER ENG*, **2008**, 46 (10), 746. □
- [33] L. Felipe-Sesé et al., *OPT LASER ENG*, **2014**, 52, 66. □

□

1
2
3 FIG. 1: Summary of the identification process detailed in [2].

4 FIG. 2: Experimental setup

5
6 FIG. 3: Procedure Test A : Near Infrared Thermography assessment.

7 FIG. 4: Procedure Test B : 2D - DIC assessment. The dashed black lines are the setting point.

8
9 The plain lines are the measurements.

10 FIG. 5: Procedure Test B. a) Top view of the experimental setup – position of the cameras. b)

11 Picture of CAM1, 2D-DIC performed inside the white box, data extracted along the yellow

12 line. c) Picture of CAM2, Edge detection performed along the white line, edge in the initial

13
14 configuration.

15
16
17 FIG. 6: Procedure Test A. Pictures shot during the end of a heating with a 850°C setting point.

18 FIG. 7: Procedure Test B. Scheme of the experiment used to calibrate the optical system

19 parameters: d_0, x_c, y_c .

20 FIG. 8: Procedure Test B. Virtual in-plane strain versus the normalized out-of-plane

21 displacement u_r/r_0

22
23 FIG. 9: Procedure Test B. Scheme of the combined edge detection / 2D-DIC approach.

24 FIG. 10: Procedure Test B. Normalized out-of-plane displacement u_r/r_0 of each marker

25
26 versus the normalized axial coordinate Z/Z_0

27
28 FIG. 11: Procedure Test A a) Comparison NIRT – Thermocouples measurements for the

29 second cycle of Test A. b) Radiometric model identification – one model per thermal cycle.

30
31 FIG. 12: Procedure Test B. a) Grey level histograms of the sets of pictures associated to

32 markers t_A and t_B , respectively at room and high temperature (See Fig. 4). b) Displacement

33 histograms of the sets of pictures associated to markers t_A and t_B . c) Axial (ϵ_{yy}) and hoop

34 Strains (ϵ_{xx}) histograms related to marker t_A . d) Axial (ϵ_{yy}) and hoop Strains (ϵ_{xx}) histograms

35
36 related to marker t_B .

37
38
39 FIG. 13: Comparison between the 2D-DIC and the combined edge detection / 2D-DIC

40 approach, (a) axial strain, (b) hoop strain, (c) J2 equivalent strain.

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




FIG. 1: Summary of the identification process detailed in [2].

659x360mm (600 x 600 DPI)

er Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
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




FIG. 2: Experimental setup

1057x793mm (72 x 72 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
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




FIG. 3: Procedure Test A : Near Infrared Thermography assessment.

184x134mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Review





FIG. 4: Procedure Test B : 2D - DIC assessment. The dashed black lines are the setting point. The plain lines are the measurements.

286x262mm (300 x 300 DPI)



21 FIG. 5: Procedure Test B. a) Top view of the experimental setup – position of the cameras. b) Picture of
22 CAM1, 2D-DIC performed inside the white box, data extracted along the yellow line. c) Picture of CAM2,
23 Edge detection performed along the white line, edge in the initial configuration.

24 169x71mm (300 x 300 DPI)

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

Peer Review




FIG. 6: Procedure Test A. Pictures shot during the end of a heating with a 850°C setting point.

69x23mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Peer Review




FIG. 7: Procedure Test B. Scheme of the experiment used to calibrate the optical system parameters: d_o, x_c, y_c .

134x49mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
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




FIG. 8: Procedure Test B. Virtual in-plane strain versus the normalized out-of-plane displacement u_r/r_0

190x158mm (300 x 300 DPI)




FIG. 9: Procedure Test B. Scheme of the combined edge detection / 2D-DIC approach.

131x52mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
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




FIG. 10: Procedure Test B. Normalized out-of-plane displacement u_r/r_0 of each marker versus the normalized axial coordinate Z/Z_0

190x158mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
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




FIG. 11: Procedure Test A a) Comparison NIRT – Thermocouples measurements for the second cycle of Test A. b) Radiometric model identification – one model per thermal cycle.

197x85mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Peer Review




FIG. 12: Procedure Test B. a) Grey level histograms of the sets of pictures associated to markers t_A and t_B, respectively at room and high temperature (See Fig. 4). b) Displacement histograms of the sets of pictures associated to markers t_A and t_B. c) Axial (ε_{yy}) and hoop Strains (ε_{xx}) histograms related to marker t_A. d) Axial (ε_{yy}) and hoop Strains (ε_{xx}) histograms related to marker t_B.

381x317mm (300 x 300 DPI)





FIG. 13: Comparison between the 2D-DIC and the combined edge detection / 2D-DIC approach, (a) axial strain, (b) hoop strain, (c) J2 equivalent strain.

381x310mm (300 x 300 DPI)



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
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