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# Bad Estimates as a Function of Exceeding the MCNP Random Number Stride 

Thomas E. Booth

LA-UR-14-DRAFT, Feb 14, 2014


#### Abstract

Examples of bad MCNP estimates resulting from exceeding the MCNP random number stride are given for a simple infinite medium problem.


## 1 Introduction

There have been a number of informal assertions that exceeding the MCNP random number stride does not result in bad estimates. There apparently are no theoretical justifications ever presented for these assertions. Often, it is simply asserted, as apparently obvious, that no bad estimates will result because the random numbers reused when exceeding the stride will be "used for different purposes" in "real problems." The recent discussion concerning this random number stride issue was on the MCNP forum on January 9, 2014. Typical assertions over the years have been similar to Brian Kiedrowski's [1].
"Like the choice of the random number seed, the choice of the stride is entirely arbitrary. The stride does need to be large enough such that the random numbers will not be used for the same thing."

Note several things:

1. Though this quote is out of context, the main assertion here is typically what people remember and repeat; the context is often insufficiently emphasized or even not mentioned at all.
2. The context is sometimes implicitly assumed rather than explicitly stated.
3. The authors of the statements may intend that their statements be interpreted for the typical cases that the authors have in mind. The proper interpretation of the statements is often inadequately conveyed.
4. There is a lot of leeway in the terms "large enough" and "for the same thing." A number of people have asserted that exceeding the stride did not matter using similarly vague terminology.

The purpose of this work is to give a simple infinite medium transport example for which MCNP flux tallies depend on the stride. Note that the example cannot be said to prove or disprove the imprecise lore about random number strides. It is not the purpose of this note to debate whether the examples given meet the "large enough" and "for the same thing" criteria. It is not unlikely that the lore may be valid in most cases. On the other hand, perhaps the examples show that caveat emptor is a reasonable approach to the lore in some circumstances.

## 2 The Test Problem

The test problem is an infinite medium fission system as shown below.

```
infinite medium fission system
    1 1 -1.0 -1
    2 1
    1 so 1.e11
mode n
imp:n 1 0
m1 92239.70c 4.45 1001.70c 2 8016.70c 1
sdef erg=2.0
f4:n 1
t4 1e4 1e5 1e6 1e7 1e8 1e9 1e10 1e11 1e12
vol 1 0
nps 1000000
cut:n 2.e9 j 0 0
rand gen=2 stride= 1111152917
print
```

There were two sets of runs; one set of million particle runs and one set of ten million particle runs. Within a set, the only difference was the random number stride that was used.

## 3 One million particle runs

Tables 1 and 2 show early time and late time MCNP results for the 1 million particle runs. The reference case is with a stride of 111152917 ; this reference stride was never exceeded. Note that a stride of 1000 shows a large difference from the reference case. In particular there is almost a factor of two difference in the $2 \times 10^{9}$ time bin. That is $2.91570 \mathrm{E}+04$ (reference) versus
$1.58374 \mathrm{E}+04$. Even at strides of 5000 and 10000 in the $2 \times 10^{9}$ time bin, the results look suspicious. Note that the one million particle run with a stride of 2000 did not pass MCNP's statistical tests. The rest of the one million particle runs passed the statistical tests. Here is MCNP output detail for the run with stride of 2000.

results of 10 statistical checks for the estimated answer for the tally fluctuation chart (tfc) bin of tally 4

| tfc bin behavior | $\begin{aligned} & \text {--mean-- } \\ & \text { behavior } \end{aligned}$ | value | -relati <br> decreas | $\begin{aligned} & \text { error--------- } \\ & \text { decrease rate } \end{aligned}$ | ----variance of the variance---value decrease decrease rate |  |  | --figure of merit-value behavior |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text {-pdf- } \\ & \text { slope } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| desired | random | <0.10 | yes | 1/sqrt (nps) | <0.10 | yes | $1 / \mathrm{nps}$ | constant | random | >3.00 |
| observed | random | 0.02 | no | no | 0.00 | yes | no | decrease | random | 3.11 |
| passed? | yes | yes | no | no | yes | yes | no | no | yes | yes |

warning. the tally in the tally fluctuation chart bin did not pass 4 of the 10 statistical checks.

| nps | mean | error | vov | slope | fom |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 64000 | $6.9068 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0566 | 0.0181 | 3.4 | 24 |
| 128000 | $7.7291 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0372 | 0.0068 | 10.0 | 25 |
| 192000 | $7.8675 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0305 | 0.0050 | 10.0 | 25 |
| 256000 | $8.0300 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0280 | 0.0063 | 4.7 | 21 |
| 320000 | $7.8963 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0249 | 0.0048 | 2.7 | 22 |
| 384000 | $7.8227 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0228 | 0.0038 | 5.6 | 22 |
| 448000 | $8.1384 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0213 | 0.0030 | 10.0 | 21 |
| 512000 | $8.1112 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0200 | 0.0025 | 10.0 | 21 |
| 576000 | $8.3744 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0196 | 0.0029 | 10.0 | 19 |
| 640000 | $8.8009 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0198 | 0.0036 | 5.9 | 16 |
| 704000 | $8.7093 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0187 | 0.0033 | 5.4 | 16 |
| 768000 | $9.2101 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0199 | 0.0048 | 6.1 | 12 |
| 832000 | $9.2108 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0189 | 0.0043 | 5.2 | 13 |
| 896000 | $9.2216 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0182 | 0.0039 | 6.1 | 13 |
| 960000 | $9.2512 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0174 | 0.0035 | 3.1 | 13 |
| 1000000 | $9.2152 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0170 | 0.0034 | 3.1 | 13 |

Table 1: Early times on 1 million particle runs

|  | time | time | time | time | times stride |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| stride | $1.0000 \mathrm{E}+04$ | $1.0000 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $1.0000 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.0000 \mathrm{E}+07$ | exceeded |
| 1000 | $8.29471 \mathrm{E}+030.0049$ | $1.58804 \mathrm{E}+040.0111$ | $2.52317 \mathrm{E}+030.0387$ | $1.21254 \mathrm{E}+030.0446$ | 283984 |
| 2000 | $8.33418 \mathrm{E}+030.0049$ | $1.66519 \mathrm{E}+040.0115$ | $3.89681 \mathrm{E}+030.0505$ | $1.38708 \mathrm{E}+030.0520$ | 199366 |
| 5000 | $8.42154 \mathrm{E}+030.0050$ | $1.75335 \mathrm{E}+040.0115$ | $3.64764 \mathrm{E}+030.0462$ | $1.53010 \mathrm{E}+030.0577$ | 124568 |
| 10000 | $8.37007 \mathrm{E}+030.0050$ | $1.71213 \mathrm{E}+040.0115$ | $3.45582 \mathrm{E}+030.0463$ | $1.45445 \mathrm{E}+030.0508$ | 87643 |
| 20000 | $8.38088 \mathrm{E}+030.0050$ | $1.77812 \mathrm{E}+040.0114$ | $3.77033 \mathrm{E}+030.0446$ | $1.55431 \mathrm{E}+030.0500$ | 61521 |
| 50000 | $8.34281 \mathrm{E}+030.0050$ | $1.75441 \mathrm{E}+040.0116$ | $3.59448 \mathrm{E}+030.0429$ | $1.53030 \mathrm{E}+030.0491$ | 38164 |
| 111152917 | $8.42560 \mathrm{E}+030.0050$ | $1.76903 \mathrm{E}+040.0116$ | $3.64263 \mathrm{E}+030.0401$ | $1.52114 \mathrm{E}+030.0505$ | 0 |

Table 2: Late times on 1 million particle runs

|  | time | time | time | time | times stride |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| stride | $1.0000 \mathrm{E}+08$ | $1.0000 \mathrm{E}+09$ | $2.0000 \mathrm{E}+09$ | total | exceeded |
| 1000 | $6.90403 \mathrm{E}+030.0243$ | $3.22593 \mathrm{E}+040.0197$ | $1.58374 \mathrm{E}+040.0308$ | $8.29116 \mathrm{E}+040.0144$ | 283984 |
| 2000 | $7.66249 \mathrm{E}+030.0238$ | $3.53743 \mathrm{E}+040.0218$ | $1.88448 \mathrm{E}+040.0307$ | $9.21515 \mathrm{E}+040.0170$ | 199366 |
| 5000 | $8.43538 \mathrm{E}+030.0262$ | $3.94349 \mathrm{E}+040.0222$ | $2.59983 \mathrm{E}+040.0322$ | $1.05001 \mathrm{E}+050.0177$ | 124568 |
| 10000 | $8.68752 \mathrm{E}+030.0269$ | $4.04040 \mathrm{E}+040.0236$ | $2.72949 \mathrm{E}+040.0324$ | $1.06788 \mathrm{E}+050.0182$ | 87643 |
| 20000 | $8.76767 \mathrm{E}+030.0264$ | $4.31024 \mathrm{E}+040.0227$ | $2.84519 \mathrm{E}+040.0312$ | $1.11809 \mathrm{E}+050.0179$ | 61521 |
| 50000 | $8.94740 \mathrm{E}+030.0266$ | $4.31878 \mathrm{E}+040.0233$ | $2.89412 \mathrm{E}+040.0319$ | $1.12088 \mathrm{E}+050.0184$ | 38164 |
| 111152917 | $9.03989 \mathrm{E}+030.0275$ | $4.35742 \mathrm{E}+040.0226$ | $2.91570 \mathrm{E}+040.0299$ | $1.13051 \mathrm{E}+050.0177$ | 0 |

## 4 Ten million particle runs

Tables 3 and 4 show early time and late time MCNP results for the 10 million particle runs. The reference case is with a stride of 111152917 ; this reference stride was never exceeded. Note that runs below a stride of 2000 show significant differences from the reference case. Note that all the ten million particle runs with a strides 256 and smaller did not pass MCNP's statistical tests. The rest of the ten million particle runs passed the statistical tests. Here is MCNP output detail for the run with stride of 256 :


| time: | $1.0000 \mathrm{E}+09$ | $2.0000 \mathrm{E}+09$ | total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $3.92528 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0069 | $2.43567 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0106 |

results of 10 statistical checks for the estimated answer for the tally fluctuation chart (tfc) bin of tally
4

| tfc bin <br> behavior | --mean-- <br> behavior | value | decrease | decrease rate | ----variance of the variance---- |  |  | --figure of merit-- |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text {-pdf- } \\ & \text { slope } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| desired | random | <0.10 | yes | 1/sqrt(nps) | $<0.10$ | yes | 1/nps | constant | random | >3.00 |
| observed | random | 0.01 | no | no | 0.00 | yes | no | decrease | random | 2.60 |
| passed? | yes | yes | no | no | yes | yes | no | no | yes | no |

warning. the tally in the tally fluctuation chart bin did not pass 5 of the 10 statistical checks.

| nps | mean | error | vov | slope | fom |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 512000 | $6.7548 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0191 | 0.0026 | 10.0 | 15 |
| 1024000 | $7.7226 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0132 | 0.0009 | 10.0 | 13 |
| 1536000 | $7.8037 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0110 | 0.0007 | 10.0 | 13 |
| 2048000 | $7.9415 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0101 | 0.0008 | 10.0 | 11 |
| 2560000 | $7.9253 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0089 | 0.0006 | 10.0 | 11 |
| 3072000 | $8.0405 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0082 | 0.0005 | 10.0 | 11 |
| 3584000 | $8.2885 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0077 | 0.0004 | 10.0 | 10 |
| 4096000 | $8.2978 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0072 | 0.0003 | 10.0 | 10 |
| 4608000 | $8.4691 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0070 | 0.0003 | 10.0 | $9.7 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 5120000 | $8.8871 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0070 | 0.0004 | 10.0 | $8.3 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 5632000 | $8.7596 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0066 | 0.0004 | 10.0 | $8.6 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 6144000 | $9.1585 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0070 | 0.0006 | 10.0 | $6.7 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 6656000 | $9.2033 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0066 | 0.0005 | 10.0 | $6.8 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 7168000 | $9.2145 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0064 | 0.0005 | 10.0 | $6.8 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 7680000 | $9.2184 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0061 | 0.0004 | 10.0 | $7.0 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 8192000 | $9.3000 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0059 | 0.0004 | 10.0 | $6.9 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 8704000 | $9.3956 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0057 | 0.0003 | 10.0 | $7.1 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 9216000 | $9.4758 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0.0055 | 0.0003 | 10.0 | $7.2 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 9728000 | $1.0208 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 0.0058 | 0.0004 | 2.6 | $6.1 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 10000000 | $1.0179 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 0.0057 | 0.0004 | 2.6 | $6.2 \mathrm{E}+00$ |

Table 3: Early times on 10 million particle runs

|  | time |  | time | time <br> stride | $1.0000 \mathrm{E}+04$ | $1.0000 \mathrm{E}+05$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Table 4: Late times on 10 million particle runs

|  | time | time | time | time | times stride |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| stride | $1.0000 \mathrm{E}+08$ | $1.0000 \mathrm{E}+09$ | $2.0000 \mathrm{E}+09$ | total | exceeded |
| 4 | $8.94582 \mathrm{E}+030.0069$ | $3.65851 \mathrm{E}+040.0062$ | $3.75593 \mathrm{E}+040.0062$ | $1.10173 \mathrm{E}+050.0043$ | 10000000 |
| 8 | $6.15031 \mathrm{E}+030.0075$ | $2.94001 \mathrm{E}+040.0060$ | $2.28253 \mathrm{E}+040.0075$ | $8.38698 \mathrm{E}+040.0043$ | 9948877 |
| 16 | $4.71375 \mathrm{E}+030.0079$ | $2.27866 \mathrm{E}+040.0061$ | $1.36935 \mathrm{E}+040.0090$ | $6.51806 \mathrm{E}+040.0043$ | 9897673 |
| 32 | $6.90231 \mathrm{E}+030.0079$ | $3.02711 \mathrm{E}+040.0061$ | $1.55182 \mathrm{E}+040.0082$ | $8.04492 \mathrm{E}+040.0044$ | 9756833 |
| 64 | $6.50453 \mathrm{E}+030.0078$ | $3.15383 \mathrm{E}+040.0062$ | $1.49857 \mathrm{E}+040.0091$ | $8.01119 \mathrm{E}+040.0045$ | 9359642 |
| 128 | $7.63931 \mathrm{E}+030.0078$ | $3.48216 \mathrm{E}+040.0068$ | $1.71896 \mathrm{E}+040.0101$ | $8.86312 \mathrm{E}+040.0050$ | 8246198 |
| 256 | $7.78633 \mathrm{E}+030.0076$ | $3.92528 \mathrm{E}+040.0069$ | $2.43567 \mathrm{E}+040.0106$ | $1.01791 \mathrm{E}+050.0057$ | 5845470 |
| 512 | $8.15965 \mathrm{E}+030.0083$ | $3.96555 \mathrm{E}+040.0070$ | $2.62217 \mathrm{E}+040.0099$ | $1.04709 \mathrm{E}+050.0055$ | 3941714 |
| 1000 | $8.48283 \mathrm{E}+030.0083$ | $4.13028 \mathrm{E}+040.0073$ | $2.68425 \mathrm{E}+040.0098$ | $1.07112 \mathrm{E}+050.0056$ | 2840818 |
| 2000 | $8.57010 \mathrm{E}+030.0084$ | $4.30759 \mathrm{E}+040.0072$ | $2.82495 \mathrm{E}+040.0097$ | $1.10965 \mathrm{E}+050.0056$ | 1994426 |
| 5000 | $8.73097 \mathrm{E}+030.0084$ | $4.29361 \mathrm{E}+040.0074$ | $2.89770 \mathrm{E}+040.0102$ | $1.11426 \mathrm{E}+050.0058$ | 1248496 |
| 10000 | $8.76775 \mathrm{E}+030.0084$ | $4.38078 \mathrm{E}+040.0074$ | $2.91971 \mathrm{E}+040.0100$ | $1.12655 \mathrm{E}+050.0058$ | 877926 |
| 20000 | $8.67877 \mathrm{E}+030.0082$ | $4.36380 \mathrm{E}+040.0072$ | $2.93541 \mathrm{E}+040.0099$ | $1.12478 \mathrm{E}+050.0057$ | 615692 |
| 50000 | $8.67245 \mathrm{E}+030.0083$ | $4.30747 \mathrm{E}+040.0072$ | $2.92431 \mathrm{E}+040.0100$ | $1.11911 \mathrm{E}+050.0057$ | 383460 |
| 111152917 | $8.77685 \mathrm{E}+030.0083$ | $4.28879 \mathrm{E}+040.0072$ | $2.92135 \mathrm{E}+040.0099$ | $1.11749 \mathrm{E}+050.0057$ | 0 |

## 5 Summary

This note has shown that bad MCNP estimates are sometimes obtained when the random number stride is exceeded. Five things are worth noting

1. Erroneous results were obtained for strides smaller than a few thousand.
2. Very early versions of MCNP had a default stride in the range of 4000 .
3. The bad estimates were apparent only in runs for which the stride was exceeded on a significant fraction of the particles. Preumably an MCNP user would increase the stride if the stride were being so routinely exceeded. In this sense, the tests reported here would hopefully be unrealistic in practice.
4. Although not the main point of this study, note the second and higher score moments estimates are even more problematic than the mean score estimates, as often indicated by the failure to pass MCNP's statistical tests. A look at the two FOM tables presented herein shows erratic behavior.
5. The author believes that is probably possible to construct examples of bad mean estimates when the random number stride is exceeded relatively rarely, say only $1 \%$ of the time.
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