International Journal of Scientific Engineering and Science
Volume 9, Issue 3, pp. 149-153, 2025.
ISSN (Online): 2456-7361

Technologies for Enhancing the Safety of Next-Generation Nuclear Reactors

Sagarkumar Soni
Senior Nuclear Engineer, Duke Energy Company
Charlotte, North Carolina, USA

Abstract— *This article explores the cutting-edge approaches and technological innovations critical to enhancing the safety of next-generation (Gen-IV) nuclear reactors. It begins by examining the evolution of physical protection systems, moving from traditional "guns, gates, and guards" methods toward integrated security architectures that emphasize "security-by-design" and "defense-in-depth." The text then highlights the pivotal role of advanced materials—including ferritic/martensitic steels, austenitic stainless steels, oxide dispersion strengthened (ODS) steels, and nickel-based alloys—in ensuring long-term structural integrity under the extreme conditions (high temperatures, elevated neutron doses, corrosive coolants) characteristic of Gen-IV reactors. Emphasis is placed on material behavior under transient load conditions, the challenges of void swelling and embrittlement, and innovative manufacturing technologies such as additive processes and grain boundary engineering. Finally, the study discusses how converging safety and security considerations at the design stage—through remote monitoring, real-time material accountancy, and improved containment barriers—can significantly reduce operational costs and bolster protection against both accidents and malicious acts. The analysis provides a comprehensive framework for future research and development, underscoring the importance of an interdisciplinary approach that aligns materials science, nuclear engineering, and advanced security strategies.*

Keywords— *Next-generation reactors, Gen-IV, security-by-design, advanced materials, oxide dispersion strengthened steels, safety-by-design, defense-in-depth, nuclear security.*

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, the increasing global demand for energy—coupled with the urgency of mitigating carbon emissions—has thrust nuclear power back into the spotlight as a reliable and low-carbon energy source [1]. The next generation of nuclear reactors, commonly referred to as Generation IV (Gen-IV) systems, are envisioned to surpass the safety, efficiency, and sustainability of their predecessors [2]. These advanced reactors operate at higher temperatures, often involve fast neutron spectra, and may utilize innovative coolants such as molten salts or lead–bismuth eutectics [3]. Despite notable design enhancements, these novel conditions intensify the challenges of ensuring a robust security framework and reliable structural materials, which are paramount to preventing catastrophic failures, guarding against malicious activities, and maintaining public trust in nuclear energy [4].

Early-generation nuclear power plants employed a "guns, gates, and guards" approach that focused on perimeter security and human surveillance [5]. Over time, escalating concerns about terrorism, insider threats, and the proliferation of nuclear materials prompted a shift toward layered defense-in-depth concepts [6, 7]. Aghara & Peel [4] have demonstrated that high-level regulatory frameworks, such as the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material (CPPNM) and its Amendment, guide the overall security requirements but leave room for adaptation to emerging reactor designs.

From a materials standpoint, Murty & Charit [8] underscore the limitations of existing alloys—originally used in Generation II/III reactors—when subjected to higher temperatures and elevated neutron doses. Conventional zirconium-based claddings, for example, exhibit increased hydride formation and swelling at temperatures beyond 350–400°C, rendering them less viable for high-temperature applications [9]. Similarly, austenitic stainless steels may suffer from radiation-induced segregation and void swelling under fast-spectrum conditions [10], whereas ferritic/martensitic steels, while exhibiting lower swelling, can degrade in terms of ductility and toughness at high dose rates [11]. To address these concerns, researchers have investigated oxide-dispersion-strengthened (ODS) steels that incorporate fine oxide particles acting as sinks for radiation-induced defects [12]. Nonetheless, full qualification of ODS steels, nickel-based superalloys, and ceramic-based composites remains an open challenge [8, 13].

Current academic and industrial efforts also explore new security paradigms—"security-by-design" and advanced digital monitoring—to integrate physical protection strategies with intrinsic safety features [14]. Although these developments suggest a promising synergy between reactor safety and security, a comprehensive model that merges high-temperature materials performance, real-time monitoring, and automated response protocols is still under development [4]. Hence, the literature points toward a clear need to combine advanced materials research with novel security approaches tailored to Gen-IV environments, but a unifying framework connecting all these advances remains insufficiently articulated.

While multiple research groups have concentrated on either the materials science aspect—especially regarding high-temperature creep, irradiation-induced embrittlement, and corrosion—or on advanced security frameworks, an integrative approach that addresses both domains cohesively is lacking. The majority of published works tend to isolate materials challenges (e.g., void swelling, phase stability) from the system-wide security requirements (e.g., real-time threat detection, cyber-physical integration). This separation creates a scientific gap: understanding how materials degradation under extreme conditions might interplay with evolving security architectures and how these two fields can reinforce each other through design optimization.

This study aims to develop a unified conceptual model for enhancing the safety of next-generation nuclear reactors by coupling advanced materials selection and design (“materials-by-design”) with integrated security measures (“security-by-design”). The objective is to propose and substantiate a framework that ensures both physical and operational robustness under Gen-IV conditions, thereby reducing overall vulnerabilities and lifecycle costs.

II. EVOLUTION OF SECURITY APPROACHES IN NEXT-GENERATION REACTOR PROJECTS

The Generation IV (Gen-IV) reactor initiative encompasses a range of advanced nuclear energy systems that aim to improve upon previous reactor generations in terms of safety, sustainability, and proliferation resistance [2, 4]. Six main reactor designs—Gas-cooled Fast Reactor (GFR), Lead-cooled Fast Reactor (LFR), Molten Salt Reactor (MSR), Sodium-cooled Fast Reactor (SFR), Very High Temperature Reactor (VHTR), and Supercritical Water-cooled Reactor (SCWR)—stand at the forefront of current research and development [8, 15].

These systems differ significantly in coolant type, neutron spectrum, and thermal regime. GFR and LFR both employ a fast neutron spectrum, with helium or lead-based coolants, respectively, whereas MSR typically utilizes molten fluoride salts in a thermal or sometimes fast neutron configuration [2]. The SFR relies on liquid sodium as coolant, also operating in the fast spectrum. In contrast, the VHTR uses helium under a thermal neutron spectrum and can reach core outlet temperatures exceeding 900°C [16]. The SCWR bridges the gap with supercritical water as the coolant; it can be designed for either thermal or fast spectrum operation and outputs temperatures up to approximately 620°C [8]. Table 1 provides a concise comparison of these key parameters.

TABLE 1. Comparative analysis of generation IV reactor designs

Reactor Type	Neutron Spectrum	Coolant	Core Outlet Temp. (°C)	Notable Features
GFR	Fast	Helium	~850	High-temperature operation; direct Brayton cycle potential
LFR	Fast	Lead or Lead–Bismuth Eutectic	550–800	Low chemical reactivity; high boiling point; advanced material challenges
MSR	Thermal / Fast	Molten fluoride salts	700–800	Liquid fuel (in many designs); online fuel processing
SFR	Fast	Sodium	~550	Proven fast reactor experience (e.g., BN-series, Phénix); sodium–water reactivity
VHTR	Thermal	Helium	>900	High outlet temperatures; potential hydrogen cogeneration
SCWR	Thermal / Fast	Supercritical water	350–620	High thermal efficiency; evolutionary design from water-cooled reactors

The overall technological vision for Gen-IV reactors focuses on *Evolutionary and Innovative Designs* (EIDs) and modular construction. Smaller modular units (e.g., certain LFR and MSR concepts) can be factory-fabricated and transported to the site, reducing on-site construction time and potentially lowering capital costs [4, 17]. Additionally, passive safety systems are increasingly integrated into these designs to diminish reliance on external power sources and operator interventions [18]. The modular approach also facilitates incremental capacity addition and offers potentially enhanced security configurations via standardized physical protection measures [15].

The original paradigm of nuclear security, dating back to the 1960s, was predominantly characterized by the so-called “guns, gates, and guards” approach [4, 5]. Facilities relied on perimeter defenses, armed personnel, and stringent access control to deter intruders. Although effective to a degree, this model rested heavily on manual oversight and was vulnerable to increasingly sophisticated threats.

Over the past few decades, new challenges such as insider threats, cyberattacks, and terrorism have necessitated a broader view of security [6]. Gen-IV reactors must incorporate advanced detection systems that utilize automation, data analytics, and machine learning to identify abnormal behaviors or intrusions [14]. Such measures go beyond physical barriers, integrating surveillance, intelligent decision-making algorithms, and remote operations to minimize the human factor’s inherent risks [19].

An emerging principle in modern nuclear facility protection is “security-by-design,” whereby security considerations are built into the reactor layout, materials selection, and control systems from the earliest design stages [4]. This approach parallels the well-established safety-by-design philosophy, aiming to provide multiple, redundant barriers against both external and internal threats. Defense-in-depth is achieved through progressive layers of sensors, hardened structures, and contingency response protocols. As a result, the plant’s security architecture benefits from better detection capabilities, increased delay mechanisms for adversaries, and more time for intervention [2, 14].

The Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material (CPPNM), originally adopted in 1980, and its 2005 Amendment, are central to the international legal framework for nuclear security [4]. Alongside the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism (ICSANT), these treaties mandate states to implement stringent protective measures for nuclear materials and facilities, establishing baseline responsibilities for Gen-IV security. Additional guidance is provided through the IAEA Nuclear Security Series [6], covering risk assessment, response planning, and international cooperation.

As reactor designs evolve toward higher temperatures, novel coolants, and advanced fuel cycles, existing regulatory structures often lag behind these technological developments [8]. Many national laws, traditionally focused on light-water reactors (LWRs), may be overly prescriptive or may lack provisions for accommodating integrated security systems, on-line refueling, or specialized transportable modules [4]. Consequently, national authorities must adapt licensing and oversight processes to account for new operational paradigms, including the management of possibly higher-enriched fuels (e.g., high-assay low-enriched uranium) in certain Gen-IV concepts [9].

Innovative projects, such as molten salt reactors with continuous fuel reprocessing or very high-temperature reactors aimed at cogenerating hydrogen, face added layers of regulatory scrutiny [16]. Regulators need to evaluate not only radiological safety but also potential proliferation pathways introduced by unconventional fuel forms and their processing. Delays or uncertainties in licensing can pose significant barriers to the timely deployment of Gen-IV systems [14]. Moreover, states with limited historical experience in nuclear power must develop new institutional expertise, further complicating the global licensing landscape [2].

III. MATERIALS TECHNOLOGIES AS THE BASIS FOR ENHANCED SAFETY

A core challenge in next-generation (Gen-IV) reactors is ensuring that structural materials can endure higher operating temperatures, greater neutron doses, and potentially corrosive media without compromising safety or reliability [4, 8]. Advances in metallurgy and materials science—coupled with rigorous testing under simulated reactor conditions—are critical to achieving the robustness demanded by these novel systems.

Among the various classes of metallic materials, Ferritic/Martensitic (F–M) steels (with 9–12% Cr) have garnered significant attention due to their low swelling rates under fast neutron irradiation [9]. Their tempered martensite structure exhibits relatively high resistance to radiation-induced void formation, making them appealing for core components in fast reactors [19]. However, they face challenges related to long-term creep rupture strength at elevated temperatures (above ~550°C) and irradiation embrittlement at moderate doses [13]. Mitigating temper embrittlement and maintaining ductility over extended operational cycles remain areas of active research [8].

Austenitic stainless steels (e.g., Type 316, 316LN, D9) exhibit good high-temperature creep properties and corrosion resistance, which have made them longstanding candidates for nuclear applications [9]. Despite their attractive mechanical performance, these alloys are prone to radiation-induced segregation (RIS) and void swelling, especially at high doses above ~40 displacements per atom (dpa) [13]. Phase instability (e.g., formation of σ phases, carbides) can also compromise performance in extended service [8]. Research efforts focus on microalloying, improved thermomechanical processing, and potential protective coatings to reduce swelling and improve phase stability.

Oxide Dispersion Strengthened (ODS) steels incorporate a fine dispersion of nanometric oxide particles (typically Y–Ti–O compounds) within a ferritic or ferritic–martensitic matrix. Mechanical alloying processes confer high-temperature strength and remarkable swelling resistance because these oxide particles act as efficient sinks for radiation-induced defects [12]. Nanoclusters effectively pin dislocations and impede grain boundary movement, thereby enhancing creep performance [8]. Challenges persist in large-scale manufacturing and weldability, necessitating ongoing research into fabrication techniques and design codes that account for their unique microstructure [4].

Nickel-based alloys (e.g., Alloy 617, IN740) have excellent creep and oxidation resistance at high temperatures, making them strong contenders for balance-of-plant components such as heat exchangers and superheater tubes in Gen-IV systems [8, 20]. Their main limitation lies in uncertain behavior under high-dose neutron irradiation, as most Ni-base alloys have been historically deployed in environments with lower neutron fluences [19]. Nonetheless, ongoing irradiation studies seek to characterize the embrittlement and segregation phenomena over extended operation [12]. Integration of Ni-base alloys within reactor cores may demand specialized design strategies to accommodate potential irradiation-induced property changes.

These metallic materials are also subject to nonstationary conditions involving startup–shutdown cycles, temperature gradients, and variations in neutron flux [8]. Such transients can accelerate damage mechanisms like creep–fatigue interactions and thermal shock. Prolonged irradiation can induce embrittlement via defect accumulation (vacancies, interstitials), helium buildup in certain alloys, and microchemical changes at grain boundaries [13]. The combination of thermal stress and radiation effects underscores the necessity for robust predictive models and systematic testing protocols.

TABLE 2. Comparative analysis of metallic materials for generation IV reactors [8, 9, 12, 13, 19, 20]

Material Class	Typical Service Temp. (°C)	Key Advantages	Main Limitations
F–M Steels (9–12% Cr)	Up to ~550	Low void swelling; decent strength	Limited creep strength at high temp.; potential irradiation embrittlement
Austenitic Stainless Steels	550–650	Good creep & corrosion resistance; widely used	Prone to void swelling & RIS; phase instability at high doses
ODS Steels	600–700+	Excellent swelling resistance; high creep strength; defect sinks	Complex fabrication; weldability concerns
Ni-Base Alloys	650–800+	Outstanding high-temp strength & oxidation resistance	Data on high-dose irradiation limited; cost & specialized handling

In addition to the above, designing for corrosion and chemical compatibility under diverse coolants is essential. Supercritical Water-cooled Reactors (SCWRs), operating at temperatures and pressures beyond the critical point of water, offer higher thermal efficiencies but also heightened susceptibility to stress-corrosion cracking (SCC) and radiation-assisted corrosion [18]. Surface oxide layers in austenitic steels or Ni-base alloys can mitigate these issues but need careful optimization [4]. Sodium-cooled fast reactors (SFRs) require steels that resist dissolution in sodium and are protected against potential sodium–water reactions [2]. In lead and lead–bismuth (Pb–Bi) systems, steels with adequate chromium and sometimes silicon or aluminum form stable oxide layers to safeguard against corrosive attacks at high temperatures [21]. Meanwhile, inert helium used in Gas-cooled Fast Reactors (GFRs) or Very High Temperature Reactors (VHTRs) can still present oxidation concerns if minor impurities (e.g., oxygen, moisture) are not tightly controlled [8, 12].

To address performance gaps and harness novel solutions, thermomechanical processing and microstructure control—commonly referred to as Grain Boundary Engineering (GBE)—help develop stable, damage-tolerant microstructures [22]. By combining iterative cycles of cold work and annealing, GBE increases the fraction of special grain boundaries, which show reduced susceptibility to cracking and localized corrosion [19]. Parallel approaches like additive manufacturing (e.g., laser powder bed fusion) enable rapid prototyping of complex designs and the potential for functionally graded structures [23]. However, porosity and anisotropy in as-built materials demand careful process control and post-processing to meet nuclear-quality standards [4].

Predictive modeling is also pivotal. Digital twins—virtual replicas of reactor components—allow for real-time data integration, facilitating simulations of thermal gradients, neutron flux variations, and mechanical loads [24]. This approach helps forecast phenomena such as creep, swelling, and embrittlement, guiding both design optimization and proactive inspection schedules [4]. By uniting advanced materials research with computational tools, Gen-IV projects aim to achieve unprecedented levels of safety and reliability throughout extended reactor lifetimes.

IV. Integrating Safety-By-Design and Security-By-Design into Reactor Construction

Modern nuclear power plants increasingly recognize the interdependence of safety and security measures, both of which demand careful attention at early project stages [4]. Fusing these traditionally separate disciplines—often referred to as “safety-by-design” and “security-by-design”—allows designers to address vulnerabilities proactively and holistically, thereby reducing life-cycle costs and enhancing public trust [8].

By embedding physical protections and automated control strategies into the structural and operational layout, Gen-IV reactors minimize areas accessible to unauthorized personnel. Compact modular designs, particularly in small modular reactors (SMRs) or other Evolutionary and Innovative Designs (EIDs), capitalize on smaller footprints and simplified building configurations [14]. In combination with remote operation facilities, these design concepts limit the number of potential “points of entry,” decreasing the likelihood of intrusions [4]. Reduced on-site staff further shrinks insider-threat vectors, especially when robust vetting protocols and real-time surveillance networks are in place [6].

A key driver in minimizing operational costs is automating inspection and monitoring systems. Advanced sensors, robotics, and intelligent algorithms enable near-continuous observation of critical parameters—such as temperature, pressure, radiation fields, and coolant chemistry—without requiring extensive human presence [3]. By applying decision-support software, plant operators can detect and respond to anomalies swiftly, either dispatching specialized on-site teams or drawing on centralized support forces [14]. This approach is particularly relevant for reactors with online refueling or fuel reprocessing capabilities, as in some molten salt reactor (MSR) concepts, where near-real-time material accountancy (NRTA) serves to reconcile fissile inventories and deter unauthorized diversion [4]. Table 3 illustrates how selected design features simultaneously enhance both safety and security.

TABLE 3. Integrated safety and security enhancements in modern nuclear power plants [4, 14]

Feature	Safety Enhancement	Security Enhancement
Compact Modular Layout	Fewer large penetrations reduce accident pathways	Smaller perimeter; fewer entry points minimize intrusion opportunities
Advanced Sensors & AI	Early detection of system malfunctions; automated shutdowns	Automated threat detection; improved situational awareness
Remote/Automated Ops	Reduced operator error and exposure to radiation	Fewer on-site personnel lessen insider threat vectors
Reinforced Structures	Enhanced containment during thermal or pressure transients	Increased delay time for adversaries; more robust physical barriers
NRTA Systems	Rapid detection of abnormal material flows	Deters illicit removal of fissile materials; supports proliferation resistance

These synergistic effects underscore the growing emphasis on real-time material accounting in advanced reactors, especially those using non-traditional fuel cycles [8]. The ability to monitor and control nuclear material continuously, rather than relying on periodic inspections, substantially complicates adversarial attempts at diversion [4]. In parallel, the introduction of new high-performance structural materials strengthens physical barriers that protect against external impacts (e.g., aircraft crash) and internal upsets (e.g., sudden reactivity insertions). Materials with better creep and thermal shock resistance, such as oxide dispersion strengthened steels, provide a margin of safety under unplanned temperature excursions [12].

Improving post-accident management strategies also benefits from advanced materials research. For instance, rapid cooldown scenarios may be critical in mitigating high-temperature damage to fuel cladding or in preventing significant hydrogen generation [18]. The improved robustness of structural and cladding materials delays failure long enough to engage engineered safety systems or off-site support [8]. Furthermore, carefully tailored alloys can help reduce hydride formation under thermal transients, thereby extending the grace period before damage sets in [3]. Consequently, protective barriers work in tandem with operational protocols to preserve integrity even under severe conditions.

By weaving safety and security features into each design stage—from conceptual frameworks to detailed engineering and manufacturing processes—Gen-IV reactors stand poised to achieve higher levels of operational readiness and public acceptance. Advanced materials, real-time monitoring, and integrated defense-in-depth strategies are key to safeguarding reactors against both inadvertent accidents and deliberate acts of sabotage [4]. This alignment not only reduces costs associated with retrofitting protective measures but also enhances the overarching resilience of nuclear infrastructures in the face of evolving threats.

V. CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that the next generation of nuclear reactors requires not only advanced engineering and higher thermal efficiencies but also a holistic approach to safety and security. The historical evolution of nuclear safeguards—from predominantly manual, perimeter-focused defenses to automated, integrated, and intelligence-driven systems—underpins the urgency of embracing “security-by-design” principles. By analyzing reactor technologies and materials, this work shows that the simultaneous improvement of safety and security is achievable through innovations in structural materials, real-time monitoring, and modularized architectures.

A crucial element of Gen-IV development is the strategic selection and fabrication of materials capable of withstanding higher temperatures, longer operational cycles, and more corrosive environments. Ferritic/martensitic steels, austenitic stainless steels, oxide dispersion strengthened alloys, and Ni-based superalloys each offer unique advantages but also introduce distinct challenges under extended neutron exposure and high-temperature operations. Alongside these materials advances, holistic integration of safety mechanisms—ranging from inert coolant control to robust digital twinning—can reduce reliance on traditional human-centered solutions.

In merging safety-by-design and security-by-design at an early stage, stakeholders can lower life-cycle costs and complexity, enhance operational reliability, and minimize vulnerabilities to both accidental and adversarial events. As Gen-IV reactor deployment proceeds, continued research into material performance, advanced manufacturing, and regulatory adaptation will be essential for aligning the technical, economic, and societal imperatives of modern nuclear power.

REFERENCES

1. World Nuclear Association. (2017). *Nuclear Power Economics and Project Structuring: 2017 Edition.* World Nuclear Association.
2. IAEA. (2021). *Nuclear Power Reactors in the World, 2021 Edition* (IAEA Reference Data Series No. 2). International Atomic Energy Agency.
3. Cheng, L. Y., & Bari, R. A. (2021). Proliferation resistance and physical protection (PR&PP) in small modular reactors (SMRs). In *Handbook of small modular nuclear reactors* (pp. 217-238). Woodhead Publishing.
4. Aghara, S. K., & Peel, R. (2023). Nuclear Security for Next-Generation Reactors. In *The Oxford Handbook of Nuclear Security*(pp. 341-357). Oxford University Press.
5. Gill, A. S. (2020). *The Priority of Control (1950s–1960s).* In *Nuclear Security Summits: A History* (pp. 20–22). Palgrave MacMillan.
6. IAEA. (2018). *Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and Nuclear Facilities (Implementation of INFCIRC/225/Revision 5)* (IAEA Nuclear Security Series No. 27-G). International Atomic Energy Agency.
7. Miller, C., Xing, C., Jensen, C., & Marshall, D. (2015). Experimental measurement and numerical modeling for effective thermal conductivity in TRISO fuel compacts. *Journal of Nuclear Materials, 458*, 198–205.
8. Murty, K. L., & Charit, I. (2008). Structural materials for Gen-IV nuclear reactors: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Nuclear Materials, 383*(1–2), 189–195.
9. Klueh, R. L. (2005). Elevated temperature ferritic and martensitic steels and their application to future nuclear reactors. *International Materials Reviews, 50*(5), 287–310.
10. Seibert, R. L., Jolly, B. C., Balooch, M., Schappel, D. P., & Terrani, K. A. (2018). Production and characterization of TRISO fuel particles with multilayered SiC. *Journal of Nuclear Materials, 515*, 215–226.
11. Nanstad, R. K., Rowcliffe, A. F., & Stoller, R. E. (2004). The development of advanced radiation-resistant steels for reactor pressure vessels. *Journal of Nuclear Materials, 329–333*(Part A), 166–172.
12. Hoelzer, D. T. (2012). Nanostructured ferritic alloys for advanced fission and fusion reactors. *Journal of Nuclear Materials, 417*(1–3), 271–274.
13. Wirth, B. D., Kurtz, R., & Odette, G. R. (2015). Radiation effects in ferritic/martensitic steels for next-generation nuclear systems. *Journal of Nuclear Materials, 468*, 226–241.
14. WINS. (2019). *Security of Small Modular Reactors (SMRs) Workshop Report.* World Institute for Nuclear Security.
15. Generation IV International Forum [GIF]. (2011). *Evaluation Methodology for Proliferation Resistance and Physical Protection of Generation IV Nuclear Energy Systems*. GIF/PRPPWG/2011/002.
16. Generation IV International Forum [GIF]. (2014). *GIF Annual Report: Advancing Nuclear Energy for a Sustainable Future*. GIF.
17. World Nuclear Association. (2021). *Nuclear Power Economics and Project Structuring*. World Nuclear Association.
18. Liou, J. (2021). Safety by design: How the new generation of nuclear reactors addresses safety. *IAEA Bulletin, 62*(1), 18–19.
19. Allen, T. R., Sridharan, K., & Was, G. S. (2021). Materials challenges for advanced reactor systems. *Progress in Nuclear Energy, 134*, 103672.1
20. Tancret, F., Sourmail, T., Yescas, M. A., Evans, R. W., McAleese, C., Singh, L., Smeeton, T., & Bhadeshia, H. K. D. H. (2003). Design of novel nickel-base superalloys by microstructure modelling. *Materials Science and Technology, 19*(3), 296–299.
21. Kurata, Y., Futakawa, M., & Saito, S. (2005). Corrosion behavior of steels in lead–bismuth eutectic at 450–550 °C. *Journal of Nuclear Materials, 343*(1–3), 333–339.
22. Watanabe, T. (1978). An approach to grain boundary design for strong and ductile polycrystals. *Scripta Metallurgica, 12*(5), 361–364.
23. Frazier, W. E. (2014). Metal additive manufacturing: A review. *Journal of Materials Engineering and Performance, 23*(6), 1917–1928.
24. Yvon, P., & Carré, F. (2009). Structural materials challenges for advanced reactor systems. *Journal of Nuclear Materials, 385*(2), 217–222.