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Abstract
The primary aim of this investigation is to synthesize a novel glass system with a composition (35+x) PbO-5TeO$_2$-20Bi$_2$O$_3$-(20-x) MgO-20B$_2$O$_3$ (where $x=0, 5, 10, 15,$ and 20 mol%) by melt quenching method. The confirmation of the amorphous behavior and the presence of the various vibration modes and stretching modes have been analyzed using the XRD and FTIR techniques, respectively. The radiation shielding parameters of these glasses were reported using MCNP5 simulation. The effects of PbO on the MCNP5 parameters were investigated in detail. The mass attenuation coefficient (MAC) was simulated via MCNP5 code, and it was found that the MAC values from MCNP5 all follow the same trend as the XCOM data. The similarity means that the two simulations strongly agree with each other. The linear attenuation coefficient (LAC) was calculated for all the glasses. The glass sample with 55 mol% of the PbO has the greatest LAC at any energy, such as 0.317 at 10 MeV, the lowest investigated energy. From the LAC values, other parameters such as transmission factor (TF), lead equivalent thickness ($d_{\text{lead}}$), and half-value layer (HVL) were reported. The results for the TF of the glasses revealed that the glass systems become more effective as their thickness increases. Glass sample with 35 mol% of the PbO recorded the highest TF at all energies due to its lack of PbO content, such as 15.533% for a thickness of 1 cm and 6.122% for 1.5-cm thickness at 0.3 MeV. The radiation protection efficiency (RPE) was also determined, and we found that the glasses with the greater PbO content and least MgO content have the highest RPE. Therefore, based on the RPE values, glasses with the greater PbO are the most effective radiation shield from the investigated glasses.
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Introduction
Technologies that use radiation to function properly are becoming increasingly prominent. Ionizing radiation has enough energy to detach electrons from atoms, whereas non-ionizing radiation does not. Ionizing radiation is used in the dental and other fields, for example, in X-ray imaging machines for radiography. It is also used in other fields such as agriculture and energy generation. Although ionizing radiation is widely used...
for its many benefits, human exposure to this type of radiation can have serious consequences [1–5].

Long-term exposure to the radiation may cause nausea, vomiting, cancer, and even death. In order to prevent excessive exposure of workers and patients who must contact radiation, it is advised to both limit the time under exposure and remain as far away from the source as possible. However, in some cases, these two guidelines would not be sufficient to keep people from experiencing these side effects. Thus, radiation shielding materials are used to provide more protection levels and absorb incoming photons [6–9].

Radiation shields reduce the amount of radiation the person is exposed to. The radiation shield aims to attenuate or absorb as much radiation as possible to reduce the intensity of the incoming photons to safe levels [10]. Various kinds of materials are often used as radiation shields depending on the application. Concrete is utilized in this regard because of its sturdiness and low cost [11]. Although concrete is a versatile and effective material, it is prone to cracking and losing its water content when exposed to high radiation levels. Other materials such as alloys are often used. Alloys are a mixture of multiple metals that can often be highly effective. Another material has gained recent attention due to its unique properties [12].

Glasses are used as radiation shields because of their easily modifiable characteristics, low cost, and transparency, a property unique to glass [13–16]. They can be used in X-ray rooms, for instance, to allow workers to view inside the room where the patient is. Glasses can be doped with metal oxides or HMOs, heavy metal oxides to improve their attenuation properties. Common glass formers include borate and silicate. Borate offers good chemical resistance when used as a glass former due to its BO3 units. The addition of glass modifiers, which are oxides that alter the properties of the glass, can convert some of the BO3 units into tetrahedral BO4 units. This transformation creates non-bridging oxygens (NBOs), which can alter the glass’s physical properties. Alkali and alkaline earth elements are common examples of glass modifiers [17].

Other oxides act as intermediates, which can function as glass formers or modifiers depending on the glass system’s composition. Some examples of intermediates include tellurium, lead, and bismuth. When combined with borate, bismuth improves the optical transparency, rate of crystallization, and refractive index of the glass. These properties make Bi2O3 useful in thermal and mechanical sensors and scintillation detectors. Additionally, all three of these intermediates also have a high density, which previous research has shown to have a positive correlation with attenuation. Lead is especially useful because of its accessibility and effectiveness as a radiation shield [18, 19].

To understand the ability of a medium to attenuate radiation, some factors are calculated and evaluated. Typically, experimental methods are used to obtain these parameters; however, due to the lack of facilities currently available because of the COVID-19 pandemic, alternative methods are necessary to determine these parameters. Theoretical approaches using some computer programs are often used to check the accuracy of radiation shielding experiments and have proven to be highly accurate in previous studies as an alternative method. Phys-X computer software specifically has been found to be acceptable because of its ability to calculate different shielding variables accurately. In our recent paper, we have reported the preparation and investigations of the optical and the mechanical properties of the PbO-TeO2-Bi2O3-MgO-B2O3 glass system. Also, we reported the gamma ray shielding behavior of the aforementioned glasses using the FLUKA code from 0.1218 to 1.405 MeV [20]. In continuation of the work, the present studies used MCNP5 code to investigate the radiation shielding ability of PbO-5TeO2-20Bi2O3-(20-x) MgO-20B2O3 glasses. In addition to this, the detailed study of physical and structural properties has also been discussed.

**Materials and methods**

**Glass preparation and characterization**

The glass samples were fabricated with nominal composition of (35+x) PbO-5TeO2-20Bi2O3-(20-x) MgO-20B2O3 (where x = 0, 5, 10, 15, and 20 mol% and are denoted PTBMB35, PTBMB40, PTBMB45, PTBMB50, and PTBMB55, respectively). The specific weights of the powders of analytical reagent-grade chemicals were utilized in the current investigation. The melt quenching technique prepares the glass samples. Firstly, the appropriate amounts of homogeneously mixed samples were taken in an alumina crucible and melted in an electronic furnace at 1030 °C for 1 h. The melted mixture was then poured in a graphite mold and annealed at 300 °C for 2 h to remove residual thermal strain and then allowed to cool the room temperature for a period of 24 h. A picture of the fabricated glasses is given in Fig. 1. The density of the samples was determined via the Archimedes’ Principle [20, 21]. The composition of the tested samples has been listed in Table 1. The appropriate amounts of these powdered samples are taken for different characterization studies of XRD and FTIR spectroscopy, respectively. The details of the instrumentation and the formulations used for the physical and the structural studies have been discussed in detail in our previous studies [21–25].

**Gamma ray shielding capacity determination**

MCNP5 code is a valuable and helpful code to estimate the projected photons’ average track length in the fabricated samples. For good and accurate simulation data, geometry should
be performed. In the present study, the geometry was arranged to be similar to the experimental measurement, as exhibited in Fig. 2. The photon source was placed in the center of the organized geometry and surrounded by a lead collimator to collimate the projected photon flux. After that, the collimated photon flux was directed to the fabricated glass samples. After the gamma flux interaction with the fabricated material, the photon flux transmitted the glass thickness and headed to the detector. It was arranged to be an F4 tally to estimate the detector’s average flux per unit cell. The MCNP-5 code was connected with the primary cross-section data sources ENDF, ACTI, ...etc files [26]. The NPS card is arranged to be 10^6 historical/min. It is important to state that the output file recorded a relative error of less than 1%.

XCOM is an online software program; it has the ability to calculate different shielding variables accurately in the energy range between 1keV to 1 GeV. The requirement of the mentioned program to calculate the MAC is the composition of the tested sample in wt% and the gamma photon energies [27].

Results and discussion

This work has been classified into various subsections. The subsections describe the physical, structural, and radiation shielding features for the tested PTBMB samples as follows:

Table 1 Chemical composition of the present samples

| Glass code | Glass composition (mol %) | Density (g/cm^3) |
|------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
|            | TeO2 | Bi2O3 | PbO | MgO | B2O3 |
| PTBMB35    | 5    | 20    | 35  | 20  | 20   | 5.09 |
| PTBMB40    | 5    | 20    | 40  | 15  | 20   | 5.36 |
| PTBMB45    | 5    | 20    | 45  | 10  | 20   | 5.49 |
| PTBMB50    | 5    | 20    | 50  | 5   | 20   | 6.1  |
| PTBMB55    | 5    | 20    | 55  | 0   | 20   | 6.21 |

Physical properties

Table 2 describes the several physical properties of the selected glass system. The density value of the selected PTBMB glasses changes from 5.09 to 6.21 g/cm^3 with an increase in contents of PbO in the glass systems because of the higher atomic mass of lead which accounts for the increment in the average molecular weight of the selected glass systems. The increase in density implies the compactness of the samples with an increase in contact of PbO. The molecular mass of the samples is increasing from 201.27 to 237.85 g/mol. The molar volume (V_m) decreases from 39.58 to 38.30 cm^3 as the amount of PbO increases resulting in the sample’s compactness. This trend may be due to the creation of non-bridging oxygen atoms [28]. The ion concentration (N) increases from 5.33 × 10^{21} to 5.5 × 10^{21} ions/cm^3 with an increase in the amount of PbO. The volume of boron atoms per mole (V_m^b) decreases from 24.71 to 23.93 cm^3. The average boron-boron separations (<d_{b-b}>) are decreasing from 3.45 × 10^{-8} to 3.41 × 10^{-8} m with increasing in the concentration of PbO. The decrease in separation indicates that the glass structures are compact, and the density of the glass systems is increasing. The polaron radius (r_p) value reduces from 2.31 × 10^{-8} to 2.28 × 10^{-8} m [29]. A similar indication is given by the internuclear distance (r_i) as it also decreases from 5.72 × 10^{-8} to 5.66 × 10^{-8} m [29]. The field strength (F) rises from 5.64 × 10^{15} to 5.76 × 10^{15} cm^{-2} with a rise in the mol% of PbO from 35 to 55%.

Structural properties

In Fig. 3 we exhibits the XRD profiles of selected glasses. The non-occurrence of sharp peak indicates the non-existence of the crystalline structure. The presence of broadband is due to the diffused X-ray scattering.

FTIR spectra in the absorbance mode have been represented in Fig. 4. Evidently, the borate groups play a dominant role in the IR spectra. A band around ~411 cm^{-1} represents the vibrations of metal cations in their oxygen sites and respective tetrahedral [30]. The other three bands around ~480 cm^{-1} represent the stretching vibration in
PbO$_4$ groups [31]. There are small bands around ~639 cm$^{-1}$, ~646 cm$^{-1}$, and ~670 cm$^{-1}$ that may be due to Pb–O bond vibrations of PbO$_n$ units with $n = 3$ and/or 4 [31]. There are small bands around ~892 cm$^{-1}$ that may be due to the symmetric stretching of BO$_4$ units [32]. The two IR bands approximately ~935 cm$^{-1}$ and ~936 cm$^{-1}$ represent the B-O stretching vibrations of tetragonal (BO$_4$) units in diborate groups [32]. Small other bands like ~1223 cm$^{-1}$ and ~1229 cm$^{-1}$ may be due to B-O stretching vibrations of [BO$_3$] unit orthoborate groups [30]. The small bands are observed ~1310 cm$^{-1}$, and ~1317 cm$^{-1}$ represents B–O bond stretching vibration of BO$_3$ units in metaborate, pyroborate, and orthoborate groups [33]. The other IR bands ~1363 cm$^{-1}$ and ~1364 cm$^{-1}$ may be due to asymmetric stretching modes of BO$_3$ and BO$_3$O$^-$ unit [32]. The IR spectra of selected glasses possess three broad transmittance IR bands at 600–800 cm$^{-1}$ due to bending vibrations of B-O atoms between trigonal boron atoms, 800–1200 cm$^{-1}$ due to the stretching of B–O bond of the tetrahedral BO$_4$ units, and 1200–1500 cm$^{-1}$ due to the asymmetric stretching relaxation of B-O bond of trigonal BO$_3$ units with NBOs [22, 34].

### Radiation shielding investigation

The MAC of the five glasses is listed in Table 3. Two simulation programs were used to obtain the MACs, MCNP5, and XCOM. The MACs were calculated between 0.015 and 15 MeV. The values from the MCNP5 code all follow the same

| Physical properties | PTBMB35 | PTBMB40 | PTBMB45 | PTBMB50 | PTBMB55 |
|---------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Density (g/cm$^3$)  | 5.09    | 5.36    | 5.49    | 6.1     | 6.21    |
| $M$ (g)             | 201.27  | 210.42  | 219.56  | 228.71  | 237.85  |
| $V_m$ (cm$^3$)      | 39.54   | 39.26   | 39.99   | 37.49   | 38.30   |
| $N$ (ions/cm$^3$)   | 5.33 E+21 | 5.37 E+21 | 5.27 E+21 | 5.62 E+21 | 5.5 E+21 |
| $V_m$ (cm$^3$)      | 24.71   | 24.54   | 24.99   | 23.43   | 23.93   |
| $<\delta_{ds}>$ (m) | 3.45 E−08 | 3.44 E−08 | 3.46 E−08 | 3.39 E−08 | 3.41 E−08 |
| $r_f$ (m)           | 2.31 E−08 | 2.3 E−08  | 2.32 E−08 | 2.27 E−08 | 2.28 E−08 |
| $r_i$ (m)           | 5.72 E−08 | 5.71 E−08 | 5.75 E−08 | 5.62 E−08 | 5.66 E−08 |
| $F$(cm$^{-2}$)      | 5.64 E+15 | 5.67 E+15 | 5.6 E+15 | 5.84 E+15 | 5.76 E+15 |

**Fig. 3** The XRD plot for the present samples

**Fig. 4** The FTIR plot for the present samples
The similarity means that the two approaches used for the determination of the MAC agree with each other. For PTBMB35 (as an example) and at 0.05 MeV, the MAC values obtained by MCNP5 and XCOM are, respectively, 6.752 and 6.783 cm$^2$/g (the difference as given in Table 3 is 0.026%). For higher energy and for another sample (0.8 MeV and for PTBMB50 glass), the MCNP5 and XCOM are 0.067 and 0.070 cm$^2$/g (with a difference of around 3%). For any prepared glass and at all selected energies, the MCNP5 and XCOM values show a good agreement. Also, from Table 3, the five glasses’ MAC values can be noticed to reduce as energy increases. The MACs can be observed to decline sharply for low energies, slowing down and decreasing at a steady pace as energy increases. At 0.015 MeV, the MAC of PTBMB35 is equal to 90.253 cm$^2$/g, at 0.08 MeV, it is equal to 2.018 cm$^2$/g, while for E=5 MeV, its MAC is 0.04 cm$^2$/g.

The LAC for the five glasses was graphed against photon energy plus the PbO content in Fig. 5. Two main trends can be noticed when examining the figure, trends that can also be applied to the MACs in Table 3. First, at all photon energies, LAC decreases as energy increases for all five glasses. This trend can be subdivided into three sections. The first energy region, region a, between 0.015 and 0.3 MeV, is the range where the photoelectric effect is influential. A sharp decrease in the LAC values can be observed in the region a. For instance, at this low-energy region, the LAC of the PTBMB35 glass decreases from 459.390 to 1.862 cm$^{-1}$ between 0.015 and 0.3 MeV. At higher energies, namely, between 0.5 and 3 MeV, the LAC relatively remains constant, decreasing slowly as energy increases. For example, at 0.5 MeV, PTBMB35 has a LAC of 0.746 cm$^{-1}$, and PTBMB40 has a LAC of 0.812 cm$^{-1}$, whilst for PTBMB45, the LAC is 0.842 cm$^{-1}$. This region (say region b) is dominated by Compton scattering, another photon interaction phenomenon, which is responsible for the slighter decrease in values. For $E > 3$ MeV, a new photon interaction phenomenon becomes important, namely, pair production, and we found a very slight increase in the LAC between 5 to 15 MeV. The other trend comes from the content of PbO of the glasses. At any energy, PTBMB55, which has the greatest amount of PbO, has the greatest LAC, while PTBMB35, with the least amount of PbO (35 mol%), has the lowest LAC. At 0.03 MeV (as an example), the LAC for PTBMB35 is 90.253 cm$^2$/g, for PTBMB40 it is 90.400 cm$^2$/g, for PTBMB45 it is 91.774 cm$^2$/g, for PTBMB50 it is 93.166 cm$^2$/g, and for PTBMB55 it is 94.443 cm$^2$/g.

### Table 3

The mass attenuation coefficient (cm$^2$/g) for the prepared samples obtained by MCNP5 and XCOM

| Energy (MeV) | PTBMB35 MCNP5 | PTBMB35 XCOM | diff (%) | PTBMB40 MCNP5 | PTBMB40 XCOM | diff (%) | PTBMB45 MCNP5 | PTBMB45 XCOM | diff (%) | PTBMB50 MCNP5 | PTBMB50 XCOM | diff (%) | PTBMB55 MCNP5 | PTBMB55 XCOM | diff (%) |
|-------------|---------------|--------------|----------|---------------|--------------|----------|---------------|--------------|----------|---------------|--------------|----------|---------------|--------------|----------|
| 0.003       | 24.322        | 24.340       | 0.075    | 24.751        | 24.770       | 0.079    | 25.143        | 25.170       | 0.010    | 25.505        | 25.530       | 0.097    | 25.839        | 25.860       | 0.082    |
| 0.05        | 6.752         | 6.783        | 0.455    | 6.851         | 6.882        | 0.456    | 6.941         | 6.973        | 0.463    | 7.024         | 7.057        | 0.469    | 7.101         | 7.134        | 0.462    |
| 0.08        | 2.018         | 2.045        | 1.583    | 2.083         | 2.101        | 1.781    | 2.071         | 2.110        | 1.783    | 2.049         | 2.134        | 1.887    | 2.116         | 2.156        | 1.882    |
| 0.3         | 0.366         | 0.394        | 0.472    | 0.370         | 0.394        | 0.472    | 0.377         | 0.394        | 0.472    | 0.378         | 0.394        | 0.472    | 0.381         | 0.392        | 0.472    |
| 0.5         | 0.147         | 0.154        | 0.044    | 0.151         | 0.154        | 0.044    | 0.153         | 0.154        | 0.044    | 0.154         | 0.154        | 0.044    | 0.154         | 0.154        | 0.044    |
| 0.8         | 0.085         | 0.085        | 0.000    | 0.085         | 0.085        | 0.000    | 0.085         | 0.085        | 0.000    | 0.085         | 0.085        | 0.000    | 0.085         | 0.085        | 0.000    |
| 1           | 0.067         | 0.067        | 0.000    | 0.067         | 0.067        | 0.000    | 0.067         | 0.067        | 0.000    | 0.067         | 0.067        | 0.000    | 0.067         | 0.067        | 0.000    |
| 3           | 0.041         | 0.041        | 0.000    | 0.041         | 0.041        | 0.000    | 0.041         | 0.041        | 0.000    | 0.041         | 0.041        | 0.000    | 0.041         | 0.041        | 0.000    |
| 5           | 0.040         | 0.040        | 0.000    | 0.040         | 0.040        | 0.000    | 0.040         | 0.040        | 0.000    | 0.040         | 0.040        | 0.000    | 0.040         | 0.040        | 0.000    |
| 8           | 0.042         | 0.042        | 0.000    | 0.042         | 0.042        | 0.000    | 0.042         | 0.042        | 0.000    | 0.042         | 0.042        | 0.000    | 0.042         | 0.042        | 0.000    |
| 10          | 0.044         | 0.044        | 0.000    | 0.044         | 0.044        | 0.000    | 0.044         | 0.044        | 0.000    | 0.044         | 0.044        | 0.000    | 0.044         | 0.044        | 0.000    |
| 15          | 0.049         | 0.049        | 0.000    | 0.049         | 0.049        | 0.000    | 0.049         | 0.049        | 0.000    | 0.049         | 0.049        | 0.000    | 0.049         | 0.049        | 0.000    |
example), PTBMB35 has a LAC of 123.798 cm$^{-1}$, and PTBMB55 has a LAC of 160.460 cm$^{-1}$. Even though this difference is maintained at all energies, the difference between the values largely decreases at higher energies (see Fig. 6). The observed difference between the LAC values in Fig. 6 is related to the glass-effective atomic number variation with increasing the PbO incrementations. The photon interaction cross-section varied with $Z^4$, $Z$, and $Z^2$ for photon electric, Compton scattering, and pair production interactions, respectively. Thus, at the low-energy zone (e.g., 0.015 MeV), the photoelectric is prevailing. The LAC variation at 0.015 MeV is higher than the other two energies (0.3 for Compton scattering and 15 MeV for pair production interaction) when the PbO increased between 35 and 55 mol%. For instance, when the photon energy is 15 MeV, PTBMB35 has a LAC of 0.250 cm$^{-1}$, PTBMB40 has a LAC of 0.266 cm$^{-1}$, PTBMB45 has a LAC of 0.275 cm$^{-1}$, while for PTBMB50 and PTBMB55, LAC values are, respectively, 0.308 and 0.316 cm$^{-1}$. As can be seen, the values are much closer together. From this parameter, PTBMB55 offers the superior radiation attenuation potential among the PTBMB samples. At higher energies, the shielding abilities of the glasses are quite similar. Thus, it can be concluded that the amount of PbO in this glass system has a significant role on the shielding competence at lower energy while only having a slight impact at higher energies.

Figure 7 presents a comparison between the tested glasses LAC and those of some commercial and previously manufactured lead-based glasses like RS 360, RS 520, and LBPCu0 at 0.662 MeV [35, 36]. The LAC of the tested glass samples is ranged between 0.5236 and 0.6493 cm$^{-1}$ at gamma photon energy 0.662 MeV. The mentioned values of LAC are higher than that reported for glasses RS 360, RS520, and LBPCu0. The LAC for glasses RS 360, RS520, and LBPCu0 at 0.662 MeV is 0.32, 0.52, and 0.345, respectively.

The half-value layer (HVL) for the PTBMB glasses with different concentrations of PbO was investigated and plotted in Fig. 8a. The HVL starts with a small value until $E=0.1$ MeV, where it starts to increase quickly. It is found from Fig. 8a that the HVL for PTBMB35 changes from 0.002 (at 0.015 MeV) to 0.043 cm (at 0.1 MeV), and to 3.252 cm (at 8 MeV). The same increase behaviour in the HVL is reported for the other glasses. From these values, one can conclude that a greater thickness of the medium is required to decline the energy of the incident photons by 50%. The figure reveals that HVL decreases as the PbO changes from 0 to 20 mol%. This relationship is due to the inverse relationship between density and HVL; as the amount of PbO increases, the density of the glass diminishes, decreasing HVL. Since a lower HVL signifies a more effective shield, the figure indicates that the greater the PbO content, the better the glass will be as a radiation shield. In Fig. 8b, c, and d, we calculated the average HVL in low-, moderate-, and high-energy zones and plotted the results as a function of the content of PbO. In the three mentioned zones, the average HVL decreases with increasing the PbO content. The HVL is varied between 0.0217 and 0.0275 cm at the low-energy zone, varied between 1.578 and 1.955 cm for the moderate-energy zone, and varied between 2.415 and 3.043 cm for the high-energy zone.

Transmission factor (TF) for the PTBMB glasses is investigated. It is noteworthy to remember that a lower TF means a more efficient radiation shield. The fabricated glass TF was plotted in Fig. 9 versus the glass thicknesses at different gamma photon energies. The chosen thicknesses varied between 0.5 and 2 cm, representing a variety of thinner and thicker samples. The subfigures demonstrate a reducing behaviour as energy increases. Since more radiation can penetrate
through the sample at higher energies, the ratio increases, increasing TF. For PTBMB55, the minimum values for TF, which occur at 0.3 MeV, are 30.617, 9.374, 2.870, and 0.879% for 0.5, 1, 1.5, and 2 cm, respectively. This glass’s maximum values occur at the greatest energy, 15 MeV, and equal to 85.381, 72.900, 62.243, and 53.144% for the selected thicknesses. Like the LAC values, a greater difference between the TFs can be observed at lower energies, while the values are closer together as energy increases. The figure also demonstrates that the highest the glass’s thickness, the lower the TF and the better the shield. Typically, a thicker radiation shield is always more desirable as more collisions can occur between the material and the incoming photons, absorbing the radiation if space is not a major issue. A larger difference between thicker and thinner samples can especially be observed at low energies.

Also, from Fig. 9, we can compare the influence of the PbO present in each glass on the TF. Apparently, TF decreases with PbO, implying that a sample with a higher amount of PbO is more effective at stopping radiation. When comparing two different samples at the same energy (let us choose the sample with the lowest and highest PbO), the TF for PTBMB55 is lower than the TF for PTBMB35 for all thicknesses. For 0.3 MeV (Fig. 9a), the TF for 1 cm PTBMB35 is 15.533% and 6.122% for 1.5 cm, while the TF for 1 cm PTBMB55 is 9.374% and 02.870 % for 1.5 cm. This difference indicates that the greater the PbO content in these glasses, the more effective the glass will be as a radiation shield.

Figure 10 demonstrates the RPE of the glasses at the selected thicknesses used in the previous curves and at some energies. A greater RPE typically correlates with a more effective radiation shield since more photons are absorbed. The results indicate a similar trend when compared to LAC. The values increase rapidly with increasing the thickness of the sample. The exact opposite of what we found in the previous figure, RPE continually decreases as energy increases. For instance, PTBMB35 with a thickness of 0.5 cm decreases from 60.59 at 0.3 MeV, to 31.13% at 0.5 MeV, and to 11.73% at 15 MeV. In addition, at all energies, RPE follows the trend of PTBMB35 < PTBMB40 < PTBMB45 < PTBMB50 < PTBMB55, such as at 0.444 MeV, the RPE values at 0.5 MeV are 67.33, 70.42, 71.72, 75.62, and 76.40% for PTBMB35, PTBMB40, PTBMB45, PTBMB50, and PTBMB55, respectively (this is for a
The samples with the greater PbO content and least MgO content (PTBMB55) have the highest RPE since Pb has a higher atomic number than Mg, so as more PbO replaces the MgO, the RPE increases. Accordingly, the greater the PbO content in the glass system, the better the radiation shield the glass will be. Therefore, based on the RPE values, PTBMB55 is the most efficacious radiation shield out of the tested glasses, which agrees with the other parameters’ results.

In addition to TF and RPE, the equivalent lead thickness of the glasses ($d_{lead}$) was calculated. We calculated each fabricated sample’s thickness, which has the same shielding capacity of a Pb with a thickness of 0.5 and 1 cm (see Fig. 11a and b). Apparently, the $d_{lead}$ decreases with the addition of PbO. This result agrees with the data from the TF and RPE. At 0.08 MeV, 1.336 cm of PTBMB35 can attenuate the same radiation level that a 0.5 cm of a lead sample can do. When the PbO content becomes 55 mol% (i.e., PTBMB55), the $d_{lead}$ reduces to 1.044 cm (this is at 0.08 MeV). At this energy, the $d_{lead}$ decreases from 2.671 to 2.087 cm. Generally, the addition of PbO causes a reduction in the $d_{lead}$ which indicates that more PbO is preferable in order to decrease the dimensions of the glass that can shield specific amount of the radiation.

The fast neutron effective removal cross-section ($\Sigma_R$) is presented in Fig. 12. The values given in this figure are varied between 0.01637 and 0.01503 cm$^2$ g$^{-1}$. As we can see from Fig. 12, the ability of the PTBMB glass to shield the neutrons depends on the content of PbO and MgO. The reduction in the parameter given in Fig. 12 can be explained according to the fact that the low atomic number element (Mg in this work) is better in shielding the neutron than the high atomic number. So, the glass with the maximum MgO content (PTBMB35) owns the highest fast neutron effective removal cross-section.

**Conclusion**

We succeed to synthesize a novel glass system with a composition (35+x) PbO-5TeO$_2$-20Bi$_2$O$_3$-(20-x) MgO-20B$_2$O$_3$. The confirmation of amorphous behavior and
Fig. 10  The radiation protection efficiency for the present samples

Fig. 11  Variation of the lead-equivalent thickness for the fabricated samples versus the PbO content
the presence of the various vibration modes and stretching
modes have been analyzed using the XRD and FTIR tech-
niques, respectively. The LAC, TF, RPE, and $d_{\text{lead}}$ of the
glasses were calculated via the MCNP5 code and suitable
formulas. The MAC values were determined using
MCNP5 and XCOM simulations, and when compared, it
was found that they both greatly agreed with each other.
The LACs of the glasses followed the trend of PTBMB35
< PTBMB40< PTBMB45< PTBMB50< PTBMB55. The
HVL values tended to decrease as the PbO increased.
Also, the HVL values tended to increase as the energy
increased, such as PTBMB35 increases from 0.002 (at
0.015 MeV) to 3.252 cm (at 8 MeV). The TF results
revealed that the glass systems become more effective as
their thickness increases. The results concluded that
PTBMB55 was the most effective radiation shield, how-
ever, by a smaller margin at higher energies. The addition
of PbO in the glasses was determined to have a beneficial
effect on the glass system’s shielding ability.
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