Accepted Manuscript

Low salinity polymer flooding: Lower polymer retention and improved injectivity

E. Unsal, A.B.G.M. Ten Berge, D.A.Z. Wever

PII: S0920-4105(17)30847-1

DOI: 10.1016/j.petrol.2017.10.069

Reference: PETROL 4393

To appear in: Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering

Received Date: 19 July 2017

Revised Date: 24 October 2017

Accepted Date: 25 October 2017

Please cite this article as: Unsal, E., Ten Berge, A.B.G.M., Wever, D.A.Z., Low salinity polymer flooding: Lower polymer retention and improved injectivity, *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering* (2017), doi: 10.1016/j.petrol.2017.10.069.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



1	Low salinity polymer flooding: lower polymer retention and
2	improved injectivity
3	
4	E. Unsal, A.B.G.M. ten Berge, D.A.Z. Wever [*]
5	Shell Global Solutions International BV, Rijswijk, Netherlands
6	*Corresponding author
7	
8	Delayed arrival of the oil bank and reduced injectivity are risks which are commonly associated
9	with low salinity polymer (LSP) flooding. In this study, experimental work was carried out to
10	address these risks; the polymer retention and the cationic exchange in the presence of polymer
11	were the main subjects of investigation. Single phase coreflood experiments were performed,
12	where low and high salinity polymer (HSP) solutions, i.e., conventional polymer flood using
13	formation brine, were injected in reservoir core plugs. The performance of the two polymer
14	solutions were analyzed for polymer retention, injectivity and polymer acceleration. Compared
15	to the HSP coreflood, the LSP coreflood showed considerably lower polymer retention and better
10	long-term injectivity. There was no delay in polymer breakthrough, and the polymer acceleration
10	division approximation bigher than the injected solution and the solution which was already
10	in equilibrium with the rock. This suggested that the division were released from the rock
20	into the solution because of cation exchange in the presence of the LSP solution. Such increase
20	in divalent ion concentration increased the polymer solution salinity and resulted in a viscosity
21	loss. The results of the experimental study indicated that I SP flooding can be an attractive
22	alternative to conventional polymer flooding although viscosity loss due to cation exchange is a
23	subject for further de-risking work. A numerical model which couples the cation exchange in
25	presence of polymer with flow dynamics in core scale has also been developed. As the polymer
26	was transported with the flow, it altered the equilibrium condition between the rock surface and
27	the solution. The model was used to study the sensitivities around the geochemistry coupled flow
28	process.
29	
30	
31	Nomenclature:
32	HSP : High Salinity Polymer
33	LSP : Low Salinity Polymer
34	Sor : Residual oil saturation
35	$\rho_{\rm rock}$: rock density
36	ρ_{water} : water density
37	ϕ : rock porosity

- *PA* : polymer acceleration
- c_0 : polymer concentration injected
- $f(c_0)$: polymer retention as a function of the polymer concentration.

دريافت فورى 🛶 متن كامل مقاله

- امکان دانلود نسخه تمام متن مقالات انگلیسی
 امکان دانلود نسخه ترجمه شده مقالات
 پذیرش سفارش ترجمه تخصصی
 امکان جستجو در آرشیو جامعی از صدها موضوع و هزاران مقاله
 امکان دانلود رایگان ۲ صفحه اول هر مقاله
 امکان پرداخت اینترنتی با کلیه کارت های عضو شتاب
 دانلود فوری مقاله پس از پرداخت آنلاین
 پشتیبانی کامل خرید با بهره مندی از سیستم هوشمند رهگیری سفارشات
- ISIArticles مرجع مقالات تخصصی ایران