THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CAPILLARY PRESSURE, SATURATION AND INTERFACIAL AREA FROM A MODEL OF MIXED-WET TRIANGULAR TUBES

J.O. HELLAND¹ AND S.M. SKJÆVELAND¹

¹Department of Petroleum Engineering, Faculty of Science & Technology, University of Stavanger, N-4036 Stavanger

Abstract

A simple bundle-of-triangular-tubes model is employed to calculate specific interfacial area for primary drainage, imbibition and secondary drainage for mixed-wet conditions. Accurate expressions for the capillary entry pressures are employed, that include the possibility of hinging interfaces in the corners due to contact angle hysteresis. Analytical expressions for specific interfacial area as a function of saturation and capillary pressure are derived for primary drainage, assuming that only the interfaces between bulk and corner fluid is contributive to interfacial area. Approximate correlations for interfacial area as a function of saturation are suggested for the subsequent imbibition and drainage processes. The correlations are fitted to the simulated data, and good agreement is obtained. We also demonstrate that hysteresis remains present in the relationship between interfacial area, capillary pressure and saturation when contact angle hysteresis is assumed. Hysteresis may be significant for both water-wet and mixed-wet conditions.

1. INTRODUCTION

Fluid-fluid interfacial area is recognized in the literature as an important parameter in understanding various multiphase flow processes in porous media. Mass transfer processes such as dissolution, adsorption and volitalization occur across interfaces and are strongly related to interfacial area. In particular, the coefficient for interfacial mass transfer rate is assumed to be proportional to the interfacial area [e.g., *Kennedy and Lennox*, 1997]. It has also been observed experimentally that surfactants and bacteria may preferentially accumulate at the fluid-fluid interfaces and affect the subsequent fluid transport [e.g., *Schäfer et al.*, 1998]. Thus the magnitude of the interfacial area is needed to quantify the efficiency and consequences of these processes.

Specific interfacial area between phase i and j is defined as

$$a_{ij} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{V}} \int_{\mathcal{S}_{ij}} d\mathcal{S},\tag{1}$$

where \mathcal{V} is a representative volume including both phases and \mathcal{S}_{ij} is the total area of the interfaces in \mathcal{V} .

Despite the difficulties involved in direct measurements of the parameter a_{ij} as a function of saturation in porous media, progress has been made the last ten years to develop more reliable experimental methods. *Saripalli et al.* [1998]; *Schaefer et al.* [2000a] and *Faisal Anwar et al.* [2000] employed interfacial tracer techniques to determine the two-phase interfacial area using water-soluble surfactants. The mass of surfactant adsorbed at the interfaces was determined,

and the Gibbs adsorption equation was employed together with measurements of interfacial tensions to calculate the interfacial area. *Schaefer et al.* [2000b] used the same approach to determine three-phase interfacial area.

Pore-scale modelling represents an appealing approach to estimate the interfacial area explicitly and to study its functional dependencies. This is mainly due to the possibility of calculating several key parameters for multiphase flow simultaneously which may be difficult or even impossible to obtain from experimental measurements. *Reeves and Celia* [1996] calculated the specific interfacial area between bulk fluids in a network constructed by conical pore throats of circular cross-sections. More recently, networks of angular pore shapes have been used to include the contribution of interfacial area from fluid-fluid interfaces in the corners of the pore space [*Dillard et al.*, 2001; *Dalla et al.*, 2002]. *Or and Tuller* [1999] and *Gladkikh and Bryant* [2003] have in addition included the area of thin films coating the pore walls in the calculations.

Other methods to calculate the interfacial area focus on the relationship between capillary pressure and saturation ($P_c - S$). Based on thermodynamics, *Bradford and Leij* [1997] estimated two- and three-phase interfacial area from measured $P_c - S$ data. *Oostrom et al.* [2001] derived analytical expressions for free and entrapped interfacial area as functions of water saturation by assuming the Brooks–Corey [*Brooks and Corey*, 1964] and the van Genuchten [*van Genuchten*, 1980] correlations for the $P_c - S$ relationship. The estimated expressions were in good agreement with experimental measurements.

Hassanizadeh and Gray [1993] argue that there exists a formal constitutive relationship between capillary pressure, saturation and specific interfacial area. They hypothesized that hysteresis in the $P_c - S$ relationship was an artifact of projecting the $P_c - S - a_{ij}$ surface onto the $P_c - S$ plane. New macroscale theories for multiphase flow have subsequently been developed that require the $P_c - S - a_{ij}$ relationship [e.g., *Gray*, 1999]. *Reeves and Celia* [1996] investigated the conjecture of Hassanizadeh and Gray [1993] with their network model. The a_{ij} surfaces plotted as a function of P_c and S displayed a characteristic convex shape which indicated that the functional relationship is nonunique, e.g., for any value of capillary pressure there corresponds at least two points on the surface with different saturations and the same specific interfacial area. Held and Celia [2001] calculated the aii surfaces with another network model, and the same convex shape was observed. They simulated imbibition and drainage scanning curves to cover the entire area within the bounding hysteretic $P_c - S$ loop and found a small separation between the imbibition and drainage surfaces. Thus they concluded that hysteresis was essentially eliminated in their numerical experiments. However, they only calculated interfacial area between the bulk fluids for water-wet conditions and hence neglected the impact mixed wettability and corner fluid occupancy have on the capillary pressure.

In this paper we use a physically-based bundle-of-triangular-tubes model to calculate twophase specific interfacial area for mixed-wet conditions. The model is programmed in MAT-LAB[†] and has been shown to reproduce main features of two-phase capillary pressure curves for mixed-wet rock, scanning loops included [*Helland and Skjæveland*, 2004]. We derive analytical expressions for the specific interfacial area as a function of saturation and capillary pressure for primary drainage and propose approximate correlations for the specific interfacial area for subsequent imbibition and drainage processes. The correlations are compared with simulated

[†]MATLAB is a registered trademark of TheMathWorks Inc.



FIGURE 1. Fluid configurations for primary drainage, imbibition, secondary drainage, and secondary imbibition, with water in blue, and oil in red. The bold lines along the sides represent lengths of the pore walls where the wettability may have changed.

data. Finally, we challenge the conjecture of [*Hassanizadeh and Gray*, 1993] and explore if hysteresis can be eliminated for mixed-wet drainage and imbibition $P_c - S$ curves when specific interfacial area is incorporated in the relationship.

2. MODEL DESCRIPTION

In this work we employ a pore-scale model with a bundle-of-tubes representation of the pore network, the tubes having equilateral, triangular cross-sections. This triangular geometry is readily described by the half angle of the corner, $\alpha = \frac{\pi}{6}$, and the inscribed radius *R*. The angular pore shape allows for representation of physical processes such as the establishment of mixed wettability within a single pore and drainage through fluid layers in the corners of the pore space [e.g., *Kovscek et al.*, 1993; *Hui and Blunt*, 2000]. In this section we review the aspects of the model which is relevant for the calculation of the specific interfacial area. The model is described in detail elsewhere [*Helland and Skjæveland*, 2004].

The cross-sectional fluid configurations that may occur in a tube for the sequence of processes primary drainage, imbibition, secondary drainage and secondary imbibition are shown in Fig. 1. The curvatures across the interfaces in the corners are allowed to be positive or negative depending on the contact angles and the capillary pressure. Configuration A shows a tube that has always been waterfilled, while configuration B–G represent tubes that at some point have been invaded by oil. The bold lines indicate the lengths of the pore walls that have been contacted by oil and hence may have altered wettability after primary drainage. Configuration B and C may occur for the first time during waterflooding when the water content in the corners has started to increase after primary drainage. Water invasion into configuration B is always a displacement to configuration D, while water invasion into configuration C is a displacement to configuration G may occur for the first time during secondary drainage when oil invades configuration E. Configuration G may occur for the first time during secondary drainage when oil invades configuration B is invaded by water. To restrict the number of possible configurations we do not

allow additional formation of interfaces in configuration F and G during subsequent saturation reversals. In theory, although not very likely, the number of interfaces in a cross-section could increase constantly as saturation reversals proceed, provided that contact angle hysteresis is large.

The capillary pressure across an interface in a corner is given by

$$P_c = \frac{\sigma}{r},\tag{2}$$

where r is the radius of curvature measured through the oil phase. For convenience we introduce the radius of curvature r_b measured through the *bulk* phase:

$$r_b = \begin{cases} r & \text{if bulk oil is bounded by water,} \\ -r & \text{if bulk water is bounded by oil.} \end{cases}$$
(3)

To account for contact angle hysteresis and wettability alteration we use a receding contact angle θ_{pd} in primary drainage, an advancing contact angle θ_a in imbibition, and a receding contact angle θ_r in secondary drainage. The contact angles satisfy $\theta_{pd} \leq \theta_r \leq \theta_a$. The angle between an interface and the pore wall measured through the corner phase is given by

$$\psi = \begin{cases} \theta & \text{if bulk oil is bounded by water,} \\ \pi - \theta & \text{if bulk water is bounded by oil.} \end{cases}$$
(4)

For later use we apply the notation $\psi_i = \psi(\theta_i)$.

After a reversal of saturation change, the interfaces in the corners, if present, may be stuck at fixed positions while the contact angle changes with capillary pressure. The angle ψ_h hinges according to

$$\psi_h = \arccos\left(\frac{b\sin\alpha}{r_b}\right) - \alpha,\tag{5}$$

where *b* is the distance from the apex of the corner to the interface, and α is the half-angle of the corners. If the advancing or receding contact angle is reached prior to piston-like invasion, the interfaces in the corners begin to move at constant contact angles during a further change of capillary pressure. The distance *b* is then changing according to

$$b = r_b \frac{\cos(\alpha + \psi)}{\sin \alpha},\tag{6}$$

where ψ is equal to ψ_{pd} in primary drainage, ψ_a in imbibition, and ψ_r in secondary drainage.

2.1. **Capillary entry pressures.** The capillary entry pressures for piston-like invasion are calculated from an energy balance equation which equates the virtual work with the associated change in surface free energy for a small displacement of the invading interface in the direction along the tube length. The energy balance equation relates the effective entry radius of curvature, expressed by r, to the cross-sectional area exposed to change of fluid occupancy, A_{eff} , the bounding cross-sectional fluid-solid and fluid-fluid lengths, L_s and L_f , respectively, and the contact angle θ [e.g., *Ma et al.*, 1996; Øren et al., 1998; *Helland and Skjæveland*, 2004]. This relationship may be formulated as follows using the notation from Eqs. (3), (4):

$$r_b = \frac{A_{\rm eff}}{L_s \cos \psi + L_f},\tag{7}$$

4

where ψ is equal to ψ_{pd} , ψ_a and ψ_r for primary drainage, imbibition and secondary drainage, respectively. Furthermore,

$$A_{\rm eff} = \frac{3R^2}{\tan\alpha} - 3r_b b \sin(\alpha + \beta) + 3r_b^2 \beta, \tag{8}$$

$$L_s = \frac{6R}{\tan \alpha} - 6b,\tag{9}$$

$$L_f = 6r_b\beta,\tag{10}$$

and

$$r_b \sin \beta = b \sin \alpha, \tag{11}$$

with β defined as

$$\beta(\psi_h) = \frac{\pi}{2} - \alpha - \psi_h. \tag{12}$$

If invasion occurs while the interfaces in the corners hinge at fixed positions *b*, then $\psi_h \neq \psi$, and Eqs. (7)–(11) are solved iteratively to obtain a converged value of *r*. When $\psi_h = \psi$, explicit expressions for *r* are derived by combining Eqs. (7)–(12). This is always the case in primary drainage since $\psi_h = \psi_{pd} = \theta_{pd}$. The capillary entry pressure is finally calculated from Eq. (2).

2.2. Layer formation. Formation of fluid layers is only possible if the following condition is satisfied: π

$$\psi < \frac{\pi}{2} - \alpha. \tag{13}$$

Oil layers may form during imbibition if ψ_a satisfies Eq. (13), i.e., when a displacement from configuration C to E or from B to G is possible. Similarly, water layers may form during drainage if ψ_r satisfies Eq. (13), i.e., if a displacement from configuration E to F is possible. A second requirement for layer formation is that the capillary presssures associated with these displacements must be favourable compared to the collapse capillary pressure calculated when the interfaces surrounding the layer meet at their midpoints[e.g., Øren et al., 1998; Hui and Blunt, 2000; Helland and Skjæveland, 2004]. According to van Dijke et al. [2004] and Piri and Blunt [2004] these two geometric conditions are necessary but not sufficient conditions for layer formation. They argue that even if the above conditions are satisfied, one should also calculate the entry pressure for the displacement without layer formation, e.g., the displacement from configuration C to D, and compare it with the entry pressure for the displacement with layer formation, e.g., the displacement from configuration C to E. The actual displacement is the one associated with the most favourable capillary pressure. Hence, layers form if and only if the two geometric conditions are satisfied and the displacement is the most favourable one. In this work we follow van Dijke et al. [2004] and Piri and Blunt [2004] and employ all the three conditions to determine if layers form, as opposed to Helland and Skjæveland [2004] who only used the necessary geometric conditions.

3. CALCULATION OF INTERFACIAL AREA

Since we assume a model of straight triangular tubes, it suffices to consider the cross-sections when calculating saturation and specific interfacial area. The cross-sectional area A of a tube is related to the radius of the inscribed circle, R, by

$$A = \frac{3R^2}{\tan\alpha}.$$
 (14)

J.O. Helland and S.M. Skjæveland

To calculate the area of oil and water occupied in corners and layers we use combinations of the following equation with appropriate arguments ψ :

$$A_c(\psi) = 3r^2(\psi + \alpha - \frac{\pi}{2} + \cos\psi(\frac{\cos\psi}{\tan\alpha} - \sin\psi)).$$
(15)

As an example, the area of water in the corners of configuration C is given by $A_c(\theta_h)$, whereas the area of oil in layers of configuration E is calculated from $A_c(\pi - \theta_a) - A_c(\theta_h)$ when the interfaces bounding bulk water are advancing towards the corners. Thus, Eqs. (14), (15) constitute the expressions required to calculate the saturation.

Specific interfacial area is calculated from Eq. (1) by adding the lengths of all oil-water interfaces in the corners of the tubes and dividing by the total cross-sectional tube area in the bundle. The interfacial lengths are readily expressed in terms of Eq. (10) with the appropriate values for r_b and ψ determined from Eqs. (3), (4), respectively:

$$L_f = 6r_b \beta(\psi). \tag{16}$$

As an example, the interfacial length in configuration C with hinging interfaces is $6r\beta(\theta_h)$. The interfacial length in configuration E is given by $6r\beta(\theta_h) - 6r\beta(\pi - \theta_a)$ if the interfaces surrounding bulk water advance towards the corners. Since the model only accounts for cross-sectional configurations, it is not possible to calculate interfacial area between bulk phases. Moreover, we neglect the contribution to interfacial area from possible thin films along the sides of the tubes.

3.1. **Analytical correlations for primary drainage.** To develop analytical expressions for specific interfacial area in primary drainage, we assume the simple pore-size density

$$f(R) = \nu R_{\max}^{-\nu} R^{\nu - 1},$$
(17)

which includes the adjustable parameter $\nu > 0$. The uniform case corresponds to $\nu = 1$. *Helland and Skjæveland* [2004] have shown that this pore-size density is compatible with the Brooks-Corey correlation if no water is residing in the corners after oil invasion, or if a bundleof-cylindrical-tubes model is assumed. The water saturation was expressed as a sum of two terms,

$$S_w = S_{wb} + S_{wc},\tag{18}$$

where S_{wb} is the contribution from the tubes completely filled with water, and S_{wc} is the contribution from the tubes with water residing in the corners after invasion. It was found that

$$S_{wb} = \left(\frac{c}{P_c}\right)^{\nu+2},\tag{19}$$

and

$$S_{wc} = \epsilon \frac{\nu + 2}{\nu} \left(\frac{c}{P_c}\right)^2 \left[1 - \left(\frac{c}{P_c}\right)^\nu\right],\tag{20}$$

where ϵ is a geometry factor given by

$$\epsilon = \frac{g_1}{g_2},\tag{21}$$

with

$$g_1(\theta_{pd}) = \cos \theta_{pd} - \sqrt{\frac{\tan \alpha}{2}} (\sin 2\theta_{pd} - 2\theta_{pd} - 2\alpha + \pi), \tag{22}$$

and

$$g_2(\theta_{pd}) = \cos \theta_{pd} + \sqrt{\frac{\tan \alpha}{2}} (\sin 2\theta_{pd} - 2\theta_{pd} - 2\alpha + \pi).$$
(23)

The capillary entry pressure *c* for the largest pore size R_{max} is found by combining Eqs. (7)–(12) with $\psi_h = \psi = \theta_{pd}$ and $r_b = r$. This results in the relation

$$c = \frac{\sigma}{R_{\text{max}}} g_2. \tag{24}$$

By Eq. (19), capillary pressure may be expressed in terms of the bulk saturation as

$$P_c = c S_{wb}^{-a},\tag{25}$$

where the pore-size distribution index a is related to v by

$$a = \frac{1}{\nu + 2}.\tag{26}$$

If $S_{wc} = 0$, which corresponds to the case when no water is residing in the corners after oil invasion, the Brooks-Corey correlation [*Brooks and Corey*, 1964],

$$P_c = c S_w^{-a}, (27)$$

is valid.

To derive analytical expressions for the specific interfacial area, we employ the definition given by Eq. (1) as a starting point. For the bundle of triangular tubes, Eq. (1) yields

$$a_{ow} = \frac{L_f \int_{R_o}^{R_{\max}} f dR}{\int_0^{R_{\max}} f A dR},$$
(28)

since the length L_f is independent of pore size. The pore size invaded by oil at capillary pressure P_c is denoted R_o . By combining Eqs. (7)–(12), we find that P_c is related to R_o by

$$R_o = \frac{\sigma}{P_c} g_2. \tag{29}$$

Furthermore, with $L_f = 6r\beta(\theta_{pd})$ and $r = \sigma/P_c$, Eq. (28) may be written as

$$a_{ow} = \frac{2c\beta \tan \alpha}{\sigma g_2^2} \frac{\nu + 2}{\nu} \frac{c}{P_c} \left[1 - \left(\frac{c}{P_c}\right)^{\nu} \right]. \tag{30}$$

Eq. (30) relates specific interfacial area to capillary pressure. Eq. (25) may be inserted into Eq. (30) to provide an equation which relates specific interfacial area to bulk water saturation:

$$a_{ow} = \frac{2c\beta \tan \alpha}{\sigma g_2^2} \frac{\nu + 2}{\nu} S_{wb}^{\frac{1}{\nu+2}} \Big[1 - S_{wb}^{\frac{\nu}{\nu+2}} \Big].$$
(31)

Moreover, a comparison between Eqs. (20, (30) shows that corner water saturation is related to specific interfacial area by

$$a_{ow} = \frac{2P_c\beta\tan\alpha}{g_1g_2\sigma}S_{wc}.$$
(32)

We have solved Eqs. (18)–(20) and calculated specific interfacial area from Eq. (30) for different combinations of R_{max} and ν . The results are presented in Fig. 2. The level of specific interfacial area and capillary pressure is more sensitive to variations of R_{max} than to variations of ν . The level of interfacial area is increased if the range of pore sizes is reduced. The $a_{ow}(S_w)$ curves

7



FIGURE 2. Primary drainage $a_{ow}(S_w)$, $a_{ow}(P_c)$ and $P_c(S_w)$ curves calculated from Eqs. (18)–(20), (30) using three different combinations of v and R_{max} .

exhibit the same general trends as measured data [*Faisal Anwar et al.*, 2000; *Schaefer et al.*, 2000b; *Oostrom et al.*, 2001].

3.2. Approximate correlations for the bounding hysteresis loop. Since the bulk water saturation is much larger than the corner water saturation in most of the saturation range, we propose to formulate interfacial area as a function of total water saturation by employing the same functional form as in Eq. (31). Different rock and fluid properties are accounted for by including adjustable parameters. Thus, for water-wet media we propose the correlation

$$a_{ow} = u_w S_w^{v_w} (1 - S_w^{q_w}), \tag{33}$$

where the three parameters u_w , v_w and q_w have to be determined. Obviously, u_w has the same dimension as specific interfacial area, whereas v_w and q_w are dimensionless.

For water invasion into a complete oilfilled and oil-wet bundle of triangular tubes with Eq. (13) satisfied for θ_a , it can be shown that Eq. (31) is valid with the angle $\beta(\theta_{pd})$ replaced by $\beta(\theta_a)$, and with the bulk water saturation replaced by the bulk oil saturation. For mixed-wet conditions we propose to formulate the interfacial area as a sum of two terms where one term is expressed by the water saturation, as in Eq. (33), while the other term is expressed by the oil saturation. This results in the correlation

$$a_{ow} = u_w S_w^{v_w} (1 - S_w^{q_w}) + u_o S_o^{v_o} (1 - S_o^{q_o}),$$
(34)

where the two sets of the parameters u, v, q have to be determined. The oil saturation term is intended to dominate at small oil saturations, while the water saturation term should dominate at small water saturations. For mixed-wet conditions, interfacial area may decrease at small water saturations in imbibition because of the displacement from configuration C to D. The interfacial area may start to increase at larger water saturations due to the formation of oil layers in the displacement from configuration C to E. When the oil layers collapse, interfacial area decreases abruptly. Eq. (34) accounts for such behavior since the proposed correlation may yield a local minimum and a local maximum of interfacial area.

To investigate the flexibility of Eqs. (33), (34), we have fitted the correlations to simulated data. For this purpose we assume that the pore-size density is described by a truncated Weibull distribution, which is a much more general distribution than the one defined by Eq. (17). The pore sizes R are generated in the following manner: Pick random numbers $x \in [0, 1]$ and calculate inscribed radii from

$$R = R_{\rm ch} \Big(-\ln[(1-x)\exp(-\left[\frac{R_{\rm max} - R_{\rm min}}{R_{\rm ch}}\right]^{\eta}) + x] \Big)^{\frac{1}{\eta}} + R_{\rm min},$$
(35)

where R_{\min} , R_{\min} and R_{ch} are the inscribed radii of the largest, smallest and characteristic pore sizes, respectively, and η is a dimensionless parameter. In the simulations we set $R_{\min} = 0\mu m$, $R_{\max} = 100\mu m$, $R_{ch} = 15\mu m$ and $\eta = 1.5$. Furthermore, $\sigma = 0.050$ N/m and $\theta_{pd} = 0^{\circ}$. Primary drainage is terminated at $P_c = 25$ kPa. In the subsequent imbibition and drainage processes, we consider randomly distributed contact angles. For water-wet conditions we assume $\theta_a \in [50^{\circ}, 80^{\circ}]$, while for mixed-wet conditions we assume $\theta_a \in [90^{\circ}, 180^{\circ}]$. The receding contact angles are calculated by $\theta_r = 0.5\theta_a$ for both water-wet and mixed-wet conditions.

Eq. (33) is fitted to the primary drainage curve, while Eq. (34) is fitted to the main imbibition and secondary drainage curves. A standard curvefitting method is employed to determine the correlation parameters. The results are shown in Fig. 3, and the correlations agree fairly well with the simulated data. A better match may be obtained using appropriate error weighting. A comparison between Eqs. (33), (34) and Eq. (31) indicates that all parameters are likely to be positive. However, to obtain a good match beetween the correlations and the simulated data, one or two of the parameters in Eq. (34) turns out to be slightly negative in some cases.

There is a paucity of measured imbibition and secondary drainage interfacial area data in the literature. However, the imbibition curve in Fig. 3(b) seem to display similar trends as imbibition measurements [Fig. 5, *Schaefer et al.*, 2000a]. Nevertheless, more data is required to validate the correlations and to determine the applicability of the model to predict general trends in interfacial area for various conditions.



FIGURE 3. Specific interfacial area plotted against water saturation for primary drainage, imbibition and secondary drainage. Simulation results are shown by broken lines, while the proposed correlations fitted to the simulated data are represented by the solid lines.

4. THE CONJECTURE OF Hassanizadeh and Gray [1993]

To investigate if hysteresis is absent in the $P_c - S_w - a_{ow}$ relationship, as proposed by *Hassanizadeh and Gray* [1993], we employ our simple bundle-of-tubes model to perform the same exercise as *Held and Celia* [2001]. They utilized a network model and generated a drainage a_{ow} surface from drainage scanning curves initiated from different reversal points on the main imbibition curve. Similarly, an imbibition a_{ow} surface was generated by imbibition scanning curves initiated from different reversal points on the main secondary drainage curve. If the intersections of the two surfaces at constant P_c follow the same $a_{ow}(S_w)$ curve, then hysteresis is absent. *Held and Celia* [2001] found that the intersections essentially followed the same $a_{ow}(S_w)$ curve, and hence they concluded that the conjecture of *Hassanizadeh and Gray* [1993] could not be rejected. However, *Held and Celia* [2001] only considered water-wet media and neglected the contribution of interfacial area from interfaces present in corners of the pore space.

We explore if hysteresis can be eliminated when only interfaces between bulk and corner fluids is contributive to interfacial area. The water-wet and mixed-wet cases modelled in Section 3 are both examined. After primary drainage, configuration A remains in a few of the smaller tubes. Imbibition is terminated when $S_w = 1$ in the water-wet case. In the mixed-wet case, imbibition is terminated when $S_w = 0.995$. At this stage, configuration E is still present in some of the tubes.

The drainage and imbibition a_{ow} surfaces for the water-wet case are shown in Fig. 4(a), (b), respectively, with the bounding hysteresis loop marked by bold lines. The surfaces display a concave-convex shape, implying that for any value of capillary pressure there exists at least two points on the surface with different saturations and equal interfacial area. Similarly, for any value of saturation there exists at least two points on the surface with different capillary pressure and interfacial area. The projections onto the $a_{ow} - S_w$ plane show that the drainage $a_{ow}(S_w)$ scanning curves have a convex shape with a maximum value of a_{ow} at an intermediate



FIGURE 4. Specific interfacial area a_{ow} plotted as a function of P_c and S_w for water-wet conditions. Projections onto the $P_c - S_w$ plane (green) and $a_{ow} - S_w$ plane (red) are also shown. The bounding hysteresis loop is marked by the bold lines. (a) Surface created by drainage scanning curves. (b) Surface created by imbibition scanning curves. (c) Planes at three constant P_c through the drainage (dr) and imbibition (imb) a_{ow} surfaces.

value of S_w , similar to the primary drainage curves in Figs. 2, 3. These general trends are in agreement with the simulations presented by *Reeves and Celia* [1996] and *Held and Celia* [2001]. However, the corresponding imbibition scanning curves in the $a_{ow} - S_w$ plane reveal that a_{ow} decreases monotonically with increasing water saturation. This is different from the results by *Reeves and Celia* [1996] and *Held and Celia* [2001]. The deviations are caused by the significant contact angle hysteresis assumed in our simulations, which causes the interfaces to hinge instead of moving with constant contact angles towards the center of the cross-sections prior to piston-like water invasion. Intersections of the drainage and imbibition a_{ow} surfaces for three constant values of P_c are shown in Fig. 4(c). Evidently, very different values of specific interfacial area occurs for the different directions of saturation change, implying that hysteresis remains present in the $P_c - S_w - a_{ow}$ relationship. Notice also that the imbibition interfacial area is higher than the drainage interfacial area for a constant value of capillary pressure. It should be emphasized that this does not imply that interfacial area is higher in imbibition scanning curves are initiated from the main secondary drainage curve where interfacial area may be large, while drainage scanning curves are initiated from the main imbibition curve where interfacial area may be small. Because of the significant contact angle hysteresis assumed, the different scanning curves may reach the chosen level of constant capillary pressure before piston-like invasion results in pronounced changes of interfacial area. The differences between drainage and imbibition interfacial area decreases as water saturation increases. This is due to the shape of the projection of the bounding hysteresis loop in the $a_{ow} - S_w$ plane shown in Fig. 4(a), (b).

The corresponding results for the mixed-wet case are presented in Fig. 5. The projections onto the $a_{ow} - S_w$ plane reveal that the interfacial area is higher during main imbibition than during main secondary drainage, as opposed to the results for water-wet conditions. The a_{ow} surfaces display a more complex shape for the mixed-wet case because of oil layer formation during imbibition. After primary drainage, the interfaces are hinging until the displacements from configuration C to D occur, resulting in a decrease of interfacial area at small water saturations in imbibition. For larger water saturations, the displacements from configuration C to E occur, resulting in an increased interfacial area. The interfaces separating oil layers from bulk water move towards the corners, resulting in a slight decrease of interfacial area. Eventually, the oil layers collapse and the interfacial area decreases significantly. These trends are also present in the imbibition scanning curves, as they display a concave-convex shape with a local minimum and a local maximum. This is demonstrated in Fig. 5(b). In the drainage processes, the displacement from configuration E to C dominates at large S_w , while the displacement from configuration D to C dominates at small water saturations. Thus, the drainage scanning curves display concave shapes in the $a_{ow} - S_w$ plane, as shown in Fig. 5(a). Following the same reasoning as for the water-wet case, it is expected that the $a_{ow}(S_w)$ curves produced by intersections of the surfaces at constant P_c , result in higher interfacial area in drainage than in imbibition, as shown in Fig. 5(c). Moreover, the differences between drainage and imbibition interfacial area increases with water saturation. This is due to the shape of the projection of the bounding hysteresis loop in the $a_{ow} - S_w$ plane shown in Fig. 5(a), (b). Evidently, Fig. 5(c) indicates that hysteresis in the $P_c - S_w - a_{ow}$ relationship remains present for mixed-wet conditions as well.

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

We have used a simple bundle-of-triangular-tubes model to calculate interfacial area as a function of saturation for primary drainage, imbibition and secondary drainage for mixed-wet conditions. The model employs accurate expressions for the capillary entry pressures, accounting for the possibility of hinging interfaces in the corners due to contact angle hysteresis. Analytical expressions for specific interfacial area as a function of saturation and capillary pressure are derived for primary drainage, assuming that only the interfaces between bulk and corner fluid is contributive to interfacial area. Flexible correlations are suggested for the subsequent imbibition and secondary drainage processes. We have also investigated if hysteresis occurs in





FIGURE 5. Specific interfacial area a_{ow} plotted as a function of P_c and S_w for mixed-wet conditions. Projections onto the $P_c - S_w$ plane (green) and $a_{ow} - S_w$ plane (red) are also shown. The bounding hysteresis loop is marked by the bold lines. (a) Surface created by drainage scanning curves. (b) Surface created by imbibition scanning curves. (c) Planes at three constant P_c through the drainage (dr) and imbibition (imb) a_{ow} surfaces.

the relationship between capillary pressure, saturation and interfacial area. The specific conclusions are as follows:

- (i) The proposed correlations are in agreement with the interfacial area data generated by the model. Experimental measurements of hysteresis loops are required to validate the correlations and to determine the applicability of the model for interfacial area calculations.
- (ii) Hysteresis in the relationship between capillary pressure, saturation and corner fluid bulk fluid interfacial area remains present between imbibition and secondary drainage

J.O. Helland and S.M. Skjæveland

processes if contact angle hysteresis is assumed. Hysteresis may be significant for both water-wet and mixed-wet conditions.

NOMENCLATURE

- *A* Cross-sectional area
- *A*_{eff} Cross-sectional area exposed to change of fluid occupancy during invasion
 - *a* Specific interfacial area
 - *b* Position of arc meniscus
 - *f* Pore-size density
 - g_1 Geometry factor, see Eq. (22)
 - g_2 Geometry factor, see Eq. (23)
- L_s Cross-sectional fluid-solid length
- L_f Cross-sectional fluid-fluid length
- P Pressure
- q Correlation parameter, see Eqs. (33), (34)
- *r* Radius of curvature
- *R* Radius of the inscribed circle
- *S* Saturation
- \mathcal{S} Total area of interfaces within a representative volume
- *u* Correlation parameter, see Eqs. (33), (34)
- \mathcal{V} Representative volume
- v Correlation parameter, see Eqs. (33), (34)
- x Random number between 0 and 1
- α Corner half angle
- β Angle defined from geometry of the interfaces in the corners, see Eq. (12)
- ϵ Geometry factor, see Eq. (21)
- η Parameter in the Weibull distribution
- θ Contact angle
- ν Parameter in pore-size distribution
- σ Interfacial tension
- ψ Angle the interface makes with the pore wall measured through the corner phase, see Eq. (4)

Subscripts.

- *a* Advancing
- b Bulk
- *c* Corner or capillary
- ch Characteristic
- h Hinging
- max Maximum
- min Minimum
- o Oil
- *pd* Primary drainage
- r Receding
- w Water

14

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Support for Johan Olav Helland was provided by Statoil through the VISTA program.

REFERENCES

- Bradford, S. A., and F. J. Leij (1997), Estimating interfacial areas for multi-fluid soil systems, *J. Cont. Hydr.*, 27, 83–105.
- Brooks, R. H., and A. T. Corey (1964), Hydraulic properties of porous media, *Hydraulic paper* no. 3, *Colorado State University*.
- Dalla, E., M. Hilpert, and C. T. Miller (2002), Computation of the interfacial area for two-fluid porous medium systems, *J. Cont. Hydr.*, *56*, 25–48.
- Dillard, L. A., H. I. Essaid, and M. J. Blunt (2001), A functional relation for field-scale nonaqueous phase liquid dissolution developed using a pore network model, *J. Cont. Hydr.*, 48, 89–119.
- Faisal Anwar, A. H. M., M. Bettahar, and U. Matsubayashi (2000), A method for determining air-water interfacial area in variably saturated porous media, *J. Cont. Hydr.*, 43, 129–146.
- Gladkikh, M., and S. Bryant (2003), Prediction of interfacial areas during imbibition in simple porous media, *Adv. Water Resources*, *26*, 609–622.
- Gray, W. G. (1999), Thermodynamics and constitutive theory for multiphase porous-media flow considering internal geometric constraints, *Adv. Water Resources*, 22(5), 521–547.
- Hassanizadeh, S. M., and W. G. Gray (1993), Thermodynamic basis of capillary pressure in porous media, *Water Resources Research*, 29(10), 3389–3405.
- Held, R., and M. A. Celia (2001), Modeling support of functional relationships between capillary pressure, saturation, interfacial area and common lines, *Adv. Water Resources*, *24*, 325–343.
- Helland, J. O., and S. M. Skjæveland (2004), Physically-based capillary pressure correlation for mixed-wet reservoirs from a bundle-of-tubes model, *Paper SPE 89428 presented at the SPE/DOE Fourteenth Symposium on Improved Oil Recovery, Tulsa, OK, Apr. 17–21.*
- Hui, M., and M. J. Blunt (2000), Effects of wettability on three-phase flow in porous media, *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 104, 3833–3845.
- Kennedy, C. A., and W. C. Lennox (1997), A pore-scale investigation of mass transport from dissolved DNAPL droplets, *J. Cont. Hydr.*, 24, 221–246.
- Kovscek, A. R., H. Wong, and C. J. Radke (1993), A pore-level scenario for the development of mixed wettability in oil reservoirs, *Am. Inst. Chem. Eng. J.*, 39(6), 1072–1085.
- Ma, S., G. Mason, and N. R. Morrow (1996), Effect of contact angle on drainage and imbibition in regular polygonal tubes, *Coll. and Surf. A: Phys. and Eng. Asp.*, *117*, 273–291.
- Oostrom, M., M. D. White, and M. L. Brusseau (2001), Theoretical estimation of free and entrapped nonwetting–wetting fluid interfacial areas in porous media, *Adv. Water Resources*, 24, 887–898.
- Or, D., and M. Tuller (1999), Liquid retention and interfacial area in variably saturated porous media: upscaling from single-pore to sample-scale model, *Water Resources Research*, 35(12), 3591–3605.
- Øren, P., S. Bakke, and O. Arntzen (1998), Extending predictive capabilities to network models, *SPE Journal*, pp. 324–336.

- Piri, M., and M. Blunt (2004), Three-phase threshold capillary pressures in non-circular capillary tubes with different wettabilities including contact angle hysteresis, *Phys. Rev. E*, 70(061603).
- Reeves, P. C., and M. A. Celia (1996), A functional relationship between capillary pressure, saturation and interfacial area as revealed by a pore-scale network model, *Water Resources Research*, *32*(8), 2345–2358.
- Saripalli, K. P., P. S. C. Rao, and M. D. Annable (1998), Determination of specific NAPL-water interfacial areas of residual NAPLs in porous media using the interfacial tracers technique, J. Cont. Hydr., 30, 375–391.
- Schaefer, C. E., D. A. DiCarlo, and M. J. Blunt (2000a), Experimental measurement of airwater interfacial area during gravity drainage and secondary imbibition in porous media, *Water Resources Research*, 36(4), 885–890.
- Schaefer, C. E., D. A. DiCarlo, and M. J. Blunt (2000b), Determination of water-oil interfacial area during 3-phase gravity drainage in porous media, *J. Coll. Int. Sci.*, 221, 308–312.
- Schäfer, A., P. Ustohal, H. Harms, F. Stauffer, T. Dracos, and A. J. B. Zehnder (1998), Transport of bacteria in unsaturated porous media, *J. Cont. Hydr.*, *33*, 149–169.
- van Dijke, M. I. J., M. Lago, K. S. Sorbie, and M. Arujo (2004), Free energy balance for three fluid phases in a capillary of arbitrarily shaped cross-section: capillary entry pressures and layers of the intermediate-wetting phase, *J. Coll. Int. Sci.*, 277, 184–201.
- van Genuchten, M. T. (1980), A closed-form equation for predicting the hydraulic conductivity of unsaturated soils, *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 44, 892–898.