



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/petrol

A model ranking and uncertainty propagation approach for improving confidence in solids transport model predictions

Frits Byron Soepyan^a, Selen Cremaschi^{b,*}, Cem Sarica^c, Hariprasad J. Subramani^d, Haijing Gao^d

^a The University of Tulsa, Russell School of Chemical Engineering, 800 South Tucker Drive, Tulsa, OK 74104, USA

^b Auburn University, Department of Chemical Engineering, 212 Ross Hall, Auburn, AL 36849-5127, USA

^c The University of Tulsa, McDougall School of Petroleum Engineering, 800 South Tucker Drive, Tulsa, OK 74104, USA

^d Chevron Energy Technology Company, 1400 Smith Street, Houston, TX 77002, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Solid particle transport
Threshold velocity prediction
Model evaluation
Uncertainty propagation
Confidence in model predictions
Monte Carlo simulation

ABSTRACT

The transport of solid particles in pipelines is of interest in the petroleum industry, and is needed to increase flow efficiency in the pipe and prevent pipeline damage due to the particles' accumulation. To achieve this goal, the velocity of the carrier fluid in the pipe needs to exceed the threshold velocity. Many solids transport models are available for predicting the threshold velocity, but for the same input condition, the predictions of these models may vary by orders of magnitude, and information regarding the confidence of the models' predictions is not readily available. To resolve these issues, this paper presents a model evaluation and uncertainty propagation approach that uses a novel combination of data clustering, model parameter fine-tuning, model screening and ranking, model uncertainty quantification, and Monte Carlo simulation methods. The inputs are the experimental database for solids transport, a set of solids transport models, and the input condition(s) where the models' predictions are needed. The outputs of the methodology include the models' rankings, and the envelopes of the models' predictions to within a predetermined confidence level. By propagating the uncertainties of the models, experimental data, and input conditions, the highest-ranked models produce velocity envelopes at the 90% confidence level that cover the experimentally-observed values for 92% of the cases; while using the prediction of an individual model does not provide any information regarding the prediction confidence.

1. Introduction

In the petroleum industry, the need to hydraulically transport solid particles is encountered frequently. For instance, hydraulic fracturing involves injecting fluid [typically water, oil, acids, methanol (Pangilinan et al., 2016), or water mixed with drag-reducing polymer (Gu and Mohanty, 2015)] and proppants [typically sand, ceramic, or resin-coated ceramic or sand (Pangilinan et al., 2016)] at high rate and pressure (Shiozawa and McClure, 2016). This process creates fractures in the "geologic formations" (Pangilinan et al., 2016), which increases the permeability and the production rate of the oil reservoir (Zheng et al., 2015). In another application, during well drilling, the cuttings need to be transported by the drilling fluid (Akhshik et al., 2015) to prevent the formation of a stationary bed of solids at the bottom of the wellbore (Rodriguez Corredor et al., 2016). Consequences of having a stationary bed of solids include "slow drilling rate, and in severe cases, stuck pipe" (Rodriguez Corredor et al., 2016).

In these cases, the fluid velocity must exceed the threshold velocity

to successfully transport the solid particles in the pipe. Many solids transport models exist that predict such velocity (Soepyan, 2015). Furthermore, different threshold velocity definitions exist (Soepyan et al., 2014), including the critical velocity (the fluid velocity that marks the boundary between the settling of solid particles at the bottom of the pipe and the particles' full suspension) (Oroskar and Turian, 1980), saltation velocity (the minimum fluid velocity needed to prevent suspended solid particles from settling to the bottom of the pipe) (Zenz, 1964), equilibrium velocity (the fluid velocity where the rate at which the particles are transported by the fluid equals the rate at which the particles settle to the bottom of the pipe) (Gruesbeck et al., 1979), pick-up velocity (the fluid velocity required to initiate the motion of a solid particle initially at rest on a bed of solids) (Hayden et al., 2003), and incipient motion velocity (the fluid velocity required to initiate the motion of a solid particle initially at rest at the bottom of the pipe) (Rabinovich and Kalman, 2009a).

Different models may be developed using different assumptions regarding the dominant forces for solid particle transport, given the

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: selen-cremaschi@auburn.edu (S. Cremaschi).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.petrol.2016.12.025>

Received 8 September 2016; Received in revised form 1 December 2016; Accepted 19 December 2016
0920-4105/ © 2016 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Nomenclature

C	particle volumetric concentration	model j that lie outside $\pm(100\%) \times \min(1 - \varepsilon_l, \varepsilon_u - 1)$ of the experimental observations
C_i	particle volumetric concentration of datum point i	R_j^2 R^2 statistic of model j
C_0	particle volumetric concentration of the input condition	$R_{adj,dev,j}^2$ deviation of the modified adjusted- R^2 statistic of model j from the value of one
d_i	weighted Euclidean distance between experimental datum point i and the input condition	$R_{adj,j}^2$ adjusted- R^2 statistic of model j
D	hydraulic diameter of the conduit	$R_{adj,mod,j}^2$ modified adjusted- R^2 statistic of model j
D_i	hydraulic diameter of the conduit of datum point i	S_j score of model j
D_0	hydraulic diameter of the conduit of the input condition	t index of the trial (replication) of the Monte Carlo simulation method
d_p	particle diameter	T_{SS} total sum of squares of the experimentally-observed threshold velocity
$d_{p,i}$	particle diameter of datum point i	$T_{SS,mod}$ modified total sum of squares of the experimentally-observed threshold velocity
$d_{p,0}$	particle diameter of the input condition	T_1 test statistic for the null hypothesis
$E_{MA,j}$	mean absolute error of model j	$U_{exp,i}$ uncertainty of the experimentally-observed threshold velocity at datum point i
$E_{MAP,j}$	mean absolute error percentage of model j	$under\%_j$ percentage of experimentally-observed threshold velocity underestimated by model j in the reduced database
$E_{MS,j}$	mean squared error of model j	U_{x_l} uncertainty of independent variable l
$EP_{i,j}$	error percentage of model j at experimental datum point i in the reduced database	$U_{x_{l,i}}$ uncertainty of independent variable l at datum point i
ESS_j	error sum of squares of the threshold velocity predictions of model j	v threshold velocity
$F_{calc}(v)$	distribution function of the predicted threshold velocity in the reduced database	$v_{calc,i,j}$ threshold velocity predicted by model j for experimental datum point i
$F_{exp}(v)$	distribution function of the experimentally-observed threshold velocity in the reduced database	v_{exp} experimentally-observed threshold velocity
$f(x_l, \underline{k})$	equation of the model	$v_{exp,avg}$ average value of the experimentally-observed threshold velocity in the reduced database
$f\left(\underline{x}_{l,i}, \underline{k}_j\right)$	equation of model j at datum point i	$v_{exp,i}$ experimentally-observed threshold velocity of datum point i
H_a	alternative hypothesis	$v_{L,exp,i}$ lower bound of the value of the threshold velocity at experimental datum point i
h_l	correlation between independent variable l and the threshold velocity	$v_{M,i,j}$ estimated “true” value of the threshold velocity at the input condition given the error of model j at experimental datum point i
H_0	null hypothesis	$v_{U,exp,i}$ upper bound of the value of the threshold velocity at experimental datum point i
i	index of the experimental data points	$v_{0,avg}$ average value of the threshold velocity predictions of all the ranked models for the input condition
j	index of the models	$v_{0,dev,j}$ absolute deviation of $v_{0,j}$ from $v_{0,avg}$
J	number of ranked models	$v_{0,i}$ threshold velocity prediction of the model for the i th input condition
\underline{k}	vector that consists of the parameters (constants) of the model	$v_{0,j}$ threshold velocity prediction of model j for the input condition
k_j	number of parameters in model j	x independent variable
\underline{k}_j	vector that consists of the parameters of model j	x_l value of independent variable l
$k_{j,non}$	number of parameters in model j that become non-zero after the model parameter fine-tuning process	\underline{x}_j vector that contains the values of the independent variables
l	index of the independent variables	$x_{l,i}$ value of independent variable l at datum point i
$max\%_j$	maximum between $over\%_j$ and $under\%_j$	$\underline{x}_{l,i}$ vector that contains the independent variables of datum point i
m_j	slope between the predictions of model j and the experimentally-observed values of the threshold velocity	$\bar{x}_{l,i}$ normalized $x_{l,i}$
$m_{0,j}$	slope between the predictions of model j and the experimentally-observed values of the threshold velocity, with the intercept forced to be at the origin	$x_{L,l,i}$ lower bound of the value of independent variable l at experimental datum point i
N_{Ar}	Archimedes number	$x_{l,0}$ value of independent variable l at the input condition
$N_{Ar,i}$	Archimedes number of datum point i	$\bar{x}_{l,0}$ normalized $x_{l,0}$
$N_{Ar,0}$	Archimedes number of the input condition	$x_{U,l,i}$ upper bound of the value of independent variable l at experimental datum point i
n_{data}	number of data points in the reduced database	x_1 first independent variable
N_{data}	number of data points in the experimental database	x_2 second independent variable
$n_{indep,j}$	number of independent variables incorporated in model j	y_j statistic of model j
N_{model}	total number of models available in the model database	z dependent variable
$N_{Re,p}$	particle Reynolds number	α_S level of significance
$N_{Re,p,i}$	particle Reynolds number of datum point i	ε_l acceptable lower bound of the ratio of the model's prediction to the value of the threshold velocity observed experimentally
$N_{Re,p,i,j}$	particle Reynolds number predicted by model j for datum point i	ε_u acceptable upper bound of the ratio of the model's predic-
n_{trial}	total number of trials (replications) for the Monte Carlo simulation method	
N_{var}	total number of independent variables that describe the physical system	
$over\%_j$	percentage of experimentally-observed threshold velocity overestimated by model j in the reduced database	
$P\%_j$	percentage of threshold velocity predictions produced by	

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5484368>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/5484368>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)