ABSTRACT

Normally, production data are analyzed by decline-curve fitting. However, analogous to pressure-transient analysis, the reciprocal flow rate and its derivative may be analyzed and interpreted for reservoir characterization purposes. In some cases, formation linear flow regime may be seen once the radial flow regime vanished. This flow regime is very important and can be presented in fractured well, horizontal wells and long reservoirs. Either pressure-transient analysis or rate-transient analysis may be affected by linear flow regime. For the case of production rate at constant well-flowing pressure, most of the analysis is conducted by decline-curve analysis and little attention has been given to rate-transient analysis. This paper presents the governing equations used for rate-transient analysis in elongated systems using characteristic points and “fingerprints” found on the log-log plot of reciprocal rate and reciprocal rate derivative, so analytical expressions were developed to determine reservoir parameters, following the philosophy of the TDS Technique. It allows for the estimation of reservoir permeability, reservoir width and geometrical skin factors. If the test is long enough, reservoir drainage area, well position inside the reservoir and/or reservoir length can also be determined. The methodology was successfully verified by its application to synthetic cases.
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RESUMEN

Normalmente, los datos de producción se analizan por medio de ajuste de curvas de declinación. Sin embargo, análogo al análisis de pruebas de presión, el recíproco del caudal y su derivada podrán analizarse e interpretarse para propósitos de caracterización del yacimiento. En algunos casos, el régimen de flujo lineal dentro de la formación podría ser visto una vez que desaparezca el flujo radial. Este régimen de flujo se presenta en pozos fracturados, pozos horizontales y yacimientos alargados. Ya sea el análisis transitorio de la presión o el análisis de datos de caudal podrán estar afectados por el régimen de flujo lineal. En el caso de producción a presión de fondo constante, la mayoría del análisis se conduce mediante curvas de declinación y muy poca atención ha recibido el análisis transitorio de la tasa de flujo. En este artículo se presentan las ecuaciones gobernantes usadas en análisis transitorio del caudal para sistemas alargados usando puntos característicos y “huellas digitales” hallados en el gráfico logarítmico del recíproco del caudal y su derivada de modo que se desarrollaron expresiones analíticas para determinar los parámetros del yacimiento siguiendo la filosofía de la técnica TDS. Esta permite determinar la permeabilidad, el ancho del yacimiento y los datos geométricos. Si la prueba es lo suficientemente larga se pueden estimar el área de drenaje, posición del pozo dentro del yacimiento y/o la longitud del yacimiento. La metodología se verificó satisfactoriamente mediante su aplicación a ejemplos simulados.

PALABRAS CLAVES

Flujo lineal, flujo parabólico, ancho del yacimiento, presión de fondo fluyente, derivada del recíproco del caudal.

1. INTRODUCTION

Formation linear flow in vertical wells can be due to geological events (meandering), hydraulic fractures, horizontal wells, faulting or sand lens. Nutakki and Mattar (1982) presented an investigation for infinite channel reservoirs using a vertical fracture approach with a pseudo skin factor. Their governing pressure equation possesses a wrong constant but they provided the first mathematical insights to work on long and narrow reservoir systems and provided a conventional straight-line methodology for well test interpretation. Raghavan and Chu (1996) introduced a method to estimate average pressure when radial flow conditions are nonexistent for the cases of linear and bilinear flow regimes which may be applicable to channel reservoirs. Massonat et al., (1993) presented flow simulations in geologically complex channelized reservoirs. Their well test analysis was performed by non-linear regression analysis and no interpretation technique was presented. Wong et al., (1986) introduced new type curves to interpret pressure transient analysis for rectangular reservoirs. They solved some field examples using type-curve matching and conventional techniques. Their type curves allowed easy recognition of the late-time behavior for all possible well positions in the mentioned reservoir systems.

Recently, Escobar et al. (2007) introduced the application of the TDS technique for characterization of long and homogeneous reservoirs, presenting new...
equations for estimation of reservoir area, reservoir width and geometrical skin factors. Escobar et al. (2005) introduced a new flow regime exhibiting a negative half slope on the pressure derivative curve once dual-linear flow has ended. Escobar and Montealegre (2006) studied the impact of the geometric skin factors on elongated systems. Characterization of pressure tests in elongated systems using the conventional method was also presented by Escobar and Montealegre (2007). Escobar (2008) presented a summary of the advances in characterization of long and homogenous reservoirs using pressure-transient analysis. El-Banbi and Wattenbarger (1996) were the first in applying rate-transient analysis to elongated systems. An example of this behavior can be seen in the log-log plot of the reciprocal rate versus time for a Mexican well shown in Figure-1. Escobar et al. (2010) presented a detailed study on the interpretation of reciprocal rate vs. time data by the straight-line conventional analysis method. They presented the governing equations for heterogeneous and naturally fractured reservoir. Actually, this study is a continuation of it.

2. FORMULATION

For the mathematical development consider the following dimensionless parameters:

\[ t_D = \frac{0.0002637 \cdot k t}{\phi \mu \cdot r_w^2} \]  
(1)

\[ t_{DA} = \frac{0.0002637 \cdot k t}{\phi \mu \cdot A} \]  
(2)

\[ \frac{1}{q_D} = \frac{k h \Delta P}{141.2 \mu B} \cdot 1 \]  
(3)

\[ \left[ t_D \cdot (1/q_D)^y \right] = \frac{k h \Delta P}{141.2 \mu B} \left[ t \cdot (1/q)^y \right] \]  
(4)

\[ t_{DL} = \frac{t_D}{W_D^2} \]  
(5)

\[ W_D = \frac{Y_E}{r_w} \]  
(6)

\[ X_D = \frac{2b_y}{X_E} \]  
(7)

\[ Y_D = \frac{2b_y}{Y_E} \]  
(8)

2.1 Characteristics lines and points for homogeneous reservoirs

2.1.1 Linear-flow regime

When the extreme reservoir boundaries are closed to flow and the well is off-centered inside the reservoir, the dominant flow regime is called linear (or single-linear) which is identified by a half slope on the curve of the derivative of the reciprocal rate. In Figure-2, a transition between linear and dual-linear flow regimes is observed since production tests take more time than pressure tests. The governing equation for this behavior is:

\[ \frac{1}{q_D} = \frac{4 \pi \cdot t_D}{W_D^2} + s_L \]  
(9)
Where \( s_L \) is the geometrical skin factor caused by the transition from dual-linear to linear flow regime. The derivative of Eq. 9 is:

\[
\left[ t_D * (1/q_D) \right]' = \frac{2 \pi \sqrt{t_D}}{W_D} \quad (10)
\]

Replacing Eqs. 1, 5 and 6 into Eq. 10 and solving for the \( k_{0.5} Y_E \) product, it yields:

\[
Y_E \sqrt{k} = \frac{14.4068 B}{h\Delta P \left[ \frac{1}{q} \right]_L} \left[ \frac{\Delta \mu}{\phi c_i} \right] \quad (11)
\]

For \( \Delta t = 1 \) hr

\[
\left[ t_D * (1/q_D) \right]' = \frac{5 \sqrt{\pi_D}}{4 W_D} \quad (15)
\]

Once the dimensionless quantities are replaced into Eq. 15, it yields:

\[
Y_E \sqrt{k} = \frac{5.0801 B}{h\Delta P \left[ \frac{1}{q} \right]_{DL}} \left[ \frac{\Delta \mu}{\phi c_i} \right] \quad (16)
\]

For \( \Delta t = 1 \) hr

\[
Y_E \sqrt{k} = \frac{5.0801 B}{h\Delta P \left[ \frac{1}{q} \right]_{DL}} \left[ \frac{\mu}{\phi c_i} \right] \quad (17)
\]

As for the case of linear flow regime, the geometrical skin factor is obtained by dividing the reciprocal rate equation by the derivative equation:

\[
s_{DL} = \frac{1}{q} \left[ \frac{1}{q} \right]_{DL} - 2 \frac{1}{27.7945 Y_E} \left[ \frac{k t_{DL}}{\phi c_i} \right] \quad (18)
\]

Where \( t_{DL} \) is any convenient during the dual-linear flow regime and \( \left[ \frac{1}{q} \right]_{DL} \) and \( \left[ \frac{1}{q} \right]_{DL}' \) are the reciprocal rate and its derivative corresponding to \( t_{DL} \).
2.1.3 Parabolic flow

This flow regime is depicted in Figure-4 as a result of the combination of a constant-pressure boundary, when it is felt, and the travel of the perturbation along the other lateral side of the reservoir. The governing dimensionless reciprocal rate and reciprocal rate derivative are:

\[ \frac{1}{q_D} = - \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{4} W_D \left( \frac{X_E}{Y_E} \right)^2 t_D^{-0.5} + s_{PB} \]  

(19)

\[ \left[ t_D * (1/q_D) \right] = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{8} W_D \left( \frac{X_E}{Y_E} \right)^2 t_D^{-0.5} \]  

(20)

After the dimensionless parameters are plugged in the former expression, we obtain:

\[ \frac{k^{1.5} Y_e}{b_{x}^{2}} = \frac{\mu B}{h} \left( \frac{X}{t^*(1/q)} \right)_{PB} \left( \frac{\phi \mu c_t}{t_{PB}} \right)^{0.5} \]

(21)

The geometrical parabolic skin factor is obtained by dividing the reciprocal rate equation, Eq. 19, by the reciprocal rate derivative equation, Eq. 20:

\[ s_{PB} = \left( \frac{1}{q} \left( t^*(1/q) \right)_{PB} + 2 \right) \frac{54.5745 b_{x}}{Y_E} \sqrt{\frac{\phi \mu c_t}{k t_{PB}}} \]

(22)

Where \( t_{PB} \) is any convenient during the parabolic flow regime and (1/q) PB and \( t^*(1/q)' \) PB are the reciprocal rate and its derivative corresponding to \( t_{PB} \).
2.1.4 Intersection points

2.1.4.1 Intersection between the pseudosteady-state line with the dual-linear, linear and radial lines

A unit-slope line is observed on the derivative during late times as shown in Figure-5. This line has the following governing equation:

\[\left[t_D \ast \left(\frac{1}{q_E}\right)\right] = \frac{1}{2} \pi t_{DA}\]

The intercept of this line with the dual-linear, linear and radial lines allows, respectively, estimating reservoir drainage area, such as:

\[A = \frac{kt_{DLPSI} Y_E^2}{62.3221 \phi \mu c_i}\]  

When the radial flow is masked but the hemi-radial flow is seen, the intersection of this line with the pseudosteady-state line leads to obtain:

\[A = \frac{kt_{RPSSI}}{109.7355 \phi \mu c_i}\]  

2.1.4.2 Intersection of the radial with dual-linear and linear lines

The intersection point between the infinite-acting reciprocal rate derivative and the dual-linear and linear lines allows obtaining expressions to estimate reservoir width. Therefore, if Eqs. 15 and 10 are equal to 0.5, Eq. 52; the following expressions are obtained once the dimensionless parameters are replaced:

\[Y_E = 0.07195 \left(\frac{kt_{RL}{L}}{\phi \mu c_i}\right)\]  

\[Y_E = 0.2040 \left(\frac{kt_{RL}{L}}{\phi \mu c_i}\right)\]

2.1.4.3 Intersection of the parabolic line with dual linear and linear lines

These intersection points are sketched in Figure-6, and they can be used to estimate the distance from the well to the closer lateral boundary, \(b_x\).

\[b_x = \frac{1}{38.9470} \left(\frac{kt_{DLPSI}}{\phi \mu c_i}\right)\]  

\[b_x = \frac{Y_E}{109.2242} \left(\frac{kt_{RPSSI}}{\phi \mu c_i}\right)^{0.5}\]
2.1.4.4 Intersection of the negative-unit slope for mixed and constant-pressure boundaries when the well is near a constant-pressure boundary (dual linear, radial and parabolic)

When both lateral boundaries are subjected to constant-pressure once the dual-linear flow vanishes, the governing equation for the negative-unit slope, Figure-7, is governed by:

\[
\left[ t_D \ast \left( 1/ q_D \right) \right] = \frac{4}{7\pi} W^2_D \left( X_{D}^{1.5} \right) \left( \frac{X_E}{Y_E} \right)^3 t_D^{-1} \]  

(34)

For the mixed-boundary case when the well is near the constant-pressure boundary, once the parabolic flow vanishes the derivative presents a hump before falling down. This also has a negative-unit slope which governing equation is:

\[
\left[ t_D \ast \left( 1/ q_D \right) \right] = \frac{W^2_D}{\pi} \left( X_{D}^{1.5} \right) \left( \frac{X_E}{Y_E} \right)^3 t_D^{-1} \]  

(35)

The intersection of the negative-unit slope lines, Eqs. 34 and 35, with the dual-linear, parabolic and radial lines leads to find the following expressions:

Constant-pressure boundaries

\[
X_E^3 = \frac{1}{1.33 \times 10^9} \left( \frac{kt_{PBSS}}{\phi \mu c_t} \right) \frac{1}{b_z^2} \]  

(36)

\[
X_E^3 = \frac{1}{1.74 \times 10^6} \left( \frac{kt_{RSSI}}{\phi \mu c_t} \right) \frac{Y_E^2}{b_z^2} \]  

(37)

Mixed boundaries (well near the constant-pressure boundary)

\[
X_E^3 = \frac{1}{129.48} \left( \frac{kt_{PBSS}}{\phi \mu c_t} \right) \frac{1}{b_z^2} \]  

(38)

\[
X_E^3 = \frac{1}{9.02 \times 10^7} \left( \frac{kt_{RSSI}}{\phi \mu c_t} \right) ^3 \frac{1}{b_z^2} \]  

(39)
\[ X_E^2 = \frac{1}{4.66 \times 10^7} \left( \frac{kt_{PBSSI}}{\phi \mu c_f} \right)^2 Y_E^2 \frac{b_x^3}{b_x^3} \] (40)

\[ X_E^2 = \frac{1}{3913.6439} \left( \frac{kt_{PBSSI}}{\phi \mu c_f} \right) b_x \] (41)

### 2.1.5 Maximum points

Figure-8 shows the maximum points developed when the well is off-centered and near constant-pressure boundaries.

![Figure-8. Derivative plot showing the parabolic flow, steady-state period flow, maximum points and intersection points.](image)

These maximum points permit to determine reservoir area, \( A \), reservoir length, \( X_E \), and well location, \( b_x \). The governing equations are:

**First maximum point** (Change from dual-linear to parabolic)

\[ t_{D1} \left[ \frac{1}{q_D} \right] = \frac{5}{4} \left[ \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{W_D X_D} \right]^{0.5} \] (42)

\[ \frac{X_E}{Y_E} = 5 \left[ \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{W_D X_D} \right]^{0.5} t_{D1} \] (43)

\[ \frac{X_E}{Y_E} = \left[ \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{X_D} \right] \left[ \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{X_D} \right]^{0.5} \] (44)

**Second maximum point** (End of parabolic and start of steady-state)

\[ t_{D2} \left[ \frac{1}{q_D} \right] = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{W_D X_D} \] (45)

\[ \frac{X_E}{Y_E} = \left[ \frac{\pi}{2X_D} \right]^{0.5} t_{D2} \] (46)

After replacing the dimensionless parameters given by Eqs. 1, 5 and 6 into Eqs. 43 and 44, two equations for well position are obtained:

\[ b_x = \left( \frac{1}{55.58} \right) \sqrt{\left( \frac{kt_{s1}}{\phi \mu c_f} \right)} \] (48)

\[ b_x = \frac{kh Y_E \Delta P \left[ t_1 \left[ \frac{1}{q} \right] \right]}{159.327 \mu B} \] (49)

Replacing the dimensionless parameters given by Eqs. 6 and 7 into Eqs. 48 and 49, two new equations are obtained for reservoir length estimation:

\[ X_E = 637.3 \left( \frac{h_x}{Y_E} \right) \left( \frac{\mu B}{\Delta P k h} \right) \left[ \frac{1}{t_2 \left[ \frac{1}{q} \right]} \right] \] (50)

\[ X_E = \frac{1}{39.2} \left( \frac{kt_{s2}}{\phi \mu c_f} \right)^{0.5} \] (51)

Finally, during radial flow the reciprocal rate derivative is defined by:
\[
\left[ t_D^* \left(\frac{1}{q_D} \right) \right] = 0.5
\]

Replacing Eq. 4 into Eq. 52 will result:
\[
k = \frac{70.6 \mu B}{h \Delta P \left[ t^* \left(\frac{1}{q} \right) \right]^2}
\]

where \( (t^*/q) \), is the reciprocal rate derivative at any convenient time, \( t_r \), during radial flow. The mechanical skin factor is obtained by dividing the reciprocal rate equation during radial flow assuming its behavior is the same as the pressure equation presented by Tiab (1993), therefore:
\[
s_r = 0.5 \left( \frac{1}{q_r} \right) \left[ t^* \left(\frac{1}{q} \right) \right] - \ln \left( \frac{kt_r}{\phi \mu c Y_2^2} \right) + 7.43
\]

For a heterogeneous reservoir:
\[
s_r = 0.5 \left( \frac{1}{q_r} \right) \left[ t^* \left(\frac{1}{q} \right) \right] - \ln \left( \frac{kt_r}{\phi \mu c Y_2^2} \right) + 7.43
\]

**2.2 Characteristics lines and points for heterogeneous reservoirs**

**2.2.1 Dual-linear flow regime**

The found governing dimensionless reciprocal rate and reciprocal rate derivative equations for this flow regime are given by:
\[
\frac{1}{q_D} = \frac{9 \sqrt{\pi} t_D}{4 \sqrt{\omega W_D}} + s_{DL}
\]

**2.2.2 Maximum and minimum points**

Figure-9 presents the dimensionless rate derivative behavior against the dimensionless time for several values of \( \lambda \) and \( \omega \). Notice in that plot the existence of a characteristic maximum point once the dual-linear flow regime is interrupted by the transition period caused from heterogeneous to homogeneous behavior.

\[
\left[ t_D^* \left(\frac{1}{q_D} \right) \right] = \frac{9 \sqrt{\pi} t_D}{8 W_D \sqrt{\omega}}
\]

where \( s_{DL} \) is Eq. 55 is the geometrical skin factor due to the convergence from radial to dual-linear flow. Substituting Eqs. 1, 4, and 6 into Eq. 56 and solving for the reservoir width;
\[
Y_E = \frac{4.162115B}{h \Delta P \left[ t^* \left(\frac{1}{q} \right) \right]_{DL} \sqrt{k \phi c, \omega}}
\]

For \( \Delta t = 1 \) hr
\[
Y_E = \frac{4.162115B}{h \Delta P \left[ t^* \left(\frac{1}{q} \right) \right]_{DL} \sqrt{k \phi c, \omega}}
\]

As for the homogeneous case, the equation for the geometrical skin factor is:
\[
s_{DL} = \left( \frac{(1/q)}{[t^* (1/q)]_{DL}} - 2 \right) \frac{1}{54.738732 Y_E} \sqrt{k \phi c, \omega}
\]

**Figure-9.** Dimensionless reciprocal rate derivative behavior vs. time for \( 1x10^{-8} \leq \lambda \leq 9x10^{-8} \) and \( 0.01 \leq \omega \leq 0.1 \).
A unique maximum value of the reciprocal rate derivative is obtained when this is multiplied by the square root of the interporosity flow parameter as shown in Figure-10. The governing equation for this maximum point is:

\[
\left[ t_D^* (1/q_D^*) \right]_{\text{max}}^{1/2} = 0.0003876
\]  

(60)

Replacing Eq. 4 into Eq. 60 and solving for the interporosity flow parameter,

\[
\frac{\lambda}{\lambda^*} = 0.05472912 (1/\tau_{max})^{0.0003876} 
\]  

(61)

In order to derive a correlation of \( \omega \) as a function of \( 1/q_D^* \), \( (t_D^* 1/q_D^*)' \) and \( t_D^* \) for a given value of \( \lambda \) a plot of the dimensionless reciprocal rate and its derivative against time was built, see Figure-12, and different derivative minimum values were read from that plot to give the following relationship which has a correlation coefficient of 0.9998:

\[
\omega = a + b \ln (t_D^* 1/q_D^*)_\text{min} + c (\ln (t_D^* 1/q_D^*)_\text{min})^2 + d (\ln (t_D^* 1/q_D^*)_\text{min})^3 + e \ln \lambda 
\]  

(62)

Where;

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha & = -0.154097411 & \beta & = -0.0039050889 & \gamma & = 0.0022261207 \\
\delta & = 4.2190240 \times 10^{-4} & \epsilon & = -0.0070273981 & \tau & = 0.28942576 \\
\gamma & = -0.872909166 & \delta & = 0.003141729 & \tau & = 0.07290547 
\end{align*}
\]

Figure-10. Effect of the square root of \( \lambda \) on the maximum point of the reciprocal rate derivative.

2.2.3 Intersection point between the pseudo steady-state and dual-linear lines

Equating Eq. 25 with 56, then, plugging the dimensionless quantities and solving for reservoir drainage area, it yields:

\[
A = 0.140998 \frac{Y_k^2 ok_t_{DLPSS}}{\phi \mu c} 
\]  

(63)

Being \( t_{DLPSS} \) the intersection time between the dual-linear flow regime and the pseudosteady-state period lines.

2.2.4 Intersection point between the radial and dual-linear lines

According to Eq. 52, the infinite-acting radial line has a dimensionless value of 0.5 during radial flow regime. If this value is set equal to the reciprocal rate derivative of the dual-linear equation extrapolated to the radial flow value, it allows to obtain an expression to find reservoir width once the dimensionless parameters have been replaced,

\[
Y_E = 0.0648256 \frac{k t_{RD}}{\phi \mu c \omega} 
\]  

(64)
Being \( t_{RD/L} \) the intersection time between the radial and dual-linear flow regime lines,

2.2.5 Intersection point between the radial and Pseudosteady-state lines

Again, Eq. 28 is obtained from manipulation of Eq. 52 and 25.

\[ s_L = \left( \frac{1}{q} \right)_{L} - 2 \left( \frac{1}{q} \right)_{L} \frac{1}{29.32416} \sqrt{\phi \mu c_\omega} \]  

As described by Figure-14, there exists a direct relationship between the square root of the interporosity flow parameter multiplied by the reciprocal rate derivative against the maximum point. This allows obtaining the following expression:

\[ \sqrt{\lambda} \left( \frac{1}{q} \right)_{\max} = 0.000746 \]  

Solving for \( \lambda \) from Eq. 68 once the respective dimensionless group is replaced, it yields:

\[ \lambda = \left[ \frac{0.105335 \mu B}{kh \Delta P} \right]^{2} \]  

As stated before, Eqs. 64 and 65 allow obtaining:

\[ Y_E = 42.480763 \frac{B}{h \Delta P \left( \frac{1}{q} \right)_{L}^{2}} \sqrt{\phi \mu c_\omega} \]  

\[ \omega = \frac{a + b \ln \lambda + c \ln \lambda^2 + d \left( t_{D} * (1/q_D) \right)_{\min}^3 + e \left( t_{D} * (1/q_D) \right)_{\min}^2 + f \left( t_{D} * (1/q_D) \right)_{\min}}{1 + g \ln \lambda + h \left( t_{D} * (1/q_D) \right)_{\min}^3 + i \left( t_{D} * (1/q_D) \right)_{\min}^2 + j \left( t_{D} * (1/q_D) \right)_{\min}} \]
Finally, the unit-slope line during the transition period was correlated \( r^2 = 0.9923 \) to obey the following governing equation:

\[
\lambda = a + b \ln t_{D,usl} + d(\ln t_{D,usl})^2 + f \ln t_{D,usl} + g(\ln t_{D,usl})^3 + i\ln t_{D,usl} + j(\ln t_{D,usl})^2 \ln y
\]  

(71)

where \( usi \) is the intercept of the unit-slope line during the transition period with the radial flow line. \( \lambda \) may also be estimated by the equation introduced by Tiab and Escobar (2003):

\[
\lambda = \frac{3792(\phi c_i) \mu r^2}{k\Delta t_{min}} \left[ \omega \ln \left( \frac{1}{\omega} \right) \right]
\]  

(72)

where

\[
\begin{align*}
\gamma &= 0.14645803 & \beta &= 0.013432717 & \sigma &= 0.000304234555 \\
\delta &= -0.00026701191 & \alpha &= 2.4497641 \times 10^4 & \tau &= -0.2595964 \times 10^4 \\
\rho &= 0.048735248 & \gamma &= 0.0021617165 & \kappa &= -8.3473003 \times 10^4 \\
\phi &= 8.9505382 \times 10^{-9} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Figure-12. Linear flow regime after the transition period.

Figure-13. Linear flow regime before the transition period.
3. EXAMPLES

Examples 1 to 5 were simulated with the input data of Table-1. The results along with the used equations are given in Table-2.

3.1 Synthetic example 1 - homogeneous reservoir

Both lateral boundaries are subjected to constant pressure and the well is off-centered. Reciprocal rate and reciprocal rate derivative are given in Figure-16. From this plot, the following information was read:

\[ \frac{1}{q} = 6.94 \times 10^{-6} \text{ DSTB/hr} \]
\[ \frac{1}{q} = 2.43 \times 10^{-6} \text{ DSTB/hr} \]
\[ \frac{1}{q} = 0.035 \text{ hr} \]
\[ \frac{1}{q} = 600 \text{ hr} \]
\[ \frac{1}{q} = 25 \text{ hr} \]
\[ \frac{1}{q} = 16 \text{ hr} \]
\[ \frac{1}{q} = 6 \text{ hr} \]
\[ \frac{1}{q} = 165 \text{ hr} \]
\[ \frac{1}{q} = 1500 \text{ hr} \]
\[ \frac{1}{q} = 4 \text{ hr} \]

The estimated parameters along with the number of the used equation are reported in Table-2.

3.2 Synthetic example 2 - homogeneous reservoir

In this case, both lateral boundaries are closed to flow and the well is off-centered. Then, pseudosteady-state is developed. The reciprocal rate and reciprocal rate derivative are given in Figure-17 from which the below data was obtained:

\[ \frac{1}{q} = 6.93 \times 10^{-6} \text{ DSTB/hr} \]
\[ \frac{1}{q} = 3.62 \times 10^{-6} \text{ DSTB/hr} \]
\[ \frac{1}{q} = 7.64 \times 10^{-6} \text{ DSTB/hr} \]
\[ \frac{1}{q} = 0.035 \text{ hr} \]
\[ \frac{1}{q} = 10.04 \text{ hr} \]
\[ \frac{1}{q} = 165 \text{ hr} \]
\[ \frac{1}{q} = 400 \text{ hr} \]
\[ \frac{1}{q} = 1500 \text{ hr} \]
\[ \frac{1}{q} = 7.5 \text{ hr} \]
\[ \frac{1}{q} = 0.4 \text{ hr} \]

As for the former example, the results of estimated parameters along with the number of used equation are reported in Table-2.
### Table-1. Input data for the examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Synthetic example</th>
<th>Field example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∆P, psi</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ, cp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ, %</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B, rb/STB</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c_r, psi</td>
<td>1x10^-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r_n, ft</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h, ft</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_E, ft</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>16000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y_E, ft</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b_n, ft</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k, md</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λ</td>
<td>5x10^-8</td>
<td>4x10^-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ω</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s_r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table-2. Results for synthetic examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Synthetic example</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eq.</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Eq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k, md</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y_E, ft</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>564.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y_E, ft</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>509.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y_E, ft</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y_E, ft</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b_n, ft</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1148.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b_n, ft</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1119.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_E, ft</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4678.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_E, ft</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3939.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_E, ft</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s_r</td>
<td>54.a</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s_DL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s_L</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s_PBG</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.0133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, ft²</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>206.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, ft²</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>219.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, ft²</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>191.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table-1.** Input data for the examples.
**Table-2.** Results for synthetic examples.
3.3 Synthetic example 3 - homogeneous reservoir

Figure-18 presents the data of reciprocal rate and its derivative for a well near a constant-pressure boundary and the other lateral boundary is closed to flow. From this plot the below information was obtained:

- \( \frac{1}{q} = 6.92 \times 10^{-10} \frac{D}{STB} \)
- \( t_{dW} = 0.05 \) hrs
- \( t_{lW} = 50.4 \) hrs
- \( t_{DLP} = 17000 \) hrs
- \( \frac{(t/1/q)}{I} = 3.11 \times 10^{-10} \frac{D}{STB} \)
- \( \frac{(t/1/q)}{L} = 3004.74 \) hr

Again, the results for this example and the number of used equation are reported in Table-2.

3.4 Synthetic example 4-heterogeneous reservoir

In this case, both lateral boundaries are closed to flow. In this case the dual-linear flow regime is interrupted by the heterogeneity. Therefore, pseudosteady-state is expected to develop if the test is long enough. The reciprocal rate and reciprocal rate derivative are given in Figure-19 from which the below data was obtained:

- \( \frac{(t/1/q)}{L} = 6.95 \times 10^{-10} \frac{D}{STB} \)
- \( \frac{(t/1/q)}{W} = 200 \) hr
- \( \frac{(t/1/q)}{I} = 0.07 \times 10^{-10} \frac{D}{STB} \)

The estimated parameters are also reported in Table-2 along with the number of the used equation.

3.5 Synthetic example 5 - heterogeneous reservoir

Figure-20 contains data of the reciprocal rate and the reciprocal rate derivative against time for an elongated naturally reservoir in which the linear flow regime was interrupted by the transition period. The following readings were obtained from Figure-20.
Figure-18. Reciprocal rate and reciprocal rate derivative for synthetic example 3.

Figure-19. Reciprocal rate and reciprocal rate derivative for synthetic example 4.

Figure-20. Reciprocal rate and reciprocal rate derivative for synthetic example 5.
3.6 Field example-heterogeneous reservoir

Marhaendrajana et al. (2004) presented a field case for a naturally fractured system which input information is given in Table-1 and reciprocal rate and its derivative vs. time is given in the Figure-21. The following data was obtained from Figure-21.

\[ \frac{b_{max}}{t_{max}} = 0.032 \text{ hr} \quad \left( \frac{1}{q} \right)_{DL} = 2 \times 10^{-4} \text{ hr} \quad t_{max} = 12.66 \text{ hr} \]

The first step, for this exercise is to estimate \( \omega \) using Eq. 70. This value is then used in Eqs. 57 and 64 to estimate reservoir width and the dual-linear skin factors, Eq. 59. Because of the noise in the data is not possible to obtain a clear value of the maximum point on the pressure derivative, then, \( \lambda \) is estimated using the minimum point with Eq. 72. It can be seen that the data is so noisy and the radial flow regime is unclear. Using the permeability, given in Table-1, the derivative during radial flow regime, \( \left( \frac{t^*}{q'} \right)_r \), can be estimated from Eq. 52:

\[
\left[ \frac{t^*}{q'} \right]_r = \frac{70.6 \mu B}{h \Delta P k} = \frac{70.6(1.52)(1.04)}{(100)(2800)(65)} = 6.13 \times 10^{-4} \text{ md}
\]

With this value and the first \( (1/q) \) value is possible to estimate the mechanical skin factor with Eq. 54.b. This problem was also solved by Escobar et al. (2010). All the values are reported in Table-3.

![Figure-21. Reciprocal rate and reciprocal rate derivative for the field case.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Escobar et al. (2010)</th>
<th>Marhaendrajana et al. (2004)</th>
<th>This work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda )</td>
<td>1.94x10^{-7}</td>
<td>4x10^{-3}</td>
<td>8.28x10^{-8}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \omega )</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( s_r )</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( s_{DL} )</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>-5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Y_{Ei} ), ft</td>
<td>122.7</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>138.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Y_{Ei} ), ft</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>133.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The simulated examples indicate that the proposed equations provide results which are in good agreement with the input data. For the actual field case of a heterogeneous reservoir, the reservoir width agrees closely with the results from Escobar et al. (2010). The interporosity flow parameters matches the values from the three sources, but the dimensionless storativity coefficient do not agree with the result from Marhaendrajana et al. (2004) but the difference is acceptable and are due to the noisy data.
Nomenclature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Oil formation factor, rb/STB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b_x</td>
<td>Well position inside the reservoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c_t</td>
<td>Total system compressibility, 1/psi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Formation thickness, ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Permeability, md</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_i</td>
<td>Initial reservoir pressure, psi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_wf</td>
<td>Well-flowing pressure, psi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Pressure, psi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>Skin factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s_r</td>
<td>Mechanical skin factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>Time, hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W_D</td>
<td>Dimensionless reservoir width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_D</td>
<td>Dimensionless well position along the x-axis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_E</td>
<td>Reservoir length, ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y_D</td>
<td>Dimensionless well position along the y-axis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y_E</td>
<td>Reservoir width, ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/q</td>
<td>Reciprocal flow rate, D/STB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/q_D</td>
<td>Dimensionless reciprocal flow rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ω</td>
<td>Dimensionless storativity coefficient, ((\phi c_2)/[(\phi c_2)m+(\phi c_2)])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Change, drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ</td>
<td>Porosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λ</td>
<td>Interporosity flow parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>Densidad, lbm/ft³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ</td>
<td>Oil viscosity, cp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suffices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 1r, er</td>
<td>Primer régimen de flujo o temprano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Dimensionless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>Dual linear, dimensionless based on width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLPBi</td>
<td>Dual linear and parabolic intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLPSi</td>
<td>Dual linear and pseudosteady-state intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLSSi</td>
<td>Dual linear and steady-state intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Lineal temprano a 1 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPSSi</td>
<td>Linear and pseudosteady-state intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>Parabolic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBSSi</td>
<td>Parabolic and steady-state intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDLi</td>
<td>Radial and dual linear intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLi</td>
<td>Radial and linear intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPBi</td>
<td>Radial and parabolic intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPSSi</td>
<td>Radial and pseudosteady-state intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSi</td>
<td>Radial and steady-state intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usi</td>
<td>Intercept of the radial line with the int-slope line during</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. CONCLUSIONS

The TDS methodology for rate transient analysis was complemented with new equations for long and narrow homogeneous and naturally fractured reservoirs. The equations were successfully applied to synthetic examples. A field example for a heterogeneous reservoir was presented to demonstrate the application of the proposed solution.
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