

Chemical Compositions in Modified Salinity Waterflooding of Carbonate Reservoirs – Experiment

M.P. Yutkin C.J. Radke T.W. Patzek

April 23, 2021

Abstract

Modified or low-salinity waterflooding of carbonate oil reservoirs is of considerable economic interest because of potentially inexpensive incremental oil production. The injected modified brine changes the surface chemistry of the carbonate rock and crude oil interfaces and detaches some adhered crude oil. Composition design of the modified brine to enhance oil recovery is determined by labor-intensive trial-and-error laboratory corefloods. Unfortunately, limestone, which predominantly consists of aqueous-reactive calcium carbonate, alters injected brine composition by mineral dissolution/precipitation. Accordingly, the rock reactivity hinders rational design of the tailored brine to improve oil recovery. Previously, we presented a theoretical analysis of 1D, single-phase brine injection into calcium carbonate-rock that accounts for mineral dissolution, ion exchange, and dispersion (Yutkin et al., 2021). Here we present the results of single-phase waterflood-brine experiments that verify the theoretical framework. We show that concentration histories eluted from Indiana limestone cores possess features characteristic of fast calcium carbonate dissolution, 2:1 ion exchange, and high dispersion. The injected brine reaches chemical equilibrium inside the porous rock even at injection rates higher than 1000 ft/day. Ion exchange results in salinity waves observed experimentally, while high dispersion is responsible for long concentration history tails. Using the verified theoretical framework, we briefly explore how these processes modify aqueous-phase composition during the injection of designer brines into a calcium-carbonate reservoir. Because of high salinity of the initial and injected brines, ion exchange affects injected concentrations only in high surface area carbonates/limestones, such as chalks. Calcium-carbonate dissolution only affects aqueous solution pH. The rock surface composition is affected by all processes.

Keywords: Indiana Limestone, Dispersion, Ion-Exchange, Calcite Dissolution Rate, Mass Transfer

1 Introduction

Modified brine composition floods may increment oil recovery at low cost, and consequently they have been studied quite intensively (Morrow and Buckley, 2011; Al-Shalabi and Sepehrnoori, 2016; Mahani et al., 2017; Hao et al., 2019; Katende and Sagala, 2019). Although first discovered with low-salinity waterfloods of crude oils from sandstone cores (Jadhunandan and Morrow, 1995), application to more plentiful carbonate rocks has shown similar recoveries (Zhang and

29 Austad, 2006; Strand et al., 2006; Zhang et al., 2007; Yousef et al., 2011). In both rock types, decreasing salinity is not
 30 a necessary condition for improved recovery. Rather, the composition of the injected brine must be altered compared to
 31 that initially present in the medium (Austad et al., 2010, 2015; Collini et al., 2020). Although detailed molecular- and
 32 pore-level mechanism(s) are not known, there is some agreement that incremental oil production originates by altering
 33 rock wettability towards more water wet (Mahani et al., 2017; Katende and Sagala, 2019; Hao et al., 2019; Rücker et al.,
 34 2020). Apparently, modified injected brine changes the surface chemistry of the rock/brine and crude-oil/brine (*i.e.*,
 35 COBR) interfaces to detach oil from rock surfaces (Jackson et al., 2016; Hu et al., 2018). Carefully tailored, specific brine
 36 packages are required to increment oil recovery. Brine design is currently accomplished by labor-intensive trial-and-error
 37 coreflooding experiments.

38 Modified-brine flooding of carbonate reservoirs presents additional challenges. In aqueous solution, calcite undergoes
 39 mineral dissolution/precipitation reactions that alter the injected brine composition. During advance of a waterflood
 40 through carbonate rock, brine composition adjusts to calcite dissolution/precipitation and, in turn, alters the surface
 41 chemistry of COBR interfaces. Ion exchange produces salinity and composition waves traveling through the porous rock
 42 (Yutkin et al., 2021). Dissolution/precipitation kinetics of minority reactive minerals like dolomite and anhydrite adds
 43 more complexity. Dispersion and stagnant micropore zones add further complication.

44 Design of modified-salinity waterfloods must account for the composition changes induced by contact with dissolving
 45 and ion-exchanging rock. Few authors account for reactive-rock compositional effects in displacement simulation (Qiao
 46 et al., 2015; Al-Shalabi et al., 2015; Pouryousefy et al., 2016; Farajzadeh et al., 2017). Previously, we presented a theoretical
 47 analysis of 1D single-phase brine injection into calcium carbonate-rock accounting for mineral reaction, ion exchange, and
 48 dispersion. Numerical solution is based on a widely available open-source code, PHREEQC (Charlton and Parkhurst, 2011;
 49 Parkhurst and Appelo, 2013), validated against analytical solutions for reactive transport, mass-transfer, ion exchange,
 50 and dispersion during flow through a carbonate porous medium. We capture all aqueous carbonate species, as well as
 51 surface charge densities and zeta potentials of calcium carbonate rock. Published reaction-rate and mass-transfer constants
 52 for aqueous calcium-carbonate dissolution elicit high Damköhler numbers and fast attainment of local equilibrium. Our
 53 theoretical analysis provides a tool to predict the effects of rock contact on tailored modified-brine waterflood compositions.

54 To verify our theoretical framework, we report here experimental single-phase waterflood-brine histories from Indiana-
 55 limestone core plugs for several initial and injected sodium chloride/calcium chloride compositions in both loading and
 56 washout modalities. Comparison is then made to predicted behavior from our theoretical analysis. We confirm that
 57 carbonate-mineral dissolution achieves equilibrium directly upon brine injection even at high flow rates and in short
 58 cores and that ion exchange and dispersion play critical roles. Our findings emphasize the importance of understanding
 59 carbonate chemistry for interpretation of modified-salinity corefloods. Without insights on the processes occurring during
 60 advance of injected brine through a reactive porous rock, observed history data can be misinterpreted and the underlying
 61 physics and chemistries overlooked. Our proposed theory correctly captures aqueous ion-concentration histories emerging
 62 from a porous limestone. Moreover, we predict companion concentration profiles that are crucial for revealing possible
 63 oil-recovery mechanisms with low/modified/controlled salinity waterflooding, as well as for rational design of injected

64 brine compositions that provide incremental oil production.

65 **2 Methods**

66 **2.1 Materials and Chemicals**

67 All flow experiments were performed on 1.5" by 3" Indiana limestone core plugs obtained from Kocurek Industries, Inc
68 (Texas). Two different permeability cores used were used ~ 25 mD and ~ 250 mD . Salt chemicals for the coreflood
69 experiments were obtained from Fisher Scientific (reagent grade) and were used without additional treatment. Brine
70 solutions were prepared with reverse-osmosis water further purified with a four-stage Milli-Q ADVANCE water system
71 from Millipore (σ , conductivity > 18.2 M Ω cm, TOC = 3 ppb).

72 **2.2 Liquid Saturation**

73 Prior to liquid-permeability measurements, core plugs were saturated with 1-mM NaCl brine. A dry core was loaded in
74 a stainless-steel core holder (PC625014, MetaRock Laboratories, Texas) with a Viton rubber sleeve and confined to 500
75 psi. Confining pressure was maintained automatically during the experiments by an ISCO pump (100D, Teledyne ISCO,
76 Nebraska). The core was evacuated and vacuum level was monitored with a high resolution digital pressure gauge (200M,
77 DigiVac, New Jersey). After several hours, when the vacuum level reached 300 mTorr corresponding to evaporation of
78 irreducible water, the core remained under vacuum for at least another 8 hours. The core inlet was then opened to a
79 calibrated burette containing the saturating brine. This procedure guaranteed complete brine saturation and permitted
80 volumetric measurement of brine porosity as reported in Tables 1 – 4.

81 **2.3 Corefloods**

82 Displacement experiments were performed at room temperature in vertical geometry (top to bottom flow) with automatic
83 confining pressure control set to 500 psi. Injection flow rates were set either at 5 mL/min or at 50 mL/min (i.e., at \sim
84 140 ft/day or at ~ 1400 ft/day frontal advance rate, respectively). Typical reservoir velocities are of the order of 1 ft/day
85 (Masalmeh et al., 2014). However, we chose high flow rates to probe for the possible importance of calcite-dissolution
86 kinetics which is gauged by the ratio of the dissolution rate constant divided by the frontal advance rate. Four pairs of
87 replicated corefloods (i.e., loading and washout) were conducted on three separate core plugs (16 experiments in total).

88 Two brines were studied (A): NaCl $\sim 10^{-3}$ M and (B): NaCl ~ 0.1 M. Both brines were devoid of calcium and each was
89 at pH = 5.6 corresponding to environmental CO₂ exposure. Two injection sequences were implemented: (1) saturation
90 with brine A followed by displacement with brine B and (2) saturation with brine B followed by displacement with brine A.
91 Note, these injection sequences were executed as separate experiments, but without core resaturation. Core equilibration
92 with low-salinity brine A favors exchangeable surface calcium (generated by dissolution), whereas equilibration with high-
93 salinity brine B favors low calcium surface occupancy. Accordingly, the first sequence corresponds to calcium unloading
94 or washout, and the second sequence corresponds to calcium-exchanger loading (Pope et al., 1978; Yutkin et al., 2021,

Appendix C). After initial brine saturation, each core plug was pre-flushed with at least 5 pore volumes (PV) of brine A or B, depending on the injection sequence chosen. Flow was switched to the second brine in the sequence for 5 – 6 additional pore volumes, using a 4-way cross-over valve (SS-43YFS, Swagelok).

Core effluent samples were collected every 0.1 – 0.2 PV (2 – 3 mL). The mass of each collection vial was recorded; incremental volume was calculated from gravimetric data. After suitable aqueous dilution, chemical analyses for sodium and calcium were performed using ICP-OES (Model 7200-ES, Varian, Inc/Agilent). Chloride analyses were done by a colorimetric ferrocyanide method (Aquakem 250, Thermo Scientific). Because chloride ion does not participate in bulk-solution or surface-reaction equilibria, it serves as an inert tracer. pH measurements were not performed due to small sample volumes.

3 Tracer Pore Volume and Dispersion

We conduct 4 pairs of single-phase corefloods on 3 separate core plugs, referred to below as experiments 1 through 4, each replicated. Each coreflood pair consists of a calcium loading and unloading displacement. Data analysis for each displacement experiment starts with tracer behavior. After correction for dead volume of the apparatus, mass balance on the effluent chloride tracer concentration from the core plug determines the tracer liquid porosity, φ , using frontal-analysis chromatography as described in Appendix A. Results for the 4 coreflood pairs in both loading and washout sequences are summarized in Tables 1 – 4. Agreement with the volumetric-determined porosities, φ_{brine} , from the core initial brine saturation is good.

Once frontal-analysis core porosity is established, tracer concentration histories are analyzed to determine the longitudinal dispersion coefficient D_L . Error standard deviations in the measured dispersion coefficient are listed in Tables 1 – 4. Fitting error is smaller the larger is the number of collection samples analyzed. Analytic solution to 1D tracer transport in porous media subject to Danckwerts boundary conditions gives the effluent concentration, C_L , as (Lapidus and Amundson, 1952; Danckwerts, 1953; Ogata and Banks, 1961; Hashimoto et al., 1964; Gupta and Greenkorn, 1974; Lake, 1989)

$$\tilde{C}(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{erfc} \left[\frac{(\tilde{x} - \tilde{t}) \sqrt{Pe_L}}{\sqrt{\tilde{t}}} \right] + \frac{1}{2} \exp(Pe_L) \operatorname{erfc} \left[\frac{(\tilde{x} + \tilde{t}) \sqrt{Pe_L}}{\sqrt{\tilde{t}}} \right] \quad (1)$$

where $\tilde{C} = (C_L - C_0)/(C_\infty - C_0)$ with subscript 0 and ∞ denoting initial and injected tracer concentrations respectively, $\tilde{t} = ut/\varphi L$ is PV injected, $\tilde{x} = x/L$ is dimensionless length (When $x = L$, the equation yields concentration history, when $0 < x < L$, the equation yields concentration profiles), and $Pe_L = uL/D_L$ is the longitudinal Peclet number. Example tracer histories from Indiana-limestone Core 1 are shown in Figure 1 (open squares) for exchanger loading (sequence 1) in Figure 1a and for exchanger unloading (sequence 2) in Figure 1b. Typical error bars shown in the legend indicate one standard deviation. Dashed lines in Figure 1 represent best fits of the experimental data to Equation 1. In obedience to Equation 1, measured tracer breakthrough histories are asymmetric about one pore volume due to the small measured longitudinal Peclet numbers and the corresponding large dispersion coefficients. Nevertheless, we find good fits for all

126 tracer experiments interpreted in the same manner as in Figure 1. Tables 1 – 4 illustrate that the fit dispersion coefficients
 127 are consistent in both loading and washout sequences.

128 Hydrodynamic dispersion coefficients obtained from our tracer-chromatography data (see Tables 1 – 4) are notably
 129 larger than those for beadpacks, sandpacks, or sandstones (Perkins and Johnston, 1963; Delgado, 2006). Carbonates,
 130 however, are well known for their large dispersivities because of high heterogeneity (Gist et al., 1990; Bijeljic et al., 2011,
 131 2013; Kurotori et al., 2019) with, for example, nested microporosities of ooids and porositons (Clerke et al., 2008). Few
 132 authors report hydrodynamic dispersion coefficients for Indiana limestone. The available list includes Gist et al. (1990),
 133 Vargas et al. (2013), and Singer et al. (2016). All experiments of these authors are at slower flow rates than we study
 134 except for those of Vargas et al. (2013) whose highest flow rate overlaps our lowest flow rate. Comparison to Vargas et al.
 135 (2013) suggests that our findings are reasonable.

136 4 Dissolution Kinetics and Dispersion

137 We explore calcite dissolution in experimental calcium-concentration histories. Calcium is not injected either during initial
 138 core saturation or during single-phase displacements. Yet, we consistently observe nonzero calcium concentrations in the
 139 effluent. Effluent calcium arises because of calcite dissolution during the initial 5 PV loading sequence. Final effluent
 140 calcium concentrations are different at different initial injected NaCl concentrations.

141 Figure 2 compares experimental (a) washout and (b) loading calcium histories obtained from Core 1. Symbols portray
 142 tracer (open squares) and calcium (open circles) concentration histories, each experiment replicated. Typical error bars are
 143 shown, as in the figures to follow. Pertinent parameters and injection-sequence concentrations are given in Table 1. Theory-
 144 predicted tracer history is represented by dashed lines based on the measured porosity and the fit dispersion coefficient
 145 (see Figure 1). Dotted, dot-dashed, and double dot-dashed lines give theoretical calcium histories corresponding to calcite
 146 dissolution kinetics with longitudinal dispersion. Calcium histories are calculated using the aqueous equilibrium speciation
 147 in Table 5 and the calcite dissolution reaction kinetics of (Yutkin et al., 2021, SI). The spreads in the concentration history
 148 in Figure 2 are controlled by dispersion, whereas the long-time concentration levels are controlled by dissolution-reaction
 149 rate and mass-transfer resistance.


150 The ambient-temperature dissolution rate constant of calcite is $k_{rxn} = 10^{-5}$ m/s (Morse and Arvidson, 2002) and the
 151 mass transfer coefficient at the 1400 ft/day frontal advance rate is $k_{mt} = 2.25 \cdot 10^{-4}$ m/s (Rexwinkel et al., 1997, Fig.
 152 2). For the flow conditions of Core 1, these coefficients correspond to reaction and mass-transfer Damköhler numbers
 153 of $Da_{rxn} = 120$ and $Da_{mt} = 2660$, respectively, where $Da_{rxn} = \varphi_1 a_{V_1} k_{rxn} L/u$ and $Da_{mt} = \varphi_1 a_{V_1} k_{mt} L/u$. In these
 154 definitions, φ_1 and a_{V_1} are calcite mineral porosity and surface area per unit solid calcite volume, respectively. Appendix
 155 B summarizes the calculation of φ_1 and a_{V_1} for each core. To illustrate the roles of reaction kinetic and mass transfer
 156 resistances, the reaction rate constant is lowered to 4.2×10^{-9} m/s (i.e., $Da_{rxn} = 0.05$ shown by dotted lines) and, likewise,
 157 the mass transfer coefficient is lowered to 10^{-6} m/s ($Da_{mt} = 2.66$ shown by double-dot-dashed lines). Dotted and double-
 158 dot-dashed lines in Figure 2 are close or overlap confirming that mass-transfer Damköhler numbers greater than about
 159 unity play little role in calcium dissolution kinetics (Yutkin et al., 2021). Comparison of the dotted and dot-dashed lines

in Figure 2 reveals that the reaction Damköhler number must fall well below unity before reaction kinetics plays a role in calcite dissolution. Once the reaction Damköhler number exceeds unity, local reaction equilibrium prevails throughout the core, except at very near the core inlet (Yutkin et al., 2018, 2021).

Reaction kinetics and dispersion adequately represent the long-time calcium experimental histories, with some underprediction in Figure 2b (and in Figures 6 – 8 to follow). Calcite equilibrium chemistries in Table 5 are extensively documented, suggesting that Indiana-limestone core plugs contain minor calcium-dissolving minerals other than pure calcite. The discrepancy, however, is not major. Thus, the tabulated equilibrium reaction constants predict calcite dissolution in Indiana-limestone cores with no adjustable parameters. We conclude that calcite dissolution achieves local equilibrium with carbonate rock almost directly at the inlet face. Even in short cores at high frontal-advance rates, reaction rate and mass transfer resistances in carbonate rocks are negligible. Nevertheless, dissolution reaction with dispersion does not account for the breakthrough maximum in calcium concentration. The observed calcium-concentration maximum in Figure 2a, and its absence in Figure 2b, are not captured by calcite dissolution.

5 Ion exchange and Dispersion

To address the calcium maximum in Figure 2a, we hypothesize 2:1 equilibrium exchange of sodium and calcium ions on the carbonate-rock surface (Yutkin et al., 2021) or



where $>S^-$ denotes a surface exchange site and K_{CaNa} is the exchange equilibrium constant (Yutkin et al., 2021, Appendix B). Equilibrium calcium uptake on the rock surface then obeys the expression

$$\frac{y_{Ca^{2+}}}{(1 - y_{Ca^{2+}})^2} = \left[\frac{K_{CaNa} n_{CEC}}{C_{Cl^-}} \right] \frac{x_{Ca^{2+}}}{(1 - x_{Ca^{2+}})^2} \quad (3)$$

where $y_{Ca^{2+}} = 2n_{Ca^{2+}}/n_{CEC}$, $n_{CEC} = 2n_{Ca^{2+}} + n_{Na^+}$ is the cation exchange capacity expressed in mole per m² surface area, $x_{Ca^{2+}} = 2C_{Ca^{2+}}/C_{Cl^-}$, $C_{Cl^-} = 2C_{Ca^{2+}} + C_{Na^+}$ is the total chloride concentration neutralizing calcium and sodium ions in mol/m³, and K_{CaNa} is the ion-exchange equilibrium constant with units of m⁻¹.

In porous-media displacement processes with ion exchange, it is convenient to replace the surface-area units in the definition of n_{CEC} to pore volume units (Pope et al., 1978) giving a cation exchange capacity of

$$CEC = n_{CEC} a_{V_2} \varphi_2 / \varphi \quad (4)$$

with CEC expressed units of mol/L pore volume. a_{V_2} in Equation 4 is the exchange mineral surface area per mineral volume, φ_2 is the volume of the exchange mineral per core volume, and φ is rock porosity.

Equation 3 applies most directly to clay-type reservoir minerals (Soudek, 1985; Pope et al., 1978). Application to the aqueous-calcite surface is more complicated (Yutkin et al., 2018, and others). The calcite surface consists of many

ion-exchange and charging reactions as enumerated by the surface complexation model (SCM) in Table 6. Reactions S_5 and S_6 in Table 6 correspond to calcium/sodium ion exchange in Equation 3. However, reactions S_1 through S_4 occur simultaneously on calcite rock as dictated by local calcite-equilibrated pore concentrations.

To assess the validity of Equation 3 for calcite surfaces, we implement the surface complexation model of Table 6 (Yutkin et al., 2018). In the SCM calculations, we set the initial brine solution as an aqueous mixture of NaCl, CaCl_2 , and environmental dissolved CO_2 . Given the initial-brine concentrations, we equilibrate that solution with calcite per the equilibrium chemistries in Table 6. The resulting equilibrated brine then sets the bulk aqueous concentrations to establish the SCM surface-species concentrations following Table 6. Figure 3 compares the sodium/calcium ion exchange isotherm predicted from the SCM (filled squares) with those predicted by Equation 3 for a fixed cation exchange capacity and for four different exchange equilibrium constants. Best fit of Equation 3 to SCM predictions in Figure 3 (filled squares) is successful giving an exchange equilibrium constant near 10^7 m^{-1} and a cation exchange capacity of 1.7 sites/nm^2 . The literature lattice surface site density for (104) calcite surface is 5 sites/nm^2 (Yutkin et al., 2018). Due to the occupancy of other surface species in reactions S_1 through S_4 of Table 6, however, less than a half of the total available sites are available for sodium/calcium ion exchange on calcite. The SCM isotherm (filled squares) does not extend to zero calcium concentration because equilibration of the aqueous solution with calcite mineral always demands finite aqueous calcium concentrations. This restriction also explains the narrow range of calcium exchanger loadings on calcite mineral.

We find that Equation 3 provides adequate representation of calcium/sodium ion exchange on calcite. However, clays and minor minerals in Indiana-limestone cores may also contribute to sodium/calcium ion exchange. Here, all ion-exchange minerals are lumped into a single 2:1 exchange isotherm according to Equation 3. In addition, the individual cores studied have differing porosities and permeabilities and, hence, differing surface areas for ion exchange. We express the cation exchange capacity for each individual core according to Equation 4. To establish a_{V_2} and φ_2 necessary to convert exchange-capacity units, we assume that calcite mineral is in excess (i.e., $\varphi_2 = \varphi_1$) and utilize the Carman-Kozeny expression for a_{V_2} (see Appendix B). Resulting values are listed in Tables 1 – 4. Because of the differing mineralogy of each core, we adjust n_{CEC} in the three different cores plugs. To reduce the number of adjustable model parameters, we keep the same equilibrium exchange constant for each core of $pK_{\text{CaNa}} = -5.8$ from Figure 3.

Figure 4 presents frontal-displacement theory calculations for calcium (a) unloading and (b) loading experiments with Core 1 for ion exchange and dispersion but with no rock dissolution. A skeleton of chromatographic ion-exchange waves is seen. Namely, in Figure 4a, a high calcium-concentration washout zone is apparent with a desorption-spreading tail (Pope et al., 1978; Yutkin et al., 2021, Appendix C). Conversely in Figure 4b, a low calcium-concentration loading zone with a sharpening tail (Pope et al., 1978; Yutkin et al., 2021, Appendix C) is faintly visible. In both displacement scenarios, the ion-exchange waves are significantly smeared by large longitudinal dispersion. Two equilibrium exchange constants are shown in Figure 4 by the dotted and dot-dashed lines, each with the best-fit dispersion coefficient listed in Table 1. The cation exchange capacity is fixed from Figure 3 at $1.4 \times 10^{-3} \text{ M}$ (i.e., 1.74 sites/nm^2). Limestone Core-1 exchange capacity is significantly lower than that of Berea sandstone (Pope et al., 1978; Hill and Lake, 1978). With ion-exchange/dispersion theory in Figure 4a, the calcium maximum now appears as does a shallow minimum in Figure 4b. With the pK_{CaNa} fixed,

the cation exchange capacity (CEC) controls the washout peak height. We fit the CEC to the maximum in the washout history giving $\sim 3 \times 10^{-3}$ mol/L. Similarly obtained ion-exchange parameters for each experimental displacement pair are listed in Tables 1 – 4.

Although ion exchange without calcite dissolution explains the calcium concentration peak and valley in Figures 4 (a) and (b), respectively, it does not explain the calcium history at large throughputs. Apparently, inclusion of both ion exchange and rock dissolution in the displacement model are required.

6 Dissolution Reaction, Ion exchange and Dispersion

We consider finally the combined effects of dissolution reaction kinetics, ion exchange, and longitudinal dispersion (Yutkin et al., 2021). Experimental washout and loading histories in Figure 5 are those from Core 1 and, thus, are identical to those in Figures 2 and 4. Theory parameters are highlighted in Table 1. All parameters have been previously determined from the analyses underscoring Figures 2 – 4. To illustrate the comparative roles of reaction kinetics and ion exchange, theory calculations are shown for a low aphysical value of the reaction Damköhler number (i.e., $Da_{rxn} = 0.05$) and cation exchange capacity (i.e., $CEC = 0$).

Only the combined dissolution/ion-exchange/dispersion theory captures the experimental behavior in Figure 5. After peaking in Figure 5a, the calcium concentration slowly falls to the calcite equilibrated value, which would not be possible without fast dissolution. The double-dot dashed line shows the model with ion exchange but slow dissolution (i.e., k_{rxn} is 1000 times smaller than that reported by Morse and Arvidson (2002)). The final predicted equilibrium calcium concentration in Figure 5, approximately 0.225 mM, is not reached until between 3 and 4 injected pore volumes. The long tail observed in Figure 5 arises partly from the self-spreading of washout ion exchange but mostly from the large hydrodynamic dispersion. The slowly decaying calcium history in Figure 5a is well captured by theory.

Figure 5b compares numerical and experimental results for exchanger loading of Core 1. Clearly again, slow dissolution (double-dot-dashed line) and no ion exchange (dot-dashed line), each including dispersion fail to capture the loading history. The combined theory (solid line) represents the measured calcium history adequately. We stress that only the dispersion coefficient and the cation exchange capacity are adjusted in Figures 1 – 5. Reaction and mass transfer Damköhler numbers are large so that local equilibrium prevails. Accordingly, fitting the precise dissolution rate and mass transfer coefficients is unnecessary. The cation exchange capacity follows from the SCM in Table 6 and Equation 4 with evaluation of the rock specific surface area outlined in Appendix B.

Figures 6 – 8 summarize similar theory and experiment for Cores 2 and 3. Experimental conditions are listed in Tables 2 – 4. Core 2 has a much lower permeability and, hence, higher specific surface area than that of Core 1. Additionally, the flow rate used for the washout/loading displacement is 10 times smaller than that used in Core 1. Experiments 3 and 4 (Tables 3 and 4) utilize Core 3 in sequence at the two different flow rates of Cores 1 and 2, respectively. All displacement experiments are continued for 6 PV.

As above, we first analyze chloride-tracer breakthrough curves (open squares and triangles). This is justified both experimentally by history shape and theoretically by the absence of chloride ion in the surface ion-complexing reactions

in the SCM of Table 6. Sodium histories mostly follow chloride histories because of the high concentration of injected sodium chloride and the relative low CEC of Indiana limestone. Sodium and chloride-ion histories deviate somewhat from each other due to sodium-ion measurement error. We rely on chloride-ion analyses for porosity and dispersion-coefficient determination in Figures 6 – 8. Best-fit longitudinal Péclet numbers in Figure 6 for unloading and loading experiments (1.73 and 2.05 respectively, in Table 2) are in good agreement with each other.

The calcium history in Figure 6a is significantly different from that in Figure 5a (and from those in Figures 7a and 8a to follow) in that the peak calcium concentration is much higher. One reason is the higher specific surface area of Core 2 increasing the ion-exchange capacity. This alone, however, may not completely explain the factor of 10 increase in CEC necessary to fit the calcium peak height in Figure 6a. We hypothesize that Core 2, and Core 3 to follow, contain other 2:1 calcium/sodium exchanging minerals that we lump with calcite ion exchange. The $CECs$ in Figures 6 – 8 are best fit with the equilibrium exchange constant held constant and equal to that in Figures 2 – 5.

Concentrations histories in Figures 7 and 8 (Experiments 3 and 4) were obtained from the same core (Core 3) but at different flow rates (50 mL/min and 5 mL/min, respectively), so we discuss them together. The traits of the calcium histories in Figure 7 are similar to those in Figure 5. Obtained Péclet numbers are in good agreement at 4 and 2 for unloading and loading experiments, respectively (see Table 3).

Likewise, calcium concentration histories in Figure 8 share similar features with Figures 5 – 7. The most notable distinctions are the calcium peak heights during unloading and the valley depths during unloading. Thus, similar to Figure 6, the best-fit CEC at the slower flow rate in Figure 8 is 1.5 – 3 times higher than that in Figure 7. The same observation was made for Figures 5 and 6: slower flows demand higher best-fit $CECs$. Because Figures 7 and 8 arise from the same core plug (Core 3), however, differing amounts of minority cation-exchanging minerals cannot be the explanation. One possibility is that minority exchanging minerals are distributed in relatively flow-inaccessible locations. Aqueous ion diffusion may be necessary to reach the exchange sites. Diffusion-limited ion exchange manifests at lower flow rates. Nevertheless, the discrepancy is not major. Overall, agreement between theory and experiment is remarkable, especially when only the CEC is adjusted in each figure with physically reasonable values.

7 Discussion

We have carefully validated our approach to modeling and understanding calcite concentration histories obtained from Indiana-limestone core plugs during single phase waterflooding Yutkin et al. (2021). The experimentally observed effluent calcium concentrations can only be explained by the synergistic effect of fast dissolution, ion exchange on calcite and other mineral surfaces, and large dispersion. However, the experimental brines used for our model validations, are far from those employed in modified salinity flooding. In this section, we apply our model to higher salinity brines of a more practical composition and demonstrate how the above chemical processes affect the brine composition in low salinity waterflood.

Low salinity waterflooding of a reservoir corresponds to our second injection sequence discussed above i.e. for loading, which is shown in panels (b) of Figures 5 – 8. Reservoirs have long traverse injection lengths, so we increase Péclet numbers accordingly while neglecting D_L dependence on length and velocity. We use the CEC from our experiments.

Figure 9 shows the predicted concentration profile (a) and concentration history (b) for low salinity waterflooding of Indiana limestone. The initial brine present in the core has a high salinity of 1.5 M Na^+ , 2.5 M Cl^- , and 0.5 M Ca^{2+} and pH of about 8.5. The injected brine has notably lower salinity containing only 0.15 M of Na^+ , 0.35 M of Cl^- , and 0.1 M of Ca^{2+} , and a pH of 7. Figure 9a corresponds to 0.5 PV injected into the core. The concentration plateaus to the right of 0.5 PV designate those initially present in the core; with the exception of pH, concentration plateaus to the left of 0.5 PV designate those injected. The spread of the concentrations is due to dispersion. Calcite rock dissolution changes the injected pH by about two orders of magnitude. Because of fast rock dissolution, the pH attains new equilibrium values almost instantaneously. No effects other than rock dissolution and dispersion are observed in the concentration profiles. Even if ion exchange exists, its effect is so small that it does not influence the concentration history in Figure 9b.

The *CEC* of Indiana limestone in Figure 9 is too low to cause notable effects at such high ion concentrations. However, higher surface area carbonates, such as chalks, can alter the injected brine composition. Figure 10 shows concentration profile (a) and concentration history (b) for low salinity waterflooding of a Norwegian chalk (Punternvold et al., 2007, 2009). Chalk cores have very high porosity and very low permeability increasing the chalk exchange capacity by several orders of magnitude compared to Indiana limestone. We increased the *CEC* by 20 in our calculations times to simulate the exchange capacity of a chalk porous rock. Figure 10a shows the predicted profile at 0.5 pore volume. Concentration plateaus to the right of 0.5 PV designate concentrations initially present in the core. With the exception of pH, concentration plateaus to the left of 0.5 PV designate those injected. Spreading of the concentrations is again due to dispersion, and calcite rock dissolution again changes the injected brine pH significantly. Calcium concentration fall directly behind 0.5 PV due to ion exchange on the calcium carbonate surface. In Figure 10b, this effect translates through the core and for a quarter of pore volume almost devoids the emanating brine of calcium. We conclude that high-surface-area carbonates can significantly alter injected brine composition even at high salinities.

Salinity waves caused by ion exchange also shift calcite-rock surface chemical equilibrium. Figure 11 corresponds to Figure 10 for the high-surface-area chalk, but now with the calcite surface charge density in the β -plane listed in Figure 11a. In Figure 11a concentration plateaus to the right of 0.5 PV designate concentrations initially present in the core. With the exception of pH, concentration plateaus to the left of 0.5 PV designate those injected. All the concentrations in Figure 11a, except the pH, are replicated from Figure 10a. The gray dot-dashed line plots σ_β . Surface charge density is positive in the entire column and follows the tracer front and step concentration change. However, directly behind the tracer front in the region devoid of calcium, the charge density falls abruptly from 1 to 0.6 $\mu\text{C cm}^{-2}$ and then rebounds to about 0.75 $\mu\text{C cm}^{-2}$. Along the traverse of the tracer front, the region with the lowest σ_β broadens following the broadening of the low calcium concentration region. In this example simulation, σ_β does not reverse sign. Nevertheless, this is a significant change in σ_β and surface ionic composition during the modified salinity waterflood.

8 Conclusions

This work presents experimental effluent concentration histories for reactive transport, mass transfer, ion exchange, and dispersion during single-phase flow through Indiana-limestone core plugs. Experiments are well-matched by our previously

published theory using only one fit parameter, the cation exchange capacity (Yutkin et al., 2021). We successfully lump the core mineralogy into pure calcium carbonate. More complex systems with mixed minerals, temperature effects, presence of crude oil and CO₂ *etc* require more detailed investigation.

We demonstrate that concentration histories eluting from Indiana-limestone cores possess features characteristic of fast calcium carbonate dissolution, 2:1 ion-exchange on calcium carbonate or clay surface, and high dispersion. Experimentally observed histories can only be explained when all three effects are accounted for.

In our experiments, calcite dissolution is almost instantaneous. The injected brine achieves local equilibrium with the core material even at high injection rates, up to 1000 ft/day. Ion exchange in Indiana-limestone cores follows a classical 2:1 ion-exchange isotherm. The cation exchange capacity can be found using calcite surface complexation modeling (SCM) that accounts for adsorption sites taken up by other ions. Indiana limestone, with other limestones, exhibits a highly heterogeneous pore structure. The result is high dispersion and long tails in concentration histories. Because of pore-structure heterogeneity, some pores are apparently less accessible than others. Pore surfaces not observable at high flow rates can be interrogated at low flow rates, which results in experimentally higher cation exchange capacities than that predicted from surface SCM.

Finally, we explore the effect of ion exchange and calcite dissolution on injected brine compositions during low salinity waterfloods. A low-salinity injection scheme corresponds to washout of ions from a calcium carbonate surface. Because of high salinity of the *in-situ* (250000 ppm) and injected (50000 ppm) brines, ion exchange with the cation exchange capacity measured in our experiments induces virtually no effect on bulk ionic concentrations. Calcite dissolution only affects pH, while ion concentrations change negligibly. However, chalks with orders higher exchange capacity appreciably change injected concentrations. This change in turn changes σ_β and the surface composition of calcite, which if unaccounted can negatively affect efficiency of low salinity waterfloods.

9 Acknowledgments

MPY thanks Dr. Sirisha Kamireddy for performing chemical analysis.

10 Declarations

Funding This work was supported from baseline research funding to prof. Tadeusz Patzek. Partial support was provided by Saudi Aramco as project #3899.

Conflicts of interest/Competing interests The authors declare no conflict of interests

Availability of data and material The experimental data sets are available from electronic supplementary information

Code availability We are working on making the code available to the public through github.

Authors' contributions All authors contributed to the study conception and design. Material preparation, data collection and analysis were performed by Dr. Maxim Yutkin and partially by Dr. Sirisha Kamireddy (chemical analysis, acknowledged above). The first draft of the manuscript was written by Maxim Yutkin and all authors commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Ethics approval Not applicable

Consent to participate Not applicable

Consent for publication Not applicable

References

- Al-Shalabi EW, Sepehrnoori K (2016) A comprehensive review of low salinity/engineered water injections and their applications in sandstone and carbonate rocks. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering* 139:137–161, DOI 10.1016/j.petrol.2015.11.027
- Al-Shalabi EW, Sepehrnoori K, Pope G (2015) Geochemical Interpretation of Low-Salinity-Water Injection in Carbonate Oil Reservoirs. *SPE Journal* 20(06):1212–1226, DOI 10.2118/169101-PA
- Austad T, Rezaeidoust A, Puntervold T (2010) Chemical Mechanism of Low Salinity Water Flooding in Sandstone Reservoirs. *Spe* 129767:19–22, DOI 10.2118/129767-MS
- Austad T, Shariatpanahi SF, Strand S, Aksulu H, Puntervold T (2015) Low Salinity EOR Effects in Limestone Reservoir Cores Containing Anhydrite: A Discussion of the Chemical Mechanism. *Energy and Fuels* 29(11):6903–6911, DOI 10.1021/acs.energyfuels.5b01099
- Bijeljic B, Mostaghimi P, Blunt MJ (2011) Signature of non-fickian solute transport in complex heterogeneous porous media. *Physical Review Letters* 107(20):204502, DOI 10.1103/physrevlett.107.204502
- Bijeljic B, Mostaghimi P, Blunt MJ (2013) Insights into non-fickian solute transport in carbonates. *Water Resources Research* 49(5):2714–2728, DOI 10.1002/wrcr.20238
- Bird R, Stewart W, Lightfoot E (2007) *Transport Phenomena*. Wiley International edition, Wiley
- Charlton SR, Parkhurst DL (2011) Modules based on the geochemical model phreeqc for use in scripting and programming languages. *Computers & Geosciences* 37:1653–1663, DOI 10.1016/j.cageo.2011.02.005
- Clerke E, W Mueller H, Craig Phillips E, Y Eyvazzadeh R, H Jones D, Ramamoorthy R, Srivastava A (2008) Application of thomeer hyperbolas to decode the pore systems, facies and reservoir properties of the upper jurassic arab d limestone, ghawar field, saudi arabia: A "rosetta stone" approach. *GeoArabia* 13

380 Collini H, Li S, Jackson MD, Agenet N, Rashid B, Couves J (2020) Zeta potential in intact carbonates at reservoir
381 conditions and its impact on oil recovery during controlled salinity waterflooding. *Fuel* 266:116927, DOI 10.1016/j.fuel.
382 2019.116927

383 Danckwerts P (1953) Continuous flow systems. *Chemical Engineering Science* 2(1):1–13, DOI 10.1016/0009-2509(53)
384 80001-1

385 Delgado JM (2006) A Critical Review of Dispersion in Packed Beds. *Heat and Mass Transfer/Waerme- und Stoffueber-
386 tragung* 42(4):279–310, DOI 10.1007/s00231-005-0019-0

387 Farajzadeh R, Guo H, van Winden J, Bruining J (2017) Cation exchange in the presence of oil in porous media. *ACS
388 Earth Space Chem* 1(2):101–112, DOI 10.1021/acsearthspacechem.6b00015

389 Gist GA, Thompson AH, Katz AJ, Higgins RL (1990) Hydrodynamic dispersion and pore geometry in consolidated rock.
390 *Physics of Fluids A: Fluid Dynamics* 2(9):1533–1544, DOI 10.1063/1.857602

391 Gupta SP, Greenkorn RA (1974) Determination of Dispersion and Nonlinear Adsorption Parameters for Flow in Porous
392 Media. *Water Resources Research* 10(4):839–846, DOI 10.1029/WR010i004p00839

393 Hao J, Mohammadkhani S, Shahverdi H, Esfahany MN, Shapiro A (2019) Mechanisms of smart waterflooding in carbonate
394 oil reservoirs - a review. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering* 179:276–291, DOI 10.1016/j.petrol.2019.04.049

395 Hashimoto I, Deshpande KB, Thomas HC (1964) Peclet numbers and retardation factors for ion exchange columns.
396 *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Fundamentals* 3(3):213–218, DOI 10.1021/i160011a007

397 Hill H, Lake L (1978) Cation Exchange in Chemical Flooding: Part 3 - Experimental. *Society of Petroleum Engineers
398 Journal* 18(06):445–456, DOI 10.2118/6770-PA

399 Hu X, Yutkin MP, Hassan S, Wu J, Prausnitz J, Radke C (2018) Calcium ion bridging of aqueous carboxylates onto silica:
400 Implications for low-salinity waterflooding. *Energy Fuels* 33(1):127–134, DOI 10.1021/acs.energyfuels.8b03366

401 Jackson MD, Al-Mahrouqi D, Vinogradov J (2016) Zeta potential in oil-water-carbonate systems and its impact on oil
402 recovery during controlled salinity water-flooding. *Sci Rep* 6(1), DOI 10.1038/srep37363

403 Jadhunandan PP, Morrow NR (1995) Effect of Wettability on Waterflood Recovery for Crude-Oil/Brine/Rock Systems.
404 *SPE Reservoir Engineering* 10(1):40–46, DOI 10.2118/22597-pa

405 Katende A, Sagala F (2019) A critical review of low salinity water flooding: Mechanism, laboratory and field application.
406 *Journal of Molecular Liquids* 278:627–649, DOI 10.1016/j.molliq.2019.01.037

407 Kurotori T, Zahasky C, Hejazi SAH, Shah SM, Benson SM, Pini R (2019) Measuring, imaging and modelling solute
408 transport in a microporous limestone. *Chemical Engineering Science* 196:366–383, DOI 10.1016/j.ces.2018.11.001

409 Lake L (1989) *Enhanced oil recovery*. Prentice Hall

410 Lapidus L, Amundson NR (1952) Mathematics of adsorption in beds. vi. the effect of longitudinal diffusion in ion exchange
411 and chromatographic columns. The Journal of Physical Chemistry 56(8):984–988, DOI 10.1021/j150500a014

412 Mahani H, Menezes R, Berg S, Fadili A, Nasralla R, Voskov D, Joekar-Niasar V (2017) Insights into the impact of
413 temperature on the wettability alteration by low salinity in carbonate rocks. Energy Fuels 31(8):7839–7853, DOI
414 10.1021/acs.energyfuels.7b00776

415 Masalmeh SK, Sorop T, Suijkerbuijk BM, Vermolen EC, Douma S, van del Linde H, Pieterse S (2014) Low salinity
416 flooding: Experimental evaluation and numerical interpretation. IPTC, DOI 10.2523/iptc-17558-ms

417 Morrow N, Buckley J (2011) Improved Oil Recovery by Low-Salinity Waterflooding. Journal of Petroleum Technology
418 63(5):106–112, DOI 10.2118/129421-JPT

419 Morse JW, Arvidson RS (2002) The Dissolution Kinetics of Major Sedimentary Carbonate Minerals. Earth-Science Reviews
420 58(1-2):51–84, DOI 10.1016/S0012-8252(01)00083-6

421 Ogata A, Banks RB (1961) A solution of the differential equation of longitudinal dispersion in porous media. Tech. rep.,
422 DOI 10.3133/pp411A

423 Parkhurst DL, Appelo CAJ (2013) Description of input and examples for PHREEQC version 3—A computer program for
424 speciation, batch-reaction, one-dimensional transport, and inverse geochemical calculations. URL <https://pubs.usgs.gov/tm/06/a43>
425

426 Perkins T, Johnston O (1963) A Review of Diffusion and Dispersion in Porous Media. Society of Petroleum Engineers
427 Journal 3(01):70–84, DOI 10.2118/480-PA

428 Pope G, Lake L, Helfferich F (1978) Cation Exchange in Chemical Flooding: Part 1—Basic Theory Without Dispersion.
429 Society of Petroleum Engineers Journal 18(06):418–434, DOI 10.2118/6771-PA

430 Pouryousefy E, Xie Q, Saeedi A (2016) Effect of multi-component ions exchange on low salinity eor: Coupled geochemical
431 simulation study. Petroleum 2(3):215–224, DOI 10.1016/j.petlm.2016.05.004

432 Puntervold T, Strand S, Austad T (2007) Water flooding of carbonate reservoirs: effects of a model base and natural
433 crude oil bases on chalk wettability. Energy Fuels 21(3):1606–1616, DOI 10.1021/ef060624b

434 Puntervold T, Strand S, Austad T (2009) Coinjection of seawater and produced water to improve oil recovery from
435 fractured north sea chalk oil reservoirs. Energy Fuels 23(5):2527–2536, DOI 10.1021/ef801023u

436 Qiao C, Johns R, Li L, Xu J (2015) Modeling low salinity waterflooding in mineralogically different carbonates. In: Day
437 3 Wed, September 30, 2015, SPE, DOI 10.2118/175018-ms

438 Rexwinkel G, Heesink A, Van Swaaij W (1997) Mass Transfer in Packed Beds at Low Peclet Numbers—wrong Experiments
439 or Wrong Interpretations? Chemical Engineering Science 52(21-22):3995–4003, DOI 10.1016/S0009-2509(97)00242-X

440 Rücker M, Bartels WB, Garfi G, Shams M, Bultreys T, Boone M, Pieterse S, Maitland G, Krevor S, Cnudde V, Mahani H,
 441 Berg S, Georgiadis A, Luckham P (2020) Relationship between wetting and capillary pressure in a crude oil/brine/rock
 442 system: From nano-scale to core-scale. *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science* 562:159–169, DOI 10.1016/j.jcis.2019.
 443 11.086

444 Singer P, Mitchell J, Fordham E (2016) Characterizing dispersivity and stagnation in porous media using nmr flow
 445 propagators. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance* 270:98–107, DOI 10.1016/j.jmr.2016.07.004

446 Soudek A (1985) A Site-Binding Model for Multicomponent Ion-Exchange on Montmorillonite. PhD thesis, University of
 447 California

448 Strand S, Høgnesen EJ, Austad T (2006) Wettability alteration of carbonates - effects of potential determining ions
 449 (Ca_2^+ and SO_4^{2-}) and temperature. *Colloids and Surfaces A: Physicochemical and Engineering Aspects* 275(1-3):1–10,
 450 DOI 10.1016/j.colsurfa.2005.10.061

451 Vargas JAV, Pagotto PC, dos Santos RG, Trevisan OV (2013) Determination of dispersion coefficient in carbonate rock
 452 using computed tomography by matching in situ concentration curves. In: *SPE Annual Technical Conference and*
 453 *Exhibition, International Symposium of the Society of Core Analysts*, pp SCA2013–053

454 Yousef AA, Al-Saleh S, Al-Kaabi A, Al-Jawfi M (2011) Laboratory investigation of the impact of injection-water salinity
 455 and ionic content on oil recovery from carbonate reservoirs. *SPE Reservoir Evaluation and Engineering* 14(5):578–593,
 456 DOI 10.2118/137634-PA

457 Yutkin M, Radke C, Patzek T (2021) Chemical compositions in salinity waterflooding of carbonate reservoirs: Theory.
 458 *Transp Porous Med* 136(2):411–429, DOI 10.1007/s11242-020-01517-7

459 Yutkin MP, Mishra H, Patzek TW, Lee J, Radke CJ (2018) Bulk and Surface Aqueous Speciation of Calcite: Implications
 460 for Low-Salinity Waterflooding of Carbonate Reservoirs. *SPE Journal* 23(01):084–101, DOI 10.2118/182829-PA

461 Zhang P, Austad T (2006) Wettability and oil recovery from carbonates: Effects of temperature and potential determining
 462 ions. *Colloids and Surfaces A: Physicochemical and Engineering Aspects* 279(1-3):179–187, DOI 10.1016/j.colsurfa.2006.
 463 01.009

464 Zhang P, Tweheyo MT, Austad T (2007) Wettability alteration and improved oil recovery by spontaneous imbibition
 465 of seawater into chalk: Impact of the potential determining ions Ca_2^+ , Mg_2^+ , and SO_4^{2-} . *Colloids and Surfaces A:*
 466 *Physicochemical and Engineering Aspects* 301(1-3):199–208, DOI 10.1016/j.colsurfa.2006.12.058




Figure 1: Tracer breakthrough analysis. (a) $\text{Na}_\infty = 10^{-3}$ M, $\text{Na}_0 = 0.1$ M. (b) $\text{Na}_\infty = 0.1$ M, $\text{Na}_0 = 10^{-3}$ M. Blue open squares denote experimental data; blue lines denote transport-model calculations. Error bar in the legend indicates typical measurement error.




Figure 2: Concentration histories from core 1. (a) unloading or washout: $\text{Na}_\infty = 10^{-3}$ M, $\text{Na}_0 = 0.1$ M, $\text{Ca}_{\text{Na}_\infty}^{\text{eq}} = 0.123$ mM, $\text{Ca}_{\text{Na}_0}^{\text{eq}} = 0.225$ mM. (b) loading: $\text{Na}_\infty = 0.1$ M, $\text{Na}_0 = 10^{-3}$ M, $\text{Ca}_{\text{Na}_\infty}^{\text{eq}} = 0.225$ mM, $\text{Ca}_{\text{Na}_0}^{\text{eq}} = 0.123$ mM. Open symbols denote experimental data; lines denote transport model calculations. Blue dashed lines correspond to tracer theory. Red lines denote calcium concentrations calculated using different assumptions: dotted line – $Da_{rxn} = 120$, $Da_{mt} = 2700$; dot dashed line – $Da_{rxn} = 0.05$, $Da_{mt} = 2700$; double dot dashed line – $Da_{rxn} = 120$, $Da_{mt} = 2.66$. Error bars in the legend indicate typical measurement error. See Table 1 for other details.




Figure 3: Calcium adsorption isotherms at variable salinity obtained from ion-exchange equilibria (lines) and calcite surface complexation model (SCM, red closed squares) at a fixed adsorption sites density (or CEC) of 1.74 sites/nm². Line styles denote different ion-exchange equilibrium constants. Closed red squares are results from SCM (Yutkin et al., 2018).




Figure 4: Concentration histories from core 1. (a) unloading or washout: $\text{Na}_\infty = 10^{-3}$ M, $\text{Na}_0 = 0.1$ M, $\text{Ca}_{\text{Na}_\infty}^{\text{eq}} = 0.123$ mM, $\text{Ca}_{\text{Na}_0}^{\text{eq}} = 0.225$ mM. (b) loading: $\text{Na}_\infty = 0.1$ M, $\text{Na}_0 = 10^{-3}$ M, $\text{Ca}_{\text{Na}_\infty}^{\text{eq}} = 0.225$ mM, $\text{Ca}_{\text{Na}_0}^{\text{eq}} = 0.123$ mM. Open symbols denote experimental data; lines denote transport-model calculations. Blue dashed lines correspond to tracer theory. Red lines denote calcium concentrations calculated using different assumptions: dotted line $-pK_{\text{CaNa}} = -6.78$ m $^{-1}$; dot dashed line $-pK_{\text{CaNa}} = -5.78$ m $^{-1}$. Error bars in the legend indicate typical measurement error. See Table 1.




Figure 5: Concentration histories from core 1. (a) unloading or washout: $\text{Na}_\infty = 10^{-3}$ M, $\text{Na}_0 = 0.1$ M, $\text{Ca}_{\text{Na}_\infty}^{\text{eq}} = 0.123$ mM, $\text{Ca}_{\text{Na}_0}^{\text{eq}} = 0.225$ mM. (b) loading: $\text{Na}_\infty = 0.1$ M, $\text{Na}_0 = 10^{-3}$ M, $\text{Ca}_{\text{Na}_\infty}^{\text{eq}} = 0.225$ mM, $\text{Ca}_{\text{Na}_0}^{\text{eq}} = 0.123$ mM. Open symbols denote experimental data; lines denote transport model calculations: red solid lines: Ca^{2+} ; blue dashed lines: Na^+ ; Cl^- was not measured in this experiment; red dot dashed line: Ca^{2+} for the model without ion-exchange but with fast dissolution, and red double-dot dashed lines: Ca^{2+} for the model with slow dissolution and ion exchange. Error bars in the legend indicate maximal measurement error. See Table 1.




Figure 6: Concentration histories from core 2. (a) unloading or washout: $\text{Na}_\infty = 10^{-3}$ M, $\text{Na}_0 = 0.1$ M, $\text{Ca}_{\text{Na}_\infty}^{\text{eq}} = 0.123$ mM, $\text{Ca}_{\text{Na}_0}^{\text{eq}} = 0.225$ mM. (b) loading: $\text{Na}_\infty = 0.1$ M, $\text{Na}_0 = 10^{-3}$ M, $\text{Ca}_{\text{Na}_\infty}^{\text{eq}} = 0.225$ mM, $\text{Ca}_{\text{Na}_0}^{\text{eq}} = 0.123$ mM. Open symbols denote experimental data; lines denote transport model calculations: red solid lines: Ca^{2+} ; blue dashed lines: Na^+ ; green dotted lines: Cl^- ; red dot dashed lines: Ca^{2+} for the model without ion exchange but with fast dissolution, and red double dot dashed lines: Ca^{2+} for the model with slow dissolution and ion exchange. Error bars in the legend indicate maximal measurement error. See Table 2.




Figure 7: Concentration histories from core 3 (50 mL/min). (a) unloading or washout: $\text{Na}_{\infty} = 10^{-3} \text{ M}$, $\text{Na}_0 = 0.1 \text{ M}$, $\text{Ca}_{\text{Na}_{\infty}}^{\text{eq}} = 0.123 \text{ mM}$, $\text{Ca}_{\text{Na}_0}^{\text{eq}} = 0.225 \text{ mM}$. (b) loading: $\text{Na}_{\infty} = 0.1 \text{ M}$, $\text{Na}_0 = 10^{-3} \text{ M}$, $\text{Ca}_{\text{Na}_{\infty}}^{\text{eq}} = 0.225 \text{ mM}$, $\text{Ca}_{\text{Na}_0}^{\text{eq}} = 0.123 \text{ mM}$. Open symbols denote experimental data; lines denote transport model calculations: red solid lines: Ca^{2+} ; blue dashed lines: Na^+ ; green dotted lines: Cl^- ; red double-dot-dashed lines: Ca^{2+} for model without ion exchange. Error bars in the legend indicate maximal measurement error. See Table 3.




Figure 8: Concentration histories from core 3 (5 mL/min). (a) unloading or washout: $Na_{\infty} = 10^{-3}$ M, $Na_0 = 0.1$ M, $Ca_{Na_{\infty}}^{eq} = 0.123$ mM, $Ca_{Na_0}^{eq} = 0.225$ mM. (b) loading: $Na_{\infty} = 0.1$ M, $Na_0 = 10^{-3}$ M, $Ca_{Na_{\infty}}^{eq} = 0.225$ mM, $Ca_{Na_0}^{eq} = 0.123$ mM. Open symbols denote experimental data; lines denote transport model calculations: red solid lines: Ca^{2+} ; blue dashed lines: Na^+ ; green dotted lines: Cl^- ; red double-dot-dashed lines: Ca^{2+} for model without ion exchange. Error bars in the legend indicate maximal measurement error. See Table 4.




Figure 9: (a) Predicted concentration profiles and (b) concentration histories for the following injection sequence: $\text{Na}_\infty = 1.5 \text{ M}$, $\text{Na}_0 = 0.15 \text{ M}$, $\text{Ca}^{2+}_\infty = 0.5 \text{ M}$, $\text{Ca}^{2+}_0 = 0.05 \text{ M}$, $\text{Cl}^-_\infty = 2.5 \text{ M}$, $\text{Cl}^-_0 = 0.25 \text{ M}$. Red solid lines: Ca^{2+} ; blue dashed lines: Na^+ ; green dotted lines: Cl^- ; black solid lines: pH. $Pe_L = 1000$, $CEC = 3 \times 10^{-2} \text{ mol/L}$, $pK_{\text{CaNa}} = -5.78 \text{ m}^{-1}$.




Figure 10: (a) Predicted concentration profiles and (b) concentration histories for the following injection sequence: $\text{Na}_\infty = 1.5 \text{ M}$, $\text{Na}_0 = 0.15 \text{ M}$, $\text{Ca}^{2+}_\infty = 0.5 \text{ M}$, $\text{Ca}^{2+}_0 = 0.05 \text{ M}$, $\text{Cl}^-_\infty = 2.5 \text{ M}$, $\text{Cl}^-_0 = 0.25 \text{ M}$. Red solid lines: Ca^{2+} ; blue dashed lines: Na^+ ; green dotted lines: Cl^- ; black solid lines: pH. $Pe_L = 1000$, $CEC = 6 \times 10^{-1} \text{ mol/L}$, $pK_{\text{CaNa}} = -5.78 \text{ m}^{-1}$.




Figure 11: (a) Predicted concentration profiles and (b) concentration histories for the following injection sequence: $\text{Na}_\infty = 1.5 \text{ M}$, $\text{Na}_0 = 0.15 \text{ M}$, $\text{Ca}^{2+}_\infty = 0.5 \text{ M}$, $\text{Ca}^{2+}_0 = 0.05 \text{ M}$, $\text{Cl}^-_\infty = 2.5 \text{ M}$, $\text{Cl}^-_0 = 0.25 \text{ M}$. Red solid lines: Ca^{2+} ; blue dashed lines: Na^+ ; green dotted lines: Cl^- ; black solid lines: pH; gray dot dashed line: σ_β . $Pe_L = 1000$, $CEC = 6 \times 10^{-1} \text{ mol/L}$, $pK_{\text{CaNa}} = -5.78 \text{ m}^{-1}$.

Table 1: Experimental and optimization parameters for two injection sequences (loading and unloading) on core plug #1

Param Name	Unloading	Loading	Units
Flow Rate Q	8.33×10^{-7}	8.33×10^{-7}	$\text{m}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$
Unstressed Core Porosity φ_{brine}	1.39×10^{-1}	1.39×10^{-1}	-
Tracer Core Porosity φ	1.26×10^{-1}	1.31×10^{-1}	-
Liquid permeability κ_l	2.50×10^{-1}	2.50×10^{-1}	μm^2
Average Grain Diameter D_g	8.90×10^{-5}	8.90×10^{-5}	m
Specific Surface Area a_V	7.00×10^4	7.00×10^4	m^{-1}
Longitudinal Dispersion Coefficient D_L	$9.80 \times 10^{-6} \pm 2.20 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.12 \times 10^{-5} \pm 4.90 \times 10^{-6}$	m s^{-2}
Longitudinal Peclet Number Pe_L	5.70	5.00	-
Molecular Peclet Number Pe_m	3.27×10^1	3.27×10^1	-
^a Reaction Damköhler Number Da_{rxn}	1.19×10^2	1.19×10^2	-
^b Mass Transfer Damköhler Number Da_{mt}	2.66×10^3	2.66×10^3	-
$C(\text{NaCl}_{inj})$	1.05×10^{-1}	2.30×10^{-3}	mol L^{-1}
$C(\text{NaCl}_{init})$	2.90×10^{-3}	9.20×10^{-2}	mol L^{-1}
^c Cation Exchange Capacity CEC	3.11×10^{-3}	2.99×10^{-3}	mol L^{-1}
Exchange Equilibrium Constant pK_{CaNa}	-5.78	-5.78	m^{-1}

^a $k_{rxn} = 10^{-5} \text{ m s}^{-1}$, (Morse and Arvidson, 2002)

^b $k_{mt} = 2.25 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m s}^{-1}$, Appendix B

^c CEC variation is due to core porosity determination error

Table 2: Experimental and optimization parameters for two injection sequences (loading and unloading) on core plug #2

Param Name	Unloading	Loading	Units
Flow Rate Q	1×10^{-7}	1×10^{-7}	$\text{m}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$
Unstressed Core Porosity φ_{brine}	1.28×10^{-1}	1.28×10^{-1}	-
Tracer Core Porosity φ	1.09×10^{-1}	1.04×10^{-1}	-
Liquid permeability κ_l	2.50×10^{-2}	2.50×10^{-2}	μm^2
Average Grain Diameter D_g	2.80×10^{-5}	2.80×10^{-5}	m
Specific Surface Area a_V	2.10×10^5	2.10×10^5	m^{-1}
Longitudinal Dispersion Coefficient D_L	$3.90 \times 10^{-6} \pm 2.50 \times 10^{-6}$	$3.30 \times 10^{-6} \pm 2 \times 10^{-7}$	m s^{-2}
Longitudinal Peclet Number Pe_L	1.70	2.10	-
Molecular Peclet Number Pe_m	1.20	1.20	-
^a Reaction Damköhler Number Da_{rxn}	3.12×10^3	3.12×10^3	-
^b Mass Transfer Damköhler Number Da_{mt}	2.00×10^4	2.00×10^4	-
NaCl_{inj}	1.01×10^{-1}	2.20×10^{-3}	mol L^{-1}
NaCl_{init}	9×10^{-4}	9.80×10^{-2}	mol L^{-1}
^c Cation Exchange Capacity CEC	2.84×10^{-2}	2.99×10^{-2}	mol L^{-1}
Exchange Equilibrium Constant pK_{CaNa}	-5.78	-5.78	m^{-1}

^a $k_{rxn} = 10^{-5} \text{ m s}^{-1}$, (Morse and Arvidson, 2002)

^b $k_{mt} = 6.39 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m s}^{-1}$, Appendix B

^c CEC variation is due to core porosity determination error

Table 3: Experimental and optimization parameters for two injection sequences (loading and unloading) on core plug #3

Param Name	Unloading	Loading	Units
Flow Rate Q	8.33×10^{-7}	8.33×10^{-7}	$\text{m}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$
Unstressed Core Porosity φ_{brine}	1.39×10^{-1}	1.39×10^{-1}	-
Tracer Core Porosity φ	1.17×10^{-1}	9.40×10^{-2}	-
Liquid permeability κ_l	2.70×10^{-1}	2.70×10^{-1}	μm^2
Average Grain Diameter D_g	7.20×10^{-5}	7.20×10^{-5}	m
Specific Surface Area a_V	8.00×10^4	8.00×10^4	m^{-1}
Longitudinal Dispersion Coefficient D_L	$1.42 \times 10^{-5} \pm 1.08 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.77 \times 10^{-5} \pm 2.50 \times 10^{-6}$	m s^{-2}
Longitudinal Peclet Number Pe_L	3.90	2.00	-
Molecular Peclet Number Pe_m	2.64×10^1	2.64×10^1	-
^a Reaction Damköhler Number Da_{rxn}	1.42×10^2	1.42×10^2	-
^b Mass Transfer Damköhler Number Da_{mt}	3.96×10^2	3.96×10^2	-
NaCl_{inj}	1.02×10^{-1}	3×10^{-3}	mol L^{-1}
NaCl_{init}	1.20×10^{-3}	1.20×10^{-3}	mol L^{-1}
^c Cation Exchange Capacity CEC	4.20×10^{-3}	5.10×10^{-3}	mol L^{-1}
Exchange Equilibrium Constant pK_{CaNa}	-5.78	-5.78	m^{-1}

^a $k_{rxn} = 10^{-5} \text{ m s}^{-1}$, (Morse and Arvidson, 2002)

^b $k_{mt} = 2.78 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m s}^{-1}$, Appendix B

^c CEC variation is due to core porosity determination error

Table 4: Experimental and optimization parameters for two injection sequences (loading and unloading) on core plug #3 at low flow rate

Param Name	Unloading	Loading	Units
Flow Rate Q	8.33×10^{-8}	8.33×10^{-8}	$\text{m}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$
Unstressed Core Porosity φ_{brine}	1.39×10^{-1}	1.39×10^{-1}	-
Tracer Core Porosity φ	1.12×10^{-1}	1.36×10^{-1}	-
Liquid permeability κ_l	2.70×10^{-1}	2.70×10^{-1}	μm^2
Average Grain Diameter D_g	7.20×10^{-5}	7.20×10^{-5}	m
Specific Surface Area a_v	8.00×10^4	8.00×10^4	m^{-1}
Longitudinal Dispersion Coefficient D_L	$1.60 \times 10^{-6} \pm 4 \times 10^{-7}$	$1.80 \times 10^{-6} \pm 2 \times 10^{-7}$	m s^{-2}
Longitudinal Peclet Number Pe_L	3.40	3.20	-
^a Molecular Peclet Number Pe_m	2.60	2.60	-
^b Reaction Damköhler Number Da_{rxn}	1.43×10^3	1.43×10^3	-
Mass Transfer Damköhler Number Da_{mt}	3.96×10^3	3.96×10^3	-
NaCl_{inj}	8.40×10^{-2}	2.40×10^{-3}	mol L^{-1}
NaCl_{init}	7×10^{-3}	8.30×10^{-2}	mol L^{-1}
^c Cation Exchange Capacity CEC	1.10×10^{-2}	9×10^{-3}	mol L^{-1}
Exchange Equilibrium Constant pK_{CaNa}	-5.78	-5.78	m^{-1}

^a $k_{rxn} = 10^{-5} \text{ m s}^{-1}$, (Morse and Arvidson, 2002)

^b $k_{mt} = 2.78 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m s}^{-1}$, Appendix B

^c CEC variation is due to core porosity determination error

Table 5: Solution equilibrium reactions and equilibrium constants, K_r (298 K)

#	Reaction	pK_r	Units
1	$\text{CO}_2(\text{g}) \rightleftharpoons \text{CO}_2(\text{aq})$	1.47	$\text{mol L}^{-1} \text{atm}^{-1}$
2	$\text{CO}_2(\text{aq}) + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightleftharpoons \text{H}_2\text{CO}_3$	2.59	-
3	$\text{H}_2\text{CO}_3 \rightleftharpoons \text{H}^+ + \text{HCO}_3^-$	3.76	mol L^{-1}
4	$\text{HCO}_3^- \rightleftharpoons \text{H}^+ + \text{CO}_3^{2-}$	10.33	mol L^{-1}
5	$\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightleftharpoons \text{H}^+ + \text{OH}^-$	14	$\text{mol}^2 \text{L}^{-2}$
6	$\text{CaCO}_3 \rightleftharpoons \text{Ca}^{2+} + \text{CO}_3^{2-}$	8.48	$\text{mol}^2 \text{L}^{-2}$
7	$\text{CaOH}^+ \rightleftharpoons \text{Ca}^{2+} + \text{OH}^-$	1.22	mol L^{-1}
8	$\text{CaHCO}_3^+ \rightleftharpoons \text{Ca}^{2+} + \text{HCO}_3^-$	1.11	mol L^{-1}
9	$\text{NaHCO}_3 \rightleftharpoons \text{Na}^+ + \text{HCO}_3^-$	-0.25	mol L^{-1}
10	$\text{NaCO}_3^- \rightleftharpoons \text{Na}^+ + \text{CO}_3^{2-}$	1.27	mol L^{-1}

Table 6: Surface complexation reactions and corresponding equilibrium constants, K_s (298 K)

#	Reaction	pK_s^a	Units
S ₁	$>\text{Ca}^+ + \text{OH}^- \rightleftharpoons >\text{CaOH}$	-2	mol L^{-1}
S ₂	$>\text{Ca}^+ + \text{HCO}_3^- \rightleftharpoons >\text{CaHCO}_3$	-3	L mol^{-1}
S ₃	$2>\text{Ca}^+ + \text{CO}_3^{2-} \rightleftharpoons (>\text{Ca})_2\text{CO}_3$	1	L mol^{-1}
S ₄	$>\text{CO}_3^- + \text{H}^+ \rightleftharpoons >\text{CO}_3\text{H}$	2	L mol^{-1}
S ₅	$2>\text{CO}_3^- + \text{Ca}^{2+} \rightleftharpoons (>\text{CO}_3)_2\text{Ca}$	-4	L mol^{-1}
S ₆	$>\text{CO}_3^- + \text{Na}^+ \rightleftharpoons >\text{CO}_3\text{Na}$	0	L mol^{-1}

^a modified from Yutkin et al. (2018)

Appendix A: Derivation of Tracer Mass-Balance

The right side of Equation 1 of the main text for dispersion in porous medium contains two terms. At high $Pe_L > 50$, the contribution of the second term is negligible compared to the first, the breakthrough curve adopts a symmetrical shape (Lake, 1989). Experimentally, this enables precise determination of the breakthrough time, and thus the medium porosity. In this case, the time to reach $\tilde{C} = 0.5$ is the breakthrough time. However, in our experiments Pe_L is small (see Tables 1 – 4). The contribution of the second term in Equation 1 is significant, and the breakthrough curve is asymmetric about the breakthrough time. Below we present a mass-balance analysis that justifies the approach we used for pore-volume calculation from the breakthrough curves.

Mass conservation through a packed column reads as

$$\frac{dm}{dt} = C_0 Q - C(t, x = L) Q \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where m is tracer mass, C_0 is injected tracer concentration into a column, $C(t, x = L)$ tracer concentration at the column outlet, and Q is volumetric flow. At $t = \infty$ the integral form becomes

$$m(t = \infty) - m(t = 0) = Q \int_0^\infty [C_0 - C(t, x = L)] dt \quad (\text{A.2})$$

On the other hand $m(t = \infty) = \varphi A L C_0$, and $m(t = 0) = \varphi A L C_\infty$, where φ is porosity, A is column cross-sectional area, and L is column length. But $Q = \varphi L A / t_b$, where t_b is breakthrough time, while $\varphi L A$ is pore volume. Substituting these definitions in Equation A.2 yields

$$\frac{\varphi A L (C_0 - C_\infty)}{Q} = (C_0 - C_\infty) t_b = \int_0^\infty [C_0 - C(t, x = L)] dt \quad (\text{A.3})$$

For unknown t_b the equality can be satisfied when the two areas (shaded and hatched-shaded, in Figure A.1) are equal. An algorithm based on the method of bisections was used in the model routine to calculate pore volume from tracer breakthrough.




Figure A.1: Schematic demonstration of the tracer breakthrough curve mass balance. (a): non-dispersive tracer history is a step function. The white area on the right is equal to the cross-hatched area on the left. (b): dispersive tracer transport. Grey and cross-hatched-gray areas must be equal to satisfy mass balance.

484 Appendix B: Mass-Transfer Rate and Specific Surface Area Estimation

485 Rexwinkel et al. (1997) summarizes experimental mass-transfer coefficients in packed beds at different molecular Péclet
486 numbers Pe_m . In our experiments with high flow rates Pe_m is of the order of 10^2 . From Rexwinkel et al. (1997, fig.
487 2) we find Sherwood number (Sh) of about 10 for high-flow-rate experimental conditions. Likewise, for low flow rate
488 experiments, we find Sherwood numbers of 1, where Sherwood number is a dimensionless mass-transfer coefficient defined
489 by

$$Sh = \frac{k_{mt} D_g}{D_m} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

490 where D_g is average particle diameter, m, D_m is molecular diffusion coefficient (10^{-9} m²/s). D_g is obtained from a_V ,
491 such that $D_g = 6/a_V$. We estimate a_V using the well-known Carmen-Kozeny expression (Bird et al., 2007).

$$a_V^2 = \frac{36}{150} \frac{\varphi^3}{(1 - \varphi)^2 \kappa} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

492 Here φ is porosity, and κ is brine permeability. For the 250-mD core sample (Core 1) used in this work, D_g is of the order
493 of 10^{-5} m. This gives a mass-transfer coefficient ($k_{mt} \approx 3.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$ m/s for high flow rate and $k_{mt} \approx 3.5 \cdot 10^{-4}$ m/s for low
494 flow rate.

495 Appendix C: Experimental Data Attachments

496 The SI pdf file contains enclosed experimental data.

497 File attachments: Data archive: 