

EVALUATION OF NANO SILICA FLUID RECOVERY MECHANISMS FOR
ENHANCED OIL RECOVERY

TARIQ ALI CHANDIO

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA

EVALUATION OF NANO SILICA FLUID RECOVERY MECHANISMS FOR
ENHANCED OIL RECOVERY

TARIQ ALI CHANDIO

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the award of the degree of
Master of Philosophy

School of Chemical and Energy Engineering
Faculty of Engineering

Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

FEBRUARY 2022

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would start by thanking Allah (SWT), the one who has taught man what he knows not also for granting me wisdom, knowledge, understanding, and sufficing me through all the challenges that have come during this work and faced in entire life.

My special regards remain with my supervisor Assoc. Prof Dr. Muhammad Bin A. Manan for serious efforts and proper guidance throughout my degree. He has been a source of inspiration, guidance, knowledge, and motivation throughout my work.

Next, I will name this work to my parents with whose strong support prayers and motivation has made it possible to meet the requirements. I also thank my wife who has been the best companion and has helped me during degree to deal with workload and has remain as source of encouragement.

Finally, I would be thankful to Universiti Teknologi Malayasia, UTM, that provided me the conducive environment along with the administration and staff of UTM in general and of School of Chemical and Energy Engineering in specific.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to evaluate the oil recovery potential of hydrophilic silica nanofluids in sandstone reservoirs at varying salinities and concentrations. The impact of nanofluid as secondary and tertiary recovery mechanisms on recovery potential is also discussed, and recovery mechanisms are determined for all flooding parameter variations. The integrated study of parameters, recovery, and mechanism is to outline the impact of changes in fluid parameters on mechanisms and recovery for future clear understanding of the mechanisms at a specific set of nanofluid conditions. The study conducted at ambient conditions and flooding was carried out at 1000 psi overburden pressure. The nano flooding was carried out for 12 nano meter nanosilica with concentrations of 0.02 wt. %, 0.05 wt. %, 0.07 wt. % and 0.10 wt. % in salinity ranges from 20,000 to 40,000 ppm. Along with recovery potential, recovery mechanisms were also determined by contact angle evaluation, interfacial tension (IFT) measurements, porosity reduction evaluation, and pressure differential monitoring. In scenario 1, it was observed that the highest recovery at 20,000 ppm salinity was achieved with 0.05 wt. % of nanosilica which was approximately 11% of original oil in place (OOIP). The dominant mechanism was found to be wettability change to water wet condition (i.e., reduced to 46°) and interfacial reduction (i.e., reduced to 14.9 from 18.5 mN/m), whereas for higher concentrations mechanical mechanisms like mechanical entrapment along with pore jamming were also found to play the role. Whereas in scenario 2, where salinities were changed, the highest recoveries were recorded for 20,000 and 40,000 ppm (i.e., 11% and 11.2% of OOIP respectively). In the case of 20,000 ppm salinity, wettability change and IFT reduction played the dominant role but when salinity was increased to 30,000 ppm, due to instability of the solution the impact of wettability change and IFT reduction subsided hence recovery declined to 8.33% of OOIP. In the case of 40,000 ppm though nanofluids formed agglomerations and wettability change and IFT reduction were not dominant but mechanical entrapment enhanced the recoveries further. In the third scenario, it was outlined that at lower injection rate of 0.5 ml/min the recovery potential was lowered, as reduction in disjoining and mechanical mechanisms impact was observed. Application of nanofluids as tertiary recovery mechanism was found to be suitable as compared to secondary recovery in terms of recovery. Hence for optimum effect of nano flooding on oil recovery, the optimum design of nanofluid concentration, stability, injection rate, and mode of application have been identified. For the most effective nano flooding it should be ensured that major mechanisms like wettability change, interfacial reduction, and log jamming remain equally active. The study establishes that design of any nano flooding as tertiary recovery mechanism would be effective when a mechanistic study is carried out ensuring effectiveness of chemical and mechanical mechanisms which would result in incremental recovery.

ABSTRAK

Tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk menilai potensi perolehan minyak menggunakan nanobendalir silika hidrofilik bagi reservoir batu pasir pada kemasinan dan kepekatan nanosilika yang berbeza. Kesan nanobendalir sebagai mekanisme perolehan sekunder dan tertier terhadap potensi perolehan turut dibincang, dengan mekanisme perolehan ditentukan untuk semua perubahan parameter banjiran. Kajian bersepadu bagi parameter, perolehan, dan mekanisme adalah untuk merangka impak terhadap perubahan parameter bendalir pada mekanisme dan perolehan bagi pemahaman tentang mekanisme yang lebih jelas pada keadaan tertentu nanobendalir. Kajian ini dilakukan pada keadaan ambien dengan banjiran dilaksanakan pada tekanan beban atas 1000 psi. Banjiran nano dilaksana menggunakan nanosilika bersaiz 12 nano meter dengan kepekatan 0.02 % berat, 0.05 % berat, 0.07 % berat, dan 0.10 % berat pada kemasinan berjulat dari 20,000 ppm sehingga 40,000 ppm. Seiring dengan potensi perolehan, mekanisme perolehan juga ditentukan menerusi penilaian sudut sentuh, pengukuran, tegangan antara muka (IFT), penilaian pengurangan keliangan, pemantauan tekanan kebezaan. Pada senario 1, didapati perolehan tertinggi adalah lebih kerrang 11 % daripada minyak asal di tempat (OOIP) pada kemasinan 20,000 ppm yang dicapai dengan 0.05 % berat nanosilika. Mekanisme utama adalah perubahan keterbasahan kepada keadaan basah air (berkurang kepada 46°) dan pengurangan tegangan antara muka (iaitu berkurang menjadi dari 18.5 ke 14.9 mN/m). Bagi kepekatan nanosilika yang lebih tinggi mekanisme mekanikal seperti pemerangkapan mekanikal berserta dengan penyesakan liang turut berperanan. Sebaliknya bagi senario 2, dengan kemasinan diubah, perolehan tertinggi direkodkan pada 20,000 dan 40,000 ppm (iaitu masing-masing 11% dan 11.2% daripada OOIP). Bagi kemasinan 20,000 ppm, perubahan keterbasahan dan pengurangan IFT memainkan peranan yang dominan, tetapi apabila kemasinan ditingkatkan kepada 30000 ppm, oleh sebab berlakunya ketakstabilan larutan, maka impak perubahan keterbasahan dan pengurangan IFT terjadi melemah yang menyebabkan penurunan perolehan kepada 8.33% daripada OOIP. Bagi kemasinan 40,000 ppm, walaupun nanobendalir membentuk gumpalan dengan perubahan keterbasahan dan pengurangan IFT adalah tidak dominan tetapi pemerangkapan mekanikal boleh meningkatkan perolehan. Bagi senario ketiga, didapati bahawa pada kadar suntikan yang lebih rendah iaitu pada 0.5 ml/min telah menghasilkan potensi perolehan yang rendah berikutan berlakunya pengurangan impak mekanisme tak searas dan mekanikal. Pengaplikasian nanobendalir mekanisme perolehan tertier adalah lebih sesuai berbanding perolehan sekunder dari segi perolehan. Oleh itu bagi mengoptimumkan kesan banjiran nano terhadap perolehan minyak, reka bentuk optimum bagi kepekatan nanobendalir, kestabilan, kadar suntikan dan mod pengaplikasian telah dikenal pasti. Banjiran nano yang paling berkesan perlu memastikan mekanisme utama, misalnya perubahan keterbasahan, pengurangan tegangan antara muka dan penyesakan log semuanya aktif berperanan secara seimbang. Kajian ini mengesahkan bahawa reka bentuk sebarang banjiran nano sebagai mekanisme perolehan tertier akan menjadi berkesan apabila sesuatu kajian mekanistik dilaksana bagi memastikan keberkesanan mekanisme kimia dan mekanikal, yang mampu menghasilkan perubahan tokokan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	TITLE	PAGE
	DECLARATION	i
	DEDICATION	ii
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iii
	ABSTRACT	iv
	ABSTRAK	v
	LIST OF TABLES	xi
	LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
	LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xv
	LIST OF SYMBOLS	xvi
	LIST OF APPENDICES	xvii
CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Background of Study	1
1.2	Problem Statement	3
1.3	Research Objectives	4
1.4	Scope of the Study	5
1.5	Significance of the Study	6
CHAPTER 2	LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1	Introduction	7
2.2	Nanotechnology	7
2.2.1	Application of Nanotechnology in Upstream Oil and Gas Industry	9
2.3	Enhanced Oil Recovery	9
2.3.1	Types of EOR	10
2.4	Nano based Enhanced Oil Recovery	12
2.4.1	Nanofluids	13
2.4.2	Advantages of Nano based EOR	13

2.5	Recovery Mechanisms Associated with SiO ₂ Nanofluid Flooding	15
2.5.1	Wettability Alteration	16
2.5.2	Pore Channels Plugging	19
2.5.3	Structural Disjoining Pressure	20
2.5.4	Interfacial Tension (IFT) Reduction	21
2.5.5	Decreased Mobility Ratio by Viscosity Adjustments	22
2.5.6	Preventing Asphaltene Precipitation	23
2.5.7	Retention	23
2.6	Parameters Affecting Recovery during Silica based Nano-EOR	24
2.6.1	Concentration of SiO ₂ Nanoparticle	24
2.6.2	Stability of SiO ₂ Nanoparticles	25
2.6.3	Size of SiO ₂ Nanoparticles	26
2.6.4	Type of SiO ₂ Nanoparticles	26
2.6.5	Injection Rate of SiO ₂ Nanoparticle	27
2.6.6	Salinity and Temperature (SiO ₂ Interaction with Injected Fluid)	28
2.7	Challenges	28
2.8	Opportunities	29
2.9	Literature Review of the Important Work	29
2.9.1	Review of Important Parameters in Nanofluid Studies in Literature	30
2.9.2	Review of Mechanisms Study in Literature	34
2.10	A Critical Review of the Available Literature	35
CHAPTER 3	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	41
3.1	Introduction	41
3.2	Approach	41
3.3	Experimental Design	42
3.4	Materials	47
3.5	Experimental Methodology	49
3.5.1	Preparations and Characterization of SiO ₂ based Nanofluids	50

3.5.2	Core Preparation	52
3.5.3	Rock Core Flooding	54
3.5.4	Basic Nanofluid Core Flooding Method	57
3.5.5	Interfacial Tension Measurements	58
3.5.6	Wettability Measurements	59
3.6	Nanoparticle's Retention Evaluation	61
CHAPTER 4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	63
4.1	Introduction	63
4.2	Core Measurements	63
4.3	Oil Properties	64
4.4	Nanofluid Properties	64
4.4.1	Zeta Potential	65
4.4.2	Particle Size Distribution	66
4.5	Core Flooding	66
4.6	Scenario 1: Impact of Nanoparticle Concentration	67
4.6.1	Case 1: 0.02 wt. % Nanofluid at 20000 ppm Salinity	67
4.6.2	Case 2: 0.05 wt. % Nanofluid at 20000 ppm Salinity	69
4.6.3	Case 3: 0.07 wt.% Nanofluid at 20000 ppm Salinity	71
4.6.4	Case 4: 0.10 wt. % Nanofluid at 20000 ppm Salinity	72
4.6.5	The Optimum Concentration for Scenario 1	74
4.6.6	Evaluation of Recovery Mechanisms for Scenario 1	75
4.6.6.1	Interfacial Tension (IFT) Evaluation	75
4.6.6.2	Contact Angle Measurements	76
4.6.6.3	Physical Observation	78
4.6.6.4	Porosity Reductions	79
4.6.6.5	Differential Pressure Evaluation	81
4.7	Scenario 2: Impact of Salinity Changes on EOR recovery at 20000 ppm, 30000 ppm, and 40000 ppm	81

4.7.1	Case 5, 6 and 7: 0.05 wt. % Nanofluid for 20000 ppm, 30000 ppm and 40000 ppm Salinity	82
4.7.2	Comparative Analysis for Scenario 2	85
4.7.3	Evaluation of Recovery Mechanisms for Scenario 2:	86
4.7.3.1	Physical Stability Observation of the Solution	86
4.7.3.2	Pressure Differential Evaluation	87
4.7.3.3	Porosity Reduction	87
4.7.3.4	Contact angle	88
4.7.3.5	IFT evaluation	90
4.8	Scenario 3: Nanofluid Recovery Impact at a Varying Injection Rate	91
4.8.1	Comparative analysis of recovery potential at varying rates	94
4.8.2	Evaluation of Recovery Mechanisms for Scenario 3:	95
4.8.2.1	Pressure Differential Evaluation	95
4.8.2.2	Porosity Reduction	96
4.9	Scenario 4: Recovery Potential at Secondary and Tertiary Nano flooding	97
4.9.1	Case 10: Secondary Recovery	98
4.9.2	Case 11: Tertiary Nano Flooding Recovery Mechanism	99
4.9.3	Comparative Analysis	99
4.9.4	Porosity Reduction	100
4.9.5	Pressure Differential Evaluation	101
4.10	Summary	101
4.10.1	Evaluation of Recovery Potential	102
4.10.2	Mechanism Evaluation Case Wise:	104
CHAPTER 5	CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS	107
5.1	Conclusions	107
5.2	Future Recommendations:	109

REFERENCES	110
APPENDIX A	117
APPENDIX B	118
APPENDIX C	119
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	120

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
Table 2.1	Review of recovery mechanisms and parameter literature	32
Table 2.2	Summary of the main Literature Review	36
Table 3.1	Scenario 1 for Silica Nanofluid flooding at different concentrations	45
Table 3.2	Core flooding at Optimized Concentrations by varying salinity	45
Table 3.3	Core flooding scenario for varying injection rate	46
Table 3.4	Core flooding scenario for various injection patterns	46
Table 4.1	Physical and rock properties of cores	64
Table 4.2	Properties of the oleic phase used in the study	64
Table 4.3	Zeta potential of nanofluid	65
Table 4.4	Details of mean hydrodynamic volume of particles in suspension	66
Table 4.5	Nanofluids prepared at varying concentrations and low salinity (20000ppm)	67
Table 4.6	Recovery data of 0.02 Nanofluid against PV at 20000 ppm salinity	68
Table 4.7	Recovery data of 0.05 wt. % Nanofluid against PV at 20000 ppm salinity	70
Table 4.8	Recovery data of 0.07 wt. % nanofluid at 20000 ppm salinity	71
Table 4.9	Recovery data of 0.1 wt. % Nanofluid against PV at 20000 ppm salinity	73
Table 4.10	Saturation data of Scenario 1 (Different concentrations)	74
Table 4.11	IFT evaluation for different nanofluid concentrations	75
Table 4.12	Contact Angle for nanofluids at various concentrations and salinities	77
Table 4.13	Porosity impairment data for pre and post flooding changes	79
Table 4.14	Scenarios for comparison of salinity impact on recoveries	81
Table 4.15	Recovery (% OOIP) at 0.05 wt. % at 30000 ppm	82

Table 4.16	Recovery (% OOIP) at 0.05 wt. % at 40000 ppm	84
Table 4.17	Core flooding output: scenario 2 (Varying salinities), C _{opt} =0.05 wt. %	85
Table 4.18	Porosity impairment data for salinity changes scenario	87
Table 4.19	Contact Angle for nanofluids at various concentrations and salinities	88
Table 4.20	IFT evaluation for various salinities	91
Table 4.21	Case details for scenario 3 (Varying rate)	92
Table 4.22	Recovery data against injected PV for Case 8 at 0.5 cc/min	92
Table 4.23	Case details for injection rate change	94
Table 4.24	Porosity impairment data for pre- and post-flooding changes	96
Table 4.25	Secondary vs tertiary recovery comparison scenario by nano flooding	97
Table 4.26	Nano flooding based secondary recovery and tertiary brine recovery output	98
Table 4.27	Porosity impairment data for pre and post flooding changes	100
Table 4.28	Summary recovery data and associated mechanism	105

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
Figure 2.1	Surface area to volume ratio of the same material in varying dimensions	08
Figure 2.2	NPs with a high surface-to-volume ratio	14
Figure 2.3	Schematic showing different EOR recovery mechanisms.	16
Figure 2.4	Schematic of wettability change from oil-wet to water-wet	16
Figure 2.5	A schematic diagram of rock wettability conditions of a rock-brine/nanofluid-oil system	17
Figure 2.6	The schematic of two mechanisms causing pore channels plugging: (a) mechanical entrapment; (b) log-jamming	19
Figure 2.7	Disjoining mechanism	20
Figure 3.1	Experimental Design Flow	44
Figure 3.2	Silica Nanoparticles AEROSIL 200 used in the study	47
Figure 3.3	Castlegate sandstone (Core B) and Berea sandstone (Core E) used in the experiments	49
Figure 3.4	Solution of Brine(left) and Nanofluid(right) being electronically stirred	50
Figure 3.5	Appearance changes due to silica nanoparticle addition in brine	51
Figure 3.6	LiquidPerm apparatus for measuring absolute brine permeability	53
Figure 3.7	Soxhlet extraction using toluene for cleaning cores	54
Figure 3.8	FARS- EOR core flooding setup	55
Figure 3.9	Schematic of core flooding experimental setup	56
Figure 3.10	KRUSS shape analyser	60
Figure 3.11	Modified syringe to drop fluid below glass substrate	60
Figure 3.12	Contact angle measurement schematic	61
Figure 4.1	Recovery (in %OOIP) and Pressure differential against PV, at 0.02 wt. % and 20000 ppm	69
Figure 4.2	Recovery (in % OOIP) and Pressure differential against PV at 0.05 wt. %	70

Figure 4.3	Recovery (in %OOIP) and Pressure differential against PV, at 0.07 wt. %	72
Figure 4.4	Recovery (in %OOIP) and Pressure differential vs PV at 0.1 wt. %	74
Figure 4.5	IFT comparison for various nanofluids concentration	76
Figure 4.6	Contact angle for different concentrations of Silica based nanofluids	77
Figure 4.7	ImageJ processed contact angle images of nanofluid-oil-solid system for different concentrations	78
Figure 4.8	Porosity impairment for Scenario 1	80
Figure 4.9	Recovery and Pressure differential vs Pore Volume PV at 30000 ppm	83
Figure 4.10	Recovery and Pressure differential vs Pore Volume PV, at 40000 ppm	85
Figure 4.11	Porosity impairment for Scenario 2	88
Figure 4.12	Contact angle for different salinities based nanofluid	89
Figure 4.13	Contact angle reductions at different salinities	90
Figure 4.14	Contact angles of 0.05 wt. % nanofluid-oil-solid at different salinities	90
Figure 4.15	IFT reduction by 0.05 wt. % silica nanofluids at different salinities	91
Figure 4.16	Recovery and Pressure differential vs Pore Volume PV (at 0.5 ml/min)	93
Figure 4.17	Recovery and Pressure differential vs Pore Volume PV at 1.0 ml/min	94
Figure 4.18	Comparison of recovery and displacement efficiency at lower and higher injection rate.	95
Figure 4.19	Porosity reduction for injection rate variance case	97
Figure 4.20	Recovery output and pressure differential data vs pore volume injected for secondary nano flooding case	99
Figure 4.21	Porosity impairment for tertiary(2_B) vs Secondary recovery (8_G)	101
Figure 4.22	Comparison of recovery (% OOIP) for different concentrations	102
Figure 4.23	Comparison of recovery (% OOIP) for different salinities	103
Figure 4.24	Comparison of recovery profile for different injection rates	104
Figure 4.25	Comparison of recovery profile for mode of recovery mechanism	104

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

OOIP	-	Original oil in place
EOR	-	Enhanced oil recovery
CEOR	-	Chemical enhanced oil recovery
IFT	-	Interfacial tension
SiO ₂	-	Silicon dioxide
Wt. %	-	Weight %
CSS	-	Cyclic steam simulation
SAGD	-	Steam assisted gravity drainage
N ₂	-	Nitrogen
CO ₂	-	Carbon dioxide
WAG	-	Water alternating gas
SWAG	-	Simultaneous water alternating gas
FAWAG	-	Foam assisted water alternating gas
NPs	-	Nanoparticles
TiO ₂	-	Titanium dioxide
Al ₂ O ₃	-	Aluminium oxide
SDS	-	Sodium Dodecyl Sulphate
Ppm	-	Particles per million
Nm	-	Nano meter
RF	-	Recovery factor
PSD	-	Particle size distribution
ZP	-	Zeta Potential
PV	-	Pore Volume
WF	-	Water flooding

LIST OF SYMBOLS

I_w	-	Wettability Index
V_o	-	Volume of oil
V_w	-	Volume of water
S_{wr}	-	Residual water Saturation
S_{or}	-	Residual Oil Saturation
K_{ro}	-	Oil Relative permeability
M	-	Mobility Ratio
λ_i	-	Injected fluid mobility
λ_o	-	Oil mobility
K_{ri}	-	Relative injected fluid permeability
C_{NP}	-	Concentration of nanoparticle
C_{opt}	-	Optimum concentration
d_H	-	Hydrodynamic diameter
μ	-	Viscosity
D	-	Translational diffusion constant
ED	-	Displacement efficiency

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGE
APPENDIX A	Zeta potential distribution	113
APPENDIX B	Particle size distribution	114
APPENDIX C	Preparation methods	120

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of Study

The world's energy needs have risen because of rapid industrialization in the contemporary era. While renewable energies have recently been suggested, the key contributors to energy supply remain the traditional non-renewable energy sources, with hydrocarbons being the most heavily relied on. The oil fields throughout major oil-producing regions are nearing the end of their useful life. The vast mature fields are on the verge of being abandoned, with almost half of the original oil in place (OOIP) left unrecovered [1,2]. As mature fields deplete and higher capital costs halt new projects, professionals' emphasis has turned to enhance the ultimate recoveries of developed fields to meet the needs of the market. Enhanced oil recovery (EOR), also known as tertiary recovery, is a process that aids in recovery increment by enhancing recovery (by altering the fluid-fluid and fluid-rock interactions inside the reservoir). Existing EOR methods can recover 30-60% or more of the hydrocarbons, compared to 20-40% recovered by primary and secondary recovery methods [3]. The most advanced approach used is chemical enhanced oil recovery mechanisms (CEOR), in which various additives, polymers, surfactants, emulsions, or variants of more than one is used as displacing fluid to change microscopic properties as well as an additional macroscopic influence of simple flooding and improve recoveries.

Even after the incorporation of these complicated techniques, oil remains trapped, however, the use of nanoparticles in EOR as nanofluid has opened new frontiers for improving recoveries to new limits. Nano based EOR allows modifications of the properties of displacing fluid at the nanoscale consequently microscopic recovery enhancing parameters are optimized. Promising results found at the lab scale have contributed to shifting focus to nanofluids. Nanofluids have been found to en-

hance recoveries in sandstone and carbonate reservoirs at the lab scale [4,5,6]. The detailed investigation concludes that as the EOR additives have been replaced with nano particles in displacing fluid, their impact is higher compared to previously used CEOR additives, as the major increment in recovery is contributed by the smaller pores that were not impacted previously. Owing to their hydrophilic attribute of dispersing in the water phase, they enhance recoveries by changing the wettability of the system to water wet. The shift of wettability to water wet sets free trapped reservoir fluid ultimately enhancing recovery further. The smaller size of these particles (nanomaterials) sticks around the rock pore surface which enhances recovery by disjoining mechanism. The smaller the size of the nanomaterial more is the impact due to this disjoining impact of the nanofluids. They also serve as viscosity enhancers and improve recovery by improving mobility. Other mechanisms like the log jamming effect, clogging at pore throat and IFT reduction all play an important role in contributing to incremental recovery [7]. Hence the success of any nanomaterial application in the system depends on what mechanisms amongst them are dominant and to what extent.

Nanofluids despite being an efficient agent to enhance recoveries have rarely been evaluated in pilot or field tests. The reasons for this slow process are more than one and a few amongst them are economics, environmental constraints in few countries, and contradiction of recovery output results [8]. Irreproducibility of recovery results is due to many uncertainties such as the lack of detailed evaluation studies of rock properties, and concentrations, retention ability, and stability of nanofluids that have not been integrated to achieve the optimum setting of these parameters. Even though it has been established that the nanofluids are comparatively feasible than many current CEOR methods however above-mentioned hurdles have delayed utilizing the true potential of nanomaterials in the field of EOR.

Many metallic and non-metallic NPs have been utilized at lab scales but amongst them, silica NPs are considered as the most suitable nanomaterial to be implied in sandstone cores because of their technical, environmental, and economical advantages [9,10]. Due to their hydrophilic attribute, they tend to change wettability from oil-wet to water-wet and reduce the interfacial tensions [11]. The interfacial re-

duction has also been reported to be amongst the effective mechanism. All these mechanisms are impacted by various factors such as particle concentration, particle size, injection rate, salinity, and stability of the nanofluid.

Many studies have been published that have worked on stabilising the nano-based fluids for enhanced oil recovery applications whereas identification of mechanisms for any instability that may occur have not been outlined. The understanding of mechanisms without use of any stabilisers can be helpful in designing optimal nano-based recovery fluids which may be effective even if harsher environments are encountered. Evaluation of nano particles on range of salinities and with different concentration will cause expected instabilities hence their impact on recovery and understanding of underlying mechanisms can be beneficial for future research and applications of nanofluids as EOR agents.

1.2 Problem Statement

Integration of nanoparticle in general and SiO₂ NPs in specific, in EOR techniques has given optimistic results on a lab scale. Despite promising results, pilot and field applications have not taken place and the reason for that is on technical, environmental, and economical aspects of nano-EOR methods. The major focus of the research at the lab scale to date has been around higher recovery using SiO₂ nanoparticles, but optimal conditions are yet not outlined. The optimum conditions in which still not established due to contradiction in results [12], stability being important is hard to establish, lack of integrated study for understanding mechanisms [13], and factors affecting recovery potential. All the studies carried out have independently investigated wettability alteration, IFT reduction, colloidal stability, and the impact of varying concentrations on recovery enhancement. But most of the work carried out has not been able to establish the fact about major contributing mechanisms in recovery enhancement by the nanofluid application. The theoretical understanding states that with increasing concentration, recoveries should also increase but most of the lab work carried on has shown that recoveries at higher concentrations have been lesser than those at lower concentrations. Despite high recovery potential in most of the studies at lab scale, the challenges associated with applicability are due to:

- Recovery enhancement results by silica nanofluids have contradicted to be high and low in different lab studies, as in at one stance it was 14.29 % [51], while in another study, it was found to be 2% OOIP only as reported by Hu et al [14].
- Concentration being an important criterion requires the identification of an optimized nanoparticle concentration to be identified for application in sandstone reservoirs. Each reported study has identified different concentration as optimum in recovery enhancement, normally in ranges of 0.01-0.10 wt. %.
- Recovery mechanisms attributed to silica nanofluid recovery enhancement have not been clearly outlined and major contributing mechanisms have differed in different studies. Wettability changes, interfacial tension reduction, pore throat plugging, and mechanical entrapment of particles are the commonly reported mechanisms when nanofluids are implied.
- Stability remains a challenge in the application of nanofluids in highly saline environments. Despite achieving stability in many lab-based studies, the unpredictability of harsher scenarios requires understanding of mechanisms even if solutions become unstable to certain degrees.

1.3 Research Objectives

This study majorly focuses on the evaluation of work that has been carried out regarding nano particle based EOR with the focus on recoveries, the concentration of nanomaterial, and stability in a high saline environment. Since most reported lab work has resulted in better recoveries and is among the most environmentally acceptable due to silica content, silica nanoparticles were chosen for evaluation in sandstone reservoirs. Though stability without stabilizers is expected to be compromised this study aims to evaluate silica nanofluids without stabilizing the solution, as the use of stabilizers may cross the economical limits. Hence the true objective of our study is to evaluate various parameters that affect the recovery potential of silica

nanofluids and the changes in mechanisms associated. Though progress has been made on several fronts independently in the past, no integrated methodology has been used to build confidence in results and ensure that the same results can be replicated under similar conditions. Thus, the objectives of this research are:

- I. To assess the impact of salinity on the oil recovery potential of hydrophilic Silica (SiO_2) nano particles from low to high salinities (i.e. 20000, 30000, and 40000 ppm) at variable concentrations of 0.02, 0.05, 0.07 and 0.10 wt. %.
- II. To evaluate the impact of injection rate at variable injection rates (1.0 ml/min and 0.5 ml/min) and mode of application on oil recovery potential of silica NPs as tertiary and secondary recovery mechanisms.
- III. To determine the impact of recovery mechanisms of wettability alteration, interfacial tension (IFT) reduction, material retention and pore plugging due to variance in material design parameters.

1.4 Scope of the Study

The performance of nanofluids in recovery enhancement has been reported to be based on their concentration, particle size, nanoparticle stability in solutions, reservoir environment, wettability alteration ability, and suitability to the type of reservoir. Whereas studies have reported different recovery mechanisms as the contributing phenomenon in the recovery output due to application of silica based nano particles. Hence scope of this study is limited to:

- a) Evaluating the recovery potential of silica nano particles as enhanced oil recovery technique in nano particles concentration of 0.02, 0.05, 0.07 and 0.10 wt. %, as beyond 0.10 wt. % the effectiveness of nano particles reduces due to larger agglomerations.

- b) The nano fluids would be prepared using brine as the base solution using sodium chloride (NaCl) for salinity of 20000-40000 ppm.
- c) Flooding is carried out for different injection rates i.e. 0.05 ml/min and 0.10 ml/min, whereas secondary and tertiary recovery mechanisms are evaluated to evaluate the effective in each mode of application.
- d) For recovery mechanisms evaluation wettability changes, interfacial tension IFT, retention, and pressure differential evaluations are carried out to establish relationship between mechanisms and parameters like concentration, salinity, injection rates and mode of application.
- e) Four Castlegate cores and three Berea sandstone cores have been utilized in core flooding experiments conducted with average porosities of 20-25 % and average permeability of 400-600 mD.

1.5 Significance of the Study

As the conventional reservoirs are depleting and lower crude oil prices have halted the execution of the new ventures, it has become eminent that current producing fields produce maximum recovery. Advent of novel methods has enhanced recovery potentials at field and lab scale by utilizing advanced methodologies. The application of nanotechnology in EOR mechanisms has been successful in lab studies. Nano particle induced EOR is the field that can cater to the energy needs of the world. This study aims to find out optimum concentration at which we achieve better recoveries are achieved and underlying mechanisms are identified with changes in concentrations and salinities. Generally, this study intends to enhance understanding regarding mechanistic impact of NPs at variable parameters with changes in stability, hence clear understanding of mechanism shall help in designing nano-based recovery applications that would help in enhancing recovery potential of the fields. This study enhances the understanding regarding mechanistic changes at variable parameters which can impact the design of silica based nano fluids as an EOR technique.

REFERENCES

- [1] R.O. Afolabi, "Enhanced oil recovery for emergent energy demand: challenges and prospects for a nanotechnology paradigm shift". *Int Nano Lett* 9, 1–15 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40089-018-0248-0>.
- [2] M.M. Saggaf,. "A Vision for Future Upstream Technologies." *J Pet Technol* 60 (2008): 54–98. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2118/109323-JPT>.
- [3] A.T. Turta, and A.K.Singhal. "Field Foam Applications in Enhanced Oil Recovery Projects: Screening and Design Aspects." *J Can Pet Technol* 41 (2002): No Pagination Specified. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2118/02-10-14>
- [4] N. Lashari and T. Ganat, "Emerging applications of nanomaterials in chemical enhanced oil recovery: Progress and perspective," *Chinese J. Chem. Eng.*, vol. 28, no. 8, pp. 1995–2009, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.cjche.2020.05.019.
- [5] M. F. Fakoya and S. N. Shah, "Emergence of nanotechnology in the oil and gas industry: Emphasis on the application of silica nanoparticles," *Petroleum*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 391–405, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.petlm.2017.03.001.
- [6] X. Sun, Y. Zhang, G. Chen, and Z. Gai, "Application of nanoparticles in enhanced oil recovery: A critical review of recent progress," *Energies*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 12–13, 2017, doi: 10.3390/en10030345.
- [7] R. Abhishek, G. S. Kumar, and R. K. Sapru, "Wettability alteration in carbonate reservoirs using nanofluids," *Pet. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 33, no. 7, pp. 794–801, 2015, doi: 10.1080/10916466.2015.1014967.
- [8] L. Hendraningrat, B. Engeset, S. Suwarno, and O. Torst er, "Improved oil recovery by nanofluids flooding: An experimental study," *Soc. Pet. Eng. - Kuwait Int. Pet. Conf. Exhib. 2012, KIPCE 2012 People Innov. Technol. to Unleash Challenging Hydrocarb. Resour.*, vol. 2, no. 2006, pp. 585–593, 2012, doi: 10.2118/163335-ms.
- [9] A. M. S. Ragab, "Experimental Investigation of Improved Oil Recovery using Nanotechnology Potentials",*The 1 st International Conference*,25-28 Feb 2014, pp. 1–14, 2015, doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.2272.6486.
- [10] C. R. Miranda, L. S. De Lara, B. C. Tonetto, and U. Federal, "Stability and

- Mobility of Functionalized Silica Nanoparticles for Enhanced Oil Recovery Applications", *SPE International Oilfield Nanotechnology Conference and Exhibition*, Noordwijk, The Netherlands, June 2012. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2118/157033-MS>
- [11] A. Shahrabadi, H. Bagherzadeh, A. Roustaei, and H. Golghanddashti, "Experimental investigation of HLP nanofluid potential to enhance oil recovery: A mechanistic approach," *Soc. Pet. Eng. - SPE Int. Oilf. Nanotechnol. Conf. 2012*, pp. 168–176, 2012, doi: 10.2118/156642-ms.
- [12] A. Bera, A. Mandal, and T. Kumar, "The effect of rock-crude oil-fluid interactions on wettability alteration of oil-wet sandstone in the presence of surfactants," *Pet. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 33, no. 5, pp. 542–549, March 2015, doi: 10.1080/10916466.2014.998768.
- [13] A. Bila, J. Å. Stensen, and O. Torsæter, "Experimental evaluation of oil recovery mechanisms using a variety of surface-modified silica nanoparticles in the injection water," *Soc. Pet. Eng. - SPE Norw. One Day Semin. 2019*, November, 2019, doi: 10.2118/195638-ms.
- [14] Z. Hu, S. M. Azmi, G. Raza, P. W. J. Glover, and D. Wen, "Nanoparticle-Assisted Water-Flooding in Berea Sandstones," *Energy and Fuels*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 2791–2804, 2016, doi: 10.1021/acs.energyfuels.6b00051.
- [15] A. Kamyshny and S. Magdassi, "Aqueous Dispersions of Metallic Nanoparticles: Preparation, Stabilization and Application in Nanoscience: Colloidal and Interfacial Aspects" *Surfactant Sci. Ser.*, 2010, pp. 747–778.
- [16] A. J. P. Fletcher and J. P. Davis, "How EOR can be transformed by nanotechnology," *SPE - DOE Improv. Oil Recover. Symp. Proc.*, vol. 1, pp. 152–167, 2010, doi: 10.2118/129531-ms.
- [17] I. Evdokimov, N. Eliseev, A. Losev, and M. Novikov, "Emerging Petroleum-Oriented Nanotechnologies for Reservoir Engineering," April. 2007, *SPE Russian Oil and Gas Technical Conference and Exhibition*, Moscow, Russia, 3–6 October 2006 doi: 10.2523/102060-ms.
- [18] M. Amanullah and A. M. Al-Tahini, "Nano-Technology - Its Significance in Smart Fluid Development for Oil and Gas Field Application," *SPE Saudi Arabia Section Technical Symposium, AlKhobar, Saudi Arabia*, 09–11 May 2009, doi: 10.2118/126102-ms.
- [19] K. V. Wong and O. De Leon, "Applications of Nanofluids: Current and

- Future,” *Adv. Mech. Eng.*, vol. 2, p. 519659, Jan. 2010, doi: 10.1155/2010/519659.
- [20] G. Maserati, E. Daturi, A. Belloni, L. De Gaidio, S. Bolzoni, W. Lazzari., “Nano-emulsions as Cement Spacer Improve the Cleaning of Casing Bore During Cementing Operations,” *SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, Florence, Italy, September 2010*. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2118/133033-MS>
- [21] T. Skauge, K. Spildo, and A. Skauge, “Nano-sized particles for EOR,” *SPE - DOE Improv. Oil Recover. Symp. Proc.*, vol. 2, pp. 1281–1290, April 2010, doi: 10.2523/129933-ms.
- [22] X. Kong and M. M. Ohadi, “Applications of micro and nano technologies in the oil and gas industry-an overview of the recent progress,” *Soc. Pet. Eng. - 14th Abu Dhabi Int. Pet. Exhib. Conf. 2010, ADIPEC 2010*, vol. 3, pp. 1703–1713, 2010, doi: 10.2118/138241-ms.
- [23] S. Ayatollahi and M. M. Zerafat, “Nanotechnology-Assisted EOR Techniques: New Solutions to Old Challenges,” *SPE International Oilfield Nanotechnology Conference and Exhibition, Noordwijk, The Netherlands, June 2012*. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2118/157094-MS>
- [24] V. Alvarado and E. Manrique, “Enhanced oil recovery: An update review,” *Energies*, vol. 3, no. 9, pp. 1529–1575, 2010, doi: 10.3390/en3091529.
- [25] I. P. Gonzalez Da Silva, M. A. De Melo, J. M. Luvizotto, and E. F. Lucas, “Polymer flooding: A sustainable enhanced oil recovery in the current scenery,” *Proc. SPE Lat. Am. Caribb. Pet. Eng. Conf.*, vol. 2, pp. 999–1007, 2007, doi: 10.2523/107727-ms.
- [26] Y. Ahmadi, S. E. Eshraghi, P. Bahrami, M. Hasanbeygi, Y. Kazemzadeh, and A. Vahedian, “Comprehensive Water-Alternating-Gas (WAG) injection study to evaluate the most effective method based on heavy oil recovery and asphaltene precipitation tests,” *J. Pet. Sci. Eng.*, vol. 133, pp. 123–129, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.petrol.2015.05.003.
- [27] X. Sun, M. Dong, Y. Zhang, and B. B. Maini, “Enhanced heavy oil recovery in thin reservoirs using foamy oil-assisted methane huff-n-puff method,” *Fuel*, vol. 159, pp. 962–973, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.fuel.2015.07.056.
- [28] H. L. Chang, Z. Q. Zhang, Q.M. Wang, Z.S. Xu, Z.D. Guo, H.Q. Sun, X.L. Cao, and Q. Qiao, “Advances in polymer flooding and

- alkaline/surfactant/polymer processes as developed and applied in the People's Republic of China," *J. Pet. Technol.*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 84–89, 2006, doi: 10.2118/89175-JPT.
- [29] J. Vargo, J. Turner, V. Bob, M. Pitts, J. Malcolm, K. Wyatt, H. Surkalo, and P. David, "Alkaline-surfactant-polymer flooding of the Cambridge Minnelusa Field," *SPE/AAPG West. Reg. Meet.*, no. September 1999, pp. 1–7, 2000, doi: 10.2523/55633-ms.
- [30] A. Muggeridge, A. Cockin, K. Webb, H. Frampton, I. Collins, T. Moulds, and P. Salino, "Recovery rates, enhanced oil recovery and technological limits," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, vol. 372, no. 2006, pp. 20120320–20120320, Dec. 02, 2014, doi: 10.1098/rsta.2012.0320.
- [31] M. Ahmadi, A. Habibi, P. Pourafshary, and S. Ayatollahi, "Zeta potential investigation and mathematical modeling of nanoparticles deposited on the rock surface to reduce fine migration," *SPE Middle East Oil Gas Show Conf. MEOS, Proc.*, vol. 3, pp. 1966–1979, 2011, doi: 10.2118/142633-ms.
- [32] O. A. Alomair, K. M. Matar, and Y. H. Alsaeed, "Nanofluids application for heavy oil recovery," *Soc. Pet. Eng. - SPE Asia Pacific Oil Gas Conf. Exhib. APOGCE 2014 - Chang. Game Oppor. Challenges Solut.*, vol. 2, no. October, pp. 1346–1363, 2014, doi: 10.2118/171539-ms.
- [33] H. Zhang, A. Nikolov, and D. Wasan, "Enhanced oil recovery (EOR) using nanoparticle dispersions: Underlying mechanism and imbibition experiments," *Energy and Fuels*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 3002–3009, 2014, doi: 10.1021/ef500272r.
- [34] A. Keykhosravi, M. B. Vanani, A. Daryasafar, and C. Aghayari, "Comparative study of different enhanced oil recovery scenarios by silica nanoparticles: An approach to time-dependent wettability alteration in carbonates," *J. Mol. Liq.*, vol. 324, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.molliq.2020.115093.
- [35] S. Li and O. Torsæter, "An Experimental Investigation of EOR Mechanisms for Nanoparticles Fluid in Glass Micromodel," *International symposium of the society of the core analysts*, Avignon France, 2010, pp. 1–12, 2014, doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.4181.3604.
- [36] S. Le Van and B. H. Chon, "Chemical flooding in heavy-oil reservoirs: From technical investigation to optimization using response surface methodology,"

- Energies*, vol. 9, no. 9, 2016, doi: 10.3390/en9090711.
- [37] A. O. Gbadamosi, R. Junin, M. A. Manan, N. Yekeen, A. Agi, and J. O. Oseh, “Recent advances and prospects in polymeric nanofluids application for enhanced oil recovery,” *J. Ind. Eng. Chem.*, vol. 66, pp. 1–19, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.jiec.2018.05.020.
- [38] T. W. Teklu, W. Alameri, H. Kazemi, and R. M. Graves, “Contact angle measurements on conventional and unconventional reservoir cores,” *Soc. Pet. Eng. - Unconv. Resour. Technol. Conf. URTeC 2015*, no. d, pp. 1–17, 2015, doi: 10.2118/178568-ms.
- [39] J. Giraldo, P. Benjumea, S. Lopera, F. B. Cortés, and M. A. Ruiz, “Wettability alteration of sandstone cores by alumina-based nanofluids,” *Energy and Fuels*, vol. 27, no. 7, pp. 3659–3665, 2013, doi: 10.1021/ef4002956.
- [40] A. Dehghan Monfared, M. H. Ghazanfari, M. Jamialahmadi, and A. Helalizadeh, “Potential Application of Silica Nanoparticles for Wettability Alteration of Oil-Wet Calcite: A Mechanistic Study,” *Energy and Fuels*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 3947–3961, 2016, doi: 10.1021/acs.energyfuels.6b00477.
- [41] C. Negin, S. Ali, and Q. Xie, “Application of nanotechnology for enhancing oil recovery – A review,” *Petroleum*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 324–333, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.petlm.2016.10.002.
- [42] R. Hashemi, N. N. Nassar, and P. Pereira Almao, “Enhanced heavy oil recovery by in situ prepared ultradispersed multimetallic nanoparticles: A study of hot fluid flooding for Athabasca bitumen recovery,” *Energy and Fuels*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 2194–2201, 2013, doi: 10.1021/ef3020537.
- [43] A. Zamani, B. Maini, and P. Pereira-Almao, “Flow of nanodispersed catalyst particles through porous media: Effect of permeability and temperature,” *Can. J. Chem. Eng.*, vol. 90, no. 2, pp. 304–314, 2012, doi: 10.1002/cjce.20629.
- [44] A. Ahmed, I. Mohd Saaid, R. M. Pilus, A. Abbas Ahmed, A. H. Tunio, and M. K. Baig, “Development of surface treated nanosilica for wettability alteration and interfacial tension reduction,” *J. Dispers. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 39, no. 10, pp. 1469–1475, 2018, doi: 10.1080/01932691.2017.1417133.
- [45] A. Bila, J. Å. Stensen, and O. Torsæter, “Experimental investigation of polymer-coated silica nanoparticles for enhanced oil recovery,” *Nanomaterials*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 1–25, 2019, doi: 10.3390/nano9060822.
- [46] S. Ayatollahi, “Nanotechnology-assisted EOR techniques: New solutions to the

- old challenges,” *World Pet. Congr. Proc.*, vol. 6, pp. 4127–4138, 2014.
- [47] J.R. D. Shah, “Application of nanoparticle saturated injectant gases for EOR of heavy oils,” *Proc. - SPE Annu. Tech. Conf. Exhib.*, vol. 7, no. October, pp. 4784–4795, 2009, doi: 10.2118/129539-stu.
- [48] S. N. Molnes, I. P. Torrijos, S. Strand, K. G. Paso, and K. Syverud, “Sandstone injectivity and salt stability of cellulose nanocrystals (CNC) dispersions—Premises for use of CNC in enhanced oil recovery,” *Ind. Crops Prod.*, vol. 93, pp. 152–160, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.indcrop.2016.03.019.
- [49] S. Al-Anssari, A. Barifcani, S. Wang, L. Maxim, and S. Iglauer, “Wettability alteration of oil-wet carbonate by silica nanofluid,” *J. Colloid Interface Sci.*, vol. 461, pp. 435–442, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.jcis.2015.09.051.
- [50] B. J. Abu Tarboush and M. M. Husein, “Adsorption of asphaltenes from heavy oil onto in situ prepared NiO nanoparticles,” *J. Colloid Interface Sci.*, vol. 378, no. 1, pp. 64–69, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.jcis.2012.04.016.
- [51] L. Hendraningrat, S. Li, and O. Torsæter, “A coreflood investigation of nanofluid enhanced oil recovery,” *J. Pet. Sci. Eng.*, vol. 111, pp. 128–138, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.petrol.2013.07.003.
- [52] K. R. Aurand, G. S. Dahle, and O. Torsæter, “Comparison of Oil Recovery for Six Nanofluids in Berea Sandstone Cores,” *Int. Symp. Soc. Core Anal.*, no. February 2015, pp. 1–12, 2014.
- [53] S.K. Muhammad, A.A. Ahmad, S.S. Abdullah, M.F. Al-Hamad and M. Umer, “Recent advances in nanoparticles enhanced oil recovery: Rheology, interfacial tension, oil recovery, and wettability alteration,” *Journal of Nanomaterials*, vol. 2017, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/2473175>
- [54] E. Khalafi, A. Hashemi, M. Zallaghi, and R. Kharrat, “An Experimental Investigation of Nanoparticles Assisted Surfactant Flooding for Improving Oil Recovery in a Micromodel System,” *J. Pet. Environ. Biotechnol.*, vol. 09, no. 01, pp. 1–6, 2018, doi: 10.4172/2157-7463.1000355.
- [55] M. Y. Kanj, J. J. Funk, and Z. Al-Yousif, “Nanofluid coreflood experiments in the ARAB-D,” *Soc. Pet. Eng. - SPE Saudi Arab. Sect. Tech. Symp. 2009*, pp. 1–11, 2009, doi: 10.2118/126161-ms.
- [56] M. I. Youssif, R. M. El-Maghraby, S. M. Saleh, and A. Elgibaly, “Silica nanofluid flooding for enhanced oil recovery in sandstone rocks,” *Egypt. J. Pet.*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 105–110, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.ejpe.2017.01.006.

- [57] S. Al-Anssari, S. Wang, A. Barifcani, M. Lebedev, and S. Iglauer, “Effect of temperature and SiO₂ nanoparticle size on wettability alteration of oil-wet calcite,” *Fuel*, vol. 206, pp. 34–42, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.fuel.2017.05.077.
- [58] L. Hendraningrat and O. Torsæter, “Unlocking the potential of metal oxides nanoparticles to enhance the oil recovery,” *Proc. Annu. Offshore Technol. Conf.*, vol. 1, no. 2013, pp. 211–222, 2014, doi: 10.4043/24696-ms.
- [59] R. Jiang, K. Li, and R. Horne, “A mechanism study of wettability and interfacial tension for EOR using silica nanoparticles,” *Proc. - SPE Annu. Tech. Conf. Exhib.*, vol. 0, pp. 1–17, 2017, doi: 10.2118/187096-ms.
- [60] L. Hendraningrat, S. Li, and O. Torsæter, “Effect of some parameters influencing enhanced oil recovery process using Silica Nanoparticles: An experimental investigation,” *Soc. Pet. Eng. - SPE Reserv. Characterisation Simul. Conf. Exhib. RCSC 2013 New Approaches Characterisation and Modelling Complex Reserv.*, vol. 1, pp. 186–195, 2013, doi: 10.2118/165955-ms.
- [61] M. Zallaghi, R. Kharrat, and A. Hashemi, “Improving the microscopic sweep efficiency of water flooding using silica nanoparticles,” *J. Pet. Explor. Prod. Technol.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 259–269, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s13202-017-0347-x.
- [62] S. Li, M. Genys, K. Wang, and O. Torsæter, “Experimental study of wettability alteration during nanofluid enhanced oil recovery process and its effect on oil recovery,” *Soc. Pet. Eng. - SPE Reserv. Characterisation Simul. Conf. Exhib. RCSC 2015*, pp. 393–403, 2015, doi: 10.2118/175610-ms.
- [63] A. Agi, R. Junin, and A. Gbadamosi, “Mechanism governing nanoparticle flow behaviour in porous media: insight for enhanced oil recovery applications,” *Int. Nano Lett.*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 49–77, Jun. 2018, doi: 10.1007/s40089-018-0237-3.
- [64] J. Geddes, “Quantification of Swelling Clays in Mineral Mixtures and Rocks using Infrared Spectroscopy,” PhD Thesis, Sheffield Hallam University, June 2006,.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

1. Chandio, T.A.; Manan, M.A.; Memon, K.R.; Abbas, G.; Abbasi, G.R. Enhanced Oil Recovery by Hydrophilic Silica Nanofluid: Experimental Evaluation of the Impact of Parameters and Mechanisms on Recovery Potential. *Energies* 2021, 14, 5767. <https://doi.org/10.3390/en14185767>.
2. Chandio, T.A.; Manan, M.A.; Lashari, N. Bibliometric Analysis of Nanofluid Based Enhanced Oil Recovery; Identifying Current Trends, Gaps, and Future Areas for Multidisciplinary Research. 4th International Conference on Emerging Trends in Engineering, Management and Sciences” (ICETEMS-2021) Peshawar, Pakistan. 29-30 September 2021.