

ESTIMATION OF SAND PRODUCTION VOLUME FOR WEAK TO
MODERATE STRENGTH SANDSTONE RESERVOIR USING FINITE
ELEMENT METHOD

SUREJ KUMAR SUBBIAH

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA

ESTIMATION OF SAND PRODUCTION VOLUME FOR WEAK TO
MODERATE STRENGTH SANDSTONE RESERVOIR USING FINITE
ELEMENT METHOD

SUREJ KUMAR SUBBIAH

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

Faculty of Chemical & Energy Engineering
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

OCTOBER 2022

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to Prof. Dr. Ariffin Samsuri (UTM), my PhD supervisor and lifetime academic mentor and Guru, who have been very patient with me throughout this research journey. My gratitude also for my co-supervisor Prof Madya Dr Mohd Zaidi Jaafar. I special thanks and appreciation to my industrial co-supervisor, Dr Assef Mohamad Hussein (Schlumberger) for his support, guidance and helping me throughout the research work and improving the methodology as per industrial needs. My gratitude to Prof Madya Issham Ismail from for his support.

I owe the deepest appreciation to my Schlumberger colleagues, Ying Ru Chen, Andrew Pearce, Joel Wesley Martin, Richard Birchwood, Adrian Rodriguez Herrera, Ashwani Zutshi, Rajeev Ranjan Kumar, Rajendra Nath, Xavier Garcia-Teijeiro and Rahul Talreja for their kind help in sharing technical ideas and knowledge.

My sincere gratitude to the Schlumberger management for providing all the rock specimens for experimental work, access to laboratory facilities and software that required for this research work. Deepest gratitude to the Schlumberger Geomechanics software development team for helping me to integrate the new constitutive model code that I developed into VISAGE software.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my wife, parents, brothers and sisters, family and friends for their love and moral support.

ABSTRACT

The aim of this research work is to develop a new non-linear constitutive model and novel technique to estimate sand production volume for weak to moderate strength sandstone reservoir rocks. Sand production due to rock failure can have a severe impact on the economics of an oil or gas field where the downhole or surface components erosion due to sand production can lead to loss of well integrity and hydrocarbon leakage. Furthermore, if the drawdown increases, sand production volume is becoming more prevalent. To facilitate best sand management over the life of a field, an accurate prediction of sand production volume is required to increase productivity of the well at low operating cost. The current method is unable to fully cater the industry's need as most of the work related to sand production models are developed for onset failure but little on sand production volume estimation. This research work was initiated to fill this industry gap by developing a new technique for sand production volume estimation. The selection of failure criteria has a big impact on accurate predictability on sandstone failure and sand production volume prediction, thus an investigation on the needs for a new non-linear constitutive model has been performed. A new constitutive model has been developed and validated to assist numerical model validation. A new workflow and method have been developed for accurate sand production volume prediction. A novel approach has been developed in this study to enable continuum Finite Element Method (FEM) model to replicate as discontinuum model. This was achieved by creating a new computer code to communicate with FEM solver to remove all failed grid cells (mesh) and allow stress stabilisation around perforation cavity. This technique is known as progressive perforation cavity failure and stabilisation (PPCFS). The invented technique was tested on both laboratory test and field data. A 3D FEM model developed using actual well and field data was used to validate and evaluate the robustness of the developed workflow and method. The outcome of this study shows that the new constitutive model has better predictive capability on both the sandstone failure and sand production volume. The combination of the newly developed Assef-Surej-Ariffin (ASA) constitutive model and the PPCFS FEM method is able to predict onset failure of sandstone and sand production volume accurately within 2.5% and 5% error margin respectively when compared to actual laboratory testing. Meanwhile, field data yields an excellent match with actual observed sand production volume in the field within 3% error margin. The parametric analysis concluded that rock strength has proportional impact on sand production volume. Meanwhile the combination of borehole deviation, smaller perforation diameter, and oriented perforation could reduce the sand production volume. This method also can be used to optimize the controllable parameters (well and perforation design) to eliminate sand production completely provided that the compressive strength and far field stresses of the reservoir permit. Therein, it can be concluded that the developed model is novel and able to assist the oil and gas industry to estimate the possible producible sand volume for their planned drawdown for sandstone reservoirs using the geomechanical properties.

ABSTRAK

Tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk membangunkan satu model juzuk tak linear yang baharu dan teknik asli bagi menganggar isi padu pengeluaran pasir untuk batuan reservoir yang lemah hingga ke sederhana. Pengeluaran pasir yang berpunca daripada kegagalan batuan memberikan kesan ekonomi yang teruk terhadap medan minyak dan gas dengan hakisan yang berlaku pada komponen dalam lubang dan komponen permukaan boleh menyebabkan telaga kehilangan integriti dan bocoran hidrokarbon. Jika surutan meningkat, isi padu pengeluaran pasir menjadi semakin ketara. Demi menghasilkan pengurusan terbaik pasir sepanjang hayat sebuah medan, peramalan yang tepat bagi isi padu pengeluaran pasir adalah diperlukan supaya boleh meningkatkan produktiviti telaga pada kos operasi yang rendah. Kaedah terkini tidak mampu memenuhi keperluan industri memandangkan kebanyakan model dibangunkan untuk kajian kegagalan permulaan dengan tumpuan yang terhad terhadap penganggaran isi padu pengeluaran pasir. Kajian ini dilaksanakan bagi memenuhi jurang itu dengan membangunkan satu teknik yang baharu untuk penganggaran isi padu pengeluaran pasir. Pemilihan kriteria kegagalan mempunyai kesan yang besar terhadap ketepatan dalam kebolehamalan kegagalan batu pasir dan penganggaran isi padu pengeluaran pasir. Oleh itu, kajian yang memerlukan penggunaan model juzuk tak linear telah dilaksanakan. Satu model juzuk yang baharu telah dibangun dan disahkan bagi mengesah model berangka. Alir kerja dan kaedah yang baharu telah dibangun bagi meramal secara tepat isi padu pengeluaran pasir. Pendekatan yang dibangun adalah untuk membolehkan model kontinum Kaedah Unsur Terhingga (FEM) diulangi sebagai model tak kontinum. Kajian ini berakhir dengan terciptanya satu kod baharu komputer yang boleh berkomunikasi dengan penyelesaian FEM bagi menyingkir semua sel grid (jaringan) yang gagal dan membenarkan penstabilan tegasan di sekitar rongga penebukan. Teknik yang dikenali penstabilan dan kegagalan progresif rongga penebukan (PPCFS) itu telah diuji menggunakan data medan dan data uji kaji makmal. Model FEM 3D telah dibangun menggunakan data telaga dengan data medan digunakan bagi mengesah dan menilai kemampuan alir kerja dan kaedah yang terhasil. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa model baharu juzuk mempunyai kemampuan ramalan yang lebih baik tentang kegagalan batu pasir dan isi padu pengeluaran pasir. Gabungan model baharu juzuk Assef-Surej-Ariffin (ASA) dan kaedah PPCFS FEM boleh meramal secara tepat kegagalan permulaan batu pasir dan isi padu pengeluaran pasir dengan masing-masing jidar selisih sekitar 2.5% dan 5% apabila dibandingkan dengan hasil pengujian makmal. Di samping itu, data medan memberikan hasil yang baik berbanding isi padu pengeluaran pasir sebenar di medan dengan jidar selisih sekitar 3%. Analisis parameter menunjukkan bahawa kekuatan batuan mempunyai kesan berkadar terhadap isi padu pengeluaran pasir. Selain itu, gabungan lengungan lubang, diameter penebukan yang kecil, dan penebukan berarah mampu mengurangkan isi padu pengeluaran pasir. Kaedah ini juga boleh diguna untuk mengoptimumkan parameter-parameter boleh kawal (reka bentuk penebukan dan telaga) bagi menyingkir sepenuhnya pengeluaran pasir dengan bantuan kekuatan mampatan dan tegasan batuan reservoir. Kesimpulannya, model yang dibangun adalah asli dan boleh membantu industri minyak dan gas untuk menganggar isi padu pengeluaran pasir berdasarkan surutan yang dirancang bagi reservoir batu pasir menerusi penggunaan sifat-sifat geomekanikal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	TITLE	PAGE
	DECLARATION	iii
	DEDICATION	iv
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	v
	ABSTRACT	vi
	ABSTRAK	vii
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
	LIST OF TABLES	xiii
	LIST OF FIGURES	xv
	LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxii
	LIST OF SYMBOLS	xxiii
	LIST OF APPENDICES	xxviii
CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Background	1
1.2	Problem Statement	3
1.3	Research Objectives	4
1.4	Scope of The Work	5
1.5	Significance of Study	5
1.6	Research Gaps	7
1.7	Study Limitations	8
CHAPTER 2	LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1	Geomechanics	9
2.1.1	Mechanical Rock Properties	13
2.1.1.1	Young's Modulus	13
2.1.1.2	Poisson's Ratio	14
2.1.1.3	Unconfined Compressive Strength	15
2.1.1.4	Tensile Strength	16

	2.1.1.5	Friction Angle	17
	2.1.2	In-situ Stresses and Pore Pressure	18
	2.1.2.1	Overburden Vertical Stress	18
	2.1.2.2	Pore Pressure	19
	2.1.2.3	Maximum and Minimum Horizontal Stress	19
	2.1.2.4	Horizontal Stress Direction	21
	2.1.2.5	Stresses Around Wellbore or Perforation Tunnel	22
2.2		Numerical Modeling	27
	2.2.1	Finite Element Method	27
2.3		Sand Production	30
	2.3.1	Sand Production Mechanism	31
	2.3.2	Rock Mechanical Failure Mechanism	35
	2.3.3	Erosion Failure Mechanism	38
	2.3.4	Sand Production Phenomenon Variability	38
2.4		Sand Production Prediction	39
	2.4.1	Analytical Method	40
	2.4.2	Numerical Method	46
CHAPTER 3		RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	55
	3.1	Introduction	55
	3.2	Data Preparation	57
	3.3	Rock Mechanical Laboratory Experiments	59
	3.3.1	Specimen Preparation	62
	3.3.2	Specimen Saturation Process	64
	3.3.3	Compression Test Equipment and Apparatus	64
	3.3.4	Unconfined Compressive Strength Test	67
	3.3.5	Triaxial Compressive Test	67
	3.3.6	Hollow Cylindrical Test	68
	3.3.7	Perforated Cylindrical Test	69
	3.4	Development of New Constitutive Model	71
	3.5	Development of Computer Programming	71

3.5.1	Development and Implementation of Subroutines for the Proposed Constitutive Model	72
3.5.2	Workflow and Subroutines for Laboratory Model Preparation	74
3.5.3	Workflow and Subroutines for Progressive Perforation Cavity Failure and Stabilization Using Grid Cell Removal	76
3.6	Validation Process	79
3.7	Field Data Testing and Validation Procedure	82
3.7.1	1D Mechanical Earth Model Construction	84
3.7.2	Onset Failure Analysis	87
3.7.3	3D FEM Model Construction	89
3.7.4	Sand Production Volume Estimation using 3D FEM Model	90
3.7.5	Parametric Analysis	93
CHAPTER 4	DEVELOPMENT OF CONSTITUTIVE MODEL AND PROGRESSIVE PERFORATION CAVITY FAILURE AND STABILISATION	95
4.1	Formulation of Constitutive Model	95
4.1.1	Characterization of Plastic Deformation	98
4.2	Progressive Perforation Cavity Failure and Stabilization Development	101
4.2.1	Shear Deformation and Dilation	104
CHAPTER 5	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	107
5.1	Laboratory Measurement Results	107
5.1.1	Numerical Modeling and Validation	117
5.1.1.1	Failure Criteria Comparisons	117
5.1.1.2	Triaxial Test Results Validation	121
5.1.1.3	Hollow Cylindrical Test Validation	128
5.2	Sand Production Analysis	131
5.2.1	Failure Mechanism	132
5.2.2	Numerical Model Setup for Sand Production Volume Validation	134

5.2.3	Specimen SKSW15	135
5.2.3.1	Numerical Model Validation for Specimen SKSW15	137
5.2.4	Specimen SKSW3	144
5.2.4.1	Numerical Model Validation for Specimen SKSW3	145
5.2.5	Specimen SKSW21	152
5.2.5.1	Numerical Model Validation for Specimen SKSW21	154
5.3	Field Data Test and Validation	161
5.3.1	One Dimensional Mechanical Earth Model Construction	163
5.3.2	Onset Failure Analysis for First Sand Production	169
5.3.3	Sand Production Volume Prediction and Validation Using Field Data	177
5.3.3.1	Numerical Model Construction	179
5.3.3.2	Finite Element Simulation Results using PPCFS Method	180
5.3.3.3	Pre-production Stress Initialization	183
5.3.3.4	Depletion and Sand Production Modeling	191
5.4	Parametric Analysis	198
5.4.1	Parametric Analysis for Unconfined Compressive Strength	199
5.4.2	Parametric Analysis for Borehole Deviation and Perforation Orientation	200
5.4.2.1	Non-oriented Perforation	201
5.4.2.2	Oriented Perforation	203
5.4.3	Parametric Analysis for Perforation Diameter	205
CHAPTER 6	CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMEDATIONS	209
6.1	Conclusions	209
6.2	Recommendations	210
REFERENCES		213

APPENDIX A	DEVELOPED COMPUTER CODE	223
APPENDIX B	TRIAXIAL TEST ANALYSIS	239
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS		243

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
Table 3.1	List of commercial software used in the study	55
Table 3.2	Summary of laboratory tests conducted	61
Table 3.3	Summary of specimens dimension for testing	63
Table 5.1	Summary of elastic and strength properties from the laboratory test results on Castlegate Sandstone Set-1	108
Table 5.2	Summary of elastic and strength properties from the laboratory test results on Castlegate Sandstone Set-2	109
Table 5.3	Summary of elastic and strength properties from the laboratory test results on Saltwash Sandstone	110
Table 5.4	Summary of elastic and strength properties from the laboratory test results on SS1 Sandstone	111
Table 5.5	Summary of rock strength parameter used for failure criteria	117
Table 5.6	Summary of sand production phenomenon from laboratory test results	131
Table 5.7	Summary of measured and simulated sand production	161
Table 5.8	1D MEM layout track guidance	164
Table 5.9	Field well test data for sand production	169
Table 5.10	Comparison between field well test and modelled for sand production	173
Table 5.11	Well-1 sand production history during the well test	178
Table 5.12	Total and effective far field stress for Well-1	184
Table 5.13	Baseline data for Well-1 for parametric analysis	199
Table 5.14	UCS parametric analysis and sand production volume for Well-1	200
Table 5.15	Hole deviation parametric analysis and sand production volume for Well-1 for non-oriented perforation	201
Table 5.16	Hole deviation parametric analysis and sand production volume for Well-1 for oriented perforation	204

Table 5.17 Perforation diameter parametric analysis and sand production volume for Well-1

207

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
Figure 2.1	Balance between controllable and uncontrollable parameter to avoid sand production	10
Figure 2.2	Geomechanical model construction workflow.	11
Figure 2.3	Mohr-Coulomb failure criteria	17
Figure 2.4	Far field stress and wellbore stress	23
Figure 2.5	Far field stress and deviated wellbore coordinate system	24
Figure 2.6	Cylindrical polar coordinate system around a wellbore and away	25
Figure 2.7	Illustration of rock failure due to deviatoric stress using Mohr Circle	32
Figure 2.8	Cross section view of CT scan image for different type of rock and failure (a) Castlegate rock with failure Type-A (b) Saltwash North with failure Type-B and (c) Saltwash South with failure Type-C	36
Figure 2.9	2D axisymmetric problem for single perforation model	49
Figure 2.10	Model setup with 2 million sand grains as 2D Model	53
Figure 3.1	Flowchart for research methodology plan	58
Figure 3.2	Schematic illustration of (a) unconfined compressive strength test (UCS) and (b) triaxial compressive strength test (TXS)	60
Figure 3.3	Schematic illustration of (a) Type 1 hollow cylindrical test (HCS) and (b) Type 2 perforated cylindrical test (PCS)	60
Figure 3.4	Three types of sandstone specimens used for laboratory tests (a) Castlegate sandstone (b) Saltwash South and (c) SS1 reservoir sandstone	63
Figure 3.5	Servo Controller used for all test	65
Figure 3.6	Hoek cell based with load cell	65
Figure 3.7	Cantilever-type strain transducer for radial strain (left) and transducer for axial strain measurement (right)	66
Figure 3.8	Apparatus to collect sand production during the test from fluid outlets	66

Figure 3.9	Flowchart for new constitutive model implementation	74
Figure 3.10	Flowchart for FEM model preparation	75
Figure 3.11	Control file example for FEM model preparation	75
Figure 3.12	Flowchart for developed method (progressive perforation cavity failure and stabilization using grid cell removal)	78
Figure 3.13	Stress path during loading and the failure and non-failure zone	79
Figure 3.14	Model validation process using laboratory test	81
Figure 3.15	Overall Field data testing process adopted for this research work	83
Figure 3.16	Part 1 of field data testing process for 1D MEM construction along the wellbore	86
Figure 3.17	Flowchart for onset failure analysis python code	88
Figure 3.18	Part 2 of field data testing process for onset failure and 3D FEM pre-production stress initialisation	91
Figure 3.19	Part 3 of field data testing process for actual drawdown and pore pressure	92
Figure 4.1	Illustration of stress strain curves and associated types of strains adopted from Pietruszczak	96
Figure 4.2	Variation of α in function of generalized plastic shear strain, γ_p illustrating hardening and softening phases	100
Figure 4.3	Regions and zones around perforation tunnel	102
Figure 4.4	Progressive perforation cavity failure and stabilization	103
Figure 4.5	Shear band caused north shearing and dilation of the porous sandstone	106
Figure 5.1	Stress-strain cure from laboratory tests for Castlegate Sandstone Set-1	108
Figure 5.2	Stress-strain cure from laboratory tests for Castlegate Sandstone Set-2	109
Figure 5.3	Stress-strain curve from laboratory tests on Saltwash Sandstone	110
Figure 5.4	Stress Strain curve from laboratory tests on SS1 Sandstone	111
Figure 5.5	Relationship between confining pressure and Poisson's ratio	113

Figure 5.6	Relationship between confining pressure and Young Modulus	113
Figure 5.7	Elastic Young's Modulus and Poisson's Ratio of a sandstone	114
Figure 5.8	Mohr-circles plots for Castlegate sandstone	115
Figure 5.9	Mohr-circles plots for Saltwash sandstone	116
Figure 5.10	Mohr-circles plots for S1 sandstone	116
Figure 5.11	Illustration of the p-q plot for all commonly used failure criteria	118
Figure 5.12	The p-q plot for the peak stress at failure for Castlegate Sandstone (Set 1 and 2 combined)	119
Figure 5.13	The p-q plot for the peak stress at failure for Saltwash Sandstone	120
Figure 5.14	The p-q plot for the peak stress at failure for reservoir SS1 Sandstone	120
Figure 5.15	Combined p-q plot for the new ASA constitutive model and Castlegate Sandstone laboratory test results for both Set 1 and Set 2	121
Figure 5.16	The p-q plot for the new ASA constitutive model and Saltwash Sandstone laboratory test results	122
Figure 5.17	The p-q plot for the new ASA constitutive model and reservoir SS1 Sandstone laboratory test results	122
Figure 5.18	Comparison between laboratory and numerical model (FEM) produced stress strain curves for Castlegate sandstone (Set-1) using ASA constitutive model for different confining pressures ((a) 5MPa, (b) 10 MPa, (c) 20 MPa, (d) 30 MPa)	123
Figure 5.19	Comparison between laboratory and numerical model (FEM) produced stress strain curves for Castlegate sandstone (Set-2) using the ASA constitutive model for different confining pressures ((a) 4MPa, (b) 7 MPa, (c) 14 MPa, (d) 28 MPa)	124
Figure 5.20	Comparison between laboratory and numerical model (FEM) produced stress strain curves for Saltwash sandstone using the ASA constitutive model for different confining pressures ((a) 7 MPa, (b) 14 MPa, (c) 24 MPa, (d) 48 MPa)	125
Figure 5.21	Comparison between laboratory and numerical model (FEM) of stress strain curves for reservoir sandstone SS1	

	using ASA constitutive model for different confining pressures ((a) 0 MPa, (b) 4 MPa, (c) 7 MPa, (d) 14 MPa)	126
Figure 5.22	Error between laboratory measured and modelled q deviatoric stress value (a) at failure and (b) at yield for all specimens tested in the laboratory	127
Figure 5.23	HCS laboratory test specimen geometry (left) and numerical model mesh/grid and loads setup (right)	128
Figure 5.24	HCS laboratory test results and numerical model showing the volumetric strain and mean effective external pressure for Castlegate specimen	129
Figure 5.25	HCS laboratory test results and numerical model showing the volumetric strain and mean effective external pressure for Saltwash specimen	129
Figure 5.26	Error between laboratory measured and modelled strain, volumetric strain (left) and axial strain (right)	130
Figure 5.27	Cross section view of CT scan image of tested specimen (a) SKSW15, (b) SKSW3 and (c) SKSW21	132
Figure 5.28	p - q plot for Saltwash specimens overlaid with ASA constitutive model shear failure line	133
Figure 5.29	Illustration of the FEM mesh grid model structure used for numerical stimulation and pressure load	134
Figure 5.30	Axial stress and confining pressure loading scheme for specimen SKSW15	135
Figure 5.31	Stress-strain and sand production from laboratory test results at various applied mean effective for specimen SKSW15	136
Figure 5.32	Stress-Strain relationship comparison between modelled and laboratory test results for SKSW15 specimen	138
Figure 5.33	Simulated 3D FEM results using progressive cavity perforation failure and stabilization (grey) for specimen SKSW15 at different mean effective stress values	139
Figure 5.34	Laboratory observed and FEM modelled sand production volume for SKSW15 specimen	140
Figure 5.35	Side view of the (a) simulated progressive cavity failure, (b) actual laboratory test result and (c) CT Scan image of tested specimen SKSW15	141
Figure 5.36	CT Scan image for perforation tunnel failure during triaxial loading on (a) Berea Buff sandstone specimen ((b)	

	perforation failure shape for Red Wilmoor sandstone specimen and (c) sandstone from an oil field reservoir	142
Figure 5.37	Left (a) Bottom view of the simulated progressive cavity failure and right (b) CT Scan image of the actual laboratory tested specimen SKSW15	143
Figure 5.38	Stress distribution around perforation tunnel for SKSW15 specimen	143
Figure 5.39	Axial stress and confining pressure loading scheme for specimen SKSW3	144
Figure 5.40	Stress-strain and sand production from laboratory test results at various applied mean effective for specimen SKSW3	145
Figure 5.41	Stress-Strain relationship comparison between modelled and laboratory test results for SKSW3 specimen	146
Figure 5.42	Simulated 3D FEM results using progressive cavity perforation failure and stabilization (grey) for specimen SKSW3 at different mean effective stress values	149
Figure 5.43	(a) Laboratory test sketch of specimen and hydrostatic loading scheme and (b) CT Scan image of the specimen after perforation tunnel failure during hydrostatic loading	150
Figure 5.44	Laboratory observed and FEM modelled sand production volume for SKSW3 specimen	150
Figure 5.45	Side view of the (a) simulated progressive cavity failure, (b) actual laboratory test result and (c) CT Scan image of tested specimen SKSW3	151
Figure 5.46	Left (a) Bottom view of the simulated progressive cavity failure and right (b) CT Scan image of the actual laboratory tested specimen SKSW3	152
Figure 5.47	Loading scheme for specimen SKSW21	153
Figure 5.48	Stress-strain and sand production from laboratory test results for applied mean effective for specimen SKSW21	153
Figure 5.49	Stress-strain relationship comparison between modelled and laboratory test results for SKSW21 specimen	154
Figure 5.50	Simulated 3D FEM results using progressive cavity perforation failure and stabilization (grey) for specimen SKSW21 at different mean effective stress values	156
Figure 5.51	Laboratory observed and FEM modelled sand production volume for SKSW21	157

Figure 5.52	Side view of the (a) simulated progressive cavity failure, (b) CT Scan image of tested specimen SKSW21	158
Figure 5.53	Failure of perforation tunnel during laboratory test on weak sandstone specimen using extensional loading	159
Figure 5.54	Simulated plastic strain and failure for sandstone specimen using FEM for an extension loading	159
Figure 5.55	Left (a) Bottom view of the simulated progressive cavity failure and right (b) CT Scan image of the actual laboratory tested specimen SKSW21	160
Figure 5.56	Cross plot with 5% error bar line between laboratory measured and modelled for (a) mean effective stress when first was sand observed (b) total produced sand as weight and (c) mean effective stress at final sand production	162
Figure 5.57	1D MEM for Well-2	164
Figure 5.58	Constructed 1D MEM for Well-1	165
Figure 5.59	Constructed 1D MEM for Well-2	166
Figure 5.60	Constructed 1D MEM for Well-3	167
Figure 5.61	Constructed 1D MEM for Well-4	168
Figure 5.62	Guidance for single depth analysis and definition of Critical Drawdown Pressure	170
Figure 5.63	Analytical sanding analysis for Well-1 reservoir	171
Figure 5.64	Analytical sanding analysis for Well-2 reservoir with magnified insert	172
Figure 5.65	Analytical sanding analysis for Well-3	172
Figure 5.66	Analytical sanding analysis for Well-4	173
Figure 5.67	Sand Production History for Well-1 and the estimated BHFP	178
Figure 5.68	Constructed 3D FEM model for Well 1 (a) skeleton of the model (b) 3D FEM grid meshes (c) grid meshes around perforation tunnel	181
Figure 5.69	SPAN analysis for perforation length and diameter for Well-1	182
Figure 5.70	Boundary condition for stress initiation for the Well-1 sector 3D FEM model	183
Figure 5.71	Top view illustration of elements and type of stress acting at near and away from wellbore wall	185

Figure 5.72	Pre-production effective stresses along x direction (σ_{min}) from middle of wellbore to edge of 3D FEM model	186
Figure 5.73	Pre-production effective stresses along y-direction (σ_{max}) from middle of wellbore to edge of 3D FEM model	186
Figure 5.74	Illustration of effective principal stress acting on an element	187
Figure 5.75	Simulated pre-production effective maximum principal stress ($S1'$)	189
Figure 5.76	Simulated pre-production effective intermediate principal stress ($S2'$)	190
Figure 5.77	Simulated pre-production effective minimum principal stress ($S3'$)	191
Figure 5.78	Simulated pore pressure diffusion due to production	192
Figure 5.79	Simulated progressive failure for perforation tunnel along maximum horizontal stress direction (removed grid cell in grey/white colour)	195
Figure 5.80	Simulated progressive failure for perforation tunnel along minimum horizontal stress direction (removed grid cell in white colour)	196
Figure 5.81	Simulated sand production volume for given drawdown and actual sand production volume for 6 perforation tunnels	197
Figure 5.82	Comparison between modelled sand production volume and actual field observation for Well-1	198
Figure 5.83	UCS sensitivity analysis on Well-1	200
Figure 5.84	Borehole deviation sensitivity analysis for non-oriented perforation completion for Well-1 drilled along (a) minimum horizontal and (b) maximum horizontal stress direction	202
Figure 5.85	Borehole deviation sensitivity analysis for oriented perforation completion for Well-1 drilled along (a) minimum horizontal and (b) maximum horizontal stress direction	203

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BEM	-	Boundary element method
BHFP	-	Bottom hole flowing pressure
BHFP	-	Bottom hole flowing pressure
CDPP	-	Critical drawdown pressure
CPP	-	Critical pore pressure
DEM	-	Discrete element method
DTCO	-	Compressional wave travel time
DTSM	-	Shear wave travel time
FANG	-	Internal friction angle
FD	-	Finite difference method
FDEM	-	Finite discrete element method
FEM	-	Finite element method
FEM	-	Finite element method
FVM	-	Finite volume method
GR	-	Gamma ray
IOC	-	International oil company
MEM	-	Mechanical earth model
MM	-	Meshless method
NOC	-	National oil company
PPCFS	-	Progressive perforation cavity failure and stabilisation
PPRS	-	Reservoir pore pressure
PR	-	Poisson's ratio
RHOB	-	Bulk density
TSTR	-	Tensile strength
TXSP	-	Total minimum horizontal stress
TYSP	-	Total maximum horizontal stress
TZSP	-	Total overburden vertical stress
UCS	-	Unconfined compressive strength
UCS _{apparent}	-	Apparent unconfined compressive strength
YME	-	Young's modulus e

LIST OF SYMBOLS

$\nu, \nu_{sta}, \nu_{static}$	-	Static poisson's ratio
E, E_{sta}, E_{static}	-	Static young's modulus
σ_{axial}	-	Axial stress
σ_{radial}	-	Radial stress
ε_{axial}	-	Axial strain
ε_{radial}	-	Radial/lateral strain
Diameter <i>original</i>	-	Original diameter
Diameter <i>final</i> ;	-	Final deformed diameter
Length <i>original</i>	-	Original length
Length <i>final</i>	-	Final deformed length
E_{dyn}	-	Dynamic young's modulus
ν_{dyn}	-	Dynamic poisson's ratio
ρ, ρ_b	-	Bulk density
Δt_c	-	Compressional wave travel time, $\mu\text{secs}/\text{ft}$
Δt_s	-	Shear wave travel time, $\mu\text{secs}/\text{ft}$
ν_{dyn}	-	Dynamic poisson's ratio
G_{dyn}	-	Dynamic shear modulus
E_{dyn}	-	Dynamic young's modulus
K_b	-	Bulk modulus
β_b	-	Bulk compressibility
$LF_{failure}$	-	Load force at failure
A	-	Surface area for the specimen
ϕ_{fang}	-	Internal friction angle
μ	-	Coefficient of internal friction
τ	-	Shear stress
σ'	-	Effective normal stress
$\beta, \beta_{failure}$	-	Failure angle
d, D	-	Diameter
F	-	Failure

P, P_p	-	Pressure
g	-	Gravity
$\rho_{surface}$	-	Bulk density for surface formation
z	-	True vertical depth
σ_v, S_v	-	Overburden vertical stress
σ_{min}, S_{hmin}	-	Minimum horizontal stress
σ_{max}, S_{Hmax}	-	Maximum horizontal stress
σ'_v	-	Effective overburden vertical stress
σ'_{min}	-	Effective minimum horizontal stress
σ'_{max}	-	Effective maximum horizontal stress
α	-	Poroelastic biot's coefficient
ε_x	-	Tectonic strains in minimum horizontal stress directions
ε_y	-	Tectonic strains in maximum horizontal stress directions
r, R	-	Radius
L	-	Length
U_{strain}	-	Total strain energy
W_{load}	-	Work done by loads
E_{total}	-	Total potential energy
F_i^n	-	Normal force
k^n	-	Normal stiffness
k^s	-	Shear stiffness
F_i^s	-	Shear force
φ	-	Borehole azimuth reference to minimum horizontal stress
φ_{min}	-	Minimum horizontal stress direction
ψ	-	Borehole deviation
μ	-	Mohr friction co-efficient slope
g	-	Gravitational constant
z	-	True vertical depth

n_{exp}	-	Fitting parameters for overburden vertical stress calculation
$\rho_{surface}$	-	Bulk density for surface formation
E_{total}	-	Total potential energy
U_{strain}	-	Strain energy
W_{load}	-	Work done by applied loads
σ_1	-	Maximum principal stress
σ_2	-	Intermediate principal stress
σ_3	-	Minimum principal stress
\bar{J}_1	-	Mean effective stress
J_2	-	Deviatoric stress component
P_{bhf}, P_w	-	Bottom hole flowing pressure
$UCS_{apparent}$	-	Apparent unconfined compressive strength
μ_{kappa}	-	Pore pressure depletion factor
r_c	-	Radius for total collapse
r_1	-	Arch spherical radius
r_s	-	New spherical radius
S_o	-	Cohesive strength
ρ_2, ρ_1	-	Gas density
P_{rc}	-	Pressure at the face of cavity
σ_r, σ_{rr}	-	Radial stress
$\sigma_t, \sigma_\theta, \sigma_{\theta\theta}$	-	Tangential stress/hoop stress
m_{total}, M_{sand}	-	Total sand mass
ϕ_{poro}	-	Porosity
R_{po}^I	-	Radius of plastic zone
R_{pL}^I	-	Radius of plastic zone along perforation length
R_i	-	Perforation diameter
L_{perf}	-	Perforation length
N_{perf}	-	Number of perforations
ε_v^p	-	Volumetric plastic strain
ω	-	Damage variable
ℓ	-	Number of elements

V_{sand}	-	Volume of sand
Ω_i	-	Volume of an element
p^{cap}	-	Mean effective stress at cap
f, F_{shear}	-	Failure in shearing
$F_{tensile}$	-	Failure in tension
F_{cap}	-	Failure at cap (pore collapse)
t_{cutoff}	-	Tensile strength cut-off
$d\bar{\epsilon}$	-	Incremental total strain tensor
$d\bar{\epsilon}^e$	-	Elastic reversible strain component
$d\bar{\epsilon}^p$	-	Non-linear plastic irreversible strain component
$\alpha_{thermal}$	-	Thermal expansion co-efficient
ΔT	-	Differential temperature
ϵ_3^{pp}	-	Post failure radial plastic strain
ϵ_3^p	-	Radial plastic strain at failure
ϵ_3^e	-	Radial elastic strain
ϵ_1^e	-	Axial elastic strain
ϵ_1^{phard}	-	Axial plastic strain before failure
ϵ_1^{psoft}	-	Post failure axial plastic strain
$F_{failure}$	-	Failure value
q'	-	Deviatoric stress
\bar{S}'	-	Deviatoric stress tensor
θ_{lode}	-	Lode's angle
A_\emptyset	-	Represents the coefficient of internal friction
n_a	-	Dependency of material failure parameter
$\bar{\delta}$	-	Kronecker tensor
A_\emptyset	-	Represents the coefficient of internal friction
n_a	-	Dependency factor of material failure
γ_p	-	Plastic distortion
α_0	-	Represents onset of yielding
α_r	-	Represents to residual state
C_{so}	-	Material cohesion
ϵ_p^f	-	Equivalent plastic strain at failure

ε_p	-	Equivalent plastic strain
ε_{vol}^f	-	Volumetric strain at failure
K_{ratio}	-	Ratio between the tensile and compressive meridian
W_{sand}	-	Mass of the sand
$V_{i,j,k}$	-	Volume of the ijk cell
$n_{i,j,k}^{failed}$	-	Number of failed ijk cell
ρ_{sand}	-	Density of the sand grains

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGE
Appendix A	DEVELOPED COMPUTER CODE	223
Appendix B	TRIAxIAL TEST ANALYSIS	239

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

In 2017 Wang, described that an estimated 50 percent of existing wells require sand control or sand management throughout their lifetime (Wang, 2017). This includes high porosity unconsolidated sandstone in conventional and unconventional reservoirs cause by high stress during the flowback. Most recent major hydrocarbon discoveries, from both transcontinental countries like Tunisia, Morocco, Egypt and countries in Africa (Mozambique, Angola, and Tanzania), North America (United States and Canada) and East Asia (Thailand, Vietnam, Myanmar and Malaysia), are offshore with soft formation sands and high-permeability with half of them being gas-bearing reservoirs. Wang (2017) also concluded that, to ensure a successfully effective sand-management process deployment, a multidisciplinary engagement is necessary, especially the geomechanics modelling. The subsurface and engineering teams should be able to predict the sanding tendencies including volume and rate as well as detecting the sanding locations. This should be followed by selecting appropriate downhole sand-management and/or sand control devices as well as implementing the best operating practices for the life of the well. As the number of existing fields (weak and/or depleted sand reservoirs) around the world increases, these experiences are likely to become more widespread. The United Kingdom based British Petroleum (BP) operator, for example, estimated that more than 60% of its production comes from sand-prone reservoirs (Liou, 2014). To manage the economics of a field and minimize capital expenditure, it is useful to know at the outset whether sand failure is a significant risk. This allows decisions to be made on the most effective completion strategy to manage sand failure for the life of the field.

Sand production phenomenon can be described as hydrocarbon fluid production accompanied by sand grain particles when reaching the surface. In the event that the velocity of fluid production is not sufficient to carry the sand particles to surface, then the sand grain particles will fill up the wellbore. As a result, this eventually acts as gravel pack which may lead to loss of production (Subbiah *et al.*, 2014; Fuller *et al.*, 2017). Sand failure can have a severe impact on the economics of an oil or gas field. Erosion of downhole or surface components by sand can lead to loss of integrity and hydrocarbon leakage. Production rates from screenless completions may need to be reduced to limit solids either flowing to surface or filling the wells. Sand handling, either at surface or flushed from a downhole, adds expense to lifting costs and significant disposal difficulties. Therefore, the sand production phenomenon either needs to be controlled or avoided in any circumstance.

The sand production phenomenon is normally a two-stage process. The first stage is onset of failure caused by stresses acting on the rock which result in failure of the rock. The second stage is that the failed/spalled sand grains/solid are transported by producing hydrocarbon fluid to the surface or becomes deposited within the well system. With the onset of formation failure and evidence of mobilized sand (or solid particulates) through the formation, operators can opt to reduce flow to rates incapable of carrying solids, manage produced sand or create a barrier (a filter) to prevent sand movement from formation to wellbore. Stopping, or at least slowing, the flow of sand, while minimally impacting production, requires the operator to choose from among mechanical exclusion techniques such as cased-hole gravel packs, high-rate water packs, frac packs, open hole gravel packs or stand-alone screens. Additionally, screenless completions such as oriented perforation or a chemical consolidation can be applied (Acock *et al.*, 2004). Therefore, the best completion strategy and field scale production development plan for each well of the reservoir can be further optimized by predicting both the locations and conditions that lead to the onset of sand production and the volume of sand that will be produced.

During the ARMA (American Rock Mechanics Association) annual conference in 2017 at San Francisco, United States, a discussion was held on the topic of sand production volume and rate predictions and the industry's current practises on

this subject. It was concluded that the current technology is good for initial sandstone failure but poses an unsolved challenge in predicting sand volume and rate. All delegates agreed that sand production volume and rate is very important for sand management. There is no proper toolkit and simulator currently available. However, a number of oil and gas operators and consulting organisations are using standard analytical models and Finite Element Method (FEM) code and are yet still unable to find a holistic solution to predict the volume of sand that will be produced (Cook, 2017). On another occasion, during a technical meeting held in Schlumberger Gould Research at Cambridge, UK, divulged that they worked a lot on sand production volume and rate prediction using FEM codes and were still unable to accurately predict the severity of sand production (Cook and Moffet, 2017).

Sand control methods must be used if the well will be producing more than 5 lb of sand per 1000 bbl/day (five pounds of sand per thousand barrels, pptb) of oil and much lesser for gas wells in the range of 0.3 to 0.5 lb for mmscf/day (Cook and Fuller, 2005). Therefore, estimating the sand volume will be critical for many oil and gas operators for their CAPEX planning.

1.2 Problem Statement

Sand production erodes hardware, blocks tubulars, creates downhole cavities and must be separated and prior to disposal. Petroleum industry has been struggling for a robust and accurate modeling technique to predict or estimate sanding propensity (volume and rate). The sand volume quantification has a big impact for field development planning, i.e., requiring an initial investment and its own rate of return (ROI). Cost for sand control remedial can range between 50,000 to 1 million US Dollars. This cost normally varies depending on field location such as onshore, offshore and deep-water (Cook and Fuller, 2005). Thus, the decision must be made based on sand production severity and long-term durability i.e., life of the field. Therefore, workflow and a computer simulator or modeling toolkit to predict and quantifying sand volume that will be produced is very essential for field developing planning in the petroleum industry.

As described, sand production can cause a loss of millions of dollars for oil and gas operators. This unwanted phenomenon needs to be quantified for (i) an optimum sand control method selection, (ii) operation planning and (iii) decision on overall field development plan investment and economic feasibility. Considerable efforts have been made in the past few decades in investigating the mechanisms and modelling approach involved in sand production while producing hydrocarbon fluid.

Less effort has been put on modelling sand production volume and rate and few researchers investigate both analytical and numerical methods (Ranjith *et al.*, 2013; Rahmati *et al.*, 2013). Therefore, there is still room in improving the existing modelling methods in predicting sand production volume and rate. Rock failure that leads to sand production is a continuous and dynamic process and is discontinuous in nature. Such dynamic process is not captured by the models that are based on continuum approaches (FEM). Physical and mechanical rock properties appear to greatly influence the sand production volume and rate. Previous works are inconclusive in generating best methods in predicting sand production volume and rate as the work was either done using only the analytical or continuum approach or only the discontinuum approach. Therefore, effort required to investigate turning 3D FEM continuum method to discontinuum and allow stress stabilisation after failure.

1.3 Research Objectives

The objectives of the research are:

1. To investigate reliable constitutive models for sandstone failure prediction and sand volume estimation.
2. To develop a new reliable constitutive model for sandstone failure prediction and sand volume estimation.
3. To develop a new workflow and method for accurate sand production volume prediction.

1.4 Scope of The Work

1. To conduct series of laboratory tests according to ASTM/ISRM standard on the weak to moderate strength sandstone to investigate if non-linear constitutive model is required for better sand production failure and volume prediction. The laboratory tests conducted for various loading mechanism and standard core specimen size.
2. Using the laboratory test results to develop a new non-linear constitutive model honoring full spectrum of sandstone mechanical behavior (elastic, plasticity/hardening, failure and softening). Followed by validation of developed model (ASA) using Finite Element Method (FEM) to reproduce the stress strain rock mechanical behavior.
3. To develop a new workflow and computer simulation techniques to turn FEM continuum medium to discontinuum medium by newly implemented grid cell removal method during the simulation (known as progressive perforation cavity failure and stabilization namely PPCFS). Estimate sand production volume using PPCFS method and validate/verify numerically estimated sand production volume with both laboratory test data and actual field data.
4. To develop customize subroutines codes for the numerical model simulation and analysis work, while industry recognized/commercial software such as Techlog, VISAGE, Petrel and GiD to ease field deployment of the proposed method.

1.5 Significance of Study

This study has its own uniqueness and novelty as it considered non-linearity behavior together with simulation techniques to turn FEM continuum medium to discontinuum medium. For this study, grid cell (mesh) removal technique has been used in FEM for sand production volume prediction. In other word turning

conventional continuum FEM to replicate discontinuum method (as example, DEM is discontinuum method). A common FEM code or engine is not able to do this. Thus, an additional computer program code has been programmed to communicate with VISAGE software to achieve the requirement known as PPCFS method (perforation cavity failure and stabilization). Furthermore, selection of the constitutive model is important for non-linear (plastic) sandstone rock. Most of researchers in petroleum geomechanics still using commonly available failure models which are not able to capture a proper post-yielding and post-failure (plasticity/hardening and softening) behavior. Capturing and modeling this behavior is important for onset sand production and sand production volume (stress at failure and stress stabilization after failure). In this study in order to honor a full spectrum of stress strain behavior in a single equation, a new/modified constitutive law for sandstone has been developed. The intention is to simulate for better failure estimation honoring the elasto-plastic non-linear behavior. In other word failure criterion that can handle both hardening and softening aspect of mechanical behavior of weak to moderate strength rock using single equation. These are two new additional contribution from this study to petroleum geomechanics, which has been validated using both laboratory test results and field data.

As for sand production from onset failure, a new software has been developed using Python language for both open-hole and perforated cased hole completion. Three different constitutive models have been implemented in the software including the newly developed model from this study. Eventually, after satisfied with newly developed constitutive model validation, algorithm has been implemented within VISAGE software engine for finite element analysis.

Combination of new constitutive model and PPCFS has been used for sand production volume estimation. Where, its honors the stress stabilization around the failed perforation cavity, and newly developed PPCFS method able to remove for any failed material (grid cells). This study able to improve the prediction/estimation of producible sand volume more precisely for any given or planned drawdown pressure.

Having better and accurate volume of sand production estimation is essential for decision making process for best type of completion option, which has direct

impact on the CAPEX planning and its Return of Investment (ROI). Some operators nowadays also opt to produced sand to the surface. The produced sand accumulated in vessels later will be cleaned and disposed. For this, they need to know accurately the quantity/volume of sand production. On other hand it is very important to estimated accurately the volume of sand production during well testing operation. Knowing the quantity of sand is key to mitigate any risk of operation failure and non-productive time (NPT). Sand filters can be blocked due to high amount of sand produced volume. Knowing this ahead of time using modelling, the well testing and completion engineers able to prepare the correct quantity and sizing of filters, this is essential especially for deep water operation.

1.6 Research Gaps

Despite the numerous efforts in sand production and modelling, there are still some significant gaps in knowledge that require to be filled. After studying the current projects reported in the literature, there is still much that can be done to improve sanding models. Some are listed below:

1. Most of the conducted sand production study/research are mainly related to onset failure and not much work has been done on estimating the volume of sand production.
2. Majority of sand production related work was done or simulated in 1D and 2D domains and used plan strain and axisymmetric assumption.
3. No work was conducted in FEM using element or grid cell removal techniques and stabilization which could be more appropriate for sand production.
4. Constitutive Model: Most of the models used were elastic model and a few modified to elasto plastic. No single researcher considered a full spectrum of rock mechanical behaviour such as elastic, hardening and softening which can provide more realistic representations of sand production (stress stabilisation).

1.7 Study Limitations

This study has its own limitation listed below:

1. Erosion aspect and bifurcation were not analysed.
2. Sand production validation is for weak to medium rock strength only (approximately to 32 MPa).
3. Effect of water-cut and capillary pressure are not considered in modelling the sand production volume.

REFERENCES

- Acock, A. , ORourke.T and Shimbih,D,, 2004. Practical approaches to sand management. oilfield review, Schlumberger, p.10–27.
- Acock, A., Heitmann.N, Hoover.S, and Malik,B.Z, 2003. Screenless methods to control sand. oilfield review, Schlumberger, 15(Spring), p.38–53.
- Akbar Ali, A., Brown,T., Delgado,R. and Donald,L., 2003. Watching rocks change - Mechanical Earth Model. Oilfield Review, Schlumberger, p.22–39.
- Al Khalifin, N., Al-Ajmi, A. and Al-Hadrami, H., 2019. Geomechanical sanding prediction in oil fields by wellbore stability wharts. Journal of Chemical and Petroleum Engineering, 53(2), p.237–244.
- Al-Shaabi, S.K., Al-Ajmi, A.M. and Al-Wahaibi, Y., 2013. Three-dimensional modeling for predicting sand production. Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering, 109, p.348–363.
- An, H., Shi, J., Zheng, X. and Wang, X., 2016. Hybrid finite-discrete element method modeling of rock failure processes in brazilian disc tests. Electron. J. Geotech. Eng, 21(7).
- Antheunis, D., Vriezen, P.B., Schipper, B.A. and Van der Vlis, A.C., 1976a. Perforation Collapse: Failure of perforated friable sandstones. 1976 Society of Petroleum Engineers.
- Argyris, J.H., 1960. Energy theorems and structural analysis, Butterworths Scientific publications, London, U.K.
- ASTM D7012 - 14e1, 2016. Standard test methods for compressive strength and elastic moduli of intact rock core specimens under varying states of stress and temperatures. ASTM International, West Conshohocken, PA. Available at: www.astm.org.
- Azadbakht, S., Jafarpour,M., Rahmati,H. and Nouri,A., 2012. A Numerical model for predicting the rate of sand production in injector wells. SPE-156394-MS. 1 January 2012 Society of Petroleum Engineers, SPE.
- Berntsen, A.N. and Papamichos, E., 2012. Scale effect in volumetric sand production. ARMA-2012-482. 1 January 2012 American Rock Mechanics Association, ARMA.

- Bettess, P., 1977. Infinite elements. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, 11, p.53–64.
- Biot, M.A. and Willis, D.G., 1957. The elastic coefficients of the theory of consolidation. *J. Appl. Mech.*
- Bradley, W.B., 1979. Failure of inclined borehole. *Journal of Energy Resources Technology*.
- Bratli, R.K. and Risnes, R., 1981. Stability and failure of sand arches. *Society of Petroleum Engineers Journal*, 21(02), p.236–248.
- Carlson, J., Gurley, D. and King, G., 1992. Sand Control: Why and How? *Oilfield Review*, Schlumberger, 4, p.41–53.
- Cheng, Y.M., 1996. The use of infinite element. *Computational Geomechanics*, 18, p.65–70.
- Climent, N., 2016. A Coupled CFD-DEM Model for sand production in oil wells, *Universitat Politècnica De Catalunya, Barcelona*, September.
- Climent, N., Arroyo, M., O’Sullivan, C. and Gens, A., 2014. Sand production simulation coupling DEM with CFD. *European Journal of Environmental and Civil Engineering*, 18.
- Clough, R.W., 1960. *The finite element method in plane stress analysis*. 1960 Pittsburg.
- Cook, J., 2004. A Laboratory sand production rate-measuring device (Research Report).
- Cook, J., 2017. Sand rate prediction discussion at ARMA.
- Cook, J. and Fuller, J., 2005. *Fundamental of geomechanics and sanding - NExT Training*.
- Cook, J. and Moffet, T., 2017. Sand rate prediction discussion with ExxonMobil.
- Cook, J.M., 1996. The Role of borehole pressure in thick-walled cylinder closure tests in sandstones. ARMA-96-1113. 1 January 1996 American Rock Mechanics Association, ARMA, p.8.
- Cook, J.M., Bradford, I.D.R. and Plumb, R.A., 1994. A study of the physical mechanisms of sanding and application to sand production prediction. SPE-28852-MS. 1 January 1994 Society of Petroleum Engineers, SPE, p.8.
- Cui, G. et al., 2022. Particle migration and formation damage during geothermal exploitation from weakly consolidated sandstone reservoirs via water and CO₂ recycling. *Energy*, 240, p.122507.

- Desroches, J. and Woods, T.E., 1998. Stress measurements for sand control. SPE-47247-MS. 1 January 1998 Society of Petroleum Engineers, SPE, p.10.
- Dragon, A. and Mróz, Z., 1979. A continuum model for plastic-brittle behaviour of rock and concrete. *International Journal of Engineering Science*, 17(2), p.121–137.
- Du Bernard, X., Eichhubl, P. and Aydin, A., 2002. Dilation bands: A new form of localized failure in granular media. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 29(24), p.29–1.
- Dudley, J.W. et al., 2016. ISRM Suggested method for uniaxial-strain compressibility testing for reservoir geomechanics. *Rock Mechanics and Rock Engineering*, 49(10), p.4153–4178.
- Farmer, I., 1983. *Engineering behavior of rock* 2nd ed., Chapman and Hall Ltd, London.
- Fjaer, E. et al., 2008. *Petroleum related rock mechanics* 2nd ed., Developments in Petroleum Science, 33. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier Science Publishers B.V.
- Fossen, H., Schultz, R.A., Shipton, Z.K. and Mair, K., 2007. Deformation bands in sandstone: a review. *Journal of the Geological Society*, 164(4), p.755–769.
- Fuller, J. et al., 2017. Balancing productivity and sanding risk in weak sandstones through a size dependent approach. ARMA-2017-0600. 28 August 2017 American Rock Mechanics Association, ARMA, p.11.
- Garolera, D., Carol, I. and Papanastasiou, P., 2020. Application of zero-thickness interface elements to sanding prediction analysis. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering*, 190, p.107052.
- Ghassemi, A. and Pak, A., 2015. Numerical simulation of sand production experiment using a coupled Lattice Boltzmann–Discrete Element Method. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering*, 135, p.218–231.
- Hall, C.D. and Harrisberger, W.H., 1970. Stability of sand arches: a key to sand control. *Journal of Petroleum Technology*, 22(07), p.821–829.
- Han, G., Dusseault, M.B. and Cook, J., 2002. Quantifying rock capillary strength behavior in unconsolidated sandstones. SPE-78170-MS. 1 January 2002 Society of Petroleum Engineers, SPE, p.10.

- Hansen, N.R. and Schreyer, H.L., 1994. A thermodynamically consistent framework for theories of elastoplasticity coupled with damage. *International Journal of Solids and Structures*, 31(3), p.359–389.
- Hayakawa, K. and Murakami, S., 1997. Thermodynamical modeling of elastic-plastic damage and experimental validation of damage potential. *International Journal of Damage Mechanics*, 6(4), p.333–363.
- van den Hoek, P.J. et al., 2000. A New concept of sand production prediction: theory and laboratory experiments. SPE-65756-PA.
- Honari, S. and Seyed Hosseinia, E., 2021. Particulate modeling of sand production using coupled DEM-LBM. *Energies*, 14(4).
- Hou, B. et al., 2017. Prediction of wellbore stability in conglomerate formation using discrete element method. *Arabian Journal for Science and Engineering*, 42(4), p.1609–1619.
- Howard, G.C. and Fast, C.R., 1970. Hydraulic fracturing, Society of Petroleum Engineers, New York.
- Ibrahimbegovic, A., 2009. Nonlinear solid mechanics, Springer International Publishing, London.
- Jaeger, J.C., 1972. Rock Mechanics and engineering practices, Cambridge University Press, UK.
- Jaeger, J.C. and Cook, N.G.W., 1976. Fundamental of rock mechanics, Chapman and Hall Ltd, London.
- Khamitov, F., Minh, N.H. and Zhao, Y., 2022. Numerical investigation of sand production mechanisms in weak sandstone formations with various reservoir fluids. *International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences*, 154, p.105096.
- Kim, S.H., Sharma, M.M. and Fitzpatrick, H.J., 2011. A Predictive model for sand production in poorly consolidated sands. IPTC-15087-MS. 1 January 2011 International Petroleum Technology Conference, IPTC.
- Kooijman, A.P. et al., 1996. Horizontal wellbore stability and sand production in weakly consolidated sandstones. SPE-36419-MS. 1 January 1996 Society of Petroleum Engineers, SPE, p.14.
- Liou, J., 2014. Keeping sand at bay. *Drilling Contractor*. Available at: <http://www.drillingcontractor.org/keeping-sand-at-bay-27871>.

- Liu, H. et al., 2020. Predicting sand production rate in high-pressure, high-temperature wells in the Tarim Basin. *SPE Production & Operations*. <https://doi.org/10.2118/191406-PA>.
- Lu, Y. et al., 2021. Predicting the critical drawdown pressure of sanding onset for perforated wells in ultra-deep reservoirs with high temperature and high pressure. *Energy Science & Engineering*.
- Lubarda, V.A. and Krajcinovic, D., 1995. Some fundamental issues in rate theory of damage-elastoplasticity. *International Journal of Plasticity*, 11(7), p.763–797.
- Mahtab, M.A. and Goodman, R.E., 1968. Stresses around wellbores in nonlinear rock. SPE-2005-PA.
- Mohamad-Hussein, A. and Ni, Q., 2018. Numerical modelling of onset and rate of sand production in perforated wells. *Journal of Petroleum Exploration and Production Technology*.
- Mohamad-Hussein, A. and Shao, J. F., 2007. An elastoplastic damage model for semi-brittle rocks. *Geomechanics and Geoengineering*, 2(4), p.253–267.
- Mohamad-Hussein, A. and Shao, J.F., 2007. Modelling of elastoplastic behaviour with non-local damage in concrete under compression. *Computers & Structures*, 85(23), p.1757–1768.
- Morita, N., Whitfill, D.L., Fedde, O.P. and Levik, T.H., 1989. Parametric study of sand-production prediction: analytical approach. *SPE Production Engineering*, 4(01), p.25–33.
- Morita, N., Whitfill, D.L., Massie, I. and Knudsen, T.W., 1989. Realistic sand-production prediction: numerical approach. *SPE Production Engineering*, 4(01), p.15–24.
- Mühlhaus, H.B. and Vardoulakis, I., 1987. The thickness of shear bands in granular materials. *Géotechnique*, 37(3), p.271–283.
- Munjiza, A., 2004. *The combined finite-discrete element method*, Wiley, Hoboken, NJ.
- Naylor, D.J., Pande, G.N., Simpson, B. and Tabb, R., 1981. *Finite elements in geotechnical engineering*, Prentice Hall, Swansea UK.
- Nicholson, E.D., Goldsmith, G. and Cook, J.M., 1998. Direct observation and modeling of sand production processes in weak sandstone. SPE-47328-MS. 1 January 1998 Society of Petroleum Engineers, SPE, p.10.

- Nilsen, H.M., Larsen, I. and Raynaud, X., 2017. Combining the modified Discrete Element Method with the Virtual Element Method for Fracturing of Porous Media.
- Nordgren, R.P., 1977. Strength of well completions. ARMA-77-0236. 1 January 1977 American Rock Mechanics Association, ARMA.
- Nouri, A., 2004. A Comprehensive approach to modeling and eliminating sanding problems during oil production , Dalhousie University.
- Nouri, A., Vaziri, H., Belhaj, H. and Islam, R., 2003. A comprehensive approach to modeling sanding during oil production. SPE-81032-MS. 1 January 2003 Society of Petroleum Engineers, SPE, p.7.
- Nouri, A., Vaziri, H.H., Belhaj, H.A. and Islam, M.R., 2006. Sand production prediction: a new set of criteria for modeling based on large-scale transient experiments and numerical investigation. SPE-90273-PA.
- Okland, D. and Plischke, B., 1996. Perforation stability analysis as a tool for predicting sand production: application for the brage field. SPE-35552-MS. 1 January 1996 Society of Petroleum Engineers, SPE, p 8.
- Palmer, I. et al., 2003. Predicting and managing sand production: a new strategy. 2003 Society of Petroleum Engineers.
- Pande, G.N., Beer, G. and Williams, J.R., 1990. Numerical methods in rock mechanics, Wiley, New York.
- Papamichos, E., 2006. Sand production: physical and experimental evidence. *Revue européenne de génie civil*, 10(6–7), p.803–816.
- Papamichos, E. and Malmanger, E.M., 2001. A Sand erosion model for volumetric sand predictions in a North Sea reservoir. *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering*, 4(01), p.44–50.
- Papanastasiou, P., 2006. Cavity stability prediction method for wellbores, US7066019B1.
- Papanastasiou, P.C. and Vardoulakis, I.G., 1992. Numerical treatment of progressive localization in relation to borehole stability. *International Journal for Numerical and Analytical Methods in Geomechanics*, 16(6), p.389–424.
- Penberthy, W.L. and Shaughnessy, C., M., 1992. Sand control SPE series on special topics, SPE.
- Pietruszczak, S., 2010. Fundamentals of plasticity in geomechanics, Taylor & Francis.

- Plumb, R. et al., 2000. The Mechanical Earth Model concept and its application to high-risk well construction projects. Schlumberger, Houston, US.
- Preece, D.S., Jensen, R.P., Perkins, E.D. and Williams, J.R., 1999. Sand production modeling using superquadric discrete elements and coupling of fluid flow and particle motion. 1 January 1999 American Rock Mechanics Association.
- Rahmati, H., 2013. Micromechanical study of borehole breakout mechanism. University of Alberta, Alberta.
- Rahmati, H. et al., 2013, Review of sand production prediction models, Journal of Petroleum Engineering, Volume 2013, p.16 .
- Ranjith, P.G. et al., 2013. Effective parameters for sand production in unconsolidated formations: An experimental study. Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering, 105, p.34–42.
- Risnes, R., Bratli, R.K. and Horsrud, P., 1982a. Sand srching - A Case Study. 1982 Society of Petroleum Engineers.
- Risnes, R., Bratli, R.K. and Horsrud, P., 1982b. Sand stresses around a wellbore. SPE-9650-PA.
- Sanfilippo, F., Brignoli, M., Giacca, D. and Santarelli, F.J., 1997. Sand production: from prediction to management. 1997 Society of Petroleum Engineers.
- Sanfilippo, F., Ripa, G., Brignoli, M. and Santarelli, F.J., 1995. Economical management of sand production by a methodology validated on an extensive database of field data. 1995 Society of Petroleum Engineers.
- Schlumberger, 2021. Techlog Geomechanics., Techlog Manual, London, U.K.
- Schlumberger, 2018. VISAGE Manual, London, U.K.
- Schlumberger, 2007. Well productivity. Pipesim Manual, London, U.K.
- Selfridge, F., Munday, M., Kvernfold, O. and Gordon, B., 2003. Safely improving production performance through improved sand management. SPE-83979-MS. 1 January 2003 Society of Petroleum Engineers, SPE, p 5.
- Shabdirova, A., Minh, N.H. and Zhao, Y., 2019. A sand production prediction model for weak sandstone reservoir in Kazakhstan. Journal of Rock Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering, 11(4), p.760–769.
- Shao, J.F., Jia, Y., Kondo, D. and Chiarelli, A.S., 2006. A coupled elastoplastic damage model for semi-brittle materials and extension to unsaturated conditions. Mechanics of Materials, 38(3), p.218–232.

- Stagg, K.K. and Zienkiewicz, O.C., 1988. Rock mechanics in engineering practices, John Wiley & Sons Inc, London.
- Subbiah, S.K., Mohamad-Hussein, Assef, Samsuri,A.; Jaafar; M.Z., Chen,Y.R.,2021. Development of new novel constitutive model for deep reservoir sandstone rock for sand production application. IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, 1051(1), p.012093.
- Subbiah, S.K., Mohamad-Hussein, Assef, Samsuri,A.; Jaafar; M.Z., Chen,Y.R., 2020. New novel constitutive model for solid production prediction with laboratory test validation. SPE-203130-MS. 9 November 2020 Society of Petroleum Engineers, SPE, p.16.
- Subbiah,S.K ; Samsuri,A. ; Mohamad-Hussein,A., Jaafar; M.Z., Chen,Y.R. Kumar,R.R (2020). Root cause of sand production and methodologies for prediction. Petroleum, Volume 7, Issue 2 , p.263-271.
- Subbiah, S.K., 2007. Sanding propensity studies, B Field, Schlumberger & GDF Netherlands.
- Subbiah, S.K., Mohamad-Hussein, Assef, Samsuri,A.; Jaafar; M.Z., Chen,Y.R., 2020. Solution for sand production problem in oil and gas well. 5th International Conference on Advanced Technology & Applied Sciences in conjunction. October 2020 IOP, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Subbiah, S.K., Fuller,J. and Burgstaller, C., 2008. Solving completion options for underground gas storage through geomechanics. SPE-116409-MS. 1 January 2008 Society of Petroleum Engineers, SPE, p.9.
- Subbiah, S.K., 1998. Wellbore instability studies by physical modeling. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Skudai, Johor Malaysia.
- Subbiah, S.K., de Groot, L. and Graven, H., 2014. An Innovative approach for sand management with downhole validation. SPE-168178-MS. 26 February 2014 Society of Petroleum Engineers, SPE, p.15.
- Subbiah, S.K., Wielemaker, E. and Derda, R., 2007. Sanding propensity studies B Field, Netherlands, Schlumberger, Netherlands.
- Tiffin, D.L., Stein, M.H. and Wang, X., 2003. Drawdown guidelines for sand control completions. SPE-84495-MS. 1 January 2003 Society of Petroleum Engineers, SPE, p.10.
- TNO, 2021. Groningen gasfield. <https://www.nlog.nl/en/groningen-gasfield>.

- TNO, 2020, NLOG: Dutch Oil and Gas portal [Online]. Available at: <https://www.nlog.nl/en>.
- Tronvoll, J. and Fjær, E., 1994. Experimental study of sand production from perforation cavities. *International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences & Geomechanics Abstracts*, 31(5), p.393–410.
- Tronvoll, J. and Papamichos, E., 1993. Perforation cavity stability: investigation of failure mechanisms. *International Symposium on Geotechnical Engineering of Hard Soils—Soft Rock*, p.1687–1693.
- Tutluoğlu, L., Öge, İ.F. and Karpuz, C., 2015. Relationship between pre-failure and post-failure mechanical properties of rock material of different origin. *Rock Mechanics and Rock Engineering*, 48(1), p.121–141.
- Van den Hoek, P.J. and Geilikman, M.B., 2003. Prediction of sand production rate in oil and gas reservoirs. 2003 Society of Petroleum Engineers.
- Vardoulakis, I., Stavropoulou, M. and Papanastasiou, P., 1996. Hydro-mechanical aspects of the sand production problem. *Transport in Porous Media*, 22, p.225–244.
- Vaziri, H., Willson, S. and Luce, T.A., 2002. What is the Magic of water in producing sand? SPE-77683-MS. 1 January 2002 Society of Petroleum Engineers, SPE.
- Vaziri, H., Willson, S. and Luce, T.A., 2008. Perforation flow – triaxial extension tests for evaluation of sand production at high flow rates using oil and gas, TerraTek, Saltlake City, USA.
- Vaziri, H.H., 1988. Theoretical analysis of stress, pressure, and formation damage during production. *Journal of Canadian Petroleum Technology*, 27(06), p.8.
- Veeken, C.A.M., Davies, D.R., Kenter, C.J. and Kooijman, A.P., 1991. Sand production prediction review: developing an integrated approach. 1991 Society of Petroleum Engineers.
- Volonté, G., Scarfato, F. and Brignoli, M., 2013. Sand prediction: a practical finite-element 3d approach for real field applications. *SPE Production & Operations*, 28(01), p.95–108.
- Vutukuri, L. and Lama, R.D., 1974a. Handbook on mechanical properties o rocks - testing techniques and results - Volume 2 1st ed., Trans.Tech Pub.
- Vutukuri, L. and Lama, R.D., 1974b. Handbook on mechanical properties o rocks - testing techniques and results volume 1 1st ed., Trans.Tech Pub.

- Wang, X., 2017. Sand management and sand control. *Journal of Petroleum Technology*, 69(10). Available at: <https://www.spe.org/en/jpt/jpt-article-detail/?art=3407>.
- Weingarten, J.S. and Perkins, T.K., 1995. Prediction of sand production in gas wells: methods and gulf of mexico case studies. SPE-24797-PA.
- William, K.J. and Warnke, E.P., 1975. Constitutive model for the triaxial behavior of concrete. *Proceedings of the International Assoc. for Bridge and Structural Engineering*. 1975 p. 1–30.
- Willson, S.M., Moschovidis, Z.A., Cameron, J.R. and Palmer, I.D., 2002. New model for predicting the rate of sand production. 2002 Society of Petroleum Engineers.
- Willson, S.M. and Terra Tek, I., 1993. CEA 11, Phase II: An experimental investigation of phenomena affecting sand production in low-strength sandstones : Final Report, Terra Tek Incorporated. US
- Willson, S.M. and TerraTek, I., 2003. CEA 61, Perforation/flow tests for evaluation of perforation performance, clean-up and associated sand production at high flow rates. Final Report, Terra Tek Incorporated. US
- Wriggers, P., 2008. *Nonlinear finite element method*, Springer International Publishing, London.
- Zazovsky, A., 1993. Sand production and sand control modelling: Review, Schlumberger, Schlumberger Gould Research.
- Zhang, J., Lin, Z., Dong, B. and Guo, R., 2021. Triaxial compression testing at constant and reducing confining pressure for the mechanical characterization of a specific type of sandstone. *Rock Mechanics and Rock Engineering*, 54(4), p.1999–2012.
- Zhang, J., Standifird, W.B. and Shen, X., 2007. Optimized perforation tunnel geometry, density and orientation to control sand production. 2007 Society of Petroleum Engineers.
- Zienkiewicz, O.C., Emson, C. and Bettess, P., 1983. A novel boundary infinite element. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, 19(3), p.393–404.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

Journal with Impact Factor

1. **Subbiah, S.K.**; Samsuri,A. ; Mohamad-Hussein,A,. ; Jaafar; M.Z., Chen,Y.R. Kumar,R.R (2020). Root cause of sand production and methodologies for prediction. Petroleum, Volume 7, Issue 2 263-271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.petlm.2020.09.007>. **(Q1,IF: 4.44)**.

Indexed Conference Proceedings

1. **Subbiah, S.K.**, Samsuri,A. ; Mohamad-Hussein,A, Jaafar; M.Z., Chen,Y.R. Pearce.A., Paramanathan.R. (2020) . New Novel Constitutive Model for Solid Production Prediction with Laboratory Test Validation (SPE-203130-MS) Abu Dhabi International Petroleum Exhibition & Conference, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.2118/203130-MS> **(Indexed by SCOPUS)**.
2. **Subbiah, S.K.**, Samsuri,A. ; Mohamad-Hussein,A, Jaafar; M.Z., Chen,Y.R. Pearce.A., Kumar,R.R , Paramanathan.R. (2020). Sanding Propensity Prediction Technology and Methodology Comparison" (SPE-203238-MS) Abu Dhabi International Petroleum Exhibition & Conference, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.2118/203238-MS> **(Indexed by SCOPUS)**.
3. **Subbiah, S.K.**, Samsuri,A. ; Mohamad-Hussein,A,. Jaafar; M.Z., Chen,Y.R. Pearce.A., Kumar,R.R , Paramanathan.R **(2021)**.Development of new novel constitutive model for deep reservoir sandstone rock for sand production application. IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering 1051 (1): 012093. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1757-899x/1051/1/012093>.
4. **Subbiah, S.K.**, Samsuri,A. ; Mohamad-Hussein,A,Jaafar; M.Z., Chen,Y.R. Pearce.A., Kumar,R.R , Paramanathan.R. (2021). Solution for Sand Production Problem in Oil and Gas well. IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering 1051 (1): 012050. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1757-899x/1051/1/012050>.

5. **Subbiah, S.K.**, Samsuri,A. ; Mohamad-Hussein,A., Jaafar; M.Z., Chen,Y.R. Pearce.A., Kumar,R.R , Paramanathan.R . Groot. D.L. (2021). Managing Sanding Risk in Sandstone Reservoir Through a New Constitutive Model. SPE Middle East Oil & Gas Show and Conference, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.2118/204666-MS> (**Indexed by SCOPUS**).