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Abstract The geological storage of CO\textsubscript{2} in deep saline formations is increasing seen as a viable strategy to reduce the release of greenhouse gases to the atmosphere. There are numerous sedimentary basins in China, in which a number of suitable CO\textsubscript{2} geologic reservoirs are potentially available. To identify the multi-phase processes, geochemical changes and mineral alteration, and CO\textsubscript{2} trapping mechanisms after CO\textsubscript{2} injection, reactive geochemical transport simulations using a simple 2D model were performed. Mineralogical composition and water chemistry from a deep saline formation of Songliao Basin were used. Results indicate that different storage forms of CO\textsubscript{2} vary with time. In the CO\textsubscript{2} injection period, a large amount of CO\textsubscript{2} remains as a free supercritical phase (gas trapping), and the amount dissolved in the formation water (solubility trapping) gradually increases. Later, gas trapping decreases, solubility trapping increases significantly due to migration and diffusion of the CO\textsubscript{2} plume, and the amount trapped by carbonate minerals increases gradually with time. The residual CO\textsubscript{2} gas keeps dissolving into groundwater and precipitating carbonate minerals. For the Songliao Basin sandstone, variations in the reaction rate and abundance of chlorite, and plagioclase composition affect significantly the estimates of mineral alteration and CO\textsubscript{2} storage in different trapping mechanisms. The effect of vertical permeability and residual gas saturation on the
overall storage is smaller compared to the geochemical factors. However, they can affect the spatial distribution of the injected CO$_2$ in the formations. The CO$_2$ mineral trapping capacity could be in the order of ten kilogram per cubic meter medium for the Songliao Basin sandstone, and may be higher depending on the composition of primary aluminosilicate minerals especially the content of Ca, Mg, and Fe.
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1. Introduction

With the development of economies and an increase in human activities, global emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG) such as carbon dioxide (CO$_2$), methane (CH$_4$), nitrous oxide (NO$_2$) and chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) have increased rapidly and lead to global climate change and ocean acidification with severe consequences for ecosystems and for human society (Holloway, 2001; West et al., 2005). CO$_2$ is responsible for about 64% of the greenhouse effect among the various greenhouse gases, and the average concentrations of CO$_2$ in the atmosphere have risen from a pre-industrial level (1750) of 280 parts per million by volume (ppmv) to over 370 ppmv currently and, if unabated, is projected to reach 1100 ppmv by 2100 (Bachu and Adams, 2003; Hepple and Benson, 2005; Kharaka et al., 2006). Thus, reducing the concentration of CO$_2$ in the atmosphere is very important to the mitigation of global climate change. The anthropogenic CO$_2$ emitted into the Earth’s atmosphere originates mainly from the burning of fossil fuels to produce energy, which provide nowadays 75-85% of the world’s energy demands (Holloway, 2001; Bachu and Adams, 2003; Allen et al., 2005). Even though increasing the efficiency of energy usage and/or developing lower carbon or non-carbon energies (e.g., natural gas, nuclear, wind, and biomass) to replace high carbon fuels (coal, oil) can reduce the accumulation of CO$_2$ in the atmosphere (Jean-Baptiste and Ducroux, 2003; Li et al., 2006), fossil fuels will still remain a major component of world’s energy supply in the near future (Grimston et al., 2001) because of their inherent advantages, such as availability, competitive cost, ease of transport and storage, and large resources (Bachu, 2003; Bachu and Adams, 2003).

Therefore, other approaches have to be taken to reduce anthropogenic CO$_2$ emissions into the atmosphere. Currently, the research of CO$_2$ geological storage as a possible way is being extensively carried out. The main geologic formations include depleted or depleting oil and gas
reservoirs, un-mineable coal seams, and deep saline formations (Bachu et al., 1994; Hitchon et al., 1999). Injecting CO$_2$ into saline formations in sedimentary basins is one of the most promising methods of geological storage of CO$_2$ for the long-term sequestration of the gas. This is because saline formations are ubiquitous to sedimentary basins (Hitchon et al., 1999; Gunter et al., 2000), they have enough capacity to store large amounts of CO$_2$ from anthropogenic emissions, and there are shorter distances between most large CO$_2$ point sources and saline formations, which can minimize CO$_2$ transportation costs (Soong et al., 2004; Allen et al., 2005; Zerai et al., 2006). The injected CO$_2$ is stored by three trapping mechanisms in saline formations (Hitchon, 1996). First, CO$_2$ can be trapped as a gas or supercritical fluid in a formation, commonly called hydrodynamic trapping. Here we refer to this approach as “gas trapping”. Second, CO$_2$ can dissolve into the groundwater, referred to as solubility trapping. The dissolution of CO$_2$ in groundwater increases the acidity of water and affects the dissolution of minerals composing the host rock matrix. Third, CO$_2$ can react directly or indirectly with minerals in the geologic formation leading to the precipitation of secondary carbonates. The latter process, so-called “mineral trapping”, is potentially attractive because it could immobilize CO$_2$ for long-time scales, and prevent its easy return to the atmosphere.

The Energy Information Administration (EIA) of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) published the International Energy Outlook 2005 (IEO2005) which pointed out that China is the world’s second largest emitter of CO$_2$ after the United States in 2002, accounting for 13.6% of the world's total CO$_2$ emissions (approximately 3.3 gigatons (Gt) of CO$_2$), and predicting that the CO$_2$ emissions in China will grow 4.0% per year, reaching 8.1 Gt CO$_2$ by 2025, and becoming the world’s largest emitter of CO$_2$ (Meng et al., 2007). So the reduction of anthropogenic CO$_2$ emissions in China is very important and urgent.
Bai et al. (2006) estimated the total amount and distribution of CO\textsubscript{2} emitted from the major industrial point sources (e.g., power plants, cement production, steelworks, refineries, ethylene, ammonia, and ethylene oxide and hydrogen plants) in China. Their results indicated that the total emissions equals 2.96315×10\textsuperscript{9} t CO\textsubscript{2}, and these emissions are mainly concentrated in the eastern and central China. This is consistent with the population distribution and level of economic development in China. The studies of Zhou (2005) and Li et al. (2005) also indicated that there are numerous sedimentary basins in the eastern and central China, such as Songliao, Bohai Bay, Ordos, North Jiangsu and Sichuan basins located on land, and Yellow Sea, East China Sea, Pearl River Delta, Beibuwan and Yingerhai basins located on the continental shelf (The total area is larger than 1.8×10\textsuperscript{6} km\textsuperscript{2}). Large numbers of deep saline formations buried in the sedimentary basins are saturated with high concentration of dissolved solids, which make groundwater unsuitable to any large-scale exploitation. Friedmann (2003) pointed out that China’s rich Mesozoic-Cenozoic tectonic and stratigraphic histories suggest a significant CO\textsubscript{2} storage potential (Meng et al., 2007). The extensive and concentrated distribution of CO\textsubscript{2} emission sources and sedimentary basins in the eastern and central China indicates that the development of CO\textsubscript{2} capture and storage (CCS) in China has a great potential.

Li et al. (2005) and Liu et al. (2005, 2006) estimated the CO\textsubscript{2} storage capacity in deep saline formations, coalbeds, and gas fields in China to be 1.43505×10\textsuperscript{11} t, 1.2078×10\textsuperscript{10} t, and 4.103×10\textsuperscript{9} t, respectively. Yu et al. (2007) estimated that in China’s coalbeds the CO\textsubscript{2} storage capacity is about 1.4267×10\textsuperscript{11} t. The main contributes of CO\textsubscript{2} sequestration in coalbed methane (CBM) zone are Qinghai, Eastern Ordos and Eastern Yunnan-Western Guizhou. Meng et al. (2007) estimated the economical availability of CO\textsubscript{2} storage demonstration projects in China. Although the above estimates and studies were not completely detailed and accurate, the
results still indicates that the development of CO$_2$ geological storage projects would be helpful for the reduction of anthropogenic CO$_2$ emissions in China.

In this paper, a reactive geochemical numerical simulation was used to model the CO$_2$ geological storage in a deep saline formation of Songliao Basin. The basin, located in northeastern China, is a large and productive basin covering an area of about 260,000 km$^2$ (Fig. 1). It is the most important oil-producing basin in China, accounting for one-third of the total national petroleum production. It is also one of the most important heavy industrial zones in China, having a large number of CO$_2$ emission sources such as power plants, cement production, steelworks, and oil and gas refiners. The research area used here is a sandstone formation of Xinli oilfield in central Songliao Basin.

This paper emphasizes the tremendous potential of CCS in China and aims to identify the long term trapping mechanisms in a deep saline formation of Songliao basin, which could be a suitable location for a CO$_2$ storage demonstration project. The objective of the study is to assess the multi-phase processes, geochemical changes and mineral alteration, and CO$_2$ trapping mechanisms over time up to 10,000 years when injecting 50 kg/s (corresponding to about 1.6 Mt of CO$_2$ per year) during 100 years, using coupled reactive-transport modelling. A sensitivity test is carried out to assess the influence on the unknown precise composition of the plagioclase mineral. Another sensitivity test is carried out on the kinetic rate of chlorite dissolution. The simulation results may be useful for the development of CO$_2$ demonstration projects in China.
2. Numerical approaches

2.1. Numerical tool

Simulations were performed using the non-isothermal multiphase reactive transport program TOUGHREACT (Xu and Pruess, 2001; Xu et al., 2006), which was developed by introducing reactive geochemical transport into the existing multiphase fluid and heat flow simulator TOUGH2 V2 (Pruess et al., 1999, 2004). The numerical method for solving fluid flow and chemical transport is based on an integral finite difference (IFD) method for space-discretization. The IFD method provides flexible discretization of geologic media by allowing the use of irregular grids, which is well suited for simulation of flow, transport, and fluid-rock interaction in heterogeneous and fracture rock systems with varying petrology. For regular grids, the IFD method is equivalent to the conventional finite difference method. An implicit time-weighting scheme is used for the flow, transport and kinetic geochemical equations. A sequential non-iterative approach is used for the coupling between transport and geochemical reactions. The program can be applied to one-, two-, or three-dimensional porous and fractured media with physical and chemical heterogeneity. It can accommodate any number of chemical species present in the liquid, gas and solid phases. A wide range of subsurface thermo-physical-chemical processes are considered under various thermohydrological and geochemical conditions such as pressure, temperature, ionic strength, pH and Eh.

2.2. Geological setting

The Songliao Basin is a large Mesozoic-Cenozoic intracratonic sedimentary basin developed
as the result of the initial rifting of the Eurasian Continent during the late Jurassic. It is bordered to the west by the Daxingan Mountains, to the north by the Xiaoixingan Mountains, to the east by the Zhangguangcai Mountains, and to the south by the Kangping-Kafu Hills; and the central area is a broad depression (Fig.1). This basin was formed first by rifting and then by subsidence and inversion. Based on the filling sequence and structures, the basin evolution can be divided into four phases (1) a pre-rift phase, (2) a syn-rift phase, (3) a post-rift phase, and (4) a compression phase (Hu et al., 1998; Zhou and Littke, 1999; Huang et al., 2004).

Fig. 2 shows the stratigraphy of the Songliao Basin (modified from Jin et al., 1999; Zhou and Littke, 1999; Huang et al., 2004). The stratigraphic sequence of non-marine deposits of upper Jurassic through Tertiary age is commonly divided into 10 Formations and more than 20 Members.

Xinli oilfield is located in Xinmiao town, Songyuan city, Jilin province of the northeastern China (Fig. 3). The sandstone formation, located in the third and fourth Members of the Lower Cretaceous Quantou Formation (K1q3 and K1q4), is a deep saline formation and oil producing unit, and the average thickness is about 50 m and the depth is around 1200 m. The location is considered as a potential candidate for CO\(_2\) geological sequestration because it is close to the Changshan thermal and coal fired power plant (Fig. 3). In addition, CO\(_2\) can be used to enhance oil recovery and store more CO\(_2\). As Fig. 2 shown, the Lower Cretaceous Quantou Formation comprises interbedded shale, mudstone, and sandstone deposited in the lacustrine, delta environments (Cheng et al., 2006). The impermeable caprocks such as shale and mudstone are contributed to the safety of CO\(_2\) geological storage.
2.3. Model setup

Much specific and detailed information is required to assess the feasibility of injection of CO$_2$ and to develop engineering designs for the injection systems. Before conducting site-specific investigations, general features and issues relating to the injected formation should be explored. This can be done by extracting the site-specific features and representing characteristics. Therefore, a simple two-dimensional (2D) radial model was used to study the temporal evolution and spatial distribution of the injected CO$_2$ and the subsequent geochemical changes. The 2D model was a homogeneous sandstone formation of 50 m thickness with a cylindrical geometrical configuration (Fig. 4). In the vertical direction, 10 model layers were used with a constant spacing of 5 m. In the horizontal direction, a radial distance of 100 km was modeled with a radial spacing that increases gradually away from the injection well. A total of 45 radial grid elements were used. The volume of the outer grid element is specified a large value of $10^{30}$ m$^3$, representing an infinitive lateral boundary. CO$_2$ injection was applied at the bottom portion of 10 m thickness with a constant rate of 50 kg/s (corresponding to 1.6 Mt/year) for a period of 100 years. The fluid flow and geochemical transport simulation was run for a period of 10,000 years.

2.4. Hydrogeochemical conditions

The hydrogeologic parameters used are listed in Table 1, the formation was assumed as homogenous. The petrophysical characteristics such as porosity and permeability were taken from the experimental measurements and data collection. The average porosity and permeability of the sandstone formation is 0.30 and $1.0\times10^{-13}$ m$^2$, respectively. Due to the lack
of available data, other parameters such as those of the capillary pressure and relative permeability model were taken from Xu et al. (2006, 2007). A hydrostatic pressure distribution over the depth was specified initially.

The initial mineral composition of the sandstone formation used in the present simulations is derived from lithology slice analysis of the clastic rocks in the Songliao Basin (Table 2). It mainly consists of quartz, illite, chlorite, calcite, plagioclase and K-feldspar. Minor constituents include kaolinite, zeolite, pyrite and anhydrite. The composition of the plagioclase is uncertain, in which the ratio between albite and anorthite may affect the simulation results. Note that in other geochemical systems such as that of Gaus et al. (2005), anorthite did have an impact on the mineral trapping of CO$_2$. These investigators performed some kinetic batch modelling to assess the effects of different plagioclase compositions on the simulation results. Their results indicated that the CO$_2$ mineral trapping increases due to the presence of anorthite. However, in the modelling of Audigane et al (2007) all plagioclase is present as pure albite. Because albite is much more resistant to weathering than anorthite, Na will be the dominant cation in plagioclase. In our simulations we performed two simulations with different plagioclase compositions to assess their influence on the simulation results (see Section 3.2.2). In the first case all plagioclase is present as pure albite (base-case), in the second case oligoclase (containing both Na and Ca, see Table 2) is used to substitute plagioclase. The trace minerals zeolite, pyrite, and anhydrite are not included in the simulations. Magnesite, dolomite, siderite, ankerite, dawsonite, Na-smectite and Ca-smectite could be formed after CO$_2$ injection and are specified as secondary minerals in the simulations. Chalcedony is also included as a secondary silica phase, because at low temperature such as 50 °C considered in the present study, dissolved silica is thermodynamically controlled by chalcedony rather than quartz.
Halite may be formed close to the injection well because water evaporates into the injected CO₂ stream (André et al., 2007). The effect of formation of halite close to the well on the evaluation of the amounts and variations of long-term CO₂ trapped in different mechanisms is very small. Therefore, halite was not considered in the current simulation. Simulation results could be sensitive to the choice of secondary minerals. However, almost all possibilities of secondary carbonate and clay minerals are covered in the simulations, which are based on previous studies of modelling (Xu et al., 2005, 2006, 2007; Gaus et al., 2005; White et al., 2005), laboratory experiments (Wolf et al., 2004; Chen et al., 2006), and field observations (Pearce et al., 1996; Watson et al., 2004; Moore et al., 2005; Worden 2006).

The formation water is dominated by NaHCO₃ water type like the whole basin (Cheng et al., 2006). The concentration of total dissolved solids (TDS) ranges from 7,000 to 10,000 mg/L. Chloride is a very important anion in the area (the content exceeds 4,000 mg/L). Prior to simulating reactive transport, batch geochemical modeling of water-rock interaction was performed to generate an aqueous-phase chemical composition closely approaching the composition of a typical formation brine by equilibrating a 0.171 M (mol/kg H₂O) solution of sodium chloride in the presence of the primary minerals listed in Table 2 (with CO₂ gas pressure of 0.01 bar at a temperature of 50°C). A reasonably short simulation time (10 years in the present study) is needed to obtain a quasi-stable (or nearly steady-state) aqueous solution composition (Table 3). An initial pH of 8.343 was obtained, which is highly depends on CO₂ gas partial pressure used. If using a higher CO₂ pressure, the initial pH will be lower. We are primarily interested in the region affected by CO₂ injection. The uncertainty of background CO₂ pressure on simulation results should be very small for our objectives.
2.5. Kinetics of mineral dissolution and precipitation

A general kinetic rate law for mineral dissolution and precipitation is used (Lasaga et al., 1994; Steefel and Lasaga, 1994)

\[ r_m = \pm k(T_m) A_m \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{Q_m}{K_m} \right) \right]^{\theta \eta} \] (1)

where \( m \) is the kinetic mineral index, \( r_m \) is the dissolution/precipitation rate (positive values indicate dissolution, negative values indicate precipitation), \( k(T_m) \) is the rate constant depending on the temperature (mol/m\(^2\) s), \( T \) is the absolute temperature, \( A_m \) is the specific reactive surface area per kg water, \( K_m \) is the equilibrium constant for the mineral-water reaction written for the destruction of one mole of mineral \( m \), and \( Q_m \) is the corresponding ion activity product. The parameters \( \theta \) and \( \eta \) are two positive numbers determined by experiments; usually, but not always, they are taken to be equal to 1 (like in the present work).

For many minerals the kinetic rate constant \( k(T) \) can be summed from three mechanisms (Lasaga et al., 1994; Palandri and Kharaka, 2004):

\[ k(T) = k_{n}^{\text{nu}} \exp \left[ \frac{-E_{n}^{\text{nu}}}{R} \left( \frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{298.15} \right) \right] + k_{n}^{\text{H}} \exp \left[ \frac{-E_{n}^{\text{H}}}{R} \left( \frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{298.15} \right) \right] \alpha_{n}^{\text{H}} + k_{25}^{\text{OH}} \exp \left[ \frac{-E_{25}^{\text{OH}}}{R} \left( \frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{298.15} \right) \right] \alpha_{25}^{\text{OH}} \] (2)

where superscripts and subscripts \( \text{nu}, \text{H}, \) and \( \text{OH} \) indicate neutral, acid and base mechanisms, respectively, \( E_a \) is the activation energy, \( k_{25} \) is the rate constant at 25 °C, \( R \) is the gas constant \((8.31 \text{ J/mol K})\), and \( T \) is the absolute temperature, \( \alpha \) is the activity of the species, and \( n \) is a power term (constant). Notice that parameters \( \theta \) and \( \eta \) (see Eq. (1)) are assumed to be the same for each mechanism. For all minerals it is assumed that the precipitation rate equals the dissolution rate.

Table 4 lists parameters for the kinetics of dissolution and precipitation of all minerals used in the simulations. Calcite is assumed to react with aqueous species at local equilibrium.
because its reaction rate is typically quite rapid. The dissolution and precipitation of other minerals are kinetically controlled. Rate law parameters for kaolinite, illite, chlorite, albite-low, oligoclase, K-feldspar, magnesite, and dolomite were taken from Palandri and Kharaka (2004), who compiled and fitted experimental data reported by many investigators. The detailed list of the original data sources is given in Palandri and Kharaka (2004). Chalcedony kinetic data were referred to Tester (1994). Illite kinetic data were set to those of smectite. Siderite kinetic data were from Steefel (2001). Ankerite and dawsonite kinetic data were set to these of siderite. Xu et al. (2005) performed sensitivity simulations regarding ankerite and dawsonite precipitation kinetics, and results indicated that changes in the reaction rate result in small changes in their precipitation because the precipitation requires reactants whose availability is controlled by the slow dissolution of aluminosilicate minerals.

Mineral reactive-surface areas (the second column of Table 4) are based on the work of Sonnenthal et al. (2005), and were calculated assuming a cubic array of truncated spheres constituting the rock framework. The larger surface areas for clay minerals (kaolinite, illite and smectite) are due to smaller grain sizes. In conformity with White and Peterson (1990) and Zerai et al. (2006), a surface roughness factor of 10 is incorporated and defined as the ratio of the true (BET) surface area to the equivalent geometric surface area. Interaction with the minerals is generally expected to occur only at selective sites of the mineral surface, and the actual reactive surface area could be between one and three orders of magnitude less than the surface roughness-based surface area (Lasaga, 1995; Zerai et al. 2006). The difference is attributed to the fact that only part of the mineral surface is involved in the reaction due to coating or armoring, a small area exposed to the brine, and channeling of the reactive fluid flow. To account for these effects, the actual reactive surface areas given in Table 4 are decreased by
two orders of magnitude from the surface roughness-based surface areas. The reactive surface areas used here for most minerals are similar to those of Zerai et al. (2006), who used a surface area of 10 cm$^2$/g for all minerals.

If the aqueous phase supersaturates with respect to a potential secondary mineral, a small volume faction such as $1 \times 10^{-6}$ is used for calculating the seed surface area for the new phase to grow. The precipitation of secondary minerals is represented using the same kinetic expression as that for dissolution. However, because precipitation rate data for most minerals are unavailable, parameters for neutral pH rates only, as given in Table 4, were employed to describe precipitation. Multiple kinetic mechanisms for precipitation can be specified in an input file of the TOUGHREACT program, should such information become available.

The evolution of the surface area in natural geologic media is very complex, especially for multi-mineral systems, and is not quantitatively understood at present. The magnitudes of surface areas specified are highly uncertain. We performed sensitivity simulations regarding the kinetic rate constants and/or reactive surface areas to partially address this issue. Details are given in Section 3.2.1.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Base case

3.1.1. Gas and solubility trapping

The injected supercritical CO$_2$ fluid (called “gas” here for simplicity) at the bottom of the storage formation migrates upward rapidly by buoyancy forces because the density of supercritical CO$_2$ phase is lower than that of aqueous phase. A small fraction of CO$_2$ gas is trapped in the porous rock as residual gas after injection, and most of the free CO$_2$ gas
accumulates below the caprock.

The injected CO$_2$ is dissolved in the surrounding formation water, forming H$_2$CO$_3$ (aq), HCO$_3^-$, and CO$_3^{2-}$, and increasing acidity (Druckenmiller and Maroto-Valer, 2005; Rosenbauer et al., 2005):

\[
CO_2(gas) \leftrightarrow CO_2(aq) \tag{3}
\]

\[
CO_2(aq) + H_2O \leftrightarrow H_2CO_3 \tag{4}
\]

\[
H_2CO_3 \leftrightarrow H^+ + HCO_3^- \tag{5}
\]

\[
HCO_3^- \leftrightarrow H^+ + CO_3^{2-} \tag{6}
\]

Then, the increased acidity induces dissolution of many of the primary host rock minerals. The mineral dissolution increases concentrations of cations such as Na$^+$, Ca$^{2+}$, Mg$^{2+}$, and Fe$^{2+}$, which in turn causes complexing of dissolved cations with the bicarbonate ion to form NaHCO$_3$, CaHCO$_3^+$, MgHCO$_3^+$, and FeHCO$_3^+$, such as

\[
Ca^{2+} + HCO_3^- \leftrightarrow CaHCO_3^+ \tag{7}
\]

Over time they tend to increase CO$_2$ solubility and enhance solubility trapping.

In the upper portions of the reservoir, CO$_2$ dissolution into groundwater increases the density of the aqueous phase. Aqueous phase will then move downward due to gravity, giving rise to “convective mixing” (Ennis-King and Paterson, 2007). This CO$_2$ dissolution process and subsequent aqueous-phase convection will tend to mix aqueous CO$_2$ in the vertical direction. The density-driven convection will accelerate the dissolution of the free CO$_2$ gas.

Figs. 5 and 6 show the spatial distribution of CO$_2$ gas saturation and dissolved CO$_2$ concentration in the saline formation after different times. The CO$_2$ gas saturation in porous rock increases with the injection of CO$_2$ (Fig. 5), especially the area around the injection well. In about 100 m radial distance rock pores are completely filled by CO$_2$ gas at 100 years (complete water drying out zone). After injection ends (at 100 years), with the coming back of
groundwater the chemical reactions (dissolution and precipitation) between the dissolved CO$_2$ and minerals occurs again. The CO$_2$ gas stored in porous rock gives rise to tension that makes a very small amount of the CO$_2$ gas immobile and permanently trapped (the saturation of the remaining gas is referred to as residual gas saturation, $S_{gr}$). For large values of $S_{gr}$, more CO$_2$ can be trapped in the pore space, hampering the long-term migration of the CO$_2$ plume away from its injection site. The residual CO$_2$ gas continues to dissolve into groundwater and precipitate carbonate minerals, consequently leading to more injected CO$_2$ being stored in the geologic medium. The effect of residual gas saturation on long-term geological storage of CO$_2$ will be discussed in Section 3.2.3. With the migration of CO$_2$ gas, the concentration of dissolved CO$_2$ rapidly increases, larger than 1 mol/kg H$_2$O in the two-phase region (Fig. 6). The dissolved CO$_2$ tends to migrate downward after 1,000 years, but it is not significant, because precipitation of carbonate minerals partially consume the dissolved CO$_2$.

3.1.2. Mineral trapping

Fig. 7 shows the spatial distribution of cumulative CO$_2$ sequestered by precipitation of secondary carbonate minerals. The amount of CO$_2$ sequestered by carbonate minerals only increases gradually after 1,000 years (Fig. 7). The maximum mineral trapping capacity of CO$_2$ after 10,000 years could reach about 8 kg per one m$^3$ medium. The injected CO$_2$ is mainly immobilized by precipitation of ankerite (CaMg$_{0.3}$Fe$_{0.7}$(CO$_3$)$_2$) (Fig. 8). Precipitation of ankerite requires Ca$^{2+}$ provided by the dissolution of calcite (CaCO$_3$) (Fig. 9), Mg$^{2+}$ and Fe$^{2+}$ provided by the dissolution of chlorite (Mg$_{2.5}$Fe$_{2.5}$Al$_2$Si$_3$O$_{10}$(OH)$_8$) (Fig. 10). The CO$_2$ mineral trapping capability depends on the dissolution of primary aluminosilicate minerals containing Ca, Mg, and Fe like chlorite in this case. In Section 3.2.2 we will discuss the effect of change in chlorite abundance on the simulation results. Note that dissolution of one mole of calcite (CaCO$_3$) leads precipitation of one mole of ankerite CaMg$_{0.3}$Fe$_{0.7}$(CO$_3$)$_2$, with more cations Mg$^{2+}$ and Fe$^{2+}$ in addition to Ca$^{2+}$ and an extra mole of (CO$_3$) entity. Therefore, net balance is
CO$_2$ mineral trapping.

The increased concentration of H$^+$ in aqueous phase induced by CO$_2$ injection interacts with aluminosilicate and/or silicate minerals such as feldspars and clay minerals releasing cations such as Ca$^{2+}$, Mg$^{2+}$, and Fe$^{2+}$. The dissolved bicarbonate species reacts with these divalent cations to precipitate carbonate minerals, sequestrating CO$_2$ permanently. Lackner et al. (1995) found that the precipitation of carbonate minerals requires involvement of silicate rocks rich in Mg and Ca. Fyfe et al. (1996) also found that silicate minerals such as olivine could be sources of Ca and Mg (Hitchon et al., 1999; Gentzis, 2000; Cipolli et al., 2004). Therefore, siliciclastic (sandstone) formations are considered better candidates for CO$_2$ sequestration than carbonate formations which will partially dissolve due to low pH (Hitchon et al., 1999; Gentzis, 2000). This does not mean that carbonate formations are not suitable for the geological storage of CO$_2$, but that the dominant CO$_2$ trapping mechanisms in carbonate formations are solubility and gas trapping (Zerai et al., 2006).

3.1.3. Time evolution of the injected CO$_2$ in different trapping mechanisms

Amounts of CO$_2$ in different trapping mechanisms vary with time (Fig. 11). In the CO$_2$ injection period (0-100 years), a large amount of injected CO$_2$ remains as a free supercritical phase (gas trapping). The mass of CO$_2$ dissolved in the formation water gradually increases. After 100 years (injection end time), CO$_2$ gas trapping decreases, the amount of CO$_2$ dissolved in the formation water increases significantly because of the upward and horizontal migration of CO$_2$ plume and the convective mixing between CO$_2$-saturated water and unsaturated water. The amount of CO$_2$ trapped by precipitation of carbonate minerals increases gradually with time after 1,000 years.
3.2. Sensitivity analysis

Variations in mineral reaction rate and composition, and hydrological parameters may affect the simulation results, consequently the estimates of long-term CO$_2$ storage in different trapping mechanisms. In this Section, we examine uncertainties of simulation result to these factors.

3.2.1. Reaction rate

Xu et al. (2004, 2005) and Gaus et al. (2005) discussed the sensitivity of CO$_2$ mineral sequestration to kinetic rate constants or reactive surface areas. Their simulation results indicated that modifying the kinetic rate constants (or reactive surface areas) for all minerals by the same factor is equivalent to scaling the time-axis and does not lead to different results, and the key affecting the rate of the overall reactivity of the system is the kinetics of the dissolving aluminosilicate minerals bearing Ca, Mg, and Fe. As discussed above, chlorite containing Mg and Fe is a very important mineral. Here we examine the sensitivity of CO$_2$ mineral sequestration to dissolution kinetics of chlorite. Two additional simulations were carried out using respectively increasing and decreasing the reaction rate of chlorite by two orders of magnitude from the base case, Cases 2 and 3.

The increase of chlorite rate (Case 2) results in rapid dissolution of chlorite and calcite with time (Figs. 12 and 13). After 1,000 years chlorite dissolves completely (the initial volume fraction of chlorite is 0.027, see Table 2), which cannot provide more Fe$^{2+}$ for precipitation of ankerite. The pattern of ankerite precipitation is similar to the base-case (Fig. 14), but the time and amount of the precipitation is different. The decrease of chlorite rate (Case 3) only causes
precipitation of some amount of siderite (FeCO$_3$) (Fig. 15). The precipitation of ankerite does not occur in this case, which is different from the base-case and Case 2. In the previous two cases, a very small amount of siderite precipitates only in the bottom of formation.

Fig. 16 shows the overall time evolution of the injected CO$_2$ in different trapping mechanisms for the three reaction rate cases. The total amount of CO$_2$ trapped in minerals increases with the increase of chlorite reaction rate (Case 2), while gas trapping decreases accordingly. Because CO$_2$ gas dissolution into brine is a very rapid process, the amount of CO$_2$ trapped in aqueous phase is relative stable. For Case 3 with the decrease of chlorite reaction rate, no significant CO$_2$ mineral trapping occurs. The results indicate that changes in the reaction rate of the dissolving aluminosilicate minerals containing Ca, Mg, and Fe like chlorite has a significant impact on mineral alteration and CO$_2$ storage in different mechanisms.

3.2.2. Mineral composition

Due to the uncertainty of mineral composition in actual geologic formations, two additional cases were performed to analyze the effect of variations in mineral composition: (1) an increase in chlorite abundance from 0.027 to 0.040 in volume fraction (Case 4), and (2) using oligoclase (bearing both Ca and Na) to substitute plagioclase (Case 5) instead of albite (bearing only Na) as used in the base-case.

Fig. 17 shows the time evolution of CO$_2$ stored in different trapping mechanisms for sensitivity simulations for different mineral composition. Increase in initial abundance of chlorite (Case 4) results in more dissolution of calcite and chlorite, and more precipitation of ankerite, consequently more CO$_2$ trapped in the solid phase, similar to those of Case 2 in Section 3.2.1. The amount of CO$_2$ trapped in gas phase decreases accordingly. The pattern of
the spatial distribution is similar to the base-case, so the results are not shown here.

Using oligoclase to substitute plagioclase (Case 5) obtained quite different results compared to the base-case (Fig. 17). The amount of CO$_2$ trapped in minerals is significantly increased especially after 1000 years, and gas trapping is significantly reduced accordingly. Solubility trapping is essentially unchanged. Injected CO$_2$ is immobilized by precipitation of dawsonite (NaAlCO$_3$(OH)$_2$), siderite and calcite, due to the dissolution of oligoclase (Ca$_{0.2}$Na$_{0.8}$Al$_{1.2}$Si$_{2.8}$O$_8$) and chlorite (Figs. 18 to 22). While in the base-case the precipitated carbonate mineral is essentially ankerite. Calcite precipitates in Case 5 instead of dissolution in the base-case because of supply of Ca$^{2+}$ from dissolution of oligoclase. The maximum mineral trapping capacity of CO$_2$ after 10,000 years could reach about 55 kg per one m$^3$ medium (Fig. 23), which is significantly higher than that in the base-case.

3.2.3. Hydrological parameters

Hydrological parameters such as vertical permeability and residual gas saturation could have significant effects on simulation results (Lindeberg and Bergmo, 2002; Ennis-King et al., 2002; Kumar et al., 2004; Audigane et al., 2007). We performed two sensitivity simulations to examine these efforts. In Case 6, we reduced the ratio of vertical to horizontal permeability from 0.5 to 0.01 (Table 1). In Case 7, we increased the residual gas saturation from 0.05 to 0.20, corresponding to an efficient residual gas trapping (Audigane et al., 2007).

Decrease in vertical permeability (Case 6) results in significant decrease in the gas trapping, and increases in solubility and mineral trapping (Fig. 24). The lower value of vertical permeability in this case leads to a slower upward migration of injected CO$_2$ gas to the top of the formation, and a more rapid horizontal migration in middle and bottom of the formation,
resulting in more contact between injected CO$_2$ gas and formation waters and more dissolution of CO$_2$ gas (Fig. 25). For Case 7 with increase in residual gas saturation, amounts of CO$_2$ in different trapping mechanisms are slightly changed compared to the base-case during the CO$_2$ injection period (first 100 years). However, after injection stops, the gas trapping increases and the solubility trapping decreases. This is similar to the result of Audigane et al (2007). Increase in residual gas saturation limits CO$_2$ movement in the gas residing in porous rock (Fig. 26), which leads to decreasing contact between CO$_2$ gas and formation waters and decreasing dissolution of CO$_2$ gas.

The effect of the hydrological parameters on amounts of CO$_2$ storage in different trapping mechanisms is smaller than that of mineral reaction rate and abundance. However, variations in hydrological parameters can affect the spatial distribution of injected CO$_2$ in geologic formations, which is very important for studying the geological storage of CO$_2$.

4. Findings and conclusions

We have developed a 2D radial reactive transport model for the injection of CO$_2$ in a deep saline formation, using mineralogical composition and water chemistry encountered in Songliao Basin of China. Major findings and conclusions from simulations are summarized as follows:

1. Different storage forms of CO$_2$ vary with time. In the CO$_2$ injection period, a large amount of CO$_2$ remains as a free supercritical phase (gas trapping), and the amount dissolved in the formation water (solubility trapping) gradually increases. After injection stops, gas trapping decreases, solubility trapping increases slightly due to migration and diffusion of the CO$_2$ plume, and the amount trapped by precipitation of carbonate minerals increases
with time.

2. During the injection period, a small fraction of CO₂ gas is trapped in the porous rock as residual gas, and most of CO₂ gas accumulates below the caprock. Later, the CO₂ gas saturation decreases as it continues to disperse and further dissolve in groundwater. The bicarbonate in groundwater complexes with dissolved cations from aluminosilicate minerals further increases the solubility trapping. The residual gas keeps CO₂ dissolving into groundwater and precipitating carbonate minerals. As a result, the amount of CO₂ in the gas phase gradually decreases.

3. Limited numbers of sensitivity simulations have been performed. For the Songliao Basin sandstone, variations in the reaction rate and abundance of chlorite, and plagioclase composition affect significantly the estimates of mineral alteration and CO₂ storage in different trapping mechanisms. The effect of vertical permeability and residual gas saturation on the overall storage is smaller compared to the geochemical factors. However, they can affect the spatial distribution of the injected CO₂ in the formations.

4. The CO₂ mineral trapping capacity could be in the order of ten kilogram per cubic meter medium for Songliao Basin sandstone, and may be higher depending on the composition of primary aluminosilicate minerals especially the content of Ca, Mg, and Fe. In the base-case, precipitation of ankerite requires Ca²⁺ provided by the dissolution of calcite, Mg²⁺ and Fe²⁺ provided by the dissolution of chlorite. Variation in Ca content in Plagioclase affect significantly carbonate mineral precipitation, then amounts of CO₂ mineral trapping.

Because of rather significant reactivity of the storage reservoir, the potential impact on porosity and feedback on fluid flow and mechanical stability should be investigated in the
future. The range of problems concerning water-rock-CO$_2$ interaction is very broad. The present simulation results and conclusions are specific to the conditions and parameters considered. Due to computational constraints, our studies did not consider medium heterogeneities and geometric complexities. The “numerical experiments” presented here give a detailed view of the dynamical interplay between coupled hydrologic and chemical processes, albeit in an approximate fashion. A critical evaluation of modeling results can provide useful insight into the long-term CO$_2$ storage and geochemical performance.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Formation</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Thickness (m)</th>
<th>Source rock</th>
<th>Reservoir</th>
<th>Seal rock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quaternary</td>
<td>Plio.</td>
<td>Taikang</td>
<td>Nt</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Mi.</td>
<td>Daan</td>
<td>Nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oe-Ea.</td>
<td>Yan</td>
<td>K2-3y</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mingshui</td>
<td>K2m2</td>
<td>0-333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K2m1</td>
<td>0-243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sifangtai</td>
<td>K2s</td>
<td>0-413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Cretaceous</td>
<td>K1n5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K1n4</td>
<td></td>
<td>155-334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K1n3</td>
<td></td>
<td>47-131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K1n2</td>
<td></td>
<td>50-252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K1n1</td>
<td></td>
<td>27-222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Cretaceous</td>
<td>K2y2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>17-140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K1y1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qingshantou</td>
<td>K1qn2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>263-503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K1qn1</td>
<td></td>
<td>36-131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantou</td>
<td>K1q4</td>
<td></td>
<td>65-128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K1q3</td>
<td></td>
<td>451-672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K1q2</td>
<td></td>
<td>212-417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K1q1</td>
<td></td>
<td>356-651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Denglouku</td>
<td>K1d4</td>
<td></td>
<td>134-212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K1d3</td>
<td></td>
<td>250-621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K1d2</td>
<td></td>
<td>309-700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K1d1</td>
<td></td>
<td>119-220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurassic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 1.
Hydrogeological parameters used in the simulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Sandstone formation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porosity</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permeability (m²)</td>
<td>1.0×10⁻¹³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of vertical to horizontal permeability</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressibility (Pa⁻¹)</td>
<td>4.5×10⁻¹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffusivity (m²/s)</td>
<td>1.0×10⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock grain density (kg/m³)</td>
<td>2600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formation heat conductivity (W/m °C)</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock grain specific heat (J/kg °C)</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (°C)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure (bar)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative permeability model:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid (Van Genuchten)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ k_w = \sqrt{S'} \left{1 - \left[1 - (S'')^{\frac{1}{m}}\right]^2 \right} ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ S'' = (S_i - S_p) / (1 - S_p) ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ S_p : \text{residual water saturation} ]</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ m : \text{exponent} ]</td>
<td>0.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas (Corey):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ k_w = (1 - \hat{S})^3 (1 - \hat{S}^3) ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ \hat{S} = (S_i - S_p) / (S_i - S_p - S_p) ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ S_p : \text{residual gas saturation} ]</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capillary pressure model (Van Genuchten):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ P_{cap} = -P_0 \left{ S' \right}^{1/m} - 1 \right}^m ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ S' = (S_i - S_p) / (1 - S_p) ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ S_p : \text{residual water saturation} ]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ m : \text{exponent} ]</td>
<td>0.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ P_0 : \text{strength coefficient} ]</td>
<td>[ P_0 = 19.61 \text{ kPa} ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2.
Mineralogical composition of the Songliao Basin derived from the lithology slice analysis of clastic rocks, initial mineral volume fractions introduced in the model, and possible secondary mineral phases used in the simulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sandstone mineral compositions</th>
<th>Volume fraction</th>
<th>Minerals used in the model</th>
<th>Chemical composition</th>
<th>Volume fraction used in the model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary minerals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartz</td>
<td>0.2570</td>
<td>Chalcedony</td>
<td>SiO$_2$</td>
<td>0.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaolinite</td>
<td>0.0087</td>
<td>Kaolinite</td>
<td>Al$_2$Si$_2$O$_5$(OH)</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illite</td>
<td>0.0275</td>
<td>Illite</td>
<td>K$_0.0$Mg$_0.12$Al$_1.8$(Al$_0.5$Si$_3.5$O$_10$)(OH)$_2$</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorite</td>
<td>0.0268</td>
<td>Chlorite</td>
<td>Mg$<em>{2.5}$Fe$</em>{2.5}$Al$_2$Si$_2$O$_8$(OH)$_8$</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcite</td>
<td>0.0303</td>
<td>Calcite</td>
<td>CaCO$_3$</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagioclase</td>
<td>0.4148</td>
<td>Albite~low</td>
<td>NaAlSi$_3$O$_8$</td>
<td>0.415$^1$/0.415$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oligoclase</td>
<td>Ca$<em>{0.12}$Na$</em>{0.8}$Al$_1.2$Si$_2.8$O$_8$</td>
<td>0$^1$/0.415$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-feldspar</td>
<td>0.2328</td>
<td>K-feldspar</td>
<td>KAlSi$_3$O$_8$</td>
<td>0.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeolite</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>Not used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrite</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>Not used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhydrite</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
<td>Not used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary minerals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesite</td>
<td></td>
<td>MgCO$_3$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolomite</td>
<td></td>
<td>CaMg(CO$_3$)$_2$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siderite</td>
<td></td>
<td>FeCO$_3$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawsonite</td>
<td></td>
<td>NaAlCO$_3$(OH)$_2$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankerite</td>
<td></td>
<td>CaMg$<em>0.3$Fe$</em>{0.7}$(CO$_3$)$_2$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na-smectite</td>
<td></td>
<td>Na$<em>0.29$Mg$</em>{0.26}$Al$<em>{1.7}$Si$</em>{3.97}$O$_{10}$(OH)$_2$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca-smectite</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ca$<em>{0.148}$Mg$</em>{0.26}$Al$<em>{1.7}$Si$</em>{3.97}$O$_{10}$(OH)$_2$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ Plagioclase composition for case 1 (base case).

$^2$ Plagioclase composition for case 5.
Table 3. Initial concentrations of the formation water at reservoir conditions of 50°C and 120 bars. (Iron is the sum of Fe^{2+}, Fe^{3+} and their related complexes. Carbon is the sum of CO_2(aq), CH_4(aq), and their related species such as HCO_3^- and acetic acid(aq). Sulfur is the sum of sulfate and sulfide species. Redox reactions are set using O_2(aq))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Concentration (mol/kg H_2O)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (°C)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Al</td>
<td>0.1362×10^{-07}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>8.348</td>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td>0.3717×10^{-01}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>0.3233×10^{-04}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>0.1697×10^{00}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>0.4100×10^{06}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>0.9366×10^{-03}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>0.3819×10^{-07}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>0.2354×10^{00}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sulfur</td>
<td>0.1000×10^{-19}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>0.6167×10^{-03}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O_2(aq)</td>
<td>0.177×10^{-06}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.
List of parameters for calculating kinetic rate constants of minerals. Note that: (1) all rate
constants are listed for dissolution; (2) $k_{25}$ is kinetic constant at 25°C, $E_a$ is activation energy,
and $n$ is the power term (Eq. 2); (3) the power terms $n$ for both acid and base mechanisms are
with respect to $H^+$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minerals</th>
<th>Surface area (cm²/g)</th>
<th>Parameters for kinetic rate law</th>
<th>Neutral mechanism</th>
<th>Acid mechanism</th>
<th>Base mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$k_{25}$ (mol/m² s)</td>
<td>$E_a$ (kJ/mol)</td>
<td>$k_{25}$</td>
<td>$E_a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcite</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalcedony</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1.2500e-14</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>4.8978e-12</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaolinite</td>
<td>151.6</td>
<td>6.9183e-14</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>2.1380e-10</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illite</td>
<td>151.6</td>
<td>1.6596e-13</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>1.4451e-12</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorite</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>3.0200e-13</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>2.1380e-10</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albite~low</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.7542e-13</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>1.4451e-12</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oligoclase</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1.4451e-12</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>2.1380e-10</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-feldspar</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>3.8905e-13</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>2.1380e-10</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesite</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>4.5709e-10</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>2.1380e-10</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolomite</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.9512e-08</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>2.1380e-10</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(sedimentary disordered)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minerals</th>
<th>Surface area (cm²/g)</th>
<th>Parameters for kinetic rate law</th>
<th>Neutral mechanism</th>
<th>Acid mechanism</th>
<th>Base mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siderite</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1.2598e-09</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>62.76</td>
<td>4.5665e-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawsonite</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1.2598e-09</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>62.76</td>
<td>4.5665e-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankerite</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1.2598e-09</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>62.76</td>
<td>4.5665e-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na-smectite</td>
<td>151.6</td>
<td>1.6596e-13</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>1.0471e-11</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca-smectite</td>
<td>151.6</td>
<td>1.6596e-13</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>1.0471e-11</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>